

# 1 The role of educational settings in the transmission chain of SARS- 2 CoV-2 in 2020: a systematic review

3 **Authors:** Constantine Vardavas<sup>1,2</sup>, Katerina Nikitara<sup>1</sup>, Alexander Mathioudakis<sup>3,4</sup>, Michele  
4 Hilton-Boon<sup>5</sup>, Revati Phalkey<sup>6,7</sup>, Jo Leonardi-Bee<sup>7</sup>, Anastasia Pharris<sup>8</sup>, Charlotte Deogan<sup>8</sup>,  
5 Jonathan E. Suk<sup>8\*</sup>

6

## 7 Affiliations

8 1: School of Medicine, University of Crete, Greece

9 2: Department of Oral Health Policy and Epidemiology, Harvard School of Dental Medicine, Harvard  
10 University, Boston, MA, USA

11 3: Division of Infection, Immunity and Respiratory Medicine, School of Biological Sciences, The  
12 University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.

13 4: North West Lung Centre, Wythenshawe Hospital, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust,  
14 Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, Manchester, UK.

15 5: WISE Centre for Economic Justice, Glasgow Caledonian University

16 6: Climate Change and Health Group, Public Health England, United Kingdom

17 7: Division of Epidemiology and Public Health, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, UK

18 8: European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, Solna, Sweden

19

20

21 \*: Corresponding author: Jonathan E. Suk, [jonathan.suk@ecdc.europa.eu](mailto:jonathan.suk@ecdc.europa.eu), +46858601633. Gustav III:s  
22 Boulevard, 169 73 Solna, Sweden.

23 Word counting: 3216 words

24 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, pandemic, children, schools, household

25

26

27 **Abstract (240 words)**

28 **Background:** School closures have been used as a core Non pharmaceutical intervention  
29 during the COVID-19 pandemic, however the role of educational settings in COVID-19  
30 transmission is still unclear.

31 **Methods:** This systematic literature review assessed studies published between December  
32 2019 and April 1, 2021 in Medline and Embase, which included studies that assessed  
33 educational settings from approximately January 2020 to January 2021. The inclusion  
34 criteria were based on the PCC framework (P-Population, C-Concept, C-Context). The study  
35 *Population* was restricted to people 1-17 years old (excluding neonatal transmission), the  
36 *Concept* was to assess child-to-child and child-to-adult transmission, while the *Context* was  
37 to assess specifically educational setting transmission clusters.

38 **Results:** Fifteen studies met inclusion criteria, ranging from daycare centers to high schools  
39 and summer camps, while eight studies assessed the re-opening of schools in the 2020-2021  
40 school year. In principle although there is sufficient evidence that children can both be  
41 infected by and transmit SARS-CoV-2 in school settings, the SAR remain relatively low -when  
42 NPI measures are implemented in parallel. Moreover, although the evidence was limited  
43 there was an indication that younger children may have a lower SAR than adolescents.

44 **Conclusions:** Transmission in educational settings in 2020 was minimal -when NPI measures  
45 were implemented in parallel. However, with an upsurge of cases related to variants of  
46 concern, continuous surveillance and assessment of the evidence is warranted to ensure the  
47 maximum protection of the health of students and the educational workforce, while also  
48 minimising the numerous negative impacts that school closures may have on children.

49 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 50 • This study provides a rapid review of the peer-reviewed literature pertaining to SARS-  
51 CoV-2 transmission by children within educational settings.
- 52 • The review reflects the status quo of the previous school years (January 2020 - January  
53 2021) due to the lag time between study implementation, peer review and publication.
- 54 • The included studies represent child-to-child transmission within the context of previous  
55 SARS-CoV-2 strains and are not directly applicable to newer variants.

56 **MAIN TEXT**

57 **INTRODUCTION**

58 One of the more perplexing and controversial dimensions during the first year of the COVID-  
59 19 pandemic surrounded the role of children in the transmission. Are they drivers of the  
60 pandemic, or are they merely innocent bystanders, affected in myriad ways by school  
61 closures and other physical distancing measures while not being generally at-risk of COVID-  
62 19 themselves?

63 Epidemiologic indicators of SARS-CoV-2 infection in children provide a complex picture  
64 regarding their potential role in the transmission chain. Systematic reviews have concluded  
65 that children and adolescents have lower susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 infection [1, 2].  
66 However, when infected and symptomatic, children may shed viral RNA in similar quantities  
67 to adults [3], and that younger children (under 5 years) with mild to moderate symptoms  
68 may shed even more virus than older children and adults [4]. While the proportion of  
69 asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections among children in the general population is uncertain,  
70 initial data had indicated that 16% of paediatric cases in Europe in the first phase of the  
71 pandemic were classified as asymptomatic [5], while up to 90% of paediatric cases in China  
72 were deemed to be asymptomatic, mild, or moderate [6]. Moreover, it is possible that  
73 children are less often asymptomatic carriers than adults: a study of non-COVID-19-related  
74 hospitalizations in Milan identified 1% of children and 9% of adults as asymptomatic carriers  
75 of SARS-CoV-2 [7]. Meanwhile, while children are overall noted to have lower rates of  
76 severe COVID-19 cases [8], there is evidence of differing transmission dynamics between  
77 younger vs. older children [2]. There is evidence that when index cases, younger children,  
78 such as under 10 years of age, lead to lower secondary attack rates than older children and  
79 adult [9, 10].

80 Important potential sources of evidence surrounding the role of children in the COVID-19  
81 pandemic come from studies situated in the community, household, healthcare or  
82 educational settings. Transmission of SARS-COV-2 has thus far been documented to be  
83 higher in household settings than in other community settings – including schools – a finding  
84 which may be potentially attributable to the individual, behavioural and contextual factors  
85 of households vs. other settings, as has been suggested elsewhere [9].

86

87 Although, at the time of writing, the more transmissible Delta variant of concern is driving  
88 SARS-CoV-2 transmission (*ref to add ECDC RRA 16-pending*) there is currently a gap in  
89 published studies looking at the transmission of Delta in school settings. However, as  
90 decisions currently need to be taken to ensure high levels of preparedness in school settings  
91 [11], the literature published thus far may have important insights to guide decision-making  
92 around school closures and re-openings, as well support decision making for mitigation  
93 measures in educational settings. This systematic literature review was conducted to assess  
94 child-to-child and child-to-adult SARS-CoV-2 transmission within educational settings and to  
95 calculate where possible the secondary attack rate (SAR) when the child is the index case.

## 96 **METHODS**

### 97 ***Search Strategy***

98 This systematic literature review is reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting  
99 Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines [12]. Relevant studies  
100 published between December 2019 and April 1, 2021 were identified by searching Medline  
101 and Embase. The following set of inclusion criteria were used to determine eligibility of the  
102 studies, which is based on the PCC framework (P-Population, C-Concept, C-Context). The  
103 study *Population* was restricted to people 1-17 years old (excluding neonatal transmission  
104 [13]), the *Concept* was to assess child-to-child and child-to-adult transmission when the  
105 child is the index case, while the *Context* was to assess specifically educational setting  
106 transmission clusters. Subject heading terms and free text words relating to the Population,  
107 Concept and Context terms as identified in the inclusion criteria were used to develop a  
108 comprehensive list of terms for the search strategy, from which this specific review was  
109 based. We included all studies of quantitative research, while, opinion pieces,  
110 commentaries, case reports and editorials were excluded. Mathematical modelling and  
111 simulation studies were also excluded. We additionally screened reference lists of the  
112 included articles to identify further relevant studies. The search was limited to the English  
113 language.

114

### 115 ***Study selection***

116 Initially, a pilot training screening process was used where 100 identical articles were  
117 screened for their eligibility independently by two reviewers to ensure consistency in  
118 screening. As a high measure of inter-rater agreement was achieved between the two  
119 reviewers during the pilot assessment (percentage agreement >90% and/ or Cohen's Kappa  
120 >0.81), the remaining titles were randomly allocated to the two reviewers and screened for  
121 eligibility independently by them. After an initial selection of the titles, each reviewer  
122 assessed each other's selected studies. The retrieved articles were then independently  
123 double-screened by two reviewers based on the full text of the articles.

#### 124 ***Data extraction***

125 The data extraction template was piloted independently by the two reviewers on a random  
126 sample of two included studies to enable an assessment of consistency in data extraction  
127 and to identify where amendments needed to be made to the template. The remaining  
128 studies were then data extracted independently by two reviewers, and the results were  
129 double checked across the original manuscript by a third reviewer.

#### 130 ***Data synthesis***

131 Characteristics of the included studies were presented in tabulated form detailing the study  
132 design, geographical location of the study, sample size, characteristics of the populations  
133 considered, setting, context, parallel implemented Non Pharmaceutical Interventions (NPI),  
134 and the findings of the study. Depending on the level of information available, infection SAR  
135 were noted. A narrative synthesis approach was applied to look systematically at the data  
136 and to describe each study categorized by the study design. Patterns in the data were  
137 identified through tabulation of results, and an inductive approach was taken to translate  
138 the data to identify areas of commonality between studies.

#### 139 ***Patient and Public Involvement statement***

140 Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or  
141 dissemination plans of our research.

## 142 **RESULTS**

#### 143 ***Study selection and description***

144 A total of 5,406 studies were identified according to the specified selection criteria from  
145 Medline and Embase. After the removal of duplicates, 5,233 were screened by  
146 title/abstract, out of which 333 were assessed via full text, and 15 studies subsequently  
147 included in this review. The PRISMA flowchart showing the flow of study selection is  
148 presented in **Figure 1**.

149 Fifteen published studies were identified to address child-to-child and/or child-to-adult  
150 transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Timeframes of data collection within these studies ranged  
151 between January 2020 and January 2021. Studies from 11 countries were included (United  
152 States, South Korea, Israel, Germany, Italy, Ireland, France, Singapore, Australia, Norway,  
153 and England). A full detailed overview of the published studies is provided in **Table 1**.

#### 154 ***Studies assessing outbreaks in Educational Settings***

155 Heavey et al. [14] conducted a case study in order to explore the role of transmission among  
156 children in the school setting in the Republic of Ireland, before school closure. Three  
157 pediatric index cases of COVID-19 with a history of school attendance were detected with  
158 895 contacts. Child-to-adult transmission or child-to-child transmission was not reported in  
159 this study. Similarly Danis et al. [15] presented the contact tracing results of a nine-year-old  
160 child in France, who visited 3 different schools the first days of symptom appearance. There  
161 was no evidence of secondary transmission in any of the school contacts. Moreover, Yung et  
162 al. traced three COVID-19 cases (2 pediatric and 1 adult) in three different educational  
163 settings, and the results were negative, as were the tracing of close contacts of a preschool  
164 case in S Korea [16]. Gold et al, in early 2020 had also indicated the possibility of educators  
165 playing a role in school transmission as identified through the assessment of a transmission  
166 cluster in primary (elementary) schools in the US [17] while Lopez et al assessed three  
167 COVID-19 outbreaks in child care facilities in Utah, during April 1–July 10, 2020 and noted  
168 that SARS-CoV-2 Infections among young children acquired in child care settings were  
169 transmitted to their household members [18].

170 One study from New South Wales, Australia presented an overview of COVID-19 cases and  
171 transmission in schools. In a total number of 15 schools and 10 Early Childhood Educational  
172 and Care Settings, 27 index cases were identified, among which 12 were children and 15  
173 staff members. Secondary transmission was noted only in four out of 25 educational

174 settings, where 2 children and 1 adult secondary cases were detected after the tracing of  
175 752 contacts [19].

### 176 ***Studies assessing the re-opening of schools and summer camps***

177 Eight studies reported on the regional evidence after the re-opening of schools. A school  
178 outbreak in Israel after reopening of schools in May 2020 was described by Stein-Zamir et al.  
179 The outbreak assessment was initiated by two pediatric COVID-19 cases that were not  
180 epidemiologically related. The results showed that 153/1161 students and 25/151 staff  
181 members tested positive for COVID-19. However, this outbreak was attributed to crowded  
182 classes, combined with the exemption of facemasks and the use of air-condition due to an  
183 extreme heatwave [20]. On the contrary, a study by Link-Gelles et al., in Rhode Island, USA,  
184 among 666 child care programs that reopened on 1 June, 2020 after a 3-month closure  
185 revealed 52 confirmed and probable cases (33 confirmed cases), of which 30 were among  
186 children and 22 among adults. Secondary transmission for 10 cases was noted in only 4/666  
187 childcare programs, which was attributed to class distancing, the use of face masks for  
188 adults, universal symptom screening daily and disinfection [21]. The regional reopening of  
189 schools in Germany in May 2020 was assessed by Ehrhardt et al., who noted that child-to-  
190 child transmission in schools/childcare facilities appeared very uncommon, with an  
191 estimated six of the identified 137 cases that had attended school to have led to a  
192 secondary transmission overall to 11 additional pupils [22]. While two additional studies  
193 from S Korea by Yoon et al., indicated that upon the return of children to school in May-June  
194 2020, no indication of secondary transmission was noted in kindergarten children, middle  
195 school or high schools, while in primary school only two cases of secondary transmission  
196 was noted [23, 24]. The reopening of schools in September 2020 in Italy was not associated  
197 with elevated SAR, which reached 3.8% overall, 0% in preschool, 0.38% in primary and  
198 6.46% in secondary schools, however these percentages included both adult and child cases  
199 [25]. Brandal et al., assessed the transmission of COVID-19 in school settings in Norway  
200 between August-November 2020 and identified minimal child-to-child (0.9%, 2/234) and  
201 child-to-adult (1.7%, 1/58) transmission [26].

202 Summer educational camps are presented separately, as close proximity between students  
203 is not only noted within school hours but throughout the day and night due to additional  
204 extra curriculum activities and close sleeping proximity. Two studies assessed secondary

205 transmission within summer educational camps, with striking differences. Pray et al  
206 identified a rapid transmission of SARS-CoV-2 at an overnight retreat where adolescents and  
207 young adults aged 14–24 years had prolonged contact and shared sleeping quarters, where  
208 one index case/child led to the infection of 76% of attendees [27]. On the contrary Blaisdell  
209 in four overnight camps noted no indication of secondary transmission following the  
210 isolation of the paediatric index case and quarantine of their cohort, indicating the  
211 importance of the implementation of NPI to reduce COVID-19 transmission [28].

### 212 ***Secondary attack rates of COVID-19 transmission in educational settings***

213 **Table 2** presents the SAR extracted from the studies, ranging from 0 to 76%, depending on  
214 the setting, the timeframe and the implementation of NPI. With the exception of the study  
215 by Pray et al., [27] within the context of summer camps in which a high transmission rate  
216 (76%) was noted, in all studies within the context of school settings, the reported SARs were  
217 minimal. Age differentiations were noted, for instance in the study by Larosa et al., across  
218 36 schools in northern Italy, who identified an overall SAR of 3.2%, reaching 6.6% in middle  
219 and high schools and 0.38% in primary schools.

## 220 **DISCUSSION**

221 This study provides a rapid review of the peer-reviewed literature pertaining to SARS-CoV-2  
222 transmission by children within educational settings, a topic which is a crucial input to  
223 assessments of the role of school settings in COVID-19 transmission. The literature  
224 appraised in this review provides sufficient evidence that children can both be infected by  
225 and transmit SARS-CoV-2 in school settings, however the SAR remained relatively low within  
226 the studies assessed by our review, reflecting primarily schools in 2020. Our results with  
227 regards to educational settings are in line with population based studies published after the  
228 cut-off of this review, in which SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks were uncommon in educational  
229 settings [29] in England [30], Canada [31] and in Utah, [32], Missouri [33] and New Jersey,  
230 USA [34], during similar periods.

231 During the first waves of the COVID-19 pandemic, the vast uncertainty surrounding the  
232 epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 led many countries globally to include school closure  
233 concomitant with other NPIs for reducing COVID-19 transmission. Within our review there  
234 were limited cases in the assessed studies in which a child index case was responsible for



235 extensive secondary transmission in schools, with the notable exception of an outbreak in  
236 Israel (which was associated with dense spacing, lack of the use of facemasks and closed  
237 spaces with poor ventilation) and secondary transmission within summer educational  
238 camps, where prolonged exposure between case-contact pairs is expected [27]. This finding  
239 is supported by data from a large population based study assessing transmission dynamics  
240 that identified that patterns of enhanced transmission risk in similar age pairs were  
241 strongest among children aged 0 to 14 years [2].

242 On the contrary, evidence from studies that note a very small number of cases after school  
243 reopenings the authors attribute to the strict NPIs implemented including the use of face  
244 masks, physical distancing, screening for symptoms and classroom disinfection. Close  
245 proximity between students was linked to elevated transmission rates in both school  
246 settings and educational camps [20, 27], while adult educators have also been noted to play  
247 a role in school transmission [17].

248 Modelling studies using various assumptions of infectivity from the first 3-4 months of the  
249 pandemic [35-41], have previously assessed the role of school closure, and overall indicated  
250 that school closure is associated with a reduction in the number of cases, hospitalisations  
251 and ICU admissions, with the effect of school closure dependent on the transmission rate,  
252 and the duration of school closure. Within this context age is noted to be a crucial aspect, as  
253 recent modelling studies from the Netherlands indicated that contact restrictions within the  
254 age group of 10-20 years old caused a slightly more significant reduction in  $R_e$  compared to  
255 5-10 years old [54]. The same study also assessed the impact of reducing school contacts in  
256 pandemic progression and showed that if complete school closure were implemented after  
257 the summer holidays,  $R$  would be reduced by 10%, however, if school closure was enacted  
258 in November, after implementing a partial lockdown since August, it could further decrease  
259  $R$  by 16%. Another recent European study that assessed school closure, based on the  
260 population of two large cities of Norway, Oslo and Tromso, indicating that a controlled and  
261 gradual school re-opening would only have a slight increase in the reproduction number of  
262 less than 0.25, and probably in the range between 0.10 and 0.14, which would not  
263 substantially affect the infection rates [55].

264 While school closure may reduce SARS-CoV-2 transmission as noted above, the societal and  
265 economic impacts of prolonged school closure are noteworthy, as they may impact the

266 availability of the healthcare workforce [37, 42] and may also have negative effects on  
267 children through the interruption of the educational learning, social isolation, increased  
268 exposure to domestic violence, and rise in dropout rates [43]. Furthermore, the impact of  
269 school closures has been noted to impact significantly also special education [44], while  
270 research performed within the context of the COVID-19 pandemic has identified that  
271 contextual factors of particular relevance during school closures had negative impacts on  
272 student wellbeing [45]. In light of the above, policy makers need to be aware of the  
273 cost/benefit in each setting when considering school closures as a NPI [46].

274 Transmission of SARS-COV-2 has been noted to be higher in household settings than other  
275 community settings, including schools, a finding which may be potentially attributable to the  
276 individual, behavioural and contextual factors of the household vs. other settings, which  
277 may support transmission dynamics [47]. Direct evidence showing children as a source of  
278 transmission is scarce and largely based on small studies or studies investigating few  
279 paediatric cases, however the results presented here concur with other and previous  
280 systematic reviews that have summarised the evidence on the role of children in SARS-CoV-  
281 2 transmission [48-50].

282 There are important limitations to this study that may impact the direct implications for  
283 decision-making. As we assessed peer-reviewed evidence published in two biomedical  
284 databases, it inherently reflects the status quo of the interim of the previous school years  
285 (January 2020 - January 2021) due to the lag time between study implementation, peer  
286 review and publication. A further limitation of this report refers to the fact that these  
287 studies represent child-to-child transmission within the context of previous SARS-CoV-2  
288 strains and are not directly applicable to newer and more transmissible variants, such as the  
289 SARS-CoV-2 Delta (B.1.617.2) variant of concern. Finally, the included studies reflect a broad  
290 geographical and temporal range and are limited in comparability due to varying factors  
291 such as: background levels of community SARS-CoV-2 transmission; enrolment strategies  
292 and varying NPI policies which in turn depends highly on the geographical region and the  
293 socioeconomic context, while accountability to government and political stability were  
294 found to exert influence [51]. Hence in light of the above, supporting educators and parents  
295 in the implementation of NPIs is important as population based studies have indicated that

296 adults concerned about the impact of COVID-19 on their children's education were more  
297 likely to practice personal protective measures and social distancing [52].

## 298 **CONCLUSIONS**

299 The findings presented here provide an assessment of the published peer-reviewed  
300 evidence on transmission in educational settings during 2020, in which transmission was  
301 minimal -when NPI measures were implemented in parallel. However, with an upsurge of  
302 cases related to new variants of concern, notably Delta, continuous surveillance and  
303 assessment of the evidence is warranted to ensure the maximum protection of the health of  
304 students and the educational workforce, while also minimising the numerous negative  
305 impacts that school closures may have on children. Where schools remain open, in-school  
306 NPI measures should be continually refined according to new knowledge according to the  
307 epidemiologic context, taking into account levels of community SARS-CoV-2 transmission,  
308 information on the severity of the Delta variant, and vaccination coverage levels among  
309 eligible students, which includes children over 12 in many jurisdictions, at the time of  
310 writing [53].

311 **Acknowledgments**

312 We would like to thank Katerina Papathanasaki, Chrysa Chatzopoulou, Konstantinos  
313 Skouloudakis and Ioanna Lagou for their assistance in data archiving and report preparation.

314 We acknowledge the bravery and dedication of educational professionals everywhere  
315 during these most challenging times.

316

317 **Funding**

318 This report was produced under a service contract 6-ECD.11297, within Framework contract  
319 ECDC/2019/001 Lot 1B, with the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control  
320 (ECDC), acting under the mandate from the European Commission. The information and  
321 views set out in this piece of work are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the  
322 official opinion of the Commission/Agency. The Commission/Agency do not guarantee the  
323 accuracy of the data included in this analysis. Neither the Commission/Agency nor any  
324 person acting on the Commission's/Agency's behalf may be held responsible for the use  
325 which may be made of the information contained therein.

326

327 **Conflicts of interest/Competing interests**

328 None to report.

329

330 **Availability of data and material**

331 Not applicable

## TABLES

**Table 1. Studies assessing SARS-CoV-2 transmission in educational settings, reported secondary cases and parallel non pharmaceutical interventions.**

Lead Author, Year	Country	Timeframe	Age Range*	Setting	Number of symptomatic pediatric index cases	Number of asymptomatic pediatric index cases	Secondary cases in the school settings <sup>1</sup>	Parallel non pharmaceutical interventions
<b>Child care settings</b>								
Lopez et al., 2020 (18)	USA, Utah	April –July 2020	0.2-16	3 childcare facilities	0 child (3 adults)		Transmission was documented from 12 secondary pediatric cases (3 asymptomatic) to at least 12/46 nonfacility contacts (confirmed or probable cases)	Quarantine for 14 days of cases + contacts; in 2 facilities: daily screening and staff members were using masks
Yoon et al., 2021 (24)	South Korea	February – March 2020	4	1 childcare center	1 (information about symptoms not reported)		0/190	Adult staff wore masks, but mask wearing by children were not consistent. After the index case-patient was identified, the center was closed. All potentially exposed persons were quarantined at home for 14 days.
<b>Combined childcare-school settings</b>								
Heavey et al., 2020 (14)	Ireland	March	10-15	Schools	2	1	0/822 school	Exposure before school

		2020					contacts 0/73 other contacts	closure. Schools closed, contacts were quarantined
Danis et al., 2020 (15)	France	January to February 2020	9	3 schools	1	0	0/86 school contacts 1/6 hospitalised contacts	Not reported
Yung et al., 2020 (54)	Singapore	February to March 2020	2.8-15	3 schools	2	0	0/42 symptomatic contacts	Contacts were quarantined. Targeted measures at the school level
Macartney et al., 2020 (19)	Australia, NSW	25 January to 10 April 2020	<18	15 schools and 10 childcare settings	12 (information about symptoms not reported)		3/752 (3: 2 children & 1 adult)	Contacts were quarantined
Stein-Zamir et al., 2020 (20)	Israel	May 2020	12-18	1 high school	2	0	178/1312 (178: 153 children & 25 staff)	Closed spaces with poor ventilation, high temperatures, crowded spaces and close contact with no masks
Link-Gelles et al., 2020 (21)	USA, RI	June – July 2020	<18	666 educational settings	33 confirmed and 19 probable cases in 29 settings		17 cases in 4/666 educational settings with.	Class distancing, the use of face masks for adults, universal symptom screening daily and disinfection
Ehrhardt et al., 2020 (22)	Germany, Baden-Württemberg	May – August 2020	<18	Schools and childcare facilities	137 (information about symptoms not reported)		11/>2300, estimation of 1 secondary case per roughly 25 infectious school days	Masks, social distancing, hygiene, ventilation, smaller class sizes, cancelled activities, exclusion of sick children
Brandal et al., 2020 (26)	Norway, Oslo and Viken counties	August – November 2020	5-13	Primary schools	13 (information about symptoms not reported)		3/292 (3: 2 children & 1 adult)	National guideline-based infection control measures, i.e. hygiene, physical distancing, symptomatic children to stay at home.

								Masks not worn in schools
Gold et al., 2021 (17)	USA, Georgia	December 2020 – January 2021	5-13	8 primary schools	1 (information about symptoms not reported)		5/contacts traced not reported	Physical distancing and masks; imperfect compliance noted
Larosa et al., 2020 (25)	Italy, Reggio Emilia	September – October 2020	<18	8 preschools, 10 primary 18 secondary	43	0	17/1,198 (17 children & 0 adults)	Mandatory surgical masks for children except when seated and not speaking; physical distancing measures
Yoon et al., 2020 (23)	South Korea	Up to July 2020	<18	6 preschools 13 primary, 6 secondary, 14 high schools	44 (information about symptoms not reported)		2/≥ 13,100	School closure continued until 6/4/2020. Social distancing strategies and mask wearing when schools opened with rigorous contact tracing and rapid testing on any suspected cases.
<b>Summer Camps</b>								
Pray et al., 2020 (27)	USA, Wisconsin	July – August 2020	14-24	1 overnight camp	1	0	115/151 confirmed or probable cases	Documentation of a negative prearrival RT-PCR result, 7-day prearrival quarantine, and outdoor programming
Blaisdell et al., 2020 (28)	USA, Maine	June – August 2020	7-18	4 overnight camps	0	1	No secondary transmission identified	Prearrival quarantine, pre- and postarrival testing and symptom screening, cohorting, use of face coverings, physical distancing, enhanced hygiene measures, cleaning and disinfecting, and maximal outdoor programming

1: Measured from the date of last contact; 2: Probable cases; \*Except when the age refers to only 1 pediatric case and age range is n/a


**Table 2. Studies that assessed the secondary attack rate (SAR), when children are the index case within educational settings.**

Lead Author, Year	Country	Timeframe	SAR
Heavey et al., 2020 (14)	Ireland	March 2020	0
Danis et al., 2020 (15)	France	January to February 2020	School: 0/86, Community: 0/80, Hospitalised: 1/6
Yung et al., 2020 (54)	Singapore	February to March 2020	0/42
Macartney et al., 2020 (19)	Australia, NSW	25 January to 9 April, 2020	All settings, all child case to child contacts 0.3% (2/649) All settings, all child case to staff member contacts 1.0% (1/103), Child close contacts 28.0% (7/25)
Stein-Zamir et al., 2020 (20)	Israel	May 2020	178 / 1312
Heavey et al., 2020 (14)	USA, Rhode Island	1 June- 31 July, 2020	n/a
Pray et al., 2020 (27)	United States, Wisconsin	July-August 2020	115/151 (76%)
Blaisdell et al., 2020 (28)	United States, Maine	June-August 2020	0
Lopez et al., 2020 (18)	USA, Utah	April-July 2020	n/a
Ehrhardt et al., 2020 (22)	Germany, Baden-Württemberg	25 May - 5 August 2020	estimation of one secondary case per roughly 25 infectious school days
Brandal et al., 2020 (26)	Norway, Oslo and Viken counties	28 August - 11 November 2020	child 2/234 (0.9%), adult 1/58 (1.7%)
Gold et al., 2021 (17)	United States, Georgia	1 December 2020 - 22 January 2021	n/a
Larosa et al., 2020 (25)	Italy	1 September -15 October 2020	38/994 (3.82%) overall 0.38% in primary schools (1/266) 6.46% in secondary schools (37/572)
Yoon et al., 2021 (24)	South Korea	27/2-16/3/2020	0
Yoon et al., 2020 (23)	Korea	up to 31/7/2020	2/≥ 13,100



## FIGURES

Figure 1. PRISMA Flowchart of study selection included in the rapid review.



## References (imported via Endnote)

1. Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonell C, Melendez-Torres GJ, Ward J, Hudson L, et al. Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Children and Adolescents Compared With Adults. *JAMA Pediatrics*. 2021;175(2):143.
2. Laxminarayan R, Wahl B, Dudala SR, Gopal K, Mohan BC, Neelima S, et al. Epidemiology and transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in two Indian states. *Science*. 2020/11/07 ed2020. p. 691-7.
3. Jones TC, Mühlemann B, Veith T, Biele G, Zuchowski M, Hofmann J, et al. An analysis of SARS-CoV-2 viral load by patient age. medRxiv2020. p. 2020.06.08.20125484.
4. Heald-Sargent T, Muller WJ, Zheng X, Rippe J, Patel AB, Kociolek LK. Age-Related Differences in Nasopharyngeal Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Levels in Patients With Mild to Moderate Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *JAMA Pediatr*. 2020;174(9):902-3.
5. Götzinger F, Santiago-García B, Noguera-Julián A, Lanaspa M, Lancellata L, Calò Carducci FI, et al. COVID-19 in children and adolescents in Europe: a multinational, multicentre cohort study. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. 2020;4(9):653-61.
6. Dong QQ, Qiu LR, Cheng LM, Shu SN, Chen Y, Zhao Y, et al. Kindergartens Reopening in the Period of Regular Epidemic Prevention and Control, Beneficial or Harmful? *Curr Med Sci*. 2020;40(5):817-21.
7. Milani GP, Bottino I, Rocchi A, Marchisio P, Elli S, Agostoni C, et al. Frequency of Children vs Adults Carrying Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Asymptotically. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2021;175(2):193-4.
8. Ludvigsson JF. Systematic review of COVID-19 in children shows milder cases and a better prognosis than adults. *Acta Paediatr*. 2020;109(6):1088-95.
9. Goldstein E, Lipsitch M. Temporal rise in the proportion of younger adults and older adolescents among coronavirus disease (COVID-19) cases following the introduction of physical distancing measures, Germany, March to April 2020. *Euro Surveill*. 2020;25(17).
10. Cho EY, Choi EH, Kim JH. Interpreting Transmissibility of COVID-19 in Children. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(12):3106-7.
11. Control ECDC. COVID-19 in children and the role of school settings in transmission - second update. 8 July 2021.
12. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med*. 2009;6(7):e1000097.
13. Antonakou A. The latest update on the effects of COVID-19 infection in pregnancy. *Eur J Midwifery*. 2020;4:12.
14. Heavey L, Casey G, Kelly C, Kelly D, McDarby G. No evidence of secondary transmission of COVID-19 from children attending school in Ireland, 2020. *Eurosurveillance* 2020.
15. Danis K, Epaulard O, Bénet T, Gaymard A, Campoy S, Botelho-Nevers E, et al. Cluster of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the French Alps, February 2020. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020. p. 825-32.
16. Yung CF, Kam K-Q, Nadua KD, Chong CY, Tan NWH, Li J, et al. Novel Coronavirus 2019 Transmission Risk in Educational Settings. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* 2021. p. 1055-8.
17. Gold JA GJ, Kimball A, et al. Infection Among Elementary School Educators and Students in One School District — Georgia, December 2020–January 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2021;70:289–2922021.

18. Lopez A, Hill M, Antezano J, Vilven D, Rutner T, Bogdanow L, et al. Transmission Dynamics of COVID-19 Outbreaks Associated with Child Care Facilities - Salt Lake City, Utah, April-July 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report* 2020. p. 1319-23.
19. Macartney K, Quinn HE, Pillsbury AJ, Koirala A, Deng L, Winkler N, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australian educational settings: a prospective cohort study. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health: Elsevier BV*; 2020. p. 807-16.
20. Stein-Zamir C, Abramson N, Shoob H, Libal E, Bitan M, Cardash T, et al. A large COVID-19 outbreak in a high school 10 days after schools' reopening, Israel, May 2020. *Eurosurveillance: European Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (ECDC)*; 2020.
21. Link-Gelles R, DellaGrotta AL, Molina C, Clyne A, Campagna K, Lanzieri TM, et al. Limited Secondary Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Child Care Programs - Rhode Island, June 1-July 31, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(34):1170-2.
22. 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-Wurttemberg, Germany. *Euro Surveill.* 2020/09/12 ed2020.
23. Yoon Y, Kim KR, Park H, Kim S, Kim YJ. Stepwise School Opening and an Impact on the Epidemiology of COVID-19 in the Children. *J Korean Med Sci.* 2020/12/02 ed2020. p. e414.
24. Yoon Y, Choi GJ, Kim JY, Kim KR, Park H, Chun JK, et al. Childcare Exposure to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 for 4-Year-Old Presymptomatic Child, South Korea. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020/12/01 ed2021. p. 341-7.
25. Larosa E, Djuric O, Cassinadri M, Cilloni S, Bisaccia E, Vicentini 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.* 2020/12/12 ed2020.
26. Brandal LT, Ofitserova TS, Meijerink H, Rykkvin R, Lund HM, Hungnes O, et al. Minimal transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from paediatric COVID-19 cases in primary schools, Norway, August to November 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2021/01/09 ed2021.
27. Pray I, Gibbons-Burgener S, Rosenberg A, Cole D, Borenstein S, Bateman A, et al. COVID-19 Outbreak at an Overnight Summer School Retreat — Wisconsin, July–August 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 2020. p. 1600-4.
28. Blaisdell L, Cohn W, Pavell J, Rubin D, Vergales J. Preventing and mitigating SARS-CoV-2 transmission - Four Overnight Camps, Maine, June-August 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report* 2020. p. 1216-20.
29. Ladhani SN, Baawuah F, Beckmann J, Okike IO, Ahmad S, Garstang J, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection and transmission in primary schools in England in June-December, 2020 (sKIDs): an active, prospective surveillance study. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health.* 2021;5(6):417-27.
30. Ismail SA, Saliba V, Lopez Bernal J, Ramsay ME, Ladhani SN. SARS-CoV-2 infection and transmission in educational settings: a prospective, cross-sectional analysis of infection clusters and outbreaks in England. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2021;21(3):344-53.
31. Bark D, Dhillon N, St-Jean M, Kinniburgh B, McKee G, Choi A. SARS-CoV-2 transmission in kindergarten to grade 12 schools in the Vancouver Coastal Health region: a descriptive epidemiologic study. *CMAJ Open.* 2021;9(3):E810-e7.
32. Hershov RB, Wu K, Lewis NM, Milne AT, Currie D, Smith AR, et al. Low SARS-CoV-2 Transmission in Elementary Schools - Salt Lake County, Utah, December 3, 2020-January 31, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70(12):442-8.
33. Dawson P, Worrell MC, Malone S, Tinker SC, Fritz S, Maricque B, et al. Pilot Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 Secondary Transmission in Kindergarten Through Grade 12 Schools Implementing Mitigation Strategies - St. Louis County and City of Springfield, Missouri, December 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70(12):449-55.

34. Volpp KG, Kraut BH, Ghosh S, Neatherlin J. Minimal SARS-CoV-2 Transmission After Implementation of a Comprehensive Mitigation Strategy at a School - New Jersey, August 20-November 27, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70(11):377-81.
35. Abdollahi E, Haworth-Brockman M, Keynan Y, Langley JM, Moghadas SM. Simulating the effect of school closure during COVID-19 outbreaks in Ontario, Canada. *BMC medicine.* 2020. p. 230.
36. Chin ET, Huynh BQ, Lo NC, Hastie T, Basu S. Projected geographic disparities in healthcare worker absenteeism from COVID-19 school closures and the economic feasibility of child care subsidies: a simulation study. *BMC medicine.* 2020. p. 218.
37. Bayham J, Fenichel EP. Impact of school closures for COVID-19 on the US health-care workforce and net mortality: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health.* 2020;5(5):e271-e8.
38. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, Wang Y, Wang W, Zhao S, et al. Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science (New York, NY)*2020. p. 1481-6.
39. Koo JR, Cook AR, Park M, Sun Y, Sun H, Lim JT, et al. Interventions to mitigate early spread of SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious diseases.* 2020. p. 678-88.
40. Kim S, Kim YJ, Peck KR, Jung E. School Opening Delay Effect on Transmission Dynamics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Korea: Based on Mathematical Modeling and Simulation Study. *J Korean Med Sci.* 2020/04/04 ed2020. p. e143.
41. Prem K, Liu Y, Russell TW, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Davies N, et al. The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health.* 2020. p. e261-e70.
42. Sadique MZ, Adams EJ, Edmunds WJ. Estimating the costs of school closure for mitigating an influenza pandemic. *BMC Public Health.* 2008;8:135.
43. Adverse consequences of school closures: UNESCO; [Available from: <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse/consequences>].
44. Yakut AD. Educators' experiences in special education institutions during the COVID-19 outbreak. *J Res Spec Educ Needs.* 2021.
45. Mansfield KL, Newby D, Soneson E, Vaci N, Jindra C, Geulayov G, et al. COVID-19 partial school closures and mental health problems: A cross-sectional survey of 11,000 adolescents to determine those most at risk. *JCPP Adv.* 2021;1(2):e12021.
46. Viner RM, Russell SJ, Croker H, Packer J, Ward J, Stansfield C, et al. School closure and management practices during coronavirus outbreaks including COVID-19: a rapid systematic review. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health.* 2020;4(5):397-404.
47. Merckx J, Labrecque JA, Kaufman JS. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by Children. *Dtsch Arztebl Int.* 2020;117(33-34):553-60.
48. Li X, Xu W, Dozier M, He Y, Kirolos A, Theodoratou E. The role of children in transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A rapid review. *J Glob Health.* 2020;10(1):011101.
49. Suk JE, Vardavas C, Nikitara K, Phalkey R, Leonardi-Bee J, Pharris A, et al. The role of children in the transmission chain of SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review and update of current evidence. medRxiv. 2020:2020.11.06.20227264.
50. Wiedenmann M, Goutaki M, Keiser O, Stringhini S, Tanner M, Low N. The role of children and adolescents in the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic: a rapid review. *Swiss Med Wkly.* 2021;151:w30058.
51. Haug N, Geyrhofer L, Londei A, Dervic E, Desvars-Larrive A, Loreto V, et al. Ranking the effectiveness of worldwide COVID-19 government interventions. *Nat Hum Behav.* 2020;4(12):1303-12.
52. Vardavas CI, Odani S, Nikitara K, El Banhawi H, Kyriakos CN, Taylor L, et al. Perceptions and practice of personal protective behaviors to prevent COVID-19 transmission in the G7 nations. *Population Medicine.* 2020;2(June).

53. Control ECfDPa. Overview of the implementation of COVID-19 vaccination strategies and vaccine deployment plans in the EU/EEA 23 September 2021.
54. Yung CF, Kam KQ, Chong CY, Nadua KD, Li J, Tan NWH, et al. Household Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 from Adults to Children. *J Pediatr.* 2020/07/08 ed2020. p. 249-51.