

Homebound by COVID19: The Benefits and Consequences of Non-Pharmaceutical Intervention Strategies

Buse Eylul Oruc¹, MSc; Arden Baxter¹; Pinar Keskinocak^{2,3}, PhD; John Asplund^{4,5}, PhD; Nicoleta Serban⁶, PhD

1. PhD Student, School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America

2. William W. George Chair and Professor, School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America

3. Adjunct Professor, Department of Environmental Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America

4. Visiting Professor, School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America

5. Research Scientist, Metron, Inc. 1818 Library Street #600, Reston, VA 20190.

6. Virginia C. and Joseph C. Mello Professor, School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America

Corresponding Author: Dr. Pinar Keskinocak, PhD; School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, North Ave NW, Atlanta, GA, USA 30332; 404-964-3978; pinar@isye.gatech.edu

Keywords: agent-based disease modeling, non-pharmaceutical intervention strategies, COVID19

Word Count: 2,415

Number of charts, tables, and figures: 4

28 **ABSTRACT**

29

30 **Objectives.** To evaluate the tradeoffs between potential benefits (e.g., reduction in infection spread and
31 deaths) of non-pharmaceutical interventions for COVID19 and being homebound (i.e., refraining from
32 community/workplace interactions).

33

34 **Methods.** An agent-based simulation model to project the disease spread and estimate the number of
35 homebound people and person-days under multiple scenarios, including combinations of shelter-in-
36 place, voluntary quarantine, and school closure in Georgia from March 1 to September 1, 2020.

37

38 **Results.** Compared to no intervention, under voluntary quarantine, voluntary quarantine with school
39 closure, and shelter-in-place with school closure scenarios 3.43, 19.8, and 200+ homebound adult-days
40 were required to prevent one infection, with the maximum number of adults homebound on a given day
41 in the range of 121K-268K, 522K-567K, 5,377K-5,380K, respectively.

42

43 **Conclusions.** Voluntary quarantine combined with school closure significantly reduced the number of
44 infections and deaths with a considerably smaller number of homebound person-days compared to
45 shelter-in-place.

46

47 **Keywords:** agent-based disease modeling, non-pharmaceutical intervention strategies, COVID19

48

49 **Three-question Summary Box**

50 1.) What is the current understanding of this subject?

51 Recent research has been conducted by various countries and regions on the impact of non-
52 pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) on reducing the spread of COVID19.

53 2.) What does this report add to the literature?

54 Our report assessed which intervention strategies provided the best results in terms of both
55 reducing infection outcomes (cases, deaths, etc.) and minimizing their social and economic
56 effects (e.g., number of people homebound, providing childcare, etc.).

57 3.) What are the implications for public health practice?

58 Voluntary quarantine proved to be the most beneficial in terms of reducing infections and deaths
59 compared to the number of people who were homebound.

60

61 INTRODUCTION

62

63 Recent research and experiences from various communities around the world highlighted the potential
64 benefits of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) for slowing down the spread of COVID19 and
65 reducing the severe health outcomes¹⁻³. NPIs include school closure, reducing public gatherings, social
66 distancing, restricting travel, and voluntary quarantine (entire household staying at home if someone in
67 the household has symptoms)⁴⁻⁷ and more stringent interventions such as shelter-in-place^{8,9}.

68

69 People may become “homebound” (i.e., stay home and refrain from interactions in the
70 community/workplace) due to complying with some of the NPIs (even if they do not experience
71 symptoms), showing symptoms, or providing childcare. Hence, despite their benefits, there are also
72 unintended consequences of NPIs, including the impact on the economy, unemployment, household
73 spending, mobility, energy usage, etc.¹⁰⁻¹³ and the social impact on caring for the elderly, education of
74 the young, family support, domestic violence, and personal health and wellbeing¹⁴⁻²³.

75

76 Some NPIs, such as shelter-in-place, apply to large populations for an extended duration, whereas
77 others, such as voluntary quarantine, impact targeted populations for a limited time. It is important to
78 understand the tradeoffs between the public health benefits and other consequences of NPIs,
79 particularly, as measured by homebound person-days or the size of the homebound population over
80 time. There is sparse research on assessing which interventions have a higher overall impact in reducing
81 societal interactions versus the ability to reduce infection spread and adverse outcomes^{8,9,24,25}.

82

83 This study evaluates the trade-offs between the public health impact measures (e.g., the number of cases,
84 hospitalizations and deaths²⁶) and intervention metrics, including number of homebound people and
85 person-days under various NPI scenarios, including variations of shelter-in-place, voluntary quarantine,
86 and school closure. The intervention metrics aim to capture how much an intervention reduces societal
87 activity and interaction, much needed to maintain economic and social life. Such evaluations can assist
88 local and national decision makers in choosing different combinations of targeted interventions over
89 time to reduce infection spread while considering the societal and economic impact.

90

91 METHODS

92

93 **Intervention Analysis**

94 The following NPIs, with varying combinations and compliance levels in different scenarios (*Figure 1*),
95 are analyzed in this study and compared to the baseline of no intervention (NI):

- 96 1. School Closure (SC) – No peer-group interactions among children or youth (i.e., no K-12 school
97 interactions).
- 98 2. Voluntary Quarantine (VQ) – Household members stay home if any member of the household is
99 symptomatic, until the entire household is symptom-free.
- 100 3. Shelter-in-Place (SIP) – Household members stay home.

101 [insert Figure 1.]

102

103 **Modeling Case Projection and Estimating Intervention Impact**

104 An agent-based simulation model with heterogeneous population mixing was utilized and adapted,
105 which has been previously applied to project the number of COVID19 infections and severe outcomes
106 under various social distancing strategies²⁶. The study period is March 1, 2020- September 1, 2020.

107

108 The population in the simulation includes children (ages 0-9), youth (ages 10-19), adults (ages 20-64),
109 and elderly (ages 65+). The simulation monitors the health status (e.g., symptomatic, hospitalized, dead)
110 as well as the homebound status of each household member (further details are provided in
111 *Supplementary Material Section A and Table B1*).

- 112 • Homebound: For adults and elderly, this status is defined as staying home due to voluntary
113 quarantine, symptoms, shelter-in-place, or *at home childcare*, i.e., providing supervision to a
114 child who is home due to their status (e.g., due to symptoms or school closure). For example, if a
115 child is at home in need of supervision, the status of an adult or elderly member in the household
116 is updated to indicate that they provide supervision, labeled as *at home childcare*. For children
117 and youth, homebound is defined as staying home due to voluntary quarantine, symptoms, or
118 school closure.
- 119 • Inactive: For adults and elderly, a status of inactive refers to being inactive from society due to
120 being homebound, hospitalized, or providing hospital care, i.e., caring for a child or youth who
121 became hospitalized. A status of inactive for children and youth is defined as being inactive from
122 society due to being homebound or hospitalized.

123

124 **Infection Spread Outcome Measures and Intervention Metrics**

125 The infection spread outcome measures reported for the study period include:

- 126 • Cumulative deaths: Number of people who died due to COVID19.
- 127 • Cumulative infections: Number of people infected (including asymptomatic infections).
- 128 • Peak day: The day when the number of new infections was highest.
- 129 • Peak infection: The highest number (or percentage) of the population infected on a given day.

130

131 A statistical summary of infection spread outcome measures under baseline and intervention scenarios is
132 provided in *Supplementary Material Table B2*.

133

134 The infection spread measures are contrasted with the following intervention metrics, which are reported
135 for the study period:

- 136 • Homebound or inactive subpopulation: Number of people in a subpopulation (adults/elderly or
137 children/youth) with homebound or inactive status, respectively, on a given day.
- 138 • Percentage of days adults homebound or inactive: Average percentage of days an adult has
139 homebound or inactive status, respectively.
- 140 • Homebound days: Average number of days a (sub)population has homebound status.
- 141 • Homebound or inactive peak day: The day when the number of a (sub)population has
142 homebound or inactive status, respectively, is highest.
- 143 • Homebound or inactive peak: The highest number (or percentage) of a (sub)population
144 homebound or inactive, respectively, on a given day.
- 145 • Adults absent from work: The number of adults who are absent from work due to an inactive
146 status (further details are provided in *Supplementary Material Section B*).
- 147 • Homebound days to prevent an infection: Additional adult homebound days needed to prevent an
148 infection (in Scenario X, relative to Scenario 1), calculated as follows:

149

$$\frac{\text{Adult Homebound Days in Scenario X} - \text{Adult Homebound Days in Scenario 1}}{\text{Cumulative Infections in Scenario 1} - \text{Cumulative Infections in Scenario X}}$$

150

- 151
- 152 • Homebound days to prevent a death: Additional adult homebound days needed to prevent a death
153 (in Scenario X, relative to Scenario 1), calculated as follows:

154

Adult Homebound Days in Scenario X–Adult Homebound Days in Scenario 1
Cumulative Deaths in Scenario 1–Cumulative Deaths in Scenario X

155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186

RESULTS

Supplementary Material Table B2 presents the infection spread outcome measures, including the population infected or dead and the peak infection.

Figure 2 presents the daily new infections and the homebound adults over time across all scenarios. Under Scenarios 1, 3a, 3b, 3c (non-school closure scenarios), the homebound peak for adults decreased from 267,566 under Scenario 3a to 121,346 under Scenario 3c, and the peak under Scenario 1 was 242,948. Under Scenarios 2, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5a, 5b, 5c (school closure scenarios), the homebound peak for adults was highest under Scenarios 5a, 5b, 5c, due to shelter-in-place, ranging from 5,377,886 to 5,379,960, followed by homebound peak of 584,235 under Scenario 2. Adults absent from work followed a similar pattern as homebound adults across all scenarios (*Supplementary Material Figure B1*). [insert Figure 2.]

Higher compliance with voluntary quarantine reduced homebound peak for adults to 566,973, 535,559, 522,775 under Scenarios 4a, 4b, 4c, respectively (*Figure 2*), decreased the peak infection (in Scenarios 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a, 4b, 4c) by at least half, and delayed the peak day by 14-61 days compared to Scenario 1 (*Supplementary Material Table B2*).

Figure 3 presents a comparison of the percentage of the population infected or dead and the percentage of days adults homebound. The percentage of the population infected was 60.09% under Scenario 1 (no intervention) and 51.69% under Scenario 2 (school closure only). The percentage of the population infected reduced to a range of 11.68-44.15% under Scenarios 3a, 3b, 3c (voluntary quarantine) and 4.53-31.07% under Scenarios 4a, 4b, 4c (voluntary quarantine with school closure). The percentage of days adults homebound was 0.72% under Scenario 1 and 7.16% under Scenario 2 (school closure only). The percentage of days adults homebound ranged from 1.36-1.63% and 7.62-7.74% under Scenarios 3a, 3b, 3c (voluntary quarantine) and Scenarios 4a, 4b, 4c (voluntary quarantine with school closure), respectively. Compared to Scenario 2 (school closure only), Scenarios 5a, 5b, 5c (shelter-in-place with school closure) reduced the percentage of the total population infected from 51.69% to 48.11-50.55% but more than doubled the percentage of days adults homebound to a range of 18.92-30.66%.

187 *Supplementary Material Table B3* provides the percentage of days children, youth, adults, and elderly
188 are homebound across all scenarios. [insert Figure 3.]

189
190

191 *Figure 4* presents the homebound days to prevent an infection or death. The homebound days to prevent
192 an infection was 87 under Scenario 2 (school closure only) and over 200 under Scenarios 5a, 5b, 5c
193 (shelter-in-place with school closure). The homebound days to prevent an infection was 1.9, 3.7, 4.7
194 under Scenarios 3c, 3b, 3a (voluntary quarantine), respectively, versus 14.4, 17.8, 27.3 under Scenarios
195 4c, 4b, 4a (voluntary quarantine with school closure), respectively. The homebound days to prevent a
196 death was 30,650 under Scenario 2 (school closure only) and over 60,420 under Scenarios 5a, 5b, 5c
197 (shelter-in-place with school closure). The homebound days to prevent a death was 500, 928, 1,130
198 under Scenarios 3c, 3b, 3a (voluntary quarantine), respectively, versus 4,050, 4,840, 7,360 under
199 Scenarios 4c, 4b, 4a (voluntary quarantine with school closure), respectively. [insert Figure 4.]

200
201

202 *Supplementary Material Table B4* presents the homebound and inactive peak percentages for children,
203 youth, adults, elderly, and the total population. Increasing voluntary quarantine compliance, regardless
204 of school closure, decreased the homebound and inactive peak percentage for adults, elderly, and the
205 total population. *Supplementary Material Figures B2 and B3* present the homebound peak broken down
206 by statuses for adults and elderly and for children and youth, respectively.

207

208 *Supplementary Material Figure B4* shows the percentage distribution of statuses (at home childcare,
209 voluntary quarantine, symptoms) for the homebound peak for adults. At the homebound peak, among
210 homebound adults: (i) Under Scenarios 2, 4a, 4b, 4c (school closure scenarios without shelter-in-place),
211 0.33%-27.26% and 72.75%-83.47% were symptomatic or providing at home childcare, respectively. (ii)
212 Under Scenarios 3a, 3b, 3c (non-school closure scenarios), 3.61%-26.59% and 0.89%-4.04% were
213 symptomatic or providing at home childcare, respectively. (iii) Under no intervention, 89.99% and
214 10.01% were symptomatic or providing at home childcare, respectively.

215

216 *Supplementary Material Tables B5-B7* summarize the impact of voluntary quarantine, school closure
217 and shelter-in-place by comparing the percentage difference between a pair of scenarios in terms of the
218 homebound days (for children, youth, adult and elderly populations), cumulative infections, and deaths.

219

220 **DISCUSSION**

221

222 Many governments are faced with difficult decisions about when and how quickly to lift social
223 distancing restrictions and reopen their economies; hence, it is crucial to analyze the benefits of NPIs in
224 decreasing the spread of COVID19 versus the economic and social consequences considering the people
225 who become homebound due to illness or due to complying with NPIs. In the state of Georgia, school
226 closure began on March 16th and a shelter-in-place order was enacted from April 3rd to April 30th, and
227 the reopening of the state continued gradually since then. The number of new COVID19 confirmed
228 cases in Georgia have rapidly increased since early June.

229

230 This study focused on the public health benefits versus the need to refrain from societal or workplace
231 interactions due to NPIs. The COVID19 pandemic led to widespread school closure and shelter-in-place
232 orders in the United States^{27,28}. Despite the potential public health benefits, there were many concerns
233 about the economic impacts of shelter-in-place¹⁰⁻¹³ and the disruptive effects of school closures on the
234 education of children and youth^{14,21-23,29}. This study analyzed and compared several NPI scenarios,
235 including combinations of school closure, voluntary quarantine, and shelter-in-place, with varying
236 compliance levels and durations, as well as baseline scenarios of no intervention (Scenario 1) and school
237 closure only (Scenario 2).

238

239 School closure alone had limited impact on reducing the spread of COVID19. Compared to no
240 intervention, school closure only reduced the percentage of the population infected by less than 10%
241 while more than doubling the peak number of adults homebound and causing nearly 450,000 work
242 absences, the majority of which due to the need to provide at home childcare.

243

244 Shelter-in-place combined with school closure (Scenarios 5a-5c) temporarily slowed down the infection
245 spread and delayed the peak, but had little impact on the magnitude of the peak and the cumulative
246 number of infections and deaths, which were similar to that observed in the school closure only scenario.
247 However, under Scenarios 5a-5c, the peak number of homebound adults was 9-44 times larger than all
248 other intervention scenarios. Hence, the limited positive public health impact of shelter-in-place came at
249 a very high societal cost.

250

251 Under voluntary quarantine (Scenarios 3a, 3b, 3c) the percentage of the population infected was
252 11.68%-44.15% (compared to 60.09% under no intervention), with the peak number of adults
253 homebound being 267,566 under low, 211,695 under medium, and 121,346 under high compliance.
254 Under voluntary quarantine combined with school closure (Scenarios 4a, 4b, 4c) the percentage of the
255 population infected was 4.53%- 31.06% (compared to 51.69% under school closure only), with the peak
256 number of adults homebound being 566,973 under low, 535,559 under medium, and 522,775 under high
257 compliance. Higher levels of voluntary quarantine compliance decreased the percentage of the
258 population infected and the peak number of adults homebound (or absent from work).

259

260 Voluntary quarantine compliance provided the greatest benefits in terms of the reduction in infections
261 and deaths compared to the number of adults homebound. Compared to school closure only, voluntary
262 quarantine combined with school closure yielded up to a 92% decrease in cumulative infections and
263 deaths while homebound days increased by at most 8% for adults, 6% for elderly and 1.5% for the total
264 population. Under voluntary quarantine scenarios, the number of homebound days to prevent an
265 infection or death was 3-154 times lower than that of all other scenarios.

266

267

268 **CONCLUSION**

269

270 While large-scale interventions such as shelter-in-place temporarily slow down the infection spread,
271 they are highly disruptive to the society and their public health impact is limited unless they are imposed
272 for long durations of time, with high compliance levels, or followed by additional interventions.

273

274 Targeted interventions such as voluntary quarantine or voluntary quarantine combined with school
275 closure significantly reduce the infection spread without causing a social and economic disruption as in
276 the case of an extended shelter-in-place.

277

278 Strong public messaging should continue about voluntary quarantine, voluntary shelter-in-place (if
279 possible), as well as other practices of physical distancing and the usage of facemasks.

280

281 Some of the conclusions of the study may be generalized to other states/countries that have geographic
282 and population characteristics similar to the state of Georgia. The model and analysis would need to be

283 adjusted for other pandemics; for example, COVID19 leads to fewer adverse health outcomes in
284 younger populations and this may explain why school closure have a lesser impact on reducing infection
285 spread.

286

287 **Limitations**

288 If facemask usage was also considered in the NPI scenarios, the relative reduction in the number of
289 cases and deaths could be higher compared to baseline scenarios. The simulation was populated with
290 data from the state of Georgia and the results presented may not apply to other states or regions which
291 have significantly different population characteristics or density.

292

293 **Acknowledgements**

294 The authors of this paper are thankful to state representatives for sharing multiple data sources from the
295 cases confirmed in Georgia to date. The authors are also thankful to Melody Shellman, Hannah Lin,
296 Ethan Channel, Pravara Harati, April Yu Zhuoting, Gabriel Siewert, and Christopher Stone for
297 supporting various parts of the projects.

298

299 **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

300 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

301

302 **REFERENCES**

303

- 304 1. Hartley DM, Perencevich EN. Public Health Interventions for COVID-19: Emerging Evidence
305 and Implications for an Evolving Public Health Crisis. *JAMA*. 2020.
- 306 2. Cowling BJ, Ali ST, Ng TW, et al. Impact assessment of non-pharmaceutical interventions
307 against coronavirus disease 2019 and influenza in Hong Kong: an observational study. *The*
308 *Lancet Public Health*. 2020.
- 309 3. Ngonghala CN, Iboi E, Eikenberry S, et al. Mathematical assessment of the impact of non-
310 pharmaceutical interventions on curtailing the 2019 novel Coronavirus. *Mathematical*
311 *Biosciences*. 2020:108364.
- 312 4. Qualls N, Levitt A, Kanade N, et al. Community mitigation guidelines to prevent pandemic
313 influenza—United States, 2017. *MMWR Recommendations and Reports*. 2017;66(1):1.
- 314 5. Tian H, Li Y, Liu Y, et al. Early evaluation of Wuhan City travel restrictions in response to the
315 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak. *Medrxiv*. 2020.
- 316 6. Lasry A, Kidder D, Hast M, et al. Timing of community mitigation and changes in reported
317 COVID-19 and community mobility—four US metropolitan areas, February 26–April 1, 2020.
318 2020.
- 319 7. Peak CM, Childs LM, Grad YH, Buckee CO. Comparing nonpharmaceutical interventions for
320 containing emerging epidemics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
321 2017;114(15):4023-4028.

- 322 8. Dave DM, Friedson AI, Matsuzawa K, Sabia JJ. *When do shelter-in-place orders fight covid-19*
323 *best? policy heterogeneity across states and adoption time*. National Bureau of Economic
324 Research;2020. 0898-2937.
- 325 9. Friedson AI, McNichols D, Sabia JJ, Dave D. *Did california's shelter-in-place order work? early*
326 *coronavirus-related public health effects*. National Bureau of Economic Research;2020. 0898-
327 2937.
- 328 10. Wright AL, Sonin K, Driscoll J, Wilson J. Poverty and economic dislocation reduce compliance
329 with covid-19 shelter-in-place protocols. *University of Chicago, Becker Friedman Institute for*
330 *Economics Working Paper*. 2020(2020-40).
- 331 11. Baker SR, Farrokhnia RA, Meyer S, Pagel M, Yannelis C. *How does household spending*
332 *respond to an epidemic? Consumption during the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic*. National Bureau
333 of Economic Research;2020. 0898-2937.
- 334 12. Chen S, Igan D, Pierri N, Presbitero AF. Tracking the Economic Impact of COVID-19 and
335 Mitigation Policies in Europe and the United States. 2020.
- 336 13. Couch KA, Fairlie RW, Xu H. The Impacts of COVID-19 on Minority Unemployment: First
337 Evidence from April 2020 CPS Microdata. *Available at SSRN 3604814*. 2020.
- 338 14. UNESCO. Adverse consequences of school closures. UNESCO.
339 <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse/consequences>. Published 2020. Accessed 31
340 May 2020, 2020.
- 341 15. Armitage R, Nellums LB. COVID-19 and the consequences of isolating the elderly. *The Lancet*
342 *Public Health*. 2020;5(5):e256.
- 343 16. Wang G, Zhang Y, Zhao J, Zhang J, Jiang F. Mitigate the effects of home confinement on
344 children during the COVID-19 outbreak. *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10228):945-947.
- 345 17. Duan L, Zhu G. Psychological interventions for people affected by the COVID-19 epidemic. *The*
346 *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2020;7(4):300-302.
- 347 18. Pfefferbaum B, North CS. Mental health and the Covid-19 pandemic. *New England Journal of*
348 *Medicine*. 2020.
- 349 19. Campbell AM. An increasing risk of family violence during the Covid-19 pandemic:
350 Strengthening community collaborations to save lives. *Forensic Science International: Reports*.
351 2020:100089.
- 352 20. Bradley NL, DiPasquale AM, Dillabough K, Schneider PS. Health care practitioners'
353 responsibility to address intimate partner violence related to the COVID-19 pandemic. *CMAJ*.
354 2020.
- 355 21. Esposito S, Principi N. School Closure During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)
356 Pandemic: An Effective Intervention at the Global Level? *JAMA Pediatrics*. 2020.
- 357 22. Sharfstein JM, Morphey CC. The Urgency and Challenge of Opening K-12 Schools in the Fall
358 of 2020. *JAMA*. 2020.
- 359 23. Viner RM, Russell SJ, Croker H, et al. School closure and management practices during
360 coronavirus outbreaks including COVID-19: a rapid systematic review. *The Lancet Child &*
361 *Adolescent Health*. 2020;4(5):397-404.
- 362 24. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, et al. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions
363 on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*. 2020.
- 364 25. Hsiang S, Allen D, Annan-Phan S, et al. The effect of large-scale anti-contagion policies on the
365 COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature*. 2020.
- 366 26. Keskinocak P, Oruc Aglar BE, Baxter A, Asplund J, Serban N. The Impact of Social Distancing
367 on COVID19 Spread: State of Georgia Case Study. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2004.2029.20084764.
- 368 27. Education Week. Map: Coronavirus and School Closures. Education Week.
369 <https://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/map-coronavirus-and-school-closures.html>.
370 Published 2020. Updated 6 March 2020. Accessed.
- 371 28. Mervosh S, Lu D, Swales V. See Which States and Cities Have Told Residents to Stay at
372 Home. The New York Times. [https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/coronavirus-stay-at-](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/coronavirus-stay-at-home-order.html)
373 [home-order.html](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/coronavirus-stay-at-home-order.html). Published 2020. Accessed 24 April 2020.

374 29. Kuhfeld M, Soland J, Tarasawa B, Johnson A, Ruzek E, Liu J. Projecting the potential impacts
375 of COVID-19 school closures on academic achievement. In: Annenberg Institute at Brown
376 University; 2020.
377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403


404

405

406


407

408 **Figure 1:** Description of the intervention scenarios considered in this study.




409
410

411 **Figure 2:** Homebound adults and daily new infections over time. Scenarios 2, 4a, 4b, 4c include school
412 closure.




413
414

415 **Figure 3: Percentage of days adults homebound compared to the percentage of the population infected**
416 *(left figure) and dead (right figure).*



417
418

419 **Figure 4:** Homebound days to prevent an infection (left figure) or a death (right figure).



420