

A retrospective study of the effects of COVID-19 Non-pharmaceutical interventions on Influenza in Canada.

Matthew I Betti^{a,b,*}, Heather MacTavish^a, Kenzie MacIntyre^a, and Paniz Zadeh^a

^aMount Allison University, Sackville, Canada; ^bCentre for Disease Modeling, Toronto, Canada; * corresponding author

This manuscript was compiled on February 14, 2024

1 **The COVID-19 pandemic had a significant impact on endemic respiratory illnesses. Through behavioural changes in populations and**
2 **government policy, mainly through non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), Canada saw historic lows in the number of Influenza A cases**
3 **from 2020 through 2022. In this study, we use historical influenza A data for Canada and three provincial jurisdictions within Canada: Ontario,**
4 **Quebec and Alberta to quantify the effects of these NPIs on influenza A. We aim to see which base parameters and derived parameters of**
5 **an SIR model are most affected by NPIs. We find that the effective population size is the main driver of change, and discuss how these**
6 **retrospective estimates can be used for future forecasting.**

Influenza | COVID-19 | Non-pharmaceutical Interventions |

1. Introduction

2 The COVID-19 pandemic had a substantial impact on every facet of daily life around the world. In Canada, the non-
3 pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) put in place for much of the time period beginning around March 2020 to approximately
4 the end of 2022 had a profound impact on other endemic respiratory infections.

5 Beginning in March 2020, jurisdictions across Canada experienced a variety of measures that could impact the spread of
6 airborne infectious diseases. These measures included lockdowns (1, 2), masking (both on a personal and institutional level
7 (3, 4), and social distancing (5). While adherence, enforcement and austerity of these measures in Canada differed by province
8 (6), they left a measurable effect on seasonal Influenza.

9 Almost immediately, as NPIs took hold a measurable effect was seen on Influenza testing as reported by FluWatch (7). In
10 fact, it is possible that one of the two major lineages of Influenza B may have been driven to extinction through COVID-19
11 and associated NPIs (8). In this study, we hope to measure the qualitative and quantitative effects of NPIs on Influenza A and
12 B in Canada.

13 Influenza has long and thoroughly been studied using mathematical modeling. Using compartmental models, to study the
14 spread of infectious diseases has been used for over a century, with work being done as early as 1911 (9). The compartmental
15 SIR framework, where a population is broken into three classes: (S)usceptible, (I)nfected, and (R)ecovered, is a popular
16 choice for influenza modeling (10) and can be easily adapted to study different aspects of an epidemic such as cross-immunity
17 from previous infections(11), vaccination strategies (12), . The SIR model is often well suited for parameter estimation of key
18 epidemiological parameters, given appropriate population level data (13).

19 Unfortunately, testing and reporting is often biased toward severe cases (14), and therefore will severely underestimate the
20 true number of cases within a population. Since 2020, the amount of data collected - particularly for SARS-CoV-2 infections -
21 has improved leading to better estimates of parameters (15). Meanwhile, at least in Canada, the collection and reporting of
22 influenza has not changed. While this can provide overestimates or underestimates of model parameters (16), in this study we
23 hope to circumvent the limits of available data by focusing on relative comparisons of parameters.

24 Here we use a simple SIR model coupled with influenza A data from Summer 1999 to Spring 2023 to estimate relative
25 changes in the reproduction number, attack rate, effective susceptible population, and contact rate induced by NPIs and
26 COVID-19 policy. An SIR model is chosen for its simplicity as influenza data is reported weekly, resulting in fewer than 50
27 data points per season. We discuss the interpretation and impacts of these parameter estimates and changes in the context of
28 other endemic or emerging infectious diseases, and in relation to policy.

MB developed and analyzed the model; HM collected data and performed analysis; KM and PZ collected data.

The authors have no competing interests.

²To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: mbetti@mta.ca

29 2. Methodology

30 In this study, in order to reduce the effects of correlations, we will use a simple SIR model with our historical flu data. This
31 technique is not new, and is the basis for forecasting of seasonal influenza in some studies (16, 17) and is used to simulate data
32 in other cases (18). In implementing this model, we reduce the number of parameters required to fit by fixing those that are
33 less likely to change over the period of time we are considering (i.e. the rate of recovery). The effective starting susceptible
34 population is highly variable year-to-year as it depends on vaccination rates, vaccine efficacy, social behaviours, weather, etc.
35 We fit this parameter and show that NPIs largely affect the effective population size.

36 Our model framework is

$$37 \quad \frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta SI \quad [1]$$

$$38 \quad \frac{dI}{dt} = \beta SI - \mu I \quad [2]$$

$$39 \quad \frac{dR}{dt} = \mu I \quad [3]$$

$$40 \quad \frac{dC}{dt} = \beta SI \quad [4]$$

$$41 \quad S(0) = S_0 \quad [5]$$

$$42 \quad I(0) = I_0 \quad [6]$$

$$43 \quad R(0) = 0 \quad [7]$$

44 where S is the susceptible population, I is the infected population and R are those that have recovered with immunity. The
45 model is augmented with C , the cumulative case counts for the flu season. We do this so that we can fit both dC/dt (new
46 cases per week) and $C(t)$ (cumulative cases) to data.

47 While S_0 is often taken to be the whole population, this is complicated for influenza due to potential cross-immunity (11)
48 and vaccination(19). We take S_0 then to be the effective susceptible population size at the beginning of the flu season. In the
49 context of our study, this is further complicated as NPIs effectively remove individuals from the population in some capacity.
50 Thus, we consider S_0 to be an *effective* initial susceptible population.

51 We likewise assume that the demographic changes within the approximate six months of the influenza season are negligible.
52 These assumptions are again made to reduce the number of parameters of the model (to reduce covariance) and to keep the
53 model mathematically tractable.

54 We estimate a seasonal reproduction number for each flu season using the standard expression for the reproduction number
55 of an *SIR* model.

$$56 \quad R_0 = \frac{\beta}{\mu} S_0 \quad [8]$$

57 We do not start each year with a fully susceptible population, and thus this is not a true basic reproduction number (20). Our
58 interpretation of S_0 as an effective population size, leads to the interpretation of R_0 as a seasonal reproduction number. In
59 other words, it measures the effective reproduction of Influenza A at the start of a season.

60 We use provincial and national influenza data from Canada obtained from the publicly available FluWatch (21). Our interest
61 is mainly in how model parameters differ in the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 flu seasons.

62 3. Fitting

63 We fit this model using least squares to minimize the error between the cumulative case counts per week and the new cases per
64 week. We use both data sets as often corrections and delays in data collection and reporting will be reflected in cumulative
65 case counts but not in the weekly new case counts. By using both, we are able to minimize the effects of errors in data
66 collection/reporting.

67 By using both cumulative cases and new reported cases, we also are able to take into consideration the different scales of
68 reported cases across an outbreak. If we only used cumulative case data for instance, our fitting would favour the later points
69 in an outbreak as the magnitude of these points will create a larger difference in the residual. We show in Figure 1 that this
70 method does indeed produce a small relative error as well 9, indicating good fits to the beginning and end of an outbreak.

71 We fix $\mu = 7/2$ based on established data that the flu lasts approximately 2.5 days (19, 22, 23). We do this as we do not
72 expect non-pharmaceutical interventions to change the rate of recovery of individuals within the population.

73 An influenza season is defined approximately from August of a given calendar year until July of the following calendar year.
74 As an example, the 99-00 season runs from August 1999 through July, 2000.

75 Seasons are fit sequentially against data from Canada's FluWatch (21) where available. For Ontario and Quebec, provincial
76 level databases, (24) and (25), respectively, were used when FluWatch data was missing. We use direct reported case values for
77 cumulative cases and new cases as opposed to percent positivity.

78 Literature estimates are used for the initial guess at β (19).

Parameter	Value	Fixed
β	0.000017	False
S_0	Total Seasonal Tests or Estimated	False
μ	7/2.5	True
$I(0)$	1	False
$R(0)$	0	True

Table 1. Table of initial values for model fitting.

79 The initial susceptible population, S_0 , is fit. We use the total number of tests done in a season as a starting point for fitting;
 80 where this is unavailable, we use an estimated attack rate of 0.25 (19) and start fitting from the cumulative cases at the end of
 81 the season over the assumed attack rate.

82 Starting values and fixed values for parameter fitting are given in Table 1.

83 This method of fitting give the lowest relative root-mean square error,

$$84 \quad RRMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{(N - P)m} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}, \quad [9]$$

85 where N is the number of of data points, P is the number of parameters fit, m is the mean of squares of all values fit, y_i are
 86 the data points and \hat{y}_i are the fitted values.

87 We compare two fitting algorithms per season: least-squares and dual annealing, and take the better fit of the two in a
 88 relative root-mean-square error sense.

89 4. Results

90 Figure 1 shows the relative root mean-square error of the fit for each season. We can see from the plot that we generally fit
 91 seasonal data quite well. Any fit with a RMSE > 2% is discounted as the fitting did not visually accurately describe the data
 92 in any of these cases.

93 Figure 2 shows these fits overlaid on the data for each season for Canada. Due to each season being considered in isolation,
 94 there is little continuity between the seasons. We see that the fitted curves generally agree with the data on a per-season basis.
 95 Provincial level fits give qualitatively similar visuals.

96 Table 2 shows the estimates for β , S_0 , R_0 and the Attack Rate for each flu season for Canada, Ontario, Alberta and Quebec
 97 for which at least one fitting method converged. We note that Canada’s FluWatch did not report provincial-level data for the
 98 2020-2021 season, or for proceeding seasons. For these seasons, provincial level data was used when available (24–26). As such,
 99 this season is absent from analysis. Other missing rows of data are indicative of non-convergent fitting or large (> 2%) RRMSE.

100 Of particular interest are seasons 2020 – 2021 and 2021 – 2022, during which NPIs for COVID-19 were highly used, including
 101 increased masking by the general public, widespread social distancing, and intermittent lockdowns. We see that the effect is
 102 largely seen in the base parameters through effective susceptible population size, S_0 . Which translates to decreases in R_0 and
 103 Attack Rate.

104 We mark Spring/Summer 2022 as its own season as the changes in NPIs created conditions for a secondary flu season in
 105 2022. This can be seen in Figures 3, and 4. We across all four jurisdictions a delayed Influenza A season in Spring of 2022.

106 Figure 5 shows the mean R_0 and 95% confidence interval for this mean for season 99-00 through 18-19, deemed pre-COVID,
 107 and how the seasons 19-20, 20-21, 21-22, 22, and 22-23 compare. Similarly, Figure 6 shows the mean Attack Rate and a 95%
 108 confidence interval for this mean for the seasons 99-00 through 18-19. Also on the figure are point estimates of Attack Rate for
 109 the seasons 19-20 through 22-23. All mean values exclude the 09-10 season due to the effects of the H1N1 pandemic (28).

110 Table 3 gives mean values for R_0 , Attack Rate, and S_0 for Influenza A across all seasons studied, with the exception of 2009
 111 due to the H1N1 pandemic (27). This table largely quantifies information in Figures 5 and 6 and shows the relative change in
 112 value for seasons in which NPIs were in effect. We include the 22-23 season to highlight the substantial rebound in Influenza A
 113 ‘post’-COVID, when NPIs have been largely abandoned. Instead of a return to the mean, we see a more severe Influenza A
 114 season.

115 The pre-COVID mean values of R_0 and the attack rate are similar to those found in the literature (19, 29–31).

116 5. Discussion

117 The results show that the effective initial susceptible population size is greatly affected by NPIs. While S_0 and β are correlated
 118 in the expression for R_0 , the additional information at hand, like the number of tests conducted and the cumulative number of
 119 infections in one season, give us bounds on S_0 so that a model parameterized with the same R_0 , but different S_0 will not yield
 120 the same fit.

121 With less biased and more randomized testing of influenza case data, this information could readily be applied to an entire
 122 population to monitor the effectiveness of NPIs during an outbreak of a novel infectious disease with similar transmission
 123 routes to the flu. As it stands, the raw parameters are subject to limitations of available data.




Fig. 1. Root Mean-Square Error, equation Eq. (9) for the best fit model for each season. We use the RRMSE and a visual inspection to flag and remove bad or non-convergent fits.

Season	Canada				Alberta			
	beta	S0	R0	Attack Rate	beta	S0	R0	Attack Rate
99-00	0.00016622	20462.8498	1.21473396	0.33483552	0.00151036	2457.57559	1.3256531	0.44755481
00-01	0.00084378	4028.24184	1.2139103	0.33065638	0.00541328	652.489663	1.26146686	0.3837101
01-02	0.00011566	27349.6485	1.12971228	0.22064108	0.00135953	2456.36191	1.19267561	0.30468599
02-03	0.00030219	10261.5702	1.10748155	0.18811571	0.0004846	5948.61466	1.02952665	0.05823518
03-04	6.05E-05	52142.6253	1.12735838	0.21760458	0.00100328	3427.25511	1.22803561	0.34724654
04-05	7.52E-05	42887.2548	1.15171921	0.25141863	0.0001697	17004.3483	1.03056289	0.06476137
05-06	0.00014047	22397.7092	1.12365913	0.21172432	0.00101366	3147.40347	1.1394265	0.23432425
06-07	0.00010339	30877.4116	1.140166	0.23537004	0.00037969	7983.6144	1.08259861	0.14970736
07-08	0.00010339	30877.4116	1.140166	0.23537004	0.00072213	4368.71252	1.12670388	0.21618121
08-09	-	-	-	-	0.00072213	4368.71252	1.12670388	0.21618121
09-10	-	-	-	-	0.00043458	9780.91446	1.5180509	0.5943478
10-11	-	-	-	-	0.00058206	5376.39581	1.11764071	0.20299028
11-12	-	-	-	-	0.00047632	6596.29444	1.12213486	0.20949767
12-13	-	-	-	-	0.00041514	7979.79024	1.18311704	0.29272945
13-14	-	-	-	-	0.00037289	9565.34304	1.2738693	0.39670902
14-15	-	-	-	-	0.00037808	9393.82048	1.26842327	0.39104772
15-16	3.41E-05	97157.9315	1.18415282	0.294231	0.00023391	14072.5729	1.17559655	0.28306968
16-17	-	-	-	-	0.00023164	14074.295	1.16433378	0.26844891
17-18	1.82E-05	172721.58	1.11996118	0.20692799	0.00018046	18464.4047	1.19006223	0.30154145
18-19	1.09E-05	280261.419	1.09060028	0.16248652	0.00010419	30140.5105	1.12155327	0.2100721
19-20	2.10E-05	150376.379	1.13046545	0.22182137	0.00014545	21557.9891	1.11987677	0.20638974
20-21	0.01075928	275.094253	1.05707739	0.11709196	-	-	-	-
21-22	0.0035854	916.891558	1.17408102	0.284589	0.02212772	148.882271	1.17658036	0.28451531
22*	6.93E-05	48541.2115	1.2010877	0.3249449	0.00028839	11209.0558	1.1544847	0.26096192
22-23	2.09E-05	166948.38	1.24519128	0.36630147	0.00015764	22485.5027	1.26594304	0.38850824
Season	Ontario				Quebec			
	beta	S0	R0	Attack Rate	beta	S0	R0	Attack Rate
99-00	0.00074962	4851.85059	1.29894834	0.4230064	0.00077977	4342.60522	1.20937034	0.32530217
00-01	0.00296546	1138.75531	1.20604749	0.32103014	0.00541212	649.274594	1.25498398	0.37677228
01-02	0.00088892	3725.36893	1.18270203	0.29216692	0.00064844	5494.58375	1.27246434	0.39525457
02-03	0.00177442	1942.89855	1.23125333	0.35153767	0.00153609	2133.80177	1.17061285	0.27659946
03-04	0.00046549	7789.40159	1.29495522	0.41827243	0.00039401	8571.04925	1.20610585	0.32109775
04-05	0.0003318	9905.84902	1.1738567	0.28081599	0.00031742	10819.6541	1.22656879	0.34515459
05-06	0.00054947	5975.2032	1.17256237	0.27913414	0.00089931	3894.79047	1.25093969	0.37239322
06-07	0.00035166	9220.84317	1.15808148	0.25998643	0.00081906	4307.13253	1.25992366	0.38206704
07-08	0.00018104	16750.107	1.08298577	0.14954702	0.00040096	8148.89306	1.16690804	0.27173346
08-09	9.53E-05	32397.7244	1.10266733	0.18025097	7.70E-05	38451.7123	1.05740624	0.10710804
09-10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10-11	0.00014013	23577.9282	1.18001947	0.28877445	0.00015133	21651.0311	1.17014936	0.27602551
11-12	0.00086374	3730.03208	1.15063427	0.24987398	0.00050017	6561.96133	1.17216564	0.27861838
12-13	0.00014499	23590.2503	1.22153541	0.33955597	0.00017254	20963.9145	1.29181146	0.41490045
13-14	0.00022792	15057.8952	1.22570189	0.34435907	0.00021373	16006.0153	1.22177968	0.33962464
14-15	0.00011358	29328.1298	1.18968194	0.30103562	0.00011507	29182.9071	1.19935499	0.31292873
15-16	0.00015381	21998.8842	1.2084727	0.32393718	0.0001359	25391.9529	1.23238512	0.35179066
16-17	9.34E-05	34930.4781	1.16542693	0.26989898	6.85E-05	46505.5978	1.13827091	0.23275074
17-18	0.00011989	26279.2055	1.12525571	0.21463281	5.66E-05	57014.6818	1.15221044	0.25206623
18-19	0.0001122	27927.841	1.11908254	0.2056516	5.07E-05	62989.0653	1.14088207	0.23646914
19-20	0.0001419	23132.3505	1.17228102	0.27940252	5.73E-05	55742.2386	1.14034734	0.23568172
20-21	0.0093146	308.51246	1.02631054	0.06245293	-	-	-	-
21-22	0.01059945	311.293043	1.17840484	0.29000035	0.01365794	242.424461	1.18250705	0.29204132
22*	0.00044435	7215.20374	1.14502913	0.26338778	0.00018216	19384.4053	1.26108525	0.3836769
22-23	5.23E-05	64596.1557	1.20684163	0.32451261	7.90E-05	45305.5685	1.27857975	0.40156215

Table 2. Fitted β , S_0 , R_0 and computed Attack Rate for historical influenza A data for Canada, Ontario, Alberta and Quebec. Can see from this data that the effects of NPIs put in place for COVID-19 have quantitative and qualitative effects on the Influenza A. We see that on average we see approximately 5% decrease in the basic reproduction number of Influenza A, and we see that this mostly comes from a decrease in the effective susceptible population S_0 , rather than the contact rate, β . Note that Ontario experienced two waves of influenza A, one over 2021-2022 Winter, and one in Spring 2022.

	R0				Attack Rate			
	Canada	Alberta	Ontario	Quebec	Canada	Alberta	Ontario	Quebec
Mean	1.15±0.04	1.18±0.11	1.18±0.06	1.20±0.06	0.24±0.05	0.28±0.13	0.29±0.07	0.31±0.07
% Change 20-21	-7.70	-	-13.29	-	-51.37	-	-78.40	-
% Change 21-22	2.51	-0.62	-0.45	-1.43	18.19	2.10	0.30	-5.45
% Change 22*	4.87	-2.49	-3.27	5.12	34.95	-6.35	-8.90	24.22
% Change 22-23	8.72	6.93	1.96	6.57	52.13	39.42	12.24	30.01

Table 3. Mean values of R_0 and Attack Rate of Influenza A across all available pre-COVID seasons (with exception of the 2009-2010 season due to the H1N1 pandemic(27)) for Canada, Ontario, Alberta and Quebec. We also report the percent change from the mean for the 20-21, 21-22, and 22-23 seasons.




Fig. 2. Influenza A data for Canada, Alberta, Ontario, and Quebec plotted per season starting from 1990 through 2023. The data is fit individually per season, as shown by the colour variation. Gaps show missing seasons from the dataset, or non-convergent fits.




Fig. 3. Influenza A reported cases for (a) Canada, (b) Alberta, (c) Ontario, and (d) Quebec. The grey shaded area shows the typical Influenza A season, and the pink shaded area shows the shifted outbreak in 2022. This was common across all three provinces and nationally.




Fig. 4. Plot showing the week with the most new Influenza A reports per season for each of the four studied jurisdictions. We see that in 2022 there was an abnormal outbreak of Influenza A in the spring. The year 08-09 is likely affected by the H1N1 pandemic which was officially declared in August 2009, straddling two influenza seasons.




Fig. 5. Mean R_0 values for all seasons pre-COVID (i.e. seasons 99-00 through 18-19), the season 09-10 is excluded from any computation due to the H1N1 pandemic. Point estimates are given for the 19-20, 20-21, 21-22, 22, and 22-23 seasons for comparison.




Fig. 6. Mean Attack Rate values for all seasons pre-COVID (i.e. seasons 99-00 through 18-19), the season 09-10 is excluded from any computation due to the H1N1 pandemic. Point estimates are given for the 19-20, 20-21, 21-22, 22, and 22-23 seasons for comparison.

124 Due to these limitations, we focus on the relative change in epidemiological parameters of seasonal influenza A in each
125 jurisdiction of study. In the 2020-2021 flu season, we see large changes (50% decrease) in the attack rate for influenza and
126 about a 7% decrease in the reproduction number for influenza nation-wide. Further suggesting that when forecasting and
127 modeling disease transmission during periods of wide-spread societal changes, the effective population number is incredibly
128 important and cannot be assumed to be the entire population. Using a known disease with similar routes of transmission may
129 help guide estimates for effective population size during future outbreaks of novel infectious diseases.

130 We note that in Table 3, we see that by Spring 2022, the behavioural changes induced by the COVID-19 pandemic largely
131 fell out of favour nationally leading to a moderate rebound of influenza A. We see specifically in Ontario, where the data exists,
132 that the reduction in R_0 and the Attack Rate are substantially lower than in the 20-21 season.

133 These values also give measures of adherence to NPIs. We see, by comparing the % Change in the 21-22, 22, and 22-23
134 seasons that more Ontarians likely continued to practice person NPIs like masking and distancing. Another factor that can
135 impact the milder rebound of influenza could be vaccine up-take of the flu vaccine in different jurisdictions.

136 Because they are inversely correlated, we see in our fitting that when S_0 sees a significant decrease, β , the contact rate,
137 shows a significant increase. The fact that R_0 was lower during the 2020-2021 season shows that the increase in β is not exactly
138 proportional to the decrease in S_0 . Our interpretation is that there are effectively fewer individuals in the population but they
139 are generally those with higher contacts. This may inform estimates of effective contact rates of the subsets of the population
140 who are considered 'essential workers' during a pandemic.

141 The data shown in Figure 2 shows, particularly in the 2021-2022 season, that temporary regional lockdowns had minimal
142 effect on influenza. This could be due to the timing of the lockdowns compared to the flu season of that year, or the relative
143 length of flu season against the length and scope of lockdowns. This suggests that it was the social behaviours like masking
144 and long-term policy and behavioural changes that drove a reduction in influenza A cases.

145 Future work includes expanding this framework and pipeline to other endemic, airborne infections in Canada to see if
146 different pathogens are affected differently by NPIs. This work could help inform how certain policies will affect pathogens
147 with differing properties. This could lead to targeted, effective NPIs being put in place once certain characteristics of infectious
148 diseases are known.

149 We would also like to expand to different jurisdictions, perhaps all provinces and territories of Canada and other countries.
150 Here we focus on three large provincial jurisdictions to highlight that this fitting pipeline can be extended to the provincial
151 level and produces consistent results.

152 Another curiosity is the increase in the reproduction number and the attack rate in the 2022-2023 season when NPIs and
153 associated policies were phased out by the population at large. This may be tied to a possible decrease in uptake of the
154 flu shot(32), a reduction in cross-immunity through several seasons without exposure to Influenza A, or cross-infection with
155 COVID-19 (33). While there are many open questions about the mechanics of this rebound that we aim to study in the near
156 future, we hope that these estimates of the effects on NPIs on an endemic infection like influenza A can help modeling and
157 forecasting in the future.

158 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

- 159 1. SC Anderson, et al., Quantifying the impact of covid-19 control measures using a bayesian model of physical distancing. *PLoS computational biology* **16**, e1008274 (2020).
- 160 2. A Aleta, et al., Modelling the impact of testing, contact tracing and household quarantine on second waves of covid-19. *Nat. Hum. Behav.* **4**, 964–971 (2020).
- 161 3. A Karaivanov, SE Lu, H Shigeoka, C Chen, S Pamplona, Face masks, public policies and slowing the spread of covid-19: Evidence from canada. *J. Heal. Econ.* **78**, 102475 (2021).
- 162 4. A Peng, S Bosco, A Tuite, A Simmons, D Fisman, Impact of community masking on sars-cov-2 transmission in ontario after adjustment for differential testing by age and sex. *medRxiv* pp. 2023–07
163 (2023).
- 164 5. IR Moyles, JM Heffernan, JD Kong, Cost and social distancing dynamics in a mathematical model of covid-19 with application to ontario, canada. *Royal Soc. open science* **8**, 201770 (2021).
- 165 6. MI Betti, JM Heffernan, A simple model for fitting mild, severe, and known cases during an epidemic with an application to the current sars-cov-2 pandemic. *Infect. Dis. Model.* **6**, 313–323 (2021).
- 166 7. PHAo Canada, Government of canada (2021).
- 167 8. M Koutsakos, AK Wheatley, K Laurie, SJ Kent, S Rockman, Influenza lineage extinction during the covid-19 pandemic? *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **19**, 741–742 (2021).
- 168 9. R Ross, Some quantitative studies in epidemiology. *Nature* **87**, 466–467 (1911).
- 169 10. G Chowell, L Sattenspiel, S Bansal, C Viboud, Mathematical models to characterize early epidemic growth: A review. *Phys. life reviews* **18**, 66–97 (2016).
- 170 11. R Casagrandi, L Bolzoni, SA Levin, V Andreasen, The sirc model and influenza a. *Math. biosciences* **200**, 152–169 (2006).
- 171 12. G Nakamura, B Grammaticos, M Badooui, Vaccination strategies for a seasonal epidemic: a simple sir model. *Open Commun. Nonlinear Math. Phys.* **1** (2021).
- 172 13. B Sara, Z Omar, T Abdessamad, R Mostafa, F Hanane, Parameters' estimation, sensitivity analysis and model uncertainty for an influenza a mathematical model: case of morocco.
173 *Commun. Math. Biol. Neurosci.* **2020**, Article-ID (2020).
- 174 14. C Reed, et al., Estimating influenza disease burden from population-based surveillance data in the united states. *PLoS one* **10**, e0118369 (2015).
- 175 15. SL Wu, et al., Substantial underestimation of sars-cov-2 infection in the united states. *Nat. communications* **11**, 4507 (2020).
- 176 16. L Kalachev, EL Landguth, J Graham, Revisiting classical sir modelling in light of the covid-19 pandemic. *Infect. Dis. Model.* **8**, 72–83 (2023).
- 177 17. D Osthus, KS Hickmann, PC Caragea, D Higdon, SY Del Valle, Forecasting seasonal influenza with a state-space sir model. *The annals applied statistics* **11**, 202 (2017).
- 178 18. S Boonpatcharanon, JM Heffernan, H Jankowski, Estimating the basic reproduction number at the beginning of an outbreak. *PLoS one* **17**, e0269306 (2022).
- 179 19. AR Tuite, DN Fisman, JC Kwong, AL Greer, Optimal pandemic influenza vaccine allocation strategies for the canadian population. *PLoS one* **5**, e10520 (2010).
- 180 20. P Van den Driessche, J Watmough, Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission. *Math. biosciences* **180**, 29–48 (2002).
- 181 21. PHAo Canada, Government of canada (2024).
- 182 22. ON Bjørnstad, C Viboud, Timing and periodicity of influenza epidemics. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **113**, 12899–12901 (2016).
- 183 23. S Edlund, et al., Comparing three basic models for seasonal influenza. *Epidemics* **3**, 135–142 (2011).
- 184 24. O Public Health, Ontario respiratory virus tool (2024).
- 185 25. dQ Institut national de santé publique, Archives influenza: Inspq (2024).
- 186 26. A Government of, Respiratory virus dashboard (2024).
- 187 27. SM Moghadas, NJ Pizzi, J Wu, SE Tamblin, DN Fisman, Canada in the face of the 2009 h1n1 pandemic. *Influ. Other Respir. Viruses* **5**, 83–88 (2011).
- 188 28. M Patel, A Dennis, C Flutter, Z Khan, Pandemic (h1n1) 2009 influenza. *Br. journal anaesthesia* **104**, 128–142 (2010).
- 189 29. D He, J Dushoff, R Eftimie, DJ Earn, Patterns of spread of influenza a in canada. *Proc. Royal Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* **280**, 20131174 (2013).
- 190 30. PR Lagace-Wiens, E Rubinstein, A Gumel, Influenza epidemiology—past, present, and future. *Critical care medicine* **38**, e1–e9 (2010).
- 191 31. C Sikora, et al., Transmission of pandemic influenza a (h1n1) 2009 within households: Edmonton, canada. *J. clinical virology* **49**, 90–93 (2010).

- 192 32. H Lymon, Declines in influenza vaccination coverage among health care personnel in acute care hospitals during the covid-19 pandemic—united states, 2017–2023. MMWR. Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.
193 **72** (2023).
- 194 33. SS Lee, C Viboud, E Petersen, Understanding the rebound of influenza in the post covid-19 pandemic period holds important clues for epidemiology and control. Int. J. Infect. Dis. **122**, 1002–1004
195 (2022).