



16 examined how various transmission characteristics were affected by disease symptoms, demo-  
17 graphics (age, gender, and race), and time period (during shelter-in-place and after reopening).  
18 In addition, we estimated the time course of reproduction numbers during early February–mid-  
19 June for all 159 counties in the state of Georgia, using a total of 118,491 reported COVID-19  
20 cases.

### 21 ***Findings***

22 Over this period, the serial interval appeared to decrease from 5.97 days in February–April to  
23 4.40 days in June–July. With regard to age, transmission was assortative and patterns of trans-  
24 mission changed over time. COVID-19 mainly spread from adults to all age groups; transmis-  
25 sion among and between children and the elderly was found less frequently. Younger adults (20–  
26 50 years old) were involved in the majority of transmissions occurring during or after reopening  
27 subsequent to the shelter-in-place period. By mid-July, two waves of COVID-19 transmission  
28 were apparent, separated by the shelter-in-place period in the state of Georgia. Counties around  
29 major cities and along interstate highways had more intense transmission.

### 30 ***Interpretation***

31 The transmission of COVID-19 in the state of Georgia had been heterogeneous by area and  
32 changed over time. The shelter-in-place was not long enough to sufficiently suppress COVID-19  
33 transmission in densely populated urban areas connected by major transportation links. Studying  
34 local transmission patterns may help in predicting and guiding states in prevention and control  
35 of COVID-19 according to population and region.

### 36 ***Funding***

37 Emory COVID-19 Response Collaborative.

38 ***Keywords:*** novel coronavirus disease; COVID-19; transmission; serial interval; reproduction number;  
39 shelter-in-place; Georgia

## 40 **Research in context**

### 41 ***Evidence before this study***

42 The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has caused 37,109,581 cases and 1,070,355 deaths worldwide as of  
43 October 11, 2020. We searched PubMed for articles published on and before October 11, 2020 using

44 keywords “novel coronavirus”, “SARS–nCoV–2”, “COVID-19”, “transmission”, “serial interval”, “re-  
45 production number”, and “shelter-in-place”. Few published studies have estimated the serial interval  
46 but no study was found that examined the time-varying serial interval. Few studies have examined the  
47 transmission patterns between groups with different characteristics. And no study has examined the time-  
48 varying reproduction number for COVID-19 and impact of shelter-in-place order at the county level in  
49 the United States.

#### 50 ***Added value of this study***

51 To our knowledge, this is the first study showing the multiple aspects of COVID-19 transmission, includ-  
52 ing serial interval, transmission patterns between age, gender, or race groups, and spatiotemporal patterns,  
53 based on data from 118,491 confirmed COVID-19 cases and 4080 tracked pairs of infector and infectee.  
54 We found that during February–July the serial interval for symptom onset shortened, and the major con-  
55 tribution to the spread of COVID-19 shifted to younger ages (from 40–70 years old in February–April to  
56 20–50 years old in June–July). We also found three to four weeks of the shelter-in-place slowed trans-  
57 mission but was insufficient to prevent transmission into urban and peri-urban counties connected with  
58 major transportation.

#### 59 ***Implications of all the available evidence***

60 The contracting serial intervals and increasing spread by younger generation show the COVID-19 trans-  
61 mission at county level changes over time. The spatiotemporal patterns of transmission in county level  
62 further provide important evidence to guide effective COVID-19 prevention and control measures (e.g.,  
63 shelter-in-place) in different areas.

## 64 Introduction

65 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is an infectious disease caused by the severe acute respiratory  
66 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). After the disease was first reported in Wuhan, China in De-  
67 cember 2019, COVID-19 spread rapidly across the world to its currently ongoing global pandemic. As  
68 of October 22, 2020, the United States had the most COVID-19 confirmed cases (8,338,467) and deaths  
69 (222,220) globally [1], and the state of Georgia had reported 343,750 confirmed cases and 7704 deaths  
70 [2].

71 Transmission of COVID-19 has been shown to vary by region (states and counties), setting (long-term  
72 care facilities, prisons, churches, and factories), population demographics (age, sex, and race), and even  
73 among individuals (by physiologic and behavioral differences). During the early phases of transmission  
74 in the United States, new cases were mainly imported by travelers and transmission was associated with  
75 human mobility [3]. Local transmission was more intense in regions with high population density and  
76 in populations with frequent social contacts [4, 5, 6]. When SARS-CoV-2 was introduced into high-risk  
77 settings such as long-term care facilities, transmission rates were observed to be high and the outcomes  
78 were often fatal [7].

79 To study transmission of COVID-19, two important characteristics, the time scale and magnitude of  
80 spreading can be defined. The time scale for spreading of infectious disease can be expressed by the  
81 serial interval for onset of symptoms defined as the time interval between a case-patient experiencing  
82 symptoms and a descendant case-patient, infected by the first case-patient, becoming symptomatic. The  
83 magnitude of spreading can be expressed as the reproduction number  $R_t$ : the expected number of cases  
84 directly caused by any single infectious person.  $R_t$  has been shown to vary strongly with some case-  
85 patients leading to super-spreading events [8, 9]. Such heterogeneity influences the spread as well as the  
86 control of COVID-19, as documented by studies of non-pharmaceutical interventions in China [10, 11]  
87 and Europe [12] at country and province level.

88 After the first case of COVID-19 was reported in the state of Georgia on March 2, 2020, a series of  
89 transmission events and interventions occurred (Table S1). On March 14, a cumulative total of 1712  
90 cases had been confirmed in Georgia and the governor declared a public health emergency. On March  
91 24, large gatherings were banned, and on April 3 a shelter-in-place order was announced. Approximately  
92 three weeks later beginning on April 24, Georgia became the first U.S. state that allowed some businesses  
93 to reopen, and on April 30 the shelter-in-place order was lifted. On June 1, limits on the size of pub-  
94 lic gatherings were relaxed, bars and nightclubs could reopen, sport events could resume, and summer  
95 schools and camps were allowed to begin sessions [13]. During June–July 2020, as new COVID-19 cases  
96 continued to surge in Georgia and other states, it was critical to understand how shelter-in-place and the  
97 subsequent reopening events impacted the transmission of COVID-19 in different regions.

98 In this study, we examined the characteristics of COVID-19 transmission in the state of Georgia by  
99 estimating serial intervals and  $R_t$  using epidemiological data based on confirmed cases. Using these data,  
100 we sought to characterize the spread of COVID-19 among various subpopulations. Identifying a large  
101 number of linked cases, including the infector and infectee, enabled us to estimate the distribution of  
102 the serial interval for COVID-19 symptoms. Using the serial interval distribution, we can estimate the

103 time-varying effective reproduction number ( $R_t$ ) using the methods developed by Wallinga and Teunis  
104 [14,15]. With  $R_t$ s over time, we can study the spatial distribution of transmission across all 159 Georgia  
105 counties, as well as the effects of shelter-in-place and subsequent gradual reopening.

## 106 **Methods**

### 107 *Data Source*

108 The Georgia Department of Public Health (GDPH) provided data from 118,491 confirmed COVID-19  
109 cases in all 159 counties during February 1–July 13, 2020. Available data included demographic char-  
110 acteristics (age, sex, and race), clinical characteristics (dates of symptom onset, recorded symptoms,  
111 hospitalization, and ventilator usage), and social contacts (contact with confirmed cases and participant  
112 in a confirmed cluster) (Table 1). With regard to events possibly driving transmission, time periods were  
113 categorized as early transmission and shelter-in-place (February to April), after reopening (May), and  
114 further reopening (June to July). In this study, a COVID-19 case is defined as laboratory confirmation  
115 of SARS-CoV-2 infection by reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) in a person irre-  
116 spective of clinical signs and symptoms.

### 117 *Tracked Pairs: Serial Intervals and Characteristics of Transmission*

118 Based on reported contacts with confirmed cases, pairs of primary case-patients (infectors) and their  
119 secondary case-patients (infectees) were identified, assuming the symptom onset of any infector occurred  
120 before the symptom onset of his/her infectees. The serial interval for symptom onset was defined as the  
121 number of days between symptom onset for a primary case and an associated secondary case. Thus,  
122 serial intervals were assumed to be always positive. Transmission pairs with serial intervals longer than  
123 15 days were dropped as such long intervals are unlikely, as shown in previous studies [16, 17]. We  
124 modeled the serial interval as a gamma distribution and maximum likelihood estimators of shape and  
125 scale parameters were obtained. Furthermore, we explored whether the duration of the serial interval  
126 varied by demographic characteristics, various disease symptoms, and time periods. For example, do  
127 infectious cases with specific symptoms (e.g., coughing) lead to a shorter serial interval when infecting a  
128 descendant case compared to cases without those specific symptoms? The large numbers of linked cases  
129 enabled us to examine the variation in transmission within and between different groups by age, sex, and  
130 race.

### 131 *Confirmed Cases: Reproduction Numbers*

132 We estimated probabilities of transmission between any pair of case-patients in an outbreak, as proposed  
133 by Teunis et al [15]. For an outbreak with  $n$  observed case-patients, a transmission probability matrix  
134  $\mathbf{V}$  can be defined with any element  $v_{i,j}$  representing the probability that case-patient  $i$  was infected by  
135 case-patient  $j$ . When two cases are linked by their serial interval, the likelihood of transmission between

136 these two case-patients can be calculated using the serial interval distribution as a kernel density [15].  
137 Additional information at an individual level (e.g., evidence of social contact between case-patients  $i$  and  
138  $j$ ) is accounted for by a  $n \times n$  weighting matrix [15]. The transmission probability matrix  $V$  can be  
139 estimated in a Markov chain Monte Carlo procedure [15, 4].

140 When the transmission probability matrix is known, it can be used to calculate reproduction numbers.  
141 Elements of row  $i$  show the probabilities of case-patient  $i$  having received their infection from any other  
142 case-patient in the observed population. Rows of  $V$  must therefore add to 1. Likewise, elements of  
143 column  $j$  show the probabilities that case-patient  $j$  has transmitted their infection to any other case-  
144 patient in the observed population. Columns of  $V$  therefore add to an estimate of the number of cases  
145 infected by case-patient  $j$ : its reproduction number.

146 Using GDPH data on cases confirmed with COVID-19 during February 1– July 13, 2020, we estimated  
147 effective reproduction numbers ( $R_t$ ) by date, using dates of symptoms onset and social contact informa-  
148 tion (wherever available) in each county independently by estimating the transmission probability matrix.  
149 Among 118,491 confirmed cases, 48,887 (41.3%) had a missing date of symptom onset. These missing  
150 symptom onset dates were imputed based on dates of first specimen collection when available, or dates  
151 of laboratory report otherwise. The number of days between symptom onset and date of first specimen  
152 collected (or date of laboratory report) was modeled using negative binomial regression with the date of  
153 first specimen collected (or date of laboratory report) as the predictor.

154 Estimation of  $R_t$  approaching present date (i.e., nowcasting) was not feasible because not all contribut-  
155 ing cases had become symptomatic and been reported. To avoid this right censoring issue, the most  
156 recent four weeks (June 16–July 13) were removed from the analysis. It is likely to have multiple  
157 waves of COVID-19 transmission in the state of Georgia with considerable variation among Georgia  
158 counties. The time-varying average  $R_t$  estimations were smoothed using LOESS regression and local  
159 maximum/minimum were identified for each individual county.

160 We defined five transmission pattern categories based on reviewing the epidemic curves and  $R_t$  curves.  
161 Transmission patterns for individual counties were categorized as: consistent spreading, two strong  
162 waves, strong first wave, strong second wave, and small case number. Maps were generated to spatially  
163 examine the spreading of COVID-19 first wave and transmission patterns. The impact of shelter-in-place,  
164 reopening, and further reopening were evaluated by the trend of reproduction numbers before and after  
165 those events in different regions in the state of Georgia.

166 The GDPH Institutional Review Board has determined that this analysis is exempt from the requirement  
167 for IRB review and approval and informed consent was not required. This activity was reviewed by the  
168 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and was conducted consistent with applicable federal  
169 law and CDC policy<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>See e.g., 45 C.F.R part 46, 21 C.F.R part 56; 42 U.S.C. §241(d); 5 U.S.C. §552a; 44 U.S.C. §3501 et seq.

170 ***Role of the funding source***

171 The funder of this study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or  
172 writing the report. All authors had full access to all the data in the study, and the corresponding author  
173 had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

174 **Results**

175 ***Tracked Pairs: Serial Interval***

176 Based on 4080 tracked pairs of primary case-patients (infectors) and their secondary case-patients (in-  
177 fectees) in the state of Georgia (Table [S2](#)), the serial interval distribution in Georgia was estimated as a  
178 gamma distribution with shape parameter 2.00 and scale parameter 2.49. Table [S3](#) shows the variation  
179 in serial interval distribution by subgroup, for clinical and demographic categories. Generally, the serial  
180 interval was longer when primary case-patients had severe clinical outcomes, such as hospitalization, un-  
181 dergoing ventilation, having an abnormal chest X-ray result, or death. Specific symptoms in the primary  
182 cases including fever, cough, shortness of breath, or diarrhea did not shorten serial intervals. Serial inter-  
183 vals were not differentiated across demographic categories including age, sex, race, or location. Figure  
184 [1](#) shows estimated serial interval distributions for the three different time periods (February–April, May,  
185 and June–July). The average serial interval became shorter over time: from 5.97 days in February–April,  
186 to 5.03 days in May, and then to 4.40 days in June–July.

187 ***Tracked Pairs: Characteristics of Transmission***

188 To study the variation in transmission by age, the frequencies of tracked links can be shown in an age  
189 matrix. Figure [2\(a\)](#)–[2\(b\)](#) show the disease transmission within and between age, sex, and race groups.  
190 Males were twice as likely to infect a female as to infect a male, while females were equally as likely to  
191 infect a male or a female. Transmission between races was strongly assortative. Compared with people  
192 of other races, white people were 4.4 times as likely to infect white people and black people were 5.6  
193 times as likely to infect black people.

194 Based on these data, COVID-19 seemed to mainly spread from adults aged 20–60 years during February–  
195 July; transmission among and between children (<20 years old) and the elderly (>60 years old) was ob-  
196 served less often, suggesting that transmission occurred more frequently between people of similar ages.  
197 Figure [3\(a\)](#)–[3\(d\)](#) further shows the transmission by age given sex of primary case-patient and secondary  
198 case-patient. Transmission between sexes happened mainly within the same age group. Cases in persons  
199 aged 10–30 years were associated with the majority of transmission pairs of the same sex. Over the study  
200 period, the majority of transmission pairs shifted from ages 40–70 years (median age for primary case-  
201 patients was 52 years, and for secondary case-patients was 50 years) in February–April to 20–50 years  
202 old (median age for primary case-patients was 36 years, and for secondary case-patients was 34 years) in  
203 June–July (Figure [4](#)).

## 204 *Temporal and Spatial Patterns of Transmission*

205 During February and March, reproduction numbers started higher than 1 and then decreased until late  
206 April and early May, which can be considered as the “first wave” in Georgia.  $R_t$  usually decreased to  
207 a (mathematical) local minimum during the shelter-in-place period but started to increase again as the  
208 “second wave” took off. As was observed during the first wave, the  $R_t$ s peaked and then started to  
209 decrease (Figure 5). Although the number of reported cases was lower in first wave, the  $R_t$  (around 3)  
210 was much higher compared with the second wave.

211 Although the general pattern of COVID-19 transmission was similar across all counties, the dates of  
212 local maxima/minima (i.e., first peak, local minimum, and second peak) and the magnitude of  $R_t$  at  
213 these extremes varied among counties. Figure 6(a) shows the peak dates for the first wave in counties  
214 with cumulative case numbers higher than 200 cases by July 13, 2020. At that time, counties with high  
215 numbers of COVID-19 cases were located around cities and along highways. Starting in early February,  
216 COVID-19 spread radially and along the interstate highway from Atlanta and Albany, the two initial  
217 outbreak sources. Other cities, including Augusta and Savannah had outbreaks later. Figure 7 shows that  
218 74.7% (65/87) of counties with more than 200 cumulative cases by July 13th reached a local minimum in  
219  $R_t$  during the shelter-in-place period (April 3–April 30). After reopening, many counties experienced a  
220 strong second wave with increased numbers of COVID-19 cases reported.

221 Based on the magnitude of  $R_t$  at first peak, local minimum, and second peak, we categorized case data  
222 into the following patterns (Figure 5):

- 223 • **Consistent spreading:** sustained transmission of COVID-19 ( $R_t > 1$ ) during the shelter-in-place  
224 period. Consequently, numbers of cases were high and increased rapidly upon reopening.
- 225 • **Two strong waves:** a first wave of early transmission followed by a slowdown ( $R_t < 1$ ) during  
226 the shelter-in-place period. After reopening, a new surge in cases ( $1 \leq R_t < 2$ ) appeared.
- 227 • **Strong first wave:** a considerable number of cases during the initial period of the outbreak. During  
228 the shelter-in-place period spreading was controlled and after reopening no new surge in cases  
229 occurred ( $R_t < 1$ ).
- 230 • **Strong second wave:** there were few cases during the early transmission period, but a surge in  
231 new cases ( $R_t \geq 2$ ) after reopening;
- 232 • **Small case number** ( $n < 200$ ): COVID-19 transmission was rare.

233 Figure 6(b) shows the spatial distribution of these five patterns of COVID-19 transmission on a map  
234 of the state of Georgia. Consistent spreading occurred in counties around some major cities, such as  
235 Atlanta, Athens, Columbus, Savannah, and counties along interstate highways. In counties bordering  
236 those counties with consistent spreading, there were two strong waves or only a strong second wave.  
237 Counties around the city of Albany (Lee, Sumter, Terrell, Mitchell, Crisp, and Dooly) had an early intense  
238 first wave but did not have a strong second wave. Counties not connected by the interstate highways had  
239 fewer COVID-19 cases.



## 240 Discussion

### 241 *Serial Interval Contraction*

242 During February–July 2020, the estimated serial intervals for symptom onset of COVID-19 in the state  
243 of Georgia appeared to become shorter (Figure 1). Such a phenomenon was also observed in mainland  
244 China during January–February 2020 [18]. Shorter serial intervals imply more rapid transmission, leading  
245 to a higher number of new cases. Cases with severe symptoms and in older people tended to have longer  
246 observed serial intervals. During February–July, the state of Georgia had increasing disease prevalence  
247 and by August 25, 2020 it had the fifth highest number of confirmed COVID-19 cases in the U.S. In 2008,  
248 Kenah et al. showed that as the local prevalence increases, the mean generation interval, which is time  
249 between the infection of infector and infectee, becomes shorter. As there are increasingly more infectious  
250 cases present in the local population, they are competing to infect susceptibles and the expected time until  
251 a new infection is shortened [19]. Additional causes of contracting serial intervals could be that people  
252 had more contacts after reopening, in particular younger people (20–50 years old) might play a more  
253 important role in COVID-19 transmission; or that, with improved testing capacity, symptomatic cases  
254 were tested more promptly and thus isolated more quickly, which led to fewer exposures during their  
255 infectious periods.

256 The serial interval estimation also could be affected by changing testing practices over the duration of  
257 the pandemic. Georgia had limited COVID-19 testing capacity and contact tracing ability during earlier  
258 stages of the pandemic, and thus identification of COVID-19 cases during this period skewed towards  
259 populations with known COVID-19 contacts or COVID-19 associated symptoms. Because contact tracing  
260 is voluntary, there are likely segments of the population that are not represented in the tracing data due  
261 to unwillingness or inability of some contact persons to respond to contact tracers. Therefore, during  
262 February–April, older cases with more severe symptoms may have been over-represented in the notified  
263 case data. More recent data collected when availability of testing has improved are less likely to have this  
264 bias. As Figure 1 shows, contraction of serial intervals continued into May–early July, so that the changes  
265 may still be explained at least partly by increased prevalence and increased contact rates.

### 266 *Transmission Patterns by Age, Gender, and Race*

267 Transmission of a respiratory infection such as COVID-19 is dependent on behavioral factors, and in  
268 particular on social contacts. Studies of contact behavior have shown that people tend to have social  
269 contacts with peers of the same age and demographic backgrounds [20]. The traced transmission links  
270 in this study show that such assortative mixing also applies to COVID-19 transmission (Figure 2). The  
271 tracked case pairs in this study were more likely to be observed when case-patients knew each other (e.g.,  
272 family members, friends, or colleagues), while transmissions in public spaces (e.g., stores or restaurants)  
273 usually could not be traced. Transmission occurs frequently among subjects of the same age group, and  
274 less likely among different age groups. Figure 3 shows that some off-diagonal (between different age  
275 groups) transmission occurred in Georgia, although this may have been across generations, for example,

276 between parents and children, or grandparents and grandchildren [21].  
277 As to differences in transmission by sex, a primary case-patient who was male was more likely to pass  
278 their infection to a female contact than to a male contact. Figure 3(b) also shows that female case-patients  
279 were infected by male case-patients across a wide range of ages, while Figure 3(a) shows that male case-  
280 patients were mainly infected by young male case-patients. A possible explanation may be that females  
281 tend to be caregivers, taking care of sick people in the household, while young males may be more likely  
282 to acquire infection from outside the household.  
283 Like the serial interval, transmission patterns also changed as the pandemic continued. The major con-  
284 tribution to spreading COVID-19 shifted over time to younger generation. This could be caused by the  
285 elderly becoming more careful to protect themselves from infection by taking measures such as staying at  
286 home, wearing face masks in public spaces, and observing good hand hygiene. At the same time, younger  
287 people might have been less compliant with quarantine measures and more likely to attend indoor gath-  
288 erings such as parties, or to have visited bars, gyms, and clubs while not wearing facemasks.

### 289 ***Waves of COVID-19 and Impact of Shelter-in-place and Reopening***

290 Previous pandemics, such as the 1918 Spanish Flu and the 2009 H1N1 Swine Flu caused multiple waves  
291 of infections [22]. In the state of Georgia, we have observed two waves of COVID-19 transmission  
292 separated by the shelter-in-place period. The COVID-19 cases of the first wave were first observed in  
293 Atlanta, the state capital with one of the busiest airports in US, and Albany, the eighth largest city in  
294 Georgia. The outbreak in Albany was sparked by two super-spreading funeral events. However, the  
295 connectivity of these two cities is different: Atlanta as a transportation hub connects multiple interstate  
296 highways while Albany has no interstate highways. During the first wave, COVID-19 spread radially  
297 from both cities to the surrounding areas. For Atlanta, cases also started to appear along the interstate  
298 highway (Figure 6(a)). Concentrations of increased transmission along highways, as links connecting  
299 population centers, suggests that commuter links might have been effective transmission links.  
300 During the shelter-in-place period (April 3–April 30), COVID-19 transmission slowed and the reproduc-  
301 tion numbers reached a local minimum in most counties. However, before reopening, the reproduction  
302 numbers were still above 1 in many counties even at the local minimum, indicating continued disease  
303 spreading (Figure 6(b)). After reopening, transmission increased again across the state of Georgia. These  
304 data suggest that the three or four weeks of shelter-in-place orders were not long enough to sufficiently  
305 suppress COVID-19 transmission (local and out-of-state imported) in densely populated urban areas con-  
306 nected by major transportation links (i.e., airports and interstate highways).  
307 Thus far, the second wave has been heterogenous in time and magnitude in different counties. Local  
308 prevalence was different at the time of reopening, and counties with high prevalence (i.e., counties bor-  
309 dering cities and along interstate highways) experienced a stronger second wave. Counties (e.g., those  
310 counties around Albany) not connected by major transportation links often saw a second wave of COVID-  
311 19 cases as well, but on a relatively small scale. Finally, some counties (e.g., Lee, Sumter, Terrell, and  
312 Mitchell), that saw an early and intense first wave, did not experience an obvious second wave. Possibly,  
313 inhabitants of these counties were more compliant with the disease prevention and control measures.

314 ***Limitations***

315 Despite having information for more than one hundred thousand cases, a majority of the records had  
316 missing reported contacts with a confirmed case. The tracked pairs were missed not at random, since  
317 contact tracing is voluntary and its capacity was limited at the early stage of the pandemic. Also, tracked  
318 pairs were more likely to be recorded when they involved known contacts; and identifying transmission  
319 links in public spaces or in a cluster of cases is challenging. In addition, testing capacity of COVID-19  
320 showed a spatiotemporal variation with only cases with severe symptoms detected during February–April.

321 ***Key Findings***

322 In this study, we found the COVID-19 transmission changed over time during February–July 2020. The  
323 serial interval decreased from 5.97 days in February–April to 4.40 days in June–July. The younger popu-  
324 lation (20–50 years old) was involved in the majority of transmissions occurring during or after reopening  
325 subsequent to the shelter-in-place period. By mid-July, two waves of COVID-19 transmission were ap-  
326 parent, separated by the shelter-in-place period in the state of Georgia. Counties around major cities and  
327 along interstate highways had more intense transmission. These findings of transmission patterns can  
328 help in predicting and guiding states in prevention and control of COVID-19 according to population and  
329 region.

330 ***Contributors***

331 YW and PT conceived the study. YW and PT developed the methods. YW, CS, YC, and CA conducted  
332 literature review. YW, CS, and YC produced the estimates. YW, CS, and YC created figures and tables.  
333 YW and PT wrote the first draft of the manuscript and led the writing of subsequent drafts. BL, LE, MT,  
334 CS, CA, and ML provided critical feedback on the first draft and contributed to the writing of subsequent  
335 drafts of the manuscript. ML and BL acquired the funding for the research.

336 ***Declaration of Interests***

337 The authors declare no competing interests.

338 ***Disclaimer***

339 The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the  
340 official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

341 ***Data Sharing***

342 The raw data used in this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

343 *Acknowledgements*

344 This study was funded by the Emory Covid-19 Response Collaborative. We are grateful to Dr. Hannah  
345 Cooper and Laura Donnelly from Emory University for their efforts in leading and coordinating the  
346 research partnership between GDPH and Emory University. And we thank Michael Bryan from the  
347 Georgia Department of Public Health for providing the data.

## 348 References

- 349 1. Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track covid-19 in real time. *The*  
350 *Lancet infectious diseases* 2020;**20**(5):533–534.
- 351 2. Georgia Department of Public Health. Georgia department of public health daily status report,  
352 2020. URL <https://dph.georgia.gov/covid-19-daily-status-report> [Online;  
353 accessed 22-October-2020].
- 354 3. Kraemer MU, Yang CH, Gutierrez B, et al. The effect of human mobility and control measures on  
355 the covid-19 epidemic in china. *Science* 2020;**368**(6490):493–497.
- 356 4. Wang Y, Teunis P. Strongly heterogeneous transmission of covid-19 in mainland china: Local and  
357 regional variation. *Frontiers in Medicine* 2020;**7**. doi:10.3389/fmed.2020.00329. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2020.00329>  
358 <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2020.00329>
- 359 5. Rocklöv J, Sjödin H. High population densities catalyze the spread of covid-19. *Journal of Travel*  
360 *Medicine* 2020;**27**(3). doi:10.1093/jtm/taaa038. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jtm/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taaa038)  
361 [taaa038](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taaa038)
- 362 6. Prem K, Liu Y, Russell TW, et al. The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes  
363 of the covid-19 epidemic in wuhan, china: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health* 2020;  
364 **5**(5):e261–e270. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30073-6. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30073-6)  
365 [S2468-2667\(20\)30073-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30073-6)
- 366 7. McMichael TM, Currie DW, Clark S, et al. Epidemiology of covid-19 in a long-term care facility in  
367 king county, washington. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020;**382**(21):2005–2011. doi:10.1056/  
368 nejmoa2005412. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2005412>
- 369 8. Liu Y, Eggo RM, Kucharski AJ. Secondary attack rate and superspreading events for sars-cov-2. *The*  
370 *Lancet* 2020;**395**(10227):e47.
- 371 9. Lloyd-Smith JO, Schreiber SJ, Kopp PE, Getz WM. Superspreading and the effect of individual  
372 variation on disease emergence. *Nature* 2005;**438**(7066):355–359. doi:10.1038/nature04153. URL  
373 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature04153>
- 374 10. Lai S, Ruktanonchai NW, Zhou L, et al. Effect of non-pharmaceutical interventions to contain covid-  
375 19 in china. *Nature* 2020;**585**(7825):410–413. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2293-x. URL [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2293-x)  
376 [10.1038/s41586-020-2293-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2293-x)
- 377 11. Cowling BJ, Ali ST, Ng TW, et al. Impact assessment of non-pharmaceutical interventions against  
378 coronavirus disease 2019 and influenza in hong kong: an observational study. *The Lancet Public*  
379 *Health* 2020;**5**(5):e279–e288. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30090-6. URL [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30090-6)  
380 [10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30090-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30090-6)

- 381 12. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, et al. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on  
382 covid-19 in europe. *Nature* 2020;pages 1–5.
- 383 13. Wikipedia contributors. COVID-19 pandemic in Georgia (u.s. state), 2020. URL [https://en.  
384 wikipedia.org/wiki/COVID-19\\_pandemic\\_in\\_Georgia\\_\(U.S.\\_state\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/COVID-19_pandemic_in_Georgia_(U.S._state)) [Online;  
385 accessed 25-August-2020].
- 386 14. Wallinga J, Teunis P. Different epidemic curves for severe acute respiratory syndrome reveal similar  
387 impacts of control measures. *American Journal of epidemiology* 2004;**160**(6):509–516.
- 388 15. Teunis P, Heijne JC, Sukhrie F, van Eijkeren J, Koopmans M, Kretzschmar M. Infectious disease  
389 transmission as a forensic problem: who infected whom? *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*  
390 2013;**10**(81):20120955.
- 391 16. Nishiura H, Linton NM, Akhmetzhanov AR. Serial interval of novel coronavirus (covid-19) infec-  
392 tions. *International journal of infectious diseases* 2020;**93**:284–286.
- 393 17. Du Z, Xu X, Wu Y, Wang L, Cowling BJ, Meyers LA. Serial interval of covid-19 among publicly  
394 reported confirmed cases. *Emerging infectious diseases* 2020;**26**(6):1341.
- 395 18. Ali ST, Wang L, Lau EH, et al. Serial interval of sars-cov-2 was shortened over time by nonpharma-  
396 ceutical interventions. *Science* 2020;**369**(6507):1106–1109.
- 397 19. Kenah E, Lipsitch M, Robins JM. Generation interval contraction and epidemic data analysis. *Math-  
398 ematical Biosciences* 2008;**213**(1):71–79.
- 399 20. Newman ME. Mixing patterns in networks. *Physical review E* 2003;**67**(2):026126.
- 400 21. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, et al. Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of  
401 infectious diseases. *PLoS Med* 2008;**5**(3):e74.
- 402 22. Mummert A, Weiss H, Long LP, Amigó JM, Wan XF. A perspective on multiple waves of influenza  
403 pandemics. *PloS one* 2013;**8**(4):e60343.

404 **Tables**

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of demographic and clinical information for people with confirmed COVID-19 cases in the state of Georgia in three time periods (February–April, May, and June–July 2020).

		<b>February–April</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>June–July</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total	N	31,575	19,270	67,646	118,491
Age	median (Q1-Q3)	51 (37-65)	43 (28-59)	34 (23-50)	40 (26-56)
Sex	Male	13,770 (43.6%)	9,142 (47.4%)	30,247 (44.7%)	53,159 (44.9%)
	Female	17,308 (54.8%)	9,747 (50.6%)	33,828 (50%)	60,883 (51.4%)
	Missing	497 (1.6%)	381 (2.0%)	3,571 (5.3%)	4,449 (3.7%)
Race	Black	13,010 (41.2%)	4,639 (24.1%)	13,878 (20.5%)	31,527 (26.6%)
	White	11,418 (36.2%)	7,168 (37.2%)	17,500 (25.9%)	36,086 (30.5%)
	Other	2,818 (8.9%)	2,029 (10.5%)	6,158 (9.1%)	11,005 (9.3%)
	Missing	4,329 (13.7%)	5,434 (28.2%)	30,110 (44.5%)	39,873 (33.6%)
Hospitalized	Yes	6,714 (21.3%)	2,099 (10.9%)	4,523 (6.7%)	13,336 (11.3%)
	No	15,627 (49.5%)	10,729 (55.7%)	27,926 (41.3%)	54,282 (45.8%)
	Missing	9,234 (29.2%)	6,442 (33.4%)	35,197 (52%)	50,873 (42.9%)
Ventilator use	Yes	1,046 (3.3%)	184 (1.0%)	258 (0.4%)	1,488 (1.3%)
	No	12,188 (38.6%)	8,404 (43.6%)	19,313 (28.6%)	39,905 (33.7%)
	Missing	18,341 (58.1%)	10,682 (55.4%)	48,075 (71.1%)	77,098 (65.0%)
Abnormal Chest X-ray	Yes	2,602 (8.2%)	494 (2.6%)	742 (1.1%)	3,838 (3.2%)
	No	10,151 (32.1%)	8,081 (41.9%)	18,246 (27.0%)	36,478 (30.8%)
	Missing	18,822 (59.6%)	10,695 (55.5%)	48,658 (71.9%)	78,175 (66.0%)
Death	Yes	2,127 (6.7%)	558 (2.9%)	320 (0.5%)	3,005 (2.5%)
	No	15,766 (49.9%)	10,183 (52.8%)	26,304 (38.9%)	52,253 (44.1%)
	Missing	13,682 (43.3%)	8,529 (44.3%)	41,022 (60.6%)	63,233 (53.4%)
Fever	Yes	10,094 (32.0%)	4,005 (20.8%)	11,787 (17.4%)	25,886 (21.8%)
	No	8,489 (26.9%)	7,951 (41.3%)	19,655 (29.1%)	36,095 (30.5%)
	Missing	12,992 (41.1%)	7,314 (38%)	36,204 (53.5%)	56,510 (47.7%)
Cough	Yes	12,417 (39.3%)	4,992 (25.9%)	15,319 (22.6%)	32,728 (27.6%)
	No	6,462 (20.5%)	7,059 (36.6%)	16,434 (24.3%)	29,955 (25.3%)
	Missing	12,696 (40.2%)	7,219 (37.5%)	35,893 (53.1%)	55,808 (47.1%)
Short of Breath	Yes	8,504 (26.9%)	2,952 (15.3%)	7,325 (10.8%)	18,781 (15.9%)
	No	9,807 (31.1%)	8,960 (46.5%)	23,542 (34.8%)	42,309 (35.7%)
	Missing	13,264 (42%)	7,358 (38.2%)	36,779 (54.4%)	57,401 (48.4%)
Diarrhea	Yes	4,410 (14%)	1,971 (10.2%)	6,072 (9.0%)	12,453 (10.5%)
	No	12,718 (40.3%)	9,589 (49.8%)	23,936 (35.4%)	46,243 (39.0%)
	Missing	14,447 (45.8%)	7,710 (40.0%)	37,638 (55.6%)	59,795 (50.5%)

405 **Figures**




Figure 1: The estimated serial interval distribution for three time periods: Early transmission and shelter-in-place (Feb-Apr); after reopening (May); further reopening (Jun-Jul).  $k$  and  $\theta$  are the scale and shape parameters for the gamma distribution. The y-axis represents the probability density of having certain serial interval. The unit of probability density is one per unit of time.






Figure 2: Patterns of COVID-19 disease transmission by age, sex, and race based on 4080 tracked pairs of COVID-19 cases from Georgia, U.S. over the time period of February–July 2020. The matrix graphs show numbers of transmission pairs as a percentage of the total, with primary case-patients (infectors) as columns and their secondary case-patients (infectees) as rows. Darker colors indicate a higher percentages of fraction of tracked pairs observed. Marginal totals are shown as density curves to illustrate the age distribution of case-patients in (a).




Figure 3: Patterns of COVID-19 disease transmission according to sex and age based on 4080 tracked pairs of COVID-19 cases over the time period of February–July 2020. The matrix graphs show numbers of transmission pairs as a percentage of the total, with primary case-patients (infectors) as columns and their secondary case-patients (infectees) as rows. Darker colors indicate a higher percentages of fraction of tracked pairs observed. Marginal totals are shown as density curves to illustrate the age distribution of case-patients.




Figure 4: Patterns of COVID-19 disease transmission by age group in three successive time periods. Matrix graphs as in Figure 2. The time periods were divided as early transmission and shelter-in-place (February–April), after reopening (May), further reopening (June–July).






Figure 5: Epidemic curves from the start of the outbreak until July 13, 2020 and reproduction number estimates until June 15, 2020 in Gwinnett, Clayton, Sumter, Glynn, and Dawson counties. The x-axis represents the date of symptom onset. The y-axis in the top plot shows the number of cases while the y-axis in the bottom plot shows the estimated median reproduction numbers. The error bars represent 2.5th-97.5th percentile ranges of reproduction numbers. The grey area shows how  $R_t$  estimations were truncated at June 15.



(a) Early Spread



(b) Transmission Patterns

Figure 6: Spatial patterns of transmission of COVID-19. (a) date of reaching the peak (local maximum of  $R_t$ ) for the first wave. (b) spatial distribution of the five categories of transmission patterns of COVID-19 in Georgia by June 15, 2020. The black lines represent the interstate highways.




Figure 7: Distributions of estimated dates of first maximum, minimum, and second maximum in  $R_t$  for 87 counties with cumulative 200 cases by July 13, 2020, and key events possibly driving COVID-19 transmission.

## 406 **Supplementary material**

### 407 **A Supplemental Tables**

Table. S1: COVID-19 pandemic situation and state government responses.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Situation and Response</b>
January 20, 2020	First COVID-19 case reported in the United States.
March 2, 2020	First COVID-19 case reported in the state of Georgia.
March 14, 2020	Georgia governor declared a public health emergency.
March 23, 2020	Large gatherings were banned and shelter-in-place order was issued for “medically fragile” population.
March 24, 2020	Bars and clubs were ordered to close.
April 1, 2020	All K–12 schools were closed.
April 3, 2020	Statewide shelter-in-place order was issued.
April 24, 2020	Some businesses (gyms, fitness centers, bowling alleys, body art studios, barbers, cosmetologists, hair designers, nail care artists, estheticians, their respective schools, and massage therapists) were allowed to reopen w/minimum basic operations.
April 27, 2020	More businesses (theaters, private social clubs, and restaurant dine-in services) were allowed to reopen with social distancing and sanitation mandates.
April 30, 2020	Statewide shelter-in-place order was lifted.
June 1, 2020	Limits on the size of public gathering were relaxed: bars and nightclubs were allowed to reopen, sports events could resume, and summer schools and camps were allowed to begin sessions.

Table. S2: Clinical outcomes and demographic information for 4080 tracked pairs of primary case-patients (infectors) and secondary case-patients (infectees).

	Clinical outcome	Infector		Infectee	
		Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)
<b>Clinical</b>	Hospitalized	737 (18.1)	3232 (79.2)	504 (12.4)	3486 (85.4)
	Ventilator Use	121 (3.0)	3139 (76.9)	92 (2.3)	3246 (79.6)
	Abnormal Chest X-ray	370 (9.1)	2697 (66.1)	216 (5.3)	2909 (71.3)
	Death	154 (3.8)	3436 (84.2)	99 (2.4)	3552 (87.1)
	Fever	2056 (50.4)	1723 (42.2)	1654 (40.5)	2141 (52.5)
	Cough	2662 (65.2)	1197 (29.3)	2283 (56)	1569 (38.5)
	Short of Breath	1438 (35.2)	2323 (56.9)	1129 (27.7)	2640 (64.7)
	Diarrhea	1093 (26.8)	2565 (62.9)	916 (22.5)	2792 (68.4)
<b>Demographics</b>	Sex	Male (%)	Female (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
		1851 (45.4)	2220 (54.4)	1707 (41.8)	2352 (57.6)
	Race	White (%)	Black (%)	White (%)	Black (%)
		1959 (48.0)	1273 (31.2)	1978 (48.5)	1247 (30.6)
	Age	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
	42.7	18.3	40.8	20.4	



Table. S3: Serial interval by subgroup with different clinical characteristics and demographic characteristics

	<b>Subgroup</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean (day)</b>	<b>SD (day)</b>	<b>shape</b>	<b>scale</b>
<b>Clinical Info</b>	Hospitalized+	650	5.69	3.68	2.05	2.77
	Hospitalized-	2986	4.84	3.43	2.00	2.42
	Ventilator+	106	6.28	3.81	2.21	2.84
	Ventilator-	2877	4.93	3.43	2.02	2.44
	Abnormal Chest X-ray+	307	6.13	3.76	2.22	2.76
	Abnormal Chest X-ray-	2492	4.84	3.37	2.04	2.37
	Death+	133	5.91	3.74	2.06	2.87
	Death-	3153	4.95	3.45	2.03	2.44
	Fever+	1889	5.12	3.52	2.06	2.48
	Fever-	1575	4.87	3.45	1.94	2.51
	Cough+	2435	5.09	3.51	2.05	2.49
	Cough-	1096	4.79	3.45	1.92	2.50
	Short of Breath+	1302	5.25	3.51	2.07	2.54
	Short of Breath-	2140	4.81	3.45	1.98	2.43
	Diarrhea+	993	5.22	3.71	1.88	2.77
	Diarrhea-	2349	4.87	3.39	2.05	2.37
<b>Age</b>	20-	412	4.10	3.06	1.96	2.09
	20-40	1369	4.76	3.32	2.05	2.33
	40-60	1330	5.29	3.61	2.05	2.58
	60+	618	5.47	3.70	1.99	2.75
<b>Sex</b>	Male	1720	4.85	3.45	1.96	2.47
	Female	2009	5.11	3.51	2.05	2.50
<b>Race</b>	Black	1147	5.39	3.63	2.04	2.64
	White	1790	4.73	3.39	1.95	2.43
	Other	801	4.99	3.49	2.00	2.49
<b>Resident Area</b>	Metro Atlanta	839	4.88	3.38	2.06	2.37
	Out of Metro Atlanta	2899	5.02	3.52	1.99	2.53
<b>Time Period</b>	Feb-Apr	1070	5.97	3.84	2.09	2.86
	May	850	5.03	3.44	2.11	2.38
	Jun-Jul	1818	4.40	3.14	2.03	2.17
<b>Total</b>		3738	4.99	3.49	2.00	2.49

For clinical characteristics, “+” represents yes and “-” represents no. The shape and scale parameters of gamma distributions were estimated using maximum likelihood estimator.