

1 **Outbreaks of publications about emerging infectious** 2 **diseases: the case of SARS-CoV-2 and Zika virus**

3 Aziz Mert **Ipekci**¹, Diana **Buitrago-Garcia**^{1,2}, Kaspar Walter **Meili**³, Fabienne
4 **Krauer**⁴, Nirmala **Prajapati**⁵, Shabnam **Thapa**⁶, Lea **Wildisen**⁷, Lucia Araujo
5 **Chaveron**⁵, Lukas **Baumann**⁸, Sanam **Shah**⁵, Tessa **Whiteley**⁵, Gonzalo **Solís-**
6 **García**⁹, Foteini **Tsotra**¹⁰, Ivan **Zhelyazkov**¹⁰, Hira **Imeri**¹, Nicola **Low**¹, Michel
7 Jacques **Counotte**^{1*}

8 ¹. Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

9 ². Graduate School of Health Sciences, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

10 ³. Department of Epidemiology and Global Health, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

11 ⁴. Centre for Ecological and Evolutionary Synthesis (CEES), University of Oslo, Norway

12 ⁵. École des Hautes Études en Santé Publique (EHESP), Saint Denis, France

13 ⁶. Institute of Public Health, Jagiellonian University Medical College, Kraków, Poland

14 ⁷. Institute of Primary Health Care (BIHAM), University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

15 ⁸. Department of Internal Medicine, Kantonsspital Olten, Olten, Switzerland

16 ⁹. Pediatrics Department, Hospital General Universitario Gregorio Marañón, Madrid, Spain

17 ¹⁰. School of Health and Related Research (SchARR), University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United
18 Kingdom

19 * corresponding author: michel.counotte@ispm.unibe.ch

20 Summary

21 **Background.** Outbreaks of infectious diseases generate outbreaks of scientific evidence. In 2016
22 epidemics of Zika virus emerged, largely in Latin America and the Caribbean. In 2020, a novel severe
23 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) caused a pandemic of coronavirus disease
24 2019 (COVID-19). We compared patterns of scientific publications for the two infections over time.

25 **Methods.** We used living systematic review methods to search for and annotate publications
26 according to study design. For Zika virus, a review team performed the tasks for publications in 2016.
27 For SARS-CoV-2, a crowd of 25 volunteer scientists performed the tasks for publications up to May
28 24, 2020. We used descriptive statistics to categorise and compare study designs over time.

29 **Findings.** We found 2,286 publications about Zika virus in 2016 and 21,990 about SARS-CoV-2 up to
30 24 May 2020, of which we analysed a random sample of 5294. For both infections, there were more
31 epidemiological than laboratory science studies. Amongst epidemiological studies for both
32 infections, case reports, case series and cross-sectional studies emerged first, cohort and case-
33 control studies were published later. Trials were the last to emerge. Mathematical modelling studies
34 were more common in SARS-CoV-2 research. The number of preprints was much higher for SARS-
35 CoV-2 than for Zika virus.

36 **Interpretation.** Similarities in the overall pattern of publications might be generalizable, whereas
37 differences are compatible with differences in the characteristics of a disease. Understanding how
38 evidence accumulates during disease outbreaks helps us understand which types of public health
39 questions we can answer and when.

40 **Funding.** MJC and HI are funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF grant number
41 176233). NL acknowledges funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and
42 innovation programme - project EpiPose (grant agreement number 101003688). DBG is funded by
43 the Swiss government excellence scholarship (2019.0774) and the Swiss School of Public Health
44 Global P3HS.

45 Introduction

46 Scientists publish their findings to understand epidemics caused by novel pathogens. This evidence
47 will guide decisions, actions and interventions to mitigate the effects of the disease through policy,
48 programmes, guidelines and further research.¹ Two viral pathogens that have caused epidemics
49 across a large number of countries since 2016 resulted in the declaration of a Public Health
50 Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC) by the World Health Organization (WHO) Director-
51 General.² Zika virus, a mosquito-borne virus caused epidemics of microcephaly that were first
52 noticed in late 2015 in Brazil, although it was first discovered in 1947 and had caused small
53 outbreaks of infection before then.³ Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2),
54 was first discovered in January 2020 as the cause of a new zoonotic disease, coronavirus disease
55 2019 (COVID-19), spread primarily through the respiratory route.⁴ There are marked differences in
56 the natural history of the two diseases, where microcephaly caused by Zika virus infection only
57 emerges months after infection, COVID-19 occurs acutely. Intensive research efforts for both
58 infections were catalysed by the needs of national, regional and global health agencies to answer
59 key questions on transmission, prevention, and interventions at the individual and community level.⁵
60 During the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, the accumulation of peer-reviewed and preprint publications has
61 been vast; from April, 2020 onwards, an average of 2,000 scientific publications appeared per week.⁶
62 A similar, albeit smaller surge in publications occurred in 2016 during the Zika virus epidemic. The
63 sudden large increases in publications about these conditions over a short time can also be
64 described as outbreaks.

65 The emergence of a new disease provides an opportunity to examine how research evidence
66 emerges and develops, according to the research question and the feasibility of the study methods.
67 Hierarchies of evidence are often used to rank the value of epidemiological study designs,
68 prioritising experimental methods,⁷ but these do not take account of purposes, other than the
69 effects of interventions. Anecdotal observations allow for the discovery and description of
70 phenomena, studies with comparison groups are more appropriate to test hypotheses, and
71 randomised trials test the causal effects of interventions.⁸ Early on in the Zika epidemic, questions
72 about causality were important because the link between clusters of babies born with microcephaly
73 and Zika virus infection was not obvious; congenital abnormalities caused by a mosquito-borne virus
74 had never been reported. In an analysis of 346 publications about Zika virus, we described the
75 temporal sequence of publication of types of study to investigate causality.⁹ Others have assessed
76 the accumulation of study designs over time during the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak and concluded that
77 early in the outbreak, simple observational studies and narrative reviews were most abundant.¹⁰
78 Here, we proposed a hypothetical sequence: first, anecdotal observations are reported in case

79 reports or case series. Analytical observational studies follow. In parallel, basic research studies
80 investigate the biology and pathogenesis of the disease. Mathematical modelling can provide
81 evidence where direct observations are not available.¹¹ After a delay, controlled trials examining
82 interventions are published.

83 The emergence of SARS-CoV-2 allows a comparison with Zika virus between the timing and types of
84 evidence published at the start of an outbreak of a new disease. The objectives of this study were to
85 analyse the patterns of evolution of the evidence over time during the 2016 Zika virus epidemic and
86 the 2020 SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. We compare the sequence of evidence accumulation with the
87 previously hypothesised pattern.⁹

88 Methods

89 Data collection

90 **Searches and sources.** We used databases that were created for the Zika Open Access Project
91 (ZOAP) and COVID-19 Open Access Project (COAP).¹² For each pathogen, we ran daily automated
92 searches to index and deduplicate records of articles about Zika virus (from January 1, 2016) and
93 SARS-CoV-2 research (from January 1, 2020) in EMBASE via OVID, MEDLINE via PubMed, and the
94 preprint server bioRxiv (for SARS-CoV-2 we also searched medRxiv). We specify the search terms in
95 the appendix (pp 2).

96 **Annotation of records with study design.** We screened the title and abstract, or full text when the
97 first was insufficient, and annotated each record with its study design. For weeks where the volume
98 SARS-CoV-2 of research was over 400 publications, starting mid-March, we drew a random sample of
99 400 publications. The annotation of the Zika virus dataset was performed (from January 1, 2016 to
100 December 31, 2016) for previous systematic reviews.^{13, 14}

101 **Study design classification.** We first classified publications into the broad groups “epidemiology”,
102 “basic research”, “non-original research” (editorials, viewpoints, and commentaries) and “other”.
103 We subdivided epidemiological and basic research further, based on their study design. We provide
104 details on the classification of the study designs in the appendix (pp 3).

105 **Crowd.** To distribute the annotation workload, we recruited a ‘crowd’ of volunteer scientists.¹⁵ We
106 included researchers with a background in medicine or public health, who qualified by passing a pilot
107 test using an online tool that simulates classification tasks. A demonstration and the source code of
108 the tool are provided online.¹⁶

109 The crowd members used another online tool for screening, annotation, and verification of each
110 record. A first crowd member screened and annotated a record, and a second crowd member
111 verified the annotated data. Disagreements were resolved by a third member of the team. One
112 person (MJC) distributed tasks centrally and a ‘crowd supervisor’ (AMI) monitored progress. Crowd
113 members took part in the interpretation of the results.

114 **Reported number of cases.** To compare the number of publications against the number of reported
115 cases, we used open-source data on Zika virus and SARS-CoV-2 from, see Data sharing.

116 **Date that a publication becomes available.** We defined the date at which a publication became
117 available as the date it was indexed in the MEDLINE or EMBASE database, or when it appeared on
118 the preprint server.

119 Data analysis

120 First, we described the evolution of reported cases and publications over time. Second, we described
121 the proportions of study designs, by week, for SARS-CoV-2 and by month for Zika virus, due to the
122 differences in research volume. We omitted the first two weeks of 2020 for SARS-CoV-2 because
123 there were only four publications, making the proportions unstable. To take into account the
124 random sampling of the SARS-CoV-2 research, we provided the Wilson score 95% confidence
125 intervals (CI) for the proportions. Third, we quantified the timing and speed of the accumulation of
126 publications of different study designs: We plotted the time elapsed between the first and twentieth
127 occurrence of publications of each study design. Last, we described the proportion of evidence that
128 was published on preprint servers during the two epidemics, and by study design.

129 Role of the funding sources

130 The funders of this study had no role in the study design, data analysis, data interpretation, or
131 writing of the report. All authors had full access to all of the data and final responsibility for the
132 decision to submit for publication.

133 Results

134 Between week one and week 21 (up to May 24) 2020, we indexed 21,990 publications, and a crowd
135 of 25 contributors annotated a sample of 5,294 publications on SARS-CoV-2. For the Zika virus
136 research, we annotated all 2,286 identified publications for 2016. Both the volume of the weekly
137 reported cases and number of publications were 30-50-fold higher for SARS-CoV-2 than for Zika virus
138 (figure 1).

139 **Figure 1. The global number of reported cases (A), and the number publications (B) by week for**
140 **SARS-CoV-2 infections in 2020 and Zika virus infections (ZIKV) in 2016.** In panel B, the dashed grey
141 boxes contain the period and number of publications for which the study design was annotated. The
142 vertical scales differ for each infection. SARS-CoV-2: Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus
143 2.

144 **The proportion of different study designs**

145 In both epidemics, a substantial and reasonably stable proportion of the publications were non-
146 original research. The overall proportion of non-original publications was higher for Zika virus (55%,
147 (appendix pp 4)) than for SARS-CoV-2 (34% [95% CI: 33-35], (appendix pp 5)). For publications of
148 original research, the proportion of basic research publications increased over time for Zika virus,
149 but decreased for SARS-Cov-2 research (figure 2A).

150 Within the epidemiological study designs, mathematical modelling studies had a larger role at the
151 beginning of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic (10.1%, [95% CI: 9.3-11.0]) and compared to the Zika virus
152 outbreak (3.2%). Many of these were published as preprint publications. When we excluded preprint
153 publications, the evolution of evidence over time became more similar between the two epidemics
154 (appendix pp 6). Case reports and case series accounted for approximately 10% of the total body of
155 evidence; 10.7% [95% CI: 9.9-11.6] for SARS-CoV-2 and 9.7% for Zika virus research. Analytical
156 epidemiological study designs became more prevalent later in the SARS-Cov-2 and Zika virus
157 epidemics. Case-control and cohort studies accounted for 4.0% [95% CI: 3.5-4.6] for SARS-CoV-2 and
158 0.8% for Zika virus. Trials also emerged later but in smaller numbers (27/5,294 for SARS -CoV-2, and
159 1/2,286 for Zika virus) (Fig 2B).

160 **Figure 2. Proportions of different study designs of published research on SARS-CoV-2 (SARS-CoV-2)**
161 **and Zika virus (Zika virus) over time.** Epidemiological, basic, and “non-original” research (A);
162 epidemiological research by study design (B). For display purposes SARS-CoV-2 data is shown by
163 week and Zika virus data by month. SARS-CoV-2: Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2;
164 PHEIC: Public Health Emergency of International Concern.

165 **Accumulation of epidemiological and basic research**

166 Despite the difference in volume, the accumulation of study designs over time for SARS-CoV-2 and
167 Zika virus research show some similarities (figure 3). Case reports, case series and cross-sectional
168 studies were the first epidemiological study designs to be reported, together with non-original
169 articles and reviews. Case-control and cohort studies followed later; this delay was more prominent
170 in the Zika virus research. Phylogenetic studies and mathematical modelling studies had a more
171 prominent role early on during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic than in the Zika virus epidemic. *In vivo* and

172 *in vitro* laboratory studies followed between case reports and controlled observational studies. Trials
173 were the last type of study to be published.

174 **Figure 3. Time to the first 20 publications in a study design, for SARS-CoV-2 infections (SARS-CoV-
175 2) and Zika virus infections (Zika virus).** SARS-CoV-2: Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus
176 2; PHEIC: Public Health Emergency of International Concern.

177 The role of preprint publications

178 The role of preprint publications was more prominent at the start of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic than
179 the Zika virus epidemic. In January and February 2020, the majority of publications on SARS-CoV-2
180 were manuscripts on preprint servers (figure 4A). Basic research reviews were seldom published on
181 preprint servers, whereas 77% of the mathematical modelling studies were initially made available
182 on preprint servers (figure 4B). The proportion of modelling and sequencing studies that were
183 published as preprints was high throughout the first 21 weeks of 2020, whereas other designs
184 reduced over time (appendix pp 8). The proportion of preprints decreased over time.

185 **Figure 4. The proportion of preprint publications and peer-reviewed publications for SARS-CoV-2
186 (SARS-CoV-2) and Zika virus (Zika virus) research over time (A) and by study design for SARS-CoV-2
187 (B).** SARS-CoV-2: Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2

188 Discussion

189 The overall distribution of publications at the start of the SARS-CoV-2 and Zika virus epidemics was
190 similar. Epidemiological research was more commonly published than laboratory research and non-
191 original contributions accounted for a substantial fraction of all publications for both infections. For
192 both infections, case reports and case series, mathematical modelling and phylogenetic studies were
193 prominent at the start of the epidemic, whereas analytical study designs, such as cohort and case-
194 control studies, appeared later. Trials emerged later and accounted for a small proportion of all
195 studies. The volume and speed of evolution were much higher for SARS-CoV-2 than for Zika virus.
196 Modelling studies were more prominent and basic research studies were less common for SARS-
197 CoV-2 than for Zika virus. More studies were published as preprints for SARS-CoV-2, but this
198 proportion declined over time.

199 Strengths and limitations. Strengths of this study include the comparable and reproducible search
200 strategies for two emerging infectious diseases and categorisation of study design by a volunteer
201 crowd of epidemiologist reviewers. A limitation is that the design of an epidemiological study is not
202 always clear, and different scientists might classify the same study differently. We tried to tackle this
203 limitation by screening and training of the volunteer scientists, verification of decisions and having a

204 third person resolving disagreements.¹² There are other limitations. First, we only recorded the study
205 design of publications and did not assess the content or its methodological quality. To trace the
206 evolution of evidence for specific research questions, in-depth studies are needed. Second, for SARS-
207 CoV-2, the volume of publications meant that we only annotated a sample of records. The total in
208 the first five months of the pandemic was, however, higher than for one year of publications about
209 Zika virus and the proportions of different study designs for Zika virus stabilised quickly. Third, the
210 searches do not include all sources of peer-reviewed evidence or preprint sources. Incompleteness
211 of the evidence base should not affect our conclusions as long as other sources account for a stable
212 proportion of publications.

213 We followed two dimensions of the publication of evidence about two newly emerging infectious
214 diseases; the overall distribution of publication types and changes over time. Similarities in the
215 overall distribution of epidemiological, basic science and non-original publications for SARS-CoV-2
216 and Zika virus could reflect patterns of the overall trajectory of research about emerging infectious
217 diseases. In the initial phase of an outbreak with a novel pathogen, case reports and case series
218 predominate. These types of study describe and refine the clinical characteristics of the disease.¹⁷
219 Observations from these studies are commonly used to define research questions and formulate
220 hypotheses about various aspects of transmission and disease. More formal, hypothesis-driven and
221 interventional research follows later.⁸

222 The differences between study designs in the two epidemics are compatible with differences in
223 characteristics of the diseases. The higher proportion of basic research in Zika virus research may
224 have several explanations. First, the occurrence of congenital abnormalities following a vector-borne
225 infection was poorly understood; *in vivo* and *in vitro* studies were essential to investigate in utero
226 transmission and mechanisms for neurotoxicity and neuropathology.¹⁸ Second, the establishment of
227 mouse models was more successful in Zika virus research than for SARS-CoV-2 research,¹⁹ although
228 efforts are ongoing.²⁰ Third, the later occurrence of case-control studies and cohorts studies in Zika
229 virus, might be caused by the delay to congenital outcomes, compared to the shorter delay in
230 outcomes caused by SARS-CoV-2. Fourth, the prominent role of mathematical modelling studies
231 during the beginning of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, probably reflects early recognition of the
232 pandemic potential and the need for forecasts of the global spread. Mechanistic models describing
233 the transmission SARS-CoV-2 are also less complex than for arboviruses like Zika virus, allowing
234 many to explore transmission dynamics.¹¹ The higher volume of observational research about SARS-
235 CoV-2 research could reflect both the 50-fold higher numbers of cases than for Zika virus and the
236 severity of the pandemic, whereas Zika virus was largely limited to the Americas and cases of
237 infection were already declining as the research volume started to increase. The increasing role of

238 preprints during the SARS-CoV-2 coincided with developments in open access publishing and the
239 need for speedy access to outbreak research.²¹

240 Other researchers have studied the evolution of evidence during disease outbreaks as well. During
241 the SARS outbreak in 2003, Xing et al. (2010) described epidemiological studies about Toronto and
242 Hong Kong, whereas we included epidemiological and non-epidemiological articles all over the
243 globe.²² Xing and colleagues primarily studied the publication time delay during the outbreak and
244 concluded that only a minority (7%) of the publications was published during the time outbreak,
245 while we investigated the proportion of the preprints over peer-reviewed publications.²² For the
246 SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, Liu et al. (2020) performed a bibliometric analysis of the SARS-CoV-2
247 literature up to March 24, 2020,²³ classifying research by theme, rather than by study design. They
248 observed that clinical features of the COVID-19 were studied heavily, whereas other research areas
249 such as mental health, the use of novel technologies and artificial intelligence, and pathophysiology
250 remained underexplored. In contrary to the manual annotation of our project, Tran et al. (2020)
251 performed automatic Latent Dirichlet allocation topic modelling of publications on SARS-CoV-2,
252 published up to April 23, 2020,²⁴ with findings similar to those of Liu. et al. While we validated
253 classification of study design manually, Tran et al. did not describe a validation of their automated
254 modelling method. Jones et al. (2020) showed a similar pattern of study design occurrence during
255 the early SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, where case reports and narrative reviews were found to be most
256 published.¹⁰ However, they merely present absolute numbers and a comparison with other
257 outbreaks is absent.¹⁰ Haghani and Bliemer (2020) compared SARS, MERS and SARS-CoV-2 literature
258 and showed that around 50% of studies were non-original, which is in line with our results.²⁵ Unlike
259 our categorization method, Haghani and Bliemer used the categorization by the citation database
260 ‘SCOPUS’ and conclude that the studies linked to public health response are first to emerge.²⁵

261 Our work has several implications for policy and research. The change over time in the types of
262 studies has particular implications for synthesis of evidence as more research is published. The
263 earliest publications about a new pathogen come from studies that can be done quickly and non-
264 original commentaries. The earliest studies published might not be the most appropriate to answer
265 specific questions, for example, about causality,²⁶ or to quantify disease characteristics.

266 Triangulation of different sources of evidence using frameworks, such as those based on the
267 Bradford Hill criteria,¹³ and careful interpretation through explicit acknowledgment of limitations can
268 help. Living systematic reviews are particularly useful because changes to inclusion criteria can be
269 planned and protocols can be amended in advance of an update. For example, quantifying the
270 proportion of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections in March 2020 relied largely on descriptions from

271 contact investigations in single families.²⁷ By June 2020, there were also studies at lower risk of
272 selection and measurement biases, such as population screening.²⁸

273 The vast quantity of evidence about emerging infections poses challenges for the efficient handling
274 and evaluation of information. The speed with which the evidence about SARS-CoV-2 has
275 accumulated is unprecedented. We recruited a large team of experienced scientists, but we were
276 still not able to categorise all publications by the time this manuscript is written. Machine learning
277 methods, such as natural language processing, to classify text is a promising approach for the triage
278 of publication types.¹⁵ We also see potential in a scaled-up version of collaborative crowd-sourcing
279 among experts in the field, to increase efficiency and avoid research waste.²⁹ The technical tools to
280 manage such efforts are available, but guidelines on how to best conduct the live synthesis of
281 evidence should be developed and evaluated further.³⁰ The findings of this study show how
282 description of the types and timing of publications during outbreaks of emerging and re-emerging
283 diseases can help us understand which types of public health questions we can answer and when.
284 Further analyses of the generation and accumulations of research evidence during disease outbreaks
285 could help to improve the public health response.

286 Contributions

287 **Conceptualization:** MJC, NL; **Methodology:** MJC, NL, AMI; **Data collection:** AMI, DBG, KWM, FK, NP,
288 ST, LW, LAC, LB, SS, TW, GSG, FT, IZ, HI, NL, MJC; **Analyses:** MJC, AMI; **Interpretation of analyses:**
289 AMI, DBG, KWM, FK, NP, ST, LW, LAC, LB, SS, TW, GSG, FT, IZ, HI, NL, MJC; **Writing – original draft**
290 **preparation:** MJC, AMI; **Writing – review and editing:** AMI, DBG, KWM, FK, NP, ST, LW, LAC, LB, SS,
291 TW, GSG, FT, IZ, HI, NL, MJC; **Supervision:** MJC, NL;

292 Declaration of interests

293 None declared.

294 Data sharing

295 All data is available online: <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/IPHUJN>

296 References

- 297 1. Brownson RC, Fielding JE, Maylahn CM. Evidence-based public health: a fundamental
298 concept for public health practice. *Annual review of public health* 2009; **30**: 175-201.
- 299 2. World Health Organization. WHO statement on the first meeting of the International Health
300 Regulations (2005) (IHR 2005) Emergency Committee on Zika virus and observed increase in
301 neurological disorders and neonatal malformations. 2016. [https://www.who.int/news-](https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/01-02-2016-who-statement-on-the-first-meeting-of-the-international-health-)
302 [room/detail/01-02-2016-who-statement-on-the-first-meeting-of-the-international-health-](https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/01-02-2016-who-statement-on-the-first-meeting-of-the-international-health-)

- 303 regulations-(2005)-(ihr-2005)-emergency-committee-on-zika-virus-and-observed-increase-in-
304 neurological-disorders-and-neonatal-malformations (accessed 10/10/2020).
- 305 3. World Health Organization. COVID-19 Public Health Emergency of International Concern
306 (PHEIC) Global research and innovation forum. 2020.
307 [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-public-health-emergency-of-international-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-public-health-emergency-of-international-concern-(pheic)-global-research-and-innovation-forum)
308 [concern-\(pheic\)-global-research-and-innovation-forum](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-public-health-emergency-of-international-concern-(pheic)-global-research-and-innovation-forum) (accessed 10/10/2020).
- 309 4. Wiersinga WJ, Rhodes A, Cheng AC, Peacock SJ, Prescott HC. Pathophysiology, Transmission,
310 Diagnosis, and Treatment of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Review. *JAMA* 2020; **324**(8):
311 782-93.
- 312 5. Zhang L, Zhao W, Sun B, Huang Y, Glanzel W. How scientific research reacts to international
313 public health emergencies: a global analysis of response patterns. *Scientometrics* 2020; **124**(1): 1-27.
- 314 6. Counotte MJ, Imeri H, Ipekci M, Low N. Living Evidence on COVID-19. 2020.
315 <https://ispmbern.github.io/covid-19/living-review/> (accessed 31/07/2020).
- 316 7. Borgerson K. Valuing evidence: bias and the evidence hierarchy of evidence-based medicine.
317 *Perspectives in biology and medicine* 2009; **52**(2): 218-33.
- 318 8. Vandenbroucke JP. Observational research, randomised trials, and two views of medical
319 science. *PLoS medicine* 2008; **5**(3): e67.
- 320 9. Counotte MJ, Meili KW, Low N. Emergence of evidence during disease outbreaks: lessons
321 learnt from the Zika virus outbreak. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.03.16.20036806.
- 322 10. Jones RC, Ho JC, Kearney H, et al. Evaluating Trends in COVID-19 Research Activity in Early
323 2020: The Creation and Utilization of a Novel Open-Access Database. *Cureus* 2020; **12**(8): e9943.
- 324 11. Metcalf CJE, Morris DH, Park SW. Mathematical models to guide pandemic response. *Science*
325 2020; **369**(6502): 368-9.
- 326 12. COVID-19 Open Acces Project. Screening and annotation of citations. 2020.
327 <https://ispmbern.github.io/covid-19/living-review/screening.html> (accessed 07/08/2020).
- 328 13. Krauer F, Riesen M, Reveiz L, et al. Zika Virus Infection as a Cause of Congenital Brain
329 Abnormalities and Guillain-Barre Syndrome: Systematic Review. *PLoS medicine* 2017; **14**(1):
330 e1002203.
- 331 14. Counotte MJ, Egli-Gany D, Riesen M, et al. Zika virus infection as a cause of congenital brain
332 abnormalities and Guillain-Barre syndrome: From systematic review to living systematic review.
333 *F1000Research* 2018; **7**: 196.
- 334 15. Thomas J, Noel-Storr A, Marshall I, et al. Living systematic reviews: 2. Combining human and
335 machine effort. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2017; **91**: 31-7.
- 336 16. Counotte MJ. Rapid screening with a R Shiny App. 2020.
337 <https://github.com/ZikaProject/ShinyScreeningExample> (accessed 03-08-2020).
- 338 17. Vandenbroucke JP. In defense of case reports and case series. *Annals of internal medicine*
339 2001; **134**(4): 330-4.
- 340 18. Morrison TE, Diamond MS. Animal Models of Zika Virus Infection, Pathogenesis, and
341 Immunity. *Journal of virology* 2017; **91**(8).
- 342 19. Lakdawala SS, Menachery VD. The search for a COVID-19 animal model. *Science* 2020;
343 **368**(6494): 942-3.
- 344 20. Sun SH, Chen Q, Gu HJ, et al. A Mouse Model of SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Pathogenesis. *Cell*
345 *host & microbe* 2020; **28**(1): 124-33 e4.
- 346 21. Kupferschmidt K. 'A completely new culture of doing research.' Coronavirus outbreak
347 changes how scientists communicate. *Science* 2020.
- 348 22. Xing W, Hejblum G, Leung GM, Valleron AJ. Anatomy of the epidemiological literature on the
349 2003 SARS outbreaks in Hong Kong and Toronto: a time-stratified review. *PLoS medicine* 2010; **7**(5):
350 e1000272.
- 351 23. Liu N, Chee ML, Niu C, et al. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): an evidence map of
352 medical literature. *BMC medical research methodology* 2020; **20**(1): 177.

- 353 24. Tran BX, Ha GH, Nguyen LH, et al. Studies of Novel Coronavirus Disease 19 (COVID-19)
354 Pandemic: A Global Analysis of Literature. *International journal of environmental research and public*
355 *health* 2020; **17**(11).
- 356 25. Haghani M, Bliemer MCJ. Covid-19 pandemic and the unprecedented mobilisation of
357 scholarly efforts prompted by a health crisis: Scientometric comparisons across SARS, MERS and
358 2019-nCoV literature. *Scientometrics* 2020: 1-32.
- 359 26. Higgins JP, Ramsay C, Reeves BC, et al. Issues relating to study design and risk of bias when
360 including non-randomized studies in systematic reviews on the effects of interventions. *Research*
361 *synthesis methods* 2013; **4**(1): 12-25.
- 362 27. Buitrago-Garcia DC, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, et al. The role of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2
363 infections: rapid living systematic review and meta-analysis [Version 1]. *medRxiv* 2020:
364 2020.04.25.20079103.
- 365 28. Buitrago-Garcia D, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, et al. Occurrence and transmission potential of
366 asymptomatic and presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: A living systematic review and meta-
367 analysis. *PLoS medicine* 2020; **17**(9): e1003346.
- 368 29. Macleod MR, Michie S, Roberts I, et al. Biomedical research: increasing value, reducing
369 waste. *Lancet* 2014; **383**(9912): 101-4.
- 370 30. Khamis AM, Kahale LA, Pardo-Hernandez H, Schunemann HJ, Akl EA. Methods of conduct
371 and reporting of living systematic reviews: a protocol for a living methodological survey.
372 *F1000Research* 2019; **8**: 221.





