

Power and sample size calculations for testing the ratio of reproductive values in phylogenetic samples

Lucy D'Agostino McGowan^{1†*}, Shirlee Wohl^{2,3}, Justin Lessler^{4,5,3†}

1 Wake Forest University, Department of Statistical Sciences,

2 The Scripps Research Institute, Department of Immunology and Microbiology,

3 Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Department of Epidemiology,

4 The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Department of Epidemiology,

5 The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Carolina Population Center,

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

* mcgowald@wfu.edu

SUMMARY

The quality of the inferences we make from pathogen sequence data is determined by the number and composition of pathogen sequences that make up the sample used to drive that inference. However, there remains limited guidance on how to best structure and power studies when the end goal is phylogenetic inference. One question that we can attempt to answer with molecular data is whether some people are more likely to transmit a pathogen than others. Here we present an estimator to quantify differential transmission, as measured by the ratio of reproductive numbers between people with different characteristics, using transmission pairs linked by molecular data, along with a sample size calculation for this estimator. We also provide extensions to our method to correct for imperfect identification of transmission linked pairs, overdispersion in the transmission process, and group imbalance. We validate this method via simulation and provide tools to implement it in an R package, *phylosamp*.

1. INTRODUCTION

Analysis of pathogen sequence data has revolutionized how we study infectious disease, helping us address a myriad of questions ranging from identifying the geographic origin and expansion of pathogens (Faria *and others* 2014), to reconstructing outbreaks (Garday *and others* 2011; Wohl *and others* 2020), to estimating the transmissibility of emerging infectious diseases (Fraser *and others* 2009; Lai *and others* 2020; Volz *and others* 2020). While many of the methods used to answer these questions are quite sophisticated and leverage core principles of evolutionary and epidemic theory (Stadler *and others* 2012; MacPherson *and others* 2022), much work is based on simply identifying transmission linked pairs (Garday *and others* 2011; Ratmann *and others* 2020). Regardless of the sophistication of the methods used, the quality of the inferences we make from pathogen sequence data is determined by the size and structure of the sample of pathogen sequences used to drive that inference. However, there remains limited guidance on how to best structure and power studies when the end goal is phylogenetic inference.

In previous work we showed how sample size (i.e., the number of sequences considered) and other study characteristics influenced the identification of transmission linked pairs, including how many pairs a study could expect to identify and the number of “false positives” (i.e., people deemed to be transmission linked that were not) that would occur if the criteria used to define transmission linkage is imperfect. However, while this work provided guidance on study design to identify transmission linked pairs, it did not explore whether the resulting set of pairs identified would be sufficient to answer an overarching inferential question.

Here, we attempt to take that next step for one key question we might ask from pathogen sequence data: whether some people are more likely to transmit a pathogen than others. Specifically, we present an estimator for the ratio of reproductive values between groups (i.e., individuals with different characteristics) along with a sample size calculation for this estimator. We explore the impact of imperfect observation of transmission linked pairs (i.e., the sensitivity and specificity of the linkage criteria) on required sample size, and address how other aspects of the transmission process, such as super spreading and differential susceptibility, impact this estimate.

2. METHODS

2.1 *Defining transmission pairs*

Often we are interested in asking whether there is differential transmissibility of a pathogen between people with different levels of some covariate, G . For example, are older people more likely to transmit than younger people. A core measure of differences in transmissibility is the ratio of the reproductive number of those with covariate level ‘ A ’ ($G = A$), denoted R_A , versus those with covariate level ‘ B ’ ($G = B$), denoted R_B . We assume the characteristic of interest does not influence who you will be infected by or who you will infect, however it may influence *how many* people you will infect (i.e. transmission is not differential based upon the relationship between the value of G of the infector and infectee). For example, while we may be exploring whether men transmit more than women, we are assuming that men are no more likely to infect other men than women, and vice-versa.

2.2 *Definitions and Distributional Assumptions*

We denote the size of the total infected population as N with π_A representing the proportion for whom $G = A$ and $\pi_B = 1 - \pi_A$. Hence, $N_A = N\pi_A$ is the total infected population for whom $G = A$ and $N_B = N\pi_B$ is the total infected population in which $G = B$. Each individual in the infected population can be thought of as a *node* connected to both their infector and their infectees via *edges*. Let us assume that our data consists of pathogen sequences obtained from a simple random sample of infected individuals such that the sampling proportion is ρ and the total number of nodes sampled with each covariate level is as follows: $M_A = N_A\rho$, $M_B = N_B\rho$.

A sampled transmission pair is defined as two individuals i and j who are both included in the sample and are connected by an edge (i.e., i infected j). If e_i is the total number of infections in the sample caused by infector i , then the total number of directed edges in a sample of size M is E :

$$E = \sum_{i=1}^M e_i.$$

The probability that a transmission partner for infector i is included in the sample is $\frac{M-1}{N-1}$ (we subtract 1 from the numerator and denominator to account for the infector) where M is the total number of nodes in the sample. We assume the total number infected by i (e_i) is Poisson distributed with a rate $\lambda = \frac{M-1}{N-1}R_{g_i}$ (Wohl *and others* 2021) where R_{g_i} is the total number of infectees for a given sampled infection i belonging to group $G = g$. Assuming e_i is Poisson distributed, the sum of all e_i (E) is also Poisson distributed with rate $M \times \frac{M-1}{N-1}R_{pop}$. Where R_{pop} is the average reproductive number for the infected population (i.e. R_{pop} is the total number of transmissions divided by the total number of infected individuals, See Appendix A for further intuition).

If we could perfectly observe transmission events, we would be able to observe the frequency of four types of directed edges in our sample:

- (1) E_{AA} : The total number of directed edges in a sample where an individual in group A infects another individual in group A
- (2) E_{AB} : The total number of directed edges in a sample where an individual in group A infects an individual in group B
- (3) E_{BA} : The total number of directed edges in a sample where an individual in group B infects an individual in group A
- (4) E_{BB} : The total number of directed edges in a sample where an individual in group B infects another individual in group B

If these transmission pairs are identified using phylogenetic linkage criteria (Wohl *and others* 2021), such as the genetic distance between infecting viruses, we often will not know who is the infector and who is the infectee absent additional epidemiological information (e.g. the timing of symptom onset) or deep sequencing data. (Rose *and others* 2019) Hence we do not know the directionality of edges and cannot differentiate E_{AB} from E_{BA} without further assumptions, therefore we do not know the group of the infector for such edges. However, for concordant edges in a sample, E_{gg} for $g \in \{A, B\}$, we do know the group of the infector, hence such edges contain information about the group's relative likelihood of transmitting the pathogen.

2.3 Defining an Estimator for the Ratio of Reproductive Numbers

Using the definitions and distributional assumptions above, we define an estimator for differential transmission as characterized by the ratio of reproductive numbers between groups and define our hypothesis test in relation to this estimator.

We assume the total number of observable group g concordant edges in a sample of size M (edges where both the infector and infectee are included in the sample) is Poisson distributed with a mean of λ_g , $E_{gg} \sim Pois(\lambda_g)$ where

$$\lambda_g = \frac{M(M-1)R_g\pi_g^2}{(N-1)} \quad (2.1)$$

for $g \in \{A, B\}$. See Appendix A for the derivation.

We are interested in testing whether the ratio of R values in each group is equal to 1 versus greater than 1, in other words we conducting the following one-sided hypothesis test:

$$H_0 : R_A = R_B \text{ against } H_1 : R_B/R_A > 1.$$

Equivalently, we are testing the null hypothesis that $\log(R_B/R_A) = 0$, therefore we can develop a test statistic similar to that specified in (Ng and Tang 2005),

Note that the sample estimate for R_g is

$$\hat{R}_g = \frac{E_{gg}(N-1)}{M(M-1)\pi_g^2}, g \in \{A, B\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Hence $\frac{\hat{R}_B}{\hat{R}_A}$ is

$$\frac{\hat{R}_B}{\hat{R}_A} = \frac{E_{BB}\pi_A^2}{E_{AA}\pi_B^2}. \quad (2.3)$$

Giving us the following test statistic

$$U = \log(\hat{R}_B/\hat{R}_A) = \log(E_{BB}/E_{AA}) - \log(d^2), \quad (2.4)$$

where $d = \pi_B/\pi_A$. If unknown, since this is a simple random sample, we can estimate this by $d = M_B/M_A$ since $\hat{\pi}_g = M_g/M$ for $g \in \{A, B\}$. Applying the delta method,

$$\text{var}(U) = \sigma_U^2 = \frac{(N-1)}{R_A\pi_A^2M(M-1)} + \frac{(N-1)}{R_B\pi_B^2M(M-1)}. \quad (2.5)$$

This can be estimated by

$$s_U^2 = \frac{(N-1)}{\tilde{R}_A\pi_A^2M(M-1)} + \frac{(N-1)}{\tilde{R}_B\pi_B^2M(M-1)}, \quad (2.6)$$

where \tilde{R}_g is any reasonable estimate for R_g for $g \in \{A, B\}$. By letting $\tilde{R}_g = \hat{R}_g$ for $g \in \{A, B\}$, we can use U/s_U to test the null hypothesis, resulting in the following statistic,

$$W = \frac{\log(E_{BB}/E_{AA}) - \log(d^2)}{\sqrt{1/E_{AA} + 1/E_{BB}}}. \quad (2.7)$$

Under the null hypothesis, W is asymptotically normally distributed, with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1, thus we reject the null hypothesis when $W > z_{1-\alpha}$ where $z_{1-\alpha}$ is the $100 \times (1 - \alpha)$ th percentile of the standard normal distribution. Note that this statistic does not exist when $E_{gg} = 0$.

2.4 Power and Sample Size

Now that we have an estimator, we can calculate the sample size needed to detect pre-specified effects with a given power.

We can represent the variance $(N - 1)/R_A\pi_A^2M(M - 1) + (N - 1)/R_B\pi_B^2M(M - 1)$ as $\left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2R_B}\right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A\pi_A^2M(M-1)}$ where $d = \pi_B/\pi_A$. Under $H_1 : R_B/R_A > 1$, we know asymptotically $\log(E_{BB}/E_{AA}) - \log(d^2)$ follows a normal distribution, as expressed below.

$$\log(E_{BB}/E_{AA}) - \log(d^2) \sim N\left(\log(R_B/R_A), \left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2R_B}\right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A\pi_A^2M(M-1)}\right)$$

Therefore the power can be expressed as

$$P = 1 - \Phi\left[z_{1-\alpha} - \frac{\log\left(\frac{R_B}{R_A}\right)}{\sqrt{\left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2R_B}\right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A\pi_A^2M(M-1)}}}\right]. \quad (2.8)$$

Hence, the total sample size needed to achieve $1 - \beta$ power under $H_1 : R_B/R_A > 1$ is

$$M = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \sqrt{4 \left[1 + \frac{R_A}{R_B d^2}\right] \frac{(z_{1-\alpha} + z_{1-\beta})^2 (N-1)}{\log(R_B/R_A)^2 R_A \pi_A^2} + 1}\right], \quad (2.9)$$

where $z_{1-\beta}$ is the $100(1 - \beta)$ th percentile of the standard normal distribution.

2.5 Adjusting for sensitivity and specificity of linkage criteria

When identifying transmission pairs using some phylogenetic criteria, or a combination of epidemiologic and phylogenetic criteria, the transmission pairs actually identified in our sample will be dependent on the sensitivity and specificity of that criteria (Wohl *and others* 2021). That is, since any criteria for identifying transmission pairs will be imperfect, we will sometimes misclassify pairs of individuals as being part of a transmission pair when they are not (and vice versa). This matters because the expected number of observed transmission pairs (edges) under misclassification, E_{gg}^* , differs from the expected number of sampled edges in the absence of misclassification, E_{gg} . The expected number of observed edges under misclassification is

$$E_{gg}^* = E_{gg}(\eta + \gamma + 1) + \frac{M_g(M_g - 1)}{2}(1 - \gamma), g \in \{A, B\}$$

where η is the assumed sensitivity level and γ is the assumed specificity level.

Therefore, accounting for imperfect sensitivity and specificity, the sample estimate for R_g is as follows,

$$\hat{R}_g = \frac{E_{gg}^* - \frac{M_g(M_g-1)}{2}(1-\gamma)}{\eta + \gamma - 1} \times \frac{(N-1)}{M(M-1)\pi_g^2}, g \in \{A, B\}.$$

First, let's consider the case where specificity is 100%, and we have imperfect sensitivity. Here, the number of edges observed will be reduced from its true value, but our estimator will still be unbiased, hence we can adjust our sample size estimate as follows

$$M = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \sqrt{4 \left[1 + \frac{R_A}{R_B d^2} \right] \frac{(z_{1-\alpha} + z_{1-\beta})^2}{\log(R_B/R_A)^2} \frac{N-1}{R_A \eta \pi_A^2} + 1} \right] \quad (2.10)$$

Where η is the estimated sensitivity. However, if specificity is less than 100% then our observed estimate of R_B/R_A will be biased towards the null (assuming errors are non-differential). This bias will further decrease our power. If $\pi_A < \pi_B$ then the following will be a conservative estimate for the sample size needed to achieve a given power

$$M = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \sqrt{4 \left[1 + \frac{R_A^*}{R_B^* d^2} \right] \frac{(z_{1-\alpha} + z_{1-\beta})^2}{\log(R_B^*/R_A^*)^2} \frac{N-1}{R_A^* \pi_A^2} + 1} \right] \quad (2.11)$$

Where $R_A^* = R_A(\eta + \gamma - 1) + (1 - \gamma)(N - 1)/2$, $R_B^* = R_B(\eta + \gamma - 1) + (1 - \gamma)(N - 1)/2$, and η is the assumed sensitivity level and γ is the assumed specificity level. Alternatively, if a more accurate estimate is required, or $\pi_B < \pi_A$, then the appropriate sample size can be calculated by solving the transcendental equation that occurs when you replace R_g^* with $R_g^* = R_g \times (\eta + \gamma - 1) + \frac{((M\pi_g - 1)/2) \times (1 - \gamma)(N - 1)}{(M - 1)\pi_g}$ in Eq 2.11 (see the Appendix B for sample code and implementation in the `phylosamp` package).

2.6 Correcting for overdispersion

In real disease systems, the number of people each infected individual infects is known not to be perfectly Poisson distributed. That is, the presence of “super-spreading events” leads to overdispersion in the transmission process.

To account for this, instead of assuming $E_{gg} \sim Pois(\lambda_g)$ as specified in Eq 2.1, which assumes the mean and variance of the distribution are equivalent, we can instead allow E_{gg} to follow a negative binomial distribution with an overdispersion parameter k . E_{gg} following a negative binomial distribution will change our variance from Eq 2.5 to the following by the delta method

$$\text{var}(U) = \sigma_U^2 = \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2 M(M-1)} + \frac{(N-1)}{R_B \pi_B^2 M(M-1)} + \frac{2}{k}. \quad (2.12)$$

This updates the power calculation as follows

$$P_{\text{overdisp}} = 1 - \Phi \left[z_{1-\alpha} - \frac{\log\left(\frac{R_B}{R_A}\right)}{\sqrt{\left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2 R_B}\right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2 M(M-1)} + \frac{2}{k}}} \right]. \quad (2.13)$$

Therefore, the total sample size needed to achieve $1 - \beta$ power under $H_1 : R_B/R_A > 1$ given the overdispersion parameter, k is

$$M = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \sqrt{4 \left[1 + \frac{R_A}{R_B d^2} \right] \frac{1}{\log(R_B/R_A)^2 / (z_{1-\alpha} + z_{1-\beta})^2 - 2/k} \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2} + 1} \right]. \quad (2.14)$$

2.7 Two-sided hypothesis tests

We can extend the above to the two-sided scenario where $H_0 : R_A = R_B$ and $H_1 : R_B/R_A \neq 1$ as follows, where the power for the two-sided test is

$$P_{\text{two sided}} = 1 - \Phi \left[z_{1-\alpha/2} - \frac{\left| \log\left(\frac{R_B}{R_A}\right) \right|}{\sqrt{\left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2 R_B} \right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2 M(M-1)}}} \right]. \quad (2.15)$$

Therefore, the total sample size needed to achieve $1 - \beta$ power under $H_1 : R_B/R_A \neq 1$ is

$$M = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \sqrt{4 \left[1 + \frac{R_A}{R_B d^2} \right] \frac{(z_{1-\alpha/2} + z_{1-\beta})^2 (N-1)}{\log(R_B/R_A)^2} \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2} + 1} \right]. \quad (2.16)$$

2.8 Sample size correction

The asymptotic properties of these methods have been shown to overestimate the needed sample size when there is imbalance between groups such that $\pi_B > \pi_A$ and underestimate when $\pi_B < \pi_A$ (Ng and Tang 2005; Gu *and others* 2008). To this end, we have implemented a simulation based approach that provides a corrected sample size for a given desired power under specified parameters. Functions to implement these simulations are available in the `phylosamp` R package and sample code is provided in Appendix B (Wohl *and others* 2023).

3. VALIDATION METHODS

We validate our approach using two simulation frameworks. In the first, “theoretical” approach, we assume our distributional assumptions about observed edges are correct and explore a wide range of the parameters space. In the second, “applied” approach, we directly simulate outbreaks

and then sample from them. In this latter approach we explore a smaller range of the parameter space due to computational constraints.

3.1 Theoretical Simulations

With the goal of covering a reasonable range of transmission difference and group imbalance, we examine 31 values for the ratio R_B/R_A as follows from 1 to 4 by 0.1 and 5 values for the proportion of the population in the numerator, $\pi_B = 0.05, 0.2, 0.5, 0.95$, resulting in 155 scenarios. We simulate 100,000 “epidemics” under each scenario. All epidemics have $N = 100,000$ infected individuals (a large number was selected to ensure achievable sample sizes). In each generated epidemic, we simulated the total number of like edges in each group, E_{AA} and E_{BB} , by sampling from a Poisson distribution with λ_g as specified in Eq 2.1 based on the specifications of each scenario. We perform a one-sided hypothesis test testing the alternative hypothesis $H_1 : R_B/R_A > 1$. For scenarios where $R_B/R_A > 1$ M is specified using the Eq 2.9, setting the nominal power to 80% ($\beta = 0.2$) and $\alpha = 0.05$. Additionally, we calculate a “corrected” sample size, $M_{corrected}$ using a simulation based approach. For scenarios where $R_B/R_A = 1$ we sample $\rho = 0.1$ to 0.9 proportion of the epidemic. We then use the generated E_{AA} and E_{BB} values to calculate the test statistic specified in Eq 2.7 to perform the one-sided hypothesis test in order to estimate the Type 1 (when $R_B/R_A = 1$) and Type 2 (otherwise) errors.

Additionally, we consider scenarios where there is imperfect sensitivity and specificity in our identification of transmission linked case pairs. We examine sensitivity levels of 0.5, 0.75, 0.9 and 0.99 and specificity levels of 0.99, 0.999, and 0.9999.

3.2 Applied Simulations

3.2.1 Generating the outbreaks We consider a wide range of potential ratios of R_B/R_A (1, 1.25, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4) and 3 values for the proportion of the population in the numerator, $\pi_B = 0.2, 0.5, 0.8$, resulting in 24 scenarios. We simulate 200 outbreaks under each scenario. In each generated outbreak, we simulate the total number of susceptible individuals, S_0 from a Poisson distribution with the mean, λ_s , selected such that each scenario would generate outbreaks of size $N = 5,000$, on average. Each individual was assigned a group, A or B , with probability π_A and π_B as specified. Simulated individuals moved through three stages: S (susceptible), I (infectious), R (recovered). We randomly selected one individual to seed the epidemic. The infected individual infected remaining susceptible individuals with probability $p_g = R_{0g}/S_0$, where R_{0g} is the basic reproductive number for group $G = g$. Infected individuals were infectious for one time step (i.e. the epidemic progresses in discrete generations). The epidemic continued until there were no susceptible individuals remaining.

3.2.2 Sampling from the outbreaks We perform a one-sided hypothesis test testing the alternative hypothesis $H_1 : R_B/R_A > 1$. For scenarios where $R_B/R_A > 1$, we use Eq 2.9 to calculate the sample size, setting the nominal power to 80% ($\beta = 0.2$) and $\alpha = 0.05$. Additionally, we calculate a “corrected” sample size using a simulation based approach. For scenarios where $R_B/R_A = 1$ sample $\rho = 0.1$ to 0.9 proportion of the outbreak. Using the specified sample size, M (and additionally $M_{corrected}$ for the scenarios where $R_B/R_A > 1$) for each scenario, we randomly sample 10,000 times for each outbreak and calculate the test statistic specified in Eq 2.7 in order to estimate the

Type 1 and Type 2 errors.

4. RESULTS

Over multiple simulation studies we find that the derived test statistics and sample size calculations have the expected performance properties.

When there is no difference in transmissibility between groups, our approach successfully bounds the probability of erroneously detecting a significant difference. That is, the test statistic presented in Eq 2.7 has the expected type one error rate (or less in cases where a small proportion of the population is sampled) (Fig 1).

Selecting sample sizes based on our approach successfully identifies significant differences in transmissibility with the specified probability. In the setting of perfect detection of linked pairs, selecting sample sizes as per Eq 2.9 yields the expected power in both theoretical and applied simulations (Fig 2 A,B). That is, the actual power achieved is close to the target of 80% when the ratio of R_B/R_A is near one, and deviates as expected for a the ratio of Poisson rates as per prior work by Ng and Tang (2005); with the target power being (roughly) achieved when equal proportions of the population are in each group, power being higher than targeted when the more transmissible group is the majority, and lower than targeted when the less transmissible group is the majority. We find that our simulation based approach to correcting the sample size yields a study population that achieves the desired power in all cases (Fig 2 C,D).

We examined the impact of imperfect detection of transmission linked pairs (i.e., reduced sensitivity and specificity) on the power calculations. Sensitivity is the probability that we will detect a transmission linked pair that is in our sample. When this is less than one, we will need a larger sample size than indicated by Eq 2.9 (as confirmed by simulations, Fig 3). Eq 2.10 gives a corrected sample size (Fig 3 B), this can be further optimized using our simulation-based approach (Fig 3 C).

Specificity is the probability that we will not link two people in our sample who are in fact not a transmission linked pair. Perhaps more intuitively, 1-specificity is the probability that two random people in our sample would be considered a transmission linked pair if they are in fact not linked. Because imperfect specificity biases estimates towards the null (if errors are independent of the characteristic of interest), imperfect specificity increases the needed sample size beyond that indicated in Eq 2.9 (Fig 4 A). This corrected by using an iterative solving of Eq 2.11 (Fig 4 B) and further optimized by using our simulation based approach (Fig 4 C).

For examples of sample sizes given specific parameters, see Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix B.

5. DISCUSSION

Here we have presented a simple estimator for the ratio of reproductive numbers between two groups based on the identification of transmission linked pairs, and provided validated tools for sample size calculation based on this estimator. We have provided extensions to our method to correct for imperfect identification of linked pairs, overdispersion in the transmission process (i.e., the presence of super-spreading), and group imbalance. In doing so, we aimed to provide accessible methods for guiding study design, while retaining enough sophistication to deal with the imperfect nature of molecular inferences about transmission. In order to aid adoption, all methods are implemented in




Figure 1: Simulated type 1 error ($\alpha = 0.05$, shown in the dashed black line) varying the sampling fraction, ρ , from 0 to 0.9 (x-axis) $\pi_B = 0.05$ (orange, only in the theoretical simulation), 0.2 (light blue), 0.5 (green), 0.8 (yellow), 0.95 (dark blue, only in the theoretical simulation). A. Observed type 1 error in the theoretical simulation B. Observed type 1 error in outbreak simulation.

the `phylosamp` R package available on CRAN and at <https://github.com/HopkinsIDD/phylosamp> (Wohl *and others* 2023). Use of this approach should lead to more efficient study designs and better evaluation of information gleaned from molecular studies of transmission, though more work is needed to address situations with more complex dynamics (e.g., where transmission is assortative within groups).

Because our approach is based only on linkage among individuals within the same group, it is likely that it provides a conservative estimate of the amount of information available in a given sample. If techniques or data are available that allow us to leverage the information provided by transmission pairs spanning groups, the sample size rendered by our approach should be more than adequate to test the hypothesis of differential transmission between groups (i.e., it should represent an upper limit on the required sample size). For example, if the direction of transmission could be known or inferred, linkages between individuals with different characteristics could be better utilized. Likewise, sophisticated techniques that take advantage of phylogenetic relationships beyond direct linkage to characterize transmission pathways may be able to more efficiently estimate the ratio of reproductive numbers between groups, particularly if characteristics represent distinct populations (e.g., different geographic regions); thereby reducing the needed sample size. While more work is needed to make studies with such additional information maximally efficient, use of our method should ensure that they would be adequately powered.

Our assumption of transmission being independent of the relationship between infector and




Figure 2: Simulated average power ($\alpha = 0.05, \beta = 0.2$, the nominal 80% power is shown with the dashed black line) varying the ratio of R values from 1 to 4 (x-axis) and $\pi_B = 0.05$ (orange), 0.2 (light blue), 0.5 (green), 0.8 (yellow), 0.95 (dark blue). A. Shows the theoretical simulation, B. Shows the outbreak simulation C. Shows the theoretical simulation with the 'correction factor' applied. D. Shows the outbreak simulation with the 'correction factor' applied.




Figure 3: Simulated average power ($\alpha = 0.05, \beta = 0.2$, the nominal 80% power is shown in the dashed black line) varying the ratio of R values from 1 to 4 (x-axis). Here, the total number of infected individuals is 100,000 and the two groups are of equal size. Each line shows a different sensitivity: 0.5 (orange), 0.75 (light blue), 0.9 (green), 0.99 (yellow). A. This panel shows the impact on power if the sensitivity is not taken into account in the sample size calculation. B. This panel shows the impact on power when the sensitivity is taken into account in the sample size calculation, demonstrating that the original power is recovered. C. This panel shows the impact on power when the sensitivity is taken into account and the ‘correction factor’ is applied, bringing the power back to 80% as specified.

infectee characteristics could be violated if there is assortative mixing or if particular kinds of contacts were more likely to lead to transmission than others. For example, different sex acts have different probabilities of transmission for many STIs and are more likely to occur in certain types of partnerships than others. Extension of our approach to this setting is a clear avenue for future work.

A further limitation of this approach is the assumption that sequences come from a random sample of the infected population. This may be a particular challenge for molecular studies as clinical or other convenience samples are so often used. When the random sampling assumption is violated, our methods may still be valid or correctable using standard weighting techniques; doing so would require careful consideration of the sampling process and potential biases.

However, it should be noted that our approach is robust to differential susceptibility between groups. To understand why this is the case consider that, absent assortative mixing, when we are looking at a sample of only infected individuals we are unable to distinguish differences in susceptibility between groups from differences in the proportion of individuals in each group in




Figure 4: Simulated average power ($\alpha = 0.05, \beta = 0.2$, the nominal 80% power is shown in the dashed black line) varying the ratio of R values from 1 to 4 (x-axis). Here, the total number of infected individuals is 100,000. In the top three panels (A, B, C) the two groups are of equal size; in the bottom panels (D, E, F), $\pi_B = 0.05$, meaning 5% of the infected population are from group B, 95% from group A. Each line shows a different specificity: 0.999 (orange), 0.9999 (blue), 0.99999 (green) A. This panel shows the impact on power if the specificity is not taken into account in the sample size calculation. B. This panel shows the impact on power when the specificity is taken into account in the sample size calculation, demonstrating that the specified power is recovered, although slightly over-powered, as is the case in general as the ratio of R values increases. C. This panel shows the impact on power when the specificity is taken into account in the sample size calculation and the ‘correction factor’ is applied, demonstrating that the specified power is recovered, regardless of the ratio of R values. D. This panel shows the impact on power if the specificity is not taken into account in the sample size calculation. E. This panel shows the impact on power when the specificity is taken into account in the sample size calculation, demonstrating that the original power is not quite recovered, as is the case when the groups are imbalanced with the smaller group in the numerator (group B in this case). F. This panel shows the impact on power when the specificity is taken into account in the sample size calculation and the ‘correction factor’ is applied, demonstrating that the specified power is recovered, regardless of the ratio of R values.

the underlying population (i.e., the ratio of individuals from each group in the infected population is simply modified by the ratio of their susceptibility). Since our estimator corrects for these proportions, it is not biased by differential susceptibility between these populations. However, this also means that it is impossible to distinguish differential susceptibility between groups from differences in their prevalence in the source population without information on uninfected individuals, regardless of the sophistication of the techniques used.

As molecular data becomes increasingly important in the practice of infectious disease epidemiology, it is important that we have accessible and robust techniques to guide the collection of samples for a wide variety of inferential goals. The approaches presented here are one small step on the path to creating this set of tools. Though these methods are limited to examining differential transmission between people with different characteristics absent assortitivity, such focused analyses are the key building blocks on the road to developing more sophisticated techniques.

REFERENCES

- Faria, N. R., Rambaut, A., Suchard, M. A., Baele, G., Bedford, T., Ward, M. J., Tatem, A. J., Sousa, J. D., Arinaminpathy, N., Pépin, J., et al. (2014). The early spread and epidemic ignition of HIV-1 in human populations. *science* **346**, 56–61.
- Fraser, C., Donnelly, C. A., Cauchemez, S., Hanage, W. P., Van Kerkhove, M. D., Hollingsworth, T. D., Griffin, J., Baggaley, R. F., Jenkins, H. E., Lyons, E. J., et al. (2009). Pandemic potential of a strain of influenza a (H1N1): Early findings. *science* **324**, 1557–1561.
- Gardy, J. L., Johnston, J. C., Sui, S. J. H., Cook, V. J., Shah, L., Brodtkin, E., Rempel, S., Moore, R., Zhao, Y., Holt, R., et al. (2011). Whole-genome sequencing and social-network analysis of a tuberculosis outbreak. *New England Journal of Medicine* **364**, 730–739.
- Gu, K., Ng, H. K. T., Tang, M. L. and Schucany, W. R. (2008). Testing the ratio of two poisson rates. *Biometrical Journal: Journal of Mathematical Methods in Biosciences* **50**, 283–298.
- Lai, A., Bergna, A., Acciarri, C., Galli, M. and Zehender, G. (2020). Early phylogenetic estimate of the effective reproduction number of SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of medical virology* **92**, 675–679.
- MacPherson, A., Louca, S., McLaughlin, A., Joy, J. B. and Pennell, M. W. (2022). Unifying phylogenetic birth–death models in epidemiology and macroevolution. *Systematic biology* **71**, 172–189.
- Ng, H. K. T. and Tang, M.-L. (2005). Testing the equality of two poisson means using the rate ratio. *Statistics in medicine* **24**, 955–965.
- Ratmann, O., Kagaayi, J., Hall, M., Golubchick, T., Kigozi, G., Xi, X., Wymant, C., Nakigozi, G., Abeler-Dörner, L., Bonsall, D., et al. (2020). Quantifying HIV transmission flow between high-prevalence hotspots and surrounding communities: A population-based study in rakai, uganda. *The Lancet HIV* **7**, e173–e183.
- Rose, R., Hall, M., Redd, A. D., Lamers, S., Barbier, A. E., Porcella, S. F., Hudelson, S. E., Piwowar-Manning, E., McCauley, M., Gamble, T., et al. (2019). Phylogenetic methods inconsistently predict the direction of HIV transmission among heterosexual pairs in the HPTN 052 cohort. *The Journal of infectious diseases* **220**, 1406–1413.
- Stadler, T., Kouyos, R., Wyl, V. von, Yerly, S., Böni, J., Bürgisser, P., Klimkait, T., Joos, B., Rieder, P., Xie, D., et al. (2012). Estimating the basic reproductive number from viral sequence data. *Molecular biology and evolution* **29**, 347–357.
- Volz, E., Baguelin, M., Bhatia, S., Boonyasiri, A., Cori, A., Cucunuba Perez, Z., Cuomo-Dannenburg, G., Donnelly, C., Dorigatti, I., Fitzjohn, R., et al. (2020). Phylogenetic analysis of SARS-CoV-2. *Imperial College London*. doi:10.25561/77169.

- Wohl, S., Giles, J. R. and Lessler, J. (2021). Sample size calculation for phylogenetic case linkage. *PLoS computational biology* **17**, e1009182.
- Wohl, S., Lee, E. C., D'Agostio McGowan, L., Giles, J. R. and Lessler, J. (2023). Phylosamp: Sample size calculations for molecular and phylogenetic studies. <https://github.com/HopkinsIDD/phylosamp>.
- Wohl, S., Metsky, H. C., Schaffner, S. F., Piantadosi, A., Burns, M., Lewnard, J. A., Chak, B., Krasilnikova, L. A., Siddle, K. J., Matranga, C. B., et al. (2020). Combining genomics and epidemiology to track mumps virus transmission in the united states. *PLOS biology* **18**, e3000611.

Appendix: Power and sample size calculations for testing the ratio of reproductive values in phylogenetic samples

Appendix A

Distributional Assumptions

Below is intuition behind our derivations. Let's begin by assuming we are observing the whole outbreak of size N . A transmission pair is defined as two individuals i and j who are connected by an edge. Assume e_{ij} is the probability that individual i infected individual j . The total number of people infected by individual i is the sum, which we assume is Poisson distributed $e_i \sim Pois(R_{g_i})$, where R_{g_i} is the reproductive number for individual i who has group level $G = g$.

The total number of edges is equal to:

$$E = \sum_{i=1}^N e_i.$$

The sum of N Poisson distributed random variables is Poisson, hence we can define the total number of edges in an outbreak as:

$$E \sim Pois(NR_{pop})$$

Assuming there are two groups $g \in \{A, B\}$, the weighted average of R_g across both groups, also known as R_{pop} , can be written as $\pi_A R_A + \pi_B R_B$, where π_g is the proportion of the outbreak belonging to group $G = g$.

The total number of edges where a member of group $G = g$ was the infector can be written as:

$$E_{g\cdot} = \sum_{\{i:G_i=g\}} e_i.$$

The total number of individuals for whom $G_i = g$ is $N\pi_g$, therefore $E_{g\cdot} \sim Pois(N\pi_g R_g)$.

The total number of individuals in group $G = g$ who are infected by individual i is the sum of e_{ij} where $G_j = g$ is:

$$e_{i\cdot\{G_j=g\}} = \sum_{j:G_j=g} e_{ij} \sim Pois(\pi_g R_{g_i})$$

Since the proportion of the susceptible population belonging to group $G = g$, that is the group of the infectee, is π_g .

The total number of edges where the infector and infectee are both members of the same group, $G = g$ is as follows:

$$E_{gg} = \sum_{i:G_i=g} e_{i\cdot\{G_j=g\}}$$

The total number of individuals for whom $G_i = g$ in an outbreak of size N is $N\pi_g$, therefore $E_{gg} \sim Pois(N\pi_g^2 R_g)$.

The above intuition assumes we are observing the entire outbreak. Under a simple random sample, where $M/N = \rho$ proportion of the outbreak are sampled, the probability of sampling infector i is M/N and the probability of sampling infector i 's infectee j is $\frac{M-1}{N-1}$. Therefore, the expected number of total number of edges in a sample of size M from an outbreak of size N is:

$$\mathbb{E}[E] = \frac{M(M-1)}{N-1} R_{pop}$$

where $E \sim Pois\left(\frac{M(M-1)}{N-1} R_{pop}\right)$. Similarly, the expected number of like edges, E_{gg} in a sample is:

$$\mathbb{E}[E_{gg}] = \frac{M(M-1)}{N-1} \pi_g^2 R_g$$

where $E_{gg} \sim Pois\left(\frac{M(M-1)}{N-1} \pi_g^2 R_g\right)$.

Sample size derivation

$$\begin{aligned}
 -z_{1-\beta} &= z_{1-\alpha} - \frac{\log\left(\frac{R_B}{R_A}\right)}{\sqrt{\left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2 R_B}\right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2 M(M-1)}}} \\
 \sqrt{\left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2 R_B}\right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2 M(M-1)}} &= \frac{\log\left(\frac{R_B}{R_A}\right)}{z_{1-\alpha} + z_{1-\beta}} \\
 \left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2 R_B}\right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2 M(M-1)} &= \frac{\log\left(\frac{R_B}{R_A}\right)^2}{(z_{1-\alpha} + z_{1-\beta})^2} \\
 M(M-1) &= \left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2 R_B}\right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2} \frac{(z_{1-\alpha} + z_{1-\beta})^2}{\log\left(\frac{R_B}{R_A}\right)^2} \\
 M^2 - M + \frac{1}{4} &= \left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2 R_B}\right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2} \frac{(z_{1-\alpha} + z_{1-\beta})^2}{\log\left(\frac{R_B}{R_A}\right)^2} + \frac{1}{4} \\
 \left(M - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 &= \left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2 R_B}\right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2} \frac{(z_{1-\alpha} + z_{1-\beta})^2}{\log\left(\frac{R_B}{R_A}\right)^2} + \frac{1}{4} \\
 M - \frac{1}{2} &= \sqrt{\left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2 R_B}\right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2} \frac{(z_{1-\alpha} + z_{1-\beta})^2}{\log\left(\frac{R_B}{R_A}\right)^2} + \frac{1}{4}} \\
 M &= \sqrt{\left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2 R_B}\right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2} \frac{(z_{1-\alpha} + z_{1-\beta})^2}{\log\left(\frac{R_B}{R_A}\right)^2} + \frac{1}{4}} + \frac{1}{2} \\
 M &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\sqrt{4 \left[1 + \frac{R_A}{d^2 R_B}\right] \frac{(N-1)}{R_A \pi_A^2} \frac{(z_{1-\alpha} + z_{1-\beta})^2}{\log\left(\frac{R_B}{R_A}\right)^2} + 1} + 1 \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

Appendix B

Below is code to estimate the sample size needed to estimate the ratio between $R_A : 0.83$, $R_B : 1.67$, where the prevalence of the characteristic of interest in the infected population is 0.8 for group A (and therefore 0.2 for group B). We are targeting 80% power for a one-sided hypothesis test (testing $H_0 : R_B/R_A = 1$ vs $H_1 : R_B/R_A > 1$) with a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. The full outbreak size is 5,000.

```

library(phylosamp)
set.seed(7)
relR_samplesize(R_a = 0.83,
                R_b = 1.67,
                p_a = 0.8,
                N = 5000,
                alpha = 0.05,
                power = 0.8,
                alternative = "greater")

```

This estimates that we need a sample size of 1033 given the above parameters. If instead of a one-sided hypothesis test we wanted to conduct a two sided hypothesis test, we would run the following.

```

relR_samplesize(R_a = 0.83,
                R_b = 1.67,
                p_a = 0.8,
                N = 5000,
                alpha = 0.05,
                power = 0.8,
                alternative = "two_sided")

```

A two-sided test with the above parameters is estimated to require a sample size of 1164. Since we have imbalanced groups (80% are in group A vs 20% in group B) we know that this will be an underestimate for the sample size needed, assuming that our distributional assumptions are met. We can correct for this by using our simulation-based approach by setting the parameter `correct_for_imbalance = TRUE` as follows.

```

relR_samplesize(R_a = 0.83,
                R_b = 1.67,
                p_a = 0.8,
                N = 5000,
                alpha = 0.05,
                power = 0.8,
                alternative = "two_sided",
                correct_for_imbalance = TRUE)

```

After correcting for the group imbalance using our simulation approach, a two-sided test with the above parameters is estimated to require a sample size of 1273. Let's assume that we expect to imperfectly observe linkage pairs such that the sensitivity is 0.9 and the specificity is 0.999.

```
relR_samplesize(R_a = 0.83,
                R_b = 1.67,
                p_a = 0.8,
                N = 5000,
                alpha = 0.05,
                power = 0.8,
                alternative = "two_sided",
                sensitivity = 0.9,
                specificity = 0.999,
                correct_for_imbalance = TRUE)
```

After incorporating sensitivity and specificity, our required sample size increases to 2540. Let's assume that there is overdispersion present, with an overdispersion parameter of $k = 35$. This overdispersion parameter implies that you are assuming a negative binomial distribution as opposed to a Poisson distribution, as is the default. An overdispersion parameter of infinity would be equivalent to the default.

```
relR_samplesize(R_a = 0.83,
                R_b = 1.67,
                p_a = 0.8,
                N = 5000,
                alpha = 0.05,
                power = 0.8,
                alternative = "two_sided",
                correct_for_imbalance = TRUE,
                overdispersion = 35)
```

After allowing for overdispersion, a two-sided test with the above parameters is estimated to require a sample size of 4434.

Estimated sample sizes

The following figures demonstrate the estimated sample sizes needed given specific parameters.




Figure 1: The sample size needed for an epidemic of size 100,000 with π_B as specified on the y-axis and the ratio between R_B and R_A as specified on the x-axis, chosen such that $R_A\pi_A + R_B\pi_B = 1$ to achieve 80% power for a one-sided test where $\alpha = 0.05$. The top two panels (A, B) correspond to a perfectly observed sample (i.e. no sensitivity or specificity). Panel C has a sensitivity of 0.9, the bottom panel (D) has a specificity of 0.999. Panel A uses the sample size calculation given in Equation 9. Panels B-D use the simulation-based optimal sample size, using methods in the `phylosamp` R package. Grey boxes indicate parameter combinations for which the sample size needed to detect the requested change exceeds the size of the epidemic.




Figure 2: The sample size needed for an outbreak of size 5,000 with π_B as specified on the y-axis and the ratio between R_B and R_A as specified on the x-axis, chosen such that $R_A\pi_A + R_B\pi_B = 1$ to achieve 80% power where $\alpha = 0.05$. The top two panels (A, B) correspond to a perfectly observed sample (i.e. no sensitivity or specificity). Panel C has a sensitivity of 0.9, the bottom panel (D) has a specificity of 0.999. Panel A uses the sample size calculation given in Equation 9. Panels B-D use the simulation-based optimal sample size, using methods in the `phylosamp` R package. Grey boxes indicate parameter combinations for which the sample size needed to detect the requested change exceeds the size of the outbreak.