

Supplementary Material for: An imperfect tool: COVID-19 ‘test & trace’ success relies on minimising the impact of false negatives and continuation of physical distancing.

Emma L. Davis^{a,1,*}, Tim C. D. Lucas^{a,1}, Anna Borlase^a, Timothy M
Pollington^{a,b}, Sam Abbot^c, Diepreye Ayabina^a, Thomas Crellan^a,
Joel Hellewell^c, Li Pi^a, CMMID COVID-19 working group^{c,3}, Graham F.
Medley^c, T. Déirdre Hollingsworth^{a,2}, Petra Klepac^{c,d,2}

^a*Big Data Institute, Li Ka Shing Centre for Health Information and Discovery,
University of Oxford, UK*

^b*MathSys CDT, University of Warwick, UK*

^c*Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical
Medicine, UK*

^d*Department for Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, University of Cambridge,
UK*

S1. Timing of test relative to exposure

By comparing the time individuals are tested after exposure in the model to temporal estimates of PCR test sensitivity¹ we see that an average of 65% sensitivity is likely to be a relatively realistic expectation if tests are conducted two days post-isolation (Figure S3). Sensitivity peaks at just over 75% 8 days post-exposure, but the majority of testing is likely to occur between 4 and 7 days post-exposure, where estimates are much wider. In the case of immediate testing 65% sensitivity is potentially an over-estimate, which is likely to further exacerbate the trend we saw in Figure 3, making it

*Corresponding author

Email address: emma.davis@bdi.ox.ac.uk (Emma L. Davis^a)

¹Authors contributed equally

²Authors contributed equally

³Full list of members below




Figure S1: Varying delay to tracing (A) and self-reporting probability (B).

even less likely that immediate advice to leave quarantine is an appropriate response to a negative test.




Figure S2: Average total numbers of cases tested and isolated (left and middle respectively) and total overall cases (right).




Figure S3: Density distributions of time cases are tested in our model, measured in days post-exposure, for an immediate test upon identification (orange) and a 2 day delay to testing (blue). Black data points and error bars are temporal sensitivity estimates from Kuchirka et al. and used as a comparison.¹ In the model we assumed a fixed 65% test sensitivity except for special cases.

References

- [1] L. M. Kucirka, S. A. Lauer, O. Laeyendecker, D. Boon, J. Lessler, Variation in false-negative rate of reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction-based SARS-CoV-2 tests by time since exposure, *Annals of Internal Medicine* (2020).

S2. CMMID working group authorship list

The following authors were part of the Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Disease 2019-nCoV working group. Each contributed in processing, cleaning and interpretation of data, interpreted findings, contributed to the manuscript, and approved the work for publication: Alicia Rosello, Rosalind M Eggo, Quentin J Leclerc, Matthew Quaife, Emily S Nightingale, Thibaut Jombart, Jon C Emery, Timothy W Russell, Nikos I Bosse, Megan Auzenberg, Amy Gimma, Charlie Diamond, Yang Liu, Kiesha Prem, Eleanor M Rees, Christopher I Jarvis, W John Edmunds, Akira Endo, David Simons, Billy J Quilty, Damien C Tully, Oliver Brady, C Julian Villabona-Arenas, Gwenan M Knight, Samuel Clifford, Stéphane Hué, Kevin van Zandvoort, Adam J Kucharski, Mark Jit, Arminder K Deol, Kathleen O'Reilly, Anna M Foss, Fiona Yueqian Sun, James D Munday, Hamish P Gibbs, Rein M G J Houben, Rachel Lowe, Sophie R Meakin, Georgia R Gore-Langton, Sebastian Funk, Carl A B Pearson, Katherine E. Atkins, Simon R Procter, Stefan Flasche, Nicholas G. Davies.

The following funding sources are acknowledged as providing funding for the working group authors. Alan Turing Institute (AE). BBSRC LIDP (BB/M009513/1: DS). This research was partly funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (INV-003174: KP, MJ, YL; NTD Modelling Consortium OPP1184344: CABP; OPP1180644: SRP; OPP1183986: ESN; OPP1191821: KO'R, MA). DFID/Wellcome Trust (Epidemic Preparedness Coronavirus research programme 221303/Z/20/Z: CABP, KvZ). Elrha R2HC/UK DFID/Wellcome Trust/This research was partly funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) using UK aid from the UK Government to support global health research. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the UK Department of Health and Social Care (KvZ). ERC Starting Grant (#757688:

CJVA, KEA; #757699: JCE, MQ, RMGJH). This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme - project EpiPose (101003688: KP, MJ, WJE, YL). This research was partly funded by the Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) project 'RECAP' managed through RCUK and ESRC (ES/P010873/1: AG, CIJ, TJ). HDR UK (MR/S003975/1: RME). Nakajima Foundation (AE). NIHR (16/137/109: BJQ, CD, FYS, MJ, YL; Health Protection Research Unit for Modelling Methodology HPRU-2012-10096: NGD, TJ; PR-OD-1017-20002: AR). Royal Society (Dorothy Hodgkin Fellowship: RL). UK DHSC/UK Aid/NIHR (ITCRZ 03010: HPG). UK MRC (LID DTP MR/N013638/1: EMR, GRGL, QJL; MC_PC 19065: RME; MR/P014658/1: GMK). Authors of this research receive funding from UK Public Health Rapid Support Team funded by the United Kingdom Department of Health and Social Care (TJ). Wellcome Trust (206250/Z/17/Z: AJK, TWR; 206471/Z/17/Z: OJB; 208812/Z/17/Z: SC, SFlasche; 210758/Z/18/Z: JDM, NIB, SFunk, SRM). No funding (AKD, AMF, DCT, SH).