## **1 Estimating the generation time for<br>
2 influenza transmission using** 2 influenza transmission using<br>3 household data in the United States<br>4 Louis Yat Hin Chan<sup>1</sup>, Sinead E. Morris<sup>1,9</sup>, Melissa S. Stockwell<sup>2</sup>, Natalie M. Bowman<sup>3</sup>, Edwin Asturias<sup>4</sup>, 3 **household data in the United States**<br>
<sup>3</sup> Louis Yat Hin Chan<sup>1</sup>, Sinead E. Morris<sup>1,9</sup>, Melissa S. Stockwell<sup>2</sup>, Natalie M. Bowman<sup>3</sup>, Edwin Asturi<br>
<sup>3</sup> Suchitra Rao<sup>4</sup>, Karen Lutrick<sup>5</sup>, Katherine D. Ellingson<sup>5</sup>, Huon

Louis Yat Hin Chan<sup>+</sup>, Sinead E. Morris<sup>47</sup>, Melissa S. Stockwell<sup>4</sup>, Natalie M. Bowman<sup>3</sup>, Edwin Asturias<sup>+</sup>,<br>5 Suchitra Rao<sup>4</sup>, Karen Lutrick<sup>5</sup>, Katherine D. Ellingson<sup>5</sup>, Huong Q. Nguyen<sup>6</sup>, Yvonne Maldonado<sup>7</sup>, Son H<br> 5 Suchitra Rao<sup>+</sup>, Karen Lutrick<sup>-</sup>, Katherine D. Ellingson<sup>-</sup>, Huong Q. Nguyen<sup>o</sup>, Yvonne Maldonado<sup>-</sup>, Son H.<br>6 McLaren<sup>2</sup>, Ellen Sano<sup>2</sup>, Jessica E. Biddle<sup>1</sup>, Sarah E. Smith-Jeffcoat<sup>1</sup>, Matthew Biggerstaff<sup>1</sup>, Melissa

6 McLaren", Ellen Sano", Jessica E. Biddle", Sarah E. Smith-Jeffcoat", Matthew Biggerstaff", Melissa A.<br>7 Rolfes<sup>1</sup>, H. Keipp Talbot<sup>8</sup>, Carlos G. Grijalva<sup>8</sup>, Rebecca K. Borchering<sup>1</sup>, Alexandra M. Mellis<sup>1</sup>, RVTN-<br>8 Sent

, H. Keipp Talbot", Carlos G. Grijalva<br>El Study Group<br>Centers for Disease Control and Pre<br>Columbia University Irving Medical , Rebecca K. Borchering<sup>1</sup> , Alexandra M. Mellis<sup>1</sup> 7 , RVTN-

- 
- Sentinel Study Group<br>1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 9 1. Centers for Di<br>1. Centers for Di<br>2. Columbia University of I
- 
- 
- 2. Columbia University Irving Medical Center<br>1. 3. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill<br>2. 4. University of Colorado School of Medicine a 11 3. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill<br>12 4. University of Colorado School of Medicine<br>13 5. University of Arizona 12 4. University of Colorado School of Medicine<br>13 5. University of Arizona<br>14 6. Marshfield Clinic Research Institute
- 
- 13 5. University of Arizona<br>14 6. Marshfield Clinic Research Institute<br>15 7. Stanford University
- 
- 14 6. Marshfield Clinic Rese<br>15 7. Stanford University<br>16 8. Vanderbilt University 15 7. Stanford University<br>16 8. Vanderbilt University Medical Cente<br>17 9. Goldbelt Professional Services 16 8. Vanderbilt Universit<br>17 9. Goldbelt Profession<br>18 \* Influenza Division, Centers
- 

17 9. Goldbelt Professional Services<br>18 \* Influenza Division, Centers for Disease Contr<br>19 US (LouisChan@cdc.gov) 18 <sup>\*</sup> Influenza Division, Centers for Diseas<br>19 US (<u>LouisChan@cdc.gov</u>)

19 bus (<u>LouisChan@cdc.gov)</u><br>20 **Keywords** Enters for Disease Control and Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road, Atlanta, Atlanta, Atlanta, Atlanta, A

# 20 Keywords<br>
21 • Generati<br>
22 • Serial int<br>
23 • Incubatio

- 20 Keywords<br>21 Generation interv
- 
- 21 Generation interval<br>22 Serial interval<br>23 Incubation period<br>24 Pre-symptomatic tra 22 • Serial interval<br>23 • Incubation per<br>24 • Pre-symptoma<br>25 • Household tra
- 24 Pre-symptomatic transmission<br>25 Household transmission<br>26 Respiratory diseases<br>27 Abstract
	-
- 23 Incubation period<br>24 Pre-symptomatic t<br>25 Household transm<br>26 Respiratory diseas 25 • Household transmission<br>26 • Respiratory diseases<br>27 Abstract

# 27 **Abstract**<br>28 The generation<br>29 essential for u<br>30 the real-time

28 The generation time, representing the interval between infections in primary and secondary cases, is<br>29 essential for understanding and predicting the transmission dynamics of seasonal influenza, including

- 29 essential for understanding and predicting the transmission dynamics of seasonal influenza, including<br>30 the real-time effective reproduction number (Rt). However, comprehensive generation time estimate<br>31 for seasonal
- 20 the real-time effective reproduction number (Rt). However, comprehensive generation time estimates<br>21 for seasonal influenza, especially post the 2009 influenza pandemic, are lacking.<br>22 We estimated the generation time
- 
- 31 for seasonal influenza, especially post the 2009 influenza pandemic, are lacking.<br>32 We estimated the generation time utilizing data from a 7-site case-ascertained household study in the<br>33 United States over two influe 32 We estimated the generation time utilizing data from a 7-site case-ascertained h<br>33 United States over two influenza seasons, 2021/2022 and 2022/2023. More than<br>34 tested positive for influenza and their household conta
- 33 United States over two influenza seasons, 2021/2022 and 2022/2023. More than 200 individuals who<br>34 tested positive for influenza and their household contacts were enrolled within 7 days of the first illnes<br>35 in the ho
- 1333 United States over two influenzations over the States over the States over the first illness<br>35 United States over the first illness<br>36 United States and collecting nasal swabs, which were tested for influenza via RT-
- 35 in the household. All participants were prospectively followed for 10 days completing daily symptom<br>36 diaries and collecting nasal swabs, which were tested for influenza via RT-PCR. We analyzed these data
- 35 in the household. All participants were prospectively followed for 10 days completing daily symptom<br>36 diaries and collecting nasal swabs, which were tested for influenza via RT-PCR. We analyzed these data

- 
- 37 by modifying a previously published Bayesian data augmentation approach that imputes infection times<br>38 of cases to obtain both intrinsic (assuming no susceptible depletion) and realized (observed within<br>39 household) g
- 
- the incubation period, and generated estimates of the proportion of transmission before symptomatic 39 the incubation period, and generated estimates of the proportion of transmission before symptomation<br>41 onset, infectious period, and latent period.<br>42 We estimated a mean intrinsic generation time of 3.2 (95% credible
- 
- 41 onset, infectious period, and latent period.<br>42 We estimated a mean intrinsic generation time of 3.2 (95% credible interval, Crl: 2.9-3.6) days, with a<br>43 realized household generation time of 2.8 (95% Crl: 2.7-3.0) day
- 42 We estimated a mean intrinsic generation t<br>43 a realized household generation time of 2.8 (<br>44 a sensitivity to incubation period variation. Es 42 We estimated a mean intrinsic generation time of 3.2 (95% credible interval, CrI: 2.9-3.6) days, with a<br>43 realized household generation time of 2.8 (95% CrI: 2.7-3.0) days. The generation time exhibited limited<br>44 sens
- sensitivity to incubation period variation. Estimates of the proportion of transmission that occurred
- 45 before symptom onset, the infectious period, and the latent period were sensitive to variation in<br>46 incubation periods.<br>47 Our study contributes to the ongoing efforts to refine estimates of the generation time for inf
- 
- 46 incubation periods.<br>47 before symptom on set infectious period, and the included were sensitive for influer<br>48 Our estimates, derived from recent data following the COVID-19 pandemic, are consistent with pi 47 Our study contribute<br>48 Our estimates, derived<br>49 pre-pandemic estim
- 48 Our estimates, derived from recent data following the COVID-19 pandemic, are consistent with previous<br>
49 pre-pandemic estimates, and will be incorporated into real-time Rt estimation efforts.<br>
50 **Introduction**
- 49 pre-pandemic estimates, and will be incorporated into real-time Rt estimation efforts.<br>19 **Introduction**<br>19 The generation time, a crucial parameter in understanding the dynamics of infectious

- 51 The generation time, a crucial parameter in understanding the dynamics of infectious diseases, is<br>52 defined as the time interval between infections in primary and secondary cases. In the context of
- **Introduction**<br>
The generation time, a crucial parameter in understanding the dynamics of infectious diseases, is<br>
defined as the time interval between infections in primary and secondary cases. In the context of<br>
seasonal
- 
- 11 The generation time, a crucial parameter in understanding the dynamics of infectious increases.<br>
51 Seasonal influenza, estimation of the generation time becomes increasingly important for predictive trajectory of outbr 53 seasonal influenza, estimation of the generation time becomes increasingly important for prediction-<br>54 trajectory of outbreaks and informed public health decision-making during an influenza season. The interval represe 13 Seasonal influences of the generation of the generation of the generating input time becomes transmission.<br>54 trajectory of outbreaks and informed public health decision-making during an influenza season. This<br>56 likely
- 55 trajectory of outbreaks and informed public health decision-making an influence outbreaks and influenza infections, reflecting when most transmission-<br>56 likely to happen.<br>57 Estimating the generation time is challengin
- 
- 56 likely to happen.<br>57 Estimating the generation time is challenging because few investigations can accurately detect the exaction<br>58 time of infection. The generation time is often inferred from the serial interval, defi
- 57 Lettimating the get<br>58 time of infection.<br>59 between sympto 57 Estimating the generation time is challenging because few investigations can accurately detect the exaction. The generation time is often inferred from the serial interval, defined as the time<br>between symptom onsets of
- 59 between symptom onsets of primary and secondary cases (Svensson 2007), due to the practicality of observing symptom onsets rather than infections. However, this alternative measure may not alway approximate the generati
- 50 observing symptom onsets rather than infections. However, this alternative measure may not always<br>51 approximate the generation time due to its dependence on the incubation period, defined as the<br>52 duration from infect
- Enterting symptom onsets rather than infection times is alternative measure measure may not analyze<br>62 obtation from infection to symptom onset, and the possibility of asymptomatic infections.<br>63 Accurate estimation of the
- 
- 62 duration from infection to symptom onset, and the possibility of asymptomatic infections.<br>63 Accurate estimation of the generation time is important for predicting the real-time effective<br>64 reproduction number (Rt), a Experimental inferior to symptom onto your and the possibility of asymptomate information<br>64 decurate estimation of the generation time is important for predicting the real-time effection<br>65 2020). During the 2023/2024 inf
- Franchise estimation of the generation and the map changes predicting in the time in control<br>65 according the 2023/2024 influenza season, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention<br>66 estimated the current epidemic gro
- Frementing the 2023/2024 influenza season, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)<br>66 estimated the current epidemic growth status for influenza infections in the U.S. as either growing or<br>67 declining based o
- estimated the current epidemic growth status for influenza infections in the U.S. as either growing or<br>67 declining based on the Rt (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2024) (Centers for Disease<br>68 Control and Prev
- 
- 
- 67 declining based on the Rt (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2024) (Centers for Disease<br>68 Control and Prevention 2024). For this estimate, the generation time was approximated with a serial<br>69 interval from a 68 Control and Prevention 2024). For this estimate, the generation time was approximated with a se<br>69 interval from a study by Cowling et al. (Cowling, et al. 2009) that utilized data collected in Hong Ko<br>70 2007, prior to 68 Control and Prevention 2024). For this estimate, the generation time was approximated with a serial<br>69 interval from a study by Cowling et al. (Cowling, et al. 2009) that utilized data collected in Hong Kong in<br>70 2007,
- 
- From a structure from a study by Colling et al. (Colling, et al. 2007, and under the concernent in Hong Kong<br>The Superior of the 2009 H1N1 influenza pandemic.<br>The interval from a structure of the Superior of Superior State The 2007, prior to the 2009 Handama parameters in the 2009 H1<br>71 To improve our understanding of seasonal influenz<br>73 generation time estimates derived from an influen
- 12 Sumprove our understanding of season minimized contemporary interests a network of the seasonal provides updated<br>17 Superation time estimates derived from an influenza household transmission study (Rolfes, et al. 2023)<br>
- 
- Transformation time estimates derived from an influenza household transmission study (Rolfes, et al. 2023)<br>This conducted during the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 influenza seasons in the U.S. We employ a model using<br>This analys 23 generation time estimates derived from an influence from an influence from plus, (Figures, et al. 2021)<br>75 a published Bayesian data augmentation approach (Hart, Abbott, et al. 2022) (Hart, Maini and<br>76 Thompson 2021) (
- 
- 75 a published Bayesian data augmentation approach (Hart, Abbott, et al. 2022) (Hart, Maini and<br>76 Thompson 2021) (Hart, Miller, et al. 2022) to impute missing event times, including infections and 76 Thompson 2021) (Hart, Miller, et al. 2022) to impute missing event times, including infections and Thompson 2021) (Hart, Miller, et al. 2022) to impute missing event times, including infections and  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  $\mathcal{T}_1$  , thompson 2021) to impute missing event times, including infections and

- 
- 57 symptom onsets of cases, and estimate generation times. We estimate both the intrinsic generation<br>
78 time, which assumes no susceptible depletion, as well as the realized household generation time<br>
79 observed within t
- 
- The state of the household setting. We also estimate the serial interval. We derived estimate<br>
28 across the two seasons, virus types (influenza A and B), and household sizes to understand potent<br>
22 across the two seasons 20 across the two seasons, virus types (influenza A and B), and household sizes to understand potentiand<br>21 differences and robustness to model assumptions. The insights gained from these sensitivity analys<br>22 contribute t
- 
- 
- 81 differences and robustness to model assumptions. The insights gained from these sensitivity analyses<br>82 contribute to our understanding of the reliability of our estimates across different data stratifications<br>83 and as 82 contribute to our understanding of the reliability of our estimates across different data stratifications<br>83 and assumptions, providing evidence that the generation time has remained substantially unchanged<br>84 over the 83 and assumptions, providing evidence that the generation time has remained substantially unchanged<br>84 over the last decade or two.<br>85 We also estimate other transmission parameters, including the proportion of transmissi
- 
- 85 Me also estimate other trans<br>86 Symptomatic onset, the infer<br>87 Symptomatic transmission, the
- 85 We also estimate other transmission parameters, including the proportion of transmission before<br>86 arematic onset, the infectious period, and the latent period. This helps in assessing pre- and post-
- 
- 86 symptomatic onset, the infectious period, and the latent period. This helps in assessing pre- and portion of<br>87 symptomatic transmission, thereby providing insights to inform effective disease control strategie.<br>88 Thes  $\frac{8}{5}$  symptom, the infectious period, and the latent period. This help is help in assessing pre-87 symptomatic transmission, thereby providing insights to inform effective disease control strategies.<br>
88 These insights are crucial for preventing pre-symptomatic transmission through interventions such as<br>
89 isolation 89 isolation.<br>90 Material and methods experience transmission through interventions such as a method intervention through in
- er<br><sub>90</sub> Materi<br><sub>91</sub> Househ 90 **Material and methods**<br>91 Household data<br>92 Participants included in this analysis<br>93 Respiratory Virus Transmission Netv

- 
- 91 Household data<br>
92 Participants included in this analysis were enrolled in a 7-site case-ascertained household study, the<br>
93 Respiratory Virus Transmission Network Sentinel (RVTN-S), conducted in the U.S. over two co Respiratory Virus Transmission Network – Sentinel (RVTN-S), conducted in the U.S. over two consect<br>94 Influenza seasons: 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 (Rolfes, et al. 2023). After informed consent was obtain<br>95 International stu
- 94 influenza seasons: 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 (Rolfes, et al. 2023). After informed consent was obtained,<br>95 the study enrolled individuals identified with influenza infections via polymerase chain reaction (PCR)<br>96 testin
- 
- the study enrolled individuals identified with influenza infections via polymerase chain reaction (PCR)<br>96 testing and their household contacts within 7 days of the initial illness onset within the household.<br>97 Households 1999 the study enrolled individuals individuals in the study of the initial illness onset within the household.<br>1979 Households were only enrolled if the index case who first presented for clinical testing was the first<br>19
- 
- 
- 97 Households were only enrolled if the index case who first presented for clinical testing was the first<br>98 symptomatic or positive person in the household, with no other members of the household<br>99 symptomatic on the fir experiments were entity the index case symptoms. Participants of the household<br>99 Symptomatic on the first day of index case symptoms. Participants, including both index cases and<br>00 household contacts, were then prospecti examples in person in the household contacts person in the household contacts, were then prospectively followed for 10 days, during which they complete symptom diaries and collected daily nasal swabs, which were tested for
- 99 symptomatic on the first day of index case symptoms. Participants, including both index cases and<br>100 household contacts, were then prospectively followed for 10 days, during which they completed daily<br>101 symptom diari
- 
- 101 symptom diaries and collected daily nasal swabs, which were tested for influenza via RT-PCR.<br>102 The dataset encompasses detailed information regarding symptoms and viral testing, including four<br>103 The dataset encompa 102 The dataset encompasses detailed information regarding symptoms and viral testing, includin<br>103 main variables used in the model: whether individuals tested positive for influenza, their symp<br>104 status, dates of posit
- main variables used in the model: whether individuals tested positive for influenza, their symptomat<br>104 Status, dates of positive test results, and dates of symptom onset. Using the test positivity and<br>105 Symptomatic sta
- 
- 105 symptomatic status, we stratified individuals into three types: symptomatic infected, asymptom<br>106 infected, and uninfected. Both the dates of positive test results and symptom onset were used<br>107 bounds for the date o
- 104 status, dates of positive test results, and dates of symptom onset. Using the test positivity and<br>105 symptomatic status, we stratified individuals into three types: symptomatic infected, asymptomatic<br>106 infected, and symptomatic status, we stratified individuals into three types: symptomatic infected, asymptomatic<br>106 infected, and uninfected. Both the dates of positive test results and symptom onset were used as upper<br>107 bounds for t
- 
- the 107 bounds for the date of infection for each individual.<br>108 In the primary analysis, we excluded households with multiple co-primary cases, i.e., more than one<br>109 Individual exhibiting the same date of the earliest 107 bounds for the date of infection for the manufacture<br>108 In the primary analysis, we excluded households wit<br>100 we also performed a separate stratified analysis that
- 
- 108 Individual exhibiting the same date of the earliest symptom onset concurrently. To assess robustness<br>110 We also performed a separate stratified analysis that included households both with and without<br>111 Inuitiple co-109 individual exhibiting the same date of the earliest symptom onset concurrently. To assess robustrues we also performed a separate stratified analysis that included households both with and without multiple co-primary c
- 

## 112 Estimating the generation time<br>113 We employed a Susceptible-Exposed-Inf<br>114 augmentation, originally developed by F<br>115 19 contact tracing data. The model was

- 111 multiple co-primary cases.<br>112 Estimating the generation time<br>113 We emploved a Susceptible-Exposed-Infectious-Recovered (SEIR) model with Bavesian data 112 Estimating the generation time<br>113 We employed a Susceptible-Exposed-Infectious-Recovered (SEIR) model with Bayesian data<br>114 augmentation, originally developed by Hart et al. (Hart, Maini and Thompso
- 114 augmentation, originally developed by Hart et al. (Hart, Maini and Thompson 2021) for analy<br>115 19 contact tracing data. The model was also used in two subsequent studies of household data<br>116 United Kingdom (Hart, Abb
- 
- 
- 11, augmentation, original metallic compartments for asymptomatic, pro-symptomatic and symptomatic 116 United Kingdom (Hart, Abbott, et al. 2022) (Hart, Miller, et al. 2022). The SEIR model, referred to as th<br>117 mechanistic model, which includes compartments for asymptomatic, pre-symptomatic and symptoma<br>117 117 mechanistic model, which includes compartments for asymptomatic, pre-symptomatic and symptomatic<br>117 mechanistic model, which includes compartments for asymptomatic, pre-symptomatic and symptomatic  $117$  mechanistic model, which includes comparison comparison as  $\frac{3}{2}$

- 
- infectious stages (Hart, Maini and Thompson 2021). Each stage may have different relative<br>
119 infectiousness, or transmission rates. Upon infection and entry into the non-infectious exposed stage,<br>
120 individuals may pro
- 
- asymptomatic or by developing symptoms following a pre-symptomatic stage. Consequently,
- 
- 123 We estimated both intrinsic and realized generation times by integrating data augmentation Markov 122 transmissions may occur before symptom onset, depending on the length of the incubation portons the estimated both intrinsic and realized generation times by integrating data augmentation N<br>124 Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) 123 We estimated both intrinsic and realized generation times by integrating data augmentation Markov<br>124 Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) techniques (Hart, Abbott, et al. 2022), to impute infection times and<br>125 Symptom onset of
- 
- 124 Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) techniques (Hart, Abbott, et al. 2022), to impute infection times and<br>125 symptom onset of cases. The intrinsic generation time assumes no depletion of susceptible individual<br>125 providing an e Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) techniques (Hart, Abbott, et al. 2022), to impute infection times and<br>125 symptom onset of cases. The intrinsic generation time assumes no depletion of susceptible individuals,<br>126 providing an est
- 
- 126 symptom onset on the international generation time assumes in approach of cases providing an estimate of the time it takes for an infected individual to infect others in the community<br>127 with an unlimited supply of su 127 with an unlimited supply of susceptible individuals. The realized household generation time reflects the actual time interval observed within households, restricted by the depletion of susceptible individuals over time
- 128 actual time interval observed within households, restricted by the depletion of susceptible individuals<br>129 over time. Susceptible depletion refers to the gradual reduction in the number of individuals within a<br>130 pop
- 
- 
- 129 over time. Susceptible depletion refers to the gradual reduction in the number of individuals within a<br>130 population that have not yet been infected with a virus. For example, within the SEIR framework,<br>131 members ma 130 population that have not yet been infected with a virus. For example, within the SEIR framework,<br>131 members may become infected, develop immunity, and subsequently be removed from the susceptib<br>132 and 132 131 population that have not yet been infected minimum in the changes, minimum contraction,<br>132 pool. Considering this distinction allows for a more thorough understanding of influenza transmiss<br>133 dynamics, capturing bot
- 132 pool. Considering this distinction allows for a more thorough understanding of influenza transmission<br>133 dynamics, capturing both theoretical and observed aspects of transmission.<br>134 We also estimated several other c
- 
- 
- dynamics, capturing both theoretical and observed aspects of transmission.<br>134 We also estimated several other crucial transmission parameters, including the proportion of<br>135 transmission before symptomatic onset, the rat 134 We also estimated several other crucial transmission parameters, including t<br>135 transmission before symptomatic onset, the ratio of pre-symptomatic to syn<br>136 rates (i.e., relative infectiousness of symptomatic infect 135 transmission before symptomatic onset, the ratio of pre-symptomatic to symptomatic transm<br>136 rates (i.e., relative infectiousness of symptomatic infected individuals before symptom onset of<br>137 to after), as well as t
- 135 transmission before symptomatic onset, the ratio of pre-symptomatic to symptomatic transmission<br>136 trates (i.e., relative infectiousness of symptomatic infected individuals before symptom onset compared<br>137 to after),
- 137 to after), as well as the latent period, the pre-symptomatic infectious period, and the symptomatic<br>138 infectious period, all under the SEIR framework.<br>139 In adapting the model for our influenza study, we used estima
- 
- The infectious period, all under the SEIR framework.<br>139 to adapting the model for our influenza study, we used estimates for the incubation period of influe<br>140 A from a systematic review by Lessler et al. (Lessler, et al 139 In adapting the model for our influenza study, works and the SEIR from a systematic review by Lessler et al. (Less<br>141 variations derived from parallel estimates for inf
- 
- 139 In adapting the model for our influenza study, we used estimates for the incubation period of influer<br>140 A from a systematic review by Lessler et al. (Lessler, et al. 2009). In sensitivity analyses, we explored<br>141 va 141 *A from a systematic review by Letter Com*, (Letter, 20 m 2009, m Centrally, analyses, it can be variations derived from parallel estimates for influenza B (Lessler, et al. 2009) and for influenza<br>142 A (H1N1)pdm09 (Tu
- 
- 142 A(H1N1)pdm09 (Tuite, et al. 2010).<br>143 Regarding the relative infectiousness of asymptomatic infected individuals compared with symptomatic infected individuals, we assumed a value of 0.57 (i.e., asymptomatic infected
- 143 Regarding the relative infectiousnes<br>144 infected individuals, we assumed a<br>145 infectious than those symptomatic Regarding the relative infectiousness of asymptomatic infected individuals compared with symptomatic<br>144 infected individuals, we assumed a value of 0.57 (i.e., asymptomatic infected individuals were 43% less<br>145 infectiou
- 
- al. 2023), and we also conducted sensitivity analyses using values of 0.11 and 1.54 based on the al. 2023), and we also conducted sensitivity analyses using values of 0.11 and 1.54 based on the<br>147 corresponding 95% credible interval (CrI).<br>148 To compare posterior distributions of estimates, we calculated the overlap
- 
- corresponding 95% credible interval (CrI).<br>148 To compare posterior distributions of estimates, we calculated the overlapping index, a measure<br>149 distribution similarities (Pastore 2018) (Pastore and Calcagnì 2019). A val 148 To compare posterior distributions of estinated intervals.<br>149 distribution similarities (Pastore 2018) (Pa<br>150 similarity, implying no substantial differen
- 148 To compare posterior and annually the compared the overlapping mean, a measure of the distribution similarities (Pastore 2018) (Pastore and Calcagni 2019). A value close to 1 indicates high similarity, imply substantia
- 
- 
- 150 similarity, implying no substantial differences, while a value close to 0 indicates low similarity, implyi<br>151 substantial differences. We compared the estimates of generation time across multiple data<br>152 stratificati 151 substantial differences. We compared the estimates of generation time across multiple data<br>152 stratifications and sensitivity analyses to the primary results excluding households with multiple coprimary cases. 152 Stratifications and sensitivity analyses to the primary results excluding households with multi<br>153 Stratifications and sensitivity analyses to the primary results excluding households with multi<br>154 The model was impl
- 
- primary cases.<br>154 The model was implemented in R (version 4.3.1) with 1,000,000 Markov chain Monte Carlo iterations,<br>155 discarding the initial 20% as burn-in and obtaining posterior distributions by thinning every 100<br>15
- discarding the initial 20% as burn-in and obtaining posterior distributions by thinning every 100<br>156 iterations. The code for the model is available at https://github.com/CDCgov/influenza-<br>157 generation time-us.
- 156 iterations. The code for the model is available at https://github.com/CDCgov/influenza-<br>157 generation time-us.
- 157 g<u>eneration.</u><br>157 generation

- 158 Ethics statement<br>159 This study was reviewed and approved by the IRB at Vanderbilt University Medical Center (see 45 C.F.R.<br>160 part 46.114; 21 C.F.R. part 56.114).<br>161 Results
- 160 part 46.114; 21 C.F.R. part 56.114).<br>161 **Results**

## 162 The household data

- 161 Results<br>162 The household data<br>163 During the data cleaning process, we excluded 93 individuals who did not have at least two valid PCR<br>164 tests and 2 individuals who were the only household members. In the primary an
- 162 The household data<br>163 During the data cleaning p<br>164 tests and 2 individuals who<br>165 excluded 23 individuals fro 164 tests and 2 individuals who were the only household members. In the primary analysis, we further<br>165 excluded 23 individuals from 6 households that had co-primary cases. The final cleaned dataset,<br>166 covering both sea
- excluded 23 individuals from 6 households that had co-primary cases. The final cleaned dataset,<br>166 the overing both seasons, comprised 820 individuals from 246 households (Table 1).<br>167 As shown in Table 1, more household
- 
- 167 As shown in Table 1, more households were enrolled in the 2022/2023 season. In<br>168 influenza A viruses predominantly circulated. In the 2021/2022 season, influenza /<br>169 identified in 78% of individuals, and influenza
- 168 influenza A viruses predominantly circulated. In the 2021/2022 season, influenza A(H3N2) virus was 168 influenza A viruses predominantly circulated. In the 2021/2022 season, influenza A(H3N2) virus<br>169 identified in 78% of individuals, and influenza A(H1N1) virus was identified in 1% of individuals. I<br>170 2022/2023 seas
- 169 identified in 78% of individuals, and influenza A(H1N1) virus was identified in 1% of individuals. In the<br>170 2022/2023 season, the percentages changed to 64% and 6%, respectively. Since households consistil<br>171 of 3 o
- 169 identified in 78% of individuals, and influenza A(H1N1) virus was identified in 1% of individuals. In the<br>170 2022/2023 season, the percentages changed to 64% and 6%, respectively. Since households consisting<br>171 of 3
- of 3 or 4 members were the majority, we stratified the data into two groups: those with 2 or 3
- members, and those with 4 or greater, to ensure comparability in quantity.



## $\frac{Table 1}{Table 1}$ <br>Conspara 173 Trans 1. Characteristics of models add.<br>174 Consistent estimates of the<br>175 The the primary analysis using all dat

- 174 Consistent estimates of the generation time across data stratifications and<br>175 parameter assumptions<br>176 In the primary analysis using all data excluding households with multiple co-primary cases from l<br>177 seasons, w 175 parameter assumptions<br>176 In the primary analysis using all<br>177 seasons, we estimated a mean<br>178 (Figure 1A, 1B and Table 2). The
- 
- 176 In the primary analysis using all data excluding households with multiple co-primary cases from both<br>177 seasons, we estimated a mean intrinsic generation time of 3.2 (95% credible interval, Crl: 2.9-3.6) days<br>178 (Fig 178 (Figure 1A, 1B and Table 2). The corresponding mean (intrinsic) serial interval was 3.2 (95% Crl: 2.8-3.5)<br>179 days, with a standard deviation (SD) of 2.2 (95% Crl: 1.8-2.6) days. The mean realized household<br>180 genera
- 179 days, with a standard deviation (SD) of 2.2 (95% CrI: 1.8-2.6) days. The mean realized household<br>180 generation time was 2.8 (95% CrI: 2.7-3.0) days, nearly half a day shorter than the mean intrinsic<br>181 generation tim
- 180 generation time vas 2.8 (95% CrI: 2.7-3.0) days, nearly half a day shorter than the mean intrinsic<br>181 generation time.
- 181 generation time.<br>
2.8 (95% Critical and mean interior than the mean intrinsic and mean interior than the mean intrinsic and mean<br>
2.8 (95% Critical and mean intrinsic and mean interior than the mean interior than the m 181 generation time.<br>181 generation time.<br>181 generation time.

- We found no substantial differences in the mean intrinsic generation time estimates across multiple<br>
183 data stratifications (Figure 1C and Supplemental Table S1). The overlapping indices for both 2021/2022<br>
184 and 2022/
- 
- 
- and 2022/2023 were high at 71% and 87%, respectively, aligning with the primary analysis above.<br>185 Influenza A data showed a notable high overlapping index of 94%, reflecting its dominance, as influenza<br>186 A was identifi
- 
- 185 Influenza A data showed a notable high overlapping index of 94%, reflecting its dominance, as influenza B<br>186 A was identified in 83% of the individuals. Conversely, using the data exclusively from influenza B y<br>187 a 186 A was identified in 83% of the individuals. Conversely, using the data exclusively from influenza B yieldec<br>187 a similar mean but with a wider credible interval due to the smaller sample size, i.e., influenza B was<br>18 a similar mean but with a wider credible interval due to the smaller sample size, i.e., influenza B was<br>188 identified in only 17% of the individuals, resulting in a lower overlapping index of 47%. Upon examining<br>189 inter
- 
- 
- 188 identified in only 17% of the individuals, resulting in a lower overlapping index of 47%. Upon examini<br>189 household sizes, although we found slightly longer mean intrinsic and realized household generation<br>190 times i 188 bousehold sizes, although we found slightly longer mean intrinsic and realized household generation<br>190 times in smaller households compared to larger ones, the overlapping index for household sizes of 2 or 1<br>191 membe 1991 household sizes and 4 or more members were moderately high at 61% and 74%, respectively. Incorporating<br>1911 households with co-primary cases remained consistent with a moderately high overlapping index of 190 times in smaller households compared to larger ones, the overlapping index for household sizes of 2 or 4 members and 4 or more members were moderately high at 61% and 74%, respectively. Incorporating households with co
- 
- 191 members and 4 or more members and 4 or more members with a moderately high overlapping index of<br>193 64%, indicating the similarity between exclusion and inclusion of multiple co-primary cases.<br>194 The mean intrinsic ge
- 
- 193 64%, indicating the similarity between exclusion and inclusion of multiple co-primary cases.<br>194 The mean intrinsic generation time exhibited limited sensitivity to variations in the incubation period<br>195 (Figure 1D an 194 The mean intrinsic generation time exhibited limited sensitivity to variations in the incubation<br>195 (Figure 1D and Supplemental Table S2). In the primary analysis shown above, we used an inc<br>196 period with a mean of
- 
- 
- 194 The mean intrinsic generation time exhibited limited sensitivity to variations in the incubation period<br>195 (Figure 1D and Supplemental Table S2). In the primary analysis shown above, we used an incubation<br>196 period w 196 (Figure 10 and Supplemental Table 10, the primary analysis shown above, we used an incubation<br>196 period with a mean of 1.55 days and a standard deviation (SD) of 0.66 days by fitting previously<br>198 considering a short published estimates (Lessler, et al. 2009) to a gamma distribution (Supplemental Figure S1). Wh<br>198 considering a shorter incubation period, which yielded a mean of 0.61 days and a SD of 0.25 day<br>199 (Lessler, et al. 2009)
- 
- 198 considering a shorter incubation period, which yielded a mean of 0.61 days and a SD of 0.25 days<br>199 (Lessler, et al. 2009), the mean intrinsic generation time remained unchanged with an overlapping<br>190 of 86%. Convers 198 (Lessler, et al. 2009), the mean intrinsic generation time remained unchanged with an overlapping<br>200 of 86%. Conversely, with a longer incubation period, which yielded a mean of 4.30 days and a SD of 0.43 days (Tuite,
- 
- 1990 (1998), of 86%. Conversely, with a longer incubation period, which yielded a mean of 4.30 days and a SD of<br>1991 (Lessler, et al. 2010), the mean intrinsic generation time increased slightly with an intermediate<br>1992 ( 201 of 86%. Conversely, with a longer incubation period, which yielded a mean of the 1.8, considered a days (Tuite, et al. 2010), the mean intrinsic generation time increased slightly with an intermediate<br>202 overlapping i
- 
- 202 overlapping index of 56%.<br>203 Our estimates were not sensitive to changes in the relative infectiousness of asymptomatic infected<br>204 Individuals, due to the limited number of asymptomatic infected individuals in this 203 Our estimates were not se<br>204 individuals, due to the limi<br>205 Figure S6). We found no su
- 203 Our estimates were not sensitive to changes in the relative infectiousness of asymptomatic infected<br>
204 individuals, due to the limited number of asymptomatic infected individuals in this study (Supplemental<br>
205 Figu
- 
- 205 Figure S6). We found no substantial differences in the mean intrinsic generation time estimates<br>206 (Supplemental Table S2), as indicated by overlapping indices of 94% and 97% when using the values of<br>207 0.11 and 1.54 206 (Supplemental Table S2), as indicated by overlapping indices of 94% and 97% when using the val<br>207 0.11 and 1.54 compared to the primary value of 0.57 (Tsang, et al. 2023).
- 0.11 and 1.54 compared to the primary value of 0.57 (Tsang, et al. 2023). 207 0.11 and 1.54 compared to the primary value of 0.57 (Tsang, et al. 2023).



208<br>209

209 Figure 1. (A) Distributions of intrinsic generation time and serial interval using the posterior samples. The lines represent the<br>210 median, and the shaded areas denote the 95% credible intervals (Crl). The blue color 211 distribution, while the orange color represents the serial interval distribution. (B) Posterior distribution of mean intrinsic and 212 realized household generation time. (C) Posterior distributions of mean intrinsic generation time across seasons, virus types, 213 household sizes, and with multiple co-primary cases. The incubation period, derived from influenza A, had a mean of 1.55 days 214 and a standard deviation (SD) of 0.66 days (Lessler, et al. 2009). Only for influenza B, we assumed the shorter incubation period 215 to yield a mean of 0.61 days and a standard deviation (SD) of 0.25 days (Lessler, et al. 2009). (D) Posterior distributions of mean

215 to yield a mean of 0.61 days and a standard deviation (SD) of 0.25 days (Lessler, et al. 2009). (D) Posterior distributions of mean 216 intrinsic generation time estimated using the full dataset across different incubation periods.



Table 2. Posterior mean (95% Crls) of estimates in primary analysis using the full dataset. The incubation period, derived from

217 Table 2. Posterior mean (95% CrIs) of estimates in primary analysis using the full dataset. The incubation period, derived from 218 influenza A, had a mean of 1.55 days and a standard deviation (SD) of 0.66 days (Lessler, et al. 2009). The relative infectiousness s

219 of asymptomatic infected individuals compared with symptomatic infected individuals was assumed to be 0.57 (Tsang, et al. 220 2023).

## 221 Sensitivity of other transmission parameters to the incubation period<br>222 In our sensitivity analyses, where we varied the assumed incubation period from the mean of 1.55 days

222 In our sensitivity analyses, where we varied the assumed incubation period from the mean of 1.55 days 223 and SD of 0.66 days, we found significant influences on several crucial pre-symptomatic transmission

- 224 parameters and the duration of various symptomatic infectious stages (Table 3 and Supplemental Figure 225 S5).
- 226 Notably, given the shorter incubation period (mean of 0.61 days and SD of 0.25 days), the proportion of 227 transmission before symptomatic onset was lower at 3% (95% Crl: 0-6%), and the ratio of pre-
- 
- 228 symptomatic to symptomatic transmission rates indicated a lower relative infectiousness of
- 228 symptomatic to symptomatic transmission rates indicated a lower relative infectiousness of
- 229 symptomatic infected individuals before symptom onset compared to after. This indicates that the 230 majority of transmission occurred after individuals developed symptoms. Consequently, this was

- 
- 
- reflected in a shorter latent period of 0.4 (95% CrI: 0.2-0.6) days and pre-symptomatic infectious period<br>232 of 0.2 (95% CrI: 0.0-0.4) days, or a longer symptomatic infectious period of 2.6 (95% CrI: 2.3-3.0) days.<br>233 Co
- 233 Conversely, given the longer incubation period (mean of 4.30 days and SD of 1.25 days), the proportion<br>234 of transmission before symptomatic onset was higher at 76% (95% CrI: 65-87%), and the ratio of pre-<br>235 symptom 234 of transmission before symptomatic onset was higher at 76% (95% Crl: 65-87%), and the ratio of pre-<br>235 symptomatic to symptomatic transmission rates was higher. This resulted in a longer latent period of 0.1<br>236 (95%
- 
- 
- $237$  of transmission before symptomatic onset was shorter at  $2.2$  (95% Criticis  $2.5$ 7%), and  $9.5$



 $\frac{7}{7}$ <br>Table 3.<br>incubati<br>(SD) of C<br>a SD of C Table 3. Posterior mean (95% CrIs) of estimates of generation time and transmission parameters given different assumed<br>
239 incubation periods. The primary incubation period, derived from influenza A, had a mean of 1.55 da

239 incubation periods. The primary incubation period, derived from influenza A, had a mean of 1.55 days and a standard deviation<br>240 (SD) of 0.66 days (Lessler, et al. 2009). The shorter incubation period, derived from in

240 (SD) of 0.66 days (Lessler, et al. 2009). The shorter incubation period, derived from influenza D, yielded a mean of 0.25 days with a SD of 0.25 days (Lessler, et al. 2009), while the longer incubation period, derived

241 a SD of 0.25 days (Lessler, et al. 2005), while the longer incubation period, derived from influenza A(H1N1)pamos, had a mean of 4.30 days with a SD of 1.25 day (Tuite, et al. 2010). The relative infectiousness of asy 242 of 4.30 days with a SD of 1.25 day (Take, et al. 2010). The relative infectiousness of asymptomatic infected individuals compared<br>243 with symptomatic infected individuals was assumed to be 0.57 (Tsang, et al. 2023).<br>

## 243 white symptomatic injected individuals was assumed to be 0.57 (Tsang, et al. 2023).<br>244 Discussion<br>245 Estimates of generation time

244 Discussion<br>245 Estimates of generation time<br>246 This study employed a Bayesian data augmentation approach (Hart, Maini and Thompson 2021, Hart,<br>247 Abbott, et al. 2022, Hart, Miller, et al. 2022) to estimate both intri 245 Estimates of generation time<br>246 This study employed a Bayesian data a<br>247 Abbott, et al. 2022, Hart, Miller, et al.<br>248 using data collected from a U.S. house

247 Abbott, et al. 2022, Hart, Miller, et al. 2022) to estimate both intrinsic and realized generation times<br>248 using data collected from a U.S. household study during the post COVID-19 pandemic influenza seasons,<br>2021/20 248 Using data collected from a U.S. household study during the post COVID-19 pandemic influenza sease<br>249 2021/2022 and 2022/2023. Our findings indicate that the intrinsic generation time, reflecting<br>250 transmission dyna 249 2021/2022 and 2022/2023. Our findings indicate that the intrinsic generation time, reflecting<br>250 transmission dynamics within community settings, ranged from 2.9 to 3.6 days, while the realized<br>251 household generatio 250 transmission dynamics within community settings, ranged from 2.9 to 3.6 days, while the real<br>251 household generation time, restricted to household settings, ranged from 2.7 to 3.0 days. The<br>252 and the including direc

251 household generation time, restricted to household settings, ranged from 2.7 to 3.0 days. These<br>252 estimates of the generation time for influenza fall within the uncertainty bounds of pre-pandemic<br>253 studies, includi estimates of the generation time for influenza fall within the uncertainty bounds of pre-pandemical<br>253 bott studies, including directly using viral shedding data (Carrat, et al. 2008) and other contact tracing<br>254 (Fraser

252 estudies, including directly using viral shedding data (Carrat, et al. 2008) and other contact tracing c<br>254 (Fraser, et al. 2009) (te Beest, et al. 2013) (Lau, et al. 2015), with estimates varying between 2 and<br>255 Ad

- 
- 254 (Fraser, et al. 2009) (te Beest, et al. 2013) (Lau, et al. 2015), with estimates varying between 2 and 4<br>255 days, suggesting that there has not been substantial change since the 2009 H1N1 influenza pandemic.<br>256 Addit 255 days, suggesting that there has not been substantial change since the 2009 H1N1 influenza pandemi<br>256 Additionally, the overlapping indices higher than 70% suggested no substantial differences between two influenza sea 256 Additionally, the overlapping indices higher than 70% suggested no substantial differences between th<br>257 two influenza seasons.<br>258 Both seasons of this study were atypical, being the first seasons since the COVID-19
- 
- 257 two influenza seasons.<br>258 Both seasons of this study were atypical, being the first seasons since the COVID-19 pandemic, during<br>259 which the immunity to influenza had potentially decreased. The 2022/2023 season, in p 258 Both seasons of this students.<br>259 Which the immunity to<br>260 experienced an early in
- 
- which the immunity to influenza had potentially decreased. The 2022/2023 season, in particular,<br>260 experienced an early influenza activity peak along with RSV and COVID-19 outbreaks. Despite these<br>261 unusual circumstance
- 259 Both seasons of the first study were atypical, a study decreased. The 2022/2023 season, in particular,<br>260 Both sexperienced an early influenza activity peak along with RSV and COVID-19 outbreaks. Despite these<br>261 Bot unusual circumstances, both seasons dominated by influenza A(H3N2) were tested in our sensitivity  $261$  unusual circumstances, both seasons dominated by influenza  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$  were tested in our sensitivity.

- 
- 
- 
- analyses, which were based on different parameter assumptions. The generation time estimates<br>
263 remained similar to those from earlier studies, suggesting that virus transmission dynamics within<br>
264 households have not work is needed to fully explore estimates for influenza that were less prevalent in this study (i.e., work is needed to fully explore estimates for influenza that were less prevalent in this study (i.e.,<br>266 households have not vary in the may not vary with the study (i.e.,<br>267 hour finding that the realized household gene
- 
- 266 influenza B and A(H1N1)).<br>267 Our finding that the realized household generation time was shorter than the intrinsic generation<br>268 could be attributed to the depletion of susceptible individuals over time. As househol
- 267 Our finding that the realize<br>268 could be attributed to the<br>269 become infected and deve 268 could be attributed to the depletion of susceptible individuals over time. As household members<br>269 become infected and develop immunity, although individuals may still be infectious, there are no<br>274 between the intri
- 269 become infected and develop immunity, although individuals may still be infectious, there are no<br>270 susceptible contacts still exposed to each case. This depletion terminates transmission chains,<br>271 diminishing the p
- 
- 
- 270 susceptible contacts still exposed to each case. This depletion terminates transmission chains,<br>271 diminishing the potential for further infections. This process, along with factors such as closer pro-<br>272 and longer 271 diminishing the potential for further infections. This process, along with factors such as closer process.<br>272 and longer exposure times inherent to household settings, can increase the chance of transmis<br>273 within ho 271 diminishing the potential for further infections. This process, along with factors such as closer proxi<br>272 and longer exposure times inherent to household settings, can increase the chance of transmission<br>273 within h
- 
- 274 Our updated estimates, particularly for the intrinsic generation tim<br>275 modeling efforts which require estimated generation times, such a<br>276 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2024) (Centers for Dise
- 275 modeling efforts which require estimated generation times, such as real-time influenza Rt estimation 275 modeling efforts which require estimated generation times, such as real-time influenza Rt estim<br>276 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2024) (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2<br>277 (Gostic, et al. 20
- 
- 
- 276 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2024) (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2024)<br>277 (Gostic, et al. 2020). Our estimates are slightly shorter than the serial interval estimated by Cowling et<br>278 al.
- 277 (Gostic, et al. 2020). Our estimates are slightly shorter than the serial interval estimated by Cowling et<br>278 al. (Cowling, et al. 2009) at 3.6 days (95% confidence interval, CI: 2.9-4.3). This shorter interval sugges 278 al. (Cowling, et al. 2009) at 3.6 days (95% confidence interval, CI: 2.9-4.3). This shorter interval suggest<br>279 a more rapid spread, potentially leading to higher estimated Rt and emphasizes the need for prompt<br>280 an 279 a more rapid spread, potentially leading to higher estimated Rt and emphasizes the need for prompt<br>280 and effective interventions to control transmission.<br>281 Reliability of other transmission parameters
- 

- 280 and effective interventions to control transmission.<br>281 Reliability of other transmission parameters<br>282 Comparing our other parameter estimates with prior research, we found the mean serial interval to be 281 Beliability of other transmission parameters<br>1982 Comparing our other parameter estimates with prior research, we found the mean serial interval to 283 Sup<br>1982 S.2 days, within the 95% CI of 2.9 to 4.3 days reported b
- 281 Reliability of other transmission parameters<br>282 Comparing our other parameter estimates with prior res<br>283 3.2 days, within the 95% Cl of 2.9 to 4.3 days reported by<br>284 estimate also falls within the 3-to-4-day range
- 
- 283 3.2 days, within the 95% CI of 2.9 to 4.3 days reported by Cowling et al. (Cowling, et al. 2009). Our<br>284 estimate also falls within the 3-to-4-day range of uncertainty reported in previous household studies<br>285 (Cauch 284 bestimate also falls within the 3-to-4-day range of uncertainty reported in previous household studies<br>285 (Cauchemez, Donnelly, et al. 2009, Petrie, et al. 2013, Levy, et al. 2013, Xu, et al. 2015, Cowling, et<br>286 201 estimate also falls within the 3-to-4-day range of uncertainty reported in previous household studies<br>285 (Cauchemez, Donnelly, et al. 2009, Petrie, et al. 2013, Levy, et al. 2013, Xu, et al. 2015, Cowling, et al.<br>286 2010
- 
- 286 (Cauchemez, Donnelly, Donnelloty, Donnelloty, Donnelloty, Donnelloty, Ny Donnelloty, Donnelloty, Donnell<br>287 (We estimated a latent period of less than a day, which is shorter than the 1 to 3 days reported in other<br>288 287 Unit alternated a latent period of less than a day, which is shorte<br>288 Studies (Tuite, et al. 2010) (Cori, et al. 2012). It is possible that t<br>289 Influenced by undocumented exposures outside households. Fo
- 
- 288 studies (Tuite, et al. 2010) (Cori, et al. 2012). It is possible that this shorter latent period could be<br>289 influenced by undocumented exposures outside households. For instance, both the index case and<br>290 infected 289 influenced by undocumented exposures outside households. For instance, both the index case an<br>290 infected household member may have been exposed to influenza elsewhere, with the index case<br>201 developing symptoms befo
- 
- 291 developing symptoms before the household member. Consequently, when the household member becomes sick, we attribute it to the index case within the household, but this infection could have<br>293 originated from previous
- 290 infected household member may have been exposed to influenza elsewhere, with the index case<br>291 developing symptoms before the household member. Consequently, when the household member<br>292 becomes sick, we attribute it 292 becomes sick, we attribute it to the index case within the household, but this infection could have<br>293 originated from previous exposure outside the household, which has not been accounted for in this<br>294 analysis. No
- 293 becomes significant in the index case with the index case of the index case of the index originated form previous exposure outside the household, which has not been accounted for in this analysis. Nonetheless, we exclu
- originated from previous exposure outside the household, which has not been accounted for in this<br>294 analysis. Nonetheless, we excluded households with multiple co-primary cases to reduce these effects,<br>295 ensuring accur
- 
- 295 analying accurate assessment of transmission dynamics within each household.<br>296 Furthermore, there was substantial uncertainty in our estimates for the symptomatic infectious period,<br>297 which ranged from 1 to 3 days, 296 Furthermore, there was substantial uncertainty in our estimates for the symptor<br>297 which ranged from 1 to 3 days, given different assumed incubation periods. Like<br>298 wide range of estimates in earlier studies, includ
- 297 but which ranged from 1 to 3 days, given different assumed incubation periods. Likewise, there has been a<br>298 but wide range of estimates in earlier studies, including those less than a day (Cori, et al. 2012) and mor
- which ranged from 1 to 3 days, given different assumed incubation periods. Likewise, there has been<br>298 wide range of estimates in earlier studies, including those less than a day (Cori, et al. 2012) and more<br>299 than 3 da
- 
- 209 The estimates of the pre-symptomatic transmission parameters<br>201 Symptomatic stages should be interpreted with caution due to the<br>202 Sestimating the incubation period. Our estimates incorporated va
- 299 than 3 days (Tuite, et al. 2010) (Cauchemez, Carrat, et al. 2004).<br>299 than 3 days (Tuite, et al. 2010) (Cauchemez, Carrat, et al. 2004).<br>301 symptomatic stages should be interpreted with caution due to the inherent un 301 Symptomatic stages should be interpreted with caution due to the inherent uncertainty in a<br>302 Estimating the incubation period. Our estimates incorporated values from various studies back the duration of various studi
- 301 symptomatic stages should be interpreted with caution due to the inherent uncertainty in accuratel<br>302 estimating the incubation period. Our estimates incorporated values from various studies based on 302 estimating the incubation period. Our estimates incorporated values from various studies based on

- 
- 303 different types or subtypes of influenza (Lessler, et al. 2009) (Tuite, et al. 2010). This variability in the<br>304 incubation period contributes to a wide range of pre-symptomatic transmission parameters. Without a<br>305
- 305 reliable input for the incubation period, accurately determining these transmission dynamics becomes<br>306 challenging.<br>307 Implications for preventing transmission
- 

- 306 challenging.<br>307 Implications for preventing transmission<br>308 Understanding the proportion of transmission that occurs prior to symptoms is critical to informing 307 Implications for preventing transmission<br>308 Understanding the proportion of transmission that<br>309 effective disease control strategies and assessing th
- 307 Implications for preventing transmission<br>308 Understanding the proportion of transmission that complete<br>309 Effective disease control strategies and assessing the<br>310 measures, such as isolation of cases. We estimated
- 309 effective disease control strategies and assessing the potential impact of post-symptomatic mitigation<br>310 measures, such as isolation of cases. We estimated that between 3% and 76% of transmission may occ<br>311 before a
- 
- 310 measures, such as isolation of cases. We estimated that between 3% and 76% of transmission may occur<br>311 before a person develops symptoms. This wide range was influenced by our assumptions of the<br>312 incubation period 312 incubation period, which were taken from a variety of previously published estimates. Longer incubation<br>313 period assumptions yielded higher estimates of the percentage of transmission that occurred before<br>314 symptom 312 incubation period, which were taken from a variety of previously published estimates. Longer in<br>313 period assumptions yielded higher estimates of the percentage of transmission that occurred be<br>314 symptoms. Similarly
- 
- 
- 313 period assumptions yielded higher estimates of the percentage of transmission that occurred before<br>314 symptoms. Similarly, attempts to estimate individual-level pre-symptomatic transmission using viral<br>315 kinetics da
- 314 symptoms. Similarly, attempts to estimate individual-level pre-symptomatic transmission using viral<br>315 kinetics data have revealed substantial heterogeneity (Morris, et al. 2024). This highlights that pre-<br>316 symptom 315 kinetics data have revealed substantial heterogeneity (Morris, et al. 2024). This highlights that pre-<br>316 symptomatic transmission of influenza does occur, aligning with findings for other respiratory pathology<br>317 li stably of the Symptomatic transmission of influenza does occur, aligning with findings for other respiratory pathoger<br>1317 like SARS-CoV-2 (Buitrago-Garcia, et al. 2022).<br>318 Given the wide range of pre-symptomatic transmi
- 
- 318 Given the wide range of pre-symptomatic transmission, relying solely on isolation of symptomatic 318 Given the wide range of pre-symptomatic tranch individuals may reduce but not eliminate influence after symptom onset are likely to mitigate at lead
- 319 Given the wind wing of pre-symptomatic transmission, although isolation measures initial<br>320 after symptom onset are likely to mitigate at least some influenza spread, given the relatively low<br>321 of asymptomatic infec
- 
- 320 after symptom onset are likely to mitigate at least some influenza spread, given the relatively low levels<br>321 of asymptomatic infection and pre-symptomatic transmission among the majority of individuals, there<br>322 com 321 of asymptomatic infection and pre-symptomatic transmission among the majority of individuals, there<br>322 remains large heterogeneity (Morris, et al. 2024). A layered approach, including isolation of ill or<br>323 infected
- 
- 321 of asymptomatic infection and pre-symptomatic transmission among the majority of individuals, then<br>322 remains large heterogeneity (Morris, et al. 2024). A layered approach, including isolation of ill or<br>323 infected p
- 323 infected people, maintaining good respiratory hygiene, and promoting influenza vaccination, may be<br>324 most effective to reduce transmission within households (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention<br>325 2024). This
- 
- 324 most effective to reduce transmission within households (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention<br>325 2024). This underscores the importance of vaccination as the primary recommendation to prevent<br>326 influenza-assoc 225 and 2024). This underscores the importance of vaccination as the primary recommendation to prevent<br>326 influenza-associated morbidity and mortality, especially for individuals at increased risk of influenza<br>327 complic 326 influenza-associated morbidity and mortality, especially for individuals at increased risk of influenza<br>327 complications.<br>328 Modeling details and limitations
- 

## 328 Modeling de<br>329 While our relia<br>330 primary cases.

- 327 implications.<br>328 Modeling details and limitations<br>329 While our reliance on household data might introduce limitations, such as the presence of multiple co-328 Modeling details and limitations<br>329 While our reliance on household data mig<br>330 primary cases, sensitivity analyses confirn<br>331 data stratifications and model assumption
- 
- 
- 332 First, we did not account for vaccination status. This omission is less likely to impact our estimates for
- 330 primary cases, sensitivity analyses confirmed the robustness of our generation time estimates to various<br>331 data stratifications and model assumptions. Nevertheless, there are several limitations to our study.<br>332 Fir 332 First, we did not account for vaccination status. This omission is less likely to impact our estimates fo<br>333 influenza given similarities in viral load dynamics between infected vaccinated and unvaccinated<br>334 individ
- 334 individuals (Morris, et al. 2024) (Suess, et al. 2012). Nevertheless, it is possible that different vacc<br>335 statuses could be associated with different generation time estimates.<br>336 Second, we did not account for pot
- 334 individuals (Morris, et al. 2024) (Suess, et al. 2012). Nevertheless, it is possible that different vaccination statuses could be associated with different our generation inne estimates.
- 335 statuses could be associated with different generation time estimates.<br>336 Second, we did not account for potential exposures outside households. When we excluded household<br>337 members who did not have at least two val 336 Second, we did not account for potential exposures outside household:<br>337 members who did not have at least two valid PCR tests, the household<br>338 analysis. While this might not directly affect our generation time esti
- members who did not have at least two valid PCR tests, the household sizes were reduced in our<br>338 analysis. While this might not directly affect our generation time estimates, it could lead to an<br>339 overestimation of ove
- 
- 338 analysis. While this might not directly affect our generation time estimates, it could lead to an<br>339 overestimation of overall infectiousness due to the absence of unobserved uninfected members.<br>340 Third, it is essen overestimation of overall infectiousness due to the absence of unobserved uninfected members overestimation of overall infectiousness due to the absence of unobserved uninfected members<br>340 Third, it is essential to acknow
- 340 Third, it is essential to acknowledge the influence of the COVID-19 pandemic on our influenza dat<br>341 Generalizing these findings to pre-pandemic or post-pandemic periods should be done with caution<br>342 During the peri
- 341 Generalizing these findings to pre-pandemic or post-pandemic periods should be done with caution<br>342 During the period when this study was conducted, individuals may have been more likely to adopt<br>343 preventive measur
- 342 During the period when this study was conducted, individuals may have been more likely to adopt<br>343 preventive measures against transmission within the home, such as self-isolating, practicing good
- 343 During the period when the study was conducted, individuals may have been more likely to adopte<br>343 preventive measures against transmission within the home, such as self-isolating, practicing good 343 preventive measures against transmission within the home, such as self-isolating, practicing good

- 
- respiratory and hand hygiene, wearing masks, and reducing contact with household members. These<br>non-pharmaceutical interventions, alongside changes in human behavior and heightened awareness of<br>infection control, could hav
- 346 infection control, could have impacted the spread of influenza.<br>347 **CONCLUSIONS**<br>348 Through comprehensive data collected during the 2021/2022 a

- 348 Through comprehensive data collected during the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 influenza seasons in the<br>349 U.S., we provide updated estimates of the generation time, essential for informing influenza modeling
- **CONCIUSIONS**<br>348 Through comprehensive data collected during the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 influenza seasons in the<br>349 U.S., we provide updated estimates of the generation time, essential for informing influenza modeling<br>3
- 
- 349 U.S., we provide updated estimates of the generation time, essential for informing influenza modeling<br>350 and public health strategies. Despite the significant changes in public behavior and preventive measure<br>351 due 350 and public health strategies. Despite the significant changes in public behavior and preventive measure<br>351 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, our study did not detect substantial changes in the generation time of<br>352 influ 351 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, our study did not detect substantial changes in the generation time of<br>352 influenza since the 2009 influenza pandemic. This finding is particularly significant given that the study<br>353 pe
- 
- 
- 352 influenza since the 2009 influenza pandemic. This finding is particularly significant given that the study<br>353 period followed the extreme measures implemented to prevent COVID-19, which also reduced the<br>354 transmissi 353 period followed the extreme measures implemented to prevent COVID-19, which also reduced the<br>354 transmission of influenza and other respiratory infections. Our findings contribute to our understanding<br>355 of influenza 1354 transmission of influenza and other respiratory infections. Our findings contribute to our understan<br>355 of influenza transmission dynamics within households and underscore the importance of ongoing<br>356 research for e
- 354 transmission of influenza and other respiratory infections. Our findings contribute to our understa<br>355 of influenza transmission dynamics within households and underscore the importance of ongoing<br>356 research for eff
- 356 research for effective outbreak management.<br>357  $357$

## 358 Author contributions



... choose from the following items: https://credit.niso.org/

methods of the following items: https://credit.niso.org/<br>https://www.elsevier.com/researcher/author/policies-and-guidelines/credit-author-statement<br>1. Conceptualization 360 https://www.elsevier.com/researcher/author/policies-and-g<br>361 1. Conceptualization<br>362 2. Data curation

- 361 https://www.elsevier.com/researcher/author-statement<br>362 2. Data curation<br>363 3. Formal analysis
- 
- 
- 362 2. Data curation<br>363 3. Formal analysis<br>364 4. Funding acquisition 362 2. Data curation<br>363 3. Formal analysis<br>364 4. Funding acquisi<br>365 5. Investigation<br>366 6. Methodology 364 4. Funding acquisit<br>365 5. Investigation<br>366 6. Methodology
- 
- 
- 365 5. Investigation<br>366 6. Methodology<br>367 7. Project administration 366 6. Methodology<br>367 7. Project admin<br>368 8. Resources<br>369 9. Software 367 7 Project admin<br>368 8. Resources<br>369 9 Software
- 
- 
- 368 8. Resources<br>369 9. Software<br>370 10. Supervision 369 9. Software<br>370 10. Supervision<br>371 11. Validation
- 
- 370 10. Supervision<br>371 11. Validation<br>372 12. Visualizat 371 11. Validation<br>372 12. Visualization<br>373 13. Roles/Writin 372 12. Visualization<br>373 13. Roles/Writ<br>374 14. Writing - re
- 373 13. Roles/Writing<br>374 14. Writing revi<br>--- A oknowlodom
- 

## 374 14. Writing - review & editing.<br>375 Acknowledgments

- 375 Acknowledgments<br>376 The authors thank the follo 375 Acknowledgments 376 • The authors thank the following members of the Respiratory Virus Transmission Network – 378 a. Vanderbilt University M<br>379 Samuel Massion, Brittal<br>Samuel Massion, Brittal a. Vanderbilt University Medical Center: Chris Lindsell, Judy King, John Meghreblian,<br>379 Samuel Massion, Brittany Creasman, Lauren Milner, Andrea Stafford Hintz, Jorge
- 379 Samuel Massion, Brittany Creasman, Lauren Milner, Andrea Stafford Hintz, Jorge



• L. Y. H. C. thanks the CDC Steven M. Teutsch Prevention Effectiveness (PE) Fellowship.<br>403 **Data sharing statement**<br>404 The household data are available upon reasonable request and upon completion of required approvals.<br>

403 **Data sharing statement**<br>404 The household data are available upo<br>405 The R code for estimating the generat<br>406 generation time-us. The R code for estimating the generation time is available at <u>https://github.com/CDCgov/influenza-</u><br>406 <u>generation time-us</u>.<br>407 **Disclaimer** 

# 407 **Disclaimer**<br>
408 The conclusions, f<br>
409 necessarily reflect<br>
410 Health Service, th

- 405 The R code for estimating the generation time is available at https://github.com/CDCgov/influenza-
- 408 The conclusions, findings, and opinions expressed by authors contributing to this article do not<br>409 Thecessarily reflect the official position of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the Public
- me conclusions, manage, and protect the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the Health Service, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, or the authors' affiliated institutions.<br>
Recording the Centers for

## Health Service, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, or the authors' affiliated institutions.<br>411 Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the Writing process Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the<br>412 Writing process<br>413 During the preparation of this work the authors used ChatGPT in order to enhance the clarity,<br>414 coherence, and correctness of the w

- 
- 
- Writing process<br>
During the preparation of this work the authors used ChatGPT in order to enhance the clarity,<br>
coherence, and correctness of the writing, and to check for grammatical errors. After using this tool, the<br>
au 414 coherence, and correctness of the writing, and to check for grammatical errors. After using this authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content 416 publication. 415 authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.<br>416 publication. 416 authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take function  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$  for the content of the content o
- 416 publication.

- **Declaration of interest**<br>
417 **Declaration of interest**<br>
418 **•** M. S. S. reports a leadership role as Associate Director of the American Academy of Pediatrics'<br>
420 **•** N. M.B. reports grant/contracts from NIH to the Uni 418 • M. S. S. reports a leadership role as Associate Director of the American Academy of Pediatrics'<br>419 Pediatric Research in Office Settings (PROS), paid to Trustees of Columbia University. All other<br>421 • N. M.B. repor
- authors report no potential conflicts.<br>
120 Pediatric Research in Office Settings (PROS), paid to Trustees of Columbia University.<br>
122 Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, and North Carolina Collaboratory; participation on a 421 **and M. M. B. reports grant/contracts from**<br>422 Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, an<br>423 advisory board for the Snowball Study 421 • N. M.B. reports grant/contracts from NIH to the University of North Carolina School of Medicine,<br>422 Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, and North Carolina Collaboratory; participation on a DSMB or<br>423 advisory board f advisory board for the Snowball Study Technical Interchange; a leadership or fiduciary role on<br>
the American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene Scientific Committee; and other financial<br>
or nonfinancial interests wit 424 be American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene Scientific Committee; and other finance<br>425 or nonfinancial interests with the COVID-19 Equity Evidence Academy (RADx-UP CDCC) Steerin<br>426 Committee and North Caroli
- 425 or nonfinancial interests with the COVID-19 Equity Evidence Academy (RADx-UP CDCC) Steering<br>426 Committee and North Carolina Occupational Safety and Health Education Research Center.<br>427 **E. A. reports serving as a for**
- 426 Committee and North Carolina Occupational Safety and Health Education Research Center.<br>427 E. A. reports serving as a former consultant for Hillevax and Moderna, presenting a Merck-<br>428 **Figure 2018** Step 2018 Consul 427 **■** E. A. reports serving as a former consultant for Hillevax and Moderna, presenting a Merck-<br>428 supported lecture at the Latin American Vaccine Summit, and receipt of grant/research sup<br>from Pfizer for pneumococcal • E. A. reports serving as a former consultant for Hillevax and Moderna, presenting a Merck-<br>
428 supported lecture at the Latin American Vaccine Summit, and receipt of grant/research support<br>
430 • S. R. reports grant sup
- 
- 431 H. Q. N. reports grant/research support from CSL Seqirus, GSK, and ModernaTX, and honorarium<br>432 for participating in a consultancy group for ModernaTX outside the submitted work. for participating in a consultancy group for ModernaTX outside the submitted work.<br>433 • S. H. M. reports grants/contracts from NIH, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and 430 • S. R. reports grant support from BioFire.<br>
431 • H. Q. N. reports grant/research support f<br>
432 • S. H. M. reports grants/contracts from N
- 431 H. Q. N. reports grant/research support from CSL Seqirus, GSK, and ModernaTX, and honorarium<br>432 for participating in a consultancy group for ModernaTX outside the submitted work.<br>433 S. H. M. reports grants/contra 433 **6 S. H. M. reports grants/contracts from NIH, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and<br>434 Duke Charitable Foundation.<br>435 <b>6 E. S. reports grants or contracts to institution from Vanderbilt University Medical Cer**
- 434 Duke Charitable Foundation.<br>
435 E. S. reports grants or contracts to institution from Vanderbilt University Medical Center<br>
436 H. K. T. has received research funding from the CDC.<br>
→ H. K. T. has received rese • E. S. reports grants or contracts to institution from Vanderbilt University Medical Center<br>436 (originating at CDC #75D30121C11656).<br>437 • H. K. T. has received research funding from the CDC.<br>438 • C. G. G. reports parti
- 437 H. K. T. has received research funding from the CDC.<br>438 C. G. G. reports participation on an advisory board fo
- 437 H. K. T. has received research funding from the CDC.<br>
438 C. G. G. reports participation on an advisory board fo<br>
439 All authors have submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclo
- C. G. G. reports participation on an advisory board for Merck, and receipt of grant/research<br>
439 All authors have submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest.<br>
441 Conflicts that the edi 440 • All authors have submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Inte<br>441 Conflicts that the editors consider relevant to the content of the manuscript have bee<br>442 disclosed. 440 • All authors have submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest.<br>441 Conflicts that the editors consider relevant to the content of the manuscript have been<br>442 disclosed.<br>**443 Financial S** 11 Conflicts that the editors consider relevant to the manuscript of the manus

- 443 Financial su 443 Financial support<br>444 • The parent househo<br>445 Sentinel) was funded<br>446 Control and Prevent • The parent household transmission study (the Respiratory Virus Transmission Network –<br>
Sentinel) was funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (Centers for Disease<br>
Control and Prevention; contracts 75D301 Control and Prevention; contracts 75D30121C11656 and 75D30121C11571) and National Center<br>
447 for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS) Clinical Translational Science Award (CTSA)<br>
448 Program, Award Number 5UL1TR002243 447 for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS) Clinical Translational Science Award (CTSA)<br>448 Program, Award Number 5UL1TR002243-03.<br>449 S. H. M. reports support to institution (Trustees of Columbia University) from Van
- For Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS) contract the CONSTRESS (NCATS)<br>
148 For Advances (NCATS) Clinical Translational Translational Translation<br>
149 S. H. M. reports support to institution (Trustees of Columbia Univ 448 Program, Award Number 5UL1TR002243-03.
- 449 S. H. M. reports support to institution (Trustees of Columbia University) from Vanderbilt 451 • M. S. S. reports a subcontract from Vanderbilt University Medical Center (funding originated<br>452 from CDC) paid to Trustees of Columbia University.<br>453 453 from CDC  $\frac{1}{2}$  from CDC

453<br>454

- References<br>156 Boëlle, Pierre-Yves, Séverine Ansart, Anne Cori, and Alain-Jacques Valleron. 2011. "Transmission<br>157 https://www.farking.com/influenza virus pandemic: a review." Influenza and Other<br>158 https://www.farking.c
- 459 Buitrago-Garcia, Diana, Aziz Mert Ipekci, Leonie Heron, Hira Imeri, Lucia Araujo-Chaveron, Ingrid parameters of the A/H1N1 (2009) influenza virus pandemic: a review. "Influenza and Other<br>458 Respiratory Viruses (Wiley Online Library) 5 (5): 306-316.<br>460 Arevalo-Rodriguez, Agustín Ciapponi, et al. 2022. "Occurrence and 460<br>460 Arevalo-Rodriguez, Agustín Ciapponi, et al. 2022. "Occurrence and transmission potentia<br>461 asymptomatic and presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: Update of a living systematic<br>462 and meta-analysis." *PLOS Medicin* 160 Arevalo-Rodriguez, Agustin Ciapponi, 2021 are constrained and hardwareline potential of<br>160 Ares and meta-analysis." PLOS Medicine (Public Library of Science) 19 (5): e1003987.<br>163 Carrat, Fabrice, Elisabeta Vergu, Nei
- and meta-analysis." *PLOS Medicine* (Public Library of Science) 19 (5): e1003987.<br>463 Carrat, Fabrice, Elisabeta Vergu, Neil M. Ferguson, Magali Lemaitre, Simon Cauchemez, Steve Leach, and<br>464 Alain-Jacques Valleron. 2008. 462 and meta-analysis." PLOS Medicine (Public Library of Science) 15 (5): e1003587.<br>463 Carrat, Fabrice, Elisabeta Vergu, Neil M. Ferguson, Magali Lemaitre, Simon Cauchemez, S.<br>464 Alain-Jacques Valleron. 2008. "Time Lines Carrat, Fabrice, Elisabeta Vergu, Neil M. Ferguson, Magali Lemaitre, Simon Cauchemez, Steve Leach, and<br>464 Alain-Jacques Valleron. 2008. "Time Lines of Infection and Disease in Human Influenza: A Review<br>465 of Volunteer Ch of Volunteer Challenge Studies." *American Journal of Epidemiology* (Oxford University Press) 167<br>166 (7): 775-785.<br>467 Cauchemez, Simon, Christl A. Donnelly, Carrie Reed, Azra C. Ghani, Christophe Fraser, Charlotte K. Ken
- 165 of Volumeer Challenge Studies." American Journal of Epidemiology (Oxford Offversity Press) 167<br>466 (7): 775-785.<br>468 Lyn Finelli, and Neil M. Ferguson. 2009. "Household Transmission of 2009 Pandemic Influenza A 1967<br>467 Cauchemez, Simon, C<br>468 Lyn Finelli, an<br>469 (H1N1) Virus Cauchemez, Simon, Christl A. Donnelly, Carrie Reed, Azra C. Ghani, Christophe Fraser, Charlotte K. Kent,<br>468 Lyn Finelli, and Neil M. Ferguson. 2009. "Household Transmission of 2009 Pandemic Influenza A<br>469 (H1N1) Virus in 469 (H1N1) Virus in the United States." New England Journal of Medicine (Mass Medical Soc) 361<br>470 (27): 2619-2627.<br>471 Cauchemez, Simon, Fabrice Carrat, Cecile Viboud, Alain Jacques Valleron, and Pierre-Yves Boëlle. 2004.
- (H1N1) Virus in the Office States." New England Journal by Medicine (Mass Medical Soc) 3614<br>470 (27): 2619-2627.<br>471 Cauchemez, Simon, Fabrice Carrat, Cecile Viboud, Alain Jacques Valleron, and Pierre-Yves Boëlle. 2004<br>472 471 Cauchemez, Simon, Fabri<br>472 "A Bayesian MCN<br>473 Iongitudinal data 472 Cauchemez, Simon, Fabrice Carrat, Cecile Piacea, Alam Carefore Carre-Yves Boëlle.<br>473 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2024. Current Epidemic Growth Status (Based on Rt) for<br>474 Centers for Disease Control a
- 473 Iongitudinal data." *Statistics in Medicine* (Wiley Online Library) 23 (22): 3469-3487.<br>474 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2024. Current Epidemic Growth Status (Based on Rt) for influen<br>475 States and Terr 1998 1999 Iongruumin data." Statistics in Medicine (Wiley Online Library) 23 (22): 3469-3467.<br>1974 – Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2024. Current Epidemic Growth Status (Based c<br>1976 – States and Territories. 474 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2024. Current Epidemic Growth Status (Based on Rt) for<br>475 States and Territories. March 22. Accessed March 25, 2024. https://www.cdc.gov/forecast-<br>477 — 2024. Preventing Spr
- 313 States and Territories. March 22. Accessed March 23, 2024. https://www.cdc.gov/forecast-<br>476 outbreak-analytics/about/rt-estimates.html.<br>477 2024. *Preventing Spread of Respiratory Viruses When You're Sick.* March 1. 477 — 2024. Preventing Spread of Respiratory Viruses W.<br>478 https://www.cdc.gov/respiratory-viruses/pre
- 477 2024. Preventing Spread of Respiratory Viruses When You're Sick. March 1. Accessed June 11, 2024.<br>478 https://www.cdc.gov/respiratory-viruses/prevention/precautions-when-sick.html.<br>479 2024. Technical Blog: Improvi 479 https://www.cdc.gov/respiratory-virustery-presention/presentions-when-sicknami<br>480 March 25, 2024. https://www.cdc.gov/forecast-outbreak-analytics/about/technica<br>481 ft.html. 479 1982, Technical Blog: Improving CDC's Tools for Assessing Epidemic Growth. March 3. Accessed<br>480 March 25, 2024. https://www.cdc.gov/forecast-outbreak-analytics/about/technical-blog-<br>482 Cori, A., A.J. Valleron, F. Car
- 483 **March 25, 2024. Heating 25, 2024.** Harph 25, 2024. Harph 482 Cori, A., A.J. Vall<br>483 **Particular**<br>1988 Results
- arty and infectious period durations using viral excretion data." *Epidemics* 4 (3): 132-138.<br>484 Cowling, Benjamin J, Vicky J Fang, Steven Riley, J S Malik Peiris, and Gabriel M Leung. 2009. "Estimation<br>485 of the serial Hatency and infectious period durations using viral excretion data." Epidemics 4 (3): 132-138.<br>484 Cowling, Benjamin J, Vicky J Fang, Steven Riley, J S Malik Peiris, and Gabriel M Leung. 2009. "Estimation<br>485 of the serial
- 1485 Cowling, Benjamin J, Vichy Princip, Persistin Mary Journal Peiris, Juris Peiris, 1998.<br>1486 Cowling, Benjamin J., Kwok Hung Chan, Vicky J. Fang, Lincoln L.H. Lau, Hau Chi So, Rita O.P. Fung,<br>1487 Edward S.K. Ma, et al For the serial interval of influenza." Epidemiology (EWW) 20 (3): 344-347.<br>486 Cowling, Benjamin J., Kwok Hung Chan, Vicky J. Fang, Lincoln L.H. Lau, Hau Chi So,<br>487 Fall Sulf Rew England Journal of Medicine (Mass Medical 487 Edward S.K. Ma, et al. 2010. "Comparative Epidemiology of Pandemic and Seasonal Influe<br>488 in Households." New England Journal of Medicine (Mass Medical Soc) 362 (23): 2175-218<br>489 Fraser, Christophe, Christl A. Donnel
- 1994 Edward State State State State Comparative Specific Comparative International ABS<br>188 Traser, Christophe, Christl A. Donnelly, Simon Cauchemez, William P. Hanage, Maria D. Van Kerkhove, T<br>190 Déirdre Hollingsworth, Ja Fraser, Christophe, Christl A. Donnelly, Simon Cauchemez, William P. Hanage, Maria D. Van Kerkhov<br>189 Fraser, Christophe, Christl A. Donnelly, Simon Cauchemez, William P. Hanage, Maria D. Van Kerkhov<br>191 (H1N1): Early Find Fraser, Christophe, Christl A. Donnelly, Simon Cauchemez, William P. Hanage, Maria D. Van Kerkhove, 1<br>490 Déirdre Hollingsworth, Jamie Griffin, et al. 2009. "Pandemic Potential of a Strain of Influenza A<br>491 (H1N1): Early (H1N1): Early Findings." Science (American Association for the Advancement of Science) 324 492 (H1N1): Early Findings." Science (American Association for the Advancement of Science) 324<br>492 (5934): 1557-1561.  $\frac{4}{3}$

493 Gostic, Katelyn M., Lauren McGough, Edward B. Baskerville, Sam Abbott, Keya Joshi, Christine Tedijanto,<br>494 Rebecca Kahn, et al. 2020. "Practical considerations for measuring the effective reproductive<br>495 Hart, Willia 496 Hart, William S, Elizabeth Miller, Nick J Andrews, Pauline Waight, Philip K Maini, Sebastian Funk, and<br>497 **Robin N Thompson, 2022, "Generation time of** the alpha and delta SARS-CoV-2 variants: an 498 epidemiological analysis." The Lancet Infectious Diseases (Elsevier) 22 (5): 603--610. 497 Robin N Thompson. 2022. "Generation time of the alpha and delta SARS-CoV-2 variants: an<br>498 epidemiological analysis." The Lancet Infectious Diseases (Elsevier) 22 (5): 603--610.<br>499 Hart, William S, Philip K Maini, an epidemiological analysis." The Lancet Infectious Diseases (Elsevier) 22 (5): 603--610.<br>499 Hart, William S, Philip K Maini, and Robin N Thompson. 2021. "High infectiousness immediately before COVID-19 symptom onset highlig 499 Fract Michael analysis." The Lancet Injectious Diseases (Elsevier) 22 (5): 603–616.<br>499 Hart, William S, Philip K Maini, and Robin N Thompson. 2021. "High infectiousness immediat<br>500. COVID-19 symptom onset highlights 499 1991 COVID-19 symptom onset highlights the importance of continued contact tracing." *eLife* (eLife<br>1991 Sciences Publications, Ltd) 10: e65534.<br>1992 Hart, William S, Sam Abbott, Akira Endo, Joel Hellewell, Elizabeth M 500 COVID-19 symptom onset highlights the importance of continued contact tracing." eLife (eLife Sciences Publications, Ltd) 10: e65534.<br>502 Hart, William S, Sam Abbott, Akira Endo, Joel Hellewell, Elizabeth Miller, Nick r 502 Hart, William S, Sam Abbott, Akira Endo, Joel Hernando Sebastian Funk, and Robin N Thompson<br>503 Sebastian Funk, and Robin N Thompson<br>504 using UK household data." *eLife* (eLife S 503 Sebastian Funk, and Robin N Thompson. 2022. "Inference of the SARS-CoV-2 generation til<br>504 Sebastian Funk, and Robin N Thompson. 2022. "Inference of the SARS-CoV-2 generation til<br>505 Lau, Max S.Y., Benjamin J. Cowling asing UK household data." *eLife* (eLife Sciences Publications, Ltd) 11: e70767.<br>1995 Lau, Max S.Y., Benjamin J. Cowling, Alex R. Cook, and Steven Riley. 2015. "Inferring influenza dynamics<br>1996 and control in households." 505 Lau, Max S.Y., Benjamin J. Cowling, Alex R. Cook, and Steven Riley. 2015. "Inferring inf<br>506 and control in households." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*<br>507 Sciences) 112 (29): 9094-9099. 506 Lau, Marten, Benjamin Jerming, Alex Research Marten Richard, 2016<br>507 Sciences (National Acad Sciences) 112 (29): 9094-9099.<br>508 Lessler, Justin, Nicholas G Reich, Ron Brookmeyer, Trish M Perl, Kenrad E Nelson, and Der 506 and control in households." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (National Academy Sciences 112<br>508 Lessler, Justin, Nicholas G Reich, Ron Brookmeyer, Trish M Perl, Kenrad E Nelson, and Derek AT<br>509 Cummings 508 Lessler, Justin, Nicholas G Reich, Ron Br<br>112 Sog Cummings. 2009. "Incubation p<br>112 The Lancet infectious diseases ( 509 Cummings. 2009. "Incubation periods of acute respiratory viral infections: a systematic<br>510 The Lancet infectious diseases (Elsevier) 9 (5): 291–300.<br>511 Levy, Jens W., Benjamin J. Cowling, James M. Simmerman, Sonja J. 510 The Lancet infectious diseases (Elsevier) 9 (5): 291–300.<br>511 Levy, Jens W., Benjamin J. Cowling, James M. Simmerman, Sonja J. Olsen, Vicky J. Fang, Piyarat<br>512 Suntarattiwong, Richard G. Jarman, Brendan Klick, and Taw Fire Editet infectious diseases (Elsevier) 9 (5): 291--300.<br>511 Levy, Jens W., Benjamin J. Cowling, James M. Simmerman, Sonja<br>512 Suntarattiwong, Richard G. Jarman, Brendan Klick, and T<br>513 Serial Intervals of Seasonal and 512 Suntarattiwong, Richard G. Jarman, Brendan Klick, and Tawee Chotipitayasunondh. 201<br>513 Serial Intervals of Seasonal and Pandemic Influenza Viruses in Households in Bangkok,<br>514 *American Journal of Epidemiology* (Oxfo 513 Serial Intervals of Seasonal and Pandemic Influenza Viruses in Households in Bangkok, Thailand<br>514 *American Journal of Epidemiology* (Oxford University Press) 177 (12): 1443-1451.<br>515 Morris, Sinead E., Huong Q. Nguye 514 *American Journal of Epidemiology* (Oxford University Press) 177 (12): 1443-1451.<br>515 Morris, Sinead E., Huong Q. Nguyen, Carlos G. Grijalva, Kayla E. Hanson, Yuwei Zhu, Jessica E. Biddle,<br>516 Jennifer K. Meece, et al. STA AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EPIDEMIOLOGY (OXFORE OTNOFSICY PRESS) 177 (12): 1443-1451.<br>515 Morris, Sinead E., Huong Q. Nguyen, Carlos G. Grijalva, Kayla E. Hanson, Yuwei Zhu, Jessica<br>517 implications from a multi-season househ 515 Morris, Sinead E., Huong Q. Nguyen, Carlos G. Grijalva, Kayla E. Hanson, Yuwei Zhu, Jessica E. Biddle,<br>516 Jennifer K. Meece, et al. 2024. "Influenza virus shedding and symptoms: Dynamics and<br>517 implications from a mu implications from a multi-season household transmission study." *medRxiv* (Cold Spring<br>18 Laboratory Press) 2024--03.<br>19 Pastore, Massimiliano. 2018. "Overlapping: a R package for Estimating Overlapping in Empirical 517 implications from a multi-season household transmission study." *mediant* (Cold Spring Harbor<br>518 Laboratory Press) 2024--03.<br>520 Distributions." Journal of Open Source Software (The Open Journal) 3 (32): 1023. 519 Pastore, Massimiliano. 2018. "Overland<br>520 Distributions." Journal of Op 520 Distributions." Journal of Open Source Software (The Open Journal) 3 (32): 1023.<br>1921 Pastore, Massimiliano, and Antonio Calcagni. 2019. "Measuring Distribution Similarities Between<br>1932 Samples: A Distribution-Free Ov 520 Distributions. "Journal of Open Source Software (The Open Journal) 3 (32): 1023.<br>521 Pastore, Massimiliano, and Antonio Calcagni. 2019. "Measuring Distribution Similarities B<br>522 Samples: A Distribution-Free Overlappin 522 Samples: A Distribution-Free Overlapping Index." *Frontiers in Psychology* (Frontiers Media<br>523 10: 1089.<br>524 Petrie, Joshua G., Suzanne E. Ohmit, Benjamin J. Cowling, Emileigh Johnson, Rachel T. Cross, Ryan Samples: A Distribution-Free Overlapping Index." *Frontiers in Psychology* (Frontiers Media SA)<br>523 10: 1089.<br>524 Petrie, Joshua G., Suzanne E. Ohmit, Benjamin J. Cowling, Emileigh Johnson, Rachel T. Cross, Ryan E.<br>525 Mal 523 10: 1089. Malosh, Mark G. Thompson, and Arnold S. Monto. 2013. "Influenza Transmission in a Cohort<br>526 Households with Children: 2010-2011." PLOS ONE (Public Library of Science) 8 (9): e75339.<br>527 Rolfes, Melissa A., H. Keipp Talbot 526 Manuson, Mark G. Thompson, Melissa<br>527 Molfes, Melissa A., H. Keipp Talbot, Huong Q. McLean, Melissa S. Stockwell, Katherine D. Ellingson, Karer<br>5 Frouseholds with Children: 2010-2011. Theos ONE (Public Library of Science) 8 (3): e733339.<br>527 – Rolfes, Melissa A., H. Keipp Talbot, Huong Q. McLean, Melissa S. Stockwell, Katherine D. Ellingson, K<br>529 – 2021-2022." JAMA 527 Rolfes, Melissa A., H. Keipp Talbot, Huong Q. McLean, Melissa S. Stockwell, Katherine D. Ellingson, K<br>528 Lutrick, Natalie M. Bowman, et al. 2023. "Household Transmission of Influenza A Viruses in<br>529 2021-2022." JAMA 2021-2022." JAMA (American Medical Association) 329 (6): 482-489. 529 2021-2022." JAMA (American Medical Association) 329 (6): 482-489.

530 Suess, Thorsten, Cornelius Remschmidt, Susanne B. Schink, Brunhilde Schweiger, Alla Heider, Jeanette<br>531 Milde, Andreas Nitsche, et al. 2012. "Comparison of Shedding Characteristics of Seasonal<br>532 Influenza Virus (Sub For the Mille, Andreas Nitsche, Andreas Nitsche, Comparison of States Indiana, 2007–2011." PLOS OF<br>533 (Public Library of Science) 7 (12): e51653.<br>534 Svensson, Åke. 2007. "A note on generation times in epidemic models." M Finderiza Virus (Sub)Types and Influenza A(H1N1)pdm09; Germany, 2007–2011. The Some<br>533 (Public Library of Science) 7 (12): e51653.<br>534 Svensson, Åke. 2007. "A note on generation times in epidemic models." *Mathematical Bi* 534 Svensson, Åke. 2007. "A note on generation times<br>535 (Elsevier) 208 (1): 300-311. 534 Svensson, Åke. 2007. "A note on generation times in epidemic models." *Mathematical Biosciences*<br>535 (Elsevier) 208 (1): 300-311.<br>536 te Beest, Dennis E, Jacco Wallinga, Tjibbe Donker, and Michiel van Boven. 2013. "Est 536 te Beest, Dennis E, Jacco Wallinga, Tjibbe Donker, and Michiel van Boven. 2013. "Estimating the<br>537 seneration interval of influenza A (H1N1) in a range of social settings." *Epidemiology* (LV<br>538 (2): 244--250. 537 seneration interval of influenza A (H1N1) in a range of social settings." Epidemiology (LW<br>538 (2): 244--250.<br>539 Tsang, Tim K, Lincoln LH Lau, Simon Cauchemez, and Benjamin J Cowling. 2016. "Household tran generation interval of influenza A (H1N1) in a range of social settings." Epidemiology (LWW) 24<br>538 (2): 244--250.<br>539 Tsang, Tim K, Lincoln LH Lau, Simon Cauchemez, and Benjamin J Cowling. 2016. "Household transmissio<br>540  $539$  Tsang, Tim K, Lincoln L<br> $540$  of influenza vi 540 Frang, Tim My 2012 In Lincoln Stat<br>541 Tsang, Tim K., Can Wang, Vicky J. Fang, Ranawaka A. P. M. Perera, Hau Chi So, Dennis K. M. Ip, Gabriel<br>542 540 of influenza virus. Trends in microbiology (Elsevier) 24 (2): 125--133.<br>541 Tsang, Tim K., Can Wang, Vicky J. Fang, Ranawaka A. P. M. Perera, Hau Chi So,<br>542 M. Leung, J. S. Malik Peiris, Simon Cauchemez, and Benjamin 541 Tsang, Tim K., Can Wang, Vicky J. Fang, Ranawaka A. P. M. Perera, Hau Chi So, Dennis K. M. Ip, Gabriel<br>542 M. Leung, J. S. Malik Peiris, Simon Cauchemez, and Benjamin J. Cowling. 2023. "Reconstructing<br>543 household tra 543 household transmission dynamics to estimate the infectiousness of asymptomatic influenza<br>544 bousehold transmission dynamics to estimate the infectiousness of asymptomatic influenza<br>545 Tuite, Ashleigh R., Amy L. Greer virus infections." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 120 (33): e2304750120.<br>545 Tuite, Ashleigh R., Amy L. Greer, Michael Whelan, Anne-Luise Winter, Brenda Lee, Ping Yan, Jianhong<br>546 Wu, et al. 2010. "Esti 544 virus infections." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 120 (33): e2304730120.<br>545 Tuite, Ashleigh R., Amy L. Greer, Michael Whelan, Anne-Luise Winter, Brenda Lee, Ping Yan, Jianhon<br>547 H1N1 influenza." CMAJ 545 Tuite, Ashleigh R., Amy L. Greer, Michael Whelan, Anne-Luise Winter, Brenda Lee, Ping Yan, Jianhong<br>546 Wu, et al. 2010. "Estimated epidemiologic parameters and morbidity associated with pandemic<br>547 H1N1 influenza." C 547 Hammada, "CMAJ 182 (2): 131–136.<br>548 Wu, Cuiling, Kwok-Hung Chan, Tim K. Tsang, Vicky J. Fang, Rita O. P. Fung, Dennis K. M. Ip, Simon<br>549 Cauchemez, Gabriel M. Leung, J. S. Malik Peiris, and Benjamin J. Cowling. 2015. 548 Xu, Cuiling, Kwok-Hung Chan, Tim K. Tsang, Vicky J. Fang, Rita O. P. Fung, Dennis K. M. Ip, Simon<br>549 Cauchemez, Gabriel M. Leung, J. S. Malik Peiris, and Benjamin J. Cowling. 2015. "Compai<br>550 Epidemiology of Influenz 549 Cauchemez, Gabriel M. Leung, J. S. Malik Peiris, and Benjamin J. Cowling. 2015. "Comparently cauchemez, Gabriel M. Leung, J. S. Malik Peiris, and Benjamin J. Cowling. 2015. "Comparently Press by Epidemiology of Influen 550 Epidemiology of Influenza B Yamagata- and Victoria-Lineage Viruses in Households." American<br>551 *Journal of Epidemiology* (Oxford University Press) 182 (8): 705-713.<br>552 Journal of Epidemiology (Oxford University Press) 182 (8): 705-713.  $551$  Journal of Epidemiology (Oxford Oniversity Press) 182 (8): 705-713.<br>552<br>553

552

## 554 Supplementary material

- 555 The incubation period distribution<br>556 The incubation period distribution was modeled using estimates for influenza A from a systematic
- 557 review by Lessler et al. (Lessler, et al. 2009), with a mean of 1.55 days and a standard deviation (SD) of
- 557 review by Lessler et al. (Lessler, et al. 2009), with a mean of 1.55 days and a standard deviation (SD) of 558 0.66 days. These estimates were fitted to a gamma distribution to characterize the distribution of the
- 559 incubation period (Supplemental Figure S1).



## 560

561 Figure S1. Incubation period distribution. The black circles and blue lines represent the data (Lessler, et al. 2009), and the (A) 562 cumulative distribution function and (B) probability density function of a gamma distribution fitted to the data.

## 563 The observed household serial interval of single infection pairs<br>564 We found that the observed household serial interval, calculated without modeling, solely using data

565 from households with single infection pairs (i.e., single primary case to single secondary case) and

566 without potential transmission chains, had a mean of 3.7 days (and a SD of 2.3 days). This was longer

567 than the mean intrinsic serial interval of 3.2 (95% CrI: 2.8-3.5) days when considering households of all

568 sizes with all potential transmission chains (Table 2). This does not necessarily indicate that the intrinsic

568 sizes with all potential transmission chains (Table 2). This does not necessarily indicate that the intrinsic 569 value was shorter than the realized household one. Rather, it is mainly due to the restriction of single

570 infection pairs or mostly smaller household sizes of 2 members.

- 
- 571 In the main text, we found slightly longer mean intrinsic and realized household generation times in<br>572 Smaller households compared to larger ones (Figure 1C and Supplemental Table S1). Larger households
- 572 smaller households compared to larger ones (Figure 1C and Supplemental Table S1). Larger households 573 with more exposure and potential transmission chains could have a shorter interval, while smaller
- 574 households could have a longer interval.

- 575 Specification of parameters for the mechanistic model<br>576 In the mechanistic model (Hart, Abbott, et al. 2022), two parameters, namely the ratio of the mean
- 577 Iatent and incubation period and the mean symptomatic infectious period, were estimated directly
- 578 (Supplemental Figure S2), while the proportion of transmission before symptomatic onset was
- 579 calculated by weighting the pre-symptomatic period by the ratio of pre-symptomatic and symptomatic
- 580 transmission rates and dividing it by the sum of the (pre-symptomatic and symptomatic) infectious
- 580 transmission rates and dividing it by the sum of the (pre-symptomatic and symptomatic) infectious
- 581 periods. The mean latent and mean pre-symptomatic periods were calculated by dividing the incubation 582 period by the ratio of mean latent and incubation period.



583<br>584<br>585<br>586 Figure S2. Posterior and prior distributions of estimated parameters. Solid and dashed lines represent posterior and prior<br>585 Figure S2. Posterior and prior distributions of estimated parameters. Solid and dashed lines re

distributions, respectively.<br>1986 — Variability in estimates across data stratifications<br>1987 — Although the generation time or serial interval of influenza B may be longer than that of influenza A<br>1988 — (Levy, et al. 201 Variability in estimates across data stratifications<br>587 Although the generation time or serial interval of influenza B m<br>588 (Levy, et al. 2013), this was not the case in our findings from the<br>589 Figure S3 and S4). Howev

588 (Levy, et al. 2013), this was not the case in our findings from the two seasons (Supplemental Table S:<br>589 Figure S3 and S4). However, we note that the mean intrinsic generation time exhibited a wider credi<br>590 Interva Figure S3 and S4). However, we note that the mean intrinsic generation time exhibited a wider credibl<br>590 interval when using data exclusively from influenza B compared to influenza A, which likely reflects the<br>591 dominan 589 Figure S3 and S4). However, we note that the mean intrinsic generation time exhibited a wider credible<br>590 interval when using data exclusively from influenza B compared to influenza A, which likely reflects the<br>591 do

dominance of influenza A during the study timeframe and the smaller sample size of influenza B.





595 days and a standard deviation (SD) of 0.25 days.

Table S1. The posterior mean (95<br>Table S1. The posterior mean (95<br>multiple co-primary cases. The in<br>(SD) of 0.66 days (Lessler, et al. 2)<br>days and a standard deviation (5 592 Table S1. The posterior mean (95% CrIs) of mean intrinsic generation time across seasons, virus types, household sizes, and wit<br>593 multiple co-primary cases. The incubation period, derived from influenza A, had a mean (SD) of 0.66 days (Lessler, et al. 2009). Only for influenza B, we assumed the shorter incubation period to yield a mean of 0.61 595 days and a standard deviation (SD) of 0.25 days.<br>595 days and a standard deviation (SD) of 0.25 days.



597 Figure S3. Posterior distributions of parameters across data stratifications: (A) seasons, (B) virus types, (C) household sizes, and<br>598 (D) with multiple co-primary cases. (D) with multiple co-primary cases.





600 Figure S4. Posterior distributions of parameters across data stratifications: (A) seasons, (B) virus types, (C) household sizes, and<br>601 (D) with multiple co-primary cases. (D) with multiple co-primary cases.

- 
- 
- 602 Sensitivity analyses<br>603 Similar to the sensitivity are<br>604 limited effect on the intrin<br>605 influenza A (Supplemental 604 limited effect on the intrinsic generation time when exclusively using data from households circula<br>605 influenza A (Supplemental Figure S6, Panel B) or households circulating influenza B (Supplemental l<br>606 S6, Panel 604 limited effect on the intrinsic generation time when exclusively using data from households circulating<br>605 influenza A (Supplemental Figure S6, Panel B) or households circulating influenza B (Supplemental Figure<br>606 S
- 
- 
- 506 56, Panel C).<br>606 56, Panel C).<br>607 Consistent with the previous study (Hart, Abbott, et al. 2022), assuming a higher relative infectiousness<br>608 of asymptomatic infected individuals resulted in slightly lower estimate 607 Consistent w<br>608 of asymptom<br>609 infectors (Suj of asymptomatic infected individuals resulted in slightly lower estimates of the overall infectiousness of<br>609 infectors (Supplemental Figure S6, Panel D).<br>**Sensitivity analyses** Mean intrinsic generation time Overlapping
- 



Table S2. The posterior mean (95% Crls) of mean intrinsic generation time given different incumfectiousness of asymptomatic infected individuals. The primary incubation period, derived f<br>1.55 days and a standard deviation

610 Table S2. The posterior mean (95% CrIs) of mean intrinsic generation time given different incubation periods or relative<br>611 infectiousness of asymptomatic infected individuals. The primary incubation period, derived

612 and the state of asymptomatic infected individuals. The primary incubation period, derived from influenza A, had a mean of 0.61 days and a SD of 0.66 days (Lessler, et al. 2009). For the shorter incubation period deriv 613 influenza B, we assumed a mean of 0.61 days and a SD of 0.25 days (Lessler, et al. 2009). For the longer incubation period derived from influenza A(H1N1)pdm09, we assumed a mean of 0.61 days and a SD of 0.25 days (Tuit

derived from influenza A(H1N1)pdm09, we assumed a mean of 0.61 days and a SD of 0.25 days (Tuite, et al. 2010). 614 derived from influenza A(H1N1)pdm09, we assumed a mean of 0.61 days and a SD of 0.25 days (Tuite, et al. 2010).





616 Figure S5. Posterior distributions of parameters given different assumptions: (A-C) incubation periods, and (D) relative<br>617 infectiousness of asymptomatic infected individuals. Panel (A) presents results obtained usin

617 infectiousness of asymptomatic infected individuals. Panel (A) presents results obtained using data from households with both 618 influenza A and B, whereas Panels (B) and (C) present results obtained using data solely from households with influenza A and B, , 619 respectively.  $\frac{3}{4}$ 





621 Figure S6. Posterior distributions of parameters given different assumptions: (A-C) incubation periods, and (D) relative<br>622 infectiousness of asymptomatic infected individuals. Panel (A) presents results obtained usin

622 infectiousness of asymptomatic infected individuals. Panel (A) presents results obtained using data from households with both 623 influenza A and B, whereas Panels (B) and (C) present results obtained using data solely from households with influenza A and B, ,

624 respectively.