

1 **Title:** The role of children in the transmission chain of SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review  
2 and update of current evidence

3 **Authors:** Jonathan E. Suk<sup>1\*@</sup>, Constantine Vardavas<sup>2,3\*</sup>, Katerina Nikitara<sup>2</sup>, Revati Phalkey<sup>4</sup>, Jo  
4 Leonardi-Bee<sup>4</sup>, Anastasia Pharris<sup>1</sup>, Emma Wiltshire<sup>1</sup>, Tjede Funk<sup>1</sup>, Lisa Ferland<sup>1</sup>, Nick Bundle<sup>1</sup>, Jan  
5 C. Semenza<sup>1</sup>

## 6 **Affiliations**

7 1: European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, Stockholm, Sweden

8 2: School of Medicine, University of Crete, Greece

9 3: Department of Oral Health Policy and Epidemiology, Harvard School of Dental Medicine, Harvard  
10 University, Boston, MA, USA

11 4: Division of Epidemiology and Public Health, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, UK

12 \*: The authors contributed equally to this manuscript.

13 @: Corresponding author: Jonathan E. Suk, [jonathan.suk@ecdc.europa.eu](mailto:jonathan.suk@ecdc.europa.eu), +46858601633.  
14 Gustav III:s Boulevard, 169 73 Solna, Sweden.

15

## 16 **Abstract:**

17 Decisions on school closures and on safe schooling during the COVID-19 pandemic should  
18 be evidence-based. We conducted a systematic literature review to assess child-to-child and  
19 child-to-adult SARS-CoV-2 transmission and to characterise the potential role of school  
20 closures on community transmission. 1337 peer-reviewed articles published through August  
21 31, 2020 were screened; 22 were included in this review. The literature appraised provides  
22 sufficient evidence that children can both be infected by and transmit SARS-CoV-2 in  
23 community, household and school settings. Transmission by children was most frequently  
24 documented in household settings, while examples of children as index cases in school  
25 settings were rare. Included studies suggested that school closures may help to reduce SARS-  
26 CoV-2 transmission, but the societal, economic, and educational impacts of prolonged school  
27 closures must be considered. In-school mitigation measures, alongside continuous  
28 surveillance and assessment of emerging evidence, will promote the protection and  
29 educational attainment of students and support the educational workforce.

## 30 MAIN TEXT

### 31 Introduction

32 One of the more perplexing and controversial dimensions of the COVID-19 pandemic  
33 surrounds the role of children in the transmission. Are they drivers of the pandemic, or are  
34 they merely innocent bystanders, affected in myriad ways by school closures and other physical  
35 distancing measures while not being generally at-risk of COVID-19 themselves?

36 During the first few months of the COVID-19 pandemic, the vast uncertainty surrounding the  
37 epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 led many countries globally to include school closures as part  
38 of more general lockdowns. In the European Union (EU) / European Economic Area (EEA),  
39 all but two countries, Iceland and Sweden closed primary schools roughly during the period of  
40 March 2020 – May 2020 (**Figure 1**); all EU/EEA countries closed secondary schools, to some  
41 degree, during the same period (**1**). These school closures were concomitant with other societal-  
42 level physical distancing measures during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic.  
43 Available data from The European Surveillance System (TESSy) indicates that severe  
44 outcomes from SARS-CoV-2 infections, including fatalities, are much lower in paediatric  
45 patients compared to adults (**Figure 2**). As of 1 November 2020, and from over a million  
46 reported COVID-19 cases in Europe from 12 countries (Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Germany,  
47 Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Norway, Poland and Slovakia), rates of  
48 hospitalization and severe hospitalization (i.e. intensive care unit admissions, respiratory  
49 support or oxygen therapy) are notably lower for children than for adults (particularly for those  
50 over 40 years of age), with one notable exception being hospitalization rates for infants under  
51 1 year (**Figure 2**). Meanwhile, fatalities among children due to COVID-19 are very rare: as of  
52 1 November 2020, across these 12 countries in the European Union and European Economic  
53 Area (EU/EEA), there have been 12 reported fatalities for children under 16 years of age (of  
54 67,701 reported cases), and six deaths for children between 16 and 19 years of age (of 42,545  
55 reported cases). Since September 2020, which coincides with start of the new school year, the  
56 age-specific risk of severe outcomes has fallen in all age groups (**Figure 2, panels a-c**).

57 Other epidemiologic indicators of SARS-CoV-2 infection in children provide a complex  
58 picture regarding their potential role in the transmission chain. A systematic review concluded  
59 that, based on current evidence, children and adolescents have lower susceptibility to SARS-  
60 CoV-2 infection (2). However, when infected and symptomatic, children appear to shed viral  
61 RNA in similar quantities to adults (3), and that younger children (under 5 years) with mild to  
62 moderate symptoms may shed even more virus than older children and adults (4). While the  
63 proportion of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections among children in the general population  
64 is uncertain, 16% of paediatric cases in Europe were classified as asymptomatic (5), while up  
65 to 90% of paediatric cases in China were deemed to be asymptomatic, mild, or moderate (6).  
66 It is possible that children are less often asymptomatic carriers than adults: a study of non-  
67 COVID-19-related hospitalizations in Milan identified 1% of children and 9% of adults as  
68 asymptomatic carriers of SARS-CoV-2 (7).

69 Important potential sources of evidence surrounding the role of children in the COVID-19  
70 pandemic come from studies situated in the community, household, or school settings and from

71 modelling studies. As the emerging literature may have important insights to guide decision-  
72 making around school closures as well support decision making for mitigation measures in  
73 household and school settings, and to complement the literature on the susceptibility of  
74 children to SARS-CoV-2 (2), a systematic literature review was conducted to assess the role  
75 of children in the transmission of SARS-CoV-2.

76 The primary aim of this systematic literature review was to assess child-to-child and child-to-  
77 adult SARS-CoV-2 transmission and secondarily to characterise the potential role of the  
78 opening and closing of schools on community transmission. Here we outline the findings from  
79 this review, while highlighting perspectives of the European Centre for Disease Prevention and  
80 Control (ECDC) on current uncertainties and research gaps, mitigation measures for schools,  
81 community and household settings, and surveillance and monitoring priorities.

## 82 **METHODS**

### 83 ***Search Strategy***

84 This systematic literature review is reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items  
85 for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines (8). The methodology used  
86 adhered to PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis)  
87 guidelines. Relevant studies published between December 2019 and August 31, 2020 were  
88 identified by searching Medline and Embase. The following set of inclusion criteria were used  
89 to determine eligibility of the studies, which is based on the PCC framework (P-Population, C-  
90 Concept, C-Context). The study *Population* was restricted to people 1-17 years old (excluding  
91 neonatal transmission), the *Concept* was to assess child-to-child and child-to-adult  
92 transmission, while the *Context* was to assess community, household and school transmission.  
93 Subject heading terms and free text words relating to the Population, Concept and Context  
94 terms as identified in the inclusion criteria were used to develop a comprehensive list of terms  
95 for the search strategy (Supplementary Table 1). We included all studies of quantitative  
96 research, while opinion pieces, commentaries, editorials were excluded. We additionally  
97 screened reference lists of the included articles to identify further relevant studies. The search  
98 was limited to the English language.

99

### 100 ***Study selection***

101 Initially, a pilot screening process was used where 100 identical articles were screened for their  
102 eligibility independently by two reviewers to ensure consistency in screening. As a high  
103 measure of inter-rater agreement was achieved between the two reviewers during the pilot  
104 assessment (percentage agreement >90% and/ or Cohen's Kappa >0.81), the remaining titles  
105 were randomly allocated to the two reviewers and screened for eligibility independently by  
106 them. After an initial selection of the titles, each reviewer assessed each other's selected  
107 studies. The retrieved articles were then independently double-screened by two reviewers  
108 based on the full text of the articles.

### 109 ***Data extraction***

110 The data extraction template was piloted independently by the two reviewers on a random  
111 sample of two included studies to enable an assessment of consistency in data extraction and  
112 to identify where amendments needed to be made to the template. The remaining studies were  
113 then data extracted independently by two reviewers, and the results were double checked across  
114 the original manuscript by a third reviewer.

### 115 ***Data synthesis***

116 Characteristics of the included studies were presented in tabulated form detailing the study  
117 design, geographical location of the study, sample size, characteristics of the populations  
118 considered, setting, context, and the findings of the study. A narrative synthesis approach was  
119 applied to look systematically at the data and to describe each study categorized by the study  
120 design. Patterns in the data were identified through tabulation of results, and an inductive  
121 approach was taken to translate the data to identify areas of commonality between studies.  
122 Mathematical modelling and simulation studies were assessed separately from those reporting  
123 real-life data.

## 124 **Results**

### 125 ***Study selection and description***

126 A total of 1411 studies were identified according to the specified selection criteria from  
127 Medline and Embase. After the removal of duplicates, 1337 were screened by title/abstract, out  
128 of which 102 were assessed via full text, and 22 studies subsequently included in this review.  
129 Overall, 14 of the included studies reported on child-to-adult transmission of SARS-CoV-2,  
130 while eight explored the impact of school closures on the epidemiology of the COVID-19  
131 pandemic. Almost all studies (7/8) that assessed the impact of school closure were simulation  
132 models, while all 14 studies that assessed child-to-adult transmission patterns were  
133 observational in design. The PRISMA flowchart showing the flow of study selection is  
134 presented in **Figure 3**.

### 135 ***Child-to-child and child-to-adult transmission of SARS-CoV-2***

136 Fourteen published studies were identified to address child-to-adult transmission of SARS-  
137 CoV-2. Two referred to transmission within a community setting, six within a household and  
138 six within a school setting.

### 139 **Community settings**

140 Only one case study and one ecological study assessed child-to-adult transmission of COVID-  
141 19 within a community setting. A case study by Jung et al. (9), reported the contact-tracing  
142 results of a 9-year-old infected asymptomatic girl. A total of 1206 close and casual contacts  
143 were identified of which 96% underwent a SARS-CoV-2 PCR test and for which the results  
144 were negative for every close and casual contact, except for one adult. Goldstein & Lipsitch  
145 (2020) (10) used data on COVID-19 cases in Germany evaluated the contributing role of  
146 different age groups in COVID-19 community transmission. According to their analyses,  
147 COVID-19 cases among 10-14 and 15-19 year olds were 0.78 times lower and 1.14 times more  
148 likely respectively to be a case compared to other age groups after the implementation of  
149 physical distancing measures. In comparison to all age groups, individuals aged 10-14 years  
150 had lower odds of being a case compared to adults 15-34 years old, while 15-19 year olds were  
151 less likely to be a case (OR 0.81) than 20-24 year olds, after the implementation of physical  
152 distancing measures, including school closure.

### 153 **Household settings**

154 Four studies assessed household child-to-child and child-to-adult transmission within family  
155 clusters as detailed in **Table 1**. Posfay-Barbe et al. assessed the clinical presentation of the 111  
156 household contacts of the first pediatric cases of COVID-19 in Geneva, Switzerland, according  
157 to which only in 3/39 (8%) of households the study child was the index case (11). Similarly,  
158 Teherani et al., conducted contact tracing among household members of 32 confirmed pediatric  
159 COVID-19 cases, for which only in 7/32 households did children develop first symptoms of  
160 COVID-19 and were assumed as the suspected index cases (12). Somekh et al. also investigated  
161 the role of children in household COVID-19 transmission in Israel, using a cluster of 13  
162 families, and found that only in one family the index case was a child (13). Maltezou et al.  
163 noted that among 23 family clusters in Greece only in 2 families the index case was a child,  
164 while there was no evidence of child-to-adult or child-to-child secondary transmission (14).

165 Two studies from South Korea assessed secondary attack rates when children were the index  
166 cases as depicted in **Table 2**. Park et al. performed an assessment of 46 COVID-19 index cases  
167 (three cases 0-9 years old and 43 cases 10-19 years old) in households. For index cases under  
168 9 years old, the household secondary attack rate was 5.3%, the non-household 1.1% and the  
169 overall secondary attack rate was 2.1%. On the contrary, for index cases 10-19 years of age,  
170 the secondary attack rates were 18.6% (household), 0.9% (non-household) and 9.8% (overall)  
171 (15). An additional study from South Korea among 107 index children and 248 household  
172 members, identified only one case of secondary transmission to a household member and the  
173 secondary attack rate was estimated to be 0.5%. In this study an additional 40 confirmed cases  
174 were found in household members, but it could not be determined as a secondary transmission  
175 as they had the same exposure as the pediatric index case (16).

### 176 School settings

177 Six studies assessed SARS-CoV-2 transmission in a school setting the main results of which  
178 are outlined in **Table 3**. Heavey et al. conducted a case study in order to explore the role of  
179 transmission among children in the school setting in the Republic of Ireland, before school  
180 closure (17). Three pediatric and three adult cases of COVID-19 with a history of school  
181 attendance were detected with 1155 contacts. Child-to-adult transmission or child-to-child  
182 transmission was not reported in this study. Similarly Danis et al. presented the contact tracing  
183 results of a nine-year-old child in France, who visited 3 different schools the first days of  
184 symptom appearance. There was no evidence of secondary transmission in any of the school  
185 contacts (18). Moreover, Yung et al. traced three COVID-19 cases (2 pediatric and 1 adult) in  
186 three different educational settings, and the results were negative (19). One study from New  
187 South Wales, Australia presented an overview of COVID-19 cases and transmission in schools.  
188 In a total number of 25 schools and 10 Early Childhood Educational and Care Settings, 27  
189 index cases were identified, among which 12 were children and 15 staff members. Secondary  
190 transmission was noted only in four out of 25 educational settings, and the overall child-to-  
191 adult attack rate was estimated at 1.0%. (20).

192 Two studies reported on the regional evidence after the re-opening of schools. A school  
193 outbreak in Israel after reopening of schools in May 2020 was described by Stein-Zamir et al.  
194 (21). The outbreak assessment was initiated by two pediatric COVID-19 cases that were not  
195 epidemiologically related. The results showed that 153/1161 students and 25/151 staff  
196 members tested positive for COVID-19. However, this outbreak was attributed to crowded  
197 classes, combined with the exemption of facemasks and the use of air-condition due to an  
198 extreme heatwave. On the contrary, a study by Link-Gelles et al., in Rhode Island, USA. among  
199 666 child care programs that reopened on 1 June, 2020 after a 3-month closure revealed 52  
200 confirmed and probable cases (33 confirmed cases), of which 30 were among children and 22  
201 among adults (22). Secondary transmission for 10 cases was noted in only 4/666 childcare  
202 programs, which was attributed to class distancing, the use of face masks for adults, universal  
203 symptom screening daily and disinfection.

### 204 *The impact of school closure on COVID-19 transmission*

205 Eight published studies were identified with regard to the effect of school closure on the  
206 epidemiology of the COVID-19 pandemic, the results of which are presented in **Table 4**. Seven

207 of these studies were based on mathematical modelling and various assumptions of infectivity  
208 from the first 3-4 months of the pandemic (23-29), while one was a time series study (30). The  
209 modelling studies in principal indicated that school closure is associated with a reduction in the  
210 number of cases, a reduction of hospitalizations and ICU admissions, with the effect of school  
211 closure dependent on the transmission rate, and the duration of school closure. Only one time  
212 series was reported by Auger et al. assessing data collected between 9 March 2020 and 7 May  
213 2020, aiming at determining whether the closure of primary and secondary schools affects  
214 COVID-19 incidence and mortality in the USA (30). The results (adjusted for other enacted  
215 policies and testing rates) indicated that school closure was associated with a 62% reduction of  
216 COVID-19 incidence per week and a 58% reduction in mortality per week. It was found that  
217 countries which had a low cumulative COVID-19 incidence at the time of school closure, had  
218 greater reductions in incidence and mortality compared to those with a higher cumulative  
219 incidence at the same time.

220

## 221 **Discussion**

222 This study provides an up-to-date rapid review of the peer-reviewed literature pertaining to  
223 SARS-CoV-2 transmission by children, a topic which is a crucial input to assessments of the  
224 role of school settings in COVID-19 transmission (31). The literature appraised in this review  
225 provides sufficient evidence that children can both be infected by and transmit SARS-CoV-2  
226 in both community, household and school settings. This finding is corroborated by research  
227 published after the cut-off date for this review, such as a large study from India (32).

228 Transmission of SARS-COV-2 has thus far been documented to be higher in household settings  
229 than in other community settings – including schools – a finding which may be potentially  
230 attributable to the individual, behavioural and contextual factors of households vs. other  
231 settings, as has been suggested elsewhere (33). Meanwhile, while children are overall noted to  
232 have lower rates of severe COVID-19 cases, there is evidence of differing transmission  
233 dynamics between younger vs. older children. In particular, there is some evidence that when  
234 index cases, younger children, such as under 10 years of age, lead to lower secondary attack  
235 rates than older children and adult. This matter warrants further investigation before concrete  
236 conclusions can be drawn (34, 35).

237 Within our review there were limited cases in the assessed studies in which a child index case  
238 was responsible for secondary transmission in schools, with the notable exception of an  
239 outbreak in Israel (21), which was associated with dense spacing, lack of the use of  
240 facemasks and closed spaces with poor ventilation. On the contrary, evidence from Rhode  
241 Island in the US, noted a very small number of cases after schools reopened during June-July  
242 2020, which the authors attribute to the strict non-pharmaceutical interventions implemented  
243 including the use of face masks, physical distancing, screening for symptoms and classroom  
244 disinfection (22). A similar experience has been highlighted in Hong Kong, where multiple  
245 potential introductions of COVID-19 did not lead to secondary transmission, amidst a setting  
246 with numerous precautionary in-school measures, such as widespread facemask use, daily  
247 temperature checks, and staggered entries and exits (36).

248 In our review, seven modelling studies assessed the role of school closure, and overall  
249 indicated that school closure is associated with a reduction in the number of cases,  
250 hospitalisations and ICU admissions. However, the primary endpoints in the modelling  
251 studies were dependent on the transmission rate and the duration of school closure. While  
252 school closure may reduce SARS-CoV-2 transmission, the societal and economic impacts of  
253 prolonged school closure are noteworthy, as they may impact the availability of the  
254 healthcare workforce, (25, 37) and may also have negative effects on children through the  
255 interruption of the educational learning, social isolation, increased exposure to home  
256 violence, and rise in dropout rates (38).

257 There are important limitations to this study that may impact the direct implications for  
258 decision-making. As we assessed peer-reviewed evidence published in two biomedical  
259 databases, it inherently reflects the status quo of the end of the previous school year (2019-  
260 2020) due to the lag time between study implementation, peer review and publication. A further  
261 limitation of this report refers to the study designs, notably case series and case reports. Finally,  
262 the household studies that we assessed reflect a broad geographical and temporal range are  
263 limited in comparability due to varying factors such as: background levels of community  
264 SARS-CoV-2 transmission; enrolment strategies; household structures and social isolation  
265 practices within households; study testing rates; and varying physical distancing policies  
266 including school closures.

267 Despite these limitations, the findings presented here provide an up-to-date assessment of the  
268 currently published peer-reviewed evidence. However, with an upsurge of cases in autumn  
269 2020, the likelihood of introductions of SARS-CoV-2 into school settings increases.  
270 Continuous surveillance and assessment of the evidence is warranted to ensure the maximum  
271 protection of the health of students and the educational workforce. Where schools remain open,  
272 in-school mitigation measures, particularly for schools with older children, should be adopted  
273 and continually refined as new knowledge comes to light.

274

275

276



277

## 278 **Acknowledgments**

279 We would like to thank Tommi Kärki and the ECDC team collecting data on COVID-19 response  
280 measures for Figure 2. We would like to thank Katerina Papathanasaki, Chrysa Chatzopoulou and  
281 Ioanna Lagou for their assistance in data archiving and report preparation. We acknowledge the  
282 bravery and dedication of educational professionals everywhere during these most challenging times.  
283 This work was financed by ECDC under direct service contract ECD.10660.

284

285

286

287

288

289

## TABLES

**Table 1. Studies assessing household child-to-child and child-to-adult transmission within family clusters.**

| Author                         | Country             | Population         | Timeframe                  | Number of cases | Median Age of cases (Range or IQR) | Household Contacts | Child index case in household |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| Posfay-Barbe et al., 2020 (10) | Switzerland, Geneva | 39 family clusters | 10 March to 10 April, 2020 | 39              | 11.1 (5.7 to 14.5)                 | 111                | 3/39                          |
| Teherani et al., 2020 (11)     | USA, Atlanta        | 32 family clusters | 16 March to 14 June 2020   | 32              | 12.7 (IQR: 8.3-15.7)               | 144                | 7/32                          |
| Somekh et al., 2020 (12)       | Israel, Bnei Brak   | 13 family clusters | n/r                        | 1               | 0.5-17                             | n/r                | n/r                           |
| Maltezou et al., 2020 (13)     | Greece              | 23 family clusters | 26 February to 3 May 2020  | 1               | 0-18                               | 109                | 2/23                          |

n/r: not reported

**Table 2. Studies that assessed the secondary household attack rate, when children are the household index case.**

| Author                 | Country     | Population   | Timeframe                   | Number of index cases | Age of cases (Range or IQR) | Positive/traced   | Secondary Attack Rate         |                              |                               |
|------------------------|-------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|                        |             |  |                             |                       |                             |                   | Household                     | Non household                | Overall                       |
| Park et al., 2020 (14) | South Korea | 29 and 124 COVID-19 index cases 0-9 and 10-19 years of age | 20 January to 27 March 2020 | 29<br>124             | 0-9 & 10-19                 | 29/237<br>124/457 | 3/57 (5.3%)<br>43/231 (18.6%) | 2/180 (1.1%)<br>2/226 (0.9%) | 5/237 (2.1%)<br>45/457 (9.8%) |
| Kim et al., 2020 (15)  | South Korea | 107 pediatric COVID-19 index cases                         | 20 January to 6 April 2020  | 107                   | Median: 15, (IQR 10-17)     | 1/248             | 1/248 (0.5%)                  | n/r                          | n/r                           |

n/r: not reported

**Table 3. Studies assessing SARS-CoV-2 transmission in a school setting.**

| Author                        | Country        | Timeframe                   | Age Range | Setting                              | Number of index cases                             | Symptomatic secondary cases in the school settings <sup>1</sup>            | Parallel interventions  |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Heavey et al., 2020 (16)      | Ireland        | March 2020                  | 10-15     | Schools in Ireland                   | 6 cases (3 children, 3 staff)                     | 0/822 child contacts   | Exposure before school closure. Schools closed, contacts were quarantined                               |
| Danis et al., 2020 (17)       | France         | January to February 2020    | n/a       | 3 schools                            | 1 child   | 0/86 in school contacts<br>1/6 hospitalised contacts                       | n/a   |
| Yung et al., 2020 (18)        | Singapore      | February to March 2020      | 2.8-15    | 3 schools                            | 3 cases (2 pediatric-1 adult)                     | 0/42 (symptomatic)   | Contacts were quarantined<br>Targeted measures at the school level                                      |
| Macartney et al., 2020 (19)   | Australia, NSW | 25 January to 10 April 2020 | <18       | 25 schools and 10 childcare settings | 27 cases (12 children, 15 adults)                 | 18/1448 overall contacts<br>5/914 in 3 schools<br>(5/18 were asymptomatic) | Contacts were quarantined   |
| Stein-Zamir et al., 2020 (20) | Israel         | May 2020                    | 12-18     | one high school                      | 153 children and 25 adults                        | n/a  | Closed spaces with poor ventilation, high temperatures, crowded spaces and close contact with no masks. |
| Link-Gelles et al., 2020 (21) | USA, RI        | June – July 2020            | <18       | 666 educational settings             | 33 confirmed and 19 probable cases in 29 settings | 17 cases in 4/666 educational settings with.                               | Class distancing, the use of face masks for adults, universal symptom screening daily and disinfection. |

1: Measured from the date of last contact

2: Probable cases

**Table 4. Results of the studies referring to the impact of school closures and SARS-CoV-2.**

| AUTHOR                        | COUNTRY   | SETTING/POPULATION   | STUDY DESIGN     | OBJECTIVE   | RESULTS  |
|-------------------------------|-----------|--|------------------|---|--|
| Koo et al., 2020 (22)         | Singapore | Community level actions, with quarantine, school closure, workplace distancing and combined interventions assessed separately. | Simulation study | To investigate the impact of school closure, quarantine, workplace distancing on the number of cases on day 80 of the pandemic.                                   | Total number of infections on day 80 of the pandemic based on the implementation of the measures<br>Ro=1.5<br>Baseline cases 279,000 (245,000-320,000)<br>School closure alone would reduce the cases to 10,000 (200-28,000)<br>Ro=2.0<br>Baseline cases 727,000 (670,000-776,000)<br>School closure alone would reduce the cases to 97,000 (14,000-219,000)<br>Ro=2.5<br>Baseline cases 1,207,000 (1,164,000 – 1,249,000)<br>School closure alone would reduce the cases to 466,000 (175,000-728,000) |
| Bayham & Feniche 1, 2020 (24) | USA       | Community level, assessing the impact of school closure using the US CPS data.   | Simulation study | To estimate the impact on mortality attributable to the reduction of the U.S. healthcare labor force due to child-care responsibilities induced by school closure | The reduction in healthcare workers due to school closures must not raise the mortality per case to more than 3.4% (2.7–4.2) or the elasticity of healthcare worker productivity must not exceed 0.099 (0.077–0.124) in order school closures to be effective.   |

|                         |              |   |                  |  |  |
|-------------------------|--------------|---|------------------|--|--|
| Zhang et al., 2020 (23) | China        | Community level, modelling data from 1245 contacts reported by 636 study participants in Wuhan and 1296 contacts reported by 557 participants in Shanghai, China. | Simulation study | To explore how transmission is affected by age differences altered mixing patterns owing to social distancing, and to project the impact of social distancing and school closure on COVID-19 transmission. | Scenario 1 - Vacation periods<br>In a COVID-19 outbreak for a baseline $R_0$ of 2.5 and assuming a vacation mixing pattern, the mean peak daily incidence is reduced by about 64%.<br>Scenario 2 - Regular weekdays with removal of all contacts: In the corresponding scenario where school contacts are removed, a reduction of about 42% was noted. |
| Prem et al., 2020 (28)  | China, Wuhan | Community level/ 11 million (virtual population of Wuhan)   | Simulation study | To estimate the effect of physical distancing measures, including school closure on the progression of COVID-19  | Intense control measures of prolonged school closure and work holidays reduce the cumulative infections + peak incidence and delay the peak of the outbreak.<br>The modelled effects of prolonged school closure and work holidays vary by duration of infectiousness  |
| Kim et al., 2020 (25)   | Korea        | Community-level, simulation based on data from the Korean Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.   | Simulation study | To model the effect of school opening on the COVID-19 epidemic in South Korea.   | Assuming that the transmission rate increased 10-fold after schools open, a school opening on 2 March 2020, would lead to an additional 60 cases within one week, +100 cases within the following two weeks.<br>Assuming higher transmission rates lead to a higher number of cases after school opening.  |
| Chin et al.,            | USA          | Community-level, simulation using the   | Simulation study | To estimate the impact of school closures on hospital bed and ICU demand.  | At the national level a reduction in peak demand for hospital beds by 7.6% and for ICU beds by 8.4%  |


|                                   |                    |  |                             |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|--|
| 2020<br>(26)                      |                    | American<br>Community<br>Survey  |                             |  | At the regional level a reduction in peak demand for hospital beds by 5.2% and for ICU beds by 6.8%<br>The effectiveness of school closures decreases with increasing $R_0$ values   |
| Abdollahi et al.,<br>2020<br>(27) | Canada,<br>Ontario | Community-level, simulation for the population of Ontario.                           | Simulation study            | To evaluate the effect of a 4-month school closures on attack rate and the need for critical care.                                 | In the scenario that daily contacts are reduced by 60% a reduction in the peak of COVID-19 incidence by 24.4%, in the attack rate by 8.1% and in ICU admissions by 4.6% was estimated. In the scenario that daily contacts are reduced by 80% a reduction in the peak of COVID-19 incidence by 32.4%, in the attack rate by 11.8% and in ICU admissions by 5.5% was estimated. |
| Auger et al.<br>2020<br>(29)      | USA                | Community-level, assessing the impact of school closure using population based data. | Observational (time series) | To assess the impact of school closures on COVID-19 incidence and mortality. Data were collected for 6 weeks after school closure. | School closure was associated with a significant decline in COVID-19 incidence. Relative reduction in COVID-19 incidence per week by 62% and a relative reduction in mortality per week by 58%   |




## FIGURES

**Figure 1. Timing of the closure of primary (panel a) and secondary (panel b) schools in the EU/EEA and the UK March-September 2020**


Panel a) closure of primary schools in the EU/EEA and the UK.




Panel b) closure of secondary schools in the EU/EEA and the UK.



**Figure 2. Age-specific proportion of severe outcomes of COVID-19 in the periods up to, and after 1 September 2020, the European Surveillance System (TESSy) (data extracted 4 November, 2020 for the period up to 1 November 2020)**



**Figure 3. PRISMA Flowchart of study selection included in the rapid review.**



## Supplementary Table 1. Search strategy

Database(s): **Embase** 1974 to 2020 June 22

Search Strategy:

| #  | Searches   | Results |
|----|--|---------|
| 1  | exp coronavirus/   | 14828   |
| 2  | exp coronavirus infections/  | 14705   |
| 3  | (Coronavir* or nCov or covid or Middle East Respiratory Syndrome or MERS or Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome or SARS).ti,ab,tw. | 44118   |
| 4  | 1 or 2 or 3  | 50748   |
| 5  | (adolescent or (pre?school adj child) or child or infant or baby or toddler or juvenile).ti,ab,tw.                               | 830046  |
| 6  | (bab\$ or infant or child or boy or girl or teen\$ or school?child\$).ti,ab,tw.  | 856745  |
| 7  | 5 or 6   | 1048284 |
| 8  | 4 and 7  | 604     |
| 9  | limit 8 to human   | 515     |
| 10 | limit 9 to yr="2019 -Current"  | 278     |
| 11 | limit 10 to english language   | 263     |

Database(s): **Ovid MEDLINE(R) ALL** 1946 to June 22, 2020

Search Strategy:

| # | Searches | Results |
|---|----------|---------|
|---|----------|---------|

|    |  |          |
|----|--|----------|
| 1  | exp Coronavirus/   | 17477    |
| 2  | exp Coronavirus Infections/  | 16923    |
| 3  | (Coronavir* or nCov or covid or covid-19 or Middle East Respiratory Syndrome or MERS or Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome or SARS).ti,ab,kf.           | 46333    |
| 4  | 1 or 2 or 3  | 51033    |
| 5  | (baby or babies or infant* or child* or boy* or girl* or toddler* or preschool* or pre?school* or teen* or schoolchild* or adolescen* or juvenil*).tw. | 2026780  |
| 6  | 4 and 5  | 2184     |
| 7  | humans.sh.   | 18540514 |
| 8  | 6 and 7  | 1161     |
| 9  | limit 8 to yr="2019 -Current"  | 340      |
| 10 | limit 9 to english language  | 295      |

## References

1. ECDC. Download data on country response measures to COVID-19 2020 [Available from: <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/download-data-response-measures-covid-19>].
2. Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonell C, Melendez-Torres GJ, Ward J, Hudson L, et al. Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Children and Adolescents Compared With Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr.* 2020.
3. Jones TC, Mühlemann B, Veith T, Biele G, Zuchowski M, Hoffmann J, et al. An analysis of SARS-CoV-2 viral load by patient age. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.06.08.20125484.
4. Heald-Sargent T, Muller WJ, Zheng X, Rippe J, Patel AB, Kocielek LK. Age-related differences in nasopharyngeal severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) levels in patients with mild to moderate coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *JAMA Pediatr.* 2020;174(9):902-3.
5. Götzinger F, Santiago-García B, Noguera-Julián A, Lanaspa M, Lancella L, Calò Carducci FI, et al. COVID-19 in children and adolescents in Europe: a multinational, multicentre cohort study. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health.* 2020;4(9):653-61.

6. Dong Y, Dong Y, Mo X, Hu Y, Qi X, Jiang F, et al. Epidemiology of COVID-19 among children in China. *Pediatrics*. 2020;145(6).
7. Milani GP, Bottino I, Rocchi A, Marchisio P, Elli S, Agostoni C, et al. Frequency of Children vs Adults Carrying Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Asymptotically. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2020.
8. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Altman D, Antes G, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med*. 2009;6(7).
9. Investigation of a nosocomial outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 in a paediatric ward in South Korea: successful control by early detection and extensive contact tracing with testing. (2020).
10. Goldstein E, Lipsitch M. Temporal rise in the proportion of younger adults and older adolescents among coronavirus disease (COVID-19) cases following the introduction of physical distancing measures, Germany, March to April 2020. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25:2000596.
11. Posfay-Barbe KM, Wagner N, Gauthey M, Moussaoui D, Loevy N, Diana A, et al. COVID-19 in Children and the Dynamics of Infection in Families. *Pediatrics*. 2020;146:e20201576.
12. Teherani MF, Kao CM, Camacho-Gonzalez A, Banskota S, Shane AL, Linam WM, et al. Burden of illness in households with SARS-CoV-2 infected children. *Journal of the Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society*. 2020.
13. Somekh E, Gleyzer A, Heller E, Lopian M, Kashani-Ligumski L, Czeiger S, et al. The Role of Children in the Dynamics of Intra Family Coronavirus 2019 Spread in Densely Populated Area. *The Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal*. 2020;39(8).
14. Maltezou HC, Vorou R, Papadima K, Kossyvakis A, Spanakis N, Gioula G, et al. Transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 within families with children in Greece: A study of 23 clusters. *Journal of Medical Virology*. 2020:0-3.
15. Park YJ, Choe YJ, Park O, Park SY, Kim Y-M, Kim J, et al. Contact Tracing during Coronavirus Disease Outbreak, South Korea, 2020. *Emerging Infectious Disease journal*. 2020;26(10):2465.
16. Kim J, Choe YJ, Lee J, Park YJ, Park O, Han MS, et al. Role of children in household transmission of COVID-19. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. 2020:1-3.
17. Heavey L, Casey G, Kelly C, Kelly D, McDarby G. No evidence of secondary transmission of COVID-19 from children attending school in Ireland, 2020. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25:2000903.
18. Danis K, Epaulard O, Bénet T, Gaymard A, Campoy S, Botelho-Nevers E, et al. Cluster of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the French Alps, February 2020. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020;71(15):825-32.
19. Yung CF, Kam K-q, Nadua KD, Chong CY, Tan NWH, Li J, et al. Novel coronavirus 2019 transmission risk in educational settings. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020:3-6.
20. Macartney K, Quinn HE, Pillsbury AJ, Koirala A, Deng L, Winkler N, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australian educational settings: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. 2020;4642:1-10.
21. Stein-Zamir C, Abramson N, Shoob H, Libal E, Bitan M, Cardash T, et al. A large COVID-19 outbreak in a high school 10 days after schools' reopening, Israel, May 2020. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25:1-5.
22. Link-Gelles R, DellaGrotta AL, Molina C, Clyne A, Campagna K, Lanzieri TM, et al. Limited Secondary Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Child Care Programs — Rhode Island, June 1–July 31, 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2020;69:1170-2.

23. Koo JR, Cook AR, Park M, Sun Y, Sun H, Lim JT, et al. Interventions to mitigate early spread of SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020;20:678-88.
24. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, Wang Y, Wang W, Zhao S, et al. Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science (New York, NY)*. 2020;368:1481-6.
25. Bayham J, Fenichel EP. Impact of school closures for COVID-19 on the US health-care workforce and net mortality: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2020;5:e271-e8.
26. Kim S, Kim YJ, Peck KR, Jung E. School opening delay effect on transmission dynamics of Coronavirus disease 2019 in Korea: Based on mathematical modeling and simulation study. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*. 2020;35.
27. Chin ET, Huynh BQ, Lo NC, Hastie T, Basu S. Projected geographic disparities in healthcare worker absenteeism from COVID-19 school closures and the economic feasibility of child care subsidies: a simulation study. *BMC medicine*. 2020;18:218.
28. Abdollahi E, Haworth-Brockman M, Keynan Y, Langley JM, Moghadas SM. Simulating the effect of school closure during COVID-19 outbreaks in Ontario, Canada. *BMC Medicine*. 2020;18:1-8.
29. Prem K, Liu Y, Russell TW, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Davies N, et al. The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2020;5:e261-e70.
30. Auger KA, Shah SS, Richardson T, Hartley D, Hall M, Warniment A, et al. Association between Statewide School Closure and COVID-19 Incidence and Mortality in the US. *JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association*. 2020;45229:859-70.
31. ECDC. COVID-19 in children and the role of school settings in COVID-19 transmission. Solna, Sweden: European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control; 2020 August 6.
32. Laxminarayan R, Wahl B, Dudala SR, Gopal K, Mohan C, Neelima S, et al. Epidemiology and transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in two Indian states. *Science*. 2020:eabd7672.
33. Merckx J, Labrecque JA, Kaufman JS. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by Children. *Dtsch Arztebl International*. 2020;117(33-34):553-60.
34. Cho EY, Choi EH, Kim J-H. Interpreting Transmissibility of COVID-19 in Children. *Emerging Infectious Disease journal*. 2020;26(12).
35. Goldstein E, Lipsitch M, Cevik M. On the effect of age on the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in households, schools and the community. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.07.19.20157362.
36. Fong M, Cowling B, Leung G, Wu P. Letter to the editor: COVID-19 cases among school-aged children and school-based measures in Hong Kong, July 2020. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25(37):2001671.
37. Sadique MZ, Adams EJ, Edmunds WJ. Estimating the costs of school closure for mitigating an influenza pandemic. *BMC Public Health*. 2008;8(1):135.
38. UNESCO. Adverse consequences of school closures. Unesco. 2020.