It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Empirical networks for localized COVID-19 interventions using WiFi infrastructure at university campuses

Vedant Das Swain [*]	Jiajia Xie ^{*,†}	$Maanit Madan^*$
Sonia Sargolzaei*	James Cai [‡] N	Junmun De Choudhury*
Gregory D. Abowd ^{∗,}	Lauren N. Steiml	le [†] B. Aditya Prakash ^{*,1}

*College of Computing, Georgia Institute of Technology
 [†]H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology
 [‡]Department of Computer Science, Brown University
 [°]College of Engineering, Northeastern University

December 23, 2021

Abstract

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Infectious diseases, like COVID-19, pose serious challenges to university campuses, which typically adopt closure as a non-pharmaceutical intervention to control spread and ensure a gradual return to normalcy. Intervention policies, such as remote instruction (RI) where large classes are offered online, reduce potential contact but also have broad side-effects on campus by hampering the local economy, students' learning outcomes, and community wellbeing. In this paper, we demonstrate that university policymakers can mitigate these tradeoffs by leveraging anonymized data from their WiFi infrastructure to learn community mobility — a methodology we refer to as *WiFi mobility models* (WIMOB). This approach enables policymakers to explore more granular policies like localized closures (LC). WIMOB can construct contact networks that capture behavior in various spaces, highlighting new potential transmission pathways and temporal variation in contact behavior. Additionally, WIMOB enables us to design LC policies that close super-spreader locations on campus. By simulating disease spread with contact networks from WIMOB, we find that LC maintains the same reduction in cumulative infections as RI while showing greater reduction in peak infections and internal transmission. Moreover, LC reduces campus burden by closing fewer locations, forcing fewer students into completely online schedules, and requiring no additional isolation. WIMOB can

¹⁷ empower universities to conceive and assess a variety of closure policies to prevent future outbreaks.

Keywords: COVID-19; mobility; modeling; policy; non-pharmaceutical intervention; passive
 sensing; WiFi

²⁰ ¹To whom correspondence should be addressed. Email: badityap@cc.gatech.edu

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

¹ Introduction

2 University campuses are often hotspots for infectious disease outbreaks and hence are tar-

³ geted for interventions. In the wake of the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) [53], the U.S.

4 witnessed more than half a million cases at universities [66], and colleges are still left with

⁵ decisions for operations in Fall 2021 [39, 56]. Controlling the disease at universities can be

pivotal to securing the surrounding environment [6]. To reduce on-campus infections and the
likelihood of superspreading events, a recommended form of non-pharmaceutical intervention

⁸ (NPI) is partial closure of the campus [22].

During COVID-19, advancement in teleconferencing technology equips universities to q continue operations by adopting a form of campus closure that relies on remote instruction 10 (RI) [49]. As a consequence, the campus community has fewer opportunities to visit spaces, 11 such as classrooms, to congregate and risk transmission [1, 3]. One common approach cam-12 puses consider to design RI policies is to use enrollment data (EN) to assume contact and 13 therefore, offer large classes online while other classes remain in person [9, 72]. In fact, 14 during COVID-19, 44% colleges and universities in the U.S., primarily offered instruction 15 online [64]. However, these policies can still have broad, negative, and indiscriminate impact 16 on the community by forcing students into completely remote course schedules. Such policies 17 can have adverse effect on learning outcomes [18], where students can lose close to 7 months 18 of education [2]. Additionally, RI can disincentivize students to stay on campus and thus, 19 universities incur losses in auxiliary revenue (e.g., boarding, parking, dining, etc.) [25, 17], 20 with universities standing to lose up to \$50 million because of unused services [75]. Even 21 the local population unaffiliated with the university takes sustains losses to business due to 22 university closures [32, 71]. Furthermore, with socioeconomic disparities and heterogeneous 23 household contexts, the demands of remote instruction can lead to added anxiety and stress 24 among students [12, 74]. Relying on RI, university campuses struggle to balance community 25 health with the demands of learning, economy, and broad wellbeing [58]. Instead, there is 26 a need for a more versatile approach to design closure policies that empowers policymakers 27 to accurately assess impact of closure interventions and model more data-driven targeted 28 intervention strategies. 29

This paper showcases a new approach that universities can take to design closure poli-30 cies by leveraging data from their existing WiFi infrastructure. Our methodology, WiFi 31 *mobility models* (WIMOB), involves constructing anonymized mobility networks of cam-32 pus (Figure 1a), which helps determine extended periods of collocation — or "proximate 33 contact" [30]— between individuals to describe contact networks on campus. Particularly, 34 WIMOB enables a more expressive toolkit for university policymakers that represents contact 35 longitudinally and allows them to assess closure at the granularity of a room, suite, or hall. 36 Thus, it lends itself to the design of targeted interventions that focus on localized closures 37 (LC). We demonstrate the utility of WIMOB with data collected over two years, of approx-38 imately 40,000 anonymous occupants and visitors of the Georgia Institute of Technology 39 (GT), a large urban campus in the U.S. — including about 16,000 undergraduate students, 40 9,000 graduate students, and 7,600 staff members. In general, on comparing WIMOB to EN 41 as an approach to model contact, we find that WIMOB captures contact behavior at a com-42 munity scale for a variety of campus spaces, describes temporal variations in contact, and 43 provides a better estimate of local context by being aware of occupancy and the non-student 44

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 1: The WiFi mobility models (WIMOB) methodology uses anonymized network logs to model campus mobility and target spaces for localized closures (LC) (a) WiFi network logs reflect timestamps when people's devices associate with access points (APs) on campus. WIMOB mines these logs to characterize mobility as a bipartite graph that describes people (e.g., P1, P2) visiting campus locations (e.g., L1, L2) during different times (e.g., t_1, t_2). Since people's devices can proxy their presence, we estimate collocation (e.g., P1 and P2 were collocated at L1 at t_1), and movement (P2 dwelled at L1 and then at L2). (b) We use the collocation network construct a SEIR-based epidemiological ABM, calibrated to Fall 2020 incidence of COVID-19 (c) WIMOB highlights mobility behavior to evaluate and inform policy. (c)-top-left: Mobility on campus between the top 100 most frequented locations on the GT campus in the Fall semester of 2019. Edges only connect points of significant dwelling and thus do not represent pedestrian routes. (c)-top-right: RI is a form of broad closure which affects a large number of students and locations. (c)-bottom-right: By contrast, we propose to use WIMOB to parsimoniously identify a small set of spreader locations within buildings and design LC policies. (c)- bottom-left: We use our epidemiological ABM to evaluate these policies under different budgetary constraints and various behavioral scenarios (Persistence, Non-Residential Avoidance, Complete Avoidance). Our study shows that LC policies provide equal or better control on the disease spread, and yet minimize the burden on campus compared to RI.

population. Using WIMOB also reveals that EN overestimates the impact of RI on reducing
 contact on campus. Hence, we propose a less burdensome alternative to RI, by deriving
 more targeted LC policies based on WIMOB (Figure 1) (indeed EN is too coarse-grained for
 designing targeted LC policies).

We further exhibit that LC presents better disease control outcomes than RI by con-5 structing and simulating an agent-based epidemiological model (ABM) over the people-6 people contact networks (Figure 1b) derived from the collocation identified with WIMOB 7 (Figure 1a). Our ABM was calibrated with GT on-campus COVID-19 cases from the Fall 8 semester of 2020 [28] and infection rates from Fulton County [51]. To compare the effect of 9 interventions, we construct a counterfactual semester — that is unaltered by other policy-10 induced behaviors of 2020 — by leveraging WiFi data from Fall 2019 to determine the 11 contact structure of the simulation. We assess the effectiveness of closure NPIs (Figure 1c) 12

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

¹ by simulating COVID-19 under various behavioral scenarios. We find LC is comparable to RI

² in controlling total infections but more effective at reducing the peak infections and internal

³ transmission. Additionally, LC targets fewer locations, forces fewer students into fully online

- schedules, and does not isolate any more people than RI illustrating that WIMOB can help
 universities devise highly-specific closure policies, like LC, which can contain disease spread
- universities devise highly-specific closure policies, like LC, which can contain disease spread
 and mitigate campus disruption in comparison to RI policies.
- Our methodology also promises other advantages. Mobility generally has been used to 7 dynamically model disease spread of influenza [59], rubella [73] and COVID-19 [3, 57] showing 8 the effectiveness of mobility restrictions at a regional, or city-level [79, 11, 7, 45, 34]. These q studies typically rely on cell tower localization or aggregating GPS information from mobile 10 phones [10]. Neither of these data sources is easy to access for university campuses. At the 11 same time, studies to infer campus mobility networks have relied on accessing user devices 12 with specialized data logging applications (e.g., contact tracing mobile apps) [13, 19, 61, 31], 13 but these approaches are typically constrained for disease modeling because they require 14 mass adoption to represent the entire community and continuous maintenance of software is 15 needed to capture longitudinal behavior changes. In contrast, our work repurposes already 16 existing managed WiFi networks to model mobility, which provides room level granularity 17 for mobility [20, 70, 15, 67] and consequently indicates proximate contact [30]. Much like EN. 18 universities internally archive such data over a long term for other purposes and do not need 19 to install any additional surveillance infrastructure to access it. Prior work has repurposed 20 such data for campuses of size 10,000-50,000 in different locations including Singapore, the 21 U.K., and the U.S [20, 76]. With the appropriate privacy considerations, a university can 22 obtain such data at a low cost, continuously and unobtrusively. The possibility of pandemic 23 still looms large in the future [37, 26]. As campuses prepare for the upcoming Fall semester 24 and unforeseen contagious diseases of tomorrow, WIMOB presents an attractive and practical 25 method to inform better public health policies. 26

$_{27}$ Results

We present two sets of analyses in our work. The first set contrasts structural characteristics of contact networks described by WIMOB with current practices that use enrollment data (EN). In the next set, we used WIMOB to build an epidemiological model (an agent-based model over the contact networks, referred to as ABM) and analyze the remote instruction (RI) and localized closure (LC) interventions in terms of their differences in dynamic diseasecontrol outcomes and burdens to campus.

Note, throughout the paper we use the small-caps to denote different methodologies to model contact (WIMOB and EN) and sans-serif to denote different intervention strategies (RI and LC).

³⁷ WIMOB provides local, holistic and dynamic structural insights for ³⁸ contact networks on campus

Studies on RI policies tend to assume that contact in universities is largely informed by EN—
 transcripts showing which courses a student is registered for. EN can provide structural

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 2: Results show difference in structural characteristics of contact networks from EN (course enrollment) and WIMOB (campus mobility). (a) In general, EN overestimates connections (grev edges) between students (green nodes) and does not anticipate changes through the semester. EN assumes 90% of students to be connected in a single component, but WIMOB reveals (red edges) that on any given week only 69% are in the largest component (those not on campus are isolated and shown in the circumference). Moreover, WIMOB reveals that density of connections changes over the semester. (b) EN depicts campus contacts to be connected closely into a "small world". WIMOB shows that contacts evolve over time. As mobility captures interactions outside classrooms we observe that for the first 6 weeks the shortest transmission path between people is shorter than what is reported by EN. (c) Enrolling into a course does not necessitate physically collocating with the class for extended periods (students can also choose to be entirely absent). WIMOB reflects this behavior and highlights a decline in average contacts over time. (d) These structural differences can help policymakers anticipate the effect of closure policies by describing how it fragments the underlying contact network. En shows that remote instruction leads to a 94% reduction in contacts and 50% increase in transmission path length (similar to numbers reported in prior work [72], shown as EN (Ext.)). However, the estimate is significantly lower when measured using WIMOB. As a result, WIMOB emphasizes the limits of remote instruction policies and in turn motivates new policies that can be designed and evaluated with actual on-campus behavior.

insights on density of connections and disease transmission paths to inform modeling disease 1 simulations [29]. However, such static data can overestimate attendance and ignore overlap 2 between courses (via instructors) and organic interactions outside classes (e.g., waiting areas, 3 dining, parties, and extra-curricular activities). Therefore, using EN can overemphasize 4 the disease-mitigating structural changes to the network by RI interventions. By contrast, 5 WIMOB is more grounded in community behavior as it captures multiple scheduled and 6 serendipitous contact situations dynamically over the semester. We compared the features 7 of contact networks constructed with WIMOB, against networks constructed with EN using 8 data from GT for Fall semester of 2019 (August 19 – December 14), prior to any COVID-19 q reported cases in the U.S. EN approximates contact based on students enrolling for classes 10 that could potentially collocate them in the same room during lectures. WIMOB infers 11 contact when any two individuals actually collocate near the same WiFi access point [15, 67] 12 for extended period (see explanation in SI WiFi Mobility). We found that WIMOB rendered 13 new insight into contact on campus that was invisible to the EN methodology. 14

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

¹ WIMOB characterizes temporal variation in proximity

² Variation in contact over the semester would naturally impact the severity of disease spread.

³ However, EN describes a static network that does not capture such dynamics (Figure 2a).

⁴ Instead, we found that WIMOB shows contacts got sparser over the semester. Figure 2c

⁵ presents a notable decline in contacts after the first two weeks, which coincides with multiple

⁶ orientation seminars and the so-called "course shopping" period of Fall 2019. In fact, contact

⁷ decreased considerably in classrooms, with a steeper slope possibly because of reduction in
attendance. WIMOB was able to reveal other observable changes, such as drop in contacts

attendance. WIMOB was able to reveal other observable changes, such as drop in contacts
during exam period (week 15) and increase after fall recess (week 10). EN rendered a highly

¹⁰ connected static network, which can miscalculate the speed at which a disease spreads. By

¹¹ contrast, the longitudinal behavior represented by WIMOB can help universities anticipate

¹² disease spread more accurately.

¹³ EN overestimates contact-based risk

Campuses can assess risk of an outbreak by characterizing the number of individuals that 14 would be at risk of infection through contact. In our study, EN indicated 99% of the indi-15 viduals on campus were clustered in a single component — if any of them would have been 16 infected in Fall 2019, the entire component would be at risk. From the lens of EN a virus 17 can exhaust an entire population with infection very early. However, WIMOB showed that 18 only 69% of the population was connected in a single component (Table S2). This difference 19 is because WIMOB can distinguish how many individuals are active on campus. Therefore, 20 WIMOB provides a pragmatic estimate of risk by grounding it in local occupancy and helps 21 campuses budget for resources better. 22

²³ WIMOB reveals different paths for disease transmission

Reports suggest that a key contributor to cases in the pandemic is actually clustering of 24 individuals in non-academic spaces [49]. However, EN does not depict a holistic view of 25 campus contact. It is limited to classrooms and, therefore, fixates on contacts in lectures, 26 while ignoring other spaces. In fact, WIMOB showed that in the first 6 weeks of Fall 2019, 27 the shortest path among individuals was smaller than that approximated by EN (Figure 2b). 28 With WIMOB, we observed new paths in the contact network from situations outside classes. 29 On a given week, WIMOB showed the average shortest path with contact is $3.26(\pm 0.5)$ when 30 only considering lectures, whereas capturing all contexts reduced the average shortest path to 31 $2.67(\pm 0.28)$. Characterizing shorter pathways is crucial for policymakers as closure policies 32 by design aim to disconnect these pathways. 33

³⁴ EN overemphasizes the impact of remote instruction

Prior work uses EN to posit that RI reduces contact and in turn significantly fragments the network for disease spread in universities [72, 9]. To compare policy effectiveness with WIMOB, we operationalize RI in our study:

Remote Instruction (RI): The status quo for data-driven policies offers strictly online in struction for large class enrollment, while continuing the other classes in person. When

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

using EN to model contacts, we implemented RI by removing connections between stu-

dents who were only in contact through courses of size ≥ 30 . When using WIMOB to

³ model contacts, we removed connections between students if they were only connected

⁴ because of collocations during scheduled lectures of such courses.

⁵ We evaluated the effectiveness of such a policy if it were applied in Fall 2019, with both ⁶ WIMOB and EN. Figure 2d shows that RI with EN reduced contact by 94% and increases ⁷ shortest path by 50%. However, the same intervention with WIMOB showed a relatively ⁸ milder impact (contact reduction 45%; shortest path increase 11%). This reinforces that ⁹ contact outside courses are significant and remain unaffected by enrollment-oriented policies ¹⁰ like RI. WIMOB provides a more encompassing view of the structural effects to a network ¹¹ and motivates design of more impactful closure policies.

¹² Epidemiological model built with WIMOB shows that LC yields bet-¹³ ter infection reduction outcomes with lower burden

As outlined above, EN does not comprehensively capture the contact on campus. By contrast, contact networks built with WIMOB demonstrate new structural insights, which are critical to describe disease spread. A campus is composed of many different spaces, and EN does not have the flexibility to design closure of such spaces or assess its impact. These drawbacks naturally motivate a new approach to design interventions. Since WIMOB mitigates the limitations of EN, we leveraged it to demonstrate the effectiveness of localized closure (LC) policies.

We used WIMOB to define the contact structure of each day and simulate COVID-19 with 21 an agent-based model. Our ABM was overlayed by a modified SEIR compartmental model 22 for COVID-19 for each agent. GT also had implemented a robust surveillance program on 23 campus. Hence we calibrated the ABM on the positivity rate for COVID-19 for GT [28] in 24 the first 5 weeks of Fall 2020 also incorporating external seeding from the surrounding Fulton 25 County, GA [51]. We validated our model by predicting future trends for the rest of Fall 26 2020. For robustness, we performed additional calibrations by varying time windows and 27 university context (details in SI Sensitivity Analyses). We studied interventions by applying 28 the ABM over the contact networks produced by WIMOB with data from Fall 2019 — a 29 counterfactual to Fall 2020 if no closure had occurred (see SI Simulation Model for further 30 details). 31

³² WIMOB can model RI and LC interventions with various configurations

Prior works show a few locations are responsible for majority spread [11] and restricting movement between them leads to greater control [38]. In addition to RI, we modeled LC, which we formalize as follows:

Localized Closure (LC): We identified rooms-level spaces that are highly central location
 nodes in the network. We removed contacts between people who are only connected
 because of collocating at these locations. While, we employed various centrality al gorithms to identify such locations, for the results discussed in this section we use
 PageRank [54]). Details in SI Identifying Locations for Closure.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 3: Results of policy interventions with our calibrated ABM on contact networks from Fall 2019, derived from WIMOB (a) This graph compares the mean active infections between LC and RI. LC show improved outcomes (shaded regions) even when constrained to the same restrictions of RI policies. (a)-inset: After the first wave, even though LC shows slightly higher active infections, the cumulative infections are still lower, especially those that are a result of internal transmission on campus. Figure S11— Figure S18 show changes in cumulative infections under different policies, including 2.5^{th} and 97.5^{th} percentile intervals. (b) Outcomes of policies within the same behavioral scenario are shown with boxes of the same color (RI policies are solid, LC policies are hatched) and box heights represent the 2.5^{th} and 97.5^{th} percentile. In S1, even though LC and RI are equally burdensome in terms of students avoiding campus, LC shows improved outcome on peak reductions. In fact, for the other scenarios, LC shows better outcomes than RI, without forcing as many students into online schedules, and, therefore, being even less burdensome with greater impact. Figure S10 show comparison of all policy outcomes with different budgets.

¹ We found that, if COVID-19 spread through Fall 2019 (a regular semester), the cases rose ² after 7 days (Figure 3a). Therefore, we applied both RI and LC interventions after the first ³ week.

To make the comparisons between the closure policies, we established fixed budgets to design LC based on the resource utilization on RI. We considered 2 kinds of budgets, (i) mobility reduction — to depict space use on campus, and (ii) risk of exposure — to reflect testing capacity. Also note, response to closure policies can lead to unpredictable side-effects in campus behavior, particularly when a student's schedule is entirely online. Therefore, we design policies within three behavioral scenarios (each with a varying budget):

S1: Persistence: Irrespective of the locations closed or classes restricted, individuals con tinue their other visiting behaviors.

12 S2: Non-Residential Avoidance: Non-residential students stop all visits to campus if
 they enrolled in at least 3 courses and the policy forces their entire academic schedule
 online.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

 S3: Complete Avoidance: Same as S2, but even residential students avoid campus based on their schedule.

Similar to other works that model closure [72, 5], we assume that when a location is
shutdown, the individuals who ought to have visited that location isolated during the time.
To devise interventions, WIMOB estimated how RI uses the budget and then designed LC
to match this budget under every behavioral scenario Table 1 describes how the budget for
each policy varies. Additional details are present in SI Modeling Policy and Scenarios.

⁸ We present differences between LC and RI based on three infection reduction outcomes; ⁹ peak infections (maximum active cases on a given day), internal transmission (exposure ¹⁰ from infected individuals on campus), and total infections (cumulative cases at the end of ¹¹ the semester). Additionally, we measured the burden of policy interventions with the number ¹² of locations closed — requires resources to monitor and maintain super-spreader locations, ¹³ the percentage of students that avoid campus — disruption to learning outcomes [18, 12], ¹⁴ and the percentage of individuals completely isolated — worsens mental wellbeing [60].

¹⁵ LC cause greater reduction in peak infections, while affecting fewer locations

Controlling peak infections relaxes the burden on a university to support positive cases for 16 any given day, and allows resources to be distributed over time. In all behavioral scenarios 17 of our simulation of Fall 2019, we observed that the peak reduction was significantly better 18 in LC (Figure 3) than RI. While RI impacted 58 different locations (classrooms and lecture 19 halls), in S1 and S2, LC achieved better outcomes by closing fewer locations. For example, 20 in S2, RI achieved a 28.9% peak reduction, but LC showed reductions of 49.3% (mobility 21 budget) and 48.1% (exposure risk budget). This was attained by closing 38 or 50 locations 22 respectively. Therefore, with such policies, policymakers need to restrict fewer locations to 23 remarkably minimize the pressure of active infections on campus (e.g., diagnoses, treatment, 24 quarantining). 25

LC lead to comparable reduction in total infections, while keeping more students on campus

Universities want to minimize the number of infected cases while ensuring majority of the 28 population remains active on campus to continue successful operation. In Scenario S1, the 29 total number of infections reduced by both LC was more than the reduction shown by RI. 30 were similar. For other behavioral scenarios the total infection reduction between policies 31 was similar ((Table S2). In contrast, the impact the policies had on the student schedules 32 was remarkably different. RI forced multiple students to adapt to fully online schedules. In 33 Scenario S2, 9% of students did not visit campus and in S3, 27% of students did not visit 34 campus. On the other hand, in LC, the number of students expected to avoid campus could 35 be as low as 0 and never exceeded 12%. Besides sustaining economic loss to the campus, 36 remote instruction can increase anxiety among students and hinder learning outcomes [12, 37 74]. Compared to RI, LC offers policymakers a way to defend against turnover in the student 38 population, without compromising overall control of disease spread (Table 1). Limiting the 39 number of students that avoid campus helps preserve on-campus businesses [32, 71] and 40 minimally disrupts the student wellbeing. 41

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Behavioral Scenario S1: Persistence			ce	S2:	S2: Non-Res Avoidance			S3: Complete Avoidance		
Policy		RI	L	C	RI	L	с	RI	ı	_C
Budget		-	Mobility (95.5%)	Exposure Risk (18800)	-	Mobility (92.3%)	Exposure Risk (16900)	-	Mobility (69.2%)	Exposure Risk (12700)
Infection Reduction Outcomes										
Peak Infect	ions (%)	$25.34(\pm 12)$	$36.92(\pm 14)^{**}$	$34.30(\pm 13)^{**}$	$35.44(\pm 10)$	$49.33(\pm 11)^{**}$	$52.19(\pm 10)^{**}$	$61.62(\pm 7)$	$69.34(\pm 5)^{**}$	$64.44(\pm 6)^{**}$
Total Infect	tions (%)	6.99(±5)	$10.63(\pm 6)^{**}$	$8.19(\pm 5)^{**}$	$14.88(\pm 4)$	$13.96(\pm 6)^*$	$15.67(\pm 6)$	$33.00(\pm 5)$	$33.4(\pm 5)$	$26.94(\pm 5)^{**}$
Internal T sions (%)	Fransmis-	$17.13(\pm 9)$	$22.62(\pm 11)^{**}$	$21.01(\pm 11)^{**}$	$27.58(\pm 8)$	$35.35(\pm 12)^{**}$	$39.20(\pm 11)^{**}$	$54.00(\pm 8)$	70.89(±7)**	$60.90(\pm 9)^{**}$
Burdens on	Campus									
Locations A	Affected	58	18	19	58	38	50	58	192	124
Students (%)	Avoiding	0	0	0	9.30	0.20	0.45	27.21	12.45	6.57
Completely on Campus	Isolated (%)	5.42	8.40	8.40	5.95	5.72	5.71	7.09	5.18	5.23

Table 1: Comparison of policies in terms of controlling the disease and impacts on campus in Fall 2019.

Within each behavioral scenario, we performed the Kruskal-Wallis H-Test [40] to compare outcomes of LC with RI. We found that LC leads to significantly improved peak infection reduction and internal transmission. In terms of reduction in total infections, the outcomes were comparable in general but varied by specific scenarios. In addition, every policy also exerted some burden on campus, either in terms of locations affected, students avoiding campus or isolation. We observed that LC policies focus on fewer locations (except in S3). Moreover, these policies affected fewer student's schedules and therefore fewer people avoid campus due to completely remote schedules. Finally, LC does not increase the percentage of people completely isolated on campus (*p*-value: < 0.01:*, < 0.001:**).

LC cause greater reduction in internal transmission without causing further iso-1 lation on campus 2

Universities are responsible for limiting spread on campus, but they must also ensure that 3 aggressive policies do not worsen mental wellbeing of the community. In terms of internal transmission the reduction is significantly larger with LC (Table 1). However, when LC 5 restricted the infections early in Fall 2019, it left more individuals susceptible to external 6 transmission. College student behavior outside campus on weekends and breaks is known to 7 impact local transmission [16]. When policymakers consider LC they should also consider policies on re-entry or required testing based on off-campus activities. In terms of isolating 9 individuals on campus, it's notable that LC and RI were similar in S2. Interestingly, in S3, 10 where LC closed more than 100 locations, the percentage of isolated individuals per week was 11 less than that of RI. This finding implies that LC can keep individuals on campus without 12 forcing them into complete isolation. Here "isolation" refers to no form of proximate con-13 tact with any individual on campus — extreme social distancing where individuals are not 14 even collocated in the same suite or hall. While social distancing is a recommended coun-15 termeasure for COVID-19 [1], complete isolation can have adverse effects on psychological 16 wellbeing [60, 41, 55]. LC can help alleviate concerns of closure interventions that increase 17

loneliness and limit social connectedness [41]. 18

LC identifies a wider variety of auxiliary spaces. 19

By using WIMOB to design LC we were able to identify locations for closure at the granularity 20

level of rooms, including unbound spaces such as lobbies and work areas. As policy design 21

budgets changed with every behavioral scenario we found that LC identified different types 22

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

of locations for closure. First, in S1, we found that most locations that LC targeted are 1 a subset of the auditoriums-like rooms where large classes would take place in Fall 2019. 2 Note, LC needs to restrict only a few such spaces to utilize the same budget as RI. This is 3 because, under S1, RI policies only altered visits to lectures, while these spaces are used for Δ other purposes during other times (e.g., club activities and seminars). We also noted that 5 LC targeted 'high traffic' locations like conference center lobbies which are typically used 6 as waiting areas or for networking events. Next, in Scenario S_2 , we saw that in addition 7 to spaces mentioned earlier, interestingly LC further restricted the use of smaller rooms 8 (occupancy 13 - 35) which would not be affected by RI (as only classes of size ≥ 30 are 9 offered online). LC also targeted areas in the recreation center (which includes locker rooms 10 and indoor courts for 4-20 people). This insight indicates that our methodology WIMOB 11 accounts for a diverse set of student activities. Moreover, we also found a selection of spaces 12 that would not be frequented by the undergraduate population, such as lab areas and facility 13 buildings like the police station. Lastly, in Scenario S3, LC targeted closure of activity in 14 far more spaces than RI. However, the better outcomes can be attributed to the fact that 15 LC diversified the potential restriction areas. LC restricted heavily used small study rooms 16 or breakout rooms (for 1-6 people). Furthermore, it restricts use of spaces where multiple 17 small groups of people can organically assemble, such as cafes, dining halls, and reading 18 areas. We also observed that LC restricted activity in about 10 Greek Houses but does not 19 target other housing areas — demonstrating its ability to restrict social behavior that could 20 amplify disease spread. Figure S19 shows the diversity in locations for various LC policies. 21

²² Sensitivity and robustness analyses

The results above use an ABM calibrated on the positivity rate of the first 5 weeks of Fall 23 2020. This rate can be influenced by many latent factors (e.g., mask-wearing, hand washing, 24 distancing, and compliance). To study any effect of these variations, we also calibrated on 25 different time windows throughout the semester. We calibrate on weeks 5-9 and 10-1426 in Fall 2020, and validate on the remaining semester. In both cases, compared to RI, we 27 found that LC still exhibits better reduction in peak infections (up to 90%) and internal 28 transmission (up to 77%). In the original calibration, LC maintained the same level of total 29 infections as RI, but with the new periods we found total infections were substantially less 30 than RI (Table S8 and Table S9). Another important variable for positivity is the wider 31 context of the campus e.g. urban/rural, the surrounding county, city, etc. To investigate 32 this, we also calibrated our ABM on the positivity rate of different universities in the US in 33 Fall 2020 (along with information from their county to seed external cases). Consider this 34 as a hypothetical where the mobility of the GT community remains the same but disease 35 outcomes resemble a different campus. We calibrated on data from University of Illinois 36 at Urbana-Champaign and University of California, Berkeley. We found no remarkable 37 differences from our findings with GT (Table S10 and Table S11). 38

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

¹ Discussion

² Non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPI) are the first line of defense for universities to re-

spond to contagious diseases like COVID-19 [21, 47] and are also crucial to control infections
and continue operations until recovery. On a campus, a common form of NPI is closure [33].

⁵ Universities consider enrollment data (EN) to design remote instruction (RI) for closure to

⁶ support continued operations safely [72]. However, EN can misconstrue contact on campus,

⁷ and RI policies can have broad impacts despite their effects on curbing the disease spread.

* This paper demonstrates that repurposing logs from a managed WiFi network (WIMOB)

• can help design effective localized closure policies (LC). We show that WIMOB uncovers rich

¹⁰ contact dynamics and provides policymakers multiple dimensions to design policies like LC.

 $_{11}\,$ We simulate COVID-19 with an ABM that harnesses WIMOB to compare RI and LC. As

¹² universities plan for Fall 2021, our results present evidence that LC designed with WIMOB ¹³ can lead to improved infection reduction outcomes, while simultaneously relaxing burdens

¹⁴ on the campus caused by coarse-grained broad RI policies.

Generalizability for Other Contexts: In practice LC policies should be deployed in con-15 junction with the other tools as well like testing, tracing, and quarantining. WIMOB can 16 complement disease-specific knowledge to identify closure spaces. For example, small indoor 17 spaces with poor ventilation increase the risk of infection for COVID-19 [63], while other 18 algorithm-identified locations for closure might not require closure because users of a space 19 are compliant with mask-wearing and testing. Further, as a pandemic progresses and public 20 health guidance develops [62], with WIMOB, campuses can regulate the restriction of LC 21 policies and anticipate the path to 'normal' operations [39, 56]. Moreover, WIMOB captures 22 various spillover effects that cannot be captured in methods like EN. For instance, with 23 WIMOB we observe that the mobility in Fall 2020 was 39% of that in Fall 2019 because the 24 on-ground policies lead to certain staff working remotely as well. With additional informa-25 tion, WIMOB enables policymakers to model such scenarios and design alternatives like LC 26 with new budgets. Policymakers can use WIMOB as a versatile tool to explore dynamic in-27 tervention strategies as well. Prior work shows that staggering policy restrictions could have 28 variable impact on campus [78]. Accordingly, WIMOB could be used to build an adaptive 29 version of LC that updates at different points in the semester based on expected mobility 30 changes. Additionally, depending on campus priorities and resource limitations, different 31 campuses can use this same data to model policies differently. The effectiveness of reopening 32 policies is expected to be sensitive to a campus' specific context that includes physical infras-33 tructure, overarching guidelines, and human compliance [6]. For certain campuses policies 34 might not need to be constrained by exposure risk as testing might be frequent, ubiquitous, 35 and voluminous. Other campuses could have limits on quarantining capacity. Policymakers 36 might even consider the cost trade-offs by actually forecasting actual financial losses incurred 37 by reduction in mobility [7], or valuate loss of services based on community needs [65]. We 38 elaborate on these considerations in the SI Implications for Policy Design. 39 **Operational Considerations:** Beyond assessing cost-benefits, universities need to de-40

vise practical methods of obtaining, storing, and processing mobility of the community as
WIMOB. University can access logs from the managed network internally as it is passively
collected. Moreover, it does not require any new form of surveillance sensing but universities
must revise terms of use and stay sensitive to community perspectives. Despite population

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

mobility being valuable for many applications [77], accumulating localization data can be a 1 major privacy concern [69]. Instead, operational applications need to conceive approaches 2 that only retain insights on locations to shutdown but not individual data. Similarly, any 3 operational use needs to employ differential privacy to limit what stakeholders can learn from 4 the data [4] (e.g., decision-makers can only get a list of candidate locations to close). In the SI 5 Discussion, we further detail approaches to reconcile privacy, ethics and legal considerations. 6 Limitations and Future Work: For future investigations of better closure policies, re-7 searchers and policymakers need to be cognizant of the limitations of our work. Our analyses 8 capture heterogeneity in individual behavior but does not account for differences in intrinsic q vulnerabilities, which are related to severity of risk [35, 55, 23] and disparity in burden of 10 shutdowns on demographic groups [11]. WIMOB can be extended with other streams of data 11 to characterize sub-contexts in the population and devise new forms of LC to explicitly study 12 the impact of policies on specific vulnerable subgroups in the community. Additionally, our 13 work explores the avoidance based behavioral responses to closure interventions with as-14 sumptions in line with prior work [72, 5]. Researchers and policymakers can be interested 15 in substitution behaviors where the population visits new locations when others are closed. 16 WIMOB has the flexibility to model more nuanced spillover effects. Exploring different ways 17 to remove and reallocate edges in the contact network is interesting future work. Further 18 discussion in SI Limitations and Future Work. 19

$_{20}$ Methods

This section summarizes (i) the data used to derive contact networks and policies, and (ii) the dynamics of our simulation and calibration approach. Additional information for every subsection is present in SI Methods.

24

²⁵ WiFi Mobility

²⁶ Here we describe the data for our methodology, WiFi mobility models (WIMOB) and the ²⁷ process to yield Localized (LC) policies.

²⁸ Data Use and Access

The IT management facility at Georgia Tech (GT) accumulates WiFi access point logs over 29 time. This is common in most universities with managed WiFi infrastructure. We actively 30 collaborated with IT management to define safety and security safeguards that allow us to 31 obtain a de-identified version of these raw logs. Before accessing the data we established a 32 data-use agreement and an ethics protocol that was approved by the Institutional Review 33 Board (IRB) at Georgia Institute of Technology (Protocol H20208). For the WiFi data, 34 we were provided access to logs from Fall 2019 and Fall 2020. We processed these logs to 35 characterize mobility (WIMOB) and it encompasses all 40,000 unique visitors that connected 36 to the network via 6,959 different access points [15]. The logs did not contain any personally 37

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

identifiable information and locations are also coded. The logs indicated the WiFi access 1 point (AP) a device associates with and can therefore be used to infer dwelling locations 2 of users across the entire campus. This is limited to indoor spaces where APs are located 3 and the scope of this localization is at the granularity of a room or suite [20, 76]). For EN 4 we only used aggregate insights for enrollment, which were derived from course registration 5 transcripts. Note, we did not cross-identify any students. We used publicly accessible course 6 schedules to approximate schedules of de-identified nodes and infer if they were students or 7 staff, and non-residential or residential. We elaborate on our data in SI Data. 8 **Note.** Like most universities, GT's managed WiFi network is not equipped with any 9 Real-Time Location System (RTLS) [14, 46]. RTLS systems use Received Signal Strength 10

Indicator (RSSI) values from multiple neighboring APs to provide high precise localization of individuals in terms of time and space. However, deploying such systems requires surveying the entire network. Additionally, precision localization raises more privacy concerns. These factors together make it challenging for universities to justify the deployment of RTLS, unlike small retail settings that can monetize RTLS insights directly (e.g., insights on footfall can be tied to improving revenue).

¹⁷ Contact and Movement Networks

WIMOB leverages the logs to create bipartite graphs K_t , for each day t, which connect P 18 users to L access point locations (Figure 1a). Any edge, $\{p, l\}_i$ indicates the i^{th} instance 19 when a p was dwelling at l. These edges describe the time period of dwelling. Subsequently, 20 by comparing all edges in K_t we can infer if different individuals are collocated near an AP 21 to create a contact network, G_t , for each day t — between any collocated $p_i, p_j \in P$. These 22 networks define the contact structure for an epidemiological agent-based model at every time-23 step. Similarly, by inspecting the sequence of dwelling locations for any p in graph K, we 24 compute a mobility network, H_t — between locations $l \in L$. In our approach, we considered 25 collocation as a form of *proximate contact* — people in the same room — and therefore 26 established collocation only when this occurred for "an extended period" [30]. By varying 27 this threshold between 30 and 40 minutes we found the contact networks to be structurally 28 similar as their clustering coefficients (over the semester) were highly correlated (r = 0.97). 29 In our experiments, we used the 40 minute threshold as it was more computationally less 30 expensive. We provide more details of our approach in SI Data Processing and in SI Modeling 31

32 Contact and Movement.

33 Modeling Policies

We compared the disease outcomes and burdens of 2 policies, Remote Instruction (RI) and 34 Localized Closure (LC), both of which are modeled with WIMOB. For RI we inferred en-35 rollment size of each course in Fall 2019 by determining the number of unique individuals 36 that visited lecture locations during scheduled times. After the first week, we applied the 37 RI by removing all visiting edges in K_t for any $l_c \in L_{RI}$ if visits were during lecture times of 38 course c with an enrollment ≥ 30 . This helped create counterfactual contact networks G'_t . 39 The removal of edges from K described the mobility budget of RI and the structure of G'_t 40 indicated the risk of exposure budget. We designed LC with these budgets by identifying 41

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

¹ locations for closure (L_{LC}) with different algorithms, such as PageRank [54], Eigenvector

² Centrality [8], Load Centrality [48], and Betweenness Centrality [24]. When a location was

³ closed, we removed all edges in K_t connected to any $l_x \in L_{LC}$. We aggregated the movement

⁴ graph H_t over a week and apply the algorithms to identify locations. Subsequently, we iden-

5 tified the number of top-ranked locations to remove such that the resultant counterfactual

 ${}_{\mathfrak{6}}$ contact network G_t'' has is within 1% of the budget. The budgets varied for different be-

7 havioral scenarios and we only compared policies within the same scenario. This is further

⁸ elaborated in SI Modeling Policies and Scenarios.

[,] Disease Simulation

¹⁰ Here we summarize our epidemiological model and calibration process.

¹¹ Agent-Based Model

We constructed an agent-based model (ABM) that captures the spread of COVID-19 be-12 tween individuals active on campus. This ABM leveraged the contact networks produced by 13 WIMOB. The simulation iterated a time-step each day with the underlying contact networks 14 i.e., G_t for no interventions, G'_t for RI, and G''_t for LC. Each agent in our ABM follows a mod-15 ified version of susceptible-exposed-infectious-removed (SEIR) template that disambiguates 16 the *infectious* compartment into *asymptomatic* and *symptomatic*. New infections were in-17 troduced to the model either externally or internally. External transmission arose because 18 individuals could contract the virus outside campus and bring the infection back for local 19 spread [43, 49]. We adopted data of positive cases from Fulton county [51] with a scaling 20 factor α to estimate the probability that a *susceptible* individual, who is active on campus, 21 was infected from interactions that take place outside campus. Internal transmissions are 22 determined by p, as the probability of *susceptible* individuals in contact with an *infectious* 23 one. We calibrated the parameters related to disease transmission by training and validating 24 our models on the positivity rate reported by GT surveillance testing [28]. SI Agent-Based 25 Model details the disease progression and describes the various parameters. 26

27 Calibration

In our study, we estimated three key parameters: (i) infectious individuals at day 0, (ii) 28 transmission probability between infectious and susceptible individuals, and (iii) the proba-29 bility of infection transmission from contacts outside the network. We estimated the range 30 of optimal parameters for disease transmission by minimizing the root means square error 31 (r.m.s.e) between the Georgia Tech surveillance testing positive rates [52, 28] and the ob-32 served positivity rate of the model every week— percentage of new asymptomatic cases out 33 of the total testable population. The surveillance testing conducted by Georgia Tech was 34 designed for detecting individuals who contracted Covid-19 without showing Flu-like symp-35 toms within the community [52]. We calibrated the model on the positivity rates on the 36 first 5 weeks of Fall 2020. To attain a point estimation of the optimal parameters, we fitted 37 the model to predict trends in the remaining weeks by running a numerical optimization 38

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Parameter	Definition	Value	Std	Source
p	Transmission probability: For any edge between a $susceptible$ and $infectious$ individual in the contact network, p is the probability that the $susceptible$ person will enter into the $exposed$ state. This only dictates internal transmission	0.034	0.007	Calibration
α	Scaling factor of the normalized confirmed cases in the surrounding county (1). This is the parameter for us to generate $I_{out}(t)$	0.032	0.0032	Calibration
I_0	Proportion of population that is asymptomatic at day 0	0.012	0.0009	Calibration
p_S	Probability of <i>exposed</i> persons becoming symptomatic	0.66	-	[36]
Δ_S	Incubation period (days) since the first day of exposure	5	-	[36]
$\Delta_{\mathrm{Asym} \to R}$	Asymptomatic duration (days); it is the time taken for an <i>asymptomatic</i> person to recover since the first day of exposure	7	-	[36]
Δ_I, σ_I	Time of an <i>symptomatic</i> entering <i>isolated</i> since the first day of exposure of a <i>symptomatic</i> person	8	2	[27]
Δ_R, σ_R	Time for recovery for a <i>symptomatic</i> , since the first day of exposure	12	2	[42]
p_D	Death rate under isolation	0.0006	-	[42]

Table 2: Model Parameters of the ABM

The variables p, α , and I_0 are estimated by calibrating the simulation model on the first 5 weeks of positivity rates provided by GT surveillance for Fall 2020, while incorporating external cases from Fulton County. These parameters were found by validating the ABM on the remaining weeks of Fall 2020. SI Calibration provides additional details.

algorithm, Nelder-Mead [44]. To account for quantitative uncertainty, we estimated a range
of parameters, within 40% of optimum r.m.s.e [11]. For other model parameters, we adopted
values proposed by previous studies on similar populations [36, 27, 42]. Table 2 shows a full
list of our parameters.

Note that our calibration characterized latent factors associated with pandemic-related 5 cautious behaviors, including the relationship with external transmission. And these factors 6 could be related to "county characteristics, partisanship, media consumption, and racial and 7 ethnic composition" [1]. To account for the effect of these varying latent factors on dis-8 ease outcomes, we performed additional calibrations for hypothetical variations in disease 9 spread. For these analyses we kept the GT mobility behavior constant while calibrating the 10 model on different time periods of surveillance testing and on positivity rates of different 11 U.S. universities — University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign [50] and University of Cali-12 fornia [68], Berkeley. We evaluated RI and LC on these variations and describe the design of 13 these complementary experiments in SI Sensitivity Analyses. See SI Calibration for details 14 on the calibration process and results of all variations are in Table S3. 15

16 Data Availability

Interested parties can request deidentified version of this data through appropriate data use
agreements. The data are not publicly available as disclosing them would breach our IRB
protocol.

20 Code Availability

The code used for processing the WiFi logs into mobility networks can be requested under requisite terms of use agreements. The code for simulation is publicly available at:

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

1 https://github.com/AdityaLab/cv-wifi-GT

2 Author Contributions Statement

- ³ V.D.S., M.D.C., G.D.A., L.N.S., and B.A.P. designed the research; V.D.S., J.X., L.N.S., and
- B.A.P. performed the research; V.D.S. and G.D.A. acquired the data; V.D.S., J.X., J.C.,
- 5 S.S., and M.M. analyzed, and interpreted data for the work; V.D.S., J.X., M.D.C., G.D.A.,
- ⁶ L.N.S., and B.A.P. wrote the paper.

7 Acknowledgements

- ⁸ This paper is based on work partially supported by the NSF (Expeditions CCF-1918770, CA-
- 9 REER IIS-2028586, RAPID IIS-2027862, RAPID IIS-2027689, Medium IIS-1955883, NRT
- ¹⁰ DGE-1545362, CCF-2115126), CDC MInD program, ORNL, and Semiconductor Research
- ¹¹ Corporation (in collaboration with Intel Labs). Some research personnel were supported by
- ¹² internal seed funding from the Georgia Institute of Technology and Georgia Tech Research
- ¹³ Institute. Other computing resources were provided by the Office of Information Technology
- 14 at Georgia Tech. The authors thank Di Wu, Hanna Hamilton, and Dima Nazzal (Georgia
- ¹⁵ Institute of Technology) for their analysis of EN.

¹⁶ Competing Interests

¹⁷ The authors declare no competing interests.

¹⁸ Materials Correspondence

¹⁹ Correspondence should be addressed to B.A.P., e-mail: badityap@cc.gatech.edu.

References

- [1] M. Andersen. Early evidence on social distancing in response to covid-19 in the united states. Available at SSRN 3569368, 2020.
- [2] J. P. Azevedo, A. Hasan, D. Goldemberg, S. A. Iqbal, and K. Geven. Simulating the potential impacts of COVID-19 school closures on schooling and learning outcomes: A set of global estimates. The World Bank, 2020.
- [3] H. S. Badr, H. Du, M. Marshall, E. Dong, M. M. Squire, and L. M. Gardner. Association between mobility patterns and covid-19 transmission in the usa: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 20(11):1247–1254, 2020.
- [4] E. Bagdasaryan, G. Berlstein, J. Waterman, E. Birrell, N. Foster, F. B. Schneider, and D. Estrin. Ancile: Enhancing privacy for ubiquitous computing with use-based privacy. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*, pages 111–124, 2019.

- [5] R. Bahl, N. Eikmeier, A. Fraser, M. Junge, F. Keesing, K. Nakahata, and L. Z. Wang. Modeling covid-19 spread in small colleges. arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.09597, 2020.
- [6] J. C. Benneyan, C. Gehrke, I. Ilies, and N. Nehls. Potential community and campus covid-19 outcomes under university and college reopening scenarios. *medRxiv*, 2020.
- [7] S. G. Benzell, A. Collis, and C. Nicolaides. Rationing social contact during the covid-19 pandemic: Transmission risk and social benefits of us locations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(26):14642–14644, 2020.
- [8] P. Bonacich. Some unique properties of eigenvector centrality. Social networks, 29(4):555– 564, 2007.
- [9] M. Borowiak, F. Ning, J. Pei, S. Zhao, H.-R. Tung, and R. Durrett. Controlling the spread of covid-19 on college campuses. arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.07293, 2020.
- [10] C. O. Buckee, S. Balsari, J. Chan, M. Crosas, F. Dominici, U. Gasser, Y. H. Grad, B. Grenfell, M. E. Halloran, M. U. Kraemer, et al. Aggregated mobility data could help fight covid-19. *Science (New York, NY)*, 368(6487):145–146, 2020.
- [11] S. Chang, E. Pierson, P. W. Koh, J. Gerardin, B. Redbird, D. Grusky, and J. Leskovec. Mobility network models of covid-19 explain inequities and inform reopening. *Nature*, 589(7840):82–87, 2021.
- [12] I. Chirikov, K. M. Soria, B. Horgos, and D. Jones-White. Undergraduate and graduate students' mental health during the covid-19 pandemic. 2020.
- [13] T. Choudhury and A. Pentland. Characterizing social networks using the sociometer. Proceedings of the North American association of computational social and organizational science (NAACSOS), 2004.
- [14] Cisco. Wi-fi location-based services 4.1 design guide white paper, 2014. Available at: https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/td/docs/solutions/Enterprise/Mobility/ WiFiLBS-DG/wifich2.html.
- [15] V. Das Swain, H. Kwon, B. Saket, M. B. Morshed, K. Tran, D. Patel, Y. Tian, J. Philipose, Y. Cui, T. Plötz, et al. Leveraging wifi network logs to infer social interactions: A case study of academic performance and student behavior. arXiv e-prints, 2020.
- [16] D. Dave, A. Friedson, K. Matsuzawa, J. J. Sabia, and S. Safford. Jue insight: Were urban cowboys enough to control covid-19? local shelter-in-place orders and coronavirus case growth. *Journal of urban economics*, page 103294, 2020.
- |17| A. DePietro. Here's a look at the impact of coronavirus (covidcolleges the 2020.19)and universities inu.s., Available on https://www.forbes.com/sites/andrewdepietro/2020/04/30/ at: impact-coronavirus-covid-19-colleges-universities/?sh=26c3f79c61a6.

- [18] E. Dorn, B. Hancock, J. Sarakatsannis, and E. Viruleg. Covid-19 and student learning in the united states: The hurt could last a lifetime. *McKinsey & Company*, 2020.
- [19] N. Eagle and A. S. Pentland. Reality mining: sensing complex social systems. Personal and ubiquitous computing, 10(4):255–268, 2006.
- [20] M. H. S. Eldaw, M. Levene, and G. Roussos. Presence analytics: making sense of human social presence within a learning environment. In 2018 IEEE/ACM 5th International Conference on Big Data Computing Applications and Technologies (BDCAT), pages 174– 183. IEEE, 2018.
- [21] N. Ferguson, D. Laydon, G. Nedjati Gilani, N. Imai, K. Ainslie, M. Baguelin, S. Bhatia, A. Boonyasiri, Z. Cucunuba Perez, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, et al. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (npis) to reduce covid19 mortality and healthcare demand.
- [22] C. for Disease Control and Prevention. Community npis: Flu prevention in community settings, 2020. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/ nonpharmaceutical-interventions/community/index.html.
- [23] C. for Disease Control and Prevention. People at increased risk and other people who need to take extra precautions, 2020. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/ coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/index.html.
- [24] L. C. Freeman. A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. Sociometry, pages 35–41, 1977.
- [25] S. Friedman, T. Hurley, T. Fishman, and P. Fritz. Covid-19 impact on higher education, 2020. Available at: https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/pages/public-sector/ articles/covid-19-impact-on-higher-education.html.
- [26] R. Frutos, M. Lopez Roig, J. Serra-Cobo, and C. A. Devaux. Covid-19: the conjunction of events leading to the coronavirus pandemic and lessons to learn for future threats. *Frontiers in medicine*, 7:223, 2020.
- [27] K. Gaythorpe, N. Imai, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, M. Baguelin, S. Bhatia, A. Boonyasiri, and A. Cori. Report 8: Symptom progression of covid-19, 2020.
- [28] G. Gibson, J. S. Weitz, M. P. Shannon, B. Holton, A. Bryksin, B. Liu, S. Bramblett, J. Williamson, M. Farrell, A. Ortiz, C. T. Abdallah, and A. J. García. Surveillanceto-diagnostic testing program for asymptomatic sars-cov-2 infections on a large, urban campus - georgia institute of technology, fall 2020. medRxiv, 2021. Available at: https: //www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/01/31/2021.01.28.21250700.
- [29] P. T. Gressman and J. R. Peck. Simulating covid-19 in a university environment. Mathematical biosciences, 328:108436, 2020.

- [30] E. S. Gurley. Strategies to support the covid-19 response in lmics, 2020. Available at: https://hopkinsglobalhealth.org/assets/documents/CGH_Webinar_ -_Contact_Tracing_(Final_Version).pdf.
- [31] H. L. Hambridge, R. Kahn, and J.-P. Onnela. Examining sars-cov-2 interventions in residential colleges using an empirical network. *medRxiv*, 2021.
- [32] M. Harris and K. Holley. Universities as anchor institutions: Economic and social potential for urban development. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, pages 393–439. Springer, 2016.
- [33] N. Haug, L. Geyrhofer, A. Londei, E. Dervic, A. Desvars-Larrive, V. Loreto, B. Pinior, S. Thurner, and P. Klimek. Ranking the effectiveness of worldwide covid-19 government interventions. *Nature human behaviour*, 4(12):1303–1312, 2020.
- [34] J. S. Jia, X. Lu, Y. Yuan, G. Xu, J. Jia, and N. A. Christakis. Population flow drives spatio-temporal distribution of covid-19 in china. *Nature*, 582(7812):389–394, 2020.
- [35] R. E. Jordan, P. Adab, and K. Cheng. Covid-19: risk factors for severe disease and death, 2020.
- [36] P. Keskinocak, B. E. Oruc, A. Baxter, J. Asplund, and N. Serban. The impact of social distancing on covid19 spread: State of georgia case study. *Plos one*, 15(10):e0239798, 2020.
- [37] S. M. Kissler, C. Tedijanto, E. Goldstein, Y. H. Grad, and M. Lipsitch. Projecting the transmission dynamics of sars-cov-2 through the postpandemic period. *Science*, 368(6493):860–868, 2020.
- [38] K. Kondo. Simulating the impacts of interregional mobility restriction on the spatial spread of covid-19 in japan. *medRxiv*, pages 2020–12, 2021.
- [39] M. Korn. Colleges begin more normal fall-with mapping out \mathbf{a} 2021. Available https://www.wsj.com/articles/ caveats, at: colleges-begin-mapping-out-a-more-normal-fallwith-caveats-11615800600? reflink=desktopwebshare_permalink.
- [40] W. H. Kruskal and W. A. Wallis. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. Journal of the American statistical Association, 47(260):583–621, 1952.
- [41] M. E. Loades, E. Chatburn, N. Higson-Sweeney, S. Reynolds, R. Shafran, A. Brigden, C. Linney, M. N. McManus, C. Borwick, and E. Crawley. Rapid systematic review: the impact of social isolation and loneliness on the mental health of children and adolescents in the context of covid-19. Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 2020.
- [42] B. Lopman, C. Y. Liu, A. Le Guillou, A. Handel, T. L. Lash, A. P. Isakov, and S. M. Jenness. A modeling study to inform screening and testing interventions for the control of sars-cov-2 on university campuses. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1):1–11, 2021.

- [43] D. Mangrum and P. Niekamp. Jue insight: College student travel contributed to local covid-19 spread. *Journal of Urban Economics*, page 103311, 2020.
- [44] K. I. McKinnon. Convergence of the nelder-mead simplex method to a nonstationary point. *SIAM Journal on optimization*, 9(1):148–158, 1998.
- [45] Z. Mehrab, A. goud Ranga, D. Sarkar, S. Venkatramanan, Y. C. Baek, S. Swarup, and M. Marathe. High resolution proximity statistics as early warning for us universities reopening during covid-19. *medRxiv*, 2020.
- [46] A. W.-F. L. Monitor. Wifi location monitor accuracy, 2016. Available at: https://www.accuware.com/support/wi-fi-location-monitor-accuracy/.
- [47] S. S. Morse, R. L. Garwin, and P. J. Olsiewski. Next flu pandemic: what to do until the vaccine arrives? 2006.
- [48] M. E. Newman. Scientific collaboration networks. ii. shortest paths, weighted networks, and centrality. *Physical review E*, 64(1):016132, 2001.
- [49] A. Nierenberg and A. Pasick. Schools briefing: University outbreaks and parental angst, 2020. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/19/us/ colleges-closing-covid.html.
- [50] U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. On-campus covid-19 testing, 2020. Available at: https://covid19.illinois.edu/on-campus-covid-19-testing-data-dashboard/.
- [51] G. D. of Public Health. Georgia department of public health daily status report, 2020. Available at: https://dph.georgia.gov/covid-19-daily-status-report.
- [52] G. I. of Technology. Georgia tech launches campus coronavirus testing, 2020. Available at: https://health.gatech.edu/coronavirus/testing-launched.
- [53] W. H. Organization et al. Critical preparedness, readiness and response actions for covid-19: interim guidance, 22 march 2020. Technical report, World Health Organization, 2020.
- [54] L. Page, S. Brin, R. Motwani, and T. Winograd. The pagerank citation ranking: Bringing order to the web. Technical report, Stanford InfoLab, 1999.
- [55] B. Pfefferbaum and C. S. North. Mental health and the covid-19 pandemic. New England Journal of Medicine, 383(6):510–512, 2020.
- [56] R. C. Rabin. C.d.c. officials say most available evidence indicates schools can be safe if precautions are taken on campus and in the community, 2021. Available at: https: //www.nytimes.com/2021/01/26/world/cdc-schools-reopening.html.
- [57] A. Rodríguez, A. Tabassum, J. X. Jiaming Cui, J. Ho, P. Agarwal, B. Adhikari, and B. A. Prakash. Deepcovid: An operational deep learning-driven framework for explainable real-time covid-19 forecasting. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Apr. 2021.

- [58] R. Rojas and M. Delkic. As states reopen, governors balance existing risks with new ones, 2020. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/17/us/coronavirus-states-reopen.html.
- [59] M. Salathé, M. Kazandjieva, J. W. Lee, P. Levis, M. W. Feldman, and J. H. Jones. A high-resolution human contact network for infectious disease transmission. *Proceedings* of the National Academy of Sciences, 107(51):22020–22025, 2010.
- [60] L. Y. Saltzman, T. C. Hansel, and P. S. Bordnick. Loneliness, isolation, and social support factors in post-covid-19 mental health. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 2020.
- [61] P. Sapiezynski, A. Stopczynski, R. Gatej, and S. Lehmann. Tracking human mobility using wifi signals. *PloS one*, 10(7):e0130824, 2015.
- [62] S. Saul and S. Hubler. Colleges vowed a safer spring. then students, and variants, arrived, 2021. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/09/us/colleges-covid. html.
- [63] L. J. Schoen. Guidance for building operations during the covid-19 pandemic. ASHRAE Journal, 5(3), 2020.
- [64] A. Smalley. Higher education responses to coronavirus (covid-19). In National Conference of State Legislatures. [Accessed May 15, 2020]. https://www.ncsl. org/research/education/higher-education-responses-to-coronavirus-covid-19. aspx, 2020.
- [65] J. Suh, E. Horvitz, R. W. White, and T. Althoff. Population-scale study of human needs during the covid-19 pandemic: Analysis and implications. In *Proceedings of the* 14th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, pages 4–12, 2021.
- [66] T. N. Y. Times. Tracking coronavirus cases at u.s. colleges and universities, 2021. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/us/college-covid-tracker. html.
- [67] A. Trivedi, C. Zakaria, R. Balan, and P. Shenoy. Wifitrace: Network-based contact tracing for infectious diseases using passive wifi sensing. arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.12045, 2020.
- [68] B. University of California. Coronavirus dashboard testing, 2020. Available at: https://coronavirus.berkeley.edu/dashboard/.
- [69] J. L. Wang and M. C. Loui. Privacy and ethical issues in location-based tracking systems. In 2009 IEEE International Symposium on Technology and Society, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2009.
- [70] S. Ware, C. Yue, R. Morillo, J. Lu, C. Shang, J. Kamath, A. Bamis, J. Bi, A. Russell, and B. Wang. Large-scale automatic depression screening using meta-data from wifi infrastructure. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies*, 2(4):1–27, 2018.

- [71] S. Watson, S. Hubler, D. Ivory, and R. Gebeloff. A new front in america's pandemic: College towns, 2020. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/06/ us/colleges-coronavirus-students.html.
- [72] K. A. Weeden and B. Cornwell. The small-world network of college classes: implications for epidemic spread on a university campus. *Sociological science*, 7:222–241, 2020.
- [73] A. Wesolowski, C. Metcalf, N. Eagle, J. Kombich, B. T. Grenfell, O. N. Bjørnstad, J. Lessler, A. J. Tatem, and C. O. Buckee. Quantifying seasonal population fluxes driving rubella transmission dynamics using mobile phone data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(35):11114–11119, 2015.
- [74] C. Woolston. Signs of depression and anxiety soar among us graduate students during pandemic, 2020. Available at: https://www.nature.com/articles/ d41586-020-02439-6.
- [75] V. Yuen. Mounting peril for public higher education during the coronavirus pandemic. Center for American Progress, 2020.
- [76] C. Zakaria, A. Trivedi, E. Cecchet, M. Chee, P. Shenoy, and R. Balan. Analyzing the impact of covid-19 control policies on campus occupancy and mobility via passive wifi sensing. arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.12050, 2020.
- [77] Y. Zhang, B. Li, and K. Ramayya. Learning individual behavior using sensor data: The case of gps traces and taxi drivers. *Forthcoming in Information Systems Research*, 2020.
- [78] H. Zhao and Z. Feng. Staggered release policies for covid-19 control: Costs and benefits of relaxing restrictions by age and risk. *Mathematical biosciences*, 326:108405, 2020.
- [79] Y. Zhou, R. Xu, D. Hu, Y. Yue, Q. Li, and J. Xia. Effects of human mobility restrictions on the spread of covid-19 in shenzhen, china: a modelling study using mobile phone data. *The Lancet Digital Health*, 2(8):e417–e424, 2020.

Supplementary Information Appendix

¹ Supplementary Methods

² In this section, first, we describe the primary data source for mobility models (WIMOB),

³ the data used for calibrating our simulations, and for comparison of contact networks with

⁴ methods using enrollment data (EN). Next, we describe how we construct counterfactual

⁵ mobility networks under the two main policies of interest in our study: remote instruction

 $_{6}$ (RI) and localized closures (LC). Finally, we describe an agent-based-model (ABM) of disease

 $_{7}$ transmission, which has a contact structure based on WIMOB, and how this model was

⁸ calibrated.

9 Data

10

11 WiFi Mobility

We use data provided by the IT management facility at Georgia Institute of Technology (GT) which accumulates WiFi access point (AP) logs over time. The primary use of WiFi network logs is for maintenance and security purposes. We mine these logs post-hoc to describe the mobility of individuals on campus, which we refer to as WIMOB. Here mobility is expressed by visits to certain locations that are demarcated by a corresponding AP. WIMOB can also describe dwelling (duration of visits) and collocation (dwelling in the presence of others around the same AP).

The campus WiFi network spans 6959 APs distributed between 240 buildings (and some 19 outdoor locations). We label APs according to which building they are inside, along with 20 the closest room or space (e.g., hallway, lobby, suite, cafe, etc.). The AP may or may not 21 reside inside the room, however, in most cases, only a single AP is associated with space. 22 For less than 5% of the APs, the AP shared association to space with another AP. This 23 many-to-one mapping is typically in the case of large halls and auditoriums. We resolve such 24 many-to-one associations by using APs as a proxy of the space they are associated with. 25 Therefore, individuals connected to different APs in the same space will still be identified 26 as collocated. Similarly, an individual could connect to the network with multiple devices. 27 However, less than 1% logs show that a user is connected to multiple APs around the same 28 time. Therefore, WIMOB is agnostic to which device connects to the APs to proxy the 29 presence of the individual. For this study, we obtain the WiFi network logs retrospectively 30 for all of Fall 2019, and the data for Fall 2020 was provided on a per-day basis. Each day, 31 approximately 33,000 different people connect their devices to the WiFi network on campus. 32 Overall in Fall 2019, approximately 40,000 different people connected to the campus network. 33

³⁴ Asymptomatic surveillance testing data

³⁵ We calibrated the ABM using the publicly reported positivity rate on the GT campus as ³⁶ reported through the asymptomatic surveillance and diagnostic testing program [52]. The

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- ¹ testing program used pooled saliva sample surveillance with follow-up diagnostic testing.
- ² The positivity rate was reported each day, but individuals must wait at least 1 week between
- ³ tests. We aggregated the positivity rate by week during the Fall 2020 semester.

⁴ Confirmed case data

- ⁵ When calibrating our ABM, we considered the reported confirmed cases in Fulton County [51],
- ⁶ the county in which GT is located. The 'Confirmed COVID-19 Cases' reported in this dataset
- 7 are cases that have been confirmed with a positive molecular (PCR) test. We considered
- ⁸ cases during the Fall 2020 semester to inform external transmissions in the ABM.

9 Enrollment network summary statistics

¹⁰ We compare structural properties of contact networks constructed with WIMOB to contact

- ¹¹ networks constructed from GT's course enrollment transcripts (EN) To ensure that individ-
- ¹² uals cannot be identified by combining anonymous WiFi network logs and course enrollment
- ¹³ transcripts, we only use aggregate statistics from EN— structural characteristics of the con-
- tact networks described in Table S2. The EN network was based on Fall 2019 transcripts for
- ¹⁵ GT's Atlanta campus. These were cleaned to account for cross-listed courses and was used
- ¹⁶ to determine which students were classmates with each other to form a contact network.

¹⁷ WiFi Mobility Models

¹⁸ Inferring location from Logs

WIMOB is our approach to describe contact between people and movement of people be-19 tween locations. The first step requires using WiFi network logs to infer when individuals 20 were at specific locations on campus by determining when devices were connected to the 21 corresponding APs. Our system mines the WiFi network logs that are populated via the 22 Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) — a standard and widely used monitoring 23 protocol to organize device association behavior to a WiFi network. Periodic SNMP updates 24 can be caused either by poll requests to the APs that log which devices are associated with 25 it at that time. However, devices can appear invisible to detached from an AP for multiple 26 reasons, for example, when devices are idle. Otherwise. SNMP updates can occur whenever 27 a new device connects, which is typical when individuals move between APs. Our approach 28 exploits this factor to first mine periods when individuals are moving, then identify periods 29 of dwelling between movements, and finally determine collocation when two or more individ-30 uals are dwelling near the same AP. This system follows from other studies that mine WiFi 31 $\log [20, 70]$ and the detailed processing pipeline and evaluation is presented in [15]. This 32 system to infer collocations has been tested against lecture attendance and reports a high 33 precision of 0.89, but a relatively lower specificity of 0.79 [15]. While it is not likely to show 34 false-positives, it has a possibility to erroneously mark people absent from a location even 35 though they were there. However, for the purposes of our study, a contact network is made 36 over an entire day and it only needs a single collocation instance for us to consider contact. 37 And therefore we believe this limitation would not significantly affect our models. 38

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure S1: In a managed network, SNMP updates the logs by describing device association to an AP at a certain timestamp. WIMOB mines these logs to characterize mobility as a bipartite graph. The nodes are partitioned to describe people nodes (e.g., P1, P2) connected to locations nodes (e.g., L1, L2). Every edge across the partition describes people visiting locations on campus during different times (e.g., t_1 , t_2). Projecting the bipartite on people nodes helps construct a contact network (e.g., P1 and P2 were collocated at L1 at t_1), while projecting it on locations helps construct a directed movement graph (P2 dwelled at L1and then at L2).

¹ Characterizing Logs as Contact and Movement Networks

After inferring where an individual is located on campus, we represent the entire community 2 behavior as graphs. We describe a bipartite graph, K, that shows when a user is at a given 3 location on campus (Figure S1). This bipartite graph has edges connecting a set of m4 people, P, to a set of n locations, L. An individual can have multiple edges connecting to 5 the location if they visited that location multiple times (e.g., t_1, t_2). The edge data contains 6 the start and end times of these dwelling periods. For these bipartite graphs, we make a 7 projection on set P to describe collocation. This projection graph, G, contains an edge 8 between users if they were visiting the same location during overlapping times. Since we 9 do not use RTLS, our approach can only identify if people were in the vicinity of the same 10 AP, but does not describe the distance between them. However, it can reasonably determine 11 collocation in the same room [15]. Since our study is limited to localizing people indoors, 12

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

we adapt the definition of *proximate contact* [30] where people might be "more than 6 feet 1 but in the same room for an extended period". In our work, we use a lower bound threshold 2 of 40 minutes to determine proximate contact. Therefore, individuals are only considered 3 in contact when they are collocated in a room for 40 minutes or more. This threshold 4 was set up to account for typical lecture duration on campus (for standard 3-credit hour 5 courses taught 3 times a week). Additionally, we compared the clustering coefficient of the 6 contact networks for different days by varying contact thresholds as 30 and 40 minutes. The 7 Pearson's r correlation of these was very high 0.97. Thus, we chose to use the 40 minute 8 threshold as it produced structurally similar graphs while requiring lower space constraints. q Every edge between two individuals contains a list of locations where they were possibly 10 in contact. G forms the basis of the contact-network that we use an agent-based model 11 to simulate. Alternatively, we also make a projection on the set L. This projection is a 12 directed graph, H, where an edge from L_i to L_j represents movement from the first location 13 to the next within a span of 60 minutes. GT's large urban campus with pedestrian pathways 14 and motorized transit services enables direct movement between any two places on campus 15 within the threshold. The 60 minutes threshold helps discount erroneously labeling returning 16 from outside campus (e.g., non-residential students visiting two different locations between 17 2 days). H effectively describes how locations are connected and which locations could be 18 more conducive to attracting and disseminating the virus. As a consequence, the H helps 19 inform policy design. We compute the bipartite graph and its projections for each day of 20 the semester. 21

²² Modeling Policies and Scenarios

23

²⁴ RI: Offering Large Classes Online

As a response to COVID-19, prior work has recommended using EN to enforce a form of 25 RI— moving classes large to an online remote instruction setup while other classes are offered 26 in-person [29, 9, 72]. While we have access to aggregate insights on EN contact networks, 27 our study protocol prohibits us from accessing course-specific information at an individual 28 level. Therefore to infer individual enrollment, we analyze the edges of the bipartite graph 29 K. For this, we first scrape the GT's course roster for Fall 2019 (filtered to only represent 30 the Atlanta campus). This process provides us with a location and weekly schedule for every 31 lecture conducted on campus, including its various sections. With this information, we are 32 able to identify which edges represent visits to lectures, and subsequently, we can account 33 for unique visitors to a lecture. Thus, we can first identify the number of unique individuals 34 on campus who are enrolled in classes. The aggregate data from course enrollment reports 35 that 21,299 students were enrolled in Fall 2019. In comparison, our inference identifies 36 22,248 students. The excess number can be explained by the fact that our method does 37 not distinguish between instructors, TAs, and students. Next, we study the unique visitors 38 to every lecture in the scraped course schedule which gives us an estimate for the size of 39 every class. Given the limitations of our data processing, actual enrollment sizes could be 40 larger, but our process is less likely to count false positives [15]. Finally, to model RI, for the 41

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

¹ contact network G_t , we create a counterfactual network G'_t for each day t. These exclude ² collocations that took place at lecture locations during lecture times. If two people were

³ connected solely by proximity during lectures — in a class with large enrollment — they will

⁴ appear disconnected in the counterfactual network.

5 LC: Closing Important Locations

This article demonstrates the effectiveness of localized closures, LC, which are targeted in-6 terventions to seize mobility at different spaces on campus. For this, we identify important 7 locations on campus by analyzing H. In the main paper, LC uses PageRank [54] as an illus-8 trative algorithm to identify important location nodes. For robustness, we apply various ad-9 ditional algorithms to identify highly authoritative nodes in H — betweenness centrality [24], 10 eigenvector centrality [8], and load centrality [48]. In the SI Appendix, we distinguish these 11 different policies as $\mathsf{LC}_{\mathrm{PRank}},\,\mathsf{LC}_{\mathrm{BCen}},\,\mathsf{LC}_{\mathrm{ECen}},\,\mathsf{LC}_{\mathrm{LCen}}.$ Since RI captures a weekly schedule to 12 determine enrollment, LC is implemented to find locations based on behavior from the past 13 7 days of mobility. We apply the weighted version of the algorithms mentioned earlier on 14 the directed graph representing movement, H. The edge weight is based on the number of 15 instances of movement between any L_i and L_j . After sorting the locations by importance, 16 we determine the number of locations to shut down based on different budgets induced by 17 RI— mobility and risk of exposure. For this purpose, we take the approach of a greedy algo-18 rithm which successively removes highly-ranked locations till the constraint is met (within 19 1% margin of error). Similar to RI, LC also render counterfactual collocation networks, G_{t}^{*} 20 for each day t. In these networks, we remove instances of collocations that occurred at the 21 shutdown locations. Figure S19 and Figure S20 shows the categories of buildings where 22 different spaces are closed by LC policies. 23

²⁴ Inducing Budgets and Characterizing Behavioral Scenarios

We now describe how we compare the RI and LC policies. First, we consider the effects of 25 these policies under three behavioral scenarios. These scenarios express the spillover effects of 26 closure that lead to students avoiding campus entirely because their entire schedule is forced 27 online. This analysis assumes that the motivation to be present on campus is determined 28 primarily by enrollment. We consider that, if a student has a full course load (enrolled in a 29 minimum of 3 classes) and all their classes are offered online, that student might have less 30 incentive to visit campus at all (for any engagement) and thus practice Avoidance. Since LC 31 could end up closing classrooms, it can also lead to academic schedules being affected and 32 elicit Avoidance behavior. As a result, we describe three behavioral scenarios. Persistence, 33 is the preliminary, or null scenario, which represents no Avoidance. This counterfactual 34 collocation graph only removes edges directly affected by RI or LC. The second scenario 35 we model is *Non-Residential Avoidance* where only non-residential students with full online 36 schedules stop visiting campus entirely. Here the counterfactual graph will remove all edges 37 of non-residential students with fully online schedules. Lastly, the third scenario we model is 38 *Complete Avoidance* where any student with fully online schedules stops activity on campus 39 entirely (including residential students). Here the counterfactual graph will remove all edges 40 from any student with fully online schedules. Since our study protocol prohibits us from 41

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

1 mapping our data to other sources, we heuristically infer which individuals are likely to

² be residential and which are not. We label individuals as residential when they dwell an

³ average of at least 15 minutes at residential locations between 6pm and 10am, on workdays

4 (Monday–Thursday).

Under each behavioral scenario, we limit the number of locations that can be closed under 5 the LC policy to ensure the level of restriction is constrained to be similar to the RI policy. 6 We limit the number of locations under two types of restrictive budgets. The first budget 7 is based on *mobility*, which is the percentage of edges remaining in the bipartite graph if 8 a policy were to be implemented. The second budget is based on *exposure risk*, which is 9 the number of unique individuals who would be in the 1-hop collocation neighborhood of 10 positive individuals. We compute this budget by randomly sampling 2.5% of the population 11 as positive, based on the highest 7-day average positivity rate reported by GT [28] in Fall 12 2019. Note, however, the effect of RI on campus can vary in different behavioral scenarios, 13 thereby changing the budget available to design a comparable LC policy. For instance, the 14 number of people at exposure risk is much lower in *Complete Avoidance*. As a result, we 15 build multiple alternate networks representing the effect of policies under counterfactual 16 behavioral scenarios. 17

The infection reduction outcomes and burdens of different policy interventions (under various behavioral scenarios and budgets) is described in Table S4—Table S7 presents boxplots that compares the distribution of disease control outcomes. Figure S11—Figure S14 show cumulative plots of disease control outcomes

²² Agent-based Model

23

²⁴ Agent-Based Model

We constructed an agent-based model (ABM) that captures the spread of COVID-19 be-25 tween individuals active within the GT community. The model is used to evaluate the 26 effectiveness of different policy interventions. We consider a modified version of the SEIR 27 framework for simulating the spread of COVID-19 [34, 11] by using an underlying contact 28 network given by WIMOB. Figure S2 shows the compartments of the framework. The 29 susceptible state (S) represents individuals who have not been infected and can contract the 30 disease by having contact with an infectious individual. The *exposed* state (E) is canoni-31 cally equivalent to the "incubation period" and is similar to the pre-symptomatic state found 32 in related work [39, 36]. Individuals are considered *infectious* when they are in either the 33 asymptomatic state (Asym) or symptomatic state (Sym). Individuals in the asymptomatic 34 state are assumed to be the major "spreaders" [36] and transmit the infections to susceptible 35 individuals before they are recovered (R) [23] — after 7 days [36]. Since asymptomatic 36 is considered a state of mild severity [32], individuals in this state do not have a risk of 37 fatality. By contrast, for individuals in the symptomatic state, will be eventually isolated 38 (Iso) (e.g. self-quarantine, or hospitalization on campus). Once in the *isolated* state, they 39 cannot transmit the disease to individuals in the susceptible state. Unlike the asymptomatic 40 track, the symptomatic state is considered critical severity. Therefore, after moving to the 41

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.



Figure S2: (a) The schematic of the compartments in our modified SEIR model. By the design of the GT surveillance testing [52, 28], the total testable population is defined as the summation of susceptible, exposed, and asymptomatic. Infectious persons are in either symptomatic or symptomatic. For every effective edge in the mobility network, a susceptible individual that is exposed to an infectious person becomes infected with probability p. Individuals may also get infected due to an exposure not captured by the WIMOB network which occurs with probability $I_{out}(t)$ on day t. account for new infected cases. (b) The mobility behavior represented by WIMOB changes every day of the semester (shown weekly here). The contact network constructed from WIMOB forms the underlying contact structure of the ABM.

- ¹ isolated state, individuals have risk of fatality and entering the death state (D). If the iso-
- ² lated individual survives, they enter the recovered state. We assume immunity is preserved
- ³ and therefore after recovery the individual is no longer *susceptible*.

4 Definitions

⁵ Let $t = \{0, 1, 2, 3, ..., T\}$ be the index of days in simulations. We denote the sequence of ⁶ dynamic collocation networks indexed by day t, as $\{G_t(A_t, B_t)\}_{t=0}^T$. A_t is the set of vertices, ⁷ i.e. individuals on campus, and B_t is the set of edges. The universe set of the population ⁸ throughout the simulation time period is given by $M = \bigcup_{i=1}^T A_t$. For convenience, we use ⁹ $a_i \in M$ to index every person in the universe population set.

The SEIR model consists of seven compartments. Each of these corresponds to a function of population subsets with respect to day t: susceptible S(t), exposed E(t), asymptomatic Asym(t), symptomatic Sym(t), isolation I(t), recovered R(t), and dead D(t). For example, $a_i \in I(t)$ means a_i is in the isolation state at day t. We use $N_{S \to E}^t$, $N_{E \to Asym}^t$, $N_{E \to Sym}^t$, $N_{Asym \to R}^t$, $N_{Sym \to I}^t$, $N_{I \to R}^t$, and $N_{I \to D}^t$ to denote the transitions between states between day t and day t + 1.

¹⁶ Model Initialization

The entire population M is fixed where M = S(t) + E(t) + Asym(t) + Sym(t) + I(t) + R(t) + D(t)for all t. To capture the positivity out of the students coming back to campus at the start of the semester, we initialize the system by setting a subset of M into Asym(0) and the

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

reminder into S(0). The initial percentage of *asymptomatic* is described by:

$$Asym(0) \sim Binomial(M, I_0)$$

$$S(0) \sim M - Asym(0)$$

where I_0 is a parameter defined as the initial percentage of Asymptomatic at day t = 0.

² New exposures

³ We consider two ways that an individual in the ABM could be exposed: (i) exposures

4 that occur due to contacts among individuals captured by the mobility network (internal

transmission) and (ii) exposures that occur due to contacts that occur outside of the mobility
network (external transmission).

Internal transmissions happen exclusively among individuals in the model. On any given day, an edge becomes effective, when one of the *susceptible* individual comes in contact with the other which is infectious, i.e. *asymptomatic* or *symptomatic*, individual. Therefore, for every effective edge between two such people, the probability of the susceptible individual getting *exposed* is described by the transmission probability p, which is another model parameter. The probability for an susceptible individual a_i entering *exposed* at the end of day t is given by the following function:

14

$$f_p(a_i, t, p) = \begin{cases} 1 - (1 - p)^{e(t, a_i)}, & \text{if } a_i \in V_t \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Here, $e(t, a_i)$ is the number of effective edges of individual a_i at time t. Since $(1-p)^{e(t,a_i)}$ 15 is the probability that a_i does not contracted the disease at time t under $e(t, a_i)$ Bernoulli 16 trials, $1 - (1 - p)^{e(t,a_i)}$ is the probability that at least one effective edge leading a_i to exposed. 17 In addition to exposure due to internal transmission, we also consider new exposure due 18 to external transmission. We consider external transmission to be exposure resulting from 19 the physical collocations outside the scope of mobility network. For instance, the WIMOB 20 does not capture the connections between individuals without access to the campus WiFi or 21 someone contacting infectious persons outside the campus. To reflect this risk in our model, 22 for any day t, $I_{out}(t)$ describes the probability of infection on day t from a collocation that is 23 external to the mobility network. We assume that the probability an individual is infected 24 due to an external source is proportional to the number of cases in the broader community. 25 Therefore, we model the probability of external infection as a function of confirmed cases 26 in Fulton county, where GT is located [51]. C_t represents the confirmed cases reported by 27 Fulton County where C_{max} is the maximum number of the cases over the whole period, 28 $I_{out}(t)$ is given by 29

$$I_{out}(t) = \alpha * \frac{C_t}{C_{max}} \tag{1}$$

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- where α is a parameter scaling the normalized confirm cases in the surrounding county. The
- ² resulting number of external infections on day t is then modeled to be are Binomial with ³ |S(t)| trials with probability of success $I_{out}(t)$.

In summary, for every day t > 0, the overall number of individuals that become newly exposed is represented as $N_{S \to E}^t$ which is the result of both external and internal transmissions.

$$N_{S \to E}^{t} \sim \underbrace{Binomial(|S(t)|, I_{out}(t))}_{\text{external infections}} + \underbrace{\sum_{a_i \in M} f_p(a_i, t, p)}_{\text{internal transmissions}}$$

5 Model dynamics after exposure

6 After exposure, individuals in the model will progress through other disease states in our

7 model. We update the number of individuals in each state daily to reflect transitions between

 \mathbf{s} them. The transitions between the states on day t are summarized according to the following

• equations:

10

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{S}(t+1) - \mathbf{S}(t) &= -\mathbf{N}_{S \to E}^{t} \\ \mathbf{E}(t+1) - \mathbf{E}(t) &= \mathbf{N}_{S \to E}^{t} - N_{E \to \mathrm{Asym}}^{t} - N_{E \to \mathrm{Sym}}^{t} \\ Asym(t+1) - Asym(t) &= \mathbf{N}_{E \to \mathrm{Asym}}^{t} - N_{\mathrm{Asym} \to R}^{t} \\ Sym(t+1) - Sym(t) &= \mathbf{N}_{E \to \mathrm{Sym}}^{t} - N_{\mathrm{Sym} \to I}^{t} \\ \mathbf{I}(t+1) - \mathbf{I}(t) &= \mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{Sym} \to I}^{t} - N_{I \to D} - N_{I \to R} \\ \mathbf{R}(t+1) - \mathbf{R}(t) &= \mathbf{N}_{I \to R} \\ \mathbf{D}(t+1) - \mathbf{D}(t) &= \mathbf{N}_{I \to D} \end{split}$$

After an individual has been exposed, they will spend $\Delta_{\rm S}$ days in an incubation period. At day $\Delta_{\rm S}$ after their exposure, individuals will become a *symptomatic* infection with probability p_S . Otherwise the agent will become an *asymptomatic* infection This process is given by the following two equations:

12

11

$$\mathbf{N}_{E \to \mathrm{Sym}}^{t} \sim \begin{cases} Binomial(|E(t - \Delta_{\mathrm{S}})|, p_{S}), & t \ge \Delta_{\mathrm{S}} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

$${}_{1} \qquad \mathbf{N}_{E \to \mathrm{Asym}}^{t} \sim \begin{cases} |E(t - \Delta_{\mathrm{S}})| - N_{E \to \mathrm{Sym}}^{t}, & t \geq \Delta_{\mathrm{S}} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Individuals who enter the *asymptomatic* state will recover after $\Delta_{\text{Asym}\to R}$ days since they were first *exposed*. Thus, we represent the number of transitions from *asymptomatic* to *recovered* on day t as:

5

⁵
₆
$$N_{\text{Asym}\to R}^t \sim \begin{cases} N_{E\to\text{Asym}}^{t-\Delta_{\text{Asym}\to R}}, & t \ge \Delta_{\text{Asym}\to R} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

⁷ On the other hand, individuals who enter the symptomatic will eventually enter the ⁸ isolation state [36]. The time that individuals spend in the symptomatic state before entering ⁹ the isolated state is normally distributed $\delta_I^t \sim Normal(\Delta_I, \sigma_I^2)$. We simulate each individual's ¹⁰ transition between symptomatic and isolated by using a sampling function $\Gamma(a_i, t, \Delta_t)$ and a ¹¹ function $\tau(a_i, t)$ that returns the days since exposed respectively:

12

$$\Gamma(a_i, t, \delta_I^t) = \begin{cases} 1, & t - \tau(a_i, t) \ge \delta_I^t \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\tau(a_i, t) = \begin{cases} \text{first day of } a_i \text{ entering } exposed, & a_i \in Sym(t) \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The aggregated transitions $N_{\text{Sym}\to I}^t$ between *symptomatic* and *isolated* is the sum of the distribution above on each day t.

$$N_{\mathrm{Sym} \to I}^t \sim \sum_{a_i \in M} \Gamma(a_i, t, \delta_I^t)$$

Individuals who enter the *isolated* state may end up with one of two states: *dead* or *recovered*. We defined $N_{I \to D}^t$ as following another binomial distribution with parameter p_D :

$$N_{I \to D}^t \sim Binomial(|I(t)|, p_D)$$

The transitions between *isolation* and *recovered* is quite similar to the transitions between symptomatic and *isolation* except $\delta_R^t \sim Normal(\Delta_R, \sigma_R^2)$ where Δ_R and σ_R are the two parameters standing for the mean and standard deviation of days for an individual in the *isolation* state entering *recovered* since the first day of infection. This leads to:

$$N_{I \to R}^t \sim \sum_{a_i \in M} \Gamma(a_i, t, \delta_R^t).$$

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Parameter	Definition	Valu	e Std	Source
p	Transmission probability: For any edge between a susceptible and infectious individual in the contact network, p is the probability that the susceptible person will enter into the exposed state. This only dictates internal transmission	0.034	4 0.007	Calibration
α	Scaling factor of the normalized confirmed cases in the surrounding county (1). This is the parameter for us to generate $I_{out}(t)$	0.032	2 0.0032	2 Calibration
I ₀	Proportion of population that is asymptomatic at day 0	0.012	2 0.000	9 Calibration
p_S	Probability of <i>exposed</i> persons becoming symptomatic	0.66	-	[36]
Δ_S	Incubation period (days) since the first day of exposure	5	-	[36]
$\Delta_{\text{Asym}\to R}$	Asymptomatic duration (days); it is the time taken for an <i>asymptomatic</i> person to recover since the first day of exposure	7	-	[36]
Δ_I, σ_I	Time of an $symptomatic$ entering $isolated$ since the first day of exposure of a $symptomatic$ person	8	2	[27]
Δ_R, σ_R	Time for recovery for a <i>symptomatic</i> , since the first day of exposure	12	2	[42]
<i>p</i> _D	Death rate under isolation	0.000	6 -	[42]

Table S1: Model Parameters of the ABM

The variables p, α , and I_0 are estimated by calibrating the simulation model on the first 5 weeks of positivity rates provided by GT surveillance for Fall 2020, while incorporating external cases from Fulton County. These parameters were found by validating the ABM on the remaining weeks of Fall 2020. Figure S3 shows model estimate during the calibration and validation period.

¹ Model calibration

Most of our model parameters can be estimated from previous studies (see Table S1). 2 However, three parameters in our study are not easily estimated from previous studies: (i) 3 the proportion of the agents that begin the semester asymptotically infected, I_0 , (ii) the 4 probability of transmission between a given infectious individual and susceptible individual 5 given a contact in the mobility network, p, and (iii) the scaling factor α used to determine 6 probability of transmission due to contact outside of WIMOB network on day t, $I_{out}(t)$ (see 7 (1)). We fit these three parameters to the published weekly positivity rate (percentage 8 of asymptomatic cases) as reported by GT's asymptomatic surveillance testing program 9 [52]. To fit the parameters, we performed calibration to minimize the root mean square 10 of error(r.m.s.e) between the simulation estimates of the weekly positivity rate and the 11 observed weekly positivity rate on GT's campus of the Fall 2020 semester as reported by the 12 surveillance testing program. 13

To perform the calibration, we used two sets of public data pertaining to 2020 Fall 14 semester at GT: (i) the confirmed cases in Fulton County [51], and (ii) the aggregated 15 surveillance test positivity rate for each week [52]. The former helps estimate the daily 16 external infection percentage. The latter is the ground truth trajectory we fit our model on. 17 We consider the data aggregated by week because each individual on campus can only get 18 tested once per week. The positivity rate provided by the surveillance testing data can be 19 interpreted as the estimated percentage of new asymptomatic cases out of the total testable 20 population which includes *susceptible*, *exposed*, and *asymptomatic* — with an asymptom 21 that every testable population get tested at the same rate. 22

To formalize the calibration problem, let R_w be the surveillance-testing aggregated result at week w. Let $S(I_0, \alpha, p, w)$ be the function of the simulation model which returns the percentage of new *asymptomatic* in week w out of the total testable population. For every combination of parameters, the predicted result for each week w is estimated by taking the average of N simulation outputs. The objective function is:

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

$$f(I_0, \alpha, p) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{W} \sum_{w=1}^{W} \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} S(I_0 \alpha, p, w)}{N} - R_w\right)^2}$$

The optimization problem is:

 $\min_{I_0,\alpha,p} f(I_0,\alpha,p)$

We fit our model to the first 5 weeks of Fall 2020 and validate the results on the remaining 1 weeks. After obtaining the optimal set of parameters, for robust comparison of policies with 2 different viral variants, we generate a range of parameters by compromising the r.m.s.e within 3 40% of the minima [11]. First, we implement the Nelder Mead method [44] to discover 4 the optimal set of parameters that minimizes the r.m.s.e. Next, we sample 40 different 5 combinations of parameters within 40% of the minimum r.m.s.e to estimate the means and 6 standard deviations of these parameters (Table S1). Throughout this paper, we pool together 7 all simulation results across those parameters over multiple runs (N = 15) and report the 8 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles of the simulation outputs for every policy experiment. 9

¹⁰ Sensitivity Analyses

22

In this section, we design complementary experiments to inspect the robustness LC policies under different setups and calibration approaches. These variations are defined as follows:

• Calibration periods (V1): For the results in the main paper, we discuss results with 13 our ABM calibrated on the first 5 weeks of surveillance testing data. For additional 14 analyses, the model parameters are re-estimated based on the surveillance data from 15 week 5-9 and 10-14 in Fall 2020 at GT. The calibration is validated on the remaining 16 weeks in the semester. Figure S3 shows the calibration and validation. The results 17 of policy comparison with these variations can be found in Table S8 and Table S9, 18 for weeks 5-9 and 10-14 respectively. Additionally, Figure S9 shows boxplots to 19 compare the distributions of different policies, while Figure S15 and Figure S16 show 20 cumulative plots of the disease control outcomes, for weeks 5-9 and 10-14 respectively. 21

• Campuses and counties (V2): For the results in the main paper, the calibration of 23 our ABM reflects certain latent factors inherent to GT that could affect both mobility 24 behavior as well as testing results. To complement this we consider calibrating our 25 data under different settings informed by surveillance testing from other similar large 26 universities. This analysis is intended to represent the GT community in a different 27 geographic setting, which is influenced by a different surrounding community, policies 28 and resources. The new parameters are estimated based on the first 5 weeks of surveil-29 lance testing from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) and the 30 University of California, Berkeley (Berkeley) [50, 68], and the corresponding county 31 data [10, 9] The calibration is validated on the remaining weeks in the semester. 32 Figure S4 and Figure S5 show the calibration and validation for UIUC and Berkeley 33 respectively. The results of policy comparison with these variations can be found in 34 Table S10 and Table S11. Additionally, Figure S10 shows boxplots to compare the 35

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

distributions of different policies, while Figure S17 and Figure S18 show cumulative

² plots of the disease control outcomes.

3

The estimated parameters with these calibration variations are described in Table S3. Both RI and LC are evaluated in the same infection reduction metrics and burden metrics again under behavioral scenarios S1, S2, and S3. Since the budgets are structural (mobility, and exposure risk) the LC policies are unchanged among the variants. Moreover, since the burden metrics are structural, those results are invariant.

³ Supplementary Discussion

¹⁰ Implications for Policy Design

To evaluate the efficacy of policies, we inspect infection reduction by simulating the disease 11 with contact networks from Fall 2019. Since managed WiFi networks accumulate logs for 12 long periods of time, policymakers can use WIMOB to model data from previous semesters 13 and experiment with closure policies like LC. We show that WIMOB can provide retrospective 14 disease-mitigating insight into multiple counterfactual behavioral scenarios. For instance, 15 policymakers can consider studying seasonal behaviors over multiple semesters for more ro-16 bustness. Since the underlying data is longitudinal, it provides the flexibility to realistically 17 assess policy interventions at different time points and also study updating policies. Re-18 stricting movement on campus at different time-points is known to exert varying degrees of 19 control on disease spread [11]. Our data also shows that mobility on campus varies across 20 the semester and therefore, allows policymakers to consider loosening shutdowns depending 21 on the phase of the semester. 22

Policy design is determined by practical budgets. We model two kinds of budgets, mo-23 bility reduction and risk of exposure. The former represents disruptions in space utilization, 24 availing services, and social life. The latter translates to the testing burden on campus. Our 25 analysis determines the budget in different behavioral scenarios by observing the changes 26 to the graph when large classes are moved online. This is to ensure an equitable com-27 parison with targeted policies. However, in real situations, these budgets can be relaxed 28 or restricted based on that campus' preparedness to tackle a pandemic. For instance, a 29 hypothetical campus that can test everyone every day might not be constrained by risk of 30 exposure. Alternatively, policymakers can model other tangible budgets such as the capacity 31 in isolation wards or available hospital beds. This can be informed by practical limitations of 32 the campus. Similarly, this paper only assesses limited forms of cost, e.g., students avoiding 33 campus or closing locations. From a financial perspective, university campuses can digitize 34 their core service—education—but still realize losses from other curtailed services [21, 7, 71]. 35 When students avoid campus it can lead to direct losses from meal passes and parking and 36 also quantifiable losses to learning outcomes [2, 18] Policymakers can compute actual costs 37 by complementing this data with information from other sources (e.g., revenue generated 38 by cafes and stores on campus). This can help qualifying WIMOB to reflect different costs 39 and in turn help design policies that optimize for financial losses. Different campuses have 40 different priorities and challenges in implementing policies. 41

¹ Privacy, Ethics and Legal Considerations

We purposefully compare our prototype targeted policies against moving classes online 2 because of practical budgets within the university. Both the WIMOB and EN based contact 3 networks are derived from archival data accumulated by universities. This does not require 4 instrumenting campus or its community with any new form of surveillance infrastructure. 5 However, its use for a different purpose demands approval by an IRB. Moreover, acquiring 6 these kinds of data would require collaborating with data-stewards (e.g., the IT department) 7 to establish a data-use agreement. This document must clarify how the data will be de-8 identified, transferred, and stored. 9 For this form of data, the critical privacy challenge might not be localization itself, but 10

rather the aggregation of data over a period of time [69]. Data spanning a longer period are 11 more susceptible to cross-analyzing and identifying. To mitigate over-accumulation of data, 12 we suggest an adherence to principles of data minimization [31]. Instead of storing entire 13 mobility graphs, the campus can compute and preserve only high-level insights, such as the 14 importance of locations. This redacts any underlying individual behavior and corresponding 15 identifiable information. Actually, for future purposes campuses can consider a form of 16 differential privacy that authorizes limited forms of data querying depending on the privileges 17 of the stakeholder 4. 18

An operational application would require the university to update the terms of use for 19 its managed network. Particularly, the university should disclose how this data can be used 20 in critical circumstances that invoke shared vulnerabilities [6]. On notifying the campus 21 community of this change it offers individuals the choice to refrain from using the university 22 network. Prior work on a sample within the same university campus shows that 90% of 23 students are connected to the network on any given day [15]. Therefore, proposing such 24 an opt-out condition can be viewed as an unfair choice. As a result, the campus needs to 25 develop a contingency plan to accommodate network access to users who do not want their 26 mobility behavior to constitute the aggregated insights. 27

²⁸ Limitations and Future Work

This work presents evidence that university campuses can repurpose existing data sources 29 to inform the design of LC policies that can control COVID-19. We evaluate these policies 30 as alternatives to other data-driven, but, broad impact policies that universities consider 31 implementing, such as moving large classes online. One of the drawbacks of this analysis, 32 however, is that it assumes all edges to be the same. For example, when constraining by 33 mobility, in real scenarios losing certain visits might be more valuable than others. Decline in 34 mobility around profit-making services, such as shops and cafeterias, versus losing mobility at 35 common rooms have a different tangible effects on campus. Currently, we take an agnostic 36 stance towards the mobility behavior, where all visits at all locations are the same. In 37 reality, implementing policies could have inequitable qualitative impacts despite appearing 38 to have a similar network configuration. This can be improved by embedding more qualitative 39 information into the network and conceiving ingenious ways to associate costs to edges. 40

Similar to the assumption that all visits and locations, the current work also assumes all people to be equal. However, different people have different underlying conditions that

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

¹ can make their vulnerabilities more concerning [55]. The privacy safeguards of this study

 $_{\rm 2}~$ restricted the research team from acquiring any additional demographic or historical in-

³ formation. Further work can attempt to characterize the nodes by randomly seeding the

⁴ network to reflect the approximate demographic break up of the community. Alternatively,

 $_5$ researchers could try to estimate some demographic based on behavior as well. However,

⁶ to leverage accurate individual information, even for operational use during a public health

⁷ emergency, policymakers and researchers need to develop new privacy protocols [24].

Lastly, this paper only studies three rudimentary behavioral scenarios, persistence, non-8 residential avoidance, complete avoidance. Yet, other substitution behaviors are possible q and the richness of networks leveraged with WIMOB enables the exploration of various new 10 scenarios that can be triggered by policy interventions on campus. For instance, individuals 11 might not even visit transitory spaces, such as lobbies or cafes between classes. Certain 12 collocations could be the consequence of social ties which might never be developed because 13 of a shutdown (e.g., project teams meeting outside of class). Further research can illuminate 14 the effects of policies in more specific scenarios by modeling post-intervention behavior more 15

16 accurately.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

	Cor	nell			Georgia Tech	Georgia Tech			
Contact Network	En		En			WiMob			
Contact Situations	Course Lectures	RI	Course Lectures	RI	All Spaces	Course Lectures	RI		
Number of Active Nodes	22051		21299		15379(±3353)	$15379(\pm 3353)$	$15380(\pm 3353)$		
Average Contacts Density	529 0.024	22 - 41 0.001	341 0.016	30 0.001	$ \begin{array}{c c} 152(\pm 63) \\ 0.009(\pm 0.002) \end{array} $	$86(\pm 35)$ $0.005(\pm 0.001)$	$86(\pm 34)$ $0.0053(\pm 0.0014)$		
Largest Connected Component(%)	0.991	0.763	0.994	0.627	0.999(±0.001)	$0.999(\pm 0.02)$	0.978(±0.025)		
Average Shortest Path	2.47	3.75	2.54	3.54	$2.67(\pm 0.28)$	$3.26(\pm 0.5)$	$2.953(\pm 0.35)$		

Table S2: Comparison of Contact Network Structure (Fall 2019)

We create a contact network of only students with WIMOB and compare it with insights from contact networks created with EN. On average, we find the contact network constructed with WIMOB shows fewer average contacts, lower density and higher average shortest path (between reachable paths). Moreover, within WIMOB itself, characterizing all spaces reveals more contacts and shorter paths than only focusing on

reachable paths). Moreover, within WiMOB itself, characterizing all spaces reveals more contacts and shorter paths than only focusing on contacts in lectures. While the proportion of the largest component appears similar, note that with WiMOB, on average about only 70% of the students visit campus on a given week. We further inspect the disease-mitigating structural changes of the RI policy on the network. We observe that the changes across all metrics with EN appear to be more drastic than compared to WiMOB.

Table S3: Calibration outcomes with variations

	Calibrat	ing on Positivity Ra	ate at GT	Calibrating on H	Positivity Rate with other University Behavior
Parameter	weeks 0 – 4	weeks $5-9$	weeks $10 - 14$	UIUC	Berkeley
p	0.034 ± 0.007	0.073 ± 0.005	0.0024 ± 0.0003	0.024 ± 0.0009	0.041 ± 0.003
α	0.032 ± 0.0032	0.0042 ± 0.0006	0.0159 ± 0.002	0.0069 ± 0.0013	0.038 ± 0.006
I_0	0.012 ± 0.0009	0.00057 ± 0.00007	0.0030 ± 0.0007	0.0039 ± 0.0013	0.0048 ± 0.0003
Optimal r.m.s.e	0.0034	0.0007	0.0015	0.0028	0.0031
Effective R_0 (min - max), Fall 2020	1.15 - 1.18	1.17 - 2.14	0.33 - 0.95	1.12 - 1.19	1.24 - 1.28
Effective R_0 (min - max), Fall 2019	2.87 - 5.68	5.15 - 12.93	1.27 - 1.36	3.35 - 5.35	3.32 - 7.00

The results in the main paper use variables p, α , and I_0 as estimated by calibrating the simulation model on the first 5 weeks of positivity rates provided by GT surveillance for Fall 2020, while incorporating external cases from Fulton County. For sensitivity analyses, we perform calibrations on GT data for weeks 5 – 9 and 10 – 14. Additionally, we perform calibrations on first five weeks of UIUC and Berkeley positivity rate (along with data from their respective county). These parameters were found by validating the ABM on the remaining weeks of Fall 2020. To assess the basic reproductive number (R_0) of our ABM we study the first 4 weeks of the disease. We find the effective R_0 to be higher for Fall 2019 than Fall 2020 as the mobility behaviors between the 2 semesters was vastly different. Note, Fall 2020 exhibits only 39% of the mobility we observe in Fall 2019. In fact, the ABM is calibrated on Fall 2020, where behavior was subject to pandemic related closures, but in Fall 2019 the mobility was not hindered by any interventions. Thus, Fall 2019 reflects a counterfactual of Fall 2020 without any closures.

Behavioral Scenario	Behavioral Scenario S1: Persistence			S2:	Non-Res Avoi	dance	S3: Complete Avoidance			
Policy	RI	L	C	RI	L	.C	RI	L	.c	
Budget	_	Mobility (95.5%)	Exposure Risk (18800)	_	Mobility (92.3%)	Exposure Risk (16900)	-	Mobility (69.2%)	Exposure Risk (12700)	
Infection Reduction (Outcomes									
Peak Infections (%)	$25.34(\pm 12)$	$36.92(\pm 14)^{**}$	$34.30(\pm 13)^{**}$	$35.44(\pm 10)$	$49.33(\pm 11)^{**}$	$52.19(\pm 10)^{**}$	$61.62(\pm 7)$	$69.34(\pm 5)^{**}$	$64.44(\pm 6)^{**}$	
Total Infections (%)	$6.99(\pm 5)$	$10.63(\pm 6)^{**}$	$8.19(\pm 5)^{**}$	$14.88(\pm 4)$	$13.96(\pm 6)^*$	$15.67(\pm 6)$	$33.00(\pm 5)$	$33.4(\pm 5)$	$26.94(\pm 5)^{**}$	
Internal Transmis- sions (%)	$17.13(\pm 9)$	$22.62(\pm 11)^{**}$	$21.01(\pm 11)^{**}$	$27.58(\pm 8)$	$35.35(\pm 12)^{**}$	39.20(±11)**	$54.00(\pm 8)$	70.89(±7)**	$60.90(\pm 9)^{**}$	
Burdens on Campus										
Locations Affected	58	18	19	58	38	50	58	192	124	
Students Avoiding (%)	0	0	0	9.30	0.20	0.45	27.21	12.45	6.57	
Completely Isolated on Campus (%)	5.42	8.40	8.40	5.95	5.72	5.71	7.09	5.18	5.23	

Table S4: Comparison of different LC_{PRank} policies in terms of controlling the disease and impacts on campus in Fall 2019; calibrated from week 0 - 4 in Fall 2020 at GT

Note that this table is the same as Table 1. We repeat the results here for easier comparison of LC_{PRank} to other algorithms shown in Table S5, Table S6 and Table S7. Within each behavioral scenario, we perform the Kruskal-Wallis H-Test [40] to compare outcomes of LC_{PRank} with R1. We find that LC_{PRank} leads to significantly improved peak infection reduction and internal transmission. In terms of reduction in total infections, the outcomes are comparable in general but can vary by specific scenarios. In addition, every policy also exerts some burden on campus, either in terms of locations affected, students avoiding campus or isolation. We observe that LC_{PRank} policies focus on fewer locations (except in S3). Moreover, these policies affect fewer student's schedules and therefore fewer people avoid campus due to completely remote schedules. Finally, LC_{PRank} does not increase the percentage of people completely isolated on campus (p-value: < 0.01:**).

Table S5: Comparison of different LC_{BCen} policies in terms of controlling the disease and impacts on campus in Fall 2019; calibrated from week 0 - 4 in Fall 2020 at GT

Behavioral Scenario		S1: Persisten	ce	S2: Non-Res Avoidance			S3: Complete Avoidance		
Policy	RI	LC ^B	BCen	RI	LC _E	$LC_{ m BCen}$		RI LC _E	
Budget	-	Mobility (95.5%)	Exposure Risk (18800)	-	Mobility (92.3%)	Exposure Risk (16900)	-	Mobility (69.2%)	Exposure Risk (12700)
Infection Reduction	Outcomes								
Peak Infections (%)	$25.34(\pm 12)$	$19.14(\pm 12)^{**}$	30.93(±13)**	$35.44(\pm 10)$	30.79(±13)**	$51.87(\pm 10)^{**}$	$61.62(\pm 7)$	$65.07(\pm 6)^{**}$	$61.38(\pm 7)$
Total Infections (%)	$6.99(\pm 5)$	$4.85(\pm 4)^{**}$	$7.74(\pm 5)$	$14.88(\pm 4)$	$7.76(\pm 5)^{**}$	$15.30(\pm 6)$	$33.00(\pm 5)$	$25.32(\pm 5)^{**}$	$22.08(\pm 6)^{**}$
Internal Transmis- sions (%)	$17.13(\pm 9)$	$11.96(\pm 9)^{**}$	$19.64(\pm 10)^{**}$	$27.58(\pm 8)$	$19.63(\pm 10)^{**}$	38.74(±11)**	$54.00(\pm 8)$	$63.29(\pm 8)^{**}$	$54.00(\pm 8)$
Burdens on Campus									
Locations Affected	58	18	19	58	38	50	58	192	124
Students Avoiding (%)	0	0	0	9.30	0.07	0.45	27.21	11.47	6.74
Completely Isolated on Campus (%)	5.42	8.63	8.63	5.95	5.49	5.47	7.09	5.15	5.19

Within each behavioral scenario, we perform the Kruskal-Wallis H-Test [40] to compare outcomes of LC_{BCen} with Rl. We find that LC_{BCen} leads to significantly improved peak infection reduction and internal transmission, when designed with the exposure risk budget, but can be worse with the mobility budget. In terms of reduction in total infections, the outcomes are typically worse. In addition, every policy also exerts some burden on campus, either in terms of locations affected, students avoiding campus or isolation. We observe that LC_{BCen} policies focus on fewer locations (excent in S3). Moreover, these policies affect fewer student's schedules and therefore fewer people avoid campus due to completely remote

(except in S3). Moreover, these policies affect fewer student's schedules and therefore fewer people avoid campus due to completely remote schedules. Finally, LC_{LCen} does not increase the percentage of people completely isolated on campus (*p*-value: < 0.01:*, < 0.001:**).

Table S6:	Comparison of	different LC_{ECen}	policies in t	erms of c	ontrolling the	ne disease	and impacts of	on campus
in Fall 2019	; calibrated fro	om week $0 - 4$ in	Fall 2020 a	t GT				

Behavioral Scenario	oral Scenario S1: Persistence S2: 1			Non-Res Avoidance S3: Complete Avoidance				oidance	
Policy	RI	LC _E	Cen	RI	LC _E	Cen	RI LC _{ECe}		ECen
Budget	-	Mobility (95.5%)	Exposure Risk (18800)	-	Mobility (92.3%)	Exposure Risk (16900)	-	Mobility (69.2%)	Exposure Risk (12700)
Infection Reduction (Outcomes								
Peak Infections (%)	$25.34(\pm 12)$	$36.15(\pm 13)^{**}$	36.13(±13)**	$35.44(\pm 10)$	$44.52(\pm 12)^{**}$	$51.33(\pm 10)^{**}$	$61.62(\pm 7)$	$65.13(\pm 6)^{**}$	$62.15(\pm 7)$
Total Infections (%)	$6.99(\pm 5)$	8.66(±6)**	8.69(±6)**	$14.88(\pm 4)$	$11.75(\pm 6)^{**}$	$14.96(\pm 6)$	$33.00(\pm 5)$	$25.39(\pm 5)^{**}$	$22.82(\pm 6)^{**}$
Internal Transmis- sions (%)	$17.13(\pm 9)$	$22.33(\pm 11)^{**}$	22.37(±11)**	$27.58(\pm 8)$	$29.95(\pm 12)^*$	37.94(±11)**	$54.00(\pm 8)$	$63.56(\pm 8)^{**}$	57.07(±10)**
Burdens on Campus									
Locations Affected	58	18	19	58	38	50	58	192	124
Students Avoiding (%)	0	0	0	9.30	0.20	0.55	27.21	13.11	6.96
Completely Isolated on Campus (%)	5.42	8.59	8.59	5.95	5.53	5.51	7.09	5.17	5.23

Within each behavioral scenario, we perform the Kruskal-Wallis H-Test [40] to compare outcomes of LC_{ECen} with Rl. We find that LC_{ECen} leads to significantly improved peak infection reduction and internal transmission. In terms of reduction in total infections, the outcomes vary by specific scenarios. In addition, every policy also exerts some burden on campus, either in terms of locations affected, students avoiding campus or isolation. We observe that LC_{ECen} policies focus on fewer locations (except in S3). Moreover, these policies affect fewer student's schedules and therefore fewer people avoid campus due to completely remote schedules. Finally, LC_{ECen} does not increase the percentage of people completely isolated on campus (*p*-value: < 0.01:*, < 0.001:**).

Table S7: Comparison of different LC_{LCen} policies in terms of controlling the disease and impacts on campus in Fall 2019; calibrated from week 0 - 4 in Fall 2020 at GT

Behavioral Scenario		S1: Persisten	ce	S2:	Non-Res Avoi	dance	S3: Complete Avoidance			
Policy	RI	LC_{I}	Cen	RI	LCI	Cen	RI	LCI	LCen	
Budget	-	Mobility (95.5%)	Exposure Risk (18800)	_	Mobility (92.3%)	Exposure Risk (16900)	-	Mobility (69.2%)	Exposure Risk (12700)	
Infection Reduction	Outcomes									
Peak Infections (%)	$25.34(\pm 12)$	$22.42(\pm 13)^{**}$	$30.73(\pm 13)^{**}$	$35.44(\pm 10)$	$32.85(\pm 13)^*$	$51.44(\pm 10)^{**}$	$61.62(\pm 7)$	$65.01(\pm 6)^{**}$	$61.40(\pm 7)$	
Total Infections (%)	$6.99(\pm 5)$	$5.48(\pm 5)^{**}$	$7.64(\pm 5)$	$14.88(\pm 4)$	$8.23(\pm 5)^{**}$	$15.03(\pm 6)$	$33.00(\pm 5)$	$25.33(\pm 5)^{**}$	$21.98(\pm 6)^{**}$	
Internal Transmis- sions (%)	17.13(±9)	$13.79(\pm 9)^{**}$	19.37(±10)**	$27.58(\pm 8)$	$20.86(\pm 11)^{**}$	38.08(±11)**	$54.00(\pm 8)$	$63.28(\pm 8)^{**}$	$55.28(\pm 9)$	
Burdens on Campus										
Locations Affected	58	18	19	58	38	50	58	192	124	
Students Avoiding (%)	0	0	0	9.30	0.07	0.43	27.21	11.47	6.73	
Completely Isolated on Campus (%)	5.42	8.63	8.63	5.95	5.49	5.47	7.09	5.15	5.20	

Within each behavioral scenario, we perform the Kruskal-Wallis H-Test [40] to compare outcomes of LC_{LCen} with RI. We find that LC_{LCen} leads to significantly improved peak infection reduction and internal transmission. In terms of reduction in total infections, the outcomes are comparable in some scenarios but can vary in specific scenarios. In addition, every policy also exerts some burden on campus, either in terms of locations affected, students avoiding campus or isolation. We observe that LC_{LCen} policies focus on fewer locations (except in S3). Moreover, these policies affect fewer student's schedules and therefore fewer people avoid campus due to completely remote schedules. Finally, LC_{LCen} does not increase the percentage of people completely isolated on campus (*p*-value: < 0.01:*, < 0.001:**).

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table S8: Comparison of different LC_{PRank} policies in terms of controlling the disease and impacts on campus in Fall 2019; calibrated from week 5 – 9 in Fall 2020 at GT

Behavioral Scenario	Behavioral Scenario S1: Persistence			S2	S2: Non-Res Avoidance			S3: Complete Avoidance		
Policy	Broad	LC_{P}	Rank	RI	LC_{P}	Rank	RI	LC_P	Rank	
Budget	-	Mobility (95.5%)	Exposure Risk (18800)	-	Mobility (92.3%)	Exposure Risk (16900)	-	Mobility (69.2%)	Exposure Risk (12700)	
Infection Reduction (Outcomes									
Peak Infections (%)	$20.10(\pm 4)$	$25.60(\pm 3)^{**}$	$25.63(\pm 3)^{**}$	$31.25(\pm 3)$	$42.32(\pm 4)^{**}$	$47.29(\pm 4)^{**}$	$62.35(\pm 2)$	88.87(±2)**	$76.89(\pm 3)^{**}$	
Total Infections (%)	$8.89(\pm 2)$	$10.50(\pm 3)^{**}$	$9.70(\pm 3)^{**}$	$20.26(\pm 2)$	$20.02(\pm 3)$	$23.71(\pm 4)^{**}$	$46.72(\pm 2)$	$67.92(\pm 4)^{**}$	$51.30(\pm 4)^{**}$	
Internal Transmis- sions (%)	$9.97(\pm 2)$	$11.51(\pm 2)^{**}$	$10.95(\pm 2)^{**}$	$21.84(\pm 2)$	$22.51(\pm 3)$	$26.64(\pm 3)^{**}$	$49.80(\pm 2)$	$74.96(\pm 3)^{**}$	56.89(±4)**	

Within each behavioral scenario, we perform the Kruskal-Wallis H-Test [40] to compare outcomes of LC_{PRank} with RI. We find that LC_{PRank} leads to significantly improved peak infection reduction and internal transmission. In terms of reduction in total infections, the outcomes are better in general but can be comparable in specific scenarios. The burden exerted on campus is the same as structural impacts of LC_{PRank} (Table S4). (p-value: < 0.01:*, < 0.001:**).

Table S9: Comparison of different LC_{PRank} policies in terms of controlling the disease and impacts on campus in Fall 2019; calibrated from week 10 - 14 in Fall 2020 at GT

Behavioral Scenario S1: Persistence		S2: Non-Res Avoidance			S3: Complete Avoidance				
Policy	Broad	LC_{P}	Rank	RI	LC_{PRank}		RI	LC_{PRank}	
Budget	-	Mobility (95.5%)	Exposure Risk (18800)	-	Mobility (92.3%)	Exposure Risk (16900)	-	Mobility (69.2%)	Exposure Risk (12700)
Infection Reduction Outcomes									
Peak Infections (%)	$-1.75(\pm 8)$	$3.65(\pm 8)^{**}$	$-1.95(\pm 8)$	$3.88(\pm 8)$	$-2.24(\pm 8)^{**}$	$-2.06(\pm 8)^{**}$	$20.39(\pm 7)$	$7.57(\pm 8)^{**}$	$2.81(\pm 8)^{**}$
Total Infections $(\%)$	$3.93(\pm 9)$	$10.36(\pm 8)^{**}$	$5.13(\pm 9)$	$9.87(\pm 8)$	$6.36(\pm 9)^{**}$	$6.48(\pm 9)^{**}$	$26.02(\pm 7)$	$16.37(\pm 8)^{**}$	$11.80(\pm 8)^{**}$
Internal Transmis- sions (%)	$ 42.33(\pm 10) $	$61.15(\pm 7)^{**}$	$56.25(\pm 8)^{**}$	$49.83(\pm 9)$	$67.10(\pm 6)^{**}$	$69.10(\pm 6)^{**}$	$74.74(\pm 5)$	$84.80(\pm 3)^{**}$	$79.90(\pm 4)^{**}$

Within each behavioral scenario, we perform the Kruskal-Wallis H-Test [40] to compare outcomes of LC_{PRank} with RI. We find that LC_{PRank} leads to significantly improved peak infection reduction and internal transmission. In terms of reduction in total infections, the outcomes are better in general but can be comparable in specific scenarios. The burden exerted on campus is the same as structural impacts of LC_{PRank} (Table S4). (p-value: < 0.01:*, < 0.001:**).

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Das Swain, V. et al • 43

Table S10: Comparison of different LC_{PRank} policies in terms of controlling the disease and impacts on campus in Fall 2019; calibrated from week 0 - 4 in Fall 2020 at UIUC

Behavioral Scenario S1: Persistence		S2: Non-Res Avoidance			S3: Complete Avoidance				
Policy	Broad	LC_{PRank}		RI	LC_{PRank}		RI	LC _{PRank}	
Budget	-	Mobility (95.5%)	Exposure Risk (18800)	-	Mobility (92.3%)	Exposure Risk (16900)	-	Mobility (69.2%)	Exposure Risk (12700)
Infection Reduction Outcomes									
Peak Infections (%)	$41.40(\pm 3)$	$60.44(\pm 2)^{**}$	$59.52(\pm 2)^{**}$	$49.75(\pm 2)$	$74.22(\pm 2)^{**}$	$76.44(\pm 2)^{**}$	$78.14(\pm 1)$	$85.81(\pm 1)^{**}$	$83.71(\pm 1)^{**}$
Total Infections $(\%)$	$18.46(\pm 3)$	$27.12(\pm 3)^{**}$	$25.25(\pm 3)^{**}$	$27.09(\pm 3)$	$38.00(\pm 4)^{**}$	$40.68(\pm 4)^{**}$	$51.97(\pm 3)$	$59.93(\pm 5)^{**}$	$54.07(\pm 5)^{**}$
Internal Transmis- sions (%)	$28.22(\pm 3)$	$40.93(\pm 3)^{**}$	$39.09(\pm 3)^{**}$	$37.89(\pm 3)$	$58.47(\pm 2)^{**}$	$65.45(\pm 2)^{**}$	$68.04(\pm 2)$	$86.45(\pm 1)^{**}$	$80.08(\pm 1)^{**}$

 $\label{eq:compared} \hline Within each behavioral scenario, we perform the Kruskal-Wallis H-Test [40] to compare outcomes of LC_{\rm PRank} with Rl. We find that LC_{\rm PRank} leads to significantly improved peak infection reduction, internal transmission and total infections. The burden exerted on campus is the same as structural impacts of LC_{\rm PRank} (Table S4). (p-value: < 0.01:*, < 0.001:**).$

Table S11: Comparison of different LC_{PRank} policies in terms of controlling the disease and impacts on campus in Fall 2019; calibrated from week 0 - 4 in Fall 2020 at UC Berkeley

Behavioral Scenario S1: Persistence			S2: Non-Res Avoidance			S3: Complete Avoidance			
Policy	Broad	Broad LC _{PRank}		RI	LC_{PRank}		RI	LC_{PRank}	
Budget	-	Mobility (95.5%)	Exposure Risk (18800)	-	Mobility (92.3%)	Exposure Risk (16900)	-	Mobility (69.2%)	Exposure Risk (12700)
Infection Reduction Outcomes									
Peak Infections $(\%)$	$29.13(\pm 3)$	$36.46(\pm 5)^{**}$	$36.34(\pm 5)^{**}$	$38.83(\pm 3)$	$54.95(\pm 4)^{**}$	$58.88(\pm 4)^{**}$	$66.69(\pm 2)$	$78.18(\pm 1)^{**}$	$77.65(\pm 2)^{**}$
Total Infections $(\%)$	$6.34(\pm 3)$	$8.59(\pm 3)^{**}$	$7.28(\pm 3)^{**}$	$14.71(\pm 3)$	$13.18(\pm 4)^{**}$	$14.83(\pm 4)$	$33.86(\pm 4)$	$33.98(\pm 5)$	$27.10(\pm 5)^{**}$
Internal Transmis- sions (%)	$15.99(\pm 3)$	$20.43(\pm 4)^{**}$	$19.17(\pm 4)^{**}$	$27.01(\pm 3)$	$34.60(\pm 4)^{**}$	$38.78(\pm 4)^{**}$	$55.01(\pm 2)$	$74.65(\pm 2)^{**}$	$63.57(\pm 3)^{**}$

 $\label{eq:compared} \hline Within each behavioral scenario, we perform the Kruskal-Wallis H-Test [40] to compare outcomes of LC_{PRank} with RI. We find that LC_{PRank} leads to significantly improved peak infection reduction, internal transmission and total infections. The burden exerted on campus is the same as structural impacts of LC_{PRank} (Table S4). (p-value: < 0.01:*, < 0.001:**).$

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure S3: We calibrate ABM on positivity rates from Fall 2020 at GT. The objective function of the calibration is to minimize the r.m.s.e. with the weekly average of positivity rate obtained from surveillance testing results at GT [28]. (a) The parameter that determines external transmission of infections on a given day, $I_{out}(t)$, is a function of cases in Fulton county (where GT is located). (b) The models discussed in the main paper are calibrated using the first 5 weeks of data. We illustrate the output for a range of parameters that incorporate quantitative uncertainty, i.e., within 40% of the r.m.s.e. (c, d) illustrate calibration on the second period of 5 weeks and third period of 5 weeks respectively. These only show the optimal parameter output. The shaded region around the lines show the 2.5th and 97.5th percentile.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Das Swain, V. et al • 45



(b) Calibrating on the weeks 0-4

Figure S4: We calibrate ABM on positivity rates from first 5 weeks of Fall 2020 at UIUC. The objective function of the calibration is to minimize the r.m.s.e. with the weekly average of positivity rate obtained from surveillance testing results at GT [28]. (a) The parameter that determines external transmission of infections on a given day, $I_{out}(t)$, is a function of cases in Champaign county (where UIUC is located). (b) We illustrate the output for a range of parameters that incorporate quantitative uncertainty, i.e., within 40% of the r.m.s.e. The shaded region around the lines show the 2.5^{th} and 97.5^{th} percentile.



Figure S6: We calibrate ABM on positivity rates from first 5 weeks of Fall 2020 at UC Berkeley. The objective function of the calibration is to minimize the r.m.s.e. with the weekly average of positivity rate obtained from surveillance testing results at GT [28]. (a) The parameter that determines external transmission of infections on a given day, $I_{out}(t)$, is a function of cases in Alameda county (where UIUC is located). (b) We illustrate the output for a range of parameters that incorporate quantitative uncertainty, i.e., within 40% of the r.m.s.e. The shaded region around the lines show the 2.5th and 97.5th percentile.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure S7: Disease control outcomes in Fall 2019 for different algorithms of LC with the ABM is calibrated on weeks 0-4 of Fall 2020 at GT. (a-c) Comparison of RI with LC_{PRank}. Under all behavioral scenarios, for peak infection reduction (b) and internal transmission reduction (c), LC_{PRank} shows better disease control outcomes than RI. For total infection reduction (b), LC_{PRank} is better in S1, worse in S3 when designed within an exposure risk budget, and comparable in others. (d - f) Comparison of RI with LC_{BCen}. Under all behavioral scenarios, for peak infection reduction (d) and internal transmission reduction (f) LC_{BCen} is better when designed within an exposure risk budget. For total infection reduction (e), LC_{BCen} is always worse than RI

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Budget Mobility Constraint

//// Exp. Bisk Constraint

Policies RI Das Swain, V. et al • 47



(a) Peak Infection Reduction Percentage $(\mathsf{LC}_{\mathrm{ECen}})$



(d) Peak Infection Reduction Percentage $(LC_{\rm LCen})$



(b) Total Infection Reduction Percentage $(\mathsf{LC}_{\mathrm{ECen}})$



(e) Total Infection Reduction Percentage (LC_{LCen})



(c) Internal Transmission Reduction Percentage $(\mathsf{LC}_{\mathrm{ECen}})$



(f) Internal Transmission Reduction Percentage $(\mathsf{LC}_{\mathrm{LCen}})$

Figure S8: Disease control outcomes in Fall 2019 for different algorithms of LC with the ABM is calibrated on weeks 0 - 4 of Fall 2020 at GT. (a - c) Comparison of RI with LC_{ECen} . Under all behavioral scenarios, for peak infection reduction (b) and internal transmission reduction (c), LC_{ECen} shows better disease control outcomes than RI. For total infection reduction (b), LC_{ECen} is better in S1 and worse in S3 when designed within an exposure risk budget. (d - f) Comparison of RI with LC_{ECen} . Under all behavioral scenarios, for peak infection reduction (d) and internal transmission reduction (f), LC_{ECen} shows better disease control outcomes than RI. For total infection reduction (e), LC_{ECen} is better in S1 and worse in S3 when designed within an exposure risk budget.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure S9: Disease control outcomes in Fall 2019 for LC_{PRank} . (a - c) The ABM was calibrated on weeks 5 - 9 of Fall 2020 at GT. Under all behavioral scenarios, for all outcomes, LC_{PRank} is better than RI. (d - f) The ABM was calibrated on weeks 10 - 14 of Fall 2020 at GT. Under all behavioral scenarios, for all outcomes, LC_{PRank} is better than RI.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Das Swain, V. et al • 49



Figure S10: Disease control outcomes in Fall 2019 for LC_{PRank} . (a-c) The ABM was calibrated on weeks 0-4 of Fall 2020 at UIUC. Under all behavioral scenarios, for all outcomes, LC_{PRank} is better than RI. (d-f) The ABM was calibrated on weeks 0-4 of Fall 2020 at UC Berkeley. Under all behavioral scenarios,

for all outcomes, $\mathsf{LC}_{\mathrm{PRank}}$ is better than RI.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure S11: Cumulative infections in Fall 2019 while comparing RI and LC_{PRank} with ABM calibrated on weeks 0-4 of Fall 2020, GT. The bands show the 2.75^{th} and 97.25^{th} percentile. (a-c) Total infections of interventions is lower than no-intervention and is lowest in the S3 scenario. In this behavioral scenario, the mobility budget is 69% of what it would be without interventions, and therefore the transmissions are also contained. In comparison, in Fall 2020, we saw far fewer infections which is because the mobility was 39% of that in Fall 2019. (d-f) Internal transmissions are lower with LC_{PRank} in comparison to RI. (g-i) External transmissions are higher with LC_{PRank} in comparison to RI. Since internal transmission is controlled, more individuals remain susceptible to infections from outside campus.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure S12: Cumulative infections in Fall 2019 while comparing RI and LC_{BCen} with ABM calibrated on weeks 0-4 of Fall 2020, GT. The bands show the 2.75^{th} and 97.25^{th} percentile. (a-c) Total infections of interventions is lower than no-intervention and is lowest in the S3 scenario. In this scenario, the mobility budget is 69% of what it would be without interventions, and therefore the transmissions are also contained. In comparison, in Fall 2020, we saw far fewer infections which is because the mobility was 39% of that in Fall 2019. (d-f) Internal transmissions are lower with LC_{BCen} in comparison to RI, only when constrained under the exposure risk budget. (g-i) External transmissions are higher with LC_{BCen} in comparison to RI. Since internal transmission is controlled, more individuals remain susceptible to infections from outside campus.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure S13: Cumulative infections in Fall 2019 while comparing RI and LC_{ECen} with ABM calibrated on weeks 0-4 of Fall 2020, GT. The bands show the 2.75^{th} and 97.25^{th} percentile. (a - c) Total infections of interventions is lower than no-intervention scenarios and is lowest in the S3 scenario. In this scenario, the mobility budget is 69% of what it would be without interventions, and therefore the transmissions are also contained. In comparison, in Fall 2020, we saw far fewer infections which is because the mobility was 39% of that in Fall 2019. (d - f) Internal transmissions are lower with LC_{ECen} in comparison to RI. (g - i) External transmission is controlled, more individuals remain susceptible to infections from outside campus.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure S14: Cumulative infections in Fall 2019 while comparing RI and LC_{LCen} with ABM calibrated on weeks 0-4 of Fall 2020, GT. The bands show the 2.75^{th} and 97.25^{th} percentile. (a-c) Total infections of interventions is lower than no-intervention scenarios and is lowest in the S3 scenario. In this scenario, the mobility budget is 69% of what it would be without interventions, and therefore the transmissions are also contained. In comparison, in Fall 2020, we saw far fewer infections which is because the mobility was 39% of that in Fall 2019. (d-f) Internal transmissions are lower with LC_{LCen} in comparison to RI. (g-i) External transmission is controlled, more individuals remain susceptible to infections from outside campus.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



(a) S1 (ABM calibrated on weeks 5 - 9 (b) S2 (ABM calibrated on weeks 5 - 9 (c) S3 (ABM calibrated on weeks 5 - 9 at GT) at GT)



(d) S1 (ABM calibrated on weeks 5 - 9 (e) S2 (ABM calibrated on weeks 5 - 9 (f) S3 (ABM calibrated on weeks 5 - 9 at GT) at GT)



(g) S1 (ABM calibrated on weeks 5 - 9 (h) S2 (ABM calibrated on weeks 5 - 9 (i) S3 (ABM calibrated on weeks 5 - 9 at GT) at GT)

Figure S15: Cumulative infections in Fall 2019 while comparing RI and LC_{PRank} with ABM calibrated on weeks 5-9 of Fall 2020, GT. The bands show the 2.75^{th} and 97.25^{th} percentile. (a - c) Total infections of interventions is lower than nointervention scenarios and is lowest in the S3 scenario. In this scenario, the mobility budget is 69% of what it would be without interventions, and therefore the transmissions are also contained. In comparison, in Fall 2020, we saw far fewer infections which is because the mobility was 39% of that in Fall 2019. (d - f) Internal transmissions are lower with LC_{PRank} in comparison to RI. (g - i) External transmissions are higher with LC_{PRank} in comparison to RI. Since internal transmission is controlled, more individuals remain susceptible to infections from outside campus.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



(a) S1 (ABM calibrated on weeks 10 - (b) S2 (ABM calibrated on weeks 10 - (c) S3 (ABM calibrated on weeks 10 - 14 at GT)
14 at GT)
14 at GT)



(d) S1 (ABM calibrated on weeks 10 - (e) S2 (ABM calibrated on weeks 10 - (f) S3 (ABM calibrated on weeks 10 - 14 at GT) 14 at GT) 14 at GT)



(g) S1 (ABM calibrated on weeks 10 - (h) S2 (ABM calibrated on weeks 10 - (i) S3 (ABM calibrated on weeks 10 - 14 14 at GT) 14 at GT) at GT)

Figure S16: Cumulative infections in Fall 2019 while comparing RI and LC_{PRank} with ABM calibrated on weeks 10 - 14 of Fall 2020, GT. The bands show the 2.75^{th} and 97.25^{th} percentile. (a - c) Total infections of interventions is lower than nointervention scenarios and is lowest in the S3 scenario. In this scenario, the mobility budget is 69% of what it would be without interventions, and therefore the transmissions are also contained. In comparison, in Fall 2020, we saw far fewer infections which is because the mobility was 39% of that in Fall 2019. (d - f) Internal transmissions are lower with LC_{PRank} in comparison to RI. (g - i) External transmissions are higher with LC_{PRank} in comparison to RI. Since internal transmission is controlled, more individuals remain susceptible to infections from outside campus.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Das Swain, V. et al • 56



(a) S1 (ABM calibrated on UIUC data) (b) S2 (ABM calibrated on UIUC data) (c) S3 (ABM calibrated on UIUC data)



(d) S1 (ABM calibrated on UIUC data) (e) S2 (ABM calibrated on UIUC data) (f) S3 (ABM calibrated on UIUC data)



(g) S1 (ABM calibrated on UIUC data) (h) S2 (ABM calibrated on UIUC data) (i) S3 (ABM calibrated on UIUC data)

Figure S17: Cumulative infections in Fall 2019 while comparing RI and LC_{PRank} with ABM calibrated on weeks 0-4 of Fall 2020, UIUC. The bands show the 2.75^{th} and 97.25^{th} percentile. (a-c) Total infections of interventions is lower than no-intervention scenarios and is lowest in the S3 scenario. In this scenario, the mobility budget is 69% of what it would be without interventions, and therefore the transmissions are also contained. In comparison, in Fall 2020, we saw far fewer infections which is because the mobility was 39% of that in Fall 2019. (d-f) Internal transmissions are lower with LC_{PRank} in comparison to RI. (g-i) External transmissions are higher with LC_{PRank} in comparison to RI. Since internal transmission is controlled, more individuals remain susceptible to infections from outside campus.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



(a) S1 (ABM calibrated on UC Berkeley (b) S2 (ABM calibrated on UC Berkeley (c) S3 (ABM calibrated on UC Berkeley data) data)



(d) S1 (ABM calibrated on UC Berkeley (e) S2 (ABM calibrated on UC Berkeley (f) S3 (ABM calibrated on UC Berkeley data) data)



(g) S1 (ABM calibrated on UC Berkeley (h) S2 (ABM calibrated on UC Berkeley (i) S3 (ABM calibrated on UC Berkeley data) data)

Figure S18: Cumulative infections in Fall 2019 while comparing RI and LC_{PRank} with ABM calibrated on weeks 0-4 of Fall 2020, UC Berkeley. The bands show the 2.75^{th} and 97.25^{th} percentile. (a-c) Total infections of interventions is lower than no-intervention scenarios and is lowest in the S3 scenario. In this scenario, the mobility budget is 69% of what it would be without interventions, and therefore the transmissions are also contained. In comparison, in Fall 2020, we saw far fewer infections which is because the mobility was 39% of that in Fall 2019. (d-f) Internal transmissions are lower with LC_{PRank} in comparison to RI. (g-i) External transmissions are higher with LC_{PRank} in comparison to RI. Since internal transmission is controlled, more individuals remain susceptible to infections from outside campus.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure S19: The locations shutdown by each policy are grouped into the the general building category. The distribution of locations is different between policies, for example, in S1 (a) and S2 (b), LC closes fewer locations that RI. Even when targeting spaces in similar buildings, the locations are qualitatively different — RI only affects classrooms, whereas LC also closes smaller spaces like breakout rooms, reading areas and cafes. LC In S3 (c) we find LC to target locations in a greater variety of buildings, but it also targets more locations to utilize the budget.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure S20: The locations shutdown by each policy are grouped into the the general building category. The distribution of locations is different between policies, for example, in S1 (a) and S2 (b), LC closes fewer locations that RI. Even when targeting spaces in similar buildings, the locations are qualitatively different — RI only affects classrooms, whereas LC also closes smaller spaces like breakout rooms, reading areas and cafes. LC In S3 (c) we find LC to target locations in a greater variety of buildings, but it also targets more locations to utilize the budget.

SI References

- João Pedro Azevedo, Amer Hasan, Diana Goldemberg, Syedah Aroob Iqbal, and Koen Geven. Simulating the potential impacts of COVID-19 school closures on schooling and learning outcomes: A set of global estimates. The World Bank, 2020.
- [2] Eugene Bagdasaryan, Griffin Berlstein, Jason Waterman, Eleanor Birrell, Nate Foster, Fred B Schneider, and Deborah Estrin. Ancile: Enhancing privacy for ubiquitous computing with use-based privacy. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Workshop on Privacy* in the Electronic Society, pages 111–124, 2019.
- [3] Seth G Benzell, Avinash Collis, and Christos Nicolaides. Rationing social contact during the covid-19 pandemic: Transmission risk and social benefits of us locations. *Proceedings* of the National Academy of Sciences, 117(26):14642–14644, 2020.
- [4] Phillip Bonacich. Some unique properties of eigenvector centrality. Social networks, 29(4):555-564, 2007.
- [5] Molly Borowiak, Fayfay Ning, Justin Pei, Sarah Zhao, Hwai-Ray Tung, and Rick Durrett. Controlling the spread of covid-19 on college campuses. arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.07293, 2020.
- [6] Gabriela Arriagada Bruneau, Vincent C. Müller, and Mark S. Gilthorpe. The ethical imperatives of the covid 19 pandemic: A review from data ethics. Veritas: Revista de Filosofía y Teología, 46:13–35, 2020.
- [7] Serina Chang, Emma Pierson, Pang Wei Koh, Jaline Gerardin, Beth Redbird, David Grusky, and Jure Leskovec. Mobility network models of covid-19 explain inequities and inform reopening. *Nature*, 589(7840):82–87, 2021.
- [8] V Das Swain, H Kwon, B Saket, M Bin Morshed, K Tran, D Patel, Y Tian, J Philipose, Y Cui, T Plötz, et al. Leveraging wifi network logs to infer social interactions: A case study of academic performance and student behavior. arXiv e-prints, 2020.
- [9] Alameda County Public Health Department. Real-time data of the impact of covid-19, 2020. Available at: https://covid-19.acgov.org/data.page.
- [10] Champaign-Urbana Public Health Distric. Champaign-urbana covid-19 coronavirus information, 2020. Available at: https://www.c-uphd.org/ champaign-urbana-illinois-coronavirus-information.html.
- [11] Emma Dorn, Bryan Hancock, Jimmy Sarakatsannis, and Ellen Viruleg. Covid-19 and student learning in the united states: The hurt could last a lifetime. *McKinsey & Company*, 2020.
- [12] Muawya Habib Sarnoub Eldaw, Mark Levene, and George Roussos. Presence analytics: making sense of human social presence within a learning environment. In 2018 IEEE/ACM 5th International Conference on Big Data Computing Applications and Technologies (BDCAT), pages 174–183. IEEE, 2018.

- [13] Linton C Freeman. A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. Sociometry, pages 35–41, 1977.
- [14] Katy Gaythorpe, Natsuko Imai, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, Marc Baguelin, Sangeeta Bhatia, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, and A Cori. Report 8: Symptom progression of covid-19, 2020.
- [15] Greg Gibson, Joshua S. Weitz, Michael P. Shannon, Benjamin Holton, Anton Bryksin, Brian Liu, Sandra Bramblett, JulieAnne Williamson, Michael Farrell, Alexander Ortiz, Chaouki T. Abdallah, and Andrés J. García. Surveillance-to-diagnostic testing program for asymptomatic sars-cov-2 infections on a large, urban campus - georgia institute of technology, fall 2020. medRxiv, 2021. Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/ content/early/2021/01/31/2021.01.28.21250700.
- [16] Philip T Gressman and Jennifer R Peck. Simulating covid-19 in a university environment. *Mathematical biosciences*, 328:108436, 2020.
- [17] Emily S. Gurley. Strategies to support the covid-19 response in lmics, 2020. Available at: https://hopkinsglobalhealth.org/assets/documents/CGH_Webinar_-_ Contact_Tracing_(Final_Version).pdf.
- [18] Pinar Keskinocak, Buse Eylul Oruc, Arden Baxter, John Asplund, and Nicoleta Serban. The impact of social distancing on covid19 spread: State of georgia case study. *Plos one*, 15(10):e0239798, 2020.
- [19] William H Kruskal and W Allen Wallis. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. Journal of the American statistical Association, 47(260):583–621, 1952.
- [20] Ben Lopman, Carol Y Liu, Adrien Le Guillou, Andreas Handel, Timothy L Lash, Alexander P Isakov, and Samuel M Jenness. A modeling study to inform screening and testing interventions for the control of sars-cov-2 on university campuses. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1):1–11, 2021.
- [21] Christos Makridis and Jonathan Hartley. The cost of covid-19: A rough estimate of the 2020 us gdp impact, 2020.
- [22] Ken IM McKinnon. Convergence of the nelder-mead simplex method to a nonstationary point. SIAM Journal on optimization, 9(1):148–158, 1998.
- [23] Seyed M Moghadas, Meagan C Fitzpatrick, Pratha Sah, Abhishek Pandey, Affan Shoukat, Burton H Singer, and Alison P Galvani. The implications of silent transmission for the control of covid-19 outbreaks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(30):17513–17515, 2020.
- [24] Stephen J Mooney and Vikas Pejaver. Big data in public health: terminology, machine learning, and privacy. Annual review of public health, 39:95–112, 2018.
- [25] Mark EJ Newman. Scientific collaboration networks. ii. shortest paths, weighted networks, and centrality. *Physical review E*, 64(1):016132, 2001.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- [26] University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. On-campus covid-19 testing, 2020. Available at: https://covid19.illinois.edu/ on-campus-covid-19-testing-data-dashboard/.
- [27] Georgia Department of Public Health. Georgia department of public health daily status report, 2020. Available at: https://dph.georgia.gov/ covid-19-daily-status-report.
- [28] Georgia Institute of Technology. Georgia tech launches campus coronavirus testing, 2020. Available at: https://health.gatech.edu/coronavirus/testing-launched.
- [29] Lawrence Page, Sergey Brin, Rajeev Motwani, and Terry Winograd. The pagerank citation ranking: Bringing order to the web. Technical report, Stanford InfoLab, 1999.
- [30] Betty Pfefferbaum and Carol S North. Mental health and the covid-19 pandemic. New England Journal of Medicine, 383(6):510–512, 2020.
- [31] Andreas Pfitzmann and Marit Hansen. A terminology for talking about privacy by data minimization: Anonymity, unlinkability, undetectability, unobservability, pseudonymity, and identity management, 2010.
- [32] John H Stone, Matthew J Frigault, Naomi J Serling-Boyd, Ana D Fernandes, Liam Harvey, Andrea S Foulkes, Nora K Horick, Brian C Healy, Ruta Shah, Ana Maria Bensaci, et al. Efficacy of tocilizumab in patients hospitalized with covid-19. New England Journal of Medicine, 383(24):2333–2344, 2020.
- [33] Berkeley University of California. Coronavirus dashboard testing, 2020. Available at: https://coronavirus.berkeley.edu/dashboard/.
- [34] Srinivasan Venkatramanan, Adam Sadilek, Arindam Fadikar, Christopher L Barrett, Matthew Biggerstaff, Jiangzhuo Chen, Xerxes Dotiwalla, Paul Eastham, Bryant Gipson, Dave Higdon, et al. Forecasting influenza activity using machine-learned mobility map. *Nature Communications*, 12(1):1–12, 2021.
- [35] Jessa Liying Wang and Michael C Loui. Privacy and ethical issues in location-based tracking systems. In 2009 IEEE International Symposium on Technology and Society, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2009.
- [36] Shweta Ware, Chaoqun Yue, Reynaldo Morillo, Jin Lu, Chao Shang, Jayesh Kamath, Athanasios Bamis, Jinbo Bi, Alexander Russell, and Bing Wang. Large-scale automatic depression screening using meta-data from wifi infrastructure. *Proceedings of the ACM* on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies, 2(4):1–27, 2018.
- [37] Sarah Watson, Shawn Hubler, Danielle Ivory, and Robert Gebeloff. A new front in america's pandemic: College towns, 2020. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/06/us/colleges-coronavirus-students.html.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- [38] Kim A Weeden and Ben Cornwell. The small-world network of college classes: implications for epidemic spread on a university campus. *Sociological science*, 7:222–241, 2020.
- [39] Bryan Wilder, Marie Charpignon, Jackson A Killian, Han-Ching Ou, Aditya Mate, Shahin Jabbari, Andrew Perrault, Angel N Desai, Milind Tambe, and Maimuna S Majumder. Modeling between-population variation in covid-19 dynamics in hubei, lombardy, and new york city. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(41):25904–25910, 2020.