

1 An Early SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Outbreak in a Dormitory in Saint-  
2 Petersburg, Russia

3 **Running title**

4 An early SARS-CoV2 Omicron outbreak in a dormitory

5 **Keywords**

6 SARS-CoV2, Russia, founder effect, BA.1.1, superspreading, outbreak, public facility

7

8 Galya V. Klink<sup>1</sup>, Daria M. Danilenko<sup>2</sup>, Andrey B. Komissarov<sup>2</sup>, Nikita Yolshin<sup>2</sup>, Olga V.  
9 Shneider<sup>2,3</sup>, Sergey Shcherbak<sup>3</sup>, Elena Nabieva<sup>1</sup>, Nikita Shvyrev<sup>4</sup>, Nadezhda Konovalova<sup>2</sup>,  
10 Alyona Zheltukhina<sup>2</sup>, Artem Fadeev<sup>2</sup>, Kseniya Komissarova<sup>2</sup>, Andrey Ksenafontov<sup>2</sup>, Tamila  
11 Musaeva<sup>2</sup>, Veronica Eder<sup>2</sup>, Maria Pisareva<sup>2</sup>, Petr Nekrasov<sup>2</sup>, Vladimir Shchur<sup>4</sup>, Georgii A.  
12 Bazykin<sup>1,5\*</sup>, Dmitry Lioznov<sup>3,6</sup>

13

14 <sup>1</sup>A.A. Kharkevich Institute for Information Transmission Problems of the Russian Academy of  
15 Sciences, Moscow, Russia

16 <sup>2</sup>Smorodintsev Research Institute of Influenza, Saint Petersburg, Russia

17 <sup>3</sup>City Hospital #40, Saint Petersburg, Russia

18 <sup>4</sup>HSE University, Moscow, Russia

19 <sup>5</sup>Skolkovo Institute of Science and Technology (Skoltech), Moscow, Russia

20 <sup>6</sup>First Pavlov State Medical University, Saint Petersburg, Russia

21 \*e-mail: [g.bazykin@skoltech.ru](mailto:g.bazykin@skoltech.ru)

## 22 **Biographical Sketch**

23 Galya V. Klink, PhD, researcher, Institute for Information Transmission Problems of the Russian  
24 Academy of Sciences (Kharkevich Institute), Moscow. Primary research interests: molecular  
25 evolution, fitness landscapes, phylogenetics, molecular epidemiology.

## 26 **Address for Correspondence**

27 Georgii A. Bazykin, [yegor.bazykin@gmail.com](mailto:yegor.bazykin@gmail.com); Skolkovo Institute of Science and Technology,  
28 Skolkovo Innovation Center, Nobel st., Building 1, Moscow 121205, Russia; +7 (495) 280 14  
29 81

30

## 31 **Abstract**

32 **The Omicron variant of SARS-CoV-2 has rapidly spread globally in late 2021 - early 2022,**  
33 **displacing the previously prevalent Delta variant. Before December 16, 2021, community**  
34 **transmission had already been observed in tens of countries globally. However, in Russia,**  
35 **the majority of reported cases at that time had been sporadic and associated with travel.**  
36 **Here, we report an Omicron outbreak at a student dormitory in Saint Petersburg between**  
37 **December 16 - 29, 2021, which was the earliest known instance of large-scale community**  
38 **transmission in Russia. Out of the 465 sampled residents of the dormitory, 180 (38.7%)**  
39 **tested PCR positive. Among the 118 residents for whom the variant has been tested by**  
40 **whole-genome sequencing, 111 (94.1%) carried the Omicron variant. Among these 111**  
41 **residents, 60 (54.1%) were vaccinated or had reported previous COVID-19. Phylogenetic**  
42 **analysis confirmed that the outbreak was caused by a single introduction of the BA.1.1**  
43 **sublineage of Omicron. The dormitory-derived clade constituted a significant proportion of**  
44 **BA.1.1 samples in Saint-Petersburg and has spread to other regions of Russia and other**

45 **countries. The rapid spread of Omicron in a population with preexisting immunity to**  
46 **previous variants underlines its propensity for immune evasion.**

47

48

## 49 **Introduction**

50 The Omicron variant of SARS-CoV-2 was first reported in South Africa on November 24, 2021  
51 (1,2) and has been observed to rapidly spread globally soon thereafter. By mid-December, it  
52 outpaced the preceding diversity (mostly Delta) in many countries, including South Africa, the  
53 United Kingdom, Australia and Canada, and became the prevalent variant (3). While between  
54 May and December 2021, the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in Russia was dominated by the Delta  
55 variant, with one particular Delta lineage, AY.122, having over 90% prevalence (4), by the end  
56 of January 2022, Omicron became the dominant variant in Russia as well  
57 (<https://www.interfax.ru/russia/818539>). The details of its onset in Russia are poorly studied.  
58 Here, we report an outbreak of Omicron in a student dormitory in the early weeks of the  
59 Omicron wave in Russia.


60

61 Among the 19 full-genome Omicron samples obtained in Russia and deposited to GISAID by  
62 September 1st, 2022 with sampling dates between December 3–15, 12 were from people with  
63 known history of travel: 10 to the Republic of South Africa (all sampled on December 3 in  
64 Moscow), one to the Dominican Republic (sampled on December 13 in Saint Petersburg), and  
65 one to The Republic of the Congo (sampled on December 10 in Rostov-on-Don). Among the  
66 seven early genomic samples without known travel history, six were not associated with any  
67 other Russian sequences when placed on the UShER phylogenetic tree using on-line UShER tool

68 (5), i.e., represented Russian singletons (6); the seventh sequence was phylogenetically adjacent  
69 to the Rostov-on-Don sample with travel history to The Republic of the Congo. Therefore,  
70 community transmission of the Omicron variant, if present, was low-level on those dates. Three  
71 of the 19 samples belonged to the BA.1.1 lineage, including that from the traveler to The  
72 Republic of the Congo.

73

74



76

77 **Fig. 1.** The Russian samples obtained between December 3–30 and the Saint Petersburg  
78 dormitory outbreak on the global tree of BA.1.1. All GISAID samples from Russia are shown (in  
79 red), together with a random sample of 400 (out of 8396) GISAID Omicron samples obtained in  
80 other countries (gray). The clade A defined by the presence of the C5812T mutation is shown in  
81 blue. A zoom in of clade A including the outbreak samples (blue) is shown at the right, together  
82 with the descendant non-dormitory samples (red).

83

84

85 While the Delta epidemic continued in Saint Petersburg throughout late 2021, with an average of  
86 48.7 daily reported cases per 100K in November ([https://xn--80aesfpebagmfb1c0a.xn--](https://xn--80aesfpebagmfb1c0a.xn--p1ai/information/)  
87 [p1ai/information/](https://xn--80aesfpebagmfb1c0a.xn--p1ai/information/)), we started systematic screening for early Omicron detection using the  
88 Ins214EPE assay (7) on general population samples obtained from multiple hospitals and  
89 outpatient clinics. Between November 29 – December 15, we screened 200 to 1000 samples  
90 daily.

91

## 92 **Results**

93 On December 16, in the course of screening, we detected Omicron in a hospital sample from a  
94 patient without travel history. Follow-up contact tracing revealed that this sample came from a  
95 SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in a student dormitory in Saint Petersburg. Between December 17–29,  
96 we performed follow-up testing of dormitory residents. Out of the 465 residents, 180 (38.7%)  
97 tested positive for COVID-19 over these dates. For 137 samples, the Ins214EPE assay indicated  
98 that they were of the Omicron variant.

99

100 We performed whole-genome sequencing (WGS) for 118 samples with sufficiently low ct  
101 values. 111 of the 118 sequences (94.1%) were classified as Omicron on the basis of WGS. The  
102 remaining 7 sequences were classified as non-Omicron (Delta).

103

104 Phylogenetic distribution of samples indicates a single introduction into the dormitory

105

106 All seven Delta samples belonged to AY.122, the predominant lineage in Saint Petersburg. Four  
107 of them formed a compact clade (transmission lineage (6)), while the remaining three were  
108 phylogenetically distinct (singletons (6)). The fact that the Delta samples were scattered across  
109 the phylogeny of AY.122 is consistent with multiple distinct sources of non-Omicron infection,  
110 in line with a high prevalence of Delta at Saint Petersburg on those dates.

111

112 By contrast, all the 111 Omicron samples belonged to the BA.1.1 sublineage, and had a compact  
113 phylogenetic distribution within this sublineage (Fig. 1). This is consistent with a single  
114 introduction and subsequent spread within the dormitory or multiple infections from a single  
115 source.

116

117 The BA.1.1 sublineage is characterized by the S:R346K mutation. S:346 is an important  
118 immunogenic residue, and various mutations at it allow the virus to escape neutralization by  
119 multiple antibodies (8). This site was shown to experience positive selection within the BA.1  
120 sublineage of Omicron (9). However, the arginine-to-lysine change observed in BA.1.1 is  
121 chemically conservative, does not lead to a major shift in antibody recognition, and does not

122 confer a significant transmission advantage (10). Therefore, the fact that the dormitory outbreak  
123 has been caused by BA.1.1 rather than the ancestral BA.1 lineage is probably due to a founder  
124 effect. In any case, the extensive spread of a single Omicron sublineage but none of the three  
125 Delta sublineages is consistent with a higher transmission rate of Omicron compared to Delta in  
126 this setting.

127

128 All but five dormitory samples formed a single compact clade within BA.1.1, which we refer to  
129 as clade A. This clade was characterized by the C5812T synonymous mutation (nsp3:D1031D).  
130 Notably, the remaining five dormitory samples were positioned at the root of clade A, i.e.,  
131 carried all mutations of clade A except C5812T; however, even for these samples, position 5812  
132 was polymorphic, with derived variant T present at between 7-50% of sequencing reads,  
133 suggesting that the C5812T mutation arose in the dormitory at the beginning of the outbreak.

134

135 We characterized the introduction and transmission of the virus in the dormitory outbreak using a  
136 phylodynamics approach. For this, we applied the birth-death skyline model (11) of BEAST2  
137 (12) to the dormitory samples of Omicron. We considered three different fixed values of clock  
138 rate:  $0.75 \times 10^{-3}$ ,  $0.95 \times 10^{-3}$  and  $1.15 \times 10^{-3}$  (1,13). In each scenario, the effective reproductive  
139 number  $R_e$  was estimated for three time periods:  $R_1$  before the first sample was collected on  
140 December 16,  $R_2$  between December 16 and December 24, and  $R_3$  between December 24 and  
141 December 29 (the date of the last sample collected).


142

143 The most recent common ancestor of the dormitory outbreak is estimated to be on December 2  
144 with the 95% CI [Nov 23, Dec 9] for the lowest value of clock rate ( $0.75 \times 10^{-3}$ ), December 5



145 [Nov 28, Dec 11] for the intermediate value ( $0.95 \times 10^{-3}$ ), and December 7 [Dec 1, Dec 12] for the  
146 highest value of  $1.15 \times 10^{-3}$  (Fig. 2, Supplementary Table 1). Assuming a single introduction into  
147 the dormitory which is supported by the monophyly of the dormitory samples, this implies that  
148 the infection was introduced into the dormitory about two weeks prior to the collection of the  
149 first sample on December 16. The initial effective reproductive number  $R_1$  is high in all three  
150 scenarios: 3.90 with 95% CI of [2.22, 5.67], 4.59 [2.56, 6.96], or 5.23 [2.82, 8.00] for different  
151 clock rate values respectively. Later, it drops by a factor of approximately 2.5 consistently in all  
152 runs, with  $R_2$  being equal to 1.69 [1.00, 2.41], 1.83 [1.11, 2.58] and 1.97 [1.21, 2.74]  
153 respectively.  $R_3$  has a very wide credible interval which includes  $R_e=1$  and it is not informative  
154 about the phylodynamics between December 25 and December 29. This is explainable by the  
155 low number of samples from this time period.

156



157

158 **Fig. 2.** Skyline plots for the effective reproductive number  $R_e$  for different values of molecular  
159 clock rate.

160 **Supplementary Table 1.** Phylodynamic parameters for the dormitory outbreak inferred for three  
161 values of clock rate under birth-death skyline model.

162

163

164 The substantial fraction of infected individuals in the dormitory outbreak likely had some  
165 preexisting immunity to SARS-CoV-2. Among the 137 patients who tested positive for Omicron,  
166 71 (51.8%) reported previous infection or vaccination. This is in line with the high immune  
167 evasion properties of Omicron (14,15).

168

169 An elevated rate of within-room transmission

170

171 The dormitory occupied a single multistory building. Most dormitory rooms had a 4-bed layout,  
172 with up to 24 rooms per floor. For 104 of the 111 Omicron-positive residents, the floor and room  
173 were known. We asked how the risk of transmission was affected by living together in the same  
174 room or on the same floor with an infected individual. We reasoned that if the Omicron variant  
175 has been introduced into the dormitory just once, all differences between samples originated  
176 during within-dormitory transmission. Therefore, the samples separated by a direct transmission  
177 of the virus will be distinguished by fewer differences, compared to samples separated by a chain  
178 of more than one transmission through other individuals.

179

180 To test this, we calculated the mean pairwise phylogenetic distance  $m$  (which typically equaled  
181 the number of single-nucleotide differences) between samples from individuals residing in the  
182 same room or at the same floor, and compared it with the expected distance between samples  
183 from the same floor or from anywhere in the building. To obtain these expected values, we  
184 reshuffled across individuals the room labels while controlling or not controlling for the floor; or  
185 the floor labels.


186

187 We found that when two infected individuals resided in the same room, the phylogenetic  
188 distance between their SARS-CoV-2 samples was 1.8 times lower compared to an average pair  
189 of infected individuals residing on any floor (0.65 vs. 1.19, Fig. 3A), and 1.5 times lower  
190 compared to individuals residing on the same floor (0.65 vs. 0.99, Fig. 3B), and these differences  
191 were significant ( $p=0.0001$  and  $p=0.006$  respectively). Conversely, accommodation on the same  
192 floor irrespective of the room did not lower the phylogenetic distance between samples,  
193 compared to pairs of infected individuals from anywhere in the building (1.18 vs 1.18,  $p=0.491$ ,  
194 Fig. 3C). These results indicate that residing in the same room with an infected individual  
195 increased the risk of transmission from that individual, while living on the same floor but in a  
196 different room had no effect.

197

198

199



200

201

202 **Fig. 3.** The mean phylogenetic distance  $m$  between two samples from the same room (A, B) or  
203 floor (C) (red), compared to the expected distributions obtained by reshuffling of room labels  
204 independent of the floor (A), within the floor (B), or by reshuffling of floor labels (C) of  
205 samples.  $p$ , fraction of reshuffling trials with mean phylogenetic distance below  $m$ .

206

207

208 The role of dormitory outbreak in the Russian and global epidemic of Omicron

209


210 The BA.1.1 lineage comprised a considerable fraction of Russian samples in the beginning of  
211 2022 (Fig. 4A). The UShER tree of BA.1.1 contained 489 non-dormitory Russian samples  
212 obtained after December 16, 2021. Among them, 51 (10%; Wilson 95% CI = 8%-13%) belonged  
213 to clade A and carried all three of its characteristic mutations (Fig. 1, Supplementary Table 2).  
214 Among the dormitory samples of clade A, 47.2% (50/106) of which were basal, i.e. carried no  
215 extra changes on top of the characteristic C5812T mutation of clade A. By contrast, all 51 non-  
216 dormitory samples carried extra mutations, indicating that they were exported from the  
217 dormitory into the general population of Saint Petersburg and beyond. According to the  
218 phylogenetic tree, there were at least three such exports of clade A (Fig. 1). Clade A samples  
219 were most frequent in Saint Petersburg (comprising 18.6% of all Omicron samples in February  
220 2022) as well as the surrounding Leningrad Oblast (Figs 4B and 5), pointing to a considerable  
221 contribution of the dormitory outbreak to the Omicron wave here. Meanwhile, the role of the  
222 dormitory outbreak in the spread of Omicron in most other Russia's regions was negligible: for  
223 example, none of the 81 samples from Moscow belonged to clade A (Fig. 5).

224

225

226


227 A



228

229 B

230




231

232 **Fig. 4.** The fraction of clade A, BA.1.1 and Omicron samples among Russian (A) and Saint-  
233 Petersburg (B) samples from GISAID included in the UShER phylogenetic tree downloaded on  
234 May 26, 2022. Samples from the dormitory are not included.

235

236



237

238

239 **Fig. 5.** Clade A samples (orange) among all BA.1.1 samples in Russia's regions. Numbers on  
240 bars are the percentage of clade A samples in each region; 95% Wilson CIs are shown as bars.

241 Dormitory samples are not included.

242

243

244 **Supplementary Table 2.** The fraction of clade A samples among all Russian BA.1.1 samples  
245 obtained after 16th December 2021 that were present in the UShER tree downloaded on May 25,  
246 2022. \*95% Wilson CI

247  
248 Besides samples from Russia, clade A also carried 118 non-Russian samples from 20 countries  
249 (Supplementary Table 3). All of them were collected after December 16, 2021. The fraction of  
250 such samples among all BA.1.1 samples was low ( $\ll 1\%$ ) in all countries except Estonia where it  
251 reached 1.8%. Notably, the two countries with the highest fraction, Estonia (1.8%; Wilson 95%  
252 CI = 0.8%-3.9%) and Finland (0.5%; Wilson 95% CI = 0.3%-0.8%), are geographically close to  
253 Saint Petersburg and are frequent travel destinations for Saint Petersburg residents.

254  
255 **Supplementary Table 3.** The fraction of clade A samples among all non-russian BA.1.1  
256 samples obtained after December 16, 2021. Only countries with non-zero fraction are  
257 shown.\*95% Wilson CI

258

259

260

## 261 **Discussion**

262 In this work, we describe an outbreak of BA.1.1 in a student dormitory in Saint Petersburg at the  
263 beginning of the wave caused by Omicron. We show that the dormitory-derived variant spilled  
264 over into the general population of Saint Petersburg, representing a substantial fraction among  
265 the BA.1.1 samples here. Additionally, it spread to some other regions of Russia and to other  
266 countries. As clade A differs from the root of BA.1.1 in three nucleotide mutations, all of which

267 are synonymous, it is unlikely that it had a fitness difference, meaning that most likely it has  
268 spread due to chance. Transmission of SARS-CoV2 is highly non-uniform, providing an  
269 important role for superspreading events in the epidemic (16,17). Recently, using early Omicron  
270 transmission chains in Hong Kong, it was estimated that 80% of transmissions were generated by  
271 20% of cases, and the superspreading potential of Omicron was suggested to be higher than for  
272 the variants circulating in 2020 (18). In Russia, the whole Delta wave was mostly made by a  
273 single clade that has likely spread due to chance (4).

274

275 Hotels and dormitories provide a major potential for superspreading. For Omicron, it was shown  
276 that even in a quarantine hotel, the virus moved between neighboring rooms by circulating air  
277 (19). Nevertheless, in this study, we show that even in a student dormitory, where residents of  
278 different rooms are likely to actively communicate with each other, infection from roommates  
279 were more likely than from other residents of the same floor or the entire building. Therefore,  
280 living places with layouts carrying more beds per room may host more rapidly growing  
281 outbreaks than places with smaller rooms.

282

283 At the onset of Omicron in South Africa, its estimated per day growth advantage over Delta was  
284 estimated to be 0.24 (1). In agreement with this, while we detected four independent  
285 introductions of Delta in the dormitory simultaneously with the introduction of Omicron, neither  
286 of these four introductions led to an outbreak. The higher transmissibility of Omicron is thought  
287 to be mainly due to its immune evasion properties (14,15). In our study, near half of dormitory  
288 residents with Omicron variant were previously vaccinated or infected, illustrating its potential  
289 for spread in a population with preexisting partial immunity.



290

291 Notably, despite the high fraction of dormitory-derived clade A in Saint Petersburg and  
292 Leningrad Oblast, its prevalence in other regions of Russia was low (Fig. 5), pointing out that  
293 even close regions with a high passenger flow between them, such as Saint Petersburg and  
294 Moscow, have unique epidemiological histories of equally fit viral variants. This is of course  
295 conditional on similar fitness of these variants; a novel advantageous variant can rapidly spread  
296 across a country and the world, as repeatedly observed during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.

297

298

## 299 **Methods**

300 We performed whole-genome sequencing (WGS) using the SARS-CoV-2 ARTIC V4 protocol  
301 and the Oxford Nanopore gridION or Illumina NextSeq 2000 sequencing technology. Consensus  
302 genome assembly was performed by bwa-mem and bcftools, preceded by adapter and primer  
303 trimming by trimmomatic, ivar (Illumina) or BAMClipper (Oxford Nanopore) and custom  
304 scripts. An alternative allele was called if its read frequency exceeded 0.5 at a position.  
305 Positions with coverage below 10 (Illumina) or 20 (Oxford Nanopore) were masked as N.  
306

307 A few dormitory sequences assigned to the Omicron lineage had positions that were called as  
308 ancestral and/or Delta nucleotides. While these could be legitimate new mutations (including  
309 reversions), a close analysis of the NGS data hinted at the possibility that these could be artifacts  
310 of primer integration into reads (leading to the reference variant) or contamination (or  
311 coinfection) with the Delta variant. To be on the conservative side, we marked such positions as  
312 N in the dormitory sequences for the purposes of tree construction.

313

314 For phylogenetic analysis, we downloaded the UShER SARS-CoV2 phylogenetic tree on May  
315 26th, 2022 and extracted a subtree of 572,763 BA.1.1 samples available in GISAID. We  
316 removed all dormitory samples from the tree and added their improved consensus to this tree  
317 with the UShER tool (5) and visualized it with iTOL (20). The same was done with seven  
318 Russian samples of Delta and Delta subtree. Statistical analysis was performed with R (21).  
319 Wilson confidence intervals were calculated with Hmisc package (22), and plots were made  
320 using tidyverse (23) and ggsignif (24) packages for R.

### 321 **Acknowledgements**

322 We thank UShER team for providing currently updating phylogenetic tree of SARS-CoV2. We  
323 are grateful to all GISAID submitting and originating labs (Supplementary File 1) for rapid open  
324 release of SARS-CoV-2 sequencing data.

325 Samples acquisition and sequencing were supported by the Ministry of Health of Russian  
326 Federation as a research work of the state assignment #121110800170-8 (2022). Bioinformatic  
327 analysis was funded by the Russian Science Foundation (project no. 21-74-20160 to G.A.B.)

328

### 329 **References**

- 330 1. Viana R, Moyo S, Amoako DG, Tegally H, Scheepers C, Althaus CL, et al. Rapid epidemic  
331 expansion of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant in southern Africa. *Nature*. 2022  
332 Mar;603(7902):679–86.
- 333 2. World Health Organization. Classification of Omicron (B.1.1.529): SARS-CoV-2 Variant of  
334 Concern. 2021 Nov 26; Available from: [https://www.who.int/news/item/26-11-2021-](https://www.who.int/news/item/26-11-2021-classification-of-omicron-(b.1.1.529)-sars-cov-2-variant-of-concern)  
335 [classification-of-omicron-\(b.1.1.529\)-sars-cov-2-variant-of-concern](https://www.who.int/news/item/26-11-2021-classification-of-omicron-(b.1.1.529)-sars-cov-2-variant-of-concern)

- 336 3. Figgins MD, Bedford T. SARS-CoV-2 variant dynamics across US states show consistent  
337 differences in effective reproduction numbers [Internet]. *Epidemiology*; 2021 Dec [cited  
338 2022 Nov 20]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.12.09.21267544>
- 339 4. Klink GV, Safina KR, Nabieva E, Shvyrev N, Garushyants S, Alekseeva E, et al. The rise  
340 and spread of the SARS-CoV-2 AY.122 lineage in Russia. *Virus Evol.* 2022;8(1):veac017.
- 341 5. Turakhia Y, Thornlow B, Hinrichs AS, De Maio N, Gozashti L, Lanfear R, et al. Ultrafast  
342 Sample placement on Existing tRees (USHER) enables real-time phylogenetics for the  
343 SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. *Nat Genet.* 2021 Jun;53(6):809–16.
- 344 6. Komissarov AB, Safina KR, Garushyants SK, Fadeev AV, Sergeeva MV, Ivanova AA, et al.  
345 Genomic epidemiology of the early stages of the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in Russia. *Nat*  
346 *Commun.* 2021 Jan 28;12(1):649.
- 347 7. Yolshin N, Varchenko K, Komissarova K, Danilenko D, Komissarov A, Lioznov D. One-  
348 step RT-PCR Ins214EPE assay for Omicron (B.1.1.529) variant detection v1 [Internet]. 2021  
349 Dec [cited 2022 Nov 20]. Available from: [https://www.protocols.io/view/one-step-rt-pcr-  
350 ins214epe-assay-for-omicron-b-1-1-b2trqem6](https://www.protocols.io/view/one-step-rt-pcr-ins214epe-assay-for-omicron-b-1-1-b2trqem6)
- 351 8. Jian F, Yu Y, Song W, Yisimayi A, Yu L, Gao Y, et al. Further humoral immunity evasion  
352 of emerging SARS-CoV-2 BA.4 and BA.5 subvariants. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases.*  
353 2022 Nov;22(11):1535–7.
- 354 9. Martin DP, Lytras S, Lucaci AG, Maier W, Grüning B, Shank SD, et al. Selection Analysis  
355 Identifies Clusters of Unusual Mutational Changes in Omicron Lineage BA.1 That Likely

- 356 Impact Spike Function. Crandall K, editor. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*. 2022 Apr  
357 10;39(4):msac061.
- 358 10. Obermeyer F, Jankowiak M, Barkas N, Schaffner SF, Pyle JD, Yurkovetskiy L, et al.  
359 Analysis of 6.4 million SARS-CoV-2 genomes identifies mutations associated with fitness.  
360 *Science*. 2022 Jun 17;376(6599):1327–32.
- 361 11. Stadler T, Kühnert D, Bonhoeffer S, Drummond AJ. Birth-death skyline plot reveals  
362 temporal changes of epidemic spread in HIV and hepatitis C virus (HCV). *Proc Natl Acad  
363 Sci U S A*. 2013 Jan 2;110(1):228–33.
- 364 12. Bouckaert R, Vaughan TG, Barido-Sottani J, Duchêne S, Fourment M, Gavryushkina A, et  
365 al. BEAST 2.5: An advanced software platform for Bayesian evolutionary analysis. *PLoS  
366 Comput Biol*. 2019 Apr;15(4):e1006650.
- 367 13. du Plessis L, McCrone JT, Zarebski AE, Hill V, Ruis C, Gutierrez B, et al. Establishment  
368 and lineage dynamics of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in the UK. *Science*. 2021 Feb  
369 12;371(6530):708–12.
- 370 14. Chaguza C, Coppi A, Earnest R, Ferguson D, Kerantzas N, Warner F, et al. Rapid emergence  
371 of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant is associated with an infection advantage over Delta in  
372 vaccinated persons. *Med (N Y)*. 2022 May 13;3(5):325-334.e4.
- 373 15. Hu J, Peng P, Cao X, Wu K, Chen J, Wang K, et al. Increased immune escape of the new  
374 SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern Omicron. *Cell Mol Immunol*. 2022 Feb;19(2):293–5.

- 375 16. Chen PZ, Koopmans M, Fisman DN, Gu FX. Understanding why superspreading drives the  
376 COVID-19 pandemic but not the H1N1 pandemic. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2021 Sep;21(9):1203–  
377 4.
- 378 17. Lewis D. Superspreading drives the COVID pandemic - and could help to tame it. *Nature*.  
379 2021 Feb;590(7847):544–6.
- 380 18. Guo Z, Zhao S, Lee SS, Mok CKP, Wong NS, Wang J, et al. Superspreading potential of  
381 COVID-19 outbreak seeded by Omicron variants of SARS-CoV-2 in Hong Kong. *J Travel*  
382 *Med*. 2022 Sep 17;29(6):taac049.
- 383 19. Wong SC, Au AKW, Chen H, Yuen LLH, Li X, Lung DC, et al. Transmission of Omicron  
384 (B.1.1.529) - SARS-CoV-2 Variant of Concern in a designated quarantine hotel for travelers:  
385 a challenge of elimination strategy of COVID-19. *Lancet Reg Health West Pac*. 2022  
386 Jan;18:100360.
- 387 20. Letunic I, Bork P. Interactive Tree Of Life (iTOL) v5: an online tool for phylogenetic tree  
388 display and annotation. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2021 Jul 2;49(W1):W293–6.
- 389 21. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for  
390 Statistical Computing [Internet]. 2021; Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 391 22. Frank E, Harrell J. Hmisc: Harrell Miscellaneous. Available from: [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Hmisc)  
392 [project.org/package=Hmisc](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Hmisc)
- 393 23. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R, et al. Welcome to the  
394 Tidyverse. *JOSS*. 2019 Nov 21;4(43):1686.

395 24. Ahlmann-Eltze C, Patil I. ggsignif: R Package for Displaying Significance Brackets for

396 “ggplot2” [Internet]. PsyArXiv; 2021 Mar [cited 2022 Nov 20]. Available from:

397 <https://osf.io/7awm6>

398