

1 Results

2 Analytical Solution for the Posterior Distribution of τ_s and τ_l

3 We specified a Bernoulli likelihood and a beta-distributed prior on τ_s and τ_l . Therefore, the
4 posterior distributions of τ_s and τ_l satisfy a conjugate-prior relationship and can be solved
5 analytically as beta distributions.

6 The prior distribution for τ_s is a beta distribution with hyperparameters $\alpha_s = 12$ and $\beta_s =$
7 3, and the prior distribution for τ_l is a beta distribution with hyperparameters $\alpha_l = 3$ and $\beta_l = 12$.
8 Following the conjugate-prior relationship, the posterior distribution for τ_s is calculated as a beta
9 distribution with hyperparameters,

10

$$11 \quad \hat{\alpha}_s = \alpha_s + \sum_{n_{founders}} \mathbb{I}(report\ travel) \quad (S1)$$

12

$$13 \quad \hat{\beta}_s = \beta_s + \left(n_{founders} - \sum_{n_{founders}} \mathbb{I}(report\ travel) \right). \quad (S2)$$

14

15 The summation in eq. (S1) is the number of cases that reported travel and are inferred by the
16 algorithm to be imported cases. Similarly, the second term in eq. (S2) is the number of cases
17 inferred by the algorithm to be imported cases that did not report travel. The posterior
18 distribution for τ_l is similarly described by a beta distribution with hyperparameters,

19

$$20 \quad \hat{\alpha}_l = \alpha_l + \sum_{n_{local}} \mathbb{I}(report\ travel) \quad (S3)$$

21

$$\hat{\beta}_l = \beta_l + \left(n_{local} - \sum_{n_{local}} \mathbb{I}(report\ travel) \right). \quad (S4)$$

23

24 In eq. (S3), the summation is the number of cases that reported travel and were inferred by the
25 algorithm to be locally acquired. Similarly, the second term in eq. (S4) is the number of cases
26 inferred by the algorithm to be locally acquired that did not report travel.

27

28 We then compared the prior distributions, the posterior distributions obtained from the
29 MC3 sampling algorithm, and the posterior distribution obtained using the analytical solutions in
30 eqs. (S1-S4) for τ_s and τ_l inferred from the Eswatini surveillance data. Because each case had a
31 posterior probability of being imported or locally acquired but eqs. (S1-S4) required a binary
32 classification, we classified a case as imported if the posterior probability of being imported
33 exceeded 0.25. This threshold was arbitrarily defined, but the purpose of this exercise is purely
34 illustrative.

35

36 Under both inference settings in which the accuracy of the travel histories was inferred,
37 we observed good agreement between the analytical and numerical posterior distributions for τ_s
38 and τ_l . Whether or not the posterior distribution deviated from the prior distribution depended
39 upon the number of cases that were classified as imported or locally acquired. When there are
40 more cases classified as imported, the strength of the data predominated in eqs. (S1-S2), and the
41 posterior distribution of τ_s deviated from the prior distribution. By contrast, when most cases are
42 locally acquired, the posterior distribution of τ_s resembled the prior distribution. This is
43 consistent with the posterior distributions that we observed when we used spatial and temporal
44 data and estimated the accuracy of the travel history versus when we used temporal data and

43 estimated the accuracy of the travel history. Using the former, we estimated 5.2% of the cases as
44 imported, which was sufficient to shift the posterior distribution of τ_s away from the prior
45 distribution (S5 Fig). Using the latter, we only estimated 0.13% of cases as imported. This small
46 number of imported cases implied that the posterior distribution of τ_s resembled the prior
47 distribution (S6 Fig).

48

49 **S5 Fig. Comparison of the prior and posteriors of τ_s and τ_l from the Eswatini surveillance**
50 **data using spatial and temporal data and estimating the accuracy of the travel history.** The
51 prior (gray shape), the analytical posterior distribution (black line), and the numerical posterior
52 distribution from MC3 (green histogram) are plotted for τ_s and τ_l .

53

54 **S6 Fig. Comparison of the prior and posteriors of τ_s and τ_l from the Eswatini surveillance**
55 **data using temporal data and estimating the accuracy of the travel history.** The prior (gray
56 shape), the analytical posterior distribution (black line), and the numerical posterior distribution
57 from MC3 (pink histogram) are plotted for τ_s and τ_l .

58

59 The derivation of the analytical solution of τ_s explains our inability to correctly estimate this
60 parameter from simulated data (Fig 5B). Using the spatial and temporal data and estimating the
61 accuracy of the travel history, the true value of τ_s was 0.61, and 5.2% of all cases in the
62 simulated data set were imported. However, applying the MC3 algorithm to this simulated data
63 set, we inferred only ~1% of all cases to be imported. Consequently, we do not estimate a
64 sufficient number of imported cases to shift the posterior distribution of τ_s away from the prior
65 distribution and correctly estimate this parameter (S7 Fig).

66

67 **S7 Fig. Comparison of the prior and posteriors of τ_s from simulated data using spatial and**

68 **temporal data and estimating the accuracy of the travel history.** The prior (gray shape), the

69 analytical posterior distribution (black line), and the numerical posterior distribution from MC3

70 (green histogram) are plotted for τ_s .