

1 **Title:**

2 **Transmission dynamics of coronavirus disease 2019 outside of Daegu-Gyeongsangbuk**
3 **provincial region in South Korea**

4

5 **Authors:**

6 Sukhyun Ryu¹, Sheikh Taslim Ali², Cheolsun Jang¹, Baekjin Kim¹, Benjamin J. Cowling²

7

8 **Affiliation:**

9 1. Department of Preventive Medicine, Konyang University College of Medicine, Daejeon,
10 Republic of Korea

11 2. WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Control, School of
12 Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
13 Special Administrative Region, China

14

15

16

17

18

19 **Abstract**

20 We analyzed transmission of coronavirus disease 2019 in South Korea. We estimated that
21 non-pharmaceutical measures reduced the immediate transmissibility by maximum of 34% for
22 coronavirus disease 2019. Continuous efforts are needed for monitoring the transmissibility to
23 optimize epidemic control.

24 **Main text**

25 The first coronavirus diseases 2019 (COVID-19) infection was identified on January 20, 2020, in
26 South Korea (1). By April 21, 2020, South Korea has been experienced the epidemics of
27 COVID-19 with 10,683 laboratory-confirmed cases, including 237 deaths (2) (Figure 1A).
28 Super-spreading events occurred in the Daegu-Gyeongsangbuk provincial regions, which
29 contributed a large number of cases and deaths of COVID-19 in Korea (Figure 1B). In the early
30 phase of the COVID-19 outbreak in Korea, Korean public health authorities mainly conducted
31 contact tracing of confirmed cases and quarantining of suspected and confirmed cases (3).
32 However, as the number of COVID-19 cases increased, Korean public health authorities raised
33 the infectious disease alert to its highest level on February 23, 2020 and addressed the public to
34 report illness related to COVID-19 for screening.

35
36 As of April 21, 2020, the epidemic of COVID-19 has been contained in Korea, and from
37 April 19, 2020, the Korean public health authorities started to relax some of the social distancing
38 measures, which were implemented on March 21, 2020. Recent studies examined how public
39 health interventions can possibly contain the first wave of COVID-19 outbreak (4, 5). However,
40 there has been no information on public health measures against the transmission dynamics of
41 COVID-19 in Korea, which is valuable for preparedness of future epidemics. The purpose of this
42 study is to estimate the transmissibility of COVID-19 and evaluate the impact of the public
43 health measures implemented outside the Daegu-Gyeongsangbuk provincial region, South
44 Korea.

45

46 **The study**

47 We collected data published by local public health authorities including the city or
48 provincial department of public health in South Korea. The data comprised the date of exposure,
49 date of illness onset, as well as the source of infection including contact history and demographic
50 characteristics, including birth year and gender. We extracted the information of the cases by
51 using a structured data-extraction form. We divided the study period into two on the declaration
52 of highest public alert; period-1 (January 20 to February 23, 2020) and period-2 (February 24 to
53 April 21, 2020). We restricted our analysis to the regions in South Korea excluding Daegu-
54 Gyeongsangbuk provincial region, where there were super spreading events and the data have
55 not been made publicly available (6). A total of 2,023 cases were collected during two months
56 (from January 20 to April 21, 2020), which accounts for 98% of 2,066 reported cases from the
57 Korean Ministry of Health and Welfare.

58
59 The median age of cases was 42 (range 1-102), and 820 (41%) was male (Table 1). We
60 analysed the statistical difference in age and sex between period-1 and period-2 by using the chi-
61 squared test; However, we have not identified any significant difference. In period-1, the
62 proportion of imported cases from Daegu-Gyeongsangbuk provincial regions were 31% and
63 reduced to 5% in period-2. However, the proportion of imported cases from abroad and cases
64 occurring in large clusters increased from 8% to 30%.

65
66 We analyzed the time interval between illness onset and laboratory confirmation for 818
67 symptomatic cases. The estimated mean time interval from symptom onset to confirmation of
68 COVID-19 during period-1 and period-2 was estimated by fitting three parametric distributions

69 (Weibull, gamma, and log-normal) and selected the best fit based on the Akaike information
70 criterion (AIC) (7). The lognormal distribution found to be the best fit for this time interval with
71 mean 4.6 (95% Confidence Interval (CI): 0.0–12.4) in period-1 and a significant reduction to 3.4
72 (0.0–9.0) for period 2. We analyzed 181 cases having precise contact history with other
73 confirmed cases to estimate the incubation period. The incubation period was estimated by fitting
74 three parametric distributions and best fitted by the log-normal distribution, and the overall
75 estimated median incubation period was 4.7 (95% CI, 0.1–15.6) days (Appendix). We identified
76 44 clusters of infection and 79 cases who had clear exposure to only one index case among these
77 clusters (Appendix). Overall, 8 of the 79 transmission pairs had negative serial intervals. The
78 serial interval distribution was estimated by fitting a normal distribution to all 79 observations
79 (8). We estimated a mean estimated serial interval was 3.9 days, with a standard deviation of 4.2
80 days (Appendix).

81
82 In Mid February 2020, the number of cases rapidly increased, and the largest proportion
83 of cases were in persons infected in Daegu-Gyeongsangbuk provincial region and traveling to
84 other regions of South Korea (Figure 2A). To investigate the effectiveness of non-
85 pharmaceutical interventions implemented in Korea (Appendix), we estimated the instantaneous
86 effective reproduction number (R_t), from daily onset cases and our estimated serial interval
87 distribution using the EpiEstim package in R (9, 10). The R_t is defined as the mean number of
88 secondary infections per primary case with illness onset at time t and R_t below 1 indicates the
89 epidemic is under control.

90

91 The daily estimates of R_t are presented from February 16, 2020, onward because the
92 stable estimate of R_t was not available due to the low number of confirmed cases (Figure 2B).
93 The mean R_t at the end of period-1 was reached up to the highest value of 2.85 (Credible
94 Interval (CrI) 2.02, 3.87) on February 21, 2020, and then started to decline faster to below 1 by
95 February 29, 2020. R_t further declined and sustained below 1 during the rest of the period-2,
96 indicating the potential impact of different non-pharmaceutical interventions implemented over
97 time, on COVID-19 transmission (Figure 2B). Specifically, the mean R_t was 2.23 (CrI 2.05, 2.40)
98 before 1-week period of the declaration of the public alert to highest level and reduced to 1.48
99 (CrI 1.36, 1.60) in the following 1-week period, corresponding to a 33.6% (95% CI 23.46%–
100 43.44%) reduction in immediate transmissibility. Similarly along with high public alert, the strict
101 social distancing measures implemented on March 12, 2020 was associated with an immediate
102 reduction in R_t by additional 9.28% (95% CI 6.80%–11.75%).

103

104 **Conclusions**

105 The epidemic of COVID-19 sustained over two months in South Korea. Combined non-
106 pharmaceutical interventions including enhancing the screening and quarantining for suspected
107 and confirmed cases, and social distancing measures were implemented over time, and our
108 results suggest the interventions reduced the transmissibility of COVID-19 in the region outside
109 of the Daegu-Gyengsangbuk provincial region, South Korea. In our analysis of the changes of
110 transmissibility of COVID-19, we did not include the large clustered cases reported as super
111 spreading events because in these large clusters the reporting date may not be a good proxy of
112 the date of infection and would overestimate R_t (11). We estimated the time delay based on self-

113 reported data. The daily number of confirmed cases from the collected line list we used was very
114 similar to the official daily reports from the Korean Ministry of Health and Welfare (Appendix).

115

116 In conclusion, our study suggests that the non-pharmaceutical interventions implemented
117 in Korea during the COVID-19 outbreak were effective in reducing transmissibility and
118 suppressing local spread. However, the Korean population is still susceptible to further outbreaks
119 or epidemic waves, and social distancing measures will be relaxed, while there continue to be
120 opportunities for importation of infections from abroad. Therefore, ongoing monitoring of the
121 effective reproductive number can provide relevant information to the policymakers to control a
122 potential second wave of COVID-19.

123

124 **Acknowledgments**

125 We appreciate the Korean public health authorities' response to COVID-19.

126

127 **Funding**

128 Not applicable

129

130 **About the Author**

131 Dr. Ryu is an assistant professor of preventive medicine at Konyang University, Daejeon, South
132 Korea. His research interests include infectious disease epidemiology with focus on public health
133 interventions.

134

135 **References**

136 1. Ryu S, Chun BC, Korean Society of Epidemiology -nCo VTFT. An interim review of the
137 epidemiological characteristics of 2019 novel coronavirus. Epidemiol Health.

138 2020;42:e2020006.

139 2. Korea Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The updates of COVID-19 in
140 Republic of Korea. 2020 [cited April 28, 2020]; Available from:

141 <https://www.cdc.go.kr/board/board.es?mid=a30402000000&bid=0030>

142 3. Covid-19 National Emergency Response Center E, Case Management Team KCfDC,
143 Prevention. Contact Transmission of COVID-19 in South Korea: Novel Investigation
144 Techniques for Tracing Contacts. Osong Public Health Res Perspect. 2020 Feb;11(1):60-3.

145 4. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Wang W, Wang Y, Deng X, Chen X, et al. Evolving epidemiology
146 and transmission dynamics of coronavirus disease 2019 outside Hubei province, China: a
147 descriptive and modelling study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020 Apr 2.

148 5. Cowling BJ, Ali ST, Ng TWY, Tsang TK, Li JCM, Fong MW, et al. Impact assessment
149 of non-pharmaceutical interventions against coronavirus disease 2019 and influenza in Hong
150 Kong: an observational study. Lancet Public Health. 2020 Apr 17.

151 6. Covid-19 National Emergency Response Center E, Case Management Team KCfDC,
152 Prevention. Coronavirus Disease-19: The First 7,755 Cases in the Republic of Korea. Osong
153 Public Health Res Perspect. 2020 Apr;11(2):85-90.

- 154 7. Akaike H. Information Theory and an Extension of the Maximum Likelihood Principle.
155 In: Parzen E, Tanabe K, Kitagawa G, editors. Selected Papers of Hirotugu Akaike. New York,
156 NY: Springer New York; 1998. p. 199-213.
- 157 8. Du Z, Xu X, Wu Y, Wang L, Cowling BJ, Meyers LA. The serial interval of COVID-19
158 from publicly reported confirmed cases. medRxiv. 2020:2020.02.19.20025452.
- 159 9. Cori A, Ferguson NM, Fraser C, Cauchemez S. A new framework and software to
160 estimate time-varying reproduction numbers during epidemics. Am J Epidemiol. 2013 Nov
161 1;178(9):1505-12.
- 162 10. Thompson RN, Stockwin JE, van Gaalen RD, Polonsky JA, Kamvar ZN, Demarsh PA, et
163 al. Improved inference of time-varying reproduction numbers during infectious disease
164 outbreaks. Epidemics. 2019 Dec;29:100356.
- 165 11. Leung K, Wu JT, Liu D, Leung GM. First-wave COVID-19 transmissibility and severity
166 in China outside Hubei after control measures, and second-wave scenario planning: a modelling
167 impact assessment. Lancet. 2020 Apr 25;395(10233):1382-93.

168
169

170 **Table 1.** Demographic characteristics of confirmed cases of COVID-19 infection from publicly
 171 available data, South Korea, outside of Daegu-Gyeongsangbuk provincial region on April 21,
 172 2020 (n=2023)

| | All (n=2023) | Period-1 (Jan 20 to Feb 23; n=208) | Period-2 (Feb 24 to April 21; n=1815) |
|--|--------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Age group | | | |
| 0-19 years | 123 (6%) | 11 (5%) | 112 (6%) |
| 19-39 years | 715 (35%) | 104 (50%) | 611 (34%) |
| 40-59 years | 619 (31%) | 50 (24%) | 569 (31%) |
| 60-79 years | 295 (15%) | 37 (18%) | 258 (14%) |
| ≥80 years | 50 (3%) | 6 (3%) | 44 (2%) |
| Unknown | 221 (11%) | 0 | 221(12%) |
| Sex | | | |
| Male | 820 (41%) | 107 (56%) | 713 (39%) |
| Female | 953 (47%) | 100 (43%) | 853 (47%) |
| Unknown | 250 (12%) | 1 (1%) | 249 (14%) |
| Type of transmission | | | |
| Local cases | 892 (44%) | 116 (55%) | 776 (43%) |
| Imported cases from Daegu-Gyeongsangbuk | 155 (8%) | 65 (31%) | 90 (5%) |
| Imported cases from abroad | 552 (27%) | 16 (8%) | 536 (30%) |
| Cases occurring in large clusters | 424 (21%) | 11 (5%) | 413 (23%) |

173 The period was divided based on the date of symptom onset. If the cases were asymptomatic or the data of symptom onset date
 174 was not reported, we used the date of confirmation. All the cases has the specific information of the source of infection. If the source
 175 of infection was not identified, we considered the case occurred by local transmission.
 176

177 **FIGURE LEGEND**

178 **Figure 1.** Timeline and geographical distribution of occurrence of laboratory-confirmed cases of
179 COVID-19 in South Korea as of April 21, 2020

180

181 **Figure 2.** Incidence and estimated daily effective reproductive number (R_t) of COVID-19 in
182 regions outside of Daegu-Gyeongsanbuk provincial region, South Korea as of April 21, 2020.
183 (A) The epidemic curve shows the daily number of symptom onsets of confirmed cases. For
184 cases that did not report any symptoms at the date of confirmation ($N=1,205$ cases; 60% of total),
185 the date of confirmation was plotted instead. (B) A solid line indicates daily estimated R_t and
186 gray dashed lines indicate 95% CrI of R_t ; The gray area indicates the area below the epidemic
187 threshold of $R_t=1$.



