Early response model for containing newly emerging infectious diseases

Marcus P.S. Dekens[1], Tobias Neumann[1,2], Thomas Micheler[3], Vinika Gandhi[1,4,5], Max J. Kellner[1,4], Marianne Rocha-Hasler[6], Martina Weißenböck[1], Michaela Fellner[1], Mariam Al-Rawi[7], Nikolaus Beer[1,4,5], Sarah Rieser[1,2], Christian Umkehrer[1], David Hoffmann[4], Martin Mátl[1,4], Katrin Künstner[8], Vienna COVID-19 Detection Initiative*, Zlatka Cular[9], Sabine Walch[1], Johanna Trupke[3], Peter Steinlein[1], Harald Scheuch[1,4,5], Thomas Wochele-Thoma[8,10], Robert Heinen[1,4,5], Johannes Zuber[1,11]

Abstract

Global interconnectedness has heightened the risk of rapidly spreading pathogens. The recent epidemics of influenza, AIDS, SARS, Ebola, Zika, and COVID suggest that RNA viruses will drive future threats. During COVID, the lack of monitoring capabilities left lockdowns as the only measure to reduce virus transmission, though these had to be cut short to prevent an economic collapse. By contrast, early identification and isolation of cases can protect health systems, inform policy decisions, and maintain economic stability. Molecular diagnostics are critical for detecting pathogens that spread pre- and asymptomatically, but must shift from medical to epidemiological applications. Minimizing outbreak risk requires purpose-built workflows with integrated supply and information systems, combining high frequency testing with fast, reliable and affordable results. We implemented monitoring by repurposing nonprofit research infrastructure, which validated the diagnostic process for containing outbreaks. Additionally, we developed qPCR assays that can detect circulating and newly emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants, preventing detection evasion and minimizing outbreak size. Here we present an after-action report and propose an early response model for containing newly emerging infectious diseases.

Introduction

An infectious disease outbreak occurs when there is little or no pre-existing immunity in the population, which can lead to an epidemic and spread globally if not quickly contained. Pathogens that can spread fast through human populations have traits that make them hard to avoid, such as airborne, presymptomatic and asymptomatic transmission. Vaccination campaigns are the most effective defense against infectious diseases, as vaccines prepare the immune system to fight against them, reducing disease severity, hospitalizations and mortality. However, developing, mass producing and distributing vaccines takes time. Therefore, the most effective early response to protect public health and prevent economic collapse is the rapid identification and isolation of infected individuals [1].

1 Research Institute of Molecular Pathology, Vienna, Austria. 2 Quantro Therapeutics GmbH, Vienna, Austria. 3 Vienna BioCenter Core Facilities, Vienna, Austria. 4 Institute of Molecular Biotechnology of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, Austria. 5 Gregor Mendel Institute, Vienna, Austria. 6 Centre for Microbiology and Environmental Systems Science, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. 7 Max Perutz Labs, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. 8 Caritas Erzdiözese Wien, Vienna, Austria. 9 Global Second Opinion, Brookline, MA, U.S.A. 10 Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Digital Health and Patient Safety, Vienna, Austria. 11 Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. * VCDI authors at the end of this report. Correspondence: marcus.dekens@gmail.com

Monitoring also provides essential data for making decisions under uncertainty. The reliability of outbreak assessments depends on the extent of testing. Insufficient testing masks true case numbers, leading to delayed interventions and premature relaxation of measures. This allows residual cases to initiate a new wave of infections [2, 3]. Delays provide the pathogen with time to accumulate mutations, followed by the selection of variants with enhanced infectivity and partial immune evasion. These variants of concern (VoC) increase the likelihood of subsequent infection surges [4]. Thus, to effectively control transmission, monitoring must begin immediately after the first cases are reported and achieve high population coverage.

Monitoring differs from routine clinical laboratory operations in that its primary goal is transmission control rather than individual patient care. This requires a shift in the diagnostic process. For monitoring, testing frequency and turnaround time are more critical than maximum analytical sensitivity [5, 6, 7]. As it is sufficient to identify infected individuals before they become contagious [8], capacity can be expanded through batch testing when using a highly sensitive method [9, 10]. The method's specificity must be both exclusive and inclusive. Exclusive specificity

ensures that uninfected individuals test negative. Pathogens with epidemic potential tend to be RNA viruses that mutate at high rates [11]. Variant-inclusive specificity prevents emerging variants from evading detection, thereby minimizing outbreak size. Quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) is the preferred method because it combines high sensitivity and specificity with broad pathogen detectability. By contrast, rapid antigen tests, while fast and easy to use, have lower sensitivity, missing individuals in the early contagious stage [12]. Moreover, following an infectious disease outbreak, qPCR assays can be developed in one month due to their modular design, whereas antigen assays require time-consuming antibody production. Since testing frequency is essential, purpose-built high-throughput workflows with integrated supply and information systems are as important as the diagnostic assay itself.

On December 31, 2019, the World Health Organization (WHO) country office reported an outbreak of an atypical pneumonia-like illness of unknown etiology in Wuhan, China. On March 11, 2020, the WHO declared the identified coronavirus disease (COVID-19) a pandemic. COVID is caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), a single-stranded positive-sense RNA virus [13, 14]. The infection begins with rapid replication in the nasopharynx and may progress to acute respiratory failure [15]. The combination of airborne with pre- and asymptomatic transmission [16-18] made SARS-CoV-2 particularly difficult to control. Because most governments lacked the core capabilities for rapid detection and response, the only immediate option to avert health system collapse was to slow transmission through lockdowns. While effective in reducing critically ill patients, the lockdowns had to be cut short as they brought the economy to a standstill.

During the pandemic, our mission was to establish cost-effective high-throughput monitoring, validate this approach as a means of mitigating virus transmission, and support vulnerable groups. Implementation requires infrastructure consisting of specialist staff, resources, safe workspaces and support systems. To rapidly establish monitoring, we repurposed the nonprofit research infrastructure of the Vienna BioCenter (VBC). To minimize outbreak size, we developed variant-inclusive qPCR assays targeting stable regions of the SARS-CoV-2 genome, identified through analysis of genomes available through GISAID (Global Initiative on Sharing All Influenza Data) [19, 20]. Over one and a half years, we monitored care homes, research institutes and companies, conducting 476,502 tests. To contain the spread of newly emerging infectious diseases, a monitoring model is needed that can be rapidly deployed and that protects public health and the economy until a vaccine becomes available. Here, we propose an early response model for infectious disease containment and present a risk analysis to support response strategies.

Results

A project plan was created to establish a monitoring system including specimen collection, diagnostic analysis and reporting (Figure S1A-D). With laboratories and expertise in place, RT-qPCR assays were rapidly developed. The published target sequences of the SARS-CoV-2 genome from the Charité [21] and the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) [22] obviated the need for oligonucleotide design, although performance testing remained necessary. The use of commercially available reagents further accelerated development. The in-house assays allowed us to overcome the global shortage of diagnostic kits, rapidly adapt to emerging variants, and reduce costs. A major challenge in monitoring is the labor-intensive collection of nasopharyngeal swabs at centralized stations. To improve compliance with regular testing and reduce costs, we introduced self-sampling by gargling. This method has been proven reliable for virus detection [23] and was validated in our system. On campus, all specimens were deposited at a central outdoor collection point, while monitoring of caregivers required more advanced logistics because the care homes are dispersed across the city.

We first implemented a small-scale workflow with a daily testing capacity of ~500 specimens, with VBC employees volunteering to participate in anonymous monitoring. This allowed optimization of the workflow before scaling up. Capacity was then increased through the establishment of a monitoring facility. High-throughput, error-free pipetting, and reproducibility were achieved by automating all stages of the workflow (Figure 1). The stages were separated into clean, low-copy, and high-copy rooms (Figure S2). To expedite specimen handling, ensure data integrity, and deliver results directly to participants, we developed a database application compliant with the General Data Protection Regulation (Figure S1B). To further expand capacity, we introduced two-stage batch testing: pooling specimens for initial testing, followed by testing individual specimens from positive batches. The batch testing workflow included nucleic acid extraction to maximize the sensitivity of the RT-qPCR. While batch testing increases capacity and reduces reagent costs, the deconvolution of positive batches has the opposite effect. In this case, a more efficient approach, performing RT-qPCR directly with each crude backup specimen eliminates extraction costs and shortens turnaround time. Direct RT-qPCR requires inactivation of RNases and viruses in the specimens. To achieve this, we validated an existing inactivation method using the reducing agent TCEP combined with heat [24], and selected assays that only amplify viral RNA from throat wash containing both RNA and genomic DNA.

On January 8, 2021, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) warned that several authorized nucleic acid amplification test (NAAT) kits could potentially produce false negative results for new SARS-



Figure 1. Scalable qPCR workflow for infectious disease monitoring

Specimens are self-sampled (1) and deposited in a dropbox, which is delivered to the laboratory (2). To scale up the workflow, batch testing was introduced, requiring two specimens per person: one specimen is pooled, and the other serves as a backup if the pool tests positive. Five or ten specimens are pooled and mixed with sodium ascorbate or DTT to reduce viscosity (3). The batch is then registered (4), centrifuged (5), and mixed with extraction buffer (6). Plate preparation (7), and nucleic acid extraction using robots (8), is followed by RT-qPCR (9). A qPCR machine can analyze 90 batches in one hour, yielding results from 450 or 900 specimens. To identify positive specimens within positive pools, RT-qPCR is performed directly on each crude backup specimen (blue arrows), reducing turnaround time and cost. After quality control, test results are uploaded to the database (10). To prevent contamination, workflow steps are spatially separated, as indicated by the numbers on the floor plan in figure S2.

CoV-2 variants. Commercial kits do not disclose their target sequences, preventing independent validation. At the same time, mismatches between published assays and variants were reported [25, 26]. With millions of SARS-CoV-2 genome sequences available through GISAID, we evaluated a set of widely used assays: E-Sarbeco, RdRP-SARSr [21], CDC-N1, CDC-N2, CDC-N3 [22], CCDC-N [27], CCDC-ORF1ab [28], and NIID-N [29]. In early 2021, we aligned the assays with ~350,000 complete, high-coverage viral genomes collected from patients globally, and by December 2022 our final iteration included 4,295,664 genomes. To assess inclusive specificity, we defined "match rate" as the percentage of viral genomes that perfectly align with an

assay. A high match rate corresponds to a low probability of false negatives and outbreaks. The RdRP-SARSr, CDC-N1 and CCDC-N assays showed strongly reduced match rates (Table 1, Figure 2A,C,D). To gain insight into the present mutational landscape, we analyzed a dataset of 42,874 genomes collected at the end of our timeframe. E-Sarbeco, CDC-N1 and CCDC-N showed decreased match rates, while that of RdRP-SARSr increased, reflecting replacement of one variant lineage by another (Figure 2E-G, S3A,B). To reduce outbreak risk, assays that target different genomic regions were combined [30].

To improve reliability for detecting circulating and newly emerging variants, we focused on stable regions of the viral genome. A cumulative mutation map of the SARS-CoV-2 genome was created by extracting mutations at each position in the reference sequence [13] from alignments with 4,295,664 complete high-coverage viral genomes collected from patients globally (Figure 2A). Ninety candidate assays were designed that target stable regions within the SARS-CoV-2 genome (Figure S1C). Exclusive specificity was empirically validated against the oral microbiome, and by sequence comparison against SARS-CoV, the closest Sarbecovirus relative of SARS-CoV-2 that is capable of infecting humans [31]. As the VBC assays display multiple mismatches with SARS-CoV, its detection is highly unlikely (Table S2). Three assays targeting the viral replicase (ORF1b) and spike (S) genes, as well as human β2-microglobulin RNA (B2M, internal control), were selected and subsequently compared to CDC-N2 and B2M in a clinical performance study (Table S1) [32, 33]. The CDC-N2 assay was chosen as the reference due to its superior performance relative to other published assays [34]. Compared to CDC-N2 (98.05%), the VBC assays showed higher match rates: 99.16% for VBC-O1b and 99.69% for VBC-S, combined they exceeded 99.99% (Table 1). In addition to comparing assay match rates using a large variant pool, we demonstrate high variant-inclusive specificity for the VBC assays (Table S3). These data indicate a low outbreak risk for the VBC assays.

The limit of detection (LoD) indicates whether the assay can detect low copy numbers of the virus, so is critical for identifying individuals before they become contagious. The LoD is defined as the copy number detected in 95% of replicates [35]. Throat wash from healthy individuals was spiked with a dilution series of AccuPlex standard: packaged complete viral genomes. These were purified followed by replicate RT-qPCR. LoDs were 5.7 copies/reaction for CDC-N2, 6.6 for VBC-O1b, and 5.7 for VBC-S (Figure 3A). The LoD for CDC-N2 is consistent with that reported by the CDC (5 copies/reaction) despite their optimal conditions that omit purification [22]. Given that viral load is correlated with transmissibility, the LoDs indicate that the VBC assays can detect SARS-CoV-2 well before an infected individual becomes contagious.

Reproducibility, assessed with the coefficient of variation in technical replicates, was high across assays for purified specimens, with CDC-N2 outperforming the VBC assays (Table S4). RT-qPCR with crude specimens showed reduced reproducibility across all assays.

In a study of 48 clinical specimens, we compared the VBC-O1b-S-B2M with the CDC-N2-B2M. Each specimen was split for parallel testing of purified versus crude samples. CDC-N2 detected virus in purified samples an average of three cycles earlier than in crude samples, while the VBC assays showed only a cycle difference (Figure 3B, S4B). Agreement between the C_q-values from the assays was measured using the coefficient of determination (R^2). The R^2 exceeded 99% for both VBC assays compared with CDC-N2 for purified specimens, indicating high accuracy (Figure 3C,D, S4).

PCR efficiency, a measure of optimal amplification, was calculated from the fluorescence curve of each reaction with viral RNA in the clinical specimens using LinRegPCR software [36, 37]. The efficiency of VBC-O1b ($E=97.4\pm1.6\%$, $P=2.37\times10^{-14}$) and VBC-S ($E=95.9\pm3.2\%$, $P=2.13\times10^{-6}$) is significantly higher

Table 1. Match rates of assays based on 4,295,664 SARS-CoV-2 genomes

Assay ID	Match Rates (%)			
	Forward Primer	Probe	Reverse Primer	Assay
VBC-O1a	99.1710	99.8981	99.9119	98.9826
VBC-O1b	99.4969	99.8488	99.8121	99.1613
VBC-S	99.8963	99.9275	99.8657	99.6901
VBC-O1b-S *	-	-	-	99.9984
CDC-N1	94.8557	88.3280	99.5203	82.8760
CDC-N2	99.0192	99.0202	99.9990	98.0478
CDC-N3	98.9413	98.8782	99.2493	97.0886
CCDC-N	5.1567	99.6636	77.4356	3.8835
CCDC-ORF1ab	99.7524	99.7224	99.8113	99.2882
E-Sarbeco	90.0432	99.8896	99.9012	89.8519
RdRP-SARSr	40.9639	99.8765	97.1601	40.7879

* A match is recorded when both or either of the assays in the multiplex match the same genome.



Figure 2. Cumulative mutation map of the SARS-CoV-2 genome

A. Mutation rate at each position in the SARS-CoV-2 reference genome, determined by aligning it with 4,295,664 complete, high-coverage genomes collected from patients worldwide during Q1 2021 - Q4 2022. White bars above the map indicate gene locations. Vertical blue bars highlight stable regions, with the number of assays designed for each region shown above. Iterative analysis revealed that the region marked with a red cross became unstable over time and was therefore excluded. Bars below the map show assay target sites, with red bars indicating high mismatch rates. **B.** Mutation rate in the target region of the E-Sarbeco assay (Charité). Primer and probe target sites are shown below. **C.** As in B, for the US CDC-N1 assay. **D.** As in B, for the Chinese CDC-N assay. **E.** Mutation rate in the target region of the E-Sarbeco assay using 42,874 genomes collected in Q3-Q4 2022. **F.** As in E, for the US CDC-N1 assay. **G.** As in E, for the Chinese CDC-N assay.

than that of CDC-N2 (E=86.8±0.8%) for purified specimens (Figure 3E). The reported higher efficiency of 99.4% for CDC-N2 may be due to measurements based on a standard curve instead of actual conditions [21]. With crude specimens, efficiencies were also significantly higher for the VBC-O1b (E=87.3±2.9%, P=1.07×10^{-5}) and VBC-S (E=96.0±9.5%, P=7.66×10^{-8}) compared with CDC-N2 (E=79.1±1.7%) (Figure 3E). While crude specimens reduced efficiency for all assays, VBC assays remained more robust (Table S4).

To assess differences in quantitative performance, relative initial copy numbers (N_0) were determined (Figure 3F). This was calculated by applying a constant to the amplicon number (N_n) in the amplification equation. No significant difference in relative N_0 values was observed between CDC-N2, VBC-O1b (P=0.96), and VBC-S (P=0.42) for purified specimens. For crude specimens, VBC-O1b (P=6.39×10^{-6}) and VBC-S (P=3.65×10^{-5}) yielded higher relative N_0 values.

False negatives were the primary quality issue reported for NAAT testing during the pandemic, likely resulting from reduced design and processing standards [38]. Analysis of 4.3 million SARS-CoV-2 genomes revealed higher mutation rates at the 3' end, which is targeted by most commonly used assays. We developed qPCR assays that target stable genomic regions to ensure reliable detection of circulating and newly emerging variants, thereby reducing outbreak risk. The VBC assays also demonstrated high analytical sensitivity (LoD), enabling expansion of capacity through batch testing while detecting SARS-CoV-2 well below the infectious viral load.



Figure 3. qPCR performance parameters of the CDC and VBC SARS-CoV-2 assays

A. Dilution PCR demonstrates high analytical sensitivity of the reference and VBC assays: CDC-N2 (0.81 copy/µl, green line), VBC-O1b (0.95 copy/µl, blue line) and VBC-S (0.82 copy/µl, pink line). White dots indicate overlapping values. **B.** Boxplot of C_q values from 48 clinical specimens analyzed with CDC-N2, VBC-O1b, and VBC-S assays. Dark boxes represent qPCR with purified specimens; light boxes represent qPCR with crude specimens. Means are indicated by red dots. **C.** Accuracy of the VBC-O1b assay, showing that 99.2% of variation in test results from purified clinical specimens is shared with the reference (P=3.15×10^{-50}). **D.** As in C, for the VBC-S assay, showing 99.4% agreement (P=4.55×10^{-52}). **E.** Individual qPCR efficiencies calculated from fluorescence curves of reactions with viral RNA in each specimen. **F.** Relative initial copy number (N_0) for each specimen tested across all assays. Asterisks indicate significant differences, bottom-left to top-right: P=3.44×10^{-7}, P=0.02, P=6.39×10^{-6}, P=3.65×10^{-5}.

Discussion

During the COVID pandemic, many countries imposed lockdowns to keep their health systems from collapsing under the patient load. But lockdowns are not a viable solution because they cannot be sustained long enough to protect the health system, given their devastating economic impact. A monitoring system is essential to an outbreak response strategy, requiring a diagnostic process that supports epidemiological decision-making. If this is unavailable, a complete infrastructure must be rapidly established for mass testing. This includes staff, resources, safe workspaces, and information systems. Additionally, mass testing must be cost-efficient to be affordable. We achieved this by repurposing nonprofit research infrastructure, because repurposing existing resources allows for quick and cost-efficient implementation. To minimize outbreak size, we developed variant-inclusive assays based on 4.3 million SARS-CoV-2 genomes. We separated monitoring from R&D, as assay development requires flexibility that could compromise processing quality. In over one and a half years, we performed 476,502 tests, including 186,894 on caregivers, with a positive rate of 0.16%. High-throughput testing together with rapid notification and contact-tracing validated our strategy for reducing transmission, and demonstrated that reallocating nonprofit research infrastructure is an effective model for monitoring. Here, we discuss the broader context for infectious disease response.

Clinical laboratories are not well suited for monitoring. Their process is designed for diagnostics that guide treatment decisions, prioritizing individual specimen collection and analysis over throughput, speed, and cost-effectiveness. In addition, the in vitro diagnostic regulations do not account for epidemic conditions, preventing clinical laboratories from establishing a process tailored to epidemiological needs [39]. Moreover, without external sponsorship, monitoring efforts are unlikely, as opportunity costs drive resource allocation in the private sector.

The effectiveness of monitoring depends on how quickly the test can be developed and how capacity can be cost efficiently scaled up. qPCR is well suited because its modular design enables rapid development. Efficiency is measured by the product cost per specimen when capacity is maximized. Product costs consist of fixed components, like facility rental, and variable



Figure 4. Timeline of daily new cases, alerts, measures, and variants of concern

Seven-day moving average of confirmed COVID cases in Vienna (orange line), with key events marked by arrowheads. Two months after the first confirmed case, the WHO declared a public health emergency of international concern (PHEIC). By that time, the virus had already spread from Wuhan in East Asia to Europe and North America. In the absence of a monitoring system, transmission could only be slowed through lockdowns (boxes). The lockdowns had to be time-limited to prevent economic collapse, which reduced their effectiveness. Ten months after the Wuhan outbreak, the first variant of concern appeared. The first vaccine was developed within nine months, but mass production and supply chain disruptions delayed vaccination campaigns. The Vienna BioCenter established small-scale monitoring within five weeks, but supply shortages delayed the scale up of capacity.

components, like reagents. Fixed costs decline per specimen as capacity rises, while variable costs remain constant per specimen. Variable costs dominate when processing specimens individually, so no economies of scale are realized (Figure S5A,B). Batch testing lowers the variable as well as the fixed costs per specimen (Figure S5C, Table S5, S6). Variable costs per specimen decrease as fewer reagents are needed when testing multiple specimens in a single reaction, and as this increases capacity the fixed costs per specimen also decrease. Economical purchasing and in-house production of reagents can further reduce the variable costs, though in-house production requires expertise to ensure the highest quality and delays implementation. The maximum batch size is limited by the test's sensitivity and the transmissibility of the circulating variant. As cases rise more batches require deconvolution, increasing material use and reducing throughput (Figure S5D). This decrease in capacity and increase in costs can be alleviated by reducing the batch size when the incidence rate increases (Figure S5E-I). Scaling nationally is more robust when specimen processing is decentralized, as many local facilities allow faster turnaround time and reduce the risk of amplicon contamination related shutdowns.

Monitoring is critical not only for isolation, but also for executing strategy. Adding anonymized metadata, such as variant, age, gender and location, improves disease modeling and helps target measures where it is most needed. Variant monitoring is especially important, as emerging variants may spread faster requiring stronger measures. At the VBC, a high-throughput sequencing platform was developed for variant detection [4, 40]. This enabled the first detection of the Alpha variant in Austria, which showed ~50% increase in transmissibility [41, 42]. The information produced by local monitoring is also of global value. Through the GISAID platform, millions of viral genome sequences are shared worldwide, enabling public health responses, such as when and how to update vaccines and diagnostic tests [19, 20]. We quantified mutations relative to the reference genome, which identifies variable regions by recording selected and recurrent mutations at a site cumulatively. While global analysis is biased toward the most frequently sequenced strains in countries with greater resources, stable regions in the genome are less affected by this bias and are reliable for test design.

Protecting vulnerable groups is a highly effective strategy to save lives [43]. At the start of the pandemic, care home staff were faced with unprecedented challenges that required immediate solutions. Demographic data showed that older people were disproportionately affected [44], and the communal

structure of these homes increases transmission risk. Caritas, a Catholic social aid organization, initiated an epidemiological study to identify the best strategy to prevent outbreaks in care homes [45]. The study showed that, due to its higher sensitivity, qPCR testing is more effective at reducing outbreaks than rapid antigen testing. Additionally, monitoring twice weekly with same-day results reduces the risk of an outbreak for the Alpha variant. Caritas isolated residents, so that staff became the main route of virus introduction, making immediate monitoring of staff critical. This required affordable qPCR tests, supplies and data systems. Additionally, a loop-mediated isothermal amplification test was developed for situations requiring an immediate diagnosis [46]. Our partnership with Caritas started with monitoring ~150 staff in one home and expanded to 17 homes with ~2500 staff monitored twice weekly. The VBC provided testing and materials, but de-emphasized the organization of specimen collection and contact tracing in order to focus its resources on its core competencies and save time. Working with Caritas, a partner with complementary expertise, medical know-how, commitment and excellent infrastructure, led to rapid implementation of monitoring. Similar outcomes for governments, organizations and companies depend on tailored solutions, cross-functional collaboration with the relevant expertise of their partners, and commitment up to the highest organizational level.

The International Health Regulation (IHR) requires countries to develop core capabilities for outbreak detection, response and timely reporting. Although the IHR provides a pragmatic legal framework, compliance is limited and the WHO lacks enforcement power. To strengthen implementation, the Global Health Security Agenda introduced a security-based approach, but global systems for monitoring and response still lack effective coordination between the WHO, governments and nongovernmental organizations [47-49]. In many low-income countries, weak public health and clinical infrastructure make outbreak containment unreliable. The COVID pandemic revealed that high-income countries also lack the core capabilities for responding to fast spreading infectious diseases (Figure 4). This resulted in a disease control only paradigm that undermines public trust, whereas monitoring requires broad public support. Medical care is essential both for trust and disease control. Health care providers are a primary vulnerable group that must be monitored and have access to personal protective equipment to prevent health system collapse [43]. However, advanced biomedical technologies are ineffective without adequate resources, as demonstrated by the supply chain disruptions in the COVID pandemic (Figure 4). Stockpiling critical supplies and preparing laboratories, clinics and care homes through regular functional and full-scale exercises is vital for an effective response [50]. When a country has the capability to rapidly test a large share of its population at the start of an outbreak, isolate positive cases, trace their contacts, and manage imported cases, it can keep the caseload under control. If, due to ill-preparedness, large-scale testing is not implemented quickly, extreme measures such as lockdowns become the only option to prevent widespread infections [49]. Risks can be further reduced by focusing on general principles of prevention, education, communication, accountability, and investment in research frameworks that accelerate knowledge transfer (Table S7). Vaccination, in particular, protects communities against infectious disease outbreaks. Prevalent vaccine hesitancy increases the risk of re-emerging infectious diseases.

In today's highly connected world, a direct flight between any two cities is shorter than the incubation period of any known human pathogen [51, 52]. State security therefore requires investment in robust regional and global health systems supported by long-term prevention and response strategies.

Ethical approval

This study involving human specimens was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of the Vienna Hospitals of the Vinzenz Group (#EK57/2020).

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: JZ, SW, TW-T, PS, HS, TM, RH, MPSD. Implementation: SW, MW, CU, JT, KS, SR, MA-R, TM, MM, MJK, MR-H, RH, DH, MF, MPSD, NB. Clinical study: VG, MPSD. Data analysis: TN, MPSD with input from JZ. Development of data analysis tools: TN. Development of data management tools: TM. Writing: MPSD with feedback from JZ, ZC, RH and TW-T.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge all data contributors for generating the genetic sequence and metadata and sharing via the GISAID Initiative, on which part of this study is based (gisaid.org/EPI_SET_220330me). We thank Raoul Lavaulx-Vrecourt for assistance with estimating fixed costs, Sabina Kula, Kristina Uzunova and Boril Bochev for technical advice, Andreas Untergasser for advice on the individual PCR efficiency, Robert Fritsche-Polanz, Petra Pjevac, Buck Hanson, and Mihaela Peycheva for support. Figure 1 was partially created using icons from BioRender. MPSD and MJK were supported by the WWTF through project COV20-031 (to JZ). The IMP receives funding from Boehringer Ingelheim GmbH and the Austrian Research Promotion Agency (HQ grant FFG-852936).

References

1. Lavezzo, E., et al., *Suppression of a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in the Italian municipality of Vo'.* Nature, 2020. **584**(7821): p. 425-429.
2. Li, R., et al., *Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2).* Science, 2020. **368**(6490): p. 489-493.
3. Cacciapaglia, G., C. Cot, and F. Sannino, *Multiwave pandemic dynamics explained: how to tame the next wave of infectious diseases.* Scientific Reports, 2021. **11**(1): p. 6638.
4. Frank, O., et al., *Genomic surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 evolution by a centralised pipeline and weekly focused sequencing, Austria, January 2021 to March 2023.* Eurosurveillance, 2024. **29**(23): p. 2300542.
5. Mina, M.J., R. Parker, and D.B. Larremore, *Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity — A Strategy for Containment.* New England Journal of Medicine, 2020. **383**(22): p. e120.
6. Mina, M.J. and K.G. Andersen, *COVID-19 testing: One size does not fit all.* Science, 2021. **371**(6525): p. 126-127.
7. Larremore, D.B., et al., *Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround time for COVID-19 screening.* Sci Adv, 2021. **7**(1).
8. Wölfel, R., et al., *Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019.* Nature, 2020. **581**(7809): p. 465-469.
9. Barak, N., et al., *Lessons from applied large-scale pooling of 133,816 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests.* Sci Transl Med, 2021. **13**(589).
10. Abdalhamid, B., et al., *Assessment of Specimen Pooling to Conserve SARS-CoV-2 Testing Resources.* Am J Clin Pathol, 2020. **153**(6): p. 715-718.
11. Duffy, S., *Why are RNA virus mutation rates damn so high?* PLoS Biol, 2018. **16**(8): p. e3000003.
12. Corman, V.M., et al., *Comparison of seven commercial SARS-CoV-2 rapid point-of-care antigen tests: a single-centre laboratory evaluation study.* Lancet Microbe, 2021.
13. Wu, F., et al., *A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China.* Nature, 2020. **579**(7798): p. 265-269.
14. *Coronaviridae Study Group of the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses. The species Severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus: classifying 2019-nCoV and naming it SARS-CoV-2.* Nat Microbiol, 2020. **5**(4): p. 536-544.
15. Phua, J., et al., *Intensive care management of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): challenges and recommendations.* Lancet Respir Med, 2020. **8**(5): p. 506-517.
16. He, X., et al., *Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19.* Nature Medicine, 2020. **26**(5): p. 672-675.
17. Arons, M.M., et al., *Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility.* N Engl J Med, 2020. **382**(22): p. 2081-2090.
18. Ma, Q., et al., *Global Percentage of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections Among the Tested Population and Individuals With Confirmed COVID-19 Diagnosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.* JAMA Netw Open, 2021. **4**(12): p. e2137257.
19. Elbe, S. and G. Buckland-Merrett, *Data, disease and diplomacy: GISAID's innovative contribution to global health.* Glob Chall, 2017. **1**(1): p. 33-46.
20. Khare, S., et al., *GISAID's Role in Pandemic Response.* China CDC Wkly, 2021. **3**(49): p. 1049-1051.
21. Corman, V.M., et al., *Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR.* Euro Surveill, 2020. **25**(3).
22. Lu, X., et al., *US CDC Real-Time Reverse Transcription PCR Panel for Detection of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2.* Emerg Infect Dis, 2020. **26**(8): p. 1654-65.
23. Bennett, S., R.S. Davidson, and R.N. Gunson, *Comparison of gargle samples and throat swab samples for the detection of respiratory pathogens.* Journal of Virological Methods, 2017. **248**: p. 83-86.
24. Myhrvold, C., et al., *Field-deployable viral diagnostics using CRISPR-Cas13.* Science, 2018. **360**(6387): p. 444-448.
25. Khan, K.A. and P. Cheung, *Presence of mismatches between diagnostic PCR assays and coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 genome.* R Soc Open Sci, 2020. **7**(6): p. 200636.
26. Vogels, C.B.F., et al., *Analytical sensitivity and efficiency comparisons of SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR primer-probe sets.* Nature microbiology, 2020. **5**(10): p. 1299-1305.
27. Niu, P., et al., *Three Novel Real-Time RT-PCR Assays for Detection of COVID-19 Virus.* China CDC Wkly, 2020. **2**(25): p. 453-457.
28. *National Institute for Viral Disease Control and Prevention. Specific primers and probes for detection of 2019 novel coronavirus.* 2020; Available from: https://ivdc.chinacdc.cn/kyjz/202001/t20200121_211337.html
29. Shirato, K., et al., *Development of Genetic Diagnostic Methods for Detection for Novel Coronavirus 2019(nCoV-2019) in Japan.* Jpn J Infect Dis, 2020. **73**(4): p. 304-307.
30. Peñarrubia, L., et al., *Multiple assays in a real-time RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 panel can mitigate the risk of loss of sensitivity by new genomic variants during the COVID-19 outbreak.* International journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases, 2020. **97**: p. 225-229.
31. Bi, S., et al., *Complete genome sequences of the SARS-CoV: the BJ Group (Isolates BJ01-BJ04).* Genomics Proteomics Bioinformatics, 2003. **1**(3): p. 180-92.
32. Kralik, P. and M. Ricchi, *A Basic Guide to Real Time PCR in Microbial Diagnostics: Definitions, Parameters, and Everything.* Front Microbiol, 2017. **8**: p. 108.
33. ISO, *International Standard ISO 13485 - Medical Devices - Quality management systems - Requirments for regulatory purposes.* 2016, International Organization for Standardization: Geneva, Switzerland.
34. Nalla, A.K., et al., *Comparative Performance of SARS-CoV-2 Detection Assays Using Seven Different Primer-Probe Sets and One Assay Kit.* J Clin Microbiol, 2020. **58**(6).
35. Bliss, C.I., *THE METHOD OF PROBITS.* Science, 1934. **79**(2037): p. 38-9.
36. Untergasser, A., et al., *Web-based LinRegPCR: application for the visualization and analysis of (RT)-qPCR amplification and melting data.* BMC Bioinformatics, 2021. **22**(1): p. 398.
37. Peirson, S.N., J.N. Butler, and R.G. Foster, *Experimental validation of novel and conventional approaches to quantitative real-time PCR data analysis.* Nucleic Acids Res, 2003. **31**(14): p. e73.
38. Buchta, C., et al., *Performance of SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid amplification testing in Austria as measured by external quality assessment schemes during 3 years of the COVID-19 pandemic: an observational retrospective study.* Lancet Microbe, 2023. **4**(12): p. e1015-e1023.
39. Boeckh, M., et al., The Seattle Flu Study: when regulations hinder pandemic surveillance. Nature Medicine, 2022. 28(1): p. 7-8.
40. Yelagandula, R., et al., *Multiplexed detection of SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory infections in high throughput by SARSeq.* Nature Communications, 2021. **12**(1): p. 3132.
41. Davies, N.G., et al., *Estimated transmissibility and impact of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 in England.* Science, 2021. **372**(6538).
42. Kidd, M., et al., *S-Variant SARS-CoV-2 Lineage B1.1.7 Is Associated With Significantly Higher Viral Load in Samples Tested by TaqPath Polymerase Chain Reaction.* The Journal of Infectious Diseases, 2021. **223**(10): p. 1666-1670.
43. Grohma, P., et al., *Defining vulnerabilities and enabling community engagement in epidemics preparedness: the CAVE model from Austria.* Eur J Public Health, 2024.

44. Dowd, J.B., et al., *Demographic science aids in understanding the spread and fatality rates of COVID-19.* Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 2020. **117** (18): p. 9696-9698.
45. Lasser, J., et al., *Agent-based simulations for protecting nursing homes with prevention and vaccination strategies.* J R Soc Interface, 2021. **18** (185): p. 20210608.
46. Kellner, M.J., et al., *A Rapid, Highly Sensitive and Open-Access SARS-CoV-2 Detection Assay for Laboratory and Home Testing.* Front Mol Biosci, 2022. **9**: p. 801309.
47. Bloom, D.E. and D. Cadarette, *Infectious Disease Threats in the Twenty-First Century: Strengthening the Global Response.* Frontiers in Immunology, 2019. **10**.
48. Gates, B., *The Next Epidemic — Lessons from Ebola.* New England Journal of Medicine, 2015. **372** (15): p. 1381-1384.
49. Gates, B., *How to prevent the next pandemic.* First Edition ed. 2022, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
50. World Health Organization, *A practical guide for developing and conducting simulation exercises to test and validate pandemic influenza preparedness plans.* 2018; Available from: https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/274298/9789241514507-eng.pdf.
51. Christidis, P. and A. Christodoulou, *The Predictive Capacity of Air Travel Patterns during the Global Spread of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Risk, Uncertainty and Randomness.* Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health, 2020. **17** (10): p. 3356.
52. Brockmann, D. and D. Helbing, *The Hidden Geometry of Complex, Network-Driven Contagion Phenomena.* Science, 2013. **342** (6164): p. 1337-1342.
53. Li, H., *Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences.* Bioinformatics, 2018. **34** (18): p. 3094-3100.
54. Untergasser, A., et al., *Primer3—new capabilities and interfaces.* Nucleic Acids Research, 2012. **40** (15): p. e115-e115.
55. World Health Organization, *Laboratory quality management system: handbook.* 2012; Available from: https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/44665/9789241548274_eng.pdf.
56. ISO, *International Standard ISO 15189 - Medical laboratories - Requirements for quality and competence.* 2022, International Organization for Standardization: Geneva, Switzerland.
57. Boom, R., et al., *Rapid and simple method for purification of nucleic acids.* Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 1990. **28** (3): p. 495-503.
58. Holland, P.M., et al., *Detection of specific polymerase chain reaction product by utilizing the 5′----3′ exonuclease activity of Thermus aquaticus DNA polymerase.* Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 1991. **88** (16): p. 7276-80.
59. Emery, S.L., et al., *Real-time reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction assay for SARS-associated coronavirus.* Emerg Infect Dis, 2004. **10** (2): p. 311-6.
60. Shapiro, S.S. and M.B. Wilk, *An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples)†.* Biometrika, 1965. **52** (3-4): p. 591-611.
61. Student, *THE PROBABLE ERROR OF A MEAN.* Biometrika, 1908. **6** (1): p. 1-25.
62. Wilcoxon, F., *Individual Comparisons by Ranking Methods.* Biometrics Bulletin, 1945. **1** (6): p. 80-83.

Vienna COVID-19 Detection Initiative Authors

Stefan Ameres, Institute of Molecular Biotechnology of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (IMBA), Vienna, Austria; Benedikt Bauer, Research Institute of Molecular Pathology (IMP), Vienna, Austria; Nikolaus Beer, IMP, IMBA, and Gregor Mendel Institute (GMI), Vienna, Austria; Katharina Bergauer, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Wolfgang Binder, Max Perutz Labs (MPL), Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Claudia Blaukopf, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Boril Bochev, IMP, IMBA, and GMI, Vienna, Austria; Julius Brennecke, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Selina Brinnich, Vienna Biocenter Core Facilities (VBCF), Vienna, Austria; Aleksandra Bundalo, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Meinrad Busslinger, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Aleksandr Bykov, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Tim Clausen, IMP, and Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Luisa Cochella, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Geert de Vries, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Marcus Dekens, IMP, Vienna, Austria; David Drechsel, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Zuzana Dzupinkova, IMP, IMBA, and GMI, Vienna, Austria; Michaela Eckmann-Mader, VBCF, Vienna, Austria; Ulrich Elling, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Michaela Fellner, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Thomas Fellner, VBCF, Vienna, Austria; Laura Fin, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Bianca Valeria Gapp, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Gerlinde Grabmann, VBCF, Vienna, Austria; Irina Grishkovskaya, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Astrid Hagelkruys, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Bence Hajdusits, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Buck Hanson, Centre for Microbiology and Environmental Systems Science, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; David Haselbach, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Robert Heinen, IMP, IMBA, and GMI, Vienna, Austria; Louisa Hill, IMP, Vienna, Austria; David Hoffmann, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Stefanie Horer, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Harald Isemann, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Robert Kalis, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Max Kellner, IMP and IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Juliane Kley, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Thomas Köcher, VBCF, Vienna, Austria; Alwin Köhler, MPL, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Darja Kordic, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Christian Krauditsch, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Sabina Kula, IMP, IMBA, and GMI, Vienna, Austria; Richard Latham, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Marie-Christin Leitner, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Thomas Leonard, MPL, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Dominik Lindenhofer, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Raphael Arthur Manzenreither, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Karl Mechtler, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Anton Meinhart, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Stefan Mereiter, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Thomas Micheler, VBCF, Vienna, Austria; Paul Moeseneder, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Tobias Neumann, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Simon Nimpf, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Magnus Nordborg, GMI and IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Egon Ogris, MPL, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Michaela Pagani, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Andrea Pauli, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Jan-Michael Peters, IMP, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Petra Pjevac, Centre for Microbiology and Environmental Systems Science, and Joint Microbiome Facility of the University of Vienna and Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Clemens Plaschka, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Martina Rath, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Daniel Reumann, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Sarah Rieser, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Marianne Rocha-Hasler, Centre for Microbiology and Environmental Systems Science, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Alan Rodriguez, IMP and IMBA, Vienna, Austria; James Julian Ross, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Harald Scheuch, IMP, IMBA, and GMI, Vienna, Austria; Karina Schindler, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Clara Schmidt, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Hannes Schmidt, Centre for Microbiology and Environmental Systems Science, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Jakob Schnabl, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Stefan Schüchner, MPL, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Tanja Schwickert, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Andreas Sommer, VBCF, Vienna, Austria; Johannes Stadlmann, Institute of Biochemistry, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences (BOKU), Vienna, Austria; Alexander Stark, IMP, Vienna, Austria, and Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Peter Steinlein, IMP, IMBA, and GMI, Vienna, Austria; Simon Strobl, VBCF, Vienna, Austria; Qiong Sun, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Wen Tang, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Linda Trübestein, MPL, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Christian Umkehrer, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Sandor Urmosi-Incze, VBCF, Vienna, Austria; Kristina Uzunova, IMP, IMBA, and GMI, Vienna, Austria; Gijs Versteeg, MPL, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Alexander Vogt, VBCF, Vienna, Austria; Vivien Vogt, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Michael Wagner, Centre for Microbiology and Environmental Systems Science, and Joint Microbiome Facility of the University of Vienna and Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; Martina Weißenböck, IMP, Vienna, Austria; Barbara Werner, VBCF, Vienna, Austria; Ramesh Yelagandula, IMBA, Vienna, Austria; Johannes Zuber, IMP, and Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria.