

1 **Contact tracing indicators for COVID-19: rapid scoping review and conceptual framework**

2 Vogt F^{1,2*}, Kurup K³, Mussleman P⁴, Habrun C⁵, Crowe M⁶, Woodward A⁷, Jaramillo-Gutierrez G⁸,

3 Kaldor J¹, Vong S⁹, Del Rio Vilas VJ⁹

4 ¹The Kirby Institute, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia

5 ² National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, Research School of Population Health,

6 College of Health and Medicine, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia

7 ³Independent public health consultant, New Delhi, India

8 ⁴University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, USA

9 ⁵ University of New Mexico, New Mexico Emerging Infections Program, NM, USA

10 ⁶ World Health Organization, Health Emergencies Programme, Geneva, Switzerland

11 ⁷Global Emerging Infections Surveillance, Armed Forces Health Surveillance Division, U.S.

12 Department of Defense, Silver Spring, Maryland, United States of America

13 ⁸ World Health Organization, Global Outbreak Alert & Response Network, Geneva, Switzerland

14 ⁹ World Health Organization, World Health Emergencies, South East Asia Regional Office, New Delhi,

15 India.

16 * Corresponding author. E-mail: fvogt@kirby.edu.unsw.au

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

17 **Abstract**

18 Background: Contact tracing is one of the key interventions in response to the COVID-19 pandemic
19 but its implementation varies widely across countries. There is little guidance on how to monitor
20 contact tracing performance, and no systematic overview of indicators to assess contact tracing
21 systems or conceptual framework for such indicators exists to date.

22 Methods: We conducted a rapid scoping review using a systematic literature search strategy in the
23 peer-reviewed and grey literature as well as open source online documents. We developed a
24 conceptual framework to map indicators by type (input, process, output, outcome, impact) and
25 thematic area (human resources, financial resources, case investigation, contact identification,
26 contact testing, contact follow up, case isolation, contact quarantine, transmission chain
27 interruption, incidence reduction).

28 Results: We identified a total of 153 contact tracing indicators from 1,555 peer-reviewed studies, 894
29 studies from grey literature sources, and 15 sources from internet searches. Two-thirds of indicators
30 were process indicators (102; 67%), while 48 (31%) indicators were output indicators. Only three
31 (2%) indicators were input indicators. Indicators covered seven out of ten conceptualized thematic
32 areas, with more than half being related to either case investigation (37; 24%) or contact
33 identification (44; 29%). There were no indicators for the input area “financial resources”, the
34 outcome area “transmission chain interruption”, and the impact area “incidence reduction”.

35 Conclusions: Almost all identified indicators were either process or output indicators focusing on
36 case investigation, contact identification, case isolation or contact quarantine. We identified
37 important gaps in input, outcome and impact indicators, which constrains evidence-based
38 assessment of contact tracing systems. A universally agreed set of indicators is needed to allow for
39 cross-system comparisons and to improve the performance of contact tracing systems.

40 **Background**

41 Contact tracing has become one of the key interventions in response to the coronavirus disease 2019
42 (COVID-19) pandemic in many countries, and is considered an indispensable outbreak response
43 activity to reduce new severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infections (1,
44 2). Contact tracing systems for SARS-CoV-2 aim to interrupt transmission chains by investigating
45 people who had contact with a probable or confirmed case, and quarantining or isolating infected
46 and exposed individuals in a timely manner, thereby reducing the occurrence of future transmission
47 events (3). While identifying and notifying contacts is a core part of contact tracing, other closely
48 related activities like case investigation, testing of contacts, and case isolation and quarantining of
49 contacts, are commonly understood to be part of contact tracing (4).

50 The World Health Organization (WHO) currently recommends contact tracing for persons with
51 exposure to a probable or confirmed case during the infectious period, defined as face to face
52 contact within one meter for 15 minutes or more, or direct physical contact regardless of duration.

53 The infectious period is defined as two days before until ten days after symptom onset for
54 symptomatic cases, and two days before until ten days after a positive test for asymptomatic cases
55 (3). The implementation of contact tracing and related activities varies widely across countries
56 depending on local public health guidance and resources. For example, prioritization of high-risk
57 contacts according to risk classification is often done in high burden settings and/or low-resource
58 contexts, e.g. by focusing on household members or other close contacts, contacts exposed during
59 crowded or closed settings, or contacts exposed to cases at the peak of their infectiousness (3).

60 Similarly, local guidance varies on whether or not all contacts should be tested or whether only
61 selective testing of close contacts should be done, and whether or not quarantine is recommended
62 or compulsory, and whether it is organized at designated facilities or at the contacts' home (2, 5).

63 Despite contact tracing having a pivotal role in the COVID-19 response, there is little guidance on
64 how to monitor and assess performance of contact tracing systems, a gap that was identified early in

65 the global pandemic (6, 7). In particular, no agreed upon or standardized indicators exist to date at
66 global or regional level to assess and monitor the performance and quality of contact tracing systems
67 for COVID-19 (5), which makes it impossible to assess performance over time and to identify
68 benchmarks across similar settings (8). While several contact tracing indicators have recently been
69 proposed both in the peer-reviewed literature as well as in non-peer reviewed documents online,
70 this often occurs without any conceptual framing or systematic development and selection of
71 indicators.

72 No systematic overview of indicators proposed for the assessment of contact tracing systems during
73 the COVID-19 pandemic and no conceptual framework to map and identify gaps in the proposed
74 indicators exist to date (3). This gap, identified already during the WHO consultation workshop in
75 June 2020 (7), hinders the development of a more comprehensive monitoring and evaluation
76 framework, thus ultimately impeding the improvement of contact tracing for COVID-19.

77 We aimed to close this gap by undertaking a systematic scoping review. Our objective was to
78 systematically scope the peer-reviewed and grey literature as well as other online resources for
79 indicators that can be used to assess the performance of COVID-19 contact tracing systems, and to
80 propose a conceptual framework for contact tracing indicators during the COVID-19 pandemic.

81 Understanding the current landscape of proposed contact tracing indicators and to establish a
82 conceptual framework for these indicators is a prerequisite towards the development of an
83 evaluation tool built on a core set of indicators for the systematic reporting of COVID-19 contact
84 tracing activities across countries.

85 **Methods**

86 We conducted a rapid scoping review using a systematic literature search strategy with the aim to
87 understand the landscape of contact tracing indicators for COVID-19. The design, conduct, and
88 reporting of this study was guided by the WHO guidance on rapid reviews (9) and the PRISMA

89 Extension for Scoping Reviews (10). The study protocol was registered in the international
90 prospective register PROSPERO prior to starting data collection (ref no CRD42020218057).

91 While the search process included locating literature in the three core health sciences databases
92 *PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane Library*, our search also relied heavily on grey literature sources. The
93 searched grey literature sources ranged from the search engine *Google* to government COVID-19
94 literature repositories such as the United States National Institutes of Health's *iSearch COVID-19*
95 *Portfolio*, to collections of curated literature from international repositories such as WHO's *GOARN*
96 *Contact Tracing Document Repository*. A complete list of all grey literature resources can be found in
97 Supporting Information File 1. In addition, we searched the internet using various combinations of
98 relevant search terms in the *Google* search engine. The searches in *PubMed, Cochrane, and Embase*
99 employed the use of both subject headings and natural language keywords. These three databases
100 were searched without any restrictions on publication dates. Boolean and proximity operators, as
101 well as filters limiting search results to the English language, were utilized. In addition to SARS-CoV-2,
102 the causal agent of COVID-19, the two other known human coronaviruses with epidemic potential,
103 MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV, were included in the search since indicators developed to trace contacts of
104 MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV were considered of potential relevance for SARS-CoV-2. The full search
105 strings used in the *PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane Library* databases can be found in Supporting
106 Information File 2. All documents containing at least one indicator related to contact tracing
107 performance were eligible for inclusion. The searches were last updated on 5 December 2020.

108 Citations arising from all of searches were compiled in the citation management software EndNote
109 v.X9 (11), and said software was used for detecting and removing duplicate citations. Results were
110 then transferred into the systematic review management software Covidence v.2491 (12) and
111 screened for eligibility by title and abstract. Full texts of all shortlisted results were assessed. A flow
112 diagram showing the screening, selection, and reasons for exclusions was produced. In addition to
113 the indicators of interest, basic information such as title, authors, year/date of publication,

114 journal/publishing site, the digital object identification number or uniform resource locator,
115 geographical scope, and article/document type were extracted.

116 We developed a conceptual framework to map the extracted contact tracing indicators, with
117 indicators being categorized by indicator type and grouped by thematic area. Indicators were also
118 classified by type of measurement. Exact duplications were removed but otherwise indicators and
119 benchmarks, where proposed, were mapped in the framework as presented in the source
120 documents.

121 **Results**

122 We screened 1,555 peer-reviewed studies and 894 studies from grey literature sources. After
123 screening and merging of results, we retained 9 peer-reviewed studies and 1 non-peer reviewed
124 study. Additionally, 15 sources were retained from the internet searches (see flow diagram in Figure
125 1 and citation details in Supporting Information File 3).

126 We identified a total of 153 contact tracing indicators from the included sources. Our conceptual
127 framework consisted of five types of indicators (input, process, output, outcome, and impact) with
128 ten thematic areas (human resources, financial resources, case investigation, contact identification,
129 contact testing, contact follow up, case isolation, contact quarantine, transmission chain
130 interruption, incidence reduction). All identified indicators were mapped into this conceptual
131 framework (see Supporting Information File 4 and Table 1): Two-thirds of indicators were classified
132 as process indicators (102; 67%), while 48 (31%) of indicators were classified as output indicators.
133 Only three (2%) indicators were input indicators. The identified indicators covered seven of the ten
134 conceptualized thematic areas, with more than half of the indicators being related either to case
135 investigation (37; 24%) or contact identification (44; 29%). There were no indicators for the input
136 area “financial resources”, the outcome area “transmission chain interruption”, and the impact area
137 “incidence reduction”.

138 The majority of indicators (89, 58%) had a percentage, proportion or ratio (e.g. proportion of
139 identified contacts contacted) as type of measurement. Absolute numbers (e.g. number of contacts
140 tested) and time duration (e.g. time from exposure of a contact with a case to notification) were the
141 type of measurement in 41 (27%) and 35 (23%) indicators, respectively. Thirty-eight (24.8%)
142 indicators included a proposed target benchmark to measure success (e.g. proportion of contacts of
143 COVID-19 positive contacts who become COVID-19 positive: target: <1%).

144 **Discussion**

145 Indicators are means to measure achievements and can be used to assess and monitor the
146 performance of systems as part of a logical framework (13). In the evaluation of public health
147 systems, indicators are often classified as input, process, output, outcome and impact indicators (14).
148 While input indicators are about what is needed to run a system, and process indicators are about
149 the activities undertaken by the system, output, outcome, and impact indicators are three different
150 ways to measure the external effects of a system ranging from immediate effects (output) to higher-
151 level goals (impact) (15, 16).

152 We systematically collated all indicators that have been proposed in the peer-reviewed, grey and
153 online literature to assess the performance of contact tracing systems, and we developed a
154 conceptual framework to assess the coverage of core thematic areas by the identified indicators. We
155 found the 153 identified indicators to focus heavily on the process performance of case investigation,
156 contact identification, and testing of contacts; and on the output performance of case isolation and
157 contact quarantine. We only identified a very small number of input indicators and no outcome or
158 impact indicators (see Supporting Information File 4 and Table 1).

159 The vast majority of our identified indicators were either process or output indicators. This focus on
160 the mid-level indicator types is not uncommon in health systems assessments (17). For process
161 indicators it is often the availability of data that explains their frequent use, and for output indicators

162 this is largely due to the immediacy of the measured effects (16, 18). Outcome and impact indicators,
163 on the other hand, measure more distal long-term effects, and are harder to measure and to
164 attribute to a specific system, hence their absence in our study was hardly surprising given that
165 COVID-19 contact tracing systems were built or adapted under immense time pressure in the midst
166 of a global pandemic.

167 Building on the understanding of COVID-19 contact tracing activities as established by WHO, we
168 conceptualized ten core thematic areas which a comprehensive evaluation approach should cover
169 across the different indicator types (see Supporting Information File 4 and Table 1): human
170 resources, financial resources (input); case investigation; contact identification, contact testing,
171 contact follow up (process); case isolation, contact quarantine (output); transmission chain
172 interruption (outcome); and incidence reduction (impact). All thematic areas of process and output
173 indicators were heavily covered by the identified indicators, but we found important gaps in the
174 input, outcome and impact categories. Showing and validly attributing the interruption of ongoing
175 transmission chains and a subsequent decline in incidence to contact tracing requires properly
176 planned research studies, in particular in high-transmission settings, which might explain the absence
177 of indicators in these thematic areas. Lacking such impact indicators puts contact tracing in a
178 disadvantageous position with regards to the strategic distribution of limited resources compared to
179 other interventions such as vaccination, where impacts appear better documented. However,
180 indicators on human and financial resources were clearly underrepresented, which can hardly be
181 explained by lack of data availability for these indicators. Instead, this gap could indicate that
182 efficiency is not a priority. It is likely that program managers were generally more concerned about
183 the middle and proximal front end of the system, i.e. process and output, instead of the back end
184 (input). This is somewhat expected although counterintuitive given the large amount of resources
185 that contact tracing consumes, especially in community transmission settings. Given that adequate
186 human resources and in particular training has been identified as a main factor of successful contact
187 tracing systems, this area requires better evaluation tools. WHO provides specific guidance for

188 member states to estimate workforce needs depending on the specific transmission scenario (19),
189 which could be used to develop additional indicators to address these gaps.

190 Overall, we noticed substantial duplications and strong similarities between indicators, in particular
191 in the thematic areas that were the most heavily covered (see Supporting Information File 4), which
192 can be explained in large parts by a lack of standardized terminology and use of epidemiological
193 concepts in the non-scientific literature. Most of the identified sources did not provide clear
194 definitions of the terms used. There is a need to harmonize the understanding and use of
195 terminology and concepts related to contact tracing. Also, the benchmarks that were proposed for
196 about a quarter of the identified indicators were often not contextualized, which made it difficult to
197 establish whether these were considered minimum standards or indicators of success, and to
198 determine the rationale behind the choice of certain thresholds. Furthermore, indicators using
199 measures of centrality were based either on averages (means) or medians, but none of the identified
200 indicators aimed to measure the dispersion of transmission risks between cases and contacts, which
201 is increasingly recognized as an important factor in the control of COVID-19 (20).

202 Our study was subject to several limitations. First, our search was restricted to English, thus
203 documents in any other language would have been missed. Second, we restricted our search to the
204 three known human coronaviruses with epidemic potential due to their similar epidemiological
205 profiles. Contact tracing indicators for other epidemic-prone infectious diseases were thus missed.
206 Third, we did not assess system-wide indicators, e.g. those relating to coordination across units
207 and/or levels, or governance. Fourth, we were not able to record the total number of websites
208 searched during our internet search, and could therefore only report the number of websites from
209 which indicators were included for this study (see Figure 1). Fifth, it is possible that there is
210 publication bias across indicator categories, with input indicators being underrepresented in
211 published or online documents compared to process and output indicators due to perceived lower
212 operational relevance by public health officials in charge of contact tracing systems. This might be

213 particularly the case for indicators that are more relevant at peripheral levels of health systems
214 compared to priorities at central levels. Sixth, though we applied a very systematic search strategy
215 for the peer-reviewed and grey literature, this was not a full systematic review and therefore did not
216 include or adhere to all items recommended for full systematic reviews (21). We did, however, follow
217 existing guidance for the rapid conduct of scoping reviews (9, 10) and report on all items of the
218 PRISMA-ScR Checklist (see Supporting Information File 5).

219 We provide the first comprehensive mapping of published indicators to assess the performance of
220 contact tracing systems during the COVID-19 pandemic. Our findings can assist countries to develop
221 new indicators for their own contact tracing systems or to complement existing lists of indicators.
222 Despite the recent development of several effective vaccines against SARS-CoV-2, contact tracing will
223 remain a cornerstone in the public health response worldwide until the very end of the pandemic (3).
224 The importance yet absence of comprehensive guidance on how to assess performance of contact
225 tracing systems across countries has been recognized (2, 5). The centerpiece of such global guidance
226 should be a set of core indicators that are widely accepted, operationally relevant, and easy to report
227 across contact tracing systems. This core set might even be useful in future epidemics with similar
228 epidemiological characteristics as SARS-CoV-2. The development of such a core set of indicators will
229 require a coordinated, methodologically robust ranking and consensus seeking undertaking, and our
230 study provides important insights to inform such initiatives.

231 **Conclusions**

232 Almost all identified indicators were either process or output indicators with a strong focus on case
233 investigation, contact identification, case isolation or contact quarantine. Important gaps in process,
234 outcome and impact indicators exist. Duplications, inconsistent use of terminology and unclear
235 choice for benchmarks were common. A universally agreed set of indicators is needed to allow for
236 comprehensive cross-system evaluations in order to improve the performance of COVID-19 contact
237 tracing systems.

238 **Tables**

239 **Table 1: Indicator types and topics**


Indicator type & thematic areas	Absolute number ^{a,b} (%)	Percentages, proportion or ratio ^b (%)	Time duration (%)	Total (%)	Indicator including benchmark (%)
Input				3 (2%)	
· Human resources	3 (7%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	3 (2%)	1 (3%)
· Financial resources	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
Process				102 (67%)	
· Case investigation	13 (32%)	21 (51%)	12 (29%)	37 (24%)	8 (21%)
· Contact identification	15 (37%)	21 (51%)	9 (22%)	44 (29%)	11 (29%)
· Contact testing	1 (2%)	19 (46%)	1 (2%)	21 (14%)	6 (16%)
· Contact follow-up	2 (5%)	6 (15%)	0 (%)	8 (5%)	1 (3%)
Output				48 (31%)	
· Case isolation	3 (7%)	11 (27%)	3 (7%)	16 (10%)	0 (%)
· Contact quarantine	4 (10%)	11 (27%)	10 (24%)	24 (17%)	11 (29%)
Outcome				0 (%)	
· Transmission reduction	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
Impact				0 (%)	
· Incidence reduction	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
TOTAL	41	89	35	153 (100%)	38

240 ^a including average number over specified time period

241 ^b multiple classification possible for type of measurement

242 **Figures**

243 **Figure 1: Flow diagram**



244

245 **Supporting Information Files**

246 Supporting Information File 1: Grey literature

247 Supporting Information File 2: Peer-reviewed literature

248 Supporting Information File 3: Included resources

249 Supporting Information File 4: Conceptual framework

250 Supporting Information File 5: PRISMA-ScR Checklist

251 **References**

- 252 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Case Investigation and Contact Tracing: Part of a
253 Multipronged Approach to Fight the COVID-19 Pandemic. Available from
254 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/principles-contact-tracing.html>. Last updated 3
255 December 2020; accessed 29 April 2021.
- 256 2. Girum T, Lentiro K, Geremew M, Migora B, Shewamare S. Global strategies and effectiveness
257 for COVID-19 prevention through contact tracing, screening, quarantine, and isolation: a systematic
258 review. *Trop Med Health*. 2020 Nov 23;48(1):91. doi: 10.1186/s41182-020-00285-w.
- 259 3. World Health Organization. Contact tracing in the context of COVID-19 – Interim guidance.
260 Available from [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/339128/WHO-2019-nCoV-
261 Contact_Tracing-2021.1-eng.pdf?sequence=24&isAllowed=y](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/339128/WHO-2019-nCoV-Contact_Tracing-2021.1-eng.pdf?sequence=24&isAllowed=y). Last updated 1 February 2021;
262 accessed 29 April 2021.
- 263 4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Contact Tracing. Available from
264 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/index.html>. Last updated 10
265 November 2020; accessed 29 April 2021.
- 266 5. Habrun C, Hill S, Ortega E, Teigen J, Moses L. A comparative analysis of COVID-19 contact
267 tracing guidance across WHO member states and regions. COVID-19 Knowledge Hub. Available from
268 [https://extranet.who.int/goarn/sites/default/files/A%20comparative%20analysis%20of%20COVID-
269 19%20contact%20tracing%20guidance%20across%20WHO%20member%20states%20and%20region
270 s_GOARNKHversion.pdf](https://extranet.who.int/goarn/sites/default/files/A%20comparative%20analysis%20of%20COVID-19%20contact%20tracing%20guidance%20across%20WHO%20member%20states%20and%20regions_GOARNKHversion.pdf). Accessed 29 April 2021.
- 271 6. World Health Organization. COVID-19 Strategic Preparedness and Response – Monitoring
272 and evaluation framework, draft updated 5 June 2020. Available from
273 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/monitoring-and-evaluation-framework>. Last updated 5
274 June 2020; accessed 29 April 2021.
- 275 7. World Health Organization, Global Outbreak Alert and Response Network. Online global
276 consultation on contact tracing for COVID-19. Available from

- 277 [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/online-global-consultation-on-contact-tracing-for-covid-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/online-global-consultation-on-contact-tracing-for-covid-19-9-11-june-2020)
278 [19-9-11-june-2020](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/online-global-consultation-on-contact-tracing-for-covid-19-9-11-june-2020). Last updated 22 January 2021; accessed 29 April 2021].
- 279 8. UK National Health System. The Good Indicators Guide: understanding how to use and
280 choose indicators. Available from [https://www.england.nhs.uk/improvement-hub/wp-](https://www.england.nhs.uk/improvement-hub/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2017/11/The-Good-Indicators-Guide.pdf)
281 [content/uploads/sites/44/2017/11/The-Good-Indicators-Guide.pdf](https://www.england.nhs.uk/improvement-hub/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2017/11/The-Good-Indicators-Guide.pdf). Last updated 30 November
282 2017; accessed 29 April 2021.
- 283 9. Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: a practical guide.
284 World Health Organization. Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: a practical guide.
285 Available from [http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/258698/9789241512763-](http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/258698/9789241512763-eng.pdf?sequence=1)
286 [eng.pdf?sequence=1](http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/258698/9789241512763-eng.pdf?sequence=1). Published 2017; accessed 29 April 2021.
- 287 10. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, Moher D, Peters MDJ, Horsley
288 T, Weeks L, Hempel S, Akl EA, Chang C, McGowan J, Stewart L, Hartling L, Aldcroft A, Wilson MG,
289 Garritty C, Lewin S, Godfrey CM, Macdonald MT, Langlois EV, Soares-Weiser K, Moriarty J, Clifford T,
290 Tunçalp Ö, Straus SE. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and
291 Explanation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018 Oct 2;169(7):467-473. doi: 10.7326/M18-0850.
- 292 11. Endnote, Clarivate, Philadelphia, USA.
- 293 12. Covidence, Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia. .
- 294 13. Sartorius RH. The Logical Framework Approach to Project Design and Management.
295 *Evaluation Practice*. 1991;12(2):139-147. doi:10.1177/109821409101200204
- 296 14. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Indicators. Available from
297 <https://www.cdc.gov/eval/indicators/index.htm>. Last updated 9 April 2021; accessed 29 April 2021.
- 298 15. World Health Organization. Indicators. Available from
299 <http://www.emro.who.int/child-health/research-and-evaluation/indicators/All-Pages.html>. Last
300 updated April 2014; accessed 29 April 2021.
- 301 16. UK Department for International Development. Indicators of Inputs, Activities, Outputs,
302 Outcomes and Impacts in Security and Justice Programming. Available from

- 303 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/304626/Indicators.pdf)
304 [/304626/Indicators.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/304626/Indicators.pdf). Published 15 October 2013; accessed 29 April 2021.
- 305 17. Derose SF, Schuster MA, Fielding JE, Asch SM. Public health quality measurement: concepts
306 and challenges. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2002;23:1-21. doi:
307 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.23.092601.095644.
- 308 18. Reeve C, Humphreys J, Wakerman J. A comprehensive health service evaluation and
309 monitoring framework. *Eval Program Plann*. 2015 Dec;53:91-8. doi:
310 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2015.08.006.
- 311 19. World Health Organization. Health Workforce Estimator. Available from
312 [https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/Health-systems/pages/strengthening-the-health-](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/Health-systems/pages/strengthening-the-health-system-response-to-covid-19/surge-planning-tools/health-workforce-estimator-hwfe)
313 [system-response-to-covid-19/surge-planning-tools/health-workforce-estimator-hwfe](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/Health-systems/pages/strengthening-the-health-system-response-to-covid-19/surge-planning-tools/health-workforce-estimator-hwfe). Accessed 29
314 April 2021.
- 315 20. Transmission heterogeneities, kinetics, and controllability of SARS-CoV-2.
316 Sun K, Wang W, Gao L, Wang Y, Luo K, Ren L, Zhan Z, Chen X, Zhao S, Huang Y, Sun Q, Liu Z, Litvinova
317 M, Vespignani A, Ajelli M, Viboud C, Yu H. Transmission heterogeneities, kinetics, and controllability
318 of SARS-CoV-2. *Science*. 2021 Jan 15;371(6526):eabe2424. doi: 10.1126/science.abe2424.
- 319 21. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for
320 systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med*. 2009 Jul
321 21;6(7):e1000097. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097.