

1 **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

2 **Inferring time-varying generation time, serial interval and incubation period distributions**
3 **for COVID-19**

4 Dongxuan Chen^{1,2,†}, Yiu Chung Lau^{1,2,†}, Xiao-Ke Xu^{3,†}, Lin Wang⁴, Zhanwei Du^{1,2}, Tim K.
5 Tsang^{1,2}, Peng Wu^{1,2}, Eric H. Y. Lau^{1,2}, Jacco Wallinga^{5,6}, Benjamin J. Cowling^{1,2,*}, Sheikh
6 Taslim Ali^{1,2}

7

8 **Affiliations:**

9 ¹ WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Control, School of Public
10 Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special
11 Administrative Region, China

12 ² Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health Limited, Hong Kong Science and Technology Park,
13 New Territories, Hong Kong.

14 ³ College of Information and Communication Engineering, Dalian Minzu University, Dalian
15 116600, China.

16 ⁴ Department of Genetics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 3EH, UK.

17 ⁵ Center for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment
18 (RIVM), Bilthoven, The Netherlands

19 ⁶ Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The
20 Netherlands

21

22 * **Corresponding author:** bcowling@hku.hk

23 **Abstract**

24 **Background:** The generation time distribution, reflecting the time between successive infections
25 in transmission chains, is one of the fundamental epidemiological parameters for describing
26 COVID-19 transmission dynamics. However, because exact infection times are rarely known, it is
27 often approximated by the serial interval distribution, reflecting the time between illness onsets of
28 infector and infectee. This approximation holds under the assumption that infectors and infectees
29 share the same incubation period distribution, which may not always be true.

30 **Methods:** We analyzed data on observed incubation period and serial interval distributions in
31 China, during January and February 2020, under different sampling approaches, and developed an
32 inferential framework to estimate the generation time distribution that accounts for variation over
33 time due to changes in epidemiology, sampling biases and public health and social measures.

34 **Results:** We analyzed data on a total of 2989 confirmed cases for COVID-19 during January 1 to
35 February 29, 2020 in Mainland China. During the study period, the empirical forward serial
36 interval decreased from a mean of 8.90 days to 2.68 days. The estimated mean backward
37 incubation period of infectors increased from 3.77 days to 9.61 days, and the mean forward
38 incubation period of infectees also increased from 5.39 days to 7.21 days. The estimated mean
39 forward generation time decreased from 7.27 days (95% confidence interval: 6.42, 8.07) to 4.21
40 days (95% confidence interval: 3.70, 4.74) days by January 29. We used simulations to examine
41 the sensitivity of our modelling approach to a number of assumptions and alternative dynamics.

42 **Conclusions:** The proposed method can provide more reliable estimation of the temporal variation
43 in the generation time distribution, enabling proper assessment of transmission dynamics.

44

45 **Introduction**

46 The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has caused over 557 million cases and 6
47 million deaths by July 15, 2022¹. The generation time (GT) distribution is one of the key
48 transmission parameters and defined as the time between successive infections in a transmission
49 chain. The generation time distribution shapes the relationship between epidemic growth rate and
50 reproduction number², while the reproduction number has been widely used to indicate the
51 measure of transmissibility, and is defined as the average number of secondary cases infected by
52 one typical infector in the population.

53

54 Exact infection times are hard to observe, hence the generation time distribution is usually
55 unobserved. It is easier to record symptom onset times. Thus, in practice, the time between the
56 illness onsets of infector and infectee, which is called the serial interval (SI), is commonly used as
57 a proxy for the GT. Under the assumption that the infector and infectee have the same incubation
58 period (IP) distribution, the mean SI would equal the mean GT^{3,4}. Therefore, the entire serial
59 interval distribution is often used to estimate the reproduction number^{5,6}. However, this parametric
60 approximation does not always hold, as GT and SI have different distributional properties.
61 Importantly, the SI can be negative when the infectee has onset earlier than infector as shown in
62 the pre-symptomatic transmission for COVID-19^{7,8}, while GT must be positive since the infectee's
63 infection time must be later than infector's infection time. In addition, the SI always has a larger
64 variance than GT due to their different biological and clinical characteristics⁹. Thus when mean SI
65 equals mean GT, using SI distribution as a proxy of GT distribution may underestimate the
66 reproduction number¹⁰⁻¹².

67

68 Sampling biases can also affect the estimation of transmission parameters^{10,11}. While following up
69 the cases since their infection time (i.e. forward sampling) would result in correct estimation of IP,
70 case sampling with reference to onset times (i.e. backward sampling) would favour
71 underestimation and overestimation of IP during the exponential and fading phase of the epidemic
72 respectively¹⁰. Sampling with reference to infectee onset times, regarded as backward sampling of
73 SI, will have the same issue. Moreover, sampling with reference to infector onset times, regarded
74 as forward sampling of SI, also results in time-varying estimates of SI, as Park et al¹¹ showed that
75 the forward SI can be decomposed as the forward GT plus the forward IP of infectee minus the
76 backward IP of infector, and posited that the decreasing trend of forward SI over time was due to
77 the overestimation of infector's IP under the backward sampling approach. Therefore, it is not
78 appropriate to directly use temporal forward SI as a proxy of temporal GT. Following Park's
79 hypotheses, in this study, we developed an inferential framework to estimate the time-varying
80 forward GT, hence to have more accurate estimation of the reproduction number. We apply this
81 framework to observations on IP and SI in China during the first months of the COVID-19
82 pandemic, and quantify the actual magnitude of temporal variations in the estimates and their
83 impact on the estimated generation times and reproduction numbers.

84

85 **Results**

86 **Construction of transmission pairs**

87 We investigated a total of 2989 confirmed cases for COVID-19 during January 1 to February 29,
88 2020 in Mainland China. Of these 2989 cases, the median age was 46 years-old (interquartile range
89 (IQR): 33 – 58), and the proportion of male and female was 51% and 49% respectively. We
90 reconstructed 629 transmission pairs having symptom onset times for both infectors and infectees,
91 which consisted of 428 infectors and 629 infectees. Among the 428 infectors, the median age was
92 47 years-old (IQR: 37 – 57), and 59% were male; while among the 629 infectees, the median age
93 was 49 years-old (IQR: 34 – 61), and 47% were male. The mean number of infectees infected by
94 an infector in our data was 1.47, 386 (90%) infectors had no more than 2 infectees, while 4 (1%)
95 infectors had more than 5 infectees, with the maximum of 16 infectees being suspected to have
96 been infected by one single infector.

97

98 Despite the unknown infection times, the incubation period could be inferred by onset time and
99 the exposure window as from the first to the last day of the case's suspected exposure history,
100 according to the available case contact tracing report (see Methods and Supplementary Methods
101 section 1.1 for details in data processing). There were 126 infectors and 344 infectees with
102 available information on complete exposure window as well as symptom onset times. Fig. 1
103 presented the epi-curves for the number of infectors and infectees identified over time based on
104 their onset dates. We found 7-day moving window could ensure sufficient sample size for the
105 temporal analysis on the estimation of these epidemiological parameters under forward and
106 backward schemes, while the first and last moving windows were widened to capture the sporadic

107 cases in the early and declining phases of the epidemic (Supplementary Tables 1-2). The details of
108 the number of infectors and infectees that have complete exposure information, and number of
109 transmission pairs in each time window of the study period can be found in Supplementary
110 Methods section 1.2.

111

112 **Temporal estimates of serial intervals, incubation periods and** 113 **generation times**

114 During the study period, the empirical forward SI decreased from a mean of 8.90 (interquartile
115 range (IQR): 5.00 – 11.25) days to 2.68 (IQR: 0.00 – 6.00) days (Fig. 2a). The estimated mean
116 backward IP of infectors increased from 3.77 (95%CI: 3.09, 4.53) days to 9.61 (8.14, 11.13) days
117 (Fig. 2b), and the mean forward IP of infectees also increased from 5.39 (4.50, 6.30) days to 7.21
118 (6.36, 8.10) days (Fig. 2b). The mean empirical backward SI showed an increasing trend over time
119 (Supplementary Fig. 1a), as well as the backward IP of infectee, while IP of infector referenced by
120 infectee onset was increasing during the early phase and later became stable till the end of the
121 study period (Supplementary Fig. 1b).

122

123 The mean forward GT decreased from 7.27 (95%CI: 6.42, 8.07) to 4.21 (3.70, 4.74) days until
124 January 29 and then increased slightly up to 5.20 (4.39, 6.02) days (Fig. 3a). While the estimated
125 SD of forward GT decreased from 3.81 (2.84, 4.80) days on January 10 to 1.84 (1.38, 2.49) days
126 on January 25 and then it increased to 3.65 (2.72, 4.51) days on February 14 (Fig. 3b). On the other

127 hand, applying our estimation framework for backward GT, it was estimated that the mean
128 backward GT ranged from 4.32 (3.87, 4.77) to 5.80 (5.25, 6.39) days (Supplementary Fig. 2).

129

130 **Sensitivity analysis and bias evaluation for generation time**

131 **estimates**

132 We compared the fittings by different choices of distributions for incubation periods and
133 generation times respectively (Supplementary Table 3, Supplementary Fig. 3). The Weibull-
134 distributed IPs of infectors and infectees and Log-normal distributed GT gave the lowest AIC
135 values on the data for entire epidemics, while different choices of distributions for the forward GT
136 showed similar AIC (difference < 5) in most of the moving windows. When the sampling biases
137 in incubation period between infector and infectee at the temporal scale were not accounted, the
138 estimated mean GT would be overestimated up to 17.83% in the early phase of the epidemic and
139 underestimated up to 29.48% in the later phase with a decreasing pattern over the study period
140 (Supplementary Fig. 4a). While estimated SD for GT would be overestimated up to 25.64% and
141 underestimated up to 21.28% during the early and later phases respectively (Supplementary Fig.
142 4b).

143

144 We also compared the estimates under a model that considered the potential correlation between
145 infector's backward IP and forward GT ($\tilde{\rho}$), which suggested the correlations of 0.31(0.13 – 0.47)
146 – 0.61(0.41 – 0.76) during the study period, as well as higher means (ranging from 5.12 (4.69 –
147 5.56) to 8.04 (7.25 – 8.89)) and higher standard deviations (ranging from 2.37 (1.89 – 2.87) to 4.41

148 (3.33 – 5.53)) of forward GT compared to the main result where independence between IP and GT
149 was assumed (Supplementary Table 4). The changing patterns were consistent with main results
150 (Supplementary Fig. 5). Similar estimates of GT were obtained when the correlation was assumed
151 to be fixed at 0.25, 0.5 or 0.75 instead of being estimated by the model (Supplementary Table 4;
152 Supplementary Fig. 5). However, our simulation study revealed that these estimates might suffer
153 from bias (Supplementary Tables 9-11).

154

155 **Estimation of the basic and effective reproduction number**

156 The basic reproduction number, R_0 , was estimated to be 1.95 (95% CI: 1.70, 2.26) given the
157 exponential growth rate of 0.10 (0.08, 0.12), and forward GT distribution in the early part of the
158 epidemic with a mean of 7.27 (6.42, 8.07) days and SD of 3.81 (2.84, 4.80) days. In contrast, when
159 the backward GT distribution based on data from January 1 to 26, 2020 (the first moving window)
160 was used instead, which had a mean of 4.93 (4.35, 5.53) days and SD of 2.99 (2.34, 3.57) days, R_0
161 was estimated to be 1.58 (1.43, 1.74) which was underestimated by 18.97%.

162

163 The observed epi-curve of all cases onset showed the peak incidence was on January 29, 2020
164 (Fig. 4a). Based on this epi-curve, we estimated R_t by temporal GT distribution with reference to
165 infector onset (red line in Fig. 4b) and effective SI distribution (Supplementary Fig. 6) with
166 reference to infector onset (blue line in Fig. 4b) respectively. As shown in Fig. 4b, these two
167 estimates and their corresponding confidence interval mostly overlap in the growing phase, and

168 both declined to 1 at the end of January. But during the fading phase since February, the estimated
169 R_t by temporal SI distribution was a little bit higher than the estimates by temporal GT distribution.

170

171 **Simulation results for inference of generation time**

172 Park et al¹¹ showed that the realized GT distribution over the simulated epidemics could be
173 different from its intrinsic distribution, subject to sampling bias and susceptible dynamics in
174 population. Based on our simulation study, our proposed inferential framework was able to recover
175 the simulated values of realized GT, when the mean width of exposure window did not exceed the
176 mean of intrinsic GT, and also below or approximately equal to the mean of intrinsic IP. Under
177 such criteria, the proportions of 95% CI of estimated mean of realized GT covering simulated
178 mean of realized GT ranged from 78% to 98% over all intrinsic GT setting (Supplementary Table
179 5), while the proportions of 95% CI of estimated SD of realized GT covering simulated SD of
180 realized GT ranged from 80% to 100% based on 50 simulations (Supplementary Table 6),
181 suggesting satisfactory recovery performance of our model. However, longer width of exposure
182 window was associated with lower proportions of 95% CI of estimated value covering the
183 simulated value, as well as larger bias especially overestimation in SD. When there were 1/3 of
184 infector and infectees with completely missing exposure information, the proportions of 95% CI
185 of estimated value of realized GT covering simulated value of realized GT would be generally
186 lower, and bias in estimates were larger, compared to the situation when all infectors and infectees
187 had complete exposure information (Supplementary Tables 7 – 8). Note the simulation of
188 transmission data and estimation of GT were both under the assumption that IP and GT were
189 independent. Besides, we further tested the reliability of using forward GT/SI to estimate effective

190 reproduction number in the initial time window (R_I) as a proxy of R_0 (Supplementary Note section
191 2.2, Supplementary Table 9). We found that R_I would suffer from bias of 6% - 25% and -1% - 7%
192 when forward SI distribution and forward GT distribution were used respectively, depending on
193 the underlying intrinsic GT settings.

194

195 In another simulation study involving the intrinsic distribution of correlated forward IP and GT
196 with a correlation coefficient of ρ , we tested the performance of our adjusted model that considered
197 correlation between infector's backward IP and forward GT ($\tilde{\rho}$) by estimating the realized
198 correlation coefficient, the mean and SD of GT simultaneously (Supplementary Methods section
199 1.6). Simulation results suggested that the estimates were very sensitive to the width of exposure
200 windows. The recovery performance was satisfactory when the mean width of exposure windows
201 was 1 day (Supplementary Note section 2.3, Supplementary Tables 10-12), with the bias of <5%
202 and proportion of 95% CI of estimate covering the realized value of >80% in almost all time
203 windows especially when $\rho \leq 0.5$. However, the exposure window with mean width of ≥ 4 days
204 was associated with biased estimates (over-/under-estimation dependent on the parameters)
205 (Supplementary Note section 2.3, Supplementary Tables 10 – 12). We thus reported the estimates
206 under the assumed independence between IP and GT as the main result given the promising
207 recovery performance in simulation studies.

208

209

210 **Discussion**

211 We have obtained the time-varying estimates of generation times by incorporating the temporal
212 changes in the estimates of serial intervals and incubation periods. Based on transmission pairs
213 data, the mean generation time of COVID-19 was estimated to be around 7 days in the beginning
214 of the epidemic in mainland China and the corresponding basic reproduction number was 1.95. In
215 one month, the mean of generation time decreased to 4 – 5 days accounting for the effectiveness
216 of public health and social measures (PHSMs) that were implemented to control transmission.
217 Previous studies have estimated the mean generation time of COVID-19 in early 2020 to be 5.20
218 (95% CrI: 3.78, 6.78) days in Singapore¹² and 5.70 days (95%CI: 4.80, 6.50) in mainland China¹³,
219 which were both within the range of our temporal estimates in the growing-to-peak phase of the
220 onset-based epi-curve. On the other hand, the mean of temporal GT was reduced to 4.21 (95% CI:
221 3.70, 4.74) days on January 29, which was consistent with the result reported by Li et al¹⁴ that the
222 estimated mean GT decreased from 5.47 (95% CI: 4.57, 6.45) days in first generation to 4.25 (95%
223 CI: 2.82, 6.23) days in successive generations with majority of the infectors exposed before and
224 after January 23, 2020 respectively.

225

226 Depletion of susceptibles in the population due to high hazard of infection during the epidemic
227 could temporally lead to reduction in mean of forward GT, which has been illustrated
228 mathematically by Nishiura¹⁵ and further visualized by Champredon & Dushoff¹⁶ and Park et al¹¹.
229 However, an antibody seroprevalence study by Li et al¹⁷ estimated the weighted seroprevalence
230 for Wuhan and provinces outside Hubei after the first wave in mainland China was only 4.43%
231 (95% CI: 3.48%, 5.62%) and <0.1% respectively, indicating there should only be a limited degree

232 of susceptible depletion that could lead to a reduction in the mean of the forward GT. It is more
233 likely that the GT was shortened due to the implementation of nation-wide control measures on
234 January 23, 2020¹⁸. Apart from lockdown in Wuhan, the nation-wide control measures included
235 early detection and isolation of suspected cases, quarantine of close contacts, restricting opening
236 time of public facilities and requiring mask wearing in public places¹⁹. Such control measures
237 would reduce the forward infections from the infectors, hence shorten the mean GT, similar to the
238 mean SI as illustrated in recent studies^{11,18}. Besides, while the backward GT should have a
239 consistently increasing pattern due to the nature of backward sampling^{11,15,16}, the reduction in our
240 backward estimated GT also suggested the impact of PHSMs on shortening GT (Supplementary
241 Fig. 2).

242 We noted Sender et al²⁰ investigated the unmitigated infectious profile during the early epidemic
243 stage in mainland China based on 77 transmission pairs for which the infector developed
244 symptoms before January 17, 2020. They estimated the mean GT of 9.7 (95%CI: 8.3, 11.2) days
245 and SD of 6.9 (95%CI: 4.3, 10.1) days, with the estimated correlation coefficient between IP and
246 GT of 0.75 (95%CI: 0.5, 0.9), and thus estimated R_0 of 2.2 (95%CI: 1.9, 2.7). Our result
247 considering correlated IP and GT meanwhile suggested a mean GT of 8.04 (95% CI: 7.25, 8.89)
248 days, SD of GT of 4.41 (95% CI: 3.33, 5.53) days, and the estimated correlation coefficient of 0.41
249 (95%CI: -0.03, 0.64) considering the data before January 20, 2020. Despite different timeframe,
250 while Sender et al adjusted for sampling bias with an assumed IP distribution and an assumed
251 exponential growth rate of epidemic, we used the estimated forward/backward IP from our
252 transmission pairs data, which might contribute to the difference in GT estimates and correlation
253 estimates. Nevertheless, our result was generally comparable with that from Sender et al.

254 We have compared the effective reproduction number (R_t) estimates by temporal GT distribution
255 and SI distribution respectively, and showed that the estimates mostly overlap before the fading
256 phase of the epidemic (Fig. 4b). During the fading phase, however, forward temporal SI would
257 suffer from systematic bias of smaller mean and larger variance by overweighing the transmission
258 pairs with shorter serial intervals¹¹, hence resulted in a higher R_t than that estimated by temporal
259 forward GT. In particular, R_t here was limited to the epi-curve constructed from transmission pairs
260 data instead that of all observed infections/ case-onsets in the first wave in mainland China. In fact,
261 R_t in Fig. 4b was evaluated based on our observed data to compare the impact of time varying GT
262 and SI under comparative settings, therefore initial R_t could not be directly compared with our
263 estimated R_0 , which was calculated here based on the population-level growth rate using all case-
264 onset data²¹. While in our simulation study (supplementary table 9) we tried using forward SI or
265 GT distribution in the initial time window to obtain effective reproduction number as a proxy of
266 R_0 , and found that using SI would suffer from substantially overestimation bias than using GT.

267
268 We conducted simulation studies to assess the performance of the proposed inferential framework
269 by testing how efficiently the generation time could be recovered under known setting. For given
270 mean generation time of 5-7 days¹²⁻¹⁴ and the 95% quantile of incubation period of 14 days for
271 COVID-19, our model suggested promising estimates with >80% of 95% CIs (dependent on the
272 parameters) covering the simulated values of realized GT when the intrinsic GT has a mean of 7
273 days and a SD of 4 days under the mean width of exposure windows of 7 days (14 days as
274 maximum) (Supplementary Tables 5 – 6). However, our model might be sensitive to long exposure
275 windows which resulted in poor recovery performance of forward generation time, especially
276 when the exposure windows had a mean width larger than mean intrinsic IP (i.e., mean exposure

277 width > 7 days while intrinsic mean IP of 6.5 days), or when the intrinsic generation time had a
278 mean comparatively shorter than the mean width of exposure windows (Supplementary Tables 5
279 – 6). Infector/infectee with missing exposure windows would also have similar impact on GT
280 estimates (Supplementary Tables 7 – 8). It is possible that the long width and the absence of
281 information of exposure window led to more uncertainties in the estimates of incubation periods
282 of infectors and infectees, and hence may lead to potential bias in the estimates of generation time.

283
284 One advantage of our method is that we allow time-varying estimations on epidemiological
285 parameters, providing more information on transmission dynamics. The traditional approach
286 usually estimates the generation time as a constant distribution over the whole epidemic, while our
287 method can reflect the potential impact of PHSMs in reshaping the interval measures¹⁸. An
288 additional advantage is that we have accounted for the sampling bias in each related interval
289 parameter in the inferential framework. It is usually considered that the SI and GT share the same
290 mean assuming the mean IP does not differ between infector and infectee. However, for the
291 estimates at the temporal scale these assumptions were not often true, due to different sampling
292 approach of infector and infectee along with the case characteristics. When the sampling bias in
293 IP is not adjusted for, the mean GT will be overestimated and underestimated in the early and later
294 phase of an epidemic respectively (Supplementary Fig. 4).

295
296 However, our study has some limitations. First, our analysis was limited to symptomatic cases,
297 therefore the framework might not be directly adopted to the transmission pairs including
298 asymptomatic infectors or infectees, and our results may be affected by selection bias as we only

299 analysed a small proportion of all confirmed cases. Second, our method might be limited by the
300 long width of exposure windows, which would lead to biased estimates of generation time
301 especially when the intrinsic generation time is relatively short (Supplementary Tables 5 – 6).
302 Based on our data, the average exposure widths for infector and infectee were 3.42 days and 5.87
303 days respectively, suggesting the possibility of biased estimates of forward GT as the estimated
304 mean of GT was reduced to <5 days due to COVID-19 PHSMs. Third, we assumed incubation
305 period and generation time were independent in our inferential procedure, which may not hold for
306 example if there is an association between inoculum and incubation speed^{22,23}, but pre-
307 symptomatic transmission was observed^{7,8} and the literature does not have such clear evidence on
308 the correlation between incubation period and generation time for COVID-19. Our method could
309 be further extended to consider the correlation between incubation period and generation time
310 (Supplementary Table 4), yet our simulation result suggested that those estimates might not be
311 reliable since they were very sensitive to the width of exposure windows (Supplementary Tables
312 10-12). Fourth, the case definition might have changed during the study period. The diagnosis
313 criteria and case definition in mainland China broadened over time²¹, therefore milder cases were
314 more likely to be identified later in the epidemic. While previous studies indicated shorter time
315 delay from infection to clinical outcome for severe COVID-19 cases²⁴, and even for MERS and
316 SARS^{25,26}, this might lead to the increase in mean of the estimated forward incubation period.
317 Moreover, our result was subject to recall bias which might affect the accuracy of the exposure
318 information and onset timings in our data, hence the precision of our estimates.

319

320 In conclusion, we have developed a method to estimate forward temporal generation times of
321 COVID-19 that accounts for the sampling bias and temporal variations in serial interval and

322 incubation periods of infector and infectee, and provides improved and time-varying estimates.
323 We identified potential biases in the estimates of generation times including sampling bias at
324 temporal scale, emphasizing the importance of using more accurate GT estimation for
325 understanding the time-varying transmissibility of COVID-19. The time-varying estimates of
326 generation time could be crucial for better assessment of the disease dynamics and transmissibility,
327 and could help to improve public health policies and mitigation strategies in real-time.

328

329

330 **Methods**

331 **Data collection and characterizing epidemiological parameters**

332 We used line list data reported by China's municipal health commissions outside Hubei province
333 from January 1 to February 29, 2020. The original data was extracted from the publicly available
334 case reports provided by more than 200 municipal health commissions in Mainland China and
335 reported in earlier studies^{6,18,27}, and further integrated and compiled by Liu and colleagues²⁸. The
336 line-list data contains the information on the case demography (age, sex, occupation, residence
337 place), exposure and contact history, onset and hospitalization dates, and potential transmission
338 links in addition.

339

340 In this study, we reconstructed each possible transmission pairs by checking and compiling the
341 information on epidemiology history, contact tracing reports and inter-relationship for these

342 confirmed cases. We defined infectors as cases that had exposure history to risk areas or contagious
343 person, and infected other cases within the same transmission chain/network, and the
344 corresponding infectees as the cases who had contact history with the infector from his /her earliest
345 exposure time until the isolation time. If infectees had more than one suspected infector, we
346 considered the corresponding infector who contacted the infectee earlier during his/her infectious
347 period; if more than one suspected infector contacted the infectee at the same day, we considered
348 the corresponding infector, having closer and more frequent contacts with the infectee. For the
349 cases in further complicated infection events with uncertain transmission paths, they were
350 excluded from this study. We also investigated and constructed exposure windows for the cases
351 with available exposure history and checked the symptom onset times as the time when the case
352 developed symptoms or reported self-recognized discomfort for the first time during his/her illness
353 history. See Supplementary Methods section 1.1 for details. Our study received ethical approval
354 from the Institutional Review Board of the University of Hong Kong.

355

356 **Inferential framework of temporal generation times**

357 The serial interval was found to be shortened over time by implementation of public health and
358 social measures (PHSMs)^{18,29}; further, forward and backward incubation period found to have
359 different temporal patterns¹¹. Therefore, the distribution of generation time based on the estimates
360 of incubation periods and serial interval can vary over time. We considered the estimations under
361 a 7-day moving window to ensure the sufficient sample size and to capture the temporal changes
362 of these epidemiological parameters.

363

364 We first assessed different sampling approaches and identified the respective biases in these
365 interval estimates. The backward sampling in estimating SI (i.e., referenced by infectee onset)
366 would underestimate SI during the growth phase of the epidemic, because the transmission pairs
367 with longer SI might be missed out as the corresponding infectees had not shown their illness onset
368 yet. On the contrary, forward sampling in estimating SI (i.e., referenced by infector onset) would
369 provide relatively reliable estimates, because the follow-up ended until every infectee onset was
370 observed in that cohort of infectors. But the pairs with infector onset before the start of follow-up
371 would be excluded by forward sampling scheme, which could lead to larger variance in the
372 estimates accounting for very few observed pairs, especially during the growth phase. Therefore,
373 the underlying problems brought by forward and backward sampling are in line with problems
374 brought by left and right censoring (Figs. 5a – 5b). These issues also apply when estimating IP,
375 where forward and backward sampling of IP is referenced by exposure time and onset time
376 respectively. When a complete epidemic curve is observed, the retrospective backward and
377 forward sampling of SI eventually result in same estimates as all cases are sampled. But at temporal
378 scale (i.e., estimation with reference to a certain time period) the forward temporal SI would keep
379 decreasing, whereas the backward temporal SI would keep increasing. Such change was attributed
380 to the backward sampling bias in IP¹¹, which suggested that the temporal SI may not be a good
381 proxy of temporal GT.

382

383 In theory, GT should be referenced by infection times, which are rarely observed in practice.
384 Consequently, we considered decomposing GT by respective forward and backward SIs as
385 presented in Park et al¹¹, and proposed the inferential frameworks for the estimates of forward and
386 backward GTs based on the observations of these SIs and estimates of infector-infectee specific

387 IPs as shown in Figs. 5c – 5d. For a given transmission pair i , the forward GT (G_i) can be
388 decomposed as the forward SI (S_i) minus forward IP of infectee (Y_i) plus backward IP of infector
389 (Z_i), i.e. $G_i = S_i - Y_i + Z_i$. We assumed the IP of infectee is independent of the IP and GT of
390 infector given the infection time of infectee, and the symptom onset time of infector is independent
391 of infectiousness, thus the IP of infector is also independent of GT. Therefore, by assuming S, Y
392 and Z are independently distributed, the probability density function of the GT for transmission
393 pair i can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} 394 \quad f_G(G_i) &= f_G(S_i - Y_i + Z_i) \\ 395 \quad &= \int_{L_{Y_i}}^{U_{Y_i}} f_G(S_i - y + Z_i|y) f_Y(y) dy \\ 396 \quad &= \int_{L_{Y_i}}^{U_{Y_i}} \left(\int_{L_{Z_i}}^{U_{Z_i}} f_G(S_i - y + z|y, z) f_Z(z) dz \right) f_Y(y) dy \\ 397 \quad &= \int_{L_{Y_i}}^{U_{Y_i}} \int_{L_{Z_i}}^{U_{Z_i}} \{f_G(S_i - y + z|y, z)\} f_Z(z) f_Y(y) dy dz \quad (1) \end{aligned}$$

398 Where U_{Y_i} and L_{Y_i} are the upper and lower bounds of IP for infectee, U_{Z_i} and L_{Z_i} are the upper
399 and lower bounds of IP for infector, $f_Z(z)$ and $f_Y(y)$ are the probability density functions of
400 infector's backward IP distribution and infectee's forward IP distribution respectively. Using
401 Monte Carlo method, we can approximate this probability density function as

$$402 \quad f_G(G_i) \approx \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M f_G(S_i - y_{im} + z_{im}) \quad (2)$$

403 Where M is the number of Monte Carlo samples, z_{im} and y_{im} are the m -th Monte Carlo samples
404 from $f_Z(z)$ and $f_Y(y)$ for the i -th transmission pair respectively. Thus, given N transmission pairs,
405 the likelihood function is given as

$$406 \quad L(\theta|S) = \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M f_G(S_i - y_{im} + z_{im}|\theta) \quad (3)$$

407 Where θ is the parameter set of the GT and IP distributions. As the exact infection time is
408 unobservable, we could infer the IPs from the exposure windows of the cases by fitting
409 distributions on interval censored data, which could be used to generate Monte Carlo samples of
410 IP and further evaluate the likelihood (Supplementary Methods section 1.3). On the other hand,
411 when the dependence between IP and GT of infector was considered, we assumed the backward
412 IP and forward GT of infector followed a bivariate normal distribution with a correlation
413 coefficient $\tilde{\rho}$ under logarithm scale. Similar approach considering the correlation between IP and
414 GT was also used by Park et al³⁰. The likelihood could be evaluated similarly by using the
415 conditional distribution of forward GT given the Monte Carlo samples of backward IP of infector
416 (Supplementary Methods section 1.6).

417 The 95% confidence interval (CI) was constructed by the percentile bootstrap method with 1000
418 bootstrapped samples. Statistical analyses were conducted using R version 4.0.4 (R Foundation
419 for Statistical Computing). Visualization of estimations in inconsecutive time windows was
420 implemented by R *ggbreak* package³¹.

421

422 **Sensitivity analysis on underlying distribution fitting**

423 We first fitted three different distributions (Gamma, Log-Normal, Weibull) to infector's and
424 infectee's incubation periods, and thus generated samples for GT which were further fitted by these
425 three different distributions again. The results from the fitted distribution on GT samples with the
426 lowest total Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) values over the moving windows were presented.
427 We also evaluated the bias in GT estimates when the infectors and infectees were assumed to share
428 the same IP distribution, where the sampling bias in infector and infectee's IP were not adjusted
429 for. We compared these estimates with main results that accounted for such sampling bias, and
430 estimated the corresponding degree of overestimation/underestimation in each time windows.

431

432 **Estimating the basic and effective reproduction number**

433 We referred to the previous estimate of epidemic growth rate, reported by Tsang et al²¹ as 0.10
434 (95% CI: 0.08, 0.12) for mainland China excluding Hubei province before Jan 23, 2020, and
435 estimated the basic reproduction number (R_0) using the forward GT estimates in the first time-
436 window in the study period, where such forward GT distribution was an approximation of intrinsic
437 GT distribution¹⁶, hence the calculated R_0 has a better reflection of the infection spread at the early
438 phase of the epidemic. We estimated R_0 using the Lotka-Euler equation²:

$$439 \quad \frac{1}{R_0} = \int_0^{\infty} e^{-ra} f_G(a) da \quad (4)$$

440 Where r is the growth rate, $f_G(a)$ is the generation time distribution. We simulated 1000 Monte
441 Carlo samples of r and used our 1000 bootstrapped GT estimates to calculate R_0 . We use the term

442 basic reproduction number to stress that over this period there were no population-wide
443 interventions in place, and that all individuals were susceptible to infection.

444

445 Using the time-varying estimates of GT, we estimated the effective reproduction number R_t , which
446 shows the average number of secondary cases caused by one primary case at time t , accounting
447 the population when some individuals may no longer be susceptible³². We used Wallinga & Teunis
448 method³³, a cohort based approach to estimate R_t via *EpiEstim* package in R (version 2.2-3)³⁴. To
449 compare the difference when using SI as a proxy of GT in evaluating transmissibility, we
450 calculated R_t based on onset epi-curve and the time-varying estimates of GT and SI distributions
451 respectively (Supplementary Methods section 1.4).

452

453 **Model validation by simulation studies**

454 We have conducted several simulation studies to validate our proposed method. We first built an
455 individual-based stochastic susceptible-infected-recovered (SIR) model with population size of
456 1000, 10 initial infected people, R_0 equals to 2.5¹¹. Given a Gamma-distributed intrinsic IP with a
457 mean of 6.50 days and standard deviation (SD) of 3.50 days, we assessed the model performance
458 under different distributions of intrinsic GT, where the intrinsic distribution indicates the original
459 distribution at the initial phase of the epidemic¹⁶. During the progress of the epidemic, the
460 distribution of realized GT may change due to high hazard rate of infection, particularly during the
461 peak activity^{15,35}. We assessed how our proposed framework could recapture the changes in mean
462 and variance of the temporal realized GT during the epidemic progress. We tested three intrinsic

463 GT settings of short (mean of 4 days, SD of 2 days), medium (mean of 7 days, SD of 4 days), and
464 long (mean of 10 days, SD of 6 days) GT.

465

466 Besides, we also assessed how the width of exposure windows would influence the estimation
467 accuracy. We assumed the width of exposure windows was uniformly distributed, and tested the
468 recovery performance of parameters when the mean width of exposure windows was shorter than,
469 equal to, and longer than the expected intrinsic GT (Supplementary Methods section 1.5).
470 Furthermore, we assessed the recovery performance when 1/3 of infector and infectees did not
471 have exposure information available (i.e. both earliest and latest exposure time were unknown)
472 and further allowing no more than 1/3 of them partly missed exposure information (i.e. earliest
473 exposure time unknown), as observed in our data, therefore in each simulation around 1/3 to 2/3
474 infector and infectees had complete exposure information in the medium GT setting.

475

476 On the other hand, we adopted the similar setting for the simulation studies for assessing the model
477 performance which considered correlation between infector's backward IP and forward GT.
478 Focusing on the medium GT setting, we used the Log-Normal-distributed intrinsic IP with a mean
479 of 6.50 days and standard deviation (SD) of 3.50 days, and Log-Normal-distributed intrinsic GT
480 with a mean of 7 days and SD of 4 days during simulation, where they were correlated with a
481 correlation coefficient ρ under the logarithm scale (Supplementary Note section 2.2). We tested
482 the model performance under different $\rho \in \{0, 0.25, 0.50, 0.75\}$ and mean width of exposure
483 windows of 1, 4, 7 days.

484

485 **Data availability**

486 All the data used in the analysis will be available at Github (on acceptance):

487 <https://github.com/DxChen0126/>

488

489 **Code availability**

490 Statistical analyses were conducted using R version 4.0.5 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing,
491 Vienna, Austria). Code will be available at Github (on acceptance):

492 <https://github.com/DxChen0126/>

493

494 **Acknowledgements**

495 The authors thank Julie Au for technical assistance. This project was supported by the Health and
496 Medical Research Fund (project no. 20190712); a commissioned grant from the Health and
497 Medical Research Fund from the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region;
498 The Collaborative Research Scheme (Project No. C7123-20G) of the Research Grants Council of
499 the Hong Kong SAR Government; and AIR@InnoHK administered by Innovation and
500 Technology Commission. The funding bodies had no role in study design, data collection and
501 analysis, preparation of the manuscript, or the decision to publish.

502

503 **Author contributions**

504

505 All authors meet the ICMJE criteria for authorship. B.J.C., S.T.A. and D.C. conceived the study.

506 D.C. and X.K.X. prepared the data. D.C., Y.C L. and S.T.A. developed the model. D.C. and Y.C

507 L. conducted the data analyses. S.T.A., X.K.X., T.K.T., Z.D., L.W., P.W., E.H.Y.L., J.W. and

508 B.J.C. interpreted the results. D.C., Y.C L. and S.T.A. wrote the first draft of the paper. B.J.C. and

509 S.T.A. supervised the study. B.J.C. and S.T.A. acquired funding for the study. All authors provided

510 critical review and revision of the text and approved the final version.

511

512 **Competing interests**

513 B.J.C. consults for AstraZeneca, Fosun Pharma, GSK, Moderna, Pfizer, Roche, and Sanofi Pasteur.


514 The remaining authors declare no competing interests.

515

516 References

- 517 1. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) dashboard. <https://covid19.who.int/>. [Last access: 15 July
518 2022]
- 519 2. Wallinga, J. & Lipsitch, M. How generation intervals shape the relationship between growth
520 rates and reproductive numbers. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **274**, 599–604 (2007).
- 521 3. Torneri, A. *et al.* On realized serial and generation intervals given control measures: The
522 COVID-19 pandemic case. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **17**, e1008892 (2021).
- 523 4. Svensson, A. A note on generation times in epidemic models. *Math. Biosci.* **208**, 300–311
524 (2007).
- 525 5. Li, Q. *et al.* Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel Coronavirus-infected
526 pneumonia. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **382**, 1199–1207 (2020).
- 527 6. Du, Z. *et al.* Serial interval of COVID-19 among publicly reported confirmed cases. *Emerg.*
528 *Infect. Dis.* **26**, 1341–1343 (2020).
- 529 7. Ren, X. *et al.* Evidence for pre-symptomatic transmission of coronavirus disease 2019
530 (COVID-19) in China. *Influenza Other Respi. Viruses* **15**, 19–26 (2021).
- 531 8. Tindale, L. C. *et al.* Evidence for transmission of COVID-19 prior to symptom onset. *Elife* **9**,
532 (2020).
- 533 9. Lehtinen, S., Ashcroft, P. & Bonhoeffer, S. On the relationship between serial interval,
534 infectiousness profile and generation time. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **18**, 20200756 (2021).
- 535 10. Britton, T. & Scalia Tomba, G. Estimation in emerging epidemics: biases and remedies. *J. R.*
536 *Soc. Interface* **16**, 20180670 (2019).
- 537 11. Park, S. W. *et al.* Forward-looking serial intervals correctly link epidemic growth to
538 reproduction numbers. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **118**, e2011548118 (2021).
- 539 12. Ganyani, T. *et al.* Estimating the generation interval for coronavirus disease (COVID-19)
540 based on symptom onset data, March 2020. *Euro Surveill.* **25**, (2020).
- 541 13. Lau, Y. C. *et al.* Joint estimation of generation time and incubation period for Coronavirus
542 disease (covid-19). *J. Infect. Dis.* (2021) doi:10.1093/infdis/jiab424.
- 543 14. Li, M., Liu, K., Song, Y., Wang, M. & Wu, J. Serial interval and generation interval for
544 imported and local infectors, respectively, estimated using reported contact-tracing data of
545 COVID-19 in China. *Front. Public Health* **8**, 577431 (2020).
- 546 15. Nishiura, H. Time variations in the generation time of an infectious disease: implications for
547 sampling to appropriately quantify transmission potential. *Math. Biosci. Eng.* **7**, 851–869
548 (2010).
- 549 16. Champredon, D. & Dushoff, J. Intrinsic and realized generation intervals in infectious-disease
550 transmission. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **282**, 20152026 (2015).
- 551 17. Li, Z. *et al.* Antibody seroprevalence in the epicenter Wuhan, Hubei, and six selected
552 provinces after containment of the first epidemic wave of COVID-19 in China. *Lancet Reg*
553 *Health West Pac* **8**, 100094 (2021).
- 554 18. Ali, S. T. *et al.* Serial interval of SARS-CoV-2 was shortened over time by nonpharmaceutical
555 interventions. *Science* **369**, 1106–1109 (2020).
- 556 19. Lai, S. *et al.* Effect of non-pharmaceutical interventions to contain COVID-19 in China.
557 *Nature* **585**, 410–413 (2020).
- 558 20. Sender, R. *et al.* The unmitigated profile of COVID-19 infectiousness. *Elife* **11**, (2022).

- 559 21. Tsang, T. K. *et al.* Effect of changing case definitions for COVID-19 on the epidemic curve
560 and transmission parameters in mainland China: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health* **5**,
561 e289–e296 (2020).
- 562 22. Van Damme, W., Dahake, R., van de Pas, R., Vanham, G. & Assefa, Y. COVID-19: Does the
563 infectious inoculum dose-response relationship contribute to understanding heterogeneity in
564 disease severity and transmission dynamics? *Med. Hypotheses* **146**, 110431 (2021).
- 565 23. Trunfio, M. *et al.* On the SARS-CoV-2 “variola hypothesis”: No association between viral
566 load of index cases and COVID-19 severity of secondary cases. *Front. Microbiol.* **12**, 646679
567 (2021).
- 568 24. Ward, T. & Johnsen, A. Understanding an evolving pandemic: An analysis of the clinical time
569 delay distributions of COVID-19 in the United Kingdom. *PLoS One* **16**, e0257978 (2021).
- 570 25. Virlogeux, V., Park, M., Wu, J. T. & Cowling, B. J. Association between severity of MERS-
571 CoV infection and incubation period. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **22**, 526–528 (2016).
- 572 26. Virlogeux, V. *et al.* Brief report: Incubation Period Duration and Severity of Clinical Disease
573 Following Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus Infection . *Epidemiology* **26**,
574 666–669 (2015).
- 575 27. Xu, X.-K. *et al.* Reconstruction of transmission pairs for novel Coronavirus disease 2019
576 (COVID-19) in mainland China: Estimation of superspreading events, serial interval, and
577 hazard of infection. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **71**, 3163–3167 (2020).
- 578 28. Liu, X. F., Xu, X.-K. & Wu, Y. Mobility, exposure, and epidemiological timelines of COVID-
579 19 infections in China outside Hubei province. *Sci. Data* **8**, 54 (2021).
- 580 29. Ali, S. T. *et al.* Serial intervals and case isolation delays for Coronavirus disease 2019: A
581 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **74**, 685–694 (2022).
- 582 30. Park, S. W. *et al.* Inferring the differences in incubation-period and generation-interval
583 distributions of the Delta and Omicron variants of SARS-CoV-2. *bioRxiv* (2022)
584 doi:10.1101/2022.07.02.22277186.
- 585 31. Xu, S. *et al.* Use ggbreak to effectively utilize plotting space to deal with large datasets and
586 outliers. *Front. Genet.* **12**, 774846 (2021).
- 587 32. Gostic, K. M. *et al.* Practical considerations for measuring the effective reproductive number,
588 Rt. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **16**, e1008409 (2020).
- 589 33. Wallinga, J. & Teunis, P. Different epidemic curves for severe acute respiratory syndrome
590 reveal similar impacts of control measures. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **160**, 509–516 (2004).
- 591 34. Cori, A., Ferguson, N. M., Fraser, C. & Cauchemez, S. A new framework and software to
592 estimate time-varying reproduction numbers during epidemics. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **178**, 1505–
593 1512 (2013).
- 594 35. Kenah, E., Lipsitch, M. & Robins, J. M. Generation interval contraction and epidemic data
595 analysis. *Math. Biosci.* **213**, 71–79 (2008).
- 596




597

598 **Fig. 1 Infector-infectee specific symptom onset epi-curves from January 1 to February 29,**

599 **2020 in Mainland China. a,** Epidemic curve based on symptom onset timing for the daily number

600 **of infectors. b,** Epidemic curve based on symptom onset timing for the daily number of infectees.

601



602

603 **Fig. 2 Temporal estimates of forward serial intervals (SIs) (a), forward incubation periods**

604 **(IPs) of infectees, and backward IPs of infectors (b).** **a,** Empirical mean and inter-quartile range

605 (IQR) of forward SI in each moving window. The black dots and segments represent the empirical

606 mean and IQR respectively. The red arrow indicates the timing of public health social measures


607 (PHSMs) implemented since January 23, 2020. **b,** The estimated mean IP stratified by infector and

608 infectee in each moving window. The dots and segments indicate the mean estimates and the

609 corresponding 95% confidence intervals. The estimates for the forward IP of infectees and

610 backward IP of infectors are presented in red and teal respectively.


611



612

613 **Fig. 3 Temporal estimates of forward generation time (GT) distributions.** **a**, The time-varying
614 estimates of mean GT presented by the black dots with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) in vertical
615 line-segments for each time window. **b**, The temporal estimates of standard deviation of GT
616 presented by the black dots with 95% CIs in vertical line-segments for each time window. Red
617 arrow indicates the implementation of public health social measures (PHSMs) since January 23,
618 2020.

619



620

621 **Fig. 4 Epi-curve of observed onset times (a), and effective reproduction numbers estimated**

622 **by temporal generation time (GT) and serial interval (SI) respectively (b). a, Epidemic curve**

623 **of all cases symptom onset. b, Case-based effective reproduction numbers estimated based on epi-**


624 **curve and temporal generation times (GT) with reference to infector onset, versus estimates based**

625 **on epidemic curve and temporal serial intervals (SI) with reference to infector onset, shown as**

626 **lines colored in red and teal respectively. Shaded areas correspond to 95% credible intervals of the**

627 **estimates.**

628



629

630 **Fig. 5 Censoring issues in sampling serial interval (SI) (a – b) and corresponding inferential**
 631 **frameworks for generation time (GT) (c – d).** **a**, Forward sampling with reference point as the
 632 start of the event leads to left censoring issue. **b**, Backward sampling with reference point as the
 633 end of the event leads to right censoring issue. The biases are due to failure in observing the sample
 634 under these forward and backward schemes (as presented in the salmon colour shades). **c**,
 635 Inferential framework presented for forward GT. **d**, Inferential framework presented for backward
 636 GT. The inferential frameworks of GT have considered the inter-relationship among SIs and
 637 infector-infectee specific incubation periods (IPs).

638