

# 1 *High household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the United States: living density,* 2 *viral load, and disproportionate impact on communities of color*

3 *Carla Cerami<sup>1</sup>, Tyler Rapp<sup>2</sup>, Feng-Chang Lin<sup>3</sup>, Kathleen Tompkins<sup>2</sup>, Christopher Basham<sup>2</sup>, Meredith S. Muller<sup>2</sup>,*  
4 *Maureen Whittelsey<sup>2</sup>, Haoming Zhang<sup>3</sup>, Srijana B. Chhetri<sup>2</sup>, Judy Smith<sup>2</sup>, Christy Litel<sup>2</sup>, Kelly Lin<sup>2</sup>, Mehal Churiwal<sup>2</sup>,*  
5 *Salman Khan<sup>4</sup>, Faith Claman<sup>2</sup>, Rebecca Rubinstein<sup>3</sup>, Katie Mollan<sup>3</sup>, David Wohl<sup>2</sup>, Lakshmanane Premkumar<sup>4</sup>,*  
6 *Jonathan J. Juliano<sup>2</sup>, Jessica T. Lin<sup>2\*</sup>*

7 **1** Medical Research Council Unit The Gambia at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, The Gambia.

8 **2** Institute of Global Health and Infectious Diseases, University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, NC USA

9 **3** Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC USA

10 **4** Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, NC USA

11 \*Corresponding author

12 **Short title:** High household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the United States

## 13 **ABSTRACT**

14 **Background** Few prospective studies of SARS-CoV-2 transmission within households have been reported from the  
15 United States, where COVID-19 cases are the highest in the world and the pandemic has had disproportionate  
16 impact on communities of color.

17 **Methods and Findings** This is a prospective observational study. Between April-October 2020, the UNC CO-HOST  
18 study enrolled 102 COVID-positive persons and 213 of their household members across the Piedmont region of  
19 North Carolina, including 45% who identified as Hispanic/Latinx or non-white. Households were enrolled a median  
20 of 6 days from onset of symptoms in the index case. Secondary cases within the household were detected either by  
21 PCR of a nasopharyngeal (NP) swab on study day 1 and weekly nasal swabs (days 7, 14, 21) thereafter, or based on  
22 seroconversion by day 28. After excluding household contacts exposed at the same time as the index case, the  
23 secondary attack rate (SAR) among susceptible household contacts was 60% (106/176, 95% CI 53%-67%). The  
24 majority of secondary cases were already infected at study enrollment (73/106), while 33 were observed during  
25 study follow-up. Despite the potential for continuous exposure and sequential transmission over time, 93% (84/90,  
26 95% CI 86%-97%) of PCR-positive secondary cases were detected within 14 days of symptom onset in the index  
27 case, while 83% were detected within 10 days. Index cases with high NP viral load ( $>10^6$  viral copies/ul) at  
28 enrollment were more likely to transmit virus to household contacts during the study (OR 4.9, 95% CI 1.3-18  
29  $p=0.02$ ). Furthermore, NP viral load was correlated within families (ICC=0.44, 95% CI 0.26-0.60), meaning persons in  
30 the same household were more likely to have similar viral loads, suggesting an inoculum effect. High household  
31 living density was associated with a higher risk of secondary household transmission (OR 5.8, 95% CI 1.3-55) for  
32 households with  $>3$  persons occupying  $<6$  rooms (SAR=91%, 95% CI 71-98%). Index cases who self-identified as  
33 Hispanic/Latinx or non-white were more likely to experience a high living density and transmit virus to a household  
34 member, translating into an SAR in minority households of 70%, versus 52% in white households ( $p=0.05$ ).

35 **Conclusions** SARS-CoV-2 transmits early and often among household members. Risk for spread and subsequent  
36 disease is elevated in high-inoculum households with limited living space. Very high infection rates due to  
37 household crowding likely contribute to the increased incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection and morbidity observed  
38 among racial and ethnic minorities in the US. Quarantine for 14 days from symptom onset of the first case in the  
39 household is appropriate to prevent onward transmission from the household. Ultimately, primary prevention  
40 through equitable distribution of effective vaccines is of paramount importance.

## 41 **AUTHORS SUMMARY**

### 42 **Why was this study done?**

- 43 ● Understanding the secondary attack rate and the timing of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 within households is  
44 important to determine the role of household transmission in the larger pandemic and to guide public  
45 health policies about quarantine.
- 46 ● Prospective studies looking at the determinants of household transmission are sparse, particularly studies  
47 including substantial racial and ethnic minorities in the United States and studies with adequate follow-up  
48 to detect sequential transmission events.
- 49 ● Identifying individuals at high risk of transmitting and acquiring SARS-CoV-2 will inform strategies for  
50 reducing transmission in the household, or reducing disease in those exposed.

### 51 **What did the researchers do and find?**

- 52 ● Between April-November 2020, the UNC CO-HOST study enrolled 102 households across the Piedmont  
53 region of North Carolina, including 45% with an index case who identified as racial or ethnic minorities.
- 54 ● Overall secondary attack rate was 60% with two-thirds of cases already infected at study enrollment.
- 55 ● Despite the potential for sequential transmission in the household, the majority of secondary cases were  
56 detected within 10 days of symptom onset of the index case.
- 57 ● Viral loads were correlated within families, suggesting an inoculum effect.
- 58 ● High viral load in the index case was associated with a greater likelihood of household transmission.
- 59 ● Spouses/partners of the COVID-positive index case and household members with obesity were at higher risk  
60 of becoming infected.
- 61 ● High household living density contributed to an increased risk of household transmission.
- 62 ● Racial/ethnic minorities had an increased risk of acquiring SARS-CoV-2 in their households in comparison to  
63 members of the majority (white) racial group.

### 64 **What do these findings mean?**

- 65 ● Household transmission often occurs quickly after a household member is infected.
- 66 ● High viral load increases the risk of transmission.
- 67 ● High viral load cases cluster within households - suggesting high viral inoculum in the index case may put  
68 the whole household at risk for more severe disease.
- 69 ● Increased household density may promote transmission within racial and ethnic minority households.
- 70 ● Early at-home point-of-care testing, and ultimately vaccination, is necessary to effectively decrease  
71 household transmission.

## 72 INTRODUCTION

73 Since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, households have been a well-recognized setting for SARS-CoV-2  
74 transmission. Proximity and ventilation, important determinants of person-to-person transmission [1], are difficult  
75 to control in shared living spaces. For those infected and isolating at home, following guidelines to sleep in a  
76 separate bedroom, use a separate bathroom, use masks, and not share items such as dishes, towels, and bedding  
77 [2] may be difficult in families with young children and/or small living spaces; especially once more than one  
78 household member is infected. Furthermore, since infectiousness and viral transmission peaks just before the onset  
79 of symptoms [3–5], household spread can occur before anyone is aware of a potential infection, as most Americans  
80 do not wear masks at home or in what they define as their family bubble.

81 Secondary household attack rates reported from China and other Asian countries early in the pandemic ranged  
82 from 10-15% [6]. This relatively low attack rate is at odds with anecdotal experience in the United States, where the  
83 virus has spread unchecked. While several meta-analyses have evaluated household transmission rates, all have  
84 incorporated both retrospective and prospective analyses. Prospective testing of household contacts regardless of  
85 symptoms status is required to estimate the true secondary attack rate (SAR). Yet only two such studies in the US  
86 have been reported. These two studies, following a total of 159 households in Utah, Wisconsin, and Tennessee,  
87 have started to paint a picture of much higher SARs in US households (29 and 53%) [7,8]. Yet, representation of  
88 racial and ethnic diversity was limited (around 25% of households), and testing was limited to 7 and 14 days of  
89 follow-up, which may not capture secondary cases that result from sequential transmission within households.  
90 Given the disproportionate impact of the COVID-19 epidemic on communities of color, measuring secondary  
91 household attack rates in vulnerable communities is important for shaping preventive and testing strategies,  
92 modeling spread, targeting high-risk populations, and assessing the length of time households should quarantine.

93 The UNC CO-HOST (COVID-19 Household Transmission Study) is the largest single-site observational household  
94 cohort in the US thus far and the most ethnically and racially diverse. Covering both suburban and rural areas of  
95 North Carolina, the study recruited from a testing center providing results within 24-hours that allowed for timely  
96 recruitment. Weekly sampling for quantitative viral loads combined with antibody testing at one month provided an  
97 extended period to evaluate transmission relative to other studies. During the time of this study, April to November  
98 2020, the spike protein D614G variant was already fully penetrant in North Carolina [9]. The specific objective of  
99 this study was to measure the secondary attack rate in a setting where infected individuals were asked to  
100 quarantine at home and given standard guidance. Household and individual demographics as well as daily  
101 symptoms and weekly viral loads were collected to identify risk factors and timing of household transmission.

## 102 **METHODS**

### 103 **Study Design**

104 The CO-HOST Study evaluated SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the household of individuals who tested positive and  
105 quarantined at home. Here we describe the pre-planned primary analysis of the secondary attack rate and risk  
106 factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the household setting in the southern United States. Study  
107 follow-up started in April 2020 and ended in November 2020.

### 108 **Ethics, standards and informed consent**

109 The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of North Carolina and is registered at  
110 [clinicaltrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) (NCT04445233). All participants (or their parents/guardians) gave written, informed consent.  
111 Minors over the ages of 7 provided assent.

### 112 **Role of the Funding source**

113 None

### 114 **Study setting**

115 Index cases were recruited after testing at the Respiratory Diagnostic Center at the University of North Carolina  
116 School of Medicine [10]. Participants were visited between 3-4 times at their private homes using a mobile unit van  
117 and returned to the Respiratory Diagnostic Center for the final study visit.

### 118 **Recruitment, screening and enrollment**

119 Inclusion criteria for the index cases included any patient 18 years of age or older with a positive qualitative  
120 nasopharyngeal (NP) swab for SARS-CoV-2 obtained at UNC Hospitals, willingness to self-isolate at home for a  
121 14-day period, willingness to participate in all required study activities for the entire 28-day duration of the study,  
122 living with at least one household contact who was also willing to consent to study follow-up, and living within  
123 reasonable driving distance (<1 hour) suitable for home visits by the study team. Inclusion criteria for household  
124 contacts of index patients included age greater than 1 year, and currently living in the same home as the index case  
125 without plans to leave to live elsewhere through the end of the 28-day study.

126 Pre-screening was conducted by telephone when qualifying results of the NP swab were available. During the  
127 telephone pre-screening, exclusion criteria were reviewed with the patient and the study procedures were  
128 reviewed with potential study participants.

129 The overall study design is depicted in **Figure S1**. After consenting, all participants were visited at their homes on  
130 Day 1 by a mobile clinical team. NP and nasal mid-turbinate (NMT) swabs were collected for analysis by PCR for  
131 SARS-CoV-2 and blood samples were collected for serology by both a rapid antibody test and an enzyme-linked  
132 immunosorbent assay (ELISA). Index cases and household contacts completed baseline questionnaires that included  
133 basic demographic and household information, abbreviated medical history, symptoms, recent travel history, and  
134 exposure to confirmed COVID-positive cases. All participants received instruction on how to perform a self-collected  
135 NMT swab. For nasal sampling, participants were instructed to insert the swab about 1-2 inches into one nostril,  
136 then swirl 5-8 times while slowly withdrawing the swab and placing it into the collection tube. In the case of  
137 participants under 7 years of age, parents or guardians were instructed how to perform the swabbing for their  
138 children.

139 All participants received a daily symptom questionnaire via email. Index cases and COVID-positive household

140 contacts received the questionnaire daily until no symptoms were reported for two consecutive days. Other  
141 household contacts received the questionnaire daily for 21 days to monitor for symptoms that might indicate new  
142 COVID-19 infection.

143 On Days 7, 14 and 21, a study staff member conducted home visits for sample collection pickup. The staff member  
144 left a nasal swab on the doorstep for each participant and waited outside until everyone had completed the nasal  
145 swabs. At the final study visit on Day 28 participants were asked about COVID-related care-seeking and testing and  
146 underwent venipuncture for analysis of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies by a rapid antibody test and by ELISA.

147 All samples collected during the study were placed into a cooler on ice immediately after collection and transported  
148 to a BSL2+ laboratory within 2 hours. If a study participant was hospitalized or left the household for other reasons,  
149 they were still followed until Day 28 to record outcomes, but sample collection was suspended.

## 150 **Laboratory analyses**

### 151 **qRT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 viral quantification**

152 Nasopharyngeal and nasal swab samples were tested using a CDC RT-qPCR protocol authorized for emergency use  
153 that consists of three unique assays: two targeting regions of the virus' nucleocapsid gene (N1, N2) and one  
154 targeting human RNase P gene (RP) (Catalog # 2019-nCoV-EUA-01, Integrated DNA Technologies) [11]. Details of  
155 assay implementation and calculation of the limit of detection are described elsewhere [12]. Briefly, samples were  
156 designated positive if all three PCRs were positive (N1 and N2 for virus, RP for adequate sampling). The viral load of  
157 each sample, in copies/uL, was extrapolated from standard curves generated for each viral assay (N1 and N2) using  
158 serial dilutions of the nCoVPC plasmid control (2 to 100,000 viral RNA copies/uL). The average copies/uL between  
159 the N1 and N2 assays was used as the final quantitative viral load. Probit analysis yielded a limit of detection  
160 (LOD) for the N1 and N2 assays of 9 and 13 copies/uL, respectively. Thus, the average LOD between the two  
161 assays, 11 copies/uL, was used as the cutoff for sample positivity. Based on the sample collection and RNA  
162 extraction volumes as well as volume of template RNA used in the RT-qPCR (5uL), the reported viral load represents  
163 the number of viral RNA copies per 5 uL of VTM or Shield sample.

### 164 **Serology:**

#### 165 **Rapid Test**

166 The BioMedomics COVID-19 IgM/IgG Rapid Test is a point-of-care lateral flow immunoassay (LFIA) [13,14] that has  
167 been validated as a research tool [15]. Approximately 20 microliters of finger prick blood was obtained via a  
168 capillary sampler and dispensed on the sample port of the device. Two to three drops of buffer/developer solution  
169 were applied and results were read after 10 minutes by trained study staff. Positive, weak positive, and negative  
170 bands for IgM and IgG were recorded and a photograph was stored. A second reader reviewed the photographs  
171 blinded to the field results and consensus was reached on discrepant readings.

#### 172 **Immunoassay to detect antibodies against the receptor binding domain (RBD) of the spike protein**

173 Plasma samples were heat inactivated at 56°C for 30 minutes, then total Ig binding to the receptor binding domain  
174 (RBD) of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein was measured using a previously described enzyme-linked immunosorbent  
175 (ELISA) assay [16,17]. Briefly, biotinylated recombinant antigen produced in mammalian cells consisting of SARS-2 Spike  
176 RBD is captured on a 96-well ELISA plate coated with streptavidin. The serum sample at 1:40 dilution is incubated with  
177 the RBD-captured wells, and bound antigen detected using HRP conjugated anti-goat total (IgG, IgM and IgA) antibody on

178 a microplate reader. This in-house ELISA was previously evaluated on a large panel of well characterized samples and  
179 shown to have high sensitivity and specificity for detecting SARS-CoV-2 infection [16,17].

### 180 **D614G genotyping**

181 A real-time PCR assay targeting a 107 bp region encompassing the D614G mutation in the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein  
182 receptor binding domain associated with increased viral load [18] was designed to evaluate the prevalence of 614G  
183 mutants in our study cohort. 5ul of RNA was reverse transcribed using the Invitrogen SuperScript III First-Strand  
184 Synthesis System for RT-PCR kit (Thermofisher Scientific). 2.5ul cDNA was then placed in 22.5uL of qPCR master mix  
185 with Roche FastStart Universal Probe Master (ROX) along with primers and probes listed in **Table S1**. Positive control  
186 plasmids for mutant (MT) and wild-type (WT) sequences were synthesized by Genewiz (inserts listed in **Table S1**)  
187 and used to set the appropriate Ct threshold for positivity in each run. Samples were considered WT if detected  
188 only by WT probe; MT if detected only by MT probe or if detected by both MT and WT probes with MT Ct >3 cycles  
189 lower than WT Ct; or mixed (containing both WT and MT virus) if detected by both with Ct difference of <3 cycles.

### 190 **Sample size determination**

191 This is a prospective observational study. The planned target enrollment was 200 households. The study was  
192 stopped prior to reaching this target due to funding considerations.

### 193 **Study objectives and outcomes**

194 The primary objective was to evaluate the secondary household attack rate among household members of persons  
195 quarantined in their home after testing positive for SARS-CoV-2.

196 The primary study endpoint was SARS-CoV-2 infection in the household contacts as determined by real-time PCR of  
197 nasopharyngeal or nasal swabs for SARS-CoV-2 at any of the timepoints or evidence of seroconversion during the  
198 study based on anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing.

199 A secondary objective was to assess individual and household risk factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 transmission  
200 in the household.

### 201 **Data entry, handling, storage and security**

202 After giving written consent, the participants were given a study identification number, which was used in all future  
203 datasets for participant anonymity. Collected data were entered in real-time using electronic Case Report Forms  
204 (eCRF) developed on a REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) database. Any data collected on paper format  
205 was entered by a study staff member and then checked by the study coordinator. Daily symptom diaries were  
206 entered directly into the REDCap database by the participants and were checked by study staff for completion and  
207 inconsistencies. Laboratory related data were extracted directly from laboratory equipment and uploaded to the  
208 database. The study was conducted in compliance with Good Clinical Practice.

### 209 **Statistical analysis**

210 For each household, if multiple participants were SARS-CoV-2 positive at enrollment, we defined the index case as  
211 the person with the earliest onset of infection based on onset of symptoms and known date(s) of PCR test  
212 positivity. If this was ambiguous and to prevent bias, then baseline antibody positivity was also used as evidence of  
213 less recent infection. This resulted in index case reassignments in 11 households. Any study participant with  
214 evidence of prior infection (antibody-positive with negative PCR) at enrollment was excluded from the analysis  
215 (n=4).

216 We summarized demographic characteristics and underlying conditions of index cases and household contacts, as  
217 well as their household demographics. Baseline characteristics that are continuous variables were dichotomized  
218 (e.g. age, BMI) per standard conventions.

219 The secondary attack rate (SAR) among household contacts was calculated as the proportion of susceptible  
220 household contacts with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection during the 28-day follow-up period. Household  
221 contacts who were COVID-positive at enrollment and reported the same COVID exposure outside the household as  
222 the index case were not considered in the at-risk population as susceptible contacts. As per above, secondary cases  
223 were defined as the remaining susceptible household contacts found positive for SARS-CoV-2 by PCR testing or with  
224 evidence of seroconversion during the study. Household contacts were excluded from the SAR analysis if they  
225 missed all follow-up study visits (n=6) or were symptomatic with negative PCR testing but missing antibody data at  
226 day 28 (n=1). Among those included in the analysis, the rate of missing data was low (<5%); thus, we did not impute  
227 missing data. A 95% CI for the SAR was constructed using the Wilson method for a single proportion. A logistic  
228 regression model with a random intercept to account for within-household variation was used to calculate the  
229 race/ethnicity-specific SAR.

230 In the primary SAR analysis, all secondary cases were presumed due to household transmission (not  
231 community-acquired). Sensitivity analyses were performed excluding secondary cases already infected at baseline  
232 or excluding secondary cases identified at day 14 or later that may have been acquired outside the household. The  
233 SAR for households was calculated as the proportion of households with at least one secondary case identified in  
234 the household during the 28-day follow-up.

235 We estimated the serial interval (in days) of symptom onset between sequential SARS-CoV-2 infections in the  
236 household, as well as the number of days between symptom onset of the index case and PCR positivity of  
237 secondary cases in the household.

238 We determined whether nasopharyngeal SARS-CoV-2 viral loads were correlated within households (whether  
239 persons in the same household were more likely to have similar NP viral loads) by the intraclass correlation  
240 coefficient (ICC), which compares within versus between households variation of baseline NP viral loads. For those  
241 participants who did not complete an NP swab on study day 1, we used a transformed NMT viral load to impute the  
242 missing NP value. The transformation formula was derived from a linear regression equation generated from >100  
243 study participants with positive viral load from both NP and NMT swabs on study day 1 [12]. To determine whether  
244 NP viral load in index cases was associated with secondary cases in the same household, we dichotomized the NP  
245 viral load with a cutoff of  $1 \times 10^6$  viral copies/ul and compared the proportion of transmission events.


246 Finally, we examined other potential risk factors for secondary transmissions within the household, including  
247 characteristics of index cases, household contacts, and their household environment. We presented the odds ratio  
248 (OR) and corresponding 95% CI for potential risk factors using logistic regression with a random intercept to account  
249 for within-household correlation. Household contacts were excluded from the risk factors analysis if they missed all  
250 follow-up study visits (n=3) unless they were already found to be infected at enrollment (n=3). To address potential  
251 misclassification, we excluded household contacts with negative PCR testing but missing antibody testing at day 28  
252 (n=3).

253 Statistical analysis and preparation of figures were conducted using R 4.0.2 (R Core Team, Vienna, Austria),  
254 GraphPad Prism (GraphPad Software INC, CA 92037, USA), and ArcGIS (Esri, Redlands, California). All hypothesis  
255 tests were two-sided at a significance level of 0.05 with no adjustment for multiplicity.

256 **RESULTS**

257 **Household enrollment**  
258 **and demographics**

259 Between April 29 -  
260 October 16, 2020, the  
261 UNC CO-HOST study  
262 recruited and enrolled  
263 102 households all of  
264 whom had at least one  
265 member with laboratory  
266 confirmed SARS-CoV-2  
267 infection. Two  
268 households were  
269 excluded from analysis  
270 because all household  
271 contacts either had  
272 evidence of prior  
273 infection at baseline  
274 (antibody-positive with  
275 negative PCR test) or did



276 not complete the baseline questionnaire. The remaining 100 households (median size = 3.5 persons) were enrolled  
277 a median of 6 (IQR 4-7) days after symptom onset of the designated index case. These households spanned 34 zip  
278 codes across the North Carolina Piedmont Region, North Carolina, USA (**Figure 1**).

279 Among the 100 participating households, the index case was reassigned in 11 households. Four household contacts  
280 were antibody-positive but PCR-negative at enrollment (indicating prior infection) and thus excluded from analysis.  
281 One household contact without antibody data at either day 1 or day 28 was also excluded. Baseline characteristics  
282 for the remaining 100 index cases and 204 household contacts (HCs) enrolled in the study are shown in **Table 1**.  
283 Among the 100 index cases, 48 were male, 52 were female, 92 were over 18 years of age and 42 reported  
284 non-white race-ethnicity. The index cases had a median viral load of 148,992 copies/ul (IQR 757-2,423,155  
285 copies/ul) at the first study visit on nasopharyngeal (NP) swab. Among the 204 household contacts, 48% were male,  
286 52% were female, 66% were over 18 years of age and 47% reported non-white race-ethnicity. Both the index cases  
287 and HCs had a similar percentage of adult participants with a Body Mass Index (BMI) over 30 kg/m<sup>2</sup>: 38% of index  
288 cases and 32% of household contacts, consistent with the prevalence of obesity in North Carolina (34%)[19]. A  
289 significant number of adult index cases (24%) and household contacts (19%) had both obesity and one other  
290 co-morbidity. Further description of the underlying conditions is shown in **Table S2**. Three index cases and three  
291 household contacts (all from different households) also enrolled in a treatment study in which they were  
292 randomized to receive either the oral drug EIDD-2801 (molnupiravir) or placebo (NCT04405570).

293 Household demographics are shown in **Table S3**. 27% of participating households were limited to two members,  
294 while 28% of households had 5 or more members. 63% were owner occupied single family homes and 42% lived in  
295 homes greater than 2,000 square feet. Households with a non-white index case were larger (median household size  
296 4 versus 3, p=0.02) and also more likely to live in a home <2,000 square feet (76% versus 43%, p=0.003) compared  
297 to households with a white index case. This led to a higher “living density” for non-white households: 41% had >3

298 household members living in a home with fewer than 6 rooms, compared to 10% of white households ( $p < 0.001$ ). In  
 299 44% of households, at least one household member declined to be enrolled in the study.

**Table 1. Demographics of study participants**

INDIVIDUALS	Index (n)	Index (%)	HC (n)	HC (%)
	100	%	204	%
Male	48	48.0	98	48.0
Female	52	52.0	106	52.0
<b>Race</b>				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	1.0	1	0.5
Asian	2	2.0	3	1.5
Black or African American	11	10.0	18	8.8
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0	0.0
White	58	58.0	108	52.9
Other Race	27	28.0	65	31.9
Unknown	1	1.0	9	4.4
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Hispanic/Latinx	28	28.0	70	34.3
Non-Hispanic/Non-Latinx	72	72.0	132	64.7
<b>Language</b>				
Spanish speaking (yes)	15	15.0	33	16.2
Spanish speaking (no)	85	85.0	170	83.3
<b>Age</b>				
0-12y	2	2.0	46	22.5
13-17y	6	6.0	24	11.8
18-24y	21	21.0	25	12.3
25-49y	48	48.0	67	32.8
50-64y	19	19.0	30	14.7
>65y	4	4.0	12	5.9
<b>Education (excluding &lt;18y)</b>				
<i>Total Responses for Adults &gt;18y</i>	88	%	130	%
High school or lower	40	46.0	63	48.5
College degree	25	28.7	38	29.2
Graduate degree	23	26.4	29	22.3
<b>Occupation (excluding &lt;18y)</b>				
<i>Total Responses for Adults &gt;18y</i>	92	%	134	%
Education	4	4.3	6	4.5
Healthcare worker	13	14.1	12	9.0
Retail/hospitality/other frontline worker	26	28.3	35	26.1
Student	7	7.6	12	9.0
White collar worker	21	22.8	33	24.6
Other (trade and arts)	7	7.6	6	4.5
Not working outside the home	14	15.2	30	22.4
<b>Co-Morbidities (excluding &lt;18y)</b>				
Diabetes	6	6.5	12	9.0
High blood pressure	16	17.4	30	22.4
BMI >30	35	38.0	43	32.1
BMI 25-29.9	24	26.1	37	27.6
BMI >30 and one or more co-morbidity				
Adults >18y (n = 92 index, 134 HC)	22	23.9	25	18.7
Adults >50y (n = 23 index, 42 HC)	8	34.8	12	28.6

300 **Secondary attack rate among household contacts**


301 The overall secondary attack rate (SAR) among susceptible household contacts was 60% (106/176, 95% CI 53%-67%)  
 302 (**Figure 2**). Of 100 households with 304 study participants (100 index cases and 204 HCs) included in the analysis,  
 303 99 households completed one month follow-up. One household of 6 withdrew shortly after enrollment. No  
 304 households were lost to follow-up. Twenty-two of the household contacts tested positive at baseline for  
 305 SARS-CoV-2, but were judged to have had the same environmental exposure to SARS-CoV-2 as the index cases (for  
 306 example, both attended a cookout or other gathering where multiple individuals later tested COVID-positive). These

307 contacts were considered to have a common exposure with the index case and were excluded from the  
 308 transmission analysis, leaving 176 susceptible HCs.

309 Secondary transmission cases were defined as household members who either tested positive for SARS-CoV-2  
 310 either by PCR or had evidence of seroconversion by day 28. Among the 176 susceptible household contacts, 73  
 311 were positive for SARS-CoV-2 at baseline (plus 3 that dropped out) and were classified as secondary cases. 33  
 312 additional secondary cases were observed during the study follow-up. Thus, 42% of HCs were already infected at  
 313 the time of study enrollment, while the cumulative SAR was 60% (106/176, 95% CI 53%-67%). Among those  
 314 infected at enrollment, 90% (64/71) reported having symptoms within the previous week, with a median duration  
 315 of 5 days of symptoms at the time of enrollment.


316 Of the 33 secondary transmission cases that were observed during the study, 25 were identified by PCR testing and  
 317 8 were detected only because they seroconverted and were antibody positive at the day 28 visit. The majority  
 318 (n=21) occurred in the first week after enrollment. Of the 5 cases detected by PCR after the first week of  
 319 enrollment, 4 occurred in households of 5 or more, including 2 from the same household. Of the 33 secondary  
 320 cases among household contacts who became infected with SARS-CoV-2 during the study, 27 (82%) experienced  
 321 symptoms while 6 (18%) remained asymptomatic.

322 If restricting the SAR to a more conservative definition of only those secondary cases that were observed during the  
 323 study (i.e. those who tested negative at baseline), the observed SAR was 32% (33/103). If removing late secondary  
 324 cases that were identified at study day 14 or later, considering that these may have been acquired via later  
 325 community exposure rather than household transmission, the early SAR ranged between 53-57% (depending on  
 326 how the 7 cases identified only by antibody-positivity are distributed).



**Figure 2. Secondary attack rate (SAR) among susceptible household contacts.** Of 100 households included in the analysis, 99 completed one month follow-up. One household of 6 withdrew (3 infected at baseline). Among 182 susceptible household contacts, 42% (76/182) were already infected at the time of study enrollment and 33 additional secondary cases were observed during follow-up, resulting in an overall SAR of 60% (106/176, 95% CI 53%-67%).

327 At the household level, assessing whether any secondary cases occurred within the household, SAR was even  
 328 higher and skewed towards early transmission (**Figure 3**). Fifty three percent of susceptible households (49/92)  
 329 contained at least one infected household member at enrollment besides the primary index case, rising to 70%  
 330 (64/92) of households containing secondary cases one month later.



**Figure 3. Secondary household attack rate.** Of 92 households included in the analysis, 53% (49/92) contained infected household contacts at enrollment, with 15 more households sustaining transmission over the next 21 days, resulting in a secondary household attack rate of 70% (64/92).

### 331 Timing of secondary cases within the household

332 The serial interval for secondary cases in the household, based on onset of symptoms was a median of 3 days (IQR  
 333 1-6 days) after symptom onset in the index case and 2 days (IQR 1-4 days) from the most recent symptomatic case  
 334 in the household. Because over two-thirds of secondary household cases (73/106 or 69%) were already infected at  
 335 enrollment and 28% of households had multiple secondary cases, we regard these as imprecise estimates.



336 However, understanding when secondary cases became PCR-positive in relation to onset of symptoms in the index  
 337 or other preceding case(s) is useful for informing guidelines for duration of quarantine [20]. Of the 89 PCR+  
 338 secondary cases for which the index case reported symptom duration, 84% (75/89) tested PCR-positive within 10  
 339 days of illness onset in the index case, while 94% (84/89) tested PCR-positive within 14 days. When also taking into  
 340 account other subsequently infected household members besides the index case, 93% (83/89) of secondary cases  
 341 tested PCR+ within 10 days of reported symptom onset of the most recent case in the same household while 99%  
 342 (88/89) tested PCR-positive within 14 days. Thus, “resetting the clock” on a 14-day quarantine period based on  
 343 subsequent COVID+ cases in the household would have achieved incremental benefit, isolating 4 more cases during  
 344 the extended quarantine period. One of these was an asymptomatic infection with low viral load (402 copies/ul on  
 345 NMT swab) found at study day 14, while the other 3 cases (2 from the same household) were symptomatic prior to  
 346 their PCR diagnosis.

347 **Viral load within households and**  
348 **transmission**

349 SARS-CoV-2 viral burden is correlated  
350 within households (**Figure 4**). When  
351 comparing the baseline  
352 nasopharyngeal viral load within  
353 versus between households, viral  
354 burden showed significant clustering  
355 within households (ICC=0.44, 95% CI  
356 0.26-0.60,  $p < 0.001$ ). Differences in  
357 viral load are not attributable to  
358 D614G mutation in the viral spike  
359 protein that has been associated with  
360 increased viral load and infectivity  
361 [18], as the vast majority of isolates  
362 genotyped contained the mutation.  
363 Of 92 COVID-positive isolates (index  
364 cases and HCs) that were successfully  
365 genotyped from the first 90  
366 households, 90/92 (98%) contained  
367 the 614G mutant, while only 2 were  
368 wild-type at this locus.

369 Additionally, index cases with a high  
370 NP viral load ( $>10^6$  viral copies/ul) at  
371 study enrollment were more likely to

372 transmit virus to their household contacts during the study (OR 4.9, 95% CI 1.3-18  $p=0.02$ ). The median NP viral load among index cases was 1.4  $\log_{10}$   
373 higher in households with new secondary cases detected during the study versus those with no transmission in the household (**Figure 5**). This difference  
374 was even greater when restricting the analysis to index cases who were not already antibody-positive, and thus more recently infected [15,16]. This  
375 association of index viral burden and transmission did not extend to secondary cases that were already present at study enrollment, likely due to a failure  
376 to capture the peak viral load of the index case in these households. Other characteristics of COVID disease status of the index case - including duration of  
377 symptoms and symptom severity - were not associated with secondary transmission in the household (**Table 2**). However, the 4 index cases that were  
378 hospitalized transmitted within the household before hospitalization.



379 **Other risk factors for household**  
380 **transmission**

381 Non-white index cases were more likely  
382 to transmit virus within their household  
383 (**Table 2**), despite there being no  
384 difference in viral loads by race/ethnicity  
385 (data not shown). This translates to a  
386 SAR of 70% (95% CI 59%-79%) in  
387 households where the index case was  
388 non-white or Hispanic compared to 52%  
389 (95% CI 42%-62%) in white households  
390 (**Table 3**). Among other factors, this is  
391 likely attributable to household  
392 crowding. A higher living density,  
393 defined as greater than 3 household  
394 members living in a home with fewer  
395 than 6 rooms (excluding bathrooms and  
396 garage), was associated with a greater  
397 odds of infection (OR 5.9, 95% CI 1.3-27;  
398 SAR 91%, 95% CI 71%-98% in high living  
399 density households) (**Table 4**), and a  
400 greater proportion of  
401 non-white/Hispanic households met this  
402 definition of high living density (44%,  
403 18/41) compared to white households  
404 (8%, 4/51) ( $p < 0.001$ ). Healthcare  
405 workers were less likely to transmit virus  
406 within the household (OR 0.22 95% CI  
407 0.05-0.85) (**Table 2**).

408 Among susceptible household contacts,  
409 partners of the index case and those  
410 with a BMI in the obesity range were at  
411 higher risk of acquiring infection (OR  
412 4.1, 95% CI 1.3-13 and OR 5.4, 95%  
413 CI 1.4-21, respectively) (**Table 5**).  
414 While not reaching statistical  
415 significance, non-white household  
416 members and those who shared a  
417 bedroom with the index case  
418 appeared to have a higher risk of  
419 infection. Sharing a bathroom was  
420 associated with a higher risk of  
421 secondary infection during study follow-up ( $p = 0.01$ , data not shown). Children of the index case had a lower risk of  
422 infection, but this did not reach statistical significance (OR 0.42, 95% CI 0.15-1.2).

**Table 2. Potential risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 transmission from index cases**

INDEX CASES	All Indexes (n, %)	Transmitters (n, %)	Non-transmitters (n, %)	p-value
	92 (100%)	64 (70%)	28 (30%)	-
<i>Age</i>				
<18y	8 (9%)	5 (8%)	3 (11%)	NS
18-50y	64 (70%)	44 (69%)	20 (71%)	NS
>50y	20 (22%)	15 (23%)	5 (18%)	NS
<i>Sex</i>				
Female	49 (53%)	31 (48%)	18 (64%)	NS
Male	43 (47%)	33 (52%)	10 (36%)	-
<i>Mask wearing prior to enrollment (missing n = 4)</i>				
Mask wearing at home	15 (17%)	9 (15%)	6 (22%)	NS
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>				
White, non-Hispanic	51 (55%)	30 (47%)	21 (75%)	0.02
Black or African American	10 (11%)	8 (13%)	2 (7%)	NS
Other, non-Hispanic	5 (5%)	5 (8%)	0 (0%)	NS
Hispanic/Latinx	26 (28%)	21 (33%)	5 (18%)	NS
<i>Symptom severity (missing n = 5)</i>				
Mild	25 (29%)	17 (29%)	8 (29%)	NS
Moderate/Severe	58 (67%)	38 (64%)	20 (71%)	NS
Hospitalized	4 (5%)	4 (7%)	0 (0%)	NS
<i>Duration of symptoms at enrollment (missing n = 8)</i>				
Median (IQR)	6 (4-7)	6 (5-7)	6 (4-7)	NS
<i>Antibody status at enrollment (missing n = 4)</i>				
IgG-positive	32 (36%)	24 (39%)	8 (30%)	NS
IgG-negative	51 (58%)	34 (56%)	17 (63%)	NS
<i>Co-morbidities for adults &gt;18y (missing n = 1 for diabetes, n = 5 for obesity)</i>				
Diabetes	6 (7%)	6 (9%)	0 (0%)	NS
Obesity, BMI >30	34 (39%)	26 (43%)	8 (30%)	NS
<i>Education for adults &gt;18y (missing n = 12)</i>				
High school or lower	36 (45%)	28 (51%)	8 (32%)	NS
College degree	23 (29%)	15 (27%)	8 (32%)	NS
Graduate degree	21 (26%)	12 (22%)	9 (36%)	NS
<i>Occupation</i>				
Healthcare worker	13 (14%)	5 (8%)	8 (29%)	0.01

p-values only reported if  $\leq 0.10$ , otherwise noted as not significant (NS)

**Table 3. Secondary attack rate by race/ethnicity of index case in the household**

Race/Ethnicity	Susceptible HCs	Secondary household transmission			SAR (95% CI)
		at baseline	over 21 days	total*	
All	176	76	33	106*	60% (53-67%)
White, non-Hispanic	96	32	18	50	52% (42-62%)
Non-white	80	41	15	56	70% (59-79%)
Black or African-American	17	8	4	12	71%
Hispanic/Latinx	56	33	10	40*	71%
Other, non-Hispanic	7	3	1	4	57%

\*accounting for 3 dropouts from secondary cases infected at baseline

**Table 4. Potential household-level risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 transmission**

HOUSEHOLDS	All Households (n, %)	Infected (n, %)	Uninfected (n, %)	p-value
	92 (100%)	64 (70%)	28 (30%)	-
<i>Household size</i>				
Mean	3.8	3.9	3.4	NS
<i>Living space (missing n = 5)</i>				
<2000 sq ft	48 (55%)	37 (62%)	11 (41%)	NS
>2000 sq ft	39 (45%)	23 (38%)	16 (59%)	0.07
<i>Number of rooms*</i>				
2 or fewer rooms	10 (11%)	7 (11%)	3 (11%)	NS
3-5 rooms	40 (43%)	32 (50%)	8 (29%)	NS
6 or more rooms	42 (46%)	25 (39%)	17 (61%)	NS
<i>Living density</i>				
>3 people and <6 rooms	22 (24%)	20 (31%)	2 (7%)	0.02
<i>Home ownership (missing n = 4)</i>				
Renting apartment	10 (11%)	8 (13%)	2 (7%)	NS
Renting home	25 (28%)	19 (32%)	6 (21%)	NS
Own home	53 (60%)	33 (55%)	20 (71%)	NS

\*Number of rooms includes bedrooms, kitchen, and common rooms, but not bathrooms or garage  
p-values only reported if ≤ 0.10, otherwise noted as not significant (NS)

**Table 5. Potential risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 infection among household contacts**

HOUSEHOLD CONTACTS	All Household Contacts (n, %)	Infected (n, %)	Uninfected (n, %)	p-value
	176 (100%)	109 (62%)	67 (38%)	-
<i>Relationship to index case</i>				
Partner	50 (28%)	37 (34%)	13 (19%)	0.02
Child	61 (35%)	34 (31%)	27 (40%)	0.10
Parent	27 (15%)	12 (11%)	15 (22%)	NS
Caregiver	53 (30%)	31 (28%)	22 (33%)	NS
<i>Age</i>				
<18y	61 (35%)	35 (32%)	26 (39%)	NS
18-50y	85 (48%)	55 (50%)	30 (45%)	NS
>50y	30 (17%)	19 (17%)	11 (16%)	NS
<i>Sex</i>				
Female	89 (51%)	58 (53%)	31 (46%)	NS
Male	87 (49%)	51 (47%)	36 (54%)	-
<i>Shared activities prior to enrollment (missing n = 12)</i>				
Sharing bedroom	55 (34%)	38 (38%)	17 (27%)	0.10
Sharing bathroom	105 (64%)	69 (69%)	36 (56%)	NS
Sharing meals	112 (68%)	67 (67%)	45 (70%)	NS
Sharing car rides	92 (56%)	57 (57%)	35 (55%)	NS
<i>Mask wearing prior to enrollment (missing n = 21)</i>				
Mask wearing at home	40 (26%)	23 (24%)	17 (29%)	NS
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>				
White, non-Hispanic	94 (53%)	50 (46%)	44 (66%)	0.06
Black or African American	17 (10%)	12 (11%)	5 (7%)	NS
Other, non-Hispanic	7 (4%)	4 (4%)	3 (4%)	NS
Hispanic/Latinx	58 (33%)	43 (39%)	15 (22%)	NS
<i>Co-morbidities for adults &gt;18y (missing n = 19 for diabetes, n = 31 for obesity)</i>				
Diabetes	9 (8%)	5 (7%)	4 (10%)	NS
Obesity, BMI >30	38 (37%)	31 (48%)	7 (18%)	0.02
<i>Education for adults &gt;18y (missing n = 22)</i>				
High school or lower	54 (48%)	40 (56%)	14 (34%)	NS
College degree	33 (29%)	18 (25%)	15 (37%)	NS
Graduate degree	25 (22%)	13 (18%)	12 (29%)	NS

p-values are adjusted for household clustering and only reported if ≤ 0.10  
109 infected household contacts includes 3 that were already infected at baseline but dropped out after enrollment and thus not included in the SAR analysis.  
67 uninfected includes the 70 in the SAR analysis but with an additional 3 excluded because they did not have antibody testing at day 28 (though all were PCR-negative throughout the study)

## 423 **DISCUSSION**

424 Household transmission is one of the main drivers of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. By incorporating timely  
425 recruitment of index cases, prospective sampling to 21 days regardless of symptom status, and diverse  
426 representation, we show that household transmission occurs in the majority of COVID-positive North Carolina  
427 households. The overall secondary attack rate in our sample was 60%, rising to 70% in minority households and  
428 91% in households with higher living density. Importantly, we show not only that those infected with a high viral  
429 load are more likely to transmit virus to other members of the household, but that they seed other high-viral load  
430 infections, putting the entire household at higher risk for more severe illness [21]. Spread within the household  
431 happens quickly, often with one or more household members already infected by the time the first case in the  
432 household is diagnosed.

433 While the most complete meta-analysis of household transmission studies, published in December 2020, found a  
434 much lower overall household SAR of 16.6% (95% CI, 14.0%-19.3%), it noted significant heterogeneity between  
435 studies (ranging 4-45%) and combined both retrospective studies based on contact tracing data and prospective  
436 analyses, with the former comprising most of the studies [6]. As would be expected, studies with increased  
437 frequency of testing regardless of symptom status generally show higher infection rates [22]. In the US, a  
438 retrospective study in New York that included household testing offered regardless of symptom status reported a  
439 SAR of 38% [23], while two more recently published prospective studies following a total of 159 households in Utah  
440 and Wisconsin (58 households, SAR 29%)[7], and Tennessee and Wisconsin (101 households, SAR 53%) [8] also  
441 report higher SARs. The former study was completed during a time of shelter-in-place policies. A retrospective  
442 study of 32 households of pediatric cases that relied on symptom ascertainment, also during a time of  
443 shelter-in-place, found a SAR of 46% [24]. Altogether, these studies have started to paint a picture of much higher  
444 secondary attack rates within households.

445 There are several likely explanations for why the SAR we report is the highest yet among US studies. Compared to  
446 previous studies, this study had longer follow-up, including weekly PCR testing to 21 days, combined with antibody  
447 testing at day 28. Longer follow-up is needed to capture potential tertiary cases (from sequential transmission) in  
448 the household. However, cases identified later during follow-up may also have been acquired in the community, as  
449 the study spanned seven months whilst the epidemic in North Carolina evolved from nursing homes, prisons, and  
450 meatpacking facilities; to frontline workers; to returning college students; and finally the general population. We  
451 suspect separately community-acquired cases are few amongst the household contacts in this study, but even  
452 limiting our SAR analysis to secondary cases detected within the first week of enrollment, the attack rate among  
453 household contacts is still >50%. Second, representation of racial and ethnic diversity has been limited in prior  
454 studies (>=70% white, non-Hispanic in each of the three aforementioned studies [7,8,23]). We found that risk  
455 factors for secondary infection in household contacts - including higher living density and obesity - were more  
456 frequent among households with participants who identified as non-white or Hispanic, who comprised 45% of our  
457 study sample. Third, although we excluded 22% of household contacts infected at baseline due to report of a  
458 common exposure as the index case, this proportion may in fact have been higher due to potential recall bias for  
459 common exposures. However, in our experience, a large proportion of these exposures still occur among family, if  
460 not the immediate household. In 44% of households, at least one household member (most often young children)  
461 declined to participate, which may have biased our estimate as well. Finally, the CO-HOST study was conducted  
462 during a time when the potentially more infectious 614G variant [25] predominated in North Carolina, involving  
463 >95% of our sample, paralleling its rise and dominance in the United States [18]. Overall, it is clear that SAR will vary

464 in different settings and needs to be contextualized based on geography, risk groups, and the level of community  
465 transmission and public policies in effect at the time of the study.  
466 Our data, with the majority of cases occurring within one week from illness onset in the index case, are consistent  
467 with previous modeling studies indicating that infectiousness peaks just before the onset of symptoms [3–5,26].  
468 Practically speaking, this means that by the time the first case in the household is diagnosed, others are already  
469 incubating virus if not already testing positive. This is especially true when there are delays to testing or obtaining  
470 results, as was common in the first few months of the pandemic. Thus, public health messages to wear masks and  
471 self-isolate at onset of symptoms, while prudent, are unlikely to eliminate household spread, even if they were  
472 feasible in all households. Early and frequent testing, combined with agents for post-exposure prophylaxis, would  
473 be needed to substantially mitigate the impact of the virus on families that have been inoculated and not yet  
474 vaccinated [27]. Otherwise, mask wearing within a household at all times is preferable in households with  
475 unvaccinated members who are vulnerable to severe COVID-19.

476 The length of household quarantine is often problematic for COVID-positive persons and their households. Current  
477 recommendations worldwide favor a 14-day quarantine period for the entire household if one member is infected.  
478 However, compliance is difficult, especially for families with young children, those with limited resources, and those  
479 unable to work from home. If the quarantine period is decreased, the risk of onward transmission is increased, but  
480 the size of this risk remains an active subject of investigation [20,27]. One approach has been to reset the  
481 ‘quarantine clock’ for the entire household by 14 days each time a new household member is diagnosed, but this  
482 has further increased the burden and decreased compliance. In this study, two-thirds of household contacts were  
483 already infected at enrollment, a median of 6 days after symptom onset in the index case. We found that 94% of  
484 secondary cases were detected within 14 days from symptom onset of the index case, and resetting the clock on  
485 quarantine based on subsequent cases in the household was of incremental benefit (capturing an additional 4% of  
486 cases). This data supports the recommendation of a single 14-day quarantine for the entire household.

487 A novel finding of our study is the correlation of SARS-CoV-2 viral burden within households. Increased viral load  
488 increases infectivity *in vivo* [25], and a recent study of 282 clusters in Spain (many involving household contacts)  
489 showed increased risk of transmission with shorter time to onset of symptoms among contacts as viral load  
490 increased [28]. Additionally, an increasing number of studies are confirming that greater viral burden (high viral load  
491 or lower Ct values by PCR) is associated with disease severity [21,29,30]. Now adding a third piece to this puzzle, we  
492 show that households seeded with a high viral load infection are more likely to have others with high viral loads,  
493 and therefore increased risk for severe illness. This implies that when a person is hospitalized, others in the same  
494 household may be at an even higher risk for a similar outcome compared to risk based on their individual risk  
495 factors (age, comorbidities) alone. Anecdotally, husbands and wives, siblings, and adult parents and children are not  
496 infrequently hospitalized in succession, though the prevalence of this is unknown. An inoculum effect may underlie  
497 this finding [31] and also explain why secondary cases in households appear to be overdispersed, with either most  
498 or all members infected, or none at all [6,32,33]. Viral load dynamics will no doubt continue to shape household  
499 transmission and the larger pandemic, as newer, potentially more infectious variants emerge even as vaccination  
500 decreases the “community viral load.”

501 To our knowledge, this is also the first study to show increased transmission in non-white US households. Though  
502 they experience similar rates of case fatality, African American/Black and Hispanic populations in the US experience  
503 disproportionately higher rates of SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19–related mortality [34]. These racial  
504 disparities are thought to be due to differences in health care access and exposure risk that are driven by systemic  
505 societal inequities rather than individual biological or behavioral characteristics [35–38]. The CO-HOST study is

506 consistent with this explanation. While the sample size was not sufficient to investigate drivers of the increased  
507 transmission in minority households, we found that high living density/household crowding, which was more  
508 common in the non-white households, was associated with increased transmission. Trends in home ownership,  
509 educational status, and living space within our data support the role of social vulnerabilities in modulating  
510 transmission risk within households, a major setting of SARS-CoV-2 transmission.

511 In our risk factors analysis, we found that spouses/partners and household members with obesity were at higher  
512 risk of becoming infected, while households of healthcare workers were less likely to become infected. All of the  
513 index cases in this study were symptomatic, hence we were unable to assess the likelihood of transmission from  
514 symptomatic versus asymptomatic cases. We were also unable to detect any impact of age or other comorbidities  
515 on acquisition of infection, likely due to the small effect size mediated through these variables and limited sample  
516 numbers. However, a meta-analysis has found that secondary attack rates are increased from symptomatic index  
517 cases in comparison to asymptomatic cases, adult index cases in comparison to child index cases, and in spouses  
518 compared to other family members [6].

519 In conclusion, SARS-CoV-2 transmits early and often among household members. While masking, physical  
520 distancing, and quarantining the whole household may reduce or prevent transmission beyond the household,  
521 these strategies are less effective and feasible within the household, especially in the setting of high viral load  
522 infections and crowded living spaces. Frequent point-of-care testing and prophylaxis in those at-risk for severe  
523 illness, and ultimately widespread and equitable distribution of vaccines, are needed to lessen the impact of  
524 COVID-19 within households and vulnerable communities.

#### 525 **DATA AVAILABILITY**

526 Data is available on request for any interested researchers to allow replication of results provided all ethical  
527 requirements are met.

#### 528 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**


529 We thank our wonderful CO-HOST study participants, Moby and the Chapel Hill CRS, and the UNC RDC team.  
530 Thanks to Michelle Berrey, JoAnn Kuruc, and Dania Munson for help with protocol writing and submission; to  
531 Oksana Kharabora, Maureen Furlong, Amy James Loftis, Tia Belvin, and Dana Swilley for help with study preparation  
532 and implementation; to Joe Eron, Billy Fischer, and Ada Adimora for their input and support; and to Gabby Streeter  
533 for help with data analysis.

#### 534 **FUNDING**

535 Research was supported by funds and charitable contributions from the UNC Department of Medicine, UNC  
536 COVID-19 Response Fund/Health Foundation, a Gillings Innovations Lab Award, and the National Center for  
537 Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS), National Institutes of Health, through Grant Award Number  
538 UL1TR002489. Rapid antibody tests were provided by Biomedomics Inc, Morrisville, NC.

539 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

**Figure S1. Schematic of CO-HOST Study Design**



**Table S1: Sequences of primers, probes, and plasmids used for SARS-CoV-2 D614G genotyping by real-time PCR**

Reagent	Sequence (5' → 3')
Forward Primer	TTCTTTGGTGGTGTGTCAGTGTTATAAC
Reverse Primer	CATGAATAGCAACAGGGACTTCTG
Wild-type Probe	FAM-TCTTTATCAGGATGTTAAC-MGB
Mutant Probe	VIC-TTCTTTATCAGGGTGTGTTAAC-MGB
Wild-type Plasmid Insert	TTACACCATGTTCTTTGGTGGTGTGTCAGTGTTATAACACCAGGAACA AATACTTCTAACCAGGTTGCTGTTCTTTATCAGGATGTTAACTGCA
Mutant Plasmid Insert	TTACACCATGTTCTTTGGTGGTGTGTCAGTGTTATAACACCAGGAACA AATACTTCTAACCAGGTTGCTGTTCTTTATCAGGCTGTTAACTGCA CAGAAAGTCCCTGTTGCTATTCATGCAGATCAACTTAC

**Table S2. Comorbidities of study participants**

INDIVIDUALS	Index (n)	Index (%)	HC (n)	HC (%)
<b><i>Underlying Conditions for Adults &gt;18y*</i></b>	<b>92</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>%</b>
Cancer	3	3.3	0	0.0
Chronic lung disease	1	1.1	2	1.5
Asthma	9	9.8	19	14.2
Daily smoker	2	2.2	11	8.2
Diabetes	6	6.5	12	9.0
High blood pressure	16	17.4	30	22.4
Heart disease	2	2.2	2	1.5
Chronic kidney disease	1	1.1	0	0.0
Recent (within past 2 weeks) or current pregnancy	3	3.3	5	3.7
BMI >30	35	38.0	43	32.1
BMI 25-29.9	24	26.1	37	27.6
<b><i>Underlying Conditions for Adults &gt;50y*</i></b>	<b>23</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>%</b>
Asthma	2	8.7	2	4.8
Daily smoker	0	0.0	5	11.9
Diabetes	5	21.7	7	16.7
High blood pressure	6	26.1	21	50.0
BMI >30	11	47.8	14	33.3
BMI 25-29.9	5	21.7	16	38.1
BMI >30 and one or more co-morbidity (adults >18y) (n = 92, 134)	22	23.9	25	18.7
BMI >30 and one or more co-morbidity (adults >50y) (n = 23, 42)	8	34.8	12	28.6
<i>*No adults &gt;18y with HIV or chronic liver disease</i>				

**Table S3. Household demographics**

HOUSEHOLDS	(n=100)	(%)
<b><i>Household Size</i></b>		
2 People	27	27.0
3 People	23	23.0
4 People	22	22.0
5 or more people	28	28.0
<b><i>Home Ownership (n = 97)</i></b>		
Single-family home/townhome occupied by owner	61	62.9
Single-family home/townhome occupied by renter	25	25.8
Apartment occupied by renter	10	10.3
Other	1	1.0
<b><i>Rooms in the House*</i></b>		
2 or fewer rooms	10	10.0
3-5 rooms	43	43.0
6 or more rooms	47	47.0
<i>*including bedrooms, kitchen, and common rooms, but not bathrooms or garage</i>		
<b><i>Living Space</i></b>		
<500 sq feet (<46.5 sq m)	3	3.0
500-1000 sq feet (46-93 sq m)	17	17.0
1000-2000 sq feet (93-186 sq m)	33	33.0
>2000 sq feet (>186 sq m)	42	42.0
Unknown	5	5.0

## 540 REFERENCES

- 541 1. Meyerowitz EA, Richterman A, Gandhi RT, Sax PE. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Review of Viral, Host, and  
542 Environmental Factors. *Ann Intern Med.* 2021;174: 69–79.
- 543 2. CDC. Public Health Guidance for Community-Related Exposure. 3 Dec 2020 [cited 16 Feb 2021]. Available:  
544 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/public-health-recommendations.html>
- 545 3. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of  
546 COVID-19. *Nat Med.* 2020;26: 672–675.
- 547 4. Tindale LC, Stockdale JE, Coombe M, Garlock ES, Lau WYV, Saraswat M, et al. Evidence for transmission of  
548 COVID-19 prior to symptom onset. *Elife.* 2020;9. doi:10.7554/eLife.57149
- 549 5. Benefield AE, Skrip LA, Clement A, Althouse RA, Chang S, Althouse BM. SARS-CoV-2 viral load peaks prior to  
550 symptom onset: a systematic review and individual-pooled analysis of coronavirus viral load from 66 studies.  
551 *bioRxiv. medRxiv;* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.09.28.20202028
- 552 6. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM Jr, Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic  
553 Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020;3: e2031756.
- 554 7. Lewis NM, Chu VT, Ye D, Connors EE, Gharpure R, Laws RL, et al. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the  
555 United States. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1166
- 556 8. Grijalva CG, Rolfes MA, Zhu Y, McLean HQ, Hanson KE, Belongia EA, et al. Transmission of SARS-COV-2  
557 Infections in Households - Tennessee and Wisconsin, April-September 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.*  
558 2020;69: 1631–1634.
- 559 9. McNamara RP, Caro-Vegas C, Landis JT, Moorad R, Pluta LJ, Eason AB, et al. High-Density Amplicon Sequencing  
560 Identifies Community Spread and Ongoing Evolution of SARS-CoV-2 in the Southern United States. *Cell Rep.*  
561 2020;33: 108352.
- 562 10. Barzin A, Wohl DA, Daaleman TP. Development and Implementation of a COVID-19 Respiratory Diagnostic  
563 Center. *Ann Fam Med.* 2020;18: 464.
- 564 11. for Disease Control C, Prevention, Others. CDC 2019-novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) real-time RT-PCR  
565 diagnostic panel. *Revis Biol Celular.* 2020;3: 30.
- 566 12. Muller MS, Bhattarai Chhetri S, Basham C, Rapp T, Lin F-C, Lin K, et al. Practical strategies for SARS-CoV-2  
567 RT-PCR testing in resource-constrained settings. *medRxiv;* 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.02.18.21251999
- 568 13. Li Z, Yi Y, Luo X, Xiong N, Liu Y, Li S, et al. Development and clinical application of a rapid IgM-IgG combined  
569 antibody test for SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis. *J Med Virol.* 2020;92: 1518–1524.
- 570 14. COVID-19 IgM/IgG Rapid Test – BioMedomics Inc. [cited 17 Feb 2021]. Available:  
571 <https://www.biomedomics.com/products/infectious-disease/covid-19-rt/>
- 572 15. Naranbhai V, Chang CC, Beltran WFG, Miller TE, Astudillo MG, Villalba JA, et al. High Seroprevalence of  
573 Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in Chelsea, Massachusetts. *J Infect Dis.* 2020;222: 1955–1959.
- 574 16. Premkumar L, Segovia-Chumbez B, Jadi R, Martinez DR, Raut R, Markmann A, et al. The receptor binding  
575 domain of the viral spike protein is an immunodominant and highly specific target of antibodies in SARS-CoV-2  
576 patients. *Sci Immunol.* 2020;5. doi:10.1126/sciimmunol.abc8413
- 577 17. Markmann AJ, Giallourou N, Bhowmik DR, Hou YJ, Lerner A, Martinez DR, et al. Sex disparities and neutralizing  
578 antibody durability to SARS-CoV-2 infection in convalescent individuals. *medRxiv.* 2021.  
579 doi:10.1101/2021.02.01.21250493

- 580 18. Korber B, Fischer WM, Gnanakaran S, Yoon H, Theiler J, Abfalterer W, et al. Tracking Changes in SARS-CoV-2  
581 Spike: Evidence that D614G Increases Infectivity of the COVID-19 Virus. *Cell*. 2020;182: 812–827.e19.
- 582 19. Explore Obesity in North Carolina. [cited 23 Feb 2021]. Available:  
583 <https://www.americashealthrankings.org/explore/annual/measure/Obesity/state/NC>
- 584 20. Rolfes MA, Grijalva CG, Zhu Y, McLean HQ, Hanson KE, Belongia EA, et al. Implications of Shortened Quarantine  
585 Among Household Contacts of Index Patients with Confirmed SARS-CoV-2 Infection - Tennessee and Wisconsin,  
586 April-September 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;69: 1633–1637.
- 587 21. Maltezou HC, Raftopoulos V, Vorou R, Papadima K, Mellou K, Spanakis N, et al. Association between upper  
588 respiratory tract viral load, comorbidities, disease severity and outcome of patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection.  
589 *J Infect Dis*. 2021. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa804
- 590 22. Fung HF, Martinez L, Alarid-Escudero F, Salomon JA, Studdert DM, Andrews JR, et al. The Household Secondary  
591 Attack Rate of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2): A Rapid Review. *Clin Infect Dis*.  
592 2020 [cited 21 Feb 2021]. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1558
- 593 23. Rosenberg ES, Dufort EM, Blog DS, Hall EW, Hoefler D, Backenson BP, et al. COVID-19 Testing, Epidemic  
594 Features, Hospital Outcomes, and Household Prevalence, New York State—March 2020. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020  
595 [cited 13 Sep 2020]. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa549
- 596 24. Teherani MF, Kao CM, Camacho-Gonzalez A, Banskota S, Shane AL, Linam WM, et al. Burden of Illness in  
597 Households With Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2-Infected Children. *J Pediatric Infect Dis*  
598 *Soc*. 2020;9: 613–616.
- 599 25. Hou YJ, Chiba S, Halfmann P, Ehre C, Kuroda M, Dinnon KH 3rd, et al. SARS-CoV-2 D614G variant exhibits  
600 efficient replication ex vivo and transmission in vivo. *Science*. 2020;370: 1464–1468.
- 601 26. Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV viral load  
602 dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*  
603 *Microbe*. 2021;2: e13–e22.
- 604 27. Quilty BJ, Clifford S, Hellewell J, Russell TW, Kucharski AJ, Flasche S, et al. Quarantine and testing strategies in  
605 contact tracing for SARS-CoV-2: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health*. 2021.  
606 doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30308-X
- 607 28. Marks M, Millat-Martinez P, Ouchi D, Roberts CH, Alemany A, Corbacho-Monné M, et al. Transmission of  
608 COVID-19 in 282 clusters in Catalonia, Spain: a cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2021.  
609 doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30985-3
- 610 29. Magleby R, Westblade LF, Trzebucki A, Simon MS, Rajan M, Park J, et al. Impact of SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load on  
611 Risk of Intubation and Mortality Among Hospitalized Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis*.  
612 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa851
- 613 30. Liu Y, Yan L-M, Wan L, Xiang T-X, Le A, Liu J-M, et al. Viral dynamics in mild and severe cases of COVID-19.  
614 *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20: 656–657.
- 615 31. Silvia Munoz-Price L, Rivera F, Ledebner N. Air contamination of households versus hospital inpatient rooms  
616 occupied by SARS-CoV-2 positive patients. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. : 1–14.
- 617 32. Ladhani SN, Andrews N, Aiano F, Baawuah F, Amin-Chowdhury Z, Brown KE, et al. Secondary attack rate and  
618 family clustering of SARS-CoV-2 infection in children of healthcare workers with confirmed COVID-19. *Clin*  
619 *Infect Dis*. 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1737
- 620 33. Tibebu S, Brown KA, Daneman N, Paul LA, Buchan SA. Household secondary attack rate of COVID-19 by

- 621 household size and index case characteristics. medRxiv. 2021. Available:  
622 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.02.23.21252287v1.abstract>
- 623 34. Mackey K, Ayers CK, Kondo KK, Saha S, Advani SM, Young S, et al. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in  
624 COVID-19-Related Infections, Hospitalizations, and Deaths : A Systematic Review. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020.  
625 doi:10.7326/M20-6306
- 626 35. Karmakar M, Lantz PM, Tipirneni R. Association of Social and Demographic Factors With COVID-19 Incidence  
627 and Death Rates in the US. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4: e2036462.
- 628 36. Poteat T, Millett GA, Nelson LE, Beyrer C. Understanding COVID-19 risks and vulnerabilities among black  
629 communities in America: the lethal force of syndemics. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2020;47: 1–3.
- 630 37. Holmes L, Enwere M, Williams J, Ogundele B, Chavan P, Piccoli T, et al. Black--White risk differentials in  
631 COVID-19 (SARS-COV2) transmission, mortality and case fatality in the United States: translational  
632 epidemiologic perspective and challenges. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17: 4322.
- 633 38. Rogers TN, Rogers CR, VanSant-Webb E, Gu LY, Yan B, Qeadan F. Racial Disparities in COVID-19 Mortality Among  
634 Essential Workers in the United States. *World medical & health policy*. 2020;12: 311–327.