medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Can we safely reopen schools during COVID-19 epidemic?

Laura Di Domenico[1], Giulia Pullano[1,2], Chiara E. Sabbatini[1], Pierre-Yves Boëlle[1], Vittoria Colizza[1,*]

1 INSERM, Sorbonne Université, Pierre Louis Institute of Epidemiology and Public Health, Paris, France
2 Sociology and Economics of Networks and Services lab at Orange Experience Design Lab (SENSE/XDLab) Chatillion, Paris, France

* *vittoria.colizza@inserm.fr*

ABSTRACT

Countries adopted different plans regarding schools when lifting lockdown. Through a stochastic age-structured transmission model calibrated to the observed epidemic in Île-de-France, we explore scenarios of partial, progressive, or full school reopening. Given uncertainty on children's role, we find that reopening schools after lockdown may increase COVID-19 cases, yet protocols exist that maintain the epidemic controlled. With pre-schools and primary schools in session starting May 11, ICU occupation would reach at most 72% [62,80]% of capacity if no other school level reopens, or if middle and high schools reopen in June. Immediately reopening all schools may overwhelm ICUs. Priority should be given to pre- and primary schools, whereas full attendance in middle and high schools is not recommended. Large-scale trace and testing are required to maintain the epidemic under control. Ex-post assessment shows that progressive school reopening, limited attendance, and strong adoption of preventive measures contributed to a decreasing epidemic.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Countries are slowly unveiling strategies to progressively phase out lockdown restrictions as rates of COVID-19 infection continue to fall. They aim to strike a delicate balance between reviving the economy and relieving social pressure while averting a potentially devastating second wave of infections. Plans for lifting lockdown are quite heterogeneous in Europe[1], and a large debate sparked regarding the closure or reopening of schools. Italy and Spain have chosen to adopt restrictive and conservative solutions, keeping schools closed until September to preserve children's health[2,3]. Denmark and Norway already reopened their primary schools[4,5]. Austria allowed students to go back to school on May 18 with alternating classes, i.e. splitting students in two groups, each attending lessons during half of the week. Greece restarted classes with high schools first, followed possibly by pre-schools and primary schools in June, if epidemic conditions remain favorable.

On April 28, French authorities presented the exit strategies, with a progressive plan to reopen schools[6]. Pre-schools and primary schools were allowed to reopen on May 11, with classes limited to groups of 15 and based on voluntary attendance. Middle schools may follow one week later, but only in those departments weakly affected by the epidemic. Middle school students are asked to wear masks, differently from younger children[7]. Reopening of high schools will be decided in late May, depending on the epidemic evolution in each department. Universities will remain closed till next academic year.

Assessing the risk that school reopening may have on the transmission of the epidemic faces a key challenge, as the role of children in COVID-19 spread is not yet well understood. Current evidence from household studies, contact tracing investigations, and modeling works suggest that children are less susceptible than adults, and more likely to become either asymptomatic or paucisymptomatic[8–12]. This may explain the very small percentage (<5%) of children in COVID-19 confirmed cases worldwide[13]. Their role in acting as source of infection remains unclear.

Epidemic data so far does not show the typical signature of widespread school outbreaks reported in past influenza pandemics, and responsible for driving transmission in the community[14–18]. However, such transmission could have gone unobserved because of (i) asymptomatic infections in children, (ii) testing restricted to symptomatic cases during the early phase of the outbreak, (iii) early school closure as reactive measure, or schools not in session because of holidays (e.g. in South Korea in January). A retrospective analysis of the Oise cluster in northern France showed evidence for large asymptomatic viral circulation in a high school, though initial case investigation and contact tracing had identified only two symptomatic cases (testing was not performed in absence of symptoms)[19].

Adolescents, however, may have a different role in driving the epidemic spread compared to younger children. Massive testing in Iceland and in the municipality of Vo', Italy, the initial epicenter of the Italian outbreak, showed that children under 10 years of age had a lower incidence of COVID-19 than adolescents and adults[20,21]. A second serological investigation performed retrospectively in the Oise cluster in the primary schools found similar results, together with evidence for lack of onward transmission after introductions of 3 infected children in primary schools[22]. In addition, contact tracing in South Korea showed that infection attack rates among household contacts of index cases were lowest when the index case was younger than 10 years old[23].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Multiple evidence therefore suggests that younger children may have a weaker role in COVID-19 transmission dynamics than adolescents. Accounting for this uncertainty, here we focus on the role of contacts at schools and the impact that different protocols for school reopening may have on the control of the epidemic in the upcoming months. We propose scenarios of partial, progressive or full reopening of schools, with differential opening of pre-school and primary schools vs. middle and high schools, following the plan illustrated by the French Government[6]. School reopening according to different protocols is compared with the scenario where all schools remain closed after lockdown ends. School reopening or closure is coupled with moderate social distancing interventions[24] and large-scale case tracing, testing, and isolation. The focus is on Île-de-France, the most affected region by the COVID-19 epidemic in France.

This study was conducted before the end of lockdown. Here, we also provide an ex-post assessment of the epidemic situation reported by data that became available after the initial submission.

RESULTS

Age-structured transmission model and role of children. We use a stochastic discrete age-structured epidemic model based on demographic and age profile data[25] of the region of Île-de-France. Four age classes are considered: [0-11), [11-19), [19-65), and 65+ years old. The first class includes ages of students in pre-school and primary school, and the second class corresponds to students in middle and high school. We use social contact matrices measured in France in 2012[26] to account for the mixing, in the no interventions scenario, between individuals in these age groups, depending on the type of activity and place where contacts occur (household, school, workplace, transport, leisure, other).

Transmission dynamics follow a compartmental scheme specific for COVID-19 (**Fig. S1**), where individuals are divided into susceptible, exposed, infectious, hospitalized, in ICU, recovered, and deceased. The infectious phase is divided into two steps: a prodromic phase (I_p) and a phase where individuals may remain either asymptomatic (I_a) or develop symptoms. In the latter case, we distinguished between different degrees of severity of symptoms, ranging from paucisymptomatic (I_{ps}), to infectious individuals with mild (I_{ms}) or severe (I_{ss}) symptoms. Asymptomatic and paucisymptomatic individuals have a reduced transmissibility $r_\beta = 0.55$, as estimated in Ref.[27].

We consider the two classes of children to be half as susceptible as adults, and to become either asymptomatic or paucisymptomatic only, following Refs. [8–10,27]. Viral load is similar across age classes[28] and across asymptomatic and symptomatic cases[21,29,30], however the risk of transmission was shown to vary with the severity of symptoms[31]. Given the role of asymptomatic infection in high school students observed in the Oise cluster[19], we assume that adolescents have the same reduction r_β in transmissibility as adults in absence of symptoms[19–21]. We account for the weaker role of younger children in acting as source of infection by exploring four different values for their reduction in transmissibility compared to adolescents and adults: $r_\beta^{[0-11)} = 0.1, 0.25, 0.33, 0.55$. That is, their transmissibility is approximately 20%, 50%, 60%, 100% of the transmissibility of adolescents, respectively.

Intervention measures are modeled through modifications of the contact matrices, accounting for a reduction of the number of contacts engaged in specific settings[24]. The lockdown matrix is constructed assuming a certain fraction of workers not going to work (because of telework, closure of activity,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

caring for children not going to school, and other cases), school closure, 90% reduction of contacts established by seniors, and closure of non-essential activities (**Table 1**). We used data on mobile phone trajectories in France to evaluate the change of mobility induced by lockdown[32] and inform the model with the estimated percentage of individuals in Île-de-France staying at home. Physical contacts during lockdown are removed to account for the adoption of physical distancing.

The model was shown to capture the transmission dynamics of the epidemic in Île-de-France and was used to assess the impact of lockdown and exit strategies[24]. More details are available in the Methods section.

Epidemic situation projected for May 11, 2020. Calibrating the model in the lockdown phase to hospital and ICU admission data up to April 26, 2020, we estimate a drop of the reproduction number from $R_0 = 3.24$ [3.13, 3.34] (95% confidence interval) prior to lockdown[24] to $R_{LD} = 0.67$ [0.65, 0.69] during lockdown, in agreement with prior estimates[24,33,34]. Model projections indicate that by May 11 the region would experience 461 [354, 560] new clinical cases per day (corresponding to 879 [690, 1060] new infections), 16 [8, 26] new admissions in ICUs, with an ICU system occupied at 45% [35, 57]% of currently strengthened capacity (**Fig. 1**). Our projections for ICU demand slightly overestimate the data, likely because they do not account for the transfer of patients in intensive care to less affected regions. These projections are obtained assuming that the reproduction number does not change throughout the lockdown phase. If the spreading potential was 10% lower or higher than the estimated R_{LD}, e.g. corresponding to a decreased compliance to lockdown, the projected number of new clinical cases on May 11 would be 246 [189, 305] or 840 [660, 985], respectively, corresponding to an ICU demand of 37% [28, 46]%, or 57% [44, 71]% of currently strengthened capacity.

Scenarios for reopening of schools. In Ref.[24] we explored progressive exits from lockdown, with social distancing interventions of different degrees of intensity (strict, moderate, mild) coupled or not with case finding, testing and isolation. Following announcements by authorities, here we consider exit strategies as a combination of moderate interventions with efficient tracing, testing and isolation of cases (**Table 1**). Moderate interventions consider that 50% of adults do not go to work, 50% of non-essential activities remain closed, contacts of seniors are reduced by 75%, and contacts on transport are reduced according to presence of workers and reopening of activities. Scenarios assume that physical contacts are fully restored phasing out lockdown. A different hypothesis is explored in the ex-post analysis. These social distancing interventions are combined with isolation of 50% of cases through a 90% reduction of their contacts, simulating the result of rapid and efficient tracing and testing of cases[24]. With schools closed, the resulting reproduction number corresponding to these interventions is $R_{MOD,SC} = 1.05\ [1.01, 1.08]$. A sensitivity on the rate of case isolation under the moderate interventions scenario is also performed.

We simulate the reopening of schools on May 11 through three sets of four different scenarios (**Fig. 2**) – namely, progressive or prompt protocols at full or partial attendance, differentiated for type of schools (pre-school, primary, and middle, high school). The first set of scenarios foresees the reopening of pre-schools and primary schools only, on May 11, whereas middle and high schools would remain closed till next school calendar. Progressive reopening is tested starting with an attendance of 25% in the first week that gradually increases over the following weeks, up to partial attendance (*Progressive 50%*) or full attendance (*Progressive 100%*). Prompt reopening is also considered, with 50% or 100% of students returning to school on May 11 (*Prompt 50%* or *Prompt 100%*). Protocols with 50% attendance envision for example a rotation of students every half of the week or every week, or consider 50% attending in the morning and 50% in the afternoon. The second

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

set of scenarios considers the scenario *Progressive (100%)* for pre-school and primary schools starting May 11, coupled with the reopening of middle and high schools 4 weeks after (June 8) through progressive or prompt protocols at full or partial attendance (i.e. as before, but for adolescents and starting on June 8). This set of scenarios is closer to the plan put in place by the French Government, accounting that Île-de-France has been highly affected, so school opening for secondary school is expected to occur later compared to less affected regions. For sensitivity, we also consider the scenario *Prompt (100%)* for pre-school and primary school starting May 11, followed by the 4 scenarios for middle and high schools starting June 8 (**Fig. S5**). Finally, the third set of scenarios assumes that all school levels, from pre-school to high school, would reopen after lifting the lockdown on May 11, through progressive or prompt protocols at full or partial attendance. Contacts at schools are proportional to school attendance in the various scenarios. All scenarios are compared to the situation where schools remain closed.

Impact on epidemic activity and health system. If only pre-schools and primary schools are reopened starting May 11 till the end of the school calendar, the projected number of new clinical cases at the start of summer holidays (July 5) is 2 to 2.5 times the number expected in the scenario with schools closed, depending on the reopening protocol and the transmissibility of younger children (**Fig. 3a,d** and **Fig. 5a**). Though increasing, the epidemic remains under control, with an expected maximum occupation of the ICU system on August 1 equal to 58% [50, 66]% of the foreseen 1,500-bed capacity (**Fig. 4a**, **6a**). No difference between protocols is observed when transmissibility of younger children is lower than the transmissibility of adolescents ($r_\beta^{[0-11)} = 0.1, 0.25, 0.33$; **Fig. 3d, 5a,** and **Fig. S3a,d** of the Supplementary Information). If $r_\beta^{[0-11)}$ is the same for both younger children and adolescents, maximum attendance mainly determines the increase of cases, whereas progressive and prompt protocols do not show substantial differences.

Additionally reopening middle and high schools starting June 8 would lead to an epidemic situation similar to the scenario with largest epidemic activity predicted for reopening lower educational levels only (*Progressive (100%, 50%)* and *Prompt (50%)* of **Fig. 3b**, **5b** compared to *Prompt (100%)* of **Fig. 3a**, **5a**), if attendance is limited to 50% or if full attendance is reached through a progressive protocol. These scenarios would lead to a maximum ICU demand equal to 59% [51, 67]% of foreseen capacity. With full attendance in middle and high schools on June 8 (*Prompt (100%)* of **Fig. 3b**, **5b**), the new number of clinical cases per day would be 2.7 to 3.0 times higher relatively to the school closure scenario at the start of the summer (median values; **Fig. 5b**), leading to 52% [45, 59]% to 72% [62, 80]% ICU occupation by mid-summer (**Fig. 6b**), depending on younger children transmissibility. Results do not change if pre-schools and primary schools fully reopen on May 11 (**Fig. S5-S7**).

If all schools reopen on May 11 with full attendance, the increase in the number of new infections would lead to saturation of the ICU capacity before the end of July (*Prompt (100%)* of **Fig. 4c**, **6c**). Adopting a progressive reopening would still push the healthcare system to its limits by mid-summer, with ICU occupation reaching 92% [80, 103]% if younger children transmit as much as adolescents (*Progressive 100%*, **Fig. 4c**, **6c**). To avoid this situation, limiting attendance to 50% per day would be key (maximum demand on ICU system as of August 1 expected to be between 44% [37, 49]% and 57% [49, 64]% of foreseen ICU capacity; **Fig. 4c,f** and **Fig. 6c**).

Among the scenarios avoiding oversaturation of the healthcare system, the model predicts a maximum of 2,000 cases per day in the region who are promptly tested and put in isolation (*Progressive 100%*, third set of scenarios). Results are robust against a 10% increase of the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

reproduction number during lockdown (**Fig. S8**, with all scenarios avoiding full attendance of adolescents at school not exceeding ICU capacity). Reopening schools maintaining the epidemic under control would however require fast and massive tracing and testing of cases to allow their isolation. All scenarios obtained with 25% case isolation would overwhelm the ICU system by mid-summer (**Fig. S9-S11**). If contacts engaged by adolescents are reduced by 50%, the risk of the reopening of middle and high schools will be less pronounced (**Figure S12**) compared to the results of the main analysis.

Ex-post assessment. Starting May 11, schools in France reopened on a voluntary basis, and only a small percentage of students went back to school. The attendance registered in Île-de-France in June was 14.5% for pre-/primary schools[35], whereas middle and high school remained closed at that time because of sustained viral circulation. Detection was estimated to be around 10% in the region for the overall period before school holidays[36]. The epidemic continued to decrease in the two months of school reopening, after exiting lockdown, corresponding to a reproduction number of $R_{EXIT} = 0.81\ [0.79, 0.84]$. The discrepancy with the scenarios analyzed before is mainly due to the conservative assumption of including all physical contacts after exiting lockdown. The maximum likelihood estimate in the exit scenario corresponds indeed to 80% avoidance of physical contacts by the population, which is able to bring the reproduction number below 1. By simply altering adoption of physical contacts – while maintaining recommendations on schools, workplace, non-essential activities – our results indicate that a large spectrum of dynamics are possible, from a continuing decrease of epidemic activity to an increased viral circulation leading to a rise in ICU admissions. Scenarios presented before remain valuable to evaluate the impact of school reopening (e.g. start of the academic year) under stable epidemic activity.

DISCUSSION

Reopening schools after lifting the lockdown will likely lead to an increase in the number of COVID-19 cases in the following 2 months compared to schools closed, even with lower transmissibility in children, yet protocols exist that would allow maintaining the epidemic under control without saturating the healthcare system. With pre-schools and primary schools in session starting May 11, ICU occupation would remain below the foreseen 1,500-bed capacity (at most 72% [62, 80]%) , as long as middle and high schools limit students' attendance or reopen one month later. Healthcare system would exceed foreseen capacity (136% [119%, 151%]) if middle and high school reopen earlier in May accepting all students. Adopting a progressive protocol for adolescents starting May 11 would delay the increase in the epidemic activity, but largely engage the healthcare system by mid-summer (ICU occupancy at 92% [80%, 103%]). These findings are consistent across different assumptions on the relative transmissibility of younger children, however they require intensive large-scale tracing, testing, and isolation of cases, coupled with moderate social distancing interventions.

The impact of school reopening on ICU occupancy will only be visible after a certain delay, due to the natural progression of the disease, the spread among individuals in the community mainly leading to asymptomatic or subclinical forms of infection, and the long time period during which a patient requires intensive care. COVID-19 activity indicators estimated by the sentinel surveillance system[37] need to be closely monitored to anticipate surge of patients. Additionally, massive testing targeting case contacts to break the chains of transmission through isolation will, at the same time, provide a reliable indicator

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

to react in a more rapid and agile way to the evolving epidemic situation and revise social distancing recommendations.

Easing exit strategies through progressive reopening of schools may help the preparation of schools to welcome younger children in the class. No substantial difference in the epidemic risk is predicted between progressive and prompt reopening of pre-schools and primary schools. In light of the remaining 8 weeks in the school calendar, full attendance of younger children in pre-schools and primary schools is thus possible. This would allow resuming learning and development for all students in the age classes mostly in need[38]. Full attendance in middle and high schools is instead not recommended. Our findings are based on current evidence suggesting that higher school levels may become important settings for transmission[19], being then responsible for spreading the epidemic in the community. Virological evidence indicates that no significant difference in viral load is observed across age[28], or between symptomatic and asymptomatic infections[21,29,30]. Transmission, however, is mediated by symptoms and their severity[31], possibly explaining why younger children have a limited role as source of transmission[39,40]. Additional epidemiological and virological investigations are urgently needed to better characterize the role of children in the transmission dynamics of the disease, across age classes (e.g. also distinguishing between middle school and high school students), both at schools and in the community.

Our results are based on projections estimated on data up to April 28, 2020 and assume that the reproduction number does not change throughout the lockdown phase. A 10% increase in the reproduction number than estimated from data, to account for uncertainty in the estimation or for reduced compliance to lockdown restrictions in the last weeks before May 11, would not affect our main results.

In the scenario analyses, occupation of ICU system was not evaluated on the basis of current capacity[41]. Such capacity (approximately 2,800 beds in Île-de-France) was largely strengthened as an emergency response to cope with the large influx of COVID-19 patients requiring critical care during the first wave. It required not only additional material (beds, respirators, rooms, etc.) but also personnel who was transferred from other medical specialties to support the increase in response. Exiting the current emergency, we envision that ICU capacity will be restored to lower levels for the upcoming months, as the system has been stretched to limits that are not sustainable in the long term. We foresee a capacity of 1,500 beds, considering a 25% increase compared to pre-COVID-19 epidemic size to re-establish almost routine conditions while accounting for the need to continue facing a pandemic situation for the next several months. The aim is to avoid a second epidemic wave as large as the first one. If a second emergency would occur, the system would need to be strengthened again to higher limits.

We considered moderate social distancing interventions[24], as they envision that a certain percentage of workers would resume their professional activity, including the partial reopening of commerce. This scenario is in line with recommendations by the authorities[6] and it is predicted to maintain the epidemic activity stable over time if massive targeted testing is also implemented. According to model projections, a maximum of about 2,000 infected individuals per day will need to be isolated in Île-de-France at the largest epidemic activity (end of school calendar) in the scenarios allowing control of the epidemic. Targeting a maximum of 5% positivity rate of performed tests, as suggested by WHO[42], at least 40,000 tests per day would thus be required in the region at the peak of demand. This estimate exceeds the ballpark of expected regional capacity, considering the objective of 700,000 tests by week

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

at national level announced by the Government[43] and assuming a population-based distribution by region (i.e. about 18,000 tests per day in Île-de-France). Plans to increase capacity over time are needed. A massive effort in human resources is required to conduct epidemiological investigations to rapidly and efficiently identify suspect cases. Under the same social distancing strategy to lift lockdown, a less efficient tracing, testing and isolation of cases would not be able to avoid a second wave.

Poor detection, however, can be balanced with the adoption of preventive measures by the population. Analyzing the epidemic in the post-lockdown phase once data became available, our results show that despite a low percentage of detection and isolation of infectious individuals[36], the epidemic continued to decrease, a dynamic that was also reported in other European countries[44]. Our results suggest that the continued decrease was due to a large adoption of preventive measures by the population, and to a minimal increase of contact activity in the community due to limited school attendance (and, specifically, only in the younger school levels). Our maximum likelihood estimate of 80% avoidance of physical contacts by the population is in line with estimates provided by public health authorities through large-scale survey in that period[45]. Communication on the sustained and continuative use of preventive measures is critical to manage the pandemic in the next months.

We did not consider explicitly the generalized use of masks, required in public transports and recommended in open places once lockdown ended[6]. However, their effect in reducing transmission in the community is implicitly accounted for in the calibration of the model in the ex-post analysis. In addition, avoidance of physical contacts is considered in the analysis once data became available. We modeled epidemic trajectories through summer to estimate the delayed impact that 8 weeks of schools in session in May and June may have on the hospital system in the month of July. However, we cannot accurately parameterize the model during summer, because of lack of contact data (we used Spring holiday contact data as a proxy instead) and of information about control measures and protocols for holidays that will be enforced during summer months (we considered moderate social distancing measures still in effect, with no holidays). Also, we did not consider seasonal behavior in viral transmission[46], as this is still under investigation. Due to these large uncertainties, the trajectory of the number of cases during summer cannot be considered accurate and should be interpreted with caution. Empirical contacts used in this study were measured in 2012, and no data are available to confirm that patterns have not been altered over time. A reduction of 50% of contacts in adolescents, suggested by a recent study for the UK[47], would mitigate the increase in the epidemic activity when middle and high schools are reopened, as adolescents would play a less important role in the transmission dynamics relatively to the other age classes.

We did not study reactive school closure as a means to slow down propagation[48,49], as our study was focused on the conditions allowing reopening for the last two months of the school calendar. We focused on Île-de-France region, following our previous work[24], and did not consider spatially targeted reopening within the region[50].

Given the heterogeneous situation in Europe regarding exit strategies, and more specifically the opening or closure of schools[1], data gathered after the first wave will become critical in the upcoming months as schools reopen for the new school calendar. Findings can also help informing strategies in the countries in the southern hemisphere struggling with the school calendar.

METHODS

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Parametrization of the model. Parameters, values, and sources used to define the compartmental model are listed in **Table S1** of the Supplementary Information. Results of the main paper refer to a probability of being asymptomatic p_a =20%[51,52]; a sensitivity analysis on this value was performed in a previous work[24]. Time spent in each compartment is assumed to follow an exponential distribution.We use data on patient trajectories recorded in Île-de-France hospitals after admission to estimate time spent in hospital or ICU up to date of discharge or death. We fit mixture and competing risks models to time to event data, taking into account censoring due to patients being still in the hospital at the time of analysis.

Calibration of the model. The model was calibrated to hospital and ICU admission data before and during lockdown through a maximum likelihood approach. Before lockdown we fit the transmission rate per contact and the starting date of the simulation. During lockdown, we fit the transmission rate per contact considering data in the interval April 13-26, 2020, to avoid fluctuations observed after lockdown entered into effect. More details are reported in the Supplementary Information.

Case isolation. Our model assumes that a percentage of infections is promptly tested and isolated to avoid onward transmission. Isolation corresponds to a 90% reduction of contacts. To account for a delay in tracing, testing, and self-isolation, we consider that infected individuals in their prodromic stage maintain their contacts as in the no-intervention scenario. The resulting effect of test-trace-isolate is therefore obtained by altering the number of contacts in the matrix associated to the detected infections, with a certain delay from the start of infectiousness.

Holidays. Summer vacations last from July 5 to August 31, 2020. The model cannot be easily parameterized during summer holidays because of lack of data and lack of information on recommendations for those months. For the simulations with reopening of schools, we used the number of contacts established by children during spring holidays, estimated by the social contact survey in France[26]. Holidays for adults were not modeled. We do not evaluate the epidemic trajectory during summer holidays (except for ICU occupancy due to the intrinsic delay in admission and occupation, see below), as the parameterization of the model has still too many uncertainties.

Evaluation. Each scenario of school reopening is evaluated in terms of: number of clinical cases (i.e. cases with mild or severe symptoms) at the start of summer holidays (July 5, 2020) compared to the school closure scenario; ICU beds demand on August 1, to account for cases generated before summer holidays and the average delay due to disease progression. Current capacity of ICU beds in the region was largely strengthened during the first wave of the epidemic (approximately from 1,200 to 2,800 beds)[41]. To evaluate the school reopening scenarios, we foresee an ICU capacity restored at 1,500 beds in the months following the emergency, i.e. considering a 25% increase compared to standard pre-COVID-19 size. For each scenario, we perform 500 stochastic runs; median curves are displayed together with the associated 95% probability ranges.

Sensitivity analysis. We investigate social distancing measures based on moderate interventions coupled with a smaller rate of testing and isolation of cases (25%). We additionally perform the analysis also assuming that the reproduction number during lockdown is 10% lower or higher than the one estimated on current data. We evaluate the reopening of middle and high school starting June 8 (second set of scenarios), considering a full attendance of younger children starting May 11. Finally, we consider contact matrices with a 50% reduction of contacts in the [11,19) age class, to account for possible changes in the pattern of contacts measured in 2012, as suggested by a recent survey conducted in the UK[47].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Ex-post assessment analysis. We retrospectively compare ICU admission data in the post-lockdown phase with different exit scenarios. We consider (i) lockdown extended beyond May 11, (ii) school closure with moderate interventions and 50% case isolation, (iii) a scenario parametrized on the observed attendance at schools and the estimated detection rate in the region, for varying adoption of avoidance of physical contacts. This last scenario is based on the reported attendance of 14.5% in pre-schools and primary schools in June, when middle and high schools were still closed[36]. Detection was parameterized based on estimates from another study[36], indicating that about 10% of cases were detected by the test-trace-isolate system in the period from May 11 to June 28, 2020. Avoidance of physical contacts was explored as a free parameter and fitted to ICU admission data up to July 5, through a maximum likelihood approach. Curves corresponding to 100% avoidance of physical contacts in the population and 0% avoidance are shown for comparison.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study is partially funded by: ANR projects SPHINX (ANR-17-CE36-0008-05) and DATAREDUX (ANR-19-CE46-0008-03); EU H2020 grants RECOVER (H2020- 101003589) and MOOD (H2020-874850); REACTing COVID-19 modeling grant; INSERM-INRIA partnership on data science and public health. We thank Chiara Poletto, Alain Barrat, Juliette Paireau, and Sante publique France for useful discussions.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

We declare no competing interests.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

VC conceived and designed the study. LDD, CES, PYB collected and analysed the data. LDD, GP performed the simulations and numerical analysis. LDD, GP, CES, PYB, VC interpreted the results. VC drafted the Article. All authors contributed to the writing of the final version of the Article.

REFERENCES

1 Coronavirus lockdowns unlocked: Which countries are easing restrictions. *Sky News*. https://news.sky.com/story/coronavirus-lockdowns-unlocked-which-countries-are-easing-restrictions-11974027 (accessed May 3, 2020).

2 Europe Tiptoes Toward New Normal as Spain Keeps Schools Shut. *Bloomberg.com*. 2020; published online April 28. https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-04-28/europe-tiptoes-toward-new-normal-as-spain-keeps-schools-closed (accessed April 29, 2020).

3 Emergenza coronavirus, quando ricomincerà davvero la scuola? *la Repubblica.* 2020; published online April 23. https://www.repubblica.it/cronaca/2020/04/23/news/emergenza_coronavirus_quando_ricomincera_davvero_la_scuola_-254798342/ (accessed May 3, 2020).

4 Easing up: US and Europe grapple with when to reopen schools. *Times Isr*. https://www.timesofisrael.com/easing-up-us-and-europe-grapple-with-when-to-reopen-schools/ (accessed April 29, 2020).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

5 Denmark lets young children return to school. *BBC News*. 2020; published online April 15. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-52291326 (accessed May 4, 2020).

6 Info Coronavirus COVID-19 - Stratégie de déconfinement. *Gouvernement.fr*. https://www.gouvernement.fr/info-coronavirus/strategie-de-deconfinement (accessed May 4, 2020).

7 Coronavirus : «Quels niveaux vont reprendre l'école et à quelle date ?». *leparisien.fr*. 2020; published online May 1. http://www.leparisien.fr/societe/coronavirus-quels-niveaux-vont-reprendre-l-ecole-et-a-quelle-date-01-05-2020-8309322.php (accessed May 3, 2020).

8 Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, Prem K, Jit M, Eggo RM. Age-dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. *Nat Med* 2020; : 1–7.

9 Zimmermann P, Curtis N. Coronavirus Infections in Children Including COVID-19: An Overview of the Epidemiology, Clinical Features, Diagnosis, Treatment and Prevention Options in Children. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2020; **39**: 355–68.

10 Cai J, Xu J, Lin D, *et al.* A Case Series of children with 2019 novel coronavirus infection: clinical and epidemiological features. *Clin Infect Dis* DOI:10.1093/cid/ciaa198.

11 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; published online April 27. DOI:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30287-5.

12 Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, *et al.* Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science* 2020; **368**: 1481–6.

13 Ludvigsson JF. Systematic review of COVID-19 in children shows milder cases and a better prognosis than adults. *Acta Paediatr* DOI:10.1111/apa.15270.

14 Smith A, Coles S, Johnson S, Saldana L, Ihekweazu C, O'Moore E. An outbreak of influenza A(H1N1)v in a boarding school in South East England, May-June 2009. *Euro Surveill Bull Eur Sur Mal Transm Eur Commun Dis Bull* 2009; **14**. DOI:10.2807/ese.14.27.19263-en.

15 Kar-Purkayastha I, Ingram C, Maguire H, Roche A. The importance of school and social activities in the transmission of influenza A(H1N1)v: England, April - June 2009. *Euro Surveill Bull Eur Sur Mal Transm Eur Commun Dis Bull* 2009; **14**. DOI:10.2807/ese.14.33.19311-en.

16 Guinard A, Grout L, Durand C, Schwoebel V. Outbreak of influenza A(H1N1)v without travel history in a school in the Toulouse district, France, June 2009. *Euro Surveill Bull Eur Sur Mal Transm Eur Commun Dis Bull* 2009; **14**. DOI:10.2807/ese.14.27.19265-en.

17 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Swine-origin influenza A (H1N1) virus infections in a school - New York City, April 2009. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2009; **58**: 470–2.

18 Huai Y, Lin J, Varma JK, *et al.* Original Article: A primary school outbreak of pandemic 2009 influenza A (H1N1) in China. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* 2010; **4**: 259–66.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

19 Fontanet A, Tondeur L, Madec Y, *et al.* Cluster of COVID-19 in northern France: A retrospective closed cohort study. *medRxiv*. 2020; published online April 23. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.18.20071134v1 (accessed April 29, 2020).

20 Gudbjartsson DF, Helgason A, Jonsson H, *et al.* Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic Population. *N Engl J Med* 2020; : NEJMoa2006100.

21 Lavezzo E, Franchin E, Ciavarella C, *et al.* Suppression of a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in the Italian municipality of Vo'. *Nature* 2020; **584**: 425–9.

22 Fontanet A, Grant R, Tondeur L, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 infection in primary schools in northern France: A retrospective cohort study in an area of high transmission. *medRxiv*. 2020; published online June 29. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.25.20140178v2.

23 Park YJ, Choe YJ, Park O, *et al.* Contact Tracing during Coronavirus Disease Outbreak, South Korea, 2020 - Volume 26, Number 10—October 2020 - *Emerging Infectious Diseases journal* - CDC. DOI:10.3201/eid2610.201315.

24 Di Domenico L, Pullano G, Sabbatini CE, Boëlle P-Y, Colizza V. Impact of lockdown on COVID-19 epidemic in Île-de-France and possible exit strategies. *BMC Med* 2020; **18**: 240.

25 Population légale de 'Île-de-France. *INSEE.fr*. https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/4270719 (accessed March 22, 2020).

26 Béraud G, Kazmercziak S, Beutels P, *et al.* The French Connection: The First Large Population-Based Contact Survey in France Relevant for the Spread of Infectious Diseases. *PLOS ONE* 2015; **10**: e0133203.

27 Li R, Pei S, Chen B, *et al.* Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV2). *Science* 2020; **368**: 489–93.

28 Jones TC, Mühlemann B, Veith T, *et al.* An analysis of SARS-CoV-2 viral load by patient age. https://virologie-ccm.charite.de/fileadmin/user_upload/microsites/m_cc05/virologie-ccm/dateien_upload/Weitere_Dateien/analysis-of-SARS-CoV-2-viral-load-by-patient-age-v2.pdf.

29 Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **382**: 1177–9.

30 Cereda D, Tirani M, Rovida F, *et al.* The early phase of the COVID-19 outbreak in Lombardy, Italy. ArXiv200309320 Q-Bio. 2020; published online March 20. http://arxiv.org/abs/2003.09320 (accessed April 29, 2020).

31 Luo L, Liu D, Liao X, *et al.* Modes of contact and risk of transmission in COVID-19 among close contacts. *medRxiv* 2020. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.24.20042606v1.

32 Pullano G, Valdano E, Scarpa N, Rubrichi S, Colizza V. Population mobility reductions during COVID-19 epidemic in France under lockdown. *medRxiv* 2020; : 2020.05.29.20097097.

33 Salje H, Kiem CT, Lefrancq N, *et al.* Estimating the burden of SARS-CoV-2 in France. *Science* 2020; **369**: 208–11.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

34 Roux J, Massonnaud C, Crépey P. COVID-19: One-month impact of the French lockdown on the epidemic burden. *medRxiv*. 2020; published online April 27. http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.22.20075705.

35 Déconfinement phase 2 : point de situation au 28 mai. *Ministère Educ. Natl. Jeun*. https://www.education.gouv.fr/deconfinement-phase-2-point-de-situation-au-28-mai-303813 (accessed July 17, 2020).

36 Pullano G, Di Domenico L, Sabbatini CE, *et al.* Underdetection of COVID-19 cases in France in the exit phase following lockdown. *medRxiv* 2020; published online Aug 12. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.10.20171744v1.

37 Réseau Sentinelles. *French GPs Sentinelles network*. https://websenti.u707.jussieu.fr/sentiweb/?lang=en (accessed April 5, 2020).

38 Framework for reopening schools. *unicef.org*. https://www.unicef.org/media/68366/file/Framework-for-reopening-schools-2020.pdf (accessed May 4, 2020).

39 Children and COVID-19. *rivm.nl*. https://www.rivm.nl/en/novel-coronavirus-covid-19/children-and-covid-19 (accessed May 4, 2020).

40 COVID-19 chez l'enfant : état des connaissances en amont de la réouverture des écoles. *santepubliquefrance.fr*. /les-actualites/2020/covid-19-chez-l-enfant-etat-des-connaissances-en-amont-de-la-reouverture-des-ecoles (accessed May 5, 2020).

41 300 lits de réanimation supplémentaires en Ile-de-France, le tour de force. *leparisien.fr*. 2020; published online April 2. http://www.leparisien.fr/info-paris-ile-de-france-oise/coronavirus-300-lits-de-reanimation-supplementaires-en-ile-de-france-un-tour-de-force-02-04-2020-8293173.php (accessed May 4, 2020).

42 *WHO*. Public health criteria to adjust public health and social measures in the context of COVID-19. https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/public-health-criteria-to-adjust-public-health-and-social-measures-in-the-context-of-covid-19 (accessed July 1, 2020).

43 Coronavirus: combien de tests PCR fait-on vraiment en France? *Le Figaro.fr*. 2020; published online May 1. https://www.lefigaro.fr/sciences/coronavirus-combien-de-tests-pcr-fait-on-vraiment-en-france-20200501 (accessed May 4, 2020).

44 Bertuzzo E, Mari L, Pasetto D, *et al.* The geography of COVID-19 spread in Italy and implications for the relaxation of confinement measures. *Nat Commun* 2020; **11**: 4264.

45 Covid-19 : une enquête pour suivre l'évolution des comportements et de la santé mentale pendant l'épidémie. /etudes-et-enquetes/covid-19-une-enquête-pour-suivre-l'évolution-des-comportements-et-de-la-sante-mentale-pendant-l-epidemie (accessed July 21, 2020).

46 Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Lipsitch M, Grad Y. Social distancing strategies for curbing the COVID-19 epidemic. 2020; published online March 24. DOI:10.1101/2020.03.22.20041079.

47 Klepac P, Kucharski AJ, Conlan AJ, *et al.* Contacts in context: large-scale setting-specific social mixing matrices from the BBC Pandemic project. *medRxiv* 2020; : 2020.02.16.20023754.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

48 Litvinova M, Liu Q-H, Kulikov ES, Ajelli M. Reactive school closure weakens the network of social interactions and reduces the spread of influenza. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2019; **116**: 13174–81.

49 Gemmetto V, Barrat A, Cattuto C. Mitigation of infectious disease at school: targeted class closure vs school closure. *BMC Infect Dis* 2014; **14**. DOI:10.1186/s12879-014-0695-9.

50 Munday JD. Evaluation of the impact of targetted school closures on the spread of infectious disease outbreaks using a network of schools: The Netherlands. James Munday. http://jdmunday.github.io/SC_Writeup/ (accessed May 4, 2020).

51 Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A, Chowell G. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Eurosurveillance* 2020; **25**: 2000180.

52 Buitrago-Garcia DC, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, *et al.* Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: a living systematic review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv* 2020; : 2020.04.25.20079103.

53 Devenez acteur de la surveillance du Covid19. Covidnet.fr. https://covidnet.fr/ (accessed April 1, 2020).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

TABLE

Table 1. Exit strategies following the lifting of the lockdown.

	School closure / reopening	**Telework (=% of individuals not going to work)**	**Senior isolation**	**Closure non-essential activities**	**Case isolation**
Lockdown[24]	School closure	70%[32]	Yes, with 90% contact reduction	Yes, 100% closure	No
Set of moderate interventions + case isolation[24]	School closure or Reopening through scenarios of Fig. 1	50% [53]	Yes, with 75% contact reduction	Yes, 50% closure	Yes, for 50% of cases (25% tested for sensitivity)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

FIGURES



Figure 1. Simulated epidemic trajectories till May 11. (a) Simulated daily incidence of admissions in ICU over time. (b) Simulated number of ICU beds occupied over time. The fitted curve slightly overestimates the data, likely because it does not account for the transfer of patients in intensive care to less affected regions. Vertical dashed line refers to the start of the lockdown; shaded areas correspond to 95% probability ranges; horizontal line refers to strengthened ICU capacity in the region to face the first COVID-19 wave[41]; LD stands for lockdown. White dots indicate data used for the analysis; grey dots indicate data that became available after the initial submission of this study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2. Protocols of school reopening. The first set of scenarios considers the reopening of pre-schools and primary schools only, on May 11, through *Progressive (100%)*, *Progressive (50%)*, *Prompt (50%)*, and *Prompt (100%)* protocols. *Progressive (100%)*: progressive reopening up to 100% attendance, where 25% of students go back to school on the 1st week after lockdown is lifted, 50% on the 2nd, 75% on the 3rd, and 100% from the 4th week till summer holidays. *Progressive (50%)*: progressive reopening up to 50% attendance, where 25% of students go back to school on the 1st week after lockdown is lifted, and 50% from the 2nd week till summer holidays. *Prompt (50%)* : partial reopening with 50% attendance from May 11. *Prompt (100%)* : full reopening with 100% attendance from May 11. Colors indicate student attendance (from lighter to darker, 25% to 100% at 25% incremental steps). The second set of scenarios considers the reopening of pre-schools and primary schools on May 11, only through *Progressive (100%)*, followed by the reopening of middle and high schools on June 8 through all 4 possible protocols. A sensitivity scenario assuming *Prompt (100%)* for pre-schools and primary schools is provided in the Supplementary Information. The third set of scenarios considers the reopening of all schools on May 11, with all schools following the same protocol.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Simulated epidemic activity in scenarios with reopening of schools. (a-c) Simulated daily number of new clinical cases assuming that only pre-schools and primary schools are reopened on May 11 through 4 different protocols (first set of scenarios, panel a), additionally considering the reopening of middle and high schools on June 8 (second set of scenarios, panel b), or assuming that all school levels reopen on May 11 (third set of scenarios, panel c). Four protocols (*Progressive (100% ,50%), Prompt (100%, 50%)*) are compared to the school closure scenario. Results are obtained for a relative transmissibility of younger children $r_\beta^{[0-11)}$ =0.55, i.e. younger children are as infectious as adolescents. (d-f) As panels (a-c) assuming $r_\beta^{[0-11)}$ =0.1. Results for other values of $r_\beta^{[0-11)}$ are reported in the Supplementary Information. The red area indicates the lockdown phase; the grey area indicates summer holiday. Results are obtained considering moderate social distancing interventions coupled with 50% case isolation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. Simulated ICU occupancy in scenarios with reopening of schools. (a-c) Simulated demand of ICU beds assuming that only pre-schools and primary schools are reopened on May 11 through 4 different protocols (first set of scenarios, panel a), additionally considering the reopening of middle and high schools on June 8 (second set of scenarios, panel b), or assuming that all school levels reopen on May 11 (third set of scenarios, panel c). Four protocols (*Progressive (100% ,50%), Prompt (100%, 50%)*) are compared to the school closure scenario. Results are obtained for a relative transmissibility of younger children $r_\beta^{[0-11)}$ =0.55, i.e. younger children are as infectious as adolescents. (d-f) As panels (a-c) assuming $r_\beta^{[0-11)}$ =0.1. Results for other values of $r_\beta^{[0-11)}$ are reported in the Supplementary Information. The red area indicates the lockdown phase; the grey area indicates summer holiday (lighter grey in the month of July to show the delayed effect of the epidemic on ICU demand). Horizontal line refers to the foreseen 1,500-bed ICU capacity in the region restored after the first wave emergency. Results are obtained considering moderate social distancing interventions coupled with 50% case isolation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 5. Impact of reopening schools on epidemic activity. (a-c) Projected increase in the daily number of new cases relative to the school closure scenario on July 5 (start of summer holidays) as a function of the relative transmissibility of younger children, for different reopening protocols. Results are obtained considering moderate social distancing interventions coupled with 50% case isolation.



Figure 6. Impact of reopening schools on ICU occupancy. (a-c) Projected ICU demand on August 1 relative to the foreseen 1,500-bed ICU capacity in the region restored after the first wave emergency, as a function of the relative transmissibility of younger children, for different reopening protocols. Results are obtained considering moderate social distancing interventions coupled with 50% case isolation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20095521; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 7. Retrospective analysis of the epidemic in the exit phase following lockdown. Number of daily ICU admissions, comparison between data and different scenarios describing the post-lockdown phase. Red curve: lockdown maintained beyond May 11; orange curve: school closure scenario with moderate interventions and 50% case isolation (i.e. the reference scenario with schools closed used for Fig. 3-4); green and blue curves: scenarios parameterized on data on interventions and attendance at school, for varying adoption of avoidance of physical contacts (light green, full avoidance of physical contacts; blue, 80% avoidance of physical contacts; dark green, no respect of the recommendation to avoid physical contacts). The blue curve corresponds to the maximum likelihood estimate obtained by fitting ICU admissions data up to July 5, start of summer holidays. The red area indicates the lockdown phase. Shaded areas around the curves indicate 95% probability ranges; they are shown only for the fitted scenario for the sake of visualization.