

1 Clustering and longitudinal change in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in  
2 school-children: prospective cohort study of 55 schools in Switzerland  
3

4 **Authors:**

5 Agne Ulyte\*, Thomas Radtke\*, Irene A. Abela\*, Sarah R. Haile, Christoph Berger,  
6 Michael Huber, Merle Schanz, Magdalena Schwarzmüller, Alexandra Trkola#, Jan Fehr#,  
7 Milo A. Puhan#, Susi Kriemler#

8 \* shared first authorship

9 # shared last authorship

10

11 **Corresponding author:**

12 Susi Kriemler

13 Tel: +41 44 634 63 20

14 susi.kriemlerwiget@uzh.ch

15 Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich

16 Hirschengraben 84

17 8001 Zürich, Switzerland

18

19 **Author affiliations:**

20 Agne Ulyte, Thomas Radtke, Sarah R. Haile, Milo A. Puhan, Susi Kriemler – Epidemiology,  
21 Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001  
22 Zürich, Switzerland

23 Irene A. Abela, Michael Huber, Merle Schanz, Magdalena Schwarzmüller, Alexandra Trkola  
24 – Institute of Medical Virology, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich,  
25 Switzerland

26 Christoph Berger – University Children Hospital Zurich, Steinwiesstrasse 75, 8032 Zürich,  
27 Switzerland

28 Jan Fehr – Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich,  
29 Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich; Division of Infectious Diseases & Hospital Epidemiology,  
30 University Hospital Zurich, Rämistrasse 100, 8091 Zurich, Switzerland

31

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

32 **Abstract**

33 **Background and aims:** The facilitating role of schools in SARS-CoV-2 infection spread is still  
34 debated and the potential of school closures to mitigate transmission unclear. In autumn  
35 2020, Switzerland experienced one of the highest second waves of the SARS-CoV-2  
36 pandemic in Europe while keeping schools open, thus offering a high-exposure environment  
37 to study SARS-CoV-2 infections in schools. The aim of this study was to examine longitudinal  
38 change in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in children and the evolution of clustering within  
39 classes and schools from June to November, 2020, in a prospective cohort study of school  
40 children in the canton of Zurich, Switzerland.

41

42 **Methods:** Children from randomly selected schools and classes, stratified by district, were  
43 invited to participate in serological testing of SARS-CoV-2 in June-July and October-  
44 November 2020. Parents of children filled questionnaires on sociodemographic and health-  
45 related questions. 55 schools and 275 classes within them were enrolled, with 2603 children  
46 participating in the first, and 2552 in the second testing (age range 6-16 years). We  
47 evaluated longitudinal changes of seroprevalence in districts and investigated clustering of  
48 seropositive cases within classes and schools.

49

50 **Results:** Overall SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence was 2.4% (95% CrI 1.4%-3.6%) in summer and  
51 4.5% (95% CrI 3.2%-6.0%) in not previously seropositive children in late autumn, leading to  
52 estimated 7.8% (95% CrI 6.2%-9.5%) of ever seropositive children, without significant  
53 differences among lower, middle and upper school levels. Among the 2223 children with  
54 serology tested twice, 28 (40%) of previously seropositive were negative, and 109 (5%)  
55 previously negative became seropositive. Seroprevalence was not different between school  
56 levels or sexes, but varied across districts (1.7% to 15.0%). Between June-July and October-  
57 November 2020, the ratio of diagnosed to newly seropositive children was 1 to 8. At least  
58 one newly seropositive child was detected in 47 of 55 schools and 90 of 275 classes. Among  
59 130 classes with high participation rate, 0, 1-2 or  $\geq 3$  seropositive children were present in 73  
60 (56%), 50 (38%) and 7 (5%) classes, respectively. Class level explained slightly more variation  
61 of individual serological results (standard deviation of random effects (SD) 0.97) than school  
62 level (SD 0.61) in the multilevel logistic regression models. Symptoms were reported for 22%  
63 of seronegative and 29% of newly seropositive children since summer.

64

65 **Conclusions:** Under a regimen of open schools with some preventive measures in place  
66 since August, clustering of seropositive cases occurred in very few classes and not across  
67 entire schools despite a clear increase in seropositive children during a period of high  
68 transmission of SARS-CoV-2.

69  
70 **Trial registration:** ClinicalTrials.gov NCT04448717.

71 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04448717>

72 **Key words:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, children, adolescents, school.

73

## 74 Introduction

75

76 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection and the role of  
77 schools is still a controversy: children, particularly adolescents, can be infected as often as  
78 adults [1,2] but rarely develop clinically manifest coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) or  
79 severe health outcomes [3–6]. However, the prevalence of asymptomatic and  
80 oligosymptomatic infections and potential spread in schools is still debated. School closures  
81 have been implemented in many countries in the first half of 2020 in order to curb the  
82 pandemic, leading to disrupted education for 1.5 billion learners in up to 172 countries in  
83 April 2020 [7]. On December 17, more than 0.3 billion learners were still affected by school  
84 closures [7].

85 The negative effects of school closures include an increase in social and economic  
86 inequality, and adverse long-term educational, social and health outcomes for children [8–  
87 10]. There is less uncertainty about the mentioned negative effects of school closures than  
88 about the risks that school setting presents for transmission of SARS-CoV-2. However,  
89 evidence has accumulated that children in schools and households are not the main drivers  
90 of the infection spread [11–13].

91 Although a few outbreaks in educational settings have been reported worldwide  
92 during early 2020 (e.g., in Israel [14], the US [15]), full or partial opening of schools in many  
93 countries in Autumn 2020 has not been followed by more frequent outbreaks [16–19].  
94 It is thus unclear how frequent silent or noticeable outbreaks in classes and entire schools  
95 are. Most studies of SARS-CoV-2 in schools have focused on identified SARS-CoV-2 cases and  
96 subsequent contact-tracing within schools. Thus, asymptomatic or oligosymptomatic  
97 children infected with SARS-CoV-2 are still likely missed and it is not clear how frequent and  
98 significant they are for infection spread. There is a need for longitudinal, population and  
99 school-based studies with random sampling on class and school level.

100 In this article, we present the results of the longitudinal cohort study *Ciao Corona* in the  
101 canton of Zurich, Switzerland with measurement of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and symptoms in  
102 a cohort of more than 2500 children from 55 schools in June-July and October-November  
103 2020 (hereafter referred to as T1 and T2). As for most of Europe, schools were open in this  
104 most populous canton of Switzerland since late August 2020, with preventive measures in  
105 place. Switzerland experienced one of the highest second waves of the SARS-CoV-2  
106 pandemic in Europe in autumn 2020, thus presenting a high-exposure environment to study  
107 SARS-CoV-2 infections in schools. *Ciao Corona* is one of the few prospective, population and

108 school-based studies of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence, and takes place in a country with one  
109 of the highest SARS-CoV-2 incidences worldwide, offering unique insights into the change in  
110 clustering of seropositive cases within classes and schools, and the association with self-  
111 reported symptoms. The aims of the study were to estimate the longitudinal change of  
112 seroprevalence, clustering within schools and classes, and to assess the association with  
113 reported symptoms.  
114

## 115 **Methods**

116

117 This longitudinal cohort study is registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (identifier number  
118 NCT04448717) and the protocol is reported elsewhere [20]. The study is part of the  
119 nationally coordinated research network in Switzerland, *Corona Immunitas* [21]. The canton  
120 of Zurich, in which the study was based, comprises 1.5 million linguistically and ethnically  
121 diverse residents, approximately 18% of Swiss population, residing both in urban and rural  
122 settings. In 2020, physical attendance of schools was interrupted only between March 16  
123 and May 10. Implemented preventive measures (e.g., masks for school personnel and  
124 children in secondary schools, reduction of some large group activities) have fluctuated  
125 since then. However, the schools have been in continuous operation since the start of the  
126 school year on August 17 to the end of 2020. Once an index case was identified in a school,  
127 children and school personnel were quarantined based on contact-tracing of close contacts.  
128 Full classes were quarantined only when two or more infected students were identified  
129 within a class. All schools were obliged to develop a plan and implement specific preventive  
130 measures by August (e.g., masks for teachers and children >12-years-old, distancing rules in  
131 class- and teachers' rooms, tapering of school breaks, no mixing of classes, ban of group  
132 gatherings such as excursions and camps beyond class units, no parents on school grounds)  
133 to mitigate transmission but they varied from school to school. Common to all schools was  
134 the requirement to keep children at home if they are sick beyond very mild symptoms such  
135 as runny nose or mild cough, masking for adults in the school from 19 October and  
136 additionally for children of secondary schools (above 12-years-old) from 2 November.

137

## 138 **Population**

139 Primary schools were selected randomly from the list of all schools in the canton of Zurich,  
140 stratified by region, and the geographically closest secondary school (often, in the same  
141 school building) matched. From 156 invited, 55 schools agreed to participate. Classes within  
142 participating schools were selected randomly, stratified by school level: grades 1-2 in lower  
143 level (attended by 6 to 9-year-old-children), grades 4-5 in middle level (attended by 9 to 13-  
144 year-old children) and grades 7-8 in upper school level (attended by 12 to 16-year-old-  
145 children). Invited grades were selected to ensure that the same cohort of children will  
146 remain in the classes until April 2021 (children in grades 3, 6 and 9 often change the class  
147 and school in the next year). We aimed to enroll at least three classes and at least 40  
148 children in each school level at the invited schools. Major exclusion criterion was suspected

149 or confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection in the given child during the testing (precluding the  
150 attendance of the testing at school).

151 First round of testing (T1) was completed with 2585 participants (serology results  
152 available for 2484) in June-July 2020, and first results are reported elsewhere [1]. 18 eligible  
153 children, who could not participate in June-July, were additionally tested in August (serology  
154 results available for 12), and results merged to T1 testing round, resulting in a total of 2603  
155 children at T1. Flowchart of study participants is shown in Figure 1.

156 The same cohort of classes was invited to the second testing round (T2) in October-  
157 November. If the previously invited class had been restructured after the summer break, all  
158 children in the newly formed classes attended by previously enrolled participants were  
159 eligible to participate.

160

### 161 ***Serological testing***

162 Collection of venous blood samples was performed in participating schools in October 26 –  
163 November 19, 2020.

164 Venous blood samples were analyzed with the ABCORA 2.0 binding assay of the  
165 Institute of Medical Virology (IMV) of the University of Zurich, which is based on Luminex  
166 technology. The test was described in detail in previously [1]. The test analyzes  
167 immunoglobulins G (IgG), M (IgM) and A (IgA) against four SARS-CoV-2 targets (receptor  
168 binding domain (RBD), spike proteins S1 and S2, and the nucleocapsid protein (N), yielding  
169 12 different measurements. Cut-off values were established against pre-pandemic plasma  
170 allowing a high sensitivity (94.3%) and specificity (99.0%) (see [22] for test description; test  
171 parameters have been updated since based on expanded validation cohort). Samples were  
172 defined as seropositive for SARS-CoV-2 if at least two of the 12 parameters were above the  
173 cut-off.

174 Three serological outcomes were analyzed, combining the results at T1 and T2. First,  
175 we estimated seroprevalence in June-July (T1) among all children tested. Second, we  
176 estimated seroprevalence in October-November among previously non-positive or non-  
177 tested children since June-July (T2). Even though some of the seropositive children at T1  
178 tested negative at T2, we excluded them from T2 results because of a potentially persisting  
179 cellular immunity [23] and generally rare reports of reinfection in children, and thus a low  
180 likelihood of a repeated infection since summer. Third, we estimated the proportion of  
181 children who ever had a SARS-CoV-2 infection based on serological test results by October-  
182 November by analyzing the children tested at T2 (or seropositive at T1 and not retested at

183 T1) and counting as positive those who were tested positive at T1 (regardless of subsequent  
184 T2 results) or T2. Seroprevalence outcomes are summarized in Table 1.

185

186 **Table 1** Definitions of seroprevalence outcomes

Abbreviation	Definition	Numerator	Denominator
T1 seroprevalence (seropositive in summer testing)	Seroprevalence in children in June-July 2020	Seropositive children in June-July	All tested children in June-July*
T2 seroprevalence (newly seropositive in autumn testing)	Seroprevalence in children, susceptible at June-July, in October-November 2020	Seropositive children in October-November, excluding those who also tested seropositive in June-July	All tested children in October-November, excluding those who also tested seropositive in June-July
T1+T2 seroprevalence (ever seropositive in summer and/or autumn)	Proportion of children who had been infected with SARS-CoV-2 by October-November 2020, as reflected by ever being seropositive	Children tested seropositive at least once in June-July or October-November (ever tested seropositive)	All tested children in October-November and seropositive children tested in June-July who did not participate in the testing in October-November

187 \* also including 18 children tested (serological results available for 12) in late August-early September

188

### 189 **Statistical analysis**

190 Statistical analysis included descriptive statistics and Bayesian hierarchical modelling to  
191 estimate seroprevalence, accounting for the sensitivity and specificity of the SARS-CoV-2  
192 antibody test, the hierarchical structure of cohort (individual and school levels), and post-  
193 stratification weights, which adjusted for the population-level grade level at school and  
194 geographic district [2]. The factor of confirmed to total infections (dark figure) was  
195 calculated as the ratio of real-time polymerase chain reaction (rtPCR) confirmed cumulative  
196 incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections from July 30 (after the first testing was completed) to  
197 November 8 2020 (during autumn testing period) and the total cumulative incidence until  
198 November 8, based on official statistics [24], and the estimated autumn (T2) and overall  
199 (T1+T2) seroprevalence.

200 Clusters within classes were defined as three or more cases of newly seropositive  
201 children within a class in autumn (T2) testing. We estimated the proportion of classes with a  
202 cluster of seropositive children by dividing their number by the total number of enrolled  
203 classes where at least 5 children and at least 50% of the children were tested at the relevant  
204 time point. This way, classes with low participation rate and very small classes (less than 5  
205 children) were excluded from the analysis of clusters, as likely to be misclassified in the  
206 cluster analysis. However, if a cluster was identified in a class with less than 50%  
207 participation rate, the class was additionally included both in the numerator and the



208 denominator for the proportion of classes with clusters. Clustering of seropositive children  
209 within classes was further examined by comparing our study results with a simulation of a  
210 hypothetical study with the population (classes and numbers of children tested at T2)  
211 identical to this study. In the simulation, independent chance of seropositive results (i.e., no  
212 association of seropositive cases within a class) was assumed, equal to the observed  
213 proportion of T2 seropositive among all T2 tested children. By comparing the number of  
214 classes with clusters actually observed in our study and that in the simulation, we could  
215 estimate if such number of clusters would be likely to be observed by chance.

216         Semi-structured interviews with the principals of schools with classes with observed  
217 clusters of T2 seropositive children were performed after T2 testing to further investigate  
218 the detected clusters. Interview questions covered numbers of diagnosed and quarantined  
219 teachers and children in the affected classes, potential temporal sequence of infections and  
220 other related circumstances.

221         To determine whether schools or specific classes explained more of the variance in  
222 seropositivity, individual level serology results were modeled in a multilevel logistic  
223 regression, with sex and school level (as a proxy for age) as fixed effects. Three models were  
224 compared: with random effects for school level, with random effects for class level, and  
225 with both random effects.

226         Data analysis was performed with R version 4.0.3 [25]. Bayesian hierarchical  
227 modelling was performed using the R package `rstan` [26].

228

229


## 230 Results

231

232 In total, 2831 children from 275 classes within 55 schools in the canton of Zurich were  
233 enrolled in the study by October-November 2020. From these, 2603 participated in T1  
234 summer testing, and 2552 participated in T2 autumn testing. The flowchart of enrolled  
235 participants with serological test results and questionnaire information available is shown in  
236 Figure 1.

237

238 **Figure 1** Flowchart of the cohort study participants



239

240 T1 – testing in June-July 2020. T2 – testing in October-November 2020.

241 \*Some classes were split or rearranged into multiple classes after the summer break.

242 \*\*18 of these children were enrolled in August/September (12 serological results, 18 questionnaires).

243


244 At T2 testing, serological results were available for 731 children from lower school  
245 level (median age 8, age range 6-10 years), 863 children from middle school level (median  
246 age 11, age range 8-13 years), and 909 children from upper school level (median age 14, age  
247 range 11-16 years). 1287 children were female, 1211 male and 5 reported other gender.  
248 Median participation rate at T2 within a class was 47% (interquartile range 30%-62%).

249 Serological test results were positive for 74 children in T1 testing. For these children,  
250 in T2 testing serology result was positive for 42 (60%, median age 10 years, age range 7-14  
251 years, symptoms reported in 31/41 (76%) in January-July) and negative for 28 (40%, median  
252 age 10 years, age range 7-14 years, symptoms reported in 17/24 (71%) in January-July),  
253 while 4 did not attend T2 testing. Serological results were positive for 173 children in T2,  
254 including 109 children who tested negative in T1, and 22 newly enrolled children. The  
255 complete distribution of positive results in T1 and T2 is shown in the Appendix1.

256 Estimated SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in T1 in children was 2.4% (95% CrI 1.4%-  
 257 3.6%). Seroprevalence in autumn (newly seropositive in T2) in children was 4.5% (95% CrI  
 258 3.2%-6.0%) (Figure 2). The proportion of children having had SARS-CoV-2 infection (ever  
 259 seropositive, T1+T2) by autumn was 7.8% (95% CrI 6.2%-9.5%). The seroprevalence at T1  
 260 and T2 does not add up to the proportion of ever seropositive children (T1+T2) as the  
 261 populations included in the numerator and denominator of these three outcomes are not  
 262 exactly the same (see Table 1 and explanation in Appendix2). The range of newly  
 263 seropositive children in the districts of the canton of Zurich was 1.7%– 15.0%, and the range  
 264 of proportion of ever seropositive children 3.5%-21.2% (Figure 2). T2 seroprevalence in  
 265 lower, middle and upper school levels was 4.4% (95% CrI 2.7-6.7%), 5.0% (95% CrI 3.0-7.4%)  
 266 and 3.9% (95% CrI 2.1-6.2%), respectively, and T1+T2 seroprevalence in lower, middle, and  
 267 upper school level was 8.5% (95% CrI 6.1-11.4%), 8.0% (95% CrI 5.7-10.7%) and 6.4% (95%  
 268 CrI 4.3-8.9%), respectively. The difference in estimated seroprevalence was not different  
 269 between males and females (T2: 4.8% vs 4.2%; T1+T2: 8.3% vs 7.2%).

270

271 **Figure 2** Seroprevalence estimates in school levels, sexes and districts of the canton of  
 272 Zurich



273

274 Districts are ranked in the order of decreasing population size.

275

276           Compared to the cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections between July and  
277 November in the canton of Zurich in children between 4 and 15-years-old, the ratio of  
278 diagnosed to seropositive children was 1 to 8. The ratio of total cumulative incidence of  
279 SARS-CoV-2 infections in children since January to November 2020 to ever seropositive  
280 children was 1 to 13.


281           The number of newly T2 (ever T1+T2) seropositive children within a school-level  
282 ranged from 0 to 12 (0 to 14), and within a class from 0 to 10 (0 to 11). At least one newly  
283 seropositive child was detected in 47 out of 55 schools and in 90 out of 275 classes (56 out  
284 of 129 classes with  $\geq 5$  children and  $\geq 50\%$  of children tested; 57 out of 130 classes with high  
285 participation rate or at least three newly seropositive children).

286           At least one ever seropositive child was detected in 52 out of 55 schools and in 125  
287 out of 275 classes (75 out of 129 classes with  $\geq 5$  children and  $\geq 50\%$  of children tested).

288           Distribution of newly and ever seropositive children within tested classes with more than 5  
289 children and more than 50% of the class tested is shown in Figure 3.

290

291 **Figure 3** Distribution of children seropositive at T1 and newly at T2 in classes with  $\geq 5$  and  
 292  $\geq 50\%$  of children tested



294  
 295 Figure depicts children tested at T2 (autumn 2020): seronegative (blue), seropositive in T1 (orange),  
 296 newly seropositive in T2 (red), and not tested or without serological results available in T2 (grey).  
 297 A – lower school level classes, B – middle school level classes, C – upper school level classes.  
 298 D presents the summary of the newly seropositive children at T2 numbers in the classes depicted in A-C.  
 299

300 Seven classes in five schools had three or more newly seropositive children: three  
 301 classes in lower, two in middle, and two in upper school levels. Detailed information about  
 302 the clusters is provided in Table 2. Assuming a uniform 5.4% seropositivity rate across all  
 303 tested children, and numbers of children tested within classes as observed in this study, a  
 304 simulation study showed that 7 or more clusters would be expected by chance in 14% of  
 305 repetitions, with median expected number of classes with such clusters 4 (95% CrI 1 – 9).  
 306 Thus, even if infections within classes were not associated, in a population with the classes  
 307 structure and total number of seropositive children as in this study, we would expect to see  
 308 4 clusters of three or more seropositive children in a class.

309 **Table 2** Details about the classes with three or more newly seropositive children between  
310 July and November 2020

School ID	School Level	N of children in the class			PCR positivity		Quarantine/Isolation		Probable index case			
		Total	Tested	Newly seropositive	Teacher	Children	Teacher	Children		Information	Teacher	Child
1	middle	17	14	3	0	0	0	8	Individual unrelated cases in quarantine due to positive household members.			x
2	lower	19	9	3	0	0	0	0	Cases not previously known.	?	?	?
3	lower	25	16	4	1	2	1	Whole class	Teacher tested positive; next day 2 children tested positive.	x		
4	medium	23	16	10	1	3	1	Whole class	Child tested positive; next day 2 other children and teacher positive; many household members of the class infected as well; index case unclear.	?	?	?
	lower	22	17	5	0	0	0	2	Two unrelated children in quarantine due to diagnosed sports camp coach and affected household member.			x
5	upper	17	13	3	0	1	0	Whole class	Class quarantined after a mother and subsequently the child (class student) tested positive, while the class was in a camp.			x
	upper	16	12	3	0	0	0	3	Individual unrelated cases (one due to infected brother in another class, other two unknown).		?	?

311

312 Information was obtained through semi-structured interviews with school principals, including the  
313 information about the probable index case. Class from School 2 had a participation rate of 47% and  
314 therefore is not shown in Figure 3.

315


316 In the multilevel logistic regression models of individual serology results of T2  
317 serology, school level (as a proxy for age) and sex were not significant predictors. Estimated  
318 standard deviation (SD) of random effects for the school decreased once the random effect  
319 for class was added (from 0.606 (95% CI 0.400-0.864) to 0.467 (95% CI 0-0.786)). Estimated  
320 SD of random effects for class remained relatively stable and was bigger than the effect of  
321 school once the random effect of school was added (from 0.969 (95% CI 0.692-1.290) to  
322 0.767 (95% CI 0.371-1.170)).

323 Symptoms between the summer break and November 2020 were reported in 21.8%  
324 seronegative and in 28.7% newly seropositive children (T2). The distribution of individual  
325 symptoms is depicted in Figure 4. Although reported rarely in general, only loss of smell or  
326 taste was more frequent in seropositive than in seronegative children, (3/101 (3.0%) vs  
327 4/1923 (0.2%)). The most frequently reported symptoms in seropositive children were  
328 headache (13.9%), runny or congested nose (11.9%), sore throat (11.9%), and fatigue  
329 (8.9%).

330

331

332 **Figure 4** Symptoms reported between July and November 2020 in seronegative and newly  
333 seropositive (T2) children



334

## 335 Discussion

336

337 In this cohort study of 55 schools and more than 2500 children, we observed only minimal  
338 clustering of seropositive cases within classes and schools between July and November 2020  
339 despite a clear increase in seroprevalence among children during a time of very high  
340 transmission. Clusters could be partially explained by independent occurrence of cases from  
341 individual infections among classmates given the high community transmission of  
342 SARS-CoV-2. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence increased since June-July from 2.4% to 7.8% in  
343 October-November. SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were not detected after four months for 40%  
344 previously seropositive children. There was no difference in seroprevalence between school  
345 levels (age groups), although a trend of lower seroprevalence was observed in older  
346 children.

347 In autumn 2020, Switzerland had one of the highest reported incidences of SARS-  
348 CoV-2 infections in Europe, peaking at approximately 950 daily cases per million inhabitants  
349 in early November [27]. A similarly high incidence was observed in the canton of Zurich,  
350 where the study was conducted, with approximately 590 daily cases per million inhabitants  
351 and rtPCR test positivity of approximately 16% recorded for the first half of November [24].  
352 However, schools have been open since the school year started on August 17, 2020. Some  
353 but not extensive preventive measures were implemented, such as masks for school  
354 personnel and restriction of large group activities. As the number of cases in the community  
355 increased, masking for children in secondary schools (over 12-years-old) was implemented  
356 from November. In light of this context, the increase in seroprevalence since summer is  
357 expected. However, it was not accompanied by high incidence of clustered seropositive  
358 cases within schools and classes. This finding documents the potential for schools to remain  
359 open and operate safely, without substantial risk for frequent outbreaks, even in a high  
360 community transmission setting.

361 Clusters of 3 or more newly seropositive children were observed only in the minority  
362 of classes (six out of 129 classes with high participation rate, and in one class with 47%  
363 participation rate). In contrast to some other studies, we did not observe higher  
364 seroprevalence or clustering of cases in children of older age in the secondary schools.  
365 Potentially, behavioral factors and preventive measures in schools including masking of  
366 children in higher school grades helped to mitigate the potential spread of infection. The  
367 ratio of diagnosed to seropositive cases among children, although still alarming, had



368 decreased substantially since summer, from 1 to 89 [1] to 1 in 8 cases, meaning that  
369 diagnosis of the infected children had dramatically improved.

370 Observed clustering of cases within a class does not necessarily signal an outbreak  
371 (internal infection spread) has occurred in the school. In the seven classes with observed  
372 potential clusters, seropositive children were likely not part of the same infection  
373 transmission chain in at least two of the classes. In six classes, at least some of the  
374 seropositive children were previously diagnosed or quarantined. The results of the  
375 simulation showed that even if seropositive status was assigned to children of the study  
376 population completely randomly, clusters of seropositive children would be observed in  
377 seven or more of the tested classes with 14% probability. Thus, even if the seropositive  
378 children were not associated within classes (i.e., infections completely independent of each  
379 other), it would be not unreasonable to expect to see as many clusters as observed in this  
380 study just by chance.

381 When clustering did exist, it seemed to be related to the class rather than to the  
382 school, as suggested by the multilevel models. This could mean that, as could be expected,  
383 infection is more likely to spread within a class rather than school (if at all). Potentially, the  
384 random effect of the school would become even smaller once the incidence in the  
385 community (district) is controlled for. This is another reason why focused class-based  
386 quarantine measures may be more efficient than penalizing whole schools or even the  
387 entire school system for localized clustering.

388 This study offers unique insights into the transmission and prevalence of SARS-CoV-2  
389 infection in schools on a randomly selected, representative, longitudinal, population level  
390 cohort. Most of the other studies of SARS-CoV-2 in schools have focused on contact tracing  
391 of index cases [16,28], thus potentially missing unidentified cases. Other studies have relied  
392 on the prevalence of diagnosed SARS-CoV-2 cases to estimate the frequency of outbreaks  
393 and risk for children infected while schools are operating in person [16–18]. Finally, a few  
394 ecological studies tried to estimate the overall effect of closing and opening schools on the  
395 development of the pandemic (in terms of diagnosed and reported cases and deaths) [29–  
396 31], with major limitations of uncontrolled confounding, high level of aggregation (e.g.,  
397 pooling school and university closures as one intervention, or analyzing aggregated  
398 outcomes on country-level) and potentially measuring the outcome in a population not  
399 exposed to the intervention. Finally, a stochastic modelling study of infection spread in  
400 schools have shown that some, although minimal, clustering of infections (outbreaks) is  
401 likely to happen even if major prevention and screening strategies are implemented [32].

402 In contrast to the mentioned retrospective and modelling studies, our study offers a  
403 prospective population level view, corresponding to school structure thanks to sampling on  
404 the school and class levels. In addition, having measured the baseline seroprevalence in  
405 June-July 2020, we were able to study the incidence of newly seropositive cases and their  
406 clustering in classes and schools in autumn. The study had a very high retention rate, with  
407 89% of enrolled children retested in autumn. Together with the newly enrolled children  
408 from the same classes joining in autumn, the study had a high overall participation rate,  
409 especially given that it included venous blood sampling in children. High participation rate  
410 within a large proportion of classes allowed to study clustering on class level, which has not  
411 been possible in other (rare) seroprevalence studies in children [33].

412 The study has a few limitations. First, seroprevalence does not necessarily reflect the  
413 exact levels of past infection. Although we were able to adjust for test accuracy parameters  
414 on the population levels, leading to accurate estimates of overall seroprevalence, some false  
415 negatives and positives can be expected on individual level. In comparison to the summer  
416 testing, the number of false positives is expected to be lower as the prevalence has  
417 increased [34]. Among the 131 newly positively tested children in autumn, 20 would be  
418 expected to be false positive and among the 2330 negatively tested, 11 false negative,  
419 based on the estimated seroprevalence and test accuracy parameters. This means that the  
420 true rate of clustering could be expected to be even lower. Second, measuring  
421 seroprevalence rather than acute diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 allows only a retrospective  
422 analysis, and prevents full reconstruction of the temporal sequence of infected cases within  
423 classes. In addition, seroprevalence is a dynamic parameter, as some children lose the  
424 antibodies and thus might appear seronegative despite having had the virus. Based on the  
425 very low re-infection rates in the literature, serological status only tells a partial story about  
426 the immunity against SARS-CoV-2 infections. Other unspecific or T-cell mediated cellular  
427 responses may exist to confer long-term immunity [23]. However, the limitation would be  
428 even higher with diagnostic testing, within significantly smaller window of positivity and no  
429 retrospective information. We were able to reconstruct at least some of the temporal  
430 information by comparing the serology status of children in summer and autumn, and thus  
431 differentiating cases infected in the first (spring) and second (autumn) wave of the  
432 pandemic, and by interviewing school principals about development of infections in classes.

433 In conclusion, clustering of cases occurred in very few classes and not across entire  
434 schools despite a striking increase in individual seroprevalence in children during a period of  
435 high transmission of SARS-CoV-2. As SARS-CoV-2 pandemic mitigation and the debate of the

436 role of schools in the transmission of infections remains relevant, this study brings evidence  
437 that clusters of SARS-CoV-2 infection are rare in schools, and the transmission is more likely  
438 to be limited to classes. These findings from a country with high community transmission  
439 give hope that schools can be kept open, given that preventive measures are implemented  
440 within the school and the surrounding community.

441

442

#### 443 **Ethics approval**

444 The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Canton of Zurich, Switzerland  
445 (2020-01336). All participants provided written informed consent before being enrolled in  
446 the study.

447

#### 448 **Data sharing statement**

449 Data is still being collected for the cohort study *Ciao Corona*. Deidentified participant data  
450 might be available on reasonable request by email to the corresponding author at later  
451 stages of the study.

452

#### 453 **Funding**

454 This study is part of *Corona Immunitas* research network, coordinated by the Swiss School of  
455 Public Health (SSPH+), and funded by fundraising of SSPH+ that includes funds of the Swiss  
456 Federal Office of Public Health and private funders (ethical guidelines for funding stated by  
457 SSPH+ will be respected), by funds of the Cantons of Switzerland (Vaud, Zurich and Basel)  
458 and by institutional funds of the Universities. Additional funding, specific to this study is  
459 available from the University of Zurich Foundation. The funder/sponsor did not have any  
460 role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and  
461 interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision  
462 to submit the manuscript for publication.

463

464

465

466

## 467 References

- 468 1 Ulyte A, Radtke T, Abela IA, *et al.* Variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in school-children across  
469 districts, schools and classes. *medRxiv* 2020;:2020.09.18.20191254. doi:10.1101/2020.09.18.20191254
- 470 2 Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, *et al.* Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Geneva,  
471 Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. *Lancet* 2020;0. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
472 6736(20)31304-0
- 473 3 Levin AT, Hanage WP, Owusu-Boaitey N, *et al.* Assessing the Age Specificity of Infection Fatality Rates  
474 for COVID-19: Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis, and Public Policy Implications. *medRxiv*  
475 2020;:2020.07.23.20160895. doi:10.1101/2020.07.23.20160895
- 476 4 Shekerdemian LS, Mahmood NR, Wolfe KK, *et al.* Characteristics and outcomes of children with  
477 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infection admitted to US and Canadian pediatric intensive care  
478 units. *JAMA Pediatr* 2020;174:868–73. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.1948
- 479 5 Hoang A, Chorath K, Moreira A, *et al.* COVID-19 in 7780 pediatric patients: A systematic review.  
480 *EClinicalMedicine* 2020;0:100433. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100433
- 481 6 Göttinger F, Santiago-García B, Noguera-Julían A, *et al.* COVID-19 in children and adolescents in  
482 Europe: a multinational, multicentre cohort study. *Lancet Child Adolesc Heal* 2020;4:653–61.  
483 doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30177-2
- 484 7 UNESCO. School closures caused by Coronavirus (Covid-19).  
485 2020.<https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse> (accessed 19 Dec 2020).
- 486 8 Lancker W Van, Parolin Z. COVID-19, school closures, and child poverty: a social crisis in the making.  
487 *Lancet Public Heal* 2020;5:e243. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30084-0
- 488 9 Norman RE, Byambaa M, De R, *et al.* The Long-Term Health Consequences of Child Physical Abuse,  
489 Emotional Abuse, and Neglect: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLoS Med* 2012;9:e1001349.  
490 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001349
- 491 10 Christakis DA, Van Cleve W, Zimmerman FJ. Estimation of US Children’s Educational Attainment and  
492 Years of Life Lost Associated With Primary School Closures During the Coronavirus Disease 2019  
493 Pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020;3:e2028786. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.28786
- 494 11 Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonell C, *et al.* Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Children and  
495 Adolescents Compared With Adults. *JAMA Pediatr* Published Online First: 25 September 2020.  
496 doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.4573
- 497 12 APS M, SN F. Children are not COVID-19 super spreaders: time to go back to school. *Arch Dis Child*  
498 2020;105. doi:10.1136/ARCHDISCHILD-2020-319474
- 499 13 Kim J, Choe YJ, Lee J, *et al.* Role of children in household transmission of COVID-19. *Arch Dis Child*  
500 Published Online First: 7 August 2020. doi:10.1136/ARCHDISCHILD-2020-319910
- 501 14 Stein-Zamir C, Abramson N, Shooob H, *et al.* A large COVID-19 outbreak in a high school 10 days after  
502 schools’ reopening, Israel, May 2020. *Eurosurveillance* 2020;25:2001352. doi:10.2807/1560-  
503 7917.ES.2020.25.29.2001352
- 504 15 Szablewski CM, Chang KT, Brown MM, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Transmission and Infection Among Attendees  
505 of an Overnight Camp — Georgia, June 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69:1023–5.  
506 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6931e1
- 507 16 Larosa E, Djuric O, Cassinadri M, *et al.* Secondary transmission of COVID-19 in preschool and school  
508 settings in northern Italy after their reopening in September 2020: a population-based study.  
509 *Eurosurveillance* 2020;25:2001911. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.49.2001911
- 510 17 Otte im Kampe E, Lehfeld A-S, Buda S, *et al.* Surveillance of COVID-19 school outbreaks, Germany,  
511 March to August 2020. *Eurosurveillance* 2020;25:2001645. doi:10.2807/1560-  
512 7917.ES.2020.25.38.2001645
- 513 18 Ismail SA, Saliba V, Bernal JL, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 infection and transmission in educational settings: a  
514 prospective, cross-sectional analysis of infection clusters and outbreaks in England. *Lancet Infect Dis*;0.  
515 doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30882-3
- 516 19 Buonsenso D, Rose C De, Moroni R, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 infections in Italian schools: preliminary findings  
517 after one month of school opening during the second wave of the pandemic. *medRxiv*  
518 2020;:2020.10.10.20210328. doi:10.1101/2020.10.10.20210328
- 519 20 Ulyte A, Radtke T, Abela IA, *et al.* Seroprevalence and immunity of SARS-CoV-2 infection in children and  
520 adolescents in schools in Switzerland: design for a longitudinal, school-based prospective cohort study.  
521 *Int J Public Health* Published Online First: 2020. doi:10.1007/s00038-020-01495-z
- 522 21 West EA, Anker D, Amati R, *et al.* Corona Immunitas: study protocol of a nationwide program of SARS-  
523 CoV-2 seroprevalence and seroepidemiologic studies in Switzerland. *Int J Public Health* 2020;:1–20.  
524 doi:10.1007/s00038-020-01494-0
- 525 22 Institute of Medical Virology IMV SARS-CoV-2 Antikörper Differenzierung (ABCORA).
- 526 23 Dan JM, Mateus J, Kato Y, *et al.* Immunological memory to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for greater than six  
527 months after infection. *bioRxiv* 2020;:2020.11.15.383323. doi:10.1101/2020.11.15.383323

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) .

- 528 24 Canton of Zurich. Numbers and Facts on COVID-19 [Kanton Zürich. Zahlen & Fakten zu COVID-19].  
529 <https://www.zh.ch/de/gesundheit/coronavirus/zahlen-fakten-covid-19.html?keyword=covid19#/home>  
530 (accessed 13 Nov 2020).
- 531 25 R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical  
532 Computing, Vienna, Austria. 2020.<https://www.r-project.org/> (accessed 17 Dec 2020).
- 533 26 Stan Development Team. RStan: the R interface to Stan. R package version 2.21.2. 2020.
- 534 27 Roser M, Ritchie H, Ortiz-Ospina E, *et al.* Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). 2020.
- 535 28 Macartney K, Quinn HE, Pillsbury AJ, *et al.* Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australian educational  
536 settings: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Child Adolesc Heal* 2020;**0**. doi:10.1016/s2352-  
537 4642(20)30251-0
- 538 29 Haug N, Geyrhofer L, Londei A, *et al.* Ranking the effectiveness of worldwide COVID-19 government  
539 interventions. *Nat Hum Behav* 2020;**4**:1303–12. doi:10.1038/s41562-020-01009-0
- 540 30 Brauner JM, Mindermann S, Sharma M, *et al.* Inferring the effectiveness of government interventions  
541 against COVID-19. *Science (80- )* 2020;:eabd9338. doi:10.1126/science.abd9338
- 542 31 Auger KA, Shah SS, Richardson T, *et al.* Association Between Statewide School Closure and COVID-19  
543 Incidence and Mortality in the US. *JAMA* 2020;**324**:859. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.14348
- 544 32 Tupper P, Colijn C. COVID-19's unfortunate events in schools: mitigating classroom clusters in the  
545 context of variable transmission. *medRxiv* 2020;:2020.10.20.20216267.  
546 doi:10.1101/2020.10.20.20216267
- 547 33 COVID-19 Schools Infection Survey Round 1, England - Office for National Statistics.  
548 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/covid19schoolsinfectionsurveyround1england/november2020)  
549 [/bulletins/covid19schoolsinfectionsurveyround1england/november2020](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/covid19schoolsinfectionsurveyround1england/november2020) (accessed 19 Dec 2020).
- 550 34 Watson J, Whiting PF, Brush JE. Interpreting a covid-19 test result. *BMJ*. 2020;**369**.  
551 doi:10.1136/bmj.m1808  
552  
553

554 **Appendix 1** Comparison of individual serological results in study participants in summer (T1)  
555 and autumn (T2)

		Serological result in T2		
		Negative	Positive	Not available
Serological result in T1	Negative	2044	109	269
	Positive	28	42	4
	Not available	258	22	55

556 T1 – June-July 2020. T2 – October-November 2020.

557

558

559 **Appendix 2** Comparison of numerator and denominator in estimating seroprevalence at  
560 different time points of the study (T1, T2 and T1+T2)

Serology test results				Analysis of seroprevalence		
T1	T2	T1+T2	N	T1	T2	T1+T2
-	-	-	2044	-	-	-
-	+	+	109	-	+	+
-	NA	NA	269	-		
+	-	+	28	+	*	+
+	+	+	42	+	**	+
+	NA	+	4	+		+
NA	-	-	258		-	-
NA	+	+	22		+	+
NA	NA	NA	55			
Number of positive results (numerator)				74	131	205
Total number analyzed (denominator)				2496	2433	2507
Raw proportion of seropositive results				3.0%	5.0%	8.2%

561 N – number of participants in the corresponding row.

562 - negative result at the testing, + positive result at the testing, NA – results not available.

563 Cells in yellow are used for the analysis of seroprevalence at the corresponding time points.

564 \* previously seropositive results that are seronegative at T2 are not counted, as immunity might be still  
565 persisting, thus leading to a different further susceptibility and rates of infection than in those previously  
566 seronegative.

567 \*\* previously seropositive results that are still seropositive at T2 are not counted in T2, as they are more  
568 likely related to infections in spring (before T1) rather than in summer and autumn (between T1 and T2).

569 Raw proportion of seropositive results does not correspond to the seroprevalence estimated with  
570 Bayesian hierarchical models (see Methods and Results), which additionally corrects for test accuracy and  
571 population structure parameters. Estimated seroprevalence T1+T2 is higher than the sum of T1 and T2  
572 seroprevalence – similarly as for the raw proportions of seropositive results, shown in this table – due to  
573 slightly different denominators used in the estimation at each time point.

574

575