

What do we know about SARS-CoV-2 transmission? A systematic review and meta-analysis of the secondary attack rate, serial interval, and asymptomatic infection

Wee Chian KOH¹, Lin NAING², Muhammad Ali ROSLEDZANA³, Mohammad Fathi ALIKHAN³, Liling CHAW², Matthew GRIFFITH⁴, Roberta PASTORE⁴, Justin WONG^{3}*

¹ Centre for Strategic and Policy Studies, Brunei Darussalam

² PAPRSB Institute of Health Sciences, Universiti Brunei Darussalam

³ Disease Control Division, Ministry of Health, Brunei Darussalam

⁴ Western Pacific Regional Office (Manila), World Health Organization

*Corresponding author: Dr Justin Wong
Disease Control Division, Ministry of Health
Commonwealth Drive, Bandar Seri Begawan BB3910, Brunei Darussalam
justin.wong@moh.gov.bn

Word count: abstract 394 words; main text 4218 words

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Ethical approval

Not required.

Conflict of interest

All authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Authors' contributions

JW and WCK conceived and designed the study. WCK, MAR, and MFA conducted the literature search and extracted the data. WCK performed the statistical analyses with input from LN. JW and WCK wrote the manuscript with critical feedback from MG, RP, LN, and LC. The final manuscript was approved by all the authors.

Abstract

Background

Current SARS-CoV-2 containment measures rely on the capacity to control person-to-person viral transmission. Effective prioritization of these measures can be determined by understanding SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics. We conducted a systematic review and meta-analyses of three parameters: (i) secondary attack rate (SAR) in various settings, (ii) clinical onset serial interval (SI), and (iii) the proportion of asymptomatic infection.

Methods and Findings

We searched PubMed, medRxiv, and bioRxiv databases between January 1, 2020, and May 15, 2020, for articles describing SARS-CoV-2 attack rate, SI, and asymptomatic infection. Studies were included if they presented original data for estimating point estimates and 95% confidence intervals of the three parameters. Random effects models were constructed to pool SAR, mean SI, and asymptomatic proportion. Risk ratios were used to examine differences in transmission risk by setting, type of contact, and symptom status of the index case. Publication and related bias were assessed by funnel plots and Egger's meta-regression test for small-study effects.

Our search strategy for SAR, SI, and asymptomatic infection identified 459, 572, and 1624 studies respectively. Of these, 20 studies met the inclusion criteria for SAR, 18 studies for SI, and 66 studies for asymptomatic infection. We estimated the pooled household SAR at 15.4% (95% CI: 12.2%, 18.7%) compared to 4.0% (95% CI: 2.8%, 5.2%) in non-household settings. We observed variation across settings; however, the small number of studies limited power to detect associations and sources of heterogeneity. SAR of symptomatic index cases is significantly higher than cases that were symptom-free at diagnosis (RR 2.55, 95% CI: 1.47, 4.45). Adults appear to be more susceptible to transmission than children (RR 1.40, 95% CI: 1.00, 1.96). The pooled mean SI is estimated at 4.87 days (95% CI: 3.98, 5.77). The pooled proportion of cases who had no symptoms at diagnosis is 25.9% (95% CI: 18.8%, 33.1%).

Conclusions

Based our pooled estimates, 10 infected symptomatic persons living with 100 contacts would result in 15 additional cases in <5 days. To be effective, quarantine of contacts should occur within 3 days of symptom onset. If testing and tracing relies on symptoms, one-quarter of cases would be missed. As such, while aggressive contact tracing strategies may be appropriate early in an outbreak, as it progresses, control measures should transition to account for SAR variability across settings. Targeted strategies focusing on high-density enclosed settings may be effective without overly restricting social movement.

What do we know about SARS-CoV-2 transmission? A systematic review and meta-analysis of the secondary attack rate, serial interval, and asymptomatic infection

Introduction

The ongoing pandemic caused by SARS-CoV-2 continues to escalate. Modeling studies have enhanced understanding of COVID-19 transmission dynamics and initial phylogenetic analysis of closely related viruses suggest highly linked person-to-person spread of SARS-CoV-2 originating from mid-November to early December 2019 (1-3).

There are no known effective therapeutics or vaccines (4, 5). As such, containment measures rely on the capacity to control viral transmission from person-to-person, such as case isolation, contact tracing and quarantine, and physical distancing (6). Effective prioritization of these measures can be determined by understanding SARS-CoV-2 transmission patterns.

There is an abundance of literature on the biological mode of transmission of coronaviruses: through exhaled droplets, aerosol at close proximity, fomites, and possibly through fecal-oral contamination (7, 8). However, few observational studies have assessed transmission patterns in populations, and what determines whether the infection is contained or spreads. Previous theoretical work by Fraser et al. proposed three transmission-related criteria that impact on outbreak control: (i) viral transmissibility; (ii) disease generation time; and (iii) the proportion of transmission occurring prior to symptoms (9).

To better understand SARS-CoV-2 transmission, we conducted a systematic review and meta-analyses of these three parameters. Using publicly available articles, we estimated the (i) secondary attack rate (SAR) in various settings, (ii) clinical onset serial interval (SI) from studies that linked dates of symptom onset for infector-infectee pairs, and (iii) proportion of asymptomatic infection.

Methods

This systematic review and meta-analysis followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines.

Definitions

SAR is defined as the probability that an exposed susceptible person develops disease caused by an infected person (10). It is calculated by dividing the number of exposed close contacts who tested positive (numerator) by the total number of close contacts of the index case (denominator).

SI is defined as the time between disease symptom onset of a case and that of its infector (11). It is used as a proxy for the generation interval—the time between the infection of the infectee and that of the infector, which is an unobservable duration.

Asymptomatic cases are defined as those with laboratory confirmation, but without clinical signs and symptoms at diagnosis. This definition therefore includes pre-symptomatic cases. The asymptomatic proportion is calculated as the number of asymptomatic cases divided by the total number of cases.

Data source and search strategy

We performed a literature search of published journal articles in PubMed and pre-print articles in medRxiv and bioRxiv from January 1, 2020. For SAR, we used the search terms (“SARS-CoV-2” OR

“COVID-19”) AND (“attack rate” OR “contact tracing”). We replaced the last search term with “serial interval” for SI, and “asymptomatic” for asymptomatic infection. The last search date was on May 15, 2020. All studies that were written in English or have an abstract in English were included.

The articles were initially screened by title and abstract, and subsequently by review of selected full-text articles. Three reviewers selected the studies independently using predetermined inclusion criteria and differences in opinions were resolved through consensus. From the included articles, the same reviewers extracted the data for all parameter estimates: event counts, point estimates, confidence intervals (CI), and sample size. Whenever available, we also extracted data on setting, symptom status, age group, and relationship of cases and close contacts. Data were obtained directly from the reports, but when not explicitly stated, we derived the data from tables, charts, or supplementary materials.

Inclusion criteria

Studies reporting SAR were included if they: (i) presented original data for estimating the SAR, such as from a contact tracing investigation; (ii) reported a numerator and denominator of close contacts, or at least two of numerator, denominator, and SAR; (iii) specified a particular setting; and (iv) cases were confirmed positive with SARS-CoV-2 through reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) test. Point-testing or prevalence studies to measure cumulative incidence of infection in a setting were excluded as the source of infection could not be traced, but we reported these studies as supplementary materials.

For SI, studies were included if they: (i) contained original parameter estimates of either mean or median SI; (ii) reported the associated 95% CI; and (iii) reported the number of infector-infectee pairs.

For asymptomatic infection, studies were included if they: (i) presented original data for estimating the proportion of asymptomatic cases at diagnosis, such as from a cross-sectional survey, cohort study, or case series; (ii) reported the number of asymptomatic cases and the number of total cases, or at least two of the asymptomatic proportion, number of asymptomatic cases, and number of total cases; and (iii) cases were confirmed positive by RT-PCR test. Studies with data on asymptomatic infection assessed at admission or throughout the follow-up period were included for comparison purposes.

Statistical analysis

Point estimates and 95% CI were calculated. Meta analyses were performed using a random-effects DerSimonian-Laird model (12) for the SAR, SI, and the proportion of asymptomatic cases. We estimated risk ratios to examine SAR differences by setting, symptom status of the index case, age of close contacts, and relationship of household contacts. The I^2 statistic is used as a measure of heterogeneity, with higher values signifying greater degree of variation (13). Publication and related bias were assessed by funnel plots and Egger’s meta-regression test for small-study effects (14). A p-value of <0.05 was considered as statistically significant. Statistical analysis was done in STATA 14 using the package metan, metafunnel, and metabias (15-17).

Results

Secondary attack rate

We identified 20 studies that allowed direct estimation of the SAR (Table 1; Supplementary materials Figure S1a). Fifteen of these were published articles (three in Chinese language) and the other five were pre-prints. Some studies identified close contacts through active surveillance systems while in others they were identified following an outbreak investigation. Testing protocols of close contacts also differed; in the United States, only those with symptoms or persons under investigation were tested whereas in others, particularly Asian countries, all close contacts were tested regardless of symptoms.

There was variation in the definition of household contacts; most used a traditional definition as those who resided with the index case but some studies broadened the scope to include others who spent at least a night in the same residence or a specified duration of at least 24 hours of living together.

From these studies, we estimated household SAR in 17 locations, and non-household SAR in different settings in 10 locations. The non-household settings were non-household family, meal, travel, workplace or school, healthcare, religious event, chalet, and choir. The sample size of the settings varied depending on the location and context studied. We also estimated the SAR by symptom status of the index case, adults vs. children, and in the household, spouse vs. child and other household members.

Study, location	Description of study	Definition of close contact of an index case	Setting: secondary attack rate (%)	Additional comments
Bi et al. 2020, Shenzhen, China (18)	Retrospective study of cases identified through symptomatic surveillance and contact tracing	Household: shared a room, apartment, or other sleeping arrangement Others: shared a meal, travelled, or socially interacted 2 days before symptom onset	Household: 77/686 (11.2%) Meal: 61/707 (8.6%) Travel: 18/318 (5.7%)	
Chen et al. 2020, Ningbo, China (19)	Prospective study under different exposure settings	Definition not provided	Household: 37/279 (13.3%) Meal: 52/724 (7.2%) Travel: 28/235 (11.9%) Work/school: 1/47 (2.1%) Healthcare: 4/297 (1.3%)	
Jing et al. 2020, Guangzhou, China (20)	Retrospective study of households	Family members, or close relatives, such as parents and parents-in-law, or live in the same residential address	Household: 97/770 (12.6%)	
Luo et al. 2020, Guangzhou, China (21)	Prospective study under different modes of contact	Household: living in the same household Others: contact with suspected cases, confirmed cases, mild cases after onset of initial symptoms, and asymptomatic cases with positive results, but fail to take effective protection measures	Household: 96/946 (10.1%) Healthcare: 7/679 (1.0%) Travel: 3/2358 (0.1%)	
Li et al. 202), Hubei, China (22)	Retrospective study of households	Living in the same residence for at least 24 hours	Household: 64/392 (16.3%)	
Jiang et al. 2020, Shandong, China(23)	Analysis of contact investigation	Living in the same household	Household: 8/15 (53.3%)	
Zhang et al. 2020, Shandong, China (24)	Retrospective study of a supermarket cluster	Definition not provided	Household: 12/93 (12.9%)	
Wang et al.	Retrospective study	Definition not provided	Household: 47/155 (30.3%)	Only close contacts

2020, Wuhan, China (25)	of households			with symptoms tested; 51 close contacts without symptoms assumed negative
Sun et al. 2020, Zhejiang, China (26)	Retrospective study of family clusters	Definition not provided	Household: 189/598 (31.6%)	
Wu et al. 2020, Zhuhai, China (27)	Retrospective study of households	Household: Spent at least one night in the house after symptom onset of the case	Household: 48/148 (32.4%) Meal: 40/103 (38.8%) Travel: 34/73 (46.6%)	
Cheng et al. 2020, Taiwan, China (28)	Prospective study under different exposure settings and different exposure time windows	Household: living in the same household Others: within 2m without appropriate PPE and without a minimal requirement of exposure time	Household: 10/151 (6.6%) Non-household family: 5/76 (6.6%) Healthcare: 6/698 (0.9%)	
Park et al. 2020, Seoul, South Korea (29)	Retrospective study of a call center cluster	Definition not provided	Household: 34/225 (15.1%)	
Korea CDC 2020, South Korea (30)	Summary of contact investigations	Definition not provided	Household: 9/119 (7.6%)	
Chaw et al. 2020, Brunei (31)	Retrospective study under different exposure settings	Household: living in the same household	Household: 28/264 (10.6%) Non-household family: 5/144 (3.5%) Work/school: 6/848 (0.7%) Religious: 8/54 (14.8%)	
Böhmer et al. 2020, Bavaria, Germany (32)	Analysis of contact investigation	Sharing living space	Household: 2/10 (20%)	
Burke et al. 2020, United States (33)	Analysis of contact investigation	Family members or friends who spent at least one night in the same residence during the presumed infectious period of the case	Household: 2/15 (13.3%)	All household contacts were tested. Other close contacts tested only if symptomatic
Canova et al. 2020, Switzerland (34)	Analysis of contact investigation	Healthcare workers with unprotected contact with the case	Healthcare: 0/21 (0%)	
Ghinai et al. 2020, Illinois, United States (35)	Analysis of contact investigation	People who reported or were identified to have potential exposure on or after the date of symptom onset of the case	Healthcare: 0/195 (0%)	Only persons under investigation and selected asymptomatic healthcare personnel tested
Danis et al. 2020, French Alps (36)	Analysis of contact investigation	Those who stayed in the chalet as the case	Chalet: 11/15 (73.3%)	
Hamner et al. 2020, United States (37)	Analysis of contact investigation	Those who attended a choir practice as the case	Choir: 32/60 (53.3%)	20 persons with probable infections but not tested were excluded

Table 1. Description of studies included in the review and analysis of secondary attack rate (SAR)

Figure 1 summarizes the estimated SARs. The estimated mean household SAR is 15.4% (95% CI: 12.2%, 18.7%) with significant heterogeneity ($p < 0.001$). Household SAR ranged from 6.6% in Taiwan to more than 30% in Shandong, Wuhan, Zhejiang, and Zhuhai in mainland China. In non-household settings, the

mean SAR is significantly lower at 4.0% (95% CI: 2.8%, 5.2%). However, there is large variation across the settings. Higher SARs were observed in a chalet (73.3%), at a choir (53.3%), eating with a case (18.2% average), and at a religious event (14.8%). Funnel plot and Egger's meta-regression test for household SAR studies do not support the presence of publication bias and small-study effects (Supplementary materials Figure S2a, Table S1a). Similar analyses could not be done for other settings due to the limited number of studies.




Figure 1. Forest plot of secondary attack rates (SAR) in different settings. ES is the estimated SAR, with 95% confidence intervals (CI). I-squared is the percentage of between-study heterogeneity that is attributable to variability in the true effect, rather than sampling variation.

The risk of infection also varies by the symptom status of the index case. Based on six studies, SARs of symptomatic index cases were 2.55 times of that of asymptomatic cases (including pre-symptomatic cases; Supplementary materials Figure S3).

SARs from eight studies showed that close contacts who are adults were more likely to be infected compared to children, with a relative risk of 1.40 (95% CI: 1.00, 1.96) (Supplementary materials Figure S4). SARs from several studies indicated a 3.23 (95% CI: 2.23, 4.68) times risk of infection for a spouse of an index case as compared to a child (Supplementary materials Figure S5), and 3.63 (95% CI: 1.68, 7.87) times as compared to other household members (Supplementary materials Figure S6).

Serial interval

We included 18 studies (9 published articles, 9 pre-prints) in the meta-analysis of the mean SI (Table 2; Supplementary materials Figure S1b). We found a pre-print rapid review of SI (38) and cross-checked their articles—they were all included in our full-text shortlist. Several studies used the same dataset of the infector-infectee pairs; we therefore selected those that were the most comprehensive from a single location. For studies with multiple locations, publicly available datasets were used and hence there is likely to be substantial overlaps; nonetheless, we reported these studies as a comparison instead of discarding them.

Most of the studies were from Asian countries, particularly China, and two were from Italy. In multiple-location studies, data from Germany and the United States were also used. The number of infector-infectee pairs ranged from less than 10 in single-location studies to 689 in multiple-location ones. However, studies with a large sample size are not necessarily representative of the countries from which the data were drawn. For instance, in He et al. with 77 pairs used, only one was from the United States, 20 were from East Asian countries, and the rest from mainland China (39). We evaluated the value of a larger sample size against the accuracy of the infector-infectee relationship, and decided to retain all small-sample studies.

The mean SI was more often reported compared to the median. Statistical distributions used were usually Gamma, Weibull, or lognormal. Negative serial intervals were reported in a few studies, and the authors suggested the Normal distribution as a more appropriate fit (31, 40, 41).

Study	Location	Number of infector-infectee pairs	Estimated serial interval (95% CI), days
Bi et al. 2020 (18)	Shenzhen, China	48	Mean 6.3 (5.2, 7.6) Median 5.4 (na)
Li et al. 2020 (42)	Wuhan, China	6	Mean 7.5 (5.3, 19.0)
Liao et al. 2020 (43)	Chongqing, China	12	Mean 6.50 (2.45, 17.38) Median 1.91 (0.37, 6.16)
Kwok et al. 2020 (44)	Hong Kong, China	26	Mean 4.58 (3.35, 5.85)
Cheng et al. 2020 (45)	Taiwan, China	7	Mean 7.00 (3.69, 13.18)
	China, Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan, South Korea, Vietnam, Singapore, Germany	48	Mean 5.44 (4.11, 7.15)
Ganyani et al. 2020 (41)	Singapore	91	Mean 5.21 (-3.35, 13.94)
	Tianjin, China	135	Mean 3.95 (-4.47, 12.51)
Mettler and Maathius 2020 (46)	South Korea	76	Mean 3.58 (2.62, 4.53)
Chaw et al. 2020 (31)	Brunei	35	Mean 4.26 (2.84, 5.67)
Cereda et al. 2020	Lombardy, Italy	90	Mean 6.6 (0.7, 19.0)

(47)				Median 5.5 (na)
Lavezzo et al. 2020	Vo, Italy	120		Mean 6.90 (2.56, 13.39)
(48)				Mean 4.7 (3.7, 6.0)
Nishiura et al. 2020	China, Taiwan, South Korea, Vietnam, Singapore, Germany	28		Median 4.0 (3.1, 4.9)
(49)				Mean 7.0 (5.8, 8.1)
Wu et al. 2020 (50)	China, Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia, Vietnam, United States	43		
He et al. 2020 (39)	China, Taiwan, Japan, Singapore, Malaysia, Vietnam, United States	77		Mean 5.8 (4.8, 6.8)
Ma et al. 2020 (51)	China, Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan, Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Malaysia, Vietnam, Germany	689		Median 5.2 (4.1, 6.4)
Zhang et al. 2020 (52)	China (outside Hubei)	35		Mean 6.70 (6.31, 7.10)
Li et al. 2020 (42)	China (outside Hubei)	337		Median 6.00 (na)
Du et al. 2020 (53)	China (outside Hubei)	339		Mean 5.1 (1.3, 11.6)
Du et al. 2020 (40)	China (outside Hubei)	468		Mean 5.80 (5.38, 6.24)

Table 2. Description of studies included in the review and analysis of the serial interval (SI)

The estimated mean SI are shown in Figure 2. The mean SI of the single-location studies is estimated to be 4.87 days (95% CI: 3.98, 5.77). The shortest SI was observed in South Korea (3.6 days) and the longest in Wuhan (7.5 days). In the multiple-location studies, the shortest mean SI was 4.0 days and longest 7.0 days. There is wide heterogeneity in the multiple-location studies ($p < 0.001$), but less in the single-location ones.




Figure 2. Forest plot of the serial interval (SI). ES is the estimated mean SI, with 95% confidence intervals (CI). I-

squared is the percentage of between-study heterogeneity that is attributable to variability in the true effect, rather than sampling variation.

Asymptomatic infection

We identified 66 studies that allowed estimation of the proportion of cases that were asymptomatic (Table 3; Supplementary materials Figure S1c). 54 of these were published articles (5 in Chinese language) and the remainder pre-prints. Twelve studies focused on children. For studies with overlapping datasets, we selected the ones that were most comprehensive. We found a rapid review of asymptomatic infections (54) but it only included studies with cases that were asymptomatic throughout the duration of their illness; we cross-checked the articles and they were all covered in our full-text shortlist.

Most of the retrospective cohort studies were from China and those on point-testing and prevalence studies were outside China. In terms of symptom assessment, many of the retrospective studies followed up patients throughout whereas symptoms at diagnosis could be observed in cross-sectional surveys and in investigation of family clusters. There is wide variation in the sample size, from less than 10 in family clusters in China to 1,192 in Japan's case series. We did not exclude studies based on an arbitrary sample size cut-off as we see value in assessing asymptomatic infection in different settings and study populations.

Study	Location	Type of study	Study population	Mean/median age of study population (range)	Asymptomatic proportion (%)	Time of symptom assessment
Bai et al. 2020 (55)	Anyang, China	Retrospective study	Family cluster	na	1/6 (16.7%)	Diagnosis
Luo et al. 2020 (56)	Anhui, China	Retrospective study	Family cluster	na	2/4 (50%)	Diagnosis
Zhang et al. 2020 (57)	Beijing, China	Retrospective study	Family cluster	na	2/5 (40%)	Diagnosis
Bai et al. 2020 (58)	Gansu, China	Retrospective study	Family cluster	47 (2-82)	5/8 (62.5%)	Diagnosis
Pan et al. 2020 (59)	Guangzhou, China	Retrospective study	Family cluster	23.7 (3-35)	2/3 (66.7%)	Diagnosis
Jiang et al. 2020 (60)	Henan, China	Retrospective study	Family cluster	48 (9-87)	4/9 (44.4%)	Diagnosis
Ye et al. 2020 (61)	Luzhou, China	Retrospective study	Family cluster	40.4 (23-51)	3/5 (60%)	Diagnosis
Jiang et al. 2020 (23)	Shandong, China	Retrospective study	Family cluster	39.4 (0.25-65)	5/8 (62.5%)	Diagnosis
Chan et al. 2020 (62)	Shenzhen, China	Retrospective study	Family cluster	48 (10-66)	1/5 (20%)	Admission
Luo et al. 2020 (63)	Wuhan, China	Retrospective study	Family cluster	36 (7-64)	5/6 (83.3%)	Diagnosis
Qian et al. 2020 (64)	Zhejiang, China	Retrospective study	Family cluster	46.6 (1-76)	2/8 (25%)	Diagnosis
Park et al. 2020 (29)	Seoul, South Korea	Contact tracing	Employees at a call center	38 (20-80)	8/97 (8.2%)	Diagnosis
Danis et al. 2020 (36)	French Alps	Contact tracing	Guests in a chalet	na	1/12 (8.3%)	Diagnosis

Yamahata et al. 2020 (65)	Yokohama, Japan	Point-testing	Cruise passengers (Diamond Princess)	na	410/696 (58.9%)	Diagnosis
Lombardi et al. 2020 (66)	Lombardy, Italy	Point-testing	Healthcare workers	44.5 (21-76)	41/138 (29.7%)	Diagnosis
Arons et al. 2020 (67)	King County, Washington	Point-testing	Residents in a nursing facility	78.6 (na)	27/48 (56.3%)	Diagnosis
Roxby et al. 2020 (68)	Seattle, Washington	Point-testing	Residents in an independent and assisted living community	68.3 (51-92)	3/6 (50%)	Diagnosis
Hamner et al. 2020 (37)	Skagit County, Washington	Contact tracing	Members of a choir practice	69 (31-83)	8/61 (13.1%)	Throughout
Arima et al. 2020 (69)	Japan	Point-testing	Residents evacuated from China	na	5/7 (71.4%)	Diagnosis
Zhang et al. 2020 (24)	Liaocheng City, China	Contact tracing	Supermarket cluster	na	3/25 (12%)	Diagnosis
Ly et al. 2020 (70)	Marseille, France	Cross-sectional survey	Vulnerable population	na	25/49 (51%)	Diagnosis
Breslin et al. 2020 (71)	New York	Retrospective study	Pregnant patients from New York City hospitals	26.9 (20-39)	14/43 (32.6%)	Admission
Wu et al. 2020 (72)	Wuhan, China	Retrospective study	Pregnant patients from the Maternal and Child Health Hospital of Hubei Province	29.9 (26-35)	4/8 (50%)	Admission
Wu et al. 2020 (73)	Wuhan, China	Retrospective study	Pregnant patients from the Central Hospital of Wuhan	29 (21-37)	15/23 (65.2%)	Admission
Huang et al. 2020 (74)	Anhui, China	Contact tracing	Cases and contacts in Anhui	22 (16-23)	0/8 (0%)	Admission
Tian et al. 2020 (75)	Beijing, China	Retrospective study	Patients from Beijing hospitals	47.5 (1-94)	13/262 (5%)	Throughout
Chen et al. 2020 (76)	Chongqing, China	Retrospective study	Patients from Chongqing hospitals	47 (37-61)	30/136 (22.1%)	Admission
Liao et al. 2020 (43)	Chongqing, China	Retrospective study	Patients from Chongqing Three Gorges Central Hospital of Chongqing University	na (10-35)	4/46 (8.7%)	Admission
Chen et al. 2020 (77)	Guangzhou, China	Retrospective study	Patients from Guangzhou Eighth People's Hospital	48 (na)	17/284 (6%)	Throughout
Luo et al. 2020 (21)	Guangzhou, China	Prospective study	Cases and close contacts in Guangzhou	na	8/129 (6.2%)	Throughout
Kim et al. 2020 (78)	Gwangju, South Korea	Retrospective study	Patients from Affiliated Hospitals of Chonnam National University	na	13/71 (18.3%)	Diagnosis
Li et al. 2020 (22)	Hubei, China	Contact tracing	Household contacts in Hubei	45 (na)	9/64 (14.1%)	Throughout
Wan et al. 2020 (79)	Hunan, China	Retrospective study	Patients from the First Affiliate Hospital of Hunan Normal University	na	2/78 (2.6%)	Throughout
Qiu et al. 2020 (80)	Hunan, China	Contact tracing	Patients from the First People's Hospital of Huaihua and the Central Hospital of Shaoyang	43 (8-84)	5/104 (4.8%)	Throughout
Yin et al. 2020 (81)	Hunan, China	Retrospective study	Patients from Second Xiangya Hospital of Central South University	46 (31.5-65)	4/33 (12.1%)	Throughout

Xu et al. 2020 (82)	Jiangsu, China	Retrospective study	Patients from Jiangsu hospitals	na	15/342 (4.4%)	Throughout
Ma et al. 2020 (83)	Jinan, China	Retrospective study	Patients from Jinan Infectious Diseases Hospital	34 (1-72)	11/47 (23.4%)	Throughout
Yin and Jin 2020 (84)	Ningbo, China	Contact tracing	Cases and close contacts in Ningbo	na	30/187 (16%)	Diagnosis
Du et al. 2020 (85)	Shandong, China	Retrospective study	Patients from Jinan Infectious Diseases Hospital and Rizhao People's Hospital	34.1 (na)	8/67 (11.9%)	Throughout
Zhou et al. 2020 (86)	Shanghai, China	Retrospective study	Patients from Shanghai Public Health Center	na	13/328 (4%)	Diagnosis
Bi et al. 2020 (18)	Shenzhen, China	Contact tracing	Cases and close contacts in Shenzhen	45 (na)	25/391 (6.4%)	Admission
Song et al. 2020 (87)	Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, China	Retrospective study	Patients from People's Hospital in Daofu county	na	18/83 (21.7%)	Throughout
He et al. 2020 (88)	Wenzhou, China	Retrospective study	Patients from hospitals in Wenzhou	na	12/206 (5.8%)	Diagnosis
Tao et al. 2020 (89)	Wuhan, China	Retrospective study	Patients from Chongqing Public Health Medical Center	46 (na)	20/167 (12%)	Throughout
Wang et al. 2020 (90)	Wuhan, China	Retrospective study	Patients from Fangcang Hospital	50 (16-89)	30/1012 (3%)	Throughout
Xu et al. 2020 (91)	Wuhan, China	Retrospective study	Patients from hospitals in several provinces	57 (43-69)	1/69 (1.4%)	Admission
Zhang et al. 2020 (92)	Wuhan, China	Retrospective study	Patients from Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University	45.4 (na)	16/120 (13.3%)	Admission
Wu et al. 2020 (27)	Zhuhai City, China	Contact tracing	Cases and contacts in Zhuhai	45.8 (na)	8/83 (9.6%)	Throughout
Leung et al. 2020 (93)	Hong Kong, China	Retrospective study	Patients from Hong Kong hospitals	55.2 (22-96)	2/50 (4%)	Throughout
Liu et al. 2020 (94)	Taiwan	Case series	Imported cases in Taiwan	na (4-88)	11/321 (3.4%)	Throughout
Korea CDC 2020 (95)	South Korea	Case series	Confirmed cases in South Korea	42.6 (20-73)	3/28 (10.7%)	Throughout
Kim et al. 2020 (96)	Daegu, South Korea	Cross-sectional survey	Patients at an isolation facility	26 (na)	41/213 (19.2%)	Admission
Qasim et al. 2020 (97)	Japan	Case series	Confirmed cases in Japan	na (40-79)	112/1192 (9.4%)	Diagnosis
Wong et al. 2020 (98)	Brunei	Case series	Confirmed cases in Brunei	na	58/138 (42%)	Diagnosis
Pongpirul et al. 2020 (99)	Thailand	Retrospective study	Patients from Bamrasnaradura Infectious Diseases Institute	61 (28-74)	1/11 (9.1%)	Throughout
Le et al. 2020 (100)	Vietnam	Retrospective study	Patients from hospitals in Vietnam	31.2 (0.25-55)	1/12 (8.3%)	Diagnosis
Shabrawishi et al. 2020 (101)	Saudi Arabia	Retrospective study	Patients from Al-Noor Specialist Hospital	46.1 (11-87)	47/150 (31.3%)	Throughout
Tan et al. 2020 (102)	Changsha, China	Retrospective study	Children (<12 years old)	7 (1-12)	2/10 (20%)	Throughout
Liao et al. 2020 (43)	Chongqing, China	Contact tracing	Children (<24 years old)	na (10-24)	2/14 (14.3%)	Admission
Song et al. 2020 (103)	Hubei, China	Retrospective study	Children (<14 years old)	8.5 (1-14)	8/16 (50%)	Throughout
Du et al. 2020 (85)	Shandong, China	Retrospective study	Children (<16 years old)	6.2 (0-16)	8/14 (57.1%)	Throughout

Feng et al. 2020 (104)	Shenzhen, China	Retrospective study	Children (<14 years old)	7.9 (4-14)	10/15 (66.7%)	Diagnosis
Zhou et al. 2020 (105)	Shenzhen, China	Retrospective study	Children (<3 years old)	1.6 (0.75-3)	5/9 (55.6%)	Throughout
Lu et al. 2020 (106)	Wuhan, China	Retrospective study	Children (<15 years old)	6.7 (0-15)	27/171 (15.8%)	Diagnosis
Ma et al. 2020 (107)	Wuhan, China	Retrospective study	Children (<14 years old)	na (0-15)	61/115 (53%)	Diagnosis
Tao et al. 2020 (89)	Wuhan, China	Retrospective study	Children (<14 years old)	na	2/7 (28.6%)	Throughout
Xia et al. 2020 (108)	Wuhan, China	Retrospective study	Children (<14 years old)	2.1 (0-14.5)	2/20 (10%)	Throughout
Qiu et al. 2020 (109)	Zhejiang, China	Retrospective study	Children (<16 years old)	8.3 (1-16)	10/36 (27.8%)	Admission
Li et al. 2020 (110)	Zhuhai City, China	Retrospective study	Children (<6 years old)	3.4 (1-6)	4/5 (80%)	Admission

Table 3. Description of studies included in the review and analysis of asymptomatic infection

Figure 3 summarizes the proportion of asymptomatic cases. The estimated mean asymptomatic proportion at diagnosis is 25.9% (95% CI: 18.8%, 33.1%). Unsurprisingly, this proportion is larger than that at admission (14.8%) and throughout the follow-up period (8.0%). In general, the asymptomatic proportion decreases with age—this is more evident in hospital-based studies that observe patients over a certain time period (Supplementary materials Figure S7). The mean asymptomatic proportion at diagnosis is higher in children at 41.8% but there is wide variation due to the limited number of studies (Supplementary materials Figure S8). The asymptomatic proportion in children seems to change little over the course of the follow-up period.

Among the studies with asymptomatic cases assessed at diagnosis, the asymptomatic proportion is notably high in the Diamond Princess cruise (58.9%), a nursing facility in the United States (56.3%), vulnerable population in France (51.0%), Japanese residents evacuated from China (33.3%), and healthcare workers in Italy (29.7%). Pregnant women also had a high asymptomatic proportion (49.3%). The proportion is also high in studies investigating family clusters (49.1%); we note that there is a systematic overestimation in such contact investigations since all clusters include at least one asymptomatic case.

The funnel plot for overall asymptomatic infection is asymmetric, suggesting the presence of small-study effects and confirmed by Egger’s meta-regression test (including segregation by asymptomatic at diagnosis, admission, or throughout), as noted above (Supplementary materials Figure S2b and Table S1b). We therefore conducted an additional search but could not identify any other relevant articles. There is no evidence of bias in studies on children (Supplementary materials Figure S2c and Table S1c).




Figure 3. Forest plot of the proportion of asymptomatic cases. ES is the estimated asymptomatic proportion, with 95% confidence intervals (CI). I-squared is the percentage of between-study heterogeneity that is attributable to variability in the true effect, rather than sampling variation.

Discussion

Summary of key findings

We estimated household SAR at 15.4% (95% CI: 12.2%, 18.7%), almost four times higher than non-household SAR at 4.0% (95% CI: 2.8%, 5.2%). The mean SI was 4.87 days (95% CI: 3.98, 5.77) and the asymptomatic proportion at diagnosis was 25.9% (95% CI: 18.8%, 33.1%). Symptomatic persons had a 2.55 (95% 1.47, 4.45) times higher risk of infecting others.

Secondary attack rate

We estimated SAR across various settings as a measure of viral transmissibility. While a number of studies have estimated the basic reproductive number (R0) at 2–4, (111-114) in isolation it is a suboptimal gauge of infectious disease dynamics as it does not account for variability in specific situations and settings (115, 116).

The significant heterogeneity in SAR across the different settings is unsurprising given that SAR depends not only on the causative agent but also on socio-demographic, environmental, and behavioral factors in

study populations (117). Variation in methods for case ascertainment and then subsequent detection of infected cases among contacts likely contributed to the heterogeneity across studies.

Household SAR at 15.4% was higher than in non-household settings at 4.0%. Reports suggest that familial transmission account for the majority of transmissions (25, 118). The household is thought to be a fundamental unit of SARS-CoV-2 transmission because of the high frequency and intensity of contacts that occur between family members, and because transmission has continued in places with movement restriction (31). We found the household SAR for COVID-19 approaches the upper range of estimates of the household SAR for the 2009 H1N1 pandemic influenza (5–15%) (119-121), and higher than that observed for both SARS (5–10%) (122-124) and MERS (4–5%) (125, 126). This suggests relatively higher SARS-CoV-2 transmissibility in the household setting. SARS-CoV-2 also has a higher R_0 when compared to MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV-1 (127). This finding highlights the necessity of case isolation, immediate tracing, and quarantine of household contacts (128).

The relatively lower SAR in non-household settings may mask variation between setting types. Some studies reported significantly higher SAR in mass gatherings and other enclosed settings with potential for prolonged physical contact, such as at the ski chalet in France (73.3%), at a choir in the United States (53.3%), and a religious gathering in Brunei (14.8%) (31, 36, 37). In contrast, SAR in workplace/school and in healthcare settings ranged between 1–2%, suggesting a gradation of risk outside the household (19, 28, 31). As an aggregate, we found that the transmission risk was significantly reduced outside the household.

Our meta-analysis excluded studies that solely reported attack rates (AR) without identification of an index case and their transmission generations within the cluster. However, such studies may be important in understanding the role of super-spreading events (SSEs) in driving SARS-CoV-2 transmission (116). Specific settings where high ARs have been observed were in a nursing home in Kings County, Washington (64%), a call centre in South Korea (43.5%), a church in Arkansas (38%), a homeless shelter in Boston (36%), a fitness dance class (26.3%), and the Diamond Princess cruise ship in Japan (18.8%) (Supplementary materials Table S2).

Reflecting on the high household SAR and high AR in some settings, we suggest that several common environmental factors potentially account for the rapid person-to-person transmission observed: closed environments, population density, and shared eating environments. This is supported by environmental sampling studies (129) and ecological observations on the declining incidence of COVID-19 cases in areas with restrictions on indoor mass gatherings (130).

There are implications for mass gatherings and certain religious events, particularly as countries begin to relax physical distancing measures. Non-household residential settings such as long-term care facilities, dormitories, and detention facilities pose specific challenges where additional prevention measures merit consideration, including staff screening, enhanced testing, and strict visitor policies (67).

Certainly, across all settings, the longer the duration and the greater the degree of physical contact with an index case, the higher the risk of transmission. However, we find that the risk model for transmission of SARS-CoV-2 is nuanced—while the highest risk of transmission is in crowded and enclosed settings, social interaction in public settings has a lower risk. This suggests that socially disruptive large-scale community lockdowns can be avoided if case isolation, tracing, and physical distancing measures that target higher risk activities can be implemented effectively (131). This combination of measures is

dependent upon the stage of the epidemic in a particular area and may be more feasible in areas with imported cases or limited local transmission.

In addition, as anxiety with physical distancing measures (so-called “quarantine fatigue”) gain momentum (132), public communications surrounding these measures should convey this continuum of risk based on the transmission dynamics across different settings, supporting sustainable longer-term behavior changes.

Serial interval

The SI depends upon the temporal relation between infectiousness and clinical onset of a source case and the incubation period of the receiving case (133). We estimated the mean SI at 4.87 days, with studies reporting the SI ranging from 3.58 to 7.5 days, which is considerably shorter than observed for SARS (8.4 days) and MERS (14.6 days). The variation between studies is expected, as the interval between symptoms in an infector-infectee pair is influenced by the level of close contact, varying widely between different countries and in different settings.

Negative serial intervals were reported in several studies indicating that the infectee had symptoms earlier than the infector, thereby strengthening the evidence for pre-symptomatic transmission (98). Using a mean SI of 5.21 days obtained from the Grace Assembly of God cluster in Singapore, Ganyani et al. conducted a sensitivity analysis suggesting that the proportion of pre-symptomatic transmission increased from 48% to 66% when negative SI values were taken into account (41). Other studies have estimated that persons can potentially be transmitting up to 2 days prior to symptom onset (28, 39). Taken together, our findings suggest that for quarantine to be effective, cases have to be identified and contacts traced and quarantined within 2.87 days of the onset of symptoms of the index case. Quarantine after this period potentially results in transmission from secondary to tertiary cases.

Asymptomatic infections

If significant transmission were occurring prior to symptoms, this could pose challenges for symptom-based public health control measures, such as clinical criteria for testing, and early case isolation (9). We estimated that 25.9% of COVID-19 cases were asymptomatic at time of diagnosis. Of these, more than two-thirds went on to develop symptoms over the course of their disease with a ‘true asymptomatic’ proportion of 8.4%. Our study does not support claims that the majority of SARS-CoV-2 infections are asymptomatic (134). Questions remain as to the role of asymptomatic carriers in the transmission of SARS-CoV-2. A number of studies have described familial clusters resulting from asymptomatic carrier transmission (55, 135). From the observational studies included in our analysis, we found a significantly higher risk of transmission where the index case was symptomatic with a relative risk of 2.55, suggesting that testing strategies should prioritize symptomatic persons (9) particularly where resources are finite.

Nonetheless, the proportion of asymptomatic infection combined with a relatively short SI warrant caution as there is potential for silent transmission (98). Even with a highly effective case isolation and quarantine system, asymptomatic infections are difficult to detect rapidly and may give rise to transmission chains within community settings. Therefore, some degree of physical distancing is likely to be needed to account for this (131).

SARS-CoV-2 transmission in children

For many infectious diseases, such as seasonal and pandemic influenza, children are known to be drivers of transmission in households and communities (136). Case series data on SARS-CoV-2 suggests that children are less likely to be affected than adults. A national analysis of the first 72,314 cases in China reported only 2.1% of all cases were in children aged 0-19 years old (137). Other studies show similarly low proportions (138).

To better understand their relative susceptibility of infection, we compared the SAR between adults and children and found adults at 1.40 times higher risk of infection than children. The lower rate of susceptibility in children could be explained by differences in symptomatic infection rates and subsequent issues with case ascertainment (139). The estimated mean asymptomatic proportion among children is 41.8%, about 1.6 times the proportion in the general population.

The literature surrounding infectivity in children is scarce. In household transmission studies, children are usually identified through contact tracing of adult cases, although a number of case reports have documented transmission from children to adults (140). There is also insufficient knowledge on transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 from children to other children. In addition, age may be important to determine dynamics of interactions among children but inadequate data hampered our efforts at risk stratification by age.

While there are still important unknowns with respect to SARS-CoV-2 in children, these early findings may assist health authorities in determining proportionate thresholds for school closures in future waves of the pandemic.

Strengths and limitations

Our analysis has important limitations. The studies selected were based on field investigation; variability was noted with respect to study design, the number of individuals assessed, clinical definitions, the extent to which confirmatory laboratory tests were used, the methods of clinical data collection, and the duration of follow-up. Studies may have different definitions of household and contacts and are subject to recall and observer bias (141). Moreover, without accounting for outside sources of infection, setting-specific SARs are likely to be overestimated (117). In fact, none of the reviewed studies addressed the composition of secondary vs. community infections when estimating the SAR or used viral sequencing to confirm homology between the strains infecting the index and secondary cases in the household.

All studies on SAR were retrospective transmission studies based on contact tracing datasets where the index case determination or the direction of transmission may be uncertain, particularly in diseases such as COVID-19 where a substantial proportion of cases are asymptomatic or mild. An additional challenge concerns the timing of recruitment of cases and their contacts during the course of an epidemic. Studies conducted in early stages can provide timely SAR estimates; however, this may be influenced by behavioral factors and other non-pharmaceutical interventions (e.g. community quarantine) that alter over the course of the epidemic (117).

Studies reporting SI face have similar limitations. Most do not account for incomplete reporting over the course of the epidemic and hence have incomplete transmission networks (41). Changes in social contacts and other behavioral changes, such as mask-wearing, may also alter the SI (133). Akin to contact tracing-based transmission studies, the order of transmission in clusters can easily be mistaken.

Moreover, given the potential for pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission, it can be difficult to determine the source of infection with certainty.

Estimates of the asymptomatic proportion should be interpreted with caution as they are approximated from studies that lack a standardized case definition for asymptomatic infections. The collection of acute and convalescent serology from household contacts in household transmission studies could provide key information on asymptomatic cases, which is essential to forecasting the course of the pandemic. We cannot exclude publication bias for studies reporting on asymptomatic proportion given the media attention surrounding this particular topic.

The major strength of our study is that it comprehensively covers several key parameters of SARS-CoV-2 transmission-related dynamics, thus facilitating discussion and allowing for triangulation of these different parameters to identify the key drivers of transmission.

Conclusion

Our estimates of SAR, SI, and asymptomatic infection demonstrate the challenges in controlling SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Based on our pooled estimates of these three parameters, 10 infected symptomatic persons living with 100 contacts would result in 15 additional symptomatic infected persons in <5 days and 39 in <15 days. If the testing and tracing strategy is based on symptoms, we would further miss 25% of infected individuals, who are asymptomatic and could potentially be transmitting.

Overall, these findings suggest that aggressive contact-tracing strategies based on suspect cases may be appropriate early in an outbreak but as it progresses, control measures should transition to a combination of approaches that account for setting-specific transmission risk. Quarantine may need to cover entire communities such as dormitories, workplaces, or other institutional and residential settings, while contact tracing should shift to identifying hotspots of transmission and vulnerable populations. The variability in SAR across settings suggests targeted strategies may allow for reducing infections while not overly restricting social movement.

Supplementary materials




Figure S1a. Flow chart of search strategy and study selection for the secondary attack rate (SAR)




Figure S1b. Flow chart of search strategy and study selection for the serial interval (SI)




Figure S1c. Flow chart of search strategy and study selection for asymptomatic infection




Figure S2a. Funnel plot of the 17 studies on household secondary attack rate.




Figure S2b. Funnel plot of the 57 studies on overall asymptomatic infection.




Figure S2c. Funnel plot of the 12 studies on asymptomatic infection in children.




Figure S3. Forest plot of secondary attack rate by symptom status of index case. RR is the estimated relative risk ratio, with 95% confidence intervals (CI). I-squared is the percentage of between-study heterogeneity that is attributable to variability in the true effect, rather than sampling variation.




Figure S4. Forest plot of secondary attack rate in adults and children. RR is the estimated relative risk ratio, with 95% confidence intervals (CI). I-squared is the percentage of between-study heterogeneity that is attributable to variability in the true effect, rather than sampling variation.




Figure S5. Forest plot of secondary attack rate in spouse and child of an index case. RR is the estimated relative risk ratio, with 95% confidence intervals (CI). I-squared is the percentage of between-study heterogeneity that is attributable to variability in the true effect, rather than sampling variation.




Figure S6. Forest plot of secondary attack rate in spouse and other household members (excluding child) of an index case. RR is the estimated relative risk ratio, with 95% confidence intervals (CI). I-squared is the percentage of between-study heterogeneity that is attributable to variability in the true effect, rather than sampling variation.






Figure S7. Scatter plots of asymptomatic infection and mean or median age of the study population




Figure S8. Forest plot of the proportion of asymptomatic cases in children at diagnosis, admission, and throughout the follow-up period. ES is the estimated asymptomatic proportion, with 95% confidence intervals (CI). I-squared is the percentage of between-study heterogeneity that is attributable to variability in the true effect, rather than sampling variation.

Parameter	Estimate	SE	t value	p value	95% CI
Slope (coefficient)	1.038	0.090	11.48	0.000	0.846, 1.231
Bias (intercept)	1.464	1.479	0.99	0.338	-1.689, 4.615

Test of H_0 : no small-study effects, p value = 0.338

Table S1a. Results from Egger’s meta-regression test assessing the presence of small-study effects in 17 household secondary attack rate studies

Parameter	Estimate	SE	t value	p value	95% CI
Slope (coefficient)	0.597	0.067	8.98	0.000	0.464, 0.730
Bias (intercept)	3.414	0.870	3.92	0.000	1.670, 5.159

Test of H_0 : no small-study effects, p value = 0.000

Table S1b. Results from Egger’s meta-regression test assessing the presence of small-study effects in 57 studies on overall asymptomatic infection

Parameter	Estimate	SE	t value	p value	95% CI
Slope (coefficient)	1.243	0.138	9.04	0.000	0.937, 1.550
Bias (intercept)	0.862	0.702	1.23	0.247	-0.701, 2.426

Test of H_0 : no small-study effects, p value = 0.247

Table S1c. Results from Egger’s meta-regression test assessing the presence of small-study effects in 12 studies on asymptomatic infection in children

Study	Location	Setting	Attack rate (%)
Roxby et al. 2020 (68)	Seattle, Washington	Independent and assisted living community	5/142 (3.5%)
Arons et al. 2020 (67)	King County, Washington	Nursing facility	57/89 (64.0%)
Baggett et al. 2020 (142)	Boston	Homeless shelter	147/408 (36.0%)
Ly et al. 2020 (70)	France	Homeless shelter	48/683 (7.0%)
Lombardi et al. 2020 (66)	Lombardy, Italy	Healthcare workers	138/1573 (8.8%)
James et al. 2020 (143)	Arkansas	Church	35/92 (38.0%)
Park et al. 2020 (29)	Seoul, South Korea	Call center	94/216 (43.5%)
Jang et al. 2020 (144)	Cheonan, South Korea	Fitness dance class	57/217 (26.3%)
Dyal et al. 2020 (145)	United States	Meat processing plant	4913/130578 (3.8%)
Zhang et al. 2020 (24)	Shandong, China	Supermarket	11/120 (9.2%)
Yamahata et al. 2020 (65)	Japan	Cruise (Diamond Princess)	696/3711 (18.8%)

Table S1. Attack rates in different settings.

References

1. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, Niu P, Yang B, Wu H, et al. Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor binding. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10224):565-74.
2. Kucharski AJ, Russell TW, Diamond C, Liu Y, Edmunds J, Funk S, et al. Early dynamics of transmission and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20(5):553-8.
3. Forster P, Forster L, Renfrew C, Forster M. Phylogenetic network analysis of SARS-CoV-2 genomes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2020;117(17):9241-3.
4. Lurie N, Saville M, Hatchett R, Halton J. Developing Covid-19 Vaccines at Pandemic Speed. *N Engl J Med*. 2020.
5. Salvi R, Patankar P. Emerging pharmacotherapies for COVID-19. *Biomed Pharmacother*. 2020:110267.
6. Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Goldstein E, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Projecting the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period. *Science*. 2020.
7. Cowling BJ, Leung GM. Epidemiological research priorities for public health control of the ongoing global novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) outbreak. *Euro Surveill*. 2020;25(6).
8. Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, Zhao L, Nurtay A, Abeler-Dörner L, et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *Science*. 2020;368(6491).
9. Fraser C, Riley S, Anderson RM, Ferguson NM. Factors that make an infectious disease outbreak controllable. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2004;101(16):6146-51.
10. Liu Y, Eggo RM, Kucharski AJ. Secondary attack rate and superspreading events for SARS-CoV-2. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10227):e47.
11. Vink MA, Bootsma MC, Wallinga J. Serial intervals of respiratory infectious diseases: a systematic review and analysis. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2014;180(9):865-75.
12. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials*. 1986;7(3):177-88.
13. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. 2003;327(7414):557-60.
14. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ*. 1997;315(7109):629-34.
15. Sterne JAC, Harbord RM. Funnel Plots in Meta-analysis. 2004. *The Stata Journal*;4(2):15.
16. Harris RJ, Bradburn MJ, Deeks JJ, Harbord RM, Altman DG, Sterne JAC. metan: fixed- and random-effects meta-analysis. *The Stata Journal*. 2008;8:26.
17. Harbord RM, Harris RJ, Sterne JAC. Updated tests for small-study effects in meta-analyses. *The Stata Journal*. 2009;9(2):14.
18. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, Ye C, Zou X, Zhang Z, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391 cases and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020.
19. Chen Y, Wang A, Yi B, Ding K, Wang H, Wang J, et al. The epidemiological characteristics of infection in close contacts of COVID-19 in Ningbo city. *Chinese Journal of Epidemiology*. 2020;41(5):5.
20. Jing Q-L, Liu M-J, Yuan J, Zhang Z-B, Zhang A-R, Dean NE, et al. Household secondary attack rate of COVID-19 and associated determinants. *medRxiv*. 2020: 2020.04.11.20056010.
21. Luo L, Liu D, Liao X-l, Wu X-b, Jing Q-l, Zheng J-z, et al. Modes of contact and risk of transmission in COVID-19 among close contacts. *medRxiv*. 2020: 2020.03.24.20042606.
22. Li W, Zhang B, Lu J, Liu S, Chang Z, Cao P, et al. The characteristics of household transmission of COVID-19. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020.
23. Jiang XL, Zhang XL, Zhao XN, Li CB, Lei J, Kou ZQ, et al. Transmission potential of asymptomatic and paucisymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: a three-family cluster study in China. *J Infect Dis*. 2020.

24. Zhang J, Zhuo P, Han D, Wang W, Cui C, Zhou R, et al. Investigation of a cluster epidemic of COVID-19 in a supermarket in Liaocheng, Shandong province. *Chinese Journal of Epidemiology*. 2020;41.
25. Wang Z, Ma W, Zheng X, Wu G, Zhang R. Household transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *J Infect*. 2020.
26. Sun WW, Ling F, Pan JR, Cai J, Miao ZP, Liu SL, et al. [Epidemiological characteristics of 2019 novel coronavirus family clustering in Zhejiang Province]. *Zhonghua Yu Fang Yi Xue Za Zhi*. 2020;54(0):E027.
27. Wu J, Huang Y, Tu C, Bi C, Chen Z, Luo L, et al. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2, Zhuhai, China, 2020. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020.
28. Cheng HY, Jian SW, Liu DP, Ng TC, Huang WT, Lin HH, et al. Contact Tracing Assessment of COVID-19 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different Exposure Periods Before and After Symptom Onset. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2020.
29. Park SY, Kim YM, Yi S, Lee S, Na BJ, Kim CB, et al. Coronavirus Disease Outbreak in Call Center, South Korea. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(8).
30. COVID-19 National Emergency Response Center EaCMT, Korea Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Coronavirus Disease-19: Summary of 2,370 Contact Investigations of the First 30 Cases in the Republic of Korea. *Osong Public Health Res Perspect*. 2020;11(2):81-4.
31. Chaw L, Koh WC, Jamaludin SA, Naing L, Alikhan MF, Wong J. SARS-CoV-2 transmission in different settings: Analysis of cases and close contacts from the Tablighi cluster in Brunei Darussalam. *medRxiv*. 2020: 2020.05.04.20090043.
32. Böhmer MM, Buchholz U, Corman VM, Hoch M, Katz K, Marosevic DV, et al. Investigation of a COVID-19 outbreak in Germany resulting from a single travel-associated primary case: a case series. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020.
33. Burke RM, Balter S, Barnes E, Barry V, Bartlett K, Beer KD, et al. Enhanced Contact Investigations for Nine Early Travel-Related Cases of SARS-CoV-2 in the United States. *medRxiv*. 2020: 2020.04.27.20081901.
34. Canova V, Lederer Schläpfer H, Piso RJ, Droll A, Fenner L, Hoffmann T, et al. Transmission risk of SARS-CoV-2 to healthcare workers -observational results of a primary care hospital contact tracing. *Swiss Med Wkly*. 2020;150:w20257.
35. Ghinai I, Woods S, Ritger KA, McPherson TD, Black SR, Sparrow L, et al. Community Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 at Two Family Gatherings - Chicago, Illinois, February-March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(15):446-50.
36. Danis K, Epaulard O, Bénet T, Gaymard A, Campoy S, Bothelo-Nevers E, et al. Cluster of coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) in the French Alps, 2020. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020.
37. Hamner L, Dubbel P, Capron I, Ross A, Jordan A, Lee J, et al. High SARS-CoV-2 Attack Rate Following Exposure at a Choir Practice - Skagit County, Washington, March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(19):606-10.
38. Casey M, Griffin J, McAloon CG, Byrne AW, Madden JM, McEvoy D, et al. Estimating pre-symptomatic transmission of COVID-19: a secondary analysis using published data. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.05.08.20094870.
39. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(5):672-5.
40. Du Z, Xu X, Wu Y, Wang L, Cowling BJ, Meyers LA. Serial Interval of COVID-19 among Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(6).
41. Ganyani T, Kremer C, Chen D, Torneri A, Faes C, Wallinga J, et al. Estimating the generation interval for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) based on symptom onset data, March 2020. *Euro Surveill*. 2020;25(17).
42. 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(13):1199-207.

43. Liao J, Fan S, Chen J, Wu J, Xu S, Guo Y, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of COVID-19 in adolescents and young adults. medRxiv. 2020: 2020.04.27.20081901.
44. Kwok KO, Wong VWY, Wei WI, Wong SYS, Tang JW. Epidemiological characteristics of the first 53 laboratory-confirmed cases of COVID-19 epidemic in Hong Kong, 13 February 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(16).
45. Cheng H-Y, Jian S-W, Liu D-P, Ng T-C, Huang W-T, team TC-oi, et al. High transmissibility of COVID-19 near symptom onset. medRxiv. 2020: 2020.03.18.20034561.
46. Mettler SK, Maathuis MH. Clinical onset serial interval and diagnostic serial interval of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 in South Korea. medRxiv. 2020: 2020.03.18.20034561.
47. Cereda D, Tirani M, Rovida F, Demicheli V, Ajelli M, Poletti P, et al. The early phase of the COVID-19 outbreak in Lombardy, Italy. arXiv. 2020.
48. Lavezzo E, Franchin E, Ciavarella C, Cuomo-Dannenburg G, Barzon L, Del Vecchio C, et al. Suppression of COVID-19 outbreak in the municipality of Vo, Italy. medRxiv. 2020: 2020.04.17.20053157.
49. Nishiura H, Linton NM, Akhmetzhanov AR. Serial interval of novel coronavirus (COVID-19) infections. Int J Infect Dis. 2020;93:284-6.
50. Wu JT, Leung K, Bushman M, Kishore N, Niehus R, de Salazar PM, et al. Estimating clinical severity of COVID-19 from the transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China. Nat Med. 2020;26(4):506-10.
51. Ma S, Zhang J, Zeng M, Yun Q, Guo W, Zheng Y, et al. Epidemiological parameters of coronavirus disease 2019: a pooled analysis of publicly reported individual data of 1155 cases from seven countries. medRxiv. 2020: 2020.03.21.20040329.
52. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Wang W, Wang Y, Deng X, Chen X, et al. Evolving epidemiology and transmission dynamics of coronavirus disease 2019 outside Hubei province, China: a descriptive and modelling study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020.
53. Du Z, Xu X, Wu Y, Wang L, Cowling BJ, Meyers LA. COVID-19 serial interval estimates based on confirmed cases in public reports from 86 Chinese cities. medRxiv. 2020: 2020.03.21.20040329.
54. Buitrago-Garcia DC, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, Hossmann S, Imeri H, Salanti G, et al. The role of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: rapid living systematic review and meta-analysis. medRxiv. 2020:2020.04.25.20079103.
55. Bai Y, Yao L, Wei T, Tian F, Jin DY, Chen L, et al. Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19. JAMA. 2020.
56. Luo SH, Liu W, Liu ZJ, Zheng XY, Hong CX, Liu ZR, et al. A confirmed asymptomatic carrier of 2019 novel coronavirus. Chin Med J (Engl). 2020;133(9):1123-5.
57. Zhang J, Tian S, Lou J, Chen Y. Familial cluster of COVID-19 infection from an asymptomatic. Crit Care. 2020;24(1):119.
58. Bai SL, Wang JY, Zhou YQ, Yu DS, Gao XM, Li LL, et al. [Analysis of the first cluster of cases in a family of novel coronavirus pneumonia in Gansu Province]. Zhonghua Yu Fang Yi Xue Za Zhi. 2020;54(0):E005.
59. Pan X, Chen D, Xia Y, Wu X, Li T, Ou X, et al. Asymptomatic cases in a family cluster with SARS-CoV-2 infection. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020;20(4):410-1.
60. Jiang Y, Niu W, Wang Q, Zhao H, Meng L, Zhang C. Characteristics of a family cluster of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Henan, China. J Infect. 2020.
61. Ye F, Xu S, Rong Z, Xu R, Liu X, Deng P, et al. Delivery of infection from asymptomatic carriers of COVID-19 in a familial cluster. Int J Infect Dis. 2020;94:133-8.
62. Chan JF, Yuan S, Kok KH, To KK, Chu H, Yang J, et al. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. Lancet. 2020;395(10223):514-23.

63. Luo Y, Trevathan E, Qian Z, Li Y, Li J, Xiao W, et al. Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Household Contacts of a Healthcare Provider, Wuhan, China. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;26(8).
64. Qian G, Yang N, Ma AHY, Wang L, Li G, Chen X. A COVID-19 Transmission within a family cluster by presymptomatic infectors in China. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020.
65. Yamahata Y, Shibata A. Preparation for Quarantine on the Cruise Ship Diamond Princess in Japan due to COVID-19. *JMIR Public Health Surveill.* 2020;6(2):e18821.
66. Lombardi A, Consonni D, Carugno M, Bozzi G, Mangioni D, Muscatello A, et al. Characteristics of 1,573 healthcare workers who underwent nasopharyngeal swab for SARS-CoV-2 in Milano, Lombardy, Italy. *medRxiv.* 2020: 2020.05.07.20094276.
67. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, Kimball A, James A, Jacobs JR, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. *N Engl J Med.* 2020.
68. Roxby AC, Greninger AL, Hatfield KM, Lynch JB, Dellit TH, James A, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Among Residents and Staff Members of an Independent and Assisted Living Community for Older Adults - Seattle, Washington, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(14):416-8.
69. Arima Y, Shimada T, Suzuki M, Suzuki T, Kobayashi Y, Tsuchihashi Y, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection among Returnees to Japan from Wuhan, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;26(7).
70. Ly TDA, Hoang VT, Goumballa N, Louni M, Canard N, Dao ThL, et al. Screening of SARS-CoV-2 among homeless people, asylum seekers and other people living in precarious conditions in Marseille, France, March April 2020. *medRxiv.* 2020: 2020.05.05.20091934.
71. Breslin N, Baptiste C, Gyamfi-Bannerman C, Miller R, Martinez R, Bernstein K, et al. COVID-19 infection among asymptomatic and symptomatic pregnant women: Two weeks of confirmed presentations to an affiliated pair of New York City hospitals. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM.* 2020:100118.
72. Wu X, Sun R, Chen J, Xie Y, Zhang S, Wang X. Radiological findings and clinical characteristics of pregnant women with COVID-19 pneumonia. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet.* 2020.
73. Wu C, Yang W, Wu X, Zhang T, Zhao Y, Ren W, et al. Clinical Manifestation and Laboratory Characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Pregnant Women. *Viol Sin.* 2020.
74. Huang L, Zhang X, Wei Z, Zhang L, Xu J, Liang P, et al. Rapid asymptomatic transmission of COVID-19 during the incubation period demonstrating strong infectivity in a cluster of youngsters aged 16-23 years outside Wuhan and characteristics of young patients with COVID-19: A prospective contact-tracing study. *J Infect.* 2020;80(6):e1-e13.
75. Tian S, Hu N, Lou J, Chen K, Kang X, Xiang Z, et al. Characteristics of COVID-19 infection in Beijing. *J Infect.* 2020;80(4):401-6.
76. Chen P, Zhang Y, Wen Y, Guo J, Jia J, Ma Y, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 136 cases of COVID-19 in main district of Chongqing. *J Formos Med Assoc.* 2020.
77. Chen X, Zhang Y, Zhu B, Zeng J, Hong W, He X, et al. Associations of clinical characteristics and antiviral drugs with viral RNA clearance in patients with COVID-19 in Guangzhou, China: a retrospective cohort study. *medRxiv.* 2020: 2020.04.09.20058941.
78. Kim SE, Jeong HS, Yu Y, Shin SU, Kim S, Oh TH, et al. Viral kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic carriers and presymptomatic patients. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020;95:441-3.
79. Wan R, Mao ZQ, He LY, Hu YC, Wei-Chen. Evidence from two cases of asymptomatic infection with SARS-CoV-2: Are 14 days of isolation sufficient? *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020;95:174-5.
80. Qiu C, Deng Z, Xiao Q, Shu Y, Deng Y, Wang H, et al. Transmission and clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 in 104 outside-Wuhan patients, China. *J Med Virol.* 2020.
81. Yin S, Peng Y, Ren Y, Hu M, Tang L, Xiang Z, et al. The implications of preliminary screening and diagnosis: Clinical characteristics of 33 mild patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection in Hunan, China. *J Clin Virol.* 2020;128:104397.

82. Xu T, Huang R, Zhu L, Wang J, Cheng J, Zhang B, et al. Epidemiological and clinical features of asymptomatic patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection. *J Med Virol*. 2020.
83. Ma Y, Xu QN, Wang FL, Ma XM, Wang XY, Zhang XG, et al. Characteristics of asymptomatic patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection in Jinan, China. *Microbes Infect*. 2020.
84. Yin G, Jin H. Comparison of transmissibility of coronavirus between symptomatic and asymptomatic patients: Reanalysis of the Ningbo Covid-19 data. *medRxiv*. 2020: 2020.04.09.20058941.
85. Du W, Yu J, Wang H, Zhang X, Zhang S, Li Q, et al. Clinical characteristics of COVID-19 in children compared with adults in Shandong Province, China. *Infection*. 2020.
86. Zhou X, Li Y, Li T, Zhang W. Follow-up of asymptomatic patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2020.
87. Song H, Xiao J, Qiu J, Yin J, Yang H, Shi R, et al. A considerable proportion of individuals with asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection in Tibetan population. *medRxiv*. 2020: 2020.03.27.20043836.
88. He G, Sun W, Fang P, Huang J, Gamber M, Cai J, et al. The clinical feature of silent infections of novel coronavirus infection (COVID-19) in Wenzhou. *J Med Virol*. 2020.
89. Tao Y, Cheng P, Chen W, Wan P, Chen Y, Yuan G, et al. High incidence of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection, Chongqing, China. *medRxiv*. 2020: 2020.03.27.20043836.
90. Wang X, Fang J, Zhu Y, Chen L, Ding F, Zhou R, et al. Clinical characteristics of non-critically ill patients with novel coronavirus infection (COVID-19) in a Fangcang Hospital. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2020.
91. Xu Y, Li Y-r, Zeng Q, Lu Z-b, Li Y-z, Wu W, et al. Clinical Characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 Pneumonia Compared to Controls in Chinese Han Population. *medRxiv*. 2020: 2020.03.08.20031658.
92. Zhang R, Ouyang H, Fu L, Wang S, Han J, Huang K, et al. CT features of SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia according to clinical presentation: a retrospective analysis of 120 consecutive patients from Wuhan city. *Eur Radiol*. 2020.
93. Leung KS-S, Ng TT-L, Wu AK-L, Yau MC-Y, Lao H-Y, Choi M-P, et al. A territory-wide study of early COVID-19 outbreak in Hong Kong community: A clinical, epidemiological and phylogenomic investigation. *medRxiv*. 2020: 2020.03.30.20045740.
94. Liu JY, Chen TJ, Hwang SJ. Analysis of Imported Cases of COVID-19 in Taiwan: A Nationwide Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(9).
95. COVID-19 National Emergency Response Center EaCMT, Korea Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Early Epidemiological and Clinical Characteristics of 28 Cases of Coronavirus Disease in South Korea. *Osong Public Health Res Perspect*. 2020;11(1):8-14.
96. Kim GU, Kim MJ, Ra SH, Lee J, Bae S, Jung J, et al. Clinical characteristics of asymptomatic and symptomatic patients with mild COVID-19. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2020.
97. Qasim M, Yasir M, Ahmad W, Yoshida M, Azhar M, Ali MA, et al. Early epidemiological and clinical manifestations of COVID-19 in Japan. *medRxiv*. 2020: 2020.04.17.20070276.
98. Wong J, Abdul Aziz ABZ, Chaw L, Mahamud A, Griffith MM, Ying-Ru LO, et al. High proportion of asymptomatic and presymptomatic COVID-19 infections in travelers and returning residents to Brunei. *J Travel Med*. 2020.
99. Pongpirul WA, Mott JA, Woodring JV, Uyeki TM, MacArthur JR, Vachiraphan A, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Patients Hospitalized with Coronavirus Disease, Thailand. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(7).
100. Le TQM, Takemura T, Moi ML, Nabeshima T, Nguyen LKH, Hoang VMP, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Shedding by Travelers, Vietnam, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(7).
101. Shabrawishi M, Al-Gethamy MM, Naser AY, Ghazawi MA, Alsharif GF, Obaid EF, et al. Clinical, Radiological and Therapeutic Characteristics of Patients with COVID-19 in Saudi Arabia. *medRxiv*. 2020: 2020.05.07.20094169.
102. Tan YP, Tan BY, Pan J, Wu J, Zeng SZ, Wei HY. Epidemiologic and clinical characteristics of 10 children with coronavirus disease 2019 in Changsha, China. *J Clin Virol*. 2020;127:104353.

103. Song W, Li J, Zou N, Guan W, Pan J, Xu W. Clinical features of pediatric patients with coronavirus disease (COVID-19). *J Clin Virol.* 2020;127:104377.
104. Feng K, Yun YX, Wang XF, Yang GD, Zheng YJ, Lin CM, et al. [Analysis of CT features of 15 children with 2019 novel coronavirus infection]. *Zhonghua Er Ke Za Zhi.* 2020;58(4):275-8.
105. Zhou Y, Yang GD, Feng K, Huang H, Yun YX, Mou XY, et al. [Clinical features and chest CT findings of coronavirus disease 2019 in infants and young children]. *Zhongguo Dang Dai Er Ke Za Zhi.* 2020;22(3):215-20.
106. Lu X, Zhang L, Du H, Zhang J, Li YY, Qu J, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Children. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(17):1663-5.
107. Ma YL, Xia SY, Wang M, Zhang SM, DU WH, Chen Q. [Clinical features of children with SARS-CoV-2 infection: an analysis of 115 cases]. *Zhongguo Dang Dai Er Ke Za Zhi.* 2020;22(4):290-3.
108. Xia W, Shao J, Guo Y, Peng X, Li Z, Hu D. Clinical and CT features in pediatric patients with COVID-19 infection: Different points from adults. *Pediatr Pulmonol.* 2020;55(5):1169-74.
109. Qiu YY, Wang SQ, Wang XL, Lu WX, Qiao D, Li JB, et al. [Epidemiological analysis on a family cluster of COVID-19]. *Zhonghua Liu Xing Bing Xue Za Zhi.* 2020;41(4):494-7.
110. Li W, Cui H, Li K, Fang Y, Li S. Chest computed tomography in children with COVID-19 respiratory infection. *Pediatr Radiol.* 2020;50(6):796-9.
111. Zhao S, Lin Q, Ran J, Musa SS, Yang G, Wang W, et al. Preliminary estimation of the basic reproduction number of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in China, from 2019 to 2020: A data-driven analysis in the early phase of the outbreak. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020;92:214-7.
112. Liu Y, Gayle AA, Wilder-Smith A, Rocklöv J. The reproductive number of COVID-19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *J Travel Med.* 2020;27(2).
113. Distante C, Piscitelli P, Miani A. Covid-19 Outbreak Progression in Italian Regions: Approaching the Peak by the End of March in Northern Italy and First Week of April in Southern Italy. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;17(9).
114. Caicedo-Ochoa Y, Rebellón-Sánchez DE, Peñaloza-Rallón M, Cortés-Motta HF, Méndez-Fandiño YR. Effective Reproductive Number estimation for initial stage of COVID-19 pandemic in Latin American Countries. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020;95:316-8.
115. Lloyd-Smith JO, Schreiber SJ, Kopp PE, Getz WM. Superspreading and the effect of individual variation on disease emergence. *Nature.* 2005;438(7066):355-9.
116. Frieden TR, Lee CT. Identifying and Interrupting Superspreading Events-Implications for Control of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;26(6).
117. Tsang TK, Lau LLH, Cauchemez S, Cowling BJ. Household Transmission of Influenza Virus. *Trends Microbiol.* 2016;24(2):123-33.
118. World Health Organization. Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). Geneva; 2020: <https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/who-china-joint-mission-on-covid-19-final-report.pdf>.
119. Carcione D, Giele CM, Goggin LS, Kwan KS, Smith DW, Dowse GK, et al. Secondary attack rate of pandemic influenza A(H1N1) 2009 in Western Australian households, 29 May-7 August 2009. *Euro Surveill.* 2011;16(3).
120. Casado I, Martínez-Baz I, Burgui R, Irisarri F, Arriazu M, Elía F, et al. Household transmission of influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 in the pandemic and post-pandemic seasons. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(9):e108485.
121. Janjua NZ, Skowronski DM, Hottes TS, Osei W, Adams E, Petric M, et al. Transmission dynamics and risk factors for pandemic H1N1-related illness: outbreak investigation in a rural community of British Columbia, Canada. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses.* 2012;6(3):e54-62.
122. Goh DL, Lee BW, Chia KS, Heng BH, Chen M, Ma S, et al. Secondary household transmission of SARS, Singapore. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2004;10(2):232-4.

123. Lau JT, Lau M, Kim JH, Tsui HY, Tsang T, Wong TW. Probable secondary infections in households of SARS patients in Hong Kong. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2004;10(2):235-43.
124. Wilson-Clark SD, Deeks SL, Gournis E, Hay K, Bondy S, Kennedy E, et al. Household transmission of SARS, 2003. *CMAJ.* 2006;175(10):1219-23.
125. Drosten C, Meyer B, Müller MA, Corman VM, Al-Masri M, Hossain R, et al. Transmission of MERS-coronavirus in household contacts. *N Engl J Med.* 2014;371(9):828-35.
126. Van Kerkhove MD, Alaswad S, Assiri A, Perera RAPM, Peiris M, El Bushra HE, et al. Transmissibility of MERS-CoV Infection in Closed Setting, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, 2015. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2019;25(10):1802-9.
127. Petrosillo N, Viceconte G, Ergonul O, Ippolito G, Petersen E. COVID-19, SARS and MERS: are they closely related? *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2020.
128. Salathé M, Althaus CL, Neher R, Stringhini S, Hodcroft E, Fellay J, et al. COVID-19 epidemic in Switzerland: on the importance of testing, contact tracing and isolation. *Swiss Med Wkly.* 2020;150:w20225.
129. Yamagishi T. Environmental sampling for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) during a coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak aboard a commercial cruise ship. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.05.02.20088567.
130. Wang KW, Gao J, Wang H, Wu XL, Yuan QF, Guo FY, et al. Epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus in Jiangsu Province, China after wartime control measures: A population-level retrospective study. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* 2020:101654.
131. Kucharski AJ, Klepac P, Conlan A, Kissler SM, Tang M, Fry H, et al. Effectiveness of isolation, testing, contact tracing and physical distancing on reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in different settings. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.04.23.20077024.
132. Dailey SF, Kaplan D. Shelter-in-place and mental health: an analogue study of well-being and distress. *J Emerg Manag.* 2014;12(2):121-31.
133. Fine PE. The interval between successive cases of an infectious disease. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2003;158(11):1039-47.
134. Day M. Covid-19: four fifths of cases are asymptomatic, China figures indicate. *BMJ.* 2020;369:m1375.
135. Yu X, Yang R. COVID-19 transmission through asymptomatic carriers is a challenge to containment. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* 2020.
136. Glatman-Freedman A, Portelli I, Jacobs SK, Mathew JI, Slutzman JE, Goldfrank LR, et al. Attack rates assessment of the 2009 pandemic H1N1 influenza A in children and their contacts: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One.* 2012;7(11):e50228.
137. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA.* 2020;323(13):1239-42.
138. Wang P, Lu J, Jin Y, Zhu M, Wang L, Chen S. Epidemiological characteristics of 1212 COVID-19 patients in Henan, China. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.02.21.20026112.
139. Mehta NS, Mytton OT, Mullins EWS, Fowler TA, Falconer CL, Murphy OB, et al. SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19): What do we know about children? A systematic review. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020.
140. Cai J, Xu J, Lin D, Yang z, Xu L, Qu Z, et al. A Case Series of children with 2019 novel coronavirus infection: clinical and epidemiological features. *Clinical Infectious Diseases.* 2020.
141. Yom-Tov E, Johansson-Cox I, Lamos V, Hayward AC. Estimating the secondary attack rate and serial interval of influenza-like illnesses using social media. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses.* 2015;9(4):191-9.
142. Baggett TP, Keyes H, Sporn N, Gaeta JM. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Residents of a Large Homeless Shelter in Boston. *JAMA.* 2020.

143. James A, Eagle L, Phillips C, Hedges S, Bodenhamer C, Brown R, et al. High COVID-19 Attack Rate Among Attendees at Events at a Church — Arkansas, March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020.
144. Jang S, Han SH, Rhee JY. Cluster of Coronavirus Disease Associated with Fitness Dance Classes, South Korea. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;26(8).
145. Dyal JW, Grant MP, Broadwater K, Bjork A, Waltenburg MA, Gibbins JD, et al. COVID-19 Among Workers in Meat and Poultry Processing Facilities - 19 States, April 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(18).