

1 **Asymptomatic COVID-19 screening tests to facilitate full-time school attendance: model-based**
2 **analysis of cost and impact**

3
4 Alyssa Bilinski MS¹; Andrea Ciaranello MD²; Meagan C. Fitzpatrick PhD³; John Giardina MA¹; Maunank
5 Shah MD, PhD⁴; Joshua Salomon PhD⁵; Emily A. Kendall MD, PhD⁴

6
7 ¹ Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Cambridge, MA

8 ² Medical Practice Evaluation Center and Division of Infectious Disease, Massachusetts General Hospital,
9 Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts

10 ³ Center for Vaccine Development and Global Health, University of Maryland School of Medicine,
11 Baltimore, Maryland

12 ⁴ Division of Infectious Diseases, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD

13 ⁵ Center for Health Policy and Center for Primary Care and Outcomes Research, Stanford University
14 School of Medicine, Stanford, California

15
16 **Abstract**

17
18 **Background:** In March 2021, the Biden administration allocated \$10 billion for COVID-19 diagnostic and
19 screening tests in schools.

20
21 **Objective:** We address to what extent screening tests reduce the risks of full-time in-person learning
22 and how costs of testing compare to short-term financial costs of reduced in-person educational time, at
23 different levels of community incidence.

24
25 **Design:** We used an agent-based network model to simulate transmission in elementary and middle
26 school communities.

27
28 **Setting:** We parameterized school structure based on a US setting.

29
30 **Patients (or participants):** Students and faculty/staff.

31
32 **Interventions:** We assess the value of asymptomatic screening tests for students and faculty/staff 1-2
33 times per week. We also consider vaccination of teachers and of middle school students.

34
35 **Measurements:** We project 30-day cumulative incidence of COVID-19, proportion of cases detected,
36 proportion of planned and unplanned days out of school, and cost per COVID-19 case averted in
37 students and staff.

38
39 **Results:** Accounting for programmatic and childcare costs, 5-day school attendance with weekly
40 screening has a lower cost than hybrid models without screening and achieves similarly low rates of
41 transmission. Compared to a 5-day model with no screening, the cost per infection averted with
42 screening drops as community transmission rises. Cost/infection averted is also lower for middle schools
43 than elementary schools, and in settings with less mitigation.

44
45 **Limitations:** We include only screening and childcare costs, and there is uncertainty in transmission
46 parameters.

47

48 **Conclusions:** Schools operating in hybrid models may use screening tests to facilitate 5-day attendance
49 with small transmission risk. In the event of resurgent COVID-19 in the fall due to more transmissible
50 variants or seasonal effects, screening can facilitate safe 5-day in-person education across a wide range
51 of community incidence.

52
53 **Funding Sources:** The authors were supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
54 through the Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists (NU38OT000297-02; AB, JAS), the National
55 Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (R37AI058736-16S1; AC, K01AI141576; MCF, and K08127908;
56 EAK), the National Institute on Drug Abuse (3R37DA01561217S1; JAS), and Facebook (unrestricted gift;
57 JG, AB, JAS). The papers' contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not represent the
58 official views of the funders.

59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95

96 **Introduction**

97 In K-12 education, COVID-19 poses potential risks to student and teacher health, school operations, and
98 local communities. To reduce these risks, many school systems have adopted virtual or hybrid models.
99 As of May 2021, about a third of US students were not offered the option of full-time in-person
100 attendance and, where in-person schooling was offered, a substantial proportion of families had opted
101 for remote learning (1–3). More than a year into the pandemic, there is growing pressure to return
102 students to full-time, in-person schooling. Virtual and hybrid models impose substantial burdens,
103 including educational and mental health risks for students, training and logistical burden for teachers,
104 and productivity or child-care costs for the working parents of younger students (4–10). At the same
105 time, high community incidence in some settings and concern about more transmissible variants
106 necessitate continued attention to the control of school-related transmission (11–15). Districts are
107 currently making plans for the fall, with a priority on safe in-person education even in the event of
108 seasonal increases in transmission or reduced vaccine efficacy against new variants.

109
110 One tool to facilitate safer in-person instruction is routine asymptomatic screening. Improvements in
111 SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic technology and infrastructure – such as increased PCR testing capacity, new
112 lateral flow rapid antigen tests, and validations of specimen pooling – make frequent, widespread
113 screening a viable option. When re-opening schools in the spring of 2021 after winter shutdowns,
114 Germany, Austria, and Norway implemented regular COVID-19 screening in schools 1-2 times per week,
115 and some US school systems have adopted a similar approach (16–20). In March, the Biden
116 administration allocated \$10 billion for diagnostic and screening tests in schools (21). The Centers for
117 Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) developed guidelines that include asymptomatic screening as an
118 option for districts when community cases exceed 1.4 per 100,000 per day, and pilot programs and
119 modeling analyses predict that frequent screening will reduce in-school transmission (14,22–25).

120 However, many districts are understandably concerned about the economic and operational burden of
121 asymptomatic screening. As these strategies have lower yield as community incidence falls (22,23),
122 there is a need to understand how the benefits of screening compare to its costs at different levels of
123 community transmission.

124
125 In this manuscript, we address several questions regarding the role of asymptomatic screening in
126 educational settings: to what extent screening can support schools' transition from virtual or hybrid to
127 full-time in-person learning; how the disruptions of case detection and quarantine compare to the
128 benefits of reduced transmission; how costs of screening compare to financial costs associated with
129 school closure; and how these benefits may vary depending on local transmission risks and screening
130 implementation. We focus on elementary and middle schools, both because childcare costs are more
131 substantial for these groups and because vaccines are not yet authorized for all students of these ages,
132 although vaccination availability will soon expand to 12-15-year-olds with the Emergency Use
133 Authorization for the Pfizer vaccine (26). We use an agent-based simulation of COVID-19 transmission to
134 compare outcomes associated with school-wide screening strategies and alternatives including hybrid
135 schedules and remote learning, with a particular focus on infections, in-person educational days, and
136 costs.

137

138 **Methods**

139 We used a previously-described agent-based simulation model to estimate the effects of regular
140 asymptomatic screening in an elementary and a middle school in the US (Figure S1) (24). In brief, the
141 model incorporates interactions between individuals in school, household, and out-of-school childcare
142 settings, as well as infections introduced exogenously through other community interactions.

143

144 **Model structure**

145 We modeled an elementary (638 students aged ~5-10 and 60 staff) and a middle school (460 students
146 aged ~11-13 and 51 staff) setting. For each, we generated households from synthetic population data
147 (27) and grouped students into fixed classroom cohorts with a primary teacher. The model also included
148 adults outside of a primary classroom to represent other school roles (e.g., administrators, counselors,
149 and teachers of special education and related arts). In schools, individuals had sustained daily contact
150 with their classroom cohort as well as random interactions with members of the school community. We
151 assumed that elementary schoolers are half as susceptible and half as infectious as adults, that
152 moderate levels of mitigation (e.g., masking, ventilation, and distancing) were implemented, and that
153 90% of teachers and staff were vaccinated. Outside of schools, in addition to an exogenous community
154 infection risk, individuals interacted with household members, and each day that students did not
155 attend school, families mixed with another randomly chosen family from the same school to reflect
156 “learning pods,” social interactions, or shared childcare. Further details of model structure and
157 assumptions are described in (24) and the Supplement.

158

159 **Screening and schedule-based mitigation strategies**

160 Screening strategies were modeled in conjunction with a five-day in-person school attendance schedule.
161 We modeled weekly or twice-weekly screening (Monday ± Thursday) of all students and teachers, and
162 our primary analyses assumed 90% coverage and 90% sensitivity (such that 81% of cases were detected
163 if screening occurred during their period of infectiousness) and a 24-hour test turnaround time. Positive
164 results led to quarantine of the exposed classroom cohort and primary teacher (but not of casual
165 contacts within the school) for 10 days; in a sensitivity analysis, we considered that the screening
166 infrastructure could also be used to test exposed individuals and shorten the duration of classroom
167 quarantine to 7 days (28,29). We compared these screening scenarios to three scenarios without

168 asymptomatic screening: 1) five-day in-person attendance, 2) a hybrid model in which half of students
169 attend class on Monday and Tuesday and the other half on Thursday and Friday, and 3) fully remote
170 learning. In all scenarios, symptom-driven COVID diagnostic testing still occurred outside of the school
171 environment, as described in the Supplement.

172

173 **Cost estimation**

174 We based screening test performance and costs on PCR testing with pooling of specimens to reduce
175 costs. Specifically, we assumed (a) specimens (e.g., anterior nasal swabs) were collected from each
176 student and teacher, and (b) that aliquots from up to eight specimens obtained in a single classroom
177 were combined for pooled PCR testing, with negligible loss of sensitivity to detect active infection
178 (38,39). When a pooled specimen yielded a positive result, all individual specimens that had been
179 included in the pool were immediately tested separately to identify the positive individual(s). Costs of
180 PCR testing were estimated at \$100 per assay based on Medicare reimbursement rates, plus an \$8 per-
181 specimen cost of labor and supplies for nasal swab collection (Table 1). In a sensitivity analysis, we
182 considered the use of rapid antigen tests (\$12 per assay plus the same specimen collection costs as for
183 PCR specimens, 99.5% specificity, and same sensitivity as pooled PCR for infectious individuals) with PCR
184 confirmation of positive results prior to classroom quarantine (1-day turnaround, cost as above) (32,33).
185 Costs for diagnostic testing of symptomatic or exposed students, staff, or household members are
186 excluded, because these are assumed to occur outside of the school setting.

187

188 In comparing screening costs to the costs associated with schedule-based risk mitigation, we took a
189 societal perspective but focused on the childcare or parent-productivity costs of remote learning;
190 associated educational and other costs are likely but difficult to estimate. We estimated the cost of a
191 planned day of remote instruction based on the average cost of group childcare (Table 1); estimates are

192 based on the costs of pre-kindergarten in the pre-COVID era (34), which are also similar to summertime
193 childcare costs for school-aged children (35). For unplanned days at home (i.e., while isolated due to
194 COVID-19 diagnosis or symptoms, or quarantine due to COVID-19 exposure), we estimated costs based
195 on the average childcare worker's wages over a 7-hour day (36) to account for the higher costs of last-
196 minute scheduling or inability to use group childcare (Table 1). While parents may choose to supervise
197 remote learning at home, we assume that the average productivity loss of supervising at-home learning
198 is at least equal to childcare costs.

199

200 **Outcomes**

201 For each scenario, we ran the model 1000 times for 30 days each, and estimated over that one-month
202 period: average cumulative true COVID incidence in staff and students (as a proportion of students and
203 staff infected and as the raw number of infections per school, excluding secondary transmissions to their
204 household members or community contacts), case detection (proportion of all students and staff
205 diagnosed with COVID, and number of cases per school), detection fraction (the ratio between cases
206 detected and true cases), and proportion of weekdays spent at home (for "unplanned" isolation or
207 quarantine reasons, or for "planned" days at home dictated by the virtual/hybrid schedule). Isolation
208 and diagnostic testing for symptoms caused by non-COVID etiologies were not modeled because other
209 respiratory illnesses are expected to occur with similar frequency in all scenarios and also be reduced by
210 masking and distancing (37).

211

212 **Sensitivity analyses**

213 We performed one-way sensitivity analyses for multiple parameters with regard to two main outcomes:
214 1) the difference in cumulative COVID incidence in staff and students (number of infections per school
215 per month) between full-time in-person attendance with weekly screening and a hybrid schedule

216 without screening, and 2) the cost of weekly screening (including any incremental childcare costs) per
217 infection averted among students and staff, relative to the same 5-day in-person schedule without
218 screening.

219

220 The model was implemented in R 4.0.2. Model code is publicly available as an R package at:

221 <https://github.com/abilinski/BackToSchool2>.

222

223 **Role of Funding Sources**

224 Funders had no role in the design or conduct of this study or in the decision to submit this work for
225 publication.

226

227 **Results**

228 **Incidence**

229 Figure 1 and Table S1 show 30-day incidence, case detection, and school attendance outcomes of
230 different school schedules and asymptomatic screening frequencies. At the elementary school level, in-
231 school transmission is a minor contributor to COVID-19 incidence; compared to fully remote instruction,
232 5-day in-person attendance with no asymptomatic screening is associated with a 39% increase in COVID
233 incidence among students (2 additional infections per school per month) at a community notification
234 rate of 10/100k/day and a 31% increase (6 additional infections per school per month) at 50
235 notifications/100k/day (Figure 1A). Among elementary teachers, the increase in incidence attributable
236 to in-person teaching is 26% or 8%, respectively. Middle school attendance has greater potential to
237 increase transmission: for example, at a community notification rate of 25 per 100k per day, attending 5
238 days in person without screening increases the monthly risk of infection by 160% among middle school

239 students and 17% among their teachers, and results in an average of 13 additional infections per middle
240 school per month (Figure 1E).

241
242 Weekly asymptomatic screening at the start of the week, with quarantine at the classroom level once a
243 case is detected, eliminates much of this incremental transmission associated with in-person school
244 attendance. At a community notification rate of 10 per 100k per day, weekly screening averts 47% of the
245 excess incidence relative to remote learning at the elementary level and 67% at the middle school level
246 where school-related outbreaks are more common. If community notifications rise five-fold, this
247 proportion increases to 54% at the elementary level (due to more frequent isolation and quarantine),
248 whereas it declines to 62% at the middle school level (Figure 1 A and E, dotted lines, and Table S1). With
249 a second weekly screening day added later in the week, 60-76% of excess, school-associated
250 transmission is averted at the elementary level and 77-78% at the middle school level, for community
251 notification rates between 10 and 50 per 100k per day. A single weekly screening day is less effective if it
252 occurs late in the week (Figure S10) because much of the averted infectious person-time of the detected
253 cases falls over the weekend.

254

255 **Case detection and in-person learning days lost**

256 Although asymptomatic screening and the resulting increase in detection fraction reduce transmission,
257 they lead to more students required to isolate and quarantine, disrupting in-person education. At the
258 elementary level, with a community notification rate range of 10 cases per 100k per day, detection
259 fraction increases from 25% with 5-day in-person school and no screening to 67% with weekly screening.
260 Because there are few in-school transmissions for screening to prevent, screening also increases the
261 absolute number of cases detected (Figure 1B) and thus increases the days spent in isolation/quarantine
262 by up to a factor of three; however, the average isolation/quarantine per student per month is limited

263 to <1 day at a community incidence of 10/100k/day and <6 days even at a community notification rate
264 as high as 100 cases/100k/day (Figure 1C). In a middle school, the detection fraction similarly more than
265 doubles from 23% to 60% with weekly screening, but because screening also substantially reduces the
266 total number of infections that occur, it increases time spent in isolation/quarantine by less than a
267 factor of two. If a school's screening infrastructure could also be used for testing to shorten quarantine
268 duration to 7 days (Figure S2), this approach could result in no net increase in quarantine time at the
269 middle school level, compared to the same 5-day schedule without screening.

270

271 **Scheduling**

272 Compared to weekly or twice-weekly screening (with full-time in-person attendance), hybrid scheduling
273 could reduce COVID-19 incidence (Figure 1 A,E). For example, in a middle school at a community
274 notification rate of 10/100k/day, a hybrid schedule prevents 91% of the excess transmission associated
275 with in-person attendance, compared to 59% and 70% prevented by once and twice weekly screening,
276 respectively (Table S1). The trade-off is a large reduction in in-person school days, from 97% of school
277 days in-person with either testing frequency, to 40% in-person with a hybrid schedule (Figure 1H).

278

279 **Costs**

280 Screening and childcare costs over the 30-day period were estimated for each school attendance
281 schedule and screening strategy (Figure 2, breakdowns in S3-S6). When no pooled screening tests are
282 positive and all students and staff are in attendance, once-weekly screening requires 465 PCR tests per
283 month in the elementary school (330 tests in the smaller middle school) and costs \$117 per student per
284 month; as incidence rises, the costs of individual follow-up testing to deconvolute positive pools are
285 more than offset by the reduction in screening volumes due to quarantine, and the school's screening
286 costs decline (Fig S3-S4). After adding the costs of childcare during isolation and quarantine, the societal

287 costs associated with once-weekly screening in an elementary school range from <\$140 per student per
288 month at community notification rates $\leq 5/100k/day$, to \$290/student/month at a community
289 notification rate of 50/100k/day, and to \$400/student/month at a community notification rate of
290 100/100k/day (Figure 2, top-right panel). In comparison, the cost of childcare exceeds
291 \$400/student/month for a hybrid schedule and exceeds \$600/student/month for a fully-remote
292 schedule at all incidence levels. For the costs of weekly screening to exceed the estimated childcare
293 costs of a hybrid schedule at a community notification rate of 10 cases/100k/day, the price of a PCR
294 assay would have to exceed \$500, or the cost of specimen collection would have to exceed \$60 per
295 person. The estimated costs of a rapid antigen screening strategy were very similar to those of pooled
296 PCR screening (Figure S7).

297
298 Figure 3 shows the cost of weekly screening per infection averted among students and teachers/staff,
299 when compared to the same full-time in-person school schedule without asymptomatic screening. Costs
300 include screening and incremental childcare costs. In the elementary school, screening costs per
301 infection averted range from <\$40,000 at community notification rates of ≥ 25 cases/100k/day, to
302 \$109,000 per infection averted at 10 cases/100k/day and nearly \$1 million per infection averted at 1
303 case/100k/day. In the middle school, where more in-school transmission occurs, the costs of screening
304 per infection averted are lower than in the elementary school by roughly a factor of five: they range
305 from <\$10,000 per infection averted at community notification rates $\geq 25/100k/day$ to approximately
306 \$200,000 per infection averted at 1 case/100k/day.

307
308 Childcare costs induced by 10-day quarantines remain modest at low community incidence but result in
309 a doubling of the total costs per infection averted over screening costs alone at high levels of community

310 incidence. Using testing to reduce quarantine duration to 7 days reduces or eliminates these
311 incremental childcare costs but increases the overall cost per infection averted due to increased testing.
312
313 In a scenario analysis, 50% vaccination coverage of middle school students increases the screening cost
314 per infection averted by 3 to 4-fold at most incidence levels, e.g., from \$8,000 to \$27,000 per infection
315 averted at a community notification rate of 25/100k/day (Figure S9).

316

317 **Sensitivity analysis**

318 The largest determinants of the absolute incidence difference between a 5-day schedule with screening
319 strategy and a hybrid model without screening were the community notification rate; the timing,
320 sensitivity, and frequency of screening (with Monday being most effective screening day, and a second
321 day of screening reducing the difference between 5-day+screening and hybrid+no screening strategies
322 from 4 infections to 2 infections per school per month in a middle school at a community notification
323 rate of 25/100k/day); and the transmission-mitigating measures in place (with 50% student vaccination
324 similarly reducing the difference between 5-day+screening and hybrid+no screening strategies to <2
325 infections per middle school per month) (Figure S10 panels A and B). The cost-effectiveness of screening
326 was sensitive to similar variables but was most sensitive to the transmission-mitigating measures in
327 place; at a community notification rate of 25/100k/day, the cost per infection averted ranged from
328 \$3,000 with minimal other mitigation to \$25,000 with strong mitigation in place in the middle school,
329 and similarly ranged from \$26,000 to \$150,000 in the elementary school (Figure S10 C and D).

330

331 **Discussion**

332 Our work highlights that asymptomatic screening tests can support safe school reopening and, for
333 schools that have reopened, can help maintain 5-day in-person education if community incidence rises.

334 With the addition of weekly screening, 5-day in-person school attendance can achieve levels of
335 transmission nearly as low as hybrid or remote models without screening, at a substantially lower net
336 societal cost. For school systems currently favoring hybrid or remote models, our work underscores the
337 importance of considering multiple dimensions of cost in school reopening plans. While incorporation of
338 school-based screening increases school system expenditures and is likely to be feasible only with
339 additional state or federal funding, these costs may be offset societally by reducing the burden of
340 COVID-19-related childcare costs currently borne by parents and caregivers. Similarly, for school systems
341 practicing or considering full-time in-person instruction, our work shows the public health value that
342 screening may offer under different local conditions.

343
344 While previous analyses have documented that weekly screening can control transmission, this analysis
345 adds the key finding that 5-day in-person learning with screening is cost-saving from a societal
346 perspective, compared to hybrid or remote models (24,38,39). Cost savings persist across levels of
347 community transmission up to 100 cases per 100,000 per day, even when improved case detection
348 through the screening program increases the time that students spend in quarantine. Therefore, in
349 districts currently operating in hybrid models, it may be possible to use currently-allocated federal funds
350 to add screening and move to a 5-day in-person model without substantially increasing public health
351 risk. The small differences in infection risk between these two models may also be informative for
352 parents deciding about in-person attendance, as opt-out rates remain high, including 65% in New York
353 City public schools and 43% in Boston Public Schools (2,3).

354
355 A related question is whether school systems that have committed to 5-day in-person education should
356 offer regular COVID-19 screening to students and staff. The value of such screening varies substantially
357 across different levels of community transmission, between elementary and middle schools, and by

358 school attack rate. In turn, school attack rate is influenced by factors including mitigation measures
359 (masking, ventilation, and distancing), vaccination uptake (among staff, parents, and students when
360 available), and the properties of emerging variants of concern. Our results suggest that screening
361 capacity may be useful as an “insurance policy” to maintain in-personal instructional time if cases
362 increase during fall 2021, and would be most efficiently targeted toward older students, groups that are
363 not yet fully vaccinated, settings where adherence to mitigation precautions is low or unknown, and
364 settings in which adults have lower vaccination rates.

365
366 In estimating the cost-effectiveness of screening, we did not include the downstream infections averted
367 beyond students and staff. We also excluded many dimensions of cost, including the long-term costs
368 associated with either COVID-19 infection among children and adults or lifetime impact of lost
369 educational time. Our estimates of cost per infection averted are therefore likely to be conservative.

370 While COVID-19 is generally mild in children, the results presented here nevertheless suggest that
371 screening could be cost-effective in some circumstances, particularly for older students and if the
372 impacts of onward transmission are considered. For example, one report estimated that 1.5 QALYs are
373 gained from averting a case of COVID-19 when considering onward transmission (40); using this value,
374 for a middle school in a community with a COVID-19 notification rate as low as 1 case per 100K per day
375 (where we estimated weekly screening would cost \$162,000 per infection averted), screening programs
376 would be cost-effective at a threshold as low as \$108,000 per QALY. In practice, the cost per case
377 averted is dependent on local factors, particularly the vaccination rate. As vaccination uptake increases,
378 school-based screening is unlikely to remain cost-effective at low community incidence levels, but an
379 economic case for screening at high community incidence rates is likely to persist through the fall,
380 particularly for US communities (often low-income and minority) where vaccination coverage is lower
381 and in communities (US and international) with more limited vaccine supply.

382 Last, we provide a number of insights useful for the practical implementation of screening. These
383 include that weekly screening is most beneficial on Mondays and that twice weekly screening,
384 recommended by some guidelines, provides a much smaller incremental benefit than once weekly
385 screening (51). Furthermore, given the costs associated with quarantine days when students are
386 exposed to COVID-19, priority should be given to testing symptomatic and exposed students (including
387 testing in order to shorten quarantines), per CDC guidance, before implementing screening (28). Finally,
388 as the availability of rapid tests expands, individual rapid screening with high-specificity assays (>99.5%)
389 could offer a similar benefit at a comparable cost to a pooled PCR screening strategy, even accounting
390 for PCR confirmation of positive results.

391
392 Our model does not address the operational aspects of specimen collection, laboratory transport, and
393 reporting of results, which some schools have navigated successfully but may nevertheless pose barriers
394 to adoption by others. There are a number of additional limitations, including imprecision in attack rates
395 and behavioral mitigation parameters, a focus on households rather than the full community, and
396 limited measures of cost. Nevertheless, this work highlights how asymptomatic screening can help
397 ensure stable 5-day in-person education.

398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413

414 **References**

- 415 1. Burbio School and Community Events Data Platform [Internet]. [cited 2021 Feb 22]. Available from:
416 <https://info.burbio.com/school-tracker-update-feb-22/>
- 417 2. 2020-2021 Boston Public Schools Dashboard [Internet]. Google Data Studio. [cited 2021 Apr 21].
418 Available from: [http://datastudio.google.com/reporting/77e82eef-349a-4f00-bd50-](http://datastudio.google.com/reporting/77e82eef-349a-4f00-bd50-0824cd0df332/page/1vChB?feature=opengraph)
419 [0824cd0df332/page/1vChB?feature=opengraph](http://datastudio.google.com/reporting/77e82eef-349a-4f00-bd50-0824cd0df332/page/1vChB?feature=opengraph)
- 420 3. Shapiro E. Over 50,000 N.Y.C. public school students will return to classrooms, including in middle
421 and high school. The New York Times [Internet]. 2021 Apr 12 [cited 2021 Apr 21]; Available from:
422 <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/12/nyregion/nyc-public-schools-students.html>
- 423 4. Polikoff AR Anna Saavedra, Dan Silver, and Morgan. Surveys show things are better for students
424 than they were in the spring—or do they? [Internet]. Brookings. 2020 [cited 2020 Nov 20].
425 Available from: [https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2020/11/18/surveys-](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2020/11/18/surveys-show-things-are-better-for-students-than-they-were-in-the-spring-or-do-they/)
426 [show-things-are-better-for-students-than-they-were-in-the-spring-or-do-they/](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2020/11/18/surveys-show-things-are-better-for-students-than-they-were-in-the-spring-or-do-they/)
- 427 5. Gaudiano N. Missing: Millions of students [Internet]. POLITICO. [cited 2020 Nov 25]. Available
428 from: <https://politi.co/3dVrNxg>
- 429 6. Leeb RT. Mental Health–Related Emergency Department Visits Among Children Aged 18 Years
430 During the COVID-19 Pandemic — United States, January 1–October 17, 2020. MMWR Morb
431 Mortal Wkly Rep [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Nov 30];69. Available from:
432 <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6945a3.htm>
- 433 7. Hess A. Widespread school closures mean 30 million kids might go without meals [Internet]. CNBC.
434 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 1]. Available from: [https://www.cnbc.com/2020/03/14/widespread-school-](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/03/14/widespread-school-closures-mean-30-million-kids-might-go-without-meals.html)
435 [closures-mean-30-million-kids-might-go-without-meals.html](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/03/14/widespread-school-closures-mean-30-million-kids-might-go-without-meals.html)
- 436 8. Baron EJ, Goldstein EG, Wallace CT. Suffering in Silence: How COVID-19 School Closures Inhibit the
437 Reporting of Child Maltreatment [Internet]. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network; 2020
438 Jul [cited 2020 Aug 1]. Report No.: ID 3601399. Available from:
439 <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3664803>
- 440 9. Bueno C. Bricks and Mortar vs. Computers and Modems: The Impacts of Enrollment in K-12 Virtual
441 Schools [Internet]. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network; 2020 Jul [cited 2020 Aug 1].
442 Report No.: ID 3642969. Available from: <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3642969>
- 443 10. Soland J, Kuhfeld M, Tarasawa B, Johnson A, Ruzek E, Liu J. The impact of COVID-19 on student
444 achievement and what it may mean for educators [Internet]. Brookings. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 1].
445 Available from: [https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2020/05/27/the-](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2020/05/27/the-impact-of-covid-19-on-student-achievement-and-what-it-may-mean-for-educators/)
446 [impact-of-covid-19-on-student-achievement-and-what-it-may-mean-for-educators/](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2020/05/27/the-impact-of-covid-19-on-student-achievement-and-what-it-may-mean-for-educators/)
- 447 11. Goldhaber D, Imberman S, Strunk KO, Hopkins B, Brown N, Harbatkin E, et al. To What Extent Does
448 In-Person Schooling Contribute to the Spread of COVID-19? Evidence from Michigan and
449 Washington [Internet]. 2020 Dec [cited 2021 Jan 24]. Available from:
450 <https://epicedpolicy.org/does-in-person-schooling-contribute-to-the-spread-of-covid-19/>
- 451 12. Harris D, Ziedan E, Hassig S. The Effects of School Reopenings on COVID-19 Hospitalizations
452 [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jan 24]. Available from: [https://www.reachcentered.org/publications/the-](https://www.reachcentered.org/publications/the-effects-of-school-reopenings-on-covid-19-hospitalizations)
453 [effects-of-school-reopenings-on-covid-19-hospitalizations](https://www.reachcentered.org/publications/the-effects-of-school-reopenings-on-covid-19-hospitalizations)
- 454 13. Volz E, Mishra S, Chand M, Barrett JC, Johnson R, Geidelberg L, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2
455 Lineage B.1.1.7 in England: Insights from linking epidemiological and genetic data. medRxiv. 2021
456 Jan 4;2020.12.30.20249034.
- 457 14. Panovska-Griffiths J, Kerr C, Stuart RM, Mistry D, Klein D, Viner RM, et al. Determining the optimal
458 strategy for reopening schools, work and society in the UK: balancing earlier opening and the
459 impact of test and trace strategies with the risk of occurrence of a secondary COVID-19 pandemic
460 wave. medRxiv. 2020 Jun 1;2020.06.01.20100461.
- 461 15. Schechter-Perkins EM, van den Berg P, Branch-Elliman W. The Science Behind Safe School Re-

- 462 Opening: Leveraging the Pillars of Infection Control to Support Safe Elementary and Secondary
463 Education During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* [Internet]. 2021 Mar
464 17 [cited 2021 Apr 29];(ofab134). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ofid/ofab134>
- 465 16. Reopening Home | Chicago Public Schools [Internet]. [cited 2021 Feb 22]. Available from:
466 <https://www.cps.edu/school-reopening-2020/>
- 467 17. Coronavirus/COVID-19: Pooled Testing in K-12 Schools [Internet]. [cited 2021 Feb 22]. Available
468 from: <https://www.doe.mass.edu/covid19/pooled-testing/>
- 469 18. COVID Testing Results [Internet]. web. [cited 2021 Jan 24]. Available from:
470 [https://www.schools.nyc.gov/school-year-20-21/return-to-school-2020/health-and-safety/covid-](https://www.schools.nyc.gov/school-year-20-21/return-to-school-2020/health-and-safety/covid-19-testing/covid-testing-results)
471 [19-testing/covid-testing-results](https://www.schools.nyc.gov/school-year-20-21/return-to-school-2020/health-and-safety/covid-19-testing/covid-testing-results)
- 472 19. Bender R. Can Mass Self-Testing for Covid-19 Keep Schools Safe? *Wall Street Journal* [Internet].
473 2021 Feb 21 [cited 2021 May 2]; Available from: [https://www.wsj.com/articles/can-mass-self-](https://www.wsj.com/articles/can-mass-self-testing-for-covid-19-keep-schools-safe-11613908800)
474 [testing-for-covid-19-keep-schools-safe-11613908800](https://www.wsj.com/articles/can-mass-self-testing-for-covid-19-keep-schools-safe-11613908800)
- 475 20. 'Step by step': Norway unveils four-step plan for lifting Covid-19 restrictions [Internet]. *The Local*
476 *Norway*. 2021 [cited 2021 May 2]. Available from: [https://www.thelocal.no/20210407/norway-](https://www.thelocal.no/20210407/norway-presents-plan-for-lifting-covid-19-restrictions/)
477 [presents-plan-for-lifting-covid-19-restrictions/](https://www.thelocal.no/20210407/norway-presents-plan-for-lifting-covid-19-restrictions/)
- 478 21. White House Announces \$10 Billion For COVID-19 Testing In Schools [Internet]. *NPR.org*. [cited
479 2021 May 2]. Available from: [https://www.npr.org/sections/coronavirus-live-](https://www.npr.org/sections/coronavirus-live-updates/2021/03/17/978262865/white-house-announces-10-billion-for-covid-19-testing-in-schools)
480 [updates/2021/03/17/978262865/white-house-announces-10-billion-for-covid-19-testing-in-](https://www.npr.org/sections/coronavirus-live-updates/2021/03/17/978262865/white-house-announces-10-billion-for-covid-19-testing-in-schools)
481 [schools](https://www.npr.org/sections/coronavirus-live-updates/2021/03/17/978262865/white-house-announces-10-billion-for-covid-19-testing-in-schools)
- 482 22. Gillespie DL, Meyers LA, Lachmann M, Redd SC, Zenilman JM. The Experience of Two Independent
483 Schools with In-Person Learning During the COVID-19 Pandemic [Internet]. *Public and Global*
484 *Health*; 2021 Jan [cited 2021 Feb 6]. Available from:
485 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.01.26.21250065>
- 486 23. Klein D, Kerr C, Mistry D, Thakkar N, Cohen J. Testing the waters: is it time to go back to school?
487 [Internet]. *Institute for Disease Modeling*; 2020 Nov [cited 2021 Feb 22]. Available from:
488 https://covid.idmod.org/data/Testing_the_waters_time_to_go_back_to_school.pdf
- 489 24. Bilinski A, Salomon JA, Giardina J, Ciaranello A, Fitzpatrick MC. Passing the Test: A Model-based
490 analysis of safe school-reopening strategies. *Forthcoming in Annals of Internal Medicine*.
- 491 25. CDC. Community, Work, and School [Internet]. *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*. 2020
492 [cited 2021 Feb 22]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/operation-strategy.html)
493 [ncov/community/schools-childcare/operation-strategy.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/operation-strategy.html)
- 494 26. COVID-19 Vaccination | CDC [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Apr 20]. Available from:
495 <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/index.html>
- 496 27. Wheaton WD. *U.S. Synthetic Population 2010 Version 1.0 Quick Start Guide*, RTI International.
497 2014 May.
- 498 28. CDC. COVID-19 and Your Health [Internet]. *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*. 2020 [cited
499 2021 Jan 4]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/quarantine.html)
500 [sick/quarantine.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/quarantine.html)
- 501 29. Wells CR, Townsend JP, Pandey A, Moghadas SM, Krieger G, Singer B, et al. Optimal COVID-19
502 quarantine and testing strategies. *Nat Commun* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 7 [cited 2021 May 5];12.
503 Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7788536/>
- 504 30. Mutesa L, Ndishimye P, Butera Y, Souopgui J, Uwineza A, Rutayisire R, et al. A pooled testing
505 strategy for identifying SARS-CoV-2 at low prevalence. *Nature*. 2021 Jan;589(7841):276–80.
- 506 31. Lohse S, Pfuhl T, Berkó-Göttel B, Rissland J, Geißler T, Gärtner B, et al. Pooling of samples for
507 testing for SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic people. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020 Nov
508 1;20(11):1231–2.
- 509 32. Pilarowski G, Marquez C, Rubio L, Peng J, Martinez J, Black D, et al. Field Performance and Public

- 510 Health Response Using the BinaxNOWTM Rapid Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
511 (SARS-CoV-2) Antigen Detection Assay During Community-Based Testing. *Clin Infect Dis* [Internet].
512 [cited 2021 Apr 25]; Available from: [https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-](https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa1890/6052342)
513 [article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa1890/6052342](https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa1890/6052342)
- 514 33. Prince-Guerra JL. Evaluation of Abbott BinaxNOW Rapid Antigen Test for SARS-CoV-2 Infection at
515 Two Community-Based Testing Sites — Pima County, Arizona, November 3–17, 2020. *MMWR*
516 *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Apr 25];70. Available from:
517 <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7003e3.htm>
- 518 34. Workman S, Jessen-Howard S. Understanding the True Cost of Childcare for Infants and Toddlers
519 [Internet]. Center for American Progress. [cited 2021 Apr 20]. Available from:
520 [https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/early-](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/early-childhood/reports/2018/11/15/460970/understanding-true-cost-child-care-infants-toddlers/)
521 [childhood/reports/2018/11/15/460970/understanding-true-cost-child-care-infants-toddlers/](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/early-childhood/reports/2018/11/15/460970/understanding-true-cost-child-care-infants-toddlers/)
522 35. Parents and the High Cost of Childcare [Internet]. ChildCare Aware of America; 2017 [cited 2021
523 May 2]. Available from: [https://www.childcareaware.org/wp-](https://www.childcareaware.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/2017_CCA_High_Cost_Report_FINAL.pdf)
524 [content/uploads/2017/12/2017_CCA_High_Cost_Report_FINAL.pdf](https://www.childcareaware.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/2017_CCA_High_Cost_Report_FINAL.pdf)
- 525 36. Childcare Workers [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Apr 20]. Available from:
526 <https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes399011.htm>
- 527 37. Baker RE, Park SW, Yang W, Vecchi GA, Metcalf CJE, Grenfell BT. The impact of COVID-19
528 nonpharmaceutical interventions on the future dynamics of endemic infections. *PNAS*. 2020 Dec
529 1;117(48):30547–53.
- 530 38. McGee RS, Homburger JR, Williams HE, Bergstrom CT, Zhou AY. Model-driven mitigation measures
531 for reopening schools during the COVID-19 pandemic. *medRxiv*. 2021 Feb 6;2021.01.22.21250282.
- 532 39. Gill BP, Goyal R, Hotchkiss J. Operating Schools in a Pandemic: Predicted Effects of Opening,
533 Quarantining, and Closing Strategies. :63.
- 534 40. Basu A, Gandhay VJ. Quality-Adjusted Life-Year Losses Averted With Every COVID-19 Infection
535 Prevented in the United States. *Value in Health* [Internet]. 2021 Mar 8 [cited 2021 Apr 20];0(0).
536 Available from: [https://www.valueinhealthjournal.com/article/S1098-3015\(21\)00034-6/abstract](https://www.valueinhealthjournal.com/article/S1098-3015(21)00034-6/abstract)
- 537 41. School Testing | California Coronavirus Testing Task Force [Internet]. [cited 2021 Apr 25]. Available
538 from: <https://testing.covid19.ca.gov/school-testing/>
- 539 42. Larremore DB, Wilder B, Lester E, Shehata S, Burke JM, Hay JA, et al. Test sensitivity is secondary to
540 frequency and turnaround time for COVID-19 screening. *Sci Adv* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 1 [cited 2021
541 Mar 15];7(1). Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7775777/>
- 542 43. Atkeson A, Droste M, Mina MJ, Stock JH. Economic Benefits of COVID-19 Screening Tests with a
543 Vaccine Rollout [Internet]. *Health Economics*; 2021 Mar [cited 2021 Mar 15]. Available from:
544 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.03.03.21252815>
- 545 44. Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV
546 viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness: a systematic review and meta-
547 analysis. *The Lancet Microbe*. 2021 Jan 1;2(1):e13–22.
- 548 45. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar P, et al. Saliva
549 or Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *New England Journal of*
550 *Medicine* [Internet]. 2020 Aug 28 [cited 2021 Apr 19]; Available from:
551 <https://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMc2016359>
- 552 46. COVID-19 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on Medicare Fee-for-Service (FFS) Billing. 2021 Mar
553 31;174.
- 554 47. Bastos ML, Perlman-Arrow S, Menzies D, Campbell JR. The Sensitivity and Costs of Testing for
555 SARS-CoV-2 Infection With Saliva Versus Nasopharyngeal Swabs. *Ann Intern Med*. 2021 Jan
556 12;174(4):501–10.
- 557 48. Waller A. About 80 Percent of K-12 Teachers and Staff Have Gotten a Covid-19 Vaccine Dose. The

558 New York Times [Internet]. 2021 Apr 6 [cited 2021 May 12]; Available from:
559 <https://www.nytimes.com/live/2021/04/06/world/covid-vaccine-coronavirus-cases>
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605

606 **Table 1: Model parameters**


	Estimate	Sources/Notes
Key transmission model parameters (see (24) for full list and sources)		
Duration of infectiousness	Lognormal (5, 2)	
Classroom attack rate	2% (1% or 3% in sensitivity analysis)	Daily transmission rate between two unvaccinated adults during shared full-day contact
Relative attack rate for random school contacts (vs. classroom)	0.13	Based on 45 minutes/day of exposure
Household attack rate	20%	
Probability that disease has clinically recognizable symptoms	20%, children 40%, adults	
Presymptomatic period (days)	Normal (1.2, 0.4)	
School size	Elementary: 638 students, 60 teachers/staff, 30 classes Middle: 460 students, 51 teachers/staff, 21 classes	
Case detection ratio in community	1/3	
Vaccine effectiveness	90%	
Teacher vaccination uptake	90%	(48), assuming full completion of regimens among those who received their first dose and additional 10% uptake
Testing parameters		
Sensitivity of testing during infectious period	0.9	(42–45). Combined with 90% testing coverage, so 81% of infectious students and staff are detected.
Frequency of testing	0, 1x, or 2x per week	Testing is assumed to occur on Monday +/- Thursday
Test turnaround time	1 day	
Duration of isolation after COVID-19 diagnosis	10 days	(28)
Duration of quarantine after COVID-19 exposure	7 or 10 days	(28)
Costs		
Cost per PCR run (per 8-sample pool, and per individual in pool for testing after a positive pooled result)	\$100	Medicare reimbursement for high-throughput PCR, <2-day turnaround (46)
Added cost per specimen collected	\$8	(47)

Cost per planned day at home	\$35.50	Based on group childcare costs (34)
Cost per unplanned day at home	\$85.90	Based on childcare worker wages (36)


607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649

650 **Figure 1: One-month cumulative incidence, case detection, isolation/quarantine, and remote learning**
 651 **days with multiple school schedules and testing frequencies.** Results are shown over a range of
 652 community COVID-19 notification rates, for an elementary school of 638 students and a middle school
 653 of 460 students. Infections (panels A and E) and diagnoses (panels B and F) are shown both as a
 654 proportion of all students and staff infected or proportion with detected cases per month (left-hand y
 655 axes) and as an expected number of infections/diagnoses among students and staff per school per
 656 month (right-hand y axes); these outcomes do not include infections among others in the community
 657 that may result from school-associated transmission. Panels C and G show the average proportion of
 658 weekdays that students and staff were scheduled to attend school but are in isolation or quarantine due
 659 to COVID-19 symptoms, diagnosis, or exposure. Panels D and H show the proportion of weekdays that
 660 student and staff attend in person after accounting for the scheduling model and isolation/quarantine.
 661 The detection fraction as reported in the text reflects the absolute number of diagnosed cases (B)
 662 divided by true cumulative incidence (A).
 663

Elementary




Middle



664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679


680 **Figure 2: Costs associated with in-school COVID-19 testing and/or out-of-school childcare for different**
681 **risk-reduction strategies, at varying community notification rates.**
682



683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699

700 **Figure 3: Cost per infection directly prevented among students/staff, compared to a 5-day in-person**
 701 **schedule with no in-school testing.** Plots show the incremental cost of testing (blue, and numerical

702 labels) or testing plus childcare (orange), per infection directly averted.



703