

1 Household clusters of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron subvariants contemporaneously sequenced from  
2 dogs and their owners

3  
4 Francisco C. Ferreira<sup>1\*</sup>, Lisa D. Auckland<sup>2</sup>, Rachel E. Busselman<sup>2</sup>, Edward Davila<sup>2</sup>, Wendy  
5 Tang<sup>1</sup>, Ailam Lim<sup>3</sup>, Nathan Sarbo<sup>4</sup>, Hayley D. Yaglom<sup>4</sup>, Heather Centner<sup>4</sup>, Heather Mead<sup>4</sup>, Ying  
6 Tao<sup>5</sup>, Juan Castro<sup>6</sup>, Yan Li<sup>5</sup>, Jing Zhang<sup>5</sup>, Haibin Wang<sup>7</sup>, Lakshmi Malapati<sup>8</sup>, Peter Cook<sup>5</sup>, Adam  
7 Retchless<sup>5</sup>, Suxiang Tong<sup>5</sup>, Italo B. Zecca<sup>5</sup>, Ria R. Ghai<sup>5</sup>, Casey Barton Behravesh<sup>5</sup>, Rebecca S.  
8 B. Fischer<sup>9</sup>, Gabriel L. Hamer<sup>1</sup>, Sarah A. Hamer<sup>2\*</sup>

9 Affiliation:

10 <sup>1</sup>Department of Entomology, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA

11 <sup>2</sup>Department of Veterinary Integrative Biosciences, Texas A&M University, College Station,  
12 Texas, USA

13 <sup>3</sup>Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory, UW-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA

14 <sup>4</sup>Translational Genomics Research Institute (TGen North), Flagstaff, Arizona, USA

15 <sup>5</sup>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Atlanta, Georgia, USA

16 <sup>6</sup>Eagle Global Scientific, contractor to CDC, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

17 <sup>7</sup>IHRC, Inc. contractor to CDC, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

18 <sup>8</sup>The St. John Group, LLC, contractor to CDC, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

19 <sup>9</sup>School of Public Health, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA

20

21 \*Emails for correspondence: franciscocarlosfj@gmail.com; shamer@cvm.tamu.edu

22

23 **Keywords**

24 One Health, longitudinal study, surveillance, COVID-19, zoonosis

25

26 **Abstract**

27 Monitoring the zoonotic potential of emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants in animals is a critical tool  
28 to protect public health. We conducted a longitudinal study in 47 households reporting people  
29 with COVID-19 in Texas in January-July 2022, during the first Omicron wave. We evaluated  
30 105 people and 100 of their companion animals by RT-qPCR for SARS-CoV-2 at three  
31 sequential sampling events 1-2 weeks apart, starting 0-5 days after the first reported diagnosis of  
32 COVID-19 in the house. Of 47 households that reported people with COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2  
33 was detected in 43, with 68% of people testing positive by RT-qPCR; 95.5% of people had  
34 antibodies to SARS-CoV-2. Dogs were the only animal species positive by RT-qPCR (5.4%;  
35 3/55). Viral copies were consistently lower in dogs than household members, and no infectious  
36 virus was recovered in cell culture. Whole genome sequencing revealed household clusters of  
37 Omicron subvariants BA.1.1, BA.2.3.4 and BA.5.1.1 in people, dogs and a food bowl,  
38 confirming human-to-dog transmission within households, with no evidence of onward  
39 transmission from the infected dogs. Eleven dogs (n = 55) and two cats (n = 26) had neutralizing  
40 antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. Infection was not associated with clinical signs in pets; only  
41 two animals that tested negative for SARS-CoV-2 were reported to be sick. Nearly one-third  
42 (30.2%) of households with active COVID-19 had pets exposed to SARS-CoV-2, similar to our  
43 pre-Omicron studies, yet incidence of infection in cats was lower compared to pre-Omicron.  
44 These differences suggest that the zoonotic transmission dynamics in households may differ  
45 based on variant.

46 **Significance statement**

47 Monitoring companion animals offer insights into the zoonotic potential of SARS-CoV-2 ahead  
48 of its introduction into other animal populations where viral spread may go unchecked. At the  
49 peak of the first Omicron wave, we assessed SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics in households  
50 longitudinally testing people and their pets in Texas. Omicron infections in cats were  
51 significantly lower when compared to pre-Omicron variants. Whole genome sequencing revealed  
52 three household clusters of human-to-dog transmission, each with a different Omicron  
53 subvariant, yet we did not find evidence of onward transmission to other animals or humans from  
54 infected dogs. Sustained animal surveillance in at-risk animals and people using the One Health  
55 approach are critical given the ongoing potential for viral evolution that can impact public health.

## 56 **Introduction**

57 Severe acute respiratory syndrome virus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), the agent of coronavirus disease 2019  
58 (COVID-19), is a zoonotic virus of worldwide importance to public health and to the health of  
59 at-risk mammalian species. Spillover infections from people to animals are widespread given the  
60 wide range of susceptible mammal species (1). Confirmation of the susceptibility of companion  
61 animals, especially cats and dogs, to SARS-CoV-2 via experimental challenges (2, 3) and the  
62 detection of natural infections at early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic across multiple  
63 continents (4-6) raised questions about the role of pets in transmission cycles of the virus.  
64 However, few human infections resulting from contact with infected pets have been reported (7,  
65 8).

66 The highly transmissible Omicron variant emerged globally in November 2021, and  
67 confirmed predictions that virus variants and subvariants may differ in their host-range (9, 10).  
68 Because dogs and cats remained susceptible to Omicron under laboratory (11, 12) and in natural  
69 conditions (13, 14), it is essential to survey pets for their involvement in SARS-CoV-2  
70 transmission cycles as new variants continue to emerge. This is critical because dogs  
71 experimentally infected with Omicron can sustain onward transmission to naive conspecifics  
72 (12).

73 Pets living in households with active COVID-19 cases are more likely to have been  
74 exposed to SARS-CoV-2 compared to pets with no or unknown evidence of exposure to infected  
75 people (15-17). While cross-sectional studies are useful for determining pet infection prevalence,  
76 longitudinal studies of pets and household members are needed to understand transmission  
77 dynamics within households. Therefore, we conducted a longitudinal investigation enrolling

78 people and pets living in households with active COVID-19 cases during the emergence of  
79 Omicron in Texas to understand inter-species transmission patterns under natural conditions.

80

## 81 **Results**

### 82 **General results**

83 In total, we sampled 105 people and 100 animals from 47 households where at least one person  
84 self-reported COVID-19, with 1-7 people per house and 1-12 pets per house (Table 1). Thirty-  
85 five households had dogs, 19 had cats and nine had both dogs and cats. An average of 1.63 dogs  
86 ( $n = 57$ ; 0.88 standard deviation) and 1.38 cats ( $n = 29$ ; 0.59 SD) were tested per household. The  
87 mean age for dogs and cats was 6.7 (4.58 SD) and 6.4 (3.99 SD) years, respectively. The cohort  
88 also included five goats, three horses, two pigs, a donkey, a rabbit, a gecko and a tortoise.

89 We collected swabs at three consecutive sampling events 0-33 days after the self-reported  
90 date of first COVID-19 diagnosis within each household (referred to as "days after diagnosis";  
91 Table 1). The average number of days after diagnosis was 2.22 (1.6 SD) for the first sampling,  
92 8.9 (3.7 SD) for the second, and 15.7 (5 SD) for the third.

### 93 **Detection of SARS-CoV-2**

94 We confirmed at least one positive result among people with SARS-CoV-2 via RT-qPCR in 43  
95 of the 47 households; households with no SARS-CoV-2 detection in humans were excluded from  
96 analyses below. Positivity rate by RT-qPCR in humans (samples positive by both N1 and N2  
97 tests) was 63.9% ( $n = 97$ ), 52.1% ( $n = 96$ ), 22.6% ( $n = 93$ ) at the first, second and third sampling  
98 event, respectively (Supplementary Figure S1). Overall, 68.4% (67/98) of the people tested  
99 positive at least once. Our generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs) showed that Ct values  
100 increased for both N1 and N2 assays with the number of days after diagnosis ( $P < 0.001$ )

101 between the first and the second sampling event ( $P < 0.001$ ), and between the second and the  
102 third sampling event ( $P < 0.001$ ; Supplementary Figure S1).

103 Of the 55 dogs sampled, three (5.4%) from different households had respiratory swabs  
104 positive by RT-qPCR; positive samples were collected at 2, 5, and 9 days after diagnosis of the  
105 first person with COVID-19. Rectal swabs from these dogs were negative at all sampling events.  
106 All swab samples (respiratory and rectal) from cats ( $n = 27$ ) and other pet species were negative  
107 by RT-qPCR. A total of 3 of 43 households (7%) with people with COVID-19 had RT-qPCR  
108 positive pets. Overall, 33 households owned dogs, indicating dogs in 9.1% of these households  
109 became positive following potential exposure. The positivity rate by RT-qPCR is lower for cats  
110 when compared to our prior, pre-Omicron study ((18) *in preparation*;  $n = 157$ ; 13.4%; Fisher's  
111 Exact Test,  $P = 0.048$ ), but rates does not differ for dogs ( $n = 396$ ; 4.8%; Fisher's Exact Test,  $P =$   
112 0.7).

113 The Ct values from these dogs were consistently higher than values from humans  
114 sampled at the same time using the day of the first COVID-19 diagnosis as a reference (GLMM;  
115  $P = 0.008$  for the N1 and  $P = 0.007$  for the N2 assay; Figure 1). The first two positive dog  
116 samples were collected during the first sampling event, while the third dog converted from  
117 negative to positive between the first and second sampling. In all cases, the household with a  
118 positive dog had a second pet (two with dogs and one with a cat) that remained negative by RT-  
119 qPCR in all three sampling events.

120 A total of 39 dogs and 21 cats from 32 households had their food and water bowls tested,  
121 and a food bowl utilized by a RT-qPCR-positive dog likewise tested positive (2.6%) by RT-  
122 qPCR. This household also had a cat that tested negative by RT-qPCR at all three sampling  
123 events, and whose food bowl also consistently tested negative.

124 Attempts to isolate viable virus from RT-qPCR-positive samples collected from dogs and  
125 from the food bowl by passages on Vero cells expressing Transmembrane Protease, Serine 2 and  
126 Human Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme 2 (Vero E6-TMPRSS2-T2A-ACE2) were unsuccessful.  
127 Ct values for these samples ranged from 32.5 to 36.9.

### 128 **Whole genome sequencing and phylogeny**

129 Whole-genome sequencing revealed that viruses detected in humans, dogs and a food bowl from  
130 each of the three households clustered in monophyletic clades by household (Figure 2).

131 The subvariant BA.1.1 was detected in samples collected from a dog (GISAID acc. num.:  
132 EPI\_ISL\_18065574, GenBank acc. num.: OR398175) and from two people  
133 (EPI\_ISL\_18065564, EPI\_ISL\_18065569; OR398179, OR398183) living in the same household  
134 (HH 9A). Sequencing the virus collected at the second sampling event from one of these two  
135 people revealed the same virus sequence (EPI\_ISL\_18065567; OR398182). Sequences obtained  
136 from humans and from the dog had 99.6-99.7% and 95.8% coverage of the SARS-CoV-2  
137 genome, respectively, being identical to each other when excluding gaps in coverage.

138 In a second household (HH 21A), a dog and a person were infected by the Omicron  
139 lineage BA.2.3.4 (EPI\_ISL\_18065573; OR398173 and EPI\_ISL\_18065570; OR398184,  
140 respectively). We successfully sequenced the same virus genome from this person at the second  
141 sampling event (EPI\_ISL\_18065566; OR398181). Sequence coverage was 99.5-99.6% for  
142 human and 98.2% for dog samples, respectively, and were identical to each other.

143 In the third household (HH 46A), the Omicron lineage BA.5.1.1 was sequenced from two  
144 people during the first sampling event (EPI\_ISL\_18065565, EPI\_ISL\_18065562; OR398180,  
145 OR398177; sequencing coverage = 99.6%); a second viral sequence was obtained from one of  
146 the people during the second sampling event (EPI\_ISL\_18065563; OR398178; sequencing

147 coverage = 99.6%) and from the other person during the third sampling event  
148 (EPI\_ISL\_18065561; OR398174; sequencing coverage = 90.1%). The virus sequences obtained  
149 during the first two sampling events were identical to the one obtained from a dog food bowl that  
150 was positive in the third sampling event (EPI\_ISL\_18065572; OR398176; sequencing coverage  
151 = 93.1%). The virus sequenced from one person sampled in the third event, 14 days after the first  
152 sampling, had six single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP) and a six-nucleotide deletion  
153 compared to the other sequences obtained from this household. One of these mutations  
154 (C27532A), which was not present in the first sample sequenced from this person, placed this  
155 sequence into a separate clade within BA.5.1.1 from Texas, suggesting an independent infection  
156 event. The virus detected from the dog was not successfully sequenced. Shotgun metagenomic  
157 sequencing was conducted to verify the species origin of samples from the positive food bowl  
158 from this household, which showed a mixture of mitochondrial DNA matching human and  
159 canine, but also chicken, cow, and pig, likely reflecting dog food components.

## 160 **Serology**

161 We used an ELISA assay targeting IgG against SARS-CoV-2 spike protein (Inbios, Seattle,  
162 USA) in eluates from dried blood spots (DBS) collected from people in the first sampling event.  
163 This serological test detects IgG in response to either natural exposure to SARS-CoV-2 or  
164 vaccination. Overall, 95.3% of the people (82/86) were seropositive. Five people with serology  
165 data (5.8%) reported never having been vaccinated against COVID-19, three of which were  
166 seropositive and tested positive by RT-qPCR, at days 3, 5, and 5 after the initial COVID-19  
167 diagnosis in their households. Only one person was vaccinated yet tested negative by serology.

168       Eleven out of 55 dogs (20%) had antibody titers capable of neutralizing the formation of  
169 at least 50% of viral plaques (PRNT<sub>50</sub>-positive), two of which (18.2%) neutralized 90% or more



170 virus plaques (PRNT<sub>90</sub>) at 1:10 and at 1:20 dilutions during all three sampling events. Two cats  
171 (7.7%; n = 26) were PRNT<sub>50</sub>-positive (Figure 3a). Five goats, three horses, and one donkey  
172 tested negative by PRNT. Two households had two pets each that were seropositive, while seven  
173 other multi-pet households had only a single seropositive animal (Figure 3a). SARS-CoV-2  
174 active infection and/or past exposure in pets, as demonstrated by positivity by RT-qPCR and by  
175 PRNT, respectively, was not statistically different between dogs (23.6%) and cats (7.4%; Fisher's  
176 Exact Test,  $P = 0.13$ ). Seroprevalence is lower for cats when compared to our pre-Omicron study  
177 (n = 146; 35.7%; Fisher's exact test,  $P = 0.005$ ), but rates are similar for dogs (n = 382; 24.9%;  
178  $\chi^2$  with Yates correction = 0.4,  $P = 0.54$ ; (18)).

179 The dynamics for RT-qPCR and PRNT<sub>50</sub> tests for pets positive by RT-qPCR and for  
180 other pets from the same household are shown in Figure 3b. Only one RT-qPCR-positive dog  
181 had neutralizing antibodies (PRNT<sub>50</sub> positive) against SARS-CoV-2, which were first detected at  
182 the third sampling event. The other dog from this same household was PRNT<sub>50</sub>-positive at the  
183 first and second sampling events. None of the other RT-qPCR-positive dogs or pets with which  
184 they were co-housed were PRNT<sub>50</sub>-positive.

185 We examined viral plaque neutralization capacity over time among samples that did not  
186 meet the PRNT<sub>50</sub> threshold. At the first, second, and third sampling events, mean PRNT values  
187 were 21.9% (SD = 21.8), 24.2% (SD = 24.2), and 27.1% (SD = 23.6) for dogs, and 20.4% (SD =  
188 16.3), 21.2% (SD = 14.6) and 16.2% (SD = 14.4) for cats, respectively, with no difference over  
189 time.

190 Combining both RT-qPCR and serostatus data, infection rates are lower for cats when  
191 compared to our pre-Omicron study (n = 157; 35.7%; Fisher's Exact Test,  $P = 0.002$ ) but are  
192 similar for dogs (n = 396; 27.3%;  $\chi^2$  with Yates correction = 0.6,  $P = 0.68$ ). Overall, 13 out of 43

193 (30.2%) households with active COVID-19 cases had pets infected/exposed to SARS-CoV-2,  
194 similar rates to pre-Omicron (n = 281; 39.1%;  $\chi^2$  with Yates correction = 1,  $P = 0.31$ ).

195

### 196 **Survey and odds of infection in pets**

197 The only two pets reported by household members to have clinical signs of disease (coughing  
198 and lethargy) were dogs that tested negative by both diagnostic methods at all three time points.

199 Logistic regression models indicated that the odds of detecting infected or exposed dogs were

200 correlated with the number of days after human diagnosis in the first sampling event (Table 1;  $P$

201 = 0.01). Specifically, for each additional day after human diagnosis, the odds of being positive

202 increased by a factor of 2.55 (95% CI: 1.40 - 6.16). No correlation was observed for the second

203 and third sampling events. Male dogs had 5.74 higher odds of being positive compared to

204 females (95% CI: 1.25 - 34.14;  $P = 0.03$ ). Although the number of infected people administering

205 medicine or providing treats to dogs showed a trend towards reducing the odds of positivity

206 (odds ratio = 0.37, 95% CI: 0.10 - 1.05), this effect was not statistically significant ( $P = 0.09$ ).

207 None of the other explanatory factors included in the initial models were retained in the final

208 model (Table 1).

209 **Table 1: General statistics for 43 households in Texas with active SARS-CoV-2 infections in humans owning pets.** Logistic  
 210 regression models were used to determine factors associated with risk of infection in dogs only due to the small numbers of cats  
 211 sampled and determined as infected with or exposed to SARS-CoV-2. Odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals were included for the  
 212 factors kept in the final model; significant values are in bold.

Factor	Dogs (n = 55)			Cats (n = 27)	
	Non-infected (n = 42)	Infected (n = 13)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Non-infected (n = 25)	Infected (n = 2)
<b>Sampling aspects</b>					
Days after diagnosis, 1st sampling <sup>2,3</sup>	1.69 (1.57)	3.31 (1.38)	<b>2.55 (1.4-6.16)</b>	2.12 (1.54)	3.5 (2.12)
Days after diagnosis, 2nd sampling <sup>2</sup>	8.21 (3.43)	10.54 (3.62)		8.88 (4.03)	11.5 (3.53)
Days after diagnosis, 3rd sampling <sup>2</sup>	15.14 (4.60)	17.46 (3.23)		16.04 (7.35)	18 (1.41)
<b>Household characteristics</b>					
People per household <sup>1</sup>	2.79 (1.41)	3 (1.58)		2.61 (1.50)	3.5 (0.71)
Pets per household <sup>1</sup>	3.33 (2.38)	3.85 (3.72)		2.72 (1.4)	2.5 (2.12)
Infected people per household <sup>2</sup>	1.55 (0.63)	1.54 (0.52)		1.64 (0.76)	1 (0)
Mean Ct values per household at 1st sampling <sup>2</sup>	21.17 (5.10)	22.47 (5.34)		20.29 (4.3)	25.6 (4.24)
<b>Animal aspects</b>					
Male, count (%) <sup>2,3</sup>	15 (62.5)	9 (37.5)	<b>5.74 (1.25-34.13)</b>	10 (40)	1 (50)
Female, count (%) <sup>2,3</sup>	26 (86.7)	4 (13.3)		15 (60)	1 (50)

Mostly indoors, count (%) <sup>2</sup>	36 (85.7)	11 (84.6)		22 (88)	2 (100)
Number of infected people pet share bed during sleep <sup>1</sup>	0.69 (0.81)	0.77 (0.83)		0.96 (0.73)	0.5 (0.71)
Number of infected people pet share room during sleep <sup>2</sup>	0.83 (0.82)	0.92 (0.86)		0.92 (0.76)	0.5 (0.71)
Number of infected people petting the pet <sup>1</sup>	1.43 (0.77)	1.38 (0.65)		1.48 (0.87)	1 (0)
Number of infected people cuddling the pet <sup>1</sup>	1.43 (0.77)	1.38 (0.65)		1.28 (0.74)	1 (0)
Number of infected people kissing the pet <sup>2</sup>	1 (0.96)	1.23 (0.83)		0.84 (0.90)	1 (0)
Number of infected people sharing food with the pet <sup>2</sup>	0.57 (0.83)	0.31 (0.48)		0.28 (0.54)	0.5 (0.71)
Number of infected people administering medicine or giving treats by hand to the pet <sup>2,3</sup>	1.14 (0.84)	0.85 (0.80)	0.37 (0.10-1.05)	0.64 (0.76)	0.5 (0.71)
<b>Human aspects</b>					
Infected people not taking precautions with people in the household <sup>2</sup>	0.33 (0.75)	0.31 (0.75)		0.28 (0.68)	0
Infected people not taking precautions with pets in the household <sup>1</sup>	1.43 (0.80)	1.54 (0.52)		1.64 (0.76)	0.5 (0.71)

213

214 <sup>1</sup>Explanatory variables not included in the models because they were highly correlated with other variables analyzed. See methods  
 215 section for details.

216 <sup>2</sup>Variables included in the initial logistic regression models

217 <sup>3</sup>Variables kept in the final model after employing backward stepwise selection

- 218 Values are mean followed by standard deviation (in parenthesis) unless otherwise stated.
- 219 Pets were considered as infected when positive at least once by RT-qPCR and/or when capable of inhibiting at least 50% of viral
- 220 plaques in plaque reduction neutralization tests.
- 221 Precautions to prevent transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to people included isolation and using face mask.
- 222 Precautions to prevent transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to pets included isolation, using face mask and avoiding touching the pets

## 223 **Discussion**

224 We conducted a longitudinal study using a One Health approach by examining humans and their  
225 pets for SARS-CoV-2 infection. Our study from January 2022 through July 2022, took place  
226 during the peak of the BA.1 Omicron wave to the BA.2/BA.5 wave. We detected SARS-CoV-2  
227 RNA and neutralizing antibodies at low rates in pets, particularly cats, despite multiple sampling  
228 starting shortly after human COVID-19 diagnosis (average of 2.2 days). We show transmission  
229 dynamics within houses, with the conversion of a dog from RT-qPCR-negative to positive  
230 between consecutive sampling events six days apart, emphasizing the importance of longitudinal  
231 sampling. By obtaining full virus genomes from people, pets and from a food bowl utilized by a  
232 RT-qPCR-positive dog, we confirmed horizontal transmission from humans to their pets within  
233 households.

234 Within the three households with RT-qPCR-positive dogs, all co-housed pets remained  
235 negative despite sequential sampling. This is especially remarkable given lower detection rates in  
236 cats in this study compared to pre-Omicron (18). Our results are consistent with a prior study  
237 reporting a marked reduction in seropositivity in pets after the emergence of the Omicron variant  
238 (19).

239 The Ct values in dogs were consistently above the upper limit of the confidence interval  
240 of Ct values from human samples collected at the same reference time, suggesting lower viral  
241 loads in dogs. Ct values may or may not be negatively correlated with the likelihood of detecting  
242 infectious virus in biological samples (reviewed by (20)), but our results provide epidemiological  
243 data showing that the low infectability of dogs during the high exposure time period, and lack of  
244 onward transmission to other pets may be associated with high Ct values during active  
245 infections. Failure to isolate virus from RT-qPCR-positive swab samples from pets further

246 confirm that they were not shedding or shedding extremely low levels of infectious virus at the  
247 time of sampling. These samples were collected between two and nine days after diagnosis of the  
248 human cases. We, therefore, suggest that Omicron variants are not efficiently transmitted from  
249 humans to pets or between pets under natural conditions. Factors such as increased levels of  
250 immunity due to vaccines and prior infection could have contributed to reduced human-to-pets  
251 transmission.

252         Of note, 49% of dogs and 48% of cats were living with between two and four people with  
253 active COVID-19 that were not taking precautions to prevent SARS-CoV-2 transmission to their  
254 pets in most cases, revealing high chances of natural exposure to the virus. However, none of the  
255 factors related to dog-human interactions were associated with increased odds of infection. For  
256 instance, sharing food with pets has been associated with increased human-to-animal  
257 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 (21), but we did not detect such effect. However, the small number  
258 of households and pets tested may have limited the power of our analysis.

259         Genomic epidemiology has inferred only two and four cases of transmission of SARS-  
260 CoV-2 from dogs and cats to humans, respectively (22). However, the inferred number of  
261 transmissions from humans to pets was at least 13 times higher than those values. Our results  
262 provide evidence that pets may not transmit the Omicron variants efficiently intra- and inter-  
263 species under natural conditions, which would be one of the factors explaining the low likelihood  
264 of pet-to-human transmission (22).

265         Whole genome sequencing confirmed that dogs and people from the same household  
266 were infected by the same virus in two cases, with no variation in the viral sequences recovered  
267 from the animals vs. the people. Additionally, we saw that the same virus infecting people was  
268 present in the food bowl from a household with a positive dog. One specimen from this

269 household contained a viral sequence with six SNPs and a deletion relative to the other viral  
270 sequences from the household, including one sequence obtained from the same individual two  
271 weeks earlier. This number of mutations is at the extreme end of what is typically observed  
272 among viruses collected from the same household (23) or in persistent infections (24), suggesting  
273 that this may be a separate introduction of SARS-CoV-2 into the household. This inference is  
274 supported by one of these mutations being shared with sequences obtained from community  
275 surveillance activities in Texas in the weeks prior. Reinfections within a period of a few weeks  
276 are rare, but have been reported (24).

277         Our detection of a RT-qPCR-positive dog food bowl may reflect use by a positive dog  
278 and/or contamination by a positive household member. People experimentally infected with the  
279 wild-type SARS-CoV-2 contaminated household items with the virus (25). Moreover,  
280 contaminated surfaces may be correlated with increased within-household transmission risk (26).  
281 Both people from the household with the positive food bowl were positive, with average Ct  
282 values of 16.9 at the first sampling event. However, the food bowl tested positive only at the  
283 third sampling, when only one person was still positive (average Ct = 32.5), while the dog was  
284 positive at the second sampling event only (average Ct = 37.5). This suggests that viral RNA  
285 detected in the food bowl was derived from the positive dog.

286         Experimentally infected cats shed lower virus loads of an Omicron variant when  
287 compared to pre-Omicron variants (11). Additionally, a recent study did not isolate infectious  
288 virus from cats infected with a low dose of Omicron, despite recovering infectious viruses from  
289 cats infected with the ancestral, gamma and delta strains (27). This helps to explain the lack of  
290 SARS-CoV-2 detection in cats in our study, and the lower detection rates here when compared to



291 a broad study conducted pre-Omicron also in households with active COVID-19 cases in Texas  
292 (18).

293 In experimental challenges, cats seroconvert at 7 days post challenge with pre-Omicron  
294 strains, and dogs seroconvert 7-14 days (2, 11), while Omicron-infected cats display a delayed  
295 seroconversion between 7 and 14 days post infection (11) or do not seroconvert when exposed to  
296 low viral doses (27). The repeated nature of our study allowed the detection of late  
297 seroconversion in seven out of 11 seropositive dogs. We also observed that most seropositive  
298 pets had low antibody titers (PRNT<sub>50</sub>-positive at 1:10 serum dilution only). These low titers  
299 could explain the fact that 30.1% of these pets were seronegative in a subsequent sampling event,  
300 suggesting waning neutralizing antibodies within one to two weeks. All but one of these pets  
301 were negative by RT-qPCR, indicating that the low titers may alternatively reflect exposures to  
302 SARS-CoV-2 earlier in the pandemic. Lack of seroconversion in two of the three infected dogs,  
303 including one that was resampled five and eleven days after the positive RT-qPCR diagnosis,  
304 and the other resampled eight days after RT-qPCR positivity, suggest late seroconversion or  
305 undetectable titers of neutralizing antibodies.

306

## 307 **Conclusions**

308 Multiple Omicron variants were detected in household clusters among dogs and household  
309 members, yet infection rates in cats were lower than in pre-Omicron studies. The high Ct values  
310 in RT-qPCR assays targeting SARS-CoV-2 and lack of infectious virus in samples from dogs,  
311 associated with a lack of evidence of onward transmission between pets, indicate that dogs and  
312 cats were unlikely to act as amplifying hosts for early Omicron variants. As host-breadth and  
313 virus fitness change with the evolution of new variants, continued surveillance using One Health

314 approaches may be critical as new waves driven by a diversity of viruses are expected for years  
315 to come. Involving companion animals in SARS-CoV-2 surveillance efforts may inform if and  
316 how the virus can affect other animals populations, and may serve as a proxy when humans  
317 cannot be sampled directly.

318

## 319 **Methods**

### 320 **Recruiting and sampling**

321 Between January-July 22, 2022, we recruited people and pets living in the same household as a  
322 person with a SARS-CoV-2 infection via COVID-19 portal of Texas A&M University (TAMU).  
323 Participating persons responded to a short questionnaire by phone to tally the number of humans  
324 and pets living in the house; human COVID-19 vaccination history, date of positive human test  
325 result, pet species and signalment (breed, age, sex), and any pet clinical signs of disease. The  
326 TAMU Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (2018-0460 CA) and Clinical Research  
327 Review Committee approved animal sampling. The Institutional Review Board issued a public  
328 health surveillance exemption.

329 We visited each house three times over an approximate 2-week period for sample  
330 collection. We collected nasal swabs from people during all three sampling visits. From the pets,  
331 we collected nasal and oral swabs that were combined into a single vial containing 3 mL of viral  
332 transport media (VTM; made following CDC SOP#: DSR-052-02), while rectal swabs were  
333 stored in a separate vial with 3 mL of VTM. Additionally, in a subset of households, we  
334 collected swab samples from food and water bowls utilized by the pets. Swabs in VTM were  
335 stored in a cooler with ice packs until arrival in the laboratory, where samples were stored in a -  
336 80 °C freezer.

337 From humans, we collected blood onto Whatman® protein saver cards (Sigma-Aldrich,  
338 St. Louis, MO, USA) via finger prick at the first visit only. These samples were air-dried and  
339 stored at room temperature. From pets, blood was collected from either jugular, cephalic or  
340 saphenous veins into clot activator tubes and kept in a cooler until centrifugation with serum  
341 aliquots stored at -80°C.

#### 342 **Molecular testing**

343 VTM aliquots from humans, pets, food and water bowls were shipped to the Wisconsin  
344 Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory for RT-qPCR targeting nucleocapsid gene region 1 (N1) and  
345 nucleocapsid gene region 2 (N2) (28, 29) of SARS-CoV-2. Cycle threshold (Ct) values were  
346 reported as the average of the values for regions N1 and N2.

#### 347 **Virus isolation**

348 VTM aliquots of three pets and the food bowl that tested positive by RT-qPCR were transferred  
349 to a BSL-3 laboratory in Texas A&M University. For virus isolation, 100 µL of VTM with 900  
350 µL of 1× Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM) via syringe filtration using an 0.2 micron  
351 pore size onto Vero E6-TMPRSS2-T2A-ACE2 (BEI Resources, NR-54970) cells expressing  
352 both endogenous cercopithecine ACE2 and TMPRSS2 as well as transgenic human ACE2 and  
353 TMPRSS2. Plates were incubated for 72 h and presence of cytopathic effects was evaluated  
354 using a brightfield microscope following published protocols (30).

#### 355 **SARS-CoV-2 whole genome sequencing, metagenomics, and phylogenetic analysis**

356 Aliquots of VTM from infected pets, food bowl, and the humans living with infected pets were  
357 sent to the CDC for SARS-CoV-2 whole genome sequencing according to established protocols  
358 (31). Phylogenetic tree were inferred using RAxML in the NextStrain pipeline (v7.1.0; (32)) with  
359 all 15305 SARS-CoV-2 genomes from the GISAID database that were detected in Texas two

360 weeks before or after the start of sampling at each household. PANGO lineages were assigned  
361 using ‘pangolin’ (software v4.3.1; data v1.29; (33)). Mammalian mitochondrial DNA was  
362 identified by untargeted metagenomic sequencing as described previously (34) followed by  
363 mapping reads to a database of mtDNA sequences representing clusters with 93% sequence  
364 identity (35).

### 365 **Serologic testing**

366 At the TGen North laboratory, human dried blood spots were eluted to 1:100 in dilution buffer.  
367 Anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were detected using a qualitative SARS-CoV-2 IgG ELISA assay  
368 (InBios, Seattle, WA, USA). All assays, including controls, were used as per the manufacturer’s  
369 recommendations.

370 Pet serum samples were tested by plaque neutralization tests (PRNT) at Texas A&M  
371 University Global Health Research Complex to quantify neutralizing antibodies against SARS-  
372 CoV-2 in BSL-3 following the protocol described by Roundy et al. (36). Briefly, we used Vero  
373 CCL-81 cell cultures in 6-well plates and SARS-CoV-2 isolate USAIL1/2020, NR 52381 (BEI  
374 Resources, Manassas, VA, USA) for an initial screening using serum samples at a dilution of  
375 1:10 to test their ability to reduce virus plaques by at least 50% when compared to the virus  
376 control, a well-established method (37) with sensitivity of 97% (38) which reduced the chances  
377 of assigning pets as false-negative in our study. The subset of positive serum samples with  
378 antibody titers able to reduce more than 90% of virus plaques were further tested at 2-fold serial  
379 dilutions to determine 90% endpoint titers.

### 380 **Statistical analysis**

381 We used either Chi-squared test with Yates' correction or Fisher's Exact test to compare  
382 positivity rates by RT-qPCR and PRNT<sub>50</sub> between this study and a previous one conducted pre-  
383 Omicron in the same region in Texas (18).

384 We employed generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs) (using the *lme4* package (39))  
385 to analyze changes in Ct values from positive samples using species (humans or dogs), days after  
386 diagnosis and sampling event as fixed effects, and host ID as random. We used separate models  
387 for N1 and N2 genes, which produced similar results. Given the non-normal distribution of Ct  
388 values, we applied a Gamma distribution with a log link function, which produced a better-fit  
389 model. To assess changes in PRNT values over time, we employed a GLMM adding species as  
390 explanatory variable, also using animal ID as a random effect. We used a Tweedie distribution  
391 with a log link function because PRNT values presented a non-normal distribution and had  
392 values equal to zero. We performed backward stepwise selection using Akaike Information  
393 Criterion (AIC) to identify significant predictors.

394 We built a logistic regression model to determine factors associated with the risk of dogs  
395 becoming infected with SARS-CoV-2. We detected high multicollinearity (correlation values  
396 above or below 0.85 and -0.85, respectively) among some explanatory variables. For example,  
397 the number of infected people petting, cuddling and not taking precautions to not transmit  
398 SARS-CoV-2 were highly correlated with the number of infected people per household.  
399 Therefore, only the latter variable was kept. Similarly, the number of infected people sharing the  
400 bed and room with pets were also correlated and only the latter was included. The initial model  
401 included number of days after diagnosis, pet sex, number of infected people in household, mean  
402 SARS-CoV-2 Ct value of people in household, number of infected people interacting with dog  
403 (sleeping in same room, kissing, sharing food, giving medicine and treats by hand) and whether

404 the pet stayed >75% indoors. We performed backward stepwise selection using AIC to identify  
405 significant predictors in these models. The coefficients from the final model were used to  
406 calculate odds ratios (OR) and their 95% confidence intervals (CI). We did not build models for  
407 cats because only two individuals tested positive. We performed all analyses using R 4.2.2 (40).

408

#### 409 **Acknowledgments**


410 Funding provided by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. We thank Dr. Benjamin  
411 Neuman and Tahmina Pervin, Texas A&M University, for virus isolation efforts. We thank Dan  
412 Christensen from the Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory for diagnostic support.

#### 413 **Disclaimer**

414  
415 The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily  
416 represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.


417

418 **Figure 1. Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR Ct values from positive people (67 testing**  
419 **positive at least once, with a total of 133 positive samples), dogs (n = 3) and a food bowl in**  
420 **relation to the number of days after diagnosis of first COVID-19 case in the household.**  
421 Locally estimated scatterplot smoothing ("loess" function) was fitted for data from each RT-  
422 qPCR assay for human samples, displaying 95% confidence intervals. Ct values from household  
423 members sampled in the same day as positive dogs and the food bowl are in bold colors.





425

**Figure 2. Phylogenetic context of SARS-CoV-2 from dogs in relation to people from the same households.** Genome sequences of SARS-CoV-2 from each household with an infected dog were analyzed alongside 15305 sequences from community surveillance in Texas collected within two weeks before or after start of sampling at each household. The main phylogeny at the top left shows sequence divergence with branch labels for the major PANGO lineages and color-coding for the time of specimen collection. Insets show specimens from each household displayed with the most closely related surveillance samples and positioned by collection date. Viral hosts are indicated with markers: circle for human; diamond for canine (including water bowl in HH 46A).







**Figure 3. Plaque reduction neutralization assay (PRNT) results over time for dogs and cats sampled in households with a human COVID-19 case.** Numbers inside boxes represent the proportion of viral plaques neutralized per pet per sampling event. **A.** All pets from households with seropositive pets at one or more time points are displayed. **B.** PRNT<sub>50</sub> for pets in households with RT-qPCR-positive dogs, which are identified with a "P". The food bowl from dog HH46A-201 was RT-qPCR-positive at the third sampling point ("P\*"). Households are separated by thick horizontal lines; tiles in grey indicate missing data. Cats are indicated by icons; all other individuals are dogs.



**Supplementary Figure S1. Distribution of Ct values for the two RT-qPCR assays (N1 and N2) from human samples according to sampling event.** Median, interquartile range (IQR), and whiskers representing 1.5 times the IQR are displayed. Number of positive samples for the first, second and third sampling points were 62, 50 and 21, respectively. All samplings for event 1 occurred within 0-5 days after the first COVID-19 diagnosis, within 4-18 days for event 2, and within 8-33 days for event 3.



**Supplementary Figure S2. Distribution of PRNT values for samples collected from dogs and cats according to sampling event.** Median, interquartile range (IQR), and whiskers representing 1.5 times the IQR are displayed. A total of 55 dogs were tested at least once, with 51, 51 and 51 samples evaluated in the first, second and third sampling event, respectively. A total of 26 cats were tested, with 21, 24 and 23 samples evaluated in the first, second and third sampling event, respectively.



## References

1. WOAHA (2023) World Organisation for Animal Health - SARS-CoV-2 in animals - situation report 22.
2. A. M. Bosco-Lauth *et al.*, Experimental infection of domestic dogs and cats with SARS-CoV-2: Pathogenesis, transmission, and response to reexposure in cats. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **117**, 26382-26388 (2020).
3. J. Shi *et al.*, Susceptibility of ferrets, cats, dogs, and other domesticated animals to SARS-coronavirus 2. *Science* **368**, 1016-1020 (2020).
4. Q. Zhang *et al.*, A serological survey of SARS-CoV-2 in cat in Wuhan. *Emerging Microbes & Infections* **9**, 2013-2019 (2020).
5. A. Newman *et al.*, First Reported Cases of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Companion Animals - New York, March-April 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **69**, 710-713 (2020).
6. E. I. Patterson *et al.*, Evidence of exposure to SARS-CoV-2 in cats and dogs from households in Italy. *Nature Communications* **11**, 6231 (2020).
7. T. Sila *et al.*, Suspected Cat-to-Human Transmission of SARS-CoV-2, Thailand, July-September 2021. *Emerg Infect Dis* **28**, 1485-1488 (2022).
8. H. L. Yen *et al.*, Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 delta variant (AY.127) from pet hamsters to humans, leading to onward human-to-human transmission: a case study. *Lancet* **399**, 1070-1078 (2022).
9. Z. Niu *et al.*, N501Y mutation imparts cross-species transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to mice by enhancing receptor binding. *Signal Transduct Target Ther* **6**, 284 (2021).
10. G. T. Barut *et al.*, The spike gene is a major determinant for the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron-BA.1 phenotype. *Nat Commun* **13**, 5929 (2022).
11. M. Martins *et al.*, The Omicron Variant BA.1.1 Presents a Lower Pathogenicity than B.1 D614G and Delta Variants in a Feline Model of SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *J Virol* **96** (2022).
12. K. S. Lyoo *et al.*, Experimental Infection and Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Delta and Omicron Variants among Beagle Dogs. *Emerg Infect Dis* **29**, 782-785 (2023).
13. C. Piewbang *et al.*, SARS-CoV-2 Transmission from Human to Pet and Suspected Transmission from Pet to Human, Thailand. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* **60**, e01058-01022 (2022).
14. L. Sánchez-Morales, J. M. Sánchez-Vizcaíno, M. Pérez-Sancho, L. Domínguez, S. Barroso-Arévalo, The Omicron (B. 1.1. 529) SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern also affects companion animals. *Frontiers in veterinary science* **9**, 940710 (2022).
15. L. Fernández-Bastit *et al.*, Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection and humoral responses against different variants of concern in domestic pet animals and stray cats from North-Eastern Spain. *Transbound Emerg Dis* (2022).
16. M. Fritz *et al.*, High prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in pets from COVID-19+ households. *One Health* **11** (2020).
17. M. M. Kannekens-Jager *et al.*, SARS-CoV-2 infection in dogs and cats is associated with contact to COVID-19-positive household members. *Transbound Emerg Dis* **69**, 4034-4040 (2022).
18. A. Pauvolid-Corrêa *et al.* (High prevalence of respiratory shedding of SARS-CoV-2, neutralizing antibodies, and isolations of infectious virus among 580 companion animals

- from households with a confirmed human COVID-19 case in Texas, United States. *In preparation*.
19. C. Klein *et al.*, Dogs and Cats Are Less Susceptible to the Omicron Variant of Concern of SARS-CoV-2: A Field Study in Germany, 2021/2022. *Transbound Emerg Dis* **2023**, 1868732 (2023).
  20. O. Puhach, B. Meyer, I. Eckerle, SARS-CoV-2 viral load and shedding kinetics. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* **21**, 147-161 (2023).
  21. S. Alberto-Orlando *et al.*, SARS-CoV-2 transmission from infected owner to household dogs and cats is associated with food sharing. *Int J Infect Dis* **122**, 295-299 (2022).
  22. S. Naderi *et al.*, Zooanthroponotic transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and host-specific viral mutations revealed by genome-wide phylogenetic analysis. *eLife* **12**, e83685 (2023).
  23. M. A. P. Donnelly *et al.*, Household Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Alpha Variant-United States, 2021. *Clin Infect Dis* **75**, e122-e132 (2022).
  24. M. Ghafari *et al.*, Prevalence of persistent SARS-CoV-2 in a large community surveillance study. *Nature* **626**, 1094-1101 (2024).
  25. J. Zhou *et al.*, Viral emissions into the air and environment after SARS-CoV-2 human challenge: a phase 1, open label, first-in-human study. *The Lancet Microbe* [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247\(23\)00101-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(23)00101-5) (2023).
  26. N. Derqui *et al.*, Risk factors and vectors for SARS-CoV-2 household transmission: a prospective, longitudinal cohort study. *The Lancet Microbe* **4**, e397-e408 (2023).
  27. E. S. Park *et al.*, The comparison of pathogenicity among SARS-CoV-2 variants in domestic cats. *Sci Rep* **14**, 21815 (2024).
  28. G. W. Goryoka *et al.*, One Health Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Seropositivity among Pets in Households with Confirmed Human COVID-19 Cases—Utah and Wisconsin, 2020. *Viruses* **13**, 1813 (2021).
  29. M. D. Ramuta *et al.*, SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory pathogens are detected in continuous air samples from congregate settings. *Nat Commun* **13**, 4717 (2022).
  30. S. P. Chaki, M. M. Kahl-McDonagh, B. W. Neuman, K. A. Zuelke, Validating the inactivation of viral pathogens with a focus on SARS-CoV-2 to safely transfer samples from high-containment laboratories. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* **14**, 1292467 (2024).
  31. C. R. Paden *et al.*, Rapid, Sensitive, Full-Genome Sequencing of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *Emerg Infect Dis* **26**, 2401-2405 (2020).
  32. J. Hadfield *et al.*, Nextstrain: real-time tracking of pathogen evolution. *Bioinformatics* **34**, 4121-4123 (2018).
  33. Á. O'Toole *et al.*, Assignment of epidemiological lineages in an emerging pandemic using the pangolin tool. *Virus Evolution* **7**, veab064 (2021).
  34. Y. Li *et al.*, Identification of diverse viruses in upper respiratory samples in dromedary camels from United Arab Emirates. *PLoS One* **12**, e0184718 (2017).
  35. A. Crits-Christoph *et al.*, Genetic tracing of market wildlife and viruses at the epicenter of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Cell* **187**, 5468-5482.e5411 (2024).
  36. C. M. Roundy *et al.*, High Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in White-Tailed Deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) at One of Three Captive Cervid Facilities in Texas. *Microbiology Spectrum* **10**, e00576-00522 (2022).

37. E. H. Y. Lau *et al.*, Neutralizing antibody titres in SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nature Communications* **12** (2021).
38. I. S. Horbach *et al.*, Plaque Reduction Neutralization Test (PRNT) Accuracy in Evaluating Humoral Immune Response to SARS-CoV-2. *Diseases* **12** (2024).
39. D. Bates, M. Mächler, B. Bolker, S. Walker, Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.* **67**, 1 - 48 (2015).
40. R. C. Team (2022) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>.