medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Transmission roles of symptomatic and asymptomatic COVID-19 cases: a modeling study

Authors:

Jianbin Tan[1]†, Yang Ge[2]†, Leonardo Martinez[3], Zhiping Chen[4], Changwei Li[5], Adrianna Westbrook[2], Enfu Chen[4], Jinren Pan[4], Yang Li[6], Feng Ling[4], Jimin Sun[4]‡, Hui Huang[1]‡, Ye Shen[2]‡.

Author affiliations:

[1]Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Mathematics, Guangzhou, China;
[2]University of Georgia, College of Public Health, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Athens, Georgia, United States;
[3]Boston University, Department of Epidemiology, Boston, United States;
[4]Zhejiang Provincial Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Hangzhou, China;
[5]Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, Department of Epidemiology, New Orleans, Louisiana, United States;
[6]Renmin University of China, School of Statistics, Beijing, China.

† Joint first authors; ‡ Joint senior authors.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Ye Shen, University of Georgia, College of Public Health, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Athens, Georgia, United States

Word count: 3485.

Key words: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, age-dependent contact, asymptomatic case, transmission

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Declarations

Funding: This study was supported by the Zhejiang Basic Public Welfare Research Project (Grant No. LGF21H260003, PI: Feng Ling). The funders had no role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Ethics approval: The research protocol was approved by the institutional review board at the Zhejiang Provincial Center for Disease Control and Prevention. The study was based on deidentified data.

Data availability statement: The data we used in the analysis contain the age and COVID-19 symptom onset/disease confirmation dates of each case. It is possible to reveal the patients' identities by linking these individual-level information to other sources such as local media coverage or social media release. Therefore, the data were not made publicly available. However, we will provide de-identified data upon request for research purposes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Age-dependent asymptomatic and symptomatic transmission dynamics of COVID-19 have not been well quantified due to limited data. Through a population-based surveillance network, we collected data on 1342 confirmed cases with a 90-days follow-up for all asymptomatic cases. The difference in transmissibility of a symptomatic and asymptomatic case depended on age and was most distinct for the middle-age groups. The asymptomatic cases had a 66.72% lower transmissibility rate than symptomatic cases, and 74.10% (95%CI: 65.85% - 80.72%) of all asymptomatic cases were missed in detection. The average proportion of asymptomatic cases was 28.22% (95%CI: 22.97% - 34.56%). Simulation showed that the burden of asymptomatic transmission increased as the epidemic continued and could potentially dominate the spreading. Asymptomatic COVID-19 cases play a significant role in transmission. Vaccine Strategies prioritizing the population between 30-60 years old are likely to have the most population-level benefits.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Background

COVID-19, caused by the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2),[1] is a great threat to human health.[2] Nonpharmaceutical interventions such as social distancing, case isolation and contact quarantines are the most common tools for suppressing the pandemic in many countries where vaccine supplements are limited.[3–5] However, these interventions are less effective in asymptomatic transmission prevention and control.[6]

COVID-19 patients may present and remain pre-symptomatic, asymptomatic, or symptomatic and transmission may occur at each of these disease states.[7–9] Unlike the transmission caused by symptomatic cases, pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission are hard to detect and difficult to measure as many surveillance systems rely on symptom-based population screening.[7,10–12] Previous case studies suggested that asymptomatic COVID-19 individuals are less infectious than symptomatic cases.[13,14] However, asymptomatic cases may spread for a longer period due to reduced efficiency in case detection.[15] Several studies investigated the silent transmission of SARS-CoV-2, but presented contradictory conclusions with estimated burden ranged from 3% to 79%.[15–17]

Without sufficient follow-up time, asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic cases are often indistinguishable. Consequently, studies using population-level data to estimate of age-specific transmission and susceptibility parameters commonly falls short of accuracy which potentially explains for the heterogeneous findings from different studies.[18–20] Common issues were modeling without data on observed asymptomatic infection[15–17,21] and inclusion of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

pre-symptomatic cases as part of an asymptomatic classification,[18–20] . Meanwhile, few studies assessing asymptomatic infectiousness and viral load with limited sample sizes fail to capture the transmission dynamics.[13,14,22–29] No studies to date have attempted to combine reliable case symptom classification with age-dependent transmissibility, social contact measures, and susceptibility parameters at the population level to learn the transmission dynamics. However, a comprehensive understanding of the age-specific symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission dynamics at the population level is essential to the evaluation of an epidemic and the creation of responding health policies.

In this study, we report on a longitudinal cohort of all diagnosed COVID-19 infections, between January 7th and February 22nd, 2020, from Zhejiang province, China. All patients without initial symptoms were followed by at least 90 days to distinguish between asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic cases, an essential procedure rarely implemented by previous studies to ensure reliable classification of case symptoms. We then built age-stratified compartmental models to study the age-dependent population-level transmission roles of symptomatic and asymptomatic COVID-19 cases.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods

Data sources

Zhejiang province is an eastern coastal province adjacent to Shanghai city with a population of approximately 54 million individuals.[30] The first and only major wave of the COVID-19 epidemic in Zhejiang began on January 7th, 2020 and continued until February 22nd, 2020 after which only sporadic single-case events were observed. We included information from all confirmed cases in this major wave (a total of 1342 cases), as well as a follow-up investigation related to all detected asymptomatic infections to distinguish between asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic cases. Individual-level data related to the symptom onset of symptomatic infections, as well as COVID-19 confirmation dates and ages of both symptomatic and asymptomatic cases were collected. For the contact data, we obtained contact matrices between age groups from surveys conducted in Shanghai.[31,32] Other primary sources of data used in our analyses include the population census data of Zhejiang province[30] and the estimated age-dependent susceptibility of COVID-19 from a previous study.[21]

On January 23rd ,2020, the provincial government changed its infectious disease alert category to the highest level and, on February 1st, began a comprehensive set of interventions.[33] As of April 10th, 2020, the date in which we restricted our data for this analysis, no additional outbreak had been observed. Trained health professionals investigated each confirmed case with a predefined questionnaire by which basic health and demographic information were collected.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Definition of symptomatic and asymptomatic cases

All confirmed cases and their close contacts were isolated or quarantined after being identified through contact tracing. During the isolation/quarantine period, cases and their contacts received regular testing and daily symptom screening for fever, cough, and shortness of breath. Tests for case confirmation were conducted using reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) or viral genome sequencing on samples from throat swabs (oropharynx and nasopharynx). If a case or contact had a positive test result but without any symptoms, they would be temporarily classified as an asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic case at the time. All cases were followed for at least 90 days after their initial positive test to distinguish between asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic cases. Among these subjects, those who developed symptoms later would receive a final classification as a symptomatic case. Others who had never developed any symptoms between their initial positive test and first subsequent negative PCR test would be classified as asymptomatic cases.

Model structure

We divided the total population of Zhejiang province into seven age groups: 0-10, 10-20, 20-30, 30-40, 40-50, 50-60, 60+. To consider transmission related to symptomatic and asymptomatic infections among different age groups, our model contained 8 compartments for the ith age group: susceptible population (S^i), exposed contacts (E^i), pre-symptomatic cases (I_{ps}^i, infected but have not yet developed symptoms), symptomatic cases (I_s^i), asymptomatic cases (I_a^i, infected but asymptomatic till confirmed/recovery), and removed/recovery groups

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(R_{cs}^i, R_{ca}^i, R_h^i). We assumed new infections were driven by transmission from compartments of I_{ps}^i, I_s^i and I_a^i in all age groups. Asymptomatic cases (I_a^i) were infections without typical symptoms. These infections were difficult to identify through symptom-based screening; therefore, underreporting in this category of infections was notable. While some asymptomatic cases may have been quarantined through contact tracing, others may have remained unnoticed throughout the entirety of their transmissibility. As such, it is essential to consider unconfirmed asymptomatic cases, also referred as the self-recovered asymptomatic cases (R_h^i in Figure 1) in modeling. For all age groups, the details of the compartments are given in Table 1, and the state transitions in the compartmental model are given in Figure 1.

Social contacts

To identify age-varying transmissibility and susceptibility within the compartmental model,[21] we assumed a time-varying curve for the average contact numbers of ith age group with j^{th} age group (c_t^{ij}), which is estimated with the contact matrix between age groups through surveys conducted in Shanghai.[31,32] The surveys provided two different strengths of contact (before and during the epidemic). The first survey conducted in 2017 to 2018 in Shanghai was considered as a background of the strength of contact.[16] The second survey, with the same design, was conducted during the epidemic (from February 1 to 10, 2020). The details of the modeling of the contact function (c_t^{ij}) are further described in the Supplementary Appendix.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Susceptibility-contact-transmissibility transmission process

When modeling transmission dynamics of infectious diseases, a key factor to consider is the probability of infection for a susceptible individual given contact with an infectious individual. Here, we separate this concept into two components: transmissibility (T) and susceptibility (s). We define transmissibility (T) as the infectiousness of one case. Theoretically, it is the secondary attack rate in their fully susceptible contacts ($s = 1$). Similarly, we define susceptibility (s) as the probability of acquiring infection from an infectious case ($T = 1$). Therefore, $s = 0$ corresponds to a situation in which the susceptible individuals are immune to the disease (this setting was later used to conduct a simulation study to assess possible age-dependent vaccination strategies if a certain age group were to achieve 100% immunity by vaccinations). We assumed that case transmissibility would depend on age and the presence of symptoms. To better quantify transmissibility and susceptibility, we introduced the estimated susceptibility (s_i) for i^{th} age group from a previous study as a prior in our model.[21] In this setting, the occurrence of a transmission event depends on both transmissibility of the index case and the susceptibility of the contact. The number of secondary cases (ρ) from one infectious case at unit time can be calculated as:

$$\rho = s \cdot \text{contact number} \cdot T$$

Let $T_{i,s}$ be the transmissibility of symptomatic infections in i^{th} age group. To capture the age-dependent pattern, B splines basis functions were used to model the variability in age-varying transmissibility smoothly. Given $T_{i,s}$, we assumed that the age-varying transmissibility of asymptomatic infectious individuals was equivalent to $T_{i,a} := \gamma_i T_{i,s}$, where $\gamma_i \leq 1$, i.e., the transmissibility of asymptomatic cases is no stronger than that of symptomatic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

cases across different age groups, based on currently available evidence[13,14,34]. The estimated mean of s_i and the B spline functions mentioned above are shown in Table S3 and Figure S2 (in the Supplementary Appendix).

Asymptomatic infections

Our compartmental model (Figure 1) considered the transmission from asymptomatic infections, which were often untraceable in the clinical survey and, therefore, their contribution to population-level transmission would be underestimated. To account for this, we assumed only a proportion of asymptomatic infections were detected (R_{ca}^i), while others (R_h^i) would be unconfirmed (and not diagnosed) if self-recovery occurred prior to diagnosis. We were able to observe disease confirmation date but not the date of infection for the period from cases becoming infectious to the diagnosis of COVID-19 ($\mathcal{A}_1^i$) in those with confirmed asymptomatic infection. Based on the virus shedding pattern of asymptomatic infections reported in previous studies,[12,14,35,36] we assumed that this period should be less than 30 days, after which virus shedding generally ceases, and infection is no longer detectable through pathogen-specific testing. As such, a uniform prior with an upper bound of 30 days was adopted for$\mathcal{A}_1^i$. For the period from being infectious to becoming non-infectious (negative conversion of virus shedding) in the undetected asymptomatic infections ($\mathcal{A}_2$), we used a more informative log normal prior with a mean of 17 days and standard error of 1.07 based on estimated parameters from a previous study.[12,14,35,36] The difference between $\mathcal{A}_1^i$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ would reflect the intensity of the contact tracing for different ages. More details are provided in the Supplementary Appendix.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Model fitting

Let N_i be the total population of ith age group in Zhejiang province. Based on the setting above, we defined a dynamic system for the 8×7 compartments, which is shown in the equation (S3) (in the Supplementary). The state transitions in the compartmental model are given in Figure 1. Based on our compartmental model, we can estimate the secondary cases transmitted by symptomatic and asymptomatic indexes respectively, which are used to evaluate the burden of both symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission from different age groups. More details are given in the equation (S4) and (S5) (in the Supplementary).

We built our model with features mentioned in above sections through a Bayesian procedure for the estimation and inference of model parameters (listed in Table S5).[37–39] Specifically, the compartmental model was fitted to the daily new symptomatic and asymptomatic cases in Zhejiang province for each age group. The Bayesian procedure with a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling algorithm also utilized information relating to the COVID-19 transmission from other sources of datasets, e.g. survey studies on the contact matrix, and estimated age-dependent susceptibility from previous studies, therefore, the posterior distributions of parameters could be elegantly extracted by the sufficient prior and sample evidence. More details of the Bayesian model structure, assessment, and estimation of parameters are given in the Supplementary Appendix. All analyses were implemented in R version 3.5.1. Packages of deSolve,[40] extraDistr,[41] and splines[42] were used for model

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

fitting. Unless stated otherwise, the medians of the posterior distributions were used as the point estimators of parameters and simulated numbers.

Ethics approval

The research protocol was approved by the institutional review board at the Zhejiang Provincial Center for Disease Control and Prevention. The study was based on deidentified data.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Results

Transmissibility

The estimated transmissibility presented an age-dependent difference between symptomatic and asymptomatic infections (Figure 2). While the transmission of symptomatic cases monotonically increased with increasing age, the transmissibility of asymptomatic infection remained low until age 40, after which point it significantly increased with increasing age. The age-varying ratios of the two kinds of transmissibility indicated asymptomatic cases were, on average, 66.72% lower in transmission than symptomatic cases. However, the difference between the two types of infections was not as big in those aged 0-20 and 60+ years old, but became more obvious in the middle-aged group where the ratios were as low as 24.42% and 23.38% for those aged 30-40 and 40-50 years old, respectively.

The proportion of asymptomatic cases

In Figure 3, the proportion of asymptomatic cases ($\frac{R_h^i+R_{ca}^i}{R_h^i+R_{cs}^i+R_{ca}^i}$) estimated by our model was much larger than what was observed in the data. The average proportion of asymptomatic cases was 28.22% (95%CI: 22.97% - 34.56%) of the total counts of cases in our model estimation, but was 9.24% in the observed data ($\frac{R_{ca}^i}{R_{cs}^i+R_{ca}^i}$). In our estimation from the empirical data, the highest proportion of asymptomatic case was among 0-10 (60.18% (95%CI: 53.61% - 66.99%)) and 10-20 (57.64% (95%CI: 47.45% – 66.98%)) years old groups. For asymptomatic cases, we further estimated the proportion of cases that failed to be detected ($\frac{R_h^i}{R_h^i+R_{ca}^i}$). In the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

posterior samples, the average proportion of unconfirmed cases in all asymptomatic infections was 74.10% (95%CI: 65.85% - 80.72%). The maximum proportion of unconfirmed cases was observed in 20-30 years old at 86.59% (95%CI: 73.64% - 92.19%).

Symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission

To explore the impact of symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission, we present several features of the estimated dynamic of the epidemic and the transmission burden caused by symptomatic and asymptomatic cases in Figure 4. The estimated number of daily new transmissions reached a peak around ten days prior to the peak of the daily reported new confirmed cases (Figure 4A). We estimated a substantial number of undetected asymptomatic cases (109 (95%CI: 73 - 164)) were infected before the first asymptomatic case was diagnosed (January 27th) (Figure 4B). New transmissions were nearly eliminated by February 1st, 2020 (Figure 4A), when a comprehensive set of restrictions[19] had been implemented. The peak of the two types of transmission both occurred between January 17th to 21st (Figure 4C). The average burden of asymptomatic transmission during the major outbreak period was estimated to be 12.86% (95%CI: 7.54% - 19.27%). The burden of asymptomatic transmission increased with time, ranging from 7.77% to 16.03% (Figure 4D). Simulation studies were conducted to investigate the dynamic changes in the transmission burden over time during a prolonged epidemic (Figure S5). When the duration of the decreasing process of the contact function (represented by "m" in Figure S1) was prolonged by two weeks and each individual's daily contact number was increased by one person during the outbreak period, we found a slower decreasing trend in daily new cases infected by asymptomatic cases compared with that contributed by

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

symptomatic cases (Figure S5, scenario 1). Additional scenarios were generated demonstrating the possibility of asymptomatic transmission dominating the total transmission under different conditions, especially when the duration between symptom onset and disease confirmation for symptomatic infections was shortened and the asymptomatic infections were not controlled (Figure S5, scenarios 2 and 3).

Age-depended transmission

Within each age group, we observed heterogeneous transmission contributions during different time periods (Figure 5A). Early on in the epidemic, the transmission burden was dominated by persons of 50-60 years old (32.75% from January 7th to January 11th), but the proportion of transmission contribution from people over 60 years old significantly increased over time, surpassing the 50-60 years old and reaching 30.42% by January 31st, 2020. The proportion of transmission contribution among varying age groups was distinct between symptomatic and asymptomatic cases (Figure 5B). The majority of both symptomatic and asymptomatic transmissions were contributed by persons over 30 years old (Table S9). Individuals below 30 years old only contributed less than 5% of all symptomatic transmission and approximately 12% of all asymptomatic transmission, respectively, despite representing almost 40% of the entire population. Contributions to asymptomatic transmission among 20-30 and >60 year age groups (9.44%, and 31.73%, respectively) were substantially higher than their corresponding contributions to symptomatic transmission (3.77%, and 26.55%, respectively). To further understand possible age-dependent vaccination strategies, a simulation of seven scenarios was conducted to assess the percentage decline in different age groups if one age

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

group were to achieve 100% immunity by vaccinations (Figure S6). The results suggested that vaccinations targeting age groups above 30 years are likely to be more effective at the population level, with the most percentage decline of cases from the entire population achieved by targeting the 50-60 years old group. Meanwhile, vaccinating those younger than 30 years old are more likely to benefit their own age groups.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion

In our study, we found that asymptomatic cases were over 60% less infectious compared to symptomatic cases. While great efforts like mass screening and strict contact tracing were conducted, our results suggested that a large proportion of asymptomatic infections were still not detected.[43] The burden of asymptomatic transmission was inferior in the early outbreak but could become higher with the continuous spread of COVID-19. Under strained resources, age-specific prevention and control strategies aimed at the middle age population may return greater population-level benefits.

Current evidence suggests that asymptomatic COVID-19 cases are generally less infectious[13] than cases with symptoms. We found that this difference may partially be explained by patient age. Age may directly impact COVID-19 transmission through virus shedding patterns[14] as discussed in previous studies.[44] Symptoms are commonly mild in children[45] but severe in the elderly.[46] While still debatable,[47] higher severity has been associated with increased shedding of the virus.[48] In our study, symptomatic and asymptomatic cases were most infectious in individuals 60 years old or older. In contrary to the monotonic increasing association between age and transmission in symptomatic cases, there was a plateau of a low degree of transmission in young asymptomatic infections. We suspect older adults are not only the most vulnerable to succumb to COVID-19 but also may be more likely to transmit once infected, regardless of symptom status. Interventions attempting to suppress asymptomatic transmission, such as mask-wearing, should primarily focus on older adults if interventions to the whole community are not feasible.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Similar to previous studies, our results suggest a small proportion of asymptomatic cases have been detected since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in our setting.[49–51] Symptom-based screening has limited capability in asymptomatic case detection,[6] while mass pathogen or immunological-based testing at the population-level consumes tremendous health resources, and thus is not feasible in most settings. Considering these challenges, age-dependent screening strategies may be more practical. We found that the highest number of undetected asymptomatic cases was among young adults aged 20 to 30 years old (Table S7) and the corresponding transmission contribution was significantly higher than that of symptomatic case (Figure 5B). Young people were less likely to adhere to social distancing guidelines,[52] often had mild symptoms or were asymptomatic after infection,[53] and were not prioritized in prevention and controlling strategies.[54] Meanwhile, younger asymptomatic patients were also more likely to have normal CAT scan findings, which may further complicate case detection.[11] Case detection of asymptomatic COVID-19 cases based on current control strategies implemented in this study is alarming.

Based on the estimated transmission contributions from symptomatic and asymptomatic infections, roughly 13% of infections were associated with asymptomatic transmission and that percentage continuously increased with a prolonged period. The overall burden of transmission was mainly contributed by symptomatic cases at the beginning of the epidemic, but asymptomatic infections appeared to have increasing percentages of subsequent cases later on. Additional simulations suggested that the transmission burden could even be

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

dominated by asymptomatic transmissions under certain circumstances (Figure S5). Therefore, the spreading potential of asymptomatic cases cannot be ignored, especially in the later stages of the epidemic and in regions where social distancing has not been mandated. Meanwhile, potential differences in transmission burden by age groups, as shown in Figure 5 and S6, supports prioritizing age-dependent prevention and control strategies when facing strained resources. As the larger contributor to the transmission of COVID-19, the older age population is not only a highly vulnerable group but should also be the primary target for prevention strategies. Vaccine Strategies prioritizing the population between 30-60 years old are likely to have the most population-level benefits.

There are several limitations in this study. First, data collection likely missed potential cases of the epidemic, despite intensified efforts devoted by the local investigation team to trace contacts. Due to this, we introduced a compartment in our model (R_h^i) to adjust for poor case ascertainment and missing cases. Second, transmissibility and susceptibility were two factors related to symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission estimation and can be difficult to capture simultaneously. We used the susceptibility estimates from a previous study[21] as priors in our model to account for this parameter identification problem. Third, the contact survey data we used in our model were obtained in Shanghai, a city adjacent to Zhejiang province. Although the two regions share a similar culture and modes of social activities, there were potential uncertainties associated with the discrepancies in contact matrices. To address this limitation, we introduced a correction parameter in our model, so these uncertainties were partially adjusted for in the analyses.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

In summary, our results suggest individual-level transmissibility of COVID-19 increases with patient age, therefore targeting older age groups with prevention and intervention strategies is expected to be more efficient. While asymptomatic cases are difficult to trace, the burden of asymptomatic transmission is still sizable and should not be ignored. The results from our study can be used to inform policy decisions on pandemic control and safe reopening.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Guan W-J, Ni Z-Y, Hu Y, Liang W-H, Ou C-Q, He J-X, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. N Engl J Med. Massachusetts Medical Society; 2020;382:1708–20.

2. World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard (12/12/2020) [Internet]. [cited 2020 Dec 12]. Available from: https://covid19.who.int

3. Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin M, et al. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand [Internet]. Imperial College London; 2020 Mar. Available from: http://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/77482

4. Prem K, Liu Y, Russell TW, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Davies N, et al. The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. The Lancet Public Health. Elsevier; 2020;5:e261–70.

5. Lewnard JA, Lo NC. Scientific and ethical basis for social-distancing interventions against COVID-19. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2020;20:631–3.

6. Gandhi M, Yokoe DS, Havlir DV. Asymptomatic Transmission, the Achilles' Heel of Current Strategies to Control Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2020;382:2158–60.

7. Rothe C, Schunk M, Sothmann P, Bretzel G, Froeschl G, Wallrauch C, et al. Transmission of 2019-nCoV Infection from an Asymptomatic Contact in Germany. N Engl J Med. Massachusetts Medical Society; 2020;382:970–1.

8. Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, Lofy KH, Wiesman J, Bruce H, et al. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United States. N Engl J Med. 2020;382:929–36.

9. Hoehl S, Rabenau H, Berger A, Kortenbusch M, Cinatl J, Bojkova D, et al. Evidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Returning Travelers from Wuhan, China. N Engl J Med. 2020;382:1278–80.

10. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. Nature. 2020;581:465–9.

11. Kronbichler A, Kresse D, Yoon S, Lee KH, Effenberger M, Shin JI. Asymptomatic patients as a source of COVID-19 infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2020;98:180–6.

12. Han MS, Seong M-W, Kim N, Shin S, Cho SI, Park H, et al. Viral RNA Load in Mildly Symptomatic and Asymptomatic Children with COVID-19, Seoul, South Korea. Emerging Infectious Diseases. 2020;26:2497–9.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

13. Gao M, Yang L, Chen X, Deng Y, Yang S, Xu H, et al. A study on infectivity of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 carriers. Respir Med. 2020;169:106026.

14. Kim SE, Jeong HS, Yu Y, Shin SU, Kim S, Oh TH, et al. Viral kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic carriers and presymptomatic patients. Int J Infect Dis. 2020;95:441–3.

15. Moghadas SM, Fitzpatrick MC, Sah P, Pandey A, Shoukat A, Singer BH, et al. The implications of silent transmission for the control of COVID-19 outbreaks. PNAS. National Academy of Sciences; 2020;117:17513–5.

16. Li R, Pei S, Chen B, Song Y, Zhang T, Yang W, et al. Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). Science. 2020;368:489–93.

17. Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, Zhao L, Nurtay A, Abeler-Dörner L, et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. Science [Internet]. American Association for the Advancement of Science; 2020 [cited 2020 Dec 21];368. Available from: https://science.sciencemag.org/content/368/6491/eabb6936

18. Hu Z, Song C, Xu C, Jin G, Chen Y, Xu X, et al. Clinical characteristics of 24 asymptomatic infections with COVID-19 screened among close contacts in Nanjing, China. Sci China Life Sci. Nature Publishing Group; 2020;63:706–11.

19. Huang L, Zhang X, Zhang X, Wei Z, Zhang L, Xu J, et al. Rapid asymptomatic transmission of COVID-19 during the incubation period demonstrating strong infectivity in a cluster of youngsters aged 16-23 years outside Wuhan and characteristics of young patients with COVID-19: A prospective contact-tracing study. J Infect. 2020;80:e1–13.

20. Meng H, Xiong R, He R, Lin W, Hao B, Zhang L, et al. CT imaging and clinical course of asymptomatic cases with COVID-19 pneumonia at admission in Wuhan, China. J Infect. 2020;81:e33–9.

21. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, Prem K, Jit M, CMMID COVID-19 working group, et al. Age-dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. Nat Med. Nature Publishing Group; 2020;26:1205–11.

22. Zhou R, Li F, Chen F, Liu H, Zheng J, Lei C, et al. Viral dynamics in asymptomatic patients with COVID-19. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2020;96:288–90.

23. Berlin DA, Gulick RM, Martinez FJ. Severe Covid-19. N Engl J Med. Massachusetts Medical Society; 2020;

24. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, Winskill P, Whittaker C, Imai N, et al. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020;20:669–77.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

25. CDC COVID-19 Response Team. Severe Outcomes Among Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) - United States, February 12-March 16, 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020;69:343–6.

26. Kong D, Zheng Y, Wu H, Pan H, Wagner AL, Zheng Y, et al. Pre-symptomatic transmission of novel coronavirus in community settings. Influenza Other Respir Viruses. 2020;14:610–4.

27. Furukawa NW, Brooks JT, Sobel J. Evidence Supporting Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 While Presymptomatic or Asymptomatic. Emerg Infect Dis [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 8];26. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7323549/

28. Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A, Chowell G. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. Eurosurveillance [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Apr 5];25. Available from: https://www.eurosurveillance.org/content/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.10.2000180

29. Bai Y, Yao L, Wei T, Tian F, Jin D-Y, Chen L, et al. Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19. JAMA. American Medical Association; 2020;323:1406–7.

30. Bureau of Statistics. Zhejiang Provincial Bureau of Statistics: Sixth Census Data [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2020 Jul 30]. Available from: http://tjj.zj.gov.cn/art/2014/9/3/art_1530851_20980968.html

31. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, Wang Y, Wang W, Zhao S, et al. Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. Science. 2020;368:1481–6.

32. Zhang J, Klepac P, Read JM, Rosello A, Wang X, Lai S, et al. Patterns of human social contact and contact with animals in Shanghai, China. Scientific Reports. Nature Publishing Group; 2019;9:15141.

33. Chong KC, Cheng W, Zhao S, Ling F, Mohammad KN, Wang MH, et al. Monitoring disease transmissibility of 2019 novel coronavirus disease in Zhejiang, China. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2020;96:128–30.

34. Luo L, Liu D, Liao X, Wu X, Jing Q, Zheng J, et al. Contact Settings and Risk for Transmission in 3410 Close Contacts of Patients With COVID-19 in Guangzhou, China: A Prospective Cohort Study. Ann Intern Med. American College of Physicians; 2020;173:879–87.

35. Long Q-X, Tang X-J, Shi Q-L, Li Q, Deng H-J, Yuan J, et al. Clinical and immunological assessment of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. Nat Med. Nature Publishing Group; 2020;26:1200–4.

36. Lee S, Kim T, Lee E, Lee C, Kim H, Rhee H, et al. Clinical Course and Molecular Viral Shedding Among Asymptomatic and Symptomatic Patients With SARS-CoV-2 Infection in a Community Treatment Center in the Republic of Korea. JAMA Internal Medicine. 2020;180:1447–52.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

37. Bolstad WM, Curran JM. Introduction to Bayesian statistics. John Wiley & Sons; 2016.

38. Wikle CK, Berliner LM. A Bayesian tutorial for data assimilation. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena. 2007;230:1–16.

39. Gelman A, Carlin JB, Stern HS, Dunson DB, Vehtari A, Rubin DB. Bayesian Data Analysis, Third Edition. CRC Press; 2013.

40. Soetaert K, Petzoldt T, Setzer RW. Solving Differential Equations in R: Package deSolve. Journal of Statistical Software. 2010;33:1–25.

41. Wolodzko T, Wolodzko MT. Package 'extraDistr.' 2017;

42. Perperoglou A, Sauerbrei W, Abrahamowicz M, Schmid M. A review of spline function procedures in R. BMC Medical Research Methodology. 2019;19:46.

43. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, Unwin HJT, Mellan TA, Coupland H, et al. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. Nature. Nature Publishing Group; 2020;584:257–61.

44. Esposito S, Principi N. To mask or not to mask children to overcome COVID-19. Eur J Pediatr. 2020;179:1267–70.

45. Dong Y, Mo X, Hu Y, Qi X, Jiang F, Jiang Z, et al. Epidemiology of COVID-19 Among Children in China. Pediatrics. American Academy of Pediatrics; 2020;145:e20200702.

46. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. The Lancet. 2020;395:1054–62.

47. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. Nature Medicine. Nature Publishing Group; 2020;26:672–5.

48. 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. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2020;20:656–7.

49. Fauci AS, Lane HC, Redfield RR. Covid-19 — Navigating the Uncharted. New England Journal of Medicine. 2020;382:1268–9.

50. García LF. Immune Response, Inflammation, and the Clinical Spectrum of COVID-19. Front Immunol. 2020;11:1441.

51. Oran DP, Topol EJ. Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Narrative Review. Ann Intern Med. 2020;173:362–7.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

52. Czeisler MÉ, Tynan MA, Howard ME, Honeycutt S, Fulmer EB, Kidder DP, et al. Public attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs related to COVID-19, stay-at-home orders, nonessential business closures, and public health guidance—United States, New York City, and Los Angeles, May 5–12, 2020. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2020;69:751.

53. Felsenstein S, Hedrich CM. COVID-19 in children and young people. The Lancet Rheumatology. Elsevier; 2020;2:e514–6.

54. Bedford J, Enria D, Giesecke J, Heymann DL, Ihekweazu C, Kobinger G, et al. COVID-19: Towards controlling of a pandemic. The Lancet. 2020;395:1015–8.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Tables and Figures

Table 1. The definitions of compartments.

Figure 1. Compartmental model for SARS-CoV-2 transmission, where "j" represents another age group different from "i" for the compartments.

Figure 2. (A) The estimated transmissibility and 95% credible intervals for each age group; (B) The ratios of asymptomatic transmissibility to symptomatic transmissibility for seven age groups.

Figure 3. The proportion of asymptomatic infections and unconfirmed asymptomatic infections until February 22nd, 2020 for seven age groups.

Figure 4. The estimated dynamics of the epidemic and the transmission burdens from symptomatic and asymptomatic cases. (A): The estimated numbers of daily new transmissions with 95% credible intervals and the observed numbers of daily reported new confirmed cases from January 7th to February 21st, 2020; (B) The observed numbers of daily reported new confirmed symptomatic (R_{cs}) and asymptomatic cases (R_{ca}) and the estimated numbers of daily new cases that failed to be detected (R_h) with 95% credible intervals; (C): The estimated numbers of infected individuals caused by symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission over time, with 95% credible intervals; (D): Corresponding proportions of symptomatic and asymptomatic transmissions over different time periods.

Figure 5. The burden of transmission caused by different ages. (A) The estimated (contribution) ratios of new transmissions from different ages over different time periods; (B) The estimated (contribution) ratios of symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission from different ages. The contribution ratio of each age group is calculated by the proportion of the transmissions caused by the corresponding age group to the number of all transmissions in each transmission type, from January 7th to February 1st, 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. The definitions of compartments

Compartments	Meaning
S^i	Represents the individuals who are susceptible to the infectious disease.
E^i	Represents the individuals who are exposed to the infectious disease but are not infectious. The individuals of E would transfer to I_{ps} or I_a with proportion α_s^i and α_a^i for different ages after latent period $\mathcal{L}$.
I_{ps}^i	Represents the symptomatic infectious individuals before symptom onset, which would transfer to I_s^i after the period of pre-symptomatic transmission $\mathcal{S}_1$.
I_s^i	Represents the symptomatic infectious individuals after symptom onset, which would transfer to R_{cs}^i after the period of symptomatic transmission $\mathcal{S}_2^i$.
I_a^i	Represents the asymptomatic infectious individuals, which would transfer to R_{ca}^i (confirmed by testing after $\mathcal{A}_1^i$ days for different ages) or R_h^i (self-recovered after $\mathcal{A}_2$ days) eventually.
R_{cs}^i, R_{ca}^i and R_h^i	Represents the individuals assumed to be noninfectious and immune to the disease in the first wave of Zhejiang epidemic (roughly two months).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1. Compartmental model for SARS-CoV-2 transmission, where "j" represents another age group different from "i" for the compartments.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2. (A) The estimated transmissibility and 95% credible intervals for each age group; (B) The ratios of asymptomatic transmissibility to symptomatic transmissibility for seven age groups.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 3. The proportion of asymptomatic infections and unconfirmed asymptomatic infections until February 22nd, 2020 for seven age groups. The estimated proportions of asymptomatic cases, the proportions of cases that failed to be detected among asymptomatic infections (unconfirmed proportions), and the observed proportions of asymptomatic cases are defined as: $\frac{R_h^i+R_{ca}^i}{R_h^i+R_{cs}^i+R_{ca}^i}$, $\frac{R_h^i}{R_h^i+R_{ca}^i}$, and $\frac{R_{ca}^i}{R_{cs}^i+R_{ca}^i}$, respectively. The 95% credible intervals for the estimated proportions of asymptomatic cases are shown for each age group.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 4. The estimated dynamics of the epidemic and the transmission burdens from symptomatic and asymptomatic cases. (A): The estimated numbers of daily new transmissions with 95% credible intervals and the observed numbers of daily reported new confirmed cases from January 7th to February 21st, 2020; (B) The observed numbers of daily reported new confirmed symptomatic (R_{cs}) and asymptomatic cases (R_{ca}) and the estimated numbers of daily new cases that failed to be detected (R_h) with 95% credible intervals; (C): The estimated numbers of infected individuals caused by symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission over time, with 95% credible intervals; (D): Corresponding proportions of symptomatic and asymptomatic transmissions over different time periods.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.11.21257060; this version posted August 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 5. The burden of transmission caused by different ages. (A) The estimated (contribution) ratios of new transmissions from different ages over different time periods; (B) The estimated (contribution) ratios of symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission from different ages. The contribution ratio of each age group is calculated by the proportion of the transmissions caused by the corresponding age group to the number of all transmissions in each transmission type, from January 7th to February 1st, 2020.