

APPENDIX C2

Risk of Bias Assessment for modelling studies

Study information			Model structure	
Reviewer initials	Checked by	Study ID	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	1. Comments
Overall	MH/KB	Irvine 2020	No to minor concerns	transparent and well jsutified
Overall	MH/KB	Trulove 2020	No to minor concerns	transparent, but partly they seem very pragmatic
Overall	MH/KB	Hariri 2020	Moderate concerns	partly, the fundamental approach of the model remains unclear

2. Quotes	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective and scope of the model?
<i>We implemented a simple stochastic susceptible-exposed-infected-recovered (SEIR) model. In this model, individuals are initially susceptible (S) to COVID-19 infection and become infected and transition to an exposed class (E) at a rate dependent on the reproductive number, known as the R_0, and the proportion of individuals who are currently infectious (I). Individuals in the exposed class then transition to an infectious state (I) after a latent period and, finally, to a recovered state (R) at a constant recovery rate. The SEIR model and related variants support the vast majority of COVID-19 modeling studies around the world at present.</i>	No to minor concerns
<i>We used a stochastic Susceptible Exposed Infectious Recovered (SEIR) mathematical model to simulate transmission in this population [15]. To capture the potential variability of transmission possible in this setting, we simulated epidemics under three potential scenarios with different values of the basic reproductive number, R_0:</i>	No to minor concerns
-	No to minor concerns

	Input data	
2. Comments	2. Quotes	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?
assumptions are fitting to current state of knowlegde	-	No to minor concerns
assumptions are fitting to current state of knowlegde	-	No to minor concerns
different scenarios for different populations and transmissions respectively	-	No to minor concerns

3. Comments	3.Quotes	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?
-	<i>Drawing from the published estimates, we studied three scenarios ranging from a most optimistic to most pessimistic estimate of the R0 as 2.5, 3.5, and 7 for low, medium, and high R0 scenarios, respectively. The incubation and infectious periods were estimated to be 6.4 days [16] and 7 days [17], respectively.</i>	Moderate concerns
yes, see table 1	-	Moderate concerns
reported in table 1	-	Moderate concerns

	Validation (external)
4. Comments	5. Has an external validation process been described?
Parameters may not be 1:1 transferable, but the validity of the scenario in terms of its impact (what if this parameter would be present in detention centres) remains unaffected	Moderate concerns
Data is taken primarily from Wuhan outbreaks, which raises questions on transferability to crowded camp settings	Moderate concerns
Heterogeneity of populations not considered	Major concerns

			Validation (internal)
5. Comments	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	6. Comments	7. Has an internal validation process been described?
No process, most data relies on "real" data, but no external validation per se, especially related to covid data in detention	Major concerns	not reported	Major concerns
In author contributions "Validation" is listed, although ist unsure where ist reffered to. We rate rather moderate than major concerns.	Major concerns	not reported	Moderate concerns
not reported	Major concerns	not reported	Major concerns

7. Comments	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	8. Comments
not reported	Major concerns	not reported
In author contributions "Validation" is listed, although ist unsure where ist reffered to. We rate rather moderate than major concerns.	Major concerns	not reported
no information /not reported	Major concerns	no information /not reported

Uncertainty		Transparency
9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	9. Comments	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?
Moderate concerns	Three scenarios, a probabilistic linear approach would have been stronger	No to minor concerns
Moderate concerns	3 scenarios, a more probabilistic scenario would have been stronger	No to minor concerns
Major concerns	No confidence intervals for estimates, rigid approach with three scenarios	Major concerns

	OVERALL Risk of Bias:	
10. Comments	Judgement	Comment
Minor concerns as very detailed in the text which allows for replication	LOW	Overall, this study has a low risk of bias, although validation raises concerns, the model is well reported and Input data is appropriate
supplement provided and details in methods	LOW	Overall, this study has a low risk of bias, although validation raises concerns and reasonability of input data might be discussed.
Overall documentation, level of details and methods are not sufficient to allow replicability	HIGH	Overall, high risk of bias for major and moderate concerns exist in 8 out of 10 domains. Moreover the replicability of the model as well as the fundamental approach to the model is not sufficiently reported.