

1 SIS-1 household transmission SCCS study

2 Final draft – 11th September 2023

3 **Word count:** 2937

4

5 **Title:**

6 The association between SARS-CoV-2 infections in English primary and secondary school children

7 and staff, and infections in members of their household in the schoolyear 2020-2021: a self-

8 controlled case-series analysis

9 **Authors:**

10 Elliot McClenaghan^{1 †} MPH, Patrick Nguipdop-Djomo^{1 †} PhD, Alexandra Lewin¹ PhD, Charlotte

11 Warren-Gash¹ PhD, Sarah Cook² PhD, Punam Mangtani¹ PhD

12 **Affiliations:**

13 ¹Faculty of Epidemiology & Population Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine,

14 London, United Kingdom ²School of Public Health Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom

15 †Equal contribution

16 **Corresponding author:**

17 Patrick Nguipdop-Djomo, Faculty of Epidemiology & Population Health, London School of Hygiene &

18 Tropical Medicine, Keppel St, London, United Kingdom patrick.nguipdop-djomo@lshtm.ac.uk

19 **Alternate corresponding author:**

20 Elliot McClenaghan, Faculty of Epidemiology & Population Health, London School of Hygiene &

21 Tropical Medicine, Keppel St, London, United Kingdom Elliot.mcclenaghan@lshtm.ac.uk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

22 [Abstract](#)

23 **Background:** The role of children and staff in SARS-CoV-2 transmission outside and within
24 households is still not fully understood when large numbers are in regular, frequent contact in
25 schools.

26 **Methods:** We used the self-controlled case-series method during the alpha- and delta-dominant
27 periods to explore the incidence of infection in periods around a household member infection,
28 relative to periods without household infection, in a cohort of primary and secondary English school
29 children and staff from November 2020 to July 2021.

30 **Results:** We found the relative incidence of infection in students and staff was highest in the 1-7
31 days following household infection, remaining high up to 14 days after, with risk also elevated in the
32 6-12 days before household infection. Younger students had a higher relative incidence following
33 household infection, suggesting household transmission may play a more prominent role compared
34 with older students. The relative incidence was also higher amongst students in the alpha variant
35 dominant period.

36 **Conclusions:** This analysis suggests SARS-CoV2 infection in children, young people and staff at
37 English schools were more likely to be associated with within-household transmission than from
38 outside the household, but that a small increased risk of seeding from outside is observed.

39

40 [Keywords:](#)

41 Coronavirus, schools, transmission, SARS-CoV-2, self-controlled case-series

42

43 Key messages:

- 44 • **Question:** With respect to incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection before and after household
45 member infection, is within-household transmission more likely than community transmission
46 amongst school children and staff?
- 47 • **Findings:** In this self-controlled case-series analysis, the relative incidence of infection in
48 students and staff was highest in the 1-7 days following household infection, remaining high up
49 to 14 days after, with the highest relative incidence found in younger, primary school-aged
50 children.
- 51 • **Importance:** Within-household transmission is more likely than from outside the household, but
52 a small increased risk of seeding from outside the household is observed as well as variation by
53 age and variant dominant period.
- 54

55 BACKGROUND:

56 The first cases of severe acute respiratory coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) emerged in December 2019
57 and subsequently spread worldwide.¹ In response to the significant morbidity and mortality caused
58 by coronavirus (COVID-19) disease, many governments rapidly implemented non-pharmaceutical
59 interventions (NPI) to curb transmission of SARS-CoV-2, which often included school closures. In the
60 United Kingdom (UK) schools were intermittently closed to most students between March 2020 and
61 September 2021. These closures have been associated with ongoing negative consequences on
62 students' learning and wellbeing.^{2,3}

63 Initial caution that schools might contribute to community transmission was partly informed by
64 influenza outbreaks where children are key drivers of transmission. There was however, early on,
65 conflicting evidence of the importance of SARS-CoV-2 transmission by children and young people
66 (CYP) in both households and school settings. This uncertainty together with the higher proportion
67 of asymptomatic infection in CYP compared to adults led to epidemiological studies with active
68 ascertainment such as the English Schools Infection Survey (SIS).⁴⁻⁸

69 A key question is the importance of school CYP and staff infections in schools, seeding household
70 infections and helping sustain or amplify community transmission. The presence of household co-
71 infections was the strongest risk factor in a study of determinants of incident SARS-CoV-2 infection
72 in the English SIS.⁹ The direction of transmission within households was however not possible to
73 investigate.

74 We investigated within-household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 amongst English primary and
75 secondary school children and school staff through the application of self-controlled case series
76 (SCCS) method to linked England SIS, national surveillance, and immunization data. We estimated
77 the relative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in SIS participants in different time periods before and
78 after infection in a household member and investigated variations by age, household size, dominant
79 SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern, and school type.

80 METHODS:

81 Study Design and Participants

82 We used the SCCS method, where the incidence of events in risk periods following exposure is
83 estimated and compared to that in other periods in the same person during a specified observation
84 time.¹⁰ Participants were students aged 4-18 years and school staff members in the SIS cohort with
85 recorded laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection and a record that another individual in their
86 household had a SARS-CoV-2 infection between Nov 2020 and July 2021. The event (outcome) of
87 interest was SARS-CoV-2 infection in the SIS participant, and the main exposure was the first
88 reported SARS-CoV-2 infection (other than the SIS participant) in the household.

89 Data Sources

90 Students and staff with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection were identified from SIS. SIS was
91 a longitudinal study during which biological samples and questionnaire data was collected from
92 students and staff in six panel surveys at half-termly intervals, targeting 150 randomly selected
93 state-funded primary and secondary schools across 15 Local Authorities (LAs) in England during the
94 2020-2021 school year; schools were selected using multi-stage stratified random sampling
95 respectively in 10 LAs from the top quintile and 5 LA from the bottom four quintiles community
96 incidence in September 2020.^{11,12} Biological analyses included RT-PCR testing of nasal swabs for
97 SARS-CoV-2 infection in those present in school on the visit day.

98 Participants' records were linked to the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) Second Generation
99 Surveillance System (SGSS) which contains nationwide infectious disease laboratory reports,
100 including SARS-CoV-2 PCR and antigen tests results and symptoms status at the time of sampling
101 including those in the SIS. The Unique Property Reference Numbers (UPRN) – which uniquely identify
102 residential addresses in England, was used to anonymously link participants' household members to
103 SGSS results. SGSS data was used to obtain fact and date of infections in SIS participants and their
104 household members. SIS questionnaires provided socio-demographic information and household

105 size. The linked National Immunisation Management System (NIMS) provided COVID-19 vaccination
106 status (for SIS participants only), and linked ONS census data gave an Index of Multiple Deprivation
107 (IMD) score, a small-area indicator of socio-economic deprivation.¹³

108 The study was approved by UKHSA Research Support and Governance Office (NR0237) and London
109 School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine Ethics Review Committee (ref:22657).

110 Outcome & Exposures

111 The main outcome was laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection in SIS participants during the
112 2020/2021 school year. Re-infections were uncommon during the study period, when the alpha- and
113 delta- virus variants dominated, estimated at 0.68% in children and adults.¹⁴ The exposure event was
114 restricted to the first reported household infections other than the SIS participant, assuming that
115 temporally clustered subsequent cases within the household would either result from a chain of
116 transmission within the household or common exposure to another source external to the
117 household. Subgroup analyses were conducted separately for the periods when the alpha (infection
118 reported before 1 May 2021) and delta (infection reported after 31 May 2021) virus variants
119 dominated.¹⁵

120 Definition of Risk Periods

121 The exposure periods were defined relative to the date the positive SARS-CoV-2 test sample was
122 collected for the household member. The observation period was divided into a baseline and
123 'higher' risk periods (see *Figure 1*). The overall 'higher risk' period spanned from 12 days before the
124 household member infection to 14 days after; it was further subdivided in four risk windows,
125 respectively (i) -12 to -6 (a six-day 'pre-exposure' risk period, when infection introduction into the
126 household by a SIS participant could occur as well as diagnosis and reporting delays of a household
127 infection); (ii) -5 to 0 (the length includes 2-3 days pre-symptomatic infectiousness of the first
128 household infection other than a SIS participant and 1-2 days until the test in a SIS participant was

129 taken); (iii) 1 to 7, and (iv) 8 to 14 days after the household member infection, the latter to account
130 for 14 days of infectiousness following infection.¹⁶⁻¹⁸

131 To check the robustness of our exposure risk period definition, we explored a longer 39-days
132 interval, including an additional six days (-18 to -13) before, and seven days (15 to 21) after the
133 exposure events.

134 Statistical Analysis

135 SCCS statistical models use a modified Poisson cohort design, conditioning on the occurrence of
136 outcome events (SIS-1 participant infection), with each individual acting as their own control during
137 the different exposure and baseline time periods. The outcome incidence in SIS participants within
138 the defined risk windows is compared to that in the baseline period by estimating incidence rate
139 ratios (IRR). We implemented an extension of the standard SCCS for censored post-event
140 exposures¹⁹, to address the change in risk of (re)infection following infection (see *Supplementary*
141 *figure S4*). Analyses were controlled for time-varying confounding on calendar time and vaccination
142 status in staff (CYP were not yet eligible for vaccination). The SCCS model automatically controls for
143 all observed and unobserved time-invariant confounders.

144 We divided the observation periods into three calendar time intervals, respectively 2 November
145 2020 to 1 January 2021 (schools reopening following the pandemic 1st wave, subsequent school-
146 closures and emergence of the alpha variant), 2 January 2021 to 1 March 2021 (2nd national
147 lockdown and phased roll-out of adult vaccination), and 2 March 2021 to 6 July 2021 (schools re-
148 opening, introduction of mass testing). Individual vaccination status in staff, was adjusted for by
149 dividing individual observation periods into unvaccinated and vaccinated intervals (>14 days
150 following first vaccine dose).


151 We estimated the IRR separately in students and in staff, comparing the 4 risk windows (*Figure 1*) to
152 the baseline period. We also investigated potential differences in IRRs by variant-dominant period,
153 first household member infection age group and symptomatic status, household size, participant sex

154 and school type (primary or secondary) by examining effect modification by these factors. A
 155 subgroup sensitivity analysis was restricted to study participants with positive PCR nasal swab only
 156 during SIS panel surveys.

157 All data management, linkage and statistical analysis were done within the ONS Secure Research
 158 Service (SRS) trusted research environment and performed using Stata version 17.²⁰

159 *Figure 1: Study design for investigating the association between survey participant infection*
 160 *and household infection, showing the 26-days interval with four risk periods (a and b) and the*
 161 *39-days interval with six risk periods (c).*

162



163

164 Abbreviations: HH, household; SIS, school infection survey; SCCS, self-controlled case-series. These diagrams are not to
 165 scale, and placement of the household (HH) infection (exposure) is for illustrative purposes - exposures are transient and
 166 can occur anywhere in the observation period (2 November 2020 to 6 July 2021). Each diagram represents the observation
 167 period of one SIS participant. The main analysis **(a)** and **(b)** models 26-days interval with four exposure risk periods
 168 spanning (i) 6-12 days before HH infection, (ii) 0-5 days before HH infection, (iii) 1-7 days following HH infection and (iv) 8-

169 14 days following HH infection. Exposure risk estimates are produced using the baseline periods (all parts of the
170 observation period outside the risk period) as the reference group. In **(a)** the SIS infection (outcome event) occurs within
171 the 0-5 days preceding HH infection. In **(b)** the SIS infection occurs outside the risk periods in the baseline period. In
172 contrast, the sensitivity analysis **(c)** models a 39-days interval with six risk periods defined, including an additional six (13-
173 18) days before HH infection, and seven (15 to 21) days after the HH infection. In all examples, the observation period
174 following event is modelled using a pseudo-loglikelihood as per the SCCS counterfactual method extension.

175 RESULTS:

176 Cohort characteristics

177 Overall, 5.8% (859/14,842) students and 10.4% (808/7743) staff who participated in the Schools
 178 Infection Survey had a lab-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection recorded in SGSS between 02 November
 179 2020 and 06 July 2021. Of these, 957 people, respectively 439 (54.3%) staff and 518 (60.3%) students
 180 who had at least one household member infection recorded in SGSS, were included in our study. The
 181 study participants' characteristics are presented in *Table 1*. About half of students were male, 39%
 182 were aged under 12 years, and 81% from White ethnicity; 40% lived in households with five or more
 183 members. Staff participants were mostly female (80%) and from White ethnicity (88%), with 57%
 184 aged ≥ 40 years and 70% working in secondary schools; 92% had received at least one COVID-19
 185 vaccination by the end of the observation period.

186 *Table 1*: Descriptive characteristics of school infection survey participants testing positive for
 187 SARS-CoV-2 and experiencing a household infection in the observation period, Nov 2020 to
 188 July 2021 (N=957).

Variable	Staff	Students
Positive for SARS-CoV-2; N	439	518
Multiple HH infections; n (%)	190 (43.3)	328 (63.3)
No. HH infections; n (%)		
1-2	362 (82.5)	370 (71.4)
3-4	70 (15.9)	138 (26.6)
5-8	7 (1.6)	10 (1.9)
Male sex; n (%)	89 (20.3)	240 (46.3)
Age (years) ^a ;		
<12	0 (0.0)	203 (39.2)

Variable	Staff	Students
12-19	3 (0.7)	315 (60.8)
20-39	187 (42.6)	0 (0.0)
40+	249 (56.7)	0 (0.0)
IMD Quintiles; n (%)		
1 (least deprived)	76 (17.3)	136 (26.3)
2	81 (18.5)	120 (23.2)
3	84 (19.1)	97 (18.7)
4	109 (24.8)	78 (15.1)
5 (most deprived)	84 (19.1)	86 (16.6)
Ethnicity; n (%)		
Asian	36 (8.2)	56 (10.8)
Black	3 (0.7)	10 (1.9)
Mixed	8 (1.8)	24 (4.6)
Other	* (-)	* (-)
White	387 (88.2)	420 (81.1)
Unknown	* (-)	* (-)
School type; n (%)		
Primary	131 (29.8)	116 (22.4)
Secondary	308 (70.2)	402 (77.6)
SARS-CoV-2 variant dominant periods; n (%)		
Before 01 May 2021 (Alpha)	374 (85.2)	348 (67.2)
May 2021	9 (2.1)	19 (3.7)
After 31 May 2021 (Delta)	56 (12.8)	151 (29.2)

Variable	Staff	Students
Term infection reported; n (%)		
Autumn term ^b	237 (54.0)	173 (33.4)
Spring term ^c	136 (31.0)	174 (33.6)
Summer term ^d	66 (15.0)	171 (33.0)
Vaccinated in the observation period ^e ; n (%)	404 (92.0)	26 (5.0)
Vaccinated before SARS-CoV-2 infection in participant; n (%)	57 (13.0)	* (-)
HH size; n (%)		
1-2	100 (22.8)	31 (6.0)
3-4	255 (58.1)	280 (54.1)
5+	83 (18.9)	206 (39.8)
Characteristics of 1st HH infection		
Age <18 years	121 (27.6)	121 (23.4)
Age 18+ years	318 (72.4)	397 (76.6)
Asymptomatic	91 (20.7)	135 (26.1)
Symptomatic	330 (75.2)	353 (68.1)
Unknown symptom status	18 (4.1)	30 (5.8)

189 Abbreviations: HH, household; IMD, Index of Multiple Deprivation; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory coronavirus 2.

190 ^aage at enrollment into SIS-1 (31 August 2020) ^b3 November 2020 – 2 January 2021 ^c3 January 2021 – 17 April 2021 ^d18

191 April – 6 July 2021 ^efirst dose received in the observation period. Vaccine offered to CYP only to those at high risk then

192 hence the small numbers. *Suppressed for data protection purposes.

193 Association between household member and participant SARS-CoV-2 infections

194 After adjusting for calendar time, and vaccination status in staff, the IRR of infection in all

195 participants was higher in all risk windows (12 days before to 14 days after the first household


196 infection), compared to the baseline periods (*Figure 2*). In both staff and students, the highest IRR
197 was observed in the 1-7 days after the household member infection (staff IRR 93.95 (95%CI 65.59 to
198 134.59); students IRR 150.32 (95%CI 104.59 to 216.03)). A small increased relative incidence was
199 seen in days -12 to -6 in students, and days -12 to -6 and 8 to 14 in staff but much lower than in the
200 other periods (*Figures 3-4*).

201 We further stratified the analysis in students by age group, respectively under 12 years (typically
202 primary school) and 12 to 19 years (typically secondary school) (*Figure 2*). The overall relative
203 incidence pattern was the same in both groups and similar to all students; however, the higher
204 relative incidence observed 1-7 days and 8-14 days after the household member infection were
205 nearly twice as high in younger (<12 years) students than 12-19 years students, suggesting higher
206 rate of infection in younger children following a household case, than older students.

207 Comparing IRRs using a wider (39 days) exposure window to our main analysis' 26 days window,
208 showed much lower relative risks in the additional exposure days supporting our exposure window
209 definition (details in *Supplementary table S1*). Full results for the sensitivity analyses for the wider
210 exposure period and the restricted subgroup with PCR-confirmed infection during the SIS panel
211 surveys can be found in *Supplementary table S1* and *Supplementary table S3*, respectively.

212 We also investigated differences in the association between household member and participant's
213 infection by various participant (sex, age, household size (≤ 3 versus > 3 members), school type
214 (primary vs secondary), dominant SARS-CoV-2 variant (Alpha versus delta)) and household member
215 (age (<18 vs ≥ 18 years) and symptomatic status) characteristics (*Figures 3-4 and Supplementary*
216 *table S2*). In staff, the pattern and magnitude of associations were broadly comparable across all
217 characteristics, except the dominant virus variant periods for which IRRs were much higher during
218 the alpha-dominant period (eg. day 1 to 7 IRR = 136.6 (95%CI 88.2 to 211.7)) than the delta-
219 dominant period (eg. day 1 to 7 IRR = 23.4 (95%CI 7.3 to 74.8)). The findings were similar in students.


220 *Figure 2: Incidence rate ratios (IRR) for school infection survey participant infection in relation*
 221 *to a participant household infection, stratified by staff, students, and student age groups,*
 222 *Nov 2020 to July 2021.*



223
 224 Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; HH, household; IRR, incidence rate ratio; SIS, school infection survey. No of events
 225 refers to number of SIS participant infections occurring across the baseline and risk periods. IRRs are adjusted for calendar
 226 time (all subgroups) and vaccination status (staff only). Wald test two-sided p-values.

227


228 *Figure 3: Incidence rate ratios (IRR) for student (N=518) school infection survey participant*
 229 *infection in relation to household infection by household member and participant*
 230 *characteristics, Nov 2020 to July 2021.*



231
 232 Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; HH, household; IRR, incidence rate ratio; SIS, school infection survey. For the
 233 variant-dominant period subgroups, calendar time is not adjusted for as a time varying confounder in the model. No of

- 234 events refers to number of SIS infections occurring across the baseline and risk periods. IRRs are adjusted for calendar time
- 235 (all subgroups except variants). Wald test two-sided p-values.

236 *Figure 4: Incidence rate ratios (IRR) for staff (N=439) school infection survey participant*
 237 *infection in relation to household infection across household member characteristics and*
 238 *participant characteristics, Nov 2020 to July 2021.*



239

240 Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; HH, household; IRR, incidence rate ratio; SIS, school infection survey. For the

241 variant-dominant period subgroups, calendar time is not adjusted for as a time varying confounder in the model. No of

242 events refers to number of SIS infections occurring across the baseline and risk periods. IRRs are adjusted for calendar time

243 (all subgroups except variants) and receipt of first dose vaccination. Wald test two-sided p-values.

244

245 DISCUSSION:

246 This study used a novel approach to investigate SARS-CoV-2 transmission in households with CYP
247 and staff attending school for some of the SIS study period using a case-only design. The method was
248 applied to linked data from a large national survey of school students and staff in England during the
249 alpha- and delta-variant dominant periods in the 2020/2021 school year. In both students and staff,
250 we found higher incidence of infection in the 1 to 7 days and 8 to 14 days following infection of a
251 household member, compared to periods when there was no infection in the household, with the
252 relative incidence highest in students aged under 12 years, and higher during the alpha-dominant
253 period. We note the increased relative incidence, albeit consistently lowest, in the 6 to 12 days
254 before the household case in all participants; this may reflect situations where the household
255 member acquired the infection from the SIS cohort study participant or another source, compatible
256 with infections in schools seeding into households and a chain of transmission in the household
257 though to a lesser extent than within household transmission.

258 Schools were closed because of concerns that educational settings could sustain or amplify the
259 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the community, further compounded by the recognition through
260 surveillance that infections with little to no symptoms were frequent, especially in younger
261 populations, yet they could be infectious.^{4,21-23} Respiratory infections that are preferentially aerosol
262 transmitted require close contact. Consistent with this, household transmission was noted to be
263 more important for SARS-CoV-2 than school transmission in a meta-analysis.²²

264 The finding in our study that the relative incidence of infection in our participants, both students and
265 staff, was consistently highest in the week following the first case in their household, and much
266 lower in the 12 days before, is consistent with the hypothesis that school participants acquired
267 infection predominantly from within their household, than out of the household. Several studies
268 have noted the high within-household clustering of SARS-CoV-2 infections, including during
269 'lockdown' periods when community mixing was severely restricted. Schools remained one of the

270 few settings where high frequency of close contacts between large numbers of people was
271 possible.^{9,24,25} In the SIS study period, there were several times when schools were closed leading to
272 increased mixing at home, which may have facilitated household transmission.

273 The results are also consistent with SARS-CoV-2 alpha and delta variants' generation time.¹⁷ Previous
274 studies have shown SARS-CoV-2 to be infectious up to 7-10 days following reporting of symptoms,
275 and that infectiousness rarely continues more than 10 days.^{26,27} This is reflected in our findings with
276 IRRs attenuated towards the null in the 8-14 days following household infection, but the evidence
277 for an increased IRR in this period compared with baseline is still pronounced, and may be consistent
278 with some delay from testing and reporting.^{28,29}

279 The highest relative incidence in the week following the household case was inversely correlated to
280 participant's age, highest in younger students, and decreasing in older students and school staff. This
281 result is compatible with older individuals more able to modulate their behaviour to reduce the risk
282 of transmission when there is a diagnosed infectious person in their household, than younger
283 people, and also the fact younger people require care, thus more contact with other members of the
284 household, than older subjects. Other studies have noted that children under 10-12 years have
285 increased susceptibility to transmission.²³

286 The relative incidences in the periods after household infection were consistently lower during the
287 delta versus the alpha variant dominant periods, across all participants and age groups. Estimates of
288 transmissibility based on household secondary attack rates (SARs) were previously noted to vary
289 during the alpha- and delta-dominant waves.^{24,25,30} The higher infectiousness of delta compared to
290 alpha may have increased community transmission compared with household transmission.¹⁷

291 Moreover, the relaxation of restrictions to social mixing in England around the time delta was
292 spreading in the Spring and beginning of Summer 2021, could have led to greater opportunities for
293 acquisition of infection out of the household leading to lower apparent within-household relative
294 incidence.

295 Overall, our analyses support the idea that during the 2020-2021 school year in England, primary
296 and secondary schools' students and staff were more likely to have acquired infection from within
297 their household than out. A limitation is that we did not have the data to directly measure the
298 incidence of infection in the household following infection in a school participant. Incomplete
299 household testing and reporting after a first reported case was possible. We instead approximated
300 the IRR in school participants in the 6 to 12 days before the first household case. Alternative study
301 designs have also struggled to measure household attack rates, with for example household contact
302 studies being labor-intensive and expensive, with relatively low yield and power.^{6,31}

303 Another potential limitation in our analysis is that although testing behavior was broadly similar
304 throughout the observation period, it may have varied due to local epidemic trends and government
305 recommendations. In an analysis conducted for the UK government's Events Research Program
306 where risk of SARS-CoV-2 was assessed following attendance of cultural events using SCCS, this
307 potential testing variability was controlled for by dividing the rate ratio for positive tests by the rate
308 ratio for negative tests over the same period and producing adjusted estimates.³² Lack of complete
309 negative testing data precluded similar adjustments in our study. We did split our observation period
310 to adjust for calendar time, but there is still potential for residual time-varying confounding given
311 the rapid changes to epidemic conditions during the study period.

312 Despite its limitations, the case-only design used in this study had several strengths, including our
313 ability to use readily available surveillance data, and the design's intrinsic adjustment for both
314 measured and unmeasured between-person fixed confounders, such as age, sex, and risk behavior.
315 While not perfect, this design allowed to use of routinely collected surveillance data to capture
316 household and individual infection, where there may be less capture of multiple infections.

317 This the case-only method (SCCS) can be a valuable method for similar analyses of large datasets of
318 test results and surveillance surveys where detailed parameters on transmission dynamics may not
319 be available, to generate early insights into the relative incidence of household compared to

320 community transmission of infectious outbreaks such as SARS-CoV-2. Further research could usefully
321 include similar analyses during the Omicron and future variant waves, incorporation of participant
322 and household member re-infections and genomic data, as well as further exploration of household
323 size and assessment of impact of interventions to mitigate transmission in schools as well as other
324 frontline workers. This study provides evidence for a greater magnitude of an association of SARS-
325 CoV-2 infection with household co-infection in CYP than by attending English schools with the risk in
326 households varying by age and variant-dominant periods.

327

328 [Author Notes:](#)

329 *Acknowledgements:* This study was funded by the UK Department of Health and Social Care. We
330 would like to thank the schools, head teachers, staff, families and children who took part in the SIS
331 study. We are grateful to the team at IQVIA and to the SIS Engagement Officers for working tirelessly
332 in communicating with and supporting the schools. For the purpose of Open Access, the author has
333 applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) version arising
334 from this submission.

335 *Disclaimer:* The data used in this report is independent research funded by the Department of
336 Health and Social Care (COVID 19- NTP 2.0, School Infection Study). The views expressed in this
337 publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, or the Department of
338 Health and Social Care.

339 *Authors contribution statement:* PND and PM conceived the study design and methodology, and
340 were involved in acquisition of the data with SC. EM performed the analysis, with support from PND,
341 PM, SC, CWG and AL. EM, PND, and PM, drafted the manuscript. All authors gave critical revision of
342 the manuscript for important intellectual content and contributed to reviewing and editing of the
343 manuscripts. All authors had access to the data. EM and PND had final responsibility to submit for
344 publication.

345 *Abbreviations:* COVID-19, coronavirus-19; CYP, children and young people; IMD, Index of Multiple
346 Deprivation; IRR, incidence rate ratio; LA, Local Authority; NIMS, National Immunisation
347 Management System; ONS, Office for National Statistics; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; RT-PCR,
348 reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory coronavirus
349 2; SCCS, self-controlled case-series; SGSS, Second Generation Surveillance System; SIS, school
350 infection survey; SRS, Secure Research Service; UK, United Kingdom; UKHSA, United Kingdom Health
351 Security Agency; WHO, World Health Organization

352 *Data and Statistical analysis code availability statement:* De-identified study data are available for
353 access by accredited researcher in the ONS Secure Research Service (SRS) for accredited research
354 purposes under part 5, chapter 5 of the Digital Economy Act 2017. For further information about
355 accreditation, contact Research.support@ons.gov.uk or visit the SRS website.

356 The statistical analysis code is publicly available at github.com/ElliotMcC/SIS_SCCS.

357 *Source, licence copyrights and credits:* This work contains statistical data from ONS which is Crown
358 Copyright. The use of the ONS statistical data in this work does not imply the endorsement of the
359 ONS in relation to the interpretation or analysis of the statistical data. This work uses research
360 datasets which may not exactly reproduce National Statistics aggregates.

361 *Funding:* This study was funded by the UK Department of Health and Social Care. CWG is supported
362 by a Wellcome Career Development Award (225868/Z/22/Z).

363 *Conflicts of interest:* None declared.

364 *Ethics approval:* The Public Health England (now part of the UK Health Security Agency) Research
365 Support and Governance Office (NR0237) and the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
366 Ethics Review Committee (ref: 22657).

367

368

369 [References:](#)

- 370 1. Guan W-J, Ni Z-Y, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China.
371 *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(18):1708-1720. doi:10.1056/nejmoa2002032
- 372 2. Viner R, Russell S, Saull R, et al. School Closures During Social Lockdown and Mental Health,
373 Health Behaviors, and Well-being Among Children and Adolescents During the First COVID-19 Wave.
374 *JAMA Pediatrics*. 2022;176(4):400. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2021.5840
- 375 3. Sundaram N, Abramsky T, Oswald WE, et al. Implementation of <sc>COVID</sc> -19
376 Preventive Measures and Staff Well-Being in a Sample of English Schools 2020-2021. *Journal of*
377 *School Health*. 2023;93(4):266-278. doi:10.1111/josh.13264
- 378 4. Flasche S, Edmunds WJ. The role of schools and school-aged children in SARS-CoV-2
379 transmission. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2021;21(3):298-299. doi:10.1016/s1473-
380 3099(20)30927-0
- 381 5. Forbes H, Morton CE, Bacon S, et al. Association between living with children and outcomes
382 from covid-19: OpenSAFELY cohort study of 12 million adults in England. *BMJ*. 2021:n628.
383 doi:10.1136/bmj.n628
- 384 6. House T, Riley H, Pellis L, et al. Inferring risks of coronavirus transmission from community
385 household data. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*. 2022;31(9):1738-1756.
386 doi:10.1177/09622802211055853
- 387 7. Af Geijerstam A, Mehlig K, Hunsberger M, Åberg M, Lissner L. Children in the household and
388 risk of severe COVID-19 during the first three waves of the pandemic: a prospective registry-based
389 cohort study of 1.5 million Swedish men. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(8):e063640. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-
390 2022-063640
- 391 8. Flook M, Jackson C, Vasileiou E, et al. Informing the public health response to COVID-19: a
392 systematic review of risk factors for disease, severity, and mortality. *BMC Infectious Diseases*.
393 2021/04/12 2021;21(1):342. doi:10.1186/s12879-021-05992-1

- 394 9. Nguipdop-Djomo P, Oswald WE, Halliday KE, et al. Risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 infection in
395 primary and secondary school students and staff in England in the 2020/2021 school year: a
396 longitudinal study. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2023;128:230-243.
397 doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2022.12.030
- 398 10. Petersen I, Douglas I, Whitaker H. Self controlled case series methods: an alternative to
399 standard epidemiological study designs. *BMJ*. 2016:i4515. doi:10.1136/bmj.i4515
- 400 11. al He. The COVID-19 Schools Infection Survey in England: Protocol and participation profile
401 for a prospective, observational cohort study. 2022;doi:10.2196/34075
- 402 12. Hargreaves JR, Langan SM, Oswald WE, et al. Epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 infection among
403 staff and students in a cohort of English primary and secondary schools during 2020–2021. *The*
404 *Lancet Regional Health - Europe*. 2022;21:100471. doi:10.1016/j.lanepe.2022.100471
- 405 13. David McLennan SN, Michael Noble, Emma Plunkett, Gemma Wright and Nils Gutacker.
406 *English Indices of Deprivation 2019: technical report*. 2019. 2019.
407 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/833951/IoD2019_Technical_Report.pdf)
408 [/833951/IoD2019_Technical_Report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/833951/IoD2019_Technical_Report.pdf)
- 409 14. Mensah AA, Campbell H, Stowe J, et al. Risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfections in children: a
410 prospective national surveillance study between January, 2020, and July, 2021, in England. *The*
411 *Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*. 2022;6(6):384-392. doi:10.1016/s2352-4642(22)00059-1
- 412 15. England PH. *SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern and variants under investigation in England*
413 *Technical briefing 23*. 2021. 17 September 2021. Accessed 6th June 2023.
414 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1018547/Technical_Briefing_23_21_09_16.pdf)
415 [/1018547/Technical_Briefing_23_21_09_16.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1018547/Technical_Briefing_23_21_09_16.pdf)
- 416 16. Casey M, Griffin J, McAloon CG, et al. Pre-symptomatic transmission of SARS-CoV-2
417 infection: a secondary analysis using published data. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; 2020.

- 418 17. Hart WS, Miller E, Andrews NJ, et al. Generation time of the alpha and delta SARS-CoV-2
419 variants: an epidemiological analysis. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2022;22(5):603-610.
420 doi:10.1016/s1473-3099(22)00001-9
- 421 18. Byrne AW, McEvoy D, Collins AB, et al. Inferred duration of infectious period of SARS-CoV-2:
422 rapid scoping review and analysis of available evidence for asymptomatic and symptomatic COVID-
423 19 cases. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(8):e039856. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-039856
- 424 19. Farrington CP, Whitaker HJ, Hoxby MN. Case series analysis for censored, perturbed, or
425 curtailed post-event exposures. *Biostatistics*. 2008;10(1):3-16. doi:10.1093/biostatistics/kxn013
- 426 20. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 17*. StataCorp LLC; 2021.
- 427 21. Cordery R, Reeves L, Zhou J, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by children to contacts in
428 schools and households: a prospective cohort and environmental sampling study in London. *The*
429 *Lancet Microbe*. 2022;3(11):e814-e823. doi:10.1016/s2666-5247(22)00124-0
- 430 22. Viner R, Waddington C, Mytton O, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by children and young
431 people in households and schools: A meta-analysis of population-based and contact-tracing studies.
432 *Journal of Infection*. 2022;84(3):361-382. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2021.12.026
- 433 23. Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonell C, et al. Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Children
434 and Adolescents Compared With Adults. *JAMA Pediatrics*. 2021;175(2):143.
435 doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.4573
- 436 24. Toth DJA, Beams AB, Keegan LT, et al. High variability in transmission of SARS-CoV-2 within
437 households and implications for control. *PLOS ONE*. 2021;16(11):e0259097.
438 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0259097
- 439 25. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household Transmission of SARS-
440 CoV-2. *JAMA Network Open*. 2020;3(12):e2031756. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.31756
- 441 26. Adam D. How long is COVID infectious? What scientists know so far. News. *Nature*. 26 July
442 2022 2022;608:16-17. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-02026-x>

- 443 27. Townsley H, Carr EJ, Russell TW, et al. Non-hospitalised, vaccinated adults with COVID-19
444 caused by Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 present with changing symptom profiles compared to those with
445 Delta despite similar viral kinetics. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; 2022.
- 446 28. Tu H, Hu K, Zhang M, Zhuang Y, Song T. Effectiveness of 14 day quarantine strategy: Chinese
447 experience of prevention and control. *BMJ*. 2021:e066121. doi:10.1136/bmj-2021-066121
- 448 29. Mahase E. Covid-19: Is it safe to reduce the self-isolation period? *BMJ*. 2021:n3164.
449 doi:10.1136/bmj.n3164
- 450 30. Fung HF, Martinez L, Alarid-Escudero F, et al. The Household Secondary Attack Rate of
451 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2): A Rapid Review. *Clinical Infectious*
452 *Diseases*. 2020;73(Supplement_2):S138-S145. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1558
- 453 31. Derqui N, Koycheva A, Zhou J, et al. Risk factors and vectors for SARS-CoV-2 household
454 transmission: a prospective, longitudinal cohort study. *The Lancet Microbe*. 2023;4(6):e397-e408.
455 doi:10.1016/s2666-5247(23)00069-1
- 456 32. Department for Digital C, Media & Sport, GOV.UK. Science Note - A self-controlled case
457 series study to measure the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection associated with attendance at an Events
458 Research Programme event. gov.uk. Accessed 9 November 2022, 2022.
459 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/events-research-programme-phase-ii-and-iii-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/events-research-programme-phase-ii-and-iii-findings/science-note-a-self-controlled-case-series-study-to-measure-the-risk-of-sars-cov-2-infection-associated-with-attendance-at-an-events-research-progra)
460 [findings/science-note-a-self-controlled-case-series-study-to-measure-the-risk-of-sars-cov-2-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/events-research-programme-phase-ii-and-iii-findings/science-note-a-self-controlled-case-series-study-to-measure-the-risk-of-sars-cov-2-infection-associated-with-attendance-at-an-events-research-progra)
461 [infection-associated-with-attendance-at-an-events-research-progra](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/events-research-programme-phase-ii-and-iii-findings/science-note-a-self-controlled-case-series-study-to-measure-the-risk-of-sars-cov-2-infection-associated-with-attendance-at-an-events-research-progra)

462