Cov2clusters: genomic clustering of SARS-CoV-2 sequences

Benjamin Sobkowiak[1], Kimia Kamelian[2], James E. A. Zlosnik[3], John Tyson[3], Anders Gonçalves da Silva[4], Linda M. N. Hoang[3,5], Natalie Prystajecky[3,5], Caroline Colijn[1].

1. Department of Mathematics, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada

2. Public Health Agency of Canada, National Microbiology Laboratory, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

3. BC Centre for Disease Control Public Health Laboratory, BC Centre for Disease Control, Vancouver, Canada

4. Microbiological Diagnostic Unit Public Health Laboratory, Department of Microbiology and Immunology, The University of Melbourne, Australia.

5. Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of British Columbia

Corresponding author: benjamin_sobkowiak@sfu.ca

Keywords: public health, whole genome sequencing, SARS-CoV-2

Abstract

Background: The COVID-19 pandemic remains a global public health concern. Advances in rapid sequencing has led to an unprecedented level of SARS-CoV-2 whole genome sequence (WGS) data and sharing of sequences through global repositories that has enabled almost real-time genomic analysis of the pathogen. WGS data has been used previously to group genetically similar viral pathogens to reveal evidence of transmission, including methods that identify distinct clusters on a phylogenetic tree. Identifying clusters of linked cases can aid in the regional surveillance and management of the disease. In this study, we present a novel method for producing stable genomic clusters of SARS-CoV-2 cases, cov2clusters, and compare the sensitivity and stability of our approach to previous methods used for phylogenetic clustering using real-world SARS-CoV-2 sequence data obtained from British Columbia, Canada,

Results: We found that cov2clusters produced more stable clusters than previously used phylogenetic clustering methods when adding sequence data through time, mimicking an increase in sequence data through the pandemic. Our method also showed high sensitivity when compared to epidemiologically informed clusters. These clusters often contained a high number of cases that were identical or near identical genetically.

Conclusions: This new approach presented here allows for the identification of stable clusters of SARS-CoV-2 from WGS data. Producing high-resolution SARS-CoV-2 clusters from sequence data alone can a challenge and, where possible, both genomic and epidemiological data should be used in combination.

Background

The COVID-19 pandemic has had worldwide economic, social and health impacts unlike any infectious disease in recent history. First identified as an unknown cause of pneumonia in patients from Wuhan, China in late 2019, the aetiological agent was quickly determined to be a novel *Betacoronavirus*, subsequently named severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) [1–3]. Extensive global person-to-person transmission followed and on March 11, 2020 [4], the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a pandemic, with cases since reported in almost every country in the world. As of 10th March 2022, there have been over 450 million cases and 6 million deaths associated with the disease worldwide [5].

The development of effective vaccines and regional containment strategies have allowed countries to mitigate the spread of SARS-CoV-2 and thereby reduce transmission, hospitalization, and death rates from COVID-19. Nevertheless, the threat posed by the disease is still a worldwide concern due to the emergence of Variants of Concern (VoCs) such as the Delta and Omicron variants that display increased transmissibility with lower vaccine effectiveness [6,7], delayed global vaccination deployment, vaccine hesitancy, and unequal access to vaccines and therapeutics.

We have seen an unparalleled effort in whole genome sequencing (WGS) of COVID-19 to identify new variants and mutations of concern. To date, there are over 9 million sequences publicly available through the open-source GISAID initiative [8]. Utilising these data to develop novel and easy-to-implement tools to detect growing or emerging

transmission clusters can help control the spread of the virus locally. We can use genomic similarity to identify linked cases with shared demography or geography at a higher resolution than a shared lineage assignment or simply via contact tracing. Inspecting clusters can reveal sources of common exposures or patterns of transmission through a population, which can be used to understand regional epidemiology and inform public health policy, such as implementing restrictions in certain settings with a high transmission risk. Practically, we have also seen that the SARS-CoV-2 lineage nomenclature, such as the widely used Pangolin system [9] has been dynamic through the pandemic and cannot provide sufficient resolution for epidemiological investigations. Thus, clustering sequences by genomic similarity provides the resolution and stability necessary for public health applications over the course of a dynamic pandemic.

Phylogenetic trees are an effective tool for summarizing evolutionary relationships among taxa, and tree reconstruction methods can be used to achieve realistic measures of genetic divergence. The information contained within a phylogeny can be used to define groups of closely related sequences that may indicate recent transmission between cases, either through identifying distinct clades on a tree or by using the pairwise patristic distance as a measure of divergence between tips. Phylogenetic clustering methods have been applied in many virological analyses [10–12], as well as early in the COVID-19 pandemic to define putative transmission clusters in SARS-CoV-2 [13–15]. However, clustering based solely on genetic variation may not be sufficient to effectively identify meaningful clusters in SARS-CoV-2 where there has

been rapid spread of the virus with relatively low genetic diversity [16–18], as well as periods of lineage replacement with new VoCs also reducing regional genetic diversity in the virus [19]. Additionally, comprehensive sampling of ongoing transmission within a population can result in multiple clusters that are linked genetically through ancestral samples. Defining clusters using a fixed genetic distance threshold may cause sequences to change cluster designation through time as more sequences are collected.

Here, we present a novel method for constructing SARS-CoV-2 genomic clusters, using the pairwise probability of clustering under a logit regression model, and linking cases under a given probability threshold. The logit model incorporates genetic relatedness through phylogenetic distance and collection or symptom onset date; this method also allows for the inclusion of other covariates of interest that may result in meaningful clusters (e.g., contact data, exposure events). In contrast to previous clustering approaches that often rely solely on phylogenetic inference (tree cluster reference), clustering isolates in this pairwise manner allows for greater cluster stability through time, as well as resolution by including epidemiological information without the need for time-consuming manual investigation. Previous clustering designation of sequences can also be specified *a priori* to further improve cluster stability. This also allows clustering to be performed on subsampled datasets where previously clustered sequences have been removed for ease of analysis. We provide this method as an R package, github.com/bensobkowiak/cov2clusters, for use within the research and public health community to investigate SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics.

Results

Sample description

Whole genome sequence data was obtained for 36,420 SARS-CoV-2 samples collected between 15th March 2020 and 13th August 2021 in BC, Canada. These data encompass sequences collected during the first, second and third 'waves' of the pandemic in the province, predominantly comprising the SARS-CoV-2 sub-lineages B.1.2 and B.1.438.1 (wave 2) initially before replacement with B.1.1.7 (Alpha) and P.1 (Gamma) (wave 3), which led to a rapid increase in cases (**Figure 1A)**. The data also includes the beginning of a rise in cases in June 2021 that would eventually lead to the fourth 'wave' in BC, largely driven by the Delta SARS-CoV-2 variant sub-lineages B.1.617.2 and AY.25 (more recently denoted as AY.25.1), with the number of cases caused by this variant increasing in early May 2021 before becoming the principal variants in BC by August 2021 (**Figure 1B**). Levels of genetic diversity within the SARS-CoV-2 samples collected fluctuated over the study period, with very low diversity in the population observed during the periods of high B.1.1.7 (Alpha) and P.1 (Gamma) case numbers, and with the introduction of the Delta variants (**Supplementary figure S1).**

Cluster results in BC SARS-CoV-2 data

Genomic clustering with cov2clusters (using the pairwise probability thresholds of 0.7 and 0.8) and TreeCluster 'single_linkage' found fewer, larger clusters than both cov2clusters at the 0.9 threshold and TreeCluster 'max_clade'. This occurs both in the pre-Delta dominance and Delta wave data. cov2clusters at the 0.9 probability threshold

found many small clusters and a high number of sequences assigned as non-clustered, indicating this threshold may over-cluster the data. **Figure 2** shows the phylogenetic trees produced by the pre-Delta dominance and Delta waves and the resulting cluster assignments, with the largest five clusters found by each approach shown in colours, all sequences clustered in smaller clusters in grey, and non-clustered sequences in white. The largest clusters found using cov2clusters at the 0.7 and 0.8 probability thresholds were of similar size, though the number of clusters at the 0.7 probability threshold was significantly lower, with most sequences of the same sub-lineage assigned to a single, large cluster.

Sensitivity of clustering methods with epidemiologically informed clusters

The sensitivity of the logit clustering tool, cov2clusters, for assigning sequences into seven epidemiologically well-defined clusters was tested using two pairwise probability thresholds (0.8, 0.9). These results were also compared to the sensitivity of TreeCluster using both the maximum clade distance threshold approach and the maximum pairwise linkage threshold approach (**Table 1**). We found that cov2clusters with a pairwise probability threshold of 0.8 assigned the highest number of sequences to epidemiologically informed clusters (92%), performing marginally better than TreeCluster ‘single_linkage’ method (87%) and significantly better than TreeCluster ‘max_clade’ (66%) and cov2clusters at the 0.9 probability threshold (71%). We also tested cov2clusters with a probability threshold of 0.7, though at this threshold very large lineage-specific clusters were formed, which did not add any meaningful resolution to transmission clusters compared to simply using lineage classification.

Cluster stability through time

The stability of the genomic clusters through time was assessed by running each method on the Delta wave data collected up to 11th June 2021, and then re-running the clustering, adding sequences collected each subsequent week until the end of the study period. Stability measures tested were 1) the proportion of sequences that moved from a cluster in the preceding week to non-clustered in the current week, 2) the number of clusters defined in the previous week that split in the current week (i.e., any instance where sequences that were in a single cluster in the previous week have moved to different clusters in the current week), and 3) the overall entropy score of the clusters found in the current week (with the lowest score of 0 occurring when all sequences are in a single cluster).

We found that the TreeCluster 'max_clade' method resulted in the highest proportion of sequences moving from clusters to become non-clustered in subsequent weeks (highest on 23rd July 2021 with 1.14% of sequences), with TreeCluster 'single_linkage' also resulting in low numbers of sequences moving from clustered to non-clustered (**Figure 3).** All cov2clusters methods did not result in any sequences moving from clustered to non-clustered. The number of cluster splits was also highest with TreeCluster 'max_clade', with 54 clusters splitting in the week ending 13th August 2021, followed by TreeCluster 'single_linkage'. Cluster entropy was observed at its lowest in cov2clusters at the 0.7 threshold through every week of the tested period, followed by cov2clusters at the 0.8 threshold. cov2clusters at a 0.9 threshold and TreeCluster

‘max_clade’ scored the highest entropy, reflecting the more even distribution of the data into smaller clusters, though as shown, this can be at the cost of over-clustering.

Discussion

In this study, we have presented a new method for genomic clustering of SARS-CoV-2 using pairwise probabilities of shared cluster membership derived from a logit regression model based on sequence divergence and sample collection dates. This method can readily incorporate epidemiological data, such as geography, contact or shared exposure, to add further resolution to clustering. We tested our approach using three pairwise probability thresholds for linking sequences to form clusters and found that at probability threshold of 0.8 formed the most stable clusters in our clinical data from samples collected in BC, Canada. Comparing our method to other phylogenetic clustering tools, we found the sensitivity of cov2clusters at a 0.8 probability threshold was higher than both TreeCluster ‘max_clade’ and ‘single_linkage’, and that the clusters produced were more stable as cases are added through time, owing to our approach incorporating past designations in time into the clustering pipeline. This result has particular significance for the utility of this method in real-time public health surveillance, where sequencing datasets grow over time, and stability in cluster designations is beneficial for reporting and surveillance. We have implemented our approach as a freely available R package.

We used patristic distance from phylogenetic trees as the measure for genetic divergence in our method to utilize the full information available in the sequence

162 alignment, compared to genetic distance measures that, while correlated with patristic
163 distance, may underestimate pairwise divergence [20]. Phylogenetic uncertainty in SARS-
164 CoV-2 trees, where many terminal branches are supported by low numbers of
165 mutations, has been explored previously [21]. It was shown that variation in tree topology,
166 which in turn will alter pairwise distances between tips, was driven by the sample set of
167 sequences used to construct the tree that changes through time. While this will impact
168 the stability of any method that uses patristic distance to inform clustering, we have
169 shown that our approach reduces this instability in genomic clustering.
170
171 Large clusters of genetically similar sequences were common in our dataset. Indeed,
172 given the high number of COVID-19 infections and relatively low genetic diversity of
173 SARS-CoV-2 in the province, it is expected that in settings with even moderate levels of
174 sequencing, we are likely to capture sequences separated by few mutations. Therefore,
175 large clusters will occur, with many identical or near-identical sequences and with
176 'chaining' of closely related sequences. In other words, with dense sampling of ongoing
177 person-to-person transmission, and over a short timeframe, there may be a lack of well-
178 separated clusters in datasets for any clustering method to uncover. This contrasts with
179 some other viruses, such as HIV, that will produce structured phylogenies from which
180 discrete clusters can be identified [20]. This in part due to HIV's chronic nature (leaving
181 longer time intervals between infections with a higher potential for intra-host genetic
182 diversity and viral populations), as well as the fact that, in HIV, relatively small clusters
183 are seeded by introductions from other jurisdictions. Here, when a large fraction of
184 infections is sequenced, the time between infections is short, and considerable

transmission is occurring within the sampling jurisdiction. Therefore, using only genomic divergence derived from a given phylogeny is unlikely to identify well-separated SARS-CoV-2 transmission clusters. Additional epidemiological data can be used to refine large clusters found using our genomic clustering approach. For example, including information such as common exposures and contact tracing data may divide large clusters into operational units with public health relevance. One limitation of our study is that we do not have exposure, contact or location information to explore this application.

Sequences belonging to a P.1 sublineage (P.1.14) form a single, large cluster (illustrated as the red cluster in the delta wave dataset in **Figure 2**), coinciding with a high number of low-diversity P.1 cases present in BC from April 2021 onwards [22], where almost all P.1 samples were within 0-1 SNPs of another P.1 sequence. This phenomenon is also expected with the recent Omicron variant, where rapid spread has led to high numbers of low diversity cases [23]. Increasing the probability threshold to 0.9 (or conducting phylogenetic clustering with a smaller maximum clade divergence threshold) breaks up the cluster into smaller groups of identical or near-identical sequences, but this does not reflect genuine underlying clustering (**Supplementary figure S2**). In such circumstances, we recommend including additional metadata to refine clusters into genetically related groups with shared demography and epidemiology. Alternatively, our approach could be used as a surveillance tool focusing on a particular individuals or settings of interest, identifying sequences that are linked to the focal individuals or exposure sites, moving outwards to a desired number of “rings”.

208 While COVID-19 remains at pandemic levels with high case numbers in many regions
209 globally, it is anticipated that there will be a shift to endemicity characterized by
210 persistent, lower levels of the disease interspersed with seasonal or occasional
211 outbreaks [24]. In that context, it is likely that the viral population will have smaller and
212 better-separated clusters. We suggest that the method presented here for clustering
213 can be effectively utilized in both contexts.
214

215 **Conclusions**

216 Identifying meaningful, high-resolution clusters from SARS-CoV-2 genomic sequence
217 data alone can be a challenge due to relatively low genetic diversity and high rates of
218 localised transmission. Nevertheless, WGS data can be a useful tool when combined
219 with epidemiological and demographic data to better characterise groups of individuals
220 with shared transmission histories. Here we present a simple method for producing
221 highly stable genomic clusters of SARS-CoV-2 that incorporates genomic and
222 epidemiological data to link cases for use in public health surveillance.
223

224 **Methods**

225 ***Sequence data and phylogenetic analysis***

226 Positive SARS-CoV-2 samples collected in British Columbia (BC), Canada, between
227 18th March 2020 and 13th August 2021 underwent whole-genome sequencing at the
228 BCCDC Public Health Laboratory. Sequencing sampling strategy changed over the
229 course of the pandemic and sequencing capacity, which included random sampling
230 (ranging from 5-100% of cases) and targeted sampling (outbreaks and targeted

populations such as travellers) [25]. Sequence data used in this study have been deposited in the GISAID database [8].

Nucleic acids were extracted using the MagMAX instrument from Thermofisher (AM1836) and amplified using the Freed primer scheme (1200 base pair amplicons) detailed here [26]. Consensus sequence production occurred using the Connor Laboratory pipeline (https://github.com/connor-lab/ncov2019-artic-nf) with consensus bases called at a frequency of 0.75 with a subsampling read count strategy. Consensus sequences were aligned and trimmed to Wuhan-Hu-1 reference sequence (Accession MN908947, Version MN908947.3) using the MAFFT program prior to tree generation. A specific fork has been produced to outline the modifications designed to support the SARS-CoV-2 sequencing efforts at the BCCDC Public Health Laboratory, available here: https://github.com/BCCDC-PHL/ncov2019-artic-nf. Sequences with no collection date or excess ambiguities (> 15% missing calls) were removed from the analysis.

Phylogenetic analyses

A multiple sequence alignment of the full SARS-CoV-2 genome was used to construct maximum-likelihood (M-L) phylogenetic trees with IQ-TREE [27]. One sequence per individual was included for analysis, with the earliest sequence chosen where longitudinal samples were taken from the same disease episode. Optimal nucleotide substitution models for the data were chosen using ModelFinder in IQ-TREE [28] and applied to each tree construction pipeline. For comparison to the proposed clustering approach, phylogenetic clustering was performed using TreeCluster [29] using two

254 thresholds, 1) a maximum divergence threshold within clusters of 4×10^{-4}

255 substitutions/genome, and 2) a maximum pairwise divergence threshold (among pairs in

256 a cluster) of 5×10^{-5} substitutions/genome.

257

258 ***Genomic clustering methodology***

259 Genomic clusters were defined as networks of connected sequences (nodes) where the

260 pairwise probability of clustering was above a given threshold. The probability of

261 clustering between two sequences was calculated using the logit model:

262

$$P = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-z}}$$

$$z = \beta_0 + \beta_d \chi_d + \beta_t \chi_t \dots \beta_n \chi_n$$

263

264 Coefficients (β) can be either manually chosen or estimated using the logistic regression

265 on data with known clusters. *d* is the pairwise genetic divergence, calculated between

266 all pairs of isolates by extracting patristic distances (the sum of branch lengths

267 connecting two tips) on the phylogenetic tree of up to 40,000 sequences, in units of

268 substitutions/genome. *t* is a measure of difference in time between sequences, either

269 the date of collection or symptom onset, and can be extracted from the associated

270 metadata or inferred from a timed phylogeny. Additional covariates (*n*), such as contact

271 data between hosts or shared exposure events, can be included to further resolve

272 clusters. Pairwise transmission probabilities calculated in previous clustering runs can

be included in new analysis to allow for greater continuity in cluster designations, as well as permitting subsequent clustering runs to be run on subsampled datasets to increase speed and efficiency when clustering large numbers of sequences. The full R code is available in the supplementary materials and available at github.com/bensobkowiak/cov2clusters.

We compared the results of our genomic clustering method at three pairwise probability thresholds of 0.7, 0.8 and 0.9 to link sequences to the clusters obtained using TreeCluster 'max_clade' (where the maximum pairwise patristic distance threshold between any two sequences in a cluster was 4×10^4 substitutions per sequence site) and 'single_linkage' (where any two sequences up to a maximum patristic distance threshold of 5×10^5 substitutions per sequence site must be in the same cluster). The data were separated into two large datasets, defined as pre-Delta dominance wave (N = 19,617), which included all sequences collected before 6th May 2021, and Delta wave (N = 17,297), which included all sequences after this date, as well as 500 randomly selected sequences collected before this date as a representative skeleton tree of past diversity. Beta coefficients fo r the genomic clustering algorithm of $\beta_0 = 3$, $\beta_1 = -1.9736 \times 10^{-4}$, and $\beta_2 = 7.5 \times 10^{-2}$ were manually chosen, which corresponds to a pairwise probability of 0.95 between sequences with the same genomic sequence and collected date, with a decrease in pairwise probability as the patristic distance and/or collection date difference increases. **Supplementary figure S3** provides the results of the pairwise probabilities using logistic regression with these beta coefficients with variable

295 patristic distance (converted to SNP distance by multiplying by the genome length) and
296 difference in collection dates between sequences.
297
298 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**
299 The study was approved by the University of British Columbia Ethics Board (#H20-
300 02285).
301
302 **Consent for publication**
303 Not applicable.
304
305 **Availability of data and materials**
306 Whole genome sequence data included in this study are deposited in the GISAID
307 repository https://www.gisaid.org. The cov2clusters code is available at:
308 https://github.com/bensobkowiak/cov2clusters.
309
310 **Competing interests**
311 The authors declare they have no competing interests.
312
313 **Funding**
314 This work was supported by funding from Michael Smith Foundation for Health
315 Research and he Federal Government of Canada's Canada 150 Research Chair
316 program. This work was supported by the Canadian Covid genomics network
317 (CanCoGen).

Authors' contributions

BS, CC, and NP conceived the project. BS and CC developed the methodology, with support from KK, JEAZ, AGdS and NP. Data were provided by KK, JT, LMNH and NP. BS performed the analysis. BS and CC wrote the first version of the manuscript, and KK, JEAZ, LMNH, and NP provided revisions for the final manuscript. All authors have read and approve of the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the work of the Public Health Laboratory at the British Columbia Centre for Disease Control (BCCDC), for providing the SARS-CoV-2 isolates used in this study

References

1. Lu, R. *et al.* Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor binding. *Lancet* **395**, 565–574 (2020).
2. Zhu, N. *et al.* A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **382**, 727–733 (2020).
3. Zhou, P. *et al.* A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature* **579**, 270–273 (2020).
4. World Health Organization. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020. (2020). Available at:

341 https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-
342 opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020.
343 5. Dong, E., Du, H. & Gardner, L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track
344 COVID-19 in real time. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **20**, 533–534 (2020).
345 6. Bruxvoort, K. J. *et al.* Effectiveness of mRNA-1273 against delta, mu, and other
346 emerging variants of SARS-CoV-2: test negative case-control study. *Bmj* e068848
347 (2021). doi:10.1136/bmj-2021-068848
348 7. Collie, S., Champion, J., Moultrie, H., Bekker, L.-G. & Gray, G. Effectiveness of
349 BNT162b2 Vaccine against Omicron Variant in South Africa. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **325**,
350 2728–2731 (2021).
351 8. Shu, Y. & McCauley, J. GISAID: Global initiative on sharing all influenza data –
352 from vision to reality. *Eurosurveillance* **22**, 2–4 (2017).
353 9. O'Toole, Á. *et al.* Assignment of epidemiological lineages in an emerging
354 pandemic using the pangolin tool. *Virus Evol.* **7**, 1–9 (2021).
355 10. Müller, N. F. *et al.* Characterising the epidemic spread of influenza A/H3N2 within
356 a city through phylogenetics. *PLoS Pathog.* **16**, 1–18 (2020).
357 11. Ragonnet-Cronin, M. *et al.* Automated analysis of phylogenetic clusters. *BMC*
358 *Bioinformatics* **14**, (2013).
359 12. Sivay, M. V. *et al.* Characterization of HIV-1 Epidemic in Kyrgyzstan. *Front.*
360 *Microbiol.* **12**, 1–10 (2021).
361 13. Seemann, T. *et al.* Tracking the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia using genomics.
362 *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 1–9 (2020).
363 14. Kant, R. *et al.* Incidence Trends for SARS-CoV-2 Alpha and Beta Variants,

364 Finland, Spring 2021. *Emerg. Infect. Dis. J.* **27**, (2021).

365 15. Banu, S. *et al.* A Distinct Phylogenetic Cluster of Indian Severe Acute Respiratory
366 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Isolates. *Open Forum Infect. Dis.* **7**, 1–8 (2020).

367 16. Rausch, J. W., Capoferri, A. A., Katusiime, M. G., Patro, S. C. & Kearney, M. F.
368 Low genetic diversitymay be an Achilles heel of SARS-CoV-2. *Proc. Natl. Acad.*
369 *Sci. U. S. A.* **117**, 24614–24616 (2020).

370 17. Flores-Alanis, A. *et al.* Molecular epidemiology surveillance of SARS-CoV-2:
371 Mutations and genetic diversity one year after emerging. *Pathogens* **10**, 1–14
372 (2021).

373 18. du Plessis, L. *et al.* Establishment and lineage dynamics of the SARS-CoV-2
374 epidemic in the UK. *Science (80-.).* **371**, 708–712 (2021).

375 19. Elliott, P. *et al.* Exponential growth, high prevalence of SARS-CoV-2, and vaccine
376 effectiveness associated with the Delta variant. *Science (80-.).* **9551**, (2021).

377 20. Poon, A. F. Y. Impacts and shortcomings of genetic clustering methods for
378 infectious disease outbreaks. *Virus Evol.* **2**, 1–9 (2016).

379 21. Turakhia, Y. *et al.* Stability of SARS-CoV-2 Phylogenies. *bioRxiv*
380 2020.06.08.141127 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.06.08.141127

381 22. Cecco, L. Canada ski resort linked to largest outbreak of P1 Covid variant outside
382 Brazil. *The Guardian* (2021). Available at:
383 https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/apr/11/canada-ski-resort-p1-covid-
384 variant-whistler.

385 23. Viana, R. *et al.* Rapid epidemic expansion of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant in
386 southern Africa. *Nature* (2022).

24. Telenti, A. *et al.* After the pandemic: perspectives on the future trajectory of COVID-19. *Nature* **596**, 495–504 (2021).

25. British Columbia Centre for Disease Control. Weekly update on Variants of Concern (VOC). **6**, 1–7 (2022).

26. Freed, N. E., Vlková, M., Faisal, M. B. & Silander, O. K. Rapid and inexpensive whole-genome sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 using 1200 bp tiled amplicons and Oxford Nanopore Rapid Barcoding. *Biol. Methods Protoc.* **5**, 1–7 (2021).

27. Minh, B. Q. *et al.* IQ-TREE 2: New Models and Efficient Methods for Phylogenetic Inference in the Genomic Era. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **37**, 1530–1534 (2020).

28. Kalyaanamoorthy, S., Minh, B. Q., Wong, T. K. F., Von Haeseler, A. & Jermiin, L. S. ModelFinder: Fast model selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. *Nat. Methods* **14**, 587–589 (2017).

29. Balaban, M., Moshiri, N., Mai, U., Jia, X. & Mirarab, S. TreeCluster: Clustering biological sequences using phylogenetic trees. *PLoS One* **14**, 1–20 (2019).

Figure 1. The cumulative number (A) and lineage proportion (B) of SARS-CoV-2 sequences per week included in the study, coloured by lineage. Major lineages present in the data are annotated.



Figure 2. Maximum-likelihood phylogenies and clustering assignments of the (A) pre-Delta dominance wave (N = 19,617) and (B) Delta wave (N = 17,297) sequences. Sequences in the largest five clusters found by each method are coloured, with those in the largest cluster in red, followed by green, blue, yellow and pink. All other clustered sequences are coloured grey, and non-clustered sequences are in white.



	Pre-Delta introduction (N = 19617)					Post-Delta introduction (N = 17297)				
Clustering method	cov2clusters 0.7	cov2clusters 0.8	cov2clusters 0.9	TreeCluster 'max'	TreeCluster 'linkage'	cov2clusters 0.7	cov2clusters 0.8	cov2clusters 0.9	TreeCluster 'max'	TreeCluster 'linkage'
No. clusters	567	756	1794	1060	962	453	591	1449	945	790
Max. cluster size	4638	4452	960	372	3105	4323	4250	1416	770	3619
No. non-clustered	757	1124	3486	2038	1450	671	927	2683	606	1161

Table 1. The sensitivity of cov2clusters at three pairwise probability thresholds (0.8 and 0.9) and TreeCluster ('max_clade' and 'single_linkage' methods) for placing sequences within seven epidemiologically well supported SARS-CoV-2 clusters in British Columbia, Canada.

Epidemiologically informed cluster	**cov2clusters 0.8**	**cov2clusters 0.9**	**TreeCluster 'max_clade'**	**TreeCluster 'single_linkage'**
Cluster A (B.1.1.7) (N = 5)	4/5 (80%)	4/5 (80%)	2/5 (50%)	4/5 (80%)
Cluster B (B.1.618) (N = 3)	3/3 (100%)	1/3 (33%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
Cluster C (P.1) (N = 16)	14/16 (88%)	7/16 (44%)	15/16 (94%)	14/16 (88%)
Cluster D (P.1) (N = 18)	18/18 (100%)	16/18 (89%)	2/18 (11%)	18/18 (100%)
Cluster E (P.1) (N = 14)	14/14 (100%)	14/14 (100%)	14/14 (100%)	14/14 (100%)
Cluster F (B.1.1.7) (N = 21)	17/21 (81%)	14/21 (67%)	16/21 (76%)	14/21 (67%)
Cluster G (P.1) (N = 6)	6/6 (100%)	3/6 (50%)	3/6 (50%)	5/6 (83%)
Overall	**76/83 (92%)**	**59/83 (71%)**	**55/83 (66%)**	**72/83 (87%)**

Figure 3. Cluster stability for each tested method assessed on SARS-CoV-2 sequences collected in British Columbia, Canada before 18th June 2021, adding sequences collected each week until 13th August 2021. (A) The proportion of sequences becoming non-clustered when clustered the week previously, (B) the number of cluster splits, and (C) the clustering entropy score.



Supplementary Figures

Figure S1. Median pairwise SNP distance between sequences collected in the study period by week of 2021.



Figure S2. The pairwise patristic distance between P.1 sequences in clusters identified by each clustering approach.



Figure S3. The pairwise probability of linking two sequences by SNP distance and difference in collection date using the selected beta coefficients used in this study (= 3, = -1.9736 x 10^{-4}, and = 7.5 x 10^{-2}). Patristic distance has been converted to SNP distance by multiplying SNP distance by the genome length for easier interpretation of pairwise sequence distance.