

1 Title
2 **Effect of an enhanced public health contact tracing intervention on the secondary**
3 **transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in educational settings: the four-way decomposition**
4 **analysis**

5

6 Olivera Djuric^{1,2*}, Elisabetta Larosa³, Mariateresa Cassinadri³, Silvia Cilloni³, Eufemia
7 Bisaccia³, Davide Pepe³, Laura Bonvicini¹, Massimo Vicentini¹, Francesco Venturelli¹, Paolo
8 Giorgi Rossi¹, Patrizio Pezzotti⁴, Alberto Mateo Urdiales⁴, Emanuela Bedeschi³, and the
9 Reggio Emilia Covid-19 Working Group.

10

11 Author affiliations:

12 ¹ Epidemiology Unit, Azienda Unità Sanitaria Locale – IRCCS di Reggio Emilia, Reggio
13 Emilia, Italy

14 ² Centre for Environmental, Nutritional and Genetic Epidemiology (CREAGEN), University
15 of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy

16 ³ Public Health Unit, Azienda Unità Sanitaria Locale-IRCCS di Reggio Emilia, Reggio
17 Emilia, Italy.

18 ⁴ Istituto Superiore di Sanità, Rome, Italy

19

20 *Corresponding author:

21 Olivera Djuric, MD, PhD

22 Azienda Unità Sanitaria Locale – IRCCS di Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy

23 Email: olivera.duric@ausl.re.it

24 [Tel: +390522335278](tel:+390522335278)

25 ORCID: 0000-0002-8574-5938

26

27

28 **Abstract**

29 **Background:** We assessed the impact of testing contacts immediately instead of at the end of
30 quarantine on the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in schools in Reggio Emilia Province.

31 **Methods:** We analysed surveillance data on notification of COVID-19 cases in schools
32 between 1 September 2020 and 4 April 2021.

33 **Results:** Median tracing delay decreased from 7 to 3.1 days and the percentage of the known
34 infection source increased from 34% to 54.8% (IRR 1.61 1.40-1.86). Implementation of
35 prompt contact tracing was associated with a 10% decrease in the number of secondary cases
36 (excess relative risk, EER -0.1 95%CI -0.35 to 0.15). Knowing the source of infection of the
37 index case led to a decrease in secondary transmission (IRR 0.75 95% CI 0.63-0.91) while
38 the decrease in tracing delay was associated with decreased risk of secondary cases (1/IRR
39 0.97 95%CI 0.94-1.01 per one day of delay). The direct effect of the intervention accounted
40 for the 29% decrease in the number of secondary cases (EER -0.29 95% -0.61 to 0.03).

41 **Conclusions:** Prompt contact testing in the community seems to reduce the time of contact
42 tracing and increases the ability to identify the source of infection in school outbreaks. Yet,
43 observed differences can be also due to differences in the force of infection and to other
44 control measures put in place.

45 **Funding:** This project was carried out with the technical and financial support of the Italian
46 Ministry of Health – CCM 2020 and Ricerca Corrente Annual Program 2023.

47 **Keywords:** COVID-19, schools, attack rate, contact tracing, mediation analysis

48

49

50

51 **Background**

52 Closure of educational institutions was one of the non-pharmacological infection control
53 measures often adopted during the pandemic of SARS-CoV-2, mostly based on the temporal
54 coincidence between schools reopening and COVID-19 outbreaks in some countries and the
55 concern regarding potential school-to-home transmissions of the virus from students to more
56 susceptible family members.

57 Evidence on the SARS-CoV-2 transmission in educational settings indicates not only that
58 schools opening and closing have a small impact on the increase or decrease of SARS-CoV-2
59 rates in the population, but that transmission is even lower in schools than that in the general
60 population [1-3]. However, the risk of in-school SARS-CoV-2 transmission is still considered
61 high, making prevention measures vital to restoring in-person learning [4,5]. The control of
62 infection in school-age children became even more critical after the introduction of mass
63 vaccination, which reduced transmission between adults, and with the spread of the Omicron
64 variant, which has much higher transmissibility in indoor settings.

65 Timely reporting of COVID-19 cases to the health authorities and case investigation,
66 followed by timely testing, contact tracing, and isolation, remain crucial to allow safe
67 resumption of in-presence activities. Contact tracing practices have been subject to changes
68 over time along with emerging evidence and the introduction of the vaccine. While the
69 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommends that people get tested at least
70 after five days from close contact with a person with COVID-19 [6,7], the European Centre
71 for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) recommends testing all high-risk exposure
72 contacts, whether vaccinated or not, as soon as possible after they have been identified to
73 allow for further contact tracing [4,5]. Regardless of this, it has always been acknowledged


74 that isolation of contacts is effective if initiated shortly after confirmation of the index case
75 since the delay in isolation of contacts has a major impact on the transmission of the virus [8].

76 Enhanced contact tracing, such as backward contact tracing (BCT), has also been
77 recommended to facilitate the identification of the primary case, also called “source” or
78 “original” case from which an index case acquired his/her infection [5,7]. The rationale
79 behind this recommendation is to stop chain transmission that originates from this relatively
80 small proportion of primary cases usually responsible for a large proportion of transmission.

81 By extending contact tracing window or performing source investigation, BCT aims to
82 identify asymptomatic cases that are the actual source of newly detected (index) cases.
83 Modelling studies show that primary cases generate 3-10 times more infections than a
84 randomly chosen case [9]. These cases would not have otherwise been identified and, in the
85 case of educational settings, would not have been linked to school investigation. Given that
86 BCT tend to “catch” infection sources at the end of their infectious period, if the BCT is
87 highly susceptible to testing and contact tracing delays, therefore it is meaningful only in the
88 presence of prompt tracing of contacts [10].

89 Starting from 27 November 2020, the local health authority of Reggio Emilia, Italy, improved
90 contact tracing protocols by introducing a prompt molecular tests for all contacts, whether
91 symptomatic or asymptomatic, at the beginning of quarantine (test to trace), with the aim to
92 identify all possible sources of infection in asymptomatic contacts. Before the intervention,
93 contacts of index cases were only tested at the end of the isolation period (test to release). In
94 this way, primary (asymptomatic) cases were not diagnosed or were diagnosed very late in
95 their infection course and, given that they were not attending school since they were isolated,
96 they were not indicated as a school contact until one of the school contacts become
97 symptomatic (Figure 1). Given that a large part of the infections in students is asymptomatic
98 or paucisymptomatic, they are often identified when an adult in the same household presents

99 symptoms. Prompt testing of all contacts in community allows the timely identification of
100 positive children/teachers who may be primary cases in school outbreaks. Thus, allowing a
101 prompt investigation in the school setting to start.



102

103 **Fig. 1.** Simplified illustration of the pre and post intervention scenarios. In panel A we report
104 the scenario without prompt contact testing in community and its effect on the SARS-CoV-2
105 transmission in educational setting. Day 0: One of the children in a household became
106 infected (primary case) but asymptomatic (grey). Day 5: One parent and one classmate
107 became infected, also asymptomatic (grey). Day 10: The infected parent became
108 symptomatic (orange), tested positive (red circle) and considered as index case of the
109 household. Entire family is quarantined (bold line) but not tested. Meanwhile, primary case
110 transmit infection further to two other classmates while index case transmit infection to a co-
111 worker. Classmates of the primary case are not tested because they are not identified as
112 school contacts due to late testing of the household contacts. The contact co-worker is
113 isolated but not tested promptly. Day 20: Family members of the index case are tested at the
114 end of the quarantine. One positive classmate of the primary case became symptomatic,
115 tested positive and considered an index case in the school cluster given that the classmates
116 were not considered contacts of the primary case since he was already isolated. Other
117 classmates are tested only when an index case occur. Panel B illustrates the scenario with
118 prompt contact testing in community. Day 10: The infected parent became symptomatic,
119 tested positive and entire family is quarantined and tested at the beginning of quarantine.

120 Primary case is identified promptly; his classmates are identified as contacts, tested and
121 isolated preventing further transmission of the virus.
122

123 This study aimed to estimate the impact of changing contact tracing intervention from testing
124 contacts at the end of quarantine to testing contacts immediately, on the secondary
125 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in educational settings in Reggio Emilia Province. To better
126 understand the mechanism of the possible impact that the intervention has on secondary
127 transmission, we assessed whether this association is mediated by two process indicators,
128 tracing delay and known source of infection of the index case, which was the actual target of
129 the intervention, bearing in mind limits of the before-and-after design of this study conducted
130 in a period when several changes could confound the results.

131 **Methods**

132 *Design and setting*

133 In the present study, population-based surveillance data were analysed including 1 604
134 consecutive positive cases confirmed with RT-PCR for SARS-COV-2 infection between 1
135 September 2020 and 4 April 2021 in Reggio Emilia Province that led to an epidemiological
136 investigation among children and adolescents (0–19 years old) or school staff in 1 884 classes
137 who may have been exposed or in contact with positive cases at school.

138 In Reggio Emilia Province (531 751 inhabitants, Emilia Romagna, Northern Italy) there are
139 approximately 95 000 inhabitants from 6 months-olds to 19-year-olds attending infant-toddler
140 centres (ages 0-3), preschools (ages 3-5), primary schools (ages 6-10), middle schools (ages
141 11-13) and high schools (ages 14-19), and about 12 000 teachers/ school staff members.

142 During the study period, there were two peaks of infections: in November 2020 and in
143 February/March 2021 (Supplementary file 1) [11]. After the school reopening on 1 September
144 2020 for preschool and remedial courses and, on 15 September 2020, for the regular school

145 year, in-class learning was in place until 26 October 2020 when policies to reduce crowding
146 especially in high schools were introduced (reducing the in-class time by 50% to 75%) as
147 were several short closures in the periods of highest incidence. In addition, because of the
148 high circulation of the virus, the Christmas school holidays were extended to the second week
149 of January (from 20 December to 11/15 January). Another lockdown led to the closing of
150 schools on 3 March 2021. Only infant-toddler centres and preschools, schools that require
151 laboratory work, and schools with pupils with disabilities or special needs continued in-
152 presence didactic activities.

153 Infection control measures in place during the study period were previously described in
154 detail [12-14].

155 ***Intervention***

156 Starting from 27 November 2020, the local health authority improved contact tracing
157 protocols and introduced immediate molecular tests for all contacts, whether symptomatic or
158 asymptomatic, at the beginning of quarantine, with the aim to identify all possible sources of
159 infection in asymptomatic contacts and facilitate backward tracing [13]. This strategy was
160 applied to all contacts, independently from the setting of infection, including all household
161 members of sporadic cases, and particular attention was given to testing of children and
162 adolescents because they were most commonly asymptomatic (Supplementary file 2). This
163 strategy was explicitly thought to correctly identify in a timely manner the contacts of
164 asymptomatic cases before they started the quarantine. Testing only at the end of quarantine
165 guarantees a safe return to the community of contacts and to identify secondary transmission
166 in the cluster, but, by definition, assumes that the asymptomatic cases are secondary cases
167 and became infectious during the quarantine and thus could not have contacts.

168 ***Outcome and variables of interest***

169 The main outcome was the number of secondary cases per class. Two process indicators of
170 contact tracing performance were considered: the first one, tracing delay, was calculated as
171 the time from swab positivity of the index case to the date on which the swab for (the
172 majority of) classmates was scheduled; the second indicator was the proportion of index
173 cases who had close contact with a known COVID-19 case in the ten days before the onset of
174 symptoms or diagnosis. This indicator, called “the known source of infection of the index
175 case”, is a proxy of backward contact tracing success which should reflect the extent to which
176 school index cases were tested and linked to the school investigation because of a known
177 contact with a positive person. Delay in the diagnosis of the index case was also calculated,
178 as the number of days between symptom onset and the date of swab positivity, but this
179 indicator is expected to only be marginally influenced by contact tracing strategies.

180 ***Definitions and assumptions***

181 The first case that tested positive (considering the date on which the swab was done) per class
182 was considered an index case. If more than one case in a class tested positive on the same
183 day, the one with the earliest symptom onset was considered the index case. The same class
184 can be included more than once in the analysis because it may have been involved in more
185 than one investigation during the study period.

186 When more than one class was included in a between-class transmission, index cases
187 belonging to different classes had shared exposures, or there was a single index case for more
188 than one class (usually, but not only, when the index case was a teacher), this was considered
189 a multi-class cluster.

190 Overall attack rate was calculated by dividing the number of cases by the population at risk;
191 i.e., classmates, teachers/staff who had had close contact with the index case in a period

192 starting from 48h before symptom onset of the symptomatic index case and, for
193 asymptomatic cases, 48h before diagnosis.

194 If a classmate was already in isolation prior to symptom onset or swab positivity of the index
195 case, due to contact with a positive person or re-entry from abroad, he/she was excluded from
196 the denominator. Any student or staff who refused to perform a swab was excluded from the
197 denominator.

198 *Data sources*

199 Following the identification and notification of a COVID-19 case, qualified Public Health
200 Department (PHD) personnel performed a detailed field investigation and managed the index
201 case, and identified contacts according to the regional recommendations and control measures
202 in place. Comprehensive surveillance data containing information on index cases, contacts,
203 school and class characteristics, swabs performed, secondary cases, and measures undertaken,
204 were collected by PHD, and stored in electronic forms. Each case and cluster was re-
205 abstracted by a study investigator and checked for consistency and plausibility. Missing data
206 were imputed from the COVID-19 Surveillance Registry software and a de-identified
207 research database was constructed for the analysis.

208 *Statistical analysis*

209 During the study period many factors that could influence secondary transmission in schools
210 occurred, including change in overall incidence, changes in in-school and out-of-school
211 (especially transports and leisure-time activities) control measure, time of in-person and
212 distance teaching, and the spread of the Alpha variant. Therefore, simply measuring the
213 outcome before and after the intervention would be surely biased and would not allow any
214 causal inference.

215 To test the hypothesis that the contact tracing strategy in the community had an impact on the
216 secondary case transmission in schools, we first assessed if the introduction of the new
217 strategy actually changed the tracing process analysing the trend of the timeliness of testing
218 and the proportion of index cases with a known source of infection during the study period.
219 The class was the statistical unit for analyses. Median testing delay and the proportion of
220 index cases with the known source of infection were compared before and after
221 implementation of the intervention (27 November 2020). Secondly, we tested the association
222 between the two process indicators that were the direct target of the new tracing strategy and
223 the final health outcome (number of secondary cases). Two negative binomial regression
224 models were constructed with the number of secondary cases per class as outcome and
225 intervention indicators, tracing delay and known infection source as exposures. Incidence rate
226 ratios with a 95% confidence interval (CI) were reported. Models were adjusted for types of
227 school (infant-toddler centre, primary school, middle school, high school, other educational
228 services), class size (<21 and ≥ 21 pupils), and types of index case (student vs. teacher). Given
229 that tracing delay and known contact were strongly negatively correlated ($r = -0.76$), their
230 effects were analysed separately.

231 Lastly, a novel effect decomposition method was used in a subset of pre-Alpha variant
232 (before 31.12.2020) classes to test whether one of the two process indicators mediated the
233 association between intervention and the number of secondary cases (Supplementary file 3).
234 The total effect of the intervention on the number of secondary cases is expressed as the
235 excess relative risk (ERR); i.e., an incidence risk ratio (IRR) from the negative binomial
236 regression minus one. In the presence of an exposure-mediator interaction ERR is
237 decomposed into four components: controlled directed effect (CDE) due to intervention only,
238 at a fixed level of the mediator; pure indirect effect (PIE) due to mediation only; reference
239 interaction (IntRef) due to interaction only; and mediated interaction (IntMed) due to

240 mediation and interaction [15]. Given that classes could not be randomly assigned to the
241 intervention and control group, and that the period before the intervention was used for the
242 comparison, we assume that there might be a significant interaction between the period
243 before and after intervention and two mediators. Stata's 'Med4way' command was used to
244 estimate mediation and interaction effects simultaneously [16]. The Stata code used is
245 provided in the Supplementary file 4. All analyses in this study were conducted using
246 STATA 13.0 SE (Stata Corporation, Texas, TX).

247 **Results**

248 *Description of investigated classes and secondary transmission*

249 We investigated 1884 classes overall, 1882 in which at least one case/contact was recorded,
250 and two classes where screening was done due to out-of-school contact with an index case
251 from another class. One thousand seven hundred and five secondary cases (1047 students and
252 658 teachers/staff) were identified among 43214 tested contacts linked to 1604 index cases,
253 resulting in an overall secondary attack rate of 3.9% (95%CI 3.8-4.1).

254 The median number of secondary cases per class was 1 (IQR 1-3); 2 before, and 1 after the
255 intervention (test of equal medians 0.83) (Table 1). The proportion of classes where
256 secondary transmission occurred was overall 38.6%; 37.4% and 39.0% before and after the
257 intervention, respectively ($p = 0.51$).

258 The number of symptomatic index cases significantly decreased in the period after
259 intervention from 85.3% to 80% (IRR 0.94 95%CI 0.89-0.98). There were no changes in the
260 number of classes that made up part of a multi-class cluster, as well as in the type of index
261 case.

262 **Table 1.** Characteristics of 1 884 classes and 1 604 index cases for which a school contact
 263 with Covid-19 cases was suspected, before and after the intervention

	n (%)	Before intervention n=490	After intervention n=1394	RR (95%CI)	p-value*
Classes (n=1884)					
Type of school					
Infant-toddler centre	350 (18.5)	107 (21.8)	243 (17.4)	ref	0.028
Primary school	540 (28.7)	125 (25.5)	415 (29.8)	1.17 (1.03-1.34)	
Middle school	496 (26.3)	128 (26.1)	368 (26.4)	1.11 (0.97-1.26)	
High school	478 (25.4)	129 (26.3)	349 (25.0)	1.08 (0.94-1.23)	
Other educational services	20 (1.1)	1 (0.2)	19 (1.4)	na	
Calendar period					
September/October	248 (13.1)				
November	263 (13.9)				
December	316 (16.8)				
January	265 (14.1)				
February	523 (27.8)				
March/April	269 (14.3)				
Class size					
<21	862 (45.7)	191 (39.0)	671 (48.1)	ref	<0.001
≥21	1 011 (53.7)	293 (59.8)	718 (51.5)	0.85 (0.78-0.93)	
Missing	11 (0.6)	6 (1.2)	5 (0.4)		
Secondary transmission					
No	1 157 (61.4)	307 (62.6)	850 (61.0)		0.512
Yes	727 (38.6)	183 (37.4)	544 (39.0)		
Number of secondary cases^	1 (1-3)	2 (1-3)	1 (1-3)		0.830
Part of a school cluster					
No	1 367 (72.6)	368 (75.1)	999 (71.7)	ref	0.142
Yes	517 (27.4)	122 (24.9)	395 (28.3)	1.14 (0.95-1.35)	
Tracing delay^	3 (2-5)	7 (5-10)	3 (2-4)	na	<0.001
Testing delay^	4 (2-8)	5 (3-8)	4 (2-7)	na	<0.001
Index cases (n=1604)					
Type of index case					
Student	1 213 (75.6)	321 (74.8)	892 (75.9)	ref	0.613
Teacher	391 (24.4)	108 (25.2)	283 (24.1)	0.96 (0.79-1.16)	
Index case symptomatic					
No	298 (18.6)	63 (14.7)	235 (20)	ref	0.018
Yes	1 306 (81.4)	366 (85.3)	940 (80)	0.94 (0.89-0.98)	
Potential source of infection					
Unknown	814 (50.7)	283 (66.0)	531 (45.2)	ref	<0.001
Known	790 (49.3)	146 (34.0)	644 (54.8)	1.61 (1.40-1.86)	
Type of source					
Household outbreak	614 (77.7)	97 (66.4)	517 (80.3)	ref	<0.001
Social contact	26 (3.3)	7 (4.8)	19 (2.9)	1.03 (0.98-1.09)	
Sport contact	18 (2.3)	7 (4.8)	11 (1.7)	1.05 (1.00-1.11)	

Unidentifiable contact 132 (16.7) 35 (24.0) 97 (15.1) 1.15 (1.03-1.28)

264 *Chi-square or Mann Whitney test


265 †Median (IQR), calculated only in classes with secondary transmission

266

267 **Association between intervention and indicators**

268 Overall median tracing delay was 3 days (IQR 2-5), decreasing from 7 (IQR 5-10) in the
 269 period before intervention to 3.1 (IQR 2-4) days in the period after intervention (Table 1).

270 The testing delay also significantly decreased from 5 to 4 days following the implementation
 271 of the intervention. The percentage of index cases with a known source of infection was
 272 49.3%, and it increased from 34% in November to 54.8% in the period after intervention
 273 (IRR 1.61 95%CI 1.40-1.86). The number of index cases that were part of a household
 274 outbreak increased from 66.4% before intervention to 80.3% after the intervention. Weekly
 275 average contact tracing delay decreased while the percentage of known sources of infection
 276 increased in the period after intervention implementation (Figure 2).



278 **Fig. 2.** Weekly average contact tracing delay and percentage of index cases with a known
 279 source of infection.

280 Results of negative binomial regression covering the entire period show that both known
281 source of infection (IRR 0.75 95%CI 0.63-0.91) and decrease in tracing delay (1/IRR 0.97
282 95%CI 0.94-1.01 per one day of delay) were associated with the decrease of the number of
283 secondary cases (Table 2). Sensitivity analyses restricted to the period before the spread of
284 the Alpha variant showed similar results (Table 2).

285 **Table 2.** Negative binomial regression of the association between the number of secondary
286 cases (outcome) and intervention promptness indicators (exposure)

	Entire period (n=1 884)		Before Alpha variant (n=827)	
	IRR*	95%CI	IRR*	95%CI
Tracing delay	1.08	0.89-1.30	1.23	0.95-1.61
Known source of infection of the index case	0.75	0.63-0.91	0.73	0.55-0.96

287 *Adjusted for the type of school, type of index case, and class size.

288

289 *Mediation analysis*

290 Only the known source of infection of the index case was significantly associated with the
291 outcome (number of secondary cases) in multivariate analysis and it was therefore tested for
292 the mediation and interaction in the four-way decomposition method.

293 Implementation of prompt contact tracing was associated with a 10% decrease in the number
294 of secondary cases (EER -0.1 95%CI -0.35 to 0.15) (Table 3). The direct effect of the
295 intervention accounted for the large part of the excess in risk (EER -0.29 95% -0.61 to 0.03),
296 leading to the 29% decrease in the number of secondary cases if the source of infection of the
297 index case is known. Interaction only accounted for the other large part of the excess risk
298 (EER 0.35 95% 0.03 to 0.68); knowing the source of infection of the index case in the period
299 before the intervention when tracing delay was high, would significantly increase the risk of
300 secondary cases by 35%. However, we found evidence of mediated interaction that had a

301 negative effect on the secondary transmission (EER -0.14 95%CI -0.28 to -0.01). The known
302 source of infection of the index case alone accounted for only a small percent of the reduction
303 of excess risk (EER -0.02 95% -0.10 to 0.07).

304 **Table 3.** Four-way decomposition mediation analysis of the association between intervention
305 and number of secondary cases

	ERR*	95%CI	p-value
Total effect	-0.1	-0.35 to 0.15	0.441
Controlled direct effect			
Known contact (M=1)	-0.29	-0.61 to 0.03	0.074
Unknown contact (M=0)	0.31	-0.49 to -0.02	
Pure indirect effect	-0.02	-0.10 to 0.07	0.709
Mediated interaction	-0.14	-0.28 to -0.01	0.041
Reference interaction			
Known contact (M=1)	0.35	0.03 to 0.68	0.033
Unknown contact (M=0)	-0.25	-0.49 to -0.02	0.036

306 *Adjusted for the type of school, type of index case, and class size.

307 ERR, excess relative risk; M, mediator.

308

309

310 **Discussion**

311 We found that both process indicators used to evaluate contact tracing intervention (tracing
312 delay and known source of infection of the index case) improved after implementation of the
313 public health intervention while the median number of secondary cases decreased, despite the
314 higher daily absolute number of classes investigated in the period after the intervention.

315 However, only the known source of infection of the index case evinced a significant
316 association with a decrease in secondary transmission in school classes.

317 Our findings are consistent with those of modelling studies reporting that contact tracing
318 efficacy decreases sharply with increasing delays between symptom onset and tracing and
319 with a lower fraction of symptomatic infections being tested [8,17,18]. Observational studies
320 also demonstrated that various improvements in contact tracing [19] can reduce the secondary

321 transmission or even mortality in the community [20], but there is no data on how it reflects
322 in educational settings.

323 Our results suggest that there is a modest association between the intervention and the
324 number of secondary cases. It has been shown that the effectiveness of contact tracing highly
325 depends on the number of cases being traced; i.e., it decreases when the burden of new cases
326 is too high for the tracing capacity of the health services [17]. In fact, BCT is more effective
327 when community transmission is low to moderate [21]. Similarly, increased new cases burden
328 and high transmission during the winter months in our study could be factors that might have
329 minimised the true effect of the intervention.

330 Interestingly, tracing delay was not significantly associated with the decrease in the
331 secondary transmission in schools, despite its notable decrease after intervention
332 implementation. This unexpected finding might be explained by two factors. Firstly, before
333 the intervention, most classes were put in quarantine immediately independently of the
334 presence of secondary transmission in the class, considering all classmates as close contacts,
335 thus, delay in testing was not relevant for secondary transmission in these classes.

336 Furthermore, the unmeasured tracing delay in the family/community better reflects the
337 intervention efficacy and represents the timeliness in linking SARS-CoV-2 positive children
338 to the school investigation. A better link between sporadic cases in households to school
339 exposure after the intervention implementation is also supported by the higher fraction of
340 asymptomatic index cases identified as well as the higher fraction of index cases that were
341 part of a household cluster.

342 The direct effect of the intervention would lead to an almost 30% reduction in secondary
343 transmission if the source of infection of all index cases was known. Moreover, the known
344 source of infection had a greater impact on the secondary transmission when acting in the

345 interaction with the intervention than independently (14% vs. 2% reduction in the number of
346 secondary cases).

347 The four-way decomposition analysis also showed that interaction alone accounted for a
348 considerable part of the excess risk associated with the intervention. This practically means
349 that knowing the source of infection of the index case in the period before the intervention,
350 i.e., when contacts are not promptly tested, would have had a substantially detrimental effect
351 on the secondary cases (35% increase). This possibly reflects that, before the intervention,
352 often the source of infection for the school index case was identified during the field
353 investigation and not before, thus, in the absence of BCT, knowing the source of infection is
354 not a sign of timeliness at all.

355 The major limitation of the study is its before-and-after design; i.e., the impossibility to make
356 an inference that observed changes are due to intervention and not due to other factors. In
357 fact, multivariate and mediation analysis may not be enough to control for the fact that the
358 force of infection was changing over the time series. However, under a public health
359 emergency, the only way to assess the effectiveness of an intervention is to design an
360 observational study that minimises the effect of confounding. A possible solution is testing
361 the effect of mediators strictly linked to the intervention process [22]. We adjusted analyses
362 for major sources of confounding, but there are still unmeasured confounders. In fact, we
363 could not classify the preventive measure put in place in each school, the time spent by each
364 index case in the classroom, or the out-school contacts between classmates. Another
365 important limitation is the lack of testing delay in a family/community as a process indicator,
366 that we consider one of the real mechanisms of action of the new tracing strategy (first grey
367 part of the DAG), but we assume this delay in the community follows the same trend as the
368 delay observed in schools. Lastly, the same intervention may not yield the same results in a
369 different epidemiological context, such as the presence of other variants of the virus

370 (Omicron), or different control measures. However, it can have important public health
371 implications in informing the management of the pandemic and the potential interaction
372 between control measures in the family and in the school.

373 To our knowledge, this is the only study that attempted to quantify the potential effect of
374 changing a contact tracing strategy in community on secondary transmission in schools by
375 estimating the excess risk associated with the intervention, through the application of a new
376 mediation analysis method which allowed to partition the total excess risk into separate
377 effects of the intervention and its process indicators in the presence of their interaction
378 (14,15). As such it can have important methodological implications as well.

379 **Conclusion**

380 Changing contact tracing strategy in the community, from testing contacts at the end of
381 quarantine to testing contacts immediately, reduced the time of contact tracing and increased
382 the ability to identify the source of infection in school outbreaks. The improvement in tracing
383 performance appears to be linked to a decrease in the number of secondary cases in school
384 contacts, although the intervention was implemented in a changing context just after the
385 incidence peak of the autumn wave, and we cannot exclude that the observed differences are
386 due to differences in the force of infection and to other control measures put in place before
387 as the reduction of in presence school attendance.

388 **Funding**

389 This project was carried out with the technical and financial support of the Italian Ministry
390 of Health – CCM 2020 and Ricerca Corrente Annual Program 2023.

391 **Declaration of competing Interests**

392 The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

393 **Author Contributions**

394 Data curation, formal analysis, methodology, visualization and writing original draft was
395 performed by Olivera Djuric. Material preparation, data collection and investigation were
396 performed by Elisabetta Larosa, Mariateresa Cassinadri, Silvia Cilloni, Eufemia Bisaccia,
397 Davide Pepe and Francesco Venturelli. Investigation, supervision and writing – review &
398 editing were performed by Massimo Vicentini. Laura Bonvicini contributed to formal
399 analysis and visualization. Alberto Mateo Urdiales contributed to methodology and formal
400 analysis. Conceptualization and methodology were done by Paolo Giorgi Rossi, Patrizio
401 Pezzotti and Emanuela Bedeschi. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

402 **Ethics approval**

403 The study was approved by the Area Vasta Emilia Nord Ethics Committee on 07/04/2020 n°
404 2020/0045199.

405 **Data availability statement**

406 According to Italian law, anonymized data can only be made publicly available if there is no
407 potential for the reidentification of individuals (<https://www.garanteprivacy.it>). Thus, the
408 data underlying this study are available on request to researchers who meet the criteria for
409 access to confidential data. In order to obtain data, approval must be obtained from the Area
410 Vasta Emilia Nord (AVEN) Ethics Committee, who would then authorize us to provide
411 aggregated or anonymized data. Data access requests should be addressed to the Ethics
412 Committee at CEReggioemilia@ausl.re.it as well as to the authors at the Epidemiology unit
413 of AUSL-IRCCS of Reggio Emilia at info.epi@ausl.re.it, who are the data guardians.

414

415 **References**

- 416 1. Winje BA, Ofitserova TS, Brynildsrud OB, Greve-Isdahl M, Bragstad K, Rykkvin R,
417 Hungnes O, Lund HM, Nygård K, Meijerink H, Brandal LT. Comprehensive Contact
418 Tracing, Testing and Sequencing Show Limited Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 between
419 Children in Schools in Norway, August 2020 to May 2021. *Microorganisms*.
420 2021;9(12):2587. DOI: 10.3390/microorganisms9122587.
- 421 2. Gandini S, Rainisio M, Iannuzzo ML, Bellerba F, Cecconi F, Scorrano L. A cross-
422 sectional and prospective cohort study of the role of schools in the SARS-CoV-2 second
423 wave in Italy. *Lancet Reg Health Eur*. 2021;5:100092. DOI:
424 10.1016/j.lanpe.2021.100092.
- 425 3. Viner R, Waddington C, Mytton O, Booy R, Cruz J, Ward J, Ladhani S, Panovska-
426 Griffiths J, Bonell C, Melendez-Torres GJ. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by children
427 and young people in households and schools: a meta-analysis of population-based and
428 contact-tracing studies. *J Infect*. 2022;84(3):361-382. DOI: 10.1016/j.jinf.2021.12.026.
- 429 4. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Contact tracing: public health
430 management of persons, including healthcare workers, who have had contact with
431 COVID-19 cases in the European Union – third update, 18 November 2020. Stockholm:
432 ECDC; 2020. Available at:
433 [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/covid-19-contact-tracing-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/covid-19-contact-tracing-public-health-management-third-update.pdf)
434 [public-health-management-third-update.pdf](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/covid-19-contact-tracing-public-health-management-third-update.pdf). Accessed November 30, 2022.
- 435 5. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Contact tracing in the European
436 Union: public health management of persons, including healthcare workers, who have
437 had contact with COVID-19 cases – fourth update, 28 October 2021. Available at:
438 <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-19-contact-tracing-public-health-management>.
439 Accessed November 30, 2020.

- 440 6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Considerations for Case Investigation and
441 Contact Tracing in K-12 Schools and Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs). Last
442 updated April 22, 2021. Available at: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/contact-tracing.html)
443 [ncov/community/schools-childcare/contact-tracing.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/contact-tracing.html) Accessed November 30, 2020.
- 444 7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Operational Considerations for Adapting a
445 Contact Tracing Program to Respond to the COVID-19 Pandemic in non-US Settings.
446 Last updated September 22, 2021. Available at: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/global-covid-19/operational-considerations-contact-tracing.html)
447 [ncov/global-covid-19/operational-considerations-contact-tracing.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/global-covid-19/operational-considerations-contact-tracing.html) Accessed
448 November 30, 2020.
- 449 8. Kretzschmar ME, Rozhnova G, Bootsma MCJ, van Boven M, van de Wijgert JHHM,
450 Bonten MJM. Impact of delays on effectiveness of contact tracing strategies for COVID-
451 19: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health*. 2020;5(8):e452-e459. DOI: 10.1016/S2468-
452 2667(20)30157-2.
- 453 9. Endo A, Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases COVID-19
454 Working Group; Leclerc QJ, Knight GM, Medley GF, Atkins KE, Funk S, Kucharski AJ.
455 Implication of backward contact tracing in the presence of overdispersed transmission in
456 COVID-19 outbreaks. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2021;5:239. DOI:
457 10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16344.3.
- 458 10. Raymenants J, Geenen C, Thibaut J, Nelissen K, Gorissen S, Andre E. Empirical
459 evidence on the efficiency of backward contact tracing in COVID-19. *Nat Commun*.
460 2022;13(1):4750. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-022-32531-6.
- 461 11. Istituto Superiore di Sanità. Prevalenza e distribuzione delle varianti di SARS-CoV-2 di
462 interesse per la sanità pubblica in Italia. Rapporto n. 5 del 23 luglio 2021. July 2021. [in
463 Italian] Available at: [21](https://www.epicentro.iss.it/coronavirus/pdf/sars-cov-2-</p></div><div data-bbox=)

- 464 [monitoraggio-varianti-rapporti-periodici-23-luglio-2021.pdf](#) Accessed November 30,
465 2020.
- 466 12. Larosa E, Djuric O, Cassinadri M, Cilloni S, Bisaccia E, Vicentini M, Venturelli F,
467 Giorgi Rossi P, Pezzotti P, Bedeschi E; Reggio Emilia Covid-19 Working Group.
468 Secondary transmission of COVID-19 in preschool and school settings in northern Italy
469 after their reopening in September 2020: a population-based study. *Euro Surveill.*
470 2020;25(49):2001911. DOI: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.49.2001911.
- 471 13. Djuric O, Larosa E, Cassinadri M, Cilloni S, Bisaccia E, Pepe D, Vicentini M, Venturelli
472 F, Bonvicini L, Giorgi Rossi P, Pezzotti P, Mateo Urdiales A, Bedeschi E; Reggio Emilia
473 Covid-19 Working Group. Surveillance, contact tracing and characteristics of SARS-
474 CoV-2 transmission in educational settings in Northern Italy, September 2020 to April
475 2021. *PLoS One.* 2022;17(10):e0275667. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0275667.
- 476 14. Gruppo di Lavoro ISS MdS, Ministero dell'Istruzione, INAIL, Fondazione Bruno
477 Kessler, Regione Emilia-Romagna, Regione Veneto. Indicazioni operative per la
478 gestione di casi e focolai di SARS-CoV-2 nelle scuole e nei servizi educativi
479 dell'infanzia. [in Italian] Published August 21, 2020, last updated February 2, 2021.
480 http://www.salute.gov.it/imgs/C_17_pubblicazioni_2944_allegato.pdf. Accessed
481 November 30, 2020.
- 482 15. VanderWeele TJ. A unification of mediation and interaction: a 4-way decomposition.
483 *Epidemiology.* 2014;25(5):749-61. DOI: 10.1097/EDE.0000000000000121.
- 484 16. Discacciati A, Bellavia A, Lee JJ, Mazumdar M, Valeri L. Med4way: a Stata command
485 to investigate mediating and interactive mechanisms using the four-way effect
486 decomposition. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2019; 48(1): 15-20. DOI: 10.1093/ije/dyy236.

- 487 17. Gardner BJ, Kilpatrick AM. Contact tracing efficiency, transmission heterogeneity, and
488 accelerating COVID-19 epidemics. *PLoS Comput Biol.* 2021; 17(6): e1009122. DOI:
489 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009122.
- 490 18. Bradshaw WJ, Alley EC, Huggins JH, Lloyd AL, Esvelt KM. Bidirectional contact
491 tracing could dramatically improve COVID-19 control. *Nat Commun.* 2021;12(1):232.
492 DOI: 10.1038/s41467-020-20325-7.
- 493 19. Malheiro R, Figueiredo AL, Magalhães JP, Teixeira P, Moita I, Moutinho MC, Mansilha
494 RB, Gonçalves LM, Ferreira E. Effectiveness of contact tracing and quarantine on
495 reducing COVID-19 transmission: a retrospective cohort study. *Public Health.*
496 2020;189:54-59. DOI: 10.1016/j.puhe.2020.09.012.
- 497 20. Vecino-Ortiz AI, Villanueva Congote J, Zapata Bedoya S, Cucunuba ZM. Impact of
498 contact tracing on COVID-19 mortality: An impact evaluation using surveillance data
499 from Colombia. *PLoS ONE.* 2021;16(3): e0246987. DOI:
500 10.1371/journal.pone.0246987.
- 501 21. Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion (Public Health Ontario). Focus on:
502 backward contact tracing. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario; 2021. Available at:
503 [https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/documents/ncov/phm/2021/05/covid-19-](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/documents/ncov/phm/2021/05/covid-19-backward-contact-tracing.pdf?la=en)
504 [backward-contact-tracing.pdf?la=en](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/documents/ncov/phm/2021/05/covid-19-backward-contact-tracing.pdf?la=en) Accessed 16 February 2022.
- 505 22. Accorsi EK, Qiu X, Rumpler E, Kennedy-Shaffer L, Kahn R, Joshi K, Goldstein E,
506 Stensrud MJ, Niehus R, Cevik M, Lipsitch M. How to detect and reduce potential
507 sources of biases in studies of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19. *Eur J Epidemiol.*
508 2021;36(2):179-196. DOI: 10.1007/s10654-021-00727-7.