

1 **Estimation of Individual Probabilities of COVID-19 Infection, Hospitalization, and**  
2 **Death From A County-level Contact of Unknown infection Status**

3

4 Rajiv Bhatia MD, MPH \*

5 Assistant Professor of Medicine (affiliated), Stanford University

6 Physician, VA Palo Alto Health Care System

7 [drajiv@stanford.edu](mailto:drajiv@stanford.edu)

8 Jeffrey Klausner, MD, MPH

9 Professor of Medicine and Public Health, UCLA

10 [JDKlausner@mednet.ucla.edu](mailto:JDKlausner@mednet.ucla.edu)

11

12 Abstract: - 230 words

13 Manuscript: 2747 words

14 References: 822 words

15 Tables: 3

16 Figures: 2

17

18 \* Corresponding Author

19

20 **Version Date: June 23, 2020**

21 **Abstract**

22 **Objective:** Our objective is to demonstrate a method to estimate the probability of a  
23 laboratory confirmed COVID19 infection, hospitalization, and death arising from a  
24 contact with an individual of unknown infection status.

25 **Methods:** We calculate the probability of a confirmed infection, hospitalization, and  
26 death resulting from a county-level person-contact using available data on current case  
27 incidence, secondary attack rates, infectious periods, asymptomatic infections, and  
28 ratios of confirmed infections to hospitalizations and fatalities.

29 **Results:** Among US counties with populations greater than 500,000 people, during the  
30 week ending June 13,2020, the median estimate of the county level probability of a  
31 confirmed infection is 1 infection in 40,500 person contacts (Range: 10,100 to 586,000).  
32 For a 50 to 64 year-old individual, the median estimate of the county level probability of  
33 a hospitalization is 1 in 709,000 person contacts (Range: 177,000 to 10,200,000) and  
34 the median estimate of the county level probability of a fatality is 1 in 6,670,000 person  
35 contacts (Range 1,680,000 to 97,600.000).

36 **Conclusions and Relevance:** Estimates of the individual probabilities of COVID19  
37 infection, hospitalization and death vary widely but may not align with public risk  
38 perceptions. Systematically collected and publicly reported data on infection incidence  
39 by, for example, the setting of exposure, type of residence and occupation would allow  
40 more precise estimates of probabilities than possible with currently available public  
41 data. Calculation of secondary attack rates by setting and better measures of the  
42 prevalence of seropositivity would further improve those estimates.

## 43 **Introduction**

44

45 During infectious disease epidemics, human perception of risk modifies disease  
46 transmission, and motivates, or not, protective behaviors such as hand hygiene,  
47 wearing masks and social distancing at the individual level and quarantine, travel  
48 restrictions, and restrictions on gatherings at the societal level. Novel infectious agents  
49 such as the COVID-19 virus, with immature understanding of susceptibility,  
50 transmission, and lethality, challenge accurate risk estimation.

51

52 Predictive models, government surveillance, and epidemiological studies have  
53 characterized the risk of COVID-19, in terms of aggregate, and not individual,  
54 outcomes, primarily including County-level counts of reported infections,  
55 hospitalizations, and deaths. (1) Research has attempted to estimate case fatality rates  
56 and identified risk factors for adverse outcomes from COVID-19 disease, such age and  
57 chronic disease status. (2, 3) We are not aware of any published research that  
58 estimates individual level probabilities of infection, hospitalization, and death from  
59 exposure in the general community.

60

61 In the United States, publicly accessible data does not yet permit estimating the  
62 individual risks of COVID-19 transmission in specific exposure settings, including  
63 workplaces, prisons, nursing homes, hospitals and group residential housing settings.  
64 However, a starting point for estimation can be the average individual-level probability of  
65 acquiring infection across all settings at the level of a county. One can modify those

66 estimates as data on setting specific infection incidence rates, susceptibility and  
67 secondary attack rates permit.

68  
69 Here, we contribute to COVID-19 risk assessment by demonstrating a method to  
70 estimate the individual probabilities of acquiring infection, being hospitalized, and dying  
71 in U.S. Counties. We identify areas of available and future knowledge that could make  
72 risk assessment more precise and context specific.

73

## 74 **Materials and Methods**

75

76 Our objective is to estimate the probability of acquiring COVID-19 infection from a  
77 “contact” with a random individual of unknown infection status. We conceptualize this  
78 probability under steady state conditions (e.g. no epidemic growth or decline) as a  
79 function of individual susceptibility, the current reported case incidence, accounting for  
80 undetected infection, the share of infection transmission occurring without a known  
81 contact, the chance of transmission per contact (e.g., the secondary attack rate), and  
82 the duration of infectiousness, accounting for pre-symptomatic transmission.

83

84 We use the formulae below to compute probabilities of infection, confirmed infection,  
85 hospitalization, and death.

86

87 
$$(1) P_{infection | contact} = S I_{confirmed} C \beta [1 + \alpha / (1 - \alpha)] [\sigma D_{infectious} + \eta (1 - \sigma) D_{infectious}]$$

88 
$$(2) P_{confirmed-infection | contact} = P_{infection | contact} / (1 - \alpha)$$

89 
$$(3) P_{hospitalization | contact} = CHR \times P_{confirmed-infection | contact}$$

90  $(4) P_{death | contact} = CFR \times P_{confirmed-infection | contact}$

91

92 We describe the parameters used in Table 1 and explain their sources below.

93 **Table 1. Parameters Used in Formulae**

Symbol	Parameter Description	Value
$S$	Proportion of the population susceptible	95%
$I_{confirmed}$	Incidence of confirmed (reported) infections per day	County Data
$C$	Proportion of infections resulting from unknown contacts	100%
$\alpha$	Proportion of total infections unconfirmed (undetected and unreported)	75%
$B$	Probability of infection per exposure	10%
$D_{infectious}$	Average days infectious per infection	8
$\sigma$	Proportion of infectious period pre-symptomatic <sup>a</sup>	40%
$\eta$	Proportion non-compliant with isolation	25%
$CHR$	Case Hospitalization Ratio, 0 to 49 years <sup>a</sup>	0.026
$CHR$	Case Hospitalization Ratio, 50 to 64 years <sup>a</sup>	0.057
$CHR$	Case Hospitalization Ratio, Over 65 years <sup>a</sup>	0.1
$CFR$	Case Fatality Ratio, 0 to 49 years <sup>a</sup>	0.001
$CFR$	Case Fatality Ratio, 50 to 64 years <sup>a</sup>	0.006
$CFR$	Case Fatality Ratio, Over 65 years <sup>a</sup>	0.032

94

95 <sup>a</sup> US CDC COVID-19 Pandemic Planning Scenarios. Scenario 4 Estimates

96

97

98 The prevalence of susceptibility to COVID-19 is unknown. Pre-existing immunity due to  
99 previous COVID-19-related coronaviral infections is plausible but speculative. Reliable  
100 estimates for the proportion of the population who have acquired immunity is unknown  
101 but non-zero. We have conservatively estimated the prevalence of susceptibility to be  
102 95%.

103

104 We acquired COVID-19 confirmed infection incidence data from publicly reported  
105 statistics compiled by The New York Times. (4) Confirmed infection rates underestimate  
106 the true incidence of infection in the community because of undetected infections that  
107 can be both symptomatic and asymptomatic. Several studies have estimated the  
108 asymptomatic fraction. (5-7) In one meta-analytic review, the proportion of  
109 asymptomatic infections ranged from 6% to 41%. (8) A weighted mean estimate from  
110 those studies suggests that about 1 out of 6 persons, or 16%, may be asymptomatic.  
111 On the other hand, seroprevalence studies aim to capture both the confirmed and  
112 unconfirmed fractions together without regard to symptoms. Some seroprevalence  
113 studies suggest that up to 90% of infections may be unconfirmed. (9) The US CDC  
114 gives 50% as their most conservative estimate of the proportion of asymptomatic  
115 infections. (10) We estimate 75% of all infections are unconfirmed which includes both  
116 symptomatic and asymptomatic unconfirmed infections.

117

118 Limited data is available on the share of reported infections arising without a known  
119 contact. As of this date, the US CDC has not included any statistics on this attribute of

120 confirmed infections. The State of Oregon currently publicly reports infections without a  
121 known contact a varying between 30 and 50%%. Because of limited national data, we  
122 use 100% for this parameter; we leave the parameter in the equation for the purpose of  
123 future applications.

124  
125 The attack rate for an exposure varies by exposure intensity, context, proximity, and  
126 duration. For this analysis, contact means any substantive exposures that happen in a  
127 community, household, workplaces, or group living situations. Examples of substantive  
128 contacts outside households might include dining with a friend or business contact,  
129 working in a shared office space or having close or physical contact without the types of  
130 precautions now recommended for prevention of infection transmission (e.g. avoiding  
131 handshaking, embraces, wearing a mask or indoor ventilation). We do not consider  
132 contacts to be short-term events, such as passing by a person on the street. Contact  
133 within households involves habitual and typically unprotected close physical. We  
134 understand that attack rates will vary across such diverse exposure settings.

135  
136 Overall, secondary attack rates from contact tracing studies on COVID-19 range from  
137 0.7% to 16.3%. One study in Taiwan estimated a mean attack rate of 0.7% with an  
138 attack rate of ~5% among household and non-household family contacts. (11) A Hong  
139 Kong study of the quarantined contacts of visitors from China estimated a secondary  
140 attack rate of 11.7%. (12) Two published study within China found a household attack  
141 rate of 16.3% and 11.2% respectively. (13-14)

142

143 We assume an average plausible attack rate across all settings of exposure based on  
144 these range of estimates to be 10% in the absence of more setting and activity specific  
145 data. We acknowledge that this estimate may overestimate the attack rate for a non-  
146 household contact and underestimate it for a household contact.

147  
148 We estimate the total duration of infectiousness as 8 days. Research suggests that  
149 individuals who develop symptoms may be infectious two to three days before the onset  
150 of symptoms. (15) We apply the US CDC's estimates that the proportion of  
151 infectiousness before symptom onset is 40% of the total duration. (10) Conservatively,  
152 we treat infections in the unreported fraction as being infectious for the same duration  
153 as those with reported infections.

154  
155 Compliance with self-isolation affects the number of infectious people circulating with  
156 infection after symptoms develop. Current research within the context of the COVID-19  
157 pandemic finds that compliance with isolation ranges from 57% without financial  
158 compensation to 94% with compensation. (16) Given the current US context and the  
159 availability of sick leave compensation, we assume that 75% of individuals with  
160 confirmed infection will voluntarily self-isolate after symptoms develop. We do not alter  
161 the duration of infectiousness for the unconfirmed fraction of infections.

162  
163 We estimate the probabilities per contact of reported infections, hospitalizations and  
164 deaths as fixed ratios of the estimated but unobserved probability of infection. The



165 relationship between total infections and confirmed infections is fixed and defined by the  
166 parameter alpha above.

167  
168 We estimate the probability of hospitalizations and deaths per contact using US CDC  
169 estimates of case hospitalization ratios and case fatality ratios from their pandemic  
170 planning scenario four, which is their most conservative current estimate of disease  
171 severity and transmissibility. (10) (Table 1) Based on these fixed ratios, we expect 18  
172 reported infections and 70 total infections for every hospitalization in an individual in the  
173 50-64 year old age group. And we expect 167 reported infections, and 667 total  
174 infections for every death in the 50-64 year old age group.

175  
176 These estimated case fatality ratios are within the range of published values in the  
177 United States. One study of deaths through the early part of the epidemic estimated the  
178 case fatality ratio for symptomatic cases to be 1.3% (95% CI: 0.6% to 2.1%). (2)

179  
180 We compared estimated weekly hospitalization incidence rates produced using the  
181 estimated probabilities per contact against observed incidence rates of laboratory  
182 confirmed COVID-19 hospitalization in several US multi-county regions where the US  
183 CDC conducts active hospital case surveillance. (17) To estimate weekly  
184 hospitalizations, we multiplied our estimates of age specific probabilities of  
185 hospitalization per contact and a modest number of daily contacts equal to the number  
186 of other household members plus one.

187

188 **Results**

189

190 Among US Counties with populations greater than 500,000 people (N= 1224), for the  
191 week ending June 13, 2020, the median observed county-level daily case incidence is  
192 6.78 per 100,000 (Range, 0.41- 24). In those counties, the median estimate of the  
193 county-level probability of a confirmed COVID-19 infection is 1 infection in 40,500  
194 person-contacts (Range: 10,100 - 586,000). These estimates reflect the probability per  
195 contact at a single point in time averaged across all types of contacts and settings,  
196 within and outside households.

197

198 In the same counties, for a 50 to 64 year old individual, , the median estimate of the  
199 county-level probability of a hospitalization is 1 in 709,000 person-contacts (Range:  
200 177,000 – 10,200,000) and the median estimate of the county-level probability of a  
201 fatality is 1 in 6,670,000 person-contacts (Range 1,680,000 – 97,600.000). Table 2 lists  
202 probabilities for other age groups.

203 Table 2. Estimated County-level Probabilities for the Week Ending June 13, 2020 of  
 204 COVID-19 Events in Counties with Populations Greater Than 500,000 (N = 1224)

Event	Age Group	Average	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Confirmed Case	All	0.002833%	0.002470%	0.000171%	0.009892%
Hospitalization	Under 49 yr	0.000074%	0.000064%	0.000004%	0.000257%
	50- 64 yr	0.000162%	0.000141%	0.000010%	0.000564%
	Over 65 yr	0.000283%	0.000247%	0.000017%	0.000989%
Fatality	Under 49 yr	0.000003%	0.000002%	0.000000%	0.000010%
	50- 64 yr	0.000017%	0.000015%	0.000001%	0.000059%
	Over 65 yr	0.000091%	0.000079%	0.000005%	0.000317%

205

206 Figure 1 illustrates the average estimated probabilities of confirmed infection,  
 207 hospitalization and fatality per contact as a function of daily case incidence. Figure 2  
 208 illustrates the estimated number of hospitalizations and fatalities per 1 million contacts  
 209 in a subset of analyzed US counties with populations greater than 1.5 million.

210

211 We found good concordance between the estimated weekly hospitalization rates and  
 212 rates from US CDC hospitalization surveillance data in most of our comparison regions  
 213 under the assumption that average daily contacts equaled the average number of other  
 214 household members plus one. (Table 3) CDC acknowledges that more recent data  
 215 values are subject to revision.

216 Table 3. Estimated weekly hospitalization rates per 100,000 people for the week ending  
 217 June 13, 2020 compared to weekly laboratory confirmed hospitalization rates observed  
 218 by US CDC regional surveillance.

County	Alameda, CA	Denver CO	Fulton GA	Montgomery, MD	Wayne, MI
Assumption of Contacts Per Day	2.8	2.3	2.47	2.79	2.52
Estimated Weekly New Cases per 100,000	32.94	37.55	28.2	127.4	53.8
Estimated Weekly Hospitalization Rate (per 100,000 people)					
18-49 years	0.86	0.98	0.7	3.3	1.4
50-64 years	1.88	2.14	1.6	7.3	3.1
Over 65 years	3.29	3.76	2.8	12.7	5.4
COVID-NET Observed Regional Weekly Hospitalization Rates					
18-49 years	1	1.1	1	5.3	0.4
50-64 years	1	3.2	2	6.6	0.8
Over 65 years	3.3	2.2	1.7	13.5	0.5

219

220

## 221 Discussion

222

223 We demonstrate a method to estimate the average county-level probabilities of COVID-  
 224 19 confirmed infections, hospitalizations, and deaths in the U.S resulting from a contact  
 225 with a random person in the population. Those estimates reflect current reported  
 226 COVID-19 confirmed infection incidence in US counties with more than 500,000 people  
 227 for the week ending June 6, 2020. Probabilities vary across a wide range reflecting the  
 228 varying case incidences in different counties.

229

230 Our method is limited by the availability of publicly available data on infection  
231 transmission on COVID-19, including setting and occupational specific case incidence  
232 rates, data on antibody seroprevalence, the share of infection with known contacts, and  
233 activity-specific attack rates. The estimates therefore reflect the average probability  
234 across a wide range of exposure contexts. Nevertheless, observed rates of  
235 hospitalization for laboratory confirmed COVID-19 disease in several US CDC active  
236 surveillance areas generally corroborate our estimates under the assumption of a  
237 modest level of social contact.

238

239 Our estimates of the average probabilities per contact do not accurately estimate risks  
240 for specific subsets of people. Infections occur within geographically and socially  
241 constrained chains of transmission, for example, within clusters of related or socially  
242 connected individuals or among those living in congregate living facilities such as  
243 nursing homes. Clusters of COVID-19 infections have been reported associated with  
244 prisons, workers dormitories, religious services, nightclubs, schools, cruise ships,  
245 sporting events, and professional conferences. (18) Disaggregating confirmed infection  
246 incidence rates into fractions representing those with and without known contacts and  
247 those within and without congregate living settings would allow for more setting and  
248 population specific risk estimates. This requires the systematic public reporting of  
249 confirmed infection exposure factors.

250

251 As mentioned above, systematic data on the share of confirmed infections arising  
252 without a known contact is not currently available. Applying this fraction to the model  
253 would reduce our estimates based on the assumption of a 100% share.

254  
255 Available estimates of the secondary attack rate come from observations outside the  
256 US and at an earlier time period in the pandemic, prior to normalization of behaviors  
257 that reduce the risk of infection transmission, such as increased hand washing,  
258 observing physical distance, forgoing physical greetings, and wearing masks.

259  
260 The limitations of published secondary attack rates and the lack of disaggregated data  
261 on confirmed infection incidence also do not allow our estimates to differentiate between  
262 community and household transmission. Most studies indicate that household attack  
263 rates are higher than for contacts in the community. Systematic public reporting of  
264 anonymized contact tracing data would provide information to assess context specific  
265 attack rates.

266  
267 We also cannot account for intra-individual variation in the secondary attack rate within  
268 a setting. With respiratory viruses, the number of secondary cases generated by each  
269 index case can vary significantly. (19-20) One recent estimate suggests that 80% of  
270 COVID-19 infections are due to a small fraction (10%) of particularly infectious  
271 individuals. (21)

272

273 We have assumed a high fraction of the population remains susceptible as the  
274 prevalence and significance of antibodies to COVID-19 is not known. However, there  
275 may well be factors conferring protection to infection or responsible for differences in  
276 susceptibility. For example, cross immunity due to infection with other coronaviruses  
277 may be occurring. (22) Researchers have also observed cellular immune system  
278 responses to COVID-19 among unexposed individuals likely due to prior exposure to  
279 related coronaviruses. (23) More data will be required before adjusting risk assessment  
280 for population susceptibility or immunity.

281  
282 We estimated probabilities of hospitalization and death based on CDC estimates of  
283 disease severity. We chose conservative scenarios but acknowledge that estimates of  
284 confirmed infection fatality ratios may further evolve over the course of the pandemic.  
285 Furthermore, individual states may have different criteria for recording a death from  
286 COVID-19. The risk of hospitalization and death varies with other risk factors including  
287 race/ethnicity, level of deprivation, and chronic diseases such as lung disease and  
288 diabetes, that are not reflected in our analysis.

289  
290 Better data to address the above limitations would likely reduce estimated probabilities  
291 of adverse events for a large fraction of the population; still, the estimated probabilities  
292 reported here may appear considerably lower than those reflected in public opinion  
293 surveys. Scientific uncertainties, media attention, dramatic governmental action and a  
294 subjective perceived lack of control over exposure all may be influencing risk  
295 perception. Exploring methods to communicate risk and the concordance of perceived  
296 risk and risk probabilities would be an appropriate subject for further work.

297  
298 Avoiding human contact in the setting of an uncertain and lethal epidemic threat is an  
299 expected and self-protective human behavior. Prevalent beliefs today about the sources  
300 of COVID-19 infection include ‘contact with infected persons’, ‘people coming from  
301 abroad’ or ‘foreign nationals.’ (24) Notably, many people assume that contact with a  
302 family member has a lower risk of infection transmission than contact with a stranger.  
303 This may not be true for all subgroups in the population.

304  
305 In the US, policy makers have taken dramatic and unprecedented steps to control  
306 COVID-19, applying universal contact reductions through home confinement, limits on  
307 travel, closures of schools and businesses and limits on gatherings. While heightened  
308 perception of risk (e.g., fear) motivated these restrictions at the outset of the epidemic,  
309 ongoing restrictions on community activity may be mediating risk perceptions. (25)

310  
311 Notably, in Wuhan, the government limited exponential growth of the COVID-19  
312 epidemic using isolation and quarantine, mandatory mask wearing, canceled New  
313 Year’s celebrations, the curtailment of intra-city and intercity transportation and  
314 extension of the New Year’s holiday period. (26) South Korea achieved epidemic control  
315 with scaled up testing, strong contact notification practices, case isolation and strict  
316 quarantine of those exposed and public awareness. (27) The lack of understanding of  
317 how various countries have brought their epidemics under control maybe another  
318 important factor influencing the perception of risk to COVID-19 infection in community  
319 settings in the US.

320



321 Return to community workplace and social life will require individuals to be comfortable  
322 with their personal risk of acquiring COVID-19 infection. Estimates on the individual  
323 probabilities of infection, hospitalization and death may contribute to a more accurate  
324 risk perception. Systematically collected and publicly reported data on infection  
325 incidence by, for example, the geographic setting of exposure, residence type, whether  
326 a case had a known exposure, and would allow more precise estimation than those  
327 possible with currently available public data. Calculation of secondary attack rates by  
328 setting and prevalence of seropositivity would further improve these estimates.

329

330 **Contributions:** Rajiv Bhatia and Jeffrey Klausner equally contributed to the design of  
331 the study and writing of the manuscript. Rajiv Bhatia conducted the analysis.

332

333 **Conflicts of interest:** None

334 **Funding:** None

335 **References**

- 336 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Covid-19 Forecasts. URL:  
337 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/forecasting-us.html> Accessed  
338 May 24, 2020.
- 339 2. Basu A. Estimating The Infection Fatality Rate Among Symptomatic COVID-19  
340 Cases In The United States [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 7]. *Health Aff*  
341 *(Millwood)*. 2020. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00455
- 342 3. Zheng Z, Peng F, Xu B, et al. Risk factors of critical & mortal COVID-19 cases: A  
343 systematic literature review and meta-analysis [published online ahead of print, 2020  
344 Apr 23]. *J Infect*. 2020; S0163-4453(20)30234-6. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.021
- 345 4. On ongoing repository of data on coronavirus cases and deaths in the U.S. New  
346 York Times. <https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data> Accessed: June 1, 2020.
- 347 5. Furukawa NW, Brooks JT, Sobel J. Evidence supporting transmission of severe  
348 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 while pre-symptomatic or asymptomatic.  
349 *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020 Jul. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2607.201595>
- 350 6. He, X., Lau, E.H.Y., Wu, P. et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and  
351 transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med* 26, 672–675 (2020). doi.org/10.1038/s41591-  
352 020-0869-
- 353 7. Wei WE, Li Z, Chiew CJ, Yong SE, Toh MP, Lee VJ. Presymptomatic  
354 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 - Singapore, January 23-March 16, 2020. *MMWR Morb*  
355 *Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(14):411-415. Published 2020 Apr 10.  
356 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6914e1

- 357 8. Byambasuren O, Cardona M, Bell K, Clark J, McLaws ML, Glasziou P.  
358 Estimating the extent of true asymptomatic COVID-19 and its potential for community  
359 transmission: systematic review and meta-analysis. medRxiv.  
360 [doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.10.20097543](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.10.20097543)
- 361 9. Sood N, Simon P, Ebner P, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2-Specific  
362 Antibodies Among Adults in Los Angeles County, California, on April 10-11, 2020  
363 [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 18]. . 2020;e208279.  
364 [doi:10.1001/jama.2020.8279US](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.8279US)
- 365 10. Centers for Disease Control. Covid-19 Pandemic Planning Scenarios. URL:  
366 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios.html> Accessed  
367 May 29, 2020.
- 368 11. Cheng HY, Jian SW, Liu DP, et al. Contact Tracing Assessment of COVID-19  
369 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different Exposure Periods Before and  
370 After Symptom Onset [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 1]. *JAMA Intern Med*.  
371 2020;e202020. [doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2020](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2020)
- 372 12. Kwok KO, Wong VWY, Wei WI, Wong SYS, Tang JW. Epidemiological  
373 characteristics of the first 53 laboratory-confirmed cases of COVID-19 epidemic in Hong  
374 Kong, 13 February 2020. *Euro Surveill*. 2020;25(16). [doi:10.2807/1560-](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.16.2000155)  
375 [7917.ES.2020.25.16.2000155](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.16.2000155)
- 376 13. Wei Li, Bo Zhang, Jianhua Lu, Shihua Liu, Zhiqiang Chang, Peng Cao, Xinhua  
377 Liu, Peng Zhang, Yan Ling, Kaixiong Tao, Jianying Chen, The characteristics of  
378 household transmission of COVID-19, *Clinical Infectious Diseases*.  
379 [doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa450](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa450)

- 380 14. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391  
381 cases and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study  
382 [published online ahead of print, 2020 Apr 27]. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;S1473-  
383 3099(20)30287-5. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30287-5
- 384 15. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease  
385 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and  
386 Application. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020;172(9):577-582. doi:10.7326/M20-0504
- 387 16. Bodas M, Peleg K. Self-Isolation Compliance In The COVID-19 Era Influenced  
388 By Compensation: Findings From A Recent Survey In Israel [published online ahead of  
389 print, 2020 Apr 9]. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2020;101377hlthaff202000382.  
390 doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00382
- 391 17. US CDC. Laboratory-confirmed Covid-19- Associated Hospitalizations. URL:  
392 [https://gis.cdc.gov/grasp/COVIDNet/COVID19\\_3.html](https://gis.cdc.gov/grasp/COVIDNet/COVID19_3.html) Accessed June 2, 2020.
- 393 18. Leclerc QJ, Fuller NM, Knight LE et al. What settings have been linked to SARS-  
394 CoV-2 transmission clusters? *Wellcome Open Res* 2020, 5:83  
395 doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15889.1
- 396 19. Lipsitch M, Cohen T, Cooper B, et al. Transmission dynamics and control of  
397 severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Science*. 2003;300(5627):1966-1970.  
398 doi:10.1126/science.1086616
- 399 20. Lloyd-Smith, J., Schreiber, S., Kopp, P. et al. Superspreading and the effect of  
400 individual variation on disease emergence. *Nature* 438, 355–359 (2005).  
401 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04153>

- 402 21. Endo A, Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases COVID-19  
403 Working Group, Abbott S et al. Estimating the overdispersion in COVID-19 transmission  
404 using outbreak sizes outside China [version 1; peer review: 1 approved]. Wellcome  
405 Open Res 2020, 5:67 doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15842.1
- 406 22. Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Goldstein E, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Projecting the  
407 transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period. *Science*.  
408 2020;368(6493):860-868. doi:10.1126/science.abb5793
- 409 23. Grifoni, A., Weiskopf, D., Ramirez, S.I., Mateus, J., Dan, J.M., Moderbacher,  
410 C.R., Rawlings, S.A., Sutherland, A., Premkumar, L., Jadi, R.S., Marrama, D., de Silva,  
411 A.M., Frazier, A., Carlin, A., Greenbaum, J.A., Peters, B., Krammer, F., Smith, D.M.,  
412 Crotty, S., Sette, A., Targets of T cell responses to SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus in humans  
413 with COVID-19 disease and unexposed individuals, *Cell* (2020).  
414 doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.05.015.
- 415 24. Lohiniva AL, Sane J, Sibenberg K, Puumalainen T, Salminen M. Understanding  
416 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) risk perceptions among the public to enhance risk  
417 communication efforts: a practical approach for outbreaks, Finland, February  
418 2020. *Euro Surveill*. 2020;25(13):2000317. doi:10.2807/1560-  
419 7917.ES.2020.25.13.2000317
- 420 25. Economic Attitudes as the Country Starts to Re-open. The Associated Press-  
421 NORC Center for Public Affairs Research. URL:  
422 <http://www.apnorc.org/projects/Pages/Economic-Attitudes-as-the-Country-Starts-to->  
423 [Reopen.aspx](http://www.apnorc.org/projects/Pages/Economic-Attitudes-as-the-Country-Starts-to-) Accessed: May 25, 2020.

- 424 26. Pan A, Liu L, Wang C, et al. Association of Public Health Interventions With the  
425 Epidemiology of the COVID-19 Outbreak in Wuhan, China [published online ahead of  
426 print, 2020 Apr 10]. *JAMA*. 2020;323(19):1-9. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6130
- 427 27. Ryu S, Ali ST, Jang C, Kim B, Cowling BJ. Effect of non-pharmaceutical  
428 interventions on transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2,  
429 South Korea, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020 Oct. doi.org/10.3201/eid2610.201886




Figure 1. Estimated county-level probabilities of confirmed infection, hospitalization and death per contact as a function of daily case incidence.




Figure 2. Estimated current number of predicted COVID-19 hospitalizations per 1 million contacts in counties with populations greater than 1.5 million.