# Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by children in schools and households: a prospective cohort and environmental sampling study in London

Rebecca Cordery[1] Lucy Reeves[2], Jie Zhou[2], Aileen Rowan[2], Patricia Watber[2], Carolina Rosadas[2], Michael Crone[2], Paul Freemont[2], Lucy Mosscrop[2], Alice Cowley[1], Gina Zelent[1], Kate Bisset[1], Holly Le Blond[1], Sadie Regmi[1], Christian Buckingham[2], Ramlah Junaideen[2], Nadia Abdulla[2], Miranda Mindlin[1], Theresa Lamagni,[1] Wendy Barclay[2], Graham P. Taylor[2], and Shiranee Sriskandan[2*] on behalf of the TraCK (Transmission of Coronavirus in Kids) Study

[1]Public Health England, London, UK
[2]Imperial College London, London, UK

Corresponding author Shiranee Sriskandan
s.sriskandan@imperial.ac.uk

**Abstract**

**Background** Assessing transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by children in schools is of critical importance in informing public health action. Quantification of transmission by active contact tracing in children and their contacts can be practically challenging even in non-pandemic times.

**Methods** Cases of COVID-19 in children in London schools were identified through statutory notification and matched to schools reporting cases. Bubble and non-bubble 'control' contacts at school and household contacts for each case were longitudinally sampled and tested for SARS-CoV2 using PCR. Surfaces and air in the home and school environment were also subject to longitudinal sampling and testing for SARS-CoV-2 for 21 days or 28 days.

**Results.** Secondary transmission was not detected in 28 individual Bubble contacts, representing 10 distinct bubbles. Across the 8 non-bubble 'school contact' classes, 3/62 pupils tested positive – all three were asymptomatic and tested positive in one setting on the same day, unrelated to the original index case. In contrast the secondary attack rate in naïve household contacts of children was 14.5% and the inferred secondary attack rate was 25%. Environmental contamination with SARS-CoV-2 was rare in all schools studied, regardless of school type. This contrasted with contamination in households, where 20-30% of samples were positive.

**Summary** The low levels of environmental contamination in schools are consistent with low transmission frequency and adequate levels of cleaning and ventilation in schools during the period of study. Secondary transmission in schools appeared to be infrequent during the study period. The frequency of secondary transmission in households associated with evident viral shedding throughout the home points to a need to improve advice to households with diagnosed infection in children.

**Introduction.**

The potential for children and schools to amplify infectious disease outbreaks and epidemics is well-recognised, though in the case of influenza, the impact of school closures may be hard to predict (1-3). While there is evidence that widespread school closures were associated with a reduction in COVID-19 incidence and mortality (4,5), this effect inevitably may be confounded by other non-pharmaceutical interventions. In the longer term, the ongoing benefits of closures must be weighed against the unquestionable harms to children and wider society.

COVID-19 poses a much lesser risk to children than to adults, both in terms of illness severity (ISARIC), but also in terms of risk of acquisition; children appear half as likely as adults to acquire COVID-19 (6, 7). The onward transmission risk from children infected with COVID-19 has been subject to less rigorous evaluation. Notably, shedding of virus by children is not markedly different to adults, and minor differences may be attributable to swab size (8). Infections in England have been subject to a number of very large scale point prevalence studies focussed on children, that indicate a very low prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic children attending school, that may be lower than or similar to prevalence in the community. (9) Problematically, low prevalence makes onward transmission studies in schools impractical and uneconomic. Although outbreaks provide an opportunity to study onward transmission, these are often complicated by uncertainty about to timing and transmission direction; one study in schools did identify children as a source of onward transmission in a small number of cases, but such outbreaks comprised just two cases on average (10).

Forward contact tracing offers an opportunity to search actively for secondary infections in a controlled manner. Unfortunately the risk of respiratory infection transmission in schools is seldom quantified except in the context of major outbreaks. Clinical attack rates of 20-30% are reported in schools affected by influenza A (11). Asymptomatic infections are however not routinely sought or quantified, thus the role of silent infection and onward transmission from such cases is uncertain. We recently conducted a contact tracing study in schools affected by sequential cases of scarlet fever, caused by a bacterium *Streptococcus pyogenes*; we found that prevalence of the index strain in asymptomatic contacts increased from 9.6% in week 1, to 26.9% in week 2, despite treatment and isolation of the index cases. (12) The potential for classrooms and asymptomatic 'shedders' to act as an accelerator for respiratory infection is therefore undeniable; there is a clear need to ascertain the prevalence of onward infection in this setting.

Using the same protocol as our scarlet fever study, adapted to comply with government guidelines requiring the reporting and quarantining of positive cases and their immediate classmates (the bubble), we investigated the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in contacts of children found to be infected with COVID-19 in schools and households between October 9$^{th}$ 2020 and July 18$^{th}$ 2021.

The TraCK (Transmission of Coronavirus-19 in Kids, ISRCTN 13773960) study was established to develop a clearer understanding of the infection risks posed by an infected child who attends school, by undertaking longitudinal sampling from the child, their school and household contacts, and the school and household environment around them. Our study was conducted at a time when primary and secondary schools had implemented a number of measures to limit transmission, including enhanced cleaning regimes, inform and advise letters to parents, and attendance restrictions for suspected or confirmed cases and for identified contacts of confirmed cases. Our aim was to identify transmission events as well as likely transmission mechanisms, and thereby identify potential interventions to limit spread of COVID-19 in the future, and determine efficacy of current interventions. The detailed findings from cases of COVID-19 enrolled in this study will be reported elsewhere.

**Methods**

During the study period, children were tested for SARS-CoV-2 by PCR if exhibiting any of the recognised symptoms of COVID-19 through community or postal testing programmes. From September 1st 2020 – July 19th 2021, schools and nurseries were required by the UK government to undertake contact tracing for suspected or confirmed cases of covid in pupils or staff. Children with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection were excluded from onset of symptoms (or a positive test if no symptoms). The duration of exclusion was initially 14 days (1st Sept 2020 – 14th Dec 2020) later changing to 10 days (14th Dec – 19th July 2021). Contacts identified by schools were excluded for the same duration. In early years and primary school settings the whole class were considered close contacts (the so-called “bubble”). In secondary school settings risk assessment identified individual close classroom contacts (face to face contact; contact within 1m for >1 minute; within 2m for >15 minutes).

*Study eligibility* Schools and nurseries in the London region reporting new cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection (symptomatic or asymptomatic) to local Health Protection teams were invited to take part in the study if a child (index case) had been attending school in the 48h prior to a positive PCR test for SARS-CoV-2.

Parents or guardians of such notified cases were invited to allow their child and household to participate in the study. If the case’s school was willing to support the study, parents or guardians of pupil contacts were also invited to allow their child to participate in the study. The study commenced October 9th 2020 and recruitment ended July 18th 2021.

*Case definition*. Children aged 2-14 years (extended to 2-18 years in November 2020) with a new nose or throat or combined nose and throat swab PCR result reported as positive for SARS-CoV-2.

*Contact definition.* Bubble contacts (BC) were children identified by schools who were required to isolate at home. For nurseries and primary schools, BC were in the same 'bubble' or class as the index case; for secondary schools, BC had been individually identified by the school as meeting the contact definitions above.

School contacts (SC) were children from a different 'control' class in the same school, which was adjacent in terms of age-group or geographical proximity in the school. They had not been identified by school as contacts required to isolate, but were drawn from the same wider community and, despite best efforts to keep bubbles separate, may have been exposed to similar common areas in the school as the index case the BC.

Household contacts (HC) were adults and children of any age normally resident with the Case. Household contacts of a Case were required to isolate.

*Contact sampling* Combined nose and throat samples were obtained using flocked nylon swabs (Sterilab Services, Harrogate, UK) by the research team from each participating contact (BC, SC, or HC) as soon as possible (<48 hours) after case identification, and thereafter weekly for up to 28 days. Swabs were rubbed on the posterior fauces and then rotated gently in the nostrils no deeper than the length of the flocked end of the swab, then placed into universal transport medium. BC and HHC were sampled at home by the study team, while SC were sampled at school by the same study team. Gingival crevicular fluid swabs (Oracol swabs, Malvern Medical, Worcester, UK) at the same time as viral swabs.

*Environmental sampling.* For households, swabs moistened in viral transport medium were used to swab 25 $cm^2$ of four or five surfaces in each of three rooms (child's bedroom, communal room, bathroom), identified as frequently touched or handled by the case, with attention on personal items (total 14 swabs). Air sampling was undertaken in the same three rooms for periods of 10 minutes (300 litres/minute, Coriolis micro, Bertin Instruments, France), with the case present in the communal room during sampling. Environmental sampling in the home started at time of household recruitment and surfaces were re-swabbed weekly for up to 28 days at the time of household sampling.

For schools, surface swabs were taken from four or five surfaces in three locations: Bubble classroom (5); School contact classroom (5); Washroom (4). Schools were asked to delay

cleaning of bubble classrooms until after the week 1 swabs were taken but this was not always possible. Surfaces were re-swabbed weekly for up to 28 days. Air sampling was undertaken in the same three locations, repeated weekly. Where children were present in school, sampling was undertaken immediately after children had left the class. Details of environmental sampling are in the appendix.

*Virological testing.* Nasopharyngeal swabs were coded and then assayed for SARS-CoV-2 E-gene RNA and human RNaseP RNA by a validated, accredited, quantitative RT-PCR. (13). Results were reported in real-time to participants.

*Gingival Crevicular fluid testing (GCF)*. Gingival crevicular fluid samples were collected from every participant on each sampling occasion. The Oracol foam swabs were stored at 4° C until elution in transport medium (phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), supplemented with 10% fetal calf serum, 0.2% Amphotericin B, and 0.5% gentamicin) and then stored at -20°C until analysis. Samples were tested for total IgG against SARS-CoV2 nucleoprotein by the reference laboratory (14).

Environmental samples were coded then tested by a research laboratory for SARS-CoV-2 RNA content using a quantitative RT-PCR detecting SARS-CoV-2 E gene (15) using human RNaseP and 18s rRNA as controls for sample quality and human material content. Samples with high viral load (Ct value <33) were inoculated into Vero cells for culture of infectious virus as previously reported (15).

*Ethical approval***.** The study was approved by a research ethics committee as an amendment to an existing study (Schools Transmission Study REC reference 18/LO/0025; IRAS Reference 225006). Informed consent was obtained from all participants or parents/guardians, and assent was obtained from any participant aged under 18.

*Statistical analysis.* As this was a detailed but pragmatic study of individual cases, schools, and contacts who agreed to participate, descriptive analysis only has been undertaken.

**Results.**

**Prevailing interventions in schools**. Schools in England re-opened in the first week of September 2020 to all children aged 5-18, having adopted a suite of preventive measures including social distancing, hand hygiene, and secondary school-aged pupils were required to wear masks when not in class; any positive cases arising in schools resulted in bubble contacts

quarantining for 14 days. Schools closed in mid-December 2020 for the Christmas holidays. Between January 4th and March 8th 2021 schools in England partially re-opened for vulnerable children, children of keyworkers, and secondary school-aged pupils undertaking exams in years 11 and 13 only. From March 9th 2021 schools re-opened to all pupils and, in addition to the aforementioned measures, secondary school-aged pupils were required to undertake lateral flow antigen testing for SARS-CoV-2 twice weekly and wear masks inside and outside the classroom. In the course of the study, 428 combined nose and throat swabs and a similar number of oral fluid samples were obtained from contacts of index cases.

**Transmission to Bubble Contacts.**

Bubble contacts (who were identified as close in-school contacts of a single COVID-19 case) were recruited from 10 bubbles in 8 different schools. In total 28 bubble contacts who were required to quarantine at home, were followed weekly for 21 or 28 days. Although the index cases had all attended school in the 48h prior to a positive test, onward transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to the 28 participating bubble contacts was not detected over the 21-28-day sampling period (Figure 1A, Table 1). We considered the possibility that bubble contacts might be protected through previous infection however gingival crevicular fluid testing indicated that 3/20 (15%) of bubble contacts recruited up to February 2021 had evidence of prior exposure to SARS-CoV-2. Participation rate among bubble contacts in each school varied widely (median 8.5%, range 2.4% - 26.9%), being lowest in special educational needs (SEND) and secondary schools, and highest in primary schools. In one setting, a non-participating bubble contact developed a fever and the child and household joined the study late, after the child was found to be positive on community testing. We were not able to confirm infection using PCR status, but mucosal seroconversion at 4 weeks was consistent with a recent infection.

**Transmission to and between School Contacts.**

School non-bubble contacts were recruited from single classes that had not been asked to isolate at home, from the same 8 schools; school contacts were from the same year or year above/below the bubble. These young people's in-school contact with the index case and with 'bubble contacts' was limited by the infection control measures used in schools at the time. In total, 62 pupil school contacts and 3 staff were followed over a 21 or 28 day period. Of those tested, 6/31 (19.4%) had antibodies in GCF indicating previous SARS-CoV-2 infection. Participation rates were higher in school contacts than bubble contacts, median 22.4% (range 5.2-54.5%) with one secondary and one SEND school having lowest participation.

In seven of the eight participating schools, no school contacts were found to be infected with SARS-CoV-2. In setting E, a mainstream secondary school, all ten 'school contact' pupils tested negative in week 1, but in week 2, unexpectedly, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in swabs of

3/10 pupils, all taken on the same day. (Figure 1B, Table 2). All three were asymptomatic; in one, the viral load increased from 293,240 E gene copies/swab to 5,999,560 E gene copies/swab 3 days later and onward transmission to a sibling household contact who shared a bedroom (84,040 E gene copies/swab) was observed. The other two asymptomatic pupils with detectable SARS-CoV-2 had very low viral loads; the first had 280 E gene copies/swab but was tested only once. The second had 560 E gene copies/swab, anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in GCF at the same time point, and samples 7 days earlier, and 4 days later were PCR negative. It is therefore possible that these low viral levels do not represent true infections, but transient mucosal carriage while in the company of a fellow pupil with active infection. Genome sequencing confirmed the asymptomatic case to be infected with the alpha variant however sequencing was not feasible in the other two pupils because viral load was inadequate. The original index case associated with the affected school had been identified following a community PCR test; by the time testing of the school contacts had started, the index case had a negative PCR test but was still quarantined. It therefore seems highly unlikely that any of the cases identified among school contacts were linked directly to the original index case.

**Transmission to Household contacts.**

In total 16 households took part comprising 63 individuals; each included one child who was an index or co-primary case to a bubble class. The number of households exceeded the number of bubbles that participated because, in four cases, the household agreed to take part, but the relevant schools withdrew. For setting E, two additional households were recruited that included two of the three newly identified infections in the school contact group. All of the index cases were symptomatic except these two.

In addition to the 16 index cases, 3 children and 9 adults were already reported to be infected by the start of sampling. Initial analysis focussed on those household contacts (n=35) who were considered naïve i.e. were not reported to be infected at the start of sampling, of which 11/35 were children. In all cases bar one, there were no adults infected at the start of sampling in the household. (Table 3)

Over the sampling period, 9 new infections were detected among naïve household contacts in 8 adults and 1 child (Table 3, Figure 1C). In one household, genome sequencing revealed the index case, (alpha variant by reference laboratory testing), to be unrelated to 2 new household infections in adults (both delta variant) hence these represented secondary introduction from the community. In two households, infections in two adults in week 2 of sampling may have resulted from sequential spousal spread (adult to adult), rather than child to adult. Based on the sampling undertaken, transmission by children resulted in infection of a minimum of 5/35 (14.3%) naïve household contacts (maximum 7/35, 20%). We considered the role of pre-existing immunity or vaccination among household contacts, however, only 1/31 crevicular fluid samples suggested

prior infection at the start of sampling. Oral fluid results are available only for the first period of the study (Sept-February 2021), prior to initiation of vaccination programmes and increasing levels of seropositivity in England.

A number of households reported identification of other positive cases prior to arrival of the study team. These cases were also sampled sequentially to confirm diagnosis but were not included in the above analysis due to uncertainty of transmission direction. To gain greater insight into the frequency of secondary attack rate, symptom and testing history was ascertained. Three child household contacts were positive prior to research sampling. Based on symptom onset and date of testing, it was perceived that the index child (from the bubble) had infected the second child in the home, however it was not possible to confirm or refute this.

Nine adults (from 5 households) were reported to have tested positive prior to research sampling, and this was confirmed. For 5/9 adults, test results and/or symptoms pre-dated that of the index child, suggesting that the child was not the index case within the household. For 4/9 adults, their infection was believed to arise from the index child. Taking these additional cases into consideration, the 16 index children may have resulted in 12 new cases in 47 household contacts (25% secondary attack rate).

**Environmental samples in schools**

Environmental sampling was undertaken weekly over 3 weeks in eight schools, of which 5/8 were primary schools, 2/8 secondary schools, and 1/8 was a special educational needs (SEND) school. Surface sampling identified SARS-CoV-2 in only 4/189 (2.1%) surface samples from bubble classrooms; 2/127 (1.6%) surface samples in school contact classrooms; and 5/130 (3.8%) surface samples from school bathrooms. (Figure 2A-C). Where detected, viral copy numbers were at the lower limits of detection except the edge of an index child's chair in a bubble classroom that had >10^4 E gene copies per swab in week 1, prior to deep cleaning. The same items were sampled in each location on a weekly basis and are detailed in the supplementary appendix (Appendix, Supplementary Table 1). No item was positive on subsequent sampling. Air sampling was undertaken weekly in each school in bubble classrooms, control classrooms, and washrooms, except where equipment components limited this. Only 1/68 (1.5%) air samples was positive, but this was at the limit of detection (Ct=40), in week 2 in a school that had experienced a number of staff infections, but in a classroom not known to have any COVID-19 cases among children.

Air sampling was only undertaken when children had vacated the classrooms, either at breaktimes, or at the end of the school day, or, in the case of the Bubble, when children had been sent home to self-isolate. We considered the possibility that air samples might only be positive when a room is in active use. To provide context, we undertook environmental sampling in a

university building. We identified SARS-CoV-2 in 3/10 surface samples from a small office 4 days after it had last been used by a confirmed case of COVID-19, but not in any other office or location in the university building, or on follow up (0/96 samples). We also detected low levels of SARS-CoV-2 (Ct=37) in an air sample from the same office 4 days after it had been used; all samples were negative when re-tested two weeks later (Appendix, Supplementary Table 2).

**Environmental samples in households**

In contrast to findings in schools, multiple surface samples were found to be contaminated with SARS-CoV-2 in households, with a trend to declining virus detection over the time period of sampling (Figure 2 D-F). The most frequent surface contamination was identified in index case bedrooms, where 60/248 (24.2%) samples tested positive, and communal rooms, where 66/241 (27.4%) samples tested positive. In bathrooms, 21/188 (11.2%) surface samples, tested positive, consistent with increased bathroom surface cleaning. Personal items relating to the child such as pillows, and digital equipment such as mobile phones, remote controls and digital toys were more persistently positive over the sampling period (Appendix, Supplementary Figure 1) whereas other types of sample became negative within 2-3 weeks.

Air samples were obtained from three rooms per home on each visit and were positive in 4/22 (18.2%) samples taken in the index child's bedroom; 13/42 (30.9%) samples in the communal room; and 4/21 (19%) samples in the bathroom (Figure 2D-F). The index child and any other household contacts were always present in the communal (living) room at the time of sampling, except on one occasion when the index child was in all rooms. Virus levels in air were highest in the room with an infected child and infected adults. There was no apparent association between the type of dwelling (apartment or house) and air contamination. Levels of human contamination, inferred from RNase P and 18s rRNA levels, were greater on surfaces in households compared with schools (Appendix, supplementary Figure 2). However, air samples from the two settings were remarkably similar (Appendix, supplementary Figure 2).

## Discussion

Conducted during a period of enhanced precautions, transmission from index pupils to bubble contacts, and from index pupils to other pupils in the school who were not close contacts was not detected in this study. Although the study was small, the findings were in stark contrast to a secondary attack rate of at least 14.3% in household contacts of the same index cases. When household contacts who had already been tested prior to sampling commencing were included in our analysis, the secondary attack rate in households with a child index case was 25%.

One transmission incident in school was captured in a class that were not isolating, involving three asymptomatic pupils, that could not be linked to the original index case in that school. One of these pupils had a high viral load, leading to detection of a secondary case in a household contact and, we believe, accounted for the transient (single time point) low viral loads detected in two other pupils. In one of the two pupils with a low viral load, mucosal antibody levels were positive throughout the sampling period: PCR testing one week prior to the positive test, and 4d later failed to show a productive viral infection. In the other pupil, follow up was declined, but the initial PCR and mucosal antibody samples one week earlier were negative. The low viral loads were similar to those we detected in environmental samples and could therefore be consistent with transient carriage or contamination of mucosae rather than early or late infection.

Environmental surface and air sampling was conducted as part of this study in order to understand mechanisms of transmission, where transmission occurred. This showed little or no contamination of the school environment during weekly sampling, including areas where children frequented, and provides a high level of reassurance regarding the school environment. This contrasted greatly with findings in households, where moderate levels of virus were often detected on items frequently touched by the child, and virus was detected in the air around the home, particularly the rooms where the child was present. This is perhaps not surprising since the dimensions of domestic rooms are at least 4 times smaller than classrooms and provides some insight into the risks of virus acquisition in the two types of setting. The detailed and sequential environmental sampling in schools and households that were associated with positive cases in children underlines a need to focus on cleaning of digital equipment and personal items. The high proportion of air samples that were positive in the home compared with school underlines the greater risks associated with smaller rooms and is a reminder that air may remain positive for some time if not well ventilated.

The low level of contamination in the bubble classroom also provides reassurance about the potential for ongoing infection in members of the bubble. Although the bubble class were isolating within weeks 1 and 2 of the study, the whole bubble returned to school after 10 or 14 days isolation. The low or absent levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on surfaces and in air are consistent with a lack of ongoing infection in the bubble. Although schools are cleaned regularly, the study team conducted sampling during breaktimes or shortly after children were dismissed at end of the school day, prior to cleaning. Although surfaces were less contaminated with human material in schools compared with homes, consistent with enhanced cleaning, levels of control RNase P and 18s rRNA in air were similar in the two settings. We considered the possibility that air sampling in schools was negative because the children were not present in the room. We therefore undertook control sampling in a different educational setting, including an office

previously used by a positive staff member. This demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 RNA could be detected in the air 4 days after the room had been used.

Our findings are consistent with studies undertaken in other countries that have examined transmission in the school setting; when actively sought, transmission to bubble contacts is very uncommon, with 1-2% coprimary or secondary infections identified where larger numbers have been sampled (16, 17). The infrequency of transmission to bubble and school contacts is perhaps surprising, and contrasts with reported transmission frequency of other respiratory pathogens including group A streptococcus and influenza (11,12); this may reflect the multifold interventions in place during the pandemic period, or it may reflect the heterogeneity of infection in COVID19 where most transmission is caused by only a minority of infections (18, 19).

To our knowledge this is the first study to prospectively examine transmission from the same children to contacts in both schools and households; the secondary attack rate in households was higher than expected, and was in stark contrast to that seen in schools. Our household secondary attack rate is consistent with findings from a recent study that identified a secondary attack rate of 25% in households even when the index case is a child (20), and a recent meta-analysis (21). Prospective contact tracing in households in England has shown that children are less likely than adults to become secondary cases, but the risk of generating secondary cases is no different based on whether the index was a child or adult (20, 22); this pattern is confirmed in data from other countries (21).Our study was too small to assign specific risks to individual virus variants, however the findings underline the value of active surveillance in calculating secondary attack rate. Household quarantine increases the exposure of household members to index cases and may have contributed to the exponential rise in urban areas during the first wave of the pandemic. It was notable that in all households with no onward transmission to naïve contacts, householders had ensured that the affected child was isolated from others, without sharing a bedroom, whilst still affording care and supervision.

At least 3 or 4 sequential swabs were taken in contacts in an effort to not miss infections that were cleared early in the isolation period, or those arising late. We took combined nasal and pharyngeal swabs to increase the opportunity for virus detection and used semiquantitative detection of human RNAseP as a control to ensure that all swabs were valid and that negative results can be trusted. Furthermore, almost all swabs were taken by the study team; a small number of contacts were permitted to take swabs themselves if witnessed and supervised by the study team.

We considered the possibility that vaccination may have impacted household transmission rates, as a single dose of vaccine was reported to reduce the risk of secondary transmission in households by almost two fold (23). Due to the age of our participants and timing of the study, none of the index cases who were <18 years of age had been vaccinated. Four adult household contacts from two households had received a single dose of vaccine at the time of exposure to the delta variant; all became infected except one contact who also reported COVID19 illness in 2020. Two adult household contacts had received two doses of vaccine and remained un-infected. Our study used gingival crevicular fluid to screen for prior virus infection rather than serum, to avoid any deterrent to participation by children. Although levels of systemic antibody may need to be above a certain threshold to result in detection of total antibody in this fluid (14), we have observed seroconversion using this assay among cases, suggesting that it may provide a useful surrogate of recent infection. The prevalence of crevicular fluid seropositivity among school pupils reported by larger scale testing (24) is similar to levels observed in our study, though lower than prevalence measured using blood serology (25).

The study was designed to investigate bubble sizes of ~10-15, but the interpretation of 'bubble size' changed over time, and by autumn 2020 bubble sizes routinely included 30 primary-aged and up to 200 secondary-aged pupils. (26). Due to data protection and safeguarding, the study was reliant on schools to contact potential participants initially. All schools that agreed to support the study were included, but only two secondary schools were willing to take part. The study relied upon identification of index cases who had been attending school; as such, index cases in this study were almost all symptomatic, with the aim that asymptomatic cases would be identified as a consequence of the study as a comparison group. A number of households had pursued testing prior to the study team's arrival and therefore interpretation of transmission direction may have been biased for those cases.

There are two key limitations to our study. Firstly, the study was conducted at a time of heightened and constantly changing interventions, in particular social distancing in schools and reduced class sizes. We therefore do not know how transmission in schools and environmental contamination may alter when interventions such as social distancing and mask wearing are relaxed. Secondly, in schools that agreed to support the study, participation rates in contacts related to school were low, contrasting with participation rates of over 40% in an earlier scarlet fever contact tracing study that ran in the two years prior to this (12). Key deterrents to participation in the current study reported anecdotally were the legal requirement to notify new infections; quarantine impact on child, household, and classmates; study team visiting quarantined contacts at home; knowledge that COVID19 posed low risk in children; and inclusion of older children. Participation by school contacts was consistently higher than bubble contacts in the same school, underlining

a broad reluctance to have study teams visit the home. Recruiting pupils who had been sent home to isolate was challenging, as schools use an array of methods to contact parents. Nonetheless, participants did come forwards in each school included, therefore we are confident that study materials reached the target group. Our study in one secondary school coincided with the implementation of public health surge testing in the same area; when sampling is presented as a public health intervention rather than research, it may be that participation is much higher. With ongoing disruption to education, the biggest barrier to participation was the recognition that identified infections would result in quarantine requirements for entire households or classes of pupils such that participation was actively discouraged by some parent groups, in contrast to predicted responses at the time of study inception. Although our study benefitted from the objective starting point of positive index cases who attended school, there is a risk of bias in all studies that rely on voluntary participation, in terms of perceived cost and risk of participation among schools and individual participants. Representation from a larger number of participants would however require expansive recruitment. Going forwards, research of this kind will provide more meaningful data if the results are unlinked to identifiable data, and not linked to any form of notification or requirement to isolate. As schools re-open in the autumn term of 2021, with reduced interventions, it would be prudent to evaluate transmission in a silent study.

**Funding**

UKRI/DHSC (Grant COV0322); NIHR

**Acknowledgements** The study team acknowledge the support of the school leaders, support staff, and the participants who took part in the study as well as the NIHR Clinical Research Networks for supporting the schools in this study.

The input of teaching and parent advisory groups is also acknowledged, as is the practical support of key staff from Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, Imperial College London, and Public Health England, and the TraCK study collaborators. We are also grateful to Shamez Ladhani, Samreen Ijaz, John Poh, Justin Shute and members of the Oral Fluid team at PHE Colindale.

**References**

1. Cauchemez S, Valleron AJ, Boëlle PY, Flahault A, Ferguson NM. Estimating the impact of school closure on influenza transmission from Sentinel data. Nature. 2008 Apr 10;452(7188):750-4. doi: 10.1038/nature06732.

2. Earn DJ, He D, Loeb MB, Fonseca K, Lee BE, Dushoff J. Effects of school closure on incidence of pandemic influenza in Alberta, Canada. Ann Intern Med. 2012 Feb 7;156(3):173-81. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-156-3-201202070-00005
3. Bin Nafisah S, Alamery AH, Al Nafesa A, Aleid B, Brazanji NA. School closure during novel influenza: A systematic review. J Infect Public Health. 2018 Sep-Oct;11(5):657-661. doi: 10.1016/j.jiph.2018.01.003. Epub 2018 Feb 1. PMID: 29396256.
4. 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.
5. Brauner JM, Mindermann S, Sharma M, Johnston D, Salvatier J, Gavenčiak T, Stephenson AB, Leech G, Altman G, Mikulik V, Norman AJ, Monrad JT, Besiroglu T, Ge H, Hartwick MA, Teh YW, Chindelevitch L, Gal Y, Kulveit J. Inferring the effectiveness of government interventions against COVID-19. Science. 2021 Feb 19;371(6531):eabd9338. doi: 10.1126/science.abd9338. Epub 2020 Dec 15. PMID: 33323424; PMCID: PMC7877495.
6. Swann OV, Holden KA, Turtle L, Pollock L, Fairfield CJ, Drake TM, Seth S, Egan C, Hardwick HE, Halpin S, Girvan M, Donohue C, Pritchard M, Patel LB, Ladhani S, Sigfrid L, Sinha IP, Olliaro PL, Nguyen-Van-Tam JS, Horby PW, Merson L, Carson G, Dunning J, Openshaw PJM, Baillie JK, Harrison EM, Docherty AB, Semple MG; ISARIC4C Investigators. Clinical characteristics of children and young people admitted to hospital with covid-19 in United Kingdom: prospective multicentre observational cohort study. BMJ. 2020 Aug 27;370:m3249. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m3249. PMID: 32960186; PMCID: PMC7488201.
7. Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonell C, Melendez-Torres GJ, Ward J, Hudson L, Waddington C, Thomas J, Russell S, van der Klis F, Koirala A, Ladhani S, Panovska-Griffiths J, Davies NG, Booy R, Eggo RM. Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Children and Adolescents Compared With Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Pediatr. 2020 Sep 25:e204573. doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.4573
8. Jones TC, Biele G, Mühlemann B, Veith T, Schneider J, Beheim-Schwarzbach J, Bleicker T, Tesch J, Schmidt ML, Sander LE, Kurth F, Menzel P, Schwarzer R, Zuchowski M, Hofmann J, Krumbholz A, Stein A, Edelmann A, Corman VM, Drosten C. Estimating infectiousness throughout SARS-CoV-2 infection course. Science. 2021 Jul 9;373(6551):eabi5273. doi: 10.1126/science.abi5273. Epub 2021 May 25. PMID: 34035154.
9. Office for National Statistics. COVID-19 Schools Infection Survey England, Round 6, June 2021. https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsa

nddiseases/bulletins/covid19schoolsinfectionsurveyengland/round6june2021 Accessed August 31st 2021

10. Ismail SA, Saliba V, Lopez Bernal J, Ramsay ME, Ladhani SN. SARS-CoV-2 infection and transmission in educational settings: a prospective, cross-sectional analysis of infection clusters and outbreaks in England. Lancet Infect Dis. 2021 Mar;21(3):344-353. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30882-3. Epub 2020 Dec 8. PMID: 33306981; PMCID: PMC7833602.
11. Health Protection Agency West Midlands H1N1v Investigation Team. Preliminary descriptive epidemiology of a large school outbreakof influenza A(H1N1)v in the West Midlands, United Kingdom, May 2009. Euro Surveill.2009;14(27):pii=19264. http://www.eurosurveillance.org/ViewArticle.aspx?ArticleId=19264
12. Cordery R, Purba A, Begum L, Mills EA, Mosavie M, Vieira A, Jauneikaite E, Leung RCY, Ready D, Hoffman P, Lamagni T, Sriskandan S. High frequency transmission, asymptomatic shedding, and airborne spread of *Streptococcus pyogenes* among schoolchildren exposed to scarlet fever: a longitudinal multi-cohort moleculo-epidemiological contact tracing study. medRxiv 2021.07.04.21259990; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.04.21259990
13. Rowan AG, May P, Badhan A, et al. Optimized protocol for a quantitative SARS-CoV-2 duplex RT-qPCR assay with internal human sample sufficiency control. *J Virol Methods*. 2021;294:114174. doi:10.1016/j.jviromet.2021.114174
14. Hoschler K, Ijaz S, Andrews N, Ho S, Dicks S, Jegatheesan K, Poh J, Warrener L, Kankeyan T, Baawuah F, Beckmann J, Okike IO, Ahmad S, Garstang J, Brent AJ, Brent B, Aiano F, Brown KE, Ramsay ME, Brown D, Parry JV, Ladhani SN, Zambon M. SARS-CoV-2 IgG detection in human oral fluids. medRxiv 2021.07.07.21260121; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.07.21260121
15. Zhou J, Otter JA, Price JR, Cimpeanu C, Garcia DM, Kinross J, Boshier PR, Mason S, Bolt F, Holmes AH, Barclay WS. Investigating SARS-CoV-2 surface and air contamination in an acute healthcare setting during the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic in London. Clin Infect Dis. 2020 Jul 8:ciaa905. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa905
16. Brandal Lin T, Ofitserova Trine S, Meijerink Hinta, Rykkvin Rikard, Lund Hilde M, Hungnes Olav, Greve-Isdahl Margrethe, Bragstad Karoline, Nygård Karin, Winje Brita A. Minimal transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from paediatric COVID-19 cases in primary schools, Norway, August to November 2020. Euro Surveill. 2021;26(1):pii=2002011. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.26.1.2002011
17. Dawson P, Worrell MC, Malone S, Tinker SC, Fritz S, Maricque B, Junaidi S, Purnell G, Lai AM, Neidich JA, Lee JS, Orscheln RC, Charney R, Rebmann T, Mooney J, Yoon N,

Petit M, Schmidt S, Grabeel J, Neill LA, Barrios LC, Vallabhaneni S, Williams RW, Goddard C, Newland JG, Neatherlin JC, Salzer JS; CDC COVID-19 Surge Laboratory Group. Pilot Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 Secondary Transmission in Kindergarten Through Grade 12 Schools Implementing Mitigation Strategies - St. Louis County and City of Springfield, Missouri, December 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2021 Mar 26;70(12):449-455. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7012e4. PMID: 33764961; PMCID: PMC7993558

18. Chen PZ, Bobrovitz N, Premji Z, Koopmans M, Fisman DN, Gu FX. Heterogeneity in transmissibility and shedding SARS-CoV-2 via droplets and aerosols. Elife. 2021 Apr 16;10:e65774. doi: 10.7554/eLife.65774. PMID: 33861198; PMCID: PMC8139838.
19. Adam DC, Wu P, Wong JY, Lau EHY, Tsang TK, Cauchemez S, Leung GM, Cowling BJ. Clustering and superspreading potential of SARS-CoV-2 infections in Hong Kong. Nat Med. 2020 Nov;26(11):1714-1719. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-1092-0. Epub 2020 Sep 17. PMID: 32943787.
20. Miller E, Waight PA, Andrews NJ, McOwat K, Brown KE, Katja H, Ijaz S, Letley L, Haskins D, Sinnathamby M, Cuthbertson H, Hallis B, Parimalanathan V, de Lusignan S, Lopez-Bernal J. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the household setting: A prospective cohort study in children and adults in England. J Infect. 2021 Aug 1:S0163-4453(21)00380-7. doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2021.07.037. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34348116; PMCID: PMC8325949.
21. Thompson HA, Mousa A, Dighe A, Fu H, Arnedo-Pena A, Barrett P, Bellido-Blasco J, Bi Q, Caputi A, Chaw L, De Maria L, Hoffmann M, Mahapure K, Ng K, Raghuram J, Singh G, Soman B, Soriano V, Valent F, Vimercati L, Wee LE, Wong J, Ghani AC, Ferguson NM. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Setting-specific Transmission Rates: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Clin Infect Dis. 2021 Aug 2;73(3):e754-e764. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciab100. PMID: 33560412; PMCID: PMC7929012.
22. Hall JA, Harris RJ, Zaidi A, Woodhall SC, Dabrera G, Dunbar JK. HOSTED-England's Household Transmission Evaluation Dataset: preliminary findings from a novel passive surveillance system of COVID-19. Int J Epidemiol. 2021 Jul 9;50(3):743-752. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyab057. PMID: 33837417; PMCID: PMC8083300.
23. Harris RJ, Hall JA, Zaidi A, Andrews NJ, Dunbar JK, Dabrera G. Effect of Vaccination on Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in England. N Engl J Med. 2021 Aug 19;385(8):759-760. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2107717. Epub 2021 Jun 23. PMID: 34161702; PMCID: PMC8262621.
24. Office for National Statistics. COVID-19 Schools Infection Survey England Round 4, pupil antibody data, March 2021.

https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/covid19schoolsinfectionsurveyengland/round4pupilantibodydatamarch2021#pupils-testing-positive-for-coronavirus-covid-19-antibodies. Accessed August 31st 2021

25. Ladhani SN, Ireland G, Baawuah F, Beckmann J, Okike IO, Ahmad S, Garstang J, Brent AJ, Brent B, Aiano F, Amin-Chowdhury Z, Kall M, Borrow R, Linley E, Zambon M, Poh J, Warrener L, Lackenby A, Ellis J, Amirthalingam G, Brown KE, Ramsay ME. Emergence of SARS-CoV-2 Alpha (B.1.1.7) variant, infection rates, antibody seroconversion and seroprevalence rates in secondary school students and staff: active prospective surveillance, December 2020 to March 2021, England. J Infect. 2021 Aug 13:S0163-4453(21)00401-1. doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2021.08.019. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34400220; PMCID: PMC8361003.
26. Department for Education Evidence Summary Coronavirus (COVID-19) - children, young people and education settings July 2021 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1000025/Evidence_Summary_-_July_2021.pdf Accessed August 31st 2021

**Tables**

**Table 1. Transmission events in participating Bubble contacts in each school setting**

| School | Bubble size (incl. cases) | Cases Bubble exposed to | Bubble participants | No. bubble contacts testing PCR positive/number swabbed† | | | | Crevicular Fluid¥ | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Week 1 | Week 2 | Week 3 | Week 4 | Crevicular Fluid IgG Positive on first sample | Crevicular Fluid IgG Positive on last sample |
| A | 29 | 1 | 3 | 0/2 | 0/3 | 0/3 | 0/3 | 1/3 | 1/3 |
| B | 26 | 1 | 7 | 0/4 | 0/4 | 0/6 | 0/7 | 2/7 | 1/7 |
| D | 41 | 1 | 1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | ND | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 |
| E‡ | 39 | 1 | 2 | 0/2 | 0/2 | 0/2 | ND | 0/2 | 0/2 |
| F§ | 48 | 2 | 5 | 0/5 | 0/5 | 0/5 | ND | 0/5 | 0/5 |
| G¶ | 16 | 4 | 2 | 0/2 | 0/2 | 0/2 | 0/2 | 0/2 | NC |
| K† | 150 | 11 | 6 | 0/6 | 0/6 | 0/6 | ND | NC | NC |
| M | 30 | 1 | 2 | 0/1 | 0/2 | 0/2 | ND | NC | NC |
| TOTAL | | | 28 | 0/23 | 0/25 | 0/26 | 0/13 | 3/20 | 2/18 |

‡swabbing delayed until 7d after case confirmed.

§Includes 2 different bubbles exposed to one case each. One non-participant bubble contact tested positive in community test (included in household study).

¶Bubble exposed to 2 adult and 2 child cases

† Includes 2 different bubbles exposed to 4 cases and 7 cases respectively

¥Confirmed results only reported. NC, not confirmed. ND, not done

**Table 2. Transmission events in participating School contacts in each school setting**

| School | Total class size | No. cases in whole school at start of study | No. school contact participants | No. school contacts testing PCR positive/number swabbed | | | | Crevicular Fluid[¥] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Week 1 | Week 2 | Week 3 | Week 4 | Crevicular Fluid IgG Positive on first sample | Crevicular Fluid IgG Positive on last sample |
| A | 30 | 1 | 5 | 0/1 | 0/5 | 0/5 | 0/5 | 3/5 | 1/5 |
| B | 22 | 1 | 12 | 0/12 | 0/12 | 0/12 | 0/12 | 1/12 | 1/12 |
| D | 27 | 1 | 2 | 0/2 | 0/1 | 0/2 | 0/2 | 0/2 | 1/2 |
| E[§] | 30 | 1 | 10 | 0/10 | 3/8 | 1/5 | 1/1 | 2/10 | 1/8 |
| F | 11 | 2 | 2 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/2 | ND | 0/2 | 0/1 |
| G[‡] | 24 | 4 | 7 | ND | 0/7 | 0/7 | 0/7 | NC | NC |
| | | | 3 | ND | 0/3 | 0/3 | 0/3 | NC | NC |
| K | 306 | 26 | 16 | 0/14 | 0/16 | 0/16 | ND | NC | NC |
| M | 30 | 1 | 8 | 0/6 | 0/7 | 0/8 | ND | NC | NC |
| TOTAL | | | 65 | 0/46 | 3/60 | 1/60 | 1/30 | 6/31 | 4/28 |

[§]Swabbing of school contacts started one week after initial case

[‡]4 cases include 2 children and 2 adults. Contacts include 7 children and 3 adults

[¥]Confirmed results only reported. ND, not done; NC, not confirmed

**Table 3. Transmission events in participating household contacts in each setting**

| Site | Total house-hold size[§] | No. known child cases at start of swabbing[¶] | No. known adult cases at start of swabbing | No. naïve contacts | No. naïve household contacts testing positive | | | | Crevicular fluid[¥] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Week 1 | Week 2 | Week 3 | Week 4 | IgG Positive on first sample | IgG Positive on last sample |
| A | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 |
| B | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/2 | 0/2 |
| C[ϒ] | 6 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0/5 | 0/5 | 0/4 | ND | 0/5 | 0/5 |
| D[†] | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2/3 | 1/3 | 1/3 | 0/3 | 0/3 | 1/3 |
| E.1[†] | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0/3 | 0/3 | 0/3 | ND | 0/3 | 0/3 |
| E.2[‡] | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1/3 | ND | ND | ND | 0/3 | ND |
| E.3[†] | 7 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0/6 | ND | ND | ND | 0/6 | ND |
| F | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1/2 | 2/2 | ND | ND | 0/3 | 0/3 |
| G.1[†] | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0/3 | 1/3 | 1/3 | 0/3 | 0/3 | 0/3 |
| G.2[†] | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/1 | 0/1 | 1/2 | 1/2 |
| H | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | ND | ND | NC | NC |
| I | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | ND | NC | NC |
| J | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | ND | NC | NC |
| K.1[†] | 5 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1/4 | 2/4 | 0/3 | 0/2 | NC | NC |
| K.2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | NC | NC |
| M | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0/2 | 0/2 | 0/2 | ND | NC | NC |
| TOTAL | | | | 35 | 6/35 | 7/26 | 3/21 | 0/11 | 1/31 | 2/22 |

[§]Total includes index child case: all households had 100% participation rate

[¶]Includes index child case associated with bubble plus any other child already identified as infected

[†]naïve contacts include 1 child

[‡]naïve contacts include 2 children

[ϒ]naïve contacts include 3 children

[¥] Confirmed results only reported. ND, not done; NC, not confirmed

**Figure 1**




**Figure 1. Pictograms of individual contacts in each week of sampling.** A. Bubble contacts (n=28). B. School contacts (n=62 pupils, 3 staff) and C. Household cases and contacts. (n=63 participants, including 28 reported to be positive at the start of swabbing: 16 index cases, 9 adult and 3 child participants). Participants reported to be positive prior to swabbing including child index cases are indicated*. Swab results: Blue represents un-infected. Pink represents SARS-CoV2 detected. Grey indicates subject not swabbed.

Longitudinal sampling was limited to three weeks rather than four weeks for part of the study hence some subjects were not swabbed in week 4. Two households joined study late after unexpected positive pupil identified in school contact study; these were not swabbed in week 1 although pupils were. Figure position within each panel represents individual participants and position is consistent in each week. Individual settings are separated by gaps between groups of figures. For presentation purposes, the ordering of settings has been re-arranged for each panel.

**Figure 2.**




**Figure 2 Environmental contamination with SARS-CoV-2 in schools and households**. A-C, schools; D-F, households. Red indicates surface samples; blue indicates air samples. Surface and air samples were obtained from the same items and locations weekly in each school and households. Data shown as absolute E gene copy number and represent samples from 8 schools (1 SEND; 2 secondary; 5 primary) and 16 households. A. Bubble contact classroom . B. School contact classroom C. School bathroom used by bubble. D. Child's bedroom. E. Communal room F. Bathroom used by child.

**Supplementary Appendix**

**Supplementary Table 1 Items swabbed in schools and households and university**

| **Household –surface samples** | |
|---|---|
| **Bedroom** | Bed frame |
| | Chair |
| | Computer |
| | Desk |
| | Door handle |
| | Electronic game |
| | Laptop |
| | Light switch |
| | Mobile phone |
| | Musical instrument |
| | Pillow |
| | Plastic toys |
| | School bag |
| | Soft toys |
| | Toy shelf |
| | Wardrobe handle |
| **Bathroom** | Door handle |
| | Light switch |
| | Taps |
| | Toilet flush |
| | Toilet seat |
| | Toothbrush and paste |
| **Communal area** | Card game |
| | Chair |
| | Door handle |
| | Electronic tablet |
| | Laptop |
| | Light switch |
| | Mobile phone |
| | Musical instrument |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Pet cage |
| | Pet fur |
| | Plastic bottle |
| | Refrigerator handle |
| | Sofa |
| | Soft toys |
| | Stationery |
| | Table |
| | Taps |
| | TV buttons |
| | TV remote |
| | Wall mirror |
| | Water jug |
| **School –surface samples** | |
| **Classrooms** | Chair |
| | Desk |
| | Door handle |
| | Hand sanitiser |
| | Indoor toys |
| | Light switch |
| | Locker |
| | Outdoor toys |
| | Reading books |
| | Soap dispenser |
| | Stationery |
| | Student diary |
| | Taps |
| | Window handle |
| | Work folder |
| | Work tray |
| **Bathroom** | Door handle |
| | Soap dispenser |
| | Taps |
| | Toilet flush |
| | Toilet seat |
| **University building - surface samples** | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Offices** | Chair |
| | Computer |
| | Desk |
| | Door handle |
| | Food packaging |
| | Light switch |
| | Mug |
| | Printer |
| | Clothing |
| | Stationery |
| | Personal equipment |
| | Surgical mask |
| | Telephone |
| **Laboratory** | Desk |
| | Door handle |
| | Laboratory equipment |
| | Refrigerator handle |
| | Soap dispenser |
| | Taps |
| **Kitchen** | Countertop |
| | Cupboard handle |
| | Kettle |
| | Refrigerator handle |
| | Taps |
| | Water machine |
| **Toilets** | Door handle |
| | Soap dispenser |
| | Taps |
| | Toilet flush |
| | Toilet seat |
| **Lobby & Lifts** | Card reader |
| | Desk |
| | Door handle |
| | Entry keypad |
| | Lift buttons |
| | Stair handrail |

**Supplementary Table 2 Environmental sampling results from university**

| | | Surface | Air |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Office A**[¶] | Sampling 1[‡] | 3/10 | 1/1 |
| | Sampling 2 | 0/10 | 0/1 |
| | Total | 3/20 | 1/2 |
| **Office B**[§] | Sampling 1 | 0/10 | 0/1 |
| | Sampling 2 | 0/10 | 0/1 |
| | Total | 0/20 | 0/2 |
| **Shared offices** | Sampling 1 | 0/10 | 0/1 |
| | Sampling 2 | 0/10 | 0/1 |
| | Total | 0/20 | 0/2 |
| **Laboratory** | Sampling 1 | 0/5 | 0/1 |
| | Sampling 2 | 0/5 | 0/1 |
| | Total | 0/10 | 0/2 |
| **Kitchen** | Sampling 1 | 0/5 | 0/1 |
| | Sampling 2 | 0/5 | 0/1 |
| | Total | 0/10 | 0/2 |
| **Toilets** | Sampling 1 | 0/10 | 0/2 |
| | Sampling 2 | 0/10 | 0/2 |
| | Total | 0/20 | 0/4 |
| **Lobby & Lifts** | Sampling 1 | 0/8 | 0/1 |
| | Sampling 2 | 0/8 | 0/1 |
| | Total | 0/16 | 0/2 |

Second sampling was undertaken 14-15 days after first sampling except in offices A and B

[‡] Values for surface samples were: 7589.1; 31199.7; and 4493.4 E gene copies/swab. Air sample was 3104 E gene copies/cubic metre.

[¶]Second sampling was 12d after first; [§]Second sampling was 3d after first

## Supplementary Figures

**Supplementary Figure 1 Surface contamination with SARS-CoV2 in households by category over sampling period.** Samples depicted in Figure 2D-F are presented by category.




**Figure S2 Comparison of human RNase P and 18s rRNA detection in household and school environmental surface and air samples.** Samples were obtained weekly as described; human RNaseP was used as an internal control for sample adequacy and as an estimate of contamination with human material. In the later part of the study 18s rRNA was also measured as an additional control. Individual data are shown as Ct values determined by real-time PCR, compared using a t-test. A. RNAse P in surface samples in households (n=1050) and schools (n=328) numbers were. B. RNAse P in air samples in households (n=118) and schools (n=46). C. 18s rRNA in surface samples in households (n=380) and schools (n=70). D. 18s rRNA in air samples in households (n=62) and schools (n=33).