

1 **TITLE PAGE**

2 **Title:** The incubation period of COVID-19 – A rapid systematic review and meta-analysis of
3 observational research

4 **Authors**

5 Conor G. McAloon,¹ Áine B. Collins,² Kevin Hunt,³ Ann Barber,² Andrew W. Byrne,⁴ Francis Butler,³
6 Miriam Casey,² John Griffin,⁵ Elizabeth Lane,^{6,2} David McEvoy,⁷ Patrick Wall,⁷ Martin J. Green,⁸ Luke
7 O’Grady,^{1,8} Simon J. More²

8

9 ¹Section of Herd Health and Animal Husbandry, UCD School of Veterinary Medicine, University College
10 Dublin, Dublin D04 W6F6, Ireland

11 ²Centre for Veterinary Epidemiology and Risk Analysis, UCD School of Veterinary Medicine, University
12 College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin D04 W6F6, Ireland

13 ³Centre for Food Safety, UCD School of Biosystems and Food Engineering, University College Dublin,
14 Belfield, Dublin D04 W6F6, Ireland

15 ⁴One Health Scientific Support Unit, Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine (DAFM), Kildare
16 Street, Dublin 2, Ireland.

17 ⁵Woodside Lodge, Barberstown Road, Straffan, County Kildare, Ireland

18 ⁶Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine, Backweston Campus, Co. Kildare, W23 X3PH, Ireland

19 ⁷School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Sports Science, Woodview House University College
20 Dublin, Belfield, Dublin D04 W6F6, Ireland

21 ⁸School of Veterinary Medicine and Science, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

22 **Word Count: 3156**

23 **Key words: “COVID-19”; “Incubation period”; “Meta-analysis”**

24 **Correspondence to:** Conor McAloon; conor.mcaloon@ucd.ie, UCD School of Veterinary Medicine,
25 University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland, 01 716 6083

26

27 **ABSTRACT**

28 **Background:** Reliable estimates of the incubation period are important for decision making around the
29 control of infectious diseases. Knowledge of the incubation period distribution can be used directly to
30 inform decision-making or as inputs into mathematical models.

31 **Objectives:** The aim of this study was to conduct a rapid systematic review and meta-analysis of
32 estimates of the incubation periods of COVID-19.

33 **Design:** Rapid systematic review and meta-analysis of observational research

34 **Data sources:** Publications on the electronic databases PubMed, Google Scholar, MedRxiv and BioRxiv
35 were searched. The search was not limited to peer-reviewed published data, but also included pre-print
36 articles.

37 **Study appraisal and synthesis methods:** Studies were selected for meta-analysis if they reported either
38 the parameters and confidence intervals of the distributions fit to the data, or sufficient information to
39 facilitate calculation of those values. The majority of studies suitable for inclusion in the final analysis
40 modelled incubation period as a lognormal distribution. We conducted a random effects meta-analysis of
41 the parameters of this distribution.

42 **Results:** The incubation period distribution may be modelled with a lognormal distribution with pooled
43 mu and sigma parameters of 1.63 (1.51, 1.75) and 0.50 (0.45, 0.55) respectively. The corresponding mean

44 was 5.8 (5.01, 6.69 days). It should be noted that uncertainty increases towards the tail of the distribution:
45 the pooled parameter estimates resulted in a median incubation period of 5.1 (4.5, 5.8) days, whereas the
46 95th percentile was 11.6 (9.5, 14.2) days.

47 **Conclusions and implications:** The choice of which parameter values are adopted will depend on how
48 the information is used, the associated risks and the perceived consequences of decisions to be taken.
49 These recommendations will need to be revisited once further relevant information becomes available.
50 Finally, we present an RShiny app that facilitates updating these estimates as new data become available.

51 **Key words: “COVID-19”; “Incubation period”; “Meta-analysis”**

52

53 **ARTICLE SUMMARY**

54 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 55 • This study provides a pooled estimate of the distribution of incubation periods which may be used
56 in subsequent modelling studies or to inform decision-making
- 57 • This estimate will need to be revisited as subsequent data become available. We present an
58 RShiny app to allow the meta-analysis to be updated with new estimates

59

60 **INTRODUCTION**

61 Reliable estimates of the incubation period are important for decision making around the control of
62 infectious diseases in human populations. However, incubation periods are expected to vary across
63 individuals within the population. A single measure of central tendency (i.e. mean or median) does not
64 adequately represent this variation accurately.[1] Therefore, it is critically important to understand the
65 variation in incubation periods (i.e. the distribution) within the population.

66 Knowledge of the incubation period distribution can be used directly to inform decision-making around
67 infectious disease control. For example, the maximum incubation period can be used to inform the
68 duration of isolation, or active monitoring periods of people who have been at high risk of exposure.
69 Knowledge of the incubation period, coupled with estimates of the latent period, serial interval or
70 generation times, may help infer on the duration of the pre-symptomatic infectious period, which is
71 important in understanding both the transmission of infection and opportunities for control.[2] Finally,
72 decision making in the midst of a pandemic often rely on predicted events, such as daily number of new
73 infections, from mathematical models. Such models rely on key input parameters relevant to the
74 transmission of the specific infectious disease. It is important that input parameters into such models are
75 as robust as possible. Given that some models fit data to many parameters, only some of which are
76 specifically of interest but all of which are interdependent, output estimates may be compared to the
77 robust estimates as part of the validation of the model. However, to date, many COVID-19 models have
78 used input values from a single study. The decision on which study to use may vary from model to model.
79 Earlier work has shown that for models of respiratory infections, statements regarding incubation periods
80 are often poorly referenced, inconsistent, or based on limited data.[3]

81 We hypothesized that a pooled estimate of the distribution of incubation periods could be obtained
82 through a meta-analysis of data published to date. Therefore, the aim of this study was to conduct a rapid
83 systematic review and meta-analysis of estimates of the incubation periods of COVID-19, defined as the
84 period of time (in days) from virus exposure to the onset of symptoms. Specifically, we aimed to find a
85 pooled estimate for the parameters of an appropriate distribution that could be subsequently used as an
86 input in modelling studies and that might help quantify uncertainty around the key percentiles of the
87 distribution as an aid to decision making.

88

89 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

90 For the purpose of this study we followed the Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology
91 (MOOSE) guidelines.[4] The outcome was defined as the time in days from the point of exposure, (in this
92 case, infection) to the onset of clinical signs; all observational studies were included in the analysis.
93 Finally, the population was confirmed infected individuals, where an exposure time could be ascertained
94 with some degree of certainty and precision.

95 **Search methodology, initial screening and categorisation**

96 A survey of the literature between 1 December 2019 and 8th April 2020 for all countries was
97 implemented using the following search strategy. Publications on the electronic databases PubMed,
98 Google Scholar, MedRxiv and BioRxiv were searched with the following keywords: “Novel coronavirus”
99 OR “SARS-CoV-2” OR “2019-nCoV” OR “COVID-19” AND “incubation period” OR “incubation”.
100 The dynamic curated PubMed database “LitCovid” was also monitored, in addition to national and
101 international government reports. No restrictions on language or publication status were imposed so long
102 as an English abstract was available. Articles were evaluated for data relating to the aim of this review,
103 and all relevant publications were considered for possible inclusion. Bibliographies within these
104 publications were also searched for additional resources. The initial searches were carried out by three of
105 the investigators (ÁC, KH, FB). Authors of studies were contacted only to clarify reporting queries.

106

107 **Study appraisal and selection of meta-analysis**

108 Studies were selected for meta-analysis if they reported either the parameters and confidence intervals of
109 the distributions fit to the data, or sufficient information to facilitate calculation of those values.

110 Specifically, this included studies that reported: the point estimate and confidence intervals or standard
111 errors of each parameter; the mean and standard deviation on the original (non-transformed) scale with
112 confidence intervals; the mean and one or more percentiles of the distribution (with confidence intervals);
113 or two or more percentiles of the distribution (with confidence intervals). Studies were excluded if they

114 described the distribution (e.g. with mean, median, percentile) but did not report any uncertainty around
115 that figure. The selection of studies to include in the meta-analysis was conducted by the primary author
116 (CMA).

117

118 **Data extraction**

119 On initial appraisal, it was apparent that the majority of studies fitted a lognormal distribution to the data.
120 Earlier work has shown that this distribution is appropriate for many acute infectious diseases.[3, 5]
121 Therefore, the study proceeded as the meta-analysis (pooled estimate) of the parameters of this
122 distribution.

123 A variable (X) has a lognormal distribution when the log-transformed values follow a normal distribution
124 with mean, μ , and variance, σ^2 , i.e.:

$$125 \ln(X) \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$$

126 Methods exist for the meta-analysis of studies that combine a mix of log transformed and non-
127 transformed data.[6] In this case we opted to transform data, where possible to the log-transformed scale,
128 and obtain a pooled estimate of both μ and σ .

129

130 **Calculation of distribution parameters from each study**

131 Where the values for each parameter (μ and σ) were available from the studies, along with
132 corresponding confidence intervals/standard errors, these were extracted as reported. In the remaining
133 studies, the values were calculated where possible from the information presented.

134 *Calculation of μ and σ from studies reporting the mean and standard deviation of the lognormal*
135 *distribution on the original scale.*

136 The mu and sigma parameters of the original lognormal distribution were calculated as:

$$mu = \ln(m) - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}$$

137 $\sigma = \sqrt{\ln\left(\frac{v}{m^2} + 1\right)}$

138 Where v = variance (= sd^2), and m = the mean of the distribution on the original (i.e. non-log transformed)
139 scale.

140 Similarly upper and lower confidence intervals of mu and sigma were found by substituting the upper and
141 lower bounds of the mean or standard deviation (from the original scale) into the equation above, one at a
142 time, whilst holding the value for the other parameter constant (as the point estimate for that parameter).

143

144 *Calculation of mu and sigma from studies reporting mean and percentiles on the original scale*

145 Where studies reported the results as the mean and 95th percentile on the original scale, the “lognorm”
146 package in R was used to calculate the original values of mu and sigma and corresponding standard errors
147 or confidence intervals.[7]

148

149 *Calculation of variance of mu and sigma*

150 For studies reporting confidence intervals, the standard error was calculated as (upper bound – lower
151 bound)/(2 x 1.96)

152

153 **Meta-analysis**

154 A random effects meta-analysis was conducted in R-studio Version 1.2.5033,[8] using the “metafor”
155 package,[9] of the mu and sigma parameters of the lognormal distribution, specifying the point estimate
156 and the standard error using “yi” (i.e. the point estimate) and “sei” (i.e. the standard error) arguments.
157 Forest plots were produced using the same package. Quantitative estimates of bias were obtained using
158 the Egger’s test and funnel plots. Heterogeneity was quantified using the *I*² statistic and investigated by
159 conducting subgroup analyses of the dataset.

160

161 *Calculation of the se of the mean and sd on the original scale from pooled estimates of mu and sigma*

162 The mean and standard deviation of the pooled estimate were converted to the original (i.e. non-log
163 transformed) scale as:

164
$$\text{Mean} = e^{\left(\mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right)}$$

165
$$\text{SD} = \sqrt{e^{(2 \times \mu + \sigma^2)} \times e^{(\sigma^2 - 1)}}$$

166

167 The upper and lower confidence intervals were found by substituting, one at a time, the upper and lower
168 bounds for mu and sigma and recalculating the subsequent figures for mean and SD.

169 The resulting distribution was plotted using the “ggplot2” package in R.[10] In addition, the distributions
170 for studies that did not fit a lognormal distribution, but that reported the parameters of an alternative
171 distribution fitted were also plotted alongside the pooled lognormal distribution.

172 Finally, an R Shiny app was created which allows the meta-analysis estimates to be updated as new data
173 become available.

174

175 **RESULTS**

176 After initial search and selection of relevant papers and removing duplicates, 20 studies were available for
177 appraisal.

178 ☒ Two papers were removed as they dealt with specific cohorts of cases – young adults [11] and
179 children.[12]

180 ☒ One study was removed since only the abstract was in English and there was not enough detail to
181 extract the relevant results.[13]

182 ☒ Several papers were removed since they contained insufficient data or methods description to
183 facilitate their inclusion:

184 ○ One study was removed since there was not enough detail in the paper to determine
185 whether new parameters were being estimated or whether the parameters quoted were
186 input values for their model.[14]

187 ○ Five papers were removed since the data were largely descriptive, with no confidence
188 intervals reported.[15-19]

189 ○ One study was removed because the error terms associated with the mean, median and
190 percentiles were not reported and there was not enough information presented to recover
191 the parameters of the lognormal distribution.[20]

192

193 Of the shortlisted studies (n=10), six reported lognormal distributions as best fitting the data. [21-26] Of
194 the remaining 4, one reported that several distributions were trialled but it was not clear which

195 distribution was used for the final estimates.[27] However, these authors provided raw data which we
196 used to fit the parameters of the lognormal distribution using the “riskDistributions” package.[28] The

197 remaining 3 studies reported that either Weibull or gamma distributions fitted the data better. Of these, 1
198 study also presented the results of a log normal distribution fit to the data,[29] facilitating its inclusion in

199 the subsequent analysis. The final two studies reporting a Weibull [30] and a gamma distribution [31]

200 were removed from further analysis at this stage, however, those distributions were plotted over the final

201 distribution to evaluate the impact of removing those studies. The values extracted from each study are
202 shown in Table 1.

203

204 **Table 1.** Study size and extracted data for the lognormal mu and sigma parameters from the 8 studies that
205 were used for meta-analysis.

Author	n	mu	se	sigma	se
Backer et al., 2020	88	1.796	0.077	0.349	0.045
Lauer et al., 2020	181	1.621	0.064	0.418	0.069
Li et al., 2020	10	1.425	0.240	0.669	0.141
Bi et al., 2020	183	1.570	0.245	0.650	0.167
Jiang et al., 2020	40	1.530	0.066	0.464	0.046
Linton et al., 2020	158	1.611	0.070	0.472	0.048
Zhang et al., 2020	49	1.540	0.092	0.470	0.072
Ma et al., 2020	587	1.857	0.024	0.547	0.023

206

207 The initial pooled estimate of mu from this dataset (i.e. dataset 1, n=8 studies) was 1.65 (1.55, 1.76) and
208 the pooled estimate of sigma was 0.47 (0.41, 0.54). The I^2 values were 78% and 59% for mu and sigma
209 respectively. Egger's tests for mu and sigma were not statistically significant; p=0.11 and p=0.31 for mu
210 and sigma respectively. However, evaluation of the funnel plots (Figures S1 and S2 Supplementary
211 Material) suggests the potential for bias associated with one of the studies included in the analysis.[25]
212 Evaluation of the meta-analyses results for mu demonstrated that two studies were responsible for much
213 of the heterogeneity in the analysis of this value. In particular, the values reported by Ma et al. [25] and
214 Backer et al. [29] were higher than the estimates from other studies. Both studies were further evaluated
215 to determine whether these differences may have been due to methodological differences. The Backer et

216 al. [29] study was subsequently excluded since it appeared that the exposure window was somewhat
217 imprecisely defined which would have biased this estimate upwards. Conversely, the study reported by
218 Ma et al. [25] used only patients where the exposure window was 3 days or less, with the majority of
219 those of a 1-day duration. The meta-analysis was repeated with the Backer et al. [29] study removed (i.e.
220 dataset 2, n=7 studies). The resulting pooled estimates were 1.63 (1.51, 1.75) and 0.50 (0.45, 0.55), whilst
221 the I^2 values were 78% and 28% for mu and sigma respectively. Figures 1 and 2 show the resulting forest
222 plots for the meta-analyses of mu and sigma respectively from dataset 2 (n=7), that is the 8 studies from
223 which the parameters were extracted, minus the Backer et al. [29] estimate.

224 <Figure 1 here>

225 <Figure 2 here>

226 Figure 3 shows the resulting density plot of the pooled distribution. Figure 4 shows the cumulative
227 density function plot of the same (pooled distribution). In this instance, all possible combinations of
228 distributions across the 95% confidence intervals of the estimates of each of the mu and sigma values are
229 plotted on the same graph. Table 2 shows the percentiles and corresponding confidence intervals of the
230 pooled lognormal distribution.

231 <Figure 3 here>

232 <Figure 4 here>

233

234 **Table 2.** Percentiles of the pooled log normal distribution after simulating all possible combinations of
235 mu and sigma within the 95% confidence intervals of the pooled estimates of both parameters. The
236 median days for each percentile are shown along with the minimum and maximum values for that
237 percentile.

Percentile	Median	min	max	Difference
------------	--------	-----	-----	------------

	(days)			(max – min)
0.025	1.92	1.54	2.38	0.84
0.05	2.24	1.83	2.75	0.92
0.1	2.69	2.24	3.23	0.99
0.25	3.64	3.12	4.25	1.13
0.5	5.1	4.53	5.75	1.22
0.75	7.15	6.13	8.34	2.21
0.9	9.69	8.06	11.6	3.54
0.95	11.6	9.49	14.2	4.71
0.975	13.6	10.9	16.9	6

238

239

240 Figure 5 shows the cumulative density function plots of the pooled lognormal distribution along with the
241 estimates from the original studies. Finally, Figure 6 shows the probability density function of the pooled
242 lognormal distribution, plotted alongside the two studies that could not be included in the final meta-
243 analysis due to the fact that they fit alternative distributions to the data.

244 <Figure 5 here>

245 <Figure 6 here>

246

247 **DISCUSSION**

248 For the purpose of this study we defined incubation period as the time in days from the point of COVID-
249 19 exposure to the onset of symptoms. Figure S1 (Supplementary Material) shows a schematic of this

250 time period with respect to other key parameters influencing COVID-19 transmission. Studies to
251 determine incubation period are likely most precise during the early phase of the outbreak, before the
252 pathogen is widespread.[21] During this early phase, exposure windows can be determined with some
253 confidence. Most studies achieved this by conducting the analysis based on travellers from an epicentre of
254 infection (Wuhan) to another country/region that was free from infection at that time point or in the very
255 early stages of the outbreak.

256 By definition, the required case data for the determination of individual incubation periods needs to
257 include both exposure (window) and onset of symptoms. Precisely estimating these events can be
258 difficult. Symptom onset is based on case recall, whereas exposure is determined either from: movement
259 history, thereby providing a window prior to movement of potential exposure, or a known window of
260 exposure (from earliest to latest) to a confirmed case (close contact). However, exposure and/or symptom
261 onset are rarely observed exactly. The methods used to deal with this include restricting the analysis to
262 data from patients where the exposure window could be narrowed to a short window (e.g. <3 days);
263 taking a median point from the exposure window to determine the exposure timepoint. Alternatively,
264 Linton et al.[24] included left exposure dates as parameters to be fitted in the model.

265 After the initial meta-analysis we decided to remove the Backer et al.[29] study from the pooled estimate.
266 The estimates from that study were found to be shifted considerably to the right compared to other
267 estimates. Examination of that study identified that many of the patients had long exposure windows
268 which would be expected to bias the estimate upwards. Interestingly, that study conducted an additional
269 subset analysis of patients whose exposure windows were well defined and for these data, the mean
270 incubation period dropped from 6.4 to 4.5 days. However, it is interesting to note that Ma et al.[25]
271 restricted their analysis to patients with a 3-day exposure window and still found a mean incubation
272 period of 7.4 days. Since this study had the largest sample size (n = 587), it has a significant impact on the
273 estimation of the lognormal parameters. Repeating the meta-analysis with both the Backer et al.[29] and
274 Ma et al.[25] studies removed results in values of 1.58 (1.51, 1.64) and 0.47 (0.42, 0.53) respectively.

275 With both of these studies removed the I^2 values drop to 0% for both parameters. The corresponding
276 mean and median are 5.48 days and 4.85 days respectively. Interestingly, removing this study also
277 increases the precision of the estimate of the value for mu.

278 One of the weaknesses of our approach is that we extracted and analysed the parameters of the lognormal
279 distribution independently. However, in reality the parameters and the initial distribution that they are
280 fitted to are linked. We were unable to include two studies that did not fit lognormal distributions to the
281 data. However, Figure 6 demonstrates that the impact of removing these studies is likely to be small since
282 they are similar to the pooled estimate, with one falling to the left of the pooled estimate, and the other
283 falling to the right. Ideally, we would have fit distributions to the raw data available from each of the
284 studies, in a way that facilitated the distributions to vary across studies. Such an approach was taken by
285 Lessler et al.[3] in reviewing acute respiratory viral infections. However, the raw data were not available
286 in all cases for the studies that we examined. Another limitation is that many of the papers included in this
287 study used publicly available data to estimate incubation period. Therefore, there is a reasonable chance
288 that several of the analyses have re-used at least some of the same data. In these cases, the studies would
289 not be independent of each other.

290 It is worth noting that the parameter values from our meta-analysis are somewhat higher than previously
291 used in modelling studies. For example, Ferguson et al.[32] used a mean of 5.1 days for incubation
292 period, citing two previous studies.[24, 31] Mean incubation period from our meta analysis was 5.8. Tuite
293 et al.[33] on the other hand, used an incubation period of 5.0 days citing the study by Lauer et al.[22].
294 This figure, (5.0 days) was the median incubation period reported from that study,[22] which is much
295 closer to the median estimate of 5.1 days from our meta analysis.

296 It is reasonable to assume that the incubation period estimated here should be relatively generalizable
297 across different populations: unlike parameters such as serial interval for example, incubation period
298 depends only on the interaction between the virus and the host, which is expected to be similar across
299 populations, and not on behavioural factors such as frequency of contacts which might be expected to

300 vary across different countries. However, there is potential for a number of biases in these data which
301 may impact on their external validity: In order to accurately estimate incubation period, it is possible that
302 well characterized cases which may be preferentially chosen to reduce the impact of prolonged exposure
303 windows. It is possible that such cases could be biased towards more severe cases. In that case, the
304 estimate for incubation period could be biased downwards, since it is possible that the incubation period
305 could be shorter in more severely affected individuals. Furthermore, these well characterised cases may
306 not have been representative of all cases (often male, often younger,[29]), highlighting the need for
307 information on incubation period from older people, people with comorbidities, from women and those
308 with mild symptoms. These findings are mostly based on studies from Chinese patients. Whilst the
309 incubation period for a given set of circumstances should be similar across different populations, there
310 may be factors that might impact on incubation period, such as infectious dose for example that might
311 vary between populations (and possibly within populations over the course of the outbreak) meaning that
312 the resulting distribution may vary for different populations, or potentially at different stages of the
313 outbreak. Finally, incubation periods may be different for people of different ages.[11]

314 Based on available evidence, we find that the incubation period distribution may be modelled with a
315 lognormal distribution with pooled mu and sigma parameters of 1.63 (1.51, 1.75) and 0.50 (0.45, 0.55)
316 respectively. It should be noted that uncertainty increases towards the tail of the distribution (Figure 4 and
317 Table 2). The choice of which parameter values are adopted will depend on how the information is used,
318 the associated risks and the perceived consequences of decisions to be taken. The corresponding mean
319 was 5.8 days and the median was 5.1 days. These recommendations will need to be revisited once further
320 relevant information becomes available. Finally, we present an R Shiny app which facilitates users to
321 update these estimates as new data become available <https://mcaloon-ucd.shinyapps.io/shiny2/>.

322 **Funding:** All investigators are full-time employees (or retired former employees) of University College
323 Dublin, the Irish Department of Food and the Marine or University of Nottingham. No additional funding
324 was obtained for this research.

325 **Author contributions:** CMA conducted the eligibility screening of shortlisted studies, extracted the data
326 and conducted the analysis with input from all authors; AC, KH and FB conducted the initial literature
327 searches; CMA and SM completed the initial drafts of the manuscript; MG and LOG reviewed the
328 statistical methods; All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

329 **Data statement:** The data for the meta-analyses are presented as part of the manuscript (Table 2).

330 **Competing interests:** All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at
331 www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work;
332 no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the
333 previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the
334 submitted work."

335 **Patient and public involvement statement:** It was not appropriate or possible to involve patients or the
336 public in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research

337

338 REFERENCES

339 1 Brookmeyer R. Incubation period of infectious diseases. Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference
340 Online 2014:1-8.

341 2 Fraser C, Riley S, Anderson RM, et al. Factors that make an infectious disease outbreak
342 controllable. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 2004;101:6146-51.

343 3 Lessler J, Reich NG, Brookmeyer R, et al. Incubation periods of acute respiratory viral infections:
344 a systematic review. The Lancet infectious diseases 2009;9:291-300.

345 4 Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a
346 proposal for reporting. Journal of the American Medical Association. 2000 Apr 19;283(15):2008-12.

347 5 Sartwell PE. The Distribution of Incubation Periods of Infectious Diseases. American Journal of
348 Hygiene 1950;51:310-18.

349 6 Higgins JP, White IR, Anzures-Cabrera J. Meta-analysis of skewed data: combining results
350 reported on log-transformed or raw scales. Statistics in medicine 2008;27:6072-92.

351 7 Wutzler T. lognorm: Functions for the Lognormal Distribution. R package version 0.1.6. 2019.
352 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lognorm> 2019.

353 8 Core Team R. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
354 statistical computing, Vienna 2013.

355 9 Viechtbauer W. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. Journal of statistical
356 software 2010;36:1-48.

357 10 Wickham H. ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis: Springer 2016.

358 11 Liao J, Fan S, Chen J, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of COVID-19 in
359 adolescents and young adults. medRxiv 2020:2020.03.10.20032136.

360 12 Zhang C, Gu J, Chen Q, et al. Clinical Characteristics of 34 Children with Coronavirus Disease-
361 2019 in the West of China: a Multiple-center Case Series. medRxiv 2020:2020.03.12.20034686.

362 13 Qianqian S, Han Z, Liqun F, et al. Epidemiological parameter estimation of early infectious
363 diseases of new coronavirus pneumonia. Chinese Journal of Epidemiology, 2020,41 (2020-03-01) .http :
364 //rs.yiigle.com/yufabiao/1183269.htm. DOI: 10.3760 / cma.j.cn112338-20200205-00069. [Pre-published
365 online]

366 14 Rovetta A, Bhagavathula AS. Modelling the epidemiological trend and behavior of COVID-19 in
367 Italy. medRxiv 2020:2020.03.19.20038968.

- 368 15 Guan W-j, Ni Z-y, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China.
369 New England Journal of Medicine 2020.
- 370 16 Jiang X, Rayner S, Luo M-H. Does SARS-CoV-2 has a longer incubation period than SARS and
371 MERS? Journal of Medical Virology 2020;92:476-8.
- 372 17 Pung R, Chiew CJ, Young BE, et al. Investigation of three clusters of COVID-19 in Singapore:
373 implications for surveillance and response measures. The Lancet 2020.
- 374 18 You C, Deng Y, Hu W, et al. Estimation of the time-varying reproduction number of COVID-19
375 outbreak in China. Available at SSRN 3539694 2020.
- 376 19 Xu X-W, Wu X-X, Jiang X-G, et al. Clinical findings in a group of patients infected with the
377 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-Cov-2) outside of Wuhan, China: retrospective case series. BMJ
378 2020;368:m606.
- 379 20 Wen Y, Wei L, Li Y, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of COVID-19 in
380 Shenzhen, the largest migrant city of China. medRxiv 2020:2020.03.22.20035246.
- 381 21 Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and Transmission of COVID-19 in Shenzhen China:
382 Analysis of 391 cases and 1,286 of their close contacts. medRxiv 2020:2020.03.03.20028423.
- 383 22 Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-
384 19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. Annals of Internal Medicine
385 2020.
- 386 23 Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel
387 Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia. New England Journal of Medicine 2020;382:1199-207.
- 388 24 Linton NM, Kobayashi T, Yang Y, et al. Incubation period and other epidemiological
389 characteristics of 2019 novel coronavirus infections with right truncation: a statistical analysis of publicly
390 available case data. Journal of clinical medicine 2020;9:538.

- 391 25 Ma S, Zhang J, Zeng M, et al. Epidemiological parameters of coronavirus disease 2019: a pooled
392 analysis of publicly reported individual data of 1155 cases from seven countries. medRxiv
393 2020:2020.03.21.20040329.
- 394 26 Zhang J, Litvinova M, Wang W, et al. Evolving epidemiology of novel coronavirus diseases 2019
395 and possible interruption of local transmission outside Hubei Province in China: a descriptive and
396 modeling study. medRxiv 2020:2020.02.21.20026328.
- 397 27 Jiang X, Niu Y, Li X, et al. Is a 14-day quarantine period optimal for effectively controlling
398 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)? medRxiv 2020:2020.03.15.20036533.
- 399 28 Belgorodski K, Greiner M, Tolksdorf K, Schueller K. rriskDistributions: Fitting Distributions to
400 Given Data or Known Quantiles. R package version 2015;2.
- 401 29 Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-
402 nCoV) infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20–28 January 2020. Eurosurveillance
403 2020;25:2000062.
- 404 30 Xia W, Liao J, Li C, et al. Transmission of corona virus disease 2019 during the incubation
405 period may lead to a quarantine loophole. medRxiv 2020:2020.03.06.20031955.
- 406 31 Li M, Chen P, Yuan Q, et al. Transmission characteristics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China: a
407 study driven by data. medRxiv 2020:2020.02.26.20028431.
- 408 32 Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati Gilani G, et al. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical
409 interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand. 2020.
- 410 33 Tuite AR, Fisman DN, Greer AL. Mathematical modelling of COVID-19 transmission and
411 mitigation strategies in the population of Ontario, Canada. CMAJ 2020.
- 412

413

414

415 **Figure 1.** Forest plot of the random effects (RE) meta-analysis of mu parameter of the lognormal
416 distribution of incubation period.

417

418 **Figure 2.** Forest plot of the random effects (RE) meta-analysis of sigma parameter of the lognormal
419 distribution

420

421 **Figure 3.** Probability density function of the pooled lognormal distribution of reported incubation period
422 with $\mu = 1.63$ and $\sigma = 0.50$

423

424 **Figure 4.** Cumulative distribution function of pooled lognormal distribution. Each possible combination
425 of values between the 95% confidence intervals of mu and sigma are plotted as single black lines.

426


427 **Figure 5.** Cumulative distribution function of pooled lognormal distribution for incubation period and
428 original input studies.

429


430 **Figure 6.** Probability density function of pooled lognormal distribution for incubation period and studies
431 ($n=2$) not included in the meta-analysis because of the distribution used.

432


433




RE Model 1.63 [1.51, 1.75]





Observed Outcome



Incubation period distribution







Incubation period distribution

