

1 **Lower levels of household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 VOC Omicron compared to Wild-type: an**
2 **interplay between transmissibility and immune status**

3 AMAM Winkel MD^a #, E Kozanli MSc^b #, ME Haverkort MD^c, SM Euser PhD^{a,d}, JGC Sluiter-Post MSc^a, R
4 Mariman PhD^b, A. Vogelzang^b MSc, J. de Bakker BSc^b, C.R. Lap MD^a, MA van Houten MD,PhD^{a,e}, D Eggink
5 PhD^{b*}, SFL van Lelyveld MD,PhD^{a,f*}

6 ^a Spaarne Gasthuis Academy, Hoofddorp, The Netherlands

7 ^b Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, Bilthoven, The
8 Netherlands

9 ^c Department of Infectious Disease Control, Public Health Services Kennemerland, Haarlem, The Netherlands

10 ^d Regional Public Health Laboratory Kennemerland, Haarlem, The Netherlands

11 ^e Department of Paediatrics, Spaarne Gasthuis, Haarlem/Hoofddorp, The Netherlands

12 ^f Department of Internal Medicine, Spaarne Gasthuis Hospital, Haarlem/Hoofddorp, The Netherlands

13 # shared first authors

14 * Corresponding authors and shared last authors:

15 D Eggink, E-mail: dirk.eggink@rivm.nl.

16 SFL van Lelyveld, E-mail: s.van.lelyveld@spaarnegasthuis.nl

17

18 Key words: SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; household transmission; Omicron; BA.2; saliva

19

20 Manuscript word count: 3789

21 Abstract word count: 250

22 **Abstract**

23 **Background**

24 Knowledge of SARS-CoV-2 household transmission dynamics guides infection control and vaccination
25 measures. This household cohort study prospectively assessed the impact of both the Omicron BA.2 variant and
26 immunity on household transmission using dense saliva sampling and sequence analysis.

27 **Methods**

28 Households consisting of a PCR-confirmed index and at least two household members were enrolled in March
29 and April 2022 during the Omicron BA.2 wave in the Netherlands. SARS-CoV-2 PCR was performed on ten
30 consecutive saliva samples. Serum-antibodies were measured at baseline and day 42. Whole genome sequencing
31 was performed for phylogenetic analysis, followed by sensitivity analysis, to correct for multiple household
32 introductions and index definition. Results were compared with the identical, early-pandemic and pre-
33 immunisation predecessor study.

34 **Results**

35 Sixty-seven households were included, consisting of 241 individuals (median age 33.0 years). Maximum
36 household Secondary Attack Rate (SAR) was 59.7%, per-person SAR 41.5%. Underage indexes were more
37 likely to transmit. Transmission was negatively affected by household members' immunity. Phylogenetic
38 analysis showed multiple introductions in four households. Sensitivity analysis resulted in a minimal household
39 SAR of 51.0% and per-person SAR of 28.5%.

40 **Conclusions**

41 The Omicron BA.2 variant is highly transmissible within households. Nevertheless, transmission rates are lower
42 than our pre-immunisation reported ancestral rates: household SAR decreased from 88.2% to 59.7%, per-person
43 SAR from 64.3% to 41.5%, implying immunity reduces transmission, even for a more transmittable variant.
44 Regardless of immune status, children have a crucial role in Omicron household transmission. Intensive
45 sampling and phylogenetic analysis are essential to correctly calculate transmission rate, especially in times of
46 minimal behavioural restrictions.

47

48

49 **1. Introduction**

50
51 Since the first identification in December 2019, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2)
52 has quickly spread worldwide, causing a global pandemic characterised by the continuous emergence of new
53 variants.¹ The SARS-CoV-2 variant B.1.1.529, referred to as the Omicron variant of concern (VOC), was first
54 reported in November 2021 and has become the most prevalent variant globally.¹ This variant has diversified
55 into various Omicron sublineages. Initially, five sublineages were identified, called BA.1-BA.5.² BA.1 was
56 introduced in the Netherlands in November 2021 and became the dominant variant within several weeks. This
57 sublineage was rapidly replaced by BA.2, which was dominant in the Netherlands during this study in March and
58 April 2022, followed by the dominance of BA.5 in June 2022.³ The Omicron VOC sublineages BA.1-BA.5 have
59 been reported to be more infectious than previous variants.⁴ Moreover, Omicron is less sensitive to neutralising
60 antibodies induced by vaccine or natural infection with a previous variant.⁵ These characteristics of Omicron
61 VOCs facilitate infections in immunized individuals – even in those who received a booster vaccination, keeping
62 SARS-CoV-2 highly transmissible.⁶

63 Households are of significant importance for SARS-CoV-2 transmission due to proximity and duration of
64 exposure.⁷ Estimated SARS-CoV-2 household transmission rates vary between 9.0% and 88.2% for different
65 variants.^{8,9} The highest per-person Secondary Attack Rates (SARs) have been reported by prospective household
66 studies using frequent sampling.^{10,11} Likewise, our initial early-pandemic prospective cohort study using frequent
67 saliva sampling found very high household transmission rates (88.2%).⁹ However, this study was performed
68 between October and December 2020, when the ancestral variant was still dominating (Nextclade 20A, 20B, 20E
69 (EU1)), and the national COVID-19 vaccination program had not yet been implemented. By March 2022, 84.9%
70 of people in the Netherlands aged 12 and over had received the primary vaccination series, and 58.1% had
71 received a booster vaccination.¹² Furthermore, 60% of the Dutch population was estimated to have suffered a
72 previous infection, resulting in 95% of the population having SARS-CoV-2 serum-antibodies.¹³ It is therefore
73 highly likely that SARS-CoV-2 Omicron household transmission dynamics within an immunized population
74 differ from the results described in the initial study and other pre-Omicron performed household studies.

75 Prospective data regarding household transmission in the Omicron era are scarce. Most published studies
76 extracted transmission data from register data,^{14–17} or contact tracing programs,¹⁸ This strategy misses most
77 asymptomatic and mild cases since SARS-CoV-2 testing is mostly performed in case of respiratory symptoms.
78 Since infection with Omicron often leads to milder symptoms than previous variants, reported transmission rates
79 are possibly underestimated.¹⁹ In addition, phylogenetic analysis, essential for the exclusion of multiple

80 introductions from outside the household, is seldom performed. The net impact of the Omicron BA.2 VOC on
81 household transmission among vaccinated and/or previous infected household members is of interest, since it
82 could have implications for infection control and vaccination strategies.

83 The present study aimed to prospectively assess household transmission dynamics of Omicron BA.2 VOC and
84 factors associated with transmission on household, index case, and household member levels using dense saliva
85 sampling and phylogenetic analysis. The identical study design of both this and the initial study offered a unique
86 opportunity to compare household transmission data between different pandemic phases.

87

88 **2. Methods**

89 2.1. Study design and participants

90 In this prospective cohort study, largely identical to the initial early-pandemic household transmission study,⁹
91 households were recruited in March and April 2022, during the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron (B.1.1.529) wave in the
92 Netherlands, when Omicron sublineage BA.2 was dominant.

93 Index cases were recruited at the Public Health Services Kennemerland, the Netherlands, when testing for
94 SARS-CoV-2 through reversed transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) on a combined
95 nasopharyngeal swab (NPS) and oropharyngeal swab (OPS). The indexes and their households were eligible if
96 (1) the index was 65 years or younger and had a SARS-CoV-2 positive RT-PCR maximal 72 hours before study
97 inclusion, and (2) at least two additional household members not diagnosed with SARS-CoV-2 in the previous
98 eight weeks were willing to participate in the study. Indexes could be either symptomatic or asymptomatic. A
99 household was considered to have two indexes if both participants tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 at the same
100 moment and symptoms started simultaneously. For detailed case definitions see Supplementary Methods.

101 All participants provided written informed consent. The Medical Ethical Committee of the Amsterdam
102 University Medical Centre, The Netherlands, reviewed and approved this study (reference number 2022.0073).

103 2.2. Measurements

104 *Sample collection*

105 Saliva samples were obtained by self-sampling at home on days 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 14, 21, 28, 35, and 42, with the
106 day of inclusion as day 1. On days 1 and 42, capillary blood samples were collected by the research team during
107 a home visit (Figure I). The sampling scheme was identical for index cases and household members. See
108 Supplementary Materials for details.

109 *Questionnaires*

110 An online baseline questionnaire obtained on day 1 contained questions on household composition, household
111 characteristics, medical history, previous SARS-CoV-2 infection(s), and SARS-CoV-2 vaccination status.
112 Online symptomatology questionnaires were sent to the participants each night before the pre-defined time
113 points for saliva collection.

114 *Recently SARS-CoV-2 positive household members (RPHM)*

115 Household members with a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection (by either RT-PCR or rapid antigen self-test) up
116 to eight weeks before study onset were defined as recently SARS-CoV-2 positive household members (RPHMs).

117 RPHMs were not eligible to fully participate in the study as RNA detection from the earlier infection might
118 affect transmission data.²⁰ However, these participants could conceivably be the actual index of the household.
119 To investigate a possible role of RPHMs in SARS-CoV-2 transmission within the household, their NP/OP-
120 samples were requested from the Public Health Services and sequenced. Additionally, these household members
121 completed a questionnaire regarding their recent SARS-CoV-2 infection, including test date, symptom start date,
122 duration and severity of symptoms.

123 2.3. Definitions

124 Infection of household members during study follow-up (secondary cases) was defined as SARS-CoV-2 positive
125 RT-PCR in the saliva of at least one of the ten time points and/or a >5-fold rise of SARS-CoV-2 specific
126 antibodies in serum between day 1 and day 42. Household transmission was expressed in the household
127 secondary attack rate (SAR) and per-person SAR. The household SAR, defined as SARS-CoV-2 infection of at
128 least one household member during study follow-up, was calculated by dividing households with transmission
129 by the total number of households. The per-person SAR, defined as the risk of household members to get
130 infected, was calculated by dividing the number of secondary cases by the number of participating household
131 members. Participants were divided based on self-reported immunity status into naive, previous infection only,
132 previous vaccination only and hybrid immunity (both SARS-CoV-2 vaccination and previous infection).

133 2.4. Molecular diagnostics and serology

134 The methodology for molecular diagnostics and serology analysis is similar to our initial early-pandemic study
135 and is described in detail in the Supplementary Materials.⁹ Sera of all individuals were tested for IgG-type
136 antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 antigens. Protein microarray was used to quantify fluorescent signal of a
137 duplicate 3-fold serial dilutions starting at 1:20.

138 In saliva, cycle threshold (Ct)-values were determined using RT-PCR for the presence of SARS-CoV-2.
139 Subsequently, RT-PCR-positive samples of each participant with the lowest Ct-value were sequenced in
140 amplicon-based SARS-CoV-2 sequencing for phylogenetic analysis (see phylogenetic analysis).²¹ The SARS-
141 CoV-2 sequences from the participants are compared through a phylogenetic analysis. A maximum likelihood
142 phylogenetic tree is built to display clustering of sequences (Figure II). The proximity of sequences of household
143 members distinguishes actual transmission within a household from an external introduction. Based on this
144 analysis, we could correct for external introductions in our sensitivity analysis to calculate a minimal SAR.

145 2.5. Statistical methods

146 Logistic regression was used to a) compare characteristics of households and to assess the association between
147 household characteristics and household transmission (table II), b) compare characteristics of index cases and to
148 assess the association between index case characteristics and transmission to its' household members
149 (transmission probability) (table III), c) compare characteristics of household members and to assess the
150 association between household member characteristics and secondary infection of household members (Table
151 IV).

152 Statistical analyses were performed with SPSS version 28.0.0.0. P-values <0.05 were considered statistically
153 significant.

154 *Sensitivity analysis*

155 The household and per-person SARs calculated based on RT-PCR and serological results represent the
156 maximum SAR, including every SARS-CoV-2 infection within a household during study follow-up. However,
157 this method does not consider additional external introductions, leading to possible overestimation of
158 transmission rates. A sensitivity analysis was performed to calculate a minimal household and per-person SAR,
159 only taking into account transmission from index to household member(s) confirmed by phylogenetic analysis.

160 The sensitivity analysis also accounts for the influence of the index case definition on the SAR. Our defined
161 index cases might not have been the primary cases of the household, since RPHMs could be the actual index
162 cases of the households, therefore distorting reported household transmission dynamics.

163 This analysis thus corrects for 1) multiple introductions within the household as measured by whole genome
164 sequencing and phylogenetic analysis, and 2) an RPHM being the actual index case. Then, a minimal household
165 SAR and minimal per-person SAR were calculated. See Supplementary Methods for a detailed description of the
166 corrections made in the sensitivity analysis.

167

168 **3. Results**

169 3.1. Baseline characteristics

170 Sixty-seven households were included, comprising 241 participants, of whom 70 index cases and 171 household
171 members (Table I). In addition, 21 RPHMs were included (Supplementary Table IV). For three households, two
172 indexes were identified. For all participants collecting specimens (n=241), protocol adherence for collection of
173 the specimens was 93.1% (95.9% saliva and 90.2% serum) (Supplementary Table V).

174 Baseline characteristics of indexes and household members are shown in Table I. Most indexes were female
175 (61.4%). Children aged <18 years accounted for 34.4% of the indexes and 44.4% of household members. Most
176 indexes (88.6%) and household members (89.5%) had pre-existing immunity from a laboratory-confirmed
177 SARS-CoV-2 infection, vaccination, or both.

178 The household characteristics are presented in Table II. The median household size was 4.0 participating
179 household members (IQR 4.0-4.0) (Table II). The median time between index symptom onset and study
180 enrolment (day 1) was 3.0 days (IQR 2.0-4.0) (Table III).

181 3.2. Household SAR and associations between index characteristics and SARS-CoV-2 household transmission

182 Secondary infection of one or more household members was detected in 40 of 67 households, leading to a
183 household SAR of 59.7% (Table II). The median household size did not differ between households with and
184 without transmission (4.0 [IQR 4.0-4.0] vs 4.0 [IQR 4.0-4.0]; p=0.798).

185 Transmission was detected in most households with index cases under the age of 18 (20/24, 83.3%) (Table III).
186 Children had higher odds of transmitting SARS-CoV-2 to household contacts compared with adult indexes. This
187 persisted when adjusted for baseline antibody titer (univariate OR 5.46, 95% CI 1.61-18.47, p=0.006;
188 multivariate OR 4.75, 95% CI 1.15-19.64, p=0.031; Table III).

189 Other index-case characteristics, such as index symptom status or participant-reported pre-existing immunity
190 status (infection and/or vaccination), were not statistically significantly associated with household transmission.

191 Higher baseline antibody titer of the index case was associated with lower household transmission, however not
192 statistically significant when correcting for age (univariate OR 0.95, 95% CI 0.90-1.00, p=0.049; multivariate
193 OR 1.00, 95% CI 0.92-1.02, p=0.237).

194 3.3. Per-person SAR and associations between household member characteristics and SARS-CoV-2 infection

195 At the household member level, secondary infection was detected in 71 of 171 individuals, leading to a per-
196 person SAR of 41.5% (Table IV). Most secondary cases already tested positive in saliva at day 1 (42/71, 61.8%).
197 Secondary cases reported more symptoms than negative household members. The median age did not differ
198 between secondary and non-secondary cases (36.0 [IQR 10.0–46.0] vs 20.0 [IQR 12.0–45.0]; $p=0.620$) (Table
199 IV).

200 Household members with self-reported hybrid immunity and with previous infection only, had significantly
201 lower odds for secondary infection compared to naïve members (OR 0.04 [95% CI 0.01–0.17]; $p<0.001$) vs (OR
202 0.13 [95% CI 0.03–0.56]; $p=0.006$). Previous vaccination only did not significantly lower the odds for secondary
203 infection, independent from the number of prior vaccinations.

204 To analyse the association between the immune status of household members and secondary infection more
205 specifically, members were grouped based on baseline antibody titer. Household members with high antibody
206 titers (>3000) at day 1 had significantly lower odds for secondary infection compared to naïve members
207 (antibody titer ≤ 10) (Table IV). Moreover, the median day 1 titer of non-infected household members was
208 significantly higher than that of infected members (median 7000 vs. 4000, $p=0.005$). This persisted when
209 adjusting median antibody titer for age (univariate OR 0.96, 95% CI 0.93–0.99, $p=0.005$; multivariate OR 0.96,
210 95% CI 0.93–0.99, $p=0.003$; Table IV).

211 3.4. Sequencing and phylogenetic results

212 Sequence analysis was successful for 115 SARS-CoV-2 positive individuals originating from 62 households, of
213 whom 59 indexes and 56 household members. For 27 of 40 (67.5%) households with transmission or positive
214 household member(s), sequences were available for both the index and all positive members. For four
215 households, sequences were available for the index and one positive household member.

216 The phylogeny of these sequences showed a distinct cluster with minimal sequence differences in 23 of the 27
217 (85.2%) households with fully known sequences and in all four incomplete households, indicative of a single
218 introduction within each household (Figure II). However, in four households, sequences showed large genetic
219 distances between each of the household members or their appointed index case, indicating multiple,
220 independent introductions of SARS-CoV-2 into the household. The subsequent sensitivity analysis took these
221 cases into account.

222 3.5. Recent positive household members (RPHMs) and sequencing

223 Sequencing was performed on available isolates of RPHMs who tested positive within two weeks before
224 inclusion to investigate whether these cases were related to the later transmission within the household. Of the
225 six RPHMs that tested positive within two weeks before inclusion, four sequences became available. Three of
226 these isolates showed clustering with other members of the household, including the index case, indicative of
227 mutual transmission. One sequence was not closely related to other members, showing an independent
228 introduction. Therefore, the three RPHMs with confirmed similar sequences could be appointed as the actual
229 index case. Moreover, the two RPHMs with unknown sequences could not be excluded as the actual index. The
230 subsequent sensitivity analysis corrected for these five cases.

231 3.6. Sensitivity analysis

232 The selection of households and household members for sensitivity analysis to calculate the minimal household
233 and per-person SAR is visualized in Supplementary Figure I and II. First, the sensitivity analysis excluded the
234 above-mentioned five households containing five indexes and their 13 household members with a possible other
235 primary case (RPHM) than the defined index.

236 Moreover, for the calculation of the minimal household SAR, 11 additional households were excluded because
237 transmission from the index to at least one household member could not be confirmed by sequencing (Figure II)
238 or sequencing showed more than one introduction into the household. Transmission was confirmed by
239 phylogenetic analysis in 26 of 51 remaining households, resulting in a minimal household SAR of 51.0%.
240 Thereby, the household SAR estimates changed from the crude estimation (maximal household SAR) of 59.7%
241 to the corrected sensitivity estimation (minimal household SAR) of 51.0%.

242 Similarly, for the calculation of the minimal per person SAR, SARS-CoV-2 positive household members were
243 excluded if transmission from the index to this household member was not confirmed by sequencing, leading to
244 the exclusion of 28 positive household members. Transmission from index to household member was proven by
245 sequencing in 37 of 71 positive household members (52.1%). Since 93 negative household members were
246 remaining, the corrected minimal per person SAR is 28.5% (37/130). Thereby, the household member SAR
247 estimates changed from the crude estimation (maximal per-person SAR) of 41.5% to the corrected sensitivity
248 estimation (minimal per-person SAR) of 28.5%.

249 The characteristics of households, index cases and household members included in the sensitivity analysis are
250 presented in Supplementary Table I-III. Characteristics associated with transmission were not different between
251 the primary and sensitivity analysis (Supplementary Tables I–III).

253 **4. Discussion**

254 This study prospectively analysed household transmission of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.2 VOC using dense
255 saliva sampling and phylogenetic analysis and compared results with pre-immunisation household transmission
256 rates of the ancestral variant, using a largely identical study design. Despite the finding that infection-acquired
257 immunity, hybrid immunity and higher baseline antibody titer of household members significantly decreased
258 infection risk, this study still found high transmission rates: household SAR 51.0%–59.7% and per-person SAR
259 28.5%–41.5%. Here, we showed a decrease of 10 percentage points for the household SAR and 14 percentage
260 points for per-person SAR when correcting for our index case definition and infections from outside the
261 household. The multiple simultaneous introductions detected within households emphasise the relevance of
262 phylogenetic analysis to validate transmission within each household. This study also reveals that transmission
263 occurs within a short time interval after infection of the index case. Moreover, underage index cases were more
264 likely to transmit the virus to household members compared to adult indexes.

265 This study found high SARs, which fall within the broad range of household SARs reported in other Omicron
266 household transmission studies, varying between 15.0%–70.2%.^{8,10,22} This wide range of reported transmission
267 rates, partially caused by variability in study methods, has been found in all pandemic phases, comprising
268 diverse SARS-CoV-2 variants and immune statuses.⁸ This makes comparison of SARs between pandemic phases
269 challenging. However, comparing transmission rates is necessary to specify the net impact of the highly
270 transmissible Omicron variant versus immunity on transmission. These challenges were overcome by comparing
271 two studies with almost identical designs, thereby distilling the net impact. In our previous identical study
272 performed in December 2020–January 2021, we reported household SAR of 88.2% and per-person SAR of
273 64.3%. The Omicron BA.2 household transmission rates observed in the current study were clearly lower
274 compared to that observed in the initial early-pandemic study of ancestral SARS-CoV-2 in an immune naïve
275 population:⁹ the household SAR estimates decreased from 88.2% to 59.7%, and the per-person SAR reduced
276 from 64.3% to 41.5% compared to the initial estimates at the start of the pandemic. This remarkable decrease in
277 household transmission rate of the Omicron VOC in a high-immunised cohort, despite the higher transmissibility
278 phenotype of Omicron, emphasises the relevance of immunity to hamper transmission. In the current study,
279 higher baseline antibody titer in household members was associated with protection against transmission.
280 Thereby, participant-reported infection-induced and hybrid immunity of household members are both associated
281 with protection against Omicron VOC household transmission, as shown in the current study and a previous
282 household study.¹⁰ The vaccine effectiveness against household transmission in absence of prior infection is less

283 prominent in this study, possibly related to the fact that vaccines contained the ancestral strain at the time or the
284 limited size of our study population. However, various studies indicate that indexes with prior immunity
285 acquired by vaccination reduce Omicron household transmission compared to non-vaccinated indexes,^{15,17,23,24}
286 although vaccine effectiveness is lower for the Omicron variant than for previous variants.²⁵ Thus, pre-existing
287 immunity has a reductive impact on household transmission, although new variants challenge this by immune
288 escaping strategies.⁵ These strategies oppose a steep reduction in transmission rate, which still allows the virus to
289 spread substantially.

290 This study found that children were more likely to transmit the Omicron BA.2 variant to household members,
291 and that children were as susceptible to infection with this variant as adult household members. However, our
292 previous study did not find children to have a pivotal role in the household transmission of SARS-CoV-2.⁹ This
293 shift is in line with literature, showing an increased role of children in household transmission since the
294 emergence of VOCs compared to the first pandemic phase.²⁶ One cause of increased transmission from children
295 to their household members relative to the ancestral virus could be the different immunisation rates between
296 children and adults, since immunisation is shown to play a role in preventing SARS-CoV-2 household
297 transmission in this and other studies.^{15,17,24,25} However, this study observed that children still have a significantly
298 increased risk of transmitting SARS-CoV-2 after adjusting for immunisation status. This may be because young
299 children are more likely to spend time with family compared to other age groups. However, it also supports the
300 hypothesis that the evolution of the virus over time resulted in an increased role for children in transmission over
301 the course of the pandemic.²⁶ This could be attributed to the finding that the ancestral strain, but not the Omicron
302 variant, is less efficient at replicating in the primary nasal epithelial cells of children, which may impact the viral
303 shedding of children compared to adults.²⁷

304 This study detected multiple introductions in at least four households by whole genome sequencing. In times of
305 high incidence and regular social interaction patterns, it is possible that household members independently
306 become infected by different sources. These introductions from external sources into the household may result in
307 an overestimation of the household transmission rate if left undetected. In the initial early-pandemic study,
308 performed in a lockdown period with strict preventative measures such as the closure of public locations and
309 schools, sequencing and phylogenetic results showed no evidence of multiple introductions within households.⁹
310 To our knowledge, this is the first household transmission study performing whole genome sequencing in both
311 indexes and household members during the Omicron wave, describing multiple introductions within one

312 household and performing a sensitivity analysis to calculate corrected (minimal) transmission rates. Thereby, the
313 reported transmission estimates in this study more accurately approach the true rates.

314 There are some limitations. First, a selection bias is introduced towards symptomatic index cases since
315 symptomatic individuals are more likely to test themselves, while many asymptomatic cases are easily
316 overlooked.²⁸ Not only does this affect the entire pool enrolled in this study, but this might also affect the
317 appointment of the index within households towards a symptomatic member. Although overlooking an
318 asymptomatic index case cannot be prevented entirely, testing history and symptoms up to 8 weeks before
319 inclusion were investigated. Second, as no lockdown measures were implemented in the Netherlands at the time
320 of this study, and many of the participants were positive at study start, the possibility of an external case that
321 infected all household members at once cannot be excluded. Third, recruiting after voluntary testing at facilities
322 may introduce a volunteer bias towards those who are more inclined to adhere to COVID-19 testing measures
323 and isolation policies.²⁹ This could potentially result in higher transmission rates in the general population.

324 In conclusion, by using dense saliva sampling and phylogenetic analysis, this study reveals that the household
325 transmission of the Omicron BA.2 VOC is high despite immunization. However, the transmission rate is lower
326 compared to previous studies with other SARS-CoV-2 variants, highlighting the effect of immunity. Children
327 have a crucial role in household transmission, while immunity has been demonstrated to provide protection
328 against household member infection. Moreover, this study found multiple unique introductions in households by
329 whole genome sequencing, which emphasises the importance of sequencing in future household transmission
330 studies. These findings thereby contribute to the design of future transmission studies and the development of
331 future public health strategies.

332

333 **Authors' contributions**

334 SvL, DE, MAVH, JSP, AW, MH, CR contributed to the conception and design of the study; AW, SvL, MEH,
335 participated in the acquisition of data; DE and EK coordinated the laboratory analyses; AW, EK, SvL, JGCS,
336 SE, DE, and MAVH were responsible for data analyses and interpretation; AW, EK, SE, SvL and DE verified the
337 underlying data; AW, EK, SvL, DE wrote the manuscript. All authors had full access to all the data and reviewed
338 and approved the final version of the manuscript.

339 **Corresponding authors**

340 SFL van Lelyveld, E-mail: s.van.lelyveld@spaarnegasthuis.nl; D Eggink, E-mail: dirk.eggink@rivm.nl.

341 **Declaration of interests**

342 We declare no competing interests.

343 **Data availability statement**

344 Deidentified data collected for the study, including individual participant data collected during the study and a
345 data dictionary, will be shared upon reasonable request. These requests will be discussed with all project partners
346 (Spaarne Gasthuis and RIVM). Requests should be directed to s.van.lelyveld@spaarnegasthuis.nl
347 or dirk.eggink@rivm.nl. These requests will be reviewed and approved by the investigator and project partners
348 based on scientific merit. To gain access, data requesters will need to sign a data access agreement. Privacy-
349 sensitive data, which is traceable to the participant, will not be shared.

350 **Acknowledgements, funding and meeting(s) where the information has previously been presented**

351 There were no funding sources. The data has not been presented in international meetings.

352 We thank the team of the Public Health Services (GGD) Kennemerland for providing information to the
353 (possible) participants, the laboratory team of the National Institute for Public Health and the Environment
354 (RIVM), including Sophie van Tol, Gert-Jan Godeke, Coralie Valle, Lisa Wijsman, Bas van der Veer,
355 Annemarie van den Brandt, Jeroen Cremer, Sharon van den Brink, Ryanne Jaarsma, Kim Freriks, Lynn Aarts,
356 Sanne Bos, Mansoer Elahi, Jil Kocken for the laboratory analyses and the research team of the Spaarne Gasthuis
357 Academy, particularly Jacqueline Zonneveld, Sandra Kaamer van Hoegee, Mara van Roermund, Josseline
358 Veldhuijzen and Yara Sijm for their hard work and efforts concerning the continuation of the SARSLIVA 2.0
359 study.

360

361

362 **References**

- 363 1. (WHO) World Health Organization. Tracking SARS-CoV-2 variants [Internet]. Vol. 2023. [cited 2023
364 Jun 27]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/activities/tracking-SARS-CoV-2-variants>
- 365 2. Dhawan M, Saied AA, Mitra S, Alhumaydhi FA, Emran T Bin, Wilairatana P. Omicron variant
366 (B.1.1.529) and its sublineages: What do we know so far amid the emergence of recombinant variants of
367 SARS-CoV-2? *Biomed Pharmacother.* 2022;154:113522.
- 368 3. National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM). Variants of the coronavirus SARS-
369 CoV-2 [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 28]. Available from: [https://www.rivm.nl/en/coronavirus-covid-](https://www.rivm.nl/en/coronavirus-covid-19/virus/variants)
370 [19/virus/variants](https://www.rivm.nl/en/coronavirus-covid-19/virus/variants)
- 371 4. Shrestha LB, Foster C, Rawlinson W, Tedla N, Bull RA. Evolution of the SARS-CoV-2 omicron
372 variants BA.1 to BA.5: Implications for immune escape and transmission. *Rev Med Virol.*
373 2022;32(5):e2381.
- 374 5. Dejnirattisai W, Huo J, Zhou D, Schreiber G, Stuart DI, Sreaton GR, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron-
375 B.1.1.529 leads to widespread escape from neutralizing antibody responses. *Cell.* 2022;185(3):467–84.
- 376 6. Kuhlmann C, Mayer CK, Claassen M, Maponga T, Burgers WA, Keeton R, et al. Breakthrough
377 infections with SARS-CoV-2 omicron despite mRNA vaccine booster dose. *Lancet.*
378 2022;399(10325):625–6.
- 379 7. Sun K, Wang W, Gao L, Wang Y, Luo K, Ren L, et al. Transmission heterogeneities, kinetics, and
380 controllability of SARS-CoV-2. *Science (1979).* 2021;371(6526).
- 381 8. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Jr IML, Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household Secondary Attack Rates of SARS-
382 CoV-2 by Variant and Vaccination Status: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA*
383 *Netw Open.* 2022;5(4):e229317.
- 384 9. Kolodziej LM, van Lelyveld SFL, Haverkort ME, Mariman R, Sluiter-Post JGC, Badoux P, et al. High
385 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Household Transmission Rates
386 Detected by Dense Saliva Sampling. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2022;75(1):e10–9.

- 387 10. Frutos AM, Kuan G, Lopez R, Ojeda S, Shotwell A, Sanchez N, et al. Infection-induced immunity is
388 associated with protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection and decreased infectivity. *Clin Infect Dis.*
389 2023;76(12):2126–33.
- 390 11. Reukers DFM, van Boven M, Meijer A, Rots N, Reusken C, Roof I, et al. High Infection Secondary
391 Attack Rates of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Dutch Households Revealed by
392 Dense Sampling. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2022 Jan;74(1):52–8.
- 393 12. National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM). Archive COVID-19 vaccination
394 figures 2022 [Internet]. Vol. 2023. [cited 2023 Jun 27]. Available from: [https://www.rivm.nl/en/covid-](https://www.rivm.nl/en/covid-19-vaccination/archive-covid-19-vaccination-figures-2022)
395 [19-vaccination/archive-covid-19-vaccination-figures-2022](https://www.rivm.nl/en/covid-19-vaccination/archive-covid-19-vaccination-figures-2022)
- 396 13. National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM). Results Pienter Corona-Study Round
397 7 [Internet]. Vol. 2023. [cited 2023 Jun 27]. Available from: [https://www.rivm.nl/pienter-corona-](https://www.rivm.nl/pienter-corona-onderzoek/resultaten/ronde-7)
398 [onderzoek/resultaten/ronde-7](https://www.rivm.nl/pienter-corona-onderzoek/resultaten/ronde-7)
- 399 14. Baker JM, Nakayama JY, O’Hegarty M, McGowan A, Teran RA, Bart SM, et al. SARS-CoV-2
400 B.1.1.529 (Omicron) Variant Transmission Within Households - Four U.S. Jurisdictions, November
401 2021-February 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2022;71(9):341–6.
- 402 15. Lee J, Ko M, Kim S, Lim D, Park G, Lee SE. Household secondary attack rates and risk factors during
403 periods of SARS-CoV-2 Delta and Omicron variant predominance in the Republic of Korea. *Osong*
404 *Public Health Res Perspect.* 2023;14(4):263–71.
- 405 16. Lyngse FP, Mølbak K, Denwood M, Christiansen LE, Møller CH, Rasmussen M, et al. Effect of
406 vaccination on household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant of concern. *Nat Commun.* 2022
407 Jun;13(1):3764-y.
- 408 17. Jalali N, Brustad HK, Frigessi A, Macdonald EA, Meijerink H, Feruglio SL, et al. Increased household
409 transmission and immune escape of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron compared to Delta variants. *Nat*
410 *Commun.* 2022;13(1):5706.
- 411 18. Del Águila-Mejía J, Wallmann R, Calvo-Montes J, Rodríguez-Lozano J, Valle-Madrado T, Aginagalde-
412 Llorente A. Secondary Attack Rate, Transmission and Incubation Periods, and Serial Interval of SARS-
413 CoV-2 Omicron Variant, Spain. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2022;28(6):1224–8.

- 414 19. Veneti L, Bøås H, Kristoffersen AB, Stålcrantz J, Bragstad K, Hungnes O, et al. Reduced risk of
415 hospitalisation among reported COVID-19 cases infected with the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.1 variant
416 compared with the Delta variant, Norway, December 2021 to January 2022. *Euro Surveill.*
417 2022;27(4):2200077.
- 418 20. Stanoeva KR, van der Eijk AA, Meijer A, Kortbeek LM, Koopmans MPG, Reusken CBEM. Towards a
419 sensitive and accurate interpretation of molecular testing for SARS-CoV-2: a rapid review of 264
420 studies. *Euro Surveill.* 2021;26(10):2001134.
- 421 21. Artic Network. Protocols [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 22]. Available from: [https://artic.network/2-](https://artic.network/2-protocols.html)
422 [protocols.html](https://artic.network/2-protocols.html)
- 423 22. Allen H, Tessier E, Turner C, Anderson C, Blomquist P, Simons D, et al. Comparative transmission of
424 SARS-CoV-2 Omicron (B.1.1.529) and Delta (B.1.617.2) variants and the impact of vaccination:
425 national cohort study, England. *Epidemiol Infect.* 2023;151:e58.
- 426 23. Ogata T, Tanaka H, Tanaka E, Osaki N, Noguchi E, Osaki Y, et al. Increased Secondary Attack Rates
427 among the Household Contacts of Patients with the Omicron Variant of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 in
428 Japan. *J Environ Res Public Health.* 2022;19(13):8068.
- 429 24. Kim YC, Kim B, Son NH, Heo N, Nam Y, Shin A, et al. Vaccine Effect on Household Transmission of
430 Omicron and Delta SARS-CoV-2 Variants. *J Korean Med Sci.* 2023;38(1):e9.
- 431 25. Zeng B, Gao L, Zhou Q, Yu K, Sun F. Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines against SARS-CoV-2
432 variants of concern: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Med.* 2022;20(1):200.
- 433 26. Zhu Y, Xia Y, Pickering J, Bowen AC, Short KR. The role of children in transmission of SARS-CoV-2
434 variants of concern within households: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis, as at 30 June
435 2022. *Euro Surveill.* 2023;28(18):2200624.
- 436 27. Id YZ, Chew KY, Wu M, Karawita AC, Mccallum G, Steele LE, et al. Ancestral SARS-CoV-2, but not
437 Omicron, replicates less efficiently in primary pediatric nasal epithelial cells. 2022 [cited 2024 Mar 1];
438 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001728>
- 439 28. Suhail Y, Afzal J, Kshitiz. Incorporating and addressing testing bias within estimates of epidemic
440 dynamics for SARS-CoV-2. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2021;21(1):11.

441 29. Kennedy EB, Charifson M, Jehn M, Jensen EA, Vikse J. Prospective sampling bias in COVID-19
442 recruitment methods: experimental evidence from a national randomized survey testing recruitment
443 materials. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2022;22(1):251.

444 30. Centers for Disease Control Prevention (CDC). Z-score Data Files [Internet]. Available from:
445 <https://www.cdc.gov/growthcharts/zscore.htm>

446

447

Table I – Baseline characteristics of study participants (N=241)					
	Total no of participants	Index cases	Household members		
N	241	70	171		
Characteristic				P^a	OR^b [95% CI]
Child (<18 y)	100 (41.5)	24 (34.3)	76 (44.4)	0.147	0.65 [0.37-1.16]
Adult	141 (58.5)	46 (65.7)	95 (55.6)	0.147	1.53 [0.86-2.73]
Age, y, median (IQR)	33.0 (12.0-46.0)	38.0 (11.8-48.3)	21.0 (12.0-45.0)	0.058	1.02 [0.99-1.03]
Age group, y					
< 12	57 (23.7)	17 (24.3)	40 (23.4)		1 (ref)
12-17	43 (17.8)	7 (10.0)	36 (21.1)	0.121	0.46 [0.17-1.23]
18-39	43 (17.8)	13 (18.6)	30 (17.5)	0.965	1.02 [0.43-2.42]
40-49	69 (28.6)	21 (30.6)	48 (28.1)	0.941	1.03 [0.48-2.21]
50-65	29 (12.0)	12 (17.1)	17 (9.9)	0.286	1.66 [0.65-4.22]
Sex, female	123 (51.0)	43 (61.4)	80 (46.8)	0.040*	1.81 [1.03-3.20]
BMI class^c					
Normal weight	162 (67.2)	47 (67.1)	115 (67.3)		1 (ref)
Overweight	43 (17.8)	8 (11.4)	35 (20.5)	0.175	0.56 [0.24-1.30]
Obesity	23 (9.5)	11 (15.7)	12 (7.0)	0.074	2.24 [0.93-5.44]
Underweight	13 (5.4)	4 (5.7)	9 (5.3)	0.893	1.09 [0.32-3.71]
Atopic constitution	82 (34.0)	24 (34.3)	58 (33.9)	0.956	1.02 [0.57-1.83]
Underlying medical condition^d	33 (13.7)	9 (12.9)	24 (14.0)	0.809	0.90 [0.40-2.06]
Cardiovascular disease	6 (2.5)	2 (2.9)	4 (2.3)	0.815	1.23 [0.22-6.86]
Immune disorder	4 (1.7)	1 (1.4)	3 (1.8)	0.858	0.81 [0.08-7.94]
Diabetes	4 (1.7)	1 (1.4)	3 (1.8)	0.858	0.81 [0.08-7.94]
Lung disease	1 (0.4)	1 (1.4)	0
Other	18 (7.5)	4 (5.7)	14 (8.2)	0.605	0.74 [0.23-2.34]
Pre-existing immunity					
Naïve	26 (10.8)	8 (11.4)	18 (10.5)		1 (ref)
Previous infection only ^e	30 (12.4)	8 (11.4)	22 (12.9)	0.735	0.82 [0.26-2.61]
Previous vaccination only ^f	127 (52.7)	43 (61.4)	84 (49.1)	0.761	1.15 [0.46-2.86]
Hybrid ^g	58 (24.1)	11 (15.7)	47 (27.5)	0.236	0.53 [0.18-1.52]
Vaccination-status 5-11 years					
Unvaccinated	39 (86.7)	13 (81.3)	26 (89.7)		1 (ref)
1x	5 (11.1)	3 (18.8)	2 (6.9)	0.259	3.00 [0.45-20.24]
2x	1 (2.2)	0	1 (3.4)	1.000	..
Vaccination status ≥ 12 years					
Unvaccinated	5 (2.7)	2 (3.8)	3 (2.3)		1 (ref)
1x	3 (1.6)	1 (1.9)	2 (1.5)	0.851	0.75 [0.04-14.97]
2x	78 (42.4)	15 (28.3)	63 (48.1)	0.282	0.36 [0.06-2.33]
3x/booster vaccinated	98 (53.3)	35 (66.0)	63 (48.1)	0.846	0.83 [0.13-5.23]
Antibody titer day 1, median (IQR)^h	5000 (2000-14000)	5000 (1000-11250)	5500 (2000-16000)	0.110	0.98 [0.96-1.00]

Data are presented as No. (%) unless otherwise indicated.
Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; CI, confidence interval; IQR, interquartile range; OR, odds ratio; y, year.
^a P-value for comparison between household members and index cases.
^b Odds Ratio for comparison between household members and index cases.
^c BMI categories for index cases and household members <18 years of age were defined as BMI z-score <-2, underweight; -2 to 1, normal weight; 1-2, overweight; >2, obesity.³⁰ BMI categories for index cases and household members ≥18 years of age were defined as <18.5 kg/m², underweight; 18.5–24.9 kg/m², normal weight; 25.0–29.9 kg/m², overweight; ≥30.0 kg/m², obesity.

<p>^d Cardiovascular disease, lung disease, immune disorder, diabetes and other disorders.</p> <p>^e Only previous infection</p> <p>^f Only previous vaccination</p> <p>^g Previous infection and vaccination (at least one vaccination) (hybrid immunity)</p> <p>^h Blood available for 66 index cases (66/70, 94.3%) and 152 household members (152/171, 88.9%).</p>
--

448

449

	Total households	Households with secondary transmission	Households without secondary transmission	Household secondary attack rate (%)	
N	67	40	27	59.7	
Characteristic				P^a	OR^b [95%CI]
Median household size (IQR)	4.0 (4.0-4.0)	4.0 (4.0-4.0)	4.0 (4.0-4.0)	0.798	1.12 [0.47-2.66]
Household size, No. of persons					
3	14 (20.9)	8 (20.0)	6 (22.2)		1 (ref)
4	45 (67.2)	27 (67.5)	18 (66.7)	0.849	1.13 [0.33-3.79]
5	8 (11.9)	5 (12.5)	3 (11.1)	0.806	1.25 [0.21-7.41]
Data are presented as No. (%) unless otherwise indicated.					
The household secondary attack rate was 59.7%.					
Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; IQR, interquartile range; OR, odds ratio.					
^a P-value for comparison between households with secondary transmission and households without secondary transmission.					
^b Odds Ratio for comparison between households with secondary transmission and households without secondary transmission.					

450

451

Table III – Index Case Characteristics (N=70)					
	Total index cases	Index cases of households with transmission	Index cases of households without transmission	Univariate logistic regression	
N	70	42	28	P^a	OR [95% CI]
Characteristic					
Child (<18 y)	24 (34.3)	20 (47.6)	4 (14.3)	0.006*	5.46 [1.61-18.47]
Adult	46 (65.7)	22 (52.4)	24 (85.7)	0.006*	0.18 [0.05-0.62]
Age, y, median (IQR)	38.0 [11.8-48.3]	18.5 [8.8-43.0]	46.5 [41.0-50.8]	<0.001*	0.94 [0.91-0.98]
Age group, y					
< 12	17 (24.3)	15 (35.7)	2 (7.1)	0.002*	22.50 [3.14-161.47]
12-17	7 (10.0)	5 (11.9)	2 (7.1)	0.060	7.50 [0.92-61.05]
18-39	13 (18.6)	11 (26.2)	2 (7.1)	0.006*	16.50 [2.25-121.23]
40-49	21 (30.6)	8 (19.0)	13 (46.4)	0.446	1.85 [0.38-8.93]
50-65	12 (17.1)	3 (7.1)	9 (32.1)		1 (ref)
Sex, female	43 (61.4)	27 (64.3)	16 (57.1)	0.548	1.35 [0.51-3.59]
BMI class^c					
Normal weight	47 (67.1)	31 (73.8)	16 (57.1)		1 (ref)
Overweight	8 (11.4)	2 (4.8)	6 (21.4)	0.044*	1.17 [0.03-0.95]
Obesity	11 (15.7)	5 (11.9)	6 (21.4)	0.214	0.43 [0.11-1.63]
Underweight	4 (5.7)	4 (9.5)	0
Atopic constitution	24 (34.3)	16 (38.1)	8 (28.6)	0.412	1.54 [0.45-4.31]
Underlying medical condition^d	9 (12.9)	6 (14.3)	3 (10.7)	0.663	1.39 [0.32-6.08]
Pre-existing immunity					
Naïve or unknown infection	8 (11.4)	7 (16.7)	1 (3.6)		1 (ref)
Previous infection only ^e	8 (11.4)	6 (14.3)	2 (7.1)	0.529	0.43 [0.03-5.99]
Previous vaccination only ^f	43 (61.4)	24 (57.1)	19 (67.9)	0.124	0.18 [0.02-1.60]
Hybrid ^g	11 (15.7)	5 (11.9)	6 (21.4)	0.083	0.12 [0.01-1.32]
Time interval till study onset in weeks, median (IQR)					
Last infection ^e	16.1 (12.5-19.8)	16.6 (15.0-30.0)	10.4 (8.4-)	0.977	..
Last vaccination ^f	11.9 (10.0-15.9)	11.7 (10.1-16.6)	12.6 (9.9-15.7)	0.624	1.02 [0.94-1.10]
Last infection or vaccination ^g	13.3 (8.7-14.6)	13.7 (5.8-32.9)	11.8 (6.6-13.8)	0.359	1.01 [0.93-1.24]
Antibody titer day 1^h					
≤10	4 (5.7)	3 (7.1)	1 (3.6)		1 (ref)
10-100	1 (1.4)	1 (2.4)	0
>10	62 (88.6)	36 (85.7)	26 (92.9)	0.513	0.46 [0.05-4.69]
>100	61 (87.1)	35 (83.3)	26 (92.9)	0.498	0.50 [0.04-4.56]
>1000	55 (78.6)	29 (69.0)	26 (92.9)	0.404	0.37 [0.04-3.80]
>3000	40 (57.1)	20 (47.6)	20 (71.4)	0.359	0.33 [0.03-3.48]
>10.000	18 (25.7)	6 (14.3)	12 (42.9)	0.154	0.17 [0.01-1.96]
N.A.	4 (5.7)	3 (7.1)	1 (3.6)	1.000	1.00 [0.04-24.55]
Antibody titer day 1, median (IQR)^h	5000 (1000-11250)	3000 (1000-7000)	9000 (3000-15000)	0.049*	0.95 [0.90-1.00]
Symptom statusⁱ					
Severe symptoms ^j	0	0	0
Moderate symptoms	19 (27.1)	13 (31.0)	6 (21.4)	0.335	2.17 [0.45-10.44]
Mild symptoms	41 (58.6)	24 (57.1)	17 (60.7)	0.626	1.41 [0.35-5.65]
Asymptomatic	10 (14.3)	5 (11.9)	5 (17.9)		1 (ref)
Days of symptoms before study onset (day 1), median (IQR)	3.0 (2.0-4.0) (N=56)	3.0 (2.0-4.0) (N=36)	2.5 (2.0-3.8)	0.402	1.17 [0.81-1.70]

Data are presented as No. (%) unless otherwise indicated.
Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; CI, confidence interval; IQR, interquartile range; OR, odds ratio; SD, standard deviation; y, year.

^a P-value for comparison between index cases in households with secondary transmission and households without secondary transmission.

^b Odds Ratio for comparison between index cases in households with secondary transmission and households without secondary transmission.

^c BMI categories for index cases and household members <18 years of age were defined as BMI z-score <-2, underweight; -2 to 1, normal weight; 1-2, overweight; >2, obesity.³⁰ BMI categories for index cases and household members ≥18 years of age were defined as <18.5 kg/m², underweight; 18.5–24.9 kg/m², normal weight; 25.0–29.9 kg/m², overweight; ≥30.0 kg/m², obesity .

^d Cardiovascular disease, lung disease, immune disorder, diabetes, rheumatic disorder, and other disorders.

^e Index cases with previous infection only (n=8)

^f Index cases with previous vaccination only (n=43)

^g Index cases with previous infection and vaccination (at least one vaccination) (hybrid immunity) (n=11)

^h Blood available for 66 index cases (66/70, 94.3%).

ⁱ Maximum over ten time points.

^j Hospital admission due to coronavirus-related symptoms.

452

Table IV – Household Member Characteristics (N=171)					
	Total number of household members at risk	Secondary case	No secondary case	Per person secondary attack rate (%)	
N	171	71	100	58.5	
Characteristic	Univariate logistic regression				
					P^a
Child (<18 y)	76 (44.4)	31 (43.7)	45 (45.0)	0.862	0.95 [0.51-1.75]
Adult	95 (55.6)	40 (56.3)	55 (55.0)	0.862	1.06 [0.57-1.95]
Age, y, median (IQR)	21.0 (12.0-45.0)	36.0 [10.0-46.0]	20.0 [12.0-45.0]	0.620	1.00 [0.99-1.02]
Age group, y					
< 12	40 (23.4)	21 (29.6)	19 (19.0)	0.976	0.98 [0.32-3.06]
12-17	36 (21.1)	10 (14.1)	26 (26.0)	0.079	0.34 [0.10-1.14]
18-39	30 (17.5)	11 (15.5)	19 (19.0)	0.281	0.52 [0.15-1.72]
40-49	48 (28.1)	20 (28.2)	28 (28.0)	0.423	0.64 [0.21-1.93]
50-65	17 (9.9)	9 (12.7)	8 (8.0)		1 (ref)
Sex, female	80 (46.8)	37 (52.1)	43 (43.0)	0.240	1.44 [0.78-2.66]
BMI class^c					
Normal weight	115 (67.3)	42 (59.2)	73 (73.0)		1 (ref)
Overweight	35 (20.5)	17 (23.9)	18 (18.0)	0.203	1.64 [0.77-3.52]
Obesity	12 (7.0)	6 (8.5)	6 (6.0)	0.364	1.74 [0.53-5.73]
Underweight	9 (5.3)	6 (8.5)	3 (3.0)	0.089	3.48 [0.83-14.63]
Atopic constitution	58 (33.9)	25 (35.2)	33 (33.0)	0.763	1.10 [0.58-2.10]
Underlying medical condition^d	24 (14.0)	11 (15.5)	13 (13.0)	0.644	1.23 [0.52-2.92]
Pre-existing immunity					
Naïve or unknown infection	18 (10.5)	14 (19.7)	4 (4.0)		1 (ref)
Previous infection only ^e	22 (12.9)	7 (9.9)	15 (15.0)	0.006*	0.13 [0.03-0.56]
Previous vaccination only ^f	84 (49.1)	44 (62.0)	40 (40.0)	0.057	0.31 [0.10-1.03]
Hybrid ^g	47 (27.5)	6 (8.5)	41 (41.0)	<0.001*	0.04 [0.01-0.17]
Time interval till study onset in weeks, median (IQR)					
Last infection ^e	15.8 (12.4-20.7)	15.4 (13.3-15.9)	16.7 (10.6-39.4)	0.279	0.94 [0.85-1.05]
Last vaccination ^f	12.7 (10.1-16.6)	11.8 (10.1-16.4)	13.3 (9.9-16.8)	0.778	0.99 [0.94-1.05]
Last infection or vaccination ^g	10.7 (8.7-16.1)	18.5 (8.5-22.7)	10.4 (8.6-14.6)	0.047*	1.15 [1.00-1.33]
Antibody titer day 1^h					
≤10	8 (4.7)	6 (8.5)	2 (2.0)		1 (ref)
10-100	3 (1.8)	1 (1.4)	2 (2.0)	0.224	0.17 [0.01-2.98]
>10	144 (84.2)	55 (77.5)	89 (89.0)	0.058	0.21 [0.04-1.06]
>100	141 (82.5)	54 (76.1)	87 (87.0)	0.059	0.21 [0.04-1.06]
>1000	125 (73.1)	47 (66.2)	78(78.0)	0.055	0.20 [0.04-1.04]
>3000	99 (57.9)	36 (50.7)	63 (63.0)	0.049*	0.19 [0.04-0.99]
>10.000	55 (32.2)	14 (25.5)	41 (41.0)	0.013*	0.11 [0.02-0.63]
N.A.	19 (11.1)	10 (14.1)	9 (9.0)	0.289	0.37 [0.06-2.32]
Antibody titer day 1, median (IQR)^h	5500 (2000-16000)	4000 (1500-10000)	7000 (2000-21000)	0.005*	0.96 [0.93-0.99]
Symptom statusⁱ					
Severe symptoms ^j	-	-	-		
Moderate symptoms	32 (18.7)	19 (26.8)	13 (13.0)	<0.001*	12.57 [3.92-40.26]
Mild symptoms	91 (53.2)	47 (66.2)	44 (44.0)	<0.001*	9.19 [3.34-25.30]
Asymptomatic	48 (28.1)	5 (7.0)	43 (43.0)		1 (ref)

Data are presented as No. (%) unless otherwise indicated.

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; CI, confidence interval; IQR, interquartile range; OR, odds ratio; y, year

^a P-value for comparison between SARS-CoV-2 positive household members and SARS-CoV-2 negative household members

^b Odds Ratio for comparison between SARS-CoV-2 positive household members and SARS-CoV-2 negative household members

^c BMI categories for index cases and household members <18 years of age were defined as BMI z-score <-2, underweight; -2 to 1, normal weight; 1-2, overweight; >2, obesity.³⁰ BMI categories for index cases and household members ≥18 years of age were defined as <18.5 kg/m², underweight; 18.5–24.9 kg/m², normal weight; 25.0–29.9 kg/m², overweight; ≥30.0 kg/m², obesity.

^d Cardiovascular disease, lung disease, immune disorder, diabetes, rheumatic disorder, and other disorders.

^e Household members with previous infection only (n=22)

^f Household members with previous vaccination only (n=84)

^g Household members with previous infection and vaccination (at least 1 vaccination) (hybrid immunity) (n=47)


^h Blood available for 152 household members (152/171, 88.9%).

ⁱ Maximum over ten time points.

^j Hospital admission due to coronavirus-related symptoms.

453

Figure I. Study design




Households consisting of index case(s) and at least two household members were enrolled upon a PCR-confirmed index case. SARS-CoV-2 PCR was performed on saliva samples obtained on days 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 14, 21, 28, 35, and 42. Whole genome sequencing was performed on the saliva samples with the highest viral load for phylogenetic analysis. SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were measured in serum samples collected on days 1 and 42. Symptom questionnaires were obtained on saliva sampling days. Household members with a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection within eight weeks before study-onset (RPHM) were not eligible to participate fully in the study as RNA detection from the earlier infection might affect transmission data.²⁰ Their recent positive NP/OP-sample was sequenced and compared with index case and household members to investigate a possible role of this participant in SARS-CoV-2 transmission within the household.

Abbreviations: Max, maximum; PCR, polymerase chain reaction.

Figure created in BioRender.com

Figure II. Phylogenetic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 sequences within households



Maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree based on all sequences obtained from (each SARS-CoV-2 positive) participants' saliva samples with the highest viral load. The tree shows the genetic distance between sequences, to check for single or multiple introductions of the virus within one household. Sequences of index and household members are coloured per household. Therefore, the different colours each represent a household. Households are numbered H01 to H59. Each dot represents the sequence of the specimen of one of the participants. This figure only shows the sequences of those households for which whole genome sequencing succeeded for multiple sequences of which at least one household member (in 85 individuals of 32 households). Sequences that cluster, are displayed in close proximity in this tree, suggesting infection with the same strain, which is expected in case of actual transmission. Asterisks indicate the households with genetically diverse

sequences between its' household members and/or index case. Genetically diverse sequences between the members of a household shows that this household had multiple introductions of the virus, instead of spread from one index case to other members of the household. These households with genetically diverse sequences are removed for our sensitivity analyses. Therefore, only households where transmission from index case to its' household members was confirmed by sequencing are included in the sensitivity analysis. In this sensitivity analysis, a minimal SAR was calculated of only proven transmission.

455

456