medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

COVID-19 infections in day care centres in Germany: Social and organizational determinants of infections in children and staff in the second and third wave of the pandemic

Franz Neuberger[1], Mariana Grgic[1], Svenja Diefenbacher[1], Florian Spensberger[1], Ann-Sophie Lehfeld[2], Udo Buchholz[2], Walter Haas[2], Bernhard Kalicki[1], and Susanne Kuger[1]

[1]German Youth Institute (DJI), Munich, Germany
[2]Robert Koch-Institute (RKI), Berlin, Germany

2nd June 2021

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: During the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, German early childhood education and care (ECEC) centres organized childrens attendance variably (i.e., reduced opening hours, emergency support for few children only or full close-down). Further, protection and hygiene measures like fixed children/staff groups, ventilation and surface disinfection were introduced among ECEC centres. To inform or modify public health measures in ECEC, we investigate the occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 infections among children and staff of ECEC centres in light of social determinants (socioeconomic status of the children) and recommended structural and hygiene measures. We focus on the question if the relevant factors differ between the 2nd (when no variant of concern (VOC) circulated) and the 3rd wave (when VOC B.1.1.7 predominated).

Methods: Based on panel data from a weekly online survey of ECEC centre managers (start August 2020, ongoing) including approx. 8500 centres, we estimate the number of SARS-CoV-2 infections in children and staff using random-effect-within-between (REWB) panel models for count data in both waves.

Results: In centres with a high proportion of children with low socioeconomic status (SES), the risk of infections in staff and children is more than doubled in both waves. Fixed child/staff cohorts seem more important in the 3rd wave.

Contribution: ECEC centres with a large proportion of children from a low SES background and lack of using fixed child/staff cohorts experience higher COVID-19 rates. Centres should be supported in maintaining recommended measures over the long run. Preventive measures such as vaccination of staff should be prioritised in centres with large proportions of low SES children.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, ECEC, Germany

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

In calendar week (CW) 16 (middle of April) 2021 Germany was in its 3rd pandemic COVID-19 wave. While the 1st wave in spring 2020 was relatively brief followed by a phase of low incidence during summer 2020, the 2nd wave started approximately in CW 40/2020 and lasted until the first weeks in 2021. The 3rd wave followed on foot and was characterized by a parallel rise of the proportion of specimens diagnosed as the VOC B.1.1.7 ("British variant"). To curb high incidences, the German government ordered national lockdowns. One related objective was to reduce the number of children in early childhood education and care (ECEC) centres to reduce the number of contacts among and between parents, staff and children [1–5].

Childrens Attendance in German ECEC Centres during the Corona Pandemic

During the 1st wave, a "strict" lockdown was introduced during which only children of parents providing essential services (i.e., jobs necessary for peoples daily lives such as physicians or food vendors) and children in need of child welfare services (e.g., cases of maltreatment) could attend ECEC centres [5]. During the 2nd wave, a "strict" lockdown was installed from CW 51/2020 until CW 04/2021. Throughout this "strict" lockdown, children of all families could attend ECEC in principle. However, most federal states appealed to parents to keep their children at home if possible [1–4]. During the 3rd pandemic wave (starting in CW 05/2021, ongoing until at least CW 22/2021), implementation of measures was largely dependent on the incidence of individual counties. Hence, ECEC attendance regulations differed widely across regional meso and micro levels as did, in consequence, the numbers of attending children.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 involving Young Children: unclear role of preventive and Hygiene Measures

Before circulation of VOC B.1.1.7 (i.e., prior to the 3rd wave), children 1-11 years old were under-represented among COVID-19 cases compared to their proportion in the general population and they were particularly under-represented among cases experiencing severe outcomes, such as hospitalization, requiring respiratory support or death [6]. Two systematic literature reviews conducted in 2020, i.e. before circulation of VOC B.1.1.7, concluded that they were less susceptible than adults [7, 8]. Data on infectiousness have shown equivocal results. In household studies children were rarely identified as primary cases [6] and gave rise to a lower (secondary) attack rate ((S)AR) of 7.9% (95% confidence interval (CI), 1.7%-16.8%) compared to that of adults (15%, 95% CI, 6.2%-27%) [9]. In German ECEC centres, children with COVID-19 infections have led to an average SAR of 1.7% and small outbreak sizes (average size: 3-4 cases) [10].

Environmental, contact or fomite transmission are all terms that are used interchangeably, and their association with the COVID-19 pandemic is controversial. Ferretti estimates that 10% of transmissions may be due to "environmental" factors, i.e. contact transmission [11]. Meyerowitz concludes that there is currently no conclusive evidence for fomite or direct contact transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in humans [12].

Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 occurs mainly through the respiratory route. Within the respiratory routel, both short and long range transmissions are believed to play a role [12–14]. Exhaled aerosols can float in the air for hours [15], and half life of viable virus in small particles is estimated as approximately one hour [16]. Once certain boundary data, such as room size, duration of exposure, number of persons exposed and type and degree of ventilation are known, it has been possible to predict the attack rate of outbreaks [17]. Conversely, at least among households, ventilation was shown to be protective for secondary infections [18]. These findings have led to the recom-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

mendations to keep a minimum distance of 1.5 m to other persons, wear masks and ventilate rooms where several persons are present at the same time.

In principle, these recommended behaviours provide protection in the context of ECEC centres as well. However, as most transmission studies have been conducted among adults, the evidence base for preventive recommendations among children is largely unexplored. For children at preschool age, it cannot be expected to keep a distance of 1.5 m to peers or staff, nor to wear masks. Recommended measures for ECEC centres have thus focused on organisational changes as well as infection control / hygiene recommendations for staff and parents.

Before the pandemic, the following (pedagogical) group concepts typically existed in German ECEC settings: (i) fixed groups, (ii) open groups (children can freely choose and switch between groups), and (iii) mixed concept, e.g. a fixed group in the morning and free roaming in the afternoon. These concepts leave all options open how staff is assigned to groups. An important organisational change in ECEC centres was the recommendation or order (depending on incidence rate) to switch not only to fixed groups, but to also keep educators of a given group constant (fixed staff assignment to a particular group). In addition, infection control and hygiene recommendations included regular ventilation of rooms and regular disinfection of surfaces [19].

Project Description

The German Youth-Institute ("Deutsches Jugendinstitut"; DJI) and the Robert Koch-Institute (the national public health institute; RKI) joined forces to monitor the situation of pre-school children during the pandemic. The study "Corona-KiTa" comprises four modules which address different research questions. In one of the project modules, the DJI established a novel surveillance system targeting and drawing information directly from ECEC centres (the so-called "KiTa-Register" which translates into "ECEC centre registry") providing panel data. It is important to note, that until then, there was no central registry to frequently monitor settings activities. The sys-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

tem started to collect weekly data in CW 36/2020. It has been set up to monitor the re-opening and closing of ECEC centres, the rate of children attending settings and the staff in attendance during the pandemic. Furthermore, information on COVID-19 infections in ECEC centres and the implementation of infection control and hygiene measures has been collected. Hence, it offers a unique database to identify determinants that may influence the frequency of COVID-19 infections among children and staff in ECEC centres.

Research Questions

To inform public health policy, we analysed data from the ECEC centre registry. We put a focus on the questions (1) to understand relevant determinants, risk and protective factors for COVID-19 occurrence in ECEC centres, (2) whether factors associated with infections differ between children and staff, and (3) as the 3rd wave is largely driven by the mutated VOC B.1.1.7 [20] with possibly different epidemiological properties if the relevant factors differ between the 2nd and 3rd wave.

Methods

Data

To investigate possibly predictive and protective factors of COVID-19 infections in ECEC centres, this paper uses the panel data set of ECEC centres in Germany established by the DJI within the Corona-KiTa-Study in cooperation with the RKI. From CW 36 in August 2020 we asked managers of all ECEC centres in Germany to fill out a weekly questionnaire. Until CW 16/2021 (the end of April 2021), 8,590 of roughly 54,000 ECEC centre managers participated at least once with an average number of 23 reported weeks. The survey comprises a baseline questionnaire distributed at registration and subsequent weekly questionnaires. The baseline questionnaire inquires about basic time-constant information such as the provider type, the centres proportion of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

children from households with low socioeconomic status (SES) and the group concept prior to the pandemic. The weekly questionnaire collects information about the current week and contains time-varying variables such as the number and age of children currently attending the ECEC centre, the number of staff working at the ECEC centre in general as well as in the current week, the currently applied group concept, if staff was assigned firmly to groups (fixed staff assignment (only asked if ECEC previously used a fixed or mixed group concept)), application of certain hygiene measures, as well as the number of children, staff and parents who are tested positive for COVID-19.

Dependent variables

We use the number of reported infections per week as a dependent variable. To measure infections in staff and children, ECEC centre managers were asked if they had any new laboratory confirmed cases of COVID-19 in children or staff. Infections were reported for staff members and for children separately. For data protection reasons, detailed information on infections in staff was only asked in ECEC centres with at least 7 staff members (which applies to 97% of our sample). The serial interval of COVID-19 (i.e., the average interval from the onset of illness in an infectious / case to the onset of illness of a case infected by that case) is estimated to have a duration of 5 days [21, 22]. After laboratory diagnosis, 1-3 days may pass until the result of a test is available at the county health department [23]. Hence, we included the variable "number of infections" with a lead of one week in our models and estimated the rate of infection in CW X+1 with data from CW X. We do not analyse infections in parents, as the link to the ECEC centre is not necessarily given here.

Independent variables

As possible predictors for the number of reported infections, we use variables which are either time-constant or time-variant.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Time-constant variables

Type of provider: The type of provider (public, private for-profit, ecclesiastical or other non-profit) of the ECEC centres is included, since it might be associated with the (systematic) implementation of particular hygiene measures.

Socioeconomic status: COVID-19 infections are known to follow a social gradient [24, 25]. To control for social composition, ECEC managers were asked to estimate the proportion of children with low socioeconomic status (SES) on a 4 point Likert scale (i.e., below 10% children with low SES background, 11% to 30%, 31% to 60%, orabove 60%, respectively).

Group concept prior to the pandemic: To grasp differences in the set-up of the institutions which might make it difficult to implement certain measures such as e.g. group separation, we include the type of pedagogical group concept before the pandemic in our model.

We include these variables as time-constant dummy variables in the models.

Time-varying variables

Currently applied group concept: Managers indicated which group concept was currently in use (i.e., fixed, open, partly open see above). We analysed the currently applied group concept as this may facilitate close contact to more or less children or staff in the ECEC centres. We distinguished between the three categories "open group concept", i.e. attendants could mix freely, "partly open" and "fixed", i.e. strict assignment of children to only one group.

Infection control and hygiene measures: Managers specified which other measures they took: (1) Regular ventilation of the rooms, (2) regular surface disinfection (e.g., furniture surfaces, door handles or toys), and (3) a fixed staff assignment to groups (only asked for fixed or mixed group concepts).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Control variables

7-day incidence on county level: Laboratory confirmed COVID-19 cases are notified to the local health authority (LHA) in accordance with the German Protection against Infection Act (IfSG)[1]. The LHA transmits reported cases via the respective federal state health authority to the RKI. The 7-day incidence includes the number of newly reported cases within seven days per 100,000 population.

Number of Children: Managers indicated per week how many children aged 0-2, 3-5, and 6 years and older attended the ECEC centres. These numbers may change due to (perhaps only regionally observed) holidays as well as regional outbreaks and measures taken by the federal state or county.

We use the latter two variables, 7-day incidence on county level and number of children attending, to control for possible exposure to the virus.

Statistical analyses

Our data provide various information about ECEC centres, namely on *time-constant* variables related to the centre from the baseline questionnaire, on average differences in the time-varying variables *between* ECEC centres and on changes *within* a centre as well. Since the Poisson distribution is known to approximate incidence counts from a wide variety of underlying processes [26], we use a random-effect panel poisson model for count data with demeaned data to approximate incidence counts (see formula 1). That allows us to estimate the effects of time-constant variables, between-unit differences and within-unit changes on the incidence count at the same time [27, 28].

$$log(E(y_{i,t+1})) = \alpha + \beta_{1within}(x_{it} - \bar{x}_i) + \beta_{2between}\bar{x}_i + \beta_3 z_i + \upsilon_{i1} + \upsilon_{1t} \qquad (1)$$

[1] `https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/ifsg/`, visited 13.4.2021

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

We specify our model with a leading y variable (t+1). β_1 estimates within-units effects, hence what happens in the next weeks after a unit e.g. decides to change its group concept to open. β_2 estimates between-units effects, hence the effect of e.g. having an open group concept all the weeks under study. β_3 estimates effects of time-constant variables, e.g. of applying an open group concept before the pandemic. υ_{i1} and υ_{1t} are unit- and time-fixed effects. Exponential coefficients could be interpreted as incidence rate ratios, hence how much the expected count changes multiplicatively when x increases by one.

As the occurrence of COVID-19 infections varies by time and region, we include a county's 7-day incidence as (log) exposure A [29] with a regression coefficient constrained to 1, allowing the model to represent rates instead of counts. This is equivalent to standardizing the dependent variable with the offset variable (see formula 2, equivalent with formula 3).

$$log(E(y_{i,t+1})) = \alpha + 1 * log(A) + \beta_{1within}(x_{it} - \bar{x}_i) + \beta_{2between}\bar{x}_i + \beta_3 z_i + \upsilon_{i1} + \upsilon_{1t} \quad (2)$$

$$log(\frac{E(y_{i,t+1})}{A}) = \alpha + \beta_{1within}(x_{it} - \bar{x}_i) + \beta_{2between}\bar{x}_i + \beta_3 z_i + \upsilon_{i1} + \upsilon_{1t} \quad (3)$$

By doing so, we include the assumption that an ECEC centre in a county with twice as many infections also reports twice as many cases in the ECEC centre. Since the likelihood of an occurrence of a COVID-19 infection does not only depend on regional conditions, but is also strongly dependent on the number of persons in the respective facilities, we add within- and between-effects for the number of children of all age groups (0-2, 3-5, 7 plus) in our model. As we tend to refrain from interpreting these variables directly, they are included in the model as mere controls and are only shown in the appendix tables.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 Results

COVID-19 infections in ECEC centres over time

Figure 1a shows the development of COVID-19 infections in children and staff between CW 36/2020 and CW 16/2021. The gray area in Figure 1 demarcates the 2nd wave (including CW 04 in 2021), the remaining white area (CW 05-16 in 2021) demarcates the 3rd wave. Our wave definitions do not exclude weeks with low incidence rates as we want to measure within and between effects, hence we need to include the lead time before incidences rise. In the 2nd wave of the pandemic, the weekly number of infections in staff per ECEC centre exceeds the number of infections in children per ECEC centre. From CW 9/2021, the two lines cross and the number of infected children per ECEC centre surpasses that of staff. To account for the number of children and staff attending week by week, Figure 1b shows the proportion of infections in ECEC staff and children, respectively, as well as the ratio of the proportion of infections among children relative to the one in staff. It can be interpreted as a rate ratio. Overall, the rate of infections in staff is higher compared to that of children, but the ratio clearly increases in the 3rd wave.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1: Infections in children and staff. (a) Average number of infections (n) in children and staff in day care centres per week, (n/N per week) and proportion of specimens in German laboratories positive for B.1.1.7 (%) (b) Average number of Infections in children and in staff per week



(a)



(b)

Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute, own calculations. RKI Data on B.1.1.7; Robert Koch-Institut (2021): Bericht zu Virusvarianten von SARS-CoV-2 in Deutschland (April).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Attendance and protection and hygiene measures in ECEC centres over time

In the following, we briefly discuss the development of our time-varying indicators. Respective figures and tables are included in the appendix. Regarding *childrens attendance*, prior to the 2nd wave, the average ECEC centre each week cared for roughly 12 children aged 0 to 2 years, for 45 children aged 3 to 6 years and for 3-4 children aged 7 years or older (see Appendix Figures A2a, A2b and Tables 3, 4 for details). The latter number might seem low, but our data collection excludes all ECEC centres with after-school childcare that do not provide ECEC services for younger children. Overall, we found only little variation in the number of children attending child care in the weeks 36 to 50 in 2020. We observe a steep drop in childrens attendance in CW 50 to 52 in 2020, as the German federal government ordered a nationwide "strict" lock-down in which most federal states appealed to parents to keep their children at home if possible [1–4]. Roughly half of the children returned after Christmas, while the 2nd half returned in CW 8/2021.

The share of ECEC centres applying a fixed group concept (see Appendix Figures A4a, A4b and Tables A3, A4) increased from 62% in CW 36/2020 to 81% in CW 15/2021. At the same time ECEC centres with a partly or fully open concept decreased from 29% to 15% and 8% to 4%, respectively.

Considering *infection control and hygiene measures*, regular ventilation was conducted in most ECEC settings during the whole period and decreased only slightly from 100% of institutions in CW 36/2020 to 98% in CW 15/2021 (see Appendix Figures A3a, A3b and Table A3, A4 in the Appendix). The vast majority of ECEC centres indicated to have disinfected surfaces regularly during the whole time under study, with only a small drop from almost 92% in CW 36/2020 to 87% in CW 15/2021. Only 63% of ECEC centre managers reported that their staff was assigned firmly to a fixed or mixed group in CW 36/2020, but this share increased to 70% in CW 15/2021. Despite these relatively small changes over time, we found within-variance, above all in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the latter variable. We observed simultaneous changes in different directions, as some started and others stopped infection control and hygiene measures in the same week, leading to a low change in overall percentages.

Factors associated with COVID-19 infections in ECEC centres

Table 1 shows results from the REWB models. It contains 4 models for different dependent variables, analysing the number of infections within different time frames (i.e. wave 2 and 3 of the pandemic) in both staff and children. Models 1 and 2 in Table 1 estimate the number of infections in staff, Models 3 and 4 the number of infections in children. Models 1 and 3 cover a 21-week time frame from CW 36/2020 to CW 04/2021 (i.e., 2nd wave, the grey area in Figure 1), while Models 2 and 4 cover a 12-week time frame from CW 05/2021 to CW 16/2021 (i.e., 3rd wave, the white area in Figure 1). Note that the dependent variable has a 1-week lead, hence the 12-week time frame from CW 05/2021 to 16/2021 is represented by the number of weeks, Num. groups: week=11 in Models 2 and 4).

Results for time-constant variables

We do not find any significant differences for different *types of providers*, except a negative effect of private providers on infections in children in wave 3 (Model 4). The *proportion of low SES children* is found to be a significant predictor for the rate of infections in staff as well as in children with higher proportions of children from a low SES background going along with a higher infection rate. For the two categories with the largest proportions of children with lower SES background, that is 31% to 60% and above 60% (compared to less than 10% low SES children), we find significant positive effects in all four models. For 11% to 30% of low SES children (compared to less than 10% low SES children), effects are significant only in Models 2 and 4 (i.e., 3rd wave), but not in Models 1 and 3 (i.e., 2nd wave). Further, effect sizes of SES tend to be larger in wave 3 compared to wave 2 for both infections in staff and children, with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1: Incidence rate ratios (log) of predictors for infections in staff in 2nd (model 1) and 3rd wave (model 2), and in children (2nd wave, model 3; 3rd wave, model 4).

	(1): Inf. Staff, 2nd Wave	(2): Inf. Staff, 3rd Wave	(3): Inf. Child, 2nd Wave	(4): Inf. Child, 3rd Wave
Intercept	−10.77***	−9.35***	−9.55***	−9.47***
	(0.45)	(0.31)	(0.40)	(0.32)
Time-constant variables				
Provider: other non-profit (ref.: ecclesiastical)	−0.02	0.10	−0.04	−0.11
	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.10)	(0.12)
Provider: private	−0.05	0.03	−0.11	−0.31*
	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.13)	(0.15)
Provider: public	−0.06	0.12	−0.12	0.06
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.09)
SES: 11 to 30% of low SES children (ref.: below 10%)	0.13	0.33***	0.15	0.31**
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.09)
SES: 31 to 60% of low SES children	0.34***	0.54***	0.29**	0.46***
	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.12)
SES: above 60% of low SES children	0.78***	0.58***	0.55***	0.77***
	(0.10)	(0.15)	(0.12)	(0.14)
Group concept before pandemic: open (ref.: fixed)	0.02	0.15	0.02	−0.04
	(0.11)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.14)
Group concept before pandemic: partly open	0.05	0.15	−0.04	0.12
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.09)
Between-units effects				
Group concept in pandemic: open (ref.: fixed) (between)	−0.20	−0.34	−0.41	−0.01
	(0.20)	(0.26)	(0.24)	(0.25)
Group concept in pandemic: partly open (between)	−0.06	−0.17	−0.02	−0.02
	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.12)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (between)	1.13*	−0.23	−0.36	0.06
	(0.44)	(0.29)	(0.37)	(0.29)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (between)	−0.03	−0.01	−0.11	−0.11
	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.13)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (between)	0.25**	0.08	0.24**	0.27**
	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.10)
Within-units effects				
Group concept in pandemic: open (ref.: fixed) (within)	0.36	0.34	0.82*	−0.33
	(0.24)	(0.62)	(0.33)	(0.66)
Group concept in pandemic: partly open (within)	0.15	0.93*	0.21	−0.11
	(0.10)	(0.39)	(0.12)	(0.39)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (within)	−0.96***	−1.00	0.07	0.96
	(0.28)	(0.97)	(0.33)	(0.75)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (within)	0.28	0.93**	0.11	0.59
	(0.17)	(0.35)	(0.20)	(0.31)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (within)	−0.05	−0.80**	0.28*	−0.84***
	(0.09)	(0.28)	(0.13)	(0.25)
AIC	26728.09	14041.13	19103.62	17139.75
Log Likelihood	−13337.05	−6993.56	−9524.81	−8542.88
Num. obs.	114041	61787	114041	61787
Num. groups: week	21	11	21	11
Num. groups: token	7479	6615	7479	6615
Var: week (Intercept)	0.10	0.06	0.32	0.10
Var: token (Intercept)	2.14	3.02	2.42	3.33

$^{***}p < 0.001$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{*}p < 0.05$. Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute. Second wave assumed to last from calendar week (CW) 36/2020-04/2021, and third wave from CW 05/2021-16/2021. REWB poisson model with two-way fixed effects, offset for county incidence (data collected by the Robert Koch-Institute), dependent variable with 1 week lead. Coefficients are displayed as log incidence rate ratio, standard errors in parentheses, controlled for number of children in different age groups (within and between effects), see Appendix Table A2 for full model, own calculations.

one exception for staff regarding the effect of the largest proportion of children with low SES background, which is larger in wave 2 than in wave 3. The variable *group concept prior to the pandemic* did not yield any significant effects.

Results for time-varying variables: Between-units effects

Between-units effects compare averages across CWs between ECEC centres and are prone to endogeneity, that is, a positive effect (indicating more infections) of implementing a protection measure could stem from the fact that centres in counties with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

very low COVID-19 incidences tend to implement protection measures to a lower extent than centres in counties with higher incidences.

We do not find significant between-units effects regarding the *currently applied group concept*. We find a significant positive between-units effect for *regular ventilation* for infections in staff in wave 2 (Model 1), indicating that, controlling for the factors in the model, ECEC centres that report to adhere to the recommendation to ventilate rooms frequently more strictly on average (i.e., implement this measure in more weeks) have higher average infections in staff in the 2nd wave. We also find positive between-units effects for *fixed group assignment of staff* (Models 1, 3, and 4). As mentioned above, those effects most likely stem from a higher number of weeks with ventilation and with fixed group assignment in centres located in counties with high COVID-19 incidences. We find no between-unit effects of regular surface disinfection.

Results for time-varying variables: Within-units effects

Next, we describe time-varying coefficients for within-units effects which estimate the effect of a within-unit change. For example, in the case of the variable group concepts, we estimate what happens if ECEC centres switch from a fixed to an open group concept between weeks. Results thus imply a temporal association of events within an ECEC centre.

Considering the *group concept*, we find significant within-units effects. Switching to an open concept (from a fixed concept) is associated with a significant increase in the number of infections among children in the 2nd wave (Model 3), and switching to a partly open concept (from a fixed concept) is associated with a significant increase of infections in staff in the 3rd wave (Model 2).

Starting the implementation of *regular room ventilation* is significantly associated with fewer infections in staff in wave two (Model 1), but no significant effect on the infection rates of staff nor the infection rates of children in any wave (Models 2, 3 and 4).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Implementing *regular disinfection of surfaces* from one week to the next is associated with a significant increase of infections among staff in the 3rd wave (Model 2). Further analysis showed that this effect is likely to stem from ECEC centres which started disinfection when local county incidences were already on the rise in the 3rd wave. Centres that reported to newly implemented surface disinfection in the 3rd wave have a county average COVID-19 incidence of 83.5/100,000 before they start, and an incidence of 115/100,000 after having started with disinfection. Hence, we assume that the start of surface disinfection was a reaction to locally rising incidence rates.

Introducing *fixed group assignment of staff* is associated with fewer infections in both staff and children for all models looking at wave 3 (Mod. 2 and 4). The measures effect is a more than halving of the infection rate in staff and children. In the second wave models, we found no effect for infections in staff but a significant positive effect for infections in children. The small positive effect in model 3 might be again read as anticipation, hence ECEC centres start with fixed staff assignments to groups in the face of rising incidence rates, presumably reacting to regional orders for implementation which are linked to high incidence rates.

To challenge our results, we additionally ran a variety of models as robustness checks, i.e., several models with protective measures only (Appendix Tables A6- A9, models that include the offset as variable (Appendix Table A10) and models with alternative wave cut-off points (Appendix Tables A11 and A12). All tests by and large confirm the above results in relation to the sign and the effect strength and can be found in appendix tables A6-A12. Considering protective measures, the very low number of within changes, especially in ventilation and disinfection, leads to a strong dependence on few observations only and the effects should therefore only be interpreted with caution. We further tested if our data fits the poisson specification by analyzing the conditional mean and variance of the outcome variables in our models, finding underdispersion in all our models. Underdispersion leads to overestimated standard errors in poisson models [30]. As we prefer to not correct for that bias, e.g. by using a quasipoisson model, (which would lead to smaller confidence bounds), our signifi-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

cance levels could be characterized as conservative. This approach seems appropriate, especially in view of the fact that our data do not represent a true random selection. We tried alternative specifications for underdispersed data, i.e. using a generalized poisson distribution (see Appendix Table A13) that by and large confirms our results. A notable exception is the within-effect of fixed staff assignment for infections in children in wave 3 (Mod. 4) which is considerably smaller and insignificant when a generalized poisson distribution is assumed.

Discussion & Recommendations

Our study investigated factors associated with infections in staff and children in ECEC centres in Germany during the 2nd and 3rd wave. We found no effects of provider type or type of group concept before the pandemic. We found ECEC centres with a larger proportion of children from a low SES background to have the highest risk of infections, and we found this effect to be increasing in wave 3 compared to wave 2. This effect is probably the most robust and one of the main findings of our analyses based on data from the ECEC centre registry. The social gradient of COVID-19 does not stop at the ECEC centret's door, indicating that children, families and staff in corresponding centres need special support, e.g. by prioritising vaccinations.

The change of *group concepts* towards a more restrictive group separation was one of the essential recommended or ordered measures since the beginning of the pandemic. A large proportion of ECEC centres in our sample followed this recommendation, especially in the 3rd wave (Appendix Figure A4). Although we have only little within-variance in wave 3, the significant association of switching from a fixed to a partly open concept with infections in staff (model 2) shows that failure to follow these recommendations, especially in wave 3, puts staff health at risk. Our results suggest that it is beneficial to keep up a fixed group concept in all ECEC centres during the pandemic.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

It is well recognized that the main route of SARS-CoV-2 transmission is through the respiratory mode, and that airborne transmission is of major importance. Our findings tend to confirm this for ECEC settings. In our data, regular ventilation had a significant protective effect on infections in one of the four models, specifically on staff in the 2nd wave (model 1). Overall, implementation of *regular ventilation* as a protective measure in ECEC centres was quite complete with only very little variance. Hence, insignificance is probably due to very low case numbers resulting in low overall variance. Nevertheless, even if regular ventilation was widely implemented during the whole period under study, we observed a small, but constant decline in implementation. Our findings support the assumed importance of the routine to ventilate regularly, although this should be easier in the spring, summer or autumn months because of higher outside temperatures.

In line with controversial findings regarding the role of contact or fomite transmission, we find a significant positive within result (representing more infections) for regular surface disinfection only in one of our four models. Definitively we have no evidence that surface disinfection prevents COVID-19 cases, but it is unlikely that it creates cases. We believe that the most likely explanation is that ECEC managers anticipate or react to local outbreaks or increasing COVID-19 incidence with implementing hygiene measures, such as disinfection of surfaces. Hence, we do not know to which extent our results are biased due to anticipation.

In the 3rd wave, some ECEC centres switched to a more flexible staff assignment to groups and changed their group concept between CW 07 and 08 (see Appendix Figure A3b, A4b), presumably due to a shortage of staff. This was associated with an increase of infections in staff in the 3rd wave. Thus, our results confirm that it should be beneficial for ECEC centres to maintain this practice in order to prevent infections, particularly among staff. Nevertheless, if all children attend ECEC it may be extremely difficult for many centres to assign staff firmly to just one group. After all, staff resources may be limited as typically, they are still based on pre-pandemic needs. Because of this, the measure was only recommended but not prescribed by law.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Overall, it must be mentioned that there is a certain chance that especially the results of surface disinfection and ventilation are driven by very few units within-changes (Appendix Figure A3b), as is further shown in the robustness section in the appendix (e.g., the within effect of surface disinfection is dependent on the wave definition, see appendix tables A11 and A12). This limitation does not hold true for the effect of fixed staff assignment on infections in staff, which remains significant in wave 3 in all robustness checks. We therefore strongly support the recommendation to keep up fixed staff assignment in all ECEC centres wherever possible.

We acknowledge as a general limitation that a managers decision to implement specific measures in their ECEC centre (and the according report in our questionnaires) is not always followed and translated into every-day practice by all staff members. Further, some measures are conceptually similar, e.g. a fixed group concept (with consequent separation of children) and a fixed staff assignment which includes that also staff does not move between groups. As both show significant effects, this suggests that strict contact restrictions are likely to be one of the most effective protective measures, especially in the 3rd wave.

Although it is unknown which infections are due to a VOC or not, the 3rd wave was dominated increasingly by the VOC B.1.1.7, which is associated with increased transmissibility [31]. This again is in line with our finding that the effects of SES are stronger in wave 3, and we find stronger effects of contact restrictions in wave 3. In this situation of VOC predominance in which vaccinations of ECEC staff have started but the vaccinations of young children are not predictable, the implementation of contact restrictions between groups of children seem to gain priority to keep ECEC services open over the long run. However, the result that about one third of the centres have not implemented the recommended fixed staff assignment is likely associated with well-known structural problems of many ECEC centres in Germany, who have to deal with limited staffing overall and within group settings and a shortage of professional staff recruitable on the labour market for years [32]. Protective measures like a fixed group concept require more staff resources within centres. At the same time, not all staff can

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

work in contact with children e.g. due to infection risks for elderly persons during the pandemic. In order to better prepare ECEC centres for such exceptional situations in the future, it is essential to finally eliminate the staff shortage that was already prevalent before the pandemic.

In summary, our panel data suggest that the COVID-19 pandemic affects ECEC centres particularly when they serve children with low SES. Although many ECEC centres are grappling with staffing difficulties it is important to maintain – to the best possible degree – fixed group assignments among children and fixed staff assignments to groups. In addition, generous and frequent ventilation may aid in preventing infections. As vaccinations become increasingly available, particularly staff of ECEC centres with a large proportion of children from a low SES background should be prioritized.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

[1] Autorengruppe Corona-KiTa-Studie. Monatsbericht der Corona-KiTa-Studie (Vol. 1/2020 - 10/2020). Technical report, Deutsches Jugendinstitut und Robert Koch-Institut, 2020. URL `https://corona-kita-studie.de/ergebnisse#berichte`.

[2] Autorengruppe Corona-KiTa-Studie. Quartalsbericht der Corona-KiTa-Studie (Vol. III/2020 - IV/2020). Technical report, Deutsches Jugendinstitut und Robert Koch-Institut, 2020. URL `https://corona-kita-studie.de/ergebnisse#berichte`.

[3] Autorengruppe Corona-KiTa-Studie. Monatsbericht 1/2021 der Corona-KiTa-Studie. Technical report, Deutsches Jugendinstitut und Robert Koch-Institut, 2021. URL `https://corona-kita-studie.de/ergebnisse#berichte`.

[4] Autorengruppe Corona-KiTa-Studie. Quartalsbericht I/2021 der Corona-KiTa-Studie. Technical report, Deutsches Jugendinstitut und Robert Koch-Institut, 2021. URL `https://corona-kita-studie.de/ergebnisse#berichte`.

[5] JFMK. Beschluss der Jugend- und Familienministerkonferenz (JFMK) gemeinsam mit der Bundesministerin für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend vom 28.04.2020, 2020.

[6] European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. COVID-19 in children (1-18 years) and the role of school settings in COVID- 19 transmission : 1 st update. Technical report, European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, 2020.

[7] Russell M. Viner, Oliver T. Mytton, Chris Bonell, G. J. Melendez-Torres, Joseph Ward, Lee Hudson, Claire Waddington, James Thomas, Simon Russell, Fiona Van Der Klis, Archana Koirala, Shamez Ladhani, Jasmina Panovska-Griffiths, Nicholas G. Davies, Robert Booy, and Rosalind M. Eggo. Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection among Children and Adolescents Compared with Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 175(2):143–156, 2021. ISSN 21686211. doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.4573.

[8] Wee Chian Koh, Lin Naing, Liling Chaw, Muhammad Ali Rosledzana, Mohammad Fathi Alikhan, Sirajul Adli Jamaludin, Faezah Amin, Asiah Omar, Alia Shazli, Matthew Grif-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

fith, Roberta Pastore, and Justin Wong. What do we know about SARS-CoV-2 transmission? A systematic review and meta-analysis of the secondary attack rate and associated risk factors. *PLoS ONE*, 15(10):1–23, 2020. ISSN 19326203. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0240205. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0240205`.

[9] Zachary J. Madewell, Yang Yang, Ira M. Longini, M. Elizabeth Halloran, and Natalie E. Dean. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA network open*, 3(12):e2031756, 2020. ISSN 25743805. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.31756.

[10] Anja Schoeps, Dietmar Hoffmann, Claudia Tamm, Bianca Vollmer, Sabine Haag, Tina Kaffenberger, Kimberly Ferguson-Beiser, Berit Kohlhase-Griebel, Silke Basenach, Andrea Missal, Katja Hoefling, Harald Michels, Anett Schall, Holger Kappes, Manfred Vogt, Klaus Jahn, Till Bärnighausen, and Philipp Zanger. COVID-19 Transmission in Educational Institutions August to December 2020, Rhineland-Palatinate, Germany: A Study of Index Cases and Close Contact Cohorts. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, (December 2020), 2021. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3774830.

[11] Luca Ferretti, Chris Wymant, Michelle Kendall, Lele Zhao, Anel Nurtay, Lucie Abeler-Dörner, Michael Parker, David Bonsall, and Christophe Fraser. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *medRxiv*, 6936 (March):1–13, 2020. ISSN 1095-9203. doi: 10.1101/2020.03.08.20032946.

[12] Eric A Meyerowitz, Aaron Richterman, Rajesh T Gandhi, and Paul E Sax. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Review of Viral, Host, and Environmental Factors. *Annals of internal medicine*, 174(1):69–79, jan 2021. ISSN 1539-3704 (Electronic). doi: 10.7326/M20-5008.

[13] Robert Koch-Institut. Epidemiologischer Steckbrief zu SARS-CoV-2 und COVID-19, 2021. URL `https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/Steckbrief.html`.

[14] Parham Azimi, Zahra Keshavarz, Jose Guillermo Cedeno Laurent, Brent Stephens, and Joseph G Allen. Mechanistic transmission modeling of COVID-19 on the Diamond

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Princess cruise ship demonstrates the importance of aerosol transmission. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(8):e2015482118, feb 2021. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2015482118. URL `http://www.pnas.org/content/118/8/e2015482118.abstract`.

[15] G. Buonanno, L. Stabile, and L. Morawska. Estimation of airborne viral emission: Quanta emission rate of SARS-CoV-2 for infection risk assessment. *Environment International*, 141(May):105794, 2020. ISSN 18736750. doi: 10.1016/j.envint.2020.105794. URL `https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105794`.

[16] Neeltje van Doremalen, Trenton Bushmaker, Dylan H. Morris, Myndi G. Holbrook, Amandine Gamble, Brandi N. Williamson, Azaaibi Tamin, Jennifer L. Harcourt, Natalie J. Thornburg, Susan I. Gerber, James O. Lloyd-Smith, Emmie de Wit, and Vincent J. Munster. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *Nejm*, pages 0–2, 2020.

[17] Martin Kriegel, Udo Buchholz, Petra Gastmeier, Peter Bischoff, Inas Abdelgawad, and Anne Hartmann. Predicted infection risk for aerosol transmission of sars-COV-2. *medRxiv*, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.10.08.20209106.

[18] Yu Wang, Huaiyu Tian, Li Zhang, Man Zhang, Dandan Guo, Wenting Wu, Xingxing Zhang, Ge Lin Kan, Lei Jia, Da Huo, Baiwei Liu, Xiaoli Wang, Ying Sun, Quanyi Wang, Peng Yang, and C. Raina Macintyre. Reduction of secondary transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in households by face mask use, disinfection and social distancing: a cohort study in Beijing, China. *BMJ Global Health*, 5(5):1–9, 2020. ISSN 20597908. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-002794.

[19] BMFSFJ; BMG. Kitas in Zeiten der Corona-Pandemie. Praxistipps für die Kindertagesbetreuung im Regelbetrieb. Technical report, BMFSFJ; BMG, 2020.

[20] Robert Koch-Institut. Bericht zu Virusvarianten von SARS-CoV-2 in Deutschland, insbesondere zur Variant of Concern (VOC) B.1.1.7. Technical Report i, Robert Koch-Institut, 2021.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[21] Balram Rai, Anandi Shukla, and Laxmi Kant Dwivedi. Estimates of serial interval for COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Epidemiology and Global Health*, 9(January):157–161, 2021.

[22] Muluneh Alene, Leltework Yismaw, Moges Agazhe Assemie, Daniel Bekele Ketema, Wodaje Gietaneh, and Tilahun Yemanu Birhan. Serial interval and incubation period of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Infectious Diseases*, 21(1):1–9, 2021. ISSN 14712334. doi: 10.1186/s12879-021-05950-x.

[23] Merle M. Böhmer, Udo Buchholz, Victor M. Corman, Martin Hoch, Katharina Katz, Durdica V. Marosevic, Stefanie Böhm, Tom Woudenberg, Nikolaus Ackermann, Regina Konrad, Ute Eberle, Bianca Treis, Alexandra Dangel, Katja Bengs, Volker Fingerle, Anja Berger, Stefan Hörmansdorfer, Siegfried Ippisch, Bernd Wicklein, Andreas Grahl, Kirsten Pörtner, Nadine Muller, Nadine Zeitlmann, T. Sonia Boender, Wei Cai, Andreas Reich, Maria an der Heiden, Ute Rexroth, Osamah Hamouda, Julia Schneider, Talitha Veith, Barbara Mühlemann, Roman Wölfel, Markus Antwerpen, Mathias Walter, Ulrike Protzer, Bernhard Liebl, Walter Haas, Andreas Sing, Christian Drosten, and Andreas Zapf. Investigation of a COVID-19 outbreak in Germany resulting from a single travel-associated primary case: a case series. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 20(8):920–928, 2020. ISSN 14744457. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30314-5.

[24] Jose Miguel Baena-Diéz, Mariá Barroso, Sara Isabel Cordeiro-Coelho, Jorge L. Diáz, and Mariá Grau. Impact of COVID-19 outbreak by income: Hitting hardest the most deprived. *Journal of Public Health (United Kingdom)*, 42(4):698–703, 2020. ISSN 17413850. doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdaa136.

[25] Benjamin Wachtler, Niels Michalski, Enno Nowossadeck, Michaela Diercke, Morten Wahrendorf, Claudia Santos-Hövener, Thomas Lampert, and Jens Hoebel. Sozioökonomische Ungleichheit und COVID-19 Eine Übersicht über den internationalen Forschungsstand. *Journal of Health Monitoring*, 5(S7)(2):1–120, 2020. URL `https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/Gesundheitsmonitoring/Gesundheitsberichterstattung/GBEDownloadsJ/JoHM_2017_02_Gesundheitsverhalten.pdf?__blob=publicationFile`.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[26] Ping Yan and Gerardo Chowell. *Quantitative Methods for Investigating Infectious Disease Outbreaks*, volume 70 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019. ISBN 978-3-030-21922-2. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-21923-9. URL http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-030-21923-9.

[27] Andrew Bell, Malcolm Fairbrother, and Kelvyn Jones. Fixed and random effects models: making an informed choice. *Quality and Quantity*, 53(2):1051–1074, 2019. ISSN 15737845. doi: 10.1007/s11135-018-0802-x. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-018-0802-x.

[28] Andrew Bell and Kelvyn Jones. Explaining Fixed Effects: Random Effects Modeling of Time-Series Cross-Sectional and Panel Data. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 3 (01):133–153, 2015. ISSN 2049-8470. doi: \url{10.1017/psrm.2014.7}.

[29] Peter McCullagh and John Ashworth Nelder. *Generalized Linear Models*. Springer Science Business Media, B.V., second edi edition, 1989.

[30] Tammy Harris, Zhao Yang, and James W. Hardin. Modeling underdispersed count data with generalized Poisson regression. *Stata Journal*, 12(4):736–747, 2012. ISSN 1536867X. doi: 10.1177/1536867x1201200412.

[31] Public Health England. Investigation of novel SARS-COV-2 variant: Variant of Concern 202012/01 Technical Briefing 3. *Gov.Uk*, (December): 1–11, 2020. URL https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/investigation-of-novel-sars-cov-2-variant-variant-of-concern-20201201.

[32] Autorengruppe Bildungsberichterstattung. Bildung in Deutschland 2020. pages 1–361, 2020. URL https://www.bmbf.de/de/bildung-in-deutschland-2020-11888.html.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

APPENDIX

COVID-19 infections in day care centres in Germany: Social and organizational determinants of infections in children and staff in the second and third wave of the pandemic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table A2: Full Models from Table 1 including effects for number of children. Incidence rate ratios (log) of predictors for infections in staff in 2nd (model 1) and 3rd wave (model 2), and in children (2nd wave, model 3; 3rd wave, model 4).

	(1): Inf. Staff, 2nd Wave	(2): Inf. Staff, 3rd Wave	(3): Inf. Child, 2nd Wave	(4): Inf. Child, 3rd Wave
Intercept	-10.77^{***}	-9.35^{***}	-9.55^{***}	-9.47^{***}
	(0.45)	(0.31)	(0.40)	(0.32)
Provider: other non-profit (ref.: ecclesiastical)	-0.02	0.10	-0.04	-0.11
	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.10)	(0.12)
Provider: private	-0.05	0.03	-0.11	-0.31^{*}
	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.13)	(0.15)
Provider: public	-0.06	0.12	-0.12	0.06
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.09)
SES: 11 to 30% of low SES children (ref.: below 10%)	0.13	0.33^{***}	0.15	0.31^{**}
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.09)
SES: 31 to 60% of low SES children	0.34^{***}	0.54^{***}	0.29^{**}	0.46^{***}
	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.12)
SES: above 60% of low SES children	0.78^{***}	0.58^{***}	0.55^{***}	0.77^{***}
	(0.10)	(0.15)	(0.12)	(0.14)
Group concept before pandemic: open (ref.: fixed)	0.02	0.15	0.02	-0.04
	(0.11)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.14)
Group concept before pandemic: partly open	0.05	0.15	-0.04	0.12
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.09)
Group concept in pandemic: open (ref.: fixed) (between)	-0.20	-0.34	-0.41	-0.01
	(0.20)	(0.26)	(0.24)	(0.25)
Group concept in pandemic: partly open (between)	-0.06	-0.17	-0.02	-0.02
	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.12)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (between)	1.13^{*}	-0.23	-0.36	0.06
	(0.44)	(0.29)	(0.37)	(0.29)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (between)	-0.03	-0.01	-0.11	-0.11
	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.13)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (between)	0.25^{**}	0.08	0.24^{**}	0.27^{**}
	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.10)
Group concept in pandemic: open (ref.: fixed) (within)	0.36	0.34	0.82^{*}	-0.33
	(0.24)	(0.62)	(0.33)	(0.66)
Group concept in pandemic: partly open (within)	0.15	0.93^{*}	0.21	-0.11
	(0.10)	(0.39)	(0.12)	(0.39)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (within)	-0.96^{***}	-1.00	0.07	0.96
	(0.28)	(0.97)	(0.33)	(0.75)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (within)	0.28	0.93^{**}	0.11	0.59
	(0.17)	(0.35)	(0.20)	(0.31)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (within)	-0.05	-0.80^{**}	0.28^{*}	-0.84^{***}
	(0.09)	(0.28)	(0.13)	(0.25)
Nr. of children aged 0-2 (between)	0.03^{***}	0.02^{***}	0.01^{***}	0.01^{*}
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 3-6 (between)	0.01^{***}	0.00^{*}	0.01^{***}	0.01^{**}
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 7 and older (between)	0.00	0.00	0.01^{**}	0.01
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 0-2 (within)	-0.00	0.03^{***}	-0.02^{**}	0.01
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Nr. of children aged 3-6 (within)	0.01^{***}	0.01^{***}	0.01^{***}	0.01^{***}
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 7 and older (within)	0.01	0.00	0.01^{**}	0.01^{**}
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)
AIC	26728.09	14041.13	19103.62	17139.75
Log Likelihood	-13337.05	-6993.56	-9524.81	-8542.88
Num. obs.	114041	61787	114041	61787
Num. groups: week	21	11	21	11
Num. groups: token	7479	6615	7479	6615
Var: week (Intercept)	0.10	0.06	0.32	0.10
Var: token (Intercept)	2.14	3.02	2.42	3.33

$^{***}p < 0.001$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{*}p < 0.05$. Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute. Second wave assumed to last from calendar week (CW) 36/2020-04/2021, and third wave from CW 05/2021-16/2021. REWB poisson model with two-way fixed effects, offset for county incidence (data collected by the Robert Koch-Institute), dependent variable with 1 week lead. Coefficients are displayed as log incidence rate ratio, standard errors in parentheses, own calculations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure A2: Number of children. (a) Average number of children per age group (n) visiting day care centres (N) per week, (n/N per week) (b) Average positive or negative change in number of children per age group (n) amongst day care centres (N) with positive or negative change, (n/N per week)



(a)



(b)

Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute, own calculations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure A3: Hygiene measures. (a) Share of day care centres with compliance to different hygiene measures (% yes answers) (b) Share of day care centres with positive and negative changes in hygiene measures (n/N per week)



(a)



(b)

Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute, own calculations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure A4: Group concepts: (a) Applied paedagogical group concept in day care centres (b) Share of day care centres with changes in paedagocial concept (n/N per week)



(a)



(b)

Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute, own calculations.

Table A3: Time-varying variables (part 1, mean, (sd))

Variables	2020_36	2020_37	2020_38	2020_39	2020_40	2020_41	2020_42	2020_43	2020_44	2020_45	2020_46	2020_47	2020_48	2020_49	2020_50	2020_51
7 day Covid-19 incidence	10.02	11.68	15.07	16.04	19.11	31.59	49.45	90.65	134.66	150.70	152.09	150.65	141.12	146.67	179.34	199.86
	(7.24)	(8.48)	(11.57)	(11.17)	(12.19)	(21)	(29.03)	(42.14)	(53.91)	(59.03)	(58.92)	(60.06)	(63.43)	(70.79)	(80.71)	(88.53)
Number of infections with children (lead 1 week)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.01
	(0.08)	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.1)	(0.15)	(0.2)	(0.21)	(0.27)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.23)	(0.5)	(0.45)	(0.24)	(0.21)
Number of infections with staff (lead 1 week)	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.03
	(0.1)	(0.11)	(0.1)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.17)	(0.25)	(0.32)	(0.3)	(0.28)	(0.32)	(0.36)	(0.42)	(0.35)	(0.29)
Group concept in pandemic: fixed	0.62	0.62	0.61	0.61	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.63	0.65	0.66	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.70	0.70	0.71
	(0.48)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.47)	(0.47)	(0.47)	(0.47)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.45)
Group concept in pandemic: open	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06
	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.27)	(0.26)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.24)
Group concept in pandemic: partly open	0.29	0.30	0.30	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.29	0.28	0.27	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.24	0.24	0.23
	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.45)	(0.45)	(0.44)	(0.44)	(0.44)	(0.43)	(0.43)	(0.42)	(0.42)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.1)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.14)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection	0.92	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.90	0.91	0.90	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.88	0.88	0.87	0.88	0.88	0.88
	(0.28)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.3)	(0.29)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to group	0.63	0.63	0.62	0.63	0.62	0.61	0.61	0.61	0.61	0.62	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.64	0.64	0.64
	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.49)	(0.48)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.48)
Nr. of children aged 0-2	12.73	12.63	12.85	12.73	12.75	12.84	12.77	12.79	12.72	12.75	12.70	12.86	12.81	12.73	12.67	9.14
	(11.58)	(11.57)	(11.67)	(11.51)	(11.33)	(11.43)	(11.39)	(11.49)	(11.33)	(11.38)	(11.4)	(11.5)	(11.36)	(11.43)	(11.42)	(10.11)
Nr. of children aged 3-6	44.42	44.64	45.38	45.68	45.56	45.66	45.01	44.92	44.91	45.21	45.26	45.24	45.33	45.31	45.24	30.04
	(26.39)	(26.82)	(26.76)	(26.38)	(26.39)	(26.93)	(26.67)	(26.5)	(26.58)	(26.67)	(26.63)	(26.79)	(26.83)	(26.7)	(26.81)	(26.77)
Nr. of children aged 7 and older	2.81	3.20	3.06	3.09	3.09	3.21	3.07	2.96	3.10	3.11	3.11	3.08	3.03	2.97	2.93	2.11
	(11.63)	(12.61)	(11.83)	(11.85)	(12.02)	(12.56)	(12.02)	(11.31)	(11.92)	(12.01)	(11.88)	(11.97)	(11.7)	(11.54)	(11.53)	(9.22)
N	4267	3984	4623	4691	4620	4648	4872	5676	5932	6186	5983	5284	5253	6015	6050	4844

Mean and standard deviation for all time-constant variables included in the models.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table A4: Time-varying variables (part 2, mean, (sd))

Variables	2020_52	2021_01	2021_02	2021_03	2021_04	2021_05	2021_06	2021_07	2021_08	2021_09	2021_10	2021_11	2021_12	2021_13	2021_14	2021_15
7 day Covid-19 incidence	158.70	161.76	133.00	108.44	89.53	74.18	58.46	60.32	64.78	68.64	83.88	108.93	135.96	127.82	139.09	168.33
	(78.61)	(70.98)	(60.27)	(44.17)	(37.89)	(33.18)	(26.19)	(29.17)	(30.51)	(32.36)	(40.35)	(49.36)	(56.94)	(48.73)	(50.14)	(56.07)
Number of infections with children (lead 1 week)	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.06
	(0.1)	(0.11)	(0.29)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.18)	(0.14)	(0.28)	(0.24)	(0.33)	(0.32)	(0.38)	(0.52)	(0.38)	(0.35)	(0.37)
Number of infections with staff (lead 1 week)	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03
	(0.19)	(0.21)	(0.24)	(0.2)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.16)	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.23)	(0.29)	(0.32)	(0.3)	(0.23)	(0.24)	(0.25)
Group concept in pandemic: fixed	0.71	0.73	0.78	0.78	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.81
	(0.45)	(0.44)	(0.41)	(0.41)	(0.41)	(0.41)	(0.41)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.39)
Group concept in pandemic: open	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04
	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.2)
Group concept in pandemic: partly open	0.22	0.21	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
	(0.42)	(0.4)	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.35)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.15)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.87	0.88	0.87
	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.32)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to group	0.64	0.65	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.70	0.70	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.70	0.70
	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.47)	(0.47)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)
Nr. of children aged 0-2	3.42	6.26	7.32	7.42	7.40	7.48	7.50	7.79	9.60	9.87	10.50	10.51	10.40	9.71	9.23	10.06
	(7.55)	(8.67)	(8.44)	(8.47)	(8.31)	(8.13)	(8.19)	(8.42)	(9.53)	(9.69)	(10.43)	(10.38)	(10.35)	(10.15)	(10.05)	(10.04)
Nr. of children aged 3-6	10.80	19.04	22.24	22.69	22.36	22.69	22.83	24.31	34.42	35.43	37.47	37.86	37.36	34.16	32.24	35.37
	(21.35)	(23.08)	(21.16)	(20.65)	(19.73)	(19.45)	(19.55)	(20.36)	(24.87)	(25.19)	(26.05)	(26.08)	(25.73)	(25.62)	(25.98)	(24.93)
Nr. of children aged 7 and older	0.77	1.19	1.41	1.44	1.42	1.40	1.43	1.62	1.97	2.05	2.25	2.24	2.22	1.80	1.84	2.06
	(5.35)	(6.29)	(6.1)	(6.17)	(6.16)	(5.95)	(5.92)	(7.05)	(7.84)	(8.36)	(9.07)	(8.92)	(8.77)	(7.28)	(8.08)	(8.53)
N	6227	6291	6237	6199	6159	6110	6073	6014	5716	5557	5653	5534	5292	5343	5396	5099

Mean and standard deviation for all time-constant variables included in the models.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table A5: Time-constant variables (mean, (sd))

Variables	Mean (sd)
Provider: ecclesiastical	0.37
	(0.48)
Provider: non-profit	0.18
	(0.38)
Provider: private	0.12
	(0.33)
Provider: public	0.33
	(0.47)
SES: 0 to 10% of low SES children	0.52
	(0.5)
SES: 11 to 30% of low SES children	0.28
	(0.45)
SES: 31 to 60% of low SES children	0.13
	(0.34)
SES: above 60% of low SES children	0.08
	(0.26)
Group concept before pandemic: fixed	0.32
	(0.47)
Group concept before pandemic: open	0.17
	(0.37)
Group concept before pandemic: partly open	0.51
	(0.5)
N	175828

Mean and standard deviation for all time-constant variables included in the models.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table A6: Hygiene variables only: Second Wave and Third Wave for Number of Infections with Staff (Mod1 and 2) and Children (Mod 3 and 4).

	(1): Inf. Staff, 2nd Wave	(2): Inf. Staff, 3rd Wave	(3): Inf. Child, 2nd Wave	(4): Inf. Child, 3rd Wave
Intercept	-9.77^{***}	-8.81^{***}	-8.95^{***}	-8.97^{***}
	(0.40)	(0.29)	(0.37)	(0.31)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (between)	0.84^{*}	-0.17	-0.36	0.07
	(0.40)	(0.28)	(0.35)	(0.29)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (between)	-0.03	-0.05	-0.12	-0.14
	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.13)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (between)	0.36^{***}	0.23^{*}	0.37^{***}	0.36^{***}
	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.09)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (within)	-0.91^{**}	-0.94	0.10	0.10
	(0.28)	(0.93)	(0.33)	(0.65)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (within)	0.23	0.87^{*}	0.11	0.55
	(0.16)	(0.34)	(0.19)	(0.31)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (within)	-0.13	-0.58^{*}	0.12	-0.73^{**}
	(0.09)	(0.25)	(0.12)	(0.23)
AIC	28094.01	14769.01	20199.26	18119.46
Log Likelihood	-14038.00	-7375.51	-10090.63	-9050.73
Num. obs.	120654	65301	120654	65301
Num. groups: week	21	11	21	11
Num. groups: token	7934	7004	7934	7004
Var: week (Intercept)	0.17	0.07	0.41	0.17
Var: token (Intercept)	2.36	3.21	2.56	3.52

$^{***}p < 0.001$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{*}p < 0.05$. Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute. Second wave assumed to last from calendar week (CW) 36/2020-04/2021, and third wave from CW 05/2021-16/2021. REWB poisson model with two-way fixed effects, offset for county incidence (data collected by the Robert Koch-Institute), dependent variable with 1 week lead. Coefficients are displayed as log incidence rate ratio, standard errors in parentheses, own calculations.

Table A7: Ventilation only: Incidence rate ratios (log) of predictors for infections in staff in 2nd (model 1) and 3rd wave (model 2), and in children (2nd wave, model 3; 3rd wave, model 4)

	(1): Inf. Staff, 2nd Wave	(2): Inf. Staff, 3rd Wave	(3): Inf. Child, 2nd Wave	(4): Inf. Child, 3rd Wave
Intercept	-9.61^{***}	-8.68^{***}	-8.81^{***}	-8.77^{***}
	(0.40)	(0.28)	(0.37)	(0.30)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (between)	0.89^{*}	-0.19	-0.37	0.00
	(0.39)	(0.27)	(0.34)	(0.28)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (within)	-0.78^{**}	-0.56	0.18	0.07
	(0.26)	(0.92)	(0.30)	(0.67)
AIC	28388.68	15009.65	20393.43	18406.84
Log Likelihood	-14189.34	-7499.83	-10191.71	-9198.42
Num. obs.	121687	66400	121687	66400
Num. groups: week	21	11	21	11
Num. groups: token	7938	7107	7938	7107
Var: week (Intercept)	0.17	0.07	0.41	0.17
Var: token (Intercept)	2.38	3.24	2.57	3.56

$^{***}p < 0.001$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{*}p < 0.05$. Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute. Second wave assumed to last from calendar week (CW) 36/2020-04/2021, and third wave from CW 05/2021-16/2021. REWB poisson model with two-way fixed effects, offset for county incidence (data collected by the Robert Koch-Institute), dependent variable with 1 week lead. Coefficients are displayed as log incidence rate ratio, standard errors in parentheses, own calculations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table A8: Desinfection only: Incidence rate ratios (log) of predictors for infections in staff in 2nd (model 1) and 3rd wave (model 2), and in children (2nd wave, model 3; 3rd wave, model 4)

	(1): Inf. Staff, 2nd Wave	(2): Inf. Staff, 3rd Wave	(3): Inf. Child, 2nd Wave	(4): Inf. Child, 3rd Wave
Intercept	-8.73^{***}	-8.80^{***}	-9.06^{***}	-8.66^{***}
	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.18)	(0.17)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (between)	-0.00	-0.07	-0.13	-0.13
	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (within)	0.07	0.73^{*}	0.14	0.50
	(0.15)	(0.33)	(0.18)	(0.31)
AIC	28406.00	15008.52	20396.10	18405.73
Log Likelihood	-14198.00	-7499.26	-10193.05	-9197.87
Num. obs.	121687	66400	121687	66400
Num. groups: week	21	11	21	11
Num. groups: token	7938	7107	7938	7107
Var: week (Intercept)	0.17	0.07	0.41	0.17
Var: token (Intercept)	2.39	3.23	2.57	3.55

$^{***}p < 0.001$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{*}p < 0.05$. Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute. Second wave assumed to last from calendar week (CW) 36/2020-04/2021, and third wave from CW 05/2021-16/2021. REWB poisson model with two-way fixed effects, offset for county incidence (data collected by the Robert Koch-Institute), dependent variable with 1 week lead. Coefficients are displayed as log incidence rate ratio, standard errors in parentheses, own calculations.

Table A9: Staff assignment only: Incidence rate ratios (log) of predictors for infections in staff in 2nd (model 1) and 3rd wave (model 2), and in children (2nd wave, model 3; 3rd wave, model 4)

	(1): Inf. Staff, 2nd Wave	(2): Inf. Staff, 3rd Wave	(3): Inf. Child, 2nd Wave	(4): Inf. Child, 3rd Wave
Intercept	-8.97^{***}	-9.03^{***}	-9.41^{***}	-9.02^{***}
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.16)	(0.15)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (between)	0.37^{***}	0.23^{*}	0.37^{***}	0.36^{***}
	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.09)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (within)	-0.13	-0.53^{*}	0.12	-0.70^{**}
	(0.09)	(0.25)	(0.12)	(0.23)
AIC	28112.64	14770.48	20206.43	18116.58
Log Likelihood	-14051.32	-7380.24	-10098.22	-9053.29
Num. obs.	120970	65413	120970	65413
Num. groups: week	21	11	21	11
Num. groups: token	7949	7017	7949	7017
Var: week (Intercept)	0.17	0.07	0.41	0.17
Var: token (Intercept)	2.37	3.21	2.56	3.51

$^{***}p < 0.001$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{*}p < 0.05$. Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute. Second wave assumed to last from calendar week (CW) 36/2020-04/2021, and third wave from CW 05/2021-16/2021. REWB poisson model with two-way fixed effects, offset for county incidence (data collected by the Robert Koch-Institute), dependent variable with 1 week lead. Coefficients are displayed as log incidence rate ratio, standard errors in parentheses, own calculations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table A10: Offset (7 day incidence) as variable. Incidence rate ratios (log) of predictors for infections in staff in 2nd (model 1) and 3rd wave (model 2), and in children (2nd wave, model 3; 3rd wave, model 4)

	(1): Inf. Staff, 2nd Wave	(2): Inf. Staff, 3rd Wave	(3): Inf. Child, 2nd Wave	(4): Inf. Child, 3rd Wave
Intercept	−7.18***	−5.60***	−5.72***	−5.41***
	(0.47)	(0.33)	(0.42)	(0.36)
Provider: other non-profit (ref.: ecclesiastical)	−0.03	0.10	−0.05	−0.10
	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.10)	(0.12)
Provider: private	−0.05	0.04	−0.09	−0.31*
	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.12)	(0.15)
Provider: public	−0.07	0.11	−0.14	0.06
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.09)
SES: 11 to 30% of low SES children (ref.: below 10%)	0.13	0.34***	0.16	0.31***
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.09)
SES: 31 to 60% of low SES children	0.35***	0.54***	0.31**	0.48***
	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.12)
SES: above 60% of low SES children	0.81***	0.60***	0.59***	0.78***
	(0.10)	(0.15)	(0.12)	(0.14)
Group concept before pandemic: open (ref.: fixed)	0.06	0.14	0.05	−0.05
	(0.11)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.14)
Group concept before pandemic: partly open	0.08	0.15	−0.01	0.12
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.09)
Group concept in pandemic (between): open (ref.: fixed)	−0.21	−0.33	−0.40	−0.02
	(0.20)	(0.26)	(0.24)	(0.25)
Group concept in pandemic (between): partly open	−0.08	−0.17	−0.03	−0.03
	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.12)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (between)	1.16**	−0.22	−0.31	0.06
	(0.44)	(0.28)	(0.37)	(0.29)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (between)	−0.03	−0.01	−0.11	−0.11
	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.13)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (between)	0.26**	0.08	0.25**	0.27**
	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.10)
Group concept in pandemic (within): open (ref.: fixed)	0.28	0.34	0.71*	−0.29
	(0.24)	(0.61)	(0.33)	(0.64)
Group concept in pandemic (within): partly open	0.11	0.91*	0.15	−0.07
	(0.10)	(0.39)	(0.12)	(0.38)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (within)	−0.97***	−0.98	−0.03	1.05
	(0.28)	(0.95)	(0.32)	(0.74)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (within)	0.27	0.90**	0.13	0.51
	(0.16)	(0.35)	(0.20)	(0.30)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (within)	−0.04	−0.78**	0.25*	−0.80**
	(0.09)	(0.27)	(0.13)	(0.25)
Nr. of children aged 0-2 (between)	0.02***	0.02***	0.01***	0.01*
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 3-6 (between)	0.01***	0.00*	0.01***	0.01**
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 7 and older (between)	0.00	0.00	0.01**	0.01
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 0-2 (within)	−0.01	0.03***	−0.02***	0.01
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Nr. of children aged 3-6 (within)	0.01***	0.01***	0.01***	0.01***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 7 and older (within)	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01**
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)
7 day incidence (between)	0.01***	0.01***	0.00***	0.00***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
7 day incidence (within)	0.00***	0.00*	0.00***	0.00***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
AIC	26811.46	14072.23	19138.73	17200.03
Log Likelihood	−13376.73	−7007.11	−9540.36	−8571.02
Num. obs.	114041	61787	114041	61787
Num. groups: week	21	11	21	11
Num. groups: token	7479	6615	7479	6615
Var: week (Intercept)	0.34	0.07	0.51	0.23
Var: token (Intercept)	2.14	3.02	2.39	3.30

$^{***}p < 0.001$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{*}p < 0.05$. Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute. Second wave assumed to last from calendar week (CW) 36/2020-04/2021, and third wave from CW 05/2021-16/2021. REWB poisson model with two-way fixed effects, offset for county incidence (data collected by the Robert Koch-Institute), dependent variable with 1 week lead. Coefficients are displayed as log incidence rate ratio, standard errors in parentheses, own calculations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table A11: Alternative Wave Definition: Incidence rate ratios (log) of predictors for infections in staff in 2nd (model 1) and 3rd wave (model 2), and in children (2nd wave, model 3; 3rd wave, model 4)

	(1): Inf. Staff, 2nd Wave	(2): Inf. Staff, 3rd Wave	(3): Inf. Child, 2nd Wave	(4): Inf. Child, 3rd Wave
Intercept	−11.06***	−9.34***	−9.55***	−9.57***
	(0.51)	(0.29)	(0.43)	(0.33)
Provider: other non-profit (ref.: ecclesiastical)	−0.02	0.06	−0.02	−0.12
	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.11)
Provider: private	−0.03	−0.01	−0.08	−0.34*
	(0.11)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.15)
Provider: public	−0.06	0.09	−0.13	0.05
	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)
SES: 11 to 30% of low SES children (ref.: below 10%)	0.11	0.34***	0.15	0.32***
	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)
SES: 31 to 60% of low SES children	0.32***	0.52***	0.27*	0.47***
	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.12)
SES: above 60% of low SES children	0.78***	0.62***	0.59***	0.72***
	(0.11)	(0.14)	(0.12)	(0.14)
Group concept before pandemic: open (ref.: fixed)	0.04	0.12	−0.00	−0.03
	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)
Group concept before pandemic: partly open	0.04	0.18*	−0.08	0.14
	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)
Group concept in pandemic: open (ref.: fixed) (between)	−0.21	−0.27	−0.45	0.11
	(0.20)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)
Group concept in pandemic: partly open (between)	−0.03	−0.21	0.00	−0.03
	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.12)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (between)	1.40**	−0.21	−0.38	0.07
	(0.50)	(0.27)	(0.39)	(0.28)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (between)	−0.01	−0.04	−0.05	−0.17
	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (between)	0.28***	0.09	0.24**	0.27**
	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.10)
Group concept in pandemic: open (ref.: fixed) (within)	0.48	0.38	0.84*	−0.42
	(0.26)	(0.54)	(0.37)	(0.59)
Group concept in pandemic: partly open (within)	0.21*	0.59	0.22	−0.43
	(0.11)	(0.32)	(0.14)	(0.33)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (within)	−1.38***	−0.35	0.17	0.14
	(0.31)	(0.74)	(0.36)	(0.65)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (within)	0.40*	0.40	0.01	0.77**
	(0.18)	(0.29)	(0.21)	(0.28)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (within)	−0.11	−0.68**	0.24	−0.56*
	(0.10)	(0.24)	(0.14)	(0.23)
Nr. of children aged 0-2 (between)	0.02***	0.02***	0.01**	0.01**
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 3-6 (between)	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.01*
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 7 and older (between)	0.00	0.00	0.01***	0.01
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 0-2 (within)	−0.00	0.02**	−0.01	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Nr. of children aged 3-6 (within)	0.01***	0.01***	0.01***	0.01***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 7 and older (within)	0.01	−0.00	0.01	0.01**
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)
AIC	24435.54	16353.94	17683.18	18627.32
Log Likelihood	−12190.77	−8149.97	−8814.59	−9286.66
Num. obs.	101683	74145	101683	74145
Num. groups: week	19	13	19	13
Num. groups: token	7422	6766	7422	6766
Var: week (Intercept)	0.11	0.06	0.36	0.25
Var: token (Intercept)	2.19	2.78	2.43	3.13

$^{***}p < 0.001$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{*}p < 0.05$. Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute. Second wave assumed to last from calendar week (CW) 36/2020-02/2021, and third wave from CW 03/2021-16/2021. REWB poisson model with two-way fixed effects, offset for county incidence (data collected by the Robert Koch-Institute), dependent variable with 1 week lead. coefficients are displayed as log incidence rate ratio, standard errors in parentheses, own calculations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table A12: Alternative Wave Definition: Incidence rate ratios (log) of predictors for infections in staff in 2nd (model 1) and 3rd wave (model 2), and in children (2nd wave, model 3; 3rd wave, model 4)

	(1): Inf. Staff, 2nd Wave	(2): Inf. Staff, 3rd Wave	(3): Inf. Child, 2nd Wave	(4): Inf. Child, 3rd Wave
Intercept	-10.75^{***}	-9.30^{***}	-9.56^{***}	-9.39^{***}
	(0.42)	(0.32)	(0.38)	(0.32)
Provider: other non-profit (ref.: ecclesiastical)	-0.04	0.12	-0.04	-0.11
	(0.08)	(0.13)	(0.10)	(0.12)
Provider: private	-0.07	0.06	-0.14	-0.31
	(0.10)	(0.16)	(0.12)	(0.16)
Provider: public	-0.07	0.14	-0.11	0.08
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.10)
SES: 11 to 30% of low SES children (ref.: below 10%)	0.14^{*}	0.35^{***}	0.17^{*}	0.31^{**}
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.10)
SES: 31 to 60% of low SES children	0.37^{***}	0.52^{***}	0.31^{**}	0.46^{***}
	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.10)	(0.12)
SES: above 60% of low SES children	0.76^{***}	0.63^{***}	0.56^{***}	0.77^{***}
	(0.10)	(0.16)	(0.12)	(0.15)
Group concept before pandemic: open (ref.: fixed)	0.03	0.15	0.03	-0.07
	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.12)	(0.14)
Group concept before pandemic: partly open	0.07	0.11	-0.02	0.09
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.10)
Group concept in pandemic: open (ref.: fixed) (between)	-0.19	-0.40	-0.45	0.05
	(0.20)	(0.28)	(0.24)	(0.26)
Group concept in pandemic: partly open (between)	-0.09	-0.14	-0.05	0.00
	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.12)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (between)	1.10^{**}	-0.26	-0.34	0.11
	(0.41)	(0.29)	(0.35)	(0.30)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (between)	0.01	-0.03	-0.11	-0.13
	(0.10)	(0.14)	(0.12)	(0.13)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (between)	0.23^{**}	0.07	0.24^{**}	0.25^{*}
	(0.08)	(0.11)	(0.09)	(0.10)
Group concept in pandemic: open (ref.: fixed) (within)	0.25	0.34	0.63^{*}	0.02
	(0.23)	(0.72)	(0.31)	(0.72)
Group concept in pandemic: partly open (within)	0.15	0.63	0.25^{*}	-0.02
	(0.09)	(0.49)	(0.12)	(0.44)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (within)	-0.79^{**}	-1.31	-0.05	1.31
	(0.27)	(1.09)	(0.31)	(0.79)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (within)	0.23	1.15^{**}	0.20	0.70^{*}
	(0.16)	(0.40)	(0.19)	(0.35)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (within)	-0.04	-0.68^{*}	0.34^{**}	-0.85^{**}
	(0.09)	(0.33)	(0.12)	(0.28)
Nr. of children aged 0-2 (between)	0.03^{***}	0.02^{***}	0.01^{***}	0.01
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 3-6 (between)	0.01^{***}	0.01^{**}	0.01^{***}	0.01^{***}
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 7 and older (between)	0.01	0.00	0.01^{**}	0.01
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 0-2 (within)	-0.00	0.01	-0.02^{***}	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Nr. of children aged 3-6 (within)	0.01^{***}	0.01^{**}	0.01^{***}	0.01^{***}
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 7 and older (within)	0.00	0.01	0.01^{***}	0.02^{**}
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)
AIC	28594.93	12330.39	20600.97	15635.25
Log Likelihood	-14270.46	-6138.20	-10273.49	-7790.62
Num. obs.	126224	49604	126224	49604
Num. groups: week	23	9	23	9
Num. groups: token	7531	6477	7531	6477
Var: week (Intercept)	0.10	0.06	0.28	0.02
Var: token (Intercept)	2.03	3.18	2.34	3.48

$^{***}p < 0.001$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{*}p < 0.05$. Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute. Second wave assumed to last from calendar week (CW) 36/2020-06/2021, and third wave from CW 07/2021-16/2021. REWB poisson model with two-way fixed effects, offset for county incidence (data collected by the Robert Koch-Institute), dependent variable with 1 week lead. coefficients are displayed as log incidence rate ratio, standard errors in parentheses, own calculations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21257958; this version posted June 9, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table A13: Alternative Distribution: Generalized Poisson. Incidence rate ratios (log) of predictors for infections in staff in 2nd (model 1) and 3rd wave (model 2), and in children (2nd wave, model 3; 3rd wave, model 4)

	(1): Inf. Staff, 2nd Wave	(2): Inf. Staff, 3rd Wave	(3): Inf. Child, 2nd Wave	(4): Inf. Child, 3rd Wave
Intercept	-10.21^{***}	-8.81^{***}	-9.04^{***}	-8.63^{***}
	(0.41)	(0.25)	(0.35)	(0.25)
Provider: other non-profit (ref.: ecclesiastical)	-0.05	0.07	-0.03	-0.12
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.10)
Provider: private	-0.08	0.02	-0.09	-0.33^{**}
	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.13)
Provider: public	-0.06	0.12	-0.11	0.05
	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.07)
SES: 11 to 30% of low SES children (ref.: below 10%)	0.10	0.33^{***}	0.15^{*}	0.26^{***}
	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.08)
SES: 31 to 60% of low SES children	0.33^{***}	0.53^{***}	0.28^{**}	0.42^{***}
	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.10)
SES: above 60% of low SES children	0.75^{***}	0.56^{***}	0.51^{***}	0.65^{***}
	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.10)	(0.11)
Group concept before pandemic: open (ref.: fixed)	0.08	0.16	0.04	-0.03
	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Group concept before pandemic: partly open	0.08	0.13	-0.05	0.09
	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.08)
Group concept in pandemic: open (ref.: fixed) (between)	-0.23	$-0.38^{\dagger}$	-0.42^{*}	-0.04
	(0.17)	(0.23)	(0.21)	(0.21)
Group concept in pandemic: partly open (between)	-0.11	-0.18	-0.04	0.02
	(0.08)	(0.11)	(0.09)	(0.10)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (between)	1.04^{**}	-0.29	-0.35	-0.04
	(0.39)	(0.24)	(0.31)	(0.23)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (between)	-0.02	0.02	$-0.19^{\dagger}$	-0.12
	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.10)	(0.10)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (between)	0.21^{**}	0.03	0.24^{**}	0.24^{**}
	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Group concept in pandemic: open (ref.: fixed) (within)	0.11	-0.36	$0.66^{\dagger}$	-0.19
	(0.27)	(0.78)	(0.34)	(0.77)
Group concept in pandemic: partly open (within)	0.09	$0.77^{\dagger}$	0.04	0.08
	(0.12)	(0.42)	(0.15)	(0.42)
Hygiene: regular ventilation of rooms (within)	-0.69^{*}	-1.03	-0.15	0.99
	(0.35)	(0.91)	(0.36)	(0.77)
Hygiene: regular surface disinfection (within)	0.09	1.14^{*}	0.14	-0.17
	(0.19)	(0.44)	(0.22)	(0.40)
Hygiene: fixed staff assignment to groups (within)	-0.07	$-0.58^{\dagger}$	0.21	-0.21
	(0.12)	(0.31)	(0.14)	(0.32)
Nr. of children aged 0-2 (between)	0.02^{***}	0.02^{***}	0.01^{***}	0.01^{*}
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 3-6 (between)	0.01^{***}	0.00^{**}	0.01^{***}	0.01^{***}
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 7 and older (between)	0.00^{*}	0.00	0.01^{**}	0.01
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 0-2 (within)	-0.00	0.01	-0.02^{*}	0.01
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Nr. of children aged 3-6 (within)	0.00^{*}	0.01^{***}	0.01^{***}	0.01^{***}
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Nr. of children aged 7 and older (within)	0.01	0.00	$0.01^{\dagger}$	0.01^{*}
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
AIC	24323.13	13019.59	17420.88	15012.93
Log Likelihood	-12133.57	-6481.79	-8682.44	-7478.47
Num. obs.	114041	61787	114041	61787
Num. groups: week	21	11	21	11
Num. groups: token	7479	6615	7479	6615
Var: week (Intercept)	0.15	0.03	0.36	0.07
Var: token (Intercept)	0.92	1.36	0.97	1.12

$^{***}p < 0.001$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{*}p < 0.05$; $^{\dagger}p < 0.1$. Source: Survey data collected by the German Youth Institute. Second wave assumed to last from calendar week (CW) 36/2020-04/2021, and third wave from CW 05/2021-16/2021. REWB generalized poisson model with two-way fixed effects, offset for county incidence (data collected by the Robert Koch-Institute), dependent variable with 1 week lead. Coefficients are displayed as log incidence rate ratio, standard errors in parentheses, own calculations.