

1 **Within-hotel transmission of SARS-CoV-2 during on-arrival quarantine in Hong**
2 **Kong**

3
4 Dillon C. Adam¹, Mario Martín-Sánchez¹, Haogao Gu¹, Peng Wu¹, Eric H. Y. Lau^{1,2},
5 Gabriel M. Leung^{1,2}, Leo L. M. Poon^{1,3,4}, Benjamin J. Cowling^{1,2}

6
7 **Affiliations:**

- 8 1. WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Control,
9 School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong
10 Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China.
- 11 2. Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health Limited (D²4H), Hong Kong Science
12 Park, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China
- 13 3. HKU-Pasteur Research Pole, School of Public Health, LKS Faculty of Medicine,
14 The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China.
- 15 4. Centre for Immunology & Infection, Hong Kong Science and Technology Park,
16 Hong Kong, China

17
18 Corresponding authors: bcowling@hku.hk and pengwu@hku.hk

19
20 Running head: COVID-19 transmission in hotel quarantine

21 Word count (abstract): 243

22 Word count (main text): 3500

23

24 **Background:** On-arrival quarantine has been one of the primary measures used to
25 prevent the introduction of COVID-19 into Hong Kong since the start of the
26 pandemic. Most on-arrival quarantines have been done in hotels, with the duration
27 of quarantine and testing frequency during quarantine varying throughout the
28 pandemic for various reasons. However, hotels are not necessarily designed with
29 infection control in mind. We aimed to study the potential risk of transmission
30 between persons in on-arrival quarantine.

31

32 **Methods:** We examined data on each laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 case
33 identified in on-arrival quarantine in a hotel in Hong Kong between 1 May 2020 and
34 31 January 2022. We sequenced the full genomes of viruses from cases that
35 overlapped with other confirmed cases in terms of the hotel of stay, date of arrival
36 and date of testing positive. A combination of epidemiological information and
37 sequence information was then used to identify probable transmission events.

38

39 **Findings:** Among 221 imported cases that overlapped with other quarantined cases,
40 phylogenetic analysis identified eight suspected clusters comprising 20 cases in total.
41 Only three of these clusters had been recognised as hotel transmission events.

42

43 **Interpretation:** We have identified potential occurrences of COVID-19 transmission
44 within hotel quarantine in Hong Kong demonstrating the underlying low but non-
45 zero risk associated with sequestering arrivals within hotels. In future pandemics,
46 on-arrival quarantine in hotels could be used to delay the introduction of infection,
47 but the construction of purpose-built facilities for on-arrival quarantine might be
48 necessary to minimize importation risk.

49

50 **Funding:** Health and Medical Research Fund, Hong Kong

51 INTRODUCTION

52 One of the measures used to reduce importation of COVID-19 into a locality is
53 quarantine of arriving persons. In Hong Kong, quarantine of arrivals either at home,
54 within purpose-built quarantine facilities or hotel quarantine (HQ) has been variably
55 implemented since 27 January 2020, with mandatory quarantine for all arrivals since
56 19 March 2020. Quarantine within hotels for 14 days became mandatory for arrivals
57 from some locations on 25 July 2020 and for all arrivals from 13 November 2020 with
58 few exceptions. From 22 December 2020 onwards the Hong Kong government
59 issued a list of selected hotels that were designated to receive inbound travellers,
60 termed “designated hotel quarantine” (DHQ). Stringent infection control measures
61 were implemented in these designated hotels.^{1,2} The required quarantine period
62 increased to 21 days from 25 December 2020 as part of the responses to the
63 emergence of SARS-CoV-2 variants.

64 Together with a range of local control measures, importation control has
65 resulted in relatively limited local circulation of SARS-CoV-2 in Hong Kong in the
66 first two years of the pandemic. By 31 January 2022, there had been approximately
67 13,000 confirmed cases, corresponding to just 1.9 confirmed cases per 1000
68 population in four distinct epidemic waves.^{3,4} However, in January 2022, spread of
69 Omicron BA.2 occurred in Hong Kong and was not controlled, resulting in a large
70 fifth epidemic wave with more than 1.1 million confirmed cases and more than 9000

71 deaths.⁵ A small number of infections have occasionally been traced back to
72 infections between guests or staff working within HQ/DHQ in Hong Kong.^{6,7}
73 Transmission of infection from quarantined guests to other guests or staff has also
74 been reported elsewhere in the world.^{8,9} Regular testing of hotel guests and staff can
75 help to identify infections more quickly and limit leaks into the community, but it
76 can be difficult to identify transmission between quarantined persons because those
77 who test positive in HQ/DHQ would typically be assumed to have acquired their
78 infection before they entered quarantine. In this study we combined genomic and
79 epidemiological data to investigate the risk of infection within HQ/DHQ from 1 May
80 2020 through to 31 January 2022.

81

82 **METHODS**

83 *Data collection and background*

84 Line lists including demographic data were provided by the Centre for Health
85 Protection (CHP) of the Department of Health for all cases confirmed by real time-
86 polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) in Hong Kong from 1 May 2020 through to 31
87 January 2022. Cases were characterised as “imported” if they had a travel history
88 overseas during the 21-days prior to the diagnosis and were presumed to have
89 acquired the infection outside of Hong Kong (i.e. with no reason to presume

90 otherwise). Arrivals were classified into seven regions of origin according to World
91 Bank Development indicators given the most recent country of departure.

92 During the study period, all persons arriving in Hong Kong were tested
93 upon arrival and then during quarantine (if negative at arrival) by RT-PCR. During
94 the HQ period (up to and including 21 December 2020), guests were tested once
95 before release towards the end of the 14-day quarantine period, whereas during the
96 DHQ period (from 22 December 2020 onwards), guests were tested by PCR up to six
97 times during quarantine, though testing frequency varied for many reasons
98 including the length of quarantine, country of origin, and local testing constraints.
99 During both periods, all laboratory-confirmed cases including asymptomatic cases
100 and mild cases were isolated in hospital or in specialised isolation facilities. Based on
101 the moment of detection and the place of stay after arrival, cases were classified into
102 (a) detected at arrival within the place of specimen collection, (b) cases with home
103 quarantine arrangements (e.g. cases coming from countries classified as low risk
104 arriving before 13 November 2020), (c) cases within a specialised quarantine facility
105 for high-risk arrivals (e.g. arrivals deemed close contacts of imported cases), (d)
106 cases that stayed in HQ (either for quarantine purposes or while waiting for initial
107 RT-PCR results in case of evening arrivals), and (e) cases under special quarantine
108 arrangements (e.g. pilots and diplomats).

109

110 *Characterisation of potential HQ/DHQ clustering*

111 For cases that stayed in HQ/DHQ, we obtained the period of stay using the date of
112 arrival and the date of admission to isolation facilities. We considered cases for
113 further investigation of SARS-CoV-2 infection or transmission during their
114 quarantine period if they stayed at least one day in the same hotel as another case
115 with overlapping periods of stay but not in the same room.

116

117 *Genomic sequencing of SARS-CoV-2*

118 Saliva samples or nasopharyngeal swab samples of SARS-CoV-2 cases were
119 sequenced. We reverse transcribed virus with primers targeting different regions¹⁰
120 with synthesized cDNA then subjected to multiple overlapping 2-kb PCRs for full-
121 genome amplification. Where PCR amplicons were obtained from the same
122 specimen, amplicons were pooled and sequenced using Nova sequencing platform
123 (PE150, Illumina). The sequencing library was prepared by Nextera XT. Base calling
124 of raw read signal and demultiplexing of reads by different samples were performed
125 using Bcl2Fastq (Illumina). A reference-based re-sequencing strategy was applied in
126 analysing the NGS data. Raw FASTQ reads were assembled and mapped to the
127 SARS-CoV-2 reference genome (Wuhan-Hu-1, GenBank: MN908947.3) using BWA
128 mem2 (v.2.0pre2). The primer reads and low-quality reads were trimmed using
129 iVar¹¹ with the above primers and default parameters. The consensus sequences for

130 each sample were called as dominant bases at each position by samtools mpileup
131 (v.1.11)¹² and iVar with default parameters. Samples less than 27kb in length
132 (excluding gaps) were excluded from further downstream analysis.

133

134 *Phylogenetic analysis & analysis of HQ/DHQ clustering*

135 We selected 350 available genome sequences for analysis given the criteria of
136 epidemiological overlap defined previously. We aligned genomes with greater than
137 70% unambiguous nucleotides (n=280) against A and B lineage references strains
138 Wuhan/WH04/2020 and Wuhan-Hu-1/2019 respectively using MAFFT v7.49 for
139 closely related viral genomes¹⁰ (FFT-NS-2 algorithm). Maximum likelihood
140 phylogenetic trees were generated from the included alignment using IQ-Tree
141 v2.1.2¹³ with 1000 ultrafast bootstrap replicates.¹⁴ We inferred sequence relatedness
142 as the pairwise genetic distance between two sequences, calculating the number of
143 genome-wide substitutions (HKY85 substitution model) given an alignment total
144 length of 29,924 base pairs. Lineage assignment was determined using PANGOLIN
145 v.3.1.14 and PLEARN model v.1.2.81 including designation of variants of concern
146 (VOC).¹⁵

147 Probable transmission was determined between pairs identified by our initial
148 screen based on epidemiological data if sequences were identical i.e., zero genome-
149 wise substitutions, with the same country of departure, or ≤ 4 genome-wide

150 substitutions between pairs with different countries of departure and were
151 monophyletically exclusive. The substitution cut-off of ≤ 4 was determined based on
152 the one-tailed 75% quantile of genetic distance between known close contacts also
153 identified in HQ/DHQ (Supplementary Figure 1), with more strict criteria chosen to
154 exclude potential false positives where sequences from the same country of
155 departure were genomically similar yet unrelated to within HQ/DHQ transmission
156 (e.g., in-flight or pre-arrival transmission). For all the above criteria, there must be
157 epidemiological overlap given the hotel of stay, date of arrival, date of symptom
158 onset and/or date of confirmation relative to each potential HQ/DHQ pair.

159

160 *Role of the funding source*

161 Funders had no role in study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of
162 data; in the writing of the report; and in the decision to submit the paper for
163 publication. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of
164 the University of Hong Kong.

165

166 RESULTS

167 *Epidemiology of imported SARS-CoV-2 cases & sequence availability*

168 During the study period, 13,165 cases were confirmed in Hong Kong, of which 23.9%
169 (n=3152/13165) cases were classified as imported, i.e. presumed to have acquired
170 infection whilst overseas, while the remaining 76.1% (n=10013/13165) of cases were
171 determined to have acquired COVID-19 infection locally. Of the 3,152 SARS-CoV-2
172 cases confirmed in Hong Kong but classified as imported during the study period,
173 the majority were aged between 20-39 years (51.9%, n=1634/3150, overall median =
174 34). Most imported cases arrived from South Asia (32.7%, n=1029/3150) followed by
175 East Asia & the Pacific (30.1%, n=949/3150) and Europe & Central Asia (21.7%,
176 n=685/3150) (Table 1).

177 Confirmed SARS-CoV-2 arrivals averaged 150 cases per month
178 (Supplementary Figure 1) and peaked at 521 cases during the month of January 2022
179 following the global emergence of the Omicron variant and was lowest during May
180 2020 (n=42). Most cases classified as overseas acquired (62.3%, n=1961/3150) did not
181 stay in HQ/DHQ but rather tested positive upon arrival at the airport (83.1%,
182 n=1630/1961) or after arrival (16.9%, n=331/1961) either waiting for arrival results,
183 home quarantine arrangements or within a specialised quarantine facility for high-
184 risk arrivals. The remaining 37.8% (n=1189/3150) of cases classified as overseas
185 acquired passed on-arrival testing and stayed within HQ/DHQ. We identified 60.6%

186 (n=720/1189) of those cases having epidemiological overlap with other cases
187 (Supplementary Figure 1). There was evidence that time from arrival-to-case
188 detection among HQ/DHQ cases identified with epidemiological overlap (but not
189 verified) was longer compared to those without overlap (median = 9 days vs. 4 days
190 respectively, $p < 0.001$, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction).

191

192 *Suspected transmissions within HQ/DHQ*

193 Of the 720 overlapping cases detected in HQ/DHQ that we identified for further
194 genomic analysis, we identified 147 potential clusters. Valid genomic samples (>70%
195 unambiguous nucleotides) however were only available for 38.9% (n=280/720) of
196 those cases corresponding to 95 (64.6%, n=95/147) possible clusters, though only 49
197 of those clusters comprising 221 cases could be analysed as the remaining clusters
198 had only one valid genome sample or comprised only samples of known family
199 contacts travelling together.

200 Given our previous genomic criteria, our analysis initially identified 13 initial
201 clusters of within HQ/DHQ transmission. Further investigation found five of these
202 clusters comprised sequences with identical countries of departure and date of
203 arrival in Hong Kong thus indicating infection prior to HQ/DHQ could not be
204 excluded, resulting in eight suspected HQ/DHQ clusters (Fig.1) comprising 20 cases.

205 Cluster one (contemporaneously reported) comprised four cases arriving
206 from Nepal in September 2020: C1, C2, C3, & C4 of which three (C1 – C3) were also
207 linked as family contacts and arrived on the same day while unlinked case C4
208 arrived four days later. All four cases belonged to lineage B.1.36.27. Cases C2, C3 &
209 C4 shared 100% pair-wise sequence identity, with case C1 two genome-wise
210 substitutions from and phylogenetically basal to the three identical cases implicating
211 C1 as the probable source of the cluster. This is also supported by the relative
212 epidemiological overlap shown in Fig. 2. Notably, case C4 completed quarantine
213 after testing negative on day 13 of 14 and was subsequently linked as the source of
214 infection for three local relatives which likely initiated the fourth epidemic wave of
215 COVID-19 in Hong Kong.¹⁶

216 Cluster two included cases J1 & J2. Case J1 arrived in Hong Kong from India
217 in December 2020 and case J2 arrived from the UK three days later. Despite different
218 countries of departure, both cases had 100% pair-wise sequence identity and
219 belonged to lineage B.1.36. Due to the identical nature of the sequences the direction
220 of transmission could not be determined, however, the relative overlap and from
221 arrival-to-confirmation or onset between the two cases suggest that case J1 was the
222 likely the infector of case J2 (Fig. 2).

223 Cluster three (contemporaneously reported) involved case R1 & R2. Case R1
224 arrived from Canada in February 2021, while case R2 arrived from the Philippines

225 nine days later and both were required to undergo 21 days mandatory quarantine
226 due to a policy change (effective from 2 February 2021). As with cluster two, despite
227 different countries of departure, both cases shared 100% pair-wise sequence identity
228 and belonged to lineage B.1.1.7 (Alpha VOC). Given the epidemiological overlap
229 (Fig. 2) and the latent period distribution of SARS-CoV-2 (Median: 5.5 days, upper
230 95th percentile: 10.6 days),¹⁷ it is most likely that R2 infected R1.

231 Cluster four involved three cases T6, T7 and T8. Cases T6 and T7 arrived in
232 Hong Kong on the same day in March 2021, from the Philippines and the USA
233 respectively, and were required to undergo 21 days mandatory quarantine. Both
234 sequences belonged to lineage P.3 (Theta VOC) despite the different countries of
235 departure and were separated by only two genome-wise substitutions (Fig.2). The
236 third case arrived from Indonesia nine days after T6 and T7, and the sequence was
237 separated by two or three substitutions between T6 and T7 respectively suggesting
238 that T6 was the likely source of infection of T7 and T8. Case T8 was asymptomatic
239 throughout their quarantine period.

240 Cluster five comprised two or three cases: T1, T2, and T3. These arrived from
241 Indonesia with T2 arriving first, T1 arriving seven days later, and T3 arriving eight
242 days later. T1 and T3 shared 100% sequence identity and were thus considered
243 probable HQ/DHQ transmission though both arrived separately from Indonesia,
244 while T2 was separated by two substitutions so within HQ/DHQ transmission was

245 considered less likely. All three belonged to lineage AY.24, a Delta-like (B.1.617.2)
246 subvariant. Given the dates of arrival and symptom onset, it is possible case T1 was
247 the infector of case T3, though if transmission with the third case is considered, T2
248 may be the infector of both T1 and T3 (Fig.1, Fig.2).

249 The last three clusters (six to eight) each comprised two sequenced cases and
250 belonged to Omicron variant lineages or sub lineages of BA.1 and BA.2. Cluster six
251 (contemporaneously reported) an early BA.1 Omicron comprised two cases T4 and
252 T5 arriving from South Africa and Canada in November 2021 and differed by only
253 one nucleotide substitution.¹⁸ Evidence for cluster seven (BA.2.3) was weaker, with
254 both cases, D1 and D2, arriving from the Philippines separately. Sequences differed
255 by two substitutions though cases had no epidemiological overlap during their stay
256 but was instead grouped into a large cluster with 22 other cases missing sequence
257 data. This suggested perhaps an unsequenced case may have infected both D1 and
258 D2 or less likely acted as an intermediate. The eighth and final cluster (BA.1.17.2)
259 comprised two cases, M1 and M2, who arrived separately from Nepal and Ireland in
260 January 2022. Virus sequences were genomically identical consistent with within-
261 DHQ transmission.

262

263 *Variants of concern*

264 Overall, among the 221 sequenced cases with suspected HQ/DHQ overlap to other
265 unlinked cases, 158 were positive for a VOC, the most common being Delta
266 (B.1.617.2-like, n=42/158, 27%) and Alpha (B.1.1.7-like, n = 38/158, 24%). There was no
267 evidence that sequenced HQ/DHQ transmission clusters were more likely to involve
268 a VOC compared to imported cases detected in HQ/DHQ (OR = 0.92, 95% CI = 0.35
269 2.72, p = 0.87, Logistic regression, Supplementary Table 1).

270

271 **DISCUSSION**

272 In this study, we present the descriptive epidemiology of all COVID-19 cases
273 imported into Hong Kong between 1 May 2020 and 31 January 2022 and identify
274 instances of probable SARS-CoV-2 transmission between persons staying within
275 HQ/DHQ. Most significantly, among the 221 imported cases with available genomic
276 data across 49 potential transmission clusters given the time and hotel of stay, 20
277 (9%) were phylogenetically linked into eight probable clusters, five of which were
278 previously unrecognised. Beyond the eight clusters reported in our study, six
279 additional instances of likely HQ/DHQ transmission between unlinked guests have
280 also been reported by the Centre for Health Protection in Hong Kong both within
281 and after our study period,^{2,19-22} bringing the total number of probable HQ/DHQ
282 transmissions in Hong Kong to a minimum of 14. In some of the additional

283 instances, the presumptive HQ/DHQ infectee was confirmed after they had
284 completed mandatory quarantine during periods of limited to no local transmission,
285 thus making local infection post-quarantine highly unlikely.

286 Most notably, a HQ/DHQ cluster reported in this study (Cluster 1) was
287 responsible for the introduction of B.1.36.27 which initiated the fourth epidemic
288 wave in Hong Kong,¹⁶ while the fifth wave was initiated by a contemporaneously-
289 recognised DHQ transmission of BA.2²⁰ which initiated the fifth and largest wave of
290 COVID-19 in Hong Kong with more than 1.1 million cases and more than 9000
291 deaths.⁵ For two of the earlier recognised HQ/DHQ clusters, subsequent
292 environmental investigations raised concerns about ventilation systems and airflow
293 between rooms.² Additionally, there have been instances of staff infected whilst
294 working within HQ/DHQ,^{7,23} and other apparent introductions of novel lineages and
295 variants without identified sources despite strict quarantine measures, including the
296 introductions which resulted in the third epidemic wave in Hong Kong.³ Overall,
297 inbound hotel quarantine was able to prevent a large number of introductions, given
298 that more than a thousand cases were identified in HQ/DHQ with substantially
299 reduced daily arrivals compared to the period before the pandemic, but could not
300 entirely prevent the introduction of Omicron, nor other lineages prior.

301 At the time of this study, Hong Kong is one of very few jurisdictions
302 continuing to pursue a local elimination strategy termed 'dynamic zero covid' in

303 2022 despite the widespread availability and high uptake of vaccines since early
304 2021. Prior to the emergence of the Omicron variant, local outbreaks were controlled
305 using a variety of stringent public health and social measures, though in each
306 instance, did not involve the sustained circulation of any VOCs which now dominate
307 global circulation (some local VOC infections were reported during periods of
308 elimination, though in each case were contained using existing measures).²⁴ Given
309 the widespread global distribution of highly infectious VOCs with shorter
310 incubation periods^{25,26} and the common experience of other formerly elimination-
311 focused countries,²⁷ the success of an ongoing elimination strategy in Hong Kong
312 would be aided by substantial improvements to HQ/DHQ infection control or the
313 construction of purpose-built quarantine facilities. However, at this time, the public
314 health impact of future introductions is likely to be substantially lower given the
315 high rate of vaccine uptake as well as natural immunity resulting from the fifth
316 wave. Whereas earlier in the pandemic, inbound quarantine could be reasonably
317 justified as protecting public health from direct and indirect COVID-19 associated
318 mortality via reducing the introduction of infections into the community and
319 thereby prolonging the time between community epidemics, the instances of within
320 HQ/DHQ infection including those identified in this study demonstrate that Hong
321 Kong remains at non-zero risk of future introductions. The need therefore for
322 ongoing inbound quarantine must now be balanced with the ongoing economic and

323 social impacts of continuing such policies, with their incremental and increasingly
324 limited public health benefits.

325 Our study has a few limitations. Firstly, valid samples or full-length sequence
326 data was only available for a minority of cases identified as potential episodes of
327 HQ/DHQ transmission (38.9%, n=280/720). Furthermore, among the 95 potential
328 HQ/DHQ clusters identified that had available sequence data, 49 of those clusters
329 had only one sample or comprised only samples of known family contacts and were
330 effectively excluded from any inference. Although many of the excluded cases
331 generally had high Ct-values typically associated with a lower risk of infectivity
332 (personal communication, Ben Cowling), it is possible we may have missed more
333 instances of within HQ/DHQ transmission. If the risk of transmission was equivalent
334 in the available and unavailable or excluded potential HQ/DHQ transmission
335 events, we estimate we might have identified 16 additional (24 total) within
336 HQ/DHQ transmission clusters during the equivalent study period. Furthermore,
337 there were a number of HQ/DHQ cases with abnormally long incubation periods
338 that were missing sequence data. Some of these cases might have resulted from
339 within HQ/DHQ transmission, given the short latent period distribution of SARS-
340 CoV-2 (Median: 5.5 days, upper 95th percentile: 10.6 days).¹⁷

341 Second, data on potential contact or proximity of unlinked HQ/DHQ cases
342 such as room or floor of stay within HQ/DHQ was not readily available for all cases,

343 though close proximity of rooms were reported among some clusters. Other
344 analyses outside the study period in Hong Kong have used such data to infer likely
345 HQ/DHQ transmissions in the event of post-HQ/DHQ detection of SARS-CoV-2
346 cases during periods of elimination.² In our study, such data could have otherwise
347 provided additional epidemiological evidence indicative of within HQ/DHQ
348 infection in the absence of genomic data. Similarly, there was no data on potential
349 contact between unlinked cases prior to arrival in Hong Kong (e.g. HQ/DHQ cluster
350 one arriving from the same country), or within the airport (e.g. HQ/DHQ cluster
351 four arriving on the same day), representing potential alternative sources of
352 infection which would overestimate the number of within HQ/DHQ transmission.
353 However, we did note and exclude clusters with the same date and country of
354 arrival or with identical flight numbers when available.^{24,28} Future studies and
355 surveillance practice could look to sample all SARS-CoV-2 cases detected in
356 HQ/DHQ and combine both additional sources of epidemiological and genomic data
357 to calculate to underlying risk of infection, while quantifying the relative effects of
358 potential risk-mitigation factors such as ventilation, room spacing, and HQ/DHQ
359 capacity.

360 In conclusion, we report at least eight instances of suspected within HQ/DHQ
361 transmission in Hong Kong, demonstrating the risks associated with confining
362 travellers to HQ/DHQ. Infection prevention and control measures within HQ/DHQ

363 should be reviewed for potential improvements, although the ongoing need for
364 inbound quarantine in mid-2022 should be weighed against its economic and social
365 impacts given increasing population immunity from vaccinations as well as the large
366 number of domestic infections in 2022 to date. In the event of a future pandemic,
367 governments aiming to prevent, or at least delay, local outbreaks of infection could
368 consider the use of purpose-built facilities.

369

370 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

371 We gratefully acknowledge the staff from the originating laboratories responsible for
372 obtaining the specimens. We acknowledge the technical support provided by
373 colleagues from the Centre for PanorOmic Sciences of the University of Hong Kong.
374 We also acknowledge the Centre for Health Protection of the Department of Health
375 for providing epidemiological data for the study.

376

377 **FUNDING**

378 This project was supported by the Health and Medical Research Fund, Food and
379 Health Bureau, Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (grant
380 no. COVID190205 & COVID190118). The funding bodies had no role in the design of
381 the study, the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, or writing of the
382 manuscript.

383

384 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

385 All authors meet the ICMJE criteria for authorship. The study was conceived by
386 LLMP and BJC. HG analysed the NGS data. DCA wrote the first draft of the
387 manuscript and conducted the combined epidemical and genomic analyses. MMS
388 compiled the epidemiological dataset and assisted in writing of the first draft. All

389 authors provided critical review and revision of the text and approved the final
390 version.

391

392 **DATA SHARING STATEMENT**

393 All final genomic sequences are made available online upon publication via GISAID
394 with accession numbers listed in the supplementary material. All individual
395 demographic data of sequenced cases also used in this study after de-identification
396 are available upon publication in Supplementary Table 2.

397

398 **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

399 BJC consults for AstraZeneca, Fosun Pharma, GlaxoSmithKline, Moderna, Pfizer,
400 Roche and Sanofi Pasteur. The authors report no other potential conflicts of interest.

401

402

403 **REFERENCES**

- 404 1. Li X, Chen H, Lu L, et al. High compliance to infection control measures
405 prevented guest-to-staff transmission in COVID-19 quarantine hotels. *The Journal of*
406 *infection* 2022; **84**(3): 418-67.
- 407 2. Wong S-C, Chen H, Lung DC, Ho P-L, Yuen K-Y, Cheng VC-C. To prevent
408 SARS-CoV-2 transmission in designated quarantine hotel for travelers: Is the
409 ventilation system a concern? *Indoor Air* 2021; **31**(5): 1295-7.
- 410 3. Gu H, Xie R, Adam DC, et al. SARS-CoV-2 under an elimination strategy in
411 Hong Kong. *medRxiv* 2021: 2021.06.19.21259169.
- 412 4. Wu P, Tsang TK, Wong JY, et al. Suppressing COVID-19 transmission in
413 Hong Kong: an observational study of the first four months. 2020.
- 414 5. Mesfin Y, Chen D, Bond H, et al. Epidemiology of infections with SARS-CoV-
415 2 Omicron BA. 2 variant in Hong Kong, January-March 2022. *medRxiv* 2022.
- 416 6. Lyu W, Wehby GL. Community Use Of Face Masks And COVID-19: Evidence
417 From A Natural Experiment Of State Mandates In The US. *Health Aff (Millwood)*
418 2020; **39**(8): 1419-25.
- 419 7. CHP investigates COVID-19 preliminary positive case at Port Centre in
420 Aberdeen. The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.
421 <https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202107/01/P2021070100602.htm>
- 422 8. Eichler N, Thornley C, Swadi T, et al. Transmission of Severe Acute
423 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 during Border Quarantine and Air Travel,
424 New Zealand (Aotearoa). *Emerging Infectious Disease journal* 2021; **27**(5): 1274.
- 425 9. Grout L, Katar A, Ouakrim DA, et al. Estimating the Failure Risk of
426 Quarantine Systems for Preventing COVID-19 Outbreaks in Australia and New
427 Zealand. *medRxiv* 2021: 2021.02.17.21251946.
- 428 10. Sit TH, Brackman CJ, Ip SM, et al. Infection of dogs with SARS-CoV-2. *Nature*
429 2020; **586**(7831): 776-8.
- 430 11. Grubaugh ND, Gangavarapu K, Quick J, et al. An amplicon-based sequencing
431 framework for accurately measuring intrahost virus diversity using PrimalSeq and
432 iVar. *Genome Biology* 2019; **20**(1): 8.
- 433 12. Li H. A statistical framework for SNP calling, mutation discovery, association
434 mapping and population genetical parameter estimation from sequencing data.
435 *Bioinformatics* 2011; **27**(21): 2987-93.
- 436 13. Minh BQ, Schmidt HA, Chernomor O, et al. IQ-TREE 2: New Models and
437 Efficient Methods for Phylogenetic Inference in the Genomic Era. *Molecular Biology*
438 *and Evolution* 2020; **37**(5): 1530-4.
- 439 14. Hoang DT, Chernomor O, Von Haeseler A, Minh BQ, Vinh LS. UFBoot2:
440 improving the ultrafast bootstrap approximation. *Molecular biology and evolution*
441 2018; **35**(2): 518-22.

- 442 15. Rambaut A, Holmes EC, O'Toole Á, et al. A dynamic nomenclature proposal
443 for SARS-CoV-2 lineages to assist genomic epidemiology. *Nature microbiology* 2020;
444 5(11): 1403-7.
- 445 16. Chu DKW, Hui KPY, Gu H, et al. Introduction of ORF3a-Q57H SARS-CoV-2
446 Variant Causing Fourth Epidemic Wave of COVID-19, Hong Kong, China. *Emerg*
447 *Infect Dis* 2021; 27(5): 1492-5.
- 448 17. Xin H, Li Y, Wu P, et al. Estimating the latent period of coronavirus disease
449 2019 (COVID-19). *Clin Infect Dis* 2021.
- 450 18. Gu H, Krishnan P, Ng DYM, et al. Probable Transmission of SARS-CoV-2
451 Omicron Variant in Quarantine Hotel, Hong Kong, China, November 2021. *Emerging*
452 *infectious diseases* 2022; 28(2): 460-2.
- 453 19. CHP investigates three additional confirmed cases of COVID-19. The
454 Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.
455 <https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202111/29/P2021112900624.htm>
- 456 20. CHP investigates six cases tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 virus involving
457 Silka Seaview Hotel Hong Kong. The Government of the Hong Kong Special
458 Administrative Region.
459 <https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202201/16/P2022011600615.htm>
- 460 21. CHP provides update on latest investigations on two COVID-19 imported
461 cases. The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.
462 <https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202111/22/P2021112200897.htm>
- 463 22. CHP investigates additional SARS-CoV-2 virus cases by nucleic acid tests and
464 rapid antigen tests as well as 11 imported cases earlier involving Omicron mutant
465 strain sub-lineage BA.2.12.1. The Government of the Hong Kong Special
466 Administrative Region.
467 <https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202205/20/P2022052000680.htm>
- 468 23. CHP reminds relevant residents to comply with "restriction-testing
469 declaration" operation on two cases tested preliminarily positive for SARS-CoV-2
470 virus. The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.
471 <https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202201/12/P2022011200674.htm>
- 472 24. Gu H, Chu DKW, Chang LDJ, et al. Genetic Diversity of SARS-CoV-2 among
473 Travelers Arriving in Hong Kong. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2021; 27(10): 2666-8.
- 474 25. Peacock TP, Sheppard CM, Brown JC, et al. The SARS-CoV-2 variants
475 associated with infections in India, B.1.617, show enhanced spike cleavage by furin.
476 *bioRxiv* 2021: 2021.05.28.446163.
- 477 26. Liu Y, Liu J, Johnson BA, et al. Delta spike P681R mutation enhances SARS-
478 CoV-2 fitness over Alpha variant. *bioRxiv* 2021: 2021.08.12.456173.
- 479 27. De Foo C, Grépin KA, Cook AR, et al. Navigating from SARS-CoV-2
480 elimination to endemicity in Australia, Hong Kong, New Zealand, and Singapore.
481 *Lancet* 2021: S0140-6736(21)02186-3.

482 28. Dhanasekaran V, Edwards KM, Xie R, et al. Air travel-related outbreak of
483 multiple SARS-CoV-2 variants. *Journal of travel medicine* 2021; **28**(8): taab149.

484

485

486 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

487 **Figure 1. A)** Phylogenetic tree of (n=221) all available cases of SARS-CoV-2
488 confirmed within hotel quarantine (HQ) or designated hotel quarantine (DHQ) with
489 overlap to other unlinked cases in Hong Kong from 1 May 2020 through 31 Jan 2022
490 aligned against representative sequences of SARS-CoV-2 lineages A and B. Tips are
491 coloured as confirmed within DHQ transmission clusters and labelled with unique
492 case identifiers equivalent to hotel of stay. Radial heat map shows PANGO lineage,
493 hotel of stay, and country of departure. **B)** Cladogram of suspected HQ/DHQ
494 clusters.

495

496 **Figure 2.** Cases of confirmed SARS-CoV-2 transmission between epidemiologically
497 unlinked arrivals within hotel quarantine (HQ) or designated hotel quarantine
498 (DHQ) in Hong Kong from 1 May 2020 through 31 Jan 2022. Case number in each
499 cluster was ordered by date of reporting (Supplementary Table 2).

500

501

502

503 TABLES


504 **Table 1.** Descriptive epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 cases confirmed in Hong Kong
 505 and characterised as overseas acquired cases from 1 May 2020 – 31 January 2022

Descriptive variables	HQ/DHQ with overlap		HQ /DHQ cases	Non- HQ /DHQ cases	Total Imported (n=3,152)
	Seqs (n=221)	Total (n=720)	Total (n=1,189)	Total (n=1,963)	
<i>Sex</i>					
Female	128 (57.9%)	445 (61.9%)	659 (55.4%)	985 (50.2%)	1644 (52.2%)
Male	93 (42.1%)	275 (38.1%)	530 (44.6%)	978 (49.8%)	1508 (47.8%)
<i>Age</i>					
0-19	31 (14.0%)	87 (12.1%)	151 (12.7%)	255 (13.0%)	406 (12.9%)
20-39	92 (41.6%)	376 (52.3%)	598 (50.3%)	1036 (52.8%)	1634 (51.8%)
40-59	78 (35.3%)	200 (27.8%)	354 (29.8%)	546 (27.8%)	900 (28.6%)
60-79	19 (8.6%)	52 (7.1%)	80 (6.7%)	121 (6.2%)	201 (6.4%)
80+	1 (0.5%)	5 (0.7%)	6 (0.5%)	5 (0.3%)	11 (0.3%)
<i>Import region</i>					
East Asia & Pacific	78 (35.3%)	300 (41.6%)	400 (33.6%)	550 (28.0%)	950 (30.1%)
Europe & Central Asia	21 (9.5%)	82 (11.4%)	242 (20.4%)	443 (22.6%)	685 (21.7%)
Latin America & Caribbean	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.3%)	7 (0.6%)	26 (1.3%)	33 (1.0%)
Middle East & North Africa	4 (1.8%)	20 (2.8%)	46 (3.9%)	71 (3.6%)	117 (3.7%)
North America	14 (6.3%)	38 (5.3%)	91 (7.7%)	143 (7.3%)	234 (7.5%)
South Asia	97 (43.9%)	257 (35.7%)	357 (30.0%)	672 (34.2%)	1029 (32.7%)
Sub-Saharan Africa	5 (2.3%)	16 (2.2%)	35 (2.9%)	41 (2.1%)	76 (2.4%)
Missing	2 (0.9%)	5 (0.7%)	11 (0.9%)	17 (0.9%)	28 (0.8%)

506

507

A



Hotel cluster

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

Country of departure

- Australia
- Bangladesh
- Canada
- Czech
- Finland
- Ghana
- India
- Indonesia
- Ireland
- Italy
- Japan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Korea
- Morocco
- Nepal
- Pakistan
- Philippines
- Saudi Arabia
- Singapore
- South Africa
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Tanzania
- Togo
- Turkey
- UAE
- UK
- Ukraine
- USA

Hotel of stay

- A
- B
- C
- D
- E
- F
- G
- H
- I
- J
- K
- L
- M
- N
- O
- P
- Q
- R
- S
- T
- U
- V
- W
- X
- Y
- Z

Lineage

A	AY.71	B.1.1.306	B.1.459	BA.1.17
AY.108	AY.75	B.1.1.63	B.1.466.2	BA.1.17.2
AY.127	AY.9	B.1.1.7	B.1.468	BA.1.21
AY.23	AY.99	B.1.177	B.1.470	BA.2
AY.24	B	B.1.2	B.1.525	BA.2.12
AY.25	B.1	B.1.280	B.1.560	BA.2.2
AY.33	B.1.1	B.1.351	B.1.562	BA.2.3
AY.38	B.1.1.12	B.1.351.3	B.1.567	P.3
AY.4.2	B.1.1.214	B.1.36	B.1.617.1	
AY.43	B.1.1.216	B.1.36.19	B.1.617.2	
AY.46.5	B.1.1.25	B.1.36.27	BA.1	
AY.69	B.1.1.263	B.1.36.29	BA.1.1	

