

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

1 **Defining the role of asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 transmission – a** 2 **living systematic review**

3

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

6 **Affiliations:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

16

17

18

19

20 **Author of correspondence:**

21 Name: Dr Muge Cevik

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

24 Telephone number: +447732800814

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

26

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

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

28

29 **Abstract:**

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

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

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

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

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

42 **Data synthesis** Of 928 studies identified, 19 were included. Secondary attack rates from
43 asymptomatic index cases ranged from 0% to 2.8% (9 studies). Pre-symptomatic secondary
44 attack rates ranged from 0.7% to 31.8% (10 studies). The highest secondary attack rates were
45 found in contacts who lived in the same household as the index case. Other activities associated
46 with transmission were group activities such as sharing meals or playing board games with the
47 index case.

48 **Limitations** We excluded some studies because the index case or number of contacts were
49 unclear. Owing to the anticipated heterogeneity, we did not produce a summary estimate of the
50 included studies.

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

54 **Systematic review registration** PROSPERO CRD42020188168

55 **Funding:** No funding was received

56

57

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

58 **Introduction:**

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

70 One of the barriers to understanding the role of asymptomatic transmission is the lack of
71 consistency in case definitions. While symptom severity exists on a spectrum, individuals
72 infected with SARS-CoV-2 can be miscategorized as asymptomatic, when they are
73 paucisymptomatic. For instance, Gudbjartsson et al. reported that approximately half of the
74 participants in their population screening in Iceland had symptoms despite asking symptomatic
75 patients not to participate (3). Additionally, studies that define symptomatic disease narrowly as
76 fever, cough, or shortness of breath might overestimate the proportion without symptoms (3, 8).
77 It is increasingly clear that some individuals experience more diverse symptoms, including taste
78 and smell disturbance or myalgia, either for the entire course of illness or preceding respiratory
79 symptoms. These symptoms can be so mild and insidious that they do not limit patients’ daily
80 activities (4, 9). The situation is further complicated by subjective patient perception and
81 differences between studies in the elicitation and reporting of symptoms.

82 There are reports describing asymptomatic individuals with SARS-CoV-2 who are infectious (10)
83 and who have infected one or more contacts (11), but the extent and significance of
84 asymptomatic transmission requires further understanding. The aim of this review is to

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

85 summarize the available evidence about secondary attack rates (defined as the probability that
86 an infected individual will transmit the disease to a susceptible individual) amongst the contacts
87 of asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic individuals with SARS-CoV-2 to provide information about
88 how contagious they are, and their role in driving the pandemic.

89

90 **Methods:**

91 Systematic review was registered in PROSPERO on 8 June 2020 (CRD42020188168) and will
92 be updated three times a year as a living systematic review (12). The larger review aims to
93 answer transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2. The analysis in this report addresses one of the
94 review questions; to identify asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic secondary attack rate.

95

96 **Definitions**

97 We defined “asymptomatic” as an individual with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection
98 who does not demonstrate symptoms throughout their entire course of infection, or after 14 days
99 of follow up; “paucisymptomatic” as an individual with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2
100 infection with mild symptoms, and “pre-symptomatic” as an individual who reports no symptoms
101 at the time of the initial positive test result, but who goes on to develop recognised COVID-19
102 symptoms. We used these definitions to categorize the index cases. Secondary attack rate was
103 defined as the number of new SARS-CoV-2 infection cases among susceptible contacts of
104 primary cases divided by the total number of susceptible contacts.

105

106 **Search Strategy**

107 We retrieved articles about transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection through systematic searches
108 of eight databases: Medline, EMBASE, Europe PMC, Web of Science, SCOPUS, Chinese
109 database (CNKI), and preprint servers (MedRxiv, BioRxiv) using relevant Medical Subject
110 Headings (MeSH) terms (Supplementary material). The initial search was completed from 30
111 December 2019 to 21 May 2020, searches were repeated on 8 June 2020 and 3 July 2020,
112 owing to the rapidly increasing numbers of studies.

113

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

114 **Study Selection**

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

121

122 **Data Extraction**

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

133

134 **Risk of bias in included studies**

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

139

140 **Data synthesis and statistical analysis**

141 The studies are summarized in text and table form, descriptive statistics were completed for key
142 outcome measures. Secondary attack rates were computed from raw data in each study, dividing

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

143 the number of infected contacts of primary cases by the total number of susceptible exposed
144 contacts. A 95% confidence interval [CI] was calculated by using the Clopper-Pearson method
145 (13, 14). Secondary attack rates are presented as a proportion along with 95% CIs in forest
146 plots, stratified according to the features of index cases: truly asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic.
147 A 95% prediction interval is shown, but a pooled estimate was suppressed due to the expected
148 high methodological and clinical heterogeneity among the studies. A prediction interval is an
149 index of dispersion, providing information on how widely the true effect size varies. It is an
150 estimate of the range of values in which a future observation will fall (15). Analyses were carried
151 out through the Comprehensive Meta-analysis (CMA) software program (Version 3, Biostat,
152 Englewood, NJ, USA) and forest plots were created by means of Excel from Office 2019
153 (Microsoft, Redmond, WA, USA).

154

155 **Results:**

156 The systematic search identified 928 potentially relevant articles and 790 records were screened
157 after removal of duplicates. Of 188 articles retrieved for full-text review and assessed for
158 eligibility, 83 studies were included in the overall systematic review, and among those we
159 identified 19 studies that indicated contact tracing of asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic index
160 cases. The remaining studies are not reported in this systematic review. The number of selected
161 papers at each step of the screening and eligibility are reported in the flow diagram (Figure 1).

162

163 Of these 19 studies that indicated contact tracing of asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic index
164 cases, after reviewing the details and contacting the authors, we re-classified three studies from
165 asymptomatic to pre-symptomatic as the index cases developed symptoms later during the
166 disease course (16-18).

167

168 **Summary of secondary attack rates of asymptomatic index cases**

169 Of the 19 studies included, contact tracing of index patients who were identified as asymptomatic
170 cases, according to our definition, was reported in nine (Table 1, Figure 1) (6, 11, 19-25). All
171 except one tested all close contacts for SARS-CoV-2, regardless of symptoms (23). Cheng et al.

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

172 only tested symptomatic cases, but they also tested high risk populations regardless of
173 symptoms including the household and hospital contacts (23). Six studies reported on household
174 contacts, two studies included hospital contacts and two studies included non-household close
175 contacts.

176

177 Three studies identified no secondary cases after following up 17, 91 and 455 close contacts of
178 asymptomatic index cases (asymptomatic secondary attack rate of 0%) (21-23). Of those, two
179 studies demonstrated higher symptomatic secondary attack rates; Cheng et al. demonstrated
180 that mild cases had a secondary attack rate of 3.8% (95% CI 1.1, 12.8%) and severe cases had
181 4% (95% CI 1.0, 15.8%) secondary attack rate (23), while Park et al. showing household
182 symptomatic secondary attack rate of 16.2% (95% CI 11.6, 22.0%) (21). In another study, 305
183 contacts of 8 asymptomatic cases were followed up, identifying one secondary case (secondary
184 attack rate 0.3% (95% CI 0.0, 1.8%) (25). In the same study, mild, moderate and severe attack
185 rates were 3.3%, 5.6% and 6.2%, respectively. Zhang et al. followed up 119 close contacts of 12
186 asymptomatic index cases and identified one secondary case, an asymptomatic secondary
187 attack rate of 0.8% (95% CI 0.0, 4.6). In the same study, the secondary attack rate was 3.5%
188 (95% CI 1.5-8.0) for those with mild, 5.7% (95% CI 2.5, 12.8%) for those with moderate, and
189 4.5% (95% CI 0.8, 21.8%) for those with severe symptoms (6). In this study, close contacts that
190 lived with an index case had 12 times the risk of infection as those who did not live with the index
191 case (RR 12.5 - 95% CI 1.6, 100.8) and those who had frequent contact with an index case-
192 patient, and those who had more than 5 contacts had 29 times the risk of infection as those with
193 fewer contacts (RR 29.0 - 95% CI 3.6, 232.3). Two studies indicated an asymptomatic secondary
194 attack rate of 1% and 1.9% (19, 20). Chaw et al. reported asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic
195 contacts together. The authors clarified that 3 asymptomatic index cases and their 106 close
196 contacts were followed up, leading to 3 secondary cases, a secondary attack rate of 2.8% (95%
197 CI 0.06, 8.0%). In this study, the overall secondary attack rate was 10.6% in the household
198 setting, which was higher for symptomatic cases (14.4%, 95% CI 8-8, 19-9%) than that of
199 asymptomatic cases and for non-household contacts 0.7 (95% CI 0.1, 1.3) (11). Zeng et al.
200 conducted the largest contact tracing study, following up 753 close contacts of asymptomatic

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

201 index cases and identified one secondary case, an asymptomatic secondary attack rate of 0.13%
202 (95% CI 0.0, 0.7%). In the same study, the secondary attack rate for all contacts was 2.0% (95%
203 CI 1.8, 2.3%) for confirmed symptomatic index cases (24).

204

205 **Summary of pre-symptomatic secondary attack rates**

206 Thirteen papers reported either outbreak investigations or contact tracing studies reporting
207 transmission from an index case during the pre-symptomatic period (11, 16, 18, 23, 26-33)
208 (Table 2). Of those, ten studies followed up 22 to 585 close contacts whose initial exposure
209 occurred before symptom onset of the index case (Figure 3). These studies reported secondary
210 attack rates ranging from 0% to 31.8%. Even in studies that followed up large numbers of
211 people, including community contacts, the majority of secondary cases identified were from the
212 same household or among friend gatherings. In these studies, having meals together, or playing
213 cards with the index case were exposure activities associated with transmission. Hong et al.
214 demonstrated lower secondary attack rates in those wearing masks (8.1% vs. 19.0%; $p < 0.001$)
215 (27). The remaining three studies exclusively reported family cluster outbreaks (26, 28, 29);
216 these investigations did not test contacts outside the household and it is challenging to truly
217 differentiate transmission during the pre-symptomatic period from symptomatic transmission in
218 the household setting (Supplementary Figure 1).

219

220 **Quality assessment**

221 All but 3 studies were contact tracing studies. All papers included a clear definition of
222 symptomatic and asymptomatic cases, number of secondary cases and number of contacts. The
223 majority of studies identified index cases with a clear diagnosis, had an acceptable case
224 definition and sufficiently followed up close contacts (for a minimum of 14 days). However, in
225 some studies the definition of close contact and setting of transmission was not provided. In
226 addition, it was unclear in four reports whether all potential close contacts were included, which
227 could result in an underestimation of the secondary attack rate. (Supplementary Table 1)

228

229 **Discussion:**

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

230 This systematic review provides comprehensive data on secondary attack rates arising from
231 people with asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. While asymptomatic
232 patients can transmit the virus to others (34), the findings from nine studies in this review found
233 secondary attack rates of zero to 2.8%, compared with secondary attack rates of 0.7% to 16.2%
234 in symptomatic cases in the same studies. These findings suggest that individuals who are
235 asymptomatic throughout the disease course are responsible for fewer secondary infections than
236 symptomatic and pre-symptomatic cases. For contacts whose exposure occurred before
237 symptom onset of the index case, transmission events were associated with living with the index
238 case or group activities such as sharing meals and playing board games.

239

240 The findings of our study raise the question about whether the low secondary attack rates from
241 asymptomatic individuals result from low infectiousness or a shorter duration of infectiousness. In
242 another living systematic review, of studies published up to 6 June 2020, we found that cases
243 with asymptomatic infection have a shorter duration of RNA shedding than symptomatic
244 individuals (35). Asymptomatic patients may therefore be contagious but for a shorter duration,
245 limiting the duration they could transmit to their contacts. However, there remain limited data on
246 the shedding of infectious virus in asymptomatic individuals to quantify their transmission
247 potential, which would be needed to inform policy on quarantine duration in the absence of
248 testing. Low likelihood of transmission from asymptomatic index cases combined with high
249 symptomatic secondary attack rates emphasises that, especially in the context of limited
250 resources, approaches should be targeted predominantly on identifying and immediately
251 isolating patients with prodromal or mild symptoms and their contacts, which may avert a
252 significant number of community transmission clusters (36). These findings are in line with
253 previous contact tracing and outbreak investigations suggesting that many SARS-CoV-2-infected
254 people either do not contribute to an onward transmission or have minimal potential to do so (37,
255 38), and a large number of cases are often caused by a small number of infected patients.
256 Clusters have become a prominent characteristic of SARS-CoV-2 which distinguishes it from
257 seasonal influenza, although a similar pattern was also observed in SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV.

258

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

259 The modelling studies suggest that it isn't possible to have epidemics of this size without
260 substantial pre-symptomatic transmission. Viral load dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 derived from
261 confirmed cases suggest that peak viral loads are detected at the start of symptom onset up to
262 day 5 of illness, suggesting highest infectiousness potential in just before or within the first few
263 days after symptom onset (35). So far several contact tracing studies emphasize that the highest
264 risk of transmission occurs during the prodromal phase or early in the disease course (39, 40).
265 For instance, in a prospective contact tracing study of 100 confirmed cases of COVID-19 and
266 2761 close contacts no secondary cases were identified when the exposure occurred more than
267 5 days after the symptom onset (23). Our findings therefore have important implications from a
268 public health perspective. In settings such as nursing homes, homeless shelters, prisons, cruise
269 ships and meat-packing plants in which many people spend prolong period of time together in
270 the same environment including sleeping, dining and sharing common facilities, and where
271 several outbreaks have been documented, pre-symptomatic transmission may contribute
272 substantially to transmission (38, 41). In these settings, when infection develops, most patients
273 are already inside the facility with high viral loads that increase the risk of onward transmission.
274 This highlights the importance of mitigation measures and surveillance in these settings to
275 identify those patients early in the disease course to prevent onward transmission inside the
276 facility.

277

278 This systematic review has several strengths. Firstly, this is a living systematic review examining
279 the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 through contact tracing and outbreak investigation studies.
280 Secondly, we only included studies with clear case definitions, which indicated the number of
281 contacts and secondary cases. The most important study limitation relates to the limitations of
282 the evidence itself. We excluded studies in which the index case was unclear, or the numbers of
283 contacts were not provided. Owing to anticipated heterogeneity, we did not produce a summary
284 estimate of the included studies. The estimates from individual studies are also subject to
285 limitations, such as imprecision resulting from small study size, and sources of bias in the
286 estimation of the true secondary attack rate.

287

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

288 We identified two systematic reviews that investigated asymptomatic transmission, with different
289 research questions and search terms. One review included studies published up to 10 June 2020
290 and identified five studies that directly compared secondary attack rates between asymptomatic
291 and symptomatic index cases; all were included in our review (7). The summary risk ratios for
292 asymptomatic versus symptomatic (0.35, 95% CI 0.10, 1.27) and pre-symptomatic versus
293 symptomatic (0.63, 95% CI 0.18, 2.26) are consistent with our findings. The second review
294 estimated only household secondary attack rates and included studies published up to 29 July
295 2020 (42). Of three studies that included asymptomatic index cases, two were included in our
296 review. We excluded one of the studies because the number of contacts of asymptomatic index
297 cases was not specified; we have not yet received details of the study after contacting the
298 authors. Advantages of our review over these two studies are inclusion of studies published in
299 Chinese, search terms that aimed to capture studies specifically estimating secondary attack
300 rates in different settings and clarification about symptomatology of index cases through direct
301 contact with the authors.

302

303 Important barriers to more accurate quantification of the contribution of asymptomatic and pre-
304 symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 transmission relate to the different definitions used to estimate the
305 asymptomatic fraction of infections, not taking into account mild or atypical symptoms, or the use
306 of estimates from cross-sectional studies without follow up (43). Therefore, in order to
307 understand the extend of asymptomatic infections and transmission, a clear and comprehensive
308 case definition, which assesses the presence or absence of a defined list of major and minor or
309 atypical symptoms is required in future studies.

310

311 In summary, whilst asymptomatic transmission is a major concern for SARS-CoV-2 community
312 spread, secondary attack rates from those who remain asymptomatic throughout their course of
313 infection are low suggesting limited infectiousness. Although it is difficult to estimate the
314 proportion of pre-symptomatic transmission, these patients are likely to be highly infectious
315 around the time of symptom onset and appear to transmit efficiently, especially within
316 households. Those with mild symptoms, who feel otherwise well, still carry large amounts of virus

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

317 in the upper respiratory tract, which might contribute to easy and rapid spread of SARS-CoV-2
318 (20). Future clinical studies should incorporate clear definitions and assess a broad range of
319 symptoms associated with COVID-19, should include longitudinal follow up of patients, and
320 calculate secondary attack rates for a wider range of settings and populations.

321

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

323

324 **Funding:** No funding was received

325

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

331

332 **Contribution statement:**

333 X Qiu: investigation, data curation, writing – original draft; A Nergiz: investigation, data curation,
334 writing – review and editing; A. E. Maraolo: methodology, formal analysis, writing – original draft;
335 I. Bogoch and N. Low: interpretation, writing – review and editing; M. Cevik: conceptualisation,
336 methodology, investigation, writing – original draft, supervision.

337

338

339 **Figure legends:**

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

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

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

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

	Index Cases	Environment	Number of contacts	Number of Secondary cases	Asymptomatic SAR (95% CI)	Symptomatic SAR (95% CI)
Chaw et al. * (11)	3	Household Non-household	106	3	2.8% (0.06, 8.0)	14.4% (8.8, 19.9) 0.7% (0.01, 1.3)
Cheng et al.(23)	9	Non-household	91	0	0% (0.0, 4.1)	Mild 3.76 (1.1-12.8) Severe 3.99 (1.0-15.8)
Gao et al.(22)	1	Household and healthcare	455	0	0% (0.0, 0.08)	
Jiang et al.(19)	3	Household	195	2	1% (0.1, 3.7)	
Luo et al. (25)	8	Household and non-household	305	1	0.33% (0.0, 1.8) OR (0.29 (0.04, 2.2))	Mild 3.3% (OR 0.48 (0.28, 0.82)) Mod 5.6% (OR 1.0) Sev 6.2% (OR 1.19 (0.7, 2.1))
Mandić-Rajčević et al.(20)	1	Healthcare	53	1	1.9% (0.0,10.0)	
Park et al.(21)	4	Household	17	0	0% (0.0, 19.5)	16.2 % (11.6–22.0)
Zeng et al. (24)		All contacts	753	1	0.13% (0.0, 0.7)	2.02% 1.8, 2.3)
Zhang et al.(6)	12	Household	119	1	0.8% (0.0, 4.6)	Mild 3.5% (1.5, 8.0) Mod 5.7% (2.5, 12.8) Severe 4.5% (0.8, 21.8)

344 Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio; SAR, secondary attack rate; sev, severe

345 * authors contacted for more details

346 Table 2: Transmission during pre-symptomatic period

	Index Cases	Environment	Number of contacts	Number of Secondary cases	Pre-symptomatic SAR (95% CI)	Secondary cases
Contract-tracing investigation						
Chaw et al.* (11)	7	Household and non-household	585	15	2.56% (1.4, 4.2)	
Cheng et al.(23)	NR	Household and non-household	299	2	0.7% (0.1, 2.4)	
Hong L et al.(27)	41	Household and non-household	197	24	12.2% (8.0, 17.6)	Friends, family, card playing partners
Huang et al.(16)	1	Friends	22	7	31.8% (13.0, 54.9)	Shared meal with index
Pang et al. (30)	1	Household and non-household	103	6	5.8% (2.2, 12.2)	Living together or sharing meal
Park et al. (21)	4	Household	11	0	0% (0.0, 2.8)	
Qian et al. (31)	1	Household and non-household	137	10	7.3% (3.6, 13.0)	Living together or sharing meal
Yang et al. (32)	2	Household and non-household	123	6	4.9% (1.8, 10.3)	All secondary cases lived together
Ye et al. (18)	1	Family	44	4	9.1% (2.5, 21.4)	Extended family
Zhao et al (33)	1	Friends	15	4	26.7% (7.8, 55.1)	Meal and Mahjong game gathering
Family outbreak investigation						
Chen M et al.(26)	1	Household	3	2	66.7% (9.4, 99.2)	Family cluster outbreak

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

Li P et al.(28)	1	Household	5	4	80% (28.4, 99.5)	Family cluster outbreak
Qian G et al. (29)	2	Household	4	3	75% (10.4, 99.4)	Family cluster outbreak

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

348 * authors contacted for more details


349

350

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

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


353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398



Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates


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

400



Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

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



428

429 For each study the SAR is reported with its 95% CI.

430 A prediction interval at the bottom of the forest is depicted.

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

448 **References:**

- 449 1. Ruan L, Wen M, Zeng Q, Chen C, Huang S, Yang S, et al. New Measures for the
450 Coronavirus Disease 2019 Response: A Lesson From the Wenzhou Experience.
451 *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020.
- 452 2. Gandhi M, Yokoe DS, Havlir DV. Asymptomatic Transmission, the Achilles' Heel of
453 Current Strategies to Control Covid-19. *New England Journal of Medicine*.
454 2020;382(22):2158-60.
- 455 3. Gudbjartsson DF, Helgason A, Jonsson H, Magnusson OT, Melsted P, Norddahl GL,
456 et al. Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic Population. *N Engl J Med*. 2020.
- 457 4. Cevik M, Bamford CGG, Ho A. COVID-19 pandemic-a focused review for clinicians.
458 *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2020.
- 459 5. Wang Y, Liu Y, Liu L, Wang X, Luo N, Li L. Clinical Outcomes in 55 Patients With
460 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Who Were Asymptomatic at
461 Hospital Admission in Shenzhen, China. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2020.
- 462 6. Zhang W, Cheng W, Luo L, Ma Y, Xu C, Qin P, et al. Secondary Transmission of
463 Coronavirus Disease from Presymptomatic Persons, China. *Emerg Infect Dis*.
464 2020;26(8).
- 465 7. Buitrago-Garcia DC, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, Hossmann S, Imeri H, Ipekci AM, et
466 al. The role of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: rapid living systematic review
467 and meta-analysis. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.04.25.20079103.
- 468 8. Lavezzo E, Franchin E, Ciavarella C, Cuomo-Dannenburg G, Barzon L, Del Vecchio
469 C, et al. Suppression of COVID-19 outbreak in the municipality of Vo, Italy. *medRxiv*.
470 2020:2020.04.17.20053157.
- 471 9. Kim ES, Chin BS, Kang CK, Kim NJ, Kang YM, Choi JP, et al. Clinical Course and
472 Outcomes of Patients with Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
473 Infection: a Preliminary Report of the First 28 Patients from the Korean Cohort Study
474 on COVID-19. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*. 2020;35(13):e142.
- 475 10. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, Kimball A, James A, Jacobs JR, et al.
476 Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing
477 Facility. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020.
- 478 11. Chaw L, Koh WC, Jamaludin SA, Naing L, Alikhan MF, Wong J. SARS-CoV-2
479 transmission in different settings: Analysis of cases and close contacts from the
480 Tablighi cluster in Brunei Darussalam. 2020.
- 481 12. Elliott JH, Synnot A, Turner T, Simmonds M, Akl EA, McDonald S, et al. Living
482 systematic review: 1. Introduction—the why, what, when, and how. *Journal of*
483 *Clinical Epidemiology*. 2017;91:23-30.
- 484 13. Dean N, Pagano M. Evaluating Confidence Interval Methods for Binomial Proportions
485 in Clustered Surveys. *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology*. 2015;3(4):484-
486 503.
- 487 14. Brown LD, Cai TT, DasGupta A. Interval Estimation for a Binomial Proportion.
488 *Statistical Science*. 2001;16(2):101-17.
- 489 15. Int'Hout J, Ioannidis JPA, Rovers MM, Goeman JJ. Plea for routinely presenting
490 prediction intervals in meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(7):e010247.
- 491 16. Huang L, Zhang X, Zhang X, Wei Z, Zhang L, Xu J, et al. Rapid asymptomatic
492 transmission of COVID-19 during the incubation period demonstrating strong
493 infectivity in a cluster of youngsters aged 16-23 years outside Wuhan and
494 characteristics of young patients with COVID-19: A prospective contact-tracing study.
495 *Journal of Infection*. 2020;80(6):e1-e13.
- 496 17. Li C, Ji F, Wang L, Wang L, Hao J, Dai M, et al. Asymptomatic and Human-to-
497 Human Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in a 2-Family Cluster, Xuzhou, China.
498 *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2020;26(7):31.
- 499 18. Ye F, Xu S, Rong Z, Xu R, Liu X, Deng P, et al. Delivery of infection from
500 asymptomatic carriers of COVID-19 in a familial cluster. *International Journal of*
501 *Infectious Diseases*. 2020;94:133-8.

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

- 502 19. Jiang XL, Zhang XL, Zhao XN, Li CB, Lei J, Kou ZQ, et al. Transmission potential of
503 asymptomatic and paucisymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: a three-family cluster
504 study in China. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2020;22:22.
- 505 20. Mandic-Rajcevic S, Masci F, Crespi E, Franchetti S, Longo A, Bollina I, et al. Contact
506 tracing and isolation of asymptomatic spreaders to successfully control the COVID-
507 19 epidemic among healthcare workers in Milan (Italy). 2020.
- 508 21. Park SY, Kim YM, Yi S, Lee S, Na BJ, Kim CB, et al. Coronavirus Disease Outbreak
509 in Call Center, South Korea. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2020;26(8):23.
- 510 22. Gao M, Yang L, Chen X, Deng Y, Yang S, Xu H, et al. A study on infectivity of
511 asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 carriers. *Respiratory medicine*. 2020:106026-.
- 512 23. Cheng H-Y, Jian S-W, Liu D-P, Ng T-C, Huang W-T, Lin H-H, et al. Contact Tracing
513 Assessment of COVID-19 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different
514 Exposure Periods Before and After Symptom Onset. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2020.
- 515 24. 曾晶, 邱乐平, 邹晏, 张光霞, 吴先萍, 胥馨尹, et al. [Zeng et
516 al]四川省新型冠状病毒肺炎密切接触者分析. *中国公共卫生*. 2020;36(04):503-6.
- 517 25. Luo L, Liu D, Liao X, Wu X, Jing Q, Zheng J, et al. Contact Settings and Risk for
518 Transmission in 3410 Close Contacts of Patients With COVID-19 in Guangzhou,
519 China. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2020.
- 520 26. Chen M, Fan P, Liu Z, Pan R, Huang S, Li J, et al. A SARS-CoV-2 familial cluster
521 infection reveals asymptomatic transmission to children. *Journal of Infection and
522 Public Health*. 2020;13(6):883-6.
- 523 27. Hong LX, Lin A, He ZB, Zhao HH, Zhang JG, Zhang C, et al. Mask wearing in pre-
524 symptomatic patients prevents SARS-CoV-2 transmission: An epidemiological
525 analysis. *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease*. 2020;36 (no pagination):101803.
- 526 28. Li P, Fu JB, Li KF, Liu JN, Wang HL, Liu LJ, et al. Transmission of COVID-19 in the
527 terminal stages of the incubation period: A familial cluster. *International Journal of
528 Infectious Diseases*. 2020;96:452-3.
- 529 29. Qian G, Yang N, Ma AHY, Wang L, Li G, Chen X, et al. A COVID-19 Transmission
530 within a family cluster by presymptomatic infectors in China. *Clinical infectious
531 diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*. 2020.
- 532 30. 庞秋艳, 李朋, 李天忠, 李化 . [1]一起高速服务区新型冠状病毒肺炎聚集性疫情调查.
533 *安徽预防医学杂志*. 2020;26(02):130-2.
- 534 31. 钱丽珍, 郑志强, 洪万胜, 孙芳红, 吴方楠, 金瑞盈.
535 [2]瑞安市一起新型冠状病毒肺炎聚集性疫情调查. *预防医学*. 2020;32(05):486-8+91.
- 536 32. 阳雅兰, 李林洪, 李长凤, 肖玉春, 彭君.
537 [3]重庆市一起新型冠状病毒肺炎家庭聚集性疫情调查分析. *中国公共卫生*.
538 2020;36(03):285-8.
- 539 33. Zhao H, Li BS, Xia Y, Zhou HL, Li TR, Zeng Y, et al. Investigation of transmission
540 chain of a cluster COVID-19 cases. *Chung-Hua Liu Hsing Ping Hsueh Tsa Chih
541 Chinese Journal of Epidemiology*. 2020;41(0):E064.
- 542 34. Chau NVV, Thanh Lam V, Thanh Dung N, Yen LM, Minh NNQ, Hung LM, et al. The
543 natural history and transmission potential of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection.
544 *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020.
- 545 35. Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-
546 1 and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding and infectiousness:
547 a living systematic review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.07.25.20162107.
- 548 36. Peak CM, Kahn R, Grad YH, Childs LM, Li R, Lipsitch M, et al. Individual quarantine
549 versus active monitoring of contacts for the mitigation of COVID-19: a modelling
550 study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.

Transmission dynamics and secondary attack rates

- 551 37. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, Ye C, Zou X, Zhang Z, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of
552 COVID-19 in 391 cases and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a
553 retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
554 38. Dillon Adam PW, Jessica Wong et al. Clustering and superspreading potential of
555 severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infections in Hong
556 Kong
557 . PREPRINT (Version 1) available at Research Square 2020.
558 39. Wang Y, Tian H, Zhang L, Zhang M, Guo D, Wu W, et al. Reduction of secondary
559 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in households by face mask use, disinfection and
560 social distancing: a cohort study in Beijing, China. *BMJ Global Health*.
561 2020;5(5):e002794.
562 40. Böhmer MM, Buchholz U, Corman VM, Hoch M, Katz K, Marosevic DV, et al.
563 Investigation of a COVID-19 outbreak in Germany resulting from a single travel-
564 associated primary case: a case series. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
565 41. Leclerc QJ FN, Knight LE. What settings have been linked to SARS-CoV-2
566 transmission clusters? [version 1; peer review: 1 approved with reservations].
567 *Wellcome Open Res* 2020;5:83
568 42. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household transmission of
569 SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review and meta-analysis of secondary attack rate.
570 *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.07.29.20164590.
571 43. Meyerowitz E, Richterman, A., Bogoch, I., Low, N., Cevik, M. Towards an Accurate
572 and Systematic Characterization of Persistently Asymptomatic Infection with SARS-
573 CoV-2
574 . SSRN Electronic Journal. 2020.
575