

1 **Description of a University COVID-19 Outbreak and Interventions to Disrupt Transmission,**  
2 **Wisconsin, August – October 2020.**

3 Dustin W. Currie<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Gage K. Moreno<sup>3\*</sup>, Miranda J. Delahoy<sup>1,2</sup>, Ian W. Pray<sup>1,2,4</sup>, Amanda Jovaag<sup>5</sup>,  
4 Katarina M. Braun<sup>6</sup>, Devlin Cole<sup>4,7</sup>, Todd Shechter<sup>8</sup>, Geroncio C. Fajardo<sup>1</sup>, Carol Griggs<sup>5</sup>, Brian S.  
5 Yandell<sup>9,10</sup>, Steve Goldstein<sup>10</sup>, Dena Bushman<sup>1,2</sup>, Hannah E. Segaloff<sup>1,2,4</sup>, G. Patrick Kelly<sup>5</sup>, Collin  
6 Pitts<sup>5,7</sup>, Christine Lee<sup>1,11</sup>, Katarina M. Grande<sup>12</sup>, Amanda Kita-Yarbro<sup>12</sup>, Brittany Grogan<sup>12</sup>, Sara  
7 Mader<sup>12</sup>, Jake Baggott<sup>5</sup>, Allen C. Bateman<sup>13</sup>, Ryan P. Westergaard<sup>4,7</sup>, Jacqueline E. Tate<sup>1</sup>, Thomas C.  
8 Friedrich<sup>6</sup>, Hannah L. Kirking<sup>1</sup>, David H. O'Connor<sup>3</sup>, Marie E. Killerby<sup>1</sup>

9 \* These authors contributed equally to this work.

10 <sup>1</sup>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, COVID-19 Response Team, Atlanta, GA  
11 <sup>2</sup>Epidemic Intelligence Service, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA  
12 <sup>3</sup>Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI  
13 <sup>4</sup>Wisconsin Department of Health Services, Madison, WI  
14 <sup>5</sup>University Health Services, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI  
15 <sup>6</sup>Department of Pathobiological Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI  
16 <sup>7</sup>School of Medicine and Public Health, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI  
17 <sup>8</sup>Division of Information Technology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI  
18 <sup>9</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI  
19 <sup>10</sup>American Family Insurance Data Science Institute, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI  
20 <sup>11</sup>Laboratory Leadership Service, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA  
21 <sup>12</sup>Public Health Madison and Dane County, Madison, WI  
22 <sup>13</sup>Wisconsin State Laboratory of Hygiene, Madison, WI  
23

24 **Disclosures**

25 The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the  
26 official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Use of trade names is for  
27 identification only and does not imply endorsement by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

28

29 **Acknowledgements:** This research was performed using the computing resources and assistance of the  
30 University of Wisconsin (UW)-Madison Center for High Throughput Computing (CHTC) in the  
31 Department of Computer Sciences. The CHTC is supported by UW-Madison, the Advanced Computing  
32 Initiative, the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, the Wisconsin Institutes for Discovery, and the  
33 National Science Foundation, and is an active member of the Open Science Grid, which is supported by  
34 the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Science. G.K.M. is

35 supported by an NLM training grant to the Computation and Informatics in Biology and Medicine  
36 Training Program (NLM 5T15LM007359). This work was funded in part by the U.S. Centers for  
37 Disease Control and Prevention Contract #75D30120C09870: Defining the Role of College Students in  
38 SARS-CoV-2 Spread in the Upper Midwest.

39

40 **Author Contributions:**

41 **Drafting Manuscript:** DWC, GKM, MEK

42 **Reviewing and Editing Manuscript:** MJD, IWP, AJ, KMB, DC, TS, GCF, CG, BSY, SG, DB, HS,  
43 GPK, CP, CL, KMG, AK-Y, BG, SM, JB, ACB, RPW, JET, TCF, HLK, DHO, MEK

44 **Conceptualization and Data Collection Procedures:** DWC, GKM, IWP, KMB, KMG, AK-Y, BG,  
45 SM, RPW, JET, TCF, HLK, DHC, MEK

46 **Designing and Implementing Policies and Interventions:** DC, TS, CG, GPK, CP, JB

47 **Epidemiologic Data Management and Analysis:** DWC, MJD, IWP, AJ, GCF, BSY, SG, DB, HS

48 **Genomic Data Management and Analysis:** GKM, IWP, KMB, TCF, DHO

49 **Laboratory Technical Assistance:** CL, ACB

50 **Supervision:** RPW, JET, TCF, HLK, DHO, MEK

51 **Abstract:**

52 University settings have demonstrated potential for COVID-19 outbreaks, as they can combine  
53 congregate living, substantial social activity, and a young population predisposed to mild illness. Using  
54 genomic and epidemiologic data, we describe a COVID-19 outbreak at the University of Wisconsin  
55 (UW)–Madison. During August – October 2020, 3,485 students tested positive, including 856/6,162  
56 students living in residence halls. Case counts began rising during move-in week for on-campus students  
57 (August 25-31, 2020), then rose rapidly during September 1-11, 2020. UW-Madison initiated multiple  
58 prevention efforts, including quarantining two residence halls; a subsequent decline in cases was  
59 observed. Genomic surveillance of cases from Dane County, where UW-Madison is located, did not find  
60 evidence of transmission from a large cluster of cases in the two residence halls quarantined during the  
61 outbreak. Coordinated implementation of prevention measures can effectively reduce SARS-CoV-2  
62 spread in university settings and may limit spillover to the community surrounding the university.  
63

64

## 65 **Introduction**

66 SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), can spread  
67 rapidly within congregate settings, including institutions of higher education (IHEs).<sup>1,2</sup> During the fall of  
68 2020, as IHEs around the United States resumed in-person instruction, IHE-associated SARS-CoV-2  
69 cases began to rise.<sup>3</sup> By February 2021, more than 530,000 COVID-19 cases linked to American IHEs  
70 had been identified.<sup>4</sup> In many IHE settings that are populated significantly by young adults ages 18-24,<sup>5</sup>  
71 there is less susceptibility to severe COVID-19 disease as compared to older populations (65+).<sup>6</sup>  
72 Adhering to physical distancing is also particularly challenging for young people, for whom interaction  
73 with peers and social networks is important.<sup>7</sup>

74 As students returned to in-person learning, high-density clustering with on-campus housing and  
75 recreation potentially increased transmission and may have resulted in community outbreaks.<sup>8-12</sup> Whole  
76 genome sequencing (WGS) provides an enhanced method for tracing cases. WGS relies on patterns of  
77 genome variation that eventually compose viral lineages, to reveal links between individuals that might  
78 not be apparent by case counts alone. This genome variation serves as a fingerprint, enabling tracking of  
79 specific SARS-CoV-2 lineages through space and time.<sup>13-19</sup> One study using whole genome sequencing  
80 data suggested that SARS-CoV-2 transmission chains beginning or proliferating on IHE campuses may  
81 lead to spread within the community where the IHE is located, including to populations at higher risk of  
82 severe disease.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, enhanced strategies to identify and prevent SARS-CoV-2 spread on IHE  
83 campuses and between IHEs and the community are needed.

84 Here, we use epidemiologic and genomic data to describe an outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 infection  
85 at the University of Wisconsin – Madison (UW-Madison) shortly after reopening for the Fall 2020  
86 semester. We report the trajectory of the outbreak, including cumulative incidence within residence halls  
87 and attack rates among roommates, and describe measures taken to reduce transmission. In addition,  
88 using genomic data, we investigate whether UW-Madison-associated SARS-CoV-2 lineages may have

89 spread into the community surrounding UW-Madison and discuss broader implications for IHE in  
90 preventing and responding to COVID-19 outbreaks.

## 91 **Methods**

### 92 *Setting*

93 UW-Madison is a large public university in the Midwest region of the United States, with  
94 approximately 45,540 enrolled students and 23,917 staff during the Fall of 2020.<sup>20</sup> UW-Madison offered  
95 a combination of in-person and virtual classes for the Fall 2020 semester. Undergraduate students living  
96 in on-campus residence halls moved in on pre-assigned days during August 25-31, 2020. They were  
97 tested for SARS-CoV-2 on move-in day and were subsequently required to undergo a screening test  
98 every two weeks regardless of symptoms. Appointment-based testing for all students and staff was also  
99 made available free of charge. All specimens were collected via anterior nasal swabs, and testing was  
100 conducted using FDA-authorized real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR)  
101 tests. At the beginning of the semester, UW-Madison also instituted a mandatory COVID-19 student  
102 pledge, which required mask usage at all times (except within students' own rooms), physical distancing  
103 when possible, self-monitoring for symptoms, and limited gatherings in accordance with local public  
104 health guidelines.<sup>21</sup> Students were provided a symptom screening tool to facilitate symptom self-  
105 monitoring; those screening positive were instructed to schedule a test and self-isolate (except to receive  
106 medical care) until a negative test result was received.

107 Isolation facilities were established in designated residence halls to temporarily house students  
108 living on-campus who had tested positive for SARS-CoV-2. Quarantine facilities were established in  
109 local hotels to temporarily house students living on-campus who had been in close contact with a person  
110 who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2. Roommates of students living in residence halls that tested  
111 positive were automatically moved into quarantine facilities, while the UW-Madison case investigation  
112 team elicited additional residence hall contacts who were then quarantined. Students identified as close

113 contacts (defined as being within 6 feet of an infected person for at least 15 minutes within a 24-hour  
114 period from 2 days before illness onset or positive specimen collection through the end of isolation)  
115 were quarantined in individual single rooms in hotels for 14 days, with meals delivered to the rooms,  
116 and tested for SARS-CoV-2 during the first and second week of quarantine. If a quarantined student  
117 tested positive, they isolated within the same location that they were quarantining in. Students testing  
118 positive that had not been in quarantine were transferred to designated isolation residence halls on  
119 campus. Isolation lasted for 10 days after symptom onset for those who were symptomatic, or 10 days  
120 after positive specimen collection for those who were asymptomatic, consistent with Centers for Disease  
121 Control and Prevention (CDC) recommendations.<sup>22</sup>

122         As the semester progressed, some modifications to the quarantine procedure were required due to  
123 the large volume of cases, particularly in two residence halls on campus (Residence Halls A and B).  
124 Given the high frequency of positivity within these two halls during universal testing events, all student  
125 residents of Residence Halls A and B were asked to quarantine within their residence hall for two weeks.  
126 This decision was made to mitigate transmission within Residence Halls A and B and prevent spread to  
127 other members of the campus and local community. During the quarantine period in these two residence  
128 halls, students were asked to wear a face covering when leaving their room, refrain from congregating,  
129 self-monitor for symptoms, test onsite, and stay in their residence hall. During the residence hall  
130 quarantines, residents testing positive were moved to an isolation facility, while roommates of residents  
131 testing positive initially quarantined within their residence hall room. Roommates of residents testing  
132 positive were not initially moved to an alternative quarantine facility during the full-hall quarantines as  
133 they were being frequently tested within the residence halls, and there were space and time limitations  
134 involved in moving roommates into alternate quarantine facilities. However, approximately one week  
135 into the residence hall quarantine, roommates of positive cases were moved to alternative quarantine  
136 facilities, student resident's personal quarantine based on close contact with their roommate would end

137 after the full-hall quarantine. Students could quarantine at their (permanent) home rather than in the  
138 residence hall if they chose; they could then return to the residence hall after the quarantine ended after  
139 providing a negative test result. Food was provided during designated time periods for residents of these  
140 two residence halls. Resident advisors checked in on students virtually, and mental health resources  
141 were provided by UW-Madison.

142 In addition to UW-Madison-specific mitigation measures outlined above, county-level  
143 ordinances passed earlier in the summer also applied to the UW-Madison community. As of July 13,  
144 2020, Dane County Emergency Order #8 mandated the use of face coverings when in public, limited the  
145 size of public gatherings (10 people indoors, 25 people outdoors), limited restaurant capacity to 25%,  
146 and closed bars except for (a) ordering/pick-up and payment of food or beverage for takeout, or (b)  
147 providing outdoor seating with at least six feet distance between customers who were not members of  
148 the same household.<sup>23</sup>

#### 149 *Epidemiologic data analysis*

150 Wisconsin Department of Health Services public health surveillance system data (i.e., Wisconsin  
151 Electronic Disease Surveillance System, or WEDSS) were used to describe demographic characteristics,  
152 the location of on-campus clusters, and symptoms of COVID-19 cases. A UW-Madison-affiliated  
153 SARS-CoV-2 infection was defined as a positive SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR test result in a specimen  
154 collected from a UW-Madison student or staff member during August 1 – October 31, 2020. Daily  
155 percent positivity (positive SARS-CoV-2 specimens collected on a given day divided by the total  
156 number of specimens collected) and attack rates within residence halls were calculated using data  
157 collected by the campus testing program. Campus testing data were merged with University Housing  
158 data, which includes the residence hall and room number of each student living in on-campus housing,  
159 to determine specific housing location for students living on-campus as of September 22, 2020. A total  
160 of 19 residence halls with student populations ranging from 26-1195 individuals were included in the

161 analysis. To calculate attack rates among roommates of positive cases, index cases were defined as the  
162 resident with the first positive SARS-CoV-2 test result within a room in a residence hall. Susceptible  
163 students were defined as residents sharing a room with an index case that had not previously tested  
164 positive for SARS-CoV-2. Roommate attack rates were defined as the proportion of susceptible students  
165 who had a positive SARS-CoV-2 specimen collected within 2-14 days after the index case specimen  
166 collection, consistent with the virus incubation period.<sup>24</sup>

167 Epidemiologic data analyses were performed using SAS software, version 9.4 (SAS Institute,  
168 Cary, NC), and RStudio, version 1.2.1335 (RStudio Team, Boston, MA).

### 169 ***Whole Genome Sequencing***

#### 170 *Sample selection criteria*

171 Sequences for this study were derived from 262 anterior nasal swab samples from UW-Madison  
172 students living in the two residence halls experiencing the largest outbreaks, Residence Halls A and B,  
173 with collection dates between September 8- 22, 2020.

#### 174 *Viral RNA (vRNA) isolation*

175 Anterior nasal swabs received in viral transport medium (VTM) were centrifuged at 21,130 x g  
176 for 30 seconds at room temperature. Viral RNA (vRNA) was extracted from 100 µl of VTM using the  
177 Viral Total Nucleic Acid Purification kit (Promega, Madison, WI, USA) on a Maxwell RSC 48  
178 (Promega, Madison, WI, USA) instrument and was eluted in 50 µL of nuclease free H<sub>2</sub>O. All genomic  
179 samples were processed using a modified ARTIC tiled amplicon approach.<sup>25,26</sup>

#### 180 *Complementary DNA (cDNA) generation*

181 cDNA was synthesized using a modified ARTIC Network approach.<sup>25,27</sup> Briefly, vRNA was  
182 reverse transcribed with SuperScript IV Reverse Transcriptase (SSIV RT) (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA,  
183 USA) using random hexamers and deoxynucleotide triphosphates (dNTPs). Reaction conditions were as  
184 follows: 1 µL of random hexamers and 1 µL of dNTPs were added to 11 µL of sample RNA, heated to



185 65°C for 5 minutes, then cooled to 4°C for 1 minute. Final concentrations were 2.5µM for random  
186 hexamers and 0.5µM for dNTPs. Then 7 µL of a master mix (4 µL 5x RT buffer, 1 µL 0.1M  
187 dithiothreitol (DTT), 1 µL RNaseOUT RNase Inhibitor, and 1 µL SSIV RT) were added and incubated  
188 at 42°C for 10 minutes, 70°C for 10 minutes, and then 4°C for 1 minute.

### 189 *Multiplex PCR to generate SARS-CoV-2 genomes*

190 A SARS-CoV-2-specific multiplex PCR for Nanopore sequencing was performed, similar to  
191 amplicon-based approaches as previously described.<sup>25,27</sup> In short, primers for 96 overlapping amplicons  
192 spanning the entire genome with amplicon lengths of 500 bp and overlapping by 75 to 100 bp between  
193 the different amplicons were used to generate cDNA. Primers used in this manuscript were designed by  
194 ARTIC Network and are shown in supplementary table 1. cDNA (2.5 µL) was amplified in two  
195 multiplexed PCR reactions using Q5 Hot-Start DNA High-fidelity Polymerase (New England Biolabs,  
196 Ipswich, MA, USA) using the following cycling conditions: 98°C for 30 seconds, followed by 25 cycles  
197 of 98°C for 15 seconds and 65°C for 5 minutes, followed by an indefinite hold at 4°C. Following  
198 amplification, samples were pooled before Oxford Nanopore Technologies (ONT) library prep.

### 199 *Library preparation and sequencing*

200 Amplified PCR product was purified using a 1:1 ratio of AMPure XP beads (Beckman Coulter,  
201 Brea, CA, USA) and eluted in 30 µL of water. PCR products were quantified using Qubit dsDNA high-  
202 sensitivity kit (Invitrogen, USA) and were diluted to a final concentration of 1 ng/µL. A total of 5 ng for  
203 each sample was then made compatible for deep sequencing using the one-pot native ligation protocol  
204 with Oxford Nanopore kit SQK-LSK109 and its Native Barcodes (EXP-NBD104 and EXP-NBD114).  
205 Specifically, samples were end-repaired using the NEBNext Ultra II End Repair/dA-Tailing Module  
206 (New England Biolabs, Ipswich, MA, USA). Samples were then barcoded using 2.5 µL of ONT Native  
207 Barcodes and the Ultra II End Repair Module. After barcoding, samples were pooled directly into a 1:1  
208 concentration of AMPure XP beads (Beckman Coulter, Brea, CA, USA) and eluted in 30 µL of water.

209 Samples were then tagged with ONT sequencing adaptors according to the modified one-pot ligation  
210 protocol. Up to 24 samples were pooled prior to being run on the appropriate flow cell (FLO-MIN106)  
211 using the 72 hr run script.

### 212 *Processing raw ONT data*

213 Sequencing data were processed using the ARTIC bioinformatics pipeline scaled up using on-  
214 campus computing cores (<https://github.com/artic-network/artic-ncov2019>). The entire ONT analysis  
215 pipeline is available at <https://github.com/gagekmoreno/SARS-CoV-2-in-Southern-Wisconsin>.

### 216 *Phylogenetic analysis*

217 All available full-length sequences from Dane County through January 31, 2021, were used for  
218 phylogenetic analysis using the tools implemented in Nextstrain custom builds  
219 (<https://github.com/nextstrain/ncov>).<sup>28,29</sup> In addition to the 262 samples sequenced from students living  
220 in Residence Halls A and B, 875 samples were sequenced from individuals tested at University of  
221 Wisconsin Hospital and Clinics (UWHC) from September 1, 2020 – January 31, 2021, representing  
222 approximately 3% of all cases within Dane County, where UW-Madison is located, during the time  
223 period. Those utilizing UWHC testing services included community members receiving pre-operative  
224 testing, employees, inpatient and emergency department patients, patients from associated hospitals, and  
225 those with known exposures. Of these 875 UWHC samples sequenced, 714 were collected on or after  
226 September 23, 2020, when the quarantine of Residence Halls A and B ended. This convenience sample  
227 of sequences was used to assess strains circulating within the Dane County community following the  
228 UW-Madison outbreak. Time-resolved and divergence phylogenetic trees were built using the standard  
229 Nextstrain tools and scripts. We used custom scripts written in Python to filter and clean metadata.

### 230 *Analyses comparing roommate sequences*

231 SARS-CoV-2 accumulates approximately one fixed mutation every other transmission event.<sup>30,31</sup>  
232 Therefore, if SARS-CoV-2 is directly transmitted from one individual to another, viruses from the two  
233 individuals in this “transmission pair” are expected to differ by  $\leq 1$  consensus single nucleotide variant

234 (SNV). To test the hypothesis that roommates are more likely to have similar viral sequences than non-  
235 roommate pairs, we linked data from 33 roommate pairs in which both roommates had sequencing data  
236 and performed a permutation test comparing the percent overlap in single nucleotide polymorphism  
237 (SNP) identities between roommate pairs and random pairs of sequences derived from Residence Halls  
238 A and B. We performed a Mann-Whitney U test to compare the amount of diversity shared in roommate  
239 pairs and random pairs.

#### 240 *Ethical approvals*

241 A waiver of HIPAA Authorization was obtained by the Western Institutional Review Board  
242 (WIRB #1-1290953-1) to obtain the clinical specimens for whole genome sequencing. This analysis was  
243 reviewed by CDC and was conducted consistent with applicable federal law and CDC policy.\*

---

\* 45 C.F.R. part 46.102(l)(2), 21 C.F.R. part 56; 42 U.S.C. Sect. 241(d); 5 U.S.C. Sect. 552a; 44 U.S.C. Sect. 3501 et seq.

244 These activities were determined to be non-research public health surveillance by the Institutional  
245 Review Board at UW-Madison.

## 246 **Results**

### 247 *Demographics, symptom presentation, and measures to reduce transmission*

248 During August 1 – October 31, 2020, 3,485 students and 245 staff affiliated with UW-Madison  
249 tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by rRT-PCR, out of an overall enrollment of approximately 45,540  
250 students and 23,917 staff (**Table 1**). Cases in fraternity and sorority life (FSL) and other off-campus  
251 housing began rising before residence hall move-in week. UW-associated cases peaked during the week  
252 of September 6-12, 2020; soon after, cases began declining, with a sustained decline through September  
253 and consistently low case counts in October (**Figure 1**). Most student (81.4%) and staff (80.4%) case-  
254 patients reported at least one symptom of COVID-19; 68.0% of students and 72.7% of staff met the  
255 Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists clinical criteria for a COVID-19 case (**Table 1**).<sup>32</sup>  
256 Hospitalization was rare for both students and staff (<1.0%). Specimen collection occurred before  
257 symptom onset for 4.6% of student cases, while a positive result was reported before symptom onset for  
258 0.7% of student cases. Among student cases, 902 (25.9%) were associated with an on-campus residence  
259 hall, 1,019 (29.2%) were associated with off-campus housing clusters, and 460 (13.2%) were associated  
260 with FSL (**Table 1**); the remainder were not linked to housing-specific clusters.

261 Multiple mitigation measures were put into place to reduce transmission during the week of  
262 September 6-12, 2020. These included suspending in-person classes and other events, prohibiting non-  
263 sanctioned social activities, holding additional mass testing events, quarantining all students in  
264 Residence Halls A and B during September 9-23, 2020, as these residence halls were experiencing the  
265 highest percent positivity, and transitioning from biweekly to weekly COVID-19 screening tests for all  
266 students residing in any residence hall (**Figure 1**). The local health department, which maintains  
267 jurisdiction for off-campus housing, also required testing and quarantine for 26 FSL house chapters.

268 ***Infections among students in residence halls***

269  
270 Across all residence halls, 5,820 of 6,162 students (94.4%) were tested during move-in week  
271 (August 25-31, 2020), with a mean turnaround time from test to result of two days (Interquartile Range:  
272 1-2 days). Thirty-four students (0.6%) tested positive at move-in without documentation of a previous  
273 positive test in the last 90 days; these students were moved into isolation dorms. Overall, 856/6,162  
274 (13.9%) students living in the 19 on-campus residence halls had a positive SARS-CoV-2 specimen  
275 collected through campus testing during August 25-October 31, 2020; attack rates in residence halls  
276 ranged from 1.9% to 31.9% (**Table 2**) during this time. Fifteen residence halls had attack rates of less  
277 than 10.0%, two had attack rates between 10.0% and 20.0%, and two had attack rates of over 20.0%.  
278 Residence Halls A and B accounted for 68.5% of all residence hall cases (586/856), but only 34.4% of  
279 all students living in residence halls (2,119/6,162) (**Figure 2**); all students living in these two residence  
280 halls were asked to quarantine in place for 14 days starting September 9, 2020.

281 In addition, we used a divergence phylogeny, colored by residence hall, to compare the number  
282 of mutations present in each sequence relative to the initial SARS-CoV-2 reference (Genbank:  
283 MN908947.3). If Residence Halls A and B had distinct, but contemporaneous outbreaks, we might  
284 expect viral sequences from the two halls to segregate into distinct taxa on a divergence tree. However,  
285 **Figure 3c** illustrates that substantial mixing of viral genetic lineages between the two residence halls  
286 occurred, indicating that outbreaks of COVID-19 within these residence halls were not distinct and  
287 resulted from intermingling between residents.

288 ***Whole genome sequencing among students from two residence halls***

289 We sequenced complete viral genomes from 262 (44.7%) of the 586 specimens taken from  
290 students living in Residence Halls A and B (**Figure 3**). Using a Dane County-centric phylogeny, we  
291 visualized the relationship of SARS-CoV-2 viruses circulating in Residence Halls A and B (**Figure 3**).  
292 Almost two-thirds of sequences from the residence halls (172/262; 65.6%) form a cluster in the 20A

293 clade (PANGO lineage B.1.369) (**Figure 3b**). This cluster contains a unique spike mutation encoding a  
294 glutamic acid-to-glutamine substitution at spike residue 780 (S E780Q), which was not seen in Dane  
295 County prior to this outbreak. This mutation was not subsequently found in 467 sequenced specimens  
296 from Dane County (out of 15,740 total positive tests, for a sequencing coverage of 2.96%) during  
297 November 11, 2020 - January 31, 2021.

298 The remaining 90 residence hall sequences clustered with 20A (32/262), 20G (30/262), 20C  
299 (24/262), and 20B (4/262) clades. Sequences clustering in these remaining clades were more closely  
300 related to viral lineages concurrently circulating in Dane County. Between September 23, 2020, and  
301 January 31, 2021, 75.3% (538/714) of new sequences in Dane County were classified as 20G, 15.1%  
302 (108/714) classified as 20A, 7.0% (50/714) classified as 20C, and 2.5% (18/714) classified as 20B.

303 **Figure 4**, in which colors tips on the phylogenetic tree by the age of the individual providing the sample,  
304 shows the large cluster in Residence Halls A and B was almost exclusively among case-patients aged  
305 17-23 years..

#### 306 *Risk of transmission between roommates*

307 Across all residence halls, 81.6% of residents had a roommate. Percent positivity was higher  
308 overall among students with roommates (15.4%) than those without roommates (7.3%) ( $p < 0.0001$ ). Of  
309 the 514 students who had a roommate test positive but had not yet tested positive themselves, 101  
310 (19.6%) tested positive within 2-14 days. (**Table 2**).

311 Genetic distance comparisons between roommate pairs and non-roommate pairs within  
312 Residence Halls A and B revealed significantly higher levels of overlap in SNV identities between  
313 roommate pairs compared to random pairs. Specifically, 32/33 (97.0%) roommate pairs had viruses that  
314 contained 100.0% identical consensus sequences, while identical consensus sequences were found in  
315 only 1,062/33,930 (3.1%) of randomly assigned pairs ( $p < 0.0001$ ).

#### 316 **Discussion**

317 An outbreak of COVID-19 occurred at UW-Madison at the beginning of the fall semester despite  
318 nearly all students living in residence halls being tested when they moved in. Over the course of the  
319 investigation, almost 14.0% of students living in residence halls tested positive; those living with  
320 roommates were more likely to test positive. Shortly after the UW-Madison outbreak began, mitigation  
321 measures were rapidly implemented, and a rapid decline in cases was observed. Additionally, we did not  
322 detect evidence of transmission of the predominant viral lineages associated with Residence Halls A or  
323 B beyond these residence halls within Dane County. This suggests these interventions likely succeeded  
324 in preventing subsequent transmission and further spread into the Dane County community.

325 Testing at the time students moved into residence halls identified some introductions of SARS-  
326 CoV-2 onto campus, and UW-Madison subsequently facilitated isolation of infected students. However,  
327 the average two-day lag in turnaround time of test results meant that transmission might have occurred  
328 while these students were awaiting their test results. Students were only asked to self-quarantine if they  
329 had symptoms, but not specifically while awaiting test results. The on-campus residential move-in  
330 period represents a particularly high-risk situation in which students from different areas of the country  
331 (and world) with different exposure risks congregate together. Therefore, when implementing move-in  
332 testing, quarantining students until results have been received may help prevent transmission among  
333 asymptomatic students awaiting results.<sup>33</sup> Move-in testing may also fail to identify students who have  
334 recently been infected and do not yet have detectable levels of SARS-CoV-2 virus.<sup>34</sup> Move-in testing  
335 cannot prevent new infections from occurring after move-in if the virus is already circulating in the  
336 community and may have limited utility in an area of high transmission. Our results suggest that it is  
337 important to supplement move-in testing with ongoing serial testing and additional mitigation steps to  
338 effectively prevent ongoing transmission and community spread.

339 UW-Madison implemented serial screening testing every other week for students in residence  
340 halls with relatively short turnaround time (two days on average), enabling identification and isolation of

341 those with symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections, quarantine of roommates, and  
342 contact tracing to identify additional close contacts. Still, more frequent testing of students may have  
343 assisted in more rapid detection of cases and initiated isolation and quarantine procedures more quickly,  
344 preventing some of the spread observed in this investigation. A modeling study of COVID-19 spread  
345 within institutions of higher education (IHEs) suggested that frequent testing (e.g., every two days)  
346 would be needed to control the spread of the virus.<sup>35</sup> In addition, while two-day turnaround time is  
347 relatively fast for PCR-based diagnostic testing, in a rapidly expanding outbreak in a congregate setting,  
348 this may still have allowed infected students to transmit SARS-CoV-2 before a positive result required  
349 them to isolate. Recognizing this potential for rapid spread, UW-Madison has modified their testing  
350 strategy for the Spring 2021 semester, increasing the frequency of testing to twice per week for students  
351 living on-campus and living off-campus in nearby zip codes and has reduced turnaround time for results  
352 to less than 24 hours.<sup>36,37</sup> Further evaluation of serial testing strategies, including UW-Madison's  
353 modified strategy for the spring 2021 semester, is needed to determine optimal testing frequency in IHE  
354 settings and to prioritize populations for testing when capacity is limited. The high proportion of  
355 infected students who were symptomatic (>80.0%) suggests that even in young adults, SARS-CoV-2  
356 infection is frequently associated with at least mild symptoms, reinforcing the importance of educating  
357 students on COVID-19 symptoms, symptom monitoring, testing, and self-isolation when symptoms  
358 develop (even if only mild).<sup>38</sup>

359 Roommates live in close contact with each other, providing substantial opportunities for  
360 transmission.<sup>39</sup> At UW-Madison, roommates were not required to wear masks within their rooms;  
361 requiring them to do so would be impractical and unenforceable. Roommates of confirmed case-patients  
362 within residence halls had an estimated attack rate of 19.6%, and a larger proportion of students with  
363 roommates tested positive over the investigation period than those without. Further, SARS-CoV-2  
364 genomes collected from 33 roommate pairs found a high proportion of identical sequences, suggesting



365 transmission occurred either within the roommate pair or based on a shared exposure. Given the elevated  
366 risk of infection associated with having a roommate, efforts to reduce the density of residence halls,  
367 including single-occupancy rooms when available, may reduce transmission.<sup>1</sup>

368 Two residence halls accounted for over two-thirds of all confirmed cases among students living  
369 in residence halls during the investigation period, despite the fact that these two halls accounted for only  
370 one-third of students living in on-campus housing. Students living in Residence Halls A and B were  
371 significantly more likely to visit bars in September 2020 than students living in other residence halls  
372 located further away from bars, which may have contributed to transmission.<sup>40</sup> Transmission may have  
373 occurred within the residence halls, but it may have also occurred in other undetected settings (e.g., bars,  
374 private residences, fraternities or sororities) possibly more frequently visited by residents of Residence  
375 Halls A and B than by students living in other residence halls.<sup>40,41</sup> The sequencing data strongly suggest  
376 that the clusters in Residence Halls A and B were not independent and were the result of intermingling,  
377 providing additional evidence that transmission may have occurred at common dining, study, and  
378 recreation areas that both halls share.

379 Viral genome sequencing is an important tool in understanding the transmission dynamics  
380 between UW-Madison students and the broader community.<sup>11,13-19</sup> Our sequencing data covering 44.7%  
381 of student case-patients living in Residence Halls A and B, 7.5% of all student case-patients, and 3.0%  
382 of community samples from Dane County, suggest that the large cluster of UW-Madison cases  
383 associated with these residence halls gave rise to few descendent infections, with little evidence that  
384 viruses from this cluster subsequently circulated at high frequencies in the community. This suggests  
385 that the series of mitigation interventions put in place by the UW-Madison, including the quarantines of  
386 Residence Halls A and B and the suspension of most non-essential on-campus activity for two weeks,  
387 may have prevented substantial community transmission.

388 This analysis is subject to limitations. Full lists of off-campus students and staff and their  
389 COVID-19 testing histories were not available; therefore, attack rates could only be calculated for  
390 students living in on-campus residence halls. Data related to race, ethnicity, and other social  
391 determinants of health that may have impacted case counts and disease progression were not examined.  
392 Occupancy levels remained fluid throughout the semester, but available data used for residence hall  
393 census calculations represented a single point in time at the end of the outbreak, when occupancy was  
394 lower than at the start of the semester. UW-Madison's rapid implementation of a series of interventions  
395 targeting different populations limits our ability to determine the effectiveness of each individual  
396 intervention. Specimens from students living in Residence Halls A and B were initially targeted for  
397 sequencing to understand transmission patterns within and across these housing units. Therefore, our  
398 sequencing results should not be generalized to the campus at large, as transmission events may have  
399 occurred after campus-related clusters outside of Residence Halls A and B that we did not characterize.  
400 In addition, sequencing of Dane County specimens in Nextstrain represented a small proportion of the  
401 total number infections within the county (about 3.0%) and were sampled non-randomly among clients  
402 of one large testing provider. Therefore, it is possible that descendant infections from UW-Madison  
403 clusters occurred in Dane County but were not captured in the convenience sample from the community.  
404 Finally, roommate attack rate calculations were limited in that campus testing data did not include  
405 information on symptom onset. Some roommate transmission events may have been erroneously  
406 excluded based on testing timeframes, resulting in underestimation of roommate transmission events. On  
407 the other hand, some transmission events attributed to roommates may have been due to a shared  
408 exposure outside of their room, resulting in overestimation of roommate transmission events.

409 This investigation described an outbreak where COVID-19 spread rapidly among university  
410 students at UW-Madison. Given the swift rise in cases, being able to quickly identify outbreaks and  
411 rapidly implement mitigation strategies via a coordinated university-wide response in collaboration with

412 public health authorities are critical in halting transmission, both within the campus community and to  
413 the broader local community. Our findings suggest important strategies for IHEs and universities in  
414 preventing outbreaks include move-in testing with quarantine while awaiting results and frequent  
415 subsequent serial screening testing with rapid turnaround times, in addition to physical distancing,  
416 refraining from large gatherings, mask usage, and symptom screening and monitoring. Large-scale  
417 quarantines in congregate living situations (such as in dorms) and suspension of on-campus activities  
418 may be effective when experiencing large-scale outbreaks, if implemented rapidly and effectively.  
419 Given the elevated risk of transmission among roommate pairs, strategies to reduce the density of  
420 residence halls and utilize single occupancy rooms when available may reduce the spread of infection.  
421 This investigation also demonstrates the use of genomic surveillance to provide a more comprehensive  
422 understanding of transmission dynamics both in specific outbreak settings and in the general population;  
423 these tools can be used by universities and health departments to monitor spillover into the community  
424 and inform campus and community mitigation efforts.

425  
426

**Table 1: Characteristics of University of Wisconsin-Madison Student and Staff COVID-19 Cases, Dane County, Wisconsin, August 1 - October 31, 2020**

	<b>Students*</b> <b>N=3485</b>	<b>Staff</b> <b>N=245</b>
Age – Mean (Range)	19.8 years (17-72)	40.0 years (20-88)
Sex – n (%)		
Male	1677 (48.1%)	114 (46.5%)
Female	1807 (51.9%)	131 (53.5%)
Cluster affiliation – n (%) <sup>†</sup>		
Residence Hall	902 (25.9%)	
Fraternity and Sorority Life	460 (13.2%)	
Off-Campus Apartment	1019 (29.2%)	
No Known Affiliation with Cluster	1134 (32.5%)	
Hospitalized – n (%)		
Yes	4 (0.1%)	1 (0.4%)
No/Unknown <sup>§</sup>	3481 (99.9%)	244 (99.6%)
Presence of symptoms – n (%) <sup>*†</sup>		
Symptomatic	2838 (81.4%)	197 (80.4%)
Asymptomatic	647 (18.6%)	48 (19.6%)
Symptoms – n (%)		
Headache	1562 (44.8%)	132 (53.9%)
Sore throat	1454 (41.7%)	81 (33.1%)
Fatigue	1417 (40.7%)	106 (43.3%)
Cough	1311 (37.6%)	116 (47.4%)
Runny nose	1122 (32.2%)	80 (32.7%)
Muscle ache	1021 (29.3%)	100 (40.8%)
Fever	918 (26.3%)	75 (30.6%)

Loss of smell	879 (25.2%)	63 (25.7%)
Loss of taste	777 (22.3%)	53 (21.6%)
Chills	822 (23.6%)	56 (22.9%)
Shortness of breath	336 (9.6%)	19 (7.8%)
Nausea	286 (8.2%)	23 (9.4%)
Diarrhea	247 (7.1%)	19 (7.8%)
Abdominal pain	126 (3.6%)	12 (4.9%)
Vomiting	43 (1.2%)	7 (2.9%)
Meets CSTE Clinical Criteria <sup>‡</sup>		
Yes	2371 (68.0%)	178 (72.7%)
No	1114 (32.0%)	67 (27.3%)
Timing of Specimen Collection relative to Symptom Onset – n (%)		
Specimen collected on or after symptom onset date	2275 (65.3%)	162 (66.1%)
Specimen collected before symptom onset date	162 (4.6%)	7 (2.9%)
No symptoms reported	647 (18.6%)	48 (19.6%)
Symptomatic, missing symptom onset date	401 (11.5%)	28 (11.4%)
Timing of Positive Report relative to Symptom Onset – n (%)		
Positive reported on or after symptom onset date	2411 (69.2%)	167 (68.2%)
Positive reported before symptom onset date	26 (0.7%)	2 (0.8%)
No symptoms reported	647 (18.6%)	48 (19.6%)
Symptomatic, missing symptom onset date	401 (11.5%)	28 (11.4%)

427 \*student affiliation was prioritized over staff, such that those identified as both students and staff  
428 are categorized as students

429 <sup>†</sup>cluster affiliation categories are not mutually exclusive

430 \*<sup>†</sup>anyone with at least one symptom is considered symptomatic; asymptomatic does not  
431 distinguish between those that were truly asymptomatic and those that were missing  
432 symptom information.

433 <sup>§</sup>cannot distinguish between ‘No’ and ‘Unknown’; there is only one checkbox in which  
434 hospitalization can be selected.

435 ‡ CSTE clinical criteria are met if the case-patient has either cough or shortness of breath, or at  
436 least two of the following symptoms: fever, chills, myalgia, headache, sore throat, loss of smell,  
437 or loss of taste.

**Table 2: Attack Rates within Residence Halls and within Roommates for Residence Halls with  $\geq 10$  Cases, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Dane County, Wisconsin, August 25-October 31, 2020**

<b>Residence Hall</b>	<b>Residents N</b>	<b>Residents with Confirmed SARS-CoV-2 Infection n/N (%)</b>	<b>Attack Rates in Roommates 2-14 days after Index Case n/N (%)*<sup>†</sup></b>
Residence Hall A	1195	291/1195 (24.4%)	41/165 (24.8%)
Residence Hall B	924	295/924 (31.9%)	32/172 (18.6%)
Residence Hall C	478	58/478 (12.1%)	7/35 (20.0%)
Residence Hall D	181	19/181 (10.5%)	2/9 (22.2%)
Residence Hall E	532	51/532 (9.6%)	4/37 (10.8%)
Residence Hall F	384	31/384 (8.1%)	5/23 (21.7%)
Residence Hall G	372	27/372 (7.3%)	2/15 (13.3%)
Residence Hall H	319	20/319 (6.3%)	1/14 (7.1%)
Residence Hall I	435	13/435 (3.0%)	2/11 (18.2%)


All Other Residence Halls*	1342	51/1342 (3.8%)	5/33 (15.2%)
<b>Total*</b>	<b>6162</b>	<b>856/6162 (13.9%)</b>	<b>101/514 (19.6%)</b>

\*includes aggregated data from 10 residence halls not listed here that had fewer than 10 total cases each; attack rates in these halls ranged from 1.9%-5.6%

\*<sup>†</sup>one room included in the roommate attack rate analysis housed three residents, while all others housed two residents; in the room with two susceptible residents, neither tested positive within 2-14 days of the index case.




**Figure 1: Overall Epidemic Curves of COVID-19 Cases among University of Wisconsin-Madison Students and Staff, Dane County, Wisconsin, August 1 – October 31, 2020\***




\*10 student case-patients affiliated with both a residence hall and a fraternity or sorority are categorized as Residence Hall Students. Student was considered the primary affiliation, such that any student who was also a staff member was categorized as a student.

**Figure 2: COVID-19 Epidemic Curves and Percent Positivity, University of Wisconsin-Madison Students Living in Residence Halls A and B vs. All Other Residence Halls, Dane County, Wisconsin, August 25 – October 31, 2020**




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.07.21256834>; this version posted May 10, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

### Figure 3: Phylogenetic Tree of the SARS-CoV-2 Outbreak in Residence Halls A and B, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Dane County, Wisconsin, January 2020 – January 2021



(a) Phylogenetic tree of all cases sequenced in Dane County, Wisconsin (light grey tips) during January 2020 – January 2021; sequencing of case-patients living on campus in Residence Halls A and B in blue and pink, respectively. (b) Zoomed in phylogenetic tree of the large cluster of cases associated with Residence Halls A and B (shown in the red box in Figure 3a) during the September 2020 outbreak. (c) Number of mutations relative to the initially identified SARS-CoV-2 genome in Wuhan (Genbank: MN908947.3) during the outbreak in Residence Halls A and B.

**Figure 4: Phylogenetic Tree of the SARS-CoV-2 Specimens Sequenced in Dane County, Wisconsin, Coded by Age of Case-Patient Providing Specimen, January 2020 – January 2021**



## References

- <sup>1</sup> Wilson E, Donovan CV, Campbell M, Chai T, Pittman K, Sena AC, et al. (2020). Multiple COVID-19 Clusters on a University Campus – North Carolina, August 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 69(39):1416-8.
- <sup>2</sup> Fox MD, Bailey DC, Seamon MD, Miranda ML (2021). Response to a COVID-19 Outbreak on a University Campus — Indiana, August 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2021;70:118–122.
- <sup>3</sup> Salvatore PP, Sula E, Coyle JP, Caruso E, Smith AR, Levine RS, et al. (2020). Recent increase in COVID-19 cases reported among adults aged 18-22 years – United States, May 31 – September 5, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 69(39):1419-24.
- <sup>4</sup> Cai W, Ivory D, Semple K, et al. Tracking coronavirus cases at U.S. colleges and universities. *The New York Times*. Accessed March 1, 2021. Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/us/college-covid-tracker.html>.
- <sup>5</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID-19 Parental Resources Kit – Young Adulthood. Updated 12/28/2020. Accessed 4/15/2021. Available at <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/daily-life-coping/parental-resource-kit/young-adulthood.html>.
- <sup>6</sup> CDC Covid-19 Response Team (2020). Severe Outcomes among Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) – United States, February 12 – March 16, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 69(12):343-346.
- <sup>7</sup> Andrew JL, Foulkes L, Blakemore S (2020). Peer Influence in Adolescence: Public-health Implications for COVID-19. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 24(8):585-587.
- <sup>8</sup> Andersen MS, Bento AI, Basu A, Marsicano C, Simon K (2020). College Openings, Mobility, and the Incidence of COVID-19 Cases. *medRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.22.20196048>

- <sup>9</sup>Walke HT, Honein MA, Redfield RR (2020). Preventing and Responding to COVID-19 on College Campuses. *JAMA* 324(17):1727-8.
- <sup>10</sup>Leidner AJ, Barry V, Bowen VB, Silver R, Musial T, Kang GJ, et al. (2021). Opening of Large Institutions of Higher Education and County-level COVID-19 Incidence – United States, July 6-September 17, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 70(1):14-19.
- <sup>11</sup>Richmond CS, Sabin AP, Jobe DA, Lovrich SD, Kenny PA (2020). SARS-CoV-2 sequencing reveals rapid transmission from college student clusters resulting in morbidity and deaths in vulnerable populations. *MedRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.12.20210294>.
- <sup>12</sup>Pray IW, Kocharian A, Mason J, Westergaard R, Meiman J (2021). Trends in outbreak-associated cases of COVID-19 – Wisconsin, March – November 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 70(4):114-117.
- <sup>13</sup>Moreno GK, Braun KM, Riemersma KK, Martin MA, Halfmann PJ, Crooks CM, et al. (2020). Revealing fine-scale spatiotemporal differences in SARS-CoV-2 introduction and spread. *Nat Commun* 11:5558. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19346-z>.
- <sup>14</sup>Fauver JR, Petrone ME, Hodcroft EB, Shioda K, Ehrlich HY, Watts AG, et al. (2020). Coast-to-coast spread of SARS-CoV-2 during the Early Epidemic in the United States. *Cell* 181(5):990-996.e5.
- <sup>15</sup>Lemiux JE, Siddle KJ, Shaw BM, Loreth C, Schaffner SF, Gladden-Young A, et al. (2021). Phylogenetic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 in Boston highlights the impact of superspreading events. *Science* 371:6259:eabe3261. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abe3261>.
- <sup>16</sup>Miller D, Martin MM, Harel N, Tirosh O, Kustin T, Meir M, et al. (2020). Full genome viral sequences inform patterns of SARS-CoV-2 spread into and within Israel. *Nat Commun* 11:5518. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19248-0>.

<sup>17</sup>Zeller M, Gangavarapu K, Anderson C, Smither AR, Vanchiere JA, Rose R, et al. (2021). Emergence of an early SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in the United States. *MedRxiv*.

<https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251235>.

<sup>18</sup>Maurano MT, Ramaswami S, Zappile P, Dimartino D, Boytard L, Ribeiro-dos-Santo AM, et al. (2020). Sequencing identifies multiple early introductions of SARS-CoV-2 to the New York City region. *Genome Res* 30(12): 1781-1788.

<sup>19</sup>Beford T, Greninger AL, Roychoudhury P, Starita LM, Famulare M, Huang M, et al. (2020). Cryptic transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Washington State. *Science* 370(6516):571-575.

<sup>20</sup>University of Wisconsin – Madison: At a glance factsheet. Available online at

<https://www.wisc.edu/pdfs/uwmadison-factsheet-jan-2021.pdf>. Accessed March 22, 2021.

<sup>21</sup>University of Wisconsin – Madison. COVID-19 Response: Badger Pledge for Students. Accessed December 16, 2020. Available at

<https://covidresponse.wisc.edu/badgerpledge/#:~:text=As%20a%20University%2C%20we%20commit,o n%20the%20best%20available%20information>.

<sup>22</sup>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim guidance on duration of isolation and precautions for adults with COVID-19. Last updated 2/13/2021. Available at:

<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/duration-isolation.html>. Accessed 3/31/2021.

<sup>23</sup>Public Health Madison & Dane County. Emergency Order #8. Accessed March 1, 2021. Available at

[https://publichealthmdc.com/documents/2020-07-07\\_Order\\_8.pdf](https://publichealthmdc.com/documents/2020-07-07_Order_8.pdf).

<sup>24</sup>Linton NM, Kobayash T, Yang Y, Hayashi K, Akhmetzhanov AR, Jung S (2020). Incubation period and other epidemiological characteristics of 2019 novel coronavirus infections with right truncation: A statistical analysis of publicly available case data. *J Clin Med*. 9(2):538.

<sup>25</sup>Quick J, Grubaugh ND, Pulla ST, et al. (2017). Multiplex PCR method for MinION and Illumina sequencing of Zika and other virus genomes directly from clinical samples. *Nat Protoc* 12(6):1261-1276.

<sup>26</sup>Quick J (2020). nCoV-2019 sequencing protocol v3 (IoCost) V.3. Available at <https://www.protocols.io/view/ncov-2019-sequencing-protocol-v3-locost-bh42j8ye>. Accessed March 9, 2021.

<sup>27</sup>Quick J (2020). nCoV-2019 sequencing protocol v2 (GunIt) V.2. Available at [https://www.protocols.io/view/ncov-2019-sequencing-protocol-v2-bdp7i5m?version\\_warning=no](https://www.protocols.io/view/ncov-2019-sequencing-protocol-v2-bdp7i5m?version_warning=no). Accessed March 9, 2021. doi: 10.17504/protocols.io.bdp7i54n.

<sup>28</sup>Hadfield J, Megill C, Bell SM, et al. (2018). Nextstrain: real-time tracking of pathogen evolution. *Bioinformatics* 34(23):4121-4123.

<sup>29</sup>Saguleno P, Puller V, Neher RA (2018). TreeTime: Maximum-likelihood phylodynamic analysis. *Virus Evol* 4(1):vex042. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ve/vex042>.

<sup>30</sup>Popa A, Genger J, Nicholson MD, Penz T, Schmid D, Aberle SW, et al. (2020). Genomic epidemiology of superspreading events in Austria reveals mutational dynamics and transmission properties of SARS-CoV-2. *Science Translational Medicine* 12(573): eabe2555. doi: 10.1126/scitranslmed.abe2555.

<sup>31</sup>Lythgoe KA, Hall M, Ferretti L, de Cesare M, MacIntyre-Cockett G, Trebes A, et al. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 within-host diversity and transmission. *Science*. DOI: 10.1126/science.abg0821.

<sup>32</sup>Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) 2020 Interim Case Definition, Approved August 5, 2020. CSTE Position Statement: Interim-20-ID-02. Accessed



<https://www.cdc.gov/nndss/conditions/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/case-definition/2020/08/05/>

on Jan 7, 2021.

<sup>33</sup>Yarney G, Wlaensky RP (2020). Covid-19: re-opening universities is high risk. *BMJ*, 370:m3365.

<sup>34</sup>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID-19 Testing Overview. Accessed 2/23/2021. Available at <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/testing.html>.

<sup>35</sup>Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Walensky RP (2020). Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Screening Strategies to Permit the Safe Re-opening of College Campuses in the United States. *JAMA Netw Open* 3(7):e2016818. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.16818.

<sup>36</sup>University of Wisconsin. What is the testing process for undergraduates living in residence halls for spring semester? Available at <https://covidresponse.wisc.edu/faq/testing-process-undergrads-res-halls/>. Accessed March 1, 2021.

<sup>37</sup>University of Wisconsin. What is the testing process for undergraduates living off campus for spring semester? Available at <https://covidresponse.wisc.edu/faq/testing-process-off-campus-students/>. Accessed March 1, 2021.

<sup>38</sup>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Living in Shared Housing. Last updated 1/31/2020. Available at <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/shared-congregate-house/guidance-shared-congregate-housing.html>. Accessed 2/23/2021.

<sup>39</sup>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Living in Shared Housing. Accessed 2/23/2021. Available at <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/daily-life-coping/shared-housing/index.html>.

<sup>40</sup>Harris JE (2020). Geospatial Analysis of the September 2020 Coronavirus Outbreak at the University of Wisconsin – Madison: Did a Cluster of Local Bars Play a Critical Role? *National Bureau of*

*Economic Research Working Paper 28132.* <https://doi.org/10.3386/w28132>. Available at:

<https://www.nber.org/papers/w28132>.

<sup>41</sup>Vang KE, Krow-Lucal ER, James AE, et al. (2021). Participation in Fraternity and Sorority Activities and the Spread of COVID-19 Among Residential University Communities – Arkansas, August 21 – September 5, 2020. *MMWR* 70(1):20-23.