

1 **Individual-based modeling of COVID-19 transmission in college**

2 **communities**

3 Qimin Huang, PhD^{a*}, Martial Ndeffo-Mbah, PhD^{b,c*}, Anirban Mondal, PhD^a, Sara Lee, MD^d,
4 David Gurarie, PhD^{a,c}

5 ^aDepartment of Mathematics, Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Case Western Reserve
6 University, Cleveland, OH, USA, 44106.

7 ^bDepartment of Veterinary and Integrative Biosciences, College of Veterinary and Biomedical
8 Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA, 77840;

9 ^cSchool of Public Health, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA, 77840.

10 ^dDepartment of Pediatrics, School of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland,
11 OH, USA 44106;

12 ^eCenter for Global Health and Diseases, School of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University,
13 Cleveland, OH, USA, 44106;

14 *Correspondence:

15 E-mail: qxh119@case.edu (QH)

16 E-mail: mndeffo@cvm.tamu.edu (MN).

17

18

19

20

21 Highlights

- 22 ● Individual-based model for college communities with structured students' interactions.
- 23 ● We evaluated COVID-19 control measures needed for in-person college reopening.
- 24 ● Without vaccination, high testing frequency is paramount for outbreak control.
- 25 ● With high vaccination coverage, some NPIs are still needed for outbreak control.
- 26 ● General access website tool was developed for the public to explore simulations.

27

28

29

30

31


32

33

34

35

36 Graphic Abstract



37

38

39 Abstract

40 The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has created major public health and socio-economic
41 challenges across the United States. Among them are challenges to the educational system where
42 college administrators are struggling with the questions of how to reopen in-person activities
43 while prioritizing student safety. To help address this challenge, we developed a flexible
44 computational framework to model the spread and control of COVID-19 on a residential college
45 campus. The modeling framework accounts for heterogeneity in social interactions, activities,
46 disease progression, and control interventions. The relative contribution of classroom, dorm, and

47 social activities to disease transmission was explored. We observed that the dorm has the highest
48 contribution to disease transmission followed by classroom and social activities. Without
49 vaccination, frequent (weekly) random testing coupled with risk reduction measures (e.g. facial
50 mask,) in classroom, dorm, and social activities is the most effective control strategy to mitigate
51 the spread of COVID-19 on college campuses. Moreover, since random screening testing allows
52 for the successful and early detection of both asymptomatic and symptomatic individuals, it
53 successfully reduces the transmission rate such that the maximum quarantine capacity is far
54 lower than expected to further reduce the economic burden caused from quarantine. With
55 vaccination, herd immunity is estimated to be achievable by 50% to 80% immunity coverage. In
56 the absence of herd immunity, simulations indicate that it is optimal to keep some level of
57 transmission risk reduction measures in classroom, dorm, and social activities, while testing at a
58 lower frequency. Though our quantitative results are likely provisional on our model
59 assumptions, extensive sensitivity analysis confirms the robustness of their qualitative nature.

60 **Keywords:** COVID-19, individual-based model, non-pharmaceutical interventions, vaccine,
61 college

62 [Introduction](#)

63 The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has created major public health and socio-economic
64 challenges across the United States. Among them are challenges to the educational system. After
65 the 2020 Spring Break, many colleges and universities in the U.S. sent residential students home
66 and transitioned partially or completely to remote learning as an attempt to reduce the risk of
67 COVID-19 transmission on their campuses. Though such a policy may have contributed to
68 reducing the spread of the disease on college campuses as well as their surrounding

69 communities, it resulted in severe financial and potential academic losses for many colleges. In
70 an attempt to mitigate these losses, college administrators are struggling with the questions of
71 how to reopen in-person activities while prioritizing student safety. In August, 2020, over a third
72 of US colleges and universities had fully in-person classes and around 20% chose to be hybrid (a
73 mix of in-person and remote classes) [1]. Many of these reopenings were followed by campus
74 outbreaks that led universities, including the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill (UNC)
75 and the University of Notre Dame, and Indiana, to shut down or impose increased restrictions
76 once again.

77 In the absence of vaccination and proven treatment, control strategies have focused on
78 social/behavioral factors and preventive strategies such as facemask, reduced class size, reduced
79 social gatherings/events size, and reduced residence hall (dormitory) occupancy to share the
80 common utilities, bathrooms, and so on. Those strategies were combined with regular testing to
81 rapidly detect and quarantine infected students. Previous modeling studies have investigated
82 different aspects of COVID-19 spread on college campuses [2-7]. For example, Paltiel et al. [8]
83 used a simple homogeneous mixing SEIR compartmental model to evaluate the effectiveness of
84 screening strategies in a college with 5000 students; Weeden and Gornwell [9] designed student
85 contact networks through transcript data and used these networks to study the effectiveness of
86 small course enrollments on reducing the risk of epidemic spread. Gressman and Peck [10] used
87 a full-scale stochastic agent-based model (ABM) of a reasonably large research university to
88 conclude that testing accuracy is a critical issue and holding large classes greatly increases the
89 risk of a significant outbreak on campus. Goyal et al. [11] also developed an ABM that
90 incorporates important features related to risk at the University of California San Diego to assess
91 the potential impact of strategies to reduce outbreaks. They found that increased frequency of

92 asymptomatic testing from monthly to twice weekly has minimal impact on average outbreak
93 size, but substantially reduces the maximum outbreak size and cumulative number of cases.
94 Inspired by their work, we developed an individual-based model to quantitatively assess the
95 relative contribution from class, dorm, and social activities on the COVID-transmission and to
96 quantitatively assess different control strategies such as screening and test with different
97 frequency, class-size, dorm-size, and social-size control.

98 Even though vaccination of college students has started on most college campuses in the US,
99 outbreaks could continue occurring due to incomplete population coverage and the appearance of
100 new virus variants as the effect of vaccines on viral transmission and new virus variants are
101 currently unknown [12, 13]. Given these uncertainties, university administrators are still
102 determining to what degree they should continue adherence to non-pharmaceutical interventions.

103 **Challenges of Covid transmission and college specifics**

104 Mathematical models are powerful tools to explore disease transmission, and the complex
105 landscape of intervention strategies to quantify and assess different options. One of the key
106 challenges in modeling the spread of Covid-like pathogens in local communities is an efficient
107 account (parameterization) of human social interactions. Conventional approach (population-
108 based) employs a simplified form of social interactions based on ‘mean contact rate/host’ [14,
109 15]. To address this limitation, individual-based modeling has been widely used in the study of
110 pathogen spread and infection control, including Covid-19 [16-22]. Some have used individual-
111 based models (IBM) where a community is viewed as a randomly colliding system of ‘host-
112 particles’, whereby ‘infectives’ transmit the pathogen to ‘susceptibles’ via random collisions.
113 The intensity (rate) of transmission is proportional to mean contact rate. On the opposite side are

114 IBM based on social network structure where transmission pathways are confined to one's
115 'neighbors' - adjacent nodes on the social network [23]. In real life human social contact mixing
116 combines both random and scheduled (prescribed) contacts. Our proposed approach differs from
117 previous works in two important aspects: 1) the basic transmission step in our model is 'many-to-
118 many' [24] vs. conventional 'one-to-one'; 2) we keep a detailed account of daily social
119 interactions.

120 Here, we developed a flexible computational framework to model the spread of COVID-19 on a
121 residential college campus. The modeling framework accounts for heterogeneity in social
122 interactions, activities, disease progression, and control interventions. This allows us to generate
123 and simulate more realistic synthetic college communities using a handful of basic inputs that
124 combine scheduled and random contacts, and prescribed patterns of disease progression.

125 **Materials and Methods**

126 Two basic components of college IBM include (i) college community and its social interaction
127 patterns and (ii) infection transmission and disease progress. College community is made of
128 individual student hosts (other population groups such as faculty and staff could be added). They
129 are engaged in their daily activities (classes, dorm residence, social mixing). As a pathogen is
130 introduced into such a community it could spread via social interactions.

131 I) **Student body and social mixing** is made of scheduled and random contacts (See
132 Figure 1). Scheduled contacts include classes with assigned seating, and dorm
133 residence. Random social mixing consists of daily aggregation in contact pools of
134 different sizes and frequencies.

135 II) **Disease progression.** In our model, the infection stages are classified as susceptible
136 (S), infected (I), and recovered (R) stages (See Figure 1). Once infected, each
137 individual undergoes a prescribed infection progress pattern determined by stage
138 duration and time-dependent infectivity (See Figure 2(A)). We partition the host
139 population into two groups: asymptomatic and symptomatic. Each one undergoes SIR
140 transitions of prescribed duration and pattern of the I-stage. In our setup variable
141 (dynamic) infectivity serves as a proxy for viral load, a predictor for symptomatic
142 expression, and diagnostic test sensitivity (See Figure 2(B)).

143 [Social interactions](#)

144 Social mixing is implemented in our IBM via contact pools where students aggregate on a daily
145 basis. Two types of contacts are considered:

146 (i) **Scheduled contacts:**

147 (a) **Classes.** We generate a class schedule, including a seat assignment, for every student in
148 our college. We assume that each student has three randomly selected non-overlapping
149 classes. Classes are assigned to meet on a Monday, Wednesday, and Friday (MWF)
150 schedule or on a Tuesday and Thursday (TuTh) schedule. All classes are assigned to a set
151 of days and a time slot.

152 Each class has a prescribed student seating in the classroom and weekly schedule.
153 Students are assigned specific seats in each class period. Based on their seating pattern,
154 an infected individual can spread the pathogen to his/her neighbors within a prescribed
155 radius (Figure S1). Probability of transmission drops with longer distance.

- 156 (b) **Housing/dorm.** A particular form of scheduled contact whereby students aggregate in
157 shared units, halls, utilities etc. In our baseline setting, we randomly divide all students
158 into non-overlapping groups with 7 occupancy per group.
- 159 (ii) **Random social mixing.** We simulate random social mixing using a specified pool size
160 distribution. Specifically, students randomly aggregate on daily basis in contact pools of
161 prescribed sizes $m_1; m_2; \dots$, and frequencies $f_1; f_2; \dots$. The latter accounts for an average
162 number of mixing pools of a given type (per host per day), a proxy for their social-
163 contact preferences. The real number of mixing pools of size m_i is equal to Nf_i (N -total
164 student body size). As each m -pool creates $m(m-1)$ daily contacts, the mean contact
165 rate /host is equal to $w = \sum_{m \geq 2} f_m m(m-1)$ (see Table S1). The mean contact rate plays
166 an important part in the standard SIR modeling, but in our setting the key inputs are
167 numbers $\{m_1; m_2; \dots\}; \{f_1; f_2; \dots\}$. More refined contact pools can be generated from the
168 social network makeup of the host community.
- 169 (iii) **Transmission environment:** Student mixing pools (scheduled and random) aggregate
170 on a daily basis, and provide the key transmission mechanism from infected to
171 susceptibles. Furthermore, a host could partake in several daily activities, and thereby
172 accumulate his/her exposure, or contribution to disease spread. We assume each type of
173 activity (class, dorm, and social) takes place in a suitable environment, and each
174 environment has an associated mean risk factor (a_c, a_d, a_s) . These factors
175 ($0 < a_i < 1$) mitigate the probability of transmission (exposure risk) in a given
176 environment, They vary from 0 (full protection) to 1 (full exposure). In this form they

177 could also be the target of control strategies. More generally, risk factors could be made
178 site-specific (classroom and/or other place of activity). Combined with individual
179 infectivity, environmental risk factors determine the probability of I ->S transmission as
180 elaborated in the next subsection.

181 Note that the risk factors (a_c, a_d, a_s) associated with three transmission environments (class,
182 dorm, and social) are highly uncertain and could vary in different colleges. Hence we explore a
183 range of choices of environmental risk factors: three choices (low, moderate, high) for three
184 environmental risk factors; Besides, we also consider two choices of random social mixing
185 cluster sizes (mean contact rate (MCR) =3, MCR=6). Other parameters of disease progression
186 are reasonably chosen based on literature (See Table S3).

187 Infection and disease progress

188 Different hosts can undergo different disease processes in the I-stage. Here for simplicity we
189 partition the host population into two groups: asymptomatic or symptomatic. The key difference
190 between two is the stage duration and the infectivity function profile. In our setup asymptomatic
191 hosts have shorter duration and lower infectivity [25, 26]. Asymptomatic hosts do not exhibit
192 symptoms over the duration of I-stage, but are still capable of transmitting the pathogen. In
193 contrast, Symptomatic hosts would exhibit disease symptoms after their incubation period.

194 The key quantifier of disease progress in the I-stage, is host infectivity function or post infection
195 $b(d)$ day d . We view it as a proxy for variable viral load in the course of infection. It follows a
196 prescribed dynamic pattern (shown in Figure 2(A)); specifically we use function $B(t) = t^k e^{-kt}$ of
197 steepness k , and define $b(d) = b_M B(d/L)$ where b_M is peak infectivity and L is the mean

198 duration. Each I-host would progress according to his/her $b(d)$, and such patterns could be made
199 individual. But in the current version we partitioned host population into two groups:
200 asymptomatic and symptomatic with different parameters choices for $(b_M; k; L)$ (see Table S3).

201 The infectivity function $b(d)$ determines the probability of transmission per contact from an
202 infected I-host to a fully susceptible S-host. Hence, we employ it to estimate transmission rates
203 within contact pools. We also use it (timing d) as a predictor for symptomatic isolation, and
204 values of $b(d)$ for predicting positive test diagnostics in screening (See Figure 2(B)).

205 Host infection ($S \rightarrow I$) is modeled as a Bernoulli random process with the success probability
206 determined by cumulative daily contact pools of a given susceptible -host. In each contact pool,
207 scheduled or random (class, dorm, social mixing), we estimate the survival probability (staying
208 uninfected) depending on the pool's makeup, and the associated-environmental risk factor.

209 Specifically, a contact pool with m infectives with infectivity levels $\{b_1; \dots; b_m\}$, and

210 environmental risk factor a gives a survival probability of an S-host, $p_s = \prod_{i=1}^m (1 - ab_i)$. Note that

211 the classroom setting is somewhat different from other contact pools, as the probability of
212 survival depends not on the entire body of infected classmates, but only on the ‘nearest infected
213 neighbors’ determined by classroom seating (see SI for details). Several contact pools for a given
214 S-host, could accumulate over a daily period; they determine the final probability of infection,

215 $p_I = 1 - p_{sc} \cdot p_{sd} \cdot p_{ss}$, where p_{sc}, p_{sd}, p_{ss} are survival probabilities in class, dorm and random

216 social mixing.

217 Control interventions

218 Our IBM setup allows us to investigate a wide range of interventions, including (i) symptomatic
219 isolation, (ii) scheduled and random test screening at prescribed weekly schedule; (iii) regulation
220 of class size, dorm occupancy, or social mixing makeup; (iv) vaccination. Furthermore, each
221 transmission environment (classroom, dorm, social) has an associated environmental risk factor
222 which affects the probability of transmission in the setting. These risk factors account for
223 physical conditions (e.g. seat density in classrooms, specifics of dorm units), and behavioral
224 practices (e.g. adherence to face mask or other protective means during contacts). Such
225 environmental inputs are highly uncertain and we explore a range of choices to assess their
226 impact on disease outbreaks and the effectiveness of control strategies.

227 Different control strategies can be compared in terms of their efficacy in mitigating an outbreak.
228 For quantitative assessment of control interventions and their impact, we use two measurements:
229 (i) outbreak size (the cumulative infection by the end of a given time period (e.g. 16-weeks
230 semester) relative to total population); (ii) daily maximal quarantine number estimated from the
231 quarantine pool over the outbreak period. The latter could provide some guidelines to the
232 University administration on how many quarantine rooms to prepare in advance, and could also
233 give a simple economic measure of outbreak impact and putative intervention. Those are
234 estimated and compared with baseline cases to assess the efficacy of control.

235 Numeric procedures, key inputs, and website tool developed

236 All codes of the college IBM and the tools of analysis were implemented in the Wolfram
237 Mathematica platform. Supplement gives a specific parameter used in model simulations, and an
238 outline for generating a synthetic college community from typical class size enrollment, living

239 accommodations, and social activities. Overall, it consists of four key parts: (i) class, dorm,
240 social interaction, and environment risk factor; (ii) disease progression parameter; (iii) control
241 parameter, (iv) student body and initial conditions. A friendly-used website tool was also
242 developed for the public to explore the simulation
243 <https://www.wolframcloud.com/obj/ait14/ibmcollegecovidmodel>.

244

245 Results

246 Outbreak in naive host community

247 We generate a synthetic medium-sized (6000) and a small-size (3000) college community with
248 all students residing in dorms: no intervention (only depends on disease, social mixing, and
249 environment), no pre-existing immunity, and no external source of infection. All results with the
250 6000 student body are represented here, and with the 3000 student body are put in (See Figures
251 S3-S8 in SI). A naive host population is initialized with a few infected individuals.

252 Typical outbreak patterns and parameter sensitivity: baseline cases

253 A typical outbreak pattern and duration depends on transmission intensity. Under high
254 transmission intensity, outbreaks are localized within a limited range (typically less than a 16-
255 week academic semester). However, if transmission intensity is low, they could last much longer
256 and won't be terminated by the end of semester (See Figure 3).

257 All our college simulations were run over a 16-week academic semester. Under high
258 transmission intensity (e.g. high environmental risk), almost all students got infected by the end

259 of a 16-week semester. Therefore, the outbreak size distribution is localized (shown in Figure
260 3(A) and Figure 4). However, low transmission intensity creates a highly dispersed statistical
261 outcome by the end of the 16-week semester, as not all random histories are terminated (See
262 Figure 3(B) and Figure 4). The dispersal also grows larger for smaller student bodies (see details
263 **Figure S3** in SI, for a 3000 student body).

264 To compare Panel (A) with Panel (B) in Figure 4, we can see that random social mixing size also
265 plays an important role in controlling the spread of COVID-19 in college students. From now on,
266 the following experiments are implemented in the setting of the mean contact rate (MCR) of
267 random social mixing =6.

268 To further explore and assess the relative contribution of three environments (class, dorm, and
269 social) on outbreak size, we fixed other parameter values to see what would happen if one
270 environment is ignored, as shown in Figure 5. We observed the relative contribution of the dorm
271 was most significant followed by class and social mixing. Such conclusions could be provisional
272 on our assumptions about dorm, class, social make-up.

273 [Analysis of intervention](#)

274 [Baseline case with symptomatic quarantine](#)

275 We start with a simple scenario (symptomatic quarantine only) shown in Figure 6. We assume
276 that an infected individual would start showing symptoms at around 7 days, based on our time-
277 dependent infectivity level for symptomatic pathways shown in Figure 2. 70% random selection
278 of those individuals showing symptoms are put into quarantine, where they do not mix and
279 transmit the pathogens. Compared with Figure 4 where no control intervention applied, the

280 symptomatic quarantine only scheme (Figure 6) may work fine for the case that we have really
281 good control of risks from all three environments (class, dorm, and social), but definitely not
282 enough for those cases with moderate and high risk factors. In the latter, the scheme has minimal
283 impact on the outbreak size, but raises a significant economic burden to do quarantines.

284 The clue to low efficacy of symptomatic screening lies in (i) transmission rate is still high,
285 though symptomatic quarantine tries to lower it; (ii) the role of asymptomatic individuals in
286 transmission and the delay of detection. To test (i)-(ii) in the following subsection, we first
287 selected five typical cases from Figure 6 (70% symptomatic quarantine only) as our baseline
288 cases: MMM (the first letter represents the risk level for class, followed by dorm and social),
289 LMH, MHL, HLM, and HHH. For example, LMH means low risk factor for class, moderate risk
290 factor for dorm, and high risk factor for social activity.

291 [Class, Dorm, and Social size regulation](#)

292 We then consider the following means of social control: reduced class size, dorm occupancy,
293 random mixing pools, coupled with 70% symptomatic quarantine: (i) class size reduction at 25%
294 and 50% is achieved by randomly selecting a fraction of students to attend in-person from the
295 original class enrollment. While removed from their classes the remaining fraction could still
296 contribute to transmission through other activities; (ii) dorm occupancy per unit is similarly
297 reduced by 25%, 50%; (iii) random social mixing is reduced by 50%, via regulating pool sizes
298 and their frequency; (iv) combined interventions: (a) 25% class-size reduction + 25% dorm-
299 occupancy per unit reduction, (b) 50% class-size reduction + 50% dorm-occupancy per unit
300 reduction, (c) 50% class-size reduction + 50% dorm-occupancy per unit reduction + 50% mean
301 contact rate of random social mixing reduction.

302 Figures 7-8 and Table 1 show the effect of above interventions on relative outbreak size and
303 maximum quarantine capacity, respectively. The last scheme, 50% class-size reduction + 50%
304 dorm-occupancy-per-unit reduction + 50% mean contact rate of random social mixing reduction,
305 could prevent an outbreak with some control on environmental risks, but still would lead to
306 failure if there is no control on environmental risks. Overall, the effect of class, dorm, and social
307 mixing size regulation is highly dependent on the risk control (e.g., wearing facial masks in
308 class, dorm, and other social activities) in those three environments. Moreover, the reduced
309 transmission would lead to a lower number of quarantine rooms, which reduces the economic
310 burden of the University.

311 [Screening and Tests](#)

312 Next, we explore different Screening and Test policies coupled with 70% symptomatic
313 quarantine as follows: (i) we assume that the University is capable of doing about 7% of
314 population screening capacity and tests per day from randomly selected pools (i.e., about 100%
315 of the population every two week). The sensitivity of the test is assumed to be time-dependent
316 for both asymptomatic and symptomatic infected individuals (Figure 2); (ii) we assume that the
317 University is capable of doing 14% of population screening and tests per day from randomly
318 selected pools (i.e., about 100% of the population per week).

319 Note that the above two Screening and Test policies are coupled with daily random 70%
320 symptomatic quarantine (i.e., an infected individual is assumed to start showing symptoms at
321 around 7 days of infection, then 70% random selection of those individuals showing symptoms
322 are put into quarantine).

323 Figure 9 and Table 2 show that the high frequency of screening and tests is an effective control
324 strategy to mitigate and even prevent the outbreak of COVID-19 in colleges coupled with some
325 control of the risk factors in class, dorm, and social environments. Moreover, since random
326 screening testing allows for the successful and early detection of both asymptomatic and
327 symptomatic individuals, it successfully reduces the transmission rate such that the maximum
328 quarantine capacity is far lower than expected to further reduce the economic burden caused
329 from quarantine.

330 Vaccination scenarios

331 Here we assume two simple vaccine scenarios (i) 50% students are vaccinated with 95% efficacy
332 (ref), so we simply assume $50\% \times 95\% = 47.5\%$ students are fully protected (See Figure 10(A));
333 (ii) 80% students are vaccinated with 95% efficacy, i.e., 76% students are fully protected (See
334 Figure 10(B)). We then explore the effect of lifting the screening and testing with less frequency,
335 e.g., testing every week, every two weeks, every 4 weeks, every 8 weeks, and no random
336 screening at all (i.e., symptomatic screening only). We selected five typical cases as our baseline
337 cases: MMM (the first letter represents the risk level for class, followed by dorm and social),
338 LMH, MHL, HLM, and HHH. A simple conclusion is that the herd immunity can be achieved as
339 a result of 50% to 80% vaccination. When herd immunity is not reached, it is optimal to retain
340 some level of environmental risk control on class, social and dorm (e.g., the use of facial masks).
341 The impact of random screening was shown to be less important compared to environmental risk
342 control.

343

344 Discussion

345 Controlling the spread of COVID-19 is a critical challenge for colleges and universities planning
346 to reopen on-campus educational, research, sports, and social activities in the fall. Even though
347 the vaccination of college students has started on many college campuses across the US, it may
348 not by itself prevent an outbreak due to incomplete coverage. University administrators are still
349 wondering to what degree they should continue to implement non-pharmaceutical interventions
350 and what are the most efficient control strategies.

351 To capture the disease dynamic on campus and answer those questions, we developed an
352 individual-based model (IBM) of COVID-19 transmission that accounts for heterogeneity in
353 social interactions, disease progression, and control interventions. Since social mixing plays an
354 important part in COVID-19 transmission, we considered two basic types of mixing typical for
355 college communities: (i) scheduled contacts (classes and dorm residence), (ii) random contacts
356 (e.g., dining and/or other forms of unstructured social activity). Once infected each host
357 undergoes a prescribed disease progression history, with a time-dependent infectivity pattern,
358 viewed as a proxy for variable viral load during the course of infection. Such a computational
359 framework allows us to generate and simulate more realistic college communities than standard
360 SEIR models [8], and quantitatively assess the efficacy of different intervention strategies.

361 In our IBM setup, daily activities (class, dorm, and social mixing) takes place in a suitable
362 environment, and each environment is assumed to have an associated risk factor (a_c, a_d, a_s) .
363 These factors may mitigate the probability of transmission (exposure risk) in a given
364 environment ($0 < a_i < 1$). So they could represent site-specific control interventions (e.g.,
365 wearing facial masks, or providing clean contact space). Since these factors are highly uncertain

366 and could vary in different colleges, we explore a range of choices of environmental risk factors,
367 by taking three values (low, moderate, high) of each environmental risk factor (dorm, class,
368 social mixing). Another control focus could be social activities (pool sizes). Our numeric
369 simulations and analysis indicate that mixing-pool size could play an important role in
370 containing COVID-19 outbreaks. We assessed the relative contribution of three environmental
371 risk factors on outbreak size. Among these, the dorm risk was found as most significant,
372 followed by classroom risk, and random social mixing. However, this observation is provisional
373 on the underlying assumptions of the model about dorms, classrooms, social make-up.

374 A simple intervention based on symptomatic quarantine only was shown to have minimal impact
375 on the outbreak size. The low efficacy of the symptomatic screening is due to the large
376 contribution of asymptomatic hosts to disease transmission a delayed onset of symptoms,
377 whereby pre-symptomatic (infective) individuals could still contribute to its spread. We found
378 that the high frequency (weekly) random screening is the most effective non-pharmaceutical
379 control strategy to mitigate and even prevent an outbreak, when coupled with an additional risk
380 mitigation measure (e.g., facial mask) in classrooms, dorms, and social activities. Since random
381 screening testing allows for the successful and early detection of both asymptomatic and
382 symptomatic individuals, it successfully reduces the transmission rate such that the maximum
383 quarantine capacity is far lower than expected to further reduce the economic burden caused
384 from quarantine.

385 We also conducted a simple analysis on vaccination assuming 50% and 80% of the student body
386 immunized with 95% vaccine efficacy. In most cases, it sufficed to prevent an outbreak or
387 significantly mitigate its size. In highly transmissive environments, efficient
388 environmental/behavioral control measures (i.e., wearing facial masks in class, dorms, or at

389 social events) are required to mitigate disease spread even with a 80% vaccination coverage. But
390 the frequency of random test screening could be highly reduced or replaced with symptomatic
391 screening only (Figure 10).

392 Our results should be robust for colleges/universities with a smaller student body (See Figures
393 S3-S8 in SI). The proposed individual-based modeling framework can be readily applicable to
394 other aerosol or airborne infectious diseases like COVID-19. Indeed, the social mixing
395 component of the system is independent of disease progress. The potential to generate and
396 simulate synthetic college communities can be employed with robust predictions. Moreover, our
397 methodology can be extended to other local community settings such as workplaces, primary and
398 secondary schools, or hospitals.

399 Many additional topics could be explored by our IBM methodology, including consistent
400 procedures to assess risk factors and relative contributions of different transmission
401 environments and social mixing patterns on disease outbreak. Such assessment could guide
402 effective intervention strategies. Our social mixing setup (scheduled and random) could be
403 further expanded to account for more realistic intermediate levels of social connectivity. This
404 work could also be extended to account for partial or dynamic vaccine schedules. Besides, since
405 college campuses are often not isolated, we could extend current model to couple college campus
406 transmission to the local community.

407 **Conclusions**

408 Our analysis has implications for college reopening and in-person activities, planned in the near
409 future. The risk of COVID-19 outbreak could be efficiently controlled or mitigated using
410 existing control measures. Without vaccine, the high frequency (weekly) random screening

411 appears the most effective control strategy, that would allow to mitigate and even prevent an
412 outbreak on college campuses, coupled with some environmental/behavioral control (e.g., facial
413 mask in class, dorm, and social events). Our analysis of vaccination shows that some level of
414 herd immunity could be attained at 50% -80% vaccine coverage. Below herd immunity level,
415 additional environmental/behavioral control measures are essential, but random screening is less
416 important and could be reduced or lifted.

417 [Acknowledgement](#)

418 We would like to thank Dr. Daniel Tisch from the Department of Population and Quantitative
419 Health Sciences, School of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University, for comments and
420 discussions. We also would like to thank Audrey Tsoi, an undergraduate student from
421 Department of Mathematics, Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Case Western Reserve
422 University, for help with software and web implementation.

423 [Declarations of interest](#)

424 None.

425 [Funding](#)

426 This work was supported by the National Science Foundation RAPID Award [grant number
427 DEB-2028631 to QH, AM, and DG] and the National Science Foundation RAPID Award [grant
428 number DEB-2028632 to MNM]; Funders had no role in study design, writing of the report, or
429 the decision to submit for publication. The corresponding authors had the final responsibility to
430 submit for publication.

431 **Author contributions**

432 **Qimin Huang:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Writing - Original Draft,
433 Visualization, Formal analysis; **Martial Ndeffo-Mbah:** Conceptualization, Methodology,
434 Writing - Review & Editing; **Anirban Mondal:** Methodology, Writing - Review & Editing;
435 **Sara Lee:** Resources, Writing - Review & Editing; **David Gurarie:** Conceptualization,
436 Methodology, Software, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision.

437

Reference

1. Here's our list of colleges' reopening models. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/heres-a-list-of-colleges-plans-for-reopening-in-the-fall/>
2. Rennert L, Kalbaugh CA, Shi L, McMahan C. Modelling the impact of presemester testing on COVID-19 outbreaks in university campuses. *BMJ Open* **2020**; 10:e042578.
3. Rennert L, McMahan C, Kalbaugh CA, et al. Surveillance-based informative testing for detection and containment of SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks on a public university campus: an observational and modelling study. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health* **2021**; 5:428-36.
4. Elbanna A, Wong GN, Weiner ZJ, et al. Entry screening and multi-layer mitigation of COVID-19 cases for a safe university reopening. *MedRxiv* **2020**.
5. Lopman B, Liu CY, Le Guillou A, et al. A modeling study to inform screening and testing interventions for the control of SARS-CoV-2 on university campuses. *Scientific Reports* **2021**; 11:1-11.
6. Hambridge HL, Kahn R, Onnela J-P. Examining sars-cov-2 interventions in residential colleges using an empirical network. *medRxiv* **2021**.
7. Bahl R, Eikmeier N, Fraser A, et al. Modeling COVID-19 spread in small colleges. arXiv preprint arXiv:200809597 **2020**.
8. Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Walensky RP. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 screening strategies to permit the safe reopening of college campuses in the United States. *JAMA Network Open* **2020**; 3:e2016818-e.
9. Weeden KA, Cornwell B. The small-world network of college classes: implications for epidemic spread on a university campus. *Sociological Science* **2020**; 7:222-41.

10. Gressman PT, Peck JR. Simulating COVID-19 in a university environment. *Mathematical Biosciences* **2020**; 328:108436.
11. Goyal R, Hotchkiss J, Schooley RT, De Gruttola V, Martin NK. Evaluation of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Transmission Mitigation Strategies on a University Campus Using an Agent-Based Network Model. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **2021**.
12. Forni G, Mantovani A. COVID-19 vaccines: where we stand and challenges ahead. *Cell Death & Differentiation* **2021**; 28:626-39.
13. World Health Organization. The effects of virus variants on COVID-19 vaccines. <https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/the-effects-of-virus-variants-on-covid-19-vaccines>
14. Lopman B, Liu C, Le Guillou A, et al. A model of COVID-19 transmission and control on university campuses. *medRxiv* **2020**.
15. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, et al. Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS Med* **2008**; 5:e74.
16. Ferguson NM, Cummings DA, Fraser C, Cajka JC, Cooley PC, Burke DS. Strategies for mitigating an influenza pandemic. *Nature* **2006**; 442:448-52.
17. Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati Gilani G, et al. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand. **2020**.
18. Bonabeau E. Agent-based modeling: Methods and techniques for simulating human systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **2002**; 99:7280-7.
19. Enanoria WT, Liu F, Zipprich J, et al. The effect of contact investigations and public health interventions in the control and prevention of measles transmission: A simulation study. *PLoS one* **2016**; 11:e0167160.

20. Sewell DK, Miller A, Program CM-H. Simulation-free estimation of an individual-based SEIR model for evaluating nonpharmaceutical interventions with an application to COVID-19 in the District of Columbia. *PloS one* **2020**; 15:e0241949.
21. Auchincloss AH, Diez Roux AV. A new tool for epidemiology: the usefulness of dynamic-agent models in understanding place effects on health. *American Journal of Epidemiology* **2008**; 168:1-8.
22. Epstein JM. Modelling to contain pandemics. *Nature* **2009**; 460:687-.
23. Wolfram C. An agent-based model of covid-19. *Complex Systems* **2020**; 29.
24. Huang Q, Mondal A, Jiang X, et al. SARS-CoV-2 transmission and control in a hospital setting: an individual-based modelling study. *Royal Society Open Science* **2021**; 8.
25. Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Microbe* **2020**.
26. Johansson MA, Quandelacy TM, Kada S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission From People Without COVID-19 Symptoms. *JAMA Network Open* **2021**; 4:e2035057-e.

Tables

Table 1: The effect of class, dorm, and social size on relative outbreak size with a 6000 student body during a 16-week semester. We selected five typical cases as our baseline cases: MMM (the first letter represents the risk level for class, followed by dorm and social), LMH, MHL, HLM, and HHH. For example, LMH means low risk factor for class, moderate risk factor for dorm, and high risk factor for social activity. We explored the 8 different choices of class, dorm, and social size regulation. The results shown are predicted median (25% quantile and 75% quantile)

		Five typical choices of environmental risks of class, dorm and social				
		MMM	LMH	MHL	HLM	HHH
Baseline case		84.1% (83.3%, 84.8%)	90.6% (90.3%, 91.1%)	96.1% (95.9%, 96.4%)	88.0% (87.4%, 88.4%)	99.5% (99.5%, 99.6%)
class-size control	25% reduction of class size	62.5% (47.6%, 69.3%)	88.4% (87.9%, 88.8%)	90.2% (88.2%, 91.3)	66.6% (58.1%, 69.4%)	99.0% (99.0%, 99.1%)
	50% reduction of	19.6%	86.3%	39.7%	4.2%	98.5%

	class size	(7.2%, 32.9%)	(85.6%, 87.0%)	(21.3%, 51.7%)	(0.1%, 11.7%)	(98.4%, 98.6%)
dorm-unit control	25% reduction of dorm occupancy	61.4% (45.8%, 67.3%)	83.0% (82.5%, 83.9%)	84.3% (82.2%, 85.6%)	84.4% (83.7%, 84.9%)	98.7% (98.6%, 98.8%)
	50% reduction of dorm occupancy	30.0% (11.7%, 44.2%)	74.5% (72.0%, 76.8%)	51.2% (33.3%, 62.3%)	81.5% (80.8%, 82.4%)	97.8% (97.7%, 98.0%)
social-mixing size control	50% reduction of social	75.6% (69.6%, 77.7%)	81.6% (79.7%, 82.7%)	92.2% (94.9%, 95.6%)	84.8% (84.3%, 85.4%)	99.2% (99.1%, 99.3%)
combined class, dorm, and social regulation	25% reduction of class and dorm	10.9% (0.6%, 18.7%)	77.3% (73.3%, 78.4%)	31.5% (21.6%, 42.3%)	34.0% (3.7%, 45.7%)	97.3% (97.2%, 97.5%)
	50% reduction	0.1%	37.2%	0.2%	0.1%	91.6%

	class and dorm	(0%, 0.4%)	(15.4%, 50.3%)	(0%, 0.4%)	(0%, 0.6%)	(91.2%, 91.9%)
	50% reduction of class, dorm and social	0% (0%, 0.2%)	0.3% (0%, 4.0%)	0.1% (0%, 0.3%)	0.1% (0%, 0.2%)	81.4% (78.1%, 82.7%)

Table 2: The effect of two different screening and test regulations on relative outbreak size and maximum quarantine capacity with a 6000 student body during a 16-week semester: random screening 100% of population every two week and random screening 100% of population every week. We selected five typical cases as our baseline cases: MMM (the first letter represents the risk level for class, followed by dorm and social), LMH, MHL, HLM, and HHH. The results shown are predicted median (25% quantile and 75% quantile).

			Five typical choices of environmental risks of class, dorm and social				
			MMM	LMH	MHL	HLM	HHH
Relative outbreak size	Baseline case		84.1% (83.3%, 84.8%)	90.6% (90.3%, 91.1%)	96.1% (95.9%, 96.4%)	88.0% (87.4%, 88.4%)	99.5% (99.5%, 99.6%)
	Screening and Tests	Random screening every two week	41.6% (20.0%, 55.2%)	75.2% (63.2%, 76.6%)	82.5% (77.7%, 84.3%)	71.2% (59.8%, 73.1%)	97.6% (97.5%, 97.8%)

		Random screening every week	1.0% (0%, 9.4%)	12.7% (0%, 32.5%)	20.4% (5.1%, 36.8%)	9.8% (0%, 32.7%)	91.3% (90.9%, 91.6%)
Maximum Daily Quarantine	Baseline case		1155 (1127, 1177)	1516 (1483, 1537)	1574 (1550, 1600)	1465 (1430, 1493)	2726 (2695, 2752)
	Screening and Tests	Random screening every two week	612 (323, 721)	1131 (1042, 1187)	1206 (1153, 1252)	1101 (999, 1164)	2962 (2927, 2995)
		Random screening every week	19 (5, 121)	216 (5, 491)	320 (65, 556)	146 (4, 489)	2695 (2643, 2753)

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Figures




Figure 1: An abstract flowchart of social mixing and disease progress. Social mixing is implemented in our IBM via contact pools where students aggregate on a daily basis. Two types of contacts are considered: Scheduled (class and dorm mixing) and random (dining and/or other random social mixing). The infection stages are classified as susceptible (S), infected (I), and recovered (R) stages.




Figure 2: Upper panel is time-dependent infectivity levels for Asymptomatic and Symptomatic individuals, respectively. Lower panel is the time-dependent probability of a positive test for asymptomatic and symptomatic individuals, respectively.




Figure 3: Typical outbreak histories of susceptible, infected, and recovered for a high transmission scenario (Panel A) and for a low transmission scenario (Panel B), respectively. The black vertical line in Panel B means the end of a 16-week academic semester.




Figure 4: We consider three different levels of environmental risk (low, medium, and high) for three environments (class, dorm, and social mixing) and two choices of social mixing sizes (MCR=3 and MCR=6) to run our college IBM for a 16-week semester. LC, MC, and HC represent low, medium, and high risk factors for class; LD, MD, and HD represent small, medium, and high risk factors for dorms; LS, MS, and HS represent small, medium, and high risk factors for social activity. The output is split into triples, so we have 27 combinations of parameter choices for each panel. 100 realizations were run for each case and the light shaded region indicated the quantiles of the distribution of the median. Panel (A): random social mixing: mean contact rate (MCR)=3. Panel (B): MCR=6 case.




Figure 5: Predicted outbreak size distribution obtained by removing specific transmission environments: panel (A) no classroom transmission; Panel (B) no dorm transmission. Panel (C) and (D) no random social mixing. Mean contact rate for random social mixing in all cases is $MCR=6$.




Figure 6: The effect of symptomatic quarantine on relative outbreak size and maximum quarantine capacity (for college size 6000). We assume an infected individual from a symptomatic pool would exhibit symptoms after day 7, based on our time-dependent infectivity pattern (Figure 2). A random fraction of those (70%) are quarantined and don't contribute to transmission. Once recovered they are released into the normal (class-dorm-social) setting.




Figure 7: Combined control interventions of class-size, dorm-occupancy, and social mixing pools on outbreak size. We selected five typical reference cases: MMM (the first letter represents the risk level for class, followed by dorm and social), LMH, MHL, HLM, and HHH. For example, LMH means low risk factor for class, moderate risk factor for dorm, and high risk factor for social activity. We explored the 8 different choices of class, dorm, and social size regulation.




Figure 8: The effect of different combinations of class, dorm, and social control on maximum quarantine. We selected five typical cases as our baseline cases: MMM, LMH, MHL, HLM, and HHH, using the same setting as in Figure 7. We explored the 8 different choices of class, dorm, and social size regulation.




Figure 9: The effect of two different screening and test regulations on outbreak size and maximum quarantine capacity: random screening 100% of the population every two week and random screening 100% of population every week. We selected five typical cases as our baseline cases: MMM, LMH, MHL, HLM, and HHH, using the same setting as in Figure 7.




Figure 10: The effect of two vaccine scenarios and five different screening-and-test regulations on outbreak size and maximum quarantine capacity. Panel (A): 50% vaccinated with 95% efficacy; Panel (B): 80% vaccinated with 95% efficacy. For each vaccine scenario, we explore five different screening-and-test regulations: 1. no random screening (70% symptomatic quarantine); 2. random screening every eight week + 70% symptomatic quarantine; 3. random screening every four week + 70% symptomatic quarantine; 4. random screening every two week + 70% symptomatic quarantine; 5. random screening every week + 70% symptomatic quarantine; We selected five typical cases as our baseline cases: MMM, LMH, MHL, HLM, and HHH, using the same setting as in Figure 7.