

1 **Title**

2 Assessment of COVID-19 intervention strategies in the Nordic countries using genomic  
3 epidemiology

4  
5 **Running Title**

6 COVID-19 in the Nordic countries

7  
8 **Author list**

9 Sebastian Duchene<sup>1‡</sup>, Leo Featherstone<sup>1‡</sup>, Birgitte Freiesleben de Blasio<sup>2,3</sup>, Edward C. Holmes<sup>4</sup>, Jon  
10 Bohlin<sup>2\*</sup> and John H.-O. Pettersson<sup>4,5,\*</sup>

11 ‡ These authors contributed equally to this work.

12 \* Joint senior and corresponding authors

13  
14 **Author affiliations**

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

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

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

21 <sup>4</sup>Marie Bashir Institute for Infectious Diseases and Biosecurity, School of Life and Environmental  
22 Sciences and School of Medical Sciences, the University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales  
23 2006, Australia.

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

26  
27 **Corresponding authors**

28 Jon Bohlin and John H.-O. Pettersson

29  
30 **Corresponding authors email**

31 jon.bohlin@fhi.no and john.pettersson@imbim.uu.se

32  
33 **Competing interest statement**

34 All authors have read the manuscript and have no conflict of interest to declare.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

35

## 36 **Funding statement**

37 JHOP is funded by the Swedish research council FORMAS (grant no: 2015-710) and VR (grant no:  
38 2020-02593). ECH is funded by an ARC Australian Laureate Fellowship (FL170100022). SD and  
39 LF are funded by an ARC Discovery Early Career Award awarded to SD (DE190100805). The  
40 funders had no role in study design, data collection and interpretation, or the decision to submit the  
41 work for publication.

42

43

## 44 **Abstract**—word count (214<250)

45 The Nordic countries, defined here as Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland and Iceland, are known  
46 for their comparable demographics and political systems. Since these countries implemented  
47 different COVID-19 intervention strategies, they provide a natural laboratory for examining how  
48 COVID-19 policies and mitigation strategies affected the propagation, evolution and spread of the  
49 SARS-CoV-2 virus. We explored how the duration, the size and number of transmission clusters,  
50 defined as country-specific monophyletic groups in a SARS-CoV-2 phylogenetic tree, differed  
51 between the Nordic countries. We found that Sweden had the largest number of COVID-19  
52 transmission clusters followed by Denmark, Norway, Finland and Iceland. Moreover, Sweden and  
53 Denmark had the largest, and most enduring, transmission clusters followed by Norway, Finland  
54 and Iceland. In addition, there was a significant positive association between transmission cluster  
55 size and duration, suggesting that the size of transmission clusters could be reduced by rapid and  
56 effective contact tracing. Thus, these data indicate that to reduce the general burden of COVID-19  
57 there should be a focus on limiting dense gatherings and their subsequent contacts to keep the  
58 number, size and duration of transmission clusters to a minimum. Our results further suggest that  
59 although geographical connectivity, population density and openness influence the spread and the  
60 size of SARS-CoV-2 transmission clusters, country-specific intervention strategies had the largest  
61 single impact.

## 62 **Keywords**

63 SARS-CoV-2, Transmission clusters, Nordic countries, genomic epidemiology, COVID-19

64

## 65 **Introduction** (total manuscript word count 1950<2000)

66 The Nordic countries of northern Europe - Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Finland and Sweden - are  
67 known for their similar demographics and political systems. However, during the first year of the  
68 COVID-19 pandemic, and prior to widespread vaccination roll-out, these countries adopted varied  
69 policy responses and intervention measures (1). While Sweden initially implemented a more lenient  
70 mitigation strategy, Norway, Denmark and Finland applied inhibitory non-pharmaceutical

71 interventions that included a widespread population “lock-down”. Iceland, a small isolated island  
72 population, focused on contact tracing and testing (1). Because of their homogeneity, the Nordic  
73 countries therefore provide a natural laboratory to compare COVID-19 intervention strategies (2, 3).  
74 We recently analysed transmission clusters, defined as country-specific monophyletic groups  
75 derived from a phylogenetic analysis of the causative Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome  
76 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), in the Nordic countries using a genomic data set covering the  
77 Nordic region (1). Here, we use the same transmission clusters to analyse the epidemiological  
78 implications of the different intervention strategies employed by the Nordic health authorities.

## 79 **Methods**

80 Briefly, the data was generated in (1) by (i) downloading and aligning all available Nordic SARS-  
81 CoV-2 genomes from GISAID ([www.gisaid.org](http://www.gisaid.org); with 67,918 Nordic genomes) and the NextStrain  
82 global build as of 22nd March 2021 (3,437 global genomes). The data set was then subsampled ten  
83 times (referred to here as “replicates”) according to prevalence per country, resulting in alignments  
84 including between 15,297 and 15,616 SARS-CoV-2 genome sequences. For each alignment, a  
85 phylogenetic tree was computed with IQ-TREE v2.0.6 (4) scaled to time using LSD v.03 (5) under  
86 a strict molecular clock at a fixed rate of  $1 \times 10^{-3}$  nucleotide substitutions/site/year, and the GTR+ $\Gamma$   
87 substitution model. Transmission clusters were defined as the monophyletic clustering of two or  
88 more sequences from the same country. The duration of a transmission cluster was defined as the  
89 time between the last and the first sample. The data set was converted to a weekly time-series  
90 format, calculated from the time to most recent common ancestor (TMRCA) from each  
91 transmission cluster. Analyses were carried out using generalised additive mixed-effects models  
92 (GAMM) employing restricted maximum likelihood (REML) (6). We used GAMM for the  
93 regression models with country as the explanatory variable and the following outcomes: number of  
94 transmission clusters, transmission cluster size (*i.e.* the number of samples in each transmission  
95 cluster) and transmission cluster duration. An additional GAMM model was included to assess the  
96 association between duration and transmission cluster size. This model included an interaction term  
97 between country and number of samples as the explanatory variable with duration as the outcome.  
98 All models, except that having the number of transmission clusters as an outcome, were also  
99 adjusted for the number of transmission clusters and TMRCA with respect to country using splines.  
100 Replicate number (1–10) by country (Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark and Iceland) was  
101 included as a hierarchical random effect in all models. Goodness-of-fit was determined using  
102 Akaike Information Criterion (AIC),  $R^2$  and model residuals conformance to normality. Regression  
103 analyses were performed using the GAMM4 package (6), and figures were created using the  
104 ggplot2 package (7). A description of the statistical estimation procedures and results are provided  
105 in the Supplementary Appendix 1.

## 106 **Results**

107 We divided the data set into the number of transmission clusters per week. First, we compared the  
108 number of transmission clusters between the different countries (see Supplementary Figure S1 and  
109 the Methods section for more details regarding the regression models). This revealed that Sweden  
110 had significantly more transmissions clusters ( $p < 0.001$ ) than Denmark, who in turn had  
111 significantly more than Norway ( $p < 0.001$ ). The number of transmission clusters in Finland was  
112 comparable to Norway ( $p = 0.878$ ). The fewest number of transmission clusters were found in  
113 Iceland ( $p < 0.012$ ), but the smoothing spline did not fit the data properly ( $p = 0.906$ ) due to the low  
114 number of cases.

115 We next compared transmission cluster size (*i.e.* number of samples per cluster) between the  
116 different Nordic countries. These analyses suggest that transmission cluster size did not differ  
117 significantly between Sweden and Denmark ( $p = 0.895$ ). However, transmission clusters were  
118 significantly smaller ( $p < 0.001$ ) in Norway, followed by Finland ( $p < 0.001$ ), while Iceland's model  
119 was not found to be significant ( $p = 0.898$ ). Figure 1 shows the log-transformed number of samples  
120 per transmission cluster (*i.e.* transmission cluster size) with respect to TMRCA, together with  
121 regression model lines, for each Nordic country and all replicates. During the autumn and winter  
122 months of 2020 (September through December) we see an increase in transmission cluster size,  
123 with the exception of Finland and Iceland (Figure 1).

124 We also compared transmission cluster duration between the Nordic countries. This did not  
125 significantly differ between Sweden and Denmark ( $p = 0.269$ ) who, in turn, had significantly more  
126 enduring transmission clusters than the other Nordic countries ( $p < 0.002$ ). There was no significant  
127 difference between Norway and Finland ( $p = 0.503$ ), while Iceland's model was again not significant  
128 ( $p = 0.887$ ) due to the low number of cases. In Figure 2 we see that the duration of the transmission  
129 clusters drops when the winter months approach the end of 2020. A significant positive association  
130 ( $p < 0.001$ ) between transmission cluster size and duration was established suggesting that the  
131 duration of a transmission cluster correlates with its size.

## 132 **Discussion**

133 We examined how the number of transmission clusters and their size and duration, differed among  
134 the Nordic countries. The presence of many samples within a transmission cluster indicate that one  
135 common source is responsible for many subsequent cases, while a low number points to fewer  
136 secondary infections. Accordingly, Sweden had the largest number of transmission clusters and,  
137 together with Denmark, also the most enduring. Moreover, our results also point to an increase of  
138 COVID-19 transmission clusters during winter, which could be due to the cold winter climate  
139 leading to increased indoor-based activities and thus increased contact frequencies for transmission

140 (8). Alternatively, the increased spread of SARS-CoV-2 during the winter months could result from  
141 more relaxed COVID-19 intervention measures during the autumn (1). Notably, transmission  
142 cluster size decreased towards the end of 2020 in concordance with an increase in the governmental  
143 stringency index for the Nordic countries (1). Hence, while climate and change of season influence  
144 behaviour and contact frequency, our analyses suggest that the adopted intervention measures also  
145 effectively reduced virus transmission.

146 The largest transmission clusters were found in Sweden and Denmark, while the size of the  
147 transmission clusters in Norway and Finland were significantly smaller and more similar. Iceland  
148 differed in general from the other Nordic countries with substantially fewer COVID-19 cases,  
149 which can most likely be ascribed to the country's small population and isolated location.  
150 Interestingly, although Sweden had more transmission clusters (Supplementary Figure S1), their  
151 duration and size was not significantly different from the clusters obtained from Denmark.  
152 Although we have tried to adjust for bias in sequencing intensity by using sub-sampled SARS-CoV-  
153 2 sequence data from each country in the regression models (1), some bias may still persist due to  
154 country-specific strategies for selecting cases for sequencing. In particular, Swedish transmission  
155 clusters could be underestimated in terms of both size and duration. Alternatively, the more  
156 stringent intervention policies implemented in Denmark, as compared to Sweden, could have  
157 reduced the total number of infections but allowed the transmission clusters to endure. Indeed, we  
158 found a significant association between transmission cluster size and duration. Finland and Iceland  
159 had the most short-lived transmission clusters, with Iceland's significantly shorter than Finland's.

160 During the second half of 2020, Sweden adopted stricter COVID-19 intervention policies, more on  
161 par with its neighbouring countries Norway and Finland, but the number of cases remained high (1).  
162 This may point to some inertia regarding COVID-19 policies, such that the attitudes in the  
163 population and consequences from early COVID-19 intervention strategies persisted for some time  
164 after the new measures were introduced. As Norway and Finland are similar to Sweden in terms of  
165 demographics, location, climate and governance, our results demonstrate the effects of the variable  
166 COVID-19 control measures adopted. Norway, Finland and Denmark experienced a similar burden,  
167 while significantly more cases and transmission clusters were noted for Denmark. The increased  
168 number of cases and transmission clusters observed in Denmark, compared to Norway and Finland,  
169 could in part be due to far more intensive SARS-CoV-2 sequencing, although it may also be a  
170 consequence of Denmark's higher population density and placement on the European continent. We  
171 observed a similar pattern in our previous study (1), in which both Denmark and Sweden had the  
172 most importation events (as well as the most exportation events). The duration of transmission  
173 clusters in Norway and Finland, that implemented similar restriction measures to Denmark, was

174 significantly shorter compared to Denmark and Sweden. The Norwegian and Finnish strategies  
175 have focused on municipality-based, rigorous contact tracing, isolation and quarantining with the  
176 aim to clamp down transmission.

177 Our results suggest that reducing transmission cluster duration through effective contact tracing  
178 could also reduce transmission cluster size. The shorter duration of transmission clusters in Norway  
179 and Finland may reflect the effectiveness of the strategies deployed in those countries. Importantly,  
180 a growing number of transmission clusters would likely imply an increase in the genetic diversity of  
181 SARS-CoV-2, while the presence of transmission clusters of extended length better enable the virus  
182 to evolve.

183 The SARS-CoV-2 Alpha variant of concern (Pangolin lineage B.1.1.7) was first discovered in the  
184 United Kingdom and was associated with an increase in infectivity (9). Interestingly, we did not see  
185 any dramatic change in transmission cluster size or duration associated with the introduction of the  
186 Alpha variant. Indeed, with the exception of Iceland, both the duration and number of cases  
187 changed markedly in all countries from mid-2020 onwards, with cases dropping markedly at the  
188 end of 2020 (Figures 1 and 2) and not contemporaneous with the rise of the Alpha variant. The lack  
189 of any clear resurgence associated with the emergence of the Alpha variant likely reflects the  
190 impact of the COVID-19 control policies in place (1), again emphasizing their importance in  
191 controlling the pandemic.

192 The strategies implemented by Norway, Finland and Iceland, appear to have been more successful  
193 in reducing both the number and the size of their transmission clusters than those in Denmark and  
194 Sweden. As Sweden is a geographical neighbour to Norway and Finland (Denmark is located on the  
195 European continent neighbouring Germany) our findings highlight the importance of local measures  
196 in controlling the spread of SARS-CoV-2. However, it is unclear to what extent geographical  
197 location or strict COVID-19 strategies are responsible for the lower burden of COVID-19 in  
198 Norway, Finland and Iceland compared to Sweden and Denmark. Controlling outbreaks in  
199 Denmark may be more challenging as it is a relatively small country, located on the European  
200 continent, with a comparatively high population density. In contrast, the pattern in Iceland may  
201 reflect the fact that it is an island with a substantially smaller population located far away from  
202 other countries. Our findings from Iceland resembled those of other small island nations (10).

## 203 **Conclusions**

204 Using a genomic epidemiology-based approach we found that transmission cluster size and duration  
205 differed markedly among the Nordic countries. Considering the homogeneous populations and the  
206 similar political systems in these countries, our findings clearly demonstrate that COVID-19

207 intervention policies can have profound influence on how epidemics evolve at the scale of  
208 individual countries. In particular, as Norway, Sweden and Finland are neighbouring countries with  
209 similar demographics, political systems and climate, the data presented here highlight the influence  
210 of intervention strategies in controlling the spread of COVID-19. Interestingly, Denmark  
211 implemented more similar COVID-19 intervention strategies to Norway and Finland, but did not  
212 reduce the spread of COVID-19 to same extent as other Nordic countries which may reflect its  
213 location on the European continent and relatively high population density. Hence, our results  
214 suggest that disease intervention strategies should be adapted to the specific geographic and  
215 demographic factors of each country to more effectively reduce the transmission and evolution of  
216 SARS-CoV-2.


217

## 218 **References**

- 219 1. Duchene S, Featherstone L, de Blasio BF, Holmes EC, Bohlin J, Pettersson JH-O. The  
220 impact of early public health interventions on SARS-CoV-2 transmission and evolution. medRxiv.  
221 2021:2020.11.18.20233767. doi:10.1101/2020.11.18.20233767
- 222 2. Baker MG, Wilson N, Blakely T. Elimination could be the optimal response strategy for  
223 covid-19 and other emerging pandemic diseases. *BMJ*. 2020;371:m4907. doi:10.1136/bmj.m4907
- 224 3. Oliu-Barton M, Pradelski BSR, Aghion P, et al. SARS-CoV-2 elimination, not mitigation,  
225 creates best outcomes for health, the economy, and civil liberties. *Lancet*. 2021;397(10291):2234-6.  
226 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00978-8
- 227 4. Minh BQ, Schmidt HA, Chernomor O, et al. IQ-TREE 2: New Models and Efficient  
228 Methods for Phylogenetic Inference in the Genomic Era. *Mol Biol Evol*. 2020;37(5):1530-4.  
229 doi:10.1093/molbev/msaa015
- 230 5. To TH, Jung M, Lycett S, Gascuel O. Fast Dating Using Least-Squares Criteria and  
231 Algorithms. *Syst Biol*. 2016;65(1):82-97. doi:10.1093/sysbio/syv068
- 232 6. Wood SN. Generalized additive models: an introduction with R: CRC press; 2017.
- 233 7. Wickham H, Chang W, Wickham MH. Package ‘ggplot2’. Create Elegant Data  
234 Visualisations Using the Grammar of Graphics. Version. 2016;2(1):1-189.

- 235 8. Smith TP, Flaxman S, Gallinat AS, et al. Temperature and population density influence  
236 SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the absence of nonpharmaceutical interventions. Proc Natl Acad Sci  
237 U S A. 2021;118(25). doi:10.1073/pnas.2019284118
- 238 9. Volz E, Mishra S, Chand M, et al. Assessing transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 lineage  
239 B.1.1.7 in England. Nature. 2021;593(7858):266-9. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03470-x
- 240 10. Geoghegan JL, Ren X, Storey M, et al. Genomic epidemiology reveals transmission patterns  
241 and dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 in Aotearoa New Zealand. Nat Commun. 2020;11(1):6351.  
242 doi:10.1038/s41467-020-20235-8
- 243
- 244
- 245
- 246
- 247
- 248
- 249
- 250
- 251
- 252
- 253
- 254
- 255
- 256
- 257

258 **Figure legends**




259

260 **Figure 1.** The (log transformed) size of transmission clusters (*i.e.* number of cases per transmission  
261 cluster, vertical axis) for replicates 1–10 with respect to the TMRCA (time to most recent common  
262 ancestor, horizontal axis) for the Nordic countries. The red dashed line represents the regression  
263 model averaged over all replicates.

264

265

266



267

268 **Figure 2.** The (log transformed) transmission cluster duration (difference between last and first  
269 sample, vertical axis) for replicates 1–10 with respect to TMRCA (time to most recent common  
270 ancestor, horizontal axis) for the Nordic countries. The red dashed line represents the regression  
271 model averaged over all replicates.

272


273

274

275

276 **Appendix**

277 **Supplementary File 1: Appendix 1.** A pdf-file containing regression model details and statistics.



278

279 **Supplementary File 2.** Figure S1. The (log transformed) number of transmission clusters (vertical  
280 axis) for replicates 1–10 with respect to the TMRCA (time to most recent common ancestor,  
281 horizontal axis) for the Nordic countries. The red dashed line represents the regression model  
282 averaged over all replicates.