

1 **Impact of a city-wide school-located influenza vaccination program over four years on**  
2 **vaccination coverage, school absences, and laboratory-confirmed influenza: a prospective**  
3 **matched cohort study**

4

5 Jade Benjamin-Chung<sup>1</sup>, Benjamin F. Arnold<sup>1,2</sup>, Chris J. Kennedy<sup>1</sup>, Kunal Mishra<sup>1</sup>, Nolan  
6 Pokpongkiat<sup>1</sup>, Anna Nguyen<sup>1</sup>, Wendy Jilek<sup>1</sup>, Kate Holbrook<sup>3</sup>, Erica Pan<sup>3,4</sup>, Pam D. Kirley<sup>5</sup>, Tanya  
7 Libby<sup>5</sup>, Alan E. Hubbard<sup>1</sup>, Arthur Reingold<sup>1</sup>, John M. Colford, Jr.<sup>1</sup>

8

9 <sup>1</sup>Division of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720

10 <sup>2</sup>Francis I. Proctor Foundation, University of California, San Francisco, CA 94122

11 <sup>3</sup>Division of Communicable Disease Control and Prevention, Alameda County Public Health  
12 Department, Oakland, CA 94607

13 <sup>4</sup>Department of Pediatrics, Division of Infectious Diseases, University of California, San  
14 Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94143

15 <sup>5</sup>California Emerging Infections Program, Oakland, CA 94612

16

## 17 **Abstract**

18        Background: It is estimated that vaccinating 50-70% of school-aged children for  
19 influenza can produce population-wide indirect effects. We evaluated a city-wide, school-  
20 located influenza vaccination (SLIV) intervention that aimed to increase influenza vaccination  
21 coverage. The intervention was implemented in over 95 pre-schools and elementary schools in  
22 northern California from 2014 to 2018. Using a matched prospective cohort design, we  
23 estimated intervention impacts on student influenza vaccination coverage, school absenteeism,  
24 and community-wide indirect effects on laboratory-confirmed influenza hospitalizations.

25        Methods and Findings: We used a multivariate matching algorithm to identify a nearby  
26 comparison school district with similar pre-intervention characteristics and matched schools in  
27 each district. To measure student influenza vaccination, we conducted cross-sectional surveys  
28 of student caregivers in 22 school pairs (2016 survey N = 6,070; 2017 survey N = 6,507). We  
29 estimated the incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza hospitalization from 2011-2018  
30 using surveillance data from school district zip codes. We analyzed student absenteeism data  
31 from 2011-2018 from each district (N = 42,487,816 student-days). To account for pre-  
32 intervention differences between districts, we estimated difference-in-differences (DID) in  
33 influenza hospitalization incidence and absenteeism rates using generalized linear and log-  
34 linear models with a population offset for incidence outcomes.

35        The number of students vaccinated by the SLIV intervention ranged from 7,502 to  
36 10,106 (22-28% of eligible students) each year. During the intervention, influenza vaccination  
37 coverage among elementary students was 53-66% in the comparison district. Coverage was  
38 similar between the intervention and comparison districts in 2014-15 and 2015-16 and was

39 significantly higher in the intervention site in 2016-17 (7% 95% CI 4, 11) and 2017-18 (11% 95%  
40 CI 7, 15). During seasons when vaccination coverage was higher among intervention schools  
41 and the vaccine was moderately effective, there was evidence of statistically significant indirect  
42 effects: adjusting for pre-intervention differences between districts, the reduction in influenza  
43 hospitalizations in the intervention site was 76 (95% CI 20, 133) in 2016-17 and 165 (95% CI 86,  
44 243) in 2017-18 among non-elementary school aged individuals and 327 (5, 659) in 2016-17 and  
45 715 (236, 1195) in 2017-18 among adults 65 years or older. The reduction in illness-related  
46 school absences during influenza season was 3,538 (95% CI 709, 6,366) in 2016-17 and 8,249  
47 (95% CI 3,213, 13,285) in 2017-18. Limitations of this study include the use of an observational  
48 design, which may be subject to unmeasured confounding, and caregiver-reported vaccination  
49 status, which is subject to poor recall and low response rates.

50 Conclusion: A city-wide SLIV intervention in a large, diverse urban population decreased  
51 the incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza hospitalization in all age groups and decreased  
52 illness-specific school absence rates among students during seasons when the vaccine was  
53 moderately effective, suggesting that the intervention produced indirect effects. Our findings  
54 suggest that in populations with moderately high background levels of influenza vaccination  
55 coverage, SLIV programs can further increase coverage and reduce influenza across  
56 communities.

## 57 **Introduction**

58           Seasonal influenza contributes substantially to hospitalization and mortality, especially  
59 among infants and the elderly [1]. The economic burden of influenza as a result of lost earnings  
60 and medical cost was estimated to exceed \$87 billion in the United States in 2007 [2]. To  
61 prevent the spread of influenza, seasonal influenza vaccination of all individuals over 6 months  
62 of age has been recommended by the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) in  
63 the U.S. since 2010 [3]. Effectiveness of seasonal influenza vaccines varies from year to year  
64 depending on the quality of the influenza virus strain match and whether antigenic drift occurs  
65 between the time when the vaccine is manufactured and the start of the seasonal influenza  
66 epidemic, among other factors.

67           School aged children are responsible for the greatest proportion of community-wide  
68 influenza transmission, and as a result, efforts to increase vaccination are likely to have the  
69 largest impact on influenza transmission when targeted to them [4–9]. Mathematical models  
70 estimate that vaccinating at least 50-70% of school-aged children against influenza can prevent  
71 an influenza epidemic by producing herd immunity (i.e., “indirect effects”) [10,11]. In recent  
72 years, influenza vaccination coverage in the United States has ranged from 54-62% among  
73 elementary school-aged children and 37-44% among adults [12,13]. Healthy People 2020 set a  
74 goal of 70% influenza vaccination coverage for children and adults [14]. Mathematical models  
75 project that an increase in child influenza vaccination coverage to 80% would reduce influenza  
76 hospitalizations among children by 42% and among adults by approximately 20% [15]. Herd  
77 immunity is thought to play a critical role in reducing the burden of influenza morbidity and

78 mortality among older adults, for whom vaccine effectiveness is frequently lower due to  
79 immunosenescence [16].

80 School-located influenza vaccination (SLIV) programs have been proposed as strategy to  
81 increase influenza vaccination coverage among children [16]. Prior studies reported that SLIV  
82 programs increased influenza vaccination [17–26] and decreased school absence [17–20,27–29]  
83 and student illnesses [17,20], and some studies report that their economic benefits likely  
84 outweigh the cost of program delivery [30,31]. There is some evidence that SLIV programs can  
85 produce community-wide indirect effects among pre-school aged children and adults; however,  
86 other studies have produced conflicting results [21,22,32–34]. Many prior SLIV evaluations did  
87 not use randomization or multivariate matching to select a comparison group and are subject  
88 to confounding [18,19,21,22,27–29,32–34]; those that have used more rigorous designs did not  
89 measure health outcomes [24–26,35,36] or enrolled small numbers of schools [17,20]. No prior  
90 studies have rigorously measured the impacts of large-scale SLIV interventions on student and  
91 community-wide health outcomes over multiple years.

92 Here, we report the findings of a four-year evaluation of a large-scale SLIV program in  
93 over 95 public, private, and charter schools in a diverse, urban, predominantly low-income city  
94 in northern California. The intervention was specifically designed to cover all public, private,  
95 and charter elementary schools in a geographical area in order to evaluate the potential for  
96 SLIV not only to reduce influenza among elementary schoolchildren but also to interrupt  
97 community-wide influenza transmission through herd effects. We expected that the SLIV  
98 intervention would reduce school absenteeism and community-wide influenza hospitalizations  
99 if it succeeded in increasing influenza vaccination coverage and if the seasonal influenza vaccine

100 was at least moderately effective. Using a prospective matched cohort design and three  
101 independent data sources, we measured the intervention’s impact on student influenza  
102 vaccination and school absences and the incidence of community-wide laboratory-confirmed  
103 influenza hospitalization.

## 104 **Methods**

### 105 School-located influenza vaccination intervention

106 The Shoo the Flu intervention ([www.shootheflu.org](http://www.shootheflu.org)) delivered free influenza  
107 vaccinations at schools throughout the city of Oakland, California, including all of the public and  
108 charter elementary schools in Oakland Unified School District (OUSD, the “intervention  
109 district”) and offered delivery to all other charter, private, and pre-schools in Oakland prior to  
110 the start of influenza season from 2014 through 2018. OUSD enrolls a diverse, urban population  
111 of approximately 53,000 students, including over 26,000 elementary school students (grades K  
112 through 5). Over 70% of students in this district are from low-income households, and half of  
113 students speak a language other than English in their home. The intervention aimed to increase  
114 influenza vaccination coverage among primarily elementary school-aged children in order to  
115 reduce influenza among elementary schoolchildren and to produce indirect effects protecting  
116 other age groups in the community. In its first two years, the intervention deployed a mass  
117 media campaign in the Oakland area, including advertisements in the subway, bus shelters,  
118 billboards, and newspapers, as well as through digital media. The intervention did not carry out  
119 promotion efforts outside of the Oakland area, although it is possible that residents of areas  
120 near Oakland were exposed to Shoo the Flu media. Caregivers of the students provided written  
121 consent for vaccination, and this consent process was separate from consent to participate in

122 the evaluation of the intervention. Children were eligible for vaccination regardless of their  
123 insurance status. From 2014-2018, between 95 and 138 elementary and pre-schools  
124 participated in Shoo the Flu, and each year the intervention vaccinated between 7,502 and  
125 10,106 students (22-28% of eligible students) (S1 Appendix).

#### 126 Influenza vaccine effectiveness during the intervention

127 In 2014-15 and 2015-16, the intervention offered the live attenuated influenza vaccine  
128 (LAIV) to students and the inactivated injectable influenza vaccine (IIV) to students with LAIV  
129 contraindications, consistent with ACIP recommendations [37,38]. The intervention also offered  
130 the IIV to school staff and teachers. In early 2016 the ACIP changed its recommendation for  
131 children aged 2 to 8 years from LAIV to IIV due to concerns about the low effectiveness of LAIV  
132 in the two prior seasons [39]. In 2016-17 and 2017-18 the intervention offered only the IIV. The  
133 seasonal influenza vaccine delivered by the intervention had low effectiveness in 2014-15 and  
134 2015-16 and moderate effectiveness in 2016-17 and 2017-18 (S2 Appendix) [40,41].

#### 135 Study design

136 The SLIV intervention was offered to all pre-schools and elementary schools in the city  
137 of Oakland with the goal of delivering SLIV to the largest number of schools possible in order to  
138 interrupt influenza transmission (i.e., produce indirect effects) in the city. For this reason, it was  
139 infeasible to use a cluster-randomized design because all schools in the district were offered  
140 the intervention. The study used a prospective matched cohort design to evaluate the SLIV  
141 intervention program [42]. We drew on multiple independent data sources to assess a full  
142 range of outcomes that could have been affected by the SLIV intervention: 1) influenza  
143 vaccination coverage, 2) influenza hospitalizations in the community, and 3) all-cause and

144 illness-specific school absence rates among elementary school students. We conducted a  
145 survey of a sample of student caregivers to measure influenza vaccination coverage and  
146 analyzed existing school absence and influenza hospitalization records. In some cases, outcome  
147 assessment implied slightly different designs and estimators, as we describe below.

148         The matched design focused on the vaccination coverage survey. We first selected from  
149 comparison school districts among San Francisco Bay Area districts that had at least four  
150 elementary schools and had pre-intervention school-level characteristics similar to the  
151 intervention district. We restricted possible comparison districts to those with boundaries  
152 separated by at least five miles from the intervention district to minimize contamination.  
153 Though the intervention was provided to some private and charter schools, the study  
154 population was restricted to public elementary schools in the intervention city school district  
155 because pre-intervention data were not readily available to identify suitable comparison private  
156 or non-district charter schools.

157         We used a genetic multivariate matching algorithm [43] to pair-match schools in the  
158 intervention district with schools in each candidate comparison district. The matching algorithm  
159 used the following pre-intervention school-level characteristics: mean enrollment, class size,  
160 parental education, academic performance index scores, California standardized test scores,  
161 and the school-level percentage of English language learners and students receiving free lunch  
162 at school. We excluded pre-schools from this evaluation because the availability of pre-schools  
163 and enrollment criteria varied from school district to school district, complicating comparisons  
164 between districts. We identified West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD) as the  
165 best nearby comparison district because, on average, it had the smallest generalized



166 Mahalanobis distance between paired schools [43] and a sufficient number of elementary  
167 schools (N=34 schools, grades K through 6) in the district to ensure adequate statistical power.  
168 The absolute value of the standardized difference was under 50 for most variables, indicating  
169 that the matching produced good quality school pair matches [44] (see S3 Appendix for further  
170 details).

171 Analyses of influenza hospitalization and school absences leveraged the matched design  
172 but used a slightly different approach tailored to each outcome. Because the intention was to  
173 measure community-wide indirect effects of SLIV on influenza hospitalization, we included  
174 hospitalizations of all residents of zip codes within the intervention and comparison district  
175 school catchment areas, including zip codes that were partially within the district boundary. To  
176 measure impacts on school absences we pre-specified inclusion of all public elementary schools  
177 enrolling Kindergarten to grade 5 (“K-5”) (50 intervention schools, 34 comparison schools)  
178 rather than the matched subset used to design the vaccine coverage survey in order to  
179 maximize precision.

## 180 Outcomes and data sources

### 181 *Vaccine coverage survey*

182 We conducted two cross-sectional surveys of student caregivers to measure caregiver-  
183 reported student influenza vaccination, including vaccine type and vaccine provider. A survey in  
184 March 2017 measured vaccination from 2014-17, and a survey in March 2018 measured  
185 vaccination from 2017-18. We conducted the surveys in 22 of the 34 matched school pairs (22  
186 K-5 schools in the intervention district and 22 K-6 schools in the comparison district). In all  
187 classrooms in each school, teachers distributed anonymous paper surveys to students to share

188 with their caregivers. The survey was conducted independently from the intervention and  
189 allowed caregivers to report student influenza vaccination at any location. To estimate the  
190 required sample size for the survey, we assumed a realistic response rate of 50 surveys per  
191 school (approximately 16% of students), type I error = 0.05, intraclass correlation coefficient =  
192 0.01, and 70% vaccine coverage in the comparison district. Enrolling 22 school pairs (44 schools  
193 total) allowed us to detect a minimum difference in vaccination coverage between districts of  
194 6.5% with 80% statistical power.

#### 195 *Laboratory-confirmed influenza hospitalization*

196 We obtained counts of all laboratory-confirmed influenza hospitalizations, intensive  
197 care unit admissions, and deaths among hospitalized patients and the duration of influenza  
198 hospitalization from zip codes within with the intervention and comparison school districts  
199 from 2011-2018 from the CDC-sponsored California Emerging Infections Program [45].

#### 200 *School absence records*

201 We obtained records of absentee data for each student on each school day from 2011-  
202 2018 from all public elementary schools in each school district. Absences were classified by  
203 student grade, race/ethnicity, and absence type (all-cause absences versus illness-specific  
204 absences).

#### 205 Statistical analysis

206 Unless otherwise specified, analyses were conducted in R version 3.6.1 [46]. Our pre-  
207 analysis plan, selected datasets, and replication scripts are available through the Open Science  
208 Framework (<https://osf.io/c8xug/>). We defined total effects as the difference in outcomes  
209 between elementary school-aged individuals (both those who did and did not participate in the

210 intervention) in the intervention versus comparison site and indirect effects as the difference in  
211 outcomes between non-elementary school-aged individuals (individuals < 4 years,  $\geq 13$  years) in  
212 the intervention versus comparison site (Fig 1; for additional details on types of effects  
213 estimated, see S4 Appendix).

#### 214 *Definitions of influenza season*

215 Because influenza season timing varies from year to year, we pre-specified a data-  
216 derived definition of influenza season in order to conduct our analysis during the weeks in  
217 which the influenza epidemic occurred locally each year. Under this definition, influenza season  
218 started when there were at least two consecutive weeks in which the percentage of medical  
219 visits for influenza-like illness in California as reported by the California Department of Public  
220 Health [47] exceeded a cutoff, and the season ended when there were at least two consecutive  
221 weeks in which the percentage was less than or equal to a cutoff. We examined seasons  
222 defined using cutoffs of 2%, 2.5%, and 3% and selected 2.5% as the primary definition because  
223 it best captured seasonal variation in peak influenza-like illness (S5 Appendix). In addition, in a  
224 sensitivity analysis we used the California Emerging Infection Program's surveillance definition  
225 of influenza season, which classifies influenza season as the weeks between October 1 and April  
226 30 each year. This definition is widely used but is conservative in that it often includes many  
227 weeks of the year with limited influenza-like illness in influenza season.

#### 228 *Influenza vaccination coverage*

229 We estimated influenza vaccination coverage and 95% confidence intervals using robust  
230 sandwich standard errors that accounted for clustering at the school level [48]. We estimated  
231 differences in vaccination coverage between districts using a generalized linear model that

232 adjusted for student race/ethnicity and caregiver’s education level and estimated standard  
233 errors that accounted for clustering within matched school pairs. We restricted the analysis to  
234 grades K-5 because the intervention district’s elementary schools did not include 6<sup>th</sup> grade. To  
235 assess possible selection bias among the sample of caregivers who responded to the survey, we  
236 also estimated vaccination coverage after standardizing the distributions of race/ethnicity and  
237 education in the sample to the pre-intervention percentages using data from the California  
238 Department of Education for the 44 participating schools and for the entire districts (see details  
239 in S6 Appendix).

#### 240 *Laboratory-confirmed influenza hospitalization*

241 To estimate the cumulative incidence of influenza hospitalization, we obtained age- and  
242 race-specific population counts from the 2010 U.S. Census in the same set of zip codes used to  
243 identify influenza cases. We also obtained more recent annual population counts from the 5-  
244 year American Community Survey (ACS). Because counts were similar between both data  
245 sources and the ACS did not provide population counts for race and age in years, we used the  
246 U.S. Census data in our primary analyses. We fit log-linear Poisson models to estimate  
247 cumulative incidence using a log population offset and adjusting for age, sex, and race [49]. To  
248 control for pre-season differences between districts, we estimated the difference-in-differences  
249 (DID) defined as the difference in incidence in the intervention district prior to and during the  
250 intervention minus the difference in incidence in the comparison district prior to and during the  
251 intervention. Examination of pre-intervention absence trends indicated that the equal trends  
252 assumption was met (S7 Appendix). The DID parameter eliminates any time-invariant  
253 confounding and accounts for differences in pre-intervention trends between districts [50]. We

254 also estimated the relative reduction adjusting for pre-intervention differences between  
255 districts, which we defined as  $1 - RR \times 100\%$ , where RR is defined as the difference in incidence  
256 in the intervention district prior to and during the intervention divided by the difference in  
257 incidence in the comparison district prior to and during the intervention. We obtained standard  
258 errors for each quantity using the delta method. Consistent with our pre-analysis plan, we did  
259 not estimate DIDs for intensive care unit admission on its own or for influenza mortality  
260 because these are rare outcomes, and we were likely to be underpowered to detect an effect.  
261 We performed a sensitivity analysis using the following alternative influenza season cutoffs: 1)  
262 two consecutive weeks in which the percentage of medical visits for influenza-like illness  
263 exceeded 2% or 3% and 2) the period between week 40 and week 20 of each year.

#### 264 *School absence rates*

265 We restricted the primary analysis of school absence rates to school days when both  
266 districts were in session. In addition, we restricted to school days that occurred during influenza  
267 season because we did not expect the intervention to influence influenza and absenteeism  
268 outside of that period. We also estimated outcomes in the peak week of influenza season,  
269 defined as the week with the highest proportion of influenza-like illness visits in California when  
270 school was in session. We estimated DIDs in mean absence rates using linear regression models  
271 and adjusted for available time-variant covariates: student race, grade, and month of absence.  
272 We did not adjust for pre-intervention school characteristics (i.e., those used in the matching of  
273 school pairs) because they were time-invariant and thus would have no effect on DID estimates.  
274 We calculated 95% confidence intervals using robust standard errors that accounted for  
275 clustering within schools [48]. We estimated the difference in total student absences during

276 influenza season by multiplying DID estimates and confidence interval bounds by the total  
277 student enrollment and the number of school days in each influenza season.

278 To detect potential differential measurement error of school absences, we conducted a  
279 negative control analysis [51] using the school days in August, September, May, and June; these  
280 months were prior to the delivery of vaccines at school and outside of influenza season, when  
281 we did not expect to see an effect of the intervention [14]. We also performed a sensitivity  
282 analysis using the following alternative influenza season cutoffs: 1) two consecutive weeks in  
283 which the percentage of medical visits for influenza-like illness exceeded 2% or 3% and 2) the  
284 period between week 40 and week 20 of each year. We performed pre-specified subgroup  
285 analyses by student race, grade, and month.

286 As we describe in the Results, the negative control analysis indicated possible  
287 differential measurement error of school absences, so we performed a post-hoc probabilistic  
288 bias analysis to quantify the possible influence of outcome misclassification on our results [52].  
289 We focused on outcome misclassification because exposure misclassification was highly  
290 unlikely, and our DID analysis accounted for measured and time-invariant unmeasured  
291 confounders. Through conversations with each school district, we defined distributions of the  
292 sensitivity and specificity of absence classification (S8 Appendix).

293 To examine impact across different levels of program participation among the 50 SLIV  
294 intervention schools, we predicted the mean absence rates ( $Y$ ) setting each school's value to  
295 each observed level of school participation in SLIV ( $A$ ) and adjusting for school-level covariates  
296 student race/ethnicity, the percentage of students in each grade, average enrollment, mean  
297 class size, mean parent education level, percentage of English language learners, percentage of

298 students receiving free lunch, mean 2012 Academic Performance Index score, mean 2013  
299 Academic Performance Index score, and mean California Standards Test scores ( $W$ )  
300  $(\sum_w E[Y|A = a, W = w]P(W = w))$ . We used an ensemble machine learning algorithm that  
301 flexibly adjusted for covariates correlated with the outcome (p-value < 0.1) in statistical models.  
302 The algorithm included the following estimation methods: the simple mean, main effects  
303 generalized linear models, stepwise logistic regression, Bayesian generalized linear models [53],  
304 generalized additive models [54], elastic net regression [55], random forest [56], and gradient  
305 boosting [57].

#### 306 Ethical statement

307 This study was approved by the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects at the  
308 University of California, Berkeley (Protocols # 2014-01-5960 and 2016-12-9406). Caregivers of  
309 students in the influenza vaccine coverage survey received a letter from the school district  
310 describing the purpose of the survey and providing details about the optional and anonymous  
311 nature of the survey. A waiver of documented informed consent was necessary to carry out the  
312 survey because in two years of pilot surveys in which we requested documented informed  
313 consent, the complexity of consent forms contributed to very low response rates that  
314 prevented us from collecting a sufficiently large sample to estimate vaccination coverage.

#### 315 **Results**

##### 316 Influenza vaccine coverage

317 Measured pre-intervention characteristics were similar in populations residing in the  
318 catchment areas of the intervention and comparison schools (Table 1). In March 2017, field  
319 staff disseminated 8,121 surveys in 22 schools in OUSD and 10,054 surveys in 22 schools in

320 WCCUSD (S9 Appendix). The response rates were 28% (N=2,246 surveys) in OUSD and 38% in  
321 WCCUSD (N=3,824). One school in OUSD withdrew, and we excluded its matched pair from  
322 analyses comparing the two districts. In March 2018, the same schools were invited to  
323 participate, and the response rates were similar. In each survey, 34-40% of respondents had a  
324 higher than high school level education, approximately 22-27% of respondents' primarily  
325 language spoken at home was Spanish. The most common student race/ethnicity was Latino  
326 (36-41% in intervention; 50-51% in comparison), followed by Asian (22-25% in intervention; 16-  
327 17% in comparison) and Black / African American (16% in intervention; 10% in comparison).

328       Influenza vaccination coverage (from any location) among K-5 elementary students did  
329 not differ statistically between the intervention and comparison districts in the first two years  
330 of the SLIV intervention but was higher in the intervention district in the latter two years of the  
331 intervention. In relation to the comparison district, influenza vaccination coverage in the  
332 intervention district was 7% higher in 2016-17 and 11% higher in 2017-18; differences were  
333 statistically significant (Table 2). Standardizing vaccination coverage by student race and parent  
334 education produced similar results (S10 Appendix Fig 1). The percentage of elementary  
335 students vaccinated for influenza at school was 14% in 2014-15, 23% in 2015-16, 24% in 2016-  
336 17, and 26% in 2017-18 (S10 Appendix Fig 2). The majority of students not vaccinated at school  
337 were vaccinated at a doctor's office or health clinic.

338       Influenza vaccination coverage varied by student race (S10 Appendix Fig 3). In 2016-17  
339 and 2017-18, the highest coverage levels were among Asian and White students and the lowest  
340 were among Black / African American students and those whose race was not reported. Over  
341 the four years when the program was delivered, there were statistically significant increases in



342 influenza vaccination coverage in the intervention district relative to the comparison district  
343 among Black / African American, Asian, Latino, and White students. The differences in coverage  
344 between districts was most striking among Latino students (12% higher in OUSD in 2016-17;  
345 14% higher in 2017-18) and White students (10% higher in OUSD in 2016-17; 24% higher in  
346 2017-18). The difference in student influenza vaccination coverage between districts was  
347 largest among students whose primary caregiver had a high school level education or less (S10  
348 Appendix, Fig 4). When adjusting for school-level characteristics, influenza vaccination coverage  
349 did not vary by the percentage of students participating in SLIV in each school (S10 Appendix,  
350 Fig 5).

### 351 Influenza hospitalization

352 In the three years before the intervention, the incidence of influenza-related  
353 hospitalization was similar between the intervention and comparison districts (Fig 2). In 2014-  
354 15 and 2015-16, the incidence of influenza hospitalization was not statistically different  
355 between the intervention and comparison districts in any age group (Fig 3, S10 Appendix Table  
356 1). In 2016-17 and 2017-18, hospitalization incidence was lower in the intervention versus  
357 comparison district in all age groups. Among non-elementary aged individuals (0-4, >14 years),  
358 the DID in total influenza hospitalization was -76 (95% CI -133, -20) in 2016-17 and -165 (95% CI  
359 -243, -86) in 2017-18 (Fig 3, S10 Appendix Table 1) in the intervention versus comparison  
360 district. Among individuals aged at least 65 years, the DID in total influenza hospitalization was  
361 -327 (95% CI -659, -5) in 2016-17 and -715 (95% CI -1,195, -236) in 2017-18 (Fig 3, S10 Appendix  
362 Table 1). Results were similar in analyses restricted to the peak week of influenza

363 hospitalization (S10 Appendix Fig 6). When stratifying by patient race/ethnicity, in 2016-17 and  
364 2017-18 DID were the largest among Asian / Pacific Islanders and Whites (S10 Appendix Fig 7).

365       Among all ages and across all four years, the mean DID in length of influenza  
366 hospitalization was approximately 1 to 2.5 days lower in the intervention district versus the  
367 comparison district (S10 Appendix Figs 8-9). The incidence of influenza-related intensive care  
368 unit admissions was lower in the intervention site than in the comparison site in 2014-17 and  
369 was similar in 2017-18 (S10 Appendix, Fig 10). The influenza-related mortality rate was slightly  
370 higher in the intervention site before the intervention and was lower in 2014-15, 2015-16, and  
371 2017-18 influenza seasons (S10 Appendix, Fig 11). However, for all intensive care unit and  
372 mortality estimates, 95% confidence intervals for district-specific estimates overlapped. Our  
373 sensitivity analyses using alternative population denominators, influenza case definitions, and  
374 influenza season definitions yielded similar results overall (S11 Supplement, Figs 12-13).

### 375 School absenteeism

376       In the three years prior to the Shoo the Flu program, during influenza season, the mean  
377 absence rate per 100 days in the intervention versus comparison district was 4.85 versus 5.84  
378 for all-cause absences and 2.84 versus 2.81 for illness-specific absences (S10 Appendix Table 2).  
379 The DID in mean illness-specific absence rates per 100 days was -0.16 (95% CI -0.54, 0.23) in  
380 2014-15 and -0.34 (95% CI -0.78, 0.10) in 2015-16 (Fig 4, S10 Appendix Table 2). In 2016-17 and  
381 2017-18 the DID in illness-specific absence rates per 100 days was lower in the Intervention  
382 district compared to the comparison district (2016-17 DID -0.63 (95% CI -1.14, -0.13); 2017-18  
383 DID -0.80 (95% CI -1.28, -0.31)). The reduction in total illness-specific student absences during  
384 influenza season was 3,538 (95% CI 709, 6,366) in 2016-17 and 8,249 (95% CI 3,213, 13,285) in

385 2017-18 in the intervention district. For all-cause absences, the DIDs during influenza season  
386 were not statistically significant in any of the years of the program. During the peak week of  
387 influenza, there was evidence of larger reductions in illness-specific absence rates in 2014-15,  
388 2016-17, and 2017-18, and there was a significant reduction in all-cause absences in 2017-18  
389 (S10 Appendix Table 2). Our sensitivity analyses using alternative influenza season definitions  
390 were consistent with the primary analysis (S10 Appendix Fig 14).

391  
392  
393 When stratifying by student race/ethnicity, there were statistically significant reductions  
394 in all-cause and illness-specific absences among Latino students in 2016-17 and 2017-18 and a  
395 smaller reduction in absences for Asian students in 2016-17 (S10 Appendix, Fig 15). For  
396 students of other race/ethnicities, DIDs were not statistically significant. Grade-specific patterns  
397 were similar overall (S10 Appendix, Fig 16). Mean absence rates were not associated with the  
398 percentage of students in each school that participated in Shoo the Flu in 2014-15 and 2015-16.  
399 In 2017-18 the school-level SLIV participation rate was associated with a modest reduction in  
400 the mean absence rate when adjusting for potential school-level confounders (S10 Appendix Fig  
401 17).

402 We performed a negative control time period analysis, estimating DIDs outside influenza  
403 season, when we did not expect the intervention to affect absence rates. Overall, we did not  
404 see an effect on all-cause absences outside of influenza season. However, there were  
405 statistically significant reductions in illness-specific absences outside of influenza season in  
406 2015-18 (S10 Appendix, Fig 18), suggesting that differential measurement error may have

407 impacted the primary analysis. We explored the influence of outcome misclassification on our  
408 findings with probabilistic bias analysis under assumed distributions of sensitivity and specificity  
409 of outcome classification. We found that the majority of bias-corrected DID estimates in 2016-  
410 17 and 2017-18 indicated a reduction in both types of absences in the intervention district (S8  
411 Appendix Figs 2-3). These findings suggest that outcome misclassification was not strong  
412 enough to alter the scientific inferences in our primary analysis of absenteeism.

### 413 **Discussion**

414 Here, we evaluated the impact of a city-wide SLIV intervention delivered to over 95  
415 elementary schools in a diverse, predominantly low-income city. During the first two years of  
416 SLIV, the program offered LAIV, which had low effectiveness [58,59], and on the whole, we did  
417 not observe impacts of SLIV in those years. In the latter two years, when the intervention  
418 delivered the IIV and the vaccine was moderately effective [41,60], we observed reductions in  
419 school absences and reductions in hospitalizations among age groups not targeted by SLIV,  
420 suggesting that the intervention produced herd effects. Unique strengths of our study design  
421 include the use of multivariate matching and a differences-in-differences approach to minimize  
422 systematic differences between the intervention and comparison sites and the pre-specification  
423 of our statistical analysis plan [61]. Evaluating SLIV over multiple years enabled us to examine  
424 the impact of SLIV in influenza seasons with different levels of vaccine effectiveness, vaccine  
425 recommendations, and circulating strains of influenza. Furthermore, this study leveraged three  
426 distinct, independent data sources that provided internally consistent results.

427 The SLIV intervention was associated with increases in influenza vaccination coverage of  
428 up to 11 percentage points among elementary school students in the intervention site versus

429 the comparison site. This increase in vaccination coverage is smaller than those reported in  
430 prior SLIV studies, which ranged from 7 to 41 percentage points. However, in most prior  
431 studies, coverage at baseline or in the comparison group was substantially lower than 50%  
432 [17,18,20,22,24–26,34], while in our study it was 53-66%. It may be more difficult for SLIV to  
433 substantially increase coverage at moderate pre-intervention coverage levels. In addition, the  
434 switch from LAIV to IIV in the third year of the Shoo the Flu intervention may have inhibited  
435 larger increases in coverage because many children and/or caregivers prefer the nasal spray  
436 generally and in a school setting, and media coverage of poor LAIV effectiveness may have  
437 increased vaccine hesitancy for all influenza vaccine formulations. Vaccination coverage in the  
438 intervention district grew relative to the comparison district over time, in part because the  
439 comparison district coverage did not recover from the decline associated with the switch from  
440 LAIV to IIV vaccines. It is possible that coverage in the intervention district vaccine coverage will  
441 continue to grow in future years as the intervention builds trust and recognition.

442 A key question is whether SLIV interventions increase vaccination coverage among  
443 students who would otherwise not be vaccinated, whether they merely shift vaccination  
444 location from health care providers to schools, or whether both occur. Interventions that  
445 vaccinate children who would otherwise not have been vaccinated will have the largest impact  
446 on influenza transmission. Our findings suggest that both phenomena occurred in this study.  
447 Coverage was higher in the intervention versus comparison district in the final two years of the  
448 evaluation, suggesting that some otherwise unvaccinated children were vaccinated by the SLIV  
449 intervention. In addition, the proportion of students vaccinated at school in the intervention  
450 district (24-26% in the latter two years (S10 Appendix, Fig 2)) exceeded the difference in

451 coverage between districts (7-11%), suggesting that approximately 15% of students vaccinated  
452 by the SLIV intervention would otherwise have been vaccinated through other means. A  
453 limitation is that pre-intervention vaccination data were not available, so we were not able to  
454 conduct DID analyses to account for any pre-SLIV differences in vaccination coverage between  
455 districts.

456         Influenza vaccination coverage in the Shoo the Flu intervention site was 64%, which was  
457 up to 11% higher than in the comparison site and well within the 50-70% range in which herd  
458 immunity is expected [10,11]. We observed 36-60% relative reductions in influenza  
459 hospitalization among non-elementary school aged community-members in seasons with  
460 moderate vaccine effectiveness (S10 Appendix Table 1). Indirect effects were strongest among  
461 individuals aged 65 years or older – the age group most vulnerable to influenza hospitalization  
462 and mortality. The magnitude of indirect effects we observed is similar to those of other SLIV  
463 interventions [21,22,32–34] and of interventions vaccinating children at any location [62]. In  
464 addition, our results are highly consistent with mathematical models, which project that an  
465 increase from 40 to 60% coverage in children aged 6 months to 18 years would reduce  
466 influenza hospitalization among adults over 19 years by 33-36% [15]. Our findings suggest that  
467 even modest increases in vaccination (i.e., up to 11%) associated with SLIV can produce  
468 meaningful community-wide reductions in influenza hospitalization, consistent with  
469 mathematical models [63].

470         We observed greater increases in influenza vaccination coverage in the intervention site  
471 versus the comparison site in students whose caregivers had up to a high school-level  
472 education compared to those with at least an associate degree. No prior SLIV evaluations have

473 reported variation in the impact of SLIV on vaccination coverage by caregiver education level.  
474 Our findings contrast with those of prior studies of influenza vaccination outside school  
475 settings, which have generally found that higher education levels are associated with higher  
476 vaccination rates [64–66]. A limitation of this work is that education level was not available at  
477 the individual level for the influenza hospitalization and absenteeism outcomes.

478         Shoo the Flu’s impacts on influenza vaccination coverage, school absence rates, and  
479 influenza hospitalization varied by race/ethnicity. Black / African American students had the  
480 lowest influenza vaccination coverage, consistent with national CDC estimates [12], and a  
481 smaller increase in coverage in the SLIV district compared to most other races. This pattern in  
482 vaccination coverage may explain the more modest impacts on absenteeism and hospitalization  
483 among Black / African Americans compared to Whites and Asians. For Latino / Hispanic  
484 students, vaccination coverage was lower, but the increase in coverage in the intervention site  
485 was larger over time compared to White students. There was a larger reduction in absenteeism  
486 but a smaller reduction in hospitalizations in Latino / Hispanics compared to Whites and Asians.  
487 Disparities in influenza vaccination coverage may result from barriers to health care, differing  
488 knowledge and attitudes about vaccines, unconscious bias on behalf of providers promoting  
489 vaccination, underinsurance, or other social determinants of health [67]. Latino / Hispanics  
490 more commonly cite limited health care access and cost as barriers while Black / African  
491 Americans report mistrust in influenza vaccination [68]. In principle, SLIV should reduce  
492 disparities by race / ethnicity by increasing access to free influenza vaccination regardless of  
493 insurance status. However, increasing access alone does not address mistrust or vaccine  
494 hesitancy; to reduce disparities in vaccination, future interventions may need to couple SLIV

495 with outreach strategies to address vaccine hesitancy, mistrust, and misconceptions about the  
496 influenza vaccine in particular [69]; incentives for vaccination; or policies mandating  
497 vaccination.

498         This analysis is subject to several limitations. First, although the reductions in illness-  
499 specific school absences we observed were of a similar magnitude to those reported in prior  
500 studies [17–20,27–29], our finding of significant differences in absence rates outside of  
501 influenza season suggests that our absentee results may be subject to differential  
502 misclassification. It is possible that school year- and school district-specific differences  
503 unrelated to the SLIV intervention could explain these findings. For example, district-specific  
504 policies to decrease absences around school breaks (some of which coincide with influenza  
505 season) or at the beginning or the end of the school year (which is included in our negative  
506 control time period analysis) may have impacted our estimates in an unknown direction,  
507 especially if they differed before and during the SLIV intervention. In addition, parents may  
508 have attributed illness absences to a different reason, and such misclassification could have  
509 varied by district. Our probabilistic bias correction analysis suggested that correcting for  
510 misclassification would not have changed our conclusion that the SLIV intervention reduced  
511 illness-specific absences in 2016-17 and 2017-18.

512         Second, given that the SLIV intervention was delivered city-wide, it was not possible to  
513 conduct a randomized trial. The matched cohort design minimized differences in measured  
514 confounders between the intervention and comparison site, and DID analyses controlled for  
515 measured and unmeasured time-invariant confounding. Nevertheless, unmeasured time-  
516 dependent confounding could still bias this observational design. For example, the first year of



517 the SLIV intervention coincided with the rollout of the preventive benefits of the Affordable  
518 Care Act, which may have jointly affected health care utilization and vaccination patterns in the  
519 study region.

520 Third, our vaccination coverage estimates relied on caregiver reporting, which is subject  
521 to inaccurate recall and low response rates. Prior studies report that caregiver recall of child  
522 influenza vaccination in the past season has a sensitivity of 88-92% and a specificity of 82-90%  
523 compared to medical records [70–72]. Coverage estimates for 2014-15 and 2015-16 may be  
524 more vulnerable to measurement error because they rely on a 2-3 year recall period. Overall,  
525 our vaccination coverage estimates were consistent with caregiver-reported national and  
526 California-specific estimates from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [12,73].

527 Finally, we did not have a direct measure of laboratory-confirmed influenza incidence in  
528 elementary school children or influenza vaccination coverage estimates among non-elementary  
529 aged individuals; thus, it remains possible that factors other than the SLIV intervention could  
530 explain our findings. We were not able to link individuals between different data sources  
531 because personal identifiers were not available to us. Nevertheless, high levels of internal  
532 consistency across results from three independent data sources lends credence to the validity  
533 of our findings.

## 534 **Conclusions**

535 Offering school-located influenza vaccination to all elementary schools in a large, urban  
536 district led to 7-11% increases in vaccination, which translated to meaningful reductions in  
537 community-wide reductions in influenza hospitalization and illness-specific absences among  
538 school children among those not targeted by the program, including the elderly. Our findings

539 suggest that even modest increases in influenza vaccination above moderate coverage levels  
540 can produce broad community-wide benefits.

541 **Acknowledgements**

542 We would like to thank Aleta Rattanasith for her data collection and management, Hannah Warren for  
543 her consultation on community engagement and contribution to data collection, and Catharine Ratto  
544 and Amy Pine for technical advising as well as our partners at Shoo the Flu, the Alameda County Public  
545 Health Department, Oakland Unified School District, West Contra Costa Unified School District,  
546 California Emerging Infections Program, and Applied Survey Research for their contributions to this  
547 evaluation. This study was funded by the Flu Lab.

548

549 **References**

- 550 1. Thompson WW, Shay DK, Weintraub E, Brammer L, Cox N, Anderson LJ, et al. Mortality  
551 Associated With Influenza and Respiratory Syncytial Virus in the United States. *JAMA*.  
552 2003;289: 179–186. doi:10.1001/jama.289.2.179
- 553 2. Molinari N-AM, Ortega-Sanchez IR, Messonnier ML, Thompson WW, Wortley PM,  
554 Weintraub E, et al. The annual impact of seasonal influenza in the US: Measuring disease  
555 burden and costs. *Vaccine*. 2007;25: 5086–5096. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2007.03.046
- 556 3. Fiore AE, Uyeki TM, Broder K, Finelli L, Euler G, Singleton M, et al. Prevention and Control of  
557 Influenza with Vaccines: Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization  
558 Practices (ACIP), 2010. 2010 Aug. Available:  
559 <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/rr5908a1.htm>
- 560 4. Glezen WP, Couch RB. Interpandemic influenza in the Houston area, 1974-76. *N Engl J Med*.  
561 1978;298: 587–592. doi:10.1056/NEJM197803162981103
- 562 5. Monto AS, Sullivan KM. Acute respiratory illness in the community. Frequency of illness and  
563 the agents involved. *Epidemiol Infect*. 1993;110: 145–160.  
564 doi:10.1017/S0950268800050779
- 565 6. Fox JP, Cooney MK, Hall CE, Foy HM. Influenza virus infections in Seattle families, 1975-  
566 1979: II. Pattern of infection in invaded households and relation of age and prior antibody  
567 to occurrence of infection and related illness. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1982;116: 228–242.  
568 doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a113408
- 569 7. Foy HM, Cooney MK, Hall C, Malmgren J, Fox JP. Case-to-Case Intervals of Rhinovirus and  
570 Influenza Virus Infections in Households. *J Infect Dis*. 1988;157: 180–182.
- 571 8. Long CE, Hall CB, Cunningham CK, Weiner LB, Alger KP, Gouveia M, et al. Influenza  
572 surveillance in community-dwelling elderly compared with children. *Arch Fam Med*. 1997;6:  
573 459–465.
- 574 9. Neuzil KM, Fiore AE, Schieber RA. Evolution of the Pediatric Influenza Vaccination Program  
575 in the United States. *Pediatrics*. 2012;129: S51–S53. doi:10.1542/peds.2011-0737B
- 576 10. Longini IM, Halloran ME, Nizam A, Wolff M, Mendelman PM, Fast PE, et al. Estimation of  
577 the efficacy of live, attenuated influenza vaccine from a two-year, multi-center vaccine trial:

- 578 implications for influenza epidemic control. *Vaccine*. 2000;18: 1902–1909.  
579 doi:10.1016/S0264-410X(99)00419-3
- 580 11. Longini IM. A Theoretic Framework to Consider the Effect of Immunizing Schoolchildren  
581 Against Influenza: Implications for Research. *Pediatrics*. 2012;129: S63–S67.  
582 doi:10.1542/peds.2011-0737D
- 583 12. Centers for Disease Control. Estimates of Flu Vaccination Coverage among Children —  
584 United States, 2017–18 Flu Season. 5 Oct 2018 [cited 11 Dec 2018]. Available:  
585 <https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluview/coverage-1718estimates-children.htm>
- 586 13. Centers for Disease Control. Estimates of Influenza Vaccination Coverage among Adults—  
587 United States, 2017–18 Flu Season | FluVaxView | Seasonal Influenza (Flu) | CDC. 2018  
588 [cited 28 Jun 2019]. Available: [https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluview/coverage-](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluview/coverage-1718estimates.htm)  
589 [1718estimates.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluview/coverage-1718estimates.htm)
- 590 14. Immunization and Infectious Diseases | Healthy People 2020. [cited 23 Aug 2019].  
591 Available: [https://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topics-objectives/topic/immunization-](https://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topics-objectives/topic/immunization-and-infectious-diseases/objectives)  
592 [and-infectious-diseases/objectives](https://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topics-objectives/topic/immunization-and-infectious-diseases/objectives)
- 593 15. Weycker D, Edelsberg J, Halloran ME, Longini IM, Nizam A, Ciuryla V, et al. Population-wide  
594 benefits of routine vaccination of children against influenza. *Vaccine*. 2005;23: 1284–1293.  
595 doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2004.08.044
- 596 16. Gaglani MJ. Editorial Commentary: School-Located Influenza Vaccination: Why Worth the  
597 Effort? *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;59: 333–335. doi:10.1093/cid/ciu344
- 598 17. King JC, Stoddard JJ, Gaglani MJ, Moore KA, Magder L, McClure E, et al. Effectiveness of  
599 School-Based Influenza Vaccination. *N Engl J Med*. 2006;355: 2523–2532.  
600 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa055414
- 601 18. Davis MM, King JC, Moag L, Cummings G, Magder LS. Countywide School-Based Influenza  
602 Immunization: Direct and Indirect Impact on Student Absenteeism. *Pediatrics*. 2008;122:  
603 e260–e265. doi:10.1542/peds.2007-2963
- 604 19. Kjos SA, Irving SA, Meece JK, Belongia EA. Elementary School-Based Influenza Vaccination:  
605 Evaluating Impact on Respiratory Illness Absenteeism and Laboratory-Confirmed Influenza.  
606 *PLOS ONE*. 2013;8: e72243. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0072243
- 607 20. Pannaraj PS, Wang H-L, Rivas H, Wiryawan H, Smit M, Green N, et al. School-Located  
608 Influenza Vaccination Decreases Laboratory-Confirmed Influenza and Improves School  
609 Attendance. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014; ciu340. doi:10.1093/cid/ciu340
- 610 21. Pebody RG, Green HK, Andrews N, Zhao H, Boddington N, Bawa Z, et al. Uptake and impact  
611 of a new live attenuated influenza vaccine programme in England: early results of a pilot in

- 612 primary school-age children, 2013/14 influenza season. *Eurosurveillance*. 2014;19: 20823.  
613 doi:10.2807/ese.19.22.20823-en
- 614 22. Pebody RG, Green HK, Andrews N, Boddington NL, Zhao H, Yonova I, et al. Uptake and  
615 impact of vaccinating school age children against influenza during a season with circulation  
616 of drifted influenza A and B strains, England, 2014/15. *Eurosurveillance*. 2015;20.  
617 doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2015.20.39.30029
- 618 23. Pebody R, Sile B, Warburton F, Sinnathamby M, Tsang C, Zhao H, et al. Live attenuated  
619 influenza vaccine effectiveness against hospitalisation due to laboratory-confirmed  
620 influenza in children two to six years of age in England in the 2015/16 season.  
621 *Eurosurveillance*. 2017;22. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2017.22.4.30450
- 622 24. Humiston SG, Schaffer SJ, Szilagyi PG, Long CE, Chappel TR, Blumkin AK, et al. Seasonal  
623 Influenza Vaccination at School: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Am J Prev Med*. 2014;46: 1–  
624 9. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2013.08.021
- 625 25. Szilagyi PG, Schaffer S, Rand CM, Vincelli P, Eagan A, Goldstein NPN, et al. School-Located  
626 Influenza Vaccinations: A Randomized Trial. *Pediatrics*. 2016; e20161746.  
627 doi:10.1542/peds.2016-1746
- 628 26. Szilagyi PG, Schaffer S, Rand CM, Goldstein NPN, Hightower AD, Younge M, et al. Impact of  
629 elementary school-located influenza vaccinations: A stepped wedge trial across a  
630 community. *Vaccine*. 2018;36: 2861–2869. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.03.047
- 631 27. Wiggs-Stayner KS, Purdy TR, Go GN, McLaughlin NC, Tryzinka PS, Sines JR, et al. The Impact  
632 of Mass School Immunization on School Attendance. *J Sch Nurs*. 2006;22: 219–222.  
633 doi:10.1177/10598405050220040601
- 634 28. Mears CJ, Lawler EN, Sanders III LD, Katz BZ. Efficacy of LAIV-T on Absentee Rates in a  
635 School-Based Health Center Sample. *J Adolesc Health*. 2009;45: 91–94.  
636 doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2008.12.010
- 637 29. Graitcer SB, Dube NL, Basurto-Davila R, Smith PF, Ferdinands J, Thompson M, et al. Effects  
638 of immunizing school children with 2009 influenza A (H1N1) monovalent vaccine on  
639 absenteeism among students and teachers in Maine. *Vaccine*. 2012;30: 4835–4841.  
640 doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.05.008
- 641 30. Yoo B-K, Humiston SG, Szilagyi PG, Schaffer SJ, Long C, Kolasa M. Cost effectiveness analysis  
642 of elementary school-located vaccination against influenza—Results from a randomized  
643 controlled trial. *Vaccine*. 2013;31: 2156–2164. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2013.02.052
- 644 31. Schmier J, Li S, King JC, Nichol K, Mahadevia PJ. Benefits And Costs Of Immunizing Children  
645 Against Influenza At School: An Economic Analysis Based On A Large-Cluster Controlled  
646 Clinical Trial. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2008;27: w96–w104. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.27.2.w96

- 647 32. McBean M, Hull HF, O'Connor H. Possible Herd Immunity in the Elderly Following the  
648 Vaccination of School Children with Live, Attenuated Trivalent Influenza Vaccine: A Person-  
649 Level Analysis. *Procedia Vaccinol.* 2011;4: 59–70. doi:10.1016/j.provac.2011.07.009
- 650 33. Hull HF, McBean AM, Caldwell D, O'Connor H. Assessing Herd Immunity in the Elderly  
651 Following the Vaccination of School Children with Live Attenuated Trivalent Influenza  
652 Vaccine (LAIV): A County-Level Analysis. *Procedia Vaccinol.* 2010;2: 90–98.
- 653 34. Tran CH, Sugimoto JD, Pulliam JRC, Ryan KA, Myers PD, Castleman JB, et al. School-Located  
654 Influenza Vaccination Reduces Community Risk for Influenza and Influenza-Like Illness  
655 Emergency Care Visits. *PLOS ONE.* 2014;9: e114479. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0114479
- 656 35. Szilagyi PG, Schaffer S, Rand CM, Goldstein NPN, Vincelli P, Hightower AD, et al. School-  
657 located Influenza Vaccinations for Adolescents: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Adolesc*  
658 *Health.* 2018;62: 157–163. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2017.09.021
- 659 36. Szilagyi PG, Schaffer S, Rand CM, Goldstein NP, Hightower AD, Younge M, et al. School-  
660 Located Influenza Vaccination: Do Vaccine Clinics at School Raise Vaccination Rates? *J Sch*  
661 *Health.* 2019;In Press. doi:10.1111/josh.12840
- 662 37. Grohskopf LA, Olsen SJ, Sokolow LZ, Bresee JS, Cox NJ, Broder KR, et al. Prevention and  
663 control of seasonal influenza with vaccines: recommendations of the Advisory Committee  
664 on Immunization Practices (ACIP) -- United States, 2014-15 influenza season. *MMWR Morb*  
665 *Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2014;63: 691–697.
- 666 38. Grohskopf LA, Sokolow LZ, Olsen SJ, Bresee JS, Broder KR, Karron RA. Prevention and  
667 Control of Influenza with Vaccines: Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on  
668 Immunization Practices, United States, 2015-16 Influenza Season. *MMWR Morb Mortal*  
669 *Wkly Rep.* 2015;64: 818–825.
- 670 39. Grohskopf LA. Prevention and Control of Seasonal Influenza with Vaccines. *MMWR*  
671 *Recomm Rep.* 2016;65. doi:10.15585/mmwr.rr6505a1
- 672 40. Centers for Disease Control. Seasonal Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness, 2016-2017. 9 Apr  
673 2019 [cited 14 Jun 2019]. Available: [https://www.cdc.gov/flu/vaccines-work/2016-](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/vaccines-work/2016-2017.html)  
674 [2017.html](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/vaccines-work/2016-2017.html)
- 675 41. Rolfes MA, Flannery B, Chung JR, O'Halloran A, Garg S, Belongia EA, et al. Effects of  
676 Influenza Vaccination in the United States During the 2017–2018 Influenza Season. *Clin*  
677 *Infect Dis.* 2019;In Press. doi:10.1093/cid/ciz075
- 678 42. Arnold BF, Khush RS, Ramaswamy P, London AG, Rajkumar P, Ramaprabha P, et al. Causal  
679 inference methods to study nonrandomized, preexisting development interventions. *Proc*  
680 *Natl Acad Sci.* 2010;107: 22605–22610. doi:10.1073/pnas.1008944107

- 681 43. Diamond A, Sekhon JS. Genetic Matching for Estimating Causal Effects: A General  
682 Multivariate Matching Method for Achieving Balance in Observational Studies. *Rev Econ*  
683 *Stat.* 2013;95: 932–945. doi:10.1162/REST\_a\_00318
- 684 44. Rubin DB. The design versus the analysis of observational studies for causal effects: parallels  
685 with the design of randomized trials. *Stat Med.* 2007;26: 20–36. doi:10.1002/sim.2739
- 686 45. Chaves SS, Lynfield R, Lindegren ML, Bresee J, Finelli L. The US Influenza Hospitalization  
687 Surveillance Network. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2015;21: 1543–1550. doi:10.3201/eid2109.141912
- 688 46. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R  
689 Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2017. Available: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 690 47. California Department of Public Health. Influenza Surveillance Program. 2019 [cited 14 Jun  
691 2019]. Available: [https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/pages/immunization/flu-](https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/pages/immunization/flu-reports.aspx)  
692 [reports.aspx](https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/pages/immunization/flu-reports.aspx)
- 693 48. Freedman DA. On The So-Called “Huber Sandwich Estimator” and “Robust Standard Errors.”  
694 *Am Stat.* 2006;60: 299–302. doi:10.1198/000313006X152207
- 695 49. Zou G. A Modified Poisson Regression Approach to Prospective Studies with Binary Data.  
696 *Am J Epidemiol.* 2004;159: 702–706. doi:10.1093/aje/kwh090
- 697 50. Wing C, Simon K, Bello-Gomez RA. Designing Difference in Difference Studies: Best Practices  
698 for Public Health Policy Research. *Annu Rev Public Health.* 2018;39: 453–469.  
699 doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040617-013507
- 700 51. Arnold BF, Ercumen A, Benjamin-Chung J, Colford JM. Negative Controls to Detect Selection  
701 Bias and Measurement Bias in Epidemiologic Studies: *Epidemiology.* 2016;27: 637–641.  
702 doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000000504
- 703 52. Lash TL, Fox MP, Fink AK. *Applying Quantitative Bias Analysis to Epidemiologic Data.*  
704 Springer Science & Business Media; 2011.
- 705 53. Gelman A, Jakulin A, Pittau MG, Su Y-S. A Weakly Informative Default Prior Distribution for  
706 Logistic and Other Regression Models. *Ann Appl Stat.* 2008;2: 1360–1383.  
707 doi:10.2307/30245139
- 708 54. Hastie T, Tibshirani R. *Generalized Additive Models.* London: Chapman and Hall; 1990.
- 709 55. Friedman J, Hastie T, Tibshirani R. Regularization Paths for Generalized Linear Models via  
710 Coordinate Descent. *J Stat Softw.* 2010;33: 1–22.
- 711 56. Breiman L. Random Forests. *Mach Learn.* 2001;45: 5–32.



- 712 57. Friedman JH. Greedy Function Approximation: A Gradient Boosting Machine. *Ann Stat.*  
713 2001;29: 1189–1232.
- 714 58. Zimmerman RK, Nowalk MP, Chung J, Jackson ML, Jackson LA, Petrie JG, et al. 2014–2015  
715 Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness in the United States by Vaccine Type. *Clin Infect Dis.*  
716 2016;63: 1564–1573. doi:10.1093/cid/ciw635
- 717 59. Jackson ML, Chung JR, Jackson LA, Phillips CH, Benoit J, Monto AS, et al. Influenza Vaccine  
718 Effectiveness in the United States during the 2015–2016 Season. *N Engl J Med.* 2017;377:  
719 534–543. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1700153
- 720 60. Flannery B, Chung JR, Thaker SN, Monto AS, Martin ET, Belongia EA, et al. Interim Estimates  
721 of 2016–17 Seasonal Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness — United States, February 2017.  
722 *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2017;66: 167–171. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6606a3
- 723 61. Nosek BA, Alter G, Banks GC, Borsboom D, Bowman SD, Breckler SJ, et al. Promoting an  
724 open research culture. *Science.* 2015;348: 1422–1425. doi:10.1126/science.aab2374
- 725 62. Yin JK, Heywood AE, Georgousakis M, King C, Chiu C, Isaacs D, et al. Systematic Review and  
726 Meta-analysis of Indirect Protection Afforded by Vaccinating Children Against Seasonal  
727 Influenza: Implications for Policy. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2017;65: 719–728. doi:10.1093/cid/cix420
- 728 63. Hughes MM, Reed C, Flannery B, Garg S, Singleton JA, Fry AM, et al. Projected Population  
729 Benefit of Increased Effectiveness and Coverage of Influenza Vaccination on Influenza  
730 Burden — United States. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2019;In Press. doi:10.1093/cid/ciz676
- 731 64. Cohen B, Ferng Y, Wong-McLoughlin J, Jia H, Morse SS, Larson EL. Predictors of flu  
732 vaccination among urban Hispanic children and adults. *J Epidemiol Community Health.*  
733 2012;66: 204–209. doi:10.1136/jech.2009.099879
- 734 65. Singleton JA, Poel AJ, Lu P-J, Nichol KL, Iwane MK. Where adults reported receiving  
735 influenza vaccination in the United States. *Am J Infect Control.* 2005;33: 563–570.  
736 doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2005.03.016
- 737 66. Østbye T, Taylor DH, Lee AMM, Greenberg G, van Scoyoc L. Racial differences in influenza  
738 vaccination among older americans 1996–2000: longitudinal analysis of the Health and  
739 Retirement Study (HRS) and the Asset and Health Dynamics Among the Oldest Old (AHEAD)  
740 survey. *BMC Public Health.* 2003;3: 41. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-3-41
- 741 67. Fiscella K. Commentary—Anatomy of Racial Disparity in Influenza Vaccination. *Health Serv*  
742 *Res.* 2005;40: 539–550. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2005.00371.x
- 743 68. Chen JY, Fox SA, Cantrell CH, Stockdale SE, Kagawa-Singer M. Health Disparities And  
744 Prevention: Racial/ethnic Barriers To Flu Vaccinations. *J Community Health.* 2007;32: 5–20.  
745 doi:10.1007/s10900-006-9031-7




- 746 69. Lind C, Russell ML, MacDonald J, Collins R, Frank CJ, Davis AE. School-Based Influenza  
747 Vaccination: Parents' Perspectives. PLOS ONE. 2014;9: e93490.  
748 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0093490
- 749 70. Shinall MC, Plosa EJ, Poehling KA. Validity of Parental Report of Influenza Vaccination in  
750 Children 6 to 59 Months of Age. Pediatrics. 2007;120: e783–e787. doi:10.1542/peds.2007-  
751 0052
- 752 71. Irving SA, Donahue JG, Shay DK, Ellis-Coyle TL, Belongia EA. Evaluation of self-reported and  
753 registry-based influenza vaccination status in a Wisconsin cohort. Vaccine. 2009;27: 6546–  
754 6549. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2009.08.050
- 755 72. Brown C, Clayton-Boswell H, Chaves SS, Prill MM, Iwane MK, Szilagyi PG, et al. Validity of  
756 parental report of influenza vaccination in young children seeking medical care. Vaccine.  
757 2011;29: 9488–9492. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.10.023
- 758 73. Centers for Disease Control. Full and Partial Flu Vaccination Coverage in Young Children, Six  
759 Immunization Information Systems Sentinel Sites, 2012-13–2016-17 | FluVaxView |  
760 Seasonal Influenza (Flu) | CDC. 26 Feb 2019 [cited 9 Jul 2019]. Available:  
761 <https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluvoxview/full-partial-vaccination-children-2017.htm>

762  
763 **Supporting Information Captions**  
764

- 765 S1 Appendix. Influenza vaccines delivered by the SLIV intervention each year  
766 S2 Appendix. Estimated influenza vaccine effectiveness from 2014-2018  
767 S3 Appendix. Selection of schools for the vaccine coverage survey  
768 S4 Appendix. Definition of types of effects  
769 S5 Appendix. Alternative influenza season definitions  
770 S6 Appendix. Assessment of selection bias in the vaccine coverage survey  
771 S7 Appendix. Pre-intervention trends in absences in each school district  
772 S8 Appendix. Quantitative bias analysis to assess misclassification of absence rates  
773 S9 Appendix. Vaccine coverage survey participant flow  
774 S10 Appendix. Additional tables and figures

775  
776  
777


778 **Fig 1. Schematic of total effects and herd effects estimated in this study**  
779 See additional intervention effect definitions in S4 Appendix.



780  
781  
782

783 **Fig 2. Weekly incidence of inpatient laboratory-confirmed influenza prior to and during the intervention**

784




785

786 Weekly incidence proportion of laboratory-confirmed influenza hospitalizations between Week 40-52 and Week 1-20 of each year. Hospitalizations  
787 included school district residents tested at health care facility laboratories located in zip codes overlapping with OUSD and WCCUSD (Alameda County  
788 Public Health Department, Children’s Hospital Oakland, Contra Costa Public Health Department, Kaiser Permanente, Sutter Health). Population  
789 denominators were obtained from the U.S. 2010 Census using the same set of zip codes.


790

791 **Fig 3. Total and indirect effects on cumulative incidence of inpatient laboratory-confirmed**  
792 **influenza during influenza season**  
793



794 Cumulative incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza hospitalization and intensive care unit admission  
795 during influenza season. Difference-in-difference estimates represent the difference between intervention  
796 and control groups in their change in incidence from the three pre-program years (2011-2013) to each  
797 program year, which removes any time-invariant differences between groups (measured or unmeasured).  
798 The left y-axis presents the difference-in-difference in the cumulative incidence per 100,000. The right y-axis  
799 presents the difference-in-difference in the total hospitalizations, which was calculated as the product of the  
800 difference-in-difference in the cumulative incidence and the population of the intervention site. Parameters  
801 were estimated using a log-linear Poisson model with an offset for population size, and were further adjusted  
802 for age, race, and sex. Standard errors and 95% confidence intervals were obtained using the delta method.  
803  
804  
805

806 **Fig 4. Intervention effects on the school absence rate per 100 school-days**  
 807



808  
 809 In Panel A, each difference-in-difference estimate compares the difference in mean absence rates in each  
 810 district in a program year compared to the three pre-program years (2011-2013); in Panel B, each difference-  
 811 in-difference estimate compares the difference in total absence rates, which was calculated by multiplying  
 812 difference-in-difference in mean absences by the total enrollment and total number of school days during  
 813 influenza season each season. Difference-in-difference parameters remove any time-invariant differences  
 814 between groups (measured or unmeasured). Parameters were estimated using a generalized linear model  
 815 and were adjusted for month, student race, and grade. Standard errors and 95% confidence intervals account  
 816 for clustering at the school level. Note: in 2011-12, 2016-17, and 2017-18, the peak week of the percentage  
 817 of influenza-like illness visits in California were the last week of December, which coincided with school  
 818 breaks, so for the absentee analysis we shifted the peak week definition to closest week with the next  
 819 highest percentage of influenza-like illness visits when both school districts were in session.

**Table 1. Pre-intervention characteristics of the population in school district catchment areas <sup>a</sup>**

Characteristic	Intervention (95% CI)	Comparison (95% CI)
Median household income (\$)	51,849 (50,460, 53,238)	61,596 (59,662, 63,530)
Households below the poverty level (%)	21 (20, 22)	15 (13, 16)
Highest education level (%)		
Less than high school	16 (15, 18)	14 (12, 17)
High school graduate	24 (21, 26)	30 (25, 34)
Some college or Associate's	46 (43, 48)	50 (46, 55)
Bachelor's degree or higher	15 (12, 17)	6 (4, 8)
Children attending private vs. public schools (%)		
Public kindergarten	87 (81, 92)	86 (80, 92)
Private kindergarten	13 (8, 19)	14 (8, 20)
Public grade 1-4	89 (86, 92)	84 (79, 88)
Private grade 1-4	11 (8, 14)	16 (12, 21)
Public grade 5-8	89 (86, 91)	87 (83, 91)
Private grade 5-8	11 (9, 14)	13 (9, 17)
Race (%)		
White	41 (40, 42)	48 (47, 50)
Black or African American	26 (25, 27)	17 (16, 18)
American Indian and Alaska Native	16 (16, 17)	19 (18, 20)
Asian	9 (8, 10)	8 (7, 9)
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	1 (0, 1)	0 (0, 1)
Other races	6 (6, 7)	6 (5, 7)
Two or more races	26 (25, 27)	33 (32, 35)
Hispanic or Latino ethnicity (%)	41 (40, 42)	48 (47, 50)

<sup>a</sup> Data from the 3-year 2013 American Community Survey subset by school district boundaries

**Table 2. Caregiver-reported influenza vaccination coverage among elementary school students during the SILV intervention period**

Season	N	Intervention % (95% CI)	N	Comparison % (95% CI)	Intervention – Comparison <sup>a</sup> % (95% CI)
2014-15 <sup>b</sup>	2,246	59 (56, 63)	3,824	64 (61, 67)	-5 (-9, -1)
2015-16 <sup>b</sup>	2,246	68 (65, 70)	3,824	66 (64, 68)	1 (-2, 4)
2016-17 <sup>b</sup>	2,246	64 (61, 67)	3,824	56 (54, 59)	7 (4, 11)
2017-18 <sup>c</sup>	2,421	64 (60, 69)	4,086	53 (51, 56)	11 (7, 15)

<sup>a</sup> Difference in percentage vaccinated adjusting for student race and caregiver education level

All confidence intervals were calculated using robust standard errors accounted for clustering at the school level.

<sup>b</sup> Influenza vaccination was reported by caregivers in March 2017.

<sup>c</sup> Influenza vaccination was reported by caregivers in March 2018.