medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Title Page

Manuscript Title
SARS-CoV-2 transmission in different settings: Analysis of cases and close contacts from the Tablighi cluster in Brunei Darussalam

Manuscript type:
Original Research Article

Manuscript word count: 3489 words

Author Affiliations:

Liling CHAW, PhD
PAPRSB Institute of Health Sciences, Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Brunei
liling.chaw@ubd.edu.bn

Wee Chian KOH, PhD
Centre for Strategic and Policy Studies, Brunei Darussalam
wckoh@csps.org.bn

Sirajul Adli JAMALUDIN, MSc
Environmental Health Division, Ministry of Health, Brunei Darussalam
sirajul.jamaludin@moh.gov.bn

Lin NAING, MD
PAPRSB Institute of Health Sciences, Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Brunei
ayub.sadiq@ubd.edu.bn

Mohammad Fathi ALIKHAN, MSc
Disease Control Division, Ministry of Health, Brunei Darussalam
fathi.alikhan@moh.gov.bn

Justin WONG, MPhil
Disease Control Division, Ministry of Health, Brunei Darussalam
justin.wong@moh.gov.bn

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Corresponding author
Li Ling Chaw, PhD
PAPRSB Institute of Health Sciences, Universiti Brunei Darussalam
Jalan Tungku Link Gadong BE1410, Brunei Darussalam
Email: liling.chaw@ubd.edu.bn

Author contributions
Study conceptualisation and design: LC, JW
Data acquisition: JW, SJ, FA
Data analysis: LC, WCK, LN
Data interpretation: LC, WCK, LN, JW
Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: LC, JW, WCK
All authors contributed to the writing of the first and final draft.

Source of funding
This study does not receive any form of financial support.

Conflict of interest
None to be declared.

Data sharing statement
De-identified participant data is available upon request to the corresponding author.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Background

We report the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 across different settings from the first COVID-19 cluster in Brunei arising from a super-spreading event (SSE)—the Tablighi Jama'at religious gathering in Malaysia.

Methods

Epidemiological and clinical information of all cases and close contacts were collected. All suspected cases and their close contacts were tested with RT-PCR, regardless of symptom presentation. Incubation period and serial interval (SI) were calculated. Attack rates (AR) and mean reproductive numbers were calculated for five different settings, and risk factors of infection were identified using log-binomial regression.

Findings

Nineteen out of 75 identified Talbighi attendees in Brunei tested positive for SARS-CoV-2. They infected 52 other individuals, bringing the cluster size to 71. Among them, only 40 (56·3%) reported symptoms from diagnosis to discharge. Median incubation period is 4·5 days (IQR= 2·75) and mean SI is 4·26 days (SD= 4·27). Contact tracing identified 1755 contacts. The highest non-primary AR were observed at a local religious gathering (14·8% [95%CI: 7·1, 27·7]) and in the household (10·6% [95%CI: 7·3, 15·1]. Household ARs of symptomatic cases were higher (14·4% [95%CI: 8·8, 19·9]) than asymptomatic or presymptomatic cases (5·4% [95%CI: 1·2, 9·6]). Low ARs (<1%) were observed for workplace and social settings.

Interpretation

Our analysis highlights that SARS-CoV-2 transmission varies depending on environmental, behavioural, and host factors. We identify 'red flags' of potential SSE development, and propose differentiated testing strategies that account for transmission risk.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Research in context

Evidence before this study

In an effort to curb the initial entry of COVID-19 and subsequent community spread, many countries have implemented various control measures, to varying levels of success. Models have estimated the basic reproductive number (R_0) and many countries rely on this as a measure of transmission intensity. However, this does not account for variations in infectivity at the individual level. As such, current understanding of the drivers of SARS-CoV-2 transmission is limited particularly with respect to knowledge of the settings at highest risk, and targeted interventions that account for this.

Added value of this study

We use a national-level contact tracing dataset to calculate the non-primary attack rates and the mean observed reproduction number across different settings (household, relatives, workplace, social, and local religious gathering). Our findings highlight the variability of SARS-CoV-2 transmission across different settings, identify settings at highest risk, and the role of environmental, behavioural, and host factors in driving SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Our study is the first to assess the setting-specific impact of asymptomatic transmission and we demonstrate that symptomatic cases are a driver of transmission.

Implications of all the available evidence

Many countries that have imposed large-scale community lockdowns are developing strategies for de-escalation. We identify ‘red flags’ for the development of potential SSEs, for use by health authorities in risk assessment of mass gatherings and other events. We also propose differentiated testing strategies that account for transmission risk in persons with and without symptoms. Our analysis of transmission dynamics across different settings suggests that case isolation, contact tracing, and moderate physical distancing can be an effective approach to containment.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

INTRODUCTION

Initially reported on December 31, 2019, cases of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) have since escalated significantly, prompting the World Health Organisation's declaration of a pandemic on March 11. As of May 2, there are over 3.2 million cases and more than 229 thousand deaths worldwide.[1]

A rapid response by the global scientific community has described many key aspects of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Its main mode of transmission is through respiratory droplet, and indirect contact of fomites.[2] Asymptomatic transmission has been observed,[3] and the peak infective period appears to be within the first few days of symptom onset.[4] Estimates suggest a basic reproduction number (R_0) of 2–3 in the early stages of an outbreak.[5] While the R_0 is valuable in assessing the spread of the outbreak, it can obscure individual heterogeneity in the level of infectivity, among persons and in different settings.[6,7] Modelling of the 2003 SARS outbreak indicates that more than 70% of transmission occurred due to super-spreading events (SSE).[8] Early reports suggest that similar dynamics may be in play in the explosive propagation of SARS-CoV-2.[9]

As part of their mitigation strategies, many countries have adopted stringent yet blunt community quarantines or 'lockdowns' of whole cities and provinces.[10] These are unsustainable in the long term, and many are developing exit strategies. In moving towards a more targeted approach, countries should be able to answer two major questions regarding the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2: (1) what are the environmental, behavioural, and host factors that drive transmission? and, (2) what are the most effective interventions to control this? To address these knowledge gaps, we report on analysis of a transmission chain in Brunei Darussalam that resulted from an international SSE.

Brunei (population 459,500)[11] detected its first COVID-19 case on March 9. It was the first country to recognise the Tablighi Jama'at cluster, a SARS-CoV-2 SSE, arising from an Islamic religious gathering in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. More than 16,000 people attended this four-day event, including participants from Southeast and East Asian countries.[12] Out of the 138 confirmed cases in Brunei reported as of May 2, 71 cases (51·4%) have an epidemiological link to the Tablighi event.

As SARS-CoV-2 is a novel infection in a naive population, an outbreak investigation of this importation event in Brunei can provide insights into the transmission dynamics of the disease and the effectiveness of outbreak control measures. The thorough nature of Brunei's contact tracing provides a rare opportunity to study the epidemiological and transmission characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 in the community setting. Here, we report our findings of this investigation.

METHODS

Surveillance and case identification

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Brunei's Ministry of Health has responsibility for communicable disease surveillance. Since January 23, case definitions have been in place for suspected COVID-19 cases. Initially, individuals with fever, respiratory symptoms, and a travel history to a high-risk area were tested for SARS-CoV-2. Over the next weeks, the program expanded to include: (i) contacts of a confirmed case (regardless of symptoms); (ii) individuals admitted to an inpatient facility with pneumonia; and (iii) individuals who present to a health facility with influenza-like illness (ILI) for the second time within 14 days. On March 21, Brunei started testing and isolating all travellers and returning residents. On March 25, SARS-CoV-2 sampling at selected sentinel health centers was introduced, followed by mandatory screening for selected groups of foreign workers on April 7.

A confirmed case is defined as a person who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 through real-time reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) test on nasopharyngeal (NP) swab. The first positive case in Brunei was detected on March 9, having met the testing criteria as a person with fever and cough, and had a recent travel history to Kuala Lumpur (where he had attended the Tablighi event). This marked the beginning of Brunei's first COVID-19 cluster.

Epidemiological investigation

Under the Infectious Disease Act, the Ministry of Health conducts epidemiological investigation and data collection and analysis of each case and close contact. Following the identification of the first case, we interviewed him for demographic characteristics, clinical symptoms, travel history, activity mapping, and contact history. We identified his attendance at the Tablighi event in Malaysia, and found that a number of other Bruneians had also participated in the same event. We subsequently obtained the contact details of all Bruneian participants.

NP swabs were collected from all identified event participants and tested with RT-PCR. Those who tested positive were admitted to the National Isolation Centre (NIC), while those tested negative were quarantined for 14 days from their return to the country at a designated community quarantine facility where symptom and temperature screening was conducted daily. Those who developed symptoms were re-tested. Activity mapping of the confirmed cases was conducted, and contact tracing initiated.

A close contact is defined as any person living in the same household, or someone within one meter of a confirmed case in an enclosed space for more than 15 minutes. All close contacts of confirmed cases were tested with RT-PCR. Those who tested positive were admitted to NIC, while those tested negative, were placed under home quarantine for 14 days from last exposure to the confirmed case. For individuals under home quarantine, their compliance and health status were monitored daily, through video calls or face-to-face assessments. Those who developed symptoms during home quarantine were re-tested.

Clinical management

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

All confirmed cases were treated and isolated at NIC. We obtained clinical information on their history, examination, laboratory and radiological results from digital inpatient records on the national health information system database. Cases were discharged following two consecutive negative specimens collected at ≥ 24-hour intervals.

Cases

We categorised cases into two groups: primary cases (those who were presumably infected at the Tablighi event in Malaysia), and non-primary cases (those who did not attend the Tablighi event but had an epidemiological link to the primary cases).

For each case, the symptom status was recorded and classified as: (i) symptomatic, if symptoms were reported at NP swab collection; (ii) presymptomatic, if symptoms were reported after NP sampling but during admission; or (iii) asymptomatic, if no symptoms were ever reported up to discharge.

Close contacts

We classified the type of close contact into five settings: household, relatives, workplace, social, and local religious gathering.

Household setting is defined as those living in the same household. Among the household members, their relationship with a case was also recorded and classified as spouse, child, and others (which includes grandchild, parent, grandparent, sibling, housekeeper, and relatives living in the same household). Relatives setting is defined as those who live outside the household but are related to the case. Workplace setting is defined as contacts encountered in the workplace or school. Social setting is defined as those encountered during travel or in social events. Lastly, local religious gathering is defined as those who attended a local religious event in Brunei on March 5, which ran throughout the night with participants staying overnight.

Data analysis

Group comparison was done between primary and non-primary cases using Chi-square, Fisher's Exact, or Mann-Whitney's tests as appropriate. Incubation period was calculated based on cases whose dates of exposure and symptom onset were clear. Serial interval (SI) was calculated by subtracting the date of symptom onset of the infectee from the infector; only symptomatic and pre-symptomatic infector-infectee pairs with clear epidemiological links were included.

For each setting, the attack rate (AR) was calculated by dividing the number of positive contacts by the total number of close contacts (that is, the proportion of contacts that tested positive). To identify risk factors of infection, log-binomial regression analysis was applied to estimate the risk ratio for gender, age, and setting. Household contacts were also divided into three subcategories: spouse, child, and others. Further stratification was done to assess differences

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

in infector symptom status across settings. The 95% confidence interval (95% CI) was estimated using the normal-approximation method, or binomial method if the count was less than five.

The mean observed reproductive number, R, and the distribution of personal reproductive numbers in each setting were calculated from the number of infected close contacts caused by each primary case. The 95% CI was estimated based on the Poisson distribution.[13]

All analyses were conducted using Microsoft Excel and R (ver. 3·6·3).[14] A *p*-value <0·05 was considered as statistically significant. Ethical approval was obtained from the University Research Ethics Committee, Universiti Brunei Darussalam (Ref: UBD/OAVCR/UREC/Apr2020-05).

RESULTS

Epidemiological characteristics

We identified 75 individuals in Brunei who attended the Tablighi event in Malaysia. Of these, 19 were positive for SARS-CoV-2 resulting in 52 additional cases transmitted locally, bringing the total cluster size to 71. The figure illustrates the epidemiological links in the cluster by generation in the transmission chain. There were 34 (47·9%), 13 (18·3%), and 5 (7·0%) cases in generations one, two, and three, respectively.

Figure – The Tablighi cluster in Brunei Darussalam, with epidemiological links illustrated

Table 1 shows the demographic and clinical characteristics of the cases in the cluster. The median age was 33·0 years [Interquartile range (IQR): 29·5 years], majority male (65·7%, n = 46), and 5 cases (7·1%) had pre-existing chronic conditions. Compared to non-primary cases, primary cases were significantly older and predominantly male. More than three-quarter of the cases (77·4%, n=55) were diagnosed and immediately admitted to the NIC within 5 days.

A substantial proportion of cases were presymptomatic (31·0%, n=22) or asymptomatic (12·7%, n = 9). 40 (56·3%) patients reported symptoms during contact tracing investigation. The most commonly reported symptoms were fever, cough, and sore throat. Only one (1·4%) and two (2·8%) cases were critical and severe, respectively.

Table 1 - Demographic and clinical characteristics of COVID-19 cases in Tablighi cluster, Brunei

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The incubation period was calculated from eight cases that had confirmed epidemiological links and had attended the March 5 religious gathering in Brunei. Using their attendance date as the exposure date, the median incubation period was 4·5 days (IQR = 2·75 days, range: 1 to 11 days). Based on 35 symptomatic infector-infectee pairs, the mean (SD) of SI was 4·26 (4·27) days, ranging from -4 to 17 days. Four pairs (11·4%) had negative SI values. The SI distribution resembles a normal distribution (Supplementary Figure S1).

Transmission characteristics

Of the 1755 close contacts in the Tablighi cluster, 51 local transmissions were detected, giving an overall non-primary AR of 2·9% (95% CI: 2·2, 3·8). Case 121 (see Figure) was excluded from this analysis because he was not detected during contact tracing. The highest AR was observed among spouse (41·9% [95% CI: 24·1, 60·7]), followed by the local religious gathering (14·8% [95% CI: 7·1, 27·7]) and children (14·1% [95% CI: 7·8, 23·8]). The overall household AR is 10·6% (95% CI: 7·3, 15·1).

The multiple log-binomial regression model revealed that type of close contact was the only statistically significant variable (p<0·001) (Table 2). When compared to social contacts, spouses of positive cases had the highest adjusted risk ratio of getting the infection (45·20 [95% CI: 16·8, 156·1]), followed by the local religious gathering attendees (15·60 [95% CI: 4·8, 59·9]), and children of positive cases (14·09 [95% CI: 4·8, 51·5]).

Table 2 - Risk factors of SARS-COV2 infection among close contacts

ARs also differed by symptom status of the infector (Table 3). ARs in households where the infectors were symptomatic were higher than those who were asymptomatic or presymptomatic (14·4% vs. 5·4%). AR for the local religious gathering could not be calculated as three primary cases at the event had different symptom status; hence we could not ascertain how transmission occurred. No significant difference was observed in other settings.

Table 3 - Attack rates in different settings, stratified by symptom status of the infector

Table 4 summarises the transmission characteristics in each setting. The mean observed R was highest in the household setting (0·67 [95% CI: 0·44, 0·96]). The distribution of the observed R in the household setting was skewed towards zero (Supplementary Figure S2). 71·4% of household infections (20 of 28 positive contacts) were from 16·7% of cases (7 of 42 possible links).

Table 4 – Characteristics and mean observed R for each setting

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

DISCUSSION

We characterise the Tablighi Jama'at cluster that started the COVID-19 epidemic in Brunei. Our analysis reveals several key findings. First, SSE plays an important role in SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Second, there is high transmission variability across different settings. Third, transmission varies between symptomatic vs. asymptomatic and presymptomatic cases, and we highlight the potential for silent chains of transmission.

SSE

Within this cluster, 38% of all cases were participants at an SSE – 19 (26·7%) from the Tablighi event in Malaysia, and eight (11·3%) from the local religious gathering in Brunei. Notably, 19 of the 75 Brunei attendees at the Tablighi event tested positive. Assuming a representative sample, this would suggest an AR of 25%, implying that approximately 4,000 cases (of an estimated 16,000 participants) may have been infected at that single event alone. Moreover, we find that the highest overall non-primary AR and mean observed R was at the local religious gathering (AR = 14·8%, R = 2·67), which was higher than that observed in the household setting (AR = 10·6%, R = 0·67). These observations suggest a role for mass gatherings in facilitating SARS-CoV2 transmission.

Over the course of this investigation, we identified several common characteristics at both the local religious gathering and the Tablighi event in Malaysia.[12] First, significant numbers of people gathered in an enclosed area for a prolonged time period. Second, attendees had a recent travel history – the Tablighi event in Malaysia drew participants from across the world, while the local religious gathering had at least three individuals who had recently returned from Malaysia. Third, communal sharing of sleeping areas and toilets, and shared dining were observed. We propose that these three characteristics are hallmarks for the development of SSE for SARS-CoV-2 transmission and can be used as 'red flags' by health authorities in their risk assessment and mitigation strategies for preventing and detecting high risk activities including mass gatherings, and other institutional settings such as care homes, prisons and dormitories.

Variability of non-primary AR across different settings

To a lesser degree, our observations on the within-household transmission are similar to that observed for the two religious gatherings. Out of 16 household contacts who subsequently became first generation cases, 10 (62·5%) of these were from just three primary cases. As such, even within similar settings, we can expect wide variability in transmission patterns. This observation supports our finding of a moderately high household AR but an observed R of less than one, suggesting that transmission is driven by a relatively small number of cases.[6] High ARs in spouses and children reflect intimate relationships with high degree of interaction, close

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

proximity, and in the case of the spouse, sleeping in the same room. Concordant with our findings for the local religious gathering, we suggest that encounters among groups of people that involve close proximity in enclosed settings for prolonged time periods (at least for one night) is a main driver of SARS-CoV-2 transmission.

Our overall non-primary AR result of 10·6% in the household setting is comparable to other studies that used contract-tracing datasets.[15-18] A study near Wuhan, China[19] reported a higher AR of 16·3%; however, this study detected 56·2% of their cases more than five days after symptom onset. By contrast, 77·4% of the cases in our study were detected and isolated within five days of symptom onset, suggesting that early case isolation can reduce AR.

We note the low non-primary AR (<1%) and mean observed R (<0·3) for workplace and social settings. While moderate physical distancing was implemented in Brunei following the identification of this cluster, there was no community quarantine or lockdown, public services and businesses remained open, and no internal movement restrictions were imposed.

Combined with our observations on the role of SSE in driving SARS-CoV-2 transmission, we suggest that full lockdown measures that adopt a blunt approach by restricting all movement and casual social encounters can be avoided, in favour of a more targeted approach that includes a combination of case isolation, contact tracing, and moderate levels of physical distancing that take into account the 'red flags' for mass gatherings that we identified earlier. In fact, given the relatively high non-primary AR observed in the household compared to workplace and social settings, we suggest that lockdowns, in the absence of case isolation, may even be counterproductive. Other studies support our observations.[20,21] If done effectively, both contact tracing and case isolation approaches are shown to control the COVID-19 outbreak during its early stage.[22] Modelling studies using South Korean data showed that less extreme physical distancing measures can help to suppress the outbreak,[23] indicating less need for national lockdown measures.

Symptomatic vs. asymptomatic and presymptomatic transmission

We identified several environmental (settings) and behavioural factors that potentially account for higher ARs observed in mass gatherings and in the household. In order to assess the impact of host factors in driving transmission, we compared non-primary AR in symptomatic vs. asymptomatic and presymptomatic individuals, considering the high proportion of asymptomatic (12·7%) and presymptomatic (31·0%) of cases.

While there are case reports of presumptive asymptomatic and presymptomatic transmission,[24,25] observational studies quantifying such transmission are few. A study from Ningbo, China analysed the overall attack rates in symptomatic vs. asymptomatic cases and did not find significant difference between the two groups.[26] Another study, on the other hand, re-interpreted the same data and theorized that under certain conditions, symptomatic cases could be more transmissible than asymptomatic ones.[27] In fact, our overall risk ratio (RR) for symptomatic vs. asymptomatic and presymptomatic cases shows no significant difference

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

between the two groups (1·28 [95% CI: 0·69, 2·37], Table 3). However, we suggest that the overall RR masks the true picture in transmissibility when different settings are taken into account.

In our study, we do not find a significant difference in AR in non-household settings. These settings usually practice some form of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPI)—individuals with moderate and severe symptoms may be on medical leave, and it is reasonable to expect some physical distancing would be practiced by contacts of persons who display visible symptoms. This is less feasible within the household setting; hence we suggest that transmission occurs more frequently at the household level where control measures are less practical. We observed that the household AR for symptomatic cases (14·4%) is higher than that of asymptomatic or presymptomatic cases (5·4%), suggesting that the presence of symptoms is a host factor in driving transmission. To our knowledge, our study is the first to compare the transmissibility between these two groups across various settings.

The higher household AR observed among symptomatic cases suggest that testing for such cases should be prioritised, especially in low resource areas with limited testing capacity. Nonetheless, an AR of 5·4% in asymptomatic and presymptomatic cases is not negligible. As such, our findings have several implications for high resource areas with greater testing capacity. First, it strengthens the argument for testing household contacts in the absence of symptoms. Second, there is a need to allow for ‘slack’ in the surveillance system as the high proportion of asymptomatic cases pose challenges for rapid detection and isolation. We recommend that even in countries with highly developed testing and tracing capacities, moderate levels of social distancing should be implemented to account for this. Third, proactive testing of travellers and also attendees at ‘red flag’ events and institutional settings may be necessary to contain the spread of COVID-19.

This study has several limitations. First, we have not accounted for other potential environmental factors such as the relative size of the household, air ventilation, and indirect transmission through fomites. Second, we do not have information on NPIs practiced by the close contacts; presumably, individuals would take precautions during an outbreak. Third, symptom status of the cases were reported during their swab collection date. We assume this to be reflective of their actual condition when their close contacts were exposed, however, this may not be necessarily true for all cases.

The main strength of our study is the availability of a highly detailed and complete contact tracing dataset at the national level. Since all contacts were tested, it is reasonable to assume that this study more accurately detects SARS-CoV-2 transmission than those that only test symptomatic contacts. In conclusion, our analysis highlights the variability of SARS-CoV-2 transmission across different settings and in particular, the role of SSEs. We identify ‘red flags’ for the development of potential SSEs, and identify environmental, behavioural, and host factors that drive transmission. Overall, we provide evidence that a combination of case isolation, contact tracing, and moderate physical distancing measures is an effective approach to containment.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Mr Haji Mohamad Ruzaimi Haji Rosli from Corporate Communications, Ministry of Health Brunei, for his assistance in designing the figure for this manuscript.

Figure and table captions:

Figure – The Tablighi cluster in Brunei Darussalam, with epidemiological links illustrated

Table 1 - Demographic and clinical characteristics of COVID-19 cases in Tablighi cluster, Brunei

Table 2 - Risk factors of SARS-COV2 infection among close contacts

Table 3 - Attack rates in different settings, stratified by symptom status of the infector

Table 4 – Characteristics and mean observed R for each setting

Supplementary information:

Figure S1. Distribution of the serial interval, fitted with a normal distribution

Figure S2. Distribution of the household observed R

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports. 2020. https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports/ (accessed 2 May 2020).
2. Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY, et al. Air, Surface Environmental, and Personal Protective Equipment Contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) From a Symptomatic Patient. *JAMA* 2020.
3. Hu Z, Song C, Xu C, et al. Clinical characteristics of 24 asymptomatic infections with COVID-19 screened among close contacts in Nanjing, China. *Science China Life Sciences* 2020; **63**(5): 706-11.
4. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nature Medicine* 2020.
5. Kucharski AJ, Russell TW, Diamond C, et al. Early dynamics of transmission and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2020.
6. Liu Y, Eggo RM, Kucharski AJ. Secondary attack rate and superspreading events for SARS-CoV-2. *The Lancet* 2020; **395**(10227): e47.
7. Stein ML, van der Heijden PGM, Buskens V, et al. Tracking social contact networks with online respondent-driven detection: who recruits whom? *BMC Infectious Diseases* 2015; **15**(1): 1-12.
8. Li Y, Yu ITS, Xu P, et al. Predicting Super Spreading Events during the 2003 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Epidemics in Hong Kong and Singapore. *Am J Epidemiol* 2004; **160**(8): 719-28.
9. Bendavid E, Mulaney B, Sood N, et al. COVID-19 Antibody Seroprevalence in Santa Clara County, California. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.04.14.20062463.
10. Lau H, Khosrawipour V, Kocbach P, et al. The positive impact of lockdown in Wuhan on containing the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Journal of Travel Medicine* 2020.
11. Department of Economic Planning and Development. Mid-year population estimates for Brunei Darussalam, 2019. 2020. http://www.deps.gov.bn/SitePages/Population.aspx (accessed 22 April 2020).
12. Mat NFC, Edinur HA, Razab MKAA, Safuan S. A Single Mass Gathering Resulted in Massive Transmission of COVID-19 Infections in Malaysia with Further International Spread. *Journal of Travel Medicine* 2020.
13. Liu Y, Gayle AA, Wilder-Smith A, Rocklöv J. The reproductive number of COVID-19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *Journal of Travel Medicine* 2020; **27**(2).
14. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria; 2020.
15. Cheng H-Y, Jian S-W, Liu D-P, Ng T-C, Huang W-T, Lin H-H. High transmissibility of COVID-19 near symptom onset. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.03.18.20034561.
16. Luo L, Liu D, Liao X-l, et al. Modes of contact and risk of transmission in COVID-19 among close contacts. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.03.24.20042606.
17. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and Transmission of COVID-19 in Shenzhen China: Analysis of 391 cases and 1,286 of their close contacts. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.03.03.20028423.
18. Jing Q-L, Liu M-J, Yuan J, et al. Household Secondary Attack Rate of COVID-19 and Associated Determinants. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.04.11.20056010.
19. Li W, Zhang B, Lu J, et al. The characteristics of household transmission of COVID-19. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

20. Kucharski A, Klepac P, Conlan A, et al. Effectiveness of isolation, testing, contact tracing and physical distancing on reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in different settings: Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases, 2020.
21. Kretzschmar ME, Rozhnova G, van Boven ME. Isolation and contact tracing can tip the scale to containment of COVID-19 in populations with social distancing. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.03.10.20033738.
22. Hellewell J, Abbott S, Gimma A, et al. Feasibility of controlling COVID-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and contacts. *The Lancet Global Health* 2020.
23. Park SW, Sun K, Viboud C, Grenfell BT, Dushoff J. Potential roles of social distancing in mitigating the spread of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in South Korea. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.03.27.20045815.
24. Wei WE, Li Z, Chiew CJ, Yong SE, Toh MP, Lee VJ. Presymptomatic Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 — Singapore, January 23–March 16, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020.
25. Qian G, Yang N, Ma AHY, et al. COVID-19 Transmission Within a Family Cluster by Presymptomatic Carriers in China. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020.
26. Chen Y, Wang A, Yi B, et al. The epidemiological characteristics of infection in close contacts of COVID-19 in Ningbo city. *Chinese Journal of Epidemiology* 2020; **41**.
27. He D, Zhao S, Lin Q, et al. The relative transmissibility of asymptomatic cases among close contacts. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

		Overall (n=71) n (%)	Primary cases only (n=19) n (%)	Non-primary cases only (n=52) n (%)	*p*-value
Median age in years (IQR*) [range]		33·0 (29·0) [0·75 to 68]	35·0 (26·5) [17 to 64]	29·0 (26·0) [0·75 to 68]	0·009
Age group	0-9	4 (5·6)	0 (0·0)	4 (5·6)	0·002
	10-19	9 (12·7)	1 (1·4)	8 (11·3)	
	20-29	16 (22·5)	1 (1·4)	15 (21·1)	
	30-39	14 (19·7)	8 (11·3)	6 (8·5)	
	40-49	10 (14·1)	1 (1·4)	9 (12·7)	
	50-59	11 (15·5)	3 (4·2)	8 (11·3)	
	60-69	7 (9·9)	5 (7·0)	2 (2·8)	
Gender	Female	25 (35·2)	0 (0·0)	25 (48·1)	<0·001
	Male	46 (64·8)	19 (100)	27 (51·9)	
Co-morbidity	Obesity	4 (5·6)	2 (10·5)	2 (3·8)	0·289
	Heart disease	4 (5·6)	3 (15·8)	1 (1·9)	0·056
	Respiratory disease	5 (7·0)	2 (10·5)	3 (5·8)	0·605
	Cancer	1 (1·4)	1 (5·3)	0 (0·0)	0·268
	Diabetes mellitus	5 (7·0)	3 (15·8)	2 (3·8)	0·115
Time between symptom onset and diagnosis	0 - 1 days	28 (39·4)	8 (42·1)	20 (38·5)	0·788
	2 - 5 days	27 (38·0)	8 (42·1)	19 (36·5)	
	> 5 days	16 (22·5)	3 (15·8)	13 (25·0)	
Symptom status	Symptomatic	40 (56·3)	8 (42·1)	32 (61·5)	0·265
	Presymptomatic	22 (31·0)	7 (36·8)	15 (28·8)	
	Asymptomatic	9 (12·7)	4 (21·1)	5 (9·5)	
Reported symptoms	Fever	42 (59·2)	9 (47·4)	33 (63·5)	0·343
	Cough	42 (59·2)	14 (73·7)	28 (53·8)	0·218
	Runny nose	25 (35·2)	7 (36·8)	18 (34·6)	1·000
	Sore throat	42 (59·2)	9 (47·4)	33 (63·5)	0·342
Disease severity	Asymptomatic	9 (12·7)	4 (21·1)	5 (9·6)	0·278
	Mild	52 (73·2)	12 (63·2)	40 (76·9)	
	Moderate	7 (9·9)	2 (10·5)	5 (9·6)	
	Severe / Critical	3 (4·2)	1 (5·3)	2 (3·9)	

*IQR = Interquartile range

Table 1 – Demographic and clinical characteristics of COVID-19 cases in Tablighi cluster, Brunei

		Total (*n*=1755)	Positive (*n*=51)	Attack Rate [a] (95% CI)	Crude Risk Ratio [b] (95% CI)	Adjusted Risk Ratio [c] (95% CI)
Gender	Male	913	24	2·6 (1·7, 3·9)	1·00	1·00
	Female	842	27	3·2 (2·2, 4·7)	1·22 (0·71, 2·11)	1·23 (0·69, 2·27)
Age group	0-9	267	4	1·5 (0·4, 3·8)[d]	1·00	1·00
	10-19	163	8	4·9 (2·3, 9·8)	3·28 (1·05, 12·12)	1·92 (0·63, 7·03)
	20-29	364	13	3·6 (2·0, 6·2)	2·38 (0·85, 8·39)	1·91 (0·70, 6·61)
	30-39	441	6	1·4 (0·6, 3·1)	0·91 (0·26, 3·53)	0·85 (0·24, 3·38)
	40-49	255	9	3·5 (1·7, 6·8)	2·36 (0·78, 8·61)	1·95 (0·63, 7·32)
	50-59	174	8	4·6 (2·2, 9·2)	3·07 (0·98, 11·36)	1·84 (0·58, 7·05)
	60 & above	83	3	3·6 (0·8, 10·2)[d]	2·41 (0·48, 10·74)	1·00 (0·20, 4·51)
Types of Close Contacts	Social	445	4	0·9 (0·2, 2·3)[d]	1·00	1·00
	Relatives	144	5	3·5 (1·3, 8·3)	3·86 (1·04, 15·43)	4·13 (1·10, 16·51) [e]
	Local religious gathering	54	8	14·8 (7·1, 27·7)	16·48 (5·38, 60·13)	15·60 (4·81, 59·87) [e]
	Workplace/ School	848	6	0·7 (0·3, 1·6)	0·79 (0·23, 3·07)	0·79 (0·23, 3·10)
	Household: Child	85	12	14·1 (7·8, 23·8)	15·71 (5·62, 55·16)	14·09 (4·79, 51·54) [e]
	Household: Spouse	31	13	41·9 (24·1, 60·7)	46·65 (17·77,158·39)	45·20 (16·76,156·12) [e]
	Household: Others [f]	148	3	2·0 (0·4, 5·8)[d]	2·26 (0·45, 10·12)	2·23 (0·44, 10·00)

[a] Attack Rate (incidence) in percent with normal approximation 95% CI [b] Simple log-binomial regression
[c] Multiple log-binomial regression (sex, p=0·485; age group, p=0·339; types of close contact, p<0·001)
[d] Binomial 95% CI (for count <5) [e] statistically significant [f] Sibling, Parents, Housekeeper, Relatives, Grandparent, Grandchild

Table 2 – Risk factors of SARS-COV2 infection among close contacts

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

		Total (*n*=1701)	Positive (*n*=43)	AR % (95% CI) [a]		Crude risk ratio [b] (95% CI)		p-value
Household	Asymptomatic or presymptomatic	111	6	5·4	(1·2, 9·6)	1·00		
	Symptomatic	153	22	14·4	(8·8, 19·9)	2·66	(1·12 , 6·34)	0·027
Non-household [c]	Asymptomatic or presymptomatic	580	9	1·6	(0·5, 2·6)	1·00		
	Symptomatic	857	6	0·7	(0·1, 1·3)	0·45	(0·16, 1·26)	0·129
Overall	Asymptomatic or presymptomatic	691	15	2·2	(1·1, 3·3)	1·00		
	Symptomatic	1010	28	2·8	(1·8, 3·8)	1·28	(0·69, 2·37)	0·439

[a] Attack Rate (incidence) in percent with normal approximation 95% CI
[b] Simple log-binomial regression
[c] Relatives, workplace, and social settings. The local religious gathering is excluded as three primary cases at the event had varying symptom status; we could not ascertain how transmission occurred.

Table 3 – Attack rates in different settings, stratified by symptom status of the infector

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090043; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Types of close contact setting	No· of non-primary cases	Proportion of links with non-zero infections	Total no· of close contacts	Contacts traced per case	Range of setting size	Mean observed R (95% CI)
Household	28	0·36	264	9·4	1 - 13	0·67 (0·44, 0·96)
Relatives	5	0·11	144	28·8	1 - 26	0·26 (0·09, 0·61)
Workplace	6	0·20	848	141·3	1 - 202	0·24 (0·09, 0·52)
Social	4	0·16	445	111·3	1 - 179	0·16 (0·04, 0·41)
Local religious gathering	8	1·00	54	6·8	54 - 54	2·67 (NA)*
Overall	51	0·37	1755	34·4	1 - 220	0·94 (0·70, 1·24)

*95% CI could not be calculated as there was only one such event

Table 4 – Characteristics and mean observed R for each setting