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**Supplemental methods**

**Heterogeneous mixing in the CEACOV model**

The CEACOV model can accommodate a user-defined number of mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive subcohorts. For the purposes of this analysis we consider 3 subcohorts: (1) students, (2) faculty, and (3) community. With 3 subcohorts, the contact-hours within and between the subcohorts are described by the following contact matrix.

$$C=\left[\begin{matrix}c\_{11}&c\_{12}&c\_{13}\\c\_{21}&c\_{22}&c\_{23}\\c\_{31}&c\_{32}&c\_{33}\end{matrix}\right]$$

The per person force of infection is proportional to the contact hours and size of each subcohort as well as the force of transmission from infected individuals. We have:

$$f\_{k}\left(t\right)=\sum\_{j=1}^{3}\frac{\left(\frac{c\_{jk}}{c\_{j1}+c\_{j2}+c\_{j3}}\right)\sum\_{s\in S}^{}I\_{s}^{j}\left(t\right)r\_{s}}{N\_{k}} ∀k\in \{1,2,3\}$$

in which,

* $f\_{k}\left(t\right)$ is the force of infection to each person in subcohort *k* on day *t*
* $I\_{s}^{j}(t)$ is the number of infected individuals in subcohort *j* who are in infection state *s* on day *t*. The set of infection states, *S*, is defined as *S={asymptomatic, mild/moderate disease, severe disease, critical disease, recuperation}.*
* $r\_{s}$ is the effective transmission rate from a person in infection state *s*
* $N\_{k}$ is the size of subcohort *k*

In the above formula, $\sum\_{s\in S}^{}I\_{s}^{j}\left(t\right)r\_{s}$ gives the force of transmission from all infected individuals in subcohort $j$. $\left(\frac{c\_{jk}}{c\_{j1}+c\_{j2}+c\_{j3}}\right)$ is the proportion of this force which is directed towards subcohort $k$ and is divided among the $N\_{k}$ members of subcohort $k$.

**Calibration and validation of CEACOV**

We initialized the model with a cohort of 1 million simulated persons who are meant to represent the 6.9 million people in the population of Massachusetts (MA) in 2020. Each person’s age category was drawn at model start based on MA age distribution data (1).To approximate the prevalence of COVID-19 at the start of the MA epidemic, in mid-March, 2020, the prevalence of COVID-19 at model start was set to 0.14% (2). We tracked the number of people in each health state over 30 days for calibration, and 15 days for validation, totaling a 45-day horizon (3,4). We calibrated transmission to the first 30 days of the COVID-19 epidemic in MA (from mid-March to mid-April, 2020) and used data from the remaining 15 days in April (through 4/30) to validate the model. We assumed the reported number of COVID-19-attributable deaths would be close to the actual number of deaths. Thus, the number of reported COVID-19-attributable deaths was the main calibration target. We removed 59% of deaths to account for the deaths occurring in long term care facilities (LTCF) and not in the community. To ensure good model fit, we checked the mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) and the median absolute percentage error (MEDAPE) for modeled and observed the number of deaths over the validation horizon.

**Derivation of infectivity rate**

We derived infectivity/contact-hour from published literature based on the rate of infection among household contacts in Wuhan, China, where household infection rate ranged from 28% (spouses) to 17% (other household members) (5). Using an average household size of 4 people, we estimated an average rate of 21% transmission over 3 days, considering both latency and pre-symptomatic periods and the average time between symptom onset in the index person and subsequently infected person. From the Bureau of Labor Statistics, we estimated that members of the same household spent on average 11.89 hours/day at home (6), resulting in an estimated infectivity rate/contact-hour of 0.002.

**Additional details on cohort characteristics**

Based on data from Cornell University, University of California, Penn State University, California State University, and University of Maryland, on average 25% of faculty are over age 60 (7–11). Using data from college towns, including Cambridge, MA, Ithaca, NY and Austin, TX 16% of the surrounding community are over age 60 (Table 1) (12–14). We stratified our population groups by their COVID-19 disease status: we assumed that 1% of students, 1% of faculty and 4% of community members had active COVID-19 (symptomatic or asymptomatic), 89% of students (94% faculty, 81% community) were susceptible to COVID-19 and the reminder in each population already had the disease, recovered, and were assumed to be immune. To account for influenza like illness (ILI) symptoms from infections other than SARS-COV-2, we incorporated a small proportion of individuals developing daily ILI symptoms, using age-stratified rates from the CDC ILI network (15–17).

**Derivation of COVID-19-like illness inputs**

In our model, individuals with similar symptoms to COVID-19 but due to other conditions (“COVID-19-like-illness”), may present for symptom screening or laboratory testing. Estimates of the number of people presenting for testing with “COVID-19-like illness” are uncertain at the time this analysis is being conducted; therefore, we made assumptions informed by available literature from influenza-like illness. Data from the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NAMCS) were used to estimate the age-stratified per-person daily rate of presenting to one’s primary care physician (18). Of these visits, 15% were assumed to be related to COVID-19, based on estimates from New Jersey, where approximately 15% of people presenting with influenza-like symptoms did not have influenza; among these, 75% were assumed to have symptoms due to conditions other than COVID-19 (15).

**Derivation of quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs) lost per group**

Students and faculty were each assigned given utility based on available data. Given that there are currently no available utility data for COVID-19; we calculated each group’s utility based on their relative age range, and if they were healthy (19), had influenza (20) (as proxy for utility if symptomatic with COVID-19), or had pneumonia (21) (as a proxy for those in the hospital with COVID-19). We then calculated different COVID-19 utility decrements if they were symptomatic, in isolation, or in the hospital with severe or critical illness, by transmission group (22). To calculate total number of days while symptomatic for students and faculty, we assumed 50% of students were symptomatic for 5 days, and 70% of faculty were symptomatic for 10 days. We then multiplied the number of symptom-days by the symptom state utility decrement assigned to each group. To calculate the utility decrement for those on inpatient floors in the hospital (severe state), we subtracted the utility with pneumonia from the utility of healthy persons in each group. For those in the ICU (critical state), we assumed that they lost all utility assigned as a healthy person. The utility decrement was then used to calculate QALYs lost by multiplying the utility decrement due to each condition (healthy, symptomatic, in hospital, in ICU) by the number of days spent in that condition (as specified per model run). For those who died, we assumed that faculty died due to COVID-19 at an average age of 65. We used life expectancy from age 65 and adjusted for quality of life using normative utility data in the US (19).

**Table S1.** Clinical characteristics of COVID-19 infection in the US.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** | **Source** |
| **Natural history** |  |  |
| Probability of COVID-19 severity,astratified by age | Asymptomatic infection | Mild/moderate illness | Severe illness | Critical illness |  |
|  <20y | 0.594 | 0.471 | 0.005 | 0.0001 | Der. From (3,23,24) |
| 20-59y | 0.262 | 0.720 | 0.018 | 0.007 |
| ≥60y | 0.180 | 0.788 | 0.001 | 0.031 |
| Duration of illness state among hospitalized patients, stratified by COVID-19 severity, mean, daysb | Asymptomatic infection | Mild/moderate illness | Severe illness | Critical illness |  |
| Pre-infectious latent to asymptomatic state | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | Der. From (25–27) |
| Asymptomatic to mild/moderate state | -- | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | (27) |
| Mild/moderate to severe state | -- | -- | 6.5 | 3.0 | (17) |
| Severe to critical illness state | -- | -- | 10.5 | 7.1 | (28) |
| Critical illness to recuperation state | -- | -- | -- | 11.9 | (28) |

**Table S1, continued**. Clinical characteristics of COVID-19 infection in the US

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** | **Source** |
| **Natural history, continued** |  |  |
| Duration of illness state among non-hospitalized patients, stratified by COVID-19 severity, mean, daysb | Asymptomatic infection | Mild/moderate illness | Severe illness | Critical illness |  |
| Pre-infectious latent to asymptomatic state | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | Der. From (25,26)  |
| Asymptomatic to mild/moderate state | -- | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | (25,27) |
| Mild/moderate to severe state | -- | -- | 6.5 | 3.0 | (17) |
| Severe to critical illness state |  |  |  | 6.5 | (28) |
| Duration of viral shedding, stratified by COVID-19 severity, mean, daysb | Asymptomatic infection | Mild/moderate illness | Severe illness | Critical illness |  |
|  | 9.5 | 10 | 19 | 24 | (25,28,29) |

**Table S1, continued**. Clinical characteristics of COVID-19 infection in the US.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** | **Source** |
| **Natural History, continued** |  |  |
| Daily probability of mortality in the critical state, stratified by age | <20y | 20-59y | ≥60y |  |
| Hospital care | 6.00 E6 | 0.004 | 0.050 | Der. From (25,28) |
| No hospital care | 0.118 | 0.166 | 0.203 | Der. From (23,30,31) |
| Daily probability of onward transmission, stratified by disease state |  |  |
| Asymptomatic | 0.2394 |  |
| Mild/moderate | 0.1948 |  |
| Severe | 0.0135 | Der. From (25,29,32,33) |
| Critical | 0.0107 |  |
| Recuperation | 0.0135 |  |

**Table S1, continued**. Clinical characteristics of COVID-19 infection in the US.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** | **Source** |
| **Natural History, continued** |  |  |
| Persons with other respiratory illnesses exhibiting mild/moderate COVID-like symptoms, daily, % | 0.01 | (15–17) |
| Duration of mild/moderate COVID-like symptoms, mean, days | 5 | Asm. |

Abbreviations: **COVID-19**, coronavirus disease, 2019; **Der**, derived; **Asm**, assumption.

a Severity probability refers to the likelihood that an individual, once infected with SARS-CoV-2, will eventually progress to the specified severity of COVID-19 disease.

b Durations of illness state and of viral shedding were derived from model inputs of transition probabilities. See eTable 1 for more details.

**Figure S1.** Budgetary impact of COVID-19 mitigation strategies, by test cost (USD)
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**Figure Legends**

**Figure S1.** **Budgetary impact of COVID-19 mitigation strategies, by test cost (USD)**

Each panel represents the total costs for each COVID-19 mitigation strategy, for different test costs. Panel A represented the total costs for a $1 test, Panel B represents the total cost given a $25 test, Panel C considers a $36 test (a frequently referenced current cost for PCR test), and Panel D represents a $51 dollar test (another referenced cost for current PCR test).(34) On the left are the *No intervention* and *Campus Closed* strategies. Each following set of 6 bars represents isolation and testing strategies for *Minimal social distancing*, *Extensive social distancing*, *Mask Policy*, and combined *Extensive Social Distancing and Mask Policy*. In Panel A ($1 test cost), total costs decrease with more testing for *Minimal social distancing,* as infections are prevented and hospital and ICU costs decrease while test costs remain low. Total costs stay relatively stable in Panel A in any strategies that include *Extensive social distancing* or *Mask policy,* as either hybrid education costs or additional NPI costs are added. Panels B, C, and D indicate that test costs outweigh all other costs when tests are more expensive and any amount of routine testing is done. Across all panels, within each broad category, strategies involving residence isolation and no testing are cheaper than strategies involving quarantine isolation or any testing across all test costs.

Abbreviations: **ResIsol**: residence isolation; **DesigIsol**: designated isolation; **LT**: laboratory test; **RLT**: routine laboratory test; **q**: every X days; ***MinSocDist***: *Minimal social distancing* strategy; ***ExtSocDist***: *Extensive social distancing* strategy; ***Masks***: *Masks* strategy; ***ExtSocDist+Masks***: *Extensive social distancing + Masks* strategy.
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