

1 **Title**

2 The impact of early public health interventions on SARS-CoV-2 transmission and evolution

3

4 **Author list**

5 Sebastian Duchene<sup>1</sup>, Leo Featherstone<sup>1</sup>, Birgitte Freiesleben de Blasio<sup>2,3</sup>, Edward C.

6 Holmes<sup>4</sup>, Jon Bohlin<sup>2</sup> and John H.-O. Pettersson<sup>4,5,\*</sup>

7

8 **Author affiliations**

9 <sup>1</sup>Department of Microbiology and Immunology, The University of Melbourne at The Peter  
10 Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

11 <sup>2</sup>Department of Methods Development and Analytics, Division of Infectious Disease Control  
12 and Environmental Health, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway.

13 <sup>3</sup>Department of Biostatistics, Oslo Centre for Biostatistics and Epidemiology, Institute of  
14 Basic Medical Sciences, University of Oslo, Norway

15 <sup>4</sup>Marie Bashir Institute for Infectious Diseases and Biosecurity, School of Life and  
16 Environmental Sciences and School of Medical Sciences, the University of Sydney, Sydney,  
17 New South Wales 2006, Australia.

18 <sup>5</sup>Zoonosis Science Center, Department of Medical Biochemistry and Microbiology, University  
19 of Uppsala, SE-751 23 Uppsala, Sweden.

20

21 **\* Corresponding author:**

22 **Email:** john.pettersson@imbim.uu.se

23

24 **Author contributions**

25 SD, ECH, JB and JHOP designed the research; SD, LF, BFDB, ECH, JB and JHOP  
26 compiled, computed and analysed the data; SD, LF, ECH and JHOP wrote the manuscript.

27

28 **Competing interest statement**

29 All authors have read the manuscript and have no conflict of interest relating to the  
30 manuscript. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and interpretation, or the  
31 decision to submit the work for publication.

32

33 **Abstract**

34 Many countries have attempted to control COVID-19 through the implementation of non-  
35 pharmaceutical interventions. However, it remains unclear how different control strategies  
36 have impacted SARS-CoV-2 virus transmission dynamics at the local level. Using complete  
37 SARS-CoV-2 genomes, we inferred the relative frequencies of virus importation and  
38 exportation, as well as virus transmission chain dynamics in Nordic countries - Denmark,  
39 Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden - during the first months of the pandemic. Our  
40 analyses revealed that Sweden experienced more numerous transmission chains, which  
41 tended to have more cases, and were of longer duration, a set of features that increased with  
42 time. Together with Denmark, Sweden was also a net exporter of SARS-CoV-2. Hence,  
43 Sweden effectively constituted an epidemiological and evolutionary 'refugia' that enabled the  
44 virus to maintain active transmission and spread to other geographic localities. This analysis  
45 highlights the utility of genomic surveillance where active transmission chain monitoring is a  
46 key metric.

## 47 **Introduction**

48 Since its initial description in December 2019, SARS-CoV-2, the causative agent of  
49 COVID19<sup>1,2</sup>, has rapidly led to an unprecedented global health crisis. The pandemic has  
50 caused tens of millions of infections and over 1.3 million deaths worldwide and continues to  
51 accelerate, imposing a significant impact on health care systems, societies and the global  
52 economy. Countries are continuously struggling with how to effectively counteract the  
53 pandemic, balancing the protection of health with social and economic considerations. In the  
54 absence of therapeutics and available therapies and vaccines, efforts have centred on so-  
55 called ‘non-pharmaceutical strategies’, particularly initial short-term large-scale restrictions to  
56 population movement (e.g. ‘lock-downs’), increased testing and various levels of social  
57 distancing. Analysis of the local epidemiological consequences of different control strategies  
58 provides key information on the most effective approaches to reduce the rate of virus  
59 transmission within communities.

60

61 The Nordic countries, defined here as Denmark, Finland, Norway, Iceland and Sweden,  
62 provide a powerful example of geographically, politically and socially related countries that  
63 differ markedly in how control strategies for COVID-19 were implemented during the first six  
64 months of the pandemic. In particular, Sweden took a less restrictive approach where no  
65 general population movement restrictions was enforced, schools for children below the age  
66 of 16 years old remained open, no quarantine was imposed for infected households, and  
67 businesses continued almost as usual<sup>3</sup>. In contrast, Norway and Denmark enforced a more  
68 invasive population movement restriction that included enforced home office for workers in  
69 the public sector, home-bound schooling, targeted private sector close downs, as well as  
70 closed international borders for non-residents. Iceland, a relatively small homogenous island  
71 population (of ~350,000) never initiated a population movement restriction as Norway and  
72 Denmark, but rather focused on large-scale testing and contact tracing to limit virus spread  
73 within the community. In relation to population size, Sweden has had a higher number of  
74 COVID19-related cases and deaths, than all other Nordic countries<sup>4,5</sup>, with a total of around  
75 1450/58 cases/deaths per 100,000 people in Sweden, compared to around 951/13 in  
76 Denmark, 428/5 in Norway, 321/7 in Finland, and 3 in Iceland, as of 30<sup>th</sup> of October 2020<sup>6</sup>,  
77 and predominantly occurring between April and May 2020.

78

79 Although the relative ‘success’ of COVID-19 control measures are normally gauged in the  
80 number of cases and deaths at the country level, it is also the case that intervention and  
81 mitigation strategies may lead to marked differences in transmission dynamics among  
82 populations, which may in turn impact the evolution of the virus. Using a comparative  
83 analysis of genome sequence data we addressed whether the different approaches to  
84 COVID-19 control employed by the Nordic countries resulted in differences in virus  
85 transmission dynamics and the relative frequencies of virus importation/exportation during  
86 the first seven months of the pandemic. Accordingly, we compiled a representative data set  
87 of SARS-CoV-2 virus genomes and performed a phylo-epidemiological study to identify any  
88 differences in transmission chain dynamics between these countries.

89

## 90 **Results**

91 We conducted a set of analyses on transmission chains of sampled genomes, also known as  
92 “transmission lineages”<sup>7</sup>, which are defined as monophyletic groups of at least two genomes  
93 sampled from a Nordic country. The estimated time of emergence of sampled transmission  
94 chains provides information about the onset of community transmission, although such an  
95 association is sensitive to sampling bias, particularly the time-scale of country-specific  
96 sequencing efforts. Hence, we estimated that the first sampled transmission chains emerged

97 from around January in Sweden (15<sup>th</sup> January, 95% confidence interval, CI: 30<sup>th</sup> December –  
98 16<sup>th</sup> February) to late February in Norway (25<sup>th</sup> February, 95% CI: 5<sup>th</sup> February – 7<sup>th</sup> March)  
99 (Table 1). In Norway the average date of emergence of all transmission chains was around  
100 early June (2<sup>nd</sup> June, 95% CI: 24<sup>th</sup> May – 13<sup>th</sup> June), over a month later than in other  
101 countries (Table 1). This likely reflects that there are fewer genome sequences from between  
102 February and May – that is, during the first phase of the pandemic – than between June and  
103 October in this country (Supplementary Figure S1). The average time of emergence of  
104 transmission chains occurred approximately two weeks and one month, respectively, prior to  
105 the increase in COVID-19 cases and induced deaths (Figure 1, Panels F and G). This was  
106 most notable in Sweden which, in relation to the other Nordic countries, experienced a  
107 steady increase in the number of daily deaths beginning in mid-March. Correspondingly,  
108 lower numbers of daily deaths were recorded in Denmark, Finland, Norway and particularly  
109 Iceland (Figure 1, Panels F and G).

110

111 Our phylogenetic analyses revealed that SARS-CoV-2 was imported to all Nordic countries  
112 between mid-January to mid-February 2020, with detectable community transmission from  
113 the end of February as inferred by the presence of transmission chains (Figure 1). Sustained  
114 community transmission continued for all Nordic countries beyond April, with the exception of  
115 Iceland which was characterised by a relatively short one-month period of community  
116 transmission, and Norway, which had a low number of cases combined with a low  
117 sequencing proportion of 0.023 (the second lowest in our study after Sweden; Table 1).

118

119 The number of transmission chains observed was 46 (95% CI: 41.0–92.0) for Denmark, 21  
120 (95% CI: 20.0–40.8) for Finland, 45 (95% CI: 34.0–62.0) for Iceland, and 26 (95% CI: 22.0–  
121 30.8) for Norway. Notably, the highest number of transmission chains - 98 (95% CI: 72.2–  
122 105.0) - was observed in Sweden. Similarly, the mean duration of such transmission chains  
123 (number of days from detection to last sampled case) was higher in Sweden than other  
124 localities: 26.3 (95% CI: 20.0–36.0) for Sweden, 14.0 (95% CI: 10.1–15.8) for Denmark, 13.5  
125 (95% CI: 9.9–19.6) for Finland, 6.8 (95% CI: 5.0–7.2) for Iceland, and 18.1 (95% CI: 10.9–  
126 23.7) for Norway (Table 1). In Denmark, Finland and Iceland both the duration and the  
127 number of transmission chains decreased with time. Conversely, Sweden was characterised  
128 by an increase in the duration, size and number of transmission chains over time (Figure 1,  
129 Panels A–E). No particular trend was seen in Norway, characterised by an essentially flat  
130 trend line. However, only the transmission chain duration trends for Finland and Iceland were  
131 statistically significant.

132

133 The largest transmission chain was found in Denmark, with 94 cases (95% CI: 22.7–95.2),  
134 followed by Iceland with 82 (95% CI: 26.0–82.0), Norway with 57 (95% CI: 52.0–57.0),  
135 Finland with 35 (95% CI: 8.0–36.0), and Sweden with 33 (95% CI: 14.1–34.0). Although the  
136 largest transmission chain in Sweden was smaller than that for other countries, this country  
137 had the highest  $H_t$ -index (i.e. the greatest number  $H_t$  of transmission chains, each with at  
138 least  $H_t$  cases) (Table 1). In particular, the  $H_t$ -index for Sweden was 9 (95% CI: 8–9),  
139 whereas those for other countries were 8 for Denmark (95% CI: 4–9), 7 for Finland (95% CI:  
140 4–7), 7 for Iceland (95% CI: 4–8), and 6 for Norway (95% CI: 4–7), suggesting that Sweden  
141 had the least-interrupted community transmission.

142

143 To investigate the importation and exportation dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 we employed a  
144 phylogeographic approach that estimates putative number of migration events between the  
145 Nordic countries and a genomic sample of the global diversity<sup>8</sup>. As expected, genomes from  
146 all of the Nordic countries were broadly distributed throughout the phylogenetic tree, implying

147 multiple migration events (Figure 2, Panel A). For Denmark and Sweden we inferred that  
148 most migration events were exportations of the virus, whereas Norway, Iceland and Finland  
149 were characterised by virus importations (Figure 2, Panel B). The ratios of exportation to  
150 importation events for each country were: 2.1 for Sweden (95% highest posterior density,  
151 HPD: 1.5–2.5), 5.3 for Denmark (95% HPD 4.3–6.9), 0.5 for Iceland (95% HPD: 0.4–0.6),  
152 0.01 for Norway (95% HPD: 0.01–0.06). We estimated <1 exportation event for Finland, with  
153 a large number of importations, such that the exportation to importation ratio is effectively 0.  
154 The total inferred number of exportation events was larger for Denmark (335, 95% HPD:  
155 304.0–377.3) than for Sweden (187, 95% HPD: 154.7–211.0). However, because the  
156 sequencing proportion in Denmark was 7-fold higher than in Sweden (Table 1), it is likely that  
157 the number of exportation events from Sweden has been underestimated. Most inferred  
158 exportation events from Sweden were into Finland, whereas those from Denmark were into  
159 non-Nordic countries, followed by Sweden and Iceland (Figure 2, Panel B).

160

## 161 **Discussion**

162 Up to the end of October 2020, Sweden had experienced a greater number of COVID-19-  
163 related cases and deaths in relation to population size compared to all other Nordic  
164 countries<sup>6</sup>. Our genomic analysis shows that whilst SARS-CoV-2 was imported to all Nordic  
165 countries during the same time-period in early 2020, Sweden experienced more transmission  
166 chains, which lasted longer, and tended to be more numerous. Moreover, transmission  
167 chains in Sweden beginning later tended to be greater in size and duration, suggesting  
168 increasing spread in the population. These trends emerged despite Sweden having the  
169 lowest virus genome sampling proportion, suggesting that community transmission was  
170 extensive and well-established relative to the other Nordic countries. In addition, both  
171 Denmark and Sweden were characterised by having acted as exporters, of SARS-CoV-2 to  
172 its Nordic neighbours. Conversely, Iceland, Norway and in particular Finland showed lower  
173 levels of virus exportation. At the same time, our analyses suggest that Finland was the main  
174 receiver of the exportations from Sweden, suggesting a unidirectional mode of exportation  
175 between the two countries.

176

177 During the first six months of the pandemic Sweden never enforced strict community mobility  
178 limitations. Instead, social distancing, limiting sizes of social events and moving to distance  
179 education for students above 16 years were employed as the main mitigation efforts.  
180 Conversely, Denmark, Finland and Norway enforced a relatively strict population movement  
181 restrictions of their communities, closure of borders and government run facilities<sup>4</sup>. Iceland, in  
182 a similar manner to South Korea, utilised large-scale testing and contact tracing combined  
183 with social distancing and voluntary home-based quarantine without the need to regulate  
184 population movement<sup>9</sup> (see also Supplementary table S1). Thus, while regulating population  
185 movement appears to provide an efficient mode to reduce community transmission<sup>10,11</sup>, non-  
186 population movement-targeted mitigation efforts are also viable options under certain  
187 circumstances. Norway experienced relatively low numbers of transmission chains during the  
188 first six months of the pandemic, with the bulk of the transmission chains sampled here  
189 emerging in mid-April and towards the end of July, although this might in part reflect a  
190 delayed start to genome sequencing such results should be interpreted with caution (Figure  
191 1, Panel D). Indeed, we note that the sequencing intensity of Norwegian cases is lower than  
192 some of the other Nordic countries with similar case burdens (Table 1). When sample size  
193 per country increases with time, the effect of such potential sampling biases are expected to  
194 decrease (Supplementary figure S2).

195

196 To what extent then did Sweden's mitigation strategy affect the epidemiological situation both  
197 within the country and the Nordic region as a whole? Sweden received a lot of attention due  
198 to the number of deaths reported. Sweden has been shown to have had one of the longest  
199 durations of excess deaths and highest case numbers between February and May 2020<sup>5</sup> and  
200 it has been suggested that a greater level of self-isolation likely would have reduced the  
201 number of deaths in Sweden<sup>12</sup>. However, although Sweden exhibited a relatively high  
202 number of cases compared to the other Nordic countries, and our results are consistent with  
203 a relatively high community transmission for Sweden during the first six months, such an  
204 increase in community transmission does not necessarily imply a causal relationship with  
205 excess deaths. Whilst we employ a robust genomic-based modelling approach to study  
206 transmission chain changes, equating or directly relating such changes with the number of  
207 deaths may lead to incorrect conclusions as we have not taken into account any patient-  
208 related epidemiological parameters such as gender or age. Furthermore, it has been argued  
209 that the higher number of deaths in Sweden may also have been influenced by how intensive  
210 care unit admission criteria were applied, particularly for the elderly population in care  
211 homes, during the early phase of the pandemic<sup>12</sup>. Thus, official mitigation strategies and  
212 efforts alone are unlikely to explain epidemiological differences between countries, which  
213 were also impacted by the compliance and practical enforcement from the general public,  
214 businesses, and health care providers.

215

216 A critical issue, although one that has received little attention, is that if transmission chains  
217 are allowed to remain active, they also provide increased opportunity for the virus to evolve  
218 and adapt to local populations, potentially acquiring mutations that in some way enhance  
219 virus fitness. Although mutations routinely appear in the SARS-CoV-2 genome, including  
220 viruses sampled from Sweden<sup>13</sup>, their functional relevance is currently unknown. In addition  
221 to providing increased mutational potential, sustained transmission chains also provide  
222 epidemiological 'refugia' for the virus to be transmitted to other localities. This is in line with  
223 our results showing that Sweden had a greater frequency of exportation events among  
224 neighbouring Nordic countries. Thus, interrupting and ultimately stopping transmission chains  
225 is not only important to minimise virus spread within populations, but also to reduce the  
226 chances for the virus to accumulate beneficial mutations.

227

228 Overall, our study highlights the utility of continuous genomic surveillance and retrospective  
229 studies to compare and understand differences in pandemic responses with respect to  
230 transmission dynamics. In particular, the data presented suggests that transmission chain  
231 monitoring may prove to be a useful metric in comparing outbreak mitigation outcome.

232

## 233 **Materials and Methods**

### 234 *Data set construction*

235 On the 23<sup>rd</sup> of June 2020, more than 40,000 complete SARS-CoV-2 high coverage genomes  
236 were downloaded from the GISAID platform ([www.gisaid.org/](http://www.gisaid.org/)). This alignment was updated  
237 on October 6<sup>th</sup> 2020 with additional genomes from the Nordic countries. Initially, the  
238 genomes were binned according to country of isolation and all available genomes from the  
239 Nordic countries were analysed. We calculated sequencing proportion by dividing the  
240 number of sequences per country by the number of cumulative confirmed cases at the most  
241 recent sequence collection date (see Table 1).

242

243 For all non-Nordic countries, the number of genomes per country was subsampled via cd-hit  
244 v.4.8.1 (<https://github.com/weizhongli/cdhit>) to include 99% of the total diversity per country,  
245 apart from USA for which 97% clustering was applied. All genome sequences were aligned

246 with Mafft v.7.455 (<https://mafft.cbrc.jp/alignment/software/>) and the ‘auto’ option, whereafter  
247 poorly aligned regions were removed using TrimAl (<https://github.com/scapella/trimal>)  
248 employing the ‘automated1’ algorithm. The GISAID accession numbers of all sequences  
249 included in the final sequence alignment, comprising 3,211 SARS-CoV-2 genome  
250 sequences, are available as Supplementary Table S2.

251

### 252 *Estimating a time-scaled phylogenetic tree*

253 We estimated maximum likelihood phylogenetic trees using IQ-TREE v2.0.6<sup>14</sup> employing the  
254 GTR+  $\Gamma$  model of nucleotide substitution. A root-to-tip regression of genetic divergence  
255 against sampling time was performed on the resultant maximum likelihood tree using  
256 TempEst v.1.5.3<sup>15</sup>. Due to the quantity of sequences and because it did not display obvious  
257 temporal signal, we obtained a time-scaled phylogenetic tree using LSDv0.3<sup>16</sup> with a fixed  
258 evolutionary rate of  $1 \times 10^{-3}$  subs/site/year as estimated previously<sup>17</sup>, and with the sampling  
259 dates as additional calibration information.

260

### 261 *Detection of virus transmission chains*

262 We defined transmission chains as monophyletic groups of genomes (at least 2) all collected  
263 from one of the Nordic countries, which is analogous to transmission lineages as defined  
264 previously<sup>7</sup>. We computed key statistics from each transmission chain; the duration (i.e. the  
265 length of time in days from the first to the last collected genome), the size (i.e. the number of  
266 genomes), and the time of origin. For each country we also calculated an  $H_t$ -index of  
267 transmission chains, where  $H_t$  is the number of transmission chains with at least  $H_t$  cases  
268 (analogous to the H-index citation metric). Larger values reflect increase in the number and  
269 size of lineages. For example, of Sweden’s lineages, 9 had at least 9 cases. To assess the  
270 impact of phylogenetic uncertainty we obtained 1000 time-trees from standard nonparametric  
271 bootstrap replicates and computed the key transmission chain statistics in each case. The  
272 95% quantile of the statistics from the bootstrap replicates represent a confidence interval  
273 (CI) due to phylogenetic uncertainty.

274

### 275 *Inferring virus migration dynamics between Nordic countries*

276 To infer the frequency of importation or exportation events of SARS-CoV-2 between the  
277 Nordic countries and from the rest of the world, we employed a Bayesian stochastic mapping  
278 approach, also known as a discrete phylogeographic approach, as implemented in BEAST  
279 v1.10.4<sup>18–20</sup> using guidelines from Dellicour et al. for very large genomic data sets<sup>8</sup>. We fixed  
280 the time-tree described above for the analysis. This method is broadly similar to that used to  
281 infer geographic movement of the virus in Belgium<sup>17</sup>.

282

283 The stochastic mapping generates a posterior distribution of ‘type-changes’ between  
284 locations along the branches. Our locations consisted of the five Nordic countries plus an  
285 ‘other’ category for genomes from any other location, which represent the global diversity of  
286 the virus as described above. We ran a Markov chain Monte Carlo of length  $10^7$  steps,  
287 recording every 1000<sup>th</sup> step. Sufficient sampling from the posterior was assessed using  
288 Tracer with all effective sample size values above 200 as estimated in Tracer v.1.7<sup>21</sup>. We  
289 inferred the posterior number of migration events between the six possible states and the  
290 amount of time spent at each state, known as Markov rewards.

291

### 292 **Acknowledgements**

293 We thank all people who have contributed SARS-CoV-2 genome data to the GISAID  
294 platform. Details on specific contributions are available via [www.gisaid.org/](http://www.gisaid.org/). JHOP is funded  
295 by the Swedish research council FORMAS (grant no: 2015-710). ECH is funded by an ARC

296 Australian Laureate Fellowship (FL170100022). SD and LF are funded by an ARC Discovery  
297 Early Career Award awarded to SD (DE190100805).

298

## 299 **References**

300

- 301 1. Wu, F. *et al.* A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China.  
302 *Nature* **579**, 265–269 (2020).
- 303 2. Lu, R. *et al.* Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus:  
304 implications for virus origins and receptor binding. *Lancet* **395**, 565–574 (2020).
- 305 3. Ludvigsson, J. F. The first eight months of Sweden’s COVID-19 strategy and the key  
306 actions and actors that were involved. *Acta Paediatr* (2020) doi:10.1111/apa.15582.
- 307 4. Conyon, M. J., He, L. & Thomsen, S. Lockdowns and COVID-19 Deaths in Scandinavia.  
308 *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2020) doi:10.2139/ssrn.3616969.
- 309 5. Kontis, V. *et al.* Magnitude, demographics and dynamics of the effect of the first wave of  
310 the COVID-19 pandemic on all-cause mortality in 21 industrialized countries. *Nat Med*  
311 (2020) doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1112-0.
- 312 6. WHO. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. <https://covid19.who.int>.
- 313 7. Pybus, O. *et al.* Preliminary analysis of SARS-CoV-2 importation & establishment of UK  
314 transmission lineages. *Virological.org* (2020).
- 315 8. Dellicour, S. *et al.* A phylodynamic workflow to rapidly gain insights into the dispersal  
316 history and dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 lineages.  
317 <http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.05.05.078758> (2020)  
318 doi:10.1101/2020.05.05.078758.
- 319 9. Gudbjartsson, D. F. *et al.* Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic Population. *N Engl J*  
320 *Med* **382**, 2302–2315 (2020).
- 321 10. Flaxman, S. *et al.* Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-  
322 19 in Europe. *Nature* **584**, 257–261 (2020).
- 323 11. Geoghegan, J. L. *et al.* Genomic epidemiology reveals transmission patterns and  
324 dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 in Aotearoa New Zealand.  
325 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.08.05.20168930> (2020)  
326 doi:10.1101/2020.08.05.20168930.
- 327 12. Kamerlin, S. C. L. & Kasson, P. M. Managing COVID-19 spread with voluntary public-  
328 health measures: Sweden as a case study for pandemic control. *Clin Infect Dis* (2020)  
329 doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa864.
- 330 13. Ling, J. *et al.* Spatio-Temporal Mutational Profile Appearances of Swedish SARS-CoV-2  
331 during the Early Pandemic. *Viruses* **12**, (2020).
- 332 14. Minh, B. Q. *et al.* IQ-TREE 2: New Models and Efficient Methods for Phylogenetic  
333 Inference in the Genomic Era. *Mol Biol Evol* **37**, 1530–1534 (2020).
- 334 15. Rambaut, A., Lam, T. T., Max Carvalho, L. & Pybus, O. G. Exploring the temporal  
335 structure of heterochronous sequences using TempEst (formerly Path-O-Gen). *Virus*  
336 *Evol* **2**, vew007 (2016).
- 337 16. To, T.-H., Jung, M., Lycett, S. & Gascuel, O. Fast Dating Using Least-Squares Criteria  
338 and Algorithms. *Syst Biol* **65**, 82–97 (2016).
- 339 17. Duchene, S. *et al.* Temporal signal and the phylodynamic threshold of SARS-CoV-2.  
340 *Virus Evol* (2020) doi:10.1093/ve/veaa061.
- 341 18. Minin, V. N. & Suchard, M. A. Counting labeled transitions in continuous-time Markov  
342 models of evolution. *J Math Biol* **56**, 391–412 (2008).
- 343 19. Minin, V. N. & Suchard, M. A. Fast, accurate and simulation-free stochastic mapping.  
344 *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **363**, 3985–3995 (2008).

- 345 20. Suchard, M. A. *et al.* Bayesian phylogenetic and phylodynamic data integration using  
346 BEAST 1.10. *Virus Evol* **4**, vey016 (2018).
- 347 21. Rambaut, A., Drummond, A. J., Xie, D., Baele, G. & Suchard, M. A. Posterior  
348 Summarization in Bayesian Phylogenetics Using Tracer 1.7. *Syst Biol* **67**, 901–904  
349 (2018).
- 350
- 351

352 **Tables**

353

354 **Table 1.** Summary statistics computed for SARS-CoV-2 data from each Nordic country. The  
 355 95% confidence interval (95% CI) is shown for statistics computed via non-parametric  
 356 bootstrapping. The 95% highest posterior density (95% HPD) is shown for estimates from the  
 357 Bayesian stochastic mapping analysis.

	<b>DENMARK</b>	<b>FINLAND</b>	<b>ICELAND</b>	<b>NORWAY</b>	<b>SWEDEN</b>
<b>TMRCA OF FIRST TRANSMISSION CHAIN (95% CI)</b>	2020-2-18 (2020-1-24 - 2020-3-2)	2020-2-20 (2020-2-20 - 2020-3-12)	2020-2-15 (2020-1-30 - 2020-2-26)	2020-2-25 (2020-2-5 - 2020-3-07)	2019-1-15 (2019-12-30 - 2020-2-16)
<b>MEAN TMRCA OF SAMPLED TRANSMISSION CHAINS (95% CI)</b>	2020-2-28 (2020-3-9 - 2020-3-14)	2020-3-28 (2020-3-2 - 2020-3-31)	2020-3-9 (2020-3-6 - 2020-3-11)	2020-6-2 (2020-5-24 - 2020-6-13)	2020-3-28 (2020-3-22 - 2020-4-2)
<b>MOST RECENT SEQUENCE DATE</b>	2020-5-9	2020-5-16	2020-3-28	2020-8-26	2020-8-20
<b>CASES AT TIME OF LAST SEQUENCE DATE</b>	10319	6286	963	10504	82656
<b>NUMBER OF SEQUENCES</b>	582	255	481	245	680
<b>SEQUENCING PROPORTION</b>	0.056	0.041	0.499	0.023	0.008
<b>NUMBER OF TRANSMISSION CHAINS (95% CI)</b>	46 (41.0–92.0)	21 (20.0–40.8)	45 (34.0–62.0)	26 (22.0–30.8)	98 (72.2–105.0)
<b>MEAN DURATION (95% CI)</b>	14.0 (10.1–15.8)	13.5 (9.9–19.6)	6.8 (5.0–7.2)	18.1 (10.9–23.7)	26.3 (20.0–36.0)
<b>LARGEST CHAIN (95% CI)</b>	94 (22.7–95.2)	82 (26.0–82.0)	57 (52.0–57.0)	35 (8.0–36.0)	33 (14.1–34.0)
<b>H-INDEX (95% CI)</b>	8 (4–9)	7 (4–7)	7 (4–8)	6 (4–7)	9 (8–9)
<b>NUMBER OF EXPORTS (95% HPD)</b>	335.0 (304.0–377.3)	0.0 (0.0–0.0)	64.0 (51.7–78.0)	1.0 (1.0–4.0)	189.0 (154.7–211.0)
<b>NUMBER OF IMPORTS (95% HPD)</b>	63.0 (52.7–74.0)	92.0 (92.0–94.0)	130.0 (123.0–140.0)	75.0 (72.0–77.0)	93.0 (82.0–109.3)
<b>EXPORT TO IMPORT RATIO (95% HPD)</b>	5.3 (4.3–6.9)	0.0 (0.0–0.0)	0.5 (0.4–0.6)	0.01 (0.01–0.06)	2.1 (1.5–2.5)

358

359 **Figures**

360

361 **Figure 1.** Transmission chain summaries (panels A–E). White circles mark chain duration  
362 (left y-axis; in days) against to their origin date (x-axis). Black circles represent last sample  
363 collected from each chain, with the right y-axis denoting their size, and the horizontal grey  
364 lines to their left span their duration. The trend lines represent an ordinary regression line for  
365 chain duration as a function of time, with respective p-values. New daily laboratory-confirmed  
366 cases and deaths over time are shown in the same x-axis in panels F and G, respectively.  
367 Note that Sweden reported case numbers weekly, causing their saltatory trajectory.

368

369 **Figure 2.** Phylogenetic tree of SARS-CoV-2 from Nordic countries as well as global genetic  
370 diversity. The tips are coloured according each Nordic country (panel A). Circular migration  
371 diagram of migration events between the five Nordic countries and other locations. The size  
372 of the coloured arrows denotes the posterior mean number of inferred migration events from  
373 the Bayesian phylogeographic analysis. The black arrows represent the migration direction  
374 (Panel B).

375

376

377

378 **Supplementary materials for this manuscript including the following:**

379

380 **Supplementary Figure S1.** Number of SARS-CoV-2 genomes sampled with time for  
381 all Nordic countries and global samples (i.e. ‘other’) included in the final alignment.

382

383 **Supplementary Figure S2.** Markov rewards for each Nordic country and for the global  
384 diversity in the data (labelled as “other”). The Markov rewards correspond to the portion of  
385 time that all lineages spend at either of the six states in the stochastic mapping. The y-axis is  
386 the Markov rewards as a proportion of total tree length. Note that countries with most  
387 exportation events, Sweden and Denmark are also occupy the largest portion of the tree.


388


389 **Supplementary Table S1.** Summary table of mitigation response take by the Nordic  
390 countries until 2020-10-21 according to the European Centre for Disease Control.

391

392 **Supplementary Table S2.** Table including all GIASID accession numbers for all sequences  
393 in the final multiple sequence alignment of SARS-CoV-2.

394



**A****B**