

1 **Article Summary Line:** This modeling study indicates that 2019-nCoV has a higher  
2 effective reproduction number than SARS with a comparable fatality rate.

3 **Running Title:** Effective reproduction number of 2019-nCoV

4 **Keywords:** Epidemiology, Computer Simulation, Disease Outbreaks, Coronavirus

5  
6 **Estimating the effective reproduction number of the 2019-nCoV in China**

7 **Authors:** Zhidong Cao<sup>1</sup>, Qingpeng Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Xin Lu, Dirk Pfeiffer, Zhongwei Jia, Hongbing  
8 Song, Daniel Dajun Zeng

9 **Affiliations:**

10 Chinese Academy of Sciences Institute of Automation, Beijing, China (Z. Cao, D.D. Zeng)

11 University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing (Z. Cao, D.D. Zeng)

12 Shenzhen Artificial Intelligence and Data Science Institute (Longhua), Shenzhen (Z. Cao,

13 D.D. Zeng)

14 City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong (Q. Zhang, D. Pfeiffer)

15 National University of Defense Technology, Changsha (X. Lu)

16 Peking University, Beijing (Z. Jia)

17 Chinese PLA Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Beijing (H. Song)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

25 **Abstract—35 words**

26 We estimate the effective reproduction number for 2019-nCoV based on the daily reported  
27 cases from China CDC. The results indicate that 2019-nCoV has a higher effective  
28 reproduction number than SARS with a comparable fatality rate.

29 **Text—799 words**

30 As of 01/26/2020, the 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV), originated in Wuhan  
31 China, has spread to 29 mainland provinces, Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan, as well as 11 other  
32 countries (1, 2). Early genome sequence and clinical studies of 2019-nCoV provided the  
33 evidence of human-to-human transmission and revealed its similarity to as well as differences  
34 from SARS (3-5). However, epidemiological investigations of 2019-nCoV are just  
35 beginning, and data-driven studies are critically needed to develop insights into this ongoing  
36 outbreak and evaluate the effectiveness of public health strategies, such as the currently  
37 implemented lockdown of Wuhan.

38 An important epidemiological understanding of 2019-nCoV is concerned with its  
39 transmissibility, quantified by the basic reproduction number  $R_0$  and the effective  
40 reproduction number  $R$ .  $R_0$  is the expected number of secondary infectious cases generated  
41 by an infectious case in a susceptible population.  $R$  is the expected number of secondary  
42 cases generated by an infectious case once an epidemic is underway (6).  $R = R_0x$ , where  $x \in$   
43  $(0, 1)$  is the proportion of the population susceptible. Following (7),  $R$  is calculated as  
44 follows:

45 
$$R = K^2(L \times D) + K(L + D) + 1,$$

46 where  $L$  is the average latent period,  $D$  the average latent infectious period,  $K$  the logarithmic  
47 growth rate of the case counts as reported by China CDC. This form of  $R$  is appropriate  
48 because 2019-nCoV is still at its early growth stage. According to China CDC, we set  $L = 7$   
49 days and  $D = 9$  days. Experiments with varying  $L$  and  $D$  values were also conducted.

50 Let  $t$  denote the number of days since the start of the outbreak and  $Y(t)$  the number of  
51 cases.  $K$  is estimated based on  $Y(t)$  at six time points. (Time-1) 12/31/2019, when the  
52 authorities reported the first 27 cases with the infection dated as early as 12/16/2019. As  
53 such,  $t = 15$ ,  $Y(15) = 27$ . (Time-2) 01/04/2020,  $t = 19$ ,  $Y(19) = 41$ ; (c) 01/21/2020,  $t = 36$ ,  
54  $Y(36) = 375$ ; (Time-3) 01/22/2020,  $t = 37$ ,  $Y(37) = 437$ ; (Time-4) 01/23/2020,  $t = 38$ ,  $Y$   
55  $(38) = 507$ ; (Time-5) 01/24/2020,  $t = 39$ ,  $Y(39) = 572$ ; (Time-6) 01/25/2020,  $t = 40$ ,  $Y(40)$   
56  $= 618$ . Note that the case data between 01/05/2020-01/20/2020 were discarded due to  
57 significant changes experienced in this time period in the case reporting requirements and  
58 practice.

59 Using the data described above,  $R$  is estimated to be 4.08, indicating that an infected  
60 patient infects more than four susceptible people during the outbreak. This value substantially  
61 exceeds WHO's estimate of  $R_0$  (supposed to be smaller than  $R$ ) between 1.4 and 2.5, and is  
62 also higher than a recent  $R_0$  estimate between 3.6 and 4.0 (8). Compared against the 2003  
63 SARS epidemic,  $R$  of 2019-nCoV is higher than that of SARS in both Beijing (2.76) and  
64 Guangzhou (3.01) (calculated using the same method). To test the robustness of findings, we  
65 performed sensitivity analyses by adopting varying values of  $L$  and  $D$ , generated from a  
66 Gaussian distribution with  $L \sim N(7,1)$  and  $D \sim N(9,1)$ . The resulting mean of  $R$  estimates is  
67 4.08, as expected, with  $SD=0.36$  (95% CI 3.37~4.77).

68 To predict the future outbreak profile, we developed a model based on the  
69 deterministic Susceptible-Exposed-Infectious-Recovered-Death-Cumulative (SEIRDC)  
70 structure (9). Overall, our model appears to explain the reported case counts very well during  
71 the current early stage of the outbreak. An interesting finding is that by setting the start date  
72 to a time earlier than 12/16/2020 (the experimented range is from 12/01/2019—12/15/2019),  
73 the SEIRDC model is able to provide a better fit for the case counts. This indicates that  
74 human-to-human transmission may have started earlier than what the current prevailing

75 viewpoint suggests. Obviously, further molecular and epidemiological studies are needed to  
76 draw any conclusions in this regard.

77         The SEIRDC model estimates the fatality rate for 2019-nCoV is 6.50%. As a base of  
78 comparison, the fatality rate for 2003 SARS was 7.66% and 3.61% for Beijing and  
79 Guangzhou, respectively. We used the model to predict the confirmed case counts and death  
80 counts in the first 80 days of the ongoing 2019-nCoV outbreak. We simulated these counts  
81 for the 2003 SARS outbreaks in Beijing and Guangzhou as well, using the case counts as  
82 input. The basic assumption is the absence of any control measures in all these scenarios. At  
83 the end of this 80-day period, according to our simulations, the 2019-nCoV case counts  
84 (35,454) is close to that of SARS in Guangzhou (37,663) and much higher than that of SARS  
85 in Beijing (17,594). The 2019-nCoV death count (1,089) is much higher than that of SARS in  
86 Guangzhou (725) and Beijing (690).

87         Our study also suggests that by reducing the average infectious period to <2.3 days,  
88 the resulting  $R$  will decrease to a value less than 1, meaning the epidemic can be effectively  
89 controlled.

90         In conclusion, considering transmissibility and fatality rate, 2019-nCoV poses a major  
91 public health threat, at least at the level of 2003 SARS. Epidemiological studies are critically  
92 called for to evaluate the effectiveness of stringent measures such as lockdown and help the  
93 design of refinements and development of potential alternative strategies for the next phase of  
94 the 2019-nCoV outbreak.

## 95 **Acknowledgments**

96         This work was supported in part by grants from the Ministry of Science and  
97 Technology (2016QY02D0305), National Natural Science Foundation of China (71621002,  
98 71771213, 71790615, 71972164 and 91846301), Chinese Academy of Sciences (ZDRW-XH-  
99 2017-3), and the Hunan Science and Technology Plan Project (2017RS3040, 2018JJ1034).

100 **Disclaimers**

101 Nil.

102 **Author Bio**

103 Dr. Zhidong Cao is a researcher in the State Key Laboratory of Management and  
104 Control for Complex Systems, Chinese Academy of Sciences Institute of Automation. His  
105 primary research interests are infectious disease informatics, spatio-temporal data processing,  
106 and social computing.

107 **Footnotes**

108 <sup>1</sup> These first authors contributed equally to this article.

109 **References**

- 110 1. The Lancet. Emerging understandings of 2019-nCoV. *Lancet*. January 2020.  
111 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30186-0
- 112 2. Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. The 2019 novel coronavirus.  
113 [cited 2020 Jan 26]. [http://www.chinacdc.cn/jkzt/crb/zl/szkb\\_11803/](http://www.chinacdc.cn/jkzt/crb/zl/szkb_11803/)
- 114 3. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel  
115 coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*. January 2020. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
116 6736(20)30183-5
- 117 4. Chan JF-W, Yuan S, Kok K-H, et al. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with  
118 the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a  
119 family cluster. *Lancet*. January 2020. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30154-9
- 120 5. Xu X, Chen P, Wang J, et al. Evolution of the novel coronavirus from the ongoing  
121 Wuhan outbreak and modeling of its spike protein for risk of human transmission. *Sci*  
122 *CHINA Life Sci*. 2020. doi:10.1007/S11427-020-1637-5

- 123 6. Castillo-Chavez C, Feng Z, Huang W. On the computation of  $R_0$  and its role on global  
124 stability. In: Castillo-Chavez C, Blower S, van den Driessche P, Kirschner D, Yakubu  
125 A, eds. Mathematical approaches for emerging and reemerging infectious diseases: an  
126 introduction. New York: Springer, 2002: 229–50.
- 127 7. Lipsitch M, Cohen T, Cooper B, et al. Transmission dynamics and control of severe  
128 acute respiratory syndrome. *Science (80- )*. 2003;300(5627):1966-1970.  
129 doi:10.1126/science.1086616
- 130 8. Read JM, Bridgen JR, Cummings DA, Ho A, Jewell CP. Novel coronavirus 2019-  
131 nCoV: early estimation of epidemiological parameters and epidemic predictions.  
132 *medRxiv*. January 2020:2020.01.23.20018549. doi:10.1101/2020.01.23.20018549
- 133 9. Chowell G, Nishiura H, Bettencourt LMA. Comparative estimation of the reproduction  
134 number for pandemic influenza from daily case notification data. *J R Soc Interface*.  
135 2007;4(12):154-166. doi:10.1098/rsif.2006.0161

136

137 **Address for correspondence:** Daniel Zeng, Chinese Academy of Sciences Institute of  
138 Automation, Room 1202, Automation Building, 95 Zhongguancun East Road,  
139 Haidian, Beijing 100190, China, email: [dajun.zeng@ia.ac.cn](mailto:dajun.zeng@ia.ac.cn).

140

141 Figure. SEIRDC model predictions for (A) cumulative numbers of infected persons and (B)  
142 deaths of 2019-nCoV, 2003-SARS in Beijing, and 2003 SARS in Guangzhou in the first 80  
143 days after the outbreak.



