

Figure 6: Sensitivity of the results to the choice of contact graph. Panel (c) is identical to Figure 3. We see that regardless of the contact graph, the ranking of the strategies by effectiveness is the same, thus the qualitative results are robust. Note that the quantitative results are also similar from graph to graph, with the exception of the total number of infected people: for the high school contact graph (c), it equals 38.4, whereas for the synthetic random graph (d), it equals 76.3. That happens in spite of the fact that the random graph is calibrated to be the same as the high school graph in terms of number of nodes, edges, and contacts: thus, the difference is due to the expansion of the random graph, which contrasts with the high school group structure.




Figure 7: Sensitivity of the results to the choice of contact graph. Panel (c) is identical to Figure 4. Qualitatively, we see that the order between the curves is the same for all contact graphs and all values of R_0 , so that result is robust. The weekly and daily alternations are indistinguishable for this measure. Quantitatively, if we focus on the largest R_0 such that On-Off leads to $R_e < 1$, we see that it depends significantly on the underlying contact graph: $R_0 = 1.44$ for primary schools, 1.29 for the workplace, 1.34 for the high school, and 1.49 for the random graph.




Figure 8: For all contact networks, we performed a sensitivity analysis of the results of Figure 6 w.r.t. R_0 (or equivalently, to the parameter p .) We see that the probability of an outbreak is sensitive to the value of R_0 : for example, for On-Off, as R_0 varies from 1 to 1.5, it goes from 13% to 23%. However, it is not so sensitive to the choice of contact graph: when there is no strategy, for the base case $R_0 = 1.25$ it is between .2 and .3 for all graphs. The number of days until an outbreak, around two weeks, is fairly robust and shows little sensitivity to either R_0 or the choice of contact graph. The final number of people infected conditioned on an outbreak is the most sensitive quantity, both to the value of R_0 and to the choice of contact graph.




Figure 9: Sensitivity analysis of the results of Figure 3 for the high school contact network. In (a), we look at the parameters as a function of R_0 , which varies by changing the value of the probability p of symptomatic transmission (baseline $R_0 = 1.25$ corresponding to $p = 0.0040$, and $R_0 = 1$ corresponds to $p = 0.003$). We do not observe a phase transition in which the number of infected people would explode when R_0 becomes greater than 1, but instead, we observe a smooth increase. This is probably due to the small size of the graph (327 nodes), too small to see the theoretical asymptotic behavior as the number of nodes goes to infinity. In (b), we look at the parameters by changing the shape of the super-spreading distribution (gamma of mean 1, baseline shape value 0.1). The baseline case corresponds to the vertical dotted line at $R_0 = 1.25$, whose intersection with the curves of the strategies gives the values of Figure 3. Surprisingly, we observe that, the more dispersion in the shape of superspreaders, the less the probability of outbreak and the fewer people get infected. This can be explained intuitively by thinking about an extreme case of dispersion. Imagine that with probability $1/1000$, there is a superspreading factor of 1000, and with the complementary probability $999/1000$, the superspreading factor equals 0. Then, for most executions, the index case is not a superspreader and infects no one. In 0.1% of the cases, the index case is a superspreader and infects all of its neighbors, however none of them will be a superspreader and propagate the infection. That would have probability about equal to the number of neighbors times 0.000001, too small to ever occur in the simulations.




Figure 10: Sensitivity analysis of the results of Figure 3 for the high school contact network, w.r.t. : (a) the probability that an infected person is asymptomatic (baseline: 40%); as expected given that symptomatic individuals isolate, the higher the fraction of asymptomatic persons, the worse it is; (b) the difference of infectiousness of an asymptomatic person compared to that of a symptomatic person (baseline: $1/2$); here there is a tradeoff in the duration until outbreak, conditioning on existence of an outbreak: when asymptomatic persons are almost not infectious, the epidemic evolution is driven by symptomatic persons, who are only able to contaminate others in the first few days before they isolate, so when outbreaks do happen, they happen more quickly; at the other end of the scale, when most asymptomatic people are just as infectious as symptomatic people, they infect people earlier on but because they are more contagious, they infect more people; (c) the number of days during which a symptomatic individual continues going to school or work after developing symptoms (baseline: 1 day). The baseline case corresponds to the vertical dotted line, whose intersection with the curves of the strategies gives the values of Figure 3. Part (c) suggests that changing behavior so that a person self-isolates as soon as she develops symptoms is very effective to reduce the dissemination of the epidemic in her contact network.




Figure 11: Sensitivity analysis of the results of Figure 3 for the high school contact network, w.r.t. graph of persistent contacts. In part (a), we do a sensitivity analysis when we vary the intensity of persistent contacts (baseline: 25%). The baseline case in (a) corresponds to the vertical dotted line, whose intersection with the curves of the strategies gives the values of Figure 3. We see that, the more persistent contacts there are, the worse it is for the epidemic, but that the variation is smooth. Parts (b),(c) and (d) we do a sensitivity analysis in which we vary the *structure* of the persistent contacts graph, while keeping the total number of contacts unchanged. Part (c) is the baseline case and is an identical copy of Figure 3 for ease of comparison. Part (d) takes a complete homogeneous graph for the persistent contacts graph. Part (b) is a construction of what we call a *best friends* graph, constructed in the following two steps: First, each person lists their neighbor by order of decreasing number of contacts, stopping as soon as they reach 25% or their total number of contacts. This creates a directed graph in which many arcs carry 0 contacts. Second, we make it symmetric by putting on each edge $\{u, v\}$ the average of the number of contacts on arc (u, v) and on arc (v, u) . We observe that the results are sensitive to the structure. The best friends graph propagates the epidemic the least, the complete graph propagates it the most, and the baseline graph is intermediate. For example, regarding the probability of outbreak, when there is no strategy the probability is 36% for the complete graph, 27% for the baseline graph, and 24% for the best friends graph. Regarding the total number of persons infected when there is an outbreak, when there is no strategy we have 188.2 for the complete graph (the bar actually goes beyond the figure), 35.5 for the baseline graph, and 25.4 for the best friends graph. When the daily On-Off strategy is used, the numbers are 88.3 for the complete graph, 18.4 for the baseline graph, and just 12.5 for the best friends graph. We see that the structure of contacts in the high school, that mostly happen within well-separated groups, results in a much smaller number of infected people. A further behavioral change in which people reduce the number of people they interact with to just a few best friends, even without reducing their total number of contacts, results in a significant reduction in the number of people infected.




Figure 12: Sensitivity analysis of the results of Figure 3 for the high school contact network, w.r.t. the SEIR model parameters: (a) the mean length of the exposed period (baseline: 3.7 days); (b) the shape of the distribution of the exposed period (baseline: 5). The baseline case corresponds to the vertical dotted line, whose intersection with the curves of the strategies gives the values of Figure 3. Unsurprisingly, the longer the exposed period, the longer it takes before 5 people are infected; otherwise the distribution of the exposed period has little impact on the results.




Figure 13: Sensitivity analysis of the results of Figure 3 for the high school contact network, w.r.t. the SEIR model parameters: (a) the mean length of the infectious period (baseline: 9.5 days); (b) the shape of the distribution of the remaining of the infectious period after the first 1.5 days (baseline: 10). The baseline case corresponds to the vertical dotted line, whose intersection with the curves of the strategies gives the values of Figure 3. The variations are monotone and smooth.




Figure 14: Four simulation runs of epidemic propagation inside the primary school network (similarly to Figure 5). Among the runs producing an outbreak under no strategy, we selected the first four that produce a median number of infections.




Figure 15: Four simulation runs of epidemic propagation inside the highschool network (similarly to Figure 5). Among the runs producing an outbreak under no strategy, we selected the first four that produce a median number of infections.




Figure 16: Four simulation runs of epidemic propagation inside the workplace network (similarly to Figure 5). Among the runs producing an outbreak under no strategy, we selected the first four that produce a median number of infections.