

College campuses and COVID-19 mitigation: clinical and economic value

Elena Losina, PhD^{1,2,3,4}

Valia Leifer, AB^{1,2}

Lucia Millham, AB^{3,5}

Christopher Panella, BS⁵

Emily P. Hyle, MD, MSc^{3,5,6}

Amir M. Mohareb, MD^{5,6}

Anne M. Neilan, MD, MPH^{5,6,8}

Andrea L. Ciaranello, MD, MPH^{3,5,6}

Pooyan Kazemian*, PhD⁹

Kenneth A. Freedberg*, MD, MSc^{3,5,6,7,10}

* Drs. Kazemian and Freedberg contributed equally to this work

Affiliations:

1. Policy and Innovation eValuation in Orthopedic Treatments (PIVOT) Center, Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA
2. Orthopedic and Arthritis Center for Outcomes Research (OrACORe), Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA
3. Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA
4. Department of Biostatistics, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, MA

5. Medical Practice Evaluation Center, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA
6. Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA
7. Division of General Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine, MGH, Boston, MA
8. Division of General Academic Pediatrics, Department of Pediatrics, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA
9. Department of Operations, Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH
10. Department of Health Policy and Management, Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA

Corresponding author:

Elena Losina, PhD

Orthopedic and Arthritis Center for Outcomes Research

Brigham and Women's Hospital

60 Fenwood Rd, 5016

Boston, MA, 02115

Word Count:

Abstract: 200 words

Text: 2,942 words

Running title: COVID-19 mitigation on college campuses

Abstract

Background: Decisions around US college and university operations will affect millions of students and faculty amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. We examined the clinical and economic value of different COVID-19 mitigation strategies on college campuses.

Methods: We used the Clinical and Economic Analysis of COVID-19 interventions (CEACOV) model, a dynamic microsimulation that tracks infections accrued by students and faculty, accounting for community transmissions. Outcomes include infections, \$/infection-prevented, and \$/quality-adjusted-life-year (\$/QALY). Strategies included extensive social distancing (ESD), masks, and routine laboratory tests (RLT). We report results per 5,000 students (1,000 faculty) over one semester (105 days).

Results: Mitigation strategies reduced COVID-19 cases among students (faculty) from 3,746 (164) with no mitigation to 493 (28) with ESD and masks, and further to 151 (25) adding *RLTq3* among asymptomatic students and faculty. ESD with masks cost \$168/infection-prevented (\$49,200/QALY) compared to masks alone. Adding *RLTq3* (\$10/test) cost \$8,300/infection-prevented (\$2,804,600/QALY). If tests cost \$1, *RLTq3* led to a favorable cost of \$275/infection-prevented (\$52,200/QALY). No strategies without masks were cost-effective.

Conclusion: Extensive social distancing with mandatory mask-wearing could prevent 87% of COVID-19 cases on college campuses and be very cost-effective. Routine laboratory testing would prevent 96% of infections and require low cost tests to be economically attractive.

Key words: COVID-19, college campuses, mitigation

Introduction

Over 2,000 colleges and universities in the United States with over 20 million students are trying to determine how to minimize the impact of the COVID-19 on their students, faculty, the surrounding communities and health care systems [1]. Higher education is a \$671 billion/year industry employing over 3.6 million people [1]. High contact rates and close living conditions among students increase the risk of infection, and more than one-third of the 1.5 million faculty are over age 55, which raises their risk of morbidity and mortality from COVID-19 [2, 3]. All of this has major implications for its impact on laboratory testing and hospital capacity in the communities, towns and cities where colleges are located.

In concert with clinical leaders and local health systems and governments, colleges must balance multiple factors in their decision-making. While teaching online only would reduce campus-based transmissions, doing so might reduce quality of education, lower graduation rates, increase long-term mental health problems among students and decrease college revenue [4]. Frequent laboratory testing would require coordination between laboratories and colleges and a mechanism of acting upon tests results by isolating those with positive tests. Given these trade-offs, multiple strategies are being considered and implemented to mitigate transmission among students and faculty, while allowing colleges to maintain some in-person teaching.

Programs under consideration include combinations of non-pharmacologic interventions (NPIs), such as reducing class sizes through hybrid (in-person and online) education methods, timing access to libraries and dining halls, cancelling large events, suspending athletic programs, and implementing mandatory mask-wearing policies [5]. Colleges are considering these NPIs in concert with different methods of symptom surveillance and laboratory testing approaches [6], as

well as different isolation strategies for symptomatic students or those with confirmed COVID-19, such as using designated dormitories or renting nearby hotels [7].

Colleges are developing these strategies at the same time as evidence about the effectiveness of social distancing and masks, the accuracy and cost of laboratory tests, and the feasibility of designated isolation is rapidly evolving [8, 9]. We examined the impact of different COVID-19 mitigation strategies on clinical and economic outcomes in college settings.

Methods

Analytic overview

We used the validated Clinical and Economic Analysis of COVID-19 interventions (CEACOV) model, a dynamic microsimulation of the natural history of COVID-19 built on susceptible-infected-recovered (SIR) principles [10]. We considered contacts among students, faculty, and the surrounding community [11, 12] and assessed clinical outcomes among students and faculty, including prevalent and incident infections, isolation unit use, laboratory tests, and hospital and intensive care unit (ICU) utilization. The CEACOV models infections to students and faculty occurring from students, faculty, or community. Transmission rates within and across groups are based on estimated contact-hours for each, and the SARS-CoV-2 infectivity rate per contact-hour [13]. Costs included NPIs, testing, and hospital-related. Using quality of life (QoL) decrements for similar illnesses, we modeled QoL decrements for COVID-19 [14, 15]. We accounted for a daily proportion of individuals with influenza-like illness (ILI) unrelated to SARS-CoV-2 infections [16-18]. Outcomes included the projected clinical impact, cost, budget impact, and cost-effectiveness of alternative mitigation strategies over one semester (105 days). We calculated incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs), the difference in costs divided by the difference in quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs) saved for different strategies [19], and determined cost/infection-prevented. We described results for 5,000 students and 1,000 faculty within a surrounding community of 100,000 people.

Strategies

We considered two ‘background’ strategies for comparison where: 1) campus remains closed (*CampusClosed*) with only online education, and 2) campus operates as it did before COVID-19, without any mitigation interventions (*NoIntervention*).

We examined 24 mitigation strategies based on 4 approaches: 1) social distancing (*SocDist*); 2) mask-wearing policies (*Masks*), 3) isolation, and 4) laboratory testing (*LT*). *LT* ranged from no testing of asymptomatic students, to routine laboratory testing of asymptomatic students (*RLT*) at 14, 7, or 3 day intervals. We modeled two *SocDist* strategies: minimal social distancing (*MinSocDist*), including cancelling sports and university-sponsored concerts, and extensive social distancing (*ExtSocDist*), where 100% of large classes and 50% of smaller classes were delivered online. We also considered a strategy that combined *ExtSocDist* and *Masks* (*ExtSocDist+Masks*). Social distancing reduced contact-hours with infected persons and masks reduced infectivity of infected individuals. All 24 strategies utilized symptom screening. Positive results from symptom screens and laboratory tests led to isolation, which further reduced contacts between infected and susceptible individuals.

We examined two isolation-strategies for students with positive symptom screens or laboratory tests: 1) residence-based isolation (*ResIsol*), and 2) designated spaces (*DesigIsol*). Each reduced contact-hours between infected and susceptible individuals. *DesigIsol* was more restrictive than *ResIsol*.

CEACOV model structure

Disease states and progression

CEACOV is a dynamic microsimulation of SARS-CoV-2 [11, 12]. Susceptible individuals have a daily probability of getting infected. Infected individuals experience a daily probability of advancing in COVID-19 disease severity, which increases with age, and includes risk of hospitalization, ICU admission, and death. CEACOV includes 6 COVID-19 disease states: pre-infectious latency, asymptomatic, mild/moderate, severe, critical, and recuperation. In this analysis, we assume that all individuals recovered from COVID-19 are immune from re-infection for the remainder of the semester.

Transmissions

CEACOV captures the heterogeneity of viral transmission among students, faculty, and community. The overall force of infection depicting transmission risk from infected to susceptible individuals is distributed across transmission groups, weighted by group size and contact-hours within and across the 3 groups. The transmission rate is based on contact-hours/day and a derived infectivity rate/contact-hour. Social distancing reduces contact hours within and between groups. Masks reduce the infectivity rate [8].

Costs and quality of life

We included the cost of NPIs, isolation units, testing, and hospitalization. NPI costs included those of: 1) implementation/maintenance of online learning platforms, 2) masks, and 3)

cleaning/disinfecting measures. Strategy-specific costs depend on the NPIs in place. College-sponsored *DesigIsol* costs include the cost/day of designated isolation units. While mild/moderate COVID-19 symptoms are assumed to resolve with over-the-counter or no medications, severe or critical disease results in hospitalization or ICU costs.

For mild/moderate COVID-19, we estimated QoL losses based on utility decrements from influenza [15]. For all students, regardless of symptom state, we modeled decreased QoL for time students spent in isolation to account for the effects of isolation on mental health [20]. We derived QoL decrements for hospitalized individuals using data for complicated pneumonia [14]. The impact of mortality on QALYs lost is described in Supplementary Materials. We did not model any long-term complications from COVID-19.

Input parameters

Cohort characteristics

We derived demographic characteristics of students, faculty, and community using data from colleges and their surrounding typical college towns [21, 22]. (See Supplementary Materials).

Contact-hours

We derived contact-hours, defined as a single hour spent with a single person, within the same and across transmission groups (Table 2). We estimated contact-hours prior to COVID-19 epidemic as a basis for reduction in contact-hours in social distancing strategies.

Students: Contact-hours for students include time spent with roommates, in group study, office hours with faculty, in lectures, and in recreational, sporting, work-for-pay, shopping, and social activities. We estimated that students spend 149 contact-hours/day with each other, 1.5 contact-hours/day with faculty, and 3.9 hours/day with community members.

Faculty: We estimated that faculty spend, on average, 10 contact-hours/day with other faculty, 37 contact-hours/day with students (25 of which are teaching), and 33 contact-hours/day with community (including family).

Community: We estimated that community members spend 81 contact-hours/day interacting with others in the community, including time with family, work, shopping, and socializing.

SARS-CoV-2 infectivity

We derived the infectivity/contact-hour rate from a study of household infections in Wuhan, China (0.002/contact-hour, Supplementary Materials) [13]. Per CDC guidelines, we assumed an infectivity duration of 10 days [23].

Efficacy of NPIs

Social distancing: *MinSocDist* decreased student-student contact-hours by 26% and reduced the overall daily transmission rate from 0.238 ($R_t=2.38$) to 0.167 ($R_t=1.67$, Table 1). *ExtSocDist* decreased student-student contact hours by 39%, student-faculty contact-hours by

50%, and faculty-student contact-hours by 60%, and reduced the overall daily transmission rate to 0.141 ($R_t=1.41$).

Masks: The reported efficacy of masks in reducing infectivity ranges between 44% and 82% [9]. Recognizing that students may use different types of masks and not wear them at all times, we used a base-case infectivity reduction for masks of 50% and adherence of 50%, and varied these parameters in sensitivity analyses [8]. The overall daily transmission rates for the *Masks* and *ExtSocDist+Masks* strategies were 0.128 ($R_t=1.28$) and 0.105 ($R_t=1.05$), respectively.

To capture the potential ‘fatigue’ that students, faculty, and community might experience in terms of complying with NPIs we used ‘transmission rate multipliers’ to increase transmission rates by 25% for the second month of the semester, and 50% for the last two months.

Laboratory test characteristics

We assumed 50% accuracy in terms of students’ ability to self-screen [24], and 90% for faculty. We also assumed those with positive symptom screens have a 60% chance of adhering to *ResIsol* and 100% adherence to *DesigIsol*. We stratified the sensitivity of laboratory testing by days post-infection using published PCR test data (Table 1) [25]. We assumed 100% laboratory test specificity and modeled a 1-day delay to receiving test results.

COVID-19 clinical characteristics

Using published literature, we derived the probability of progressing to more severe COVID-19 disease stages (Table 1A, Supplementary Materials).

Costs

We considered costs from a modified societal perspective, including mitigation costs associated with prevention of COVID-19 and direct medical costs related to COVID-19 treatment. Indirect costs such as lost productivity due to isolation were captured in utilities measures. For all 24 NPI-based strategies we accounted for the cost of additional cleaning, estimating these costs would increase by ~50%, or \$31.50/student/semester, relative to before the pandemic [26]. For the *Masks* and *ExtSocDist+Masks* strategies we included cost of masks, with one \$2 cloth mask/week, and one \$0.10 disposable mask/day for each student and faculty member (\$212,500/semester in total). Total NPI costs per semester were \$151,500 for *MinSocDist*, \$407,500 for *ExtSocDist*, and \$620,000 for *ExtSocDist+Masks*. In base case analyses, we assumed colleges would negotiate a SARs-2-CoV test cost of \$10 (~25% of the lowest currently published pricing) [27]. We use Health Care Utilization Project (HCUP) data to derive per-day costs for hospital and ICU care (\$1,640 and \$2,680, Table 1). We estimated the cost of college-sponsored *DesigIsol* at \$30/day, between the maintenance cost/student/day (\$5) [26] and the daily cost of room and board (\$55) [28].

Sensitivity analyses

In sensitivity analyses we varied the efficacy of masks (50%-67% infectivity reduction), students' adherence to wearing masks (50%-80%), and the sensitivity of laboratory tests (50-90%). We varied the costs of: 1) laboratory testing (\$1-\$51), 2) a daily *DesigIsol* unit (\$5-\$55), and 3) online educational software (\$100,000-\$500,000 per semester for 5,000 students and 1,000 faculty) [29]. We also conducted a 'threshold' analysis to determine what percentage of students would need to defer for a semester (not pay tuition) to make the *CampusClosed* strategy

clinically and economically worse than other strategies. We also determined the laboratory test cost that produced an ICER $< \$150,000/\text{QALY}$ [30].

Results

Clinical outcomes: cumulative infections (Table 2, Figure 1)

We estimate that the *NoIntervention* strategy will lead to infections among 75% (17%) of students (faculty), or 3,699 incident (155) and 47 (10) prevalent infections per 5,000 students and 1,000 faculty. The *CampusClosed* strategy will lead to 1,401 (26) student (faculty) infections, with most student infections coming from other students living off campus. The *MinSocDist* strategy with self-screen or one-time laboratory testing at the semester start will reduce student infections by 16% relative to *NoIntervention*. Adding laboratory testing (every 3 days (*RLTq3*)) of asymptomatic students to *MinSocDist* will lead to 713 (54) infections in students (faculty). *ExtSocDist* will lead to 1,927-2,188 (52-73) student (faculty) infections without routine testing and 274 (35) student (faculty) infections with *RLTq3*. *Masks* is a more effective strategy alone than either *MinSocDist* or *ExtSocDist*, with 1,456 (48)-1,519 (51) student (faculty) infections without *RLT* and 215 (26) infections with *RLTq3* testing of asymptomatic students. *ExtSocDist+Masks* leads to 493 (28)-606 (28) student (faculty) infections without testing and to 151 (25) with *RLTq3*. Relative to *ResIsol*, without *RLT*, *DesigIsol* did not meaningfully reduce infections.

Clinical outcomes: hospital use

We estimate that *NoIntervention* strategy would lead to 217 (8) hospital (ICU) days among students and 40 (12) days among faculty. *ExtSocDist+Masks* would reduce the number of hospital days by 87% (95%) among students (faculty) to 29 and 2 hospital-days, respectively. Adding *RLTq3* would further reduce the number of hospital days to 7 (6) for students (faculty).

Economic Evaluation (Table 3, Figure 3)

Budgetary impact

CampusClosed cost \$1,099,181, if 100 students (2%) took a ‘gap semester.’ Without *RLT*, *MinSocDist* cost \$414,749-\$558,213, *ExtSocDist* cost \$551,693-\$663,983, *Masks* cost \$448,254-\$600,876, *ExtSocDist+Masks* cost \$664,015-\$757,625. Adding *RLTq3* to *ExtSocDist+Masks* or *MinSocDist* led to a total cost of \$2,103,264.

Cost-effectiveness

Different strategies led to substantially different costs/infection-prevented and costs/QALY (Table 3, Figure 3). *MinSocDist* was never economically efficient. Alone, *Masks* cost \$76/infection-prevented (\$17,300/QALY). We estimated the incremental value of *ExtSocDist+Masks* to be \$168/infection-prevented (ICER: \$49,200/QALY). Adding *RLTq14* to *ExtSocDist+Masks* led to a cost of \$2,008/infection-prevented (ICER: \$811,400/QALY). Adding more frequent testing prevented more infections, but cost much more, at \$4,596/infection-prevented for *RLTq7* and \$8,322/infection-prevented for *RLTq3*, both with ICERs > \$1M/QALY.

Sensitivity Analyses

Without *RLT*, the value of *ExtSocDist* depended on its cost. If *ExtSocDist*'s implementation costs doubled, from \$250,000 to \$500,000, *ExtSocDist+ResIsol* cost \$250/infection-prevented (\$53,000/QALY). The most influential factors affecting the value of *RLT* were test costs and frequency. If test costs were lowered to \$1/test, then adding *RLTq3* to *Masks* led to a favorable cost of \$275/infection-prevented (\$52,200/QALY); with a \$3/test,

adding *RLTq7* cost \$358/infection-prevented (\$120,500/QALY). At a test cost greater than \$5, even the least frequent strategy considered, *RLTq14*, produced ICERs > \$300,000/QALY.

Discussion

We conducted a model-based evaluation of the impact of COVID-19 mitigation strategies on college campuses, taking into consideration heterogeneous transmission across students and faculty, and accounting for transmission from the surrounding community. We examined the value of social distancing and mask-wearing policies, and the use of routine laboratory testing of asymptomatic students and faculty. We had 3 major findings. First, even if campuses remain closed, there will likely be many infections among faculty from the surrounding community, and among students from students returning to live off campus in and around the college town. Second, while minimal social distancing, such as cancelling large events, would reduce some infections, and extensive social distancing with a hybrid educational system would lead to even fewer infections, a mandatory mask-wearing policy alone would reduce infections the most. Combining a mask-wearing policy with extensive social distancing would prevent 87% of infections among students and faculty, and would cost \$168/infection-prevented (\$49,200/QALY saved). Third, while adding a strategy of *RLTq14* to a combined social distancing and mask-wearing policy would reduce infections, it would do so at a much higher cost/infection-prevented, even at \$10/test (25% of currently available lowest pricing) compared to the value of *ExtSocDist+Masks*. Reducing test costs to \$1/test, would lead strategies with even every 3 day testing to prevent infections with much better value.

We also found that while most infections among students were from other students, most infections in faculty were not from students, since faculty live off campus and spend a substantial amount of time in their community-based social networks.

While adding *RLT* to *ExtSocDist+Masks* further reduced infections, this strategy is costly and less economically efficient than *ExtSocDist+Masks* without *RLT* at a test cost of \$10. Even if colleges are able to support the financial and operational burden of testing, other factors, such as laboratory capacity and the availability of testing supplies, may impact the feasibility of this strategy in states such as Massachusetts, where >100 colleges have a combined student population >500,000 [1]. In Massachusetts, *RLTq14* would require 36,000 tests daily for students alone, which could divert testing resources away from symptomatic, non-student populations, or those who have been in close contact with confirmed COVID-19-infected individuals. With these trade-offs in mind, it is critical to implement and maintain mitigation programs that do not depend completely on testing capacity, such as extensive social distancing and mask-wearing policies.

Two recent studies have examined COVID-19 mitigation strategies for US colleges. Paltiel et al. examined routine surveillance screening under several epidemic scenarios defined by R_t 1.5-3.5 [31]. Consistent with our analysis, their study suggests more frequent testing prevented more infections. Differences in the apparent value of routine laboratory testing between our analyses likely result from our explicit modeling of social distancing and mask-wearing policies, which produced R_t values much lower than the ranges considered by Paltiel et al. A report from Cornell also found that routinely testing asymptomatic students would prevent the most infections. While this report suggested pooling specimens to reduce testing costs, no explicit economic analysis was presented [32]. Similar to our analysis, they report that keeping campuses closed may yield more infections than bringing students back to campus with comprehensive NPIs.

These results should be viewed in the context of several limitations. First, while we tried to capture the major COVID-19 mitigation strategies that colleges and universities are considering, we examined only a limited number of strategies. We also did not capture all potential externalities that these institutions might face, such as lost revenue from cancelled sports and the impact of social distancing on students' quality of life, and we did not examine the impact of contact tracing on transmission. Finally, there continues to be uncertainty about many aspects of COVID-19 testing and immune response. We used the best currently available data and limited our analysis to the duration of one semester.

In conclusion, implementing extensive social distancing and mandatory mask-wearing policies would enable higher education institutions to have the biggest impact in reducing COVID-19 infections among students and faculty. Routine laboratory testing would further reduce infections but would require less costly tests coupled with markedly increased capacity to be feasible for many colleges.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Infections and costs by COVID-19 mitigation strategy

Panels A and B represent the number and source of infections in students (Panel A) and faculty (Panel B) for each strategy; panel C depicts total costs. On the left are the *NoIntervention* and *CampusClosed* strategies. The 4 broad NPI-strategies (minimal social distancing, extensive social distancing, mask-wearing policy, and combined extensive social distancing and mask policy) are further stratified by the use and frequency of laboratory testing (LT), from no LT, where those who report symptoms associated with COVID-19 are asked to isolate in their residence for 10 days, to one LT for those who report symptoms to confirm placement in isolation, to routine LTs (RLTs) for all students and faculty at the start of semester, to routine LT among asymptomatic students and faculty at 3, 7, or 14-days intervals. Infections decrease as strategies increase in intensity, from minimal social distancing to the combined extensive social distancing and mask-wearing policy strategy. In each case, adding LT further decreases infections. Among students, the vast majority of infections are from other students (Panel A). Among faculty, depending on the strategy, most infections are from the community and other faculty (Panel B). In strategies without routine lab testing, hospital and ICU costs represent over 50% of costs (Panel C). In strategies with routine LT, testing is over 50% of the total cost. See Methods section for strategy name abbreviations.

Figure 2. Efficiency Frontier (\$/infection prevented)

The efficiency frontier represents the relationship between infections prevented (vertical axis) and total costs (horizontal axis). *NoIntervention* is shown in the open red circle on the lower left.

Without routine laboratory testing or testing at the semester start, regardless of isolation approach, there is clustering (depicted by ovals) of strategies involving minimal social distancing (triangles), extensive social distancing (circles), mask policy (diamonds), and combined extensive social distancing with mask policy (squares). Grey ovals represent strategies where masks are not incorporated, while beige ovals represent clustering of strategies where masks are incorporated; showing more infections prevented when masks are incorporated. Symbols on the solid black line represent economically efficient strategies. The slope of the solid line represents the incremental cost/infection-prevented for each strategy, compared to the next less costly efficient strategy. Testing at 14, 7, or 3 day-intervals prevents additional infections, but at a substantially increased cost/infection-prevented.

Notes

No authors have any potential conflicts of interest.

The work was funded by NIAID R37AI058736-16S1.

For all correspondence and requests for reprints, please contact:

Elena Losina, PhD

E-mail: elosina@partners.org

Address: 60 Fenwood Rd, 5016, Boston, MA, 02115

Literature cited

1. UnivStats, Total number of Employees at U.S. Colleges by occupation. 2019:
<https://www.univstats.com/>. Accessed 9/2/2020
2. McChesney, J., The Aging of Tenure-Track Faculty in Higher Education: Implications for Succession and Diversity (Research Report). 2020, College and University Professional Association for Human Resources.
3. Clark, A., et al., Global, regional, and national estimates of the population at increased risk of severe COVID-19 due to underlying health conditions in 2020: a modelling study. The Lancet Global Health, 2020. 8(8): p. e1003-e1017.
4. Depietro, A., Here's A Look At The Impact Of Coronavirus (COVID-19) On Colleges And Universities In The U.S. 2020: Forbes.
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/andrewdepietro/2020/04/30/impact-coronavirus-covid-19-colleges-universities/#19aa220f61a6>. Accessed 9/2/2020
5. Hadden, J., What the top 25 colleges and universities in the U.S. have said about their plans to reopen in fall 2020, from postponing the semester to offering more remote coursework. Business Insider. 2020. <https://www.businessinsider.com/how-major-us-colleges-plan-reopen-for-fall-2020-semester-2020-5>. Accessed 9/2/2020.
6. Radsken, J., Faculty of Arts and Sciences will bring up to 40% of undergraduates to campus this fall. Harvard Gazette. 2020. <https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2020/07/>
7. Logan, T., Dorm rooms at the Westin? Hotels and universities are teaming up to offer socially distanced student housing, in Boston Globe. 2020.
<https://www.bostonglobe.com/2020/07/26/business/dorm-rooms-westin-hotels-universities-are-teaming-up-offer-socially-distanced-student-housing/>

8. Stutt, R.O.J.H., et al., A modelling framework to assess the likely effectiveness of facemasks in combination with 'lock-down'; in managing the COVID-19 pandemic. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 2020. 476(2238): p. 20200376.
9. Chu, D.K., 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. 395(10242): p. 1973-1987.
10. Hethcote, H.W., *The Mathematics of Infectious Diseases*. *SIAM Review*, 2000. 42(4): p. 599-653.
11. Reddy, K.P., et al., Cost-effectiveness of public health strategies for COVID-19 epidemic control in South Africa. *medRxiv*, 2020: p. 2020.06.29.20140111.
12. Neilan, A.M., et al., Clinical Impact, Costs, and Cost-Effectiveness of Expanded SARS-CoV-2 Testing in Massachusetts. *MedRxiv*,
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.23.20160820>
13. Li, W., et al., Characteristics of Household Transmission of COVID-19. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 2020. ciaa450, <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa450>
14. Andrade, L.F., et al., Health related quality of life in patients with community-acquired pneumococcal pneumonia in France. *Health and quality of life outcomes*, 2018. 16(1): p. 28-28.
15. Yang, J., et al., The impact of influenza on the health related quality of life in China: an EQ-5D survey. *BMC infectious diseases*, 2017. 17(1): p. 686-686.

16. Wang, D., et al., Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*, 2020. 323(11): p. 1061-1069.
17. Center for Diseases Control and Prevention. Percentage of visits of ILI by age group reported by a subset of ILINet providers. 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/covidview/08282020/percent-ili-visits-age.html>. Accessed 9/2/2020.
18. Why a study showing that covid-19 is everywhere is good news. *Economist*, 2020. <https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/2020/04/11/why-a-study-showing-that-covid-19-is-everywhere-is-good-news>. Accessed 9/2/2020.
19. Carias, C., et al., Recommendations of the Second Panel on Cost Effectiveness in Health and Medicine: A Reference, Not a Rule Book. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 2018. 54(4): p. 600-602.
20. Kolovos, S., et al., Utility scores for different health states related to depression: individual participant data analysis. *Quality of life research : an international journal of quality of life aspects of treatment, care and rehabilitation*, 2017. 26(7): p. 1649-1658.
21. Most Students Living in University Housing. *College Compass* [cited 2020 8/4/2020]; Available from: [usnews.com/best-colleges/rankings/most-on-campus](https://www.usnews.com/best-colleges/rankings/most-on-campus). Accessed 9/2/2020.
22. College Navigator. National Center for Education Statistics.
23. Center for Diseases Control and Prevention: Duration of Isolation and Precautions for Adults with COVID-19. 2020.
24. Jeong, H., et al., Discordance between self-report and clinical diagnosis of Internet gaming disorder in adolescents. *Scientific Reports*, 2018. 8(1): p. 10084.

25. Variation in False-Negative Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction–Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time Since Exposure. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 0(0): p. null.
26. Agron, J., 38th Annual Maintenance & Operations Cost Study for Colleges. 2009: American School & University.
27. Medicare Administrative Contractor. COVID-19 test pricing. 2020.
28. University, T. Cost and Aid. 2020 [cited 2020 8/7/2020]; Available from: admissions.tufts.edu/tuition-and-aid/tuition-and-aid/.
29. Zoom, Zoom Meeting Plans for Your Business. 2020.
30. Neumann, P.J., J.T. Cohen, and M.C. Weinstein, Updating Cost-Effectiveness — The Curious Resilience of the \$50,000-per-QALY Threshold. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2014. 371(9): p. 796-797.
31. Paltiel, A.D., A. Zheng, and R.P. Walensky, COVID-19 screening strategies that permit the safe re-opening of college campuses. *medRxiv*, 2020: p. 2020.07.06.20147702.
32. J. Massey Cashore, N.D., Alyf Janmohamed, Jiayue Wan, Yujia Zhang, Shane Henderson, David Shmoys, Peter Frazier, COVID-19 Mathematical Modeling for Cornell's Fall Semester. 2020, Cornell University.

Table 1. Input parameters for an analysis of COVID-19 mitigation strategies on US college campuses among students, faculty, and community members.

Parameter	Value		
Cohort characteristics			
Cohort size	105,000		
	Students	Faculty	Community
Cohort distribution across transmission groups	0.0476	0.0095	0.9429
Age distribution, %			
<20	1	0	0
20-59y	0	0.75	0.84
>60y	0	0.25	0.16
Initial disease distribution			
Susceptible	0.89	0.94	0.81
Infected incubation	0.005	0.005	0.01
Infected asymptomatic	0.005	0.005	0.01
Infected mild/moderate symptoms	0	0	0.01
Infected severe/critical symptoms	0	0	0.01
Recovered	0.10	0.05	0.15

Table 1, continued. Input parameters for an analysis of COVID-19 mitigation strategies on US college campuses among students, faculty, and community members.

Parameter	Value		
Interventions			
Infectivity contact/hour	0.002		
Transmission rate/day students-students (undiagnosed)			
<i>Campus closed</i>	0.142		
<i>No intervention</i>	0.238		
<i>Minimal social distancing</i>	0.167		
<i>Extensive social distancing</i>	0.141		
<i>Masks</i>	0.128		
<i>Extensive social distancing + Masks</i>	0.105		
Contact hours ^a	Students	Faculty	Community
<i>No intervention</i>			
Students	149.41	1.51	3.86
Faculty	37.10	10.00	33.50
Community	0.50	0.30	81.36

Table 1, continued. Input parameters for an analysis of COVID-19 mitigation strategies on US college campuses among students, faculty, and community members.

Parameter	Value		
Interventions, continued			
Contact hours ^a	Students	Faculty	Community
<i>Minimal social distancing</i>			
Students	109.94	1.51	3.86
Faculty	37.10	10.00	33.50
Community	0.50	0.30	81.36
<i>Extensive social distancing</i>			
Students	90.69	0.76	3.86
Faculty	14.84	8.00	32.79
Community	0.40	0.30	71.08
<i>Residence isolation</i>			
Students	31.8	0	0
Faculty	0	0	3
Community	0	0	3

Table 1, continued. Input parameters for an analysis of COVID-19 mitigation strategies on US college campuses among students, faculty, and community members.

Parameter	Value		
Interventions, continued			
Contact hours ^a	Students	Faculty	Community
<i>Designated isolation</i>			
Students	3	0	0.5
Faculty	0	0	3
Community	0	0	3
<i>Hospitalization</i>			
Students	0	0	0.5
Faculty	0	0	0.5
Community	0.5	0.5	0.5

Table 1, continued. Input parameters for an analysis of COVID-19 mitigation strategies on US college campuses among students, faculty, and community members.

Parameter	Value		
Adherence to NPIs			
	Students	Faculty	Community
Masks	0.5	1	0.5
Truthfulness in symptoms reporting	0.5	0.9	n/a
Adherence to Residence Isolation	0.6	1	n/a
Test characteristics			
Sensitivity (day of infection)			
1-4		0.165	
5-9		0.710	
10-21		0.435	
>22		0.000	
Specificity, %		100	

Table 1, continued. Input parameters for an analysis of COVID-19 mitigation strategies on US college campuses among students, faculty, and community members.

Parameter	Value
Costs (USD)	
Interventions ^b	
<i>Minimal social distancing</i>	151,500
<i>Extensive social distancing</i>	407,500
<i>Masks</i>	370,000
<i>Extensive social distancing + Masks</i>	620,000
Laboratory SARs-Cov-2 diagnostic test (per test)	10
Student quarantine room (per day)	30
Hospital inpatient cost (per day)	1,640
ICU cost (per day)	2,680

^aFor example, a student attending an 1-hour discussion session with 10 students will accrue 15 contact-hours.

^bIntervention costs were totaled based on which NPIs and mobility restrictions were included and included masks, cleaning, and software costs.

Abbreviations: **NPIs**: Non-pharmacologic interventions. **ICU**: intensive care unit.

Table 2. Clinical outcomes among students and faculty by strategy (results are reported per 5,000 students and 1,000 faculty)

NPIs	Isolation		Infections			Total tests	Total student isolation days	Asymptomatic in isolation, %
	location	Testing	Students	Faculty	Total			
<i>Campus closed</i>	n/a	n/a	1,401	26	1,427	--	--	--
<i>No intervention</i>	n/a	n/a	3,746	164	3,910	--	--	--
<i>Minimal social distancing</i>								
	ResIsol	Self-screen	3,147	131	3,278	--	2,510	--
	DesigIsol ^a	Self-screen	3,290	140	3,430	1,057	2,325	--
	DesigIsol	1-time LT	3,146	125	3,271	6,973	2,183	0.08
	DesigIsol	RLTq14	2,441	102	2,543	42,560	3,850	0.45
	DesigIsol	RLTq7	1,479	71	1,550	80,569	3,162	0.57
	DesigIsol	RLTq3	713	54	767	140,977	2,170	0.58

Table 2, continued. Clinical outcomes among students and faculty by strategy (results are reported per 5,000 students and 1,000 faculty)

NPIs	Isolation		Infections			Total tests	Total student isolation days	Asymptomatic in isolation, %
	location	Testing	Students	Faculty	Total			
<i>Extensive Social Distancing</i>								
	ResIsol	Self-screen	1,927	52	1,979	--	1,416	--
	DesigIsol ^a	Self-screen	2,188	73	2,260	655	1,337	--
	DesigIsol	1-time LT	1,998	64	2,062	6,576	1,334	0.04
	DesigIsol	RLTq14	1,167	45	1,213	44,259	1,788	0.46
	DesigIsol	RLTq7	595	40	635	83,233	1,393	0.54
	DesigIsol	RLTq3	274	35	309	144,153	897	0.59
<i>Masks</i>								
	ResIsol	Self-screen	1,519	51	1,570	--	1,133	--
	DesigIsol ^a	Self-screen	1,456	48	1,504	454	841	--
	DesigIsol	1-time PCR	1,437	50	1,487	6,429	968	0.04

Table 2, continued. Clinical outcomes among students and faculty by strategy (results are reported per 5,000 students and 1,000 faculty).

NPIs	Isolation		Infections			Total tests	Total student isolation days	Asymptomatic in isolation, %
	location	Testing	Students	Faculty	Total			
<i>Masks, continued</i>								
	DesigIsol ^a	RLTq14	689	35	724	44,802	1,068	0.46
	DesigIsol	RLTq7	437	32	468	83,687	1,043	0.54
	DesigIsol	RLTq3	215	26	241	144,455	763	0.62
<i>Extensive Social Distancing + Masks</i>								
	ResIsol	Self-screen	493	28	521	--	391	--
	DesigIsol ^a	Self-screen	508	29	537	220	339	--
	DesigIsol	1-time LT	606	28	634	6,219	495	0.08
	DesigIsol	RLTq14	268	27	295	45,313	539	0.46
	DesigIsol	RLTq7	182	29	211	84,501	495	0.57
	DesigIsol	RLTq3	151	25	176	145,219	574	0.58

^aAdmission to quarantine if ‘positive’ symptom screen is confirmed by laboratory testing.

Abbreviations: **ResIsol**: residence isolation in student dorm room; **DesigIsol**: student quarantine in separate location. **LT**: laboratory test; **RLT**: routine laboratory test every X days.

Table 3. Cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 mitigation strategies on US college campuses.

Strategy	Isolation		Total costs (USD)	Infections prevented ^a	QALYs lost	Cost/infection	
	location	Testing				prevented ^b	Cost/QALY ^b
<i>No intervention</i>	n/a	n/a	310,283	--	16.44	--	--
<i>Minimal social distancing</i>	ResIsol	Self-screen	414,749	632	13.95	d	d
<i>Masks</i>	ResIsol	Self-screen	488,254	2,341	6.13	76	17,300
<i>Minimal social distancing</i>	DesigIsol	Self-screen	508,153	481	14.67	D	D
<i>Masks</i>	DesigIsol	Self-screen	512,750	2,407	5.79	d	D
<i>Minimal social distancing</i>	DesigIsol	1-time LT	546,927	640	13.59	D	D
<i>Extensive social distancing</i>	ResIsol	Self-screen	551,693	1,932	7.19	D	D
<i>Masks</i>	DesigIsol	1-time LT	576,108	2,423	5.79	D	d
<i>Extensive social distancing</i>	DesigIsol	Self-screen	624,371	1,650	8.76	D	D
<i>Extensive social distancing + Masks</i>	ResIsol	Self-screen	664,015	3,389	2.56	168	49,200
<i>Extensive social distancing</i>	DesigIsol	1-time LT	667,518	1,848	8.76	D	D
<i>Extensive social distancing + Masks</i>	DesigIsol	Self-screen	677,520	3,373	2.60	D	D

Table 3, continued. Cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 mitigation strategies on US college campuses.

Strategy	Isolation		Total costs (USD)	Infections prevented ^a	QALYs lost	Cost/infection	
	location	Testing				prevented ^b	Cost/QALY ^b
<i>Extensive social distancing + Masks</i>	DesigIsol	1-time LT	747,829	3,276	2.81	D	D
<i>Minimal social distancing</i>	DesigIsol	RLTq14	898,542	1,367	11.23	D	D
<i>Masks</i>	DesigIsol	RLTq14	909,557	3,186	3.47	D	D
<i>Extensive social distancing</i>	DesigIsol	RLTq14	997,635	2,698	5.19	D	D
<i>Campus closed^c</i>	n/a	n/a	1,099,181	2,483	4.46	D	D
<i>Extensive social distancing + Masks</i>	DesigIsol	RLTq14	1,118,667	3,615	2.00	2,008	811,400
<i>Minimal Social Distancing</i>	DesigIsol	RLTq7	1,183,393	2,360	7.38	D	D
<i>Masks</i>	DesigIsol	RLTq7	1,280,258	3,442	2.71	D	D
<i>Extensive social distancing</i>	DesigIsol	RLTq7	1,337,494	3,275	3.54	D	D
<i>Extensive social distancing + Masks</i>	DesigIsol	RLTq7	1,504,746	3,699	1.88	4,596	d
<i>Minimal social distancing</i>	DesigIsol	RLTq3	1,702,406	3,143	4.65	D	D
<i>Masks</i>	DesigIsol	RLTq3	1,863,026	3,669	1.88	D	D
<i>Extensive social distancing</i>	DesigIsol	RLTq3	1,909,521	3,601	2.47	D	D
<i>Extensive social distancing + Masks</i>	DesigIsol	RLTq3	2,110,595	3,735	1.64	17,200	2,804,600

^aCompared to *No intervention*.


^bA strategy is dominated if it is more costly and less effective than another strategy (strong dominance, “D”) or some combination of other strategies (weak dominance, “d”). ICERs are rounded to \$100.

^cAssuming that 100 students defer enrollment for the semester because the campus is closed.


Abbreviations: **USD**: US dollars; **QALY**: quality-adjusted life-year; **ResIsol**: residence isolation in student dorm room; **DesigIsol**: student quarantine in separate location; **LT**: laboratory test; **RLT**: routine laboratory test every X days.

Figure 1. Infections and costs by COVID-19 mitigation strategy

A. Student infections



B. Faculty infections



C. Costs (test cost: 10\$)




Figure 2. Efficiency Frontier (\$/infection-prevented)

