

1 **Title**

2 **Safety of SARS-CoV-2 test-to-stay in daycare: a regression discontinuity in time analysis**

3 **Authors**

4 Felix Dewald, MD^{1,2,3}, Gertrud Steger, Dr.¹, Irina Fish¹, Ivonne Torre-Lage¹, Christina
5 Hellriegel¹, Esther Milz¹, Anja Kolb-Bastigkeit⁴, Eva Heger, Dr.¹, Mira Fries⁵, Michael Buess⁵,
6 Niklas Marizy⁵, Barbara Michaelis⁵, Isabelle Suárez, PD⁶, Gibran Horemheb Rubio
7 Quintanares⁷, Martin Pirkel, Dr.¹, Annette Aigner, PhD⁸, Max Oberste, Dr.⁹, Martin Hellmich,
8 Prof.⁹, Anabelle Wong, MPH^{10,11}, Juan Camilo Orduz, Dr.¹², Gerd Fätkenheuer, Prof.⁶, Jörg
9 Dötsch, Prof.¹³, Annelene Kossow, Dr.^{5,14}, Eva-Maria Moench¹⁵, Dr., Gustav Quade, Dr.¹⁵, Udo
10 Neumann⁴, Rolf Kaiser, Dr.^{1,3}, Madlen Schranz, MSc.^{2,16}, Florian Klein, Prof.^{1,3,17,18}

11 **Affiliations**

12 ¹ Institute of Virology, Faculty of Medicine and University Hospital Cologne, University of
13 Cologne, 50931 Cologne, Germany

14 ² Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin and
15 Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Institute of Public Health, Berlin, Germany.

16 ³ German Center for Infection Research (DZIF), Partner site Bonn-Cologne, 50937 Cologne,
17 Germany

18 ⁴ Youth Welfare Office of Cologne, Cologne, Germany

19 ⁵ Health department of Cologne, Cologne, Germany

20 ⁶ Department I of Internal Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, Faculty of Medicine,
21 University Hospital Cologne, University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany

22 ⁷ Virus security, Paul Ehrlich Institute, Langen, Germany

23 ⁸ Institute of Biometry and Clinical Epidemiology, Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin,
24 corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Charitéplatz
25 1, 10117, Berlin, Germany.

26 ⁹ Institute of Medical Statistics and Computational Biology, Faculty of Medicine, University
27 Hospital Cologne, University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany

28 ¹⁰ Institute of Public Health, Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany

29 ¹¹ Infectious Disease Epidemiology Group, Max Planck Institute for Infection Biology, Berlin,
30 Germany

31 ¹² juanitorduz@gmail.com, <https://juanitorduz.github.io/>

32 ¹³ Department of Pediatrics, Faculty of Medicine, University Hospital Cologne, University of
33 Cologne, Cologne, Germany

34 ¹⁴ Institute for Hygiene, University Hospital Münster, Münster, Germany

35 ¹⁵ MVZ Labor Dr. Quade & Kollegen GmbH, Cologne, Germany

36 ¹⁶ Robert Koch Institute, Department for Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Seestrasse 10,
37 13353 Berlin, Germany.

38 ¹⁷ Center for Molecular Medicine Cologne (CMMC), University of Cologne, 50931 Cologne,
39 Germany

40 ¹⁸ Corresponding author, E-Mail: florian.klein@uk-koeln.de, Phone: +49 221 478-85801,
41 Address: Fürst Pückler-Straße 56, 50935 Köln

42

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

44 **Address correspondence**

45 Florian Klein, E-Mail: florian.klein@uk-koeln.de, Phone: +49 221 478-85801, Address: Fürst
46 Pückler-Straße 56, 50935 Köln

47 **Contributions**

48 Felix Dewald designed the screening, implemented the screening, planned the study, conducted
49 the study, wrote the manuscript, and managed the administrative framework. Gertrud Steger
50 designed the screening, implemented the screening, and helped to interpret the findings. Irina
51 Fish, Ivonne Torre-Lage, Christina Hellriegel, Esther Milz, Anja Kolb-Bastigkeit, Eva Heger,
52 Isabelle Suárez, and Gibran Horemheb Rubio Quintanares implemented the screening and
53 planned and optimized logistics of the screening. Mira Fries, Michael Buess, Barbara
54 Michaelis, and Annelene Kossow partnered as public health scientists, provided data on SARS-
55 CoV-2 infections in Cologne and helped to interpret the findings. Martin Pirkl, Annette Aigner,
56 Max Oberste, Martin Hellmich, Anabelle Wong, and Juan Camilo Orduz advised statistical
57 analysis and helped to interpret the findings. Gerd Fätkenheuer and Jörg Dötsch planned and
58 implemented the screening program. Eva-Maria Moench and Gustav Quade implemented the
59 screening and collected and provided data on PCR tests. Udo Neumann supervised the
60 implementation of the screening. Rolf Kaiser designed the screening, implemented the
61 screening, helped to interpret the findings, and managed the administrative framework. Madlen
62 Schranz supervised the planning and conducting of the study and manuscript preparation.
63 Florian Klein planned and supervised the screening, the study, and manuscript preparation. All
64 authors approved the final manuscript as submitted and agree to be accountable for all aspects
65 of the work.

66 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures (includes financial disclosures)**

67 Felix Dewald, Florian Klein and Rolf Kaiser hold EU-wide trademark protection for the terms
68 “Lolli-Test” (018503959) and “Lolli-Methode” (018503958). All authors have no competing
69 interests.

70 **Funding/Support**

71 Funding was provided by the German Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF)
72 (registration number: 01KX2021) within Bundesweites Forschungsnetz „Angewandte
73 Surveillance und Testung“ (B-FAST) project of the „NaFoUniMedCovid19“ consortium.
74 Furthermore, funding was provided by the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung
75 (registration number: ZMI1-2521COR004) and by the German Research Foundation (DFG,
76 CRC 1310). Additionally, funding was provided by EURCARE, EU grant No. 101046016.
77 Finally, we acknowledge support for the Article Processing Charge from the DFG (German
78 Research Foundation, 491454339).

79 **Acknowledgements**

80 The authors thank all children and staff in tested daycare facilities for support and participation.
81 We thank Moritz Lorenz and Paula Lorenz for supporting the development of the Lolli-Method.
82 We thank Sascha Nickel and Anne Fries as well as all staff members of their daycare facilities
83 for their impetus for the development of the Lolli-Method and screening adaptations. We thank
84 all members of the Institute of Virology, University Hospital Cologne. We thank all staff of
85 Labor Quade for conducting the screening and providing data. We thank Carsten Tschirner

86 (IExcelU) for supporting data visualization and Stephan Glaremin (Amt für Jugend, Arbeit und
87 Soziales der Stadt Düsseldorf) for administrative support during implementation of the
88 screening in Cologne. We thank Janna Seifried and Sindy Böttcher (Robert Koch Institute) for
89 continuous support and discussions. We thank Stefan Konigorski and Mayram Ganji (Berlin
90 School of Public Health) for statistical support and discussion.

91 **Abbreviations**

92 Coronavirus disease 2019, COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome
93 coronavirus type 2; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; RDiT, regression discontinuity in time;
94 MSE, mean squared error; SES, socioeconomic status; IQR, inter-quartile range; RKI, Robert
95 Koch Institute

96 **Data Sharing Statement**

97 Deidentified PCR test data (including data dictionaries) will be made available, in addition to
98 study protocols, the statistical analysis plan, and the code for analysis. The data and code will
99 be made available upon publication to researchers who provide a methodologically sound
100 proposal for use in achieving the goals of the approved proposal. Proposals should be submitted
101 to felix.dewald@uk-koeln.de.

102 **Short-Title**

103 Safety of SARS-CoV-2 test-to-stay in daycare

104 **Article Summary**

105 This study provides evidence on the safety of a SARS-CoV-2 test-to-stay screening in daycare
106 facilities.

107 **What's known on this subject**

108 Test-to-stay approaches have been demonstrated to safely supplant quarantine after SARS-
109 CoV-2 exposure of school children older than 6 years.

110 **What this study adds**

111 This study affirms safety of test-to-stay approaches and extends the evidence to daycare settings
112 and children younger than 6 years.

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120 **Abstract**

121 *Background and Objectives*

122 Test-to-stay concepts apply serial testing of children in daycare after exposure to SARS-CoV-
123 2 without use of quarantine. This study aims to assess safety of a test-to-stay screening in
124 daycare facilities.

125 *Methods*

126 714 daycare facilities and approximately 50,000 children ≤ 6 years in Cologne, Germany
127 participated in a SARS-CoV-2 Pool-PCR screening from March 2021 to April 2022. The
128 screening initially comprised post-exposure quarantine and was adapted to a test-to-stay
129 approach during its course. To assess safety of the test-to-stay approach, we explored potential
130 changes in frequencies of infections among children following the adaptation to the test-to-stay
131 approach by applying regression discontinuity in time (RDiT) analyses. To this end, PCR-test
132 data were linked with routinely collected data on reported infections in children and analyzed
133 using ordinary least squares regressions.

134 *Results*

135 219,885 Pool-PCRs and 352,305 Single-PCRs were performed. 6,440 (2.93%) Pool-PCRs
136 tested positive, and 17,208 infections in children were reported. We estimated that during a
137 period of 30 weeks, the test-to-stay concept avoided between 7 and 20 days of quarantine per
138 eligible daycare child. RDiT revealed a 26% reduction (Exp. Coef: 0.74, CI:0.52;1.06) in
139 infection frequency among children and indicated no significant increase attributable to the test-
140 to-stay approach. This result was not sensitive to adjustments for 7-day incidence, season,
141 SARS-CoV-2 variant, and socioeconomic status.

142 *Conclusion*

143 Our analyses provide evidence that suggest safety of the test-to-stay approach compared to
144 traditional quarantine measures. This approach offers a promising option to avoid use of
145 quarantine after exposure to respiratory pathogens in daycare settings.

146

147

148

149

150 **Introduction**

151 During the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, daycare facilities were closed to
152 mitigate infections.^{1,2} Systematic screenings for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus
153 type 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infections contributed to daycare re-openings, counteracting the
154 profound impact of stay-at-home orders on the development and health of children.^{1,3-6}
155 However, burden of post-exposure quarantine for children exposed to infected children
156 persisted amid rising incidence of infections.⁷ Test-to-stay approaches supplanted the
157 conventional practice of post-exposure quarantine by frequent serial testing for 5-10 subsequent
158 days and reduced the burden of post-exposure quarantine.⁸⁻¹⁶ Safety of test-to-stay approaches,
159 expressed as equivalence in infections as compared to quarantine approaches, was addressed
160 by several studies.⁸⁻¹⁶ These reports are mostly restricted to screenings in schools and included
161 the use of facemasks. Thus, evidence on safety of test-to-stay concepts in daycare facilities,
162 without the use of facemasks, and in an age-group less capable of sticking to hygiene rules, is
163 limited.

164 We previously reported on a city-wide SARS-CoV-2 Pool-polymerase chain reaction (PCR)
165 screening in more than 700 daycare facilities in Cologne, Germany.¹⁷ After the reported period
166 that included post-exposure quarantine measures, the screening was adapted to a test-to-stay
167 approach and was continued for 30 weeks (September 2021-April 2022). Our study aimed to
168 investigate the safety of this test-to-stay approach. We hypothesized that safety can be assumed
169 if no substantial increase in frequencies of infections among children following the adaptation
170 of the screening concept is detectable.

171

172

173 **Methods**

174 **Ethics approval**

175 All analyses were performed under a protocol approved by the institutional review board of the
176 Medical Faculty of the University of Cologne (21-1358).

177 **Screening setting**

178 The screening was implemented under the direction of the Youth Welfare Office of Cologne
179 and accompanied by a team of members of the health authorities of Cologne, the University
180 Hospital of Cologne, and a private diagnostic laboratory (“Labor Quade”). Participation in the
181 screening program was voluntary. Sample collection was performed using the Lolli-Method as
182 described previously (**Figure 1**).¹⁷⁻¹⁹ The Lolli-Method consists of sucking a nasopharyngeal
183 swab for 30 seconds and subsequent testing in SARS-CoV-2 Pool-PCR. For generation of a
184 pool of Lolli-swabs, each child of a daycare group placed a self-sampled Lolli-swab in a
185 common collection tube. One tube containing all swabs of one respective group was tested in
186 one PCR-reaction. When a Pool-PCR tested negative, all children of that pool were assumed to
187 be SARS-CoV-2 negative. When the Pool-PCR tested positive, the respective children were re-
188 tested individually on the next day in Single-PCRs. The identification of an infected child was
189 followed by the isolation of this child. Children exposed to this child were quarantined up to 14
190 days during the quarantine approach. During the test-to-stay approach, exposed children were
191 not quarantined but tested in Lolli-Single-PCRs for 5 subsequent days. If tested negative, they
192 could continue to go to daycare.

193 **Data sources**

194 *PCR test data*

195 PCRs were performed at the Institute of Virology, University Hospital Cologne, and at Labor
196 Quade. Labor Quade reported PCR test data to the Institute of Virology, containing the date of
197 sampling, specimen (Pool- or Single-PCR), test result, daycare ID, and zip code of the daycare
198 facility (**Supplemental Fig. 1**). During the roll-out of the screening (weeks 15-17 in 2021),
199 daycare facilities were enrolled gradually, and the data collection system was under
200 construction and misclassified the specimen of positive PCRs. These weeks were excluded from
201 all analyses. Pool sizes were reported as weekly average pool size per daycare facility.

202 *SARS-CoV-2 index cases and contact persons*

203 The health authorities of Cologne provided data on newly reported SARS-CoV-2 infections
204 (“index cases”) and contact persons recorded with a software developed for the documentation
205 and case management of SARS-CoV-2 in Cologne.²⁰ The data contained the date of the first
206 SARS-CoV-2 detection or the date of the beginning and the end of the quarantine, age, sex, and
207 the zip code of the place of residency (**Supplemental Fig. 1**).

208 *Frequencies of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern (VOCs) and 7-day incidence*

209 Data on Germany-wide proportions of all reported sequences of VOCs were collected as part
210 of a national molecular surveillance system and were published by the Robert Koch Institute
211 (RKI).²¹ The 7-day incidence was extracted from RKI SurvStat@RKI2.0, an online tool for
212 querying notifiable infectious diseases in Germany.²²

213 *Inhabitants and socioeconomic factors of Cologne*

214 Aggregated data on the number of inhabitants in 2020 and socioeconomic factors were
215 published online or provided by the Office for Urban Development and Statistics of Cologne.²³

216 **Descriptive analysis**

217 We reported counts and fractions of total and positive Pool-and Single-PCRs. Pool sizes were
218 reported as median of the weekly mean pool sizes per daycare facility. Cumulative numbers of
219 PCR analyses were estimated by multiplication of the counts of Pool-PCRs with the weekly
220 median pool size and addition of the Single-PCRs. Distribution of positive Pool-PCRs among
221 daycare facilities was reported as median positive Pool-PCRs per daycare facility. We
222 calculated Spearman correlation coefficient to quantify the association between the weekly
223 fraction of positive Pool-PCRs and the 7-day incidence.

224 We estimated the amount of quarantine that was avoided by the use of the test-to-stay approach
225 with the following equations:

$$226 \quad \textit{Exposed children} = (\textit{Median pool size} - 1) * \textit{Positive Pool-PCRs} \quad (1)$$

227 where 1 was subtracted from *Median pool size* to account for one assumed index case within
228 one positive pool. *Positive Pool-PCRs* represents the number of positive Pool-PCRs during the
229 test-to-stay approach. We assumed that all exposed children would have been quarantined in
230 the absence of the test-to-stay approach.

$$231 \quad \textit{Avoided quarantine days} = \textit{Exposed children} * \textit{Median duration of quarantine} \quad (2)$$

232 where *Median duration of quarantine* (days) referred to the screening approach involving
233 quarantine after exposure.

234 To account for the variability of the individual parameters, we derived a variability range for
235 the days of avoided quarantine by multiplying the first/third quartile of the pool size with the
236 number of positive Pool-PCRs (equation 1) and the exposed children with the first/third quartile
237 of the duration of quarantine (equation 2). The days of avoided quarantine per eligible child
238 were estimated dividing the number of avoided quarantine days by the number of inhabitants
239 in Cologne aged 2 to 6 years ($n = 51,830$), assuming that those were eligible for the screening.

240 **Regression discontinuity in time analysis**

241 *Outcome*

242 The outcome for the RDiT was defined as the weekly count of index cases aged 2 to 6 years in
243 Cologne divided by the weekly count of positive Pool-PCRs (**Supplemental Fig. 2**). We
244 assumed that an infected child in a daycare facility would be detected in the screening and the
245 corresponding positive Pool-PCR would contribute to the denominator of the outcome. We
246 expected that secondary infections would occur in the daycare facility. The infected child and
247 the secondary infections would be reported to the health authorities and contribute to the count
248 of reported index cases aged 2 to 6 years in Cologne, which defined the numerator of the
249 outcome. We hypothesized that the transition from the quarantine approach to the test-to-stay
250 approach might affect the number of secondary infections and thus affect the outcome.

251 Analyses were restricted to weeks which did not meet the criteria of low-testing periods as we
252 expected that in those, the denominator of the outcome would be underestimated (e.g., during
253 roll-out of the screening or holiday seasons). We defined a low-testing period as a week in
254 which less than 70% of the average weekly count of Pool-PCRs during the entire screening
255 were performed.

256 *RDiT framework*

257 We followed current best practice for RDiT.²⁴⁻²⁶ The interruption was defined as the change of
258 the test concept from a quarantine approach to a test-to-stay approach (week 37 in 2021). A lag-
259 period of two weeks, in which observations were censored, followed the interruption, to account
260 for the SARS-CoV-2 incubation period and to allow the newly introduced test concept to be
261 fully implemented.²⁷ We applied triangular kernel weights to assign higher weights to
262 observations lying closer to the interruption. We modelled the outcome based on a gamma
263 regression with the following equation:

$$264 \quad Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * (Time) + \beta_2 * (Test\ concept) + \beta_3 * (Time * Test\ concept) + \varepsilon \quad (3)$$

265 where Y is the outcome. β_0 is the intercept. $Time$ is the running variable and given as weekly
266 time units. β_1 reflects the slope before the interruption. $Test\ concept$ is a dummy variable - 0 for
267 the quarantine approach and 1 for the test-to-stay approach. The β_2 -coefficient describes the
268 effect of the interruption on the outcome. The interaction term $Time * Test\ concept$ allows for
269 the slope of the regression line to differ on either side of the interruption (β_3). ε is the error term.
270 Coefficients were exponentiated and interpreted on a multiplicative scale. Presence of
271 autocorrelation was assessed with plots of functions of autocorrelation (acf) and partial
272 autocorrelation (pacf).

273 *Data-driven optimal bandwidth calculation*

274 The width of the time period (“bandwidth”) drawn around the interruption is an important
275 choice in RDiT.^{24,25} We determined a mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth, which
276 minimizes the MSE of the regression fit.^{28,29} For the gamma regression model, we examined

277 variations of the β_2 -coefficient across different bandwidth choices (1, 1.25, 1.5, 1.75, and 2
278 times the MSE-optimal bandwidth).

279 *Robustness check*

280 To assess the robustness of the gamma regression model, we extended the model specification
281 given in equation (3) to a second-order polynomial regression instead of a linear regression
282 (**Supplemental Information, Appendix A**).

283 *Testing continuity of baseline covariates*

284 RDiT requires continuity of baseline covariates across the interruption.^{24,25} This verifies that
285 changes in the outcome are attributable to the defined interruption and not to coincident changes
286 of covariates. Continuity was assessed with help of the RDiT framework by applying local
287 linear regressions. Assuming normal distribution, we modelled the median pool size, the
288 fraction of the Delta variant and the 7-day incidence.

289 *Sensitivity analyses*

290 We included the 7-day incidence, the seasons, and the fraction of the respective SARS-CoV-2
291 variant in Germany in the gamma regression model (**Supplemental Information, Appendix**
292 **A**). We ran stratified analyses for districts with low and middle/high socioeconomic status
293 (SES). For stratification, we used a previously described index of the SES of the neighborhoods
294 of Cologne (**Supplemental Information, Appendix B**).³⁰

295 **Software**

296 Statistical analyses were performed using Microsoft Excel for Mac (v.14.7.3.), Prism 9.0
297 (GraphPad) and R within RStudio (v. 2023.03.0+386) and additional R packages.³¹⁻³³

298 **Results**

299 **Implementation of the screening program**

300 The screening was conducted from March 2021-April 2022 in Cologne, Germany (1.1 million
301 inhabitants). All daycare facilities in Cologne and 51,830 children aged 2 to 6 years were
302 eligible to participate twice weekly. The quarantine approach was conducted from week 11 to
303 36 (2021) and was substituted by the test-to-stay approach from week 37 (2021) to week 14
304 (2022) (**Table 1, Figure 2**). 714 daycare facilities participated in the screening. During the
305 screening, four VOCs emerged (Alpha, Delta, BA.1, and BA.2) and the SARS-CoV-2 7-day
306 incidence in Cologne ranged from 8.67 infections per 100,000 inhabitants in week 25 (2021) to
307 2,573 in week 9 (2022) (**Supplemental Fig. 3**).

308 219,885 Pool-PCRs and 352,305 Single-PCRs were performed. Median of weekly mean pool
309 sizes per daycare facility was 11.5 (IQR: 8-14.6) swabs per pool (**Supplemental Fig. 4**).
310 Approximately 2,897,437 SARS-CoV-2 analyses were performed in total (**Table 1, Figure 2**).
311 6,440 (2.93%) of the Pool-PCRs tested positive (**Table 1**). The median number of positive Pool-
312 PCRs per daycare facility was 9 (IQR: 5-12) (**Supplemental Fig. 5A**). The weekly fraction of
313 positive Pool-PCRs ranged from 0.0% in weeks 24-27 (2021) to 12.44% in week 9 (2022)
314 (**Figure 3A, Supplemental Fig. 5B**) and correlated strongly with the total SARS-CoV-2 7-day
315 incidence in Cologne ($r_s = 0.96$, CI: 0.94-0.98; **Figure 3B**). 12,454 of the Single-PCRs tested
316 positive. During the entire screening, the health authorities in Cologne reported 17,208 index
317 cases among children aged 2 to 6 years (**Table 1, Figure 3A**). Subsequently, our estimation

318 suggests that the screening identified 72.4% of all reported index cases aged 2 to 6 years in
319 Cologne.

320 During the test-to-stay approach, 6,298 Pool-PCRs tested positive (**Table 1**). The median
321 duration of quarantine after exposure to SARS-CoV-2 of children aged 2 to 6 years in Cologne
322 was 10 days (IQR: 8;12) (**Supplemental Fig. 6**). Consequently, we estimated that 661,290 days
323 (variability range: 352,688-1,027,833) spent in quarantine were avoided during the test-to-stay
324 approach. This translated to 13 days (variability range: 7-20) of avoided quarantine per eligible
325 daycare child during a period of 30 weeks (**Figure 4**).

326 **Safety of the test-to-stay approach**

327 Applying an RDiT analyses, we aimed to assess the safety of the test-to-stay approach in
328 comparison to the quarantine approach with the underlying causal framework depicted in a
329 directed acyclic graph (**Supplemental Fig. 7, Supplemental Table 1**).²⁵ We first incorporated
330 all observations in the gamma regression model ("global gamma regression model") which
331 yielded an exponentiated β_2 -coefficient of 0.74 (95% CI: 0.52;1.06) (**Figure 5A**). This
332 translated to 26% less index cases per positive Pool-PCR attributable to the change of the test
333 concept and indicated no substantial increase in infections among children. Visualization of the
334 acf and pacf showed no clear presence of autocorrelated residuals (**Supplemental Fig. 8**). To
335 address biases arising from potential unobserved confounders that are not in proximity of the
336 interruption, we gradually narrowed the underlying bandwidth of the global gamma regression
337 model in a sequence of local gamma regressions (**Figure 5B, Supplemental Fig. 9**). Overall,
338 the main result of the global gamma regression model was not sensitive to the choice of the
339 bandwidth. The observed decrease in precision for shorter bandwidths is a standard finding in
340 RDiT.^{24,25} As robustness check, we verified that the result of the global gamma regression

341 model was similar when using a second-order polynomial specification instead of a linear
342 regression (**Supplemental Fig. 10**).

343 **Testing continuity of baseline covariates**

344 The weekly median pool size ($\beta_2 = -0.89$, CI: -4.12;3.23) and the share of the Delta variant ($\beta_2 =$
345 -0.57 , CI: -1.42;0.28) showed continuity among the interruption. The 7-day incidence did not
346 meet the continuity assumption ($\beta_2 = -147$, CI: -244;-49) (**Supplemental Fig. 11**).

347 **Sensitivity analyses**

348 As 7-day incidence showed discontinuity across the interruption, we included it as predictor in
349 the global gamma regression model. To account for a potential impact of seasonality, we
350 included the seasons in the global gamma regression model. As we could not rule out a role as
351 confounder or competing exposure of the SARS-CoV-2 variant, we included it as predictor in
352 the global gamma regression model. Accounting for these covariates in separate global models,
353 we detected no substantial differences of the corresponding effect estimates or their respective
354 precision (**Supplemental Fig. 12**). Stratification by SES indicated differences between the β_2 -
355 coefficients of both regressions (high/middle: exp. $\beta_2 = 0.57$, CI: 0.37;0.85 and low: exp. $\beta_2 =$
356 1.29 , CI: 0.73;2.24). However, in both strata, there was no indication of an increase in infection
357 frequency (**Supplemental Fig. 13**).

358 **Discussion**

359 This study provided evidence that suggest safety of a SARS-CoV-2 Pool-PCR test-to-stay
360 screening in daycare facilities as compared to a post-exposure quarantine concept. We analyzed
361 one of the most comprehensive test-to-stay screenings in daycare facilities worldwide.³⁴⁻³⁷ This

362 screening was one of the earliest attempts to disestablish the use of quarantine of daycare
363 children in Germany. Our estimation of the impact of the test-to-stay concept on quarantine
364 avoidance showed a substantial reduction in the time spent in quarantine. Our RDiT analyses
365 did not indicate evidence of a discernible increase in infections after quarantine measures were
366 discontinued.

367 Our main results on safety are in line with previous reports on test-to-stay approaches.⁸⁻¹⁶
368 However, those studies were primarily conducted in schools with children and adolescents older
369 than 6 years, and they incorporated the use of facemasks. In contrast, the here analyzed
370 screening was conducted in the absence of the use of facemasks and in an age-group less
371 capable of sticking to hygiene rules. Furthermore, the mentioned studies were conducted during
372 the predominance of one respective SARS-CoV-2 VOCs.⁸⁻¹⁶ In contrast, our analyses spanned
373 a period during which four distinct SARS-CoV-2 VOCs have emerged (Alpha, Delta, BA.1,
374 and BA.2). These variants show distinct virological features that could affect the effectiveness
375 of infection control measures (e.g., incubation period or basic reproduction number).³⁸⁻⁴¹ We
376 show that safety of the test-to-stay screening was not affected by these VOCs. Finally, previous
377 studies mainly report on short-term observations with rather small variations in the incidence,
378 whereas our analyses encompass 13 months with low-and high incidence periods, providing
379 more generalizable evidence.

380 Lolli-swabs collect mainly saliva which has been shown to be a valid specimen for the detection
381 of other respiratory viruses.⁴²⁻⁴⁷ Thus, a test-to-stay approach involving self-sampling of saliva
382 in daycare facilities might be considered an alternative to quarantine in a future epidemic or
383 pandemic scenario of other respiratory viruses. It might contribute to an age-appropriate
384 somatic and physical development.

385 One limitation of this study is that the ethical and political circumstances during the COVID-
386 19 pandemic did not justify addressing the research question by a randomized controlled trial,
387 emerging from the initial screening with a quarantine approach. Thus, the quasi-experimental
388 study design differs from the ideal experimental design. Second, as we analyzed aggregated
389 data, we cannot deduce any causal statements on the level of individual children. Further
390 individualization of the data was not possible due to the challenge of matching index cases with
391 their corresponding positive Pool-PCRs. Third, the risk of bias due to unmeasured confounders
392 needs to be acknowledged. It might comprise changes in data collection practices of the health
393 authorities or in test indication for SARS-CoV-2 testing beyond the screening. However, we
394 assume that most index cases were constantly reported and recorded, as the screening detected
395 most of all notified index cases among children. Furthermore, we assumed that the risk of
396 confounding increases with increasing distance from the interruption and applied kernel
397 weights and different bandwidths to address this risk.

398 **Conclusion**

399 The test-to-stay approach substantially reduced the use of quarantine after SARS-CoV-
400 exposure. There was no indication of a relevant increase in infections among children with this
401 approach. This highlights it as a safe alternative to quarantine after exposure to SARS-CoV-2
402 in daycare. Test-to-stay approaches could prove valuable as infection control measures after
403 exposure to emerging respiratory pathogens in daycare during future outbreaks.

404 **References**

- 405 1. Hagihara H, Yamamoto N, Meng X, et al. COVID-19 school and kindergarten closure
406 relates to children's social relationships: a longitudinal study in Japan. *Sci Rep.*
407 2022;12(1). doi:10.1038/S41598-022-04944-2

- 408 2. Corona Kita Studie. Monatsbericht der Corona-KiTa-Studie. Published online 2020.
409 Accessed February 21, 2023.
410 https://www.dji.de/fileadmin/user_upload/abt2/KiTaCo/Corona-KiTa-
411 [Monatsbericht_Mai_2020.pdf](https://www.dji.de/fileadmin/user_upload/abt2/KiTaCo/Corona-KiTa-Monatsbericht_Mai_2020.pdf)
- 412 3. Long X, Li XY, Jiang H, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 kindergarten closure on
413 overweight and obesity among 3- to 7-year-old children. *World J Pediatr*. Published
414 online 2022. doi:10.1007/S12519-022-00651-0
- 415 4. Knebusch V, Williams J, Yordi Aguirre I, Weber MW, Rakovac I, Breda J. Effects of
416 the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic and the policy response on childhood obesity
417 risk factors: Gender and sex differences and recommendations for research. *Obes Rev*.
418 2021;22 Suppl 6(Suppl 6). doi:10.1111/OBR.13222
- 419 5. Molnár G, Hermann Z. Short- and long-term effects of COVID-related kindergarten and
420 school closures on first- to eighth-grade students' school readiness skills and
421 mathematics, reading and science learning. *Learn Instr*. 2023;83:101706.
422 doi:10.1016/J.LEARNINSTRUC.2022.101706
- 423 6. Wieler L, Häcker G. Warum müssen wir Kinder vor einer SARS-CoV-2-Infektion
424 schützen? *Epid Bull*. Published online 2021. doi:10.25646/9204
- 425 7. Kuger S, Haas W, Kalicki B, et al. *Kindertagesbetreuung Und Kindertagesbetreuung*
426 *Und Infektionsgeschehen Während Infektionsgeschehen Während Der COVID Der*
427 *COVID-19 19-Pandemie Pandemie.*; 2022. Accessed February 21, 2023.
428 [https://www.dji.de/fileadmin/user_upload/dasdji/news/2022/DJI_Abschlussbericht_Cor](https://www.dji.de/fileadmin/user_upload/dasdji/news/2022/DJI_Abschlussbericht_Corona%20KiTa-Studie_221102.pdf)
429 [ona%20KiTa-Studie_221102.pdf](https://www.dji.de/fileadmin/user_upload/dasdji/news/2022/DJI_Abschlussbericht_Corona%20KiTa-Studie_221102.pdf)
- 430 8. Harris-McCoy K, Lee VC, Munna C, Kim AA. Evaluation of a Test to Stay Strategy in
431 Transitional Kindergarten Through Grade 12 Schools - Los Angeles County, California,
432 August 16-October 31, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70(5152):1773-
433 1777. doi:10.15585/MMWR.MM705152E1
- 434 9. Nemoto N, Dhillon S, Fink S, et al. Evaluation of Test to Stay Strategy on Secondary
435 and Tertiary Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in K-12 Schools - Lake County, Illinois,
436 August 9-October 29, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70(5152):1778-1781.
437 doi:10.15585/MMWR.MM705152E2
- 438 10. Boutzoukas AE, Zimmerman KO, Benjamin DK, Chick KJ, Curtiss J, Høeg TB.
439 Quarantine Elimination for K-12 Students With Mask-on-Mask Exposure to SARS-
440 CoV-2. *Pediatrics*. 2022;149(12 Suppl 2). doi:10.1542/PEDS.2021-054268L
- 441 11. Lanier WA, Babitz KD, Collingwood A, et al. COVID-19 Testing to Sustain In-Person
442 Instruction and Extracurricular Activities in High Schools - Utah, November 2020-
443 March 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70(21):785-791.
444 doi:10.15585/MMWR.MM7021E2

- 445 12. Scott Z, Uthappa DM, Mann TK, et al. Test-to-Stay in Kindergarten Through 12th Grade
446 Schools After Household Exposure to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus
447 2. *J Sch Health*. 2023;93(5):360-369. doi:10.1111/JOSH.13283
- 448 13. Lammie SL, Ford L, Swanson M, et al. Test-to-Stay Implementation in 4 Pre-K-12
449 School Districts. *Pediatrics*. 2022;150(4). doi:10.1542/PEDS.2022-057362
- 450 14. Campbell MM, Benjamin DK, Mann TK, et al. Test-to-Stay After SARS-CoV-2
451 Exposure: A Mitigation Strategy for Optionally Masked K-12 Schools. *Pediatrics*.
452 2022;150(5). doi:10.1542/PEDS.2022-058200
- 453 15. Schechter-Perkins EM, Doron S, Johnston R, et al. A Test-to-Stay Modified Quarantine
454 Program for COVID-19 in Schools. *Pediatrics*. 2022;149(5). doi:10.1542/PEDS.2021-
455 055727
- 456 16. Campbell MM, Benjamin DK, Mann T, et al. Test-to-Stay After Exposure to SARS-
457 CoV-2 in K-12 Schools. *Pediatrics*. 2022;149(5). doi:10.1542/PEDS.2021-056045
- 458 17. Dewald F, Suárez I, Johnen R, et al. Effective high-throughput RT-qPCR screening for
459 SARS-CoV-2 infections in children. *Nature Communications* 2022 13:1. 2022;13(1):1-
460 11. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-30664-2
- 461 18. Joachim A, Dewald F, Suárez I, et al. Pooled RT-qPCR testing for SARS-CoV-2
462 surveillance in schools - a cluster randomised trial. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2021;39.
463 doi:10.1016/J.ECLINM.2021.101082
- 464 19. Kretschmer AC, Junker L, Dewald F, et al. Implementing the Lolli-Method and pooled
465 RT-qPCR testing for SARS-CoV-2 surveillance in schools: a pilot project. *Infection*.
466 Published online 2022. doi:10.1007/S15010-022-01865-0
- 467 20. Neuhaus F, Buess M, Wolff A, et al. Entwicklung einer Software zur Unterstützung der
468 Prozesse im Gesundheitsamt der Stadt Köln in der SARS-CoV-2-Pandemie, Digitales
469 Kontaktmanagement (DiKoMa). Published online June 4, 2020. doi:10.25646/6923
- 470 21. RKI - Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 - Tabelle: VOC-PCR-Finder. Accessed August 24,
471 2023.
472 https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/DESH/Tabelle_VO
473 [C-PCR-Finder.html](https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/DESH/Tabelle_VO)
- 474 22. SurvStat@RKI 2.0. Accessed August 24, 2023. <https://survstat.rki.de/>
- 475 23. Kleinräumige Statistiken - Stadt Köln. Accessed August 25, 2023. [https://www.stadt-
476 koeln.de/artikel/62998/index.html](https://www.stadt-koeln.de/artikel/62998/index.html)
- 477 24. Lee DS, Lemieux T. Regression Discontinuity Designs in Economics. *J Econ Lit*.
478 2010;48(2):281-355. doi:10.1257/JEL.48.2.281

- 479 25. Hausman C, Rapson DS. Regression Discontinuity in Time: Considerations for
480 Empirical Applications. *National Bureau of economic research working papers*.
481 2018;Working Paper 23602. doi:10.3386/w23602
- 482 26. Bernal JL, Cummins S, Gasparrini A. Interrupted time series regression for the
483 evaluation of public health interventions: a tutorial. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2017;46(1):348.
484 doi:10.1093/IJE/DYW098
- 485 27. Wu Y, Kang L, Guo Z, Liu J, Liu M, Liang W. Incubation Period of COVID-19 Caused
486 by Unique SARS-CoV-2 Strains: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw*
487 *Open*. 2022;5(8):e2228008. doi:10.1001/JAMANETWORKOPEN.2022.28008
- 488 28. Imbens G, Kalyanaraman K. Optimal Bandwidth Choice for the Regression
489 Discontinuity Estimator. *Rev Econ Stud*. 2012;79(3):933-959.
490 doi:10.1093/RESTUD/RDR043
- 491 29. Calonico S, Cattaneo MD, Titiunik R. Robust Nonparametric Confidence Intervals for
492 Regression-Discontinuity Designs. *Econometrica*. 2014;82(6):2295-2326.
493 doi:10.3982/ECTA11757
- 494 30. Neuhaan F, Ginzel S, Buess M, et al. Spatio-temporal distribution of COVID-19 in
495 Cologne and associated socio-economic factors in the period from February 2020 to
496 October 2021. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt Gesundheitsforschung Gesundheitsschutz*.
497 2022;65(9):853-862. doi:10.1007/s00103-022-03573-4
- 498 31. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, et al. Welcome to the Tidyverse. *J Open Source Softw*.
499 2019;4(43):1686. doi:10.21105/JOSS.01686
- 500 32. Calonico S, Cattaneo MD, Farrell MH, Titiunik R. Rdrobust: Software for Regression-
501 discontinuity Designs. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536867X1701700208>. 2017;17(2):372-
502 404. doi:10.1177/1536867X1701700208
- 503 33. R Core Team (2022). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
504 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org/)
505 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/).
- 506 34. Bertram R, Grebenstein L, Gualdi S, et al. Detection of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2
507 infections in daycare centers, schools, and companies for regional pandemic containment
508 by a PCR testing laboratory cooperative between July 2021 and June 2022. *GMS Hyg*
509 *Infect Control*. 2022;17:Doc22. doi:10.3205/DGKH000425
- 510 35. Kern A, Kuhlmann PH, Matl S, et al. Surveillance of Acute SARS-CoV-2 Infections in
511 Elementary Schools and Daycare Facilities in Bavaria, Germany (09/2020–03/2021).
512 *Front Pediatr*. 2022;10:888498. doi:10.3389/FPED.2022.888498/BIBTEX

- 513 36. Van Heirstraeten L, Ekinçi E, Smet M, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in young
514 children attending day-care centres in Belgium, May 2020 to February 2022.
515 *Eurosurveillance*. 2022;27(21). doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.21.2200380
- 516 37. Philippe C, Bar-Yam Y, Bilodeau S, et al. Mass testing to end the COVID-19 public
517 health threat. *The Lancet regional health Europe*. 2023;25.
518 doi:10.1016/J.LANEPE.2022.100574
- 519 38. Wu Y, Kang L, Guo Z, Liu J, Liu M, Liang W. Incubation Period of COVID-19 Caused
520 by Unique SARS-CoV-2 Strains: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw*
521 *Open*. 2022;5(8):e2228008-e2228008.
522 doi:10.1001/JAMANETWORKOPEN.2022.28008
- 523 39. Campbell F, Archer B, Laurenson-Schafer H, et al. Increased transmissibility and global
524 spread of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern as at June 2021. *Eurosurveillance*.
525 2021;26(24):1-6. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.24.2100509
- 526 40. Davies NG, Abbott S, Barnard RC, et al. Estimated transmissibility and impact of SARS-
527 CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Science (1979)*. 2021;372(6538).
528 doi:10.1126/science.abg3055
- 529 41. Volz E, Mishra S, Chand M, et al. Assessing transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 lineage
530 B.1.1.7 in England. *Nature* 2021 593:7858. 2021;593(7858):266-269.
531 doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03470-x
- 532 42. To KK, Lu L, Yip CC, et al. Additional molecular testing of saliva specimens improves
533 the detection of respiratory viruses. *Emerg Microbes Infect*. 2017;6(6):e49.
534 doi:10.1038/EMI.2017.35
- 535 43. To KKW, Yip CCY, Lai CYW, et al. Saliva as a diagnostic specimen for testing
536 respiratory virus by a point-of-care molecular assay: a diagnostic validity study. *Clin*
537 *Microbiol Infect*. 2019;25(3):372-378. doi:10.1016/J.CMI.2018.06.009
- 538 44. Ramirez J, Carrico R, Wilde A, et al. Diagnosis of Respiratory Syncytial Virus in Adults
539 Substantially Increases When Adding Sputum, Saliva, and Serology Testing to
540 Nasopharyngeal Swab RT-PCR. *Infect Dis Ther*. 2023;12(6):1593-1603.
541 doi:10.1007/S40121-023-00805-1
- 542 45. Langedijk A, Allicock O, Wijk M Van, et al. Saliva as an alternative to nasopharyngeal
543 swabs for detection of respiratory syncytial virus (RSV) in children. *European*
544 *Respiratory Journal*. 2022;60(suppl 66):4519. doi:10.1183/13993003.CONGRESS-
545 2022.4519
- 546 46. To KKW, Yip CCY, Lai CYW, et al. Saliva as a diagnostic specimen for testing
547 respiratory virus by a point-of-care molecular assay: a diagnostic validity study. *Clinical*
548 *Microbiology and Infection*. 2019;25(3):372-378. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2018.06.009

549 47. Galar A, Catalán P, Vesperinas L, et al. Use of Saliva Swab for Detection of Influenza
550 Virus in Patients Admitted to an Emergency Department. *Microbiol Spectr.* 2021;9(1).
551 doi:10.1128/SPECTRUM.00336-21

552 48. COVID-19 vaccination dashboard. Accessed September 28, 2023.
553 <https://impfdashboard.de/en/>

554

555 **Figure legends**

556 **Figure 1: Overview on the screening concept and its specifications**

557 Flowchart depicting the screening concept and both „Quarantine“ and „Test-to-stay“
558 approaches.

559 **Figure 2: Implementation of the screening concept in daycare facilities**

560 The number of tested daycare facilities, performed PCRs, median pool sizes and cumulative
561 number of performed analyses are stratified by calendar week. The horizontal lines in the Box-
562 Whisker-Plot indicate the medians, the lines at the top and at the bottom of the boxes indicate
563 first and third quartiles and the error bars represent minimum and maximum pool sizes. Data
564 on pool sizes were not available during the roll-out.

565 **Figure 3: Detection of SARS-CoV-2 infections in daycare facilities**

566 **A**, the number and fraction of positive Pool-PCRs and the number of reported index cases (2-6
567 years) are stratified by calendar week. During the roll-out of the screening (weeks 15, 16, 17 in
568 2021) the data collection system misclassified the specimen (Pool or Single-PCR) of positive
569 PCRs. Thus, data on positive PCRs are not available for these weeks.

570 **B**, Spearman correlation between 7-day incidence in Cologne and fraction of positive Pool-
571 PCRs. Each black dot represents one week. 95% CI is indicated by the bright red area.

572 **Figure 4: Estimation of quarantine avoidance**

573 The number of positive Pool-PCRs, pool sizes, estimated contact persons and cumulative
574 estimated avoided days of quarantine are stratified by calendar week. The horizontal lines in
575 the Box-Whisker-Plot indicate the medians, the lines at the top and at the bottom of the boxes
576 indicate first and third quartiles and the error bars represent minimum and maximum pool sizes.

577 **Figure 5: Assessment of safety of the test-to-stay approach: Regression discontinuity in**
578 **time analysis (RDiT)**

579 **A**, RDiT global gamma regression model. Model fit, 95% CI and the lag period are indicated
580 in their respective color.

581 **B**, Exponentiated coefficient estimates of local gamma regressions with distinct bandwidths.
582 Error bars indicate 95% CI.

Table 1: Summary of the screening program

Characteristics	Quarantine approach* n (%)	Test-to-stay approach n (%)	Entire screening n (%)
Duration			
Time period	Week 11 2021 - week 36 2021	Week 37 2021 - week 14 2022	Week 11 2021 - week 14 2022
Weeks	26	30	56
Daycare facilities			
Total	694	712	714
Pool-PCRs			
Total	87,856	132,029	219,885
Positive*	142 (0.16)	6298 (4.77)	6440 (2.93)
Single-PCRs			
Total	5,704	346,601	352,305
Positive*	111	12,343	12,454
Index cases (2-6 years in Cologne)			
Total	1,203	16,005	17,208

*During the roll-out of the screening (weeks 15-17 in 2021), daycare facilities were enrolled gradually, and the data collection system was under construction and misclassified the specimen of positive PCRs. Thus, these weeks were excluded from all analyses.




Figure 1: Overview on the screening concept and its specifications

Flowchart depicting the screening concept and both „Quarantine“ and „Test-to-stay“ approaches.




Figure 2: Implementation of the screening concept in daycare facilities

The number of tested daycare facilities, performed PCRs, median pool sizes and cumulative number of performed analyses are stratified by calendar week. The horizontal lines in the Box-Whisker-Plot indicate the medians, the lines at the top and at the bottom of the boxes indicate first and third quartiles and the error bars represent minimum and maximum pool sizes. Data on pool sizes were not available during the roll-out.




Figure 3: Detection of SARS-CoV-2 infections in daycare facilities

A, the number and fraction of positive Pool-PCRs and the number of reported index cases (2-6 years) are stratified by calendar week. During the roll-out of the screening (weeks 15-17 in 2021), daycare facilities were enrolled gradually, and the data collection system was under construction and misclassified the specimen of positive PCRs. Thus, these weeks were excluded from all analyses.

B, Spearman correlation between fraction of positive Pool-PCRs and 7-day incidence in Cologne. Each black dot represents one week. The 95% CI is indicated by the bright red area.

Estimation of quarantine avoidance




Figure 4: Estimation of quarantine avoidance

The number of positive Pool-PCRs, pool sizes, estimated contact persons and cumulative estimated avoided days of quarantine are stratified by calendar week. The horizontal lines in the Box-Whisker-Plot indicate the medians, the lines at the top and at the bottom of the boxes indicate first and third quartiles and the error bars represent minimum and maximum pool sizes. VR, variability range (see methods for details).




Figure 5: Assessment of safety of the test-to-stay approach: Regression discontinuity in time analysis (RDiT)

A, RDiT global gamma regression model. The exponentiated coefficient is interpreted on a multiplicative scale. Model fit, 95% CI and the lag-period are indicated in their respective color.

B, Exponentiated coefficient estimates of global and local gamma regressions with distinct bandwidths. Error bars indicate 95% CI. MSE: Mean-squared errors.