

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

Variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in primary and secondary school children across districts, schools and classes in Switzerland

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-047483
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Dec-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Ulyte, Agne; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Radtke, Thomas; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Abela, Irene; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Haile, S; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Blankenberger, Jacob; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Jung, Ruedi; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Capelli, Celine; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Berger, Christoph; University Children's Hospital Zürich Frei, Anja; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Huber, Michael; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology; Schanz, Merle; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Schwarzmueller, Magdalena; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Trkola, Alexandra; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Fehr, Jan; University Hospital Zurich, Division of Infectious Diseases & Hospital Epidemiology; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Fehr, Jan; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Fehr, Jan; University of Zurich, Institute of Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Puhan, Milo; University of Zurich, Institute of Epidemiology, Biostatistics & Prevention (EBPI) Kriemler, Susi; University of Zurich, Institute of Epidemiology, Biostatistics
Keywords:	Paediatric infectious disease & immunisation < PAEDIATRICS, Infection control < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Epidemiology < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, VIROLOGY, Community child health < PAEDIATRICS
	·

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

- ,



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

review only

1	1	Title
2	2	Variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in primary and secondary school children across
4	3	districts, schools and classes in Switzerland
5 6	4	
7 8	5	Authors
9 10	6	Agne Ulyte*, doctoral student, Thomas Radtke*, senior researcher, Irene A. Abela*,
11 12	7	researcher, Sarah R. Haile, senior statistician, Jacob Blankenberger, master student, Ruedi
13	8	Jung, researcher, Céline Capelli, master student, Christoph Berger, professor, Anja Frei,
14	9	senior researcher, Michael Huber, researcher, Merle Schanz, researcher, Magdalena
16 17	10	Schwarzmueller, doctoral student, Alexandra Trkola#, professor, Jan Fehr#, professor, Milo
18 19	11	A. Puhan#, professor, Susi Kriemler\$#, professor
20 21	12	* shared first authorship
22	13	# shared last authorship
23 24 25	14	
25 26	15	Corresponding author:
27 28	16	Susi Kriemler
29 30	17	Tel: +41 44 634 63 20
31 32	18	susi.kriemlerwiget@uzh.ch
33 34	19	Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich
35	20	Hirschengraben 84
37	21	8001 Zürich, Switzerland
38 39	22	
40 41	23	Agne Ulyte, agne.ulyte@uzh.ch , Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI),
42 43	24	University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
44 45	25	Thomas Radtke, thomas.radtke@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention
46	26	Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
47 48	27	Irene A. Abela, irene.abela@usz.ch, Institute of Medical Virology, University of Zurich,
49 50	28	Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
51 52	29	Sarah R. Haile, sarah.haile@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute
53 54	30	(EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
55 56	31	Jacob Blankenberger, jacob.blankenberger@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and
57 57	32	Prevention Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich,
58 59	33	Switzerland
60	34	Ruedi Jung, ruedi.jung@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI),

1	35	University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
2	36	Céline Capelli, celine.capelli@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute
4 5	37	(EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
5 6	38	Christoph Berger, Christoph.Berger@kispi.uzh.ch, University Children Hospital Zurich,
7 8	39	Steinwiesstrasse 75, 8032 Zürich, Switzerland
9 10	40	Anja Frei, anja.frei@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI),
11 12	41	University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
13 14	42	Michael Huber, huber.michael@virology.uzh.ch, Institute of Medical Virology, University of
15	43	Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
16 17	44	Merle Schanz, schanz , Institute of Medical Virology, University of
18 19	45	Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
20 21	46	Magdalena Schwarzmueller, <u>schwarzmueller.magdalena@virology.uzh.ch</u> , Institute of
22 23	47	Medical Virology, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
24	48	Alexandra Trkola, trkola.alexandra@virology.uzh.ch, Institute of Medical Virology,
25 26	49	University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
27 28	50	Jan Fehr, Jan.Fehr@usz.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI),
29 30	51	University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich; Division of Infectious Diseases &
31 32	52	Hospital Epidemiology, University Hospital Zurich, Rämistrasse 100, 8091 Zurich, Switzerland
33 34	53	Milo A. Puhan, miloalan.puhan@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute
35	54	(EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
30 37	55	Susi Kriemler, susi.kriemlerwiget@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention
38 39	56	Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
40 41	57	
42 43	58	
44 45	59	Word count: 2874
46	60	
47		
49 50		
51 52		
53		
54		
55 56		
57		
58 59		
60		

r	
2	
3	
4	
5	
2	
6	
7	
0	
0	
9	
10	
11	
11	
12	
13	
11	
14	
15	
16	
17	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
24	
25	
26	
 27	
21	
28	
29	
20	
30	
31	
32	
22	
22	
34	
35	
26	
20	
37	
38	
20	
39	
40	
41	
 ∕\2	
42	
43	
44	
15	
40	
46	
47	
10	
4ð	
49	
50	
51	
D I	
52	
53	
EA	
54	
55	
56	
57	
5/	
58	
50	

60

61 Abstract

62 **Objectives:** To determine the variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in school children, and
63 the relationship with self-reported symptoms.

64 **Design:** Baseline measurements of a longitudinal cohort study (*Ciao Corona*) from June-July
65 2020.

66 **Setting:** 55 schools stratified by district in the canton of Zurich, Switzerland.

67 Participants: 2585 children (1339 girls, median age 11, age range 6-16 years), attending
68 grades 1-2, 4-5 and 7-8.

Main outcome measures: Variation in seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in children across 12
cantonal districts, schools, and grades, assessed with Luminex-based test of four epitopes
for each of IgG, IgA and IgM. Clustering of cases within classes. Association of seropositivity
and symptoms. Comparison with seroprevalence in adult population, assessed with
Luminex-based test of combining IgG and IgA.

74 Results: Overall seroprevalence was 2.8 % (95% CI 1.5 to 4.1%), ranging from 1.0% to 4.5% 75 across districts. Seroprevalence in grades 1-2 was 3.8% (2.0 to 6.1%), in grades 4-5 – 2.4% 76 (1.1 to 4.2%), and in grades 7-8 – 1.5% (0.5 to 3.0%). At least one seropositive child was 77 present in 36 of 55 (65%) schools and in 44 (34%) of 131 classes where \geq 5 children and \geq 50% 78 of children within the class were tested. 73% of children reported COVID-19-compatible 79 symptoms since January 2020, with the same frequency in seropositive and seronegative 80 children for all symptoms. Seroprevalence of children and adults was similar (3.2%, 95% CrI 81 1.7-5.0%, versus 3.6%, 95% Crl 1.7-5.4%). The ratio of confirmed cumulative incidence to 82 seropositive cases was 1:89 in children and 1:12 in adults.

83 Conclusions: Seroprevalence was inversely related to age and revealed a ratio of diagnosed
 84 to seropositive cases of around one to 90 in children by the end of June. We did not detect
 85 clustering of SARS-CoV-2 seropositive children, but the follow-up of this study will shed
 86 more light on transmission within schools.

87 **Trial registration:** ClinicalTrials.gov NCT04448717.

- 88 https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04448717
 - 89 Key words: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, children, adolescents, school.

Page	6	of	26
	-	•••	

93 Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study presents the results of a regionally representative cohort of children,
 randomized on school and class levels, and thus, allowing the analysis of clustering of
 cases within schools.
- 97 This cross-sectional analysis estimates the seroprevalence in children in June-July in
 98 Switzerland, from a period when there is very little evidence about SARS-CoV-2
 99 seroprevalence in children globally.
- Serological test with high sensitivity and specificity was used, and Bayesian
 101
 bierarchical models were additionally applied to estimate seroprevalence, adjusting
 102
 for test accuracy parameters.

Self-reported symptoms might be subject to recall-bias, particularly when reporting retrospectively for a period of over six months.

reliez on

1	107	INTRODUCTION
2	108	The transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in the
4 5	109	school setting is not well understood [1], partly as schools were closed in many countries
5 6	110	during the peaks of the pandemic, partly due to lack of representative studies with random
7 8	111	sampling. Anecdotal evidence and case studies suggest that outbreaks can happen in
9 10	112	schools [2–4], but it is not clear if they represent outlier events or widely underdiagnosed
11 12	113	spread of the infection. School closures are even predicted to increase the total number of
13 14 15	114	deaths by some modelling studies [5]. Currently existing or planned population-based
	115	studies focusing on SARS-CoV-2 spread in schools are few and small-sized [6,7].
10	116	In this study, we present the results of the first cross-sectional analysis of a large
18 19	117	cohort of children from randomly selected schools and classes in the canton of Zurich,
20 21	118	Switzerland. The participating children were enrolled from June 16 to July 9, 2020. Schools
22 23	119	in Switzerland were closed for a relatively short period (March 16 to May 10) compared to
24 25 26 27 28	120	other countries, and lock-down measures were mild. The cohort study follows the
	121	seroprevalence, symptoms, socio-demographic and lifestyle factors of enrolled children
	122	from June 2020 to April 2021.
29 30	123	The aim of this analysis is to present the overall estimate of seroprevalence and its
31 32	124	variation across districts, schools, grades and classes, and the association of seroprevalence
33 34	125	with self-reported symptoms.
35 36	126	
37	127	
30 39		
40 41		
42 43		
44 45		
46 47		
48		
49 50		
51 52		
53 54		
55		
56 57		
58 50		
60		

128 METHODS

The study was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (identifier number NCT04448717). The protocol for this longitudinal cohort study was reported elsewhere [8]. The study is part of a large nationally coordinated research network Corona Immunitas in Switzerland [9,10]. The study took place from June 16 to July 9, 2020, in the canton of Zurich, Switzerland. The canton of Zurich comprises 1.5 million residents, roughly 18% of the Swiss population, and includes both urban and rural settings, as well as an ethnically and linguistically diverse population. The first preventive measures in schools were introduced on March 16, 2020, when physical attendance of schools was stopped. Schools were partly reopened on May 10, with a combination of online and on-site teaching with preventive measures (e.g., teaching in smaller groups, school attendance every second day, sports and large group activities limited). Schools were fully reopened on June 7, with minimal preventive measures (e.g., recommended social distancing for teachers, reduction of group events) and otherwise regular operation (e.g., full classrooms with desks mostly facing forward) until the end of the school year on July 17. The prevention measures implemented in schools after May 10 were school-specific and based on the federal and cantonal guidelines [11].

School were selected based on a full list of schools provided by the Educational Department of the canton. Primary schools were randomly selected by a computer program from the list of all primary schools in the respective district. The closest secondary school (often in the same building or area) was then selected. The random sample of primary and secondary schools was stratified by geographic district. Within schools, randomly selected classes in lower school level (grades one to two, attended by 6 to 9-year-old children), middle (grades four to five, 9 to 13-year-old children), and upper school level (grades seven to eight, 12 to 16-year-old children) were invited. Invited grades and classes were selected to ensure that the same cohort of children within the class can be followed until April 2021. Therefore, grades 1-2, 4-5 and 7-8 (but not grades 3, 6, and 9) were included, as they normally stay in the same school and class for the next school-year. We aimed to enroll at least three classes and 40 children per school level. Major exclusion criterion for the invited children was a suspected or confirmed infection with SARS-CoV-2 in the given child during the testing at schools.

Study information, link to study website (www.ciao-corona.ch), and informational
 videos in multiple languages for schools, parents, and children were sent to school principals
 and further to families of children from the selected classes. Children were enrolled and
 venous blood samples taken in schools between June 16 and July 9, 2020. Questionnaires

Page 9 of 26

BMJ Open

with information on socio-demographics and symptoms compatible with SARS-CoV-2 infection from January to June, 2020, were completed online for the majority of children by their parents in June-July, 2020 (for 3% of children in August-September). In total, 55 out of 156 invited primary and secondary schools agreed to participate, and 2585 children in 273 out of 274 invited classes (no children participated in one class). Venous blood samples were collected from 2484 children (a sufficient amount of blood could not be obtained from 101 children). An online questionnaire, containing socio-demographic, health, symptoms and quality of life information for the children, and socio-demographic and symptoms information for the household members, was completed for 2288 of all enrolled children. Questionnaires were not filled for 297 children, after several email and phone call reminders. Blood samples were analyzed with ABCORA 2.0 binding assay of the Institute of Medical Virology (IMV) of the University of Zurich based on the Luminex technology. The test analyzes immunoglobulins G (IgG), M (IgM) and A (IgA) against four SARS-CoV-2 targets (receptor binding domain (RBD), spike proteins S1 and S2, and the nucleocapsid protein (N),

July 2020. The adult study, like all studies of the Swiss-wide research program *Corona Immunitas* [9,10], used the test SenASTrIS (Sensitive Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Spike Trimer

yielding 12 different measurements. Cut-off values were established against pre-pandemic

plasma allowing a high sensitivity (93.3%) and specificity (99.6%). Samples were defined as

SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in children was compared to that estimated in a random sample

seropositive for SARS-CoV-2 if at least two of the 12 parameters were above the cut-off.

from the general population, adjusting for age group and sex, in the same region in June-

Immunoglobulin Serological) developed by the Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois (CHUV), the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Lausanne (EPFL) and the Swiss Vaccine Center [12]. The test also uses Luminex technology to detect IgG and IgA antibodies binding to the entire trimeric S protein of SARS-CoV-2 and with demonstrated 98.3% sensitivity and 98.4% specificity for the combined testing of IgG and IgA (result declared as positive when either or both were positive) [12]. In order to compare the seroprevalence estimates in children and adult cohorts, a sample of 2476 collected children blood samples was also analyzed with the SenASTrIS test (samples were insufficient for analysis with the second test for 8 children) and compared to a random population sample of 857 adults who took part in the second phase of the Switzerland-wide Corona Immunitas research program [10]. Seroprevalence was also compared to the cumulative incidence of reverse

196	and children, based on official statistics up to the beginning of June [13]. Statistical analysis
197	included descriptive statistics and Bayesian hierarchical modelling to estimate
198	seroprevalence, accounting for the sensitivity and specificity of the SARS-CoV-2 antibody
199	test, the hierarchical structure of cohort (individual and school levels), and post-
200	stratification weights, which adjusted for the population-level grade level and geographic
201	district [14]. The factor of confirmed to total infections (dark figure) was calculated as the
202	ratio of RT-PCR-confirmed cumulative incidence by the end of June 2020 and the estimated
203	seroprevalence.
204	
205	Patient and public involvement
206	Several school principals were consulted during the development of the protocol to ensure
207	feasibility of the planned study procedures. Early feedback was collected from invited
208	children and parents, in order to adapt the communication strategies and channels.
209	Numerous online informational sessions, encouraging open exchange and feedback, were
210	organized for invited and enrolled school principals, personnel and parents of the children.
211	Results of individual tests were communicated to the participants, and overall study results
212	disseminated to participating schools. Findings will be disseminated in lay language in the
213	national and local press, to the national and regional educational and public health
214	departments and on the website of the study (www.ciao-corona.ch).
215	
	196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215

1	216	RESULTS
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	217	In total, 55 schools and 2585 children were recruited (1339 (52%) girls, median age 11, age
	218	range 6-16 years), 754 (29%) in the lower level, 899 (35%) in the middle, and 932 (36%) in
	219	the upper school level. Mean participation rate was 50% of the invited children within
	220	invited classes (range from 0% to 94% (0 to 21 children), interquartile range 32% to 63%).
9 10	221	Venous blood was collected and analyzed for 2484 children (1278 (51%) girls, median age
11 12	222	11, age range 6 to 16 years).
13	223	74 children had SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, resulting in overall weighted seroprevalence
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	224	of 2.8 % (95% credible interval (CrI) 1.5 to 4.1%), ranging from 1.0% to 4.5% in districts
	225	(Figure 1). Seroprevalence was 3.8% (95% Crl 2.0 to 6.1%) in grades one to two, 2.4% (95%
	226	Crl 1.1 to 4.2%) in grades four to five, and 1.5% (95% Crl 0.5 to 3.0%) in grades seven to
	227	eight (Figure 1).
	228	Seroprevalence of children, as measured with the SenASTrIS test of IgG and IgA
	229	combined, was very similar to the seroprevalence of randomly selected adults in the same
	230	region in June-July 2020 (3.2%, 95% Crl 1.7 to 5.0%, versus 3.6%, 95% Crl 1.7 to 5.4%). The
	231	estimates of seroprevalence in the children cohort, as measured with the SenASTrIS test, in
	232	different school levels and districts were similar to those estimated with the primary
	233	ABCORA 2.0 test (Figure 1).
	234	Based on the cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-confirmed cases by the
	235	end of June (0.03% for children and 0.24% for adult populations), the ratio of confirmed
	236	infections and seropositive cases (dark figure) in children was one to 89, compared to a ratio
	237	of one to 12 in the adult Swiss population.
	238	
42 43	239	Figure 1 Overall, school level and district estimates of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in
44 45	240	children
46 47 48 49	241 242 243	Weighted point estimates and 95% credible intervals are shown. Districts are ordered by population size. ABCORA 2.0 – Primary estimate based on the ABCORA 2.0 of the Institute of Medical Virology, University of Zurich test.
50 51 52	244 245	SenASTrIS – Estimate based on the SenASTrIS test.
53	246	At least one seropositive child was present in 36/55 (65%) of tested schools. Within the
54 55	247	levels of the schools, at least one seropositive child was present in the lower level of 17
56 57	248	(59%) out of 29 tested schools, in the middle level of 14 (50%) out of 28 tested schools, and
58 59	249	in the upper level of 16 (64%) out of 25 tested schools (Figure 2).
60	250	At least one seropositive child was present in 34% (44/131) of classes where ≥5
	251	children and ≥50% of children within the class were tested (Figure 3). Among the classes

1	252	with at least one seropositive child, 38 (86%) had only one, 4 (9%) had two and 2 (5%) had
23	253	three seropositive children. When considering all classes regardless of participation rate,
4	254	24% of classes had at least one seropositive child; whereas when considering higher
5 6	255	inclusion threshold of ≥15 children and ≥60% of the class tested, 45% of classes had at least
7 8	256	one seropositive child.
9 10	257	
11 12	258	Figure 2 Seropositive children in tested schools and school levels
13	259	Each square illustrates an invited child. Each block of squares illustrates a school level in a school. Lower
14	260	and middle levels are both taught in the primary schools; however, lower and middle levels of the same
15 16	261	school are not matched in this graph due to protection of participant privacy. The distribution of the
17	262	invited, tested and seropositive children is depicted only on the school level in the figures of this
18	263	manuscript to preserve deidentification and privacy of the participants.
19	264	
20 21	265	Figure 3 Clustering of seropositive children in classes: number and proportion of
22 23	266	seropositive children in the tested classes
24	267	Only classes where at least 5 children and at least 50% of the class were tested are shown. The
25	268	distribution of seropositive children in the enrolled classes is only presented in an aggregated form to
26	269	preserve the deidentification and privacy of the participants.
27 28	270	
29	270	
30 21	271	No sex differences in seroprevalence were noted (2.8% (95% Crl 1.6 to 4.1%) in girls and
32	272	2.7% (95% Crl 1.5 to 4.0%) in boys). 73% of children reported any SARS-CoV-2 compatible
33 34	273	symptoms, such as cough, fever, fatigue or diarrhea (see Figure 4 for the full list), between
35 36	274	January and June 2020. None of the symptoms was more frequent in seropositive than in
37	275	seronegative children (Figure 4).
39	276	
40 41	277	Figure 4 Self-reported symptoms in seropositive and seronegative children in January-June
42	278	2020
43	279	Point estimates and 95% confidence intervals are shown.
44 45	280	
46		
47		
48		
49 50		
51		
52		
53		
54 57		
55 56		
57		
58		
59		
60		

Page 13 of 26

BMJ Open

1	282	DISCUSSION
2	283	In this study of randomly sampled schools and classes by July 2020, we found variation in
5 4	284	seroprevalence in 6 to 16-year-old children across districts, schools and classes, but no
5 6	285	indication of major transmission and outbreaks within schools. The overall seroprevalence
7 8	286	was not different from a randomly selected adult population living in the same region –
9 10	287	pointing to striking underdiagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection in children, with only one in 89
11 12	288	cases diagnosed. Such a high proportion of seropositive cases not previously diagnosed with
13	289	RT-PCR is likely explained by our observation that symptoms do not seem to be suggestive
14	290	of a SARS-CoV-2 infection in children, contrary to more specific symptoms in adults [15], and
16 17	291	by cautious testing indications by health authorities, with similar indications for children and
18 19	292	adults during the first half of 2020. Contrary to studies of symptomatic infections [16] and
20 21	293	some other population-based studies of seroprevalence [17], there was a trend of higher
22 23	294	seroprevalence in younger children. Although no outbreaks were reported in schools at the
23 24 25	295	time of testing in the canton of Zurich (comprising 18% of the Swiss population),
25 26	296	seropositive children were detected in more than half of the tested schools and a third of all
27 28	297	tested classes. However, the vast majority of classes with seropositive children had only a
29 30	298	single seropositive child among the tested children, reflecting low prevalence and no
31 32	299	significant clustering within classes after the re-opening of the schools. The presence of
33 34	300	symptoms was very common (three of four children reported one or several symptoms
35	301	compatible with a COVID-19 infection) and importantly not specific to the seropositive
36 37	302	children.
38 39	303	Currently, there are few studies focusing on SARS-CoV-2 spread in schools [17–19].
40 41	304	Most of the reported evidence consists of cases studies of outbreaks in specific schools or
42 43	305	reports of contact tracing of index cases in educational settings. Mostly low secondary
44	206	attack rates in schools are reported [4,20], but there are also conflicting observations of

attack rates in schools are reported [4,20], but there are also conflicting observations of
outbreaks [2,21]. Although some studies of seroprevalence have included children
[14,22,23], they mostly focused on households and the general population. The

management of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in schools is therefore highly debated [24,25]. The present study is thus unique as one of the first major studies reporting variation in seroprevalence in children from randomly selected schools in a country where the general lock-down on a population level was mild and short (one month), and school closure lasted only for two months.

Although manifest clinical disease of COVID-19 is much less prevalent in children
 than in adults [16,26] and preliminary evidence points to lower susceptibility of children

compared to adults [17], our results indicate very similar seroprevalence in adults and children. Intriguingly, we observed a not statistically significant trend of younger children having higher seroprevalence than older children, when measured with the comprehensive ABCORA 2.0 test. Infections with circulating human coronaviruses (hCoVs) are common in childhood and antibodies to hCoVs 229E, NL63, OC43 and HKU1A are prevalent in the human population and particularly children [27,28]. Cross-reactivity with hCoVs was thus considered in the development of both serology tests used in this study and both tests detect SARS-CoV-2 with high specificity (99.6% for ABCORA 2.0 and 98.4% for SenASTrIS). Importantly, to adjust for the possibility of a few false-positive results, we employed a Bayesian hierarchical model, which adjusts for the accuracy parameters of the tests to estimate population-level seroprevalence. Higher seroprevalence in younger children could be related to virtually impossible social distancing behaviour, but also to a possibly more vigorous immune response to the virus in early age that will be interesting to explore in forthcoming studies.

The frequency of both more specific (e.g., fever, cough) and less specific (rhinorrhea, headache, nausea) symptoms [29] was not different among seropositive and seronegative children. In general, symptoms, particularly rhinorrhea, cough, headache and sore throat, were reported frequently, with three of four children reporting any symptoms within the last 6 months in both groups. The specificity of COVID-19 compatible symptoms, therefore, seems to be lower in children than in adults. Moreover, the range of symptoms reported in children has shown to be different compared to adults [30].

Particular strengths of the design of this study are school-based random sampling, hierarchical data structure, and large sample size, allowing to identify clusters within district, school, grade and class levels. Testing was done in schools and study information presented in multiple formats, including videos in multiple languages, to minimize selection bias within enrolled children. The participation rate of 50% can be considered rather high for a study in children involving venous blood sampling, and additional children from the invited classes will have the opportunity to be enrolled in subsequent testing phases (October/November 2020, March/April 2021), further increasing participation rate and the size of the cohort.

The study has a few limitations. First, the retrospective evaluation of symptoms over
 six months could have been subject to recall bias. Second, the study enrolled only 35%
 348 (55/156) of the invited schools. Commonly stated reasons for non-participation on school
 level were constraints in time and human resources and competing participation in other

Page 15 of 26

BMJ Open

studies. Participation rate varied significantly depending on the district, and for a few districts, the schools had to be invited with a maximum of three invitation rounds to have a regionally representative sample. Third, although the schools were open for one to two months directly before the study, they were closed for the two months of the highest community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the canton of Zurich [13]. Therefore, the measured seroprevalence in children might be dominated by infections in households rather than school. The follow up of this study will shed more light on transmission in schools. In conclusion, clustering of SARS-CoV-2 seropositive children within schools and grades was not prominent shortly after reopening of schools in this large population-based study. Seroprevalence was similar to adults and higher in lower grade compared to higher grade children, resulting in a strikingly higher ratio of diagnosed to seropositive cases than in adults, in particular in the very young children. Considering the time window required for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies to form, this study reflects infection of SARS-CoV-2 until approximately end of May 2020, covering four months of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the community, with two months of school closure and mild lock-down policy. The subsequent testing of parents and school personnel and the follow-up of the children cohort in fall 2020 will yield further evidence of the spread of SARS-CoV-2 within and outside schools. elez oniz

Author Contributions

SK and MAP initiated the project and preliminary design, with support of JF. SK, MAP, CB, TR, RJ, JB, AF and AU developed the design and methodology. SK, RJ, AU, TR, JB, AF and CC recruited study participants, collected and managed the data. SRH performed statistical analysis. AT, MH, MaSch, MeSch and IA developed the serology analysis plan, supervised, conducted and evaluated the serology tests. AU wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to the design of the study and interpretation of its results, and revised and approved the manuscript for intellectual content. SK is the guarantor and accepts full responsibility for the work and the conduct of the study, had access to the data, and controlled the decision to publish. The corresponding author SK attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted. **Competing interests** The authors declare no competing interests to disclose. Funding This study is part of Corona Immunitas research network, coordinated by the Swiss School of Public Health (SSPH+), and funded by fundraising of SSPH+ that includes funds of the Swiss Federal Office of Public Health and private funders (ethical guidelines for funding stated by SSPH+ will be respected), by funds of the Cantons of Switzerland (Vaud, Zurich and Basel) and by institutional funds of the Universities. Additional funding, specific to this study is available from the University of Zurich Foundation. The funder/sponsor did not have any role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication. All authors had full access to all data analysis outputs (reports and tables) and take responsibility for their integrity and accuracy Data sharing statement Data is still being collected for the cohort study Ciao Corona. Deidentified participant data might be available on reasonable request by email to the corresponding author at later stages of the study. **Ethics approval**

Page 17 of 26

1	401	The s	tudy was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Canton of Zurich, Switzerland
2 3 4 5 6	402	(2020	0-01336). All participants provided written informed consent before being enrolled in
	403	the st	tudy.
	404		
7 8	405	Trans	sparency declaration
9 10	406	The le	ead authors affirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account
11 12	407	of the	e study being reported, no important aspects of the study have been omitted, and any
12 13 14	408	discre	epancies from the study as originally planned and registered have been explained.
15	409		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	410	Refer	rences
18 19	411	1	Viner RM, Russell SJ, Croker H, et al. School closure and management practices during
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35	412		coronavirus outbreaks including COVID-19: a rapid systematic review. Lancet Child
	413		Adolesc. Heal. 2020; 4 :397–404. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30095-X
	414	2	Stein-Zamir C, Abramson N, Shoob H, et al. A large COVID-19 outbreak in a high
	415		school 10 days after schools' reopening, Israel, May 2020. Eurosurveillance
	416		2020; 25 :2001352. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.29.2001352
	417	3	Lopez AS, Hill M, Antezano J, et al. Transmission Dynamics of COVID-19 Outbreaks
	418		Associated with Child Care Facilities — Salt Lake City, Utah, April–July 2020. MMWR
	419		<i>Morb Mortal Wkly Rep</i> 2020; 69 :1319–23. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6937e3
	420	4	Macartney K, Quinn HE, Pillsbury AJ, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australian
36 37	421		educational settings: a prospective cohort study. Lancet Child Adolesc Heal 2020;0.
38	422		doi:10.1016/s2352-4642(20)30251-0
40	423	5	Rice K, Wynne B, Martin V, et al. Effect of school closures on mortality from
41 42	424		coronavirus disease 2019: old and new predictions. BMJ 2020;371:m3588.
43 44	425		doi:10.1136/bmj.m3588
45 46	426	6	Ladhani S, Ramsay M, Amirthalingam G, et al. COVID-19 Surveillance in Children
47 48	427		attending preschool, primary and secondary schools. 2020.
49 50	428		https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attach
50 51	429		ment_data/file/891762/sKID_protocol_v1.3.pdf
52 53	430	7	Armann JP, Unrath M, Kirsten C, et al. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in adolescent
54 55	431		students and their teachers in Saxony, Germany (SchoolCoviDD19): very low
56 57	432		seropraevalence and transmission rates. medRxiv 2020;:2020.07.16.20155143.
58 59	433		doi:10.1101/2020.07.16.20155143
59 60	434	8	Ulyte A, Radtke T, Abela IA, et al. Seroprevalence and immunity of SARS-CoV-2
	435		infection in children and adolescents in schools in Switzerland: design for a

1	436		longitudinal, school-based prospective cohort study. Int J Public Health Published
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	437		Online First: 15 October 2020. doi:10.1007/s00038-020-01495-z
	438	9	Corona Immunitas: a nationwide program of antibody studies of SARS-CoV-2 in the
	439		Swiss population (ISRCTN18181860). http://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN18181860
	440		(accessed 28 Aug 2020).
	441	10	West EA, Anker D, Amati R, et al. Corona Immunitas: study protocol of a nationwide
	442		program of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and seroepidemiologic studies in Switzerland.
13	443		Int J Public Health 2020;:1–20. doi:10.1007/s00038-020-01494-0
14	444	11	Information for public schools. Preventive regulations Canton of Zurich.
16 17	445		https://www.zh.ch/de/gesundheit/coronavirus/informationen-rund-um-schulen-
18 19	446		kitas-heime/coronavirus-volksschule.html#-1212670983 (accessed 13 Nov 2020).
20 21	447	12	Fenwick C, Croxatto A, Coste AT, et al. Changes in SARS-CoV-2 Spike versus
22 23	448		Nucleoprotein Antibody Responses Impact the Estimates of Infections in Population-
24 25	449		Based Seroprevalence Studies. J Virol Published Online First: 2020.
25 26	450		doi:10.1128/JVI.01828-20
27 28	451	13	Canton of Zurich. Numbers and Facts on COVID-19 [Kanton Zürich. Zahlen & Fakten zu
29 30	452		COVID-19]. https://www.zh.ch/de/gesundheit/coronavirus/zahlen-fakten-covid-
31 32	453		19.html?keyword=covid19#/home (accessed 13 Nov 2020).
33 34	454	14	Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG
35 36	455		antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. Lancet
37	456		2020; 0 . doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31304-0
38 39	457	15	Struyf T, Deeks JJ, Dinnes J, et al. Signs and symptoms to determine if a patient
40 41	458		presenting in primary care or hospital outpatient settings has COVID-19 disease.
42 43	459		Cochrane Database Syst. Rev. 2020; 2020 . doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013665
44 45	460	16	de Lusignan S, Dorward J, Correa A, et al. Risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 among patients
46	461		in the Oxford Royal College of General Practitioners Research and Surveillance Centre
47	462		primary care network: a cross-sectional study. Lancet Infect Dis 2020;20:1034–42.
49 50	463		doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30371-6
51 52	464	17	Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonell C, et al. Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among
53 54	465		Children and Adolescents Compared With Adults. JAMA Pediatr Published Online
55 56	466		First: 25 September 2020. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.4573
57	467	18	Xu W, Li X, Dozier M, et al. What is the evidence for transmission of COVID-19 by
58 59	468		children in schools? A living systematic review. <i>medRxiv</i> Published Online First: 2020.
60	469		doi:10.1101/2020.10.11.20210658

Page 19 of 26

BMJ Open

1	470	19	Munro APS, Faust SN. COVID-19 in children. Curr Opin Infect Dis Published Online
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	471		First: 6 October 2020. doi:10.1097/QCO.0000000000000690
	472	20	Heavey L, Casey G, Kelly C, et al. No evidence of secondary transmission of COVID-19
	473		from children attending school in Ireland, 2020. Eurosurveillance 2020;25:2000903.
	474		doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.21.2000903
	475	21	Szablewski CM, Chang KT, Brown MM, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission and Infection
	476		Among Attendees of an Overnight Camp — Georgia, June 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal
	477		Wkly Rep 2020; 69 :1023–5. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6931e1
14	478	22	Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain
16 17	479		(ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological study. Lancet
18 19	480		(London, England) 2020; 0 . doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31483-5
20 21	481	23	Waterfield T, Watson C, Moore R, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in
22 23	482		children - A prospective multicentre cohort study. medRxiv
24 25	483		2020;:2020.08.31.20183095. doi:10.1101/2020.08.31.20183095
25 26	484	24	Esposito S, Principi N. School Closure during the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)
27 28	485		Pandemic: An Effective Intervention at the Global Level? JAMA Pediatr. 2020.
29 30	486		doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.1892
31 32	487	25	Christakis DA. School Reopening-The Pandemic Issue That Is Not Getting Its Due.
33 34	488		JAMA Pediatr. 2020. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.2068
35 36	489	26	Götzinger F, Santiago-García B, Noguera-Julián A, et al. COVID-19 in children and
37	490		adolescents in Europe: a multinational, multicentre cohort study. Lancet Child Adolesc
38 39	491		Heal 2020; 4 :653–61. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30177-2
40 41	492	27	Zhou W, Wang W, Wang H, et al. First infection by all four non-severe acute
42 43	493		respiratory syndrome human coronaviruses takes place during childhood. BMC Infect
44 45	494		Dis 2013; 13 :433. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-13-433
46 47	495	28	Ng KW, Faulkner N, Cornish GH, et al. Preexisting and de novo humoral immunity to
47	496		SARS-CoV-2 in humans. Science (80-) 2020;:eabe1107. doi:10.1126/science.abe1107
49 50	497	29	Viner R, Ward J, Hudson L, et al. Systematic review of reviews of symptoms and signs
51 52	498		of COVID-19 in children and adolescents. <i>medRxiv</i> 2020;:2020.10.16.20213298.
53 54	499		doi:10.1101/2020.10.16.20213298
55 56	500	30	Mayor S. Covid-19: UK studies find gastrointestinal symptoms are common in
57 58	501		children. doi:10.1101/2020.08.31.20183095v1
58 59 60	502		
	503		

1	504	Figure legends
2	505	
5 4	506	Figure 1 Overall, school level and district estimates of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in
5	507	children
6 7	508	Weighted point estimates and 95% credible intervals are shown. Districts are ordered by
8	509	population size.
9 10	510	ABCORA 2.0 – Primary estimate based on the ABCORA 2.0 of the Institute of Medical
11	511	Virology, University of Zurich test. SenASTrIS – Estimate based on the SenASTrIS test.
12 12	512	
13 14 15	513	Figure 2 Seropositive children in tested schools and school levels
16	514	Each square illustrates an invited child. Each block of squares illustrates a school level in a
17 19	515	school. Lower and middle levels are both taught in the primary schools; however, lower and
10	516	middle levels of the same school are not matched in this graph due to protection of
20	517	participant privacy. The distribution of the invited, tested and seropositive children is
21 22	518	depicted only on the school level in the figures of this manuscript to preserve
23	519	deidentification and privacy of the participants.
24 25	520	
25 26	521	Figure 3 Clustering of seropositive children in classes: number and proportion of
27	522	seropositive children in the tested classes
28 29	523	Only classes where at least 5 children and at least 50% of the class were tested are shown.
30	524	The distribution of seropositive children in the enrolled classes is only presented in an
31 32	525	aggregated form to preserve the deidentification and privacy of the participants.
33	526	
34	527	Figure 4 Self-reported symptoms in seropositive and seronegative children in January-June
35 36	528	2020
37	529	Point estimates and 95% confidence intervals are shown.
38 39	530	
40		
41 42		
43		
44		
45 46		
47		
48 ⊿q		
50		
51		
5∠ 53		
54		
55 56		
57		
58		
60		









	Item No.	Recommendation		Page No.	Relevant text from manuscript
Title and abstract	1	(<i>a</i>) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	5		first cross-sectional analysis of a large cohort of children from randomly selected schools and classes
		(<i>b</i>) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3		
Introduction					
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5		
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	3, 5		To determine the variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in school children across districts, schools, grades, and classes, and the relationship of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence with self- reported symptoms.
Methods					
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6-8		
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6		
Participants	6	 (a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i>—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i>—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants 	6		
		(b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed			

Case-convol studyFor matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case Variables 7 Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. 7-8 Bits sources? 8* Por cach variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment 7-8 measurement (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group 7 Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in the protocol. Continued on nest page Variables 7 Variables 7 Variables Output Variables 7 Variables 7 Variables Variables Continued on nest page 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in the protocol.					
case 7.8 Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable 7.8 Data sources/ 8* For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment 7.8 measurement (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group 7 Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in the protocol. "antimed on next page ************************************			<i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per		
Variables 7 Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, protectors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. 7-8 Data sources/ 8* For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment 7-8 measurement (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group 7 Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in the protocol. Tourismud on net page 7 7 7 7 Data sources/ 8* 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in the protocol. Tourismud on net page 7 7 7 7 7			case		
Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable Data sources/ 8* For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment 7-8 Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Deruits are provided in the protocol. "outmined on next page "Outmined on next page "Outmined on next page" "Output content protocol"	Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers.	7-8	
Data sources / 8* For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment 7-8 (measurement) Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 6 Details are provided in th protocol. Texture of the study size was arrived at			Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable		
measurement (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in the protocol.	Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment	7-8	
Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in th protocol.	measurement		(measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group		
Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in the protocol.	Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7	
ionimued on next page	Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6	Details are provided in the study protocol.
a for the second s					
2					
2					
2					
2					
2					
2					
2					
2					
\mathbf{r} , \mathbf{r}					

Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7-8
Statistical	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7-8
methods		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	NA
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	NA
		(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	7-8
		Case-control study-If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	
		Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling	
		strategy	
		(<u>e</u>) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined	6
		for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	6
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on	6, 9
		exposures and potential confounders	
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	6-7
		(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	
Outcome data	15*	Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	
		Case-control study-Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	×
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision	9
		(eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were	
		included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time	NA
		period	

Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	9
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11
imitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss	12-13
		both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	
nterpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of	13
		analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	13
Other informati	on		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the	14
		original study on which the present article is based	
tp://www.annals.	ed in .org/,	conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmediand Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at ww	cine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at w.strobe-statement.org.
tp://www.annals.	ed in .org/,	conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmediand Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at ww	examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE cine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at vw.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence across districts, schools and classes: baseline measurements of primary and secondary school children cohort in Switzerland

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-047483.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Feb-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Ulyte, Agne; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Radtke, Thomas; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Abela, Irene; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Haile, Sarah; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Blankenberger, Jacob; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Jung, Ruedi; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Capelli, Celine; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Berger, Christoph; University Children's Hospital Zürich Frei, Anja; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Huber, Michael; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology; Schanz, Merle; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Schwarzmueller, Magdalena; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Trkola, Alexandra; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Fehr, Jan; University Hospital Zurich, Division of Infectious Diseases & Hospital Epidemiology; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Puhan, Milo; University of Zurich, Institute of Epidemiology, Biostatistics & Prevention (EBPI) Kriemler, Susi; University of Zurich, Institute of Epidemiology, Biostatistics
Primary Subject Heading :	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Infectious diseases, Public health
Keywords:	Paediatric infectious disease & immunisation < PAEDIATRICS, Infection control < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Epidemiology < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, VIROLOGY, Community child health < PAEDIATRICS

1 2 3	
4 5	SCHOLARONE [™] Manuscripts
6 7	
8 9 10	
11 12	
13 14	
15 16	
17 18 19	
20 21	
22 23	
24 25 26	
20 27 28	
29 30	
31 32	
33 34 35	
36 37	
38 39	
40 41 42	
42 43 44	
45 46	
47 48 40	
50 51	
52 53	
54 55	
56 57 58	
59 60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtm



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

review only

1	1	Title
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	2	Variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence across districts, schools and classes: baseline
	3	measurements of primary and secondary school children cohort in Switzerland
	4	
	5	Authors
	6	Agne Ulyte*, researcher, Thomas Radtke*, senior researcher, Irene A. Abela*, researcher,
	7	Sarah R. Haile, senior statistician, Jacob Blankenberger, master student, Ruedi Jung,
	8	researcher, Céline Capelli, master student, Christoph Berger, professor, Anja Frei, senior
	9	researcher, Michael Huber, researcher, Merle Schanz, researcher, Magdalena
16 17	10	Schwarzmueller, doctoral student, Alexandra Trkola#, professor, Jan Fehr#, professor, Milo
18 19	11	A. Puhan#, professor, Susi Kriemler\$#, professor
20 21	12	* shared first authorship
22 23	13	# shared last authorship
24 25	14	
25 26 27 28 29 30	15	Corresponding author:
	16	Susi Kriemler
	17	Tel: +41 44 634 63 20
31 32	18	susi.kriemlerwiget@uzh.ch
33 34	19	Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich
35	20	Hirschengraben 84
37	21	8001 Zürich, Switzerland
38 39	22	
40 41	23	Agne Ulyte, agne.ulyte@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI),
42 43	24	University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
44 45	25	Thomas Radtke, thomas.radtke@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention
46	26	Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
47 48	27	Irene A. Abela, irene.abela@usz.ch, Institute of Medical Virology, University of Zurich,
49 50	28	Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
51 52	29	Sarah R. Haile, sarah.haile@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute
53 54	30	(EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
55 56	31	Jacob Blankenberger, jacob.blankenberger@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and
57	32	Prevention Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich,
58 59	33	Switzerland
60	34	Ruedi Jung, ruedi.jung@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI),

1	35	University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
2	36	Céline Capelli, celine.capelli@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute
4 5	37	(EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
6	38	Christoph Berger, Christoph.Berger@kispi.uzh.ch, University Children Hospital Zurich,
7 8	39	Steinwiesstrasse 75, 8032 Zürich, Switzerland
9 10	40	Anja Frei, anja.frei@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI),
11 12	41	University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
13 14	42	Michael Huber, huber.michael@virology.uzh.ch, Institute of Medical Virology, University of
15	43	Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
16 17	44	Merle Schanz, schanz, schanz.merle@virology.uzh.ch, Institute of Medical Virology, University of
18 19	45	Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
20 21	46	Magdalena Schwarzmueller, <u>schwarzmueller.magdalena@virology.uzh.ch</u> , Institute of
22 23	47	Medical Virology, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
24	48	Alexandra Trkola, trkola.alexandra@virology.uzh.ch, Institute of Medical Virology,
26	49	University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
27	50	Jan Fehr, jan.fehr@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI),
29 30	51	University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich; Division of Infectious Diseases &
31 32	52	Hospital Epidemiology, University Hospital Zurich, Rämistrasse 100, 8091 Zurich, Switzerland
33 34	53	Milo A. Puhan, miloalan.puhan@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute
35 36	54	(EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
37	55	Susi Kriemler, susi.kriemlerwiget@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention
38 39	56	Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
40 41	57	
42 43	58	
44 45	59	Word count: 3200
46 47	60	
48		
49 50		
51 52		
53		
54 55		
56		
57 58		
59		
60		

61

Abstract

י כ	
2	
2	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
10	
20	
∠∪ ว1	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
29	
20	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
30	
29	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
10	
79 50	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
50	
55	

60

62 **Objectives:** To determine the variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in school children, and
63 the relationship with self-reported symptoms.

64 **Design:** Baseline measurements of a longitudinal cohort study (*Ciao Corona*) from June-July
65 2020.

66 **Setting:** 55 schools stratified by district in the canton of Zurich, Switzerland.

67 Participants: 2585 children (1339 girls, median age 11, age range 6-16 years), attending
68 grades 1-2, 4-5 and 7-8.

Main outcome measures: Variation in seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in children across 12
cantonal districts, schools, and grades, assessed with Luminex-based test of four epitopes
for IgG, IgA and IgM (ABCORA 2.0). Clustering of cases within classes. Association of
seropositivity and symptoms. Comparison with seroprevalence in adult population, assessed
with Luminex-based test of IgG and IgA (SenASTriS).

74 Results: Overall seroprevalence was 2.8% (95% CI 1.5 to 4.1%), ranging from 1.0% to 4.5% 75 across districts. Seroprevalence in grades 1-2 was 3.8% (2.0 to 6.1%), in grades 4-5 – 2.4% 76 (1.1 to 4.2%), and in grades 7-8 – 1.5% (0.5 to 3.0%). At least one seropositive child was 77 present in 36 of 55 (65%) schools and in 44 (34%) of 131 classes where \geq 5 children and \geq 50% 78 of children within the class were tested. 73% of children reported COVID-19-compatible 79 symptoms since January 2020, with the same frequency in seropositive and seronegative 80 children for all symptoms. Seroprevalence of children and adults was similar (3.2%, 95% CrI 81 1.7-5.0%, versus 3.6%, 95% Crl 1.7-5.4%). The ratio of confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cumulative 82 incidence to seropositive cases was 1:89 in children and 1:12 in adults.

83 Conclusions: SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence was low in children and similar to that in adults by
 84 the end of June 2020. Very low ratio of diagnosed to seropositive children was observed.
 85 We did not detect clustering of SARS-CoV-2 seropositive children within classes, but the
 86 follow-up of this study will shed more light on transmission within schools.

87 **Trial registration:** ClinicalTrials.gov NCT04448717.

88 https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04448717

89 Key words: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, children, adolescents, school.
Pane	6	٥f	າຂ
raye	υ	0I	20

91 Article summary

- 93 Strengths and limitations of this study
- This study presents the results of a regionally representative cohort of children,
 randomly selected on school and class levels, and thus, allowing the analysis of
 clustering of cases within classes and schools.
- 97 This cross-sectional analysis estimates the seroprevalence in children in June-July in
 98 Switzerland, from a period when there is very little evidence about SARS-CoV-2
 99 seroprevalence in children globally.
- Serological test with high sensitivity and specificity was used, and Bayesian
 Serological test with high sensitivity and specificity was used, and Bayesian
 hierarchical models were applied to estimate seroprevalence, adjusting for test
 accuracy parameters.

Self-reported symptoms might be subject to recall-bias, particularly when reporting retrospectively for a period of over six months.

reliez oniz

1	107	INTRODUCTION
2	108	The transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in the
3 4 5	109	school setting is not well understood [1], partly as schools were closed in many countries
5 6	110	during the peaks of the pandemic, partly due to lack of representative studies with random
7 8	111	sampling. Anecdotal evidence and case studies suggest that outbreaks can happen in
9 10	112	schools [2–4], but it is not clear if they represent outlier events or widely underdiagnosed
11 12	113	spread of the infection. The effect of school closures on the community transmission of
13 14	114	SARS-CoV-2 ranges from minimal to substantial [5], with some modelling studies even
15	115	predicting an increase of the total number of deaths [6]. Currently existing or planned
16 17	116	population-based studies focusing on SARS-CoV-2 spread in schools are few and small-sized
18 19	117	[7,8].
20 21	118	In this study, we present the results of the first cross-sectional analysis of a large
22 23	119	cohort of children from randomly selected schools and classes in the canton of Zurich,
24 25	120	Switzerland. The cohort study follows the seroprevalence, symptoms, socio-demographic
25 26	121	and lifestyle factors of enrolled children from June 2020 to April 2021. The participating
27 28	122	children were enrolled from June 16 to July 9, 2020. Schools in Switzerland were closed for a
29 30	123	relatively short period (March 16 to May 10) compared to other countries, and lock-down
31 32	124	measures were mild. Restaurants, bars and non-essential shops and services were closed on
33 34	125	March 17 and events or meetings with over 5 people prohibited on March 20, but no strict
35	126	confinement at home implemented. These measures were gradually lifted in April-May
30 37	127	2020.
38 39	128	The aim of this analysis is to present the overall estimate of seroprevalence in
40 41	129	children and its variation across districts, schools, grades and classes, the association of
42 43	130	seroprevalence with self-reported symptoms, and the clustering of seropositive children
44 45	131	within classes.
46	132	
47 48	133	
49 50		
51 52		
53 54		
55 56		
57 58		
58 59		

134 METHODS

135 Study setting

The study was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (identifier number NCT04448717). The protocol for this longitudinal cohort study was reported elsewhere [9]. The study is part of a large nationally coordinated research network Corona Immunitas in Switzerland [10,11]. The study took place from June 16 to July 9, 2020, in the canton of Zurich, Switzerland. The canton of Zurich comprises 1.5 million residents, roughly 18% of the Swiss population, and includes both urban and rural settings, as well as an ethnically and linguistically diverse population. The first preventive measures in schools were introduced on March 16, 2020, when physical attendance of schools was stopped. Schools were partly reopened on May 10, with a combination of online and on-site teaching with preventive measures (e.g., teaching in smaller groups, school attendance every second day, sports and large group activities limited). Schools were fully reopened on June 7, with minimal preventive measures (e.g., recommended social distancing for teachers, reduction of group events) and otherwise regular operation (e.g., full classrooms with desks mostly facing forward) until the end of the school year on July 17. The prevention measures implemented in schools after May 10 were school-specific and based on the federal and cantonal guidelines [12].

³¹ 151

152 Study procedures

School were selected based on a full list of schools provided by the Educational Department of the canton. Primary schools were randomly selected by a computer program from the list of all primary schools in the respective district. The closest secondary school (often in the same building or area) was then selected. The random sample of primary and secondary schools was stratified by geographic district. Within schools, randomly selected classes in lower school level (grades one to two, attended by 6 to 9-year-old children), middle (grades four to five, 9 to 13-year-old children), and upper school level (grades seven to eight, 12 to 16-year-old children) were invited. Invited grades and classes were selected to ensure that the same cohort of children within the class can be followed until April 2021. Therefore, grades 1-2, 4-5 and 7-8 (but not grades 3, 6, and 9) were included, as they normally stay in the same school and class for the next school-year. We aimed to enroll at least three classes and 40 children per school level. As we were only able to test the children at schools, a major exclusion criterion was a suspected or confirmed infection with SARS-CoV-2 in the given child on the testing date, precluding attendance of school.

Page 9 of 28

BMJ Open

Study information, link to study website (www.ciao-corona.ch), and informational videos in multiple languages for schools, parents, and children were sent to school principals and further to families of children from the selected classes. Children were enrolled and venous blood samples taken in schools between June 16 and July 9, 2020. Questionnaires with information on socio-demographics and symptoms compatible with SARS-CoV-2 infection from January to June, 2020, were completed online for the majority of children by their parents in June-July, 2020 (for 3% of children in August-September). In total, 55 out of 156 invited primary and secondary schools agreed to participate, and 2585 children in 273 out of 274 invited classes (no children participated in one class). Venous blood samples were collected from 2484 children (a sufficient amount of blood could not be obtained from 101 children). An online questionnaire, containing socio-demographic, health, symptoms and quality of life information for the children, and socio-demographic and symptoms information for the household members, was completed for 2288 of all enrolled children. Questionnaires were not filled for 297 children, after several email and phone call reminders.

²⁹30 183 Serological tests

The primary outcome of the study was the serological results of blood serum samples analyzed with ABCORA 2.0 binding assay of the Institute of Medical Virology (IMV) of the University of Zurich based on the Luminex technology [13]. The test analyzes immunoglobulins G (IgG), M (IgM) and A (IgA) against four SARS-CoV-2 targets (receptor binding domain (RBD), spike proteins S1 and S2, and the nucleocapsid protein (N), yielding 12 different measurements. Cut-off values were established against pre-pandemic plasma allowing a high sensitivity (93.3%) and specificity (99.6%). Samples were defined as seropositive for SARS-CoV-2 if at least two of the 12 parameters were above the cut-off. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in children was compared to that estimated in a random sample from the general population, adjusting for age group and sex, in the same region in June-July 2020. The adult study, like all studies of the Swiss-wide research program Corona Immunitas [10,11], used the test SenASTrIS (Sensitive Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Spike Trimer Immunoglobulin Serological) developed by the Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois (CHUV), the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Lausanne (EPFL) and the Swiss Vaccine Center [14]. The test also uses Luminex technology to detect IgG and IgA antibodies binding to the entire trimeric S protein of SARS-CoV-2 and with demonstrated 98.3% sensitivity and 98.4% specificity for the combined testing of IgG and IgA (result declared as positive when

either or both were positive) [14]. In order to compare the seroprevalence estimates in children and adult cohorts, blood serum samples of 2476 children were also analyzed with the SenASTrIS test (samples were insufficient for analysis with the second test for 8 children) and compared to a random population sample of 857 adults who took part in the second phase of the Switzerland-wide Corona Immunitas research program [11]. Seroprevalence was also compared to the cumulative incidence of reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infections in adults and children, based on official statistics up to the beginning of June [15].

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis included descriptive statistics and Bayesian hierarchical modelling to estimate seroprevalence [16]. The Bayesian approach allowed to account for the sensitivity and specificity of the SARS-CoV-2 antibody test and the hierarchical structure of cohort (individual and school levels). The model (Bayesian logistic regression) was adjusted for participants' sex, grade, and geographic district of the school, and included random effects for school levels (lower, middle and upper). In order to compute an estimate representative for the population of the canton of Zurich, we applied post-stratification weights, which adjusted for the total population size of the specific school level and the geographic district.

The factor of confirmed to total infections was calculated as the ratio of RT-PCR-confirmed cumulative incidence by the end of June 2020 and the estimated seroprevalence. We assessed the clustering of seropositive children within classes, school levels, and schools by studying the distribution of classes with zero, one, or more seropositive children. As the probability of detecting a seropositive child increases with more children tested, we separately assessed the proportion of classes with at least one seropositive child among all class and among classes with \geq 5 participating children and \geq 50% of children participating from the class.

Patient and public involvement

Several school principals were consulted during the development of the protocol to ensure feasibility of the planned study procedures. Early feedback was collected from invited children and parents, in order to adapt the communication strategies and channels. Numerous online informational sessions, encouraging open exchange and feedback, were organized for invited and enrolled school principals, personnel and parents of the children. Results of individual tests were communicated to the participants, and overall study results

```
Page 11 of 28
```

Fage	110120	Вирорен
1	235	disseminated to participating schools. Findings will be disseminated in lay language in the
2	236	national and local press, to the national and regional educational and public health
5 4	237	departments and on the website of the study (www.ciao-corona.ch).
5 6	238	
7		
8 9		
10 11		
12		
13 14		
15 16		
17 18		
19		
20		
22 23		
24 25		
26 27		
28		
29 30		
31 32		
33 34		
35		
36 37		
38 39		
40 41		
42		
43 44		
45 46		
47 48		
49		
50		
52 53		
54 55		
56 57		
58		
59 60		

1	239	RESULTS
2	240	In total, 55 schools and 2585 children were recruited (1339 (52%) girls, median age 11, age
5 4 -	241	range 6-16 years), 754 (29%) in the lower level, 899 (35%) in the middle, and 932 (36%) in
5 6	242	the upper school level. Mean participation rate was 50% of the invited children within
7 8	243	invited classes (range from 0% to 94% (0 to 21 children), interquartile range 32% to 63%).
9 10	244	Venous blood was collected and analyzed for 2484 children (1278 (51%) girls, median age
11 12	245	11, age range 6 to 16 years).
13	246	74 children had SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, resulting in overall weighted seroprevalence
14 15	247	of 2.8 % (95% credible interval (CrI) 1.5 to 4.1%), ranging from 1.0% to 4.5% in districts, as
16 17	248	measured with ABCORA test (Figure 1). Seroprevalence was 3.8% (95% CrI 2.0 to 6.1%) in
18 19	249	grades one to two, 2.4% (95% CrI 1.1 to 4.2%) in grades four to five, and 1.5% (95% CrI 0.5 to
20 21	250	3.0%) in grades seven to eight (Figure 1).
22 23	251	Seroprevalence of children, as measured with the SenASTrIS test of IgG and IgA
24 24	252	combined, was very similar to the seroprevalence of randomly selected adults in the same
25 26	253	region in June-July 2020 (children 3.2%, 95% Crl 1.7 to 5.0%, versus adults 3.6%, 95% Crl 1.7
27 28	254	to 5.4%). The estimates of seroprevalence in different school levels and districts were
29 30	255	similar to those estimated with the primary ABCORA 2.0 test (Figure 1). Seroprevalence
31 32	256	measured with SenASTriS test was 2.0% (95% CrI 0.6 to 4.3%) in grades one to two, 4.2%
33 34	257	(95% CrI 2.1 to 6.8%) in grades four to five, and 3.3% (95% CrI 1.4 to 5.6%) in grades seven
35 26	258	to eight.
30 37	259	Based on the cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-confirmed cases by the
38 39	260	end of June (0.03% for children and 0.24% for adult populations), the ratio of confirmed
40 41	261	infections to seropositive cases in children was one to 89, compared to a ratio of one to 12
42 43	262	in the adult population.
44 45	263	
46	264	Figure 1 Overall, school level and district estimates of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in
47 48	265	children
49 50	266	Weighted point estimates and 95% credible intervals are shown. Districts are ordered by population size.
51 52	267 268	ABCORA 2.0 – Primary estimate based on the ABCORA 2.0 of the Institute of Medical Virology, University of Zurich test.
53 54	269	SenASTrIS – Estimate based on the SenASTrIS test.
55 56	270	
57 57	271	At least one seropositive child was present in 36/55 (65%) of tested schools. Within the
59	272	levels of the schools, at least one seropositive child was present in the lower level of 17/29
60	273	(59%) schools, in the middle level of 14/28 (50%) schools, and in the upper level of 16/25
	274	(64%) schools (Figure 2).

Page 13 of 28

275	Figure 2 Seropositive children in tested schools and school levels
276 277 278 279 280 281	Each square illustrates an invited child. Each block of squares illustrates a school level in a school. Lower and middle levels are both taught in the primary schools; however, lower and middle levels of the same school are not matched in this graph due to protection of participant privacy. The distribution of the invited, tested and seropositive children is depicted only on the school level in the figures of this manuscript to preserve deidentification and privacy of the participants.
282	No sex differences in seroprevalence were noted (2.8% (95% Crl 1.6 to 4.1%) in girls
283	and 2.7% (95% CrI 1.5 to 4.0%) in boys). 73% of children reported any SARS-CoV-2
284	compatible symptoms, such as cough, fever, fatigue or diarrhea (see Figure 3 for the full
285	list), between January and June 2020. None of the symptoms was more frequent in
286	seropositive than in seronegative children (Figure 3).
287	
288 289 290	Figure 3 Self-reported symptoms in seropositive and seronegative children in January-June 2020
291	rom estimates and 55% confidence intervals are shown.
292	At least one seronositive child was present in $34\% (44/131)$ of classes where >5
293	children and >50% of children within the class were tested (Figure 4). Among the classes
294	with at least one seropositive child. 38 (86%) had only one. 4 (9%) had two and 2 (5%) had
295	three seropositive children. When considering all classes regardless of participation rate.
296	24% (65/273) of classes had at least one seronositive child.
297	
298	Figure 4 Clustering of seropositive children in classes: number and proportion of
299	seropositive children in the tested classes
300 301 302 303 304 305	Each dot represents a class. Diagonal lines partition the figure into classes with 0-5% of tested seropositive children (belwe 5% and 10% lines), etc. Only classes where at least 5 children and at least 50% of the class were tested are shown. The distribution of seropositive children in the enrolled classes is only presented in an aggregated form rather than clustered within schools to preserve the deidentification and privacy of the participants.
	275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 290 291 292 293 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305

DISCUSSION

In this study of randomly sampled schools and classes, we found variation in seroprevalence in 6 to 16-year-old children across districts, schools and classes by July 2020, but no indication of major transmission and outbreaks within classes and schools. The overall seroprevalence was not different from a randomly selected adult population living in the same region - pointing to striking underdiagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection in children, with only one in 89 cases diagnosed. Contrary to studies of symptomatic infections [17] and some other population-based studies of seroprevalence [16,18], there was a trend of higher seroprevalence in younger children as measured with the main ABCORA test (the trend was not present in seroprevalence estimated based on SenASTriS test). The presence of symptoms was very common (three of four children reported one or several symptoms compatible with a COVID-19 infection) and importantly not specific to the seropositive children. Although no outbreaks were reported in schools at the time of testing in the canton of Zurich (comprising 18% of the Swiss population), seropositive children were detected in more than half of the tested schools and a third of all tested classes. However, the vast majority of classes with seropositive children had only a single seropositive child among the tested children, reflecting low prevalence and no significant clustering within classes after the re-opening of the schools.

By the time of conducting this study, there were few studies focusing on SARS-CoV-2 spread in schools [18-20]. Most of the reported evidence consisted of cases studies of outbreaks in specific schools or reports of contact tracing of index cases in educational settings. Most of the studies reported low secondary attack rates in schools [4,21] but also some conflicting observations of outbreaks [2,22]. Although some studies of seroprevalence had included children [16,23,24], they mostly focused on households and the general population. The management of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in schools was therefore highly debated [25,26]. The present study is unique as one of the first major studies reporting variation in seroprevalence in children from randomly selected schools in a country where the general lock-down on a population level was mild and short (one month), and school closure lasted only for two months.

Although manifest clinical disease of COVID-19 is much less prevalent in children than in adults [17,27,28] and preliminary evidence points to lower susceptibility of children compared to adults [18], our results indicate very similar seroprevalence in adults and children. Similar seroprevalence in adults and school-aged children was found in another region in Switzerland in April [16] and in November 2020 [29]. Intriguingly, we observed a

Page 15 of 28

BMJ Open

not statistically significant trend of younger children having higher seroprevalence than older children, when measured with the comprehensive ABCORA 2.0 test. Infections with circulating human coronaviruses (hCoVs) are common in childhood and antibodies to hCoVs 229E, NL63, OC43 and HKU1A are prevalent in the human population and particularly children [30,31]. Cross-reactivity with hCoVs was thus considered in the development of both serology tests used in this study and both tests detect SARS-CoV-2 with high specificity (99.6% for ABCORA 2.0 and 98.4% for SenASTrIS). Importantly, to adjust for the possibility of a few false-positive results, we employed a Bayesian hierarchical model, which adjusts for the accuracy parameters of the tests to estimate population-level seroprevalence. Higher seroprevalence in younger children could be compatible with less feasible social distancing behavior and possibly more vigorous immune response to the virus in early age. The trend could also reflect a chance finding, as substantial proportion of false positives is expected in the low seroprevalence setting, and it was not observed in the SenASTriS test results. Further testing of the cohort and forthcoming studies will show if this trend is observed in the future.

The frequency of both more specific (e.g., fever, cough) and less specific (rhinorrhea, headache, nausea) symptoms [32] was not different among seropositive and seronegative children. In general, symptoms, particularly rhinorrhea, cough, headache and sore throat, were reported frequently, with three of four children reporting any symptoms within the last 6 months in both groups. Anosmia was not reported by any of the seropositive children. The specificity of COVID-19 compatible symptoms, therefore, seems to be lower in children than in adults. Moreover, the range of symptoms reported in children was shown to be different than in adults [33]. Somewhat unspecific symptoms in children, contrary to more specific symptoms in adults [34], could partly explain the high proportion of seropositive children who were not previously diagnosed with RT-PCR. Furthermore, testing indications by health authorities were cautious both for children and adults during the first half of 2020. Testing was recommended only for children with acute upper respiratory tract infection symptoms or acute anosmia, and not recommended in children with rhinitis only or without symptoms [35].

Particular strengths of the design of this study are school-based random sampling, hierarchical data structure, and large sample size, allowing to identify clusters within district, school, grade and class levels. Testing was done in schools and study information presented in multiple formats, including videos in multiple languages, to minimize selection bias within enrolled children. The participation rate of 50% can be considered rather high

for a study in children involving venous blood sampling, and additional children from the invited classes will have the opportunity to be enrolled in subsequent testing phases (October/November 2020, March/April 2021), further increasing participation rate and the size of the cohort.

The study has a few limitations. First, the retrospective evaluation of symptoms over six months could have been subject to recall bias. Second, the study enrolled only 35% (55/156) of the invited schools. Commonly stated reasons for non-participation on school level were constraints in time and human resources and competing participation in other studies. Participation rate on school level varied significantly depending on the district, and for a few districts, a maximum of three invitation rounds was needed to recruit a regionally representative sample. Third, although the schools were open for one to two months directly before the study, they were closed for the two months of the highest community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the canton of Zurich [15]. Therefore, the measured seroprevalence in children might be dominated by infections in households rather than school. The follow up of this study will shed more light on transmission in schools.

In conclusion, clustering of SARS-CoV-2 seropositive children within classes and schools was not prominent shortly after reopening of schools in this large population-based study. Seroprevalence was similar to adults, resulting in strikingly fewer diagnosed infections in comparison to the seropositive cases in children than in adults. Considering the time window required for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies to form, this study reflects infection of SARS-CoV-2 until approximately end of May 2020, covering four months of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the community, with two months of school closure and mild lock-down policy. The subsequent testing of parents and school personnel and the follow-up of the children cohort in fall 2020 will yield further evidence on the observed trends and of the spread of SARS-CoV-2 within and outside schools.

1	401	Author Contributions
2	402	SK and MAP initiated the project and preliminary design, with support of JF. SK, MAP, CB,
4	403	TR, RJ, JB, AF and AU developed the design and methodology. SK, RJ, AU, TR, JB, AF and CC
5 6	404	recruited study participants, collected and managed the data. SRH performed statistical
7 8	405	analysis. AT, MH, MaSch, MeSch and IA developed the serology analysis plan, supervised,
9 10	406	conducted and evaluated the serology tests. AU wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All
11 12	407	authors contributed to the design of the study and interpretation of its results, and revised
13 14	408	and approved the manuscript for intellectual content. SK is the guarantor and accepts full
14	409	responsibility for the work and the conduct of the study, had access to the data, and
16 17	410	controlled the decision to publish. The corresponding author SK attests that all listed
18 19	411	authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.
20 21	412	
22 23	413	Competing interests
24 25	414	The authors declare no competing interests to disclose.
26	415	
27 28 29	416	Funding
29 30	417	This study is part of Corona Immunitas research network, coordinated by the Swiss School of
31 32	418	Public Health (SSPH+), and funded by fundraising of SSPH+ that includes funds of the Swiss
33 34	419	Federal Office of Public Health and private funders (ethical guidelines for funding stated by
35 36	420	SSPH+ will be respected), by funds of the Cantons of Switzerland (Vaud, Zurich and Basel)
37	421	and by institutional funds of the Universities. Additional funding, specific to this study is
38 39	422	available from the University of Zurich Foundation. The funder/sponsor did not have any
40 41	423	role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and
42 43	424	interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision
44 45	425	to submit the manuscript for publication. All authors had full access to all data analysis
46 47	426	outputs (reports and tables) and take responsibility for their integrity and accuracy
48	427	
49 50	428	Data sharing statement
51 52	429	Data is still being collected for the cohort study Ciao Corona. Deidentified participant data
53 54	430	might be available on reasonable request by email to the corresponding author at later
55 56	431	stages of the study.
57 58	432	
59 60	433	Ethics approval

1	434	The st	tudy was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Canton of Zurich, Switzerland
2	435	(2020	-01336). All participants provided written informed consent before being enrolled in
4	436	the st	udy.
5 6	437		
7 8	438	Trans	parency declaration
9 10	439	The le	ead authors affirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account
11 12	440	of the	e study being reported, no important aspects of the study have been omitted, and any
13	441	discre	epancies from the study as originally planned and registered have been explained.
15	442		
16 17	443	Refer	ences
18 19	444	1	Viner RM, Russell SJ, Croker H, et al. School closure and management practices during
20	445		coronavirus outbreaks including COVID-19: a rapid systematic review. Lancet Child
21	446		Adolesc. Heal. 2020; 4 :397–404. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30095-X
23 24	447	2	Stein-Zamir C, Abramson N, Shoob H, et al. A large COVID-19 outbreak in a high
25 26	448		school 10 days after schools' reopening, Israel, May 2020. Eurosurveillance
27 28	449		2020; 25 :2001352. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.29.2001352
29	450	3	Lopez AS, Hill M, Antezano J, et al. Transmission Dynamics of COVID-19 Outbreaks
30 31	451		Associated with Child Care Facilities — Salt Lake City, Utah, April–July 2020. MMWR
32 33	452		Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2020; 69 :1319–23. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6937e3
34 35	453	4	Macartney K, Quinn HE, Pillsbury AJ, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australian
36 37	454		educational settings: a prospective cohort study. Lancet Child Adolesc Heal 2020;0.
38	455		doi:10.1016/s2352-4642(20)30251-0
40	456	5	Walsh S, Chowdhury A, Russell S, et al. Do school closures reduce community
41 42	457		transmission of COVID-19? A systematic review of observational studies. medRxiv
43 44	458		2021;:2021.01.02.21249146. doi:10.1101/2021.01.02.21249146
45 46	459	6	Rice K, Wynne B, Martin V, et al. Effect of school closures on mortality from
47 48	460		coronavirus disease 2019: old and new predictions. BMJ 2020;371:m3588.
49	461		doi:10.1136/bmj.m3588
50	462	7	Ladhani S, Ramsay M, Amirthalingam G, et al. COVID-19 Surveillance in Children
52 53	463		attending preschool, primary and secondary schools. 2020.
54 55	464		https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attach
56 57	465		ment_data/file/891762/sKID_protocol_v1.3.pdf
58 59	466	8	Armann JP, Unrath M, Kirsten C, et al. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in adolescent
60	467		students and their teachers in Saxony, Germany (SchoolCoviDD19): very low
	468		seropraevalence and transmission rates. medRxiv 2020;:2020.07.16.20155143.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 19 of 28

1	469		doi:10.1101/2020.07.16.20155143
2	470	9	Ulyte A, Radtke T, Abela IA, et al. Seroprevalence and immunity of SARS-CoV-2
5 4	471		infection in children and adolescents in schools in Switzerland: design for a
5 6	472		longitudinal, school-based prospective cohort study. Int J Public Health Published
7 8	473		Online First: 15 October 2020. doi:10.1007/s00038-020-01495-z
9 10	474	10	Corona Immunitas: a nationwide program of antibody studies of SARS-CoV-2 in the
11 12	475		Swiss population (ISRCTN18181860). http://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN18181860
13	476		(accessed 28 Aug 2020).
14	477	11	West EA, Anker D, Amati R, et al. Corona Immunitas: study protocol of a nationwide
16 17	478		program of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and seroepidemiologic studies in Switzerland.
18 19	479		Int J Public Health 2020;:1–20. doi:10.1007/s00038-020-01494-0
20 21	480	12	Information for public schools. Preventive regulations Canton of Zurich.
22 23	481		https://www.zh.ch/de/gesundheit/coronavirus/informationen-rund-um-schulen-
24 25	482		kitas-heime/coronavirus-volksschule.html#-1212670983 (accessed 13 Nov 2020).
25 26	483	13	Institute of Medical Virology IMV SARS-CoV-2 Antikörper Differenzierung (ABCORA).
27 28	484		https://www.virology.uzh.ch/dam/jcr:0f9bbdba-e215-4e42-a877-131a04a2e175/IMV
29 30	485		ABCORA Serologie.pdf (accessed 16 Dec 2020).
31 32	486	14	Fenwick C, Croxatto A, Coste AT, et al. Changes in SARS-CoV-2 Spike versus
33 34	487		Nucleoprotein Antibody Responses Impact the Estimates of Infections in Population-
35	488		Based Seroprevalence Studies. J Virol Published Online First: 2020.
37	489		doi:10.1128/JVI.01828-20
38 39	490	15	Canton of Zurich. Numbers and Facts on COVID-19 [Kanton Zürich. Zahlen & Fakten zu
40 41	491		COVID-19]. https://www.zh.ch/de/gesundheit/coronavirus/zahlen-fakten-covid-
42 43	492		19.html?keyword=covid19#/home (accessed 13 Nov 2020).
44 45	493	16	Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG
46 47	494		antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. Lancet
48	495		2020; 0 . doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31304-0
49 50	496	17	de Lusignan S, Dorward J, Correa A, et al. Risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 among patients
51 52	497		in the Oxford Royal College of General Practitioners Research and Surveillance Centre
53 54	498		primary care network: a cross-sectional study. Lancet Infect Dis 2020;20:1034–42.
55 56	499		doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30371-6
57 58	500	18	Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonell C, et al. Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among
59 60	501		Children and Adolescents Compared With Adults. JAMA Pediatr Published Online
60	502		First: 25 September 2020. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.4573

1	503	19	Xu W, Li X, Dozier M, et al. What is the evidence for transmission of COVID-19 by
2	504		children in schools? A living systematic review. medRxiv Published Online First: 2020.
4	505		doi:10.1101/2020.10.11.20210658
5 6	506	20	Munro APS, Faust SN. COVID-19 in children. Curr Opin Infect Dis Published Online
7 8	507		First: 6 October 2020. doi:10.1097/QCO.000000000000690
9 10	508	21	Heavey L, Casey G, Kelly C, et al. No evidence of secondary transmission of COVID-19
11 12	509		from children attending school in Ireland, 2020. Eurosurveillance 2020;25:2000903.
13	510		doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.21.2000903
14	511	22	Szablewski CM, Chang KT, Brown MM, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission and Infection
16 17	512		Among Attendees of an Overnight Camp — Georgia, June 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal
18 19	513		Wkly Rep 2020; 69 :1023–5. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6931e1
20 21	514	23	Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain
22 23	515		(ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological study. Lancet
23 24 25	516		(London, England) 2020; 0 . doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31483-5
25 26	517	24	Waterfield T, Watson C, Moore R, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in
27 28	518		children - A prospective multicentre cohort study. medRxiv
29 30	519		2020;:2020.08.31.20183095. doi:10.1101/2020.08.31.20183095
31 32	520	25	Esposito S, Principi N. School Closure during the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)
33 34	521		Pandemic: An Effective Intervention at the Global Level? JAMA Pediatr. 2020.
35	522		doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.1892
30 37	523	26	Christakis DA. School Reopening-The Pandemic Issue That Is Not Getting Its Due.
38 39	524		JAMA Pediatr. 2020. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.2068
40 41	525	27	Götzinger F, Santiago-García B, Noguera-Julián A, et al. COVID-19 in children and
42 43	526		adolescents in Europe: a multinational, multicentre cohort study. Lancet Child Adolesc
44 45	527		<i>Heal</i> 2020; 4 :653–61. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30177-2
46	528	28	Posfay-Barbe KM, Wagner N, Gauthey M, et al. COVID-19 in children and the
47 48	529		dynamics of infection in families. Pediatrics 2020;146. doi:10.1542/peds.2020-1576
49 50	530	29	Stringhini S, Zaballa M-E, Perez-Saez J, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2
51 52	531		antibodies after the second pandemic peak. Lancet Infect Dis 2021;0.
53 54	532		doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00054-2
55 56	533	30	Zhou W, Wang W, Wang H, et al. First infection by all four non-severe acute
57 57	534		respiratory syndrome human coronaviruses takes place during childhood. BMC Infect
58 59	535		<i>Dis</i> 2013; 13 :433. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-13-433
60	536	31	Ng KW, Faulkner N, Cornish GH, et al. Preexisting and de novo humoral immunity to

1	537		SARS-CoV-2 in humans. Science (80-) 2020;:eabe1107. doi:10.1126/science.abe1107
2	538	32	Viner R, Ward J, Hudson L, et al. Systematic review of reviews of symptoms and signs
4	539		of COVID-19 in children and adolescents. <i>medRxiv</i> 2020;:2020.10.16.20213298.
5 6	540		doi:10.1101/2020.10.16.20213298
7 8	541	33	Mayor S. Covid-19: UK studies find gastrointestinal symptoms are common in
9 10	542		children. doi:10.1101/2020.08.31.20183095v1
11 12	543	34	Struyf T, Deeks JJ, Dinnes J, et al. Signs and symptoms to determine if a patient
13 14	544		presenting in primary care or hospital outpatient settings has COVID-19 disease.
14	545		Cochrane Database Syst. Rev. 2020; 2020 . doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013665
16 17	546	35	COVID-19 Fragen und Antworten Teil 8 - pädiatrie schweiz.
18 19	547		https://www.paediatrieschweiz.ch/news/covid-19-fragen-und-antworten-teil-8/
20 21	548		(accessed 23 Feb 2021).
22 23	549		
24 25	550		
26 27			
27			
29 30			
31 32			
33 34			
35 36			
37			
39 40			
40 41			
42 43			
44 45			
46 47			
48			
50			
51 52			
53 54			
55 56			
57			
58 59			
60			

1	551	Figure legends
2 3	552	
4	553	Figure 1 Overall, school level and district estimates of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in
5 6	554	children
7	555	Weighted point estimates and 95% credible intervals are shown. Districts are ordered by
8 9	556	population size.
10	557	ABCORA 2.0 – Primary estimate based on the ABCORA 2.0 of the Institute of Medical
11 12	558 559	Virology, University of Zurich test. SenASTrIS – Estimate based on the SenASTrIS test.
13 14	560	Figure 2 Seropositive children in tested schools and school levels
15 16	561	Each square illustrates an invited child. Each block of squares illustrates a school level in a
17	562	school. Lower and middle levels are both taught in the primary schools: however, lower and
18 19	563	middle levels of the same school are not matched in this graph due to protection of
20	564	participant privacy. The distribution of the invited, tested and seropositive children is
21 22	565	depicted only on the school level in the figures of this manuscript to preserve
23	566	deidentification and privacy of the participants.
24 25	567	
26	568	Figure 3 Self-reported symptoms in seropositive and seronegative children in January-June
27 28	569	2020
29	570	Point estimates and 95% confidence intervals are shown.
30 21	571	
32	572	Figure 4 Clustering of seropositive children in classes: number and proportion of
33 34	573	seropositive children in the tested classes
35 36	574	Each dot represents a class. Diagonal lines partition the figure into classes with 0-5% of
37 20	575	tested seropositive children (below 5% line), 5-10% of tested seropositive children (between
30 39	576	5% and 10% lines), etc. Only classes where at least 5 children and at least 50% of the class
40 41	577	were tested are shown. The distribution of seropositive children in the enrolled classes is
42 43	578	only presented in an aggregated form rather than clustered within schools to preserve the
44 45	579	deidentification and privacy of the participants.
46 47	580	
48		
49 50		
51		
52 52		
55 54		
55 56		
57		
58 50		
60		









	Item No.	Recommendation		Page No.	Relevant text from manuscript
Title and abstract	1	(<i>a</i>) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	5		first cross-sectional analysis of a large cohort of children from randomly selected schools and classes
		(<i>b</i>) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3		
Introduction					
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5		
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	3, 5		To determine the variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in school children across districts, schools, grades, and classes, and the relationship of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence with self- reported symptoms.
Methods					
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6-8		
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6		
Participants	6	 (a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i>—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i>—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants 	6		
		(b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed			

Case-control study=-rol matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case Variables 7 Data sources/ 8* 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in if protocol.			C		
cites 7 Variables 7 Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable 7 Data sources/ 8* For each variable of interest, give sources of data and detialis of methods of assessment 7-8 measurement (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group 7 Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in th protocol. Southout on next page			Case-control study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per		
Variables 7 Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, productors, potential contounders, and effect modifiers. 7-8 Data sources/ 8* For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment 7-8 measurement (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group 7 Bits 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6	· · · · ·				
Cive diagnostic critera, if applicable interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment 7-8 measurement (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in 1 protocol.	Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers.	7-8	
Data sources/ 8* For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment methods if there is more than one group 7 measurement/ 0 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in the protocol. Tominaed on next page Image: Protocol is and protocol is in the study size was arrived at Image: Protocol is protocol is protocol.			Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable		
measurement (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in the protocol. Ontinued on next page 0 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in the protocol.	Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment	7-8	
Bins 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias 7 Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in t protocol. "omtimed on next page " " " * * *	measurement		(measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group		
Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at 6 Details are provided in the protocol.	Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7	
initial on next page	Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6	Details are provided in the study protocol.
only					
2			2		

Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7-8
Statistical	12	(<i>a</i>) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7-8
methods		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	NA
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	NA
		(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	7-8
		Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	
		Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling	
		strategy	
		(<u>e</u>) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study-eg numbers potentially eligible, examined	6
		for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	6
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on	6, 9
		exposures and potential confounders	
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	6-7
		(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	
Outcome data	15*	<u>Cohort study</u> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	
		Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	·
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision	9
		(eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were	
		included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time	NA
		period	

Discussion 18 Summarise key results with reference to study objectives 11 Limitations 19 Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss 12-13 Interpretation 20 Give a caucious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence 13 Other information 21 Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results 13 Other information 22 Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based 14 Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. Iote: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE hecklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at ttp://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.	Julei analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	9
Key results 18 Summarise key results with reference to study objectives 11 Limitations 19 Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias 12-13 Interpretation 20 Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence 13 Generalisability 21 Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results 13 Other information 7 7 7 Funding 22 Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based 14 Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. 14 Give in formation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE heeklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at ttp://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.	Discussion			
Limitations 19 Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss 12-13 both direction and magnitude of any potential bias 0 Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence 13 Generalisability 21 Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results 13 Other information 7 14 14 Funding 22 Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based 14 Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. 0te: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE necklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at ttp://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.	Cey results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11
both direction and magnitude of any potential bias Interpretation 20 Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence 13 Generalisability 21 Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results 13 Other information 13 Funding 22 Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based 14 Give information sease and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. Give the Automation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE hecklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at ttp://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.	Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss	12-13
Interpretation 20 Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence 13 Generalisability 21 Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results 13 Other information 5 14 14 Funding 22 Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based 14 Give information search and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. Give information search and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE hecklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.strobe-statement.org. Hote://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.			both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	
analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence Generalisability 21 Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results 13 Other information Image: Study on which the present article is based 14 Funding 22 Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based 14 Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. Arte: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE hecklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at ttp://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.	nterpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of	13
Generalisability 21 Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results 13 Other information Funding 22 Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based 14 Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. Gote: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE hecklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at ttp://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.			analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	
Other information Funding 22 Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based 14 Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. iote: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE hecklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at ttp://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.	Jeneralisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	13
Funding 22 Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based 14 Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. 14 Inter: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE hecklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at ttp://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.	Other informati	on		
original study on which the present article is based Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. ote: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE necklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at ttp://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.	Junding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the	14
Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE hecklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at ttp://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.			original study on which the present article is based	
			and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at ww	cine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at w.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence across districts, schools and classes: baseline measurements from a cohort of primary and secondary school children in Switzerland

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-047483.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Apr-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Ulyte, Agne; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Radtke, Thomas; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Abela, Irene; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology; University Hospital Zurich Division of Infectious Diseases and Hospital Epidemiology Haile, Sarah; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Blankenberger, Jacob; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Jung, Ruedi; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Capelli, Celine; University of Zurich, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Berger, Christoph; University Children's Hospital Zürich Frei, Anja; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology; Schanz, Merle; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Schwarzmueller, Magdalena; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Trkola, Alexandra; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Fehr, Jan; University Hospital Zurich, Division of Infectious Diseases & Hospital Epidemiology; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology Fehr, Jan; University of Zurich, Institute of Medical Virology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI) Puhan, Milo; University of Zurich, Institute of Epidemiology, Biostatistics & Prevention (EBPI) Kriemler, Susi; University of Zurich, Institute of Epidemiology, Biostatistics
Primary Subject Heading :	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Infectious diseases, Public health, Paediatrics
Keywords:	Paediatric infectious disease & immunisation < PAEDIATRICS, Infection control < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Epidemiology < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, VIROLOGY, Community child health < PAEDIATRICS

SCHOLARONE [™] Manuscripts
indituseripes
For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

review only

1	1	Title
2 3 4 5 6	2	Variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence across districts, schools and classes: baseline
	3	measurements from a cohort of primary and secondary school children in Switzerland
	4	
7 8	5	Authors
9 10	6	Agne Ulyte*, researcher, Thomas Radtke*, senior researcher, Irene A. Abela*, researcher,
11 12	7	Sarah R. Haile, senior statistician, Jacob Blankenberger, master student, Ruedi Jung,
13	8	researcher, Céline Capelli, master student, Christoph Berger, professor, Anja Frei, senior
14 15	9	researcher, Michael Huber, researcher, Merle Schanz, researcher, Magdalena
16 17	10	Schwarzmueller, doctoral student, Alexandra Trkola#, professor, Jan Fehr#, professor, Milo
18 19	11	A. Puhan#, professor, Susi Kriemler\$#, professor
20 21	12	* shared first authorship
22 23	13	# shared last authorship
24 25	14	
26 27	15	Corresponding author:
27	16	Susi Kriemler
29 30	17	Tel: +41 44 634 63 20
31 32	18	susi.kriemlerwiget@uzh.ch
33 34 35 36	19	Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich
	20	Hirschengraben 84
37	21	8001 Zürich, Switzerland
39	22	
40 41	23	Agne Ulyte, agne.ulyte@uzh.ch , Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI),
42 43	24	University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52	25	Thomas Radtke, thomas.radtke@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention
	26	Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
	27	Irene A. Abela, irene.abela@virology.uzh.ch, Institute of Medical Virology, University of
	28	Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland; Division of Infectious Diseases &
	29	Hospital Epidemiology, University Hospital Zurich, Rämistrasse 100, 8091 Zürich, Switzerland
53 54	30	Sarah R. Haile, sarah.haile@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute
55 56	31	(EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
57 58	32	Jacob Blankenberger, jacob.blankenberger@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and
59 60	33	Prevention Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich,
00	34	Switzerland

35	Ruedi Jung, ruedi.jung@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI),
36	University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
37	Céline Capelli, celine.capelli@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute
38	(EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
39	Christoph Berger, Christoph.Berger@kispi.uzh.ch, University Children Hospital Zurich,
40	Steinwiesstrasse 75, 8032 Zürich, Switzerland
41	Anja Frei, anja.frei@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI),
42	University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
43	Michael Huber, huber.michael@virology.uzh.ch, Institute of Medical Virology, University of
44	Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
45	Merle Schanz, schanz.merle@virology.uzh.ch , Institute of Medical Virology, University of
46	Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
47	Magdalena Schwarzmueller, <u>schwarzmueller.magdalena@virology.uzh.ch</u> , Institute of
48	Medical Virology, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
49	Alexandra Trkola, trkola.alexandra@virology.uzh.ch, Institute of Medical Virology,
50	University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland
51	Jan Fehr, jan.fehr@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI),
52	University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich; Division of Infectious Diseases &
53	Hospital Epidemiology, University Hospital Zurich, Rämistrasse 100, 8091 Zurich, Switzerland
54	Milo A. Puhan, miloalan.puhan@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute
55	(EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
56	Susi Kriemler, susi.kriemlerwiget@uzh.ch, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention
57	Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich, Hirschengraben 84, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland
58	
59	
60	Word count: 3200
61	
	35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61

Abstract

י ר	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
17	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
20	
57	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
., ۲۶	
70 //	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	

60

63 **Objectives:** To determine the variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in school children, and
64 the relationship with self-reported symptoms.

65 Design: Baseline measurements of a longitudinal cohort study (*Ciao Corona*) from June-July66 2020.

67 **Setting:** 55 schools stratified by district in the canton of Zurich, Switzerland.

68 Participants: 2585 children (1339 girls, median age 11, age range 6-16 years), attending
69 grades 1-2, 4-5 and 7-8.

Main outcome measures: Variation in seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in children across 12
cantonal districts, schools, and grades, assessed with Luminex-based test of four epitopes
for IgG, IgA and IgM (ABCORA 2.0). Clustering of cases within classes. Association of
seropositivity and symptoms. Comparison with seroprevalence in adult population, assessed
with Luminex-based test of IgG and IgA (SenASTriS).

75 Results: Overall seroprevalence was 2.8% (95% CI 1.5 to 4.1%), ranging from 1.0% to 4.5% 76 across districts. Seroprevalence in grades 1-2 was 3.8% (2.0 to 6.1%), in grades 4-5 – 2.4% 77 (1.1 to 4.2%), and in grades 7-8 – 1.5% (0.5 to 3.0%). At least one seropositive child was 78 present in 36 of 55 (65%) schools and in 44 (34%) of 131 classes where \geq 5 children and \geq 50% 79 of children within the class were tested. 73% of children reported COVID-19-compatible symptoms since January 2020, with the same frequency in seropositive and seronegative 80 81 children for all symptoms. Seroprevalence of children and adults was similar (3.2%, 95% CrI 82 1.7-5.0%, versus 3.6%, 95% Crl 1.7-5.4%). The ratio of confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cumulative 83 incidence to seropositive cases was 1:89 in children and 1:12 in adults.

84 Conclusions: SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence was low in children and similar to that in adults by
 85 the end of June 2020. Very low ratio of diagnosed to seropositive children was observed.
 86 We did not detect clustering of SARS-CoV-2 seropositive children within classes, but the
 87 follow-up of this study will shed more light on transmission within schools.

88 **Trial registration:** ClinicalTrials.gov NCT04448717.

89 https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04448717

90 Key words: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, children, adolescents, school.

Page	6	of	30
	-	•••	

92	Article summary
92	Article summary

- Strengths and limitations of this study
- This study presents the results of a regionally representative cohort of children, randomly selected on school and class levels, and thus, allowing the analysis of clustering of cases within classes and schools.
- This cross-sectional analysis estimates the seroprevalence in children in June-July in Switzerland, from a period when there is very little evidence about SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in children globally.
- Serological test with high sensitivity and specificity was used, and Bayesian • hierarchical models were applied to estimate seroprevalence, adjusting for test accuracy parameters.
 - Self-reported symptoms might be subject to recall-bias, particularly when reporting • retrospectively for a period of over six months.

terez onz

1	108	INTRODUCTION
2	109	The transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in the
3 4	110	school setting is not well understood [1], partly as schools were closed in many countries
5 6	111	during the peaks of the pandemic, partly due to lack of representative studies with random
7 8	112	sampling. Anecdotal evidence and case studies suggest that outbreaks can happen in
9 10	113	schools [2–4], but it is not clear if they represent outlier events or widely underdiagnosed
11 12	114	spread of the infection. The effect of school closures on the community transmission of
13	115	SARS-CoV-2 ranges from minimal to substantial [5], with some modelling studies even
14	116	predicting an increase of the total number of deaths [6]. Currently existing or planned
16 17	117	population-based studies focusing on SARS-CoV-2 spread in schools are few and small-sized
18 19	118	[7,8].
20 21	119	In this study, we present the results of the first cross-sectional analysis of a large
22 23	120	cohort of children from randomly selected schools and classes in the canton of Zurich,
23 24 25	121	Switzerland. The cohort study follows the seroprevalence, symptoms, socio-demographic
25 26	122	and lifestyle factors of enrolled children from June 2020 to April 2021. The participating
27 28	123	children were enrolled from June 16 to July 9, 2020. Schools in Switzerland were closed for a
29 30	124	relatively short period (March 16 to May 10) compared to other countries, and lock-down
31 32	125	measures were mild. Restaurants, bars and non-essential shops and services were closed on
33 34	126	March 17 and events or meetings with over 5 people prohibited on March 20, but no strict
35	127	confinement at home implemented. These measures were gradually lifted in April-May
30 37	128	2020.
38 39	129	The aim of this analysis is to present the overall estimate of seroprevalence in
40 41	130	children and its variation across districts, schools, grades and classes, the association of
42 43	131	seroprevalence with self-reported symptoms, and the clustering of seropositive children
44 45	132	within classes.
46 47	133	
47 48	134	
49 50		
51 52		
53		
54 55		
56		
57		
58 59		

135 METHODS

136 Study setting

The study was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (identifier number NCT04448717). The protocol for this longitudinal cohort study was reported elsewhere [9]. The study is part of a large nationally coordinated research network Corona Immunitas in Switzerland [10,11]. The study took place from June 16 to July 9, 2020, in the canton of Zurich, Switzerland. The canton of Zurich comprises 1.5 million residents, roughly 18% of the Swiss population, and includes both urban and rural settings, as well as an ethnically and linguistically diverse population. The first preventive measures in schools were introduced on March 16, 2020, when physical attendance of schools was stopped. Schools were partly reopened on May 10, with a combination of online and on-site teaching with preventive measures (e.g., teaching in smaller groups, school attendance every second day, sports and large group activities limited). Schools were fully reopened on June 7, with minimal preventive measures (e.g., recommended social distancing for teachers, reduction of group events) and otherwise regular operation (e.g., full classrooms with desks mostly facing forward) until the end of the school year on July 17. The prevention measures implemented in schools after May 10 were school-specific and based on the federal and cantonal guidelines [12].

³¹ 32 152

153 Study procedures

School were selected based on a full list of schools provided by the Educational Department of the canton. Primary schools were randomly selected by a computer program from the list of all primary schools in the respective district. The closest secondary school (often in the same building or area) was then selected. The random sample of primary and secondary schools was stratified by geographic district. Within schools, randomly selected classes in lower school level (grades one to two, attended by 6 to 9-year-old children), middle (grades four to five, 9 to 13-year-old children), and upper school level (grades seven to eight, 12 to 16-year-old children) were invited. Invited grades and classes were selected to ensure that the same cohort of children within the class can be followed until April 2021. Therefore, grades 1-2, 4-5 and 7-8 (but not grades 3, 6, and 9) were included, as they normally stay in the same school and class for the next school-year. We aimed to enroll at least three classes and 40 children per school level. As we were only able to test the children at schools, a major exclusion criterion was a suspected or confirmed infection with SARS-CoV-2 in the given child on the testing date, precluding attendance of school.

Page 9 of 30

BMJ Open

Study information, link to study website (www.ciao-corona.ch), and informational videos in multiple languages for schools, parents, and children were sent to school principals and further to families of children from the selected classes. Children were enrolled and venous blood samples taken in schools between June 16 and July 9, 2020. Questionnaires with information on socio-demographics and symptoms compatible with SARS-CoV-2 infection from January to June, 2020, were completed online for the majority of children by their parents in June-July, 2020 (for 3% of children in August-September). In total, 55 out of 156 invited primary and secondary schools agreed to participate, and 2585 children in 273 out of 274 invited classes (no children participated in one class).

Venous blood samples were collected from 2484 children (a sufficient amount of blood could not be obtained from 101 children). An online questionnaire, containing socio-demographic, health, symptoms and quality of life information for the children, and socio-demographic and symptoms information for the household members, was completed for 2288 of all enrolled children. Questionnaires were not filled for 297 children, after several email and phone call reminders.

²⁹30 184 Serological tests

The primary outcome of the study was the serological results of blood serum samples analyzed with ABCORA 2.0 binding assay of the Institute of Medical Virology (IMV) of the University of Zurich based on the Luminex technology [13]. The test analyzes immunoglobulins G (IgG), M (IgM) and A (IgA) against four SARS-CoV-2 targets (receptor binding domain (RBD), spike proteins S1 and S2, and the nucleocapsid protein (N), yielding 12 different measurements. Cut-off values were established against pre-pandemic plasma allowing a high sensitivity (93.3%) and specificity (99.6%). Samples were defined as seropositive for SARS-CoV-2 if at least two of the 12 parameters were above the cut-off. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in children was compared to that estimated in a random sample from the general population, adjusting for age group and sex, in the same region in June-July 2020. The adult study, like all studies of the Swiss-wide research program Corona Immunitas [10,11], used the test SenASTrIS (Sensitive Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Spike Trimer Immunoglobulin Serological) developed by the Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois (CHUV), the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Lausanne (EPFL) and the Swiss Vaccine Center [14]. The test also uses Luminex technology to detect IgG and IgA antibodies binding to the entire trimeric S protein of SARS-CoV-2 and with demonstrated 98.3% sensitivity and 98.4% specificity for the combined testing of IgG and IgA (result declared as positive when

BMJ Open either or both were positive) [14]. In order to compare the seroprevalence estimates in children and adult cohorts, blood serum samples of 2476 children were also analyzed with the SenASTrIS test (samples were insufficient for analysis with the second test for 8 children) and compared to a random population sample of 857 adults who took part in the second phase of the Switzerland-wide Corona Immunitas research program [11]. Seroprevalence was also compared to the cumulative incidence of reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infections in adults and children, based on official statistics up to the beginning of June [15]. Statistical analysis Statistical analysis included descriptive statistics and Bayesian hierarchical modelling to estimate seroprevalence [16]. The Bayesian approach allowed to account for the sensitivity and specificity of the SARS-CoV-2 antibody test and the hierarchical structure of cohort (individual and school levels). The model (Bayesian logistic regression) was adjusted for participants' sex, grade, and geographic district of the school, and included random effects for school levels (lower, middle and upper). In order to compute an estimate representative for the population of the canton of Zurich, we applied post-stratification weights, which adjusted for the total population size of the specific school level and the geographic district. The model and weighing procedure are described in detail in Appendix 1. The factor of confirmed to total infections was calculated as the ratio of RT-PCR-confirmed cumulative incidence by the end of June 2020 and the estimated seroprevalence. We assessed the clustering of seropositive children within classes, school levels, and schools by studying the distribution of classes with zero, one, or more seropositive children. As the probability of detecting a seropositive child increases with more children tested, we separately assessed the proportion of classes with at least one seropositive child among all class and among classes with ≥5 participating children and ≥50% of children participating from the class. Patient and public involvement Several school principals were consulted during the development of the protocol to ensure feasibility of the planned study procedures. Early feedback was collected from invited children and parents, in order to adapt the communication strategies and channels.

- Numerous online informational sessions, encouraging open exchange and feedback, were organized for invited and enrolled school principals, personnel and parents of the children.
 - For peer review only http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
```
Page 11 of 30
```

. uge		
1	236	Results of individual tests were communicated to the participants, and overall study results
2	237	disseminated to participating schools. Findings will be disseminated in lay language in the
4	238	national and local press, to the national and regional educational and public health
5 6	239	departments and on the website of the study (www.ciao-corona.ch).
7 8	240	
9 10		
11 12		
13 14		
15 16		
17		
10 19		
20 21		
22 23		
24 25		
26 27		
28 29		
30 31		
32 33		
34 35		
36 37		
38 39		
40 41		
42 43		
44 45		
46		
48		
51 52		
53 54		
55 56		
57 58		
59 60		

1	241	RESULTS
2 3	242	In total, 55 schools and 2585 children were recruited (1339 (52%) girls, median age 11, age
4	243	range 6-16 years), 754 (29%) in the lower level, 899 (35%) in the middle, and 932 (36%) in
5 6	244	the upper school level. Mean participation rate was 50% of the invited children within
7 8	245	invited classes (range from 0% to 94% (0 to 21 children), interquartile range 32% to 63%).
9 10	246	Venous blood was collected and analyzed for 2484 children (1278 (51%) girls, median age
11 12	247	11, age range 6 to 16 years).
13	248	74 children had SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, resulting in overall weighted seroprevalence
14 15	249	of 2.8 % (95% credible interval (CrI) 1.5 to 4.1%), ranging from 1.0% to 4.5% in districts, as
16 17	250	measured with ABCORA test (Figure 1). Seroprevalence was 3.8% (95% Crl 2.0 to 6.1%) in
18 19	251	grades one to two, 2.4% (95% Crl 1.1 to 4.2%) in grades four to five, and 1.5% (95% Crl 0.5 to
20 21	252	3.0%) in grades seven to eight (Figure 1).
22	253	Seroprevalence of children, as measured with the SenASTrIS test of IgG and IgA
23 24 25	254	combined, was very similar to the seroprevalence of randomly selected adults in the same
25 26	255	region in June-July 2020 (children 3.2%, 95% Crl 1.7 to 5.0%, versus adults 3.6%, 95% Crl 1.7
27 28	256	to 5.4%). The estimates of seroprevalence in different school levels and districts were
29 30	257	somewhat different from those estimated with the primary ABCORA 2.0 test (Figure 1);
31 32	258	however, the credible intervals of the estimates overlapped. Seroprevalence measured with
33	259	SenASTriS test was 2.0% (95% CrI 0.6 to 4.3%) in grades one to two, 4.2% (95% CrI 2.1 to
35 35	260	6.8%) in grades four to five, and 3.3% (95% CrI 1.4 to 5.6%) in grades seven to eight.
36 37	261	Based on the cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-confirmed cases by the
38 39	262	end of June (0.03% for children and 0.24% for adult populations), the ratio of confirmed
40 41	263	infections to seropositive cases in children was one to 89, compared to a ratio of one to 12
42 43	264	in the adult population.
44	265	
46	266	Figure 1 Overall, school level and district estimates of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in
47 48	267	children
49 50	268	Weighted point estimates and 95% credible intervals are shown. Districts are ordered by population size.
51 52	269 270	ABCORA 2.0 – Primary estimate based on the ABCORA 2.0 of the Institute of Medical Virology, University of Zurich test.
53 54	271	SenASTrIS – Estimate based on the SenASTrIS test.
55 56	272	
57	273	At least one seropositive child was present in 36/55 (65%) of tested schools. Within the
58 59	274	levels of the schools, at least one seropositive child was present in the lower level of 17/29
60	275	(59%) schools, in the middle level of 14/28 (50%) schools, and in the upper level of 16/25
	276	(64%) schools (Figure 2).

Page 13 of 30

1	277	Figure 2 Seropositive children in tested schools and school levels
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	278 279 280 281 282 283	Each square illustrates an invited child. Each block of squares illustrates a school level in a school. Lower and middle levels are both taught in the primary schools; however, lower and middle levels of the same school are not matched in this graph due to protection of participant privacy. The distribution of the invited, tested and seropositive children is depicted only on the school level in the figures of this manuscript to preserve deidentification and privacy of the participants.
10 11	284	No sex differences in seroprevalence were noted (2.8% (95% Crl 1.6 to 4.1%) in girls
12	285	and 2.7% (95% CrI 1.5 to 4.0%) in boys). 73% of children reported any SARS-CoV-2
13 14	286	compatible symptoms, such as cough, fever, fatigue or diarrhea (see Figure 3 for the full
15 16	287	list), between January and June 2020. None of the symptoms was more frequent in
17 18	288	seropositive than in seronegative children (Figure 3).
19 20	289	
21 22 23	290 291	Figure 3 Self-reported symptoms in seropositive and seronegative children in January-June 2020
24 25 26	292 293	Point estimates and 95% confidence intervals are snown.
20	294	At least one seropositive child was present in 34% (44/131) of classes where \geq 5
28 29	295	children and ≥50% of children within the class were tested (Figure 4). Among the classes
30 31	296	with at least one seropositive child, 38 (86%) had only one, 4 (9%) had two and 2 (5%) had
32 33	297	three seropositive children. When considering all classes regardless of participation rate,
34 35	298	24% (65/273) of classes had at least one seropositive child.
36 27	299	
38	300	Figure 4 Clustering of seropositive children in classes: number and proportion of
39 40	301	seropositive children in the tested classes
39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60	302 303 304 305 306 307	Each dot represents a class. Diagonal lines partition the figure into classes with 0-5% of tested seropositive children (below 5% line), 5-10% of tested seropositive children (between 5% and 10% lines), etc. Only classes where at least 5 children and at least 50% of the class were tested are shown. The distribution of seropositive children in the enrolled classes is only presented in an aggregated form rather than clustered within schools to preserve the deidentification and privacy of the participants.

DISCUSSION

In this study of randomly sampled schools and classes, we found variation in seroprevalence in 6 to 16-year-old children across districts, schools and classes by July 2020, but no indication of major transmission and outbreaks within classes and schools. The overall seroprevalence was not different from a randomly selected adult population living in the same region - pointing to striking underdiagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection in children, with only one in 89 cases diagnosed. Contrary to studies of symptomatic infections [17] and some other population-based studies of seroprevalence [16,18], there was a trend of higher seroprevalence in younger children as measured with the main ABCORA test (the trend was not present in seroprevalence estimated based on SenASTriS test). The presence of symptoms was very common (three of four children reported one or several symptoms compatible with a COVID-19 infection) and importantly not specific to the seropositive children. Although no outbreaks were reported in schools at the time of testing in the canton of Zurich (comprising 18% of the Swiss population), seropositive children were detected in more than half of the tested schools and a third of all tested classes. However, the vast majority of classes with seropositive children had only a single seropositive child among the tested children, reflecting low prevalence and no significant clustering within classes after the re-opening of the schools.

By the time of conducting this study, there were few studies focusing on SARS-CoV-2 spread in schools [18-20]. Most of the reported evidence consisted of cases studies of outbreaks in specific schools or reports of contact tracing of index cases in educational settings. Most of the studies reported low secondary attack rates in schools [4,21] but also some conflicting observations of outbreaks [2,22]. Although some studies of seroprevalence had included children [16,23,24], they mostly focused on households and the general population. The management of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in schools was therefore highly debated [25,26]. The present study is unique as one of the first major studies reporting variation in seroprevalence in children from randomly selected schools in a country where the general lock-down on a population level was mild and short (one month), and school closure lasted only for two months.

Although manifest clinical disease of COVID-19 is much less prevalent in children than in adults [17,27,28] and preliminary evidence points to lower susceptibility of children compared to adults [18], our results indicate very similar seroprevalence in adults and children. Similar seroprevalence in adults and school-aged children was found in another region in Switzerland in April [16] and in November 2020 [29]. Intriguingly, we observed a

Page 15 of 30

BMJ Open

not statistically significant trend of younger children having higher seroprevalence than older children, when measured with the comprehensive ABCORA 2.0 test. Infections with circulating human coronaviruses (hCoVs) are common in childhood and antibodies to hCoVs 229E, NL63, OC43 and HKU1A are prevalent in the human population and particularly children [30,31]. Cross-reactivity with hCoVs was thus considered in the development of both serology tests used in this study and both tests detect SARS-CoV-2 with high specificity (99.6% for ABCORA 2.0 and 98.4% for SenASTrIS). Importantly, to adjust for the possibility of a few false-positive results, we employed a Bayesian hierarchical model, which adjusts for the accuracy parameters of the tests to estimate population-level seroprevalence. Higher seroprevalence in younger children could be compatible with less feasible social distancing behavior and possibly more vigorous immune response to the virus in early age. The trend could also reflect a chance finding, as substantial proportion of false positives is expected in the low seroprevalence setting, and it was not observed in the SenASTriS test results. Further testing of the cohort and forthcoming studies will show if this trend is observed in the future.

The frequency of both more specific (e.g., fever, cough) and less specific (rhinorrhea, headache, nausea) symptoms [32] was not different among seropositive and seronegative children. In general, symptoms, particularly rhinorrhea, cough, headache and sore throat, were reported frequently, with three of four children reporting any symptoms within the last 6 months in both groups. Anosmia was not reported by any of the seropositive children. The specificity of COVID-19 compatible symptoms, therefore, seems to be lower in children than in adults. Moreover, the range of symptoms reported in children was shown to be different than in adults [33]. Somewhat unspecific symptoms in children, contrary to more specific symptoms in adults [34], could partly explain the high proportion of seropositive children who were not previously diagnosed with RT-PCR. Furthermore, testing indications by health authorities were cautious both for children and adults during the first half of 2020. Testing was recommended only for children with acute upper respiratory tract infection symptoms or acute anosmia, and not recommended in children with rhinitis only or without symptoms [35].

Particular strengths of the design of this study are school-based random sampling, hierarchical data structure, and large sample size, allowing to identify clusters within district, school, grade and class levels. Testing was done in schools and study information presented in multiple formats, including videos in multiple languages, to minimize selection bias within enrolled children. The participation rate of 50% can be considered rather high

for a study in children involving venous blood sampling, and additional children from the
invited classes will have the opportunity to be enrolled in subsequent testing phases
(October/November 2020, March/April 2021), further increasing participation rate and the
size of the cohort.

The study has a few limitations. First, the retrospective evaluation of symptoms over six months could have been subject to recall bias. Second, the study enrolled only 35% (55/156) of the invited schools. Commonly stated reasons for non-participation on school level were constraints in time and human resources and competing participation in other studies. Participation rate on school level varied significantly depending on the district, and for a few districts, a maximum of three invitation rounds was needed to recruit a regionally representative sample. Third, although the schools were open for one to two months directly before the study, they were closed for the two months of the highest community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the canton of Zurich [15]. Therefore, the measured seroprevalence in children might be dominated by infections in households rather than school. The follow up of this study will shed more light on transmission in schools. Finally, we do not have information on how many eligible children did not attend the testing due to acute infection with SARS-CoV-2. We did not provide testing for such children at home or an alternative date due to limited resources. However, reported total weekly incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections in the canton of Zurich ranged from 42 to 185 cases (among 1.5 million residents), and 7 to 15 cases among people under 20 years old during the testing period. Considering that, in comparison, over 700 total weekly cases were reported in March-April 2020, we believe that excluding acutely infected children during the testing period could not lead to substantial underestimation of the seroprevalence.

In conclusion, clustering of SARS-CoV-2 seropositive children within classes and schools was not prominent shortly after reopening of schools in this large population-based study. Seroprevalence was similar to adults, resulting in strikingly fewer diagnosed infections in comparison to the seropositive cases in children than in adults. Considering the time window required for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies to form, this study reflects infection of SARS-CoV-2 until approximately end of May 2020, covering four months of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the community, with two months of school closure and mild lock-down policy. The subsequent testing of parents and school personnel and the follow-up of the children cohort in fall 2020 will yield further evidence on the observed trends and of the spread of SARS-CoV-2 within and outside schools.

1	411	Author Contributions
2	412	SK and MAP initiated the project and preliminary design, with support of JF. SK, MAP, CB,
4	413	TR, RJ, JB, AF and AU developed the design and methodology. SK, RJ, AU, TR, JB, AF and CC
5 6	414	recruited study participants, collected and managed the data. SRH performed statistical
7 8	415	analysis. AT, MH, MaSch, MeSch and IA developed the serology analysis plan, supervised,
9 10	416	conducted and evaluated the serology tests. AU wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All
11 12	417	authors contributed to the design of the study and interpretation of its results, and revised
13 14	418	and approved the manuscript for intellectual content. SK is the guarantor and accepts full
15	419	responsibility for the work and the conduct of the study, had access to the data, and
16 17	420	controlled the decision to publish. The corresponding author SK attests that all listed
18 19	421	authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.
20 21	422	
22 23	423	Competing interests
24 25	424	The authors declare no competing interests to disclose.
26	425	
27 28	426	Funding
29 30	427	This study is part of Corona Immunitas research network, coordinated by the Swiss School of
31 32	428	Public Health (SSPH+), and funded by fundraising of SSPH+ that includes funds of the Swiss
33 34	429	Federal Office of Public Health and private funders (ethical guidelines for funding stated by
35 36	430	SSPH+ will be respected), by funds of the Cantons of Switzerland (Vaud, Zurich and Basel)
37	431	and by institutional funds of the Universities. Additional funding, specific to this study is
38 39	432	available from the University of Zurich Foundation. The funder/sponsor did not have any
40 41	433	role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and
42 43	434	interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision
44 45	435	to submit the manuscript for publication. All authors had full access to all data analysis
46 47	436	outputs (reports and tables) and take responsibility for their integrity and accuracy
48	437	
49 50	438	Data sharing statement
51 52	439	Data is still being collected for the cohort study Ciao Corona. Deidentified participant data
53 54	440	might be available on reasonable request by email to the corresponding author at later
55 56	441	stages of the study.
57 58	442	
59 60	443	Ethics approval

1	444	The st	tudy was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Canton of Zurich, Switzerland
2	445	(2020	-01336). All participants provided written informed consent before being enrolled in
3 4	446	the st	udy.
5 6	447		
7 8	448	Trans	parency declaration
9 10	449	The le	ead authors affirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account
11 12	450	of the	e study being reported, no important aspects of the study have been omitted, and any
13	451	discre	epancies from the study as originally planned and registered have been explained.
14	452		
16 17	453	Refer	ences
18 19	454	1	Viner RM, Russell SJ, Croker H, et al. School closure and management practices during
20	455		coronavirus outbreaks including COVID-19: a rapid systematic review. Lancet Child
21 22	456		Adolesc. Heal. 2020; 4 :397–404. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30095-X
23 24	457	2	Stein-Zamir C, Abramson N, Shoob H, et al. A large COVID-19 outbreak in a high
25 26	458		school 10 days after schools' reopening, Israel, May 2020. Eurosurveillance
27 28	459		2020; 25 :2001352. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.29.2001352
20 29	460	3	Lopez AS, Hill M, Antezano J, et al. Transmission Dynamics of COVID-19 Outbreaks
30 31	461		Associated with Child Care Facilities — Salt Lake City, Utah, April–July 2020. MMWR
32 33	462		Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2020; 69 :1319–23. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6937e3
34 35	463	4	Macartney K, Quinn HE, Pillsbury AJ, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australian
36 37	464		educational settings: a prospective cohort study. Lancet Child Adolesc Heal 2020;0.
38	465		doi:10.1016/s2352-4642(20)30251-0
39 40	466	5	Walsh S, Chowdhury A, Russell S, et al. Do school closures reduce community
41 42	467		transmission of COVID-19? A systematic review of observational studies. medRxiv
43 44	468		2021;:2021.01.02.21249146. doi:10.1101/2021.01.02.21249146
45 46	469	6	Rice K, Wynne B, Martin V, et al. Effect of school closures on mortality from
47 48	470		coronavirus disease 2019: old and new predictions. BMJ 2020;371:m3588.
40 49	471		doi:10.1136/bmj.m3588
50 51	472	7	Ladhani S, Ramsay M, Amirthalingam G, et al. COVID-19 Surveillance in Children
52 53	473		attending preschool, primary and secondary schools. 2020.
54 55	474		https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attach
56 57	475		ment_data/file/891762/sKID_protocol_v1.3.pdf
58 50	476	8	Armann JP, Unrath M, Kirsten C, et al. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in adolescent
60	477		students and their teachers in Saxony, Germany (SchoolCoviDD19): very low
	478		seropraevalence and transmission rates. medRxiv 2020;:2020.07.16.20155143.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 19 of 30

1	479		doi:10.1101/2020.07.16.20155143
2	480	9	Ulyte A, Radtke T, Abela IA, et al. Seroprevalence and immunity of SARS-CoV-2
5 4	481		infection in children and adolescents in schools in Switzerland: design for a
5 6	482		longitudinal, school-based prospective cohort study. Int J Public Health Published
7 8	483		Online First: 15 October 2020. doi:10.1007/s00038-020-01495-z
9 10	484	10	Corona Immunitas: a nationwide program of antibody studies of SARS-CoV-2 in the
11 12	485		Swiss population (ISRCTN18181860). http://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN18181860
13	486		(accessed 28 Aug 2020).
14	487	11	West EA, Anker D, Amati R, et al. Corona Immunitas: study protocol of a nationwide
16 17	488		program of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and seroepidemiologic studies in Switzerland.
18 19	489		Int J Public Health 2020;:1–20. doi:10.1007/s00038-020-01494-0
20 21	490	12	Information for public schools. Preventive regulations Canton of Zurich.
22 23	491		https://www.zh.ch/de/gesundheit/coronavirus/informationen-rund-um-schulen-
24 25	492		kitas-heime/coronavirus-volksschule.html#-1212670983 (accessed 13 Nov 2020).
25 26	493	13	Institute of Medical Virology IMV SARS-CoV-2 Antikörper Differenzierung (ABCORA).
27 28	494		https://www.virology.uzh.ch/dam/jcr:0f9bbdba-e215-4e42-a877-131a04a2e175/IMV
29 30	495		ABCORA Serologie.pdf (accessed 16 Dec 2020).
31 32	496	14	Fenwick C, Croxatto A, Coste AT, et al. Changes in SARS-CoV-2 Spike versus
33 34	497		Nucleoprotein Antibody Responses Impact the Estimates of Infections in Population-
35	498		Based Seroprevalence Studies. J Virol Published Online First: 2020.
37	499		doi:10.1128/JVI.01828-20
38 39	500	15	Canton of Zurich. Numbers and Facts on COVID-19 [Kanton Zürich. Zahlen & Fakten zu
40 41	501		COVID-19]. https://www.zh.ch/de/gesundheit/coronavirus/zahlen-fakten-covid-
42 43	502		19.html?keyword=covid19#/home (accessed 13 Nov 2020).
44 45	503	16	Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG
46 47	504		antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. Lancet
48	505		2020; 0 . doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31304-0
49 50	506	17	de Lusignan S, Dorward J, Correa A, et al. Risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 among patients
51 52	507		in the Oxford Royal College of General Practitioners Research and Surveillance Centre
53 54	508		primary care network: a cross-sectional study. Lancet Infect Dis 2020;20:1034–42.
55 56	509		doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30371-6
57 58	510	18	Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonell C, et al. Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among
59	511		Children and Adolescents Compared With Adults. JAMA Pediatr Published Online
00	512		First: 25 September 2020. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.4573

1	513	19	Xu W, Li X, Dozier M, et al. What is the evidence for transmission of COVID-19 by
2	514		children in schools? A living systematic review. <i>medRxiv</i> Published Online First: 2020.
3 4	515		doi:10.1101/2020.10.11.20210658
5 6 7 8	516	20	Munro APS, Faust SN. COVID-19 in children. Curr Opin Infect Dis Published Online
	517		First: 6 October 2020. doi:10.1097/QCO.000000000000690
9 10	518	21	Heavey L, Casey G, Kelly C, et al. No evidence of secondary transmission of COVID-19
11 12	519		from children attending school in Ireland, 2020. <i>Eurosurveillance</i> 2020; 25 :2000903.
13 14	520		doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.21.2000903
15	521	22	Szablewski CM, Chang KT, Brown MM, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission and Infection
16 17	522		Among Attendees of an Overnight Camp — Georgia, June 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal
18 19	523		Wkly Rep 2020; 69 :1023–5. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6931e1
20 21	524	23	Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain
22 23	525		(ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological study. Lancet
24 25	526		(London, England) 2020; 0 . doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31483-5
25 26	527	24	Waterfield T, Watson C, Moore R, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in
27 28	528		children - A prospective multicentre cohort study. medRxiv
29 30	529		2020;:2020.08.31.20183095. doi:10.1101/2020.08.31.20183095
31 32	530	25	Esposito S, Principi N. School Closure during the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)
33 34	531		Pandemic: An Effective Intervention at the Global Level? JAMA Pediatr. 2020.
35 36	532		doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.1892
37	533	26	Christakis DA. School Reopening-The Pandemic Issue That Is Not Getting Its Due.
38 39	534		JAMA Pediatr. 2020. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.2068
40 41	535	27	Götzinger F, Santiago-García B, Noguera-Julián A, et al. COVID-19 in children and
42 43	536		adolescents in Europe: a multinational, multicentre cohort study. Lancet Child Adolesc
44 45	537		<i>Heal</i> 2020; 4 :653–61. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30177-2
46	538	28	Posfay-Barbe KM, Wagner N, Gauthey M, et al. COVID-19 in children and the
47	539		dynamics of infection in families. <i>Pediatrics</i> 2020; 146 . doi:10.1542/peds.2020-1576
49 50	540	29	Stringhini S, Zaballa M-E, Perez-Saez J, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2
51 52	541		antibodies after the second pandemic peak. Lancet Infect Dis 2021; 0.
53 54	542		doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00054-2
55 56	543	30	Zhou W, Wang W, Wang H, et al. First infection by all four non-severe acute
57 58	544		respiratory syndrome human coronaviruses takes place during childhood. BMC Infect
59	545		<i>Dis</i> 2013; 13 :433. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-13-433
60	546	31	Ng KW, Faulkner N, Cornish GH, et al. Preexisting and de novo humoral immunity to

1	547		SARS-CoV-2 in humans. Science (80-) 2020;:eabe1107. doi:10.1126/science.abe1107
2	548	32	Viner R, Ward J, Hudson L, et al. Systematic review of reviews of symptoms and signs
3 4	549		of COVID-19 in children and adolescents. <i>medRxiv</i> 2020;:2020.10.16.20213298.
5 6	550		doi:10.1101/2020.10.16.20213298
7 8	551	33	Mayor S. Covid-19: UK studies find gastrointestinal symptoms are common in
9 10	552		children. doi:10.1101/2020.08.31.20183095v1
11 12	553	34	Struyf T, Deeks JJ, Dinnes J, et al. Signs and symptoms to determine if a patient
13	554		presenting in primary care or hospital outpatient settings has COVID-19 disease.
14	555		Cochrane Database Syst. Rev. 2020; 2020 . doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013665
16 17	556	35	COVID-19 Fragen und Antworten Teil 8 - pädiatrie schweiz.
18 19	557		https://www.paediatrieschweiz.ch/news/covid-19-fragen-und-antworten-teil-8/
20 21	558		(accessed 23 Feb 2021).
22 23	559		
24 25	560		
26 27			
28 29			
30 31			
32 33			
34 35			
36 37			
38			
40			
41 42			
43 44			
45 46			
47			
48 49			
50 51			
52			
53 54			
55 56			
50 57			
58 59			
60			

1	561	Figure legends
23	562	
4	563	Figure 1 Overall, school level and district estimates of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in
5 6	564	children
7	565	Weighted point estimates and 95% credible intervals are shown. Districts are ordered by
8 9	566	population size.
10	567	ABCORA 2.0 – Primary estimate based on the ABCORA 2.0 of the Institute of Medical
11 12	568	Virology, University of Zurich test. SenASTrIS – Estimate based on the SenASTrIS test.
12 13	569	
14 15	570	Figure 2 Seropositive children in tested schools and school levels
16	571	Each square illustrates an invited child. Each block of squares illustrates a school level in a
17	572	school. Lower and middle levels are both taught in the primary schools; however, lower and
19	573	middle levels of the same school are not matched in this graph due to protection of
20 21	574	participant privacy. The distribution of the invited, tested and seropositive children is
22	575	depicted only on the school level in the figures of this manuscript to preserve
23	576	deidentification and privacy of the participants.
24 25	577	
26	578	Figure 3 Self-reported symptoms in seropositive and seronegative children in January-June
27 28	579	2020
29	580	Point estimates and 95% confidence intervals are shown.
30 31	581	
32	582	Figure 4 Clustering of seropositive children in classes: number and proportion of
33 34	583	seropositive children in the tested classes
35 36	584	Each dot represents a class. Diagonal lines partition the figure into classes with 0-5% of
37 38	585	tested seropositive children (below 5% line), 5-10% of tested seropositive children (between
39 40	586	5% and 10% lines), etc. Only classes where at least 5 children and at least 50% of the class
40	587	were tested are shown. The distribution of seropositive children in the enrolled classes is
42 43	588	only presented in an aggregated form rather than clustered within schools to preserve the
44 45	589	deidentification and privacy of the participants.
46 47	590	
48	591	Supplemental material
50	592	
51 52	593	Appendix 1 Description of Bayesian model
53 54	594	
55 56 57 58 59 60		









Variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence across districts, schools and classes: baseline measurements from a cohort of primary and secondary school children in Switzerland

Appendix 1: Description of Bayesian model

A Ulyte, T Radtke, IA Abela, SR Haile, J Blankenberger, R Jung, C Capelli, C Berger, A Frei, M Huber, M Schanz, M Schwarzmueller, A Trkola, J Fehr, MA Puhan and S Kriemler

Methods

The model formulation is essentially that proposed by "Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study" Stringhini *et al* 2020 (see also the appendix to that paper), with full description and example code in their github repository HopkinsIDD/serocovpop. Both *Ciao Corona* and *SEROCoV-POP* are part of the Corona Immunitas program of studies in Switzerland.

Statistical model

In this paper, our goal is to estimate the true underlying seroprevalence of the population of schoolchildren (in grades 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, or 8) as measured in the of the Canton of Zurich, denoted p^*).

We start by estimating the probability that each person in the survey is seropositive using a Bayesian logistic regression model that accounts for school-level clustering, the sensitivity and specificity of the antibody test, each individual's grade level and sex:

$$x_{i} \sim Bernoulli(p_{i}\theta^{+} + (1 - p_{i}) * (1 - \theta^{-}))$$

$$logit(p_{i}) = \alpha_{h} + \mathbf{X}_{i}\beta$$

$$\alpha_{h} \sim Normal(0, \sigma^{2})$$

$$x^{+} \sim Binomial(n^{+}, \theta^{+})$$

$$x^{-} \sim Binomial(n^{-}, 1 - \theta^{-})$$

where x_i is the result of the antibody test (in primary analyses) for the *i*th person (i = 1, ..., N) in the serosurvey. The sensitivity, θ^+ , is determined using n^+ RT-PCR positive controls from the lab validation study, of which x^+ tested positive. The specificity, θ^- , is determined using n^- pre-pandemic negative controls, of which x^- tested positive. The model estimates of the sensitivity and specificity are shown below.

ABCORA 2.0	Cohort	N tested	N positive	N negative
SARS-CoV-2 PCT Positive pre-pandemic healthy	$\begin{array}{c} 104 \\ 251 \end{array}$	97 1	$7 \\ 250$	93.27% sensitivity 99.6% specificity

The probability of observing a diagnostic positive is a function of the true positive rate and the false negative rate with regards to the true underlying probability of seropositivity p_i for that person. This probability itself is a function of covariates **X**, which consists of sex, grade level, and timepoint of testing, and their coefficients β , and a random effect for school, α_h $(h = 1, \ldots, H)$, with variance σ^2 . We used naive priors on all parameters to allow for an exploration of the parameter space. The priors on the sensitivity and specificity were flat from 0 to 1, equivalent to Uniform(0, 1) or Beta(1, 1). We used weak Normal(0, 1) priors for the logistic regression coefficients β . The prior on the standard deviation of the school effect, σ , was flat from 0 to infinity.

We implemented this model in the Stan probabilistic programming language and used the RStan package in R to run the model and analyse outputs. We ran 5,000 iterations (4 chains with 1,500 iterations each with 250 for warm-up) and assessed convergence visually.

Seroprevalence estimate

We estimated the seroprevalence p^* by post-stratifying the posterior samples of our parameter estimates to match the demographics of all schoolchildren in grades 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, or 8 in the Canton of Zurich. For every combination of grade level and sex, as well as timepoint of testing, we estimated the probability of seropositivity for each posterior draw of β and σ . We can find estimate the weekly seroprevalence by taking a weighted average of the p, where weights are determined by the demographic distribution of the Canton of Zurich:

$$p = \int_0^1 logit^{-1} (\mathbf{X}\beta + \sigma \Phi^{-1}(t)) dt$$
$$p^* = \sum_{sex} \sum_{grade} \frac{pop_{sex,grade} * p_{sex,grade}}{pop}$$

where $\Phi^{-1}(t)$ is the quantile function of a standard normal distribution, $pop_{sex,grade}$ is the population of each demographic "cell" and *pop* is the school age population of the Canton of Zurich. We estimate the average probability of seropositivity for the population in each demographic cell by integrating across all values of a logit-normal distribution with the standard deviation defined by the school random effect σ .

	Item No.	Recommendation		Page No.	Relevant text from manuscript
Title and abstract	1	(<i>a</i>) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	5		first cross-sectional analysis of a large cohort of children from randomly selected schools and classes
		(<i>b</i>) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3		
Introduction					
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5		
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	3, 5		To determine the variation in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in school children across districts, schools, grades, and classes, and the relationship of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence with self- reported symptoms.
Methods					
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6-8		
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6		
Participants	6	 (a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i>—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i>—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants (b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and 	6		
		unexposed			

		<i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per		
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers.	7-8	
		Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable		
Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment	7-8	
measurement		(measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group		
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7	
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6	protocol.

Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7-8
Statistical	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7-8
methods		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	NA
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	NA
		(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	7-8
		Case-control study-If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	
		Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling	
		strategy	
		(<u>e</u>) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
Results		6	
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined	6
		for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	6
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on	6, 9
		exposures and potential confounders	
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	6-7
		(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	
Outcome data	15*	<u>Cohort study</u> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	
		Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision	9
		(eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were	
		included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time	NA
		period	

Discussion Key results Limitations Interpretation Generalisability	18 19 20	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	11 12-13 13
Key results Limitations Interpretation Generalisability	18 19 20	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence.	11 12-13 13
Limitations Interpretation Generalisability Other information	19 20	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence.	12-13
Interpretation Generalisability	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of	13
Generalisability	C 1	analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	
Other information	41	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	13
Other millior mation	n		
Funding 2	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	14
ote: An Explanation necklist is best used tp://www.annals.o	on ar d in o rg/, a	d Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published e conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedic and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at ww	examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE cine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at w.strobe-statement.org.