medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

AN EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS REOPENING STRATEGIES FOR IN-PERSON CLASSES SAFELY AMID THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

[1]*Ujjal Kumar Mukherjee,* [2]*Subhonmesh Bose,* [1]*Anton Ivanov,* [1]*Sebastian Souyris,* [1]*Sridhar Seshadri,* [1]*Padmavati Sridhar,* [1]*Ronald Watkins,* and [1]*Yuqian Xu*

[1]*Gies College of Business, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign,* [2]*Electrical and Computer Engineering, Grainger College of Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

Can educational institutions open up safely amid COVID-19? We build an epidemiological model to investigate the strategies necessary for institutions to reopen. The four measures that are most relevant for in-person opening are: (i) wide-spread rapid testing, possibly saliva-based, (ii) enforcement of mask wearing, (iii) social distancing, and (iv) contact tracing. We demonstrate that institutions need to test at a relatively high level (e.g., at least once every week) in the initial phases of reopening. Contact tracing is relatively more important when the positivity rate from random testing is relatively low, which is likely during the initial phases. A Bayesian adaptive testing strategy based on positivity rates can help institutions optimally manage the costs and risks of reopening. Finally, we provide empirical estimates of some of the educational institutions opening up experience and comment on mitigation strategies. We also provide an estimate of locational effects of institution on mitigation strategies. This paper contributes to the nascent literature on combating the COVID-19 pandemic and is especially relevant for large-scale organizations. This work is motivated and guided by the SHIELD program of UIUC.

Short Title. *Reopening Strategies Amid COVID-19.*

Acknowledgements. *We acknowledge the kind guidance and support of Ron Watkins, Managing Director at Shield Illinois & Associate Dean Gies College of Business. Shield Illinois is a saliva-based rapid testing program under which 10,000 staff and students are tested every day, from a population of approximately 50,000 in campus. The program is also expanded nationally*[1]*. We also acknowledge the funding provided by C3.ai for conducting the research.*

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has closed several organizations nation-wide, including educational institutions, with severe economic and social consequences[1]. While the importance of reopening is well acknowledged, there is less of a consensus on the strategies necessary for the safe opening of educational institutions in the United States and around the globe[2-9]. The Center for Disease Control (CDC) has issued reopening guidelines[10] that include extensive hand hygiene, cloth face coverings, disinfections, physical barriers and spacing of individuals inside enclosed surroundings, and frequent testing. The early experience of reopening has met with relatively unfavorable outcomes, such as the Cherokee County School District in the state of Georgia, USA, that had to send 250 of its staff and students to quarantine after reopening in August, 2020[11-12]. The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, USA, reversed its plans for in-person classes after more than 130 confirmed infections in the first week of reopening[17]. Motivated by these observations, we explore these questions: (i) *Can schools and educational institutions and other organizations open safely amid COVID-19?* (ii) *If so, what are the measures required to open educational institutions and other organizations to commence in-person operations while maintaining public-health safety from the spread of COVID-19?* We use a combination of a stylized analytical model and an agent-based simulation analysis to provide policy guidance toward answering these questions. We evaluate the following strategies: (i) *widespread rapid testing of individuals*, (ii) *mask wearing and other safety measures such as handwashing and disinfecting*, (iii) *social distancing*, and (iv) *contact tracing* of detected individuals. The questions are motivated and guided by the SHIELD program of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, in which the university is testing 10,000 students and staff every day (testing per individual per week is 0.2) for in-person classes. We use data from UIUC SHIELD program and similar data from other institutions to comment on the likely strategies, and how institutions can adapt to emerging epidemics within institutions to ensure health and safety of their members.

[1] https://news.uillinois.edu/view/7815/1904934500

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The primary take-aways and conclusions from the study are the following: Methodologically, the compartmental diffusion models, as it is are not suitable for small population based analysis of institutional setup. Therefore, we have proposed an epidemic model that takes into account small population dynamics and can more accurately model institutional setups. To safely reopen institutions amid the COVID-19 pandemic, organizations need to adopt a combination of the four strategies. The large scale of universities creates complexities of efforts and escalation of costs in ensuring that testing can be performed at numbers that are sufficient to dampen rates of infection. While doing less of one can be compensated by adequately increasing the extent of the other, trying to use a subset of actions may require impractical levels of some strategies. For example, only testing without proper mask enforcement and social distancing will require testing almost every individual every day for safe reopening. We find optimally allocating testing capacity between random testing and contact tracing is important. Interestingly, and somewhat counterintuitively, the value of contact tracing is higher when the positivity rate from random testing is relatively lower. Positivity rates from random testing is an indicator of current and future infections. At low positivity rates, the detection rates from random testing is low. Therefore, in the initial stages of reopening, when the infection load is likely to be lower, focusing greater efforts toward contact tracing is important. However, contact tracing needs to be optimally combined with random testing. We demonstrate that given a probability of infection transmission of 5%, and contact rate of 10 individuals per day, a somewhat typical scenario, every individual needs to be tested once every 5 days or more for dampening infections in large educational institutions. Rather than adopting a fixed testing capacity, a flexible adaptive system based on Bayesian updating of estimated positivity rates of testing can be more cost efficient. During the initial stages of reopening, it is important to test at a high level, and the testing levels can be reduced adaptively as the infection load (positivity rate) reduces. The adaptive testing strategy can be seen as a risk-sensitive strategy, since it accounts for the latent risk of COVID-19 transmission. Finally, one of the primary empirical take-away are the initial opening experience of large universities (UIUC, ISU, and others) and estimation of infection transmission parameters (infectivity) from the initial opening up. This experience and analysis can provide a reference for likely infectivity and infection transmission in large institutions. Also, we empirically demonstrate that the location of a university is an important consideration because of the possibility external influx of infections from the environment. Specifically, we demonstrate with data that higher the infection rate of the county where a university is located, higher is the infection rate within the university. We also provide evidence that the relationship is in fact dyadic, in that for large universities with high levels of influx of students from outside, contribute significantly towards the growth of infection in the surrounding region. Specifically, we show for the two large universities we analyze, the reopening significantly increases the infection load of the county where the universities are located.

THE SARS-CoV-2 INFECTION AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES

The SARS-CoV-2 is a novel strain of coronavirus that currently does not have any approved cure. For mitigation, countries implemented strategies that varied from complete lockdown of large geographic areas to partial movement restrictions and mask enforcements in public places. One particular challenge is asymptomatic transmission, in which the disease remains asymptomatic in many infected individuals ranging from a few days to several weeks[13]. One estimation of the COVID-19 infection in Italy[14] indicates that the real infection in Italy as of May 4, 2020, had been between 2.2-3.5 million individuals, while the detected infections were approximately 200,000. Therefore, a strategy of random testing is required to detect and control the spread of further infections through systematic isolation and quarantining of those who test positive for infection. A study[15] indicates that mask wearing reduces infection transmission by 25% to 51% from normal rates. The FDA has recently approved saliva-based rapid testing based on the loop amplified isothermal amplification (LAMP), which costs significantly less than the usual PCR test[16]. This provides the opportunity to test at a high level and obtain results rapidly within institutions.

THE INFECTION PROCESS

We develop an analytical infection and testing process model which is suited for institutions with relatively smaller number of individuals as compared to general public life such as counties and cities. In institutional setup, large sample based compartmental epidemic models, which assume populations to be significantly larger

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

than the number of infections, are not sufficient and is not likely to provide precise estimates. Therefore, we reformulate the epidemic infection process and testing process, considering small samples which can be suitable for institutional setups. We consider the small sample dynamics that can provide a stylized, yet realistic approximation of the institutional setups, and consider issues such as contact rates, overlaps of contacts of infected individuals and external inflow of infections. The analytical model guides our simulation experiments.

Consider an institution with N individuals. Let $x(t)$ denote the number of undetected infections, $n(t)$ denote the number of uninfected individuals, and $r(t) = N - n(t) - x(t)$ denote the number of detected and isolated individuals at time $t = 1 \ldots T$. Therefore, the number of active individuals is $x(t) + n(t)$. Consider two individuals i and j. The probability of individual i being infected by individual j, denoted by $\mathbb{P}(i \leftarrow j)$, is equal to the product of the probability that j is infected $(j \in x(t))$, probability that i is not already infected $(i \in n(t))$, the probability that j comes in contact with i, $(j \leftrightarrow i \mid \mathcal{M}(t))$, where $\mathcal{M}(t)$ is the contact rate, the number of unique individuals that one individual meets on average, and the probability of infection transmission given contact $\left(\pi(m(t))\right)$, where $m(t)$ is the extent of mask enforcement, measured as the fraction of the organization that adheres to wearing masks. Therefore, the infection process by Bayes theorem is stated as: $\mathbb{P}(i \leftarrow j) = \mathbb{P}(j \leftrightarrow i|\mathcal{M}(t), x(t), n(t)) \times \mathbb{P}(j \in x(t)|x(t), n(t)) \times \mathbb{P}(i \in n(t)|x(t), n(t)) \times \pi(m(t))$. The individual probabilities are: $\mathbb{P}(j \leftrightarrow i|\mathcal{M}(t)) \approx \frac{\mathcal{M}(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}$, $\mathbb{P}(j \in x(t)|x(t), n(t)) = \frac{x(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}$, $\mathbb{P}(i \in n(t)|x(t), n(t)) = \frac{n(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}$ and $\pi(m(t)) = \pi_0(1 - m(t))^2 + 2\pi_1 m(t)(1 - m(t)) + \pi_2 m(t)^2$, where π_0 is the probability of infection when neither of the two individuals are wearing masks, π_1 is the probability that only one is wearing a mask, and π_2 is the probability that both are wearing masks. The rate of change in the transmission probability with respect to mask adherence is given by $\frac{\partial \pi(m(t))}{\partial m(t)} = -2(\pi_0 + \pi_2 - 2\pi_1)\left\{\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{\pi_1-\pi_2}{\pi_0-\pi_1}\right)} - m(t)\right\}$. *Case 1:* If we assume $\pi_1 - \pi_2 < \pi_0 - \pi_1$, then $\pi_0 + \pi_2 - 2\pi_1 > 0$, and $0 < \left(\frac{\pi_1-\pi_2}{\pi_0-\pi_1}\right) < 1$ which indicates that $\frac{\partial \pi(m(t))}{\partial m(t)} < 0$ and $\frac{\partial^2 \pi(m(t))}{\partial m(t)^2} > 0$, i.e., the infection transmission is a decreasing convex function of *m(t)*. *Case II*: if we assume that $\pi_1 - \pi_2 > \pi_0 - \pi_1$, then, $\pi_0 + \pi_2 - 2\pi_1 < 0$ and $\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{\pi_1-\pi_2}{\pi_0-\pi_1}\right)} - m(t) < 0$, indicating $\frac{\partial \pi(m(t))}{\partial m(t)} < 0$, and $\frac{\partial^2 \pi(m(t))}{\partial m(t)^2} < 0$, i.e., the infection transmission is a decreasing concave function of *m(t)*. Therefore, the transmission probability is a decreasing function in $m(t)$. Finally, $\mathbb{P}(i \leftarrow j) = \left[\frac{\mathcal{M}(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}\right] \times \left[\frac{x(t)n(t)}{(x(t)+n(t))^2}\right] \times \pi(m(t))$. The probability that individual i is infected is: $\mathbb{P}(i \in x(t)) = \pi(m(t))\mathcal{M}(t)\left[\frac{x(t)n(t)}{(x(t)+n(t))^2}\right]$ and the expected number of new infections $\Delta x(t)$ is: $\Delta x(t) = \pi(m(t))\mathcal{M}(t)\left[\frac{x(t)n(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}\right]$. No institution is a closed system. There are bound to be intrusions from outside[2]. We incorporate this as an additional parameter $r > 1$ as $\Delta x(t) = r\,\pi(m(t))\mathcal{M}(t)\left[\frac{x(t)n(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}\right]$. To illustrate the dynamics numerically, consider an infectivity rate of $\pi(m(t)) = 0.1$, contact rate of $\mathcal{M}(t) = 10$, and external interaction of 1% ($r = 1.01$); for a population of 5,000 members with 100 infections, then, 98 new infections are expected in the next period.

THE TESTING PROCESS

Let the total testing capacity be $T(t)$ and the total random testing done be $T_R(t)$. For the purpose of the simulation, we assume that the testing is rapid and the test results are available the same day. The number of new detections and isolations in purely random testing is: $\Delta R_r(t) = \frac{x(t)T_R(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}$. For safe reopening, contact tracing of the new detections is important. However, the efficiency of contact tracing is never 100%. The efficiency of contact tracing has two distinct parts: (i) *information efficiency* $(\eta_I \in (0,1))$, percentage of contact information retrieved, and (ii) *allocative efficiency* $(\eta_a \in (0,1))$, percentage of testing capacity for contact tracing. The total number of expected contacts of the detected individuals is $\mathcal{M}(t)\Delta R(t)$. However, many of these individuals may be in more than one contact list. The likelihood that a contact is in only one contact list is given by the Binomial probability of exactly one contact from the detected individuals, with the Binomial probability of contact being $\frac{\mathcal{M}(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}$. Therefore, the probability that an individual is in none of the lists of contacts of the newly

[2] One smart and feasible mitigation strategy is to test any individual who has traveled beyond the county. The saliva-based test provides a way to accomplish this quickly and at a low cost.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

detected infections through random testing is given by the Binomial probability $\left(1-\frac{\mathcal{M}(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}\right)^{\Delta R_r(t)}$. Therefore, the probability that an individual is in at least one of the contact lists is given by $1-\left(1-\frac{\mathcal{M}(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}\right)^{\Delta R_r(t)} \approx \frac{\mathcal{M}(t)\Delta R_r(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}$. Therefore, the expected number of unique individuals in the contact tracing list is given by $\left(x(t)+n(t)-\Delta R_r(t)\right)\left(\frac{\mathcal{M}(t)\Delta R_r(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}\right) = \mathcal{M}(t)\Delta R_r(t)\left(1-\frac{\Delta R_r(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}\right)$. Let us denote $Q(t) = \left(1-\frac{\Delta R_r(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}\right)$. Therefore, the total number of unique contacts is $\mathcal{M}(t)\Delta R_r(t)Q(t)$. Due to information efficiency, the total number of contacts identified will be $C(t) = \eta_I \mathcal{M}(t)\Delta R_r(t)Q(t)$. The allocative efficiency sets a maximum limit to the testing available in a day, i.e., $T_a(t) = \eta_a T(t)$. Therefore, the total number of contacts traced and tested is $C_T(t) = \min\{T_a(t), C(t)\}$ and the total number of random tests done is given by $T_R(t) = (1-\eta_a)T(t) + [\eta_a T_a(t) - C_T(t)]_+$. The likelihood of detection in the contact-traced individuals is the probability of infection transmission given that contact with an infected individual has happened, which is given by $\pi(m(t)) \times \left(\frac{n(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}\right) + \left(\frac{x(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}\right)$. Therefore, the number of detections in a period is: $\Delta R(t) = \frac{x(t)T_R(t)}{x(t)+n(t)} + C_T(t) \times \left(\frac{\pi(m(t))\, n(t)+x(t)}{x(t)+n(t)}\right)$. As an illustrative example, for a population of 5,000 persons with 100 infections, a testing capacity of 2,000 per day is likely to detect 40 individuals, from random testing. These 40 individuals are likely to have 400 contacts, where the contact rate of 0.1 would yield a detection of another 40 infected individuals.

THE POSITIVITY RATE: AN INDICATOR FOR RATE OF SPREAD

The positivity rate is defined as the rate of positive test outcomes in random testing and is given by $\hat{p}(t) = \frac{P(t)}{T(t)}$, where the total number of COVID-19 cases detected is $P(t)$ from a total number of $T(t)$ tests. The positivity rate is a leading indicator for infection prevalence and future expected infections: $\mathbb{E}[\Delta x(t)] = r\,\pi(m(t))\mathcal{M}(t)\,\hat{p}(t)(1-\hat{p}(t))(x(t)+n(t))$ with variance $\sigma^2(\Delta x(t)) \approx \left\{\frac{\hat{p}(t)(1-\hat{p}(t))}{T(t)}\right\}\left\{r\,\pi(m(t))\mathcal{M}(t)(1-2\hat{p}(t))(x(t)+n(t))\right\}^2$. It must be noted that with the sufficiently large size of the organization, these estimates are fairly precise; however, for smaller organizations the small sample properties will be approximate. For a range of positivity rate, $\hat{p}(t) \in (0,0.5)$, the expected increase in new infections is: $\frac{d\mathbb{E}[\Delta x(t)]}{d\hat{p}(t)} = r\,\pi(m(t))\mathcal{M}(t)\,(1-2\hat{p}(t))(x(t)+n(t)) \geq 0$. Also, for smaller values of positivity rates, around 1-2% the slope of the new infections with respect to the positivity rate curve $\frac{d\mathbb{E}[\Delta x(t)]}{d\hat{p}(t)} \approx r\,\pi(m(t))\mathcal{M}(t)(x(t)+n(t))$ provides an estimate of the infection transmission rate (infectivity), i.e., how well the preventative measures of mask wearing and social distancing are working. These parameters are not easy to measure; however, the positivity rate in random testing provides an estimate of the estimate of effectiveness of all preventative strategies. Furthermore, the rate of detection $(\Delta R(t))$ with respect to contact tracing (η_a) is given by: $\frac{\partial(\Delta R(t))}{\partial \eta_a} = \pi(m(t))T(t)(1-\hat{p}(t))$, which is decreasing in the positivity rate. Therefore, in the initial stages with low levels of positivity rates, it is important to have higher levels of contact tracing, preferably using a combination of electronic and manual approaches. This is expected, since a contact tracing strategy is focused toward individuals who had already been in contact with infected individuals. We use the model to analyze Fixed Testing, Adaptive Testing, and cross-verify the analysis using agent-based simulation. As an illustrative example, for a positivity rate of 2% with an infection transmission probability of 5%, the yield in contact tracing is likely to be at least 3% higher than random testing; however, when the positivity rate is 8%, the yield in contact tracing and random testing is not likely to be significantly different. Similarly, when the positivity rate is close to 40%, only random testing may suffice. Therefore, when the positivity rate is lower, contact tracing is significantly more important than when the positivity rate is higher.

FIXED TESTING CAPACITY

Decision-makers estimate the likely range of the infection that they expect in an institutional setting by observing other similar institutions, the state of infection in the social environment in which an institution is situated, and the extent of external interaction; these factors determine the baseline risk of COVID-19. If the estimated maximum initial positivity rate based on secondary experience or expert opinion is p_m, the testing capacity needs to be set at a level T_m, such that $r\,\pi(m)\mathcal{M}\,p_m(1-p_m)N \leq (p_m + \eta_a(1-p_m))T_m$, i.e., the basic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

reproduction number R_0, is less than one within the institution, which gives $\frac{T_m}{N} \geq \frac{r\,\pi(m)\mathcal{M}\,p_m(1-p_m)}{p_m+\eta_a(1-p_m)}$. The reason we focus on the initial positivity rate is that if the infection is dampened from the initial period, i.e., in period 2, if the infection load is lower than that of period 1, automatically the infection drives down a declining spiral, and vice-versa. The fixed testing capacity that ensures safe reopening given the estimation of the infection rates ($r\,\pi(m)\mathcal{M}$) is given by $\left(\frac{T}{N}\right)_{\{min\}} = \frac{r\,\pi(m)\mathcal{M}}{(1+\sqrt{\eta_a})^2}$. Therefore, for a transmission rate of $\pi(m) = 0.05$, mobility of $\mathcal{M} = 10$, and $r = 1.1$, and a 30% allocation for contact testing, $\approx$ 20% of the organization need to be tested every day.

ADAPTIVE TESTING ALLOCATION

The adaptive testing strategy works by Bayesian updating of the beliefs about the infection load in an organization. The decision-makers have a prior belief on the infection load distribution, denoted by p_0 and $\sigma_0^2(p)$. The decision-makers allocate a total testing capacity of T_0, with $R_0 = \frac{T_0}{N}$, such that $\frac{T_0}{N} \geq \frac{r\,\pi(m)\mathcal{M}\,p_0'(1-p_0')}{p_0'+\eta_a(1-p_0')}$, where $p_0' = p_0 + Z_\alpha\sigma_0^2(p)$, where α is the degree of confidence with which the organization would like to ensure that the disease is dampened. Then, the decision-makers observe the positivity rate $\hat{p}_1$. The decision-makers update the belief on the positivity rate as $p_1 = \frac{p_0\sqrt{\hat{p}_1(1-\hat{p}_1)}+\hat{p}_1\sigma_0^2(p)\sqrt{T_0}}{\sqrt{\hat{p}_1(1-\hat{p}_1)}+\sigma_0^2(p)\sqrt{T_0}}$, with $\sigma_1^2(p) = \frac{\sigma_0^2(p)\sqrt{\hat{p}_1(1-\hat{p}_1)}}{\sqrt{\hat{p}_1(1-\hat{p}_1)}+\sigma_0^2(p)\sqrt{T_0}}$, and choose a level of testing equal to T_1 such that $\frac{T_1}{N} \geq \frac{r\,\pi(m)\mathcal{M}\,p_1'(1-p_1')}{p_1'+\eta_a(1-p_1')}$, where $p_1' = p_1 + Z_\alpha\sigma_1^2(p)$. As an illustrative example, the previous estimate of positivity is 3%, and a random testing of 1,000 individuals yields a positivity rate of 4%, then the updated positivity rate will be 3.4%, and the updated testing rate should increase by 15% in the next period to dampen the growth in positivity rate.

AGENT-BASED SIMULATION OF INSTITUTIONAL REOPENING

As indicated earlier, general analytical solutions of the standard epidemiological processes are insufficient for relatively smaller populations, as in the case of institutions and universities. We use an agent-based simulation to evaluate the possible combination of strategies that can be used for possible safe reopening of large institutions. In particular, we test the relative efficacy of random and adaptive testing under different scenarios of transmission of COVID-19. The infection transmission and the detection dynamics follow the analytical setup that we described earlier. Agent-based simulations have been extensively used in the context of epidemic spreads and transmissions[18]. In agent-based simulations, a collection of independent agents are allowed to interact with each other following probabilistic but simple rules. The Agent-Based Simulation is an alternative to the compartment-based modeling (e.g., SIR) and has several advantages[19]. Due to the complex interaction of a large number of agents over a time horizon (modeled as cycles of interaction), the agent-based simulation can generate complex dynamical system behavior. Finally, agent-based simulation can incorporate randomization at the individual level and generate a distribution over possible scenarios, as shown in Figure 1a, where we show an illustrative example of the output of the agent-based simulation. We have run the simulation 1,000 times for each set of parameters, and have plotted the median case, the 95-th percentile case, and the 5-th percentile case. The median, 95-th, and 5-th percentile case are computed based on the area below the susceptible (not infected) curve. The area below the susceptible curve for a fixed population provides an estimate of the performance of the preventative strategies and testing. As an illustration, a sharp drop in the number of non-infected individuals will lead to a lower area below the susceptible curve, which indicates a high rate of infection. We summarize the strategies in terms of the normalized area under the susceptible curve.

In the agent-based simulation, we create a collection of 5,000 agents, distributed over a space. Each agent moves independently in a random manner. The mobility is controlled by the $\mathcal{M}$ parameter, which determines the average number of contacts per agent per day with other agents. We introduce 5 infected individuals at the beginning of the simulation. Further, we introduce a low probability of random external infection (0.005%) in every period. Since the initial infection and the external infections are not controllable strategies, we have kept these two parameters constant over cycles of simulation. As agents come in contact with other agents, they can transmit infection if one of the agents is already infected. The infection transmission occurs with a probability that is dependent on mask-wearing behavior. Finally, the testing is incorporated at

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

two levels. A part of the testing is dedicated to random testing, where random individuals are tested. If the random individuals are already infected, they are detected and quarantined. The second part of the testing is contact tracing. The detected individuals reveal their contacts with a probability equal to the informational efficiency of contact tracing. While in reality, the informational efficiency can be modified with institutional efforts, the informational efficiency is inelastic given a certain state of technology for contact tracing. We modify the allocation efficiency and the allocation of test capacity for contact tracing. The outcome measure is the number of infected individuals during the first 50 days. The summary outcomes from the agent-based simulation study is provided in Figure 1. Below, we summarize observations from the agent-based simulation.

Fig. 1. Agent-Based Simulation Output for Combinations of Strategies.



Effect of Social Distancing and Institutional Restrictions on Mobility

In Figure 1b, N is maintained at 5000, T at 250, CT at 0.1, and p at 0.05, which is equivalent to 95% of the population wearing masks. In Figure 1b, the red curve represents $M = 20$, indicating that each individual has a high level of contact (20 per day on average) with other individuals. In this scenario, the whole organization becomes infected within 2 weeks of reopening. The scaled (max area set equal to 1) median area under the susceptible curve is 0.225. The maximum positivity rate in the organization is 60%, which is achieved on the 15th day. Also, Figure 1a is an illustrative outcome from the simulation. Figure 1a show the median case in solid lines, the upper and the lower 90th confidence intervals in dotted lines. The red line indicates the number of infected individuals in the system who are infected but not yet detected and removed. The black line indicates

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

the number of individuals who are infected but detected and removed from the system by quarantining or other mobility restrictions. Finally, the blue line indicates the number of individuals who are not yet infected. Furthermore, from Figure 1b we observe that when the mobility reduces to $M = 10$ corresponding to the green curve, then the number of days to full infection increases to 3 weeks instead of 2 weeks. The area under the susceptible curve is 0.377. It is to be noted that these figures are for a low level of testing $\left(\frac{T}{N} = 0.05\right)$, where every individual is tested only once a month. For $M = 5$, we find that in the 5th quantile of the infections distribution, while the whole organization gets infected in 2 months (approximately 50 days), more than 50% of the organization remains uninfected for the 95th quantile. The area under the susceptible curve for the median of the distribution is 0.763. Finally, for $M = 1$, i.e., each individual only meets one other individual, then the organization largely remains uninfected even at a low level of testing. The area under the susceptible curve is 0.998. However, at $M = 1$ the idea of in-person operations is severely restrictive, and a combination of other measures may be required.

Effect of Mask Wearing and Sanitization Strategy

Mask wearing determines the probability of transmission $\pi(m)$ denoted as p. In Figure 1c, for ($p = 0.20$), the whole organization gets infected within 15 days with a median area under the susceptible curve of 0.224; in Figure 1c ($p = 0.15$), the whole organization gets infected within 20 days and the median area under the susceptible curve is 0.281; in Figure 1c ($p = 0.1$), the whole organization gets infected within 30 days with a median area under the susceptible curve equal to 0.355; and finally, for ($p = 0.05$), the infection rate is reduced significantly and the majority of the organization remains uninfected, with a median area under the susceptible curve of 0.735. These figures demonstrate that mask enforcement is an essential part of the reopening of institutions. In Figure 1c, the level of testing is still low when each individual gets tested only once a week. The figures demonstrate that just by mask enforcement, organizations cannot ensure a safe reopening. Even when the probability of transmission is only 5%, a significant section of the organization still gets infected.

Effect of Testing Capacity

Figures 1d and 1e, respectively, indicate the simulation outcome for different levels of testing for fixed values of infectivity, and the different levels of testing that the organization would need to institute at different levels of infectivity for the organization to reopen safely. From Figure 1d, at low levels of testing, even with high levels of mask enforcement and contact rates restrictions, significant transmission risk exists at low levels of testing. In Figure 1d, we vary the level of testing from a low level of 250 tests per period (red curve) for a population of 5000 individuals, 500 tests per period (green curve), 1000 tests (magenta curve), 2000 tests (blue curve), and 2500 tests (pink curve). Maintaining all other parameters invariant, the testing levels have a significant impact on the expected spread of the disease after reopening. The spread at a level of $\frac{T}{N} = 0.05$ (250 tests per day) leads to an adverse outcome in the simulation with an area under the susceptible curve of 0.248; for $\frac{T}{N} = 0.1$ (500 tests per day), the area under the susceptible curve is 0.252; for $\frac{T}{N} = 0.20$ (1000 tests per day), the area under the susceptible curve is 0.281; for $\frac{T}{N} = 0.4$ (2000 tests per day), the area under the susceptible curve is 0.521; and for $\frac{T}{N} = 0.50$ (2500 tests per day), the area under the susceptible curve is 0.989. Only when $\frac{T}{N} \geq 0.4$ do we observe favorable outcomes with moderate levels of mask enforcement ($p = 0.1$, corresponding to 75% mask enforcement) and contact rate ($M = 10$). Therefore, at these levels of mask and mobility-related measures, every individual needs to get tested twice a week to have a safe opening. Indeed the theoretical minimum number of tests per day for the parameters in Figure 1d is 0.32. The theoretical limits entail simplifications related to the dependencies of the different strategies.

In Figure 1e, we present the simulation outcome for different levels of mask enforcement and testing which can lead to favorable outcomes during reopening of institutions. Figure 1e demonstrates the level of testing required for a safe opening for varying levels of mask enforcement, while mobility and contact frequency is fixed at $M = 5$. Corresponding to $p = 0.05$, a testing level of 1000 tests $\left(\frac{T}{N} = 0.2\right)$ is required; corresponding to $p = 0.1$, a testing level of 1500 tests $\left(\frac{T}{N} = 0.3\right)$ is required; corresponding to p=0.15, a testing level of 2500 tests

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

$\left(\frac{T}{N} = 0.5\right)$ per day is required. A similar pattern can be observed for the other three scenarios, where $p = 0.05$ for all three scenarios, but the mobility and contact rate changes from 1 to 15, and the level of testing required changes from 250 to 2500. From the theoretical estimates, we observe that the minimum level of testing required for safe opening is $\frac{T_m}{N} \geq \frac{r\,\pi(m)\mathcal{M}\,p_m(1-p_m)}{p_m+\eta_a(1-p_m)}$, where p_m is the positivity rate. Therefore, for the above parameters ($p = 0.05, r = 1.1, M = 5$), the minimum level of testing required is $\frac{T_m}{N} \geq 0.2295$, which corresponds to a testing level of 1150 per day for a 5,000-member organization. Therefore, the simulation approximately conforms to the theoretical model.

Contact Tracing and Focused Testing

In Figure 1f, we present the simulation results from contact tracing (denoted CT). Large-scale random testing is important, as we indicated in Figure 1e. However, from Figure 1f we find that contact tracing can assist in the testing strategy. For ($CT = 0.3$), as compared to ($CT = 0.1$), we observe that the 95th quantile curve indicates a much-reduced rate of infection. This indicates that contact tracing helps and assists in the large-scale testing strategy. This is true for a contact tracing rate of 0.5. However, the performance deteriorates when the contact tracing is at a level of 0.7, since at this level the random testing is significantly reduced, and due to the random influx of infections in an open system, we do not have all the infections detected by contacts alone. Therefore, this shows that contact tracing efforts and random testing efforts need to be complementary to each other and can be chosen in an optimal manner. Merely structured contact tracing without wide-scale random testing leads to unfavorable outcomes.

Adaptive Testing Strategy

The discussion so far has been focused on fixed strategies, where the testing levels remain fixed at every period. Due to the variable nature of the infection, a fixed capacity may lead to unnecessary testing and wasted costs. In adaptive testing, the decision-maker estimates the positivity rate and performs the number of tests to ensure the dampening of the infection in the next period. From the tests performed, the decision-maker adjusts the number of tests to be performed in the next period. While in the simulation we have not imposed restrictions, we acknowledge that there will be practical and logistical restrictions in real implementation scenarios. The adaptive testing adjusts the testing allocation according to the updated estimates of the positivity rates. In Figure 2, we plot the outcome of an illustrative simulation of fixed versus adaptive testing. Under the fixed strategy, 1000 tests are done at every period, whereas under adaptive testing the testing is varied based on the Bayesian updating of the positivity rates in the population. The adaptive testing performs significantly better than the fixed testing strategy. The average number of tests performed under adaptive testing is 650 tests. However, under adaptive testing, the allocation needs to be significantly higher in the initial period after opening. Once the infections are controlled, then the testing allocation can be reduced adaptively to take care of the sporadic external infections only. This demonstrates the importance of controlling any infection in the initial periods after reopening before the infection can spread widely among the population. Once the infection is controlled in the initial period and the infection transmission stabilizes to a low value, just doing the necessary number of tests can be sufficient. In the analytical model, we observe that the theoretical minimum threshold for adaptive testing required is given by $\frac{T_1}{N} \geq \frac{r\,\pi(m)\mathcal{M}\,p_1'(1-p_1')}{p_1'+\eta_a(1-p_1')}$. Therefore, if the positivity rate decreases from 10% to 5%, the testing threshold decreases by 30%, which is represented in the figure.

CASE ANALYSIS: REOPENING EXPERIENCE OF UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN AND ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

So far we provided description of the theoretical model, and the agent based simulation for providing policy pointers for reopening strategies. We tuned these models with data on reopening experience of two large public universities in the state of Illinois (i) University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign County, IL and (ii) Illinois State University, Normal, McLean County, IL. Both universities closed down for in-person classes mid-March 2020 in the wake of the rising cases of COVID-19 infection in the United States, and the State of Illinois. However, both universities decided to reopen for in-person classes in the Fall of 2020. For both

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

universities, the in-person classes commenced on August 21, 2020 after closing the campuses for more than 5 months prior to reopening. Both Universities rolled out extensive plans for student awareness, mandating mask wearing in university buildings, and extensive testing students under the SHIELD program with rapid saliva bases tests. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign planned to test all its 50,000 students, faculty and staff twice a week using an electronic mobile based application for managing the testing process and contact testing[24]. As expressed by an article in New York Times[24] these were the most extensive reopening plans that were put in place. Despite the extensive plans the initial opening up experience related to the spread of COVID-19 infection within and from outside the campus had been far from expectation. Similarly, the Illinois State University had 9000 students in campus in the fall, however, soon after opening up the positive rate of the COVID-19 infection increased significantly.

Fig. 2. Fixed versus Adaptive Testing (N=5000, p=0.05, M=10, T=1000, Starting positivity = 0.002)



We collected data on the number of tests conducted per day at both the universities and the number of positive cases that were identified at both the university campuses. The data were collected from the public COVID-19 dashboards for both universities. In-line with the discussion related to adaptive testing, we estimate the real positivity rate in the population from the observed positivity rate. To formalize the estimation, we consider that the population size is N and the real positivity of the population at any day is p_t, and there are $T \leq N$ tests conducted on the day. Then the probability of observing K confirmed COVID-19 cases follows $K \sim Hypergeometric(N, Np_t, T)$ with a Beta-binomial prior $Np_t \sim Beta - Binomial\ (N, \alpha, \beta)$. We performed an MCMC estimation of the actual positivity rate in the population of each universities using a sliding window techniques, where we use the data from a week to estimate the positivity rate of the population in consideration for the week, and then we slide the time window by a day each time to estimate the moving average positivity rates of the population. Furthermore, based on the trend of the positivity rates, we estimated the infection transmission factor (infectivity) which is a compound factor $\beta_I = r\,\pi(m)\mathcal{M}$ that accounts for the base infectivity, the mask wearing behavior and the social distancing behavior. In the university setting, the slope of the real positivity rates provides us with a good estimation of the infectivity within the population of the universities. In Figure 3, we provide the data and the estimation of the positivity rates for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. In Figure 4, we provide the estimates for Illinois State University.

From Figure 3a, we observe that with re-opening the number of tests per day was increased significantly at UIUC. However, from Figure 3b, we observe that the confirmed positives also increased significantly. A part of the increased confirmed cases is due to the increased tests, which led to higher rates of quarantine and isolation of the positive cases. While higher rates of detection with rapid saliva based testing at high volumes help in reduction of future infections, the number of positive cases kept increasing, which indicates that the unobserved factors of social distancing and mask wearing was not up to the level that was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

required for a safe reopening[24]. Figure 3c indicates the scatterplot of the observed positivity rates from the tests directly, with the estimated real positivity rates with a 7 day sliding window time-frame. Initially the positivity rates has a dip from 0.5% (opening up) to 0.4% after the first week. However, after the classes started and the campus started full operations (*note that all students were not on campus, some were remotely located*) the positivity rate increased significantly to a median estimate of 1.23% with a 95% confidence interval of [0.82%-1.67%]. Figure 3d presents the estimates of the infection transmission rate (infectivity). The estimated infectivity steadily increased after opening up, demonstrating that the strategies were not sufficient in dampening the disease. The infectivity increased from a low level to a mean level of 0.11 with a 95% confidence interval of [0.079-0.155]. Based on the estimates presented in figure 1 on the likely strategies of opening up, for an infectivity of 0.15 (considering worst case), every student needs to get tested every second day for dampening the disease. We believe this is a key insight that can help the focal university UIUC, and provide an estimate for other universities on the likely infectivity with similar sized campuses and student body size. Another strategy would be stricter enforcement of social distancing and mask wearing, however, the ability to do so is somewhat limited in a public university setting with a significant number of students living in off-campus private residence halls.

Figure 3. COVID-19 Infection of University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL

Fig. 3a. Daily Tests at UIUC



Fig. 3b. Total Confirmed Positive Cases



Fig. 3c. The Observed and Estimated Positivity Rates



Fig. 3d. The Estimated Infectivity Rates



Note. *Days indicate days from start of campus move-in, which is August 10, 2020*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 4. Estimates for Illinois State University, Normal, IL

Fig. 3a. Daily Tests at UIUC



Fig. 3b. Total Confirmed Positive Cases



Fig. 3c. The Observed and Estimated Positivity Rates



Fig. 3d. The Estimated Infectivity Rates



For Illinois State University, with a relatively smaller campus and a relatively smaller student body as compared to UIUC, the infectivity rates as shown in Figure 3d initially increased, but later stabilized and even reduced. However, the positivity estimates are significantly more than UIUC. One of the contributing factor for the high positivity is the relatively lower number of tests done per day. While, the aggregate the $\frac{T}{N} = 0.15$ for UIUC, the aggregate $\frac{T}{N} = 0.07$ for ISU. Lower degree of testing led to significant rise in the positivity rates, which rose rapidly to more than 0.3 at the peak, which reduced after the campus initiated stricter control on social distancing and mask wearing. These estimates provide estimates of the reopening experience and likely strategies for universities of different sizes.

LOCATION EFFECT ON REOPENING STRATEGY OF INSTITUTIONS

We have included a parameter on the infections coming in from outside an institutions, in the analytical model the effect of the parameter is included in the infection rate. However, we believe that the possible interactions of institutions with the outside environment has the potential to significantly increase the infection rate within institutions, particularly when the infection load in the surrounding region is high. However, before we delve into the effect of environment infection on infections within universities, in continuation to the previous

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

section, we provide an estimate of the effect of institutions opening up on the surrounding regions due to high influx of students and employees from other regions. Many of the large universities act as a transmission platform, if the infection rates inside these institutions are not well controlled. In Figure 5 we present the infection rates of Champaign County in IL where UIUC is located, and McLean County in IL where ISU is located. In figure 5a (for UIUC) and 5b (for ISU) the blue curve shows the infection curve for the county (without the institution infections) and the red curve shows the corresponding infection curve for the institutions. As seen from Figure 5, reopening of institutions have significantly increased the infection load in the environment, particularly when infections within universities increased. We believe that the environmental infections and within institution infections (particularly for large institutions such as universities) have a reverse causal relationship with one reinforcing the other.

Figure 5. Infection Curves of Counties and Large Public Universities Located in those Counties

Fig. 5a. Champaign County and UIUC



Fig. 5b. McLean County and ISU



These graphs provide evidence that the location (environment) and the institutional infections are not independent of each-other, rather the infections from the environment has the potential to aversely affect infections within institutions, and vice-versa. Therefore, to investigate further we collected data on infection rates within 228 large public and private universities after initial opening up (within 1-2 weeks) from Nytimes database on tracking COVID-19 at Universities. Figure 6 provides a graphical view of the location of universities and the infections.

Figure 6. COVID-19 Infection Tracking within Large Universities in US after Reopening

Fig. 6a. Infection Map of Universities after Reopening ($N = 228$)



Fig. 6b. Infection Rate within Universities versus Infection Rate in the County of Location



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

From Figure 6a, we can observe that the universities with relatively higher numbers of infected population are located in the regions with generally higher infection load of COVID-19. In Figure 6b we have plotted the infection rate (% of total size) within universities after opening up (within 2 weeks) and the infection rate (% of county population) with the mean curve (spline fit). We observe that the increasing infection in counties has a higher effect on the institutional infection rate. To empirically characterize the effect of county infection load on institutional infections, we constructed the following variables: (i) University infection rate, which is the infection rate (%) after 2 weeks of reopening, (ii) Total infections, is the total number of detected COVID-19 infections in institutions, (iii) Enrollment is the total fall enrollment from the US higher education news source, (iv) Cases is the total number of COVID-19 cases in the county of location, (v) County Infection Rate (%) is the infection rate at the county of location. In Table 1, we provide the descriptive statistic and correlation coefficients of the variables. In Table 2, we present the regression estimates with two different dependent variables. In column 1 of Table 2 we present the beta GLM of University infection rate and in column 2 we present the quasi-Poisson (variance inflated Poisson) GLM of total number of infections.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Coefficients (Columns 1-5) of Variables

Sl	Variables	Mean	Std.Dev	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	University infection rate (%)	1.8	0.01	1.00				
(2)	Total infections (Nos.)	235.2	4365.8	0.95	1.00			
(3)	Enrollment (Nos.)	27,700.0	11,787.2	0.19	0.05	1.00		
(4)	Cases (Nos.)	22.923	43,641.3	-0.08	-0.10	0.14	1.00	
(5)	County Infection Rate (%)	1.98	1.03	0.21	0.21	0.07	0.40	1.00

Table 2. Regression Estimates of (1) University infection rates and (2) Total infections.

Variables	**(1) Dependent Variable: University infection rate (%) (Beta GLM)**	**(2) Dependent Variable: Total infections (Nos.) (Quasi-Poisson GLM)**
Enrollment (Nos.)	3.49e-06 (2.99e-06)	3.10e-05 (7.68e-06) ***
Cases (Nos.)	-3.19e-06 (1.00e-06) **	-1.48e-05 (4.34e-06) ***
County Infection Rate (%)	1.40e-01 (3.62e-02) ***	5.12e-01 (1.04e-01) ***
(Intercept)	-4.30e00 (1.39e-01) ***	3.70e00 (3.74e-01) ***
Phi Parameter / Dispersion	154.12 (14.89) ***	641.46
Sample Size	228	228
Log-likelihood	747.3	847.9
F-Statistic	21.1 (df: 3, 3) *	14.9 (df: 3, 227) ***

*Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1*

From the regression estimates of Table 2 we find that the county infection rates are significantly associated with the university infection rates (column 1, Par. Est. 1.40e-01, SE. 3.62e-02, p-value < 0.001) as well as for total number of infections (column 2, Par. Est. 5.12e-01, SE. 1.04e-01, p-value < 0.001). Furthermore, we find that large institutions with higher enrollment have a higher risk of infections. This indicates that large institutions located in counties or zip codes with higher rates of population level COVID-19 infections face relatively higher levels of risk after reopening. This is an important consideration that institutions need to account for when they develop their reopening strategies. In some counties, where infection levels are very high such as Cook County in IL and New York City, institutions may choose to adopt purely online operations until an approved cure or vaccine for COVID-19 is in place. Only testing may not be sufficient unless commensurate measures are adopted for ensuring general mask wearing behavior and social-distancing behavior.

CONCLUSIONS

The reopening of institutions during the COVID-19 pandemic is challenging. Given reasonable levels of mask enforcement (5% chance of infection transmission given contact) and social distancing (5 contacts per person per day), for large institutions such as universities and colleges, a testing level of $\frac{T}{N} \geq 0.3$ can be sufficient to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

dampen the spread of the disease. This translates into testing every individual twice a week. However, if this level of testing is not possible, then the shortfall can be compensated by ensuring higher stringency in mask enforcement and social distancing. If the testing level is around $\frac{T}{N} \geq 0.1$, then the average contact rates need to drop to 1 contact per day. These results are subject to the mathematical abstractions of simulation; however, these results provide a directional understanding of the combination of strategies that are important to consider while reopening institutions. We summarize the findings and the suggested strategy in Figure 3. Figure 3 provides a heat-map for safe reopening strategies and demonstrates the interaction of mask wearing, which determines the infectivity upon contact with infected individuals, social distancing, which determines the contact rate of individuals, and the testing per person per day or the test capacity to population ratio under adaptive testing, subject to maximum capacity as shown. The metric of performance is the area under the susceptible curve, which is a function of the number of persons not infected at any point of time. The area under the susceptible curve is determined by the average basic reproduction number of an epidemic. While the basic reproduction number is an instantaneous measure, the area under the susceptible curve is a cumulative measure. From Figure 3, we observe that an institution needs to adapt to the estimates of infectivity and contact rates, and adapt to changes in infectivity and contact rates. We have included several scenarios that provide a fairly comprehensive estimate of the rate of testing required. Many organizations are testing at a significant high level; for instance, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has been testing at a rate of 10,000 $\left(\frac{T}{N} = 0.2\right)$ individuals every day for a population of approximately 50,000 individuals on campus under the SHIELD program, using a saliva-based rapid testing methodology. Some of the initial reopening experience confirms the value of a combination of strategies. Indiana University suspended all in-person activities in certain student housings after a rapid rise in COVID-19 cases after reopening[21]. Per a recent media report[22], several universities have more than 500 cases, such as the University of Alabama at Birmingham (972 cases), University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (835 cases), University of Central Florida (727 cases), Auburn University in Alabama (557 cases), Texas A&M University (500 cases), University of Notre Dame (473 cases), and University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (448 cases), within days and weeks of reopening. Another study[23] indicated that colleges and universities would need to test every student once every two days to reopen safely. These outcomes and studies support the insights from our paper.

Fig. 3. Summary of Strategies for Safe Reopening (Heat-Map of Scaled Area Under the Susceptible Curve – Higher the Better)



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

In closing, we submit that the investigation into reopening strategies is subject to some limitations. The simulations demonstrated here are hypothetical and do not represent the practical complexities of a real organization. Furthermore, actual implementation will entail additional organizational, social, or political constraints that have not been considered in the paper. Nevertheless, we believe that the results presented here provide significant practical insights, at least in a conceptual and directional sense, that can effectively enable institutions to reopen while controlling the risk of COVID-19 spread within the organization. Finally, we believe that different universities and institutions would need to customize the right combination of strategies based on the realities of reopening and the practicality of social distancing and other preventative measure adoption. Therefore, one size does not fit all, and adaptive customization of strategies is essential for the safe reopening of institutions.

REFERENCES

1. Bonaccorsi, G., Pierri, F., Cinelli, M., Flori, A., Galeazzi, A., Porcelli, F., Schmidt, A.L., Valensise, C.M., Scala, A., Quattrociocchi, W. and Pammolli, F., 2020. Economic and social consequences of human mobility restrictions under COVID-19. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(27), pp.15530-15535.
2. Darville, S., July 23, 2020. Reopening Schools Is Way Harder Than It Should Be. N.Y. Times (https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/23/sunday-review/reopening-schools-coronavirus.html) (last accessed. August 09, 2020)
3. Tingley, K., July 29, 2020. Why Is There No Consensus About Reopening Schools? N. Y. Times (https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/29/magazine/schools-reopening-covid.html) (last accessed. August 09, 2020)
4. Goodnough, A., July 24, 2020. C.D.C. Calls on Schools to Reopen, Downplaying Health Risks. N. Y. Times (https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/24/health/cdc-schools-coronavirus.html) (last accessed. August 09, 2020)
5. Roy, A., August 07, 2020. Why It's (Mostly) Safe to Reopen the Schools. The Wall Street Journal (https://www.wsj.com/articles/why-its-mostly-safe-to-reopen-the-schools-11596812466) (last accessed. August 09, 2020)
6. Madhusoodanan, J., July 20, 2020. 'Ethically troubling.' University reopening plans put professors, students on edge. Science Magazine (https://www.sciencemag.org/careers/2020/07/ethically-troubling-university-reopening-plans-put-professors-students-edge) (last accessed. August 09, 2020)
7. Nadworny, W., July 22, 2020. Colleges Spent Months Planning For Fall, But A COVID-19 Surge Is Changing Everything. NPR.ORG (https://www.npr.org/2020/07/22/893525083/colleges-spent-months-planning-for-fall-but-a-covid-19-surge-is-changing-everyth) (last accessed. August 09, 2020)
8. Strauss, V., July 14, 2020. This college president won't open campus this fall, to avoid 'inevitable spread' of coronavirus. Washington Post (https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2020/07/14/this-college-president-wont-open-campus-this-fall-avoid-inevitable-spread-covid-19/)
9. Hartocollis, A., July 03, 2020. Colleges Face Rising Revolt by Professors. N.Y. Times (https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/03/us/coronavirus-college-professors.html)
10. Center for Disease Control (CDC), May 30, 2020. Considerations for Institutions of Higher Education. (https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/colleges-universities/considerations.html)
11. Stanglin, D., and Shannon, J., August 08, 2020. 250 students and staff asked to quarantine in Georgia district after one week of school. USA Today (https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/education/2020/08/08/hundreds-students-staff-quarantine-georgia-school-district-cherokee/3327173001/)
12. Hawkins, D., August 09, 2020. Nine people test positive for coronavirus at Georgia school where photos of packed hallways went viral. Washington Post

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188680; this version posted September 12, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

(https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2020/08/09/nine-people-test-positive-coronavirus-georgia-school-where-photos-packed-hallways-went-viral/)

13. Furukawa, N.W., Brooks, J.T. and Sobel, J., 2020. Evidence supporting transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 while pre-symptomatic or asymptomatic. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 26(7).
14. Flaxman, S., Mishra, S., Gandy, A., Unwin, H.J.T., Mellan, T.A., Coupland, H., Whittaker, C., Zhu, H., Berah, T., Eaton, J.W. and Monod, M., 2020. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*, pp.1-5.
15. Heidt, A., Aug 17, 2020. FDA Approves New Saliva-Based COVID-19 Test (SalivaDirect, an open-source protocol, avoids many of the supply bottlenecks of other tools and could be offered for as little as $10 a test). *The Scientist*. (https://www.the-scientist.com/news-opinion/fda-approves-new-saliva-based-covid-19-test-67829)
16. Levenson, E. August 18, 2020. UNC-Chapel Hill reverses plans for in-person classes after 130 students test positive for Covid-19. CNN Online (https://www.cnn.com/2020/08/17/us/coronavirus-college-university/index.html)
17. Rockett, R.J., Arnott, A., Lam, C., Sadsad, R., Timms, V., Gray, K.A., Eden, J.S., Chang, S., Gall, M., Draper, J. and Sim, E.M., 2020. Revealing COVID-19 transmission in Australia by SARS-CoV-2 genome sequencing and agent-based modeling. *Nature Medicine*, pp.1-7.
18. Kai, D., Goldstein, G.P., Morgunov, A., Nangalia, V. and Rotkirch, A., 2020. Universal masking is urgent in the covid-19 pandemic: Seir and agent based models, empirical validation, policy recommendations. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:2004.13553.
19. Wellendorf, K., August 18, 2020. 175 Iowa State students tested positive for COVID-19 over on-campus move-in period (https://www.amestrib.com/story/news/education/2020/08/18/covid-19-iowa-coronavirus-175-iowa-state-ames-students-tested-positive-during-move/3394667001/)
20. Lalvani, A., Pathan, A.A., Durkan, H., Wilkinson, K.A., Whelan, A., Deeks, J.J., Reece, W.H., Latif, M., Pasvol, G. and Hill, A.V., 2001. Enhanced contact tracing and spatial tracking of Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection by enumeration of antigen-specific T cells. *The Lancet*, 357(9273), pp.2017-2021.
21. Indiana University, August 27, 2020. IU takes action to stop COVID spread at Greek houses. (https://news.iu.edu/stories/2020/08/iub/releases/27-greek-houses-covid-quarantine-mitigation.html)
22. New York Times, August 26, 2020. Tracking Coronavirus Cases at U.S. Colleges and Universities. (https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/covid-college-cases-tracker.html)
23. Bradley, E.H., An, M.W. and Fox, E., 2020. Reopening Colleges During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic—One Size Does Not Fit All. *JAMA Network Open*, 3(7), pp.e2017838-e2017838.
24. Chang, K., September 10, 2020. A University Had a Great Coronavirus Plan, but Students Partied On: An unexpected upswing in positive tests at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign showed how even the most comprehensive approaches to limiting the virus's spread can break down. Nytimes (https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/10/health/university-illinois-covid.html)