SARS-CoV-2 Acquisition and Immune Pathogenesis Among School-Aged Learners in Four K-12 Schools

Dan M. Cooper[a,b], MD, Ilhem Messaoudi[c], PhD, Shlomit Aizik[d], PhD, Ricky L. Camplain[e], PhD, Nanette V. Lopez[e], PhD, Jessica Ardo[f], MSW, Bernadette Boden-Albala[g], DrPH, Clayton Chau[h] MD, PhD, Curt Condon[h], PhD, Charles Golden[f], DO, Izabela Coimbra Ibraim[c], BA, Allen Jankeel[c], BA, Kirsten Kasper[f], BA, Andria Meyer[a], RD, MBA, Annamarie Stehli[d] MS, Diana Stephens[a], MBA, Michael Weiss[f], DO, Michael Z. Zulu[c], PhD, Erlinda Ulloa[b,f], MD, MSc

Affiliations: [a]Institute for Clinical and Translational Science, University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California; [b]Department of Pediatrics, University of California at Irvine School of Medicine, Irvine, California; [c]Center for Virus Research, University of California at Irvine, School of Biological Sciences, Irvine, California; [d]Pediatric Exercise and Genomics Research Center, Department of Pediatrics, University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California; [e]Center for Health Equity Research, Department of Health Sciences, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona; [f]CHOC Children's Hospital, Orange, California; [g]Program in Public Health, University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California; [h]Orange County Health Care Agency, Santa Ana, California

Address correspondence to: Erlinda Ulloa, Department of Pediatrics, University of California Irvine, 843 Health Sciences Road, Hewitt Hall RM 1113, Irvine CA, 92697, chulie.ulloa@uci.edu, (949) 824-3350.

Short title: SARS-CoV-2 Infection in School Children

Conflict of Interest Disclosure: The authors have no conflict of interest to disclose

Funding/Support: NIH NCATS UCI Clinical and Translational Science Award UL1 TR001414; R01AI142841; R21AI143301; Orange County Health Care Agency Research Fund; UCI COVID-19 Research Fund; Support was provided in part by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to ERU.

Role of Funder: The funding agencies had no role in the design and conduct of the study.

Abbreviations: CHOC, Children's Hospital of Orange County; OCHCA, Orange County Health Care Agency; SOCOM, Systematic Observation of COVID-19 Mitigation; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density lipoprotein

Table of Contents Summary
SARS-CoV-2 infection and immunobiology was measured in children at 4 diverse schools with varying degrees of onsite and remote learning.

What's Known on This Subject
At the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, schools were reflexively closed as there were fears that agreggation of school-aged children would lead to increased infection. Infectivity and immunobiology of SARS-CoV-2 in children attending schools not understood.

What This Study Adds

School-associated infections reflected regional rates rather than remote or onsite learning. Successful mitigation was implemented across a diverse range of schools. Reduced immune mediator concentrations coupled with robust humoral and cellular immunity may explain the milder symptoms in school-aged children.

ABSTRACT

Objectives. To directly measure SARS-CoV-2 infection in diverse schools with either remote or onsite learning.

Methods. 4 schools participated. Schools A and B served low-income Hispanic learners, school C special needs, and all three provided predominantly remote instruction. School D served middle and upper-middle income, White learners, with predominantly onsite instruction. 320 learners [10.5±2.1(SD); 7-17 y.o.]; 86% had phlebotomy. Testing occurred early in the fall (2020), at lower levels of COVID-19, and 6-8 weeks later during the fall-winter surge (tenfold increase in COVID-19 cases).

Results: Nasal RT-qPCR for SARS-CoV-2 and 21 respiratory pathogens was performed. Phlebotomy was obtained for circulating immunity. Face covering and physical distancing fidelity was measured by direct observation. 17 learners were SARS-CoV-2 positive during the surge. School A (97% remote) had the highest infection rate (9/70, 12.9%, $p<0.01$) and IgG positivity rate (13/70, 18.6%). School D had the lowest infection and IgG positive rate (1/86, 1.2%). Mitigation compliance [physical distancing (mean 87.4%) and face covering (91.3%)] was high at all schools. Learners with documented SARS-CoV-2 infection had neutralizing antibodies (94.7%), broad and robust IFN-γ+ T cell responses, reduced frequencies of monocytes, and lower levels of circulating inflammatory mediators.

Conclusions: Infection in the schools reflected regional rates rather than remote or onsite learning modalities. Schools can implement successful mitigation strategies across a wide range of income, school-type, and student diversity. Reduced monocyte and immune mediator concentrations coupled with robust humoral and cellular immunity may explain the generally milder symptoms in school-aged children.

INTRODUCTION

An urgent need for data on SARS-CoV-2 incidence, immune mechanisms, and mitigation fidelity in the unique setting of K-12 schools was recognized at the earliest stages of the COVID-19 pandemic,[1] when K-12 schools closed in the U.S. and across the world. In this report, we summarize the results of the *Healthy School Restart Study*, a prospective study of four diverse, K-8 schools in Orange County, California, at two distinct phases of the COVID-19 pandemic: 1) early in the fall (2020) school semester, at a relatively low level of community COVID-19 disease incidence of approximately 3-4 cases per 100,000 across the county (in September, surveillance rates for the county were estimated at 12% but 17% in communities of color[2]), and 2) approximately 6-8 weeks later in the midst of the fall-winter surge in which COVID-19 had increased to about 40 cases per 100,000. We tested the assumption used to support school closures, namely, that learners would be less susceptible to viral infection if they avoided onsite learning.[3–5] Key objectives were 1) to begin to understand SARS-CoV-2 infection by identifying schools that reflected the diversity of our region; 2) to gain insight into the serological and cellular mechanisms in the pediatric population in response to SARS-CoV-2 infection; and 3) to measure the fidelity of SARS-CoV-2 mitigation procedures.

METHODS

Design

A total of 320 learners [mean age 10.5±2.1(SD)] and 99 school staff enrolled in our study across four schools for two testing cycles. Participants were allowed to enroll in the study at the second cycle even if they did not participate in the first visit. During the first cycle, 181 students aged 7-15 y.o. were enrolled. During the second cycle, 161 learners returned and 139 new

learners aged 7-17 y.o. were enrolled to accommodate additional requests for testing by the schools. At each of the testing cycles, each participant underwent:

1. Brief medical history and a COVID-19 symptom screening
2. Anterior nasal swab for SARS-CoV-2 and co-circulating respiratory pathogens
3. Optional non-fasting phlebotomy for serological and other immunologic markers of SARS-CoV-2 infection, and at cycle 2, non-fasting lipid screening.

School Selection and Study Participants

We partnered with four schools that reflected the diverse population of Orange County ensuring adequate representation of low-income, minority, and special-needs learner-participants (Table). Inclusion criteria for the student participants were age (7-17 y.o.), current enrollment at one of the schools participating in the study, and fluency and literacy in English or Spanish. The criteria for adult school staff participants were age (equal or greater than 18 years), current employment at one of the participating schools, and fluency and literacy in English or Spanish.

IRB Approval and Consent

The study was approved by the institutional review boards at the Children's Hospital of Orange County (CHOC) and the University of California Irvine (UCI). Informed assent from the children and informed consent from parents or legally authorized guardians, or from the adult participants, were obtained remotely or in person.

Approach to Participation

We organized virtual meetings with school staff and teachers to explain the study and answer questions at each school, and town-hall-type meetings with potential students and their parents or authorized legal representatives. Meetings were held in both English and Spanish. We positioned our testing setup out of the way of normal school operations.

Identification of SARS-CoV-2 and Co-Circulating Respiratory Pathogens

Anterior nasal swabs were obtained from each participant. The BIOFIRE Respiratory 2.1 Panel was used to identify SARS-CoV-2 in addition to 21 other respiratory pathogens by RT-qPCR done in the CHOC Clinical Laboratory. Per state mandates, positive SARS-CoV-2 findings were reported by the laboratory to the Orange County Health Care Agency (OCHCA) for subsequent confidential action and tracing by county health authorities.

Blood Samples for Immune Response and Lipid Profile

Whole blood samples were obtained in 317 learners into CPT tubes. Plasma and peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) were isolated via centrifugation. Presence of nucleocapsid protein (N)-specific IgG was determined with the Abbott Architect immunoassay. IgG and IgM antibody titers against N and receptor binding domain from spike protein (RBD) were measured using standard ELISA.[6] Specific SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies were measured using focus reduction neutralizing assays.[6] IFN-γ producing T-cells following stimulation with overlapping peptide pools were determined using mAB ELISpot plates and PBMCs from 17 learners positive for SARS-CoV-2 and 17 age- and sex-matched samples.[7] Circulating immune and inflammatory mediators (e.g., TNF-α, IL-6) were measured using the Human 45-Plex kit from R&D.[7] Immunophenotyping to identify innate and adaptive cells was done using flow cytometry.[7] Non-fasting lipid screening (highly recommended for children and adolescents but underutilized)[8] was offered to our participants as an added benefit to the risk of phlebotomy, and measured using enzymatic reflectance spectrophotometery.

Regional Incidence of COVID-19

OCHCA collaborators routinely collect COVID-19 case rates across the county. To better understand the specific regional impact of COVID-19 at each of the four schools, we collated the

countywide COVID-19 case data according to the zip codes of the learners at each of the schools during the two testing cycles (Figure 1).

Systematic Observation of COVID-19 Mitigation (SOCOM)

We modified the original System for Observing Play and Leisure Activity in Youth (SOPLAY) and the System for Observing Play and Recreation in Communities (SOPARC)[9,10] to quantify the fidelity of face covering and physical distancing (≥ 6 ft.) mitigation in schools.[11] SOCOM used momentary time sampling techniques in which systematic and periodic scans of individuals and contextual factors within pre-determined target areas in physical activity (e.g., recess, physical education classes) and school environments (e.g., classroom, communal dining) were made. Trained observers visited each of the 4 schools 3-5 times and quantified mitigation in classrooms, recess, communal dining, and physical education (PE) classes.

Statistical Analysis

All serology measurements and symptom ratings were treated as binary (yes/no) across the two visits. CBC and lipid measures were each classified as normal or abnormal based on age-appropriate criteria. In the case of high-density lipoprotein (HDL) and low-density lipoprotein (LDL), the abnormal cases were further distinguished as low or high. Site comparisons of proportions, as well as cross-tabulations of two factors, were performed with Chi-Square analysis utilizing the Mantel-Haenszel correction. A α-level of 0.05 was used as the criterion for statistical significance. For learners found to be infected, age- and sex-matched uninfected peers were selected as controls for analysis. Immunological datasets were first tested for normality. To compare differences in various immune cell subsets between infected and age- and sex-matched uninfected participants, we used one-way ANOVA and Holm Sidak's multiple comparisons tests. Group comparisons were tested using an unpaired t-test (Mann-Whitney U-test). For focus

reduction neutralization assay, the half maximum inhibitory concentration (IC50) was calculated by non-linear regression analysis using normalized counted foci; 100% of infectivity was obtained normalizing the number of foci counted in the wells derived from the cells infected with SARS-CoV-2 virus in the absence of plasma. Pearson correlation analyses were done by log transforming antibody end-point titers or neutralization titers.

RESULTS

Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 and Other Respiratory Viral Infections

No positive nasal RT-qPCR tests were identified in the first cycle of testing. During the second cycle, a total of 17 SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR positive results were observed among learners (5.31%, mean age 9.9±2.1 y.o.). As shown in Figure 1, school A had the highest number of SARS-CoV-2 infected learners ($p<0.01$). In the aggregate, there was no statistically significant difference in SARS-CoV-2 positive rates among remote or onsite learners ($p=.1468$). In school B (the same geographic location as school A), we found 2 of 45 onsite learners (4.4%) and 4 of 89 remote learners (4.5%) had positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR. School D had 1(1.25%) of onsite learners vs. none of remote learners had positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR. The low number of onsite participants in School A (n=2) prevented us from directly comparing SARS-CoV-2 positivity between remote and onsite instruction at each school site. Among the 99 staff and teachers tested, 6 (6.1%) were SARS-CoV-2 positive, and all positive tests were identified on the second cycle visit. When normalized to data obtained from OCHCA zip code-based case rates, school A showed the highest ratio of learner-to-local SARS-CoV-2 positivity. We found that a significant number of learners in schools A and B had either low HDL or high LDL. In addition, 26% of learners with low HDL ($p<0.0001$) were also found to be SARS-CoV-2 positive. There was no evidence of either influenza or RSV infection. Rhinovirus/enterovirus

was observed in learners at all 4 schools (A: 9 of 72, 12.5%; B:15 of 142, 10.6%; C: 1 of 17, 5.9%; and D: 8 of 89, 9.0%). There was no correlation between SARS-CoV-2 and rhinovirus/enterovirus infections (p=.8397).

Assessing Humoral and Cellular Immunity to SARS-CoV-2 in Children

Substantial numbers of learners were found to have anti-nucleocapsid (N) IgG antibodies, indicating previous infection with SARS-CoV-2 (Figure 2A). As with the SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR results, there were large differences among the schools, most likely reflecting large differences in neighborhood infection rates (Figure 1). There was a significant association ($p<0.0269$) between SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR and anti-N IgG results. Infected learners had detectable IgM and IgG titers against both N and receptor binding domain of the spike protein (RBD), as well as neutralizing antibody specifically to SARS-CoV-2 (Figure 2B, C). Neutralizing and binding antibody titers shows significant correlations (Figure 2D). Moreover, learners with a history of SARS-CoV-2 infection generated a broad and robust T cell responses as measured by IFN-γ ELISPOT following stimulation with overlapping peptides pools covering the entire viral proteome (Figure 3C), and increased proliferation of CD4+ memory T cells (Figure 3B). Levels of programmed death cell protein 1 (PD-1) were increased on T cells indicative of recent activation (Figure 3D). Frequencies of circulating monocytes and natural killer (NK) celsl were lower in infected children (Figure 4A, C, E). Levels of HLA-DR were increased on dendritic cells (DCs), while levels of CD16 and CD86 were reduced on NK cells and monocytes (Figure 4C-E), as were several inflammatory mediators (Figure 4B).

COVID-19 Symptoms

School A had the highest number of learners who reported symptoms associated with COVID-19 at 30% (p=0.0452). Rates for Schools B, C, and D were 14.9%, 7.7%, and 18.6%,

respectively. Learners who reported symptoms were significantly more likely to have SARS-CoV-2 positivity (13.6% vs. 3.5%, $p<0.0018$). Conversely, learners who were SARS-CoV-2 positive were more likely to have symptoms (47.1% vs. 16.8%, $p=0.0018$); in this group cough and fatigue were the most common.

Systematic Observation of COVID-19 Mitigation (SOCOM)

SOCOM observations revealed high levels of face coverings and physical distancing compliance in classrooms at all four schools (Figure 4) and quantified the intuitively expected reduction in face coverings and physical distancing during communal dining. At School D, which had the vast majority of on-site learners, face covering was consistently high (classroom, 96.7%; active recess, 97.3%; and PE, 97.0%). Physical distancing at School D varied (classroom, 81.6%; active recess, 35.1%; PE, 50.7%).

DISCUSSION

This is one of the first school-based studies completed during the pandemic that directly and prospectively observed SARS-CoV-2 infection rates from school learners and staff. The four participating schools reflected the enormous diversity of income, community COVID-19 case rates, school type (private, charter, public), and learning status (remote vs. onsite) that face learners, school staff, and policy makers across the US. The huge increase in COVID-19 case rates between the two testing cycles permitted insight into the effect of the fall surge in SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Our results are consistent with several recent public health agencies, surveillance-based studies focused on schools during the pandemic. Zimmerman et al.[12] implemented a comprehensive education and collaboration program and collected public health data in North Carolina; Falk et al.[13] studied a rural Wisconsin community; and Macartney et al.[14] studied

preschools and K-12 schools in Australia. All studies concluded that within-school secondary transmission of SARS-CoV-2 was limited. We also found that infection rates reflected those of the community and neither remote learning nor highly mitigated onsite school attendance could eliminate SARS-CoV-2 infection. Comparisons and conclusions among our study and others done to date must be made with caution. For example, Zimmerman and Falk relied on public health agency contact tracing data. SARS-CoV-2 testing in learners or teachers would most likely result from a family reporting either symptoms or a known exposure to a primary care provider or testing center. Positive results would subsequently be linked to a particular school. Some infected individuals who were asymptomatic or symptom-deniers may not have been identified. Although we directly tested school personnel and learners at the school sites, a weakness of our study was that we relied on the participants' willingness to consent, which could have introduced selection bias.

We showed that under certain conditions, schools could host onsite learning with relatively low SARS-CoV-2 infection rates. The private school in our study (school D) remained open with a majority of onsite learners from July through December 2020, with few SARS-CoV-2 cases and low IgG positivity despite a 14-fold increase in regional case rates. School D prepared for onsite learning by creating an advisory committee consisting of parents, local physicians, and content experts, and made an initial investment of about $1,400 per student to meet mitigation guidelines. While cost comparisons among schools serving very heterogeneous populations are always challenging, Rice et al.[15] estimated that a comprehensive program of mitigation at schools would cost up to $442 per student.

Laws et al.[16] recently confirmed the widespread observation that SARS-CoV-2 infected children tend to report fewer symptoms than adults. Despite this, we found that school A had

both the highest percentage of learners with symptoms and highest percentage of SARS-CoV-2 positivity. In addition, there was a significant relationship between SARS-CoV-2 positivity and presence of symptoms. These data support the use of limited symptom screening as a mechanism to enhance healthy school reopening.

We found that 26% of infected learners had significantly low circulating levels of HDL. Factors relating to obesity and physical activity are known to affect COVID-19 disease's severity in adults and children.[17–19] Overweight and obesity are associated with these lipid abnormalities, all of which tend to occur with greater incidence in low-income school aged children.[20,21] Levels of HDL seem to be particularly sensitive to physical activity.[22,23] The mechanisms responsible for the significant association we found between low HDL levels and SARS-CoV-2 are at present unknown, but may be related to the association of overweight/obesity and chronic inflammation in children.[24] Increases in physical inactivity and weight in children have accompanied school closures over the past year.[25,26]

Widespread implementation of pediatric COVID-19 vaccination[27] is many months away, and it is likely that adherence to COVID-19 mitigation procedures, including physical distancing and face covering, will need to continue for the near future. Previous studies cited above all highlighted the need to achieve high fidelity of COVID-19 mitigation procedures if viral transmission were to be limited. The in-classroom SOCOM data that we collected also revealed high fidelity at all four schools, including School C, which served predominantly children with special needs, presenting additional challenges to COVID-19 mitigation. The successful implementation of mitigation procedures both in onsite settings and in the instruction to remote learners might have played a role in the complete absence of influenza virus that we observed.[28,29] In contrast, rhinovirus (which has the highest detection rate on school room desks

among any respiratory viruses[30]) was observed in all schools. Implementation of quantifiable non-intrusive instruments like SOCOM along with testing of several respiratory viruses could help schools implement actionable strategies to limit SARS-CoV-2 transmission.

Our immunological analyses revealed patterns that can explain the mild symptomatology that accompanies SARS-CoV-2 infection in most children. Frequencies of circulating total and classical monocytes, expression levels of monocyte activation markers, and concentration of key inflammatory markers were surprisingly lower in the infected compared with uninfected children. This is in contrast to the monocytosis and heightened systemic inflammation observed in adult patients.[31,32] The reduced systemic inflammatory profile, however, did not indicate a weaker immune response to SARS-CoV-2. Infected children generated robust and broad humoral and cellular immune responses, and had detectable frequency of SARS-CoV-2 specific IFN-γ secreting $CD4^{+}$T following exposure to SARS-CoV-2 antigens. The infected children also had increased expression of PD1 on both CD4 and CD8 T cells and higher frequency of proliferating CD4 T cells indicative of a recent history of activation. The frequency of circulating cytolytic NK cells, those that mediate antibody-dependent cell cytotoxicity, was lower in the infected children. This observation corroborates previous studies in both children and adults, and supports the speculation that NK cells may be recruited into the lung.[31,33–35] Similarly, frequency of circulating CD4 T cells was reduced, suggestive of potential recruitment into the site of infection. These results support a maturation-dependent immune response to SARS-CoV-2 infection in children, one that specifically leads to milder disease and, possibly, to reduced transmission. The immune dysregulation that occurs in the rare but serious pediatric multisystem inflammatory syndrome in children (MIS-C) remains poorly understood.

CONCLUSION

This study indicated that neither remote nor onsite learning strategies could eliminate SARS-CoV-2 infection in school-aged children. In the four schools, varied levels of successful mitigation were observed, and the degree of success was related to socioeconomic factors and regional levels of COVID-19 infection. The key challenge, of course, is balancing the damaging effects of school closures, which in the U.S. and throughout the world have adversely impacted low-income school-aged children and those with disabilities,[36,37] with the consequences of SARS-CoV-2 transmission to other learners and school staff. In retrospect, a larger, arguably national, more comprehensive approach to prospectively collecting SARS-CoV-2 infection patterns in school-aged children, their school staff and faculty, and family contacts would likely have provided the necessary information to achieve the shared goal of the healthiest environment for the continued education and physical and mental health of children and adolescents throughout the country. Finally, we would be remiss in not highlighting the remarkable dedication of the faculty and staff at all four schools who worked tirelessly to continue to provide meaningful learning to their students, and willingly and enthusiastically permitted us to intrude into their sites during an anxiety-provoking and uncertain time.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors appreciated the outstanding management of this complex study by Phuong Dao, Brent Dethlefs, and the staff of the CHOC Research Institute.

REFERENCES

1. Cooper DM, Guay-Woodford L, Blazar BR, et al. Reopening Schools Safely: The Case for Collaboration, Constructive Disruption of Pre-Coronavirus 2019 Expectations, and Creative Solutions. *J Pediatr*. 2020;223:183-185. doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2020.05.022
2. Bruckner TA, Parker DM, Bartell SM, et al. Estimated seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among adults in Orange County, California. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1). doi:10.1038/s41598-021-82662-x
3. Ferguson NM, Cummings DAT, Fraser C, Cajka JC, Cooley PC, Burke DS. Strategies for mitigating an influenza pandemic. *Nature*. 2006;442(7101):448-452. doi:10.1038/nature04795
4. Viner RM, Russell SJ, Croker H, et al. School closure and management practices during coronavirus outbreaks including COVID-19: a rapid systematic review. *Lancet Child Adolesc Heal*. 2020;0(0). doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30095-X
5. Uscher-Pines L, Schwartz HL, Ahmed F, et al. Feasibility of Social Distancing Practices in US Schools to Reduce Influenza Transmission During a Pandemic. *J Public Heal Manag Pract*. April 2020:1. doi:10.1097/phh.0000000000001174
6. Hassert M, Geerling E, Stone ET, et al. mRNA induced expression of human angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 in mice for the study of the adaptive immune response to severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2. *PLoS Pathog*. 2020;16(12). doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1009163
7. Lewis SA, Sureshchandra S, Zulu MZ, et al. Longitudinal analyses reveal age-specific immune correlates of COVID-19 severity. *medRxiv*. January 2021:2021.01.25.21250189. doi:10.1101/2021.01.25.21250189
8. Berger JH, Chen F, Faerber JA, O'Byrne ML, Brothers JA. Adherence with lipid screening guidelines in standard- and high-risk children and adolescents. *Am Heart J*. 2021;232:39-46. doi:10.1016/j.ahj.2020.10.058
9. McKenzie TL, Marshall SJ, Sallis JF, Conway TL. Leisure-time physical activity in school environments: An observational study using SOPLAY. *Prev Med (Baltim)*. 2000;30(1):70-77. doi:10.1006/pmed.1999.0591
10. McKenzie TL. SOPLAY: System for Observing Play and Leisure Activity in Youth. https://activelivingresearch.org/sites/activelivingresearch.org/files/SOPLAY_Protocols.pdf. Published 2006.
11. Camplain R, Lopez N V., Cooper DM, McKenzie T, Zheng K, Radom-Aizik S. SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION OF COVID-19 MITIGATION (SOCOM): ASSESSING FACE COVERING AND DISTANCING IN SCHOOLS. *medRxiv*. 2021.
12. Zimmerman KO, Akinboyo IC, Brookhart MA, et al. Incidence and Secondary Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Schools. *Pediatrics*. January 2021:e2020048090. doi:10.1542/peds.2020-048090
13. Falk A, Benda A, Falk P, Steffen S, Wallace Z, Høeg TB. COVID-19 Cases and Transmission in 17 K–12 Schools — Wood County, Wisconsin, August 31–November 29, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70(4):136-140. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7004e3
14. Macartney K, Quinn HE, Pillsbury AJ, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australian educational settings: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Child Adolesc Heal*. 2020;4(11):807-816. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30251-0

15. Rice KL, Miller GF, Coronado F, Meltzer MI. Estimated Resource Costs for Implementation of CDC's Recommended COVID-19 Mitigation Strategies in Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 12 Public Schools — United States, 2020–21 School Year. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(50):1917-1921. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6950e1
16. Laws RL, Chancey RJ, Rabold EM, et al. Symptoms and transmission of SARS-CoV-2 among children - Utah and Wisconsin, March-May 2020. *Pediatrics*. 2021;147(1). doi:10.1542/PEDS.2020-027268
17. Hoste L, Van Paemel R, Haerynck F. Multisystem inflammatory syndrome in children related to COVID-19: a systematic review. *Eur J Pediatr*. February 2021. doi:10.1007/s00431-021-03993-5
18. Li S, Hua X. Modifiable lifestyle factors and severe COVID-19 risk: a Mendelian randomisation study. *BMC Med Genomics*. 2021;14(1). doi:10.1186/s12920-021-00887-1
19. Hernández-Garduño E. Obesity is the comorbidity more strongly associated for Covid-19 in Mexico. A case-control study. *Obes Res Clin Pract*. 2020;14(4):375-379. doi:10.1016/j.orcp.2020.06.001
20. Puolakka E, Pahkala K, Laitinen TT, et al. Childhood socioeconomic status in predicting metabolic syndrome and glucose abnormalities in adulthood: The cardiovascular risk in young finns study. *Diabetes Care*. 2016;39(12):2311-2317. doi:10.2337/dc16-1565
21. Vazquez CE, Cubbin C. Socioeconomic Status and Childhood Obesity: a Review of Literature from the Past Decade to Inform Intervention Research. *Curr Obes Rep*. 2020;9(4):562-570. doi:10.1007/s13679-020-00400-2
22. Muscella A, Stefàno E, Marsigliante S. The effects of exercise training on lipid metabolism and coronary heart disease. *Am J Physiol - Hear Circ Physiol*. 2020;319(1):H76-H88. doi:10.1152/ajpheart.00708.2019
23. Lu KD, Cooper DM, Haddad F, Radom-Aizik S. Four Months of a School-Based Exercise Program Improved Aerobic Fitness and Clinical Outcomes in a Low-SES Population of Normal Weight and Overweight/Obese Children With Asthma. *Front Pediatr*. 2018;6:380. doi:10.3389/fped.2018.00380
24. Zaldivar F, McMurray RGG, Nemet D, et al. Body Fat and Circulating Leukocytes in Children. *Int J Obes*. 2006;30(6):906-911. doi:10.1038/sj.ijo.0803227
25. Dunton GF, Do B, Wang SD. Early effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on physical activity and sedentary behavior in children living in the U.S. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20(1). doi:10.1186/s12889-020-09429-3
26. Storz MA. The COVID-19 pandemic: An unprecedented tragedy in the battle against childhood obesity. *Korean J Pediatr*. 2020;63(12):477-482. doi:10.3345/cep.2020.01081
27. Cooper DM, Afghani B, Byington CL, et al. SARS-CoV-2 vaccine testing and trials in the pediatric population: biologic, ethical, research, and implementation challenges. *Pediatr Res*. February 2021. doi:10.1038/s41390-021-01402-z
28. Jones N. How COVID-19 is changing the cold and flu season. *Nature*. 2020;588(7838):388-390. doi:10.1038/d41586-020-03519-3
29. Murillo-Zamora E, Guzmán-Esquivel J, Sánchez-Piña RA, Cedeño-Laurent G, Delgado-Enciso I, Mendoza-Cano O. Physical distancing reduced the incidence of influenza and supports a favorable impact on SARS-CoV-2 spread in Mexico. *J Infect Dev Ctries*. 2020;14(9):953-956. doi:10.3855/JIDC.13250
30. Zulli A, Bakker A, Racharaks R, et al. Occurrence of respiratory viruses on school desks. *Am J Infect Control*. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2020.12.006

31. Radia T, Williams N, Agrawal P, et al. Multi-system inflammatory syndrome in children & adolescents (MIS-C): A systematic review of clinical features and presentation. *Paediatr Respir Rev*. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.prrv.2020.08.001
32. Lucas C, Wong P, Klein J, et al. Longitudinal analyses reveal immunological misfiring in severe COVID-19. *Nature*. 2020;584(7821):463-469. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2588-y
33. Neeland MR, Bannister S, Clifford V, et al. Innate cell profiles during the acute and convalescent phase of SARS-CoV-2 infection in children. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12(1):1084. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-21414-x
34. van Eeden C, Khan L, Osman MS, Tervaert JWC. Natural killer cell dysfunction and its role in covid-19. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2020;21(17):1-17. doi:10.3390/ijms21176351
35. Osman M, Faridi RM, Sligl W, et al. Impaired natural killer cell counts and cytolytic activity in patients with severe COVID-19. *Blood Adv*. 2020;4(20):5035-5039. doi:10.1182/BLOODADVANCES.2020002650
36. Brandenburg JE, Holman LK, Apkon SD, Houtrow AJ, Robert R, Maurice G. S. School reopening during COVID-19 pandemic: Considering students with disabilities. *J Pediatr Rehabil Med*. 2020;13(3):425-431. doi:10.3233/PRM-200789
37. McGuine TA, Biese KM, Petrovska L, et al. Mental Health, Physical Activity, and Quality of Life of US Adolescent Athletes During COVID-19–Related School Closures and Sport Cancellations: A Study of 13 000 Athletes. *J Athl Train*. 2021;56(1):11-19. doi:10.4085/1062-6050-0478.20
38. U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: Santa Ana city, California. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/santaanacitycalifornia/PST045219. Accessed February 24, 2021.
39. California Poverty Rate. https://www.welfareinfo.org/poverty-rate/california/#by-city. Accessed March 11, 2021.

FIGURE 1. (A) The marked growths in regional case rates (by participating students' zip codes) are shown for each school site at testing cycle 1 and 2. (B) SARS-CoV-2 positivity in learners and staff at each of the school sites. (C) SARS-CoV-2 positivity in remote vs. onsite learners (aggregate of all 4 schools).



FIGURE 2. SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies. (A) Seroprevalence amongst learners at various schools. (B) Neutralizing antibody titers against SARS-CoV-2 at visit 1 and visit 2. (C) Detection of IgG and IgM against SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein (N) and receptor-binding domain (RBD) in learners (D) Correlation between focus reduction neutralization titer (FRNT50) and IgG/IgM end-point titers.



FIGURE 3. Effect of SARS-CoV-2 infection on adaptive immune cells. (A) Frequency of adaptive immune cell subsets. (B) Proliferation of total CD4+ T cells and their central memory subset (C) Detection of SARS-CoV-2-specific T cells by IFN-γ ELISpot assay. (D) PD-1 expression on T cells of infected learners.



FIGURE 4. Effect of SARS-CoV-2 infection on innate immune cells and soluble mediators. (A) Frequency of innate immune cell subsets. (B) Mean fluorescence intensity (MFI) of soluble immune mediators in plasma. (C) CD16 MFI on NK cells and Non-classical monocytes. (D) HLA-DR MFI on myeloid dendritic cells. (E) CD86 expression on monocytes.



FIGURE 5. SOCOM data. (A) Physical-distancing and face-covering compliance was high in all schools and there was no correlation between in-classroom data and SARS-COV-2 positivity. (B) Mean SOCOM values for classroom, communal dining, recess, and physical activity. Classroom physical-distancing was significantly highest (*p<0.0001). Face covering was lowest in communal dining (**p<0.0001).



Table 1: Study school and participant demographics

School	Description	Whole School Remote and Onsite Populations (n) Regional Demographics[38,39]	Consented Participating Learners				Staff (n)
			Remote**		On-site**		
			n	mean age (y.o.)	n	mean age (y.o.)	
A	Public, K-6	950 remote, 42 onsite Region: 76.8% Hispanic, 19.5% poverty level	68 (36 f)	9.46	2 (2 f)	10.0	25
B	Public charter, K-8	730 remote, 190 onsite Region: 76.8% Hispanic, 19.5 % poverty level	89 (41 f)	10.8	45 (18 f)	10.2	26
C	Public charter* K-6	91 remote, 25 onsite Region: 38.9% Hispanic, 44.6% White, 12.5% poverty level	13 (6 f)	8.54	3 (2 f)	10.3	21
D	Private, K-12	138 remote, 552 onsite Region: 3% Hispanic, 62% White, 6.2% poverty level	6 (3 f)	12.6	80 (35 f)	11.4	27
		Total	176 (57 f)		130 (86 f)		99

*Predominantly special needs learners; **We were unable to confirm onsite or remote status in 14 learners, none of whom were found to be SARS-CoV-2 positive.