

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

1 **Defining the role of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 transmission – a living systematic review**

2

3 **Authors** Xueting Qiu, PhD^{1*}, Ali Ihsan Nergiz^{2*}, Alberto Enrico Maraolo MD³, Isaac I. Bogoch,
4 MD⁴, Nicola Low, MD, MSc, FFPH⁵ Muge Cevik, MRCP⁶

5 **Affiliations:**

6 ¹ Center for Communicable Disease Dynamics, Department of Epidemiology, Harvard TH Chan
7 School of Public Health, Boston, USA

8 ² Cerrahpasa Medical School, Istanbul University-Cerrahpasa, Istanbul, Turkey

9 ³ First Division of Infectious Diseases, Cotugno Hospital, AORN dei Colli, Naples, Italy

10 ⁴ Division of Infectious Diseases, Toronto General Hospital and University of Toronto, Toronto
11 Canada

12 ⁵ Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

13 ⁶ Division of Infection and Global Health Research, School of Medicine, University of St.
14 Andrews, Fife, Scotland, UK

15

16

17

18

19 **Author of correspondence:**

20 Name: Dr Muge Cevik

21 Address: Division of Infection and Global Health Research, School of Medicine, University of St
22 Andrews, Fife, Scotland, KY16 9TF

23 Telephone number: +447732800814

24 Email address: mc349@st-andrews.ac.uk

25

26 **Key words:** COVID-19, asymptomatic, transmission, SARS-CoV-2, secondary attack rate

27

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

28 **Abstract:**

29 **Background** Reports suggest that asymptomatic individuals (those with no symptoms at all
30 throughout the infection) with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)
31 are infectious, but the extent of asymptomatic transmission requires further understanding.

32 **Purpose** This living review aims to critically appraise available data about secondary attack rates
33 from people with asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection.

34 **Data sources** Medline, EMBASE, China Academic Journals full-text database (CNKI), and pre-
35 print servers were searched from 30 December 2019 to 3 July 2020 using relevant MESH terms.

36 **Study selection** Studies that report on contact tracing of index cases with asymptomatic or pre-
37 symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection, in either English or Chinese were included.

38 **Data extraction** Two authors independently extracted data and assessed study quality and risk
39 of bias. We calculated the secondary attack rate as the number of contacts with SARS-CoV-2,
40 divided by the number of contacts tested.

41 **Data synthesis** Of 928 studies identified, 19 were included. Secondary attack rates from
42 asymptomatic index cases ranged from 0% to 2.8% (9 studies). Pre-symptomatic secondary
43 attack rates ranged from 0.7% to 31.8% (10 studies). The highest secondary attack rates were
44 found in contacts who lived in the same household as the index case. Other activities associated
45 with transmission were group activities such as sharing meals or playing board games with the
46 index case.

47 **Limitations** We excluded some studies because the index case or number of contacts were
48 unclear. Owing to the anticipated heterogeneity, we did not produce a summary estimate of the
49 included studies.

50 **Conclusion** Asymptomatic patients can transmit SARS-CoV-2 to others, but our findings
51 indicate that such individuals are responsible for fewer secondary infections than people with
52 symptoms in the same studies.

53 **Systematic review registration** PROSPERO CRD42020188168

54 **Funding:** No funding was received

55

56

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

57 **Introduction:**

58 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) demonstrates efficient
59 transmission in populations without effective public health interventions; basic reproduction
60 numbers (R_0) values range between 2-3 (1). While asymptomatic transmission has been
61 described as the “Achilles’ heel” of control efforts during this pandemic, the extent to which
62 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by people without symptoms drives this pandemic remains
63 uncertain (2). SARS-CoV-2 infection that is asymptomatic at the time of laboratory testing is
64 widely reported (3); however, studies that follow infected people over time suggest that many
65 infections are not asymptomatic throughout the entire disease course, and a large proportion of
66 these individuals ultimately develop a diverse range of symptoms (4-7). A living systematic
67 review of studies published up to 10 June 2020, estimated that 20% (95% CI 17 to 25%) of
68 people who become infected with SARS-CoV-2 remain asymptomatic throughout infection (7).

69 One of the barriers to understanding the role of asymptomatic transmission is the lack of
70 consistency in case definitions. While symptom severity exists on a spectrum, individuals
71 infected with SARS-CoV-2 can be miscategorized as asymptomatic, when they are
72 paucisymptomatic. For instance, Gudbjartsson et al. reported that approximately half of the
73 participants in their population screening in Iceland had symptoms despite asking symptomatic
74 patients not to participate (3). Additionally, studies that define symptomatic disease narrowly as
75 fever, cough, or shortness of breath might overestimate the proportion without symptoms (3, 8).
76 It is increasingly clear that some individuals experience more diverse symptoms, including taste
77 and smell disturbance or myalgia, either for the entire course of illness or preceding respiratory
78 symptoms. These symptoms can be so mild and insidious that they do not limit patients’ daily
79 activities (4, 9). The situation is further complicated by subjective patient perception and
80 differences between studies in the elicitation and reporting of symptoms.

81 There are reports describing asymptomatic individuals with SARS-CoV-2 who are infectious (10)
82 and who have infected one or more contacts (11), but the extent and significance of
83 asymptomatic transmission requires further understanding. The aim of this review is to

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

84 summarize the available evidence about secondary attack rates (defined as the probability that
85 an infected individual will transmit the disease to a susceptible individual) amongst the contacts
86 of asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic individuals with SARS-CoV-2 to provide information about
87 how contagious they are, and their role in driving the pandemic.

88

89 **Methods:**

90 Systematic review was registered in PROSPERO on 8 June 2020 (CRD42020188168) and will
91 be updated three times a year as a living systematic review (12). The larger review aims to
92 answer transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2. The analysis in this report addresses one of the
93 review questions; to identify asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic secondary attack rate.

94

95 **Definitions**

96 We defined “asymptomatic” as an individual with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection
97 who does not demonstrate symptoms throughout their entire course of infection, or after 14 days
98 of follow up; “paucisymptomatic” as an individual with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2
99 infection with mild symptoms, and “pre-symptomatic” as an individual who reports no symptoms
100 at the time of the initial positive test result, but who goes on to develop recognised COVID-19
101 symptoms. We used these definitions to categorize the index cases. Secondary attack rate was
102 defined as the number of new SARS-CoV-2 infection cases among susceptible contacts of
103 primary cases divided by the total number of susceptible contacts.

104

105 **Search Strategy**

106 We retrieved articles about transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection through systematic searches
107 of eight databases: Medline, EMBASE, Europe PMC, Web of Science, SCOPUS, Chinese
108 database (CNKI), and preprint servers (MedRxiv, BioRxiv) using relevant Medical Subject
109 Headings (MeSH) terms (Supplementary material). The initial search was completed from 30
110 December 2019 to 21 May 2020, searches were repeated on 8 June 2020 and 3 July 2020,
111 owing to the rapidly increasing numbers of studies.

112

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

113 **Study Selection**

114 Studies were eligible if they met the inclusion criteria: (1) report on Coronavirus disease 2019
115 (COVID-19) or SARS-CoV-2 infection and (2) report an outbreak investigation or contact tracing
116 study. Exclusion criteria were: (1) review articles; (2) observational studies providing only the
117 proportion of individuals infected; (3) studies that do not indicate the number of contacts or
118 secondary infections; and (4) reports in media sources. We also manually screened the
119 references of the included original studies and reviews to identify additional eligible studies.

120

121 **Data Extraction**

122 Two authors (XQ and AIN) independently reviewed reports by title and abstract for relevance,
123 with at least 20% of all reports being screened in duplicate to ensure consistency. Two authors
124 then independently read the full text report of all studies not excluded by title and abstract, to
125 consider eligibility for inclusion. Any disagreements regarding study inclusion were resolved
126 through discussion with a third author (MC). Data were extracted onto a standardized form. From
127 each study, the following variables were extracted: the name of the first author, year of
128 publication, country, sample size, details of index cases (categorised as asymptomatic, pre-
129 symptomatic and symptomatic); event details such as environment, transmission details; number
130 of contacts, number of secondary cases. If these data were not reported, we contacted authors
131 to request them.

132

133 **Risk of bias in included studies**

134 Two authors (XQ and AIN) independently assessed completeness of reporting and risks of bias,
135 using an adapted version of the Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Checklist for Case
136 Series (Supplementary material). Any disagreements were resolved through discussion with a
137 third author (MC).

138

139 **Data synthesis and statistical analysis**

140 The studies are summarized in text and table form, descriptive statistics were completed for key
141 outcome measures. Secondary attack rates were computed from raw data in each study, dividing

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

142 the number of infected contacts of primary cases by the total number of susceptible exposed
143 contacts. A 95% confidence interval [CI] was calculated by using the Clopper-Pearson method
144 (13, 14). Secondary attack rates are presented as a proportion along with 95% CIs in forest
145 plots, stratified according to the features of index cases: truly asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic.
146 A 95% prediction interval is shown, but a pooled estimate was suppressed due to the expected
147 high methodological and clinical heterogeneity among the studies. A prediction interval is an
148 index of dispersion, providing information on how widely the true effect size varies. It is an
149 estimate of the range of values in which a future observation will fall (15). Analyses were carried
150 out through the Comprehensive Meta-analysis (CMA) software program (Version 3, Biostat,
151 Englewood, NJ, USA) and forest plots were created by means of Excel from Office 2019
152 (Microsoft, Redmond, WA, USA).

153

154 **Results:**

155 The systematic search identified 928 potentially relevant articles and 790 records were screened
156 after removal of duplicates. Of 188 articles retrieved for full-text review and assessed for
157 eligibility, 83 studies were included in the overall systematic review, and among those we
158 identified 19 studies that indicated contact tracing of asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic index
159 cases. The remaining studies are not reported in this systematic review. The number of selected
160 papers at each step of the screening and eligibility are reported in the flow diagram (Figure 1).

161

162 Of these 19 studies that indicated contact tracing of asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic index
163 cases, after reviewing the details and contacting the authors, we re-classified three studies from
164 asymptomatic to pre-symptomatic as the index cases developed symptoms later during the
165 disease course (16-18).

166

167 **Summary of secondary attack rates of asymptomatic index cases**

168 Of the 19 studies included, contact tracing of index patients who were identified as asymptomatic
169 cases, according to our definition, was reported in nine (Table 1, Figure 1) (6, 11, 19-25). All
170 except one tested all close contacts for SARS-CoV-2, regardless of symptoms (23). Cheng et al.

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

171 only tested symptomatic cases, but they also tested high risk populations regardless of
172 symptoms including the household and hospital contacts (23). Six studies reported on household
173 contacts, two studies included hospital contacts and two studies included non-household close
174 contacts.

175

176 Three studies identified no secondary cases after following up 17, 91 and 455 close contacts of
177 asymptomatic index cases (asymptomatic secondary attack rate of 0%) (21-23). Of those, two
178 studies demonstrated higher symptomatic secondary attack rates; Cheng et al. demonstrated
179 that mild cases had a secondary attack rate of 3.8% (95% CI 1.1, 12.8%) and severe cases had
180 4% (95% CI 1.0, 15.8%) secondary attack rate (23), while Park et al. showing household
181 symptomatic secondary attack rate of 16.2% (95% CI 11.6, 22.0%) (21). In another study, 305
182 contacts of 8 asymptomatic cases were followed up, identifying one secondary case (secondary
183 attack rate 0.3% (95% CI 0.0, 1.8%) (25). In the same study, mild, moderate and severe attack
184 rates were 3.3%, 5.6% and 6.2%, respectively. Zhang et al. followed up 119 close contacts of 12
185 asymptomatic index cases and identified one secondary case, an asymptomatic secondary
186 attack rate of 0.8% (95% CI 0.0, 4.6). In the same study, the secondary attack rate was 3.5%
187 (95% CI 1.5-8.0) for those with mild, 5.7% (95% CI 2.5, 12.8%) for those with moderate, and
188 4.5% (95% CI 0.8, 21.8%) for those with severe symptoms (6). In this study, close contacts that
189 lived with an index case had 12 times the risk of infection as those who did not live with the index
190 case (RR 12.5 - 95% CI 1.6, 100.8) and those who had frequent contact with an index case-
191 patient, and those who had more than 5 contacts had 29 times the risk of infection as those with
192 fewer contacts (RR 29.0 - 95% CI 3.6, 232.3). Two studies indicated an asymptomatic secondary
193 attack rate of 1% and 1.9% (19, 20). Chaw et al. reported asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic
194 contacts together. The authors clarified that 3 asymptomatic index cases and their 106 close
195 contacts were followed up, leading to 3 secondary cases, a secondary attack rate of 2.8% (95%
196 CI 0.06, 8.0%). In this study, the overall secondary attack rate was 10.6% in the household
197 setting, which was higher for symptomatic cases (14.4%, 95% CI 8-8, 19-9%) than that of
198 asymptomatic cases and for non-household contacts 0.7 (95% CI 0.1, 1,3) (11). Zeng et al.
199 conducted the largest contact tracing study, following up 753 close contacts of asymptomatic

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

200 index cases and identified one secondary case, an asymptomatic secondary attack rate of 0.13%
201 (95% CI 0.0, 0.7%). In the same study, the secondary attack rate for all contacts was 2.0% (95%
202 CI 1.8, 2.3%) for confirmed symptomatic index cases (24).

203

204 **Summary of pre-symptomatic secondary attack rates**

205 Thirteen papers reported either outbreak investigations or contact tracing studies reporting
206 transmission from an index case during the pre-symptomatic period (11, 16, 18, 23, 26-33)
207 (Table 2). Of those, ten studies followed up 22 to 585 close contacts whose initial exposure
208 occurred before symptom onset of the index case (Figure 3). These studies reported secondary
209 attack rates ranging from 0% to 31.8%. Even in studies that followed up large numbers of
210 people, including community contacts, the majority of secondary cases identified were from the
211 same household or among friend gatherings. In these studies, having meals together, or playing
212 cards with the index case were exposure activities associated with transmission. Hong et al.
213 demonstrated lower secondary attack rates in those wearing masks (8.1% vs. 19.0%; $p < 0.001$)
214 (27). The remaining three studies exclusively reported family cluster outbreaks (26, 28, 29);
215 these investigations did not test contacts outside the household and it is challenging to truly
216 differentiate transmission during the pre-symptomatic period from symptomatic transmission in
217 the household setting (Supplementary Figure 1).

218

219 **Quality assessment**

220 All but 3 studies were contact tracing studies. All papers included a clear definition of
221 symptomatic and asymptomatic cases, number of secondary cases and number of contacts. The
222 majority of studies identified index cases with a clear diagnosis, had an acceptable case
223 definition and sufficiently followed up close contacts (for a minimum of 14 days). However, in
224 some studies the definition of close contact and setting of transmission was not provided. In
225 addition, it was unclear in four reports whether all potential close contacts were included, which
226 could result in an underestimation of the secondary attack rate. (Supplementary Table 1)

227

228 **Discussion:**

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

229 This systematic review provides comprehensive data on secondary attack rates arising from
230 people with asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. While asymptomatic
231 patients can transmit the virus to others (34), the findings from nine studies in this review found
232 secondary attack rates of zero to 2.8%, compared with secondary attack rates of 0.7% to 16.2%
233 in symptomatic cases in the same studies. These findings suggest that individuals who are
234 asymptomatic throughout the disease course are responsible for fewer secondary infections than
235 symptomatic and pre-symptomatic cases. For contacts whose exposure occurred before
236 symptom onset of the index case, transmission events were associated with living with the index
237 case or group activities such as sharing meals and playing board games.

238

239 The findings of our study raise the question about whether the low secondary attack rates from
240 asymptomatic individuals result from low infectiousness or a shorter duration of infectiousness. In
241 another living systematic review, of studies published up to 6 June 2020, we found that cases
242 with asymptomatic infection have a shorter duration of RNA shedding than symptomatic
243 individuals (35). Asymptomatic patients may therefore be contagious but for a shorter duration,
244 limiting the duration they could transmit to their contacts. However, there remain limited data on
245 the shedding of infectious virus in asymptomatic individuals to quantify their transmission
246 potential, which would be needed to inform policy on quarantine duration in the absence of
247 testing. Low likelihood of transmission from asymptomatic index cases combined with high
248 symptomatic secondary attack rates emphasises that, especially in the context of limited
249 resources, approaches should be targeted predominantly on identifying and immediately
250 isolating patients with prodromal or mild symptoms and their contacts, which may avert a
251 significant number of community transmission clusters (36). These findings are in line with
252 previous contact tracing and outbreak investigations suggesting that many SARS-CoV-2-infected
253 people either do not contribute to an onward transmission or have minimal potential to do so (37,
254 38), and a large number of cases are often caused by a small number of infected patients.
255 Clusters have become a prominent characteristic of SARS-CoV-2 which distinguishes it from
256 seasonal influenza, although a similar pattern was also observed in SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV.

257

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

258 The modelling studies suggest that it isn't possible to have epidemics of this size without
259 substantial pre-symptomatic transmission. Viral load dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 derived from
260 confirmed cases suggest that peak viral loads are detected at the start of symptom onset up to
261 day 5 of illness, suggesting highest infectiousness potential in just before or within the first few
262 days after symptom onset (35). So far several contact tracing studies emphasize that the highest
263 risk of transmission occurs during the prodromal phase or early in the disease course (39, 40).
264 For instance, in a prospective contact tracing study of 100 confirmed cases of COVID-19 and
265 2761 close contacts no secondary cases were identified when the exposure occurred more than
266 5 days after the symptom onset (23). Our findings therefore have important implications from a
267 public health perspective. In settings such as nursing homes, homeless shelters, prisons, cruise
268 ships and meat-packing plants in which many people spend prolong period of time together in
269 the same environment including sleeping, dining and sharing common facilities, and where
270 several outbreaks have been documented, pre-symptomatic transmission may contribute
271 substantially to transmission (38, 41). In these settings, when infection develops, most patients
272 are already inside the facility with high viral loads that increase the risk of onward transmission.
273 This highlights the importance of mitigation measures and surveillance in these settings to
274 identify those patients early in the disease course to prevent onward transmission inside the
275 facility.

276

277 This systematic review has several strengths. Firstly, this is a living systematic review examining
278 the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 through contact tracing and outbreak investigation studies.
279 Secondly, we only included studies with clear case definitions, which indicated the number of
280 contacts and secondary cases. The most important study limitation relates to the limitations of
281 the evidence itself. We excluded studies in which the index case was unclear, or the numbers of
282 contacts were not provided. Owing to anticipated heterogeneity, we did not produce a summary
283 estimate of the included studies. The estimates from individual studies are also subject to
284 limitations, such as imprecision resulting from small study size, and sources of bias in the
285 estimation of the true secondary attack rate.

286

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

287 We identified two systematic reviews that investigated asymptomatic transmission, with different
288 research questions and search terms. One review included studies published up to 10 June 2020
289 and identified five studies that directly compared secondary attack rates between asymptomatic
290 and symptomatic index cases; all were included in our review (7). The summary risk ratios for
291 asymptomatic versus symptomatic (0.35, 95% CI 0.10, 1.27) and pre-symptomatic versus
292 symptomatic (0.63, 95% CI 0.18, 2.26) are consistent with our findings. The second review
293 estimated only household secondary attack rates and included studies published up to 29 July
294 2020 (42). Of three studies that included asymptomatic index cases, two were included in our
295 review. We excluded one of the studies because the number of contacts of asymptomatic index
296 cases was not specified; we have not yet received details of the study after contacting the
297 authors. Advantages of our review over these two studies are inclusion of studies published in
298 Chinese, search terms that aimed to capture studies specifically estimating secondary attack
299 rates in different settings and clarification about symptomatology of index cases through direct
300 contact with the authors.

301

302 Important barriers to more accurate quantification of the contribution of asymptomatic and pre-
303 symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 transmission relate to the different definitions used to estimate the
304 asymptomatic fraction of infections, not taking into account mild or atypical symptoms, or the use
305 of estimates from cross-sectional studies without follow up (43). Therefore, in order to
306 understand the extend of asymptomatic infections and transmission, a clear and comprehensive
307 case definition, which assesses the presence or absence of a defined list of major and minor or
308 atypical symptoms is required in future studies.

309

310 In summary, whilst asymptomatic transmission is a major concern for SARS-CoV-2 community
311 spread, secondary attack rates from those who remain asymptomatic throughout their course of
312 infection are low suggesting limited infectiousness. Although it is difficult to estimate the
313 proportion of pre-symptomatic transmission, these patients are likely to be highly infectious
314 around the time of symptom onset and appear to transmit efficiently, especially within
315 households. Those with mild symptoms, who feel otherwise well, still carry large amounts of virus

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

316 in the upper respiratory tract, which might contribute to easy and rapid spread of SARS-CoV-2
317 (20). Future clinical studies should incorporate clear definitions and assess a broad range of
318 symptoms associated with COVID-19, should include longitudinal follow up of patients, and
319 calculate secondary attack rates for a wider range of settings and populations.

320

321 **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

322

323 **Funding:** No funding was received

324

325 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to thank the authors of Chau et al. (Dr Tan Le Van),
326 Mandić-Rajčević et al. (Dr Stefan Mandić-Rajčević), Chaw et al. (Dr Liling Chaw) for providing
327 further details about asymptomatic cases in their reports also Prof Stephen Gillespie for his
328 comments on the first draft of this manuscript. We would like to acknowledge Dr. Shuang Jin for
329 searching and downloading Chinese database for this review.

330

331 **Contribution statement:**

332 X Qiu: investigation, data curation, writing – original draft; A Nergiz: investigation, data curation,
333 writing – review and editing; A. E. Maraolo: methodology, formal analysis, writing – original draft;
334 I. Bogoch and N. Low: interpretation, writing – review and editing; M. Cevik: conceptualisation,
335 methodology, investigation, writing – original draft, supervision.

336

337

338 **Figure legends:**

339 **Figure 1: Flowchart describing the study design process**

340 **Figure 2: Secondary attack rates from asymptomatic index cases to their contacts**

341 **Figure 3: Secondary attack rates from pre-symptomatic index cases to their contacts**

342 **Table 1: Transmission from truly asymptomatic index cases**

	Index Cases	Environment	Number of contacts	Number of Secondary cases	Asymptomatic SAR (95% CI)	Symptomatic SAR (95% CI)
Chaw et al. * (11)	3	Household	106	3	2.8% (0.06, 8.0)	14.4% (8.8, 19.9)
		Non-household				0.7% (0.01, 1.3)
Cheng et al.(23)	9	Non-household	91	0	0% (0.0, 4.1)	Mild 3.76 (1.1-12.8) Severe 3.99 (1.0-15.8)
Gao et al.(22)	1	Household and healthcare	455	0	0% (0.0, 0.08)	
Jiang et al.(19)	3	Household	195	2	1% (0.1, 3.7)	
Luo et al. (25)	8	Household and non-household	305	1	0.33% (0.0, 1.8) OR (0.29 (0.04, 2.2))	Mild 3.3% (OR 0.48 (0.28, 0.82)) Mod 5.6% (OR 1.0) Sev 6.2% (OR 1.19 (0.7, 2.1))
Mandić-Rajčević et al.(20)	1	Healthcare	53	1	1.9% (0.0,10.0)	
Park et al.(21)	4	Household	17	0	0% (0.0, 19.5)	16.2 % (11.6–22.0)
Zeng et al. (24)		All contacts	753	1	0.13% (0.0, 0.7)	2.02% 1.8, 2.3)
Zhang et al.(6)	12	Household	119	1	0.8% (0.0, 4.6)	Mild 3.5% (1.5, 8.0) Mod 5.7% (2.5, 12.8) Severe 4.5% (0.8, 21.8)

343 Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio; SAR, secondary attack rate; sev, severe

344 * authors contacted for more details

345 Table 2: Transmission during pre-symptomatic period

	Index Cases	Environment	Number of contacts	Number of Secondary cases	Pre-symptomatic SAR (95% CI)	Secondary cases
Contract-tracing investigation						
Chaw et al.* (11)	7	Household and non-household	585	15	2.56% (1.4, 4.2)	
Cheng et al.(23)	NR	Household and non-household	299	2	0.7% (0.1, 2.4)	
Hong L et al.(27)	41	Household and non-household	197	24	12.2% (8.0, 17.6)	Friends, family, card playing partners
Huang et al.(16)	1	Friends	22	7	31.8% (13.0, 54.9)	Shared meal with index
Pang et al. (30)	1	Household and non-household	103	6	5.8% (2.2, 12.2)	Living together or sharing meal
Park et al. (21)	4	Household	11	0	0% (0.0, 2.8)	
Qian et al. (31)	1	Household and non-household	137	10	7.3% (3.6, 13.0)	Living together or sharing meal
Yang et al. (32)	2	Household and non-household	123	6	4.9% (1.8, 10.3)	All secondary cases lived together
Ye et al. (18)	1	Family	44	4	9.1% (2.5, 21.4)	Extended family
Zhao et al (33)	1	Friends	15	4	26.7% (7.8, 55.1)	Meal and Mahjong game gathering
Family outbreak investigation						
Chen M et al.(26)	1	Household	3	2	66.7% (9.4, 99.2)	Family cluster outbreak

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

Li P et al.(28)	1	Household	5	4	80% (28.4, 99.5)	Family cluster outbreak
Qian G et al. (29)	2	Household	4	3	75% (10.4, 99.4)	Family cluster outbreak

346 Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; SAR, secondary attack rate

347 * authors contacted for more details


348

349

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

350 **Figure 1. Flowchart describing inclusion and exclusion of studies at each stage of the**
 351 **review**


352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397



Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

398 **Figure 2: Secondary attack rates from asymptomatic index cases to their contacts**

399



400

401 For each study the SAR is reported with its 95% CI.

402 A prediction interval at the bottom of the forest is depicted.

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422


423

424

425

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

426 **Figure 3: Secondary attack rates from pre-symptomatic index cases to their contacts**



427

428 For each study the SAR is reported with its 95% CI.

429 A prediction interval at the bottom of the forest is depicted.

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

447 **References:**

- 448 1. Ruan L, Wen M, Zeng Q, Chen C, Huang S, Yang S, et al. New Measures for the
449 Coronavirus Disease 2019 Response: A Lesson From the Wenzhou Experience.
450 *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020.
- 451 2. Gandhi M, Yokoe DS, Havlir DV. Asymptomatic Transmission, the Achilles' Heel of
452 Current Strategies to Control Covid-19. *New England Journal of Medicine*.
453 2020;382(22):2158-60.
- 454 3. Gudbjartsson DF, Helgason A, Jonsson H, Magnusson OT, Melsted P, Norddahl GL,
455 et al. Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic Population. *N Engl J Med*. 2020.
- 456 4. Cevik M, Bamford CGG, Ho A. COVID-19 pandemic-a focused review for clinicians.
457 *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2020.
- 458 5. Wang Y, Liu Y, Liu L, Wang X, Luo N, Li L. Clinical Outcomes in 55 Patients With
459 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Who Were Asymptomatic at
460 Hospital Admission in Shenzhen, China. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2020.
- 461 6. Zhang W, Cheng W, Luo L, Ma Y, Xu C, Qin P, et al. Secondary Transmission of
462 Coronavirus Disease from Presymptomatic Persons, China. *Emerg Infect Dis*.
463 2020;26(8).
- 464 7. Buitrago-Garcia DC, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, Hossmann S, Imeri H, Ipekci AM, et
465 al. The role of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: rapid living systematic review
466 and meta-analysis. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.04.25.20079103.
- 467 8. Lavezzo E, Franchin E, Ciavarella C, Cuomo-Dannenburg G, Barzon L, Del Vecchio
468 C, et al. Suppression of COVID-19 outbreak in the municipality of Vo, Italy. *medRxiv*.
469 2020:2020.04.17.20053157.
- 470 9. Kim ES, Chin BS, Kang CK, Kim NJ, Kang YM, Choi JP, et al. Clinical Course and
471 Outcomes of Patients with Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
472 Infection: a Preliminary Report of the First 28 Patients from the Korean Cohort Study
473 on COVID-19. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*. 2020;35(13):e142.
- 474 10. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, Kimball A, James A, Jacobs JR, et al.
475 Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing
476 Facility. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020.
- 477 11. Chaw L, Koh WC, Jamaludin SA, Naing L, Alikhan MF, Wong J. SARS-CoV-2
478 transmission in different settings: Analysis of cases and close contacts from the
479 Tablighi cluster in Brunei Darussalam. 2020.
- 480 12. Elliott JH, Synnot A, Turner T, Simmonds M, Akl EA, McDonald S, et al. Living
481 systematic review: 1. Introduction—the why, what, when, and how. *Journal of*
482 *Clinical Epidemiology*. 2017;91:23-30.
- 483 13. Dean N, Pagano M. Evaluating Confidence Interval Methods for Binomial Proportions
484 in Clustered Surveys. *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology*. 2015;3(4):484-
485 503.
- 486 14. Brown LD, Cai TT, DasGupta A. Interval Estimation for a Binomial Proportion.
487 *Statistical Science*. 2001;16(2):101-17.
- 488 15. Int'Hout J, Ioannidis JPA, Rovers MM, Goeman JJ. Plea for routinely presenting
489 prediction intervals in meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(7):e010247.
- 490 16. Huang L, Zhang X, Zhang X, Wei Z, Zhang L, Xu J, et al. Rapid asymptomatic
491 transmission of COVID-19 during the incubation period demonstrating strong
492 infectivity in a cluster of youngsters aged 16-23 years outside Wuhan and
493 characteristics of young patients with COVID-19: A prospective contact-tracing study.
494 *Journal of Infection*. 2020;80(6):e1-e13.
- 495 17. Li C, Ji F, Wang L, Wang L, Hao J, Dai M, et al. Asymptomatic and Human-to-
496 Human Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in a 2-Family Cluster, Xuzhou, China.
497 *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2020;26(7):31.
- 498 18. Ye F, Xu S, Rong Z, Xu R, Liu X, Deng P, et al. Delivery of infection from
499 asymptomatic carriers of COVID-19 in a familial cluster. *International Journal of*
500 *Infectious Diseases*. 2020;94:133-8.

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

- 501 19. Jiang XL, Zhang XL, Zhao XN, Li CB, Lei J, Kou ZQ, et al. Transmission potential of
502 asymptomatic and paucisymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: a three-family cluster
503 study in China. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2020;22:22.
- 504 20. Mandic-Rajcevic S, Masci F, Crespi E, Franchetti S, Longo A, Bollina I, et al. Contact
505 tracing and isolation of asymptomatic spreaders to successfully control the COVID-
506 19 epidemic among healthcare workers in Milan (Italy). 2020.
- 507 21. Park SY, Kim YM, Yi S, Lee S, Na BJ, Kim CB, et al. Coronavirus Disease Outbreak
508 in Call Center, South Korea. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2020;26(8):23.
- 509 22. Gao M, Yang L, Chen X, Deng Y, Yang S, Xu H, et al. A study on infectivity of
510 asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 carriers. *Respiratory medicine*. 2020:106026-.
- 511 23. Cheng H-Y, Jian S-W, Liu D-P, Ng T-C, Huang W-T, Lin H-H, et al. Contact Tracing
512 Assessment of COVID-19 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different
513 Exposure Periods Before and After Symptom Onset. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2020.
- 514 24. 曾晶, 邱乐平, 邹晏, 张光霞, 吴先萍, 胥馨尹, et al. [Zeng et
515 al]四川省新型冠状病毒肺炎密切接触者分析. *中国公共卫生*. 2020;36(04):503-6.
- 516 25. Luo L, Liu D, Liao X, Wu X, Jing Q, Zheng J, et al. Contact Settings and Risk for
517 Transmission in 3410 Close Contacts of Patients With COVID-19 in Guangzhou,
518 China. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2020.
- 519 26. Chen M, Fan P, Liu Z, Pan R, Huang S, Li J, et al. A SARS-CoV-2 familial cluster
520 infection reveals asymptomatic transmission to children. *Journal of Infection and
521 Public Health*. 2020;13(6):883-6.
- 522 27. Hong LX, Lin A, He ZB, Zhao HH, Zhang JG, Zhang C, et al. Mask wearing in pre-
523 symptomatic patients prevents SARS-CoV-2 transmission: An epidemiological
524 analysis. *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease*. 2020;36 (no pagination):101803.
- 525 28. Li P, Fu JB, Li KF, Liu JN, Wang HL, Liu LJ, et al. Transmission of COVID-19 in the
526 terminal stages of the incubation period: A familial cluster. *International Journal of
527 Infectious Diseases*. 2020;96:452-3.
- 528 29. Qian G, Yang N, Ma AHY, Wang L, Li G, Chen X, et al. A COVID-19 Transmission
529 within a family cluster by presymptomatic infectors in China. *Clinical infectious
530 diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*. 2020.
- 531 30. 庞秋艳, 李朋, 李天忠, 李化 . [1]一起高速服务区新型冠状病毒肺炎聚集性疫情调查.
532 *安徽预防医学杂志*. 2020;26(02):130-2.
- 533 31. 钱丽珍, 郑志强, 洪万胜, 孙芳红, 吴方楠, 金瑞盈.
534 [2]瑞安市一起新型冠状病毒肺炎聚集性疫情调查. *预防医学*. 2020;32(05):486-8+91.
- 535 32. 阳雅兰, 李林洪, 李长凤, 肖玉春, 彭君.
536 [3]重庆市一起新型冠状病毒肺炎家庭聚集性疫情调查分析. *中国公共卫生*.
537 2020;36(03):285-8.
- 538 33. Zhao H, Li BS, Xia Y, Zhou HL, Li TR, Zeng Y, et al. Investigation of transmission
539 chain of a cluster COVID-19 cases. *Chung-Hua Liu Hsing Ping Hsueh Tsa Chih
540 Chinese Journal of Epidemiology*. 2020;41(0):E064.
- 541 34. Chau NVV, Thanh Lam V, Thanh Dung N, Yen LM, Minh NNQ, Hung LM, et al. The
542 natural history and transmission potential of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection.
543 *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020.
- 544 35. Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-
545 1 and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding and infectiousness:
546 a living systematic review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.07.25.20162107.
- 547 36. Peak CM, Kahn R, Grad YH, Childs LM, Li R, Lipsitch M, et al. Individual quarantine
548 versus active monitoring of contacts for the mitigation of COVID-19: a modelling
549 study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

- 550 37. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, Ye C, Zou X, Zhang Z, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of
551 COVID-19 in 391 cases and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a
552 retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
553 38. Dillon Adam PW, Jessica Wong et al. Clustering and superspreading potential of
554 severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infections in Hong
555 Kong
556 . PREPRINT (Version 1) available at Research Square 2020.
557 39. Wang Y, Tian H, Zhang L, Zhang M, Guo D, Wu W, et al. Reduction of secondary
558 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in households by face mask use, disinfection and
559 social distancing: a cohort study in Beijing, China. *BMJ Global Health*.
560 2020;5(5):e002794.
561 40. Böhmer MM, Buchholz U, Corman VM, Hoch M, Katz K, Marosevic DV, et al.
562 Investigation of a COVID-19 outbreak in Germany resulting from a single travel-
563 associated primary case: a case series. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
564 41. Leclerc QJ FN, Knight LE. What settings have been linked to SARS-CoV-2
565 transmission clusters? [version 1; peer review: 1 approved with reservations].
566 *Wellcome Open Res* 2020;5:83
567 42. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household transmission of
568 SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review and meta-analysis of secondary attack rate.
569 *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.07.29.20164590.
570 43. Meyerowitz E, Richterman, A., Bogoch, I., Low, N., Cevik, M. Towards an Accurate
571 and Systematic Characterization of Persistently Asymptomatic Infection with SARS-
572 CoV-2
573 . SSRN Electronic Journal. 2020.
574