1 2 3 4 5 6	Impact of school closures and reopening on COVID-19 caseload in 6 cities of Pakistan: An Interrupted Time Series Analysis
7 8	Short title: Impact of school closures and reopening on COVID-19 cases
9 10	Abdul Mueed <sup>1</sup> , Taimoor Ahmad <sup>1</sup> , Mujahid Abdullah <sup>1</sup> , Faisal Sultan <sup>2</sup> , Adnan Ahmad Khan <sup>2,3*</sup>
11	
12	<sup>1</sup> Akhter Hameed Khan Foundation, Islamabad, Pakistan
13	<sup>2</sup> Ministry of National Health Services, Regulation and Coordination, Islamabad, Pakistan
14	<sup>3</sup> Research and Development Solutions, Islamabad, Pakistan
15	
16	*Corresponding author:
17	Email: adnan@resdev.org (AAK)
18	
19 20 21 22 23 24	<b>Disclosures:</b> This work was supported, in whole or in part, by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation [grant number: INV-025171]. Under the grant conditions of the Foundation, a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Generic License has already been assigned to the Author Accepted Manuscript version that might arise from this submission.

25 There are no conflicts of interest.

### 26 **Abstract**

Schools were closed all over Pakistan on November 26, 2020 to reduce community 27 28 transmission of COVID-19 and reopened between January 18 and February 1, 2021. However, these closures were associated with significant economic and social costs. 29 30 prompting a review of effectiveness of school closures to reduce the spread of COVID-19 infections in a developing country like Pakistan. A single-group interrupted time series 31 analysis (ITSA) was used to measure the impact of school closures, as well as reopening 32 schools on daily new COVID-19 cases in 6 major cities across Pakistan: Lahore, Karachi, 33 Islamabad, Quetta, Peshawar, and Muzaffarabad. We found that closing schools reduced 34 COVID-19 incidence in the community by approximately a third of all cases nationwide. 35 However, any benefits were contingent on continued closure of schools, as cases 36 bounced back once schools reopened. School closures are associated with a clear and 37 statistically significant reduction in COVID-19 cases by 0.07 to 0.63 cases per 100,000 38 39 population, while reopening schools is associated with a statistically significant increase. Lahore is an exception to the effect of school closures, but it too saw an increase in 40 COVID-19 cases after schools reopened in early 2021. We show that closing schools was 41 42 a viable policy option, especially before vaccines became available. However, its social and economic costs must also be considered. 43

### 44 Introduction

Since the beginning of the global spread of COVID-19 and before effective vaccines 45 became available, non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), either barriers or means to 46 limit contact between individuals, were the mainstay to control the spread of COVID-19. 47 Perhaps the most widely debated among these NPIs was the closure of schools, which 48 49 drew criticism for the significant social, learning, economic [1, 2], and physical and mental health costs [3-6] associated with them. Notably, these costs are disproportionately borne 50 by already disadvantaged families [1, 7], thereby exacerbating social and economic 51 inequalities [8]. 52

Prior studies suggest that children infected with COVID-19 are often asymptomatic or have mild symptoms identical to other common respiratory infections [9, 10], and yet they can transmit the infection even when they feel well. Children have also been key spreaders in other respiratory infections such as influenza, because of prolonged contact in close proximities with other children at schools [11].

Early evidence on the effect of school closures on epidemic transmission of COVID-19 58 seemed mixed. Initial, and often modeling-based studies, suggested that closing schools 59 may not help reduce COVID-19 transmission in communities [12-15]. However, more 60 recent, and more empirically based studies have tended to show a role for school closure 61 62 in reducing cases in the community [16-23]. In low- and middle-income countries such as 63 Pakistan where learning is already inadequate and remote learning solutions are all too often unavailable for most students [24], it is paramount that such a social policy be used 64 only if absolutely supported by evidence of a benefit in limiting COVID-19 transmission 65 and then too, only as a means of last resort. We explore the changes in daily cases on 66

COVID-19 pre and post school closures in Pakistan using a single-group Interrupted TimeSeries Analysis (ITSA).

69 This paper is a continuation of our earlier work, which examined the effects of school

closures on the daily cases of COVID-19 in Islamabad vs. Peshawar, during the same

period as in this study [25]. However, this study attempts to examine the effect of school

closures with a different methodology, and also with a larger sample of cities.

### 73 Methods

In this paper we conduct a pre- and post-school closures and reopening analysis of changes in the daily incidence of COVID-19 cases in 6 cities of Pakistan: Lahore, Karachi, Islamabad, Quetta, Peshawar, and Muzaffarabad using a single-group ITSA. We use a single-group ITSA because it is a quasi-experimental tool that is particularly useful when data cannot be fully randomized, there is no comparison group, and there is a need to consider the effect of only one intervention.

This suits our study as, in Pakistan, all non-school NPIs in were enacted in groups – except for the closure of schools. For example, marriage hall restrictions and ban on large

scale gatherings were notified at the same time, as were mask-wearing, broader "smart"
 lockdowns (lockdowns in parts of cities), and reduced market timings. School closures,

lockdowns (lockdowns in parts of cities), and reduced market timings. School closures,
 on the other hand, were universally enforced and applied to all schools – whether day

- schools or boarding schools and to students of all grades across Pakistan [26]. These
   were the only NPI that changed (i.e. were applied and then lifted) during the period of
- 87 examination in this study.

Data for this analysis were sourced from the daily National Situation Reports (Sitreps) 88 published by the National Emergency Operations Centre (NEOC) in Islamabad, Pakistan. 89 This data is anonymized and aggregated by city, with no disaggregation by age, gender, 90 ethnicity, or any other potentially identifying characteristic. We use this data for an 91 92 inferential analysis of the change in daily COVID-19 incidence in the overall populations of the 6 aforementioned cities, regardless of demographic characteristics, due to the 93 change in one particular NPI. It is because this NPI is the only policy intervention that 94 could be isolated in our chosen time period of observation. 95

We estimated 2 sets of ordinary least square (OLS) regressions for each city using a 10or 20-day delay since COVID-19 incidence changes from school-related NPIs take effect 10 [27] or more days [17, 28, 29] after closures or reopening. Daily new COVID-19 cases were taken for equally spaced time frames with 10- and 20-day delay after the actual school closures and reopening dates. In order to analyze the effect of school closures and reopening, we took a total of 60 days for pre- and post-intervention periods. Table 1 shows the dates of school closures and reopening.

### 103 Table 1. Key intervention dates

	School Closures	School Reopening
Original	November 26, 2020	February 1, 2021
With 10-day delay	December 6, 2020	February 11, 2021
With 20-day delay	December 16, 2020	February 21, 2021

104 Note: 2 dates were removed from analysis: 4th November 2020 for Quetta and 7th December 2020 for 105 Muzaffarabad because no data for these dates was available.

### 106 Model Specification

107 Our model specification is adapted from Linden and detailed below [<u>30</u>]:

$$Y_{ti} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 T_{ti} + \beta_2 X_{ti} + \beta_3 X_{ti} T_{ti} + \epsilon_{ti}$$

109 Where

108

- 110 1)  $Y_{ti}$ , our outcome variable, is the daily number of new COVID-19 cases for each city *i*;
- 112 2)  $\beta_0$ , the constant term, is the starting level of the daily new COVID-19 cases in each city *i*;
- 114 3)  $T_{ti}$  is the time period since the beginning of this study, and the coefficient  $\beta_1$  shows 115 the slope of daily new COVID-19 cases until the start of the intervention;
- 4)  $X_{ti}$  is a dummy variable indicating the intervention period (post intervention = 1, and 0 otherwise);
- 118 5)  $\beta_2$  explains the change in daily COVID-19 cases that occurs in the time period 119 immediately followed by the school closure/reopening (our interventions);
- 6)  $X_{ti}T_{ti}$  is the interaction term between the intervention period and the time since the start of the study; and,
- 122 7)  $\beta_3$  represents the difference between the pre- and post-intervention slopes for daily 123 new COVID-19 cases.
- To get a singular, direct estimate of the effect of closing/reopening schools, we used the *lincom* estimate which is the sum of  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_3$  [31].

126 
$$Treated = \beta_1 T_{ti} + \beta_3 X_{ti} T_{ti}$$

127 This generates a separate variable that sums the values of  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_3$ .

To adjust for autocorrelation and possible heteroskedasticity, we used Newey-West standard errors in our regression models [32]. Cumby-Huizinga test for autocorrelation was performed on each regression model to identify correct lag structure. Linktest was applied to check if the models were correctly specified. Stata 16 software package was used for the analysis.

### 133 **Results**

Our descriptive results showing means and standard deviations of daily COVID-19 cases (per 100,000 population) are presented in Table 2. These were calculated for school closures and reopening periods of each city, separately for pre- and post-intervention periods. For 10-day delay, Islamabad showed highest cases (per 100,000 population) (18.80, SD: 4.411), while Quetta showed the lowest (0.722, SD: 0.294) in the preintervention period of school closures; same trend followed in school reopening preintervention period. Islamabad and Quetta also had the highest and the lowest cases (per

141 100,000 population) in pre-intervention periods of 20-day delay school closures and 142 reopening.

#### Table 2. Summary statistics of daily COVID-19 cases (per 100,000 population) in each city

		10-days Delay		20-days Delay	
	City	Pre-	Post-	Pre-	Post-
	-	intervention	intervention	intervention	intervention
	Lahore	1.23 (0.34)	1.62 (0.48)	1.32 (0.34)	1.9 (0.39)
	Karachi	5.53 (2.07)	6.66 (2.13)	7.26 (1.9)	5.77 (1.66)
School	Islamabad	18.8 (4.41)	10.4 (4.42)	18.4 (4.7)	7.62 (2.12)
Closures	Quetta	0.72 (0.29)	0.26 (0.11)	0.6 (0.3)	0.22 (0.1)
	Peshawar	1.59 (0.76)	2.18 (0.94)	2.11 (0.86)	1.93 (0.81)
	Muzaffarabad	4.58 (2.54)	0.82 (0.79)	3.11 (2.41)	0.52 (0.61)
	Lahore	1.64 (0.43)	2.130 (0.88)	1.48 (0.34)	3.35 (1.55)
	Karachi	3.94 (2.03)	1.045 (0.37)	2.38 (1.25)	0.86 (0.28)
School	Islamabad	4.9 (1.26)	7.945 (3.79)	4.74 (0.98)	14.6 (9.34)
Reopening	Quetta	0.16 (0.08)	0.145 (0.13)	0.12 (0.07)	0.22 (0.13)
	Peshawar	1.55 (0.55)	1.248 (0.49)	1.28 (0.41)	1.9 (1.14)
	Muzaffarabad	0.19 (0.25)	0.55 (0.63)	0.19 (0.23)	1.22 (1.34)

145 Means of daily COVID-19 cases over each period are reported. Standard deviations are in parentheses.

After adding a 10-day delay after the actual date of school closures (Table 3), the rate of 146 change in daily COVID-19 cases declined following closure of schools in Karachi, 147 Islamabad, Quetta, and Peshawar; the reductions per 100,000 population were by -0.16 148 cases (95% CI: -0.23, -0.13) in Karachi, -0.41 cases (95% CI: -0.53, -0.30) in Islamabad, 149 -0.01 cases (95% CI: -0.01, -0.00) in Quetta, and -0.06 cases (95% CI: -0.08, -0.03) in 150 Peshawar. In Lahore, daily COVID-19 cases continued to rise at a rate of 0.03 cases 151 (95% CI: 0.01, 0.05) per 100,000 population after the closure of schools. For 152 Muzaffarabad, the rate of change of COVID-19 cases was declining both before and after 153 the school closure, at -0.11 cases (95% CI: -0.16, -0.06) and -0.05 cases (95% CI: -0.06, 154 155 -0.03) per 100,000 population, respectively.

# Table 3. Rates of Change in Daily COVID-19 cases (per 100,000 population) through Interrupted Time Series Analysis

City	Delay after original date of intervention	Rate of Change in Daily COVID-19 cases (per 100,000 population) (95% Cl), p-value					
		School Closure			School Reopening		
		(1) Pre-Closure trend: β <sub>1</sub>	(2) Post-Closure trend: β <sub>1-</sub> β <sub>3</sub>	(3) Closure Difference: β <sub>3</sub>	(1) Pre- Reopening trend: β <sub>1</sub>	(2) Post- Reopening trend: β <sub>1-</sub> β <sub>3</sub>	(3) Reopening Difference: β <sub>3</sub>
Lahore	10-day Delay	0.02* (0.01, 0.04) p<0.01	0.03* (0.01, 0.05) p<0.01	0.00 (-0.02, 0.03)	-0.03* (-0.05, -0.02) p<0.01	0.09* (0.06, 0.11) p<0.01	0.12* (0.09, 0.15) p<0.01
	20-day Delay	-0.00 (-0.00, 0.00)	0.01* (0.00, 0.02) p<0.05	0.01* (0.00, 0.02) p<0.05	-0.02* (-0.04, 0.00) p<0.01	0.16* (0.12, 0.20) p<0.01	0.18* (0.14, 0.23) p<0.01

Karachi	10-day Delay	0.22*	-0.16*	-0.39*	-0.20*	-0.03*	0.17*
		(0.18, 0.26)	(-0.23, -0.13)	(-0.46, -0.33)	(-0.24, -0.16)	(-0.04, -0.02)	(0.12, 0.21)
		`p<0.01 ́	`	`	`p<0.01	p<0.01	`p<0.01 ́
	20-day Delay	0.16*	0.00	-0.16*	-0.11*	-0.01	0.10*
		(0.07, 0.25)	(-0.10, 0.10)	(-0.26, -0.05)	(-0.14, -0.08)	(-0.02, 0.00)	(0.07, 0.13)
		p<0.01	. ,	p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.10	p<0.01
Islamabad	10-day Delay	0.21*	-0.41*	-0.63*	-0.08*	0.34*	0.42*
		(0.07, 0.36)	(-0.53, -0.30)	(-0.81, -0.44)	(-0.12, -0.04)	(0.18, 0.50)	(0.24, 0.60)
		p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01
	20-day Delay	-0.22	-0.12*	0.10	0.05*	0.98*	0.93*
		(-0.48, 0.05)	(-0.21, -0.03)	(-0.18, 0.38)	(0.00, 0.09)	(0.69, 1.26)	(0.63, 1.23)
			p<0.05		p<0.05	p<0.01	p<0.01
Quetta		0.01	-0.01*	-0.01	-0.01*	0.01*	0.01*
	10-day Delay	(-0.01, 0.02)	(-0.01, -0.00)	(-0.03, 0.01)	(-0.01, -0.00)	(0.00, 0.01)	(0.01, 0.02)
			p<0.01		p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01
	20-day Delay	-0.02*	-0.00	0.02*	-0.00*	0.01*	0.01*
		(-0.03, -0.01)	(-0.01, 0.00)	(0.01, 0.03)	(-0.01, -0.00)	(0.00, 0.01)	(0.00, 0.02)
		p<0.01		p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01
Peshawar	10-day Delay	0.05*	-0.06*	-0.11*	-0.04*	0.02*	0.06*
		(0.03, 0.08)	(-0.08, -0.03)	(-0.14, -0.08)	(-0.06, -0.04)	(0.01, 0.04)	(0.05, 0.08)
		p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01
	20-day Delay	0.04*	-0.03	-0.07*	-0.03*	0.10*	0.13*
		(0.01, 0.07)	(-0.06, 0.01)	(-0.11, -0.02)	(-0.04, -0.02)	(0.06, 0.14)	(0.08, 0.18)
		p<0.01		p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01
Muzaffarabad	10-day Delay	-0.11*	-0.05*	0.06*	0.00	0.04*	0.04*
		(-0.16, -0.06)	(-0.06, -0.03)	(0.01, 0.12)	(-0.01, 0.01)	(0.02, 0.06)	(0.01, 0.06)
		p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.05	p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01
	20-day Delay	-0.17*	-0.03	0.14*	0.01*	0.09*	0.09*
		(-0.26, -0.07)	(-0.06, 0.00)	(0.04, 0.24)	(0.00, 0.01)	(0.04, 0.16)	(0.03, 0.15)
		p<0.01		p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01	p<0.01

158 \*Significant at 95% CI. Newey-West standard errors were used.

The opposite trend was seen following schools reopening in early 2021. Before schools reopened, accounting for a 10-day delay from the actual date of reopening, the rate of change of daily COVID-19 cases per 100,000 population was declining in every city by: -0.03 cases (95% CI: -0.05, -0.02) in Lahore, -0.20 cases (95% CI: -0.24, -0.16) in Karachi, -0.08 cases (95% CI: 0.12, -0.04) in Islamabad, -0.01 cases (95% CI: -0.01, -0.00) in Quetta, and by -0.04 cases (95% CI: -0.06, -0.04) in Peshawar. Muzaffarabad's prereopening trend is not statistically significant at 95% confidence level.

After schools reopened, the rate of change of daily COVID-19 cases became positive in every city – except in Karachi, where the rate remained negative at -0.03 cases (95% CI: -0.04, -0.02) per 100,000 population. For the remaining cities, daily new COVID-19 cases began to increase at a rate of 0.09 cases (95% CI: 0.06, 0.11) per 100,000 population in Lahore, 0.34 cases (95% CI: 0.18, 0.50) in Islamabad, 0.01 cases (95% CI: 0.00, 0.01) in Quetta, 0.02 cases (95% CI: 0.01, 0.04) in Peshawar, and 0.09 cases (95% CI: 0.04, 0.16) in Muzaffarabad.

These effects were similar but more modest when allowing for a 20-day delay after the actual date of school closures. The post-closure trend remained statistically significant in Lahore, where the rate of change in cases continued to rise at 0.01 cases (95% CI: 0.00, 0.02) per 100,000 population, while Islamabad's post-closure trend showed a decline at

a rate of -0.12 (95% CI: -0.21, -0.03). Post-reopening, in Islamabad, the rate of daily new
COVID-19 cases changed from 0.05 cases (95% CI: 0.00, 0.09) per 100,000 to 0.98
cases (95% CI: 0.69, 1.26) per 100,000 population while in Muzaffarabad, rate of change
went from 0.01 cases (95% CI: 0.00, 0.01) before schools were reopened to 0.09 cases
(95% CI: 0.04, 0.16) once schools opened.

### 182 **Discussion**

We show that school closures are associated with fewer daily new COVID-19 cases 183 compared to pre-closures by 5 to 62 actual daily cases in individual cities. 184 Correspondingly, reopening schools appear to increase them by 1 to 35 daily cases. The 185 association is the strongest in Karachi, Lahore, Peshawar, and Islamabad [33], which are 186 larger, denser cities, and had the most cases; while the association was modest for 187 188 sparse and smaller cities of Quetta and Muzaffarabad, that also had fewer overall cases. Since average daily cases in Pakistan in that period were around 3000 cases per day. 189 closure of schools reduced incident cases by approximately a third. 190

Pakistan saw a much lower reduction in cases with school closures than was seen in 191 many other countries. For example, our reduction of 5 to 62 daily cases per 100,000 192 population is considerably smaller than the 371 seen in the USA [17]. However, this is 193 consistent with the fact that cities with fewer cases had the least reductions in cases when 194 195 schools were closed. Pakistan has also seen much fewer cases, hospitalizations, and deaths from COVID-19 than in Europe or North America, perhaps relating to its sparser 196 197 social networks leading to fewer contacts among individuals within the community [34], or perhaps higher levels of nonspecific immunity from prior infections with disparate viruses 198 [35]. However, both of these possible explanations are speculative at the moment. 199

Reductions in cases with school closure is better understood in the context of the 200 education set up in Pakistan. Most school-going children in cities go to low-cost-private 201 202 schools where they sit in small classrooms with little space for social distancing [36]. Additionally, most children commute to and from schools in small vehicles – up to 15-17 203 children in the back of a minivan. Children then come into contact with adults at school 204 (teachers and custodian staff), then at home (parents and elder family members), and in 205 so doing become a conduit for COVID-19 spread outside of schools. As 31% of total 206 population of Pakistan falls in the school going age [37], schools in Pakistan then 207 essentially function as "super spreader" locations for COVID-19. 208

Our findings are consistent with the global evidence, as well as the results of our own 209 210 previous work [25], that school closures are associated with reduction in COVID-19 transmission in communities [17, 29]. In the US, school closures were associated with 211 reduced COVID-19 caseloads [15], deaths [19, 38, 39], and hospitalizations by as much as 212 half [19]. Similarly, the timely closure of schools and high education institutes were found 213 214 to lower COVID-19 transmission rates in the European Union and other developed countries [40-43]. Earlier in the epidemic, a number of modeling studies had predicted 215 more modest effects of such closures [19, 21, 24, 40-42]. However, more recent studies 216 using empirical community transmission data have generally shown a more robust 217

association between school closures and reductions in community cases of COVID-19
 [21].

### 220 Limitations

There are limitations of this analysis. The daily COVID-19 data are aggregated nationally, 221 regionally, and by certain major cities, with no disaggregation by age or gender. 222 Additionally, we acknowledge that a pre- and post-intervention analysis itself has 223 limitations. For example, it may not effectively discern the effects of an intervention from 224 that of a long-term trend on an outcome variable. This is referred to as the "maturation" 225 threat to the internal validity of a pre- and post-intervention analysis. However, this has 226 negligible impact on our analysis, as we consider a total of 60 days for each ITSA 227 regression, in each of the 6 cities, when examining the effects of the intervention after 228 229 accounting for sufficient delays – at 10 and 20 days – to be sure of the effects of the interventions. 230

It is difficult to explain why Lahore did not show any reduction in cases after school 231 closures. It is possible that the epidemic affected cities at different points in time and that 232 it was at a relatively lower level in Lahore during the study period. We also acknowledge 233 that there could be potential cross-contamination of COVID-19 cases between Islamabad 234 and Peshawar, which are separated by a 2-hours commute by road, and between 235 236 Islamabad and Lahore, which are 4-hours apart by road. However, there are no data on the magnitude of any potential contamination due to bilateral intra-city travel. 237 Nevertheless, were there significant contamination between the cities, one would have 238 expected to see convergence in COVID-19 caseloads between them, and there is no 239 evidence that this occurred. Finally, measurement of the serious social, economic, and 240 educational attainment costs from school closures was beyond the scope of our study. 241

## 242 Conclusions

School closures may be associated with lower transmission of COVID-19 in communities and such closures are an important policy tool to stop the spread of COVID-19. However, their social and economic costs are high, perhaps more so in a developing country. The balance of these costs and benefits must inform this effective NPI specially when other measures, including vaccines, are being planned.

### 248 Acknowledgements

We thank Testing, Tracing and Quarantining (TTQ) team at the National Command and Operation Centre (NCOC) and the National Emergency Operations Centre (NEOC) for

facilitating our work.

### 252 **References**

Hanushek EA, Woessmann L. The economic impacts of learning losses. 2020.
 doi: doi:https://doi.org/10.1787/21908d74-en.

 Sadique MZ, Adams EJ, Edmunds WJ. Estimating the costs of school closure for mitigating an influenza pandemic. BMC Public Health. 2008;8:135. Epub 2008/04/26.
 doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-8-135. PubMed PMID: 18435855; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2377259.

Kinsey EW, Hecht AA, Dunn CG, Levi R, Read MA, Smith C, et al. School
 Closures During COVID-19: Opportunities for Innovation in Meal Service. Am J Public
 Health. 2020;110(11):1635-43. Epub 20200917. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2020.305875.
 PubMed PMID: 32941069; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7542295.

Kishida K, Tsuda M, Waite P, Creswell C, Ishikawa SI. Relationships between
 local school closures due to the COVID-19 and mental health problems of children,
 adolescents, and parents in Japan. Psychiatry Res. 2021;306:114276. Epub 20211108.
 doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2021.114276. PubMed PMID: 34798486; PubMed Central
 PMCID: PMCPMC8585496.

Amran MS, Jamaludin KA. The Impact of Unplanned School Closures on
 Adolescent Behavioral Health During the Covid-19 Pandemic in Malaysia. Front Public
 Health. 2021;9:639041. Epub 20210607. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2021.639041. PubMed
 PMID: 34164364; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8215535.

Tang S, Xiang M, Cheung T, Xiang YT. Mental health and its correlates among
children and adolescents during COVID-19 school closure: The importance of parentchild discussion. J Affect Disord. 2021;279:353-60. Epub 2020/10/26. doi:
10.1016/j.jad.2020.10.016. PubMed PMID: 33099049; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC7550131.

7. Andrew A, Cattan S, Costa Dias M, Farquharson C, Kraftman L, Krutikova S, et
al. Inequalities in Children's Experiences of Home Learning during the COVID-19
Lockdown in England\*. Fiscal Studies. 2020;41(3):653-83. doi:
https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-5890.12240.

 8. Armitage R, Nellums LB. Considering inequalities in the school closure response to COVID-19. Lancet Glob Health. 2020;8(5):e644. Epub 2020/03/31. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30116-9. PubMed PMID: 32222161; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7195275.

Wong JJM, Abbas Q, Chuah SL, Malisie RF, Pon KM, Katsuta T, et al.
 Comparative Analysis of Pediatric COVID-19 Infection in Southeast Asia, South Asia,
 Japan, and China. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2021;105(2):413-20. Epub 20210615. doi:
 10.4269/ajtmh.21-0299. PubMed PMID: 34129517; PubMed Central PMCID:
 PMCPMC8437183.

Musa OAH, Chivese T, Bansal D, Abdulmajeed J, Ameen O, Islam N, et al.
Prevalence and determinants of symptomatic COVID-19 infection among children and
adolescents in Qatar: a cross-sectional analysis of 11 445 individuals. Epidemiol Infect.
2021;149:e203. Epub 20210914. doi: 10.1017/S095026882100203X. PubMed PMID:
34517936; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8446592.

11. Goldstein E, Nguyen HH, Liu P, Viboud C, Steiner CA, Worby CJ, et al. On the
Relative Role of Different Age Groups During Epidemics Associated With Respiratory
Syncytial Virus. The Journal of infectious diseases. 2018;217(2):238-44. doi:
10.1093/infdis/jix575. PubMed PMID: 29112722; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC5853559.

Fukumoto K, McClean CT, Nakagawa K. No causal effect of school closures in
Japan on the spread of COVID-19 in spring 2020. Nat Med. 2021;27(12):2111-9. Epub
20211027. doi: 10.1038/s41591-021-01571-8. PubMed PMID: 34707318; PubMed
Central PMCID: PMCPMC8674136.

13. Isphording IE, Lipfert M, Pestel N. Does re-opening schools contribute to the
 spread of SARS-CoV-2? Evidence from staggered summer breaks in Germany. Journal
 of Public Economics. 2021;198:104426. doi:
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2021.104426.

14. Iwata K, Doi A, Miyakoshi C. Was school closure effective in mitigating
coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)? Time series analysis using Bayesian inference.
Int J Infect Dis. 2020;99:57-61. Epub 2020/08/04. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.07.052.
PubMed PMID: 32745628; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7836901.

15. Davies NG, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Gimma A, Edmunds WJ, Centre for the
Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases C-wg. Effects of non-pharmaceutical
interventions on COVID-19 cases, deaths, and demand for hospital services in the UK:
a modelling study. Lancet Public Health. 2020;5(7):e375-e85. Epub 20200602. doi:
10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30133-X. PubMed PMID: 32502389; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC7266572.

Matzinger P, Skinner J. Strong impact of closing schools, closing bars and
wearing masks during the Covid-19 pandemic: results from a simple and revealing
analysis. medRxiv. 2020. Epub 20200928. doi: 10.1101/2020.09.26.20202457. PubMed
PMID: 33024976; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7536875.

Auger KA, Shah SS, Richardson T, Hartley D, Hall M, Warniment A, et al.
Association Between Statewide School Closure and COVID-19 Incidence and Mortality
in the US. JAMA. 2020;324(9):859-70. Epub 2020/08/04. doi:
10.1001/jama.2020.14348. PubMed PMID: 32745200; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC7391181.

Banholzer N, van Weenen E, Lison A, Cenedese A, Seeliger A, Kratzwald B, et
 al. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on the number of new
 infections with COVID-19 during the first epidemic wave. PloS one.

2021;16(6):e0252827. Epub 20210602. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0252827. PubMed
 PMID: 34077448; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8171941.

Brauner JM, Mindermann S, Sharma M, Johnston D, Salvatier J, Gavenciak T, et
al. Inferring the effectiveness of government interventions against COVID-19. Science.
2021;371(6531). Epub 20201215. doi: 10.1126/science.abd9338. PubMed PMID:
33323424; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7877495.

Li Y, Campbell H, Kulkarni D, Harpur A, Nundy M, Wang X, et al. The temporal association of introducing and lifting non-pharmaceutical interventions with the timevarying reproduction number (R) of SARS-CoV-2: a modelling study across 131 countries. The Lancet Infectious diseases. 2021;21(2):193-202. Epub 20201022. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30785-4. PubMed PMID: 33729915; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7581351.

Stage HB, Shingleton J, Ghosh S, Scarabel F, Pellis L, Finnie T. Shut and reopen: the role of schools in the spread of COVID-19 in Europe. Philosophical
transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological sciences.
2021;376(1829):20200277. Epub 20210531. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2020.0277. PubMed
PMID: 34053270; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8165592.

22. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, Prem K, Jit M, group CC-w, et al. Age-dependent
effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. Nat Med.
2020;26(8):1205-11. Epub 20200616. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-0962-9. PubMed PMID:
32546824.

Liu Y, Morgenstern C, Kelly J, Lowe R, Group CC-W, Jit M. The impact of nonpharmaceutical interventions on SARS-CoV-2 transmission across 130 countries and
territories. BMC Med. 2021;19(1):40. Epub 20210205. doi: 10.1186/s12916-020-01872PubMed PMID: 33541353; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7861967.

Alban Conto C, Akseer S, Dreesen T, Kamei A, Mizunoya S, Rigole A. Potential
effects of COVID-19 school closures on foundational skills and Country responses for
mitigating learning loss. Int J Educ Dev. 2021;87:102434. Epub 20211011. doi:
10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102434. PubMed PMID: 34658500; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC8504478.

Mueed A, Aliani R, Abdullah M, Kazmi T, Sultan F, Khan A. School closures help
 reduce the spread of COVID-19: A pre- and post-intervention analysis in Pakistan.
 PLOS Global Public Health. 2022;2(4):e0000266. doi: 10.1371/journal.pgph.0000266.

All education institutions to close down from Nov 26 as Covid-19 positivity rises.
 Dawn. 2020.

Nader IW, Zeilinger EL, Jomar D, Zauchner C. Onset of effects of non pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 infection rates in 176 countries. BMC public
 health. 2021;21(1):1472. doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-11530-0.

Ingelbeen B, Peckeu L, Laga M, Hendrix I, Neven I, van der Sande MA, et al.
Reducing contacts to stop SARS-CoV-2 transmission during the second pandemic
wave in Brussels, Belgium, August to November 2020. Euro surveillance : bulletin
Europeen sur les maladies transmissibles = European communicable disease bulletin.
2021;26(7). doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.7.2100065. PubMed PMID: 33602386;
PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7897911.

Stein-Zamir C, Abramson N, Shoob H, Libal E, Bitan M, Cardash T, et al. A large
COVID-19 outbreak in a high school 10 days after schools' reopening, Israel, May 2020.
Euro surveillance : bulletin Europeen sur les maladies transmissibles = European
communicable disease bulletin. 2020;25(29). doi: 10.2807/15607917.ES.2020.25.29.2001352. PubMed PMID: 32720636; PubMed Central PMCID:

- 379 PMCPMC7384285.
- 380 30. Linden A. Conducting Interrupted Time-series Analysis for Single- and Multiple 381 group Comparisons. The Stata Journal. 2015;15(2):480-500. doi:
   382 10.1177/1536867x1501500208.
- 383 31. Linden A. A Comprehensive set of Postestimation Measures to Enrich
  Interrupted Time-series Analysis. The Stata Journal. 2017;17(1):73-88. doi:
  10.1177/1536867x1701700105.
- 386 32. Newey WK, West KD. A Simple, Positive Semi-Definite, Heteroskedasticity and
   Autocorrelation Consistent Covariance Matrix. Econometrica. 1987;55(3):703-8. doi:
   10.2307/1913610.
- 389 33. Statistics PBo. 2017 Census Area, Population by sex, sex ratio, population
   390 density, urban proportion, household size and annual growth rate (Sindh). Islamabad,
   391 Pakistan: Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, 2021.
- 392 34. North DC, Wallis JJ, Wieingast BR. Violence and Social Orders: A Conceptual
   393 Framework for Interpreting Recorded Human History. Cambridge: Cambridge University
   394 Press; 2009. 346 p.
- 395 35. Abela IA, Pasin C, Schwarzmüller M, Epp S, Sickmann ME, Schanz MM, et al.
  396 Multifactorial seroprofiling dissects the contribution of pre-existing human coronaviruses
  397 responses to SARS-CoV-2 immunity. Nature Communications. 2021;12(1):6703. doi:
  398 10.1038/s41467-021-27040-x.
- 399 36. Shah D, Amin N, Kakli MB, Piracha ZF, Zia MA. Pakistan Education Statistics
  2016-17. National Education Management Information System (NEMIS). Academy of
  Educational Planning and Management (AEPAM), 2018.
- 402 37. Table 4 Population by single year age, sex and rural/urban. Islamabad,
  403 Pakistan: PBS; 2018.

40438.Rauscher E. Lower State COVID-19 Deaths and Cases with Earlier School

405 Closure in the U.S. medRxiv. 2020:2020.05.09.20096594. doi:

406 10.1101/2020.05.09.20096594.

39. Yehya N, Venkataramani A, Harhay MO. Statewide Interventions and
Coronavirus Disease 2019 Mortality in the United States: An Observational Study.
Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of
America. 2021;73(7):e1863-e9. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa923. PubMed PMID: 32634828;
PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7454446.

40. Klimek-Tulwin M, Tulwin T. Early school closures can reduce the first-wave of the
COVID-19 pandemic development. Z Gesundh Wiss. 2020:1-7. Epub 20201015. doi:
10.1007/s10389-020-01391-z. PubMed PMID: 33078090; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC7557316.

41. Piovani D, Christodoulou MN, Hadjidemetriou A, Pantavou K, Zaza P, Bagos PG,
et al. Effect of early application of social distancing interventions on COVID-19 mortality
over the first pandemic wave: An analysis of longitudinal data from 37 countries. J
Infect. 2021;82(1):133-42. Epub 20201201. doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2020.11.033. PubMed
PMID: 33275956; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7706420.

42. Garchitorena A, Gruson H, Cazelles B, Karki T, Sudre B, Roche B. Integrated
packages of non-pharmaceutical interventions increased public health response
efficiency against COVID-19 during the first European wave: evidence from 32
European countries. medRxiv. 2020:2020.08.17.20174821. doi:
10.1101/2020.08.17.20174821.

43. Chang SL, Harding N, Zachreson C, Cliff OM, Prokopenko M. Modelling
transmission and control of the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia. Nat Commun.
2020;11(1):5710. Epub 20201111. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-19393-6. PubMed PMID:
33177507; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7659014.

## 430 List of legends

431 Table 2. Key intervention dates

Table 2. Summary statistics of daily COVID-19 cases (per 100,000 population) in
 each city

Table 3. Rates of Change in Daily COVID-19 cases (per 100,000 population)

- 435 through Interrupted Time Series Analysis
- 436 S1 Text: Methodology steps
- 437 S1 Data: Dataset for 10-days delay
- 438 S2 Data: Dataset for 20-days delay