

1 **Angular reproduction numbers improve estimates of transmissibility** 2 **when disease generation times are misspecified or time-varying**

3 Kris V Parag^{1,*}, Benjamin J Cowling² and Ben C Lambert³

4 ¹MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Imperial College London, London, UK.

5 ²WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Control, School of Public Health,
6 The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

7 ³Department of Mathematics, College of Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, University
8 of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

9 *For correspondence: k.parag@imperial.ac.uk.

10 **Abstract**

11 We introduce the *angular reproduction number* Ω , which measures time-varying changes in
12 epidemic transmissibility resulting from variations in both the effective reproduction number R ,
13 and generation time distribution w . Predominant approaches for tracking pathogen spread
14 either infer R or the epidemic growth rate r . However, R is biased by mismatches between the
15 assumed and true w , while r is difficult to interpret in terms of the individual-level branching
16 process underpinning transmission. R and r may also disagree on the relative transmissibility
17 of epidemics or variants (i.e., $r_A > r_B$ does not imply $R_A > R_B$ for variants A and B). We find that
18 Ω responds meaningfully to mismatches and time-variations in w while mostly maintaining the
19 interpretability of R . We prove that $\Omega > 1$ implies $R > 1$ and that Ω agrees with r on the relative
20 transmissibility of pathogens. Estimating Ω is no more difficult than inferring R , uses existing
21 software, and requires no generation time measurements. These advantages come at the
22 expense of selecting one free parameter. We propose Ω as complementary statistic to R and
23 r that improves transmissibility estimates when w is misspecified or time-varying and better
24 reflects the impact of interventions, when those interventions concurrently change R and w or
25 alter the relative risk of co-circulating pathogens.

26 **Keywords:** infectious diseases; epidemic models; reproduction numbers; generation times;
27 growth rates; transmission dynamics.


28 **Introduction**

29 Estimating the rate of spread or transmissibility of an infectious disease is a fundamental and
30 ongoing challenge in epidemiology [1]. Identifying salient changes in pathogen transmissibility
31 can contribute important information to policymaking, providing useful warnings of resurgent
32 epidemics, assessments of the efficacy of interventions and signals about the emergence of

33 new variants of concern [1–3]. The effective or instantaneous reproduction number, R , and
NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

34 time-varying growth rate, r , are commonly used to characterise pathogen transmissibility. The
 35 former statistic is an estimate of the average number of new infections per active (circulating)
 36 past infection, while the latter describes the exponential rate of new infection accumulation [4].

37 Although R and r are important and popular means of tracking the dynamics of epidemics,
 38 they suffer from key limitations that diminish their fidelity and interpretability. Specifically, the
 39 meaningfulness of R depends on our ability to measure the generation time distribution of the
 40 infection under study, w . This distribution captures the inter-event times among primary and
 41 secondary infections [5] and is convolved with the past infections to define Λ , the time-varying
 42 total infectiousness of the disease. The total infectiousness serves as the denominator when
 43 inferring R , which is the ratio of new infections to Λ . We illustrate all key notation in **Figure 1**.
 44 However, infection times and hence w are difficult to measure, requiring detailed transmission
 45 chain data from contact tracing or transmission studies [6]. Even if these data are available,
 46 the estimated w (and hence Λ) depends on how inter-event times are sampled or interpreted
 47 (e.g., there are forward, backward, intrinsic and realised generation intervals) [7,8].



49 **Figure 1: Definitions of transmissibility metrics.** Panel A plots generation time distributions
50 that define how past infections cause later ones via the probabilities or weights w with support
51 m . This involves convolving these weights with past infection incidence I . We show in panel B
52 that if we represent w and I as vectors then the convolution is equivalent to a projection of w
53 onto the vector of I . Panels C-D illustrate that standard reproduction numbers R implicitly apply
54 this projection to compute the denominator Λ . This projection and hence Λ is sensitive to the
55 w , meaning that if the distribution switches between the two from panel A, our estimates of R
56 become biased (often changes in generation time are difficult to measure). Our new metric Ω
57 maximises the projection from panel B to reduce sensitivity (practically this involves a window
58 based on m) leading to a new denominator M in panel C. This maintains the branching process
59 interpretation of the epidemic in panel D, while improving transmissibility estimate robustness.

60 Workarounds, such as approximating w by the serial interval distribution [9], which describes
61 inter-event times between the onset of symptoms, or inferring w from this distribution [10], do
62 exist but suffer from related problems [6]. Consequently, w and Λ can often be misspecified,
63 biasing R and likely misrepresenting the true branching process dynamics of epidemics. While
64 r is more robust to w misspecification (it only depends on the log gradient of the smoothed
65 infection time series) [4], it lacks the individual-level informativeness and interpretation of R .
66 Given estimates of r , it is unclear how to derive the proportion of new infections that need to
67 be suppressed (roughly R^{-1}), herd immunity thresholds (related to $1-R^{-1}$) or the probability of
68 epidemic elimination and establishment (both linked to R^{-N} for N infections) [11–13]. The only
69 known means of attaining such information converts r into R using estimates of w [14].

70 Difficulties in accurately inferring generation times therefore cause practical bottlenecks that
71 constrain our ability to measure pathogen transmissibility. These problems are worsened as
72 recent studies have empirically found that generation times also vary substantially with time
73 (i.e., w is non-stationary) [15]. These variations may correspond to different epidemic phases
74 [16], emerging variants of concern [17] and coincide with the implementation of interventions
75 [18]. These are precisely the situations in which we also want to infer R . However, concurrent
76 changes in R and w are rarely identifiable, and r inextricably groups the effects of w and R on
77 transmissibility. While high quality, longitudinal contact tracing data [19] can potentially resolve
78 these identifiability issues, this is an expensive and logistically hard solution. Here we propose
79 another means of alleviating the above problems and complementing the insights provided by
80 R and r – the *angular reproduction number*, Ω .

81 The angular reproduction number defines transmissibility as a ratio of new infections to M , the
82 root mean square number of past infections over a user-defined window δ . Because it replaces

83 Λ with M , a quantity that does not require knowledge of generation times, Ω is more robust to
84 the problems of inferring w . We demonstrate that Ω is able to measure the overall changes in
85 transmissibility caused by fluctuations in both R and w . Moreover, we prove that Ω has similar
86 threshold properties to R , maintains much of its individual-level interpretation and is a useful
87 metric for communicating transmissibility. This last point follows as we only need to quote Ω
88 and the known window δ to generalise our estimates of transmissibility to different settings. In
89 contrast, the meaningfulness of R is contingent on the unknown or uncertain w . Downstream
90 studies sometimes use R outside of its generation time context [20], while dashboards aiming
91 at situational awareness commonly quote R without w , introducing biases and interpretability
92 problems into how disease spread is communicated [21].

93 Additionally, we demonstrate how r and R can easily disagree on relative transmissibility, both
94 across time and for co-circulating variants. Unmeasured changes in w over time can cause R
95 and r to vary in opposite directions (one signals an increase in transmissibility and the other a
96 decrease). Similarly, co-circulating pathogens with different but stationary and known w , may
97 possess contradictory R and r value rankings i.e., for variants A and B, $r_A > r_B$ does not imply
98 $R_A > R_B$. These issues are amplified when interventions (which can change w , R or both [18])
99 occur, obscuring notions of the relative risk of spread. However, we find $r_A > r_B$ guarantees Ω_A
100 $> \Omega_B$ and that Ω is consistent with r across time even when w changes.

101 Last, while we may also convert r into threshold statistics about 1 by using a free parameter
102 together with a transformation from [14], we show that Ω is more robust to choices of its free
103 parameter than those statistics, which implicitly make stronger assumptions (**Supplementary**
104 **Information**). These robustness and consistency properties of Ω reinforce its usefulness for
105 tracking and comparing outbreak spread and emerge from its maximum entropy approach to
106 managing uncertain generation time distributions. We propose Ω as a complementary statistic
107 that can be integrated with R and r to present a more comprehensive perspective on epidemic
108 transmissibility, especially when w is poorly specified or varying with time.

109 **Results**

110 ***Angular reproduction numbers***

111 The epidemic *renewal model* [22] provides a general and flexible representation of disease
112 transmission. It defines how the incidence of new infections at time t , denoted I_t , depends on
113 the effective or *instantaneous reproduction number*, R_t , and the past incident time series of
114 infections, $I_1^{t-1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_{t-1}\}$. This results in the conditional moment relationship in **Eq. (1)**
115 [9]. Generally, we use X_a^b to denote the time series $\{X_a, X_{a+1}, \dots, X_{b-1}, X_b\}$ and $\mathbf{E}[X|Y]$ for the

116 expectation of X over possible epidemic trajectories given known variables Y . Where obvious,
117 and for convenience, we sometimes drop Y in $\mathbf{E}[X|Y]$, writing $\mathbf{E}[X]$.

118
$$\mathbf{E}[I_t | I_1^{t-1}, w_1^m] = R_t \Lambda_t, \quad \Lambda_t = \sum_{u=1}^m w_u I_{t-u}. \quad (1)$$

119 In this model Λ_t is known as the *total infectiousness* and summarises the weighted influence
120 of past infections. The set of weights w_u for all u defines the *generation time distribution* of the
121 infectious disease with $\sum_{u=1}^m w_u = 1$, and m as the support of this distribution, which we
122 assume to be practically finite [14]. When the time series is shorter than m we truncate and
123 renormalise the w_u . Commonly, the stochasticity around the expectation $R_t \Lambda_t$ is modelled
124 using either Poisson or negative binomial count distributions [1, 12].

125 Although **Eq. (1)** has successfully been applied to model many diseases including COVID-19,
126 Ebola virus disease, pandemic influenza and measles, among others, it has one major flaw –
127 it assumes that the generation time distribution is fixed or stationary and known [9]. If this
128 assumption holds (we ignore surveillance biases [9, 23] until the Discussion), **Eq. (1)** allows
129 epidemic transmissibility to be summarised by fluctuations of the time-varying R_t parameters.
130 This follows because the sign of $R_t - 1$ determines if I_t will increase or decline relative to the
131 total infectiousness Λ_t . This reproduction number can be linked to the *instantaneous epidemic*
132 *growth rate*, r_t , using the moment generating function of the generation time distribution [14].

133 Consequently, from R_t , we obtain temporal information about the rate of pathogen spread and
134 its mechanism i.e., we learn how many new infections we can expect per circulating infection
135 because $R_t = \mathbf{E}[I_t] \Lambda_t^{-1}$. As R_t is a threshold parameter, we know that we must block at least
136 a fraction $1 - R_t^{-1}$ of new infections to suppress epidemic growth ($R_t = 1$ signifies that $r_t =$
137 0). The time scale over which this suppression is achievable [14] and our ability to detect these
138 changes in R_t [24] in the first place, however, are determined by the generation times.

139 Recent works emphasise that the assumption of a known or fixed generation time distribution
140 is often untenable, with appreciable fluctuations caused by interventions [15, 18] and emerging
141 pathogenic variants [17] or occurring as the epidemic progresses through various stages of
142 its lifetime [5]. Substantial biases in R_t can result (because its denominator Λ_t is incorrectly
143 specified [4]), which even impede optimal Bayesian inference algorithms [25]. As R_t is the
144 predominant metric of transmissibility, contributing key evidence towards infectious disease
145 policymaking [1], this may potentially obscure situational awareness or misinform intervention

146 planning. While improved and intensive contact tracing can provide updated generation time
147 information, this is usually difficult and expensive. We propose a robust alternative.

148 We redefine Λ_t by recognising it as a dot product between the vectors of generation time
149 probabilities $\vec{w} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} w_1^m$ and the past incidence $\vec{I} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} I_{t-m}^{t-1}$ over the support of the generation time
150 distribution, m . This gives the left equality of **Eq. (2)** with the Euclidian norm of \vec{X} as $\|\vec{X}\| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\sum_{u=1}^m X_u^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$
151 and θ_t as the time-varying angle between \vec{w} and \vec{I} . This equality holds for non-
152 stationary generation times i.e., both \vec{w} and \vec{I} can have elements that change over time. We
153 illustrate this notation and elements of the subsequent derivation in **Figure 1**. **Eq. (2)** implies
154 that the count of new infections (for any R_t) is maximised when θ_t is minimised i.e., when the
155 temporal profile of past infections matches the shape of the generation time distribution.

$$156 \quad \Lambda_t = \|\vec{w}\| \|\vec{I}\| \cos \theta_t, \quad \mathbf{E}[I_t] = \left(\frac{\|\vec{w}\|}{\|\vec{w}_{\max}\|} R_t \cos \theta_t \right) M_t. \quad (2)$$

157 We can compute the root mean square of the incidence across the support of the generation
158 time distribution as $M_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \|\vec{I}\|$. Under the constraint that $\sum_{u=1}^m w_u = 1$ (if $t-1 < m$ we
159 truncate this distribution to sum to 1 – this is an edge effect of the epidemic) then the maximum
160 possible value of the generation time norm is $\|\vec{w}_{\max}\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$. This is achieved by the maximum
161 entropy generation time distribution of \vec{w} , which is uniform (has m entries of $\frac{1}{m}$).

162 Combining these definitions with **Eq. (1)**, we derive the second expression in **Eq. (2)** for the
163 expected number of new infections at time t . This may seem an unnecessarily complicated
164 manipulation of the standard renewal model, but it admits a novel and important insight – we
165 can separate the influences of the reproduction numbers and the generation time distribution
166 (together with its changes) on epidemic transmissibility. These multiply M_t , which defines a
167 new denominator – the root mean square number of past infections (this is also the average
168 signal power of the past infection time series) – that replaces the total infectiousness Λ_t .

169 Consequently, we define a new metric in **Eq. (3)**, the *angular reproduction number* Ω_t , which
170 multiplies R_t by the scaled projection of the generation time distribution, $\frac{\|\vec{w}\|}{\|\vec{w}_{\max}\|} \cos \theta_t$, onto \vec{I} ,
171 the past incidence vector (see **Figure 1**). This means that Ω_t is a time-varying ratio between
172 the expected infection incidence and the past root mean square incidence M_t . We use the

173 term reproduction number for Ω_t due to its relation to R_t , the similarity of **Eq. (2)** and **Eq. (3)**
 174 and because of its threshold properties, which we explore in the next section.

175
$$\Omega_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\|\vec{w}\|}{\|\vec{w}_{\max}\|} R_t \cos \theta_t \implies \Omega_t = \mathbf{E}[I_t] M_t^{-1}. \quad (3)$$

176 This metric captures all possible variations that impact the ability of the epidemic to transmit.
 177 It responds to both changes in R_t and the generation time distribution. The latter would scale
 178 $\|\vec{w}\|$ and rotate θ_t , which is why we term this angular. The benefit of compactly describing
 179 both types of transmissibility changes does come with a trade-off in interpretability as it may
 180 be harder to intuit the meaning behind $\mathbf{E}[I_t] = \Omega_t M_t$ than the more usual $\mathbf{E}[I_t] = R_t \Lambda_t$.

181 We argue that this is not the case practically because Λ_t is frequently misspecified [15,26],
 182 obscuring the meaning of R_t . In contrast, M_t does not depend on generation time assumptions
 183 (beyond characterising its support m). We remove structural uncertainty induced by the often
 184 unknown w_u because M_t is a maximum entropy version of Λ_t i.e., $M_t = \max_{\|\vec{w}\| \cos \theta_t} \Lambda_t =$
 185 $\|\vec{w}_{\max}\| \|\vec{I}\|$ subject to $\sum_{u=1}^m w_u = 1$. We also find that $M_t = \Lambda_t$ and hence $\Omega_t = R_t$, when
 186 the past incidence is flat (as then $\Lambda_t = M_t$ and w_u has no effect). This defines the important
 187 and universal equilibrium condition $\Omega_t = R_t = 1$. There is further convergence for branching
 188 process models [27] with timesteps at its fixed generation time, as then trivially $w_1 = 1$.

189 **Relationship to popular transmissibility metrics**

190 Having defined the angular reproduction number above, we explore its properties and show
 191 why it is an interesting and viable measure of transmissibility. We examine an exponentially
 192 growing epidemic with incidence $I_t = I_0 e^{rt}$ and constant growth rate r . This model matches
 193 the dynamics of fundamental *compartmental models* such as the SIR and SEIR (in the limit of
 194 an excess of susceptible individuals) and admits the known relation $gr = (R - 1)$ [28], with
 195 g as the mean generation time. We assume growth occurs over some period of δ and compute
 196 Ω_t as the ratio $\mathbf{E}[I_t] M_t^{-1}$ from **Eq. (3)**. Since this model is deterministic $\mathbf{E}[I_t] = I_t = I_0 e^{rt}$.

197 We evaluate M_t from its definition above as $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \|\vec{I}\|$ with $\delta = m$ and using the continuous-time
 198 expression for $\|\vec{I}\| = \left(\int_{t-\delta}^t I_s^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. This yields $M_t = \left(\delta^{-1} \int_{t-\delta}^t I_s^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with $I_s^2 = I_0^2 e^{2rs}$ from
 199 the exponential incidence equation and evaluates to $\sqrt{2\delta r I_0 (e^{2rt} - e^{2r(t-\delta)})}$. Substituting
 200 this into $\Omega_t = (I_0 e^{rt}) M_t^{-1}$ results in the left relation in **Eq. (4)**.

$$201 \quad \Omega_t^2 = \frac{2\delta r}{1 - e^{-2\delta r}} \geq 1, \quad \Omega_t^2 = \frac{2\delta g^{-1}(R-1)}{1 - e^{-2\delta g^{-1}(R-1)}}. \quad (4)$$

202 Several important points follow. First, as $x \geq 1 - e^{-x}$ for every $x \geq 0$, then $\Omega_t - 1$ and r are
 203 positive too (an analogous argument proves the negative case). Second, we substitute for r
 204 using the compartmental R - r relationship $gr = (R - 1)$ to get the right-side relation of **Eq. (4)**.
 205 Applying L' Hopital's rule we find $\lim_{R \rightarrow 1} \Omega_t = 1$. We hence confirm the threshold behaviour of Ω_t
 206 i.e., the sign of $\Omega_t - 1$ and $R_t - 1$ are always consistent (for all values of $\delta > 0$).

207 Third, we see that constant growth rates imply constant angular reproduction numbers. The
 208 converse is also true, and we may input time-varying growth rates, r_t , into **Eq. (4)** to estimate
 209 Ω_t . These properties hold for any δ , which is now a piecewise-constant time window. We plot
 210 the ramifications of **Eq. (4)** in **Figure 2**. Further, in **Table 1** we summarise how Ω_t relates to
 211 predominant R_t and r_t metrics. We explore some properties in this table in later sections (in
 212 addition to reinforcing our analyses with stochastic models) and demonstrate that relationships
 213 among r_t , R_t and Ω_t have important consequences when comparing outbreaks subject to
 214 interventions and variations in generation times.

Metric property	Growth r	Effective R	Angular Ω
Definition of transmissibility	$r_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{d \log \mathbf{E}[I_t]}{dt}$	$R_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\mathbf{E}[I_t]}{\Lambda_t}$	$\Omega_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\mathbf{E}[I_t]}{M_t}$
Pathogen spread threshold	$r_t > 0$	$R_t > 1$	$\Omega_t > 1$
Biased by generation time \vec{w} assumed, given curve I_1^t	Insensitive to the assumed \vec{w}	Biased when \vec{w} is misspecified	Signals changes in \vec{w} and R_t
Ranking risk of outbreaks or variants by spreading rate	$r_A > r_B \Rightarrow$ variant A spreads faster	$r_A > r_B \not\Rightarrow R_A > R_B$ (inconsistent)	$r_A > r_B \Rightarrow \Omega_A > \Omega_B$ (consistent)
Short-term predictive power	Negligible differences among metrics in prediction quality		
Non-dimensional metric	No, inverse time	Yes, both have no units, scalable	
Individual-level interpretability	Not obvious	New infections per circulating ones	

Computability if \vec{w} unknown	Yes (smooth I_1^t)	Not possible	Yes, for any δ
------------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------------------

215 **Table 1: Summary of transmissibility metrics.** We list important relationships among the
 216 instantaneous growth rate (r), the instantaneous or effective reproduction number (R) and the
 217 angular reproduction number (Ω) and assess their value as measures of transmissibility.


218 Note that we may also invert the relationship in **Eq. (4)** to estimate r_t from Ω_t (see Methods
 219 for details). This involves solving **Eq. (5)**, where $W_k(x)$ is the Lambert W function with index
 220 $k \in [0, -1]$ (this range results from the indicator $\mathbf{1}(y)$) [29].

$$221 \quad \frac{d \log I_t}{dt} = r_t = 2\delta^{-1} \left(\Omega_t^2 + W_{-1(\Omega < 1)}(-\Omega_t^2 e^{-\Omega_t^2}) \right). \quad (5)$$

222 A central implication of **Eq. (4)** and **Eq. (5)** is that we can infer angular reproduction numbers
 223 directly from growth rates or vice versa, without requiring knowledge of the generation times.

224 We further comment on connections between angular and effective reproduction numbers
 225 using a deterministic *branching process* model, which is also foundational in epidemiology.
 226 We again focus on growth, which is geometric as this is a discrete-time process with time
 227 steps scaled in multiples of the mean generation time g . Here incidence is $I_t = R^t$ and $\Omega_t =$
 228 $\mathbf{E}[I_t]M_t^{-1} = R^t \left(\delta^{-1} \sum_{s=t-\delta}^{t-1} R^{2s} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, with window δ in units of g . If $\delta = 1$ we recover $\Omega_t = R$.
 229 If $R = 1$, then $\Omega_t = R$ for all δ . For growing epidemics, as δ increases, $\Omega_t > R$ because we
 230 reference present incidence to smaller past infections (or denominators). The opposite occurs
 231 if the epidemic declines. This may seem undesirable, but we argue that Ω_t improves overall
 232 practical transmissibility measurement because g will likely be misspecified or vary with time.

233 Any g mismatches bias R , limiting its interpretation, meaningfulness and making comparisons
 234 among outbreaks or pathogenic variants difficult, because we cannot be certain that our
 235 denominators correspond. This is particularly problematic when estimates of R obtained from
 236 a modelling study are incorporated as parameters into downstream studies without accounting
 237 for the generation time context on which those estimates depend. However, by additionally
 238 communicating Ω and δ , we are sure that denominators match and that we properly include
 239 the influences of any g mismatches. Choosing δ is also no worse (and more explicit) than
 240 equivalent window assumptions made when inferring R and r [4,30] In the **Supplementary**
 241 **Information** we perform analyses of window choices for Ω and other threshold metrics.



242

243 **Figure 2: Relationships among transmissibility metrics.** Panel A and B show how growth
 244 rates (r) and reproduction numbers (R) have diverse functional relationships (see [14,30]) for
 245 SEIR models with an excess of susceptible individuals and branching processes. Coloured
 246 lines indicate R at different mean generation times (g). Black lines highlight a single functional
 247 relationship between angular reproduction numbers Ω and r at all g , using a window δ of 20d.
 248 Panel C shows that while Ω varies with choice of δ (increasing from blue to red and computed
 249 from **Eq. (4)**), we have a bijective relationship with r . Panel D indicates that R and r can signify
 250 inverted changes e.g., an NPI reducing R and g may increase r , raising questions about impact
 251 (see [15,18]). Here Ω converts r into a consistent transmissibility metric (also from **Eq. (4)**).

252 Last, we illustrate how Ω_t relates to other key indicators of epidemic dynamics such as herd
253 immunity and elimination probabilities. As our derivation replaces **Eq. (1)** with $\mathbf{E}[I_t | I_1^{t-1}, \delta] =$
254 $\Omega_t M_t$ for the same observed incidence, these indicators are also readily obtained. Assuming
255 Poisson noise, the elimination probability $\prod_{s=t}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}[I_t = 0 | I_1^{t-1}, R_1^{t-1}] = e^{-\sum_{s=t}^{\infty} \Lambda_t R_t}$ is replaced
256 by $e^{-\sum_{s=t}^{\infty} M_t \Omega_t}$, and has analogous properties [31]. Herd immunity, which traditionally occurs
257 when a fraction $1 - R^{-1}$ of the population is immune is approximated by $1 - \Omega^{-1}$ (since both
258 metrics possess the same threshold behaviour) [11]. In a subsequent section we demonstrate
259 that one-step-ahead incidence predictions from both approaches are also comparable.


260 ***Responding to variations in generation time distributions***

261 We demonstrate the practical benefits of Ω_t using simulated epidemics with non-stationary or
262 time-varying generation time distributions. Such changes lead to misspecification of Λ_t in **Eq.**
263 **(1)**, making estimates of the effective reproduction number R_t , denoted \hat{R}_t , a poor reflection
264 of the true underlying R_t . In contrast variations in the estimated $\hat{\Omega}_t$ are a feature (see **Eq. (3)**)
265 and not a bug (for some chosen δ we control M_t , which is not misspecified). We simulate
266 epidemics with Ebola virus or COVID-19 generation times from [32,33] using renewal models
267 with Poisson noise [9]. We estimate both the time-varying R_t and Ω_t using *EpiFilter* [25], which
268 applies Bayesian algorithms that minimise mean square estimation error.

269 Inferring Ω_t from incident infections, I_1^t , requires only that we replace the input Λ_t with M_t in
270 the estimation function and that we choose a window δ for computing M_t . We provide software
271 for general estimation of Ω_t and code for reproducing this and all other analyses in this paper
272 at <https://github.com/kpzoo/Omega>. We heuristically set $\delta \approx 2g_0$ as our window with g_0 as
273 the original mean generation time of each disease from [32,33]. We find (numerically) that this
274 δ ensures $\sum_{u=0}^{\delta} w_u \geq 0.86$ over many possible gamma distributed generation times i.e., it is
275 long enough to cover most of the likely probability mass of unknown changes to the generation
276 time distributions, which cause time-varying means g_t . In general, we find that an overly small
277 δ tends to neglect important dynamics, while too large a δ induces edge effects. The Methods
278 and **Supplementary Information** provide for more information on choosing δ .

279 Our results are plotted in **Figure 3**. We show that $\hat{\Omega}_t$ responds as expected to both changes
280 in the true R_t and w_1^m , subject to the limits on what can be inferred [24]. In **Figure 3** we achieve
281 changes in w_1^m by altering the mean generation time g_t by ratios that are similar in size to
282 those reported from empirical data [15]. In contrast, we observe that \hat{R}_t provides incorrect and

283 overconfident transmissibility estimates, which emerge because its temporal fluctuations also
 284 have to encode structural differences due to the misspecification of w_1^m . These can strongly
 285 mislead our interpretation and understanding of the risk posed by a pathogen.



286

287 **Figure 3: Estimating transmissibility under temporal variations in generation times.** We
 288 simulate epidemic incidence curves (black) using generation time distributions of Ebola virus
 289 disease (EVD) [32] and COVID-19 [33] in panels A and B. The means of these distributions
 290 (g) vary over time (grey piecewise, starting from original mean g_0), but we fix their variance at
 291 their original values. We find substantial bias in R estimated from the initial EVD and COVID-
 292 19 generation times (red with 95% credible intervals, true value in black). These estimates try
 293 to compensate for generation time mismatches and changes in an uncontrolled manner that
 294 obscures interpretation. However, Ω responds as we expect (blue with 95% credible intervals,
 295 window δ , true value in black) and we infer change-points due to both R and g fluctuations
 296 (subject to bounds induced by noise i.e., at low incidence inference is more difficult [24]). Our
 297 estimates derive from EpiFilter [25] with default settings and we truncate time series to start

298 from δ to remove any edge effects. Vertical dashed lines highlight times at which we change
299 g or keep it fixed. When it is fixed, Ω infers no spurious changes.

300 We can derive alternative threshold statistics that relate to r_t and do not explicitly depend on
301 the generation time by applying monotonic transformations from [14]. In theory these should
302 have comparable behaviour around the critical point of 1 to both R_t and Ω_t . We investigate
303 these statistics in the **Supplementary Information**, computing them across the simulations
304 of **Figure 3**. We find that they require stronger assumptions than Ω_t (i.e., they fix distributional
305 formulae for generation times), possess at least as many free parameters as Ω_t and are less
306 robust to changes in those parameters (often strongly over-estimating transmissibility), than
307 Ω_t is to fluctuations in δ . This confirms that angular reproduction numbers can complement
308 standard metrics, improving transmissibility estimates when generation times are changing,
309 or unknown and forming part of a more comprehensive suite of outbreak diagnostics.


310 ***Ranking epidemics or variants by transmissibility***

311 Misspecification of generation time distributions, and corresponding misestimation of R as in
312 **Figure 3**, also plays a crucial role when assessing the relative transmissibility of pathogens,
313 variants of concern or even outbreaks (where we may want to contrast the spread of contagion
314 among key demographic or spatial groups). As shown in **Figure 2**, these variations can mean
315 that increases in the growth rate r_t actually signify decreases in the effective reproduction
316 number R_t or that a pathogen with a larger r_t can have a smaller R_t . Here we illustrate that
317 these issues can persist even if the generation time distributions of pathogens are correctly
318 specified and remain static, obscuring our understanding of relative transmission risk.

319
320 In **Figure 4** we simulate epidemics under two hypothetical variants of two pathogens. We use
321 EVD and COVID-19 generation time distributions from [32,33] to define our respective base
322 variants. For both pathogens we specify the other variant by reducing the mean generation of
323 each base but fixing the variance of the generation times. Reductions of this type are plausible
324 and have been measured for COVID-19 variants [17]. All w_1^m distributions are stationary and
325 known in this analysis. We discover that changes in R_t alone can initiate inversions in the
326 relative growth rate of different variants or epidemics. As far as we can tell, this phenomenon
327 has not been explicitly investigated. Given that interventions can change R_t in isolation or in
328 combination with w_1^m [15,18], this effect has the potential to be widespread. We determine the
329 mathematical conditions for this inversion in the **Supplementary Information**.

330 Interestingly, the angular reproduction numbers of **Figure 4** do preserve an ordering that is
 331 consistent with growth rates, while maintaining the interpretability (e.g., threshold properties)
 332 of reproduction numbers. Hence, we argue that Ω_t blends advantages from both R_t and r_t [4]
 333 and serves as a useful outbreak analytic for understanding and conveying the relative risk of
 334 spread of differing pathogens or pathogen strains, or of spread among different spatial and
 335 demographic groups. Recent studies have only begun to disentangle component drivers of
 336 transmission, including the differing effects that interventions can introduce (e.g., by defining
 337 the strength and speed of control measures [34]) and the diverse properties of antigenic
 338 variants [17]. We believe that Ω can play a distinctive role in accelerating these investigations.

339



340
 341 **Figure 4: Comparing transmissibility across outbreaks, variants or even diseases.** We
 342 simulate epidemics of variant 1 in blue (g with estimates of metrics also in blue) under standard
 343 generation time distributions of Ebola virus disease (EVD) [32] and COVID-19 [33] in panels
 344 A and B. In red (with estimates also in red) we overlay simulations in which the generation
 345 time of these diseases is 40% and 50% shorter (than the blue epidemics), which may indicate
 346 a new co-circulating variant 2 or another epidemic with different properties (e.g., in a higher

347 risk group). We demonstrate (for the first time to our knowledge) that changes in R due to an
348 intervention (or release of one) may invert the relative growth rates (r) of the epidemics (see
349 **Supplementary Information** for mathematical intuition for this inversion). The mismatches in
350 the R - r rankings alter perceptions of relative risk, making transmissibility comparisons difficult.
351 However, Ω classifies the risk of these epidemics in line with their realised growth rates, while
352 still offering the individual-level interpretability of a reproduction number. True values are in
353 black and all estimates (with 95% credible intervals) are outputs from EpiFilter [25] with default
354 settings. We truncate the time series to start from δ to remove any edge effects.


355 ***Reproduction numbers for explanation or prediction?***

356 We highlight an important but underappreciated subtlety when inferring the transmissibility of
357 epidemics – that the value of accurately estimating R , r and Ω largely depends on if our aim
358 is to explain or predict [35] the dynamics of epidemics. The above analyses have focussed on
359 characterising transmissibility to explain mechanisms of spread and design interventions. For
360 these problems, misestimation of parameters, such as R , can bias our assessment of outbreak
361 risk and hence misinform the implementation of control measures. An important concurrent
362 problem aims to predict the likely incidence of new infections from these estimates. This
363 involves projecting the epidemic dynamics forward in time to infer upcoming infection patterns.

364 Here we present evidence that the solution of this problem, at least over short projection time
365 horizons, is robust to misspecification of generation times provided both the incorrect estimate
366 and the misspecified denominator are used in conjunction. We repeat the analyses of **Figure**
367 **3** for 200 replicate epidemics and apply EpiFilter [25] to obtain the one-step-ahead predictive
368 distributions $\mathbf{P}(I_t | I_1^{t-1})$ for every t . We compute the predicted mean square error (PMSE)
369 and the accumulated predictive error (APE). These scores, which we denote as $D(I_t | I_1^{t-1})$,
370 average square errors between mean predictions and true incidence and sum log probabilities
371 of observing the true incidence from the predicted distribution respectively [36,37]. We plot the
372 distributions of scores over replicates and illustrate individual predictions in **Figure 5**.

373 We find only negligible differences among the one-step-ahead predictive accuracies of the R
374 estimated given knowledge of the changing generation times ($R|w$), the R estimated assuming
375 an unchanged (and hence wrongly specified) w and our inferred Ω . As APE and PMSE also
376 measure model suitability, their similarity across the three estimates demonstrate that, if the
377 problem of prediction is of interest, then incorrect generation time choices are not important
378 as long as the erroneous denominator (Λ_t) and estimate (R_t) are used together. If this estimate
379 is however used outside of the context of its denominator (e.g., if it is simply input into other
380 studies), then inaccurate projections will occur (in addition to poor estimates). As multi-step-

381 ahead predictions can be composed from iterated one-step-ahead ones [38], we conjecture
 382 that subtleties between prediction and explanation are likely to also apply on longer horizons.




383

384 **Figure 5: One-step-ahead prediction accuracy and model mismatch.** We simulate 200
 385 replicates of the epidemics from **Figure 3**, which involve non-stationary changes to EVD and
 386 COVID-19 generation times. We use estimates of effective, R , and angular, Ω , reproduction
 387 numbers to produce successive one-step-ahead predictions and assess their accuracy to the
 388 simulated (true) incidence. Panels A-D provide a representative example of a single simulated
 389 epidemic (true incidence shown as black dots) and the R and Ω one-step ahead predictions
 390 (red and blue respectively with 95% credible intervals). In panels E-F we formally compute
 391 accuracy using distance metrics, D , based on accumulated prediction errors (APE, dashed)
 392 and prediction mean square errors (PMSE, solid) for all 200 replicates from R , Ω and R given
 393 knowledge of the generation time changes i.e., $R|w$. We obtain distributions of D by applying
 394 kernel smoothing. We find negligible differences in predictive power from all approaches.

395 **Empirical example: COVID-19 in mainland China**

396 We complete our analysis by illustrating the practical usability of Ω on an empirical case study
 397 where generation time changes are known to have occurred. In [15], the dynamics of COVID-
 398 19 in mainland China are tracked across January and February 2020. Transmission pair data
 399 indicated that the serial interval of COVID-19 shortened across this period leading to biases
 400 in the inferred R if updated serial intervals are not used. Here serial intervals, which measure
 401 the lag between the symptom onset times of an infector and infectee are used as a proxy for
 402 the generation time. **Figure 6** presents our main results. We find Ω (blue), which requires no
 403 serial interval information, behaves similarly to the R (red) inferred from the time-changing w .
 404 Both metrics appear less biased than estimates of R (green) that assume a fixed serial interval.
 405 This is largely consistent with the original investigation in [15].



406
 407 **Figure 6: COVID-19 transmissibility in China under non-stationary generation times.** We
 408 analyse COVID-19 data from [15], which spans 9th January 2020 to 13 February 2020 and is
 409 known to feature a serial interval distribution that shortened in mean substantially from 7.8d
 410 to 2.6d (change times are shown as grey vertical lines). We assume that the serial interval

411 approximates the generation time well and replicate the analysis from Figure 2 of [15]. In panel
412 A, we compare estimates (green) of effective reproduction numbers, R , using fixed generation
413 time distributions inferred in [15] (specified by their means g) against those of our angular
414 reproduction number Ω (blue). We use EpiFilter [25] to obtain all estimates (means shown
415 with 95% credible intervals) and find relative trends similar to those in Figure 2 of [15]. In panel
416 B we plot the incidence (black) and the denominators we use to compute an R that does
417 account for the generation time changes (Λ , red) and for Ω (M , blue). This R uses the different
418 distributions inferred at the grey vertical change times (their means are in panel B and are
419 also the fixed distributions of panel A in sequence). We plot these R and Ω estimates in panel
420 C. In panel D we show the growth rates that are inferred from the R and Ω estimates of C (red
421 and blue respectively) against that obtained from taking the smoothed log derivative (black).

422 We see that Ω provides a lower assessment of the initial transmissibility as compared to the
423 R that is best informed by the changing w but that both agree in general and in particular at
424 the important threshold between super- and subcritical spread. Interestingly, Ω indicates no
425 sharp changes at the w change-times. This follows because the incidence is too small for
426 those changes to shape overall transmissibility and matches the gradual w changes originally
427 inferred in [15]. The distributions used in **Figure 6** provide a piecewise approximation to these
428 variations. We also compare r estimates derived from R (red, from [14]), Ω (blue, from **Eq. (5)**)
429 and the empirical log gradient of smoothed incidence (black, $\frac{d \log S[I_t]}{dt}$ [4]). We find that the r
430 from Ω agrees more closely with the empirical growth rate than the r from R , which somewhat
431 by design shows jumps at the w change-points. While this analysis is not meant as a detailed
432 study of COVID-19 in China, it does demonstrate the practical usefulness of Ω .

433 **Discussion**

434 Quantifying the time-varying transmissibility of a pathogen remains an enduring challenge in
435 infectious disease epidemiology. Changes in transmissibility may signify shifts in the dynamics
436 of an epidemic of relevance to both preparedness and policymaking. While this challenge has
437 been longstanding, the statistics that we use to summarise transmissibility have evolved from
438 dispersibility [39] and incidence to prevalence ratios [40] to cohort [41] and instantaneous [22]
439 reproduction numbers. While the last, which we have denoted R , has become the predominant
440 metric of transmissibility, all of these proposed statistics ultimately involve a ratio between new
441 infections and a measure of active infections (i.e., the denominator). Deciding on appropriate
442 denominators necessitates some notion (implicit or explicit) of a generation time [42].

443 Difficulties in characterising these generation times and their changes substantially bias [6]
444 estimates of transmissibility and have motivated recent works to propose the instantaneous
445 growth rate, r , as a more reliable approach for inferring pathogen spread [20]. However, on its
446 own, r is insufficient to resolve many of the transmission questions that R can answer and its
447 computation may employ smoothing assumptions that are in some instances equivalent to the
448 generation time ones behind R [4]. We formulated the novel angular reproduction number Ω ,
449 to merge some advantages from both R and r and to contribute to a more comprehensive view
450 of transmissibility. By applying basic vector algebra (**Eqs. 1-3**), we encoded both changes to
451 R and the generation time distribution, w , into a single time-varying metric, deriving Ω .

452 We found that Ω maintains the threshold properties and individual-level interpretability of R
453 but responds to variations in w , in a manner consistent with r (**Figure 2**). Moreover, Ω indicates
454 variations in transmissibility caused by R and w without requiring measurement of generation
455 times (**Figure 3**). This is a consequence of its denominator, which is the root mean square of
456 infections over a user-specified window δ that is relatively simple to tune (see Methods). We
457 can interpret $\Omega = a > 1$ as indicating that infections across δ need to be reduced by a^{-1} . This
458 reduces mean and root mean square infections by a^{-1} and causes Ω to equal 1. Further, Ω
459 circumvents identifiability issues surrounding the joint inference of R and w [43] by refocussing
460 on estimating the net changes produced by both. This improves our ability to *explain* the shifts
461 in transmissibility underpinning observed epidemic dynamics and means Ω is essentially a
462 reproduction number that provides individual-level interpretation of growth rates (**Eqs. 4-5**).

463 The benefits of this r - Ω correspondence are twofold. First, as interventions may alter R , w or
464 R and w concurrently [15,18] situations can arise where r and R disagree across time on both
465 the drivers and magnitude of transmissibility. While it may seem possible to minimise this issue
466 by constructing alternative threshold statistics by directly combining r with assumed generation
467 time structures, we find these statistics often exhibit worse performance and larger bias than
468 Ω (**Supplementary Information**). Second, this disagreement can also occur when comparing
469 pathogenic variants or epidemics (e.g., from diverse spatial or sociodemographic groups) with
470 different but known and unchanging w . This study appears to be among the earliest to highlight
471 these discrepancies, which can occur in multiple settings (see **Supplementary Information**).
472 Realistic transmission landscapes possess all of the above complexities, meaning that relying
473 solely on conventional measures of relative transmissibility can lead to contradictions.

474 We found that Ω consistently orders epidemics by growth rate while capturing notions of the
475 average new infections per past infection (**Figure 4**). This suggests Ω blends advantages from
476 R and r , with clearer assumptions (choice of window δ). However, Ω offers no advantage if we

477 want to *predict* epidemic dynamics (see [35] for more on prediction-explanation distinctions).
478 For this problem even an R inferred using a misspecified denominator performs equally well
479 (**Figure 5**). This follows as only the product of any reproduction number and its denominator
480 matter when determining the next incidence value. Iterations of this product underpin multi-
481 step ahead predictions [38]. This may explain why autoregressive models, which ignore some
482 characteristics of w , can serve as useful predictive models [44]. Other instances where Ω will
483 not improve analysis are at times earlier than δ (due to edge effects [9]) and in periods of near
484 zero incidence (there is no information to infer R either [24]). We summarised and compared
485 key properties of R , r and Ω in **Table 1**.

486 There are several limitations to our study. First, we only examined biases inherent to R due to
487 the difficulty of measuring the generation time accurately and across time. While this is a major
488 limitation of existing transmissibility metrics [15], practical surveillance data are also subject
489 to under-reporting and delays, which can severely diminish the quality of any transmissibility
490 estimates [23,43,45]. While Ω ameliorates issues due to generation time mismatch, it is as
491 susceptible as R and r to surveillance biases and corrective algorithms (e.g., deconvolution
492 methods [46]) should be applied before inferring Ω . Second, our analysis depends on renewal
493 and compartmental epidemic models [22]. These assume random mixing and cannot account
494 for realistic contact patterns. Despite this key structural uncertainty, there is evidence that well-
495 mixed and network models are comparable when estimating transmissibility [47].

496 Although the above limitations can, in some instances, reduce the added value of improving
497 the statistics summarising transmissibility, we believe that Ω will be of practical and theoretical
498 benefit, offering complementary insights to R and r and forming part of a more comprehensive
499 epidemic analytic toolkit. Its similarity in formulation to R means it is as easy to compute using
500 existing software and therefore can be deployed on dashboards and updated in real time to
501 improve situational awareness. Further, Ω improves comparison and communication of the
502 relative risks of circulating variants or epidemics among diverse groups, avoiding R - r
503 contradictions provided the known parameter, δ , is fixed. This supplements R , which is hard
504 to contextualise [20] when w is misspecified or varying and hence compare across groups, as
505 each group may have distinct and correspondingly poorly specified denominators. Last, Ω can
506 help probe analytical questions about how changes in R and w interact because it presents a
507 common framework for testing how variations in either influence overall transmissibility.

508 **Methods**

509 ***Inferring angular reproduction numbers across time***

510 We outline how to estimate Ω_t given a time series of incident infections I_1^T , with T defining the
511 present or last available data timepoint i.e., $1 \leq t \leq T$. Because Ω_t simply replaces the total
512 infectiousness Λ_t , used for computing R_t , with the root mean square of the new infection time
513 series (see **Figure 1**), M_t , we can obtain Ω_t from standard R_t estimation packages with minor
514 changes. This requires evaluating M_t over some user-defined, backward sliding window of
515 size δ . Under a Poisson (Pois) renewal model this follows as in **Eq. (6)** for timepoint t .

516
$$\mathbf{P}(I_t | I_1^{t-1}, \delta) \equiv \text{Pois}(\Omega_t M_t), \quad M_t = \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{u=t-\delta}^{t-1} I_u^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (6)$$

517 The choice of δ is mostly arbitrary but should be sufficiently long to capture most of the likely
518 probability mass of the unknown generation time but not overly long since it induces an edge
519 effect (similar to the windows in [9,37]). We found a suitable heuristic to be twice or thrice the
520 initial expected mean generation time (g_0). We can then input M_t and I_t into packages such
521 as EpiEstim [9] or EpiFilter [25] to estimate Ω_t with 95% credible intervals.

522 Due to the similarity between computing R_t and Ω_t we only specify the latter but highlight that
523 replacing M_t with Λ_t yields the expressions for evaluating any equivalent quantities from R_t .
524 The only difference relates to how the growth rates r_t are computed. We estimate r_t from R_t
525 by applying the generation time, \vec{w} , based transformation from [14]. For a correctly specified
526 \vec{w} this gives the same result as the smoothed derivative of the incidence curve [4]. We derive
527 r_t from Ω_t using **Eq. (5)**, which follows from rearranging **Eq. (4)** into $(2\delta r_t - \Omega_t^2) e^{2\delta r_t - \Omega_t^2} =$
528 $-\Omega_t^2 e^{-\Omega_t^2}$. This expression then admits Lambert W function solutions. In all estimates of r_t we
529 propagate uncertainty from the posterior distributions (see below) over R_t or Ω_t .

530 We applied EpiFilter in this study due to its improved extraction of information from I_1^T . This
531 method assumes a random walk state model for our transmissibility metric as in **Eq. (7)** with
532 ϵ_{t-1} as a normally distributed (Norm) noise term and η as a free parameter (default 0.1).

533
$$\Omega_t = \Omega_{t-1} + (\eta \sqrt{\Omega_{t-1}}) \epsilon_{t-1}, \quad \mathbf{P}(\epsilon_{t-1}) \equiv \text{Norm}(0, 1). \quad (7)$$

534 The EpiFilter approach utilises Bayesian smoothing algorithms incorporating the models of
535 **Eq. (6)-(7)** and outputs the complete posterior distribution $\mathbf{P}(\Omega_t | I_1^T, \delta)$ with T as the complete
536 length of all available data (i.e., $1 \leq t \leq T$). We compute our mean estimates $\hat{\Omega}_t$ and 95%
537 credible intervals from this posterior distribution and these underlie our plots in **Figures 3-4**.

538 EpiFilter also outputs the one-step-ahead predictive distributions $\mathbf{P}(I_t | I_1^{t-1}, \delta)$, which we use
539 in **Figure 5**. There we quantify predictive accuracy using the predicted mean square error
540 PMSE and the accumulated prediction error APE, defined as in **Eq. (8)** [36,37] with \hat{I}_t as the
541 posterior mean estimate from $\mathbf{P}(I_t | I_1^{t-1}, \delta)$ and I_t^* as the true simulated incidence. These are
542 computed with $\mathbf{P}(\Omega_{t-1} | I_1^{t-1}, \delta)$ and not $\mathbf{P}(\Omega_t | I_1^T, \delta)$, ensuring no future information is used.

$$543 \quad \text{PMSE} = \frac{1}{T - \delta} \sum_{t=\delta+1}^T (I_t^* - \hat{I}_t)^2, \quad \text{APE} = \sum_{t=\delta+1}^T -\log \mathbf{P}(I_t = I_t^* | I_1^{t-1}, \delta). \quad (8)$$

544 We collectively refer to these as distance metrics $D(I_t | I_1^{t-1})$ and construct their distributions,
545 $\mathbf{P}(D)$, over many replicates of simulated epidemics. Last, we use $\mathbf{P}(\Omega_t | I_1^T, \delta)$ to compute the
546 posterior distribution of the growth rate $\mathbf{P}(r_t | I_1^T, \delta)$ and hence its estimates as in **Eq. (5)**. More
547 details on the EpiFilter algorithms are available at [25,31,48]. We supply open-source code to
548 reproduce all analyses at <https://github.com/kpzoo/Omega> as well as functions in MATLAB
549 and R to allow users to estimate Ω_t from their own data.

550 Bibliography

- 551 1. Anderson R, Donnelly C, Hollingsworth D, Keeling M, Vegvari C, Baggaley R.
552 Reproduction number (R) and growth rate (r) of the COVID-19 epidemic in the UK:
553 methods of. The Royal Society. 2020;
- 554 2. Li Y, Campbell H, Kulkarni D, Harpur A, Nundy M, Wang X, et al. The temporal
555 association of introducing and lifting non-pharmaceutical interventions with the time-
556 varying reproduction number (R) of SARS-CoV-2: a modelling study across 131
557 countries. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2021;21: 193–202. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30785-4
- 558 3. Volz E, Mishra S, Chand M, Barrett JC, The COVID-19 Genomics UK (COG-UK)
559 consortium, Johnson R, et al. Assessing transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 lineage
560 B.1.1.7 in England. *Nature*. 2021; doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03470-x
- 561 4. Parag KV, Thompson RN, Donnelly CA. Are epidemic growth rates more informative
562 than reproduction numbers? *J Royal Statistical Soc A*. 2022; doi:10.1111/rssa.12867
- 563 5. Svensson A. A note on generation times in epidemic models. *Math Biosci*. 2007;208:
564 300–311. doi:10.1016/j.mbs.2006.10.010
- 565 6. Britton T, Scalia Tomba G. Estimation in emerging epidemics: biases and remedies. *J*
566 *R Soc Interface*. 2019;16: 20180670. doi:10.1098/rsif.2018.0670
- 567 7. Champredon D, Dushoff J. Intrinsic and realized generation intervals in infectious-
568 disease transmission. *Proc Biol Sci*. 2015;282: 20152026. doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.2026
- 569 8. Nishiura H. Time variations in the generation time of an infectious disease: implications
570 for sampling to appropriately quantify transmission potential. *Math Biosci Eng*. 2010;7:
571 851–869. doi:10.3934/mbe.2010.7.851
- 572 9. Cori A, Ferguson NM, Fraser C, Cauchemez S. A new framework and software to
573 estimate time-varying reproduction numbers during epidemics. *Am J Epidemiol*.
574 2013;178: 1505–1512. doi:10.1093/aje/kwt133
- 575 10. Ganyani T, Kremer C, Chen D, Torneri A, Faes C, Wallinga J, et al. Estimating the
576 generation interval for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) based on symptom onset data,

- 577 March 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.17.2000257
- 578 11. Hethcote HW. *The Mathematics of Infectious Diseases.* SIAM Rev. 2000;42: 599–653.
579 doi:10.1137/S0036144500371907
- 580 12. Parag KV. Sub-spreading events limit the reliable elimination of heterogeneous
581 epidemics. *J R Soc Interface.* 2021;18: 20210444. doi:10.1098/rsif.2021.0444
- 582 13. Anderson R, May R. *Infectious diseases of humans: dynamics and control.* Oxford
583 University Press; 1991.
- 584 14. Wallinga J, Lipsitch M. How generation intervals shape the relationship between
585 growth rates and reproductive numbers. *Proc R Soc B.* 2007;274: 599–604.
- 586 15. Ali ST, Wang L, Lau EHY, Xu X-K, Du Z, Wu Y, et al. Serial interval of SARS-CoV-2
587 was shortened over time by nonpharmaceutical interventions. *Science.* 2020;369:
588 1106–1109. doi:10.1126/science.abc9004
- 589 16. Kenah E, Lipsitch M, Robins JM. Generation interval contraction and epidemic data
590 analysis. *Math Biosci.* 2008;213: 71–79. doi:10.1016/j.mbs.2008.02.007
- 591 17. Hart WS, Miller E, Andrews NJ, Waight P, Maini PK, Funk S, et al. Generation time of
592 the alpha and delta SARS-CoV-2 variants: an epidemiological analysis. *Lancet Infect
593 Dis.* 2022;22: 603–610. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00001-9
- 594 18. Favero M, Scalia Tomba G, Britton T. Modelling preventive measures and their effect
595 on generation times in emerging epidemics. *J R Soc Interface.* 2022;19: 20220128.
596 doi:10.1098/rsif.2022.0128
- 597 19. Kraemer MUG, Pybus OG, Fraser C, Cauchemez S, Rambaut A, Cowling BJ.
598 Monitoring key epidemiological parameters of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Nat Med.*
599 2021;27: 1854–1855. doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01545-w
- 600 20. Pellis L, Scarabel F, Stage HB, Overton CE, Chappell LHK, Fearon E, et al.
601 Challenges in control of COVID-19: short doubling time and long delay to effect of
602 interventions. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B, Biol Sci.* 2021;376: 20200264.
603 doi:10.1098/rstb.2020.0264
- 604 21. The R value and growth rate - GOV.UK [Internet]. [cited 1 Jul 2021]. Available:
605 <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/the-r-value-and-growth-rate>
- 606 22. Fraser C. Estimating individual and household reproduction numbers in an emerging
607 epidemic. *PLoS One.* 2007;2: e758. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0000758
- 608 23. Parag KV, Donnelly CA, Zarebski AE. Quantifying the information in noisy epidemic
609 curves. *Nat Comput Sci.* 2022;2: 584-594 doi.org/10.1038/s43588-022-00313-1
- 610 24. Parag KV, Donnelly CA. Fundamental limits on inferring epidemic resurgence in real
611 time using effective reproduction numbers. *PLoS Comput Biol.* 2022;18: e1010004.
612 doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1010004
- 613 25. Parag KV. Improved estimation of time-varying reproduction numbers at low case
614 incidence and between epidemic waves. *PLoS Comput Biol.* 2021;17: e1009347.
615 doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009347
- 616 26. Torneri A, Libin P, Scalia Tomba G, Faes C, Wood JG, Hens N. On realized serial and
617 generation intervals given control measures: The COVID-19 pandemic case. *PLoS
618 Comput Biol.* 2021;17: e1008892. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008892
- 619 27. Lloyd-Smith JO, Schreiber SJ, Kopp PE, Getz WM. Superspreading and the effect of
620 individual variation on disease emergence. *Nature.* 2005;438: 355–359.
621 doi:10.1038/nature04153
- 622 28. Bettencourt LMA, Ribeiro RM. Real time bayesian estimation of the epidemic potential
623 of emerging infectious diseases. *PLoS One.* 2008;3: e2185.
624 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0002185

- 625 29. Lehtonen J. The Lambert W function in ecological and evolutionary models. *Methods*
626 *Ecol Evol.* 2016;7: 1110–1118. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12568
- 627 30. Gostic KM, McGough L, Baskerville EB, Abbott S, Joshi K, Tedijanto C, et al. Practical
628 considerations for measuring the effective reproductive number, Rt. *PLoS Comput*
629 *Biol.* 2020;16: e1008409. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008409
- 630 31. Parag KV, Cowling BJ, Donnelly CA. Deciphering early-warning signals of SARS-CoV-
631 2 elimination and resurgence from limited data at multiple scales. *J R Soc Interface.*
632 2021;18: 20210569. doi:10.1098/rsif.2021.0569
- 633 32. Van Kerkhove MD, Bento AI, Mills HL, Ferguson NM, Donnelly CA. A review of
634 epidemiological parameters from Ebola outbreaks to inform early public health
635 decision-making. *Sci Data.* 2015;2: 150019. doi:10.1038/sdata.2015.19
- 636 33. Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati-Gilani G, Others. Impact of non-pharmaceutical
637 interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID- 19 mortality and healthcare demand. Imperial
638 College London; 2020.
- 639 34. Dushoff J, Park SW. Speed and strength of an epidemic intervention. *Proc Biol Sci.*
640 2021;288: 20201556. doi:10.1098/rspb.2020.1556
- 641 35. Shmueli G. To Explain or to Predict? *Stat Sci.* 2010;25: 289–310. doi:10.1214/10-
642 STS330
- 643 36. Wagenmakers E-J, Grünwald P, Steyvers M. Accumulative prediction error and the
644 selection of time series models. *J Math Psychol.* 2006;50: 149–166.
645 doi:10.1016/j.jmp.2006.01.004
- 646 37. Parag KV, Donnelly CA. Using information theory to optimise epidemic models for real-
647 time prediction and estimation. *PLoS Comput Biol.* 2020;16: e1007990.
648 doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007990
- 649 38. Marcellino M, Stock JH, Watson MW. A comparison of direct and iterated multistep AR
650 methods for forecasting macroeconomic time series. *J Econom.* 2006;135: 499–526.
651 doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2005.07.020
- 652 39. Nishiura H, Chowell G, Heesterbeek H, Wallinga J. The ideal reporting interval for an
653 epidemic to objectively interpret the epidemiological time course. *J R Soc Interface.*
654 2010;7: 297–307. doi:10.1098/rsif.2009.0153
- 655 40. White PJ, Ward H, Garnett GP. Is HIV out of control in the UK? An example of
656 analysing patterns of HIV spreading using incidence-to-prevalence ratios. *AIDS.*
657 2006;20: 1898–1901. doi:10.1097/01.aids.0000244213.23574.fa
- 658 41. Wallinga J, Teunis P. Different epidemic curves for severe acute respiratory syndrome
659 reveal similar impacts of control measures. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2004;160: 509–516.
660 doi:10.1093/aje/kwh255
- 661 42. Yan P. Separate roles of the latent and infectious periods in shaping the relation
662 between the basic reproduction number and the intrinsic growth rate of infectious
663 disease outbreaks. *J Theor Biol.* 2008;251: 238–252. doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2007.11.027
- 664 43. Azmon A, Faes C, Hens N. On the estimation of the reproduction number based on
665 misreported epidemic data. *Stat Med.* 2014;33: 1176–1192. doi:10.1002/sim.6015
- 666 44. Bracher J, Held L. Endemic-epidemic models with discrete-time serial interval
667 distributions for infectious disease prediction. *Int J Forecast.* 2020;
668 doi:10.1016/j.ijforecast.2020.07.002
- 669 45. Dalziel BD, Lau MSY, Tiffany A, McClelland A, Zelner J, Bliss JR, et al. Unreported
670 cases in the 2014-2016 Ebola epidemic: Spatiotemporal variation, and implications for
671 estimating transmission. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2018;12: e0006161.
672 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0006161

- 673 46. Goldstein E, Dushoff J, Ma J, Plotkin JB, Earn DJD, Lipsitch M. Reconstructing
674 influenza incidence by deconvolution of daily mortality time series. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
675 *USA*. 2009;106: 21825–21829. doi:10.1073/pnas.0902958106
- 676 47. Liu Q-H, Ajelli M, Aleta A, Merler S, Moreno Y, Vespignani A. Measurability of the
677 epidemic reproduction number in data-driven contact networks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
678 *USA*. 2018;115: 12680–12685. doi:10.1073/pnas.1811115115
- 679 48. Sarrka S. *Bayesian Filtering and Smoothing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University
680 Press; 2013.

681
682

683 **Funding**

684 KVP acknowledges funding from the MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis
685 (reference MR/R015600/1), jointly funded by the UK Medical Research Council (MRC) and
686 the UK Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO), under the MRC/FCDO
687 Concordat agreement and is also part of the EDCTP2 programme supported by the European
688 Union. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to
689 publish, or manuscript preparation.

690 **Data availability statement**

691 All data and code underlying the analyses and figures of this work are freely available (in R
692 and MATLAB) at: <https://github.com/kpzoo/Omega>

693
694