

Supporting Information

The impact of school reopening on the spread of COVID-19 in England.

Matt J. Keeling^{1*}, Michael J. Tildesley^{1‡}, Benjamin D. Atkins¹, Bridget Penman¹, Emma Southall^{1,2}, Glen Guyver-Fletcher^{1,3}, Alex Holmes^{1,2}, Hector McKimm^{1,4}, Erin E. Gorsich¹, Edward M. Hill^{1‡}, Louise Dyson^{1‡}.

1 The Zeeman Institute for Systems Biology & Infectious Disease Epidemiology Research, School of Life Sciences and Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.

2 Mathematics for Real World Systems Centre for Doctoral Training, Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.

3 Midlands Integrative Biosciences Training Partnership, School of Life Sciences, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.

4 Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.

‡These authors contributed equally to this work.

* Corresponding Author. Email: M.J.Keeling@warwick.ac.uk

Table of Contents

1	Supporting Text S1: Model description	1
2	Supporting Text S2: Modelling social distancing	4
3	Supporting Figure S1	5
4	Supporting Figure S2	6
5	Supporting Figure S3	7

1 Supporting Text S1: Model description

We present here the system of equations that account for both household saturation of transmission and household quarantining. As described in the main text, individuals may be susceptible (S), exposed (E), with detectable infection (D), or undetectable infection (asymptomatic, U). Undetectable infections are assumed to transmit infection at a reduced rate given by τ . We let superscripts denote the first infection in a household (F), a subsequent infection from a detectable/symptomatic household member (SD) and a subsequent infection from an asymptomatic household member (SU). A fraction (H) of the first detected case in a household is quarantined (QF), as are all their subsequent household infections (QS).

Model equations

The full equations are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS_a}{dt} &= -(\lambda_a^F + \lambda_a^{SD} + \lambda_a^{SU} + \lambda_a^Q) \frac{S_a}{N_a}, \\
\frac{dE_{1,a}^F}{dt} &= \lambda_a^F \frac{S_a}{N_a} - \epsilon E_{1,a}^F, \\
\frac{dE_{1,a}^{SD}}{dt} &= \lambda_a^{SD} \frac{S_a}{N_a} - \epsilon E_{1,a}^{SD}, \\
\frac{dE_{1,a}^{SU}}{dt} &= \lambda_a^{SU} \frac{S_a}{N_a} - \epsilon E_{1,a}^{SU}, \\
\frac{dE_{1,a}^Q}{dt} &= \lambda_a^Q S - \epsilon E_{1,a}^Q, \\
\frac{dE_{i,a}^F}{dt} &= \epsilon(E_{i-1,a}^F - E_{i,a}^F), \quad \text{for } i = 2, 3, \\
\frac{dE_{i,a}^{SD}}{dt} &= \epsilon(E_{i-1,a}^S D - E_{i,a}^S D), \quad \text{for } i = 2, 3, \\
\frac{dE_{i,a}^{SU}}{dt} &= \epsilon(E_{i-1,a}^S U - E_{i,a}^S U), \quad \text{for } i = 2, 3, \\
\frac{dE_{i,a}^Q}{dt} &= \epsilon(E_{i-1,a}^Q - E_{i,a}^Q), \quad \text{for } i = 2, 3, \\
\frac{dD_a^F}{dt} &= d_a(1 - H)\epsilon E_{3,a}^F - \gamma D_a^F, \\
\frac{dD_a^{SD}}{dt} &= d_a\epsilon E_{3,a}^{SD} - \gamma D_a^{SD}, \\
\frac{dD_a^{SU}}{dt} &= d_a(1 - H)\epsilon E_{3,a}^{SU} - \gamma D_a^{SU}, \\
\frac{dD_a^{QF}}{dt} &= d_a H \epsilon E_{3,a}^F - \gamma D_a^{QF}, \\
\frac{dD_a^{QS}}{dt} &= d_a H \epsilon E_{3,a}^{SU} + d_a \epsilon E_{3,a}^Q - \gamma D_a^{QS}, \\
\frac{dU_a^F}{dt} &= (1 - d_a)\epsilon E_{3,a}^F - \gamma U_a^F, \\
\frac{dU_a^S}{dt} &= (1 - d_a)\epsilon(E_{3,a}^{SD} + E_{3,a}^{SU}) - \gamma U_a^S, \\
\frac{dU_a^Q}{dt} &= (1 - d_a)\epsilon E_{3,a}^Q - \gamma U_a^Q,
\end{aligned}$$

with the forces of infection obeying

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_a^F &= \sigma_a \sum_b (D_b^F + D_b^{SD} + D_b^{SU} + \tau(U_b^F + U_b^S)) \beta_{ba}^N, \\ \lambda_a^{SD} &= \sigma_a \sum_b D_b^F \beta_{ba}^H, \\ \lambda_a^{SU} &= \sigma_a \tau \sum_b U_b^F \beta_{ba}^H, \\ \lambda_a^Q &= \sigma_a \sum_b D_b^{QF} \beta_{ba}^H,\end{aligned}$$

where β^H is household transmission and $\beta^N = \beta^S + \beta^W + \beta^O$ is all other transmission locations, comprising school-based transmission (β^S), work-place transmission (β^W) and transmission in all other locations (β^O). σ_a corresponds to the age-dependent susceptibility of individuals to infection, d_a the age-dependent probability of displaying symptoms (and hence being detected), and τ represents reduced transmission of infection by undetectable individuals compared to detectable infections.

Amendments to within-household transmission

Note that this raw, un-scaled format would under-estimate the amount of within-household transmission, as only the first infection generates any secondary cases. However, a simple multiplicative scaling to the household transmission ($\beta^H \rightarrow z\beta^H$, $z \approx 1.3$) generates a comparable match between the new model and the standard approach — even when age structure is included.

Relationship between age-dependent susceptibility and detectability

We interlinked age-dependent susceptibility, σ_a , and detectability, d_a , by a quantity Q_a . Q_a can be viewed as the scaling between force of infection and symptomatic infection.

Explicitly, we let $d_a = 0.9Q_a^{(1-\alpha)}$ and $\sigma_a = \frac{1}{0.9}Q_a^\alpha$. As a consequence, $Q_a = d_a\sigma_a$.

2 Supporting Text S2: Modelling social distancing

Age-structured contact matrices for the United Kingdom were obtained from Prem et al. [1] and used to provide information on household transmission (β_{ab}^H , with the subscript ab corresponding to transmission from age group a against age group b), school-based transmission (β_{ab}^S), work-place transmission (β_{ab}^W) and transmission in all other locations (β_{ab}^O). We assumed that social-distancing acted to reduce the work, school and other matrices while increasing household contacts.

We defined an age-dependent scaling for pre-school (0-4yrs), school (5-19yrs), adults (20-69yrs) and elderly (70+yrs) in each of the four settings:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^H &= (q_1^h & q_2^h & q_3^h & q_4^h) \\ Q^S &= (q_1^s & q_2^s & q_3^s & q_4^s) \\ Q^W &= (q_1^w & q_2^w & q_3^w & q_4^w) \\ Q^O &= (q_1^o & q_2^o & q_3^o & q_4^o) \end{aligned}$$

where $q_1^h = 1 + 0.25q_1^o$, $q_2^h = 1 + 0.25q_2^o + 0.25q_2^s$, $q_3^h = 1 + 0.25q_3^o + 0.25q_3^w$, $q_4^h = 1 + 0.25q_4^o$, and q^s, q^w, q^o correspond to the relative fraction of contacts remaining (given full compliance) after imposing the effect of school closure, work closure and social distancing, respectively.

For a compliance level, ϕ , we scaled the matrices as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{ab}^H &= \beta_{ab}^H \times (\phi Q_a^H + (1 - \phi)) \\ \beta_{ab}^S &= \beta_{ab}^S \times (\phi Q_a^S + (1 - \phi)) \\ \beta_{ab}^W &= \beta_{ab}^W (\phi Q_a^W + (1 - \phi)) \times ((1 - \theta) + \theta(\phi Q_a^O + (1 - \phi))) \\ \beta_{ab}^O &= \beta_{ab}^O \times (\phi Q_a^O + (1 - \phi))^2 \end{aligned}$$

As such, home and school interactions scaled with the assumed scaling Q and the compliance ϕ . Work interactions not attributed to ‘service industries’ (a proportion $1 - \theta$) were also assumed to scale in this manner; while those that interact with the general populations (such as shop-workers) were assumed to scale as both a function of their reduction and the reduction of others. Throughout, we have assumed $\theta = 0.3$.

Finally, we assumed the transmission in other settings (β_{ab}^O) scaled with the reduction in activity of both members of the interaction.

3 Supporting Figure S1




Fig. S1: Posterior distributions of key model parameters from fitting to date until 1st June. The left-hand graphs show how the probability of symptoms (d_a) and susceptibility (σ_a) varies with age; given the low value of α most of the age-dependence is in the displaying of symptoms. The right-hand graph shows the relative adherence with lockdown measures in each region; high values correspond to a dramatic reduction in the mixing matrix, while an adherence of zero returns the matrix to pre-lockdown levels. This figure supplements the information in Table 1. Bars show the 95% credible intervals from the posterior distribution.

4 Supporting Figure S2






Fig. S2: Distribution of household symptomatic, asymptomatic and isolated cases in each age group on 1st June. Used in conjunction with Fig. 1. Bottom segments (blue shading) represent symptomatic infection. Middle segments (orange shading) represent asymptomatic infection. Top segments (yellow shading) represent those in isolation due to household quarantine. Dots specify the fraction of the population within that age bracket.

5 Supporting Figure S3

(a)



(b)



(c)




Fig. S3: Increase in reproductive number, R , under eight school reopening scenarios for three regions in England not featured in the main paper. Estimates are depicted for the following three regions: (a) North West, (b) South East, (c) South West. For each scenario, bars represent the mean absolute increase in R , compared to what we would observe if schools remained closed. We also give the 95% prediction intervals. Solid red lines identify the absolute increase required to raise R above 1, within each region, alongside 95% credible intervals (dashed red lines). Means and intervals are calculated from 1000 replicates sampled from the posterior parameter distributions. All scenarios are implemented on 1st June and continued until 22nd July.

References

- [1] Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact surveys and demographic data. *PLOS Comput. Biol.* **13**(9):e1005697 (2017). doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005697.