

# 1 Impacts of K-12 school reopening on the COVID-19 epidemic in 2 Indiana, USA

3 Guido España<sup>#</sup>, Sean Cavany<sup>\*</sup>, Rachel Oidtman<sup>\*</sup>, Carly Barbera,  
Alan Costello, Anita Lerch, Marya Poterek, Quan Tran, Annaliese Wieler  
Sean Moore, T. Alex Perkins<sup>#</sup>

Department of Biological Sciences and Eck Institute for Global Health,  
University of Notre Dame, United States

<sup>#</sup>Correspondence: [guido.espana@nd.edu](mailto:guido.espana@nd.edu), [taperkins@nd.edu](mailto:taperkins@nd.edu)

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution

## 4 Abstract

5 In the United States, schools closed in March 2020 due to COVID-19 and have begun reopening  
6 as of August 2020, despite continuing transmission of SARS-CoV-2. To determine the impact  
7 of school reopening with varying levels of operating capacity and face-mask adherence, we used  
8 an agent-based model calibrated to and validated against multiple data types from the state of  
9 Indiana, USA. In our model, transmission can occur in schools, workplaces, community settings,  
10 and households, all of which are structured in a realistic way according to state geography  
11 and demography. Using this model, we quantified the burden of COVID-19 on K-12 students,  
12 teachers, their families, and the general population under alternative scenarios about school  
13 reopening. In our primary analysis, we considered three levels of school operating capacity  
14 (50%, 75%, and 100%) and three assumptions about face-mask adherence in schools (50%, 75%,  
15 and 100%). Under a scenario in which schools operate remotely, we projected 45,579 (95%  
16 CrI: 14,109-132,546) infections and 790 (95% CrI: 176-1680) deaths between August 24 and  
17 December 31. Reopening at 100% capacity with 50% face-mask adherence in schools resulted  
18 in a proportional increase of 42.9 (95% CrI: 41.3-44.3) times that number of infections and 9.2  
19 (95% CrI: 8.9-9.5) times that number of deaths. In contrast, operating at 50% capacity with  
20 100% face-mask adherence resulted in only an 11% (95% CrI: 5%-18%) increase in the number  
21 of infections compared to the scenario in which schools operate remotely. We conclude that  
22 reduced capacity and high face-mask adherence in schools substantially reduce the burden of  
23 COVID-19, both among those with direct ties to schools and across the state. As Indiana and  
24 other states proceed with school reopening, our results illustrate quantitatively the benefits of  
25 safety measures that schools are undertaking, underscoring their value for both schools and their  
26 communities.

## 27 **Keywords**

28 COVID-19, agent-based model, public health, school reopening, face masks

## 29 **1 Introduction**

30 The United States has been the country most severely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic  
31 in terms of total reported cases and deaths, with over 5.2 million cases and 167,000 deaths  
32 through August 14 [1]. This severity led to social interventions on an unprecedented scale,  
33 including restrictions on mass gatherings, bans on non-essential travel, and school closures [2, 3,  
34 4, 5]. While such restrictions were initially successful in reducing transmission, the subsequent  
35 relaxation of restrictions on mass gatherings and movement were followed by large increases in  
36 notified cases and, more recently, deaths [1, 3, 6, 7]. The state of Indiana reported its highest  
37 daily number of cases to date (1,249) on August 6 [8].

38 It is within this context of intense community transmission that attention has turned to the  
39 reopening of schools for the start of the academic year in August [9, 10, 11]. During influenza  
40 epidemics, school closures have been estimated to reduce transmission community-wide [12, 13,  
41 14]. In general, schools are seen as key drivers of the transmission of respiratory pathogens due to  
42 close contact among children at school [15, 16, 17]. However, several factors complicate the effect  
43 of school reopenings on SARS-CoV-2 transmission. In particular, children and adolescents appear  
44 less susceptible to infection and are much less likely to experience severe outcomes following  
45 infection [18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]. It is also still unclear what their contribution to transmission is,  
46 but several studies suggest they can play an important role [18, 24, 25, 26]. There are additional  
47 economic and social factors to consider, too, such as the economic costs of school closures for  
48 families that must then stay home from work, and the nutritional benefits of school reopening  
49 for children who rely on free and subsidized school meals [27, 28, 29].

50 Our objective in this study was to explore the impacts of strategies for school reopening on  
51 the burden of COVID-19 in the state of Indiana, USA. We synthesized evidence around features  
52 of COVID-19 epidemiology in children [19] in an agent-based model originally developed for  
53 pandemic influenza [30] that is equipped to translate such evidence into projections of community-  
54 wide transmission under alternative scenarios about school reopening. We focused on the role of  
55 reducing the capacity of classrooms and adherence to wearing face masks in schools, given that  
56 both physical distancing and face masks have been shown to reduce transmission of SARS-CoV-  
57 2 in community settings [31]. Our main outcome measures were changes in statewide totals of  
58 SARS-CoV-2 infections, symptomatic infections, and deaths, across different scenarios of school  
59 capacity and face-mask adherence, compared with a baseline scenario in which schools operate  
60 remotely.

## 61 2 Methods

### 62 Approach

63 Our approach to modeling SARS-CoV-2 transmission is based on the Framework for Recon-  
64 structing Epidemic Dynamics (FRED) model [30]. Using this model, we simulated the spread of  
65 SARS-CoV-2 in the population of Indiana, USA using a synthetic population with demographic  
66 and geographic characteristics of the population, including age, household composition, house-  
67 hold location, and occupation [32]. We analyzed the impact of school reopening from August 24  
68 (first day of classes in Marion County, the most populous) to December 31, 2020 in the overall  
69 population of Indiana, as well as in students, teachers, and their households. We quantified  
70 impact as the difference in the number of COVID-19 infections, symptomatic infections, and  
71 deaths, between each scenario and the baseline scenario.

### 72 Agent-based model

73 We chose an agent-based model for this analysis to address key issues such as heterogeneity of  
74 transmission within a population due to population density, age, occupation, and contact net-  
75 work. We used a synthetic population of Indiana to realistically represent characteristics of the  
76 population [32]. FRED simulates pathogen spread in a population by recreating interactions  
77 among people on a daily basis. Each human is modeled as an agent who visits a set of places  
78 defined by their activity space (houses, schools, workplaces, and neighborhood locations). Trans-  
79 mission can occur when an infected person visits the same location as a susceptible person on  
80 the same day, with numbers of contacts per person specific to each location type. For instance,  
81 school contacts depend not on the size of the school but on the age of the student. Every day of  
82 the week, students and teachers visit their school, and students are assigned to classrooms based  
83 on their age. Given that schools are closed during the weekends, community contact is increased  
84 by 50% [30]. For both schools and other locations, we adopted contact rates for each location  
85 type that were previously calibrated to attack rates for influenza specific to each location type  
86 [30, 33].

87 Once infected, each individual had latent and infectious periods drawn from distributions  
88 calibrated so that the average generation interval distribution matched estimates from Singapore  
89 (mean = 5.20, standard deviation = 1.72) [34]. The absolute risk of transmission depended on the  
90 number and location of an infected individual's contacts and a parameter that controls SARS-  
91 CoV-2 transmissibility upon contact, which we calibrated. A proportion of the infections were  
92 asymptomatic [35]. We assumed these infections were as infectious as symptomatic infections  
93 and had identical incubation and infectious period distributions [36, 37, 26, 38]. We assumed that  
94 children were less susceptible to infection than adults, which we modeled with a logistic function  
95 calibrated to model-based estimates of this relationship by Davies et al. [19]. We assumed that  
96 severity of disease increased with age, consistent with statistical analyses performed elsewhere  
97 [39, 40, 41, 21].

98 Agent behavior in FRED has the potential to change over the course of an epidemic. Following  
99 the onset of symptoms, infected agents self-isolate at home according to a fixed daily rate, whereas

100 others continue their daily activities [42, 43]. This rate was chosen so that, on average, 68% of  
101 agents will self-isolate at some point during their symptoms, where 68% is the proportion of  
102 symptomatic infections with a fever and assuming that those with a fever are likely to self-  
103 isolate. [43]. Agents can also respond to public health interventions, including school closure,  
104 shelter in place, and a combination of mask-wearing and social distancing. School closures  
105 occur on specific dates [44], resulting in students limiting their activity space to household and  
106 neighborhood locations. Shelter-in-place interventions reduce some agents' activity spaces to  
107 their households only, whereas others continue with their daily routines. We used mobility  
108 reports from Google [45] to drive daily compliance with shelter-in-place, such that shelter-in-  
109 place compliance in our model accounts for both the effects of shelter-in-place orders and some  
110 people deciding to continue staying at home after those orders are lifted [46]. We used Google  
111 Trends data for Indiana using the terms "face mask" and "social distancing" [47] to capture  
112 temporal trends and survey data [48] to capture the magnitude of these behaviors. Our default  
113 assumption about protection afforded by face masks followed a median estimate of the adjusted  
114 odds ratio of 0.3 against SARS-CoV in a non-health care setting [49, 31]. Further details about  
115 the model are available in the Supplementary Text.

## 116 **Data and outcomes**

117 We obtained daily incidence of death from the New York Times COVID-19 database [1]. Hospi-  
118 talizations and the age distribution of deaths reported in Indiana were obtained from the Indiana  
119 COVID-19 dashboard [8]. Daily numbers of tests performed in the state were available from The  
120 Covid Project [50]. We calibrated the model to daily values of deaths, hospitalizations, and test  
121 positivity through August 10 and to the age distribution of deaths cumulative through July 13  
122 to estimate nine model parameters using a sobol design sampling algorithm [51, 52] (Supplemen-  
123 tary Material). We validated the model by comparing its predictions of the infection attack rate  
124 overall and by age to results from two statewide serological surveys undertaken in late April and  
125 early June [53, 54].

126 To account for uncertainty in the calibrated parameters in our future projections, we sim-  
127 ulated nine scenarios about school reopening with values of the model's nine free parameters  
128 sampled from the calibrated distribution. From August 24 to December 31, we outputted num-  
129 bers of daily infections, symptomatic cases, hospitalizations, and deaths, structured by age, place  
130 of infection (school, home, other), and affiliation with schools (student, teacher, none). For our  
131 analysis, we focused on infections, symptomatic infections, and deaths in the overall population  
132 and the subgroups of students, teachers, and their families.

## 133 **Model scenarios**

134 Our primary analysis focused on three scenarios for school operating capacity (50%, 75%, or  
135 100% of students receiving in-person instruction) and three scenarios for face-mask adherence  
136 in schools (50%, 75%, or 100%). We compared each of the nine combinations of these scenarios  
137 to a scenario in which schools reopened normally (100% capacity, 0% face-mask adherence) and  
138 to a scenario in which schools operated remotely until the end of the calendar year. For each

139 of these scenarios, we analyzed the sensitivity of the model outcomes to parameter uncertainty  
140 by calculating the partial rank correlation coefficient [55] of each calibrated parameter and two  
141 outcomes: the cumulative number of infections between August 24 and December 31, and the  
142 proportion of infections acquired in schools during that period.

143 In addition to our primary analysis, we considered alternative scenarios about select model  
144 parameters that we regarded as potentially important unknowns. To explore the possibility that  
145 children play a lesser role in SARS-CoV-2 transmission than our default assumptions would  
146 suggest, we considered one alternative scenario in which asymptomatic infections (which are  
147 more likely to occur among children) are half as infectious as symptomatic infections, and a  
148 second alternative scenario in which children aged 0-10 years have lower susceptibility (0.1). To  
149 explore the possibility that face masks could be either more or less protective than our default  
150 assumption would suggest, we considered scenarios that followed adjusted odds ratio estimates at  
151 the lower (0.12) and upper (0.73) ends of the 95% CrI from the study that informed our default  
152 assumption about protection afforded by face masks [49, 31].

### 153 3 Results

154 Our model was generally consistent with the data to which it was calibrated, capturing trends  
155 over time in daily deaths, hospitalizations, and test positivity (Fig. 1A-C), as well as greater  
156 proportions of deaths among older age groups (Fig. 1D). Some trade-offs in the model's ability  
157 to recreate different data types were apparent, such as a recent increase in hospitalizations that  
158 the model failed to capture (Fig. 1C), likely due to the predominance of data on deaths in the  
159 likelihood. Even so, the model's predictions reproduced the range of variability in the data, as  
160 assessed by coverage probability of its 95% posterior predictive intervals (daily deaths: 0.85;  
161 daily hospitalizations: 0.93; daily test positivity: 0.95; cumulative deaths by age: 1.0). The  
162 model was also consistent with data withheld from fitting. Across all ages, the model's 95%  
163 posterior predictive intervals of the cumulative proportion infected through late April (median:  
164 0.017; 95% CrI: 0.0045-0.051) and early June (median: 0.022; 95% CrI: 0.0058-0.069) spanned  
165 estimates from two state-wide serological surveys [53] (Fig. 2A). Our model's predictions also  
166 overlapped with age-stratified estimates from those surveys (Fig. 2B), although it underpredicted  
167 infections among individuals aged 40-60 years.

168 Calibration of the parameter that scaled the magnitude of SARS-CoV-2 importations [56, 57]  
169 in our model resulted in a median of 1.299 (95% PPI: 0.502-1.461) imported infections per day  
170 from February 1 to August 10. To ensure that the model reliably reproduced the high occurrence  
171 of deaths observed in long-term care facilities, we seeded infections into those facilities at a daily  
172 rate proportional to the prevalence of infection on that day; this calibrated proportion was 0.037  
173 (95% PPI: 0.022-0.092). On the opposite end of the age spectrum, our calibration resulted in  
174 a median estimate of susceptibility among children of 0.346 (95% CrI: 0.311-0.506), compared  
175 to 0.834 (95% CrI: 0.652-0.946) in adults (Fig. S1). Our calibration resulted in an estimate of  
176 transmissibility (median: 0.593; 95% CrI: 0.501-0.788) that corresponded to values of  $R(t)$  during  
177 the initial phase of the epidemic in Indiana of 1.46 (95% CrI: 0.31-3.48), which represents an  
178 average of daily values across the month of February (Fig. 1A). Driven by a calibrated estimate

179 that the proportion of people sheltering in place rose in early March and peaked at a median of




Figure 1. Model calibration to data: A) daily incidence of death; B) proportion of deaths through July 13 in decadal age bins; C) daily incidence of hospitalization; and D) daily proportion of tests administered that are positive for SARS-CoV-2. In all panels, blue diamonds represent data. In A, C, and D, the gray line is the median, the dark shaded region the 50% posterior predictive interval, and the light shaded region the 95% posterior predictive interval.

180 32.1% (95% CrI: 28.8-66.9%) on April 7 (Fig. S2A), our estimates of  $R(t)$  dropped to a low of  
181 0.57 (95% CrI: 0.42-0.71) on April 7 and have remained below 1 since (Fig. 1A). Also impacting  
182 our estimates of  $R(t)$  is the increasing use of face masks in the community, which we estimated  
183 at 0.534 (95% CrI: 0.461-0.540) as of July 19 (Fig. S2B). Note that this estimated distribution  
184 of community face-mask adherence does not differ between scenarios and is not the same as the  
185 level of adherence in schools, which we imposed at different levels depending on the scenario.

186 In the event that schools reopen at full capacity and without any use of face masks, our model  
187 projects that  $R(t)$  would increase to 1.72 (95% CrI: 1.43-2.17) by mid-September (Fig. 3A). This  
188 assumes that levels of sheltering in place and face-mask adherence in the community remain at  
189 their estimated levels as of August 13 (Fig. S2B). Consistent with our model's prediction that  
190 schools contributed appreciably to transmission early in the epidemic (median: 26.2%; 95% CrI:  
191 21.0-27.5%), this increase in transmission is associated with an increase in the proportion of  
192 infections arising in schools upon their reopening (Fig. 3B). The sensitivity of the proportion  
193 of infections arising in schools to model parameters was highest for the inflection point of the  
194 age-susceptibility relationship, the transmissibility parameter, and the rate at which infections  
195 were imported into long-term care facilities (Fig. S6). This increase in infections arising in  
196 schools is projected to give rise to additional transmission statewide (Fig. 3C). An example of  
197 transmission chains arising from schools and spilling out into school-affiliated families and the




Figure 2. Model comparison with data withheld from fitting. We validated the model's predictions against data withheld from fitting on A) the cumulative proportion of the population of Indiana infected through late April and early June, and B) the cumulative proportion infected among individuals aged 12-40, 40-60, and 60+. Data are shown in navy and come from a random, statewide serological survey [53]. Model predictions are shown in gray. In A, the line and band indicate the median and 95% posterior predictive interval. In B, lines, boxes, and error bars indicate median, interquartile range, and 95% posterior predictive interval.

198 broader community is shown in Fig. 4.




Figure 3. The impact of school reopening in Indiana on: A) the reproduction number,  $R(t)$ , over time; B) the proportion of infections acquired in different location types over time; and C) the daily incidence of infection over time. In all panels, schools reopened on August 24. In A and C, the line represents the median, and the shaded region represents the 50% posterior predictive interval.






Figure 4. Example transmission tree of SARS-CoV-2 from one simulation of the model for Saint Joseph County, Indiana. Green shapes at the top represent agents in the model infected at school, and arrows descending from them and other shapes show transmission events in school-affiliated households (orange) and the community at large (purple) that trace back to infections originally acquired in schools. Different shapes distinguish children (circles) from adults (squares).

199 In the event that schools remain open throughout the semester and no other policies or  
200 behavioral responses occur, the increase in  $R(t)$  driven by reopening schools at full capacity and  
201 without the use of face masks would be projected to result in 2.57 million (95% CrI: 2.36-2.88  
202 million) infections (Fig. 5A) and 10,246 (95% CrI: 7,862-13,794) deaths (Fig. 5B) from Indiana's  
203 population as a whole between August 24 and December 31. At the other extreme, if schools  
204 were to go to remote instruction and all children remained at home, our model projects that  $R(t)$   
205 would remain near current levels through the remainder of 2020 (Fig. S3A). Again, this assumes  
206 that levels of sheltering in place and face-mask adherence in the community as a whole remain at  
207 their estimated levels as of August 13. Under this scenario, transmission would continue through  
208 contacts at workplaces, within homes, and elsewhere in the community (Fig. S3B), with 45,579  
209 (95% CrI: 14,651-132,546) infections (Fig. S3C) and 790 (95% CrI: 176-1680) deaths between  
210 August 24 and December 31.

211 Differing policies on the capacity at which schools operate in person and enforce the use of  
212 face masks have a strong influence on the projected statewide burden of COVID-19. If schools  
213 operate at 50% capacity and achieve high face-mask adherence, the number of infections and  
214 deaths that we project is similar to what we project under the scenario in which schools operate  
215 remotely (Fig. 5, Table S1). Of these two policies, projections of infections and deaths were more  
216 sensitive to the capacity at which schools operate, with the worst outcomes projected to occur  
217 when schools operate at full capacity and with low face-mask adherence. Under this scenario,  
218 cumulative infections statewide were projected to be 42.8 (95% CrI: 41.3-44.3) times greater

219 than if schools operated remotely, and cumulative deaths statewide were projected to be 9.2  
220 (95% CrI: 8.9-9.5) times greater (Table S1). The sensitivity of these results to model parameters  
221 was relatively high for parameters that define the age-susceptibility relationship and, in some  
222 cases, for the transmissibility and shelter-in-place compliance parameters (Fig. S5).

223 We also explored the sensitivity of these results to alternative assumptions about the contri-  
224 bution of children to SARS-CoV-2 transmission and protection afforded by face masks. Under  
225 an alternative assumption that susceptibility of children aged 0-10 years was only 0.1, we ob-  
226 served reductions in cumulative infections and deaths that were consistent but relatively modest  
227 compared to differences due to operating capacity and face-mask adherence (Table S10, S11).  
228 Under an alternative assumption that the relative infectiousness of asymptomatic infections was  
229 50% that of symptomatic infections, we observed reductions in cumulative infections and deaths  
230 under high operating capacity but increases under low and medium capacity (Table S10, S11).  
231 Again though, these differences were relatively modest compared to differences due to operating  
232 capacity and face-mask adherence. Alternative assumptions about protection afforded by face  
233 masks resulted in consistent differences in cumulative infections and deaths, with lower face-  
234 mask efficacy associated with more infections and deaths (Table S12, S13). For example, under  
235 a scenario with 50% operating capacity and 100% face-mask adherence in schools, the increase in  
236 cumulative infections relative to operating remotely ranged from 7% (95% CrI: 3-11%) to 307%  
237 (95% CrI: 294-322%). Even so, the relative impacts of varying levels of operating capacity and  
238 face-mask adherence were generally similar under these alternative assumptions.

239 The burden of COVID-19 associated with reopening schools differed for students, teachers,  
240 and their families. Relative to a scenario with remote instruction, risk of infection and symp-  
241 tomatic infection was greatest for students (Fig. 6, left column), with a hundred-fold or greater  
242 increase in the risk of infection if schools operate at full capacity with moderate or low face-mask  
243 adherence (Table S2). Due to their older ages, teachers and families experienced a much higher  
244 risk of death under scenarios with high capacity and moderate or low face-mask adherence, as  
245 compared with a scenario with remote instruction (Fig. 6, center & right columns). Under a  
246 scenario with high capacity and low face-mask adherence, there was a 166-fold higher risk of  
247 death for teachers (Table S3) and a 223-fold higher risk of death for family members of students  
248 and teachers (Table S4). At the same time, the risk of death under a scenario with high capacity  
249 and low face-mask adherence was around 72% the risk of death if schools were to operate at full  
250 capacity with no masks (Tables S7 & S8).




Figure 5. The impact of different school reopening strategies on A) cumulative infections and B) cumulative deaths in Indiana between August 24 and December 31. Scenarios are defined by the capacity at which schools operate (x-axis) and face-mask adherence (shading). Orange lines represent projections under a scenario of school reopening at full capacity without masks (solid: median; dotted: 95% posterior predictive interval). Blue lines represent a scenario where schools operate remotely. Error bars indicate inter-quartile ranges.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).




Figure 6. The impact of different school reopening strategies on cumulative infections (top row), cumulative symptomatic infections (middle row), and cumulative deaths (bottom row) in Indiana between August 24 and December 31. These outcomes are presented separately for students (left column), teachers (middle column), and school-affiliated families (right column). Scenarios are defined by the capacity at which schools operate (x-axis) and face-mask adherence (shading). Orange lines represent projections under a scenario of school reopening at full capacity without masks (solid: median; dotted: 95% posterior predictive interval). Blue lines represent a scenario where schools operate remotely. Error bars indicate inter-quartile ranges.

## 251 4 Discussion

252 Our model provides a detailed, demographically realistic representation of SARS-CoV-2 trans-  
253 mission in Indiana that is consistent both with data to which it was calibrated and to data that  
254 was withheld from calibration. In contrast to models that rely on assumptions about intervention  
255 impacts or estimate them statistically [2, 58], our model makes predictions about intervention  
256 impacts based on first-principles assumptions about individual-level behavior and contact pat-  
257 terns. Consistent with results from other analyses [2, 58, 20], the inputs and assumptions in  
258 our model led to a prediction that schools made a considerable contribution to SARS-CoV-2  
259 transmission in February and early March, prior to large-scale changes in behavior. Extending  
260 that, a primary result of our analysis is that schools could, once again, make a considerable  
261 contribution to SARS-CoV-2 transmission as they resume normal activity in the fall semester.

262 Our results indicate that operating at reduced capacity and achieving high face-mask adher-  
263 ence would reduce the burden of COVID-19 in schools and across the state. In the event that  
264 both interventions are pursued fully, our model projects that infections and deaths statewide  
265 would be around 10% greater than under a scenario with fully remote instruction. In the event  
266 that schools operate at full capacity, our model projects that infections and deaths statewide  
267 could be one to two orders of magnitude greater than under a scenario with fully remote instruc-  
268 tion, especially if there is poor face-mask adherence in schools. The impacts associated with  
269 reducing capacity result from reductions in both the number of contacts within the school and  
270 the probability that an infected student would be in attendance in the first place, similar to the  
271 logic behind why smaller gatherings are associated with reduced risk of transmission [3, 59, 60].  
272 The magnitude of our results was most sensitive to the degree of protection afforded by face  
273 masks, which remains uncertain in school and other community settings for SARS-CoV-2 [31].

274 Although the scenarios we considered resulted in projected impacts spanning nearly the full  
275 range between fully remote instruction and fully in-person instruction with no face masks, they  
276 are a simplification of the full range of scenarios of how schools could operate this fall. Scenarios  
277 that we did not explore include different groups of students attending in person or remotely [61],  
278 varying degrees of modularization within schools [62], and the implementation of testing-based  
279 control strategies in schools [63]. A related simplification of our statewide analysis is that the  
280 state, in reality, consists of a patchwork of policies across districts. In light of this complexity that  
281 our model does not capture, our results should be interpreted with caution in setting specific,  
282 quantitative targets for capacity or face-mask adherence. For any scenario though, our results  
283 illustrate the importance of reducing capacity and maximizing face-mask adherence to the extent  
284 possible, as do other modeling studies [61, 62, 63, 64, 65].

285 The burden of COVID-19 associated with reopening schools is not expected to fall evenly  
286 across the state's population. Under scenarios with schools operating at full capacity, our model  
287 projects that hundreds of thousands of children could be infected during the fall semester.  
288 Whereas very few deaths are expected among infected children, the numbers of deaths among  
289 teachers and school-affiliated families could number in the hundreds. In comparison, the total  
290 number of deaths projected across the state is projected to be in the low thousands, meaning  
291 that adults with close ties to schools could represent a sizable fraction of deaths across the state

292 in coming months, if schools operate at full capacity and with low face-mask adherence. Im-  
293 portantly, the magnitude of these projections depend further on factors outside the control of  
294 schools [2]. In the absence of school reopening, our projections assume steady, controlled levels  
295 of transmission with  $R(t) < 1$ . Changes in government policies, individual behavior, and face-  
296 mask adherence in the community all have the potential to alter this trajectory for the state as  
297 a whole, as well as its schools [2, 31, 66].

298 A critical assumption of our analysis is that children are capable of being infected with SARS-  
299 CoV-2 and transmitting it to others at meaningful levels. Although the burden of severe disease  
300 skews strongly towards older ages [22, 67, 8], there are other lines of evidence that support  
301 our assumption. These include a contact-tracing study that found no distinguishable difference  
302 between infectivity of children and adults [26], several studies that found no distinguishable  
303 difference in viral load between children and adults [68, 37, 36, 69], a study that observed a  
304 greater secondary attack rate among children in homes [26], and a modeling study that found  
305 no evidence that children were less infectious [70]. More direct evidence comes from COVID-  
306 19 outbreaks that have already been observed in schools, including one in a high school in  
307 Israel in which 13.2% of students and 16.6% of staff were infected in just 10 days [71]. Even  
308 more pertinent, some schools in Indiana recently reopened and have already reported cases of  
309 COVID-19 among students [72]. Our analysis offers perspective on what those initial cases could  
310 give rise to in coming months, depending on the degree to which schools choose to operate  
311 at reduced capacity and enforce face-mask adherence. Based on two alternative scenarios we  
312 explored about the potential for SARS-CoV-2 transmission among children, these lessons about  
313 the importance of operating capacity and face-mask adherence appear robust to outstanding  
314 biological uncertainties about transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by children.

315 There is now a growing body of evidence that school closures contributed to mitigating the  
316 first wave of the epidemic and could lead to rising case numbers if relaxed [6, 63]. Our study  
317 adds to this evidence, and suggests an even greater impact of school reopening than several  
318 other studies [65, 63, 62, 73, 61]. This is due in part to our assumption that asymptomatic  
319 and symptomatic infections contribute similarly to transmission [26, 68, 37, 36, 69], and in part  
320 to our model's ability to capture chains of transmission within schools and extending out into  
321 the community. Our study echoes several modeling studies in emphasizing the importance of  
322 reducing school capacity to impede transmission [62, 63, 64, 65, 73]. As schools grapple with  
323 COVID-19 throughout fall 2020 and beyond, results such as these provide an important basis for  
324 motivating the adoption and sustainment of reductions in operating capacity and adherence to  
325 face-mask requirements. As we demonstrated, these actions are highly consequential for those  
326 directly linked to schools and for the communities in which they are embedded.

## 327 5 Acknowledgements

328 This work was supported by an NSF RAPID grant to TAP (DEB 2027718), an Arthur J. Schmitt  
329 Fellowship and Eck Institute for Global Health Fellowship to RJO, and a Richard and Peggy  
330 Notabaert Premier Fellowship to MP. We thank the University of Notre Dame Center for Research  
331 Computing for computing resources.

## 332 References

- 333 [1] The New York Times. “Coronavirus in the U.S.: Latest Map and Case Count”. en-US. In:  
334 *The New York Times* (July 2020). ISSN: 0362-4331.
- 335 [2] H Juliette T Unwin et al. “State-Level Tracking of COVID-19 in the United States”. In:  
336 *medRxiv* (2020). DOI: [10.1101/2020.07.13.20152355](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.13.20152355). eprint: [https://www.medrxiv.org/  
337 content/early/2020/07/14/2020.07.13.20152355.full.pdf](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/07/14/2020.07.13.20152355.full.pdf).
- 338 [3] Seth Flaxman et al. “Estimating the Effects of Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions on COVID-  
339 19 in Europe”. In: *Nature* 584.7820 (Aug. 2020), pp. 257–261. ISSN: 1476-4687. DOI: [10.  
340 1038/s41586-020-2405-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2405-7).
- 341 [4] *Coronavirus Government Response Tracker*. en. [https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-  
342 projects/coronavirus-government-response-tracker](https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/coronavirus-government-response-tracker).
- 343 [5] Hamada S Badr et al. “Association between Mobility Patterns and COVID-19 Transmission  
344 in the USA: A Mathematical Modelling Study”. In: *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* (2020).  
345 ISSN: 1473-3099. DOI: [10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30553-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30553-3).
- 346 [6] Katherine A. Auger et al. “Association between Statewide School Closure and COVID-19  
347 Incidence and Mortality in the US”. In: *JAMA* (July 2020). ISSN: 0098-7484. DOI: [10.1001/  
348 jama.2020.14348](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.14348).
- 349 [7] Charles Courtemanche et al. “Strong Social Distancing Measures In The United States  
350 Reduced The COVID-19 Growth Rate: Study Evaluates the Impact of Social Distancing  
351 Measures on the Growth Rate of Confirmed COVID-19 Cases across the United States.”  
352 In: *Health Affairs* (2020), pp. 10–1377.
- 353 [8] *ISDH - Novel Coronavirus: Indiana COVID-19 Dashboard*. <https://www.coronavirus.in.gov/2393.htm>.
- 354 [9] Kenne A. Dibner, Heidi A. Schweingruber, and Dimitri A. Christakis. “Reopening K-12  
355 Schools during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Report from the National Academies of Sci-  
356 ences, Engineering, and Medicine”. In: *JAMA* (July 2020). ISSN: 0098-7484. DOI: [10.1001/  
357 jama.2020.14745](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.14745).
- 358 [10] *President Donald J. Trump Is Supporting America’s Students and Families By Encouraging  
359 the Safe Reopening of America’s Schools*. en-US. [https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-  
360 statements/president-donald-j-trump-supporting-americas-students-families-encouraging-safe-  
361 reopening-americas-schools/](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/president-donald-j-trump-supporting-americas-students-families-encouraging-safe-reopening-americas-schools/).
- 362 [11] Indiana State Department of Health, Indiana Department of Education, and Indiana Fam-  
363 ily and Social Services Administration. *IN-CLASS: Indiana’s Considerations for Learning  
364 and Safe Schools. COVID-19 Health and Safety Re-Entry Guidance*. June 2020.
- 365 [12] Charlotte Jackson et al. “School Closures and Influenza: Systematic Review of Epidemio-  
366 logical Studies”. In: *BMJ Open* 3.2 (2013). ISSN: 2044-6055. DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2012-  
367 002149](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2012-002149). eprint: <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/3/2/e002149.full.pdf>.

- 368 [13] Shoko Kawano and Masayuki Kakehashi. “Substantial Impact of School Closure on the  
369 Transmission Dynamics during the Pandemic Flu H1N1-2009 in Oita, Japan”. In: *PLOS*  
370 *ONE* 10.12 (Dec. 2015), pp. 1–15. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0144839](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0144839).
- 371 [14] Simon Cauchemez et al. “Closure of Schools during an Influenza Pandemic”. In: *The Lancet*  
372 *Infectious Diseases* 9.8 (2009), pp. 473–481. ISSN: 1473-3099. DOI: [10.1016/S1473-3099\(09\)](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(09)70176-8)  
373 [70176-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(09)70176-8).
- 374 [15] Niel Hens et al. “Estimating the Impact of School Closure on Social Mixing Behaviour  
375 and the Transmission of Close Contact Infections in Eight European Countries”. In: *BMC*  
376 *infectious diseases* 9.1 (2009), p. 187.
- 377 [16] Simon Cauchemez et al. “Estimating the Impact of School Closure on Influenza Transmis-  
378 sion from Sentinel Data”. In: *Nature* 452.7188 (Apr. 2008), pp. 750–754. ISSN: 1476-4687.  
379 DOI: [10.1038/nature06732](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06732).
- 380 [17] Charlotte Jackson et al. “The Effects of School Closures on Influenza Outbreaks and Pan-  
381 demics: Systematic Review of Simulation Studies”. In: *PLOS ONE* 9.5 (May 2014), pp. 1–  
382 10. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0097297](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0097297).
- 383 [18] Sten H Vermund and Virginia E Pitzer. “Asymptomatic Transmission and the Infection  
384 Fatality Risk for COVID-19: Implications for School Reopening”. In: *Clinical Infectious*  
385 *Diseases* (June 2020). ISSN: 1058-4838. DOI: [10.1093/cid/ciaa855](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa855).
- 386 [19] Nicholas G. Davies et al. “Age-Dependent Effects in the Transmission and Control of  
387 COVID-19 Epidemics”. In: *Nature Medicine* (June 2020). ISSN: 1546-170X. DOI: [10.1038/](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0962-9)  
388 [s41591-020-0962-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0962-9).
- 389 [20] Juanjuan Zhang et al. “Changes in Contact Patterns Shape the Dynamics of the COVID-  
390 19 Outbreak in China”. In: *Science* 368.6498 (2020), pp. 1481–1486. ISSN: 0036-8075. DOI:  
391 [10.1126/science.abb8001](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb8001). eprint: [https://science.sciencemag.org/content/368/6498/1481.](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/368/6498/1481.full.pdf)  
392 [full.pdf](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/368/6498/1481.full.pdf).
- 393 [21] Joseph T Wu et al. “Estimating Clinical Severity of COVID-19 from the Transmission  
394 Dynamics in Wuhan, China”. In: *Nature medicine* (2020), pp. 1–5.
- 395 [22] Robert Verity et al. “Estimates of the Severity of Coronavirus Disease 2019: A Model-  
396 Based Analysis”. eng. In: *The Lancet. Infectious Diseases* (Mar. 2020). ISSN: 1474-4457.  
397 DOI: [10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30243-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30243-7).
- 398 [23] Willem et al. “The Impact of Contact Tracing and Household Bubbles on Deconfinement  
399 Strategies for COVID-19: An Individual-Based Modelling Study”. In: *medRxiv* (2020). DOI:  
400 [10.1101/2020.07.01.20144444](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.01.20144444). eprint: [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/07/](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/07/06/2020.07.01.20144444.full.pdf)  
401 [06/2020.07.01.20144444.full.pdf](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/07/06/2020.07.01.20144444.full.pdf).
- 402 [24] Christine M Szablewski. “SARS-CoV-2 Transmission and Infection among Attendees of an  
403 Overnight Camp—Georgia, June 2020”. In: *MMWR. Morbidity and mortality weekly report*  
404 69 (2020), pp. 1023–1025. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6931e1>.



- 405 [25] Young Joon Park et al. “Contact Tracing during Coronavirus Disease Outbreak, South  
406 Korea, 2020”. In: *Emerging Infectious Disease journal* 26.10 (2020). ISSN: 1080-6059. DOI:  
407 [10.3201/eid2610.201315](https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2610.201315).
- 408 [26] Pirous Fateh-Moghadam et al. “Contact Tracing during Phase I of the COVID-19 Pandemic  
409 in the Province of Trento, Italy: Key Findings and Recommendations”. In: *medRxiv* (2020).  
410 DOI: [10.1101/2020.07.16.20127357](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.16.20127357). eprint: [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/  
411 07/29/2020.07.16.20127357.full.pdf](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/07/29/2020.07.16.20127357.full.pdf).
- 412 [27] George Psacharopoulos et al. “Lost Wages: The COVID-19 Cost of School Closures”. In:  
413 *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* 9246 (2020).
- 414 [28] Danielle G. Dooley, Asad Bandealy, and Megan M. Tschudy. “Low-Income Children and  
415 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the US”. In: *JAMA Pediatrics* (May 2020). ISSN:  
416 2168-6203. DOI: [10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.2065](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.2065). eprint: [https://jamanetwork.com/  
417 journals/jamapediatrics/articlepdf/2766115/jamapediatrics\textbackslash\\_\\_dooley\textb  
418 ackslash\\_\\_2020\textbackslash\\_\\_vp\textbackslash\\_\\_200021.pdf](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/articlepdf/2766115/jamapediatrics/textbackslash__dooley/textbackslash__2020/textbackslash__vp/textbackslash__200021.pdf).
- 419 [29] Wim Van Lancker and Zachary Parolin. “COVID-19, School Closures, and Child Poverty:  
420 A Social Crisis in the Making”. In: *The Lancet Public Health* 5.5 (2020), e243–e244.
- 421 [30] John J Grefenstette et al. “FRED (A Framework for Reconstructing Epidemic Dynamics):  
422 An Open-Source Software System for Modeling Infectious Diseases and Control Strategies  
423 Using Census-Based Populations”. In: *BMC public health* 13.1 (2013), p. 940.
- 424 [31] Derek K Chu et al. “Physical Distancing, Face Masks, and Eye Protection to Prevent  
425 Person-to-Person Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: A Systematic Review and  
426 Meta-Analysis”. In: *The Lancet* (2020).
- 427 [32] W D Wheaton. “2005-2009 U.S. Synthetic Population Ver.2. RTI International”. In: (2012).
- 428 [33] Joël Mossong et al. “Social Contacts and Mixing Patterns Relevant to the Spread of Infec-  
429 tious Diseases”. In: *PLOS Medicine* 5.3 (Mar. 2008), pp. 1–1. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pmed.  
430 0050074](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074).
- 431 [34] Tapiwa Ganyani et al. “Estimating the Generation Interval for COVID-19 Based on Symp-  
432 tom Onset Data”. en. In: *medRxiv* (Mar. 2020), p. 2020.03.05.20031815. ISSN: 10.1101/2020.03.05.20031815.  
433 DOI: [10.1101/2020.03.05.20031815](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.05.20031815).
- 434 [35] Kenji Mizumoto et al. “Estimating the Asymptomatic Proportion of Coronavirus Disease  
435 2019 (COVID-19) Cases on Board the Diamond Princess Cruise Ship, Yokohama, Japan,  
436 2020”. en. In: *Eurosurveillance* 25.10 (Mar. 2020), p. 2000180. ISSN: 1560-7917. DOI: [10.  
437 2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.10.2000180](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.10.2000180).
- 438 [36] Lael M. Yonker et al. “Pediatric SARS-CoV-2: Clinical Presentation, Infectivity, and Im-  
439 mune Responses”. In: *The Journal of Pediatrics* (). ISSN: 0022-3476. DOI: [10.1016/j.jpeds.  
440 2020.08.037](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2020.08.037).

- 441 [37] Taylor Heald-Sargent et al. “Age-Related Differences in Nasopharyngeal Severe Acute Res-  
442 piratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Levels in Patients with Mild to Moderate  
443 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)”. In: *JAMA Pediatrics* (July 2020). ISSN: 2168-  
444 6203. DOI: [10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.3651](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.3651). eprint: [https://jamanetwork.com/journals/  
445 jamapediatrics/articlepdf/2768952/jamapediatrics\textbackslash\\\_healdsargent\textbac  
446 kslash\\\_2020\textbackslash\\\_id\textbackslash\\\_200036.pdf](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/articlepdf/2768952/jamapediatrics%5Ctextbackslash%5C_healdsargent%5Ctextbac%5Ckslash%5C_2020%5Ctextbackslash%5C_id%5Ctextbackslash%5C_200036.pdf).
- 447 [38] Shixiong Hu et al. “Infectivity, Susceptibility, and Risk Factors Associated with SARS-CoV-  
448 2 Transmission under Intensive Contact Tracing in Hunan, China”. In: *medRxiv* (2020).  
449 DOI: [10.1101/2020.07.23.20160317](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.23.20160317). eprint: [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/  
450 08/07/2020.07.23.20160317.full.pdf](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/08/07/2020.07.23.20160317.full.pdf).
- 451 [39] Stephen A. Lauer et al. “The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)  
452 From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application”. en. In: *Annals of  
453 Internal Medicine* (Mar. 2020). ISSN: 0003-4819. DOI: [10.7326/M20-0504](https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-0504).
- 454 [40] Qifang Bi et al. “Epidemiology and Transmission of COVID-19 in 391 Cases and 1286 of  
455 Their Close Contacts in Shenzhen, China: A Retrospective Cohort Study”. In: *The Lancet  
456 Infectious Diseases* (2020).
- 457 [41] The Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia Emergency Response Epidemiology Team. “The Epi-  
458 demiological Characteristics of an Outbreak of 2019 Novel Coronavirus Diseases (COVID-  
459 19) — China, 2020”. en. In: *China CDC Weekly* 2.8 (Feb. 2020), pp. 113–122. ISSN: 2096-  
460 7071.
- 461 [42] T Alex Perkins et al. “Calling in Sick: Impacts of Fever on Intra-Urban Human Mobility”.  
462 In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* 283.1834 (2016). ISSN:  
463 0962-8452. DOI: [10.1098/rspb.2016.0390](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.0390).
- 464 [43] Team CDC COVID et al. “Characteristics of Health Care Personnel with COVID-19-United  
465 States, February 12-April 9, 2020.” In: *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*  
466 (2020).
- 467 [44] IHME COVID-19 health service utilization forecasting Team and Christopher JL Murray.  
468 “Forecasting COVID-19 Impact on Hospital Bed-Days, ICU-Days, Ventilator-Days and  
469 Deaths by US State in the next 4 Months”. en. In: *medRxiv* (Mar. 2020), p. 2020.03.27.20043752.  
470 DOI: [10.1101/2020.03.27.20043752](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20043752).
- 471 [45] *COVID-19 Community Mobility Report*. <https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility?hl=en>.
- 472 [46] Christopher J Cronin and William N Evans. *Private Precaution and Public Restrictions:  
473 What Drives Social Distancing and Industry Foot Traffic in the COVID-19 Era?* Working  
474 Paper 27531. National Bureau of Economic Research, July 2020. DOI: [10.3386/w27531](https://doi.org/10.3386/w27531).
- 475 [47] *Google Trends*. en-US. <https://trends.google.com/trends/?geo=US>.
- 476 [48] New York Times and Dynata. *Estimates from The New York Times, Based on Roughly  
477 250,000 Interviews Conducted by Dynata from July 2 to July 14*. Tech. rep.

- 478 [49] Jiang Wu et al. “Risk Factors for SARS among Persons without Known Contact with SARS  
479 Patients, Beijing, China”. In: *Emerging Infectious Disease journal* 10.2 (2004), p. 210. ISSN:  
480 1080-6059. DOI: [10.3201/eid1002.030730](https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1002.030730).
- 481 [50] The COVID Tracking Project. *Michigan*. en. <https://covidtracking.com/data/state/michigan>.  
482 2020.
- 483 [51] Aaron A. King et al. *pomp: Statistical Inference for Partially Observed Markov Processes*.  
484 Manual. 2020.
- 485 [52] Aaron A. King, Dao Nguyen, and Edward L. Ionides. “Statistical Inference for Partially  
486 Observed Markov Processes via the R Package pomp”. In: *Journal of Statistical Software*  
487 69.12 (2016), pp. 1–43. DOI: [10.18637/jss.v069.i12](https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v069.i12).
- 488 [53] Nir Menachemi et al. “Population Point Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Based on  
489 a Statewide Random Sample—Indiana, April 25–29, 2020”. In: *Morbidity and Mortality*  
490 *Weekly Report* 69.29 (2020), p. 960.
- 491 [54] Andrea Zeek. *COVID-19 Study’s Phase 2 Results Show Spread of Virus in Indiana*. en.  
492 [https://news.iu.edu/stories/2020/06/iupui/releases/17-fairbanks-isdh-second-phase-covid-](https://news.iu.edu/stories/2020/06/iupui/releases/17-fairbanks-isdh-second-phase-covid-19-testing-indiana-research.html)  
493 [19-testing-indiana-research.html](https://news.iu.edu/stories/2020/06/iupui/releases/17-fairbanks-isdh-second-phase-covid-19-testing-indiana-research.html). June 2020.
- 494 [55] Mark Stevenson with contributions from Telmo Nunes et al. *epiR: Tools for the Analysis*  
495 *of Epidemiological Data*. Manual. 2020.
- 496 [56] T. Alex Perkins et al. “Estimating Unobserved SARS-CoV-2 Infections in the United  
497 States”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* (2020). ISSN: 0027-8424. DOI:  
498 [10.1073/pnas.2005476117](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2005476117). eprint: [https://www.pnas.org/content/early/2020/08/20/](https://www.pnas.org/content/early/2020/08/20/2005476117.full.pdf)  
499 [2005476117.full.pdf](https://www.pnas.org/content/early/2020/08/20/2005476117.full.pdf).
- 500 [57] *MIDAS Network, Midas-Network/COVID-19*. GitHub. [https://github.com/midas-net-work/COVID-](https://github.com/midas-net-work/COVID-19)  
501 [19](https://github.com/midas-net-work/COVID-19).
- 502 [58] Susanna Esposito and Nicola Principi. “School Closure during the Coronavirus Disease  
503 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic: An Effective Intervention at the Global Level?” In: *JAMA*  
504 *Pediatrics* (May 2020). ISSN: 2168-6203. DOI: [10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.1892](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.1892). eprint:  
505 [https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/articlepdf/2766114/jamapediatrics\te](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/articlepdf/2766114/jamapediatrics\textbackslash\_esposito\textbackslash\_2020\textbackslash\_vp\textbackslash\_200019.pdf)  
506 [xtbackslash\\\_esposito\textbackslash\\\_2020\textbackslash\\\_vp\textbackslash\\\_200019.](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/articlepdf/2766114/jamapediatrics\textbackslash\_esposito\textbackslash\_2020\textbackslash\_vp\textbackslash\_200019.pdf)  
507 [pdf](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/articlepdf/2766114/jamapediatrics\textbackslash\_esposito\textbackslash\_2020\textbackslash\_vp\textbackslash\_200019.pdf).
- 508 [59] Nor Fazila Che Mat et al. “A Single Mass Gathering Resulted in Massive Transmission  
509 of COVID-19 Infections in Malaysia with Further International Spread”. In: *Journal of*  
510 *Travel Medicine* 27.3 (Apr. 2020). ISSN: 1708-8305. DOI: [10.1093/jtm/taaa059](https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taaa059). eprint:  
511 <https://academic.oup.com/jtm/article-pdf/27/3/taaa059/33226391/taaa059.pdf>.
- 512 [60] Sukbin Jang, Si Hyun Han, and Ji-Young Rhee. “Cluster of Coronavirus Disease Associated  
513 with Fitness Dance Classes, South Korea”. eng. In: *Emerging infectious diseases* 26.8 (Aug.  
514 2020), pp. 1917–1920. ISSN: 1080-6059. DOI: [10.3201/eid2608.200633](https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2608.200633).

- 515 [61] Matt J Keeling et al. “The Impact of School Reopening on the Spread of COVID-19 in  
516 England”. In: *medRxiv* (2020). DOI: [10.1101/2020.06.04.20121434](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20121434). eprint: [https://www.  
517 medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/05/2020.06.04.20121434.full.pdf](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/05/2020.06.04.20121434.full.pdf).
- 518 [62] Jennifer R Head et al. “The Effect of School Closures and Reopening Strategies on COVID-  
519 19 Infection Dynamics in the San Francisco Bay Area: A Cross-Sectional Survey and Mod-  
520 eling Analysis”. In: *medRxiv* (2020). DOI: [10.1101/2020.08.06.20169797](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.06.20169797). eprint: [https:  
521 //www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/08/07/2020.08.06.20169797.full.pdf](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/08/07/2020.08.06.20169797.full.pdf).
- 522 [63] Jasmina Panovska-Griffiths et al. “Determining the Optimal Strategy for Reopening Schools,  
523 the Impact of Test and Trace Interventions, and the Risk of Occurrence of a Second COVID-  
524 19 Epidemic Wave in the UK: A Modelling Study”. In: *The Lancet Child & Adolescent  
525 Health* (2020). ISSN: 2352-4642. DOI: [10.1016/S2352-4642\(20\)30250-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30250-9).
- 526 [64] Benjamin Lee et al. “Modeling the Impact of School Reopening on SARS-CoV-2 Trans-  
527 mission”. In: *Research Square* (2020).
- 528 [65] Alfonso Landeros et al. “An Examination of School Reopening Strategies during the SARS-  
529 CoV-2 Pandemic”. In: *medRxiv* (2020). DOI: [10.1101/2020.08.05.20169086](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.05.20169086). eprint: [https:  
530 //www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/08/06/2020.08.05.20169086.full.pdf](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/08/06/2020.08.05.20169086.full.pdf).
- 531 [66] Richard OJH Stutt et al. “A Modelling Framework to Assess the Likely Effectiveness of  
532 Facemasks in Combination with ‘Lock-down’ in Managing the COVID-19 Pandemic”. In:  
533 *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* 476.2238 (2020), p. 20200376.
- 534 [67] *COVID-19 Hospitalizations*. [https://gis.cdc.gov/grasp/COVIDNet/COVID19\\_3.html](https://gis.cdc.gov/grasp/COVIDNet/COVID19_3.html).
- 535 [68] Enrico Lavezzo et al. “Suppression of a SARS-CoV-2 Outbreak in the Italian Municipality of  
536 Vo”. In: *Nature* 584.7821 (Aug. 2020), pp. 425–429. ISSN: 1476-4687. DOI: [10.1038/s41586-  
537 020-2488-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2488-1).
- 538 [69] Terry C Jones et al. “An Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load by Patient Age”. In: *medRxiv*  
539 (2020). DOI: [10.1101/2020.06.08.20125484](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.08.20125484). eprint: [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/  
540 early/2020/06/09/2020.06.08.20125484.full.pdf](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/09/2020.06.08.20125484.full.pdf).
- 541 [70] Itai Dattner et al. “The Role of Children in the Spread of COVID-19: Using Household  
542 Data from Bnei Brak, Israel, to Estimate the Relative Susceptibility and Infectivity of  
543 Children”. In: *medRxiv* (2020). DOI: [10.1101/2020.06.03.20121145](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.03.20121145). eprint: [https://www.  
544 medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/05/2020.06.03.20121145.full.pdf](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/05/2020.06.03.20121145.full.pdf).
- 545 [71] Chen Stein-Zamir et al. “A Large COVID-19 Outbreak in a High School 10 Days after  
546 Schools’ Reopening, Israel, May 2020”. In: *Eurosurveillance* 25.29 (2020), p. 2001352. DOI:  
547 [10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.29.2001352](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.29.2001352).
- 548 [72] Arika Herron and MJ Slaby. *Search COVID-19 Cases in Indiana Schools Using Our  
549 Database*. en-US. [https://www.indystar.com/story/news/education/2020/08/10/coronavirus-  
550 indiana-schools-search-covid-19-cases-database/3318071001/](https://www.indystar.com/story/news/education/2020/08/10/coronavirus-indiana-schools-search-covid-19-cases-database/3318071001/).
- 551 [73] Elaheh Abdollahi et al. “Simulating the Effect of School Closure during COVID-19 Out-  
552 breaks in Ontario, Canada”. In: *BMC Medicine* 18.1 (July 2020), p. 230. ISSN: 1741-7015.  
553 DOI: [10.1186/s12916-020-01705-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-020-01705-8).