

1 **Susceptibility and infectiousness of SARS-CoV-2 in children versus**
2 **adults, by variant (wild-type, Alpha, Delta): a systematic review and**
3 **meta-analysis of household contact studies**

4 Olalekan A. Uthman, PhD^{1*}, Frederik Plesner Lyngse, PhD², Seun Anjorin, PhD¹, Barbara Hauer, PhD³,
5 Seran Hakki, PhD⁴, Diego A. Martinez, PhD^{5,12}, Yang Ge, PhD⁶, Jakob Jonnerby, DPhil⁷, Cathinka
6 Halle Julin, PhD⁸, Gary Lin, PhD⁹, Ajit Lalvani, PhD⁴, Julika Loss, PhD¹⁰, Kieran J Madon, PhD⁴,
7 Leonardo Martinez, PhD¹¹, Lisbeth Meyer Næss, PhD⁸, Kathleen R. Page, MD⁵, Diana Prieto, PhD¹²,
8 Anna Hayman Robertson, PhD⁸, Ye Shen, PhD¹³, Juliane Wurm, PhD¹⁰, Udo Buchholz, PhD³

9 ¹Warwick Centre for Global Health, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

10 ²Department of Economics & Center for Economic Behaviour and Inequality, University of
11 Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

12 ³Department for Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Respiratory Infections Unit, Robert Koch Institute,
13 13353 Berlin, Germany

14 ⁴NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Respiratory Infections, National Heart and Lung Institute,
15 Imperial College London, London, UK

16 ⁵Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA

17 ⁶School of Health Professions, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, 39406, Mississippi,
18 USA

19 ⁷School of Public Health, Imperial College London, Norfolk Place, London W2 1PG, UK.

20 ⁸Division of Infection Control, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, P.O. Box 222 Skøyen, 0213 Oslo,
21 Norway.

22 ⁹Department of Emergency Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD,
23 USA

24 ¹⁰Department of Epidemiology and Health Monitoring, Robert Koch-Institute, General Pape-Str. 62-
25 66, Berlin, Germany

26 ¹¹Department of Epidemiology, Boston University School of Public Health, 715 Albany St., Boston,
27 MA 02118, United States

28 ¹²School of Industrial Engineering, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Valparaíso, Chile

29 ¹³Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, College of Public Health, University of Georgia, 101
30 Buck Road, Athens, GA 30602, United States

31 *Correspondence author: Professor Olalekan A. Uthman, Warwick Centre for Global Health,
32 Division of Health Sciences, Warwick Medical School, The University of Warwick, Coventry,
33 CV4 7AL, United Kingdom. Email: olalekan.uthman@warwick.ac.uk. Tel: +4424 7657 3163

34

35 ABSTRACT

36 **Importance:** Understanding the susceptibility and infectiousness of children and
37 adolescents in comparison to adults is important to appreciate their role in the COVID-19
38 pandemic.

39 **Objective:** To determine SARS-CoV-2 susceptibility and infectiousness of children and
40 adolescents with adults as comparator for three variants (wild-type, Alpha, Delta) in the
41 household setting. We aimed to identify the effects independent of vaccination.

42 **Data Sources:** We searched EMBASE, PubMed and medRxiv up to January 2022. Additional
43 studies were identified through contacting subject experts.

44 **Study Selection:** Two reviewers independently identified studies providing secondary
45 attack rates (SAR) for SARS-CoV-2 infection in children (0-9 years), adolescents (10-19 years)
46 or both compared with adults (20 years and older) derived from household data.

47 **Data Extraction and Synthesis:** Two reviewers independently performed data extraction.
48 We assessed risk of bias of included studies using a critical appraisal checklist and a random-
49 effects meta-analysis model to pool association estimates.

50 **Main Outcomes and Measures:** Odds ratio (OR) for SARS-CoV-2 infection comparing
51 children and adolescents with adults stratified by wild-type, Alpha, and Delta variant,
52 respectively. *Susceptibility* was defined as the secondary attack rate (SAR) among
53 susceptible household contacts irrespective of the age of the index case. Infectiousness was
54 defined as the SAR irrespective of the age of household contacts when
55 children/adolescents/adults were the index case.

56 **Results:** Twenty-eight studies (308,857 contacts) were included in the susceptibility
57 analysis, for Delta only one (large) study was available. Compared to adults children and
58 adolescents were less susceptible to the wild-type and Delta variant, but equally susceptible
59 to the Alpha variant. In the infectiousness analysis, 21 studies (201,199 index cases) were
60 included. Compared to adults, children and adolescents were less infectious when infected
61 with the wild-type and Delta variant. Alpha variant-related infectiousness remained unclear,
62 0-9 year old children were at least as infectious as adults. SAR among household contacts
63 was highest during circulation of the Alpha variant, lowest during wild-type circulation and
64 intermediate during Delta circulation.

65 **Conclusions and Relevance:** When considering the potential role of children and
66 adolescents, for each variant susceptibility, infectiousness, age group and overall
67 transmissibility need to be assessed to guide public health policy.

68 KEY POINTS

69 **Question:** What is the evidence on the susceptibility and infectiousness of wild-type, Alpha
70 and Delta variant of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) among
71 children and adolescents compared with adults in the household setting?

72

73 **Findings:** In this systematic review and meta-analysis of 28 studies that included 308,857
74 household contacts, children and adolescents were less susceptible to the wild-type and
75 Delta variant and likely equally susceptible to the Alpha variant of SARS-Cov-2. Children
76 aged 0-9 years old infected with the Alpha variant may be more infectious than adults, but
77 for adolescents, Alpha infectiousness is unclear. The overall secondary attack rate (SAR) rose
78 substantially from wild-type to Alpha and dropped somewhat from Alpha to Delta.

79 **Meaning:** The epidemiological role of children and adolescents towards SARS-CoV-2 may be
80 influenced by susceptibility, infectiousness, variant, age group and overall (relative)
81 contagiousness.

82 INTRODUCTION

83 By January 20, 2022, about 337 million people tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 and 5.56
84 million COVID-19 deaths were reported to the World Health Organization (WHO)¹. Age-
85 disaggregated data reported to WHO show that children and adolescents are
86 underrepresented, particularly concerning severe disease and death². Compared to children
87 and adolescents, adults are more vulnerable to severe forms of COVID-19, particularly those
88 with pre-existing comorbidities, older age, and other risk factors³⁻⁶. There is concern that
89 children could be a substantial, undetected source of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the
90 community given their milder disease and higher frequency of asymptomatic infections
91 compared to adults⁷. A better understanding of their susceptibility and infectiousness
92 among children is important to inform the overall scale of the public health response,
93 including infection control strategies in kindergartens and schools, particularly as long as
94 many children may not be vaccinated².

95 As new variants of concern (VOCs) emerged worldwide, the epidemiological effects
96 associated with their circulation also changed. Alpha and Delta variants have been shown to
97 be more transmissible than previous strains⁸. However, most studies have been performed
98 among adults, and it is unclear how viral evolution has affected susceptibility and
99 infectiousness of children and adolescents. A common approach often used to assess the
100 epidemiological properties of a given infectious agent is to measure transmission to
101 household contacts after introduction of the agent through an index case⁹. In general,
102 advantages of the household setting are that the transmission risk in households is high and
103 relatively similar in comparison to many other settings. In addition, results have a global
104 application (despite cultural differences), and if there is potential for a virus or other agent

105 to be transmitted from human-to-human, it should be measurable in that setting.
106 Households can be considered mini cohorts where it is possible to study both susceptibility
107 and infectiousness of children and adolescents, using adult household members as
108 reference point. This study aimed to determine the relative SARS-CoV-2 susceptibility and
109 infectiousness of SARS-CoV-2 in children (0-9 years old) and adolescents (10-19 years old)
110 relative to adults, stratified by different viral variants (wild-type, Alpha and Delta), based on
111 household contact data. We endeavour to identify the effect of the variants themselves
112 independent of the effect of vaccination.

113

114 **METHODS**

115 **Protocol registration**

116 This report was structured according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
117 Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement guidelines¹⁰. The protocol was registered
118 with PROSPERO (CRD42021271023).

119

120 **Eligibility criteria**

121 Studies were included if they met the following eligibility criteria: (A) they reported
122 household secondary attack rates (SAR) or included the data required to compute
123 household SAR with the possibility to compare children (0-9 years old), adolescents (10-19
124 years old), or both combined (0-19 years old) with adults (20+ years old); (B) they tested—at
125 a minimum—all symptomatic household contacts for SARS-CoV-2 infection by reverse

126 transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR); and (C) reported results regarding SARS-
127 CoV-2 for wild-type, Alpha or Delta variants. For wild-type studies, we included studies that
128 collected data before 2021, i.e., before VOCs Alpha and Delta began to circulate widely.

129

130 **Information sources and search strategy**

131 We formulated a search strategy to identify all relevant studies regardless of language or
132 publication status in EMBASE, MEDLINE, and medRxiv up to January 2022. We used the
133 following index terms in PubMed: COVID, children, infectiousness, susceptibility and other
134 terms paraphrasing the infectiousness and susceptibility concepts. Full search terms are
135 included in supplementary Annex 1. A ‘backwards’ snowball search was conducted of the
136 references in all included articles. Due to the likelihood of a high volume of relevant studies
137 for the wild-type virus, we followed standard guidelines for integrating existing systematic
138 reviews into new reviews^{11,12}. Where existing systematic reviews with equivalent search and
139 study selection methods were available, these were used as a starting point to identify
140 relevant studies.

141

142 **Study Selection**

143 Two reviewers independently screened titles and abstracts. We obtained full reports for all
144 titles and abstracts that met the inclusion criteria or where there was any uncertainty. Full-
145 text articles were reviewed to assess eligibility, and exclusion reasons were coded.
146 Disagreements were resolved by consensus or by a third author if necessary.

147 **Data Extraction and Quality Assessment**

148 Citations extracted from electronic databases were imported to EndNote. The Covidence
149 systematic review software¹³ was used for the screening and review processes, including
150 removal of duplicates. The reviewers independently used a pre-defined and piloted
151 standardized tool to extract data pertinent to the research questions. Two reviewers
152 independently extracted data from publications and reports and entered them in Microsoft
153 Excel. Extracted data included all the necessary information to describe and characterise the
154 studies, perform the quality assessments, synthesise data for the meta-analyses and assess
155 heterogeneity. In case of missing data or insufficient reporting of details, the studies'
156 corresponding authors were contacted for clarification or with a request to recalculate data
157 to match age groups as used here. In addition, only data for unvaccinated persons were
158 used or requested for studies on the Delta variant (which circulated when COVID-19
159 vaccines were already broadly available). After data extraction was completed, codebooks
160 were reviewed, and any discrepancies were resolved by consensus or by a third author if
161 necessary.

162

163 The major categories of extracted data were: (1) study characteristics (author, journal, year
164 of publication, country/region, funding sources); (2) study design (type of study, study
165 period, duration of follow-up); (3) study population (sample size at baseline, population
166 characteristics); and (4) case definition of index and household secondary case; (5)
167 vaccination status of participants.

168

169

170 **Study risk of bias assessment**

171 To assess the methodological quality and risk of bias of included studies, we used the
172 modified version of the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale for observational
173 studies¹⁴. Studies received as many as 9 points based on participant selection (4 points),
174 study comparability (1 point), and outcome of interest (4 points). Studies were classified as
175 having high (≤ 3 points), moderate (4-6 points), and low (≥ 7 points) risk of bias.

176

177 **Definitions, Data Synthesis and Analysis**

178 We defined a “household”¹⁵ as a group of people, often a family, who live together in a
179 house or flat. We defined an “index (or primary) case” as used in the studies themselves
180 (**eTable 1**), usually defined as either the first case to be confirmed in a household or the
181 confirmed case with the earliest date of symptom onset. “Household contacts” (hhc) were
182 defined as persons having been exposed to an index case and deemed susceptible
183 (unvaccinated and – if available - with no history of SARS-CoV-2 infection). A “secondary
184 case” was defined as a hhc with a positive RT-PCR test. The “household secondary attack
185 rate (SAR)” was defined as the proportion of all hhc who were reported to have tested
186 positive for SARS-CoV-2 divided by all susceptible hhc. We estimated **susceptibility** of an age
187 group as the SAR of hhc of that age group, irrespective of the age of the index case.
188 **Infectiousness** of an age group was the SAR of hhc (irrespective of age) exposed to index
189 cases in that age group. As a relative measure for susceptibility, we estimated odds ratios
190 (OR) comparing the SAR of children and/or adolescent hhc versus the SAR of adult hhc. As a

191 relative measure for infectiousness, we compared SAR when children and/or adolescents
192 were index cases versus when adults were index cases. We defined children as those 0-9
193 years, adolescents as 10 to 19 years, and adults as 20+ years. In three studies a slightly
194 deviant age grouping was used which we accepted to be used for the three age groups
195 children/adolescents/adults (Grijalva (<12, 12-17, 18+) ¹⁶; Koureas (<12, 13-19, 20+) ¹⁷;
196 Singanayagam 2021 (4-9, 14-19, 20+) ¹⁸). We avoided unit-of-analysis error that could be
197 created by double-counting the participants in the multiple groups from one study, i.e.
198 children versus adolescents versus adults, by splitting the "shared" adult group into two by
199 dividing both the number of events (infected) and the total number of participants by
200 two ^{19,20}. To "isolate" the effect of the variants alone we extracted data on SAR among non-
201 vaccinated household contacts infected from non-vaccinated index cases. Thus, if studies
202 did not explicitly state that vaccination was an exclusion criterion, we felt it was reasonable
203 during wild-type and Alpha to assume that the index cases and household contacts were
204 previously uninfected and unvaccinated (eTable 1).

205 We pooled ORs across studies using the DerSimonian and Laird random-effects model due
206 to expected heterogeneity. We termed non-overlapping confidence intervals (CI) as
207 statistically significant ORs. The I^2 statistic was used to evaluate heterogeneity between
208 studies. We used an $I^2 > 50\%$ as indicating statistically significant heterogeneity. All statistical
209 analyses were performed in R (version 3.6.1) with freely available statistical packages 'meta'
210 (version 5.2.0) ²¹.

211 Data from Danish studies were of high quality. Results are therefore also presented
212 separately for these data in the analysis. The data from these studies were collected
213 consistently during circulation of all variants with the same methodology, had a large

214 sample size, and provided data from unvaccinated index cases to unvaccinated household
215 contacts, and included only households with no previously documented SARS—CoV-2
216 infection.

217 RESULTS


218 Search results and study characteristics

219 Our systematic review search yielded 6,341 articles. **Figure 1** shows the study selection flow
220 diagram. After deduplication and screening of articles using title and abstract, 218 full-text
221 articles were selected for critical examination. Of these, 190 articles were further excluded
222 because they failed to meet the inclusion criteria, largely, either because the results were
223 based on non-household or mixed contacts (household/non-household not separated), or
224 no relevant outcome data were reported. The remaining 28 articles^{16-18,22-46} involving
225 308,857 participants, met the inclusion criteria and were included in the review. Of the 28
226 studies, 18 (64%) were published in peer-reviewed journals, and 10 were accessible as pre-
227 prints. The studies were based on surveillance data (n=12, 43%), cohort study data (n=12,
228 43%), register data (n=3, 11%), and one retrospective case series (n=1, 4%). Most of the
229 studies were from China (n=8, 32%), followed by the United States of America (n=7, 28%).
230 The majority of included studies reported on the wild-type virus (n=21, 75%), followed by
231 Alpha variant (n=3, 11%), wild-type and Alpha (n=2, 7%), Delta (n=1, 4%), and wild-type,
232 Alpha and Delta (n=1, 4%). The supplementary file shows detailed information on data
233 extracted from each study in **eTable 1**. The risk of bias in included studies is shown in **eTable**
234 **2**. The study quality total rating score ranged from 5 to 9 of a total of 9 possible points.
235 Most of the studies were rated as having a low risk of bias (n=23, 92%) and five studies were
236 rated as having a moderate risk of bias (18%).

237

238

239 Figure 1: PRISMA Flow for study selection



240


241


242 Susceptibility to infection

243 *Wild-type virus:* Almost all the studies reported results for the wild-type virus (24 of 28
244 studies). The reported SAR varied greatly across studies, ranging from 0% to 56% in children,
245 5% to 47% in adolescents and 12% to 66% in adults (**eFigure 1**). Moreover, the number of
246 contacts (denominator) varied from 2 (in the children subgroup) to 1,934 across studies,
247 implying large differences in the precision of the studies' estimates. Heterogeneity of the
248 SAR was 94%, 87% and 99% (**eFigure 1**), respectively, for the three age groups. The
249 heterogeneity for OR for SARS-CoV-2 infection comparing children to adults and adolescents
250 to adults was smaller than the heterogeneity for the SAR (42% and 0%, respectively; **Figure**
251 **2**). Compared to adults, the OR for SARS-CoV-2 infection in children was 28% lower,
252 although not statistically significant (OR = 0.72, 95% CI 0.49-1.05, nine studies), whereas
253 Danish data yielded an OR of 0.84 (95% CI 0.73-0.96) showing statistical significance²⁵
254 (**Figure 2, 3**). Adolescents were 23% less susceptible (OR = 0.77, 95% CI 0.68-0.88, nine
255 studies) than adults (**Figure 2, 3**). Both the pooled estimate derived from the studies
256 reporting on the 0-19 years old age group (OR=0.45; 95% CI 0.27-0.76, 11 studies) as well as
257 the estimate pooled for children and adolescents (OR = 0.59, 95% CI 0.45-0.77, 20 studies)
258 indicated statistical significance.

259

260 **Figure 2: Susceptibility analysis showing forest plot comparing odds ratios (OR) of**
 261 **secondary attack rates among (0–9 years old) child contacts and adults, among (10-19**
 262 **years old) adolescents and adults, as well as among children and adolescents combined**
 263 **(0-19-year-old) and adults; wild-type, Alpha variant, Delta variant; ordered by descending**
 264 **OR.**





265

266 *Note: NaN - Not a number, inestimable, mean (0/0)*

267

268 *Alpha variant:* We identified six studies reporting results for this variant^{18,33,37-39,41}. The
 269 reported SAR for households infected with Alpha was higher than for households infected
 270 with the wild-type but varied across studies and ranged from 33% to 70% in children, 31% to
 271 100% in adolescents and 37% to 79% in adults (**eFigure 2**). Heterogeneity of SAR (13%, 69%
 272 and 73% among children, adolescents and adults, respectively; **eFigure 2**) was less than in
 273 wild-type studies (94%, 87%, 99%, respectively; **eFigures 1**), but higher than for the 1OR of

274 the comparisons children-adults (0%) and adolescents-adults (0%; Figure 2). Compared to
275 adults, with point estimates of the OR close to 1 and above 1, comparisons in both age
276 groups were not statistically significant (children vs. adults: OR = 0.97, 95% CI 0.77-1.23; five
277 studies; adolescents vs. adults: OR = 1.24, 95% CI 0.98-1.56, six studies) (**Figure 2**). There
278 were no additional studies reporting on the age group 0-19 years old. The pooled estimate
279 of the studies used for the two comparisons above was not statistically significant from 1
280 (OR=1.10, 95% CI 0.93 to 1.3).

281


282 *Delta variant:* We only identified one large study from Denmark⁴⁶. Compared to adults, no
283 statistically significant difference was seen for susceptibility in children (OR = 0.93, 95% CI
284 0.86-1.00) or in adolescents (OR = 1.06, 95% CI 0.97-1.15), pooled estimate 0.99 (95% CI
285 0.87-1.12) (Figure 2)⁴⁶.

286

287 Overall, the crude SAR increased from about 20-30% for the wild-type virus to 40-45% for
288 the Alpha variant and dropped approximately to 30% in the Delta variant (**Figure 3**). The OR
289 increased from below 1 for the child age groups during wild-type circulation to around 1
290 during Alpha and slightly (but significantly) below 1 during Delta circulation (Figure 3).

291 **Figure 3:** Susceptibility analysis: Secondary attack rates (SAR) of household contacts of
292 children, adolescents and adults (top) as well as odd ratios (OR) (bottom) for SARS-CoV-2-
293 infection among children and adolescents when compared to adults; wild-type, Alpha
294 variant, Delta variant. To better visualize the point estimates of SAR, 95% confidence

295 intervals are omitted. A (left): all included studies, B (right): Danish studies only^{25,39,46}. Red
 296 bars are statistically significant from 1 on a 95% level.



297 Note: hhc: household contact, ic: index case, nv: non-vaccinated, v: vaccinated

298 Infectiousness


299 *Wild-type virus*: The reported SAR varied greatly across studies, ranging from 0% to 53% in
 300 children, 7% to 50% in adolescents and 12% to 57% in adults (**Figure 4**). In 6 of 7 studies the
 301 SAR of household contacts was lower when children were the index case (versus when
 302 adults were the index case), and the overall OR was 0.85, although not statistically

303 significant from 1 (95% CI 0.70-1.03; eight studies). Also, the overall OR estimate for
304 adolescents (versus adults) was not statistically different from 1 (OR = 0.82, 95% CI 0.54-
305 1.26, nine studies) (**Figure 4, 5**). The estimate pooled for all studies and both age groups
306 (children, adolescents) showed that children/adolescents/combined were 30% less
307 infectious than adults (OR = 0.70, 95% CI 0.52-0.94, 13 studies) (**Figure 4**). The Danish study
308 alone indicated statistically significantly lower infectiousness when children or adolescents
309 were the index case (OR = 0.71, 95% CI 0.67-0.75)²⁵.

310

311

312 **Figure 4: Infectiousness analysis showing forest plot comparing odds ratios (OR) of**
 313 **secondary attack rates among household contacts when (0–9-year-old) children or adults**
 314 **were index cases, when (10–19-year-old) adolescents or adults were index cases, as well**
 315 **as when children or adolescents (0-19-year-old) were index cases; wild-type, Alpha**
 316 **variant, Delta variant; ordered by descending OR.**



326 0.23-4.83, five studies) (**Figure 4, 5**). Also, the pooled estimate for children and adolescents
327 (versus adults) was not statistically significantly different from 1 (OR=1.05, 95% CI 0.66-
328 1.66).

329


330 *Delta variant:* ^{18,46}Children were 27% less infectious (OR = 0.73, 95% CI 0.68-0.78), and
331 adolescents were 43% less infectious than adults (OR = 0.57, 95% CI 0.54-0.61). ⁴⁶(**Figure**
332 **4)**⁴⁶.

333

334

335

336 **Figure 5:** Infectiousness analysis: Secondary attack rates of household contacts when
 337 children, adolescents and adults were index cases (top), as well as odds ratios (OR) for SARS-
 338 CoV-2-infection when children vs adults, adolescents vs adults, or combined 0-19 year olds
 339 vs adults were index cases; wild-type, Alpha variant, Delta variant (bottom). To better
 340 visualize the point estimates of SAR 95% confidence intervals are omitted. A (left): all
 341 included studies, B (right): Danish study only⁴⁶. Red bars are statistically significant.



342 Note: hhc: household contact, ic: index case, nv: non-vaccinated, v: vaccinated

343

344

345 DISCUSSION

346 Our systematic review and meta-analysis provides an assessment of SARS-CoV-2
347 susceptibility and infectiousness in children (0-9 years old) and adolescents (10-19 years old)
348 compared to adults (20+ years old) derived from data in household settings stratified by the
349 dominating circulating strain (wild-type, Alpha, and Delta). Children and adolescents were
350 less susceptible to the wild-type and likely the Delta variant but equally susceptible to the
351 Alpha variant as adults. Similarly, children and adolescents infected with the wild-type were
352 less infectious than adults and likely less infectious when infected with the Delta variant.
353 However, Alpha variant-related infectiousness is unclear; possibly 0-9 year old children were
354 even more infectious than adults. The SAR among household contacts was lowest during
355 wild-type circulation, highest during circulation of the Alpha variant, and intermediate
356 during Delta circulation.

357 This type of information is generally valuable because households are an important “gear
358 changer” where infections may be lifted or moved down from one age group level (e.g.
359 children) to another (adolescents, or parents in working age). Thus, it adds information on
360 the preferred directionality. For example, children often acquire influenza infection from
361 peers, introduce them into their households and their parents promote them in their own
362 age group, e.g. through the means of work contacts. This type of (age stratified) information
363 is particularly important at the beginning of a pandemic, because, if children and
364 adolescents are more on the “receiving side”, closures of schools and/or daycare centers
365 with the aim to contain spread in the community should be highly scrutinized.

366 Our finding that children of 0 to 9 years and adolescents of 10 to 19 years were less
367 susceptible to the wild-type strain of SARS-CoV-2 than adults, but as susceptible to the

368 Alpha variant as adults, is consistent with the comprehensive review and meta-analysis of
369 household studies by Madewell et al.⁴⁷. The authors also described a wide range of SARs;
370 however, they did not differentiate between children and adolescents. They stated that <18
371 year old children experienced lower SAR in the household based on studies conducted
372 before the Alpha variant circulated⁴⁷. Similarly, the meta-analysis of household studies by
373 Zhu⁴⁸ indicated a 38% decreased susceptibility of children <18 years old for the wild-type
374 strain (OR=0.62, 95% CI 0.42-0.91). Irfan⁴⁹ and Viner⁵⁰ (covering studies during wild-type
375 circulation) disaggregated into children and adolescents and agreed in that the odds of
376 infection in children is significantly less than for adults, but stated that adolescents are as
377 susceptible or even more susceptible than adults. However, in contrast to our approach,
378 both studies included not only the household, but also other settings, which may explain the
379 difference to our results.

380 Several hypotheses have been proposed why SAR in children were found to be lower than
381 that in adults, such as lower probability of testing, lower viral load⁵¹ or the activity, innate
382 immunity^{52,53} or cross protection through cellular immunity from previous exposure to
383 seasonal corona viruses. At any rate, lower susceptibility of children compared to adults
384 stands in contrast to influenza, where several household studies have found that children
385 (mostly pooled in broad age groups, e.g. <18 years) are more susceptible than adults⁵⁴⁻⁵⁷.
386 However, not all child age groups may be the same. When broken down into smaller age
387 groups one study conducted before the influenza pandemic (A/H1N1) 2009 and another
388 conducted during the pandemic found that children younger than 6 and 5 years,
389 respectively, may be as susceptible as adults^{56,58}.

390

391 The situation for the variants following the wild-type is less clear. Circulation of the Alpha
392 variant generally seems to have been associated with a substantially higher SAR among both
393 children and adolescents similar to that among adults. Evaluation of the Delta variant is
394 complicated by increasing vaccination coverage and prior infection. Only the Danish data
395 were able to analyse effects of the Delta variant alone, i. e. when exposure occurred in
396 households without prior infection, and from unvaccinated index cases to unvaccinated
397 household contacts. Results suggest that at least for the combined age group of 0-19 year
398 olds susceptibility is again lower compared to adults. Perhaps the Delta wave was the last
399 where the “true” effect of a variant alone, irrespective of vaccination and previous infection,
400 was possible in household contact studies as done here, because – as vaccine uptake
401 became widely available - restricting analysis to unvaccinated persons may introduce a bias
402 due to different adherence and attitudes towards recommended public health and infection
403 prevention measures. In addition, after the omicron wave the majority of the population
404 likely had experienced at least one, not always documented, SARS-CoV-2 infection⁵⁹.

405

406 Our analysis suggests that susceptibility and infectiousness of child age and adolescent age
407 groups in relation to adults has changed from variant to variant. However, it has not
408 changed in the same direction and magnitude. Thus, susceptibility and infectiousness may
409 have to be reassessed with every new variant anew. Although after the advent of VOC
410 omicron analyses restricting to unvaccinated index cases and unvaccinated household
411 contact persons have almost become impossible further household transmission studies are
412 warranted nevertheless.

413

414 **Study strengths and limitations**

415 The main strength of our review is the strict methodological process. We followed Cochrane
416 Collaboration, PRISMA, and GRADE recommendations, performed two comprehensive
417 searches, and used duplicate data extraction and risk of bias assessments by two
418 independent authors. Most of the included studies were at low risk of bias. Compared with
419 previous reviews^{48-51,60-63}, we sought to further characterize the risk of both susceptibility
420 and infectiousness and we have undertaken pre-specified sub-group analyses by age group
421 (by children as well as by adolescents) and variant types. Furthermore, to improve
422 comparability, we have restricted our analysis to household contacts alone, while many
423 other studies mix in data from contact-tracing activities or do not differentiate between
424 household and non-household contacts. By analysing the susceptibility and infectiousness
425 relative to adults, we automatically were able to adjust for unknown conditions that may
426 influence the SAR within households in various ways, such as cultural behaviour or phase of
427 the pandemic. For example, the estimates of SAR of susceptibility for wild-type variants
428 were very heterogeneous for both children, adolescents, and adults (eFigure 1), whereas
429 the OR estimates were more homogenous (Figure 2). It is also a strength that one of the
430 authors (FL) contributed large data with the same study design (register study) and
431 methodology for all three variants. In addition to providing precise estimates from a large
432 number of households, using the same methods across time allows for comparisons, while
433 holding possible confounding conditions constant.

434 There are several limitations to our study. If household transmission is not closely
435 monitored the true primary case may not be the index case. As children/adolescents (0-19
436 year old) are more frequently asymptomatic than adults⁶⁴, it is possible that children (and

437 adolescents) are partially missed as index cases and the SAR associated with child index
438 cases is underestimated when compared to adult index cases⁶⁵. Results of a childcare
439 outbreak/household study in Germany corroborate this consideration³⁸.

440 We did not take the timing of the epidemic into account in this study (e.g., epidemic peak
441 vs. decline). We concentrated on variant-specific analyses. Depending on the timing of each
442 study, times of open or closed school or kindergartens (due to mandate or vacation) may
443 affect contact time within the household and – vice versa – limit contacts outside.

444 We did not extend our analysis to the Omicron variant mainly because of the dearth of
445 studies. A few studies indicate that both children and adults are more susceptible and more
446 infectious in regards to the Omicron variant compared to the Delta variant⁶⁶ which holds for
447 both BA.1 as well as BA.2⁶⁷. However, this needs to be verified through further studies.

448

449 The results of the pooled data should be interpreted with caution, as in any active outbreak
450 response, there was high heterogeneity across studies in study design (e.g., follow-up
451 duration, frequency of testing, and universal and/or symptomatic testing), age groups were
452 not standardized, transmission mitigation strategies after index case diagnosis, follow-up,
453 testing strategies, household crowding, underlying seroprevalence, and other factors may
454 have differed. In particular, testing of children is prone to bias, as they may be less
455 frequently tested. Retrospective register (surveillance) studies may underestimate SAR in
456 general and especially for children.

457

458 As is customary for household studies, we assumed that secondary SARS-CoV-2 infections
459 among household contacts of the index (assumed primary) case were the result of a direct
460 transmission event. It is possible that the index case in the family is not the primary case⁴⁸.
461 We were unable to control for the chance of a ‘common exposure’ where two individuals
462 were infected by the same source at the same time, but one individual was incorrectly
463 identified as the sole index case of the cluster as they were the first to develop symptoms⁴⁸.
464 Furthermore, concurrent community acquisition may be different for different age groups.
465 Likewise, it is important to note that these data should not be extrapolated to SARS-CoV-2
466 transmission outside the home where older children and adolescents tend to have more
467 social contacts than adults³.

468

469 CONCLUSION

470 Our results show that children and adolescents are both susceptible and infectious to SARS-
471 CoV-2 and their role in overall transmissibility likely changed with new variants emerging.
472 Children and adolescents were less susceptible to the wild-type and probably also the Delta
473 variant of SARS-Cov-2 infection, they were less infectious when infected with the wild-type
474 and probably also when infected with the Delta variant. For the Alpha variant, data suggest
475 that children and adolescents were as susceptible as adults, and that children were at least
476 as infectious as adults. These results show the importance of understanding the relative
477 transmissibility of children and adolescents and the heterogeneity across variants. In
478 consequence, the relative susceptibility and infectiousness of children and adolescents may
479 have to be reassessed for every new variant anew.

480 **Author Contributions:** Prof Uthman and Dr Anjorin had full access to all of the data in the
481 study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data
482 analysis.

483

484 Concept and design: Uthman, Buchholz, Hauer, Anjorin

485

486 Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors.

487

488 Drafting of the manuscript: Uthman, Buchholz, Lyngse, Hauer, Anjorin

489

490 Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors.

491

492 Statistical analysis: Uthman, Buchholz, Anjorin

493

494 Obtained funding: Uthman, Anjorin

495

496 Administrative, technical, or material support: Uthman, Anjorin

497

498 Supervision: Buchholz, Hauer.

499

500 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures:** None reported.

501

502 **Funding/Support:** This research was commissioned by the Robert Koch Institute, Germany
503 (OAU, SA, UB, BH).

504 Frederik Plesner Lyngse: Independent Research Fund Denmark (Grant no. 9061-00035B.); Novo
505 Nordisk Foundation (grant no. NNF17OC0026542); the Danish National Research Foundation
506 through its grant (DNRF-134) to the Center for Economic Behavior and Inequality (CEBI) at the
507 University of Copenhagen.

508 REFERENCES

509

- 510 1. World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. (URL:
511 <https://covid19.who.int/>). Accessed February 3, 2022,
- 512 2. World Health Organization. Interim statement on COVID-19 vaccination for children
513 and adolescents. World Health Organization. Accessed 7 December 2021, 2021.
- 514 3. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, Prem K, Jit M, Eggo RM. Age-dependent effects in the
515 transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. *Nat Med*. Aug 2020;26(8):1205-1211.
516 doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0962-9
- 517 4. Bundle N, Dave N, Pharris A, et al. COVID-19 trends and severity among symptomatic
518 children aged 0-17 years in ten EU countries, 3 August 2020 – 3 October 2021. *medRxiv*.
519 2021:2021.11.25.21266875. doi:10.1101/2021.11.25.21266875
- 520 5. Faycal A, Ndoadoumgue AL, Sellem B, et al. Prevalence and factors associated with
521 symptom persistence: a prospective study of 429 mild COVID-19 outpatients. *Infect Dis*
522 *Now*. Nov 17 2021;doi:10.1016/j.idnow.2021.11.003
- 523 6. Mahase E. Covid-19: Adults in poorest areas are almost four times more likely to die,
524 inquiry finds. *Bmj*. Jul 7 2021;374:n1728. doi:10.1136/bmj.n1728
- 525 7. Sah P, Fitzpatrick MC, Zimmer CF, et al. Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection: A
526 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
527 2021;118(34):e2109229118. doi:10.1073/pnas.2109229118
- 528 8. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. SARS-CoV-2 variants of
529 concern as of 3 December 2021. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control.
530 Accessed 8 December 2021, 2021.
- 531 9. Tsang TK, Lau LLH, Cauchemez S, Cowling BJ. Household Transmission of Influenza
532 Virus. *Trends Microbiol*. Feb 2016;24(2):123-133. doi:10.1016/j.tim.2015.10.012
- 533 10. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated
534 guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. Mar 29 2021;372:n71.
535 doi:10.1136/bmj.n71
- 536 11. Robinson KA, Chou R, Berkman ND, et al. Twelve recommendations for integrating
537 existing systematic reviews into new reviews: EPC guidance. *J Clin Epidemiol*. Feb
538 2016;70:38-44. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.05.035
- 539 12. Robinson KA, Whitlock EP, Oneil ME, et al. Integration of existing systematic reviews
540 into new reviews: identification of guidance needs. *Syst Rev*. Jun 23 2014;3:60.
541 doi:10.1186/2046-4053-3-60
- 542 13. Covidence. Covidence systematic review software, Veritas Health Innovation,
543 Melbourne, Australia. Available at www.covidence.org.
- 544 14. Well G, Shea B, O'Connell D, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing
545 the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analysis.
546 http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp. Accessed 21 December
547 2021,
- 548 15. Cambridge University Press. Household. In Cambridge dictionary. URL:
549 <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/household>. Accessed 21 January
550 2022,

- 551 16. Grijalva CG, Rolfes MA, Zhu Y, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Infections in
552 Households - Tennessee and Wisconsin, April-September 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly*
553 *Rep.* Nov 6 2020;69(44):1631-1634. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6944e1
- 554 17. Koureas M, Speletas M, Bogogiannidou Z, et al. Transmission Dynamics of SARS-CoV-
555 2 during an Outbreak in a Roma Community in Thessaly, Greece-Control Measures and
556 Lessons Learned. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* Mar 11
557 2021;18(6)doi:10.3390/ijerph18062878
- 558 18. Singanayagam A, Hakki S, Dunning J, et al. Community transmission and viral load
559 kinetics of the SARS-CoV-2 delta (B.1.617.2) variant in vaccinated and unvaccinated
560 individuals in the UK: a prospective, longitudinal, cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* Oct 29
561 2021;doi:10.1016/s1473-3099(21)00648-4
- 562 19. Higgins JP, Eldridge S, Li T. Including variants on randomized trials. *Cochrane*
563 *Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.* 2019:569-593.
- 564 20. Senn SJ. Overstating the evidence: double counting in meta-analysis and related
565 problems. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* Feb 13 2009;9:10. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-9-10
- 566 21. Balduzzi S, Rücker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a
567 practical tutorial. *Evid Based Ment Health.* Nov 2019;22(4):153-160. doi:10.1136/ebmental-
568 2019-300117
- 569 22. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391 cases and
570 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet Infect*
571 *Dis.* Aug 2020;20(8):911-919. doi:10.1016/s1473-3099(20)30287-5
- 572 23. Jing QL, Liu MJ, Zhang ZB, et al. Household secondary attack rate of COVID-19 and
573 associated determinants in Guangzhou, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet Infect*
574 *Dis.* Oct 2020;20(10):1141-1150. doi:10.1016/s1473-3099(20)30471-0
- 575 24. Li W, Zhang B, Lu J, et al. Characteristics of Household Transmission of COVID-19. *Clin*
576 *Infect Dis.* Nov 5 2020;71(8):1943-1946. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa450
- 577 25. Lyngse FP, Kirkeby CT, Halasa T, et al. COVID-19 Transmission Within Danish
578 Households: A Nationwide Study from Lockdown to Reopening. *medRxiv.*
579 2020:2020.09.09.20191239. doi:10.1101/2020.09.09.20191239
- 580 26. Park YJ, Choe YJ, Park O, et al. Contact Tracing during Coronavirus Disease Outbreak,
581 South Korea, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis.* Oct 2020;26(10):2465-2468.
582 doi:10.3201/eid2610.201315
- 583 27. Rosenberg ES, Dufort EM, Blog DS, et al. COVID-19 Testing, Epidemic Features,
584 Hospital Outcomes, and Household Prevalence, New York State-March 2020. *Clin Infect Dis.*
585 Nov 5 2020;71(8):1953-1959. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa549
- 586 28. Wang Z, Ma W, Zheng X, Wu G, Zhang R. Household transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *J*
587 *Infect.* Jul 2020;81(1):179-182. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.03.040
- 588 29. Wei L, Lv Q, Wen Y, et al. Household transmission of COVID-19, Shenzhen, January-
589 February 2020. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.05.11.20092692. doi:10.1101/2020.05.11.20092692
- 590 30. Wu J, Huang Y, Tu C, et al. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2, Zhuhai, China,
591 2020. *Clin Infect Dis.* Nov 19 2020;71(16):2099-2108. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa557
- 592 31. Cerami C, Rapp T, Lin F-C, et al. High household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the
593 United States: living density, viral load, and disproportionate impact on communities of
594 color. *medRxiv.* 2021:2021.03.10.21253173. doi:10.1101/2021.03.10.21253173
- 595 32. Ge Y, Martinez L, Sun S, et al. COVID-19 Transmission Dynamics Among Close
596 Contacts of Index Patients With COVID-19: A Population-Based Cohort Study in Zhejiang

- 597 Province, China. *JAMA Intern Med.* Oct 1 2021;181(10):1343-1350.
598 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2021.4686
- 599 33. Julin CH, Robertson AH, Hungnes O, et al. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A
600 Prospective Longitudinal Study Showing Higher Viral Load and Increased Transmissibility of
601 the Alpha Variant Compared to Previous Strains. *Microorganisms.* 2021;9(11):2371.
- 602 34. Kuba Y, Shingaki A, Nidaira M, et al. The characteristics of household transmission
603 during COVID-19 outbreak in Okinawa, Japan from February to May 2020. *Jpn J Infect Dis.*
604 Apr 30 2021;doi:10.7883/yoken.JJID.2020.943
- 605 35. Lewis NM, Chu VT, Ye D, et al. Household Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory
606 Syndrome Coronavirus-2 in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis.* Oct 5 2021;73(7):1805-1813.
607 doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1166
- 608 36. Li F, Li YY, Liu MJ, et al. Household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and risk factors for
609 susceptibility and infectivity in Wuhan: a retrospective observational study. *Lancet Infect*
610 *Dis.* May 2021;21(5):617-628. doi:10.1016/s1473-3099(20)30981-6
- 611 37. Loenenbach A, Markus I, Leheld AS, et al. SARS-CoV-2 variant B.1.1.7 susceptibility
612 and infectiousness of children and adults deduced from investigations of childcare centre
613 outbreaks, Germany, 2021. *Euro Surveill.* May 2021;26(21)doi:10.2807/1560-
614 7917.Es.2021.26.21.2100433
- 615 38. Loss J, Wurm J, Varnaccia G, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 among children and
616 staff in German daycare centres. *Epidemiology and Infection.* 2022:1-25.
617 doi:10.1017/S0950268822001194
- 618 39. Lyngse FP, Mølbak K, Skov RL, et al. Increased Transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 Lineage
619 B.1.1.7 by Age and Viral Load: Evidence from Danish Households. *medRxiv.*
620 2021:2021.04.16.21255459. doi:10.1101/2021.04.16.21255459
- 621 40. Maltezou HC, Vorou R, Papadima K, et al. Transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2
622 within families with children in Greece: A study of 23 clusters. *J Med Virol.* Mar
623 2021;93(3):1414-1420. doi:10.1002/jmv.26394
- 624 41. Martinez DA, Klein EY, Parent C, et al. Latino Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2.
625 *Clin Infect Dis.* Aug 31 2021;doi:10.1093/cid/ciab753
- 626 42. Metlay JP, Haas JS, Soltoff AE, Armstrong KA. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-
627 2. *JAMA Netw Open.* Feb 1 2021;4(2):e210304. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.0304
- 628 43. Miyahara R, Tsuchiya N, Yasuda I, et al. Familial Clusters of Coronavirus Disease in 10
629 Prefectures, Japan, February-May 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis.* Mar 2021;27(3):915-918.
630 doi:10.3201/eid2703.203882
- 631 44. Tibebu S, A. Brown K, Daneman N, Paul LA, Buchan SA. Household secondary attack
632 rate of COVID-19 by household size and index case characteristics. *medRxiv.*
633 2021:2021.02.23.21252287. doi:10.1101/2021.02.23.21252287
- 634 45. Yousaf AR, Duca LM, Chu V, et al. A Prospective Cohort Study in Nonhospitalized
635 Household Contacts With Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection:
636 Symptom Profiles and Symptom Change Over Time. *Clin Infect Dis.* Oct 5 2021;73(7):e1841-
637 e1849. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1072
- 638 46. Lyngse FP, Mølbak K, Denwood M, et al. Effect of Vaccination on Household
639 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Delta VOC. *medRxiv.* 2022:2022.01.06.22268841.
640 doi:10.1101/2022.01.06.22268841
- 641 47. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Jr., Halloran ME, Dean NE. Factors Associated With
642 Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.
643 *JAMA Netw Open.* Aug 2 2021;4(8):e2122240. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.22240

- 644 48. Zhu Y, Bloxham CJ, Hulme KD, et al. A Meta-analysis on the Role of Children in Severe
645 Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Household Transmission Clusters. *Clin Infect*
646 *Dis.* Jun 15 2021;72(12):e1146-e1153. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1825
- 647 49. Irfan O, Li J, Tang K, Wang Z, Bhutta ZA. Risk of infection and transmission of SARS-
648 CoV-2 among children and adolescents in households, communities and educational
649 settings: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Glob Health.* 2021;11:05013.
650 doi:10.7189/jogh.11.05013
- 651 50. Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonell C, et al. Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among
652 Children and Adolescents Compared With Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.
653 *JAMA Pediatr.* Feb 1 2021;175(2):143-156. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.4573
- 654 51. Fung HF, Martinez L, Alarid-Escudero F, et al. The Household Secondary Attack Rate
655 of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2): A Rapid Review. *Clin*
656 *Infect Dis.* Jul 30 2021;73(Suppl 2):S138-s145. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1558
- 657 52. Filippatos F, Tatsi EB, Michos A. Immune response to SARS-CoV-2 in children: A
658 review of the current knowledge. *Pediatr Investig.* Aug 17 2021;5(3):e12283.
659 doi:10.1002/ped4.12283
- 660 53. Dowell AC, Butler MS, Jinks E, et al. Children develop robust and sustained cross-
661 reactive spike-specific immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat Immunol.* Jan
662 2022;23(1):40-49. doi:10.1038/s41590-021-01089-8
- 663 54. Viboud C, Boëlle PY, Cauchemez S, et al. Risk factors of influenza transmission in
664 households. *Br J Gen Pract.* Sep 2004;54(506):684-9.
- 665 55. Cauchemez S, Donnelly CA, Reed C, et al. Household transmission of 2009 pandemic
666 influenza A (H1N1) virus in the United States. *N Engl J Med.* Dec 31 2009;361(27):2619-27.
667 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa0905498
- 668 56. Cowling BJ, Chan KH, Fang VJ, et al. Facemasks and hand hygiene to prevent
669 influenza transmission in households: a cluster randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med.* Oct 6
670 2009;151(7):437-46. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-151-7-200910060-00142
- 671 57. Suess T, Remschmidt C, Schink SB, et al. The role of facemasks and hand hygiene in
672 the prevention of influenza transmission in households: results from a cluster randomised
673 trial; Berlin, Germany, 2009-2011. *BMC Infect Dis.* Jan 26 2012;12:26. doi:10.1186/1471-
674 2334-12-26
- 675 58. Remschmidt C, Stöcker P, an der Heiden M, et al. Preventable and non-preventable
676 risk factors for influenza transmission and hygiene behavior in German influenza
677 households, pandemic season (H1N1) 2009/2010. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses.* May
678 2013;7(3):418-25. doi:10.1111/j.1750-2659.2012.00407.x
- 679 59. Clarke KEN, Jones JM, Deng Y, et al. Seroprevalence of Infection-Induced SARS-CoV-2
680 Antibodies - United States, September 2021-February 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.*
681 Apr 29 2022;71(17):606-608. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7117e3
- 682 60. Koh WC, Naing L, Chaw L, et al. What do we know about SARS-CoV-2 transmission? A
683 systematic review and meta-analysis of the secondary attack rate and associated risk
684 factors. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(10):e0240205. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0240205
- 685 61. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Jr., Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household Transmission
686 of SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open.* Dec 1
687 2020;3(12):e2031756. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.31756
- 688 62. Spielberger BD, Goerne T, Geweniger A, Henneke P, Elling R. Intra-Household and
689 Close-Contact SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Among Children - a Systematic Review. *Front*
690 *Pediatr.* 2021;9:613292. doi:10.3389/fped.2021.613292

- 691 63. Thompson HA, Mousa A, Dighe A, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
692 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Setting-specific Transmission Rates: A Systematic Review and
693 Meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis*. Aug 2 2021;73(3):e754-e764. doi:10.1093/cid/ciab100
- 694 64. Sah P, Fitzpatrick MC, Zimmer CF, et al. Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection: A
695 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. Aug 24
696 2021;118(34)doi:10.1073/pnas.2109229118
- 697 65. Darcis G, Meuris C, Kremer C, Faes C, Hens N. The risk of underestimating the
698 contribution of children to SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. *Clin Infect Dis*. Jun 30
699 2021;doi:10.1093/cid/ciab571
- 700 66. Lyngse FP, Mortensen LH, Denwood MJ, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron VOC
701 Transmission in Danish Households. *medRxiv*. 2021:2021.12.27.21268278.
702 doi:10.1101/2021.12.27.21268278
- 703 67. Lyngse FP, Kirkeby CT, Denwood M, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron VOC
704 subvariants BA.1 and BA.2: Evidence from Danish Households. *medRxiv*.
705 2022:2022.01.28.22270044. doi:10.1101/2022.01.28.22270044
- 706 68. Julin CH, Robertson AH, Hungnes O, et al. Household transmission of SARS-CoV-2; a
707 prospective longitudinal study showing higher viral load and transmissibility of the Alpha
708 variant compared to previous strains. *medRxiv*. 2021:2021.08.15.21261478.
709 doi:10.1101/2021.08.15.21261478

710