Supplementary Information

Baseline parameter settings

Figure S1: Baseline assumptions concerning transmission and diagnosis: (a) Transmission probability per contact per day of the infectious period. (b) Probability distribution for the number of contacts per day, including both household and non-household contacts. (c) Distribution of percent onward transmission per day of the infectious period. (d) Probability of being diagnosed by day of infectious period for the when all infections are symptomatic there is no delay in diagnosis.



Sensitivity analyses

We report here some of the sensitivity analyses to show how the effectiveness of contact tracing depends on time delays in tracing and diagnosis.

In Supplementary Figure S2 we show how the basic and effective reproduction numbers are related. We explore how varying the fraction of non-household contacts that are traced, and the time to diagnosis of index cases influence the effective reproduction number. In the first case, we observe that failure to find all infected contacts does not lead to a loss of control for R_0=2.5 or lower (Figure S2a). This is only due to the optimistic values of all other parameters, in particular that cases will be diagnosed and isolated without delay as soon as they become symptomatic. If there is delay in diagnosis, loss of control will occur for delays of more than 1 week, even if all non-household contacts can be traced and isolated (Figure S2b). Contacts have then already entered their infectious period and, consequently, have had time to spread the infection. Thus, we conclude that timeliness of diagnosis is of utmost importance for controlling an outbreak.

Figure S2: The effective reproduction number R_e for varying the basic reproduction number R_0 in the optimistic baseline scenario. (a) Colors indicate a range from 100% of infected non-household contacts isolated (Blue) to no non-household contacts isolated (Pink) in steps of 10%; (b) Colors indicate a range of no delay in diagnosis (Blue) to 10 days delay in diagnosis (Pink) in steps of 1 day; all other parameters are at baseline values.



Fraction of non-household contacts needed to trace and isolate

If there is a diagnosis delay, the question arises how successful contact tracing has to be to keep the outbreak under control. We therefore compute the minimum fraction of non-household contacts that need to be traced and isolated (henceforth termed "critical tracing coverage") to bring R_e to below 1. The results are shown in Figure S3. For a diagnosis delay up to 4 days, there is a chance of controlling the outbreak if the coverage of tracing non-household contacts is above the critical fraction (Figure S3a). We varied the time it takes to trace non-household contacts between 1 and 7 days, assuming no diagnosis delay. In this case, the time needed to trace contacts does not have a large impact on the critical tracing coverage (Supplementary Figure S3b). This is because diagnosis is quick enough, such that despite a delay in tracing infected contacts, they are found before they become infectious, or if they are not found by contact tracing, they get rapidly diagnosed themselves.

Impact of asymptomatic cases

If we look at these same plots for situations where not all infected cases are diagnosed, the possibility of controlling the outbreak quickly fades. Not being diagnosed can be a consequence of not developing symptoms, having only mild symptoms, or any other reason why infected persons might not be identified by health care. We subsume these possible reasons for cases not being ascertained under the term "asymptomatic". In Figure S2b critical tracing coverages are shown for a situation of 80% symptomatic cases, in Figure S2c for 60% symptomatic cases. In the latter case, control of the outbreak is not possible, even if all other parameters are set at the most optimistic values.

Figure S3: The critical fraction of non-household contacts that need to be found and isolated to control the outbreak for a range of the basic reproduction number R_0. The vertical green line depicts the baseline value of R_0=2.5. Blue shows the critical tracing coverage in the optimistic baseline scenario, pink the worst case scenario. In panels A, C, and E, the delay in diagnosis was varied between 1 and 10 days in steps of 1 day; in the panels B, D, and F, the time needed to trace non-household contacts was varied between 1 and 7 days in steps of 1 day. The rows differ in the fraction of asymptomatic infections: 100% symptomatic (A and B), 80% symptomatic (C and D), and 60% symptomatic (E and F).


100% symptomatic
A
Critical tracing coverage
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
0
1
2
3
4
R0
100% symptomatic
B
Critical tracing coverage
R0
80% symptomatic
C
Critical tracing coverage
R0
80% symptomatic
D
Critical tracing coverage
R0
60% symptomatic
E
Critical tracing coverage
R0
60% symptomatic
F
Critical tracing coverage
R0

Exponential growth rate and doubling time

In situations, where control of the outbreak is not possible with isolation and contact tracing only, it might still be possible to slow down the epidemic by those measures and thereby gain time for the health care system to deal with the outbreak. We find that contact tracing has an impact on the epidemic growth rate for diagnosis delays less than 3 days (Supplementary Figure S4a) and high coverages of tracing non-household contacts (Supplementary Figure S4c). Supplementary Figures S4b and S4d show doubling times of the epidemic for situations where the fraction of symptomatic cases is 60% or lower. For very successful contact tracing interventions (i.e. small diagnosis delays and high tracing coverages) the doubling time can be increased to 30 days if 60% are symptomatic. Below that value there is little impact on the doubling time.

In the above we considered the impact of diverging from an optimistic baseline scenario one parameter at a time. In reality, many parameters will be imperfect and their impact on the success of contact tracing will add up. As an illustration, we considered a more pessimistic scenario, where it takes 7 days to find and isolate infected non-household contacts, the coverage of tracing is 50%, the delay in diagnosis is 5 days, and only 60% of cases develop symptoms. For this scenario, the effective reproduction number if only isolation of cases is performed is 2.4. If contact tracing and isolation of contacts is done, the effective reproduction number can be further reduced to 1.8; the exponential growth rate is then lowered to 0.08, and the doubling time is increased to 8.8 days. Although containment is not possible in this scenario, the doubling time can be increased by a factor of 1.6, which implies a slowing down of the epidemic.

Figure S4: The exponential growth rate for (A) varying delay in diagnosis and (C) varying tracing coverage. The colors depict varying levels of symptomatic infections: Blue: 100% symptomatic cases; Pink: 2% symptomatic cases. When the exponential growth rate is smaller than zero (red horizontal line), the outbreak is controlled. In (B) and (D), the doubling time of the epidemic is shown for situations where the exponential growth rate is positive. In (B) delay in diagnosis is varied and in (D) tracing coverage is varied. The uppermost curve corresponds to a situation with 60% symptomatic cases, the lowest one to 2% symptomatic cases. For the situation with 60% asymptomatic cases, contact tracing and isolation can slow down the epidemic substantially, but not control it, even if there is no diagnosis delay and all non-household contacts are traced.