

1 **SUPPLEMENT: Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 screening tests to facilitate full-time school attendance:**
2 **model-based analysis of cost and impact**

3
4 Alyssa Bilinski MS¹; Andrea Ciaranello MD²; Meagan C. Fitzpatrick PhD³; John Giardina¹; Maunank Shah
5 MD, PhD⁴; Joshua Salomon PhD⁵; Emily A. Kendall MD, PhD⁴

6
7 ¹ Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Cambridge, MA

8 ² Medical Practice Evaluation Center and Division of Infectious Disease, Massachusetts General Hospital,
9 Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts

10 ³ Center for Vaccine Development and Global Health, University of Maryland School of Medicine,
11 Baltimore, Maryland

12 ⁴ Division of Infectious Diseases, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD

13 ⁵ Center for Health Policy and Center for Primary Care and Outcomes Research, Stanford University
14 School of Medicine, Stanford, California

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Model Details**

49

50 We assumed an SEIR model of COVID-18 transmission (1). Briefly, when individuals interacted with an
51 agent (i.e. person) infected with SARS-CoV-2, transmission risk was proportional to duration and
52 intensity of exposure. The model drew stochastic outcomes assuming an average incubation period of
53 three days prior to the onset of infectiousness, two days of pre-symptomatic transmission if symptoms
54 develop (2,3), total infectious time of five days (4–7), and overdispersion of infectivity in adolescents
55 and adults (4,8) (Table 1). We assumed that adults with fully asymptomatic disease transmit COVID-19
56 at half the rate of those with any symptoms (9). We assumed vaccine coverage among teachers
57 sufficient to reduce susceptibility to infection by 80%, with approximately 90% coverage and 90%
58 reduction in infection risk among vaccinated individuals. Students were not vaccinated in the primary
59 model, but 50% reduction in the susceptibility of middle school students is included as a sensitivity
60 analysis. Based on data from household contact tracing studies, we further specified that, in absence of
61 vaccination, children under 10 are half as susceptible and half as infectious as symptomatic adolescents
62 and adults (10–14). Beyond interactions with infectious agents within the simulation, students, staff,
63 and their families had a probability of becoming infected through other community interactions
64 equivalent to an age-adjusted community per capita daily incidence, with children and adolescents
65 having half the incidence of unvaccinated adults.


66

67 In all scenarios, symptom-driven COVID diagnostic testing still occurred outside of the school
68 environment: individuals with COVID-19 who developed clinically-recognizable symptoms were assumed
69 to self-isolate from out-of-household contacts (including staying home from school) and to obtain
70 testing in the community. Results became available 24 hours after the first appearance of symptoms, at
71 which point classrooms were notified and quarantined for 10 days. Symptom-driven community-based
72 testing, and self-isolation of symptomatic individuals who had not been tested since symptom onset,
73 were assumed to occur with the same probabilities regardless of in-school screening practices.

74

75

76 **Fig S1 Model diagram**



77

78

79


80

81

82


83

84 **Fig S2. Incidence, case detection, and school attendance outcomes if screening strategies are**
 85 **accompanied by a reduction of the classroom quarantine duration to 7 days.**
 Elementary, with 7-day quarantine if screening




86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112

113 **Fig S3. Screening costs, as dollars per student per month in an elementary school.** Costs decline at
114 higher levels of incidence because increases in classroom quarantine cause screening days to be missed;
115 potential costs of community-based testing by exposed students or their contacts are not modeled.




116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132

133 **Fig S4. Screening costs, as dollars per student per month in a middle school.** As incidence rises, the
 134 spending on initial tests declines because increases in classroom quarantine cause screening days to be
 135 missed, but the higher proportion of pooled results that are positive and require individual follow-up
 136 testing results in little change in overall cost per student.




137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149

150 Fig S5. Childcare costs (elementary school)




151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170

171 **Fig S6. Childcare costs (middle school)**




172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192

193 **Fig S7. Costs associated with rapid antigen screening tests** (weekly tests at \$12 per test, PCR
 194 confirmation of positive results with same one-day turnaround, 0.5% false positive rapid tests, no
 195 change in sensitivity for acute infection) compared to those of schedule-based mitigation and of full-
 196 time in-person attendance without asymptomatic screening.
 197




198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212

213 Fig S8. Cost-effectiveness of rapid screening (cost per infection directly averted among students and
 214 staff), comparing weekly screening to full-time attendance without screening, under the same rapid
 215 screening assumptions as in Figure S7.




216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239

240 Fig S9. Cost effectiveness of weekly screening in middle school with 50% vaccination coverage of
241 students (and 90% of teachers and staff).



242
243


244 **Fig S10. One-way sensitivity analyses.** Panels A and B consider how individual parameter values or
 245 assumptions affect the difference in absolute incidence (infections per school per month)
 246 between asymptomatic screening and hybrid scheduling approaches in an elementary (A) and middle school (B).
 247 Panels C and D consider parameter sensitivity of the estimated cost per infection averted in an
 248 elementary (C) and middle (D) school. In each panel, the vertical dashed line shows the value of the
 249 outcome in the primary analysis. Text in gray along the dashed line indicates the values used in primary
 250 analyses, and black text on bars shows the one or two additional values that were explored for each
 251 parameter. Figures assume 90% teacher vaccination. For parameters other than the community
 252 notification rate, sensitivity analyses use a notification rate of 25 cases/100k/day.



253


254

C. Cost, Elementary school



255

D. Cost, Middle school



- 256
- 257
- 258
- 259
- 260
- 261
- 262
- 263
- 264
- 265
- 266
- 267
- 268
- 269
- 270

271 **Table S1. Comparison of transmission, case-detection, operational, and cost outcomes between**
 272 **different schedules and screening frequencies**

273
 274

	Infected (proportion of school per month)	Difference in proportion of school infected, per month vs full-time without screening	Proportion of incremental infections prevented (of difference between 5-day no screening and Remote)	Proportion of cases detected	In-person attendance (proportion of school days)	screening costs (\$ per student per month)	Societal costs (\$ per student per month)
Elementary school, community notification rate 10/100k/day							
5-day no screening	0.008	0	0	0.25	0.99	0	17
5-day 1x screening	0.007	-0.001	0.47	0.67	0.98	115	155
5-day 2x screening	0.007	-0.001	0.6	0.81	0.97	203	249
Hybrid	0.007	-0.002	0.73	0.25	0.4	0	423
Remote	0.006	-0.002	1	0.26	0	0	695
Elementary school, community notification rate 50/100k/day							
5-day no screening	0.04	0	0	0.25	0.95	0	79
5-day 1x screening	0.035	-0.005	0.54	0.65	0.89	108	288
5-day 2x screening	0.033	-0.007	0.76	0.77	0.88	181	378
Hybrid	0.032	-0.008	0.88	0.26	0.38	0	446
Remote	0.031	-0.009	1	0.26	0	0	695
Middle school, community notification rate 10/100k/day							
5-day no screening	0.018	0	0	0.23	0.98	0	28
5-day 1x screening	0.011	-0.007	0.67	0.6	0.97	114	163
5-day 2x screening	0.01	-0.009	0.77	0.72	0.97	202	254
Hybrid	0.008	-0.01	0.92	0.25	0.4	0	417
Remote	0.007	-0.011	1	0.25	0	0	685
Middle school, community notification rate 50/100k/day							

5-day no screening	0.078	0	0	0.23	0.93	0	119
5-day 1x screening	0.054	-0.024	0.57	0.58	0.87	110	320
5-day 2x screening	0.047	-0.032	0.74	0.71	0.87	182	399
Hybrid	0.04	-0.038	0.89	0.25	0.38	0	443
Remote	0.035	-0.043	1	0.26	0	0	685

275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312

313 **References**

- 314 1. Bilinski A, Salomon JA, Giardina J, Ciaranello A, Fitzpatrick MC. Passing the Test: A
315 Model-based analysis of safe school-reopening strategies. Forthcoming in *Annals of Internal*
316 *Medicine*.
- 317 2. Gatto M, Bertuzzo E, Mari L, Miccoli S, Carraro L, Casagrandi R, et al. Spread and
318 dynamics of the COVID-19 epidemic in Italy: Effects of emergency containment measures. *Proc*
319 *Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2020 May 12;117(19):10484–91.
- 320 3. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding
321 and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med*. 2020 Apr 15;1–4.
- 322 4. Kerr CC, Stuart RM, Mistry D, Abeysuriya RG, Hart G, Rosenfeld K, et al. Covasim: an
323 agent-based model of COVID-19 dynamics and interventions. *medRxiv*. 2020 May
324 15;2020.05.10.20097469.
- 325 5. He D, Zhao S, Lin Q, Zhuang Z, Cao P, Wang MH, et al. The relative transmissibility of
326 asymptomatic COVID-19 infections among close contacts. *International Journal of Infectious*
327 *Diseases*. 2020 May 1;94:145–7.
- 328 6. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in
329 Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020
330 Jan 29;0(0):null.
- 331 7. Firth JA, Hellewell J, Klepac P, Kissler SM, CMMID COVID-19 working group, Kucharski AJ,
332 et al. Combining fine-scale social contact data with epidemic modelling reveals interactions
333 between contact tracing, quarantine, testing and physical distancing for controlling COVID-19
334 [Internet]. *Epidemiology*; 2020 May [cited 2020 Jun 2]. Available from:
335 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.05.26.20113720>
- 336 8. Endo A, Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases COVID-19
337 Working Group, Abbott S, Kucharski AJ, Funk S. Estimating the overdispersion in COVID-19
338 transmission using outbreak sizes outside China. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2020 Apr 9;5:67.
- 339 9. Byambasuren O, Cardona M, Bell K, Clark J, McLaws M-L, Glasziou P. Estimating the
340 extent of asymptomatic COVID-19 and its potential for community transmission: Systematic review
341 and meta-analysis. *Official Journal of the Association of Medical Microbiology and Infectious*
342 *Disease Canada*. 2020 Dec 1;5(4):223–34.
- 343 10. Fontanet A, Grant R, Tondeur L, Madec Y, Grzelak L, Cailleau I, et al. SARS-CoV-2
344 infection in primary schools in northern France: A retrospective cohort study in an area of high
345 transmission. *medRxiv*. 2020 Jun 29;2020.06.25.20140178.
- 346 11. Stein-Zamir C, Abramson N, Shoob H, Libal E, Bitan M, Cardash T, et al. A large COVID-19
347 outbreak in a high school 10 days after schools’ reopening, Israel, May 2020. *Eurosurveillance*.
348 2020 Jul 23;25(29):2001352.
- 349 12. Dattner I, Goldberg Y, Katriel G, Yaari R, Gal N, Miron Y, et al. The role of children in the
350 spread of COVID-19: Using household data from Bnei Brak, Israel, to estimate the relative
351 susceptibility and infectivity of children [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Jun
352 [cited 2020 Jun 19]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.06.03.20121145>
- 353 13. Park YJ, Choe YJ, Park O, Park SY, Kim Y-M, Kim J, et al. Early Release - Contact Tracing
354 during Coronavirus Disease Outbreak, South Korea, 2020 - Volume 26, Number 10—October 2020
355 - *Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC*. [cited 2020 Aug 1]; Available from:
356 https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/10/20-1315_article
- 357 14. Fontanet A, Tondeur L, Madec Y, Grant R, Besombes C, Jolly N, et al. Cluster of COVID-19
358 in northern France: A retrospective closed cohort study. *medRxiv*. 2020 Apr
359 23;2020.04.18.20071134.
- 360