## **Supplementary Online Content**

Ma Q, Liu J, Liu Q, et al. Global percentage of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections among the tested population and individuals with confirmed COVID-19 diagnosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(12):e2137257. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.37257

eMethods 1. Search Strategies
eMethods 2. Study Quality Assessments
eFigure 1. Percentage of Asymptomatic Cases Among the Tested Population
eFigure 2. Percentage of Asymptomatic Cases Among the Confirmed Population
eFigure 3. Percentage of Asymptomatic Cases Among the Tested Population by
Subgroups, Using the Knapp-Hartung Adjustments
eFigure 4. Percentage of Asymptomatic Cases Among the Confirmed Population by
Subgroups, Using the Knapp-Hartung Adjustments

This supplementary material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.

## eMethods 1. Search Strategies

## PubMed

("COVID-19"[Title/Abstract] OR "coronavirus"[Title/Abstract] OR "SARS-CoV-2"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("asymptomatic transmission"[Title/Abstract] OR "asymptomatic infection"[Title/Abstract] OR "asymptomatic carrier"[Title/Abstract] proportion"[Title/Abstract] OR "asymptomatic OR "asymptomatic carriers"[Title/Abstract] OR "asymptomatic contact"[Title/Abstract] OR "asymptomatic ratio" [Title/Abstract] OR "asymptomatic cases" [Title/Abstract] OR "asymptomatic case"[Title/Abstract] OR "asymptomatic people"[Title/Abstract] OR "asymptomatic patients"[Title/Abstract] OR "asymptomatic patient"[Title/Abstract]) AND 2019/11/01:2021/12/27[Date - Publication]

## EMBASE

('covid 19':ab,ti OR 'sars cov 2':ab,ti OR coronavirus:ab,ti) AND ('asymptomatic transmission':ab,ti OR 'asymptomatic infection':ab,ti OR 'asymptomatic proportion':ab,ti OR 'asymptomatic carrier':ab,ti OR 'asymptomatic carriers':ab,ti OR 'asymptomatic carriers':ab,ti OR 'asymptomatic case':ab,ti OR 'asymptomatic case':ab,ti OR 'asymptomatic people':ab,ti OR 'asymptomatic patients':ab,ti OR 'asymptomatic patient':ab,ti OR 'asymptomatic patient

## ScienceDirect

((COVID-19)OR(coronavirus)OR(SARS-CoV-2))+ ((asymptomatic transmission)OR(asymptomatic infection)OR(asymptomatic proportion)OR(asymptomatic carrier)OR(asymptomatic contact)OR(asymptomatic ratio)OR(asymptomatic case)OR(asymptomatic people)OR(asymptomatic patient)) ((COVID-19)OR(coronavirus)OR(SARS-CoV-2))+ ((asymptomatic carriers)OR(asymptomatic cases)OR(asymptomatic patients)) eMethods 2. Study Quality Assessments (according to the quality assessment by Yanes-Lane et al<sup>18</sup>)

**Cohort studies** 

1.1 Is the cohort1.2 Irepresentative of the targetseldpopulation?	Is there likely election bias?	a n 2.2 Is there likely reporting bias? c	3.1 Were objective, standard criteria used for diagnosis of the condition?	3.2 Was symptom development assessed in asymptomatic subjects?	3.3 Was follow-up long enough for symptoms to occur? (14 days on average)	3.4 Were symptoms assessed in a systematic and reliable way?	3.5 Adequacy of follow up of cohorts (lost to follow up)	3.6 Is there likely detection bias?
---	-----------------------------------	---	---	---	--	--	---	--

Grading scale: If question 1.2 is answered "yes" then the study is automatically low quality. If one question assessing bias (2.2 or 3.6) is answered "yes" then study is moderate quality. If both questions assessing bias (2.2 and 3.6) are answered "yes" then the study is low quality.

#### **Cross-sectional studies**

1.1 Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly	1.2 Was an appropriate method of sampling used? Random, complete,	1.3 Participation rate	1.4 Were the study subjects representative of the target population?	1.5 Is there likely to be selection bias?	2.1 Was there a clear definition for an asymptomatic case?	2.2 Were the study subjects and the setting described in	2.3 Is there likely to be reporting bias?	3.1 Were objective, standard criteria used for diagnosis of the	3.2 Was symptom assessment carried out in a standard objective	3.3 Is there likely detection bias?
clearly defined?	other.				case:	detail?	Dias:	condition?	way?	

Grading scale: If questions 1.2 is not a random sample, or if question 1.3 has a lower than 70% participation rate, then the study is automatically low quality. If one question assessing bias (1.5, 2.3 or 3.3) is answered "yes" then study is moderate quality. If two or more questions assessing bias (1.5, 2.3 or 3.3) are answered "yes" then the study is low quality.

#### **Case series**

1.1 Were the inclusion criteria for the case series clearly defined?	1.2 Were valid methods used to diagnose COVID-19 for all participants included in the case series?	1.3 Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants?	1.4 Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants?	1.5 Is there likely selection bias ?	2.1 Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?	2.2 Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?	2.3 Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported?	2.4 Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information?	2.5 Is there likely reporting bias?
---	--	--	---	---	--	---	--	--	--

Grading scale: If question 1.1 is answered "no" then the study is automatically low quality, and if 1.1 is answered "yes" but questions 1.3 or 1.4 are answered "no" then the study is also low quality. If one question assessing bias (1.5 or 2.5) is answered "yes" then study is moderate quality. If both questions assessing bias (1.5 or 2.5) are answered "yes" then the study is low quality.

### Case series on transmission

1.1 Is the method for contact tracing clearly defined?	1.2 Is the number of contacts identified and tested clearly reported?	1.3 Is there likely bias due to missing information? i.e reporting bias	2.1 Is the method for contact tracing rigorous and exhaustive to identify all potential contacts?	2.2 Was the follow-up of people without symptoms sufficient to allow for the incubation period?	2.3 Is there likely missing data on contacts ?	2.4 Is there likely bias in contact identification?	2.5 Is there likely exposure to other potential index cases that were symptomatic?	2.6 Was the index case symptomatic at any time during the exposure to contacts?	2.7 Was the index case identified after the contacts? i.e was the index case identified by exclusion	2.8 Is there likely bias in index case identificati on?
			contacts.	period?			symptomatic:		exclusion	

Grading scale: If questions 2.6 AND 2.7 are answered "yes" then the study is automatically low quality. If one question assessing bias (1.3, 2.4 or 2.8) is answered "yes" then study is moderate quality. If two or more signalling questions are answered "yes" then the study is low quality. For studies on household transmission, signalling questions 1.1 and 1.2 were omitted.

Study	Asymptomatic	Tested individuals	Pe	ercentage	95% CI	Weight
Study Cao et al (2020.11) Ren et al (2020.4) Tsou et al (2020.4) Han et al (2020.7) Krüger et al (2020.7) Kessler et al (2020.7) Kessler et al (2020.7) Menting et al (2020.7) Menting et al (2020.7) Menting et al (2020.10) Pavli et al (2020.9) Pavli et al (2020.10) Zhang et al (2020.10) Zhang et al (2020.10) Chaine et al (2020.10) Macchler et al (2020.10) Macchler et al (2020.10) Samos et al (2020.10) Matchler et al (2020.10) Matchler et al (2020.10) Samos et al (2020.12) Marschner et al (2020.7) Rashid-Abdi et al (2020.7) Akbarialiabad et al (2020.7) Akbarialiabad et al (2020.7) Armold et al (2020.7) Armold et al (2020.7) Armold et al (2020.7) Armold et al (2020.7) Hoxhat et al (2020.7) Armold et al (2020.7) Hoxhat et al (2020.7) Hoxhat et al (2020.7) Hoxhat et al (2020.8) Clouticr et al (2020.8) Clouticr et al (2020.8) Clouticr et al (2020.8) Clouticr et al (2020.9) Greehukhina et al (2020.11) Hung et al (2020.12) Hoxhat et al (2020.9) Greehukhina et al (2020.9) Harada et al (2020.12) Hoxhat et al (2020.7) Al-Qahtam et al (2020.11) Hung et al (2020.7) Al-Qahtam et al (2020.12) Hiano et al (2020.7) Al-Qahtam et al (2020.11) Harting et al (2020.7) Al-Qahtam et al (2020.10) Al-Shamsi et al (2020.11) Harting et al (2020.7) Al-Qahtam et al (2020.10) Al-Shamsi et al (2020.10) Al-Shamsi et al (2020.7) Al-Qahtam et al (2020.7) Al-Qahtam et al (2020.7) Al-Qahtam et al (2020.7) Al-Qahtam et al (2020.10) Al-Shamsi et al (2020.7) Bianco et al (2020.10) Al-Shamsi et al (2020.7) Bianco et al (2020.9	Asymptomatic 300 1749 30 18 4 4 7 25 1 1 1 1 100 288 211 100 288 211 100 288 211 100 288 211 100 288 211 100 288 211 100 299 100 44 422 299 100 100 299 100 100 299 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000	Tested individuals 9865404 19398384 8437 17935 29299 4729 6940 17400 689 625 1185 522 511 4751 891 36061 8553 2807 2087 3473 36061 8553 2807 2087 3473 11622 2087 347 4333 11622 2087 3433 11622 2087 3433 11622 2087 2087 2087 2087 2087 2087 2087 20		$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{prcentage} \\ 0.00 \\ 0.014 \\ 0.006 \\ 0.006 \\ 0.006 \\ 0.006 \\ 0.006 \\ 0.014 \\ 0.015 \\ 0.021 \\ 0.021 \\ 0.0224 \\ 0.025 \\ 0.0229 \\ 0.0233 \\ 0.0$	$\begin{array}{c} 95\% \ CI \\ 0.00; 0.00] \\ 0.01; 0.01] \\ 0.00; 0.009 \\ 0.03; 0.099 \\ 0.03; 0.099 \\ 0.03; 0.09 \\ 0.00; 0.43; \\ 0.00; 0.43; \\ 0.00; 0.43; \\ 0.00; 0.44; \\ 0.00; 0.57; \\ 0.08; 0.34i \\ 0.00; 0.55i \\ 0.08; 0.34i \\ 0.00; 0.55i \\ 0.08; 0.34i \\ 0.00; 0.55i \\ 0.090; 0.55i \\ 0.29i \\ 0.015; 0.49i \\ 0.00; 0.55i \\ 0.25; 0.47i \\ 0.00; 0.25i \\ 0.00; 1.29i \\ 0.00; 0.22i \\ 0.00; 1.29i \\ 0.00; 2.25i \\ 0.00; 0.212i \\ 0.00; 2.25i \\ 0.00; 1.29i \\ 0.00; 2.25i \\ 0.00; 2.10i \\ 0.00; 2.25i \\ 0.00; 2.12i \\ 0.00; 2.25i \\ 0.00; 5.22i \\ 0.00; 5.22i \\ 1.00; 5.5i \\ 0.57; 2.17i \\ 1.17; 2.23i \\ 2.17; 2.228i \\ 0.00; 5.424i \\ 1.64; 5.50i \\ 1.04; 5.50i \\ 1$	Weight 17.1% 8.3% 9.6% 17.1% 8.3% 9.6% 17.1% 8.3% 9.6% 17.1% 8.3% 9.6% 17.1% 8.3% 9.6% 17.1\% 17.1\% 17
Tang et al (2020.11) Arons et al (2020.4)	424 27	1970 76	+ 	21.52 35.53	$\begin{bmatrix} 19.71 \\ 23.3\overline{4} \\ 24.77 \\ 46.29 \end{bmatrix}$	$0.0\% \\ 0.0\%$
<b>Random effects model</b> Heteropenelity: $f^2 = 99\%_{\rm b} \frac{\pi^2}{2} < 0.0001$ y <sup>2</sup> . 10274.22 (cs.	0)			0.25	[0.23; 0.27]	100.0%
neterogeneny; r = 992%, r < 0.0001, X <sub>94</sub> = 10374.27 (p	07		0 10 20 30 40			
		Percent	age of asymptomatic infect	ions		

## eFigure 1. Percentage of Asymptomatic Cases Among the Tested Population

Study	Asymptomatic	Confirmed population		Percentage	95% CI	Weight
Study Deng et al (2020.10) Macchler et al (2020.12) Rashid-Abdi et al (2020.11) LaCourse et al (2020.5) Park et al (2020.4) Ibrahim et al (2020.8) Tsou et al (2020.11) Scheier et al (2021.2) Zhang et al (2020.11) Scheier et al (2021.2) Zhang et al (2020.7) Park et al (2020.7) Martinez-Fierro et al (2020.10) Blain et al (2020.7) Menting et al (2020.7) Menting et al (2020.11) Sacco et al (2020.11) Sacco et al (2020.11) Ly et al (2020.11) Al-Shamsi et al (2020.11) Sacco et al (2020.12) Wi et al (2020.11) Al-Shamsi et al (2020.11) Sacco et al (2020.12) Wi et al (2020.12) Wi et al (2020.12) Wi et al (2020.12) Trang et al (2020.12) Trang et al (2020.12) Trang et al (2020.12) Trang et al (2020.12) Krüger et al (2020.12) Trang et al (2020.11) Cattelan et al (2020.12) Trang et al (2020.12) Krüger et al (2020.12) Trang et al (2020.11) Cattelan et al (2020.11) Cattelan et al (2020.11) Cattelan et al (2020.11) Arnold et al (2021.11) Migueres et al (2020.7) Nishiura et al (2020.7) Nishiura et al (2020.9) Rincón et al (2020.7) Nishiura et al (2020.9) Rincón et al (2020.9) Rincón et al (2020.9) Rincón et al (2020.9) Mattar et al (2020.9) Rincón et al (2020.9) Mattar et al (2020.9) Attar et al (2020.10) Mattar et al (2020.10) Arons et al (2020.10) Arons et al (2020.10) Arons et al (2020.10) Mattar et al (2020.10) Arons et al (2020.10) Arons et al (2020.10) Arons et al (2020.10) Assan et al (2020.10) Mattar et al (2020.10) Matsasaroffi et al (2020.10) Massaroffi et al (2020.4) Random effects model	Asymptomatic	Confirmed population 27 333 21 13 97 2355 5822 131 147 300 686 211 111 161 226 866 211 111 161 205 533 133 143 244 444 395 533 133 143 246 866 211 111 161 395 533 133 143 244 395 533 133 143 144 395 533 133 143 144 395 533 133 144 395 533 133 143 144 395 533 133 143 144 395 533 133 144 395 533 133 144 395 533 134 144 395 533 134 144 395 533 135 533 134 144 395 533 134 144 395 533 135 533 144 103 226 636 649 144 395 533 143 144 395 533 143 144 395 533 144 103 224 8325 533 144 103 224 8325 533 144 103 224 8325 533 144 103 224 8325 533 144 103 104 104 104 104 104 104 105 105 55 126 606 609 158 88 188 188 199 199 229 226 606 609 158 88 188 199 197 105 55 57 27 105 55 57 27 126 126 126 126 126 126 127 127 129 129 129 129 129 129 129 129	<b>★</b> <b>■</b> <b>↓</b> <b>↓</b> <b>↓</b> <b>↓</b> <b>↓</b> <b>↓</b> <b>↓</b> <b>↓</b> <b>↓</b> <b>↓</b>	Percentage 3,700 4,200 4,769 7,669 8,944 9,455 8,944 9,455 10,000 11,766 12,200 12,2773 14,279 14,714 18,188 18,185 19,054 20,035 22,027 22,525 22,000 25,934 20,035 22,027 22,525 22,000 25,934 22,027 22,525 22,000 25,934 22,027 22,525 22,000 25,934 22,027 22,525 22,000 25,934 22,027 22,525 22,000 25,934 22,027 22,525 22,000 25,934 22,027 22,555 56,635 5	95% C1 [0.00; 10.83] [2.05; 6.36] [0.00; 13.87] [0.00; 13.87] [0.00; 13.87] [2.07; 13.72] [5.29; 12.58] [2.77; 13.72] [5.29; 12.58] [2.77; 15.88] [4.12; 15.88] [4.12; 15.88] [4.12; 15.88] [4.12; 15.88] [4.12; 15.88] [4.12; 15.88] [4.12; 15.88] [4.12; 15.88] [4.12; 15.88] [5.23; 32.27] [2.80; 2.64] [1.32; 22.31] [1.1; 25.50] [1.3,23; 30.86] [1.3,23; 30.86] [1.3,23; 30.86] [1.3,23; 30.86] [1.3,23; 30.86] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [1.4,75; 30.29] [2.3,76; 52.83] [2.5,65] [2.5,77; 46.21] [2.3,66] [3.3,35; 50.37] [2.4,22; 70.28] [3.4,81] [2.3,62; 50.95] [2.3,77; 52.33] [2.4,22; 70.28] [3.4,81] [2.3,62; 50.95] [3.3,62; 67.28] [3.4,84] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,84] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,84] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,84] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,84] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,84] [3.22; 77.239] [3.3,62; 67.78] [3.0,44] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,84] [5.22; 72.39] [3.3,62; 67.78] [3.0,44] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,87] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,87] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,87] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,87] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,87] [3.4,87] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,87] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,87] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,87] [3.22; 70.28] [3.4,87] [3.4,87] [3.4,87] [3.4,87] [3.4,48] [3.52; 67.28] [3.54,77] [3.54,77] [3.54,77] [3.54,77] [3.54,77] [3.55] [3.57] [3.57] [3.57] [3.57] [3.57] [3.57] [3.57] [3.57] [3.57] [3.57] [3.57] [3.57] [3.57] [3.58] [3.55] [3.58	Weight 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0919$ , $\chi^2_{79} = 8735.46$ ( $p =$	0)	•				
		Percen	0 20 40 60 80 100 tage of asymptomatic infe	0 ections		

eFigure 2. Percentage of Asymptomatic Cases Among the Confirmed Population

# eFigure 3. Percentage of Asymptomatic Cases Among the Tested Population by Subgroups, Using the Knapp-Hartung Adjustments

Subgroup	No. of studies	I-squared	P value	•	Percentage (%(95%CI))	Weight (%)
Location						
Africa	1	-	-	_ <b></b> -	14.29 (9.47-19.10)	0
Asia	25	98%	< 0.01	4	0.05 (0.00-0.15)	79.3
Europe	35	99%	< 0.001	-	0.90 (0.53-1.27)	17.3
North America	32	97%	< 0.01	+	0.47 (0.03-0.90)	3.4
South America	2	0%	0.48		2.87 (0.00-7.41)	0
Development level						
Developed	74	99%	< 0.001	•	0.70 (0.46-0.95)	27.0
Developing	21	98%	< 0.01	-	0.04 (0.00-0.12)	73.0
Study population						
Air / Cruise travel	8	99%	< 0.01	<b></b>	2.02(0.00-4.94)	8.6
Close contact	6	98%	<0.01	-	1 46 (0 00-3 65)	64
Community residents	14	95%	< 0.01	•	0.40 (0.00-0.96)	22.3
Healthcare workers / Inhospital patients	37	92%	< 0.01	-	0.75(0.39-1.11)	49.0
Nursing home residents / staff	17	08%	<0.01		4.52(1.87-7.17)	80
Prognant woman	17	9070 040/	<0.01		4.32(1.07-7.17)	5.0
Pregnant women	15	9470	<0.01	-	2.34 (0.44-4.23)	5.7
Publication period						
June and before	21	98%	< 0.01	1	0.09 (0.00-0.34)	20.3
July and after	74	99%	< 0.001	t	0.29 (0.13-0.46)	79.7
Sample size						
1-100	8	84%	< 0.01		6.74 (0.63-12.86)	0
100-1000	49	94%	< 0.01	+	0.69 (0.19-1.18)	1.8
1000-10000	30	99%	< 0.001	÷	0.27 (0.00-0.56)	23.4
10000-	8	100%	< 0.001	+	0.23 (0.00-0.75)	74.8
Study design						
Case series	7	92%	< 0.01	+	0.55 (0.00-1.55)	10.1
Case series on transmission	3	7%	0.34	ł	0.18 (0.00-0.50)	5.4
Cohort studies	41	98%	< 0.001	-	2.98 (1.63-4.34)	34.1
Cross-sectional studies	44	99%	< 0.001	•	1.55 (0.73-2.38)	50.4
Study quality						
Low	53	95%	< 0.01	ł	0.22 (0.07-0.37)	21.6
Moderate	25	100%	< 0.001	-	0.64 (0.22-1.06)	24.5
High	17	99%	< 0.01	+	0.05 (0.00-0.21)	54.0
Male: female ratio						
0-0.5	23	94%	< 0.01		2.71 (1.12-4.31)	48.5
0.5-1.0	18	98%	< 0.01	_ <b>_</b>	3.91 (0.77-7.05)	32.7
1.0-1.5	6	96%	< 0.01	<b></b>	2.26 (0.00-7.21)	10.8
1.5-	4	89%	< 0.01	-	1.40 (0.00-5.06)	7.9
Average age						
<20	2	84%	0.01	<b></b>	1 27 (0 00-16 74)	78
20-39	12	94%	<0.01	L	2 42 (0 21 4 62)	30.4
40-59	7	02%	<0.01		0.84(0.00240)	31.5
	10	99%	<0.01	L_	3.69(0.00-2.40)	30.3
00-	10	JJ/0	~0.01		5.07 (0.00-0.40)	50.5
Combined percentage	95	99%	< 0.001	ļ	0.25 (0.11-0.39)	100.0
				0123456789 11 13 15 17 1	9	

# **eFigure 4.** Percentage of Asymptomatic Cases Among the Confirmed Population by Subgroups, Using the Knapp-Hartung Adjustments

Subgroup	No. of studies	I-squared	P value	e	Percentage (%(95%CI))	Weight (%)
Location						
Asia	20	99%	< 0.001		27.58 (18.05-37.12)	26.6
Europe	31	99%	< 0.001	-	44.18 (34.03-54.33)	40.6
North America	25	90%	< 0.01	+	46.32 (37.91-54.73)	31.5
South America	1	-	-		51.43 (0.00-100.00)	1.3
Development level						
Developed	62	99%	< 0.001	+	43.51 (37.31-49.72)	80.1
Developing	15	99%	< 0.01	-•-	28.46 (16.46-40.47)	19.9
Study population						
Air / Cruise travel	8	92%	< 0.01	<b></b>	52.91 (33.21-72.61)	9.8
Close contact	6	98%	< 0.01	_ <b>-</b> +	26.94 (0.00-54.33)	8.2
Community residents	9	98%	< 0.01	_ <b>i</b>	39.74 (15.63-63.86)	12.0
Healthcare workers / Inhospital patients	27	91%	< 0.01		30.01 (22.67-37.34)	35.3
Nursing home residents / staff	17	99%	< 0.001	+ <b>-</b> -	47.53 (36.89-58.17)	22.3
Pregnant women	10	94%	< 0.01	<b>+•</b>	54.11 (34.52-73.70)	12.4
Publication period						
June and before	16	97%	< 0.01		43 68 (29 96-57 41)	20.1
July and after	61	99%	< 0.001	+	39.72 (33.49-45.96)	79.9
Samnle size						
1-100	51	92%	< 0.01	<b>_</b>	40 86 (33 82-47 91)	63.7
100-500	20	99%	<0.01		36.98(25.73.48.22)	27.8
500-	6	100%	< 0.001		47.06 (21.59-72.53)	8.5
Study design						
Case series	6	87%	< 0.01		28 52 (3 65-53 38)	78
Case series on transmission	3	45%	0.16	_	15.85(0.00-59.69)	3.6
Cohort studies	38	98%	<0.10		40.96 (33.47-48.46)	49.2
Cross sectional studies	30	9870	<0.01		40.90(33.47-48.40)	49.2 30 <i>A</i>
Closs-sectional studies	50	9970	<0.001	Ē	44.47 (34.70-34.24)	39.4
Study quality	40	059/	<0.01		28 02 (20 70 47 16)	50.0
Low	40	95%	<0.01		38.95(30.70-47.10)	28.1
Moderate	21	99%	< 0.01		48.00 (38.01-38.11)	28.1
High	10	99%	<0.001	-	32.94 (20.67-45.20)	20.9
Male: female ratio	21	0.60/	-0.01		41.07 (00.15.54.00)	50.0
0-0.5	21	96%	< 0.01	-+-	41.27 (28.15-54.38)	50.8
0.5-1.0	12	98%	< 0.01	-•+	31.29 (18.14-44.44)	30.4
1.0-1.5	4	97%	< 0.01		55.09 (0.00-100.00)	9.3
1.5-	4	90%	< 0.01	-	39.98 (18.50-61.46)	9.6
Average age						
<20	2	88%	< 0.01		60.21 (0.00-100.00)	7.5
20-39	9	98%	< 0.01	- <b>+</b> •	49.49 (26.65-72.33)	37.3
40-59	5	88%	< 0.01		32.48 (3.57-61.39)	22.0
60-	8	97%	< 0.01		33.83 (19.09-48.56)	33.1
Combined percentage	77	99%	< 0.001	0 25 50 75 10	40.50 (34.94-46.07)	100.0