1 SARS-CoV-2 RNA and antibody dynamics in a Dutch household study with dense sampling frame

- 2 Wanda G.H. Han^{1*}
- Arno Swart^{1*} 3
- 4 Axel Bonacic Marinovic¹
- 5 Dirk Eggink¹
- 6 Johan Reimerink¹
- 7 Lisa A. Wijsman¹
- Bas van der Veer¹ 8
- 9 Sharon van den Brink¹
- Anne-Marie van den Brandt¹ 10
- 11 Sophie van Tol¹
- Gert-Jan Godeke¹ 12
- Fion Brouwer¹ 13
- 14 Marieke Hoogerwerf¹
- 15 On behalf of the Dutch FFX-COVID-19 research group
- 16 Daphne F.M. Reukers¹
- Nynke Rots¹ 17
- 18 Chantal Reusken¹
- 19 Adam Meijer¹
- 20
- 21 ¹Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment,
- 22 Bilthoven, the Netherlands
- 23 *Equal contribution
- 24 Membership of the Dutch FFX-COVID-19 research group is provided in the Acknowledgments
- 25
- 26 Corresponding author contact information:
- 27 Adam Meijer
- Centre for Infectious Diseases Research, Diagnostics and Laboratory Surveilance, Centre for 28
- 29 Infectious Disease Control (CIb), National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM)
- 30 PO Box 1, 3720 BA Bilthoven, the Netherlands
- Tel.: +31 302743595 31
- 32 E-mail: Adam.Meijer@rivm.nl
- 33
- 34 Running title: SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics and symptom onset

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

35 Abstract

36

This study investigated the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 infection and diagnostics in household members 37 38 of different ages and with different symptom severity after SARS-CoV-2 exposure during the early 39 phase of the pandemic. Households with a SARS-CoV-2 confirmed positive case and at least one child 40 in the Netherlands were followed for 6 weeks. Naso (NP)- and oropharyngeal (OP) swabs, oral fluid 41 and feces specimens were analyzed for SARS-CoV-2 RNA and serum for SARS-CoV-2-specific 42 antibodies. The dynamics of the presence of viral RNA and the serological response was modeled to determine the sampling time-frame and sample type with the highest sensitivity to confirm or reject 43 a SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 between adults and children within a household 44 was correlated with symptom severity of index cases. In children higher viral loads compared to adults 45 46 were detected at symptom onset. Early in infection, higher viral loads were detected in NP and OP 47 specimens, while RNA in especially feces were longer detectable. SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies have 48 a 90% probability of detection from 7 days (total Ig) and 18 days (IgG) since symptom onset. In 49 conclusion this study has shown that on average, children carry higher loads of virus as compared to 50 adults early after infection. For highest probability of detection in SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics early in infection, RT-PCR on NP and OP specimens are more sensitive than on oral fluid and feces. For SARS-51 52 CoV-2 diagnostics late after infection, RT-PCR on feces specimens and serology are more valuable.

53

54 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, Household study, molecular diagnostics, serological diagnostics, infection
 55 dynamics

57 Introduction

58 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has spread rapidly across the world since January 2020 [1]. In the Netherlands, the first COVID-19 (the syndrome caused by SARS-CoV-2) 59 case was detected on 27 February 2020. From March until May 2020, the Dutch government 60 61 mandated a partial lockdown. This included social distancing, self-quarantine and self-isolation orders, 62 closing of schools, bars and restaurants, and urging people to work from home [2]. Yet, households 63 are close-contact settings with high probability of (pre/a-symptomatic) transmission of SARS-CoV-2 64 after introduction of the virus. In this period, a prospective cohort study was performed including 55 65 complete households with a RT-PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 positive case (index case) and at least one 66 child below 18 years of age. All household contacts were tested as soon as possible after a SARS-CoV-67 2 infection in the household was identified. At multiple timepoints, various clinical samples were 68 collected for molecular and serological diagnostics. Using a dense sampling strategy, SARS-CoV-2 69 transmission and kinetics of diagnostic parameters could be closely monitored within the households. 70 Earlier we described that the estimated Secondary Attack Rate (SAR) in this cohort that was high (35% 71 in children, 51% in adults), with reduced susceptibility of children compared to adolescents and adults 72 (0.67; 95%CI: 0.40-1.1) [3]. Here we looked further into the kinetics of infection.

In the present study, we use the results of the dense sampling and various molecular and serological assays to identify participants with an acute or recent SARS-CoV-2 infection to analyse household transmission patterns in relation to disease severity. Secondly, we describe the dynamics of the infection per individual based on viral RNA and antibody presence. Lastly, we compared the dynamics of the different diagnostic methods (test and sample type), by modeling the outcomes per assay in relation to the days post symptom onset (dps), disease severity and age.

79

81 Methods

82 Study protocol

A prospective cohort study was performed following households where one symptomatic household member was tested RT-PCR positive for SARS-CoV-2 in the period 24 March – 6 April 2020 [3]. In brief, persons 18 years and older testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR (i.e. the index case) who had at least one child in their household below the age of 18 could be included in this study (METC nr: NL13529.041.06). Table 1 describes the sampling scheme (See Reukers et al [3] for more details). We defined adults as individuals of 18 years of age or older and individuals as SARS-CoV-2 infection positive when they tested positive in at least one RT-PCR or serological assay.

90

91 COVID-19 severity

92 The day of onset of possible COVID-19 associated symptoms, i.e. respiratory symptoms (including sore 93 throat, cough, dyspnea or other respiratory difficulties, rhinorrhoea), fever, chills, headache, anosmia 94 or ageusia, muscle pain, joint ache, diarrhoea, nausea, vomiting, loss of appetite or fatigue, as 95 reported by the participant was defined 1 dps. Laboratory confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected cases with 96 any clinical symptoms other than pneumonia and/or requiring medical consultation were defined as mild cases. Moderate cases showed clinical signs of pneumonia, including dyspnea. Severe cases 97 98 reported dyspnea and consulted a health care professional for their symptoms, or reported having 99 been admitted to the hospital for COVID-19 [3, 4].

100

101 Transmission categories

We categorized the household transmission patterns in three groups. In the 'no transmission' category, SARS-CoV-2 infection was only detected in the index case. In the 'adult transmission' category, SARS-CoV-2 infection was detected in adults other than the index case only. In the 'family transmission' category, SARS-CoV-2 infection was detected in children and possibly also adults other than the index case. In order to assess the significance of differences in severities over transmission

categories a generalized linear model (GLM) for count data with Poisson family and exponential link
was set up with interactions between the transmission category and severity classes.

109

110 *Molecular diagnostics*

111 Nasopharyngeal swabs (NP) and oropharyngeal swabs (OP) were collected in gelatin-lactalbumin-112 yeast (GLY) viral transport medium (Mediaproducts BV, Groningen, The Netherlands), transported to 113 the laboratory in a cooling box and stored at maximum a few days at 4° C until being processed for 114 RT-PCR. Feces specimens were self-collected by the patient and send to the laboratory by regular mail, stored frozen at -20° C until being processed for RT-PCR. Oral fluid specimens were collected with a 115 116 Oracol sponge (Malvern Medical Developments Ltd, U.K.), transported to the laboratory in a cooling 117 box, processed for storage according to the manufacturer's instructions, and aliquots stored frozen at 118 -80° C until being used for RT-PCR. Total nucleic acid was extracted from NP-, OP swab, oral fluid or 119 feces using MagNApure 96 (MP96) with total nucleic acid kit small volume (Roche). Of the feces 120 specimens a 5% suspension was made in MEM with Hanks' salts and penicillin and streptomycin, 121 vortex for 15 seconds and 1 minute centrifuged at 16,000 Relative Centrifugal Force. Two-hundred ul 122 supernatant was mixed with 275 µl MP96 lysis buffer including equine arteritis virus (EAV) internal 123 control and yeast tRNA stabilizer. Total nucleic acid was eluted in 50 µl Tris EDTA buffer. RT-qPCR was 124 performed on 5 µl total nucleic acid using TaqMan® Fast Virus 1-Step Master Mix (Thermo Fisher) on 125 Roche LC480 II thermal cycler with SARS-like beta coronavirus (Sarbeco) specific E-gene primers and 126 probe and EAV as described previously [5, 6]. As no other Sarbeco viruses are currently detected in 127 humans, a positive Sarbeco E-gene RT-qPCR is validly taken as positive for SARS-CoV-2. For modeling 128 purposes no detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA was given an artificial cycle threshold (Ct) value of 40.

129

130 Serological diagnostics

The Wantai SARS-CoV-2 total antibody ELISA (Beijing Wantai Biological Pharmacy Enterprise, Beijing,
 China; catalogue number WS1096) was performed according to the manufacturer's instructions [7].

This assay is a double-antigen sandwich ELISA using the recombinant receptor-binding domain of SARS-CoV-2 as antigen. Optical density (OD) is measured at 450 nm and the antibody OD ratio for each sample is calculated as the ratio of the OD of that sample to the reading of a calibrator (included in the kit).

Sera were tested for the presence of IgG antibodies reactive with the SARS-CoV-2 S1 and SARS-CoV-2 N antigens in a protein microarray, in duplicate 2-fold serial dilutions starting at 1:20, essentially as described previously [8]. For each antigen, a 4-parameter loglogistic calibration curve was generated. Antibody titers (EC50 value) were defined as the interpolated serum dilution that gave a fluorescence intensity of 50% of the corresponding calibration curve. Raw data were processed with the R 4.04 statistical software as described previously [9].

143

144 Modeling RT-PCR

145 All available RT-PCR outcomes (Table 1) were modelled by a Bayesian hierarchical model of the form

146 $Ct_i \sim N(\mu_i, \sigma)$

147 $\mu_i = \alpha_{\text{test}[i]} + \alpha_{\text{test}[i], \text{id}[i]} + \alpha_{\text{test}[i], \text{agecat}[i]} + \alpha_{\text{test}[i], \text{severity}[i]}$

148 $+ + (\beta_{\text{test}[i]} + \beta_{\text{test}[i],\text{id}[i]} + \beta_{\text{test}[i],\text{agecat}[i]} + \beta_{\text{test}[i],\text{severity}[i]} +)d_i$

Here, Ct_i is the measured Ct value for sample *i*, and σ the overall variation. There is a part dependent on the days since onset of symptoms (d_i) with coefficients β , and a constant part with coefficients α . Both the α and β parameters include several contributions stratified by categorical variables: id[*i*] is the person specific identifier for sample *i* enabling longitudinal modelling, agecat[*i*] is either 'child' or 'adult', severity[*i*] is either 'asymptomatic', 'mild', 'moderate' or 'severe', and test[*i*] is either 'pcr NP, 'pcr OP, 'pcr oral fluid', 'pcr feces', 'wantai', 'microarray S1' or 'microarray N'.

155 For the id's a hierarchical model is built (i.e. a random effect),

156 $\alpha_{\text{test}[i], \text{id}[i]} \sim N(0, \sigma_{\text{test}[i]}), \quad \beta_{\text{test}[i], \text{id}[i]} \sim N(0, \tau_{\text{test}[i]}).$

157 Whenever a Ct-value of 40 is encountered, we apply censoring in the model by changing the 158 probability density function $f(x; \mu_i, \sigma)$ into its cumulative counterpart $1 - F(40; \mu_i, \sigma)$, thereby 159 encoding that we have an unknown Ct value which would either indicate the absence of amplifiable

160 RNA or presence of RNA but well below the detection limit of the used RT-PCR. All parameters are 161 given weakly informative priors, and the posterior distributions are obtained using the JAGS software 162 [10], interfaced from R [11]. Bayesian credible intervals were obtained from the samples of the posterior as calculated by JAGS. Prediction intervals were calculated by drawing randomly from 163 164 $N(\hat{\mu}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i)$, where the indicated means and standard deviations are samples from the posterior distributions. The posterior probability of being positive is modelled by $F(40; \hat{\mu}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i)$. The modeling 165 did not include the Ct values of the inclusion RT-PCR NP+OP which was performed in index cases just 166 167 before start of the study, since these values are not known to us.

168

169 Modeling serology

170 The dynamics of serology cannot be assumed to be linear as is the case for Ct-values. Rather, 171 seronegative individuals have a titer (OD ratio for Wantai or EC50 for protein microarray) varying 172 around a low value, and seropositive individuals have a titer varying around a high value. In the case 173 of the ELISA-test and microarray-based assays used in the current study, we find that a cut-off value 174 to distinguish seropositives and seronegatives works well, since the two components are well separated (Figure S1). Using the cut-off values 1 for Wantai (according to manufacturer's instructions) 175 176 and 10 for microarray [8], we classify each measurement X_i as either positive or negative. Using a 177 Bernouilli distribution and logit link for the probability we model the outcomes as

 $X_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_i)$

+ $(\beta_{\text{test}[i]} + \beta_{\text{test}[i],\text{id}[i]} + \beta_{\text{test}[i],\text{agecat}[i]} + \beta_{\text{test}[i],\text{severity}[i]})d_i$

 $logit(p_i) = \alpha_{test[i]} + \alpha_{test[i],id[i]} + \alpha_{test[i],agecat[i]} + \alpha_{test[i],severity[i]}$

- 178
- 179
- 180

181 Parameter estimation proceeds analogous to the RT-PCR model.

182

183 Assessing differences between factors

184 We assessed the difference between posterior estimates of parameters using the Region of Practical

185 Equivalence (ROPE) [12-14]. The ROPE is an interval chosen based on domain knowledge that indicates

values that are practically indistinguishable. For Ct-values our ROPE interval is [-1,1], which means that

187 we consider differences between Ct-values of less than one as not meaningful. For changes in Ct-value 188 per day (the slope) we choose [-1/7, 1/7], which means that we consider differences between Ct-189 values of less than one per week as not meaningful. For serology detection probability (dps) our ROPE 190 interval is [-2,2], which means that we consider differences between days of less than 2 as not 191 meaningful. The ROPE is compared to the 89% highest posterior density interval (HDI). When the ROPE 192 contains the HDI, no meaningful difference exists, when the ROPE is completely outside of the HDI, 193 there is a difference, when the ROPE and HDI overlap we withhold a decision because of too high 194 uncertainty.

195

196 Results

197 Household transmission SARS-CoV-2

198 A total of 242 participants from 55 complete households were included in this study. The number of 199 analyses performed per assay and specimen type at the various timepoints with the day of the first 200 home visit (so the start of the study within the particular household) defined as day 1 are described in 201 Table 1 and Table S1. To identify different transmission patterns, we visualized SARS-CoV-2 infection 202 detection by the different assays and specimen types per participant and household in heatmaps. We 203 identified the transmission pattern 'no transmission' in 16 households (Figure 1A), 'adult transmission' 204 in 11 households (Figure 1B) and 'family transmission' in 28 households (Figure 1C). Eight of the 28 205 households in the 'family transmission' category did not show transmission to adults.

Symptom severity of COVID-19 index cases correlated with transmission of SARS-CoV-2 between adults and children within a household as reflected by the overrepresentation of index cases with severe symptoms in the family transmission group (p=0.03, 54% of indexes with severe COVID-19) compared to the other groups (Figure 2). In the no transmission category, more than half (56.3%) of the index cases had mild symptoms, whilst only 19% had severe symptoms. In the adult transmission category, there were 4 severe index cases out of 10 (36%).

212

213 SARS-CoV-2 infection dynamics

214 We investigated the SARS-CoV-2 infection dynamics in the participants of the study. Using an 'upset plot' [15], Figure 3 shows patterns of positive and negative results in the various molecular and 215 216 serological assays. Of the 242 participants, 136 individuals were positive for SARS-CoV-2 infection by 217 either molecular and/or serological diagnostics. Of these 136 SARS-CoV-2 infection positive 218 individuals, 125 (91.9%) were symptomatic and severe symptomatic individuals were mainly (29 out 219 of 32) RT-PCR- and serology-positive (Figure 3B). Most individuals were found SARS-CoV-2 positive by 220 multiple diagnostic assays and/or materials, but 19 individuals tested positive with only one assay type 221 and/or material (only Wantai n=5, RT-PCR NP n=3, RT-PCR oral fluid n=3, RT-PCR OP n=2, RT-PCR feces 222 n=2, Inclusion PCR NP+OP n=2, MA-S n=1, MA-N n=1) during the study period (Figure 3A). In most of 223 the infected cases (81.6%, 111 of the 136) both SARS-CoV-2 RNA and SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies 224 were detected (Figure 3B). For 12 individuals only at one timepoint during the study one positive test 225 was found (Figure 1, red rectangles).

226 Next, for the individuals with at least one RT-PCR and one serological result at visit 1, 2 and 3 227 (n=198), we could analyze rough dynamics of the infection process (Figure 4). The median dps relative 228 to visit 1 is indicated in Figure 4. Six common patterns in 173 individuals, ranked A – F based on frequency, could be identified. Within laboratory confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals, the 229 230 common patterns B (n=28) and C (n=27) included individuals with a positive PCR and serological assay 231 at visit 1. As can be expected, SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA was not detected anymore in these cases at the 232 end of the study (4-6 weeks after inclusion), while SARS-CoV-2 antibodies remained present. 233 Individuals with pattern E (n=12) did not have detectable SARS-CoV-2 RNA at any visit, but did have 234 detectable SARS-CoV-2 antibodies at visit 1, 2 and 3. This pattern is in line with an earlier onset of 235 symptoms compared to the individuals with pattern B and C, thus these individuals were included in the study later in their infection process resulting in already diminished viral RNA and present 236 237 antibodies at visit 1. Pattern D (n=18) and F (n=9) included individuals with a positive RT-PCR at visit 1 238 and developed antibodies after visit 1. Compared to pattern B and C, these individuals reported their

onset of symptoms 2-4 days later, thus at study inclusion (visit 1) they were earlier in their infection
process. Pattern A included individuals with negative RT-PCR and serology results at all visits. These
rough patterns underline that there are optimal time windows in which detection of SARS-CoV-2 viral
RNA or SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies are most appropriate in diagnostics. To further investigate this
we used a modelling approach.

244

245 Dynamics SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics

246 Bayesian modeling on all available RT-PCR data demonstrated a difference in Ct-values at symptoms 247 onset between adults and children (Figure 5A, B and S2-G1) and in Ct-values at symptom onset and in 248 Ct-value increase per day between different specimen types (Figure 5C and S2-A to F). The predicted 249 Ct value (inversely correlated with viral load), was on average 2.6 Ct lower in children (Ct 27.5; all 250 specimens) compared to adults (Ct 30.1; all specimens) at the day of symptom onset (intercept) 251 (Figure 5A, B and S2-G1). The decay in time in viral load (slope) was comparable between adults and 252 children (Figure 5B and S2-G2). In line with this, there is a longer probability of SARS-CoV-2 RNA 253 detection with increasing dps in children (99% detection until 13 dps), compared to adults (99% 254 detection until 7.6 dps) (Figure S3A). When analyzing all ages, the predicted viral load seems slightly higher in NP and OP swabs (Ct 28.8 and 28.7) compared to feces (Ct 30.1) and oral fluid (Ct 30.7) at 255 256 the day of symptom onset (intercept) (Figure 5C) indicating higher sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 RNA 257 detection in NP and OP specimens compared to oral fluid (Figure S2-B1 and D1) and possibly feces 258 (Figure S2-C1 and E1). In contrast, there seems te be a slower decay (slope) in viral load in oral fluid 259 and feces specimens (0.25 and 0.22 Ct per day) compared to NP and OP specimens (0.35 and 0.36 Ct 260 per day) (Figure 5C). The relevance of these findings is uncertain as there is partial overlap between 261 the ROPE and HDI (Figure S2-B1 to E1 and B2 to E2). Overall, as a most likely estimate, the estimated viral load is higher in NP and OP swabs compared to oral fuid until 21.1 dps and 19.0 dps, respectively 262 263 (Figure S4-B and D), and compared to feces until 10.2 dps and 9.7 dps, respectively (Figure S4-C and 264 E). Furthermore, there is a longer probability of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection with increasing dps in feces

(90% detection until 27 dps), compared to NP, OP and oral fluid specimens (90% detection until 19.4,
20.3 and 22.7 dps, respectively) (Figure 5D and Figure S5-C, E and F). Similar trends are shown for 50%
and 10% detection probability (Figure S5 and S6). We could not find a clear correlation in severity of
symptoms and the dynamics of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection (data not shown).

269 Furthermore, we investigated the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection (Figure 6). The 270 Wantai assay (total Ig) demonstrated a higher sensitivity for detection of anti-S1 antibodies than the 271 micro-array (IgG) as the probability for detection was earlier using Wantai upon onset of illness (Figure 272 6A and S7-A). The dps at which 90% detection probability was reached for Wantai was 7.1 compared 273 to 16.9 and 18 for Nucleoprotein (N)- and S1-protein microarray respectively (Figure 6B). The protein 274 microarray for S1 and N had comparable sensitivity, in line with a previous study [8]. The probability 275 of detecting N-specific IgG antibodies in children was delayed by 3.0 days (at 90% probability 276 detection) versus adults (Figure 6C and D), while this was not the case for detection of S1-specific 277 antibodies (Figure 6C). The relevance of this finding is uncertain as there is much overlap between the 278 distributions in children and adults (Figure S8). The N-specific IgG antibody titers (at visit 3; 279 convalescent phase) were not significantly lower in children compared to adults (Figure S9). 280 Furthermore, we could not find a correlation in severity of symptoms and the dynamics of the SARS-281 CoV-2 infection detection by the serological assays (data not shown).

282

283 Discussion

We studied SARS-CoV-2 RNA and antibody kinetics in a household cohort during the early phase of the pandemic using an unusual dense sampling schedule allowing for high resolution analysis. For highest probability of detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by RT-PCR early in infection NP and OP are more suitable than oral fluid and feces. SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies have a 90% probability of detection from 7 dps with the Wantai assay and 18 dps with the microarray S1 and N assay. This study has been performed in a naïve population during the early phase of the pandemic. Although SARS-CoV-2 vaccination, previous infection and the circulation of other SARS-CoV-2 variants may influence the

dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 infection and thereby diagnostics, our study provides valuable reference
 insights into this subject.

293 Households present close-contact settings with high risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission after 294 introduction of SARS-CoV-2 in the household [3, 16]. We observed a positive correlation between 295 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 between adults and children and the severity of disease in the household 296 indexes. This is in line with studies that report that the severity of SARS-CoV-2 infection of the index 297 case was associated with higher infectiousness [16, 17]. It should be noted that at the time of the 298 study, SARS-CoV-2 testing in the Netherlands was limited to symptomatic healthcare workers and 299 symptomatic vulnerable individuals. The index cases were thus mainly symptomatic healthcare 300 workers [3]. As schools and daycare centres were closed during the study period, transmission outside 301 the households among children was minimalized. Due to limited sample size, we could only 302 categorized children as those of 17 years of age or younger for the Bayesian hierarchical modelling. It 303 would be of interest to stratify the children in more groups, e.g. primary school age and adolescent 304 age.

305 Seroconversion rates in mild to severe symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR positive cases have 306 been reported in the range of 93-100% after 3-4 week [18-20]. During the course of this study, a vast 307 majority of RT-PCR confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected participants (91.0%, 111/122) developed SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies (Figure 3B). In 6 RT-PCR positive cases, serology data was missing. In 11 of 308 309 122 (9.0%) RT-PCR confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals there was no seroconversion (Figure 310 3B). These individuals may have experienced a relative mild infection, or in the cases with only one 311 positive RT-PCR test (including the available results of the extra sampling between visit 1 and 2, n=8) and no evidence of antibody response, the SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis of these individuals is disputable. 312 313 Four of the 8 RT-PCR-negative cases that did have SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies during the study period, showed only one positive serological test, suggesting also a disputable SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis. 314 315 In the other 4 individuals, SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies were detected at multiple visits including at 316 visit 1, therefore likely having experienced infection before inclusion. Nevertheless, technically there

317 was no evidence of false positivity as all negative controls had correct results. Therefore, the 318 disputable results remain unexplained. Transient exposure without established infection and rapid 319 waning of immune response might be one explanantion. The individuals with negative RT-PCR and 320 serology results at all visits were probably not infected with SARS-CoV-2 (Figure 3B and Figure 4, 321 pattern A). Those reporting symptoms were not tested for alternative diagnoses (i.e. other respiratory 322 viruses). From national surveillance reports we known that also other viruses causing COVID-19-like 323 acute respiratory infection symptoms circulated (https://www.rivm.nl/virologische-weekstaten). 324 Especially in March 2020, the first study month, before the COVID-19 measures were put in place. 325 Later on rhinoviruses continued circulating during the measures.

326 In the current study we used Bayesian hierarchical models to determine the sampling time-327 frame and sample type with the highest sensitivity to confirm or reject a SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis. Due 328 to the close-contact settings with high probability of (pre/a-symptomatic) transmission of SARS-CoV-329 2 after introduction of the virus in households and the longitudinal dense sampling performed in this 330 study, the analysis yielded results with relatively narrow credibility intervals which support our 331 findings. For highest probability of a SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis (lower Ct), RT-PCR on NP and OP specimens 332 were more suitable than feces and oral fluid until 10 dps and 20 dps, respectively (Figure S4C, E and B, D). Our study confirms that NP and OP (or combined NP+OP) were the preferred sample type for 333 334 RT-PCR-based SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics within 1 week upon onset of symptoms [21-23]. A systematic 335 review concluded that of the alternative specimens to NP and OP swabs, oral fluid (saliva) has an 336 estimated sensitivity of 83.9% (95% CI: 77.4-88.8) and specificity of 96.4% (95% CI: 89.5-98.8) 337 compared to reference NP and OP swabs in nucleic acid assays [23]. The sensitivity and specificity of feces specimens seems much lower, although limited data is available [23]. For SARS-CoV-2 338 339 diagnostics late in infection or in past infections, RT-PCR on feces and oral fluid specimens are more 340 valuable than NP and OP specimens, since the presence of viral RNA in especially feces remain present over a longer time compared to NP and OP swab specimens. This is in line with findings of other studies 341 342 that indicate that SARS-CoV-2 RNA can be detected up to 126 days in feces compared to 83 days in

respiratory specimens and that beyond 10 dps, feces sampling may be preferred [22, 24, 25]. Although
SARS-CoV-2 RNA can remain present in respiratory and feces specimens for a long time, the duration
of presence of viable virus is relatively short-lived [26, 27]. Alternatively, from a week after symptom
onset testing for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 Spike-specific total Ig using Wantai ELISA can confirm a
recent or past SARS-CoV-2 infection. SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics using protein microarray detecting SARSCoV-2 Spike- and Nucleoprotein-specific IgG antibodies, is useful 2 weeks after infection or symptom
onset.

350 The infection dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 may be influenced by characteristics of the tested 351 population, such as age and the severity of COVID-19. We, however, could not find a clear correlation 352 in severity of symptoms or age and the RNA and SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody kinetics, although our 353 study may be underpowered to detect these differences (data not shown). Children in general report 354 milder symptoms compared to adults (Table S1) [3]. It is known that with age, the expression of ACE-355 2 increases in nasal epithelium [28]. Since SARS-CoV-2 uses the ACE-2 receptor for host entry, a lower 356 expression of ACE-2 in children relative to adults might explain the lower susceptibility and milder 357 infection course in children. However, our findings and other studies show that viral loads in children 358 are similar or higher than viral loads in adults [29, 30]. In our study children displayed lower Ct values 359 (higher viral loads) at the day of symptom onset compared to adults, while the decay in viral load was 360 comparable (Figure 5). This suggests that if children become infected with SARS-CoV-2, they can carry 361 high loads of virus for a longer time compared to adults. Therefore, children are potentially longer 362 infectious than adults after symptom onset. Whether this observation holds for new Variants of 363 concern (VOC) e.a. delta, warrants further investigation. No clear differences between adults and 364 children were found in the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 serology, yet the detection of N-specific antibodies 365 seems slightly delayed in children compared to adults (Figure 6C, D and S8). A study showed a reduced 366 breadth of anti-SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies, predominantly generating IgG antibodies specific for 367 the S protein but not the N protein in children compared to adults [31]. Whether this has 368 consequences for the development of immunity to SARS-CoV-2 is not yet clear.

In summary, our study allowed for a high resolution analysis of the sensitivity of molecular and serology-based detection of recent SARS-CoV-2 infections due to the unusual dense sampling strategy in a confined setting. For highest probability of SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics early in infection, PCR on NP and OP specimens are in favor over oral fluid and feces. For SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics late in infection or in past infection, RT-PCR on feces specimens and serology are more valuable. Children seem to carry higher loads of virus for a prolonged time in comparison to adults. The data presented here strengthen the evidence-basis for SARS-CoV-2 testing strategies.

376

377 Acknowledgements

378 We thank the Public Health Service Utrecht for assistance in the recruitment of households. We thank 379 Alper Cevirgel, Anneke Westerhof, Anoek Backx, Elma Smeets-Roelofs, Elsa Porter, Elske Bijvank, 380 Francoise van Heiningen, Gabriel Goderski, Harry van Dijken, Helma Lith, Hinke ten Hulscher, Ilse 381 Akkerman, Ilse Schinkel, Jeroen Hoeboer, Jolanda Kool, Josine van Beek, Joyce Greeber, Kim Freriks, 382 Lidian Izeboud, Lisa Beckers, Liza Tymchenko, Maarten Emmelot, Maarten Vos, Margriet Bisschoff, 383 Marit de Lange, Marit Middeldorp, Marjan Bogaard, Marjan Kuijer, Martien Poelen, Nening Nanlohy, 384 Olga de Bruin, Rogier Bodewes, Ruben Wiegmans, Sakinie Misiedjan, Saskia de Goede, Titia Kortbeek, 385 and Yolanda van Weert for assistance in logistics and laboratory analyses. We thank Bettie Voordouw 386 for critical review of manuscript. The Dutch FFX-COVID-19 research group of the Centre for Infectious 387 Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, the Netherlands, includes 388 the following members: Arianne B. van Gageldonk-Lafeber, Wim van der Hoek, Susan van den Hof, 389 Adam Meijer, Daphne F.M. Reukers, Chantal Reusken, Inge Roof and Nynke Rots.

390 This study was funded by the Dutch Ministry of Health, Welfare, and Sport (VWS).

391 None of the authors has any potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.06.21263384; this version posted October 12, 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.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

393 References

- 394 [1] World Health Organization (WHO). Timeline of WHO's response to COVID-19.
- 395 <u>https://www.who.int/news/item/29-06-2020-covidtimeline</u>.
- 396 [2] Minister Bruno Bruins MIvE, Minister Arie Slob, Minister Tamara van Ark. Kamerbrief met nieuwe
- 397 aanvullende maatregelen om de COVID 19 uitbraak te bestrijden. Medische Zorg en Sport OCeW,
- Basis- en Voortgezet Onderwijs en Media, Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid. Den Haag, 15 March2020.
- 400 [3] Reukers DFM, van Boven M, Meijer A, Rots N, Reusken C, Roof I, et al. High infection secondary
- 401 attack rates of SARS-CoV-2 in Dutch households revealed by dense sampling. Clin Infect Dis. 2021.
 402 [4] (WHO) WHO. Clinical Management of COVID-19, 2020.
- 403 [5] Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, et al. Detection of 2019 novel
 404 coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Euro Surveill. 2020;25.
- 405 [6] Scheltinga SA, Templeton KE, Beersma MF, Claas EC. Diagnosis of human metapneumovirus and
- rhinovirus in patients with respiratory tract infections by an internally controlled multiplex real-time
 RNA PCR. J Clin Virol. 2005;33:306-11.
- 408 [7] Lassaunière R FA, Harboe ZB, Nielsen AC, Fomsgaard A, Krogfelt KA, Jørgensen CS. Evaluation of 409 nine commercial SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays. medRxiv 2020040920056325. 2020.
- 410 [8] van Tol S, Mogling R, Li W, Godeke GJ, Swart A, Bergmans B, et al. Accurate serology for SARS-
- 411 CoV-2 and common human coronaviruses using a multiplex approach. Emerg Microbes Infect.412 2020;9:1965-73.
- 413 [9] Koopmans M, de Bruin E, Godeke GJ, Friesema I, van Gageldonk R, Schipper M, et al. Profiling of
- 414 humoral immune responses to influenza viruses by using protein microarray. Clin Microbiol Infect.415 2012;18:797-807.
- 416 [10] Martyn Plummer (2003). JAGS: A Program for Analysis of Bayesian Graphical Models Using
- Gibbs Sampling, Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Distributed Statistical Computing
 (DSC 2003), March 20–22, Vienna, Austria. ISSN 1609-395X.
- [11] R Core Team (2021). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Foundation for
 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/.
- 421 [12] Kruschke JK, Liddell TM. The Bayesian New Statistics: Hypothesis testing, estimation, meta-
- 422 analysis, and power analysis from a Bayesian perspective. Psychon Bull Rev. 2018;25:178-206.
- 423 [13] R M. Statistical rethinking: A bayesian course with examples in r and stan2018.
- 424 [14] Piironen J VA. Comparison of bayesian predictive methods for model selection. Statistics and425 Computing. 2017;27:711–35.
- 426 [15] Lex A, Gehlenborg N, Strobelt H, Vuillemot R, Pfister H. UpSet: Visualization of Intersecting Sets.
 427 IEEE Trans Vis Comput Graph. 2014;20:1983-92.
- 428 [16] Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Jr., Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household Transmission of SARS-
- 429 CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Netw Open. 2020;3:e2031756.
- 430 [17] Fung HF, Martinez L, Alarid-Escudero F, Salomon JA, Studdert DM, Andrews JR, et al. The
- household secondary attack rate of SARS-CoV-2: A rapid review. Clin Infect Dis. 2020.
- 432 [18] Fu Y, Li Y, Guo E, He L, Liu J, Yang B, et al. Dynamics and Correlation Among Viral Positivity,
- 433 Seroconversion, and Disease Severity in COVID-19 : A Retrospective Study. Ann Intern Med.
- 434 2021;174:453-61.
- [19] Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, Wu GC, Deng K, Chen YK, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in
 patients with COVID-19. Nat Med. 2020;26:845-8.
- 437 [20] Wajnberg A, Mansour M, Leven E, Bouvier NM, Patel G, Firpo-Betancourt A, et al. Humoral
- 438 response and PCR positivity in patients with COVID-19 in the New York City region, USA: an
- 439 observational study. Lancet Microbe. 2020;1:e283-e9.
- 440 [21] Moreira VM, Mascarenhas P, Machado V, Botelho J, Mendes JJ, Taveira N, et al. Diagnosis of
- 441 SARS-Cov-2 Infection by RT-PCR Using Specimens Other Than Naso- and Oropharyngeal Swabs: A
- 442 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Diagnostics (Basel). 2021;11.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.06.21263384; this version posted October 12, 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 .

- 443 [22] Stanoeva KR, van der Eijk AA, Meijer A, Kortbeek LM, Koopmans MPG, Reusken C. Towards a
- 444 sensitive and accurate interpretation of molecular testing for SARS-CoV-2: a rapid review of 264 445 studies. Euro Surveill. 2021;26.
- 446 [23] Lee RA, Herigon JC, Benedetti A, Pollock NR, Denkinger CM. Performance of Saliva,
- Oropharyngeal Swabs, and Nasal Swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Molecular Detection: a Systematic Review 447 448 and Meta-analysis. J Clin Microbiol. 2021;59.
- 449 [24] Mallett S, Allen AJ, Graziadio S, Taylor SA, Sakai NS, Green K, et al. At what times during
- 450 infection is SARS-CoV-2 detectable and no longer detectable using RT-PCR-based tests? A systematic
- 451 review of individual participant data. BMC Med. 2020;18:346.
- [25] Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV 452
- 453 viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness: a systematic review and meta-454 analysis. Lancet Microbe. 2021;2:e13-e22.
- 455 [26] van Kampen JJA, van de Vijver D, Fraaij PLA, Haagmans BL, Lamers MM, Okba N, et al. Duration
- 456 and key determinants of infectious virus shedding in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease-457 2019 (COVID-19). Nat Commun. 2021;12:267.
- 458 [27] Wolfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Muller MA, et al. Virological
- 459 assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. Nature. 2020;581:465-9.
- 460 [28] Bunyavanich S, Do A, Vicencio A. Nasal Gene Expression of Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme 2 in 461 Children and Adults. JAMA. 2020;323:2427-9.
- 462 [29] Heald-Sargent T, Muller WJ, Zheng X, Rippe J, Patel AB, Kociolek LK. Age-Related Differences in
- 463 Nasopharyngeal Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Levels in Patients
- 464 With Mild to Moderate Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). JAMA Pediatr. 2020;174:902-3.
- 465 [30] L'Huillier AG, Torriani G, Pigny F, Kaiser L, Eckerle I. Culture-Competent SARS-CoV-2 in
- Nasopharynx of Symptomatic Neonates, Children, and Adolescents. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020;26:2494-466 467 7.
- 468 [31] Weisberg SP, Connors TJ, Zhu Y, Baldwin MR, Lin WH, Wontakal S, et al. Distinct antibody
- 469 responses to SARS-CoV-2 in children and adults across the COVID-19 clinical spectrum. Nat Immunol.
- 470 2021;22:25-31.

472 Legends

473

Figure 1. Various transmission patterns of SARS-CoV-2 infection based on different assays and specimen types collected at visits 1, 2 and 3 in households visualized in heatmaps. (A) households with no transmission. (B) household with only transmission in adults. (C) heatmaps of household with transmission in children and possibly also adults. Symptoms can be unrelated to a SARS-CoV-2 infection. On the left side, age category (A = adult and C = Child) of the participant is indicated. * Index case. Blanks = not available/tested. Red rectangle: individual with only one test positive on one timepoint. On the right side the Household ID (number) is indicated.

481

Figure 2. Symptom severity of COVID-19 index cases in the households. The GLM (generalized linear
model) revealed that there were less individuals in the "Severe" category than in the "Mild" category
(p=0.1), and that households in "Family transmission" category was overrepresented in the "Severe"
category (p=0.03). Maximum severity score of index is used.

486

Figure 3. (A) Overview of the (combination of) various positive SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis in the 487 242 participants of the study cohort for all various diagnostic assays or specimens. All available RT-488 489 PCR and serology outcomes (Table 1) were incuded in these analyses. The black dots indicate a 490 positive test at any (or multiple) moment(s) during the study, except for 'Inclusion PCR NP+OP' which was performed in index cases just before start of the study. The number of individuals with a 491 492 particular combination of positive tests are indicated in the top of the figure. The numbers at the 493 right after each test indicates the overall number of positive tests. (B) The number of individuals 494 with a positive or negative tests or missing data for serological and molecular (PCR) diagnostics 495 combined. In brackets the number of symptomatic or severe symptomatic individuals, respectively, 496 are indicated. Color intensity is related to the frequency.

497

Figure 4. Common SARS-CoV-2 infection dynamics patterns, based on the presence or absence of a
positive or negative RT-PCR or serological assay at visit 1, 2 and 3. Common patterns were named A
- F based on frequency, with the number of individuals (n) displaying the pattern indicated. The
median timing of onset of symptoms relative to visit 1 is indicated on the left. The black line
indicates whether on average symptoms were reported at visit 1, 2 or 3.
Figure 5. Dynamics SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis by RT-PCR in various specimens since symptoms

505 onset (dps). All available RT-PCR outcomes (Table 1) were incuded in these analyses. A) Predicted viral 506 load (Ct values RT-PCR) in relation to dps and specimen type. The shadow indicates the 95% Bayesian 507 confidence interval and the dotted lines indicate the prediction interval (variation over individuals). B 508 and C) Ct-value distribution at day symptom onset (intercept) and increase of Ct-value per day (slope) 509 in relation to age category (B) and different specimens (C). D) Average dps until when different 510 specimens have at least 90% detection probability.

511

512 Figure 6. Dynamics SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis by different serological assays. All available 513 serology outcomes (Table 1) were incuded in these analyses. Probability SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody detection (A) and average dps from when the Wantai (Spike-specific IgM and IgG), microarray S1 514 515 (Spike-specific IgG) and microarray N (Nucleoprotein-specific IgG) assays have at least 90% detection 516 probability (B) for all ages. C) Probability SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody detection by Wantai, 517 microarray S1 and microarray N in adults and children D) Average dps from when microarray N has at 518 least 90% detection probability for adults and children. The shadows in (C) and (D) indicate the 95% 519 Bayesian confidence interval.

	Visit 1									Visit 2	Visit 3					
Day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15 (range 14-21)	35 (range 28-42)
Start questionnaire	Х															
Symptoms diary		Х	х	Х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х		
Final questionnaire																х
Blood (serum) - Wantai	222														210	149
Blood (serum) - Microarray S1 and N	230														221	208
Nasopharyngeal swab	183 ¹		53			46			51			55			221	
Oropharyngeal swab	187 ¹		53			47			51			54			230	
Oral fluid	219														206	189
Feces	222														226	195

Table 1. Schedule of administering questionnaires, symptom diaries and home visits for sampling. The numbers in the table indicate the amount of analyzed specimens in 242 participants. ¹ A naso- and oropharyngeal swab was not collected for the index case at the first home visit, as these persons were already swabbed a few days before and tested SARS-CoV-2 positive.

Figure 1

L

A. No transmission

	PCR NP	PCR OP	PCR teces	FCR oral fluid	Microaray St	Microarray N	Wantai	Severity
1 A* -	. 1		+ 1 1	2.2.2		1 -	+ + +	
3. C -		88						
5. C -	0.0	13.3	1.2.2.2	1.2.2		3 4 4 K		
1. A* -	+				-		- + +	
2.A - 3.C -	5.5	10.5	10.0.0	2.2.2	1 2 2	1.1.1	2.2.2	×
4. C -	2.2	2.2	19.9.9	19 ° 9	2.2.2	8.8.8	2.2	
5. C -	* *		+ + +					
1. A* -			2.2	* 2.2	* * *		+ + +	
3. A -	2.2		2.2			1 1 1		
4. C -	0.0	10.0	. a. a	1.1.1		2 + x	1. 10	
								-
2. A -	2.2	2.2	2.3.2		2.2.2		2 2 2	
3. C -			5 F		A 4			
4. C								
1. A* -			IN		+ + +		+ + +	
2.A - 3.C -	2.1	2.2	1.1.1	A 4 5	1 1 1	1 1 1	2.2.2	
4.C -	6.6		1 1 1	1.1				
9.67							1.1.1	
1. A* -	0.0		2.2.5	2 2 2			+ + +	
3.C				12.2.2		1 1 1		2
4. C -	2.2		2.2.2	0.0.0	2.2.2	2.2.2	2.2.2	
1. 4	+							-
2. A -	1.2.2	2.2	2.2.2	2.2				60
3. C -	5 C	÷	2.2.2	15 5	2.5.5	- $ -$	-	
4. C -	•				• •	• •	-	-
1. A* -	. *				+		+ +	
2.A -	5.5	2.2	1 . I	0.00	2.2.2	0.0.0	2.2	6
4. C -	2.2	0.0	2.2	0.0.0	12 m 2	2 1 2	2	
	-					in the second second		-
2. A -	0.0	0.0	0.0.0	0.00	2.2.2	2.2.2	0.00	
3. C -								2
4. C -	2.2	2.2	2 2 2	1 2 2	2.2.2		2.2.2	
1. A* -	*		(* * *)			* * *	+ + +	
2. A -		8.8	8.8.9	8 8 8				-
3.6-	0.0	0.0	10.0.0	10.0.0	- 2.2		2 2 2	
1. A* -	+		a a -	2.5.5	- <u>-</u> -		÷ + +	
2. A -		X X	* * *				* * *	-
3. C -	* *	× × .			\cdot \cdot \cdot	\bullet \bullet \bullet	+ $+$ $+$	
1. A	- x 1	1	(x, x)	(* * *)		10 10 10	+ + +	
2. A -	2.2	8.8		8 8 8				
3.C-	8 J	5 .	2.2.1	15 5 5	* .5	* *		
7.07								-
1. A* -	- 2	20	* * *	×	1 2 4 1	1.2.2	+ + +	
2. A -	2.2	2.2		$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$	2.2.2	* * *		*
3. C -	2.2	14 X	2.2.2		-	*		
1. A* -	•			-		+ - +	+ + +	
2.A -	2.3	12.5	88.5	10 8				
4. C -	2.2		12.2.2	0.0.0	2.2		2. 2	
5, C -	* *	+ +	+ +		• -			
1. A* -			+	+ •	- + +	• + +	+ + +	
2.A -	2.5	2.5		2.2.2				
4.C -	2	S 8 .	1 2 2 2	2 2 2	8 8 8	2 2 3	0.01	
1.A -	1							
2. A -	2.2	1.1	2.3	8.8	0.0	0.0	2 2	
0. A. T				- ×	-			8
4.5.C	8 B	1.5 5	5 8 1				1.2	

pcr 1 Ct < 20 pcr 2 Ct 20-25 pcr 3 Ct 25-30 pcr 4 Ct 30-35 pcr 5 Ct 35-40
 micr 1
 EC50
 <10</th>
 wantai 1
 OD4sonm
 <1.0</th>

 micr 2
 EC50
 10-100
 wantai 2
 OD4sonm
 1.0-10

 micr 3
 EC50
 100-100
 wantai 3
 OD4sonm
 >10

 micr 4
 EC50
 >1000
 wantai 3
 OD4sonm
 >10
 Asymptomatic Mild Moderate Severe B. Adults transmission PCR NP PCR OP PCR feces PCR oral fluid Microarray St. Microarray N Wantai + . . + + + + * : . + - -. . 1. A* . 2. A -10.04 + + + . . + + + + + + 3. A -+ + + + 4. C -1. A* + + 2. A - + + + + + 3. C - - -4. C - + . -. . 1. A* + + + + + + + + 2. A - • • -. . -. + + 3. A -. . . . 1.0 4.C -5. C -1. A --2. A' + + + + . -3. C -. 8 Family members 4. C -5. C -1. A' -+ + + + + 2.A - - ---24 3. C -4. C -1. A* -+ + + + + 2. A - + + + + + 3.C - - -. 1. A* -. . . 24 2. A - + - 64 3. C -1. A* + + - -+ + + + + -+ • 2. A -. . 1.4 + 3. C -: : + -+ -+ + 100 + + 8 6. A - + + + + + + + + + 1. A* 2. A - + + + + K - 0 0 - 0 0 3.0 - - -140 . . 2 2 2 - 03 50

- 04 09

- 04 09

- 04 02 -N Visit

- 01 02

Legend

Visit

Figure 1 continued

C. Family transmission





Figure 2







Figure 4



Figure 5



Figure 6

