

1 **Community incidence patterns drive the risk of SARS-CoV-2**
2 **outbreaks and alter intervention impacts in a high-risk institutional**
3 **setting**

4
5 Sean M. Moore,^{1*} Guido España,¹ T. Alex Perkins,¹ Robert M. Guido,² Joaquin B.
6 Jucaban,² Tara L. Hall,² Mark E. Huhtanen,³ Sheila A. Peel,⁴ Kayvon Modjarrad,⁵ Shilpa
7 Hakre,^{5,6} Paul T. Scott⁵

8
9 ¹ Department of Biological Sciences and Eck Institute for Global Health, University of Notre
10 Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

11 ² Moncrief Army Health Clinic, Fort Jackson, South Carolina 29207

12 ³ United States Army Training Center, Fort Jackson, South Carolina 29207

13
14 ⁴ Diagnostics and Countermeasures Branch, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Silver Spring,
15 Maryland 20910

16
17 ⁵ Emerging Infectious Diseases Branch, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Silver Spring, Maryland
18 20910

19
20 ⁶ Henry M. Jackson Foundation for the Advancement of Military Medicine, Inc., Bethesda, Maryland
21 20817

22
23 *Corresponding author: Sean M. Moore, smoore15@nd.edu
24
25
26
27

28 **Abstract**

29

30 Optimization of control measures for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
31 (SARS-CoV-2) in high-risk institutional settings (e.g., prisons, nursing homes, or military
32 bases) depends on how transmission dynamics in the broader community influence
33 outbreak risk locally. We calibrated an individual-based transmission model of a military
34 training camp to the number of RT-PCR positive trainees throughout 2020 and 2021.
35 The predicted number of infected new arrivals closely followed adjusted national
36 incidence and increased early outbreak risk after accounting for vaccination coverage,
37 masking compliance, and virus variants. Outbreak size was strongly correlated with the
38 predicted number of off-base infections among staff during training camp. In addition,
39 off-base infections reduced the impact of arrival screening and masking, while the
40 number of infectious trainees upon arrival reduced the impact of vaccination and staff
41 testing. Our results highlight the importance of outside incidence patterns for modulating
42 risk and the optimal mixture of control measures in institutional settings.

43

44

45 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, agent-based model, epidemiology, disease
46 dynamics, high-risk settings, forecasting

47

48 **Disclaimer**

49 The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be construed to represent
50 the positions of the U.S. Army, the Department of Defense, or the Henry M. Jackson
51 Foundation for the Advancement of Military Medicine, Inc.

52

53 Introduction

54
55 Over the course of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic there have been numerous outbreaks
56 linked to indoor environments where close-contact interactions make preventing
57 transmission difficult (1–3). SARS-CoV-2 is highly transmissible in high-density, indoor
58 settings where prolonged exposures are common, such as on cruise ships and naval
59 vessels as well as in overnight camps, prisons, and nursing homes (1, 2, 4–6). Basic
60 training camps for new military recruits are particularly high-risk settings due to the
61 frequent arrival of new individuals and the close contacts between trainees including
62 group sleeping quarters (7, 8). The average number of contacts and the probability of
63 transmission per contact may both be higher in military basic training and similar
64 institutional settings than they are in the broader community, leading to a higher basic
65 reproduction number (R_0) (9). In addition to R_0 , another critical factor determining the
66 risk of an outbreak in these settings is the probability or rate of SARS-CoV-2
67 introductions from the outside community (10–12). However, the relative importance of
68 external importation pressure versus local transmission dynamics for outbreak risk in
69 high-transmission institutional settings is not well understood. The relative importance of
70 these two factors has important implications for outbreak prevention and control,
71 because interventions can vary in their effectiveness at preventing introductions versus
72 controlling spread of transmission once SARS-CoV-2 has already been introduced into
73 a setting.

74
75 The importation risk into high-risk institutional settings has likely varied across both time
76 and location over the course of the pandemic. Temporal patterns of COVID-19
77 incidence at the local- and national-levels have also varied over the course of the
78 pandemic, with several large national waves of incidence (13). In addition, the timing
79 and magnitude of peak incidence at the state or county level has fluctuated over the
80 course of these waves. There have also been regional outbreaks outside of these
81 waves (14). To assess the risk of an outbreak in high-risk settings, it is therefore
82 important to estimate the importation risk based on the current epidemiological context
83 of the broader community in which the setting is situated. At one extreme, without any
84 introductions the outbreak risk is zero, regardless of R_0 ; while, if multiple infectious
85 individuals are introduced into a large susceptible population with a sufficiently high R_0 ,
86 an outbreak is highly likely (15). If, however, R_0 is closer to or below one, then local
87 conditions and interventions within the institutional setting are likely an important
88 component of the outbreak risk in that setting.

89
90 If outbreak risk is influenced by external importation pressures, then assessing the risk
91 of introductions in real time, or in advance, is a useful component of outbreak
92 prevention and control in institutional settings. As a result, it is important to determine

93 the extent to which the expected number of introductions or importations into a
94 particular setting can be predicted from reported incidence at the local or regional level.
95 Examining the association between national incidence and viral introductions into
96 military training camps is essential, as new recruits arrive on a weekly basis from all
97 over the United States. Beyond the immediate importation pressure, the risk of an
98 outbreak will also depend on the infection history and vaccination status of the
99 population within the setting, as these variables determine an individual's susceptibility
100 to infection (13). In the absence of serology testing, it is possible that population-level
101 susceptibility in a particular setting at any given time could be estimated from local- or
102 national-level infection and vaccination trends, assuming that these are representative
103 of the population of interest (16). It is therefore an urgent question whether publicly
104 available incidence and vaccination data, as well as estimates of important geographic
105 or demographic variations in this data, could be used to estimate the probability of
106 introduction into a particular setting, as well as the likely attack rate or outbreak size
107 following an introduction(s).

108

109 The effectiveness of control measures in high-risk institutional settings will also depend
110 on both the importation risk and R_0 (4, 17, 18). If introduction patterns are the primary
111 driver of outbreak risk then arrival screening and other interventions that prevent
112 importations are important. However, if local conditions, particularly the setting-specific
113 R_0 or transmission rates, are the main driver of outbreak risk, then interventions that
114 prevent local transmission within the community are critical. Active surveillance testing
115 is likely to be important in settings where new individuals regularly arrive from the
116 broader community and serve as potential vectors of SARS-CoV-2 into the local
117 community (12, 19–21). Regarding local conditions, congregate living settings, such as
118 prisons, overnight summer camps, naval vessels, and military training bases, make it
119 difficult to implement certain social distancing measures and therefore may require
120 other interventions (22–26). Non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), such as mask
121 wearing or testing-and-isolation strategies, that lower R_0 below one on their own in low-
122 or moderate-risk settings may not prevent an outbreak in a setting with a high intrinsic
123 R_0 value (26). As a result, a mix of interventions should be considered in these settings.
124 Given the limitations of different control measures, it is important to understand which
125 combination of interventions is most likely to be effective in a particular setting, and
126 whether their effectiveness changes over time with shifts in SARS-CoV-2 epidemiology.

127

128 In this study, we extended an earlier analysis of outbreak dynamics in a military training
129 camp to assess the relative importance of the impact of transmission dynamics in the
130 broader community on importation pressure and outbreak risk during training. First, we
131 tested the predictability of importation pressure in this setting by using publicly available
132 infection estimates to predict SARS-CoV-2 introductions into camps from newly arrived

133 military recruits from all over the United States, as well the probability that military
134 trainers and support staff were infected off base over the course of the training camp.
135 Next, we used an individual-based transmission model to estimate R_0 in this high-risk
136 setting while taking into account changing vaccination rates, mask wearing, and the
137 relative prevalence of different SARS-CoV-2 variants. The model simulates daily
138 contacts between trainees, trainers, and support staff during a ten-week training camp
139 consisting of an initial two-week cocoon period with smaller training units of 60 trainees
140 each, followed by the remaining eight weeks of camp when trainees are assigned to
141 companies of 240 trainees each (Figure S1). Model calibration was conducted by fitting
142 the model to the observed number of reported infections for training camps that began
143 between October 2020 and April 2021. Model results show how outbreak size was
144 associated with the number of introductions from newly arrived trainees or trainers and
145 staff infected off base during training camp over the course of the pandemic. We then
146 used the calibrated model to assess the impact of different control strategies including
147 surveillance testing, mask-wearing, and vaccination mandates. We assessed the
148 effectiveness of these strategies over the course of the pandemic as importation risk
149 and population-level susceptibility changed considerably. Our results highlight the
150 importance of addressing the broader community context when designing prevention
151 and control efforts for high-risk settings.

152

153 **Results**


154

155 *Infections in arriving trainees and correlations in observed infections*

156

157 The observed portion of new military trainees testing positive by RT-PCR for SARS-
158 CoV-2 infection on arrival at camp between the first week of October 2020 and the first
159 week of October 2021 ranged from 0.6% to 10.7% (Figures 1A,2A). There was a
160 significant correlation between the portion of trainees testing positive on arrival and the
161 portion of trainees testing positive during the initial two-week cocoon period ($r=0.47$,
162 $p=0.016$). There was also a significant correlation between the portion of trainees
163 testing positive on arrival and the portion of trainees testing positive during the entire
164 training camp ($r=0.46$, $p=0.020$), as well as a significant correlation between the portion
165 of trainees testing positive during the initial cocoon period and the portion of trainees
166 testing positive during the post-cocoon period ($r=0.66$, $p=0.001$; Figure 1B). Although
167 the number of trainers and support staff infected off base during training camp was not
168 reported, there was a significant correlation between incidence in the surrounding
169 county during training camp and both the number of trainees testing positive on arrival
170 ($r=0.69$, $p<0.001$), and the number of positive tests during the entire training camp
171 ($r=0.43$, $p=0.029$; Figure 1C).


172



173
174 **Figure 1. Correlations between observed SARS-CoV-2 positive tests.** (A) Correlation
175 between the number of new trainees testing positive upon arrival at training camp and the
176 number of positive tests during the initial two-week cocoon period or the entire ten-week training
177 camp. (B) Correlation between the number of positive tests during the cocoon and post-cocoon
178 periods. (C) Correlation between incidence in the adjacent county during the ten-week training
179 camp and the number of positive tests during training camp.

180
181 From October 2020 to October 2021, our median estimate of the portion of new arrivals
182 expected to test positive ranged from 1.9% (95% prediction interval (PrI): 1.1-2.8%) on
183 10/10/20, to a peak of 8.8% (95% PrI: 7.1%-10.9%) on 01/16/2021, followed by a
184 decline and then a second peak of 6.2% (95% PrI: 4.8-7.8%) on 09/04/2021 following
185 the spread of the delta variant (Figure 2A). The 95% prediction interval of our estimates
186 overlapped with the 95% confidence interval for the observed number of positive
187 trainees on arrival in 35 of 44 weeks during this time period. The correspondence
188 between observed and simulated positive trainees on arrival indicates that adjusted,
189 national-level infection estimates provide a useful, independent prediction of the risk of
190 importation into this setting. Simulating beyond our observation period, our model
191 predicts a large omicron wave starting in late 2021 and peaking at 9.3% (95% PrI: 7.5-
192 11.2%) on 01/22/2022. Following this peak, the portion of new trainees testing positive
193 on arrival declined rapidly up to March 2022 and was forecasted to continue to decline
194 to 0.8% (95% PrI: 0.4-1.5%) by 03/19/2022 based on CDC projections (27). The
195 modeled fraction of trainers and support staff infected off base ranged from a low of
196 0.0% (95% PrI: 0.0-2.9%) for the training camp beginning on 05/01/2021 to a high of
197 10.0% (95% PrI: 4.0-15.0%) for the training camp beginning on 12/04/2021. Because all
198 of the off-base infections over the 10-week training period are grouped by the camp
199 start date in Figure 2E, these peaks occur earlier than the peaks in the number of
200 infections in newly arrived trainees.

201



202
203 **Figure 2. Portion of individuals infected before or during training camp.** (A) Portion of new
204 recruits testing positive upon arrival, (B) Portion of trainees testing positive during the initial
205 cocoon period, (C) portion of trainees testing positive during the post-cocoon training period,
206 and (D) portion of trainers and support staff infected off base during training camp. The red
207 circles in (A-C) are the observed portion of positives for each time period. Dashed line
208 represents the start of the period when estimates are based on forecasted cases from the CDC
209 forecasting project (27).
210

211 *Basic reproduction number, R_0 , and training camp transmission patterns*

212
213 The estimated basic reproduction number, R_0 , for the original SARS-CoV-2 during
214 training camp was 6.5 (95% credible interval (CrI): 6.0-6.8). Based on estimates of their
215 increased transmissibility (see Table S2), the resulting R_0 values for the major variants
216 of concern during the cocoon period were 8.4 (95% CrI: 7.7-8.8) for alpha, 9.0 (95% CrI:
217 8.3-9.4) for gamma, 12.9 (95% CrI: 11.8-13.5) for delta, and 18.6 (95% CrI: 17.1-19.5)
218 for omicron. The estimated dispersion parameter for R_0 was 4,466 (95% CrI: 501-
219 10,000), indicating that there was not strong evidence for overdispersion of transmission
220 in this setting. Overall, our model was able to recreate the observed outbreak size
221 during the entire training camp, with the 95% prediction interval for the portion of
222 recruits testing positive during training camp overlapping with 15 out of 20 observations


223 (and 17 out of 20 of the 95% confidence intervals for the observations). The simulated
224 portion of trainees testing positive during the cocoon period matched the observed
225 number of trainees testing positive during this period well, with the exception of two
226 large observed outbreaks at the end of 2020 (right after the holiday break when most
227 trainees travel off base, a phenomenon not captured in our model) and three smaller
228 outbreaks in March-April 2021 (Figure 2C). The predicted number of individuals testing
229 positive during the post-cocoon period of training camp also matched observations well,
230 although several larger outbreaks fell above the 95% range of the simulations in 2021
231 (Figure 2C).

232
233 The expected number of individuals testing positive in both the cocoon and post-cocoon
234 periods of training camp exhibited peaks during the delta and omicron waves in the
235 summer and winter of 2021 that largely followed the curve of trainees testing positive on
236 arrival and the expected number of introductions from trainers and staff infected off
237 base (Figure 2E). However, both of these peaks were larger than the peak in early
238 2021, despite the number of positive arrivals not being higher than during the early-
239 2021 peak, due to the increased transmissibility of the delta and omicron variants
240 relative to the original virus. In particular, the expected number of positive individuals
241 during the post-cocoon period peaked at 24.3% (95% PrI: 14.8-28.0%) for the camp
242 starting 12/04/2021, compared to only 4.8% (95% PrI: 1.2-9.2%) for the camp that
243 started 01/02/2021. This peak in infections during training camp also occurred earlier
244 than the peak of arrivals on 01/22/2022 (Figure 2A). Although the number of positive
245 arrivals was forecasted to decline in February and March 2022, the number of trainees
246 testing positive during the post-cocoon training period remained high, likely due to the
247 high transmissibility of the omicron variant and the waning protection of individuals who
248 were vaccinated or infected earlier in 2021.

249
250 *Association between importations, R_0 , and outbreak size*


251
252 To examine the impact of importations and R_0 on outbreak size, we compared
253 simulated outcomes in training camps starting each week, as both importations and R_0
254 varied over the course of the pandemic. However, because other factors also varied
255 over the same timeframe (e.g., vaccination coverage, variants, levels of naturally-
256 acquired immunity), their impact cannot be isolated, adding uncertainty to our estimates
257 of the associations between importations or R_0 and outbreak size. The number of
258 infections during the cocoon period showed a positive correlation with the number of
259 new trainees expected to be infectious upon arrival (based on the number infected in
260 the two weeks prior to arrival) (Figure 3A), but there was no clear relationship between
261 the number of potentially infectious new arrivals and the total number of individuals
262 infected during the entire training camp (Figure 3B). However, there was a strong

263 positive relationship between the predicted number of staff infected off base and the
264 total number of individuals infected during training camp, although the relationship
265 appears to reach a saturation point as the infection rate during camp approaches 100%
266 (Figure 3C). The relationship between outbreak size (the portion of individuals infected
267 during training camp) and the number of infectious arrivals, or staff infected off base,
268 was similar across the entire period of study, but outbreak sizes were much larger per
269 importation when the delta and omicron variants predominated (Figure S2). Outbreak
270 size was also positively correlated with the mean R_0 at the start of training camp,
271 although this relationship was nonlinear, partially due to changes in the effective
272 reproduction number (R_t) over the course of the pandemic (Figure 4A). The effect of R_0
273 on outbreak size persisted even when controlling for importation pressure, with outbreak
274 size increasing as either R_0 or the rate of introductions from off base increased (Figure
275 4B).
276



277

278 **Figure 3. Effect of portion of trainees infectious upon arrival or portion of staff infected**
279 **off base on outbreak size.** (A) Portion of trainees infected during the cocoon period or (B) the
280 portion of all individuals infected during training camp as a function of the predicted number of
281 trainees who were infected in the two weeks prior to arrival. (C) Portion of all individuals infected
282 during training camp as a function of the predicted number of staff who were infected off base.
283




284 **Figure 4. Effect of R_0 on outbreak size.** (A) Portion of all individuals infected during training
285 camp as a function of the mean estimated basic reproduction number, R_0 , at the start of training
286 camp (based on the relative proportions of different variants of concern currently circulating
287 nationally). (B) Portion of all individuals infected during training camp as a function of the
288 predicted number of staff who were infected off base and R_0 at the start of training camp.
289

290
291 *Impact of existing interventions*

292
293 Our model predicts that the percentage of new trainees testing positive during the
294 cocoon period would have been noticeably higher without active surveillance testing on


295 arrival (Figure 5A). For example, for the training camp starting on 01/02/2021, the
296 percentage of trainees testing positive at the end of the cocoon period was projected to
297 be 10.5% (95% PrI: 2.9-20.9%) with arrival testing, but 30.7% (95% PrI: 19.3-41.5%)
298 without testing. The differences were even larger when the delta and omicron variants
299 were dominant. At the peak of the delta wave on 08/21/2021, the predicted number of
300 positive trainees was 15.1% (95% PrI: 4.5-27.8%) with arrival testing and 43.8% (95%
301 PrI: 27.7-54.7%) without arrival testing. At the peak of the omicron wave on 01/08/2022,
302 the predicted number of positive trainees were 26.0% (95% PrI: 13.2-43.7%) and 66.5%
303 (95% PrI: 49.8-77.8%) with or without arrival testing, respectively. Over the whole
304 simulation period, the median number of positive trainees during the cocoon period was
305 5.6% with arrival testing (95% PrI: 0.1-27.8%) and 20.1% (95% PrI: 2.4-65.0%) without
306 arrival testing. The impact of arrival surveillance testing on the attack rate over the
307 entire training period was not as large as the impact during the initial cocoon period
308 (Figure 5B), because arrival testing did not reduce transmission in the post-cocoon
309 period, and for some training periods the attack rate was higher in the post-cocoon
310 period with arrival testing due to the smaller number of trainees who were infected
311 during the cocoon period (Figure 5C). In contrast to the large impact of arrival testing on
312 transmission during the cocoon period, model simulations suggest that surveillance
313 testing at the end of the cocoon period had only a small impact on the percentage of
314 trainees who subsequently tested positive during the remainder of the training period
315 (Figure 5B,D). The median number of trainees testing positive during the post-cocoon
316 training period was 9.8% (95% PrI: 0.0-24.1%) with testing and 11.6% (95% PrI: 0.0-
317 25.7%) without active surveillance testing at the end of the cocoon period.
318



319
320 **Figure 5. Impact of surveillance testing on outbreak size.** (A) Portion of trainees (recruits)
321 testing positive during the initial cocoon period with and without active surveillance testing upon
322 arrival. (B) Portion of all individuals infected during training camp with and without active
323 surveillance testing upon arrival. (C) Portion of trainees (recruits) testing positive during the
324 post-cocoon training period with and without active surveillance testing upon arrival. (D) Portion
325 of trainees (recruits) testing positive during the post-cocoon training period with and without
326 active surveillance testing at the end of the cocoon period. The black circles in (A,C,D) are the
327 observed portion of positive trainees for the appropriate time period. Dashed line represents the
328 start of the period when estimates are based on forecasted cases from the CDC forecasting
329 project (27).

330
331 Mask wearing also had a substantial impact on the number of individuals who were
332 infected during training camp (Figures 6A,B). The median number of individuals infected
333 during training camp was 44.5% (95% PrI: 0.2-94.4%) under our baseline scenario
334 where compliance with masking guidelines varied over the course of the pandemic.
335 When no masks were worn at all during training camp, a median of 57.2% (2.2-98.0%)
336 of individuals were infected, and when no masks were worn and there were also no
337 surveillance tests upon arrival or at the end of the cocoon period, 69.9% (95% PrI: 16.2-
338 97.3%) were infected. Under an alternate scenario where mask-wearing compliance
339 was 100% (except while sleeping or eating), only 31.1% (95% PrI: 0.2-90.3%) of
340 individuals were infected during training camp. The voluntary vaccination of

341 unvaccinated trainees upon arrival at training camp did not have a large impact on the
342 number of individuals infected during training camp (Figures 6C,D). Compared to the
343 baseline infection attack rate of 44.5% (95% PrI: 0.2-94.4%) with voluntary vaccination
344 starting on 05/22/2021, the median infection attack rate was 45.7% (95% PrI: 0.4-
345 96.4%) without voluntary vaccination upon arrival, and still 42.0% (95% PrI: 0.3-91.2%)
346 even with a 100% uptake rate among unvaccinated trainees. The prediction intervals for
347 the attack rates presented in this section are often quite wide because they incorporate
348 both model stochasticity and variability in epidemiological conditions (e.g., variants,
349 importation pressure, vaccination coverage) over the course of the pandemic.
350




351
352 **Figure 6. Impact of mask wearing or vaccination on outbreak size.** (A) Impact of
353 mask wearing on the portion of all individuals infected, and (B) portion of individuals with
354 symptomatic infections during training camp. Baseline mask wearing rate varied over
355 the course of the pandemic (see Methods). (C) Impact of vaccinating un-vaccinated
356 trainees upon arrival at training camp on the portion of all individuals infected and (D)
357 the portion of individuals with symptomatic infections during training camp. Baseline
358 vaccination rate varied over the course of the pandemic (see Methods). Dotted line is
359 the date for the start of vaccination requirement (05/22/2021).

360
361 *Impact of alternative intervention scenarios*

362

363 In addition to assessing the impact of interventions that were implemented, we also
364 examined the potential impact of several interventions that were not implemented:
365 requiring vaccination of all trainers and staff by 05/22/2021 (with a booster administered
366 on 12/01/2021), weekly or daily antigen testing of trainers and staff, or requiring that
367 new trainees provide proof of full vaccination prior to the start of training camp
368 beginning on 05/22/2021 (with a booster required after 12/01/2021). Because of the
369 delayed rollout of the vaccine, here we focus on the impact of these interventions on
370 training camps starting after 05/31/2021. Of the additional interventions, requiring daily
371 antigen testing for trainers and staff had the largest impact on infection attack rates,
372 reducing the number of individuals infected during training camp by 26.8% (95% CrI:
373 23.9-29.7%; $t=18.5$, $p<0.001$) and the number of symptomatic infections by 28.0% (95%
374 CrI: 24.6-31.5%; $t=16.3$, $p<0.001$) compared to the default intervention scenario (Figure
375 7). Requiring new trainees to be fully vaccinated prior to arrival only reduced total
376 infections by 7.1% (95% CrI: 5.1-9.2%; $t=7.0$, $p<0.001$), but reduced the number of
377 symptomatic infections by 27.5% (95% CrI: 24.2-30.9%; $t=16.7$, $p<0.001$; Figure 7).
378 Both of these interventions had a greater impact on symptomatic infections than
379 masking, which was the most effective of the implemented interventions after
380 05/31/2021, with 100% masking reducing symptomatic infections by 12.8% (95% CrI:
381 10.9-14.8%; $t=13.5$, $p<0.001$) relative to the default masking scenario and by 21.1%
382 (95% CrI: 17.9-24.5%; $t=13.0$, $p<0.001$) relative to a scenario with no masking (Figure
383 7). Requiring staff vaccination had a more modest impact, reducing infections by 6.5%
384 (95% CrI: 4.6-8.5%; $t=6.7$, $p<0.001$) and symptomatic infections by 7.7% (95% CrI: 5.3-
385 10.1%; ; $t=6.4$, $p<0.001$). However, combining all three additional interventions was
386 highly effective against both total infections and symptomatic infections, reducing these
387 by 47.0% (95% CrI: 41.4-52.5%; $t=17.0$, $p<0.001$) and 59.0% (95% CrI: 52.8-65.2%; $t=$
388 19.2, $p<0.001$) respectively, relative to the default scenario with arrival screening,
389 variable masking compliance, and voluntary vaccination upon arrival. Compared to a
390 scenario with no interventions, combining arrival screening and moderate masking
391 compliance with the three additional interventions reduced all infections by 53.2% (95%
392 CrI: 47.2-59.2%; $t=18.0$, $p<0.001$) and symptomatic infections by 66.8% (95% CrI: 59.5-
393 74.1%; $t=18.5$, $p<0.001$; Figure 7).
394




395
396 **Figure 7. Impact of different intervention strategies on the total number of**
397 **individuals infected and the number of symptomatic infections during training**
398 **camp.** All percent reductions are relative to the baseline scenario minus that particular
399 intervention, except for the 'All interventions' scenario which is relative to a scenario
400 with no interventions.

401
402 *Impact of importation pressure on intervention effectiveness*

403
404 The impact of several individual interventions, and all interventions combined,
405 weakened as the portion of new trainees infected in the two weeks prior to camp
406 increased (Figure 8A). Fewer symptomatic infections were prevented by mask wearing
407 (5.4 additional symptomatic infections per one percentage point increase (PI) in the
408 infection attack rate, $p=0.005, r^2=0.18$), requiring staff vaccination (2.7 additional
409 symptomatic infections per PI, $p=0.04, r^2=0.10$), daily staff antigen testing (7.3 additional
410 symptomatic infections per PI, $p<0.001, r^2=0.37$) and all interventions combined (9.0
411 additional symptomatic infections per PI, $p=0.06, r^2=0.08$). Increases in the number of
412 trainers and staff infected off base during training camp also altered the impact of
413 several individual interventions, although it did not significantly reduce the impact of all
414 interventions combined (Figure 8B). The only significant reduction in the impact on an
415 intervention as off-base infections increased was for arrival screening, which prevented

416 4.1 fewer symptomatic infections per one percentage point increase in off-base
417 infections ($p < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.24$).
418



419 **Figure 8. Effect of portion of trainees infectious upon arrival or portion of staff infected**
420 **off base on impact of interventions.** (A) The impact of several interventions as a function of
421 the number of trainees who were infected in the two weeks prior to arrival. (B) The impact of
422

423 several interventions as a function of the number of staff who were infected off base during
424 training camp.

425

426 **Discussion**

427

428 Our calibrated model results show that the risk of viral importation via newly arrived
429 trainees, as well as off-base infections among trainers and support staff, varied
430 considerably over the course of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. In addition, there was a
431 positive correlation between the observed number of trainees testing positive on arrival
432 and the observed fraction who tested positive during training camp. However, although
433 both sources of introductions contributed to the amount of transmission occurring during
434 training camp, the probability of an outbreak and final outbreak size were more strongly
435 correlated with the number of trainers and support staff who were infected off base
436 during the training period. The rate of viral introductions from off base was the strongest
437 indicator of whether an outbreak would occur, but local conditions (as measured by the
438 setting-specific R_0) also influenced outbreak size. As more transmissible SARS-CoV-2
439 variants became dominant in this setting, outbreak sizes increased, even after
440 accounting for the influence of introductions from off base. The combination of high
441 importation rates and a high R_0 value made control efforts difficult, and no single
442 intervention was able to completely prevent outbreaks, particularly once the delta and
443 omicron variants that had even higher R_0 values became dominant. The most effective
444 single intervention was daily antigen testing of trainers and support staff, which reduced
445 the importation pressure from off-base infections. However, the impact of daily testing of
446 staff, as well as the impact of several other interventions, was reduced when importation
447 pressure was high from either newly arrived trainees or from off-base infections among
448 staff. This suggests that preventing SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks in institutional settings
449 requires tailoring multiple interventions that respond to importation pressures from the
450 broader community, in addition to controlling transmission within the setting.

451

452 Despite the modest correlation between the observed number of positive trainees upon
453 arrival at training camp and the number of trainees testing positive during training camp,
454 our model suggests that SARS-CoV-2 introductions from trainers and support staff
455 infected off base during training camp had a much stronger influence on outbreak risk
456 and size. This result aligns with our previous research, which also highlighted the
457 importance of off-base infections among trainers and support staff in driving outbreak
458 risk (8). Introductions from off-base infections are important drivers of outbreak risk
459 because they can seed new outbreaks at any time during training camp, and support
460 staff who interact with trainees from different companies can seed outbreaks in multiple
461 cocoons or companies. Other institutional settings face similar issues with importation
462 pressures from certain community members who have contact with the broader
463 community on a regular basis and can therefore introduce the virus at any time: prison

464 staff and visitors (28), nursing home staff and visitors (18), or off-campus infections
465 among college and university students following pre-matriculation screening (12, 29,
466 30). These individuals are also of particular importance for broader prevention efforts
467 because, during an outbreak within an institutional setting, they can also spread the
468 virus in the opposite direction back into the broader community (1, 31).

469
470 Of the interventions that were implemented during basic training in 2020 and 2021, our
471 model suggests that mask wearing was the most effective at reducing the number of
472 both symptomatic and total infections. However, the effectiveness of mask wearing did
473 decrease as importation pressure from newly arrived trainees or staff infected off base
474 increased, and at the highest observed rates of positivity among newly arrived trainees,
475 arrival PCR screening was equally as effective as mask wearing at reducing infections
476 during training camp. Mask wearing was also not effective enough to completely
477 prevent outbreaks except when importations were low over the entire training period.
478 The effectiveness of mask wearing is reduced in this setting by the communal sleeping
479 quarters and communal dining. In addition, the most effective N95 or KN95 masks were
480 not required, and anecdotal evidence suggests that compliance was well below 100%
481 during certain periods of the pandemic. However, increasing masking compliance to
482 100% in our model only led to modest reductions in outbreak size during most periods
483 of the pandemic. PCR screening of all newly arrived trainees also lowered the number
484 of infections in training camp and maintained its effectiveness even when positivity rates
485 among incoming trainees were at their highest. However, its impact on transmission
486 was limited to the first two weeks of training camp (the cocoon period), and its impact
487 was minimal when introductions via off-base infections of trainers and staff were high.
488 The final implemented intervention, offering voluntary vaccination of unvaccinated
489 trainees upon arrival, had almost no impact on outbreak size and did not reduce
490 imported infections due to the timing of the intervention.

491
492 Our model results indicate that several interventions that were not implemented might
493 have had a larger impact on outbreak risk—and outbreak size—than those interventions
494 that were implemented (surveillance testing, masking, and voluntary vaccination for new
495 trainees upon arrival). The intervention with the largest average impact over the course
496 of the pandemic was daily antigen testing of trainers and support staff. The large impact
497 of this intervention highlights the importance of preventing, or at least reducing, the
498 number of viral introductions via off-base infections. The impact of testing trainers and
499 staff did decline as importation pressure from newly arrived trainees increased. As a
500 result, estimating importation pressure from regional or national incidence patterns may
501 be an important component of SARS-CoV-2 prevention and control efforts in this and
502 similar institutional settings. Knowledge of importation pressure can be used to tailor the
503 prevention strategy, ideally by implementing multiple interventions that target different

504 sources of introduction into the community (e.g., screening both incoming trainees upon
505 arrival and testing trainers and support staff who live off base on a regular basis). Unlike
506 daily antigen testing, weekly surveillance testing of trainers and support staff via PCR or
507 antigen tests had minimal impact on outbreak size, likely due to the short generation
508 interval of SARS-CoV-2 and the quick rise in infectiousness within a few days of
509 infection (32–35). Although daily antigen testing of staff had the largest impact on
510 infections, it is likely not the most cost effective or feasible intervention due to the large
511 number of tests that would be required on a daily basis. Each training cohort is
512 supported by up to 120 trainers and staff, and there are multiple training cohorts on
513 base on any given day.

514
515 Requiring all new military recruits to be fully vaccinated prior to arrival at training camp
516 had a smaller impact on outbreak size (total infections) than daily testing of staff, but
517 had a similar impact on the number of symptomatic infections. In addition, early
518 vaccination was more effective than testing staff when the importation pressure from
519 new trainees was predicted to be high based on national incidence patterns. In this
520 scenario, staff testing is less effective because it does not catch introductions via
521 trainees, while vaccination of trainees prior to arrival both reduces the probability that
522 they will be infectious on arrival (lowering importation pressure) and reduces
523 transmission during training camp (particularly if asymptomatic infections are less
524 infectious). In contrast to the impact of requiring vaccination prior to arrival, voluntary
525 vaccination of trainees upon arrival had almost no effect on outbreak risk and only a
526 small impact on the number of symptomatic infections during training camp. Post-arrival
527 vaccination does not reduce SARS-CoV-2 introductions from arriving trainees, and full
528 protection is only established about halfway through the ten-week training period,
529 limiting the impact on transmission within the camp. Requiring all staff to be vaccinated
530 by 05/31/2021 (and receive a booster dose by 12/01/2021) had a smaller impact on
531 outbreak size than daily testing of staff or pre-arrival vaccination of trainees due to the
532 rapid decline in protection from infection provided by vaccination.

533
534 Combining daily antigen testing of staff with a vaccine requirement for new trainees
535 prior to arrival had an additive impact on reductions in both the total number of
536 infections and symptomatic infections during training camp. Screening new trainees
537 upon arrival, adding a vaccine requirement for staff, or requiring masking all further
538 reduced outbreak size when added either individually or as a group. The continued
539 impact of additional interventions showcases the importance of combining multiple
540 interventions in institutional settings with high R_0 , where no currently available
541 intervention is capable of entirely preventing transmission by itself (36–38). While all
542 interventions combined reduced symptomatic infections by ~75% when importation
543 pressure from either new arrivals or staff living off base was low, an increase in viral

544 introductions from either group lowered the overall impact. When importation pressure
545 from newly arrived trainees was at its highest during the pandemic, all interventions
546 combined only prevented about 50% of symptomatic infections, partly because the
547 impact of daily antigen testing of staff was greatly reduced. This highlights the
548 importance of understanding the current source of introductions when implementing
549 intervention strategies, and suggests that at times of high importation risk additional
550 interventions, such as stronger contact tracing and quarantine policies, might be
551 necessary to prevent outbreaks in this or similar institutional settings. One caveat
552 regarding these impact estimates is that they are for training camps that started after
553 vaccination became routine (05/31/2021), and therefore, they mostly reflect periods
554 when the highly transmissible delta and omicron variants were dominant. Outbreak
555 sizes from the first year of the pandemic suggest that even without vaccination, a
556 combination of surveillance testing, masking, and social distancing could limit outbreaks
557 except when importation pressure was at its highest during the winter of 2020-2021.
558

559 Although viral introductions via off-base infections among trainers and staff were a
560 major driver of outbreak size, transmission dynamics within training camp also played a
561 major role, with higher R_0 values leading to larger outbreak sizes at a given off-base
562 infection rate. Our estimate of R_0 for the original SARS-CoV-2 strain in this setting was
563 higher than estimates from broader community settings (39–41), but similar to some
564 estimates from high-risk settings like cruise ships (2, 42), as well as previous estimates
565 from two outbreaks at other military bases (8). The reported number of positive tests
566 during training camp also indicate frequent within-camp transmission, although the
567 extent of these outbreaks is hard to determine because there was no active surveillance
568 after the initial two-week cocoon period and only symptomatic individuals were tested
569 and isolated. This evidence indicates that in addition to interventions intended to
570 prevent introductions, such as screening new trainees upon arrival or daily testing of
571 staff who live off base, control efforts that limit transmission within training camp remain
572 an essential tool to limiting outbreaks, particularly as new variants with increased
573 transmissibility have emerged. While vaccination remains a critical tool for preventing
574 severe disease and hospitalization, its protection against infection is modest and
575 declines rapidly, particularly for the omicron variants that are now dominant (43, 44).
576

577 By estimating the infection histories of new military recruits from national incidence
578 patterns, our model's predictions closely matched the number of new trainees testing
579 positive upon arrival at training camp in 2020 and 2021. This result suggests that
580 publicly available data can be used to assess population-level infection patterns and
581 importation pressure into similar institutional settings. Based on knowledge about the
582 demographic makeup of the population of military recruits (mostly 18-24 year olds) we
583 adjusted infection estimates based on age-specific incidence patterns and

584 geographically-weighted state-level estimates based on historical recruiting patterns.
585 Other institutional settings, such as colleges and universities or summer camps, will
586 have different, but potentially still identifiable, demographic and geographic
587 compositions and could adjust infection estimates accordingly. Forecasting the
588 importation pressure from the broader community is important for prevention and control
589 efforts because our results show that even though arrival screening is relatively
590 effective, it will still miss very recent infections (45, 46). While overall our predictions of
591 positivity among newly arrived trainees closely matched the observed data, there were
592 three weeks when the observed rates of positive infection were substantially higher than
593 our predictions. One possibility for these outliers is that some trainees were infected
594 during shared transportation from a processing center to training camp. Observed
595 positive rates also declined more rapidly than our predictions following epidemic peaks
596 in January and September of 2021, even though peak predictions closely matched
597 observed positive rates. This suggests that actual infections may have fallen more
598 rapidly than estimated by Chitwood et al. (47), at least among the new military trainee
599 cohort.

600

601 *Limitations*

602

603 One limitation of our analysis was that while we estimated off-base infections among
604 trainers and support staff, we did not have any observational data with which to validate
605 those estimates. If the infection risk among military staff was different from the
606 estimated risk among adults in Richland County, SC due to differences in their
607 community contact patterns, then these estimates might not accurately reflect the
608 importation pressure from this source. Another limitation of our model is that we did not
609 have detailed information on contact patterns among trainees or between trainees and
610 staff during training, and therefore contacts within a training unit were randomly
611 assigned and assumed to be of equal duration and strength. Our model therefore is not
612 capable of capturing the impact of contact heterogeneity among trainees on
613 transmission dynamics or the potential role of superspreaders due to the constraints on
614 the number of contacts each agent can have. Given the importance of transmission
615 from trainers and staff to trainees in our model, it would also be useful to assess
616 whether contacts between trainees and staff actually have the same transmission
617 potential as trainee-trainee contacts. Finally, we did not consider the cost-effectiveness
618 or the feasibility of implementing the different interventions included in our analysis.
619 Logistical constraints could outweigh the epidemiological effectiveness of certain
620 interventions depending on the setting.

621

622 *Conclusion*

623

624 Our model highlights how SARS-CoV-2 transmission patterns in the outside community
625 affect outbreak risk in institutional settings similar to the military training camp
626 considered in this study. Outbreak size was highly correlated with the importation
627 pressure from off-base infections among staff, and our model indicates that the single
628 most effective intervention would have been daily antigen screening of trainers and staff
629 living off base. We also found that the effectiveness of some interventions (e.g., arrival
630 screening of new trainees and masking requirements) decreased as importations from
631 off-base infections of staff increased, while the effectiveness of other interventions (e.g.,
632 daily screening of staff, vaccination of staff, masking requirements) decreased as
633 importations from newly arrived trainees increased. These influences of viral
634 introduction rates on intervention effectiveness highlight the importance of tailoring
635 multiple-intervention strategies in institutional settings to address both sources of
636 introduction and local transmission. The correspondence between our estimated
637 infection rates and observed positivity rates among newly arrived trainees also indicates
638 that publicly-available incidence data can be used to predict importation pressure and
639 outbreak risk in real-time, and therefore could inform outbreak prevention and control
640 efforts in institutional settings such as military bases, prisons, schools, and assisted-
641 living facilities.

642

643

644

645

646 **Methods**

647
648 To examine SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics during military basic training, we
649 developed an agent-based model that captures key features of this institutional setting.
650 The model tracks a single cohort of new military recruits (trainees) through the 10-week
651 training period and simulates daily contacts between individual trainees, their trainers,
652 and support staff (Figure S1). Full details of the original model are described in España
653 et al. (8). For this analysis we updated the original model by incorporating temporal
654 dynamics in the importation risk from outside of the military base, vaccination, waning of
655 immunity from natural infection and vaccination, and the introduction of new SARS-
656 CoV-2 variants of concern. The model was implemented in the R programming
657 language (48). Model code, as well as R code to calibrate the model and analyze model
658 results are available at https://github.com/confunguido/basic_training_dynamics.

659 660 *Structure of agents and contacts*

661
662 The model is designed to simulate the daily interactions of new military recruits
663 (trainees), along with their trainers and support staff during the initial ten-week training
664 camp. Individual agents in our model are classified as either trainees, military trainers,
665 or other support staff (Figure S1). We assumed that all new trainees arrive as a single
666 cohort at the beginning of training camp each week and are initially assigned to cocoons
667 containing 60 trainees each, with two trainers assigned to each cocoon. During the
668 initial two-week cocoon (quarantine) period there is no contact between trainees or
669 trainers in different cocoons, but individuals also have contacts with support staff
670 (dining, equipment, etc.) who interact with multiple cocoons. At the end of the two-week
671 cocoon or quarantine period, the trainees, trainers, and support staff from each cocoon
672 are pooled into larger companies with a maximum of 240 trainees each. The default
673 weekly cohort size is 1200 trainees (20 initial cocoons and 5 companies), but most
674 training camps in 2020 and 2021 had smaller cohorts, and a few had over 1200 (a
675 maximum of 1254). We assume that trainees do not leave base during training camp,
676 but that trainers and support staff leave the military base each evening and can
677 therefore become infected in the outside community.

678
679 Prior to simulating transmission dynamics during training camp, the model was first
680 initialized by simulating an infection and vaccination history for each individual based on
681 national incidence and vaccination data (see below). We then constructed a contact
682 network for the entirety of training camp, with trainee-trainee and trainer-trainee
683 contacts restricted to within-cocoon contacts during the initial two-week cocoon period,
684 and to within-company contacts during the post-cocoon period. During the cocoon
685 period, trainees were randomly assigned contacts within their cocoon using a binomial

686 distribution with a probability of 0.2 (a mean of 12 trainee contacts per individual for
687 cocoons of 60 trainees). During the post-cocoon period, trainees were randomly
688 assigned contacts within their company using a binomial distribution with a probability of
689 0.1 (a mean of 24 trainee contacts per individual for companies of 240 trainees).
690 Trainers were assumed to have contact with all trainees in their assigned cocoon, which
691 continued in the post-cocoon period when cocoons had been merged into larger
692 companies. Support staff were randomly assigned contacts with trainees from any
693 cocoon or company. We assumed that the mean number of contacts per staff member
694 was 20. The number of contacts for each staff member was drawn from a multinomial
695 distribution, with the size equal to the number of staff multiplied by the mean number of
696 contacts, and the contact probability drawn from a Beta (1,1) distribution.

697

698 *SARS-CoV-2 infection and transmission*

699

700 SARS-CoV-2 introductions in our simulations occurred either at the start of the
701 simulation via newly arrived infected trainees, or throughout training camp when trainers
702 and support staff were infected off base (see below for description of initial
703 importations). During the training camp, the probability of an infected agent transmitting
704 the virus to a susceptible contact was calculated based on the basic reproduction
705 number (R_0), the time since infection, and the generation interval distribution, which we
706 approximated with a Weibull distribution (see Table S1 for generation interval
707 parameters). The probability of a symptomatic individual infecting each immunologically-
708 naïve (completely susceptible) contact on day t of their infection is

$$709 \quad \rho_{S,t} = \frac{R_0}{\bar{C}} G_t \left(\frac{1}{\text{symp} + (1 - \text{symp} * \alpha)} \right),$$

710 where \bar{C} is the average number of contacts, G_t is the generation distribution on day t ,
711 symp is the probability of an infection being symptomatic, and α is the reduction in
712 infectiousness for asymptomatic infections. For asymptomatic individuals, the probability
713 of transmission to each immunologically-naïve contact on day t is reduced by α , $\rho_{A,t} =$
714 $\rho_{S,t}\alpha$. Therefore, R_0 is equivalent to the sum of daily transmission probabilities across all
715 days of the generation distribution multiplied by the average number of contacts, \bar{C} , and
716 weighted by the probability that an individual develops a symptomatic infection, $R_0 =$
717 $(\text{symp} \sum_t \rho_{S,t} + (1 - \text{symp}) \sum_t \rho_{A,t}) \bar{C}$. The probability of transmission from an infectious
718 individual ($\rho_{S,t}$ or $\rho_{A,t}$) would be reduced if a susceptible contact had some partial
719 immunity to infection from a prior infection or vaccination. The probability of
720 transmission would also be reduced if either the infectious individual or their contact (or
721 both) wore a facemask (see Table S1 for mask efficacy).

722

723 Symptomatic infections manifested according to an incubation period drawn from a
724 discretized gamma distribution (45) and lasted for a certain number of days drawn from

725 a Poisson distribution (49). We assume that trainees are tested via PCR on the day that
726 they become symptomatic. Trainees that tested positive were placed in a communal
727 sick bay and remained there for a minimum of ten days or until their symptoms
728 resolved. Trainers and support staff testing positive isolated at home off base for a
729 minimum of ten days or until their symptoms were resolved.

730

731 *Waning of natural and vaccine-derived immunity*

732

733 Following an infection, we assume that an individual is completely immune to reinfection
734 by all variants for the first 30 days due to the immune response to the primary infection.
735 Individuals remained immune to reinfection from the same variant from day 30 to day 90
736 post-infection, after which immunity waned exponentially according to estimates from
737 Townshend et al. (50). Cross-protection against other variants was modeled as a
738 reduction in immunity relative to immune protection against the infecting variant and
739 was assumed to wane at the same rate. Variant-specific cross-protection estimates are
740 provided in Table S2. The first, second, and booster vaccine doses were assumed to
741 provide protection against infection 14 days after the dose was administered. Initial
742 protection against infection from the original SARS-CoV-2 virus was 36.8%, 77.5%, and
743 77.5% respectively for these three doses (51), with lower levels of protection for several
744 variants of concern (Table S1 and S2). Protection against infection via vaccination
745 waned according to a logistic equation fit to the estimates of protection at 1-6 months
746 (51).

747

748 The increased transmissibility of the alpha, gamma, and delta variants relative to the
749 transmissibility of the original SARS-CoV-2 strain were obtained from published
750 estimates (Table S2). In the absence of a reliable estimate of the increased
751 transmissibility of the omicron variant that isolated the separate impacts of increased
752 transmissibility and immune escape on its relative fitness, we estimated the relative
753 transmissibility based on the results of a modeling study that examined plausible ranges
754 of transmissibility and immune escape (52). Assuming that protection against an
755 omicron infection from a previous SARS-CoV-2 infection was 56% (53), we selected the
756 most plausible relative transmissibility according to the estimates of (52). For each
757 variant, the relative transmissibility was treated as a multiplier on the R_0 of the original
758 virus.

759

760 *Model initialization*

761

762 Prior to the start of each training camp, we first simulated an infection and vaccination
763 history for each individual agent. The prior infection history and vaccination status of
764 individuals varied significantly over the course of the pandemic (13), and likely had a

765 major impact on transmission dynamics in the military training setting. Therefore, for
766 each cohort we simulated prior infection histories using estimates of daily infections at
767 the state-level from CovidEstim (47). These state-level infection estimates were age-
768 adjusted using national-level age-specific case data from the CDC
769 ([https://data.cdc.gov/Case-Surveillance/COVID-19-Case-Surveillance-Public-Use-](https://data.cdc.gov/Case-Surveillance/COVID-19-Case-Surveillance-Public-Use-Data/vbim-akqf)
770 [Data/vbim-akqf](https://data.cdc.gov/Case-Surveillance/COVID-19-Case-Surveillance-Public-Use-Data/vbim-akqf)) by multiplying the proportion of the population infected on a particular
771 day by the weekly relative risk of infection for the 20–29-year-old age group. The age-
772 adjusted, state-level infection estimates were then aggregated to the national-level with
773 each state weighted by the percentage of military recruits from that state in 2018
774 (<https://www.cfr.org/backgroundunder/demographics-us-military>). The infection estimates
775 were provided as median, 2.5%, and 97.5% confidence intervals, from which we
776 calculated a daily mean and standard deviation. For each trainee, we then used the
777 daily infection estimates to generate an infection history prior to their arrival at training
778 camp. The probability that an individual was infected by the original SARS-CoV-2 virus
779 or one of the alpha, gamma, delta, or omicron variants was estimated using weekly
780 sequence data from GISAID and Covariants.org (54). The weekly proportion of
781 sequences for each variant at the state-level were aggregated to the national level using
782 the same geographical weighting as the infection estimates. The vaccination history for
783 each arriving trainee was estimated in a similar manner using state-level daily estimates
784 of the number of 18–24-year-olds receiving their first, second, and booster doses
785 provided by CDC (55). We also generated infection and vaccination histories for trainers
786 and support staff using the infection and vaccination estimates among individuals 18 or
787 older for Richland County, SC where Fort Jackson is located. The potential
788 infectiousness of newly arrived trainees at the start of training camp was determined by
789 their simulated infection histories and the generation interval (Table S1). In addition to
790 importations via newly arrived trainees, the virus can also be imported into the training
791 camp by trainers and staff who live off base and return home every evening. The daily
792 probability of one of these individuals being infected off base was estimated using the
793 same daily CovidEstim infection estimates for Richland County, SC that were used to
794 simulate pre-camp infection histories for trainers and staff.

795

796 *Baseline scenario*

797

798 Surveillance testing via PCR was conducted for all new trainees when they arrived at
799 training camp, and again at the end of the initial two-week quarantine period before
800 cocoons were merged to form the larger companies. Any individuals testing positive
801 during one of these tests were placed in a common isolation bay. During the remainder
802 of training camp, testing and isolation of positives was only performed for symptomatic
803 individuals. A detailed description of the model assumptions regarding test specificity
804 and sensitivity are provided in España et al. (8). A mask-wearing requirement for

805 trainees, trainers, and staff in camp has been in place throughout the pandemic per
806 CDC guidelines for high-risk settings (56), except for when trainees were eating,
807 sleeping, or attending to personal hygiene. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that
808 compliance has not been universal, particularly during periods of low transmission
809 nationally. Therefore, we assumed that masking compliance followed the daily reported
810 mask wearing rate for South Carolina as surveyed by Delphi and reported in Covidcast
811 (57), with an adjustment of 2/3 of this value to account for periods when trainees were
812 indoors but not required to wear masks (sleeping, etc.). Starting the week of
813 05/22/2021, all new trainees who were unvaccinated or incompletely vaccinated were
814 offered a two-dose vaccine regimen upon arrival. While weekly data on vaccine uptake
815 at arrival was not available, based on anecdotal evidence we assumed that vaccine
816 uptake upon arrival among unvaccinated trainees was 25% from 05/22/2021 to
817 06/30/2021, 40% from 07/01/2021 to 12/26/2021, and 60% after 12/26/2021. We
818 assumed that the first dose was administered on day 3 of training camp, with the
819 second dose administered 14 days after the first dose.

820

821 **Model calibration**

822

823 We estimated the basic reproduction number (R_0) for the original SARS-CoV-2 virus in
824 this military training setting by calibrating the model to surveillance data from a U.S.
825 Army training base. Between October 2020 and April 2021, all trainees were tested via
826 PCR on arrival and at the end of the two-week quarantine period. In addition, we also
827 obtained data for the same dates on the number of symptomatic individuals who tested
828 positive via PCR during the remainder of training camp. The arrival test data was not
829 used for model fitting, but was instead used to validate our estimates of the expected
830 number of infections in newly arrived trainees based on national incidence. Initial
831 estimation of R_0 during training camp was done by running the model and assuming
832 that the number of contacts infected by an infectious agent was approximated by a
833 beta-binomial distribution with a dispersion parameter, k . We ran 4000 different
834 parameter combinations using a sobol sequence with R_0 ranging from 1-30 and the
835 dispersion parameter, k , ranging from 10^{-6} to 10^4 . For each parameter combination
836 we ran 200 simulations to capture parameter uncertainty and model stochasticity. The
837 log likelihood for each simulation was estimated by summing the separate log
838 likelihoods of the number of positives during the cocoon period and the post-cocoon
839 training period using a beta-binomial distribution for each period. We then fit a
840 generalized additive model with a Gaussian process smoothing term to produce a joint
841 posterior distribution for R_0 and the dispersion parameter.

842

843 **Analyses**

844 *Model behavior under baseline scenario*

845 Following calibration of the model and the estimation of R_0 , we simulated training camps
846 starting on a weekly basis from October 10, 2020 through March 19, 2022. For training
847 camps starting between 10/10/2020 and 04/10/2021 we used the reported cohort size,
848 which varied from 631 to 1254. For all subsequent training camps, we assumed that
849 there were 1200 trainees, along with 40 trainers and 60 support staff. We performed
850 200 replicate simulations for each week and examined the time course of the outbreak
851 for each replicate, tracking the number of agents who were infected (including off base
852 infections for trainers and support staff) during the initial two-week cocoon period and
853 during the subsequent eight weeks of training camp. We ran these model projections
854 through 03/02/2022 using the daily infection estimates from CovidEstim (47) and the
855 variant data from Covariants.org (54). We then extended the model projections for an
856 additional three weeks using the forecasted state-level case data from the 02/28/2022
857 four-week ahead forecast from the COVID Forecasting project (27). Weekly forecasted
858 case numbers were converted to infection estimates by assuming that the probability of
859 an infection being reported during the forecasted period would equal the mean reporting
860 rate over the course of the pandemic, and then adjusting for the lag between the date of
861 infection and the date a case would be reported.

862 *Assessing the potential impact of different interventions*

863
864 To examine the importance of the surveillance testing, mask wearing, and voluntary
865 vaccination of trainees on arrival we ran counterfactual scenarios with one or more of
866 these interventions removed. We also examined the potential impact of several potential
867 interventions that were not implemented. These additional interventions were enforcing
868 100% masking compliance, surveillance testing of trainers and staff, requiring
869 vaccination of new trainees starting on 05/22/2021, and requiring vaccination of support
870 staff and trainers starting on 05/22/2021 (with required booster shots also administered
871 on 12/01/2021). Three different surveillance testing regimes were considered for staff:
872 weekly testing via PCR, weekly antigen testing, or daily antigen testing. In addition to
873 examining the impact of requiring all unvaccinated trainees to receive a full vaccine
874 course on arrival (rather than arrival vaccination being voluntary), we also examined the
875 impact of requiring trainees to be fully vaccinated before arriving at the beginning of
876 training camp. For this scenario, we assumed that all trainees who were not already
877 vaccinated 35 days prior to the start of training camp would receive their first and
878 second vaccine doses 35 and 14 days prior to arrival respectively, so that they would
879 have the maximum vaccine-derived protection upon arrival. For this pre-arrival
880 vaccination scenario we also assumed that all trainees would receive a booster dose 14
881 days prior to arrival for all training camps starting after 12/01/2021. In addition to
882 simulating each of these additional intervention scenarios individually for each weekly
883 training camp, we also examined the impact of combining the staff surveillance, pre-
884 arrival vaccination, and/or staff vaccination interventions.

885

886 The impact of each intervention was measured by comparing the mean number of
887 infections or symptomatic infections from 200 simulations with and without that
888 intervention. Statistical significance of intervention impact was assessed using a two-
889 sample Student's t-test. To permit comparison between all intervention types, statistical
890 tests were restricted to the impact of interventions during training camps starting after
891 05/31/2021 following the implementation of vaccination requirements. To determine
892 whether the impact of each intervention was influenced by the number of viral
893 introductions from off base, we used linear regression models with mean difference in
894 symptomatic infections with and without that intervention as the response variable and
895 either (a) number of new trainees estimated to have been infected in the two weeks
896 prior to arrival, or (b) the number of trainers and staff infected off base during training
897 camp as the explanatory variable.

898

899

900

902 **Acknowledgements**

903

904 **Funding:**

905

906 Support for this work was provided by the Defense Health Program, U.S. Department of
907 Defense and was supported by a contract from the U.S. Army Medical Research and
908 Development Command to the University of Notre Dame.

909

910 **Author Contributions:**

911

912 Conceptualization: SMM, TAP, TLH, KM, PTS, RMG

913 Methodology: SMM, GE, TAP, RMG, TLH, PTS, SP

914 Software: SMM, GE

915 Formal Analysis: SMM

916 Visualization: SMM

917 Validation: SMM

918 Data acquisition, curation, analysis: MEH, JBJ

919 Interpretation: RMG, PTS

920 Supervision: TAP, KM, PTS, RMG

921 Project administration: TAP, KM, SH

922 Funding acquisition: PTS, SP

923 Writing—original draft: SMM

924 Writing—review & editing: SMM, TAP, GE, KM, MEH, JBJ, RMG, SH, SP, RMG

925

926 **Competing Interests:**

927 Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

928 **Data and materials availability:**

929

930 For questions related to the SARS-CoV-2 testing data used for model calibration,

931 contact the Fort Jackson Public Affairs Office at [usarmy.jackson.93-sig-bde.mbx.atzj-](mailto:usarmy.jackson.93-sig-bde.mbx.atzj-pao@army.mil)

932 pao@army.mil. All publicly available data and all code used in this analysis are

933 available at https://github.com/confunguido/prioritizing_interventions_basic_training

934

935 References

- 936 1. M. A. Waltenburg, T. Victoroff, C. E. Rose, M. Butterfield, R. H. Jervis, K. M. Fedak, J. A.
937 Gabel, A. Feldpausch, E. M. Dunne, C. Austin, F. S. Ahmed, S. Tubach, C. Rhea, A.
938 Krueger, D. A. Crum, J. Vostok, M. J. Moore, G. Turabelidze, D. Stover, M. Donahue, K.
939 Edge, B. Gutierrez, K. E. Kline, N. Martz, J. C. Rajotte, E. Julian, A. Diedhiou, R. Radcliffe,
940 J. L. Clayton, D. Ortbahn, J. Cummins, B. Barbeau, J. Murphy, B. Darby, N. R. Graff, T. K.
941 H. Dostal, I. W. Pray, C. Tillman, M. M. Dittrich, G. Burns-Grant, S. Lee, A. Spieckerman, K.
942 Iqbal, S. M. Griffing, A. Lawson, H. M. Mainzer, A. E. Bealle, E. Edding, K. E. Arnold, T.
943 Rodriguez, S. Merkle, K. Pettrone, K. Schlanger, K. LaBar, K. Hendricks, A. Lasry, V.
944 Krishnasamy, H. T. Walke, D. A. Rose, M. A. Honein, COVID-19 Response Team, Update:
945 COVID-19 Among Workers in Meat and Poultry Processing Facilities - United States, April-
946 May 2020. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **69**, 887–892 (2020).
- 947 2. J. Rocklöv, H. Sjödin, A. Wilder-Smith, COVID-19 outbreak on the Diamond Princess cruise
948 ship: estimating the epidemic potential and effectiveness of public health countermeasures.
949 *Journal of Travel Medicine.* **27** (2020), doi:10.1093/jtm/taaa030.
- 950 3. R. Zhang, Y. Li, A. L. Zhang, Y. Wang, M. J. Molina, Identifying airborne transmission as
951 the dominant route for the spread of COVID-19. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **117**, 14857–
952 14863 (2020).
- 953 4. R. B. Hershov, H. E. Segaloff, A. C. Shockey, K. R. Florek, S. K. Murphy, W. DuBose, T. L.
954 Schaeffer, J. A. Powell Mph, K. Gayle, L. Lambert, A. Schwitters, K. E. N. Clarke, R.
955 Westergaard, Rapid spread of SARS-CoV-2 in a state prison after introduction by newly
956 transferred incarcerated persons - Wisconsin, August 14-October 22, 2020. *MMWR Morb.*
957 *Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **70**, 478–482 (2021).
- 958 5. G. R. Alvarado, B. C. Pierson, E. S. Teemer, H. J. Gama, R. D. Cole, S. S. Jang, Symptom
959 Characterization and Outcomes of Sailors in Isolation After a COVID-19 Outbreak on a US
960 Aircraft Carrier. *JAMA Netw Open.* **3**, e2020981 (2020).
- 961 6. M. L. Barnett, D. C. Grabowski, Nursing Homes Are Ground Zero for COVID-19 Pandemic.
962 *JAMA Health Forum.* **1**, e200369–e200369 (2020).
- 963 7. A. G. Letizia, I. Ramos, A. Obla, C. Goforth, D. L. Weir, Y. Ge, M. M. Bamman, J. Dutta, E.
964 Ellis, L. Estrella, M.-C. George, A. S. Gonzalez-Reiche, W. D. Graham, A. van de Guchte,
965 R. Gutierrez, F. Jones, A. Kalomoiri, R. Lizewski, S. Lizewski, J. Marayag, N. Marjanovic,
966 E. V. Millar, V. D. Nair, G. Nudelman, E. Nunez, B. L. Pike, C. Porter, J. Regeimbal, S.
967 Rirak, E. Santa Ana, R. S. G. Sealfon, R. Sebra, M. P. Simons, A. Soares-Schanoski, V.
968 Sugiharto, M. Termini, S. Vangeti, C. Williams, O. G. Troyanskaya, H. van Bakel, S. C.
969 Sealfon, SARS-CoV-2 Transmission among Marine Recruits during Quarantine. *N. Engl. J.*
970 *Med.* **383**, 2407–2416 (2020).
- 971 8. G. España, T. A. Perkins, S. Pollett, M. E. Smith, S. M. Moore, P. O. Kwon, T. L. Hall, M. H.
972 Beagle Jr, C. K. Murray, S. Hakre, S. Peel, K. Modjarrad, P. T. Scott, Prioritizing
973 interventions for preventing COVID-19 outbreaks in military basic training. *medRxiv* (2021),
974 , doi:10.1101/2021.11.28.21266969.
- 975 9. Q. J. Leclerc, N. M. Fuller, L. E. Knight, CMMID COVID-19 Working Group, S. Funk, G. M.
976 Knight, What settings have been linked to SARS-CoV-2 transmission clusters? *Wellcome*
977 *Open Res.* **5**, 83 (2020).

- 978 10. D. B. Larremore, B. Wilder, E. Lester, S. Shehata, J. M. Burke, J. A. Hay, M. Tambe, M. J.
979 Mina, R. Parker, Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround time for COVID-
980 19 screening. *Sci Adv.* **7** (2021), doi:10.1126/sciadv.abd5393.
- 981 11. B. Revollo, I. Blanco, P. Soler, J. Toro, N. Izquierdo-Useros, J. Puig, X. Puig, V. Navarro-
982 Pérez, C. Casañ, L. Ruiz, D. Perez-Zsolt, S. Videla, B. Clotet, J. M. Llibre, Same-day
983 SARS-CoV-2 antigen test screening in an indoor mass-gathering live music event: a
984 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **21**, 1365–1372 (2021).
- 985 12. H. T. Walke, M. A. Honein, R. R. Redfield, Preventing and Responding to COVID-19 on
986 College Campuses. *JAMA.* **324**, 1727–1728 (2020).
- 987 13. K. Koelle, M. A. Martin, R. Antia, B. Lopman, N. E. Dean, The changing epidemiology of
988 SARS-CoV-2. *Science.* **375**, 1116–1121 (2022).
- 989 14. H. Jalal, K. Lee, D. S. Burke, Prominent Spatiotemporal Waves of COVID-19 Incidence in
990 the United States: Implications for Causality, Forecasting, and Control, ,
991 doi:10.1101/2021.06.29.21259726.
- 992 15. M. Hartfield, S. Alizon, Introducing the outbreak threshold in epidemiology. *PLoS Pathog.* **9**,
993 e1003277 (2013).
- 994 16. J. Zelner, M. Eisenberg, Rapid response modeling of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Science.*
995 **376**, 579–580 (2022).
- 996 17. S. Bagchi, J. Mak, Q. Li, E. Sheriff, E. Mungai, A. Anttila, M. M. Soe, J. R. Edwards, A. L.
997 Benin, D. A. Pollock, E. Shulman, S. Ling, J. Moody-Williams, L. A. Fleisher, A. Srinivasan,
998 J. M. Bell, Rates of COVID-19 Among Residents and Staff Members in Nursing Homes —
999 United States, May 25–November 22, 2020. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly*
1000 *Report.* **70**, 52–55 (2021).
- 1001 18. M. K. Chen, J. A. Chevalier, E. F. Long, Nursing home staff networks and COVID-19. *Proc.*
1002 *Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **118** (2021), doi:10.1073/pnas.2015455118.
- 1003 19. K. Gostic, A. C. Gomez, R. O. Mummah, A. J. Kucharski, J. O. Lloyd-Smith, Estimated
1004 effectiveness of symptom and risk screening to prevent the spread of COVID-19. *Elife.* **9**
1005 (2020), doi:10.7554/eLife.55570.
- 1006 20. L. Rivett, S. Sridhar, D. Sparkes, M. Routledge, N. K. Jones, S. Forrest, J. Young, J.
1007 Pereira-Dias, W. L. Hamilton, M. Ferris, M. E. Torok, L. Meredith, CITIID-NIHR COVID-19
1008 BioResource Collaboration, M. D. Curran, S. Fuller, A. Chaudhry, A. Shaw, R. J. Samworth,
1009 J. R. Bradley, G. Dougan, K. G. Smith, P. J. Lehner, N. J. Matheson, G. Wright, I. G.
1010 Goodfellow, S. Baker, M. P. Weekes, Screening of healthcare workers for SARS-CoV-2
1011 highlights the role of asymptomatic carriage in COVID-19 transmission. *Elife.* **9** (2020),
1012 doi:10.7554/eLife.58728.
- 1013 21. D. Buitrago-Garcia, D. Egli-Gany, M. J. Counotte, S. Hossmann, H. Imeri, A. M. Ipekci, G.
1014 Salanti, N. Low, Occurrence and transmission potential of asymptomatic and
1015 presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: A living systematic review and meta-analysis.
1016 *PLoS Med.* **17**, e1003346 (2020).
- 1017 22. J. E. Marcus, D. N. Frankel, M. T. Pawlak, T. M. Casey, R. S. Blackwell, F. V. Tran, M. J.

- 1018 Dolan, H. C. Yun, COVID-19 Monitoring and Response Among U.S. Air Force Basic Military
1019 Trainees - Texas, March-April 2020. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **69**, 685–688 (2020).
- 1020 23. M. R. Kasper, J. R. Geibe, C. L. Sears, A. J. Riegodedios, T. Luse, A. M. Von Thun, M. B.
1021 McGinnis, N. Olson, D. Houskamp, R. Fenequito, T. H. Burgess, A. W. Armstrong, G.
1022 DeLong, R. J. Hawkins, B. L. Gillingham, An Outbreak of Covid-19 on an Aircraft Carrier. *N.*
1023 *Engl. J. Med.* (2020), doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2019375.
- 1024 24. L. Hawks, S. Woolhandler, D. McCormick, COVID-19 in Prisons and Jails in the United
1025 States. *JAMA Internal Medicine.* **180** (2020), p. 1041.
- 1026 25. L. M. Hagan, S. P. Williams, A. C. Spaulding, R. L. Toblin, J. Figlenski, J. Ocampo, T.
1027 Ross, H. Bauer, J. Hutchinson, K. D. Lucas, M. Zahn, C. Chiang, T. Collins, A. Burakoff, J.
1028 Bettridge, G. Stringer, R. Maul, K. Waters, C. Dewart, J. Clayton, S. de Fijter, R.
1029 Sadacharan, L. Garcia, N. Lockett, K. Short, L. Sunder, S. Handanagic, Mass Testing for
1030 SARS-CoV-2 in 16 Prisons and Jails - Six Jurisdictions, United States, April-May 2020.
1031 *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **69**, 1139–1143 (2020).
- 1032 26. K. Van Naarden Braun, M. Drexler, R. A. Rozenfeld, E. Deener-Agus, R. Greenstein, M.
1033 Agus, M. Joffe, A. Kasowitz, P. Levy, C. Nerwen, Multicomponent Strategies to Prevent
1034 SARS-CoV-2 Transmission - Nine Overnight Youth Summer Camps, United States, June-
1035 August 2021. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **70**, 1420–1424 (2021).
- 1036 27. Home - COVID 19 forecast hub, (available at <https://covid19forecasthub.org>).
- 1037 28. N. M. Lewis, A. P. Salmanson, A. Price, I. Risk, C. Guymon, M. Wisner, K. Gardner, R.
1038 Fukunaga, A. Schwitters, L. Lambert, H. C. Baggett, R. Ewetola, A. C. Dunn, Community-
1039 Associated Outbreak of COVID-19 in a Correctional Facility - Utah, September 2020-
1040 January 2021. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **70**, 467–472 (2021).
- 1041 29. E. Wilson, C. V. Donovan, M. Campbell, T. Chai, K. Pittman, A. C. Seña, A. Pettifor, D. J.
1042 Weber, A. Mallick, A. Cope, D. S. Porterfield, E. Pettigrew, Z. Moore, Multiple COVID-19
1043 Clusters on a University Campus - North Carolina, August 2020. *MMWR Morb. Mortal.*
1044 *Wkly. Rep.* **69**, 1416–1418 (2020).
- 1045 30. K. Doyle, R. A. Teran, J. Reefhuis, J. L. Kerins, X. Qiu, S. J. Green, H. Choi, S. A. Madni,
1046 N. Kamal, E. Landon, R. C. Albert, M. Pacilli, L. E. Furtado, M. K. Hayden, K. J. Kunstman,
1047 C. Bethel, L. Megger, M. J. Fricchione, I. Ghinai, Multiple Variants of SARS-CoV-2 in a
1048 University Outbreak After Spring Break - Chicago, Illinois, March-May 2021. *MMWR Morb.*
1049 *Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **70**, 1195–1200 (2021).
- 1050 31. K. M. Nowotny, K. Seide, L. Brinkley-Rubinstein, Risk of COVID-19 infection among prison
1051 staff in the United States. *BMC Public Health.* **21**, 1036 (2021).
- 1052 32. L. Ferretti, C. Wymant, M. Kendall, L. Zhao, A. Nurtay, L. Abeler-Dörner, M. Parker, D.
1053 Bonsall, C. Fraser, Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with
1054 digital contact tracing. *Science.* **368** (2020), doi:10.1126/science.abb6936.
- 1055 33. S. W. Park, B. M. Bolker, S. Funk, C. J. E. Metcalf, J. S. Weitz, B. T. Grenfell, J. Dushoff,
1056 The importance of the generation interval in investigating dynamics and control of new
1057 SARS-CoV-2 variants. *J. R. Soc. Interface.* **19**, 20220173 (2022).

- 1058 34. X. He, E. H. Y. Lau, P. Wu, X. Deng, J. Wang, X. Hao, Y. C. Lau, J. Y. Wong, Y. Guan, X.
1059 Tan, X. Mo, Y. Chen, B. Liao, W. Chen, F. Hu, Q. Zhang, M. Zhong, Y. Wu, L. Zhao, F.
1060 Zhang, B. J. Cowling, F. Li, G. M. Leung, Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and
1061 transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat. Med.* **26**, 672–675 (2020).
- 1062 35. L. C. Tindale, J. E. Stockdale, M. Coombe, E. S. Garlock, W. Y. V. Lau, M. Saraswat, L.
1063 Zhang, D. Chen, J. Wallinga, C. Colijn, Evidence for transmission of COVID-19 prior to
1064 symptom onset. *Elife*. **9** (2020), doi:10.7554/eLife.57149.
- 1065 36. M. Chinazzi, J. T. Davis, M. Ajelli, C. Gioannini, M. Litvinova, S. Merler, A. Pastore Y
1066 Piontti, K. Mu, L. Rossi, K. Sun, C. Viboud, X. Xiong, H. Yu, M. E. Halloran, I. M. Longini Jr,
1067 A. Vespignani, The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus
1068 (COVID-19) outbreak. *Science*. **368**, 395–400 (2020).
- 1069 37. W. Yang, J. Shaff, J. Shaman, Effectiveness of non-pharmaceutical interventions to contain
1070 COVID-19: a case study of the 2020 spring pandemic wave in New York City. *Journal of*
1071 *The Royal Society Interface*. **18** (2021), doi:10.1098/rsif.2020.0822.
- 1072 38. N. Haug, L. Geyrhofer, A. Londei, E. Dervic, A. Desvars-Larrive, V. Loreto, B. Pinior, S.
1073 Thurner, P. Klimek, Ranking the effectiveness of worldwide COVID-19 government
1074 interventions. *Nat Hum Behav.* **4**, 1303–1312 (2020).
- 1075 39. S. W. Park, B. M. Bolker, D. Champredon, D. J. D. Earn, M. Li, J. S. Weitz, B. T. Grenfell, J.
1076 Dushoff, Reconciling early-outbreak estimates of the basic reproductive number and its
1077 uncertainty: framework and applications to the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) outbreak.
1078 *J. R. Soc. Interface*. **17**, 20200144 (2020).
- 1079 40. M. Biggerstaff, B. J. Cowling, Z. M. Cucunubá, L. Dinh, N. M. Ferguson, H. Gao, V. Hill, N.
1080 Imai, M. A. Johansson, S. Kada, O. Morgan, A. Pastore y Piontti, J. A. Polonsky, P. V.
1081 Prasad, T. M. Quandelacy, A. Rambaut, J. W. Tappero, K. A. Vandemaerle, A. Vespignani,
1082 K. Lane Warmbrod, J. Y. Wong, for the WHO COVID-19 Modelling Parameters Group,
1083 Early Insights from Statistical and Mathematical Modeling of Key Epidemiologic Parameters
1084 of COVID-19. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. **26** (2020), doi:10.3201/eid2611.201074.
- 1085 41. S. Flaxman, S. Mishra, A. Gandy, H. J. T. Unwin, T. A. Mellan, H. Coupland, C. Whittaker,
1086 H. Zhu, T. Berah, J. W. Eaton, M. Monod, Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team, A.
1087 C. Ghani, C. A. Donnelly, S. Riley, M. A. C. Vollmer, N. M. Ferguson, L. C. Okell, S. Bhatt,
1088 Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*.
1089 **584**, 257–261 (2020).
- 1090 42. J. C. Emery, T. W. Russell, Y. Liu, J. Hellewell, C. A. Pearson, CMMID COVID-19 Working
1091 Group, G. M. Knight, R. M. Eggo, A. J. Kucharski, S. Funk, S. Flasche, R. M. Houben, The
1092 contribution of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections to transmission on the Diamond
1093 Princess cruise ship. *Elife*. **9** (2020), doi:10.7554/eLife.58699.
- 1094 43. Lu, L. Lu, B. W.-Y. Mok, L.-L. Chen, J. M.-C. Chan, O. T.-Y. Tsang, B. H.-S. Lam, V. W.-M.
1095 Chuang, A. W.-H. Chu, W.-M. Chan, J. D. Ip, B. P.-C. Chan, R. Zhang, C. C.-Y. Yip, V. C.-
1096 C. Cheng, K.-H. Chan, D.-Y. Jin, I. F.-N. Hung, K.-Y. Yuen, H. Chen, K. K.-W. To,
1097 Neutralization of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Omicron Variant by
1098 Sera From BNT162b2 or CoronaVac Vaccine Recipients. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*
1099 (2021), doi:10.1093/cid/ciab1041.

- 1100 44. S. Cele, L. Jackson, D. S. Khoury, K. Khan, T. Moyo-Gwete, H. Tegally, J. E. San, D.
1101 Cromer, C. Scheepers, D. G. Amoako, F. Karim, M. Bernstein, G. Lustig, D. Archary, M.
1102 Smith, Y. Ganga, Z. Jule, K. Reedoy, S.-H. Hwa, J. Giandhari, J. M. Blackburn, B. I.
1103 Gosnell, S. S. Abdool Karim, W. Hanekom, NGS-SA, COMMIT-KZN Team, A. von
1104 Gottberg, J. N. Bhiman, R. J. Lessells, M.-Y. S. Moosa, M. P. Davenport, T. de Oliveira, P.
1105 L. Moore, A. Sigal, Omicron extensively but incompletely escapes Pfizer BNT162b2
1106 neutralization. *Nature*. **602**, 654–656 (2022).
- 1107 45. S. A. Lauer, K. H. Grantz, Q. Bi, F. K. Jones, Q. Zheng, H. R. Meredith, A. S. Azman, N. G.
1108 Reich, J. Lessler, The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From
1109 Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **172**,
1110 577–582 (2020).
- 1111 46. L. M. Kucirka, S. A. Lauer, O. Laeyendecker, D. Boon, J. Lessler, Variation in False-
1112 Negative Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction–Based SARS-CoV-2
1113 Tests by Time Since Exposure. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **173**, 262–267 (2020).
- 1114 47. M. H. Chitwood, M. Russi, K. Gunasekera, J. Havumaki, F. Klaassen, V. E. Pitzer, J. A.
1115 Salomon, N. A. Swartwood, J. L. Warren, D. M. Weinberger, T. Cohen, N. A. Menzies,
1116 Reconstructing the course of the COVID-19 epidemic over 2020 for US states and
1117 counties: results of a Bayesian evidence synthesis model. *PLoS Comp. Biol.* (2022),
1118 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1010465>.
- 1119 48. R Core Team, *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing (R Foundation for*
1120 *Statistical Computing, 2021)* (2021; <https://www.R-project.org/>).
- 1121 49. J. Chen, T. Qi, L. Liu, Y. Ling, Z. Qian, T. Li, F. Li, Q. Xu, Y. Zhang, S. Xu, Z. Song, Y.
1122 Zeng, Y. Shen, Y. Shi, T. Zhu, H. Lu, Clinical progression of patients with COVID-19 in
1123 Shanghai, China. *J. Infect.* **80**, e1–e6 (2020).
- 1124 50. J. P. Townsend, H. B. Hassler, Z. Wang, S. Miura, J. Singh, S. Kumar, N. H. Ruddle, A. P.
1125 Galvani, A. Dornburg, The durability of immunity against reinfection by SARS-CoV-2: a
1126 comparative evolutionary study. *Lancet Microbe*. **2**, e666–e675 (2021).
- 1127 51. H. Chemaitelly, P. Tang, M. R. Hasan, S. AlMukdad, H. M. Yassine, F. M. Benslimane, H.
1128 A. Al Khatib, P. Coyle, H. H. Ayoub, Z. Al Kanaani, E. Al Kuwari, A. Jeremijenko, A. H.
1129 Kaleeckal, A. N. Latif, R. M. Shaik, H. F. Abdul Rahim, G. K. Nasrallah, M. G. Al Kuwari, H.
1130 E. Al Romaihi, A. A. Butt, M. H. Al-Thani, A. Al Khal, R. Bertollini, L. J. Abu-Raddad,
1131 Waning of BNT162b2 Vaccine Protection against SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Qatar. *N. Engl.*
1132 *J. Med.* **385**, e83 (2021).
- 1133 52. N. Gozzi, M. Chinazzi, J. T. Davis, K. Mu, A. P. y. Piontti, A. Vespignani, N. Perra,
1134 Preliminary modeling estimates of the relative transmissibility and immune escape of the
1135 Omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern in South Africa. *bioRxiv* (2022), ,
1136 doi:10.1101/2022.01.04.22268721.
- 1137 53. H. N. Altarawneh, H. Chemaitelly, M. R. Hasan, H. H. Ayoub, S. Qassim, S. AlMukdad, P.
1138 Coyle, H. M. Yassine, H. A. Al-Khatib, F. M. Benslimane, Z. Al-Kanaani, E. Al-Kuwari, A.
1139 Jeremijenko, A. H. Kaleeckal, A. N. Latif, R. M. Shaik, H. F. Abdul-Rahim, G. K. Nasrallah,
1140 M. G. Al-Kuwari, A. A. Butt, H. E. Al-Romaihi, M. H. Al-Thani, A. Al-Khal, R. Bertollini, P.
1141 Tang, L. J. Abu-Raddad, Protection against the Omicron Variant from Previous SARS-CoV-
1142 2 Infection. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **386**, 1288–1290 (2022).

- 1143 54. E. B. Hodcroft, CoVariants: SARS-CoV-2 mutations and variants of interest (2021).
- 1144 55. IISInfo, COVID-19 vaccination demographics in the United States, national (2021),
1145 (available at [https://data.cdc.gov/Vaccinations/COVID-19-Vaccination-Demographics-in-](https://data.cdc.gov/Vaccinations/COVID-19-Vaccination-Demographics-in-the-United-St/km4m-vcsb)
1146 [the-United-St/km4m-vcsb](https://data.cdc.gov/Vaccinations/COVID-19-Vaccination-Demographics-in-the-United-St/km4m-vcsb)).
- 1147 56. CDC, COVID-19 Community Levels. *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention* (2022),
1148 (available at <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/community-levels.html>).
- 1149 57. A. Reinhart, L. Brooks, M. Jahja, A. Rumack, J. Tang, S. Agrawal, W. Al Saeed, T. Arnold,
1150 A. Basu, J. Bien, Á. A. Cabrera, A. Chin, E. J. Chua, B. Clark, S. Colquhoun, N. DeFries, D.
1151 C. Farrow, J. Forlizzi, J. Grabman, S. Gratzl, A. Green, G. Haff, R. Han, K. Harwood, A. J.
1152 Hu, R. Hyde, S. Hyun, A. Joshi, J. Kim, A. Kuznetsov, W. La Motte-Kerr, Y. J. Lee, K. Lee,
1153 Z. C. Lipton, M. X. Liu, L. Mackey, K. Mazaitis, D. J. McDonald, P. McGuinness, B.
1154 Narasimhan, M. P. O'Brien, N. L. Oliveira, P. Patil, A. Perer, C. A. Politsch, S. Rajanala, D.
1155 Rucker, C. Scott, N. H. Shah, V. Shankar, J. Sharpnack, D. Shemetov, N. Simon, B. Y.
1156 Smith, V. Srivastava, S. Tan, R. Tibshirani, E. Tuzhilina, A. K. Van Nortwick, V. Ventura, L.
1157 Wasserman, B. Weaver, J. C. Weiss, S. Whitman, K. Williams, R. Rosenfeld, R. J.
1158 Tibshirani, An open repository of real-time COVID-19 indicators. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.*
1159 *A.* **118** (2021), doi:10.1073/pnas.2111452118.
- 1160 58. T. A. Perkins, T. Alex Perkins, M. Stephens, W. A. Barrios, S. Cavany, L. Rulli, M. E.
1161 Pfrender, Performance of Three Tests for SARS-CoV-2 on a University Campus Estimated
1162 Jointly with Bayesian Latent Class Modeling. *Microbiology Spectrum.* **10** (2022), ,
1163 doi:10.1128/spectrum.01220-21.
- 1164 59. D. C. Payne, S. E. Smith-Jeffcoat, G. Nowak, U. Chukwuma, J. R. Geibe, R. J. Hawkins, J.
1165 A. Johnson, N. J. Thornburg, J. Schiffer, Z. Weiner, B. Bankamp, M. D. Bowen, A. MacNeil,
1166 M. R. Patel, E. Deussing, CDC COVID-19 Surge Laboratory Group, B. L. Gillingham,
1167 SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Serologic Responses from a Sample of U.S. Navy Service
1168 Members - USS Theodore Roosevelt, April 2020. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **69**,
1169 714–721 (2020).
- 1170 60. C. for Disease Control, Prevention, Others, Duration of isolation and precautions for adults
1171 with COVID-19. *Atlanta, GA: CDC* (2020) (available at
1172 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/duration-isolation.html>).
- 1173 61. F. Campbell, B. Archer, H. Laurenson-Schafer, Y. Jinnai, F. Konings, N. Batra, B. Pavlin, K.
1174 Vandemaele, M. D. Van Kerkhove, T. Jombart, O. Morgan, O. le Polain de Waroux,
1175 Increased transmissibility and global spread of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern as at June
1176 2021. *Euro Surveill.* **26** (2021), doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.24.2100509.
- 1177 62. M. G. Thompson, K. Natarajan, S. A. Irving, E. A. Rowley, E. P. Griggs, M. Gaglani, N. P.
1178 Klein, S. J. Grannis, M. B. DeSilva, E. Stenehjem, S. E. Reese, M. Dickerson, A. L.
1179 Naleway, J. Han, D. Konatham, C. McEvoy, S. Rao, B. E. Dixon, K. Dascomb, N. Lewis, M.
1180 E. Levy, P. Patel, I.-C. Liao, A. B. Kharbanda, M. A. Barron, W. F. Fadel, N. Grisel, K.
1181 Goddard, D.-H. Yang, M. H. Wondimu, K. Murthy, N. R. Valvi, J. Arndorfer, B. Fireman, M.
1182 M. Dunne, P. Embi, E. Azziz-Baumgartner, O. Zerbo, C. H. Bozio, S. Reynolds, J.
1183 Ferdinands, J. Williams, R. Link-Gelles, S. J. Schrag, J. R. Verani, S. Ball, T. C. Ong,
1184 Effectiveness of a Third Dose of mRNA Vaccines Against COVID-19–Associated
1185 Emergency Department and Urgent Care Encounters and Hospitalizations Among Adults
1186 During Periods of Delta and Omicron Variant Predominance — VISION Network, 10 States,

1187 August 2021–January 2022. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. **71** (2022), pp.
1188 139–145.
1189

1190 **Supplementary materials**

1191

1192 **Table S1. Model parameters.**

1193 **Table S2. Variant-specific model parameters.** Relative transmissibility is
1194 transmissibility of a variant relative to the original SARS-CoV-2 strain. Relative cross-
1195 protection is the amount of cross-protection against a particular variant that is provided
1196 by a past infection with a different variant, relative to the level of protection provided by
1197 a same-variant infection. Vaccine protection is the level of protection against infection
1198 by a particular variant relative to vaccine-derived protection against infection by the
1199 original SARS-CoV-2 strain.

1200

1201 **Figure S1. Model schematic.** Trainees arrive at the beginning of training camp (blue),
1202 progress to cocoons of 60 trainees each for 14 days (yellow), and then progress to
1203 companies of 240 trainees each for 56 days (green). Trainees have contact with other
1204 trainees in their cocoon or company, with trainers (brown) assigned to their unit (two per
1205 cocoon, eight per company), and with support staff (gray). Trainees who test positive
1206 following arrival testing or presentation with symptoms are placed in the sick bay (red)
1207 for ten days (or until symptoms resolve) before returning to their unit. Trainers and
1208 support staff who test positive following presentation with symptoms isolate from home
1209 for a minimum of ten days. All processes in the model are defined on a daily time step.

1210

1211 **Figure S2. Effect of portion of trainees infectious upon arrival or portion of staff**
1212 **infected off base on outbreak size before or after July 1, 2021.** (A) Portion of all
1213 individuals infected during training camp starting either before or after 07/01/21 as a
1214 function of the number of trainees who were infected in the two weeks prior to arrival.
1215 (B) Portion of all individuals infected during training camp starting either before or after
1216 07/01/21 as a function of the number of staff who were infected off base.

1217

1218

1219