

1 **Association of close-range contact patterns with SARS-CoV-2: a household**  
2 **transmission study**

3 **Author list**

- 4 Jackie Kleynhans, MPH (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for Communicable Diseases of the National  
5 Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa. School of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the  
6 Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.)
- 7 Lorenzo Dall'Amico, PhD (ISI Foundation, Turin, Italy.)
- 8 Laetitia Gauvin, PhD (ISI Foundation, Turin, Italy.)
- 9 Michele Tizzoni, PhD (ISI Foundation, Turin, Italy. Department of Sociology and Social Research, University of Trento, Trento, Italy)
- 10 Lucia Maloma, BA(Hons) (Perinatal HIV Research Unit (PHRU), University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.)
- 11 Sibongile Walaza, PhD (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for Communicable Diseases of the National  
12 Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa. School of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the  
13 Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.)
- 14 Neil A. Martinson, MD (Perinatal HIV Research Unit (PHRU), University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. Johns Hopkins  
15 University Center for TB Research, Baltimore, Maryland, United States of America.)
- 16 Anne von Gottberg, PhD (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for Communicable Diseases of the National  
17 Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa. School of Pathology, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand,  
18 Johannesburg, South Africa.)
- 19 Nicole Wolter, PhD (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for Communicable Diseases of the National Health  
20 Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa. School of Pathology, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand,  
21 Johannesburg, South Africa.)
- 22 Mvuyo Makhasi, MSc (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for Communicable Diseases of the National  
23 Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa. School of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the  
24 Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.)
- 25 Cheryl Cohen, PhD (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for Communicable Diseases of the National Health  
26 Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa. School of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand,  
27 Johannesburg, South Africa.)
- 28 Ciro Cattuto, PhD (ISI Foundation, Turin, Italy. University of Turin, Department of Informatics, Turin, Italy.)
- 29 Stefano Tempia, PhD (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for Communicable Diseases of the National Health  
30 Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa. School of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand,  
31 Johannesburg, South Africa.)
- 32 For the SA-S-HTS Group

33 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, transmission, household, contacts

34

35

36 **Abstract (242/250)**

37 **Background**

38 Households are an important location for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-  
39 CoV-2) transmission, especially during periods where travel and work was restricted to essential  
40 services. We aimed to assess the association of close-range contact patterns with SARS-CoV-2  
41 transmission.

42 **Methods**

43 We deployed proximity sensors for two weeks to measure face-to-face interactions between  
44 household members after SARS-CoV-2 was identified in the household, in South Africa, 2020 - 2021.  
45 We calculated duration, frequency and average duration of close range proximity events with SARS-  
46 CoV-2 index cases. We assessed the association of contact parameters with SARS-CoV-2 transmission  
47 using mixed effects logistic regression accounting for index and household member characteristics.

48 **Results**

49 We included 340 individuals (88 SARS-CoV-2 index cases and 252 household members). On  
50 multivariable analysis, factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 acquisition were index cases with  
51 minimum  $C_t$  value  $<30$  (aOR 10.2 95%CI 1.4-77.4) vs  $>35$ , contacts aged 13-17 years (aOR 7.7 95%CI  
52 1.0-58.2) vs  $<5$  years and female contacts (aOR 2.3 95%CI 1.1-4.8). No contact parameters were  
53 associated with acquisition (aOR 1.0 95%CI 1.0-1.0) for all three of duration, frequency and average  
54 duration.

55 **Conclusion**

56 We did not find an association between close-range proximity events and SARS-CoV-2 household  
57 transmission. It may be that droplet-mediated transmission during close-proximity contacts play a  
58 smaller role than airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the household, due to high contact rates in  
59 households or study limitations.

60 **Funding**

61 Wellcome Trust (Grant number 221003/Z/20/Z) in collaboration with the Foreign, Commonwealth  
62 and Development Office, United Kingdom.

63

## 64 **Introduction**

65 South Africa has experienced five waves of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-  
66 CoV-2) infection, with over 4 million laboratory-confirmed cases by August 2022<sup>1</sup>. The true burden is  
67 highly underestimated, since based on seroprevalence data, after the third wave of infection, 43% to  
68 83% of the 59.5 million South African inhabitants had already been infected, varying by age and  
69 setting<sup>2,3</sup>.

70 SARS-CoV-2 transmission is mainly via the respiratory route, with droplet-mediated transmission  
71 thought to be the most important but airborne transmission also occurs<sup>4,5</sup>. Infection from  
72 contaminated surfaces has also been described<sup>4</sup>. Although infection risk is highest from  
73 symptomatic individuals<sup>6</sup>, with the most infectious period one day before symptom onset<sup>4</sup>,  
74 asymptomatic individuals can still transmit SARS-CoV-2<sup>7,8</sup>. Households are a focal point for SARS-  
75 CoV-2 transmission<sup>9,10</sup>, especially during peaks of non-pharmaceutical intervention (NPI)  
76 restrictions, when movement outside of the household was limited<sup>9</sup>. Transmission within  
77 households can in turn lead to spill over to the community<sup>11</sup>.

78 Prior to the widespread availability of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines, most countries relied on NPIs to reduce  
79 the transmission of the virus, including wearing face masks, social and physical distancing. While  
80 mobility and contact survey data showed that the implementation of NPIs led to a reduction in  
81 community contacts<sup>9,12</sup> and in turn opportunity for infection, it is still unknown what the role of  
82 contact patterns are in the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the household. Most analysis relating  
83 contact patterns and SARS-CoV-2 transmission done to date has been based on low resolution data  
84 collected from contact tracing<sup>13</sup>, mobility data<sup>9</sup> and contact surveys<sup>12</sup>. To obtain high-resolution  
85 contact data, devices broadcasting and receiving radio frequency waves can be used to measure the  
86 frequency and duration of close-proximity contacts. This has been used previously to collect contact  
87 data in among others, schools<sup>14</sup>, workplaces<sup>15</sup>, hospitals<sup>16</sup> and households<sup>17</sup>, which can, in turn, be  
88 used for modelling disease transmission. Specifically, for SARS-CoV-2 so far, high-resolution contact  
89 data were collected on cruise ships to identify areas of high contact, and to investigate the  
90 usefulness of NPIs<sup>18</sup>.

91 Understanding the drivers of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the household, especially contact patterns,  
92 can help inform NPIs for future SARS-CoV-2 resurgences and potentially future emerging pathogens  
93 with pandemic potential. We aimed to assess the association of household close-range contact  
94 patterns with the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the household using proximity sensors deployed  
95 after the identification of SARS-CoV-2 in the household.

## 96 **Methods**

### 97 *Screening, enrolment and follow-up*

98 We nested a contact study within a case-ascertained, prospective, household transmission study for  
99 SARS-CoV-2, implemented in two urban communities in South Africa, Klerksdorp (North West  
100 Province) and Soweto (Gauteng Province) from October 2020 through September 2021. Sample size  
101 calculations were performed for the main study, but not the nested contact study. For the main  
102 study we aimed to assess a significant difference in the household cumulative infection risk (HCIR)  
103 between household contacts exposed to SARS-CoV-2 by a HIV-infected vs HIV-uninfected index case  
104 for a 95% confidence interval and 80% power. The resulting total sample size was 440 exposed  
105 household members. Detailed sample size calculations and methods for the main study have been  
106 reported previously<sup>19</sup>. In short, symptomatic adults (aged  $\geq 18$  years, symptom onset  $\leq 5$  days prior)

107 consulting at clinics were screened for SARS-CoV-2 with real-time reverse transcription polymerase  
108 chain reaction (rRT-PCR) on nasopharyngeal swabs. We enrolled household contacts of SARS-CoV-2  
109 infected individuals identified through screening (presumptive index) with  $\geq 2$  household contacts of  
110 whom none reported symptoms prior to index case onset. We visited enrolled households three  
111 times a week to collect nasal swabs and data on symptoms and healthcare seeking. At enrolment  
112 household characteristics (household size, number of rooms used for sleeping, smoking inside the  
113 household and household income) and individual characteristics (demographics, education,  
114 employment, smoking, HIV infection, underlying illness, if SARS-CoV-2 index case was main  
115 caregiver, or sleeping in same room as index case) were collected. Nasopharyngeal (screening) and  
116 nasal swabs (follow-up) were tested for SARS-CoV-2 on rRT-PCR using the Allplex™ 2019-nCoV kit  
117 (Seegene Inc., Seoul, South Korea) and the first positive of each infection episode was characterised  
118 using the Allplex™ SARS-CoV-2 Variants I and II PCR assays (Seegene Inc., Seoul, Korea) and through  
119 whole genome sequencing on the Ion Torrent Genexus platform (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA). We  
120 classified the infection episodes as Alpha, Beta, Delta, non-Alpha/Beta/Delta or unknown variant  
121 where we were unable to classify the sample as a variant of concern due to primary testing done  
122 elsewhere, low viral load or poor sequence quality. Households with multiple SARS-CoV-2 variants  
123 circulating at the same time (mixed clusters) were excluded from the analysis. We also collected  
124 serum at the first and final household visit for serological testing, using an in-house ELISA to detect  
125 antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 spike protein<sup>20</sup> and nucleocapsid protein using Roche Elecsys anti-  
126 SARS-CoV-2 assay. Individuals were considered seropositive if they tested positive on either assay.  
127 Individuals sero-positive at the start of follow-up with no rRT-PCR confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection  
128 during follow-up were excluded from the analysis as they may have been protected from infection  
129<sup>21</sup>.

### 130 *Contact pattern measurements*

131 At the first or second visit during follow-up, we deployed wearable radio frequency (RF) proximity  
132 sensors<sup>15</sup> for two weeks to measure close-range interactions (<1.5 meters) between household  
133 members. The proximity sensors exchange low-power radio packets in the ISM (Industrial, Scientific  
134 and Medical) radio band. Exchange of packets and Received Signal Strength Indicator (RSSI), suitably  
135 thresholded, are used to assess proximity between the devices. A contact interval between two  
136 devices is defined as a sequence of consecutive 20-second intervals within which at least one radio  
137 packet was exchanged. Each sensor had a unique hardware identifier that was linked to participant  
138 study identifiers. Sensors were worn in a PVC pouch either pinned to clothing on the chest, or on a  
139 lanyard around the neck based on participant preference. We requested participants to wear the  
140 device while at home, to store them separately from other household member sensors at night, and  
141 to complete a log sheet every day for the periods the sensors were put on and taken off. During each  
142 household visit during the sensor deployment period, field workers confirmed sensors were worn. A  
143 deployment log was completed for each household to link the sensor identifier to the participant  
144 identifier and to log the date and time sensors were deployed and collected. After sensor collection,  
145 batteries were removed to prevent further package exchange between sensors. Sensors were  
146 transported to the study office where each sensor was connected to a computer and data  
147 downloaded.

### 148 *Data analysis*

149 We assumed the first individual with COVID-19 compatible symptoms in the household (individual  
150 screened at clinic) was the index case. Any household member testing positive for SARS-CoV-2  
151 within the two weeks from the last positive result for the index case was considered a secondary  
152 SARS-CoV-2 case. Contact event data were cleaned using an automated pipeline. We excluded any  
153 close-range proximity events outside of the deployment period and that occurred during a 5-minute  
154 time slice that the accelerometer did not detect any movement of the sensor. Due to a technical  
155 error, some sensors at the Klerksdorp site did not have a valid time stamp and needed additional  
156 processing to align the time series of close-range proximity events. This was achieved by computing,  
157 for each pair of tags X and Y, the temporal shift that maximizes the correlation between the time  
158 series of the number of packets per unit time transmitted by X and received by Y, and the reciprocal  
159 time series of the number of packets per unit time transmitted by Y and received by X (operation  
160 that can be efficiently carried out working in the frequency domain via Fourier transformation). This  
161 allowed us to build a temporal alignment graph between sensors and – as long as there was at least  
162 one sensor with a valid timestamp in the household – to use such graph to propagate the valid  
163 timestamp to all other sensors, thus recovering global temporal alignment. For the analysis, we only  
164 considered close-range proximity events that occurred one day after deployment and one day  
165 before collection. Where no timestamp was available, we used data collected from one to ten days  
166 after deployment.

167 We assessed three contact parameters: 1) duration (median daily cumulative time in contact in  
168 seconds), 2) frequency (median daily number of contacts with the index/infected individuals over  
169 the deployment period) and 3) average duration (cumulative time in contact divided by the  
170 cumulative number of close-range proximity events over full deployment period). Median values  
171 were preferred over mean values due to the rightly skewed data, and the different number of days  
172 with measured contact data for each household after data cleaning. We assessed contact  
173 parameters in two ways: 1) median number of close-range proximity events with the presumptive  
174 index case and 2) median number of close-range proximity events with all SARS-CoV-2 infected  
175 household members (as confirmed by rRT-PCR). The latter assessment was to take into account that  
176 the transmission could have been from any of the infected household members, and not necessarily  
177 the index case, or that the index case was misclassified.

178 We constructed contact matrices by combining the median duration and frequency of close-range  
179 proximity events for all participants between each age group, respectively. To normalize the matrix  
180 based on number of participants, we divided the cumulative contact duration and frequency by the  
181 total number of individuals in the two age groups being investigated in each cell.

182 We assessed the association of contact parameters with SARS-CoV-2 household transmission using  
183 the Wilcoxon rank-sum test (considering  $p < 0.05$  as significant) and through logistic regression  
184 controlling for individual characteristics associated with transmission. To assess factors associated  
185 with SARS-CoV-2 household transmission, we performed logistic regression with a mixed effects  
186 hierarchical regression model to account for household- and site-level clustering. For the analysis  
187 with a defined index case (i.e. investigating close-range proximity events with all presumptive index  
188 cases, first person with COVID-19 symptoms), we included only household contacts with their SARS-  
189 CoV-2 infection status as the outcome, assessing both index (transmission) and contact (acquisition)  
190 characteristics. For the analysis with no defined index case (i.e. investigating close-range proximity  
191 events with all SARS-CoV-2 infected household members), we included all enrolled household  
192 members (originally considered presumptive index and household contacts), assessing only their  
193 own characteristics. For the analysis with close-range proximity events with all SARS-CoV-2 infected  
194 household members, we included an offset term in the model to account for the number of SARS-

195 CoV-2 infected members in contact with (number of nodes). We first built the model using individual  
196 characteristics to assess factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 transmission (excluding contact  
197 parameters). We included age and SARS-CoV-2 variant *a priori*, and assessed other co-variables on  
198 univariate analysis, keeping those with  $p < 0.2$  in the multivariable analysis. For which we then  
199 performed backwards elimination, keeping only those with  $p < 0.05$ , and comparing each subsequent  
200 model to the previous using a likelihood ratio test. Finally, we generated three separate models for  
201 each analysis (index and infected household members), including each contact parameter to the  
202 final model to assess the association with transmission.

### 203 *Ethics*

204 The study protocol was approved by University of the Witwatersrand Human Research Ethics  
205 Committee (Reference M2008114). Participants in follow-up received grocery store vouchers of USD  
206 3 per visit to compensate for time required for specimen collection and interview, and an additional  
207 voucher once proximity sensors were returned with no visible damage.

### 208 **Results**

209 We screened 1,531 individuals and identified 277 (18%) positive for SARS-CoV-2, of which 124 (45%)  
210 were enrolled and included in the household cumulative infection risk analysis<sup>19</sup>, with 373  
211 household contacts. After data cleaning, we had contact data for 88 (71%) index cases and 252 (68%)  
212 household contacts (Supplementary Figure 1). Ninety-three individuals (19%, 36 index cases and 73  
213 household contacts) were excluded due to non-compliance, where no contacts were logged, or  
214 sensors was stationary for the period based on accelerometer data. We were more likely to have  
215 contact data for individuals from the Soweto site, from larger households, and with no household  
216 member reporting smoking indoors (Supplementary Table 1). The median number of household  
217 members included in the analysis was 4 (inter quartile range [IQR] 3-5), with a median of 3 (IQR 1-4)  
218 SARS-CoV-2 cases per household and a median of 67% (IQR 50-100%) of household members  
219 infected (including index cases). Sixty-six percent (225/340) of individuals included in the analysis  
220 lived in a household with 3-5 members, and 49% (168/340) lived in a home with only 1-2 rooms used  
221 for sleeping, a third (53/340) living in households where crowding was reported (>2 people per  
222 sleeping room, Supplementary Table 1).

223 The overall median duration of daily close-range proximity events was 1,095 seconds (18 minutes,  
224 IQR 398-2,705 seconds), with a 39 second (IQR 32-49 seconds) average duration per contact event,  
225 and a median of 26 (IQR 10-58) close-range proximity events per day amongst household members  
226 (Figure 1, Supplementary Table 2). The highest median daily contact duration was observed between  
227 individuals within the <5 year, 5-12 year and 35-59 year groups (Figure 2 A, D). Similar patterns were  
228 also seen for median daily close-range proximity duration and frequency in children aged 5-12 and  
229 13-17 years (Figure 2 B-F).

230 We did not find any association between any of the contact parameters (either with the index case  
231 or all SARS-CoV-2 infected household members) and SARS-CoV-2 infection in the household using  
232 the Wilcoxon rank-sum test (p-values ranging 0.2-0.9, Table 1).

233 When assessing factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 transmission from presumptive index cases and  
234 acquisition in household members, none of the contact parameters were associated with SARS-CoV-  
235 2 transmission on univariate analysis. Sleeping in the same room as the index case was also not  
236 associated with transmission (OR 0.94, 95%CI 0.47 to 1.88). On multivariable analysis after  
237 controlling for index age and SARS-CoV-2 infecting variant, factors significantly associated with  
238 higher SARS-CoV-2 transmission and acquisition was index case minimum  $C_t$  value <30 (aOR 10.2

239 95%CI 1.4-77.4) compared to  $C_t >35$ , contacts aged 13-17 years (aOR 7.7 95%CI 1.0-58.2) compared  
240 to <5 years and female contacts (aOR 2.3 95%CI 1.1-4.8). Neither close-range proximity duration  
241 (aOR 1.0 95%CI 1.0-1.0), frequency (aOR 1.0 95%CI 1.0-1.0) or average close-range proximity  
242 duration (aOR 1.0 95%CI 1.0-1.0) with the index case were associated with acquisition (Table 2).

243 When not considering transmission from the presumptive index case, but rather all SARS-CoV-2  
244 infected household members, factors significantly associated with SARS-CoV-2 acquisition on  
245 multivariable analysis after controlling for SARS-CoV-2 infecting variant were contacts aged 13-17  
246 years (aOR 9.4 95%CI 1.2-75.9), 18-34 years (aOR 10.1 95%CI 1.3-76.0) and 35-59 years (aOR 8.8  
247 95%CI 1.1-67.7) compared to <5 years, being obese (aOR 4.1 95%CI 1.5-11.1) compared to normal  
248 weight, and not currently smoking (aOR 3.2 95%CI 1.2-9.2). Neither close-range proximity duration  
249 (aOR 1.0 95%CI 1.0-1.0), frequency (aOR 1.0 95%CI 1.0-1.0) or average close-range proximity  
250 duration (aOR 1.0 95%CI 1.0-1.0) with SARS-CoV-2 infected household members was associated with  
251 acquisition (Table 3).

## 252 **Discussion**

253 In this case-ascertained, prospective household transmission study we did not find an association  
254 between the duration and frequency of close-range proximity events with SARS-CoV-2 infected  
255 household members with transmission in the household.

256 High-resolution contact patterns have been previously used to investigate influenza virus  
257 transmission routes in a hospital setting<sup>22</sup>, and contact surveys to show the association between  
258 contacts, locations and influenza infection<sup>23</sup>, the high correlation between pneumococcal infection  
259 risk and contact behaviour<sup>24</sup>, and in the context of tuberculosis transmission where contact with  
260 adults are more important than contact with children<sup>25</sup>. To our knowledge, there are few data  
261 available on the direct association of close-range proximity events and SARS-CoV-2, and none  
262 making use of high-resolution contact data. During contact tracing efforts early in the pandemic in  
263 Singapore, it was found that sharing a bedroom with an index case and speaking to the index case  
264 for more 30 minutes or longer increased the risk for infection<sup>26</sup>. We did not see similar results when  
265 assessing sharing a bedroom with the index case, and this may be due to the already high level of  
266 crowding in included households. Although we observed an increase in infection risk with higher  
267 average contact durations with the index case on univariate analysis, this association was no longer  
268 seen when adjusting for age and other index and contact factors associated with  
269 transmission/acquisition.

270 There are several possible reasons why we did not observe an association with close-range proximity  
271 events and SARS-CoV-2 transmission, these can be classified as related to transmission dynamics or  
272 study limitations. One possibility is that along with droplet-mediated transmission during close-  
273 proximity contacts, airborne<sup>4,5</sup>, and to a lesser extent, fomite-mediated transmission<sup>4</sup> may also play  
274 a role in the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the household. More evidence is becoming available  
275 showing that aerosol transmission may be a more important transmission route for SARS-CoV-2 than  
276 initially anticipated, especially so in poorly ventilated indoor environments<sup>5,27</sup>. Households in these  
277 communities do not have central air-conditioning or heating<sup>28</sup>, and during the winter months  
278 ventilation may be poorer than in summer, although we did not measure this. Furthermore, sensors  
279 only measure face-to-face interactions, and if individuals were close to each other but not directly  
280 facing one another for extended durations, we would not have measured this, although sharing of  
281 the same air may have occurred. The ventilation within households should be considered in future  
282 studies, as this can be a target for intervention strategies to reduce secondary transmission. The high  
283 level of interaction in relatively crowded South African households may already be above the

284 threshold for transmission risk, with host-characteristics like index viral load and contact age being  
285 more important to determine infection risk in this context. It is of interest that close-range proximity  
286 patterns within the household did not fully account for the differences in transmission based on age;  
287 with teenagers and adults experiencing the highest infection risk, but children aged 5-17 years  
288 having the highest contacts.

289 Our study had limitations both in design and execution. Due to the nature of the case-ascertained  
290 study design, we would have missed the period when the index case was most infectious, just before  
291 symptom onset <sup>4</sup>, and the close-range contact patterns measured during the study may have been  
292 different after the household members were aware of the index SARS-CoV-2 case (leading to  
293 reduced contact), and again once secondary cases were informed of their infection status (leading to  
294 increased contact). We also did not collect any information on possible NPI usage in the households,  
295 like wearing of masks. A study from South Africa showed that individuals staying at home were less  
296 likely to wear a mask <sup>29</sup>, but these data were not ascertained during a time when a household  
297 member was infected with SARS-CoV-2. We also did not consider where contacts took place (indoors  
298 or outdoors), which relates to ventilation and may have influenced transmission. We may have also  
299 misclassified the true index case if they were asymptomatic, and did not consider tertiary  
300 transmission chains in the index-directed analysis. To adjust for possible misclassification, we  
301 performed a grouped assessment investigating close-range proximity events with all SARS-CoV-2  
302 infected household members. This grouped analysis may also have diluted possible associations with  
303 the true infector. We also did not consider multiple introductions within the household, although we  
304 did exclude households with more than one SARS-CoV-2 variant detected. During the peaks of waves  
305 of infection in South Africa, one variant was responsible for the majority of the infections <sup>30</sup>, and the  
306 additional introductions within the household were likely to have been the same as the initial  
307 variant. Higher resolution sequencing data may be useful to more accurately identify chains of  
308 transmission within the household. Combining contact data with clinical and  
309 virological/bacteriological data have been shown to be useful to reconstruct transmission networks  
310 <sup>31</sup>, and we will consider this for future analyses. Our measurement of close-range contact patterns  
311 was also limited by compliance, as during the cleaning process we identified 73 sensors that were  
312 not worn, based on accelerometer data. We also had limited data in some households, where some  
313 individuals did not consent to the contact aspect for the study, or where we were unable to retrieve  
314 data due to hardware failure, lost or damaged tags.

315 In conclusion, we did not observe an association with close-proximity contacts and SARS-CoV-2  
316 transmission in the household. A case-ascertained, prospective household transmission study may  
317 not be well suited to investigate this question. A possible other study design to consider is randomly  
318 selected prospective household cohorts, but deployment of sensors for extended periods of time  
319 may be logistically challenging and lead to participant fatigue and households in a cohort may not  
320 experience infection episodes unless the community attack rate is very high. High-resolution  
321 contacts in other settings like schools or workplaces where contacts are less frequent could be  
322 useful to identify the type of contact events that may lead to SARS-CoV-2 transmission. It may be  
323 that aerosol transmission plays a more important role than droplet-mediated transmission, which  
324 would make ventilation within households can also be an important consideration for future studies,  
325 and increased ventilation can be a method to reduce secondary transmission in households.  
326 Nevertheless, our study provides high-resolution household contact data that can be used to  
327 parametrise future transmission models.



328 **Funding**

329 This research was funded by the Wellcome Trust (Grant number 221003/Z/20/Z) in collaboration  
330 with the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, United Kingdom. For the purpose of  
331 open access, the author has applied a CC BY-ND public copyright licence to any Author Accepted  
332 Manuscript version arising from this submission.

333 **Author contributions**

334 Conception and design of study: JK, LD, LG, MT, SW, NM, AvG, NW, MM, CCo, CCa, ST

335 Data collection and laboratory processing: LM, JK, SW, LM, NM, AvG, NW

336 Analysis and interpretation: JK, LD, LG, MT, SW, CCo, CCa, ST

337 Accessed and verified underlying data: JK, LD, LG, MT, CCa

338 Drafted the Article: JK

339 All authors critically reviewed the Article. All authors had access to all the data reported in the study.

340 **Data availability**

341 The contact network, selected individual characteristics and analysis script are available at  
342 <https://github.com/crdm-nicd/sashts.git>.

343 **Other members of the South African SARS-CoV-2 Household Transmission Study (SA-S-**  
344 **HTS) Group**

345 Amelia Buys, ND (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for  
346 Communicable Diseases of the National Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa.)

347 Daniel G. Amoako, PhD (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for  
348 Communicable Diseases of the National Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa.  
349 School of Health Sciences, College of Health Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal, KwaZulu-Natal,  
350 South Africa.)

351 Dylan Toi, MD (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for Communicable  
352 Diseases of the National Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa.)

353 Jinal N. Bhiman, PhD (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for  
354 Communicable Diseases of the National Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa.  
355 School of Pathology, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg,  
356 South Africa.)

357 Juanita Chewparsad, MSc (Perinatal HIV Research Unit (PHRU), University of the Witwatersrand,  
358 Johannesburg, South Africa.)

359 Kedibone Ndlangisa, PhD (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for  
360 Communicable Diseases of the National Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa.)

361 Leisha Genade, MPH (Perinatal HIV Research Unit (PHRU), University of the Witwatersrand,  
362 Johannesburg, South Africa.)

363 Limakatso Lebina, PhD (Perinatal HIV Research Unit (PHRU), University of the Witwatersrand,  
364 Johannesburg, South Africa. Africa Health Research Institute (AHRI), Durban, South Africa)

- 365 Linda de Gouveia, ND (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for  
366 Communicable Diseases of the National Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa.)
- 367 Mzimasi Neti, MPH (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for  
368 Communicable Diseases of the National Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa.)
- 369 Retshidisitswe Kotane, BCMP (Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for  
370 Communicable Diseases of the National Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa.)

371 **Tables**

372 Table 1. Association of contact parameters with SARS-CoV-2 household acquisition\* using the  
373 Wilcoxon rank-sum test, Klerksdorp and Soweto, South Africa, September 2020 – October 2021

<b>Contact parameter</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Median daily contact duration with index	0.82
Median daily contact frequency with index	0.71
Median daily average contact duration with index	0.22
Median daily contact duration with infected household members	0.25
Median daily contact frequency with infected household members	0.32
Median daily average contact duration with infected household members	0.95

374 \*Outcome investigated: testing positive for SARS-CoV-2

375 Table 2. Factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 household transmission from index cases and acquisition in household contacts (contact parameters with index  
 376 case), Klerksdorp and Soweto, South Africa, 2020-2021, (n=252)

	SARS-CoV-2 infection <sup>1</sup>		Univariate analysis	Multivariable analysis	Multivariable analysis (including contact parameter)		
	Negative, N = 99	Positive, N = 153	OR (95%CI)	aOR (95%CI)	aOR (95%CI)	aOR (95%CI)	aOR (95%CI)
<b>Index Characteristics</b>							
Site							
Klerksdorp	47 (44%)	59 (56%)	Reference				
Soweto	52 (36%)	94 (64%)	1.73 (0.72 to 4.14)				
Age (years)							
18-34	36 (47%)	40 (53%)	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
35-59	48 (35%)	89 (65%)	2.20 (0.80 to 6.02)	2.23 (0.80 to 6.23)	2.22 (0.78 to 6.32)	2.34 (0.81 to 6.83)	2.24 (0.80 to 6.30)
≥60	15 (38%)	24 (62%)	1.86 (0.47 to 7.37)	2.19 (0.53 to 9.09)	2.05 (0.48 to 8.72)	2.19 (0.50 to 9.57)	2.09 (0.50 to 8.76)
Minimum Ct value							
>35	17 (81%)	4 (19%)	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
30-35	23 (46%)	27 (54%)	<b>7.58 (1.21 to 47.43)</b>	6.82 (0.72 to 64.47)	6.88 (0.71 to 66.40)	6.62 (0.66 to 65.97)	6.96 (0.73 to 66.72)
<30	58 (33%)	120 (67%)	<b>16.84 (3.05 to 93.06)</b>	<b>10.21 (1.35 to 77.35)</b>	<b>10.22 (1.33 to 78.64)</b>	<b>9.83 (1.25 to 77.60)</b>	<b>10.33 (1.34 to 79.47)</b>
Unknown	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	15.69 (0.31 to 793.51)	6.19 (0.10 to 379.16)	6.62 (0.10 to 423.95)	7.82 (0.11 to 548.46)	6.81 (0.11 to 431.42)
SARS-CoV-2 Variant							
non-Alpha/Beta/Delta	5 (36%)	9 (64%)	1.22 (0.22 to 6.93)	2.04 (0.31 to 13.67)	2.07 (0.31 to 14.01)	2.04 (0.29 to 14.22)	2.14 (0.32 to 14.41)
Alpha	2 (15%)	11 (85%)	4.81 (0.59 to 39.19)	5.14 (0.52 to 50.68)	5.16 (0.47 to 56.71)	4.79 (0.46 to 49.54)	5.05 (0.45 to 56.32)
Beta	70 (41%)	101 (59%)	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Delta	8 (21%)	30 (79%)	3.24 (0.93 to 11.32)	3.72 (0.95 to 14.50)	3.90 (0.98 to 15.53)	3.97 (0.98 to 16.14)	4.02 (1.01 to 15.98)
Variant Unknown	14 (88%)	2 (12%)	0.06 (0.01 to 0.41)	0.14 (0.01 to 1.55)	0.15 (0.01 to 1.62)	0.12 (0.01 to 1.43)	0.18 (0.01 to 1.59)
<b>Contact characteristics</b>							

Age (years)								
<5	8 (73%)	3 (27%)	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
5-12	21 (44%)	27 (56%)	4.16 (0.62 to 27.74)	1.66 (0.25 to 11.16)	1.52 (0.23 to 10.21)	1.63 (0.24 to 11.14)	1.79 (0.26 to 12.22)	
13-17	11 (26%)	31 (74%)	<b>15.42 (2.07 to 114.67)</b>	<b>7.72 (1.02 to 58.22)</b>	7.06 (0.91 to 54.71)	<b>8.70 (1.08 to 69.95)</b>	<b>8.46 (1.10 to 65.20)</b>	
18-34	22 (37%)	38 (63%)	6.04 (0.95 to 38.47)	3.07 (0.47 to 20.17)	2.86 (0.43 to 19.26)	3.39 (0.49 to 23.38)	3.40 (0.51 to 22.85)	
35-59	27 (40%)	41 (60%)	4.34 (0.67 to 28.18)	1.84 (0.28 to 12.28)	1.72 (0.25 to 11.69)	2.03 (0.29 to 14.13)	2.01 (0.30 to 13.64)	
≥60	10 (43%)	13 (57%)	4.73 (0.59 to 38.26)	1.91 (0.23 to 15.49)	1.75 (0.21 to 14.82)	2.20 (0.25 to 19.25)	2.11 (0.25 to 17.47)	
Sex								
Male	52 (48%)	56 (52%)	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Female	47 (33%)	97 (67%)	<b>2.51 (1.25 to 5.02)</b>	<b>2.33 (1.14 to 4.76)</b>	<b>2.38 (1.15 to 4.91)</b>	<b>2.21 (1.06 to 4.58)</b>	<b>2.31 (1.13 to 4.72)</b>	
Sleep in same room as index								
No	68 (40%)	103 (60%)	Reference					
Yes	31 (38%)	50 (62%)	0.94 (0.47 to 1.88)					
Cared for by index								
No	84 (40%)	128 (60%)	Reference					
Yes	15 (38%)	25 (62%)	0.92 (0.36 to 2.34)					
Median Daily Contact Duration With Index (Seconds)	280 (80, 680)	230 (100, 700)	1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)		1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)			
Median Daily Contact Frequency With Index	6 (3, 15)	7 (3, 15)	1.00 (0.98 to 1.02)			1.01 (0.99 to 1.03)		
Median Daily Average Contact Duration With Index (Seconds)	32 (26, 41)	33 (27, 40)	1.54 (0.84 to 2.82)					1.00 (0.99 to 1.01)

377 <sup>1</sup> n (%); Median (inter quartile range). aOR: adjusted odds ratio. Significant associations on multivariable analysis in bold face.

378 Factors investigated but not found significant on multivariable analysis: index sex, HIV status, underlying conditions, body mass index, current smoking, episode duration,  
379 serostatus at follow-up end; contact HIV status, underlying conditions, body mass index, current smoking, cared for by index.

380

381

382

383 Table 3. Factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 acquisition within in the household (contact parameters with SARS-CoV-2 infected household members),  
 384 Klerksdorp and Soweto, South Africa, 2020-2021, (n=340)


	SARS-CoV-2 infection <sup>1</sup>		Univariate analysis	Multivariable analysis (no contact parameter)	Multivariable analysis (including contact parameter)		
	Negative, N = 99	Positive, N = 241	OR (95%CI)	aOR (95%CI)	Duration aOR (95%CI)	Frequency aOR (95%CI)	Average duration aOR (95%CI)
Site							
Klerksdorp	47 (33%)	96 (67%)	Reference				
Soweto	52 (26%)	145 (74%)	1.70 (0.64 to 4.51)				
Age (years)							
<5	8 (73%)	3 (27%)	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
5-12	21 (44%)	27 (56%)	3.36 (0.47 to 24.26)	1.88 (0.25 to 14.08)	1.83 (0.23 to 14.74)	2.07 (0.27 to 15.89)	1.85 (0.22 to 15.30)
13-17	11 (26%)	31 (74%)	<b>14.43 (1.85 to 112.57)</b>	<b>9.43 (1.17 to 75.88)</b>	<b>9.64 (1.10 to 84.68)</b>	<b>11.57 (1.36 to 98.30)</b>	<b>11.02 (1.23 to 98.45)</b>
18-34	22 (26%)	63 (74%)	<b>16.64 (2.43 to 113.93)</b>	<b>10.08 (1.34 to 76.04)</b>	<b>10.22 (1.25 to 83.50)</b>	<b>12.13 (1.52 to 96.70)</b>	<b>9.60 (1.18 to 78.33)</b>
35-59	27 (23%)	89 (77%)	<b>16.24 (2.42 to 109.24)</b>	<b>8.79 (1.14 to 67.74)</b>	<b>8.93 (1.07 to 74.39)</b>	<b>10.51 (1.30 to 85.09)</b>	8.31 (0.99 to 69.72)
≥60	10 (26%)	28 (74%)	<b>18.49 (2.32 to 147.17)</b>	8.71 (0.98 to 77.54)	8.91 (0.91 to 87.13)	<b>10.46 (1.12 to 97.61)</b>	8.32 (0.85 to 81.73)
Body mass index							
Normal weight	50 (36%)	90 (64%)	Reference				
Underweight	7 (35%)	13 (65%)	0.89 (0.22 to 3.53)	0.90 (0.22 to 3.67)	0.90 (0.20 to 3.98)	0.89 (0.22 to 3.66)	0.87 (0.19 to 3.90)
Overweight	22 (32%)	47 (68%)	1.61 (0.70 to 3.71)	1.17 (0.49 to 2.76)	1.16 (0.47 to 2.89)	1.17 (0.49 to 2.78)	1.13 (0.45 to 2.82)
Obese	17 (16%)	89 (84%)	<b>7.47 (3.10 to 17.98)</b>	<b>4.14 (1.54 to 11.11)</b>	<b>4.21 (1.51 to 11.71)</b>	<b>4.27 (1.58 to 11.51)</b>	<b>3.99 (1.43 to 11.11)</b>
Unknown	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	0.53 (0.03 to NA)	NA	NA	NA	NA

			10.58)					
Current smoking								
Yes	18 (42%)	25 (58%)	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
No	80 (27%)	214 (73%)	<b>3.02 (1.19 to 7.63)</b>	<b>3.24 (1.15 to 9.18)</b>	<b>3.15 (1.04 to 9.49)</b>	<b>3.12 (1.10 to 8.88)</b>	<b>3.04 (1.00 to 9.21)</b>	
Unknown	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	8.06 (0.17 to 386.04)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SARS-CoV-2 variant								
non-Alpha/Beta/Delta	5 (26%)	14 (74%)	1.21 (0.15 to 9.96)	1.19 (0.14 to 10.06)	1.19 (0.13 to 11.05)	1.12 (0.13 to 9.44)	1.35 (0.14 to 13.48)	
Alpha	2 (12%)	15 (88%)	3.19 (0.24 to 42.01)	4.61 (0.31 to 69.26)	4.46 (0.29 to 68.58)	3.75 (0.24 to 57.66)	20.95 (0.70 to 626.60)	
Beta	70 (30%)	160 (70%)	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Delta	8 (16%)	42 (84%)	3.00 (0.64 to 13.99)	3.00 (0.60 to 14.89)	3.00 (0.58 to 15.38)	2.77 (0.55 to 13.93)	3.40 (0.63 to 18.43)	
Variant Unknown	14 (58%)	10 (42%)	0.48 (0.09 to 2.57)	0.45 (0.08 to 2.48)	0.47 (0.08 to 2.73)	0.47 (0.09 to 2.54)	0.41 (0.07 to 2.58)	
Median daily contact duration with infected household members (seconds)	460 (165, 1,250)	680 (160, 1,760)	1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)		1.00 (0.99 to 1.01)			
Median daily contact frequency with infected household members	13 (5, 27)	18 (4, 38)	0.99 (0.99 to 1.00)			1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)		
Median daily average contact duration with infected household members (seconds)	33 (28, 44)	37 (28, 47)	0.98 (0.96 to 0.99)				0.99 (0.98 to 1.00)	

385 <sup>1</sup> n (%); Median (inter quartile range). aOR: adjusted odds ratio. Significant associations on multivariable analysis in bold face.

386 Factors investigated but not found significant on multivariable analysis: sex, HIV status, underlying conditions.

387




389

390 Figure 1. Contact parameters by age group (year) and site, Klerksdorp and Soweto, South Africa,  
 391 September 2020 – October 2021. Horizontal line represents the median, box represents the 25<sup>th</sup> and  
 392 75<sup>th</sup> percentile, whiskers represent 1<sup>st</sup> and 99<sup>th</sup> percentile, circles indicate outliers.

393





394

395 Figure 2. Aged-based contact matrices based close-proximity event duration (A-C) and frequency (D-  
 396 E) for entire deployment period overall (A, D) Klerksdorp (B,D), and Soweto (C,F), September 2020 –  
 397 October 2021. Teal denotes lowest value, purple highest, white no data for age group combination


398 **References**

- 399 1 National Institute for Communicable Diseases. *COVID-19 Weekly Epidemiology Brief*,  
400 <[https://www.nicd.ac.za/diseases-a-z-index/disease-index-covid-19/surveillance-](https://www.nicd.ac.za/diseases-a-z-index/disease-index-covid-19/surveillance-reports/weekly-epidemiological-brief/)  
401 [reports/weekly-epidemiological-brief/](https://www.nicd.ac.za/diseases-a-z-index/disease-index-covid-19/surveillance-reports/weekly-epidemiological-brief/)> (2022).
- 402 2 Kleynhans, J. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence after Third Wave of Infections, South Africa.  
403 *Emerging Infectious Disease Journal* **28**, 1055, doi:10.3201/eid2805.220278 (2022).
- 404 3 Cable, R. *et al.* Estimates of prevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among blood donors  
405 in eight provinces of South Africa in November 2021. *Res Sq*, doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-  
406 1359658/v1 (2022).
- 407 4 Meyerowitz, E. A., Richterman, A., Gandhi, R. T. & Sax, P. E. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A  
408 Review of Viral, Host, and Environmental Factors. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **174**, 69-79,  
409 doi:10.7326/M20-5008 (2020).
- 410 5 Wang, C. C. *et al.* Airborne transmission of respiratory viruses. *Science* **373**, eabd9149,  
411 doi:doi:10.1126/science.abd9149 (2021).
- 412 6 Madewell, Z. J., Yang, Y., Longini, I. M., Jr., Halloran, M. E. & Dean, N. E. Household  
413 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA network open* **3**,  
414 e2031756-e2031756, doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.31756 (2020).
- 415 7 Liu, T. *et al.* Transmission dynamics of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV). *bioRxiv*,  
416 2020.2001.2025.919787, doi:10.1101/2020.01.25.919787 (2020).
- 417 8 Cohen, C. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 incidence, transmission, and reinfection in a rural and an urban  
418 setting: results of the PHIRST-C cohort study, South Africa, 2020-21. *The Lancet Infectious*  
419 *Diseases* **22**, 821-834, doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00069-X (2022).
- 420 9 Aleta, A. *et al.* Quantifying the importance and location of SARS-CoV-2 transmission events  
421 in large metropolitan areas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **119**,  
422 e2112182119, doi:doi:10.1073/pnas.2112182119 (2022).
- 423 10 Hsu, C.-Y. *et al.* Household transmission but without the community-acquired outbreak of  
424 COVID-19 in Taiwan. *J. Formos. Med. Assoc.* **120**, S38-S45,  
425 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfma.2021.04.021> (2021).
- 426 11 Nande, A., Adlam, B., Sheen, J., Levy, M. Z. & Hill, A. L. Dynamics of COVID-19 under social  
427 distancing measures are driven by transmission network structure. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **17**,  
428 e1008684, doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008684 (2021).
- 429 12 Liu, C. Y. *et al.* Rapid Review of Social Contact Patterns During the COVID-19 Pandemic.  
430 *Epidemiology* **32**, 781-791, doi:10.1097/ede.0000000000001412 (2021).
- 431 13 McAloon, C. G. *et al.* Numbers of close contacts of individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 and  
432 their association with government intervention strategies. *BMC Public Health* **21**, 2238,  
433 doi:10.1186/s12889-021-12318-y (2021).
- 434 14 Salathe, M. *et al.* A high-resolution human contact network for infectious disease  
435 transmission. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **107**, 22020-22025, doi:10.1073/pnas.1009094108  
436 (2010).
- 437 15 Cattuto, C. *et al.* Dynamics of person-to-person interactions from distributed RFID sensor  
438 networks. *PLoS One* **5**, e11596-e11596, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0011596 (2010).
- 439 16 Voirin, N. *et al.* Combining high-resolution contact data with virological data to investigate  
440 influenza transmission in a tertiary care hospital. *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* **36**, 254-  
441 260, doi:10.1017/ice.2014.53 (2015).
- 442 17 Kiti, M. C. *et al.* Quantifying social contacts in a household setting of rural Kenya using  
443 wearable proximity sensors. *EPJ data science* **5**, 21, doi:10.1140/epjds/s13688-016-0084-2  
444 (2016).
- 445 18 Pung, R. *et al.* Using high-resolution contact networks to evaluate SARS-CoV-2 transmission  
446 and control in large-scale multi-day events. *Nature communications* **13**, 1956,  
447 doi:10.1038/s41467-022-29522-y (2022).







- 448 19 Kleynhans, J. *et al.* Household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from adult index cases living with  
449 and without HIV in South Africa, 2020–2021: a case-ascertained, prospective observational  
450 household transmission study. *Clin. Infect. Dis.*, doi:10.1093/cid/ciac640 (2022).
- 451 20 Wibmer, C. K. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 501Y.V2 escapes neutralization by South African COVID-19  
452 donor plasma. *Nat. Med.* **27**, 622–625, doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01285-x (2021).
- 453 21 Torresi, J., Edeling, M. A., Nolan, T. & Godfrey, D. I. A Complementary Union of SARS-CoV-2  
454 Natural and Vaccine Induced Immune Responses. *Front. Immunol.* **13**, 914167,  
455 doi:10.3389/fimmu.2022.914167 (2022).
- 456 22 Whitney, C. G. Changing Epidemiology of Pneumococcal Disease in the Era of Conjugate  
457 Vaccines. *Curr Epidemiol Rep* **3**, 125–135, doi:10.1007/s40471-016-0077-5 (2016).
- 458 23 Kwok, K. O. *et al.* Social contacts and the locations in which they occur as risk factors for  
459 influenza infection. *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **281**, 20140709, doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.0709  
460 (2014).
- 461 24 Qian, G. *et al.* Association of pneumococcal carriage in infants with the risk of carriage  
462 among their contacts in Nha Trang, Vietnam: A nested cross-sectional survey. *PLoS Med.* **19**,  
463 e1004016, doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1004016 (2022).
- 464 25 Dodd, P. J. *et al.* Age- and Sex-Specific Social Contact Patterns and Incidence of  
465 Mycobacterium tuberculosis Infection. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **183**, 156–166,  
466 doi:10.1093/aje/kwv160 (2016).
- 467 26 Ng, O. T. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and transmission risk factors among high-risk  
468 close contacts: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* **21**, 333–343,  
469 doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30833-1 (2021).
- 470 27 Duval, D. *et al.* Long distance airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2: rapid systematic review.  
471 *BMJ* **377**, e068743, doi:10.1136/bmj-2021-068743 (2022).
- 472 28 Mathee, A. *et al.* Housing Quality in a Rural and an Urban Settlement in South Africa. *Int. J.*  
473 *Environ. Res. Public Health* **18**, 2240, doi:10.3390/ijerph18052240 (2021).
- 474 29 Burger, R., Christian, C., English, R., Maughan-Brown, B. & Rossouw, L. Predictors of mask-  
475 wearing during the advent of the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from South Africa. *Transl.*  
476 *Behav. Med.* **12**, doi:10.1093/tbm/ibab132 (2021).
- 477 30 National Institute for Communicable Diseases. *Tracking SARS-CoV-2 Variants*,  
478 <[https://www.nicd.ac.za/diseases-a-z-index/disease-index-covid-19/sars-cov-2-genomic-  
479 surveillance-update/](https://www.nicd.ac.za/diseases-a-z-index/disease-index-covid-19/sars-cov-2-genomic-surveillance-update/)> (2022).
- 480 31 Campbell, F., Cori, A., Ferguson, N. & Jombart, T. Bayesian inference of transmission chains  
481 using timing of symptoms, pathogen genomes and contact data. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **15**,  
482 e1006930, doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006930 (2019).

483

484



\*Not included in HCIR analysis in study main manuscript (Kleynhans J, Walaza S, Martinson NA, et al. Household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from adult index cases living with and without HIV in South Africa, 2020-2021: a case-ascertained, prospective observational household transmission study. Clin Infect Dis 2022.), \*\*More than one SARS-CoV-2 variant detected in household, \*\*\*Household completed first week of follow-up before proximity sensors were deployed in field, \*\*\*\*No data available due to: Non-compliance based on lack of contacts logged or stationary accelerometer (n=73), Tag hardware failure (n=11), Tag lost/damaged (n=9)



SARS-CoV-2      Negative      Positive

SARS-CoV-2      Negative      Positive