Manuscript Number: NA

Article Summary Line: The loosening of the social distancing measures imposed by the Korean government in May 2020 has resulted in the second wave of COVID-19 in the greater Seoul area in the first two weeks of June, yielding reproduction numbers exceeding 3.0.

Running Title: Transmission potential of COVID-19 in South Korea

Keywords: Coronavirus; COVID-19; Republic of Korea; Seoul; severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; Coronavirus Infections; Reproduction number; Government

Title: Spatial and temporal variability in the transmission potential of COVID-19 in South Korea including the second wave in the greater Seoul area, February to July 2020

Authors: Eunha Shim, Gerardo Chowell

Affiliations:

Department of Mathematics, Soongsil University, Seoul, Republic of Korea (E. Shim)

Department of Population Health Sciences, School of Public Health, Georgia State University, Atlanta, USA (G. Chowell)

Abstract

In South Korea, 13,745 cases of COVID-19 have been reported as of 19 July, 2020. We used *EpiEstim R* package to investigate the time-varying reproduction numbers of the COVID-19 in the four most affected regions in South Korea: Seoul, Gyeonggi Province, Gyeongbuk Province, and Daegu. At the regional level, Seoul and Gyeonggi Province have experienced two waves with the first major peak of COVID-19 in early March, followed by the second wave in the first two weeks of June, with reproduction numbers in early May greater than 3.0. Gyeongbuk Province and Daegu are yet to experience a second wave of the disease, where the mean reproduction number reached values as high as 3.5-4.4. Our findings indicate that the loosening of the restrictions imposed by the government in May 2020 facilitated a second wave in the greater Seoul area.

Since the first COVID-19 cases reported in Wuhan, Hubei Province, China, in December 2019, more than 12 million cases of coronavirus disease (COVID-19), including 551,046 related deaths, have been reported worldwide (1). In South Korea, the novel coronavirus was first diagnosed in a 36-year-old Chinese woman who entered the country on 20 January 2020. South Korea has since experienced two heterogenous waves of the disease with a total of 13,745 cases including 295 deaths as of 19 July (2).

In the early phase of the COVID-19 outbreak in South Korea, public health authorities primarily conducted strict contact tracing and isolation of confirmed cases as well as put under quarantine orders those suspected with the novel coronavirus (3). As the number of COVID-19 cases increased, Korean public health authorities set the alert to the highest level (Level 4) on 23 February and required the population to report any symptoms related to COVID-19 for further screening and testing. In addition, the country rapidly adopted a “test, trace, isolate, and treat” strategy that has been deemed effective in stamping out localized outbreaks of the novel coronavirus (2). However, the total number of confirmed cases in South Korea spiked from 31 cases on 18 February to 433 on 22 February. According to the Korea Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (KCDC), this sudden jump was mainly attributed to a super-spreader (the 31st case) who had participated in a religious gathering of attendees of the Shincheonji Church of Jesus in Daegu (2). Superspreading events occurred in the Daegu and Gyeongbuk provincial regions, leading to more than 5,210 secondary COVID-19 cases in Korea (2, 4). These events facilitated sustained transmission chains, with 38% of the cases in the country being associated with the church cluster in Daegu (5).

On 8 March, the KCDC announced that 79% of the confirmed cases were tied to clusters of infections. Case clusters started to accumulate from churches in the Seoul Capital Area, and on

17 March, 79 church attendees developed COVID-19 after attending a service at the River of Grace Community Church. Notwithstanding social distancing orders put forward by the government, some churches held services, which led to new clusters of infections. For instance, the Manmin Central Church in Seoul was involved in one of the clusters, with 41 infections linked to a gathering in early March; other church clusters including one with 50 cases involving the SaengMyeongSu Church in Gyeonggi Province (6).

As infection rates rose outside Korea, the number of imported cases increased, resulting in 476 imported out of 9,661 total cases as of 30 March. Consequently, as of 1 April, the KCDC implemented self-quarantine measures for travellers from Europe or the U.S. (2). In addition, incoming travellers that showed symptoms but tested negative, as well as asymptomatic short-term visitors, were ordered to follow 2-week quarantines in government facilities (2).

After a sustained low incidence period with fewer than 20 cases per day, the government eased its strict nationwide social distancing guidelines on 6 May, with phased reopening of schools starting mid-May, 2020. However, a new cluster tied to nightclubs in Itaewon emerged in central Seoul in early May, resulting in a resurgence of cases that led to a second wave in the greater areas of Seoul. As of 29 May, the number of cases that were linked to this cluster had reached 266 (2). Accordingly, the Seoul city government ordered all clubs, bars, and other nightlife establishments in the city to close indefinitely (2). Moreover, one more cluster emerged from an e-commerce warehouse in the Gyeonggi Province, resulting in 108 cases as of 30 May.

In the last week of May, the number of daily new cases increased and varied between 40 and 80 (2). Following this highest spike in the number of new COVID-19 infections in nearly 2 months, public health authorities reimplemented strict lockdown measures in Seoul and ordered schools closed one more time across the nation. In June, it was announced that the strict social

distancing campaign would be indefinitely extended as a preventive measure in Seoul, Incheon, and Gyeonggi Province; however, phased reopening of schools was initiated on May 20. It was reported by the KCDC that a holiday weekend in early May triggered a new wave of infections focused in the greater Seoul area, the so-called second wave of COVID-19 in South Korea (7). In Seoul, the average number of new daily cases from 4 June to 17 June was 43 cases (2). In July, sporadic clusters of infections across the country continued to occur, most of them related to religious facilities and door-to-door salespeople, especially in the densely populated Seoul region and adjacent areas. Therefore, since 10 July, the government banned churches from organising small gatherings other than regular worship services (2).

To estimate the regional and temporal variability in the reproduction number of COVID-19 in South Korea, including the second wave concentrated in the greater Seoul areas, we analysed the spatial-temporal progression of the epidemic in the country from mid-February to mid-July 2020. Here our focus is on estimating and interpreting the effective reproduction number $R_{t,}$ a metric that quantifies the time-dependent transmission potential, incorporating the effect of control measures, susceptible depletion, and behavioural changes. This key epidemiological parameter, R_t, represents the average number of secondary cases per case if conditions remain as they were at time t. In this report, we estimated the effective reproduction number involving two epidemic waves of the COVID-19 epidemic in South Korea by employing the time series of cases by date of symptoms onset for the four most affected Korean regions: Seoul, Gyeonggi Province, Gyeongbuk Province, and Daegu. We also discuss the spatial-temporal variability of the reproduction number in terms of the public health policies that were put in place by the Korean government.

Methods

Data

We collected the daily series of confirmed local COVID-19 cases in South Korea from 20 January to 19 July, which were published by national and local public health authorities, including city or provincial departments of public health in South Korea (8). We focused our analysis on the regions with the highest disease burden including Seoul, Gyeonggi Province, Gyeongbuk Province, and Daegu (Figure 1).

Imputing the date of onset

To estimate epidemic growth rates with more accuracy, the epidemic curve should be analysed according to the date of symptom onset rather than the date of reporting because reporting delays can fluctuate substantially over the course of the epidemic. For the COVID-19 data in Korea, however, the symptom-onset date is only available for the 732 cases reported in Gyeonggi Province. Therefore, we imputed the onset date for the cases with missing data using the empirical distribution of the reporting delay from onset to diagnosis as in a previous study (9). Specifically, we reconstructed 300 epidemic curves according to symptom-onset date, from which we derived the mean incidence curve of local case incidence (9, 10). For the calculation of $R_t(t)$, the mean incidence curve estimated based on symptom-onset date was used for the regions of our interest (i.e., Seoul, Gyeonggi Province, Gyeongbuk Province, and Daegu) (Figure 2).

Calculation of R_t

To estimate the temporal variation in the transmission potential, we estimated $R_t(t)$ using the distribution of the serial interval (SI) for COVID-19 and calculated the transmission ability (11). The SI is defined as the period between the time of symptom onset in two successive cases in a chain of transmission and its distribution is denoted by a probability distribution w_s, the infectivity profile of the infected individual. The distribution of SI, w_s, is dependent on the time since infection (s) but independent of calendar time (t). For example, an individual would be the most infectious at time s when w_s is the largest. In addition, the infectiousness of a patient is a function of the time since infection and is proportional to w_s if we set the timing of infection in the primary case as the time zero of w_s and assume that the generation interval equals the SI. Individual biological factors such as pathogen shedding or symptom severity can affect the distribution w_s. The SI was assumed to follow a gamma distribution with a mean of 4.8 days and a standard deviation of 2.3 days (12).

$R_t(t)$ can be estimated by the ratio of the number of new infections generated at time step t (I_t) to the total infectiousness of infected individuals at time t, given by $\sum_{s=1}^{t} I_{t-s} w_s$ (13, 14). Here, $\sum_{s=1}^{t} I_{t-s} w_s$ indicates the sum of infection incidence up to time step $t-1$, weighted by the infectivity function w_s. Steady values of R_t above one indicate sustained disease transmission, whereas values less than one indicate that the number of new cases is expected to follow a declining trend. Analytical estimates of R_t were obtained within a Bayesian framework using *EpiEstim R* package in *R* language version 3.6.3 (*R* Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) (12). R_t was estimated at 7-day intervals, and we reported the median and 95% credible interval (CrI).

Results

City of Seoul

As of 19 July, Seoul has reported a total of 1,474 cases (10.7% of the total reported in South Korea), including 323 imported cases and 10 deaths, yielding an incidence rate estimated at 151 cases per million. In Seoul, the first peak based on the estimated dates of symptom onset occurred during the second week of March (8th–14th March), with 18 new cases reported each day as the number of new cases linked to a Guro-gu call centre was rising. Based on the estimated dates of symptom onset, the 7-day moving average of daily cases reached 19 on 9 March (Figure 3) whereas R_t reached its highest value at 2.9 (95% CrI: 1.6-4.7) on 19 February and stayed above one until 6 March (Figure 3).

After its first peak in February, the number of daily new cases by date of symptoms onset in Seoul gradually declined, dropping below five on 1 April and staying under five new cases per day for about a month (Figure 3). However, in early May, despite a steady decline in imported cases, locally transmitted infections surged throughout the Seoul metropolitan area with case clusters traced to clubs, churches, and sports facilities. Therefore, R_t increased, reaching 3.0 (95% CrI: 1.6-5.0) on 4 May 2020.

The number of cases continued to increase, and in the first week of June, the average daily number of confirmed COVID-19 cases in the capital surpassed the previous high point reached in the middle of March. The major clusters in Seoul were linked to nightclubs (139 cases), the Guro-gu call centre (99 cases), Manmin Central Church (41 cases), Richway (97 cases), Yangcheon-gu table tennis club (41 cases), and Newly Planted Church in the Seoul Metropolitan Region (37 cases) as of 18 June. On 14 June, the average R_t in the capital, which reflects the average number of people infected by a patient, dropped below one (95% CrI: 0.8-1.2), implying that the spread of the virus had slowed down substantially in the city (Figure 3). As of 15 July

2020, the R_t in Seoul was estimated at 0.9 (95% CrI: 0.7-1.2), straddling the epidemic threshold of 1.0, and suggesting potential for further transmission of the virus.

Gyeonggi Province

Gyeonggi Province (literally meaning the "province surrounding Seoul") is located in the western central region of Korea and is the most populous province in South Korea with a population of 13.5 million people. In Gyeonggi Province, the daily number of new cases by date of symptoms onset during the last weeks of February was 6.3 on average (Figure 4). Accordingly, the first peak of R_t occurred on 22 February, reaching 8.9 (95% CrI: 4.8-14.2). In the second week of March, South Korea recorded continuous drops in the number of daily new infections as massive testing of the followers of a religious sect in the south-eastern city of Daegu, the epicentre of COVID-19, was nearing its end; thereafter, the number of cases in Gyeonggi Province gradually decreased.

However, clusters of infections in Gyeonggi Province raised concerns about further community spread, with a resurgence of cases in the province occurring in late May and resulting in the highest peak in early June. Between 1 June and 13 June, an average of 14 new cases were reported each day in Gyeonggi Province. The second peak of R_t in the region occurred on 12 May, with an estimated value at 4.8 (95% CrI: 3.0-7.0). Since its second peak, R_t gradually decreased (Figure 3); however, a series of sporadic clusters have continued to occur. The major clusters in Gyeonggi Province included Grace River Church (67), Coupang warehouse (67), nightclubs (59), Richway (58), Uijeongbu St. Mary's Hospital (50), Guro-gu call centre/Bucheon SaengMyeongSu Church (50), door-to-door sales in the Seoul Metropolitan Region (32), and Yangcheon-gu sports facility (28). As of 19 July, the number of local cases in Gyeonggi Province

was 1,027 (10.4% of the total reported cases in South Korea), including 29 deaths, with R_t estimated at 0.8 (Figure 4). The incidence rate in the province was estimated at 108 per million.

Gyeongbuk Province

The first case in the Sincheonji cult cluster (the largest COVID-19 cluster in South Korea) appeared on 18 February, resulting in sustained transmission chains, with 39% of the cases associated with the church cluster in Gyeongbuk Province. Therefore, the virus alert level was raised to "red" (the highest level) on 23 February, and health authorities focused on halting the spread of the virus in Daegu and Gyeongbuk Provinces. Figure 5 shows that the peak of the epidemic occurred in the first week of March (with a reproduction number greater than one until 9 March) (Figure 5). As of 18 July, the number of cases in Gyeongbuk Province was 1,393, including 54 deaths. Among these cases, 566 were related to the Shincheonji cluster. The incidence rate in Gyeongbuk Province was 523 per million, accounting for 10.2% of all confirmed cases in South Korea (2). The major clusters in Gyeongbuk Province were linked to Cheongdo Daenam Hospital (119 cases), Bonghwa Pureun Nursing Home (68 cases), Gyeongsan Seo Convalescent Hospital (66 cases), pilgrimage to Israel (41 cases), Yecheon-gun (40 cases), and Gumi Elim Church (11 cases).

City of Daegu

The epicentre of the South Korean COVID-19 outbreak has been identified in Daegu, a city of 2.5 million people, approximately 150 miles south-east of Seoul. The rapid spread of COVID-19 in Daegu was attributed to a superspreading event in a religious group called Shincheonji,

resulting in an explosive outbreak with 4,511 infections in the city of Daegu (Figure 6). Other major clusters in Daegu included the second Mi-Ju Hospital (196 cases), Hansarang Convalescent Hospital (124 cases), Daesil Convalescent Hospital (101 cases), and Fatima Hospital (39 cases). Daegu was the most severely affected area in South Korea with 6,932 cumulative cases as of 19 July, accounting for 51.0% of all confirmed cases. According to our model, the number of new cases based on the onset of symptoms was estimated to be the highest on 27 February; the number gradually decreased thereafter. Accordingly, the estimated R_t was above two until 27 February and dropped below one on 5 March, although recent sporadic infections caused the R_t to fluctuate around one (Figure 6).

Discussion

The estimates of the transmission potential of COVID-19 in Korea displayed substantial spatiotemporal variation. Indeed, several factors influence the value of the reproduction number, including the transmissibility of an infectious agent, individual susceptibility, individual contact rates, and control measures. Our results indicate that the effective reproduction number for COVID-19 declined to low levels after the first wave and straddled the epidemic threshold of 1.0 in March and April suggesting that social distancing measures had a significant effect on mitigating the spread of the novel coronavirus. In prior studies, the early national R_t for South Korea has been estimated at 2.9 (95% CrI 2.0-3.9) in February (15) or 2.6 (95% CI: 2.3-2.9) in March (16). These values are in good agreement with our estimates.

Our results suggest that South Korea has experienced two spatially heterogenous waves of the novel coronavirus. At the regional level, Seoul and Gyeonggi Province have experienced two

waves whereas Daegu and Gyeongbuk Provinces are yet to experience the second wave of the disease. The highest epidemic peak occurred in Daegu and Gyeongbuk Province in late February and early March, with R_t being estimated at 4.4 (95% CrI: 2.6-6.6) and 3.5 (95% CrI: 0.9-7.3), respectively. Similarly, in Gyeonggi Province and Seoul, the first wave was observed in late February and early March, respectively. However, sporadic clusters of infections appeared in Seoul and near Gyeonggi Province, immediately after the government eased its strict nationwide social distancing guidelines on May 6. This resurgence of infections in Seoul and Gyeonggi Province (i.e., the province surrounding Seoul) after a sustained period with fewer than 5 cases per day in each region, led to the second epidemic wave with sub-exponential growth dynamics. Accordingly, our findings revealed sustained local transmission in Seoul and Gyeonggi Province, with the estimated reproduction number above one until the end of May. In late May, the country implemented two weeks of tougher virus prevention guidelines for the metropolitan area, with measures including shutting down public facilities and regulating bars and karaoke rooms. In the second week of June, South Korea decided to indefinitely extend a period of tougher social distancing measures, as nearly all locally transmitted cases were in the metropolitan area.

Although Korea has a relatively low number of reported cases compared with other countries including the U.S. and China, it is believed that South Korea is currently experiencing yet another resurgence of the virus. Originally, South Korean authorities predicted a resurgence of the virus in the fall or winter; however, this possible second wave started in and around Seoul, which, with 51.6 million inhabitants, accounts for about half of the entire population of the country. Secondary waves of the disease can result from multiple factors, including easing of travel restrictions and resuming social activities especially in the high population density areas of Seoul and Gyeonggi Province. Furthermore, a substantial proportion of COVID-19 cases are

asymptomatic (17); thus, they are not detected by surveillance systems, resulting in the underestimation of the epidemic growth curve. It was also recently reported that individuals aged 20-39 years in South Korea drove the COVID-19 epidemic throughout society with multiple rebounds, and an increase in infection among the elderly was significantly associated with an elevated transmission risk among young adults (18).

Our study is not exempted of limitations including the lack of dates of symptoms onset for all of the cases, relying on a statistical reconstruction of the epidemic curve by dates of symptoms onset as in a previous study (9). Overall, using most up-to-date epidemiological data from South Korea, our study highlights the effectiveness of strong control interventions in South Korea and emphasizes the need to maintain firm social distancing and contact tracing efforts to mitigate the risk of additional waves of the disease.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT) [No. 2018R1C1B6001723] to E.S. For G.C., this work was supported by RAPID NSF No. 2026797.

Author Bio

Dr. Shim is an Associate Professor of Mathematics at Soongsil University, Seoul, South Korea. Her research interests include using mathematics and quantitative tools to understand infectious disease dynamics and to evaluate the effectiveness of public health interventions.

Dr. Chowell is a professor of epidemiology and biostatistics and chair of the department of population health sciences at Georgia State University School of Public Health, Atlanta, Georgia. As a mathematical epidemiologist, he studies the transmission dynamics of emerging infectious diseases, such as Ebola, MERS, and SARS.

References

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

2. KCDC. The Updates of COVID-19 in Republic of Korea. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Korea; 2020.

3. Covid-19 National Emergency Response Center E, Case Management Team KCfDC, Prevention. Contact Transmission of COVID-19 in South Korea: Novel Investigation Techniques for Tracing Contacts. Osong Public Health Res Perspect. 2020 Feb;11(1):60-3.

4. Ryall J. Coronavirus: Surge in South Korea virus cases linked to church ‘super-spreader’. The Telegraph. 2020 Feb 20, 2020.

5. 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 Mar 10, 2020.

6. Park CK. Coronavirus cluster emerges at another South Korean church, as others press ahead with Sunday services. South China Morning Post. 2020 Mar 30, 2020.

7. Coronavirus: South Korea confirms second wave of infections. BBC. 2020 June 20.

8. KCDC. The updates on COVID-19 in Korea as of 25 February. Seoul, Korea: Korea Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2020.

9. Shim E, Tariq A, Choi W, Lee Y, Chowell G. Transmission potential and severity of COVID-19 in South Korea. International journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases. 2020 Apr;93:339-44.

10. Tariq A, Roosa K, Mizumoto K, Chowell G. Assessing reporting delays and the effective reproduction number: The Ebola epidemic in DRC, May 2018-January 2019. Epidemics. 2019 Mar;26:128-33.

11. Wallinga J, Teunis P. Different epidemic curves for severe acute respiratory syndrome reveal similar impacts of control measures. American journal of epidemiology. 2004 Sep 15;160(6):509-16.

12. Cori A, Ferguson NM, Fraser C, Cauchemez S. A new framework and software to estimate time-varying reproduction numbers during epidemics. American journal of epidemiology. 2013 Nov 1;178(9):1505-12.

13. Chong KC, Zee BCY, Wang MH. Approximate Bayesian algorithm to estimate the basic reproduction number in an influenza pandemic using arrival times of imported cases. Travel Med Infect Dis. 2018 May - Jun;23:80-6.

14. Fraser C. Estimating individual and household reproduction numbers in an emerging epidemic. PloS one. 2007 Aug 22;2(8):e758.

15. Ryu S, Ali S, Jang C, Kim B, Cowling BJ. Transmission dynamics of coronavirus disease 2019 outside of Daegu-Gyeongsangbuk provincial region in South Korea. 2020.

16. Zhuang Z, Zhao S, Lin Q, Cao P, Lou Y, Yang L, et al. Preliminary estimates of the reproduction number of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak in Republic of Korea and Italy by 5 March 2020. International journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases. 2020 Jun;95:308-10.

17. 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 Mar;25(10).

18. Yu X, Duan J, Jiang Y, Zhang H. Distinctive trajectories of the COVID-19 epidemic by age and gender: A retrospective modeling of the epidemic in South Korea. International journal of infectious

diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases. 2020 Jul 2;98:200-5.

Address for correspondence: Eunha Shim, Department of Mathematics, Soongsil University, 369 Sasngdo-ro, Dongjak-gu, Seoul, 06978 Republic of Korea; email: alicia@ssu.ac.kr

Figure 1. Map depicting the location of Seoul, Gyeonggi Province, Gyeongbuk Province, and Daegu.

Figure 2. Timeline of confirmed cases of COVID-19 in Seoul, Gyeonggi Province, Gyeongbuk Province, and Daegu. The daily number of COVID-19 cases by date of reported and by date of symptom onset are shown. The empirical distribution of reporting delays from the onset to diagnosis for 732 cases were used to impute the missing dates of onset for the remainder of the cases with missing data.

Figure 3. The epidemic trajectory of coronavirus disease 2019 in Seoul, as of 19 July 2020. Upper panel: The epidemic curve shows the daily number of new cases by date of symptom onset in Seoul. The onset date for cases with missing data were imputed based on the empirical distribution of the reporting delay from the onset to diagnosis. Lower panel: Real-time estimates of the time-varying reproduction number (R_t) in Seoul. The solid line indicates the daily estimated R_t and the grey area indicates the 95% credible interval of R_t. The dotted line indicates the epidemic threshold of R_t =1.

Figure 4. The epidemic trajectory of coronavirus disease 2019 in Gyeonggi Province, as of 19 July 2020. Upper panel: The epidemic curve shows the daily number of new cases by date of symptom onset in Gyeonggi Province. The onset date for cases with missing data were imputed based on the empirical distribution of the reporting delay from the onset to diagnosis. Lower panel: Real-time estimates of the time-varying reproduction number (R_t) in Gyeonggi Province.

The solid line indicates the daily estimated R_t and the grey area indicates the 95% credible interval of R_t. The dotted line indicates the epidemic threshold of R_t =1.

Figure 5. The epidemic trajectory of coronavirus disease 2019 in Gyeongbuk Province, as of 19 July 2020. Upper panel: The epidemic curve shows the daily number of new cases by date of symptom onset in Gyeongbuk Province. The onset date for cases with missing data were imputed based on the empirical distribution of the reporting delay from the onset to diagnosis. Lower panel: Real-time estimates of the time-varying reproduction number (R_t) in Gyeongbuk Province. The solid line indicates the daily estimated R_t and the grey area indicates the 95% credible interval of R_t. The dotted line indicates the epidemic threshold of R_t =1.

Figure 6. The epidemic trajectory of coronavirus disease 2019 in Daegu, as of 19 July 2020. Upper panel: The epidemic curve shows the daily number of new cases by date of symptom onset in Daegu. The onset date for cases with missing data were imputed based on the empirical distribution of the reporting delay from the onset to diagnosis. Lower panel: Real-time estimates of the time-varying reproduction number (R_t) in Daegu. The solid line indicates the daily estimated R_t and the grey area indicates the 95% credible interval of R_t. The dotted line indicates the epidemic threshold of R_t =1.


Seoul
Gyeongi
Province
Gyeongbuk
Province
Daegu


Seoul
Confirmed (n=1151)
date of report
date of onset
60
40
20
0
Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul
Gyeonggi Province
Confirmed (n=1027)
40
30
20
10
0
Mar Apr May Jun Jul
Gyeongbuk Province
Confirmed (n=1377)
150
100
50
0
Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul
Daegu
Confirmed (n=6932)
900
600
300
0
Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul


Seoul
Social distancing
(Feb 29~Mar 21)
Enhanced social distancing
(Mar 22~May 5)
Distancing in daily life
(May 6~)
Number of new cases
Feb 18
31st patient reported (super-spreader)
Mar 7
Nation-wide distribution of public facemasks
Mar 12
Declaration of COVID-19 as a public health emergency of international concern
Apr 1
Quarantining all travelers from overseas countries for 14 days
Apr 19
Softening social distancing measures
May 9
All Seoul bars and clubs ordered to shut
May 11
Anonymous COVID-19 testing offered for recent visitors to nightclubs in Itaewon
May 20
Phased school reopening
May 26
Enforcement of public transport face mask rules
June 10
Mandatory QR code-based registration at entertainment facilities
June 28
Implementation of three-level social distancing
Feb 13
Mar 13
Apr 13
May 13
Jun 13
Jul 13
Alert level 3
(Jan 27~)
Alert level 4
(Feb 23~)
Reproduction number (R_t)
Jan 23
First case in Seoul
Feb 18
31st patient reported (super-spreader)
Mar 8
First case linked to Guro call center cluster
May 6
First case linked to the nightclubs in Seoul
Mar 12
Declaration of COVID-19 as a public health emergency of international concern
Mar 31
First case linked to Manmin Central Church cluster
Apr 9
Softening social distancing measures
May 6
First case linked to the nightclubs cluster
May 24
First case linked to Samsung Seoul Hospital cluster
Jun 2
First case linked to Richway cluster
Jun 11
First case linked to Yangcheon table tennis club cluster
Feb 1
Mar 1
Apr 1
May 1
Jun 1
Jul 1
Mean
95% CrI


Gyeonggi Province
Social distancing
(Feb 29–Mar 21)
Enhanced social distancing
(Mar 22–May 5)
Distancing in daily life
(May 6–)
Number of new cases
Mar 12
Declaration of COVID-19 as a public health emergency of international concern
Apr 1
Quarantining all travelers from overseas countries for 14 days
Mar 7
Nation-wide distribution of public facemasks
Feb 18
31st patient reported (super-spreader)
Apr 19
Softening social distancing measures
May 11
Anonymous COVID-19 testing offered for recent visitors to nightclubs
May 9
All Seoul bars and clubs ordered to shut
May 20
Phased school reopening
May 26
Enforcement of public transport face mask rules
June 10
Mandatory QR code-based registration at entertainment facilities
June 28
Implementation of three-level social distancing
Feb 18
Mar 18
Apr 18
May 18
Jun 18
Jul 18
Reproduction number (R_t)
Feb 18
31st patient reported (super-spreader)
Mar 8
First case linked to Guro call center
Mar 9
First case linked to Grace River Church cluster
Mar 12
Declaration of COVID-19 as a public health emergency of international concern
Apr 2
First case linked to Uijeongbu St. Mary's Hospital cluster
Apr 19
Softening social distancing measures
May 6
First case linked to the nightclubs in Seoul
May 25
First case linked to Coupang warehouse
June 2
First case linked to the Richway cluster
Feb 1
Mar 1
Apr 1
May 1
Jun 1
Jul 1
Mean
95% CrI

Gyeongbuk Province






Daegu
Social distancing
(Feb 29–Mar 21)
Enhanced social distancing
(Mar 22–May 5)
Distancing in daily life
(May 6–)
Number of new cases
400
200
0
Feb 24
Enumeration survey on Shincheonji members
Mar 7
Nation-wide distribution of public facemasks
Mar 12
Declaration of COVID-19 as a public health emergency of international concern
Mar 15
Declaration of Daegu and Gyeongbook Province as special disaster zones
May 26
Enforcement of public transport face mask rules
June 10
Mandatory QR code-based registration at entertainment facilities
May 13
Phased school reopening
Feb 18
31st patient reported (super-spreader)
June 28
Implementation of three-level social distancing
Apr 19
Softening social distancing measures
Feb 1
Mar 1
Apr 1
May 1
Jun 1
Jul 1


Reproduction number (R_t)
6
4
2
0
Mar 15
Declaration of Daegu and Gyeongbook Province as special disaster zones
Mar 16
First case linked to Hansarang Convalescent Hospital cluster
Mar 18
First case linked to Daesil Hospital cluster
Jul 4
First case linked to Acting Academy
Feb 24
Enumeration survey on Shincheonji members
Mar 26
First case linked to Mi-Ju Hospital cluster
Apr 19
Softening social distancing measures
Feb 18
31st patient reported (super-spreader)
Feb 1
Mar 1
Apr 1
May 1
Jun 1
Jul 1
Mean
95% CrI