Secondary transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in educational settings in Northern Italy from September 2020 to April 2021: a population-based study

Authors:

Olivera Djuric[1,2], Elisabetta Larosa[3], Mariateresa Cassinadri[3], Silvia Cilloni[3], Eufemia Bisaccia[3], Davide Pepe[3], Massimo Vicentini[1], Francesco Venturelli[3], Laura Bonvicini[1], Paolo Giorgi Rossi[1], Patrizio Pezzotti[4], Alberto Mateo Urdiales[4], Emanuela Bedeschi[3], and the Reggio Emilia Covid-19 Working Group.

Affiliations:

1) Epidemiology Unit, Azienda Unità Sanitaria Locale – IRCCS di Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy

2) Center for Environmental, Nutritional and Genetic Epidemiology (CREAGEN), Section of Public Health, Department of Biomedical, Metabolic and Neural Sciences, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia. Italy

3) Public health unit, Azienda Unità Sanitaria Locale – IRCCS di Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy

4) Department of Infectious Diseases, Istituto Superiore di Sanità, Rome, Italy.

The following are members of the Reggio Emilia Covid-19 Working Group:

Reggio Emilia Covid-19 Working Group: Massimo Costantini, Paolo Giorgi Rossi, Roberto Grilli, Massimiliano Marino, Debora Formisano, Giulio Formoso, Emanuela Bedeschi, Cinzia Perilli, Ivano Venturi, Eufemia Bisaccia, Elisabetta Larosa, Mariateresa Cassinadri, Silvia Cilloni, Cinzia Campari, Francesco Gioia, Serena Broccoli, Marta Ottone, Pierpaolo Pattacini, Giulia Besutti, Valentina Iotti, Lucia Spaggiari, Pamela Mancuso, Andrea Nitrosi, Marco Foracchia, Rossana Colla, Alessandro Zerbini, Marco Massari, Anna Maria Ferrari, Mirco Pinotti, Nicola Facciolongo, Ivana Lattuada, Laura Trabucco, Stefano De Pietri, Giorgio Francesco Danelli, Laura Albertazzi, Enrica Bellesia, Simone Canovi, Mattia Corradini, Tommaso Fasano, Elena Magnani, Annalisa Pilia, Alessandra Polese, Silvia Storchi Incerti, Piera Zaldini, Efrem Bonelli, Bonanno Orsola, Matteo Revelli, Carlo Salvarani, Francesco Venturelli.

Corresponding author:

Olivera Djuric, MD, PHD
Epidemiology Unit
Azienda USL-IRCCS di Reggio Emilia
Via Amendola 2
42122 Reggio Emilia, Italy
Email: olivera.djuric@ausl.re.it
Tel: +39/ 0522335278

Abstract

Background: We aimed to quantify the risk of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the school setting by type of school, characteristics of the index case and calendar period in the Reggio Emilia province (RE), Italy. The secondary aim was to estimate the promptness of contact tracing.

Methods: A population-based analysis of surveillance data of all COVID-19 cases occurring in RE, Italy, from September 1, 2020, to April 4th, 2021, for which a school contact and/or exposure was suspected. Indicator of the delay in contact tracing was computed as the time elapsed since positivity of the index case and the date on which the swab for classmates was scheduled (or most were scheduled).

Results: Overall, 30,184 and 13,608 contacts among classmates and teachers/staff, respectively, were identified and received recommendation for testing; 43,214 (98.7%) performed the test. Secondary transmission occurred in about 40% of the investigated classes, and the overall secondary case attack rate was 4%, slightly higher when the index case was a teacher, but with almost no differences by type of school and stable during the study period. Promptness of contact tracing increased during the study period, reducing the time from index case identification and testing of contacts from 7 to 3 days, as well the ability to identify possible source of infection in the index case.

Conclusions: Despite the spread of the Alpha variant during the study period in RE, the secondary case attack rate remained stable from school reopening in September 2020 until the beginning of April 2021.

Key words: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, schools, attack rate, contact tracing

Background

Since the first case of COVID-19 was described at the end of 2019, there have been almost 249 million cases and 5 million deaths reported globally up to October 2021.[1] In the period prior to the implementation of mass vaccination programmes, social distancing and movement-restriction measures were the main measures undertaken to prevent virus transmission. Closure of educational institutions was one of the preventive measures considered and often adopted during the pandemic. This was due to the concern about potential school-to-home transmissions of the virus from students to more susceptible family members, although the overall risk of severe COVID-19 in children and young people was shown to be very small.[2]

The role of school contacts in the spread of the virus as well the effectiveness of school closures in controlling the epidemic have been debated, and inconsistent results have emerged.[3,4] Modelling studies have provided scenarios with a small impact of school closure on virus transmission under the conditions hypothesized by the authors.[5,6,7] A recent systematic review of empiric studies[8] showed heterogenous results ranging from no effect to an important reduction in virus transmission in the community, with studies with lower risk of bias showing a small effect.[9,10] Finally, three large studies from the US, the UK and Italy suggest a limited role of school transmission in determining mortality in the community.[11-13] It is worth noting that school opening may impact on virus transmission because of the increase in public transport-related contacts and other non-school activities, not only through contacts occurring in the classroom.

In our first study conducted between 1 September and 15 October 2020, non-negligible secondary attack rates were detected, especially in secondary schools. After this first report, several changes occurred that could have influenced the risk of transmission and its control in schools.[14] Starting from 27 November 2020, the local health authority improved contact tracing protocols and introduced immediate molecular tests for all contacts, whether symptomatic or asymptomatic, at the beginning of quarantine, with the aim of identifying all possible sources of infection in

85 asymptomatic contacts, i.e., backward tracing (figure 1). Policies to reduce crowding especially in
86 high schools were introduced (reducing in-class time by 25% to 50%) as were several short closures
87 in the periods of highest incidence (figure 2). Finally, at the end of December 2020, the Alpha
88 variant started to circulate in our province, becoming predominant in February 2021.[15]

89 In this study we present the results of comprehensive epidemiological investigations conducted from
90 school reopening in September 2020 until the end of March 2021. Our aim was to quantify the risk
91 of infection transmission in the school setting by type of school, characteristics of the index case and
92 calendar period in the Reggio Emilia province by analysing surveillance data about all cases who had
93 contacts in the school setting. The second aim was to estimate the promptness of contact tracing.

94 **Methods**

95 *Setting*

96 There are approximately 95,000 inhabitants form 6 months-old to 19-year-old that can attend
97 infant-toddler centres (ages 0-3 years), preschools (ages 3-5), primary schools (ages 6-10), middle
98 schools (ages 11-13) and high schools (ages 14-19), and about 12,000 teachers/ school staff
99 members in Reggio Emilia province (531,751 inhabitants, Emilia Romagna, Northern Italy). During
100 the study period, there were two peaks of infections: in November 2020 and in February/March
101 2021 (figure 2). After the school reopening on 1 September 2020 for remedial courses and on 15
102 September 2020 for the regular school year, in-class learning was in place until 26 October 2020,
103 when most high schools moved to remote learning for at least 75% of scheduled lessons. In addition,
104 because of the to the high circulation of the virus, the Christmas school holidays were extended to
105 the second week of January, i.e., from 20 December to 11/15 January. Another lockdown led to the
106 closing of schools on 3 March 2021 (figure 2). Only infant-toddler centres and preschools, schools
107 that requires laboratory work and schools with pupils with disabilities or special needs continued in-
108 class didactic activities.

109 *Design*

110 An analysis of population-based surveillance data was conducted including all consecutive positive
111 cases confirmed with RT-PCR for SARS-COV-2 infection between 1 September 2020 and 4 April 2021
112 in Reggio Emilia province that led to an epidemiological investigation among children and
113 adolescents (0–19 years) who may have had exposure or contact with positive cases at school. Given
114 that reporting positivity of even one child led to a field investigation, contact tracing and, in some
115 cases, quarantine measures, all cases were included, regardless of the presence of an outbreak or
116 not. We excluded cases that occurred among children not attending schools in the period
117 investigated for contact tracing, i.e., in the period starting 48 h before symptom onset, and for
118 asymptomatic cases, 48 h before diagnosis or 48 h after contact with a certain case, whichever
119 occurred first.

120 *Control measures*

121 When a case occurred in primary and secondary schools, in-class activities were usually suspended,
122 but quarantine was not mandatory if all physical distancing measures were respected (sufficient
123 distance in the classroom, physical distance during all activities and utilization of face masks). All
124 students and school personnel were asked to perform a swab, with an appointment scheduled as
125 early as possible and communicated to the parents by means of a text message. If at least one
126 secondary case was found, quarantine was mandatory for all students in that class. For all close
127 contacts identified during the epidemiological investigation, a 10-day quarantine and an exit
128 negative test were required. In the infant-toddler and preschool settings, both the teachers and
129 children were considered close contacts if they had had contact with a case at school 48h before
130 symptom onset or a positive swab, in which case they were subjected to quarantine. In some cases,
131 based on the surveillance team's evaluation, the entire school was closed. Teachers were never
132 quarantined for school contacts, except if they taught in an infant-toddler centre or preschool.

133 Other control measures have been described more in detail elsewhere[14]; the major changes
134 occurring during the study period are described in figure 1.

135 *Outcome definition and variables of interest*

136 The main outcome was the secondary transmission rate. Overall attack rates were calculated by
137 dividing the number of cases by the population at risk, i.e., classmates, teachers and staff, who had
138 had close contact with the index case in a period starting from 48h before symptom onset of the
139 symptomatic index case and, for asymptomatic cases, 48h before diagnosis or 48h after contact with
140 a confirmed case, whichever occurred first. Mean attack rate was calculated as the mean value of all
141 class-level transmissions.

142 A classroom cluster was defined as the presence of two or more positive students or teachers/staff
143 members in the same class.

144 In this analysis we consider each single case or outbreak within a class as one statistical unit. For
145 each class an index case was identified, i.e., the first case who tested positive (considering the date
146 the swab was done). If more than one case in a class tested positive on the same day, the one with
147 the earliest symptom onset was considered the index case. The same class can be included more
148 than once because it may have been involved in more than one investigation during the study
149 period.

150 When more than one class was included in a between-class transmission or there was a single index
151 case for more than one class (usually, but not only, when the index case was a teacher), this was
152 considered a school cluster.

153 If a classmate was already in isolation prior to symptom onset or swab positivity of the index case,
154 due to contact with a positive person or re-entry from abroad, he/she was excluded from the
155 denominator. Any student or staff who refused to perform a swab was excluded from the
156 denominator. Cluster characteristics are reported; instead, information on the characteristics of

157 cases diagnosed outside the province or that were identified during some experimental screening
158 programme (2 classes) are missing.

159 Index cases were classified as student or teacher/staff and according to whether the case had a
160 known contact outside the school setting (household, social activity, sport activity, not identified,
161 and other/unspecified). The classes were classified according to the type of school (infant-toddler
162 centre and preschool, primary school, lower secondary school, upper secondary school) and whether
163 they were part of a multiclass cluster.

164 Delay in diagnosis of the index case, computed only for symptomatic cases, as the number of days
165 between symptom onset and the date of swab positivity. Delay in contact tracing was computed as
166 the time from swab positivity of the index case to the date on which the swab for (the majority of)
167 classmates was scheduled.

168 Descriptive statistic was used to analyse and present the data. Data were analysed using Microsoft
169 Excel and Stata v.13.1 (Statacorp, Tx).

170 *Ethical statement*

171 The study was approved by the Area Vasta Emilia Nord Ethics Committee (no. 2020/0045199). The
172 Ethics Committee authorised the use of subject data even in the absence of consent for people that
173 could not be reached, if every reasonable effort had been made to contact that subject.

174 **Results**

175 A total of 1213 student and 391 teacher/staff index cases were identified, corresponding to 1882
176 investigated classes, because some index cases, particularly teachers, had contacts in more than one
177 class. A total of 43,792 swabs were requested for contact tracing in these classes; 43,214 (98.7%)
178 were performed (table 1). The number of students and teachers/staff involved in contact tracing was
179 about slightly less than half of the number of total resident students and teachers/staff in the
180 province. However, this does not mean that epidemiological investigations involved this proportion

181 of the school population, because some classes might have been involved in more than one
182 investigation during the study period. Teacher index cases were more frequent in preschools and
183 primary schools than in secondary schools.

184 Student index cases were identified in 56.5% of cases as a contact of other cases, the vast majority
185 of which were within the same household (46.5%); a possible source of infection was identified for
186 only 26.6% of teacher index cases (Table 1).

187 Secondary transmission occurred in less than 40% of classes, and the overall attack rate was 3.9%
188 (95% CI 3.8-4.1%), 3.5% (95% CI 3.3-3.7%) for student index cases and 4.9% (95% CI 4.5-5.3%) for
189 teacher index cases (Table 1). The attack rate over the study period was 4.8% in September and
190 October, 2.6% in November, 3.9% in December and 4% from January to April (Table 2). The attack
191 rate was similar in all types of schools (Table 3).

192 The mean delay in testing was 6 days in student index cases and 4.8 in teachers (Table 1); this did
193 not change over the study period, except for a slight increase in December, and was similar across
194 types of schools (Table 3). On the contrary, the delay in contact tracing decreased from December
195 2020 on, from about 7 days to 3 days (Table 2), not showing any differences between type of index
196 case and type of school (Table 3).

197 **Discussion**

198 We confirm a modest secondary attack rate in schools, as already observed in previous studies.[16-19]
199 Secondary cases occurred in about 40% of classes that were exposed to an infected classmate or
200 teacher, and the overall attack rate was about 4%. Differently from our previous report[14] and other
201 studies reporting data on school cluster investigations,[19] the attack rate was similar in preschools,
202 primary schools and secondary schools. In fact, compared with the first two months of the study
203 period,[14] the attack rate increased in preschools from almost no transmission to 4%, while it
204 remained stable in secondary schools. It must be considered that remote learning and periodic

205 closures were implemented much more frequently in secondary schools, starting from 26 October
206 2020. Furthermore, an increase in the secondary case attack rate starting form late
207 December/January was expected because the spread of the Alpha variant, which is more infectious
208 than the previously circulating variants,[20] started in that period in our region.[15]

209 Surprisingly, the difference in attack rate between classes where the index case was a student and
210 those where the index case was a teacher was also small, despite the different kind of interactions
211 and length of exposure of student-student contact and teacher-student contacts in the school
212 setting. Unfortunately, we do not have any analytical information to define the quality and the
213 duration of interactions between index cases and contacts.

214 The effect of changes in contact tracing strategies introduced mainly after the second wave of the
215 pandemic, i.e., at the end of November 2020, was appreciable in the reduction in the delay in
216 contact tracing and in the increase in the proportion of index cases for which a contact, particularly a
217 contact in their household, was known. Indeed, a higher proportion of school investigations with a
218 known link to household clusters was precisely the anticipated effect of introducing immediate
219 testing of all asymptomatic contacts for all incident cases in the community, because this backward
220 tracing made it possible to identify asymptomatic or paucisymptomatic students and to link them to
221 their school contacts.

222 *Limitations and strengths*

223 The main limitation of this study is that any observed association between changes in secondary
224 attack rate and school or index case characteristics and especially actions implemented during the
225 study period could be confounded by other factors that we could not measure. Among these, the
226 most important was the spread of the Alpha variant, which probably started in our region around
227 Christmas and which became the dominant circulating variant in February. Unfortunately, as very
228 few cases were sequenced in Italy in that period,[15] we cannot determine which clusters were due to
229 the Alpha variant. Other variables that were missing or difficult to standardize were the duration and

intensity of contacts between the index case and other classmates and the control measures each school independently put in place both before the occurrence of the case and during the outbreak.

The main strength of the study is its population-based nature; it included all cases for a which a school contact or exposure was identified. For an analysis of routine surveillance data, the completeness of field investigations is surprisingly high; only a few classes were not characterized, and very few classmates refused to be tested. Each outbreak in each school was investigated and re-checked for plausibility by the investigation team, thereby partially overcoming the shortcomings of cross-sectional, retrospective and self-reported studies.

Conclusions

Overall, we confirmed a moderate risk of secondary transmission in the school setting (4.1% vs 3.2% in the previous study up to 15th October 2020), similar across all types of schools. The attack rate was also stable during the study period, despite the fact that the Alpha variant, which is much more infectious than the previously circulating variants, became predominant in the last included months. The promptness of contact tracing increased over the study period, reducing the time from index case identification to testing of contacts from 7 to 3 days, as well the ability to identify possible sources of infection in the index case.

Acknowledgements

We thank all the Public Health Department officers and COVID-19 reference persons in the schools that collaborated in the investigations.

We thank Jacqueline M. Costa for the English language editing.

Conflict of interest

None declared.

Authors' contributions

PGR, EL, MV and PP designed the study. EL, MC, SC, EB, DP, FV and EB contributed to the collection and management of the data. OD and LB analysed the data. OD and PGR interpreted the data and wrote the manuscript. AMU contributed to data analysis and interpretation of results. All authors revised the manuscript and approved the final version.

Funding

The study was conducted using exclusively institutional funds of the Azienda USL-IRCCS di Reggio Emilia. There was no external funding source for this study.

What is already known on this topic

- Closure of educational institutions was one of the preventive measures considered and often adopted during the pandemic.
- The role of school contacts in the spread of the virus as well the effectiveness of school closures in controlling the epidemic is still debated.
- Potential effect of the more prompt (backward) contact tracing on secondary transmission in educational setting has not been evaluated.

What this study adds

- Risk of transmission in educational setting is moderate with stabile attack rates over time and by type of school.
- Secondary attack rate is slightly higher if index case is a teacher.
- The tracing delay has halved after introducing the backward contact tracing, while ability to identify possible sources of infection in the index case increased.

276 **References**

277 1. Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time.
278 Lancet Infect Dis. 2020;20(5):533-534. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30120-1.

279 2. Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonnel C, Mellendez-Torres JG, Ward J, Hudson L, et al. Susceptibility to
280 SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Children and Adolescents Compared With Adults. A Systematic Review
281 and Meta-analysis. JAMA Pediatr. 2021;175(2):143-156. Doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.4573

282 3. Gaythorpe, KAM, Bhatia S, Mangal T, et al. Children's role in the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic
283 review of early surveillance data on susceptibility, severity, and transmissibility. 2021;11(1):13903.
284 doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-92500-9.

285 4. Haug N, Geyrhofer L, Londei A, Dervic E, Desvars-Larrive A, Loreto V, Pinior B, Thurner S, Klimek P.
286 Ranking the effectiveness of worldwide COVID-19 government interventions. Nat Hum Behav.
287 2020;4(12):1303-1312. doi: 10.1038/s41562-020-01009-0.

288 5. Head JR, Andrejko K, Cheng Q, et al. The effect of school closures and reopening strategies on
289 COVID-19 infection dynamics in the San Francisco Bay Area: a cross-sectional survey and modeling
290 analysis. medRxiv [Preprint]. 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.08.06.20169797.

291 6. Keeling MJ, Tildesley MJ, Atkins BD, et al. The impact of school reopening on the spread of COVID-
292 19 in England. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2021;376(1829):20200261 doi:
293 10.1098/rstb.2020.0261.

294 7. Landeros A, Ji X, Lange K, et al. An examination of school reopening strategies during the SARS-
295 CoV-2 pandemic. PLoS One. 2021;16(5):e0251242. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0251242.

296 8. Walsh S, Chowdhury A, Russell S, et al. Do school closures reduce community transmission of
297 COVID-19? A systematic review of observational studies MedRxiv. 2021. doi:
298 https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.02.21249146.

9. Courtemanche C, Garuccio J, Le A, et al. Strong Social Distancing Measures In The United States Reduced The COVID-19 Growth Rate. Health Aff (Millwood) 2020; 39: 1237–46. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00608.

10. Hsiang S, Allen D, Annan-Phan S, et al. The effect of large-scale anti-contagion policies on the COVID-19 pandemic. Nature 2020; 584: 262–7. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2404-8.

11. Ertem Z, Schechter-Perkins E, Oster E, et al. The Impact of School Opening Model on SARS-CoV-2 Community Incidence and Mortality: A Nationwide Cohort Study. Res Sq [Preprint]. 2021 Jul 15:rs.3.rs-712725. doi: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-712725/v1.

12. Forbes H, Morton CE, Bacon S, et al. Association between living with children and outcomes from covid-19: OpenSAFELY cohort study of 12 million adults in England. BMJ. 2021;372:n628. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n628.

13. Marziano V, Guzzetta G, Rondinone BM, et al. Retrospective analysis of the Italian exit strategy from COVID-19 lockdown. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2021;118(4):e2019617118. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2019617118.

14. Larosa E, Djuric O, Cassinadri M, et al. Secondary transmission of COVID-19 in preschool and school settings in northern Italy after their reopening in September 2020: a population-based study. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(49):2001911. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.49.2001911.

15. Istituto Superiore di Sanità. Prevalenza e distribuzione delle varianti di SARS-CoV-2 di interesse per la sanità pubblica in Italia. Rapporto n. 5 del 23 luglio 2021. July 2021. [Italian] Available at: https://www.epicentro.iss.it/coronavirus/pdf/sars-cov-2-monitoraggio-varianti-rapporti-periodici-23-luglio-2021.pdf

16. Ehrhardt J, Ekinci A, Krehl H, Meincke M, Finci I, Klein J, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in children aged 0 to 19 years in childcare facilities and schools after their reopening in May 2020, Baden-Württemberg, Germany. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(36):2001587. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.36.2001587

324 17. Macartney K, Quinn HE, Pillsbury AJ, Koirala A, Deng L, Winkler N, et al. Transmission of SARS-
325 CoV-2 in Australian educational settings: a prospective cohort study. Lancet Child Adolesc Health.
326 2020;4(11):807-816. doi: 10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30251-0
327 18. Yoon Y, Kim KR, Park H, et al. Stepwise school opening online and off-line and an impact on the
328 epidemiology of COVID-19 in the pediatric population. MedRxiv.2020; (Preprint). doi:
329 10.1101/2020.08.03.20165589.
330 19. Aiano F, Mensah AA, McOwat K, Obi C, Vusirikala A, Powell AA, Flood J, Bosowski J, Letley L,
331 Jones S, Amin-Chowdhury Z, Lacy J, Hayden I, Ismail SA, Ramsay ME, Ladhani SN, Saliba V. COVID-19
332 outbreaks following full reopening of primary and secondary schools in England: Cross-sectional
333 national surveillance, November 2020. Lancet Reg Health Eur. 2021 Jul;6:100120. doi:
334 10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100120. Epub 2021 May 19.
335 20. Davies NG, Abbott S, Barnard RC, et al. Estimated transmissibility and impact of SARS-CoV-2
336 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. Science. 2021;372(6538):eabg3055. doi: 10.1126/science.abg3055.
337

338 **Figure legends**

339 Figure 1. Timeline of the major changes in regulations and recommendations for management of
340 COVID-19 cases in educational settings in Reggio Emilia province

341 Figure 2. Weekly notification rates of new COVID-19 cases per 100,000 inhabitants aged 0-19 years,
342 by age class, Reggio Emilia province, 1 September 2020 – 31 March 2021. In the graph the main
343 changes in school opening and closure are also reported, and (in red) the proportion of Alpha variant
344 among sequenced cases as reported by the Italian National Institute of Health.

345

Tables

Table 1. Characteristics of the field investigation in 1884* classes for which a school contact with a COVID-19 case was suspected, by type of index case. Reggio Emilia, September 2020-March 2021

	Student		Teacher		Total*	
N of classes	**1224**		**658**		**1882**	
Type of school, n (%)						
Infant-toddler centre	194	15.9	156	23.7	350	18.6
Primary school	341	27.8	197	29.9	538	28.6
Middle school	310	25.3	186	28.3	496	26.3
High school	366	29.9	112	17.0	478	25.4
Other educational services	13	1.1	7	1.1	20	1.1
Classes with secondary transmission, n (%)	471	38.5	255	38.7	726	38.6
Classes that were part of a school cluster, n (%)	105	8.6	412	62.6	517	27.5
School clusters, n (%)	51		142		193	
Testing delay - days mean (SD)	6.1	4.8	4.8	4.2	5.6	4.6
Tracing delay - days mean (SD)	4.3	3.3	4.1	2.9	4.2	3.2
Number of contacts	30,184		13,608		43,792	
Number of tested contacts	29,802		13,412		43,214	
N of secondary cases	1047		658		1705	
Overall attack rate, % (95% CI)[¥ **]	3.5	3.3 - 3.7	4.9	4.5 - 5.3	3.9	3.8 - 4.1
Mean attack rate[^ **]	3.6	3.2-4.1	5.0	4.2-5.8	4.1	3.7-4.5
N of index cases	**1213**		**391**		**1604**	
Possible source of infection of index case, n (%)	686	56.6	104	26.6	790	49.2
Household outbreak	564	46.5	50	12.8	614	38.3
Social contact	19	1.6	7	1.8	26	1.6
Sport contact	18	1.5	0	0.0	18	1.1
Someone's contact	85	7.0	47	12.0	132	8.2
No contact reported	527	43.4	287	73.4	814	50.8

* In two classes there were no index cases due to screening

** Swabs not performed were excluded, as were 11 classes with unknown number of contacts

[¥] Calculated by dividing the overall number secondary cases by the number of tested contacts

[^] Mean of all classroom-level attack rates

Table 2. Characteristics of the field investigation in 1884 classes for which a school contact with a COVID-19 cases was suspected, by calendar period. Reggio Emilia, September 2020-March 2021

	September+October		November		December		January+February+March+April*	
N of classes	**248**		**263**		**316**		**1057**	
Type of school, n (%)								
Infant-toddler centre	39	15.7	72	27.4	53	16.8	186	17.6
Primary school	46	18.6	89	33.8	113	35.8	292	27.6
Middle school	52	21.0	82	31.2	104	32.9	258	24.4
High school	111	44.8	18	6.8	42	13.3	307	29.1
Other educational services	0	0.0	2	0.8	4	1.3	14	1.3
Classes with secondary transmission, n (%)	106	43.6	86	33.0	124	40.3	411	39.1
Classes that are part of a school cluster, n (%)	55	22.2	73	27.8	112	35.4	277	26.2
N of school clusters	22		27		37		107	
N of index cases	**226**		**220**		**250**		**908**	
Type of index case, n (%)								
Teacher	38	16.8	75	34.1	72	28.8	206	22.7
Student	188	83.2	145	65.9	178	71.2	702	77.3
Possible source of infection of index case	100	44.2	54	24.5	138	55.2	498	54.8
Household outbreak	59	26.1	45	20.5	113	45.2	397	43.7
Social contact	7	3.1	0	0.0	5	2.0	14	1.5
Sport contact	7	3.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	1.2
Unidentifiable contact	27	11.9	9	4.1	20	8.0	76	8.4
No contact reported	126	55.8	166	75.5	112	44.8	410	45.2
Number of contacts	6,327		6,279		6,860		24,314	
Number of tested contacts	6,252		5,964		6,827		24,204	
N of secondary cases	302		156		264		984	
Overall attack rate, % (95% CI)[¥] **	4.8	4.3 - 5.4	2.6	2.2 - 3.1	3.9	3.4 - 4.4	4.1	3.8 - 4.3
Mean attack rate[^] **	4.8	3.8-5.9	2.8	2.0-3.5	4.2	3.2-5.2	4.2	3.7-4.8
Testing delay - days mean (SD)	5.7 (4.3)		5.8 (3.8)		7.0 (5.1)		5.2 (4.6)	

Tracing delay - days mean (SD)	7.4 (3.8)	7.4 (3.9)	3.6 (1.7)	2.9 (1.9)

*Until 4 April 2021

**Swabs not performed were excluded, as were 11 classes without known number of contacts

[¥] Calculated by dividing overall secondary cases by the number of tested contacts

[^] Mean of all classroom-level attack rates

Table 3. Characteristics of the field investigation in 1884 classes for which a school contact with a Covid-19 cases was suspected, by type of school. Reggio Emilia, September 2020-March 2021

	Infant-toddler centre		Primary school		Middle school		High school		Other educational services	
N of classes	**350**		**540**		**496**		**478**		**20**	
Classes with secondary transmission	131	37.4	216	40.0	173	34.9	202	42.3	5	25.0
Classes that were part of a school cluster	25	7.1	162	30.0	207	41.7	116	24.3	7	35.0
N of school clusters	10		70		68		43		2	
N of index cases	**338**		**466**		**370**		**415**		**15**	
Type of index case, n (%)										
Teacher	144	42.6	126	27.0	66	17.8	51	12.3	4	26.7
Student	194	57.4	340	73.0	304	82.2	364	87.7	11	73.3
Number of contacts	7,767		11,709		12,106		11,936		306	
Number of tested contacts	7,652		11,575		11,923		11,799		298	
N of secondary cases	349		553		386		409		9	
Overall attack rate, % (95% CI)[¥ *]	4.6	4.1 - 5.1	4.8	4.4 - 5.2	3.2	2.9 - 3.6	3.5	3.1 - 3.8	3.0	1.4 - 5.7
Mean attack rate[^ *]	4.8	3.7-5.9	5.0	4.1-5.9	3.4	2.8-4.0	3.3	2.8-3.9	2.1	0.3-4.5
Testing delay - days mean (SD)	6.0	4.6	5.8	4.9	5.4	4.6	5.4	4.3	6.7	5.1
Tracing delay - days mean (SD)	4.4	3.5	4.1	3.1	4.1	3.3	4.4	3.0	3.3	2.3

*Swabs not performed were excluded, as were 11 classes without known number of contacts

[¥] Calculated by dividing the overall number of secondary cases by the number of tested contacts

[^] Mean of all classroom-level attack rates

Figure 1


21/9/2020
• Infant-toddler centres, preschools and elementary school (1st and 2nd grades): all present in the cluster 48h before symptom onset or swab positivity of the index case are close contacts and subject to 14-day quarantine and one swab.
• Elementary schools (3rd-5th grades), middle and high schools: only one swab without quarantine
29/10/2020
Everyone over age 6 years should wear a mask at all times when in school facility or school bus
31/01/2021
Extension of the period defining close contact for more than 48h
Changed duration of isolation/quarantine and exit swab.
• For cases, 10 days, of which at least 3 days without symptoms + test: if negative, stop, if positive, 21 days of quarantine.
• For contacts, quarantine for 14 days from the last contact with positive person or 10 days from the last contact with positive person + negative test
12/10/2020
• One swab (including antigenic) should be performed as soon as possible for all close contacts
• Temporary suspension of attendance while awaiting results of the swab for close contacts in elementary and secondary schools
• The second swab after 14 days of quarantine for the close contacts who became cases
27/11/2020

Figure 2


800.00
700.00
600.00
500.00
400.00
300.00
200.00
100.00
0.00
Remedial courses start
School opening
Reduction in in-class activities in middle and high schools
Winter break
School closure
25% 18% 20% 32% 35% 63% 70% 79% 86% 84% 83% 84% 75% 78%
01/09/2020
08/09/2020
15/09/2020
22/09/2020
29/09/2020
06/10/2020
13/10/2020
20/10/2020
27/10/2020
03/11/2020
10/11/2020
17/11/2020
24/11/2020
01/12/2020
08/12/2020
15/12/2020
22/12/2020
29/12/2020
05/01/2021
12/01/2021
19/01/2021
26/01/2021
02/02/2021
09/02/2021
16/02/2021
23/02/2021
02/03/2021
09/03/2021
16/03/2021
23/03/2021
30/03/2021
0-5
6-10
11-13
14-19
0-19