medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-ND 4.0 International license .

Assessment of spread of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR and concomitant serology in children in a region heavily affected by COVID-19 pandemic

Robert Cohen,[1,2,3,4,5,6] Camille Jung,[2,3] Naim Ouldali,[1,4,5,7] Aurélie Sellam,[1] Christophe Batard,[1,5] Fabienne Cahn-Sellem,[5] Annie Elbez,[1,5] Alain Wollner,[1] Olivier Romain,[1, 4] François Corrard,[1,5] Said Aberrane[8], Nathalie Soismier,[8] Rita Creidy,[8],Mounira Smati-Lafarge,[8] Odile Launay,[9] Stéphane Béchet,[1,2] Emmanuelle Varon,[2,4,8], Corinne Levy,[1,2,3,4,5]

1 ACTIV, Association Clinique et Thérapeutique Infantile du Val-de-Marne, Créteil, France

2 Université Paris Est, IMRB-GRC GEMINI, Créteil, France

3 Clinical Research Center (CRC), Centre Hospitalier Intercommunal de Créteil, Créteil, France

4 GPIP, Groupe de Pathologie Infectieuse Pédiatrique, Paris, France

5 AFPA, Association Française de Pédiatrie Ambulatoire, Saint-Germain-en-Laye, France

6 Unité Court Séjour, Petits nourrissons, Service de Néonatalogie, Centre Hospitalier Intercommunal de Créteil, France

7 Unité d'épidémiologie clinique, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Hôpital Robert Debré, ECEVE INSERM UMR 1123, Paris, France

8 Laboratoire de Microbiologie, Centre Hospitalier Intercommunal de Créteil, Créteil, France

9 Université Paris Descartes, Sorbonne Paris Santé, Centre d'investigation clinique Cochin-Pasteur, hôpital Cochin, Paris

Corresponding author: Dr Corinne Levy, ACTIV, 31, rue Le Corbusier, 94000 Créteil, France. Email address: corinne.levy@activ-france.fr

Phone: 0033148850404

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-ND 4.0 International license .

Alternate corresponding author: Pr Robert Cohen, ACTIV, 31, rue Le Corbusier, 94000 Créteil, France. Email address: robert.cohen@activ-france.fr

Phone: 0033148850404

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background. Several studies indicated that children seem to be less frequently infected with SARS-CoV-2 and potentially less contagious. To examine the spread of SARS-CoV-2 we combined both RT-PCR testing and serology in children in the most affected region in France, during the COVID-19 epidemic.

Methods. From April 14, 2020 to May 12, 2020, we conducted a cross-sectional prospective, multicenter study. Healthy controls and pauci-symptomatic children from birth to age 15 years were enrolled by 27 ambulatory pediatricians. A nasopharyngeal swab was taken for detection of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR and a microsample of blood for micro-method serology.

Results. Among the 605 children, 322 (53.2%) were asymptomatic and 283 (46.8%) symptomatic. RT-PCR testing and serology were positive for 11 (1.8%) and 65 (10.7%) of all children, respectively. Only 3 children were RT-PCR–positive without any antibody response have been detected. The frequency of positivity on RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 was significantly higher in children with positive serology than those with a negative one (12.3% vs 0.6%, $p<0.001$). Contact with a person with proven COVID-19 increased the odds of positivity on RT-PCR (OR 7.8, 95% confidence interval [1.5; 40.7]) and serology (15.1 [6.6; 34.6]).

Conclusion. In area heavily affected by COVID-19, after the peak of the first epidemic wave and during the lockdown, the rate of children with positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR was very low (1.8%), but the rate of positive on serology was higher (10.7%). Most of PCR positive children had at the same time positive serology.

What is already known on this topic?

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

- As compared with adults, children seem to be less frequently infected with SARS-CoV-2 and potentially less contagious according to several studies.
- Most of the studies were based on RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 testing, without antibody assays.

What this study adds?

- This study combining RT-PCR and serologic testing, assessed the spread of SARS-CoV-2 infection in children in area heavily affected by COVID-19 pandemic.
- Among a large cohort of children (>600), 11 (1.8%) were positive on RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 and 65 (10.7%) were positive on serology.
- The only factor affecting positivity of RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 or serology was the household contact COVID-19.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, reports from several countries indicated that the disease was less frequent and less severe in children than adults.[1-3] Worldwide, the number of confirmed pediatric cases seems relatively low, and they account for less than 1% of hospitalized cases and deaths.[1, 4] Although most COVID-19 cases in children are not severe, serious COVID-19 illness resulting in hospitalization can occur in this age group, and recently, hyperinflammatory shock, showing features similar to atypical Kawasaki disease were reported in several countries.[5-10]

However, concerns have been raised that children could play an important role in the spread of the disease because community testing has demonstrated a significant number of children with no or subclinical symptoms.[11] Indeed, if as for influenza, children could be the primary drivers of household SARS-CoV-2 transmission, then a silent spread from children who did not alert anyone to their infection could be a serious driver in the dynamics of the epidemic.[12] On the basis of this prevailing hypothesis, school closures were implemented almost ubiquitously around the world to try to halt the potential spread of COVID-19 despite early modelling suggesting that this would have less impact than most other non-pharmacological interventions.[13, 14]

However, several studies had already shown that when SARS-CoV-2 infection was suspected (compatible clinical signs, contact with a person with COVID-19), the rate of positivity on RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 was lower in children than adults.[14].[15] In contrast, in RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2–positive children, the viral load was comparable between children and adults.[16] Furthermore, one study suggested that children shed infectious SARS-CoV-2.[17] However, results from a systematic review of household clusters of COVID-19 revealed that only 3/31 clusters were due to a child index case, and a population-based school contact-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

tracing study found minimal transmission by child or teacher index cases.[18, 19] Finally, other studies suggested that children were potentially less contagious than adults.[16, 20-22]

Some countries such as South Korea and Iceland have implemented widespread community testing. Both countries found children significantly underrepresented in cases. In Iceland, this was true in targeted testing of high-risk groups as compared with adults (6.7% < 10 years vs 13.7% ≥ 10 years positive), and in (invited) population screening, no child under 10 years old was positive for SARS-CoV-2 as compared with 0.8% in the general population.[23]

Of note, all these studies were based on RT-PCR testing, but serology diagnosis is also an important tool to understand the spread and burden of COVID-19.[24] A serology survey tested adolescents in a high school in the north of France, the site of a cluster at the end of February. Of the 242 students tested, 2.7% of children ≤ 14 years old and 40% aged 15-17 years were positive on SARS-CoV-2 serology (IgG), which suggests a difference in susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 among younger children.[25]

To best approach the spread and dynamics of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in children at a population level, we combined both RT-PCR testing for SARS-CoV-2 and serology in asymptomatic or pauci-symptomatic children (with mild clinical symptoms) in the Paris area, the most affected region in France, during the COVID-19 epidemic.

Patients and Methods

Study population

This was a cross-sectional prospective, multicenter study conducted by the Association Clinique et Thérapeutique Infantile du Val de Marne (ACTIV) network, a research unit expert in epidemiological surveillance and clinical studies in ambulatory pediatric infectious diseases, and the University Intercommunal Créteil Hospital.[26] Primary care pediatricians (n =

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

27) took part in the study from April 14, 2020 to May 12, 2020. The strategy of closing schools and the lockdown decided by the French government for the whole country started on March 17 and finished on May 11, 2020.

This study aimed to enroll children from birth to 15 years of age consulting an ambulatory pediatrician and distributed in two groups: asymptomatic and pauci-symptomatic. Asymptomatic children were defined as children without any symptoms or signs suggesting infectious disease during the last 7 days. In this group, we defined two subgroups of children: those who had history of symptoms (fever or respiratory or digestive) between 7 days and 2 months before enrollment, and those without any history if symptoms. Pauci-symptomatic children were defined as those with fever isolated or associated with respiratory signs such as cough, dysphagia, rhinorrhea, diarrhea, vomiting, cutaneous signs, taste loss and/or anosmia during the last 7 days. Children were excluded if the clinical condition at enrollment required transfer to pediatric emergency unit or hospitalization.

After informing the parents of the participating children and obtaining their signed consent, an electronic case report form (eCRF) was completed by the pediatrician to collect socio-demographic data, history, contact with a person with confirmed COVID-19 by RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2, clinical symptoms and signs, and additional positive biological tests. We have also collected suspected COVID-19 contacts, because of the limited availability of testing. Indeed, during the lockdown, the diagnostic RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 test was mainly available for patients with severe disease and/or healthcare workers, and all symptomatic individuals could not be tested. For all enrolled children, during the same visit, a nasopharyngeal (NP) swab was taken for RT-PCR detection of SARS-CoV-2 and a microsample of blood for micro-method serology.

Calculation of the number of patients

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

To have an appropriate proportion of confirmed RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2–positive patients among asymptomatic children and pauci-symptomatic patients, with a 95% confidence interval (CI) of +/-3%, assuming a positivity proportion < 10%, we needed to enroll 300 children per group (asymptomatic and pauci-symptomatic), for 600 patients in total.

Serological assays

Pediatricians collected fingerstick whole-blood specimens and used the Biosynex COVID-19 BSS test, a rapid chromatographic immunoassay, for qualitive detection of IgG and IgM antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in blood. This test targeted the spike protein fragment receptor binding domain and was among those approved by the French national health authority.[27] According to the specifications of the manufacturer, the diagnostic accuracy of the test was sensitivity 91.8% [95% CI 83.8-96.6] and specificity 99.2% [95%CI 97.7-99.8] (https://www.biosynex.com/laboratoires-hopitaux-tests-covid-19/). However, the accuracy of the test was not stratified by age and for patients infected with other Coronavirus (OC43, 229E, NL63, HKU1) no cross-reaction was observed.

Furthermore, assessment by independent investigators confirmed the good diagnostic accuracy of this test among hospital staff with mild disease in eastern France [28].

SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR methods

The NP specimens were obtained by using the collection system eSwab™ (Minitip size nylon flocked swab placed in 1 mL of modified liquid Amies transport medium, COPAN, Brescia, Italy). They were transported to the centralized microbiology laboratory (CHIC). Before extraction, each sample was inactivated by the addition of 750 µl / ml of STARmag lysis buffer solution (Seegene, South Korea). The RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 was performed on the automated Seegene STARlet system®, according to the manufacturer's instructions using the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

CE marked AllplexTM 2019-nCoV RT-PCR assay (Seegene, South Korea®) which targets N- (viral nucleocapsid protein) and RdRP-gene (RNA-dependent RNApolymerase), both SARS-CoV-2 specific genes, and the sarbecovirus specific E-gene.

The automated Hamilton STARlet system was used for automated viral RNA extraction using the STARMag 96 Universal Cartridge kit (Seegene, South Korea) and PCR set up. Subsequently, 8 µL of extracted nucleic acids was added to 17 µL of the PCR Master Mix, and amplification and detection were performed on the CFX96^{TM} detection system (Bio-Rad, France) as per manufacturer's instruction. Ct from FAM (E gene), Cal Red 610 (RDRP gene), Quasar 670 (N gene) and HEX (internal control) were acquired. Before extraction, internal control (10 µl) was added to verify extraction and determine PCR inhibition. Positive (plasmids encoding the three AllplexTM 2019-nCoV assay target sequences) and negative (RNase-free water added to the master mix prior to PCR) controls were included in each run. The cycle threshold values (Ct) were used as indicators of the copy number of SARS-CoV-2 RNA specimens with lower Ct values corresponding to higher viral copy numbers. NP samples were considered positive when a Ct less than 40 was obtained for any gene. Amplification of two or three targets indicated that SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected, while amplification of only one target indicated a presumptive positive result. In addition, we defined as weakly positive any result with a Ct > 38 and < 40. A sample was considered negative if the internal control was amplified but not the viral target genes. A sample was considered invalid when no amplification was obtained for the internal control.

Statistical analysis

Data were entered by using the eCRF (PHP/MySQL) and analyzed by using Stata/SE v15 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA). Quantitative data were compared by Student *t* test and qualitative data by chi-square or Fisher exact test. We used a logistic regression model for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

analysis of factors associated with positivity on RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 and serology. Variables (age, clinical signs, contact, siblings and daycare attendance modalities) with $p < 0.20$ on univariate analysis were included in the model, estimating odds ratios (ORs) and 95% CIs. Only significant variables ($p<0.05$) were kept in the final model. All tests were 2-sided and were considered significant at $p<0.05$.

Ethics

The study protocol was approved by an ethics committee (CPP IDF IX no. 08-022). Parents of all infants provided written informed consent. The study was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov NCT04318431.

Results

From April 14, 2020 to May 12, 2020, 27 ambulatory pediatricians in the Paris area enrolled 605 children: 322 (53.2%) were asymptomatic and 283 (46.8%) pauci-symptomatic. Table 1 presents the characteristics of the enrolled children by group. In the pauci-symptomatic group, the main signs and symptoms were fever (187, 66.3%), cough (143, 50.7%), pharyngitis (143, 50.7%), rhinitis (137, 48.4%), diarrhea (81, 28.7%), cutaneous criteria (64, 23.0%), vomiting (52, 18.8%), taste loss (8, 3.0%) and anosmia (5, 3.3%).

Figure 1 presents the dynamics of the first epidemic wave in Paris area[29], the dates of the lockdown and the number of children enrolled by weeks.

RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 tests were positive for 11 (1.8%) children, with no significant difference between the two groups (Table 2). The supplemental Table shows the details of the 11 positive RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2. Only 3 children had positive RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 result with Ct less than 31.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

On multivariable analysis, contact with a person with proven COVID-19 was the only significant risk factor for RT-PCR–positive SARS-CoV-2 infection (OR 7.8, 95% CI [1.5; 40.7]).

Table 2 shows also the serology results by group. Serology was positive for 65 (10.7%) children, whatever the group, and among these, 87.3% had a confirmed or suspected contact. Children with history of symptoms during the preceding weeks, more frequently were positive on serology.

Table 3 presents the RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 results by serology status. The frequency of positivity was significantly higher in children with positive serology than those with a negative one (12.3% vs 0.6%, $p<0.001$). Only 3 children were RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2–positive without any antibody response detected.

Table 4 shows RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 and serology positivity by contact with a person with suspected or confirmed COVID-19. Only 2 of 275 (0.7%) children without any contact with a person with COVID-19 were positive on RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2.

On multivariate analysis, positivity on serology was associated with contact with a person with proven or suspected COVID-19 (OR 15.1 [95% CI 6.6; 34.6] and 5.8 [95% CI 2.6; 13.2]).

Discussion

This study combines RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 and serology results to assess the spread of SARS-CoV-2 infection in a large cohort of children in the community. In a region strongly affected by the epidemic (Paris area), but during the lockdown, very few children (1.8%) were positive on RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2, but the rate of children positive on serology (10.7%) was higher. Despite the relatively large number of children included (>600), we did not find a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

significant difference in the rate of positive RT-PCR or serology results between asymptomatic and pauci-symptomatic children.

Among asymptomatic children, those with no history of symptoms during the preceding weeks accounted for two third of children with positive serology results (28/41), which supports that asymptomatic infections are frequent in children. By contrast, history of symptoms during the preceding weeks increased significantly the risk of positive serology. However, on multivariate analysis, the only factor influencing the positivity of RT-PCR or serology was the household contact who has previously presented symptoms suggestive of COVID-19. Of note, the number of siblings in the family did not significantly increase the probability of a positive RT-PCR or serology result. Several studies have shown that children were usually infected by an adult in the family.[18, 22, 30, 31] In our study, the importance of familial contagion in the modalities of SARS-Cov-2 transmission is suggested by a very low RT-PCR (0.7%) and serology positivity rate (3.6%) for children without an infected relative and in a period of lockdown.

Among the children positive on RT-PCR (n=11), only 3 had no antibody response, and 8 were positive for IgG with or without IgM positivity. This finding supports that for these 3 patients, contamination had occurred during the 2 weeks before enrollment.

We highlight that the frequency of positivity on RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 was significantly higher in children with positive serology than those with a negative one (12.3% vs 0.6%, $p<0.001$). This finding highlights the difficulties in interpreting the significance of a positive RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 result without concomitant antibody testing after the epidemic wave. Indeed, children positive on RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 and positive for IgG probably had little or no infectivity.[32] In a study of 9 patients, attempts to isolate the virus in culture were not successful beyond day 8 of illness onset, which relates to the decreased infectivity beyond the first week.[33] In the study of Bullard *et al.*, SARS-CoV-2 Vero cell

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

infectivity was only observed for RT-PCR Ct < 24 and symptom onset to test < 8 days.[34] It is likely that infectivity was low for the 8 of 11 RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 positive children. Indeed, only 3 children had a Ct recorded under 31.

Our study has several limitations. First, the role of assumed household transmission probably has been over-estimated because of the well-followed lockdown in France.[35] Indeed, more than 86.5% of children with positive SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR or serology have had a confirmed or suspected COVID-19 household contact. However, our rate of positive serology for children in the Paris area was similar to the rate observed for hospitalized patients (11.7%) and at school children (8.8%).[22, 36] Second, the ability to successfully collect nasopharyngeal swabs properly could be more difficult in young children and significantly affect the results and be a factor contributing to the low RT-PCR positivity prevalence observed in our population. However, the pediatricians who performed the study were all involved for many years in a pneumococcal nasopharyngeal carriage study (started in 2001 and currently ongoing) and were particularly well trained to collect appropriately nasopharyngeal samples.[37]

School closure or limitation (reduced number of students or days of attendance) has a major impact on children's development and access to learning.[38] Therefore, the usefulness of school closure or limitation needs evaluation in controlling the COVID-19 epidemic. [39] We plan to renew this study after the full re-opening of schools and day care centre in the Paris area to better assess the transmission of SARS-Cov-2 in children.

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to the investigators of the COVILLE study Network:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Akou'ou M.H, Auvrignon A, Belaroussi N, Benani M, Cambier Nappo E, Chartier Albrech C, Coicadan L, Condor R, D'Acremont G, D'Ovidio N, De Brito B, Deberdt P, Delatour A, Gorde-Grosjean S, Louvel M, Michot-Cottias A-S, Ravilly S, Seror E, Turberg-Romain C, We are grateful to Adjemian S, Auffroy O, Begard M, Harant J, Mouaouya M, Receveau F, and Sigere ML, for technical assistance ; Cuquemelle A for secretarial assistance.

We are grateful to the ACTIV team : Ramay I, Prieur C; Prieur A, Borg M, Meyet L, Levy J, and Zemmour E (Association Clinique et thérapeutique Infantile du Val de Marne);

We are grateful to the CRC team: Brussieux M and Hoffart C from the Clinical Reaserch Center of the CHI Créteil.

References

1. Castagnoli R, Votto M, Licari A, *et al.* Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infection in Children and Adolescents: A Systematic Review. JAMA Pediatr. 2020.
2. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. JAMA. 2020.
3. Ludvigsson JF. Systematic review of COVID-19 in children shows milder cases and a better prognosis than adults. Acta Paediatr. 2020;**109**(6):1088-95.
4. Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Children — United States, February 12–April 2, 2020 MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2020;69:422-26. doi:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6914e4external. 2020.

5. Riphagen S, Gomez X, Gonzalez-Martinez C, *et al.* Hyperinflammatory shock in children during COVID-19 pandemic. Lancet. 2020;**395**(10237):1607-8.

6. Belot A, Antona D, Renolleau S, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2-related paediatric inflammatory multisystem syndrome, an epidemiological study, France, 1 March to 17 May 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020;**25**(22).

7. Davies P, Evans C, Kanthimathinathan HK, *et al.* Intensive care admissions of children with paediatric inflammatory multisystem syndrome temporally associated with SARS-CoV-2 (PIMS-TS) in the UK: a multicentre observational study. Lancet Child Adolesc Health. 2020.

8. Feldstein LR, Rose EB, Horwitz SM, *et al.* Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in U.S. Children and Adolescents. N Engl J Med. 2020.

9. Toubiana J, Poirault C, Corsia A, *et al.* Kawasaki-like multisystem inflammatory syndrome in children during the covid-19 pandemic in Paris, France: prospective observational study. BMJ. 2020;**369**:m2094.

10. Verdoni L, Mazza A, Gervasoni A, *et al.* An outbreak of severe Kawasaki-like disease at the Italian epicentre of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic: an observational cohort study. Lancet. 2020;**395**(10239):1771-8.

11. Dong Y, Mo X, Hu Y, *et al.* Epidemiology of COVID-19 Among Children in China. Pediatrics. 2020.

12. Tsang TK, Fang VJ, Chan KH, *et al.* Individual Correlates of Infectivity of Influenza A Virus Infections in Households. PLoS One. 2016;**11**(5):e0154418.

13. Eubank S, Eckstrand I, Lewis B, *et al.* Commentary on Ferguson, et al., "Impact of Non-pharmaceutical Interventions (NPIs) to Reduce COVID-19 Mortality and Healthcare Demand". Bull Math Biol. 2020;**82**(4):52.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

14. Munro APS, Faust SN. Children are not COVID-19 super spreaders: time to go back to school. Arch Dis Child. 2020.

15. Levy C. Changes in RT-PCR-positive SARS-CoV-2 rates in adults and children according to the epidemic stages. Accepted July 15, 2020 Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal. 2020.

16. Jones TC, Mühlemann B, Veith T, *et al.* An analysis of SARS-CoV-2 viral load by patient age. https://zoonosencharitede/fileadmin/user_upload/microsites/m_cc05/virologie-ccm/dateien_upload/Weitere_Dateien/analysis-of-SARS-CoV-2-viral-load-by-patient-agepdf. . 2020.

17. L'Huillier AG, Torriani G, Pigny F, *et al.* Culture-Competent SARS-CoV-2 in Nasopharynx of Symptomatic Neonates, Children, and Adolescents. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020;**26**(10).

18. Zhu Y, Bloxham CJ, Hulme KD. Children are unlikely to have been the primary source of household SARS-CoV-2 infections. medRxiv preprint server 2020 doi: 10.1101/2020.03.26.20044826 [published Online First: 30 March 2020]. 2020.

19. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, *et al.* Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. Science. 2020.

20. The National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RVIM). Children and COVID-19. https://wwwrivmnl/en/novel-coronavirus-covid-19/children-and-covid-19 [accessed 7 May 2020]. . 2020.

21. Danis K, Epaulard O, Benet T, *et al.* Cluster of coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) in the French Alps, 2020. Clin Infect Dis. 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

22. Fontanet A, Grant R, Tondeur L, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 infection in primary schools in northern France: A retrospective cohort study in an area of high transmission. https://wwwmedrxivorg/content/101101/2020062520140178v2. 2020.

23. Gudbjartsson DF, Helgason A, Jonsson H, *et al*. Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic Population. N Engl J Med. 2020.

24. Sethuraman N, Jeremiah SS, Ryo A. Interpreting Diagnostic Tests for SARS-CoV-2. JAMA. 2020.

25. Fontanet A, Tondeur L, Madec Y. Cluster of COVID-19 in northern France: A retrospective closed cohort study medRxiv 2020 ; published Online April 23.

doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.18.20071134]. 2020.

26. Levy C, Vie le Sage F, Varon E, *et al.* Pediatric Ambulatory and Hospital Networks for Surveillance and Clinical Epidemiology of Community-Acquired Infections. J Pediatr. 2018;**194**:269-70 e2.

27. Evaluation of COVID-19 Tests by the French National Health Authorities.

https://covid-19.sante.gouv.fr/tests. 2020.

28. Fafi-Kremer S, Bruel T, Madec Y, *et al.* Serologic responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection among hospital staff with mild disease in eastern France. https://wwwmedrxivorg/content/101101/2020051920101832v2. 2020.

29. Covid-19: Paris area epidemiologic situation. https://www.caducee.net/actualite-medicale/14774/covid-19-la-situation-epidemiologique-en-ile-de-france.html. 2020.

30. Li W, Zhang B, Lu J, *et al.* The characteristics of household transmission of COVID-19. Clin Infect Dis. 2020.

31. Somekh E, Gleyzer A, Heller E, *et al.* The Role of Children in the Dynamics of Intra Family Coronavirus 2019 Spread in Densely Populated Area. Pediatr Infect Dis J. 2020;**39**(8):e202-e4.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

32. La Scola B, Le Bideau M, Andreani J, *et al.* Viral RNA load as determined by cell culture as a management tool for discharge of SARS-CoV-2 patients from infectious disease wards. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2020;**39**(6):1059-61.

33. Wolfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, *et al.* Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. Nature. 2020.

34. Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, *et al.* Predicting infectious SARS-CoV-2 from diagnostic samples. Clin Infect Dis. 2020.

35. Wu J, Huang Y, Tu C, *et al.* Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2, Zhuhai, China, 2020. Clin Infect Dis. 2020.

36. Sermet-Gaudelus I, Temmam S, Huon C, *et al.* Prior infection by seasonal coronaviruses does not prevent SARS-CoV-2 infection and associated Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in children. https://wwwmedrxivorg/content/101101/2020062920142596v1. 2020.

37. Ouldali N, Cohen R, Levy C, *et al.* Pneumococcal susceptibility to antibiotics in carriage: a 17 year time series analysis of the adaptive evolution of non-vaccine emerging serotypes to a new selective pressure environment. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2019;**74**(10):3077-86.

38. https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse/consequences. 2020.

39. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, *et al.* Age-dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. Nat Med. 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Characteristics of children enrolled in the study and by pauci-symptomatic and asymptomatic group

	Overall	Pauci-symptomatic children*	Asymptomatic children			
			History of symptoms **	No history of symptoms***	Total	p$
	n=605	n=283	n=118	n=204	n=322	
Age (years)						
mean±SD	4.9±3.9	4.8±3.7	5.6±4.3	4.7±4.1	5.0±4.2	0.08
Median	3.8	4.0	4.4	3.4	3.7	
<3 mo.	8 (1.3)	6 (2.1)	0	2 (1.0)	2 (0.6)	
3-30 mo.	218 (36.0)	98 (34.6)	37 (31.4)	83 (40.7)	120 (37.3)	
31 mo. – 5 y.	184 (30.4)	96 (33.9)	34 (28.8)	54 (26.5)	88 (27.3)	0.1
6 y. – 10 y.	134 (22.2)	61 (21.6)	29 (24.6)	44 (21.6)	73 (22.7)	
≥11 y.	61 (10.1)	22 (7.8)	18 (15.2)	21 (10.3)	39 (12.1)	
Sex, male	322 (53.2)	152 (53.7)	65 (55.1)	105 (51.5)	170 (52.8)	0.8
Daycare attendance before lockdown						
Home	78 (13.8)	34 (13.0)	6 (5.4)	38 (19.7)	44 (14.5)	
Childminder	55 (9.7)	24 (9.2)	10 (9.0)	21 (10.9)	31 (10.2)	0.031
Daycare center	135 (23.9)	66 (25.2)	29 (26.1)	40 (20.7)	69 (22.7)	
School	298 (52.7)	138 (52.7)	66 (59.5)	94 (48.7)	160 (52.6)	
Comorbidities	93 (15.4)	45 (15.9)	28 (23.7)	20 (9.8)	48 (14.9)	0.004
Prematurity	35 (6.3)	15 (5.7)	7 (6.1)	13 (7.4)	20 (6.9)	0.8
Siblings						
0	115 (20.6)	57 (21.9)	18 (15.9)	40 (21.5)	58 (19.4)	
1	282 (50.5)	136 (52.3)	61 (54.0)	85 (45.7)	146 (48.8)	0.3
≥2	162 (29.0)	67 (25.8)	34 (30.1)	61 (32.8)	95 (31.8)	

Data are n (%) unless indicated.

$ p compares symptomatic children, asymptomatic children with history symptoms>7 days and asymptomatic children without history of symptoms

* Pauci-symptomatic children were defined as those with fever isolated or associated with respiratory signs such as cough, dysphagia, rhinorrhea, diarrhea, vomiting, cutaneous signs, taste loss and/or anosmia, during the last 7 days

** History of symptoms (fever or respiratory or digestive) between 7 days and 2 months before enrollment

*** No history of symptoms

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Results of RT-PCR SARS-Cov-2 testing and serology in children by pauci-symptomatic and asymptomatic group

	Overall	Pauci-symptomatic children*	Asymptomatic children		
			History of symptoms **	No history of symptoms***	Total
	n=605	n=283	n=118	n=204	n=322
RT-PCR					
Overall	11 (1.8) [0.9; 3.2]	7 (2.5) [1.0; 5.0]	1 (0.8) [0.0; 4.6]	3 (1.5) [0.3; 4.2]	4 (1.2) [0.3; 3.1]
Definite positive	5	3	0	2	2
Weakly positive	1	1	0	0	0
Probable	5	3	1	1	2
Serology					
IgM+ and/or IgG+	65 (10.7) [8.4; 13.5]	24 (8.5) [5.5; 12.4]	28 (23.7) $ [16.4; 32.4]	13 (6.4) $ [3.4; 10.7]	41 (12.7) [9.3; 16.9]
IgM+IgG-	7 (1.2) [0.5; 2.4]	4 (1.4) [0.4; 3.6]	2 (1.7) [0.2; 6.0]	1 (0.5) [0.0; 2.7]	3 (0.9) [0.2; 2.7]
IgM+IgG+	32 (5.3) [3.6; 7.4]	12 (4.2) [2.2; 7.3]	17 (14.4) $ [8.6; 22.1]	3 (1.5) $ [0.3; 4.2]	20 (6.2) [3.8; 9.4]
IgM-IgG+	26 (4.2) [2.8; 6.2]	8 (2.8) [1.2; 5.5]	9 (7.6) [3.5; 14.0]	9 (4.4) [2.0; 8.2]	18 (5.6) [3.3; 8.7]

Data are n (%) [95% confidence interval].

$ $p<0.001$

* Pauci-symptomatic children were defined as those with fever isolated or associated with respiratory signs such as cough, dysphagia, rhinorrhea, diarrhea, vomiting, cutaneous signs, taste loss and/or anosmia, during the last 7 days

** History of symptoms (fever or respiratory or digestive) between 7 days and 2 months before enrollment

*** No history of symptoms

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221; this version posted July 23, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3. RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2–positive results by serology status

RT-PCR results	IgM- IgG- n=540	IgM+ and/or IgG+ n=65	IgM+ IgG- n = 7	IgM+ IgG+ n = 32	IgM - IgG+ n = 26
Overall positive*	3 (0.6)	8 (12.3)	0	6 (18.7)	2 (7.8)
Definite positive**	2 (0.4)	3 (0.6)	0	2 (6.2)	1 (3.9)
Weakly positive ***	0	1 (1.5)	0	1 (3.1)	0
Presumptive positive ****	1 (0.2)	4 (6.2)	0	3 (9.4)	1 (3.9)

Data are n (%).
- p<0.001: comparison of overall RT-PCR with IgM-/IgG- vs IgM+ and/or IgG+
- p<0.001: comparison of definite or weakly or probable RT-PCR with IgM-/IgG- vs IgM+ and/or IgG+
* Overall positive: NP samples were considered positive when a cycle threshold value (Ct) less than 40 was obtained for any gene
** Definite positive: cycle threshold value (Ct) less than 38 obtained for 2 or 3 gene.
*** Weakly positive: any result with a Ct > 38 and < 40.
**** Presumptive: cycle threshold value (Ct) less than 38 obtained for only one target.

Table 4. RT-PCR and serology results by contact with a person with confirmed and/or suspected COVID-19

Contact	**Overall n=543***	**Positive serology n=63**	**Negative serology n=480**	**Positive RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 n=11**	**Negative RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 n=532**
Confirmed COVID-19**	93 (17.1) [14.1; 20.6]	29 (31.2) [22.0; 41.6]	64 (68.8) [58.4;78.0]	5 (5.4) [1.8; 12.1]	88 (94.6) [87.9; 98.2]
Suspected COVID-19***	175 (32.2) [28.3; 36.3]	26 (14.9) [9.9; 21.0]	149 (85.1) [79.0; 90.0]	4 (2.3) [0.6; 5.7]	171 (97.7) [94.3; 99.4]
Confirmed/ suspected COVID-19	268 (49.4) [45.1; 53.6]	55 (20.5) [15.9; 25.9]	213 (79.5) [74.1; 84.1]	9 (3.4) [1.5; 6.3]	259 (96.6) [93.7; 98.5]
No contact	275 (50.6) [46.4; 54.9]	8 (2.9) [1.3; 5.7]	267 (97.1) [94.3; 98.7]	2 (0.7) [0.1; 2.6]	273 (99.3) [97.4; 99.9]

Data are n (%) [95% confidence interval].
* 543 available data on 605 enrolled patients
** Confirmed by RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2
*** Suspected symptoms suggestive of COVID-19 because of the limited availability of testing


Number of enrolled children (Coville)
Paris area number of hospitalisations
Lockdown from March 17 to May 10
N (Paris area)
N (Coville)
Weeks
14000
12000
10000
8000
6000
4000
2000
0
200
180
160
140
120
100
80
60
40
20
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
165
184
103
153