

1  
2 Inferring the differences in incubation-period and  
3 generation-interval distributions of the Delta and Omicron  
4 variants of SARS-CoV-2

5  
6 Sang Woo Park<sup>1,\*</sup>, Kaiyuan Sun<sup>2</sup>, Sam Abbott<sup>3</sup>, Ron Sender<sup>4</sup>, Yinon Bar-on<sup>4</sup>,  
7 Joshua S. Weitz<sup>5,6,7</sup>, Sebastian Funk<sup>3,8</sup>, Bryan T. Grenfell<sup>1,9</sup>, Jantien A Backer<sup>10</sup>,  
8 Jacco Wallinga<sup>10,11</sup>, Cecile Viboud<sup>2</sup>, Jonathan Dushoff<sup>12,13,14</sup>

9 **1** Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Princeton University,  
10 Princeton, NJ, USA

11 **2** Division of International Epidemiology and Population Studies, Fogarty  
12 International Center, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA

13 **3** Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases, London School of  
14 Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK

15 **4** Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences, Weizmann Institute of Science,  
16 Rehovot, Israel

17 **5** School of Biological Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA

18 **6** School of Physics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA

19 **7** Institut de Biologie, École Normale Supérieure, Paris, France

20 **8** Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene &  
21 Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street, London, UK

22 **9** Princeton School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University,  
23 Princeton, NJ, USA

24 **10** Center for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and  
25 the Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, The Netherlands

26 **11** Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center,  
27 Leiden, The Netherlands

28 **12** Department of Biology, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada

29 **13** Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McMaster University, Hamilton,  
30 ON, Canada

31 **14** M. G. DeGroot Institute for Infectious Disease Research, McMaster University,  
32 Hamilton, ON, Canada

33 \*Corresponding author: [swp2@princeton.edu](mailto:swp2@princeton.edu)

34 **Abstract**

35 Estimating the differences in the incubation-period, serial-interval, and  
36 generation-interval distributions of SARS-CoV-2 variants is critical to  
37 understanding their transmission and control. However, the impact of epidemic  
38 dynamics is often neglected in estimating the timing of infection and

39 transmission—for example, when an epidemic is growing exponentially, a cohort of  
40 infected individuals who developed symptoms at the same time are more likely to  
41 have been infected recently. Here, we re-analyze incubation-period and  
42 serial-interval data describing transmissions of the Delta and Omicron variants  
43 from the Netherlands at the end of December 2021. Previous analysis of the same  
44 data set reported shorter mean observed incubation period (3.2 days vs 4.4 days)  
45 and serial interval (3.5 days vs 4.1 days) for the Omicron variant, but the number  
46 of infections caused by the Delta variant decreased during this period as the  
47 number of Omicron infections increased. When we account for growth-rate  
48 differences of two variants during the study period, we estimate similar mean  
49 incubation periods (3.8–4.5 days) for both variants but a shorter mean generation  
50 interval for the Omicron variant (3.0 days; 95% CI: 2.7–3.2 days) than for the Delta  
51 variant (3.8 days; 95% CI: 3.7–4.0 days). We further note that the differences in  
52 estimated generation intervals may be driven by the “network effect”—higher  
53 effective transmissibility of the Omicron variant can cause faster susceptible  
54 depletion among contact networks, which in turn prevents late transmission  
55 (therefore shortening realized generation intervals). Using up-to-date  
56 generation-interval distributions is critical to accurately estimating the  
57 reproduction advantage of the Omicron variant.

## 58 **Significance**

59 Recent studies suggest that individuals infected with the Omicron variant develop  
60 symptoms earlier (shorter incubation period) and transmit faster (shorter  
61 generation interval) than those infected with the Delta variant. However, these  
62 studies typically neglect population-level effects: when an epidemic is growing, a  
63 greater proportion of current cases were infected recently, biasing us toward  
64 observing faster transmission events. Accounting for this dynamical bias, we find  
65 that Omicron infections from the Netherlands at the end of December 2021 had  
66 similar incubation periods, but shorter generation intervals, compared to Delta  
67 infections from the same period. Shorter generation intervals of the Omicron  
68 variant might be due to its higher effective reproduction number, which can cause  
69 faster local susceptible depletion around the contact network.

## 70 1 Introduction

71 Estimating transmission advantages of new SARS-CoV-2 variants is critical to pre-  
72 dicting and controlling the course of the COVID-19 pandemic [1]. Transmission ad-  
73 vantages of invading variants are typically characterized by the ratios of reproduction  
74 numbers,  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{inv}}/\mathcal{R}_{\text{res}}$ , and the differences in growth rates,  $r_{\text{inv}} - r_{\text{res}}$ . These quantities  
75 are linked by the generation-interval distributions of the resident and invading vari-  
76 ants. For example, an invading variant with shorter generation intervals—defined  
77 as the time between infection of the infector and the infectee—will exhibit faster  
78 epidemic growth ( $r_{\text{inv}} > r_{\text{res}} > 0$ ) even if their reproduction numbers are identical  
79 ( $\mathcal{R}_{\text{inv}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{res}} > 1$ ).

80 Estimating the generation-interval distribution is challenging, in part due to dif-  
81 ficulties in observing actual infection events. Many researchers primarily focus on  
82 comparisons of other transmission intervals, such as the time between symptom on-  
83 sets (also referred to as serial intervals) or between testing events [2] of the infector  
84 and the infectee. Each of these transmission-interval distributions can be subject to  
85 dynamical effects, which can cause transmission-interval distributions to systemati-  
86 cally differ from the corresponding generation-interval distribution.

87 For example, when the epidemic is growing, there will be more recent infections,  
88 and we are therefore more likely to observe recently infected individuals among a  
89 cohort of infectors who developed symptoms at the same time. In this case, their  
90 incubation periods will be shorter, on average, than those of their infectees, causing  
91 the mean serial interval to be longer than the mean generation interval [3]. We refer  
92 to such effects of growth rate on expected intervals as “dynamical bias” Because of  
93 dynamical bias, observed differences in transmission-interval distributions between  
94 variants are not necessarily equivalent to differences in the underlying generation-  
95 interval distributions when their growth rates differ.

96 Here, we re-analyze serial-interval data collected by [4], representing within- and  
97 between-household transmissions of the B.1.617.2 (Delta) and B.1.1.529 (Omicron)  
98 variants from the Netherlands between 13 and 26 December 2021. The study found  
99 shorter mean within-household serial intervals (3.5 vs 4.1 days) and mean incubation  
100 periods (3.2 vs 4.4 days) for transmission pairs with S-gene target failure (mostly  
101 Omicron during the study period) than without (mostly Delta), but did not con-  
102 sider dynamical biases caused by growth-rate differences in their inference: during  
103 this period, the incidence of Omicron cases were increasing, whereas the incidence  
104 of Delta cases were decreasing. We take the epidemiological context in the Nether-  
105 lands during the study period into account to provide corrected estimates for the  
106 incubation periods and generation-interval distributions of the Delta and Omicron  
107 variants. We show that using up-to-date generation-interval distributions is critical  
108 to accurately estimating the reproduction advantage (i.e., the ratio between the re-  
109 production numbers of the invading and resident variants) of emerging SARS-CoV-2  
110 variants.

## 111 2 Methods

### 112 2.1 Data

113 We analyze time series of reported COVID-19 cases (<https://data.rivm.nl/covid-19/>)  
114 and proportions of SARS-CoV-2 variants detected ([https://www.rivm.nl/coronavirus-covid-19/  
115 virus/varianten](https://www.rivm.nl/coronavirus-covid-19/virus/varianten)) from the Netherlands between 29 November 2021 and 30 January  
116 2022. Data sets are publicly available on the National Institute for Public Health  
117 and the Environment (RIVM) website.

118 Serial-interval data are taken from [4]. Infector-infectee pairs were identified  
119 through contact tracing, and their symptom onset dates were reported through a  
120 national surveillance database. Serial intervals were then calculated by taking the  
121 difference between symptom onset dates of the infector and the infectee. In order  
122 to ensure independence between serial intervals, one infectee was chosen at random  
123 for each infector in the original analysis. See original article for additional details of  
124 data collection.

125 Publicly available data are aggregated by the length of the serial interval in days  
126 and do not include additional individual-level information, such as exposure dates,  
127 symptom onset dates, or age. The original article presented serial-interval estimates  
128 stratified by the vaccination status in supplementary materials, but stratified data  
129 are not publicly available; we rely on publicly available data to keep the analysis  
130 simple and to focus on the qualitative effects of dynamical biases. The aggregated  
131 data consists of 2529 transmission pairs and are further stratified by the presence of  
132 S gene target failure (SGTF), week of infectors' symptom onset date (week 50, 13–19  
133 December 2021, and week 51, 20–26 December 2021), and the type of transmission  
134 (within- or between-household transmission). In the main text, we combine data  
135 from weeks 50 and 51 of 2021 (13–26 December) and present a stratified analysis  
136 in Supplementary Material. For simplicity, we refer to transmission pairs with and  
137 without SGTFs as Omicron and Delta transmission pairs, respectively. Incubation  
138 period data were originally collected from 513 individuals (consisting of 258 Omicron  
139 and 255 Delta cases), with symptom onsets between 1 December 2021 and 2 January  
140 2022; however, the data are not publicly available with the original article. Instead,  
141 we rely on previous estimates [4] to derive growth-rate-adjusted incubation-period  
142 distributions.

### 143 2.2 Estimating epidemic growth rates

144 In order to accurately estimate incubation-period and generation-interval distribu-  
145 tions of the Delta and Omicron variants, we have to take their epidemiological  
146 dynamics—in particular, their growth rates—into account. To estimate the growth  
147 rates of the Delta and Omicron variants, we first estimate the number of COVID-19  
148 cases infected with each variant by multiplying reported weekly numbers of cases by  
149 the proportion of Delta and Omicron variants detected—we use weekly time series

150 to smooth over patterns of testing and reporting within each week. We note that  
151 the proportion of Delta and Omicron variants detected is reported with the date  
152 of sampling, whereas the case data are reported with the date of report, meaning  
153 that there is some delay between the two data sets (typically around 2 days). For  
154 simplicity, we do not account for this delay in our growth-rate estimates; instead, we  
155 later perform sensitivity analysis to assess how growth rates affect the inferences of  
156 the incubation-period and generation-interval distributions. We also do not account  
157 for uncertainties around the estimates of the proportion of each variant—almost  
158 2000 samples were tested on each week between the week of November 28, 2021,  
159 and the week of January 23, 2022, making uncertainty due to sample size small; we  
160 note however that this estimate is also sensitive to the assumption that sampling is  
161 random.

162 We then fit a generalized additive model [5] to the logged weekly case estimates  
163 to obtain smooth trajectories for case time series. More specifically, we model the  
164 logged weekly numbers of cases infected with each variant as a function of time us-  
165 ing a penalized cubic spline fitted with restricted maximum likelihood (specified as  
166 `gam(log(cases)~s(time, bs="cs"), method="REML")` using the MGCV R package):  
167 We use Gaussian likelihoods to fit to logged cases in part for convenience, and in part  
168 because the inferred numbers of cases infected with each variant are not whole num-  
169 bers. In principle, it might be preferable to explicitly model the process of sampling  
170 for strain testing, and then using negative-binomial likelihoods for case numbers [6],  
171 but our main purpose here is simply to roughly estimate growth rates with reason-  
172 able uncertainties. Finally, we take the derivative of the predicted logged numbers  
173 of cases infected with each variant to obtain time-varying growth rate estimates.

174 To obtain confidence intervals on the estimated time-varying growth rates, we  
175 generate 1000 parameter sets by resampling spline coefficients from a multivariate  
176 normal distribution using the estimated variance-covariance matrices. We calculate  
177 time-varying growth rates from each parameter set and use equi-tailed quantiles to  
178 generate 95% confidence limits. We note that this method of calculating confidence  
179 intervals gives point-wise confidence intervals, meaning that the confidence intervals  
180 give 95% coverage for the set of estimates at each time point; these intervals are  
181 narrower than simultaneous confidence intervals, which give 95% coverage for the set  
182 of estimated time series across the whole time period [7].

### 183 **2.3 Estimating forward incubation-period distributions from** 184 **backward incubation-period distributions**

185 The incubation-period distributions from 513 individuals (consisting of 258 Omicron  
186 and 255 Delta cases), with symptom onsets between 1 December 2021 and 2 January  
187 2022, were previously reported in [4]. These data cover a wider time period than the  
188 serial-interval data. [4] used the methods of [8], which estimates incubation period  
189 by inferring distributions of time of infection for each individual from their known  
190 exposure dates. In particular, the methods of [8] assume that the infection time

191 is uniformly distributed across exposure dates and compares the inferred infection  
192 time to a known symptom-onset time to calculate the incubation period for each  
193 individual. Even if this method can accurately estimate the infection time, and  
194 therefore the incubation period, of each individual, dynamical biases can still affect  
195 this sort of cohort-based estimation of incubation period.

196 More specifically, incubation periods (and other epidemiological delays) can be  
197 measured in two ways: forward and backward [3]. Forward incubation periods are  
198 measured from a cohort of individuals who were infected at the same time. We expect  
199 the forward incubation-period distribution  $f_I(\tau)$  to remain relatively constant over  
200 the course of an epidemic of one given variant, although biases can arise in *observing*  
201 incubation periods, based on public or medical awareness of the disease. Backward  
202 incubation periods are measured from a cohort of individuals who developed symp-  
203 toms at the same time. The backward incubation-period distribution is sensitive to  
204 epidemic dynamics: the difference between the forward and backward distribution  
205 arises because forward incubation periods look forward from the reference point to-  
206 wards symptom development, which is an individual-level process, while backward  
207 incubation periods look backwards towards an infection event, which requires an  
208 interaction with an infectious individual.

209 In particular, when incidence of infection is growing exponentially, we are more  
210 likely to observe backward incubation periods that are shorter than the corresponding  
211 forward incubation periods because there will be relatively more individuals who were  
212 infected recently. Assuming that incidence of infection is changing exponentially at a  
213 constant rate  $r$  across the study period, the backward incubation-period distribution  
214  $b_I(\tau)$  corresponds to:

$$b_I(\tau) = \frac{\exp(-r\tau)f_I(\tau)}{\int_0^\infty \exp(-rx)f_I(x) dx}, \quad (1)$$

215 where the denominator is a normalization constant so that  $b_I(\tau)$  integrates to 1.  
216 Therefore, the backward incubation-period distribution  $b_I(\tau)$  gives a biased estimate  
217 of the corresponding forward distribution  $f_I(\tau)$ . The method of [8] starts from ob-  
218 served symptom onsets, and estimates the backward incubation-period distribution.

219 Assuming a constant growth rate  $r$ , the corresponding forward incubation-period  
220 distributions can be calculated by inverting Eq. (1), taking into account that  $f_I$  is a  
221 probability distribution and therefore needs to be normalised to integrate to 1:

$$f_I(\tau) = \frac{\exp(r\tau)b_I(\tau)}{\int_0^\infty \exp(rx)b_I(x) dx}. \quad (2)$$

222 Since incubation-period data are not provided, we are not able to fit Eq. (2) directly;  
223 instead we take the backward incubation-period distributions  $b_I(x)$  estimated by [4],  
224 which was originally assumed to follow a Weibull distribution, and apply Eq. (2). In  
225 particular, [4] estimated the scale and shape parameters of the Weibull distribution  
226 to be 4.93 (95% CI: 4.51–5.37) and 1.83 (95% CI: 1.59–2.08), respectively, for the  
227 Delta cases, and 3.60 (95% CI: 3.23–3.98) and 1.50 ((95% CI: 1.32–1.70), respectively,  
228 for Omicron cases.

229 We also model the backward incubation-period distribution  $b_I(\tau)$  using a Weibull  
230 distribution based on the assumptions of [4]. To account for uncertainties in the orig-  
231 inal parameter estimates, we rely on a sampling scheme, similar to the one we used  
232 for the growth rate analysis (in Section 2.2). First, we approximate the previously  
233 inferred posterior distributions of the shape and scale parameters of the Weibull dis-  
234 tribution using a lognormal distribution—we parameterize the lognormal distribution  
235 such that (i) its median matches the median of the posterior distributions and (ii) the  
236 probability that a random variable following the specified lognormal distribution falls  
237 between the lower and upper credible limits is 95% [9]. We draw 1000 samples of the  
238 shape and scale parameters (for the backward distribution  $b_I(\tau)$ ) from the specified  
239 lognormal distributions and estimate the corresponding forward distribution using  
240 Eq. (2). We take 95% equi-tailed quantiles to obtain 95% confidence intervals. We  
241 repeat the analysis across plausible ranges of  $r$  for the Delta and Omicron variants  
242 separately (discussed later).

## 243 2.4 Estimating forward generation-interval distributions from 244 forward serial-interval distributions

245 Dynamical biases in the serial-interval distributions are more complex because the se-  
246 rial interval depends on the incubation periods of the infector and the infectee as well  
247 as the generation interval between them (Fig. 1). For example, [4] measured the for-  
248 ward serial-interval distributions from cohorts of infectors who developed symptoms  
249 during the same week. In this case, the forward serial interval  $\tau_s$  can be expressed  
250 in the form [3]:

$$\tau_s = -\tau_{i,1} + \tau_{g,\text{symp}} + \tau_{i,2}, \quad (3)$$

251 where  $\tau_{i,1}$  represents the backward incubation period of the infector (because all  
252 infectors developed symptoms at the same time), and  $\tau_{i,2}$ , represents the forward  
253 incubation period of the infectee. Here,  $\tau_{g,\text{symp}}$  represents the generation interval  
254 between the infector and the infectee; we use the subscript *symp* to indicate that  
255 these generation intervals are measured from infectors who developed symptoms at  
256 the same time.

The generation-interval distribution for a symptom-based cohort ( $\tau_{g,\text{symp}}$  in Eq. (3))  
is biased (compared to the generation-interval distribution for an infection-based co-  
hort) because infectors who developed symptoms at the same time will have shorter  
incubation periods (when the epidemic is growing) and are therefore likely to transmit  
earlier (Fig. 1A). This generation-interval distribution for a symptom-based cohort  
depends on the backward incubation-period distribution:

$$f_{G,\text{symptom}}(\tau) = \int_0^\infty f_{G|I}(\tau|x)b_I(x) dx, \quad (4)$$

where  $f_{G|I}(\tau|x)$  represents the forward generation-interval distribution conditional  
on a known value of the incubation period,  $x$ , and  $b_I(x)$  represents the backward




Figure 1: Schematic diagrams of serial and generation intervals from symptom- and infection-based infector cohorts. (A) Forward serial intervals are measured from the cohort of infectors who develop symptoms at the same time. In this case, infectors will have shorter incubation periods than their infectees on average; the corresponding generation intervals will be also short because infectors with short incubation periods will transmit earlier. (B) Generation intervals for the cohort of infectors who are infected at the same time are not biased by dynamical effects on incubation periods.



incubation-period distribution. Instead, the forward generation-interval distribution measured from a cohort of individuals who were infected at the time is expected to provide reliable estimates of the distribution across individuals (because their incubation-period distribution is expected to remain constant over time, Fig. 1B):

$$f_{G,\text{inf}}(\tau) = \int_0^\infty f_{G|I}(\tau|x)f_I(x) dx. \quad (5)$$

257 Previous analyses of serial-interval distributions typically assumed that the incuba-  
258 tion periods and generation intervals are independent [10]; in this case, the generation-  
259 interval distribution for the symptom-based and infection-based cohorts are identical.

260 In summary, when an epidemic is growing exponentially, there are two opposing  
261 effects affecting the relationship between the mean forward serial and generation in-  
262 terval. First, infectors who developed symptoms at the same time are more likely  
263 to have shorter (backward) incubation periods than the corresponding forward in-  
264 cubation periods of their infectees on average,  $\mathbb{E}[\tau_{i,1}] < \mathbb{E}[\tau_{i,2}]$ , causing the mean  
265 forward serial interval to be longer than the mean symptom-based generation inter-  
266 val ( $\mathbb{E}[\tau_s] > \mathbb{E}[\tau_{g,\text{symp}}]$ ). Second, the mean symptom-based generation interval will  
267 be shorter than the mean infection-based generation interval:  $E[\tau_{g,\text{inf}}] > \mathbb{E}[\tau_{g,\text{symp}}]$   
268 due to correlations between incubation periods and generation intervals. Therefore,  
269 the difference between the mean forward serial interval and the mean infection-based  
270 generation interval is difficult to predict in general; in most cases, however, we expect  
271 the former effect to dominate, causing the mean forward serial interval to be longer  
272 than the mean infection-based generation interval:  $\mathbb{E}[\tau_s] > E[\tau_{g,\text{inf}}]$  [3]. Earlier work  
273 on serial-interval distributions neglected dynamical biases in the incubation periods  
274 of the infectors [11, 12], which allowed the authors to conclude that the mean gener-  
275 ation and serial intervals are identical. For simplicity, we will use the term “forward  
276 generation-interval” to refer to the infection-based generation-interval distribution  
277 (measured from a cohort of infectors who were infected at the same infection time,  
278 Fig. 1B), and drop the subscript inf.

279 Assuming that the incidence of infection will continue to change exponentially at  
280 a constant rate  $r$ , the forward serial-interval distribution for a cohort of infectors who  
281 developed symptoms at the same time  $t$  is expected to remain unchanged through  
282 time [3]. Then, we can focus on the forward serial-interval distribution at  $t = 0$ ,  
283 which in turn allows us to reparameterize the incubation-period and generation-  
284 interval distributions in terms of the infection time of the infector  $\alpha_1 < 0$  and of  
285 the infectee  $\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$ . Under this parameterization, for a given length of a serial  
286 interval  $\tau$ , we can rewrite the incubation period of the infector as  $-\alpha_1$ ; the generation  
287 interval as  $\alpha_2 - \alpha_1$ ; and the incubation period of the infectee as  $\tau - \alpha_2$ . Then, the  
288 forward serial-interval distribution  $f_S(\tau)$  for a cohort of infectors who developed  
289 symptoms at time  $t = 0$  can be expressed in terms of three distributions (Eq. (3)):  
290 the backward incubation-period distribution of the infector  $b_I(-\alpha_1)$  (taken from  
291 Eq. (1)), the forward generation-interval distribution conditional on a known value  
292 of the incubation period  $x$ ,  $f_{G|I}(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 | -\alpha_1)$ , and the forward incubation-period

293 distribution of the infectee  $f_I(\tau - \alpha_2)$ . Integrating across infection time of the infector  
294  $\alpha_1 < 0$  and of the infectee  $\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$  and rewriting the backward incubation-period  
295 distribution  $b_I(-\alpha_1)$  in terms of the forward distribution, we obtain [3]:

$$f_S(\tau) = \frac{1}{\phi} \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{\alpha_1}^{\tau} \exp(r\alpha_1) f_{G|I}(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 | -\alpha_1) f_I(-\alpha_1) f_I(\tau - \alpha_2) d\alpha_2 d\alpha_1, \quad (6)$$

296 where  $\phi$  is a normalization constant chosen so that  $\int f_S(x) dx = 1$ . As discussed  
297 earlier, this method assumes that the incidence is changing exponentially at a con-  
298 stant rate  $r$  across the study period. As we show in Results, the exponential growth  
299 rate changes over the study period, including weeks 50 and 51 (13–26 December  
300 2021); for illustrative purposes, we choose representative values of  $r$  that for Delta  
301 and Omicron during this period and also explore across plausible ranges of  $r$  (see  
302 below).

303 While the derivation of the forward serial-interval distribution Eq. (6) may be  
304 complex, its implementation is simple. The main difference between our model and  
305 previous models that neglect dynamical effects [10, 13, 14, 15] is the exponential  
306 growth term  $\exp(r\alpha_1)$  and the normalization term  $\phi$ —it is relatively straightforward  
307 to include these terms in existing models of serial intervals. [16, 17] also included this  
308 term in their analyses of serial-interval data, but only accounted for the epidemic  
309 growth effect (and not the decay effect).

310 We model the forward incubation-period  $f_I(\tau)$  and generation-interval  $f_G(\tau)$  dis-  
311 tributions using a bivariate lognormal distribution. The joint distribution is pa-  
312 rameterized by log-scale means,  $\mu_I$  and  $\mu_G$ , log-scale variances,  $\sigma_I^2$  and  $\sigma_G^2$ , and  
313 the log-scale correlation coefficient  $\rho$ . Thus, the forward generation-interval dis-  
314 tribution conditional on the incubation period  $f_{G|I}(\tau|\tau_{i,1})$  has a log-scale mean of  
315  $\mu_G + \sigma_G\rho(\log(\tau_{i,1}) - \mu_I)/\sigma_I$  and a log-scale variance of  $\sigma_G^2(1 - \rho^2)$ . For a given value  
316 of  $r$ , we first estimate the forward incubation-period distribution from the backward  
317 distribution, previously estimated by [4], using Eq. (2). We then approximate the  
318 forward incubation-period distribution with a lognormal distribution by matching  
319 the mean and standard deviation (also known as the method of moments); we note  
320 that we are unable to directly fit a lognormal distribution to the forward incubation-  
321 period distribution because we are relying on existing estimates rather than raw  
322 data. Using this incubation-period distribution, we fit Eq. (6) to the observed serial-  
323 interval data by minimizing the negative log-likelihood. We then calculate the mean  
324 forward generation interval using Eq. (5). The 95% confidence intervals are calcu-  
325 lated by taking the estimated variance-covariance matrix for our mean and standard  
326 deviation parameters and calculating the corresponding variance-covariance for the  
327 overall mean using Taylor expansion—this method is also known as the Delta method  
328 [18]. We assume  $\rho = 0.75$  throughout based on [19]—since we do not have individual-  
329 level data on infection and symptom onset times, we expect this parameter to be  
330 unidentifiable in practice. In Supplementary Material, we explore how assumptions  
331 about  $\rho$  affect inferences of the generation-interval distribution.

## 332 2.5 Estimating instantaneous reproduction numbers

333 We use our estimates of the generation-interval distributions to infer instantaneous  
334 reproduction numbers  $\mathcal{R}(t)$  of the Delta and Omicron variant, as well as the ratio  
335 between the two reproduction numbers. Estimating the instantaneous reproduction  
336 number—defined as the average number of secondary infections that a primary case  
337 will generate if epidemiological conditions remain constant [20]—requires the intrinsic  
338 generation-interval distribution  $g(\tau)$ :

$$\mathcal{R}(t) = \frac{i(t)}{\int_0^\infty i(t-x)g(x) dx}, \quad (7)$$

339 where  $i(t)$  represents incidence of infection. Here, we approximate the intrinsic  
340 generation-interval distribution with the forward generation-interval that we esti-  
341 mate for weeks 50 and 51 of 2021 (13–26 December)—when the epidemic is growing  
342 or decaying exponentially, we expect the forward generation-interval to be a good  
343 proxy for the intrinsic generation-interval distribution [21, 22]. Incidence of infection  
344 is approximated by shifting the smoothed case trajectories by one week to account  
345 for reporting delays. This method of approximating incidence of infection assumes  
346 a fixed delay between infection and case reporting; in practice, deconvolution is re-  
347 quired to accurately estimate the incidence of infection [23]. Case reports are also  
348 sensitive to changes in testing behavior, and therefore our estimates of  $\mathcal{R}(t)$  must be  
349 interpreted with care. Confidence intervals are calculated by sampling parameters of  
350 the smoothed case trajectories as well as the generation-interval distributions from  
351 multivariate normal distributions and repeating the analysis 1000 times.

## 352 3 Results

353 Fig. 2 summarizes the epidemiological context in the Netherlands during the study  
354 period. The first known Omicron case in the Netherlands was sampled on 19 Novem-  
355 ber 2021 [4], during a period when COVID-19 incidence was decreasing (Fig. 2A). As  
356 the Omicron variant continued to spread and increase in proportion (Fig. 2B), the  
357 number of COVID-19 cases started to increase (Fig. 2A). Multiplying the proportion  
358 of each variant with the number of reported COVID-19 cases further allows us to esti-  
359 mate the epidemiological dynamics of each (Fig. 2C). The number of COVID-19 cases  
360 infected with the Delta variant continued to decrease throughout the study period  
361 with time-varying growth rates decreasing from  $r \approx -0.01/\text{day}$  to  $r \approx -0.09/\text{day}$  by  
362 the week of January 16, 2022, and increasing back up to  $r \approx -0.04/\text{day}$  by the end of  
363 January, 2022 (Fig. 2D). The number of COVID-19 cases infected with the Omicron  
364 variant increased rapidly but decelerated over time with time-varying growth rates  
365 decreasing from  $r = 0.18/\text{day}$  on the week of December 19, 2021, to  $r = 0.04/\text{day}$   
366 by the end of January, 2022. These changes in growth rates coincide with the in-  
367 troduction of lockdown on 19 December 2021 [24] and its relaxation beginning 15  
368 January 2022 [25, 26]. We note that the growth-rate difference between the Delta

369 and Omicron variants decreased over time. Hereafter, we use  $r = -0.05/\text{day}$  for the  
370 Delta variant and  $r = 0.15/\text{day}$  for the Omicron variant as representative growth  
371 rates—these growth rates correspond to the mean growth rates between 1 December  
372 2021 and 2 January 2022, during which the incubation-period data were collected.  
373 We then evaluate the growth-rate effects across  $r = -0.1/\text{day}$ – $0.0/\text{day}$  for the Delta  
374 variant and  $r = 0.1/\text{day}$ – $0.2/\text{day}$  for the Omicron variant as a sensitivity analysis.

375 Previous analysis of a cohort of individuals who developed symptoms between 1  
376 December 2021 and 2 January 2022 found longer mean (backward) incubation period  
377 for the Delta variant than for the Omicron variant [4] (Fig. 3A). However, when we  
378 account for growth-rate differences and re-estimate the forward incubation periods,  
379 we find that both variants have similar incubation-period distributions with a mean  
380 of 4.1 days (95% CI: 3.8–4.4 days) for the Delta variant and 4.2 days (95% CI: 3.6–  
381 4.9 days) for the Omicron variant (Fig. 3B). In this case, the difference between the  
382 mean backward and forward incubation periods correspond to  $-22\%$  and  $7\%$  bias  
383 for the Omicron and Delta variants, respectively. Although the exact estimate of  
384 the mean forward incubation periods of both variants are sensitive to the assumed  
385 growth/decay rates, we find similar means across a plausible ranges of growth rates  
386 (Fig. 3C–D). For example, the mean forward incubation period of the Delta variant  
387 changes from 3.8 days (95% CI: 3.5–4.1 days) to 4.4 days (95% CI: 4.0–4.8 days)  
388 as we change the assumed values of  $r$  from  $-0.1/\text{days}$  to  $0.0/\text{days}$  (Fig. 3C), while  
389 the mean forward incubation period of the Omicron variant changes from 3.8 days  
390 (95% CI: 3.4–4.4 days) to 4.5 days (95% CI: 3.9–5.5 days) as we change the assumed  
391 values of  $r$  from  $0.1/\text{days}$  to  $0.2/\text{days}$  (Fig. 3D). Wider confidence intervals for the  
392 Omicron variant are driven by greater uncertainties from the dynamical correction,  
393 which is larger for Omicron because of higher absolute growth rates.

394 We can use these estimates of the forward incubation-period distributions to esti-  
395 mate the forward generation-interval distributions. For illustrative purposes, we first  
396 focus on aggregated serial intervals from infectors who developed symptoms dur-  
397 ing week 50–51 (13–26 December, 2021). For within-household transmission pairs  
398 (Fig. 4A), the Omicron variant has shorter mean serial interval (3.1 days; 95% CI:  
399 2.9–3.3 days) than that of the Delta variant (3.7 days; 95% CI: 3.5–3.8 days). When  
400 we account for growth-rate differences (assuming  $r = -0.05/\text{day}$  and  $r = 0.15/\text{day}$   
401 for the Delta and Omicron variants, respectively), the estimated mean forward gen-  
402 eration interval exhibits a slightly larger difference (Fig. 4B): 3.0 days (95% CI:  
403 2.7–3.2 days) for the Omicron variant and 3.8 days (95% CI: 3.7–4.0 days) for the  
404 Delta variant. Our estimate of this difference in these mean generation intervals is  
405 robust across plausible ranges of assumptions about the growth rates of the vari-  
406 ants (Fig. 4C–D). Assuming lower values of the correlation  $\rho$  between the incubation  
407 period and generation intervals leads to larger differences in the mean generation  
408 intervals of the Delta and Omicron variants (Supplementary Figure S1). In partic-  
409 ular, the generation-interval estimates of the Omicron variant are more sensitive to  
410 the assumed values of  $\rho$  due to faster changes in incidence of infection—for example,  
411 changing  $\rho$  from 0.85 to 0.5 changes the mean generation-interval estimates for the




Figure 2: **Epidemic dynamics of the Delta and Omicron variants in the Netherlands between November 2021 and January 2022.** (A) Daily numbers of reported COVID-19 cases in the Netherlands (points). The solid line represents the 7-day moving average. Data are publicly available at <https://data.rivm.nl/covid-19/>. (B) Proportion of SARS-CoV-2 variants detected from the Netherlands. Data are publicly available at <https://www.rivm.nl/coronavirus-covid-19/virus/varianten>. (C) Weekly numbers of COVID-19 cases infected with the Delta (black points) and Omicron (orange triangles) variants are estimated by multiplying the weekly numbers of cases (A) with the proportion of each variant (B). Solid lines and shaded areas represent fitted lines and corresponding 95% confidence intervals using generalized additive model. (D) Estimated growth rates of the Delta (black) and Omicron variants (orange) and their growth-rate differences (purple). Lines and shaded areas represent medians and corresponding 95% confidence intervals. Growth rates are estimated by taking the derivative of the generalized additive model estimates of logged number of cases.

412 Omicron variant from 3.1 days (95% CI: 2.8–3.3 days) to 2.7 days (95% CI: 2.5–2.9  
 413 days). We explore a wide range of  $\rho$  to consider the possibility that our original





Figure 3: **Observed and corrected differences in incubation-period distributions of Delta and Omicron variants.** (A) Posterior median estimates of the observed (backward) incubation periods of the Delta (black) and Omicron (orange) variants by [4]. (B) Forward incubation-period distributions assuming  $r = -0.05/\text{day}$  and  $r = 0.15/\text{day}$  for the Delta (black) and Omicron (orange) variants, respectively. (C–D) Corrected estimates of the mean forward incubation-period for different assumptions about the growth rates of the Delta (C) and Omicron variants (D). Lines represent median estimates. Shaded regions represent the corresponding 95% confidence intervals.

414 assumption ( $\rho = 0.75$ ) may under or over-estimate the true  $\rho$ .

415 Similar pictures arise for between-household transmission pairs, but the differ-  
 416 ences in mean serial intervals are unclear (Fig. 4E): 3.0 days (95% CI: 2.7–3.3 days)  
 417 for the Omicron variant and 3.3 days (95% CI: 3.0 days–3.6 days) for the Delta  
 418 variant. Consistent with the original study, which also reported shorter mean serial  
 419 intervals for between-household pairs [4], we estimate shorter mean generation in-  
 420 tervals for between-household Delta pairs. While the difference in mean generation  
 421 intervals is larger, there is greater uncertainty in their mean estimates (Fig. 4F): 2.9  
 422 days (95% CI: 2.5–3.3 days) for the Omicron variant and 3.5 days (95% CI: 3.2–3.8  
 423 days) for the Delta variant. Once again, these patterns are robust across plausible

424 ranges of assumptions about the growth rates of the Delta and Omicron variants  
 425 (Fig. 4G–H).

426 In Supplementary Figure S2, we present generation-interval estimates that are  
 427 further stratified by the week of infectors' symptom onset (13–19 December 2021  
 428 and 20–26 December 2021). While we generally estimate shorter mean generation  
 429 intervals for the Omicron variant, but the differences are unclear across all strata,  
 430 except for within-household transmission pairs during week 50 (13–19 December  
 431 2021). We also estimate a reduction in the mean forward generation intervals from  
 432 week 50 (13–19 December 2021) to week 51 (20–26 December 2021), especially for  
 433 the Delta variant; this decrease in the mean generation interval is likely associated  
 434 with the lockdown.



**Figure 4: Estimated forward generation-interval distributions of Delta and Omicron variants.** (A, E) Observed and fitted forward serial-interval distributions for within-household (A) and between-household (E) transmission pairs in the Netherlands for the Delta (black) and Omicron (orange) variants [4]. Serial intervals are calculated for infectors who developed symptoms on weeks 50 and 51 (13–26 December, 2021). Points represent the observed data. Lines represent the fitted lines assuming  $r = -0.05/\text{day}$  for the Delta variant and  $r = 0.15/\text{day}$  for the Omicron variant. (B, F) Estimated forward generation-interval distributions for within-household (B) and between-household (F) transmission pairs in the Netherlands. (C, D, G, H) Sensitivity of the mean forward generation-interval estimates to assumed growth rates of the Delta (C, G) and Omicron variants (G, H) for within-household (C, D) and between-household (G, H) transmission pairs. Lines represent maximum likelihood estimates. Shaded regions represent the corresponding 95% confidence intervals.

435 Accounting for differences in the generation-interval distributions, we estimate

436 that the instantaneous reproduction number of the Omicron variant decreased from  
437 1.73 (95% CI: 1.59–1.89) to 1.14 (95% CI: 1.00–1.32) between December 12, 2021,  
438 and January 23, 2022 (Fig. 5A). On the other hand, the instantaneous reproduc-  
439 tion number of the Delta variant decreased from 0.90 (95% CI: 0.83–0.97) to 0.69  
440 (95% CI: 0.65–0.75) between December 5, 2021, and January 9, 2022, and increased  
441 back up to 0.83 (95% CI: 0.73–0.94) by January 23, 2022 (Fig. 5A). We estimate  
442 the reproduction advantage (i.e., the ratio between the instantaneous reproduction  
443 numbers of the Omicron and Delta variants) stayed roughly constant at around 2.10  
444 (95% CI: 1.90–2.33) between December 12–26, 2021, and slowly decreased to 1.38  
445 (95% CI: 1.15–1.65). However, if we neglect differences in the generation-interval  
446 distributions and solely rely on the generation-interval-distribution estimate for the  
447 Delta variant, we over-estimate the reproduction number of the Omicron variant  
448 and therefore the reproduction advantage (Fig. 5B). In this case, the reproduction  
449 advantage decreases from 2.38 (95% CI: 2.13–2.67) to 1.43 (95% CI: 1.17–1.75), cor-  
450 responding to roughly 4–13% bias. Using between-household generation intervals  
451 also gives similar conclusions about changes and biases in the reproduction number  
452 estimates (Supplementary Figure S3).

453 In both cases, the decrease in the reproduction advantage coincides with the  
454 decrease in the reproduction number of the Omicron variant, implying that epidemi-  
455 ological changes driving the dynamic had larger effects on the transmission of the  
456 Omicron variant than on the transmission of Delta variant; a larger reduction in  
457 the reproduction number of the Omicron variant also caused its growth rate to de-  
458 crease faster, causing changes in the observed growth-rate difference shown earlier  
459 (Fig. 2D).

## 460 4 Discussion

461 We compare estimates of the forward incubation-period and generation-interval dis-  
462 tributions of the Delta and Omicron variants from the Netherlands in late 2021 and  
463 early 2022. The original analysis detailing the data set previously reported a shorter  
464 mean incubation period and serial interval for the Omicron variant [4]. Accounting  
465 for differences in epidemic growth rates, however, we find similar incubation-period  
466 distributions for both variants but a shorter (by 0.3–0.8 days) mean generation inter-  
467 val for the Omicron variant relative to that of the Delta variant. Finally, we estimate  
468 that the transmission advantage of the Omicron variant decreased from 2.1-fold to  
469 1.4-fold between early December and late January. Improving generation-interval  
470 estimates by taking dynamical effects into account may improve understanding of  
471 epidemic dynamics and control measures.

472 The generation-interval distribution describes changes in the individual-level trans-  
473 mission dynamics over the course of infection and therefore provides crucial infor-  
474 mation for epidemic control. A few studies have estimated the generation-interval  
475 distributions of SARS-CoV-2 infections from serial-interval data, but most of them






Figure 5: **Estimated instantaneous reproduction number advantages of the Omicron variant.** (A) Estimated instantaneous reproduction numbers and their ratios over time while accounting for differences in the generation-interval distributions. (B) Estimated instantaneous reproduction numbers and their ratios over time while assuming identical generation-interval distributions. The instantaneous reproduction number of each variant is estimated using the renewal equation by shifting the smoothed case curves by one week (Fig. 2C). The intrinsic generation-interval distribution is approximated by the maximum likelihood estimates of the forward generation-interval distributions for within-household transmission pairs based on  $r = -0.05$  for the Delta variant (black) and  $r = 0.15$  for the Omicron variant (orange). Purple lines represent the ratio between the effective reproduction numbers of the Delta and Omicron variants. Lines and shaded regions represent medians and corresponding 95% confidence intervals.

476 neglect the effects of epidemic growth rates [10, 13, 14, 15]—these practices can be  
477 largely attributed to historical work that concluded that serial and generation in-  
478 tervals have the same means based on the assumption that infectors and infectees  
479 have identical incubation-period distributions [11, 12, 27]. We build on newer work  
480 [3], which demonstrated theoretically that forward serial-interval distributions de-  
481 pend on epidemic growth rates, and further confirm that estimates of the forward  
482 generation-interval distributions are indeed sensitive to epidemic growth rates. These  
483 effects are also pertinent to epidemiological inferences of past events from a cohort of  
484 infected individuals who experienced a later event at the same time—this includes in-  
485 ferences of other delay distributions, such as incubation-period distributions, as well  
486 as viral load trajectories [28]. Our sensitivity analysis also shows that the assump-  
487 tions about the correlation between incubation periods and generation intervals can  
488 also have important effects on the estimates of the generation-interval distributions  
489 (Supplementary Figure S1).

490 This study presents a method for accounting for dynamical biases when in-  
491 ferring incubation-period distributions based on epidemic growth rates. Observed  
492 incubation-period distributions based on symptom-based cohorts are generally ex-

493 pected to be biased, and similar kinds of corrections will be necessary to accurately  
494 estimate the incubation-period distribution. We note that making these kinds of cor-  
495 rections will also depend on data availability, model complexity, and other epidemio-  
496 logical covariates affecting incubation periods, such as vaccine statuses. Accounting  
497 for different sources of biases is critical to accurately estimating incubation-period  
498 distributions (and other epidemiological distributions alike) but will necessarily in-  
499 crease uncertainties in the estimates. On the other hand, it is still possible to char-  
500 acterize the forward incubation-period distributions without making growth-rate-  
501 based corrections through a careful cohorting of individuals with similar infection  
502 times when detailed information about infection time is available—we were not able  
503 to explore this in our analysis because we relied on publicly available information,  
504 which do not contain individual-level information, such as exposure or symptom  
505 onset dates.

506 A few studies have suggested that the incubation period of the Omicron variant  
507 may be shorter than that of the Delta variant. The median estimates of the Omicron  
508 incubation period typically range between 3–4 days, consistent with earlier findings  
509 of [4]. However, these data were collected when the number of Omicron infections  
510 was growing rapidly [29, 30], suggesting that they may have been subject to similar  
511 biases. On the other hand, incubation-period estimates based on individuals who  
512 were exposed from the same event are likely more reliable (because they look forward  
513 in time): [31] estimated the median incubation period of the Omicron variant to be  
514 3 days among those who attended the same holiday party ( $n = 117$ ) on 26 November  
515 2021 in Norway. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that some of these  
516 attendees were infected prior to the party given that some individuals had COVID-  
517 like symptoms prior to the party with at least 96 of the attendees sharing offices;  
518 neglecting these factors can lead to underestimation of the mean incubation period.  
519 Systematic comparisons of data collection methods and epidemiological contexts are  
520 needed to properly assess the differences in incubation period distributions of the  
521 Delta and Omicron variants.

522 A few studies have estimated that the Omicron variant has shorter transmis-  
523 sion intervals than the Delta variant [2, 32, 30], but there has been a lack of direct  
524 generation-interval estimates. [33, 34] tried to estimate the generation-interval dis-  
525 tributions of the Omicron variant but they both relied on population-level epidemic  
526 dynamics (rather than individual-level transmission data). Although we estimate a  
527 shorter mean generation interval for the Omicron variant, we find the generation-  
528 interval distribution of the Omicron and Delta variants have similar modes (around  
529 2.5 days), implying that the realized transmissibility of the Omicron variant decays  
530 faster. We tentatively hypothesize that these differences may be primarily driven by  
531 the network effect [22, 15]: a higher reproduction number of the Omicron variant  
532 leads to faster susceptible depletion among close contacts, which in turn prevents  
533 long generation intervals from generating infections. Previous simulations showed  
534 that network effects can have considerable impact on realized generation intervals  
535 even during the initial exponential growth phase, when susceptible depletion is negli-

536 gible at the population level [22]. While the network effect is expected to be strongest  
537 among household contacts, it is also applicable to other forms of contact structures  
538 that involve repeated contacts between the same group of individuals (because only  
539 the first infectious contact results in infection). Shorter generation-interval estimates  
540 for between-household contacts may be attributable to behavioral effects: individuals  
541 who have symptoms or tested positive may be more likely to stay home, preventing  
542 long between-household transmission. Other factors, such as more stringent contact  
543 tracing measures against the Omicron variant in the Netherlands [4] faster within-  
544 host clearance of the Omicron variant [35], and viral kinetics of reinfection and  
545 breakthrough infections, also likely contributed to shortening of generation intervals.  
546 If shorter generation intervals of the Omicron variant represents an increased pro-  
547 portion of presymptomatic transmission, control measures that target symptomatic  
548 individuals can become less effective.

549 While our study indicates that the Omicron variant has a shorter mean real-  
550 ized generation interval than that of the Delta variant, it is still uncertain how  
551 infectiousness profiles differ intrinsically between Omicron and Delta. In particular,  
552 similarities in the incubation-period distributions of the Delta and Omicron variants  
553 suggest that the differences in their true infectiousness profile may be smaller than  
554 the estimated differences in their realized generation-interval distributions. In ad-  
555 dition, the “intrinsic” generation intervals of both Omicron and Delta variants are  
556 likely longer than what we estimate given existing levels of interventions, includ-  
557 ing vaccination, and pandemic awareness—estimating intrinsic (or “unmitigated”)   
558 generation-interval distributions of SARS-CoV-2 variants is expected to be a diffi-  
559 cult problem as it requires data from times when awareness levels were low [19].  
560 Nonetheless, estimates of realized generation-interval distributions describe current  
561 epidemic dynamics, implicitly accounting for intervention and behavioral effects, and  
562 can therefore be expected to improve estimates of effective reproduction numbers.

563 Our study also has important implications for estimating transmission advantages  
564 of new SARS-CoV-2 variants. In the example we consider, neglecting differences in  
565 the generation-interval distributions leads to  $\approx 10\%$  bias in the estimates of the  
566 reproduction advantage (i.e., the ratio between the reproduction numbers of the  
567 Omicron and Delta variants). More generally, the bias in inferring the reproduc-  
568 tion advantage of an emerging variant is expected to be sensitive to the assumed  
569 generation-interval distribution of the resident variant. For example, [36] estimated  
570 a much higher reproduction advantage of the Omicron variant ( $> 4$ -fold) compared  
571 to the Delta variant in South Africa but also assumed a longer mean generation in-  
572 terval for the Delta and Omicron variants (6.4 vs 5.2 days, respectively). With our  
573 generation-interval estimates, we estimate a 2.6-fold reproduction advantage for the  
574 Omicron variant assuming  $r = -0.06$  and  $r = 0.26$  for the Delta and Omicron vari-  
575 ants, respectively—these growth rates were chosen to match the 4-fold reproduction  
576 advantage with the previously assumed generation-interval distributions and esti-  
577 mated growth-rate differences of 0.32/day for the Gauteng province, South Africa  
578 [36].

579 We considered two ways of measuring transmission advantages: growth-rate dif-  
580 ferences and reproduction advantage. Characterizing new variants in terms of their  
581 reproduction advantage is useful because it is directly related to the amount of in-  
582 creased transmissibility and immune evasion [36]. On the other hand, the growth-  
583 rate difference is easier to estimate in real time, and is also more directly relevant to  
584 short-term dynamics. For example, when two strains have the same  $\mathcal{R} > 1$ , the one  
585 with shorter generation intervals will grow faster and become dominant as long as  
586  $\mathcal{R} > 1$ ; however, when  $\mathcal{R}$  is reduced below 1 (either due to intervention or susceptible  
587 depletion), the one with longer generation interval will grow faster. These transmis-  
588 sion advantages are captured by the growth-rate difference, but not by the ratio of  
589 reproduction numbers of two strains. Therefore, we suggest using growth-rate dif-  
590 ferences and reproduction advantage as complementary measures for understanding  
591 the dynamics of emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants.

592 There are several limitations to our analysis. First, we primarily rely on case data  
593 to understand epidemic patterns of the Delta and Omicron variants. In doing so,  
594 we implicitly assume that the delay between infection and reports is fixed. However,  
595 changes in case trajectories are sensitive to testing patterns and therefore may not  
596 accurately reflect patterns of infections. While this limitation does not affect our  
597 generation-interval estimates, our inferences of the transmission advantages of the  
598 Omicron variant should be interpreted with care.

599 We assume a constant growth rate for each variant throughout our analysis. Dur-  
600 ing the study period, growth rates of both the Delta and Omicron variants changed  
601 slowly, and therefore our constant-growth-rate assumption provides a reasonable ap-  
602 proximation for their dynamics across two weeks. However, this assumption might  
603 be problematic when growth rates are changing rapidly (e.g., due to an introduction  
604 of stringent control measures) or if the sampling window is too wide. Extending  
605 our framework to account for time-varying growth rates is relatively simple when in-  
606 ferring the forward incubation-period distribution from the corresponding backward  
607 distribution—we can simply replace  $r$  with  $r(t)$  in Eq. (2) because the backward  
608 incubation-period distribution is a weighted average of the forward incubation-period  
609 distributions and the number of individuals in each cohort (i.e., individuals who were  
610 infected at the same time). However, such extensions are more complicated for link-  
611 ing generation- and serial-interval distributions because the forward serial-interval  
612 distribution also depends on the cohort reproduction number—for example, if a cer-  
613 tain cohort of infectors had higher reproduction number (e.g., because they were  
614 infected before control measures were observed), we are more likely to observe trans-  
615 mission from this cohort (see [3] for more details). Assuming exponential growth  
616 allows us to avoid this complexity. Extending our framework to account for time-  
617 varying growth rates can provide more accurate tools for inferring epidemiological  
618 delay distributions.

619 We do not account for individual-level heterogeneity, such as age, vaccination  
620 status, or previous exposure history. In general, epidemic growth rates may dif-  
621 fer between infection groups (e.g., the incidence of infection caused by any vari-

622 ant is expected to grow faster among immunologically naive individuals), and these  
623 growth-rate differences can affect estimates of epidemiological delay distributions,  
624 including the incubation-period and generation-interval distributions. We are not  
625 able to perform stratified analyses because individual-level information was not pub-  
626 licly available. Therefore, while we estimate unclear differences in incubation-period  
627 distributions between Delta and Omicron infections, controlling for other covariates,  
628 such as age and immune history, may help better characterize differences in Delta  
629 and Omicron infections.

630 Finally, there are several sources of biases in serial-interval data that we did  
631 not consider. For example, the direction of transmission is difficult to establish for  
632 SARS-CoV-2 due to pre-symptomatic transmission. Other sources of information,  
633 such as exposure history and positive test results, can help resolve uncertainties but  
634 are imperfect. Serial-interval data also depend on the ability of infected individuals  
635 to accurately recall when their symptoms started. Future studies may explore how  
636 these biases affect the inference of generation intervals from serial intervals. While  
637 comparisons of incubation-period and serial-interval distributions can shed insight  
638 on pathogen dynamics, both distributions typically do not account for the dynamics  
639 of asymptomatic infections; neglecting these differences can further bias estimates of  
640 transmissibility of a pathogen [37].

641 Monitoring changes in key epidemiological parameters is critical to understand-  
642 ing the evolution of SARS-CoV-2 and predicting its future dynamics [38]. Our study  
643 synthesizes a previously developed theoretical framework on serial- and generation-  
644 interval distributions and presents methodological advances in monitoring epidemi-  
645 ological parameters. Similar efforts will be critical to improve estimates of the infec-  
646 tiousness profiles of future SARS-CoV-2 variants, especially among asymptotically  
647 infected individuals. These conclusions are relevant for other emerging and endemic  
648 pathogens in general.

## 649 **Data availability**

650 All data and code are stored in a publicly available GitHub repository (<https://github.com/parksw3/omicron-generation>).  
651

## 652 **Acknowledgements**

653 We thank Ron Milo for providing helpful comments on the manuscript. JD was  
654 supported by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the Natural Sciences and  
655 Engineering Research Council of Canada, and the Michael G. DeGroot Institute  
656 for Infectious Disease Research. JSW acknowledges support from the Army Re-  
657 search Office W911NF1910384 and the Ile de France region via the Chaires Blaise  
658 Pascal program. JW and JB has received funding from European Union’s Horizon  
659 2020 research and innovation programme—project EpiPose, Epidemic intelligence

660 to Minimize COVID-19's Public Health, Societal and Economical Impact (grant  
661 agreement number 101003688). SF was supported by the Wellcome Trust (grant  
662 no. 210758/Z/18/Z). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and  
663 analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. The findings and  
664 conclusions in this study are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent  
665 the official position of the funding agencies, the National Institutes of Health, or the  
666 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

## 667 Supplementary Materials





Figure S1: **Sensitivity of the estimates of the mean generation interval to the assumed values of the correlation coefficient of the lognormal distribution.** Lines and shaded regions represent maximum likelihood estimates and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals for the Delta (black, solid lines) and Omicron variants (orange, dashed lines). For illustrative purposes we use within-household serial-interval data from the cohort of infectors who developed symptoms during weeks 50 (13–19 December) and 51 (20–26 December) of 2021.



**Figure S2: Estimated mean forward generation intervals of Delta and Omicron variants across different stratifications.** Sensitivity of the mean forward generation-interval estimates to assumed growth rates of the Delta and Omicron variants stratified by the types of transmission (within- vs between-household transmission) and the week of infectors' symptom onset (week 50, 13–19 December 2021, vs week 51, 20–26 December 2021,). Lines represent maximum likelihood estimates. Shaded regions represent the corresponding 95% confidence intervals.






Figure S3: **Estimated time-varying reproduction number advantages of the Omicron variant using between-household generation-interval distributions.** (A) Estimated instantaneous reproduction numbers and their ratios over time while accounting for differences in the generation-interval distributions. (B) Estimated instantaneous reproduction numbers and their ratios over time while assuming identical generation-interval distributions. The instantaneous reproduction number of each variant is estimated using the renewal equation by shifting the smoothed case curves by one week (Fig. 2C). The intrinsic generation-interval distribution is approximated by the maximum likelihood estimates of the forward generation-interval distributions for between-household transmission pairs based on  $r = -0.05$  for the Delta variant (black) and  $r = 0.15$  for the Omicron variant (orange). Purple lines represent the ratio between the effective reproduction numbers of the Delta and Omicron variants. Lines and shaded regions represent medians and corresponding 95% confidence intervals.

## 668 References

- 669 [1] Sang Woo Park, Benjamin M Bolker, Sebastian Funk, C Jessica E Metcalf,  
670 Joshua S Weitz, Bryan T Grenfell, and Jonathan Dushoff. Roles of generation-  
671 interval distributions in shaping relative epidemic strength, speed, and control  
672 of new SARS-CoV-2 variants. *medRxiv*, 2021.
- 673 [2] Sam Abbott, Katharine Sherratt, Moritz Gerstung, and Sebastian Funk. Esti-  
674 mation of the test to test distribution as a proxy for generation interval distri-  
675 bution for the Omicron variant in England. *medRxiv*, 2022.
- 676 [3] Sang Woo Park, Kaiyuan Sun, David Champredon, Michael Li, Benjamin M  
677 Bolker, David JD Earn, Joshua S Weitz, Bryan T Grenfell, and Jonathan  
678 Dushoff. Forward-looking serial intervals correctly link epidemic growth to re-  
679 production numbers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(2),  
680 2021.
- 681 [4] Jantien A Backer, Dirk Eggink, Stijn P Andeweg, Irene K Veldhuijzen, Noortje  
682 van Maarseveen, Klaas Vermaas, Boris Vlaemynck, Raf Schepers, Susan van den  
683 Hof, Chantal BEM Reusken, and Jacco Wallinga. Shorter serial intervals in  
684 SARS-CoV-2 cases with Omicron BA.1 variant compared with Delta variant,  
685 the Netherlands, 13 to 26 December 2021. *Eurosurveillance*, 27(6):2200042,  
686 2022.
- 687 [5] Simon N Wood. mgcv: GAMs and generalized ridge regression for R. *R News*,  
688 1(2):20–25, 2001.
- 689 [6] Jay M Ver Hoef and Peter L Boveng. Quasi-poisson vs. negative binomial re-  
690 gression: how should we model overdispersed count data? *Ecology*, 88(11):2766–  
691 2772, 2007.
- 692 [7] Gavin Simpson. Simultaneous intervals for derivatives of smooths  
693 revisited. 2017. [https://fromthebottomoftheheap.net/2017/03/21/  
694 simultaneous-intervals-for-derivatives-of-smooths/](https://fromthebottomoftheheap.net/2017/03/21/simultaneous-intervals-for-derivatives-of-smooths/).
- 695 [8] Jantien A Backer, Don Klinkenberg, and Jacco Wallinga. Incubation period of  
696 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) infections among travellers from Wuhan,  
697 China, 20–28 January 2020. *Eurosurveillance*, 25(5):2000062, 2020.
- 698 [9] Sang Woo Park, Benjamin M Bolker, David Champredon, David JD Earn,  
699 Michael Li, Joshua S Weitz, Bryan T Grenfell, and Jonathan Dushoff. Rec-  
700 onciling early-outbreak estimates of the basic reproductive number and its un-  
701 certainty: framework and applications to the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2)  
702 outbreak. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 17(168):20200144, 2020.

- 703 [10] Tapiwa Ganyani, Cecile Kremer, Dongxuan Chen, Andrea Torneri, Christel  
704 Faes, Jacco Wallinga, and Niel Hens. Estimating the generation interval for  
705 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) based on symptom onset data, March 2020.  
706 *Eurosurveillance*, 25(17):2000257, 2020.
- 707 [11] Åke Svensson. A note on generation times in epidemic models. *Mathematical*  
708 *biosciences*, 208(1):300–311, 2007.
- 709 [12] Tom Britton and Gianpaolo Scalia Tomba. Estimation in emerging epidemics:  
710 biases and remedies. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 16(150):20180670,  
711 2019.
- 712 [13] Xi He, Eric HY Lau, Peng Wu, Xilong Deng, Jian Wang, Xinxin Hao, Yiu Chung  
713 Lau, Jessica Y Wong, Yujuan Guan, Xinghua Tan, et al. Temporal dynamics in  
714 viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nature medicine*, 26(5):672–  
715 675, 2020.
- 716 [14] Shi Zhao, Biao Tang, Salihu S Musa, Shujuan Ma, Jiayue Zhang, Minyan Zeng,  
717 Qingping Yun, Wei Guo, Yixiang Zheng, Zuyao Yang, et al. Estimating the  
718 generation interval and inferring the latent period of COVID-19 from the contact  
719 tracing data. *Epidemics*, 36:100482, 2021.
- 720 [15] William S Hart, Elizabeth Miller, Nick J Andrews, Pauline Waight, Philip K  
721 Maini, Sebastian Funk, and Robin N Thompson. Generation time of the al-  
722 pha and delta SARS-CoV-2 variants: an epidemiological analysis. *The Lancet*  
723 *Infectious Diseases*, 2022.
- 724 [16] Luca Ferretti, Chris Wymant, Michelle Kendall, Lele Zhao, Anel Nurtay, Lucie  
725 Abeler-Dörner, Michael Parker, David Bonsall, and Christophe Fraser. Quanti-  
726 fying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact  
727 tracing. *Science*, 368(6491):eabb6936, 2020.
- 728 [17] Luca Ferretti, Alice Ledda, Chris Wymant, Lele Zhao, Virginia Ledda, Lucie  
729 Abeler-Dörner, Michelle Kendall, Anel Nurtay, Hao-Yuan Cheng, Ta-Chou Ng,  
730 et al. The timing of COVID-19 transmission. *medRxiv*, 2020.
- 731 [18] Gary W Oehlert. A note on the Delta method. *The American Statistician*,  
732 46(1):27–29, 1992.
- 733 [19] Ron Sender, Yinon M Bar-On, Sang Woo Park, Elad Noor, Jonathan Dushoffd,  
734 and Ron Milo. The unmitigated profile of COVID-19 infectiousness. *medRxiv*,  
735 2021.
- 736 [20] Christophe Fraser. Estimating individual and household reproduction numbers  
737 in an emerging epidemic. *PloS one*, 2(8):e758, 2007.

- 738 [21] David Champredon and Jonathan Dushoff. Intrinsic and realized generation  
739 intervals in infectious-disease transmission. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*  
740 *Biological Sciences*, 282(1821):20152026, 2015.
- 741 [22] Sang Woo Park, David Champredon, and Jonathan Dushoff. Inferring  
742 generation-interval distributions from contact-tracing data. *Journal of the Royal*  
743 *Society Interface*, 17(167):20190719, 2020.
- 744 [23] Edward Goldstein, Jonathan Dushoff, Junling Ma, Joshua B Plotkin, David JD  
745 Earn, and Marc Lipsitch. Reconstructing influenza incidence by deconvolution  
746 of daily mortality time series. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,  
747 106(51):21825–21829, 2009.
- 748 [24] Government of the Netherlands. Slowing the spread  
749 of the Omicron variant: lockdown in the Netherlands.  
750 2021. [https://www.government.nl/latest/news/2021/12/18/  
751 slowing-the-spread-of-the-omicron-variant-lockdown-in-the-netherlands](https://www.government.nl/latest/news/2021/12/18/slowing-the-spread-of-the-omicron-variant-lockdown-in-the-netherlands).
- 752 [25] Government of the Netherlands. Shops, gyms and hairdressers  
753 to reopen on Saturday 15 January. 2021. [https://www.  
754 government.nl/topics/coronavirus-covid-19/news/2022/01/14/  
755 shops-gyms-and-hairdressers-to-reopen-on-saturday-15-january](https://www.government.nl/topics/coronavirus-covid-19/news/2022/01/14/shops-gyms-and-hairdressers-to-reopen-on-saturday-15-january).
- 756 [26] Government of the Netherlands. Nearly all locations can be open until 22:00.  
757 2021. [https://www.government.nl/topics/coronavirus-covid-19/news/  
758 2022/01/25/press-conference-25-january-2022](https://www.government.nl/topics/coronavirus-covid-19/news/2022/01/25/press-conference-25-january-2022).
- 759 [27] Sonja Lehtinen, Peter Ashcroft, and Sebastian Bonhoeffer. On the relationship  
760 between serial interval, infectiousness profile and generation time. *Journal of*  
761 *the Royal Society Interface*, 18(174):20200756, 2021.
- 762 [28] James A Hay, Lee Kennedy-Shaffer, Sanjat Kanjilal, Niall J Lennon, Stacey B  
763 Gabriel, Marc Lipsitch, and Michael J Mina. Estimating epidemiologic dynamics  
764 from cross-sectional viral load distributions. *Science*, 373(6552):eabh0635, 2021.
- 765 [29] Lauren Jansen, Bryan Tegomoh, Kate Lange, Kimberly Showalter, Jon  
766 Figliomeni, Baha Abdalhamid, Peter C Iwen, Joseph Fauver, Bryan Buss, and  
767 Matthew Donahue. Investigation of a Sars-Cov-2 B.1.1.529 (Omicron) vari-  
768 ant cluster—Nebraska, November–December 2021. *Morbidity and Mortality*  
769 *Weekly Report*, 70(5152):1782, 2021.
- 770 [30] Jin Su Song, Jihee Lee, Miyoung Kim, Hyeong Seop Jeong, Moon Su Kim,  
771 Seong Gon Kim, Han Na Yoo, Ji Joo Lee, Hye Young Lee, Sang-Eun Lee, et al.  
772 Serial intervals and household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant,  
773 South Korea, 2021. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 28(3):756, 2022.

- 774 [31] Lin T Brandal, Emily MacDonald, Lamprini Veneti, Tine Ravlo, Heidi Lange,  
775 Umaer Naseer, Siri Feruglio, Karoline Bragstad, Olav Hungnes, Liz E Ødeskaug,  
776 et al. Outbreak caused by the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant in Norway, Novem-  
777 ber to December 2021. *Eurosurveillance*, 26(50):2101147, 2021.
- 778 [32] Cécile Kremer, Toon Braeye, Kristiaan Proesmans, Emmanuel André, Andrea  
779 Torneri, and Niel Hens. Observed serial intervals of SARS-CoV-2 for the Omi-  
780 cron and Delta variants in Belgium based on contact tracing data, 19 November  
781 to 31 December 2021. *medRxiv*, 2022.
- 782 [33] Kimihito Ito, Chayada Piantham, and Hiroshi Nishiura. Estimating relative  
783 generation times and relative reproduction numbers of Omicron BA.1 and BA.2  
784 with respect to Delta in Denmark. *medRxiv*, 2022.
- 785 [34] Alex Selby. Estimating generation time of Omicron. 2022.
- 786 [35] James A Hay, Stephen M Kissler, Joseph R Fauver, Christina Mack, Caroline G  
787 Tai, Radhika M Samant, Sarah Connelly, Deverick J Anderson, Gaurav Khullar,  
788 Matthew MacKay, et al. Viral dynamics and duration of PCR positivity of the  
789 SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant. *medRxiv*, 2022.
- 790 [36] Carl AB Pearson, Sheetal P Silal, Michael WZ Li, Jonathan Dushoff, Ben-  
791 jamin M Bolker, Sam Abbott, Cari van Schalkwyk, Nicholas G Davies,  
792 Rosanna C Barnard, W John Edmunds, et al. Bounding the levels of trans-  
793 missibility & immune evasion of the Omicron variant in South Africa. *MedRxiv*,  
794 2021.
- 795 [37] Sang Woo Park, Daniel M Cornforth, Jonathan Dushoff, and Joshua S Weitz.  
796 The time scale of asymptomatic transmission affects estimates of epidemic po-  
797 tential in the COVID-19 outbreak. *Epidemics*, 31:100392, 2020.
- 798 [38] Moritz UG Kraemer, Oliver G Pybus, Christophe Fraser, Simon Cauchemez,  
799 Andrew Rambaut, and Benjamin J Cowling. Monitoring key epidemiological  
800 parameters of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Nature medicine*, 27(11):1854–1855,  
801 2021.