Evidence-based, cost-effective interventions to suppress the COVID-19 pandemic: a rapid systematic review

Carl-Etienne Juneau, PhD,[1] Tomas Pueyo, M.Sc, Matt Bell, BS, Genevieve Gee, Louise Potvin, PhD.[1]

1. École de santé publique, Université de Montréal, C.P. 6128, succursale Centre-ville, Montréal (Québec) H3C 3J7 (514) 343-6170

Correspondence to: carl-etienne.juneau@umontreal.ca

ABSTRACT

Background: Countries vary in their response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Some emphasise social distancing, while others focus on other interventions. Evidence on the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of these interventions is urgently needed to guide public health policy and avoid unnecessary damage to the economy and other harms. We aimed to provide a comprehensive summary of the evidence on epidemic control, with a focus on cost-effectiveness.

Methods: MEDLINE (1946 to March week 3, 2020) and Embase (1974 to March 27, 2020) were searched using a range of terms related to epidemic control. Reviews, randomized trials, observational studies, and modelling studies were included. Articles reporting on the effectiveness or cost-effectiveness of at least one intervention were included and grouped into higher-quality (randomized trials) and lower-quality evidence (other study designs).

Findings: We found 1,653 papers; 34 were included. Higher-quality evidence was only available to support the effectiveness of hand washing and face masks. Modelling studies suggested that these measures are highly cost-effective. For other interventions, only evidence from observational and modelling studies was available. A cautious interpretation of this body of lower-quality evidence suggests that: (1) the most cost-effective interventions are swift contact tracing and case isolation, surveillance networks, protective equipment for healthcare workers, and early vaccination (when available); (2) home quarantines and stockpiling antivirals are less cost-

effective; (3) social distancing measures like workplace and school closures are effective but costly, making them the least cost-effective options; (4) combinations are more cost-effective than single interventions; (5) interventions are more cost-effective when adopted early and for severe viruses like SARS-CoV-2. For H1N1 influenza, contact tracing was estimated to be 4,363 times more cost-effective than school closures ($2,260 vs. $9,860,000 per death prevented).

Conclusions: A cautious interpretation of this body of evidence suggests that for COVID-19: (1) social distancing is effective but costly, especially when adopted late and (2) adopting as early as possible a combination of interventions that includes hand washing, face masks, swift contact tracing and case isolation, and protective equipment for healthcare workers is likely to be the most cost-effective strategy.

Funding: LP holds the Canada Research Chair in Community Approaches and Health Inequalities (CRC 950-232541). This funding source had no role in the design, conduct, or reporting of the study.

KEYWORDS

Non-pharmaceutical interventions, epidemic interventions, outbreak control, pandemic control, cost-effectiveness, COVID-19.

INTRODUCTION

On March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) characterized COVID-19 as a pandemic. Since then, the virus has infected exponentially more men and women worldwide. As of April 19, the WHO reports 2,241,359 confirmed cases and 152,551 deaths (WHO, 2020). This is more than double the deaths reported on April 6 (WHO, 2020b), indicating that the burden of COVID-19 is currently doubling approximately every 13 days. Countries have implemented a range of responses, and many are imposing nationwide school closures. These currently affect over 1.5 billion (almost 90%) of the world's students (WHO, 2020b). But closing school is costly—$10 to $47 billion for 4 weeks in the US alone (Lempel et al. 2009)—and could lead to a greater number of deaths than they prevent by creating unintended downstream effects, such as child-care obligations and losses in health-care workforce capacity (Bayham and Fenichel, 2020). Other countries have focused on other interventions, such as contact tracing and case isolation. These have been estimated to be 4,363 times more cost-effective than school closures for H1N1 influenza ($2,260 vs. $9,860,000 per death prevented) (Madhav et al. 2017). As states in the US and around the world are faced with the challenge of balancing public health interventions with economic (and other) considerations, evidence on the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of these interventions is urgently needed to guide policy and avoid unnecessary harm. In this rapid systematic review, we aimed to provide a comprehensive summary of the evidence on epidemic control and to identify cost-effective interventions in the context of COVID-19.

METHODS

We performed preliminary searches to locate review articles, devise our search strategy, and identify potential shortcomings in the literature. A systematic review analyzed 7 studies, included only randomized trials, and concluded that the evidence was lacking for most non-pharmaceutical interventions (Smith et al. 2015). While we do not dispute this conclusion when looking only at randomized trials, we would argue that as urgent decisions of unknown cost-effectiveness are made in reaction to the COVID-19 pandemic, some evidence, even of lower quality, is better than no evidence at all. Therefore, we included a broad range of study designs in this review to provide a comprehensive summary of the peer-reviewed evidence. Reviews (all types), randomized trials,

observational studies, and modelling studies were included. Articles reporting on the effectiveness or cost-effectiveness of at least one intervention were included. Articles in English, French, Spanish, and Portuguese were included. Studies of sexually transmitted infections (e.g. syphilis) and mosquito-borne diseases (e.g. dengue) were not included. Abstracts, case reports, and conferences proceedings were also excluded. MEDLINE (1946 to April week 2, 2020) and Embase (1974 to April 17, 2020) were then searched using the terms "non-pharmaceutical interventions", "outbreak control", "outbreak interventions", "epidemic control", "epidemic interventions", "pandemic control", and "pandemic interventions" (last search: April 19, 2020). Screening of titles, abstracts, and full texts was carried out by a single investigator. Reference lists and PubMed related articles of included studies were reviewed for additional studies. For this rapid systematic review, we followed PRISMA guidelines (Moher et al. 2009), but we limited quality assessment to grouping studies into two categories: higher quality (randomized trials) and lower quality (other study designs).

RESULTS

Result of the search

A total of 2,742 papers were found in MEDLINE and Embase. Removing duplicates left 1,653. We retained 622 based on title, 132 based on abstract, and 15 based on full text. We found 19 additional studies via reference lists and PubMed related articles searches. Therefore, a total of 34 studies were included (eFigure in the Supplement). Randomized trial evidence was only available for the effectiveness of hand washing and face masks (Jefferson et al. 2011; Smith et al. 2015; MacIntyre et al. 2015; Saunders-Hastings et al. 2017). For other interventions, only lower-quality evidence was available (observational and modelling studies).

Cost-effectiveness of interventions

Pasquini-Descomps et al. (2017) conducted a systematic review of the cost-effectiveness of interventions in H1N1 influenza. They found 18 studies covering 12 interventions: disease surveillance networks (very cost-effective), contact tracing and case isolation (very cost-effective), face masks (very cost-effective), preventive measures in hospitals (cost-effective), antiviral

treatment (cost-effective), antiviral prophylaxis (cost-effective), low efficiency vaccination (cost-effective if timed before cases peak), high efficiency vaccination (cost-effective if timed before cases peak), stockpiling antiviral medicine (cost-effective for high-income countries), quarantining confirmed cases at home (cost-effective for viruses with a case fatality rate of 1%, not cost-effective for viruses with a case fatality rate of 0.25%), self-isolation at home (cost-effective with a case fatality rate of 1%, not cost-effective with a case fatality rate of 0.25%), and school closure (not cost-effective). For H1N1 influenza, contact tracing was estimated to be 4,363 times more cost-effective than school closures ($2,260 vs. $9,860,000 per death prevented) (Madhav et al. 2017). Indeed, Lempel et al. (2009) estimated that closing all schools in the US for 4 weeks would cost $10 to $47 billion (0.1–0.3% of GDP). Other systematic reviews found that school closures did not contribute to the control of the 2003 SARS epidemic in China, Hong Kong, and Singapore and would prevent only 2-4% of COVID-19 deaths (Viner et al. 2020); reduced the peak of epidemics by 29.65% on average and were more effective when timed early (Bin Nafisah et al. 2018); would be most effective if they caused large reductions in contact, if transmissibility was low (e.g. a basic reproduction number <2), and if attack rates were higher in children than in adults (Jackson et al. 2014); and appeared to be moderately effective in reducing the transmission of influenza and in delaying the peak of an epidemic, but were associated with very high costs (Rashid et al. 2015). Differences in publication date, virus transmissibility, and study selection may explain the discrepancies among these reviews.

Contact tracing and case isolation was one of the most cost-effective interventions, based on H1N1 data from Hubei, China (Wang et al. 2012). Pasquini-Descomps et al. (2017) computed that it cost less than $1,000 per disability-adjusted life year. In a simulation study, Hellewell et al. (2020) found that in most scenarios, highly effective contact tracing and case isolation would be enough to control a new outbreak of COVID-19 within 3 months. Timing was important: with five initial cases, there was a greater than 50% chance of achieving control, even at modest contact-tracing levels. However, at 40 initial cases, control was much less likely. Similarly, any delay from symptom onset to isolation decreased the probability of control, highlighting the need for swift action. In another modelling study, Chen et al. (2018) compared the effects of four interventions on the total attack rate and duration of a school influenza outbreak in Changsha, China. Case isolation was the most effective single intervention, and the addition of antiviral therapeutics,

antiviral prophylaxis, vaccination prior to the outbreak, and school closure decreased the attack rate only slightly, and shortened outbreak duration by only 9 days.

Saunders-Hastings et al. (2017) carried out a systematic review and meta-analysis of personal protective measures to reduce pandemic influenza transmission. They did not find any study evaluating respiratory etiquette (e.g. covering the mouth during coughing). Meta-analyses suggested that regular hand hygiene provided a significant protective effect (OR = 0.62; 95% CI 0.52–0.73). Face masks had a non-significant protective effect (OR = 0.53; 95% CI 0.16–1.71) which became significant (OR = 0.41; 95% CI 0.18–0.92) when randomized control trials and cohort studies were pooled with case–control studies (this also decreased heterogeneity). In an earlier systematic review, Jefferson et al. (2011) also found a protective effect of masks. Overall, they were the best performing intervention across populations, settings, and threats. Similarly, in a narrative review, MacIntyre et al. (2015) drew on evidence from randomized community trials to conclude that face masks do provide protection against infection in various community settings, subject to compliance and early use. Differences in publication date, search strategy, and study selection criteria may explain the discrepancies among these reviews. Tracht et al. (2012) estimated savings of $573 billion if 50% of the US population used masks in an unmitigated H1N1 epidemic. For hand washing, Townsend et al. (2017) estimated that a national behaviour change program in India would net $5.6 billion (3.4-8.6), a 92-fold return on investment. A similar program in China would net $2.64 billion (2.08-5.57), a 35-fold return on investment.

Preventive measures in hospitals include use of personal protective equipment for healthcare workers in direct contact with suspected patients. Dan et al. (2009) estimated that this measure was cost-effective for H1N1 ($23,600 per death prevented). However, adopting a wider set of measures (full personal protective equipment, restricting visitors, and cancelling elective procedures) was much less cost-effective ($2,500,000 per death prevented). Similarly, Lee et al. (2011) found that increasing hand hygiene, use of protective apparel, and disinfection are the most cost-saving interventions to control a hospital outbreak of norovirus.

Suphanchaimat et al. (2020) found that influenza vaccination for prisoners in Thailand was cost-effective. The incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of vaccination (compared with routine outbreak

control) was $1283 to $1990 per disability-adjusted life year. Prosser et al. (2011) also found that H1N1 vaccination in the US was cost-effective under many assumptions if initiated prior to the outbreak. Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios ranged from $8,000 to $52,000 per quality-adjusted life year for persons aged 6 months to 64 years without high-risk conditions. The authors noted that all doses (two for some children, one for adults) should be delivered before the peak of a hypothetical influenza season. Otherwise, vaccination may not be cost-effective. Khazeni et al. (2009) also found that earlier vaccination is more cost-saving. If vaccine supplies are limited, Lee et al. (2010) found that priority should be given to at-risk individuals, and to children within high-risk groups.

In another systematic review of economic evaluations, Pérez Velasco et al. (2012) examined 44 studies and found that combinations of pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical interventions were more cost-effective than vaccines and/or antivirals alone. Reducing non-essential contacts, using pharmaceutical prophylaxis, and closing schools was the most cost-effective combination for all countries. However, quarantine for household contacts was not cost-effective, even in low- and middle-income countries. A modelling study by Day et al. (2006) suggested that quarantine (of all individuals who have had contact with an infected individual) would be beneficial only when case isolation is ineffective, when there is significant asymptomatic transmission, and when the asymptomatic period is neither very long, nor very short.

Perlroth et al. (2010) estimated the health outcomes and costs of combinations of 4 social distancing strategies and 2 antiviral medication strategies. For a virus with a case fatality rate of 1% and a reproduction number of 2.1 or greater, school closure alone was the least cost-effective intervention and cost $32,100 per case averted. Antiviral treatment ($18,200), quarantine of infected individuals ($15,300), and adult and child social distancing ($5,600) had increasing levels of cost-effectiveness. However, combining interventions was more cost-effective, and the most cost-effective combination included adult and child social distancing, school closure, and antiviral treatment and prophylaxis ($2,700 per case). However, the same combination without school closure was more cost-effective for milder viruses (case fatality rate below 1%, reproduction number 1.6 or lower). If antivirals are not available, the combination of adult and child social distancing and school closure was most effective.

Halder et al. (2011) also aimed to determine the most cost-effective interventions for a pandemic similar to H1N1. They found that a combination of interventions was most cost-effective. This combination included treatment and household prophylaxis using antiviral drugs and limited duration school closure. If antiviral drugs are not available, limited duration school closure was significantly more cost-effective compared to continuous school closure. Other social distancing strategies, such as reduced workplace attendance, were found to be costly due to productivity losses. Closing school for 2 to 4 weeks without other interventions did not cost much more than doing nothing but gave a significant 34% to 37% reduction in cases "if optimally timed". The authors examined timing in another study, in which the effectiveness of school closures were analyzed for durations of 2, 4 and 8 weeks (Halder et al. 2010). They found that the most appropriate strategy depended on the virus' severity and transmissibility. For mild viruses, they concluded that individual school closures should begin once daily new cases reach 10 to 50. For highly transmissible epidemics (reproduction number of 2 or above), they concluded that long duration school closure should begin as soon as possible and be combined with other interventions. Indeed, for such viruses, they found that school closure alone would be ineffective (~4% reduction in attack rate) and recommend "additional rigorous social distancing interventions."

Studies on intervention effectiveness without cost-effectiveness analysis

Smith et al. (2015) carried out a systematic review of non-pharmaceutical interventions to reduce the transmission of influenza in adults. Only randomized trials were included and 7 studies met all selection criteria. The authors found that positive significant interventions included professional oral hygiene intervention in the elderly and hand washing, and noted that home quarantine may be useful, but required further assessment.

Jefferson et al. (2011) conducted a Cochrane systematic review of physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. They found that the highest quality randomized cluster trials suggested this could be achieved by hygienic measures such as handwashing, especially around younger children. They recommended that the following effective interventions be implemented, preferably in a combined fashion, to reduce transmission of viral respiratory disease: frequent handwashing with or without adjunct antiseptics; barrier measures

such as gloves, gowns and masks with filtration apparatus; and suspicion diagnosis with isolation of likely cases.

Lee et al. (2009) carried out a systematic review of modelling studies quantifying the effectiveness of strategies for pandemic influenza response. They found that combinations of strategies increased the effectiveness of individual strategies and could reduce their potential negative impact. Combinations delayed spread, reduced overall number of cases, and delayed and reduced peak attack rate more than individual strategies.

Pan et al. (2020) examined associations between public health interventions and the epidemiology of COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. Traffic restrictions, cancellation of social gatherings, and home quarantines were associated with reduced transmission, but were not sufficient to prevent increases in confirmed cases. These were reduced and estimates of the effective reproduction number fell below 1 only when additional interventions were implemented. Those included hospital-based measures (designated hospitals and wards, use of personal protective equipment, increased testing capacity and accelerated reporting, and timely medical treatment) and community-based interventions (quarantine of confirmed and presumptive cases and of close contacts in designated facilities).

Markel et al. (2007) examined nonpharmaceutical interventions in US cities during the 1918-1919 influenza pandemic (isolation or quarantine, school closure, public gathering ban). They found that every city adopted at least one of these interventions, and that 15 cities applied all three. The most common combination (school closure and public gathering bans) was implemented in 34 cities (79%) for a median duration of 4 weeks and was significantly associated with reductions in weekly excess death rate. Cities that implemented interventions earlier had greater delays in reaching peak mortality (Spearman $r=-0.74$, $P<0.001$), lower peak mortality rates (Spearman $r=0.31$, $P=.02$), and lower total mortality (Spearman $r=0.37$, $P=.008$). There was a significant association between increased duration of interventions and a reduced total mortality burden (Spearman $r=-0.39$, $P=.005$).

Ishola and Phin (2011) reviewed the literature on mass gatherings. They found 24 studies and cautiously concluded that there is some evidence to indicate that mass gatherings may be associated with an increased risk of influenza transmission. In a more recent systematic review, Rainey et al. (2016) found that mass gathering-related respiratory disease outbreaks were relatively rare between 2005 and 2014 in the US. They concluded that this could suggest—perhaps surprisingly—low transmission at most types of gatherings, even during pandemics. Similarly, in a US survey of 50 state health departments and 31 large local health departments, Figueroa et al. (2017) found that outbreaks at mass gatherings were uncommon, even during the 2009 H1N1 pandemic. In a modelling study, Shi et al. (2010) found that mass gatherings that occur within 10 days before the epidemic peak can result in a 10% relative increase in peak prevalence and total attack rate. Conversely, they found that mass gatherings may have little effect when occurring more than 40 days earlier or 20 days later than the infection peak (when initial Ro = 1.5). Thus the timing of mass gatherings might explain the apparent lack of evidence in support of their ban.

Recently, Zhao et al. (2020) quantified the association between domestic travel out of Wuhan, China, and the spread of SARS-CoV-2. Using location-based data, they estimated that each increase of 100 in daily new cases and daily passengers departing from Wuhan was associated with an increase of 16.25% (95% CI: 14.86–17.66%) in daily new cases outside of Wuhan. Ryu et al. (2020) conducted a systematic review of international travel restrictions, screening of travelers, and border closure. They examined 15 studies and concluded that the evidence did not support entry screening as an effective measure, and that travel restrictions and border closures would have limited effectiveness in controlling pandemic influenza. In another systematic review, Mateus et al. (2014) concluded that the evidence did not support travel restrictions as an isolated intervention for the containment of influenza, and that restrictions would be "extremely limited" in containing the emergence of a pandemic virus. Chinazzi et al. (2020) used a global disease transmission model to project the impact of travel limitations on the spread of COVID-19. They estimated that the travel quarantine of Wuhan delayed the overall epidemic progression by 3 to 5 days in Mainland China, and reduced international case importations by nearly 80% until mid February. Modeling results also indicated that sustained 90% travel restrictions to and from China only modestly affect the epidemic trajectory unless combined with a 50% or higher reduction of transmission in the

community. Travel limitations may be more effective when neighbouring countries fail to implement adequate outbreak control efforts (Bwire et al. 2016).

DISCUSSION

This rapid systematic review aimed to provide a comprehensive summary of the evidence on pandemic control, with a focus on cost-effective interventions in the context of COVID-19. Randomized trial evidence was only available to support the effectiveness of hand washing and face masks. Modelling studies suggested that these measures are highly cost-effective. For other interventions, only evidence from observational and modelling studies was available. This lower-quality evidence suggests that overall, when timed appropriately, the following interventions are likely to be highly cost-effective: contact tracing and case isolation, protective equipment for healthcare workers, and vaccination prior to the outbreak (when available). Surveillance networks and protective equipment for healthcare workers are also likely to be cost-effective. Home quarantine for confirmed cases and stockpiling antivirals appear less cost-effective. The least cost-effective interventions appear to be social distancing measures like workplace and school closures. The evidence suggests that these are more cost-effective for severe viruses like SARS-CoV-2, and when timed early in the outbreak. Vaccination past the peak of infections and long-term school closures late in the outbreak appear less cost-effective, underscoring the importance of timing.

As many authors have noted, the cost-effectiveness of interventions depends on virus severity. For SARS-CoV-2, Wu et al. (2020) estimated a case fatality rate of 1.4% in Wuhan, China, and a crude case fatality risk in areas outside Hubei of 0.85%. Russell et al. (2020) estimated a case fatality rate of 1.2% in China, and of 2.6% on the Diamond Princess cruise ship. Roussel et al. (2020) reported a mortality rate of 1.3% in OECD countries as of March 2, 2020. Onder al. (2020) reported a case fatality rate of 1% in Korea and rates in Italy ranging from 3.1% (February 24) to 7.2% (March 17). They point out that the high rates in Italy may be due to differences in population age, definition of COVID-19–related deaths, and testing strategies. Based on the above, our assessment of the cost-effectiveness of interventions is based on an estimate of 1 to 2% case fatality rate for

COVID-19. The cost-effectiveness of interventions also depends on their timing. Taking this into account, we propose a 3-stage framework for pandemic control interventions, adapted from Madhav et al. (2017). This framework is illustrated in Figure 1. Stages are shown from left to right, and interventions are shown from top (most cost-effective) to bottom (least cost-effective).

Figure 1—Cost-effectiveness of interventions in COVID-19, by stage



Figure 1 shows the cost-effectiveness of interventions to control COVID-19 by stage of the pandemic. According to this framework, surveillance networks are highly cost-effective, should be established before the pandemic starts (stage 1), and maintained through stages 2 and 3. Vaccination, when available, should occur before the pandemic, or as early as possible. Antivirals can be stockpiled cost-effectively in high-income countries. As the pandemic starts (stage 2), early contact tracing and case isolation is the most cost-effective intervention. It may be sufficient to contain the outbreak. If the outbreak is not contained, hand hygiene, face masks, and protective equipment for healthcare workers are all highly cost-effective. If these measures are not sufficient, home quarantines, social distancing, and school closures are all effective, albeit increasingly costly measures. Assuming a 1 to 2% case fatality rate for COVID-19, these measures are likely to be cost-effective nonetheless, especially if implemented early. As COVID-19 spreads (stage 3), and especially past the peak, the costliest interventions can be replaced cost-effectively by a

combination of interventions centered on swift contact tracing and case isolation. Once antivirals are available, they can also replace the costlier interventions cost-effectively.

Limitations

This rapid systematic review has a number of limitations. First, randomized trial evidence was not available for most epidemic control interventions. Consequently, we included observational and modelling studies. Their results should be interpreted with caution. Still, as COVID-19 forces urgent decision-making, we submit that some evidence is better than none. Second, because of time constraints, our search was limited to two databases (MEDLINE and Embase). Only one investigator screened titles, abstracts, and the full text of papers. We performed limited quality assessment and we did not examine risk of bias. Third, most of the studies we have reviewed focused on H1N1 and other viruses, not SARS-CoV-2. Fourth, estimates of COVID-19 case fatality rate are subject to substantial uncertainties. We assessed the cost-effectiveness of interventions based on estimates of 1 to 2%. These are likely to change as more data emerge. Should the true rate be higher, all interventions would be more cost-effective. Conversely, should it be lower, costly interventions such as extended school closures may not be cost-effective.

Conclusions

Hand washing and face masks were the only measures supported by higher-quality evidence. Other interventions were supported by lower-quality evidence. In the context of COVID-19, a cautious interpretation suggests that (1) social distancing is effective but costly, especially when adopted late and (2) adopting as early as possible a combination of interventions that includes hand washing, face masks, swift contact tracing and case isolation, and protective equipment for healthcare workers is likely to be the most cost-effective strategy.

Funding

LP holds the Canada Research Chair in Community Approaches and Health Inequalities (CRC 950-232541). This funding source had no role in the design, conduct, or reporting of the study.

Conflicts of interests

CEJ, TP, MB, and LP declare no conflict of interest. GG holds a contractual position with the Millar Group (provider of personal protective equipment) and executive roles at Panacea Health Solutions and Angular Momentum (providers of diabetes and corporate wellness programs).

Authors' contributions

CEJ, TP, and LP designed the study. CEJ, GG, and MB searched and analyzed the literature. CEJ and TP interpreted the findings. CEJ wrote the first draft. All authors revised drafts and approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

Alonso-Coello P, Schünemann HJ, Moberg J, Brignardello-Petersen R, Akl EA, Davoli M, Treweek S, Mustafa RA, Rada G, Rosenbaum S, Morelli A, Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Group GW. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks: a systematic and transparent approach to making well informed healthcare choices. 1: Introduction. BMJ 2016; 353: i2016.

Bayham J, Fenichel EP. Impact of school closures for COVID-19 on the US health-care workforce and net mortality: a modelling study. The Lancet Public Health. Published online first:April 03, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30082-7

Bin Nafisah S, Alamery AH, Al Nafesa A, Aleid B, Brazanji NA. School closure during novel influenza: A systematic review. J Infect Public Health. 2018 Sep - Oct;11(5):657-661. doi: 10.1016/j.jiph.2018.01.003.

Bwire G, Mwesawina M, Baluku Y, Kanyanda SS, Orach CG. Cross-Border Cholera Outbreaks in Sub-Saharan Africa, the Mystery behind the Silent Illness: What Needs to Be Done? PLoS One. 2016 Jun 3;11(6):e0156674. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0156674.

Chen T, Zhao B, Liu R, Zhang X, Xie Z, Chen S. Simulation of key interventions for seasonal influenza outbreak control at school in Changsha, China. J Int Med Res. 2020 Jan;48(1):300060518764268. doi: 10.1177/0300060518764268.

Chinazzi M, Davis JT, Ajelli M, Gioannini C, Litvinova M, Merler S, Pastore Y Piontti A, Mu K, Rossi L, Sun K, Viboud C, Xiong X, Yu H, Halloran ME, Longini IM Jr, Vespignani A. The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. Science. 2020 Mar 6. pii: eaba9757. Doi: 10.1126/science.aba9757.

Dan YY, Tambyah PA, Sim J, Lim J, Hsu LY, Chow WL, Fisher DA, Wong YS, Ho KY. Cost-effectiveness analysis of hospital infection control response to an epidemic respiratory virus threat. Emerg Infect Dis. 2009 Dec;15(12):1909-16. doi: 10.3201/eid1512.090902.

Day T, Park A, Madras N, Gumel A, Wu J. When is quarantine a useful control strategy for emerging infectious diseases? Am J Epidemiol. 2006 Mar 1;163(5):479-85.

Fähnrich C, Denecke K, Adeoye OO, Benzler J, Claus H, Kirchner G, Mall S, Richter R, Schapranow MP, Schwarz N, Tom-Aba D, Uflacker M, Poggensee G, Krause G. Surveillance and Outbreak Response Management System (SORMAS) to support the control of the Ebola virus disease outbreak in West Africa. Euro Surveill. 2015 Mar 26;20(12).

Figueroa A, Gulati RK, Rainey JJ. Estimating the frequency and characteristics of respiratory disease outbreaks at mass gatherings in the United States: Findings from a state and local health department assessment. PLoS One. 2017 Oct 27;12(10):e0186730. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0186730.

Halder N, Kelso JK, Milne GJ. Developing guidelines for school closure interventions to be used during a future influenza pandemic. BMC Infect Dis. 2010 Jul 27;10:221. doi: 10.1186/1471-2334-10-221.

Halder N, Kelso JK, Milne GJ. Cost-effective strategies for mitigating a future influenza pandemic with H1N1 2009 characteristics. PLoS One. 2011;6(7):e22087. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0022087.

Hellewell J, Abbott S, Gimma A, Bosse NI, Jarvis CI, Russell TW et al. Feasibility of controlling COVID-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and contacts. The Lancet Global Health. 2020 Apr;pe488-e496. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30074-7

Ishola DA, Phin N. Could influenza transmission be reduced by restricting mass gatherings? Towards an evidence-based policy framework. J Epidemiol Glob Health. 2011 Dec;1(1):33-60. doi: 10.1016/j.jegh.2011.06.004.

Jackson C, Mangtani P, Hawker J, Olowokure B, Vynnycky E. The effects of school closures on influenza outbreaks and pandemics: systematic review of simulation studies. PLoS One. 2014 May 15;9(5):e97297. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0097297.

Jefferson T, Del Mar CB, Dooley L, Ferroni E, Al-Ansary LA, Bawazeer GA, van Driel ML, Nair S, Jones MA, Thorning S, Conly JM. Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2011 Jul 6;(7):CD006207. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006207.pub4.

Khazeni N, Hutton DW, Garber AM, Hupert N, Owens DK. Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of vaccination against pandemic influenza (H1N1) 2009. Ann Intern Med. 2009 Dec 15;151(12):829-39. Doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-151-12-200912150-00157.

Lee BY, Brown ST, Korch GW, Cooley PC, Zimmerman RK, Wheaton WD, Zimmer SM, Grefenstette JJ, Bailey RR, Assi TM, Burke DS. A computer simulation of vaccine prioritization, allocation, and rationing during the 2009 H1N1 influenza pandemic. Vaccine. 2010 Jul 12;28(31):4875-9. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2010.05.002.

Lee VJ, Lye DC, Wilder-Smith A. Combination strategies for pandemic influenza response - a systematic review of mathematical modeling studies. BMC Med. 2009 Dec 10;7:76. doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-7-76.

Lempel H, Epstein JM, Hammond RA. Economic cost and health care workforce effects of school closures in the U.S. PLoS Curr. 2009 Oct 5;1:RRN1051.

MacIntyre CR, Chughtai AA. Facemasks for the prevention of infection in healthcare and community settings. BMJ. 2015 Apr 9;350:h694. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h694.

Mateus AL, Otete HE, Beck CR, Dolan GP, Nguyen-Van-Tam JS. Effectiveness of travel restrictions in the rapid containment of human influenza: a systematic review. Bull World Health Organ. 2014 Dec 1;92(12):868-880D. doi: 10.2471/BLT.14.135590.

Markel H, Lipman HB, Navarro JA, Sloan A, Michalsen JR, Stern AM, Cetron MS. Nonpharmaceutical interventions implemented by US cities during the 1918-1919 influenza pandemic. JAMA. 2007 Aug 8;298(6):644-54.

Madhav N, Oppenheim B, Gallivan M, Mulembakani P, Rubin E, Wolfe N. Chapter 17: Pandemics: Risks, Impacts, and Mitigation *in* Disease Control Priorities: Improving Health and Reducing Poverty. 3rd edition. Jamison DT, Gelband H, Horton S, et al., editors. Washington (DC): The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank; 2017 Nov 27.

Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. BMJ. 2009 Jul 21;339:b2535. doi: 10.1136/bmj.b2535.

Onder G, Rezza G, Brusaferro S. Case-Fatality Rate and Characteristics of Patients Dying in Relation to COVID-19 in Italy. JAMA. Published online March 23, 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.4683

Pan A, Liu L, Wang C, Guo H, Hao X, Wang Q, Huang J, He N, Yu H, Lin X, Wei S, Wu T. Association of Public Health Interventions With the Epidemiology of the COVID-19 Outbreak in Wuhan, China. JAMA. 2020 Apr 10. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.6130.

Pasquini-Descomps H, Brender N, Maradan D. Value for Money in H1N1 Influenza: A Systematic Review of the Cost-Effectiveness of Pandemic Interventions. Value Health. 2017 Jun;20(6):819-827. doi: 10.1016/j.jval.2016.05.005.

Pérez Velasco R, Praditsitthikorn N, Wichmann K, Mohara A, Kotirum S, Tantivess S, Vallenas C, Harmanci H, Teerawattananon Y. Systematic review of economic evaluations of preparedness strategies and interventions against influenza pandemics. PLoS One. 2012;7(2):e30333. Doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0030333.

Perlroth DJ, Glass RJ, Davey VJ, Cannon D, Garber AM, Owens DK. Health outcomes and costs of community mitigation strategies for an influenza pandemic in the United States. Clin Infect Dis. 2010 Jan 15;50(2):165-74. doi: 10.1086/649867.

Porgo TV, Norris SL, Salanti G, Johnson LF, Simpson JA, Low N, Egger M, Althaus CL. The use of mathematical modeling studies for evidence synthesis and guideline development: A glossary. Res Synth Methods. 2019 Mar;10(1):125-133. doi: 10.1002/jrsm.1333.

Prosser LA, Lavelle TA, Fiore AE, Bridges CB, Reed C, Jain S, Dunham KM, Meltzer MI. Cost-effectiveness of 2009 pandemic influenza A(H1N1) vaccination in the United States. PLoS One. 2011;6(7):e22308. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0022308.

Rainey JJ, Phelps T, Shi J. Mass Gatherings and Respiratory Disease Outbreaks in the United States - Should We Be Worried? Results from a Systematic Literature Review and Analysis of the National Outbreak Reporting System. PLoS One. 2016 Aug 18;11(8):e0160378. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0160378.

Rashid H, Ridda I, King C, Begun M, Tekin H, Wood JG, Booy R. Evidence compendium and advice on social distancing and other related measures for response to an influenza pandemic. Paediatr Respir Rev. 2015 Mar;16(2):119-26. doi: 10.1016/j.prrv.2014.01.003.

Roussel Y, Giraud-Gatineau A, Jimeno MT, Rolain JM, Zandotti C, Colson P, Raoult D. SARS-CoV-2: fear versus data. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2020 Mar 19:105947. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105947.

Russel T, Hellewell J, Jarvis CI et al. Estimating the infection and case fatality ratio for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) using age-adjusted data from the outbreak on the Diamond Princess cruise ship, February 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(12):pii=2000256. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.12.2000256

Ryu S, Gao H, Wong JY, Shiu EYC, Xiao J, Fong MW, et al. Nonpharmaceutical measures for pandemic influenza in nonhealthcare settings—international travel–related measures. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020 May. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2605.190993

Sacks JA, Zehe E, Redick C, Bah A, Cowger K, Camara M, Diallo A, Gigo AN, Dhillon RS, Liu A. Introduction of Mobile Health Tools to Support Ebola Surveillance and Contact Tracing in Guinea. Glob Health Sci Pract. 2015 Nov 12;3(4):646-59. doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-15-00207.

Saunders-Hastings P, Crispo JAG, Sikora L, Krewski D. Effectiveness of personal protective measures in reducing pandemic influenza transmission: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Epidemics. 2017 Sep;20:1-20. Doi: 10.1016/j.epidem.2017.04.003.

Shi P, Keskinocak P, Swann JL, Lee BY. The impact of mass gatherings and holiday traveling on the course of an influenza pandemic: a computational model. BMC Public Health. 2010 Dec 21;10:778. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-10-778.

Smith SM, Sonego S, Wallen GR, Waterer G, Cheng AC, Thompson P. Use of non-pharmaceutical interventions to reduce the transmission of influenza in adults: A systematic review. Respirology. 2015 Aug;20(6):896-903. doi: 10.1111/resp.12541.

Suphanchaimat R, Doung-Ngern P, Ploddi K, Suthachana S, Phaiyarom M, Pachanee K, Chaifoo W, Iamsirithaworn S. Cost effectiveness and budget impact analyses of influenza vaccination for prisoners in thailand: an application of system dynamic modelling. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020 Feb 14;17(4). pii: E1247. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17041247.

Townsend J, Greenland K, Curtis V. Costs of diarrhoea and acute respiratory infection attributable to not handwashing: the cases of India and China. Trop Med Int Health. 2017 Jan;22(1):74-81. doi: 10.1111/tmi.12808.

Tracht SM, Del Valle SY, Edwards BK. Economic analysis of the use of facemasks during pandemic (H1N1) 2009. J Theor Biol. 2012 May 7;300:161-72. doi: 10.1016/j.jtbi.2012.01.032.

Viner RM, Russell SJ, Croker H, Packer J, Ward J, Stansfield C, Mytton O, Bonell C, Booy R. School closure and management practices during coronavirus outbreaks including COVID-19: a rapid systematic review. Lancet Child Adolesc Health. 2020 Apr 6. pii: S2352-4642(20)30095-X. Doi: 10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30095-X.

Wang B, Xie J, Fang P. Is a Mass Prevention and Control Program for Pandemic (H1N1) 2009 Good Value for Money? Evidence from the Chinese Experience. Iran J Public Health. 2012;41(11):34-43.

Wu, J.T., Leung, K., Bushman, M. et al. Estimating clinical severity of COVID-19 from the transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China. Nat Med (2020). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0822-7

World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report – 90. 2020 Apr 19. (https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200419-sitrep-90-covid-19.pdf)

World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report – 77. 2020 Apr 6. (https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200406-sitrep-77-covid-19.pdf)

Zhao S, Zhuang Z, Cao P, Ran J, Gao D, Lou Y, Yang L, Cai Y, Wang W, He D, Wang MH. Quantifying the association between domestic travel and the exportation of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) cases from Wuhan, China in 2020: a correlational analysis. J Travel Med. 2020 Mar 13;27(2). pii: taaa022. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa022.

SUPPLEMENT — RESULT OF THE SEARCH

Step	Searches	Results
1	pandemic control.mp. [mp=ti, ab, hw, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, fx, dq, nm, kf, ox, px, rx, ui, sy]	108
2	pandemic interventions.mp. [mp=ti, ab, hw, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, fx, dq, nm, kf, ox, px, rx, ui, sy]	15
3	non-pharmaceutical interventions.mp. [mp=ti, ab, hw, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, fx, dq, nm, kf, ox, px, rx, ui, sy]	283
4	outbreak control.mp. [mp=ti, ab, hw, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, fx, dq, nm, kf, ox, px, rx, ui, sy]	1314
5	epidemic control.mp. [mp=ti, ab, hw, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, fx, dq, nm, kf, ox, px, rx, ui, sy]	981
6	epidemic interventions.mp. [mp=ti, ab, hw, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, fx, dq, nm, kf, ox, px, rx, ui, sy]	30
7	outbreak interventions.mp. [mp=ti, ab, hw, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, fx, dq, nm, kf, ox, px, rx, ui, sy]	35
8	1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7	2742
9	remove duplicates from 8	1653

SUPPLEMENT

eFigure—PRISMA Flow Diagram



From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). *P*referred *R*eporting *I*tems for *S*ystematic Reviews and *M*eta-*A*nalyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit www.prisma-statement.org.