The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on influenza surveillance: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Article type: **Systematic review and meta-analysis**

S Sabeena[1], N Ravishankar[2], S Robin[3]

Short title: Influenza surveillance during the pandemic

1.Dr Sasidharanpillai Sabeena [1]

Independent Researcher

Allure Residency

Lalitpur, Bagmati Province

Kathmandu Valley

Nepal

Email: sabeenauthradam@gmail.com

2. Nagaraja Ravishankar [2]

Assistant Professor

Department of Biostatistics

Vallabhbhai Patel Chest Institute

University of Delhi

New Delhi, Delhi 110007, India

Email: ravi8133@gmail.com

3. Dr Sudandiradas Robin [3]

Research Officer

Manipal Institute of Virology

Manipal Academy of Higher Education

Karnataka, India

Email: robinnaturedoc@gmail.com

Corresponding Author name:

[1] Dr Sasidharanpillai Sabeena

Independent Researcher

Allure Residency

Lalitpur, Bagmati Province

Kathmandu Valley

Nepal

Email: **sabeenauthradam@gmail.com**

ORCID

First Author Name: Dr Sasidharanpillai Sabeena

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2099-9312

Dr Nagaraja Ravishankar

ORCID: https://orcid.org/ 0000-0002-9533-039X

Dr Sudandiradas Robin

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4340-9434

Abstract

Influenza activity was reported to be below the seasonal levels during the COVID-19 pandemic globally. However, during the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak, the routine real-time surveillance of influenza like illness (ILI) and acute respiratory infection (ARI) was adversely affected due to the changes in priorities, economic constraints, repurposing of hospitals for COVID care and closure of outpatient services. A systematic review and meta-analysis were carried out to assess the pooled proportion of symptomatic cases tested for influenza virus before the COVID-19 pandemic in 2019 and during the pandemic in 2020/2021. The study was designed based on PRISMA guidelines and the meta-analysis was performed to synthesise the pooled proportion of patients sampled for influenza surveillance before the COVID-19 pandemic in 2019 and during the pandemic in 2020/21 with 95% confidence interval (CI). The overall pooled proportion of symptomatic cases undergone influenza surveillance before and during the pandemic was 2.38% (95% CI 2.08%-2.67%) and 4.18% (95% CI 3.8%-4.52%) respectively. However, the pooled proportion of samples tested for influenza before the pandemic was 0.69% (95% CI 0.45-0.92%) and during the pandemic was 0.48% (95% CI 0.28-0.68%) when studies from Canada were excluded. The meta-analysis concludes that globally there was a decline in influenza surveillance during the COVID-19 pandemic except in Canada.

Keywords: COVID-19, influenza, influenza like illness, pandemic, surveillance

Title: The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on Influenza surveillance: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Introduction

Severe acute respiratory syndrome corona virus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) virus is genetically linked to deadly SARS coronavirus, which emerged in 2002 and disappeared within eighteen months. SARS-CoV-2 and influenza viruses affecting the respiratory systems have the same transmission route, and various control measures to combat the current pandemic mitigate the spread of other respiratory viruses such as influenza and respiratory syncytial virus[1]. The diagnosis of influenza cases was 99% lower in 2020 than in the previous influenza seasons.[2,3]

Influenza is a systematically monitored viral disease due to the ongoing threat of epidemics and pandemics. A network of laboratories known as Global Influenza Surveillance and Response System (GISRS) was established in 1952 to update the circulating influenza strain variation information. This system facilitates the prompt identification and implementation of preventive measures against impending influenza activity in the community. The changing priorities in infectious disease surveillance and resource constraints during the Coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19) pandemic have negatively impacted the surveillance. Many countries have witnessed a short-term interruption or delayed influenza data reporting.

Meanwhile, a study from Canada reported a drastic fall in the number of other seasonal non-SARS-CoV-2 respiratory viral infections, including influenza and respiratory syncytial virus (RSV)[4]. The surveillance data from the United States and Australia reported low influenza activity during 2020/2021.[5,6] Various public health measures such as hand sanitisation, face masking, social distancing, travel restrictions, working from home, school closures and changes in health-seeking behaviours contribute to in low influenza activity. During the early months of the pandemic, outpatient services and elective procedures were deferred worldwide in hospitals. Even after the relaxation of lockdowns, fewer patients with acute respiratory

infections attended the hospitals mainly due to the fear of getting infected with SARS-CoV-2 and transmitting it to elderly family members.

Surveillance is mandatory to identify and respond to early Influenza outbreaks of pandemic potential, and sentinel surveillance among a defined population provides data with the highest quality[7]. A steep drop in the number of influenza cases during the current pandemic was attributed to non-pharmaceutical public health measures, modified health care seeking behaviours and testing priorities. However, reduced population exposure might result in low immunity to the influenza virus resulting in a rebound activity in the coming seasons.

This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to evaluate the pooled proportion of patients sampled for influenza before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. This quantitative meta-analysis emphasises the importance of maintaining influenza surveillance during challenging times.

Methodology

This systematic review and meta-analysis were started after excluding registered or ongoing systematic reviews regarding the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on influenza surveillance in the PROSPERO database.

The study protocol was registered in PROSPERO database (CRD42021296702) and can be accessed at www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display_record.asp?ID=CRD42021296702. An electronic search of PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus and Google Scholar was carried out for the articles in English concerning the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on Influenza surveillance among humans between January 2020 and December 2021. The study protocol was designed based on Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines updated in May 2020[8]. The meta-analysis component was modified appropriately to synthesise the pooled proportion of patients sampled for influenza

surveillance before the COVID-19 pandemic in 2019 and during the pandemic among the catchment population.

1 Description of the condition:

Influenza-like illness (ILI): A case is defined as ILI if the symptoms begin within the past ten days with a measured fever of 38˚C or more, cough (respiratory infection)[9].

Acute Respiratory Infection (ARI): Some countries use ARI instead of ILI for surveillance of respiratory viruses, including influenza in humans.

SARI: A case is defined as SARI if the symptoms begin within the past ten days with fever (measured≥ 38□) and respiratory infection (cough) necessitating hospitalization[9].

2 Study Protocol

An electronic search of PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus and Google Scholar was carried out for all the articles published between January 2020 and December 2021 concerning the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on Influenza surveillance. The relevant articles in English involving human subjects were identified using search terms such as “impact” AND “COVID-19” OR “SARS-CoV-2” AND “influenza surveillance” NOT “vaccination”.

3 Inclusion process and criteria

Original research articles published in peer-reviewed scientific journals reporting the number of ILI/ARI/SARI cases sampled for influenza among the catchment population, as part of influenza surveillance at the sentinel, non-sentinel and diagnostic surveillance units before the COVID-19 pandemic in 2019 and during the pandemic were included. Observational studies such as cross-sectional and cohort studies reporting the number of patients screened for influenza among the target population were included. The studies reporting only the influenza positivity were excluded.

4 Data extraction

A validated proforma including the first author, year of publication, region, study design, number of ILI/ARI/SARI cases attending the influenza surveillance centres before the pandemic in 2019, symptomatic cases during the pandemic, and the target population of the study area was prepared. A three-stage selection process was carried out for the final inclusion of the studies. One reviewer assessed the titles from the records for the relevance for inclusion in the study (n=5384). Studies applicable to the review were moved to the second stage after excluding irrelevant topics and duplicates (n=155). In the second stage, the abstracts of the studies were obtained and were independently analysed by two reviewers (n=94). After reviewing the abstracts, full texts of studies were retrieved, which were scrutinised by two reviewers independently (n=55). The corresponding authors were contacted electronically if further interpretation was needed. Manual library searches for articles in peer-reviewed journals were carried out, and references of retrieved articles were reviewed to increase the search sensitivity. The study selection process was depicted in the PRISMA chart (**Figure 1**). The last date of the search was on January 31, 2022.

5 Risk of bias (quality) assessment in individual studies

To assess the risk of bias in individual studies (quality assessment), chosen after the abstract and content review, the National Institutes of Health checklist for observational, cohort and cross-sectional studies was used[10]. The studies with a minimum score of eight or above, seven, or five or less than five “Yes responses” were considered good, fair, and poor quality, respectively. For cross-sectional studies, question numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 11 were applicable. The responses to the remaining eight questions (6-10, 12, 13, 14) were marked as not applicable (NA). The studies with six “Yes” responses were considered good, and those with four /five were taken as fair. The studies with less than four “Yes responses” were

considered poor quality. The quality of the studies was assessed independently by two reviewers.

6 Statistical analysis

The meta-analysis was accomplished in STATA version 13.0 (College Station, Texas 77, 845 USA). The forest plots were constructed using metaprop package in STATA. A substantial amount of heterogeneity across the studies was expected as the included studies were observational. The pooled proportion of symptomatic cases of influenza-like illness, acute respiratory illness or severe acute respiratory illness presented to surveillance centres out of the catchment population before the pandemic in 2019 and during the pandemic was reported with 95% CI along with Chi-square statistic (Q statistic) and I^2 index to quantify the heterogeneity. The I^2 value ranging between 0% to 24% specifies consistency. I^2 values of 25%-49% imply low heterogeneity, and 50-74% point toward moderate heterogeneity. The I^2 value varying between 75%-100% is indicative of high heterogeneity.

7 Assessment of Publication bias

The egger's test was used to analyse the publication bias. Weighted linear regression with standardised effect estimate and precision were considered the dependent and independent variable, respectively. In the present study, the $\log_e$ proportion of patients under surveillance and precision were considered the effect estimate and 1/standard error of $\log_e$ proportion rate, respectively. Weights were allotted using the inverse variance approach (1/variance of the effect estimate). A statistically significant bias coefficient is the evidence for publication bias.

Results

1. Included studies

The nine qualified studies for the meta-analysis were from the WHO-European region, Canada, Japan, Germany, Italy, Spain, South Africa and the United States, comprising 448,423 symptomatic cases sampled before the pandemic in 2019 and 1,270,518 cases sampled during the pandemic in 2020-2021[2,7,11–17]. Except for one study from Spain, which did not specify the months during which cases were sampled, all the included studies were qualified as good[15]. As per the US-CDC influenza surveillance data, approximately 8-9% of the US population is under routine influenza sentinel-surveillance[18]. Meanwhile, about 1% of the total population in Germany and 2.5% of the total population in Spain are under sentinel influenza surveillance[19]. The comprehensive surveillance data from the WHO-European region was reported by Adlhoch et al[77]. The representative national network of primary care practitioners regularly conducts sentinel influenza surveillance among 1-6% of the WHO-European region population [20]. Hence, for studies with no information on the target population, 6% of the region's total population was taken as the target population [7,11,14,16,17]. The qualified study from Hokkaido Prefecture in Japan carried out non-sentinel surveillance of respiratory infection among hospitalised children below 15 years. The catchment population of children aged less than 15 was 11.4% of the total population[12]. Amongst the qualified studies, the number of cases under surveillance varied between 2128 and 508,533 before the pandemic in 2019. The highest number of symptomatic cases sampled were from the WHO-European region and Canada in 2019. The highest number of symptomatic cases sampled for influenza during the pandemic were from Canada, as shown in **Table 1**.

Compared to the pre-pandemic period, the two qualified studies from Canada tested more than double the number of ILI cases for influenza as part of sentinel hospital and laboratory-based studies[11,17]. Park et al. from Canada reported the proportion of cases under influenza surveillance in the whole of 2019 (before pandemic) and the entire 2020[11]. Meanwhile, another study from Canada reported the sentinel laboratory surveillance data during the three corresponding months in 2019 and 2020[17].

Our meta-analysis included data from sentinel, non-sentinel and hospital-based surveillance centres in the context of an ongoing pandemic. **As in Table 1**, the number of symptomatic cases sampled from hospitals was less than sentinel surveillance samples. Three studies enrolled cases as part of non-sentinel surveillance[12,14,16]. Even though all age groups were included in seven qualified studies, there was a discrepancy in the age groups enrolled for the surveillance.

Meta-analysis

The **figure 2** presents the overall pooled proportion of symptomatic cases undergone influenza testing before the pandemic in 2019 was 2.38% (95% CI 2.08%-2.67%). The **figure 3** depicts the pooled proportion of cases sampled during the pandemic in 2020/2021, which was 4.18% (95% CI 3.84%-4.52%). However, the pooled proportions of samples tested before the pandemic in 2019 and during the pandemic were 0.69% (CI 0.45%-0.92%) and 0.48% (CI 0.28%-0.68%), respectively, when the studies from Canada were excluded (**figures 4&5)**. As the I^{2-}value was>90%, high heterogeneity was observed between the studies and random-effects model was used for pooling[21].

Publication bias

There was no publication bias as the *p*-value for the bias coefficient was not statistically significant as shown Supplementary Table 1 (**Table S1**).

Discussion

Our systematic review observed a lack of data from the Middle East, South East Asia, Western Pacific and Latin American regions regarding the number of acute respiratory cases sampled for influenza surveillance before the COVID-19 pandemic in 2019. Meanwhile, almost double the number of symptomatic cases were sampled as part of influenza surveillance during the current pandemic in Canada[11,17]. The WHO European region testing a large number of influenza samples reported a decline in surveillance samples during the COVID-19 pandemic and the lowest number of influenza types and subtypes were noted since the establishment of GISRS in 1952.[7] In the US, the surveillance for influenza and the influenza test positivity rate declined by 61% and 98% respectively[2]. Similarly, the seasonal influenza positivity declined by 64% in China [22] and the sentinel surveillance of influenza was interrupted in the Lombardy region in Italy[23]. Australia witnessed consistently low influenza-like illness activity (ILI) since July 2021[24]. However, upgrading the established influenza surveillance system empowered the European countries for the monitoring of SARS-Co-V-2[25]. As per WHO, influenza surveillance and SARS-CoV-2 monitoring have to be carried out along with syndromic surveillance of SARI cases hospitalised during the pandemic. Case definitions specific to COVID-19/ARI/ILI/SARI have to be incorporated into the case reporting and sample submission forms[26]. A subset of SARS-CoV-2 samples have to be tested for influenza.

Countries in the northern hemisphere reported a fall in influenza cases during the influenza season spanning between October and April in 2020 [22,27–29]. During the regular influenza season in the southern hemisphere from April to September Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Chile also observed low influenza activity[14,30,31]. Upon systematic review, the studies from China, Taiwan, Korea, Singapore, Japan and Bangladesh reported low influenza activity during the COVID-19 pandemic[27,29,32–35]. Meagre test positivity rates for all respiratory viruses, including influenza and respiratory syncytial virus (RSV), were reported from Canada.[4] A recent study from Canada reported no influenza-related hospital admissions or deaths among paediatric cases aged 16 years and below during the 2020/21 influenza season [36]. China witnessed the lowest test positivity rates of respiratory viruses over the past decade during the current pandemic[37]. The test positivity was consistently low for influenza and human metapneumovirus with increased detection rates for rhinovirus, coronavirus, adenovirus, RSV, human parainfluenza virus, and Boca virus when the non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPI) were relaxed in China. There was a substantial reduction in detecting all types and subtypes of influenza in the WHO-European region during the 2020/2021 influenza season[20]. Due to the execution of strict measures to control the COVID-19, low influenza and respiratory syncytial virus (RSV) activity in South Africa was observed. Even though there was an increase in the detection rate of RSV with the easing of public health measures, the influenza positivity remained at very low levels[14]. However, an increase in the circulation of rhinovirus was observed in Canada, as in Japan and Turkey[38,39], which is often attributed to the greater environmental stability of non-enveloped viruses and greater efficacy of face masks in filtering out enveloped viruses.[40]

There was a significant disparity in the number of weeks during which the samples were procured for surveillance. Some studies included data from influenza season and few retrieved data from late winter. The data were based on sentinel, non-sentinel and hospital-

based surveillance in the context of an ongoing pandemic. Even though all age groups were included in seven qualified studies, there was a discrepancy in the age groups enrolled for the surveillance. Five of the nine qualified studies included data from surveillance centres with a defined denominator. Meanwhile, there were no well-defined catchment population for hospital or facility-based surveillance. The number of symptomatic cases sampled from hospitals was less than that of sentinel surveillance samples.

Even during challenging times, sustained surveillance of influenza-like illness is essential to evaluate the geographical extent and sudden changes in circulating influenza strains globally. Optimisation of vaccines to circulating influenza strains is possible only by ensuring consistent influenza surveillance of the catchment population. The sparse data on the genetic and antigenic characterisation during 2020/2021 results in insufficient information on the vaccine composition for the coming influenza seasons. An innovative, cost-effective and sustainable strategy is needed to concentrate on influenza surveillance at the human-animal interface as many emerging and re-emerging infections in humans, including 2009 Pandemic influenza (H1N1 pdm09 virus), Nipah virus, Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS Co-V) and SARS-CoV-2 are zoonotic.

Strength of the meta-analysis

This is the first meta-analysis reporting the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on influenza surveillance.

Limitations

Even though we limited the review to articles in English, very few studies were excluded for that reason. We could not include studies from Asia and South America because of incomplete data of cases tested in 2019, even after contacting the corresponding authors. Another limitation was the inaccuracy in the catchment population for hospital-based and

non-sentinel surveillances. Due to a lack of studies enrolling all age groups from Japan, one hospital-based study among paediatric cases had to be included for the quantitative synthesis.

Conclusion

Globally there was a decline in influenza surveillance during the COVID-19 pandemic except in Canada. A steep decline in the seasonal influenza activity in both northern and southern hemispheres was observed. There is a need to have resilient ILI/SARI surveillance even during pandemics like COVID19 to recognise outbreaks by novel respiratory pathogens of pandemic potential.

Funding: None

Conflicts of interest: Authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

ETHICS STATEMENT

The author states that this manuscript does not involve any misconduct such as plagiarism, forgery, tampering, improper signature, multiple submission, repeated publication, split publication, etc. The systematic review and meta analysis used published data in indexed journals. As such, ethical approval to conduct the analysis was not sought as this was a secondary data analysis which requires no approval. No data with personal identifier was used

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request (Dr S Sabeena, sabeenauthradam@gmail.com).

ORCID

Sasidharanpillai Sabeena https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2099-9312

Nagaraja Ravishankar https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9533-039X

Sudandiradas Robin https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4340-9434

Data available in MedRxiv: https://medrxiv.org/cgi/content/short/2022.03.31.22273236v1

References

1. Noor R, Maniha SM. A brief outline of respiratory viral disease outbreaks: 1889–till date on the public health perspectives. *Virusdisease*. 2020;31(4):441-449. doi:10.1007/s13337-020-00628-5

2. Olsen SJ. Changes in Influenza and Other Respiratory Virus Activity During the COVID-19 Pandemic — United States, 2020–2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7029a1

3. Rubin R. Influenza's Unprecedented Low Profile During COVID-19 Pandemic Leaves Experts Wondering What This Flu Season Has in Store. *JAMA*. 2021;326(10):899-900. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.14131

4. Groves HE, Piché-Renaud PP, Peci A, et al. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on influenza, respiratory syncytial virus, and other seasonal respiratory virus circulation in Canada: A population-based study. *The Lancet Regional Health – Americas*. 2021;1. doi:10.1016/j.lana.2021.100015

5. Health AGD of. Australian Influenza Surveillance Report and Activity Updates. Accessed December 6, 2021. https://www1.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/cda-surveil-ozflu-flucurr.htm

6. CDC. Weekly U.S. Influenza Surveillance Report. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published December 3, 2021. Accessed December 6, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/flu/weekly/index.htm

7. Adlhoch C, Sneiderman M, Martinuka O, et al. Spotlight influenza: The 2019/20 influenza season and the impact of COVID-19 on influenza surveillance in the WHO European Region. *Euro surveill*. Published online 2021. Accessed December 6, 2021. https://dx.doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.40.2100077

8. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71

9. WHO. Surveillance case definitions for ILI and SARI. Accessed December 6, 2021. https://www.who.int/teams/control-of-neglected-tropical-diseases/yaws/diagnosis-and-treatment/global-influenza-programme

10. Study Quality Assessment Tools | NHLBI, NIH. Accessed September 27, 2020. https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools

11. Park KY, Seo S, Han J, Park JY. Respiratory virus surveillance in Canada during the COVID-19 pandemic: An epidemiological analysis of the effectiveness of pandemic-related public health measures in reducing seasonal respiratory viruses test positivity. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(6):e0253451. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0253451

12. Fukuda Y, Tsugawa T, Nagaoka Y, et al. Surveillance in hospitalized children with infectious diseases in Japan: Pre- and post-coronavirus disease 2019. *J Infect Chemother*. 2021;27(11):1639-1647. doi:10.1016/j.jiac.2021.07.024

13. Oh DY, Buda S, Biere B, et al. Trends in respiratory virus circulation following COVID-19-targeted nonpharmaceutical interventions in Germany, January - September 2020: Analysis of national surveillance data. *Lancet Reg Health Eur*. 2021;6:100112. doi:10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100112

14. Tempia S, Walaza S, Bhiman JN, et al. Decline of influenza and respiratory syncytial virus detection in facility-based surveillance during the COVID-19 pandemic, South Africa, January to October 2020. *Euro Surveill*. 2021;26(29). doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.29.2001600

15. Larrauri A, Prosenc Trilar K. Preparing for an influenza season 2021/22 with a likely co-circulation of influenza virus and SARS-CoV-2. *Euro Surveill*. 2021;26(41). doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.41.2100975

16. De Francesco MA, Pollara C, Gargiulo F, Giacomelli M, Caruso A. Circulation of Respiratory Viruses in Hospitalized Adults before and during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Brescia, Italy: A Retrospective Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(18):9525. doi:10.3390/ijerph18189525

17. Lagacé-Wiens P, Sevenhuysen C, Lee L, Nwosu A, Smith T. Impact of nonpharmaceutical interventions on laboratory detections of influenza A and B in Canada. *Can Commun Dis Rep*. 2021;47(3):142-148. doi:10.14745/ccdr.v47i03a04

18. O'Halloran AC, Holstein R, Cummings C, et al. Rates of Influenza-Associated Hospitalization, Intensive Care Unit Admission, and In-Hospital Death by Race and Ethnicity in the United States From 2009 to 2019. *JAMA Network Open*. 2021;4(8):e2121880. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.21880

19. WHO/Europe. Influenza Surveillance Country, Territory and Area Profiles 2019. Published 2019. Accessed January 28, 2022. https://www.euro.who.int/en/countries/spain/publications/influenza-surveillance-country,-territory-and-area-profiles-2019

20. WHO/Europe. Operational considerations for influenza surveillance in the WHO European Region during COVID-19: interim guidance (2020) (produced by WHO/Europe). Published October 2020. Accessed January 30, 2022. https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/communicable-diseases/influenza/publications/2020/operational-considerations-for-influenza-surveillance-in-the-who-european-region-during-covid-19-interim-guidance-2020-produced-by-whoeurope

21. Sabeena S, Ravishankar N. Postvaccination prevalence of vaccine-Human Papillomavirus (vHPV) genotypes among the target population: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Medical Virology*. 2021;93(8):4659-4667. doi:10.1002/jmv.26968

22. Lei H, Xu M, Wang X, et al. Nonpharmaceutical Interventions Used to Control COVID-19 Reduced Seasonal Influenza Transmission in China. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2020;222(11):1780-1783. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa570

23. Grosso F, Castrofino A, Del Castillo G, et al. A comparative study between the incidence and epidemiological features of Influenza-Like Illness and laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases in the Italian epicenter (Lombardy). *Journal of Infection and Public Health*. 2021;14(5):674-680. doi:10.1016/j.jiph.2021.02.003

24. Health AGD of. Australian Influenza Surveillance Report and Activity Updates – 2021. Accessed January 24, 2022. https://www1.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/cda-ozflu-2021.htm

25. Rigoine de Fougerolles T, Puig-Barbera J, Kassianos G, et al. A comparison of coronavirus disease 2019 and seasonal influenza surveillance in five European countries: France, Germany, Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*. Published online December 5, 2021. doi:10.1111/irv.12941

26. Maintaining surveillance of influenza and monitoring SARS-CoV-2 – adapting Global Influenza surveillance and Response System (GISRS) and sentinel systems during the COVID-19 pandemic. Accessed February 16, 2022. https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/maintaining-surveillance-of-influenza-and-monitoring-sars-cov-2-adapting-global-influenza-surveillance-and-response-system-(gisrs)-and-sentinel-systems-during-the-covid-19-pandemic

27. Soo RJJ, Chiew CJ, Ma S, Pung R, Lee V. Decreased Influenza Incidence under COVID-19 Control Measures, Singapore. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(8):1933-1935. doi:10.3201/eid2608.201229

28. Suntronwong N, Thongpan I, Chuchaona W, et al. Impact of COVID-19 public health interventions on influenza incidence in Thailand. *Pathogens and Global Health*. 2020;114(5):225-227. doi:10.1080/20477724.2020.1777803

29. Kuo SC, Shih SM, Chien LH, Hsiung CA. Collateral Benefit of COVID-19 Control Measures on Influenza Activity, Taiwan. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(8):1928-1930. doi:10.3201/eid2608.201192

30. Sullivan SG, Carlson S, Cheng AC, et al. Where has all the influenza gone? The impact of COVID-19 on the circulation of influenza and other respiratory viruses, Australia, March to September 2020. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25(47):2001847. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.47.2001847

31. Huang QS, Wood T, Jelley L, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 nonpharmaceutical interventions on influenza and other respiratory viral infections in New Zealand. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12(1):1001. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-21157-9

32. Lee H, Lee H, Song KH, et al. Impact of Public Health Interventions on Seasonal Influenza Activity During the COVID-19 Outbreak in Korea. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2021;73(1):e132-e140. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa672

33. Cheng W, Yu Z, Liu S, et al. Successful interruption of seasonal influenza transmission under the COVID-19 rapid response in Zhejiang Province, China. *Public Health*. 2020;189:123-125. doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2020.10.011

34. Akhtar Z, Chowdhury F, Rahman M, et al. Seasonal influenza during the COVID-19 pandemic in Bangladesh. *PLOS ONE*. 2021;16(8):e0255646. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0255646

35. Sakamoto H, Ishikane M, Ueda P. Seasonal Influenza Activity During the SARS-CoV-2 Outbreak in Japan. *JAMA*. 2020;323(19):1969-1971. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6173

36. Groves HE, Papenburg J, Mehta K, et al. The effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on influenza-related hospitalization, intensive care admission and mortality in children in Canada: A population-based study. *The Lancet Regional Health – Americas*. 2022;7. doi:10.1016/j.lana.2021.100132

37. Li ZJ, Yu LJ, Zhang HY, et al. Broad impacts of COVID-19 pandemic on acute respiratory infections in China: an observational study. *Clin Infect Dis*. Published online November 12, 2021:ciab942. doi:10.1093/cid/ciab942

38. Watanabe Y, Kamioka Y, Seki M. Rhinovirus-Infected Patients in the COVID-19 Pandemic Period . *IDR*. 2021;14:609-611. doi:10.2147/IDR.S300001

39. Kıymet E, Böncüoğlu E, Şahinkaya Ş, et al. Distribution of spreading viruses during COVID-19 pandemic: Effect of mitigation strategies. *Am J Infect Control*. 2021;49(9):1142-1145. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2021.06.002

40. Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, et al. Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(5):676-680. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2

Table 1: Characteristics of the studies included for meta-analysis

S No	Reference (year)	Region	Study design	Sentinel /non-sentinel/ diagnostic units	Age group (yrs)	Catchment population (denominator)	Cases Sampled Before pandemic 2019 N(%)	Duration	Cases sampled during pandemic 2020-21 N (%)	Duration	Quality of the study
1	Adlhoch et al 2021[7]	WHO-Europe	retrospective observational	sentinel and non-sentinel	all	54,000,000	508,533 (0.94)	21 wks	450,147 (0.83)	21 wks	Good
2	Park et al 2021[11]	Canada	retrospective	Sentinel hospital and laboratory (RVDSS)	all	2,293,596	312,708 (13.6)	53 wks	617,535 (26.9)	53 weeks	Good
3	Fukuda et al 2021[12]	Hokkiado Prefecture, Japan	retrospective observational	hospital-based	0-15	615,600	4266 (0.69)	34 weeks July 2019 -Feb 2020	701 (0.11)	34 weeks July 2020 -Feb 2021	Good
4	Oh et al 2021[13]	Germany	retrospective observational	sentinel	all	4,992,000	3150 (0.06)	38 weeks Jan-Sept 2019	3580 (0.07)	38 weeks Jan-Sept 2020	Good
5	Olsen et al 2020[2]	US	retrospective observational	sentinel	all	29,000,000	49,696 (0.17)	25 weeks Sept 2019–Feb 2020	19,537 (0.07)	25 weeks March-May 2020	Good
6	Tempia et al 2021[14]	South Africa	retrospective observational	facility-based	all	3,558,000	5509 (0.15)	40 weeks Jan-Oct 2019	4601 (0.13)	40 weeks Jan-Oct 2020	Good
7	Larrauri et al2021[15]	Spain	retrospective observational	sentinel	all	10,000,000	4,369 (0.04)	Influenza season	4,753 (0.05)	Influenza season	Fair
8	De Francesco et al 2021[16]	Bresica, Italy	retrospective observational	hospital based	>18	75,600	2128 (2.8)	13 weeks March-May 2019	1628 (2.1)	13 weeks March2020-May 2021	Good
9	Lagacé-Wiens 2021[17]	Canada	retrospective observational	Sentinel laboratory Surveillance	all	2,293,596	66,597 (2.9)	13 weeks March-May 2019	168,036 (7.3)	13 weeks March-May 2020	Good



Figure 1: PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for updated systematic reviews which included searches of databases, registers and other sources[8]. The flow diagram illustrates the number of studies identified, screened, abstracts/full-text articles included/excluded for the systematic review and meta-analysis.



Figure 2: The Forest Plot of the summary effect size (Proportion of symptomatic cases tested for influenza among the catchment population before the COVID-19 pandemic) using random effects model amongst the target population. Squares indicate the effect size of individual studies and the extended lines denote 95% confidence intervals (CI). Sizes of squares imply the weight of studies based on sample size using a random effects analysis. The diamond data indicates pooled prevalence. Test of heterogeneity: $I^{2=}100\%$, *p*-value=0.00.



Figure 3: The Forest Plot of the summary effect size (Proportion of symptomatic cases screened for influenza among the catchment population during the COVID-19 pandemic) using random effects model. Squares indicate the effect size of individual studies and the extended lines denote 95% confidence intervals (CI). Sizes of squares imply the weight of studies based on sample size using a random effects analysis. The diamond data indicates pooled prevalence. Test of heterogeneity: $I^{2=}100$ %, p=0.00.



Figure 4: The Forest Plot depicting the summary effect size (Proportion of symptomatic cases tested for influenza among the catchment population before the COVID-19 pandemic) using random effects model amongst the target population after eliminating the studies from Canada. Test of heterogeneity: $I^{2=}$100.00%, *p*-value=0.00



Figure 5: The Forest Plot depicting the summary effect size (Proportion of symptomatic cases tested for influenza among the catchment population during the COVID-19 pandemic) using random effects model amongst the target population after eliminating the studies from Canada. Test of heterogeneity: $I^{2=}$100.00%, *p*-value=0.00