medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Estimating Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2

Mihaela Curmei* UC Berkeley
Andrew Ilyas*† MIT
Owain Evans University of Oxford
Jacob Steinhardt UC Berkeley

Introduction and Goals. SARS-CoV-2 is transmitted both in the community and within households. Social distancing and lockdowns reduce community transmission but do not directly address household transmission. We provide quantitative measures of household transmission based on empirical data, and estimate the contribution of households to overall spread. We highlight policy implications from our analysis of household transmission, and more generally, of changes in contact patterns under social distancing.

Methods. We investigate the household secondary attack rate (SAR) for SARS-CoV-2, as well as R_h, which is the average number of within-household infections caused by a single index case. We estimate the SAR through a meta-analysis of previous studies. Taking a Bayesian approach, we correct estimates for the false-negative rate (FNR) of testing and compute posterior credible intervals for SAR. We estimate R_h using results from population testing in Vo', Italy and contact tracing data that we curate from Singapore. The code and data behind our analysis are publicly available[1].

Results. Our analysis of eight recent attack rate studies yields an SAR estimate of 0.28 (0.10, 0.61). From contact tracing data, we infer an R_h value of 0.32 $(0.22, 0.42)$. Blanket testing data from Vo' yields an R_h estimate of 0.37 $(0.34, 040)$ and a CRI estimate of 0.5 after correcting for FNR and asymptomatic cases.

Interpretation. Our estimates of R_h suggest that household transmission was a small fraction (5%-35%) of R before social distancing but a large fraction after (30%-55%). This suggests that household transmission may be an effective target for interventions. A remaining uncertainty is whether household infections actually contribute to further community transmission or are contained within households. This can be estimated given high-quality contact tracing data.

More broadly, our study points to emerging contact patterns (i.e., increased time at home relative to the community) playing a role in transmission of SARS-CoV-2. We briefly highlight another instance of this phenomenon (differences in contact between essential workers and the rest of the population), provide coarse estimates of its effect on transmission, and discuss how future data could enable a more reliable estimate.

1 Introduction

Lockdowns and stay-at-home orders have been deployed across the world to curb the growth of SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19. These policies reduce transmission by reducing overall mobility. Since the introduction of lockdowns, community mobility has decreased by $28\% - 70\%$ (Google, 2020), and the effective reproduction number R has decreased by an average of 48% (IQR 38-65%) across 16 regions studied.

At the same time, these policies have increased time spent at home (by $15\% - 29\%$ (Google, 2020)) and therefore likely increased household transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Household transmission played an important role in previous epidemics such as the 2009 H1N1 pandemic (Endo et al., 2019; Tsang et al., 2016; Lau et al., 2012). It may now also be an important factor in SARS-CoV-2 transmission, especially since community transmission has decreased and household transmission has increased under stay-at-home policies.

*Equal contribution.
†Correspondence to: ailyas@mit.edu
[1] https://github.com/andrewilyas/covid-household-transmission

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/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Our aim is to estimate household transmission and determine its overall contribution to growth of SARS-CoV-2. We do so both via a meta-analysis of previous studies, a direct analysis of data collected in Vo', Italy (Ferretti et al., 2020), and analysis of contact tracing data that we curated from Singapore (Singapore COVID-19 Dashboard, 2020). We correct these data for false negatives and in some cases for selective testing (of only symptomatic cases). Code for our analysis, together with the Singapore dataset, are available at `https://github.com/andrewilyas/covid-household-transmission`.

We estimate that household transmission contributes between 0.22 and 0.42 infections to the overall reproduction number. In comparison, overall reproduction numbers during stay-at-home policies ranged from 0.65 to 1.25. We conclude that household transmission is now a significant contributor to overall SARS-CoV-2 reproduction (see Figure 4 for region-specific estimates).

We next examine two folk theories that have sometimes been used to argue against attending to household transmission. The two theories are that preventing transmission within a household is either (a) futile, since transmission is inevitable or (b) low-impact, since secondary infections are "contained" in the household (Horowitz, 2020):

1. *Household inevitability*: No interventions to reduce household transmission are likely to work.
2. *Household containment*: People infected at home will stay at home and not cause community spread.

Our meta-analysis of household secondary attack rate yielded a typical range of $10\% - 61\%$ with significant variability across studies. This implies that household infection is not a certainty and can be mediated by differences in setting, which casts doubt on inevitability. In Section 4.2 we discuss policies for reducing household infection. More generally, our estimates imply that infection is not certain even among individuals who are in regular contact.

We formalize the household containment theory in terms of ratios of secondary transmission, and show that these can be estimated from well-annotated contact tracing data. Unfortunately, existing data are too noisy to reliably estimate containment. In Section 4.2 we outline how these rates can be approximated from aggregate data, and suggest future work for estimating them directly.

Our results underscore that mobility is an imperfect measure of infection risk, since decreases in mobility likely increase household infections. We suggest instead basing policy on contact patterns, which mediate transmission both for COVID-19 (Liu et al., 2020; Jarvis et al., 2020) and previous epidemics (Edmunds et al., 1997; Wallinga et al., 1999; 2006; Mossong et al., 2008; Hens et al., 2009; Eames et al., 2012). To this end, we explore contact heterogeneity caused by stay-at-home orders, due to the divide between essential workers and the rest of the population. An initial simulation study (Section 4.3) forecasts that decreasing transmission risk between essential workers is $8-35$ times as effective as reducing other types of transmission.

2 Methods

The dynamics of disease spread are described via the effective reproduction number R, which measures the average number of new infections caused by each infected person i. To quantify household transmission, we decompose R into two components $R = R_c + R_h$. The *community* reproduction number R_c is the average number of new infections caused by an infected individual i outside i's household. The *intra-household* reproduction number R_h is the average number of new infections caused by an infected individual i inside i's household. The ratio $\frac{R_h}{R}$ measures the fraction of transmission occurring within households.

In addition to R_h, we consider two measures of intra-household spread that quantify individual risk of infection. The *household secondary attack rate* (SAR) is the probability an infected person i infects a specific household member j. Additionally, we define the *household conditional risk of infection* (CRI) to be the probability that j is infected, conditioned on household member i being infected. In contrast to the SAR, the CRI allows for j having been infected by someone other than i, and so CRI can be estimated without attributing infections to particular primary cases.

2.1 Challenges in estimating R_h, SAR and CRI from empirical data

Estimating the growth and prevalence of household cases requires detailed household-level data. The relevant information to estimate R_h, SAR, and CRI includes:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- Testing results for all members of a household, including both positive and negative cases.
- Infection attribution within a household, which involves identifying the primary cases in a household and constructing the household transmission chains.
- Clinical outcome at the end of the study. If a case is still infectious at the end of a study the data might undercount the number of infections attributed to the case.

Assuming accurate household level data we can estimate R_h, SAR, and CRI as follows:

- R_h can be estimated as the ratio of secondary household cases to total household cases. It requires accurate attribution of infections within households, but does not require negative case counts.
- SAR can be estimated as the ratio of secondary household cases to total susceptible household members. It requires accurate attribution as well as negative test counts in households.
- CRI can be estimated as the ratio of total number of infected pairs in households to total number of household pairs. It requires positive and negative case count at household level but not direct attributions.

In practice, estimating these quantities is made difficult by asymptomatic infections and false negatives. Existing evidence suggests that asymptomatic cases constitute 18-43% of all infections and may have different households transmission dynamics than symptomatic cases (Lavezzo et al., 2020; Gudbjartsson et al.; Ferretti et al., 2020; Streeck et al., 2020). However most studies predominantly test symptomatic individuals, which leads to biases in the estimates. We can correct the estimates to account for asymptomatic cases. We calibrate our corrections on studies that have tested a representative sample of the population, as in studies of Vo', Italy and Gangelt, Germany (Lavezzo et al., 2020; Streeck et al., 2020).

Regarding false negatives, recent studies have shown a high false-negative rates (FNR) for RT-PCR tests, and this rate varies over the time course of the disease. Kucirka et al. (2020) find an FNR of 20% for patients tested on Day 8 of infection and 67% on Day 1. The average FNR in the 10 days following onset of symptoms is estimated as 17% by Wikramaratna et al. (2020) and 30% by Kucirka et al. (2020). The FNR also varies between different kinds of swab (Wikramaratna et al., 2020) and between different labs (Kucirka et al., 2020). The problem of false negatives can be mitigated by correcting estimates using the FNR (Wikramaratna et al., 2020) . However, in recent studies of household transmission (see Section 2.2.1), estimates of SAR have not been corrected for the FNR.

2.2 Procedure for estimating R_h, SAR, and CRI

In order to estimate R_h, SAR, and CRI and account for asymptomatics and false negatives we propose two approaches. First we adjust estimates from previous studies to account for false negatives and asymptomatics (see Section 2.2.1). Second, we estimate CRI on the blanket testing dataset from Vo', Italy (Lavezzo et al., 2020) (see Section 2.2.3). Additionally, we have assembled our own dataset based on contact tracing data from Singapore, which we use to estimate R_h (see Section 2.2.2).

2.2.1 Adjusting SAR literature estimates

For the SAR, we searched PubMed and Google Scholar to find any previous work that estimates the household SAR from empirical data. We found a total of eight papers. Whenever appropriate, we recalculate the SAR to correct for the FNR of RT-PCR testing and the asymptomatic rate (AR). We define a Bayesian model that relates SAR, FNR and AR. We assume uniform priors for FNR and AR on intervals reported in literature (FNR (0.15-0.35) and AR (0.18, 0.43)). For studies that only testest symptomatic household members we model the probability that a household member is infected, as: $p = SAR * (1 - FNR) * (1 - AR)$. After correcting the positive case counts, we recalculated 95% credible intervals via rejection sampling. After adjusting credible intervals for SAR we compute ranges for the corresponding R_h values.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

2.2.2 Singapore contact tracing data for estimating R_h

Singapore's Ministry of Health has collected information about COVID-19 cases tracked via contact tracing (Singapore MOH, 2020). UpCode Academy published this data in an interactive dashboard (Singapore COVID-19 Dashboard, 2020). We extracted associated metadata for each positive case along with a directed graph providing information about the infection source. This resulted in a case and transmission network for 6588 patients. Confirmation dates for cases ranged from January, 23rd to April 19th.

We used the data to construct a transmission graph, where nodes correspond to cases and edges to infections. As terminology, we distinguish *source* cases (which are the cause of infections) from *target* cases (which are infected by sources). When relationships are known, edge annotations reflect the relationship between source and target cases (e.g. family member, colleague, contact). R_h can be thus estimated as the ratio of total number of *household* infections to total number of source cases. Since there is no annotation for "household", we use the annotation "family member" as a proxy.

A schematic infection graph is shown in Figure 1. In the case of real data some of the edges are not direct source-target attributions, but are mediated by 'Cluster' nodes. Despite not always having direct infection attributions we can use temporal information to determine the number of sources and targets.



Figure 1: Estimation of R_h from annotated contact tracing data. Nodes represent positive cases and their horizontal position indicates confirmation date. We consider the subset of the graph containing cases with confirmation date prior to cut-off date: *target* nodes are infected by *sources*. R can be estimated as $R = \frac{\#\texttt{targets}}{\#\texttt{sources}}$ and hence $R = 13/7$ for this cluster. There are 3 distinct households in the cluster and thick borders denote secondary household infections. The household reproductive number is $R_h = 5/7$.

2.2.3 Data from Vo' for estimating R_h and CRI

Most of the population in the town of Vo', Italy was tested both at the start of a lockdown and 14 days later (Lavezzo et al., 2020). The two phases of testing covered 86% (2812 subjects) and 72% (2343 subjects) of the population in Vo', respectively.

We analyzed data collected in order to estimate R_h and CRI. Following the same terminology as in the previous section, the date of the second round of testing acts as a cut-off date. Since the data does not trace infections to sources, we assume that all secondary household infections were caused by the primary case.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

We estimate the FNR by assuming that symptomatic cases in household with other confirmed infections are positive cases.

3 Results

3.1 Estimates from literature.

Estimates of SAR are shown in Table 1. The estimates vary considerably, with some confidence intervals having no overlap. This could be explained by variation in FNR and the proportion of asymptomatic primary cases. Studies also varied in how quickly primary cases were isolated from their households (either at home or in hospitals), which likely explains part of the variation. Overall, we conclude that the SAR is in the range 10-61%, assuming some effort is made to isolate symptomatic household members. This is similar to the household SAR for H1N1 influenza (15%) and SARS (15%) (Streeck et al., 2020).

3.2 Estimates from Singapore contact tracing data.

In Singapore, the quality of annotations appears to have degraded over time. Therefore, we limited our analysis to consider source cases that were confirmed prior to March 27th 2020, along with their corresponding target cases (even if the target cases are confirmed later). We believe this cut-off date was early enough to ensure data quality. This subset of the infection graph contains a total of 1076 nodes and 599 edges. Out of the total number of cases, 710 are connected to other known cases forming 111 clusters. Among these, 417 out of 710 are source cases with confirmation date prior to the cut-off. The remaining 366 out of 1076 are not traced to any other case.

The effective reproductive number R is the average number of new infections generated by each case. We can estimate R from our transmission graph by computing the ratio of total number infections to total number of source cases. The data contains 599 total infections and 417 source cases, which results in an estimated R of 1.44 (0.77-2.31). Figure 2 contains estimates for cut-off dates other than March 27th, central estimates for which range between 0.90 and 4.93. Regarding household transmission, there are 108 household infections. Assuming FNR of 20% the corrected estimate for R_h is 0.32 (0.22-0.42).

The corrected central estimate ranges from 0.19 to 0.34 depending on the cut-off date (see Figure 2; also Figure 7 and Table 4 in Appendix A).

3.3 Estimates from blanket testing data.

In Vo', Italy, the first round of testing recorded 73 positive cases among 53 households with a total of 137 members. The second round of testing identified 7 more positive cases, 3 of which were in households with prior reported cases. The CRI can be estimated as the ratio between the total number of ordered pairs among infected individuals in the same household (60) and the total number of ordered household pairs where the first individual in the pair is infected (136). This yields a point estimate for CRI of $0.44 = \frac{60}{136}$.

Assuming that secondary infections are caused by the primary case in a household, there 73 sources, 23 (73+3-53) targets (household infections), and 84 (137-53) susceptible individuals (household contacts). This yields a point estimate for R_h of $0.31 = \frac{23}{73}$. Due to the nature of blanket testing we cannot determine the number of index cases, which makes estimates of SAR unreliable.

Correcting for false negatives and asymptomatics Out of subjects residing in households with at least one conformed case, 7 have experienced symptoms but have tested negative. We can adjust for false negatives by considering the distribution of case counts across households. Assuming an asymptomatic rate of 0.41 Lavezzo et al. (2020) (among confirmed cases), and a false negative rate (FNR) of 22%, the expected number of false negatives in infected households is 6.77, which corresponds to the observed value. For FNR value of 22%, and average household size of 2.1.[2], the corrected estimates are CRI= 0.54 and $R_h = 0.37$ $((0.34 - 0.40))$. We estimate confidence intervals for R_h by making normal approximations to the conditional distribution of the corrected R_h values for each individual. In the case of CRI we cannot

[2]More accurately, 2.1 was the mean number of individuals in each household who were tested.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Original study	**Quantity**	**Adjusted estimate**	**Notes**
(Li et al., 2020), Wuhan, China	SAR R_h	0.17 (0.14-0.22) 0.39 (0.34-0.45)	Not corrected for AR or FNR: all household contacts were tested and only counted as negative after two negative results.
(Cheng et al., 2020), Taiwan	SAR R_h	0.10 (0.04-0.19) 0.14 (0.06-0.22)	Corrected for FNR and AR: only symptomatic contacts were tested.
(Jing et al., 2020), Guangzhou, China	SAR R_h	0.25 (0.18-0.34) 0.48 (0.40-0.55)	Corrected for FNR and AR: only symptomatic contacts were tested.
(Korea CDC, 2020), South Korea	SAR R_h	0.16 (0.08-0.29) 0.39 (0.23-0.53)	Corrected for FNR and AR: only symptomatic contacts were tested.
(Park et al., 2020), Seoul, South Korea	SAR R_h	0.21 (0.14-0.29) 0.33 (0.25-0.40)	Not corrected for AR, corrected for FNR: all household members tested.
(Wang et al., 2020), Wuhan, China	SAR R_h	0.61 (0.42-0.84) 0.53 (0.43-0.60)	Corrected for FNR and AR: only symptomatic contacts were tested.
(Böhmer et al., 2020) Bavaria, Germany	SAR R_h	0.45 (0.18-0.83) 0.35 (0.11-0.55)	Corrected for FNR and AR: only symptomatic contacts were tested
(Burke et al., 2020), USA	SAR R_h	0.28 (0.06-0.65) 0.73 (0.52-0.83)	Corrected for FNR and AR: only symptomatic contacts were tested
Estimates derived from (Streeck et al., 2020), Gangelt, Germany	CRI	0.31	Not corrected for AR or FNR as study used antibody testing.
Our estimate from Vo', Italy data	CRI R_h	0.50 0.37 (0.34-0.40)	Smaller mean household size but older population. CRI for under 50s was 0.24.
Our estimates from Singapore tracing data	R_h	0.19-0.34	Estimates vary with cut-off date value.
Calculated from SAR= 0.2	CRI	0.29	Simple theoretical estimate assuming no outside infection.

Table 1: Estimates of household transmission quantities. Literature estimates were corrected for FNR and AR. The case counts are taken from the cited studies (see Appendix A). Vo' and Singapore estimates are based on original analysis of the respective datasets. The SAR intervals for the estimates derived from previous studies are credible intervals obtained via rejection sampling. The R_h intervals are the plug-in estimates for SAR credible intervals. The R_h range for Singapore is the range of central estimates for differennt cut-off dates. The R_h interval for Vo' is the confidence intervals derived from normal approximations. We do not report confidence intervals for CRI.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 2: Daily aggregate estimates of effective and household reproduction number in Singapore based on contact tracing data. We observe that in early phases of the epidemic R_{eff} was greater than 1. With increased public awareness and contact tracing efforts the effective reproduction number has decreased steadily through March 15th. Throuhout this time household transmission stayed constant, with R_h values in the $0.2 - 0.3$ range. The ratio of infections attributable to household decreased sharply at the end of March due to large outbreaks in migrant worker dormitories. Even though their infections are not annotated as households, this indicates that co-habitation and proximity play a large role in transmission dynamics.

accurately quantify uncertainty due to heterogeneity in household sizes and difficulties in estimating number of index cases in the community. (see Table 2 for other FNR values).

Confounds and heterogeneity. We might be concerned that testing decreased the household transmission due to earlier household isolation, as in (Bi et al., 2020). However, if we restrict to early cases (where the first household member has symptoms prior to the start of testing), the adjusted CRI is essentially unchanged at 48%.

Next we might ask about heterogeneity in CRI: perhaps spouses have a very high CRI rate. But among presumed partners (adult co-habitants in the same ten-year age range), CRI was still only 52%. Possibly more important is age: CRI is only 24% among individuals under 50 when adjusting for 15% FNR. There is evidence that younger people have a higher FNR, but even an FNR of 40% would only lead to an adjusted CRI of 33%.

Each of these subgroup analyses is on only a small number of total cases and so should be interpreted with caution. In addition, the Vo' data may overestimate both R_h and the CRI due to an older population, lack of awareness of infection risk in early February and violation of single index case assumption. In the other direction, Vo' has a smaller-than-typical mean household size of 2.1.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

FNR	CRI	R_h	Expected false negatives
15%	0.50	0.35 (0.32-0.38)	4.24
22%	0.54	0.37 (0.34-0.40)	6.77
30%	0.60	0.39 (0.36-0.42)	10.29

Table 2: Estimates of CRI and R_h and SAR assumong different FNR values for Vo' data.

4 Discussion

4.1 The contribution of household transmission to reproduction number

In the previous section, we estimated the contribution of household transmission to the spread of COVID-19 through SAR, CRI, and the household reproduction number R_h from a variety of sources. Estimates for R_h based on contact tracing data and blanket testing data ranged from 0.2-0.37. Here we examine the extent to which this household transmission explains overall transmission levels. More formally, we study the ratio of the effective household reproductive number R_h to the effective reproductive number R.

We estimated R across geographic regions where enough data was available[3] for both pre- and post-lockdown time periods (Figure 3). Specifically, we used an overdispersed ($\alpha = 0.1$) Poisson model (Yadlowsky et al., 2020) fit to death data (Dong et al., 2020) to estimate the growth rate, which was translated into R using the generation time distribution $\omega(t)$ estimated by Ferretti et al. (2020).

Based on our results in Table 1, we assume that $R_h = 0.3$ for all regions pre-lockdown. After lockdown, location tracking data from Google shows that people spent more time in their households (an 11% increase in the United States (Google, 2020)). Hence we estimate post-lockdown R_h as $0.3 \cdot M$, where M is the increase in average time spent inside residential areas (Google, 2020).

Figure 4 (left) shows a scatter plot of estimated community vs household reproduction numbers for each region we study. Figure 4 (right) shows a histogram of the estimated contribution of household transmission to total reproduction number both pre- and post-lockdown. The share of R attributed to household transmission increased from 0-25% pre-lockdown to 25-50% post-lockdown. This shows there could be meaningful benefits from interventions that reduce R_h.

4.2 Implications for household inevitability and containment

We previously identified two common arguments against reducing household transmission: household inevitability and household containment. We now revisit these theories in light of our estimates.

Inevitability. Household inevitability posits that once a household member is infected, the other members are sure to be infected, thus making interventions futile. While we estimate that household transmission contributes significantly to the effective reproduction number of COVID-19, household SAR is unlikely to be above 25% and so transmission is not inevitable. Based on what is known about the incubation and generation time (Jing et al., 2020; Ferretti et al., 2020), the SAR could be reduced by immediately isolating any symptomatic household members in a separate room. To our knowledge, this policy has not been systematically studied. Li et al. (2020) report the SAR was 0% for cases who isolated on symptom onset, but only study 14 primary cases. We expect interventions that reduce transmission outside the household–such as PPE (Feng et al., 2020), physical distancing, household hygiene, and spending social time in ventilated or outdoor spaces (Qian et al., 2020)–would also reduce the household SAR, but there is not yet strong evidence supporting this.

Containment. Household containment posits that people infected in the household (as opposed to the community) are unlikely to cause further community infection. If true, this would imply that interventions to reduce household transmission are less valuable for reducing overall spread.

[3]Regions were selected from a pool of all US states and over 100 other regions, and were included based on (a) availability of lockdown dates, (b) having enough pre-lockdown data to estimate R reliably. The exact calculations are given in our code release.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 3: Estimated values of the reproduction number R pre- and post-lockdown in a subset of US states (top) and other countries (bottom). The growth rate was estimated by fitting an overdispersed Poisson distribution onto daily death statistics, as described in Yadlowsky et al. (2020). This was translated into a reproduction number R via the generation time distribution (c.f. (Ferretti et al., 2020)). 95% confidence intervals are shown.



Figure 4: **Left**: Reproduction numbers for community transmission (R_c) and intra-household transmission (R_h) for the regions whose R values are shown in Figure 3. The overlaid contour plot shows level sets of the overall reproduction number $R = R_h + R_c$. **Right**: The estimated share of transmission attributable to household infections (R_h/R). In both graphs we assume $R_h = 0.3$ pre-lockdown—to obtain post-lockdown R_h we multiply by a mobility factor M, obtained from Google's estimates of average time spent in residential areas.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

We can quantify this effect, if it exists, by considering secondary transmission rates from household and community infections. To simplify matters we refer to those infected via household transmission as "household cases" and those infected via community transmission as "community cases." We then let $R_{c|h}$ be the average number of community infections caused by a household case, and $R_{c|c}$ the average number of community infections caused by a community case. Household containment asserts that $R_{c|h}/R_{c|c} \ll 1$.

To our knowledge, there is no public dataset that allows us to test household containment empirically. Accurate contact tracing data would enable us to measure $R_{c|h}$ and $R_{c|c}$ directly by counting cases, but existing data does not reliably distinguish between primary and secondary infections within a household. Instead, we provide an *a priori* analysis. There are two relevant differences between people infected at home and those infected in the community:

1. Household cases may be demographically different (e.g., they could predominantly be children) or have different levels of exposure to the community (e.g., they could predominantly be non-essential workers).

2. Household cases may self-isolate earlier than community cases, based on observing that the primary case in the household is symptomatic.

These demographic and contact differences could decrease $R_{c|h}/R_{c|c}$: for example, if all household cases are non-essential workers and all community cases are essential workers, the differences in contact would decrease $R_{c|h}/R_{c|c}$ by a factor of 3.5 (based on self-reported contact data from (Rothwell, 2020)). We also expect early isolation protocols to have an effect. The effect size should depend on the proportion of households that decide to use early isolation, and the probability of secondary transmission under the protocol. The former is dependent on policy and population behaviour, whereas the latter can be estimated from disease characteristics (generation time distribution, incubation time distribution, and asymptomatic rate; c.f. (Ferretti et al., 2020)).

More empirical data on these quantities, or more fine-grained contact tracing and testing data, is needed for better estimates and will facilitate a proper cost-benefit analysis around reducing household transmission.

4.3 Other types of contact heterogeniety

Our results highlight the fact that net community mobility gives an incomplete picture of overall transmission, and thus a contact-based view of transmission dynamics (Hens et al., 2009; Eames et al., 2012; Mossong et al., 2008) may be helpful. Contact-based models may be especially relevant in the presence of interventions that drastically shift contact patterns, such as lockdown orders. For example, lockdowns have amplified differences in contact between essential workers and the rest of the population: a recent Gallup panel (Rothwell, 2020) found that essential workers report 3.5 times as many contacts per day as other individuals. In this section, we briefly show how even outside of households, studying contact may help shed light on the effectiveness of policy interventions.

While the most accurate way to study contact in an epidemic is through a network or graph model (Meyers et al., 2005; Lloyd-Smith et al., 2005; Kiss et al., 2006), prior work has shown that even simple stratified compartmental models can be effective (Wallinga et al., 2006; Jarvis et al., 2020; Xia et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2020) at predicting epidemic growth. These models partition the population into groups and are specified by the average level of contact between groups, rather than between individuals; a common choice is to assign groups to age ranges (e.g. the POLYMOD study (Mossong et al., 2008)).

Here, we use a compartmental model with only two groups: people staying at home ('low contact' or LC) and essential workers ('high contact' or HC). Transmission under our HC/LC model is determined by a two-by-two contact matrix M, where M_{ij} is the number of contacts made by a member of group $j \in \{LC, HC\}$ with members of group $i \in \{LC, HC\}$. Since we are not aware of high-quality data measuring these quantities directly during lockdowns, we instead obtain coarse estimates from available survey data. Using self-reported contact data (Rothwell, 2020; Jarvis et al., 2020), we obtain point estimates for the contact matrix in the United States (see Figure 5; methodology, sensitivity analysis, and an analagous estimate based on data from the UK are shown in the Appendix).

A common assumption for respiratory diseases such as SARS-CoV-2 is that exposure levels are proportional to contact levels (Edmunds et al., 1997; Wallinga et al., 1999; 2006). Under this assumption, the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

	HC	**LC**
HC	9.3	1.0
LC	4.6	3.0

Figure 5: Contact matrix estimates for the United States using data from (Rothwell, 2020). Derivation can be found in the Appendix.



Figure 6: The effect of reducing each contact mode by 10% under the simple compartmental model presented here.

dominant eigenvalue of the contact matrix is a constant multiple of the reproductive number (more precisely, the contact matrix is a constant multiple of the "next-generation matrix" (Diekmann et al., 1990; den Driessche and Watmough, 1992), whose dominant eigenvalue is R). We can therefore estimate how changes in contact affect disease transmission, by looking at how each entry of the contact matrix affects the dominant eigenvalue (Caswell, 2006; Klepac et al., 2020).

Since the two groups in our model are easily identifiable, policymakers can target interventions to specific modes of interaction (e.g. by enforcing more stringent physical distancing in the workplace to reduce HC-HC contact, or providing PPE to workers with public-facing occupations to reduce HC-LC contact). To forecast the effect of such interventions, we consider the decrease in reproduction number R caused by a 10% decrease in each type of contact (Figure 6). The results predict that reducing contact between high-contact individuals will have disproportionate effect on reducing overall transmission. Specifically, our point estimate predicts a 10% reduction in contact between high-contact individuals (HC-HC contact) being 35x more effective than a 10% reduction in LC-LC contact, and 8x more effective than a 10% reduction in HC-LC contact.

These predictions are based on rather crude parameter estimates, and could be greatly improved by more direct measurements of contact structures, and by incorporating heterogeneity from other sources (e.g. by also stratifying the model on age (Jarvis et al., 2020) or contact location (Liu et al., 2020)).

References

Danielle Allen, Sharon Block, Joshua Cohen, Peter Eckersley, M Eifler, Lawrence Gostin, Darshan Goux, Dakota Gruener, Vi Hart, Zoë Hitzig, Julius Krein, Ted Nordhaus, Meredith Rosenthal, Rajiv Sethi, Divya Siddarth, Joshua Simons, Ganesh Sitaraman, Anne-Marie Slaughter, Allison Stanger, Alex Tabarrok, Lila A. Tretikov, and E. Glen Weyl. Roadmap to pandemic resilience, 2020.

Qifang Bi, Yongsheng Wu, Shujiang Mei, Chenfei Ye, Xuan Zou, Zhen Zhang, Xiaojian Liu, Lan Wei, Shaun A Truelove, Tong Zhang, Wei Gao, Cong Cheng, Xiujuan Tang, Xiaoliang Wu, Yu Wu, Binbin Sun, Suli Huang, Yu Sun, Juncen Zhang, Ting Ma, Justin Lessler, and Teijian Feng. Epidemiology and transmission of covid-19 in shenzhen china: Analysis of 391 cases and 1,286 of their close contacts. *medRxiv*, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.03.03.20028423.

Merle M Böhmer, Udo Buchholz, Victor M Corman, Martin Hoch, Katharina Katz, Durdica V Marosevic, Stefanie Böhm, Tom Woudenberg, Nikolaus Ackermann, Regina Konrad, et al. Investigation of a covid-19 outbreak in germany resulting from a single travel-associated primary case: a case series. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Rachel M. Burke, Claire M. Midgley, Alissa Dratch, Marty Fenstersheib, Thomas Haupt, Michelle Holshue, Isaac Ghinai, M. Claire Jarashow, Jennifer Lo, Tristan D. McPherson, Sara Rudman, Sarah Scott, Aron J. Hall, Alicia M. Fry, and PhD1 Melissa A. Rolfes. Active Monitoring of Persons Exposed to Patients with Confirmed COVID-19 – United States, January-February 2020. 2020.

Hal Caswell. Matrix population models. *Encyclopedia of environmetrics*, 3, 2006.

Hao-Yuan Cheng, Shu-Wan Jian, Ding-Ping Liu, Ta-Chou Ng, Wan-Ting Huang, and Hsien-Ho Lin. Contact tracing assessment of covid-19 transmission dynamics in taiwan and risk at different exposure periods before and after symptom onset. In *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 2020.

P.van den Driessche and James Watmough. Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission. In *Mathematical Biosciences*, 1992.

O. Diekmann, J. A. P. Heesterbeek, and J. A. J. Metz. On the definition and the computation of the basic reproduction ratio r0 in models for infectious diseases in heterogeneous populations. In *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 1990.

Ensheng Dong, Hongru Du, and Lauren Gardner. An interactive web-based dashboard to track covid-19 in real time. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 20(5):533–534, May 2020. ISSN 1473-3099. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30120-1. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30120-1.

KTD Eames, NL Tilston, E Brooks-Pollock, and JW Edmunds. Measured dynamic social contact patterns explain the spread of h1n1v influenza. In *PLoS Comput Biology*, 2012.

WJ Edmunds, CJ O'Callaghan, and DJ Nokes. Who mixes with whom? a method to determine the contact patterns of adults that may lead to the spread of airborne infections. In *Proceedings Biological Sciences*, 1997.

Akira Endo, Mitsuo Uchida, Adam J Kucharski, and Sebastian Funk. Fine-scale family structure shapes influenza transmission risk in households: Insights from primary schools in matsumoto city, 2014/15. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 15(12), 2019.

Shuo Feng, Chen Shen, Nan Xia, Wei Song, Mengzhen Fan, and Benjamin J Cowling. Rational use of face masks in the covid-19 pandemic. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*, 8(5):434–436, 2020.

Luca Ferretti, Chris Wymant, Michelle Kendall, Lele Zhao, Anel Nurtay, Lucie Abeler-Dörner, Michael Parker, David Bonsall, and Christophe Fraser. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. In *Science*. American Association for the Advancement of Science, 2020.

Google. Covid-19 community mobility reports. Public Dataset, 2020. URL https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility.

Daniel F. Gudbjartsson, Agnar Helgason, Hakon Jonsson, Olafur T. Magnusson, Pall Melsted, Gudmundur L. Norddahl, Jona Saemundsdottir, Asgeir Sigurdsson, Patrick Sulem, Arna B. Agustsdottir, Berglind Eiriksdottir, Run Fridriksdottir, Elisabet E. Gardarsdottir, Gudmundur Georgsson, Olafia S. Gretarsdottir, Kjartan R. Gudmundsson, Thora R. Gunnarsdottir, Arnaldur Gylfason, Hilma Holm, Brynjar O. Jensson, Aslaug Jonasdottir, Frosti Jonsson, Kamilla S. Josefsdottir, Thordur Kristjansson, Droplaug N. Magnusdottir, Louise le Roux, Gudrun Sigmundsdottir, Gardar Sveinbjornsson, Kristin E. Sveinsdottir, Maney Sveinsdottir, Emil A. Thorarensen, Bjarni Thorbjornsson, Arthur Löve, Gisli Masson, Ingileif Jonsdottir, Alma D. Möller, Thorolfur Gudnason, Karl G. Kristinsson, Unnur Thorsteinsdottir, and Kari Stefansson. Spread of sars-cov-2 in the icelandic population. *New England Journal of Medicine*. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2006100.

N Hens, GM Ayele, N Goeyvaerts, M Aerts, J Mossong, and JW Edmunds JW et al. Estimating the impact of school closure on social mixing behaviour and the transmission of close contact infections in eight european countries. In *BMC Infectious Diseases*, 2009.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Jason Horowitz. Isolating the sick at home, italy stores up family tragedies, April 2020. URL https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/24/world/europe/italy-coronavirus-home-isolation.html.

Christopher I. Jarvis, Kevin Van Zandvoort, Amy Gimma, Kiesha Prem, Megan Auzenbergs, Kathleen O'Reilly, Graham Medley, Jon C. Emery, Rein M. G. J. Houben, Nicholas Davies, Emily S. Nightingale, Stefan Flasche, Thibaut Jombart, Joel Hellewell, Sam Abbott, James D. Munday, Nikos I. Bosse, Sebastian Funk, Fiona Sun, Akira Endo, Alicia Rosello, Simon R. Procter, Adam J. Kucharski, Timothy W. Russell, Gwen Knight, Hamish Gibbs, Quentin Leclerc, Billy J. Quilty, Charlie Diamond, Yang Liu, Mark Jit, Samuel Clifford, Carl A. B. Pearson, Rosalind M. Eggo, Arminder K. Deol, Petra Klepac, G. James Rubin, W. John Edmunds, and CMMID COVID-19 working group. Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on the transmission of covid-19 in the uk. *BMC Medicine*, 18(1):124, May 2020. ISSN 1741-7015. doi: 10.1186/s12916-020-01597-8. URL https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-020-01597-8.

Qin-Long Jing, Ming-Jin Liu, Jun Yuan, Zhou-Bin Zhang, An-Ran Zhang, Natalie E Dean, Lei Luo, Meng-Meng Ma, Ira Longini, Eben Kenah, Ying Lu, Yu Ma, Neda Jalali, Li-Qun Fang, Zhi-Cong Yang, and Yang Yang. Household secondary attack rate of covid-19 and associated determinants. *medRxiv*, 2020.

Istvan Z Kiss, Darren M Green, and Rowland R Kao. The network of sheep movements within great britain: network properties and their implications for infectious disease spread. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 3(10):669–677, 2006. doi: 10.1098/rsif.2006.0129. URL https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/abs/10.1098/rsif.2006.0129.

Petra Klepac, Adam J Kucharski, Andrew JK Conlan, Stephen Kissler, Maria Tang, Hannah Fry, and Julia R Gog. Contacts in context: large-scale setting-specific social mixing matrices from the bbc pandemic project. *medRxiv*, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.02.16.20023754. URL https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/03/05/2020.02.16.20023754.

Korea CDC. Coronavirus disease-19: Summary of 2,370 contact investigations of the first 30 cases in the republic of korea. *Osong public health and research perspectives*, 11(2):81—84, April 2020. ISSN 2210-9099. doi: 10.24171/j.phrp.2020.11.2.04. URL https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC7104686.

Lauren Kucirka, Stephen Lauer, Oliver Laeyendecker, Denali Boon, and Justin Lessler. Variation in false negative rate of rt-pcr based sars-cov-2 tests by time since exposure. *medRxiv*, 2020.

Lincoln L. H. Lau, Hiroshi Nishiura, Heath Kelly, Dennis K. M. Ip, Gabriel M. Leung, and Benjamin J. Cowling. Household transmission of 2009 pandemic influenza a (h1n1): A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Epidemiology*, 23(4), 2012. ISSN 1044-3983. URL https://journals.lww.com/epidem/Fulltext/2012/07000/Household_Transmission_of_2009_Pandemic_Influenza.5.aspx.

Enrico Lavezzo, Elisa Franchin, Constanze Ciavarella, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, Luisa Barzon, Claudia Del Vecchio, Lucia Rossi, Riccardo Manganelli, Arianna Loregian, Nicolò Navarin, Davide Abate, Manuela Sciro, Stefano Merigliano, Ettore Decanale, Maria Cristina Vanuzzo, Francesca Saluzzo, Francesco Onelia, Monia Pacenti, Saverio Parisi, Giovanni Carretta, Daniele Donato, Luciano Flor, Silvia Cocchio, Giulia Masi, Alessandro Sperduti, Lorenzo Cattarino, Renato Salvador, Katy A.M. Gaythorpe, Imperial College London COVID-19 Response Team, Alessandra R Brazzale, Stefano Toppo, Marta Trevisan, Vincenzo Baldo, Christl A. Donnelly, Neil M. Ferguson, Ilaria Dorigatti, and Andrea Crisanti. Suppression of covid-19 outbreak in the municipality of Vo and Italy. 2020.

Wei Li, Bo Zhang, Jianhua Lu, Shihua Liu, Zhiqiang Chang, Peng Cao, Xinhua Liu, Peng Zhang, Yan Ling, Kaixiong Tao, and Jianying Chen. The characteristics of household transmission of COVID-19. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 04 2020. ISSN 1058-4838. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa450. ciaa450.

Yang Liu, Zhonglei Gu, Shang Xia, Benyun Shi, X-N Zhou, Yong Shi, and Jiming Liu. What are the underlying transmission patterns of covid-19 outbreak?–an age-specific social contact characterization. *EClinicalMedicine*, page 100354, 2020.

J. O. Lloyd-Smith, S. J. Schreiber, P. E. Kopp, and W. M. Getz. Superspreading and the effect of individual variation on disease emergence. *Nature*, 438(7066):355–359, Nov 2005. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/nature04153. URL https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04153.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Lauren Ancel Meyers, Babak Pourbohloul, M.E.J. Newman, Danuta M. Skowronski, and Robert C. Brunham. Network theory and sars: predicting outbreak diversity. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 232(1):71 – 81, 2005. ISSN 0022-5193. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2004.07.026. URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022519304003510.

Joël Mossong, Niel Hens, Mark Jit, Philippe Beutels, Kari Auranen, Rafael Mikolajczyk, Marco Massari, Stefania Salmaso, Gianpaolo Scalia Tomba, Jacco Wallinga, Janneke Heijne, Malgorzata Sadkowska-Todys, Magdalena Rosinska, and W. John Edmunds. Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLOS Medicine*, 5(3):1–1, 03 2008. URL https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074.

Shin Young Park, Young-Man Kim, Seonju Yi, Sangeun Lee, Baeg-Ju Na, Chang Bo Kim, Jung il Kim, Hea Sook Kim, Young Bok Kim, Yoojin Park, In Sil Huh, Hye Kyung Kim, Hyung Jun Yoon, Hanaram Jang, Kyungnam Kim, Yeonhwa Chang, Inhye Kim, Hyeyoung Lee, Jin Gwack, Seong Sun Kim, Miyoung Kim, Sanghui Kweon, Young June Choe, Ok Park, Young Joon Park, , and Eun Kyeong Jeong. Coronavirus Disease Outbreak in Call Center, South Korea. In *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 2020.

Hua Qian, Te Miao, LIU Li, Xiaohong Zheng, Danting Luo, and Yuguo Li. Indoor transmission of sars-cov-2. *medRxiv*, 2020.

Jonathan Rothwell. Americans' Social Contacts During the COVID-19 Pandemic, 2020. URL https://news.gallup.com/opinion/gallup/308444/americans-social-contacts-during-covid-pandemic.aspx.

Singapore COVID-19 Dashboard. Dashboard of the covid-19 virus outbreak in singapore. Public Dashboard, 2020. URL https://co.vid19.sg/singapore/.

Singapore MOH. Moh updates on covid-19, 2020. URL https://www.moh.gov.sg/covid-19.

Hendrik Streeck, Bianca Schulte, Beate M. Kümmerer, Enrico Richter, Tobias Höller, Christine Fuhrmann, Eva Bartok, Ramona Dolscheid, Moritz Berger, Lukas Wessendorf, Monika Eschbach-Bludau, Angelika Kellings, Astrid Schwaiger, Martin Coenen, Per Hoffmann, Birgit Stoffel-Wagner, Markus M. Nöthen, Anna-Maria Eis-Hübinger, Martin Exner, Ricarda Maria Schmithausen, Matthias Schmid, and Gunther Hartmann. Infection fatality rate of SARS-CoV-2 infection in a German community with a super-spreading event. 2020. URL https://www.ukbonn.de/C12582D3002FD21D/vwLookupDownloads/Streeck_et_al_Infection_fatality_rate_of_SARS_CoV_2_infection2.pdf/%24FILE/Streeck_et_al_Infection_fatality_rate_of_SARS_CoV_2_infection2.pdf.

Tim K. Tsang, Lincoln L.H. Lau, Simon Cauchemez, and Benjamin J. Cowling. Household transmission of influenza virus. *Trends in Microbiology*, 24(2):123–133, Feb 2016. ISSN 0966-842X. doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2015.10.012. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2015.10.012.

J Wallinga, WJ Edmunds, and M Kretzschmar. Human contact patterns and the spread of airborne infectious diseases. In *Trends Microbiology*, 1999.

Jacco Wallinga, Peter Teunis, and Mirjam Kretzschmar. Using Data on Social Contacts to Estimate Age-specific Transmission Parameters for Respiratory-spread Infectious Agents. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 164(10):936–944, 09 2006. ISSN 0002-9262. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwj317. URL https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwj317.

Zhongliang Wang, Wanli Ma, Xin Zheng, Gang Wu, and Ruiguang Zhang. Household transmission of sars-cov-2. *Journal of Infection*, 2020. ISSN 0163-4453. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.03.040. URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0163445320301699.

Paul Wikramaratna, Robert S Paton, Mahan Ghafari, and Jose Lourenco. Estimating false-negative detection rate of sars-cov-2 by rt-pcr. *medRxiv*, 2020.

Shang Xia, Jiming Liu, and William Cheung. Identifying the relative priorities of subpopulations for containing infectious disease spread. *PloS one*, 8(6), 2013.

Steve Yadlowsky, Nigam Shah, and Jacob Steinhardt. Estimation of SARS-CoV-2 infection prevalence in Santa Clara county. 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

A Data Tables

Study	Index cases	Household contacts	Household infections	Tested asymptomatics
(Li et al., 2020), Wuhan, China	105	392	64	Yes
(Cheng et al., 2020), Taiwan	100	151	7	No
(Jing et al., 2020), Guangzhou, China	212	770	97	No
(Korea CDC, 2020), South Korea	30	119	9	No
(Park et al., 2020), Seoul, South Korea	97	225	34	Yes
(Wang et al., 2020), Wuhan, China	85	155	47	No
(Burke et al., 2020), USA	10	19	2	No
(Böhmer et al., 2020), Germany	4	24	5	No

Table 3: Case counts for index cases, household contacts and household infections.

Cut-off date	Connected sources	Untraced cases	Clusters	Targets	Households	HH infections	R_{eff}	R_h
2020-01-26	4	0	1	16	3	3	4.00 (4.00-4.00)	0.94 (0.64-1.23)
2020-01-27	7	0	1	16	3	3	2.29 (2.29-2.29)	0.54 (0.34-0.73)
2020-01-28	8	0	2	22	4	4	2.75 (2.75-2.75)	0.62 (0.43-0.82)
2020-01-29	12	0	2	22	4	4	1.83 (1.83-1.83)	0.42 (0.26-0.57)
2020-01-30	16	0	3	27	4	4	1.69 (1.69-1.69)	0.31 (0.18-0.45)
2020-01-31	17	0	3	27	4	4	1.59 (1.59-1.59)	0.29 (0.17-0.42)
2020-02-01	18	0	3	27	4	4	1.50 (1.50-1.50)	0.28 (0.16-0.40)
2020-02-02	18	0	3	27	4	4	1.50 (1.50-1.50)	0.28 (0.16-0.40)
2020-02-03	22	0	4	35	6	7	1.59 (1.59-1.59)	0.40 (0.26-0.54)
2020-02-04	26	0	4	35	6	7	1.35 (1.35-1.35)	0.34 (0.21-0.46)
2020-02-05	28	1	4	35	6	7	1.25 (1.21-1.29)	0.31 (0.17-0.46)
2020-02-06	31	2	5	37	6	7	1.19 (1.12-1.26)	0.28 (0.15-0.42)
2020-02-07	33	4	5	37	6	7	1.12 (1.00-1.24)	0.27 (0.14-0.39)
2020-02-08	38	5	6	42	7	8	1.11 (0.98-1.24)	0.26 (0.15-0.38)
2020-02-09	39	5	6	42	7	8	1.08 (0.95-1.21)	0.26 (0.14-0.37)
2020-02-10	41	6	6	42	7	8	1.02 (0.89-1.17)	0.24 (0.13-0.35)
2020-02-11	43	6	7	64	9	11	1.49 (1.31-1.63)	0.32 (0.21-0.43)
2020-02-12	47	6	7	67	10	13	1.43 (1.26-1.55)	0.35 (0.24-0.45)
2020-02-13	56	6	7	68	10	13	1.21 (1.10-1.32)	0.29 (0.19-0.39)
2020-02-14	61	7	8	71	10	14	1.16 (1.04-1.28)	0.29 (0.18-0.39)
2020-02-15	67	7	8	72	11	15	1.07 (0.97-1.18)	0.28 (0.18-0.38)
2020-02-16	69	7	9	73	11	15	1.06 (0.96-1.16)	0.27 (0.17-0.37)
2020-02-17	72	7	9	73	11	15	1.01 (0.92-1.11)	0.26 (0.17-0.36)
2020-02-18	75	7	9	74	11	15	0.99 (0.90-1.08)	0.25 (0.16-0.34)
2020-02-19	77	7	9	74	11	15	0.96 (0.88-1.05)	0.24 (0.15-0.34)
2020-02-20	78	8	9	74	11	15	0.95 (0.86-1.05)	0.24 (0.15-0.33)
2020-02-21	80	8	9	74	11	15	0.93 (0.84-1.02)	0.23 (0.14-0.32)
2020-02-22	81	9	9	74	11	15	0.91 (0.82-1.02)	0.23 (0.14-0.32)
2020-02-23	82	9	9	74	11	15	0.90 (0.81-1.01)	0.23 (0.14-0.32)
2020-02-24	82	9	9	74	11	15	0.90 (0.81-1.01)	0.23 (0.14-0.32)
2020-02-25	82	9	9	74	11	15	0.90 (0.81-1.01)	0.23 (0.14-0.32)
2020-02-26	84	10	11	130	18	24	1.55 (1.38-1.67)	0.36 (0.27-0.45)
2020-02-27	87	10	11	131	18	24	1.51 (1.35-1.62)	0.34 (0.26-0.43)
2020-02-28	90	10	11	131	18	24	1.46 (1.31-1.57)	0.33 (0.25-0.42)
2020-02-29	92	10	11	132	18	24	1.43 (1.29-1.54)	0.33 (0.24-0.41)
2020-03-01	97	10	11	133	18	24	1.37 (1.24-1.47)	0.31 (0.23-0.39)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

2020-03-02	100	10	11	134	18	24	1.34 (1.22-1.44)	0.30 (0.22-0.38)
2020-03-03	100	11	11	134	18	24	1.34 (1.21-1.45)	0.30 (0.22-0.38)
2020-03-04	102	12	11	134	18	24	1.31 (1.18-1.43)	0.29 (0.22-0.37)
2020-03-05	110	14	11	134	18	24	1.22 (1.08-1.35)	0.27 (0.20-0.35)
2020-03-06	121	17	11	136	19	25	1.12 (0.99-1.26)	0.26 (0.19-0.33)
2020-03-07	126	18	13	148	20	26	1.17 (1.03-1.32)	0.26 (0.18-0.33)
2020-03-08	133	20	13	149	21	27	1.12 (0.97-1.27)	0.25 (0.18-0.32)
2020-03-09	142	21	13	149	21	27	1.05 (0.91-1.20)	0.24 (0.17-0.31)
2020-03-10	148	22	13	155	23	29	1.05 (0.91-1.20)	0.24 (0.18-0.31)
2020-03-11	155	24	13	158	23	29	1.02 (0.88-1.17)	0.23 (0.17-0.30)
2020-03-12	163	26	15	167	25	31	1.02 (0.88-1.18)	0.24 (0.18-0.30)
2020-03-13	174	30	16	178	26	32	1.02 (0.87-1.20)	0.23 (0.17-0.29)
2020-03-14	181	38	16	183	28	34	1.01 (0.84-1.22)	0.23 (0.18-0.29)
2020-03-15	190	42	16	199	31	43	1.05 (0.86-1.27)	0.28 (0.22-0.35)
2020-03-16	201	46	16	203	32	44	1.01 (0.82-1.24)	0.27 (0.21-0.33)
2020-03-17	220	67	16	216	39	51	0.98 (0.75-1.29)	0.29 (0.23-0.35)
2020-03-18	237	87	16	222	41	53	0.94 (0.69-1.30)	0.28 (0.23-0.33)
2020-03-19	253	110	16	228	45	57	0.90 (0.63-1.34)	0.28 (0.22-0.34)
2020-03-20	269	140	17	242	50	62	0.90 (0.59-1.42)	0.29 (0.23-0.34)
2020-03-21	282	168	18	256	52	64	0.91 (0.57-1.50)	0.28 (0.23-0.34)
2020-03-22	294	209	18	265	55	67	0.90 (0.53-1.61)	0.28 (0.23-0.34)
2020-03-23	306	224	20	300	57	79	0.98 (0.57-1.71)	0.32 (0.26-0.38)
2020-03-24	338	265	23	337	62	86	1.00 (0.56-1.78)	0.32 (0.23-0.41)
2020-03-25	368	292	25	572	68	94	1.55 (0.87-2.35)	0.32 (0.23-0.41)
2020-03-26	395	319	25	585	73	102	1.48 (0.82-2.29)	0.32 (0.22-0.42)
2020-03-27	417	366	26	599	77	108	1.44 (0.77-2.31)	0.32 (0.22-0.42)
2020-03-28	444	387	27	2105	78	109	4.74 (2.53-5.61)	0.31 (0.21-0.40)
2020-03-29	465	402	28	2120	83	117	4.56 (2.45-5.42)	0.31 (0.22-0.40)
2020-03-30	489	419	33	2333	89	127	4.77 (2.57-5.63)	0.32 (0.24-0.41)
2020-03-31	520	446	37	2566	95	134	4.93 (2.66-5.79)	0.32 (0.24-0.40)
2020-04-01	565	461	38	2658	96	137	4.70 (2.59-5.52)	0.30 (0.22-0.38)
2020-04-02	608	473	40	3228	99	142	5.31 (2.99-6.09)	0.29 (0.22-0.37)
2020-04-03	669	498	43	3274	104	147	4.89 (2.81-5.64)	0.27 (0.20-0.34)
2020-04-04	688	501	43	3276	104	147	4.76 (2.76-5.49)	0.27 (0.20-0.34)
2020-04-05	783	526	43	3293	112	157	4.21 (2.52-4.88)	0.25 (0.19-0.31)
2020-04-06	839	537	44	3298	113	159	3.93 (2.40-4.57)	0.24 (0.18-0.29)
2020-04-07	975	595	50	3835	117	163	3.93 (2.44-4.54)	0.21 (0.16-0.26)
2020-04-08	1117	627	55	3965	121	172	3.55 (2.27-4.11)	0.19 (0.15-0.24)

Table 4: R_{eff} and R_h values for ranging values of cut-off date.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 7: Daily aggregate estimates of effective and household reproduction number in Singapore from the begining of epidemic and until April 7th.

B Contact Matrix Estimation

We thus focus on a simple model analagous to the age stratification model, but with just two groups: high-contact individuals (HC) and low-contact individuals (LC). To simplify matters, we will treat the HC cluster as consisting of essential workers only, with the rest of the population belonging to the LC cluster. If we make assumptions analagous to those made in the age stratification model[4], then once again the contact matrix M determines disease transmission via its dominant eigenvalue and eigenvector (Caswell, 2006). This observation leaves us with four relevant quantities to estimate: $M_{HC,HC}$, $M_{HC,LC}$, $M_{LC,HC}$, and $M_{LC,LC}$. Using self-reported contact data from the US (Rothwell, 2020) we provide estimates for each of these parameters below.

Total contacts. The most readily available statistic from the available data is the number of total contacts reported by members of each cluster. In the US, Rothwell (2020) find that those who are working report 13.9 contacts per day, whereas those not working report 4.0 contacts per day.

[4]Concretely, that transmission depends only on the number of cluster-specific contacts, the infection probability of each contact, and the contact duration

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559; this version posted May 26, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Population proportions. Allen et al. (2020) suggest that essential workers represent 40% of the US workforce, which as of 2018 represents 63% of the US population[5]. Since 29% of the US workforce is reportedly equipped to work from home[6], we estimate that 18% of the population is doing essential work.

Estimating $M_{HC,HC}$. This parameter corresponds to the number of essential workers that an essential worker will have close contact with, on average. This is equal to the number of contacts an essential worker has with co-workers, added to the average number of contacts an essential worker will have with other essential workers in the general population.

For coworker interactions, Rothwell (2020) report that 9.9 of the 13.9 interactions had by essential workers were at their places of work, or 71% of all contacts. This is likely to be an overestimate of coworker interaction, since it includes interactions with low-contact individuals at the essential worker's workplace (e.g. clients at a bank or shoppers at a grocery store). To get a reasonable lower bound, we use the number of workplace contacts reported by essential workers in sectors that are not public-facing, namely construction, agriculture, and communications. Workplace contacts for these sectors range from 6.1-7.4, and so we take 6.8 as a central estimate, or 49% of all contacts. This is likely an underestimate, since it does not take into account high-contact jobs such as those in food processing or assembly lines.

To get $M_{HC,HC}$, we have to add the number of interactions with coworkers to the number of interactions with essential workers in the general population. To estimate the latter, we take the remaining number of total essential worker contacts (e.g. if we estimate 9.9 coworker contacts, 4.0 remain) and use population proportions to estimate how many of them are with other essential workers (e.g. $0.18 \cdot 4.0 = 0.7$).

In the end, we give a central estimate of 9.35 for $M_{HC,HC}$ based on the range $[8.1, 10.6]$.

Estimating $M_{HC,LC}$, $M_{LC,HC}$, and $M_{LC,LC}$. Once we obtain an estimate of $M_{HC,HC}$, the remaining parameters can be straightforwardly deduced. First, $M_{LC,HC}$ is the number of total essential worker contacts minus $M_{HC,HC}$. This entry uniquely determines $M_{HC,LC}$, since contact is symmetric and thus $w_{HC} \cdot M_{LC,HC} = (1 - w_{HC}) \cdot M_{HC,LC}$, where w_{HC} is the proportion of essential workers in the population. After solving for $M_{HC,LC}$, the final entry $M_{LC,LC}$ is obtained by subtracting $M_{HC,LC}$ from the total number of contacts reported by individuals in the LC cluster.

[5] https://www.bls.gov/emp/tables/civilian-labor-force-participation-rate.htm
[6] https://www.bls.gov/news.release/flex2.t01.htm