

1

1 **Full title:** Does 2x2 airplane passenger contact tracing for infectious respiratory pathogens
2 work? A systematic review of the evidence.

3 **Short title:** 2x2 airplane passenger contact tracing for infectious respiratory pathogens

4

5 **Authors:** Anna C Rafferty^{1,2} ¶, Kelly Bofkin^{3,4} ¶, Whitney Hughes³ ¶, Sara Souter^{3,4} &, Ian
6 Hosegood³ &, Robyn N Hall² &, Luis Furuya-Kanamori⁸ &, Bette Liu⁵ &, Michael Drane⁶ &, Toby
7 Regan^{7&}, Molly Halder^{7&}, Catherine Kelaher^{2&}, Martyn D Kirk^{1,2&*}

8 **Affiliations:**

9 ¹ National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, The Australian National University

10 ² National Incident Centre, The Australian Government Department of Health

11 ³ Qantas Airways Limited,

12 ⁴ Virgin Australia Airlines,

13 ⁵ School of Population Health, University of New South Wales,

14 ⁶ Air New Zealand,

15 ⁷ New Zealand Ministry of Health

16 ⁸ UQ Centre for Clinical Research, Faculty of Medicine, The University of Queensland, Herston, Australia

17

18 ***Corresponding Author:**

19 martyn.kirk@anu.edu.au (MDK)

20

21 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

22 & 38 These authors also contributed equally to this work.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 **Keywords:**

24 SARS-CoV-2, In-flight transmission, outbreak, Contact tracing, travel, travel medicine,
25 COVID-19, aeromedical, respiratory pathogens, Disease outbreaks, Flight associated
26 transmission, SARS, SARS Virus, Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2, airplane,
27 aeroplane, Tuberculosis, measles, influenza,

28

29 **Abstract**

30 We critically appraise the literature regarding in-flight transmission of a range of respiratory
31 infections to provide an evidence base for public health policies for contact tracing
32 passengers, given the limited pathogen-specific data for SARS-CoV-2 currently available.
33 Using PubMed, Web of Science, and other databases including preprints, we systematically
34 reviewed evidence of in-flight transmission of infectious respiratory illnesses. A meta-
35 analysis was conducted where total numbers of persons on board a specific flight was
36 known, to calculate a pooled Attack Rate (AR) for a range of pathogens. The quality of the
37 evidence provided was assessed using a bias assessment tool developed for in-flight
38 transmission investigations. We identified 103 publications detailing 165 flight
39 investigations. Overall, 43.7% (72/165) of investigations provided evidence for in-flight
40 transmission. H1N1 influenza A virus had the highest reported pooled attack rate per 100
41 persons (AR= 1.17), followed by SARS-CoV-2 (AR=0.54) and SARS-CoV (AR = 0.32),
42 *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (AR= 0.25), and measles virus (AR= 0.09). There was high
43 heterogeneity in estimates between studies, except for TB. Of the 72 investigations that
44 provided evidence for in-flight transmission, 27 investigations were assessed as having a
45 high level of evidence, 23 as medium, and 22 as low. One third of the investigations that

3

46 reported on proximity of cases showed transmission occurring beyond the 2x2 seating area.

47 We suggest that for emerging pathogens, in the absence of pathogen-specific evidence, the

48 2x2 system should not be used for contact tracing. Instead, alternate contact tracing

49 protocols and close contact definitions for enclosed areas, such as the same cabin on an

50 aircraft or other forms of transport, should be considered as part of a whole of journey

51 approach.

52

53 **Introduction**

54 International travel has played a major role in the rapid global spread of SARS-CoV-2, the
55 pathogen responsible for COVID-19. [1-3] The initial response to the pandemic involved
56 restrictions on international travel, which has impacted airlines, commercial aviation,
57 tourism and associated industries. The air travel industry has progressively put in place a
58 variety of interventions to prevent infections occurring before, during and after flying. These
59 interventions include: pre-testing of passengers, physical distancing, enhanced hygiene and
60 cleaning within the aircraft, having passengers and crew wearing masks, leaving middle
61 seats free, and regular screening and testing of crew.[4]

62 Transmission of infectious respiratory pathogens in an aircraft setting is complex. Some of
63 the factors that influence transmission include infectiousness of the agent, timing and
64 severity of a passenger's illness, the nature of ventilation and filtration, space limitations,
65 and the proximity and duration of interactions between passengers. [5-7] In Australia, the
66 current public health approach is to contact trace passengers seated in the two rows in front
67 of the case, the row of the case and the two rows behind the case, across the width of the
68 fuselage, which is referred to as 2x2 contact tracing. Despite this, there have been reports of
69 transmission events reported beyond this seating configuration. [8] Furthermore, physical
70 distancing in-flight may not be sustainable or commercially viable as the demand for travel
71 increases. The evidence for in-flight transmission can also be confounded by interactions
72 elsewhere during the journey, for example in the airport terminal or in transit to or from the
73 airport. It is not always clear within the papers reviewed what provision has been made to
74 handle such confounders during an outbreak investigation.

75 Previous systematic reviews have evaluated the risk of in-flight transmission of various
76 infectious respiratory pathogens, including influenza virus (seasonal and H1N1),
77 *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (TB) and measles virus. [5, 6, 9, 10] These previous reviews
78 have contributed to the evidence, current policy decisions and frameworks that health
79 agencies are using in the COVID-19 pandemic. More recently a number of SARS-CoV-2
80 specific reviews have been published, which assess mitigation strategies or aim to estimate
81 attack rates on passenger aircraft, both with conservative estimates from public data and
82 estimates from industry. [11-14]

83 In this review, we critically appraise the literature regarding in-flight transmission of a range
84 of respiratory infections to provide an evidence base for policy given the limited pathogen-
85 specific data for SARS-CoV-2 currently available.

86 **Methods**

87 In this review, we sought to identify and aggregate the evidence for transmission of
88 infectious respiratory illnesses on aircraft and assess the utility of 2x2 contact tracing. The
89 protocol of this review was registered with the international prospective register of
90 systematic reviews (PROSPERO CRD42020191261). [15]

91 **Search Strategy**

92 We searched PubMed, Web of Science and the Cochrane library for articles containing
93 information on the transmission of respiratory illness on an aircraft or in-flight. MedRxiv and
94 BioRxiv were searched for preprints regarding flight associated transmission of SARS-CoV-2.
95 There was no language restriction on the search, however articles that were not published
96 in English or did not have an adequate translation available were excluded. Further search
97 details can be found in Appendix 1. The International Air Transport Association (IATA), the

98 Collaborative Arrangement for the Prevention and Management of Public Health Events in
99 Civil Aviation (CAPSCA), WHO, ICAO, EASA, CDC and ECDC databases were searched to
100 include all relevant studies and industry documents. We conducted the search on 20 May,
101 2021.

102 Two reviewers screened titles and abstracts, with a third reviewer resolving conflicts for
103 inclusion or exclusion. For full text screening, two reviewers reviewed each article, with
104 conflicts resolved through discussion between reviewers. We conducted additional searches
105 of outbreak investigation reports in the CDC, ECDC and CDI databases, to identify outbreak
106 investigations where flight -associated and in-flight contact tracing was undertaken as part
107 of an investigation but was not reported on separately. We included these where there was
108 evidence of contact tracing and reported outcomes.

109 We included studies detailing investigations into in-flight transmission. We excluded studies
110 that were based on modelling and simulation, along with previous systematic reviews.
111 Additionally, during the data extraction phase we excluded articles where there was
112 inadequate data presented in the study and/or a lack of investigation of affected flights.

113 Data were extracted in duplicate from each article to ensure consistency. Data extracted for
114 analyses included the pathogen, number of passengers, number of persons on a flight
115 (passengers and crew), number of infective cases, number of secondary cases, the index
116 case definition, the secondary case definition, length of flight, proximity of secondary cases
117 to the index case/s, contact tracing strategy, timeliness of contact tracing, and alternative
118 exposures addressed. Extracted data are summarised in Appendix 3.

119 During the data extraction process, references of all included articles were manually
120 searched for additional relevant articles. We estimated attack rates for flights where the

121 total number of persons (or susceptible persons) aboard an aircraft were reported,
122 regardless of the contact tracing strategy employed. The pooled attack rates by pathogen
123 were estimated using the inverse variance heterogeneity model [16]. The double arcsine
124 square root transformation was applied to stabilise the variance; results were reported after
125 back-transformation for ease of interpretation. [17] All tests were two-tailed, and $P \leq 0.05$
126 was deemed statistically significant. Pooled analyses were conducted using MetaXL version
127 5.3 (EpiGear International, Sunrise Beach, Queensland, Australia).

128 We used a bias assessment tool, developed by Leitmeyer *et al.* for influenza investigations,
129 to evaluate the level of evidence for transmission aboard aircraft. [6] The bias assessment
130 tool was modelled on the PRISMA statement and the Newcastle-Ottawa scale. Articles were
131 assessed on the strength of evidence of each investigation and categorised as low, medium,
132 or high evidence, based on factors relevant to contact tracing, such as methodology,
133 timeliness and outcomes.

134 We modified the bias assessment tool for tuberculosis investigations (changing timeframes
135 from weeks to months) to account for the difference in transmission dynamics and the
136 timeframe for contact tracing appropriate for this pathogen (Appendix 2). Tuberculosis
137 studies were also complicated by the extended latency period and corresponding delays in
138 investigations. Tuberculosis investigations commonly involved multiple flights, rather than
139 being conducted on an individual flight basis as is typical of more acute pathogens such as
140 SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) or H1N1, which have
141 pandemic potential and rapid transmission.

142 **Results**

143 **Study characteristics**

144 We screened 425 titles, resulting in the inclusion of 103 articles in our review of which, 60 of
145 these articles were identified during secondary searches (appendix 1)[18]. In total, there
146 were 165 flight investigations detailed in 103 articles that we included in our review (figure
147 1), after accounting for duplicate publications of investigations into H1N1, MERS, and SARS-
148 CoV-2.

149 Figure 1: PRISMA 2009 Flow Diagram [18]

150 Respiratory pathogens included in our review included SARS-CoV (n=5)[19-23], MERS virus
151 (n=12) [24-35], *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (n=20)[36-55], measles virus (n=27) [56-82],
152 mumps virus (n=2)[83, 84], rubella virus (n=1)[85], *Corynebacterium diphtheriae* (n=1)[55],
153 H1N1 influenza A virus (n=10)[10, 86-94], seasonal influenza virus or influenza like illness
154 (ILI; n=2)[95, 96], *Neisseria meningitidis* (n=3)[97-99], and SARS-CoV-2 (n=19)[1, 100-118].

155 The two articles on MERS virus reported on the same flights and investigations in the United
156 States and the United Kingdom, with complementary data presented in each paper [24, 25].

157 We have only counted the four flights presented in each of these papers once but have
158 treated them as two investigations based on two different index cases. We identified other
159 articles on H1N1 influenza A virus and measles virus that reported duplicate investigations,
160 which were counted once for the purposes of data analysis. [56, 63, 77, 86, 90, 119] We
161 identified two articles on the same flight outbreak for SARS-CoV-2 with contradictory
162 conclusions about the number of secondary cases due to in-flight transmission. For the
163 purposes this review, we included the investigation with greater epidemiological evidence
164 and robust discussion around pre and post flight exposures. [106] We included an

165 unpublished Australian report detailing several investigations into flight-associated
166 transmission of SARS-CoV-2.

167 Index case classification was based on laboratory confirmation in 89.1% (147/165) of
168 investigations. Of the remaining 18 investigations, either clinical presentation was used for
169 index case classification or it was not reported. Investigators used various definitions for
170 secondary cases due to the different pathogen characteristics and public health protocols. In
171 total, 84.8% (140/165) of investigations used pathogen-specific testing criteria to define
172 secondary cases, 5.5% (9/165) of investigations used clinical characteristics, while the
173 remaining 9.7% (16/165) of investigations did not provide sufficient detail on how secondary
174 cases were characterised.

175 Of the investigations that reported in-flight transmission, 97.2% (70/72) considered
176 alternative exposures when determining whether in-flight transmission may have occurred.

177 **Transmission and proximity**

178 Overall, 43.7% (72/165) of investigations provided evidence for in-flight transmission of
179 respiratory illness based on their epidemiological investigations. Of these, 21 were for SARS-
180 CoV-2 [1, 100, 102, 104, 106, 107, 109-113, 115, 116, 118], 13 for H1N1 influenza A virus [4,
181 10, 86-90, 92-94], 22 for measles virus [57-65, 68-70, 72-76, 78-82], two for seasonal
182 influenza virus and ILI [95, 96], four for SARS-CoV [21-23], seven for *Mycobacterium*
183 *tuberculosis* [36, 40, 42, 44, 48, 120], one for mumps virus [84], and two for *Neisseria*
184 *meningitidis* [98, 99].

185 We calculated attack rates for 5 pathogens in 59 investigations (44 articles) where
186 investigators provided data on the total numbers of passengers on board. H1N1 influenza A
187 virus had the highest pooled attack rate per 100 persons exposed (AR= 1.17, 82/6456, 95%

10

188 CI; 0.0000–0.82), followed by SARS-CoV-2 (AR=0.54, 63/7260, 95% CI; 0.00–1.71) and SARS-
189 CoV (AR = 0.32, 25/2835, 95% CI; 0.00–1.17), *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (AR= 0.25,
190 8/3212, 95% CI; 0.07–0.49), and measles virus (AR= 0.09, 17/11918, 95% CI; 0.00–0.82).

191

192

193 Figure 2 Forest plot showing weighted pooled attack rates for H1N1

194

195 Figure 3 Forest plot showing weighted pooled attack rates for SARS-CoV-2

196

197 There was considerable heterogeneity amongst investigations included in our review,
198 ($I^2 > 50\%$), except for *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. We present the pooled attack rate meta-
199 analysis for all pathogens in Table 1, with forest plots for the remaining pathogens in
200 Appendix 4.

201

202

Table 1. Estimated attack rates of in-flight transmission of selected respiratory pathogens and number of investigations, reported index cases, and reported secondary cases, by pathogen

Pathogen	Number of articles in meta analysis	Pooled attack rate (per 100 persons exposed)	95% Confidence Interval	I ² %	Number of unique investigations in review	Number of index cases [@]	Number of secondary cases
Measles virus	11	0.09	0.00–0.82	80.7	31	228	62
SARS-CoV-2	14	0.54	0.00–1.71	88.3	29	204	87
H1N1 influenza A virus	10	1.17	0.51–1.96	74.2	14	36	82
SARS-CoV	3	0.32	0.00–1.17	87.6	19	24	26
<i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i>	6	0.25	0.07–0.49	20.0	51	667	31
MERS virus	-	-	-	-	12	14	0
Mumps virus	-	-	-	-	2	13	2
Rubella virus	-	-	-	-	1	1	0

<i>Neisseria meningitidis</i>	-	-	-	-	3	3	3
Influenza virus (ILI)	-	-	-	-	2	2	53
<i>Corynebacterium diphtheriae</i>	-	-	-	-	1	1	0

* Number of articles included in pooled attack rate estimates

@Number of index cases not always reported

Of the investigations where in-flight transmission was documented, 63.9% (46/72) reported on the proximity of secondary cases to the index case/s. In 31.1% (14/46) of investigations, transmission was reported to have occurred exclusively within two rows of an index case. [1, 10, 68, 69, 94, 100, 106, 109, 118] For the remaining 32 investigations, transmission occurred beyond this 2x2 area. Overall, in the 46 investigations where proximity to the index case was reported on, 48.7% (94/193) of reported secondary cases occurred outside of the 2x2 seating area around the index case.

Of the 32 investigations reporting transmission outside the 2x2 zone, six were for SARS-CoV-2 [102, 104, 110, 112, 115, 118], three for *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* [40, 44, 120], seven for H1N1 influenza A virus [4, 86-90], 11 for measles virus [58-60, 63, 65, 70, 72, 74-76, 79], two for SARS-CoV [21-23], one for ILI [96], and one for meningococcal meningitis [98].

For SARS-CoV-2, investigators reported proximity in 71.4% (15/21) of investigations and 80.7% (46/57) of secondary cases occurred within the 2x2 seating area surrounding an index case. Proximity was reported in 77.0% (10/13) H1N1 investigations with 51.1% (23/45) of secondary cases occurring within the 2x2 zone. Proximity was reported in 13 of 22 measles investigations with 27.5% (11/40) of secondary cases occurring within the 2x2 zone.

Proximity was reported in 3 of 4 SARS-CoV investigations with 24% (6/25) of secondary cases occurring within the 2x2 zone. Proximity was reported in 3 of 7 tuberculosis investigations, with 40% (4/10) of secondary cases occurring within the 2x2 zone. For the single ILI and influenza investigation reporting proximity, 40% (9/15) of secondary cases occurred within the 2x2 zone. For the single meningococcal investigation reporting proximity none of the secondary cases (n=1) occurred within the 2x2 area around an index case.

Assessment of the evidence and bias

We evaluated that 46 investigations had a high level of evidence, 71 had medium, and 48 had a low level of evidence demonstrating in-flight transmission. The median evidence score of 5 (range: -1–9). Eight investigations achieved the highest score of 9, with four of these being investigations for SARS-CoV-2. These are detailed in Appendix 3.

Of the 72 investigations providing evidence for in-flight transmission, 27 were assessed as having a high level of evidence, 23 as medium, and 22 as low. Breakdown by pathogen is detailed in Table 2.

Table 2. Evidence assessment by pathogen, where in-flight transmission has been reported.

Pathogen	Number of investigations and evidence level		
	Low	Medium	High
SARS-CoV-2	3	8	10
H1N1 influenza A virus	2	4	7
<i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i>	0	3	4
Measles virus	14	3	5
SARS-CoV	0	4	0
Mumps virus	1	0	0
<i>Neisseria meningitidis</i>	2	0	0
Seasonal influenza virus & ILI	0	1	1
Total	22	23	27

Discussion

We found strong evidence for in-flight transmission of a range of respiratory pathogens, particularly for SARS-CoV-2. We found that 48.7% (94/193) of all respiratory pathogen transmission events, where proximity was reported, occurred outside of the standard arrangement that public health uses to contact trace a 2x2 seating area around an infected passenger. Pre and post flight information can be utilised within investigations into potential transmission in-flight, but this does not appear to be common practice. Integration of this information and may shift the focus towards flight-associated transmission as the primary outcome of interest rather than the current focus on the inflight period.

All studies in our review focussed on the potential for transmission to occur on the aircraft during the flight. However, a flight is not a singular event. The logistically complex nature of air travel leads to passenger and crew interactions at all stages of the air travel process, i.e., pre-flight, in-flight, and post-flight. Potential transmission, for example, could occur at the airport terminal (check-in, baggage, customs and immigration, in a transit lounge or at the gate) or on public transport to or from the airport and has been demonstrated previously in the case of measles.[75] When analysing seating maps, distant infections beyond the traditional 2x2 zone may be explained by these alternative pathways. Instances of in-flight transmission may be considered to have most likely occurred within the cabin environment, but this cannot be conclusively determined. Genomic evidence can link index and secondary infections who travelled on the same flight for many pathogens, including SARS-CoV-2, but cannot definitively determine the circumstances of transmission.[115]

Although measles virus is highly infectious, high vaccination rates internationally and the availability of post exposure prophylaxis is likely reflected in the low attack rate observed in

our review.[63] Treatment and post exposure measures are also applicable to *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, with a similarly low attack rate (AR= 0.25). Due to the rapid spread of SARS-CoV-2 in 2020, investigations into in-flight transmission were likely to be more robust as a result of higher public awareness and intense public health response and a vaccine naïve population during the period included in this review. However, this also increases the potential for publication and confirmation bias.

Just under half of the investigations that reported on proximity showed transmission occurring beyond the 2x2 area. However, this does not mean that public health agencies should not use the 2x2 area for contact tracing. We suggest that, where circumstances require, public health agencies may wish to extend tracing beyond the 2x2 zone. These circumstances could include flights in regions with a pathogen elimination strategy, where a novel or highly infectious pathogen has emerged, or where there are multiple infectious passengers on the flight. In these scenarios, public health agencies could use alternate contact tracing protocols and definitions of close contacts for enclosed areas, such as the same cabin on an aircraft or other forms of transport. This is particularly true for highly infectious variants of SARS-CoV-2, such as the Delta variant. [121]

We observed considerable heterogeneity in attack rates between studies included in the meta-analysis. This is likely due to the stochastic nature of outbreaks, differences in outbreak investigation and logistical challenges presented by contact tracing on domestic and international flights. In addition, it is likely that the many instances where infectious cases transmitted to one or fewer persons were not published. Our review does not indicate how commonly cases did not transmit outside the 2x2 zone, but does indicate that it occurs

from time to time. In addition, many published reports of investigations involved multiple infectious cases on the same flight, which would lead to a higher infection pressure.

We recommend that where public health investigators are alerted to infectious cases travelling on a flight, they should conduct a risk assessment of the characteristics of the flight including relevant infection controls utilised, as well as that of the airport transit locations when investigating transmission of highly transmissible or high-consequence pathogens. Public health authorities should conduct potential outbreak investigations in conjunction with airlines and airports where practical, noting the current challenges with contact tracing surrounding international travel. Additionally, where there is more than one index case on a flight, the 2x2 area may be inappropriate and a cabin or whole-of-plane contact tracing strategy should be undertaken after adequate risk assessment and consideration of available resources, in line with current public health strategies in their jurisdiction.

Limitations

This review is subject to several limitations including the massive emerging literature on SARS-CoV-2; difficulties in defining secondary cases as having been acquired in-flight; the heterogeneity of included studies; and the variable quality of included studies. Within the first year of the World Health Organization declaring the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, more than 200,000 journal articles and preprints on SARS-CoV-2 were published. [122] The high volume of SARS-CoV-2 publications may well result in studies being missed due to the confines of the search strategy and the dynamic nature of publications. We did search CDC, ECDC and IATA databases, however, we are mindful that there would have been many

instances where flight contact tracing was undertaken as part of outbreak investigations but never published.

Our review included investigations into SARS-CoV-2 prior to roll-out of vaccines in countries, widespread immunity due to either natural infection or vaccination, and the emergence of variants of concern with known increases in transmissibility and reduction in incubation period. As such, some of our findings may not be applicable to the current circulating strains of SARS-CoV-2 and public health control measures in place at the time of publication, but our findings do highlight that the 2x2 system of contact tracing itself is not specific enough for contact tracing management of SARS-CoV-2 in all circumstances.

We assessed the level of evidence using a bias and assessment tool that we adapted from Leitmeyer *et al.* [6] This allowed us to assess each investigation to determine the evidence level. We used the tool to assess the methods used in each investigation, which identified a high degree of heterogeneity. The methodological issues identified highlight the weakness of many investigations within this review, contributing to the overall median rating of medium evidence level in this review. The high proportion of investigations with low and medium evidence scores is attributable to the majority of investigations using the narrow 2x2 contact tracing strategies, the time between flight and commencement of contact tracing (often attributed to delays in clinical presentation and subsequent diagnosis), and the incomplete nature of contact tracing. All of these factors would lead to potentially missed secondary cases, introducing bias into the studies.

Contact tracing investigations from air travel are complicated and are often incomplete, although this has changed with greater use of electronic data for tracing. Close contact follow up is particularly difficult for international travel. The ability of any one public health

unit to undertake a thorough contact tracing investigation to determine if in-flight transmission has occurred is limited due to multiple jurisdictions, international travel and lack of contact details for passengers who are in transit. This is highlighted in a number of multi-national investigations included in this review, where the same flights or cases were reported by different jurisdictions, such as a MERS virus outbreak that was investigated in the UK and the US [24, 25] and an international flight with a H1N1 investigation that was investigated by multiple jurisdictions. [86, 90]

Asymptomatic infections may also be underreported as testing may only be conducted on symptomatic individuals. For SARS-CoV-2, many countries, including Australia and New Zealand, have required all incoming passengers to undertake mandatory quarantine in hotels or other purpose-built facilities where they are routinely tested therefore providing opportunities for more complete follow-up.[123]

Case studies of in-flight outbreaks detail secondary cases that are identified with an epidemiological link and investigated further. As case studies do not assist in quantifying the risk of in-flight transmission, they should not solely be relied on as an evidence base, but rather provide an exploratory tool to prompt further study. The relevance of case studies decreases after the initial stages of pathogen emergence once robust epidemiological investigations have occurred. Furthermore, contact tracing investigations are undertaken for the purpose of implementing public health measures, rather than for research. During an epidemic or pandemic, contact tracing capacity may be overwhelmed and robust tracing may not occur. Consequently, we cannot determine the frequency of transmission outside the 2x2 zone of seating, other than it does occur. Public health agencies may choose to use

wider contact tracing strategies depending on their local disease control priorities and resource constraints.

Investigations using routine surveillance data are only appropriate for notifiable diseases resulting in health outcomes that require presentation to medical services. Otherwise, investigations are likely underreporting the occurrence of potential in-flight transmission.

However, for the pathogen SARS-CoV-2, some countries have high levels of testing, including asymptomatic testing, meaning that there is high ascertainment of cases.

Therefore, the use of surveillance systems may be adequate to evaluate potential in-flight transmission events for SARS-CoV-2 but is limited for other pathogens. In particular, the use of 2x2 contact tracing may reinforce the belief that it is effective if no tracing and testing occurs outside this zone. Surveillance systems are likely to underrepresent cases for notifiable diseases that are less common, cause mild illness, have no treatment, are relatively rare, or do not require a laboratory test for treatment and management.

Retrospective analysis of surveillance data is not recommended as an investigative approach for public health action due to potential underreporting, inherent in surveillance systems, and lack of timeliness.

Conclusion

In our review, we determined that air travel related transmission of pathogens responsible for many respiratory illnesses occurred outside of the standard 2x2 area for contact tracing.

However, we have found overall that this evidence was only of a medium level of quality and raises questions about reliance upon a single 2x2 contact metric. In contrast, our

findings indicate that in certain circumstances, a whole-of-flight or whole-of-journey approach may be necessary for contact tracing persons infected with emerging pathogens

until pathogen-specific transmission dynamics are understood or most travellers have immunity. Consideration of the utility of contact tracing of this nature in reducing transmission within a country or community is vital to preserve resources. Case studies of outbreaks provide valuable initial insights into the in-flight transmission of SARS-CoV-2. The low level of evidence is attributable to under detection and subsequent underreporting of cases across public health units, multinational investigations and lack of airline cooperation rather than a reflection of the public health investigators methods. It is important to recognise that accounts of in-flight or flight associated transmission are uncommon in medical literature, and that the publication of case studies do not reflect the majority of flights where transmission does not occur.

The entire air travel process, from travel to an airport to departing the terminal at the end destination, needs to be considered in terms of infection control and interaction during public health investigations. This style of multilayered, approach has been recommended by the International Civil Aviation Organisation and IATA, and should be considered by public health authorities when investigating infectious respiratory diseases in the context of flight [124]. This multilayered approach will help protect public health and enable containment of infectious respiratory pathogens as international travel resumes.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge and thank our Australian and New Zealand health department and airline colleagues for their assistance with this review and participating in discussion regarding in-flight transmission.

ACR is funded by the Master of Philosophy (Applied Epidemiology) Scholarship at Australian National University. MDK is supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council fellowship (APP1145997).

References

1. Swadi T, Geoghegan JL, Devine T, McElnay C, Shoemack P, Rens X, et al. A case study of extended in-flight transmission of SARS-CoV-2 en route to Aotearoa New Zealand2020.
2. Bogoch II, Watts A, Thomas-Bachli A, Huber C, Kraemer MUG, Khan K. Potential for global spread of a novel coronavirus from China. *Journal of Travel Medicine*. 2020;27(2). doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa011.
3. Murphy N, Boland M, Bambury N, Fitzgerald M, Comerford L, Dever N, et al. A large national outbreak of COVID-19 linked to air travel, Ireland, summer 2020. *Euro Surveill*. 2020;25(42). Epub 2020/10/24. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.Es.2020.25.42.2001624. PubMed PMID: 33094715; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7651877.
4. Han E, Tan MMJ, Turk E, Sridhar D, Leung GM, Shibuya K, et al. Lessons learnt from easing COVID-19 restrictions: an analysis of countries and regions in Asia Pacific and Europe. *The Lancet*. 2020;396(10261):1525-34. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)32007-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32007-9).
5. Kotila SM, Payne Hallström L, Jansen N, Helbling P, Abubakar I. Systematic review on tuberculosis transmission on aircraft and update of the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control risk assessment guidelines for tuberculosis transmitted on aircraft (RAGIDA-TB). *Euro Surveill*. 2016;21(4). Epub 2016/02/06. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.Es.2016.21.4.30114. PubMed PMID: 26848520.
6. Leitmeyer K, Adlhoch C. Review Article: Influenza Transmission on Aircraft: A Systematic Literature Review. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass)*. 2016;27(5):743-51. Epub 2016/06/03. doi: 10.1097/ede.0000000000000438. PubMed PMID: 27253070; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4969063.

7. Communicable Diseases Network Australia. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) CDNA National Guidelines for Public Health Units. In: Health Do, editor. Australia2021.
8. Yang N, Shen Y, Shi C, Ma AHY, Zhang X, Jian X, et al. In-flight Transmission Cluster of COVID-19: A Retrospective Case Series. 2020:2020.03.28.20040097. doi: 10.1101/2020.03.28.20040097 %J medRxiv.
9. Edelson PJ. Patterns of measles transmission among airplane travelers. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* 2012;10(5):230-5. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmaid.2012.10.003>.
10. Baker MG, Thornley CN, Mills C, Roberts S, Perera S, Peters J, et al. Transmission of pandemic A/H1N1 2009 influenza on passenger aircraft: retrospective cohort study. 2010;340. PubMed PMID: WOS:000278062100002.
11. Bielecki M, Patel D, Hinkelbein J, Komorowski M, Kester J, Ebrahim S, et al. Air travel and COVID-19 prevention in the pandemic and peri-pandemic period: A narrative review. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* 2021;39:101915. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101915>.
12. Pang JK, Jones SP, Waite LL, Olson NA, Atmur RJ, Cummins JJ. Probability and Estimated Risk of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission in the Air Travel System: A Systemic Review and Meta-Analysis. medRxiv. 2021:2021.04.08.21255171. doi: 10.1101/2021.04.08.21255171.
13. Freedman DO, Wilder-Smith A. In-flight transmission of SARS-CoV-2: a review of the attack rates and available data on the efficacy of face masks. *Journal of Travel Medicine.* 2020;27(8). doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa178.
14. Khatib AN, Carvalho A-M, Primavesi R, To K, Poirier V. Navigating the risks of flying during COVID-19: a review for safe air travel. *Journal of Travel Medicine.* 2020;27(8). doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa212.

15. Rafferty AC, Hughes W, Bofkin K, Ioannides N. What is the evidence of transmission of infectious respiratory illness on aircraft? A systematic review. PROSPERO 2020 CRD420201912612020.
16. Doi SA, Barendregt JJ, Khan S, Thalib L, Williams GM. Advances in the meta-analysis of heterogeneous clinical trials I: The inverse variance heterogeneity model. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2015;45(Pt A):130-8. Epub 2015/05/25. doi: 10.1016/j.cct.2015.05.009. PubMed PMID: 26003435.
17. Barendregt JJ, Doi SA, Lee YY, Norman RE, Vos T. Meta-analysis of prevalence. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2013;67(11):974-8. Epub 2013/08/22. doi: 10.1136/jech-2013-203104. PubMed PMID: 23963506.
18. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JPA, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*. 2009;339:b2700. doi: 10.1136/bmj.b2700.
19. Vogt TM, Guerra MA, Flagg EW, Ksiazek TG, Lowther SA, Arguin PM. Risk of severe acute respiratory syndrome-associated coronavirus transmission aboard commercial aircraft. 2006;13(5):268-72. PubMed PMID: WOS:000240632500004.
20. Breugelmans JG, Zucs P, Porten K, Broll S, Niedrig M, Ammon A, et al. SARS transmission and commercial aircraft [1]. 2004;10(8):1502-3. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76956926.
21. Desenclos J-C, van der Werf S, Bonmarin I, Levy-Bruhl D, Yazdanpanah Y, Hoen B, et al. Introduction of SARS in France, March-April, 2003. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2004;10(2):195-200. doi: 10.3201/eid1002.030351. PubMed PMID: 15030682.

22. Olsen SJ, Chang HL, Cheung TYY, Tang AFY, Fisk TL, Ooi SPL, et al. Transmission of the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome on Aircraft. 2003;349(25):2416-22. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76957115.
23. Wilder-Smith A, Paton NI, Goh KT. Low risk of transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome on airplanes: the Singapore experience. 2003;8(11):1035-7. PubMed PMID: 14629772.
24. Lippold SA, Objio T, Vonnahme L, Washburn F, Cohen NJ, Chen TH, et al. Conveyance contact investigation for imported Middle East respiratory syndrome cases, United States, May 2014. 2017;23(9):1585-9. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76957077.
25. Parry-Ford F, Boddington N, Pebody R, Phin N. Public health response to two incidents of confirmed MERS-CoV cases travelling on flights through London heathrow airport in 2014-lessons learnt. 2015;20(18). PubMed PMID: rayyan-76957124.
26. Kang M, Song T, Zhong H, Hou J, Wang J, Li J, et al. Contact Tracing for Imported Case of Middle East Respiratory Syndrome, China, 2015. Emerg Infect Dis. 2016;22(9):1644-6. doi: 10.3201/eid2209.152116. PubMed PMID: 27532887.
27. Kraaij – Dirkzwager M, Timen A, Dirksen K, Gelinck L, Leyten E, Groeneveld P, et al. Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) infections in two returning travellers in the Netherlands, May 2014. 2014;19(21):20817. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES2014.19.21.20817>.
28. Kwok-ming P, Miu-ling W, Yiu-hong L, Ka-wai S, Liza TM-k, Shuk-kwan C. International Health Regulations (2005) facilitate communication for in-flight contacts of a Middle East respiratory syndrome case, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, 2014. Western Pac Surveill Response J. 2015;6(1):62-5. doi: 10.2471/WPSAR.2015.6.1.002. PubMed PMID: 25960925.

29. Mollers M, Jonges M, Pas SD, van der Eijk AA, Dirksen K, Jansen C, et al. Follow-up of Contacts of Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-Infected Returning Travelers, the Netherlands, 2014. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2015;21(9):1667-9. Epub 2015/08/21. doi: 10.3201/eid2109.150560. PubMed PMID: 26291986; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4550153.
30. Plipat T, Buathong R, Wacharapluesadee S, Siriarayapon P, Pittayawonganon C, Sangsajja C, et al. Imported case of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) infection from Oman to Thailand, June 2015. *2017;22(33):30598.* doi: <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2017.22.33.30598>.
31. Premila Devi J, Noraini W, Norhayati R, Chee Kheong C, Badrul AS, Zainah S, et al. Laboratory-confirmed case of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) infection in Malaysia: preparedness and response, April 2014. *2014;19(18):20797.* doi: <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES2014.19.18.20797>.
32. Puzelli S, Azzi A, Santini MG, Di Martino A, Facchini M, Castrucci MR, et al. Investigation of an imported case of Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) infection in Florence, Italy, May to June 2013. *2013;18(34):20564.* doi: <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES2013.18.34.20564>.
33. Racelis S, de los Reyes VC, Sucaldito MN, Deveraturda I, Roca JB, Tayag E. Contact tracing the first Middle East respiratory syndrome case in the Philippines, February 2015. *Western Pac Surveill Response J.* 2015;6(3):3-7. doi: 10.5365/WPSAR.2015.6.2.012. PubMed PMID: 26668760.
34. Tsiodras S, Baka A, Mentis A, Iliopoulos D, Dedoukou X, Papamavrou G, et al. A case of imported Middle East Respiratory Syndrome coronavirus infection and public health response, Greece, April 2014. *2014;19(16):20782.* doi: <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES2014.19.16.20782>.

35. Wu J, Yi L, Zou L, Zhong H, Liang L, Song T, et al. Imported case of MERS-CoV infection identified in China, May 2015: detection and lesson learned. 2015;20(24):21158. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES2015.20.24.21158>.
36. Centers for Disease Control. Exposure of passengers and flight crew to Mycobacterium tuberculosis on commercial aircraft, 1992-1995. 1995;273(12):911-2. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76956893.
37. Beller M. Tuberculosis and Air Travel. State of Alaska Epidemiology Bulletin,; 1996.
38. Centers for Disease Control. Public health interventions involving travelers with tuberculosis--U.S. ports of entry, 2007-2012. MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report. 2012;61(30):570-3. Epub 2012/08/03. PubMed PMID: 22854625.
39. Abubakar I, Welfare R, Moore J, Watson JM. Surveillance of air-travel-related tuberculosis incidents, England and Wales: 2007-2008. 2008;13(23). PubMed PMID: rayyan-76956903.
40. An der Heiden M, Hauer B, Fiebig L, Glaser-Paschke G, Stemmler M, Simon C, et al. Contact investigation after a fatal case of extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis (XDR-TB) in an aircraft, Germany, July 2013. Euro Surveill. 2017;22(12):30493. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2017.22.12.30493. PubMed PMID: 28367796.
41. Chemardin J, Paty MC, Renard-Dubois S, Veziris N, Antoine D. Contact tracing of passengers exposed to an extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis case during an air flight from Beirut to Paris, October 2006. Euro Surveill. 2007;12(12):E071206.2. Epub 2007/12/11. doi: 10.2807/esw.12.49.03325-en. PubMed PMID: 18067848.
42. Driver CR, Valway SE, Morgan WM, Onorato IM, Castro KG. Transmission of Mycobacterium tuberculosis associated with air travel. 1994;272(13):1031-5. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76956966.

43. Flanagan P, O'Donnell J, Mereckiene J, O'Flanagan D. Tuberculosis contact investigations associated with air travel in Ireland, September 2011 to November 2014. *Euro Surveill.* 2016;21(40):30358. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2016.21.40.30358. PubMed PMID: 27748251.
44. Kenyon TA, Valway SE, Ihle WW, Onorato IM, Castro KG. Transmission of multidrug-resistant *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* during a long airplane flight. *The New England journal of medicine.* 1996;334(15):933-8. Epub 1996/04/11. doi: 10.1056/nejm199604113341501. PubMed PMID: 8596593.
45. Kornylo-Duong K, Kim C, Cramer EH, Buff AM, Rodriguez-Howell D, Doyle J, et al. Three air travel-related contact investigations associated with infectious tuberculosis, 2007-2008. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* 2010;8(2):120-8. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76957051.
46. Marienau KJ, Burgess GW, Cramer E, Averhoff FM, Buff AM, Russell M, et al. Tuberculosis investigations associated with air travel: U. S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, January 2007–June 2008. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* 2010;8(2):104-12. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmaid.2010.02.003>.
47. McFarland J, Hickman C, Osterholm M, MacDonald K. Exposure to *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* during air travel. *The Lancet.* 1993;342(8863):112-3. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736\(93\)91311-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736(93)91311-9).
48. Miller MA, Valway S, Onorato IM. Tuberculosis risk after exposure on airplanes. *Tubercle and lung disease : the official journal of the International Union against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease.* 1996;77(5):414-9. Epub 1996/10/01. doi: 10.1016/s0962-8479(96)90113-6. PubMed PMID: 8959144.
49. Moore M, Fleming KS, Sands L. A passenger with pulmonary/laryngeal tuberculosis: No evidence of transmission on two short flights. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 1996;67(11):1097-100. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76957094.

50. Scholten D, Saunders A, Dawson K, Wong T, Ellis E. Air travel by individuals with active tuberculosis: reporting patterns and epidemiologic characteristics, Canada 2006-2008. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* 2010;8(2):113-9. Epub 2010/05/19. doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2010.02.002. PubMed PMID: 20478519.
51. Thibeault C, Tanguay F, Lacroix C, Menzies R, Rivest P. A case of active tuberculosis in a cabin crew: the results of contact tracing. *Aviation, space, and environmental medicine.* 2012;83(1):61-3. Epub 2012/01/26. doi: 10.3357/asm.3135.2012. PubMed PMID: 22272519.
52. Vassiloyanakopoulos A, Spala G, Mavrou E, Hadjichristodoulou C. A case of tuberculosis on a long distance flight: the difficulties of the investigation. 1999;4(9):96-7%P 83. doi: doi:<https://doi.org/10.2807/esm.04.09.00083-en>.
53. Whitlock G, Calder L, Perry H. A case of infectious tuberculosis on two long-haul aircraft flights: contact investigation. 2001;114(1137):353-5. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76957231.
54. Parmet AJ. Tuberculosis on the flight deck. *Aviation, space, and environmental medicine.* 1999;70(8):817-8. Epub 1999/08/14. PubMed PMID: 10447057.
55. Berger A, Meinel DM, Schaffer A, Ziegler R, Pitteroff J, Konrad R, et al. A case of pharyngeal diphtheria in Germany, June 2015. 2016;306(8):124-5. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76956918.
56. Amornkul PN, Takahashi H, Bogard AK, Nakata M, Harpaz R, Effler PV. Low risk of measles transmission after exposure on an international airline flight. 2004;189:S81-S5. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76956909.
57. Barrett P, Cotter S, Ryan F, Connell J, Cronin A, Ward M, et al. A national measles outbreak in Ireland linked to a single imported case, April to September, 2016. 2018;23(31):1700655. doi: doi:<https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2018.23.31.1700655>.

58. Beard F, Franklin L, Donohue S, Moran R, Lambert S, Maloney M, et al. Contact tracing of in-flight measles exposures: lessons from an outbreak investigation and case series, Australia, 2010. *Western Pac Surveill Response J*. 2011;2(3):25-33. doi: 10.5365/WPSAR.2011.2.2.010. PubMed PMID: 23908891.
59. Bitzegeio J, Bukowski B, Hausner M, Sissolak D, Rasmussen LD, Andersen PH, et al. Two measles clusters in connection with short inner-European air travels indicating impediments to effective measles control: A cluster analysis. *Travel Med Infect Dis*. 2020;33:101542. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmaid.2019.101542>.
60. Centers for Disease C, Prevention. Notes from the field: Multiple cases of measles after exposure during air travel--Australia and New Zealand, January 2011. 2011;60(25):851. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76956941.
61. Centers for Disease Control. Interstate importation of measles following transmission in an airport--California, Washington, 1982. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report*. 1983;32(16):210, 5-6. Epub 1983/04/29. PubMed PMID: 6406807.
62. Centers for Disease Control. Postexposure prophylaxis, isolation, and quarantine to control an import-associated measles outbreak--Iowa, 2004. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report*. 2004;53(41):969-71. Epub 2004/10/22. PubMed PMID: 15496826.
63. Centers for Disease Control. Measles—United States, 2004. *JAMA*. 2006;295(2):153-4. doi: 10.1001/jama.295.2.153 %J JAMA.
64. Centers for Disease Control. Measles Among Adults Associated with Adoption of Children in China — California, Missouri, and Washington, July–August 2006. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2007;56(7):144-6.
65. Centers for Disease Control. Measles among U.S.-bound refugees from Malaysia--California, Maryland, North Carolina, and Wisconsin, August-September 2011. *MMWR*

Morbidity and mortality weekly report. 2011;60(37):1281-2. Epub 2011/09/23. PubMed PMID: 21937975.

66. Centers for Disease Control. Hospital-associated measles outbreak - Pennsylvania, March-April 2009. MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report. 2012;61(2):30-2. Epub 2012/01/20. PubMed PMID: 22258416.

67. Chen SY, Anderson S, Kutty PK, Lugo F, McDonald M, Rota PA, et al. Health Care–Associated Measles Outbreak in the United States After an Importation: Challenges and Economic Impact. The Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2011;203(11):1517-25. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jir115 %J The Journal of Infectious Diseases.

68. Chen T-H, Kutty P, Lowe LE, Hunt EA, Blostein J, Espinoza R, et al. Measles outbreak associated with an international youth sporting event in the United States, 2007. The Pediatric infectious disease journal 2010;29(9):794-800.

69. Cocoros N, Hernandez R, Harrington N, Rausch-Phung E, Schulte CR, Blog D, et al. Measles transmission associated with international air travel - Massachusetts and New York, July-August 2010. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2010;59(33):1073.

70. Coleman KP, Markey PG. Measles transmission in immunized and partially immunized air travellers. Epidemiology and infection. 2010;138(7):1012-5. Epub 2009/11/03. doi: 10.1017/s0950268809991129. PubMed PMID: 19878613.

71. Collier MG, Cierzniewski A, Duszynski T, Munson C, Wenger M, Beard B, et al. Measles Outbreak Associated With International Travel, Indiana, 2011. Journal of the Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society. 2013;2(2):110-8. Epub 2013/06/01. doi: 10.1093/jpids/pis132. PubMed PMID: 26619458.

72. Cotter S, O’Flanagan, Darina Cooney, Fionnuala Thornton, Lelia McKeown, Paul Probable measles transmission during transatlantic travel. Epi-Insight. 2010;11(8).

73. Dayan GH, Ortega-Sánchez IR, LeBaron CW, Quinlisk MP. The Cost of Containing One Case of Measles: The Economic Impact on the Public Health Infrastructure—Iowa, 2004. *2005*;116(1):e1-e4. doi: 10.1542/peds.2004-2512 %J Pediatrics.
74. de Barros FR, Danovaro-Holliday MC, Toscano C, Segatto TC, Vicari A, Luna E. Measles transmission during commercial air travel in Brazil. *J Clin Virol.* 2006;36(3):235-6. Epub 2006/05/23. doi: 10.1016/j.jcv.2006.04.001. PubMed PMID: 16720101.
75. Huang H-I, Tai M-C, Wu K-B, Chen W-C, Huang AS-E, Cheng W-Y, et al. Measles transmission at an international airport — Taiwan, March–April 2018. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases.* 2019;86:188-90. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2019.07.038>.
76. Kantele A, Valtonen K, Davidkin I, Martelius T, Vöželevskaia N, Skogberg K, et al. Travellers returning with measles from Thailand to Finland, April 2012: infection control measures. *Euro Surveill.* 2012;17(22). Epub 2012/06/13. doi: 10.2807/ese.17.22.20184-en. PubMed PMID: 22687913.
77. Lasher LE, Ayers TL, Amornkul PN, Nakatab MN, Effler PV. Contacting passengers after exposure to measles on an international flight: Implications for responding to new disease threats and bioterrorism. *Public Health Rep.* 2004;119(5):458-63. Epub 2004/08/18. doi: 10.1016/j.phr.2004.07.002. PubMed PMID: 15313108; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC1497663.
78. Lu L, Roland E, Shearer E, Zahn M, Djuric M, McDonald E, et al. Notes from the Field: Measles Outbreak Associated with International Air Travel - California, March-April 2017. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report.* 2020;69(25):803-4. Epub 2020/06/26. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6925a6. PubMed PMID: 32584803; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7316313
Journal Editors form for disclosure of potential conflicts of interest. No potential conflicts of interest were disclosed.

79. Nelson K, Marienau K, Schembri C, Redd S. Measles transmission during air travel, United States, December 1, 2008-December 31, 2011. *2013*;11(2):81-9. PubMed PMID: 23562445.
80. Slater P AE, Bashary A. An outbreak of measles associated with a New York/Tel Aviv flight. *Travel Medicine International*. 1995;199(13):92-5.
81. Thole S, Kalhoefer D, An der Heiden M, Nordmann D, Daniels-Haardt I, Jurke A. Contact tracing following measles exposure on three international flights, Germany, 2017. *2019*;24(19). PubMed PMID: 31088599.
82. van Binnendijk RS, Hahné S, Timen A, van Kempen G, Kohl RHG, Boot HJ, et al. Air travel as a risk factor for introduction of measles in a highly vaccinated population. *Vaccine*. 2008;26(46):5775-7. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2008.08.048. PubMed PMID: 18786588.
83. Nelson KR, Marienau KJ, Barskey AE, Schembri C. No evidence of mumps transmission during air travel, United States, November 1, 2006-October 31, 2010. *2012*;10(4):165-71. PubMed PMID: 22818340.
84. Centers for Disease Control. Update: multistate outbreak of mumps--United States, January 1-May 2, 2006. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report*. 2006;55(20):559-63. Epub 2006/05/26. PubMed PMID: 16723967.
85. Kim C, Chavez P, Pierce A, Murray A, Sander M, Kenyon C, et al. Rubella contact tracing associated with air travel. *2012*;10(1):48-51. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76957045.
86. Shankar AG, Janmohamed K, Olowokure B, Smith GE, Hogan AH, De Souza V, et al. Contact Tracing for Influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 Virus-infected Passenger on International Flight. *2014*;20(1):118-20. PubMed PMID: WOS:000329272100019.
87. Ooi PL, Lai FY, Low CL, Lin R, Wong C, Hibberd M, et al. Clinical and molecular evidence for transmission of novel influenza A(H1N1/2009) on a commercial airplane.

Archives of internal medicine. 2010;170(10):913-5. Epub 2010/05/26. doi:

10.1001/archinternmed.2010.127. PubMed PMID: 20498421.

88. Kim JH, Lee D-H, Shin S-S, Kang C, Kim JS, Jun BY, et al. In-Flight Transmission of Novel Influenza A (H1N1). *Epidemiol Health*. 2010;32:e2010006-e. doi:

10.4178/epih/e2010006. PubMed PMID: 21191459.

89. Neatherlin J, Cramer EH, Dubray C, Marienau KJ, Russell M, Sun H, et al. Influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 during air travel. 2013;11(2):110-8. PubMed PMID: 23523241.

90. Young N, Pebody R, Smith G, Olowokure B, Shankar G, Hoschler K, et al.

International flight-related transmission of pandemic influenza A(H1N1)pdm09: an historical cohort study of the first identified cases in the United Kingdom. 2014;8(1):66-73. doi:

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1111%2Ffirv.12181>. PubMed PMID: 24373291.

91. Han K, et al. Lack of Airborne Transmission during outbreak of Pandemic (H1N1) 2009 among Tour Group Members, China June 2009. 2009. PubMed PMID: rayyan-83370430.

92. Pang X, Yang P, Li S, Zhang L, Tian L, Li Y, et al. Pandemic (H1N1) 2009 among quarantined close contacts, Beijing, People's Republic of China. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2011;17(10):1824-30. doi: 10.3201/eid1710.101344. PubMed PMID: 22000351.

93. Zhang L, Peng Z, Ou J, Zeng G, Fontaine RE, Liu M, et al. Protection by face masks against influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 virus on trans-pacific passenger aircraft, 2009. 2013;19(9):1403-10. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76957250.

94. Foxwell AR, Roberts L, Lokuge K, Kelly PM. Transmission of Influenza on International Flights, May 2009. 2011;17(7):1188-94. PubMed PMID: WOS:000292581600005.

95. Moser MR, Bender TR, Margolis HS, Noble GR, Kendal AP, Ritter DG. An outbreak of influenza aboard a commercial airliner. 1979;110(1):1-6. PubMed PMID: 463858.

96. Marsden AG. Outbreak of influenza-like illness [corrected] related to air travel. The Medical journal of Australia. 2003;179(3):172-3. Epub 2003/07/30. PubMed PMID: 12885291.
97. Centers for Disease Control. Exposure to Patients With Meningococcal Disease on Aircrafts — United States, 1999–2001. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2001;50(23):485-9.
98. O'Connor BA, Chant KG, Binotto E, Maidment CA, Maywood P, McAnulty JM. Meningococcal disease--probable transmission during an international flight. 2005;29(3):312-4. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76957112.
99. Riley LK. Bacterial meningitis exposure during an international flight: lessons for communicable pathogens. Aviation, space, and environmental medicine. 2006;77(7):758-60. Epub 2006/07/22. PubMed PMID: 16856365.
100. Eichler N, Thornley C, Swadi T, Devine T, McElnay C, Sherwood J, et al. Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 during Border Quarantine and Air Travel, New Zealand (Aotearoa). Emerging Infectious Disease journal. 2021;27(5). doi: 10.3201/eid2705.210514.
101. Burke RM, Balter S, Barnes E, Barry V, Bartlett K, Beer KD, et al. Enhanced contact investigations for nine early travel-related cases of SARS-CoV-2 in the United States. PLoS One. 2020;15(9):e0238342-e. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0238342. PubMed PMID: 32877446.
102. Bae SH, Shin H, Koo H-Y, Lee SW, Yang JM, Yon DK. Asymptomatic Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 on Evacuation Flight. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020;26(11):2705-8. Epub 2020/08/21. doi: 10.3201/eid2611.203353. PubMed PMID: 32822289.
103. Bernard Stoecklin S, Rolland P, Silue Y, Mailles A, Campese C, Simondon A, et al. First cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in France: surveillance, investigations

and control measures, January 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25(6):2000094. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.6.2000094. PubMed PMID: 32070465.

104. Blomquist PB, Bolt H, Packer S, Schaefer U, Platt S, Dabrera G, et al. Risk of symptomatic COVID-19 due to aircraft transmission: a retrospective cohort study of contact-traced flights during England's containment phase. n/a(n/a). doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/irv.12846>.

105. Böhmer MM, Buchholz U, Corman VM, Hoch M, Katz K, Marosevic DV, et al. Investigation of a COVID-19 outbreak in Germany resulting from a single travel-associated primary case: a case series. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020;20(8):920-8. Epub 2020/05/15. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30314-5. PubMed PMID: 32422201.

106. Chen J, He H, Cheng W, Liu Y, Sun Z, Chai C, et al. Potential transmission of SARS-CoV-2 on a flight from Singapore to Hangzhou, China: An epidemiological investigation. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* 2020;36:101816-. doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101816. PubMed PMID: 32645477.

107. Choi EM, Chu DKW, Cheng PKC, Tsang DNC, Peiris M, Bausch DG, et al. In-Flight Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;26(11):2713-6. Epub 2020/09/19. doi: 10.3201/eid2611.203254. PubMed PMID: 32946370; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7588512.

108. Draper AD, Dempsey KE, Boyd RH, Childs EM, Black HM, Francis LA, et al. The first 2 months of COVID-19 contact tracing in the Northern Territory of Australia, March-April 2020. *Communicable diseases intelligence (2018).* 2020;44. Epub 2020/07/04. doi: 10.33321/cdi.2020.44.53. PubMed PMID: 32615916.

109. Hoehl S, Karaca O, Kohmer N, Westhaus S, Graf J, Goetsch U, et al. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission on an International Flight and Among a Tourist Group. *JAMA*

Network Open. 2020;3(8):e2018044-e. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.18044 %J

JAMA Network Open.

110. Khanh NC, Thai PQ, Quach H-L, Thi N-AH, Dinh PC, Duong TN, et al.

Transmission of SARS-CoV 2 During Long-Haul Flight. *Emerging Infectious Disease journal*. 2020;26(11):2617. doi: 10.3201/eid2611.203299.

111. Murphy N, Boland M, Bambury N, Fitzgerald M, Comerford L, Dever N, et al. A large national outbreak of COVID-19 linked to air travel, Ireland, summer 2020.

2020;25(42):2001624. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.42.2001624>.

112. Pavli A, Smeti P, Hadjianastasiou S, Theodoridou K, Spilioti A, Papadima K, et al.

In-flight transmission of COVID-19 on flights to Greece: An epidemiological analysis.

Travel Med Infect Dis. 2020;38:101882-. doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101882. PubMed PMID: 32949700.

113. Qian G-Q, Yang N-B, Ding F, Ma AHY, Wang Z-Y, Shen Y-F, et al. Epidemiologic and clinical characteristics of 91 hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Zhejiang, China: a retrospective, multi-centre case series. *QJM: An International Journal of Medicine*.

2020;113(7):474-81. doi: 10.1093/qjmed/hcaa089 %J *QJM: An International Journal of Medicine*.

114. Schwartz KL, Murti M, Finkelstein M, Leis JA, Fitzgerald-Husek A, Bourns L, et al.

Lack of COVID-19 transmission on an international flight. 2020;192(15):E410. PubMed PMID: rayyan-76957149.

115. Speake H, Phillips A, Chong T, Sikazwe C, Levy A, Lang J, et al. Flight-Associated Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Corroborated by Whole-Genome Sequencing. *Emerging Infectious Disease journal*. 2020;26(12):2872. doi:

10.3201/eid2612.203910.

116. Eldin C LJ, Mailhe M, Gautret P. Probable aircraft transmission of COVID-19 in-flight from Central African Republic to France. 2020. PubMed PMID: rayyan-83370424.
117. Nir-Paz R, Grotto I, Strolov I, Salmon A, Mandelboim M, Mendelson E, et al. Absence of in-flight transmission of SARS-CoV-2 likely due to use of face masks on board. *Journal of Travel Medicine*. 2020. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa117.
118. Nye R, Hogarth F, Hall RN, Hosegood I, Souter S, Hughes W, et al. Potential in-flight transmission of SARS-CoV-2 on Australian and international flights, 1 January–1 May 2020 [Journal Article]. In press 2021.
119. Postexposure prophylaxis, isolation, and quarantine to control an import-associated measles outbreak--Iowa, 2004. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2004;53(41):969-71. Epub 2004/10/22. PubMed PMID: 15496826.
120. Wang PD. Two-step tuberculin testing of passengers and crew on a commercial airplane. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2000;28(3):233-8. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1067/mic.2000.103555>.
121. Liu Y, Rocklöv J. The reproductive number of the Delta variant of SARS-CoV-2 is far higher compared to the ancestral SARS-CoV-2 virus. *J Travel Med*. 2021. Epub 2021/08/10. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taab124. PubMed PMID: 34369565.
122. Else H. How a torrent of COVID science changed research publishing — in seven charts. *Nature*. 2020.
123. Australian Government Department of Health. National Review of Hotel Quarantine. Canberra, Australia: 2020 23 October 2020. Report No.
124. International Civil Aviation Organization. Guidance for Air Travel through the COVID-19 Public Health Crisis Canada2021 [cited 2021 21 June]. Available from: <https://www.icao.int/covid/cart/Pages/CART-Take-off.aspx>.

Appendix 1 – Search Strategy

Pubmed and Web of Science search

--("communicable diseases" OR "infectious diseases" OR "disease outbreaks" OR "influenza" OR "fomites" OR "coronavirus" OR "coronavirus infections" OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome" OR "respiratory tract infections" OR "middle east respiratory syndrome" OR "common cold")

AND

("Air travel" OR "inflight" OR "Flight" OR "Aircraft" OR "Air travel" OR "Flying")

AND

("Pilots" OR "cabin crew" OR "Crew" OR "Passengers")

Cochrane search

('communicable diseases' OR 'infectious diseases' OR 'disease outbreaks' OR 'influenza' OR 'fomites' OR 'coronavirus' OR 'coronavirus infections' OR 'severe acute respiratory syndrome' OR 'respiratory tract infections' OR 'middle east respiratory syndrome' OR 'common cold') in Title Abstract Keyword AND 'Air travel' OR 'inflight' OR 'Flight' OR 'Aircraft' OR 'Air travel' OR 'Flying' in Title Abstract Keyword AND 'Pilots' OR 'cabin crew' OR 'Crew' OR 'Passengers' in Title Abstract Keyword - (Word variations have been searched)

Appendix 2 – Quality assessment tool, adapted from Leitmeyer, et al. [6]

Criteria	Points Awarded or Withdrawn
Index case classification	
Laboratory confirmation	1
Unspecific clinical presentation or data not provided	0
Secondary case ascertainment	
Laboratory confirmation of all cases	2
Syndromic (e.g., influenza-like illness) or no comprehensive confirmation of all secondary cases	1
Not provided	0
Contact tracing strategy	

Comprehensive	2
Other (two rows, compartment, class, area, retrospective identification)	0
Timeliness of contact tracing	
Within 1 week (1 month for TB)	2
Within 3 weeks (3 months for TB)	1
After 3 weeks or more (3 months for TB)	0
Completeness of contact tracing: proportion of passengers followed up	
More than 80% were followed up	2
Between 80% and 50% were followed up	1
Less than 50% were followed up or retrospective identification	0
Limitations	
alternative exposure not addressed	-1
0 –1 Resulting evidence levels: 0–3 low, 4–6 medium, 7–9 high.	

Appendix 3

Table 1: Supplementary data and evidence assessment

Pathogen	Study (First Author and year (investigation #) [reference])	# passengers to be traced	# of passengers traced	# index cases	# 2ndry cases	2ndry cases within 2 rows	# of people on board	Index Case classification	Secondary case ascertainment	Contact tracing Strategy	Timeliness of contact tracing	Completeness of contact tracing: proportion of passengers followed up	Limitations	Total	Evidence Level
Diphtheria	Berger, 2016 (1)[55]	19	16	1	0	-	-	1	0	0	2	2	0	5	Medium
H1N1	Baker, 2010 (1)[10]	112	102	12	4	4	379	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
H1N1	Foxwell, 2011 (1) [94]	445	145	6	8	8	445	0	2	0	2	0	0	4	Medium
H1N1	Foxwell, 2011 (2)[94]	293	131	1	1	1	293	1	2	0	2	0	0	5	Medium
H1N1	Han, 2009 (1)[91]	114	114	1	0	-	115	1	2	2	0	2	0	7	High
H1N1	Han, 2009 (2) [91]	110	110	1	1	0	111	1	2	2	0	2	0	7	High
H1N1	Han, 2009 (3) [91]	110	110	2	7	1	112	1	2	2	0	2	0	7	High
H1N1	Kim, 2010 (1)[88]	337	199	1	1	0	338	1	2	2	0	1	0	6	Medium
H1N1	Neatherlin, 2013 (1) [89]	225	146	1	8	3	226	1	1	2	0	1	0	5	Medium
H1N1	Neatherlin, 2013 (2) [89]	167	133	1	4	3	168	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	Low
H1N1	Ooi, 2010 (1) [87]	596	23	1	5	2	596	1	2	2	2	0	0	7	High
H1N1	Pang, 2011 (2) [89]	1846	1846	1	8	-	1854	1	2	2	2	2	0	9	High
H1N1	Pang, 2011, (1) [89]	1283	1283	1	20	-	1303	1	2	2	2	2	0	9	High
H1N1	Young, 2014 & Shankar, 2014 (1) [86, 90]	278	232	6	6	1	278	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
H1N1	Zhang, 2013 (1) [93]	274	168	1	9	-	274	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	Low
ILI	Marsden, 2003 (1)[96]	-	-	1	15	9	-	0	0	2	2	2	0	6	Medium
Influenza	Moser, 1979 (1)[96]	54	53	1	38	-	54	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High

Measles	Amornkul, 2004 & Lasher, 2004 (1) [56, 77]	336	276	1	0	-	337	0	0	2	2	2	0	6	Medium
Measles	Barret, 2018 (1) [57]	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Measles	Barret, 2018 (2) [57]	-	-	1	2	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Measles	Barret, 2018 (3) [57]	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Measles	Barret, 2018 (4) [57]	-	250	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Measles	Beard, 2011 (1) [58]	56	-	1	4	1	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Measles	Bitzegeio, 2020 (1) [59]	-	-	1	2	0	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Measles	Bitzegeio, 2020 (2) [59]	-	476	1	3	-	-	1	2	0	1	0	0	4	Medium
Measles	CDC, 1983 (1) [61]	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Measles	CDC, 2006 (1) [64]	-	6	1	0	-	-	1	1	0	0	2	0	4	Medium
Measles	CDC, 2006 (2) [64]	118	-	1	0	-	118	1	1	0	0	2	0	4	Medium
Measles	CDC, 2011 (1) [65]	-	-	1	2	0	-	1	2	0	1	0	0	4	Medium
Measles	CDC, 2012 (1) [66]	-	-	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	1	0	0	4	Medium
Measles	Chen, 2010 (1) [68]	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Measles	Chen, 2011 (1)[67]	145	145	1	0	-	145	1	2	2	0	0	0	5	Medium
Measles	Cocoros, 2010 (1) [69]	31	29	1	1	1	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
Measles	Coleman, 2009 (1) [70]	42	42	1	2	0	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
Measles	Colier, 2013 (1)[71]	72	32	1	0	-	-	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	Low
Measles	Cotter, 2010 (1)[72]	321	169	3	2	0	-	1	2	2	2	1	0	8	High
Measles	Dayan, 2005 & CDC, 2005 &CDC, 2006 (1) [63, 73, 119]	-	-	117	4	2	10000	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	Low
Measles	CDC, 2011 (1) [60]	-	-	3	8	3	-	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	Low
Measles	Huang, 2018 (1) [75]	-	-	1	2	0	180	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Measles	Kantele, 2012 (1) [76]	580	580	3	1	0	580	1	2	2	2	0	0	7	High
Measles	Lu, 2020 (1) [78]	22	-	1	1	-	-	1	2	1	2	2	0	8	High
Measles	Lu, 2020 (2) [78]	164	-	1	0	-	-	1	2	1	2	2	0	8	High

Measles	Nelson, 2013 (1)[79]	3399	952	74	9	3	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Low
Measles	Ribiero de Barros, 2006 (1) [74]	334	118	1	2	0	334	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Measles	Slater, 1995 (1) [80]	-	-	1	8	-	350	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Measles	Thole, 2019 (1)[81]	155	155	1	0	-	-	1	2	2	2	1	0	8	High
Measles	Thole, 2019 (2) [81]	-	-	1	2	-	-	1	2	2	0	0	0	5	Medium
Measles	van Binnendijk RS, 2008 (1)[82]	-	-	3	3	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Meningococcal	CDC, 2001, (1)[97]	2	1	1	0	-	-	1	0	0	2	1	0	4	Medium
Meningococcal	O'Connor, 2005 (1)[98]	-	-	1	1	0	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Meningococcal	Riley, 2006 (1)[99]	-	200	1	2	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
MERS	Devi, 2014 (1) [31]	24	21	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
MERS	Kang, 2015 (1) [26]	27	27	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
MERS	Kraaij - Dirkwager, 2014 (1) [27]	18	18	2	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
MERS	Kwok-ming, 2015 (1) [28]	-	42	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	0	0	5	Medium
MERS	Mollers, 2015 (1) [29]	17	17	2	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
MERS	Parry-Ford, 2015 & Lippold, 2017 (1) [24, 25]	173	154	1	0	-	-	0.75	2	1	0.75	0.5	0	5	Medium
MERS	Parry-Ford, 2015 & Lippold, 2017 (2) [24, 25]	574	541	1	0	-	-	1	2	1	0.75	1.25	0	6	Medium
MERS	Plipat, 2015 (1) [30]	26	26	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
MERS	Puzelli, 2013 (1) [32]	9	9	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
MERS	Racelis, 2015 (1) [33]	237	85	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	0	0	5	Medium
MERS	Tsiodras, 2014 (1)[34]	-	12	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	0	0	5	Medium
MERS	Wu, 2015 (1)[35]	6	6	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
Mumps	CDC, 2006 (1)[84]	575	132	11	2	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
Mumps	Nelson, 2012 (1) [83]	166	21	2	0	-	-	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	Low
Rubella	Kim, 2012 (1) [85]	250	215	1	0	-	-	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	Low

SARS	Breugelmans, 2010 (1) [20]	250	36	1	0	-	-	1	0	0	2	2	-1	4	Medium
SARS	Desenclos, 2004 (1) [21]	7	7	1	2	1	402	1	2	0	1	2	0	6	Medium
SARS	Olsen, 2003 (1) [22]	315	74	1	0	-	315	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	Low
SARS	Olsen, 2003 (2) [22]	120	65	1	22	5	120	1	1	2	0	1	0	5	Medium
SARS	Olsen, 2003 (3) [22]	246	166	4	1	-	246	1	0	2	1	1	0	5	Medium
SARS	Vogt, 2006 (1) [19]	334	108	1	0	-	334	1	2	2	0	0	-1	4	Medium
SARS	Vogt, 2006 (2) [19]	296	46	1	0	-	296	1	2	2	0	0	-1	4	Medium
SARS	Vogt, 2006 (3) [19]	374	47	1	0	-	374	1	2	2	0	0	-1	4	Medium
SARS	Vogt, 2006 (4) [19]	133	73	1	0	-	133	1	2	2	0	1	-1	5	Medium
SARS	Vogt, 2006 (5) [19]	212	25	1	0	-	212	1	2	2	0	0	-1	4	Medium
SARS	Vogt, 2006 (6) [19]	32	8	1	0	-	32	1	2	2	0	0	-1	4	Medium
SARS	Vogt, 2006 (7) [19]	385	32	1	0	-	385	1	2	2	0	0	-1	4	Medium
SARS	Wilder-Smith, 2003 (1) [23]	-	-	3	0	-	-	0	2	0	2	0	0	4	Medium
SARS	Wilder-Smith, 2003 (2) [23]	-	-	1	1	0	-	0	2	0	2	0	0	4	Medium
SARS	Wilder-Smith, 2003 (3) [23]	-	-	1	0	-	-	0	2	0	2	0	0	4	Medium
SARS	Wilder-Smith, 2003 (4) [23]	-	-	1	0	-	-	0	2	0	2	0	0	4	Medium
SARS	Wilder-Smith, 2003 (5) [23]	-	-	1	0	-	-	0	2	0	2	0	0	4	Medium
SARS	Wilder-Smith, 2003 (6) [23]	-	-	1	0	-	-	0	2	0	2	2	0	6	Medium
SARS	Wilder-Smith, 2003 (7) [23]	-	-	1	0	-	-	0	2	0	2	0	0	4	Medium
SARS-CoV-2	Bae, 2020 (1) [102]	287	287	6	1	0	299	1	2	2	2	2	-1	8	High
SARS-CoV-2	Bae, 2020 (2)	202	202	3	1	-	205	1	2	2	2	2	-1	8	High
SARS-CoV-2	Bernard Stoecklin, 2020 (1)[103]	13	-	1	0	-	234	1	2	0	1	0	0	4	Medium
SARS-CoV-2	Blomquist, 2021 (1) [104]	425	79	55	5	4	2368	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
SARS-CoV-2	Bohmer, 2020 (1) [105]	-	-	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	-1	2	Low
SARS-CoV-2	Bohmer, 2020 (2)	-	-	1	0	-	-	1	2	2	2	2	0	9	High
SARS-CoV-2	Burke, 2020 (1) [101]	13	13	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High

SARS-CoV-2	Chen 2020 (1)[106]	330	330	11	1	1	342	1	2	2	2	1	0	8	High
SARS-CoV-2	Choi, 2020 (2)[107]	294	0	2	2	-	294	1	2	2	0	2	0	7	High
SARS-CoV-2	Draper, 2020 (1)[108]	389	326	14	0	-	-	1	2	2	1	2	0	8	High
SARS-CoV-2	Eichler, 2021 (1)[100]	148	148	1	2	2	149	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
SARS-CoV-2	Eichler, 2021 (2)	-	-	2	1	1	94	1	2	2	2	2	0	9	High
SARS-CoV-2	Eldin, 2020 (1) [116]	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	2	0	2	0	0	5	Medium
SARS-CoV-2	Eldin, 2020 (2)	-	-	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
SARS-CoV-2	Hoehl, 2020 (1) [109]	95	95	7	2	2	102	1	2	2	1	0	0	6	Medium
SARS-CoV-2	Khanh, 2020 (1) [110]	216	184	1	15	11	217	1	2	2	2	2	0	9	High
SARS-CoV-2	Murphy, 2020 (1) [111]	60	48	1	13	-	61	1	2	2	2	2	0	9	High
SARS-CoV-2	Nir-Paz, 2020 (1) [117]	9	9	2	0	-	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	Low
SARS-CoV-2	Nye, 2021 (1) [118]	-	-	1	3	3	-	1	2	0	0	2	0	5	Medium
SARS-CoV-2	Nye, 2021 (2) [118]	-	-	2	2	2	-	1	2	0	0	2	0	5	Medium
SARS-CoV-2	Nye, 2021 (3) [118]	-	-	3	1	1	-	1	2	0	0	2	0	5	Medium
SARS-CoV-2	Nye, 2021 (4) [118]	-	-	6	1	0	-	1	2	0	0	2	0	5	Medium
SARS-CoV-2	Nye, 2021 (5) [118]	-	-	40	3	-	-	1	2	0	0	2	0	5	Medium
SARS-CoV-2	Nye, 2021 (6) [118]	-	-	5	3	3	-	1	2	0	0	2	0	5	Medium
SARS-CoV-2	Pavli, 2020 (1) [112]	-	981	21	5	4	2334	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Low
SARS-CoV-2	Qian, 2020 (1) [113]	-	-	1	10	-	-	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	Low
SARS-CoV-2	Schwartz, 2020 (1) [114]	25	25	1	0	-	350	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
SARS-CoV-2	Speake, 2020 (1) [115]	241	-	11	11	8	241	1	2	1	2	2	0	8	High
SARS-CoV-2	Swadi, 2020 (1) [1]	84	84	2	4	4	86	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
TB	Abubakar, 2008 (1) [39]	28	3	1	0	-	-	0	2	0	0	2	-1	3	Low
TB	Abubakar, 2008 (2) [39]	28	3	1	0	-	-	0	2	0	0	0	-1	1	Low
TB	Abubakar, 2008 (3) [39]	22	7	1	0	-	-	0	2	0	0	0	-1	1	Low
TB	Abubakar, 2008 (4) [39]	32	4	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	-1	2	Low
TB	Abubakar, 2008 (5) [39]	-	4	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	-1	2	Low

TB	Abubakar, 2008 (6) [39]	-	2	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	-1	2	Low
TB	Abubakar, 2008 (7) [39]	-	-	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	-1	2	Low
TB	Abubakar, 2008 (8) [39]	41	8	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	-1	2	Low
TB	Abubakar, 2008 (9) [39]	43	15	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	-1	2	Low
TB	Abubakar, 2008 (10) [39]	47	7	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	-1	2	Low
TB	Abubakar, 2008 (11) [39]	-	-	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	-1	2	Low
TB	an der Heiden, 2017 (1) [40]	162	135	1	1	0	163	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
TB	Beller, 1996 (1) [37]	12	12	1	0	-	13	1	2	2	2	2	0	9	High
TB	CDC, 1995 (1) [36]	274	266	1	6	-	-	1	2	0	0	2	0	5	Medium
TB	CDC, 1995 (2) [36]	343	79	1	0	-	344	1	2	2	0	0	0	5	Medium
TB	CDC, 1995 (3) [36]	92	22	1	0	-	93	1	2	2	0	0	0	5	Medium
TB	CDC, 1995 (4) [36]	219	142	1	0	-	220	1	2	2	0	1	0	6	Medium
TB	CDC, 1995 (5) [36]	661	87	1	0	-	662	1	2	2	0	0	0	5	Medium
TB	CDC, 1995 (6) [36]	925	802	1	4	-	926	1	2	2	0	2	0	7	High
TB	CDC, 2012 (1) [38]	15	2	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
TB	CDC, 2012 (2) [38]	-	15650	390	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
TB	Chemardin, 2007 (1) [41]	11	7	1	0	-	-	1	0	2	0	1	-1	3	Low
TB	Driver, 1994 (1) [42]	339	334	1	9	-	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
TB	Flanagan, 2016 (1) [43]	20	20	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	1	2	0	6	Medium
TB	Flanagan, 2016 (2) [43]	24	22	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	1	2	0	6	Medium
TB	Flanagan, 2016 (3) [43]	15	6	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	1	0	0	4	Medium
TB	Flanagan, 2016 (4) [43]	39	39	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
TB	Flanagan, 2016 (5) [43]	27	18	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	1	1	0	5	Medium
TB	Flanagan, 2016 (6) [43]	10	7	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	1	0	6	Medium
TB	Flanagan, 2016 (7) [43]	27	16	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	1	1	0	5	Medium
TB	Flanagan, 2016 (8) [43]	26	26	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	2	2	0	7	High
TB	Flanagan, 2016 (9) [43]	44	44	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	2	0	5	Medium

TB	Kenyon, 1996 (1) [44]	-	298	1	0	-	-	1	2	2	2	0	-1	6	Medium
TB	Kenyon, 1996 (2) [44]	-	104	1	0	-	-	1	2	2	0	1	0	6	Medium
TB	Kenyon, 1996 (3) [44]	-	109	1	0	-	-	1	2	2	0	1	0	6	Medium
TB	Kenyon, 1996 (4) [44]	-	249	1	6	4	-	1	2	2	0	1	0	6	Medium
TB	Kornylo-Duong, 2010 (1) [45]	35	22	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	1	0	4	Medium
TB	Kornylo-Duong, 2010 (2) [44]	42	29	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	1	0	4	Medium
TB	Kornylo-Duong, 2010 (3) [44]	25	11	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
TB	Kornylo-Duong, 2010 (4) [44]	29	17	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	1	0	4	Medium
TB	Marienu, 2010 (1) [46]	4450	861	131	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
TB	Mcfarland, 1993 (1) [47]	343	136	1	0	-	344	1	1	2	2	0	0	6	Medium
TB	Miller, 1996 (1) [48]	219	120	1	2	-	-	1	2	2	0	1	0	6	Medium
TB	Moore, 1996 (1) [49]	161	120	1	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-1	Low
TB	Parment, 1999 (1) [54]	48	48	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	2	0	5	Medium
TB	Scholten, 2008 (1) [50]	-	2472	98	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	Low
TB	Thibealut, 2012 (1) [51]	56	32	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	1	1	0	5	Medium
TB	Vassiloyanakopoulos, 1999 (1)[52]	147	24	1	0	-	148	1	2	2	2	0	0	7	High
TB	Wang, 1998 (1) [120]	308	277	1	3	0	309	1	2	2	2	2	0	9	High
TB	Whitlock, 2001 (1) [53]	-	67	1	0	-	-	1	2	0	0	2	0	5	Medium
TB	Whitlock, 2001 (2) [53]	-	171	1	0	-	-	1	2	2	0	2	0	7	High

Appendix 4 – Forest plots of meta-analysis, by pathogen

Figure 4: Forest plot showing weighted pooled attack rates for measles

Figure 5: Forest plot showing weighted pooled attack rates for SARS-CoV

Figure 6: Forest plot showing weighted pooled attack rates for tuberculosis




Figure 6



PRISMA 2009 Flow Diagram - In-Flight Transmission Systematic Review




Figure 1 - Prisma flowchart




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5