

# IMPACT OF UNIVERSITY RE-OPENING ON TOTAL COMMUNITY COVID-19 BURDEN

Cipriano LE, Haddara WMR, Zaric GS, Enns EA

September 18, 2020

## Supplemental Material

### SUPPLEMENTAL METHODS

#### OVERVIEW

We developed a dynamic compartmental model of the COVID-19 pandemic that simulates the health outcomes and resource use in a representative mid-sized city with a full-time population of 500,000 plus an additional part-time academic year population of 20,000 university students. We use the model to project how COVID-19 risk and prevention behaviours of the general population, and the student community in particular, affect the incremental COVID-19 burden attributable to the arrival of 20,000 university (post-secondary) students on September 1. Under different scenarios of community physical distancing effort and testing in students, we calculated the number of infected individuals, hospital resource demand, and health outcomes overall and over time. Institutional ethics review was not required for this modeling study.

A schematic of the model is presented in **Figure 1**. We estimated model parameters including the duration of time spent in each health state, the infectiousness of COVID-19, the probability of needing general and specialized hospital resources, disease mortality, and the effectiveness of COVID-19 prevention strategies using the peer-reviewed literature, pre-published reports, and expert opinion (**Table 1**).

We calibrated the model to the observed hospitalization rates and mortality in the County of Middlesex which includes the City of London in Ontario, Canada, from March 1 to August 15, 2020. London, Ontario is a medium-sized city that experienced relatively fewer cases of COVID-19 compared to the province of Ontario overall<sup>1</sup> and is a representative case study as it has two large destination post-secondary institutions (Western University and Fanshawe College) with normal academic-year populations of approximately 24,000 undergraduate students<sup>2</sup> and 21,000 full-time students, respectively.<sup>3</sup>

In this Supplemental Methods, we provide additional detail on the structural features of the model as well as the identification and selection of input parameter values.

#### POPULATION

We model a mid-sized city of 500,000 year-round residents, of whom 3500 (0.7%) live in long-term care. We assume that 20,000 undergraduate university students, between the ages of 18 and 24, also reside in the city during the academic year (between September and April). Faculty, staff, graduate, and professional program students of the university are considered part of the general population.

## DISEASE SEVERITY AND CLINICAL RESOURCE NEED

We subdivided the infected population into disease severity groups to capture differences in the likelihood of case identification through symptom-based detection and differences in the likelihood of being hospitalized and needing specialized health care resources. The severity distribution describes the distribution of actual infections, regardless of diagnosis.

**Asymptomatic infection:** We estimated the proportion of asymptomatic cases to be 31% for both the general population and university students based on an ongoing meta-analysis of reports that include follow-up monitoring for the development of symptoms among asymptomatic cases.<sup>4</sup> University students may have a higher rate of asymptomatic presentation than the general population, but the literature continues to be very mixed. A follow-up of a cohort of US Navy sailors revealed that only 18% continued to be asymptomatic throughout their full course of infection.<sup>5</sup> However, in a cohort primarily identified as having had COVID-19 via serology, retrospectively 79% of people < 40 years of age could not recall any symptoms.<sup>6</sup> We therefore explored this uncertainty in sensitivity analysis. The proportion of cases that are asymptomatic has also been shown to be correlated with older age; we assumed that 12% of infections in LTC residents are asymptomatic based on follow-up monitoring in a LTC cluster.<sup>7,8</sup>

**Symptomatic and not hospitalized infections:** For each population, COVID-19 infections that were not classified as asymptomatic, severe, or critical were categorized as mild or moderate. Infections with mild and moderate symptoms are not hospitalized but may present to medical care for assessment and may receive some outpatient care not specifically accounted for in our analysis. In total, 60.4% of the general population and 67.8% of university students were classified as having mild and moderate infections.

LTC residents with severe symptoms, for which they would be considered for hospitalization, may choose to receive limited interventions in favour of supportive care at their LTC facility. Among LTC residents, 76.2% were classified as symptomatic but not hospitalized.

**Severe and critical infections:** In our model, critical patients are those who require mechanical ventilation (MV) or renal replacement therapy (RRT) in a critical care unit. Severe patients receive hospitalization but do not require MV or RRT.

We estimated the rate of critical care use in the general population and university students based on rates of critical care use among residents of Lombardy Italy, identified by contact tracing, who were either diagnosed with COVID-19 during their infection or identified retrospectively by serology testing.<sup>6</sup> For the general population, we estimated the rate of critical care using the observed rate in 2,666 patients < 80 years of age as 1.7% (95% CI: 1.2, 2.2). For university students, we estimated the rate of critical care using the observed rate in 835 patients < 40 years of age as 0.24% (95% CI: 0, 0.6).<sup>6</sup>

Among critical care patients, we estimate the ratio of patients requiring RRT to MV based on the UK Intensive Care National Audit and Research Centre (ICNARC) report describing the care and outcomes of 10,118 critical care COVID-19 patients in the UK. In this report, 7,277 patients required MV and 2,673 required RRT, resulting in a ratio of 0.37 RRT patients per MV patient.<sup>9</sup> Although the report describes patients in need of both technologies, we did not include this possibility in the model.

Among the 10,137 COVID-19 hospitalizations in Canada between February 23 and June 21, 20.3% involved a critical care admission,<sup>10</sup> resulting in an estimated a ratio of 3.92 patients requiring hospitalization without critical care per critical care patient. This is similar to rates of critical care observed in the UK, in which approximately 22% of all hospitalized patients required critical care.<sup>11</sup> Overall, hospitalization rates are lower in younger people, but the fraction of hospitalized cases requiring intensive care appears similar and so we also assumed this ratio of hospitalization without critical care per critical care patient also applied to university students. For example, a US report on 3222 hospitalization for COVID-19 aged 18-34 years reported 21% requiring intensive care.<sup>12</sup> This led to an initial estimate of 1.0% of infections requiring hospitalization but not critical care in university students ( $0.24\% \times 3.92$ ) and 6.7% of infections requiring hospitalization but not critical care in the general population ( $1.7\% \times 3.92$ ). The estimated rate of hospitalization in the general population resulted in a higher number than observed in London, Ontario, during model calibration and so the probability of hospitalization without critical care was lowered to 3.75% in the general population in order to better fit the observed data during the calibration procedure.

Based on 699 documented COVID-19 cases in LTC residents across Canada between February 23 and June 21, we that assumed 0.3% (95% CI: 0, 0.7) of patients would require critical care and 11.4% (95% CI: 9, 14) would require hospitalization without critical care.<sup>10</sup> LTC residents have a lower rate of critical care use than the general population because LTC residents in medical need of critical care may have directives in place instructing different levels of care.

## CLINICAL OUTCOMES AND CLINICAL RESOURCE USE

A schematic of the health states and transition times for infected individuals is presented in **Appendix Figure 1**.

We assumed a mean incubation period, the time from exposure to symptom-onset, of 5.6 days (observed median of 5.1 days [95%CI 2.2, 11.5]).<sup>13</sup> We divide the incubation period into two sub-states: 'Exposed, not Infectious', a pre-infectiousness phase in which the person is exposed and will develop the infection, and 'Exposed, Infectious', in which infectious individuals are pre-symptomatic. This two-stage approach is important because an estimated 44% of transmissions occur prior to symptom onset.<sup>14</sup> He et al. estimated infectiousness starts 2.5 days prior to symptom onset, peaks at 0.6 days prior to symptom onset, and declines within 7 days of symptom onset.<sup>14</sup> This is consistent with estimates based on cohorts from Tianjin and Singapore which indicate transmission beginning 2.5 to 2.9 days prior to symptom onset.<sup>15</sup> In our base case analysis, the 'Exposed, not Infectious' state has an average duration of 3.1 days and the 'Exposed, Infectious' state has an average duration of 2.5 days. In total, we estimate the average duration of infectiousness in asymptomatic and mild or moderate cases to be 10 days.<sup>14,16,17</sup> Among individuals who ultimately develop severe or critical symptoms requiring hospitalization, we assumed an average 5.8 days from onset of initial symptoms to the presentation of severe symptoms,<sup>11</sup> during which time these patients would be infectious but in home isolation if aware of their infection status.

We assumed that severe patients who do not need critical care (MV or RRT) have an average hospital length of stay of 8.3 days based on length of stay in UK hospitals;<sup>11</sup> critical patients who require invasive mechanical ventilation have a median length of stay of 13 days (IQR: 7, 23) in the critical care unit

followed by a median of 7 (IQR: 4,13) days in the hospital;<sup>18</sup> and critical patients who require RRT have a median length of stay of 21 days (IQR: 9, 41).<sup>9</sup> To ensure realistic distributions for the duration of infectiousness and the duration of hospital resource utilization (e.g., gamma distributions instead of exponential distributions), states were further subdivided into successive otherwise identical states.<sup>19,20</sup>

In the model, all people who survive infection move to a recovered state. We assume that a non-infectious period of home isolation continues for an average 10 days after people are no longer infectious, consistent with discharge instructions.<sup>21</sup> In the model, people with asymptomatic or mild and moderate infections who are not diagnosed during their infectious period transition into the recovered health states in which they continue to participate in physical distancing consistent with rates in the susceptible population as they will continue to adhere to behaviours consistent with individuals who believe themselves not to have been infected.

## MORTALITY

We estimated mortality rates for critical care patients, stratified by age category, using the UK ICNARC report describing the care and outcomes of 10,118 critical care COVID-19 patients in the UK.<sup>9</sup> We estimated mortality rates for patients treated in hospital, but not in critical care, using a report of over 20,000 hospitalized patients in the UK,<sup>11</sup> using the < 55 years of age population to estimate mortality in university students (0.43%) and the < 70 year old population to estimate mortality in the general population (14.4%). For LTC residents who are and are not hospitalized, we estimated the infection fatality rate based on the observed outcomes in 680 Canadian LTC patients to be 47.4% and 25.5%, respectively.<sup>10</sup> For the general population and university students, we assumed that there was no mortality risk for individuals with asymptomatic infections and infections not requiring hospitalization.

If, due to capacity constraints, patients receive a lower level of care than is medically indicated, we assumed higher mortality rates based on expert opinion. For patients with severe symptoms requiring hospitalization who are instead isolating at home, we assumed a 25% case fatality rate. For patients in hospital who need but are unable to access critical care (either MV or RRT), we assumed a 40% daily probability of death, resulting in a life expectancy of approximately 2 days. For patients in home isolation who need critical care (either mechanical ventilation or RRT) but are unable to access either critical care or hospitalization, we assumed a 60% daily probability of death, corresponding to a life expectancy of approximately 1 day.

We did not include mortality from causes other than COVID-19 in the model.

## HEALTH CARE RESOURCE CAPACITY

Consistent with the average of 14.2 per 100,000 population in Ontario,<sup>22</sup> normal pre-COVID critical care capacity of our center is 69 beds.<sup>23</sup> In a crisis situation, reductions in other services, secondment of staff from other units, and accessing strategic stockpiles of equipment,<sup>24</sup> can enable short-term expansions in capacity. In our centre, reductions in other services can facilitate operation of up to 184 critical care beds.<sup>23</sup> In the base case, we estimated hospital acute care, MV, and RRT capacity of 500 beds, 120 beds, and 30 RRT patients was the maximum amount that could be allocated to COVID-19 patients. If these

thresholds are exceeded, COVID-19 patients are directed to the next-best available care often facing higher mortality rates.

In discussion of results, we focus also on a threshold of 30 critical care beds for COVID-19 patients as a local policy-relevant threshold necessitating the partial closure of non-COVID-19 health services based on expert opinion. Based on expert opinion, substantial reductions in the provision of other types of health care (such as cancelling elective surgeries) will be required if 30 critical care beds are occupied with COVID-19 patients. This motivated setting one of the responsive behaviour triggers to activate at 15 critical care beds representing 50% of the capacity available to COVID-19 patients without modifying access to other health care services (such as cancelling elective surgeries).

## DIAGNOSIS BY CLINICAL PRESENTATION AND CONTACT TRACING

The time from symptom presentation to diagnosis in symptomatic cases decreased over the course of the pandemic with increased awareness of the disease and its varied range of symptoms;<sup>25</sup> in the base case analysis we assumed the minimum time from symptom onset to diagnosis to be 2.1 days consistent with the minimum time to self-assess, seek medical attention, and receive diagnostic results.<sup>26</sup> The observed median time to diagnosis through symptom-based surveillance alone of 4.6 days (95%CI: 4.2, 5.0) and symptom-based surveillance in combination with contact tracing efforts of 2.9 days (95%CI 2.4, 3.4).<sup>27</sup> From this, we estimated that symptom-based surveillance and contact tracing results in a daily probability of diagnosis of 15.8% in individuals with symptoms and the daily probability of detection from contact tracing of 4.1% in asymptomatic infections. This combination of assumptions resulted in approximately 22% of infected individuals being identified, consistent with the overall rates of diagnosis implied by preliminary serology data in Ontario.<sup>28</sup>

For LTC residents, we assume that twice daily symptom screening results in a 40% daily probability of detection in symptomatic patients and that contact tracing with access to all resident contacts increases that probability to 52%. Contact tracing results in a 8.2% daily probability of diagnosis in asymptomatic cases which we assume is increased further by routine testing for COVID-19 every 14 days which is recommended for the staff of LTC facilities in Ontario.<sup>29</sup> Universal testing of all residents in a nursing home with a single new case is recommended by the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.<sup>30</sup> We assumed this routine testing would be performed using nasopharyngeal swab and PCR analysis with a test sensitivity of 72.1%.<sup>31,32</sup>

## CONTACT MIXING PATTERNS

**General population:** Based on an extrapolation of the 2008 POLYMOD study in Europe to reflect network structure of the Canadian population, the average number of contacts per person in Canada is 12.6 per day.<sup>33</sup> Of these contacts, on average, 1.0 contacts are with those aged 20-24.<sup>33</sup> Nationally, 6.6% of the Canadian population is aged 20-24. We assumed that the age distribution of the year-round residents in our simulated city matches that of Canada nationally. However, during the academic year, we assumed that the 20,000 university students consist entirely of 20-24 year-olds. Thus, during the academic year, university students in our simulated city comprise 38% of all 20-24 year-olds in the overall community (20,000 / (500,000 × 6.6% + 20,000)). As a result, we estimated that of the 1.0 daily

contacts that the general population has with the 20-24 year-old age group, 0.38 contacts per day would be with university students when the university is in session.

The average number of daily contacts that a person in the general population has with someone in LTC was calculated in order to balance the total number of daily contacts between LTC residents and visitors/staff (who are considered to be from the general population). With 3,500 LTC residents each with 13.7 staff contacts and 0.48 visitor contacts per day, this implies a total of 49,630 contacts per day between LTC residents and the general population ( $3,500 \times (13.7+0.48)$ ). Dividing by the size of the general population ( $500,000 - 3,500 = 496,500$ ), this yields a total of 0.1 LTC resident contacts per person in the general population per day.

**University students:** Compared to the average number of contacts for the overall population, Canadians aged 20-24 have higher number of close contacts per day (15.7 vs. 12.6).<sup>33</sup> Further, using self-report diaries, several studies specifically of university students report still higher numbers of contacts per day than the average person in their age demographic. For example, a convenience sample from two British universities reported an average of 21.9 contacts per day on weekdays and 14.5 contacts per day on weekends for participants aged 20 to 29.<sup>34</sup> A study at the University of Antwerp, in which 83% of study participants were students, reported an average of 23.7 contacts per day.<sup>35</sup> A study of 28 students at the University of Warwick reported 26 contacts per day during the week and 19 contacts per day during the weekend.<sup>36</sup> A German study of 556 first year university students reported an average of 8.9 direct conversational contacts per weekday and 12 direct conversational contacts on weekend days; expanding to also report contacts in large groups (e.g., in a lecture hall) or random encounters within 2 meters (e.g., on public transit), the average number of contacts per day increased to 47 and 62 contacts per day, respectively. Compared to studies using self-report diary design, studies with electronic detection of interactions identify higher contact rates in school environments. A study of interactions at a US high school in which 94% of students, staff, and teachers were tagged with wireless sensors to record contacts indicated an average of 50 contacts within 3 meters of greater than 10 min in duration and an average of 30 contacts within 3 meters with greater than 20 minutes in duration within a school day.<sup>37</sup> Similarly, a study in which university students living across six residence halls were provided devices to monitor Bluetooth interactions with other devices in the study and other devices with “discoverable” Bluetooth (within 5 meters) indicated a total of 219 contacts per phone per day.<sup>38</sup>

In our base case analysis, we assume that students have 23.7 contacts per day, based on a study at the University of Antwerp.<sup>35</sup> We assumed 60% of those contacts are with other university students based on the age distribution of student’s reported contacts,<sup>34,35</sup> with the remainder being with members of the ‘general population’ which includes staff and faculty of the university as well as other members of the community when students are in transit, shopping, and working in jobs in the community or non-student members of their household. This number of contacts between university students and the general population (9.48 contacts per day) balanced with the estimated number of contacts the general population has with university students each day ( $20,000 \times 9.48 / 496,500 = 0.38$ ). Several of the studies estimating contacts among university students were performed in winter, and so may underestimate the number of contacts students have during the early weeks of the new academic year. We explore this uncertainty in scenarios with higher contact rates for a short period of time upon arrival to campus on September 1.

**Long-term care residents:** Based on a Canadian study in which a sample of long-term care residents and staff were equipped with RFID tags in order to estimate the number of contacts, we estimated the number of resident-resident and resident-staff contacts.<sup>39,40</sup> Adjusting for the likelihood of observing a contact (which required both individuals to be participating in the study), we estimate that there are 19.9 resident-resident contacts per day (95% CI: 11.3 – 28.5) and 13.7 resident-staff contacts per day (95%CI: 11.4, 15.9) using the summary participant data provided by the study’s authors (personal communication: S. Moghadas). This study did not capture resident-visitor contacts; we assumed 0.48 visitors per day based on the distribution of visit frequency in the 2012 Ohio Nursing Home Family Satisfaction Survey.<sup>41</sup> Thus, in total, LTC residents have 14.2 contacts with the general population each day. We assumed no contact directly with university students.

## INFECTION RISK AND DISEASE TRANSMISSION

Using exponential regression, we empirically estimated the basic reproduction number,  $R_0$ , the average number of secondary cases produced by one infected individual during the infected individual’s entire infectious period assuming a fully susceptible population, is 3.0 based on Ontario’s reported cases between March 7 to March 22.<sup>42</sup> Using an average duration of infectiousness of 10 days and an average number of close contacts per person of 12.6,<sup>33</sup> we calculate the probability of transmission between a susceptible and an infected person, in the absence of any interventions, to be 0.024. We also considered using an  $R_0$  of 3.5, estimated for Ontario using a date range of March 8 to 14.<sup>43</sup> The initial cumulative infection curve in Ontario was dominated by cases in Toronto which has high population density in comparison to London and other mid-size communities with university student populations that are relatively large compared to the population of the community. Also, an  $R_0$  of 3.0 demonstrated greater fit to the initial trajectory of the infection in the calibration step.

Interventions such as social distancing, which reduced the average number of contacts between susceptible and infected people, or mask wearing, which reduce the probability of disease transmission between contacts, each reduce the expected number of infections in the time periods when they are adopted.

In the model, we assume a 90% reduction in contacts for people who are aware of their infection status and in home isolation, which is at the high end of observed adherence to quarantine instructions in past epidemics.<sup>44,45</sup> We assume isolation of hospitalized patients is 100% effective at preventing transmission to others.

## COMMUNITY RESPONSE AND OUTCOMES

**General population:** An Angus Reid poll of Canadians, taken in the first week of August, classified COVID-19 prevention behaviours of Canadians into three groups: “Infection Fighters”, “Inconsistent”, and “Cynical Spreaders”.<sup>46</sup> In part based on this stratification, we divided the general population into two risk groups based on their intensity of prevention behaviours. One of those risk groups (‘high-intensity physical distancers’) engage in high levels of risk mitigation behaviours (similar to “Infection Fighters”), while the other has low uptake of prevention behaviours (similar to the “Cynical Spreaders”). In calculating the prevention behaviours (level of contact reduction and mask wearing) from the Angus

Reid poll for the risk groups in our model, we split the “Inconsistent” group evenly between the “Infection Fighters” and the “Cynical Spreaders”.

We assume that ‘high-intensity physical distancers’ reduce their average number of contacts by 75% (from 12.6 to 3.2 contacts per day) consistent with 70% of “Infection Fighters” reporting fewer than 5 contacts outside of their household, and that they wear a cloth mask with 86% of their remaining contacts.<sup>46</sup> We assume the remainder of the population are not reducing their contacts, but are using a cloth mask with 38% of their contacts.<sup>46</sup> We assume the effectiveness of cloth masks in reducing disease transmission is 40% based on a German study using synthetic control to evaluate the effectiveness of real-world mask use.<sup>47</sup>

In the base case, we assumed that 50% of the general population are initially ‘high intensity physical distancers’ consistent with 47% of Canadians reporting “Infection Fighter” behaviour in the Angus Reid poll.<sup>46</sup> We assumed that proportion of people who are ‘high intensity physical distancers’ increases by 0.5% each day if the number of COVID-19 patients in critical care exceeds 15 and by an additional 1.0% each day if the number of COVID-19 deaths in the past 10 days exceeds 10. This change in behaviour in response to observed strains on health care resources is intended to capture both individual decision-making and policy changes instituted by the city. In the base case, we assume that a maximum of 80% of the general population can become ‘high intensity physical distancers,’ reflecting the fact that not all individuals are able or willing to engage in physical distancing and high levels of mask wearing. To incorporate the re-opening and relaxation of behaviour that occurs when the prevalence of COVID-19 is low, we also assumed that proportion of people who are ‘high intensity physical distancers’ decreases by 0.5% each day if the number of COVID-19 patients in critical care is fewer than 10 and by an additional 1.0% each day if the number of COVID-19 deaths in the past 10 days is fewer than 5.

**University students:** During the COVID-19 pandemic, many university-aged persons report taking COVID-19 infection precautions, but to a lesser extent than other age groups.<sup>46</sup> The responses of 18-34 year-olds to the recent Angus Reid COVID-19 behaviour survey indicated that 60% have more than 2 COVID risk behaviours (compared to 30% in the population overall); in addition, 16% report having 10-19 contacts and 14% more than 20 contacts outside their household.<sup>46</sup>

In the base case, we assumed that, on average, university students reduce their contacts by 24% (from 23.7 to 18.0 contacts). This was to approximate the net behaviour of 18-24 year-olds in the Angus Reid survey, of which 32% reported “Infection Fighter” behaviour, which we equate with a 75% reduction in contacts in the general population. Thus, overall the net contact reduction was calculated as  $32\% \times 75\% = 24\%$ . In this same survey, 57% of 18-24 year-olds report wearing a mask indoors with people outside their household,<sup>46</sup> so we assumed this level of mask wearing among all university students. We assumed that university students respond to the same triggers as the general population and increase their social distancing behavior at the same rate, up to a maximum of a 50% reduction in contacts per day (23.7 contacts reduced to 11.9 contacts per day).

**Long term care:** The ability to reduce contacts in LTC facilities is limited by multiple occupancy rooms and the requirements of staff to provide medical care and support with activities of daily living. However, reductions in contacts can also be used as a proxy for contacts protected by highly effective medical personal protective equipment donned and doffed by trained personnel. We assume that in August, LTC residents have a 50% reduction in their average contacts (from 34.1 contacts to 17.05



contacts). We further assume that of their remaining contacts, 86% are protected by cloth masks providing a 40% reduction in disease transmission.<sup>47</sup>

Social interaction for residents such as communal meals and recreational activities, and visits with family are important for resident wellbeing. However, we assumed that more intensive restrictions on these activities would be re-instituted if adverse COVID-19 outcomes begin to appear in the community. While LTC facilities may receive their direction from provincial decision makers, we assumed that their COVID-19 precautions would also change with local outcomes consistent with the responsive behaviour of the general population. We assumed that the reduction in contacts increases by 0.5% each day if the number of COVID-19 patients in critical care exceeds 15 and by an additional 1.0% each day if the number of COVID-19 deaths in the past 10 days exceeds 10. We assume the maximum reduction in contacts is 80% (from 34.1 contacts to 6.8 contacts per day) and that 86% of remaining contacts are protected by a cloth mask. We conservatively assume that LTC facilities take a slower approach than the general population to relaxing restrictions once they have been re-engaged. We assumed that the reduction in contacts decreases by 0.25% each day if the number of COVID-19 patients in critical care is fewer than 10 and by an additional 0.25% each day if the number of COVID-19 deaths in the past 10 days is fewer than 5.

## MODEL CALIBRATION

We estimated some model parameters using calibration to the observed critical care and ward hospitalizations at London Health Sciences Centre, LTC resident mortality, and overall mortality in London-Middlesex Ontario from March 1 to August 15, 2020 (**Appendix Figure 2**). All non-essential workplaces were ordered closed on March 23 at which time, in the model, individuals began reducing their contacts.<sup>48</sup> We used trends in cell phone mobility data<sup>49,50</sup> to inform estimates of the proportion of the population participating in high-intensity physical distancing over time (**Appendix Figure 3, Appendix Figure 4**). Further, beginning May 16,<sup>51</sup> we assumed that people engaged in high-intensity physical distancing wore a mask for 86% of their remaining contacts and that people not engaged in high-intensity physical distancing wore a mask for 38% of their contacts, consistent with the levels used in our policy analysis.

To fit to the calibration targets we tuned the  $R_0$  parameter, selecting 3.0 rather than 3.5 because of the better fit to the London Ontario data, which we also believe would be representative of mid-sized, relatively lower-density cities.

We also tuned the proportion of the general population who would be in need of hospitalization. Based on the ratio of critical care to non-critical care hospitalizations estimated from the literature, described above, we had initially estimated the value to be 6.8%, but this number resulted in an overestimate of ward hospitalizations when compared to the London, Ontario observational data. We found that 3.75% represented a closer fit to the data.

Finally, we did not find an estimate for the length of time until recovery or death for a COVID-19 patient receiving care in a LTC facility. We estimated this parameter to be 18 days (median 12.5 days) fitting the shape of the mortality curve for LTC residents.

After June 7, 2020, there were fewer than 5 patients in critical care and nearly always fewer than 5 patients in ward hospital beds in London hospitals which is the minimum number for reporting. There were also few new infections reported by the Health Unit. Over the month of July, the number of active cases decreased from 62 on July 1 to 32 on July 31; there were 28 active cases on August 15.<sup>52</sup> At the end of the calibration window, we selected different levels of physical distancing behaviour to create different starting conditions for analysis. For the base case, we selected the proportion of the population engaged in high-intensity physical distancing beginning in July to be 50% consistent with the which resulted in 40 active infections (some of which would be undiagnosed) on August 15. By selecting different values for the proportion of the population engaged in high-intensity physical distancing in July, we created alternative scenarios in which there were 25, 50, and 100 people with active infections on August 15 to evaluate as alternative scenarios in sensitivity analysis.

## MODEL INITIALIZATION

In the base case, at the start of the simulation, there were 40 infected individuals, some undiagnosed, in the general population. We assumed that there are no COVID-19 infections among LTC residents. The actual number of diagnosed active cases on August 15 in London-Middlesex was 28 (based on data retrieved daily from the London Middlesex Health Unit webpage<sup>52</sup>).

The 40 cases of COVID-19 were distributed across the COVID-19 health states based on state distribution of the population at the end of the run-in period of the model, March 1 to August 15. On August 15, the population is distributed as follows: 493,937 Susceptible, 13.8 Exposed but not yet infectious, 40.2 infected individuals (10.8 exposed and infectious, 8.2 asymptomatic individuals, 18.0 mildly symptomatic individuals, 1.3 symptomatic individuals who will progress, but have not yet progressed, to needing hospitalization, and 1.9 patients in hospital), 2,476 Recovered individuals, and 35 individuals in the general population who died from COVID-19 between March 1 and August 15. The cumulative number of diagnosed cases in London-Middlesex on August 15<sup>th</sup> was 707,<sup>52</sup> which implies an overall detection rate that is consistent but somewhat higher than the estimate of 22% case detection rate the end of June in Ontario based on blood sample serology.<sup>28</sup>

Based on the state distribution of LTC residents on August 15 as estimated through the model run-in period, there were 75 residents in the recovered health states at the start of the simulation. Over the course of the run-in period, 25.3 deaths occurred in LTC facilities (consistent with the reported number of 24 deaths in LTC residents by July 31 in London-Middlesex<sup>52</sup>); we assume that new residents moved in resulting in a state distribution of LTC residents on August 1 of 3425 Susceptible and 75 Recovered LTC residents.

## ANALYSIS OF UNCERTAINTY AND POLICY ALTERNATIVES

We used the model to explore how COVID-19 risk and prevention behaviours of the general population and the student community, in particular, affect the incremental COVID-19 burden attributable to the arrival of 20,000 university (post-secondary) students on September 1<sup>st</sup>.

Under different scenarios of community physical distancing effort, student behaviour, and routine testing in students, we calculated the number of infected individuals, demand hospital resources, time to responsive behaviour thresholds being activated, and health outcomes overall and over time.

#### *Evaluating the incremental impact of university student behaviour on community covid-19 outcomes*

We considered several city scenarios varying the following city features

- Different levels of general population participation in high-intensity physical distancing,
- Different initial numbers of infected cases in the population,
- Different thresholds for engaging greater participation in physical distancing
- Different intensity of response after crossing the trigger thresholds

#### *Evaluating the uncertainty in short-term student behaviour*

We considered several levels of student COVID-19 prevention behaviours

- Different levels of immediate contact reduction,
- Delay in the initiation of contact reduction for a short-term period at the beginning of the school year,
- Short-term increase in the number of contacts before initiating a reduction contacts.

We also performed extensive sensitivity analysis on other parameters

- The number of students with COVID-19 infection when they arrive on campus
- Intensity of student response to behaviour thresholds
- Increases and decreases to student mask wearing

#### *Comparing frequencies of routine diagnostic testing targeted at the student population*

Finally, we calculated the number of infections averted through routine and one-time screening of university students. We considered routine screening of students on short periodic intervals (every 28 days, 14 days, 10 days, 7 days, 5 days, and 3 days). We also considered a one-time screening of all university students on September 22 (three weeks after the arrival of students).

We assumed routine testing would be performed using nasopharyngeal swab and PCR analysis with a test sensitivity of 72.1%.<sup>31,32</sup>

## SUPPLEMENTAL RESULTS

**Appendix Figure 2** presents a comparison of the modelled outcomes to the observed data, including hospitalization data and COVID-19 mortality, from the City of London and Middlesex County, Ontario, Canada from March 1 to August 15.

**Appendix Figure 3** presents assumptions around engagement in physical distancing and mask wearing behaviour between March 1 and August 15 used in the calibration of the model.

**Appendix Figure 4** presents the Google mobility data for Middlesex County (including the City of London) from March 1 to August 31 which was used as one source informing the physical distancing assumptions in the calibration of the model.

**Appendix Figures 5 through 7** present the number of new COVID-19 infections per day, critical care demand, and COVID-19 mortality between August 15 and December 31 without the arrival of the student population varying the number of COVID-19 infections in the city on August 15 and the level of participation in high-intensity physical distancing going forward.

**Appendix Figure 8** presents the cumulative COVID-19 mortality between August 15 and December 31 varying the initial level of student engagement in reducing physical contacts.

**Appendix Figure 9** presents the number of new COVID-19 infections per day in the general population (panel A) and in the student population (panel B) between August 15 and December 31 varying the initial level of student engagement in reducing physical contacts and the testing strategy. This figure illustrates that the increase in cases occurs first in the relatively high contact university student population followed by an increase in daily infections in the general population. This figure also illustrates the effect of routine screening of university students every 5 days and a one-time universal screening event targeted at the university student population on the number of infections per day in the university student population and the general population.

**Appendix Figure 10** presents the cumulative number of COVID-19 infections and deaths between August 15 and December 31 with and without the student population. The scenarios along the X-axis present sensitivity analysis on the behaviour of the student population in terms of level of contacts reduction and mask wearing behaviours.

**Appendix Figure 11** presents the cumulative number of COVID-19 infections and deaths between August 15 and December 31 with and without the student population. The scenarios along the X-axis

present sensitivity analysis on the behaviour of the general population, varying the number of cases in the city on August 15 and the level of general population participation in high-intensity physical distancing.

**Appendix Table 1** presents detailed epidemic outcomes *without* the introduction of 20,000 university students. Scenarios consider different initial community conditions and physical distancing (PD) behaviours in the general population (corresponding to results presented in **Appendix Figures 5, 6, and 7**).

**Appendix Table 2** presents detailed epidemic outcomes *with* the introduction of 20,000 university students on September 1. Scenarios consider different initial community conditions and physical distancing (PD) behaviours in the general population.


**Appendix Table 3** presents detailed epidemic outcomes for sensitivity analysis on the number of COVID-19 infections in the initial student population on September 1.


**Appendix Table 4** presents detailed epidemic outcomes for scenarios that vary on initial student participation in physical distancing immediately upon arriving to the community (corresponding to results presented in **Figure 2**).

**Appendix Table 5** presents detailed epidemic outcomes for various frequencies of routine testing in university students under different scenarios of initial contact reduction behaviour in students and participation in high-intensity physical distancing behaviour in the general population (corresponding to results presented in **Figure 3**).



**Appendix Table 6** presents detailed epidemic outcomes for sensitivity analysis on student population characteristics including initial contact reductions and mask wearing behaviours.

**APPENDIX FIGURE 1.** Schematic of the model states for Asymptomatic, Mild and Moderate, and Severe and Critical patients accounting for incubation period, pre-symptomatic infectiousness, delay in diagnosis from symptom onset, and the utilization of hospital resources. To ensure realistic distributions for the duration of infectiousness and the duration of hospital resource utilization (e.g., gamma distributions instead of exponential distributions), states indicated with an asterisk (\*) were further subdivided into two successive states splitting equally the average duration of the state.






**APPENDIX FIGURE 2. Calibration to observed data from London-Middlesex, Ontario, Canada from March 1, 2020 to August 15, 2020.** (A) Modelled hospital and critical care occupancy compared to reported COVID-19 hospital occupancy. (B) Modelled total community COVID-19 mortality compared to reported COVID-19 mortality. (C) Modelled COVID-19 mortality compared to reported COVID-19 mortality for residents of long-term care (LTC) facilities.








(C)




**APPENDIX FIGURE 3. Participation in high-intensity physical distancing efforts in the calibration phase of the model-based analysis. All non-essential workplaces were ordered closed on March 23.**<sup>48</sup> (A) Proportion of the general population participating in high-intensity physical distancing, defined as having reduced their average number of daily contacts by 80% (from 12.6 to 2.5 contacts per day). Further, illustrated in panel (B), beginning May 16,<sup>51</sup> we assume that people engaged in high-intensity physical distancing wore a mask for 86% of their contacts and that people not engaged in high-intensity physical distancing wore a mask for 38% of their contacts. (C) Proportion of long-term care residents engaged in high-intensity physical distancing. (D) Effective reduction in contacts from LTC resident engagement in physical distancing and the use of personal protective equipment.




(C)




(D)





APPENDIX FIGURE 4. Google mobility report<sup>48</sup> for Middlesex County (which includes the City of London), Ontario Canada from March 1 to August 31 2020. All non-essential workplaces were ordered closed on March 23.<sup>48</sup> The baseline day is the day-of-week matched median value from the 5-week period Jan 3 – Feb 6, 2020.





**APPENDIX FIGURE 5. Number of new COVID-19 infections per day comparing different initial community conditions and physical distancing behaviours without the introduction of the university student population. (A) Varying the number of active cases in the community on August 15; and (B) Varying the proportion of the general population engaged in high-intensity physical distancing on August 15. High-intensity physical distancing is defined as reducing contacts by 75% (from 12.6 contacts per day to 3.15 contacts per day) and wearing a mask for 86% of remaining contacts.**





**APPENDIX FIGURE 6. Number of COVID-19 patients medically indicated for critical care (mechanical ventilation or renal replacement therapy) each day comparing different initial community conditions and physical distancing behaviours without the introduction of the university student population. (A) Varying the number of active cases in the community on August 15; and (B) Varying the proportion of the general population engaged in high intensity physical distancing on August 15.**



**APPENDIX FIGURE 7. Cumulative number of COVID-19 deaths comparing different initial community conditions and physical distancing behaviours without the introduction of the university student population. (A) Varying the number of active cases in the community on August 15; and (B) Varying the proportion of the general population engaged in high intensity physical distancing on August 15.**




**APPENDIX FIGURE 8. Cumulative COVID-19 deaths between August 15 and December 31 with and without the introduction of 20,000 university students on September 1. Only deaths occurring prior to December 31 are included in these figures.** Scenarios presented along the X-axis of panel B correspond to scenarios presented in **Appendix Table 4**. The general population has the same features and COVID-19 prevention behaviours across all scenarios.








**APPENDIX FIGURE 9. Cumulative number of new COVID-19 infections per day in the (A) general population and (B) university student population between August 15 and December 31 with and without the introduction of 20,000 university students on September 1. Scenarios vary in the social distancing behaviour of students immediately upon arrival to university. The general population has the same features and COVID-19 prevention behaviours across all scenarios.**



**APPENDIX FIGURE 10. Cumulative number of COVID-19 infections (A) and deaths (B) between August 15 and December 31 with and without the introduction of 20,000 university students on September 1. Sensitivity analysis on university student behaviours in terms of contact reductions and mask wearing. Across all of these scenarios, the general population has base case behaviours. Numerical results are presented in **Appendix Table 6**.**



**APPENDIX FIGURE 11. Cumulative number of COVID-19 infections (A) and deaths (B) between August 15 and December 31 with and without the introduction of 20,000 university students on September 1. Sensitivity analysis on general population behaviours and initial conditions. Across all of these scenarios, students have base case behaviours. Numerical results are presented in Appendix Table 2.**



**APPENDIX TABLE 1. Epidemic outcomes in a city of 500,000 in which 0.7% of the population live in long-term care (3500) comparing different initial community conditions and physical distancing (PD) behaviours without the university population over 4.5 months.** Dates are presented in weeks from September 1 and four months is 17 weeks.

	Base case	↓ initial infection population	↑ initial infection population	↑↑ initial participation in PD	↑ initial participation in PD	↓ initial participation in PD	↓↓ initial participation in PD	↓ threshold to increase PD effort
<b>Scenario features</b>								
COVID-19 infections on August 15	40	25	50	40	40	40	40	40
Proportion of general population participating in high-intensity physical distancing on August 15	50%	50%	50%	60%	55%	45%	40%	50%
Trigger to increase general population participation in physical distancing		> 15 critical care occupancy → Increase physical distancing participation by 0.5% per day > 10 deaths in past 10 days → Increase physical distancing participation by 1.0% per day						↓ threshold to 10 critical care occupancy
<b>Cumulative infections</b>								
General population	3,869	2,736	4,754	536	1,330	7,024	9,383	3,443
Long-term care	32	22	38	7	13	46	52	27
Total	3,900	2,758	4,792	543	1,343	7,070	9,436	3,470
<b>Daily infections</b>								
Peak number of infections	79	78	78	4	53	125	192	56
Date of peak infections (in weeks)	17.6	19.9	15.7	>22 weeks	>22 weeks	13.9	11.1	>22 weeks
<b>Cumulative deaths</b>								
General population	27	19	36	7	12	59	98	27
Long-term care	4	3	5	1	2	8	11	4
Total	31	22	41	8	14	67	109	31
<b>Hospital occupancy</b>								
Peak number	31	31	31	2	21	48	69	22
Date of peak (in weeks)	20.9	23.1	19.0	>22 weeks	>22 weeks	16.4	14.0	>22 weeks
<b>Critical care (MV + RRT)</b>								
Peak number	27	27	27	2	18	40	57	19
Date of peak (in weeks)	21.6	23.9	19.9	>22 weeks	>22 weeks	17.0	14.7	>22 weeks
<b>Time to responsive behaviour triggers (in weeks)</b>								
> 10 COVID-19 deaths in past 10 days	21.0	23.4	19.3	Does not occur	Does not occur	14.4	11.4	Does not occur
> 15 COVID-19 patients in critical care	16.4	18.7	14.6	Does not occur	Does not occur	11.4	8.9	13.7

**APPENDIX TABLE 2. Epidemic outcomes in a city of 500,000 in which 0.7% of the population live in long-term care (3500) with the introduction of 20,000 university students on September 1. Scenarios consider different initial community conditions and physical distancing (PD) behaviours in the general population.**

In all scenarios, the population of university students arriving on September 1 has the same features: university students arrive in the city with no COVID-19 infections, have 24% fewer contacts than the average number of normal contacts for a university student (average of 23.7 contacts reduced to 18.0 contacts), 58% of contacts are protected through mask wearing behaviour, and when COVID-19 begins to result in adverse outcomes in the community through critical care hospitalizations, university students increase their physical distancing efforts using the same triggers and at the same rate as the general population to a maximum reduction in contacts of 50% (average of 11.8 contacts). Dates are presented in weeks from September 1 and four months (to the end of the semester) is 17 weeks.

	Base case	↓ initial infection population	↑ initial infection population	↑↑ initial participation in PD	↑ initial participation in PD	↓ initial participation in PD	↓↓ initial participation in PD	↓ threshold to increase PD effort
<b>Scenario features</b>								
COVID-19 infections on August 15	40	25	50	40	40	40	40	40
Proportion of general population participating in physical distancing on August 15	50%	50%	50%	60%	55%	45%	40%	50%
Trigger to increase general population participation in physical distancing		> 15 critical care occupancy → Increase physical distancing participation by 0.5% per day > 10 deaths in past 10 days → Increase physical distancing participation by 1.0% per day						↓ threshold to 10 critical care occupancy
<b>Cumulative infections</b>								
General population	6,297	5,199	6,685	1,151	2,936	8,529	11,366	4,978
Long-term care	42	36	44	10	23	49	58	33
University students	960	817	995	320	619	978	1,048	734
Total	7,299	6,052	7,724	1,482	3,578	9,556	12,472	5,745
<b>Daily infections</b>								
Peak number of infections	140	142	136	96	111	192	267	92
Date of peak infections (in weeks)	15.4	17.0	14.1	>22 weeks	19.3	12.7	10.6	13.7
<b>Cumulative deaths</b>								
General population	42	30	53	10	19	78	120	39
Long-term care	5	4	7	1	3	9	12	5
University students	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.2
Total	48	34	60	11	22	87	132	44
<b>Hospital occupancy</b>								
Peak number	48	49	47	31	38	64	89	33
Date of peak (in weeks)	18.1	19.7	17.0	>22 weeks	>22 weeks	15.4	13.7	17.0
<b>Critical care (MV + RRT)</b>								
Peak number	40	40	39	25	31	52	72	27
Date of peak (in weeks)	18.7	20.3	17.6	>22 weeks	>22 weeks	16.0	14.4	17.7

**Time to responsive behaviour triggers**  
(in weeks)

> 10 COVID-19 deaths in past 10 days	16.4	18.0	15.3	Does not occur	21.9	13.0	10.9	17.6
> 15 COVID-19 patients in critical care	13.3	14.9	12.0	Does not occur	18.0	10.3	8.4	11.4

---

**Incremental compared to without the university students**

**Cumulative infections**

General population	2,428	2,463	1,931	615	1,606	1,505	1,982	1,535
Long-term care	11	13	6	3	10	3	6	6
University students	960	817	995	320	619	978	1,048	734
Total	3,399	3,293	2,932	939	2,235	2,486	3,036	2,275

**Daily infections**

Peak number of infections	61	64	58	91	58	67	75	36
Date of peak infections (change in weeks)	-2.1	-2.9	-1.6	-22.1	-12.9	-1.1	-0.6	-19.7

**Cumulative deaths**

General population	15	11	17	3	7	19	22	12
Long-term care	1.5	1.1	1.6	0.2	0.7	1.3	1.3	1.1
University students	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.2
Total	17	12	19	3	8	21	24	13

**Hospital occupancy**

Peak number	17	18	16	29	16	16	20	10
Date of peak (change in weeks)	-2.7	-3.4	-2.0	-20.3	-12.7	-1.0	-0.3	-19.7

**Critical care (MV + RRT)**

Peak number	13	14	12	24	13	12	15	8
Date of peak (change in weeks)	-2.9	-3.6	-2.3	-19.4	-12.7	-1.0	-0.3	-19.9

**Time to responsive behaviour triggers**  
(change in weeks)

> 10 COVID-19 deaths in past 10 days	-4.6	-5.4	-4.0	0	Cannot be calculated	-1.4	-0.6	Cannot be calculated
> 15 COVID-19 patients in critical care	-3.1	-3.9	-2.6	0	Cannot be calculated	-1.1	-0.4	-2.3

---

**APPENDIX TABLE 3. Epidemic outcomes between August 15 and December 31 in a city of 500,000 in which 0.7% of the population live in long-term care (3500) with the introduction of 20,000 university students on September 1. Scenarios vary on the number of COVID-19 infections in the student population when they arrive on September 1. Dates are presented in weeks from September 1 and four months (to the end of the semester) is 17 weeks.**

	Without students	20,000 students arrive on September 1						
		Base case	5 infected	10 infected	15 infected	20 infected	25 infected	30 infected
<b>Scenario features</b>								
Number of infections in student population upon arrival on September 1		0	5	10	15	20	25	30
Immediate level of contact reduction among students		24% (from 23.7 → 18.0 contacts)	24%	24%	24%	24%	24%	24%
Contacts protected by mask wearing		57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	57%
<b>Cumulative infections</b>								
General population	3,869	6,297	6,824	7,047	7,301	7,410	7,399	7,655
Long-term care	32	42	44	44	45	45	44	45
University students	-	960	1,137	1,254	1,365	1,448	1,503	1,600
Total	3,900	7,299	8,005	8,346	8,711	8,902	8,946	9,301
<b>Daily infections</b>								
Peak number of infections	79	140	143	149	155	160	162	171
Date of peak infections (in weeks)	17.6	15.4	13.9	12.9	12.1	11.6	11.0	10.7
<b>Cumulative deaths</b>								
General population	27	42	55	64	72	77	80	84
Long-term care	4.0	5.4	6.8	7.8	8.5	8.9	9.1	9.5
University students	-	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.8
Total	31	48	62	73	81	86	90	95
<b>Hospital occupancy</b>								
Peak number	31	48	49	51	53	54	54	57
Date of peak (in weeks)	20.9	18.1	16.6	15.6	14.9	14.3	13.7	13.3
<b>Critical care (MV + RRT)</b>								
Peak number	27	40	40	42	43	44	44	46
Date of peak (in weeks)	21.6	18.7	17.3	16.1	15.4	14.9	14.3	13.9
<b>Time to responsive behaviour triggers (in weeks)</b>								
> 10 COVID-19 deaths in past 10 days	21.0	16.4	14.9	13.7	13.0	12.3	11.7	11.3
> 15 COVID-19 patients in critical care	16.4	13.3	11.7	10.7	10.0	9.4	8.9	8.6

**APPENDIX TABLE 4. Epidemic outcomes between August 15 and December 31 in a city of 500,000 in which 0.7% of the population live in long-term care (3500) with and without the introduction of 20,000 university students on September 1. Scenarios vary student participation in physical distancing immediately upon arrival to the community.** In all scenarios, the general population begins with 40 COVID-19 infections on August 15, 50% of the general population are participating in high intensity physical distancing (75% reduction in daily contacts, from an average of 12.6 contacts to 3.8 contacts per day), 86% of contacts among high-intensity physical distancers and 38% of contacts among individuals who are not participating in physical distancing are protected through mask wearing behaviour, and when COVID-19 begins to result in adverse outcomes in the community through critical care hospitalizations, the fraction of the general population participating in high-intensity physical distancing and mask wearing behaviours increases to a maximum participation of 80%. Dates are presented in weeks from September 1 and four months (to the end of the semester) is 17 weeks.

	Without students	20,000 students arrive on September 1						
		Immediate physical distancing (base case)	Students increase (2.0x) interactions for 1 week	Students delay physical distancing by 2 weeks	Students increase (1.5x) interactions for 2 weeks	Students increase (2.0x) interactions for 2 weeks	Students delay physical distancing by 3 weeks	Students increase (1.5x) interactions for 3 weeks
<b>Scenario features</b>								
Number of infections in student population upon arrival on September 1		0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduction in overall student physical contacts of 24% (18.0 contacts) begins		Immediately	After 1 week	After 2 weeks	After 2 weeks	After 2 weeks	After 3 weeks	After 3 weeks
Burst of student-student contacts upon arrival		None	2.0x for 1 week	None	1.5x for 2 weeks	2.0x for 2 weeks	None	1.5x for 2 weeks
<b>Cumulative infections</b>								
General population	3,869	6,297	6,900	7,230	7,647	8,258	8,181	10,590
Long-term care	32	42	44	45	45	46	46	53
University students	0	960	1,165	1,339	1,609	1,990	1,884	3,152
Total	3,900	7,299	8,109	8,613	9,301	10,294	10,112	13,794
<b>Daily infections</b>								
Peak number of infections	79	140	148	156	174	200	196	302
Date of peak infections (in weeks)	17.6	15.4	14.0	13.0	11.7	10.4	11.3	9.0
<b>Cumulative deaths</b>								
General population	27	42	55	64	78	92	86	124
Long-term care	4	5	7	8	9	10	9	12
University students	0	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.8	1.1	0.9	1.8
Total	31	48	62	73	88	103	96	137
<b>Hospital occupancy</b>								
Peak number	31	48	51	53	58	65	64	92
Date of peak (in weeks)	20.9	18.1	16.7	15.7	14.3	13.0	13.9	11.7



<b>Critical care (MV + RRT)</b>								
Peak number	27	40	41	43	47	52	51	72
Date of peak (in weeks)	21.6	18.7	17.3	16.3	14.9	13.6	14.4	12.4
<b>Time to responsive behaviour triggers</b> (in weeks)								
> 10 COVID-19 deaths in past 10 days	21.0	16.4	14.9	13.9	12.3	10.9	11.7	9.3
> 15 COVID-19 patients in critical care	16.4	13.3	11.9	10.9	9.6	8.3	9.1	7.3

---

**APPENDIX TABLE 5. Epidemic outcomes between August 15 and December 31 in a city of 500,000 in which 0.7% of the population live in long-term care (3500) with and without the introduction of 20,000 university students on September 1. Scenarios differ in the frequency with which students undergo routine testing for COVID-19. In the top third of the table, we assume students have an average 24% reduction in contacts compared to normal student social interaction behaviour (average of 23.7 contacts reduced to 18.0 contacts per day) immediately upon arrival with no short-term increase in physical contacts upon arrival to the community. In the middle of the table, we assume that students double their contacts with other students for two weeks, and then implement a 24% reduction in their contacts. In the bottom section of the table, we assume that students double their contacts with other students for two weeks, and then implement a 24% reduction in their contacts and the general population is maintaining 60% participation in high-intensity physical distancing (compared to 50% in the base case). Dates are presented in weeks from September 1 and four months (to the end of the semester) is 17 weeks.**

	20,000 students arrive on September 1							
	Without students	Symptomatic surveillance & contact tracing	Test once 3-weeks after students arrive	Test every 28 days	Test every 14 days	Test every 7 days	Test every 5 days	Test every 3 days
<b>Students immediately implement a 24% reduction in contacts compared to normal university student social behaviour</b>								
<b>Cumulative infections</b>								
General population	3,869	6,297	6,194	6,001	5,778	5,466	5,327	5,041
Long-term care	32	42	42	41	40	39	39	38
University students	0	960	936	831	735	605	541	442
Total	3,900	7,299	7,172	6,873	6,553	6,110	5,907	5,520
<b>Daily infections</b>								
Peak number of infections	79	140	137	129	121	112	109	102
Date of peak infections (in weeks)	17.6	15.4	15.4	15.4	15.4	15.6	15.9	16.0
<b>Cumulative deaths</b>								
General population	27	42	41	40	39	37	36	34
Long-term care	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
University students	0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
Total	31	48	47	46	44	42	41	39
<b>Hospital occupancy</b>								
Peak number	31	48	48	45	43	41	40	38
Date of peak (in weeks)	20.9	18.1	18.3	18.3	18.6	18.7	19.0	19.3
<b>Critical care (MV + RRT)</b>								
Peak number	27	40	39	38	36	34	34	32
Date of peak (in weeks)	21.6	18.7	18.9	18.9	19.1	19.3	19.6	19.9
<b>Time to responsive behaviour triggers (in weeks)</b>								
> 10 COVID-19 deaths in past 10 days	21.0	16.4	16.6	16.7	17.0	17.4	17.7	18.1
> 15 COVID-19 patients in critical care	16.4	13.3	13.3	13.4	13.6	13.9	14.1	14.4

**Students double their contacts with other students for two weeks, then implement a 24% reduction in contacts compared to normal university student social behaviour**

<b>Cumulative infections</b>								
General population	3,869	8,258	8,020	7,825	7,441	6,880	6,544	6,206
Long-term care	32	46	45	45	44	42	42	41
University students	0	1,990	1,868	1,731	1,517	1,214	1,047	822
Total	3,900	10,294	9,933	9,601	9,002	8,137	7,632	7,069
<b>Daily infections</b>								
Peak number of infections	79	200	191	182	162	140	127	111
Date of peak infections (in weeks)	17.6	10.4	10.7	10.6	10.7	10.9	11.1	11.7
<b>Cumulative deaths</b>								
General population	27	92	88	86	81	74	69	62
Long-term care	4	10	10	9	9	9	8	8
University students	0	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.4
Total	31	103	98	97	91	83	78	70
<b>Hospital occupancy</b>								
Peak number	31	65	62	60	56	49	46	41
Date of peak (in weeks)	20.9	13.0	13.3	13.1	13.4	13.9	14.1	14.9
<b>Critical care (MV + RRT)</b>								
Peak number	27	52	50	49	45	41	38	34
Date of peak (in weeks)	21.6	13.6	13.9	13.9	14.0	14.4	14.7	15.4
<b>Time to responsive behaviour triggers (in weeks)</b>								
> 10 COVID-19 deaths in past 10 days	21.0	10.9	11.1	11.1	11.6	12.1	12.6	13.6
> 15 COVID-19 patients in critical care	16.4	8.3	8.6	8.6	8.7	9.1	9.4	10.1

**Students double their contacts with other students for two weeks, then implement a 24% reduction in contacts compared to normal university student social behaviour; the general population has a high level of participation in high-intensity physical distancing (60%)**

<b>Cumulative infections</b>								
General population	536	5,198	4,977	4,697	4,228	3,410	2,787	1,985
Long-term care	7	36	35	35	33	28	24	18
University students	0	2,082	1,968	1,740	1,450	1,019	769	473
Total	543	7,317	6,980	6,471	5,711	4,458	3,580	2,475
<b>Daily infections</b>								
Peak number of infections	4	114	108	97	84	68	60	51
Date of peak infections (in weeks)	>22 weeks	12.7	13.3	13.3	14.0	16.4	19.7	>22 weeks
<b>Cumulative deaths</b>								
General population	7	45	40	39	34	27	23	18
Long-term care	1.2	6	5	5	5	4	3	3
University students	0	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2
Total	8	51	46	44	39	31	26	21

<b>Hospital occupancy</b>								
Peak number	2	36	34	31	28	23	21	19
Date of peak (in weeks)	>22 weeks	16.0	16.6	16.6	17.3	19.7	>22 weeks	>22 weeks
<b>Critical care (MV + RRT)</b>								
Peak number	2	29	28	26	23	19	18	16
Date of peak (in weeks)	>22 weeks	16.9	17.4	17.4	18.1	20.4	>22 weeks	>22 weeks
<b>Time to responsive behaviour triggers</b> (in weeks)								
> 10 COVID-19 deaths in past 10 days	Does not occur	16.0	17.0	Does not occur	Does not occur	Does not occur	Does not occur	Does not occur
> 15 COVID-19 patients in critical care	Does not occur	12.0	12.6	12.9	13.9	16.7	20.0	Does not occur

---

**APPENDIX TABLE 6. Epidemic outcomes between August 15 and December 31 in a city of 500,000 in which 0.7% of the population live in long-term care (3500) with the introduction of 20,000 university students on September 1. Scenarios vary on student initial participation in physical distancing (PD) and the proportion of student contacts protected by mask wearing. Dates are presented in weeks from September 1 and four months (to the end of the semester) is 17 weeks.**

	20,000 students arrive on September 1								
	Without students	Base case student behaviours	↓↓ initial participation in PD	↓ initial participation in PD	↑ initial participation in PD	↑↑ initial participation in PD	↓ mask wearing	↑ mask wearing	↑ initial participation in PD & ↑ mask wearing
<b>Scenario features</b>									
Number of infections in student population upon arrival on September 1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Immediate level of contact reduction among students		24% (from 23.7 → 18.0 contacts)	15% (23.7 → 20.1)	20% (23.7 → 19.0)	30% (23.7 → 16.6)	40% (23.7 → 14.2)	24%	24%	30% (23.7 → 16.6)
Contacts protected by mask wearing		57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	45%	65%	65%
<b>Cumulative infections</b>									
General population	3,869	6,297	8,634	7,140	5,395	4,645	7,287	5,789	5,139
Long-term care	32	42	48	45	39	36	45	41	38
University students	-	960	2,527	1,473	533	251	1,570	703	421
Total	3,900	7,299	11,209	8,657	5,966	4,932	8,902	6,533	5,598
<b>Daily infections</b>									
Peak number of infections	79	140	249	177	110	93	183	123	105
Date of peak infections (in weeks)	17.6	15.4	14.3	15.3	15.7	16.4	15.1	15.7	16.0
<b>Cumulative deaths</b>									
General population	27	42	61	49	36	32	50	39	35
Long-term care	4.0	5.4	6.9	6.0	4.9	4.5	6.1	5.1	4.8
University students	0	0.2	0.7	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.1
Total	31	48	69	55	41	36	56	44	39
<b>Hospital occupancy</b>									
Peak number	31	48	73	57	40	35	59	44	39
Date of peak (in weeks)	20.9	18.1	17.0	17.6	18.9	19.7	17.6	18.6	19.3
<b>Critical care (MV + RRT)</b>									
Peak number	27	40	58	46	34	30	47	36	33
Date of peak	21.6	18.7	17.6	18.3	19.4	20.4	18.1	19.1	19.9
<b>Time to responsive behaviour triggers (in weeks)</b>									
> 10 COVID-19 deaths in past 10 days	21.0	16.4	14.6	15.6	17.6	19.0	15.4	17.0	18.0

> 15 COVID-19 patients in critical care	16.4	13.3	11.9	12.7	14.0	15.0	12.6	13.7	14.4
---	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

---

## REFERENCES

1. Al-Jashi AA. COVID-19 in Ontario. Last updated September 10, 2020. [Accessed September 11, 2020] Available at: <https://www.covid19inontario.com/home>.
2. Western University. Facts & Figures 2019-2020. [Accessed September 11, 2020] Available at: <https://www.uwo.ca/about/whoweare/facts.html>.
3. Fanshawe College. About Fanshawe: London Campus. [Accessed September 11, 2020] Available at: <https://www.fanshawec.ca/about-fanshawe/campus/london-campus>.
4. Buitrago-Garcia DC, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, et al. Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: a living systematic review and meta-analysis [Version 3]. medRxiv 2020:2020.04.25.20079103.
5. Payne DC, Smith-Jeffcoat SE, Nowak G, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Serologic Responses from a Sample of U.S. Navy Service Members - USS Theodore Roosevelt, April 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2020;69:714-21.
6. Poletti P, Tirani M, Danilo C, et al. Probability of symptoms and critical disease after SARS-CoV-2 infection [Version 2]. arXiv.org Cornell University June 22, 2020. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.09320>.
7. Roxby AC, Greninger AL, Hatfield KM, et al. Outbreak Investigation of COVID-19 Among Residents and Staff of an Independent and Assisted Living Community for Older Adults in Seattle, Washington. JAMA Intern Med 2020.
8. Kimball A, Hatfield KM, Arons M, et al. Asymptomatic and Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Residents of a Long-Term Care Skilled Nursing Facility - King County, Washington, March 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2020;69:377-81.
9. Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre. ICNARC report on COVID-19 in critical care [July 17, 2020]. Available at: <https://www.icnarc.org/Our-Audit/Audits/Cmp/Reports>. 2020.
10. Statistics Canada. Detailed preliminary information on confirmed cases of COVID-19 (Revised), Public Health Agency of Canada. Table: 13-10-0781-01. [Accessed July 20, 2020]. Available at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/cv.action?pid=1310078101>.
11. Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Green CA, et al. Features of 20 133 UK patients in hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol: prospective observational cohort study. BMJ 2020;369:m1985.
12. Cunningham JW, Vaduganathan M, Claggett BL, et al. Clinical Outcomes in Young US Adults Hospitalized With COVID-19. JAMA Internal Medicine 2020.
13. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. Ann Intern Med 2020.
14. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. Nat Med 2020.
15. Tindale L, Coombe M, Stockdale JE, et al. Transmission interval estimates suggest pre-symptomatic spread of COVID-19. medRxiv 2020:2020.03.03.20029983.
16. Wolfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. Nature 2020.

17. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020.
18. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet* 2020.
19. Wearing HJ, Rohani P, Keeling MJ. Appropriate models for the management of infectious diseases. *PLoS Med* 2005;2:e174.
20. Keeling MJ, Rohani P. *Modeling Infectious Diseases in Humans and Animals*: Princeton University Press; 2008.
21. Novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2): Discharge criteria for confirmed COVID-19 cases. Technical report. : European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control; March 10, 2020. Available at: <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/novel-coronavirus-sars-cov-2-discharge-criteria-confirmed-covid-19-cases>.
22. Care in Canadian ICUs. Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI). 2016.
23. London Health Sciences Centre. Critical Care readiness: Expanding nursing staff to support COVID-19. [Accessed September 16, 2020]. Available at: <https://www.lhsc.on.ca/news/critical-care-readiness-expanding-nursing-staff-to-support-covid-19>.
24. Ventilator Stockpiling and Availability in the US: Center for Health Security, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health; 2020 February 14, 2020.
25. Ng Y, Li Z, Chua YX, et al. Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Surveillance and Containment Measures for the First 100 Patients with COVID-19 in Singapore - January 2-February 29, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69:307-11.
26. Gaythorpe K, Imai N, Cuomo-Dannenburg G, et al. Report 8: Symptom progression of COVID-19. Imperial College London COVID-19 Response Team 2020.
27. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391 cases and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020;20:911-9.
28. Herhalt C. Blood tests indicate one per cent of Ontario's population had COVID-19. CTV News. August 3, 2020. [Accessed September 11, 2020] Available at: <https://toronto.ctvnews.ca/blood-tests-indicate-one-per-cent-of-ontario-s-population-had-covid-19-1.5049457>.
29. Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. COVID-19 Testing for Long-Term Care Home Staff. . July 16, 2020. [Accessed: August 26, 2020]. Available at: [http://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/ltc/memo\\_20200716.aspx](http://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/ltc/memo_20200716.aspx).
30. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Testing Residents: Interim SARS-CoV-2 Testing Guidelines for Nursing Home Residents and Healthcare Personnel [Accessed August 26, 2020] Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/nursing-homes-testing.html>.
31. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in False-Negative Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction-Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time Since Exposure. *Ann Intern Med* 2020;173:262-7.
32. Carver C, Jones N. Comparative accuracy of oropharyngeal and nasopharyngeal swabs for diagnosis of COVID-19. *Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine* 2020; Available at:



<https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/comparative-accuracy-of-oropharyngeal-and-nasopharyngeal-swabs-for-diagnosis-of-covid-19/>.

33. Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact surveys and demographic data. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2017;13:e1005697.
34. Edmunds WJ, O'Callaghan CJ, Nokes DJ. Who mixes with whom? A method to determine the contact patterns of adults that may lead to the spread of airborne infections. *Proc Biol Sci* 1997;264:949-57.
35. Beutels P, Shkedy Z, Aerts M, Van Damme P. Social mixing patterns for transmission models of close contact infections: exploring self-evaluation and diary-based data collection through a web-based interface. *Epidemiol Infect* 2006;134:1158-66.
36. Edmunds WJ, Kafatos G, Wallinga J, Mossong JR. Mixing patterns and the spread of close-contact infectious diseases. *Emerg Themes Epidemiol* 2006;3:10.
37. Salathe M, Kazandjieva M, Lee JW, Levis P, Feldman MW, Jones JH. A high-resolution human contact network for infectious disease transmission. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2010;107:22020-5.
38. Aiello AE, Simanek AM, Eisenberg MC, et al. Design and methods of a social network isolation study for reducing respiratory infection transmission: The eX-FLU cluster randomized trial. *Epidemics* 2016;15:38-55.
39. Najafi M, Laskowski M, de Boer PT, Williams E, Chit A, Moghadas SM. The Effect of Individual Movements and Interventions on the Spread of Influenza in Long-Term Care Facilities. *Med Decis Making* 2017;37:871-81.
40. Champredon D, Najafi M, Laskowski M, Chit A, Moghadas SM. Individual movements and contact patterns in a Canadian long-term care facility. *AIMS Public Health* 2018;5:111-21.
41. Roberts AR, Ishler KJ, Adams KB. The Predictors of and Motivations for Increased Family Involvement in Nursing Homes. *The Gerontologist* 2018;60:535-47.
42. Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. COVID-19 case data. [Accessed August 26, 2020] Available at: <https://covid-19.ontario.ca/data>.
43. Public Health Ontario. Evolution of COVID-19 case growth in Ontario. Epidemiological summary. June 26, 2020. [Accessed: August 26, 2020]. Available at: <https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/data-and-analysis/infectious-disease/covid-19-data-surveillance>.
44. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, et al. Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science* 2020.
45. Webster R, Brooks S, Smith L, Woodland L, Wessely S, Rubin J. How to improve adherence with quarantine: Rapid review of the evidence. medRxiv 2020:2020.03.17.20037408.
46. Angus Reid Institute. COVID-19 Compliance: One-in-five Canadians making little to no effort to stop coronavirus spread. August 17, 2020. Available at: <http://angusreid.org/covid-compliance/>.
47. Mitze T, Kosfeld R, Rode J, Wälde K. Face Masks Considerably Reduce Covid-19 Cases in Germany. IZA Discussion Paper Series No 13319 Bonn, Germany: IZA Institute of Labour Economics 2020; Available at: <https://www.iza.org/publications/dp/13319/face-masks-considerably-reduce-covid-19-cases-ingermany-a-synthetic-control-method-approach:2020.06.21.20128181>.
48. Office of the Premier of Ontario. Press Release: Ontario Orders the Mandatory Closure of All Non-Essential Workplaces to Fight Spread of COVID-19. March 23, 2020. [Accessed September 11,

2020]. Available at: <https://news.ontario.ca/en/release/56435/ontario-orders-the-mandatory-closure-of-all-non-essential-workplaces-to-fight-spread-of-covid-19>.

49. Google. COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports. Middlesex County. [Accessed September 11, 2020]. Available at: <https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/>.

50. Telus Insights. Data for Good: London (CSDUID 3539036 CSD Type: City). Reporting on data from February 22 to August 16, 2020.

51. Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Face coverings and face masks. [Published May 20, 2020; Last updated June 23, 2020; Accessed September 11, 2020]. Available at: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/face-coverings-and-face-masks>.

52. Middlesex-London Health Unit. Summary of COVID-19 cases in Middlesex-London. Available at: <https://www.healthunit.com/covid-19-cases-middlesex-london>.