

Endemic-epidemic modelling of school closure to prevent spread of COVID-19 in Switzerland

M. Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar^{1, *}, F. Hofmann¹, S. Meyer^{2, *}, L. Held^{1, *}

1: Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute, University of
Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zurich, SWITZERLAND

2: Institute of Medical Informatics, Biometry, and Epidemiology,
Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Universitätsstraße
22, 91054 Erlangen, GERMANY

*: Corresponding author

★: Joint last authors

`maria.dunbar@uzh.ch`

Word count: approx. 5200

1 **Summary**

2 The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic disrupted daily life and changes
3 to routines were made in accordance with public health regulations. In 2020, non-
4 pharmaceutical interventions were put in place to reduce exposure to and spread of
5 the disease. The goal of this work was to quantify the effect of school closure dur-
6 ing the first year of COVID-19 pandemic in Switzerland. This allowed us to deter-
7 mine the usefulness of school closures as a pandemic countermeasure for emerging
8 coronaviruses in the absence of pharmaceutical interventions. The use of multivariate
9 endemic-epidemic modelling enabled us to analyse disease spread between age groups
10 which we believe is a necessary inclusion in any model seeking to achieve our goal. So-
11 phisticated time-varying contact matrices encapsulating four different contact settings
12 were included in our complex statistical modelling approach to reflect the amount of
13 school closure in place on a given day. Using the model, we projected case counts un-
14 der various transmission scenarios (driven by implemented social distancing policies).
15 We compared these counterfactual scenarios against the true levels of social distanc-
16 ing policies implemented, where schools closed in the spring and reopened in the au-
17 tumn. We found that if schools had been kept open, the vast majority of additional
18 cases would be expected among primary school-aged children with a small fraction of
19 cases percolating into other age groups following the contact matrix structure. Under
20 this scenario where schools were kept open, the cases were highly concentrated among
21 the youngest age group. In the scenario where schools had remained closed, most re-
22 duction would also be expected in the lowest age group with less effects seen in other
23 groups.

24 **1 Introduction**

25 It is known that school closures have an effect on social mixing and so school clo-
26 sures are considered useful for some infectious disease outbreaks but not necessarily
27 all [Cowling et al., 2008]. The implications of school closures are manifold and are
28 not restricted to changes in numbers of cases (knock-on effects include decreased so-
29 cialisation skills among children and economic impacts through the reduced labour of
30 guardians having to shift their focus to child rearing) meaning it is not a policy deci-
31 sion to be made lightly. As not everyone in a population attends school, we need age-
32 stratified surveillance data to answer the question of what the impact of school closure
33 is. In this work, we wish to determine the impact of school closures for COVID-19
34 control in Switzerland though the methods are applicable to other countries.

35 In earlier work [Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar et al., 2022] we considered evidence which
36 suggested the effect of school closure in the canton of Zurich (in terms of reduction in
37 disease transmission observed through a decrease in cases) seemed to not be large for
38 the early coronavirus outbreak. The canton of Zurich is the most populous region of
39 Switzerland. The analysis of data from the canton of Zurich suffered from low num-
40 bers of observed cases in the youngest age group. This proof-of-concept study pro-
41 vided a starting ground for further developing the methods used to examine these
42 kinds of policy questions using endemic-epidemic models with time-varying weights.
43 We now consider a longer time frame (until the end of 2020) and a greater popula-
44 tion (the whole of Switzerland). This also allows us to evaluate the performance of
45 the analysis at a greater resolution. Considering cases at national level rather than re-
46 gional level induces additional challenges as social distancing policy varies across the
47 country. As our study is not stratified by geographical region—our focus is age groups—
48 these differences in policy need to be incorporated. Here we showcase how to incorpo-

49 rate policy indicators which are more nuanced than those used in our previous work.

50 The endemic-epidemic framework for infectious disease modelling is a class of
51 time-series based regression models used for the analysis of infectious disease case
52 counts arising from routine surveillance systems. It is a versatile framework model
53 which has been applied to the analysis of many disease outbreaks with varying char-
54 acteristics. Endemic-epidemic modelling is considered a useful tool for emergency re-
55 sponse related to infectious disease outbreaks as it fulfils many of the requirements
56 for disaster response models raised by Brandeau et al. [2009]. In particular, endemic-
57 epidemic modelling addresses real-world infectious disease problems such as detection
58 of outbreaks and populations at increased risk and is designed for maximum usability
59 by response planners by virtue of being released as open source publications and soft-
60 ware which means we avoid issues with disease knowledge being pay-walled during on-
61 going outbreaks as seen in the 2014 Ebola virus disease outbreak [Dahn et al., 2015].
62 The framework also makes a good compromise between simplicity and complexity,
63 and due to its statistical nature is designed in a manner which captures inherent un-
64 certainties. Endemic-epidemic modelling facilitates knowing when disease is endemic
65 (prevalence levels are in the range of expected values) and when disease is epidemic
66 (incidence is higher than expected), at which point control measures may need intro-
67 ducing or intensifying. This work provides an insight into how control measures can
68 be incorporated in endemic-epidemic models through the inclusion of time-varying
69 contact matrices.

70 To accomplish our goal, we fit an endemic-epidemic model to a multivariate time
71 series of age-stratified COVID-19 cases in Switzerland and then examine two coun-
72 terfactual scenarios of the policy implemented; the true school closures consisted of
73 schools being closed early in the year and reopening for the second half of the year
74 (scenario A). We consider the counterfactual scenarios where schools did not close (al-

75 ways open; scenario B and where the schools remain closed during the second half of
76 the year (always closed; scenario C). The additional scenario is possible due to the
77 longer time frame considered in this work. Scenario B is similar to the scenario consid-
78 ered in our earlier analysis.

79 **2 Methods**

80 This work is preregistered and has a study protocol [Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar et al.,
81 2022] which is considered a useful manner of working but currently rare in epidemic
82 modelling. The protocol outlines the modelling considerations we made before work
83 began and may serve as a useful resource for the interested reader.

84 **2.1 Data**

85 In this work we consider daily data ($t = 1, \dots, 312 = T$) where the study period
86 commences on 24th February 2020 and the final observation at time T occurs on 31st
87 December 2020. COVID-19 case data is provided by the Swiss public health author-
88 ity (Bundesamt für Gesundheit) and includes case counts by date reported stratified
89 by age group. We asked for cases given by the same age groups we considered in our
90 Zurich analysis as this roughly divides the population into those of compulsory educa-
91 tion age (0–14 year olds are required to be in school when school is open), higher edu-
92 cation and young workers (15–24), parents (25–44), middle-aged workers (45–65), re-
93 tirees (66–79), and the elderly (80+). Our age group thresholds include the commonly
94 used cut-off of 65 years of age considered in epidemiology, when health is expected to
95 change.

96 Figure 1 shows the case data; the daily number of cases per 100,000 age group
97 population (upper panel), the distribution of cases per 100,000 population over time
98 (middle panel), and cases by weekday reported (lower panel). The upper panel shows
99 the oscillatory behaviour known to epidemic curves as well as weekly systematic fluc-
100 tuations in surveillance. The middle panel shows a shift in the age distribution of
101 cases across the study period which further motivates the inclusion of age groups in
102 our modelling approach. The lower panel shows the distribution of cases across the
103 days of the week, where we see a systematic fluctuation in the reporting system. The
104 legal workdays in Switzerland are Monday through Friday. Most cases are reported on
105 Mondays which is the start of the week according to European norms and the number
106 of reported cases drops across the week while fewer cases are reported on weekends
107 (Saturday and Sunday).

108 To capture baseline transmission opportunities between age groups we include a
109 contact matrix in our endemic-epidemic model. Contact matrices encapsulate the
110 number of contacts an average person in the population has with other population
111 members of the same and different ages in different settings such as the workplace
112 or school. Their inclusion in the endemic-epidemic framework was an approach in-
113 troduced by Meyer and Held [2017] which provided more realism than making an as-
114 sumption of mixing patterns for the population. Existing contact diary-based contact
115 matrices for Switzerland are only based on a small number of observations (54 obser-
116 vations) [Hoang et al., 2019], which led us to use a synthetic contact matrix in place
117 of this empirical one. A synthetic contact matrix is constructed on the basis of demo-
118 graphic information. We chose to use the synthetic matrices by Mistry et al. [2021]
119 as they were both 1) newer and 2) given with a certain level of uncertainty which we
120 could incorporate into our modelling approach. The synthetic contact matrix is con-
121 structed on the basis of household size, school enrolment records, and employment




Figure 1: Daily COVID-19 cases per 100,000 population (upper). Proportion of cases per 100,000 population contributed by each age group (middle). Number of cases reported by weekday (lower)

122 data [see Mistry et al., 2021, for details].

123 From the synthetic contact matrix we obtain the per capita frequency of contact
124 $c_{a,a',s}$ in setting s (shown in Figure 2 which describes the pattern of mixing in setting
125 s) and the numbers of contacts d_s in setting s for constructing contact matrices for
126 respiratory disease, which are 4.11 for household setting, 11.41 for school setting, 8.07
127 for work setting, and 2.79 for general community setting (shown in Figure 3). This
128 means school has the largest weight and so changes to these contacts are expected to
129 have the biggest impact. These construction weights d_s are provided with standard
130 errors. When constructing $c_{a,a'}$ we used the Swiss population (Table 1) rather than
131 the Zurich population which we considered in earlier work [see Bekker-Nielsen Dun-
132 bar et al., 2022, for the analysis of Zurich] such that the population used to weight the
133 synthetic contact matrix was the one being studied. This means the contact matrix
134 used in this work is not exactly the same as the one considered previously. The Mis-
135 try et al. [2021] contact matrices are created with respiratory diseases in mind where
136 school closure is a first line of defence against disease outbreaks. The synthetic con-
137 tact matrix was used to inform the time-varying transmission weights $w_{a,a',t}$ which
138 determine the amount of transmission between age group a and age group a' at time t ,
139 which is explained in more detail below.

140 Contact setting-specific daily policy adjustments $p_{s,t}$ are informed by information
141 provided by the Swiss authorities. This information is used to quantify the amount of
142 disease control measures enacted. We focus on those measures which have the aim
143 to decrease contact. Following the Oxford University policy classifications we con-
144 sider: school closure (“C1”), workplace closure (“C2”), and restrictions on gatherings
145 (“C4”). We code our policy indicators to take the same levels as the Oxford scheme
146 allowing researchers familiar with the controlled vocabulary established by that re-
147 search group to comprehend our indicators. We reversed and rescaled the indicators



Figure 2: Unweighted contact matrices $c_{a,a',s}$ from Mistry et al. [2021] via Laboratory for the Modeling of Biological and Socio-technical Systems [2021]

Table 1: Swiss population

Age group	Population count	Proportion
0-14	1,294,918	0.150
15-24	901,783	0.105
25-44	2,383,179	0.277
45-65	2,511,163	0.292
66-79	1,061,320	0.123
80+	453,670	0.053

148 such that $p_{s,t} \in [0, 1]$ where 0 reflects a situation of maximal measures in place and
149 1 is full relaxation of measures (source information is in our study protocol <https://osf.io/fgrdy>).
150

151 The non-pandemic school closure adjustment $h_{s,t}$ is created based on information
152 from Schweizerische Konferenz der kantonalen Erziehungsdirektoren [2018] and re-
153 flects closures of school during the academic year due to half term and other school
154 holidays. These closures reduce contact independently of disease control measures;
155 notably Easter is a period where less contacts in school settings would be expected
156 as Switzerland is a predominantly Christian country. The adjustment takes values
157 $h_{s,t} \in [0, 1]$ where 0 means that all schools in Switzerland are closed on that day and
158 1 means all schools are open. The values $h_{s,t}$ takes for the school setting are shown in
159 Figure 3 while $h_{s,t} \equiv 1$ for all other contact settings (meaning no adjustment). The
160 calculation of $h_{s,t}$ is informed by population data from Eurostat [Eurostat, 2021] (pop-
161 ulation by region). The construction of $p_{s,t}$, $h_{s,t}$, and $w_{a,a',t}$ is explained in more detail
162 in the following section.

163




Figure 3: Time series of indicators ($p_{s,t}$), disease setting-specific weights for contact matrices (d_s), and holiday score ($h_{s,t}$ for the school setting). The lowest panel shows the product, $\gamma_{s,t}$

164 2.2 Model

165 In an endemic-epidemic model, case counts Y_{at} are indexed by time t and age group
166 a . The age groups considered are 0–14, 15–24, 25–44, 45–65, 66–79, and 80+ years;
167 the same used in Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar et al. [2022]. Case counts given past cases as-
168 sumed to follow an overdispersed negative binomial distribution with age-dependent
169 overdispersion parameters ψ_a . The mean λ_{at} is additively decomposed into endemic
170 and epidemic components. Log-linear predictors for the endemic and epidemic com-
171 ponents are given by ν_{at} and ϕ_{at} respectively. The endemic component is additionally
172 weighted by population fractions e_a , where we used population data from Eurostat
173 [2021] (population by age group), given in Table 1 to inform this part of the model.

174 The epidemic component is an autoregressive process driven by cases in other
175 age groups a' in previous time periods $t - d$ up to a maximum lag of d_{\max} where u_d
176 determines by how much previous cases are weighted. We chose to use a Poisson-
177 distributed lag distribution u_d such that the majority of the weight need not be given
178 to the immediately preceding cases allowing for a serial interval of more than a single
179 day. The maximum lag represents the maximum length of the serial interval we might
180 conceive in our modelling efforts; we chose $d_{\max} = 7$ as the literature suggests early
181 types of COVID-19 have a serial interval within a week.

182 Our endemic-epidemic model with time dependent [Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar et al.,
183 2022, Grimée et al., 2021] contact matrix weights [Meyer and Held, 2017] and higher
184 order lag [Bracher and Held, 2022] is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 Y_{at} \mid Y_{a,t-1}, \dots, Y_{a,t-d_{\max}} &\sim \text{NegBin}(\lambda_{at}, \psi_a) \\
 \lambda_{at} &= \underbrace{\nu_{at} e_a}_{\text{endemic}} + \underbrace{\phi_{at} \sum_{a'} \sum_{d=1}^{d_{\max}} u_d w_{a,a',t} Y_{a',t-d}}_{\text{epidemic}} \\
 u_d &\propto \frac{\kappa^{d-1}}{(d-1)!} \cdot \exp(-\kappa), \quad \kappa > 0, d = 1, \dots, d_{\max}
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

185 Transmission between age groups is determined by a time-dependent contact ma-
 186 trix $w_{a,a',t}$. The time-varying contact matrix $w_{a,a',t}$ is the total average contacts at
 187 time t constructed by a weighted sum

$$w_{a,a',t} = \sum_s \gamma_{s,t} \cdot c_{a,a',s} \tag{2}$$

188 where $\gamma_{s,t}$ is a weight that depends on the setting s the contact occurred in and
 189 changes occurring at time t . It is created from the combination of the weights used to
 190 construct contact matrices (d_s given by Mistry et al. [2021] which depend on setting
 191 s), the time-dependent setting-specific policy adjustments ($p_{s,t}$ which depend on time
 192 t and setting s) and whether an adjustment needs to be made to incorporate non-
 193 pandemic school closure due to school holidays ($h_{s,t}$ which depends on setting s as it
 194 only affects schools and time t):

$$\gamma_{s,t} = d_s \cdot p_{s,t} \cdot h_{s,t} \tag{3}$$

195 Since school holidays in Switzerland vary not only between regions, but also within
 196 them, we construct binary indicators for all of the sub-regions r within a region R
 197 where we assign 1 to a specific day t if t is not a school holiday and 0 otherwise. In a

198 second step, we average the binary indicators of all sub-regions r within a region R in
 199 order to obtain a regional average indicator for that day. Subsequently, we use popu-
 200 lation weights to calculate the national indicator $h_{s,t}$. The sub-regions are unweighted
 201 in our averaging as we were not able to determine population sizes at school district
 202 level. We calculate

$$h_{s,t} = \begin{cases} \sum_R \frac{\sum_{r \in R} \mathbb{1}_{\{t \text{ is not a school holiday in subregion } r\}}(t) / n_r(R)}{\text{population}_R} & s = \text{school} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

203 where $\mathbb{1}$ is an indicator function and $n_r(R)$ denotes the number of sub-regions
 204 within region R . This gives us a population-weighted indicator with values $h_{s,t} \in [0, 1]$
 205 which incorporates the variation of number of school children in regions.

206 We fit the model (1) with predictors

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\nu_{at}) &= \alpha_a^{(\nu)} + \beta_1^{(\nu)} x_{1t} + \beta_2^{(\nu)} x_{2t} + \gamma^{(\nu)} \sin(2\pi t/365 + \delta^{(\nu)}) \\ \log(\phi_{at}) &= \alpha_a^{(\phi)} + \beta_1^{(\phi)} x_{1t} + \beta_2^{(\phi)} z_t + \gamma^{(\phi)} \sin(2\pi t/365 + \delta^{(\phi)}) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

207 where α_a denotes a fixed effect of age group a , x_{1t} is an indicator for public hol-
 208 idays, x_{2t} is an indicator for weekends, and z_t are effect-coded weekday effects with
 209 Monday as the reference value (six in total). Effect-coded variables are also known as
 210 sum-to-zero contrasts. This means Monday always takes the value -1 and the week-
 211 day of interest takes the value 1 while all other weekdays are 0 . We include a non-
 212 linear time trend in the form of a sine-cosine wave expressed by its amplitude γ and
 213 phase δ [Paul et al., 2008]. Our model has 31 parameters (estimates are given in Ta-
 214 ble 2) which are estimated using a maximum likelihood approach computed with stan-

215 dard errors. Information on the full model selection procedure (where we also consid-
216 ered effects of temperature, testing rate, and a linear time trend) can be found in the
217 supporting information.

218 2.3 Counterfactual scenario prediction

219 Determining the expected size of the outbreak is crucial to policy makers who need to
220 determine how resources are to be allocated. As the outbreak is ongoing, the predicted
221 final size considered here is the predicted number of infections over the time window
222 considered rather than the traditional metric considered by users of compartmental
223 models: the total number of infections over the entire outbreak period. Predicted
224 cases are based on a path trajectory (a long-term expected prediction calculated re-
225 cursively on the basis of one-step predictions) following Held et al. [2017] assuming no
226 changes to the model parameters across the scenarios considered. This means we pre-
227 dict the model (1) with the given e_a and fitted $\hat{\nu}_{at}$, $\hat{\phi}_{at}$, and \hat{u}_d effects for three differ-
228 ent versions of $w_{a,a',t}$ (for scenarios A, B, and C). The two counterfactual scenarios are
229 implemented by including transmission weights informed by $\gamma_{s,t,a,a'} = d_s \cdot q_{s,t,a,a'} \cdot h_{s,t}$
230 where γ now depends on age group. In particular we consider three scenarios (pro-
231 vided with the shorthand names we use based on their effect on the youngest age
232 group):

233 **Scenario A (“true measures”)** This is the true measures scenario where schools
234 closed in the spring and reopened in the summer where $w_{a,a',t}$ is populated by
235 the relevant policy information without adjustment as in (2). This is the same
236 scenario considered in model fitting to obtain the model coefficients used in pre-
237 diction of final size and simulation of uncertainty for the prediction.

238 **Scenario B (“schools open”)** This is a scenario where schools are never closed for

239 the youngest age group (0–14), i.e. remain open across the entire study period.

240 All other measures are as in Scenario A.

$$q_{s,t,a,a'} = \begin{cases} 1 & a = 0-14 \text{ or } a' = 0-14 \text{ and } s = \text{school} \\ p_{s,t} & a \neq 0-14 \text{ and } a' \neq 0-14 \text{ and } s = \text{school} \\ p_{s,t} & s \neq \text{school} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

241 **Scenario C (“schools closed”)** This is a scenario where schools close and remain
 242 closed. School closure once again affects age group 0–14 and their contacts. All
 243 other measures are as in Scenario A. We implement this by setting

$$q_{a,t,a,a'} = \begin{cases} p_{s,t} & t < t_0 \text{ and } a = 0-14 \text{ or } a' = 0-14 \text{ and } s = \text{school} \\ p_{s,t} & a \neq 0-14 \text{ and } a' \neq 0-14 \text{ and } s = \text{school} \\ 0 & t \geq t_0 \text{ and } a = 0-14 \text{ or } a' = 0-14 \text{ and } s = \text{school} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

244 where t_0 denotes the date schools are first closed (16th March 2020).

245 The changes only affect age group 0–14 when the contact matrix is multiplied by
 246 $\gamma_{s,t,a,a'}$ so the 0–14 row and column in Figure 2 are changed in the school setting (school
 247 aged children and their contacts). The time series of all four setting specific policy in-
 248 dicators $p_{s,t}$ for the different scenarios can be seen in Figure ?? (the building blocks
 249 of (2), (6), (7)). The truth (scenario A) is expected to lie somewhere between the two
 250 counterfactual scenarios (scenarios B and C). Examining the deviation these scenarios
 251 have allows use to evaluate the effect of disease control measures used. It is implicitly
 252 assumed that the fitted effects $\hat{\nu}_{at}$, $\hat{\phi}_{at}$, \hat{u}_d do not vary across scenarios.

253 To incorporate parameter uncertainty in our projections, we utilise Monte Carlo
 254 simulation. We sample the weights d_s with uncertainty estimates given in Mistry et al.

255 [2021] assuming they are independently normally distributed. To incorporate model
256 uncertainty we sample the coefficients $\hat{\nu}_{at}$, $\hat{\phi}_{at}$ of our fitted endemic-epidemic model
257 assuming a multivariate normal distribution; the asymptomatic normal distribution
258 of the maximum-likelihood estimates. Using these $n = 1000$ samples we then use the
259 path trajectory prediction approach to obtain n simulated expected case counts under
260 the scenarios considered. This enables us to incorporate uncertainty in our projections.
261 We examine the expected increase in cases when schools are always open (scenario B)
262 and the expected decrease in cases when schools are always closed (scenario C) and
263 compare this with the expected number of cases under the policy used (scenario A).

264 We also conducted sensitivity analyses of the assumptions made in constructing
265 the transmission weights $w_{a,a',t}$. The sensitivity analyses attempt to provide further re-
266 alism with respect to how household contacts may be affected by school closure. This
267 provides additional extensions to the analysis of Zurich data as here we only consid-
268 ered household contacts to not be affected by policy $p_{s,t}|_{\text{household}} \equiv 1$. The sensitivity
269 analyses can be found in the supporting information.

270 **3 Results**

271 In total 256 models were fit to the outbreak data and Bayesian information criterion
272 was used as a goodness-of-fit measure to determine the best fitting model (see the
273 supporting information for details). We chose this as Bayesian information criterion
274 should fit the correct model in theory while Akaike information criterion would be ex-
275 pected to overfit. Due to diverging estimates in the model—likely due to low values in
276 the transmission weights matrix $w_{a,a',t}$ or low case counts Y_{at} observed in certain age
277 groups—models which did not have converging effects were excluded from the selection
278 process. Divergence was determined on the basis of the size of the standard deviation

279 of the estimated model coefficients. It may happen that the additive decomposition
280 into endemic and epidemic components is not identifiable.

281 In particular, $\alpha_{80+}^{(\nu)}$ (the fixed effect of the oldest age group in the endemic com-
282 ponent) was excluded due to having a very small estimate with a huge standard er-
283 ror. This means the coefficient $\alpha_{80+}^{(\nu)}$ was restricted to be zero on the log-scale while
284 the corresponding epidemic effect $\alpha_{80+}^{(\phi)}$ was estimated from the data. The best fitting
285 model has 31 parameters including the lag parameter κ . The model contains system-
286 atic fluctuations in the form of weekly effects, as we expected based on the exploration
287 of the case data, and additional fluctuations in the form of the sine-cosine waves. As
288 we only use one year's worth of data in this work, we cannot denote this fluctuating
289 trend "seasonality" but with a longer time frame it would be expected to capture such
290 effects. There is not much knowledge about seasonal variation of COVID-19 at the
291 time of analysis so we note that with only one harmonic in the epidemic component
292 and not even a whole year of data, this may induce additional uncertainty in our sim-
293 ulations and predictions.

294 **3.1 Model fit**

295 The model has a good fit to the case data based on visual inspection (Figure 4 up-
296 per panel). The serial interval peaks somewhat early (Figure 4 lower panel) compared
297 with what is expected from the literature. This has been observed in other endemic-
298 epidemic models for COVID-19 and is thus likely an artefact of the model. The model
299 estimates fewer cases on public holidays and weekends, which aligns with our intuition
300 based on the exploratory data analysis of the case counts.

301 There are much greater effects of age in the endemic component, $\exp(\alpha^{(\nu)})$ ranges
302 from 9.450 to 130.061 (and $\alpha^{(\nu)} \equiv 1$) compared with the epidemic component where




Figure 4: Model fit and cases

Table 2: Model parameter estimates

Endemic			Epidemic			Other parameters		
Coefficient	Estimate	Std. Error	Coefficient	Estimate	Std. Error	Coefficient	Estimate	Std. Error
$\alpha_{0-14}^{(\nu)}$	2.806	0.218	$\alpha_{0-14}^{(\phi)}$	-3.776	0.059	ψ_{0-14}	0.229	0.030
$\alpha_{15-24}^{(\nu)}$	4.868	0.185	$\alpha_{15-24}^{(\phi)}$	-2.482	0.043	ψ_{15-24}	0.125	0.013
$\alpha_{25-44}^{(\nu)}$	4.036	0.185	$\alpha_{25-44}^{(\phi)}$	-2.172	0.027	ψ_{25-44}	0.067	0.007
$\alpha_{45-65}^{(\nu)}$	2.673	0.288	$\alpha_{45-65}^{(\phi)}$	-2.170	0.023	ψ_{45-65}	0.059	0.006
$\alpha_{66-79}^{(\nu)}$	2.246	0.321	$\alpha_{66-79}^{(\phi)}$	-1.883	0.027	ψ_{66-79}	0.074	0.009
			$\alpha_{80+}^{(\phi)}$	-0.945	0.018	ψ_{80+}	0.043	0.009
			$\beta_{\text{day of the week Tuesday}}^{(\phi)}$	0.378	0.021			
			$\beta_{\text{day of the week Wednesday}}^{(\phi)}$	0.119	0.022			
			$\beta_{\text{day of the week Thursday}}^{(\phi)}$	-0.032	0.022			
			$\beta_{\text{day of the week Friday}}^{(\phi)}$	0.001	0.022			
			$\beta_{\text{day of the week Saturday}}^{(\phi)}$	-0.404	0.023			
			$\beta_{\text{day of the week Sunday}}^{(\phi)}$	-0.684	0.024			
$\beta_{\text{weekend}}^{(\nu)}$	-0.850	0.100						
$\beta_{\text{public holiday}}^{(\nu)}$	-0.582	0.462	$\beta_{\text{public holiday}}^{(\phi)}$	-0.327	0.063			
$\beta_{\text{amplitude}}^{(\nu)}$	2.070	0.191	$\beta_{\text{amplitude}}^{(\phi)}$	0.711	0.018			
$\beta_{\text{phase}}^{(\nu)}$	-2.487	0.030	$\beta_{\text{phase}}^{(\phi)}$	1.447	0.012			
						$\log \kappa$	0.082	

303 $\exp(\alpha^{(\phi)})$ are all between 0.023 and 0.389. The fixed effect of age in the epidemic
304 component which smaller in size shows a more obvious pattern of age dependency;
305 being older makes a case more likely. The effect of day of the week is greater for all
306 $\exp(\beta^{(\phi)})$ compared with the weekend effect $\exp(\beta^{(\nu)})$. However Friday seems to have
307 less average autocorrelation. Public holidays have a greater effect on cases in the epi-
308 demic component based on the estimated effect size; this could reflect changes in con-
309 tact patterns hence transmission opportunities on those days. The sine-cosine wave
310 takes greater amplitude values in the endemic component, meaning the wave has stronger
311 variation (relative to the baseline). The greatest value of the overdispersion (excess
312 variance) parameter ψ_a is found the for the youngest age group $\hat{\psi}_{0-14}$ while the small-
313 est value is found for the oldest age group $\hat{\psi}_{80+}$.

314

Table 3: Comparisons of the number of cases in scenario A (true measures) with the number of cases in scenarios B (schools open) between 17th March 2020 and 90 days and C (schools closed) between 12th May 2020 and 90 days

Age	B - A			B / A			C - A			C / A		
	P ₁₀	P ₅₀	P ₉₀	P ₁₀	P ₅₀	P ₉₀	P ₁₀	P ₅₀	P ₉₀	P ₁₀	P ₅₀	P ₉₀
0-14	162.9	240.0	404	1.76	1.82	1.87	-27.5	-20.85	-16.98	0.91	0.92	0.93
15-24	45.1	89.9	218	1.06	1.09	1.12	-16.6	-9.38	-5.98	0.99	0.99	1.00
25-44	192.9	362.3	821	1.10	1.12	1.15	-64.4	-36.03	-23.15	0.98	0.99	0.99
45-65	153.3	311.5	773	1.07	1.09	1.12	-55.2	-30.08	-18.96	0.98	0.99	0.99
66-79	48.9	113.8	323	1.04	1.06	1.08	-13.5	-6.92	-4.05	0.98	0.99	0.99
80+	37.3	90.5	271	1.04	1.05	1.07	-9.5	-4.69	-2.62	0.98	0.99	0.99
Total (summed)	641.7	1,207.1	2,820	1.09	1.11	1.13	-186.0	-107.83	-71.69	0.98	0.99	0.99

315 3.2 Disease control scenarios

316

317 The path trajectories allow us to examine temporal changes that are not evident
318 when projections are summarised as a final size estimate. The counterfactual sce-
319 narios' path trajectories are compared in Figure 5 which shows the ratio of predicted
320 cases under a counterfactual scenario and predicted cases under the original scenario
321 A for the 90 days after measures were introduced (scenario B) or lifted (scenario C).
322 This means we conditioned on fewer days when predicting for scenario B and had
323 higher case counts included in our prediction of scenario C (as April was included).
324 Large temporal differences are not found in the final epidemic size estimates (Fig-
325 ure 6). Scenarios A and C differ with regards to when schools are closed. They show
326 much more distinct behaviour for school-aged children. We see the difference in pat-
327 terns for age group 0–14 seems to be correlated with school holidays $h_{s,t}$ (Figure 3).

328 The final epidemic size estimates (with uncertainty bounds) within each scenario
329 are given in Figure 6 and are calculated by summing the predicted number of cases
330 across the 90 day projection window. Table 3 shows the differences and ratios between
331 expected cases of scenario A and scenarios B and C for the 90 day periods. Due to




Figure 5: Showcased are the 10th, 50th, and 90th percentiles of ratios of simulated path trajectories. The ratios of predicted mean cases for scenario B (schools open) divided by those predicted under scenario A (true measures, left) and for scenario C (schools closed) over the number of cases predicted in scenario A (right). The y-axis is log-transformed




Figure 6: Comparison between simulated number of mean cases over 90 days from 17th March 2020 for scenarios A (true measures) and Scenario B (schools open) and 90 days from 12th May 2020 for scenarios A (true measures) and C (schools closed). Showcased are the 10th, 50th, and 90th percentiles as well as the observed case counts in the period considered

332 the time-sensitive nature of the policy questions being considered, the focus of this
333 work was not calibration (the match of observations and predictions) but rather the
334 differences in scenarios. We discuss the difficulties of forecasting in more detail in our
335 discussion. We are most interested in the ratio between the predicted case counts: the
336 percentage increase and decrease in cases is approximately ten per cent for both sce-
337 narios (the ratio is 1.11 for scenario B and 0.99 for scenario C). Most of the effect is
338 found among the youngest group, which have 82 per cent more cases for scenario B
339 and 8 per cent fewer cases for scenario C. The relative difference in expected cases be-
340 tween scenarios A and B suggests that case numbers would not have increased a lot of
341 schools were left open and regarding scenario C, as expected; closing schools decreases
342 cases.

343 **4 Discussion**

344 In our earlier work attempting to provide evidence-based information for policy mak-
345 ers, we found that an endemic-epidemic model (a two-component model for infectious
346 disease) provided a good fit for data from Zurich, Switzerland [Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar
347 et al., 2022]. The model had effects of day of the week, public holidays, testing rate,
348 and age in the endemic components and the same effects as well as a centred linear
349 time trend in the endemic component. This model suggested if there was no school
350 closure, an increase in cases would be expected in the youngest age group (0–14) in
351 April and later in other age groups, with the next age group expected to experience
352 an increase in cases compared with the true school closure implemented being the par-
353 ents of the first age group (25–44; parents). In this work, the main group of concern
354 was the oldest age group (80+) and they were found to be consistently the lowest in
355 terms of expected increase in cases compared with what was expected when schools

356 were closed. Here we extended this work further motivated by the fact the useful-
357 ness of school closure to combat COVID-19 was not fully determined by end of the
358 “first wave”. Schools in Switzerland re-opened after the summer of 2020 but at the
359 time questions of whether to close them remained. In our work we were able to ex-
360 amine school closure at greater spatial and temporal scale than previously which is
361 a strength of the approach. Other countries were observed to have different levels of
362 school closure during the study period compared with Switzerland and so the “ideal”
363 amount of closure remains to be determined. We note that school closures are a pri-
364 mary measure for disease control but other measures such as masked students or vac-
365 cinated students which seek to reduce within-class disease risk may be a better op-
366 tion later in the outbreak [Endo et al., 2021]. We remain cognisant that the purpose
367 of school is not just educational and it is important to investigate the impact of this
368 as the knock-on effects to children’s health of remote learning are expected to be a
369 topic of interest for years to come. While the current work considers only the options
370 of schools open or closed, the methodology used could also be used to examine use
371 of masks in educational settings, provided evidence is available to inform the time-
372 varying transmission weights and so is very versatile.

373 In the age group 80+ we find that incidence is completely explained by the epi-
374 demic component ϕ so the endemic component was not identifiable and diverged. It is
375 not ideal that $\alpha_{80+}^{(\nu)}$ was restricted to be zero but the alternative approach of setting all
376 $\alpha^{(\nu)}$ values to be the same would also not have been ideal since the results imply they
377 differ across age groups (Table 2). The analysis we present is ecological as we aggre-
378 gated our indicators across the federation of Switzerland although they differ across
379 regions. Ideally we would have liked to have done a spatio-temporal analysis across
380 age groups but as we were interested in specific age groups rather than ten-year age
381 bands, we had to choose to focus on age over age and space.

382 The uncertainty shown in the plot is the uncertainty of the predicted mean. Sce-
383 nario C has more data to predict in the one-step prediction approach used to calculate
384 this mean due to its prediction window starting later. We suspect fewer cases early
385 on in the study period to be the cause of more uncertainty in the left panels of Fig-
386 ure 5. There is less uncertainty on the predictions in scenario C but we also observed
387 fewer cases (the incidence was low in the summer). Due to the time-sensitive nature of
388 the policy questions being considered, the focus of this work was not calibration (the
389 match of observations and predictions) but rather the differences in scenarios. How-
390 ever, we note that there are greater discrepancies between the predicted number of
391 cases and the true number of cases for the real scenario in the analysis of scenario B
392 (Figure 6). Scenario B underestimates the number of cases while Scenario C some-
393 times overestimates the number while the total number of observed cases is within the
394 predictions. The predicted means are made on the basis of the same model which was
395 fit over the entire study period (Figure 1). The reason for predicting a 90 day window
396 rather than the entire year is that we find it unlikely that a decision maker at a public
397 health agency would not revisit a decision made within a 90 day period, so predicting
398 cases until the end of the period the model is fit on strikes us as a less useful exer-
399 cise. Additionally the biology of the disease changed due to a different variant of the
400 disease becoming dominant (“delta”/B.1.617.2) in the ecological niche and this infor-
401 mation is not included in our modelling work. Indeed, the model does not have change
402 points and the large increase in cases at the end of the study period (which the model
403 is fit to) might influence its ability to predict lower case counts.

404 We briefly summarise the comparison of results with the Zurich analysis [see Bekker-
405 Nielsen Dunbar et al., 2022, for details]. By virtue of the shorter time frame of the
406 earlier analysis, we are unable to note similarities and differences with scenario C as
407 this information is not available at Zurich level. The model for Zurich contains more

408 effects than the model used here. The Zurich model has $\beta_{\text{weekdays}}^{(\nu)}$, $\beta_t^{(\phi)}$, $\beta_{\text{testing rate}}^{(\nu)}$,
409 and $\beta_{\text{testing rate}}^{(\nu)}$. Notably, the Zurich analysis has additional time effects while our cur-
410 rent model only contains a non-linear time trend in the form of the sine-cosine waves.
411 While the models are different, the estimated discrete-time serial interval \hat{u}_d is sim-
412 ilar. Some of the building blocks used to construct the models are the same for the
413 two studies: $p_{s,t}$ and d_s are the same in the two studies. The relative increase (de-
414 termined by calculating the ratio of predicted cases under scenario B and scenario
415 A) takes values closer to 1 (no difference) for all age groups but the youngest. For
416 Zurich the relative increase in these age groups is no more than five per cent, while
417 it is slightly larger for the current work (ranging from 1.05 to 1.82 compared to 1.01
418 to 1.05). Many of the P_{90} values in Table 3 are a ten-fold increase with those found
419 for Zurich. The ratio for the youngest age group (0–14) is much greater in the current
420 work with no overlap with the values found in the previous work.

421 Finally we note that the existence of pharmaceutical countermeasures does not
422 guarantee their use. Vaccines are recommended to prevent disease, disability, and
423 death in children [World Health Organization, 2022]. However, with novel vaccines
424 for pandemic control, children may be included in secondary but not primary trials
425 and so may not be included in immunisation programmes as soon as a prophylaxis is
426 tested safe and made available to the population. For this reason, we believe gaining
427 an understanding of the impact of school closures in the absence of vaccine to still be
428 an interesting and relevant area of research.

429 **Data Availability Statement**

430 The protocol for this study can be accessed at <https://osf.io/fgrdy> which includes
431 description of where to source data used. The code used in this work can be accessed

432 at <https://gitlab.switch.ch/suspend/COVID-19-school-CH>. The majority of the
433 data used in this work is publicly available; descriptions and access options can be
434 found in the study protocol [Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar et al., 2022].

435 Acknowledgements

436 This work is funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (<https://data.snf.ch/covid-19/snsf/196247>). The authors declare no conflicts of interest besides some
437 being guardians of children and some being residents of Switzerland and so have an
438 interest in determining the overall benefit of school closures.
439

440 References

- 441 [1] B. J. Cowling, E. H. Y. Lau, C. L. H. Lam, C. K. Y. Cheng, J. Kovar, K. H.
442 Chan, J. S. Malik Peiris, and G. M. Leung. Effects of school closures, 2008
443 winter influenza season, Hong Kong. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.*, 14(10), 2008. DOI
444 [10.3201/eid1410.080646](https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1410.080646).
- 445 [2] M. Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar, F. Hofmann, and L. Held. Assessing the effect of
446 school closures on the spread of COVID-19 in Zurich. *J. R. Stat. Soc. A*, 2022.
447 DOI [10.1111/rssa.12910](https://doi.org/10.1111/rssa.12910).
- 448 [3] M. L. Brandeau, J. H. McCoy, N. Hupert, J.-E. Holty, and D. M. Bravata. Rec-
449 ommendations for modeling disaster responses in public health and medicine: A
450 position paper of the society for medical decision making. *Med. Decis. Mak.*, 29
451 (4):438–460, 2009. DOI [10.1177/0272989X09340346](https://doi.org/10.1177/0272989X09340346).

- 452 [4] B. Dahn, V. Mussah, and C. Nutt. Opinion: Yes, we were warned about Ebola,
453 2015. URL [https://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/08/opinion/yes-we-were-](https://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/08/opinion/yes-we-were-warned-about-ebola.html)
454 [warned-about-ebola.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/08/opinion/yes-we-were-warned-about-ebola.html). accessed: 11th January 2022.
- 455 [5] M. Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar, F. Hofmann, S. Meyer, and L. Held. Assessing the
456 impact of school closure on the spread of COVID-19 among different age groups
457 in Switzerland: Pre-existing data analysis protocol and statistical analysis plan,
458 2022.
- 459 [6] S. Meyer and L. Held. Incorporating social contact data in spatio-temporal
460 models for infectious disease spread. *Biostatistics*, 18:338–351, 2017. DOI
461 [10.1093/biostatistics/kxw051](https://doi.org/10.1093/biostatistics/kxw051).
- 462 [7] T. Hoang, P. Coletti, A. Melegaro, J. Wallinga, C. G. Grijalva, J. W. Edmunds,
463 P. Beutels, and N. Hens. A systematic review of social contact surveys to inform
464 transmission models of close-contact infections. *Epidemiology*, 30(5), 2019. DOI
465 [10.1097/EDE.0000000000001047](https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0000000000001047).
- 466 [8] D. Mistry, M. Litvinova, A. Pastore y Piontti, M. Chinazzi, L. Fumanelli,
467 M. F. C. Gomes, S. A. Haque, Q.-H. Liu, K. Mu, X. Xiong, M. E. Halloran, I. M.
468 Longini, S. Merler, M. Ajelli, and A. Vespignani. Inferring high-resolution hu-
469 man mixing patterns for disease modeling. *Nat. Commun*, 12(323), 2021. DOI
470 [10.1038/s41467-020-20544-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-20544-y).
- 471 [9] Laboratory for the Modeling of Biological and Socio-technical Systems. mixing-
472 patterns, 2021. URL <https://github.com/mobs-lab/mixing-patterns>.
- 473 [10] Schweizerische Konferenz der kantonalen Erziehungsdirektoren. Schulferien 2020,
474 2018. URL <https://edudoc.ch/record/131016?ln=de>.

- 475 [11] Eurostat. Population on 1 January by age group, sex and NUTS 3 re-
476 gion (demo_r_pjangrp3), 2021. URL [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/
477 databrowser/view/demo_r_pjangrp3/default/table?lang=en](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/demo_r_pjangrp3/default/table?lang=en).
- 478 [12] Eurostat. Population on 1 January by age and sex (demo_pjan), 2021. URL
479 [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/demo_pjan/default/
480 table?lang=en](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/demo_pjan/default/table?lang=en).
- 481 [13] M. Grimée, M. Bekker-Nielsen Dunbar, F. Hofmann, and L. Held. Modelling
482 the effect of a border closure between Switzerland and Italy on the spatiotem-
483 poral spread of COVID-19 in Switzerland. *Spat. Stat*, page 100552, 2021. DOI
484 [10.1016/j.spasta.2021.100552](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spasta.2021.100552).
- 485 [14] J. Bracher and L. Held. Endemic-epidemic models with discrete-time serial in-
486 terval distributions for infectious disease prediction. *Int. J. Forecast*, 38(3):1221–
487 1233, 2022. DOI [10.1016/j.ijforecast.2020.07.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2020.07.002).
- 488 [15] M. Paul, L. Held, and A. M. Toschke. Multivariate modelling of infectious disease
489 surveillance data. *Stat. Med*, 27(29):6250–6267, 2008. DOI [10.1002/sim.3440](https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.3440).
- 490 [16] L. Held, S. Meyer, and J. Bracher. Probabilistic forecasting in infectious disease
491 epidemiology: the 13th Armitage lecture. *Stat. Med*, 36(22):3443–3460, 2017. DOI
492 [10.1002/sim.7363](https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.7363).
- 493 [17] A. Endo, M. Uchida, N. Hayashi, Y. Liu, K. E. Atkins, A. J. Kucharski, and
494 S. Funk. Within and between classroom transmission patterns of seasonal in-
495 fluenza among primary school students in Matsumoto city, Japan. *Proc. Natl.
496 Acad. Sci*, 118(46):e2112605118, 2021. DOI [10.1073/pnas.2112605118](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2112605118).
- 497 [18] World Health Organization. Pocket book of primary health care for children
498 and adolescents: guidelines for health promotion, disease prevention and man-

499 agement from the newborn period to adolescence (2022), 2022. URL [https:](https://www.euro.who.int/en/publications/abstracts/pocket-book-of-primary-)
500 /[/www.euro.who.int/en/publications/abstracts/pocket-book-of-primary-](https://www.euro.who.int/en/publications/abstracts/pocket-book-of-primary-)
501 [health-care-for-children-and-adolescents-guidelines-for-health-](https://www.euro.who.int/en/publications/abstracts/pocket-book-of-primary-)
502 [promotion,-disease-prevention-and-management-from-the-newborn-](https://www.euro.who.int/en/publications/abstracts/pocket-book-of-primary-)
503 [period-to-adolescence-2022.](https://www.euro.who.int/en/publications/abstracts/pocket-book-of-primary-)