# Looking under the lamp-post: quantifying the performance of contact tracing in the United States during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic

**Authors:** Henry Bayly[1], Madison Stoddard[2], Debra Van Egeren[3], Ellie Murray[4], Julia Raifman[5], Arijit Chakravarty[2+], Laura F White[1*+]

**Affiliations:**

[1] Department of Biostatistics, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

[2] Fractal Therapeutics, Cambridge, MA, USA.

[3] Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA, USA.

[4] Department of Epidemiology, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

[5] Department of Health Law, Policy and Management, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

* Corresponding author

+ contributed equally

**Word count:** 3498

**Abstract word count:** 215

**Abstract:**

Contact tracing forms a crucial part of the public-health toolbox in mitigating and understanding emergent pathogens and nascent disease outbreaks. Contact tracing in the United States was conducted during the pre-Omicron phase of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. This tracing relied on voluntary reporting and responses, often using rapid antigen tests (with a high false negative rate) due to lack of accessibility to PCR tests. These limitations, combined with SARS-CoV-2's propensity for asymptomatic transmission, raise the question "how reliable was contact tracing for COVID-19 in the United States"? We answered this question using a Markov model to examine the efficiency with which transmission could be detected based on the design and response rates of contact tracing studies in the United States. Our results suggest that contact tracing protocols in the U.S. are unlikely to have identified more than 1.65% (95% uncertainty interval: 1.62%-1.68%) of transmission events with PCR testing and 0.88% (95% uncertainty interval 0.86%-0.89%) with rapid antigen testing. When considering an optimal scenario, based on compliance rates in East Asia with PCR testing, this increases to 62.7% (95% uncertainty interval: 62.6%-62.8%). These findings highlight the limitations in interpretability for studies of SARS-CoV-2 disease spread based on U.S. contact tracing and underscore the vulnerability of the population to future disease outbreaks, for SARS-CoV-2 and other pathogens.

## Introduction

The management and control of infectious disease has been a signal modern achievement. Advances in epidemiological techniques pioneered during the 19th century established public health as a discipline. Overlapping with, but distinct from the medical establishment and the biopharmaceutical industry, modern public health organizations have sought to control disease using nonpharmaceutical interventions (NPIs).

Contact tracing is a cornerstone of the public-health response, particularly with emergent pathogens and nascent disease outbreaks [1]. Effective contact tracing facilitates estimates of epidemiological parameters describing disease spread. In the current COVID-19 pandemic, rigorous early studies relying on contact tracing revealed key epidemiological features of SARS-CoV-2 such as asymptomatic transmission [2,3], superspreading [4], and aerosol transmission [5–9]. This provided a basis for projecting the future course of the outbreak and designing a public health response.

Effective contact tracing is also critical for limiting onward spread through the deployment of test-and-trace and isolation protocols. Many Asia-Pacific countries effectively limited SARS-CoV-2 community spread for the first two years of the pandemic, relying on contact tracing with isolation of contacts, including strict testing and isolation efforts at their borders. For example, South Korea used methods such as tracking credit card transactions and using closed circuit televisions to link contacts together [10]. In China, specifically Hubei, suspected contacts were placed under monitored house arrest throughout their quarantine period [11]. This strategy permitted high levels of withing country contact and mobility while keeping case counts low [12–18].

In the U.S., contact tracing was primarily performed in the pre-Omicron era, and largely abandoned in early 2022 [19]. It has been widely recognized that contact tracing in the U.S. has

not slowed disease transmission [20]. Part of the challenge has been that the process varied from state to state and relied on individual initiative and access to testing [19]. This meant that an individual typically must be symptomatic, voluntarily seek testing, and have their positive result reported to initiate contact tracing [21]. Public health officials initiated an investigation by asking the index case to identify their contacts, who in turn would be interviewed. The exposed contacts were monitored for symptoms and could choose to test for SARS-CoV-2 five days after exposure. If positive, the contact (now a secondary case) would be asked to name their contacts.

The process was largely voluntary, allowing for selection bias and many missed transmission chains. There was often no system for identifying close contacts whom the index case did not know personally. Many published papers noted that many named contacts were not successfully traced [22–24] and not all symptomatic contacts were willing to undergo testing [25]. A systematic surveillance-based cross-sectional study in the U.S. showed that 2 out of 3 index cases of COVID-19 were either not reached by tracers or declined to share contacts. Only 70% of named contacts agreed to be interviewed, and only 50% of those contacts were monitored, leading to an average of less than one contact per index case being monitored [26]. Additionally, the CDC-recommended 15 minutes of contact within six feet over a 24-hour period was somewhat arbitrary and never updated, even as evidence emerged indicating that COVID-19 could be transmitted through brief interactions.

The implications of these limitations in contact tracing are significant. The relatively high reproductive number for SARS-CoV-2 [27] would suggest that many transmission chains generated from a single index case went undetected. Additionally, asymptomatic transmission and superspreading behavior would also impact the efficacy of contact tracing for infection control and the generalizability of inferences made about transmission dynamics [28,29].

In keeping with this voluntary and symptom-gated approach to contact tracing, there are many examples of minimally observed onward transmission in settings where transmission would be

expected. This includes studies involving children with strong implications for policies related to schools. The results of studies investigating children and COVID-19 transmission have documented limited forward transmission, but this is often in context of significant mitigation strategies being in place or incomplete contact tracing [30–32]. During the initial omicron surge, when contact tracing was limited, schools struggled to remain open, reported high absenteeism rates, and in some cases, relied on the national guard to teach courses and due to incomplete contact tracing it was unclear what role children in schools played in transmission [33,34]. In one another case, two COVID-19 positive hairdressers in Missouri saw 139 clients over a ten-day period, with no reported onward transmission [24]. Notably, of the exposed clients, only ~75% (n=104) responded to contact tracers' requests for interviews, and only ~50% (n=67) agreed to be tested. Biases in willingness to respond to interviews or agree to testing may have concealed many onward transmission events.

Another example, demonstrated the challenges in identifying both primary and secondary infections, was the Sturgis motorcycle rally in August 2020. Following this 10-day event in Meade County, South Dakota (attended by approximately 460,000 persons [35] without [36–38] any mask-wearing requirements or other mitigating policies [39]), there was a wave of COVID-19 cases in Meade County and South Dakota. The counties outside of South Dakota that contributed the highest inflows of rally attendees experienced a 6.4-12.5% increase in COVID-19 cases relative to counties without inflows [40]. Despite evidence of population-level changes in COVID-19 case counts following the rally, the CDC and Minnesota Department of Health were able to identify only 21 person-to-person transmission events [41]. Out of the 86 positive cases, only 41 reported being in close contact (defined as being within 6 feet of another person for ≥15 minutes) with other people, and they reported an average of 2.5 close contacts. Both statistics are implausible for a 10-day motorcycle rally featuring indoor dining and concerts [42–44]. The CDC's report does not specify how many of the 102 secondary contacts were tested, consistent with other U.S. contact-tracing studies [45,46].

Examples such as these, coupled with the unique features of SARS-CoV-2 contact tracing in the U.S. during the early part of the pandemic raise the question "what was the efficiency of contact tracing, as it was implemented in the U.S."? We answered this question using Markov Chain modeling to synthesize data from multiple sources of information on testing and contact tracing completeness to estimate the efficiency with which onward transmission could be detected. Our model-based approach sought to quantify two metrics of performance for contact tracing: 1) the percentage of all transmission pairs identified in a disease cluster/outbreak, and 2) the percentage of onward transmission events identified from a known index case. These metrics correspond broadly to the two contact-tracing scenarios described above, the Sturgis motorcycle rally study (seeking all transmission pairs) and the Missouri hairdressers (seeking onward transmission from a known index case). Our results suggest that, as may be expected, contact tracing protocols in the United States are unlikely to have identified more than a vanishingly small fraction of transmission events. We contrast this with a similar model run that incorporates data from Asian countries with more comprehensive contact tracing protocols in place, which yields a larger fraction of identified transmission events.

## Methods

### *Model*

We created a Markov Model to represent the sequence of events in contact tracing depicted in Figure 1. The model captures the steps in contact tracing beginning with identifying a primary infectious individual through testing and then engaging that person in contact tracing by accurately identifying their contacts. The final steps of the model details engaging the infected contact and completing testing. We focus on estimating the probability of identifying infected contacts only. We parameterize the model steps through literature review. We capture uncertainty in the transition parameters by sampling over a literature-informed uncertainty range of the parameters 10,000 times. When no data was available on a parameter value, we sweep over the range of [0,1].

*Literature search and model parameterization*

We reviewed the literature to produce estimates for each of the parameters of our model (Figure 1). We used the search term "(covid 19 or covid-19 or covid19) AND (case investigation or contact tracing) AND (united states or US)" on PubMed to inform parameters that define the likelihood of individuals naming their close contacts and of those contacts responding to a contact tracing encounter and being tested. We collected data from contact tracing investigations that reported the proportion of positive cases that named contacts, the proportion of named contacts reached, the proportion of contacts that cooperated with tracers, and/or the proportion of contacts tested.

We also parameterized our model to represent a setting where stringent contact tracing was implemented. For this, we derived estimates from Taiwan and South Korea, which had rigorous contact tracing protocols during the initial phase of the pandemic using the search terms '(covid 19 or covid-19 or covid19) AND (case investigation or contact tracing) AND (taiwan)' and '(covid 19 or covid-19 or covid19) AND (case investigation or contact tracing) AND (korea or south korea)'. We run the model separately for RAT and PCR tests.

The model can be divided into two distinct categories of parameters that contribute to the overall effectiveness of contact tracing: 1) efficiency of testing and 2) efficiency of contact tracing. Efficiency of testing includes the proportion of symptomatic people receiving testing, test sensitivity (RAT or PCR) [47,48], and the proportion of contacts tested. Efficiency of contact tracing aggregates the probabilities that tracers contact a positive index case, a positive index case names contacts, and named contacts are traced. Both aggregate parameters take values between [0,1]. We plot all possible combinations of these parameters on a heatmap and identify the estimates obtained for the U.S.-based and ideal scenarios.

*Code Availability.*

The Markov Model was implemented in Python, and code for running the simulations and plotting the results are available in a Jupyter notebook on Github (https://github.com/Henry-Bayly/ContactTracingMarkovModel).

## Results

*Literature search*

Our literature search of U.S. studies yielded 1,355 papers. Of these, the first 350 were reviewed to represent a random sample of the total papers found, as our goal was to conduct a representative and not comprehensive literature review. We excluded 325 papers that did not contain data relevant to the parameters required for our model, leaving twenty-five papers with information on contact tracing parameters. When multiple papers had values for the same parameter, for instance the probability of a case naming contacts, we assumed that the true value was uniformly distributed in the range of the reported values across the papers. All parameter values are shown in Table 1; sources of the parameters are shown in Tables S1-S6. We were unable to identify precise parameter estimates for the probability of a symptomatic person receiving testing and assume a uniform distribution over [0,1].

We reviewed 225 papers from South Korea and Taiwan. However, we were unable to find studies quantifying contact tracing parameters related to the completeness of tracing. This appeared to be due to a much more comprehensive approach to contact tracing in these countries, negating the need to report on these parameters since it was assumed that reporting was nearly complete. For example, South Korea used traditional shoe-leather epidemiology along with large databases (global positioning system, credit card transactions, and closed-circuit television) [10] and in one study of 5,706 index cases an average of 9.9 contacts per index case were reported [10]. Taiwan similarly reported an average of 27.61 contacts per index case [49]. This contrasts with the US where the average number of non-household contacts reported in a large study was one for every three index cases [50]. Therefore, we hypothesized a realistic range of [0.9, 1.0] for all parameters not associated with testing sensitivity in our ideal model setting.

*Estimates of contact tracing efficacy*

We examined the efficiency of contact tracing along the two dimensions described previously: 1) the percentage of all transmission pairs identified in a disease cluster/outbreak, and 2) the percentage of onward transmission events identified from a known index case.

We estimate a 0.88% chance (95% uncertainty range: 0.86%-0.89%) of identifying any transmission pair in the U.S. when RAT are the primary testing modality. More specifically, we estimate a 20.2% chance of identifying a positive index case, a 20.0% chance of identifying contacts given that the index case has been identified, and a 21.2% chance of identifying positive secondary cases given the index cases and contacts were identified. Using more sensitive, but less available, PCR tests, we estimate a 1.65% (95% uncertainty range: 1.62%-1.68%) chance of identifying a transmission pair (Figure 2, Table 2). Our model estimates a 27.7% chance of identifying a positive index case, a 19.8% chance of identifying contacts given that the index case has been identified, and a 29.2% chance of identifying positive cases given that the index cases and its contacts were correctly identified. By contrast, when we use an idealized scenario, based on data from East Asia, we estimate a 62.7% (95% uncertainty range: 62.6%-62.8%) chance of identifying a given transmission pair when using PCR testing and 33.5% (95% uncertainty range: 33.4%-33.6%) when using RAT (Figure 2, Table 2).

When an index case has been identified, we remove the associated model steps. In our U.S. based example, we estimate a 2.62% (95% uncertainty interval: 2.59%-2.65%) and 3.62% (95% uncertainty interval: 3.58%-3.66%) chance of identifying a positive contact of a known index case using RAT and PCR testing, respectively. In our idealized tracing setting, these increase to 53.3% (95% uncertainty interval: 53.2%-53.4%) for RAT and 73.3% (95% uncertainty interval: 73.2%-73.4%) for PCR testing.

## Discussion

248 Since its emergence in humans more than three years ago, SARS-CoV-2 has overwhelmed public
249 health institutions globally. The virus still exerts an enormous mortality and morbidity burden
250 worldwide, with nearly 7 million reported deaths thus far [51]. Underlying this is the systematic
251 failure of contact tracing, which was abandoned by most states in the United States by early
252 2022 [19] and contraindicated in CDC guidance for communities with "sustained ongoing
253 transmission" of COVID-19 [21]. The Lancet Commission report on COVID-19 [52] and several
254 reviews [20,53,54] have highlighted this shortcoming in pandemic response.
255
256 Our work takes this a step further by quantifying the extent to which contact tracing failed to
257 identify transmission events in the U.S. and in an idealized setting base on East Asian data. Our
258 demonstrate that the voluntary steps in contact tracing, i.e. seeking testing and interacting with
259 contact tracers, reduced the efficiency dramatically, with fewer than 2% of transmission events
260 identified compared to 62.7% in a setting where testing and compliance with tracing was
261 higher.
262
263 Contact tracing formed the basis of modern epidemiological practice, dating back to the
264 investigation of the 1854 Broad Street Cholera outbreak in Britain [55] that led to both a
265 mechanistic understanding of cholera transmission [56] and successful control of the outbreak.
266 A more recent example of highly successful and proactive contact tracing by public health
267 authorities was the effective suppression of monkeypox in the Western US in 2003 [57].
268 Notably, during the current pandemic, many other countries (such as China, Japan, South
269 Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam and Singapore) were successful at implementing contact tracing in the
270 first two years of the pandemic [14–18].
271
272 The impact of poor contact tracing in the U.S. has undermined our understanding of the
273 transmission potential of SARS-CoV-2. For example, the argument that schools do not
274 contribute to SARS-CoV-2 transmission was based in part on the lack of detection of
275 transmission chains in a school setting. Numerous publications showed a lack of contact-traced
276 chains of transmission in a school setting [58–62], while in effect lacking a positive control for

277 the ability to identify onward chains of transmission [63]. It is now clear that SARS-CoV-2 is
278 readily transmitted in schools [64–72], particularly when robust mitigation measures are not in
279 place [73,74]. Indeed, dramatic increases in case detection rates have been observed in studies
280 that relied on surveillance testing, rather than contact tracing [70]. Additionally, this led to the
281 conclusion that the most common source of transmission was gatherings in the home, but it is
282 unclear if this is a consequence of household contacts being easiest to identify or a result of
283 many transmission studies being conducted in settings with strict shut downs, where
284 households were one of the few places where transmission could occur [75]. Also, reports from
285 the West have pointed to a lack of detected transmission chains in air travel [76–78]. These
286 reports are contradicted by careful contact tracing studies from other countries, which have
287 clearly demonstrated person-to-person transmission in flight [79–81], even when robust
288 mitigation measures were in place [82].
289
290 Our work has several limitations. We have assumed instantaneous contact tracing, ignoring the
291 impact of tracing delays on infection control which has a significant impact on contact tracing
292 effectiveness against transmission [83,84] due to short incubation period of SARS-CoV-2 [85].
293 Instead, our estimates for contact tracing effectiveness apply to the informativeness of contact
294 tracing studies, and they form an upper bound for the effectiveness of contact tracing as a
295 transmission prevention measure. We do not account for asymptomatic transmission, again
296 making our estimates an upper bound. The percent of asymptomatic COVID-19 cases is
297 estimated to be anywhere between 1.6% and 56.5% [90–96], with a these cases having a
298 relative reduced infectiousness of 0 to 62% [90-97]. This would mean our estimated 1.65% of
299 transmission pairs identified with PCR testing could be as low as 0.9%, assuming no
300 asymptomatic index cases are identified. We also have not accounted for superspreading,
301 which has been estimated to be a significant feature in COVID-19 transmission [94–96]. This
302 implies that missing a superspreading index case would have tremendous impact on
303 downstream contact tracing efforts and that there is significant stochasticity [97]. We only
304 consider the probability of identifying infected contacts, but it is ideal to also identify
305 uninfected contacts accurately. Finally, we estimate the probability of naming an infected

contact using data describing the probability of naming any contacts at all (rather than the probability of naming any given contact). This means that our final estimated probabilities are upper bounds of the true values. Despite representing an upper bound, our contact tracing estimates suggest that U.S. contact tracing studies fail to identify the vast majority of transmission pairs and onward transmission events. This severely limits the inferences that can be drawn from such studies.

Our work points to several key lessons for future public health efforts. First, compliance is a key driver of contact tracing effectiveness. Methods to improve compliance will be crucial for future contact tracing efforts- whether using technological approaches (such as mobile phone or surveillance-camera based tracing) or by making changes to the legal framework around public health efforts (see Supplementary Information S2 for a more on this topic).

Second, there is a pressing need for innovation, to develop contact tracing methodologies that are more resistant to noncompliance. One such approach may be backward contact tracing, which seeks to identify who infected the detected case. Here when contact tracing is executed backward to identify the source of infection (parent), the more offspring (infections) a parent has produced, the more frequently the parent shows up as a contact. Model-based analysis suggests that a backwards contact tracing approach does not require sampling a network at such a large scale as forward tracing [98,99] to understand transmission dynamics, and addresses the problem of low compliance. This approach has been proposed by others for COVID-19 [100–102], and has been empirically shown to be effective, particularly in identifying superspreading events [103], however this is unlikely to be as helpful in reducing transmission.

Third, public health responses to future outbreaks must include educate the public about behaviors with health outcomes, including creating a normative framework around contact tracing compliance. Consistent messaging about limiting transmission and contact tracing are key as has been noted by the Lancet Commission [52], among others [104,105]. This could include reframing messaging to reduce stigma that has often been associated with contact

335 tracing [106] and which undermines contact tracing efficacy [107]. During the HIV epidemic,
336 contact tracers emphasized the index case's personal responsibility towards the health of their
337 sexual partners [1]. It also includes addressing misinformation, which led many to believe that
338 COVID-19 was a "hoax" [108] and public health measures were overreactions [109].
339
340 Finally, we have shown that testing availability and accuracy create a critical gap in contact
341 tracing efforts. Considering only the steps for testing accuracy and cases/contacts receiving
342 testing in our model we find that only 12.4% of possible cases *could* be identified with RAT, the
343 most available testing modality. To effectively manage future outbreaks, tests need to be
344 sensitive, provide rapid results, and be readily available.
345
346 The work presented here adds to the growing body of literature [26,110,111] highlighting the
347 poor performance of contact tracing in the West during the ongoing pandemic and suggests
348 practical fixes for this problem, as we have described. In its absence, public health is forced to
349 rely on population-wide measures for disease spread and will not be able to fine-tune its
350 responses to match the situation. If we are to improve our response to the current crisis, or to
351 others in the future, we must improve our ability to deliver this key function.
352

353 **TABLES**

354 **Table 1.** Table of parameters derived from literature that were used in the model.

| **Parameter (Step in the Model)** | **U.S. Probability Range** | **Ideal Contact Tracing Probability Range** |
|---|---|---|
| Symptomatic case receives testing* | [0,1] | [0.90, 1.0] |
| COVID-19 test gives true positive* | [0.57, 0.73] (RAT) [48] and [0.88, 0.92] (PCR) [47] | [0.57, 0.73] (RAT) and [0.88, 0.92] (PCR) |
| Tracers make contact with a positive case** [22,26,45,46,50,112–116] | [0.41, 0.82] | [0.90, 1.0] |
| Positive case names any contacts**,[a] [22,26,45,112,113,116,117] | [0.17, 0.52] | [0.90, 1.0] |
| Tracers make contact with infected contacts of positive case**[22,26,46,112,113,115–117] | [0.28, 0.85] | [0.90, 1.0] |
| Infected contacts of positive case get tested* [113,117–121] | [0.19, 0.45] | [0.90, 1.0] |
| Contact's COVID-19 test gives a true positive* | [0.57, 0.73] (RAT) [48] and [0.88, 0.92] (PCR) [47] | [0.57, 0.73] (RAT) and [0.88, 0.92] (PCR) |

[a]These values represent the probability that a positive case names any contacts at all. We use this as a proxy for the given step. Thus, our model represents an overestimate of the true efficacy of contact tracing.

* parameter related to testing

**parameter related to tracing

**Table 2.** Probabilities of correctly identifying positive contacts of a given index case stratified by contact tracing style and by use of RAT/PCR tests. Values in parenthesis represent the 95% uncertainty intervals.

| | United States | | Ideal Contact Tracing | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | RAT | PCR Tests | RAT | PCR Tests |
| Percent of all transmission pairs in an outbreak | 0.88% (0.86%-0.89%) | 1.65% (1.62%-1.68%) | 33.5% (33.4%-33.6%) | 62.7% (62.6%-62.8%) |
| Percent of onward transmission from a known index case | 2.62% (2.59%-2.65%) | 3.62% (3.58%-3.66%) | 53.3% (53.2%-53.4%) | 73.3% (73.2%-73.4%) |

**FIGURES**


Index Case Tested (Phase 1)
Index Not Case Tested (Phase 1)
True Positive (Phase 1)
False Negative (Phase 1)
Tracers Make Contact (Phase 1)
Tracers Cannot Make Contact (Phase 1)
Infected Contact Named By Index Case (Phase 2)
Infected Contact Not Named By Index Case (Phase 2)
Tracers Make Contact With Infected Contact (Phase 2)
Tracers Cannot Make Contact With Infected Contact (Phase 2)
Infected Contact Receives Test (Phase 3)
Infected Contact Does Not Receive Test (Phase 3)
True Positive (Phase 3)
False Negative (Phase 3)

5 coincide with phase 2 (identifying contacts of positive cases). Finally, steps 6 and 7 coincide with Phase 3 (identifying positive cases among contacts).




**Figure 2. Impact of contact tracing and testing on the probability of identifying a positive contact of an infected individual with COVID-19.** Quality of testing refers to parts of the process relating to testing and aggregates the following probabilities: symptomatic people receiving testing, symptomatic index cases receive true positive test result (i.e. test sensitivity), contacts receive testing, contacts receive a true positive test result. Quality of contact tracing aggregates the probability of: tracers contact a positive index case, a positive index case names contacts, and tracers contact the contacts of the index case. This shows that if testing and contact tracing are done perfectly, we can expect to identify all contacts of infected individuals (illustrated through the colors of the heat map). The blue circles correspond to our simulations using RAT while the white circles correspond to PCR testing use. The two circles in the lower left hand corner correspond to our United States estimates while the two in the upper half correspond to our simulations using estimates from South Korea and Taiwan, where there was stricter contact tracing.


N = 1000 Index Cases
Step 1
Cases Lost: 500
Total Remaining: 500
Step 2
Cases Lost: 172
Total Remaining: 328
N = 5000 Total Contacts
$N^*$ = 1,640 Contacts with Detected Index Case
Step 3
$N^*$ = 1,017 Contacts Whose Index Case Responds to Tracers
Step 4
Contacts Lost: 661
Total Remaining: 356
N = 356 Total Contacts Remaining
Step 5
Contacts Lost: 153
Total Remaining: 203
Step 6
Contacts Lost: 137
Total Remaining: 66
Step 7
Contact Cases Identified: 43 (0.87%)

404 **References**

405


406 1. Brandt AM. The History of Contact Tracing and the Future of Public Health. Am J Public
407 Health. American Public Health Association; **2022**; 112(8):1097–1099.

408 2. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of
409 COVID-19. Nat Med. **2020**; 26(5):672–675.

410 3. Sun K, Wang W, Gao L, et al. Transmission heterogeneities, kinetics, and controllability of
411 SARS-CoV-2. Science. American Association for the Advancement of Science; **2021**;
412 371(6526):eabe2424.

413 4. Endo A, Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases COVID-19 Working
414 Group, Abbott S, Kucharski AJ, Funk S. Estimating the overdispersion in COVID-19
415 transmission using outbreak sizes outside China. Wellcome Open Res. **2020**; 5:67.

416 5. Lu J, Gu J, Li K, et al. COVID-19 Outbreak Associated with Air Conditioning in Restaurant,
417 Guangzhou, China, 2020. Emerg Infect Dis. **2020**; 26(7):1628–1631.

418 6. Eichler N, Thornley C, Swadi T, et al. Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
419 Coronavirus 2 during Border Quarantine and Air Travel, New Zealand (Aotearoa). Emerg
420 Infect Dis. **2021**; 27(5):1274–1278.

421 7. Kwon K-S, Park J-I, Park YJ, Jung D-M, Ryu K-W, Lee J-H. Evidence of Long-Distance Droplet
422 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by Direct Air Flow in a Restaurant in Korea. J Korean Med Sci.
423 **2020**; 35(46):e415.

424 8. Wang J, Du G. COVID-19 may transmit through aerosol. Ir J Med Sci. **2020**; 189(4):1143–
425 1144.

426 9. Shen Y, Li C, Dong H, et al. Airborne Transmission of COVID-19: Epidemiologic Evidence
427 from Two Outbreak Investigations. SSRN Electron J. **2020**; .

428 10. Park YJ, Choe YJ, Park O, et al. Contact Tracing during Coronavirus Disease Outbreak, South
429 Korea, 2020. Emerg Infect Dis. **2020**; 26(10):2465–2468.

430 11. Maier BF, Brockmann D. Effective containment explains subexponential growth in recent
431 confirmed COVID-19 cases in China. Science. **2020**; 368(6492):742–746.

432 12. Lu N, Cheng K-W, Qamar N, Huang K-C, Johnson JA. Weathering COVID-19 storm: Successful
433 control measures of five Asian countries. Am J Infect Control. **2020**; 48(7):851–852.

434 13. Zhou Y, Jiang H, Wang Q, Yang M, Chen Y, Jiang Q. Use of contact tracing, isolation, and
435 mass testing to control transmission of covid-19 in China. The BMJ. **2021**; 375:n2330.

436 14. El Guerche-Séblain C, Chakir L, Nageshwaran G, et al. Experience from five Asia-Pacific
437 countries during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic: Mitigation strategies and
438 epidemiology outcomes. Travel Med Infect Dis. **2021**; 44:102171.

439 15. Jefferies S, French N, Gilkison C, et al. COVID-19 in New Zealand and the impact of the
440 national response: a descriptive epidemiological study. Lancet Public Health. **2020**;
441 5(11):e612–e623.

442 16. Van Nguyen H, Lan Nguyen H, Thi Minh Dao A, et al. The COVID-19 pandemic in Australia:
443 Public health responses, opportunities and challenges. Int J Health Plann Manage. **2022**;
444 37(1):5–13.

445 17. Chen S-C. Taiwan's experience in fighting COVID-19. Nat Immunol. **2021**; 22(4):393–394.

446 18. Van Nguyen Q, Cao DA, Nghiem SH. Spread of COVID-19 and policy responses in Vietnam:
447 An overview. Int J Infect Dis IJID Off Publ Int Soc Infect Dis. **2021**; 103:157–161.

448 19. Feliciano M. State Approaches to Contact Tracing during the COVID-19 Pandemic [Internet].
449 Natl. Acad. State Health Policy. 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
450 https://www.nashp.org/state-approaches-to-contact-tracing-covid-19/

451 20. Clark E, Chiao EY, Amirian ES. Why Contact Tracing Efforts Have Failed to Curb Coronavirus
452 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Transmission in Much of the United States. Clin Infect Dis Off
453 Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. **2021**; 72(9):e415–e419.

454 21. CDC. Health Departments [Internet]. Cent. Dis. Control Prev. 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 26].
455 Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-
456 tracing/contact-tracing-plan/contact-tracing.html

457 22. Lash RR, Donovan CV, Fleischauer AT, et al. COVID-19 Contact Tracing in Two Counties -
458 North Carolina, June-July 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. **2020**; 69(38):1360–1363.

459 23. Nadeem R. The Challenges of Contact Tracing as U.S. Battles COVID-19 [Internet]. Pew Res.
460 Cent. Internet Sci. Tech. 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
461 https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2020/10/30/the-challenges-of-contact-tracing-
462 as-u-s-battles-covid-19/

463 24. Hendrix MJ, Walde C, Findley K, Trotman R. Absence of Apparent Transmission of SARS-
464 CoV-2 from Two Stylists After Exposure at a Hair Salon with a Universal Face Covering
465 Policy - Springfield, Missouri, May 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. **2020**;
466 69(28):930–932.

467 25. Doyle T, Kendrick K, Troelstrup T, et al. COVID-19 in Primary and Secondary School Settings
468 During the First Semester of School Reopening - Florida, August-December 2020. MMWR
469 Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. **2021**; 70(12):437–441.

26. Lash RR, Moonan PK, Byers BL, et al. COVID-19 Case Investigation and Contact Tracing in the US, 2020. JAMA Netw Open. **2021**; 4(6):e2115850.

27. Alimohamadi Y, Taghdir M, Sepandi M. Estimate of the Basic Reproduction Number for COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. J Prev Med Pub Health. Korean Society for Preventive Medicine; **2020**; 53(3):151–157.

28. Nakajo K, Nishiura H. Exploring secondary SARS-CoV-2 transmission from asymptomatic cases using contact tracing data. Theor Biol Med Model. **2021**; 18(1):12.

29. Kinoshita R, Anzai A, Jung S-M, et al. Containment, Contact Tracing and Asymptomatic Transmission of Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19): A Modelling Study. J Clin Med. **2020**; 9(10):3125.

30. Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonell C, et al. Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Children and Adolescents Compared With Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Pediatr. **2021**; 175(2):143–156.

31. Kim J, Choe YJ, Lee J, et al. Role of children in household transmission of COVID-19. Arch Dis Child. **2021**; 106(7):709–711.

32. Yung CF, Kam K, Nadua KD, et al. Novel Coronavirus 2019 Transmission Risk in Educational Settings. Clin Infect Dis. **2021**; 72(6):1055–1058.

33. Schwartz S, Gewertz C. Omicron Is Making a Mess of Instruction, Even Where Schools Are Open. Educ Week [Internet]. **2022** [cited 2023 Feb 20]; . Available from: https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/omicron-is-making-a-mess-of-instruction-even-where-schools-are-open/2022/01

34. Long C. Omicron Exacerbating School Staff Shortages | NEA [Internet]. [cited 2023 Feb 20]. Available from: https://www.nea.org/advocating-for-change/new-from-nea/omicron-exacerbating-school-staff-shortages

35. 2020 Sturgis Rally Final Vehicle Counts [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from: https://news.sd.gov/newsitem.aspx?id=27174

36. Blistein J. “Freedom-Loving People”: Behind the Scenes at That Controversial Smash Mouth Show in South Dakota [Internet]. Roll. Stone. 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from: https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-news/sturgis-covid-19-biker-fest-smash-mouth-1043040/

37. Even the Official Motorcycle Brand of the Sturgis Rally Thinks the Mass Gathering Is Too Risky [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from: https://news.yahoo.com/even-official-motorcycle-brand-sturgis-091043595.html?guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly9lbi53aWtpcGVkaWEub3JnLw&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAAE-Mbd02M7hUYmmufo9DeJ5BTNfsZOc1Z4B0b2yq9vvRmYegzua-

r6eYCg3WWyq8Hfffeq2WkWB6sR3jX1eeVKlMA_74t-hd-vLk798wTDPvXiizPqVBjiNMviJblOYBHfn-7EGUdE_4PeQ7N-eYEcch3PJ4C_8Tsi26OG7TPWAT&guccounter=2

38. "It's literally impossible to stop": Sturgis, South Dakota, braces as hundreds of thousands of bikers arrived in the middle of a pandemic [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from: https://news.yahoo.com/literally-impossible-stop-sturgis-south-231030345.html

39. Sturgis Motorcycle Rally [Internet]. Wikipedia. 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Sturgis_Motorcycle_Rally&oldid=1120591558

40. Dave D, McNichols D, Sabia JJ. The contagion externality of a superspreading event: The Sturgis Motorcycle Rally and COVID-19. South Econ J. **2021**; 87(3):769–807.

41. Firestone MJ. COVID-19 Outbreak Associated with a 10-Day Motorcycle Rally in a Neighboring State — Minnesota, August–September 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep [Internet]. **2020** [cited 2022 Nov 26]; 69. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6947e1.htm

42. Harleys everywhere, masks nowhere: Sturgis expects crowd of 250,000 [Internet]. Chic. Sun-Times. 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from: https://chicago.suntimes.com/coronavirus/2020/8/7/21359318/sturgis-motorcycle-harleys-everywhere-masks-nowhere

43. Rapier G. "If I die from the virus, it was just meant to be": 250,000 descend upon tiny South Dakota town for world-famous motorcycle rally [Internet]. Bus. Insid. [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from: https://www.businessinsider.com/sturgis-motorcycle-rally-kicks-off-despite-surging-coronavirus-cases-2020-8

44. 2020 Sturgis Motorcycle Rally attracts thousands with no mask requirements amid pandemic [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from: https://www.usatoday.com/picture-gallery/news/nation/2020/08/09/2020-sturgis-motorcycle-rally-draws-thousands-no-mask-requirements-covid-19-coronavirus/3331908001/

45. Bonacci RA, Manahan LM, Miller JS, et al. COVID-19 Contact Tracing Outcomes in Washington State, August and October 2020. Front Public Health. **2021**; 9:782296.

46. Shelby T, Schenck C, Weeks B, et al. Lessons Learned From COVID-19 Contact Tracing During a Public Health Emergency: A Prospective Implementation Study. Front Public Health. **2021**; 9:721952.

47. Kortela E, Kirjavainen V, Ahava MJ, et al. Real-life clinical sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test in symptomatic patients. PLoS ONE. **2021**; 16(5):e0251661.

48. S J, F S-R, P J, P B, M N. Diagnostic accuracy of a SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test in real-life clinical settings. Int J Infect Dis IJID Off Publ Int Soc Infect Dis [Internet]. Int J Infect Dis; **2021** [cited 2022 Nov 26]; 109. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34242764/

49. Cheng H-Y, Jian S-W, Liu D-P, et al. Contact Tracing Assessment of COVID-19 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different Exposure Periods Before and After Symptom Onset. JAMA Intern Med. **2020**; 180(9):1156–1163.

50. Hood JE, Kubiak RW, Avoundjian T, et al. A Multifaceted Evaluation of a COVID-19 Contact Tracing Program in King County, Washington. J Public Health Manag Pract JPHMP. **2022**; 28(4):334–343.

51. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jan 15]. Available from: https://covid19.who.int

52. The Lancet Commission on lessons for the future from the COVID-19 pandemic - The Lancet [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from: https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(22)01585-9/fulltext

53. Lewis D. Why many countries failed at COVID contact-tracing — but some got it right. Nature. **2020**; 588(7838):384–387.

54. Kwon O. Evidence of the importance of contact tracing in fighting COVID-19. Epidemiol Health. **2022**; 44:e2022006.

55. Tulchinsky TH. John Snow, Cholera, the Broad Street Pump; Waterborne Diseases Then and Now. Case Stud Public Health. **2018**; :77–99.

56. Competing Theories of Cholera [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 27]. Available from: https://www.ph.ucla.edu/epi/snow/cholera theories.html

57. CDC. Monkeypox in the U.S. [Internet]. Cent. Dis. Control Prev. 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 27]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/monkeypox/outbreak/us-outbreaks.html

58. COVID-19 in children and the role of school settings in transmission - second update [Internet]. Eur. Cent. Dis. Prev. Control. 2021 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from: https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/children-and-school-settings-covid-19-transmission

59. Hershow RB. Low SARS-CoV-2 Transmission in Elementary Schools — Salt Lake County, Utah, December 3, 2020–January 31, 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep [Internet]. **2021** [cited 2022 Nov 26]; 70. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7012e3.htm

573 60. Falk A, Benda A, Falk P, Steffen S, Wallace Z, Høeg TB. COVID-19 Cases and Transmission in
574 17 K-12 Schools - Wood County, Wisconsin, August 31-November 29, 2020. MMWR Morb
575 Mortal Wkly Rep. **2021**; 70(4):136–140.

576 61. Gandini S, Rainisio M, Iannuzzo ML, Bellerba F, Cecconi F, Scorrano L. No evidence of
577 association between schools and SARS-CoV-2 second wave in Italy [Internet]. medRxiv;
578 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 26]. p. 2020.12.16.20248134. Available from:
579 https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248134v1

580 62. Zimmerman KO, Akinboyo IC, Brookhart MA, et al. Incidence and Secondary Transmission of
581 SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Schools. Pediatrics. **2021**; 147(4):e2020048090.

582 63. Johnson KE, Lachmann M, Stoddard M, et al. Detecting in-school transmission of SARS-CoV-
583 2 from case ratios and documented clusters. MedRxiv Prepr Serv Health Sci. **2021**;
584 :2021.04.26.21256136.

585 64. White LF, Murray EJ, Chakravarty A. The role of schools in driving SARS-CoV-2 transmission:
586 Not just an open-and-shut case. Cell Rep Med. **2022**; 3(3):100556.

587 65. Manica M, Poletti P, Deandrea S, et al. Estimating SARS-CoV-2 transmission in educational
588 settings: A retrospective cohort study. Influenza Other Respir Viruses [Internet]. [cited
589 2022 Nov 29]; n/a(n/a). Available from:
590 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/irv.13049

591 66. Meuris C, Kremer C, Geerinck A, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 After COVID-19
592 Screening and Mitigation Measures for Primary School Children Attending School in
593 Liège, Belgium. JAMA Netw Open. **2021**; 4(10):e2128757.

594 67. Torres JP, Piñera C, De La Maza V, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
595 Antibody Prevalence in Blood in a Large School Community Subject to a Coronavirus
596 Disease 2019 Outbreak: A Cross-sectional Study. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc
597 Am. **2021**; 73(2):e458–e465.

598 68. Gold JAW, Gettings JR, Kimball A, et al. Clusters of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Elementary
599 School Educators and Students in One School District - Georgia, December 2020-January
600 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. **2021**; 70(8):289–292.

601 69. Fontanet A, Tondeur L, Grant R, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection in schools in a northern French
602 city: a retrospective serological cohort study in an area of high transmission, France,
603 January to April 2020. Euro Surveill Bull Eur Sur Mal Transm Eur Commun Dis Bull. **2021**;
604 26(15):2001695.

605 70. Crowe J, Schnaubelt AT, SchmidtBonne S, et al. Assessment of a Program for SARS-CoV-2
606 Screening and Environmental Monitoring in an Urban Public School District. JAMA Netw
607 Open. **2021**; 4(9):e2126447.

608 71. Buja A, Zabeo F, Cristofori V, et al. Opening Schools and Trends in SARS-CoV-2 Transmission
609 in European Countries. Int J Public Health. **2021**; 66:1604076.

610 72. Llupià A, Borràs-Santos A, Guinovart C, Utzet M, Moriña D, Puig J. SARS-CoV-2 transmission
611 in students of public schools of Catalonia (Spain) after a month of reopening. PloS One.
612 **2021**; 16(5):e0251593.

613 73. Theuring S, Thielecke M, Loon W van, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection and transmission in school
614 settings during the second COVID-19 wave: a cross-sectional study, Berlin, Germany,
615 November 2020. Euro Surveill Bull Eur Sur Mal Transm Eur Commun Dis Bull. **2021**;
616 26(34):2100184.

617 74. Cowger TL, Murray EJ, Clarke J, et al. Lifting Universal Masking in Schools — Covid-19
618 Incidence among Students and Staff. N Engl J Med. Massachusetts Medical Society; **2022**;
619 387(21):1935–1946.

620 75. Lei H, Xu X, Xiao S, Wu X, Shu Y. Household transmission of COVID-19-a systematic review
621 and meta-analysis. J Infect. Elsevier; **2020**; 81(6):979–997.

622 76. Nir-Paz R, Grotto I, Strolov I, et al. Absence of in-flight transmission of SARS-CoV-2 likely due
623 to use of face masks on board. J Travel Med. **2020**; 27(8):taaa117.

624 77. Saretzki C, Bergmann O, Dahmann P, et al. Are small airplanes safe with regards to COVID-
625 19 transmission? J Travel Med. **2021**; 28(7):taab105.

626 78. Pombal R, Hosegood I, Powell D. Risk of COVID-19 During Air Travel. JAMA. **2020**;
627 324(17):1798.

628 79. Guo Q, Wang J, Estill J, et al. Risk of COVID-19 Transmission Aboard Aircraft: An
629 Epidemiological Analysis Based on the National Health Information Platform. Int J Infect
630 Dis IJID Off Publ Int Soc Infect Dis. **2022**; 118:270–276.

631 80. Khanh NC, Thai PQ, Quach H-L, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV 2 During Long-Haul Flight.
632 Emerg Infect Dis. **2020**; 26(11):2617–2624.

633 81. Yang N, Shen Y, Shi C, et al. In-flight transmission cluster of COVID-19: a retrospective case
634 series. Infect Dis Lond Engl. **2020**; 52(12):891–901.

635 82. Bae SH, Shin H, Koo H-Y, Lee SW, Yang JM, Yon DK. Asymptomatic Transmission of SARS-
636 CoV-2 on Evacuation Flight. Emerg Infect Dis. **2020**; 26(11):2705–2708.

637 83. Kretzschmar ME, Rozhnova G, Bootsma MCJ, Boven M van, Wijgert JHHM van de, Bonten
638 MJM. Impact of delays on effectiveness of contact tracing strategies for COVID-19: a
639 modelling study. Lancet Public Health. **2020**; 5(8):e452–e459.

640 84. Johnson KE, Stoddard M, Nolan RP, White DE, Hochberg N, Chakravarty A. This time is
641 different: model-based evaluation of the implications of SARS-CoV-2 infection kinetics for
642 disease control [Internet]. medRxiv; 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 29]. p. 2020.08.19.20177550.
643 Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.19.20177550v2

644 85. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing
645 | Science [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 26]. Available from:
646 https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abb6936?cookieSet=1

647 86. Gao Z, Xu Y, Sun C, et al. A systematic review of asymptomatic infections with COVID-19. J
648 Microbiol Immunol Infect. **2021**; 54(1):12–16.

649 87. Johansson MA, Quandelacy TM, Kada S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission From People
650 Without COVID-19 Symptoms. JAMA Netw Open. **2021**; 4(1):e2035057.

651 88. Ma Q, Liu J, Liu Q, et al. Global Percentage of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections Among
652 the Tested Population and Individuals With Confirmed COVID-19 Diagnosis: A Systematic
653 Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Netw Open. **2021**; 4(12):e2137257.

654 89. Mahmood M, Ilyas N-U-A, Khan MF, Hasrat MN, Richwagen N. Transmission frequency of
655 COVID-19 through pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic patients in AJK: a report of 201
656 cases. Virol J. **2021**; 18(1):138.

657 90. Tan J, Ge Y, Martinez L, et al. Transmission roles of symptomatic and asymptomatic COVID-
658 19 cases: a modelling study. Epidemiol Infect. **2022**; 150:e171.

659 91. Just how contagious is asymptomatic Covid-19? [Internet]. [cited 2023 Mar 8]. Available
660 from: https://www.advisory.com/Daily-Briefing/2022/06/02/covid-transmission

661 92. Moghadas SM, Fitzpatrick MC, Sah P, et al. The implications of silent transmission for the
662 control of COVID-19 outbreaks. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. **2020**; 117(30):17513–17515.

663 93. Muller CP. Do asymptomatic carriers of SARS-COV-2 transmit the virus? Lancet Reg Health –
664 Eur [Internet]. Elsevier; **2021** [cited 2023 Mar 8]; 4. Available from:
665 https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanepe/article/PIIS2666-7762(21)00059-4/fulltext

666 94. Chen PZ, Koopmans M, Fisman DN, Gu FX. Understanding why superspreading drives the
667 COVID-19 pandemic but not the H1N1 pandemic. Lancet Infect Dis. Elsevier; **2021**;
668 21(9):1203–1204.

669 95. Lakdawala SS, Menachery VD. Catch Me if You Can: Superspreading of COVID-19. Trends
670 Microbiol. **2021**; 29(10):919–929.

671 96. Chopping the tail: How preventing superspreading can help to maintain COVID-19 control -
672 ScienceDirect [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 1]. Available from:
673 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1755436520300487

674 97. Gupta M, Parameswaran GG, Sra MS, et al. Contact tracing of COVID-19 in Karnataka, India:
675 Superspreading and determinants of infectiousness and symptomatic infection. PLoS
676 ONE. **2022**; 17(7):e0270789.

677 98. Kojaku S, Hébert-Dufresne L, Mones E, Lehmann S, Ahn Y-Y. The effectiveness of backward
678 contact tracing in networks. Nat Phys. **2021**; 17:652–658.

679 99. A National Plan to Enable Comprehensive COVID-19 Case Finding and Contact Tracing in the
680 US. :16.

681 100. Empirical evidence on the efficiency of backward contact tracing in COVID-19 | Nature
682 Communications [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 29]. Available from:
683 https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-022-32531-6

684 101. Bradshaw WJ, Alley EC, Huggins JH, Lloyd AL, Esvelt KM. Bidirectional contact tracing
685 could dramatically improve COVID-19 control. Nat Commun. Nature Publishing Group;
686 **2021**; 12(1):232.

687 102. S0523_Oxford_-_Backwards_contact_tracing.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 29].
688 Available from:
689 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachme
690 nt_data/file/1048768/S0523_Oxford_-_Backwards_contact_tracing.pdf

691 103. Endo A, Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases COVID-19 Working
692 Group, Leclerc QJ, et al. Implication of backward contact tracing in the presence of
693 overdispersed transmission in COVID-19 outbreaks. Wellcome Open Res. **2020**; 5:239.

694 104. Amara PS, Platt JE, Raj M, Nong P. Learning about COVID-19: sources of information,
695 public trust, and contact tracing during the pandemic. BMC Public Health. **2022**;
696 22(1):1348.

697 105. Samuel G, Lucivero F, Johnson S, Diedericks H. Ecologies of Public Trust: The NHS COVID-
698 19 Contact Tracing App. J Bioethical Inq. **2021**; 18(4):595–608.

699 106. Brandt AM. No Magic Bullet: A Social History of Venereal Disease in the United States
700 Since 1880- 35th Anniversary Edition. Oxford University Press; 2020.

701 107. El-Sadr WM, Platt J, Bernitz M, Reyes M. Contact Tracing: Barriers and Facilitators. Am J
702 Public Health. American Public Health Association; **2022**; 112(7):1025–1033.

703 108. Tanase L-M, Kerr J, Freeman ALJ, Schneider CR. COVID-19 risk perception and hoax
704 beliefs in the US immediately before and after the announcement of President Trump's
705 diagnosis. R Soc Open Sci. Royal Society; 9(8):212013.

706 109. Nadeem R. Lack of Preparedness Among Top Reactions Americans Have to Public Health
707 Officials' COVID-19 Response [Internet]. Pew Res. Cent. Sci. Soc. 2022 [cited 2022 Nov

26]. Available from: https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2022/10/05/lack-of-preparedness-among-top-reactions-americans-have-to-public-health-officials-covid-19-response/

110. Using a household-structured branching process to analyse contact tracing in the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic | Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 29]. Available from: https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2020.0267

111. Davis EL, Lucas TCD, Borlase A, et al. Contact tracing is an imperfect tool for controlling COVID-19 transmission and relies on population adherence. Nat Commun. Nature Publishing Group; **2021**; 12(1):5412.

112. Miller JS, Bonacci RA, Lash RR, et al. COVID-19 Case Investigation and Contact Tracing in Central Washington State, June-July 2020. J Community Health. **2021**; 46(5):918–921.

113. Stargel A, Taylor MM, Zansky S, Spencer K, Hogben M, Shultz A. Case Investigation and Contact Tracing Efforts from Health Departments in the United States, November 2020–December 2021. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. **2022**; :ciac442.

114. Kalyanaraman N, Fraser MR. Containing COVID-19 Through Contact Tracing. Public Health Rep. **2020**; 136(1):32–38.

115. Spencer KD, Chung CL, Stargel A, et al. COVID-19 Case Investigation and Contact Tracing Efforts from Health Departments - United States, June 25-July 24, 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. **2021**; 70(3):83–87.

116. Kanu FA, Smith EE, Offutt-Powell T, Hong R, Dinh T-H, Pevzner E. Declines in SARS-CoV-2 Transmission, Hospitalizations, and Mortality After Implementation of Mitigation Measures— Delaware, March–June 2020. Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. **2020**; 69(45):1691–1694.

117. Sachdev DD, Brosnan HK, Reid MJA, et al. Outcomes of Contact Tracing in San Francisco, California—Test and Trace During Shelter-in-Place. JAMA Intern Med. **2021**; 181(3):381–383.

118. Sachdev DD, Chew Ng R, Sankaran M, et al. Contact-Tracing Outcomes Among Household Contacts of Fully Vaccinated Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Patients: San Francisco, California, 29 January-2 July 2021. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. **2022**; 75(1):e267–e275.

119. Jones A, Fialkowski V, Prinzing L, Trites J, Kelso P, Levine M. Assessment of Day-7 Postexposure Testing of Asymptomatic Contacts of COVID-19 Patients to Evaluate Early Release from Quarantine - Vermont, May-November 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. **2021**; 70(1):12–13.

743 120. Matthias J. Notes from the Field: COVID-19 Case Investigation and Contact Tracing
744 Program — Spirit Lake Tribe, North Dakota, September–November 2020. MMWR Morb
745 Mortal Wkly Rep [Internet]. **2021** [cited 2022 Nov 27]; 70. Available from:
746 https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7014a4.htm

747 121. Atherstone C, Siegel M, Schmitt-Matzen E, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Associated
748 with High School Wrestling Tournaments - Florida, December 2020-January 2021.
749 MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. **2021**; 70(4):141–143.

750

751