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(a) Model I, $p = 0.12$

(b) Model II, $p = 0.034$

Figure S1: Total number of infections as a function of compliance for the higher probability of infection values in disease transmission models I and II.
Figure S2: Total number of infections as a function of compliance given 70% probability of infection for respirator use ($f_h = 0.7$) and 70% contact rate in the high-activity group ($f_d = 0.7$) for disease transmission models I and II.
Figure S3: Total number of infections as a function of compliance given 30% probability of infection for respirator use ($f_h = 0.3$) and 70% contact rate in the high-activity group ($f_d = 0.7$) for disease transmission models I and II.
Figure S4: Infections as a function of compliance given \( n_H = n_L = 50,000 \) persons in disease transmission models I and II.
Figure S5: Infections as a function of compliance given the high-activity group contact rate $\lambda_H = 35 \text{ day}^{-1}$ in disease transmission models I and II.

(a) Model I, $p = 0.10$

(b) Model II, $p = 0.028$
Figure S6: Total costs as a function of compliance given linear costs as a function of intervention compliance for both interventions, compared to exponential costs for social distancing intervention compliance in disease transmission model I with baseline conditions and $p = 0.12$. 

(a) Linear Cost

(b) Exponential Cost
Figure S7: Total costs as a function of compliance given linear costs as a function of intervention compliance for both interventions, compared to exponential costs for social distancing intervention compliance in disease transmission model II with baseline conditions and $p = 0.034$. 

(a) Linear Cost

(b) Exponential Cost
Figure S8: Total costs as a function of compliance given linear costs as a function of intervention compliance for both interventions, compared to exponential costs for social distancing intervention compliance in disease transmission model I with increased intervention effectiveness, $f_d = f_h = 0.3$, and $p = 0.10$. 
Figure S9: Total costs as a function of compliance given linear costs as a function of intervention compliance for both interventions, compared to exponential costs for social distancing intervention compliance in disease transmission model I with decreased intervention effectiveness, $f_d = f_h = 0.7$, and $p = 0.10$. 
Figure S10: Total costs as a function of compliance given linear costs as a function of intervention compliance for both interventions, compared to exponential costs for social distancing intervention compliance in disease transmission model I with decreased effectiveness of social distancing, \( f_d = 0.7 \), and increased effectiveness of the hygiene intervention, \( f_h = 0.3 \), and \( p = 0.10 \).
Figure S11: Total costs as a function of compliance given linear costs as a function of intervention compliance for both interventions in disease transmission models I ($p = 0.10$) and II ($p = 0.028$) with decreased effectiveness of social distancing, $f_d = 0.3$, and increased effectiveness of the hygiene intervention, $f_h = 0.7$. 
Figure S12: Total costs as a function of compliance given linear costs as a function of intervention compliance for both interventions, compared to exponential costs for social distancing intervention compliance in disease transmission model II with increased intervention effectiveness, $f_d = f_h = 0.3$, and $p = 0.028$. 
Figure S13: Total costs as a function of compliance given linear costs as a function of intervention compliance for both interventions, compared to exponential costs for social distancing intervention compliance in disease transmission model II with decreased intervention effectiveness, $f_d = f_h = 0.7$, and $p = 0.028$. 
Figure S14: Total costs as a function of compliance given linear costs as a function of intervention compliance for both interventions, compared to exponential costs for social distancing intervention compliance in disease transmission model II with decreased effectiveness of social distancing, $f_d = 0.7$, and increased effectiveness of the hygiene intervention, $f_h = 0.3$, and $p = 0.028$. 
Figure S15: Total costs as a function of compliance given linear costs as a function of intervention compliance for both interventions, compared to exponential costs for social distancing intervention compliance in disease transmission model I with increased contact rate in the high-activity group, $\lambda_H = 35 \text{ day}^{-1}$, and $p = 0.10$. 
Figure S16: Total costs as a function of compliance given linear costs as a function of intervention compliance for both interventions, compared to exponential costs for social distancing intervention compliance in disease transmission model II with increased contact rate in the high-activity group, $\lambda_H = 35 \text{ day}^{-1}$, and $p = 0.028$. 

(a) Linear Cost

(b) Exponential Cost
Figure S17: Total costs as a function of compliance given linear costs as a function of intervention compliance for both interventions, compared to exponential costs for social distancing intervention compliance in disease transmission model I with increased initial population in the high-activity group, \( n_H = n_L = 50,000 \) persons and \( p = 0.10 \).
Figure S18: Total costs as a function of compliance given linear costs as a function of intervention compliance for both interventions, compared to exponential costs for social distancing intervention compliance in disease transmission model II with increased initial population in the high-activity group, $n_H = n_L = 50,000$ persons and $p = 0.028$. 

(a) Linear Cost

(b) Exponential Cost