Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

1 The role of asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic infection in SARS-CoV-2 2 transmission – a living systematic review

3 **Authors** Xueting Qiu, PhD^{1*}, Ali Ihsan Nergiz^{2*}, Alberto Enrico Maraolo MD³, Isaac I. Bogoch,
4 MD⁴, Nicola Low, MD, MSc, FFPH⁵ Muge Cevik, MRCP⁶

5 **Affiliations:**

6 ¹ Center for Communicable Disease Dynamics, Department of Epidemiology, Harvard TH Chan
7 School of Public Health, Boston, USA

8 ² Cerrahpasa Medical School, Istanbul University-Cerrahpasa, Istanbul, Turkey

9 ³ First Division of Infectious Diseases, Cotugno Hospital, AORN dei Colli, Naples, Italy

10 ⁴ Division of Infectious Diseases, Toronto General Hospital and University of Toronto, Toronto
11 Canada

12 ⁵ Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

13 ⁶ Division of Infection and Global Health Research, School of Medicine, University of St.
14 Andrews, Fife, Scotland, UK

15

16

17

18

19 **Author of correspondence:**

20 Name: Dr Muge Cevik

21 Address: Division of Infection and Global Health Research, School of Medicine, University of St
22 Andrews, Fife, Scotland, KY16 9TF

23 Telephone number: +447732800814

24 Email address: mc349@st-andrews.ac.uk

25

26 **Key words:** COVID-19, asymptomatic, transmission, SARS-CoV-2, secondary attack rate

27

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

28 **Abstract:**

29 **Background** Reports suggest that asymptomatic individuals (those with no symptoms at all
30 throughout infection) with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) are
31 infectious, but the extent of transmission based on symptom status requires further study.

32 **Purpose** This living review aims to critically appraise available data about secondary attack rates
33 from people with asymptomatic, pre-symptomatic and symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection.

34 **Data sources** Medline, EMBASE, China Academic Journals full-text database (CNKI), and pre-
35 print servers were searched from 30 December 2019 to 3 July 2020 using relevant MESH terms.

36 **Study selection** Studies that report on contact tracing of index cases with SARS-CoV-2 infection
37 in either English or Chinese were included.

38 **Data extraction** Two authors independently extracted data and assessed study quality and risk
39 of bias. We calculated the secondary attack rate as the number of contacts with SARS-CoV-2,
40 divided by the number of contacts tested.

41 **Data synthesis** Of 927 studies identified, 80 were included. Summary secondary attack rate
42 estimates were 1% (95% CI: 0%-2%) with a prediction interval of 0-10% for asymptomatic index
43 cases in 10 studies, 7% (95% CI: 3%-11%) with a prediction interval of 1- 40% for pre-
44 symptomatic cases in 11 studies and 6% (95% CI: 5%-8%) with a prediction interval of 5- 38%
45 for symptomatic index cases in 40 studies. The highest secondary attack rates were found in
46 contacts who lived in the same household as the index case. Other activities associated with
47 transmission were group activities such as sharing meals or playing board games with the index
48 case, regardless of the disease status of the index case.

49 **Limitations** We excluded some studies because the index case or number of contacts were
50 unclear.

51 **Conclusion** Asymptomatic patients can transmit SARS-CoV-2 to others, but our findings
52 indicate that such individuals are responsible for fewer secondary infections than people with
53 symptoms.

54 **Systematic review registration** PROSPERO CRD42020188168

55 **Funding:** No funding was received

56

57

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

58 Introduction:

59 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) demonstrates efficient
60 transmission in populations without effective public health interventions; basic reproduction
61 numbers (R_0) values range between 2-3 [1]. While asymptomatic transmission has been
62 described as the “Achilles’ heel” of control efforts during this pandemic, the extent to which
63 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by people without symptoms drives this pandemic remains
64 uncertain [2]. SARS-CoV-2 infection that is asymptomatic at the time of laboratory testing is
65 widely reported [3]; however, studies that follow infected people over time suggest that many
66 infections are not asymptomatic throughout the entire disease course, and a large proportion of
67 these individuals ultimately develop a diverse range of symptoms [4-7]. For instance, Sugano et
68 al. reported a detailed cluster outbreak in music clubs in Japan, where asymptomatic cases
69 reported also included pre-symptomatic cases [8]. A living systematic review of studies published
70 up to 10 June 2020 estimated that 20% (95% CI 17 to 25%) of people who become infected with
71 SARS-CoV-2 remain asymptomatic throughout infection [7].

72 One of the barriers to understanding the role of asymptomatic transmission is the lack of
73 consistency in case definitions [9]. While symptom severity exists on a spectrum, individuals
74 infected with SARS-CoV-2 can be miscategorized as asymptomatic, when they have milder or
75 atypical symptoms leading to overestimation of the proportion without symptoms [3, 10]. For
76 instance, in a detailed study of SARS-CoV-2 infections in Iceland where individuals deemed at
77 high risk for COVID-19 including those with a consistent syndrome were screened in a targeted
78 manner, and other individuals were tested via a population screening mechanism, more than a
79 third in the second group reported symptoms potentially consistent with COVID-19 [3]. However,
80 it is increasingly becoming clear that some individuals experience more diverse symptoms,
81 including taste and smell disturbance or myalgia, either for the entire course of illness or
82 preceding respiratory symptoms. These symptoms can be so mild and insidious that they do not
83 limit patients’ daily activities [4, 11]. The situation is further complicated by subjective patient
84 perception and differences between studies in the elicitation and reporting of symptoms.

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

There are reports describing asymptomatic individuals with SARS-CoV-2 who are infectious [12] and who have infected one or more contacts [13], but the extent and significance of asymptomatic transmission requires further understanding. The aim of this review is to summarize the available evidence about secondary attack rates (defined as the probability that an infected individual will transmit the disease to a susceptible individual) amongst the contacts of individuals with SARS-CoV-2 with different symptom status to provide information about how contagious they are, and their role in driving the pandemic.

Methods:

Systematic review was registered in PROSPERO on 8 June 2020 (CRD42020188168) and will be updated 4-6 months according to the availability of new evidence as a living systematic review [14]. The larger review aims to answer transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2. The analysis in this report addresses one of the review questions; to identify secondary attack rate based on symptom status.

Definitions

We defined “asymptomatic” as an individual with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection but without symptoms throughout their entire course of infection, or after 14 days of follow up; “paucisymptomatic” as an individual with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection with mild symptoms, and “pre-symptomatic” as an individual who reports no symptoms at the time of the initial positive test result, but who subsequently develops symptoms attributable to COVID-19. We used these definitions to categorize the index cases. Secondary attack rate was defined as the number of new SARS-CoV-2 infection cases among susceptible contacts of primary cases divided by the total number of susceptible contacts.

Search Strategy

We retrieved articles about transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection through systematic searches of eight databases: Medline, EMBASE, Europe PMC, Web of Science, SCOPUS, Chinese database (CNKI), and preprint servers (MedRxiv, BioRxiv) using relevant Medical Subject

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

Headings (MeSH) terms (Supplementary material). The initial search was completed from 30 December 2019 to 21 May 2020, searches were repeated on 8 June 2020 and 3 July 2020, owing to the rapidly increasing numbers of studies.

Study Selection

Studies were eligible if they met the inclusion criteria: (1) report on Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) or SARS-CoV-2 infection and (2) report an outbreak investigation or contact tracing study. Exclusion criteria were: (1) review articles; (2) observational studies providing only the proportion of individuals infected; (3) studies that do not indicate the number of contacts or secondary infections; and (4) reports in media sources. We also manually screened the references of the included original studies and reviews to identify additional eligible studies.

Data Extraction

Two authors (XQ and AIN) independently reviewed reports by title and abstract for relevance, with at least 20% of all reports being screened in duplicate to ensure consistency. Two authors then independently read the full text report of all studies not excluded by title and abstract, to consider eligibility for inclusion. Any disagreements regarding study inclusion were resolved through discussion with a third author (MC). Data were extracted onto a standardized form. From each study, the following variables were extracted: the name of the first author, year of publication, country, sample size, details of index cases (categorised as asymptomatic, pre-symptomatic and symptomatic); event details such as environment, transmission details; number of contacts, number of secondary cases. If these data were not reported, we contacted authors to request them and checked with the authors about all symptoms that they sought.

Risk of bias in included studies

Two authors (XQ and AIN) independently assessed completeness of reporting and risks of bias, using an adapted version of the Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Checklist for Case Series (Supplementary material). Any disagreements were resolved through discussion with a third author (MC).

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

143

144 ***Data synthesis and statistical analysis***

145 The studies are summarized in text and table form, descriptive statistics were completed for key
 146 outcome measures. Secondary attack rates were computed from raw data in each study, dividing
 147 the number of infected contacts of primary cases by the total number of susceptible exposed
 148 contacts. A pooled analysis was carried out to generate summary estimates for the secondary
 149 attack rate in each subgroup analyzed (asymptomatic, pre-symptomatic and symptomatic index
 150 cases), in the framework of a random effect model. The Freeman – Tukey double-arcsine
 151 variance-stabilizing transformation was used to combine data, due to its advantage over log and
 152 logit transformations which did not allow to compute the proportion in the presence of zero event
 153 counts [15]. Secondary attack rates are presented as a proportion along with 95% CIs in forest
 154 plots. Heterogeneity between study estimates was gauged by means of the Cochran's Q and I^2
 155 statistic: an I^2 value above 75% indicates high heterogeneity [16]. Moreover, a 95% prediction
 156 interval is displayed in the forest plots, which is an index of dispersion, providing information on
 157 how widely the true effect size varies. It can also provide the range of values in which a future
 158 observation will fall [17]. Analyses were performed though the software MetaXL version 5.3
 159 (Ersatz, EpiGear International, Sunrise Beach, Australia) [18].

160

161 **Results:**

162 The systematic search identified 927 potentially relevant articles and 789 records were screened
 163 after removal of duplicates. Of 187 articles retrieved for full-text review and assessed for
 164 eligibility, 80 studies were included in the systematic review, and among those we identified 69
 165 studies that indicated the symptom status of index case(s). In this analysis, we excluded 11
 166 studies that reported asymptomatic and symptomatic index cases together or no symptom status
 167 of the index case was available. We re-classified three studies from asymptomatic to pre-
 168 symptomatic as the index cases developed symptoms later during the disease course after
 169 reviewing the details and contacting the authors [19-21]. The number of selected papers at each
 170 step of the screening and eligibility are reported in the flow diagram (Figure 1).

171

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

Summary of secondary attack rates of asymptomatic index cases

Ten studies were included in the quantitative analysis (Table 1) [6, 13, 22-29]. Summary secondary attack rate estimate was 1% (95% CI: 0%-2%) with a prediction interval ranged of 0-10% (Figure 2). All except one tested all close contacts for SARS-CoV-2, regardless of symptoms [26]. Cheng et al. only tested symptomatic cases, but they also tested high risk populations regardless of symptoms including the household and hospital contacts [26]. Six studies reported on household contacts, two studies included hospital contacts and two studies included non-household close contacts.

Three studies identified no secondary cases after following up 17, 91 and 455 close contacts of asymptomatic index cases (asymptomatic secondary attack rate of 0%) [24-26]. Of those, two studies demonstrated higher symptomatic secondary attack rates; Cheng et al. demonstrated that mild cases had a secondary attack rate of 3.8% (95% CI 1.1, 12.8%) and severe cases had 4% (95% CI 1.0, 15.8%) secondary attack rate [26], while Park et al. showing household symptomatic secondary attack rate of 16.2% (95% CI 11.6, 22.0%) [24]. In another study, 305 contacts of 8 asymptomatic cases were followed up, identifying one secondary case (secondary attack rate 0.3% (95% CI 0.0, 1.8%) [28]. In the same study, attack rates from index cases with mild, moderate and severe diseases were 3.3%, 5.6% and 6.2%, respectively. Zhang et al. followed up 119 close contacts of 12 asymptomatic index cases and identified one secondary case, an asymptomatic secondary attack rate of 0.8% (95% CI 0.0, 4.6). In the same study, the secondary attack rate was 3.5% (95% CI 1.5-8.0) for those with mild, 5.7% (95% CI 2.5, 12.8%) for those with moderate, and 4.5% (95% CI 0.8, 21.8%) for those with severe symptoms [6]. In this study, close contacts that lived with an index case had 12 times the risk of infection as those who did not live with the index case (RR 12.5 - 95% CI 1.6, 100.8) and those who had frequent contact with an index case-patient, and those who had more than 5 contacts had 29 times the risk of infection as those with fewer contacts (RR 29.0 - 95% CI 3.6, 232.3). Two studies indicated an asymptomatic secondary attack rate of 1% and 1.9% [22, 23]. Chaw et al. reported asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic contacts together. The authors clarified that 3 asymptomatic index cases and their 106 close contacts were followed up, leading to 3 secondary cases, a

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

secondary attack rate of 2.8% (95% CI 0.06, 8.0%). In this study, the overall secondary attack rate was 10.6% in the household setting, which was higher for symptomatic cases (14.4%, 95% CI 8.8, 19.9%) than that of asymptomatic cases and for non-household contacts 0.7 (95% CI 0.1, 1.3) [13]. Zeng et al. conducted the largest contact tracing study, following up 753 close contacts of asymptomatic index cases and identified one secondary case, an asymptomatic secondary attack rate of 0.13% (95% CI 0.0, 0.7%) [27].

Summary of pre-symptomatic secondary attack rates

Sixteen papers reported either outbreak investigations or contact tracing studies reporting transmission from an index case during the pre-symptomatic period [13, 19, 21, 26, 30-40] (Table 2). Of those, eleven studies were included in the quantitative analysis. The summary SAR estimate was 7% (95% CI: 3%-11%) with a prediction interval of 1 to 40% (Figure 3). These studies followed up 22 to 585 close contacts whose initial exposure occurred before symptom onset of the index case. Even in studies that followed up large numbers of people, including community contacts, the majority of secondary cases identified were from the same household or among friend gatherings. In these studies, having meals together, or playing cards with the index case were exposure activities associated with transmission. The remaining one study reported an outbreak in a restaurant [40] and four studies exclusively reported family cluster outbreaks [30, 32, 33, 39]; these investigations did not test contacts outside the household, and it is challenging to truly differentiate transmission during the pre-symptomatic period from symptomatic transmission in the household setting (Supplementary Figure 1).

Summary of symptomatic secondary attack rates

Forty-six papers reported either outbreak investigations or contact tracing studies reporting transmission from symptomatic index case(s). Of those, 40 reported contact tracing studies reported secondary attack rates ranging from 0% to 38.89% [13, 24, 27, 28, 38, 41-75] and 6 reported outbreak investigation [76-80] (Supplementary Table 1). 40 contact tracing studies with 44 observations were included in the quantitative analysis (Figure 4). The summary estimate of SAR from symptomatic index subjects was 6% (95% CI: 5%-8%) with a prediction interval of 5-

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

38%. Of those, 9 studies reported less than 1% secondary attack rates, 2 of those were in healthcare setting, 2 included outdoor interaction, 4 included non-household contacts. Higher frequency of contacts and household contacts were reported to be higher risk than non-household contacts.

Quality assessment

All papers included a clear definition of symptomatic and asymptomatic cases, number of secondary cases and number of contacts. The majority of studies identified index cases with a clear diagnosis, had an acceptable case definition and sufficiently followed up close contacts (for a minimum of 14 days). However, in some studies the definition of close contact and setting of transmission was not provided. In addition, it was unclear in four reports whether all potential close contacts were included, therefore, the direction of bias is uncertain. We summarized the quality assessment in Supplementary Table 2.

Discussion:

This systematic review provides comprehensive data on secondary attack rates based on symptom status of the index case(s). While asymptomatic patients can transmit the virus to others [81], the findings from ten studies in this review found summary secondary attack rates of 1% with a prediction interval of 0-10% for asymptomatic index cases compared with secondary attack rates of 6% with a prediction interval of 5-38% in symptomatic cases and 7% with a prediction interval of 1-40% in pre-symptomatic case. These findings suggest that individuals who are asymptomatic throughout the disease course are responsible for fewer secondary infections than symptomatic and pre-symptomatic cases. Most transmission events were associated with living with the index case or group activities such as sharing meals and playing board games.

Given the importance of transmission heterogeneity in propagating the pandemic, it is important that we learn about the various factors that contribute to transmission. According to modelling and contact tracing studies, around 80% of secondary infections can be linked to 20% of cases

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

which distinguishes SARS-CoV-2 from seasonal influenza, although a similar pattern was also observed in SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV [82-84]. While there are multiple factors (environmental factors, contact patterns and socioeconomic inequalities) that contribute to this heterogeneity, some evidence starting to emerge about the influence of individual's infectiousness on transmission dynamics. In this systematic review, we found that index cases with symptoms had a higher secondary attack rate compared with truly asymptomatic index cases. While there is a need to better understand this difference, it may be due to shorter duration of infectiousness. In a living systematic review including of studies published up to 6 June 2020, we found that cases with asymptomatic people had a shorter duration of RNA shedding than symptomatic individuals [85]. Asymptomatic patients may therefore be contagious but for a shorter duration than symptomatic people; this might contribute to lower transmission to their contacts. However, we do not yet know the relative importance of behavioral factors by the host versus environmental factors in determining transmission risk. It is not known whether the size of the cluster of secondary infections would be different according to index case symptom status in a high-risk environment with no mitigation measures in place.

Modelling studies suggest that it is not possible to have widespread infection without substantial pre-symptomatic transmission. Viral load dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 derived from confirmed cases suggest that peak viral loads are detected at the start of symptom onset up to day 5 of illness, indicating highest infectiousness occurs just before or within the first few days after symptom onset [85]. So far, several contact tracing studies emphasize that the highest risk of transmission occurs during the prodromal phase or early in the disease course [64, 86]. For instance, in a prospective contact tracing study of 100 confirmed cases of COVID-19 and 2761 close contacts, no secondary cases were identified when the exposure occurred more than 5 days after the symptom onset [26]. Our findings therefore have important implications from a public health perspective. In settings such as nursing homes, homeless shelters, prisons, cruise ships and meat-packing plants in which many people spend prolong period of time together in the same environment including sleeping, dining and sharing common facilities, and where several outbreaks have been documented, pre-symptomatic transmission may contribute

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

substantially to transmission [87, 88]. In these settings, when infection develops, most patients are already inside the facility with high viral loads that increase the risk of onward transmission. This highlights the importance of mitigation measures and surveillance in these settings to identify those patients early in the disease course to prevent onward transmission inside the facility.

This systematic review has several strengths. Firstly, this is a living systematic review examining the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 through contact tracing and outbreak investigation studies. Secondly, we only included studies with clear case definitions, which indicated the number of contacts and secondary cases. We excluded studies in which the index case was unclear, or the numbers of contacts were not provided. The estimates from individual studies are also subject to limitations, such as imprecision resulting from small study size, and multiple sources of bias in the estimation of the true secondary attack rate, which are detailed in this paper [89]. Moreover, while the number of index cases could influence the confidence interval estimation for secondary attack rate due to heterogeneity among index cases, we have constructed a prediction interval to yield conservative confidence interval estimates.

We identified two other systematic reviews that investigated asymptomatic transmission, with different research questions, which results in different search terms and studies retrieved. One living systematic review, which included studies published up to 10 June 2020, identified five studies that directly compared secondary attack rates between asymptomatic and symptomatic index cases; all were included in our review [7]. This study only included studies that provided data to allow relative risks to be estimated. The summary risk ratios for asymptomatic versus symptomatic (0.35, 95% CI 0.10, 1.27) and pre-symptomatic versus symptomatic (0.63, 95% CI 0.18, 2.26) are consistent with our findings. The second review estimated only household secondary attack rates and included studies published up to 29 July 2020 [90]. Of three studies that included asymptomatic index cases, two were included in our review. We excluded one of the studies because the number of contacts of asymptomatic index cases was not specified; we have not yet received details of the study after contacting the authors. Advantages of our review

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

over these two studies are inclusion of studies published in Chinese, search terms that aimed to capture studies specifically estimating secondary attack rates.

In summary, whilst asymptomatic transmission is a major concern for SARS-CoV-2 community spread, secondary attack rates from those who remain asymptomatic throughout their course of infection are low suggesting limited infectiousness. Although it is difficult to estimate the proportion of pre-symptomatic transmission, these patients are likely to be highly infectious just before and around the time of symptom onset and appear to transmit efficiently, particularly within households. Given these results, in the context of limited resources, approaches should be targeted predominantly on identifying and immediately isolating patients with prodromal or mild symptoms and their contacts, which may avert a significant number of community transmission clusters [91]. Future clinical studies should incorporate clear definitions and assess a broad range of symptoms associated with COVID-19, include longitudinal follow up of patients, and calculate secondary attack rates for a wider range of settings and populations [9].

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

Funding: No funding was received

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the authors of Chau et al. (Dr Tan Le Van), Mandić-Rajčević et al. (Dr Stefan Mandić-Rajčević), Chaw et al. (Dr Liling Chaw) for providing further details about asymptomatic cases in their reports also Prof Stephen Gillespie for his comments on the first draft of this manuscript. We would like to acknowledge Dr. Shuang Jin for searching and downloading Chinese database for this review.

Contribution statement:

X Qiu: investigation, data curation, writing – original draft; A Nergiz: investigation, data curation, writing – review and editing; A. E. Maraolo: methodology, formal analysis, writing – original draft;

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

345 I. Bogoch and N. Low: interpretation, writing – review and editing; M. Cevik: conceptualisation,
346 methodology, investigation, writing – original draft, supervision.

347

348

349 **Figure legends:**

350 **Figure 1: Flowchart describing the study design process**

351 **Figure 2: Secondary attack rates from asymptomatic index cases to their contacts**

352 **Figure 3: Secondary attack rates from pre-symptomatic index cases to their contacts**

353 **Figure 4: Secondary attack rates from symptomatic index cases to their contacts**

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

354 **Table 1: Transmission from truly asymptomatic index cases**

	Index Cases	Environment	Number of contacts	Number of Secondary cases	Asymptomatic SAR (95% CI)	Symptomatic SAR (95% CI)
Chaw et al. * [13]	3	Household	106	3	2.8% (0.06, 8.0)	14.4% (8.8, 19.9)
		Non-household				0.7% (0.01, 1.3)
Chen Y et al. [29]	30	Household	146	6	4.1% (1.7, 9.1)	6.3% (5.3, 7.5)
		Non-household				
Cheng et al.[26]	9	Non-household	91	0	0% (0.0, 4.1)	Mild 3.76 (1.1-12.8) Severe 3.99 (1.0-15.8)
Gao et al.[25]	1	Household and healthcare	455	0	0% (0.0, 0.08)	
Jiang et al.[22]	3	Household	195	2	1% (0.1, 3.7)	
Luo et al. [28]	8	Household and non-household	305	1	0.33% (0.0, 1.8) OR (0.29 (0.04, 2.2))	Mild 3.3% (OR 0.48 (0.28, 0.82)) Mod 5.6% (OR 1.0) Sev 6.2% (OR 1.19 (0.7, 2.1))
Mandić-Rajčević et al.[23]	1	Healthcare	53	1	1.9% (0.0,10.0)	
Park et al.[24]	4	Household	17	0	0% (0.0, 19.5)	16.2 % (11.6,22.0)
Zeng et al. [27]		All contacts	753	1	0.13% (0.0, 0.7)	2.02% (1.8, 2.3)
Zhang et al.[6]	12	Household	119	1	0.8% (0.0, 4.6)	Mild 3.5% (1.5, 8.0) Mod 5.7% (2.5, 12.8) Severe 4.5% (0.8, 21.8)

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

355 Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio; SAR, secondary attack rate; sev, severe * authors contacted for more details

Index Cases	Environment	Number of contacts	Number of Secondary cases	Pre-symptomatic SAR (95% CI)	Secondary cases
----------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------

356 **Table 2: Transmission during pre-symptomatic period**

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

Contract-tracing						
Chaw et al.* [13]	7	Household and non-household	585	15	2.56% (1.4, 4.2)	
Cheng et al.[26]	NR	Household and non-household	299	2	0.7% (0.1, 2.4)	
Hong L et al.[31]	41	Household and non-household	197	24	12.2% (8.0, 17.6)	Friends, family, card playing partners
Huang et al.[19]	1	Friends	22	7	31.8% (13.0, 54.9)	Shared meal with index
Pang et al. [34]	1	Household and non-household	103	6	5.8% (2.2, 12.2)	Living together or sharing meal
Park et al. [24]	4	Household	11	0	0% (0.0, 2.8)	
Pung R et al. [38]	2	Religious gathering	142	3	2.1% (0.5, 6.5)	
Qian et al. [35]	1	Household and non-household	137	10	7.3% (3.6, 13.0)	Living together or sharing meal
Yang et al. [36]	2	Household and non-household	123	6	4.9% (1.8, 10.3)	All secondary cases lived together
Ye et al. [21]	1	Family	44	4	9.1% (2.5, 21.4)	Extended family
Zhao et al [37]	1	Friends	15	4	26.7% (7.8, 55.1)	Meal and Mahjong game gathering
Outbreak investigation						
Chen M et al.[30]	1	Household	3	2	66.7% (9.4, 99.2)	Family cluster outbreak
Li P et al.[32]	1	Household	5	4	80% (28.4, 99.5)	Family cluster outbreak
Lu J et al [40]	1	Restaurant	82	9	11% (5.9, 19.6)	
Jiang Y et al [39]	1	Household	7	3	42.9% (11.8, 79.8)	Family cluster outbreak
Qian G et al. [33]	2	Household	4	3	75% (10.4, 99.4)	Family cluster outbreak

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

357 Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; SAR, secondary attack rate

358 * authors contacted for more details

359

360

361

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

Figure 1. Flowchart describing inclusion and exclusion of studies at each stage of the review

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

Figure 2: Secondary attack rates from asymptomatic index cases to their contacts

For each study the secondary attack rate is reported with its 95% CI.
A prediction interval at the bottom of the forest is depicted.

Figure 3: Secondary attack rates from pre-symptomatic index cases to their contacts

For each study the secondary attack rate is reported with its 95% CI.
A prediction interval at the bottom of the forest is depicted.

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

Figure 4: Secondary attack rates from symptomatic index cases to their contacts

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

References:

1. Ruan L, Wen M, Zeng Q, et al. New Measures for the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Response: A Lesson From the Wenzhou Experience. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **2020**.
2. Gandhi M, Yokoe DS, Havlir DV. Asymptomatic Transmission, the Achilles' Heel of Current Strategies to Control Covid-19. *New England Journal of Medicine* **2020**; 382(22): 2158-60.
3. Gudbjartsson DF, Helgason A, Jonsson H, et al. Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic Population. *N Engl J Med* **2020**.
4. Cevik M, Bamford CGG, Ho A. COVID-19 pandemic-a focused review for clinicians. *Clin Microbiol Infect* **2020**; 26(7): 842-7.
5. Wang Y, Liu Y, Liu L, Wang X, Luo N, Li L. Clinical Outcomes in 55 Patients With Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Who Were Asymptomatic at Hospital Admission in Shenzhen, China. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* **2020**.
6. Zhang W, Cheng W, Luo L, et al. Secondary Transmission of Coronavirus Disease from Presymptomatic Persons, China. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020**; 26(8).
7. Buitrago-Garcia D, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, et al. Occurrence and transmission potential of asymptomatic and presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: A living systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med* **2020**; 17(9): e1003346.
8. Sugano N, Ando W, Fukushima W. Cluster of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infections Linked to Music Clubs in Osaka, Japan. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* **2020**; 222(10): 1635-40.
9. Meyerowitz EA, Richterman A, Bogoch II, Low N, Cevik M. Towards an accurate and systematic characterisation of persistently asymptomatic infection with SARS-CoV-2. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
10. Lavezzo E, Franchin E, Ciavarella C, et al. Suppression of COVID-19 outbreak in the municipality of Vo, Italy. *medRxiv* **2020**: 2020.04.17.20053157.
11. Kim ES, Chin BS, Kang CK, et al. Clinical Course and Outcomes of Patients with Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection: a Preliminary Report of the First 28 Patients from the Korean Cohort Study on COVID-19. *J Korean Med Sci* **2020**; 35(13): e142.
12. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. *New England Journal of Medicine* **2020**.
13. Chaw L, Koh WC, Jamaludin SA, Naing L, Alikhan MF, Wong J. SARS-CoV-2 transmission in different settings: Analysis of cases and close contacts from the Tablighi cluster in Brunei Darussalam. **2020**.
14. Elliott JH, Synnot A, Turner T, et al. Living systematic review: 1. Introduction—the why, what, when, and how. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* **2017**; 91: 23-30.
15. Lin L, Xu C. Arcsine-based transformations for meta-analysis of proportions: Pros, cons, and alternatives. *Health Science Reports* **2020**; 3(3): e178.
16. Sedgwick P. Meta-analyses: what is heterogeneity? *BMJ : British Medical Journal* **2015**; 350: h1435.
17. Int'Hout J, Ioannidis JPA, Rovers MM, Goeman JJ. Plea for routinely presenting prediction intervals in meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* **2016**; 6(7): e010247.
18. Barendregt JJ, Doi SA, Lee YY, Norman RE, Vos T. Meta-analysis of prevalence. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* **2013**; 67(11): 974.
19. Huang L, Zhang X, Zhang X, et al. Rapid asymptomatic transmission of COVID-19 during the incubation period demonstrating strong infectivity in a cluster of youngsters aged 16-23 years outside Wuhan and characteristics of young patients with COVID-19: A prospective contact-tracing study. *Journal of Infection* **2020**; 80(6): e1-e13.

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

- 502 20. Li C, Ji F, Wang L, et al. Asymptomatic and Human-to-Human Transmission of
503 SARS-CoV-2 in a 2-Family Cluster, Xuzhou, China. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020**; 26(7):
504 31.
- 505 21. Ye F, Xu S, Rong Z, et al. Delivery of infection from asymptomatic carriers of COVID-
506 19 in a familial cluster. *Int J Infect Dis* **2020**; 94: 133-8.
- 507 22. Jiang XL, Zhang XL, Zhao XN, et al. Transmission potential of asymptomatic and
508 paucisymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: a three-family cluster study in China. *J*
509 *Infect Dis* **2020**; 22: 22.
- 510 23. Mandic-Rajcevic S, Masci F, Crespi E, et al. Contact tracing and isolation of
511 asymptomatic spreaders to successfully control the COVID-19 epidemic among
512 healthcare workers in Milan (Italy). **2020**.
- 513 24. Park SY, Kim YM, Yi S, et al. Coronavirus Disease Outbreak in Call Center, South
514 Korea. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020**; 26(8): 23.
- 515 25. Gao M, Yang L, Chen X, et al. A study on infectivity of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2
516 carriers. *Respir Med* **2020**: 106026-.
- 517 26. Cheng H-Y, Jian S-W, Liu D-P, et al. Contact Tracing Assessment of COVID-19
518 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different Exposure Periods Before
519 and After Symptom Onset. *JAMA Internal Medicine* **2020**.
- 520 27. 曾晶, 邱乐平, 邹晏, et al. [Zeng et al]四川省新型冠状病毒肺炎密切接触者分析.
521 *中国公共卫生* **2020**; 36(04): 503-6.
- 522 28. Luo L, Liu D, Liao X, et al. Contact Settings and Risk for Transmission in 3410 Close
523 Contacts of Patients With COVID-19 in Guangzhou, China. *Annals of Internal*
524 *Medicine* **2020**.
- 525 29. Chen Y, Wang AH, Yi B, et al. [Epidemiological characteristics of infection in COVID-
526 19 close contacts in Ningbo city]. *Chung Hua Liu Hsing Ping Hsueh Tsa Chih* **2020**;
527 41(5): 667-71.
- 528 30. Chen M, Fan P, Liu Z, et al. A SARS-CoV-2 familial cluster infection reveals
529 asymptomatic transmission to children. *J Infect Public Health* **2020**; 13(6): 883-6.
- 530 31. Hong LX, Lin A, He ZB, et al. Mask wearing in pre-symptomatic patients prevents
531 SARS-CoV-2 transmission: An epidemiological analysis. *Travel Medicine and*
532 *Infectious Disease* **2020**; 36 (no pagination): 101803.
- 533 32. Li P, Fu JB, Li KF, et al. Transmission of COVID-19 in the terminal stages of the
534 incubation period: A familial cluster. *Int J Infect Dis* **2020**; 96: 452-3.
- 535 33. Qian G, Yang N, Ma AHY, et al. A COVID-19 Transmission within a family cluster by
536 presymptomatic infectors in China. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**.
- 537 34. 庞秋艳, 李朋, 李天忠, 李化 . [1]一起高速服务区新型冠状病毒肺炎聚集性疫情调查.
538 *安徽预防医学杂志* **2020**; 26(02): 130-2.
- 539 35. 钱丽珍, 郑志强, 洪万胜, 孙芳红, 吴方楠, 金瑞盈.
540 [2]瑞安市一起新型冠状病毒肺炎聚集性疫情调查. *预防医学* **2020**; 32(05): 486-8+91.
- 541 36. 阳雅兰, 李林洪, 李长凤, 肖玉春, 彭君.
542 [3]重庆市一起新型冠状病毒肺炎家庭聚集性疫情调查分析. *中国公共卫生* **2020**;
543 36(03): 285-8.
- 544 37. Zhao H, Li BS, Xia Y, et al. Investigation of transmission chain of a cluster COVID-19
545 cases. *Chung Hua Liu Hsing Ping Hsueh Tsa Chih* **2020**; 41(0): E064.
- 546 38. Pung R, Chiew CJ, Young BE, et al. Investigation of three clusters of COVID-19 in
547 Singapore: implications for surveillance and response measures. *Lancet* **2020**;
548 395(10229): 1039-46.
- 549 39. Jiang Y, Niu W, Wang Q, Zhao H, Meng L, Zhang C. Characteristics of a family
550 cluster of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Henan, China.
551 *Journal of Infection* **2020**; 23: 23.

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

- 552 40. Lu J, Gu J, Li K, et al. COVID-19 Outbreak Associated with Air Conditioning in
553 Restaurant, Guangzhou, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020**; 26(7): 02.
- 554 41. Baettig SJ, Parini A, Cardona I, Morand GB. Case series of coronavirus (SARS-CoV-
555 2) in a military recruit school: clinical, sanitary and logistical implications. *BMJ Mil*
556 *Health* **2020**; 16: 16.
- 557 42. Bohmer MM, Buchholz U, Corman VM, et al. Investigation of a COVID-19 outbreak in
558 Germany resulting from a single travel-associated primary case: a case series. *The*
559 *Lancet Infectious Diseases* **2020**; 15: 15.
- 560 43. Boscolo-Rizzo P, Borsetto D, Spinato G, et al. New onset of loss of smell or taste in
561 household contacts of home-isolated SARS-CoV-2-positive subjects. *European*
562 *Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology* **2020**; 277(9): 2637-40.
- 563 44. Burke RM, Midgley CM, Dratch A, et al. Active Monitoring of Persons Exposed to
564 Patients with Confirmed COVID-19 - United States, January-February 2020. *MMWR*
565 *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **2020**; 69(9): 245-6.
- 566 45. Cheng HY, Jian SW, Liu DP, Ng TC, Huang WT, Lin HH. Contact Tracing
567 Assessment of COVID-19 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different
568 Exposure Periods before and after Symptom Onset. *JAMA Internal Medicine* **2020**.
- 569 46. Dawson P, Rabold EM, Laws RL, et al. Loss of Taste and Smell as Distinguishing
570 Symptoms of Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **2020**.
- 571 47. Ge R, Tian M, Gu Q, et al. The role of close contacts tracking management in
572 COVID-19 prevention: A cluster investigation in Jiaying, China. *Journal of Infection*
573 **2020**; 81(1): e71-e4.
- 574 48. Ghinai I, McPherson TD, Hunter JC, et al. First known person-to-person transmission
575 of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in the USA.
576 *Lancet* **2020**; 395(10230): 1137-44.
- 577 49. Jiang XL, Zhang XL, Zhao XN, et al. Transmission Potential of Asymptomatic and
578 Paucisymptomatic Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infections: A
579 3-Family Cluster Study in China. *J Infect Dis* **2020**; 221(12): 1948-52.
- 580 50. Liu SF, Kuo NY, Kuo HC. Three Taiwan's domestic family cluster infections of
581 coronavirus disease 2019. *J Med Virol* **2020**; 28: 28.
- 582 51. Mao S, Huang T, Yuan H, et al. Epidemiological analysis of 67 local COVID-19
583 clusters in Sichuan Province, China. *Research Square*, **2020**.
- 584 52. Pfefferle S, Guenther T, Kobbe R, et al. Low and high infection dose transmission of
585 SARS-CoV-2 in the first COVID-19 clusters in Northern Germany. *medRxiv*, **2020**.
- 586 53. Scott SE, Zabel K, Collins J, et al. First Mildly Ill, Non-Hospitalized Case of
587 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Without Viral Transmission in the United
588 States - Maricopa County, Arizona, 2020. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**.
- 589 54. Sun WW, Ling F, Pan JR, et al. [Epidemiological characteristics of 2019 novel
590 coronavirus family clustering in Zhejiang Province]. *Chung Hua Yu Fang I Hsueh Tsa*
591 *Chih* **2020**; 54(0): E027.
- 592 55. Wang Z, Ma W, Zheng X, Wu G, Zhang R. Household transmission of SARS-CoV-2.
593 *Journal of Infection* **2020**; 81(1): 179-82.
- 594 56. Wee LE, Sim JXY, Conceicao EP, et al. Containment of COVID-19 cases amongst
595 healthcare workers: the role of surveillance, early detection and outbreak
596 management. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* **2020**; 1-21.
- 597 57. Wei L, Lv Q, Wen Y, et al. Household transmission of COVID-19, Shenzhen,
598 January-February 2020. *medRxiv*, **2020**.
- 599 58. Wong SCY, Kwong RT, Wu TC, et al. Risk of nosocomial transmission of coronavirus
600 disease 2019: an experience in a general ward setting in Hong Kong. *J Hosp Infect*
601 **2020**; 105(2): 119-27.
- 602 59. Xia XY, Wu J, Liu HL, Xia H, Jia B, Huang WX. Epidemiological and initial clinical
603 characteristics of patients with family aggregation of COVID-19. *J Clin Virol* **2020**;
604 127: 104360.
- 605 60. Ye LX, Wang HB, Lu HC, et al. [Investigation of a cluster epidemic of COVID-19 in
606 Ningbo]. *Chung Hua Liu Hsing Ping Hsueh Tsa Chih* **2020**; 41(0): E065.

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

- 607 61. Zhang JZ, Zhou P, Han DB, et al. [Investigation on a cluster epidemic of COVID-19
608 in a supermarket in Liaocheng, Shandong province]. *Chung Hua Liu Hsing Ping*
609 *Hsueh Tsa Chih* **2020**; 41(0): E055.
- 610 62. Zhao H, Li BS, Xia Y, et al. [Investigation of transmission chain of a cluster COVID-
611 19 cases]. *Chung Hua Liu Hsing Ping Hsueh Tsa Chih* **2020**; 41(0): E064.
- 612 63. Wang X, Zhou Q, He Y, et al. Nosocomial outbreak of COVID-19 pneumonia in
613 Wuhan, China. *Eur Respir J* **2020**; 55(6): 2000544.
- 614 64. Wang Y, Tian H, Zhang L, et al. Reduction of secondary transmission of SARS-CoV-
615 2 in households by face mask use, disinfection and social distancing: a cohort study
616 in Beijing, China. *BMJ Global Health* **2020**; 5(5): e002794.
- 617 65. Wu Y, Song S, Kao Q, Kong Q, Sun Z, Wang B. Risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection
618 among contacts of individuals with COVID-19 in Hangzhou, China. *Public Health*
619 **2020**; 185: 57-9.
- 620 66. Yu H-j, Hu Y-f, Liu X-x, et al. Household infection: The predominant risk factor for
621 close contacts of patients with COVID-19. *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease*
622 **2020**; 36: 101809.
- 623 67. Dong XC, Li JM, Bai JY, et al. [Epidemiological characteristics of confirmed COVID-
624 19 cases in Tianjin]. *Chung Hua Liu Hsing Ping Hsueh Tsa Chih* **2020**; 41(5): 638-42.
- 625 68. 凌锋, 刘社兰, 倪朝 , et al. [Ling F, et al]
626 浙江省首例新型冠状病毒肺炎报告病例流行病学调查. *预防医学* **2020**; 32(02): 109-12.
- 627 69. 刘仲, 赵梦娇, 杨国樑, et al. [Liu Z, et al]
628 1例不明原因新型冠状病毒肺炎及其密切接触者调查分析. *山东大学学报(医学版)* **2020**;
629 58(04): 49-53.
- 630 70. 周林, 刘晓雪, 李战, 耿兴义, 刘庆皆. [Zhou L, et al]
631 新型冠状病毒肺炎病例1403例密切接触者发病分析. *山东大学学报(医学版)* **2020**;
632 58(04): 58-61.
- 633 71. 孙倩莱, 李作超, 谭夏林, et al. [Sun Q, et al]一起新型冠状病毒肺炎聚集性疫情调查.
634 *实用预防医学* **2020**; 27(04): 389-92.
- 635 72. 田元睿, 吴志明, 韩小亮, 王月萍, 刘泓. [Tian Y, et
636 al]扬州市首起输入性新型冠状病毒肺炎家庭聚集性疫情的流行病学调查.
637 *上海预防医学*: 1-7.
- 638 73. 陈凤阳, 李少雄. [Chen F, et al]江西某地一起新型冠状病毒肺炎聚集性疫情调查.
639 *江西医药* **2020**; 55(03): 346-8.
- 640 74. Li W, Zhang B, Lu J, et al. The characteristics of household transmission of COVID-
641 19. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**.
- 642 75. Wang X, Pan Y, Zhang D, et al. Basic epidemiological parameter values from data of
643 real-world in mega-cities: the characteristics of COVID-19 in Beijing, China.
644 *Research Square*, **2020**.
- 645 76. Huang R, Xia J, Chen Y, Shan C, Wu C. A family cluster of SARS-CoV-2 infection
646 involving 11 patients in Nanjing, China. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* **2020**; 20(5):
647 534-5.
- 648 77. Li CX, Wu B, Luo F, Zhang N. [Clinical Study and CT Findings of a Familial Cluster of
649 Pneumonia with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)]. *Sichuan Da Xue Xue Bao*
650 *Yi Xue Ban* **2020**; 51(2): 155-8.
- 651 78. Song R, Han B, Song M, et al. Clinical and epidemiological features of COVID-19
652 family clusters in Beijing, China. *Journal of Infection* **2020**; 23: 23.
- 653 79. Tong ZD, Tang A, Li KF, et al. Potential Presymptomatic Transmission of SARS-
654 CoV-2, Zhejiang Province, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020**; 26(5): 1052-4.

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

- 655 80. Chen D, Li Y, Deng X, et al. Four cases from a family cluster were diagnosed as
656 COVID-19 after 14-day of quarantine period. *J Med Virol* **2020**.
- 657 81. Chau NVV, Thanh Lam V, Thanh Dung N, et al. The natural history and transmission
658 potential of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **2020**.
- 659 82. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391 cases
660 and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study.
661 *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
- 662 83. Althouse BM, Wenger EA, Miller JC, et al. Superspreading events in the transmission
663 dynamics of SARS-CoV-2: Opportunities for interventions and control. *PLOS Biology*
664 **2020**; 18(11): e3000897.
- 665 84. Adam DC, Wu P, Wong JY, et al. Clustering and superspreading potential of SARS-
666 CoV-2 infections in Hong Kong. *Nature Medicine* **2020**; 26(11): 1714-9.
- 667 85. Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV,
668 and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness: a
669 systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Microbe*.
- 670 86. Böhmer MM, Buchholz U, Corman VM, et al. Investigation of a COVID-19 outbreak in
671 Germany resulting from a single travel-associated primary case: a case series. *The*
672 *Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
- 673 87. Dillon Adam PW, Jessica Wong et al. Clustering and superspreading potential of
674 severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infections in Hong
675 Kong
676 . PREPRINT (Version 1) available at Research Square **2020**.
- 677 88. Leclerc QJ FN, Knight LE. What settings have been linked to SARS-CoV-2
678 transmission clusters? [version 1; peer review: 1 approved with reservations].
679 *Wellcome Open Res* **2020**; 5:83
- 680 89. Accorsi E, Xueting Qiu, Eva Rumpler, Lee Kennedy-Shaffer, Rebecca Kahn, et al. .
681 How to detect and reduce potential sources of biases in epidemiologic studies of
682 SARS-CoV-2. *Harvard Library* **2020**.
- 683 90. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Jr., Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household
684 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA*
685 *Network Open* **2020**; 3(12): e2031756-e.
- 686 91. Peak CM, Kahn R, Grad YH, et al. Individual quarantine versus active monitoring of
687 contacts for the mitigation of COVID-19: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious*
688 *Diseases*.
- 689