



# PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
<b>TITLE</b>			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	Title
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	Page 1
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	Page 3: School closures have been a common strategy to control the spread of SARS-CoV-2...school closures have significant negative consequences...the specific contribution of school closures [to limiting SARS-CoV-2 spread] remains unclear
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	Page 3: Here, we synthesise the observational evidence of the impact of closing or reopening schools on community transmission of SARS-CoV-2.
<b>METHODS</b>			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	Page 5: Prospero (ID:CRD42020213699).
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	Page 5: We included any empirical study which reported a quantitative estimate of the effect of school closure or reopening on community transmission of SARS-CoV-2. We considered 'school' to include early years settings (e.g. nurseries or kindergartens), primary schools, and secondary school, but excluded further or higher education (e.g. universities). Community transmission was defined as any measure of community infections rate, hospital admissions, or mortality attributed to COVID-19. We included studies published in 2020 or 2021 only. We included pre-prints, peer-reviewed and grey literature. We did not apply any restriction on language, but all searches were undertaken in English. We excluded prospective modelling studies and studies in which the assessed outcome was exclusively transmission within the school environment rather than the wider community.



# PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	Page 5: We searched PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus, CINAHL, the WHO Global COVID-19 Research Database (including medRxiv and SSRN), ERIC, the British Education Index, and the Australian Education Index, searching title and abstracts for terms related to SARS-CoV-2 AND terms related to schools or NPIs. To search the grey literature, we searched Google. We also included papers identified through professional networks. Full details of the search strategy are included in Appendix A. Searches were undertaken first on 12 October 2020 and updated on 07 January 2021.
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Appendix A includes full search strategy
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	Page 6: Article titles and abstracts were imported into the Rayyan QCRI webtool(11). Two reviewers independently screened titles and abstracts, retrieved full texts of potentially relevant articles, and assessed eligibility for inclusion.
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	Page 6: Two reviewers independently extracted data and assessed risk of bias. Data extraction was performed using a pre-agreed extraction template which collected information on publication type (peer-reviewed or pre-print), country, study design, exposure type (school closure or re-opening), setting type (primary or secondary), study period, unit of observation, confounders adjusted for, other NPIs in place, analysis method, outcome measure, and findings.
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	Page 6: Two reviewers independently extracted data and assessed risk of bias. Data extraction was performed using a pre-agreed extraction template which collected information on publication type (peer-reviewed or pre-print), country, study design, exposure type (school closure or re-opening), setting type (primary or secondary), study period, unit of observation, confounders adjusted for, other NPIs in place, analysis method, outcome measure, and findings.
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	Page 6: We used the Cochrane Risk of Bias In Non-randomised Studies of Interventions (ROBINS-I) tool(12) to evaluate bias.
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	Page 6: Community transmission was defined as any measure of community infection rate, hospital admission rate, or mortality attributed to COVID-19.
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., $I^2$ ) for each meta-analysis.	Page 6: Given the heterogeneous nature of the studies, prohibiting meta-analysis, a narrative synthesis was conducted.



# PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	n/a
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	n/a
<b>RESULTS</b>			
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	Page 7: We identified 7,474 studies (Figure 1). After removing 2,339 duplicates, 5,135 unique records were screened for inclusion. We excluded 4,842 records at the title or abstract stage, leaving 293 records for full text review. Of these, 40(14–53) met the inclusion criteria.
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	Table 1
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	Table 2
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	Table 3
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	n/a
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	Figure 2
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	n/a
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	Page 16: Amongst higher quality, less confounded studies of school closures, 6 out of 14 reported that school closures had no effect on transmission, 6 reported that school closures were associated with reductions in transmission, and 2 reported mixed findings (figure 2); with findings ranging from no association to a 60% relative reduction in incidence and mortality rate(14). Most studies of school reopening reported that school reopening, with extensive infection prevention and control measures in place and when the community infection



# PRISMA 2009 Checklist

			<p>levels were low, did not increase community transmission of SARS-CoV-2.</p> <p>Page 18: Further research is needed to validate these findings and their generalisability, including with respect to new variants. These findings are highly important given the harmful effects of school closures(3,4). Policymakers and governments need to take a measured approach before implementing school closures in response to rising infection rates, and look to reopen schools, with appropriate mitigation measures in place, where other lockdown measures have successfully brought community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 under control.</p>
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	<p>Page 16: The strength of this study is that it draws on empirical data from actual school closures and reopenings during the COVID-19 pandemic and includes data from 150 countries. By necessity, we include observational rather than randomised controlled studies, as understandably no jurisdictions have undertaken such trials. We were unable to meta-analyse due to study heterogeneity. We were unable to meaningfully examine differences between primary and secondary schools as very few studies distinguished between them, despite the different transmission patterns for younger and older children. Data are also lacking from low-income countries, where sociocultural factors may produce different effects of school closures on transmission to high income settings, leaving a substantial gap in the evidence base. Data in these studies comes exclusively from 2020, and many studies report only up to the summer months, it is therefore unclear whether our findings are robust to the effects of new SARS-CoV-2 variants and vaccines.</p> <p>A major challenge with estimating the 'independent' effect of school closures, acknowledged by many of the studies, is disentangling their effect from other NPIs occurring at the same time. While most studies tried to account for this, it is unclear how effective these methods were. Even where adjustment occurred there is a risk of residual confounding, which likely overestimated preventative associations; and collinearity (highly-correlated independent variables meaning that is impossible to estimate specific effects for each) which could bias results towards or away from the null. One exception was a paper by Matzinger et al.(37) which focused on three US states that implemented school closures first and without co-interventions, and reported a two-fold increase in the time for cases to double one week after school closures. However it is possible that the benefits observed here may be attributable, at least</p>



# PRISMA 2009 Checklist

			<p>in part, to a 'signalling effect' with other changes to social mobility (e.g. working from home) being prompted by school closures. Another approach, though ineligible for inclusion in our study, is to examine transmission data for breakpoints, and then work backwards to see what NPIs were in place at the time. Two studies that did this found that transmission started to drop following other NPIs, before school closures were implemented, and found no change in the gradient of decline after school closures in Switzerland(55) and Germany(56). This may suggest school closures have different effects when implemented first, or on top of other restrictions, perhaps due to a broader signalling effect that the first implemented NPI has on societal mobility patterns. The true independent effect of school closures from the first wave around the world may simply be unknowable.</p>
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	<p>Page 18: Different countries have adopted different approaches to controlling COVID-19. Early in the pandemic school closures were common, and in some places were one of the first major social distancing measures introduced. The effectiveness of the overall bundle of lockdown measures implemented is proven, but the incremental benefit of school closures remains unclear. In contrast, only one of the four studies of school reopenings assessed at a lower risk of bias reported an increase in community transmission. Collectively the evidence around school re-openings, while more limited in size, tends to suggest that school reopenings, when implemented during periods of low incidence and accompanied by robust preventive measures, are unlikely to have a measurable impact on community transmission. Further research is needed to validate these findings and their generalisability, including with respect to new variants. These findings are highly important given the harmful effects of school closures(3,4). Policymakers and governments need to take a measured approach before implementing school closures in response to rising infection rates, and look to reopen schools, with appropriate mitigation measures in place, where other lockdown measures have successfully brought community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 under control.</p>
<b>FUNDING</b>			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	Acknowledgments section



# PRISMA 2009 Checklist