On the effect of age on the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in households, schools and the community

Goldstein E[1,*], Lipsitch M[1,2], Cevik M[3,4]

1. Center for Communicable Disease Dynamics, Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, United States
2. Department of Immunology and Infectious Diseases, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, United States
3. Division of Infection and Global Health, School of Medicine, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, United Kingdom
4. NHS Lothian Infection Service, Regional Infectious Diseases Unit, Western General Hospital, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

*. Corresponding author, egoldste@hsph.harvard.edu

Abstract

There is limited information on the effect of age on the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection in different settings. We undertook a review of published data/studies on detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection in contacts of COVID-19 cases, as well as serological studies, and studies of infections in the school setting to examine those issues. Those sources suggest significantly lower susceptibility to infection for children aged under 10 years compared to adults, for elevated susceptibility to infection in adults aged over 60y, and for the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection associated with sleeping close to an infected individual. Those sources also suggest that younger adults (particularly those aged under 35y) often have high rates of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the community. Additionally, there is evidence of robust spread of SARS-CoV-2 in high schools, and more limited spread in primary schools. Some countries with relatively large class sizes in primary schools (e.g. Chile and Israel) reported sizeable outbreaks in some of those schools, though the amount of transmission occurring in these schools (vs. outside) is not clear from current reports. Nonetheless, these reports suggest that classroom crowding and other factors related to social distancing in classrooms/schools may play a role in the spread of SARS-CoV-2 in primary schools. Those findings should have implications for school openings in different age groups of children, and they suggest the need to better protect adults over the age of 60 during the community spread of SARS-CoV-2.

Background

Among those infected with SARS-CoV-2, elderly patients have had the most severe outcomes, including the highest death rates, whereas infected younger persons, particularly children aged 1- 18y, if symptomatic at all, are far more often mildly ill [1,2]. While this age-dependent pattern of illness severity has become well-established, the roles of different age groups in transmission has not been as clear. Recently, evidence has accumulated that susceptibility to infection generally increases with age, e.g. [3,4]. This, however, does not suggest that the oldest individuals necessarily play the leading role in the spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the community – in fact, serological studies suggest that younger adults, particularly those aged under 35y often experience the highest cumulative rates of infection [5-9], possibly due to age-related differences in mixing. Additionally, there is uncertainty as to the role of different age subgroups of children in the spread of SARS-CoV-2, including how susceptibility to infection varies in different age groups of children, and how it compares to susceptibility to infection in different age groups of adults. The effect of the ongoing and future openings of schools and higher-educational institutions on the spread of infection requires a better characterization of transmission dynamics in different age groups. Here, we review the relevant evidence based on household, school and community studies, and draw some conclusions regarding the relevant public health policies.

Age variation in susceptibility to infection given contact

We undertook a literature review using the Living Evidence on COVID-19, a database collecting COVID-19 related published articles from Pubmed and EMBASE and preprints from medRxiv and bioRxiv, with MESH terms including ("child" OR "age" OR "aged") AND ("contacts" OR "household" OR "transmission" OR "susceptibility" or "contact tracing") to assess the susceptibility to and transmission in different age groups [10]. We included ten studies where estimates of either secondary attack rate, susceptibility to, or odds ratio for infection in different age groups were present, and where the setting for the contact, if varying among contacts (e.g. household vs. other) was adjusted for (as a covariate in a model) in those estimates – the latter was done to reduce the effects of heterogeneity in exposure on those estimates.

1. There is evidence that susceptibility to infection in children under the age of 10y is significantly lower (no more than ½) compared to adults.

Studies of SARS-CoV-2 infection in close contacts: Several studies found much lower secondary attack rates (measured by PCR-positive cases) in children – using different age cutoffs up to age 20y --

compared to adults (Table 1). In a hospital-based study near Wuhan, China [11], the household secondary attack rate in children under the age of 18y was 4%, compared with 17.1% for adults, OR= 0.18 (95% CI (0.06,0.54)). In Guangzhou, China [3], the household secondary attack rate in persons aged under 20y was 5.2%, while that in persons over the age of 60y was 18.4% (multivariable OR=0.23(0.11,0.46)), and it was 14.8% in persons aged 20-59y (multivariable OR=0.64 (0.43,0.97) relative to persons aged 60y+). In another hospital-based study in Wuhan, China [12], the secondary attack rate in tested adult household contacts was 58.6% vs. 11.2% in pediatric household contacts (age unspecified), OR= 11.21 (2.54,102.9). For household contacts of confirmed cases in Zhuhai, China [13], the secondary attack rate in persons aged under 19y was 16.1%, while in persons aged 19-60y it was 37% (OR=0.33(0.09,1)), whereas in persons aged over 60y, the secondary attack rate was 41.9% (OR=1.23(0.48,3.08) relative to persons aged 19-60y). In a study of household contacts in Bnei Brak, Israel [14], the secondary attack rate was 58.3% in adults aged 18-47y, 32.5% in children aged 5-17y, OR=0.35 (0.12,0.97) relative to adults, and 11.8% in children aged 0-4y, OR=0.09 (0.01,0.49) relative to adults. In a study of health and social care workers in Tayside, Scotland [15], the household secondary attack rates in pediatric contacts was 2.6%, while in adult contacts it was 19.5%, OR=9.13 (3.32,35.1). In a Chinese study [4], the attack rate among contacts of confirmed cases (not only household) was lower in children under the age of 15y compared to adults aged 15-64y (multivariable OR= 0.34 (0.24 to 0.49)). A study modeling transmission within households in Israel [16] found that susceptibility in children under the age of 20y was 0.45(0.40, 0.55) that of adults. Additionally, in the same study, data on household secondary attack rates in different age groups (Figure 4 in [16]) suggests that secondary attack rates in children aged 0-4y and 5-9y were significantly lower compared to children aged 10-14y, and less than half that for children aged 15-19y.

On the other hand, in a smaller study from Shenzhen, China [17], the household secondary attack rates in children aged <18y was 35.3%, while in adults aged 18-49y it was 27.3%, and in persons aged over 50y was 20.7%. The differences between age groups (OR=0.69 (0.17,2.99) for adults aged 18-49y vs. children, and OR=0.49 (0.10,2.28) for persons aged over 50y vs. children) failed to reach statistical significance. Finally, the multivariable analysis of 1286 close contacts of 391 index cases in Shenzhen, China [18] suggests that infection rates in close contacts were similar across age groups (except for higher point estimates in the older age groups). However, 298/391 of index cases in this study were travelers, with joint travel being associated with an odds ratio of 7.1 (1.4,34.9) for infection in close contacts. This suggests rather irregular patterns of transmission, such as the possibility of acquisition of infection outside the household (including at the source of travel) for non-index cases, etc., making the interpretation of the age-specific susceptibility differences in [18] difficult.

Potential biases and susceptibility for children under 10y: Besides the potential bias for [18] described above, estimates of susceptibility in children vs. adults based on household attack rates may be downwardly biased because certain adult-adult contacts may be more sustained than adult-child contacts: that is, higher secondary attack rates in adults vs. children may reflect greater exposure in addition to differences in susceptibility given the same exposure. A serological study of a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak on a US Navy ship [19] found that cumulative incidence of infection was higher among persons who reported sharing the same sleeping berth with a crew member who had positive test results (65.6%), compared with those who did not (36.4%), OR = 3.3 (1.8,6.1). This suggests that among contacts of an index case in a household, the spouse might face an additional risk for infection due to shared bed. In fact, for adult contacts in the Wuhan study [11], the attack rate among spouses of index cases was 27.8% (25/90), whereas the secondary attack rate among other adults in the household was 17.3% (35/202), with the relative risk (RR) for infection for a spouse of the index case vs. a non-spouse adult household contact being RR=1.60(1.02,2.51). In the Zhuhai study [13], 12/23 spouses of index cases were infected, compared to 31/89 of other adult contacts of index cases, with the relative risk for infection being RR=1.50(0.92,2.43). We note that the vast majority of detected COVID-19 index cases in household studies are adults, with a sizeable share (depending on the study, e.g. [11,13]) of adult household contacts being the spouses of the indices. Given those potential biases, information on infection in different age subgroups of children among household contacts, namely the fact that secondary attack rates in children aged 0-4y and 5-9y are less than half those children aged 15-19y in [16] suggests that children aged under 10y are at most half as susceptible as adults. Additionally, for the household studies [11,13], the secondary attack rate in non-spouse adult household contacts of index cases is more than twice as high as the secondary attack rates in pediatric household contacts. This, together with evidence of elevated susceptibility in older age groups of children compared to younger ones [16] further supports the concept that with equivalent exposure, the risk of infection in children aged under 10y is at most ½ that of adults. Finally, we note the evidence of a robust spread of SARS-CoV-2 in a high school in France [20], and more limited spread in primary schools in the same community [21], which agrees with the observed differences in susceptibility for older adolescents compared to younger school-age children (Figure 5 in [16]).

2. There is evidence that susceptibility to infection in adults aged over 60y is elevated compared to younger/middle-age adults.

One study [3] estimates that for household contacts among persons aged 20-59y, the OR for infection is 0.64 (0.43,0.97) compared to household contacts aged over 60y. Another study [4] estimates that for household contacts among persons aged over 65y, the OR for infection is 1.67 (1.12,1.92) compared to household contacts aged 15-64y. A smaller study [13] estimates the OR for infection in persons aged over 60y vs. 19-60y as 1.23 (0.48,3.08). Another smaller study [17] estimates the OR for infection in persons aged over 50y vs. 19-49y as 0.70 (0.17,2.62).

Table 1 summarizes the above estimates for the relative susceptibilities/odds ratio for infection in different age groups.

Study	Age groups		
[4]	<15y	15-64y	Over 65y
	OR=0.34 (0.24 to 0.49)	OR=1 (ref.)	OR=1.67 (1.12,1.92)
[3]	<20y	20-59y	Over 60y
	OR=0.23 (0.11,0.46)	OR=0.64 (0.43,0.97)	OR=1 (ref.)
[13]	<19y	19-60y	Over 60y
	OR=0.33 (0.09,1)	OR=1 (ref.)	OR=1.23 (0.48,3.08)
[17]	<18y	18-49y	Over 50y
	OR=1 (ref.)	OR=0.69 (0.17,2.99)	OR=0.49 (0.10,2.28)
[14]	0-4y	5-17y	Over 18y
	OR=0.09 (0.01,0.49)	OR=0.35 (0.12,0.97)	OR=1 (ref.)
[11]	<18y	Over 18y	
	OR= 0.18 (0.06,0.54)	OR=1 (ref.)	
[16]	<20y	Over 20y	
	Susceptibility = 0.45 (0.40,0.55)	Susceptibility=1 (ref.)	
[15]	Children	Adults	
	OR=1 (ref.)	OR=9.13 (3.32,35.1)	
[12]	Children	Adults	
	OR=1 (ref.)	OR=11.21 (2.54,102.9)	
[18]	No age-related differences in susceptibility were found		

Table 1: Odds ratios and relative susceptibility to infection in contacts in different age groups for studies [3,4,11-18]. [3,11-17] are household-contact studies; [4,18] include household and non-household contacts. Also see the caveats in the *Potential biases and susceptibility for children under 10y* subsection.

Age variation in infectivity

There is limited evidence in the literature regarding age-related differences in infectivity. Dattner et al. [16] estimated the relative infectivity for children aged under 20y compared to adults as 0.85 (0.65,1.1). Data from the 54 households in the Netherlands [22] suggest lower point estimates for transmissibility of infection to close contacts from children aged under 19y, and higher point estimates for adults aged over 70y compared to persons aged 19-69y. A large study of contacts (household and other) of COVID-19 cases in South Korea suggests that for adult index cases, household secondary attack rates generally increase with the age of the index [23]. For index cases aged 0-9y, the household secondary attack rate is lower than for adult indices. For index cases aged 10-19y, the household secondary attack rate is significantly higher than for index cases aged 20-29y, 30-39y, 40-49y; however, persons aged 10-19y reported by far the smallest number of contacts suggesting that some of the index cases aged 10-19y were potentially infected in the household rather than being index cases [23].

The notion that infectivity in children (particularly those aged 0-9y), is somewhat lower than in young/middle aged adults while infectivity in older adults is somewhat higher compared to young/middle aged adults is also supported by studies of viral load/viral shedding. An analysis of the viral load of COVID-19 cases in Germany [24] showed no statistically significant differences in the viral load for the different 10-year age groups, though point estimates for mean logarithm(viral load) were lowest for children aged 0-9y, followed by those aged 10-19y, generally increasing further with age (Table 2B in [24]). Evaluation of viral shedding in adult patients hospitalized with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China and Zhejiang, China [25-27] shows that older age was an independent factor associated with prolonged virus shedding time of SARS-CoV-2.

Age variation in seroprevalence

We reviewed all seroprevalence studies in the Living Evidence on COVID-19 database [10] (as well as ref. [5]) that provided age-specific seropositivity rate estimates. Twelve studies were included in the analyses, though some of them, e.g. studies of blood donors [5,6,28] may suffer from selection biases.

Several serological studies estimate that younger adults, particularly those aged under 35y have the highest seroprevalence of all or nearly all age groups. Serological studies in different regions in England, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Tokyo, Japan, as well as Heinsberg, Germany estimate that SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence is highest in adults aged under 35y [5-8]. A serological study in a slum community in Buenos Aires, Argentina found the highest seroprevalence to be in adolescents aged 14-19y [29]. In Belgium, persons aged 20-30 years had the highest estimated seroprevalence in persons aged below 80 [28] (with the oldest individuals likely affected by outbreaks in long-term care facilities). In Geneva Switzerland, persons aged 20-49 years had the highest estimated seroprevalence, followed closely by those aged 10-19 years [9].

Serosurveillance of adults outside grocery stores in New York State, USA found that rates of infection in individuals aged over 55y were significantly lower than in persons aged 18-54y [30]; the highest infection rates in New York State were in persons aged 45-54y. A serological study in Spain used a point-of-care test, and an immunoassay, each having sensitivity below 90% [31]. For the immunoassay, the highest seroprevalence was estimated in persons aged 20-49y, whereas for the point-of-care test, the highest seroprevalence was in persons aged over 50y [31]. We also note the high prevalence of multigenerational families in Spain that likely affected the relative incidence of infection in older adults. A serological study in Iceland has the highest estimate for the cumulative incidence of infection in persons aged 40-50y (Figure 2E in [32]), though a sizeable proportion of individuals with serologically confirmed infection were travellers, and rates of seropositivity in different age groups in this study were low. A study of seroprevalence in six US locations [33] found that the age group with the highest seroprevalence estimate varies by location, with highest rates observed in adults aged 18-49y in two locations, adults aged 50-64y in two locations, and adults aged 65+y in two locations. A serological study in Los Angeles County found similar seroprevalence estimates in different age groups of adults [34].

Discussion

In this review, we examine evidence in the literature and provide a comprehensive overview regarding the role that age plays in the transmission of infection in different settings.

We found evidence for a significantly lower susceptibility to infection in children under the age of 10y compared to adults and older adolescents. This, combined with evidence of a limited spread of SARS-CoV-2 in primary schools [21], as well as evidence of limited spread in smaller studies of close contacts of younger children, e.g. [35,36] suggests that opening of primary schools may have limited effect on SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the community. We note that classroom crowding and other factors related to social distancing in classrooms/schools may play a role in the spread of SARS-CoV-2 in primary schools. For example, Denmark, Austria, and Finland have various mitigation strategies implemented as part of opening of primary schools [37]; moreover, those countries have notably smaller classroom sizes in primary schools compared to England, Israel and Chile [38]. Therefore, the spread of SARS-CoV-2 in primary schools in former countries may be more limited (media publication [39]) compared to Chile, Israel and England. Primary schools saw a limited opening in England on June 1 (beginning of week 23), with a gradual increase in school outbreaks reported on weeks 23, week 24, and weeks 25-28 [40]. Israel experienced a marked growth in SARS-CoV-2 incidence in June, 2020, with elevated rates of COVID-19 in children compared to adults (media publication [41]) and sizeable outbreaks reported in some elementary schools [39]. A serological study [42] is related to an outbreak in a large private school in Santiago, Chile that has 14 grades (from pre-school to high school) and large class sizes (25-27 students in pre-school, 36-38 students in the rest of the school). While some of the infections recorded in this study [42] could have taken place after the school was closed on March 13, the fact that seroprevalence in pre-school and middle school students is significantly higher than in high school students combined with evidence of higher susceptibility to infection in older children compared to younger ones [16] suggests infections in younger students before the school closure. We should note that there is uncertainty as to the sources of infection in outbreaks in primary schools in England, Israel and Chile (e.g. the possibility that some pre-school students were infected by their caregivers or in the household in Chile [42]), though the size of the outbreaks, particularly in Israel and Chile points to the school setting as the venue for transmission. All of this suggests that efforts to avoid crowding and other mitigation measures should be implemented, to the extent possible, when opening primary schools [37,39]. As for older children, there is a lack of evidence of substantial differences in susceptibility to infections between older adolescents and non-elderly adults. Additionally, given the evidence of robust transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in high schools [20], and relatively high seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in persons aged 10-19y [28,9] and younger adults [5-8], opening high schools and higher-educational institutions may result in major outbreaks on campuses and potentially contribute to the spread of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the community.

Elevated susceptibility to infection in individuals over 60y of age [3,4] given same exposure, and infectivity no lower than in younger persons [22,23] may contribute to the spread of infection in older adults. Some examples of this are Spain [31], which has a high prevalence of multigenerational families that likely affected the relative incidence of infection in older adults, and New York City [30], where seroprevalence in persons aged over 55y (21.5% (19.6%–23.5%)) was on par with the seroprevalence in persons aged 18-34y (21.8% (19.2%–24.4%)). Another example is the Italian town of Vo. That town has a fairly old age distribution (Table 2 in [43], with 85.9% of residents sampled), and the highest incidence of infection during both population samplings was observed in older persons [43]. Further effort is needed to better understand how to protect the elderly population living outside long-term care facilities including facilitation of diminished social interaction (such as allocating certain time slots for grocery shopping among the elderly only, etc.).

Finally, a number of serological studies, e.g. [5-9] have the highest seroprevalence estimates belonging to younger adults (particularly those aged under 35y), as well as adolescents aged 14-19y [28]. While this finding is not uniform across all the published serological studies, and some of these are based on blood donor studies with potential selection bias, the ongoing relaxation of social distancing measures, and the high prevalence of younger adults and older adolescents among reported COVID-19 cases in different countries and regions in the northern Hemisphere during the summer of 2020 (e.g. [44]) suggest that efforts should be made to reduce the number and intensity of contacts in those age groups in order to mitigate the spread of the epidemic in the whole community, particularly during the Fall of 2020.

Conclusions: We found evidence that compared to younger/middle aged adults, children aged under 10y have significantly lower susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 infection, while adults aged over 60y have elevated susceptibility to infection, and they merit extra efforts for protection against infection. Opening of primary schools and daycare facilities is expected to have a limited effect on the spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the community, particularly under smaller class sizes and in the presence of mitigation measures [37], and efforts to avoid crowding in the classroom and other mitigation measures should be implemented, to the extent possible, when opening primary schools. There is evidence of robust SARS-CoV-2 spread in schools for older children, and opening middle/high schools should be undertaken with caution. Finally, given the high seroprevalence for SARS-CoV-2 in younger adults (particularly those aged under 35y) in a number of serological studies, as well as elevated rates of COVID-19 in younger adults in a number of locations during the summer of 2020, efforts should be

undertaken to diminish the mixing in younger adults to mitigate the spread of the epidemic in the whole community.

Funding: This work was supported by Award Number U54GM088558 from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (ML, EG). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institute Of General Medical Sciences.

References

[1] Cevik M, Bamford CGG, Ho A. COVID-19 pandemic-a focused review for clinicians. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2020;26(7):842-847

[2] Hildenwall H, Luthander J, Rhedin S, Hertting O, Olsson-Åkefeldt S, Melén E, et al. Paediatric COVID‐19 admissions in a region with open schools during the two first months of the pandemic. Acta Paediatr. 2020: 10.1111/apa.15432

[3] Jing QL, Liu MJ, Yuan J, Zhang ZB, Zhang AR, Dean NE, et al. Household secondary attack rate of COVID-19 and associated determinants in Guangzhou, China: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet Inf. Diseases 2020;S1473-3099(20)30471-0

[4] Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, Wang Y, Wang W, Zhao S, et al. Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. Science. 2020. pii: eabb8001. doi: 10.1126/science.abb8001

[5] Public Health England. Sero-surveillance of COVID-19. May 21, 2020. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-covid-19-surveillance-reports/sero-surveillance-of-covid-19

[6] Filho LA, Landmann Szwarcwald C, de Oliveira Garcia Mateos, Ponce de Leon ACM, de Andrade Medronho R, Gonçalves Veloso V, et. al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 among blood donors in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Rev Saude Publica. 2020; 54:69.

[7] Takita M, Matsumura T, Yamamoto K, Yamashita E, Hosoda K, Hamaki T, et al. Regional Difference in Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Tokyo: Results from the community point-of-care antibody testing. 2020. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.03.20121020v1.full.pdf

[8] Streeck H, Schulte B, Kümmerer BM, Richter E, Höller T, Fuhrmann C, et al. Infection fatality rate of SARS-CoV-2 infection in a German community with a super-spreading event. (2020). Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.04.20090076v2

[9] Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, Azman AS, Lauer SA, Baysson G, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. Lancet. 2020. Epub ahead of print. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31304-0

[10] Living Evidence on COVID-19. A database with published articles from Pubmed and EMBASE and with preprints from medRxiv and bioRxiv. 2020. Available from: https://zika.ispm.unibe.ch/assets/data/pub/search_beta/

[11] Li W, Zhang B, Lu J, Liu S, Chang Z, Cao P, et al. The characteristics of household transmission of COVID-19. Clin Infect Dis. 2020. pii: ciaa450. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa450.

[12] Wang Z, Ma W, Zheng X, Wu G, Zhang R. Household transmission of SARS-CoV-2. J Infect. 2020; 81(1): 179–182.

[13] Wu J, Huang Y , Tu C, Bi C, Chen Z, Luo L, et al. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2, Zhuhai, China, 2020. Clin Infect Dis. 2020 May 11;ciaa557

[14] Somekh E, Gleyzer A, Heller E, Lopian M, Kashani-Ligumski L, Czeiger S, et al. The Role of Children in the Dynamics of Intra Family Coronavirus 2019 Spread in Densely Populated Area. Pediatr Infect Dis J. 2020 Jun 1. doi: 10.1097/INF.0000000000002783

[15] Parcell B, Brechin K, Allstaff S, Park M, Third W, Bean S, et. al. Drive-through testing for SARS-CoV-2 in symptomatic health and social care workers and household members: an observational cohort study in Tayside, Scotland. 2020. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.08.20078386v1.full.pdf

[16] Dattner I, Goldberg Y, Katriel G, Yaari R, Nurit Gal, Yoav Miron, et al. The role of children in the spread of COVID-19: Using household data from Bnei Brak, Israel, to estimate the relative susceptibility and infectivity of children. 2020. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.03.20121145v1

[17] Wei L, Lv Q, Wen Y, Feng S, Gao W, Chen Z, et al. Household transmission of COVID-19, Shenzhen, January-February 2020. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.11.20092692v1.full.pdf

[18] Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, Ye C, Zou X, Zhang Z, et et. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391 cases and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020. pii: S1473-3099

[19] Payne DC, Smith-Jeffcoat SE, Nowak G, Chukwuma U, Geibe J, Robert J. Hawkins RJ, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Serologic Responses from a Sample of U.S. Navy Service Members — USS Theodore Roosevelt, April 2020. MMWR Weekly / June 12, 2020 / 69(23);714–721. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6923e4.htm

[20] Fontanet A, Tondeur L, Madec Y, Grant R, Besombes C, Jolly N, et al. Cluster of COVID-19 in northern France: A retrospective closed cohort study. (2020) Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.18.20071134v1

[21] Fontanet A, Grant R, Tondeur L, Madec Y, Grzelak L, Cailleau I, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection in primary schools in northern France: A retrospective cohort study in an area of high transmission. Institute Pasteur. 2020. Available from: https://www.pasteur.fr/fr/file/35404/download

[22] National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), the Netherlands. Children and COVID-19. 2020. Available from: https://www.rivm.nl/en/novel-coronavirus-covid-19/children-and-covid-19

[23] Park YJ, Choe YJ, Park O, Park SY, Kim Y-M, Kim J, eta al. Contact Tracing during Coronavirus Disease Outbreak, South Korea, 2020. Emerging Infectious Diseases 2020; 26(10).

[24] Jones TC, Mühlemann B, Veith T, Biele G, Zuchowski M, Hoffmann J, et al. An analysis of SARS-CoV-2 viral load by patient age. 2020. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.08.20125484v1

[25] Wang K, Zhang X, Sun J, Ye J, Wang F, Hua J, et al. Differences of SARS-CoV-2 Shedding Duration in Sputum and Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens Among Adult Inpatients With COVID-19. Chest. 2020 Jun 20 doi: 10.1016/j.chest.2020.06.015

[26] Zheng S, Fan J, Yu F, Feng B, Lou B, Zou Q, et al. Viral load dynamics and disease severity in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January-March 2020: retrospective cohort study. BMJ 2020; 369.

[27] Xu K, Chen Y, Yuan J, Yi P, Ding C, Wu W, et al. Factors associated with prolonged viral RNA shedding in patients with COVID-19. Clinical Infectious Diseases 2020; 09: 09

[28] Herzog S, De Bie Jessie J, Abrams S, Wouters I, Ekinci E, Patteet L, et al. Seroprevalence of IgG antibodies against SARS coronavirus 2 in Belgium – a prospective cross-sectional study of residual samples. 2020. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.08.20125179v1.full.pdf

[29] Figar S, Pagotto V, Luna L, Salto J, Wagner Manslau M, Mistchenko AS, et al. Community-level SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence Survey in urban slum dwellers of Buenos Aires City, Argentina: a

participatory research. 2020. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.14.20153858v1

[30] Rosenberg ES, Tesoriero JM, Rosenthal EM, Chung R, Barranco MA, Styer LM, et al. Cumulative incidence and diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection in New York. Annals of Epidemiology 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2020.06.004

[31] Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, Oteo J, Hernán MF, Pérez-Olmeda M, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological study. Lancet 2020. Available from: https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(20)31483-5/fulltext

[32] Gudbjartsson DF, Helgason A, Jonsson H, Magnusson OT, Melsted P, Norddahl GL, et al. Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic Population. N. Engl. J. Med. 2020. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2006100

[33] Havers FP, Reed C, Lim T, Montgomery JM, Klena JD, Hall AJ, et al. Seroprevalence of Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in Six Sites in the United States, March 23-May 3, 2020. 2020. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.25.20140384v1?rss=1%27

[34] Sood N, Simon P, Ebner P, Eichner D, Reynolds J, Bendavid E, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2–Specific Antibodies Among Adults in Los Angeles County, California, on April 10-11, 2020. JAMA. 2020 Jun 16; 323(23): 2425–2427.

[35] Wongsawat J, Moolasart V, Srikirin P, Srijareonvijit C, Vaivong N, Uttayamakul S, et al. Risk of novel coronavirus 2019 transmission from children to caregivers: A case series. J. Pediatrich and Child Health. 2020. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpc.14965

[36] Heavey L, Casey G, Kelly C, Kelly D, McDarby G. No evidence of secondary transmission of COVID-19 from children attending school in Ireland, 2020. Eurosurveillance 2020;25:21

[37] Global School Reopening Policies, Practices, and Outcomes. An online database. Available from: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1wtJRbZPqCPzrcqb8xVtXGOeQG_tKO4k3UEsR9FfvFro/edit#gid=0

[38] Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. Average class size. 2017. Available from: https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=EDU_CLASS

[39] Couzin-Frankel J, Vogel G, Weiland M. School openings across globe suggest ways to keep coronavirus at bay, despite outbreaks. Science. 2020; July 7. Available from: https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2020/07/school-openings-across-globe-suggest-ways-keep-coronavirus-bay-despite-outbreaks

[40] Public Health England. Weekly Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Surveillance Report. Week 29, 2020. Available from:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/901803/Weekly_COVID19_Surveillance_Report_week_29_FINAL.pdf
[41] The times of Israel. The silent young spreaders: Lots of asymptomatic kids among COVID-19 cases. 2020. Available from: https://www.timesofisrael.com/the-silent-spreaders-lots-of-asymptomatic-kids-among-covid-19-cases/
[42] Torres JP, Piñera C, De La Maza V, Lagomarcino AJ, Daniela Simian D, Torres B, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence in blood in a large school community subject to a Covid-19 outbreak: a cross-sectional study. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2020. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa955
[43] Lavezzo E, Franchin E, Ciavarella C, Cuomo-Dannenburg G, Barzon L, Del Vecchio C, et al. Suppression of COVID-19 outbreak in the municipality of Vo, Italy. 2020. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.17.20053157v1
[44] Florida Department of Health. COVID-19: summary of persons being monitored, persons tested, and cases. 2020. Available from: http://ww11.doh.state.fl.us/comm/_partners/covid19_report_archive/state_reports_latest.pdf