

Is SARS-CoV-2 elimination or mitigation best? Regional and disease characteristics determine the recommended strategy

Maria M. Martignoni ^{*1,4}, Julien Arino ³, and Amy Hurford ^{†1,2}

¹Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada

²Biology Department and Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada

³Department of Mathematics, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

⁴Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior, A. Silberman Institute of Life Sciences, Faculty of Sciences, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel

April 24, 2024

Abstract

Public health responses to the COVID-19 pandemic varied across the world. Some countries (e.g., mainland China, New Zealand, and Taiwan) implemented elimination strategies involving strict travel measures and periods of rigorous non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) in the community, aiming to achieve periods with no disease spread; while others (e.g., many European countries and the United States of America) implemented mitigation strategies involving less strict NPIs for prolonged periods, aiming to limit community spread. Travel measures and community NPIs have high economic and social costs, and there is a need for guidelines that evaluate the appropriateness of an elimination or mitigation strategy in regional contexts. To guide decisions, we identify key criteria and provide indicators and visualizations to help answer each question. Considerations include determining whether disease elimination is: (1) necessary to ensure health care provision; (2) feasible from an epidemiological point of view; and (3) cost effective when considering, in particular, the economic costs of travel measures and treating infections. We discuss our recommendations by considering the regional and economic variability of Canadian provinces and territories, and the epidemiological characteristics of different SARS-CoV-2 variants. While elimination may be a preferable strategy for regions with limited health care capacity, low travel volumes, and few port of entries, mitigation may be more feasible in large urban areas with dense infrastructure, strong economies, and with high connectivity to other regions.

Keywords : Elimination, mitigation, suppression, policies, public health, epidemiology, mathematical modelling, infectious disease modeling, importations, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, optimization, economy, Canada, epidemiology.

*Corresponding author: mmartignoni@mun.ca, maria.martignoni@seya@mail.huji.ac.il

†Corresponding author: ahurford@mun.ca

1 Introduction

2 During the COVID-19 pandemic, non-pharmaceutical Interventions (NPIs) greatly reduced
3 the spread of SARS-CoV-2 [39, 15], and include: travel measures, such as self-isolation, quar-
4 antine, and testing requirements applying to individuals arriving from other jurisdictions; and
5 community measures, such as physical distancing, gathering size restrictions, and business and
6 school closures, that apply to residents. However, these restrictions substantially reduced eco-
7 nomic activity, increased unemployment rates, and undermined social wellbeing [37, 73, 71].
8 As NPIs have substantial economic and societal costs, it is important to establish criteria to
9 adjust restrictions to control infection spread with minimal cost.

10 Canada is the second largest country in the world by area, extending from the Pacific
11 to the Atlantic to the Arctic Oceans with ten provinces and three territories widely differing
12 in their geography, population, and economies. Canada is also a federal state, with respon-
13 sibility for health care divided between the federal government, responsible for: regulation
14 of entry into the national territory; approval of medications and vaccines; the health of First
15 Nations living on reserves, the military, and inmates in the federal prison system, and with the
16 provinces and territories responsible for most of the remaining health care issues, including
17 the implementation of health policies, and entry to, and movement within, their borders. Ge-
18 ographic, economic and jurisdictional differences, as well as differences in health care capacity,
19 have driven broad inter-provincial variation in the type and timing of NPIs implemented to
20 limit viral spread [64, 18, 112], which has in turn led to different COVID-19 epidemics in
21 different Canadian jurisdictions.

22 Prior to the establishment of the Omicron variant in December 2021, the Atlantic provinces
23 (New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland and Labrador) and
24 Northern Canada (Nunavut, Yukon, and Northwest Territories) generally implemented a con-
25 tainment strategy [82] that resulted in periods of elimination of community infections [44]
26 consistent with an ‘elimination’ or ‘zero-COVID strategy’ [19, 10, 42] (see Fig. 1a). These
27 provinces and territories have relatively small population sizes [92], and in Newfoundland and
28 Labrador, for example, elimination was achieved through strict border control of few ports of
29 entry (through which travelers from the rest of Canada and abroad could enter the province),
30 contact tracing, testing, and rigorous restrictions to end community transmission when com-
31 munity outbreaks occurred [82]. In contrast, provinces with large urban centers, such as
32 Ontario and Quebec, may have implemented ‘mitigation’ or ‘suppression’ strategies, aiming
33 to flatten the epidemic curve and keep the number of cases below the critical care capacity,
34 with some community transmission [10, 29, 20] (see Fig. 1b). At times during 2020 and 2021,
35 these provinces reported high case counts [47], nearly reaching the critical care capacity in
36 December 2020 and March 2021 [22, 21, 31].

37 Whether an elimination or mitigation strategy is the preferable response to pandemic
38 threats has been matter of debate (e.g., [2, 99, 34, 56, 65, 75]). Early in the COVID-19
39 pandemic, countries implementing an elimination strategy were praised for obtaining better
40 public health outcomes, economic growth, civil liberties, and general population well-being [74,
41 10, 9, 40]. However, by late 2021, and especially with more people becoming vaccinated and the
42 spread of the more transmissible Omicron (B.1.1.529) variant of concern, most countries had
43 abandoned the elimination strategy [8, 26, 43], and the societal costs of strict restrictions were
44 increasingly highlighted [13, 68, 106]. These observations indicate that neither elimination,
45 nor mitigation is the indisputable optimal strategy, and that the preferred strategy may vary
46 regionally and change over time.

Box 1: Common errors and misconceptions that bias against recommending an elimination strategy

- Multiple studies have shown that travel measures do not have a substantial role when community outbreaks are occurring [7, 105, 101, 16, 24], which may lead to the misconception that travel measures are unimportant. However, in regions with no community cases, travel measures become critical to ensure that mild community restrictions can remain in place for a reasonable period of time.
- Recommendations have considered whether travel measures should be implemented [107, 24], but may have overlooked coordinated implementation of multiple components of a public health response. An elimination strategy might involve travel measures when there are no community cases, an aggressive containment response to community cases when they occur, and a plan to continue the elimination strategy only until the conditions for the implementation of the elimination strategy are no longer met, for example, when the population becomes highly vaccinated [74].
- International guidelines considered as best-practise in several countries [107, 108] are not necessarily applicable to small jurisdictions or remote communities with self-determination of health care (e.g., economically smaller Canadian provinces or Indigenous communities), which may bias against elimination strategy recommendations. While elimination may be unsustainable and economically damaging at the country level, in smaller regions an elimination strategy may provide benefits, for example, helping to protect health system capacity.
- Classic epidemiological models of community spread (e.g. the Susceptible-Infectious-Recovered (SIR) compartmental models, [54]) are frequently used to model infectious diseases, however these models are only applicable to regions implementing an elimination strategy when community outbreaks are occurring. Community spread models are not appropriate to provide reproduction number estimates from data describing travel-related cases, which report infection in individuals that did not acquire infection from the local community, and where the infected traveller may have been in quarantine or self-isolating since arrival. Indeed, the mechanisms that generate new cases when prevalence is low or zero are not the mechanisms that generate new infections in an SIR model, where it is assumed that infected individuals mix amongst susceptible members of the community. This limitation can be overcome, for example, by separately reporting travel-related and community cases, and by estimating the number of outbreaks, and then modelling each community outbreak individually [44, 91, 35].
- Results of stochastic simulations are often reported as means of an ensemble of simulations with community outbreaks starting on different days. The ensemble mean may show no elimination of infection, although elimination does occur for individual simulations. Therefore, the results of stochastic models (including agent-based models) should be carefully reported (e.g. [50]).

47

48 Infection severity, health care capacity, the efficiency of case detection, the vaccination
49 status of a population, and the economic and societal costs of NPIs have a fundamental role
50 in determining if an elimination or a mitigation strategy should be preferred. Many such
51 indicators are highlighted in *Guidance for a strategic approach to lifting restrictive public*

52 *health measures* [81] and other guidance documents by Canadian provincial public health
53 [83], the Public Health Agency of Canada [80], and the World Health Organization [108]. Yet,
54 lacking are quantitative descriptions that specify the relative importance and inter-relatedness
55 of indicators, and how these quantities combine to determine epidemiological quantities that
56 guide decisions.

57 A further issue that has not previously been highlighted, is that the most relevant epi-
58 demiological quantities for regions implementing an elimination strategy are different than for
59 those implementing mitigation or suppression. When a mitigation strategy is implemented,
60 travel-related cases make only a negligible contribution to epidemic dynamics [7, 105, 101],
61 and the infection dynamics are mainly determined by the pathogen spread rate within a com-
62 munity (e.g., by indicators such as the basic or control reproduction numbers of the infection
63 [27, 33, 53]). On the other hand, travel measures, including testing and post-arrival quarantine
64 or self-isolation, may be a more critical component of the combined public health response in
65 regions implementing an elimination strategy. In this case, other forms of assessment such as
66 the evaluation of the efficiency of travel measures, including testing and quarantine policies
67 [116, 97, 79, 96, 6, 91], and the probability of elimination under specific community NPIs
68 (i.e., capacity limits or school and business closures) for hypothetical community outbreak
69 scenarios [78, 14, 41, 35], are key to inform public health responses.

70 Due to these fundamental differences in the key quantities and modelling approaches
71 used to forecast the epidemiological dynamics of mitigation and elimination, it has been
72 challenging to develop methods that allow for a quantitative comparison of the two strategies
73 for decision-making purposes (see also Box 1, in which we highlight some common errors
74 and misconceptions when deciding whether an elimination strategy should be implemented).
75 Here, we identify key epidemiological and regional characteristics to evaluate whether disease
76 elimination or mitigation is desirable, and we outline criteria to guide this decision. We
77 highlight three main questions that should be answered to determine the circumstances when
78 elimination is a recommended approach (see Fig. 2). Namely, is elimination:

- 79 ❶ necessary to ensure health care provision?
- 80 ❷ epidemiologically feasible?
- 81 ❸ cost effective?

82 We discuss each of these questions separately, and consider which role different criteria may
83 play during an unfolding pandemic. Although our discussion mainly focuses on the approach
84 to SARS-CoV-2 of different Canadian provinces and territories, our conclusions have broad
85 implications that apply widely outside the Canadian context.




Fig. 1: Visual representation of (a) an elimination, and (b) a mitigation strategy and corresponding epidemiological indicators. When an elimination strategy is implemented, a community outbreak initiated by an infected traveler is detected after a time interval T_d . Following outbreak detection, strict restrictions to reduce the number of cases are implemented during the time interval T_e (red regions). Strict restrictions are released when the number of cases drops from I_{\max} to below a minimum I_{end} (green region). The time interval between the time of detection for two consecutive outbreaks is T_i . When a mitigation strategy is implemented, prolonged periods of moderate restrictions are enacted (yellow regions). Red persons correspond to community cases. Blue persons correspond to travel-related cases that infect individuals in the community (i.e., ‘spillover’). For simplicity, travel-related cases that do not cause community cases are not shown in the figure. Shaded cases correspond to hospitalized cases. The width of a person corresponds to the average duration of an active case and the relationship between incidence, prevalence, and hospital occupancy is investigated in the supplementary information, section A. (Figure adapted from [61]).

86 1 Is elimination necessary to ensure health care provision?

87 During the pandemic, in many countries a main purpose of NPI implementation was to ensure
 88 that the number of severe cases did not rise above hospital or Intense Care Unit (ICU) capacity.
 89 High pathogen transmissibility, high rates of asymptomatic cases, and low testing efficiency,
 90 are all factors that could cause a community outbreak to go undetected for several days. In
 91 regions with low resource capacity (e.g., jurisdictions with low hospital, contact tracing or
 92 testing capacities), the number of cases when the outbreak is initially detected may already
 93 have the potential to approach, or exceed, available resources for control and health care
 94 capacity [12, 102, 45]. This is particularly true of hospital and ICU occupancy limits, because
 95 due to the delay between exposure and hospitalization, and because hospital stays are often
 96 many days, peak hospital occupancy usually occurs weeks after the implementation of strict
 97 community NPIs and can be substantially higher than hospital occupancy at the time of
 98 strict NPI implementation. Thus, in these regions the implementation of strict community
 99 measures as soon as the outbreak is detected may be necessary to prevent hospital and ICU

100 burden, spurring the implementation of an elimination approach. This choice is accompanied
101 by the implementation of travel measures after the outbreak is eliminated, meaning that the
102 costs and disruptions of strict border control are outweighed by the benefits associated with
103 protecting the capacity of the health care system.

104 On the other hand, regions with higher resource capacity may be able to detect a new
105 outbreak before the number of hospitalizations reaches the potential to near the regional
106 capacity. In these cases, a disease mitigation approach consisting of moderate community NPIs
107 may be sufficient to ensure hospital capacity limits are not exceeded, and strict travel measures
108 may lead to unnecessary costs and disruptions, that could negatively affect the compliance
109 with other public health measures [115, 30]. Even when health care capacity is high, concerns
110 regarding pathogen variants that are highly transmissible or virulent, and uncertainty in
111 how cases will respond to interventions may justify the precautionary implementation of an
112 elimination approach (or a ‘wait-and-see approach’ [78]) rather than a mitigation approach,
113 in order to delay pathogen spread until more information is available, vaccines or therapy is
114 developed, or response preparedness is enhanced [46, 32, 1, 6].

115 In the supplementary information, section A, we present an illustrative model to determine
116 hospital occupancy from peak incidence, that can serve as a starting point to quantitatively
117 assess whether there is a risk of exceeding the regional care capacity. The model can also be
118 used to provide estimates for the detection time T_d (see Fig. 1a) between outbreak initiation
119 and detection, and for the corresponding increase in infection prevalence during this time.

120 Disease severity will also determine whether elimination or mitigation is preferable. The
121 occurrence of severe disease depends on characteristics of a population including the pro-
122 portion with different ages, co-morbidities, vaccination and immunity statuses, associations
123 between these variables, and where these factors may be heterogeneous within a population
124 [87, 100]. For instance, it may be reasonable to recommend a SARS-CoV-2 elimination
125 approach for regions whose populations have a high prevalence of co-morbidities, or a low
126 proportion of individuals vaccinated [5, 55]. On the other hand, a lower proportion of cases
127 requiring hospitalization arising from high vaccination rates, or the spread of a less severe vari-
128 ant, may reduce the need for an elimination strategy. The SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern
129 Omicron (B.1.1.529), for example, established and spread in Canada when a large proportion
130 of the population had already received at least two doses of vaccine, reducing the rates of
131 severe disease with respect to other variants (see vertical axis, Fig. 3).




Fig. 2: Three possible criteria presented in this manuscript that can be used to determine whether elimination or mitigation strategy is preferable, and key regional and disease characteristics and relevant quantities that should be considered to answer each of the questions. The meaning of the different parameters is shown in Fig. 1.

132 **2 Is elimination epidemiologically feasible?**

133 For elimination to be feasible, the duration of the strict restrictions needs to be balanced
 134 with a reasonable period when restrictions are relaxed to release the population from the
 135 adverse impacts of strict public health measures (i.e., the proportion of green zones to red
 136 zones in Fig. 1a needs to be high). This requires both that many weeks elapse between
 137 community outbreaks initiated by infected travelers, and that once the outbreak is detected
 138 strict community NPIs are implemented sufficiently rapidly to initiate the decrease in infection
 139 prevalence.

140 The probability that a travel-related case initiates a community outbreak depends on
 141 travel measures, infection prevalence in neighboring regions, pathogen characteristics, such
 142 as its transmissibility, airborne transmission, incubation time or testing efficiency [60, 86,
 143 111], community NPIs and vaccination levels [44]. The time before an outbreak can be
 144 considered under control (i.e., when the probability that further community infections may
 145 occur is very low) depends on peak incidence and on the effectiveness of the strict NPIs
 146 in reducing community transmission. Peak incidence (as discussed in 1) determines the
 147 approximate maximum from which new daily cases must decline, and the effectiveness of
 148 strict community NPIs determines the speed of the decline. The speed of the decline depends
 149 on pathogen transmissibility, and on the efficiency of contact tracing, testing, and isolation [39,
 150 90]. Thus, local socio-geographic characteristics, pathogen characteristics, and characteristics
 151 of the local population can make an elimination strategy more or less feasible from a purely
 152 epidemiological point of view, and this feasibility should be continuously reassessed given
 153 evolving pathogenic traits and compliance with public health measures.

154 When a disease is highly transmissible, outbreaks occur often, as prevalence may be higher
 155 in other connected regions, and as the virus spreads easily even when restrictions are in place
 156 [44], allowing only short or no periods of mild restrictions. For example, it may not have been

157 epidemiologically feasible to eliminate the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant in Melbourne, Victoria,
 158 Australia, even with strict NPIs. On October 21, 2021, Melbourne residents exited an 11 week
 159 lockdown because vaccination targets had been met, but at this time daily reported cases in
 160 Victoria were 2,232: the second highest that had been reported for any Australian state [49].

161 In Newfoundland and Labrador there were 10 months between the last reported case
 162 associated with the initial community outbreak (original SARS-CoV-2 virus) in March 2020,
 163 and the next community outbreak (Alpha variant) that began in February 2021 [82]. The more
 164 transmissible and virulent Delta variant was introduced into Newfoundland and Labrador in
 165 April 2021, and over the next 8 months several community outbreaks were reported in smaller
 166 regions across the province, with much shorter periods between community outbreaks than
 167 previously observed [82]. Nonetheless, elimination was achieved (and therefore feasible) in
 168 Newfoundland and Labrador for the original, Alpha, and Delta variants, but not for the more
 169 transmissible and less virulent Omicron variant.

170 In Fig. 3 (horizontal axis), we provide estimates of the average percent of days with mild
 171 restrictions between two consecutive outbreaks if an elimination strategy is implemented,
 172 based on the outbreak frequency experienced in Newfoundland for different SARS-CoV-2
 173 variants of concern. The number of days with mild restrictions depends on the time between
 174 outbreaks (i.e., T_i , see horizontal axis of Fig. 1a) and on the time needed to eliminate an
 175 outbreak (i.e., T_e , red regions in Fig. 1a), which is calculated assuming an exponential decay
 176 in infection prevalence when strict restrictions are in place, as explained in detail in the
 177 supplementary information, section B. We calculated that for $T_e < T_i$, the percentage of days
 178 with mild restrictions is given by

$$179 \quad \frac{T_i - T_e}{T_i} \times 100, \quad \text{with } T_e = \frac{\ln(I_{\text{start}}/I_{\text{end}})}{\gamma(1 - R_c)}, \quad (1)$$

180 and is equal to zero for $T_e \geq T_i$. The value of T_e depends on infection prevalence when
 181 restrictions are implemented (I_{start}), on infection prevalence when restrictions are released
 182 (I_{end}), on the infection recovery rate (γ), and on the control reproduction number (R_c).

183 The effectiveness of the same public health measures varies depending on the pathogen
 184 or variant considered, making different strategies preferable at different points in time. Ad-
 185 ditionally, as discussed in ❶, different COVID-19 variants can be characterised by different
 186 rates of severe illness, which also depends on vaccination rates. These considerations affect
 187 the risk of exceeding hospital capacity (Fig. 3, vertical axis).

188 Lastly, for an elimination strategy to be feasible it is not only important to achieve fast
 189 outbreak detection and implementation of strict community restrictions, but it is also nec-
 190 essary that strict measures are relaxed when they are no longer needed, because during an
 191 ongoing pandemic there remains a risk of disease re-introduction, and the population may be
 192 asked to comply with strict public health measures once again. The World Health Organi-
 193 zation defines an outbreak as over when two incubation periods have passed with no further
 194 cases reported (i.e., 28 days for COVID-19 [77]), however, a more precise approach could be
 195 to relax measures when there is a high probability that the number of cases in the community
 196 is zero [77]), and to consider how quickly the reported cases were isolated. Contact tracing
 197 efficiency and population compliance will affect when community NPI relaxation can feasibly
 198 occur [63, 17]. Thus, faster reopening may occur in regions characterised by social cohesive-
 199 ness, such as rural areas where ‘everyone knows everyone’, and where infected people and their
 200 contacts are easier to identify and reach [109, 59]. On the other hand, contact tracing might
 201 be impractical in larger and more densely populated areas making an elimination strategy
 202 more challenging to implement.




Fig. 3: Estimated average hospitalization per 1000 cases considering vaccination rates in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador (NL) at the time each SARS-CoV-2 variant was established (vertical axis) and estimated percent of days with mild NPIs between two consecutive community outbreaks if an elimination strategy is implemented (i.e., $100 \times (T_i - T_e)/T_i$ for $T_e < T_i$ and 0 otherwise, where T_e and T_i are shown on the horizontal axis of Fig. 1a). When high transmissibility does not allow for periods with no community cases between outbreaks, and when the risk of severe disease is relatively low, elimination is no longer feasible, and mitigation is preferred. Estimates used for producing the figure and their derivation are provided in the supplementary information, section B. [Adapted from [61]].

203 **3** Is it cost effective?

204 Discussing costs when it comes to fighting a pandemic threat is challenging, and there are
 205 trade-offs to be considered. Minimal public health restrictions may lead to many infections,
 206 hospitalizations, and deaths, while strict public health restrictions may lead to economic,
 207 social and psychological damages [73, 76]. Considering such costs involves finding a complex
 208 balance between medical needs, and social and economic freedom. This said, certain costs,
 209 whether social, economic, or medical, are unequivocally larger in some regions relative to
 210 others. When deciding if elimination or mitigation is preferable, an important consideration
 211 is the trade-off between the economic cost of implementing travel measures, which tend to be
 212 higher for a disease elimination strategy; and the costs of treating infections, which tend to
 213 be higher for a disease mitigation strategy due to higher number of infections [10, 110].

214 Travel measures, such as travel declaration forms and testing requirements that are veri-
 215 fied at arrival are less costly, and can feasibly be enforced, in regions with few ports of entry.
 216 The costs of requiring arriving travelers to quarantine or self-isolate are less in regions with
 217 low travel volumes, while the cost of reducing travel-related infections in Canada’s econom-
 218 ically larger provinces, i.e., Ontario and Quebec, are substantial due to the large volume of
 219 trade occurring across the inter-provincial and international borders [93, 94]. Travel measures
 220 may be less costly and more feasible in Atlantic Canada, where there are few ports of entry
 221 into most of the four provinces. Furthermore, during the pandemic, international arrivals

222 to Canada occurred mostly first into provinces outside of Atlantic Canada [84], with federal
223 travel measures applying to these travelers before onward travel, which may have substantially
224 reduced the risk of disease importation to Atlantic Canada.

225 The cost of treating a fixed number of infections is proportionally higher in smaller eco-
226 nomic regions, compared to larger economic regions, because of large differences in the size of
227 the economies (see horizontal axis of Figure 4) and relatively similar costs of treating infec-
228 tions. The costs of strict community NPIs, such as complete business closures, might also be
229 higher in economically larger regions relative to economically smaller regions. In Fig. 4, the
230 pre-pandemic number of international travelers arriving to Canadian provinces and territories
231 is shown versus their yearly Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2019. Areas characterised
232 by low GDP and low travel volumes, such as Northern or Atlantic Canada, might opt for
233 disease elimination to reduce pandemic costs by implementing travel measures to reduce the
234 risk of community infections initiated from travel-related cases. Additionally, due to the
235 lower travel volumes in these regions, elimination may also be more epidemiologically feasible
236 (see point 2). Economically larger provinces (e.g., Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, and
237 Alberta), might consider mitigation to be an economically preferable strategy.

238 Note that the linear relationship between costs, arrivals and GDP in Fig. 4 is illustrative,
239 and for decision-making this relationship would need to be evaluated for the specific situation.
240 For instance, the implementation of travel measures in regions whose economies strongly
241 depend on tourism can be very costly, especially if not well timed, and even when travel
242 volumes are small [88, 36]. The relationship between travel volumes and community outbreak
243 frequency may also be non-linear if efficient post-arrival travel measures (such as quarantine,
244 or self-isolation) are in place, reducing the likelihood of community outbreaks. Finally, the
245 relationship between the cost of treating an infection and the regional GDP indicators may not
246 be informative when considering that a much larger number of infections may be experienced
247 when implementing a mitigation strategy, whose relative cost in regions with higher GDP
248 may be comparable to treating a smaller number of infections in regions with low GDP under
249 an elimination strategy.

250 In addition to economic costs, social and mental health costs need to be considered when
251 discussing NPI implementation [2]. Elimination may provide more freedoms during periods of
252 mild restrictions, however, social interactions are substantially limited during periods of strict
253 restrictions, which may cause high occurrence of mental health issues, such as depression and
254 anxiety, or domestic violence [23, 25, 85]. Mitigation requires prolonged periods of moderate
255 restrictions that can be exhausting and negatively impact the population [37, 73, 71]. Social
256 and mental health costs of these two strategies are experienced unequally across population
257 groups. Different social and psychological stress levels can arise depending on personal living
258 situations, employment sector, gender, ethnicity, and social determinants of health [73], and
259 it is misleading to report only whether elimination or mitigation guarantees lower social costs
260 at a population level without also stratifying these costs for population groups. In many cases
261 social costs of NPIs are to be paid in the future, and it is only recently that researchers have
262 developed methods to determine the direct and indirect impact of NPIs implementation on
263 a population’s health and social functioning [114, 104, 57, 28, 69]. For these reasons, it is
264 premature to discuss which of elimination or mitigation may be preferred in terms of social
265 cost.




Fig. 4: Daily number of international travelers (averaged over April 2018 to March 2019, [93]) and 2018 yearly GDP [95] obtained for different provinces and territories in Canada. Mitigation may be recommended in regions with high travel volumes, as in these regions travel measures might be less feasible and more costly. Mitigation may be recommended in regions with high travel volumes, as in these regions travel measures might be less feasible and more costly. On the other hand, limiting the number of infections through the implementation of an elimination strategy may be necessary when the cost of treating infections is high compared to the regional GDP. Note that the figure is only intended to qualitatively illustrate a possible link between arrivals, regional GDP, and costs, and we acknowledge that the nonlinearity and interdependence between these factors can make these relationships more complex. The two letter abbreviations denote Alberta (AB), British Columbia (BC), Manitoba (MB), New Brunswick (NB), Newfoundland and Labrador (NL), Northwest Territories (NT), Nova Scotia (NS), Nunavut (NU), Ontario (ON), Prince Edward Island (PE), Quebec (QC), Saskatchewan (SK), Yukon (YT). Data for the Northwest territories (NT) for the same time period are not available.

Discussion

266

267 During the pandemic, the World Health Organization recommended a risk-assessment ap-
 268 proach that considers local epidemiology, public health measures and capacity, and contextual
 269 factors to determine if restrictions on international travel should be implemented [107]. Yet,
 270 quantitative criteria to evaluate whether an elimination or a mitigation strategy is preferable,
 271 and guidelines applicable to subnational jurisdictions, are lacking. We propose a concep-
 272 tual framework to guide the decision to implement an elimination or a mitigation strategy
 273 in response to a pandemic threat. We hope that our framework will inspire new modelling
 274 approaches, for example, by expanding on the two approaches described in the supplementary
 275 information, to support and regularly reassess this decision.

276 So far, the focus of many epidemiological optimization models has been to determine the
 277 optimal level of social distancing needed to minimize infections, and the socio-economic costs
 278 of interventions [11, 89, 51, 38, 3, 58, 113, 4, 70, 48]. However, as noted in [38], [50] and
 279 Box 1, common modelling formulations can produce highly erroneous results when applied
 280 to situations where infection prevalence can be zero in reality. Therefore, new mathematical
 281 tools are urgently needed to quantitatively optimize the trade-off between elimination and
 282 mitigation. We also emphasize that for proper quantitative comparison of response strategies,
 283 future modelling should explicitly consider a distinction between community cases and travel-

284 related cases, and include statistics that are relevant for the characterisation of community
285 outbreaks occurring when an elimination strategy is implemented, such as the efficiency of
286 border testing and quarantine policies and the probability of a traveller initiating a community
287 outbreak [116, 44, 91, 97, 96], the expected size of such an outbreak [78, 35, 41], the probability
288 that a community outbreak has been eliminated, such that strict NPIs might be relaxed
289 [77, 14, 72], vaccination strategies [62, 79] and elimination exit strategies [44, 63, 103] for
290 regions with low infection prevalence.

291 Our analysis supports the application of local, rather than global, public health measures
292 and responses [66, 64, 67, 52]. Indeed, large urban areas, as compared to rural and remote
293 areas, are characterised by dense infrastructure, greater accessibility to health care services,
294 stronger economies, and therefore different disease dynamics and implications of public health
295 measures. Previous studies considering the impact of travel measures to reduce the risk of
296 SARS-CoV-2 importation have been controversial [16], and the implementation of within-
297 state travel restrictions have been subject to legal challenges [98]. While some studies have
298 questioned the effectiveness of travel measures [7, 24, 105], others have emphasized their
299 importance [32, 46]. We suggest this disagreement may be due to overlooking the regional
300 context: for example, whether community spread is occurring (Box 1), and low health care
301 capacity, characteristics of small jurisdictions that may make elimination feasible, and the
302 relatively low cost of implementing travel restrictions as compared to treating infections in a
303 small economy (Fig. 2).

304 An elimination strategy can be implemented to maintain a healthier economy and less
305 restrictive social distancing in economically smaller regions with low health care capacities and
306 low travel volumes, and we present key regional and disease characteristics that can be used
307 to assess whether elimination or mitigation may be best. Estimation of the relevant quantities
308 (for example, by making figures similar to Fig. 3), and understanding the inter-relatedness
309 and relative importance of key quantities (for example, by modelling the relationship between
310 detection delay, the implementation of strict NPIs, and peak hospital occupancy, and the
311 expected proportion of days with mild to strict restrictions, as shown in the supplementary
312 information) is a necessary future research area to allow for a quantitative comparison of
313 elimination and mitigation strategies for decision-making purposes.

314 Acknowledgement

315 MM is grateful to the Azrieli fundation for the award of the Azrieli fellowship. MM, JA, and
316 AH were funded by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada-Public
317 Health Agency of Canada Emerging Infectious Disease Modelling Consortium. MM and AH
318 received funding from the Department of Health and Community Services, Newfoundland and
319 Labrador, Canada.

320 References

- 321 [1] Adeshina Adekunle, Michael Meehan, Diana Rojas-Alvarez, James Trauer, and Emma
322 McBryde. Delaying the COVID-19 epidemic in Australia: evaluating the effectiveness
323 of international travel bans. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*,
324 44(4):257–259, 2020.
- 325 [2] Lara B Akinin, Bernardo Andretti, Rafael Goldszmidt, John F Helliwell, Anna Pether-
326 ick, Jan-Emmanuel De Neve, Elizabeth W Dunn, Daisy Fancourt, Elkhonon Goldberg,

- 327 Sarah P Jones, et al. Policy stringency and mental health during the covid-19 pan-
328 demic: a longitudinal analysis of data from 15 countries. *The Lancet Public Health*,
329 7(5):e417–e426, 2022.
- 330 [3] Fernando E Alvarez, David Argente, and Francesco Lippi. A simple planning problem
331 for COVID-19 lockdown. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research,
332 2020. No. w26981.
- 333 [4] Marco Tulio Angulo, Fernando Castaños, Rodrigo Moreno-Morton, Jorge X Velasco-
334 Hernández, and Jaime A Moreno. A simple criterion to design optimal non-
335 pharmaceutical interventions for mitigating epidemic outbreaks. *Journal of the Royal*
336 *Society Interface*, 18(178):20200803, 2021.
- 337 [5] Elisha B Are, Yexuan Song, Jessica E Stockdale, Paul Tupper, and Caroline Colijn.
338 COVID-19 endgame: From pandemic to endemic? Vaccination, reopening and evolution
339 in low-and high-vaccinated populations. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 559:111368,
340 2023.
- 341 [6] Julien Arino, Nicolas Bajeux, Stephanie Portet, and James Watmough. Quarantine and
342 the risk of COVID-19 importation. *Epidemiology & Infection*, 148, 2020.
- 343 [7] Julien Arino, Pierre-Yves Boelle, Evan M Milliken, and Stephanie Portet. Risk of
344 COVID-19 variant importation - How useful are travel control measures? *Infectious*
345 *Disease Modelling*, 6:875–897, 2021.
- 346 [8] Australian Cabinet. National plan to transition Australia’s national COVID Response.
347 [https://web.archive.org/web/20220607095448/https://www.pmc.gov.au/national-](https://web.archive.org/web/20220607095448/https://www.pmc.gov.au/national-plan-transition-australias-national-covid-response)
348 [plan-transition-australias-national-covid-response](https://web.archive.org/web/20220607095448/https://www.pmc.gov.au/national-plan-transition-australias-national-covid-response), 2021.
- 349 [9] Michael G Baker, Amanda Kvalsvig, Ayesha J Verrall, and Newtown Wellington. New
350 Zealand’s COVID-19 elimination strategy. *Med J Aust*, 213(5):198–200, 2020.
- 351 [10] Michael G Baker, Nick Wilson, and Tony Blakely. Elimination could be the optimal
352 response strategy for COVID-19 and other emerging pandemic diseases. *BMJ*, 371,
353 2020.
- 354 [11] MT Barlow, ND Marshall, and RC Tyson. Optimal shutdown strategies for covid-19
355 with economic and mortality costs: British columbia as a case study. *Royal Society*
356 *Open Science*, 8(9):202255, 2021.
- 357 [12] Rachelle N Binny, Michael G Baker, Shaun C Hendy, Alex James, Audrey Lustig,
358 Michael J Plank, Kannan M Ridings, and Nicholas Steyn. Early intervention is the key
359 to success in COVID-19 control. *Royal Society Open Science*, 8(11):210488, 2021.
- 360 [13] Alicia Blair, Mattia de Pasquale, Valentin Gabeff, Mélanie Rufi, and Antoine Flahault.
361 The end of the elimination strategy: decisive factors towards sustainable management
362 of COVID-19 in New Zealand. *Epidemiologia*, 3(1):135–147, 2022.
- 363 [14] Tony Blakely, Jason Thompson, Natalie Carvalho, Laxman Bablani, Nick Wilson, and
364 Mark Stevenson. The probability of the 6-week lockdown in Victoria (commencing 9
365 July 2020) achieving elimination of community transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Medical*
366 *Journal of Australia*, 213(8):349–351, 2020.

- 367 [15] Jan M Brauner, Sören Mindermann, Mrinank Sharma, David Johnston, John Salvatier,
368 Tomáš Gavenčiak, Anna B Stephenson, Gavin Leech, George Altman, Vladimir Mikulik,
369 et al. Inferring the effectiveness of government interventions against COVID-19. *Science*,
370 371(6531), 2021.
- 371 [16] Jacob Burns, Ani Movsisyan, Jan M Stratil, Michaela Coenen, Karl MF Emmert-Fees,
372 Karin Geffert, Sabine Hoffmann, Olaf Horstick, Michael Laxy, Lisa M Pfadenhauer,
373 et al. Travel-related control measures to contain the COVID-19 pandemic: A rapid
374 review. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (9), 2020.
- 375 [17] Timothy Callaghan, Jennifer A Lueck, Kristin Lunz Trujillo, and Alva O Ferdinand.
376 Rural and urban differences in COVID-19 prevention behaviors. *The Journal of Rural*
377 *Health*, 37(2):287–295, 2021.
- 378 [18] Emily Cameron-Blake, Charles Breton, Paisley Sim, Helen Tatlow, Thomas Hale, An-
379 drew Wood, Jonathan Smith, Julia Sawatsky, Zachary Parsons, and Katherine Tyson.
380 Variation in the Canadian Provincial and Territorial responses to COVID-19. *Blavatnik*
381 *School of Government Working Paper*, 2021. Available: www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/covidtra.
- 382 [19] CAN-shield. Covid Strategic Choice. ‘Is it time to build the Canadian Shield?’ Website.
383 <https://covidstrategicchoices.ca/>. Accessed: 2021-11-18.
- 384 [20] Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), Montreal. COVID-19 News.
385 [https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/montreal-quebec-covid-third-wave-](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/montreal-quebec-covid-third-wave-vaccination-1.6006078)
386 [vaccination-1.6006078](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/montreal-quebec-covid-third-wave-vaccination-1.6006078). Accessed: 2021-05-05.
- 387 [21] Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), Montreal.
388 [https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/quebec-health-minister-covid-](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/quebec-health-minister-covid-hospitalizations-1.5847543)
389 [hospitalizations-1.5847543](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/quebec-health-minister-covid-hospitalizations-1.5847543), Accessed: 2020-12-30.
- 390 [22] Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), Toronto.
391 [https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/doses-moderna-covid-19-vaccine-expected-](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/doses-moderna-covid-19-vaccine-expected-arrive-ontario-today-1.5857207)
392 [arrive-ontario-today-1.5857207](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/doses-moderna-covid-19-vaccine-expected-arrive-ontario-today-1.5857207). Accessed: 2020-12-30.
- 393 [23] Joht Singh Chandan, Julie Taylor, Caroline Bradbury-Jones, Krishnarajah Niran-
394 tharakumar, Eddie Kane, and Siddhartha Bandyopadhyay. COVID-19: a public health
395 approach to manage domestic violence is needed. *The Lancet Public Health*, 5(6):e309,
396 2020.
- 397 [24] Matteo Chinazzi, Jessica T Davis, Marco Ajelli, Corrado Gioannini, Maria Litvinova,
398 Stefano Merler, Ana Pastore y Piontti, Kunpeng Mu, Luca Rossi, Kaiyuan Sun, et al.
399 The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19)
400 outbreak. *Science*, 368(6489):395–400, 2020.
- 401 [25] Jade Connor, Sarina Madhavan, Mugdha Mokashi, Hanna Amanuel, Natasha R John-
402 son, Lydia E Pace, and Deborah Bartz. Health risks and outcomes that dispropor-
403 tionately affect women during the COVID-19 pandemic: A review. *Social Science &*
404 *Medicine*, page 113364, 2020.
- 405 [26] Eva Corlett. New Zealand Covid elimination strategy to be phased out, Ardern
406 says. [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/oct/04/new-zealand-covid-strategy-](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/oct/04/new-zealand-covid-strategy-in-transition-ardern-says-as-auckland-awaits-lockdown-decision)
407 [in-transition-ardern-says-as-auckland-awaits-lockdown-decision](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/oct/04/new-zealand-covid-strategy-in-transition-ardern-says-as-auckland-awaits-lockdown-decision), 2021.

- 408 [27] Jonathan Dushoff and Sang Woo Park. Speed and strength of an epidemic intervention.
409 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 288(1947):20201556, 2021.
- 410 [28] Harry Ferguson, Sarah Pink, and Laura Kelly. The unheld child: social work, social
411 distancing and the possibilities and limits to child protection during the COVID-19
412 pandemic. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 52(4):2403–2421, 2022.
- 413 [29] Neil M Ferguson, Daniel Laydon, Gemma Nedjati-Gilani, Natsuko Imai, Kylie Ainslie,
414 Marc Baguelin, Sangeeta Bhatia, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Zulma Cucunubá, Gina Cuomo-
415 Dannenburg, et al. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce
416 COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand. *Imperial College COVID-19 Response*
417 *Team*, page 20, 2020.
- 418 [30] Axel Franzen and Fabienne Wöhner. Coronavirus risk perception and compliance with
419 social distancing measures in a sample of young adults: Evidence from Switzerland.
420 *PloS one*, 16(2):e0247447, 2021.
- 421 [31] Global-News. [https://globalnews.ca/news/7721656/ontario-icu-capacity-hospital-](https://globalnews.ca/news/7721656/ontario-icu-capacity-hospital-critical-level-covid-19/)
422 [critical-level-covid-19/](https://globalnews.ca/news/7721656/ontario-icu-capacity-hospital-critical-level-covid-19/). Accessed: 2021-04-06.
- 423 [32] Arnaud Godin, Yiqing Xia, David L Buckeridge, Sharmistha Mishra, Dirk Douwes-
424 Schultz, Yannan Shen, Maxime Lavigne, Mélanie Drolet, Alexandra M Schmidt, Marc
425 Brisson, et al. The role of case importation in explaining differences in early SARS-CoV-
426 2 transmission dynamics in Canada—A mathematical modeling study of surveillance
427 data. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 102:254–259, 2020.
- 428 [33] Julia R Gog and T Déirdre Hollingsworth. Epidemic interventions: insights from classic
429 results. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 376(1829):20200263, 2021.
- 430 [34] Christian Gold. Unclear conclusions on sars-cov-2 elimination versus mitigation. *Lancet*
431 *(London, England)*, 398(10311):1566, 2021.
- 432 [35] Nick Golding, David J Price, Gerard Ryan, Jodie McVernon, James M McCaw, and
433 Freya M Shearer. A modelling approach to estimate the transmissibility of sars-cov-2
434 during periods of high, low, and zero case incidence. *Elife*, 12:e78089, 2023.
- 435 [36] Stefan Gössling, Daniel Scott, and C Michael Hall. Pandemics, tourism and global
436 change: a rapid assessment of COVID-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(1):1–20,
437 2020.
- 438 [37] Emeline Han, Melisa Mei Jin Tan, Eva Turk, Devi Sridhar, Gabriel M Leung, Kenji
439 Shibuya, Nima Asgari, Juhwan Oh, Alberto L García-Basteiro, Johanna Hanefeld, et al.
440 Lessons learnt from easing COVID-19 restrictions: An analysis of countries and regions
441 in Asia Pacific and Europe. *The Lancet*, 396:1525–1534, 2020. Issue 10261.
- 442 [38] Elsa Hansen and Troy Day. Optimal control of epidemics with limited resources. *Journal*
443 *of Mathematical Biology*, 62:423–451, 2011.
- 444 [39] Nina Haug, Lukas Geyrhofer, Alessandro Londei, Elma Dervic, Amélie Desvars-Larrive,
445 Vittorio Loreto, Beate Pinior, Stefan Thurner, and Peter Klimek. Ranking the effec-
446 tiveness of worldwide COVID-19 government interventions. *Nature human behaviour*,
447 4(12):1303–1312, 2020.

- 448 [40] John F Helliwell, Max B Norton, Shun Wang, Lara B Akin, and Haifang Huang. Well-
449 being analysis favours a virus-elimination strategy for COVID-19. Technical report,
450 National Bureau of Economic Research, 2021.
- 451 [41] Shaun Hendy, Nicholas Steyn, Alex James, Michael J Plank, Kate Hannah, Rachelle N
452 Binny, and Audrey Lustig. Mathematical modelling to inform New Zealand’s COVID-19
453 response. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 51(sup1):S86–S106, 2021.
- 454 [42] Anita E Heywood and C Raina Macintyre. Elimination of COVID-19: what would it
455 look like and is it possible? *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 20(9):1005–1007, 2020.
- 456 [43] G. Ho. Zero-Covid strategy no longer feasible due to highly infectious delta variant:
457 PM Lee. [https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/politics/spore-must-press-on-with-
458 strategy-of-living-with-covid-19-and-not-be-paralysed-by](https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/politics/spore-must-press-on-with-strategy-of-living-with-covid-19-and-not-be-paralysed-by), 2021.
- 459 [44] Amy Hurford, Maria M Martignoni, J Concepción Loredó-Osti, Francis Anokye, Julien
460 Arino, Bilal Saleh Husain, Brian Gaas, and James Watmough. Pandemic modelling
461 for regions implementing an elimination strategy. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*,
462 561:111378, 2023.
- 463 [45] Amy Hurford, Maria M Martignoni, Paul Tupper, Caroline Colijn, Sarah P Otto,
464 Christopher McCabe, and David JD Earn. Travel restrictions and the Omicron variant.
465 2021.
- 466 [46] Amy Hurford, Proton Rahman, and J Concepción Loredó-Osti. Modelling the impact
467 of travel restrictions on COVID-19 cases in Newfoundland and Labrador. *Royal Society
468 Open Science*, 8(6):202266, 2021.
- 469 [47] Canada Health Infobase. Canada Health Infobase, Coronavirus disease 2019
470 (COVID-19). [https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/epidemiological-summary-
471 covid-19-cases.html](https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/epidemiological-summary-covid-19-cases.html). Epidemiology update, Accessed: 2021-11-18.
- 472 [48] Vito Janko, Nina Reščič, Aljoša Vodopija, David Susič, Carlo De Masi, Tea Tušar, Anton
473 Gradišek, Sophie Vandepitte, Delphine De Smedt, Jana Javornik, et al. Optimizing non-
474 pharmaceutical intervention strategies against COVID-19 using artificial intelligence.
475 *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11:1073581, 2023.
- 476 [49] R. Jose. Melbourne readies to exit world’s longest COVID-19 lockdown.
477 [https://www.reuters.com/world/asia-pacific/melbourne-readies-exit-worlds-longest-
478 covid-19-lockdowns-2021-10-20/](https://www.reuters.com/world/asia-pacific/melbourne-readies-exit-worlds-longest-covid-19-lockdowns-2021-10-20/), 2021.
- 479 [50] Jonas L Juul, Kaare Græsbøll, Lasse Engbo Christiansen, and Sune Lehmann. Fixed-
480 time descriptive statistics underestimate extremes of epidemic curve ensembles. *Nature
481 Physics*, 17(1):5–8, 2021.
- 482 [51] Markus Kantner and Thomas Koprucki. Beyond just “flattening the curve”: Optimal
483 control of epidemics with purely non-pharmaceutical interventions. *Journal of Mathe-
484 matics in Industry*, 10(1):1–23, 2020.
- 485 [52] Vadim A Karatayev, Madhur Anand, and Chris T Bauch. Local lockdowns outperform
486 global lockdown on the far side of the COVID-19 epidemic curve. *Proceedings of the
487 National Academy of Sciences*, 117(39):24575–24580, 2020.

- 488 [53] Matt J Keeling, Louise Dyson, Glen Guyver-Fletcher, Alex Holmes, Malcolm G Sem-
489 ple, ISARIC4C Investigators, Michael J Tildesley, and Edward M Hill. Fitting to the
490 UK COVID-19 outbreak, short-term forecasts and estimating the reproductive number.
491 *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 31(9):1716–1737, 2022.
- 492 [54] Matt J. Keeling and Pejman Rohani. *Infectious Disease Modelling*. Princeton University
493 Press, Princeton, NJ, 2011.
- 494 [55] Jackson A Killian, Marie Charpignon, Bryan Wilder, Andrew Perrault, Milind Tambe,
495 and Maimuna S Majumder. Evaluating COVID-19 lockdown and business-sector-specific
496 reopening policies for three US states. *Available at SSRN 3598744*, 2020.
- 497 [56] Michael König and Adalbert Winkler. The impact of government responses to
498 the COVID-19 pandemic on GDP growth: Does strategy matter? *PloS one*,
499 16(11):e0259362, 2021.
- 500 [57] Anastasia Kourti, Androniki Stavridou, Eleni Panagouli, Theodora Psaltopoulou, Chara
501 Spiliopoulou, Maria Tsolia, Theodoros N Sergentanis, and Artemis Tsitsika. Domestic
502 violence during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, &*
503 *Abuse*, 24(2):719–745, 2023.
- 504 [58] Thomas Kruse and Philipp Strack. Optimal control of an epidemic through social
505 distancing. 2020. Cowles Foundation Discussion Paper No. 2229, Available at SSRN:
506 <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3583186> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3583186>.
- 507 [59] R Ryan Lash, Patrick K Moonan, Brittany L Byers, Robert A Bonacci, Kimberly E
508 Bonner, Matthew Donahue, Catherine V Donovan, Heather N Grome, Julia M Janssen,
509 Reed Magleby, et al. COVID-19 case investigation and contact tracing in the US, 2020.
510 *JAMA Network Open*, 4(6):e2115850–e2115850, 2021.
- 511 [60] Dyani Lewis. Why many countries failed at COVID contact-tracing—but some got it
512 right. *Nature*, 588(7838):384–388, 2020.
- 513 [61] A. Hurford M. M. Martignoni. It’s not realistic to eliminate covid-19 in newfoundland
514 and labrador. here’s why’. Canada Broadcast Corporation (CBC) opinion, Posted: Mar
515 18, 2022, [https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/newfoundland-labrador/covid-19-here-to-](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/newfoundland-labrador/covid-19-here-to-stay-1.6384033)
516 [stay-1.6384033](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/newfoundland-labrador/covid-19-here-to-stay-1.6384033).
- 517 [62] Maria M. Martignoni, Proton Rahman, and Amy Hurford. Rotational worker vaccina-
518 tion provides indirect protection to vulnerable groups in regions with low COVID-19
519 prevalence. *AIMS Mathematics*, 7(3):3988–4003, 2022.
- 520 [63] Maria M Martignoni, Josh Renault, Joseph Baafi, and Amy Hurford. Downsizing of
521 COVID-19 contact tracing in highly immune populations. *Plos one*, 17(6):e0268586,
522 2022.
- 523 [64] Liam G McCoy, Jonathan Smith, Kavya Anchuri, Isha Berry, Joanna Pineda, Vinyas
524 Harish, Andrew T Lam, Seung Eun Yi, Sophie Hu, Laura Rosella, et al. Characterizing
525 early Canadian federal, provincial, territorial and municipal nonpharmaceutical inter-
526 ventions in response to COVID-19: A descriptive analysis. *CMAJ Open*, 8(3):E545,
527 2020.

- 528 [65] C Jessica E Metcalf, Soa Fy Andriamandimby, Rachel E Baker, Emma E Glennon, Katie
529 Hampson, T Deirdre Hollingsworth, Petra Klepac, and Amy Wesolowski. Challenges
530 in evaluating risks and policy options around endemic establishment or elimination of
531 novel pathogens. *Epidemics*, 37:100507, 2021.
- 532 [66] Sharmistha Mishra, Jeffrey C Kwong, Adrienne K Chan, and Stefan D Baral. Under-
533 standing heterogeneity to inform the public health response to COVID-19 in Canada.
534 *CMAJ*, 192(25):E684–E685, 2020.
- 535 [67] Sharmistha Mishra, Jennifer D Walker, Linda Wilhelm, Vincent Larivière, Tania
536 Bubela, and Sharon E Straus. Use and misuse of research: Canada’s response to Covid-
537 19 and its health inequalities. *BMJ*, 382, 2023.
- 538 [68] Madhavi Misra, Harsha Joshi, Rakesh Sarwal, and Krishna D Rao. Exit strategies from
539 lockdowns due to COVID-19: a scoping review. *BMC public health*, 22(1):488, 2022.
- 540 [69] Carmen Moreno, Til Wykes, Silvana Galderisi, Merete Nordentoft, Nicolas Crossley,
541 Nev Jones, Mary Cannon, Christoph U Correll, Louise Byrne, Sarah Carr, et al. How
542 mental health care should change as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic. *The*
543 *Lancet Psychiatry*, 7(9):813–824, 2020.
- 544 [70] Alex LK Morgan, Mark EJ Woolhouse, Graham F Medley, and Bram AD Van Bun-
545 nik. Optimizing time-limited non-pharmaceutical interventions for COVID-19 outbreak
546 control. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 376(1829):20200282, 2021.
- 547 [71] Krishnadas Nanath, Sreejith Balasubramanian, Vinaya Shukla, Nazrul Islam, and
548 Supriya Kaitheri. Developing a mental health index using a machine learning approach:
549 Assessing the impact of mobility and lockdown during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Tech-*
550 *nological Forecasting and Social Change*, 178:121560, 2022.
- 551 [72] Trung Nguyen, Mehnaz Adnan, Binh P Nguyen, Joep de Ligt, Jemma L Geoghegan,
552 Richard Dean, Sarah Jefferies, Michael G Baker, Winston Kg Seah, Andrew A Sporle,
553 et al. COVID-19 vaccine strategies for Aotearoa New Zealand: a mathematical mod-
554 elling study. *The Lancet Regional Health–Western Pacific*, 15, 2021.
- 555 [73] Coilín ÓhAiseadha, Gerry A Quinn, Ronan Connolly, Awwad Wilson, Michael Con-
556 nolly, Willie Soon, and Paul Hynds. Unintended Consequences of COVID-19 Non-
557 Pharmaceutical Interventions (NPIs) for Population Health and Health Inequalities.
558 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(7):5223, 2023.
- 559 [74] Miquel Oliu-Barton, Bary SR Pradelski, Philippe Aghion, Patrick Artus, Ilona Kick-
560 busch, Jeffrey V Lazarus, Devi Sridhar, and Samantha Vanderslott. SARS-CoV-2 elimi-
561 nation, not mitigation, creates best outcomes for health, the economy, and civil liberties.
562 *The Lancet*, 397(10291):2234–2236, 2021.
- 563 [75] Miquel Oliu-Barton, Bary SR Pradelski, Philippe Aghion, Patrick Artus, Ilona Kick-
564 busch, Jeffrey V Lazarus, and Samantha Vanderslott. Unclear conclusions on SARS-
565 CoV-2 elimination versus mitigation—Authors’ reply. *The Lancet*, 398(10311):1566–1567,
566 2021.
- 567 [76] Marco Pangallo, Alberto Aleta, R Maria del Rio-Chanona, Anton Pichler, David Martín-
568 Corral, Matteo Chinazzi, François Lafond, Marco Ajelli, Esteban Moro, Yamir Moreno,
569 et al. The unequal effects of the health–economy trade-off during the COVID-19 pan-
570 demic. *Nature Human Behaviour*, pages 1–12, 2023.

- 571 [77] Kris V Parag, Benjamin J Cowling, and Christl A Donnelly. Deciphering early-warning
572 signals of SARS-CoV-2 elimination and resurgence from limited data at multiple scales.
573 *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 18(185):20210569, 2021.
- 574 [78] Michael J Plank. Minimising the use of costly control measures in an epidemic elimi-
575 nation strategy: A simple mathematical model. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 351:108885,
576 2022.
- 577 [79] Michael J Plank, Rachelle N Binny, Shaun C Hendy, Audrey Lustig, and Kannan Rid-
578 ings. Vaccination and testing of the border workforce for COVID-19 and risk of com-
579 munity outbreaks: a modelling study. *Royal Society Open Science*, 8(9):210686, 2021.
- 580 [80] Public Health Agency of Canada. Federal, Provincial, Territorial Pub-
581 lic Health Response Plan for Ongoing Management of COVID-19.
582 [https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/2019-novel-coronavirus-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/2019-novel-coronavirus-infection/guidance-documents/federal-provincial-territorial-public-health-response-plan-ongoing-management-covid-19.html)
583 [infection/guidance-documents/federal-provincial-territorial-public-health-response-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/2019-novel-coronavirus-infection/guidance-documents/federal-provincial-territorial-public-health-response-plan-ongoing-management-covid-19.html)
584 [plan-ongoing-management-covid-19.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/2019-novel-coronavirus-infection/guidance-documents/federal-provincial-territorial-public-health-response-plan-ongoing-management-covid-19.html), 2022.
- 585 [81] Public Health Agency of Canada. Guidance for a strategic approach to lift-
586 ing restrictive public health measures. [https://www.canada.ca/en/public-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/2019-novel-coronavirus-infection/guidance-documents/lifting-public-health-measures.html)
587 [health/services/diseases/2019-novel-coronavirus-infection/guidance-documents/lifting-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/2019-novel-coronavirus-infection/guidance-documents/lifting-public-health-measures.html)
588 [public-health-measures.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/2019-novel-coronavirus-infection/guidance-documents/lifting-public-health-measures.html), 2022.
- 589 [82] Public Health, Newfoundland and Labrador. Report to the
590 House of Assembly on the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency.
591 [https://www.assembly.nl.ca/business/electronicdocuments/ReporttoHOACCOVID-](https://www.assembly.nl.ca/business/electronicdocuments/ReporttoHOACCOVID-19PublicHealthEmergency2022.pdf)
592 [19PublicHealthEmergency2022.pdf](https://www.assembly.nl.ca/business/electronicdocuments/ReporttoHOACCOVID-19PublicHealthEmergency2022.pdf), 2022.
- 593 [83] Public Health Ontario. Jurisdictional Scan of Frameworks and Epidemi-
594 ologic Indicators to Inform Public Health Measures during COVID-19.
595 [https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/documents/ncov/he/2020/12/covid-](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/documents/ncov/he/2020/12/covid-19-jurisdictional-scan-epi-indicators-public-health.pdf?la=en)
596 [19-jurisdictional-scan-epi-indicators-public-health.pdf?la=en](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/documents/ncov/he/2020/12/covid-19-jurisdictional-scan-epi-indicators-public-health.pdf?la=en), 2020.
- 597 [84] Public Safety Canada. Timeline – CBSA Border Measures.
598 [https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/trnsprnc/brfng-mtrls/prlmntry-](https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/trnsprnc/brfng-mtrls/prlmntry-bndrs/20210907/05-en.aspx)
599 [bndrs/20210907/05-en.aspx](https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/trnsprnc/brfng-mtrls/prlmntry-bndrs/20210907/05-en.aspx). Date: April 23, 2021.
- 600 [85] Oliver Robinson. COVID-19 lockdown policies: An interdisciplinary review. *Available*
601 *at SSRN 3782395*, 2021.
- 602 [86] Bertrand R Rowe, André Canosa, Amina Meslem, and Frantz Rowe. Increased airborne
603 transmission of COVID-19 with new variants, implications for health policies. *Building*
604 *and environment*, 219:109132, 2022.
- 605 [87] Clark D Russell, Nazir I Lone, and J Kenneth Baillie. Comorbidities, multimorbidity
606 and COVID-19. *Nature medicine*, 29(2):334–343, 2023.
- 607 [88] Siamak Seyfi, C Michael Hall, and Bardia Shabani. COVID-19 and international travel
608 restrictions: the geopolitics of health and tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 25(1):357–373,
609 2023.
- 610 [89] Oluwaseun Sharomi and Tufail Malik. Optimal control in epidemiology. *Annals of*
611 *Operations Research*, 251:55–71, 2017.

- 612 [90] Kristian Soltesz, Fredrik Gustafsson, Toomas Timpka, Joakim Jaldén, Carl Jidling,
613 Albin Heimerson, Thomas B Schön, Armin Spreco, Joakim Ekberg, Örjan Dahlström,
614 et al. The effect of interventions on COVID-19. *Nature*, 588(7839):E26–E28, 2020.
- 615 [91] Emma Southall, Z Ogi-Gittins, AR Kaye, WS Hart, FA Lovell-Read, and RN Thompson.
616 A practical guide to mathematical methods for estimating infectious disease outbreak
617 risks. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, page 111417, 2023.
- 618 [92] Statistics Canada. 2016 Census. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-316-
619 X2016001. Ottawa. Released November 29, 2017. [https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-
620 recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E](https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E). Accessed November 15, 2021.
- 621 [93] Statistics Canada. Table 24-10-0041-01 International travellers entering or returning to
622 Canada, by type of transport DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25318/2410004101-eng>.
- 623 [94] Statistics Canada. Table 12-10-0088-01 Interprovincial and international trade flows,
624 basic prices, summary level (x 1,000,000), DOI: [https://doi.org/10.25318/1210008801-
625 eng](https://doi.org/10.25318/1210008801-eng).
- 626 [95] Statistics Canada. Table 36-10-0402-02 Gross domestic product (GDP) at basic prices,
627 by industry, provinces and territories, growth rates (x 1,000,000).
- 628 [96] Nicholas Steyn, Audrey Lustig, Shaun C Hendy, Rachelle N Binny, and Michael J
629 Plank. Effect of vaccination, border testing, and quarantine requirements on the risk of
630 COVID-19 in New Zealand: A modelling study. *Infectious Disease Modelling*, 7(1):184–
631 198, 2022.
- 632 [97] Nicholas Steyn, Michael J Plank, Alex James, Rachelle N Binny, Shaun C Hendy, and
633 Audrey Lustig. Managing the risk of a COVID-19 outbreak from border arrivals. *Journal
634 of the Royal Society Interface*, 18(177):20210063, 2021.
- 635 [98] David M Studdert, Mark A Hall, and Michelle M Mello. Partitioning the curve–
636 interstate travel restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic. *New England Journal
637 of Medicine*, 383(13):e83, 2020.
- 638 [99] Zhaohui Su, Ali Cheshmehzangi, Dean McDonnell, Junaid Ahmad, Sabina Šegalo, Yu-
639 Tao Xiang, and Claudimar Pereira da Veiga. The advantages of the zero-COVID-19
640 strategy. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 19(14):8767,
641 2022.
- 642 [100] Bhaskar Thakur, Pallavi Dubey, Joseph Benitez, Joshua P Torres, Sireesha Reddy,
643 Navkiran Shokar, Koko Aung, Debabrata Mukherjee, and Alok Kumar Dwivedi. A
644 systematic review and meta-analysis of geographic differences in comorbidities and as-
645 sociated severity and mortality among individuals with COVID-19. *Scientific reports*,
646 11(1):8562, 2021.
- 647 [101] Gianpaolo Scalia Tomba and Jacco Wallinga. A simple explanation for the low impact of
648 border control as a countermeasure to the spread of an infectious disease. *Mathematical
649 Biosciences*, 214(1-2):70–72, 2008.
- 650 [102] Paul Tupper, Sarah P Otto, and Caroline Colijn. Fundamental limitations of contact
651 tracing for COVID-19. *Facets*, 6(1):1993–2001, 2021.

- 652 [103] Giorgia Vattiato, Audrey Lustig, Oliver Maclaren, Rachelle N Binny, Shaun C Hendy,
653 Emily Harvey, Dion O’Neale, and Michael J Plank. Modelling Aotearoa New Zealand’s
654 COVID-19 protection framework and the transition away from the elimination strategy.
655 *Royal Society Open Science*, 10(2):220766, 2023.
- 656 [104] Jianghao Wang, Yichun Fan, Juan Palacios, Yuchen Chai, Nicolas Guetta-Jeanrenaud,
657 Nick Obradovich, Chenghu Zhou, and Siqi Zheng. Global evidence of expressed senti-
658 ment alterations during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 6(3):349–
659 358, 2022.
- 660 [105] Chad R Wells, Pratha Sah, Seyed M Moghadas, Abhishek Pandey, Affan Shoukat,
661 Yaning Wang, Zheng Wang, Lauren A Meyers, Burton H Singer, and Alison P Galvani.
662 Impact of international travel and border control measures on the global spread of the
663 novel 2019 coronavirus outbreak. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
664 117(13):7504–7509, 2020.
- 665 [106] Shuk-Ching Wong, Albert Ka-Wing Au, Hong Chen, Lithia Lai-Ha Yuen, Xin Li,
666 David Christopher Lung, Allen Wing-Ho Chu, Jonathan Daniel Ip, Wan-Mui Chan,
667 Hoi-Wah Tsoi, et al. Transmission of Omicron (B. 1.1. 529)-SARS-CoV-2 Variant of
668 Concern in a designated quarantine hotel for travelers: a challenge of elimination strat-
669 egy of COVID-19. *The Lancet Regional Health–Western Pacific*, 18, 2022.
- 670 [107] World Health Organization. Public health considerations while resuming
671 international travel, <https://www.who.int/news-room/articles-detail/public-health-considerations-while-resuming-international-travel>, 30 Jul 2020.
672
- 673 [108] World Health Organization. Chapter 4 National pandemic influenza risk as-
674 sessment in Pandemic influenza risk management: a WHO guide to inform
675 and harmonize national and international pandemic preparedness and response.
676 <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/259893>. License: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO, 2017.
- 677 [109] World Health Organization and others. Operational guide for engaging communities in
678 contact tracing, 28 may 2021. Technical report, World Health Organization, 2021.
- 679 [110] Shishi Wu, Rachel Neill, Chuan De Foo, Alvin Qijia Chua, Anne-Sophie Jung, Victoria
680 Haldane, Salma M Abdalla, Wei-jie Guan, Sudhvir Singh, Anders Nordström, et al.
681 Aggressive containment, suppression, and mitigation of covid-19: lessons learnt from
682 eight countries. *bmj*, 375, 2021.
- 683 [111] Yu Wu, Liangyu Kang, Zirui Guo, Jue Liu, Min Liu, and Wannian Liang. Incubation
684 period of COVID-19 caused by unique SARS-CoV-2 strains: a systematic review and
685 meta-analysis. *JAMA network open*, 5(8):e2228008–e2228008, 2022.
- 686 [112] Yiqing Xia, Jorge Luis Flores Anato, Caroline Colijin, Naveed Janjua, Michael Ot-
687 terstatter, Mike Irvine, Tyler Williamson, Marie B Varughese, Michael Li, Nathaniel
688 Osgood, et al. Canada’s Provincial Covid-19 Pandemic Modelling Efforts: A Review of
689 Mathematical Models and Their Impacts on the Responses. 2023.
- 690 [113] Haoxiang Yang, Özge Sürer, Daniel Duque, David P Morton, Bismark Singh, Spencer J
691 Fox, Remy Pasco, Kelly Pierce, Paul Rathouz, Victoria Valencia, et al. Design of
692 COVID-19 staged alert systems to ensure healthcare capacity with minimal closures.
693 *Nature Communications*, 12(1):1–7, 2021.

- 694 [114] Kai Yuan, Yi-Miao Gong, Lin Liu, Yan-Kun Sun, Shan-Shan Tian, Yi-Jie Wang,
695 Yi Zhong, An-Yi Zhang, Si-Zhen Su, Xiao-Xing Liu, et al. Prevalence of posttraumatic
696 stress disorder after infectious disease pandemics in the twenty-first century, including
697 COVID-19: a meta-analysis and systematic review. *Molecular psychiatry*, 26(9):4982–
698 4998, 2021.
- 699 [115] Ricci P H Yue, Bobo HP Lau, Cecilia LW Chan, and Siu-Man Ng. Risk perception
700 as a double-edged sword in policy compliance in COVID-19 pandemic? A two-phase
701 evaluation from Hong Kong. *Journal of Risk Research*, 25(9):1131–1145, 2022.
- 702 [116] Cameron Zachreson, Freya M Shearer, David J Price, Michael J Lydeamore, Jodie
703 McVernon, James McCaw, and Nicholas Geard. COVID-19 in low-tolerance border
704 quarantine systems: Impact of the Delta variant of SARS-CoV-2. *Science Advances*,
705 8(14):eabm3624, 2022.