

Supplementary Information

Effects of case- and population-based COVID-19 interventions in Taiwan

Ta-Chou Ng, BSc;^{1*} Hao-Yuan Cheng, MD, MSc;^{2,3*} Hsiao-Han Chang, PhD;⁴ Cheng-Chieh Liu, MSc;¹ Chih-Chi Yang, MSc;¹ Shu-Wan Jian; DVM, MPH; ² Ding-Ping Liu; PhD;^{2,5} Ted Cohen, MD, DPH;⁶ Hsien-Ho Lin, MD, ScD^{1,7}

*Contributed equally

1. Institute of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, National Taiwan University College of Public Health, Taipei, Taiwan
2. Epidemic Intelligence Center, Taiwan Centers for Disease Control, Taipei, Taiwan
3. Department of Pediatrics, National Taiwan University Children's Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan
4. Institute of Bioinformatics and Structural Biology, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu City, Taipei
5. National Taipei University of Nursing and Health Sciences, Taipei, Taiwan
6. Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases and the Public Health Modeling Unit, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut, USA
7. Global Health Program, National Taiwan University College of Public Health, Taipei, Taiwan

Correspondence to:

Hsien-Ho Lin, MD, ScD, Professor, Institute of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, College of Public Health, National Taiwan University, 17 Xuzhou Rd, Rm 706, Taipei 10055, Taiwan. E-mail: hsienho@ntu.edu.tw. Tel: +886-2-33668023. Fax: +886-2-33668023.

Contents

Estimating the effect of blended approaches on COVID-19 containment in Taiwan	1
Supplementary Notes	3
Supplementary Methods	5
1. Estimation of the interval parameters	5
2. The dynamical transmission model	6
2.1 Overview	6
2.2 The branching process	6
2.3 The intervention model	7
3. Parameter estimation and model fitting	8
3.1 Sequential Monte Carlo (SMC) algorithm	8
3.2 Stage 1: fit to the serial intervals	8
3.3 Stage 2: fit to the cluster sizes	8
4. Estimation of the time-varying reproduction numbers	9
Supplementary tables	10
Supplementary Table 1. The values of fixed parameters and the priors of fitted parameters in stage-1 model fitting.	10
Supplementary Table 2. The values of fixed parameters and the priors of fitted parameters in stage-2 model fitting.	11
Supplementary Table 3. Scenarios in the assessment of case-based interventions.	12
Supplementary References	13

Supplementary Notes

Case-based interventions in Taiwan

Case detection: The detection of COVID-19 cases in Taiwan mainly depended on two surveillance systems: the National Notifiable Disease Surveillance System and the laboratory surveillance system. The COVID-19 was listed as a notifiable disease in Taiwan since January 15, 2020. The initial case definition was patients with upper respiratory infection/fever and with travel history related to Wuhan city, China, and extended to other areas/countries according to the increased risk for the COVID-19 epidemic. The case definition was finally expanded to include those pneumonia patients highly suspected to be COVID-19, regardless of travel history, on February 28 to increase the sensitivity of the passive surveillance because of the increase of the locally-acquired cases and the concern of undetected community outbreak. Cases are isolated immediately after being detected.

Of the 443 confirmed cases by June 6, only 11 cases (2.5%) had unknown sources of infection, and no locally-acquired cases were identified after April 11.

In our analysis, the rate of case detection was defined as the number of cases detected via surveillance systems. Because each case with unknown source suggests at least one or two undetected patients in the community, we assumed that the proportion of undetected patients was around 2.5–5% and thus assumed the baseline rate of case detection was approximately 95% to avoid too much overestimation of the rate of case detection.

Contact tracing: Every time when a COVID-19 case was laboratory-confirmed, case investigation would be done within 24 hours and a full list of possible contacts from 2 days before disease onset until the day before isolation would be obtained. Those contacts who had face-to-face contacts with the confirmed cases for more than 15 minutes would be considered as close contacts, which means they had higher risk of COVID-19 infection.

As of June 30, 37 of the 42 epidemiologically-linked secondary cases (88%) were found via contact tracing, 5 (12%) patients were found via case detection and recognized as a close contact of previously confirmed cases through epidemiological inspection.

We assumed the rate of case ascertainment (defined as the number of contacts identified via contact tracing efforts) was the same in the infected and non-infected close contacts, and all epidemiologically-link secondary cases were eventually caught via contact tracing or case investigation. Therefore, we then assumed the rate of contact ascertainment in infected contacts was around 90% and used this estimate as the baseline of this parameter to represent a setting with a highly efficient and effective contact tracing system. A sensitivity analysis was performed to explore the uncertainty of the parameters.

Quarantine for close contacts of confirmed cases: After the case investigation and contact tracing, the close contacts would be put in quarantine at home (home quarantine) for at least 14 days. If they became symptomatic, medical visits would be arranged, and they would be tested for COVID-19 if necessary.

Quarantine for travelers entering Taiwan: For those travelers from areas and countries where the level 3 travel alert is announced by the Central Epidemic Command Center (CECC), a 14-day quarantine at home or quarantine institution is required.

For those who require home quarantine but stay in the same household with individuals at higher risk, including elderly persons aged ≥ 65 years, children aged ≤ 6 years, and patients with chronic conditions (e.g., cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and chronic lung disease), quarantine at institutions would be recommended. An electronic tracking system was implemented to facilitate the health monitoring of the quarantined contacts. Besides, the CECC developed a positioning system using the mobile phone and cellular base station near the quarantined sites to monitor if any breach of home quarantine occurred. No secondary case caused by the COVID-19 cases diagnosed during the home quarantine period was identified.

Population-based interventions in Taiwan

Facial mask supply: After the COVID-19 outbreak in Wuhan city, China was confirmed, and the CECC was activated, the CECC soon announced the export ban of medical face masks and activated several measures to secure the stockpile of face masks for both medical use and the general public. Although no universal use of the face mask was recommended, the CECC announced guidelines for face mask use as an alternative when people could not follow the guidance of physical distancing, especially in public transportations and some massive gatherings.

Guidance on health behavior and physical distancing: Because of the experience of the SARS outbreak in 2003, the Taiwanese society established good habits of face mask use afterward, especially when they felt sick. Sick students or employees were encouraged to stay at home, especially when they were feverish. Guidance on preventing clusters of respiratory diseases in hospitals, schools, and long-term care facilities were also established and implemented by local governments and Taiwan CDC¹.

At the COVID-19 outbreak, the CECC announced the precaution of physical distancing for large-scale public gatherings and assemblies, large business premises, community maintenance, and management in April when the concern of community outbreak arose. Hand sanitizers are commonly provided in public areas.

Supplementary Methods

1. Estimation of the interval parameters

The incubation period, the onset-to-isolation interval, and the serial interval were estimated from the dates (or date intervals if the exact date is unknown) of exposure, symptom onset, isolation of the confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases in Taiwan. We estimated the distributions of these interval parameters using a Bayesian framework² that deals with the situation where the exact date is uncertain for both ends of the interval (i.e., doubly interval-censored). This method uses a hierarchical model to estimate the exact two ends of the time interval for each individual as well as the overall distribution of the interval among the population. In the case of incubation period estimation, the exact infection and onset times were unobserved and uniform priors bonded by individual exposure and onset windows were assumed. For each individual i ,

$$X_i^{start} \sim \text{Uniform}(X_{l,i}^{start}, X_{u,i}^{start})$$

$$X_i^{end} \sim \text{Uniform}(X_{l,i}^{end}, X_{u,i}^{end})$$

$$Y_i = X_i^{end} - X_i^{start}$$

, X_i^{start} is the exact time of infection, which was not observed. $[X_{l,i}^{start}, X_{u,i}^{start}]$ represents the time window within which exposure could have occurred, and was obtained based on patients' travel histories or case investigation reports. Likewise, X_i^{end} is the unobserved exact time of symptom onset and $[X_{l,i}^{end}, X_{u,i}^{end}]$ is the time window within which symptom onset could have occurred. Y_i is the individual incubation period, and was assumed to follow a gamma distribution with the shape (α) and the scale (β). We assumed flat exponential priors for α and β as follows.

$$Y_i \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$$

$$\alpha \sim \text{Exponential}(1/1000)$$

$$\beta \sim \text{Exponential}(1/1000)$$

To estimate the onset-to-isolation interval, we simply replaced the exposure-to-onset quantities with onset-to-testing quantities. To estimate the serial interval, we replaced the exposure-to-onset quantities with onset-to-onset quantities between the primary and secondary cases. We ran 4 Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) chains using the Non-U-Turn Sampler in Stan³. Each chain contains 1000 warm-up iterations and 500 samples, rendering to a total of 2000 samples. The credible intervals are obtained from the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles in the posterior predictive simulations of the gamma distributions.

2. The dynamical transmission model

2.1 Overview

We adopted the structure of the branching process model developed by Hellewell, et al.⁹, which in essence consists of two components: 1) the branching process, and 2) the intervention model. The branching process simulates the disease transmission dynamics in the early phase of an outbreak. The intervention model accounts for the effects of various case-based interventions put into outbreak mitigation or containment. Specifically, case detection, contact tracing, and quarantine of close contacts are considered. The parameters and their values for this dynamical transmission model are listed in Table 1.

2.2 The branching process

The branching process simulates growing transmission trees starting from some given initial cases. This process is implemented by the following steps.

- i. Initiate with given active cases.
- ii. For each active case, determine the onset time and the testing time by drawing an individual incubation period, and an onset-to-isolation interval.
- iii. For each active case, draw the number of secondary cases from the distribution of the reproduction number.
- iv. For each active case, apply the intervention model (see Supplementary Method 2.3 for more details) and determine the period of quarantine and isolation.
- v. For each secondary case, determine the infection time by drawing an individual generation interval.
- vi. For each transmission pair, determine whether the transmission is realized, or prevented by comparing the infection time of the secondary case and the period of quarantine/ isolation of the index case.
- vii. Deactivate the index cases, and activate the realized secondary cases.
- viii. Repeat step ii-vii, until there is no active case, or maximum number of generations is reached.

The distributions of the incubation period and onset-to-isolation interval were estimated from case series data with the method described in Supplementary Notes. We assumed a negative binomial distribution for the reproduction number, which is governed by the reproduction number (R) and the dispersion parameter (k). The dispersion parameter was estimated by fitting the dynamical model to the observed cluster sizes (see Supplementary Method 3.3). The generation interval distribution was assumed to be a skewed normal distribution centered at each index case's onset time to avoid the inconsistent length of incubation periods and generation intervals. This parameterization also makes the proportion of pre-symptomatic transmission (p^{pre}) an explicit parameter in our model. The standard deviation of the generation interval (σ), and the proportion of pre-symptomatic transmission (p^{pre}) were estimated by fitting the dynamical model to the observed serial intervals (see Supplementary Method 3.2). Regarding the possibility of asymptomatic infection, we assumed a fixed probability of being asymptomatic (p^{asym}), and fixed relative transmissibility (r^{asym}) for all infections.

2.3 The intervention model

The intervention model is composed of a set of rules which determine whether and when active cases and their contacts are quarantined or isolated and hence unable to transmit disease. Specifically, case detection, contact tracing, and quarantine of close contacts were implemented as described in the following.

- i. Case detection: Each active, untraced, and symptomatic case was tested with probability θ , and was immediately isolated if tested positive. The secondary cases generated during the incubation period (pre-symptomatic period) and the onset-to-isolation interval cannot be prevented.
- ii. Contact tracing: Each active and symptomatic case (except initial introductions) was ascertained as a close contact (traced) of another detected case with probability ρ . If the case is successfully traced, and showing symptoms around the time of contact tracing (the onset time of the detected primary case), the case was immediately isolated (i.e., it did not require a positive test outcome to isolate a traced case). Case detection plus contact tracing was able to prevent the transmission during the onset-to-isolation interval, but not during the incubation period.
- iii. Quarantine of close contacts: Each active and traced case (regardless of the presence of symptoms) was immediately quarantined at the time of being traced. If the case develops symptoms during the quarantine period, he/she was immediately isolated. Only the combination of detection, tracing, and quarantine was able to prevent pre-symptomatic transmissions and transmissions from asymptomatic cases.

Note that asymptomatic cases were never detected, traced or isolated, but could be quarantined. We also assumed the complete effect of isolation and quarantine, and all transmissions were prevented during the period. Extended Data Fig. 3 gives examples that illustrate the effects of these interventions on the prevention of disease transmission.

3. Parameter estimation and model fitting

3.1 Sequential Monte Carlo (SMC) algorithm

Since the likelihood of the dynamical model is intractable, we used a sequential Monte Carlo algorithm to obtain posterior distributions of parameters of interest. This algorithm was used to fit branching process-based dynamical models in a similar context^{10,11}. The algorithm started from a population of 1000 parameter sets drawn from the prior distributions. Data were simulated with the branching process model parameterized by these parameter sets, and the distance between the simulated and empirical data was measured by Kolmogorov–Smirnov (KS) statistics. In each round of iteration, the parameter set was resampled, perturbed, and passed on until the criteria of convergence were met. We ran 4 chains of SMC algorithm to generate a total of 4000 posterior samples for inference.

The steps of an SMC algorithm are as follows.

- i. Initiation: generate a population of 1000 parameter sets by Latin Hypercube sampling from prior distributions.
- ii. Simulation: simulate data points with each parameter set and the dynamical model.
- iii. Evaluation: calculate the KS statistics.
- iv. Evolution: resample a new population of 1000 parameter sets from the current population weighted by $1/KS^2$.
- v. Mutation: perturb each new parameter set by up to 10%.
- vi. Repeat step ii–v until the median KS statistics of the population is less than 0.05 and is within 10% of each of the previous two rounds.

3.2 Stage 1: fit to the serial intervals

The probability of pre-symptomatic transmission (p^{pre}) and the standard deviation (σ) of the generation interval was estimated in the first stage, by fitting the model to empirical serial intervals. Supplementary Table 1 lists the values of priors and fixed parameters used in this stage. We note that the reproduction number (R) and the dispersion parameter (k) only affect the number of infections, not the temporal relationship between successive generations. Hence, they do not influence the distribution of generation interval or serial interval.

3.3 Stage 2: fit to the cluster sizes

The reproduction number under population-based interventions only (R_p), and the dispersion parameter (k) were estimated in stage 2, by fitting the model to observed cluster sizes. Because clusters of size 1 are prone to incomplete observation, which happens when the imported index cases were either undetected or intervened by swift isolation upon entry (truncating the subsequent transmission), we limited the observed and simulated data to clusters with 2 or more cases. Supplementary Table 2 lists the priors and other fixed parameters used, and Extended Data Fig. 2 presents the convergence plots and the posterior distributions of the estimates in this stage. The parameters estimated in stage 1 were treated as fixed parameters in stage 2.

4. Estimation of the time-varying reproduction numbers

The time-varying reproductive number (R_t) for SARS-CoV-2 and influenza were estimated using Wallinga-Teunis method⁴, also known as the “case reproduction number”⁵. This method attributes the transmission events and assigns the value of R_t to the cohort of primary cases at time t . Since R_t represents the transmissibility of primary cases, it explains the future incidence, and can reflect the subsequent impacts of events after specific time points⁶. Practically, this method estimates the transmission probabilities between every possible transmission pair, according to their observed serial intervals. The probability that case i was infected by case j (p_{ij}) is given as

$$p_{ij} = \frac{w(t_i - t_j)}{\sum_{i \neq m} w(t_i - t_m)}$$

p_{ij} is calculated by normalizing the likelihood of case j infecting case i by the sum of the likelihood from all possible infector cases m . $w(t_i - t_j)$ is the transmission likelihood quantifying how well the observed serial interval (the onset time difference between case i and j , $t_i - t_j$) fits the serial interval distribution of ascertained transmission pairs. The effective reproduction number of case j is by definition (the expected number of secondary infections) the sum of all the transmission probabilities where case j is the infector.

$$R_j = \sum_i p_{ij}$$

We then summarized the R_j 's into the time-varying reproduction numbers (R_t) by calculating the 7-day moving averages according to their onset time. The confidence intervals were calculated by the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles in the R_t of 100 simulated transmission trees from the p_{ij} 's matrix, as in Cori, et al⁵.

For SARS-CoV-2, we directly used the daily incidence based on the symptom onset date to estimate R_t . For influenza, the weekly incidence from two different data sources were used, including the notified influenza cases with severe complications in the National Notifiable Disease Surveillance System, and the influenza-like illness (ILI) consulting rate in the out-patient and emergency departments. The ILI consultation rate was further multiplied by the positive rate of influenza according the laboratory surveillance data. Cubic spline smoothing was used to disaggregate the weekly-basis data into daily-basis incidence⁷. Another key input to R_t estimation is the distribution of the serial interval. For SARS-CoV-2, the serial interval was estimated using the ascertained transmission pairs in our case series data, as in Supplementary Notes. For seasonal influenza, we assumed the mean and standard deviation of the serial interval to be 3.6 and 1.6 according to a previous study⁸.

Supplementary tables

Supplementary Table 1. The values of fixed parameters and the priors of fitted parameters in stage-1 model fitting.

Parameter	Fixed value/ prior range
Mean Incubation period, days	5.50
Mean onset-to-isolation interval, days	5.01
Reproduction number, R	2.5
Dispersion parameter, k	20
Probability of asymptomatic infection, p^{asym}	0.15
Relative transmissibility of asymptomatic case, r^{asym}	0.5
Proportion of pre-symptomatic transmission, p^{pre}	Uniform(0.01, 0.99)
Standard deviation of the generation interval, σ	Uniform(0.001, 5)
Probability of case detection, θ	0.95
Probability of contact ascertainment, ρ	0.90
Duration of quarantine, days	14
Backtracking days for quarantined contacts	4

Supplementary Table 2. The values of fixed parameters and the priors of fitted parameters in stage-2 model fitting.

Parameter	Fixed value/ prior range
Mean Incubation period, days	5.50
Mean onset-to-isolation interval, days	5.01
Reproduction number, R	Uniform(0.1, 3.0)
Dispersion parameter, k	Uniform(0.001, 50)
Probability of asymptomatic infection, p^{asym}	0.15
Relative transmissibility of asymptomatic case, r^{asym}	0.5
Proportion of pre-symptomatic transmission, p^{pre}	0.52
Standard deviation of the generation interval, σ	2.69
Probability of case detection, θ	0.95
Probability of contact ascertainment, ρ	0.90
Duration of quarantine, days	14
Backtracking days for quarantined contacts	4

Supplementary Table 3. Scenarios in the assessment of case-based interventions.

Scenario	Probability of detection (θ)	Probability of contact ascertainment (ρ)	Duration of quarantine, days
No intervention	0	0	0
Detection	0.95	0	0
Detection + Tracing	0.95	0.9	0
Detection + Tracing + 7-day Quarantine	0.95	0.9	7
Detection + Tracing + 14-day Quarantine	0.95	0.9	14

Supplementary References

- 1 Yen, M.-Y. *et al.* From SARS in 2003 to H1N1 in 2009: lessons learned from Taiwan in preparation for the next pandemic. *Journal of Hospital Infection* **87**, 185-193 (2014).
- 2 Backer, J. A., Klinkenberg, D. & Wallinga, J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20–28 January 2020. *Eurosurveillance* **25** (2020).
- 3 Carpenter, B. *et al.* Stan: A probabilistic programming language. *Journal of statistical software* **76** (2017).
- 4 Wallinga, J. & Teunis, P. Different epidemic curves for severe acute respiratory syndrome reveal similar impacts of control measures. *American journal of epidemiology* **160**, 509-516 (2004).
- 5 Cori, A., Ferguson, N. M., Fraser, C. & Cauchemez, S. A new framework and software to estimate time-varying reproduction numbers during epidemics. *American journal of epidemiology* **178**, 1505-1512 (2013).
- 6 Gostic, K. M. *et al.* Practical considerations for measuring the effective reproductive number, R_t . *medRxiv* (2020).
- 7 Cowling, B. J. *et al.* Impact assessment of non-pharmaceutical interventions against coronavirus disease 2019 and influenza in Hong Kong: an observational study. *The Lancet Public Health* (2020).
- 8 Cowling, B. J., Fang, V. J., Riley, S., Peiris, J. M. & Leung, G. M. Estimation of the serial interval of influenza. *Epidemiology* **20**, 344 (2009).
- 9 Hellewell, J. *et al.* Feasibility of controlling COVID-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and contacts. *The Lancet Global Health* (2020).
- 10 Peak, C. M., Childs, L. M., Grad, Y. H. & Buckee, C. O. Comparing nonpharmaceutical interventions for containing emerging epidemics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **114**, 4023-4028 (2017).
- 11 Peak, C. M. *et al.* Individual quarantine versus active monitoring of contacts for the mitigation of COVID-19: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* (2020).