

Adaptively temporal evolution of reproduction number estimation with trend filtering

Jiaping Liu¹, Zhenglun Cai², Paul Gustafson¹, Daniel J. McDonald^{1*}

1 Department of Statistics, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

2 Centre for Health Evaluation and Outcome Sciences, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

* daniel@stat.ubc.ca

Abstract

aaa

Author summary

xxx

1 Introduction

Effective reproduction numbers (or instantaneous reproduction numbers) are a key to understand infectious disease dynamics including the potential sizes of a pandemic, the scale of epidemic prevention measures such as the proportion of a population that should be vaccinated, and the effectiveness of control effects. They are expected numbers of secondary infections caused by an infected individual in a population. It is a time series that can reflect the effect of time-varying factors, such as intervention policy and population immunity. Let \mathcal{R}_t be the effective reproduction number at time t . A practical interpretation is that $\mathcal{R}_t < 1$ represents a circumstance when the infection dies out gradually and achieves a *disease-free equilibrium*, whereas when $\mathcal{R}_t > 1$, the infection is always present in a state of *endemic equilibrium*. Effective reproduction number reveals an unobservable biological reality. There exist a great number of models to uncover this reality relying on various domain-specific assumptions and using different types of observed data such as incidence data and death rates. Different estimation processes and results suggest different aspects and levels of policy making in epidemic control. For example, if effective reproduction numbers are assumed to be affected by human-human interaction over time in an epidemic model, controlling the parameters influencing human-human contact rate may eventually lead to a reduction of the effective reproduction numbers in the specific model. Since some assumptions cannot be verified in practice, it is critical for an estimator to be *robust* to model misspecification. The estimation relies heavily on the quality of the available data. The infectious data may contain poor information due to the limitations of data collection, which results in difficulties in reproduction number estimation.

Many existing approaches for effective reproduction number estimation are Bayesian approaches that estimate posterior distribution of \mathcal{R}_t . [1] proposed a Bayesian approach, EpiEstim, to solve the posterior distribution of \mathcal{R}_t given incidence data prior to time t .

An advantage of EpiEstim is that it depends on limited assumptions (the Poisson distributed incidences and Gamma distribution effective reproduction number) and only requires incidence data that is easily obtainable. For these reasons, EpiEstim does not require much domain expertise in implementation. It is one of the earliest approaches that are both succinct and accurate in \mathcal{R}_t estimation. They proposed EpiEstim(2.2) in [2], which distinguished imported cases from local transmission and directly estimated the serial interval. They further extended EpiEstim by using reconstructed daily incidence data to overcome the issue when incidences are not always daily records in [3]. [4] proposed an alternative Bayesian approach, EpiFilter, that is a recursive Bayesian smoother based on Kalman Filter. EpiFilter also solves the posterior of \mathcal{R}_t given a Gamma prior and Poisson distributed infection counts. Compared to EpiEstim, EpiFilter estimates \mathcal{R}_t retrospectively using all available incidences and generates more robust estimation in low incidence periods and accurate one-step-ahead prediction. [5] proposed a Bayesian latent variable framework, EpiNow2, which uses both incidence and death counts and provides precise \mathcal{R}_t estimation and forecasts. They further proposed a generative Bayesian model to handle missing data by imputation followed by truncation adjustment in [6]. [7] proposed a Bayesian P-splines approach, EpiLPS, and argued that this approach was computationally efficient. They assumed the incidence cases follow a negative binomial distribution. [8] proposed a Bayesian model based on particle filtering to estimate spatially explicit effective reproduction numbers. Bayesian approaches estimate the posterior distribution of the effective reproduction numbers with the advantage that the credible interval estimation can be easily computed. A limitation of many Bayesian approaches, however, is that they usually require heavy computational workload, especially when data sequences are long or hierarchical structures are complex.

[9] proposed to regularize the smoothness of \mathcal{R}_t regarding its temporal and spatial evolution. They considered a penalized regression with a second-order temporal regularization and a spatial regularization on \mathcal{R}_t and with Poisson loss. They further extended it by introducing another penalty on outliers for robustness in [10]. There are other spline-based approaches such as [11–13]. [14] proposed EpiMix, which included exogenous factors other than incidence cases and introduced random effects in regression model. It is also robust against poor data condition, i.e., low incidence. There are many other practical considerations in effective reproduction number estimation. [15] proposed a generalized autoregressive moving average (GARMA) model. It solved the bias introduced by practical concerns such as particular forms of measurement errors in incidence data. They also incorporate multiple serial interval distributions. [16] is a frequentist method and based on splines. They assumed the incidence follow an exponential-family distribution. [17] considered overdispersion by making a negative binomial assumption to estimate Covid-19 \mathcal{R}_t .

We propose a retrospective effective reproduction number estimation approach to filter out discrete splines. More specifically, it is an optimization problem with Poisson loss and ℓ_1 penalty on the temporal evolution of \mathcal{R}_t , which is known as the trend filtering penalty [18, 19]. The estimated curves appear to be piecewise polynomial. The estimators have both local adaptivity (i.e., heterogeneous smoothness throughout the range of time) and allow the computational efficiency. Similar as the aforementioned approaches, our approach only requires limited assumptions on the distribution of incidences and serial intervals, and depends on the widely obtainable incidence data. Thus, it only requires limited domain expertise to apply our approach. We follow the common assumption of Poisson distributed incidence data, but the empirical study shows that the estimators are robust in negative binomial settings. Our effective reproduction number estimation is accurate and robust in model misspecification and computationally efficient compared to the aforementioned competitors. In computation,

our approach takes the advantage of convex optimization and is solved by Newton's method, which is known to converge rapidly. Moreover, the sparse structure of the divided difference matrix used in the temporal penalty allows further efficiency in computation.

2 Methods

2.1 Renewal model for incidence data

Effective reproduction number \mathcal{R}_t , the expected secondary infection by a primary infection in a population at time t , is inherently a ratio of new infections at t over the total primary infectious cases until t (excluding the new infections). Here, we assume an ideal scenario of homogenous population that individuals follow similar social behaviors, exposure risks and random mixing patterns such as having similar contact rates to each other or similar susceptibility and infectiousness. Denote the new infections at time t as N_t . Given an infectious period τ_t at t , we construct the total primary infectiousness as $\Lambda_t := \sum_{i=1}^{\tau_t} p_i N_{t-i}$, where p_i is the infectious probability that a secondary case is infected by a primary case which is infected i timepoints ago. The reproduction number can then be constructed based on the ratio $\mathcal{R}_t := N_t/\Lambda_t$. We assume a constant observable proportion of infections $c \in (0, 1)$, which is applied to all incidence counts and gets cancelled in \mathcal{R}_t ratio. Rearranging terms of the ratio yields the widely used renewal equation

$$N_t = \sum_{i=1}^{\tau_t} p_i \mathcal{R}_t N_{t-i} \quad (1)$$

for the analysis of transmission dynamics of infectious diseases. Some examples are EpiEstim [1] and EpiFilter [4].

The sequence of probabilities $p_{1:\tau_t}$ gives the probabilities that a secondary infection at t is infected by a primary infection that is infected 1 to τ_t timepoints ago. The period between primary and secondary infections is called generation time. Theoretically, $p_{1:\tau_t}$ are the cumulative probabilities of generation time in discretized, contiguous time intervals, i.e., $(0, 1], (1, 2], \dots, (\tau_{t-1}, \tau_t]$. We assume that the infectiousness disappears beyond τ_t timepoints, so that the sequence $p_{1:\tau_t}$ has a sum of 1.

The generation time (period between the infections), however, is unobservable and tricky to estimate. We take a common strategy — approximate it by serial interval (period between the onsets of symptoms). When the infectiousness profile after symptoms is independent of the incubation period, the serial interval is regarded identical as the generation time [1]. We assume the distribution of generation time, and correspondingly serial interval, to be independent to time t , i.e., the probability p_i only corresponds to the relative time range i between a primary and secondary infections. The sequence $p_{1:\tau_t}$ only depends on t by a chosen length τ_t ; if τ_t is given, the probability sequence will be right-truncated at τ_t and rescaled to have a sum of 1. We choose Gamma distribution to estimate the serial interval, which is demonstrated to be a reasonable choice in practice.

The renewal equation in Eq (1) quantifies the transmission dynamic that primary incidences result in new incidences by effective reproduction numbers given serial interval. This dynamic is straightforward and efficient in data usage as it only depends on the observed incidence counts, which can be easily obtainable and usually sufficient and of good quality, and the specification of serial interval distribution.

2.2 Poisson trend filtering estimator

122

We use the daily confirmed cases y_t on day t to estimate the observed infectious cases by assuming a consistent incubation period (from the time of infections to the time of symptom onsets when the cases are confirmed) and further assume y_t to be Poisson distributed with mean I_t , i.e.,

$$y_t \sim \text{Poisson}(I_t) = \text{Poisson}(\Lambda_t \mathcal{R}_t).$$

Considering a fixed period of days n , our interest is to estimate the Poisson parameter \mathcal{R}_t given observations $y_{1:n} := \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ and the total infectiousness based on confirmed cases $\Lambda_t^* := \sum_{i=1}^{\tau_t} p_i y_{t-i}$. A natural approach is to solve the maximum likelihood estimates (MLEs), i.e.,

123

124

125

126

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_t := \underset{\mathcal{R}_t}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_t \mid y_{1:n}, p_{1:\tau_t}) = \prod_{t=1, \dots, n} \frac{e^{-\mathcal{R}_t \Lambda_t^*} (\mathcal{R}_t \Lambda_t^*)^{y_t}}{y_t!}. \quad (2)$$

This maximization problem, however, yields a one-to-one correspondence between the confirmed case (or the total infectiousness) and the effective reproduction number at each day, so that the estimated curves have no significant graphical smoothness.

127

128

129

Smoothness of the effective reproduction numbers is a key to understand the trend of transmissibility of infectious diseases in retrospective studies. Smoother estimated curves give more high-level ideas with less changing points and hide the information of minor importance, and vice versa. We assume the effective reproduction numbers to be piecewise polynomials with multiple knots (i.e., changing points) with varying degrees. We specifically consider discrete splines with various degrees of continuity. For instance, the 0th degree discrete splines are piecewise constant, the 1st degree curves are piecewise linear, and the 2nd degree curves are piecewise quadratic. For $k \geq 2$, the k th degree discrete splines are continuous and have continuous discrete differences up to degree $k - 1$ at the knots.

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

To achieve such smoothness, we regularize the distance between adjacent effective reproduction numbers. Since $\mathcal{R}_t > 0$, penalizing the distance between \mathcal{R}_t s directly may cause numerical issues such that there may be negative estimates in computation. Therefore, we equivalently penalize the distance between natural logarithm between neighboring \mathcal{R}_t s through divided differences (i.e., discrete derivatives) with various orders. Compared to splines, discrete splines introduce computational efficiency. We penalize ℓ_1 norm of the distance, which introduces sparsity into the curvature, so that the estimates have heterogeneous smoothness in different subregions of the entire domain. It is a more realistic setting compared to homogeneous smoothness in squared ℓ_2 norm. The divided differences (i.e., discrete derivatives) with various orders to represent the temporal evolution of reproduction numbers with different degrees.

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

We define a penalized regression problem to solve the MLE problem in Eq (2) and the smoothness regularization simultaneously in . It is a minimization problem with Poisson loss and the trend filtering penalty [18, 19]. Let $\theta := \log(\mathcal{R}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and then $\Lambda \circ \mathcal{R} = \Lambda \circ e^\theta$, $\log(\Lambda \circ \mathcal{R}) = \log(\Lambda) + \theta$, where \circ is elementwise product, e^a , $\log(a)$ apply to a vector a elementwise. The problem solves a Poisson trend filtering (PTF) estimator on univariate cases. For evenly spaced observed incidences, it is defined as:

151

152

153

154

155

156

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta} &:= \underset{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n -y_i \theta_i + \Lambda_i e^{\theta_i} + \lambda \left\| D^{(k+1)} \theta \right\|_1, \\ \hat{\mathcal{R}} &:= e^{\hat{\theta}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $D^{k+1} \in \mathbb{Z}^{(n-k-1) \times n}$ is a k -th order divided difference matrix with $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Define $D^{(k+1)}$ recursively as $D^{(k+1)} := D^{(1)} D^{(k)}$, where $D^{(1)} \in \mathbb{N}^{(n-k-1) \times (n-k)}$ is a

banded matrix defined as

$$D^{(1)} := \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & & & \\ & -1 & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Define $D^{(0)} := I_n$, which is an identity matrix with size n . An exponential transformation is applied to the PTF estimator to get the estimated reproduction numbers.

The tuning parameter λ balances the contributions between data fidelity and smoothness. When $\lambda = 0$, the problem in Eq (3) reduces to regular least squares problem. A larger tuning parameter gives a higher importance on the regularization term and yields a smoother curve until the divided differences are all zeros, i.e., all parameters are projected onto the null space of the corresponding divided difference matrix.

For unevenly spaced observations, the distances between neighboring parameters vary by the periods between observation times, and thus, the divided differences should be adjusted by observation days (or data locations). Given the data locations $x_{1:n} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, define a k th order diagonal matrix

$$X^k := \text{diag} \left(\frac{k}{x_{k+1} - x_1}, \frac{k}{x_{k+2} - x_2}, \dots, \frac{k}{x_n - x_{n-k}} \right)$$

for $k \geq 1$. Let $D^{(x,1)} := D^{(1)}$ and define $D^{(x,k+1)}$ for $k \geq 1$ recursively as

$$D^{(x,k+1)} := D^{(1)} \cdot X^k \cdot D^{(x,k)}.$$

[10] considered the second-order divided different of effective reproduction number. In comparison to their study, our estimator is more flexible in the degree of temporal evolution of the effective reproduction numbers and also avoid the potential numerical issues of penalizing/estimating positive numbers. Our estimator is locally adaptive so that it captures the local changes such as the initiation of effective control measures. More specifically, it regularizes the similarity among reproduction numbers across a chosen number of neighboring time points and segments the curvature of the reproduction numbers such that there are more jumpiness in some subregions and more smoothness in others.

2.3 Proximal Newton solver

The proximal Newton method is a second-order algorithm solving a proximal Newton optimization iteratively followed by a line search algorithm adjusting the step size at each iteration for faster convergence. The proximal Newton method for Poisson trend filtering in Eq (3) takes a second-order Taylor expansion of the Poisson loss, which results in a proximal optimization — Gaussian trend filtering with dynamic weights during iteration.

Let $g(\theta) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n -y_i \theta_i + \Lambda_i e^{\theta_i}$ be the Poisson regression loss and $h(\theta) := \lambda \|D^{(k+1)} \theta\|_1$ be the regularization. At iterate $t + 1$, consider the following approximation of $g(\theta)$ using a second-order Taylor expansion around θ^t :

$$g(\theta) = g(\theta^t) + (\theta - \theta^t)^\top \nabla_{\theta}^{(1)} g(\theta^t) + \frac{1}{2} (\theta - \theta^t)^\top \nabla_{\theta}^{(2)} g(\theta^t) (\theta - \theta^t),$$

where $\nabla_{\theta}^{(1)} g(\theta^t) = \frac{1}{n} (-y + \Lambda \circ e^{\theta^t}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the gradient of $g(\theta)$ at θ^t and $\nabla_{\theta}^{(2)} g(\theta^t) = \frac{1}{n} \text{diag} (\Lambda \circ e^{\theta^t}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the Hessian matrix of $g(\theta)$ at θ^t .

Define the proximal operator as $\text{prox}_{W,D}(x) := \underset{z \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{2n} \|z - x\|_W^2 + \lambda \|D\theta\|_1$,
 where $\|a\|_W^2 := a^\top W a$. The proximal optimization problem at iterate $t + 1$ can be
 further written as, given θ^t ,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{t+} &:= \underset{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\operatorname{argmin}} (\theta - \theta^t)^\top \nabla_\theta^{(1)} g(\theta^t) + \frac{1}{2} (\theta - \theta^t)^\top \nabla_\theta^{(2)} g(\theta^t) (\theta - \theta^t) + h(\theta), \\ &= \underset{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{2n} \|\theta - c^t\|_{W^t}^2 + \lambda \|D^{(k+1)}\theta\|_1, \\ &= \text{prox}_{W^t, D^{(k+1)}}(c^t), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $W^t := \text{diag}(\Lambda \circ e^{\theta^t})$ is the weighted (Hessian) matrix multiplied by n and
 $c^t := \theta^t - (W^t)^{-1} (n \nabla_\theta^{(1)} g(\theta^t)) = y \circ \Lambda^{-1} \circ e^{-\theta^t} - \mathbf{1} + \theta^t \circ \Lambda^{-1}$, where
 $\{e^{\theta^t}\}_{i \in [n]} > 0$, $[n] := 1, 2, \dots, n$. This is just univariate *Gaussian trend filtering* with
 weights W^t [19].

We solve the trend filtering problem in Eq (4) using the specialized ADMM,
 proposed by [20], with the primal θ step solved in closed-form and the auxiliary step
 solved by the dynamic programming algorithm for fused lasso proposed by [21]. Let the
 auxiliary variable $z := D^{(k)}\theta$. The scaled augmented Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\lambda, \rho}(\theta, z, u) = \frac{1}{2n} \|\theta - c^t\|_{W^t}^2 + \lambda \|D^{(1)}z\|_1 + \frac{\rho}{2} \|D^{(k)}\theta - z + u\|^2 - \frac{\rho}{2} \|u\|^2,$$

where ρ is a scaled dual parameter and u is a dual variable. The specialized ADMM
 solves the following subproblems, at ADMM iteration $l + 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{l+1} &:= \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{2n} \|\theta - c^t\|_{W^t}^2 + \frac{\rho}{2} \|D^{(k+1)}\theta - z^l + u^l\|_2^2, \\ z^{l+1} &:= \underset{z}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{\lambda}{\rho} \|D^{(1)}z\|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \|D^{(k+1)}\theta^{l+1} - z + u^l\|_2^2, \\ u^{l+1} &\leftarrow u^l + D^{(k+1)}\theta^{l+1} - z^{l+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We further adjust the step size $\gamma^t \in (0, 1]$ at iterate t by a backtracking line search
 algorithm:

$$\theta^{t+1} \leftarrow \theta^t + \gamma^{t+1}(\theta^{t+} - \theta^t).$$

The proximal Newton algorithm iterates until the convergence of objective.

2.4 Bayesian perspective

Since many current approaches are Bayesian methods, we here provide an alternative
 interpretation of our approach from the Bayesian perspective. Our approach can be
 interpreted as a state-space model of Poisson observational noises and Laplace
 transition noises with certain degree $k \geq 0$, e.g., $\theta_{t+1} = 2\theta_t - \theta_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{t+1}$ with
 $\varepsilon_{t+1} \sim \text{Laplace}(0, 1/\lambda)$ for $k = 1$. Compared to EpiFilter [4], another retrospective
 study of \mathcal{R}_t , we share same observational assumptions, but our approach has a different
 transition noises. EpiFilter estimates the posterior distribution of \mathcal{R}_t , and thus it can
 provide the credible interval estimation with various credible levels. Our approach
 solves the point estimation using optimization problem, which has the advantage of
 computational efficiency.

3 Results

Implementation of the proximal Newton method is provided in the R package `rtestim`.

3.1 Covid-19 cases

We implement the proposed model on the Covid-19 confirmed cases in British Columbia (B.C.) as of May 18, 2023 reported by B.C. Conservation Data Centre. We choose the gamma distribution with shape 2.5 and scale 2.5 to approximate the serial interval function.

Considering the temporal evolutions of neighboring 3, 4, 5 reproduction numbers, the estimated reproduction numbers of Covid-19 in British Columbia (displayed in the top right, bottom left, and bottom right panels in Fig 1 respectively) are always lower than 2.5, which means that two distinct infected individuals can on average infect less than five other individuals in the population. The three degrees of the temporal evolution (across all regularization levels λ) all yield similar results that $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_t$ achieves the highest peak around the end of 2021 and reaches the lowest trough shortly thereafter. Throughout the estimated curves, the peaks and troughs of the reproduction numbers roughly come prior to the following growths and decays of confirmed cases respectively.

The reproduction numbers are relatively unstable before April 1st, 2022. The highest peak coincides with the emergence and globally spread of the Omicron variant. The estimated reproduction numbers are apparently below the threshold 1 during two time periods – roughly from April 1st, 2021 to July 1st, 2021 and from January 1st, 2022 to April 1st, 2022. The first trough of $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_t$ coincides with the first authorization for use of Covid-19 vaccines in British Columbia. The second trough shortly after the greatest peak may credit to many aspects, including self-isolation of the infected individuals and application of the second shot of Covid-19 vaccines. Since around April 1st, 2022, the reproduction numbers stay stable (at around 1) and the infected cases stay low.

Greater regularization levels (i.e., larger λ s) result in smoother estimated curves. Smoother curves (e.g., the yellow curve in the top right panel in Fig 1) suggest that the estimated reproduction numbers are around 1 during most time periods; however, they may not be appropriate to interpret the reality. More wiggly curves better reflect the fluctuation of \mathcal{R}_t , but sometimes fail to highlight the significant peaks or troughs. The tuning parameter λ needs to be chosen corresponding to the information in practice for a better interpretation.

4 Discussion

Our approach provides a locally adaptive estimator using Poisson trend filtering on univariate data. It captures the heterogeneous smoothness of effective reproduction numbers given the observed incidence time series in a certain region. This is a nonparametric regression model which can be written as convex optimization(minimization) problem. Minimizing the distance (averaged KL divergence per coordinate) between the estimators and (functions of) observations guarantees the data fidelity; minimizing a certain order of divided differences between each pair of neighboring parameters regularizes the smoothness. The ℓ_1 regularization introduces sparsity to the divided differences, which leads to heterogeneous smoothness within certain periods of time. The homogeneous smoothness within a time period can be either performed by a constant reproduction number, or a constant rate of changes, or a constant graphical curvature depending on the prescribed degree ($k = 0, 1, 2$ respectively).

The property of local adaptivity is useful to distinguish, for example, the seasonal outbreaks from the un-seasonal outbreak periods. Given a properly chosen degree of polynomials, for example, the growth rate of un-seasonal outbreak periods can suggest a potential upcoming outbreak, which alerts epidemiologists to propose sanitary policies to prevent the progressing outbreak ahead of the infection surge. The effective

reproduction numbers can be estimated afterwards to check the efficiency of the
sanitary policies referring to whether they are below the threshold, their tendencies of
reduction, or their graphical curvatures.

Our proposed model provides a natural way to deal with missing data, e.g., on
weekends and holidays. We linearly impute the missing data in the computation of total
primary infectiousness by assuming these values are missing at random. While solving
the convex optimization problem, the edge lengths of the line graphs can be adjusted, so
we can manually increase the length between two observations while penalizing the
distance between them. It is remarkable that our focus is to provide a mathematical
model for epidemiologists to use, rather than to focus on a specific disease. In addition,
more specialized methodologies are needed for the diseases with relatively long
incubation periods (e.g., HIV and HBV).

A group of epidemiological models are compartmental models. They establish the
epidemic transmission process by creating compartments with labels and connecting
them by directed edges. A simple compartmental model – for example,
Susceptible-Infectious-Susceptible (SIS) model – divides the population (N) into two
compartments for susceptible cases (S) and infectious cases (I) respectively and
connects them in serial as $S \rightarrow I \rightarrow S$. It only focuses on susceptible individuals. Each
directed edge corresponds to a ratio of transmission (say, α, β respectively). In such
models, reproduction numbers are defined as functions of the estimated transmission
parameters and the numbers of compartments or population, e.g., $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_0 = \hat{\beta}N/\hat{\alpha}$ in the
SIS models [22], as by-products. Compartmental models usually solve ordinary
differential equations (ODE) systems for transmission numbers (e.g., α, β in the SIS
model). A disadvantage of such parametric models is that they are less flexible than
nonparametric models and the number of parameters to be estimated grows along with
the increase of compartments in practice, which results in a growing computational
complexity. Since the epidemic mechanism depends highly on the contexts, e.g., if a
latency period exists or not, such models are lack of generalizability. Moreover, data of
high quality are not always available for all compartments especially when there is a
pandemic outbreak that results in a sudden shortage of resources in collecting daily new
infections.

There are more practical considerations that may influence the quality of \mathcal{R}_t
estimation to be considered late. In our approach, we consider a homogeneous
population without distinguishing the imported cases from the local cases. Poisson
distribution is frequently used to model non-negative count data with heteroskedasticity.
Another common alternative is negative binomial distribution with a specified level of
overdispersion. We consider a fixed serial interval throughout the transmission
dynamics, but as the factors such as population immunity vary, the serial interval may
vary as well. A common argument is that the distribution density of serial intervals is
generally wider than the correspondence of generation intervals as serial interval
includes both generation time and incubation time. If we assume generation time and
incubation time both follow gamma distributions, the serial interval is likely to perform
as a bimodal density.

Supporting information

S1 Fig. Covid-19 figure. Covid-19 cases in BC and the estimated reproduction
numbers.

S2 Fig. Lorem ipsum. Maecenas convallis mauris sit amet sem ultrices gravida.
Etiam eget sapien nibh. Sed ac ipsum eget enim egestas ullamcorper nec euismod ligula.
Curabitur fringilla pulvinar lectus consectetur pellentesque.

S1 File. Lorem ipsum. Maecenas convallis mauris sit amet sem ultrices gravida. Etiam eget sapien nibh. Sed ac ipsum eget enim egestas ullamcorper nec euismod ligula. Curabitur fringilla pulvinar lectus consectetur pellentesque.	305 306 307
S1 Video. Lorem ipsum. Maecenas convallis mauris sit amet sem ultrices gravida. Etiam eget sapien nibh. Sed ac ipsum eget enim egestas ullamcorper nec euismod ligula. Curabitur fringilla pulvinar lectus consectetur pellentesque.	308 309 310
S1 Appendix. Lorem ipsum. Maecenas convallis mauris sit amet sem ultrices gravida. Etiam eget sapien nibh. Sed ac ipsum eget enim egestas ullamcorper nec euismod ligula. Curabitur fringilla pulvinar lectus consectetur pellentesque.	311 312 313
S1 Table. Lorem ipsum. Maecenas convallis mauris sit amet sem ultrices gravida. Etiam eget sapien nibh. Sed ac ipsum eget enim egestas ullamcorper nec euismod ligula. Curabitur fringilla pulvinar lectus consectetur pellentesque.	314 315 316

Acknowledgments	317
Cras egestas velit mauris, eu mollis turpis pellentesque sit amet. Interdum et malesuada fames ac ante ipsum primis in faucibus. Nam id pretium nisi. Sed ac quam id nisi malesuada congue. Sed interdum aliquet augue, at pellentesque quam rhoncus vitae.	318 319 320

References

1. Cori A, Ferguson NM, Fraser C, Cauchemez S. A new framework and software to estimate time-varying reproduction numbers during epidemics. American journal of epidemiology. 2013;178(9):1505–1512.
2. Thompson RN, Stockwin JE, van Gaalen RD, Polonsky JA, Kamvar ZN, Demarsh PA, et al. Improved inference of time-varying reproduction numbers during infectious disease outbreaks. Epidemics. 2019;29:100356.
3. Nash RK, Bhatt S, Cori A, Nouvellet P. Estimating the epidemic reproduction number from temporally aggregated incidence data: A statistical modelling approach and software tool. PLOS Computational Biology. 2023;19(8):e1011439.
4. Parag KV. Improved estimation of time-varying reproduction numbers at low case incidence and between epidemic waves. PLoS Computational Biology. 2021;17(9):e1009347.
5. Abbott S, Hellewell J, Thompson RN, Sherratt K, Gibbs HP, Bosse NI, et al. Estimating the time-varying reproduction number of SARS-CoV-2 using national and subnational case counts. Wellcome Open Research. 2020;5(112):112.
6. Lison A, Abbott S, Huisman J, Stadler T. Generative Bayesian modeling to nowcast the effective reproduction number from line list data with missing symptom onset dates. arXiv preprint arXiv:230813262. 2023;.
7. Gressani O, Wallinga J, Althaus CL, Hens N, Faes C. EpiLPS: A fast and flexible Bayesian tool for estimation of the time-varying reproduction number. PLoS computational biology. 2022;18(10):e1010618.

8. Trevisin C, Bertuzzo E, Pasetto D, Mari L, Miccoli S, Casagrandi R, et al. Spatially explicit effective reproduction numbers from incidence and mobility data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2023;120(20):e2219816120.
9. Abry P, Pustelnik N, Roux S, Jensen P, Flandrin P, Gribonval R, et al. Spatial and temporal regularization to estimate COVID-19 reproduction number $R(t)$: Promoting piecewise smoothness via convex optimization. *Plos one*. 2020;15(8):e0237901.
10. Pascal B, Abry P, Pustelnik N, Roux S, Gribonval R, Flandrin P. Nonsmooth convex optimization to estimate the Covid-19 reproduction number space-time evolution with robustness against low quality data. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*. 2022;70:2859–2868.
11. Azmon A, Faes C, Hens N. On the estimation of the reproduction number based on misreported epidemic data. *Statistics in medicine*. 2014;33(7):1176–1192.
12. Gressani O, Faes C, Hens N. An approximate Bayesian approach for estimation of the reproduction number under misreported epidemic data. *MedRxiv*. 2021; p. 2021–05.
13. Pircalabelu E. A spline-based time-varying reproduction number for modelling epidemiological outbreaks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics*. 2023; p. qlad027.
14. Jin S, Dickens BL, Lim JT, Cook AR. EpiMix: A novel method to estimate effective reproduction number. *Infectious Disease Modelling*. 2023;.
15. Hettinger G, Rubin D, Huang J. Estimating the Instantaneous Reproduction Number With Imperfect Data: A Method to Account for Case-Reporting Variation and Serial Interval Uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:230212078*. 2023;.
16. Pircalabelu E. A spline-based time-varying reproduction number for modelling epidemiological outbreaks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics*. 2023; p. qlad027.
17. Ho F, Parag KV, Adam DC, Lau EH, Cowling BJ, Tsang TK. Accounting for the Potential of Overdispersion in Estimation of the Time-varying Reproduction Number. *Epidemiology*. 2023;34(2):201–205.
18. Kim SJ, Koh K, Boyd S, Gorinevsky D. ℓ_1 trend filtering. *SIAM review*. 2009;51(2):339–360.
19. Tibshirani RJ. Adaptive piecewise polynomial estimation via trend filtering. *The Annals of Statistics*. 2014;42(1):285–323.
20. Ramdas A, Tibshirani RJ. Fast and flexible admm algorithms for trend filtering. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*. 2016;25(3):839–858.
21. Johnson NA. A dynamic programming algorithm for the fused lasso and ℓ_0 -segmentation. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*. 2013;22(2):246–260.
22. Brauer F, Castillo-Chavez C, Feng Z. *Mathematical models in epidemiology*. vol. 32. Springer; 2019.