

Brief Report

Accounting for imported cases in estimating the time-varying reproductive number of COVID-19

Tim K. Tsang¹, Peng Wu^{1,2}, Eric H. Y. Lau^{1,2}, Benjamin J. Cowling^{1,2}

Affiliations:

1. WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Control, School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China.
2. Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health Limited, Hong Kong Science Park, New Territories, Hong Kong.

Corresponding author:

Tim Tsang, School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, 21 Sassoon Road, Pokfulam, Hong Kong.

Tel: +852 3917 6761; Fax: +852 3520 1945; email: timtsang@connect.hku.hk

Running head: Imported cases and COVID-19 transmissibility

1 **SOURCES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT**

2 This project was supported by the Health and Medical Research Fund, Food and
3 Health Bureau, Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
4 (grant no. COVID190118), and the Collaborative Research Fund from the
5 University Grants Committee of Hong Kong (project no. C7123-20G).

6

7 **COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT**

8 BJC consults for Roche and Sanofi Pasteur. The authors report no other potential
9 conflicts of interest.

10

11 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

12 The authors thank Stephanie Gao and Faith Ho for technical assistance.

13

14

15

16 **Brief Report**

17 **Accounting for imported cases in estimating the time-varying reproductive**
18 **number of COVID-19**

19

20 **ABSTRACT**

21 **Background:** Estimating the time-varying reproductive number, R_t , is critical for
22 monitoring transmissibility of an emerging infectious disease during outbreaks.
23 When local transmission is effectively suppressed, imported cases could
24 substantially impact transmission dynamics.

25 **Methods:** We developed methodology to estimate separately the R_t for local
26 cases and imported cases, since certain public health measures aim only to
27 reduce onwards transmission from imported cases. We applied the framework
28 to data on COVID-19 outbreaks in Hong Kong.

29 **Results:** We estimated that the R_t for local cases decreased from above one in the
30 early phase of outbreak to below one after tightening of public health measures.
31 Assuming the same infectiousness of local and imported cases underestimated R_t
32 for local cases due to control measures targeting travelers.

33 **Conclusions:** When a considerable proportion of all cases are imported, the
34 impact of imported cases in estimating R_t is critical. The methodology described
35 here can allow for differential infectiousness of local imported cases.

36

37 INTRODUCTION

38 During an emerging infectious disease epidemics, monitoring transmissibility is
39 important for guiding the implementation of public health measures and
40 providing situational awareness on the effectiveness of interventions [1-3]. This
41 can be achieved by estimating the time-varying reproductive number, R_t , a
42 measure of the transmissibility of the virus over time. A wide range of methods
43 have been proposed [3-8] but the impact of imported cases on estimation of R_t is
44 rarely explored [5].

45

46 Imported cases are cases that have been infected outside an area but travelled
47 into and identified in the local area during their incubation period or
48 symptomatic period. They have not been infected locally, but could potentially
49 generate local transmissions. It is expected that the impact of imported cases on
50 estimation of R_t would be limited when a local epidemic is underway as most
51 infections occur locally. However, imported cases can play a more important role
52 in the early stages of a local epidemic, or when local transmission is being
53 suppressed by public health measures. While one study [5] proposed a
54 modification by assuming the same infectiousness among imported and local
55 cases, such modification may not be accurate if there are specific interventions
56 targeting imported cases, such as testing on arrival at the border, or quarantine
57 for inbound travelers [9].

58

59 To address such issues related to imported cases, we extend the framework in
60 Cori et al [4] to estimate the R_t for local cases and imported cases separately.
61 Using the first two waves of COVID-19 outbreaks in Hong Kong as an example,

62 we illustrate the use of inappropriate methods to estimate R_t would lead to a
63 biased assessment of transmissibility.

64

65 **METHODS**

66 *Sources of Data*

67 COVID-19 has been a notifiable disease in Hong Kong since 8 January 2020. Data
68 on laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases were obtained from the webpage of
69 Centre for Health Protection. Cases are classified as “imported cases”, “local cases
70 epidemiologically linked with imported cases”, “unlinked local cases” and local
71 cases epidemiologically linked with local cases” according to their
72 epidemiological characteristics and location of infection [10].

73

74 *Statistical analysis*

75 We examined different methods to handle imported cases in the estimation of R_t .
76 First, when we ignored the fact that imported cases were infected overseas and
77 assumed them as local cases, R_t could be estimated in the framework described
78 by Cori et al. [4]. In this approach, R_t was the ratio between the number of new
79 cases at time t and the total infectiousness of cases at time t , given by $\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} I_{t-s} w_s$,
80 where I_t was the number of infections at time t and w_t was probability
81 distribution of infectiousness profile. Second, assuming equal infectiousness for
82 imported cases and local cases [5], the total infectiousness of cases could be
83 represented by $\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} (I_{t-s}^{Local} + I_{t-s}^{Imported}) w_s$, where I_{t-s}^{Local} and $I_{t-s}^{Imported}$ were the
84 numbers of local and imported cases at time $t-s$.

85

86 To account for the different infectiousness of local cases and imported cases due
87 to travel-related measures [11], we extended the framework to estimate the R_t of
88 local cases and imported cases. We modified the estimation so that R_t for
89 imported cases was the ratio of the number of new local cases infected by
90 imported cases at time t and the total infectiousness of imported case at time t ,
91 given by $\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} I_{t-s}^{Imported} w_s$. The R_t for local cases could be calculated by using the
92 same approach.

93

94 For unlinked local cases, their source of infection was unclear. In addition,
95 because of the potential for pre-symptomatic infectiousness of COVID-19 [12], it
96 is preferable to conduct inference on the epidemic curve by infection date
97 (unobserved) instead of by case confirmation date (observed). Therefore, we
98 used a bootstrap approach that involved sampling of the source of unlinked local
99 cases (linked with local cases or imported cases), and a deconvolution approach
100 [13] to reconstruct the epidemic curve by infection date from the epidemic curve
101 by confirmation date, with the distribution of delay from infection to
102 confirmation, which was the convolution distribution of the incubation period
103 distribution, with mean 5.2 days (SD 3.9) [14], and the empirical distribution of
104 delay from onset to reporting. Our inference was based on a Bayesian framework
105 and we developed Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithm to estimate the model
106 parameters (Appendix). We conducted simulation to validate that our approach
107 could obtain unbiased estimates of R_t for imported and local cases.

108

109 We used these three approaches to fit the data for the first two waves of COVID-
110 19 outbreak in Hong Kong. We compared the estimates of R_t from the alternative

111 methods. All analyses were conducted in R version 3.5.2 (R Foundation for
112 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

113

114 **RESULTS**

115 From 18 January to 8 May 2020, there were 719 imported cases and 326 local
116 cases detected in Hong Kong. Among the 326 local cases, there were 62 (19%),
117 73 (22%) and 191 (59%) cases epidemiologically linked with imported cases,
118 unlinked local cases, and epidemiologically linked with local cases respectively
119 (Figure 1A).

120

121 Based on our approach, we estimated that the surge in local case numbers
122 corresponded to an estimated R_t for local cases greater than one during March
123 14 to 26, which was the period before public health measures were tightened
124 (Figure 1B). During the period with implemented interventions in the
125 community (civil servant special work arrangement and additional social
126 distancing measure), the estimated R_t for local cases was decreasing. The R_t for
127 imported cases were well below one even when there were more than 10 daily
128 imported cases during early March (Figure 1C), consistent with the
129 implementation of a 14-day quarantine for inbound travelers.

130

131 We explored two alternative approaches to account for imported cases when
132 estimating R_t . Assuming same infectiousness for local cases and imported cases
133 would have R_t less than one all along since late February, which would miss the
134 local outbreaks in mid-March (Figure 2A). Assuming all cases were local cases in

135 the estimation led to a peak in R_t in early March, which was inconsistent with the
136 low number of local cases in that period (Figure 2B).

137

138 Simulation studies suggested that our model could obtain unbiased estimate of R_t
139 for local cases and imported cases with constant R_t (Figure S1), and with an
140 intervention controlling for local cases only so that R_t decreased from 2.0 to 0.8
141 (Figure S2).

142

143 **DISCUSSIONS**

144 In this study, we extended the current framework for estimation of R_t to account
145 for differential transmission from imported cases. In this framework, we
146 separately estimated the R_t for local cases and imported cases, so that when
147 control measures were targeting the imported cases, our framework would be
148 feasible to allow R_t for imported cases to be lower than for local cases.

149

150 We compared the extended framework with the current two approaches, namely
151 assuming all cases were local cases, or assuming equal infectiousness for
152 imported cases and local cases [5]. These two approaches would have little
153 impact when local transmission was substantial, but would bias the estimated R_t
154 in measuring transmissibility in the community, when the number of local cases
155 and imported cases were comparable. In particular, assuming all cases were local
156 cases would overestimate the number of local transmissions as imported cases
157 could not be infected locally. This was improved in the framework assuming
158 equal infectiousness of local and imported cases [5]. However, this would be
159 inappropriate if there were targeted control measures for inbound travelers.

160

161 Given that pre-symptomatic transmission was substantial for COVID-19, using
162 serial intervals as a proxy of infectiousness profile would be inappropriate [4,
163 15]. Hence, we used a deconvolution approach to infer the epidemic curve by
164 infection date from the observed epidemic curve that was by confirmation date,
165 and using the infectiousness profile since infection [16]. Misspecification of the
166 infectiousness profile since infection, or using a wrong approach to obtain the
167 epidemic curve by infection dates such as back-shifting based on the delay
168 distribution would bias the estimated R_t [8, 17]. We also properly accounted for
169 the uncertainty in each step by using a bootstrap approach [18].

170

171 Our study has some limitations. First, we did not account for incomplete
172 observations. Mild or asymptomatic cases would likely be undetected. Also,
173 testing availability and criteria would also be likely changing over time. If the
174 proportion of undetected cases were constant over the outbreak, the R_t would
175 still be unbiased [17]. Further investigation would be necessary to develop
176 method to account for the changing proportion of undetected cases. Finally,
177 rapid changes in the parameters could affect the estimated R_t , such as the sudden
178 change for the delay distribution from infection to confirmation caused by
179 overwhelmed healthcare systems, changing case definition during the epidemic
180 [19], or superspreading events during the outbreaks [20].

181

182 In conclusion, we developed methodology to estimate separately the R_t for local
183 and imported cases, to account for the potential differential infectiousness
184 between them, due to control measures targeting inbound travelers. We

185 compared the developed framework with the two current approaches to account
186 for imported cases and illustrate the importance of properly accounting for the
187 differential infectiousness in the estimation of R_t . Accurate estimation of R_t
188 allows situational awareness of transmission and control in the community.
189

190 **REFERENCES**

- 191 1. Ferguson NM, Cummings DA, Fraser C, Cajka JC, Cooley PC, Burke DS.
192 Strategies for mitigating an influenza pandemic. *Nature*. 2006;442(7101):448-
193 52. doi: 10.1038/nature04795. PubMed PMID: 16642006.
- 194 2. Fraser C, Riley S, Anderson RM, Ferguson NM. Factors that make an
195 infectious disease outbreak controllable. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*.
196 2004;101(16):6146-51. Epub 2004/04/09. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0307506101.
197 PubMed PMID: 15071187; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC395937.
- 198 3. Cauchemez S, Boelle PY, Thomas G, Valleron AJ. Estimating in real time
199 the efficacy of measures to control emerging communicable diseases. *Am J*
200 *Epidemiol*. 2006;164(6):591-7. Epub 2006/08/05. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwj274.
201 PubMed PMID: 16887892.
- 202 4. Cori A, Ferguson NM, Fraser C, Cauchemez S. A new framework and
203 software to estimate time-varying reproduction numbers during epidemics. *Am J*
204 *Epidemiol*. 2013;178(9):1505-12. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwt133. PubMed PMID:
205 24043437; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3816335.
- 206 5. Thompson RN, Stockwin JE, van Gaalen RD, Polonsky JA, Kamvar ZN,
207 Demarsh PA, et al. Improved inference of time-varying reproduction numbers
208 during infectious disease outbreaks. *Epidemics*. 2019;29:100356. Epub
209 2019/10/19. doi: 10.1016/j.epidem.2019.100356. PubMed PMID: 31624039;
210 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7105007.
- 211 6. Wallinga J, Teunis P. Different epidemic curves for severe acute
212 respiratory syndrome reveal similar impacts of control measures. *Am J*
213 *Epidemiol*. 2004;160(6):509-16. Epub 2004/09/09. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwh255.
214 PubMed PMID: 15353409; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7110200.

- 215 7. Bettencourt LM, Ribeiro RM. Real time bayesian estimation of the
216 epidemic potential of emerging infectious diseases. PLoS One. 2008;3(5):e2185.
217 Epub 2008/05/15. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0002185. PubMed PMID:
218 18478118; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2366072.
- 219 8. Abbott S HJ, Thompson RN et al. Estimating the time-varying
220 reproduction number of SARS-CoV-2 using national and subnational case counts
221 [version 2; peer review: awaiting peer review]. Wellcome Open Res 2020, 5:112
222 (<https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16006.2>).
- 223 9. Wells CR, Sah P, Moghadas SM, Pandey A, Shoukat A, Wang Y, et al. Impact
224 of international travel and border control measures on the global spread of the
225 novel 2019 coronavirus outbreak. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2020;117(13):7504-
226 9. Epub 2020/03/15. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2002616117. PubMed PMID:
227 32170017; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7132249.
- 228 10. Cowling BJ, Ali ST, Ng TWY, Tsang TK, Li JCM, Fong MW, et al. Impact
229 assessment of non-pharmaceutical interventions against coronavirus disease
230 2019 and influenza in Hong Kong: an observational study. Lancet Public Health.
231 2020;5(5):e279-e88. Epub 2020/04/21. doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30090-6.
232 PubMed PMID: 32311320; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7164922.
- 233 11. Fraser C. Estimating individual and household reproduction numbers in
234 an emerging epidemic. PLoS One. 2007;2(8):e758. doi:
235 10.1371/journal.pone.0000758. PubMed PMID: 17712406; PubMed Central
236 PMCID: PMCPMC1950082.
- 237 12. Nishiura H, Linton NM, Akhmetzhanov AR. Serial interval of novel
238 coronavirus (COVID-19) infections. Int J Infect Dis. 2020;93:284-6. Epub

- 239 2020/03/08. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.02.060. PubMed PMID: 32145466;
240 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7128842.
- 241 13. Becker NG, Watson LF, Carlin JB. A method of non-parametric back-
242 projection and its application to AIDS data. *Stat Med*. 1991;10(10):1527-42.
243 Epub 1991/10/01. doi: 10.1002/sim.4780101005. PubMed PMID: 1947509.
- 244 14. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early Transmission
245 Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J*
246 *Med*. 2020. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001316. PubMed PMID: 31995857.
- 247 15. Wallinga J, Lipsitch M. How generation intervals shape the relationship
248 between growth rates and reproductive numbers. *Proc Biol Sci*.
249 2007;274(1609):599-604. Epub 2007/05/04. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2006.3754.
250 PubMed PMID: 17476782; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC1766383.
- 251 16. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in
252 viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(5):672-5. doi:
253 10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5. PubMed PMID: 32296168.
- 254 17. Gostic KM, McGough L, Baskerville EB, Abbott S, Joshi K, Tedijanto C, et al.
255 Practical considerations for measuring the effective reproductive number, Rt.
256 *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2020;16(12):e1008409. Epub 2020/12/11. doi:
257 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008409. PubMed PMID: 33301457; PubMed Central
258 PMCID: PMC7728287.
- 259 18. Salje H, Cummings DAT, Rodriguez-Barraquer I, Katzelnick LC, Lessler J,
260 Klungthong C, et al. Reconstruction of antibody dynamics and infection histories
261 to evaluate dengue risk. *Nature*. 2018;557(7707):719-23. doi: 10.1038/s41586-
262 018-0157-4. PubMed PMID: 29795354; PubMed Central PMCID:
263 PMC7128842.

- 264 19. Tsang TK, Wu P, Lin Y, Lau EHY, Leung GM, Cowling BJ. Effect of changing
265 case definitions for COVID-19 on the epidemic curve and transmission
266 parameters in mainland China: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health*.
267 2020;5(5):e289-e96. Epub 2020/04/25. doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30089-X.
268 PubMed PMID: 32330458; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7173814.
- 269 20. Adam DC, Wu P, Wong JY, Lau EHY, Tsang TK, Cauchemez S, et al.
270 Clustering and superspreading potential of SARS-CoV-2 infections in Hong Kong.
271 *Nat Med*. 2020;26(11):1714-9. Epub 2020/09/19. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-
272 1092-0. PubMed PMID: 32943787.
- 273
- 274


275 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

276 **Figure 1.** Epidemic curve of the COVID-19 transmission in Hong Kong from
277 January through May 2020 (Panel A) and the estimated time-varying
278 reproductive number for local cases (Panel B) and imported cases (Panel C).


279

280 **Figure 2.** Comparison of estimation of time-varying reproductive number using
281 our proposed framework, with alternative approaches that assuming equal
282 infectiousness for local cases and imported cases (Panel A), or assuming all cases
283 were local cases in the analysis (Panel B).


Epidemic curve



Time varying reproductive number for local cases




Time varying reproductive number for imported cases






A


Assuming equal infectiousness for imported and local cases

**B**

Assuming all cases were local cases





A**B**