Title: Estimating the risk of COVID-19 death during the course of the outbreak in Korea, February-March, 2020

Running title: Case fatality of COVID-19 in Korea

Authors: Eunha Shim, PhD[1], Kenji Mizumoto, PhD[2,3,4], Wongyeong Choi, B.Sc.[1], Gerardo Chowell, PhD[2]

Affiliations:

1. Department of Mathematics, Soongsil University, Seoul, Republic of Korea 06978. E-mail address: alicia@ssu.ac.kr; chok10004@soongsil.ac.kr
2. Department of Population Health Sciences, School of Public Health, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA. 30303 E-mail address: gchowell@gsu.edu
3. Graduate School of Advanced Integrated Studies in Human Survivability, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan 615-8530. Email: mizumoto.kenji.5@kyoto-u.ac.jp
4. Hakubi Center for Advanced Research, Kyoto University, Yoshidahonmachi, Sakyo–ku,Kyoto, Japan 615-8530

Corresponding author: Eunha Shim (alicia@ssu.ac.kr), Department of Mathematics, Soongsil University, Korea. Tel: +82 (10) 2383-5309. Fax:+82 (2) 824-4383.

Word count

Abstract: 200

Main (MAX): 2,584

Abstract

Background: In Korea, a total of 8,799 confirmed cases of COVID-19 including 102 deaths have been recorded as of Mar 21, 2020. The time-delay adjusted case fatality risk of COVID-19 in Korea is yet to be estimated.

Methods: We obtained the daily series of confirmed cases and deaths in Korea reported prior to March 21, 2020. Using statistical methods, we estimated the time-delay adjusted risk for death from COVID-19 in the city of Daegu, Gyeongsangbuk-do, other regions in Korea, as well as for the entire country.

Results: Our model-based crude CFR fitted the observed data well throughout the course of the epidemic except for the very early stage in Gyeongsangbuk-do, partially due to the reporting delay. Our estimates of the risk for death in Gyeongsangbuk-do reached 2.4% (95% CrI: 1.6-3.4%), 1.3% (95% CrI: 1.0-1.6%) in Daegu and 0.7% (95% CrI: 0.3-1.4%) in other regions, whereas the national estimate of the risk for death was estimated at 1.4% (95% CrI: 1.2-1.7%) in Korea.

Conclusions: The relatively low CFRs are associated with the early implementation of public health interventions including widespread testing, social distancing, and delayed school openings in Korea. Geographic differences in CFR are likely influenced by clusters of nosocomial transmission.

Keywords: Coronavirus, COVID-19, Korea, fatality, deaths, case fatality risk

Introduction

Since the first reports of cases from Wuhan in the Hubei Province of China in December 2019, more than 82,000 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) including 3,293 deaths have been reported in China [1]. Based on the estimates by a joint World Health Organization (WHO)-China fact-finding mission, the epidemic in China peaked between late January and early February 2020 [2]. However, the virus has been seeded in numerous countries and is now generating sustained outbreaks in many areas of the world with the rate of new cases outpacing the rate of China. As of March 21,2020, the global cumulative number of reported infections and deaths were 266,073 and 11,183, respectively [1]. Outside China, new cases initially occurred mainly among travelers from China and their contacts, but local transmission is now driving major outbreaks in numerous countries including U.S., Italy, Spain, Germany, and Iran [1].

The spread of 2019 novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in South Korea started on Jan 19, 2020, when the first confirmed case of Chinese nationality entered the country from Wuhan, China [3]. Since then, SARS-CoV-2 has continued to spread in Korea in the form of a series of clusters of variable size and geographic location in addition to imported cases [4]. As of March 21, 2020, the cumulative number of COVID-19 reported cases and deaths in Korea are at 8,799 and 102, respectively [5].

In order to accurately estimate the epidemiological and economic burden with an emerging infectious disease, assessing the associated risk for death from the disease as well as its transmission potential are critical. Although the transmission modes of COVID-19 are not entirely understood, person-to-person spread via respiratory droplets appears to be the main mode of transmission. The transmissibility of COVID-19 was found to be relatively high, with the mean basic reproduction number in the range 1.4-1.6 in Korea ([4]) and 2-7.1 for China [6-13]. In the absence of vaccines against COVID-19 or antiviral drugs for its treatment, epidemic control relies on the implementation of symptom monitoring and non-pharmaceutical interventions such as social distancing and movement restrictions. It is worth noting that in Korea, movement restriction orders represent legal public health measures, including quarantine (isolation), home isolation, or controlled travel [14].

Assessing the severity of infection of COVID-19 is useful to anticipate the risk of death during the course of the epidemic as well as hypothesize factors that may be driving the risk of death in different geographic areas. The crude case fatality risk (CFR) can be measured by estimating the proportion of the cumulative number of deaths out of the cumulative number of cases at a point in time, which underestimates severity due to the real-time nature of the growth in the number of fatal cases. This is due to the delays from case notification to death. On the other hand, the denominator is calculated based on confirmed cases only, and thus may overestimate the actual CFR based on all infected individuals, resulting in ascertainment bias. Nevertheless, Korea has instituted broad scale testing efforts at the core of the control interventions [15]. Therefore, the present study aims to estimate the risk of death among confirmed cases while addressing ascertainment bias and a right-censored likelihood for modeling the count of deceased cases by using established methods [16]. In order to estimate the current severity of the COVID-19 epidemic in Korea, we report the estimates of the time-delay adjusted CFR for COVID-19 for the city of Daegu, Gyeongsangbuk-do, Other regions (i.e., outside Daegu and Gyeongsangbuk-do) and for Korea, with quantified uncertainty.

Method

Data sources

We obtained the daily series of confirmed cases and deaths in Korea from daily reports published by the Korea Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (KCDC) [5]. These data were categorized by geographic area: Daegu, Gyeongsangbuk-do, Other regions, or Korea, considering that over 70% of the deaths are occurring in Daegu. The virus that causes COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2 RNA, is detected by reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), and according to the Center for Laboratory Control of Infectious Diseases in KCDC, the upper limit of Ct value for positive RT-PCR of SARS-CoV-2 is 35, and the negative criterion is Ct value 37 or higher [17]. Our analysis relies on epidemiological data reported prior to March 21, 2020.

Case fatality ratio

Crude CFR is defined as the number of cumulative deaths divided by the number of cumulative cases at a specific point in time. For the estimation of CFR in real time, we employ the delay from hospitalization to death, h_s, which is assumed to be given by $h_s = H(s) - H(s\text{-}1)$ for $s>0$ where $H(s)$ is a cumulative density function of the delay from hospitalization to death and follows a gamma distribution with mean 10.1 days and SD 5.4 days, according to a recent study that estimated the CFR in China [18]. We let $\pi_{a,ti}$ be the time-delay adjusted case fatality ratio on reported day t_i in area a. The likelihood function of the estimate $\pi_{a,ti}$ is calculated as

$$L(\pi_{a,t_i}; c_{a,t}) = \prod_{t_i} \binom{\sum_{t=1}^{t_i} c_{a,t}}{D_{a,t_i}} \left(\pi_{a,t_i} \frac{\sum_{t=2}^{t_i} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} c_{a,t-s} h_s}{\sum_{t=1}^{t_i} c_{a,t}}\right)^{D_{a,t_i}} \left(1 - \pi_{a,t_i} \frac{\sum_{t=2}^{t_i} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} c_{a,t-s} h_s}{\sum_{t=1}^{t_i} c_{a,t}}\right)^{\sum_{t=1}^{t_i} c_{a,t} - D_{a,t_i}}$$

where $c_{a,t}$ represents the number of new cases with reported day t in area a, and $D_{a,ti}$ is the cumulative number of deaths until reported day t_i in area a [18-20]. Among the cumulative cases with reported day t in area a, $D_{a,ti}$ have died and the remainder have survived the infection. The contribution of those who have died with biased death risk is shown in the middle parenthetical term and the contribution of survivors is presented in the right parenthetical term. We assume that $D_{a,ti}$ is the result of the binomial sampling process with probability $\pi_{a,ti}$.

We estimated model parameters using a Monte Carlo Markov Chain (MCMC) method in a Bayesian framework. Posterior distributions of the model parameters were estimated by sampling from the three Markov chains. For each chain, we drew 100,000 samples from the posterior distribution after a burn-in of 20,000 iterations. Convergence of MCMC chains were evaluated using the potential scale reduction statistic [21, 22]. Estimates and 95% credibility intervals for these estimates are based on the posterior probability distribution of each parameter and based on the samples drawn from the posterior distributions. All statistical analyses were conducted in R version 3.6.1 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) using the ‘rstan’ package.

Results

As of March 21, 2020, a total of 8,799 cases and 102 deaths of COVID-19 have been reported in Korea. Of the 8,799 cases reported in Korea, 6,344 cases (72.1 %) are from Daegu, 1,243 cases (14.1 %) are from Gyeongsangbuk-do. Of the 102 deaths in Korea, 73 deaths (71.6%) are from Daegu, 24 deaths (23.5 %) are from Gyeongsangbuk-do and only five deaths (4.9 %) are from other areas in Korea.

Figure 1 illustrates the cumulative cases in (A) Korea, (B) Daegu, (C) Gyeongsangbuk-do, and (D) Other regions, and the cumulative deaths in (E) Korea, (F) Daegu, (G) Gyeongsangbuk-do and (H) Other regions, respectively. The curve of the cumulative number of deaths grows after that of the cumulative number of cases, and the increase in the number of deaths in Daegu is occurring more rapidly and the associated mortality burden appears to be much higher compared to the rest of Korea.

Figure 2 displays the observed and model-based posterior estimates of crude CFR in (A) Korea, (B) Daegu, (C) Gyeongsangbuk-do, and (D) Other regions, and model-based posterior estimates of the time-delay adjusted CFR in (E) Korea, (F) Daegu, (G) Gyeongsangbuk-do and (H) Other regions, in February – March, 2020. Our model-based crude CFR fitted the observed data well throughout the course of the epidemic except for the very early stage in Gyeongsangbuk-do, probably affected by the reporting delay of confirmed cases. During the course of the outbreak, our model-based posterior estimates of time-delay adjusted CFR take much higher values than the observed crude CFR. Our estimates of the time-delay adjusted CFR appear to be decreasing almost consistently in all of the three areas, whereas in Gyeongsangbuk-do, estimates were low at the early stage and then increased and peaked in the midst of the study period, and are now following a decreasing trend similar to the other two areas, reaching estimates around 2.5%.

The latest estimates (March 21, 2020) of the time-delay adjusted CFR are at 1.3% (95% CrI: 1.0-1.6%) in Daegu, 2.4% (95% CrI: 1.6-3.4%) in Gyeongsangbuk-do, 0.7% (95% CrI: 0.3-1.4%) in Other regions and 1.4% (95% CrI: 1.2-1.7%) in Korea, while the observed crude CFR is 1.2% (95% CI: 0.9-1.4%)

in Daegu, 2.0% (95% CI: 1.2-2.9%) in Gyeongsangbuk-do, 0.4% (95%CrI: 0.1-1.0%) in Other regions and 1.2 % (95% CI: 0.9-1.4%) in Korea, respectively. (Figure 3, Table 1)

Discussion

In this paper we have derived estimates of the CFR for the ongoing COVID-19 epidemic in Korea, a country that has relies on intensive social distancing and mass testing of suspected COVID-19 cases to mitigate incidence levels of the disease and deliver early medical care to the most vulnerable, potentially lowering the risk of death. Specifically, we have estimated time-delay adjusted CFR in three different geographic areas in Korea and found that the most severely affected areas were Gyeongsangbuk-do while the rest of Korea exhibits milder severity impact. Specifically, the delay-adjusted CFR in Gyeongsangbuk-do, largely driven by hospital-based transmission, was relatively high, being estimated at 2.4% (95% CrI: 1.6-3.4%), which is about 2-fold higher than our estimate for Daegu and for all regions in Korea. These findings suggest that the situation in Gyeongsangbuk-do is more severe compared with the other affected areas in Korea.

One can note a considerable increase in fatality risks with older age by multiple folds, with the oldest age group exhibiting the highest case fatality. It was also reported that the risk of symptomatic infection also increases with age, although this may be partially affected by preferential ascertainment of older and thus more severe cases [23]. In fact, a substantial fraction of the case-patients were elderly or had underlying conditions [24]. The youngest case-patient was a 35-year old Mongolian male who already had complications from chronic hepatic failure with cirrhosis and esophageal variceal bleeding [24]. The second youngest case-patient was a 40-year old male with hypertension who was diagnosed with COVID-19 after death [24]. Besides these two cases, all deaths associated with COVID-19 in Korea occurred among individuals of age over 50. Such age-dependency of COVID-19 fatality indicates the importance of monitoring infected individuals with old age and/or underlying medical conditions.

Our estimate time-adjusted CFR associated with COVID-19 in all regions in Korea is 1.4% (95% CI: 1.2-1.7%). While this remains lower than the reported CFR for other coronaviruses such as SARS [25]

and MERS [26], it is relatively higher than the estimates from the 2009 H1N1 influenza pandemic [27, 28]. In addition, our estimates on CFR are relatively lower than the CFR obtained from affected areas in China (ranging from 1.41%- 5.25%), based on the cases and deaths observed to date [18, 29]. In general, the CFR of the same disease might vary greatly in different countries or even different regions of the same country, partially due to differences in health control policies, availability of healthcare, medical standards, and detection efficiency. In Korea, an extensive COVID-19 testing regime has been instituted, and authorities launched a massive contact tracing as case numbers grew. As a result, the country has tested more people per capita than any country in the world, with a total of 327,509 people as of March 21, 2020 [5]. Such extensive testing might have effectively identified COVID-19 cases even with mild symptoms, thus lowering the CFR.

The reported CFR of COVID-19 tends to vary over the course of epidemic curve. It is noteworthy that the upward trend of CFR during the early phase generally indicates increasing ascertainment bias. During a growing epidemic the final clinical outcomes of most reported cases are unknown, and thus underestimating the true CFR early in the epidemic. Such effect was observed in our results (Fig. 2) as well as in prior studies of past epidemics of respiratory pathogens including SARS and H1N1 influenza [30, 31]. Similarly, the observed time lag between onset of symptoms and outcomes tends to bias the estimated CFR downwards during the early growth phase of an epidemic.

When the transmission of COVID-19 was widely recognized by clusters of confirmed cases such as hospital-based transmission, surveillance is typically biased towards detecting clinically severe cases, therefore resulting in higher CFR estimates. Specifically, hospital-based transmission has occurred during the outbreak of COVID-19 in Korea, including clusters based in Cheongdo Daenam Hospital (resulting in 120 infections), Hansarang Convalescent Hospital (75 infections) and Gyeongsan Seo Convalescent Hospital (30 infections) in Gyeongsangbuk-do, which explains our higher CFR estimate at 2.4% (95% CrI: 1.6-3.4%) for Gyeongsangbuk-do. Similarly, nosocomial clusters also occurred in Bundang Je-saeng Hospital (38 infections) in Gyeonggi province, KimSin Recuperation Hospital (26 infections) in Daegu, and Eunpyeong St Mary’s Hospital (14 infections) in Seoul [5]. Such hospital-based transmission resulted

in secondary infections affecting healthcare workers, inpatients and their visitors, which tend to elevate CFR estimates as has been previously documented for outbreaks of Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS) and severe acute respiratory syndrome in the past [32, 33]. In addition, a large number of COVID-19 cases are related to church clusters in Korea, including a total of 5,037 COVID-19 cases in a cluster linked to the Shincheonji Church, accounting for about 57% of all confirmed cases [5].

Asymptomatic patients complicate the estimation of CFR for COVID-19. In fact, the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from asymptomatic individuals (or individuals within the incubation period) has also been described [34-36]. For instance, in a COVID-19 outbreak on a cruise ship, about half of the 619 confirmed COVID-19 cases were asymptomatic at the time of diagnosis [37]. Moreover, some of patients with asymptomatic infection showed objective clinical abnormalities. In a previous study of 24 patients with asymptomatic infection and their chest computed tomography (CT), 50 percent of those had typical ground-glass opacities or patchy shadowing, and another 20 percent had atypical imaging abnormalities [38]. In addition, it is likely that asymptomatic or very mild cases were not reported, and thus were not included in our analysis, possibly overestimating our CFR. Future research and more accurate incidence data including age-stratified serologic studies would improve our estimates.

During the course of the epidemic, estimates of the time-adjusted CFR for Daegu, Gyeongsangbuk-do, other regions (outside Daegu and Gyeongsangbuk-do) as well as all regions in Korea showed a declining trend. A downward trend in time-adjusted CFR after its peak suggests the extent of improvement in epidemiologic surveillance. In addition, a downward trend in CFR is partially due to a substantial number of mild or asymptomatic cases, which might prolong the end of the outbreak [18]. We note that a similar trend was previously reported for the COVID-19 outbreak in China, and for the 2015 MERS outbreak in South Korea.

In conclusion, our estimates of the risk for death from COVID-19 in Korea as of March 21, 2020, were as high as 2.4% in Gyeongsangbuk-do and as low as 0.7% in the less severely affected areas in Korea, and this difference in CFR is likely influenced by nosocomial transmission of the disease. In the absence of pharmaceutical interventions (i.e., vaccination and antiviral drugs), the control of COVID-19 is highly

dependent on public health interventions including social distancing measures, isolation of the infected, delayed school openings, and extensive testing of potential contacts of confirmed cases. The estimates of CFR associated with COVID-19 is thus critical to help inform the assessments of health impacts and to determine both the intensity and appropriateness of mitigation strategies as the epidemic unfolds.

Table legends:

Table 1. Summary results of time-delay adjusted case fatality ratio of COVID-19 in the 3 areas in Korea, 2020 (As of March 21st, 2020)

Table 2. Distribution of the cases by sex and age groups, as of Mar 20, 2020 [5]

Figure legends:

Figure 1: Temporal distribution of cases and deaths by area due to COVID-19, Korea, February – March 2020.

Cumulative cases in (A) Korea, (B) Daegu, (C) Gyeongsangbuk-do, and (D) Other regions, and cumulative deaths in (E) Korea, (F) Daegu, (G) Gyeongsangbuk-do and (H) Other regions, over time. Day 1 corresponds to February 1st in 2020. As the dates of illness onset were not available, we used dates of reporting.

Figure 2: Temporal variation of risk of death caused by COVID-19, Korea, February – March 2020.

Observed and posterior estimated of crude case fatality ratio in (A) Korea, (B) Daegu, (C) Gyeongsangbuk-do, and (D) Other regions, and time-delay adjusted case fatality ratio in (E) Korea, (F) Daegu, (G) Gyeongsangbuk-do and (H) Other regions. Day 1 corresponds to February 1st in 2020. Black dots show crude case fatality ratio, and light and dark indicates 95% and 50% credible intervals for posterior estimates, respectively.

Figure 3. Latest estimates of time-delay adjusted risk of death caused by COVID-19 by area, March 2020, Korea.

Distribution of time-delay adjusted case fatality risks derived from the latest estimates (March 21st 2020) are presented. Korea (national) (top) followed by Daegu, Gyeongsanbuk-do, and other regions (bottom).

Acknowledgements

Conflicts of interests: We declare no competing interests.

Funding: This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT) [No. 2018R1C1B6001723] to ES and WC. KM acknowledges support from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI Grant Number 15K20936, from Program for Advancing Strategic International Networks to Accelerate the Circulation of Talented Researchers Grant Number G2801 and from the Leading Initiative for Excellent Young Researchers from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sport, Science & Technology of Japan. GC acknowledges support from NSF grant 1414374 as part of the joint NSF-NIH-USDA Ecology and Evolution of Infectious Diseases program, and UK Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council grant [BB/M008894/1].

Corresponding author: Eunha Shim. Email: alicia@ssu.ac.kr, Address: 369 Sangdo-ro, Department of Mathematics, Soongsil University, Korea 06978. Tel: +82 (10) 2383-5309. Fax:+82 (2) 824-4383.

Figure 1.


A
Korea (national)
B
Daegue
C
Gyeongsangbuk-do
D
Other regions
Cumulative cases
Persons
E
F
G
H
Cumulative death
Day

Figure 2.


A
Crude case fatality ratio
Observed and Estimated
Korea(national)
B
Crude case fatality ratio
Observed and Estimated
Daegue
C
Crude case fatality ratio
Observed and Estimated
Gyeongsangbuk-do
D
Crude case fatality ratio
Observed and Estimated
Other regions
E
Time adjusted case fatality ratio
Crude and time adjusted
Korea(national)
F
Time adjusted case fatality ratio
Crude and time adjusted
Daegue
G
Time adjusted case fatality ratio
Crude and time adjusted
Gyeongsangbuk-do
H
Time adjusted case fatality ratio
Crude and time adjusted
Other regions
Risk of death (%)
Day

Figure 3.


Time delay adjusted CFR by area
The latest estimate
Area
Korea (national)
Daegue
Gyeongsangbuk-do
Other regions
0
1
2
3
4
5
Percent

Table 1. Summary results of time-delay adjusted case fatality ratio of COVID-19 in the 3 areas in Korea, 2020 (As of March 21st, 2020)

Area	Latest estimate	Range of median estimates during the study period	Crude CFR
Daegu	1.3% (95%CrI [§]: 1.0-1.6%)	1.2-15.4%	1.2% (95%CI[!¶]:0.9-1.4%) 73/6344
Gyeongsanbuk-do	2.4% (95%CrI: 1.6-3.4%)	2.0-81.9%	2.0% (95%CI: 1.2-2.9%) 24/1243
Other regions	0.7% (95%CrI: 0.3-1.4%)	0.6-3.7%	0.4% (95%CI: 0.1-1.0%) 5/1212
Korea (national)	1.4% (95%CrI: 1.2-1.7%)	1.3-17.0%	1.2% (95%CI: 0.9-1.4%) 102/8799

[§]CrI: 95% credibility intervals (CrI), [¶]95%CI: 95% confidence interval

Table 2. Distribution of the cases by sex and age groups, as of Mar 20, 2020 [5]

		Confirmed cases # (%)	**Deaths # (%)**	**Fatality rate (%)**
Total		**8,652 (100.00)**	**94 (100.00)**	**1.09**
Sex	Male	3,300 (38.49)	51 (54.26)	1.53
	Female	5,322 (61.51)	43 (45.74)	0.81
Age Group	80 and above	329 (3.80)	33 (35.11)	10.03
	70-79	568 (6.56)	35 (37.23)	6.16
	60-69	1,099 (12.70)	17 (18.09)	1.55
	50-59	1,656 (19.14)	7 (7.45)	0.42
	40-49	1,193 (13.79)	1 (1.06)	0.08
	30-39	893 (10.32)	1 (1.06)	0.11
	20-29	2,365 (27.33)	0 (0.00)	-
	10-19	452 (5.22)	0 (0.00)	-
	0-9	97 (1.12)	0 (0.00)	-

References

1. WHO. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports.

2. WHO. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19.

3. Yoo J-H. The fight against the 2019-nCoV outbreak: an arduous march has just begun. Journal of Korean Medical Science **2019**; 35.

4. Shim E, Tariq A, Choi W, Lee Y, Gerardo C. Transmission potential and severity of COVID-19 in South Korea. International Journal of Infectious Diseases **2020**.

5. KCDC. The Updates of COVID-19 in Republic of Korea. In: Korea CfDCaP, ed, **2020**.

6. Association CPM. An update on the epidemiological characteristics of novel coronavirus pneumonia (COVID-19). Chin J Epidemiol **2020**; 41:139-44.

7. Zhang S, Diao M, Yu W, Pei L, Lin Z, Chen D. Estimation of the reproductive number of Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) and the probable outbreak size on the Diamond Princess cruise ship: A data-driven analysis. International Journal of Infectious Diseases **2020**; 93:201-4.

8. Lai A, Bergna A, Acciarri C, Galli M, Zehender G. Early phylogenetic estimate of the effective reproduction number of SARS-CoV-2. Journal of medical virology **2020**.

9. Zhou T, Liu Q, Yang Z, et al. Preliminary prediction of the basic reproduction number of the Wuhan novel coronavirus 2019-nCoV. Journal of Evidence-Based Medicine **2020**.

10. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, et al. Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia. New England Journal of Medicine **2020**.

11. Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Chowell G. Early epidemiological assessment of the transmission potential and virulence of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in Wuhan City: China, 2019-2020. medRxiv **2020**:2020.02.12.20022434.

12. Read JM, Bridgen JR, Cummings DA, Ho A, Jewell CP. Novel coronavirus 2019-nCoV: early estimation of epidemiological parameters and epidemic predictions. medRxiv **2020**.

13. 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. The Lancet **2020**.

14. Contact Transmission of COVID-19 in South Korea: Novel Investigation Techniques for Tracing Contacts. Osong Public Health Res Perspect **2020**; 11:60-3.

15. Kwon KT, Ko JH, Shin H, Sung M, Kim JY. Drive-Through Screening Center for COVID-19: a Safe and Efficient Screening System against Massive Community Outbreak. Journal of Korean medical science **2020**; 35:e123.

16. Mizumoto K, Chowell G. Estimating Risk for Death from 2019 Novel Coronavirus Disease, China, January-February 2020. Emerging infectious diseases **2020**; 26.

17. Kim JY. Letter to the Editor: Case of the Index Patient Who Caused Tertiary Transmission of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Korea: the Application of Lopinavir/Ritonavir for the Treatment of COVID-19 Pneumonia Monitored by Quantitative RT-PCR. J Korean Med Sci **2020**; 35:e88.

18. Mizumoto K, Chowell G. Estimating Risk for Death from 2019 Novel Coronavirus Disease, China, January-February 2020. Emerging infectious diseases **2020**; 26.

19. Nishiura H, Klinkenberg D, Roberts M, Heesterbeek JA. Early epidemiological assessment of the virulence of emerging infectious diseases: a case study of an influenza pandemic. PLoS One **2009**; 4:e6852.

20. Tsuzuki S, Lee H, Miura F, et al. Dynamics of the pneumonic plague epidemic in Madagascar, August to October 2017. Eurosurveillance **2017**; 22.

21. Gamerman D, Lopes HF. Markov chain Monte Carlo: stochastic simulation for Bayesian inference. CRC Press, **2006**.

22. Gelman A, Rubin DB. Inference from iterative simulation using multiple sequences. Statistical science **1992**; 7:457-72.

23. Wu JT, Leung K, Bushman M, et al. Estimating clinical severity of COVID-19 from the transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China. Nature Medicine **2020**:1-5.

24. Yoo J, Chung M, Kim J, et al. Report on the Epidemiological Features of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in the Republic of Korea from January 19 to March 2, 2020.

25. Lau EH, Hsiung CA, Cowling BJ, et al. A comparative epidemiologic analysis of SARS in Hong Kong, Beijing and Taiwan. BMC infectious diseases **2010**; 10:50.

26. Lessler J, Salje H, Van Kerkhove MD, et al. Estimating the severity and subclinical burden of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus infection in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. American journal of epidemiology **2016**; 183:657-63.

27. Wong JY, Wu P, Nishiura H, et al. Infection fatality risk of the pandemic A (H1N1) 2009 virus in Hong Kong. American journal of epidemiology **2013**; 177:834-40.

28. Kwok KO, Riley S, Perera RA, et al. Relative incidence and individual-level severity of seasonal influenza A H3N2 compared with 2009 pandemic H1N1. BMC infectious diseases **2017**; 17:337.

29. Yang S, Cao P, Du P, et al. Early estimation of the case fatality rate of COVID-19 in mainland China: a data-driven analysis. Annals of Translational Medicine **2020**; 8.

30. Garske T, Legrand J, Donnelly CA, et al. Assessing the severity of the novel influenza A/H1N1 pandemic. Bmj **2009**; 339:b2840.

31. Donnelly CA, Ghani AC, Leung GM, et al. Epidemiological determinants of spread of causal agent of severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. The Lancet **2003**; 361:1761-6.

32. Chowell G, Abdirizak F, Lee S, et al. Transmission characteristics of MERS and SARS in the healthcare setting: a comparative study. BMC medicine **2015**; 13:210.

33. Abdirizak F, Lewis R, Chowell G. Evaluating the potential impact of targeted vaccination strategies against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus (SARS-CoV) and Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) outbreaks in the healthcare setting. Theoretical Biology and Medical Modelling **2019**; 16:16.

34. Rothe C, Schunk M, Sothmann P, et al. Transmission of 2019-nCoV infection from an asymptomatic contact in Germany. New England Journal of Medicine **2020**.

35. Liu Y-C, Liao C-H, Chang C-F, Chou C-C, Lin Y-R. A locally transmitted case of SARS-CoV-2 infection in Taiwan. New England Journal of Medicine **2020**; 382:1070-2.

36. Yu P, Zhu J, Zhang Z, Han Y. A Familial Cluster of Infection Associated With the 2019 Novel Coronavirus Indicating Possible Person-to-Person Transmission During the Incubation Period. The Journal of Infectious Diseases **2020**.

37. Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A, Chowell G. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. Euro surveillance : bulletin europeen sur les maladies transmissibles = European communicable disease bulletin **2020**; 25.

38. Hu Z, Song C, Xu C, et al. Clinical characteristics of 24 asymptomatic infections with COVID-19 screened among close contacts in Nanjing, China. Science China Life Sciences **2020**:1-6.