

1 **Lineage BA.2 dominated the Omicron SARS-CoV-2 epidemic wave in the**
2 **Philippines**

3
4 Yao-Tsun Li^{1*}, Francisco Gerardo M. Polotan², Gerald Ivan S. Sotelo², Anne Pauline A.
5 Alpino², Ardiane Ysabelle M. Dolor², Ma. Angelica A. Tujan², Ma. Ricci R. Gomez², Othoniel
6 Jan T. Onza², Angela Kae T. Chang², Criselda T. Bautista², June C. Carandang², Dodge R. Lim²,
7 Lei Lanna M. Dancel², Mayan Uy-Lumandas², Timothy John R. Dizon², Katie Hampson¹, Simon
8 Daldry¹, Joseph Hughes³, Kirstyn Bruncker¹

9
10 ¹Institute of Biodiversity, Animal Health & Comparative Medicine, University of Glasgow,
11 Glasgow, UK

12 ²Research Institute for Tropical Medicine, Muntinlupa City, Philippines

13 ³MRC-University of Glasgow Centre for Virus Research, Glasgow, UK

14
15 *corresponding author

16 Email: yao-tsun.li@glasgow.ac.uk

17
18
19 **Running Title:** SARS-CoV-2 BA.1 and BA.2 in the Philippines

20 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, genomic epidemiology, Philippines

21

22 **Abstract**

23 The Omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant led to a dramatic global epidemic wave following detection
24 in South Africa in November, 2021. The Omicron lineage BA.1 was dominant and responsible
25 for most domestic outbreaks during December 2021-January 2022, whilst other Omicron
26 lineages including BA.2 accounted for the minority of global isolates. Here, we describe the
27 Omicron wave in the Philippines by analysing genomic data. Our results identify the presence of
28 both BA.1 and BA.2 lineages in the Philippines in December 2021, before cases surged in
29 January 2022. We infer that only lineage BA.2 underwent sustained transmission in the country,
30 with an estimated emergence around November 18th, 2021 [95% highest posterior density:
31 November 6-28th], whilst despite multiple introductions BA.1 transmission remained limited.
32 These results suggest the Philippines was one of the earliest areas affected by BA.2, and reiterate
33 the importance of whole-genome sequencing for monitoring outbreaks.

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 **Introduction**

46 The continuous transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2),
47 the aetiology of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19), has led to new viral variants with
48 accumulated genetic mutations (Rambaut et al. 2020; Harvey et al. 2021). The Omicron variant
49 was designated by the WHO as a Variant of Concern (VOC) in November, 2021, following
50 previously designated Alpha, Beta, Gamma and Delta VOCs (WHO 2021a). These SARS-CoV-2
51 variants each possess distinct combinations of mutations in the viral genome, particularly in the
52 S gene, demonstrating potential for increased transmissibility or disease severity compared with
53 viruses isolated early in the pandemic (Dhar et al. 2021; Volz et al. 2021; Viana et al. 2022).
54 VOCs may circulate efficiently in the population by evading antibodies derived from vaccination
55 or prior exposures, or if they elude diagnostic methods (Dhar et al. 2021; Volz et al. 2021; Liu et
56 al. 2022; Schmidt et al. 2022). Thus effectively tracking the emergence and evolution of SARS-
57 COV-2 lineages is essential to controlling the disease.

58 The Omicron variant was first reported in South Africa in October, 2021 (Viana et al.
59 2022), with three divergent lineages identified (BA.1, BA.2 and BA.3). Of the three lineages, the
60 lineage BA.1 (including its descending sublineages BA.1.*) has rapidly spread to dominate
61 globally, leading to another epidemic wave during the 2021 winter (Hodcroft 2021; WHO
62 2021b; Chen et al. 2022). In contrast, the BA.2 and BA.3 lineages had only accounted for a
63 minority of viral isolates by the end of 2021 (Hodcroft 2021; Chen et al. 2022). The BA.2
64 viruses, although phylogenetically clustered with BA.1 compared to other variants (Viana et al.
65 2022; Yamasoba et al. 2022), differ by at least 30 amino acids relative to BA.1 viruses
66 (Majumdar and Sarkar 2022; Tsueng et al. 2022). Recent studies provide hints that significant

67 genetic divergence of the two lineages result in different replication capacity and transmissibility
68 (Lyngse et al. 2022; UKHSA 2022; Yamasoba et al. 2022).

69 The Philippines was among a few countries, including Denmark and India, where the
70 BA.2 lineage accounted for noticeable genomic data during the 2021 winter, contrary to most
71 geographical areas mainly affected by the BA.1 lineage (Colson et al. 2022; Desingu and
72 Nagarajan 2022). The country also experienced a sharp increase in case numbers in January,
73 2022, parallel to the global Omicron wave (Department of Health, Philippines); nevertheless,
74 lineages contributing to local transmission and their dynamic interactions were unknown. In this
75 study, we show using phylogenetic approaches that the BA.2 lineage but not the BA.1 lineage
76 caused the case surge in the Philippines during the global Omicron wave. We also inferred that
77 BA.2 circulation in the Philippines could have occurred as early as November, 2021, within
78 weeks of the lineage first being identified in South Africa. These results provide insights into
79 how new SARS-CoV-2 lineages emerge and establish sustained transmission.

80

81 **Materials and Methods**

82 **Genomic surveillance in the Philippines**

83 SARS-CoV-2 sequences were collected under the framework of a collaborative project, GECO
84 (Genomic Epidemiology of COVID in the Philippines). The project aims to use viral genomes
85 generated by the nanopore sequencing to inform public health measures against COVID-19.

86 SARS-CoV-2 PCR-positive RNA samples from partnered Sub-National Laboratories (SNLs)
87 were subjected to whole genome sequencing using the ARTIC network multiplex PCR workflow
88 performed at a national core laboratory, the Research Institute for Tropical Medicine (RITM).
89 The ARTIC network bioinformatic pipeline was used to generate consensus sequences from raw

90 output files with steps of basecalling, de-multiplexing, mapping and polishing
91 (<https://artic.network/ncov-2019>). As of February 15th, 2022, 1055 consensus sequences of
92 SARS-CoV-2 have been generated by the project.

93

94 **Sequence data preparation**

95 To compile all available genomic data from the Philippines and fit the domestic isolates in the
96 context of global virus transmission, all SARS-CoV-2 sequences and metadata were downloaded
97 from GISAID on February 15th, 2022 (EpiCoV, <https://www.gisaid.org>). The downloaded data
98 were first split into Philippine/non-Philippine portions based on the location of isolation, in
99 which the Philippine data deposited in GISAID were then combined with data collected by the
100 GECO project. An Omicron data set containing all Omicron sub-lineages from the Philippines
101 and a BA.2 lineage data set containing only BA.2 lineage data from the country were prepared
102 according to the Pango lineages (Rambaut et al. 2020) assigned to each sequence by Pangolin
103 version 2022-02-02 (<https://github.com/cov-lineages/pangolin>) or information provided by
104 GISAID. For each data set, 1500 global proximal strains genetically similar to the Philippine
105 strains were sampled by the Nextstrain bioinformatic pipeline (Hadfield et al. 2018). The quality
106 of the compiled genomic data was evaluated by Nextclade CLI v1.10.3 (Aksamentov et al.
107 2021). We filtered out sequences that had more than 5 private mutations or a SNP cluster.
108 Sequences shorter than 27000 nucleotides or sequences excluded by Nextclade due to too many
109 ambiguous sites were also removed from the data sets. Accession numbers of the sequences
110 analysed in this study have been compiled as an EPI SET (EPI_SET_20220430vo).

111

112 **Phylogenetic and other genetic analyses**

113 Curated whole genome SARS-CoV-2 sequences were aligned using Nextalign v1.9
114 (Aksamentov et al. 2021), and the alignments supplemented with a reference strain Wuhan/Hu-
115 1/2019 were subject to maximum likelihood (ML) tree inference using IQ-TREE v2.2.0 (Minh et
116 al. 2020). To focus on domestic transmission in the Philippines and cross-border events, we
117 subsampled the compiled Omicron data set by selecting a taxon in each monophyletic group that
118 comprised only strains isolated from the same country outside the Philippines, and the reduced
119 data set was then used to rebuild another ML tree. Based on the resulting ML tree, the time-
120 scaled tree of the Omicron variant was estimated using TreeTime v0.8.5 with a clock rate of
121 0.0008. Times of the most recent common ancestor (tMRCAs) of specific taxa can be parsed
122 from the internal nodes in the time-scaled tree.

123 To more closely explore the timing of the BA.2 introduction, a Bayesian phylogenetic
124 framework was implemented with BA.2 sequences collected in the Philippines. A more strictly
125 filtered BA.2 data set was prepared with sequences annotated as good quality by Nextclade. With
126 this, BA.2 genome data for the time-calibrated phylogeny subsequently included all filtered
127 Philippine BA.2 sequences isolated before January 15th, 2022, with apparently divergent BA.2
128 strains removed (n=19), and early BA.2 strains in South Africa and India. A time-scaled
129 phylogeny was inferred using BEAST v10.4 (Suchard et al. 2018) facilitated by the BEAGLE
130 library v3.1 for better computational performance (Ayres et al. 2019). We employed a HKY plus
131 gamma substitution model, and a strict molecular clock with an exponential demographic prior in
132 the Bayesian analyses. Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) analysis was run for 100 million
133 steps and sampled every 10,000 steps. Three parallel runs were performed and combined with a
134 burnin of 10 million per chain using LogCombiner (Suchard et al. 2018). Parameters logged

135 during the MCMC runs were inspected by Tracer v1.7.1 (Rambaut et al. 2018). A summarized
136 maximum clade credibility (MCC) tree was inferred using TreeAnnotator (Suchard et al. 2018).
137 Genetic divergence was calculated by sequence length times genetic diversity (π)(Nei et
138 al. 2000). Introductory events and the local clusters were identified using clusterfunk v0.1.0
139 (<https://github.com/snake-flu/clusterfunk>) with phylogenetic trees inferred by IQ-TREE.
140 Statistical correlation between locations of isolation and the phylogeny was detected by BaTS
141 v0.9 with 1000 posterior trees subsampled from the MCMC process (Parker et al. 2008). All
142 phylogenetic trees were visualized by ggtree (Yu et al. 2017).

143

144 **Results**

145 The epidemic wave associated with the Omicron variant in the Philippines started in December,
146 2021. Based on case information available from the Department of Health, Philippines, reported
147 COVID-19 case numbers rose towards the end of 2021, reaching a peak with over 30,000 cases
148 per day in week 2 (10 January-16 January), 2022, before rapidly declining to fewer than 5,000
149 cases per day in week 6 (7 February-13 February)(Figure 1A, barchart). Numbers of cases
150 identified from returning overseas Filipinos (ROFs) demonstrate a remarkably similar epidemic
151 profile to the reported domestic cases (Figure 1A, line), suggesting linkage of global SARS-
152 CoV-2 transmission to the domestic epidemic.

153 To better understand the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 viruses leading to the case surge,
154 we combined sequence data collected by the GECO project (Genomic Epidemiology of COVID
155 in the Philippines) and data available on the GISAID. The sequences in the Philippines show the
156 Delta variant, including lineages 1.617.2 and AY.*, as being the dominant circulating variant in
157 the country before being replaced by the Omicron variant (lineages BA.*)(Figure 1B).

158 Specifically, the proportion of sequenced cases belonging to the Omicron variant exceeded the
159 Delta variant in November, 2021, about one month before the rise of the epidemic wave (Figure
160 1A and 1B), and the Omicron variant has accounted for the majority of sequences since. Among
161 the Omicron variant viruses in the Philippines, BA.1 lineage, first identified on 22 November,
162 had accounted for more available sequences than its sister lineage BA.2 until the last week of
163 2021 (Figure 1C), although the numbers of both lineages were low at most time points during
164 November-December, 2021. In contrast, BA.2 has been the most prevalent since the lineage
165 drastically increased in the last week of the year 2021 (Figure 1C).

166 BA.1 and BA.2 viruses isolated in the Philippines show divergent distributions on the
167 phylogeny inferred by the whole viral genome. With global strains sampled in an unbiased
168 manner against the proximal Philippines isolates, the BA.1 viruses isolated in the Philippines are
169 intermixed with the non-Philippine viruses on the temporal phylogenetic tree suggesting a large
170 number of introductions. In contrast, BA.2 viruses are largely clustered in one clade, in which
171 the most genetically similar virus of each Philippine isolate is nearly always from the Philippines
172 (Figure 2A). Estimation of introductory events by ancestral state reconstruction using the
173 parsimony method also supports this observation: 136 potential introductory events to the
174 Philippines were identified in the BA.1 lineage, which led to clusters with a mean sample size
175 below 2, compared with 25 potential introductory events identified in the BA.2 lineage, which
176 led to two major clusters with sizes of 699 and 206 in addition to the remaining clusters each
177 having less than 10 samples.

178 We therefore hypothesise that the two Omicron lineages in the Philippines demonstrate
179 different epidemiological patterns. We assume if most genomic samples were collected from the
180 context of sustained transmission rather than sporadic introduction, genetic differences between

181 sequences isolated in approximate time points would be minimal. Additionally, if most samples
182 were collected from sustained transmission, viral taxa would coalesce to close common ancestors
183 on the phylogeny, in contrast to deeper common ancestors likely shared by taxa isolated in
184 unlinked transmission chains. Our results show BA.1 lineage sequences grouped by week have
185 greater average genetic differences compared with BA.2 lineage sequences (Figure 2B).
186 Especially, among the 2 or 3 weeks where both lineages are available, average nucleotide
187 differences shared by paired BA.1 sequences are more than twice that of the BA.2 sequences.
188 Although the BA.2 lineage in the Philippines has more overall samples than the BA.1 lineage
189 (Figure 1C), weekly genetic differences of BA.2 remain stable throughout the studied intervals,
190 averaging about 2.5 nucleotide differences among sequences isolated in each week (Figure 2B).
191 Furthermore, when pairwise time intervals between the most recent common ancestor and
192 isolation time are compared between the two lineages, BA.1 lineage shows greater intervals than
193 BA.2 lineage (Figure 2C). The average time intervals of lineage BA.1 and BA.2 are 54 and 35
194 days, respectively, indicating each pair of BA.1 viruses have deeper common ancestors than the
195 BA.2 viruses. Combined with the observations where no distinguishable Philippines clade was
196 formed among the BA.1 global isolates (Figure 2A), these comparative analyses suggest that the
197 BA.2 but not BA.1 lineage underwent sustained transmission in the Philippines.

198 To gain more insights to the introduction of the BA.2 lineage in the Philippines, we
199 estimated the time of most recent common ancestor (tMRCA) based on the BA.2 genomic
200 sequences isolated in the country in addition to early BA.2 strains identified globally (Figure 3).
201 The estimated tMRCA is the 18 November, 2021 (95% highest posterior density (HPD), 6
202 November-28 November), two weeks before the first BA.2 case identified in the Philippines. The
203 estimated tMRCA does not significantly differ from the root of the BA.2 temporal phylogeny (95

204 HPD, 23 October-17 November), which may corroborate with the previous understanding that
205 the Philippines was one of the earliest countries where circulation of the BA.2 lineage was
206 discovered. No apparent diffusion pattern was observed based on the geographical distribution
207 on the phylogeny (Figure 3). Viruses isolated from the three major island groups are generally
208 mixed on the subclades, providing evidence of extensive domestic transmission and underlying
209 circulation before increased sampling in January. Indeed, available sequences assigned as BA.1
210 have only been isolated from 9 administrative regions, compared with BA.2 isolated from 16
211 regions (Supplementary Figure). Among these regions, early BA.2 from the National Capital
212 Region (Luzon island group), Ilocos (Luzon) and the Eastern Visayas (Visayas) show
213 statistically significant clustering on the phylogeny (Supplementary Table).

214

215 **Discussion**

216 In this study, we show that the BA.2 but not the BA.1 lineage of the Omicron variant fit the
217 scenario of community transmission in the Philippines based on viral genomic data. With the
218 majority of sequences isolated during the country's latest case rise identified as the BA.2 lineage,
219 we propose the Omicron epidemic wave in the Philippines was mostly driven by BA.2 viruses in
220 contrast to most other Omicron waves seen during this time globally. In most countries with
221 continuous genomic surveillance, including South Africa, UK and the USA, case peaks
222 associated with the Omicron variant during the 2021 winter were caused by the BA.1 (including
223 descendant BA.1.*) lineage (Chen et al. 2022; Tsueng et al. 2022). In contrast, the BA.2 lineage
224 was only observed to be dominant in a few countries besides the Philippines, including India,
225 Nepal, Bangladesh, Denmark and Qatar, by the end of January 2022 based on the available
226 genomic data (Hodcroft 2021; Chen et al. 2022). Our results in the Philippines thus present a

227 special case whereby the BA.2 lineage led to local transmission without a previous extensive
228 BA.1 outbreak.

229 Since March 2022, there have been clear signs that BA.2 has replaced BA.1 in several
230 geographical regions (Chen et al. 2022; Tsueng et al. 2022). Understanding how the BA.2
231 lineage became dominant over the previous circulating variants in the Philippines could provide
232 important insights for controlling BA.2 in affected countries. As there appears to have been only
233 a low level of local BA.1 circulation in the Philippines, it is not directly clear whether virological
234 properties of the two Omicron lineages, including intrinsic transmissibility or antigenicity
235 (Lyngse et al. 2022; Schmidt et al. 2022; UKHSA 2022; Yamasoba et al. 2022), competitively
236 determined the epidemic outcome through selection of a more fit strain. Since Omicron emerged,
237 routine testing using the S-gene target failure (SGTF) marker has been implemented to detect
238 and curtail the spread of BA.1 by distinguishing it from the Delta variant. However, this method
239 identifies BA.1 but rarely BA.2 based on the deletions in the viral S gene (Majumdar and Sarkar
240 2022; UKHSA 2022), and therefore may have led to reduced detection of BA.2, potentially
241 favouring the emergence and spread of BA.2 viruses. This point emphasises the importance of
242 whole genome sequencing as part of SARS-CoV-2 surveillance programmes.

243 We estimated the most recent common ancestor of the Philippine BA.2 viruses to be in
244 late November, 2021, about 2 weeks before the first detected case of BA.2 in the Philippines.
245 This estimate by Bayesian phylogenetic reconstruction is corroborated with the time-scaled tree
246 inferred using the maximum likelihood method (Figure 2A, the tMRCA of the major clade
247 formed by Philippine taxa), suggesting local spread could have started in November. The BA.2
248 lineage was first described in South Africa in early November, 2021, along with other Omicron
249 lineages (Viana et al. 2022). Local BA.2 transmission was then reported in Denmark where the

250 first BA.2 case was identified on 5 December, 2021 (Fonager et al. 2022), and the country
251 accounted for most global BA.2 sequences as of mid-January 2022 (>5000)(Desingu and
252 Nagarajan 2022). India was also identified as one of the earliest BA.2 affected countries (Colson
253 et al. 2022; Desingu and Nagarajan 2022), with BA.2 sequences isolated as early as November,
254 2021 (Hodcroft 2021). The temporal phylogeny estimated from our BA.2 dataset ascertained
255 multiple introductory events, based on the topology of the tree and limited sampling in early
256 December (Figure 3). Despite uncertainty in the exact origin of currently circulating BA.2
257 viruses in the Philippines, the estimated date of emergence appears robust to sampling effects.
258 The two BA.2 subclades, either with or without the first isolate on the 3rd of December, could
259 still trace the most recent common ancestor's origin before December (Figure 2A and 3).

260 The estimated BA.2 emergence time coincides with the general de-escalation of control
261 measures in the Philippines. The de-escalation may be attributed to the decreasing number of
262 identified COVID-19 infections in November, 2021. At this time new COVID-19 infections
263 reached their lowest number for the previous 11 months (Department of Health, Philippines).
264 There was also general optimism and anticipation for the Christmas season, during which
265 migrant Filipino workers come home to celebrate with their families. How migrant workers
266 contributed to local transmission warrants further research.

267 Variation in sequencing rates across administrative regions in the Philippines render our
268 genomic data unlikely to reflect the domestic geographical diffusion of lineages in the
269 Philippines. Our comparative analyses between BA.1 and BA.2 lineages, nevertheless, are less
270 affected by undersampling since the analyses were based on the topology of the phylogeny and
271 the sample selection for sequencing would not be biased by lineage. Importantly, routine
272 genomic surveillance in the Philippines shows no evidence of emergence of the BA.1 lineage

273 (<https://geco-ph.github.io/GECO-covid>). Retrospective sequencing of Philippine and global
274 samples will facilitate improved understanding of the BA.2 origin and reconstruction of viral
275 diffusion dynamics during the pandemic. The root of the temporal phylogeny of BA.2 is
276 estimated at 5 November, which is very close to the emergence date estimated by a recent study
277 (6 November)(Yamasoba et al. 2022).

278 In summary, we show the epidemic wave in the Philippines was driven by Omicron
279 lineage BA.2 but not BA.1, although both lineages were sampled before and during the rise in
280 case numbers. Also, the BA.2 viruses causing the country’s epidemic circulated in the
281 Philippines before December, 2021, in parallel to Denmark as one of the earliest countries where
282 local BA.2 outbreaks occurred. Our study highlights the value of phylogenetic methods for
283 understanding viral transmission, and the need to rapidly generate genomic data to inform
284 control strategies.

285

286

287 **Acknowledgements**

288 The work is supported by the UK Research and Innovation Global effort on COVID-19
289 (MR/V035444/1) and Wellcome (207569/Z/17/Z).

290

291

292

293

294

295

296 **References**

- 297 Aksamentov I, Roemer C, Hodcroft EB, Neher RA. 2021. Nextclade: clade assignment, mutation
298 calling and quality control for viral genomes. *Journal of Open Source Software* 6:3773.
- 299 Ayres DL, Cummings MP, Baele G, Darling AE, Lewis PO, Swofford DL, Huelsenbeck JP,
300 Lemey P, Rambaut A, Suchard MA. 2019. BEAGLE 3: Improved Performance, Scaling,
301 and Usability for a High-Performance Computing Library for Statistical Phylogenetics.
302 *Systematic Biology* 68:1052–1061.
- 303 Chen C, Nadeau S, Yared M, Voinov P, Xie N, Roemer C, Stadler T. 2022. CoV-Spectrum:
304 analysis of globally shared SARS-CoV-2 data to identify and characterize new variants.
305 *Bioinformatics* 38:1735–1737.
- 306 Colson P, Delerce J, Beye M, Levasseur A, Boschi C, Houhamdi L, Tissot-Dupont H, Yahi N,
307 Million M, La Scola B, et al. 2022. First cases of infection with the 21L/BA.2 Omicron
308 variant in Marseille, France. *J Med Virol*.
- 309 Department of Health, Philippines. COVID-19 Tracker. Available from:
310 <https://doh.gov.ph/covid19tracker>
- 311 Desingu PA, Nagarajan K. 2022. Omicron BA.2 lineage spreads in clusters and is concentrated
312 in Denmark. *Journal of Medical Virology* 94:2360–2364.
- 313 Dhar MS, Marwal R, VS R, Ponnusamy K, Jolly B, Bhoyar RC, Sardana V, Naushin S, Rophina
314 M, Mellan TA, et al. 2021. Genomic characterization and epidemiology of an emerging
315 SARS-CoV-2 variant in Delhi, India. *Science* 374:995–999.
- 316 Fonager J, Bennedbæk M, Bager P, Wohlfahrt J, Ellegaard KM, Ingham AC, Edslev SM,
317 Stegger M, Sieber RN, Lassauniere R, et al. 2022. Molecular epidemiology of the SARS-
318 CoV-2 variant Omicron BA.2 sub-lineage in Denmark, 29 November 2021 to 2 January
319 2022. *Eurosurveillance* 27:2200181.
- 320 Hadfield J, Megill C, Bell SM, Huddleston J, Potter B, Callender C, Sagulenko P, Bedford T,
321 Neher RA. 2018. Nextstrain: real-time tracking of pathogen evolution. *Bioinformatics*
322 34:4121–4123.
- 323 Harvey WT, Carabelli AM, Jackson B, Gupta RK, Thomson EC, Harrison EM, Ludden C, Reeve
324 R, Rambaut A, Peacock SJ, et al. 2021. SARS-CoV-2 variants, spike mutations and
325 immune escape. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 19:409–424.
- 326 Hodcroft E. 2021. CoVariants: SARS-CoV-2 Mutations and Variants of Interest. Available from:
327 <https://covariants.org/>
- 328 Liu Lihong, Iketani S, Guo Y, Chan JF-W, Wang M, Liu Liyuan, Luo Y, Chu H, Huang Yiming,
329 Nair MS, et al. 2022. Striking antibody evasion manifested by the Omicron variant of
330 SARS-CoV-2. *Nature* 602:676–681.

- 331 Lyngse FP, Kirkeby CT, Denwood M, Christiansen LE, Mølbak K, Møller CH, Skov RL, Krause
332 TG, Rasmussen M, Sieber RN, et al. 2022. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron VOC
333 subvariants BA.1 and BA.2: Evidence from Danish Households.
334 *medRxiv:2022.01.28.22270044*.
- 335 Majumdar S, Sarkar R. 2022. Mutational and phylogenetic analyses of the two lineages of the
336 Omicron variant. *Journal of Medical Virology* 94:1777–1779.
- 337 Minh BQ, Schmidt HA, Chernomor O, Schrempf D, Woodhams MD, von Haeseler A, Lanfear
338 R. 2020. IQ-TREE 2: New Models and Efficient Methods for Phylogenetic Inference in
339 the Genomic Era. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 37:1530–1534.
- 340 Nei M, Kumar S, Nei EPP of BM. 2000. *Molecular Evolution and Phylogenetics*. Oxford
341 University Press
- 342 Parker J, Rambaut A, Pybus OG. 2008. Correlating viral phenotypes with phylogeny:
343 Accounting for phylogenetic uncertainty. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution* 8:239–246.
- 344 Rambaut A, Drummond AJ, Xie D, Baele G, Suchard MA. 2018. Posterior Summarization in
345 Bayesian Phylogenetics Using Tracer 1.7. *Systematic Biology* 67:901–904.
- 346 Rambaut A, Holmes EC, O’Toole Á, Hill V, McCrone JT, Ruis C, du Plessis L, Pybus OG.
347 2020. A dynamic nomenclature proposal for SARS-CoV-2 lineages to assist genomic
348 epidemiology. *Nat Microbiol* 5:1403–1407.
- 349 Schmidt F, Muecksch F, Weisblum Y, Da Silva J, Bednarski E, Cho A, Wang Z, Gaebler C,
350 Caskey M, Nussenzweig MC, et al. 2022. Plasma Neutralization of the SARS-CoV-2
351 Omicron Variant. *New England Journal of Medicine* 386:599–601.
- 352 Suchard MA, Lemey P, Baele G, Ayres DL, Drummond AJ, Rambaut A. 2018. Bayesian
353 phylogenetic and phylodynamic data integration using BEAST 1.10. *Virus Evolution*
354 4:vey016.
- 355 Tsueng G, Mullen J, Alkuzweny M, Cano M, Rush B, Haag E, Curators O, Latif AA, Zhou X,
356 Qian Z, et al. 2022. Outbreak.info Research Library: A standardized, searchable platform
357 to discover and explore COVID-19 resources. :2022.01.20.477133. Available from:
358 <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.01.20.477133v3>
- 359 UKHSA. 2022. SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern and variants under investigation in England
360 Technical briefing 39.
- 361 Viana R, Moyo S, Amoako DG, Tegally H, Scheepers C, Althaus CL, Anyaneji UJ, Bester PA,
362 Boni MF, Chand M, et al. 2022. Rapid epidemic expansion of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron
363 variant in southern Africa. *Nature* 603:679–686.
- 364 Volz E, Mishra S, Chand M, Barrett JC, Johnson R, Geidelberg L, Hinsley WR, Laydon DJ,
365 Dabrera G, O’Toole Á, et al. 2021. Assessing transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 lineage
366 B.1.1.7 in England. *Nature* 593:266–269.

367 WHO. 2021a. Classification of Omicron (B.1.1.529): SARS-CoV-2 Variant of Concern.
368 Available from: <https://www.who.int/news/item/26-11-2021-classification-of-omicron->
369 (b.1.1.529)-sars-cov-2-variant-of-concern

370 WHO. 2021b. Update on Omicron. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news/item/28-11-2021->
371 update-on-omicron

372 Yamasoba D, Kimura I, Nasser H, Morioka Y, Nao N, Ito J, Uriu K, Tsuda M, Zahradnik J,
373 Shirakawa K, et al. 2022. Virological characteristics of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.2
374 spike. *Cell* [Internet]. Available from:
375 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0092867422005335>

376 Yu G, Smith DK, Zhu H, Guan Y, Lam TT-Y. 2017. ggtree: an r package for visualization and
377 annotation of phylogenetic trees with their covariates and other associated data. *Methods*
378 *in Ecology and Evolution* 8:28–36.

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395 **Figure legends**

396 **Figure 1.** Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infections during the
397 Omicron variant epidemic wave in the Philippines. (A) Total numbers of cases reported
398 (barchart) in the country and numbers of cases identified from returning overseas Filipinos (line)
399 based on the Case information Data from the Department of Health, Philippines. (B) Proportions
400 of variant sequences among available SARS-CoV-2 sequences as of February 15, 2022. The
401 classification was based on the software Pangolin version 2022-02-02. (C) Numbers of available
402 Omicron lineage sequences as of February 15, 2022. Numbers below 100 are annotated
403 (coloured by lineage) above the bars. BA.1 and BA.2 categories here contain the descending
404 lineages assigned by Pangolin, e.g. BA.1 includes the lineage BA.1.1. X-axis labels indicate
405 epidemiological week defined by the US-CDC, which corresponds to the ISO week starting on a
406 Sunday. VOC, Variant of Concern.


407
408 **Figure 2.** Phylogenetic relationship of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variants isolated in the
409 Philippines. (A) Time-scaled tree was inferred by TreeTime using Omicron variant genome
410 sequences isolated in the Philippines and from the global database. Blue tips and orange tips
411 indicate BA.1 and BA.2 lineage viruses, respectively, isolated in the Philippines, whereas white
412 tips indicate viruses isolated in the other countries. Long branches descending from the common
413 ancestor of BA.1 and BA.2 are shortened. (B) Average genetic divergence of viruses isolated in
414 the Philippines. Error bars represent 95% bootstrap percentiles. (C) Distribution of time intervals
415 from time of the most common ancestor (tMRCA) to the isolation time. The time intervals were
416 calculated based on pairs of Philippine taxa on the time-scaled tree (panel A); for each pair the
417 larger time difference was recorded.

418


419 **Figure 3.** Introduction of BA.2 lineage in the Philippines. Time-scaled tree was inferred by
420 BEAST using BA.2 genomes isolated in the Philippines along with genomes of early global
421 BA.2 viruses. Estimated tMRCAs with 95% highest posterior density (HPD) illustrated by gray
422 area are aligned with the phylogenetic tree. Tips are colored according to the location of
423 isolation. Red shades for viruses isolated in the Philippines indicate the three island groups in the
424 country.

Figure 1

A



B



C




Figure 2





Figure 3



Lineage BA.2 dominated the Omicron SARS-CoV-2 epidemic wave in the Philippines

Supplementary data

Supplementary Table. Correlation between geographical location and phylogeny.


Region	Observed mean (95% CI)	Null mean (95% CI)	Significance
Global	2.36 (1-3)	1.00 (1-1.02)	0.005
National Capital Region	7.47 (6-11)	6.15 (5.68-6.84)	0.04
Central Luzon	2.07 (2-3)	1.48 (1.28-2.01)	0.06
Cagayan Valley	1.03 (1-1)	1.04 (1-1.09)	1.0
Calabarzon	2.60 (2-4)	2.23 (2.06-2.44)	1.0
Western Visayas	1.15 (1-2)	1.17 (1.07-1.40)	1.0
Cordillera Administrative Region	1.01 (1-1)	1.01 (1.0-1.03)	1.0
Ilocos	2.18 (2-3)	1.11 (1.03-1.21)	0.015
Soccsksargen	1.0 (1-1)	1.00 (1.0-1.01)	1.0
Eastern Visayas	3.0 (3-3)	1.14 (1.05-1.33)	0.005
Davao Region	1.02 (1-1)	1.01 (1.0-1.03)	1.0
Central Visayas	1.07 (1-2)	1.03 (1.00-1.08)	1.0
Mimaropa	1.0 (1-1)	1.0 (1.0-1.0)	1.0

Lineage

- BA.1
- BA.2

Proportion

- 0.25
- 0.50
- 0.75
- 1.00



Supplementary Figure. Visualisation of locations of BA.1/BA.2 samples against time. X-axis labels represent year plus week and circle sizes are scaled to the proportion of the lineage per location per week. Data source is identical to Figure.1C.