medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

The cost-effectiveness of common strategies for the prevention of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in universities.

Authors

1. Zafar Zafari, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor

University of Maryland School of Pharmacy

2. Lee Goldman, MD, MPH

Professor of Medicine, Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons

Professor of Epidemiology, Mailman School of Public Health

Columbia University Irving Medical Center

3. Katia Kovrizhkin

katia.kovrizhkin@gmail.com

Research Assistant

Mailman School of Public Health

4. Peter Muennig, MD, MPH (Corresponding author)

Professor of Health Policy, Mailman School of Public Health

Columbia University

ARB 4th Floor

722 West 168th St.

New York, NY 10032

Pm124@columbia.edu

347-533-3415

Word count: 2,607 body; 242 Abstract

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Importance. The added value of interventions to prevent the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 among university affiliates is uncertain but critically needed as universities attempt to re-open.

Objective. To conduct a cost-effectiveness analysis of the 7 most common prevention strategies used by universities.

Design, Setting, and Participants. We use a Markov model with Monte Carlo simulations to examine the cost-effectiveness of interventions to reduce SARS-CoV-2 transmission within universities. All interventions are compared relative to implementing the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines alone. We also provide an online interface that allows users to change model parameters.

Main Outcome Measures. The number of days that the university can remain open and the incremental cost per incremental quality-adjusted life year (QALY) gained.

Results. At prevalence rate of actively infectious cases of COVID-19 in the community surrounding the university of 0.1%, using a symptom-checking mobile application is cost-saving relative to CDC guidelines alone. At a prevalence of 1%, providing high quality, 2-ply masks will be cost-saving. At a prevalence rate of 2%, thermal imaging cameras cost $965,070 (95% credible interval [CrI] = $198,821, $2.15 million)/QALY gained. One-time testing on entry costs $1.08 million (95% CrI = $170,703, $3.33 million)/QALY gained. Weekly testing costs $820,119 (95% CrI = $452,673, $1.68 million)/QALY gained. Upgrades to ventilation systems or installation of far-ultraviolet C lighting systems will be cost-effective at a willingness-to-pay threshold of $200,000/QALY gained if aerosols account for 86-90% of all on-campus transmission of SARS-CoV-2. As the prevalence rate increase, the time the university can expect to remain open drops from 90 days to 18.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

Conclusions and Relevance. The value of interventions to prevent transmission of SARS-CoV-2 vary greatly with the prevalence rate of actively infectious cases of COVID-19 in the community surrounding the university.

Key Words: Economic Evaluation; COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; Re-Opening Strategies

Introduction

In March of 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic led to the temporary closure of 4,234 universities and colleges in the U.S. alone, affecting over 25 million students.[1] As of August 1, 2020, 85% of U.S. universities and colleges are planning either to teach in person or to implement a hybrid model of online and in-person learning for the Fall 2020 semester.[2-4] Re-opening protocols for universities are largely based on a core set of principles set by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC),[5] including social distancing, facial coverings, an emphasis on handwashing, and enhanced cleaning procedures.[5] The CDC indicates that testing university affiliates upon entry has not been systematically studied and does not recommend this approach.[5] Many additional screening and preventive measures are available, but the value of implementing them has not been assessed.[1,6] To address such uncertainties, we developed the Columbia Covid-19 Model.[7]

Methods

Overview

The Columbia Covid-19 Model is a "Markov" model with a Monte Carlo simulation, in which a cohort of students and a cohort of staff/faculty cycle daily through a 91-day semester.[7] As each day passes, we calculate the risk of an event (e.g., an infection,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

hospitalization, or death) based on the prevalence of actively infectious cases of COVID-19 in the community where a university is situated.

Given the considerable uncertainty about the effectiveness of preventive measures, the rapidity with which new information is generated, and the variation in local university characteristics our model allows users to alter key assumptions (**Table 1**) and inputs (**Table 2**) using an online interface.[7] The user may also define his or her own intervention in the online model. For the present analysis, we used Columbia University as a case study because we have extensive information on the socio-demographic characteristics of university affiliates, novel survey data, and cost data on an array of preventive investments. Our model adopts a societal perspective that allows for comparisons across cost-effectiveness analyses using the Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards guidelines.[8]

Interventions

We compared CDC guidelines (social distancing, protective measures, and maintaining a healthy environment) to a "do nothing" status quo.[9] We then compared the CDC guidelines with a requirement that all university affiliates self-report COVD-19-associated symptoms. Third, we assessed a policy that universities provide 2-ply masks that may be of higher quality than affiliates would normally purchase.[13,14] Fourth, we assessed temperature monitoring cameras at facility entry points[11,12] to prevent entry of people with a fever. Fifth, we assessed one-time entry ("gateway") testing for SARS-CoV-2 for all affiliates.[10] Sixth, we assessed weekly testing for SARS-CoV-2. Finally, we conducted one-way sensitivity analyses on methods to remove particulate aerosols (ventilation

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

systems with minimum efficiency reporting value [MERV]-13 filters or far-ultraviolet C [far-UVC] light).[11]

Outcome measures

We examined: 1) the incremental cost of each intervention after accounting for medical and intangible costs (e.g., in-person versus online classes); 2) the incremental quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) gained,[8,12] where a QALY is the product of the number of years of life remaining in a cohort and the health-related quality of life, scaled between zero (death) and 1.0 (perfect health); and 3) the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER, changes in costs divided by the changes in QALYs).

Model

Our model was built on the R statistical platform (The R Foundation, Inc). We deployed R-Shiny upon R, an interface that allows users to alter model parameters.[7] The foundation for the model is the prevalence of actively infectious cases in the surrounding community, defined as the number of people infected within the past 7 days[13] per 100,000 people after correcting for underreporting.[14]

The model then runs for 91 days, with infected individuals undergoing three consecutive phases of disease progression, the times between: 1) primary exposure and infectiousness; 2) infectiousness and onset of symptoms (if any); and 3) symptom onset until the end of infectiousness. Infected affiliates incur risk-adjusted costs and lost QALYs associated with having and treating Covid-19 infection.[15] Lost productivity and leisure time were valued at the average American wage.[16] Intangible costs associated with online versus in-person instruction were valued using a survey administered to students who had

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

experienced learning in each format. Risk tolerance was assessed using a standard gamble exercise (see Online Appendix).

Staff/faculty and students are treated as two separate but interacting populations with different baseline ages, average number of close contacts, exposures, and risks of illness, hospitalization, and death due to Covid-19.[17] We obtained data from Columbia University on the age of each student, staff, and faculty member. Age-specific risks of hospitalization and death were obtained from the literature and from the CDC.[18,19] The model accounts for variations in adherence to mask use and self-quarantine.

We assessed two types of risk reduction: the removal of infected affiliates from the university community via screening and a reduction in SARS-CoV-2 transmission while on campus. Since infected individuals can be symptomatic (detectable) or persistently asymptomatic (not detectable),[20-23] we created six interacting "bins:" students, staff/faculty, on campus exposures, off campus exposures, symptomatic cases, and asymptomatic cases.

If a case is detected, areas where the student has attended classes, studied, or slept are temporarily closed, and close contacts are isolated. If: 1) the model reaches a total of 500 cases of COVID-19; or 2) a super-spreader episode (defined as 5 or more university affiliates from a given campus infected on a single day) occurs, instruction is switched to online-only learning for the remainder of the semester.

See the Online Appendix for additional methods, formulas, and outcome measures.[7]

Analyses

We ran Monte Carlo simulations on all variables simultaneously and 1-way sensitivity analyses on variables that produced larger changes in outcomes. We assessed 3

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

scenarios of the prevalence of actively infectious cases of COVID-19 in July, 2020: New York City, "low prevalence" (roughly 0.1%); Texas, "moderate prevalence" (1%); and Florida, "high prevalence" (2%).[14] Results are reported as mean and a 95% "credible interval" based upon a random sampling of values from multiple distributions (see **Table 2**).

Results

No guidelines in place

At a 0.1% prevalence of actively infectious cases (similar to New York City in July, 2020[24]), roughly 350 university affiliates would contract COVID-19 infections over the 91-day semester if the university were opened with no CDC guidelines in place ("status quo"). However, if the prevalence of actively infectious cases were 1% (Texas in July, 2020) or 2% (Florida in July, 2020), these numbers would rise to 2420 and 4340 infections, respectively.

CDC guidelines in place

At a community prevalence of 0.1%, implementing CDC recommendations would reduce the number of infections to roughly 230, and the university would remain open the entire semester at a cost of $2.93 million/QALY gained (95% CrI = $1.23 million/QALY gained, 11.89 million/QALY gained).

At a community prevalence of 1%, implementing the CDC guidelines would likely be cost-saving (**Table 3**), but the "status quo" projections of infections would never be reached because the university would have to shut down after 36 days (95% CrI = 26, 29 days). At a prevalence of 2%, implementing CDC guidelines is less favorable than at a 1% prevalence ($65,657/QALY gained; 95% CrI = savings, $2.30 million/QALY gained) because the university would likely close after 18 days (95% CrI = 13-25 days).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

0.1% prevalence. At a 0.1% community prevalence rate of active infectious cases, a symptom-checking application would be cost-saving and produce 0.02 QALYs gained (95% CrI = 0.01 QALYs gained-0.04 QALYs gained) relative to implementing the CDC guidelines alone (**Table 3**). University-provided 2-ply masks, temperature monitoring cameras, gateway testing, and weekly testing would each cost >$1 million dollars/QALY gained relative to CDC recommendations (**Table 3**). For example, weekly testing would cost $60.70 million (95% CrI = $37.5 million, $104.5 million)/QALY gained.

1% prevalence. At a 1% community prevalence rate of infectious cases, university-provided masks would likely become cost-saving (95% CrI = cost saving, $1.74 million/QALY gained), but, all other interventions would cost >$1.9 million dollars/QALY gained.

2% prevalence. At a 2% community prevalence rate of infectious cases, thermal imaging cameras cost $965,070 (95% CrI = $198,82, $2.15 million)/QALY gained. Gateway testing would cost $1.08 million (95% CrI = $170,703, $3.33 million)/QALY gained, and weekly testing would cost $820,119 (95% CrI = $452,673, $1.68 million)/QALY gained.

Sensitivity analyses. At prevalence rates of 0.3% or higher, early university closure is possible. Therefore, the perceived value of in-person instruction becomes an important variable. If students are willing to pay 12% of the regular tuition (rather than our baseline estimate of 48%) for online classes, gateway testing becomes cost-effective at a willingness-to-pay threshold of $200,000/QALY gained. At this prevalence rate, university-provided 2-ply masks and implementing the CDC guidelines become cost-saving.

Weekly testing is sensitive both to the number of close contacts per student on campus and the transmission rate. However, even as the number of close contacts per student increases, the value is unlikely to reach the willingness-to-pay threshold of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

$200,000/QALY gained at a prevalence of 0.1% (see Online Appendix). When the prevalence rate reaches 2%, however, weekly testing is a strategy that is cost-saving when the number of contacts or the transmission rate is higher than those we use in the baseline scenario (**Figure 1**).

At a willingness-to-pay threshold of $200,000/QALY gained and a prevalence ranges of 0.3-0.5%, MERV-13 ventilation upgrades could be cost-effective, but only if fine aerosol transmission accounts for >90% of all campus COVID-19 transmission. For far-UVC lighting, the threshold for fine aerosol transmission is >86%. As the proportion of students wearing masks on campus declines, the ICER of both of these systems becomes more favorable.

Including or excluding faculty and staff over age 70 years had no substantial impact under any scenario because of their relatively small numbers. Across all prevalence rates, increasing the chance of a super-spreader event reduced the cost-effectiveness of interventions because such events lead to early closure of the campus. Additional sensitivity analyses are available in the Online Appendix.

Discussion

Our model shows that the value of most of the interventions is dependent on the prevalence of actively infectious cases of COVID-19 in the community surrounding the university. When case rates in the surrounding community are low (e.g., as in New York in July, 2020) the most value will be realized from simply implementing the CDC recommendations and using a symptom checking application.

While a QALY is typically valued at $100,000-$200,000, larger values are placed on nuclear or aviation regulations—over $1 million/QALY gained—because of the higher

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

perceived threat amongst the public.[25-27] COVID-19 may merit higher investments because of larger perceived threat of the pandemic. Nevertheless, we find that the interventions that we study fall into this high range of willingness-to-pay values only when the prevalence of actively infectious cases reaches 2%.

A recent study by Paltiel and colleagues recommended testing for SARS-CoV-2 when the prevalence is 0.2%.[28] We find that gateway or weekly testing would be costly at this prevalence rate. These different conclusions can be attributed to differences in our: 1) infection fatality rate, 2) risk of transmission on campus, 3) the number of close contacts/student, and 4) outcome measure (we used cost/QALY gained as an outcome measure while they used cost/case detected). **Figure 1** shows as the number of close contacts between students increases and the rate of transmission increases, so too does the value of weekly testing.

Our infection fatality rate (0.02% for students and 0.18% for staff/faculty, **Table 1**) is smaller than the average rate for the U.S. (0.5%)[18,28] because the population of both the students and staff/faculty is younger than the general population. Universities in which a substantial proportion of students reside with their families in multi-generational households may have rates of transmission, close contacts, and infection fatality rates that are substantially higher. Such universities should use the online interface for our model to compute the value of the interventions that we evaluate, and should carefully re-consider the wisdom of holding in-person classes in the Fall of 2020.

Many universities plan to standardize the masks that students wear, such that their fit and filtration are superior to what students would choose to purchase on their own.[29,30] For example, Columbia University will provide two $4 2-ply masks to each student.[6] If the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

university-provided masks substitute for masks of lower efficacy, they will be cost-saving at community prevalence rates of infectious cases above 0.3%.

Fever is a common symptom in the fall.[31] Even though thermal monitoring will detect few cases of COVID-19, it will send a proportion of university affiliates home, thereby increasing social distancing and the prevalence of people on campus with a potentially infectious influenza-like illness. In most circumstances, such investments will not bring value, however.

Likewise, installations of high efficiency MERV-13 HVAC systems or far UVC light are not likely to be worthy of investment unless aerosol transmission accounts for the vast majority of COVID-19 cases on campus. However, the value of these systems rises in areas where students are less likely to wear masks, such as student housing. Additionally, while we find that far UVC light comes at a better value than HVAC systems, it is a new technology and its safety has not been extensively tested in humans.[32]

We assumed that super-spreader events would require the university to close because they may create a "perfect storm" of events in which staff are quarantined even as multiple areas of the campus must be closed for cleaning and contact tracing. When the university is closed early, the money spent on any interventions goes to waste, and large indirect costs associated with online-only instruction are incurred. Therefore, any intervention to reduce the possibility of students attending mass events, particularly those that require talking loudly and lowering masks to eat or drink, should be prioritized.

We did not examine approaches that are intuitively cost-effective. For example, influenza vaccination has been shown to save money and lives.[33] In the context of Covid-19, the reduction in influenza-like symptoms will also reduce quarantining and testing, thereby furthering savings. Second, the "cohort" model confines groups of students to 20-40 who

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

take all the same courses and live in the same housing.[34] In theory, the cohort model could largely prevent transmission of infection, thereby vastly reducing the size of each student's social network. For this model to work, students must first quarantine for 14 days.

The major limitation of our analysis is the considerable uncertainty in parameter estimates. For example, estimates of infection fatality rates can quadruple when hospitals are overwhelmed with cases.[14,18] However, the model is generally robust to different parameter inputs and assumptions.

Another limitation is that universities vary considerably with respect to socio-demographic composition and risk-taking among students. Additionally, the standard gamble exercises we used were administered to graduate students of public health, who may be more risk adverse than average students. We account for differences in student risk preferences by varying the number of assumed contacts between students, both on and off campus. Readers are encouraged to change the model inputs to suit their particular university characteristics using the online version of the model.[7] Finally, we present results from the societal perspective because both tangible and intangible costs are very similar to costs from the university perspective.

Conclusions

We find that the investments that will bring the greatest value include symptom checking and the distribution of washable 2-ply masks for students. Universities in areas with high prevalence rates of infectious cases of COVID-19 may find it difficult to remain open, even with extensive prevention measures in place. Our findings do not apply to universities in which a large number of students commute to and from multi-generational households. For universities with the resources and willingness to pay for extensive

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

prevention measures, further investments may be worthwhile. However, they will be worthwhile only if the prevalence of infectious cases in the community is high enough for the interventions to impact transmission of SARS-CoV-2, but not so high that the university will need to close early.

Acknowledgements.

We would like to acknowledge the help and contributions of Wafaa El-Sadr, Melanie Bernitz, Steven Shea, Wan Yang, Jeffery Shamen, and the Public Health Committee for Reopening Columbia University.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

References

1. Covid-19 Higher Education Resource Center. Availalbe online at: https://www.entangled.solutions/coronavirus-he/ Accessed 7/16/2020.
2. Mark B, Paul ES. Challenges of" Return to Work" in an Ongoing Pandemic. *The New England journal of medicine*.
3. Barnes M, Sax PE. Challenges of "Return to Work" in an Ongoing Pandemic. *N Engl J Med.* 2020.
4. Anonymous. Here's a List of Colleges' Plans for Reopening in the Fall. Chronicle of Higher Education. Available online at: https://www.chronicle.com/article/Here-s-a-List-of-Colleges-/248626?cid=wcontentgrid_hp_1b Accessed 7/20/2020.
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Reopening Guidance for Cleaning and Disinfecting Public Spaces, Workplaces, Businesses, Schools, and Homes. Available online at: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/reopen-guidance.html Accessed 7/16/2020.
6. Covid-19 Resource Guide for the Columbia Community. Available online at: h7ttps://covid19.columbia.edu Accessed 7/3/2020.
7. Muennig P, Zafari Z. OpenUp Model. Mailman School of Public Health. Columbia University. Available online at: https://www.publichealth.columbia.edu/academics/departments/health-policy-and-management/openup-model Accessed 8/2/2020. 2020.
8. Neumann PJ, Sanders GD, Russell LB, Siegel JE, Ganiats TG. *Cost-effectiveness in health and medicine.* Oxford University Press; 2016.
9. Williamson EJ, Walker AJ, Bhaskaran K, et al. OpenSAFELY: factors associated with COVID-19 death in 17 million patients. *Nature.* 2020:1-11.
10. Lan L, Xu D, Ye G, et al. Positive RT-PCR test results in patients recovered from COVID-19. *JAMA.* 2020;323(15):1502-1503.
11. Somsen GA, van Rijn C, Kooij S, Bem RA, Bonn D. Small droplet aerosols in poorly ventilated spaces and SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine.* 2020.
12. Gold M, Siegel J, Russell L, Weinstein M. *Cost-effectiveness in health and medicine.* New York: Oxford University Press; 1996.
13. Li R, Pei S, Chen B, et al. Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science.* 2020;368(6490):489-493.
14. Yang W, Kandula S, Huynh M, et al. Estimating the infection fatality risk of COVID-19 in New York City, March 1-May 16, 2020. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.2006.2027.20141689.
15. Bartsch SM, Ferguson MC, McKinnell JA, et al. The Potential Health Care Costs And Resource Use Associated With COVID-19 In The United States: A simulation estimate of the direct medical costs and health care resource use associated with COVID-19 infections in the United States. *Health Aff (Millwood).* 2020:10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00426.
16. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Wage data by area and occupation. Available online at: http://www.bls.gov/bls/blswage.htm Accessed 7/10/2020.
17. Mathematica, Inc. Covid-19 Risk Calculator. Available online at: https://github.com/mathematica-mpr/covid_risk_score Accessed 7/2/2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

18. Chen X, Hazra DK. Understanding the Bias between the Number of Confirmed Cases and Actual Number of Infections in the COVID-19 Pandemic. *medRxiv.* 2020.
19. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID-NET. Available online at: https://gis.cdc.gov/grasp/COVIDNet/COVID19_3.html. Accessed 7/28/2020.
20. Wu JT, Leung K, Bushman M, et al. Estimating clinical severity of COVID-19 from the transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China. *Nat Med.* 2020;26(4):506-510.
21. Huang L, Zhang X, Zhang X, et al. Rapid asymptomatic transmission of COVID-19 during the incubation period demonstrating strong infectivity in a cluster of youngsters aged 16-23 years outside Wuhan and characteristics of young patients with COVID-19: a prospective contact-tracing study. *J Infect.* 2020.
22. 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(10):2000180.
23. Sakurai A, Sasaki T, Kato S, et al. Natural History of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *N Engl J Med.* 2020.
24. Yang W. Author communication. Custom model simulations for COVID-19 for September in the area surrounding Columbia University were conducted using the Shamen Lab Projection models. Available online at https://github.com/shaman-lab/COVID-19Projection. Accessed 8/5/2020.
25. Neumann PJ, Cohen JT, Weinstein MC. Updating cost-effectiveness—the curious resilience of the $50,000-per-QALY threshold. *N Engl J Med.* 2014;371(9):796-797.
26. Tengs TO, Adams ME, Pliskin JS, et al. Five-hundred life-saving interventions and their cost-effectiveness. *Risk Anal.* 1995;15(3):369-390.
27. Muennig P, Bounthavong M. *Cost-effectiveness analysis in health: a practical approach.* John Wiley & Sons; 2016.
28. Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Walensky RP. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Screening Strategies to Permit the Safe Reopening of College Campuses in the United States. *JAMA Network Open.* 2020;3(7):e2016818-e2016818.
29. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, et al. Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet.* 2020.
30. Konda A, Prakash A, Moss GA, Schmoldt M, Grant GD, Guha S. Aerosol filtration efficiency of common fabrics used in respiratory cloth masks. *ACS nano.* 2020;14(5):6339-6347.
31. Ogoina D. Fever, fever patterns and diseases called 'fever' – A review. *Journal of Infection and Public Health.* 2011;4(3):108-124.
32. Buonanno M, Welch D, Shuryak I, Brenner DJ. Far-UVC light (222 nm) efficiently and safely inactivates airborne human coronaviruses. *Sci Rep.* 2020;10(1):1-8.
33. Muennig PA, Khan K. Cost-effectiveness of vaccination versus treatment of influenza in healthy adolescents and adults. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2001;33(11):1879-1885.
34. Plavchan, P. The case for cohorts. Available online at: https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2020/06/09/colleges-should-consider-cohort-approach-help-reopen-fall-more-safely-opinion Accessed 7/4/2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

35. 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. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases.* 2020.
36. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID-NET. COVID-19 Laboratory-Confirmed Hospitalizations. Available online at: https://gis.cdc.gov/grasp/COVIDNet/COVID19_5.html. Accessed 8/6/2020.
37. Katz J, Katz MS, Quealy K. A detailed map of who is wearing masks in the U.S. Available online at: https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/07/17/upshot/coronavirus-face-mask-map.html Accessed 7/28/2020. 2020.
38. Avalere. COVID-19 Hospitalizations Projected to Cost up to $17B in US in 2020. Available online at: https://avalere.com/insights/covid-19-hospitalizations-projected-to-cost-up-to-17b-in-us-in-2020. Accessed 8/6/2020.
39. Association of School Business Associates International. What will it cost to re-open schools? Available online at: https://www.asbointl.org/asbo/media/documents/Resources/covid/COVID-19-Costs-to-Reopen-Schools.pdf Accessed 8/3/2020.
40. Jefferson T, Foxlee R, Del Mar C, et al. Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses: systematic review. *BMJ.* 2008;336(7635):77-80.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Major assumptions used in modeling the cost-effectiveness of strategies to improve infection control for Covid-19 in the university setting.

1. The campus will be closed and classes will be held online for the remainder of the semester if: 1) the cumulative number of incident cases among students/staff reaches 50; or 2) there is a super-spreader event where university students attend a gathering in which 5 or more students are infected.
2. Super-spreader events will be detected many days after they occur, thereby producing multiple close contacts.
3. With the onset of symptoms, 85% of students will self-isolate. This percentage will vary depending on a given university's ability to monitor students and was tested in a broad 1-way sensitivity analysis.
4. The average infected student will have an average of 2 close contacts (<6 feet for more than 10 minutes) on campus and 3 close contacts/day off campus prior to detection.
5. Viral loads do not differ by sex, age, or severity of disease.
6. All wages are valued at the median hourly wage in the U.S.
7. When an otherwise healthy person is misdiagnosed by a test or thermal screening, the relevant intangible cost is lost leisure time valued at the national average wage during the quarantine time.
8. To the extent that aerosol transmission is possible, masks, ventilation systems, and far ultraviolet-C (UVC) light will be 100% effective at reducing fine aerosol transmission for those who are not in close contact because both systems clear >90% of viral particles within 8 minutes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

9. A symptom-checking application to detect a suspected infection will lead to a 10-percentage point increase in proportion of individuals who stay home when they develop symptoms.
10. Students have a similar active infectious case rate as other members of the community.
11. Fevers detected using thermal cameras will be re-checked using a second method.
12. University-provided masks will not reduce total expenditures on masks (disposable masks will still be purchased by the university and made available to affiliates).
13. No litigation costs will be incurred.

---

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Total costs and probabilities used as model inputs for estimating the cost-effectiveness of strategies to improve infection control for Covid-19 in a university setting with 16,000 students and 4,500 employees on campus during a 90-day semester.

Parameters	Baseline	Distribution*
Population		
Number of students on campus†	16,000	-
Number of staff/faculty on campus†	4,500	-
Daily number of close contacts		
Between each student and other students on campus †	2	Triangular (1, 3, 2)
Between each affiliate and community member†	3	Triangular (2, 4, 3)
Between each staff/faculty and students on campus†	1	Triangular (0, 2, 1)
Between each staff/faculty on campus†	1	Triangular (0, 2, 1)
Between each staff/faculty and community member†	2	Triangular (1, 3, 2)
Time values		
Incubation (r_{inc})	5 days	Triangular (3, 14, 5)
Infectiousness to symptoms onset (r_s)	2 days	Triangular (1, 3, 2)
Exposure to infectiousness	3 days	Computed
Duration of infectiousness	9 days	Triangular (6, 11, 9)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

Probabilities and rates		
Transmission rate per close contact[35]‡	0.066	Normal (0.07, 0.01)
Infection hospitalization rate, students[18,36]	0.008	Beta (99.192, 12299)
Infection hospitalization rate among staff/faculty[18,36]	0.018	Beta (98.182, 5356)
Infection fatality rate among students[18]	0.0002	Beta (99.98, 499799)
Infections mortality rate among staff/faculty[18]	0.0015	Beta (99.85, 66465)
Proportion of students' compliance with stay-home order when they notice their symptoms†	0.85	Triangular (0.75, 0.9, 0.85)
Proportion of community members' compliance with wearing masks outside of campus[37]	0.78	Triangular (0.72, 0.78, 0.78)
Direct costs (U.S. dollars in 2020 USD)		
Hospitalization[38,15]	$23,489	-
CDC guidelines[5]		
Adhering to cleaning protocol costs[39]	$318,798	-
Custodial staff[39]	$979,503	-
Personal protective equipment[39]	$1,386,898	-
Temperature cameras	$485,000	-
PCR test (per test) ¶	$31	-
Far UVC lights (per light, 1000 lights)	$700	-
Air handler upgrades (per unit, 138 units) ¶	$12,000	-
Indirect costs (U.S. dollars in 2020 USD)		
Productivity loss, self-isolation	$2,800	Gamma (100, 0.036)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

Productivity loss, infection	$4,200	Gamma (100, 0.024)
Lost tuition per day for online vs. in-person classes	$46	
Intervention effects		
CDC guidelines		
Risk reduction hand washing/sanitizer[40]	0.45	-
Regular mask use[40,29]	0.33	-
Symptom checking application	10%	Triangular (0.75, 0.9, 0.85)
Enhanced masks[40,29]	0.2	Beta (95.91, 2272.2)
Test for SARS-CoV-2		
Sensitivity	0.95	-
Specificity	0.95	-
Health-related quality of life		
Students	0.09	Beta (90.91, 919.20)
Faculty	0.14	Beta (85.86, 527.43)
Hospitalization	0.6	Beta (39.4, 26.267)

Note: A close contact is defined as person-to-person contact < 6 feet for > 10 minutes. See Online Appendix for further details on model inputs.

*For triangular distributions, the values listed are baseline value, high, and low. For normal, beta, and gamma distributions, the values listed are the baseline value and error. Some variables had little influence on the model (indicated with a hyphen) and were removed from the Monte Carlo simulation to reduce computing time.

†Expert opinion based on video conferences with the Public Health Committee at Columbia University, which is comprised of a range of infectious disease experts and administrators.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

‡The transmission rate assumes that half of close contacts will be at home and half of close contacts will be off campus.

¶Costs reflect actual costs paid by Columbia University including personnel.

Table 3. Average number of days that the university will remain open, incremental costs, incremental quality-adjusted life years (QALYs), and incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) for each intervention relative to guidelines from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (social distancing, mask use, sanitization of spaces).

	Days university open	Incremental cost	Incremental effectiveness	ICER
100 Cases/100,000				
Check symptoms	91 (91, 91)	-$13 (-$27, -$4)	0.019 (0.005, 0.043)	Cost-saving
Gateway testing	91 (91, 91)	$2.60m ($2.32m, $2.90)	0.064 (0.034, 0.11)	$40.9m ($24.6m, $78m)
Weekly testing	91 (91, 91)	$29.2m ($26.2m, $32.6m)	0.48 (0.28, 0.78)	$60.7m ($37.5m, $105m)
2-ply mask	91 (91, 91)	$164k ($164k, $164k)	0.11 (0.027, 0.27)	$1.44m ($597k, $6.13m)
Thermal imaging	91 (91, 91)	$3.86m ($3.38m, $4.40m)	0.066 (0.039, 0.11)	$58.9m ($35.7m, $102m)
1000 Cases/100,000				
Check symptoms	36 (26, 49)	-$107k (-$739k, -$36)	0.057 (0.014, 0.23)	Cost-saving
Gateway testing	37 (27, 50)	$1.29m ($339k, $2.07m)	0.67 (0.31, 1.20)	$1.94m ($302k, $6.1m)
Weekly testing	42 (31, 58)	$10.7m ($7.15m, $15.2m)	4.26 (2.52, 6.31)	$2.52m ($1.28m, $5.22m)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

2-ply mask	37 (27, 50)	-$780k (-$2.04m, $164k)	0.48 (0.094, 1.17)	Cost-saving
Thermal imaging	36 (26, 50)	$1.33m ($708k, $2.08m)	0.56 (0.34, 0.86)	$2.36m ($921k, $5.63m)
2000 Cases/100,000				
Check symptoms	18 (13, 25)	-$32.6k (-$721k, -$50)	0.035 (0.008, 0.27)	Cost-saving
Gateway testing	20 (15, 27)	$1.27m ($311k, $2.02m)	1.18 (0.55, 2.07)	$1.08m ($171k, $3.33m)
Weekly testing	22 (16, 30)	$5.88m ($4.13m, $8.55m)	7.18 (4.43, 10.2)	$820k ($453k, $1.68m)
2-ply mask	19 (14, 26)	-$335k (-$1.29m, $164k)	0.46 (0.086, 1.18)	Dominant*
Thermal imaging	18 (13, 26)	$915k ($247k, $1.35m)	0.95 (0.58, 1.40)	$965k ($199k, $2.15m)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20166975; this version posted August 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 4.0 International license .

Figure 1. Three-way sensitivity analysis examining the relationship between the number of close contacts between students on campus, the transmission rate per close student contact, and willingness-to-pay for the top 3 intervention strategies at a 2% prevalence rate of actively infectious cases in the community.