

Faecal shedding models for SARS-CoV-2 RNA amongst hospitalised patients and implications for wastewater-based epidemiology

Till Hoffmann*

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom

Justin Alsing

Oskar Klein Centre, Department of Physics, Stockholm University, Stockholm SE-106 91, Sweden

The concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in faeces is not well established, posing challenges for wastewater-based surveillance of COVID-19 and risk assessments of environmental transmission. We develop versatile hierarchical models for faecal RNA shedding and apply them to data collected in six studies. We find that the mean number of gene copies per mL of faeces is 1.9×10^6 (2.3×10^5 — 2.0×10^8 95% credible interval) amongst hospitalised patients. We find no evidence for a subpopulation of patients who do not shed RNA: limits of quantification can account for negative stool samples. Our models indicate that hospitalised patients represent the tail of the shedding profile with a half-life of 34 hours (28—43 95% credible interval), suggesting that wastewater-based surveillance signals are more indicative of incidence than prevalence and can be a leading indicator of clinical presentation. Shedding amongst inpatients cannot explain high RNA concentrations observed in wastewater, consistent with more abundant shedding during the early infection course.

*Corresponding author (t.hoffmann@imperial.ac.uk).

26 1. Introduction

27 The novel virus SARS-CoV-2 (severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2) infected
28 over 80 million people in 2020, and more than 2.6 million people have succumbed to the
29 resultant disease, COVID-19 (coronavirus disease 2019) [1]. Individuals infected by the
30 virus primarily suffer from respiratory symptoms [2], but gastrointestinal manifestations
31 of the disease have also been observed [3]. The presence of viral RNA in faeces allows
32 for the surveillance of COVID-19 by quantifying gene copies in sewage [4]. So-called
33 wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) provides data that can complement traditional
34 testing schemes and can be used to monitor the disease relatively cheaply by pooling
35 wastewater from thousands of people [5]. Correlations between case numbers from in-
36 dividual testing schemes and RNA concentrations in wastewater have been observed [4,
37 6, 7]. However, associative studies cannot easily be used to calibrate WBE approaches:
38 each sewerage system is different [8], and case numbers may not be a good indicator of
39 prevalence [9]—especially when testing capacity is limited. The World Health Organi-
40 sation considers “quantitative information on viral shedding” an imminent need to reap
41 the potential benefits of WBE [10].

42 Faecal shedding of RNA suggests that the virus could be transmissible via the faecal-
43 oral route [11]. While presence of RNA does not imply presence of infective virus, the
44 likelihood increases with higher RNA loads [12]. Sewer overflows could cause spillover
45 events, leading to new viral reservoirs [13]. For example, mink are susceptible to SARS-
46 CoV-2 [14] and can be exposed to untreated sewage [13]. Furthermore, wastewater
47 workers are at risk of contracting sewage-borne pathogens [15], and wastewater is a
48 possible infection mode in densely populated communities [16, 17]. Quantifying these
49 risks is essential for making informed policy decisions.

50 We developed a family of random-effect models [18, ch. 5] for SARS-CoV-2 RNA con-
51 centrations in faecal samples and applied them to data from six clinical studies to study
52 three aspects of faecal RNA shedding. First, we studied the shedding profile, i.e. the
53 temporal variability of shedding over the infection course, which affects the interpreta-
54 tion of WBE results [6]. We find that the profile decays quickly with a half-life of 34
55 hours. Second, the proportion of patients with one or more positive faecal samples has
56 been extensively studied [3, 19, 20]. We determined that the limit of quantification of
57 assays can account for patients without positive samples. Bayesian model comparison
58 revealed no evidence for a subpopulation of patients who do not shed RNA faecally.
59 Third, we obtained estimates of the mean faecal RNA concentration: a quantity impor-
60 tant for inferring disease prevalence or incidence from wastewater data [21]. We show
61 that the models are able to predict summary statistics of held-out studies accurately
62 and consider the implications of our results for wastewater-based epidemiology.

63 2. Results

64 To study faecal RNA shedding quantitatively, we developed a suite of hierarchical models
65 for RNA concentrations in faecal samples, as described in section 4.1. In contrast to




Figure 1: *A flexible hierarchical model can capture a wide range of aspects of real-world data.* The population-level distribution (shown in blue) captures variation in shedding behaviour between patients, giving rise to location parameters μ_i for each patient i (see section 4.1 for details). The location parameters (blue squares) describe the amplitude of individual shedding profiles as illustrated for three patients. The patient-level distribution (shown in orange for one patient) describes the variation between samples from the same patient, and the shedding profile (solid black line) modulates typical RNA concentrations in faecal samples over time. All samples are analysed using an RT-qPCR assay with a given limit of quantification (LOQ) θ (dashed black line), and concentrations above the LOQ (orange circles) can be quantified. Concentrations below the LOQ (orange cross) cannot be quantified. Currently available data do not allow us to constrain the early shedding profile, and late-stage shedding is consistent with an exponential decay profile.

study	patients			samples			micro- data	longi- tudinal	LOQ ($\log_{10} \text{ mL}^{-1}$)
	n	+	-	m	+	-			
Wang et al. [11]	14	6	8	14	6	8	yes	no	1.4
Wölfel et al. [12]	9	8	1	82	68	14	yes	yes	2.0
Lui et al. [25]	11	11	0	43	23	20	yes	yes	2.8
Han et al. [26]	2	2	0	9	8	1	yes	yes	3.8
Kim et al. [27]	38	8	30	129	13	116	no	no	?
Ng et al. [28]	21	21	0	81	?	?	no	no	2.5

Table 1: *Six studies providing quantitative data on faecal RNA loads were analysed.* Microdata, i.e. sample-level RNA concentrations, provided by the first four studies were used to fit random effects models. The next two studies did not provide microdata, and we validated our models by comparing reported summary statistics with model-based predictions, as discussed in section 4.4. Samples with viral loads below the limit of quantification (LOQ) are considered negative for SARS-CoV-2. The table also reports the total number of patients n and number of samples m , including a breakdown by positivity.

66 existing quantitative approaches [22, 23], our models can account for a variable number of
67 samples per patient, incorporate data from studies with different levels of quantification,
68 and capture variability between patients as well as variability between samples from the
69 same patient. The baseline model assumes that all infected patients shed viral RNA
70 faecally and that typical RNA concentrations in samples vary over the course of the
71 infection. We considered three different shedding profiles: an exponential decay profile,
72 a gamma profile, and the exponential rise-and-decay profile proposed by Teunis et al.
73 [24] for norovirus RNA shedding (see section 4.1.1 for details). We call this the *temporal*
74 *standard* model, and it is illustrated in fig. 1.

75 We considered two modifications to the baseline model. First, we considered a *constant*
76 model, where the time-variability of shedding was removed. Second, to assess whether
77 there exists a subpopulation of patients who never shed viral RNA faecally, we introduced
78 a shedding prevalence parameter ρ such that all samples of an infected patient are
79 negative with probability $1 - \rho$. We call this the *subpopulation* model (as opposed
80 to the *standard* model in which all patients shed RNA faecally). Combining the two
81 modifications (with and without a subpopulation of non-shedders, and with and without
82 time-variability) gives rise to four models in total.

83 We fitted each model to longitudinal data extracted from three studies [26, 25, 12]
84 listed in table 1. All studies used RT-qPCR assays to quantify SARS-CoV-2 RNA copies
85 in faecal samples collected from hospitalised patients. The two *constant* models were
86 also fitted to an additional dataset collected by Wang et al. [11] that does not provide
87 temporal information. As shown in table 2, we compared the models using the Bayesian
88 model evidence [29] (i.e. the marginal likelihood of the data under each model), allowing
89 us to draw two conclusions.




Figure 2: *Faecal RNA concentrations decay rapidly over the infection course.* Panel (a) shows a histogram of the number of samples collected on each day post symptom onset. The small number of samples collected within the first six days after symptom onset and the absence of samples collected prior to symptom onset make it difficult to constrain shedding during the early infection course. Panel (b) shows longitudinal faecal RNA concentration data from three studies together with the level of quantification for each study as dashed lines. The time-dependent exponential shedding profile of the *temporal standard* model is shown in black, and the shaded region represents the 95% credible interval of the profile (see section 4.1 for details). Panel (c) shows the posterior distribution for the half-life $\tau_{1/2}$ of the shedding profile.

tem- poral	subpop- ulation	log evidence	mean RNA conc. (\log_{10} mL $^{-1}$)	half-life τ (hours)	shedding prevalence ρ
no	no	-1303.1 ± 0.2	6.28 [5.36, 8.30]	constant	1 (by defn.)
no	yes	-1305.5 ± 0.2	6.28 [5.40, 8.04]	constant	0.95 [0.74, 1.00]
yes	no	-1269.3 ± 0.2	variable	34 [28, 43]	1 (by defn.)
yes	yes	-1271.6 ± 0.2	variable	34 [28, 43]	0.97 [0.82, 1.00]

Table 2: *Accounting for temporal variability of the shedding profile is essential, and there is no evidence for a subpopulation of patients who do not shed RNA faecally.* Model evidences evaluated on three common datasets prefer *temporal* models (evidence shown for an exponential decay profile) over *constant* ones, and *standard* models are preferred over models with a *subpopulation* of patients who do not shed SARS-CoV-2 RNA faecally. Parameter estimates are consistent with conclusions based on model evidences. They are reported as the posterior mode together with the 95% credible interval in brackets. All reported credible intervals are highest posterior density intervals. Estimates for *constant* models include a fourth dataset without temporal information.

90 First, accounting for the time dependence of the shedding profile is essential. The
 91 three shedding profiles we considered are indistinguishable where data are available to
 92 constrain them (see section 4.1.1 for details). However, there are only few samples
 93 obtained prior to day six past symptom onset, as shown in fig. 2 (a), and shedding
 94 behaviour during the early infection course cannot be constrained given the available
 95 data. For simplicity, we use the exponential decay profile unless otherwise specified.
 96 Typical faecal RNA concentrations decay with a maximum a posteriori half-life of 34
 97 hours (28—43 hours 95% credible interval) amongst hospitalised patients, as shown in
 98 fig. 2 (b) and (c).

99 Patients may not recall the number of days since symptom onset accurately, or they
 100 may present with atypical symptoms that are not easily identified as the onset of COVID-
 101 19 [30]. To assess the sensitivity of the inferred half-life to inaccurate reports, we repeated
 102 the inference after adding up to three days of reporting noise to the number of days
 103 since symptom onset. No sensitivity of the half-life inference to inaccurate reports was
 104 observed.

105 The second result is that there is no evidence for a subpopulation of patients who do
 106 not shed viral RNA faecally; *standard* models (without a non-shedding subpopulation)
 107 are preferred for both the *constant* (log odds of 3.1 ± 0.3) and *temporal* models (log
 108 odds of 1.8 ± 0.3). Consistent with the model comparison results, the inferred shedding
 109 prevalence is large and the 95% credible interval includes $\rho = 1$ for both *subpopulation*
 110 models. Consequently, as discussed in more depth in section 4.4, the level of quantifica-
 111 tion of the assays used in the three studies can explain the number of negative patients
 112 and samples because “the level of viral RNA present in stool can fluctuate around the
 113 margin of laboratory detection” [28].

114 To assess the out-of-sample predictive utility of the models, we considered predictions




Figure 3: *The models can make accurate out-of-sample predictions.* Predictions of the maximum concentration observed by Kim et al. [27] and Ng et al. [28] are shown in panels (a) and (b) as violin plots, respectively. The value reported in the studies is shown as black dashed lines. Panel (c) shows predictions of the median number of positive samples per patient reported by Ng et al. [28]. Only results for the *constant* models are shown because the two studies did not provide temporal information.

115 for two held-out datasets that do not provide microdata, as listed in table 1. The studies
116 conducted by Kim et al. [27] and Ng et al. [28] provided sufficiently detailed descriptions
117 of their protocols to simulate the studies and make predictions by sampling from the
118 posterior predictive distribution (see section 4.4 for details). Since our models have not
119 been fit to these data, their ability to predict summary statistics of those data is an
120 indication of how well the models generalise. *Temporal* models are preferred by the
121 data, but we do not have any temporal information about the studies conducted by
122 Kim et al. [27] and Ng et al. [28]. Nonetheless, the *constant* models can make accurate
123 out-of-sample predictions because all studies consider the same population: hospitalised
124 patients.

125 Kim et al. [27] collected 129 samples from 38 hospitalised patients, and they reported
126 the largest observed concentration $\max x = 2.7 \times 10^7$ gene copies per mL of faeces.
127 Ng et al. [28] collected 81 samples from 21 patients, and the largest observed RNA
128 concentration was $\max x = 1.3 \times 10^7$ copies per mL. As shown in fig. 3 (a) and (b),
129 predictions from our models are consistent with the reported values. Predictions of the
130 maximum are smaller for the study by Ng et al. [28] than Kim et al. [27], which is
131 expected owing to a smaller number of samples (so the tails of the distribution are less
132 well sampled). Ng et al. [28] also reported the median number of positive samples per
133 patient median $m_{\bullet(+)}$. Because they report the limit of detection of their assay, we can
134 make predictions about the median number of positive samples per patient which agree
135 with the reported value, as shown in panel (c) of fig. 3.

136 3. Discussion

137 We have inferred properties of the faecal SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding distribution by
138 fitting a suite of Bayesian hierarchical models to clinical data from four studies. The
139 models account for the limits of quantification of RT-qPCR assays and a variable number
140 of samples per patient. They are able to capture salient properties of the data and
141 generalise well to two held-out datasets. There is no evidence of patients who do not
142 shed viral RNA faecally.

143 The inferred temporal shedding profile is robust to inaccurate reports of the number
144 of days since symptom onset, and it suggests that hospitalised patients are in the tail of
145 the shedding profile because faecal RNA concentrations decay by an order of magnitude
146 over the course of four to five days. While extrapolation should be treated with caution,
147 wastewater-based surveillance of COVID-19 lends additional credibility to the hypothesis
148 that SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in wastewater are higher than expected based
149 on faecal shedding inferred from hospitalised patients [31]. Assuming mean faecal RNA
150 concentrations Λ are not larger in mild cases in the community than amongst hospitalised
151 patients, a daily per capita wastewater volume of $V = 300$ L [32], and faecal mass of
152 $m = 128$ g per person per day [33], we would expect wastewater RNA concentrations on
153 the order of $m\Lambda/V \sim 10^3$ mL⁻¹ if every person was infected. In practice, concentrations
154 in excess of 10^3 mL⁻¹ have been observed [4] at times when seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-
155 2 antibodies was less than ten percent [9]. Substantial shedding during the early stages of

156 the infection likely explains these observations. The rapid decay of the shedding profile
157 also implies that signals from wastewater-based surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 are likely
158 more indicative of incidence, rather than prevalence. Wastewater-based surveillance is
159 thus a promising approach for early detection of cases in the community. A better
160 understanding of the shape of the shedding profile, including prior to symptom onset,
161 is essential for interpreting signals from WBE correctly during critical phases of rapid
162 changes in levels of infection.

163 While one of the largest quantitative studies revealed no association between disease
164 severity and faecal RNA concentration [34], results obtained from hospitalised patients
165 are unlikely to apply to the general population, e.g. the former tend to be older and have
166 more comorbidities. Faecal samples should be collected from a representative sample of
167 patients over the entire infection course to refine quantitative estimates of faecal shedding
168 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. These data should include faecal volumes to estimate the total
169 RNA load in faeces in addition to concentrations. The effect of vaccinations and emerging
170 variants on faecal RNA shedding should also be investigated to make wastewater-based
171 surveillance an effective *quantitative* monitoring tool.

172 4. Methods

173 4.1. Models

174 We developed a suite of hierarchical models to characterise faecal shedding of SARS-
175 CoV-2 RNA quantitatively. Starting with the *standard constant* model described in
176 section 2, we discuss the generative model in three steps.

177 First, the mean faecal RNA concentration λ_i for each patient $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ follows
178 a distribution with probability density function f , where n is the number of patients.
179 Log-normal, Weibull, and gamma distributions are common choices for distributions that
180 model positive, continuous data [35]. However, conclusions based on these distributions
181 can differ substantially due to their tail behaviour [36]. We thus employed a generalised
182 gamma distribution (GGD) with shape Q , location M , and scale S . The GGD is a
183 flexible distribution which encompasses the log-normal distribution ($Q = 0$), Weibull
184 distribution ($Q = 1$), and gamma distribution ($Q = S$) as special cases [37]. This
185 choice comes at the cost of wider credible intervals, commensurate with our lack of prior
186 knowledge about the shape of the shedding distribution.

187 Second, m_i samples are collected from each patient i . The RNA concentration y_{ij}
188 in sample j from patient i follows a GGD with shape q , location μ_i , and scale σ . For
189 the *constant* model (without time-varying shedding), the location parameter μ for the
190 patient-level distribution is chosen such that $\langle y_{ij} \rangle = \lambda_i$ for each patient. Because of the
191 properties of the generalised gamma distribution, we can express the location parameter
192 in terms of the mean as

$$\mu_i = \log \lambda_i + -\frac{2\sigma}{q} \log q + \log \Gamma \left(\frac{1}{q^2} \right) - \log \Gamma \left(\frac{1 + q\sigma}{q^2} \right), \quad (1)$$

193 where Γ denotes the gamma function (see appendix A for details).

194 Third, the RNA concentration y_{ij} is quantified using an assay with level of quantifi-
195 cation (LOQ) θ_{ij} (see Kitajima et al. [38] for an overview of different assays). If the
196 concentration is below the LOQ, the sample is considered negative for the purpose of
197 this study, and we denote the output of the assay as $x_{ij} = \circ$. Otherwise, the result of
198 the assay faithfully captures the RNA concentration in the sample, i.e. $x_{ij} = y_{ij}$. We do
199 not explicitly model measurement error or variability between technical replicates in this
200 study because the relevant data are not available and assays tend to yield reproducible
201 results. For example, the CDC N1 assay [39] has a coefficient of variation $< 3.7\%$ —
202 much smaller than typical variability between samples from the same patient. The RNA
203 quantification is censored by the LOQ, and the likelihood of observing a particular assay
204 result x_{ij} is thus

$$P(x_{ij}|q, \mu_i, \sigma, \theta_{ij}) = \begin{cases} F(\theta_{ij}; q, \mu_i, \sigma) & \text{if } x_{ij} = \circ \\ f(x_{ij}; q, \mu_i, \sigma) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

205 where f denotes the probability density function of the generalised gamma distribution
206 and F denotes the corresponding cumulative distribution function [37].

207 4.1.1. Time-variation

208 RNA shedding varies over the course of the infection [40], and the *constant* model cannot
209 capture these changes. We incorporate temporal variability by introducing a shedding
210 profile such that the expected RNA concentration λ_i for each patient i varies over time.
211 In particular, we let $\lambda_i(t) = \lambda_i(t=0)g(t)$, where t is the number of days since symptom
212 onset, $g(t)$ is the shedding profile that modulates the expected RNA concentration,
213 and $\lambda_i(t=0)$ is sampled from the population-level distribution. The shape and scale
214 parameters q and σ of the patient-level distribution are kept constant.

215 Because all available data were collected from hospitalised patients several days after
216 the initial onset of symptoms, we can only constrain the later part of the shedding
217 profile. We used an exponential profile $g_{\text{exp}}(t) = \exp(-\alpha t)$, where α is the decay rate
218 of the profile, because it provides an adequate fit for late-stage faecal shedding of other
219 viruses [24]. Substituting into eq. (1), the exponential shedding profile gives rise to a
220 location parameter that varies linearly with the number of days after symptom onset for
221 each patient i such that $\mu_i(t) = \mu_i(t=0) - \alpha t$.

222 Any reporting error associated with the number of days since symptom onset t can
223 be compensated for by a corresponding change in $\mu_i(t=0)$. This explains why the
224 inferred shedding profile is robust to reporting inaccuracies, as discussed in section 2.
225 The profile shown in fig. 2 (b) is $\exp(M - \alpha t)$, and it captures the decay of the effective
226 population-level location parameter M over time. The profile half life is $\tau_{1/2} = \frac{\log 2}{\alpha}$.

227 We also considered two further shedding profiles to assess the sensitivity of our infer-
228 ences to the choice of $g(t)$. First, we used a gamma shedding profile

$$g_\gamma(t) = (t - t_0)^\alpha \exp(-\beta(t - t_0)),$$

229 where $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ control the shape of the profile and t_0 is the time at which
230 shedding can first occur, i.e. $g(t < t_0) = 0$. Second, we considered the exponential

231 rise-and-decay profile proposed by Teunis et al. [24] for norovirus shedding

$$g_{\text{Teunis}}(t) = [1 - \exp(-\alpha(t - t_0))] \exp(-\beta(t - t_0)),$$

232 where α and β control the rise and decay of the profile, respectively.

233 4.1.2. Non-shedding subpopulation

234 To investigate whether there is a subpopulation of patients who do not shed SARS-CoV-
235 2 RNA faecally, we extended the model by introducing a binary indicator $z_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for
236 each patient i . If $z_i = 1$, the shedding behaviour of the patient is unchanged. If $z_i = 0$,
237 patient i does not shed RNA, and $x_{ij} = \circ$ for all samples j . The indicator variables follow
238 a Bernoulli distribution with probability ρ , i.e. the prevalence of shedding amongst the
239 population of patients. This extension gives rise to what we refer to as the *subpopulation*
240 models.

241 We know that $z_i = 1$ for any patient with one or more positive samples, and the likeli-
242 hood follows eq. (2). However, for any patient i whose m_i samples $x_{i\bullet} = \{x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im_i}\}$
243 are all below the LOQ, the likelihood is

$$P(x_{i\bullet}|q, \mu_i, \sigma, \theta_{i\bullet}) = (1 - \rho) + \rho \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} F(\theta_{ij}; q, \mu_i, \sigma), \quad (3)$$

244 where the first term accounts for a patient who cannot shed RNA ($z_i = 0$) and the
245 second accounts for a patient whose samples are all below the LOQ ($z_i = 1$).

246 4.2. Data acquisition

247 We searched the literature for primary research that reported quantitative information
248 on SARS-CoV-2 RNA loads in faeces, and we identified eleven studies of interest [3, 11,
249 12, 26, 27, 28, 34, 41, 42, 43]. Semi-quantitative studies reporting only cycle-threshold
250 values were excluded.

251 Data from four studies were used to fit the hierarchical models described in section 4.1.
252 First, Wölfel et al. [12] reported longitudinal faecal RNA concentrations for nine patients
253 in Munich who had been in close contact with a common index case. Second, Lui et
254 al. [25] followed the first eleven patients hospitalised due to COVID-19 in Hong Kong.
255 Third, Han et al. [26] studied the viral dynamics of a neonate and her mother in Seoul.
256 Fourth, Wang et al. [11] reported cycle threshold (C_t) values of RT-qPCR assays for
257 faecal samples from a subset of patients admitted to three hospitals in China, and we
258 transformed C_t values to RNA concentrations using conversion constants provided in
259 the publication. Longitudinal information was not available. Table 1 lists information
260 on the number of patients and samples for each study.

261 Two studies provided summary statistics of viral RNA concentrations in faecal sam-
262 ples, such as the highest concentration observed, together with sufficiently detailed de-
263 scriptions of the study design to replicate the studies *in silico*, as described in section 4.4.
264 In particular, Kim et al. [27] quantified RNA concentrations in faecal samples collected

265 from hospitalised patients, and Ng et al. [28] studied RNA concentrations in faecal sam-
266 ples to assess transmission risks associated with faecal microbiota transplants. These
267 data are not used to fit the hierarchical models but instead to assess the out-of-sample
268 predictive utility of our fitted models.

269 Five studies were excluded from the analysis despite providing quantitative informa-
270 tion. First, using an assay originally developed for samples from ferrets [44], Jeong et al.
271 [41] reported RNA concentrations of various specimen types, including faecal samples.
272 However, the reported concentrations are orders of magnitude lower than reported in
273 any of the other quantitative studies for any specimen type. Indeed, most measurements
274 are below the limit of quantification of other studies. Second, Zhang et al. [42] reported
275 detailed data in a figure, but it is not possible to extract the relevant information because
276 of the low resolution of the figure, and the data could not be obtained by other means.
277 Third, Zheng et al. [34] conducted a large study, comprising 85 patients and 842 faecal
278 samples. Unfortunately, viral loads are only reported as the median for each patient
279 (private communication). Finally, Pan et al. [43] and Cheung et al. [3] collected faecal
280 RNA concentration data from 17 and 59 confirmed cases, respectively, but neither study
281 provides information on the number of samples collected.

282 4.3. Parameter inference and model comparison

283 We used the nested sampler *polychord* [45] which draws samples from the posterior
284 distribution and evaluates the model evidence, i.e. the marginal likelihood of the data
285 under the model, as listed in table 2. The study by Wang et al. [11] was not used to
286 estimate parameters for *temporal* models because longitudinal data were not available.
287 Similarly, to facilitate a direct comparison between models, that study was also omitted
288 from the evaluation of evidences. We used unit-scale half-Cauchy distributions for the
289 shape parameters Q and q as well as the scale parameters S and σ . A flat prior on the
290 interval 6—23 was used for the population location M which is sufficiently wide to avoid
291 boundary effects. A flat prior on the unit interval was used for the shedding prevalence
292 ρ . For models with temporal variability, a unit-scale Cauchy prior was used for the
293 profile parameters α and β . We used uniform prior on the interval -14—7 for t_0 such
294 that the onset of shedding can differ from the onset of symptoms. All inferences were
295 run in triplicate, and no sensitivity to different pseudo-random number generator seeds
296 was observed (Gelman-Rubin diagnostic $\hat{R} < 1.05$ for all models [46]).

297 In addition to the results discussed in section 2, we consider four technical implications
298 of the inference here.

299 First, the gamma and Teunis shedding profiles are both consistent with the exponential
300 shedding profile for late-stage shedding where data are available to constrain them.
301 However, the available data cannot constrain early shedding behaviour, as illustrated by
302 the wide range of shedding profiles consistent with the data shown in fig. 4. Miura et al.
303 [22] reported tight posteriors for early shedding behaviour using the shedding profile
304 proposed by Teunis et al. [24], but their inferences rely on the assumption that the time
305 of symptom onset and shedding onset coincide (i.e. $t_0 = 0$), an assumption that is not
306 yet supported by evidence.




Figure 4: *Different shedding profiles yield consistent results for late-stage shedding, but early shedding behaviour (prior to day five after symptom onset) cannot be constrained given the available data.* Panels (a) and (b) show the the posterior distributions for the time t_{peak} at which the inferred gamma and Teunis shedding profiles peak, respectively. Because the data cannot constrain early shedding, the posterior for t_{peak} has broad support. Panels (c) and (d) show posterior samples of the gamma and Teunis profiles, respectively, in blue. The exponential profile discussed in section 2 is shown as an orange line, and the shaded region corresponds to the 95% credible interval.

307 Second, the shape Q controls the tails of the population-level distribution: the larger
308 Q , the lighter the tails (see Prentice [37] for details). The population-level mean RNA
309 concentration, i.e. the expected RNA concentration in a random faecal sample from
310 a previously unobserved patient, depends on the tail behaviour because the mean is
311 sensitive to outliers [36]. As shown in fig. 5 (a), the inferred mean under the *constant*
312 *standard* model is larger for smaller Q because of the heavier tails. The correspond-
313 ing credible intervals are also wider because constraining the mean requires more data
314 for heavier-tailed distributions. Employing log-normal, Weibull, or gamma distributions
315 would have entailed a poorly-motivated implicit choice about the shape of the distribu-
316 tion. Using generalised gamma distributions instead allows us to explicitly account for
317 our prior uncertainty about the shape of the tails.

318 Third, the 95% credible region for the population-level shape Q and scale S is consis-
319 tent with the log-normal distribution ($Q = 0$) or Weibull distribution ($Q = 1$) for both
320 the *constant* and *temporal* models, as shown in fig. 5 (b). However, the special case of
321 the gamma distribution ($Q = S$) can be confidently excluded because its tails are too
322 light. The same conclusions apply to the patient-level distribution.

323 Fourth, the joint posterior distribution for the population-level shape and scale pa-
324 rameters are similar under both the *constant* and *temporal* models (exponential shedding
325 profile) without a subpopulation of non-shedders, as shown in fig. 5 (b): modelling the
326 temporal shedding profile does not have a significant effect on the inferred variability in
327 shedding behaviour between patients. However, as shown in fig. 5 (c), the patient-level
328 scale σ is significantly larger for the *constant* than the *temporal* model. The *constant*
329 model can only account for large (time-integrated) sample-to-sample variability with
330 a broad distribution. In contrast, the *temporal* model can explain variability between
331 samples from the same patient using the shedding profile and a narrower distribution
332 that accounts for residual idiosyncratic noise.

333 4.4. Posterior predictive model assessment

334 We assess the goodness-of-fit of the model to the data using posterior predictive replica-
335 tion of various summary statistics, and validate the ability of the fitted model to predict
336 summary statistics of held-out datasets using posterior predictive validation.

337 Posterior predictive replication is a useful tool for assessing the fit of a model to
338 data [18, ch. 6]. In short, synthetic replicates of the data generated by sampling from
339 the posterior predictive distribution should not be easily distinguishable from the data
340 the model was fit to. For example, 104 of 148 samples were positive in the composite
341 dataset used to fit the *constant standard* model. If posterior predictive replicates of
342 the data have a similar number of positive samples, the model is able to describe this
343 particular aspect of the data. In contrast, the model would evidently not be suitable if it
344 confidently predicted that all samples should be positive. We assess the goodness-of-fit
345 to the data via posterior predictive replication of two key summary statistics.

346 The first summary statistics we consider are the number of positive samples $m_{(+)}$ and
347 positive patients $n_{(+)}$ (i.e. patients with at least one positive sample) because these
348 statistics have been extensively discussed in meta-analyses [3, 19, 20]. As shown in




Figure 5: *The mean number of RNA copies per mL of faeces is sensitive to the shape of the shedding distribution.* Panel (a) shows the conditional distribution of the mean number of RNA copies per mL of faeces given the population shape parameter Q for the *constant standard* model. The mean tends to be larger for smaller Q due to heavier tails. Panels (b) and (c) show the joint distributions of the shape and scale parameters for the population-level distribution and patient-level distribution, respectively. Parametrisations corresponding to the Weibull distribution ($Q = q = 1$) and gamma distribution ($Q = S$ and $q = \sigma$) are shown as black dot-dashed and dotted lines, respectively. The patient-level scale parameter σ is larger for the *constant* than the *temporal* model (both without a non-shedding subpopulation) because the patient-level distribution needs to account for both temporal variability and idiosyncratic sample-to-sample variability.




Figure 6: *Sampling from the posterior predictive distribution can replicate summary statistics of the data well.* Heat maps in panels (a) to (d) represent the joint distribution of the number of positive patients $n_{(+)}^{\text{rep}}$ and samples $m_{(+)}^{\text{rep}}$ under posterior predictive replication. The observed numbers (shown as black crosses) are consistent with the 63% credible region of the replications. Note that the values differ between the *temporal* and *constant* models because inference for the latter included an additional dataset that did not provide longitudinal information. Panel (e) show posterior predictive replications of the sample mean (excluding negative samples) for all models as violin plots. Markers represent the mode of the distribution, and the observed values are shown as black dashed lines.

349 fig. 6 (a) to (d), replicates from all models are consistent with the observed number of
350 positive patients $n_{(+)}$ and number of positive samples $m_{(+)}$, corroborating our result that
351 the limit of quantification of assays is sufficient to account for negative samples. Repli-
352 cates from the two *subpopulation* models exhibit larger variability because assay results
353 $x_{i\bullet}$ for samples from the same patient i are correlated due to their mutual dependence
354 on the shedding indicator z_i .

355 Second, we evaluate the sample mean (i.e. the mean of all positive samples) across
356 posterior predictive replicates and compare it with the sample mean of the data. The
357 models can indeed replicate the statistic well, and the observed sample mean is consistent
358 with the predicted sample means, as shown in fig. 6 (e).

359 Posterior predictive replication can only assess the models' ability to explain the data
360 they were fit to. In other words, a model that satisfies such posterior predictive checks
361 may nevertheless fail to generalise to other datasets. To assess the out-of-sample pre-
362 dictive utility of the models, we consider predictions for two held-out datasets.

363 Kim et al. [27] collected 129 samples from 38 hospitalised patients, and we assumed
364 that at least one sample was collected from each patient. The remaining 91 samples
365 were assumed to be collected from patients with equal probability. This information
366 is sufficient to generate model-based predictions in two steps by sampling from the
367 posterior predictive distribution. First, we sampled the patient-level means λ from the
368 population-level distribution. Second, we sampled the assay results according to eqs. (2)
369 and (3) for the *standard* and *subpopulation* models, respectively. While Kim et al. [27]
370 also report the number of positive and negative samples, as shown in table 1, we could
371 not replicate these summary statistics because they do not provide the limit of detection
372 of their assay. Ng et al. [28] collected 81 samples from 21 patients, and we used the same
373 allocation of samples to patients to generate predictions as for the study by Kim et al.
374 [27].

375 Data and code availability

376 The data analysed during the current study and custom computer code are available at
377 <https://github.com/tillahoffmann/shedding>.

378 Acknowledgements

379 This work was supported by the Natural Environment Research Council grant number
380 NE/V010387/1. We thank Will Handley for discussions about the *polychord* sampler
381 as well as Nick Jones, Kathleen O'Reilly, Vincent Savolainen, Emma Ransome, Mary
382 Burkitt-Gray, and Christopher Coleman for comments on the manuscript.

383 References

- 384 [1] E. Dong, H. Du, and L. Gardner. “An interactive web-based dashboard to track
385 COVID-19 in real time”. In: *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 20.5 (2020), pp. 533–
386 534. DOI: [10.1016/s1473-3099\(20\)30120-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1473-3099(20)30120-1).
- 387 [2] C. Huang et al. “Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus
388 in Wuhan, China”. In: *The Lancet* 395.10223 (2020), pp. 497–506. DOI: [10.1016/
389 s0140-6736\(20\)30183-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30183-5).
- 390 [3] K. S. Cheung et al. “Gastrointestinal Manifestations of SARS-CoV-2 Infection
391 and Virus Load in Fecal Samples from the Hong Kong Cohort and Systematic
392 Review and Meta-analysis”. In: *Gastroenterology* 159.1 (2020), pp. 81–95. DOI:
393 [10.1053/j.gastro.2020.03.065](https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2020.03.065).
- 394 [4] G. Medema, L. Heijnen, G. Elsinga, R. Italiaander, and A. Brouwer. “Presence of
395 SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19
396 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands”. In: *Environ-
397 mental Science & Technology Letters* 7.7 (2020), pp. 511–516. DOI: [10.1021/acs.
398 estlett.0c00357](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357).
- 399 [5] D. D. Polo et al. “Making waves: Wastewater-based epidemiology for SARS-CoV-2
400 – Developing robust approaches for surveillance and prediction is harder than it
401 looks”. In: *Water Research* (2020), p. 116404. DOI: [10.1016/j.watres.2020.
402 116404](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116404).
- 403 [6] F. Wu et al. “SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater foreshadow dynamics and clinical
404 presentation of new COVID-19 cases”. In: *medRxiv* (2020), p. 2020.06.15.20117747.
405 DOI: [10.1101/2020.06.15.20117747](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20117747).
- 406 [7] M. Wade et al. *Wastewater COVID-19 monitoring in the UK: summary for SAGE*.
407 Tech. rep. Joint Biosecurity Centre, Department for Health and Social Care, 2020.
- 408 [8] A. P. Banks et al. “Potential impact of the sewer system on the applicability
409 of alcohol and tobacco biomarkers in wastewater-based epidemiology”. In: *Drug
410 Testing and Analysis* 10.3 (2018), pp. 530–538. DOI: [10.1002/dta.2246](https://doi.org/10.1002/dta.2246).
- 411 [9] E. Slot et al. “Low SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in blood donors in the early
412 COVID-19 epidemic in the Netherlands”. In: *Nature Communications* 11.1 (2020),
413 p. 5744. DOI: [10.1038/s41467-020-19481-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19481-7).
- 414 [10] Global Infectious Hazard Preparedness Team. “Status of environmental surveil-
415 lance for SARS-CoV-2 virus”. In: *WHO COVID-19 Scientific Briefs* (2020), WHO/
416 2019-nCoV/Sci_Brief/EnvironmentalSampling/2020.1.
- 417 [11] W. Wang et al. “Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Speci-
418 mens”. In: *JAMA* 323.18 (2020), pp. 1843–1844. DOI: [10.1001/jama.2020.3786](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.3786).
- 419 [12] R. Wölfel et al. “Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-
420 2019”. In: *Nature* 581.7809 (2020), pp. 1–10. DOI: [10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x).

- 421 [13] A. B. Franklin and S. N. Bevins. “Spillover of SARS-CoV-2 into novel wild hosts in
422 North America: A conceptual model for perpetuation of the pathogen”. In: *Science*
423 *of The Total Environment* 733 (2020), p. 139358. DOI: [10.1016/j.scitotenv.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139358)
424 [2020.139358](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139358).
- 425 [14] N. Oreshkova et al. “SARS-CoV-2 infection in farmed minks, the Netherlands,
426 April and May 2020”. In: *Eurosurveillance* 25.23 (2020), p. 2001005. DOI: [10.](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.es.2020.25.23.2001005)
427 [2807/1560-7917.es.2020.25.23.2001005](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.es.2020.25.23.2001005).
- 428 [15] J. W. Zabinski, K. J. Pieper, and J. M. Gibson. “A Bayesian Belief Network Model
429 Assessing the Risk to Wastewater Workers of Contracting Ebola Virus Disease
430 During an Outbreak”. In: *Risk Analysis* 38.2 (2018), pp. 376–391. DOI: [10.1111/](https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.12827)
431 [risa.12827](https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.12827).
- 432 [16] M. Kang et al. “Probable Evidence of Fecal Aerosol Transmission of SARS-CoV-2
433 in a High-Rise Building”. In: *Annals of Internal Medicine* 173.12 (2020), pp. 974–
434 980. DOI: [10.7326/m20-0928](https://doi.org/10.7326/m20-0928).
- 435 [17] J. Yuan et al. “Sewage as a Possible Transmission Vehicle During a Coronavirus
436 Disease 2019 Outbreak in a Densely populated Community: Guangzhou, China,
437 April 2020”. In: *Clinical Infectious Diseases* (2020), ciaa1494. DOI: [10.1093/cid/](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1494)
438 [ciaa1494](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1494).
- 439 [18] A. Gelman et al. *Bayesian Data Analysis*. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC,
440 2014.
- 441 [19] A. S. van Doorn, B. Meijer, C. M. A. Frampton, M. L. Barclay, and N. K. H. Boer.
442 “Systematic review with meta-analysis: SARS-CoV-2 stool testing and the poten-
443 tial for faecal-oral transmission”. In: *Alimentary Pharmacology & Therapeutics*
444 (2020). DOI: [10.1111/apt.16036](https://doi.org/10.1111/apt.16036).
- 445 [20] M. C. Wong et al. “Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in fecal specimens of patients
446 with confirmed COVID-19: A meta-analysis”. In: *Journal of Infection* 81.2 (2020),
447 e31–e38. DOI: [10.1016/j.jinf.2020.06.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.06.012).
- 448 [21] W. Ahmed et al. “First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastew-
449 ater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19
450 in the community”. In: *Science of The Total Environment* 728 (2020), p. 138764.
451 DOI: [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764).
- 452 [22] F. Miura, M. Kitajima, and R. Omori. “Duration of SARS-CoV-2 viral shedding
453 in faeces as a parameter for wastewater-based epidemiology: Re-analysis of patient
454 data using a shedding dynamics model”. In: *Science of The Total Environment*
455 (2021), p. 144549. DOI: [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144549](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144549).
- 456 [23] A. E. Benefield et al. “SARS-CoV-2 viral load peaks prior to symptom onset: a
457 systematic review and individual-pooled analysis of coronavirus viral load from 66
458 studies”. In: *medRxiv* (2020). DOI: [10.1101/2020.09.28.20202028](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.28.20202028).
- 459 [24] P. F. M. Teunis et al. “Shedding of norovirus in symptomatic and asymptomatic
460 infections”. In: *Epidemiology and Infection* 143.8 (2015), pp. 1710–1717. DOI: [10.](https://doi.org/10.1017/s095026881400274x)
461 [1017/s095026881400274x](https://doi.org/10.1017/s095026881400274x).

- 462 [25] G. Lui et al. “Viral dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 across a spectrum of disease severity
463 in COVID-19”. In: *Journal of Infection* 81.2 (2020), pp. 318–356. DOI: [10.1016/
464 j.jinf.2020.04.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.014).
- 465 [26] M. S. Han et al. “Viral RNA Load in Mildly Symptomatic and Asymptomatic
466 Children with COVID-19, Seoul, South Korea - Volume 26, Number 10—Octo-
467 ber 2020 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC”. In: *Emerging Infectious
468 Diseases* 26.10 (2020), pp. 2497–2499. DOI: [10.3201/eid2610.202449](https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2610.202449).
- 469 [27] J.-M. Kim et al. “Detection and Isolation of SARS-CoV-2 in Serum, Urine, and
470 Stool Specimens of COVID-19 Patients from the Republic of Korea”. In: *Osong
471 Public Health and Research Perspectives* 11.3 (2020), pp. 112–117. DOI: [10.24171/
472 j.phrp.2020.11.3.02](https://doi.org/10.24171/j.phrp.2020.11.3.02).
- 473 [28] S. C. Ng, F. K. L. Chan, and P. K. S. Chan. “Screening FMT donors during the
474 COVID-19 pandemic: a protocol for stool SARS-CoV-2 viral quantification”. In:
475 *The Lancet Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 5.7 (2020), pp. 642–643. DOI: [10.1016/
476 s2468-1253\(20\)30124-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2468-1253(20)30124-2).
- 477 [29] A. Gelman, J. Hwang, and A. Vehtari. “Understanding predictive information
478 criteria for Bayesian models”. In: *Statistics and Computing* 24.6 (2014), pp. 997–
479 1016. DOI: [10.1007/s11222-013-9416-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11222-013-9416-2).
- 480 [30] J. M. Gan et al. “Atypical presentation of COVID-19 in hospitalised older adults”.
481 In: *Irish Journal of Medical Science* (2020), pp. 1–6. DOI: [10.1007/s11845-020-
482 02372-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11845-020-02372-7).
- 483 [31] F. Wu et al. “SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater Are Higher than Expected from
484 Clinically Confirmed Cases”. In: *mSystems* 5.4 (2020). DOI: [10.1128/msystems.
485 00614-20](https://doi.org/10.1128/msystems.00614-20).
- 486 [32] B. J. Tschärke et al. “Harnessing the Power of the Census: Characterizing Wastew-
487 ater Treatment Plant Catchment Populations for Wastewater-Based Epidemiol-
488 ogy”. In: *Environmental Science & Technology* 53.17 (2019), pp. 10303–10311.
489 DOI: [10.1021/acs.est.9b03447](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b03447).
- 490 [33] C. Rose, A. Parker, B. Jefferson, and E. Cartmell. “The characterisation of faeces
491 and urine; a review of the literature to inform advanced treatment technology”. In:
492 *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology* 45.17 (2015), pp. 1827–
493 1879. DOI: [10.1080/10643389.2014.1000761](https://doi.org/10.1080/10643389.2014.1000761).
- 494 [34] S. Zheng et al. “Viral load dynamics and disease severity in patients infected
495 with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January–March 2020: retrospective
496 cohort study”. In: *BMJ* 369 (2020), p. m1443. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.m1443](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1443).
- 497 [35] R. F. Kappenman. “Estimation for the three-parameter Weibull, lognormal, and
498 gamma distributions”. In: *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 3 (1985),
499 pp. 11–23. DOI: [10.1016/0167-9473\(85\)90054-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-9473(85)90054-4).
- 500 [36] D. B. Rubin. “Distinguishing between the Scale of the Estimand and the Transfor-
501 mation to Normality”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 79.386
502 (1984), pp. 309–312. DOI: [10.1080/01621459.1984.10478046](https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1984.10478046).

- 503 [37] R. L. Prentice. “A log gamma model and its maximum likelihood estimation”. In:
504 *Biometrika* 61.3 (1974), pp. 539–544. DOI: [10.1093/biomet/61.3.539](https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/61.3.539).
- 505 [38] M. Kitajima et al. “SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and re-
506 search needs”. In: *Science of The Total Environment* 739 (2020), p. 139076. DOI:
507 [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076).
- 508 [39] X. Lu et al. “US CDC Real-Time Reverse Transcription PCR Panel for Detection
509 of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 - Volume 26, Number 8—Au-
510 gust 2020 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC”. In: *Emerging Infectious
511 Diseases* 26.8 (2020), pp. 1654–1665. DOI: [10.3201/eid2608.201246](https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2608.201246).
- 512 [40] M. Cevik et al. “SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV viral load dynam-
513 ics, duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness: a systematic review and meta-
514 analysis”. In: *The Lancet Microbe* (2020). DOI: [10.1016/s2666-5247\(20\)30172-
515 5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2666-5247(20)30172-5).
- 516 [41] H. W. Jeong et al. “Viable SARS-CoV-2 in various specimens from COVID-19
517 patients”. In: *Clinical Microbiology and Infection* (2020). DOI: [10.1016/j.cmi.
518 2020.07.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.07.020).
- 519 [42] N. Zhang et al. “Comparative study on virus shedding patterns in nasopharyn-
520 geal and fecal specimens of COVID-19 patients”. In: *Science China Life Sciences*
521 (2020), pp. 1–3. DOI: [10.1007/s11427-020-1783-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11427-020-1783-9).
- 522 [43] Y. Pan, D. Zhang, P. Yang, L. L. M. Poon, and Q. Wang. “Viral load of SARS-CoV-
523 2 in clinical samples”. In: *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 20.4 (2020), pp. 411–412.
524 DOI: [10.1016/s1473-3099\(20\)30113-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1473-3099(20)30113-4).
- 525 [44] Y.-I. Kim et al. “Infection and Rapid Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Ferrets”. In:
526 *Cell Host & Microbe* 27.5 (2020), 704–709.e2. DOI: [10.1016/j.chom.2020.03.023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2020.03.023).
- 527 [45] W. J. Handley, M. P. Hobson, and A. N. Lasenby. “polychord: next-generation
528 nested sampling”. In: *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 453.4
529 (2015), pp. 4384–4398. DOI: [10.1093/mnras/stv1911](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv1911).
- 530 [46] A. Gelman and D. B. Rubin. “Inference from Iterative Simulation Using Multiple
531 Sequences”. In: *Statistical Science* 7.4 (1992), pp. 457–472. DOI: [10.1214/ss/
532 1177011136](https://doi.org/10.1214/ss/1177011136).

533 A. Properties of the generalised gamma distribution

534 We use the parametrisation of the generalised gamma distribution presented by Prentice
535 [37], and the random variable x follows a generalised gamma distribution if

$$\log x = \mu + \frac{\sigma}{q} \log(q^2 s),$$

where s is a gamma random variable with shape q^{-2} . The probability density function used in eq. (2) is thus

$$f(x; q, \mu, \sigma) = \frac{q}{\sigma x \Gamma(q^{-2})} [s(x)]^{q^{-2}} \exp(-s(x)),$$
$$\text{where } s(x) = q^{-2} \exp\left(\frac{q}{\sigma} [\log x - \mu]\right).$$

536 Similarly, the cumulative distribution function is

$$F(x; q, \mu, \sigma) = \frac{\gamma(q^{-2}, s(x))}{\Gamma(q^{-2})},$$

537 where γ is the lower incomplete gamma function.

538 The expected value is

$$\lambda = \exp(\mu) q^{2\sigma/q} \frac{\Gamma(q^{-2} + \sigma/q)}{\Gamma(q^{-2})},$$

539 and expressing the location parameter μ in terms of the mean λ yields eq. (1). The
540 coefficient of variation is

$$\sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(q^{-2}) \Gamma(q^{-2} + 2\sigma/q)}{[\Gamma(q^{-1} + \sigma/q)]^2} - 1},$$

541 and the generalised gamma distribution has a constant coefficient of variation indepen-
542 dent of the location parameter μ .