

1                                    **Generation time of the Alpha and Delta SARS-CoV-2 variants**

2                    WS Hart<sup>1</sup>, E Miller<sup>2,3</sup>, NJ Andrews<sup>4</sup>, P Waight<sup>3</sup>, PK Maini<sup>1</sup>, S Funk<sup>2</sup>, RN Thompson<sup>5,6,\*</sup>

3                    **Affiliations:**

4                    <sup>1</sup>Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX2 6GG, UK

5                    <sup>2</sup>Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical  
6                    Medicine, London, WC1E 7HT, UK

7                    <sup>3</sup>Immunisation and Countermeasures Division, UK Health Security Agency, London, NW9  
8                    5EQ, UK

9                    <sup>4</sup>Data and Analytical Sciences, UK Health Security Agency, London, NW9 5EQ, UK

10                    <sup>5</sup>Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK

11                    <sup>6</sup>Zeeman Institute for Systems Biology and Infectious Disease Epidemiology Research  
12                    (SBIDER), University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK

13                    \*Correspondence to: [Robin.N.Thompson@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:Robin.N.Thompson@warwick.ac.uk)

14

## Summary

15 **Background:** In May 2021, the Delta SARS-CoV-2 variant became dominant in the UK.

16 This variant is associated with increased transmissibility compared to the Alpha variant that  
17 was previously dominant. To understand ongoing transmission and interventions, a key  
18 question is whether the Delta variant generation time (the time between infections in infector-  
19 infectee pairs) is typically shorter—i.e., transmissions are happening more quickly—or whether  
20 infected individuals simply generate more infections.

21 **Methods:** We analysed transmission data from a UK Health Security Agency household  
22 study. By fitting a mathematical transmission model to the data, we estimated the generation  
23 times for the Alpha and Delta variants.

24 **Results:** The mean intrinsic generation time (the generation time if there had been a constant  
25 supply of susceptibles throughout infection) was shorter for the Delta variant (4.6 days, 95%  
26 CrI 4.0-5.4 days) than the Alpha variant (5.5 days, 95% CrI 4.6-6.4 days), although within  
27 uncertainty ranges. However, there was a larger difference in the realised mean household  
28 generation time between the Delta (3.2 days, 95% CrI 2.4-4.2 days) and Alpha (4.5 days,  
29 95% CrI 3.7-5.4 days) variants. This is because higher transmissibility led to faster  
30 susceptible depletion in households, in addition to the reduced intrinsic generation time.

31 **Conclusions:** The Delta variant transmits more quickly than previously circulating variants.  
32 This has implications for interventions such as contact tracing, testing and isolation, which  
33 are less effective if the virus is transmitted quickly. Epidemiological models of interventions  
34 should be updated to include the shorter generation time of the Delta variant.

35

## Introduction

36 In mid-2021, the Delta SARS-CoV-2 variant became the dominant variant in the UK<sup>1</sup> and  
37 globally.<sup>2</sup> This variant presents a higher risk of severe disease compared to previously  
38 circulating variants,<sup>2,3</sup> although vaccination still provides significant protection.<sup>4</sup>  
39 Concerningly, the Delta variant led to an increase in the growth rate of COVID-19 cases in  
40 the UK, swiftly outcompeting other SARS-CoV-2 variants.<sup>1,5</sup> This was attributed to the  
41 increased transmissibility of the Delta variant, with an epidemiological study<sup>5</sup> suggesting that  
42 it is 43-68% more transmissible than the Alpha variant that was identified in the UK in late  
43 2020.<sup>6</sup>

44 Transmission of a SARS-CoV-2 variant can be characterised in two complementary ways:  
45 speed and strength.<sup>7,8</sup> Speed refers to how quickly the variant grows at the population level,  
46 which is measured by the exponential growth rate and can be inferred from disease incidence  
47 data for that variant.<sup>8</sup> However, understanding transmission of a novel variant also requires its  
48 strength to be estimated<sup>8</sup> – this is the variant’s transmissibility, which is typically measured  
49 by the time-dependent reproduction number, or “R number” (the number of people that each  
50 infected person is expected to infect). The generation time (the time between infection events  
51 in infector-infectee pairs) determines the relationship between the speed and strength of a  
52 variant,<sup>8–11</sup> and is a crucial input to many models used to estimate the reproduction number  
53 from case notification data.<sup>12,13</sup> In principle, an increase in the growth rate of COVID-19  
54 cases as observed for the Delta variant can be attributed to either an increase in  
55 transmissibility or a shortening of the generation time, or both of these factors.<sup>8,14</sup>

56 Previous studies have estimated the generation time for SARS-CoV-2 (for example <sup>15–18</sup>), with  
57 most of these estimates using data collected during the very early months of the COVID-19  
58 pandemic. A household study conducted by Public Health England (PHE) between February

59 and November 2020 in the UK indicated that the generation time became shorter in the  
60 autumn of 2020 compared to earlier months.<sup>18</sup> Since the SARS-CoV-2 generation time is  
61 changing, up-to-date generation time estimates are crucial to inform estimates of the  
62 reproduction number and to understand the relative transmissibility of different variants.  
63 However, the Alpha variant was responsible for infections in only two households in that  
64 study, while the Delta variant had not yet emerged by the end of the study.<sup>18</sup> The effect of  
65 different variants on the SARS-CoV-2 generation time has therefore not been properly  
66 assessed.

67 Here, we report analyses of data from an ongoing household study conducted by the UK  
68 Health Security Agency (UKHSA; formerly PHE). As the study began in February 2021,  
69 there was an opportunity to estimate the generation time for both the Alpha and Delta  
70 variants and to analyse the transition from the Alpha variant to the Delta variant being  
71 dominant. We estimated two quantities for each variant. First, we estimated the *intrinsic*  
72 *generation time* (the generation time if the supply of susceptible individuals remains constant  
73 throughout infection). This quantity is widely applicable, since its distribution describes the  
74 relative transmission risk posed by an infected host at each time since infection,  
75 independently of the household structure. Second, we estimated the *household generation*  
76 *time* (the realised generation time in the study households). The mean household generation  
77 time is always shorter than the mean intrinsic generation time. This is because the household  
78 generation time reflects the fact that, in small household populations, infected individuals run  
79 out of susceptible individuals to infect.<sup>9,19</sup> Most realised transmissions therefore happen more  
80 quickly within households than the intrinsic generation time distribution suggests.

81 In addition to estimating the household generation time for the Alpha and Delta variants, we  
82 estimated this quantity for individuals of different ages and vaccination statuses, and at

83 different times during the study period. We found that the variant responsible for the  
84 infections within households had a larger effect on the household generation time than any of  
85 these other factors. This indicates that the increased growth rate of COVID-19 cases due to  
86 the Delta variant can be attributed to both an increase in transmissibility and a shortening of  
87 the generation time.

## 88 Methods

### 89 Data

90 We analysed household transmission data from the UKHSA HOCO2 study (Supplementary  
91 Data). This study began in February 2021 and is ongoing, and data were available from 227  
92 households consisting of 557 participants at the time of our analyses (September 2021).  
93 Households were recruited to the study after an index case returned a positive PCR test, and  
94 (in most cases) three further PCR tests were subsequently carried out on each participating  
95 household member to determine whether they became infected. The following data were also  
96 collected from each participating household member:

- 97 ● The date of any previous positive test result, where available.
- 98 ● Symptom onset dates (for individuals who developed symptoms).
- 99 ● The number of vaccine doses received, the vaccine type, and the date(s) of vaccination.

100 We assumed individuals were infected during the household transmission cluster if they  
101 returned a positive PCR test (including tests taken up to 28 days before the household was  
102 recruited to the study) and/or developed symptoms. Otherwise, we assumed individuals  
103 remained uninfected if they returned only negative tests. Household members who did not  
104 participate in the study, or withdrew before either taking a test or developing symptoms, were  
105 excluded from our analyses (but were included in the household size).

106 Genomic sequencing was carried out in 60% of study households. Where sequencing data  
107 were not available, we assumed that the Alpha variant was responsible for infections in  
108 households that were recruited to the study before May 2021, and the Delta variant for  
109 infections in households recruited after May 2021 (data from three households recruited  
110 during May 2021 in which sequencing was not carried out were excluded from our  
111 analyses).<sup>1</sup> Overall, the Alpha and Delta variants were determined to be responsible for  
112 infections in 131 and 96 households, respectively.

### 113 Mathematical modelling

114 We provide an overview of the model and the parameter inference approach here. Full details  
115 are given in the Supplementary Material.

116 We estimated the generation time from the household transmission data using a mechanistic  
117 approach motivated by compartmental modelling.<sup>17,18</sup> In the model, each infection is divided  
118 into three successive, independently distributed, stages: latent, presymptomatic infectious and  
119 symptomatic infectious. Unlike commonly used approaches for estimating the SARS-CoV-2  
120 generation time,<sup>15,16</sup> this approach explicitly links the individual infectiousness profile of an  
121 infected host to exactly when they develop symptoms.


122 Data augmentation MCMC was used to fit the transmission model to the household data.<sup>18,20</sup>

123 We made the following assumptions when fitting the model to data:

- 124 • An incubation period distribution with mean 5.8 days and standard deviation 3.1  
125 days.<sup>21</sup>
- 126 • Entirely asymptomatic infected hosts are 35% as infectious as those who develop  
127 symptoms.<sup>22</sup>



151 constant rate throughout their infectious period, and therefore provides a generalised  
152 generation time estimate that is independent of the household size) for the Alpha and Delta  
153 variants. We estimated this quantity to be slightly shorter for the Delta variant (4.6 days, 95%  
154 CrI 4.0-5.4 days) compared to the Alpha variant (5.5 days, 95% CrI 4.6-6.4 days), although  
155 there was overlap between the credible intervals (Figure 1A). On the other hand, our results  
156 indicate a substantially higher transmissibility within households of the Delta variant  
157 compared to the Alpha variant (Figure 1B).



158

159 **Figure 1. The effect of variant on the intrinsic generation time and the household generation time.** Violin  
160 plots indicate posterior estimates for the Alpha (blue) and Delta (red) variants of: A. The mean intrinsic  
161 generation time (i.e., the mean generation time if the supply of susceptibles remains constant throughout  
162 infection); B. The overall transmissibility parameter,  $\beta_0$  (i.e., the expected number of household transmissions  
163 generated by a single infected individual introduced into a large, entirely susceptible, household); C. The mean  
164 household generation time (i.e., the mean generation time accounting for susceptible depletion in the


165 households); D. The standard deviation of household generation times. Posterior means and 95% credible  
166 intervals for these quantities are given in Table S2 and Table S3 in the Supplementary Material.

167 Estimates of the mean household generation time for the two variants (Figure 1C) are shorter  
168 than the corresponding intrinsic generation time estimates (Figure 1A), since the household  
169 generation time accounts for susceptible depletion within households (which means that  
170 potential transmissions with longer generation times are less likely to occur). We found a  
171 shorter mean household generation time for the Delta variant (3.2 days, 95% CrI 2.4-4.2  
172 days) than for the Alpha variant (4.5 days, 95% CrI 3.7-5.4 days). This is due to the higher  
173 transmissibility of the Delta variant (Figure 1B) leading to faster susceptible depletion, in  
174 addition to the smaller reduction in the intrinsic generation time shown in Figure 1A. We also  
175 estimated the standard deviation of generation times within households to be smaller for the  
176 Delta variant than for the Alpha variant (Figure 1D). In Figure S2 of the Supplementary  
177 Material, we combined the estimates obtained in each step of the data augmentation MCMC  
178 parameter fitting procedure (which are summarised in Figure 1) to obtain an estimate of the  
179 entire household generation time distribution. This also indicates that household  
180 transmissions with the Delta variant typically occur earlier in infection (Figure S2C).

181 We note that the estimates in Figure 1B cannot be compared directly with previous estimates  
182 of the transmission advantage of the Delta variant (e.g., an estimate of 43-68% obtained using  
183 incidence data<sup>5</sup>), since the value of  $\beta_0$  reflects the intrinsic transmissibility of the Alpha and  
184 Delta variants rather than realised transmission. The intrinsic transmission advantage of the  
185 Delta variant will only be realised if sufficiently many susceptibles are available to each  
186 infector.

187 We also explored the effects of vaccination (Figure 2A-C), age (Figure 2D-E) and month of  
188 recruitment to the household study (Figure 2F) on household generation times. We estimated

189 the generation time associated with infectors (Figure 2A) and infectees (Figure 2B) of  
190 different vaccination status, as well as considering infector-infectee pairs with different  
191 combinations of vaccine status (Figure 2C), each time stratifying our estimates by variant. In  
192 each case, the effect of variant on the household generation time was substantially larger than  
193 the effect of vaccination status (Figure 2A-C). Similarly, for both variants there was no clear  
194 effect of the age of infectors (Figure 2D) or infectees (Figure 2E) on the generation time.  
195 Finally, a reduction in the household generation time occurred between April and June 2021  
196 (Figure 2F), likely due to the Delta variant becoming dominant in the UK during May 2021.<sup>1</sup>



197

198 **Figure 2. The effect of different factors on household generation times.** Violin plots indicate posterior  
199 estimates of the mean household generation time for infectors, infectees and households with different  
200 characteristics, showing comparisons based on: A. Vaccination status of the infector and variant; B. Vaccination  
201 status of the infectee and variant; C. Combination of vaccination statuses in the infector-infectee pair (for  
202 example, U->V corresponds to transmissions from unvaccinated infectors to vaccinated infectees) and variant;  
203 D. Age of the infector and variant; E. Age of the infectee and variant; F. Recruitment month of the household  
204 into the study (all months shown are in 2021).

205

## Discussion

206 Novel SARS-CoV-2 variants possess different transmission characteristics to the virus that  
207 originally emerged in Wuhan, China.<sup>5,14</sup> A key transmission characteristic is the generation  
208 time, which measures the speed of transmission between individuals.<sup>17,19,24</sup> To estimate the  
209 generation time, it is necessary to analyse datasets in which it is possible to determine or  
210 estimate who-infected-whom.<sup>17,19,24</sup> Household studies provide an opportunity to conduct such  
211 analyses.<sup>18,20</sup> Here, we have analysed data from the HOCO2 household study conducted by  
212 the UKHSA, and compared the generation time for the Alpha and Delta variants (which were  
213 the dominant variants in England at the beginning and end of the time period considered<sup>1</sup>).

214 We first estimated the intrinsic generation time, which describes the generation time under  
215 the assumption that there is a steady supply of susceptible individuals available to infect (i.e.,  
216 susceptible depletion in households is not accounted for). The mean intrinsic generation time  
217 was found to be slightly lower for the Delta variant than for the Alpha variant (Figure 1A),  
218 but there was a substantial overlap in the credible intervals between the two variants.

219 However, the data indicated that the Delta variant is much more transmissible in households  
220 than the Alpha variant (Figure 1B). The impact of this increased transmissibility is a larger  
221 difference in realised generation times within households between the two variants (Figure  
222 1C) than would be expected from the difference in the intrinsic generation time alone. This is  
223 because increased transmissibility leads to susceptible individuals in the household being  
224 infected quickly, thereby being unavailable for infection later (thus shortening the average  
225 period between realised transmissions). The effect of variant on the household generation  
226 time was more substantial than the effects of other factors, including age and vaccination  
227 status (Figure 2).

228 Our study is the first to compare the generation time for different SARS-CoV-2 variants  
229 directly, and we are not aware of any other generation time estimate for the Alpha variant. A  
230 generation time estimate for the Delta variant based on 55 transmission pairs was recently  
231 stated in China CDC Weekly,<sup>25</sup> although the methods underlying that estimate were not  
232 presented. Nonetheless, the mean generation time estimate of 2.9 days in that study<sup>25</sup> lies  
233 within the credible interval of our estimate of the mean household generation time for the  
234 Delta variant (3.2 days, 95% CrI 2.4-4.2 days) and is shorter than the lower credible limit of  
235 our estimate for the Alpha variant (4.5 days, 95% CrI 3.7-5.4 days). This supports our finding  
236 that the Delta variant is transmitted more quickly than the Alpha variant.

237 Other studies have estimated quantities related to the generation time for the Alpha and Delta  
238 variants, including the serial interval<sup>26-28</sup> and the viral load trajectories of infected hosts.<sup>29-31</sup>  
239 However, while the serial interval (the interval between symptom onset times in infector-  
240 infectee pairs) is sometimes used as a proxy for the generation time (the interval between  
241 infection times), these two quantities may not follow the same distribution<sup>24</sup> – for example,  
242 the generation time always takes positive values, whereas the serial interval can be negative  
243 for pathogens such as SARS-CoV-2 for which presymptomatic transmission can occur – and  
244 may not even have the same mean value.<sup>18</sup> Similarly, although it may be possible to infer how  
245 infectiousness varies during infection based on viral load data,<sup>32</sup> the timing of realised  
246 transmissions also depends on other factors as well as intrinsic infectiousness, such as  
247 behaviour (for example, individuals may be less likely to transmit after developing symptoms  
248 and isolating) and the availability of susceptibles. Our approach explicitly accounts for  
249 changes in the transmission risk following symptom onset, while our estimates of the  
250 household generation time account for depletion of susceptibles within households.

251 Estimates of the generation time underlie a range of epidemiological analyses, including  
252 estimation of the time-varying reproduction number (or “R number”)<sup>12,13</sup> in different regions  
253 or countries and the relative transmissibility of different variants<sup>5,14</sup>. Such analyses often  
254 neglect temporal changes in the generation time, but our results indicate that the generation  
255 time is shorter for the Delta variant than for the Alpha variant. When estimating reproduction  
256 numbers, overestimation of the mean generation time generally leads to reproduction number  
257 estimates that are further from one (the threshold for an outbreak being under control)  
258 compared to the true value.<sup>10</sup> When analysing the transmissibility advantage of the Delta  
259 variant over the Alpha variant, neglecting a shorter generation time for the Delta variant  
260 would lead to its transmissibility advantage being overestimated.<sup>8</sup> We contend that the  
261 observed growth rate advantage of the Delta variant is likely due to a combination of both  
262 increased transmissibility and a shorter generation time.

263 Since susceptible depletion during infection may be a less important determinant of the  
264 timing of transmissions occurring outside households than within households, we expect the  
265 overall generation time distribution (accounting for transmissions across all settings) to lie  
266 somewhere between our “household” and “intrinsic” estimates. This suggests that inferring  
267 the transmissibility advantage of the Delta variant over the Alpha variant from incidence data  
268 using our household generation time estimates (which show a greater difference between  
269 variants) would give a lower bound for the transmissibility advantage (since the observed  
270 increased growth rate of the Delta variant is then explained in part by a substantial generation  
271 time reduction). In contrast, we expect that inferring the transmissibility advantage of the  
272 Delta variant over the Alpha variant using the intrinsic generation time estimates would give  
273 an upper bound.

274 In summary, our analyses suggests that the Delta variant transmits more quickly than the  
275 previously circulating Alpha variant. This has implications for interventions, since public  
276 health measures such as contact tracing are less effective if transmission occurs quickly. It is  
277 essential for public health that epidemiological models are updated to reflect the generation  
278 time of the variants driving transmission, and that the generation time is assessed in future as  
279 the characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 transmission continue to change.

## 280 **References**

- 281 1 Public Health England. SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern and variants under investigation in  
282 England (Technical briefing 23). 2021.
- 283 2 World Health Organization. Weekly epidemiological update on COVID-19 (Edition 58). 2021.
- 284 3 Twohig KA, Nyberg T, Zaidi A, *et al.* Hospital admission and emergency care attendance risk for  
285 SARS-CoV-2 delta (B.1.617.2) compared with alpha (B.1.1.7) variants of concern: a cohort study.  
286 *Lancet Infect Dis* 2021.
- 287 4 Lopez Bernal J, Andrews N, Gower C, *et al.* Effectiveness of Covid-19 vaccines against the  
288 B.1.617.2 (Delta) variant. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **385**: 585–94.
- 289 5 Campbell F, Archer B, Laurenson-Schafer H, *et al.* Increased transmissibility and global spread of  
290 SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern as at June 2021. *Eurosurveillance* 2021; **26**: 2100509.
- 291 6 Public Health England. SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern and variants under investigation in  
292 England (Technical briefing 7). 2021.
- 293 7 Dushoff J, Park SW. Speed and strength of an epidemic intervention. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 2021;  
294 **288**: 20201556.
- 295 8 Park SW, Bolker BM, Funk S, *et al.* Roles of generation-interval distributions in shaping relative  
296 epidemic strength, speed, and control of new SARS-CoV-2 variants. *medRxiv* 2021; :  
297 2021.05.03.21256545.
- 298 9 Fraser C. Estimating Individual and Household Reproduction Numbers in an Emerging Epidemic.  
299 *PLOS ONE* 2007; **2**: e758.
- 300 10 Wallinga J, Lipsitch M. How generation intervals shape the relationship between growth rates and  
301 reproductive numbers. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 2007; **274**: 599–604.
- 302 11 Parag KV, Thompson RN, Donnelly CA. Are epidemic growth rates more informative than  
303 reproduction numbers? Royal Statistical Society, 2021.
- 304 12 Gostic KM, McGough L, Baskerville EB, *et al.* Practical considerations for measuring the effective  
305 reproductive number, Rt. *PLOS Comput Biol* 2020; **16**: e1008409.

- 306 13 Abbott S, Hellewell J, Thompson RN, *et al.* Estimating the time-varying reproduction number of  
307 SARS-CoV-2 using national and subnational case counts. *Wellcome Open Res* 2020; **5**: 112.
- 308 14 Davies NG, Abbott S, Barnard RC, *et al.* Estimated transmissibility and impact of SARS-CoV-2  
309 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Science* 2021; : eabg3055.
- 310 15 Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, *et al.* Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic  
311 control with digital contact tracing. *Science* 2020; **368**: eabb6936.
- 312 16 Ganyani T, Kremer C, Chen D, *et al.* Estimating the generation interval for coronavirus disease  
313 (COVID-19) based on symptom onset data, March 2020. *Eurosurveillance* 2020; **25**: 2000257.
- 314 17 Hart WS, Maini PK, Thompson RN. High infectiousness immediately before COVID-19 symptom  
315 onset highlights the importance of continued contact tracing. *eLife* 2021; **10**: e65534.
- 316 18 Hart WS, Abbott S, Endo A, *et al.* Inference of SARS-CoV-2 generation times using UK  
317 household data. *medRxiv* 2021; : 2021.05.27.21257936.
- 318 19 Park SW, Champredon D, Dushoff J. Inferring generation-interval distributions from contact-  
319 tracing data. *J R Soc Interface* 2020; **17**: 20190719.
- 320 20 Ferguson NM, Cummings DAT, Cauchemez S, *et al.* Strategies for containing an emerging  
321 influenza pandemic in Southeast Asia. *Nature* 2005; **437**: 209–14.
- 322 21 McAloon C, Collins Á, Hunt K, *et al.* Incubation period of COVID-19: a rapid systematic review  
323 and meta-analysis of observational research. *BMJ Open* 2020; **10**: e039652.
- 324 22 Buitrago-Garcia D, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, *et al.* Occurrence and transmission potential of  
325 asymptomatic and presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: A living systematic review and meta-  
326 analysis. *PLOS Med* 2020; **17**: e1003346.
- 327 23 Pouwels KB, Pritchard E, Matthews PC, *et al.* Impact of Delta on viral burden and vaccine  
328 effectiveness against new SARS-CoV-2 infections in the UK. *medRxiv* 2021; :  
329 2021.08.18.21262237.
- 330 24 Lehtinen S, Ashcroft P, Bonhoeffer S. On the relationship between serial interval, infectiousness  
331 profile and generation time. *J R Soc Interface* 2021; **18**: 20200756.
- 332 25 Zhang M, Xiao J, Deng A, *et al.* Transmission dynamics of an outbreak of the COVID-19 Delta  
333 variant B.1.617.2 — Guangdong Province, China, May–June 2021. *China CDC Wkly* 2021; **3**:  
334 584–6.
- 335 26 Pung R, Mak TM, Kucharski AJ, Lee VJ. Serial intervals in SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2 variant cases.  
336 *The Lancet* 2021; **398**: 837–8.
- 337 27 Kang M, Xin H, Yuan J, *et al.* Transmission dynamics and epidemiological characteristics of Delta  
338 variant infections in China. *medRxiv* 2021; : 2021.08.12.21261991.
- 339 28 Ryu S, Kim D, Lim J-S, Ali ST, Cowling BJ. Changes in the serial interval and transmission  
340 dynamics associated with the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant in South Korea. *medRxiv* 2021; :  
341 2021.08.18.21262166.
- 342 29 Kissler SM, Fauver JR, Mack C, *et al.* Viral dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 variants in vaccinated and  
343 unvaccinated individuals. *medRxiv* 2021; : 2021.02.16.21251535.

344 30 Li B, Deng A, Li K, *et al.* Viral infection and transmission in a large, well-traced outbreak caused  
345 by the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant. *medRxiv* 2021; : 2021.07.07.21260122.

346 31 Ong SWX, Chiew CJ, Ang LW, *et al.* Clinical and virological features of SARS-CoV-2 variants of  
347 concern: a retrospective cohort study comparing B.1.1.7 (Alpha), B.1.315 (Beta), and B.1.617.2  
348 (Delta). *Clin Infect Dis* 2021; published online Aug 23. DOI:10.1093/cid/ciab721.

349 32 Hart WS, Maini PK, Yates CA, Thompson RN. A theoretical framework for transitioning from  
350 patient-level to population-scale epidemiological dynamics: influenza A as a case study. *J R Soc*  
351 *Interface* 2020; **17**: 20200230.

352

### 353 **Data sharing**

354 All data generated or analysed during this study are available in this published article and its  
355 supplementary files. Data and code for reproducing our results are available at  
356 [https://github.com/will-s-hart/variant\\_generation\\_times](https://github.com/will-s-hart/variant_generation_times).

### 357 **Acknowledgements**

358 The data collection for the study was undertaken by the UKHSA (an executive agency of the  
359 Department of Health) as part of the COVID-19 response. WSH was funded by an EPSRC  
360 Excellence Award for his doctoral studies (Grant Reference EP/R513295/1). EM receives  
361 support from the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Protection Research  
362 Unit in Immunisation at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine in partnership  
363 with the UKHSA (Grant Reference NIHR200929). SF receives funding from the Wellcome  
364 Trust (Grant Reference 210758/Z/18/Z). RNT receives support from the UKRI (Grant  
365 Reference EP/V053507/1). Thanks to the household members who took part in this study, the  
366 nursing staff at the UKHSA who recruited and followed up the households, the laboratory  
367 staff at the UKHSA who tested the swabs and the UKHSA administrative staff who arranged  
368 for the delivery and collection of testing kits from households. The household surveillance  
369 protocol was approved by the UKHSA Research Ethics and Governance Group as part of the  
370 portfolio of the UKHSA's enhanced surveillance activities in response to the pandemic. Oral

371 informed consent for sampling and follow up was obtained by the nurses from household  
372 members who were free to decline to participate in the surveillance at any time. Consent for  
373 children was obtained by a parent or legal guardian. Only anonymised data were provided to  
374 non-UKHSA authors.

### 375 **Authors' contributions**

376 Conceptualization: WSH, SF, RNT; Literature search: WSH, RNT; Data collection and  
377 curation: EM, NJA, PW; Formal analysis: WSH; Investigation: WSH; Methodology: WSH,  
378 SF, RNT; Project administration: SF, RNT; Software: WSH; Supervision: PKM, SF, RNT;  
379 Validation: WSH; Visualization: WSH; Writing – original draft: WSH, RNT; Writing –  
380 review & editing: all authors.

### 381 **Declaration of interests**

382 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.