

## Containing the Spread of Infectious Disease on College Campuses

Mirai Shah<sup>1</sup>, Gabrielle Ferra<sup>2</sup>, Susan Fitzgerald<sup>3</sup>, Paul J. Barreira<sup>4</sup>, Pardis C. Sabeti<sup>5,6,7,8</sup>, Andres Colubri<sup>5,6,7\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Harvard College, Cambridge, MA, USA

<sup>2</sup> Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

<sup>3</sup> Harvard University Health Services, Cambridge, MA, USA

<sup>4</sup> Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

<sup>5</sup> Harvard University, Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Cambridge, MA, USA

<sup>6</sup> Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA

<sup>7</sup> Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Chevy Chase, MD, USA

<sup>8</sup> Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

\* Corresponding author: [andres@broadinstitute.org](mailto:andres@broadinstitute.org)

### Abstract

College campuses in the United States are highly vulnerable to infectious diseases outbreaks, and there is a mounting need to develop strategies that best mitigate their size and duration, particularly as colleges consider reopening their campuses in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. Towards addressing this need, we applied a stochastic transmission model to quantify the impact of university-level responses to past outbreaks on their campuses and used it to determine which control interventions are most effective. The model aims to simultaneously overcome three crucial issues: stochastic variation in small populations, missing or unobserved case data, and changes in disease transmission rates post-intervention. We tested the model and assessed various interventions using data from the 2014 and 2016 mumps outbreaks at Ohio State University and Harvard University, respectively. Our results suggest that universities should design more aggressive diagnostic procedures and stricter isolation policies to decrease infectious disease incidence on campus. Our model can be applied to data from other outbreaks in college campuses and similar small-population settings.

**Keywords:** Infectious disease, mumps outbreak, college campus, stochastic SEIR model, public health intervention, Harvard University

# 1 INTRODUCTION

2 The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has forced school closures around the world (1), and  
3 universities in the United States are designing plans for safe reopening during the Fall 2020  
4 academic term (2). This is a challenging task, as college campuses provide ideal breeding grounds  
5 for infectious disease. Students live in close quarters, pack into lecture halls, share food and drinks  
6 in the dining areas, and engage in intimate contact. Outbreaks in these settings can spread very  
7 quickly. Indeed, a meningitis outbreak took place at Princeton University in March 2014,  
8 eventually claiming the life of one student. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)  
9 reported the attack rate of the disease on Princeton's campus to be 134 per 100,000 students –  
10 1,400 times greater than the national average (3).

11 A recent string of outbreaks on college campuses involves mumps, once a common  
12 childhood viral disease. After introduction of the measles-mumps-rubella (MMR) vaccine in 1977  
13 and the two-dose MMR vaccination program in 1989, the number of mumps cases in the US  
14 plummeted by 2005. But, despite a vaccinated population, there has been a recent resurgence of  
15 mumps, with a steep jump from 229 cases in 2012 to 5833 cases in 2016 (4). Although a typically  
16 mild disease in children, up to 10% of mumps infections acquired after puberty can cause severe  
17 complications, including orchitis, meningitis, and deafness. Furthermore, a majority of recent  
18 mumps cases have occurred in young adults who had received the recommended two MMR doses.  
19 This suggests that vaccine-derived immunity wanes over time, unlike natural immunity –  
20 protection acquired from contracting the disease – which is permanent. Lewnard and Grad estimate  
21 that 33.8% of young adults (ages 20 to 24) were susceptible to mumps in 1990, in contrast to the  
22 52.8% susceptible in 2006, as vaccinations have replaced contraction as the source of immunity  
23 (5). The temporary immunity from vaccines strengthens the argument for strict containment as a

24 critical line of defense amidst an outbreak. In the case of COVID-19, lack of a vaccine coupled  
25 with substantial asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic transmission (6) provide further support for  
26 such approaches.

27         The spread of mumps at Harvard University in 2016, and extensive public health measures  
28 and documentation, presents a rare opportunity to closely examine an outbreak on a college  
29 campus. Between January 1 and August 31, 2016, 210 confirmed mumps cases were identified in  
30 the Greater Boston area, with most detected at Harvard University. Mumps is a highly contagious  
31 disease with the potential to travel quickly and pervasively on a crowded college campus. Some  
32 of the most notable mumps outbreaks on college campuses occurred in Iowa (7), Indiana (8), and  
33 Ohio (9). But, whereas mumps spread rapidly at Ohio State University in 2014 and the University  
34 of Iowa in 2006 and 2016, Harvard employed a number of interventions that may have helped  
35 mitigate spread of the disease and contain it over just a few months (10).

36         The successful containment at Harvard motivates us to explore varied intervention  
37 strategies, given the relative costs of prevention. Even if the use of a booster MMR vaccination is  
38 proven theoretically to reduce infection and thus potentially prevent outbreaks (5, 7), it is unlikely  
39 that universities with limited resources will proactively invest in a third dose. A rough cost analysis  
40 conducted by Harvard University Health Services (HUHS) showed that, while the total mumps  
41 care expenses for Harvard was approximately \$75,000, the cost of providing a third MMR dose to  
42 every member of the Harvard community (at \$83 per vaccination) was \$1.7 million (11). Therefore,  
43 at least in the short term, a third MMR dose cannot be the only answer to handling mumps  
44 outbreaks; we must consider more immediate solutions and interventions.

45         In order to understand the effectiveness of interventions aimed at containing an outbreak  
46 on a college campus, we constructed an epidemiological model to simulate the dynamics of mumps

47 on such a population and quantify the impact of various interventions. Most epidemiological  
48 models have at least one of three flaws: they cannot handle random fluctuations in a small  
49 population, require complete data without unobserved or missing cases, or do not accommodate  
50 time-varying infection or recovery rates as a result of dynamically changing interventions. The  
51 modified stochastic susceptible-exposed-infectious-recovered (SEIR) model presented in this  
52 paper addresses these three issues. We developed this model within the framework of a Partially  
53 Observed Markov Process (POMP), which has been applied to introduce structural stochasticity  
54 into epidemic models (12). We fit model parameters on case data for Harvard's 2016 mumps  
55 outbreak provided by the Massachusetts Department of Public Health (MDPH). We compared it  
56 to data from Ohio State University (OSU), one of the few universities that had extensive publicly  
57 available data through the CDC.

58 In applying our model, we found that each of the interventions employed by HUHS -- email  
59 awareness campaigns, more aggressive diagnoses where clinical symptoms alone were enough to  
60 result in quarantine, and strict isolation of suspected cases -- were crucial in reducing the size and  
61 duration of the outbreak. In particular, Harvard's policies drastically increased the reporting rate  
62 of infection and shortened the time a person remains infectious in a susceptible population, relative  
63 to the baseline. As a result, one mumps case at Harvard infected less than two susceptible  
64 individuals on average, and much less once aggressive diagnosis was in place, compared to cases  
65 at non-residential schools like OSU, in which one mumps case infected an average of six  
66 susceptible individuals. However, the OSU data suggests that self-isolation could be effective, if  
67 adopted rigorously by students. The conclusions from this paper could guide future responses to  
68 infectious disease outbreaks on college campuses. Without effective measures in place, highly  
69 transmissible diseases like mumps, meningitis, and now COVID-19, spread in these environments

70 at much faster rates than in the overall population and can lead to serious health complications.

71 Simple interventions that ensure most cases are detected, treated, and separated from susceptible

72 individuals make a significant difference.

73

## 74 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

75

### 76 **2.1 Harvard mumps outbreak**

#### 77 **2.1.1 Data**

78 The mumps outbreak at Harvard began in February 2016, when six students reported onset of  
79 parotitis to HUHS. For the next three months, the number of cases continued to rise, until finally  
80 plateauing in late May and early June. There were two waves of the outbreak – one occurring in  
81 the month of March and a larger one occurring in mid-April – totaling 189 confirmed and probable  
82 cases (Figure 1). Confirmed cases are those with a positive laboratory test for mumps virus.  
83 Probable cases are those who either tested positive for the anti-mumps IgM antibody or had an  
84 epidemiologic linkage to another probable or confirmed case (13, 14). The majority of these cases  
85 received the recommended two doses of MMR (15).

86 We use data provided by MDPH, which documented every mumps case between 2015 and  
87 2017 at schools across Massachusetts (16). This data includes demographics of the patient (gender,  
88 age, county, and institution), symptoms and vaccination status, date they reported their symptoms  
89 and the date of symptom onset, and lag time between the date of symptom onset and admission to  
90 a medical clinic.

91

#### 92 **2.1.2 Interventions**

93 Harvard University employed three main interventions: (i) an email awareness campaign, (ii) more  
94 aggressive diagnoses, and (iii) strict isolation of infectious persons.

95 First, between February and May 2016, HUHS sent six different emails to Harvard students,  
96 employees, and colleagues with information on the gravity of the outbreak, recommendations on  
97 how to prevent transmission, and instructions on how to identify mumps. This raised awareness

98 throughout the campus. Particularly at the peak of the outbreak, roommates, resident deans, and  
99 athletic coaches all played essential roles in reporting potential cases of mumps, so that few cases  
100 likely went undetected and untreated by HUHS (13, 14).

101 Second, Harvard acted vigorously to treat and isolate anyone suspected of mumps  
102 throughout the outbreak. Initially, due to the disease's non-specific symptoms and less extreme  
103 manifestation in vaccinated people, HUHS used positive mumps PCR tests as a necessary ground  
104 for diagnosis. Later, on recommendation from the MDPH, HUHS stopped automatically ruling out  
105 those with negative PCR results, given that false negatives were quite frequent in vaccinated  
106 individuals, and given some individuals reported their infection to the clinic belatedly (see  
107 Supplementary Materials for details on negative PCR tests) (17). Anyone who entered HUHS  
108 displaying clinical symptoms of mumps was now deemed infected and infectious. This change in  
109 the diagnosis protocol took place on April 15 2014, day 61 of the outbreak (14).

110 Third and perhaps most notably, Harvard isolated most confirmed or probable cases of  
111 mumps. While many universities simply suggest self-isolation in one's room or dormitory (which  
112 leaves roommates and friends highly susceptible to the disease), Harvard removed anyone with  
113 clinical symptoms of mumps from the population. Of the 230 total cases at Harvard between  
114 February 2016 and November 2017, 96 were isolated in alternate housing on campus, while 110  
115 were isolated off-site. Although a person remains infectious with mumps for five days, Harvard  
116 isolated patients for six days for additional measure (13).

117 Harvard also used a variety of smaller techniques to contain the disease. For instance, water  
118 fountains with a weak upward flow were repaired in late March when it became apparent that  
119 students were directly touching the fountain with their water bottles or mouths (14). In this study,  
120 we only considered the first three larger-scale interventions in our models. Figure 1 shows a

121 timeline of the interventions as well as periods when the population was fluctuating (such as during  
122 spring and summer break). Around two weeks after HUHS improved its criteria for diagnosis in  
123 mid-April, there was a steep decline in the number of new cases. These interventions were possible  
124 thanks to the ample resources that Harvard has at its disposal, which may not be available at other  
125 universities. Nevertheless, this situation makes Harvard an ideal testing ground for interventions  
126 that could not be deployed elsewhere, at least without solid proof of their efficacy. Thus, we  
127 quantify the effects of the three main interventions (awareness campaign, aggressive diagnoses,  
128 and strict isolation of suspected cases) further in the modeling section of this paper.

129

130

131

132

133

134


135

136

137



138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158



**Figure 1:** The daily number of new mumps cases (probable or confirmed) at Harvard and the timeline of school vacations and control interventions employed by HUHS between February and June 2016. Both probable and confirmed cases display clinical symptoms of mumps, but only confirmed cases have a positive PCR result. HUHS sent multiple emails over the course of the outbreak, raising awareness about the spread of mumps. Additionally, in mid-April, HUHS began more carefully diagnosing mumps, rather than automatically ruling out those with negative PCR tests. The isolation policy is not shown because it occurred continuously throughout the entire outbreak.

## 159 **2.2 Ohio State University mumps outbreak**

### 160 **2.2.1 Data on the outbreak**


161 In 2014, a large outbreak of mumps occurred in central Ohio, with the majority of cases linked to  
162 Ohio State University (OSU) in Columbus. The outbreak began in February 2014 and peaked in  
163 early April with 96 cases in one week. By summer and early fall, the number of cases had  
164 dramatically dropped and stabilized (9). We therefore restrict our analysis of the outbreak to the  
165 time between Week 1 and Week 40 of 2014, in which there were a total of 528 cases (Figure 2).  
166 We obtained this data from CDC's *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* (18). One drawback of  
167 the data is that the cases are reported weekly, making our analysis and parameter estimations less  
168 precise. Furthermore, we cannot guarantee that all the cases in this dataset are linked to the  
169 university itself, but we know from news reports that most cases in Ohio occurred on campus  
170 during the first half of 2014 (9). The proximity in time to the Harvard outbreak and the differences  
171 in response detailed below make this a good dataset to compare to.

172

### 173 **2.2.2 Characteristics of the response**

174 We were unable to acquire data directly from OSU, and thus the exact timeline and range of  
175 interventions administered over this period are not known. We learned through online searches  
176 that advisories were published by the university, notifying students of the issue and how to prevent  
177 its spread. One notice published by OSU's medical center reads: "Stay at home for five days after  
178 symptoms (salivary gland swelling) begins (required by Ohio law OAC 3701-3-13, (P)); avoid  
179 school, work, social gatherings, and other public settings" (19). These advisories were distributed  
180 since March 2014 (20), and local news outlets also started reporting the outbreak earlier in the

181 month (21). It appears, however, that like most affected universities, OSU did not formally isolate  
182 infectious persons.



183  
184 **Figure 2:** Number of weekly mumps cases in Ohio (particularly Ohio State University) between  
185 January and November 2014. There were 528 cases during this time period, with most occurring  
186 between March and July. The dotted line in the last week of March indicates the intervention  
187 consisting in awareness campaign by OSU, as well as local and national news reports about the  
188 outbreak.

### 188 2.3 Epidemiological POMP model

189 The epidemiology of mumps can be captured by a Susceptible-Exposed-Infected-Removed (SEIR)  
190 compartmental model: after exposure, individuals go through a latent non-infectious period,  
191 followed by an infectious phase (22). Infectious individuals are removed from the transmission  
192 process either by recovery or isolation, after which they become immune. Compartmental models  
193 simplify the mathematical modeling of infectious diseases; however, they assume access to fully

194 observed disease data (see Suppl. materials). In reality, not all mumps cases are reported, and latent  
195 mumps carriers exhibit no symptoms at all. In order to address this issue, our approach integrates  
196 a standard SEIR model with a Partially Observed Markov Process (POMP) model (23). This allows  
197 us to combine the simplicity of compartmental models with a probabilistic framework for the  
198 underlying dynamics and the observed data. POMP models require the specification of a process  
199 model that describes stochastic transitions between the (unobserved) states of the system (in this  
200 case, the SEIR compartments), and a measurement model where the distribution of observed data  
201 (e.g.: confirmed cases) is expressed as a function of the unobserved states. The stochasticity  
202 introduced in the SEIR dynamics makes our model better suited to describe small populations,  
203 such as college campuses, where random fluctuations can be significant in relation to the size of  
204 the population. We describe the process and measurement models below.

205

### 206 **2.3.1 Process model**

207 The process model, defined as a stochastic SEIR model, provides the change in true incidence of  
208 mumps at every time point. We add parameters that induce random fluctuations into the population  
209 and change the compartments' rates of transfer in response to interventions. We do this by using  
210 probabilistic densities for the transition of state variables. Moreover, although disease dynamics  
211 are technically a continuous Markov process, this is computationally complex and inefficient to  
212 model, and so we make discretized approximations by updating the state variables after a time step,  
213  $\delta$ . Due to the varying granularity of the observed data (daily and weekly), we used two different  
214 time steps:  $\delta_H = 2.4 \text{ hours}$  for Harvard and  $\delta_O = 12 \text{ hours}$  for OSU. The system of discretized  
215 equations is shown in Equation 1, where  $B(t)$  is the number of susceptible individuals who

216 become exposed to mumps,  $C(t)$  is the number of newly infectious cases, and  $D(t)$  is the number  
 217 of cases that are removed from the population:

$$\begin{aligned}
 218 \quad & S(t + \delta) = S(t) - B(t) \\
 219 \quad & \\
 220 \quad & E(t + \delta) = E(t) + B(t) - C(t) \\
 221 \quad & \\
 222 \quad & I(t + \delta) = I(t) + C(t) - D(t) \quad (1) \\
 223 \quad & \\
 224 \quad & R(t + \delta) = R(t) + D(t) \\
 225 \quad & \\
 226 \quad & S(t) + E(t) + I(t) + R(t) = N \\
 227 \quad &
 \end{aligned}$$

228 Equation 1 describes how the sizes of the four compartments (susceptible, exposed,  
 229 infectious, and removed) change between  $(t, t + \delta)$ . The model further assumes that the  
 230 population size  $N$  remains constant at every time point. We added inherent randomness to our  
 231 model by setting  $B(t)$ ,  $C(t)$ , and  $D(t)$  as binomials. If we assume that the length of time an  
 232 individual spends in a compartment is exponentially distributed with some compartment-specific  
 233 rate  $x(t)$ , then the probability of remaining in that compartment for an additional day is  
 234  $\exp(-x(t))$  and the probability of leaving that compartment is  $1 - \exp(-x(t))$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 235 \quad & B(t) \sim \text{Bin}(S(t), 1 - \exp(-\lambda(t))), \text{ where } \lambda(t) = \beta(t) \frac{I(t)}{N} \\
 236 \quad & \\
 237 \quad & C(t) \sim \text{Bin}(E(t), 1 - \exp(-\sigma)) \quad (2) \\
 238 \quad & \\
 239 \quad & D(t) \sim \text{Bin}(I(t), 1 - \exp(-\gamma(t))) \\
 240 \quad &
 \end{aligned}$$

240 The force of infection,  $\lambda(t)$ , is the transition rate between the susceptible and exposed  
 241 classes at time  $t$ , and can be expressed as  $\beta(t) \frac{I(t)}{N}$ , where  $\beta(t)$  represents the transmission rate of  
 242 the disease. The removal rate between the infectious and removed compartments at time  $t$  is given  
 243 by  $\gamma(t)$ , and transition rate between the exposed and infectious classes is  $\sigma$ . Therefore,  $\gamma(t)^{-1}$   
 244 represents the mean length of time a person is infectious before being removed from the population  
 245 (either because of intervention efforts or natural recovery), while  $\sigma^{-1}$  represents the mean length

246 of time a person stays in the latent stage. With this notation, we are implicitly assuming that the  
247 transmission and removal rates could change over time due to interventions or changes in behavior,  
248 while the duration of the latent stage is constant and determined by the physiopathology of the  
249 disease. We will justify these assumptions for Harvard and OSU next, as well as provide explicit  
250 formulas for  $\beta(t)$  and  $\gamma(t)$ .

251 Leaving aside the unlikely possibility of change in pathogen's infectivity, the transmission  
252 rate  $\beta(t)$  essentially depends on the frequency of exposure events. In the case of Harvard, its  
253 nature as a residential campus would lead to significant decreases in student population, and  
254 therefore exposures, during school vacations. Exposure at OSU, a non-residential campus, is  
255 arguably less affected by vacation breaks. Another potential cause for reduction in exposures is  
256 awareness campaigns resulting in the adoption of preventive behaviors by students. Both Harvard  
257 and OSU adopted such campaigns, in the former, implemented as emails regularly sent out by  
258 HUHS recommending personal hygiene and testing in case of symptoms compatible with mumps;  
259 in the latter, in the form of advisories posted around campus and online, advising self-isolation to  
260 those students who presented symptoms. Furthermore, due to the scale of the mumps outbreak in  
261 Ohio, it received local and national news coverage, particularly in connection with OSU.  
262 Anecdotal evidence (i.e.: conversation with students) and, most importantly, the fact that HUHS  
263 emails were throughout the outbreak, make us conclude that emails were not particularly effective.  
264 On the other hand, news coverage in the case of OSU could have led to additional awareness by  
265 students and encouraged some to self-isolate. We argue that self-isolation results in lowering of  
266 transmission rate, not shortening of the removal time, because it is not perfect quarantine and  
267 people can still interact and become exposed, albeit at a lower frequency. Based on these known

268 facts and our interpretation of them, we propose the following transmission rate  $\beta_H(t)$  for the  
269 Harvard model:

$$\begin{aligned} 270 \quad \beta_H(t) &= p\beta_H, \quad t_0 \leq t \leq t_1 \text{ or } t \geq t_2 \\ 271 \quad &= \beta_H \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

272  
273 Here,  $t_0$  and  $t_1$  represent the starting and ending dates for the spring break (March 12-20 2016),  
274 and  $t_2$  the beginning of the summer recess (May 26 2016). The constant  $\beta_H$  is the baseline  
275 transmission rate during normal class term, and the parameter  $p$  is a number between 0 and 1 that  
276 accounts for the reduction of student population on campus during the school vacation. In the case  
277 of OSU, we propose:

$$\begin{aligned} 278 \quad \beta_o(t) &= w\beta_o, \quad t \geq \zeta \\ 279 \quad &= \beta_o \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

280  
281 In this equation,  $\beta_o$  the baseline transmission rate,  $w$  is a constant lower than 1, and  $\zeta$  the time  
282 when students began to self- quarantine. Based on publication of public health advisories and  
283 local news, we set this time as the last week of March 2014 (week 12). Since Harvard's  
284 quarantine was in effect through the entirety of the outbreak, we did not incorporate a similar  $w$   
285 coefficient to the corresponding  $\beta_H(t)$  equation for Harvard.

286 The removal rate  $\gamma(t)$  can also be affected by interventions and personal behaviors. We  
287 know that HUHS diagnosis protocol changed on day 61 of the outbreak at Harvard, resulting in a  
288 shorter average removal time since clinical presentation of symptoms alone was enough to result  
289 in strict isolation of suspected cases. Thus, we propose the following  $\gamma_H(t)$  for Harvard:

$$\begin{aligned} 290 \quad \gamma_H(t) &= q\gamma_H, \quad t \geq \tau \\ 291 \quad &= \gamma_H, \quad t < \tau \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

292 Here,  $q$  is a constant greater than 1 and  $\tau$  is the date when the new criteria was implemented (April  
293 15, 2014). The constant  $\gamma_H$  is the baseline removal rate reflecting the impact of the original  
294 diagnosis protocol. In the OSU model, on the other hand, we assume a constant recovery rate  $\gamma$

295 equal to the population average for mumps, since infected individuals self-isolate at home. This  
296 would not result in a strict quarantine but in a reduced contact rate with susceptible individuals,  
297 which is already modeled by a lower transmission rate in equation (4).

298 Finally, it is necessary to estimate the basic reproduction number,  $R_0$ , which equals the  
299 expected number of secondary cases produced by an infectious person in a completely susceptible  
300 population (22).  $R_0$  measures the initial growth rate of an outbreak and so, if it is less than 1, then  
301 the infection will die out and there will be no epidemic. For our stochastic SEIR model, this  
302 constant can be expressed as  $R_0 = \frac{\beta}{\gamma}$  (24). Meanwhile, the time-dependent effective reproduction  
303 number is defined as  $R_E(t) = \frac{\beta(t)}{\gamma(t)} * \frac{S(t)}{N}$ , but because  $S(t) \approx N$ , we can simplify this expression  
304 to  $R_E(t) \approx \frac{\beta(t)}{\gamma(t)}$ . Both the basic and effective reproduction numbers allow us to understand the  
305 strength of an outbreak.

306

### 307 **2.3.2 Measurement Model**

308 Although it is impossible to directly record the number of people that are susceptible, exposed,  
309 infectious, and removed directly, the MDPH and CDC data tells us the number of observed cases  
310 per day. The mean number of observed cases per day is the true number of cases multiplied by the  
311 reporting rate  $\rho$  ( $\rho < 1$ ). However, rather than simply denoting the observed number of cases as a  
312 binomial distribution, we account for greater variability in the measurements than a binomial  
313 distribution expects, since college populations are “small” (compared to cities and larger  
314 administrative units) and more affected by random fluctuations (25). Thus, the number of observed  
315 cases,  $y_t$ , given the number of true cases,  $C(t)$ , can be best modelled by an overdispersed binomial  
316 distribution defined as a discretized Normal random variable:



317 
$$y_t | C(t) \sim \text{Normal}(\rho C(t), \rho(1 - \rho)C(t) + (\psi\rho C(t))^2)$$

318  
319

320 The parameter  $\psi$  handles the increased variability in a small population. If  $\psi = 0$ , the  
321 variance in our measurement model simplifies to the variance for a binomial distribution.

322

### 323 **2.3.3 Final POMP Model**

324 The process and measurement models define our final POMP model. For each time point, the  
325 process model generates the number of new cases based on binomially distributed counts. The  
326 measurement model then estimates the observed number of cases based on the true number of  
327 cases and reporting rate. The free parameters in our POMP models for Harvard and OSU that need  
328 to be estimated from the data are the following: (i)  $\beta_H$  and  $\beta_O$ , baseline transmission rates, (ii)  $p$   
329 and  $w$ , decrease in transmission rate at Harvard and OSU due to vacation and self-isolation,  
330 respectively, (iii)  $\gamma_H$  baseline removal rate at Harvard (iv)  $q$ , increase in removal rate due to the  
331 updated HUHS diagnosis protocol, (v)  $\rho_H$  and  $\rho_O$ , case reporting rates, (vi)  $\psi_H$  and  $\psi_O$ ,  
332 overdispersion coefficient representing additional variability in the populations.

333

## 334 **2.3 Fixed parameters**

335 In addition to the free parameters to be estimated from the observed case data, our models also  
336 include a number of fixed parameters, shown in Table 1, whose values can be inferred directly  
337 from previous knowledge or available information. As mentioned earlier, we chose  $\tau = 61$  days  
338 and  $\zeta = 12$  weeks because those points in time at Harvard and OSU correspond to the introduction  
339 of the interventions that we hypothesized to be impactful in the dynamics of the respective  
340 outbreaks. Dates  $t_0$ ,  $t_1$ , and  $t_2$  for the spring and summer vacations at Harvard are available online

341 (26). We set the rate between the exposed and infectious classes and the recovery rate to  $\sigma = \frac{1}{17}$   
 342 and  $\gamma = \frac{1}{5}$ , respectively, since the average latent period and recovery time for mumps are known  
 343 to be  $\sigma^{-1} = 17$  days and  $\gamma^{-1} = 5$  days (5). Finally, we set the effective population size at Harvard  
 344  $N_H = 20,000 \times 0.53 = 10,600$  people based on records of Harvard’s enrollment and  
 345 employment, and Grad and Lewnard estimation of susceptibility to mumps among college-age  
 346 adults due to immunity waning (5). Similarly, we use an effective population for OSU given by  
 347  $N_O = 60,000 \times 0.53 = 31,800$ , leveraging the total enrollment for the 2013-2014 academic year  
 348 reported in OSU’s statistics website (27).  
 349

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Source</i>
$\tau$	Date of intervention at Harvard	61	day	Harvard records on interventions (14)
$t_0, t_1, t_2$	Vacation dates at Harvard, 2015-2016 academic year	26, 34, 100	day	Harvard archived academic calendar (26)
$\zeta$	Date of intervention at OSU	12	week	
$\sigma^{-1}$	Duration of mumps latent period	17	day	Lewnard and Grad (5)
$\gamma^{-1}$	Duration of mumps recovery period	5	day	Lewnard and Grad (5)
$N_H$	Effective population at Harvard	10,600	—	Harvard records on population size (15) and mumps susceptibility among college-aged individuals (5)
$N_O$	Effective population at OSU	31,800	—	OSU’s statistical summary (27) and mumps susceptibility among college-aged individuals (5)

350 **Table 1:** List of fixed parameters used in mumps transmission model for Harvard and OSU

351

## 352 **2.4 Maximum likelihood estimation of free parameters**

353 In order to obtain estimates of the free parameters in our models, we pick the parameter values that  
 354 maximize the log likelihood of the observed data given each model. Within the POMP framework,  
 355 we can perform fast maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) via Sequential Monte Carlo (SMC)  
 356 techniques (23). SMC allows us to calculate the likelihood of the data more efficiently by applying

357 the Markov property to generate paths in parameter space that sample the likelihood surface. We  
358 performed 100 searches from random parameter guesses, each converging to a unique value, and  
359 we then took the maximum over the 100 runs the final point estimates. We did this using the pomp  
360 package version 2.8 (28) for the R statistical software version 3.6.1 (29). In order to calculate the  
361 confidence intervals for each parameter, we selected the top decile from the set of parameters  
362 values obtained in the SMC runs, and applied the adjusted bootstrap percentile (BCa) method (30)  
363 with 10,000 bootstrap replicates using the function `boot.ci` in version 1.3.20 of package `boot` for R  
364 (31).

365

## 366 **2.5 Intervention analysis**

367 Finally, we performed an analysis of the parameters  $q$  and  $w$ , which respectively quantify the effect  
368 of what we consider to be the defining intervention at Harvard (aggressive diagnosis) occurring  
369 around day 61 of the outbreak, and the self-isolation awareness campaign at OSU during March  
370 2014. This could allow us to understand to what extent these interventions made a difference on  
371 the trajectory of the outbreak. First, we compared the scenario with the interventions versus a  
372 scenario without the interventions. Controlling for all other parameters, we run two sets of  
373 simulations at the MLEs, with 200 simulations each. The first set of simulations fixed  $q$  and  $w$  at  
374 the value obtained from MLE, while the second set of simulations set  $q$  and  $w$  to 1, assuming that  
375 no interventions occurred around day 61 at Harvard and by week 12 at OSU. We then compared  
376 the cumulative number of cases over time for these two sets of simulations, generating a 95%  
377 percentile range from all the simulations in each set. Second, we used this method to determine if  
378 administering the interventions earlier could have lowered the number of cases. For Harvard, we  
379 let the day of the intervention take on values between 1 and 60. Subsequently, we ran simulations

380 for each of these 60 cases, pulled the final outbreak size from the median simulation, and calculated  
381 the reduction in outbreak size. We applied the same procedure for OSU, in this case varying the  
382 day of intervention between 1 and 11 and calculating the corresponding final outbreak sizes.

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

### 397 3. RESULTS

#### 398 3.1 Optimal Parameters of Harvard and OSU Outbreaks

399 The MLEs of the parameters provide insight into the key characteristics of Harvard’s and OSU’s  
 400 outbreak. In general, we observe very good agreement between the observed cases and the  
 401 simulated outbreaks using the optimal parameters. The effective reproduction number also reflects  
 402 the effects of the interventions at Harvard and OSU in way that’s consistent with our initial  
 403 modeling assumptions. The bootstrap sampling method results in narrow 95% CIs.

##### 405 3.1.1 Maximum Likelihood Estimates for Harvard

406 The results are shown in Table 2. Notably, the baseline removal rate  $\gamma_H$  is quite high, indicating  
 407 that the initial diagnosis protocol was quite effective at identifying and removing infected students  
 408 from the population, but it was further increased after day 61. The reporting rate  $\rho_H$  is also  
 409 remarkably high, which suggests that HUHS was able to identify most of the cases circulating at  
 410 Harvard.

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Point estimate</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Source</i>
$\beta_H$	Baseline transmission rate	1.39	(1.35, 1.49)	day <sup>-1</sup>	MLE
$\gamma_H$	Baseline removal rate	0.85	(0.86, 0.93)	day <sup>-1</sup>	MLE
$p$	Decrease in infection due to vacation	0.11	(0.06, 0.13)		MLE
$q$	Increase in removal rate	2.8	(2.16, 2.56)	—	MLE
$\rho_H$	Proportion of infections reported	0.97	(0.93, 0.97)	—	MLE
$\psi_H$	Overdispersion parameter	0.54	(0.5, 0.56)	—	MLE
$R_E(t)$	Effective reproduction number	1.63 normal term 0.18 during vacation 0.58 after intervention	—	—	Calculated as $\frac{\beta(t)}{\gamma(t)}$

411 **Table 2:** List of parameters in the Harvard model that were obtained by MLE or calculated  
 412 using the estimated parameters.

413 We ran stochastic simulations of Harvard’s outbreak using the parameter values from Table  
 414 2. Figure 3 shows consistent results across simulations: shortly after day 61 (the time of the primary  
 415 intervention), we consistently see a decrease in the number of observed cases. The variability in  
 416 the simulations can partly be attributed to the randomness in the stochastic model as well as the  
 417 over-dispersion parameter. Variability can also be explained by the MLE of the basic reproduction  
 418 number being below 2, which together with the stochasticity built into the simulations, can result  
 419 in absence of outbreak, such as in simulation 8, or much smaller outbreaks like in 5, 7, and 9.

420


### 421 3.1.2 Maximum Likelihood Estimates for OSU

422 The MLEs of the parameters for the OSU model, as well as derived quantities, are shown in Table  
 423 3. Here we can see an initial reproductive number of almost 6, much higher than Harvard’s.  
 424 However, it eventually becomes lower than 1, which supports our modeling assumptions of an  
 425 awareness campaign from OSU, perhaps helped by news reporting about the outbreak, that lead to  
 426 effective self-isolation of individuals.

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Point estimate</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Source</i>
$\beta_O$	Transmission rate constant	1.19	(1.19, 1.2)	day <sup>-1</sup>	MLE
$w$	Decrease in infection due to self-isolation	0.16	(0.158, 1.162)	—	MLE
$\rho_O$	Proportion of infections reported	0.03	(0.029, 0.03)	—	MLE
$\psi_O$	Overdispersion parameter	0.38	(0.374, 0.381)	—	MLE
$R_E(t)$	Effective reproduction number	5.95 initial 0.95 after advisory		—	Calculated as $\frac{\beta(t)}{\gamma(t)}$

427 **Table 3:** List of parameters in the OSU model that obtained by MLE or calculated using  
 428 the estimated parameters.

429 As with Harvard, we run stochastic simulations of OSU’s outbreak using the parameter values  
 430 from Table 3. The simulated outbreaks are shown in Figure 4, and they replicate the real curve  
 431 with some random variation due to the stochastic nature of the model.




432

433

**Figure 3:** Nine simulations of the final Harvard model evaluated at the maximum likelihood estimates. Comparisons to the actual data show that many of the simulations (particularly Simulation 1, 2, 3, and 6) have similar patterns that mirror the shape curve for the observed data.

434



435

**Figure 8:** Nine simulations of the final OSU model evaluated at the maximum likelihood estimates. All of them follow the observed data quite closely.

436

### 437 **3.2 Earlier intervention decreases outbreak size at Harvard and OSU**

438 The results from the intervention analysis for Harvard and OSU is depicted in Figure 5. By the  
439 final day of the Harvard outbreak (day 130), the simulations without the intervention on day 61  
440 yielded outbreak sizes that were up to four times the size of the actual outbreak (Figure 5A). These  
441 results also indicate that the outbreak would have lasted much longer, if not for these vigilance-  
442 increasing strategies. By varying the day of the intervention from 1 to 61, we also obtained a linear  
443 regression between day of intervention and reduction of the outbreak (Figure 5C). The fitness of  
444 the regression is very high ( $R^2=0.96$ ,  $P<10^{-9}$ ), and quick inspection of the plot reveals that if the  
445 new diagnosis protocol had been implemented within the first 10 days of the outbreak, then no  
446 more than 50 students would have been infected in total at Harvard.

447 For OSU we observe similar trends. Lack of intervention on week 12 could have resulted  
448 in an outbreak twice as large (Figure 5B). The outbreak size as a function of the intervention week  
449 also shows a strong dependency, but in this case non-linear and best fit with a sigmoid function of  
450 the form  $1/(1+e^{\text{week}-12})$ . Using this transformation, the fit is also very high ( $R^2=0.63$ ,  $P<0.005$ ), and  
451 we can conclude that intervening earlier would have had a major effect as well: if the awareness  
452 campaigns prompting students to self-isolate had started around week 5 or 6 (rather than week 12),  
453 then it appears likely that the outbreak would have been eradicated.

454


455

456

457

458





459

460

461

462

**Figure 5:** Panels A and B show the comparison of the cumulative number of cases over time for the observed Harvard and OSU data and the range of cases (95% percentile of the runs) in simulations with and without interventions, with dotted lines representing the timing of the interventions in each school (panels A and B). In panels C and D, the plots show the percentage we expect outbreak size to decrease by if the date of intervention had been moved up. There is a significant linear relationship between the time and percentage reduction in the case of Harvard, as well as a significant relationship after doing a sigmoid transformation of the time variable in the case of OSU.

## 463 **4. DISCUSSION**

### 464 **4.1 Parameter interpretation**

465 The MLEs give us insight into characteristics of the mumps outbreaks at Harvard University in  
466 2016 and Ohio State University in 2014, as measured by their effective reproduction numbers  $R_E$ ,  
467 intervention parameters  $q$  and  $w$ , rates of removal  $\gamma$ , reporting rates  $\rho$ , and overdispersion  
468 parameters  $\psi$ . At Harvard,  $R_E$  during normal class term was 1.63, which indicates that the  
469 outbreak was growing, even though testing and isolation by HUHS resulted in a baseline removal  
470 time of only  $\frac{1}{0.85} = 1.2$  days. This points to the effectiveness of the quarantine system  
471 implemented by HUHS. However, a small fraction of false negative cases still managed to escape  
472 quarantine and keep the virus under circulation, as indicated by the reproduction number being  
473 higher than 1. The reproduction number goes below 1 during the spring break, which is reasonable  
474 given that most students are away given the residential nature of the Harvard campus. However,  
475 transmission resumes after the break. It is only after the implementation of the new diagnosis  
476 protocol on day 61, which required isolation if clinical symptoms were present, that had a dramatic  
477 effect on the detection and isolation of positive cases, effectively taking the removal time to less  
478 than 1 day and the reproductive number below 0.6. Thanks to this key intervention, it was possible  
479 to end the outbreak before the beginning of the summer recess.

480 The estimate of  $\rho$  is 0.96, which implies the reporting rate at Harvard was remarkable.  
481 Reasons include the email awareness campaign, a community network – from resident deans to  
482 athletic coaches – reporting students and employees who seemed at-risk, and more aggressive  
483 diagnoses, particularly towards the end of the outbreak. The estimate for  $\psi$  is 0.54, suggesting that  
484 the actual data has more variability than expected under the assumed distribution. If  $\psi$  had been

485 approximately 0, the variance in our measurement model would have simplified to the variance  
486 for a binomial distribution. However, because the 95% confidence interval is (0.5, 0.56) and thus  
487 does not include 0, we justify the modelling decision of representing the number of cases as an  
488 over-dispersed binomial. Demographic and environmental stochasticity (e.g.: a student in the  
489 midst of midterm season may be less likely to report symptoms), as well as the interventions  
490 themselves (e.g.: reporting may increase temporarily after an awareness email) can result in over-  
491 dispersion in the number of reported cases.

492         In the case of OSU, we obtain a much higher reproduction number at the beginning of the  
493 outbreak, near 6, and a very low reporting rate of 3%. Before discussing these results any further,  
494 it is important to keep in mind that we extrapolated OSU cases from state-level reports by the CDC.  
495 Furthermore, we did not have direct access to information about the containment interventions  
496 adopted by the school, as we did for Harvard, so we were only able to make educated guesses  
497 about those possible interventions based on information we found on the web. However, the  
498 internal consistency of the resulting model and the good agreement with the available data, gives  
499 some weight to these results. Within our OSU model, we see that the assumed self-isolation of  
500 students motivated by the advisories posted by OSU had the intended effect of stopping the  
501 outbreak. The effective reproduction number dips below 1 after March, which is when the  
502 awareness campaign appeared to have started, and also when the outbreak gained local and  
503 national prominence due to news reporting. The low reporting rate is closer to population-wide  
504 estimates of this parameter (5), and is also compatible with a large, non-residential campus where  
505 it is harder to reach out to students as they live scattered around the city. A consequence of this  
506 number is that the outbreak should have been 30 times larger than observed. Since the observed  
507 case count is approximately 500, it follows that the total number of cases could have reached

508 15,000 individuals, which is still possible given that the number of susceptible within the school's  
509 student population is over 30,000. This is still a very significant number, and it is possible that a  
510 large majority of these potential 15,000 cases only had mild symptoms. Furthermore, the modeling  
511 approximation of closed SEIR compartments is probably less accurate for OSU given its non-  
512 residential nature: students there have more opportunity to interact with individuals outside of their  
513 school, resulting in additional transmissions that are not captured by our model, and thus affecting  
514 the interpretation of parameters such as the reporting rate.

515

## 516 **4.2 Effect of strict isolation policy vs self-isolation**

517 Arguably the most critical intervention by HUHS was the isolation requirement for confirmed and  
518 probable mumps cases. By comparing the Harvard and OSU outbreaks, we conclude that the  
519 isolation policy led to a smaller average infectious period for Harvard patients. The MLEs for  
520 Harvard and OSU are different for several parameters, most notably basic reproduction number,  
521 reporting rate, and rate of transition from the infectious to removed class. Firstly, OSU's basic  
522 reproduction number is over four times that of Harvard. Harvard's isolation policy best explains  
523 this difference because it physically prevented infectious persons from causing multiple secondary  
524 infections, thus suppressing the growth of the outbreak. Secondly, OSU's reporting rate is  
525 extremely low, at approximately 3% compared to Harvard's 96%. We do not have access to OSU's  
526 diagnostic procedures nor do we know the extent of their email awareness campaign, but we  
527 hypothesize that a lack of one or both of these may explain at least a portion of the dissimilarity in  
528 the two schools' reporting rates. However, the reduction in OSU's transmission rate we observe  
529 in our model post-intervention is still very significant at 94%, and would have been a major  
530 contributor to help containing the outbreak there. This suggests that compliance with easy-to-

531 implement measures such as self-isolation could go a long way towards outbreak mitigation. Of  
532 course, high compliance is contingent on good educational and awareness campaigns by the health  
533 authorities.

534

### 535 **4.3 Implications of intervention analysis**

536 With the benefit of our intervention analysis, we conclude that aggressive diagnoses decreased the  
537 size of the Harvard outbreak by approximately three-fourths. Furthermore, for every day of  
538 intervention delay, we estimate that the outbreak size would have increased by 1.6 percentage  
539 points, extrapolating the regression line in Figure 5C. Likewise, self-isolation prompted by health  
540 advisories posted by the university reduced the size of the OSU outbreak by half. Given the non-  
541 linear dependency between change in outbreak size and timing of intervention (Figure 5D), the  
542 increase would have been even larger in that outbreak. Interestingly, this dependency also implies  
543 that self-isolation in the first weeks of the outbreak can be enough to completely stop spread.

544       Clearly, a limitation of this analysis is the assumption that everything remains the same  
545 while changing the time of the intervention under consideration. In reality, other factors might  
546 come into play if the outbreak becomes larger or smaller, which in turn could affect the dynamics  
547 of the outbreak as well as the interventions themselves. However, this analysis still provides a  
548 useful hypothetical quantification of the effect of accelerating or delaying interventions designed  
549 to contain the spread of an outbreak and here, as expected, the sooner the interventions are  
550 introduced, the better the outcomes in terms of outbreak size. Of course, existing constraints in the  
551 school's health system could impede fast interventions. In such situations, our method can be

552 useful to perform a cost-benefit analysis of how late an intervention could be made to still have a  
553 significant reduction in the health burden caused by the disease.

554

#### 555 **4.4 Conclusions**

556 We constructed and parametrized a POMP model for the transmission of mumps on college  
557 campuses. Unlike other models of infectious disease, which opt for deterministic representations,  
558 our stochastic model is adaptable to small populations and accounts for the noisiness and  
559 incompleteness of case data. Moreover, it incorporates parameters that measures the effect of  
560 interventions implemented after a given point in time. Given the worldwide crisis caused by the  
561 COVID-19 pandemic, such models can be useful to quickly evaluate interventions designed to  
562 contain the spread of SARS-CoV-2 once schools reopen in the U.S. and around the world.

563 We compared an outbreak at Harvard University, with its various intervention strategies,  
564 to another university outbreak of comparable reported cases at OSU. Importantly, while most  
565 literature today focuses on mumps prevention – such as administering third MMR doses to college-  
566 age students – this paper provides quantitative backing for more immediate and less costly  
567 approaches to mitigating the spread of mumps and other infectious diseases, most notably COVID-  
568 19, for which there is no vaccine yet available. In particular, requiring strict isolation if any  
569 symptoms of the disease are presented would significantly reduce transmission and ultimately the  
570 size of the outbreak. Effective awareness campaigns that lead to self-isolation of infected  
571 individuals with mild symptoms can also have a significant effect in containing the spread of  
572 disease and limiting the risk for vulnerable populations.

573

#### 574 **4.4 Limitations**

575 Some of our conclusions are likely affected by confounding factors that we cannot control for in  
576 this analysis. For example, the outbreak at Harvard started to subside in late April, not long before  
577 students finish the semester and leave campus, which would decrease the number of potential  
578 infections. The most promising method to determine the exact effect of isolation strategies is  
579 through a randomized control trial. Regarding the differences between OSU and Harvard  
580 parameters, we must be cautious in taking the OSU estimates at face value. Given that the OSU  
581 data consists of weekly reports rather than daily reports of cases, we should expect the estimates  
582 for the parameters to be less accurate. Furthermore, the cases are not solely linked to the university.  
583 Numerous cases in the data occurred in the greater Columbus area, suggesting that the parameter  
584 estimates do not only account for the dynamics of mumps on campus. Lastly, major differences in  
585 housing and campus characteristics could have also contributed to differences between the two  
586 schools; for instance, OSU's population size is three times that of Harvard, and OSU has larger  
587 dorms than Harvard's houses. Interventions used at Harvard simply may not have worked as well  
588 at OSU. We were fortunate to have direct access to school administrators who were involved in  
589 the response to the 2016 outbreak to discuss HUHS interventions in detail, but we were not able  
590 to get the same level of detail for OSU's interventions, as discussed in the main text. More broadly,  
591 lack of publicly available datasets, with the exception of CDC reports on OSU's outbreak, is a  
592 serious impediment to perform these analyses. Therefore, it will be essential that universities  
593 across the US and globe actively share data for comparative analysis, to identify the best  
594 intervention strategies to protect college campuses from outbreaks, especially in the post-COVID-  
595 19 world.

596

597 **Competing Interests:** We declare no competing interests.

598 **Source Code:** Available at <https://github.com/broadinstitute/mumps-pomp-models>

599 **Author's Contributions:** MS participated in the design of the study, carried out the data analysis,  
600 developed the epidemiological models, generated the conclusions, and drafted the manuscript; GF  
601 developed the epidemiological models, and generated the conclusions; AC conceived of the study,  
602 participated in the design of the study, coordinated the study, and helped draft the manuscript; SF  
603 and PJB provided data on the HUHS interventions and reviewed the final draft of the manuscript;  
604 PCS overviewed the study and reviewed the final draft of the manuscript. All authors gave final  
605 approval for publication.

606 **Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to thank Jonathan Grad and Joseph Lewnard for  
607 providing feedback on the study design, Hayden Metsky for reviewing the manuscript, members  
608 of MDPH for providing access to the Harvard data, and Bridget Chak and Shirlee Wohl for guiding  
609 in the interpretation of the data.

610 **Ethics:** Usage of Harvard University data for development of the SEIR model was approved by  
611 the Massachusetts Department of Public Health (MDPH) through protocol 906066. Harvard  
612 University Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Broad Institute ceded review of secondary analysis  
613 to the MDPH IRB through institutional authorization agreements. The MDPH IRB waived  
614 informed consent given this research met the requirements pursuant to 45 CFR 46.116 (d). Data  
615 from Ohio State University was obtained from the CDC's Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report  
616 2014. The Broad Institute has determined usage of this data constitutes non-human subjects  
617 research.

618 **Funding:** Howard Hughes Medical Institute, US National Institutes of Health.



## REFERENCES

- 619 1. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on education Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia2020  
620 [updated 30 May 2020. Available from: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impact\\_of\\_the\\_COVID-](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impact_of_the_COVID-19_pandemic_on_education)  
621 [19\\_pandemic\\_on\\_education](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impact_of_the_COVID-19_pandemic_on_education).
- 622 2. Rosenberg JS. Will Harvard's Campus Reopen for Fall? Harvard Magazine. 2020.
- 623 3. Costill D. College campus outbreaks require timely public health response. Healio  
624 [Available from: <https://goo.gl/aW7GaT>.
- 625 4. Hurtado C. The Rise of Mumps in the United States Outbreak Observatory [Available from:  
626 <https://www.outbreakobservatory.org/outbreakthursday-1/12/7/2017/the-rise-of-mumps-in-the->  
627 [united-states](https://www.outbreakobservatory.org/outbreakthursday-1/12/7/2017/the-rise-of-mumps-in-the-).
- 628 5. Lewnard JA, Grad YH. Vaccine waning and mumps re-emergence in the United States.  
629 Science Translational Medicine. 2018;10(433).
- 630 6. Nishiura H, Kobayashi T, Miyama T, Suzuki A, Jung S-m, Hayashi K, et al. Estimation of  
631 the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus infections (COVID-19). International Journal of  
632 Infectious Diseases. 2020;94:154-5.
- 633 7. Shah M, Quinlisk P, Weigel A, Riley J, James L, Patterson J, et al. Mumps Outbreak in a  
634 Highly Vaccinated University-Affiliated Setting Before and After a Measles-Mumps-Rubella  
635 Vaccination Campaign—Iowa, July 2015–May 2016. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2018;66(1):81-  
636 8.
- 637 8. Golwalkar M, Pope B, Stauffer J, Snively A, Clemmons N. Mumps Outbreaks at Four  
638 Universities - Indiana, 2016. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2018;67(29):793-7.
- 639 9. Bixler J, Botelho G. Over 360 cases of mumps in central Ohio, most of them tied to OSU.  
640 CNN [Available from: <https://www.cnn.com/2014/05/16/health/ohio-mumps/index.html>.
- 641 10. Mumps Cases and Outbreaks Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [Available from:  
642 <https://www.cdc.gov/mumps/outbreaks.html>.
- 643 11. Isolation Expenses (2016-2017). Harvard University Health Services; 2017.
- 644 12. Stocks T, Britton T, Höhle M. Model selection and parameter estimation for dynamic  
645 epidemic models via iterated filtering: application to rotavirus in Germany. Biostatistics. 2018.
- 646 13. Barreira P, Fitzgerald S. Personal communication. 2018.
- 647 14. Correspondence regarding Mumps 2016, Spring to Summer. Harvard University Health  
648 Services.
- 649 15. Mumps List for CDC. Harvard University Health Services.
- 650 16. Massachusetts Mumps Case Data between 2015 and 2017. Massachusetts Department of  
651 Public Health.
- 652 17. Bitsko RH, Cortese MM, Dayan GH, Rota PA, Lowe L, Iversen SC, et al. Detection of  
653 RNA of mumps virus during an outbreak in a population with a high level of measles, mumps, and  
654 rubella vaccine coverage. J Clin Microbiol. 2008;46(3):1101-3.
- 655 18. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2014.
- 656 19. Mumps Outbreak FAQs: The Ohio State University; [Available from:  
657 <https://www.osu.edu/assets/mumps/faqs.pdf>.
- 658 20. The Ohio State University Mumps Outbreak FAQs Columbus Public Health; 2014  
659 [Available from: [http://www.ccchd.com/documents/contentdocuments/doc\\_23\\_5\\_516.pdf](http://www.ccchd.com/documents/contentdocuments/doc_23_5_516.pdf).

- 660 21. Zeltner B. Mumps outbreak at Ohio State: Five things you need to know  
661 cleveland.com2014 [updated January 12 2019. Available from:  
662 [https://www.cleveland.com/healthfit/2014/03/mumps\\_outbreak\\_at\\_ohio\\_state\\_f.html](https://www.cleveland.com/healthfit/2014/03/mumps_outbreak_at_ohio_state_f.html).  
663 22. Martcheva M. An Introduction to Mathematical Epidemiology: Springer; 2015.  
664 23. King AA, Nguyen D, Ionides EL. Statistical Inference for Partially Observed Markov  
665 Processes via the R Package pomp. Journal of Statistical Software. 2016;69(12):43.  
666 24. Brauer F, Van den Driessche P, Wu J. Mathematical epidemiology: Springer; 2008.  
667 25. He D, Ionides EL, King AA. Plug-and-play inference for disease dynamics: measles in  
668 large and small populations as a case study. Journal of The Royal Society Interface.  
669 2010;7(43):271-83.  
670 26. Academic Calendar: 2015-16: Harvard Law School; 2015 [Available from:  
671 <https://hls.harvard.edu/dept/academics/academic-calendar/academic-calendar-2015-16/>.  
672 27. The Ohio State University - Statistical Summary: The Ohio State University; 2013  
673 [Available from: <https://www.osu.edu/osutoday/stuinfo13.php>.  
674 28. King AA, Ionides EL, Bretó MC, Ellner SP, Ferrari MJ, Kendall BE, et al. pomp: Statistical  
675 Inference for Partially Observed Markov Processes. 2020.  
676 29. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. 2019.  
677 30. Davison AC, Hinkley DV. Bootstrap Methods and Their Applications: Cambridge  
678 University Press; 1997.  
679 31. Canty A, Ripley BD. boot: Bootstrap R (S-Plus) Functions. 2017.