

Doubling Time of the COVID-19 Epidemic by Province, China

Kamalich Muniz-Rodriguez,¹ Gerardo Chowell,¹ Chi-Hin Cheung, Dongyu Jia, Po-Ying Lai, Yiseul Lee, Manyun Liu, Sylvia K. Ofori, Kimberlyn M. Roosa, Lone Simonsen, Cecile Viboud, Isaac Chun-Hai Fung

Author affiliations: Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, Georgia, USA (K. Muniz-Rodriguez, D. Jia, M. Liu, S.K. Ofori, I.C.-H. Fung); Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA (G. Chowell, Y. Lee, K.M. Roosa); National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA (G. Chowell, C. Viboud); Independent researcher, Hong Kong (C.-H. Cheung); Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA (P.-Y. Lai); Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark (L. Simonsen)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2608.200219>

In China, the doubling time of the coronavirus disease epidemic by province increased during January 20–February 9, 2020. Doubling time estimates ranged from 1.4 (95% CI 1.2–2.0) days for Hunan Province to 3.1 (95% CI 2.1–4.8) days for Xinjiang Province. The estimate for Hubei Province was 2.5 (95% CI 2.4–2.6) days.

Our ability to estimate the basic reproduction number (R_0) of emerging infectious diseases is often hindered by the paucity of information about the epidemiologic characteristics and transmission mechanisms of new pathogens (1). Alternative metrics could synthesize real-time information about the extent to which the epidemic is expanding over time. Such metrics would be particularly useful if they rely on minimal and routinely collected data that capture the trajectory of an outbreak (2).

Epidemic doubling times characterize the sequence of intervals at which the cumulative incidence doubles (3). If an epidemic is growing exponentially with a constant growth rate r , the doubling time remains constant and equals $(\ln 2)/r$. An increase in the doubling time indicates a slowdown in transmission if the underlying reporting rate remains unchanged (Appendix, <https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/EID/article/26/8/20-0219-App1.pdf>) (4).

We analyzed, by province, the number of times coronavirus disease (COVID-19) cumulative incidence doubled and the evolution of the doubling times in mainland China (5), from January 20

(when nationwide reporting began) through February 9, 2020. We retrieved province-level daily cumulative incidence data from provincial health commissions' websites and conducted 2 sensitivity analyses based on a longer and a shorter time period (Appendix). We excluded Tibet from further analysis because only 1 case was reported during the study period.

During January 20–February 9, the harmonic mean of the arithmetic means of the doubling times estimated from cumulative incidence ranged from 1.4 (95% CI 1.2–2.0) days in Hunan Province to 3.1 (95% CI 2.1–4.8) days in Xinjiang Province. We estimated doubling time as 2.5 (95% CI 2.4–2.6) days in Hubei Province. The cumulative incidence doubled 6 times in Hubei Province during the study period. The harmonic mean of the arithmetic means of doubling times for mainland China except Hubei Province was 1.8 (95% CI 1.5–2.3) days. Fujian, Guangxi, Hebei, Heilongjiang, Henan, Hunan, Jiangxi, Shandong, Sichuan, and Zhejiang provinces had a harmonic mean of the arithmetic means of doubling times <2 days (Figure; Appendix Figure 1).

As the epidemic progressed, it took longer for the cumulative incidence in mainland China (except Hubei) to double, which indicated an overall sub-exponential growth pattern outside Hubei Province (Appendix Figures 1, 2). In Hubei Province, the doubling time decreased and then increased. A gradual increase in the doubling time coincided with the social distancing measures and intraprovincial and interprovincial travel restrictions imposed across China since the implementation of the quarantine of Wuhan on January 23 (6).

Our estimates of doubling times are shorter than prior estimates. Li et al. covered cases reported by January 22 and found a doubling time estimate of 7.4 (95% CI 4.2–14) days (5). Wu et al. statistically inferred case counts in Wuhan by internationally exported cases as of January 25 and estimated doubling time as 6.4 (95% CI 5.8–7.1) days (7). Volz et al. identified a common viral ancestor on December 8, 2019, using Bayesian phylogenetic analysis and fitted an exponential growth model to provide the epidemic growth rate and estimated a doubling time of 7.1 (95% CI 3.0–20.5) days (8). Our estimates are based on cumulative confirmed case count by reporting date by province during January 20–February 9, 2020.

Our study is subject to several limitations, including underreporting of cases (9). One reason for underreporting is underdiagnosis, resulting from a lack of diagnostic tests, healthcare workers, and

¹These authors contributed equally to this article.

other resources. Further, underreporting is likely heterogeneous across provinces. As long as reporting remains invariant over time within the same province, the calculation of doubling times remains

reliable; however, this is a strong assumption. Growing awareness of the epidemic and increasing availability of diagnostic tests might have strengthened reporting over time, which could have artificially




Figure. Doubling time estimates for coronavirus disease in mainland China, by province, January 20–February 9, 2020. A) Harmonic mean of the arithmetic means of doubling time estimates; B) number of times the cumulative incidence doubled during the study period.

shortened the doubling time. Nevertheless, apart from Hubei and Guangdong Provinces (first cases reported on January 19, 2020), nationwide reporting began only on January 20; at that point, authorities in China openly acknowledged the magnitude and severity of the epidemic.

Because of a lack of detailed case data describing incidence trends for imported and local cases, we focused our analysis on the overall trajectory of the epidemic without adjusting for the role of imported cases on the local transmission dynamics. It is likely that the proportion of imported cases could be large for provinces that reported only a few cases; their short doubling times in the study period could simply reflect rapid detection of imported cases. However, with the data through February 9, only 2 provinces had a cumulative case count <40 (Appendix Table 1). It would be worthwhile to investigate the evolution of the doubling time after accounting for case importations if more detailed data become available.

In summary, we observed an increasing trend in the epidemic doubling time of COVID-19 by province of China during January 20–February 9, 2020. The harmonic mean of the arithmetic means of doubling times of cumulative incidence during the study period in Hubei Province, where the outbreak was first recognized, was estimated at 2.5 (95% CI 2.4–2.6) days.

G.C. receives support from National Science Foundation grant no. 1414374 as part of the joint NSF-NIH-USDA Ecology and Evolution of Infectious Diseases program. I.C.-H.F. receives salary support from the National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (grant no. 19IPA1908208). This article is not part of I.C.-H.F.'s CDC-sponsored projects.

About the Authors

Ms. Muniz-Rodriguez is a doctoral student at the Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, Georgia, USA. Her research interests include infectious disease epidemiology, digital epidemiology, and disaster epidemiology. Dr. Chowell

is a professor of epidemiology and biostatistics and chair of the department of population health sciences at Georgia State University School of Public Health, Atlanta, Georgia. As a mathematical epidemiologist, he studies the transmission dynamics of emerging infectious diseases, such as Ebola, MERS, and SARS.

References

1. Anderson RM, May RM. *Infectious diseases of humans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1991.
2. Drake JM, Bakach I, Just MR, O'Regan SM, Gambhir M, Fung IC-H. Transmission models of historical Ebola outbreaks. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2015;21:1447–50. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2108.141613>
3. Vynnycky E, White RG. *An introduction to infectious disease modelling*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2010.
4. Muniz-Rodriguez K, Fung IC-H, Ferdosi SR, Ofori SK, Lee Y, Tariq A, et al. Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 transmission potential, Iran, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020 Apr 22 [Epub ahead of print]. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2608.200536>
5. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus-infected pneumonia. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382:1199–207. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001316>
6. Du Z, Wang L, Cauchemez S, Xu X, Wang X, Cowling BJ, et al. Risk for transportation of 2019 novel coronavirus disease from Wuhan to other cities in China. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26:1049–52. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2605.200146>
7. Wu JT, Leung K, Leung GM. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *Lancet*. 2020;395:689–97. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30260-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30260-9)
8. Volz E, Baguelin M, Bhatia S, Boonyasiri A, Cori A, Cucunubá Z, et al. Report 5: phylogenetic analysis of SARS-CoV-2. 2020 [cited 2020 Apr 15]. <https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida-fellowships/Imperial-College-COVID19-phylogenetics-15-02-2020.pdf>
9. Fang G, Li S, Liu Y, Xin N, Ma K. People beyond the statistics: died of “normal pneumonia”? [in Chinese]. *Caijing Zachi* [Finance and Economics Magazine]. 2020 [cited 2020 Feb 13]. https://web.archive.org/web/20200213190623/http://www.sohu.com/a/370032279_120094087

Address for correspondence: Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology, and Environmental Health Sciences, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA 30460, USA; email: cfung@georgiasouthern.edu

Doubling Time of the COVID-19 Epidemic by Province, China

Appendix

Motivation, Scope, and Methods

Motivation

Reproduction number (R_0), a widely used indicator of transmission potential in a totally susceptible population, is driven by the average contact rate and the mean infectious period of the disease (I). However, it characterizes only transmission potential at the onset of the epidemic and varies geographically for a given infectious disease according to local healthcare provision, outbreak response, and socioeconomic and cultural factors. Furthermore, estimating R_0 requires information about the natural history of the infectious disease. Thus, our ability to estimate reproduction numbers for novel infectious diseases is hindered by the paucity of information about their epidemiologic characteristics and transmission mechanisms. More informative metrics could synthesize real-time information about the extent to which the epidemic is expanding over time. Such metrics would be particularly useful if they rely on minimal data on the outbreak's trajectory (2).

Scope and Definitions

Our analysis in this article is restricted to mainland China. A “province” encompasses 3 different types of political subdivisions of mainland China: a province, a centrally (literally, “directly”) administered municipality (Beijing, Chongqing, Shanghai, and Tianjin), and an “ethnic minority” autonomous region (Guangxi, Inner Mongolia, Ningxia, Tibet, and Xinjiang). Our analysis does not include the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macau Special Administrative Region, which are under the effective rule of the People's Republic of China through the “One Country, Two Systems” political arrangements. Our analysis also does not include Taiwan, which is governed de facto by a different government (the Republic of China).

Data Sources

Daily cumulative incidence data were retrieved from provincial health commissions' websites (Appendix Table 8). Data were double-checked against the cumulative national total published by the National Health Commission (3), data compiled by the Centre for Health Protection, Hong Kong, when available (4), and data from John Hopkins University Center for Systems Science and Engineering (5). Whenever discrepancies arose, provincial government sources were deemed authoritative.

Doubling Time Calculation and Relationship with Epidemic Growth Rate

As the epidemic grows, the times at which cumulative incidence doubles are given by t_{d_i} such that $2C(t_{d_i}) = C(t_{d_{i+1}})$, where $t_{d_0} = 0$, $C(t_{d_0}) = C_0$, and $i = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, n_d$ where n_d is the total number of times cumulative incidence doubles. The actual sequence of doubling times is defined as follows:

$$d_j = \Delta t_{d_j} = t_{d_j} - t_{d_{j-1}} \text{ where } j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n_d.$$

To quantify parameter uncertainty, we used parametric bootstrapping with a Poisson error structure around the harmonic mean of doubling times d_j to obtain the 95% confidence interval (6–8).

If we assume homogeneous mixing (equal probability of acquiring infection through contacts) and exponential growth, then $C(t_2) = C(t_1)\exp(rt)$; therefore, $\ln(C(t_2)/C(t_1)) = rt$. When $C(t_2)/C(t_1) = 2$, t is the doubling time; that is, $t = t_d$, $\ln 2 = rt_d$. Therefore, the doubling time, t_d , equals $(\ln 2)/r$ (9).

Methods

We calculated doubling time using MATLAB R2019b (Mathworks, <https://www.mathworks.com>). We created the figures using either R version 3.6.2 (R Core Team, <https://www.r-project.org>) or MATLAB R2019b. Significance level in this manuscript was a priori decided to be $\alpha = 0.05$.

Results and Discussion

Cumulative Incidence over Time

Appendix Figures 7–10 provide plots of cumulative incidence over time (left panels) and semilog plots with \log_{10} -transformed cumulative incidence over time (right panels) for 8 provinces with a relatively high number of cases: the epicenter, Hubei, followed by (in alphabetical order) Fujian, Guangdong, Heilongjiang, Henan, Hubei, Hunan, Jiangxi, and Shandong. If the epidemic is growing exponentially, the \log_{10} -transformed cumulative incidence over time will be a linear curve. If social distancing would have an impact, the slope of the semilog plot would decrease, indicating a decreasing epidemic growth rate.

Harmonic Mean of the Harmonic Mean

In this study, we also presented the harmonic mean of the harmonic means of the estimates of the epidemic doubling times. The harmonic means of the epidemic doubling times are shorter than their arithmetic means. During January 20–February 9, 2020, the harmonic mean of the harmonic means of the doubling times estimated ranged from 0.5 days (95% CI 0.2–1.3) for Guangxi to 2.3 days (95% CI 2.3–2.4) for Hubei. The harmonic mean of the harmonic means of doubling times in mainland China except Hubei were 1.2 days (95% CI, 1.0–1.4) (Appendix Table 4).

Further Discussion

The slowing down of the epidemic as represented in increasing epidemic doubling times in our study is also consistent with a study by Benjamin F. Maier and Dirk Brockmann, “Effective containment explains sub-exponential growth in confirmed cases of recent COVID-19 outbreak in Mainland China” (preprint available at arXiv 2020:2002.07572). They also identified subexponential growth of the outbreak across provinces, as mass quarantine and restriction of travels across mainland China began, since January 23, 2020.

Sensitivity Analysis 1

We performed a sensitivity analysis by expanding our data analysis to the data after December 31, 2019, when Hubei first reported a cluster of pneumonia cases with unexplained etiology that turned out to be COVID-19. The only difference between the sensitivity analysis and the main analysis is the inclusion of Hubei and Guangdong data from December 31, 2019, through January 19, 2020, because nationwide reporting started on January 20, 2020. The only

differences in results were found for Hubei and Guangdong. For Hubei, the harmonic mean of the arithmetic mean of the doubling times was 4.06 (95% CI 3.85–4.33), the harmonic mean of the harmonic means of the doubling times for Hubei was 2.28 (95% CI 2.08–2.56), and the cumulative incidence in Hubei doubled nine times from December 31, 2019, through February 9, 2020 (Appendix Table 5, Appendix Figures 3, 4, 12–14). The first doubling time of Hubei (Appendix Figure 3) was high, reflecting that real-time data were unavailable before mid-January. It was only from January 17, 2020 onward that data reporting become increasingly transparent and timely.

Sensitivity Analysis 2

We also performed a sensitivity analysis by restricting our data analysis to the data for January 23–February 9, 2020, to allow for the time that all the other provinces to ramp up their testing. January 23 was also the day when the Chinese authorities to put the city of Wuhan on lockdown and major interprovincial travel restrictions were put in place. When we changed the start date of our study period from January 20 (main analysis) to January 23, 2020 (sensitivity analysis 2), the epidemic doubling time of the aggregate cumulative incidence of mainland China (except Hubei) increased from 1.79 (95% CI 1.52–2.25) to 2.90 (95% CI 2.62–3.24) (harmonic mean of the arithmetic means), and from 1.18 (95% CI 0.96–1.42) to 1.98 (95% CI 1.82–2.17) (harmonic mean of the harmonic means) (Appendix Table 7, Appendix Figures 5, 6). Apart from the epidemic doubling time of the aggregate cumulative incidence of mainland China (except Hubei), we did not observe significant differences by province between results in the main analysis and sensitivity analysis 2. Therefore, our results should be robust for the purpose of this study.

References

1. Anderson RM, May RM. Infectious diseases of humans. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1991.
2. Drake JM, Bakach I, Just MR, O'Regan SM, Gambhir M, Fung IC-H. Transmission models of historical Ebola outbreaks. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2015;21:1447–50. PubMed <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2108.141613>
3. National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China. 2020 [cited 2020 Feb 2]. <http://www.nhc.gov.cn/>

4. Centre for Health Protection, Department of Health, The Government for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. 2020 [cited 2020 Feb 2]. <https://www.chp.gov.hk/en/index.html>
5. John Hopkins University Center for Systems Science and Engineering. 2019 Novel Coronavirus COVID-19 (2019-nCoV) Data Repository by Johns Hopkins CSSE. 2020 [cited 2020 Feb 13]. <https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID-19>
6. Banks HT, Hu S, Thompson WC. Modeling and inverse problems in the presence of uncertainty. Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press; 2014.
7. Chowell G, Ammon CE, Hengartner NW, Hyman JM. Transmission dynamics of the great influenza pandemic of 1918 in Geneva, Switzerland: Assessing the effects of hypothetical interventions. *J Theor Biol.* 2006;241:193–204. PubMed <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2005.11.026>
8. Chowell G, Shim E, Brauer F, Diaz-Dueñas P, Hyman JM, Castillo-Chavez C. Modelling the transmission dynamics of acute haemorrhagic conjunctivitis: application to the 2003 outbreak in Mexico. *Stat Med.* 2006;25:1840–57. PubMed <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.2352>
9. Vynnycky E, White RG. An Introduction to Infectious Disease Modelling. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2010.

Appendix Table 1. Confirmed cases of COVID-19 (December 31, 2019–January 19, 2020) by province in mainland China extracted from official government sources used for the sensitivity analysis.*

| Locations† | Dec | | | | | January | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|----|----|----|---------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|---|
| | 31 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | |
| Mainland China (excluding Hubei) (sum of provincial reports) | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 1 |
| Mainland China (including Hubei) (sum of provincial reports) | 27 | NR | NR | 44 | NR | 59 | NR | NR | NR | NR | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 45 | 62 | 121 | 198 | |
| Mainland China (including Hubei) (sum by NHC)‡ | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| Hubei | 27 | NR | NR | 44 | NR | 59 | NR | NR | NR | NR | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 45 | 62 | 121 | 198 | |
| Guangdong | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 1 |

*NA, not applicable; NHC, National Health Commission of China; NR, not reported.

†Observations were collected directly from government official sites from each province in mainland China. If a press release included data reported at midnight and early morning, they were considered to belong to the day before the data were reported.

‡Official national tally of cumulative case count of confirmed cases was first published by the National Health Commission of China (NHC) on January 21, 2020 for January 20, 2020 (3).

Appendix Table 2. Confirmed cases of COVID-19 (January 20–31, 2020) by province in mainland China; data extracted from official government sources used for the main analysis and sensitivity analysis.

| Locations* | January | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 |
| Mainland China (excluding Hubei) (sum of provincial reports) | 26 | 71 | 145 | 291 | 585 | 923 | 1321 | 1802 | 2386 | 3126 | 3885 | 4637 |
| Mainland China (including Hubei) (sum of provincial reports) | 296 | 446 | 589 | 840 | 1314 | 1975 | 2744 | 4516 | 5940 | 7712 | 9691 | 11790 |
| Mainland China (including Hubei) (sum by NHC)† | 291 | 440 | 571 | 830 | 1287 | 1975 | 2744 | 4515 | 5974 | 7711 | 9692 | 11791 |
| Hubei | 270 | 375 | 444 | 549 | 729 | 1052 | 1423 | 2714 | 3554 | 4586 | 5806 | 7153 |
| Anhui | 0 | 1 | 9 | 15 | 39 | 60 | 70 | 106 | 152 | 200 | 237 | 297 |
| Beijing | 5 | 10 | 14 | 26 | 36 | 49 | 68 | 80 | 91 | 111 | 132 | 156 |
| Chongqing | 0 | 5 | 9 | 27 | 57 | 75 | 110 | 132 | 147 | 165 | 206 | 238 |
| Fujian | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 18 | 35 | 59 | 82 | 101 | 120 | 144 |
| Gansu | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 19 | 24 | 26 | 29 | 35 |
| Guangdong | 14 | 26 | 32 | 53 | 78 | 98 | 146 | 188 | 241 | 311 | 393 | 520 |
| Guangxi | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 23 | 33 | 46 | 51 | 58 | 78 | 87 | 100 |
| Guizhou | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 12 | 15 | 29 |
| Hainan | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 20 | 27 | 33 | 40 | 46 | 49 | 57 |
| Hebei | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 18 | 33 | 48 | 65 | 82 | 96 |
| Heilongjiang | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 15 | 21 | 30 | 37 | 43 | 59 | 80 |
| Henan | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 32 | 83 | 128 | 168 | 206 | 278 | 352 | 422 |
| Hunan | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 43 | 69 | 100 | 143 | 221 | 277 | 332 | 389 |
| Inner Mongolia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 13 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 23 |
| Jiangsu | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 18 | 31 | 47 | 70 | 99 | 129 | 168 | 202 |
| Jiangxi | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 18 | 36 | 48 | 72 | 109 | 162 | 240 | 286 |
| Jilin | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 14 | 14 | 17 |
| Liaoning | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 19 | 22 | 30 | 36 | 41 | 45 | 60 |
| Ningxia | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 12 | 17 | 21 | 26 |
| Qinghai | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 9 |
| Shaanxi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 22 | 46 | 56 | 63 | 87 | 101 |
| Shandong | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 39 | 63 | 87 | 87 | 145 | 178 | 202 |
| Shanghai | 2 | 9 | 16 | 20 | 33 | 40 | 53 | 66 | 80 | 101 | 128 | 153 |
| Shanxi | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 13 | 20 | 27 | 35 | 39 | 47 |
| Sichuan | 0 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 28 | 44 | 69 | 90 | 108 | 142 | 177 | 207 |
| Tianjin | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 14 | 23 | 25 | 27 | 32 | 32 |
| Tibet | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Xinjiang | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 18 |
| Yunnan | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 19 | 26 | 51 | 70 | 80 | 91 |
| Zhejiang | 5 | 10 | 27 | 43 | 62 | 104 | 128 | 173 | 296 | 428 | 537 | 599 |

*Observations were collected directly from government official sites from each province in mainland China. If a press release included data reported at midnight and early morning, they were considered to belong to the day before the data were reported. NHC, National Health Commission of China.

†Data were collected from NHC press releases (3).

Appendix Table 3. Confirmed cases of COVID-19 (February 1–9, 2020) by province in mainland China, extracted from official government sources used for the main analysis and sensitivity analysis.

| Locations* | February | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| Mainland China (excluding Hubei) (sum of provincial reports) | 5396 | 6031 | 6910 | 7646 | 8352 | 9049 | 9614 | 10098 | 10507 |
| Mainland China (including Hubei) (sum of provincial reports) | 14381 | 17208 | 20432 | 24324 | 28017 | 31161 | 34567 | 37198 | 40138 |
| Mainland China (including Hubei) (sum by NCH)† | 14380 | 17205 | 20438 | 24324 | 28018 | 31161 | 34546 | 37198 | 40171 |
| Hubei | 9074 | 11177 | 13522 | 16678 | 19665 | 22112 | 24953 | 27100 | 29631 |
| Anhui | 340 | 408 | 480 | 530 | 591 | 665 | 733 | 779 | 830 |
| Beijing | 183 | 212 | 228 | 253 | 274 | 297 | 315 | 326 | 337 |
| Chongqing | 262 | 300 | 337 | 366 | 389 | 411 | 426 | 446 | 468 |
| Fujian | 159 | 179 | 194 | 205 | 215 | 224 | 239 | 250 | 261 |
| Gansu | 40 | 51 | 55 | 57 | 62 | 67 | 71 | 79 | 83 |
| Guangdong | 604 | 683 | 797 | 870 | 944 | 1018 | 1075 | 1120 | 1131 |
| Guangxi | 111 | 127 | 139 | 150 | 168 | 172 | 183 | 195 | 210 |
| Guizhou | 38 | 46 | 56 | 64 | 69 | 77 | 89 | 96 | 99 |
| Hainan | 63 | 70 | 79 | 89 | 100 | 111 | 122 | 128 | 136 |
| Hebei | 104 | 113 | 126 | 135 | 157 | 171 | 195 | 206 | 218 |
| Heilongjiang | 95 | 118 | 155 | 190 | 227 | 277 | 295 | 307 | 331 |
| Henan | 493 | 566 | 675 | 764 | 851 | 914 | 981 | 1033 | 1073 |
| Hunan | 463 | 521 | 593 | 661 | 711 | 772 | 803 | 838 | 879 |
| Inner Mongolia | 27 | 34 | 35 | 42 | 46 | 50 | 52 | 54 | 58 |
| Jiangsu | 236 | 271 | 308 | 341 | 373 | 408 | 439 | 468 | 492 |
| Jiangxi | 333 | 391 | 476 | 548 | 600 | 661 | 698 | 740 | 771 |
| Jilin | 23 | 31 | 42 | 54 | 59 | 65 | 69 | 78 | 80 |
| Liaoning | 64 | 73 | 74 | 81 | 89 | 94 | 99 | 105 | 108 |
| Ningxia | 28 | 31 | 34 | 34 | 40 | 43 | 45 | 45 | 49 |
| Qinghai | 9 | 13 | 15 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Shaanxi | 116 | 128 | 142 | 165 | 173 | 184 | 195 | 208 | 213 |
| Shandong | 225 | 246 | 270 | 298 | 343 | 379 | 407 | 435 | 466 |
| Shanghai | 177 | 193 | 208 | 233 | 254 | 269 | 281 | 292 | 295 |
| Shanxi | 56 | 66 | 74 | 81 | 90 | 96 | 104 | 115 | 119 |
| Sichuan | 231 | 254 | 282 | 301 | 321 | 344 | 363 | 386 | 405 |
| Tianjin | 45 | 48 | 60 | 67 | 69 | 81 | 88 | 90 | 94 |
| Tibet | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Xinjiang | 21 | 24 | 29 | 32 | 36 | 39 | 42 | 45 | 49 |
| Yunnan | 99 | 109 | 117 | 122 | 128 | 135 | 138 | 140 | 141 |
| Zhejiang | 661 | 724 | 829 | 895 | 954 | 1006 | 1048 | 1075 | 1092 |

*Observations were collected directly from government official sites from each province in mainland China. If a press release included data reported at midnight and early morning, they were considered to belong to the day before the data were reported. NHC, National Health Commission of China.

†Data were collected from NHC press releases (3).

Appendix Table 4. Main analysis: Doubling times of COVID-19 cumulative incidence and their harmonic mean of the arithmetic means of the doubling times and harmonic mean of the harmonic means of the doubling times (95% Confidence interval) by province in mainland China, January 20–February 9, 2020.

| | | Mainland China | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----|
| Category | Mainland China (Except Hubei) | Hubei | Anhui | Beijing | Chongqing | Fujian | Gansu | Guangdong | Guangxi | Guizhou | Hainan | |
| Harmonic mean of arithmetic means | 1.79 (1.52–2.25) | 2.54 (2.44–2.64) | 2.56 (2.16–3.11) | 2.49 (1.89–3.38) | 2.22 (1.53–3.22) | 1.71 (1.15–2.52) | 2.56 (2.00–3.78) | 2.47 (1.97–3.20) | 1.92 (1.45–3.09) | 2.71 (1.90–3.90) | 2.91 (1.91–3.89) | |
| Harmonic mean of harmonic means | 1.18 (0.96–1.42) | 2.34 (2.27–2.41) | 1.72 (1.13–2.67) | 1.48 (0.63–2.70) | 1.23 (0.67–1.96) | 0.82 (0.46–1.41) | 1.36 (0.76–2.86) | 2.01 (1.53–2.54) | 0.48 (0.22–1.34) | 1.88 (0.81–3.28) | 1.52 (0.65–2.99) | |
| Times doubled | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| | 0.59 | 2.91 | 2.12 | 1.00 | 2.05 | 0.25 | 1 | 1.33 | 0.18 | 2.5 | 1.00 | |
| | 0.86 | 2.16 | 0.75 | 1.5 | 0.56 | 0.5 | 1.14 | 1.79 | 0.36 | 3.5 | 1.55 | |
| | 0.98 | 1.5 | 2.18 | 1.8 | 0.82 | 0.85 | 1.26 | 2.17 | 0.76 | 1.64 | 2.28 | |
| | 1 | 2.17 | 1.77 | 2.7 | 1.71 | 1.15 | 4.1 | 2.38 | 1.6 | 2.56 | 5.31 | |
| | 1.3 | 3.03 | 4.03 | 4.14 | 3.58 | 1.07 | 5.9 | 2.76 | 3.4 | 5.8 | 6.86 | |
| | 1.98 | 3.43 | 4.9 | 7.31 | 4.82 | 1.39 | | 4.92 | 4.78 | | | |
| | 2.55 | | | | | 3.12 | | | | | | |
| | 4.53 | | | | | 9.21 | | | | | | |
| | Hebei | Heilongjiang | Henan | Hunan | Inner Mongolia | Jiangsu | Jiangxi | Jilin | Liaoning | Ningxia | Qinghai | |
| Harmonic mean of arithmetic means | 1.88 (1.57–2.72) | 1.93 (1.76–2.36) | 1.81 (1.35–2.05) | 1.42 (1.24–2.04) | 2.37 (1.80–3.67) | 2.43 (1.77–3.26) | 1.68 (1.45–2.33) | 2.64 (2.13–3.50) | 2.10 (1.45–3.30) | 2.54 (1.76–4.33) | 2.50 (1.50–5.00) | |
| Harmonic mean doubling time | 1.04 (0.67–1.93) | 1.08 (0.62–1.98) | 0.81 (0.56–1.12) | 0.71 (0.47–1.13) | 1.17 (0.67–2.67) | 1.93 (1.35–2.63) | 1.13 (0.71–1.71) | 1.48 (0.66–3.03) | 1.05 (0.54–1.94) | 1.59 (0.73–3.07) | 1.00 (0.38–3.87) | |
| Times doubled | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| | 1 | 0.33 | 0.25 | 0.33 | 1 | 2 | 1.25 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 0.33 | |
| | 0.33 | 0.67 | 0.5 | 0.67 | 0.4 | 1.31 | 0.84 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.67 | |
| | 0.67 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.85 | 1.75 | 0.72 | 2 | 1.07 | 1.25 | 4 | |
| | 1.6 | 1.36 | 0.55 | 0.4 | 2.75 | 2.32 | 0.96 | 3.66 | 2.76 | 2.55 | 4.5 | |
| | 1.33 | 2.12 | 0.7 | 0.47 | 4.71 | 4.07 | 1.89 | 2.43 | 4.67 | 4.53 | | |
| | 2.01 | 2.95 | 0.62 | 1.13 | | | 1.69 | 3.74 | | | | |
| | 5.28 | 3.04 | 1.38 | 1.85 | | | 1.99 | | | | | |
| | | 3.31 | 2.69 | 1.97 | | | 4.16 | | | | | |
| | | | 3.57 | 4.22 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 6.56 | | | | | | | | | |
| Harmonic mean of the arithmetic means | 2.82 (2.12–9.97) | 1.68 (1.42–2.39) | 2.19 (1.88–2.68) | 2.31 (1.67–3.25) | 1.83 (1.39–2.70) | 2.78 (2.07–4.06) | Not applied | 3.05 (2.06–4.75) | 2.05 (1.34–2.72) | | 1.91 (1.60–2.51) | |
| Harmonic mean doubling time | 2.04 (1.28–3.01) | 0.48 (0.28–1.15) | 0.77 (0.34–1.73) | 1.22 (0.68–2.51) | 0.96 (0.51–1.75) | 1.69 (0.80–3.55) | Not applied | 1.91 (0.83–4.46) | 1.25 (0.89–1.81) | | 1.20 (0.74–1.70) | |
| Times doubled | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| | 1.33 | 2.05 | 0.28 | 1.2 | 0.66 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | |
| | 2.24 | 0.1 | 0.57 | 0.4 | 0.64 | 2 | 1.6 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.58 | | |
| | 3.76 | 0.19 | 1.15 | 1.06 | 0.77 | 2.22 | 3.06 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 1.23 | | |
| | | 0.41 | 1.92 | 1.76 | 1.18 | 4.78 | 5.34 | 1.12 | 1.12 | 1.61 | | |
| | | 0.86 | 2.92 | 2.2 | 1.55 | 3.57 | | 1.61 | 1.61 | 2.29 | | |
| | | 1.43 | 3.16 | 4.18 | 2.78 | | | 1.45 | 1.45 | 1.47 | | |
| | | 2.66 | 6.13 | | 4.49 | | | 7.32 | 7.32 | 3.48 | | |
| | | 4.71 | | | | | | | | | | |

Appendix Table 5. Sensitivity analysis 1 (continued in Appendix Table 6): doubling times of COVID-19 cumulative incidence and their harmonic mean of the arithmetic means of the doubling times and harmonic mean of the harmonic means of the doubling times (95% CI) by province in mainland China, December 31, 2019–February 9, 2020: mainland China (except Hubei), Hubei, and from Anhui to Qinghai.

| | | Mainland China | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Category | (except Hubei) | Hubei | Anhui | Beijing | Chongqing | Fujian | Gansu | Guangdong | Guangxi | Guizhou | Hainan | |
| Harmonic mean of arithmetic means | 1.34 (1.28–1.52) | 4.06 (3.85–4.33) | 2.57 (2.12–3.00) | 2.51 (1.99–3.26) | 2.22 (1.60–3.23) | 1.82 (1.18–2.55) | 2.55 (1.83–3.79) | 1.88 (1.74–2.19) | 1.93 (1.47–2.96) | 2.78 (2.00–3.97) | 2.92 (1.97–4.25) | |
| Harmonic mean of harmonic means | 0.29 (0.15–0.59) | 2.28 (2.08–2.56) | 1.76 (1.21–2.40) | 1.60 (0.93–2.70) | 1.23 (0.74–1.88) | 0.83 (0.47–1.42) | 1.33 (0.70–2.62) | 0.44 (0.25–1.13) | 0.49 (0.22–1.29) | 1.98 (1.09–3.53) | 1.55 (0.60–3.29) | |
| Times doubled | 1 | 17.33 | 2.12 | 1.00 | 2.05 | 0.25 | 1.00 | 0.07 | 0.18 | 2.50 | 1.00 | |
| | 2 | 1.22 | 0.75 | 1.5 | 0.56 | 0.5 | 1.14 | 0.16 | 0.36 | 3.5 | 1.55 | |
| | 3 | 2 | 2.18 | 1.8 | 0.82 | 0.85 | 1.26 | 0.3 | 0.76 | 1.64 | 2.28 | |
| | 4 | 3.04 | 1.77 | 2.7 | 1.71 | 1.15 | 4.1 | 0.63 | 1.6 | 2.56 | 5.31 | |
| | 5 | 2.11 | 4.03 | 4.14 | 3.58 | 1.07 | 5.9 | 1.84 | 3.4 | 5.8 | 6.86 | |
| | 6 | 1.23 | 4.9 | 7.31 | 4.82 | 1.39 | | 1.44 | 4.78 | | | |
| | 7 | 2.61 | | | | 3.12 | | 2.18 | | | | |
| | 8 | 3.13 | | | | 9.21 | | 2.59 | | | | |
| | 9 | 3.87 | | | | | | 2.72 | | | | |
| | 10 | 1.48 | | | | | | 6.17 | | | | |
| | 11 | 2.17 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 12 | 2.88 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 13 | 5.55 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Hebei | Heilongjiang | Henan | Hunan | Inner Mongolia | Jiangsu | Jiangxi | Jilin | Liaoning | Ningxia | Qinghai | |
| Harmonic mean of arithmetic means | 1.89 (1.55–2.74) | 1.96 (1.76–2.26) | 1.80 (1.31–2.10) | 1.41 (1.26–1.99) | 2.37 (1.82–3.57) | 2.45 (1.75–3.31) | 1.72 (1.44–2.36) | 2.67 (2.13–3.50) | 2.16 (1.49–3.53) | 2.58 (1.72–4.43) | 2.64 (1.79–5.00) | |
| Harmonic mean of harmonic means | 1.07 (0.66–1.90) | 1.12 (0.66–1.97) | 0.77 (0.48–1.14) | 0.73 (0.48–1.15) | 1.15 (0.65–2.71) | 1.92 (1.31–2.68) | 1.17 (0.81–1.74) | 1.60 (0.70–3.11) | 1.06 (0.50–2.45) | 1.67 (0.87–3.65) | 0.96 (0.39–3.69) | |
| Times doubled | 1 | 0.33 | 0.25 | 0.33 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.25 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.33 | |
| | 2 | 0.67 | 0.5 | 0.67 | 0.4 | 1.31 | 0.84 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.67 | |
| | 3 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.85 | 1.75 | 0.72 | 2 | 1.07 | 1.25 | 4 | |
| | 4 | 1.36 | 0.55 | 0.4 | 2.75 | 2.32 | 0.96 | 3.66 | 2.76 | 2.55 | 4.5 | |
| | 5 | 2.12 | 0.7 | 0.47 | 4.71 | 4.07 | 1.89 | 2.43 | 4.67 | 4.53 | | |
| | 6 | 2.95 | 0.62 | 1.13 | | | 1.69 | 3.74 | | | | |
| | 7 | 3.04 | 1.38 | 1.85 | | | 1.99 | | | | | |
| | 8 | 3.31 | 2.69 | 1.97 | | | 4.16 | | | | | |
| | 9 | | 3.57 | 4.22 | | | | | | | | |
| | 10 | | 6.56 | | | | | | | | | |

Appendix Table 6. Sensitivity analysis 1 (continued from Appendix Table 5): doubling times of COVID-19 cumulative incidence and their harmonic mean of the arithmetic means of the doubling times and harmonic mean of the harmonic means of the doubling times (95% Confidence interval) by province in mainland China, December 31, 2019–February 9, 2020: from Shaanxi to Zhejiang.

| Category | Shaanxi | Shandong | Shanghai | Shanxi | Sichuan | Tianjin | Tibet | Xinjiang | Yunnan | Zhejiang |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Harmonic mean of arithmetic means | 2.77 (2.06–3.93) | 1.68 (1.41–2.36) | 2.21 (1.91–2.78) | 2.12 (1.67–3.00) | 1.79 (1.40–2.65) | 2.75 (2.10–3.89) | Not applied | 3.09 (2.12–4.89) | 2.10 (1.42–2.78) | 1.90 (1.59–2.55) |
| Harmonic mean of harmonic means | 2.03 (1.27–2.93) | 0.48 (0.30–1.11) | 0.82 (0.40–1.83) | 1.26 (0.68–2.60) | 0.96 (0.62–1.73) | 1.67 (0.78–3.38) | Not applied | 1.98 (0.80–4.69) | 1.28 (0.80–1.93) | 1.23 (0.77–1.72) |
| Times doubled | 1 1.33 | 2 2.05 | 3 0.28 | 4 1.20 | 5 0.66 | 6 1.00 | 7 2.00 | 8 2 | 9 0.66 | 10 1.00 |
| | 2 2.24 | 3 0.1 | 4 0.57 | 5 0.4 | 6 0.64 | 7 2 | 8 1.6 | 9 0.66 | 10 0.58 | |
| | 3 3.76 | 4 0.19 | 5 1.15 | 6 1.06 | 7 0.77 | 8 2.22 | 9 3.06 | 10 0.84 | | |
| | 4 | 5 0.41 | 6 1.92 | 7 1.76 | 8 1.18 | 9 4.78 | 10 5.34 | | | |
| | 5 | 6 0.86 | 7 2.92 | 8 2.2 | 9 1.55 | 10 3.57 | | | | |
| | 6 | 7 1.43 | 8 3.16 | 9 4.18 | 10 2.78 | | | | | |
| | 7 | 8 2.66 | 9 6.13 | | | | | | | |
| | 8 | 9 4.71 | | | | | | | | |

Appendix Table 7. Sensitivity analysis 2: doubling times of COVID-19 cumulative incidence and their harmonic mean of the arithmetic means of the doubling times and harmonic mean of the harmonic means of the doubling times (95% CI) by province in mainland China, January 23–February 9, 2020.


| Mainland China | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Category | (except Hubei) | Hubei | Anhui | Beijing | Chongqing | Fujian | Gansu | Guangdong | Guangxi | Guizhou | Hainan |
| Harmonic mean of arithmetic means | 2.9 (2.62–3.24) | 2.46 (2.37–2.55) | 2.54 (2.12–2.99) | 3.46 (2.77–4.57) | 3.11 (2.38–4.17) | 2.03 (1.29–3.10) | 2.54 (1.80–3.89) | 2.91 (2.40–3.61) | 3.26 (2.37–4.22) | 2.67 (1.85–3.92) | 3.43 (2.57–4.62) |
| Harmonic mean of harmonic means | 1.98 (1.82–2.17) | 2.25 (2.18–2.33) | 1.47 (0.90–2.29) | 3.03 (2.23–3.99) | 1.87 (1.28–2.80) | 1.26 (0.69–2.01) | 1.27 (0.66–2.84) | 2.65 (2.14–3.10) | 2.23 (1.33–3.29) | 1.73 (0.67–3.40) | 2.31 (1.40–3.71) |
| Times doubled | 1 1.01 | 2 2.12 | 3 0.62 | 4 2.15 | 5 0.90 | 6 1.00 | 7 1.00 | 8 2.16 | 9 1.30 | 10 2.50 | 11 1.55 |
| | 2 1.59 | 3 1.47 | 4 1.38 | 5 3.50 | 6 2.04 | 7 1.11 | 8 1.14 | 9 2.29 | 10 2.84 | 11 3.50 | 12 2.28 |
| | 3 2.30 | 4 2.22 | 5 2.30 | 6 4.21 | 7 4.37 | 8 1.09 | 9 1.26 | 10 2.79 | 11 4.22 | 12 1.64 | 13 5.31 |
| | 4 3.21 | 5 3.03 | 6 3.74 | | 8 7.99 | 9 1.71 | 10 4.10 | 11 4.45 | 12 8.50 | 13 2.56 | 14 6.86 |
| | 5 6.41 | 6 3.45 | 7 3.96 | | | 10 4.13 | 11 5.90 | | | 14 5.80 | |
| Harmonic mean of arithmetic means | Hebei 1.91 (1.42–2.83) | Heilongjiang 2.21 (1.74–2.81) | Henan 1.87 (1.50–2.40) | Hunan 1.89 (1.48–2.77) | Inner Mongolia 2.39 (1.84–4.00) | Jiangsu 2.31 (1.80–3.10) | Jiangxi 1.89 (1.44–2.52) | Jilin 3.01 (2.14–4.06) | Liaoning 2.44 (1.49–4.00) | Ningxia 2.68 (1.70–4.50) | Qinghai 3.21 (2.25–5.67) |
| Harmonic mean of harmonic means | 0.81 (0.39–1.78) | 1.47 (0.77–2.51) | 0.85 (0.48–1.37) | 0.75 (0.41–1.27) | 1.16 (0.66–3.02) | 1.60 (1.06–2.36) | 1.18 (0.62–1.86) | 2.44 (1.29–3.73) | 0.99 (0.37–2.46) | 1.88 (0.94–3.96) | 1.8 (0.80–5.08) |
| Times doubled | 1 0.33 | 2 0.80 | 3 0.39 | 4 0.26 | 5 1.00 | 6 1.00 | 7 0.63 | 8 3.00 | 9 0.50 | 10 2.00 | 11 2.33 |
| | 2 0.67 | 3 1.36 | 4 0.68 | 5 0.53 | 6 0.40 | 7 1.31 | 8 0.92 | 9 2.59 | 10 1.07 | 11 1.25 | 12 0.67 |
| | 3 1.60 | 4 2.12 | 5 0.71 | 6 1.30 | 7 0.85 | 8 1.75 | 9 1.78 | 10 3.53 | 11 2.76 | 12 2.55 | 13 4.00 |
| | 4 1.33 | 5 2.95 | 6 1.62 | 7 1.92 | 8 2.75 | 9 2.32 | 10 1.72 | 11 2.38 | 12 4.67 | 13 4.53 | 14 4.50 |
| | 5 2.01 | 6 3.04 | 7 2.73 | 8 2.19 | 9 4.71 | 10 4.07 | 11 1.74 | | | | |
| | 6 5.28 | 7 3.31 | 8 3.96 | 9 4.56 | | | 11 3.88 | | | | |
| Harmonic mean of arithmetic means | Shaanxi 3.44 (2.76–4.40) | Shandong 1.43 (1.18–2.14) | Shanghai 3.08 (2.52–4.07) | Shanxi 1.93 (1.50–3.09) | Sichuan 2.61 (1.89–3.60) | Tianjin 3.17 (2.16–4.59) | Tibet Not applied | Xinjiang 3.05 (2.10–4.67) | Yunnan 1.82 (1.20–2.87) | | Zhejiang 2.37 (1.87–3.14) |

| Category | Mainland China (except Hubei) | Hubei | Anhui | Beijing | Chongqing | Fujian | Gansu | Guangdong | Guangxi | Guizhou | Hainan |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------|
| Harmonic mean of harmonic means | 2.84 (1.82–4.05) | 0.24 (0.14–0.60) | 2.61 (1.72–3.59) | 0.71 (0.32–1.88) | 1.82 (1.28–2.57) | 2.12 (0.79–4.34) | Not applied | 1.86 (0.83–4.40) | 1.03 (0.56–1.77) | 1.98 (1.73–2.41) | |
| Times doubled | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 3.33 | 0.05 | 2.00 | 0.20 | 1.12 | 2.00 | | 2.00 | 0.66 | 1.57 | |
| 2 | 2.24 | 0.10 | 3.00 | 0.40 | 1.51 | 1.66 | | 1.60 | 0.84 | 2.4 | |
| 3 | 3.76 | 0.20 | 3.29 | 1.06 | 2.72 | 4.95 | | 3.06 | 1.12 | 1.39 | |
| 4 | | 0.40 | | 1.76 | 4.04 | 5.30 | | 5.34 | 1.61 | 4.06 | |
| 5 | | 0.86 | | 2.20 | | | | | 1.45 | | |
| 6 | | 1.43 | | 4.18 | | | | | 7.32 | | |
| 7 | | 2.66 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | 4.71 | | | | | | | | | |


Appendix Table 8. Websites of national and provincial health commissions in mainland China.*

| Health commission | URL | Notes |
|--|---|---|
| National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China | http://www.nhc.gov.cn | |
| Provincial health commissions | | |
| Anhui | http://wjw.ah.gov.cn | |
| Beijing | http://wjw.beijing.gov.cn | |
| Chongqing | http://wsjkw.cq.gov.cn | |
| Fujian | http://fjwsjk.fjsen.com | |
| Gansu | http://wsjk.gansu.gov.cn | |
| Guangdong | http://wsjkw.gd.gov.cn | |
| Guangxi | http://wsjkw.gxzf.gov.cn | |
| Guizhou | http://www.gzhfpc.gov.cn | |
| Hainan | http://wst.hainan.gov.cn | |
| Hebei | http://www.hebwst.gov.cn | Our team members found it often inaccessible from Statesboro, GA, USA. |
| Heilongjiang | http://wsjkw.hlj.gov.cn | |
| Henan | http://www.hnwsjsw.gov.cn | |
| Hubei | http://wjw.hubei.gov.cn | |
| Hunan | http://wjw.hunan.gov.cn | |
| Inner Mongolia | http://wjw.nmg.gov.cn | |
| Jiangsu | http://wjw.jiangsu.gov.cn | |
| Jiangxi | http://hc.jiangxi.gov.cn | |
| Jilin | http://www.jl.gov.cn | |
| Liaoning | http://www.shenyang.gov.cn | |
| Ningxia | http://wsjkw.nx.gov.cn/index.htm | |
| Qinghai | https://wsjkw.qinghai.gov.cn | |
| Shaanxi | http://sxwjw.shaanxi.gov.cn | |
| Shandong | http://wsjkw.shandong.gov.cn | Our team members found it persistently inaccessible from Statesboro, GA, USA. |
| Shanghai | http://www.shanghai.gov.cn | |
| Shanxi | http://wjw.shanxi.gov.cn | |
| Sichuan | http://wsjkw.sc.gov.cn | |
| Tianjin | http://www.tj.gov.cn | |
| Tibet | http://wjw.xizang.gov.cn/ | |
| Xinjiang | http://www.xjhfp.gov.cn/ | |
| Yunnan | http://ynswsjkw.yn.gov.cn/ | |
| Zhejiang | https://www.zjwjw.gov.cn | |


* If our team was unable to directly retrieve the press release from a provincial health commissions, we used mainland Chinese media reports that directly reported on the provincial health commissions' announcements. Note that mainland Chinese media are controlled by the Chinese Communist Party and they could not deviate from the government's announcements.




Appendix Figure 1. Main analysis: The harmonic mean of the arithmetic means of COVID-19 epidemic doubling times (red circles) with 95% confidence interval (red bars) of the doubling times (days), and their values (black diamonds) by the number of times the reported cumulative incidence doubled by province within mainland China, January 20–February 9, 2020. Each panel represents a province except the panel labeled “Mainland China (except Hubei),” which is the aggregate of all other provinces in mainland China, except Hubei. Doubling time for Tibet is not available, because there had been only 1 confirmed case in Tibet as of February 9, 2020. The x-axis represents the n th time the reported cumulative incidence doubled and the y-axis represents the value of the doubling times.




Appendix Figure 2. Main analysis: The harmonic mean of the harmonic means of COVID-19 epidemic doubling times (red circles) with 95% confidence interval (red bars) of the doubling times (days), and their values (black diamonds) by the number of times the reported cumulative incidence doubles by province within mainland China, from January 20–February 9, 2020. Each panel represents a province except the panel labeled “Mainland China (except Hubei),” which is the aggregate of all other provinces in mainland China, except Hubei. Doubling time for Tibet is not available, because there had been only 1 confirmed case in Tibet as of February 9, 2020. The x -axis represents the n th time the reported cumulative incidence doubled and the y -axis represents the value of the doubling times.




Appendix Figure 3. Sensitivity analysis 1: The harmonic mean of the arithmetic means of COVID-19 doubling times (red circles) with 95% confidence interval (red bars) of the doubling times (days), and their values (black diamonds) by the number of times the reported cumulative incidence doubled by province within mainland China, December 31, 2019–February 9, 2020. Each panel represents a province except the panel labeled “Mainland China (except Hubei),” which is the aggregate of all other provinces in mainland China, except Hubei. Doubling time for Tibet is not available, because there had been only 1 confirmed case in Tibet as of February 9, 2020. The x -axis represents the n th time the reported cumulative incidence doubled and the y -axis represents the value of the doubling times.







Appendix Figure 4. Sensitivity analysis 1: The harmonic mean of the harmonic means of COVID-19 doubling times (red circles) with 95% confidence interval (red bars) of the doubling times (days), and their values (black diamonds) by the number of times the reported cumulative incidence doubled by province within mainland China, December 31, 2019–February 9, 2020. Each panel represents a province except the panel representing “Mainland China (except Hubei)” that is the aggregate of all other provinces in mainland China, except Hubei. Doubling time for Tibet is not available, because there had only been 1 confirmed case in Tibet as of February 9, 2020. The x-axis represents the n th time the reported cumulative incidence doubled and the y-axis represents the value of the doubling times.







Appendix Figure 5. Sensitivity analysis 2: The harmonic mean of the arithmetic means of COVID-19 doubling times (red circles) with 95% confidence interval (red bars) of the doubling times (days), and their values (black diamonds) by the number of times the reported cumulative incidence doubles by province within mainland China, January 23–February 9, 2020. Each panel represents a province except the panel labeled “Mainland China (except Hubei),” which is the aggregate of all other provinces in mainland China, except Hubei. Doubling time for Tibet is not available, because there had been only 1 confirmed case in Tibet as of February 9, 2020. The x-axis represents the n th time the reported cumulative incidence doubled and the y-axis represents the value of the doubling times.




Appendix Figure 6. Sensitivity analysis 2: The harmonic mean of the harmonic means of COVID-19 doubling times (red circles) with 95% confidence interval (red bars) of the doubling times (days), and their values (black diamonds) by the number of times the reported cumulative incidence doubles by province within mainland China, January 23–February 9, 2020. Each panel represents a province except the panel labeled “Mainland China (except Hubei),” which is the aggregate of all other provinces in mainland China, except Hubei. Doubling time for Tibet is not available, because there had been only 1 confirmed case in Tibet as of February 9, 2020. The x -axis represents the n th time the reported cumulative incidence doubled and the y -axis represents the value of the doubling times.




Appendix Figure 7. Cumulative incidence and log₁₀ cumulative incidence over time (date) for Hubei (upper panel) and Fujian (lower panel).




Appendix Figure 8. Cumulative incidence and log₁₀ cumulative incidence over time (date) for Guangdong (upper panel) and Heilongjiang (lower panel).




Appendix Figure 9. Cumulative incidence and log₁₀ cumulative incidence over time (date) for Henan (upper panel) and Hunan (lower panel).




Appendix Figure 10. Cumulative incidence and log₁₀ cumulative incidence over time (date) for Jiangxi (upper panel) and Shandong (lower panel).




Appendix Figure 11. Main analysis: Map of the harmonic mean of the harmonic means of COVID-19 by province in mainland China, January 20–February 9, 2020.



Appendix Figure 12. Sensitivity analysis 1: Map of the harmonic mean of the arithmetic means of COVID-19 by province in mainland China, December 31, 2019–February 9, 2020.



Appendix Figure 13. Sensitivity analysis 1: Map of the harmonic mean of the harmonic means of COVID-19 by province in mainland China, December 31, 2019–February 9, 2020.



Appendix Figure 14. Sensitivity analysis 1: Map of the number of times the COVID-19 outbreak has doubled by province in mainland China, December 31, 2019–February 9, 2020.