

Supplementary figures and tables for
“Estimates of outbreak-specific SARS-CoV-2
epidemiological parameters from genomic data”

Timothy G. Vaughan, Jérémie Sciré, Sarah A. Nadeau and Tanja Stadler

Table S1: Sequence information.

Outbreak	No. sequences	Date of last sequence	Limiting public health intervention
Australia	9	Mar. 11	Mar. 21 nationwide social distancing begins
China	13	Jan. 23	Jan. 23 Wuhan quarantined
The Netherlands (1)	35	Mar. 12	Mar. 12 schools close, large gatherings banned
The Netherlands (2)	51	Mar. 12	”
France (1)	31	Mar. 16	Mar. 16 nationwide lockdown
France (2)	19	Mar. 16	”
Iceland (1)	47	Mar. 18	Mar. 16 secondary schools close, large gatherings banned
Iceland (2)	17	Mar. 18	”
Italy	55	Mar. 8	Mar. 8 Lombardy lockdown
Spain	14	Mar. 12	Mar. 11 schools close in Madrid
WA State (USA) (1)	217	Mar. 11	Mar. 11 large gatherings banned
WA State (USA) (2)	9	Mar. 11	”
Iran	14	Mar. 4	Feb. 22 schools close, large gatherings banned
Wales	47	Mar. 16	Mar. 20 schools close
Diamond Princess	96	Feb. 25	Feb. 4 ship quarantined




Figure S1: Posterior for the number of unique R_0 values among the 15 distinct outbreaks considered, given by Bayesian model averaging. (Only the value prior to the quarantine aboard the Diamond Princess was included in this averaging.)




Figure S2: Comparison of R_0 posterior distributions estimated using Bayesian model averaging. (Only the value prior to the quarantine aboard the Diamond Princess was included in this averaging.)




Figure S3: Comparison of R_0 posterior distributions estimated for the pre- and post-quarantine phases of the Diamond Princess outbreak.




Figure S4: Inferred sampling proportions corresponding to the outbreaks analyzed. Non-informative priors were used for all sampling proportions except for the one corresponding to the Diamond Princess. (See methods).




Figure S5: R_0 values inferred using (a) phylodynamic method without sequence data, (b) EpiEstim (1) analysis of sequenced sample collection times, and (c) linear regression of outbreak-specific cumulative sample count distributions. (The Diamond Princess regression and EpiEstim results have been excluded from this graphic, as they relate to the post- rather than pre-quarantine phase of that outbreak.)




Figure S6: Inferred cumulative case trajectories for remaining outbreaks.




Figure S7: Sample times relative to first sample from each outbreak. Horizontal bars represent full sample period lengths.




Figure S8: Estimates of R_0 produced using alternative model in which a change in R_0 and the sampling proportion s is permitted at a point midway between the first and last samples of each outbreak. The posteriors shown are for the R_0 values in the earlier of the two intervals.




Figure S9: Estimates of R_0 produced using the alternative prior $\text{Unif}(0, 10)$, illustrating the insensitivity of the results to the precise prior used.

References

- [1] A. Cori, N. M. Ferguson, C. Fraser, and S. Cauchemez. A new framework and software to estimate time-varying reproduction numbers during epidemics. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 178(9):1505–1512, sep 2013. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwt133.