

Containing the Spread of Infectious Disease on College Campuses

Mirai Shah¹, Gabrielle Ferra², Susan Fitzgerald³, Paul J. Barreira⁴, Pardis C. Sabeti^{5,6,7,8}, Andres Colubri^{5,6,7,9*}

¹ Harvard College, Cambridge, MA, USA

² Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

³ Harvard University Health Services, Cambridge, MA, USA

⁴ Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

⁵ Harvard University, Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Cambridge, MA, USA

⁶ Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA

⁷ Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Chevy Chase, MD, USA

⁸ Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

⁹ University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA, USA

* Corresponding author: andres.colubri@umassmed.edu

Abstract

College campuses are highly vulnerable to infectious disease outbreaks, and there is a pressing need to develop better strategies to mitigate their size and duration, particularly as educational institutions around the world reopen to in-person instruction during the COVID-19 pandemic. Towards addressing this need, we applied a stochastic compartmental model to quantify the impact of university-level responses to past mumps outbreaks in college campuses and used it to determine which control interventions are most effective. Mumps is a very relevant disease in such settings, given its airborne mode of transmission, high infectivity, and recurrence of outbreaks despite availability of a vaccine. Our model allows for stochastic variation in small populations, missing or unobserved case data, and changes in disease transmission rates post-intervention. We tested the model and assessed various interventions using data from the 2014 and 2016 mumps outbreaks at Ohio State University and Harvard University, respectively. Our results suggest that in order to decrease infectious disease incidence on their campuses, universities should apply diagnostic protocols that address false negatives from molecular tests, stricter quarantine policies, and effective awareness campaigns among their students and staff. However, one needs to be careful about the assumptions implicit in the model to ensure that the estimated parameters have a reasonable interpretation. This modeling approach could be applied to data from other outbreaks in college campuses and similar small-population settings.

Keywords: Infectious disease, mumps outbreak, college campus, stochastic SEIR model, public health intervention, Harvard University, Ohio State University

1 INTRODUCTION

2 College campuses provide ideal breeding grounds for infectious disease. Students live in close
3 quarters, pack into lecture halls, share food and drinks in the dining areas, and engage in intimate
4 contact. Outbreaks in these settings can spread very quickly. Indeed, a meningitis outbreak took
5 place at Princeton University in March 2014, eventually claiming the life of one student. The
6 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported the attack rate of the disease on
7 Princeton’s campus to be 134 per 100,000 students – 1,400 times greater than the national average
8 (1). Recent COVID-19 spread in educational settings (2) forced school closures around the world
9 (3), and motivated the design and implementation of plans for safe reopening (4, 5).

10 A recent string of outbreaks on college campuses involves mumps, once a common
11 childhood viral disease. After introduction of the measles-mumps-rubella (MMR) vaccine in 1977
12 and the two-dose MMR vaccination program in 1989, the number of mumps cases in the US
13 plummeted by 2005. But, despite a vaccinated population, there has been a recent resurgence of
14 mumps, with a steep jump from 229 cases in 2012 to 5833 cases in 2016 (6). Although a typically
15 mild disease in children, up to 10% of mumps infections acquired after puberty can cause severe
16 complications, including orchitis, meningitis, and deafness. Furthermore, a majority of recent
17 mumps cases have occurred in young adults who had received the recommended two MMR doses.
18 This suggests that vaccine-derived immunity wanes over time, unlike natural immunity –
19 protection acquired from contracting the disease – which is permanent. Lewnard and Grad estimate
20 that 33.8% of young adults (ages 20 to 24) were susceptible to mumps in 1990, in contrast to the
21 52.8% susceptible in 2006, as vaccinations have replaced contraction as the source of immunity
22 (7). The temporary immunity from vaccines strengthens the argument for strict containment as a
23 critical line of defense amidst an outbreak. In the case of COVID-19, even with the availability of

24 several vaccines (8), the challenges associated with their wide and quick distribution (9), the
25 substantial asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic transmission of the disease (10), and the possibility
26 of new viral strains with higher transmissibility (11) provide further support for such approaches.

27 The spread of mumps at Harvard University in 2016, and extensive public health measures
28 and documentation, presents an opportunity to closely examine an outbreak on a college campus.
29 Between January 1 and August 31, 2016, 210 confirmed mumps cases were identified in the
30 Greater Boston area, with most detected at Harvard University. Mumps is a highly contagious
31 disease with the potential to travel quickly and pervasively on a crowded college campus. Some
32 of the most notable mumps outbreaks on college campuses occurred in Iowa (12), Indiana (13),
33 and Ohio (14). But, whereas mumps spread rapidly at Ohio State University (OSU) in 2014 and
34 the University of Iowa in 2006 and 2016, Harvard employed a number of interventions that may
35 have helped mitigate spread of the disease and contain it over just a few months (15). The
36 possibility of distinct viral strains resulting in different outbreak dynamics between schools can be
37 safely dismissed, as it was shown by application of genetic epidemiology methods (16) that all
38 mumps outbreaks in the US since at least 2006 have been likely caused by the same mumps lineage,
39 mumps virus genotype G.

40 The successful containment at Harvard motivates us to explore varied intervention
41 strategies, given the relative costs of prevention. Even if the use of a booster MMR vaccination is
42 proven theoretically to reduce infection and thus potentially prevent outbreaks (7, 12), it is unlikely
43 that universities with limited resources will proactively invest in a third dose. A rough cost analysis
44 conducted by Harvard University Health Services (HUHS) showed that, while the total mumps
45 care expenses for Harvard was approximately \$75,000, the cost of providing a third MMR dose to
46 every member of the Harvard community (at \$83 per vaccination) was \$1.7 million (17). Therefore,

47 at least in the short term, a third MMR dose cannot be the only answer to handling mumps
48 outbreaks; we must consider more immediate solutions and interventions.

49 In order to understand the effectiveness of interventions aimed at containing mumps
50 outbreaks on a college campus, we constructed an epidemiological model to simulate the dynamics
51 of mumps on such a population and quantify the impact of various interventions. This modeling
52 can be challenging because the number of susceptible students in a college is small compared with
53 population-wide studies, parameters characterizing the interventions are not known, and data is
54 partially observed. Deterministic models are only appropriate when the populations of the
55 compartments are sufficiently large (18). We adopt a modified stochastic susceptible-exposed-
56 infectious-recovered (SEIR) model presented to addresses these issues. We developed this model
57 within the framework of a Partially Observed Markov Process (POMP), which has been applied
58 to introduce structural stochasticity into epidemic models (19). The stochastic nature of the model
59 allows for variability from elements that are not explicitly included, such as class schedules and
60 campus layouts. This model also allows to easily quantify time-varying interventions after fitting
61 the parameters to the observed data, by running simulations under alternative scenarios.

62 We fit model parameters on case data for Harvard's 2016 mumps outbreak provided by the
63 Massachusetts Department of Public Health (MDPH). We compared it to data from OSU, one of
64 the few universities that had extensive publicly available data through the CDC.

65 In applying our model, we found that each of the interventions employed by HUHS -- email
66 awareness campaigns, more aggressive diagnoses where clinical symptoms alone were enough to
67 result in quarantine, and strict isolation of suspected cases -- were crucial in reducing the size and
68 duration of the outbreak. In particular, Harvard's policies drastically increased the reporting rate
69 of infection and shortened the time a person remains infectious in a susceptible population, relative

70 to the baseline. As a result, one mumps case at Harvard infected less than two susceptible
71 individuals on average, and much less once aggressive diagnosis was in place, compared to cases
72 at non-residential schools like OSU, in which one mumps case infected an average of six
73 susceptible individuals. However, the OSU data suggests that self-isolation could be effective, if
74 adopted rigorously by students. The conclusions from this paper could guide future responses to
75 infectious disease outbreaks on college campuses. Without effective measures in place, highly
76 transmissible diseases like mumps, meningitis, and now COVID-19, spread in these environments
77 at much faster rates than in the overall population and can lead to serious health complications.
78 Simple interventions that ensure most cases are detected, treated, and separated from susceptible
79 individuals make a significant difference.

80

81 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

82

83 **2.1 Harvard mumps outbreak**

84 **2.1.1 Data**

85 The mumps outbreak at Harvard began in February 2016, when six students reported onset of
86 parotitis to HUHS. For the next three months, the number of cases continued to rise, until finally
87 plateauing in late May and early June. There were two waves of the outbreak – one occurring in
88 the month of March and a larger one occurring in mid-April – totaling 189 confirmed and probable
89 cases (Figure 1). Confirmed cases are those with a positive laboratory test for mumps virus.
90 Probable cases are those who either tested positive for the anti-mumps IgM antibody or had an
91 epidemiologic linkage to another probable or confirmed case (20, 21). The majority of these cases
92 received the recommended two doses of MMR (22).

93 We use data provided by MDPH, which documented every mumps case between 2015 and
94 2017 at schools across Massachusetts (23). This data includes demographics of the patient (gender,
95 age, county, and institution), symptoms and vaccination status, date they reported their symptoms
96 and the date of symptom onset, and lag time between the date of symptom onset and admission to
97 a medical clinic.

98

99 **2.1.2 Interventions**

100 Harvard University employed three main interventions: (i) an email awareness campaign, (ii) more
101 aggressive diagnoses, and (iii) strict isolation of infectious persons.

102 First, between February and May 2016, HUHS sent six different emails to Harvard students,
103 employees, and colleagues with information on the gravity of the outbreak, recommendations on
104 how to prevent transmission, and instructions on how to identify mumps. This raised awareness

105 throughout the campus. Particularly at the peak of the outbreak, roommates, resident deans, and
106 athletic coaches all played essential roles in reporting potential cases of mumps, so that few cases
107 likely went undetected and untreated by HUHS (20, 21).

108 Second, Harvard acted vigorously to treat and isolate anyone suspected of mumps
109 throughout the outbreak. Initially, due to the disease's non-specific symptoms and less extreme
110 manifestation in vaccinated people, HUHS used positive mumps PCR tests as a necessary ground
111 for diagnosis. Later, on recommendation from the MDPH, HUHS stopped automatically ruling out
112 those with negative PCR results, given that false negatives were quite frequent in vaccinated
113 individuals and that some individuals reported their infection to the clinic belatedly. Isolation or
114 detection of the mumps virus is challenging because of its transient replication and coincident
115 presence of antibodies (24). In outbreaks among two-dose vaccine recipients, mumps virus was
116 only detected in samples from approximately 30-35% of case patients if the samples were collected
117 within the first three days following onset of parotitis (25). Anyone who entered HUHS displaying
118 clinical symptoms of mumps was now deemed infected and infectious. This change in the
119 diagnosis protocol took place on April 15, 2016, day 61 of the outbreak (21).

120 Third and perhaps most notably, Harvard isolated most confirmed or probable cases of
121 mumps. While many universities simply suggest self-isolation in one's room or dormitory (which
122 leaves roommates and friends highly susceptible to the disease), Harvard removed anyone with
123 clinical symptoms of mumps from the population. Of the 230 total cases at Harvard between
124 February 2016 and November 2017, 96 were isolated in alternate housing on campus, while 110
125 were isolated off-site. Although a person remains infectious with mumps for five days, Harvard
126 isolated patients for six days for additional measure (20).

127 Harvard also used a variety of smaller techniques to contain the disease. For instance, water
128 fountains with a weak upward flow were repaired in late March when it became apparent that
129 students were directly touching the fountain with their water bottles or mouths (21). In this study,
130 we only considered the first three larger-scale interventions in our models. Figure 1 shows a
131 timeline of the interventions as well as periods when the population was fluctuating (such as during
132 spring and summer break). Around two weeks after HUHS improved its criteria for diagnosis in
133 mid-April, there was a steep decline in the number of new cases. These interventions were possible
134 thanks to the ample resources that Harvard has at its disposal, which may not be available at other
135 universities. Nevertheless, this situation makes Harvard an ideal testing ground for interventions
136 that could not be deployed elsewhere, at least without solid proof of their efficacy. Thus, we
137 quantify the effects of the three main interventions (awareness campaign, aggressive diagnoses,
138 and strict isolation of suspected cases) further in the modeling section of this paper.




Figure 1: The daily number of new mumps cases (probable or confirmed) at Harvard and the timeline of school vacations and control interventions employed by HUHS between February and June 2016. Both probable and confirmed cases display clinical symptoms of mumps, but only confirmed cases have a positive PCR result. HUHS sent multiple emails over the course of the outbreak, raising awareness about the spread of mumps. Additionally, in mid-April, HUHS began more carefully diagnosing mumps, rather than automatically ruling out those with negative PCR tests. The isolation policy is not shown because it occurred continuously throughout the entire outbreak.

150 **2.2 Ohio State University mumps outbreak**

151 **2.2.1 Data on the outbreak**


152 In 2014, a large outbreak of mumps occurred in central Ohio, with the majority of cases linked to
153 OSU in Columbus. The outbreak began in February 2014 and peaked in early April with 96 cases
154 in one week. By summer and early fall, the number of cases had dramatically dropped and
155 stabilized (14). We therefore restrict our analysis of the outbreak to the time between Week 1 and
156 Week 40 of 2014, in which there were a total of 528 cases (Figure 2). We obtained this data from
157 CDC's *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* (26). One drawback of the data is that the cases
158 are reported weekly, making our analysis and parameter estimations less precise. Furthermore, we
159 cannot guarantee that all the cases in this dataset are linked to the university itself, but we know
160 from news reports that most cases in Ohio occurred on campus during the first half of 2014 (14).
161 The proximity in time to the Harvard outbreak and the differences in response detailed below make
162 this a good dataset to compare to.

163

164 **2.2.2 Characteristics of the response**

165 We were unable to acquire data directly from OSU, and thus the exact timeline and range of
166 interventions administered over this period are not known. We learned through online searches
167 that advisories were published by the university, notifying students of the issue and how to prevent
168 its spread. One notice published by OSU's medical center reads: "Stay at home for five days after
169 symptoms (salivary gland swelling) begins (required by Ohio law OAC 3701-3-13, (P)); avoid
170 school, work, social gatherings, and other public settings" (27). These advisories were distributed
171 since March 2014 (28), and local news outlets also started reporting the outbreak earlier in the

172 month (29). It appears, however, that like most affected universities, OSU did not formally isolate
173 infectious persons.



174

175 **Figure 2:** Number of weekly mumps cases in Ohio (particularly Ohio State University) between
176 January and November 2014. There were 528 cases during this time period, with most occurring
177 between March and July. The dotted line in the last week of March indicates the intervention
consisting in awareness campaign by OSU, as well as local and national news reports about the
outbreak.

177

178 2.3 Epidemiological POMP model

179 The epidemiology of mumps can be captured by a Susceptible-Exposed-Infected-Removed (SEIR)
180 compartmental model: after exposure, individuals go through a latent non-infectious period,
181 followed by an infectious phase (30). Infectious individuals are removed from the transmission
182 process either by recovery or isolation, after which they become immune. Compartmental models
183 simplify the mathematical modeling of infectious diseases; however, they assume access to fully
184 observed disease data. In reality, not all mumps cases are reported, and latent mumps carriers
185 exhibit no symptoms at all. In order to address this issue, our approach integrates a standard SEIR

186 model with a Partially Observed Markov Process (POMP) model (31). This allows us to combine
187 the simplicity of compartmental models with a probabilistic framework for the underlying
188 dynamics and the observed data. POMP models require the specification of a process model that
189 describes stochastic transitions between the (unobserved) states of the system (in this case, the
190 SEIR compartments), and a measurement model where the distribution of observed data (e.g.:
191 confirmed cases) is expressed as a function of the unobserved states. The stochasticity introduced
192 in the SEIR dynamics makes our model better suited to describe small populations, such as college
193 campuses, where random fluctuations can be significant in relation to the size of the population.
194 We describe the process and measurement models below.

195

196 **2.3.1 Process model**

197 The process model, defined as a stochastic SEIR model, provides the change in true incidence of
198 mumps at every time point. We add parameters that induce random fluctuations into the population
199 and change the compartments' rates of transfer in response to interventions. We do this by using
200 probabilistic densities for the transition of state variables. Moreover, although disease dynamics
201 are technically a continuous Markov process, this is computationally complex and inefficient to
202 model, and so we make discretized approximations by updating the state variables after a time step,
203 δ . Due to the varying granularity of the observed data (daily and weekly), we used two different
204 time steps: $\delta_H = 2.4 \text{ hours}$ for Harvard and $\delta_O = 12 \text{ hours}$ for OSU. The system of discretized
205 equations is shown in Equation 1, where $B(t)$ is the number of susceptible individuals who
206 become exposed to mumps, $C(t)$ is the number of newly infectious cases, and $D(t)$ is the number
207 of cases that are removed from the population:

$$\begin{aligned} 208 \quad & S(t + \delta) = S(t) - B(t) \\ 209 \quad & \\ 210 \quad & E(t + \delta) = E(t) + B(t) - C(t) \\ 211 \quad & \\ 212 \quad & I(t + \delta) = I(t) + C(t) - D(t) \quad (1) \\ 213 \quad & \\ 214 \quad & R(t + \delta) = R(t) + D(t) \\ 215 \quad & \\ 216 \quad & S(t) + E(t) + I(t) + R(t) = N \\ 217 \quad & \end{aligned}$$

218 Equation 1 describes how the sizes of the four compartments (susceptible, exposed,
219 infectious, and removed) change between $(t, t + \delta)$. The model further assumes that the
220 population size N remains constant at every time point. We added inherent randomness to our
221 model by setting $B(t)$, $C(t)$, and $D(t)$ as binomials. If we assume that the length of time an
222 individual spends in a compartment is exponentially distributed with some compartment-specific
223 rate $x(t)$, then the probability of remaining in that compartment for an additional day is
224 $\exp(-x(t))$ and the probability of leaving that compartment is $1 - \exp(-x(t))$:

$$\begin{aligned} 225 \quad & B(t) \sim \text{Bin}(S(t), 1 - \exp(-\lambda(t))), \text{ where } \lambda(t) = \beta(t) \frac{I(t)}{N} \\ 226 \quad & \\ 227 \quad & C(t) \sim \text{Bin}(E(t), 1 - \exp(-\sigma)) \quad (2) \\ 228 \quad & \\ 229 \quad & D(t) \sim \text{Bin}(I(t), 1 - \exp(-\gamma(t))) \end{aligned}$$

230 The force of infection, $\lambda(t)$, is the transition rate between the susceptible and exposed
231 classes at time t and can be expressed as $\beta(t) \frac{I(t)}{N}$, where $\beta(t)$ represents the transmission rate of
232 the disease. The removal rate between the infectious and removed compartments at time t is given
233 by $\gamma(t)$, and transition rate between the exposed and infectious classes is σ . Therefore, $\gamma(t)^{-1}$
234 represents the mean length of time a person is infectious before being removed from the population
235 (either because of intervention efforts or natural recovery), while σ^{-1} represents the mean length
236 of time a person stays in the latent stage. With this notation, we are implicitly assuming that the
237 transmission and removal rates could change over time due to interventions or changes in behavior,

238 while the duration of the latent stage is constant and determined by the physiopathology of the
239 disease. We will justify these assumptions for Harvard and OSU next, as well as provide explicit
240 formulas for $\beta(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$.

241 Leaving aside the unlikely possibility of change in pathogen's infectivity, the transmission
242 rate $\beta(t)$ essentially depends on the frequency of exposure events. In the case of Harvard, its
243 nature as a residential campus would lead to significant decreases in student population, and
244 therefore exposures, during school vacations. Exposure at OSU, a non-residential campus, is
245 arguably less affected by vacation breaks. Another potential cause for reduction in exposures is
246 awareness campaigns resulting in the adoption of preventive behaviors by students. Both Harvard
247 and OSU adopted such campaigns, in the former, implemented as emails regularly sent out by
248 HUHS recommending personal hygiene and testing in case of symptoms compatible with mumps;
249 in the latter, in the form of advisories posted around campus and online, advising self-isolation to
250 those students who presented symptoms. Furthermore, due to the scale of the mumps outbreak in
251 Ohio, it received local and national news coverage, particularly in connection with OSU.
252 Anecdotal evidence (i.e.: conversation with students) and, most importantly, the fact that HUHS
253 emails were throughout the outbreak, make us conclude that emails were not particularly effective.
254 On the other hand, news coverage in the case of OSU could have led to additional awareness by
255 students and encouraged some to self-isolate. We argue that self-isolation results in lowering of
256 transmission rate, not shortening of the removal time, because it is not perfect quarantine and
257 people can still interact and become exposed, albeit at a lower frequency. Based on these known
258 facts and our interpretation of them, we propose the following transmission rate $\beta_H(t)$ for the
259 Harvard model:

$$\begin{aligned} 260 \quad \beta_H(t) &= p\beta_H, \quad t_0 \leq t \leq t_1 \text{ or } t \geq t_2 \\ 261 \quad &= \beta_H \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

262 Here, t_0 and t_1 represent the starting and ending dates for the spring break (March 12-20 2016),
263 and t_2 the beginning of the summer recess (May 26 2016). The constant β_H is the baseline
264 transmission rate during normal class term, and the parameter p is a number between 0 and 1 that
265 accounts for the reduction of student population on campus during the school vacation. In the case
266 of OSU, we propose:

$$\begin{aligned} 267 \quad \beta_o(t) &= w\beta_o, \quad t \geq \zeta \\ 268 \quad &= \beta_o \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

269
270 In this equation, β_o the baseline transmission rate, w is a constant lower than 1, and ζ the time
271 when students began to self- quarantine. Based on publication of public health advisories and
272 local news, we set this time as the last week of March 2014 (week 12). Since Harvard's
273 quarantine was in effect through the entirety of the outbreak, we did not incorporate a similar w
274 coefficient to the corresponding $\beta_H(t)$ equation for Harvard.

275 The removal rate $\gamma(t)$ can also be affected by interventions and personal behaviors. We
276 know that HUHS diagnosis protocol changed on day 61 of the outbreak at Harvard, resulting in a
277 shorter average removal time since clinical presentation of symptoms alone was enough to result
278 in strict isolation of suspected cases. Thus, we propose the following $\gamma_H(t)$ for Harvard:

$$\begin{aligned} 279 \quad \gamma_H(t) &= q\gamma_H, \quad t \geq \tau \\ 280 \quad &= \gamma_H, \quad t < \tau \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

281 Here, q is a constant greater than 1 and τ is the date when the new criteria was implemented (April
282 15, 2014). The constant γ_H is the baseline removal rate reflecting the impact of the original
283 diagnosis protocol. In the OSU model, on the other hand, we assume a constant recovery rate γ
284 equal to the population average for mumps, since infected individuals self-isolate at home. This
285 would not result in a strict quarantine but in a reduced contact rate with susceptible individuals,
286 which is already modeled by a lower transmission rate in equation (4).

287 Finally, it is necessary to estimate the basic reproduction number, R_0 , which equals the
288 expected number of secondary cases produced by an infectious person in a completely susceptible
289 population (30). R_0 measures the initial growth rate of an outbreak and so, if it is less than 1, then
290 the infection will die out and there will be no epidemic. For our stochastic SEIR model, this
291 constant can be expressed as $R_0 = \frac{\beta}{\gamma}$ (18). Meanwhile, the time-dependent effective reproduction
292 number is defined as $R_E(t) = \frac{\beta(t)}{\gamma(t)} * \frac{S(t)}{N}$, but because $S(t) \approx N$, we can simplify this expression
293 to $R_E(t) \approx \frac{\beta(t)}{\gamma(t)}$. Both the basic and effective reproduction numbers allow us to understand the
294 strength of an outbreak.

295

296 **2.3.2 Measurement Model**

297 Although it is impossible to directly record the number of people that are susceptible, exposed,
298 infectious, and removed directly, the MDPH and CDC data tells us the number of observed cases
299 per day. The mean number of observed cases per day is the true number of cases multiplied by the
300 reporting rate ρ ($\rho < 1$). However, rather than simply denoting the observed number of cases as a
301 binomial distribution, we account for greater variability in the measurements than a binomial
302 distribution expects, since college populations are “small” (compared to cities and larger
303 administrative units) and more affected by random fluctuations (32). Thus, the number of observed
304 cases, y_t , given the number of true cases, $C(t)$, can be best modelled by an overdispersed binomial
305 distribution defined as a discretized Normal random variable:

$$306 \quad y_t | C(t) \sim Normal(\rho C(t), \rho(1 - \rho)C(t) + (\psi \rho C(t))^2) \quad (6)$$

307

308

309 The parameter ψ handles the increased variability in a small population. If $\psi = 0$, the
310 variance in our measurement model simplifies to the variance for a binomial distribution.

311

312 **2.3.3 Final POMP Model**

313 The process and measurement models define our final POMP model. For each time point, the
314 process model generates the number of new cases based on binomially distributed counts. The
315 measurement model then estimates the observed number of cases based on the true number of
316 cases and reporting rate. The free parameters in our POMP models for Harvard and OSU that need
317 to be estimated from the data are the following: (i) β_H and β_O , baseline transmission rates, (ii) p
318 and w , decrease in transmission rate at Harvard and OSU due to vacation and self-isolation,
319 respectively, (iii) γ_H baseline removal rate at Harvard (iv) q , increase in removal rate due to the
320 updated HUHS diagnosis protocol, (v) ρ_H and ρ_O , case reporting rates, (vi) ψ_H and ψ_O ,
321 overdispersion coefficient representing additional variability in the populations.

322

323 **2.3 Fixed parameters**

324 In addition to the free parameters to be estimated from the observed case data, our models also
325 include a number of fixed parameters, shown in Table 1, whose values can be inferred directly
326 from previous knowledge or available information. As mentioned earlier, we chose $\tau = 61$ days
327 and $\zeta = 12$ weeks because those points in time at Harvard and OSU correspond to the introduction
328 of the interventions that we hypothesized to be impactful in the dynamics of the respective
329 outbreaks. Dates t_0 , t_1 , and t_2 for the spring and summer vacations at Harvard are available online
330 (33). We set the rate between the exposed and infectious classes and the recovery rate to $\sigma = \frac{1}{17}$
331 and $\gamma = \frac{1}{5}$, respectively, since the average latent period and recovery time for mumps are known
332 to be $\sigma^{-1} = 17$ days and $\gamma^{-1} = 5$ days (7). Finally, we set the effective population size at Harvard
333 $N_H = 20,000 \times 0.53 = 10,600$ people based on records of Harvard's enrollment and

334 employment, and Lewnard and Grad estimation of susceptibility to mumps among college-age
 335 adults due to immunity waning (7). Similarly, we use an effective population for OSU given by
 336 $N_O = 60,000 \times 0.53 = 31,800$, leveraging the total enrollment for the 2013-2014 academic year
 337 reported in OSU’s statistics website (34).
 338

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Source</i>
τ	Date of intervention at Harvard	61	day	Harvard records on interventions (21)
t_0, t_1, t_2	Vacation dates at Harvard, 2015-2016 academic year	26, 34, 100	day	Harvard archived academic calendar (33)
ζ	Date of intervention at OSU	12	week	
σ^{-1}	Duration of mumps latent period	17	day	Lewnard and Grad (7)
γ^{-1}	Duration of mumps recovery period	5	day	Lewnard and Grad (7)
N_H	Effective population at Harvard	10,600	—	Harvard records on population size (22) and mumps susceptibility among college-aged individuals (7)
N_O	Effective population at OSU	31,800	—	OSU’s statistical summary (34) and mumps susceptibility among college-aged individuals (7)

339 **Table 1:** List of fixed parameters used in mumps transmission model for Harvard and OSU

340

341 **2.4 Maximum likelihood estimation of free parameters**

342 In order to obtain estimates of the free parameters in our models, we pick the parameter values that
 343 maximize the log likelihood of the observed data given each model. Within the POMP framework,
 344 we can perform fast maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) via Sequential Monte Carlo (SMC)
 345 techniques (31). SMC allows us to calculate the likelihood of the data more efficiently by applying
 346 the Markov property to generate paths in parameter space that sample the likelihood surface. We
 347 performed 100 searches from random parameter guesses, each converging to a unique value, and
 348 we then took the maximum over the 100 runs the final point estimates. We did this using the pomp
 349 package version 3.3 (35) for the R statistical software version 4.0.5 (36). In order to calculate the

350 confidence intervals for each parameter, we applied the Monte Carlo-adjusted profile (MCAP)
351 algorithm (37).

352

353 **2.5 Intervention analysis**

354 Finally, we performed an analysis of the parameters q and w , which respectively quantify the effect
355 of what we consider to be the defining intervention at Harvard (aggressive diagnosis) occurring
356 around day 61 of the outbreak, and the self-isolation awareness campaign at OSU during March
357 2014. This could allow us to understand to what extent these interventions made a difference on
358 the trajectory of the outbreak. First, we compared the scenario with the interventions versus a
359 scenario without the interventions. Controlling for all other parameters, we run two sets of
360 simulations at the MLEs, with 200 simulations each. The first set of simulations fixed q and w at
361 the value obtained from MLE, while the second set of simulations set q and w to 1, assuming that
362 no interventions occurred around day 61 at Harvard and by week 12 at OSU. We then compared
363 the cumulative number of cases over time for these two sets of simulations, generating a 95%
364 percentile range from all the simulations in each set. Second, we used this method to determine if
365 administering the interventions earlier could have lowered the number of cases. For Harvard, we
366 let the day of the intervention take on values between 1 and 60. Subsequently, we ran simulations
367 for each of these 60 cases, pulled the final outbreak size from the median simulation, and calculated
368 the reduction in outbreak size. We applied the same procedure for OSU, in this case varying the
369 day of intervention between 1 and 11 and calculating the corresponding final outbreak sizes.

370 3. RESULTS

371 3.1 Optimal Parameters of Harvard and OSU Outbreaks

372 The MLEs of the parameters provide insight into the key characteristics of Harvard’s and OSU’s
 373 outbreak. In general, we observe very good agreement between the observed cases and the
 374 simulated outbreaks using the optimal parameters. The effective reproduction number also reflects
 375 the effects of the interventions at Harvard and OSU in way that’s consistent with our initial
 376 modeling assumptions.

377

378 3.1.1 Maximum Likelihood Estimates for Harvard

379 The results are shown in Table 2. Notably, the baseline removal rate γ_H is quite high, indicating
 380 that the initial diagnosis protocol was quite effective at identifying and removing infected students
 381 from the population, but it was further increased after day 61. The reporting rate ρ_H is also
 382 remarkably high, which suggests that HUHS was able to identify most of the cases circulating at
 383 Harvard.

384

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Point estimate</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Source</i>
β_H	Baseline transmission rate	1.39	(1.02, 2.20)	day ⁻¹	MLE
γ_H	Baseline removal rate	0.85	(0.78, 0.99)	day ⁻¹	MLE
p	Decrease in infection due to vacation	0.11	(0.00, 0.47)		MLE
q	Increase in removal rate	2.8	(1.39, 6.00)	—	MLE
ρ_H	Proportion of infections reported	0.97	(0.87, 0.99)	—	MLE
ψ_H	Overdispersion parameter	0.54	(0.36, 0.72)	—	MLE
$R_E(t)$	Effective reproduction number	1.63 normal term 0.18 during vacation 0.58 after intervention	—	—	Calculated as $\frac{\beta(t)}{\gamma(t)}$

385

Table 2: List of parameters in the Harvard model that were obtained by MLE or calculated using the estimated parameters.

386

387 We ran 200 stochastic simulations of Harvard’s outbreak using the parameter values from
 388 Table 2. Figure 3A shows the range of values across simulations, and they appear consistent with
 389 the observed data. Shortly after day 61 (the time of the primary intervention), we see a decrease in
 390 the number of cases. The variability in the simulations can partly be attributed to the randomness
 391 in the stochastic model as well as the over-dispersion parameter. Variability can also be explained
 392 by the MLE of the basic reproduction number being below 2, which together with the stochasticity
 393 built into the simulations, can result in absence of outbreak.

394

395 3.1.2 Maximum Likelihood Estimates for OSU

396 The MLEs of the parameters for the OSU model, as well as derived quantities, are shown in Table
 397 3. Here we can see an initial reproductive number of almost 6, much higher than Harvard’s.
 398 However, it eventually becomes lower than 1, which supports our modeling assumptions of an
 399 awareness campaign from OSU, perhaps helped by news reporting about the outbreak, that lead to
 400 effective self-isolation of individuals.


<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Point estimate</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Source</i>
β_O	Transmission rate constant	1.19	(0.92, 1.43)	day ⁻¹	MLE
w	Decrease in infection due to self-isolation	0.16	(0.09, 1.17)	—	MLE
ρ_O	Proportion of infections reported	0.03	(0.03, 0.08)	—	MLE
ψ_O	Overdispersion parameter	0.38	(0.22, 0.65)	—	MLE
$R_E(t)$	Effective reproduction number	5.95 initial 0.95 after advisory		—	Calculated as $\frac{\beta(t)}{\gamma(t)}$

401 **Table 3:** List of parameters in the OSU model that obtained by MLE or calculated using
 402 the estimated parameters.

403 As with Harvard, we run stochastic simulations of OSU’s outbreak using the parameter values
 404 from Table 3. The simulated outbreaks are shown in Figure 3B, and they follow the real data
 405 remarkably well. However, the proportion of infections reported, ρ_O , is very low at 3%. This would

406 imply that the true number of cases in the OSU outbreak was 30 times larger than observed, placing
407 the total count at around 15,000.

408



409

410

411

Figure 3: These plots show the observed case count data (red line) and the range of simulated case count values at each time point between the bottom 5% and top 95% percentiles (blue shaded area) from 200 simulation runs using the Harvard (A) and OSU (B) models evaluated at the maximum likelihood estimates of the parameters.

412

413

414 **3.2 Earlier intervention decreases outbreak size at Harvard and OSU**


415 The results from the intervention analysis for Harvard and OSU is depicted in Figure 4. By the

416 final day of the Harvard outbreak (day 130), the simulations without the intervention on day 61

417 yielded outbreak sizes that were up to four times the size of the actual outbreak (Figure 4A). These

418 results also indicate that the outbreak would have lasted much longer, if not for these vigilance-
419 increasing strategies. By varying the day of the intervention from 1 to 61, we also obtained a linear
420 regression between day of intervention and reduction of the outbreak (Figure 4C). The fitness of
421 the regression is very high ($R^2=0.96$, $P<10^{-9}$), and quick inspection of the plot reveals that if the
422 new diagnosis protocol had been implemented within the first 10 days of the outbreak, then no
423 more than 50 students would have been infected in total at Harvard.

424 For OSU we observe similar trends. Lack of intervention on week 12 could have resulted
425 in an outbreak twice as large (Figure 4B). The outbreak size as a function of the intervention week
426 also shows a strong dependency, but in this case non-linear and best fit with a sigmoid function of
427 the form $1/(1+e^{\text{week}-12})$. Using this transformation, the fit is also very high ($R^2=0.63$, $P<0.005$), and
428 we can conclude that intervening earlier would have had a major effect as well: if the awareness
429 campaigns prompting students to self-isolate had started around week 5 or 6 (rather than week 12),
430 then it appears likely that the outbreak could have been completely eradicated.



431

432

433

434

Figure 4: Panels A and B show the comparison of the cumulative number of cases over time for the observed Harvard and OSU data and the range of cases (95% percentile of the runs) in simulations with and without interventions, with dotted lines representing the timing of the interventions in each school (panels A and B). In panels C and D, the plots show the percentage we expect outbreak size to decrease by if the date of intervention had been moved up. There is a significant linear relationship between the time and percentage reduction in the case of Harvard, as well as a significant relationship after doing a sigmoid transformation of the time variable in the case of OSU.

435 **4. DISCUSSION**

436 **4.1 Parameter interpretation**

437 The MLEs give us insight into characteristics of the mumps outbreaks at Harvard University in
438 2016 and Ohio State University in 2014, as measured by their effective reproduction numbers R_E ,
439 intervention parameters q and w , rates of removal γ , reporting rates ρ , and overdispersion
440 parameters ψ . At Harvard, R_E during normal class term was 1.63, which indicates that the
441 outbreak was growing, even though testing and isolation by HUHS resulted in a baseline removal
442 time of only $\frac{1}{0.85} = 1.2$ days. This points to the effectiveness of the quarantine system
443 implemented by HUHS. However, a small fraction of false negative cases still managed to escape
444 quarantine and keep the virus under circulation, as indicated by the reproduction number being
445 higher than 1. The reproduction number goes below 1 during the spring break, which is reasonable
446 given that most students are away due to the residential nature of the Harvard campus. However,
447 transmission resumes after the break. It is only after the implementation of the new diagnosis
448 protocol on day 61, which required isolation if clinical symptoms were present, that had a dramatic
449 effect on the detection and isolation of positive cases, effectively taking the removal time to less
450 than 1 day and the reproductive number below 0.6. Thanks to this key intervention, it was possible
451 to end the outbreak before the beginning of the summer recess.

452 The estimate of ρ is 0.96, which implies the reporting rate at Harvard was remarkable.
453 Reasons include the email awareness campaign, a community network – from resident deans to
454 athletic coaches – reporting students and employees who seemed at-risk, and more aggressive
455 diagnoses, particularly towards the end of the outbreak. The estimate for ψ is 0.54, suggesting that
456 the actual data has more variability than expected under the assumed distribution. If ψ had been

457 approximately 0, the variance in our measurement model would have simplified to the variance
458 for a binomial distribution. However, because the 95% confidence interval is (0.22, 0.65) and thus
459 does not include 0, we justify the modelling decision of representing the number of cases as an
460 over-dispersed binomial. Demographic and environmental stochasticity (e.g.: a student during
461 midterm season may be less likely to report symptoms), as well as the interventions themselves
462 (e.g.: reporting may increase temporarily after an awareness email) can result in over-dispersion
463 in the number of reported cases.

464 In the case of OSU, we obtain a much higher reproduction number at the beginning of the
465 outbreak, near 6, and a very low reporting rate of 3%. Before discussing these results any further,
466 it is important to keep in mind that we extrapolated OSU cases from state-level reports by the CDC.
467 Furthermore, we did not have direct access to information about the containment interventions
468 adopted by the school, as we did for Harvard, so we were only able to make educated guesses
469 about those possible interventions based on information we found on the web. Within our OSU
470 model, we can conclude that self-isolation of students motivated by the advisories posted by OSU
471 had the intended effect of stopping the outbreak. The effective reproduction number dips below 1
472 after March, which is when the awareness campaign appeared to have started, and when the
473 outbreak gained local and national prominence due to news reporting. A significant issue with the
474 OSU model is the very low reporting rate of 3% derived from the MLE calculation. This rate
475 implies that the true number of mumps cases during the OSU outbreak should have been
476 approximately 30 times larger than observed. It follows that the total number of cases could have
477 reached 15,000 individuals, which is internally consistent in the model given that the number of
478 susceptible within the school's student population is over 30,000. However, such a large case count
479 is unlikely, as it doubles the highest number of yearly mumps cases reported in the US in the last

480 20 years (38), which was 6,369 in 2016. There is little data on the percentage of asymptomatic
481 mumps infections that would result in non-reporting, but the available evidence points to 15%–
482 30% (39, 40). Seroprevalence studies from the pre-vaccination era indicate a reporting rate of
483 around 4% (41), which is strikingly similar to the MLE estimate for OSU, but it is hard to imagine
484 such level underreporting in 2014 and in the midst of an active outbreak. Therefore, we are not
485 confident on this parameter estimate, even though the 95% confidence interval is very narrow at
486 (3%, 8%). Our interpretation of this situation is that the modeling approximation of a closed SEIR
487 compartments is probably less accurate for OSU given its non-residential nature: students there
488 have more opportunity to interact with individuals outside of their school, resulting both in
489 additional transmissions that are not captured by our model, and also in a “buffering” effect due to
490 a largely immune population (outside the college age).

491

492 **4.2 Effect of strict isolation policy**

493 Arguably the most critical intervention by HUHS was the isolation requirement for confirmed and
494 probable mumps cases. By taking the Harvard model on its own, we see that the infectious period
495 was already quite low at 1.2 days, even before the update in testing protocols. This conclude that
496 the isolation policy led to a smaller average infectious period for Harvard patients. The MLEs for
497 Harvard and OSU are different for several parameters, most notably basic reproduction number,
498 reporting rate, and rate of transition from the infectious to removed class. Firstly, OSU’s basic
499 reproduction number is over four times that of Harvard. Harvard’s isolation policy best explains
500 this difference because it physically prevented infectious persons from causing multiple secondary
501 infections, thus suppressing the growth of the outbreak. But as pointed out before, the extremely

502 low reporting rate inferred from the OSU model makes us less confident in it, so any comparison
503 between the Harvard and OSU outbreaks based on the MLE parameters should be taken with
504 caution.

505

506 **4.3 Implications of intervention analysis**

507 With the benefit of our intervention analysis, we conclude that aggressive diagnoses decreased the
508 size of the Harvard outbreak by approximately three-fourths. Furthermore, for every day of
509 intervention delay, we estimate that the outbreak size would have increased by 1.6 percentage
510 points, extrapolating the regression line in Figure 4C. Likewise, self-isolation prompted by health
511 advisories posted by the university reduced the size of the OSU outbreak by half. Given the non-
512 linear dependency between change in outbreak size and timing of intervention (Figure 4D), the
513 increase would have been even larger in that outbreak. Interestingly, this dependency also implies
514 that self-isolation in the first weeks of the outbreak can be enough to completely stop spread.

515 Clearly, a limitation of this analysis is the assumption that everything remains the same
516 while changing the time of the intervention under consideration. In reality, other factors might
517 come into play if the outbreak becomes larger or smaller, which in turn could affect the dynamics
518 of the outbreak as well as the interventions themselves. However, this analysis still provides a
519 useful hypothetical quantification of the effect of accelerating or delaying interventions designed
520 to contain the spread of an outbreak and here, as expected, the sooner the interventions are
521 introduced, the better the outcomes in terms of outbreak size. Of course, existing constraints in the
522 school's health system could impede fast interventions. In such situations, our method can be

523 useful to perform a cost-benefit analysis of how late an intervention could be made to still have a
524 significant reduction in the health burden caused by the disease.

525

526 **4.4 Conclusions**

527 We constructed and parametrized a POMP model for the transmission of mumps on college
528 campuses. The POMP model is a computationally efficient approach suitable to small populations
529 that accounts for the noisiness and incompleteness of case data. Moreover, it incorporates
530 parameters that measures the effect of interventions implemented after a given point in time. Given
531 the worldwide crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, such models can be useful to quickly
532 evaluate interventions designed to contain the spread of SARS-CoV-2 once schools reopen in the
533 U.S. and around the world.

534 We compared an outbreak at Harvard University, with its various intervention strategies,
535 to another university outbreak of comparable reported cases at OSU. Importantly, while most
536 literature today focuses on mumps prevention – such as administering third MMR doses to college-
537 age students – this paper provides quantitative backing for more immediate and less costly
538 approaches to mitigating the spread of mumps and other infectious diseases, most notably COVID-
539 19. Even with widespread availability of vaccines, outbreaks of highly transmissible diseases are
540 still a reality, as mumps exemplifies very clearly. In particular, requiring strict isolation if any
541 symptoms of the disease are presented would significantly reduce transmission and ultimately the
542 size of the outbreak. Effective awareness campaigns that lead to self-isolation of infected
543 individuals with mild symptoms can also have a significant effect in containing the spread of
544 disease and limiting the risk for vulnerable populations.

545 **4.4 Limitations**

546 Some of our conclusions are likely affected by confounding factors that we cannot control for in
547 this analysis. For example, the outbreak at Harvard started to subside in late April, not long before
548 students finish the semester and leave campus, which would decrease the number of potential
549 infections. The most promising method to determine the exact effect of isolation strategies is
550 through a randomized control trial. Regarding the differences between OSU and Harvard
551 parameters, we must be cautious in taking the OSU estimates at face value given the inconsistency
552 in the reporting rate, which may be indicating a more fundamental limitation of model to represent
553 the OSU outbreak. In addition to that, given that the OSU data consists of weekly reports rather
554 than daily reports of cases, we should expect the estimates for the parameters to be less accurate.
555 Furthermore, the cases are not solely linked to the university. Numerous cases in the data occurred
556 in the greater Columbus area, suggesting that the parameter estimates do not only account for the
557 dynamics of mumps on campus. Lastly, major differences in housing and campus characteristics
558 could have also contributed to differences between the two schools; for instance, OSU's population
559 size is three times that of Harvard, and OSU has larger dorms than Harvard's houses. Interventions
560 used at Harvard simply may not have worked as well at OSU. We were fortunate to have direct
561 access to school administrators who were involved in the response to the 2016 outbreak to discuss
562 HUHS interventions in detail, but we were not able to get the same level of detail for OSU's
563 interventions, as discussed in the main text. More broadly, lack of publicly available datasets, with
564 the exception of CDC reports on OSU's outbreak, is a serious impediment to perform these
565 analyses. Therefore, it will be essential that universities across the US and globe actively share
566 data for comparative analysis, to identify the best intervention strategies to protect college
567 campuses from outbreaks, especially in the post-COVID-19 world.

568 **Competing Interests:** We declare no competing interests.

569 **Source Code:** Available at <https://github.com/colabobio/mumps-pomp-models>

570 **Author's Contributions:** MS participated in the design of the study, carried out the data analysis,
571 developed the epidemiological models, generated the conclusions, and drafted the manuscript; GF
572 developed the epidemiological models, and generated the conclusions; AC conceived of the study,
573 participated in the design of the study, coordinated the study, and helped draft the manuscript; SF
574 and PJB provided data on the HUHS interventions and reviewed the final draft of the manuscript;
575 PCS overviewed the study and reviewed the final draft of the manuscript. All authors gave final
576 approval for publication and agree to be held accountable for the work performed therein.

577 **Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to thank Jonathan Grad and Joseph Lewnard for
578 providing feedback on the study design, Hayden Metsky for reviewing the manuscript, members
579 of MDPH for providing access to the Harvard data, and Bridget Chak and Shirlee Wohl for guiding
580 in the interpretation of the data.

581 **Ethics:** Usage of Harvard University data for development of the SEIR model was approved by
582 the Massachusetts Department of Public Health (MDPH) through protocol 906066. Harvard
583 University Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Broad Institute ceded review of secondary analysis
584 to the MDPH IRB through institutional authorization agreements. The MDPH IRB waived
585 informed consent given this research met the requirements pursuant to 45 CFR 46.116 (d). Data
586 from Ohio State University was obtained from the CDC's Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report
587 2014. The Broad Institute has determined usage of this data constitutes non-human subjects
588 research.

589 **Funding:** Howard Hughes Medical Institute, US National Institutes of Health.

REFERENCES

- 590 1. Costill D. College campus outbreaks require timely public health response. Healio
591 [Available from: <https://goo.gl/aW7GaT>.
- 592 2. Leidner AJ, Barry V, Bowen VB, Silver R, Musial T, Kang GJ, et al. Opening of Large
593 Institutions of Higher Education and County-Level COVID-19 Incidence - United States, July 6-
594 September 17, 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report*. 2021;70(1):14-9.
- 595 3. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on education Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia2020
596 [updated 30 May 2020. Available from: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impact_of_the_COVID-
597 19_pandemic_on_education](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impact_of_the_COVID-19_pandemic_on_education).
- 598 4. Panovska-Griffiths J, Kerr CC, Stuart RM, Mistry D, Klein DJ, Viner RM, et al.
599 Determining the optimal strategy for reopening schools, the impact of test and trace interventions,
600 and the risk of occurrence of a second COVID-19 epidemic wave in the UK: a modelling study.
601 *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. 2020;4(11):817-27.
- 602 5. Lordan R, FitzGerald GA, Grosser T. Reopening schools during COVID-19. *Science (New
603 York, NY)*. 2020;369(6508):1146.
- 604 6. Hurtado C. The Rise of Mumps in the United States Outbreak Observatory [Available from:
605 [https://www.outbreakobservatory.org/outbreakthursday-1/12/7/2017/the-rise-of-mumps-in-the-
606 united-states](https://www.outbreakobservatory.org/outbreakthursday-1/12/7/2017/the-rise-of-mumps-in-the-united-states).
- 607 7. Lewnard JA, Grad YH. Vaccine waning and mumps re-emergence in the United States.
608 *Science Translational Medicine*. 2018;10(433).
- 609 8. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, Lockhart S, et al. Safety and
610 Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med*. 2020.
- 611 9. The COVID vaccine challenges that lie ahead. *Nature*. 2020;587(7835):522.
- 612 10. Nishiura H, Kobayashi T, Miyama T, Suzuki A, Jung S-m, Hayashi K, et al. Estimation of
613 the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus infections (COVID-19). *International Journal of
614 Infectious Diseases*. 2020;94:154-5.
- 615 11. Davies N, Barnard RC, Jarvis CI, Kucharski AJ, Munday JD, Pearson CAB, et al.
616 Estimated transmissibility and severity of novel SARS-CoV-2 Variant of Concern 202012/01 in
617 England. *CMMID Repository*. 2020.
- 618 12. Shah M, Quinlisk P, Weigel A, Riley J, James L, Patterson J, et al. Mumps Outbreak in a
619 Highly Vaccinated University-Affiliated Setting Before and After a Measles-Mumps-Rubella
620 Vaccination Campaign—Iowa, July 2015–May 2016. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2018;66(1):81-
621 8.
- 622 13. Golwalkar M, Pope B, Stauffer J, Snively A, Clemmons N. Mumps Outbreaks at Four
623 Universities - Indiana, 2016. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report*. 2018;67(29):793-7.
- 624 14. Bixler J, Botelho G. Over 360 cases of mumps in central Ohio, most of them tied to OSU.
625 *CNN* [Available from: <https://www.cnn.com/2014/05/16/health/ohio-mumps/index.html>.
- 626 15. Mumps Cases and Outbreaks Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [Available from:
627 <https://www.cdc.gov/mumps/outbreaks.html>.
- 628 16. Wohl S, Metsky HC, Schaffner SF, Piantadosi A, Burns M, Lewnard JA, et al. Combining
629 genomics and epidemiology to track mumps virus transmission in the United States. *PLOS
630 Biology*. 2020;18(2):e3000611.
- 631 17. Isolation Expenses (2016-2017). Harvard University Health Services; 2017.
- 632 18. Brauer F, Van den Driessche P, Wu J. *Mathematical epidemiology*: Springer; 2008.

- 633 19. Stocks T, Britton T, Höhle M. Model selection and parameter estimation for dynamic
634 epidemic models via iterated filtering: application to rotavirus in Germany. *Biostatistics*. 2018.
- 635 20. Barreira P, Fitzgerald S. Personal communication. 2018.
- 636 21. Correspondence regarding Mumps 2016, Spring to Summer. Harvard University Health
637 Services.
- 638 22. Mumps List for CDC. Harvard University Health Services.
- 639 23. Massachusetts Mumps Case Data between 2015 and 2017. Massachusetts Department of
640 Public Health.
- 641 24. Hviid A, Rubin S, Mühlemann K. Mumps. *Lancet*. 2008;371(9616):932-44.
- 642 25. Bitsko RH, Cortese MM, Dayan GH, Rota PA, Lowe L, Iversen SC, et al. Detection of
643 RNA of mumps virus during an outbreak in a population with a high level of measles, mumps, and
644 rubella vaccine coverage. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2008;46(3):1101-3.
- 645 26. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2014.
- 646 27. Mumps Outbreak FAQs: The Ohio State University; [Available from:
647 <https://www.osu.edu/assets/mumps/faqs.pdf>.
- 648 28. The Ohio State University Mumps Outbreak FAQs: Columbus Public Health; 2014
649 [Available from: http://www.cchhd.com/documents/contentdocuments/doc_23_5_516.pdf.
- 650 29. Zeltner B. Mumps outbreak at Ohio State: Five things you need to know
651 cleveland.com2014 [updated January 12 2019. Available from:
652 https://www.cleveland.com/healthfit/2014/03/mumps_outbreak_at_ohio_state_f.html.
- 653 30. Martcheva M. *An Introduction to Mathematical Epidemiology*: Springer; 2015.
- 654 31. King AA, Nguyen D, Ionides EL. Statistical Inference for Partially Observed Markov
655 Processes via the R Package pomp. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2016;69(12):43.
- 656 32. He D, Ionides EL, King AA. Plug-and-play inference for disease dynamics: measles in
657 large and small populations as a case study. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*.
658 2010;7(43):271-83.
- 659 33. Academic Calendar: 2015-16: Harvard Law School; 2015 [Available from:
660 <https://hls.harvard.edu/dept/academics/academic-calendar/academic-calendar-2015-16/>.
- 661 34. The Ohio State University - Statistical Summary: The Ohio State University; 2013
662 [Available from: <https://www.osu.edu/osutoday/stuinfo13.php>.
- 663 35. King AA, Ionides EL, Bretó MC, Ellner SP, Ferrari MJ, Kendall BE, et al. pomp: Statistical
664 Inference for Partially Observed Markov Processes. 2020.
- 665 36. R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. 2019.
- 666 37. Ionides EL, Breto C, Park J, Smith RA, King AA. Monte Carlo profile confidence intervals
667 for dynamic systems. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*. 2017;14(132):20170126.
- 668 38. Health, United States, 2019: Table 10 [Internet]. 2021. Available from:
669 <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/hus/contents2019.htm>.
- 670 39. Hahné S, Schurink T, Wallinga J, Kerkhof J, van der Sande M, van Binnendijk R, et al.
671 Mumps transmission in social networks: a cohort study. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2017;17(1):56.
- 672 40. Bonwitt J, Kawakami V, Wharton A, Burke RM, Murthy N, Lee A, et al. Notes from the
673 Field: Absence of Asymptomatic Mumps Virus Shedding Among Vaccinated College Students
674 During a Mumps Outbreak - Washington, February-June 2017. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality*
675 *weekly report*. 2017;66(47):1307-8.
- 676 41. Levitt LP, Mahoney DH, Jr., Casey HL, Bond JO. Mumps in a general population. A sero-
677 epidemiologic study. *Am J Dis Child*. 1970;120(2):134-8.