Epidemic doubling time of the COVID-19 epidemic by Chinese province

Kamalich Muniz-Rodriguez, MPH[1]; Gerardo Chowell, PhD[1]; Chi-Hin Cheung, MS; Dongyu Jia, PhD; Po-Ying Lai, MS; Yiseul Lee, MPH, Manyun Liu, MS; Sylvia K. Ofori, MPH; Kimberlyn M. Roosa, MPH; Lone Simonsen, PhD; Cecile Viboud, PhD; Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, PhD

[1] These authors contribute equally as co-first authors

Author affiliations: Georgia Southern University (K. Muniz-Rodriguez, D. Jia, M. Liu, S. K. Ofori, I. C.-H. Fung); Georgia State University (G. Chowell, Y. Lee, K. M. Roosa); Independent researcher (C.-H. Cheung); Boston University (P.-Y. Lai), Roskilde University (L. Simonsen), The National Institutes of Health (G. Chowell, C. Viboud)

Email addresses: km11200@georgiasouthern.edu (K. Muniz-Rodriguez); gchowell@gsu.edu (G. Chowell) westerpants@gmail.com (C.-H. Cheung); djia@georgiasouthern.edu (D. Jia); pylai@bu.edu (P.-Y. Lai); ylee97@student.gsu.edu (Y. Lee); ml16842@georgiasouthern.edu (M. Liu); so01935@georgiasouthern.edu (S. K. Ofori); kroosa1@student.gsu.edu (K. M. Roosa); lsimonsen2@gmail.com (L. Simonsen); viboudc@mail.nih.gov (C. Viboud); cfung@georgiasouthern.edu (I. C.-H. Fung)

Please address correspondence to Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, PhD, Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Environmental Health Sciences, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA 30460, USA. +1 912 478 5079. Email: cfung@georgiasouthern.edu

Genre: Research Letter (Max. 800 words)

Current word count: 911.

Abstract: n=50; Word limit = 50

COVID-19 epidemic doubling time by Chinese province was increasing from January 20 through February 9, 2020. Yet, the harmonic mean doubling time was relatively short, ranging from 1.4 (Hunan, 95% CI, 1.2-2.0) to 3.0 (Xinjiang, 95% CI, 2.0-4.9) days, with an estimate of 2.5 days (95% CI, 2.4-2.7) for Hubei.

To the editor:

Our ability to estimate the basic reproduction number of emerging infectious diseases is often hindered by the paucity of information about the epidemiological characteristics and transmission mechanisms of new pathogens (1). Alternative metrics could synthesize real-time information about the extent to which the epidemic is expanding over time. Such metrics would be particularly useful if they rely on minimal and routinely collected data that capture the trajectory of an outbreak (2).

Epidemic doubling times characterize the sequence of intervals at which the cumulative incidence doubles (3). Here we analyze the number of times the cumulative incidence doubles and the evolution of the doubling times of the COVID-19 epidemic in mainland China (4). We use province-level data from January 20 (when nationwide reporting began) through February 9, 2020. See Technical Appendix 1 for a sensitivity analysis based on a longer time period. If an epidemic is growing exponentially with a constant growth rate r, the doubling time remains constant and equals to $(\ln 2)/r$. An increase in the epidemic doubling time indicates a slowdown in transmission if the underlying reporting rate remains unchanged (Technical Appendix 2).

Daily cumulative incidence data were retrieved from provincial health commissions' websites (Technical Appendix 3). Data were double-checked against the cumulative national total published by the National Health Commission (5), data compiled by the Centre for Health Protection, Hong Kong, when available (6) and by John Hopkins University (7). Whenever discrepancies arose, provincial government sources were deemed authoritative. Tibet was excluded from further analysis because there had only been one case reported during the study period. See Technical Appendix 1 for data.

From January 20 through February 9, the harmonic mean doubling time estimated from cumulative incidence ranged from 1.4 (95% CI, 1.2, 2.0) days (Hunan) to 3.0 (95% CI, 2.0, 4.9) days (Xinjiang). In Hubei, it was estimated as 2.5 (95% CI, 2.4, 2.7) days. For illustrative purpose only, this estimate corresponds to an estimated effective reproductive number in a range of 2.1 to 4.2 in scenarios

51 based on different assumptions and data sources. See Technical Appendix 2 for scenario analysis of
52 various parameter values. The cumulative incidence doubled 6 times in Hubei. The harmonic mean
53 doubling time in mainland China except Hubei was 1.8 (95% CI, 1.5-2.2) days. Provinces with a
54 harmonic mean doubling time <2d included Fujian, Guangxi, Hebei, Heilongjiang, Henan, Hubei, Hunan,
55 Jiangxi, Shandong, Sichuan, and Zhejiang (Figures 1 and S1).

56 As the epidemic progressed, it took longer for the cumulative incidence in mainland China
57 (except Hubei) to double itself, which indicated an overall sub-exponential growth pattern outside Hubei
58 (Figure S1A). In Hubei, the doubling time decreased and then increased. A gradual increase in the
59 doubling time coincide with the social distancing measures and intra-and-inter-provincial travel
60 restrictions imposed across China since the implementation of quarantine of Wuhan on January 23 (8).

61 Our estimates of doubling times are shorter than recent estimates of 7.4 days (95% CI, 4.2-14)
62 (4), 6.4 days (95% CrI, 5.8-7.1) (9), and 7.1 days (95% CI, 3.0-20.5) (10) respectively. Li et al. covered
63 cases reported by January 22 (4). Wu et al. statistically inferred case counts in Wuhan by internationally
64 exported cases as of January 25 (9). Volz et al. identified a common viral ancestor on December 8, 2019
65 using Bayesian phylogenetic analysis and fitted an exponential growth model to provide the epidemic
66 growth rate (10). Our estimates are based on cumulative reported numbers of confirmed cases by date of
67 reports by province from January 20 through February 9. Our study is also congruent with Maier and
68 Brockmann (11) who also identified sub-exponential growth of the outbreak across provinces, as mass
69 quarantine and restriction of travels across mainland China began since January 23, 2020.

70 Our study is subject to limitations, including the underreporting of confirmed cases as reported by
71 Chinese media (12). One reason for underreporting is underdiagnosis, due to lack of diagnostic tests,
72 healthcare workers, and other resources. Further, underreporting is likely heterogeneous across provinces.
73 As long as reporting remains invariant over time within the same province, the calculation of doubling
74 times remains reliable; however, this is a strong assumption. Growing awareness of the epidemic and
75 increasing availability of diagnostic tests might have strengthened reporting over time, which could have

artificially shortened the doubling time. Nevertheless, apart from Hubei and Guangdong (first case reported on January 19), nationwide reporting only began on January 20, and at this point, Chinese authorities had openly acknowledged the magnitude and severity of the epidemic. Due to a lack of detailed case data describing incidence trends for imported and local cases, we focused our analysis on the overall trajectory of the epidemic without adjusting for the role of imported cases on the local transmission dynamics. Indeed, it is likely that the proportion of imported cases was significant for provinces that only reported a few cases; their short doubling times in the study period could simply reflect rapid detection of imported cases. However, with the data until February 9, only two provinces had a cumulative case count of <40 (Table S1). It would be interesting to investigate the evolution of the doubling time after accounting for case importations if more detailed data becomes available.

To conclude, we observed an increasing trend in the epidemic doubling time of COVID-19 by Chinese province from January 20 through February 9, 2020. The harmonic mean doubling time of cumulative incidence in Hubei during the study period was short and estimated at 2.5 (95% CI, 2.4-2.7) days.

First author(s) biography

Kamalich Muniz-Rodriguez, MPH, is a doctoral student at the Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health, Georgia Southern University. Her research interests include infectious disease epidemiology, digital epidemiology and disaster epidemiology.

Gerardo Chowell, PhD, is Professor of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, and Chair of the Department of Population Health Sciences at Georgia State University School of Public Health. As a mathematical epidemiologist, Prof Chowell studies the transmission dynamics of emerging infectious diseases, such as Ebola, MERS and SARS.

Acknowledgement

GC acknowledges support from NSF grant 1414374 as part of the joint NSF-NIH-USDA Ecology and Evolution of Infectious Diseases program. ICHF acknowledges salary support from the National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (19IPA1908208). This article is not part of ICHF's CDC-sponsored projects.

Disclaimer

This article does not represent the official positions of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, or the United States Government.

References

1. Anderson RM, May RM. Infectious diseases of humans. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1991.
2. Drake JM, Bakach I, Just MR, O'Regan SM, Gambhir M, Fung IC-H. Transmission Models of Historical Ebola Outbreaks. Emerging Infectious Disease journal. 2015;21(8):1447.
3. Vynnycky E, White RG. An Introduction to Infectious Disease Modelling. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2010.
4. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. N Engl J Med. 2020 Jan 29.
5. National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China. 2020 [cited Feb 2, 2020]; Available from: http://www.nhc.gov.cn/
6. Centre for Health Protection, Department of Health, The Government for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. 2020 [cited Feb 2, 2020]; Available from: https://www.chp.gov.hk/en/index.html
7. John Hopkins University Center for Systems Science and Engineering. 2019 Novel Coronavirus COVID-19 (2019-nCoV) Data Repository by Johns Hopkins CSSE. 2020 [cited Feb 13, 2020]; Available from: https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID-19
8. Du Z, Wang L, Cauchemez S, Xu X, Wang X, Cowling BJ, et al. Risk for transportation of 2019 novel coronavirus disease from Wuhan to other cities in China. Emerging Infectious Disease journal. 2020;26(5):in press.
9. Wu JT, Leung K, Leung GM. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. Lancet. 2020 Jan 31.
10. Volz E, Baguelin M, Bhatia S, Boonyasiri A, Cori A, Cucunubá Z, et al. Report 5: Phylogenetic analysis of SARS-CoV-2. 2020 [cited Feb 15, 2020]; Available from: https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida-fellowships/Imperial-College---COVID-19---genetic-analysis-FINAL.pdf
11. Maier BF, Brockmann D. Effective containment explains sub-exponential growth in confirmed cases of recent COVID-19 outbreak in Mainland China. arXiv. 2020:2002.07572.
12. Fang G, Li S, Liu Y, Xin N, Ma K. People beyond the statistics: Died of "normal pneumonia"? [统计数字之外的人：他们死于“普通肺炎”？]. Caijing Zachi [财经杂志] (Finance and Ecomomics Magazine) 2020 [cited Feb 13, 2020]; Available from: https://web.archive.org/web/20200213190623/http://www.sohu.com/a/370032279_120094087

143 **Figure legend**

144 **Figure 1.** The harmonic mean doubling time (Panel A) and the number of times the COVID-19 epidemic
145 cumulative incidence has doubled (Panel B) by province in mainland China, from January 20 through
146 February 9, 2020.

147


Harmonic mean doubling time of COVID-19 by province
1.40 - 1.59
1.60 - 1.99
2.0 - 2.39
2.40 - 2.59
2.60 - 2.89
2.90 - 3.09
Heilongjiang
Inner Mongolia
Jilin
Liaoning
Beijing
Tianjin
Hebei
Shanxi
Shandong
Xinjiang
Gansu
Ningxia Hui
Qinghai
Shaanxi
Henan
Jiangsu
Anhui
Tibet
Hubei
Shanghai
Sichuan
Chongqing
Zhejiang
Hunan
Jiangxi
Guizhou
Fujian
Yunnan
Guangxi
Guangdong
Hainan


Number of times the COVID-19 outbreak has doubled by province
3 - 4
5
6
7 - 8
9 - 10
Heilongjiang
Inner Mongolia
Jilin
Liaoning
Beijing
Tianjin
Xinjiang
Gansu
Ningxia Hui
Hebei
Shanxi
Shandong
Qinghai
Shaanxi
Henan
Jiangsu
Anhui
Tibet
Hubei
Shanghai
Sichuan
Chongqing
Zhejiang
Hunan
Jiangxi
Guizhou
Fujian
Yunnan
Guangxi
Guangdong
Hainan

Epidemic doubling time of the COVID-19 outbreak by Chinese province

Technical Appendix 1

Kamalich Muniz-Rodriguez, MPH[1]; Gerardo Chowell, PhD[1]; Chi-Hin Cheung, MS; Dongyu Jia, PhD; Po-Ying Lai, MS; Yiseul Lee, MPH, Manyun Liu, MS; Sylvia K. Ofori, MPH; Kimberlyn M. Roosa, MPH; Lone Simonsen, PhD; Cecile Viboud, PhD; Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, PhD

[1] These authors contribute equally as co-first authors

Author affiliations: Georgia Southern University (K. Muniz-Rodriguez, D. Jia, M. Liu, S. K. Ofori, I. C.-H. Fung); Georgia State University (G. Chowell, Y. Lee, K. M. Roosa); Independent researcher (C.-H. Cheung); Boston University (P.-Y. Lai), Roskilde University (L. Simonsen), The National Institutes of Health (G. Chowell, C. Viboud)

Please address correspondence to Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, PhD, Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Environmental Health Sciences, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA 30460, USA. +1 912 478 5079. Email: cfung@georgiasouthern.edu

Technical appendix 1

Additional information on our motivation, scope and methods

Motivation. R_0 is a widely used indicator of transmission potential in a totally susceptible population and is driven by the average contact rate and the mean infectious period of the disease (1). Yet, it only characterizes transmission potential at the onset of the epidemic and varies geographically for a given infectious disease according to local healthcare provision, outbreak response, as well as socioeconomic and cultural factors. Furthermore, estimating R_0 requires information about the natural history of the infectious disease. Thus, our ability to estimate reproduction numbers for novel infectious diseases is hindered by the paucity of information about their epidemiological characteristics and transmission mechanisms. More informative metrics could synthesize real-time information about the extent to which the epidemic is expanding over time. Such metrics would be particularly useful if they rely on minimal data on the outbreak's trajectory (2).

Scope and definition. We restricted our analysis to mainland China in this paper. A 'province' herein encompasses three different types of political sub-divisions of mainland China, namely, a province, a directly administered municipality (Beijing, Chongqing, Shanghai, and Tianjin) and an autonomous region (Guangxi, Inner Mongolia, Ningxia, Tibet, and Xinjiang). Our analysis does not include the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macau Special Administrative Region, which are under the effective rule of the People's Republic of China through the so-called 'One Country, Two Systems' political arrangements. Likewise, our analysis does not include Taiwan, which is *de facto* governed by a different government (the Republic of China).

Methods. Figures 1A, 1B, 2A, 2C and all figures in Technical Appendix 4 were created using R version 3.6.2 (R Core Team). Significance level in this manuscript was a priori decided to be $\alpha = 0.05$.

Additional information on our results and discussion

Cumulative incidence over time. In Technical Appendix 4, we provided a total of 31 plots of cumulative incidence over time (left panel) and $\log_{10}$ (cumulative incidence) over $\log_{10}$ (time) (right panel), for Hubei province, mainland China (except Hubei), and then each of the provinces except Tibet (as there was only one case). Thus, we linearized an exponential curve. If social distancing would have an impact, the slope of the log-log plot would decrease, indicating a decreasing epidemic growth rate.

Sensitivity analysis

We performed a sensitivity analysis by expanding our data analysis to the data since December 31, 2019, when Hubei first reported a cluster of pneumonia cases with unexplained etiology that turned out to be COVID-19. The only difference between the sensitivity analysis and the main analysis is the inclusion of Hubei and Guangdong data from December 31, 2019, through January 19, 2020, because nationwide reporting started on January 20, 2020. The only differences in results were found for Hubei and Guangdong. The harmonic mean doubling time for Hubei was 4.06 (95% CI. 3.86, 4.33), and the cumulative incidence in Hubei doubled nine times from December 31, 2019, through February 9, 2020 (Table S3, Figures S2, S3, S4). The first doubling time of Hubei (Figure S2) was high, reflecting that real-time data was unavailable before mid-January. It was only by January 17, 2020, onwards when data reporting become increasingly transparent and timely.

Table S1A. Confirmed cases of COVID-19 (December 31, 2019 to January 19, 2020) by province in mainland China extracted from official government sources used for the sensitivity analysis.

	Dec	January																	
Locations[1]	**31**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**	**19**
Mainland China (Excluding Hubei) (Sum of provincial reports)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	1
Mainland China (Including Hubei) (Sum of provincial reports)	27	NR	NR	44	NR	59	NR	NR	NR	NR	41	41	41	41	41	41	45	62	121	199
Mainland China (Including Hubei) (Sum by NCH) [2]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hubei	27	NR	NR	44	NR	59	NR	NR	NR	NR	41	41	41	41	41	41	45	62	121	198
Guangdong	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	1

Note. NA, not applicable. NR, not reported. [1]Observations were collected directly from government official sites from each province in mainland China. If a press release included data reported at midnight and early morning, they were considered to belong to the previous day the data was reported. [2]Official national tally of cumulative case count of confirmed cases was first published by the National Health Commission of China on January 21, 2020 for January 20, 2020 (3).

Table S1B. Confirmed cases of COVID-19 (January 20 to 31, 2020) by province in mainland China extracted from official government sources used for the main analysis and sensitivity analysis.

	January											
Locations[1]	**20**	**21**	**22**	**23**	**24**	**25**	**26**	**27**	**28**	**29**	**30**	**31**
Mainland China (Excluding Hubei) (Sum of provincial reports)	26	71	145	291	585	923	1321	1802	2386	3126	3885	4637
Mainland China (Including Hubei) (Sum of provincial reports)	296	446	589	840	1314	1975	2744	4516	5940	7712	9691	11790
Mainland China (Including Hubei) (Sum by NCH)[2]	291	440	571	830	1287	1975	2744	4515	5974	7711	9692	11791
Hubei	270	375	444	549	729	1052	1423	2714	3554	4586	5806	7153
Anhui	0	1	9	15	39	60	70	106	152	200	237	297
Beijing	5	10	14	26	36	49	68	80	91	111	132	156
Chongqing	0	5	9	27	57	75	110	132	147	165	206	238
Fujian	0	0	1	5	10	18	35	59	82	101	120	144
Gansu	0	0	0	2	4	7	14	19	24	26	29	35
Guangdong	14	26	32	53	78	98	146	188	241	311	393	520
Guangxi	0	0	2	13	23	33	46	51	58	78	87	100
Guizhou	0	0	0	3	5	5	7	9	9	12	15	29
Hainan	0	0	4	8	11	20	27	33	40	46	49	57
Hebei	0	0	1	2	8	13	18	33	48	65	82	96
Heilongjiang	0	0	1	4	9	15	21	30	37	43	59	80
Henan	0	1	5	9	32	83	128	168	206	278	352	422
Hunan	0	1	4	9	43	69	100	143	221	277	332	389
Inner Mongolia	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	13	16	18	20	23
Jiangsu	0	0	1	9	18	31	47	70	99	129	168	202
Jiangxi	0	2	3	7	18	36	48	72	109	162	240	286
Jilin	0	0	1	3	4	4	6	8	9	14	14	17
Liaoning	0	0	2	4	12	19	22	30	36	41	45	60
Ningxia	0	0	1	2	3	4	7	11	12	17	21	26
Qinghai	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	6	8	9
Shaanxi	0	0	0	0	7	15	22	46	56	63	87	101
Shandong	0	1	1	1	21	39	63	87	87	145	178	202
Shanghai	2	9	16	20	33	40	53	66	80	101	128	153
Shanxi	0	0	1	1	6	9	13	20	27	35	39	47
Sichuan	0	2	5	15	28	44	69	90	108	142	177	207
Tianjin	0	2	4	5	8	10	14	23	25	27	32	32
Tibet	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Xinjiang	0	0	0	2	3	4	5	10	13	14	17	18
Yunnan	0	1	1	2	5	11	19	26	51	70	80	91
Zhejiang	5	10	27	43	62	104	128	173	296	428	537	599

Note. [1]Observations were collected directly from government official sites from each province in mainland China. If a press release included data reported at midnight and early morning, they were considered to belong to the previous day the data was reported. [2]Data was collected of press releases of the National Health Commission of China (3).

Table S1C. Confirmed cases of COVID-19 (February 1 to 9, 2020) by province in mainland China extracted from official government sources used for the main analysis and sensitivity analysis.

	February								
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
Locations[1]									
Mainland China (Excluding Hubei) (Sum of provincial reports)	5396	6031	6910	7646	8352	9049	9614	10098	10507
Mainland China (Including Hubei) (Sum of provincial reports)	14381	17208	20432	24324	28017	31161	34567	37198	40138
Mainland China (Including Hubei) (Sum by NCH)[2]	14380	17205	20438	24324	28018	31161	34546	37198	40171
Hubei	9074	11177	13522	16678	19665	22112	24953	27100	29631
Anhui	340	408	480	530	591	665	733	779	830
Beijing	183	212	228	253	274	297	315	326	337
Chongqing	262	300	337	366	389	411	426	446	468
Fujian	159	179	194	205	215	224	239	250	261
Gansu	40	51	55	57	62	67	71	79	83
Guangdong	604	683	797	870	944	1018	1075	1120	1131
Guangxi	111	127	139	150	168	172	183	195	210
Guizhou	38	46	56	64	69	77	89	96	99
Hainan	63	70	79	89	100	111	122	128	136
Hebei	104	113	126	135	157	171	195	206	218
Heilongjiang	95	118	155	190	227	277	295	307	331
Henan	493	566	675	764	851	914	981	1033	1073
Hunan	463	521	593	661	711	772	803	838	879
Inner Mongolia	27	34	35	42	46	50	52	54	58
Jiangsu	236	271	308	341	373	408	439	468	492
Jiangxi	333	391	476	548	600	661	698	740	771
Jilin	23	31	42	54	59	65	69	78	80
Liaoning	64	73	74	81	89	94	99	105	108
Ningxia	28	31	34	34	40	43	45	45	49
Qinghai	9	13	15	17	18	18	18	18	18
Shaanxi	116	128	142	165	173	184	195	208	213
Shandong	225	246	270	298	343	379	407	435	466
Shanghai	177	193	208	233	254	269	281	292	295
Shanxi	56	66	74	81	90	96	104	115	119
Sichuan	231	254	282	301	321	344	363	386	405
Tianjin	45	48	60	67	69	81	88	90	94
Tibet	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Xinjiang	21	24	29	32	36	39	42	45	49
Yunnan	99	109	117	122	128	135	138	140	141
Zhejiang	661	724	829	895	954	1006	1048	1075	1092

Note. [1]Observations were collected directly from government official sites from each province in mainland China. If a press release included data reported at midnight and early morning, they were considered to belong to the previous day the data was reported. [2]Data was collected of press releases of the National Health Commission of China (3).

Table S2. Doubling times of COVID-19 cumulative incidence and their harmonic mean (95% Confidence interval) by province in mainland China for the main analysis (January 20 to February 9, 2020).

		Mainland China (Except Hubei)	Hubei	Anhui	Beijing	Chongqing	Fujian	Gansu	Guangdong	Guangxi	Guizhou	Hainan
Harmonic mean doubling time		1.77 (1.53-2.15)	2.54 (2.42-2.66)	2.55 (2.06-3.08)	2.49 (1.92-3.43)	2.22 (1.58-3.20)	1.78 (1.16-2.52)	2.55 (1.88-3.97)	2.47 (1.96-3.10)	1.92 (1.46-2.96)	2.72 (1.92-3.79)	2.93 (2.08-4.04)
Times doubled	1	0.59	2.91	2.12	1	2.05	0.25	1	1.33	0.18	2.5	1
	2	0.86	2.16	0.75	1.5	0.56	0.5	1.14	1.79	0.36	3.5	1.55
	3	0.98	1.5	2.18	1.8	0.82	0.85	1.26	2.17	0.76	1.64	2.28
	4	1	2.17	1.77	2.7	1.71	1.15	4.1	2.38	1.6	2.56	5.31
	5	1.3	3.03	4.03	4.14	3.58	1.07	5.9	2.76	3.4	5.8	6.86
	6	1.98	3.43	4.9	7.31	4.82	1.39		4.92	4.78		
	7	2.55					3.12					
	8	4.53					9.21					
		Hebei	Heilongjiang	Henan	Hunan	Inner Mongolia	Jiangsu	Jiangxi	Jilin	Liaoning	Ningxia	Qinghai
Harmonic mean doubling time		1.87 (1.58-2.65)	1.94 (1.76-2.35)	1.81 (1.35-2.11)	1.41 (1.24-2.02)	2.42 (1.75-3.86)	2.43 (1.72-3.28)	1.73 (1.46-2.34)	2.66 (2.22-3.40)	2.13 (1.50-3.46)	2.53 (1.71-4.25)	2.52 (1.67-4.50)
Times doubled	1	1	0.33	0.25	0.33	1	2	1.25	0.5	1	1	0.33
	2	0.33	0.67	0.5	0.67	0.4	1.31	0.84	2.5	0.5	2	0.67
	3	0.67	0.8	1	0.8	0.85	1.75	0.72	2	1.07	1.25	4
	4	1.6	1.36	0.55	0.4	2.75	2.32	0.96	3.66	2.76	2.55	4.5
	5	1.33	2.12	0.7	0.47	4.71	4.07	1.89	2.43	4.67	4.53	
	6	2.01	2.95	0.62	1.13			1.69	3.74			
	7	5.28	3.04	1.38	1.85			1.99				
	8		3.31	2.69	1.97			4.16				
	9			3.57	4.22							
	10			6.56								
		Shaanxi	Shandong	Shanghai	Shanxi	Sichuan	Tianjin	Tibet	Xinjiang	Yunnan	Zhejiang	
Harmonic mean doubling time		2.72 (1.98-3.71)	1.68 (1.42-2.35)	2.21 (1.85-2.81)	2.08 (1.63-3.10)	1.76 (1.37-2.61)	2.67 (2.10-3.96)	0	3.01 (2.03-4.93)	2.06 (1.33-2.78)	1.94 (1.63-2.56)	
Times doubled	1	1.33	2.05	0.28	1.2	0.66	1	0	2	2	1	
	2	2.24	0.1	0.57	0.4	0.64	2		1.6	0.66	0.58	
	3	3.76	0.19	1.15	1.06	0.77	2.22		3.06	0.84	1.23	
	4		0.41	1.92	1.76	1.18	4.78		5.34	1.12	1.61	
	5		0.86	2.92	2.2	1.55	3.57			1.61	2.29	
	6		1.43	3.16	4.18	2.78				1.45	1.47	
	7		2.66	6.13		4.49				7.32	3.48	
	8		4.71									

Table S3. Sensitivity analysis: Doubling times of COVID-19 cumulative incidence and their harmonic mean (95% Confidence interval) by province in mainland China for the sensitivity analysis (December 31, 2019 to February 9, 2020).

		Mainland China (Except Hubei)	Hubei	Anhui	Beijing	Chongqing	Fujian	Gansu	Guangdong	Guangxi	Guizhou	Hainan
Harmonic mean doubling time		1.32 (1.28-1.42)	4.06 (3.86-4.33)	2.53 (2.06-3.07)	2.54 (1.95-3.34)	2.16 (1.46-3.14)	1.79 (1.18-2.54)	2.60 (1.93-3.83)	1.88 (1.74-2.21)	1.92 (1.50-2.94)	2.70 (1.87-3.92)	2.89 (1.94-3.87)
Times doubled	1	0.04	17.33	2.12	1	2.05	0.25	1	0.07	0.18	2.5	1
	2	0.08	1.22	0.75	1.5	0.56	0.5	1.14	0.16	0.36	3.5	1.55
	3	0.15	2	2.18	1.8	0.82	0.85	1.26	0.3	0.76	1.64	2.28
	4	0.33	3.04	1.77	2.7	1.71	1.15	4.1	0.63	1.6	2.56	5.31
	5	0.53	2.11	4.03	4.14	3.58	1.07	5.9	1.84	3.4	5.8	6.86
	6	0.73	1.23	4.9	7.31	4.82	1.39		1.44	4.78		
	7	0.92	2.61				3.12		2.18			
	8	0.98	3.13				9.21		2.59			
	9	1.01	3.87						2.72			
	10	1.48							6.17			
	11	2.17										
	12	2.88										
	13	5.55										
		Hebei	Heilongjiang	Henan	Hunan	Inner Mongolia	Jiangsu	Jiangxi	Jilin	Liaoning	Ningxia	Qinghai
Harmonic mean doubling time		1.92 (1.58-2.67)	1.93 (1.76-2.40)	1.78 (1.29-2.11)	1.42 (1.24-2.05)	2.41 (1.78-3.51)	2.47 (2.00-3.39)	1.77 (1.46-2.38)	2.72 (2.20-3.37)	2.13 (1.46-3.45)	2.57 (1.70-4.42)	2.46 (1.55-5.00)
Times doubled	1	1	0.33	0.25	0.33	1	2	1.25	0.5	1	1	0.33
	2	0.33	0.67	0.5	0.67	0.4	1.31	0.84	2.5	0.5	2	0.67
	3	0.67	0.8	1	0.8	0.85	1.75	0.72	2	1.07	1.25	4
	4	1.6	1.36	0.55	0.4	2.75	2.32	0.96	3.66	2.76	2.55	4.5
	5	1.33	2.12	0.7	0.47	4.71	4.07	1.89	2.43	4.67	4.53	
	6	2.01	2.95	0.62	1.13			1.69	3.74			
	7	5.28	3.04	1.38	1.85			1.99				
	8		3.31	2.69	1.97			4.16				
	9			3.57	4.22							
	10			6.56								
		Shaanxi	Shandong	Shanghai	Shanxi	Sichuan	Tianjin	Tibet	Xinjiang	Yunnan	Zhejiang	
Harmonic mean doubling time		2.72 (1.92-3.75)	1.68 (1.43-2.37)	2.20 (1.86-2.86)	2.11 (1.70-3.10)	1.84 (1.39-2.66)	2.75 (2.09-3.82)	0	2.98 (2.08-5.00)	2.03 (1.38-2.89)	1.89 (1.60-2.52)	
Times doubled	1	1.33	2.05	0.28	1.2	0.66	1	0	2	2	1	
	2	2.24	0.1	0.57	0.4	0.64	2		1.6	0.66	0.58	
	3	3.76	0.19	1.15	1.06	0.77	2.22		3.06	0.84	1.23	
	4		0.41	1.92	1.76	1.18	4.78		5.34	1.12	1.61	
	5		0.86	2.92	2.2	1.55	3.57			1.61	2.29	
	6		1.43	3.16	4.18	2.78				1.45	1.47	
	7		2.66	6.13		4.49				7.32	3.48	
	8		4.71									

Figure S1A. The harmonic mean (red circle) with 95% confidence interval (red bar) of the doubling times (days), and their values (black square) by the number of times the reported cumulative incidence doubles by province within mainland China (A to I) from January 20, 2020 through February 9, 2020. Each panel represents a province except the panel representing "Mainland China (except Hubei)" that is the aggregate of all other provinces in mainland China, except Hubei.



Figure S1B. The harmonic mean (red circle) with 95% confidence interval (red bar) of the doubling times (days), and their values (black square) by the number of times the reported cumulative incidence doubles by province within mainland China (J to Z) from January 20, 2020 through February 9, 2020. Each panel represents a province. Doubling time for Tibet is not available, because there had only been 1 confirmed case in Tibet as of February 9, 2020.



Figure S2. Sensitivity analysis: The harmonic mean (circle) with 95% confidence interval (bar) (main analysis: red; sensitivity analysis: blue) of the doubling times (days), and their values (black square) by the number of times the reported cumulative incidence doubles in Hubei (upper panels), aggregate of mainland China (except Hubei) (middle panels), and Guangdong (lower panels), from December 31, 2019 through February 9, 2020.



Figure S3. Sensitivity analysis: The harmonic mean doubling time of COVID-19 by province in mainland China, from December 31, 2019 through February 9, 2020.



Figure S4. Sensitivity analysis: The number of times the COVID-19 outbreak has doubled by province in mainland China, from December 31, 2019 through February 9, 2020.



Authors' contributions

Project management: Dr. Gerardo Chowell, Dr. Isaac Chun-Hai Fung and Ms. Kamalich Muniz-Rodriguez

Manuscript writing: Dr. Isaac Chun-Hai Fung and Dr. Gerardo Chowell

Manuscript editing and data interpretation: Ms. Kamalich Muniz-Rodriguez, Dr. Gerardo Chowell, Dr. Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, Dr. Lone Simonsen, and Dr. Cecile Viboud

MATLAB code: Dr. Gerardo Chowell

Doubling time calculation using MATLAB and presentation of results: Ms. Kamalich Muniz-Rodriguez, Dr. Gerardo Chowell and Dr. Isaac Chun-Hai Fung

Statistical analysis in R: Dr. Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, Ms. Kamalich Muniz-Rodriguez

Data management and quality check of epidemic data entry: Ms. Kamalich Muniz-Rodriguez, Dr. Isaac Chun-Hai Fung

Curation of epidemic data for countries and territories outside mainland China (including Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan): Ms. Kamalich Muniz-Rodriguez and Ms. Sylvia K. Ofori

Curation of epidemic data for provinces in mainland China: Ms. Manyun Liu (from the early reports, up to Jan 24, 2020 data), Ms. Po-Ying Lai (since Jan 25, 2020 data to today), Mr. Chi-Hin Cheung (since Jan 27, 2020 data to today), and Ms. Kamalich Muniz-Rodriguez and Dr. Isaac Chun-Hai Fung (whenever there is a back-log).

Retrieval of epidemic data from official websites (downloading and archiving of China's national and provincial authorities' press releases): Ms. Manyun Liu and Dr. Dongyu Jia (at the very beginning of our project)

Retrieval of statistical data from the official website of National Bureau of Statistics of the People's Republic of China: Mr. Chi-Hin Cheung

Retrieval of publicly available statistical data from various sources: Ms. Yiseul Lee, Dr. Isaac Chun-Hai Fung

Map creation: Ms. Kimberlyn M. Roosa

Literature review assistance: Ms. Sylvia K. Ofori

Plots of log cumulative incidence versus time: Ms. Sylvia K. Ofori

Technical Appendix 2: Dr. Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, Dr. Gerardo Chowell

Technical Appendix 3: Ms. Manyun Liu, Dr. Isaac Chun-Hai Fung

References

1. Anderson RM, May RM. Infectious diseases of humans. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1991.
2. Drake JM, Bakach I, Just MR, O'Regan SM, Gambhir M, Fung IC-H. Transmission Models of Historical Ebola Outbreaks. Emerging Infectious Disease journal. 2015;21(8):1447.
3. National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China. 2020 [cited Feb 2, 2020]; Available from: http://www.nhc.gov.cn/

Epidemic doubling time of the COVID-19 outbreak by Chinese province

Technical Appendix 2

Kamalich Muniz-Rodriguez, MPH[1]; Gerardo Chowell, PhD[1]; Chi-Hin Cheung, MS; Dongyu Jia, PhD; Po-Ying Lai, MS; Yiseul Lee, MPH, Manyun Liu, MS; Sylvia K. Ofori, MPH; Kimberlyn M. Roosa, MPH; Lone Simonsen, PhD; Cecile Viboud, PhD; Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, PhD

[1] These authors contribute equally as co-first authors

Author affiliations: Georgia Southern University (K. Muniz-Rodriguez, D. Jia, M. Liu, S. K. Ofori, I. C.-H. Fung); Georgia State University (G. Chowell, Y. Lee, K. M. Roosa); Independent researcher (C.-H. Cheung); Boston University (P.-Y. Lai), Roskilde University (L. Simonsen), The National Institutes of Health (G. Chowell, C. Viboud)

Please address correspondence to Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, PhD, Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Environmental Health Sciences, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA 30460, USA. +1 912 478 5079. Email: cfung@georgiasouthern.edu

Technical Appendix 2: Harmonic mean doubling time and effective reproductive number

Doubling time calculation and its relationship with growth rate of an epidemic

As the epidemic grows, the times at which cumulative incidence doubles are given by t_{d_i} such that $2C(t_{d_i}) = C(t_{d_{i+1}})$ where $t_{d_o} = 0$, $C(t_{d_o}) = C_0$, and i = 0,1,2,3, …, n_d where n_d is the total number of times cumulative incidence doubles. The actual sequence of "doubling times" are defined as follows:

$$d_j = \Delta t_{d_j} = t_{d_j} - t_{d_{j-1}} \text{ where } j = 1,2,3, \ldots, n_d.$$

To quantify parameter uncertainty, we used parametric bootstrapping with a Poisson error structure around the harmonic mean of doubling times d_j to obtain the 95% confidence interval. See references (1-3) for further details.

Doubling time calculation was conducted using MATLAB R2019b (Mathworks, Natick, MA).

If we assume homogeneous mixing (equal probability of acquiring infection through contacts) and exponential growth, then, $C(t_2) = C(t_1)\exp(rt)$, and therefore, $\ln(C(t_2)/C(t_1)) = rt$. When $C(t_2)/C(t_1) = 2$ and thus t is the doubling time, i.e. $t = t_d$, $\ln 2 = rt_d$. Therefore, the doubling time, t_d, equals to $(\ln 2)/r$. See Vynnycky and White (4), panel 4.1, p.74 for further explanation.

Connecting the harmonic mean doubling time and effective reproductive number

We explored a number of scenarios using parameter values extracted from recent literature, to calculate the effective reproductive number, R, based on our study's estimated harmonic mean doubling time from January 20 through February 9, 2020. Instead of basic reproductive number R0, R was estimated because social distancing measures have been introduced to many parts of China, since the quarantine of Wuhan on January 23, 2020. Our goal is to provide some indications of the uncertainty around the effective reproductive number R based on the epidemic doubling time that we estimated.

We reviewed parameter values from selected epidemiological literature on COVID-19, listed in Table S4. We chose the harmonic mean doubling time of Hubei (the epicenter), and those of Hunan (lowest), and Xinjiang (highest) for our scenario analysis. We rounded our R estimates to 1 decimal place.

Part 1. We made the assumption that the incubation period could be taken as a proxy for pre-infectious period (also known as latent period). We explored *Scenario 1* in which a mean incubation period (D_1) of 6.4 days estimated by Backer, Klinkenberg and Wallinga (5) based on 88 cases with known travel history to or from Wuhan, and a mean duration from onset of symptoms to isolation (D_2) of 0.7 day estimated by authors from Guangdong Provincial CDC using data of cases after January 19, 2020, in a study using 153 cases confirmed by January 23, 2020. We explored *Scenario 2* using the Guangdong CDC's data with $D_1 = 4.8$ and $D_2 = 0.7$.

Assuming that the pre-infectious period and the infectious period follow the exponential distribution, we used the following equation for R0 in Vynnycky and White (4), Table 4.1, Equation 4.13, to calculate R:

R0 = (1 + growth rate ✕ duration of pre-infectious period)

✕ (1 + growth rate ✕ duration of infectious period)

In mathematical notation, $R0 = (1+rD_1)(1+rD_2)$

Scenario 1. If $D_1 = 6.4$ and $D_2 = 0.7$, the effective reproductive number, R, in Hubei was 3.3, corresponding to a harmonic mean doubling time of 2.5 days from January 20 through February 9, 2020. In Hunan, with a harmonic mean doubling time of 1.4, the R was 5.6, while in Xinjiang, with a harmonic mean doubling time of 3.0, the R was 2.9 (Table S5).

Scenario 2. If $D_1 = 4.8$ and $D_2 = 0.7$, the R in Hubei was 2.8. In Hunan, the R was 4.5, while in Xinjiang, the R was 2.5 (Table S5).

Part 2. We used the serial interval (T_S) of 7.5 days from Li et al. (6) and 3.96 days from Du et al. (7) explored the scenarios where the ratio between the infectious period and the serial interval, f_r, is 0.5, 0.75 and 1.

We used the following R0 equation in Vynnycky and White (4) (Table 4.1 Equation 4.16) to calculate R:

R0 = 1 + growth rate × serial interval + ratio between the infectious period and the serial interval × (1 - ratio between the infectious period and the serial interval) × (growth rate × serial interval)^2

In mathematical notation, $R0 = 1 + rT_S + f_r(1-f_r)(rT_S)^2$

Scenario 3. If half of the serial interval of 7.5 days is infectious, $f_r = 0.5$, the effective reproductive number, R, in Hubei was 4.2, corresponding to a harmonic mean doubling time of 2.5 days from January 20 through February 9, 2020. In Hunan, with a harmonic mean doubling time of 1.4 days, the R was 8.2, while in Xinjiang, with a mean doubling time of 3.0 days, the R was 3.5 (Table S5).

Scenario 4. If three-quarters of the serial interval of 7.5 days is infectious, $f_r = 0.75$, the R in Hubei was 3.9. In Hunan, the R was 7.3, while in Xinjiang, the R was 3.3 (Table S5).

Scenario 5. If the entire serial interval of 7.5 days is infectious, $f_r = 1$, the R in Hubei was 3.1. In Hunan, the R was 4.7, while in Xinjiang, the R was 2.7 (Table S5).

Scenario 6. If half of the serial interval of 3.96 days is infectious, $f_r = 0.5$, the R in Hubei was 2.4. In Hunan, the R was 3.9, while in Xinjiang, the R was 2.1 (Table S5).

Scenario 7. If three-quarters of the serial interval of 3.96 days is infectious, $f_r = 0.75$, the R in Hubei was 2.3. In Hunan, the R was 3.7, while in Xinjiang, the R was 2.1 (Table S5).

Scenario 8. If the entire serial interval of 3.96 days is infectious, $f_r = 1$, the R in Hubei was 2.1. In Hunan, the R was 3.0, while in Xinjiang, the R was 1.9 (Table S5).

Conclusions. The effective reproductive number, R, of COVID-19 in Hubei was in a range of 2.1 to 4.2 in scenarios based on different assumptions and data sources. For provinces with a short mean doubling time, such as Hunan, R could be in the range of 3.0 to 8.2, while in provinces with a long mean doubling time, such as Xinjiang, R could be in the range of 1.9 to 3.5. These estimates are meant to illustrate the range of possibilities, as they are critically dependent on the estimates of the other epidemiologic parameters, such as serial intervals.

Table S4. Epidemiological parameters of COVID-19 from selected publications.

Authors and affiliations	Case data and time range	Mean incubation period (days) and data source	Mean duration from onset of symptoms to hospitalization and/or isolation (days) and data source	Mean serial interval (days) and data source	Basic or effective reproductive number and estimation method
Backer, Klinkenberg and Wallinga, 2020(5), National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), the Netherlands	Data of 88 cases reported between January 20 and 28 by provincial health commissions with known travel history to and/or from Wuhan, of whom 63 were Wuhan residents traveling elsewhere and 25 were visitors staying in Wuhan for limited period of time.	6.4 (95% credible interval: 5.6 to 7.7) ranging from 2.1 to 11.1 (2.5th to 97.5th percentile) based on a Weibull distribution. Calculation based on all 88 cases. 4.5 (95% credible interval: 3.7 to 5.6), if restricted to the 25 visitors to Wuhan with a closed exposure window.	Not reported.	Not reported.	Not reported.
Du et al., 2020 (7), The University of Texas at Austin	Data of 468 cases in mainland China apart from Hubei province between January 21, 2020 and February 8, 2020. Only confirmed cases compiled from press releases from 18 provincial CDC of China were included.	Not reported.	Not reported.	3.96 (95% CI 3.53 to 4.39).	Basic reproductive number: 1.33 estimated using early exponential epidemic growth rate of Jung et al. (8), and Li et al. (6).
Ki and Task Force for 2019-nCoV, 2020 (9), The Korean Society for Preventive Medicine & Korean Society of Epidemiology	The first 24 cases in the Republic of Korea, with date of symptom onset from January 10, 2020 to February 6, 2020. By generation of transmission, 15 were (imported) index cases, 6 were 1st generation and 3 were 2nd generation.	3.6 (median, 4), ranging from 1 to 9. Calculation was based on 22 symptomatic cases.	Mean duration from onset to quarantine or isolation, 4.0, ranging from 0 to 12. Calculation was based on 22 symptomatic cases.	4.6, ranging from 3 to 9. Calculation was based on all 24 cases.	Effective reproductive number: 0.47 (Poisson 95% CI, 0.22 to 0.90; binomial 95% CI, 0.24 to 0.71) across two generations of transmission.
Li et al., 2020 (6), China CDC and the University of Hong Kong	Data of the first 425 confirmed cases reported by China CDC, January 22, 2020. They analyzed epidemic growth rate using cases with illness onset between December 10, 2019 and January 4, 2020.	5.2 days (95% confidence interval [CI], 4.1 to 7.0). Calculation was based on data from 10 cases only.	Mean duration from onset to hospital admission: 12.5 (95% CI, 10.3 to 14.8) among 44 cases with illness onset before January 1; 9.1 (95% CI, 8.6 to 9.7) among 189 patients with illness onset between January 1 and 11.	7.5±3.4 (95% CI, 5.3 to 19). Calculation was based on data from 5 clusters of cases.	Basic reproductive number: 2.2 (95% CI, 1.4 to 3.9) A transmission model with zoonotic infections were fitted to onset dates that were not linked to the Hunan Seafood Market to derive the basic reproductive number.
Liu et al., 2020 (10), Guangdong Provincial CDC	Data of confirmed cases as of January 23, 2020, including the date of exposure, symptom onset and diagnosis. Data from Guangdong Province were extracted from medical records and epidemiological investigations. Data of cases in other locations were extracted from official websites of health authorities of different jurisdictions.	4.8±2.6 (ranging from 2 to 11) Calculation was based on data from only 16 cases who had travelled to Wuhan and stayed for no more than three days.	Mean duration from symptom onset to isolation: 2.9±3.0; decrease from 6.7 among cases before January 9, 2020 to 0.7 among cases after January 19, 2020. Calculation was based on data from 153 cases.	Not reported	Effective reproductive number: 2.90 (95% CI, 2.32 to 3.63) using exponential growth assumptions, and 2.92 (95% CI, 2.28 to 3.67) using maximum likelihood.

Table S5. Estimates of the effective reproductive number, R, of COVID-19 from January 20 through February 9, 2020, based on the point estimate of the harmonic mean doubling time estimated for Hunan (lowest), Hubei (epicenter) and Xinjiang (highest), using parameter values from different sources.

	Hunan	**Hubei**	**Xinjiang**
Harmonic mean doubling time from Jan 20 to Feb 9, 2020 as estimated in our study	1.4	2.5	3.0
Growth rate = ln 2 / doubling time	0.5	0.3	0.2
Part 1. Using equation $R0 = (1+rD_1)(1+rD_2)$			
Scenario 1. Mean incubation period of 6.4 days (5) and mean duration from onset of symptoms to isolation of 0.7 day (10).			
R	5.6	3.3	2.9
Scenario 2. Mean incubation period of 4.8 days (10) and mean duration from onset of symptoms to isolation of 0.7 day (10).			
R	4.5	2.8	2.5
Part 2. Using equation $R0 = 1 + rT_S + f_r(1-f_r)(rT_S)^2$			
Using the serial interval of 7.5 days from Li et al. (6)			
Ratio between duration of infectious period and serial interval, f_r			
Scenario 3. If $f_r = 0.5$,			
R	8.2	4.2	3.5
Scenario 4. If $f_r = 0.75$,			
R	7.3	3.9	3.3
Scenario 5. If $f_r = 1$,			
R	4.7	3.1	2.7
Using the serial interval of 3.96 days from Du et al. (7)			
Ratio between duration of infectious period and serial interval, f_r			
Scenario 6. If $f_r = 0.5$,			
R	3.9	2.4	2.1
Scenario 7. If $f_r = 0.75$,			
R	3.7	2.3	2.1
Scenario 8. If $f_r = 1$,			
R	3.0	2.1	1.9

All estimates are rounded to 1 decimal place.

References

1. Banks HT, Hu S, Thompson WC. Modeling and inverse problems in the presence of uncertainty: CRC Press; 2014.
2. Chowell G, Ammon CE, Hengartner NW, Hyman JM. Transmission dynamics of the great influenza pandemic of 1918 in Geneva, Switzerland: Assessing the effects of hypothetical interventions. J Theor Biol. 2006 Jul 21;241(2):193-204.
3. Chowell G, Shim E, Brauer F, Diaz-Duenas P, Hyman JM, Castillo-Chavez C. Modelling the transmission dynamics of acute haemorrhagic conjunctivitis: application to the 2003 outbreak in Mexico. Stat Med. 2006 Jun 15;25(11):1840-57.
4. Vynnycky E, White RG. An Introduction to Infectious Disease Modelling. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2010.
5. Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20-28 January 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(5):10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.5.2000062.
6. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. N Engl J Med. 2020 Jan 29.
7. Du Z, Wang L, Xu X, Wu Y, Cowling BJ, Meyers LA. The serial interval of COVID-19 from publicly reported confirmed cases. medRxiv. 2020:2020.02.19.20025452.
8. Jung S-m, Akhmetzhanov AR, Hayashi K, Linton NM, Yang Y, Yuan B, et al. Real time estimation of the risk of death from novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) infection: Inference using exported cases. medRxiv. 2020:2020.01.29.20019547.
9. Ki M, nCo VT. Epidemiologic characteristics of early cases with 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) disease in Republic of Korea. Epidemiology and health. 2020 Feb 9:e2020007.
10. Liu T, Hu J, Kang M, Lin L, Zhong H, Xiao J, et al. Transmission dynamics of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV). bioRxiv. 2020:Version 1.

Epidemic doubling time of the COVID-19 outbreak by Chinese province

Technical Appendix 3

Kamalich Muniz-Rodriguez, MPH[1]; Gerardo Chowell, PhD[1]; Chi-Hin Cheung, MS; Dongyu Jia, PhD; Po-Ying Lai, MS; Yiseul Lee, MPH, Manyun Liu, MS; Sylvia K. Ofori, MPH; Kimberlyn M. Roosa, MPH; Lone Simonsen, PhD; Cecile Viboud, PhD; Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, PhD

[1] These authors contribute equally as co-first authors

Author affiliations: Georgia Southern University (K. Muniz-Rodriguez, D. Jia, M. Liu, S. K. Ofori, I. C.-H. Fung); Georgia State University (G. Chowell, Y. Lee, K. M. Roosa); Independent researcher (C.-H. Cheung); Boston University (P.-Y. Lai), Roskilde University (L. Simonsen), The National Institutes of Health (G. Chowell, C. Viboud)

Please address correspondence to Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, PhD, Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Environmental Health Sciences, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA 30460, USA. +1 912 478 5079. Email: cfung@georgiasouthern.edu

Table S6. Websites of national and provincial health commissions in mainland China

Health commission	URL	Notes
National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China	http://www.nhc.gov.cn	
Provincial health commissions		
Anhui	http://wjw.ah.gov.cn/	
Beijing	http://wjw.beijing.gov.cn/	
Chongqing	http://wsjkw.cq.gov.cn/	
Fujian	http://fjwsjk.fjsen.com/	
Gansu	http://wsjk.gansu.gov.cn/	
Guangdong	http://wsjkw.gd.gov.cn/	
Guangxi	http://wsjkw.gxzf.gov.cn/	
Guizhou	http://www.gzhfpc.gov.cn/	
Hainan	http://wst.hainan.gov.cn/	
Hebei	http://www.hebwst.gov.cn/	Our team members found it often inaccessible from Statesboro, GA, USA.
Heilongjiang	http://wsjkw.hlj.gov.cn/	
Henan	http://www.hnwsjsw.gov.cn/	
Hubei	http://wjw.hubei.gov.cn/	
Hunan	http://wjw.hunan.gov.cn/	
Inner Mongolia	http://wjw.nmg.gov.cn/	
Jiangsu	http://wjw.jiangsu.gov.cn/	
Jiangxi	http://hc.jiangxi.gov.cn/	
Jilin	http://www.jl.gov.cn/	
Liaoning	http://www.shenyang.gov.cn/	
Ningxia	http://wsjkw.nx.gov.cn/index.htm	
Qinghai	https://wsjkw.qinghai.gov.cn/	
Shaanxi	http://sxwjw.shaanxi.gov.cn/	
Shandong	http://wsjkw.shandong.gov.cn	Our team members found it persistently inaccessible from Statesboro, GA, USA.
Shanghai	http://www.shanghai.gov.cn/	
Shanxi	http://wjw.shanxi.gov.cn/	
Sichuan	http://wsjkw.sc.gov.cn/	
Tianjin	http://www.tj.gov.cn/	
Tibet	http://wjw.xizang.gov.cn/	
Xinjiang	http://www.xjhfpc.gov.cn/	
Yunnan	http://ynswsjkw.yn.gov.cn/	
Zhejiang	https://www.zjwjw.gov.cn	

Notes: If our team was unable to directly retrieve the press release from a provincial health commissions, we will use mainland Chinese media reports that directly reported on the provincial health commissions' announcements. Please note that mainland Chinese media are controlled by the Chinese Communist Party and they could not deviate from the government's announcements.


Hubei
Cumulative Incidence
30000
20000
10000
0
20−Jan
27−Jan
03−Feb
10−Feb
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{4.5}$
10^{4}
$10^{3.5}$
10^{3}
$10^{2.5}$
10^{2}
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


‘Mainland China (Except Hubei)‘
Cumulative Incidence
10000
7500
5000
2500
0
20−Jan
27−Jan
03−Feb
10−Feb
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^4
$10^{3.5}$
10^3
$10^{2.5}$
10^2
$10^{1.5}$
10^0
$10^{0.5}$
10^1
Log of Days since Jan 20


Anhui
Cumulative Incidence
800
600
400
200
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^3
$10^{2.5}$
10^2
$10^{1.5}$
10^1
10^0
$10^{0.5}$
10^1
Log of Days since Jan 20


Beijing
Cumulative Incidence
300
200
100
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{2.5}$
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Chongqing
Cumulative Incidence
400
300
200
100
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{2.5}$
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Fujian
Cumulative Incidence
200
100
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{2.5}$
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Gansu
Cumulative Incidence
0
20
40
60
80
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Guangdong
Cumulative Incidence
900
600
300
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^3
$10^{2.5}$
10^2
$10^{1.5}$
10^1
10^0
$10^{0.5}$
10^1
Log of Days


Guangxi
Cumulative Incidence
200
150
100
50
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{2.5}$
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Guizhou
Cumulative Incidence
100
75
50
25
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Hainan
Cumulative Incidence
100
50
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^2
$10^{1.5}$
10^1
10^0
$10^{0.5}$
10^1
Log of Days since Jan 20


Hebei
Cumulative Incidence
200
150
100
50
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{2.5}$
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Heilongjiang
Cumulative Incidence
300
200
100
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{2.5}$
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Henan
Cumulative Incidence
900
600
300
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^3
10^2
10^1
10^0
10^0
$10^{0.5}$
10^1
Log of Days since Jan 20


Hunan
Cumulative Incidence
750
500
250
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^3
10^2
10^1
10^0
10^0
$10^{0.5}$
10^1
Log of Days since Jan 20


Inner Mongolia
Cumulative Incidence
60
40
20
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Jiangsu
Cumulative Incidence
500
400
300
200
100
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{2.5}$
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Jiangxi
Cumulative Incidence
800
600
400
200
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^{3}
$10^{2.5}$
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Jilin
Cumulative Incidence
80
60
40
20
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Liaoning
Cumulative Incidence
90
60
30
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Ningxia
Cumulative Incidence
50
40
30
20
10
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Qinghai
Cumulative Incidence
15
10
5
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Shaanxi
Cumulative Incidence
200
150
100
50
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{2.4}$
$10^{2.2}$
10^{2}
$10^{1.8}$
$10^{1.6}$
$10^{1.4}$
$10^{1.2}$
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Shandong
Cumulative Incidence
400
300
200
100
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^3
$10^{2.5}$
10^2
$10^{1.5}$
10^1
$10^{0.5}$
10^0
10^0
$10^{0.5}$
10^1
Log of Days since Jan 20


Shanghai
Cumulative Incidence
300
200
100
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{2.5}$
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Shanxi
Cumulative Incidence
100
75
50
25
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Sichuan
Cumulative Incidence
400
300
200
100
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{2.5}$
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Tianjin
Cumulative Incidence
0
25
50
75
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{2}
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Xinjiang
Cumulative Incidence
50
40
30
20
10
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Yunnan
Cumulative Incidence
100
50
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
$10^{2.5}$
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20


Zhejiang
Cumulative Incidence
900
600
300
0
Jan 20
Jan 27
Feb 03
Feb 10
Date


Log of Cumulative Incidence
10^{3}
$10^{2.5}$
10^{2}
$10^{1.5}$
10^{1}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{0}
$10^{0.5}$
10^{1}
Log of Days since Jan 20