Household factors and the risk of severe COVID-like illness early in the US pandemic

Denis Nash^{1,5}, Saba Qasmieh¹, McKaylee Robertson¹, Madhura Rane¹, Rebecca Zimba¹, Sarah Kulkarni¹, Amanda Berry¹, William You¹, Chloe Mirzayi¹, Drew Westmoreland¹, Angela Parcesepe^{3,4}, Levi Waldron^{1,5}, Shivani Kochhar¹, Andrew R Maroko^{1,2}, and Christian Grov^{1,6} for the CHASING COVID Cohort Study Team

1. Institute for Implementation Science in Population Health (ISPH), City University of New York (CUNY); New York City, New York USA
2. Department of Environmental, Occupational, and Geospatial Health Sciences, Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy, City University of New York (CUNY); New York City, New York USA
3. Department of Maternal and Child Health, Gillings School of Public Health, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA
4. Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA
5. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy, City University of New York (CUNY); New York City, New York USA
6. Department of Community Health and Social Sciences, Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy, City University of New York (CUNY); New York City, New York USA

Corresponding author:

Denis Nash, Ph.D., MPH
55 W. 125th St.
New York, NY USA 10027.
Phone: +1-(917) 740-8714
Email: denis.nash@sph.cuny.edu

Abstract

Objective: To investigate the role of children in the home and household crowding as risk factors for severe COVID-19 disease.

Methods: We used interview data from 6,831 U.S. adults screened for the Communities, Households and SARS-CoV-2 Epidemiology (CHASING) COVID Cohort Study in April 2020.

Results: In logistic regression models, the adjusted odds ratio [aOR] of hospitalization due to COVID-19 for having (versus not having) children in the home was 10.5 (95% CI:5.7-19.1) among study participants living in multi-unit dwellings and 2.2 (95% CI:1.2-6.5) among those living in single unit dwellings. Among participants living in multi-unit dwellings, the aOR for COVID-19 hospitalization among participants with more than 4 persons in their household (versus 1 person) was 2.5 (95% CI:1.0- 6.1), and 0.8 (95% CI:0.15-4.1) among those living in single unit dwellings.

Conclusion: Early in the US SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, certain household exposures likely increased the risk of both SARS-CoV-2 acquisition and the risk of severe COVID-19 disease.

48 **Introduction:**

49 Crowded indoor settings and sustained close contact are associated with an increased
50 likelihood of SARS-CoV-2 spread.¹² Stay-at-home orders and other non-pharmaceutical
51 measures, such as bans on mass gatherings and physical distancing, were effective in
52 curtailing community transmission.^{3,4} However, these measures may have resulted in
53 shifting the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to within household settings where high attack
54 rates can occur, with high rates of hospitalization and death.⁴⁻⁷ Crowded households
55 can be environments conducive to transmission due to difficulties in maintaining
56 physical distance and effective isolation,^{8,9} and when infected household members have
57 pre-symptomatic or asymptomatic infection.

58

59 There is growing evidence suggesting that asymptomatic infections contribute
60 substantially to transmission of SARS-CoV-2¹⁰⁻¹². Younger age may be an important
61 factor driving asymptomatic spread. Studies have shown differences in the presentation
62 of COVID-19 between adults and children, with children less likely than adults to be
63 symptomatic and less likely to present with severe COVID-19 disease.¹³⁻¹⁶
64 Counterintuitively, other studies have suggested that children may have viral load levels
65 that are comparable to those of adults, and that they could play a role in driving
66 SARS-CoV-2 transmission.^{17,18} One recent study in India found that children and young
67 adults accounted for 30% of cases.¹⁹ Moreover, the lack of mask use early in the US
68 pandemic indoors among members of the same household who may have been
69 asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic during the first several days of quarantine under

70 stay-at-home orders could have resulted in a higher inoculum and increased disease
71 severity.^{20,21,22}

72

73 Household studies are important for understanding the role of factors such as
74 household crowding and household age composition on household SARS-CoV-2
75 transmission. A recent systematic review of 40 SARS-CoV-2 household transmission
76 studies suggests that, while the secondary attack rate within households is high (18.8%,
77 95% CI 15.4%-22.2%), transmission rates are highest: a) when the primary household
78 cases are symptomatic (19.9%, 95% CI: 14.0% - 25.7%) vs asymptomatic; b) among
79 adult contacts (31%, 95% CI: 19.4% - 42.7%) vs children; and c) in households with
80 only 1 other contact (45.2%, 95% CI 34.1%-51.8) vs those with 3 or more contacts.²
81 Early studies in New York state showed high attack rates, hospitalizations, and deaths
82 within the households of index cases.⁶ And a recent household transmission study
83 conducted in Tennessee and Wisconsin by the CDC found a very high and rapidly
84 occurring secondary infection rate of 53% among household members of an index case,
85 with >70% of secondary cases occurring within 5 days of symptom onset of the index
86 case.⁵ The effect of household transmission versus other community transmission on
87 SARS-CoV-2 severity has not been systematically investigated.

88

89 Few household studies have examined the role of children on household transmission
90 of SARS-CoV-2, and those that have relied on small sample sizes.^{5,23,24} Understanding
91 the risk of COVID-19 in crowded households and households with children (regardless
92 of whether they are the primary case in the household) will be important in elucidating

the impact of stay-at-home orders and prolonged indoor contact on the risk severe infections. The objective of this study was to examine the effects of household characteristics, primarily the presence of children in the household and household crowding, on the risk of COVID hospitalization during the early phase of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in the US.

Methods:

Study population:

Study participants were individuals screened for enrollment into the Communities, Households, and SARS/CoV-2 Epidemiology (CHASING) COVID Cohort study who completed an initial baseline assessment. The CHASING COVID Cohort study is a national prospective cohort study of adults from the US and US territories that was launched on March 28, 2020 to understand the spread and impact of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic within households and communities. The survey methodology is described in detail in a previous publication.²⁵ Briefly, study participants were recruited online through social media platforms or through referrals using advertisements that were in both English and Spanish. The platform Qualtrics (Qualtrics, Provo, UT), an online survey platform widely used in social and behavioral research, was used for data collection.

The initial baseline assessment captured information on household characteristics, underlying risk factors, SARS-CoV-2 symptoms, and health-seeking behaviors such as testing and hospitalizations. A second version of the initial baseline questionnaire was launched on April 9, 2020 to capture healthcare and essential worker status. A total of

116 6,831 participants had completed an initial cohort screening interview by April 20, 2020.
117 The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the City
118 University of New York (CUNY).

119

120 ***Variable definitions:***

121 *Primary Outcome:*

122 The main outcome was self-report of hospitalization for COVID symptoms reported in
123 the two weeks prior to the interview. Symptoms assessed included any of the following:
124 fever, chills, rigors, runny nose, myalgia, headache, sore throat, stomach ache,
125 diarrhea, nasal congestion, nausea, vomiting, cough or coughing up blood or phlegm,
126 shortness of breath. Those reporting any of these symptoms who reported also being
127 hospitalized as a result of their reported symptoms were classified as having the
128 outcome; all other participants were classified as not having the outcome.

129

130 *Primary and secondary exposures:*

131 The primary exposure was the presence of any children under 18 years of age living in
132 participants' household. Secondary exposures were the number of persons living in a
133 household (1, 2-3, more than 4) and the type of property in which the participant lived.
134 Property type was classified as either a multi-unit property (e.g. apartment,
135 condominium, co-op, or building with two or more units), single-unit property (e.g.
136 detached home, or townhouse), or other.

137

138 *Covariates:*

139 *Socio-demographic and behavioral risk factors for COVID*

140 We identified socio-demographic, behavioral and employment factors as confounders of
 141 hypothesized exposure-outcome relationships, including age, gender, race/ethnicity,
 142 and annual combined income. Additionally, we included potential confounders such as
 143 having had close contact with someone who had coronavirus-like symptoms and/or
 144 having been involved in the diagnosis or care of someone with confirmed or suspected
 145 coronavirus infection. Finally, we considered potential employment-related confounders,
 146 including essential worker status, which was defined as having been involved in
 147 following roles in the two weeks prior to survey date: healthcare, law enforcement, fire
 148 department/first responder, delivery or pick-up services related to food or medications,
 149 or in public/private transportation.

150

151 *Community transmission:*

152 As community transmission could confound the exposure-outcome relationship, we
 153 used lagged population-based, county-level death rates as a proxy for community
 154 transmission. We tabulated the number of COVID deaths per 100,000 population for
 155 each county using data from the New York Times Github website (from 01/21/2020 to
 156 07/05/2020).²⁶ Our proxy for community SARS-CoV-2 transmission was a 5-day moving
 157 average of COVID deaths per 100,000 population, lagged by 23 days. Specifically, to
 158 use county death rates as a proxy for community transmission in the county, we
 159 introduced a lag since COVID deaths follow several other milestones after infection
 160 (infection→ incubation→ symptoms→ progression/hospitalization→ death). We
 161 assumed that data on the number of deaths for a given day represented community

transmission that was occurring 23 days *earlier*, specifically 5 days from infection to symptom onset (reflecting the average incubation period); 5 days from symptom onset to pneumonia; and 13 days from pneumonia diagnosis to death.²⁷ For those participants reporting symptoms, we then matched reported timing of symptom onset with community transmission levels 5 days earlier, corresponding to the average incubation period for SARS-CoV-2.^{28–30}

COVID-related illness

Frequencies of seven measures of COVID-related outcomes were generated to examine the health-seeking behaviors of all participants who 1) reported COVID symptoms ; 2) met the CSTE case definition for COVID-like illness which was defined as reporting at least two of following symptoms: fever, chills, myalgia, headache, sore throat, or at least one of the following: cough, shortness of breath³¹; 3) reported seeing or calling a physician or healthcare professional for any of the COVID symptoms they reported, 4) sought but were unable to get a diagnostic test, 5) received diagnostic test, 6) received a laboratory-confirmed diagnosis, or 7) were hospitalized for any of the reported COVID symptoms. All measures were dichotomized as “yes” and “no” with those who reported “do not know” or “not sure” were classified as a “no”.

Comorbid conditions

Participants were asked whether they have been told by a health professional that they had heart attack, angina or coronary heart disease, type 2 diabetes, high blood

184 pressure, cancer, asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases, emphysema, or
185 chronic bronchitis, kidney disease, HIV/AIDS, immunosuppression, and depression.

186

187 **Statistical Analysis:**

188 Descriptive statistics were generated to examine the socio-demographic, health and
189 behavioral characteristics between households with and without children, and for
190 hospitalized and non-hospitalized participants. Frequencies were generated for all
191 categorical variables and Pearson's chi-squared test of independence was performed to
192 assess group differences.

193

194 A multivariable logistic regression model was used to estimate the association between
195 presence of children in households, number of people living in a household, and
196 property types on the risk of hospitalization with COVID symptoms. We ran three
197 models, all adjusted for age, gender, race/ethnicity, income, close contact, essential
198 worker status, and community transmission rate. Models examining the exposures of
199 the number of people living in household and property types models were also adjusted
200 for presence of children in the household. These variables chosen were based on
201 hypothesized causal associations and confounders, and direct acyclic graphs³² were
202 developed for each model.

203

204 Given the associations between household crowding with COVID transmission^{8,9}, the
205 crude and multivariate associations between 1) presence of children in household or 2)
206 household size on hospitalizations due to COVID were stratified by property type. For

each main effect model, we ran a model with an interaction term (i.e., presence of children* property type and household size* property type) and adjusted for the same covariates as the main effects models.

Finally, we described the socio-demographic and behavioral characteristics, as well as comorbidities of participants who were hospitalized with COVID symptoms to those who were not. These included socio-demographic characteristics, and health and behavioral risk factors such as essential worker status, report of having comorbid conditions, and whether participants were in close contact with symptomatic, suspected or confirmed COVID cases. In addition, reported COVID symptoms were examined and ranked for both groups.

Sensitivity analyses:

Three separate sensitivity analyses were performed to assess the potential impact of missing data and misclassification. First, to assess the potential impact of missing values of essential worker status in the initial baseline assessment, a complete case analysis was performed on the participants who had completed the second version of the baseline assessment and for whom essential worker status was known. Given the negative impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on care seeking (including emergency room care)³³, a second sensitivity analysis assessed the potential impact of excluding persons with COVID symptoms who were not hospitalized in the non-hospitalized group (i.e., differential outcome misclassification). For this analysis we excluded persons who reported symptoms from the denominator of non-hospitalized. The third sensitivity

analysis examined the main effects of the exposures on those hospitalized that also had a laboratory confirmed diagnosis for COVID. For this analysis we restricted the outcome to include only those who reported being hospitalized and have received a laboratory-confirmed diagnosis for COVID.

SAS version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC) was used for all statistical analyses.

Results:

A total of 6,831 participants completed cohort screening, including 5,348 (78%) who completed the second version of the assessment with the question on essential workers.

COVID-like illness outcomes:

Between March 28, 2020 and April 20, 2020, 58.5% of the study population reported symptoms in the two weeks prior to their study interview, with 25.7% (n=1754) of those meeting the case definition for COVID-like illness³¹ (Figure 1). Twelve percent (n=820) of the study population reported seeing a healthcare provider for these symptoms, 7.6% (n=518) sought SARS-CoV-2 testing but did not receive it, 5.2% (n=357) received a diagnostic test, 2.8% (n=188) received a laboratory confirmed diagnosis of coronavirus, and 2.8% (n=191) reported being hospitalized for COVID-like symptoms (69.6% (n=133) of whom reported laboratory confirmation of their diagnosis, and were considered ‘confirmed’).

253 Compared to those without children <18 in the household (Table 1), participants with
 254 children were more likely to be under 49 years old (81.2% vs 60.5%), Hispanic (25.9%
 255 vs 13.9%), essential workers (26.5% vs 18.8%), and more likely to report having had
 256 close contact with someone with coronavirus-like symptoms or a confirmed case (23.3%
 257 vs 16.0%). Participants who completed the second version of the assessment were
 258 similar to those who completed the first (data not shown).

259

260 *Multivariate analysis:*

261 Compared to participants without children in the home, those with children had 4.99
 262 times the adjusted odds (95%CI: 3.16–7.89) in being hospitalized for COVID symptoms
 263 (Table 2). No associations were observed between households with more than four
 264 persons and hospitalization for COVID symptoms (aOR:1.11; 95%CI: 0.49–2.47)
 265 compared to one-person households. Participants who lived in a multi-unit property
 266 compared to those living in a single-unit had 4.62 (95%CI: 2.79–7.66) times higher
 267 adjusted odds of being hospitalized.

268

269 When stratified by property type, compared to participants without children living in a
 270 multi-unit property, participants with children living in multi-unit property had 10.47 times
 271 the adjusted odds for being hospitalized for those symptoms (95%CI: 5.73–19.13).
 272 Participants living in households with more than 4 people in multi-unit property had 2.46
 273 times the adjusted odds (95%CI: 0.99–6.08) of being hospitalized with COVID
 274 symptoms than participants living alone in a multi-unit property. No other statistically

significant associations were observed between household sizes on hospitalization when stratified by property type.

Characteristics of hospitalized participants compared to those not hospitalized:

A total of 191 participants were hospitalized for their reported symptoms (Table 3). Compared with all other participants (n=6,638), those hospitalized were more likely to be between the age of 18 and 49 years of age (84.4% vs 59.8%), male (82.2% vs 50.2%), and Hispanic (70.7% vs 12.2%). Hospitalized participants were more likely to report a comorbid condition (85.4% vs 31.7%) and to have had contact with a symptomatic case or suspected or confirmed case (76.4% vs 14.2%). They were also more likely to be essential workers (80.1% vs 17.1%). Fever and sore throat were the two most commonly reported symptoms which were reported by 71.7% and 70.2% of participants, respectively. About 76.4% of hospitalized participants received a test, and 69.6% of them received a laboratory-confirmed diagnosis.

Discussion

Our study suggests that certain household exposures at the beginning of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in the US not only increased the risk of SARS-CoV-2 acquisition, but also increased the risk of severe COVID-19 disease, requiring hospitalization. Household crowding and having children in the home were both strong and independent risk factors for being hospitalized with SARS-CoV-2 early in the US pandemic. Our findings have implications for public health recommendations in areas and during times where the risk of household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 may be

298 higher, such as immediately prior to and after issuing stay at home orders, when the
 299 point prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in the affected communities may be at its highest
 300 level. Essential workers, families with children, and those living in crowded indoor
 301 settings may be at particularly high risk for being hospitalized with SARS-CoV-2, and
 302 tailored recommendations to reduce the risk of household transmission are needed
 303 when community transmission is high.

304

305 Household transmission occurs rapidly after an index case introduces the infection and
 306 with high household attack rates, can originate from both children and adults¹⁹, and are
 307 associated with high rates of hospitalization and death.^{2,5,6}

308

309 Early in the US pandemic, even when mask use was recommended and became the
 310 norm outside the home, and even in areas where stay at home orders had been put in
 311 place, mask use inside the home or other at-home risk mitigation measures were not
 312 recommended except in situations where there were ill/infected persons (when 10-14
 313 days of isolation using a separate bedroom and bathroom was recommended to reduce
 314 household transmission). However, because of household crowding, a lack of space in
 315 the households, or a need to go to work, provide childcare, or care for other
 316 household/family measures, isolation of ill/infected persons and quarantine of those who
 317 have had a high risk exposure (e.g., to a confirmed case) is not always feasible, and
 318 other risk mitigation measures (e.g., mask wearing, opening windows) are therefore
 319 needed.

320

321 A higher infectious dose can result in a more severe course of SARS-CoV-2 infection.
 322 Mask use is an effective strategy to both reduce the risk of onward spread from an
 323 infected person to susceptibles, and also reduces the risk of infection to the mask
 324 wearer.³⁴ However, infections still can occur when masks are being used by infected
 325 and susceptible persons, but these infections may be more likely to result in
 326 asymptomatic or milder SARS-CoV-2 infection, because of a lower infectious dose.²⁰ It
 327 is therefore possible that a lack of mask use at home during quarantine and isolation
 328 results in a higher infectious dose of SARS-CoV-2 than would occur with masks,
 329 especially in smaller homes, with more household members, including children.

330

331 Stay at home orders usually go into effect when community transmission (and point
 332 prevalence) is highest, and by definition, they increase the amount of time that
 333 household members spend together indoors. Given this, the high attack rates of
 334 SARS-CoV-2 within households, and the higher severity of SARS-CoV-2 infections that
 335 can result from prolonged unmasked, indoor exposures when entire households are
 336 quarantined, public health officials should consider recommending mask use and other
 337 risk mitigation strategies (e.g., open windows, reduced close contact, frequent at-home
 338 testing) in all households with more than one person for a period of time immediately
 339 before and after stay at home orders go into effect.

340

341 Essential workers have several potential risks for SARS-CoV-2 infection, including
 342 commuting and exposure while at work, but they also may be at higher risk for acquiring
 343 or transmitting infection at home as well. In NYC and Chicago, a COVID-19 hotspot

analysis found that hot spots had more household crowding, in NYC, and tended to be middle income, working class neighborhoods that may have higher concentrations of essential workers.⁹

Our study, which included substantial numbers of essential workers who were hospitalized, looked within households and described some of the risk factors for severe COVID-19 early in the US pandemic. Essential workers with young children need childcare, which could put their children at risk of infection. Children with SARS-CoV-2 infection have high enough viral load to transmit to others, and may be more likely to have unrecognized infections. When children become ill, isolation may be even more challenging than for adults, and adults providing care for them are at higher risk, possibly of a more severe SARS-CoV-2 infection, especially when it is difficult to follow infection control practices, such as mask wearing at home by all household members.

Our study has limitations worth noting. First, this was not a household transmission study, and therefore we could not pinpoint household transmission as the likely source of the infection that resulted in infection and hospitalization among our study participants. We therefore cannot say whether and the extent to which household transmission occurred, and if it did, when a child in the household was the source of infection to our study participants. We also did not assess participants' mask use at home. Finally, while we controlled for several possible confounders of the association of household crowding and children in the home with SARS-CoV-2 risk, unmeasured confounding could partially explain our observed associations.

367

368 Our study also had some strengths. As a large epidemiologic cohort study, it was
 369 possible to examine the association of several potentially important household-level risk
 370 factors with a relatively rare outcome of SARS-CoV-2 hospitalization, while controlling
 371 for potential confounding factors. We also had a geographically diverse sample that
 372 included several essential workers. Finally, our findings were robust to the three
 373 sensitivity analyses, which generated similar findings to the main analysis.

374

375 *Conclusions*

376 Early in the US SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, certain household exposures likely increased
 377 the risk of both SARS-CoV-2 acquisition and the risk of severe COVID-19 disease
 378 requiring hospitalization. These findings may have implications for mask wearing and
 379 other mitigation strategies at home immediately prior to and immediately after ‘stay at
 380 home’ orders go into effect.

381

382 **Funding**

383 Funding for this project is provided by the CUNY Institute for Implementation Science in
 384 Population Health (cunyisph.org), the COVID-19 Grant Program of the CUNY Graduate
 385 School of Public Health and Health Policy, and the National Institute Of Allergy and
 386 Infectious Diseases of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number
 387 UH3AI133675.

388 **Acknowledgements**

389 We would like to acknowledge the CHASING COVID Cohort Study participants for their
390 contributions to this research.

391

392 References

- 393 1. Nishiura H, Oshitani H, Kobayashi T, et al. Closed environments facilitate secondary
394 transmission of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Epidemiology*. Published online
395 March 3, 2020.
- 396 2. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household transmission of
397 SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review and meta-analysis of secondary attack rate. *medRxiv*.
398 Published online July 31, 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.07.29.20164590
- 399 3. Xu J, Hussain S, Lu G, et al. Associations of Stay-at-Home Order and Face-Masking
400 Recommendation with Trends in Daily New Cases and Deaths of Laboratory-Confirmed
401 COVID-19 in the United States. *Explor Res Hypothesis Med*. Published online July 8,
402 2020:1-10.
- 403 4. Gudbjartsson DF, Helgason A, Jonsson H, et al. Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic
404 Population. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(24):2302-2315.
- 405 5. Grijalva CG. Transmission of SARS-COV-2 Infections in Households — Tennessee and
406 Wisconsin, April–September 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69.
407 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6944e1
- 408 6. Rosenberg ES, Dufort EM, Blog DS, et al. COVID-19 Testing, Epidemic Features, Hospital
409 Outcomes, and Household Prevalence, New York State—March 2020. *Clin Infect Dis*.
410 Published online May 8, 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa549
- 411 7. Althoff KN, Coburn SB, Nash D. Contact tracing: Essential to the public health response
412 and our understanding of the epidemiology of COVID-19. *Clin Infect Dis*. Published online
413 June 11, 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa757
- 414 8. Cromer SJ, Lakhani CM, Wexler DJ, Burnett-Bowie S-AM, Udler M, Patel CJ. Geospatial
415 Analysis of Individual and Community-Level Socioeconomic Factors Impacting
416 SARS-CoV-2 Prevalence and Outcomes. *medRxiv*. Published online September 30, 2020.
417 doi:10.1101/2020.09.30.20201830
- 418 9. Maroko AR, Nash D, Pavilonis BT. COVID-19 and Inequity: a Comparative Spatial Analysis
419 of New York City and Chicago Hot Spots. *J Urban Health*. 2020;97(4):461-470.
- 420 10. Bai Y, Yao L, Wei T, et al. Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19.
421 *JAMA*. 2020;323(14):1406-1407.
- 422 11. Zhang J, Wu S, Xu L. Asymptomatic carriers of COVID-19 as a concern for disease
423 prevention and control: more testing, more follow-up. *Biosci Trends*. 2020;14(3):206-208.
- 424 12. Kimball A, Hatfield KM, Arons M, et al. Asymptomatic and Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2

- 425 Infections in Residents of a Long-Term Care Skilled Nursing Facility - King County,
426 Washington, March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(13):377-381.
- 427 13. Lu X, Zhang L, Du H, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Children. *N Engl J Med.*
428 2020;382(17):1663-1665.
- 429 14. Yang R, Gui X, Xiong Y. Comparison of Clinical Characteristics of Patients with
430 Asymptomatic vs Symptomatic Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Netw*
431 *Open.* 2020;3(5):e2010182.
- 432 15. Loconsole D, Caselli D, Centrone F, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Children in Southern
433 Italy: A Descriptive Case Series. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;17(17).
434 doi:10.3390/ijerph17176080
- 435 16. Yousaf AR, Duca LM, Chu V, et al. A prospective cohort study in non-hospitalized
436 household contacts with SARS-CoV-2 infection: symptom profiles and symptom change
437 over time. *Clin Infect Dis.* Published online July 28, 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1072
- 438 17. Jones TC, Mühlemann B, Veith T, et al. An analysis of SARS-CoV-2 viral load by patient
439 age. doi:10.1101/2020.06.08.20125484
- 440 18. Heald-Sargent T, Muller WJ, Zheng X, Rippe J, Patel AB, Kociolek LK. Age-Related
441 Differences in Nasopharyngeal Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
442 (SARS-CoV-2) Levels in Patients With Mild to Moderate Coronavirus Disease 2019
443 (COVID-19). *JAMA Pediatr.* Published online July 30, 2020.
444 doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.3651
- 445 19. Laxminarayan R, Wahl B, Dudala SR, et al. Epidemiology and transmission dynamics of
446 COVID-19 in two Indian states. *Science.* 2020;370(6517):691-697.
- 447 20. Gandhi M, Rutherford GW. Facial masking for Covid-19—potential for “variolation” as we
448 await a vaccine. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;383(18):e101.
- 449 21. Guallar MP, Meiriño R, Donat-Vargas C, Corral O, Jouvé N, Soriano V. Inoculum at the time
450 of SARS-CoV-2 exposure and risk of disease severity. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020;97:290-292.
- 451 22. Gandhi M, Beyrer C, Goosby E. Masks Do More Than Protect Others During COVID-19:
452 Reducing the Inoculum of SARS-CoV-2 to Protect the Wearer. *J Gen Intern Med.*
453 2020;35(10):3063-3066.
- 454 23. Teherani MF, Kao CM, Camacho-Gonzalez A, et al. Burden of illness in households with
455 SARS-CoV-2 infected children. *J Pediatric Infect Dis Soc.* Published online August 11,
456 2020. doi:10.1093/jpids/piaa097
- 457 24. Maltezou HC, Vorou R, Papadima K, et al. Transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 within
458 families with children in Greece: A study of 23 clusters. *J Med Virol.* Published online
459 August 7, 2020. doi:10.1002/jmv.26394
- 460 25. Robertson M, Kulkarni S, Berry A, et al. A national prospective cohort study of SARS/COV2
461 pandemic outcomes in the U.S.: The CHASING COVID Cohort.
462 doi:10.1101/2020.04.28.20080630
- 463 26. nytimes. nytimes/covid-19-data. Accessed October 10, 2020.

<https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data>

27. Wilson N, Kvalsvig A, Barnard LT, Baker MG. Case-Fatality Risk Estimates for COVID-19 Calculated by Using a Lag Time for Fatality. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(6):1339-1441.
28. CDC. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Published September 10, 2020. Accessed October 15, 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-guidance-management-patients.html>
29. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(13):1199-1207.
30. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2020;172(9):577-582. doi:10.7326/m20-0504
31. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) | 2020 Interim Case Definition, Approved April 5, 2020. Accessed October 10, 2020. <https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nndss/conditions/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/case-definition/2020/>
32. Pearl J. Causal diagrams for empirical research. *Biometrika*. 1995;82(4):669-688.
33. Czeisler MÉ, Marynak K, Clarke KEN, et al. Delay or Avoidance of Medical Care Because of COVID-19–Related Concerns — United States, June 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2020;69(36):1250-1257. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6936a4
34. How NOT. How to Select, Wear, and Clean Your Mask. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/about-face-coverings.html>

503

504

Figure 1: SARS-CoV-2 symptoms among persons screened for enrollment in the CHASING COVID Cohort Study, April 2020

527 **Table 1: Select socio-demographic, health and behavior characteristics among**
528 **persons screened for enrollment in the CHASING COVID Cohort (N=6831), April**
529 **2020**

Presence of Children in Household			
	Total	Yes	No
	N (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Total	6831	1547 (22.7%)	5284 (77.4%)
Socio-demographic			
Age group (years)			
18-49	4133 (60.5%)	1256 (81.2%)	2877 (54.5%)
50-59	1083 (15.9%)	192 (12.4%)	891 (16.9%)
60+	1615 (23.6%)	99 (6.4%)	1516 (28.7%)
Gender			
Male	3487 (51.1%)	575 (37.2%)	2912 (55.1%)
Female	3134 (45.9%)	939 (60.7%)	2195 (41.5%)
Gender non-binary	210 (3.1%)	33 (2.1%)	177 (3.4%)
Race/ethnicity			
Hispanic	946 (13.9%)	401 (25.9%)	545 (10.3%)
White	4561 (66.8%)	828 (53.5%)	3733 (70.7%)
Black non-Hispanic	721 (10.6%)	176 (11.4%)	545 (10.3%)
Asian/Pacific Islander	326 (4.8%)	81 (5.2%)	245 (4.6%)
Other	277 (4.1%)	61 (3.9%)	216 (4.1%)
Income level			
< 50,000	3253 (47.6%)	665 (43.0%)	2588 (49.0%)
50,000- 99,000	1626 (23.8%)	298 (19.3%)	1328 (25.1%)
100,000	1530 (22.4%)	446 (28.8%)	1084 (20.5%)
Not reported	422 (6.2%)	138 (8.9%)	284 (5.4%)
Health and behaviors			
Essential worker			
Yes	1286 (18.8%)	410 (26.5%)	876 (16.6%)
No	4062 (59.5%)	865 (55.9%)	3197 (60.5%)
Not asked	1483 (21.7%)	272 (17.6)	1211 (22.9%)
Reported having comorbidities			
Yes	2271 (33.2%)	488 (31.5%)	3501 (66.3%)
No	4560 (66.8%)	1059 (68.5%)	1783 (33.7%)
Had close contact with suspected/confirmed case			
Yes	1090 (16.0%)	361 (23.3%)	729 (13.8%)
No	5741 (84.0%)	1186 (76.7%)	4555 (86.2%)
Household Factors			
Property type			
Multi-unit property	2602 (38.1%)	451 (29.2%)	2151 (40.7%)
Single-unit property	3856 (56.5%)	985 (63.7%)	2871 (54.3%)
Other	373 (5.5%)	111 (7.2%)	262 (5.0%)
Number of persons living in HH			
1	1990 (29.1%)	0	1190 (37.7%)
2-3	3157 (46.2%)	394 (25.5%)	277863 (52.3%)
4+	1684 (24.7%)	1153 (74.5%)	531 (10.1%)

531

532

Table 2: Main effects of presence of children, number of persons in households and property type on hospitalization for COVID-like symptoms (N=6831), April 2020

Main exposures	Hospitalized with COVID symptoms		
	n (%)	cOR (95% CI)	aOR (95% CI)
Children in household*			
Yes	147 (9.5%)	12.51 (8.89 – 17.61)	4.99 (3.16 – 7.89)
No	44 (0.8%)	ref	ref
Number of persons in household **			
1	18 (0.9%)	ref	ref
2-3	34 (1.1%)	1.19 (0.67 – 2.12)	0.90 (0.45 – 1.79)
More than 4	139 (8.3%)	9.85 (6.00 – 16.17)	1.11 (0.49 – 2.47)
Property Type ***			
Multi-Unit	153 (5.9%)	8.86 (5.87 – 13.38)	4.62 (2.79 – 7.66)
Single-Unit	27 (0.7%)	ref	ref
Other	11 (3.0%)	4.31 (2.12 – 8.76)	4.55 (2.00 – 10.36)
Interactions			
Presence of children stratified by property			
Children living multi-unit	131 (29.1%)	39.60 (24.83 – 63.14)	10.47 (5.73 – 19.13)
No children living in multi-unit	22 (1.0%)	ref	ref
Children living in single unit	12 (1.2%)	2.35 (1.10 – 5.04)	2.82 (1.23 – 6.47)
No children living in single unit	15 (0.5%)	ref	ref
Children living in 'other' type unit	4 (3.6%)	1.36 (0.39 – 4.75)	1.05 (0.27 – 4.14)
No children living in 'other' type unit	7 (2.7%)	ref	ref
Household size stratified by property type			
1 living in multi-unit	13 (1.1%)	ref	ref
2-3 living in multi-unit	16 (1.6%)	1.41 (0.68 – 2.95)	1.13 (0.48 – 2.64)
More than 4 living in multi-unit	124 (26.4%)	31.05 (17.32 – 55.68)	2.46 (0.99 – 6.08)
1 living in single unit	2 (0.3%)	ref	ref
2-3 living in single unit	15 (0.7%)	2.73 (0.62 – 11.98)	1.62 (0.36 – 7.38)
More than 4 living in single unit	10 (0.9%)	3.37 (0.74 – 15.41)	0.78 (0.15 – 4.06)
1 living in other type unit	3 (2.5%)	ref	ref
2-3 living in other type unit	3 (2.2%)	0.87 (0.17 – 4.41)	0.70 (0.10 – 5.707)
More than 4 living in other type unit	5 (4.2%)	1.71 (0.40 – 7.33)	0.85 (0.14 – 5.30)

* Presence of children effects are adjusted for age, gender, race/ethnicity, close contact, income, county mortality rate and essential worker status

**Household size effects are adjusted for presence of children, age, gender, race/ethnicity, close contact,

545 income, county mortality rate and essential worker status
 546 ***Property type effects are adjusted for presence of children, age, gender, race/ethnicity, close contact,
 547 income, county mortality rate and essential worker status
 548
 549
 550

551 **Table 3: Characteristics of participants by status of hospitalization with**
 552 **COVID-like symptoms, April 2020**

	Hospitalized with COVID-symptoms		
Socio-demographic Factors	Yes n (%)	No n (%)	p-value
Age group (years)			
18-49	162 (84.8%)	3969 (59.8%)	<0.0001
50-59	8 (4.2%)	1075 (16.2%)	
60+	21 (11.0%)	1594 (24.0%)	
Gender			
Male	157 (82.2%)	3329 (50.2%)	<0.0001
Female	31 (16.2%)	3102 (46.7%)	
Non-binary	3 (1.6%)	207 (3.1%)	
Race/ethnicity			
Hispanic	135 (70.7%)	811 (12.2%)	<0.0001
White	29 (15.2%)	4531 (68.3%)	
Black non-Hispanic	19 (10.3%)	702 (10.6%)	
Asian/Pacific Islander	2 (1.1%)	324 (4.9%)	
Other	6 (3.1%)	270 (4.1%)	
Income level			
< 50,000	50 (26.2%)	3202 (48.2%)	<0.0001
50,000- 99,000	14 (7.3%)	1612 (24.3%)	
100,000	123 (64.4%)	1407 (21.2%)	
Missing	4 (2.1%)	417 (6.3%)	
Health and behavioral Factors			
Reported having comorbidities			
Yes	165 (85.4%)	2105 (31.7%)	<0.0001
No	26 (13.6%)	4533 (68.3%)	
Had contact with symptomatic or suspected/confirmed case			
Yes	146 (76.4%)	944 (14.2%)	<0.0001
No	45 (23.6%)	5694 (85.8%)	
Essential Worker			
Yes	153 (80.1%)	1133 (17.1%)	<0.0001
No	29 (15.2%)	4032 (60.7%)	
Not asked	9 (4.7%)	1473 (22.2%)	

554

Reported symptoms (ranked)			
Fever	137 (71.7%)	314 (4.7%)	<0.0001
Sore throat	134 (70.2%)	924 (13.9%)	<0.0001
Headache	32 (16.8%)	1867 (28.1%)	0.0005
Myalgia	31 (16.2%)	758 (11.4%)	0.040
Cough with phlegm	30 (15.7%)	831 (12.5%)	0.191
Shortness of breath	28 (14.7%)	571 (8.6%)	0.004
New cough	27 (14.4%)	769 (11.6%)	0.279
Runny nose	26 (13.6%)	1641 (24.7%)	0.0004
Diarrhea	22 (11.5%)	853 (12.9%)	0.587
Nasal congestion	21 (11.0%)	1415 (21.3%)	0.0006
Chills	18 (9.4%)	360 (5.4%)	0.017
Nausea	15 (7.9%)	402 (6.1%)	0.306
Vomit	9 (4.7%)	82 (1.2%)	<0.0001
Cough with blood	3 (1.6%)	19 (0.3%)	0.002
Saw healthcare provider for symptoms			
Yes	173 (90.6%)	646 (9.7%)	<0.0001
No	18 (9.4%)	5992 (90.3%)	
Testing status			
Sought test	18 (9.4%)	500 (7.5%)	<0.0001
Received test	146 (76.4%)	211 (3.2%)	
Did not need or try	27 (14.1%)	5927 (89.3%)	
Received lab-confirmed diagnosis			
Yes	133 (69.6%)	55 (0.8%)	<0.0001
No	58 (30.4%)	6583 (99.2%)	