

1 **Title:** Monitoring and understanding household clustering of SARS-CoV-2 cases using surveillance data in
2 Fulton County, Georgia

3 **Authors:** Carol Y. Liu¹, Sasha Smith², Allison T. Chamberlain¹, Neel R. Gandhi^{1,3}, Fazle Khan², Steve
4 Williams⁴, Sarita Shah^{1,3}

5 **Affiliations:** ¹Emory University Rollins School of Public Health, Atlanta, GA

6 ²Fulton County Board of Health, Atlanta, GA

7 ³Emory School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA

8 ⁴Fulton County Government, Atlanta, GA

9 **Word Count:** 2,593

10 **Corresponding Author:** Carol Liu, Emory University Rollins School of Public Health, Atlanta, GA

11 **Abstract:**

12 **Background:** Households are important for SARS-CoV-2 transmission due to high intensity exposure in
13 enclosed living spaces over prolonged durations. Using contact tracing, the secondary attack rate in
14 households is estimated at 18-20%, yet no studies have examined COVID-19 clustering within
15 households to inform testing and prevention strategies. We sought to quantify and characterize
16 household clustering of COVID-19 cases in Fulton County, Georgia and further explore age-specific
17 patterns in household clusters.

18 **Methods:** We used state surveillance data to identify all PCR- or antigen-confirmed cases of COVID-19 in
19 Fulton County, Georgia. Household clustered cases were defined as cases with matching residential
20 address with positive sample collection dates within 28 days of one another. We described proportion of
21 COVID-19 cases that were clustered, stratified by age and over time and explored trends in age of first
22 diagnosed case within clusters and age patterns between first diagnosed case and subsequent
23 household cases.

24 **Results:** Between 6/1/20–10/31/21, there were 106,233 COVID-19 cases with available address
25 reported in Fulton County. Of these, 31,449 (37%) were from 12,955 household clusters. Children were
26 more likely to be in household clusters than any other age group and children increasingly accounted for
27 the first diagnosed household case, rising from 11% in February 2021 to a high of 31% in August 2021.
28 Bubble plot density of age of first diagnosed case and subsequent household cases mirror age-specific
29 patterns in household social mixing.

30 **Discussion:** One-third of COVID-19 cases in Fulton County were part of a household cluster. High
31 proportion of children in household clusters reflects higher probability of living in larger homes with
32 caregivers or other children. Increasing probability of children as the first diagnosed case coincide with
33 temporal trends in vaccine roll-out among the elderly in March 2021 and the return to in-person
34 schooling for the Fall 2021 semester. While vaccination remains the most effective intervention at
35 reducing household clustering, other household-level interventions should also be emphasized such as
36 timely testing for household members to prevent ongoing transmission.

37

38

39 Background

40 Understanding the spread of SARS-CoV-2 has been of critical importance¹⁻⁵. From the
41 perspective of public health policy and practice, identifying high-risk settings where COVID-19
42 transmission occurs provides important insights for targeting interventions such as contact
43 tracing and directed testing efforts to reduce further disease spread. Despite intense scrutiny
44 and high public interest in large superspreader events^{6,7}, smaller clusters of household cases
45 have collectively more impact on total case counts. For example, investigations of the initial
46 SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in Wuhan, China found that 78-85% of infection clusters occurred in
47 families⁸, a trend that continued even after relaxation of the most stringent lockdown measures
48 that confined cases and their contacts at home⁹.

49 Household contacts are particularly vulnerable to SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Household
50 members experience high intensity exposure over prolonged durations and share enclosed and,
51 at times, crowded living environments¹⁰ – factors that together increase the probability of
52 transmission from an infected individual to a susceptible household contact¹¹⁻¹³. While non-
53 pharmaceutical interventions such as mask-wearing and social distancing effectively reduce
54 community transmission of SARS-CoV-2^{14,15}, consistently adopting such stringent preventative
55 measures is difficult in practice, particularly in a household. Furthermore, cases can be
56 infectious prior to symptom-onset¹⁶, which precludes index household cases from taking early
57 preventative measures to protect household members. Several systematic reviews drawing
58 data from multiple countries highlight the significance of household transmission in sustaining
59 the COVID-19 pandemic. These reviews estimate the household secondary attack rate of the
60 original variant to be between 16.4–30%¹⁷⁻²¹ and higher based on preliminary evidence for
61 alpha (24.5% from meta-analysis of three studies²²) and delta variants^{23,24}. Finally, the
62 household presents a unique social context where intergenerational contact between children,
63 parents and grandparents is higher than other social settings, such as work and school; in those
64 settings, individuals tend to be in contact with other individuals of similar age²⁵⁻²⁹. As such,
65 households can be an important setting for transmission from children to older adults who
66 have increased susceptibility³⁰ and heightened probability of severe disease³¹.

67 Despite known heightened transmission between household members and the
68 importance of households in the context of intergenerational transmission, there is limited
69 quantification of the extent of household clustering of COVID-19 in the US. We sought to use
70 surveillance data to quantify the extent of household clustering of COVID-19 among confirmed
71 COVID-19 cases in Fulton County, Georgia. Fulton County, located in metropolitan Atlanta, is an
72 urban county in Georgia with a population of 1.1 million. We postulate that household
73 clustered cases continue to account for a substantial proportion of cases detected by routine
74 surveillance. We further explore temporal trends in clustering, the distribution of household-
75 clustered cases among key demographic groups and focus our analysis on age profiles of cases
76 in household clusters, exploring trends in age of first diagnosed case within clusters and age
77 patterns between first diagnosed case and subsequent household cases. Our analysis uniquely
78 leverages a robust and large public health database of routinely-collected COVID-19 case data
79 to identify temporally clustered cases residing at the same residential address and quantify
80 household clustering behavior.

81 **Methods**

82 Study design and population

83 We conducted a retrospective cohort analysis of persons residing in Fulton County,
84 Georgia, who were diagnosed with PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection. We obtained data for
85 COVID-19 cases from Georgia Department of Public Health's (DPH) State Electronic Notifiable
86 Disease Surveillance System (SENDSS) for Fulton County between June 1st, 2020 and Oct 31st,
87 2021. Per the state's COVID-19 response statutes, all individuals with a positive diagnosis for
88 SARS-CoV-2 must be notified to the Georgia DPH. All reported cases are captured by DPH into
89 the SENDSS database. Cases prior to June 1st, 2020 were excluded due to the limited availability
90 of testing early in the pandemic where only those with selected risk factors (e.g., age), COVID-
91 related symptoms, or known exposure were eligible for testing. These eligibility criteria were
92 removed in Fulton County in early June, 2020, such that all persons could access free testing,
93 regardless of symptoms or risk factors. Cases after Oct 31st, 2021 were excluded as cluster data
94 are likely incomplete due to ongoing household transmission chains.

95 Definitions and outcome measures

96 To identify cases originating from the same residence, we standardized addresses using
97 a geocoder which cross-referenced the case addresses with the US Postal Service address
98 database and only cases with a valid and complete residential address were retained. Since our
99 primary interest was in case clustering at residential locations, addresses belonging to
100 communal residential locations (e.g., nursing homes, correctional facilities, homeless shelters
101 and dormitories) were excluded, as were apartment addresses missing the unit number where
102 cases from multiple units could be erroneously classified as from the same household.

103 Clustered cases were defined as cases with a perfectly matching standardized street
104 address, including unit number for apartment complex addresses. Household clusters were
105 defined as >2 COVID-19 cases residing at the same residential address with positive sample
106 collection dates within 28 days of one another (Supplementary Figure 1). With a median
107 incubation period estimated at 5.1 days³² and a median infectious period estimated at between
108 7-10 days³³, the 28 days would cover two infectious periods, one incubation period, and a 3-4
109 day lag between symptom-onset and positive sample collection³⁴. Given the high proportion of
110 asymptomatic and undiagnosed COVID-19 cases, this would allow two diagnosed cases with
111 one undiagnosed case in between them in the transmission chain to be classified as a single
112 household cluster.

113 Variables collected during routine surveillance and utilized in this analysis were age,
114 gender, race/ethnicity, address, symptom status, hospitalization, date of positive sample
115 collection and date of symptom-onset. We estimated the extent of COVID-19 clustering among
116 cases by calculating the proportion of all COVID-19 cases that belong to a household cluster,
117 based on our operational definition of a cluster described above, stratified by age group,
118 gender, race/ethnicity, symptom and hospitalization status and over month of the pandemic.
119 We computed statistics related to cluster characteristics including cluster size and duration
120 between first and last diagnosed case within a cluster. We focus our analysis on patterns in age
121 profiles of cases in household clusters by describing the distribution of the age of first
122 diagnosed case within a household cluster over time and visualizing patterns between age

123 group of first diagnosed case and age group of subsequent household cases. For the latter
124 visualization, we expected age-specific relationships between first and subsequent cases within
125 households to mirror the age-specific mixing patterns within household contacts documented
126 in social mixing surveys²⁵.

127 This activity was determined to be consistent with public health surveillance activity as
128 per title 45 code of Federal Regulations 46.102(l)(2). The Emory University institutional review
129 board approved this activity with a waiver of informed consent.

130 Results

131 A total of 106,233 COVID-19 cases were reported in Fulton County between 6/1/20-
132 10/31/21, of which 84,383 (79.4%) were included in our analysis. Reasons for exclusion include
133 residing in a long-term care facility (N=4,540), addresses not matched to the geocoding
134 database (N= 5,991), live in communal places (ex. correctional facilities, shelters or dorms) (N=
135 1,509) and apartments with no unit number (N= 9, 810) (Supplemental Figure 2). Included
136 individuals were similar to excluded individuals with respect to age, gender, race/ethnicity,
137 symptom and hospitalization status (Supplemental Table 1). A majority of cases were female
138 (N= 44,940; 53%), 14,726 (17%) were children aged 0-18 years and 10,555 (12%) were adults
139 aged 60 years and above (Table 1). The largest racial/ethnicity group was black, non-Hispanic
140 individuals (N = 38,128, 45%), followed by white, non-Hispanic individuals (N=28,272, 34%)
141 followed by Hispanic individuals of all races (N= 7776, 9%).

142 Among these cases, 37,432 (44%) had an address that matched at least one other case;
143 31,449 (37%) (Table 1) had positive sample collection date within 28 days of another household
144 case. The age-stratified probability of being part of a household cluster followed a U-shaped
145 trend where children aged 0-18 years were most likely to be part of a household cluster (55%),
146 followed by adults aged 40 years and above (39%), with young adults between 19-39 years the
147 least likely to be in a household cluster (28%). We observed higher clustering among Hispanic
148 (47%) and non-Hispanic, Asian (47%) persons compared to non-Hispanic black (33%) and non-
149 Hispanic white (35%) persons. There are no differences in clustering by gender or reported
150 symptom status.

151 We observed temporal trends in household clustering. The proportion of household
152 cases identified in clusters fluctuated between 30-40% each month. Clustering increased
153 between November 2020 to January 2021, steadily declined between Feb to June 2021, arrived
154 at a low in June 2021, and has since rebounded to earlier levels (**Fig 1**). Trends in probability of
155 household clustering by age of case (ex. children aged 0-18 years most likely to be in household
156 clusters) have stayed consistent over the course of the pandemic (**Figure 2**).

157 Among 12,955 household clusters, the majority of clusters had 2 individuals (N=9216
158 clusters, 71%), although some clusters had ≥ 6 individuals (N=122, 1.0%; **Table 2**). Excluding
159 clusters with multiple cases diagnosed on the first day, the first diagnosed case was 0-18 years
160 in 1,314 (15%) of clusters, 19-29 years in 1,614 (19%) of clusters, 30-39 years in 1,592 (18%) of
161 clusters, 40-49 years in 1,593 (18%) of clusters 50-59 years in 1,336 (15%) of clusters and above
162 60 years in 1,235 (14%) of clusters. The proportion of children diagnosed as the first case in the
163 cluster increased from 11% in February 2021 to a high of 31% in August 2021 (**Figure 3**). In
164 contrast, proportion of elderly greater than 50 years of age diagnosed as the first case in the
165 cluster decreased during the same time period from 34% to 19%. Clusters most often
166 consisted of individuals in the same age group, as shown by the high density of bubbles along
167 the diagonal in the bubble plot counting clusters by age of first diagnosed case and age of
168 subsequent diagnosed cases in the household (**Figure 4**). Two other diagonals are present. One
169 below the main diagonal consisting of 25-50-year-old first diagnosed case clustered with 0-20-
170 year-old subsequent household cases and another diagonal above the main diagonal consisting
171 of 10-25-year-old first diagnosed case clustered with 40-55-year-old secondary cases.

172 **Discussion:**

173 Over one-third of reported COVID-19 cases in Fulton County between June 2020 and August
174 2021 were part of a household cluster. Children aged 0-18 years were substantially more likely
175 to belong to a household cluster than any other age group and increasingly represented the
176 first positive detected case in the household, rising from 11% in February 2021 to 31% in August
177 2021. Age patterns between first and subsequent cases within household clusters mirror
178 household social mixing patterns where clusters of individuals of the same age are most

179 common followed by intergenerational clusters between parents and children. High probability
180 of household clustering and cross-age transmission underscore the importance of contact
181 tracing, testing, and quarantining of household contacts and the need for innovative strategies
182 such as self-testing of household members for early identification of infections.

183 Findings from our study adds evidence to the outsized role of household clustering in
184 shaping the course of the pandemic. Our study results are comparable to those reported by
185 Massachusetts State Department of Public Health in their “cluster-busting” strategy for COVID-
186 19 control³⁴ where a third of cases reported between September and October 2020 belonged
187 to a household cluster³⁵. Small reductions in household transmission have potential to
188 meaningfully reduce overall cases. On a daily basis, a larger proportion of close proximity
189 human contact occurs within households^{36–38} rather than in community settings such as schools,
190 nursing homes or large gatherings notorious for superspreading. While households rarely
191 become superspreading locations, the majority of Americans (72%)³⁹ live with at least one
192 other individual who would be highly exposed to an index household case.

193 The higher proportion of children in household clusters likely reflects higher probability of
194 living in a home with another individual, either other children or adult caregivers. Increased
195 probability of child cases as the first diagnosed case in household clusters starting March 2021
196 coincide with vaccination of older age groups. Further increases starting in August 2021
197 coincide with the return-to-school of largely unvaccinated children for the Fall 2021 semester.
198 Collectively, these trends suggest that children are increasingly important for transmission
199 within households despite lower infectiousness compared to adults.^{40,41} Our bubble plot of age
200 profiles within household clusters show that clusters are dominated by those of individuals of
201 the same age, likely couples, roommates or sibling, and those in intergenerational age groups,
202 likely parent and child. These findings suggest the importance of age-specific mixing patterns in
203 determining the magnitude of age-specific clustering within households.

204 As the COVID-19 pandemic continues, household-level interventions to reduce household
205 clustering should be further incorporated into the existing response. For example, the US
206 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommends household index cases quarantine in a

207 separate bedroom and bathroom and limit sharing of food and kitchenware.⁴² Yet distancing
208 and safe quarantine are not feasible within all households and an estimated 20% of households
209 did not have sufficient bedrooms and bathrooms to safely quarantine an infected person at
210 home.⁴³ Vaccination remains the single most effective intervention at preventing infection and
211 severe disease;⁴⁴ however, while coverage among children is still low,⁴⁵ additional interventions
212 should be explored such as rapid antigen tests for all household members to facilitate early
213 diagnosis or provision of a box of surgical or KN95 masks to increase safer household contact
214 and prevent onward transmission outside of the household.

215 We report several limitations. Our analysis used surveillance data which is known to under-
216 ascertain COVID-19 cases, especially during the early days of the pandemic⁴⁶. Individuals with
217 known household exposure may be more likely to present for testing if health conscious or less
218 likely to present if they believe knowing their infection status will have little impact on
219 treatment course and outcome. Changing testing and screening strategies may also affect age-
220 related clustering trends. Moreover, Children 0-18 years were slightly more likely to be included
221 compared to young adults aged 19-29 year and the elderly aged 70 years and above.
222 Furthermore, we do not know if members within household clusters infected each other or
223 whether some subsequent cases were infected from the community. The distribution of
224 infections caused by household exposure versus community exposure has implications for
225 disease control strategies. Finally, the first diagnosed case may not represent the source of
226 infection for the household.

227 The unique advantage of our study is that we use rigorous methods to identify cases from
228 surveillance data residing at the same residential address, producing the first estimates of the
229 extent of household clustering over time in a large, diverse metropolitan area. No other study
230 has used public health surveillance data to systematically track temporal and demographic
231 trends of household clusters of COVID-19 in the US. The use of routinely collected surveillance
232 data provides a more accessible, rapid approach for health departments to evaluate household
233 clustering and inform interventions. In addition, our study finds evidence of higher probability
234 of household clustering among children and Hispanic and Asian persons and early indication of
235 increases in the proportion of household clusters with a child as the first diagnosed case.

236 In conclusion, we used residential address to identify cases temporally clustered within a
237 household. Our analysis found that between June 1, 2020 and October 31, 2021, 37% of
238 reported cases in Fulton County, Georgia belonged to household clusters. Our findings
239 complement the high household secondary attack rates found in cohort studies of household
240 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and further quantifies the extent of household clustering at a
241 population level. Our results support the consideration of improved public health response to
242 reducing household clustering and within-household transmission such as within-household
243 masking and rapid testing for household contacts for far-reaching public health impact in
244 controlling COVID-19.

245

246

247 Table 1. Demographic characteristics of confirmed COVID-19 cases with a valid residential address and
 248 proportion of cases identified in household clusters – June 1, 2020 to October 31, 2021

		Total	Col%	HH-clustered individuals (n=27,898)	% HH- clustered
Total population		84,383	--	31,449	37
Gender	Female	44940	53	16944	38
	Male	39150	46	14408	37
	Missing	293	0	97	33
Age group	0-18	14726	17	8089	55
	19-29	18647	22	5080	27
	30-39	16125	19	4820	30
	40-49	13050	15	5021	38
	50-59	11254	13	4298	38
	60-69	6263	7	2418	39
	70 plus	4292	5	1715	40
Race/ethnicity	Asian, NH	3503	4	1693	48
	Black, NH	38128	45	13339	35
	White, NH	28272	34	10038	36
	Hispanic, all	7776	9	3769	48
	Other, NH	2678	3	1073	40
	Missing	4026	5	1537	38
Symptom status	No	8812	10	3299	37
	Yes	49247	58	18468	38
	Unknown	26324	31	9682	37
Hospitalized	No	46602	91	17974	39
	Yes	4758	9	1476	31

249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258

259

260 Table 2. Characteristics of household clusters (N= 11,523) in Fulton County – June 1, 2020 October 31,
261 2021 .

		Total HH Clusters (N=11,523)	%
Number of individuals in cluster	2	9216	71
	3-5	3617	28
	6+	122	1
Days between first and last diagnosis in cluster	0	3398	26
	1-7 days	6198	48
	8-14 days	2166	17
	15-28 days	1110	9
	29 or more days	83	1
Clusters with more than one case on first date of diagnosis		4268	33
Age of first diagnosed case in cluster	0-18 yrs	1314	15
	19-29 yrs	1614	19
	30-39 yrs	1592	18
	40-49 yrs	1593	18
	50-59 yrs	1336	15
	60 yrs and above	1235	14

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270


271

272

273


274

275 **Figure 1.** Temporal trend in the proportion of diagnosed cases in Fulton County, Georgia, that were
276 identified in household clusters stratified by the month of positive sample collection date (dark blue
277 line), with 95% confidence interval around the point estimate. A bar chart of monthly confirmed cases in
278 Fulton County is provided on the bottom left for reference.




279
280
281
282
283
284
285

286 **Figure 2.** Temporal trend in the proportion of diagnosed cases in Fulton County, Georgia, that were
287 identified in household clusters stratified by month of positive sample collection date (x-axis) and by age
288 group




289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297

298 **Figure 3.** Temporal trend in the age distribution of first diagnosed case among household clusters (N= 299 7689) identified in Fulton County, Georgia between June 1, 2020 and Oct 31, 2021



300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311

312 Figure 4. Bubble plot of distribution of clusters across different cluster age profiles where the x-axis is
313 the age of first diagnosed case in the household cluster, y-axis is the age of subsequent secondary
314 diagnosis in the household cluster, the size of bubble represents number of clusters by each age pairing
315 of first diagnosed case and subsequent cases and the density representing more common cluster age
316 profiles (on the diagonal between cases of the same age in the same household and the two off-
317 diagonal “wings” representing intergenerational clusters).



318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326 References

- 327 1. Leclerc QJ, Fuller NM, Knight LE, CCMID COVID-19 Working Group, Funk S, Knight GM. What
328 settings have been linked to SARS-CoV-2 transmission clusters? *Wellcome open research*. 2020;5(83).
- 329 2. Liu Y, Eggo RM, Kucharski AJ. Secondary attack rate and superspreading events for SARS-CoV-2.
330 *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10227):e47. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30462-1
- 331 3. Majra D, Benson J, Pitts J, Stebbing J. SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) superspreader events. *Journal of*
332 *Infection*. 2021;82(1):36-40. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.11.021
- 333 4. Furuse Y, Sando E, Tsuchiya N, et al. Clusters of Coronavirus Disease in Communities, Japan,
334 January–April 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(9):2176-2179. doi:10.3201/eid2609.202272
- 335 5. Choi YJ, Park M jeong, Park SJ, et al. Types of COVID-19 clusters and their relationship with social
336 distancing in the Seoul metropolitan area, South Korea. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*.
337 2021;106:363-369. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2021.02.058
- 338 6. Hamner L, Dubbel P, Capron I, et al. High SARS-CoV-2 Attack Rate Following Exposure at a Choir
339 Practice — Skagit County, Washington, March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(19):606-
340 610. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6919e6
- 341 7. Lemieux JE, Siddle KJ, Shaw BM, et al. Phylogenetic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 in Boston highlights
342 the impact of superspreading events. *Science*. 2021;371(6529):eabe3261. doi:10.1126/science.abe3261
- 343 8. World Health Organization. WHO China Joint Mission on Covid19 Final Report. Published online
344 2020.
- 345 9. Cluster infections play important roles in the rapid evolution of COVID-19 transmission: A
346 systematic review | Elsevier Enhanced Reader. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.07.073
- 347 10. Cevik M, Marcus J, Buckee C, Smith T. SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics should inform policy.
348 *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. Published online September 23, 2020.
349 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1442>
- 350 11. Luo L, Liu D, Liao X, et al. Contact Settings and Risk for Transmission in 3410 Close Contacts of
351 Patients With COVID-19 in Guangzhou, China. *Annals of Internal Medicine*.:12.
- 352 12. Ng OT, Marimuthu K, Koh V, Pang J, Linn KZ, Lee V. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and transmission
353 risk factors among high-risk close contacts: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
354 21(3):333-343.
- 355 13. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391 cases and 1286 of
356 their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
357 2020;20(8):911-919. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30287-5
- 358 14. Brauner JM, Mindermann S, Sharma M, et al. Inferring the effectiveness of government
359 interventions against COVID-19. *Science*. Published online December 15, 2020:eabd9338.
360 doi:10.1126/science.abd9338

- 361 15. Guy GP, Massetti GM, Sauber-Schatz E. Mask Mandates, On-Premises Dining, and COVID-19.
362 *JAMA*. Published online April 1, 2021. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.5455
- 363 16. The assessment of transmission efficiency and latent infection period in asymptomatic carriers
364 of SARS-CoV-2 infection | Elsevier Enhanced Reader. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.06.036
- 365 17. Curmei M, Ilyas A, Evans O, Steinhardt J. *Estimating Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2*.
366 *Epidemiology*; 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.23.20111559
- 367 18. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2:
368 A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(12):e2031756.
369 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.31756
- 370 19. Fung HF, Martinez L, Alarid-Escudero F, et al. The household secondary attack rate of SARS-CoV-
371 2: A rapid review. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. Published online October 12, 2020:ciaa1558.
372 doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1558
- 373 20. Koh WC, Naing L, Chaw L, et al. What do we know about SARS-CoV-2 transmission? A systematic
374 review and meta-analysis of the secondary attack rate and associated risk factors. *PLOS ONE*.:23.
- 375 21. Shah K, Saxena D, Mavalankar D. Secondary attack rate of COVID-19 in household contacts: a
376 systematic review. :10.
- 377 22. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Halloran ME, Dean NE. Factors Associated With Household
378 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*.
379 2021;4(8):e2122240. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.22240
- 380 23. Public Health England. SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern and variants under investigation.
381 Published online June 3, 2021:66.
- 382 24. Dougherty K, Mannell M, Naqvi O, Matson D, Stone J. SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant
383 COVID-19 Outbreak Associated with a Gymnastics Facility — Oklahoma, April–May 2021. *MMWR Morb*
384 *Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70(28):1004-1007. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7028e2
- 385 25. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, et al. Social Contacts and Mixing Patterns Relevant to the Spread of
386 Infectious Diseases. Riley S, ed. *PLoS Med*. 2008;5(3):e74. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074
- 387 26. Liu CY, Berlin J, Kiti MC, et al. *Rapid Review of Social Contact Patterns during the COVID-19*
388 *Pandemic*.; 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.03.12.21253410
- 389 27. Jarvis CI, Van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, et al. Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures
390 on the transmission of COVID-19 in the UK. *BMC Med*. 2020;18(1):124. doi:10.1186/s12916-020-01597-8
- 391 28. Coletti P, Wambua J, Gimma A, et al. *CoMix: Comparing Mixing Patterns in the Belgian*
392 *Population during and after Lockdown*. Medrxiv; 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.08.06.20169763
- 393 29. Zhang J, Klepac P, Read JM, et al. Patterns of human social contact and contact with animals in
394 Shanghai, China. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9(1):15141. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-51609-8
- 395 30. Davies NG, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Gimma A, CMMID COVID-19 Working Group, Edmunds WJ.
396 *The Effect of Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions on COVID-19 Cases, Deaths and Demand for Hospital*


- 397 *Services in the UK: A Modelling Study*. Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS); 2020.
398 doi:10.1101/2020.04.01.20049908
- 399 31. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, et al. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a
400 model-based analysis. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020;20(6):669-677. doi:10.1016/S1473-
401 3099(20)30243-7
- 402 32. McAloon C, Collins Á, Hunt K, et al. Incubation period of COVID-19: a rapid systematic review
403 and meta-analysis of observational research. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(8):e039652. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-
404 2020-039652
- 405 33. Byrne AW, McEvoy D, Collins AB, et al. Inferred duration of infectious period of SARS-CoV-2:
406 rapid scoping review and analysis of available evidence for asymptomatic and symptomatic COVID-19
407 cases. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(8):e039856. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-039856
- 408 34. Massachusetts Department of Public Health COVID-19 Dashboard: Weekly COVID-19 Public
409 Health Report. Published online April 1, 2021. [https://www.mass.gov/doc/weekly-covid-19-public-
410 health-report-april-1-2021/download](https://www.mass.gov/doc/weekly-covid-19-public-health-report-april-1-2021/download)
- 411 35. Majority of Massachusetts coronavirus clusters are from households. Boston Herald. Published
412 October 30, 2020. Accessed July 4, 2021. [https://www.bostonherald.com/2020/10/30/majority-of-
413 massachusetts-coronavirus-clusters-are-from-households/](https://www.bostonherald.com/2020/10/30/majority-of-massachusetts-coronavirus-clusters-are-from-households/)
- 414 36. Liu CY, Berlin J, Kiti MC, et al. Rapid Review of Social Contact Patterns During the COVID-19
415 Pandemic. *Epidemiology*. 2021;32(6):781-791. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000001412
- 416 37. Kiti MC, Aguolu OG, Liu CY, et al. Social contact patterns among employees in 3 U.S. companies
417 during early phases of the COVID-19 pandemic, April to June 2020. *Epidemics*. 2021;36:100481.
418 doi:10.1016/j.epidem.2021.100481
- 419 38. Feehan DM, Mahmud A. Quantifying interpersonal contact in the United States during the
420 spread of COVID-19: first results from the Berkeley Interpersonal Contact Study. :8.
- 421 39. Distribution of U.S. households by size 1970-2020. Statista. Published 2021. Accessed August 15,
422 2021. [https://www.statista.com/statistics/242189/distribution-of-households-in-the-us-by-household-
423 size/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/242189/distribution-of-households-in-the-us-by-household-size/)
- 424 40. Chu VT, Yousaf AR, Chang K, et al. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from Children and
425 Adolescents. *n engl j med*. Published online 2021:3.
- 426 41. Guilamo-Ramos V, Benzekri A, Thimm-Kaiser M, Hidalgo A, Perlman DC. Reconsidering
427 Assumptions of Adolescent and Young Adult Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
428 Transmission Dynamics. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2021;73(Supplement_2):S146-S163.
429 doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1348
- 430 42. CDC. COVID-19 and Your Health. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published February
431 11, 2020. Accessed August 15, 2021. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/care-
432 for-someone.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/care-for-someone.html)

- 433 43. Sehgal AR, Himmelstein DU, Woolhandler S. Feasibility of Separate Rooms for Home Isolation
434 and Quarantine for COVID-19 in the United States. *Ann Intern Med.* 2021;174(1):127-129.
435 doi:10.7326/M20-4331
- 436 44. Thompson MG, Burgess JL, Naleway AL, et al. Interim Estimates of Vaccine Effectiveness of
437 BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 COVID-19 Vaccines in Preventing SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Health Care
438 Personnel, First Responders, and Other Essential and Frontline Workers — Eight U.S. Locations,
439 December 2020–March 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70(13):495-500.
440 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7013e3
- 441 45. Murthy BP, Zell E, Saelee R, et al. COVID-19 Vaccination Coverage Among Adolescents Aged 12–
442 17 Years — United States, December 14, 2020–July 31, 2021. *New York.* 2021;70(35):8.
- 443 46. Chamberlain AT, Toomey KE, Bradley H, et al. Cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections
444 among adults in Georgia, USA, August-December 2020. *J Infect Dis.* Published online 2021.
- 445
- 446

447 Supplementary Information


448 Supplemental Figure 1. Identifying clusters in the dataset and illustrations of scenarios that we consider
449 as a household cluster versus scenarios that we do not consider as a household cluster. Our operational
450 definition of household- clustered COVID-19 cases is two or more cases reporting a valid address at the
451 same residential location less than 28 days apart. The days are by date of positive sample collection and
452 day 1 is the date of positive sample collection of first identified case at address.

Identifying clusters in the data



453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462

463 Supplemental Figure 2. Flow diagram of cases included in the study



464
465
466
467
468
469
470

471 Supplemental Table 1.

	Value	Total	Included	Excluded	% Included
Total		106233	84383	21850	79.4
Age group	0-18	17297	14726 (17.5)	2571 (11.8)	85.1
	19-29	25186	18647 (22.1)	6539 (29.9)	74
	30-39	20481	16125 (19.1)	4356 (19.9)	78.7
	40-49	15766	13050 (15.5)	2716 (12.4)	82.8
	50-59	13391	11254 (13.3)	2137 (9.8)	84
	60-69	7700	6263 (7.4)	1437 (6.6)	81.3
	70 plus	6345	4292 (5.1)	2053 (9.4)	67.6
	NA	67	26 (0)	41 (0.2)	38.8
Gender	Female	56559	44940 (53.3)	11619 (53.2)	79.5
	Male	49171	39150 (46.4)	10021 (45.9)	79.6
	NA	503	293 (0.3)	210 (1)	58.3
Race/ethnicity	1-Asian, NH	4187	3503 (4.2)	684 (3.1)	83.7
	2-Black, NH	48237	38128 (45.2)	10109 (46.3)	79
	3-White, NH	34191	28272 (33.5)	5919 (27.1)	82.7
	4-Hispanic, all races	10608	7776 (9.2)	2832 (13)	73.3
	5-Other, NH	3400	2678 (3.2)	722 (3.3)	78.8
	NA	5610	4026 (4.8)	1584 (7.2)	71.8
Hospitalized	No	58201	46602 (55.2)	11599 (53.1)	80.1
	Yes	6391	4758 (5.6)	1633 (7.5)	74.4
	NA	41641	33023 (39.1)	8618 (39.4)	79.3
Symptom status	No	11607	8812 (10.4)	2795 (12.8)	75.9
	Unknown	32397	26324 (31.2)	6073 (27.8)	81.3
	Yes	62229	49247 (58.4)	12982 (59.4)	79.1
Month	2020-06	5053	3828 (4.5)	1225 (5.6)	75.8
	2020-07	11702	8719 (10.3)	2983 (13.7)	74.5
	2020-08	5233	3829 (4.5)	1404 (6.4)	73.2
	2020-09	2708	2036 (2.4)	672 (3.1)	75.2
	2020-10	3731	2890 (3.4)	841 (3.8)	77.5
	2020-11	7096	5520 (6.5)	1576 (7.2)	77.8
	2020-12	15019	11855 (14)	3164 (14.5)	78.9
	2021-01	16318	13779 (16.3)	2539 (11.6)	84.4
	2021-02	5339	4378 (5.2)	961 (4.4)	82
	2021-03	3540	2905 (3.4)	635 (2.9)	82.1
	2021-04	3012	2383 (2.8)	629 (2.9)	79.1
	2021-05	1304	1036 (1.2)	268 (1.2)	79.4
	2021-06	465	365 (0.4)	100 (0.5)	78.5
	2021-07	3413	2761 (3.3)	652 (3)	80.9
	2021-08	11890	9652 (11.4)	2238 (10.2)	81.2
	2021-09	7849	6336 (7.5)	1513 (6.9)	80.7
	2021-10	2561	2111 (2.5)	450 (2.1)	82.4

472


473

474

475

476


477 Supplemental Figure 3. Proportion of COVID-19 cases in each household cluster size when clusters were
478 counted for the entire outbreak versus when clusters were restricted to those within 28 days of
479 subsequent positive sample collections



480

481

482 Supplemental Figure 4. Temporal trend in the proportion of diagnosed cases in Fulton County, Georgia,
483 that was identified in household clusters stratified by month of positive sample collection date (x-axis)
484 and race/ethnicity.



485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493

494 Supplemental Table 2. Average number of household members (all ages and children 0-18 years) per
495 household by race/ethnicity.

	Average number household members (all ages)	Average number of children (0-18 years) per household
All races	2.36	0.58
Asian	2.79	0.74
Black	2.41	0.65
Hispanic	3.38	1.11
White	2.22	0.47

496