1	Assessment of the fatality rate and transmissibility taking account of undetected cases
2	during an unprecedented COVID-19 surge in Taiwan
3	
4	Hsiang-Yu Yuan <sup>1,2,*</sup> , M. Pear Hossain <sup>1</sup> , Tzai-Hung Wen <sup>3</sup> , Ming-Jiuh Wang <sup>4</sup>
5	
6 7 8	<sup>1</sup> Department of Biomedical Sciences, Jockey Club College of Veterinary Medicine and Life Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China
9 10 11	<sup>2</sup> Centre for Applied One Health Research and Policy Advice, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China
12	<sup>3</sup> Department of Geography, National Taiwan University, Taipei City, Taiwan
13 14	<sup>4</sup> Department of Anesthesiology, National Taiwan University Hospital, National Taiwan University, Taiwan
15	
16	*Correspondence to: Hsiang-Yu Yuan sean.yuan@cityu.edu.hk
17	Hsiang-Yu Yuan and M. Pear Hossain contributed equally to this article.
18	
19	
20	

### 2

### 21 Abstract

#### 22 Background

During the COVID-19 outbreak in Taiwan between May 11 and June 20, 2021, the observed fatality rate (FR) was 5.3%, higher than the global average at 2.1%. The high number of reported deaths suggests that hospital capacity was insufficient. However, many unexplained deaths were subsequently identified as cases, indicating that there were a few undetected cases, hence resulting in a higher estimate of FR. Estimating the number of total infected cases or knowing how to reduce the undetected cases can allow an accurate estimation of the fatality rate (FR) and effective reproduction number ( $R_t$ ).

### 30 Methods

After adjusting for reporting delays, we estimated the number of undetected cases using reported deaths that were and were not previously detected. The daily FR and  $R_t$  were calculated using the number of total cases (i.e. including undetected cases). A logistic regression model was developed to predict the detection ratio among deaths using selected predictors from daily testing and tracing data.

### 36 Results

37 The estimated true daily case number at the peak of the outbreak on May 22 was 897, which 38 was 24.3% higher than the reported number, but the difference became less than 4% on June 9 39 and afterward. After taking account of undetected cases, our estimated mean FR (4.7%) was 40 still high but the daily rate showed a large decrease from 6.5% on May 19 to 2.8% on June 6. 41  $R_t$  reached a maximum value of 6.4 on May 11, compared to 6.0 estimated using the reported 42 case number. The decreasing proportion of undetected cases was associated with the increases 43 in the ratio of the number of tests conducted to reported cases, and the proportion of cases that 44 are contact-traced before symptom onset.

### 45 Conclusions

46 Increasing testing capacity and tracing efficiency can lead to a reduction of hidden cases and47 hence improvement in epidemiological parameter estimation.

#### 3

### 49 Introduction

50 Knowing the actual number of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases throughout an 51 outbreak is critical to provide an accurate estimate of epidemiological parameters such as the 52 fatality rate (FR) and effective reproduction number  $(R_t)$ . These parameters aid in making 53 proper public health decisions, assessing health care system performance, and predicting the 54 trend of COVID-19 spread. However, the number of undetected cases can be large and may 55 vary during an outbreak. Limited capacities for contact tracing and testing often result in 56 underestimation of true infections <sup>1,2</sup>. The proportion of undetected cases may reduce after such 57 capacities improve. Hence, estimating this constantly changing proportion of undetected cases 58 throughout an outbreak is important.

59 After several months of zero confirmed community-acquired cases, quarantine exemption for 60 flight crews, and super spreader events in tea parlors in Wanhua in Taipei in late April and early May 2021, triggered a fresh wave of local spread of the Alpha variant <sup>3</sup>. This resulted in 61 14,005 total reported cases between May 11 and June 20, 2021<sup>4</sup>. Approximately 5% of cases 62 63 resulted in death, which was a higher case fatality rate (CFR) compared to the global rate 64 (obtained by dividing the total number of deaths by the total number of cases worldwide), 65 which has been consistently below 2.5% since November 16, 2020 <sup>5</sup>. Whether this high CFR was mainly because of insufficient hospital capacity and treatment, or a massive proportion of 66 67 undetected cases was unknown.

68 Early in the outbreak, testing capacity was insufficient to cope with the rising cases among 69 initial transmission clusters. The daily number of new cases grew to more than 200 within a 70 week and continued to increase until reaching a plateau at the end of May 2021 (i.e., 596 cases 71 on average per day from May 22 to 28). Because of the emerging outbreak, Taiwan had been 72 under Level 2 alert since May 11, 2021<sup>6</sup>, followed by escalation to Level 3 restrictions on May 73 19, 2021<sup>7</sup>, under which people are required to wear masks outdoors, gatherings of more than 74 four people indoors and more than nine people outdoors are banned, and all schools are closed. Social distancing measures reduced individual mobility <sup>8</sup> and effectively lowered  $R_t$ . At the 75 same time, the daily number of tests conducted continued to increase, presumably allowing 76 77 more cases to be identified.

78 During the outbreak, many confirmed cases failed to be detected when alive but were tested 79 because of their death, indicating that a certain number of undetected cases existed. The number 80 of undetected cases who eventually died (referred to as **undetected deaths**), together with the

number of deaths who were known to have COVID-19 (referred to as detected deaths), can
be used to infer the proportion of undetected cases if their fatality rates are known. Presumably,
the probability of death among undetected cases is similar to that among detected cases during
the early period of the outbreak when hostpial capacity and treatment is not sufficient.

Although knowing the numbers of detected and undetected deaths helps to estimate the proportion of undetected cases and hence to guide interventions, a challenge exists that many deaths from infection usually happen several weeks after symptom onset. This highlights the importance of early estimation of the true number of total cases without delay. Hence, it is important to know whether the changes in the proportion of detected deaths can be predicted by daily testing and tracing data.

We quantified time-varying FR and  $R_t$  by taking into account the proportion of undetected cases estimated using death data. We then developed a model based on logistic regression to predict the proportion of undetected cases using daily data related to testing and tracing capacity.

### 95 Methods

# 96 Data sources

97 We collected the date of symptom onset time and testing date for each reported death of

- 98 COVID-19 from May 28 to July 22, 2021 from Taiwan Centers for Disease Control <sup>9</sup>. The
  99 daily number of deaths reported before May 28 was obtained from the media. Daily number of
- 100 confirmed cases was collected from Taiwan National Infectious Disease Statistics System <sup>4</sup>.
- 101 We collected the daily number of tests conducted from the Government Information Open
- 102 Platform, Taiwan<sup>10,11</sup>.

### 103 Estimating true total cases and fatality rate

Deaths from COVID-19 were classified into two categories, detected and undetected deaths, depending on whether testing was performed before the death or not, respectively (see the schema in Figure 1A). To estimate the number of true total cases, we first considered the following ratio of undetected to detected deaths using the numbers of detected and undetected cases and their respective FR:

$$\frac{d_{ud}(t)}{d_d(t)} = \frac{c_{ud}(t) \times FR_{ud}}{c_d(t) \times FR_d(t)} \tag{1}$$

where  $d_d$  refers to the number of detected deaths, while  $d_{ud}$  refers to the number of undetected 110 111 deaths;  $c_d(t)$  and  $c_{ud}(t)$  represent the number of cases that are detected and undetected at day 112 t, respectively. Note that t refers to the reporting date for detected cases or detected deaths; For undetected cases or undetected deaths, t refers to the adjusted reporting date such that the 113 114 reporting delay (i.e., the time elapsed between symptom onset and reporting) is adjusted to be 115 the same as that of detected cases. Thus,  $d_d(t)$  represents the number of deaths among the 116 detected cases who are reported at day t. Similarly,  $d_{ud}(t)$  is the number of deaths among the undetected cases whose adjusted reporting date is at day t.  $FR_d(t)$ , which is likely to be 117 118 affected by the change in hospital capacity or treatment, represents the daily FR among the 119 detected cases at day t.  $FR_{ud}$  represents the FR among the undetected cases.  $FR_{ud}$  was 120 assumed to be a constant, estimated as the average  $FR_d(t)$  during the initial two weeks (from 121 May 11 to May 24) of the outbreak when the hostpital capacity or treatment was not sufficient. Undetected deaths who are tested later are identified as "late-detected" cases  $(c_{ld})$  (See Figure 122 123 1A). We back-projected the number of late-detected cases from their late reporting time to their adjusted reporting date  $t^{12}$ , using the mean and standard deviation of the reporting delay 124

6

125 among detected cases. Our aim was to estimate  $c_{ud}(t)$ . After rearrangement, the following 126 formula was derived:

127 
$$c_{ud}(t) = c_d(t) \times \frac{FR_d(t)}{FR_{ud}} / \frac{d_d(t)}{d_{ud}(t)}$$
(2)

The value can be solved because all of the terms on the right are either known or can be 128 129 estimated. We assumed that most of the undetected deaths were identified as "late-detected" 130 cases  $(c_{ld})$ . Therefore, the number of undetected deaths was approximated by the number of late-detected cases  $(d_{ud} \approx c_{ld})$  and then the ratio  $\frac{d_d(t)}{d_{ud}(t)}$  was obtained. At the same time, the 131 proportion of detected deaths (i.e., the detection ratio among death cases;  $\frac{d_d(t)}{d_d + d_{ud}(t)}$ ) was also 132 calculated. Finally, the true number of total cases was derived empirically as the sum of 133 detected and undetected cases (i.e.,  $c_d + c_{ud}$ ). Note that these ratios among deaths were also 134 predicted by a regression model using data related to testing and tracing and hence a model-135 136 predicted number of total cases was obtained (see later sections).

137 The FRs of reported cases (including both detected and late-detected cases;  $c_d + c_{ld}$ ) and total 138 cases were estimated at the reporting time (or the adjusted reporting time for undetected cases) 139 using the following equations.

140 
$$FR_{reported}(t) = \left(\frac{d_d(t) + c_{ld}(t)}{c_d(t) + c_{ld}(t)}\right)$$
(3)

141 
$$FR_{total}(t) = \left(\frac{d_d(t) + d_{ud}(t)}{c_d(t) + c_{ud}(t)}\right)$$
(4)

142  $FR_{reported}$  is commonly known as the case fatality rate, and  $FR_{total}$  is the infection fatality 143 rate.

### 144 Estimating the proportion of detected deaths using a predictive model

We predicted the detection ratio among death cases using daily values of five indicators related to testing, tracing, and hospital capacities as candidate predictors. These indicators are: the *proportion of cases without contact tracing delay, ratio of the number of tests conducted to reported cases, testing delay, reporting delay* and *death delay* (for definitions, see Error! **Reference source not found.**). We calculated the delay periods in testing, reporting and death by subtracting adjusting for the date of symptom onset from the dates of these three events. Testing (the first test) earlier or on the same day as symptom onset implied that cases were

7

152 contact-traced without delay. If cases were tested after symptom onset, they were either 153 contact-traced with delay or were not contact-traced. The proportion of death cases that were 154 contact-traced without delay was calculated.

- 155 To investigate the factors that influence the proportion of detected deaths, we developed a
- 156 logistic regression model. We assumed that the number of deaths that were previously detected
- 157 on day t follows a binomial distribution, i.e.  $d_d(t) \sim binomial(d(t), m(t))$ , where m(t) =

158  $\frac{d_d(t)}{d_d(t)+d_{ud}(t)}$  is the expected proportion of detected deaths on day t.

159 The full predictive model is:

160 
$$\log\left(\frac{m(t)}{1-m(t)}\right) = \alpha + \beta_1 R_{tc} + \beta_2 P_{ntd} + \beta_3 C_d + \beta_4 T_d + \beta_5 D_d \quad (5)$$

161 where  $R_{tc}$  is the daily ratio of tests conducted to reported cases;  $P_{ntd}$  represents the daily 162 proportion of cases (among detected deaths) without contact tracing delay.  $C_d$ ,  $T_d$  and  $D_d$  are 163 daily reporting, testing and death delays, respectively.  $\alpha$  is the intercept and  $\beta_i$  is the regression 164 coefficient of each covariate. The proportion of undetected COVID-19 cases can be calculated 165 using equations (1) and (5) after m(t) is estimated:

166 
$$\frac{c_{ud}(t)}{c_{ud}(t) + c_d(t)} = 1/\left(1 + \frac{m(t)}{1 - m(t)} \times \frac{FR_{ud}}{FR_d(t)}\right)$$
(6)

167 where  $\frac{m(t)}{1-m(t)} = \frac{d_d(t)}{d_{ud}(t)}$  is the odds of being detected.

### 168 Model selection

To obtain the best model, the variables in equation 5 were added to the model iteratively. First, 169 model fit was measured for each of the variables separately using the Akaike information 170 criterion (AIC)<sup>13</sup>. The model containing the lowest AIC value was selected as the best model 171 candidate in this batch. Next, we added one additional variable to the candidate model from 172 173 the remaining four variables in the next batch. Among the two-variable models, the model with 174 the lowest AIC value was selected as the best model candidate again. We obtained the best model candidates among three-variable, four-variable and full models. The final best model 175 was obtained by comparing the best model candidates in different batches with the lowest AIC. 176

### 177 Model validation

- 178 To evaluate whether the predictive model achieved its intended purpose (i.e., to improve the
- 179 accuracy of epidemiological parameter estimation), we explored the relationship between  $R_t$

- 180 estimated from the total cases predicted by the best model and daily mobility data. Cases
- 181 were back-projected to infection time. The result was compared with  $R_t$  estimated using total
- 182 cases that were empirically derived or using reported cases.  $R_t$  estimated from four scenarios
- 183 of infections were compared:

### 184 Scenario 1 (S1): Total cases (at infection time) estimated using an empirical detection

- 185 ratio These cases include both the reported and undetected cases at their infection time. The
- 186 number of undetected cases was estimated empirically assuming reporting delay was the same
- 187 for detected and undetected cases.
- 188 Scenario 2 (S2): Total cases (at infection time) estimated from a model-predicted
- 189 detection ratio These cases include both the reported and undetected cases at their infection
- 190 time. The number of undetected cases was estimated from the model assuming reporting delay
- 191 was the same for detected and undetected cases.
- 192 Scenario 3 (S3): Reported cases (at infection time) Cases that were detected before death
- and late-detected after death at their infection time.
- 194 Scenario 4 (S4): Reported cases (at reporting time) Cases that were detected before death
- 195 and late-detected after death at their reporting time. Late-detected cases were back-projected
- 196 at the adjusted reporting time.

### 197 Estimating the effective reproduction number

The effective reproduction number  $R_t$  was estimated from the daily new cases of infection 198 using the statistical package *EpiEstim*<sup>14</sup>. To estimate the daily number of new cases, we 199 200 assumed that both the incubation time and reporting delay followed gamma distribution <sup>15,16</sup>. The mean incubation time for the circulated strain in Taiwan was 3.53 days <sup>17</sup>, and we estimated 201 the mean reporting delay as 4.45 days. Assuming the standard deviations were equal for both 202 203 the distributions (estimated as 3.93 days for the reporting delay), the distribution of time 204 between infection and reporting was gamma distribution with a mean of 7.98 days and a 205 standard deviation of 5.28 days. The mean of the distribution was estimated as the sum of mean 206 incubation time and confirmation delay. In contrast, the standard deviation was obtained from 207 weighted means and pooled standard deviation for the period between infection and reporting 208 using the following formula:

209 
$$sd_{gamma} = sd_{pooled} \sqrt{\left(\frac{m_1 + m_2}{m_w}\right)}$$
(7)

- 210 where,  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are mean incubation time and confirmation delay and  $m_w$  refers weighted
- 211 mean of these two. *sd*<sub>pooled</sub> represents the pooled standard deviation for the period between
- 212 infection and reporting.

- 9
- 213 We then estimated total cases at infection time using the empirical detection ratio (S1) and the
- 214 model-predicted detection ratio (S2), and reported cases at infection time (S3) using a back-
- 215 projection method <sup>12</sup>.
- 216 We set initial conditions for estimating  $R_t$ . Before May 11, we assumed that there were 15
- 217 cases each day between May 6 and 10, which was the average number of reported cases at
- 218 infection time during this 5-day period.

#### 10

### 219 Results

Time-varying FR among true total cases (equation 4) was first quantified after taking into account undetected cases and was compared with that of reported cases. The number of total cases was also predicted using polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing data (equations 5 and 6). To assess the impact of including undetected cases, we investigated the relationship between  $R_t$  generated using total cases and mobility data and then determined whether the relationship improved, compared with  $R_t$  from reported cases.

After the number of undetected cases was considered, the estimated FR was lower than using reported cases but was still high during the initial period of the outbreak. The mean FR of total cases was estimated to be 4.7%, which was lower than the mean FR of 5.3% for reported cases (Figure 1B). The FR increased rapidly from 4.7% and peaked at 6.5% on May 19, but then

continued decreasing, reaching 2.8% on June 6. Since then, the rate was generally maintained.

From May 24 to June 3, the 5-day moving average numbers of reported cases reached a plateau and then declined thereafter (Figure 3A). The estimated true daily case number at the peak of the outbreak on May 22 was 897, which was 24.3% higher than the reported number. The difference became less than 4% on June 9 and afterward.

235 Until June 20, a total of 105 late-detected cases were reported, indicating many undetected 236 deaths. Similarly, daily detected deaths also reached a plateau around May 24 (Figure 3B). 237 However, the number of late-detected cases (at adjusted reporting time), reached a peak (7 238 persons per day) on May 21 and started to decline immediately, approaching zero after June 8. 239 This indicated the improvement of the detected ratio among deaths. The detection ratio among 240 deaths, which was about 50% initially, exceeded 95% after the end of May (Figure S1B). This 241 ratio was very different from the observed ratio (a V-shaped pattern) without back-projection 242 (Figure S1A).

### 243 Predicting detection ratio using testing data

We next investigated whether the improvement in the proportion of detected cases was related to the improved capacity of testing and tracing. The indicators of the capacity were explained by the schematic of individual infection and testing statuses of each case among deaths (for definitions, please refer to Figure 2 and its legend). Depending on the time of testing, the case can be categorized as a detected death ( contact-traced without delay or tested after symptom onset but before death) or an undetected death (tested after death). More efficient contact

250 tracing allowed more cases to be traced and tested before symptom onset and was indicated by 251 the proportion of cases without contact tracing delay. This proportion fluctuated between 25% 252 and 75% throughout the study period, with an increasing trend from late May (below 50%) to 253 late June (above 60%) (Figure 4A). The testing delay gradually increased, from approximately 254 two days to up to 4-6 days, until June 14, a few weeks after the outbreak started to decline 255 (Figure 4B). The *reporting delay* from the day of symptom onset ranged mostly between 2.5 256 and 7.5 days (Figure 4E), whereas the *death delay* continued increasing from 5 days to more 257 than 18 days (Figure 4C). The ratio of the number of tests conducted to reported cases 258 increased from less than 50 to more than 200 (Figure 4D), demonstrating the improvement in

testing capacity throughout the outbreak.

We compared models starting from the most basic to more complex ones by their AIC values to identify the best-fitting model. The model with the predictor, i.e., the proportion of cases without contact tracing delay and the ratio of tests conducted to reported cases, was selected as the best model (Model 2 in <u>Table 1</u>).

The model successfully captured the trend in the proportion of detected deaths (<u>Figure 4</u>F). 20 out of 34 daily values were successfully predicted within the confidence interval. Among the values outside the interval, most of the them were in the near distance; only two dots have errors larger than two times the intervals.

The results suggest that a higher detection ratio among deaths was driven by more cases who were contact-traced without delay and a higher number of tests conducted relative to the number of cases (<u>Table 2</u>).

### 271 Comparing effective reproduction number and mobility index

272 Comparisons were made between  $R_t$  estimated using i) total cases that were estimated using the empirical detection ratio; ii) total cases that were estimated from the model-predicted 273 274 detection ratio using testing data; and iii) reported cases only (see Figure 5A, B, Figure S2 and 275 Methods). When the total case number was used,  $R_t$  was higher during the earlier dates. The 276 number reached a maximum value of 6.4 on May 11, compared to 6.0 estimated using the 277 reported case number. We further evaluated the relationship between  $R_t$  and mobility data 278 during the period when  $R_t$  reduced from the maximum value to 1 (May 11 to May 24) (<u>Table</u> 279 S1). We found that when the total case number was used (either estimated using the empirical 280 detection ratio or predicted using the testing data), a lower AIC was produced, indicating a 281 better fit to the mobility data.

- 282 In summary, efficiencies of testing and contact tracing changed during the outbreak and were
- 283 useful in predicting the proportion of undetected cases. After adding the undetected cases, a
- better estimate of  $R_t$  was made and a reduction in the FR was observed.

#### 13

### 285 Discussion

286 Understanding whether a high FR observed in the recent largest COVID-19 outbreak in Taiwan was attributed to a higher number of undetected cases or insufficient health care capacity is 287 288 important to guide interventions to reduce COVID-19 mortality in the future. An important 289 observation is that even though the proportion of undetected cases was included, the average 290 FR was only adjusted to 4.7% from 5.3%, which is still higher than the global average for the 291 same time (i.e., 2.1% in May and June 2021<sup>5</sup>). However, the daily FR reduced to 2.8% on June 292 6 and remained at this low level, similar to that in the United States (i.e., 2.8% in May and June 293 2021<sup>18</sup>). The reduction from the initially high FR can be explained by the improvement in 294 hospital capacity or treatment to accommodate the sudden rise in cases. This is supported by 295 the observation that the duration between symptom onset and death among detected deaths 296 continued increasing from approximately five days to more than two weeks in June.

The number of hidden (undetected) COVID-19 cases often affects the estimation of transmissibility of the virus and the effectiveness of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) implemented. Even though the effects of contact tracing and testing on transmissibility have been studied<sup>19,20</sup>, how many hidden cases do they cause is unclear. We demonstrated that the time-varying detection ratios can be predicted using data on testing and contact tracing. As a result, a more accurate  $R_t$  can be obtained, which is likely to be explained by mobility data better. The guidance for implementing NPIs based on changes in mobility can be provided <sup>8</sup>.

304 We found that the ratio of the number of tests conducted to reported cases, and the proportion 305 of cases that are contact traced without delay can be used to "nowcast" the proportion of 306 undetected cases. Because the number of tested samples can quickly reach the capacity limit 307 when the case number is growing, many samples remain untested. Hence, each day, the number 308 of confirmed cases depends largely on how many tests can be performed. A day delay in testing 309 and confirming a case, leads to a day delay in tracing the close contacts of the case. Further more, a higher contact tracing coverage together with a shorter delay of being traced enables 310 more cases to be identified earlier<sup>19,20</sup>. These suggest increasing testing and tracing capacity to 311 312 identify those infections earlier can reduce hidden cases more.

Modelling has been used to estimate the proportion of undetected COVID-19 cases using the observed case number during a specific period (e.g., before or after an intervention) of an outbreak<sup>21,22</sup>. More recently, an approach through estimating under-ascertainment by directly comparing model-predicted death with excess deaths recorded was used <sup>23</sup>. We checked the

14

317 number of deaths related to flu and pneumonia illness <sup>9</sup> and found no unusual excess deaths 318 other than the reported COVID-19 deaths during this period. The proportion of undetected 319 cases can also be calculated after incorporating seroprevalence data with false negative rates 320 of tests into models <sup>24</sup>. Overall, none of these methods estimate the constantly changing 321 proportion of undetected cases.

Several criteria enabled us to make successful prediction using testing data. First, the number of deaths should be high. If this number is low, the uncertainty of estimating the number of undetected cases becomes high. Second, most of the deaths have to be tested eventually. Taiwan government has a strong directive to test all sudden death cases; for example, on June 18, it was announced that PCR tests would be performed for all sudden and unexplained deaths <sup>25</sup>. This may not likely be the case in countries with a large number of excess deaths associated with COVID-19.

In summary, predicting the number of undetected cases as early as possible using testing data can help obtain an  $R_t$  with a better relationship with mobility data, thus enabling policymakers

to make timely public health decisions using mobility information to contain the outbreak.

### 332 Acknowledgement

333 The authors are indebted to City University of Hong Kong for providing excellent research

- facilities. The authors also acknowledge support from grants funded by Health and Medical
- Research Fund [COVID190215] and City University of Hong Kong [7200573 and 9610416].

# 336 References

- Grassly, N. C., Pons-Salort, M., Parker, E. P. K., White, P. J. & Ferguson, N. M.
   Comparison of molecular testing strategies for COVID-19 control: a mathematical
   modelling study. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* 20, (2020).
- Contreras, S. *et al.* The challenges of containing SARS-CoV-2 via test-trace-and-isolate.
   *Nat. Commun.* 12, 1–13 (2021).
- Tan, Y. COVID-19: What went wrong in Singapore and Taiwan? BBC News. *BBC News* https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-57153195 (2021).
- 344 4. Taiwan National Infectious Disease Statistics System. Severe Pneumonia with Novel
  345 Pathogens (COVID-19). https://nidss.cdc.gov.tw/en/nndss/disease?id=19CoV (2021).
- 346 5. Our World in Data. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Deaths Statistics and Research.
  347 https://ourworldindata.org/covid-deaths (2021).
- Taiwan Centers for Disease Control. CECC raises epidemic warning to Level 2 and 348 6. 349 implements related restrictions and measures, effective from May 11 to June 8, in transmission. 350 increased risk of community response to 351 https://www.cdc.gov.tw/En/Bulletin/Detail/0jMIImCVWTuhO9mfQCd-352 4g?typeid=158 (2021).
- 353 Taiwan Centers for Disease Control. CECC raises epidemic warning to Level 3 7. 354 nationwide from May 19 to May 28; strengthened measures and restrictions introduced 355 Taiwan reduce across to community transmission. https://www.cdc.gov.tw/En/Bulletin/Detail/VN 6yeoBTKhRKoSy2d0hJQ?typeid=158 356 357 (2021).
- Nouvellet, P. *et al.* Reduction in mobility and COVID-19 transmission. *Nat. Commun.* 12, 1–9 (2021).
- 360 9. Taiwan Centers for Disease Control. COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2 Infection).
  361 https://www.cdc.gov.tw/En.
- 362 10. Government Information Open Platform. Taiwan's COVID-19 coronavirus test daily
   363 delivery number. https://data.gov.tw/dataset/120451 (2021).
- 364 11. Taiwan daily confirmed local case data.

365 366		https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/12tQKCRuaiBZfc9yDd6tmlOdsm62ke_4AcK mNJ6q4gdU/ (2021).			
367 368	12.	Becker, N. G., Watson, L. F. & Carlin, J. B. A method of non-parametric back-projection and its application to aids data. <i>Stat. Med.</i> <b>10</b> , 1527–1542 (1991).			
369 370	13.	Bozdogan, H. Model selection and Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC): The general theory and its analytical extensions. <i>Psychometrika</i> <b>52</b> , 345–370 (1987).			
371 372 373	14.	<ul> <li>Cori, A., Ferguson, N. M., Fraser, C. &amp; Cauchemez, S. A New Framework and Software to Estimate Time-Varying Reproduction Numbers During Epidemics. <i>Am. J. Epidemiol.</i> 178, 1505–1512 (2013).</li> </ul>			
374 375	15.	Adam, D. C. <i>et al.</i> Clustering and superspreading potential of SARS-CoV-2 infections in Hong Kong. <i>Nat. Med.</i> <b>26</b> , 1714–1719 (2020).			
376 377 378	16.	Qin, J. <i>et al.</i> Estimation of incubation period distribution of COVID-19 using disease onset forward time: A novel cross-sectional and forward follow-up study. <i>Sci. Adv.</i> <b>6</b> , eabc1202 (2020).			
379 380	17.	Homma, Y. <i>et al.</i> The incubation period of the SARS-CoV-2 B1.1.7 variant is shorter than that of other strains. <i>J. Infect.</i> <b>83</b> , e15–e17 (2021).			
381 382	18.	Worldometer.COVID-19coronoaviruspandemic.https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/ (2021).			
383 384	19.	Kretzschmar, M. E. <i>et al.</i> Impact of delays on effectiveness of contact tracing strategies for COVID-19: a modelling study. <i>Lancet Public Heal.</i> <b>5</b> , e452–e459 (2020).			
385 386 387	20.	Kucharski, A. J. <i>et al.</i> Effectiveness of isolation, testing, contact tracing, and physical distancing on reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in different settings: a mathematical modelling study. <i>Lancet Infect. Dis.</i> <b>20</b> , 1151–1160 (2020).			
388 389 390	21.	Liang, J., Yuan, HY., Wu, L. & Pfeiffer, D. U. Estimating effects of intervention measures on COVID-19 outbreak in Wuhan taking account of improving diagnostic capabilities using a modelling approach. <i>BMC Infect. Dis.</i> <b>21</b> , 1–10 (2021).			
391 392	22.	Li, R. <i>et al.</i> Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). <i>Science</i> <b>368</b> , 489–493 (2020).			
393	23.	Watson, O. J. et al. Leveraging community mortality indicators to infer COVID-19			

1	7
	/

394		mortality ar	nd transmission dyna	mics in Damascus,	Syria. Nat. Comm	<i>un.</i> <b>12</b> , 1–10
395		(2021).				
396	24.	Bhattachary	ya, R. <i>et al</i> . Incorpora	ting false negative tes	sts in epidemiologic	cal models for
397		SARS-CoV-2 transmission and reconciling with seroprevalence estimates. Sci. Rep. 1				. Sci. Rep. 11,
398		1–14 (2021)				
399	25. Taiwan Centers for Disease Control. Report on the Press Conference after the N				r the National	
400		Epidemic Prevention Conference on June 18-Department of Disease Control, Ministry				
401		of	Health	ar	ıd	Welfare.
402		https://www	.cdc.gov.tw/Bulletin/	Detail/j5bFJQGngMI	IxaaQIK-j12w?typ	eid=9 (2021).
403	26.	google.	COVID-19	Community	Mobility	Reports.
404		https://www	.google.com/covid19/	/mobility/?hl=en-GB	(2021).	
405						

### 406 Figures and tables



407



409 Figure 1. Types of cases and the fatality rate (FR). (A) Schema of different types of cases and 410 deaths in relation to their testing and death time. At the time of reporting detected cases, the 411 number of undetected cases is estimated using Eq. (2) (see Methods).  $FR_d$  is the FR among 412 detected cases, and  $FR_{ud}$  is the FR among undetected cases. Reported cases include both 413 detected and late-detected cases (after undetected deaths are tested and confirmed), while total 414 cases include both detected and undetected cases. (B) Time-varying FRs among reported and 415 total cases. The solid red line represents the proportion of reported deaths (i.e., detected and undetected deaths) among the total reported cases. The solid blue line represents the proportion 416 417 of reported deaths among the total cases. The dashed red line represents the average FR among 418 the reported cases (5.3%), whereas the blue dashed line shows the average FR among the total 419 cases (4.7%). Note that the FR of the total cases was higher than that of the reported cases in the first few days because  $FR_{ud}$  was assumed to be same as the mean  $FR_d$  between May 11 420 421 and May 26. Data points during the earliest dates when the number of detected or undetected 422 cases was zero are not shown.



424

423

425 Figure 2. (A) Statuses of infection and testing of individual deaths. The gray bar represents the 426 infection statuses of an infected case who later died after the start of infection. Orange and blue 427 bars represent the flow of testing from the first test until the infected case is reported. The 428 infected case was categorized as *Detected* if the first testing was performed before death. A 429 case that was tested on the same date of or after death was categorized as Undetected. Among 430 detected cases, we assumed that a case was contact traced without delay if the first test  $T_1$  was 431 performed before symptom onset O; otherwise, contact traced with delay or not contact traced 432 if the  $T_1$  was performed after symptom onset. Testing delay refers to the time between symptom 433 onset and the last test  $T_f$ . Similarly, the reporting delay and death delay are defined as the time

- 434 difference between symptom onset and reporting, R, and death, D, respectively. The reporting 435 time among an undetected death was adjusted to an earlier time to have the same reporting
- 435 time among an undetected death was adjusted to an earlier time to have the same reporting 426 delay as detected deaths. The definitions for each status E = 0, T = T, D and D, are listed in the
- 436 delay as detected deaths. The definitions for each status,  $E, O, T_1, T_f, R$  and D, are listed in the
- text box. (B) Estimation of total number of COVID-19 cases (sum of detected and undetected) using a regression model. With the best-fitting model (see Table 2), we estimated
- the percentage of deaths that are detected, m(t). Undetected proportion of cases was estimated
- based on the relationship between m(t) and fatality rates (see equation 6). Gray dashed lines
- 441 represent the predictors that were not included in the best-fitting model while estimating m(t).



443 Figure 3. Daily numbers of reported, total cases and deaths. Data are plotted on their reporting 444 date. (A) Daily number of cases that are reported. Daily number of total cases, including both 445 the detected and undetected cases at their reporting date (green). The reporting delay of 446 undetected cases is adjusted to be the same as that of the reported cases. The dashed vertical 447 lines represent the implementation of level 2 and level 3 restrictions in May and June. Level 2 448 restrictions were started on May 11 and lasted until June 8, whereas level 3 restrictions were 449 started on May 19 and lasted until May 28. (B) Daily number of deaths, plotted separately for 450 detected deaths at their reporting time following case confirmation (red), ) late-detected cases 451 at adjusted reporting time (dark green) and late-detected cases at their late reporting time (blue). 452 Dots represent daily numbers. Solid lines represent moving averages using a 5-day sliding 453 window, centered at day 3 (except dark green line in (B)).





455 Figure 4. Candidate predictors that influence detected deaths. Dots in each plot represent 456 observed values, whereas solid lines show moving averages using a 5-day sliding window, centered at day 3. (A) Percentage of cases without contact tracing delay was defined as the 457 proportion of cases that were tested (the first test) earlier or on the same day as symptom onset. 458 459 (B) Testing delay is the time delay between symptom onset and the final test. It was estimated 460 by subtracting these two time points. (C) Death delay was defined as the difference between the time of death and symptom onset. (D) Ratio of tests to cases was calculated as the daily 461 462 number of tests divided by the daily number of reported cases. (E) Reporting delay refers to 463 the time delay between symptom onset and reporting. (F) Percentage of deaths that are detected 464 using adjusted reported data and model prediction. Red circles represent the adjusted reported 465 data. The blue dashed line represents the prediction results using the best fitting model. The 466 gray shaded area represents forecasted values of the proportion of detection.

23



468 Figure 5. The daily number of new infections and instantaneous reproduction numbers. (A) 469 The daily number of new infections was back-projected from the daily number of cases 470 obtained from the detected and empirically estimated undetected cases (green dots; referred to 471 as S1). The daily number of new infections obtained from the detected and model-predicted 472 undetected cases were plotted (dark yellow dots; referred to as S2). The daily number of 473 reported cases at their back-projected infection time (blue dots; referred to as S3). The daily 474 numbers of new infections were back-projected from the original reported cases to virus 475 exposure time. The lines represent moving averages using a 5-day sliding window, centered at day 3. The shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval for total cases estimated using 476 477 the model-predicted detection ratio. Daily number of new detected (reported) cases at their 478 reporting time (red dots; referred to as S4) is presented in Figure S2. (B) Effective reproduction 479 number estimated from (A). Lines represent the estimated values and shaded regions represent the 95% confidence intervals. The dashed line depicts the cutoff value when  $R_t = 1$ . The full 480 481 view of the effective reproduction number  $(R_t)$  for the entire period between May 6 and June 482 20 is given in Figure S4. Color codes represent the same definition as in (A). The shaded area represents 95% confidence intervals. 483

484

485	Table 1. Candidate models used to choose the best model. $\alpha$ and $\beta$ s are model coefficients,
486	whereas the proportion of contact tracing delay $(P_{ntd})$ , the ratio of the number of tests
487	conducted and reported cases $(R_{tc})$ , the delay in testing $(T_d)$ , the delay in reporting $(C_d)$ , and
488	the delay in deaths $(D_d)$ are predictors. AIC represents the Akaike information criterion.

Models	Description	AIC
1	$\alpha + \beta_1 R_{tc}$	95.9
2	$\alpha + \beta_1 R_{tc} + \beta_2 P_{ntd}$	91.0
3	$\alpha + \beta_1 R_{tc} + \beta_2 P_{ntd} + \beta_3 C_d$	93.0
4	$\alpha + \beta_1 R_{tc} + \beta_2 P_{ntd} + \beta_3 C_d + \beta_4 T_d$	95.0
5	$\alpha + \beta_1 R_{tc} + \beta_2 P_{ntd} + \beta_3 C_d + \beta_4 T_d + \beta_5 D_d$	96.9

# 

492 Table 2. Parameter estimates of the best-fitting model (Model 2)

Covariates	Estimates	95% Confidence intervals	p-value
Ratio of number of tests conducted to	0.009	0.002-0.018	0.0180
reported cases $(R_{tc})$			
Proportion of cases without tracing	1.834	0.316-3.375	0.0185
delay $(P_{ntd})$			

26

### 495 Supplementary Materials

#### 496 *Establishing the relationship between mobility and effective reproduction number*

497 Daily mobility data were obtained from Google mobility report <sup>26</sup> and were normalized after 498 setting the mobility index on May 11 (first day of the start of the outbreak) as 1 and the value 499 -100 as 0. The normalized mobility index ranged between 0 and 1, where higher values 500 represent greater mobility. To compare and validate the estimated  $R_t$ , we used a generalized 501 linear model for Gaussian distribution with identity link function. Mobility index was adjusted 502 in the model using the following formula adopted from a recent study <sup>8</sup>:

503 
$$\log(R_t) = \log(R_0) + \beta (1 - M_b(t)).$$
 (8)

504 where  $R_0$  is the initial reproduction number obtained from  $R_t$  at the start of the outbreak (May

505 11, 2021), which gave the maximum number of  $R_t$ ;  $M_b(t)$  represents the daily normalized

506 mobility index; and  $\beta$  is the regression coefficient.



# 507 Supplementary figures



511 Figure S1. (A) Proportion of detected deaths among total reported deaths. (B) Proportion of 512 detected deaths among total deaths estimated using the empirical detection ratio. In each plot,

513 dots represent daily numbers that are observed or estimated. Solid lines represent moving

514 average using a 5-day sliding window, centered at day 3.



Figure S2. (A) Daily number of new infections at their reporting time. Daily values are indicated by red dots (referred to as S4 in Methods). The line represents moving averages using a 5-day sliding window, centered at day 3. (B) Effective reproduction number estimated from (A). The solid red line represents estimated values. The shaded area represents 95% confidence intervals. The dashed line depicts the cutoff value when  $R_t = 1$ . The value  $R_t$  during the entire period (between May 6 and June 20) is given in the Supplementary Figure S4D.



Figure S3. (A) Mobility index during the outbreak. The smooth line shows a 7-day moving average, whereas the dots represent the observed mobility index. The vertical dashed lines represent the implementation of level 2 and level 3 restrictions in May and June. Level 2 restrictions were started on May 11 and lasted until June 8, whereas level 3 restrictions were imposed for the duration between May 19 and May 28. (B) Distribution of death delay. The bars represent the observed frequency of delay distribution and line represents the fitted line for gamma distribution with mean and standard deviation 12.7 and 5.3 days, respectively.





Figure S4. Effective reproduction number  $R_t$  during the entire period between May 6 and June 20. S1 and S2 refer to the numbers of total cases at infection time. S3 and S4 refer to the numbers of reported cases at infection and reporting time, respectively. Smooth solid lines represent the estimated mean  $R_t$ , and shaded regions show the 95% confidence intervals.The dashed line depicts the cutoff value when  $R_t = 1$ .



### 539 Supplementary tables

540

Table S1. Validation of the estimates of instantaneous reproduction number using mobility 541 542 adjusted regression model between May 11 and May 24 when  $R_t$  reached one. The moving 543 average of mobility using a 7-day sliding window, centered at day 4, was considered as the predictor. AIC represents the Akaike information criterion.  $\Delta AIC$  shows the differences 544 545 between the smallest AIC and AIC of the ith model. We rechecked the values for an extended period until May 27, when  $R_t$  reached a minimum. In this case,  $R_t$ , estimated under scenario 546 547 S1, showed the best fit of the mobility data with minimum AIC -27.93 (data is not presented 548 in this table), whereas scenario S2 was treated as the second-best with AIC -27.20. The 549 difference between the AIC of these two scenarios was less than one.

Date	Type of data $R_t$ estimated from	Validation window 11 May- 24 May	
		AIC	ΔΑΙΟ
At infaction	S1: Total cases estimated using the empirical detection ratio	-27.93	0.00
time	S2: Total cases estimated using the model-predicted detection ratio	-27.20	0.73
	S3: Reported cases	-21.70	6.23
At reporting time	S4: Reported cases	27.56	55.49