

1 **Title page**

2 **Title:**

3 What is the current state of public health system preparedness for infectious disease emergencies? A
4 scoping review

5 **Authors:**

6 Jessica M Lee, Public Health Ontario, 480 University Avenue, Suite 300, Toronto, ON M5G 1V2

7 Rachel Jansen, Public Health Ontario, 480 University Avenue, Suite 300, Toronto, ON M5G 1V2

8 Kate E Sanderson, Public Health Ontario, 480 University Avenue, Suite 300, Toronto, ON M5G 1V2

9 Fiona Guerra, Public Health Ontario, 661 University Avenue, 17th Floor, Toronto, ON M5G 1M1

10 Sue Keller-Olaman, Public Health Ontario, 480 University Avenue, Suite 300, Toronto, ON M5G 1V2

11 Michelle Murti, Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health, Government of Ontario, 393 University
12 Avenue, Suite 2100, Toronto, ON M5G 2M2

13 Tracey L O'Sullivan, University of Ottawa, 25 University Private, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5

14 Madelyn P Law, Brock University, 1812 Sir Isaac Brock Way, St. Catharines, ON L2S3A1

15 Brian Schwartz, Public Health Ontario, 661 University Avenue, 17th Floor, Toronto, ON M5G 1M1

16 Laura E Bourns, Public Health Ontario, 661 University Avenue, 17th Floor, Toronto, ON M5G 1M1

17 Yasmin Khan (corresponding author), Public Health Ontario, 661 University Avenue, 17th floor, Toronto,
18 ON M5G 1M1

19 **Abstract**

20 **Background:** The COVID-19 pandemic continues to demonstrate the risks and profound health impacts
21 that result from infectious disease emergencies. Emergency preparedness has been defined as the
22 knowledge, capacity and organizational systems that governments, response and recovery
23 organizations, communities and individuals develop to anticipate, respond to, or recover from

24 emergencies. This scoping review explored recent literature on priority areas and indicators for public
25 health emergency preparedness (PHEP) with a focus on infectious disease emergencies.

26 **Methods:** Using scoping review methodology, a comprehensive search was conducted for indexed and
27 grey literature with a focus on records published from 2017 and 2020 onward, respectively. Records
28 were included if they: a) described PHEP, b) focused on an infectious emergency, and c) were published
29 in an Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development country. An evidence-based all-hazards
30 Resilience Framework for PHEP consisting of 11 elements was used as a reference point to identify
31 additional areas of preparedness that have emerged in recent publications. The findings were
32 summarized thematically.

33 **Results:** The included publications largely aligned with the all-hazards Resilience Framework for PHEP. In
34 particular, the elements related to collaborative networks, community engagement, risk analysis and
35 communication were frequently observed across the publications included in this review. Emergent
36 themes were identified that expand on the Resilience Framework for PHEP. These were related to
37 mitigating inequities, public health capacities (vaccination, laboratory system capacity, infection
38 prevention and control capacity, financial investment in infrastructure, public health legislation, phases
39 of preparedness), scientific capacities (research and evidence-informed decision making, climate and
40 environmental health), and considerations for health system capacity.

41 **Conclusions:** The themes from this review contribute to the evolving understanding of critical public
42 health preparedness actions; however, there was a paucity of recent evidence on PHEP indicators. The
43 themes can expand on the 11 elements outlined in the Resilience Framework for PHEP, specifically
44 relevant to infectious disease emergencies and risks. Further research will be important to validate
45 these findings, and expand understanding of how refinements to PHEP frameworks and indicators can
46 support public health practice.

47 **Keywords**

48 Public health; Pandemic; Infectious disease; COVID-19; Health system; Emergency preparedness

49 **1.0 Background**

50 The Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic is responsible for millions of deaths globally [1, 2],
51 and continues to demonstrate the risks and profound health impacts that result from infectious disease
52 emergencies. While the impacts of disasters and emergencies were known to have inequitable impacts
53 across populations prior to the COVID-19 pandemic [3, 4], the disparities in COVID-19 outcomes have
54 been grave [5-7]. Since the start of the pandemic, there have been demonstrable inequities in COVID-19
55 morbidity and mortality in marginalized communities such as racialized, low-income and Indigenous
56 communities in Canada, as well as inequitable impacts of implementing and removing public health
57 measures at different time periods throughout the pandemic [7-9]. Ecological impacts of climate
58 change, population growth trends, and increasing population density are amongst the factors increasing
59 global risks for the emergence of novel infectious diseases [10-12]. It is crucial to ensure a continued
60 review and reflection on emergency preparedness to assess ongoing risks, to reduce morbidity and
61 mortality, and to mitigate the inequitable impacts of infectious disease emergencies and response
62 measures, which is the focus of this paper.

63 Following the 2003 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (i.e., SARS-CoV-1) outbreak and the H1N1
64 influenza pandemic, there was a lack of evidence to inform defining and measuring public health
65 emergency preparedness (PHEP) [13]. The World Health Organization (WHO) Strategic Framework
66 (2017) has defined emergency preparedness as the knowledge, capacity and organizational system that
67 governments, response and recovery organizations, communities, and individuals develop to anticipate,
68 respond to, or recover from emergencies [14]. Operationally, emergency preparedness involves specific
69 actions, funding, partnerships and political commitment to be sustainable [14]. Investing in and

70 implementing priority actions requires an understanding of these characteristics and elements of
71 preparedness. Sustaining preparedness actions can benefit from metrics to describe, assess, and report
72 on change over time.

73 To address the knowledge gap in defining and measuring PHEP, a Canadian-based research team,
74 including several authors of this paper, explored PHEP for infectious and non-infectious emergencies,
75 and developed an evidence-based, all-hazards Resilience Framework for PHEP [15-17]. The framework
76 consists of the following elements: governance and leadership (cross-cutting), planning process,
77 collaborative networks, community engagement, risk analysis, surveillance and monitoring, practice and
78 experience, resources, workforce capacity, communication, and learning and evaluation. The set of 67
79 important and actionable PHEP indicators correspond with the framework's elements and can be used
80 by public health agencies to assess readiness and measure improvement in their critical role of
81 protecting community health. Ethics and values are included in this framework as a concept that should
82 be considered as core to all elements of PHEP rather than as a specific element with corresponding
83 indicators. While the evidence-based Resilience Framework for PHEP preceded the COVID-19 pandemic,
84 it represented a novel contribution to the field which had limited evidence to inform practice on a
85 framework and indicators for preparedness [15-17]. Given the global experience with the COVID-19
86 pandemic, there is value in exploring how the evidence base has developed since the framework and
87 indicators were created, with a focus on infectious disease preparedness.

88 In this scoping review, we explored the literature on frameworks, priority areas and indicators for PHEP
89 with a focus on infectious disease emergencies. We used the Resilience Framework for PHEP to examine
90 areas of preparedness actions and indicators developed in the period since the previous study was
91 conducted [15-17], which includes the COVID-19 pandemic period. The objective of this scoping review
92 is to investigate the following two research questions:

93 1. What recent evidence has emerged on conceptual frameworks for PHEP specific to pandemics
94 and infectious disease emergencies?

95 2. What recent evidence has emerged pertaining to measurement of preparedness for pandemics
96 and infectious disease emergencies?

97 **2.0 Methods**

98 *2.1 Aim and design*

99 A scoping review methodology was used, given the exploratory nature of the research questions. This
100 method focuses on mapping concepts underpinning a research area and is useful when examining areas
101 that are emerging, to clarify key concepts and identify gaps [18-20]. Consistent with the scoping review
102 methodology, a quality appraisal of the included studies was not conducted [18-20]. With this scoping
103 review, we aimed to expand the understanding of the current state of PHEP frameworks, priority areas
104 and indicators relevant to public health agencies, and how these may have evolved during the COVID-19
105 pandemic. The focus of this review was on local and/or regional or provincial/state (i.e. sub-national)
106 public health, given that the public health system in Canada is organized around local/regional public
107 health agencies, with provincial health system governance and organization [16, 17].

108 *2.2 Data sources and search methods*

109 Library information specialists at Public Health Ontario (PHO) were consulted to conduct database
110 searches in MEDLINE (March 22, 2022); Embase, Business Continuity & Disaster Recovery Reference
111 Center and Scopus (March 28, 2022); and the National Institutes of Health COVID-19 Portfolio for
112 Preprints (March 15, 2022). The search included terms related to public health emergencies, emergency
113 preparedness, post-pandemic recovery, indicators/measures, and frameworks.

114 The indexed literature search focused on identifying publications that included a description of
115 frameworks, tools, models, activities or indicators for emergency preparedness for infectious diseases,
116 pandemic influenza and the COVID-19 pandemic from 2017 onward. This approach captured literature
117 published since the scoping review was conducted to inform the Delphi expert panel for PHEP indicator
118 development [17], as well as literature published during the COVID-19 pandemic.

119 In addition to the indexed literature, a grey literature search was conducted from March 17, 2022 to
120 March 25, 2022. PHO library information specialists were consulted to develop search strings to be used
121 in Google Custom Search Engines and select regional, national and international public health agency
122 websites. The search was limited to records published from 2020 onward to capture frameworks,
123 models, toolkits and indicators published within the COVID-19 pandemic context. See additional file 1
124 for the full indexed and grey literature search strategies.

125 *2.3 Eligibility criteria and record selection*

126 The eligibility criteria were the same across indexed and grey literature except for the time periods
127 searched, as noted above. Records were included in the scoping review if they met the following
128 criteria: a) planning, readiness and preparedness included the roles and responsibilities of local, regional
129 or provincial/state/sub-national public health agencies relevant to Canada; b) emergency described in
130 the article or framework was a pandemic and/or of infectious origins; c) the emergency or framework
131 described was specific to an Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) country;
132 and d) described preparedness activities, including indicators to inform preparedness activities, that are
133 under local, regional or provincial/state (i.e. sub-national) level jurisdiction.

134 Records describing federal-, national-, or international-level (e.g., WHO) relevant frameworks or
135 indicators were also included if the roles, responsibilities, elements and/or indicators described were

136 relevant to public health agencies and public health system organization in Canada. For example,
137 frameworks which described surveillance and laboratory testing activities were included, whereas a
138 focus on measures relevant only to the federal level in Canada such as travel quarantine would be
139 excluded. Infectious disease emergency was defined as an incident, outbreak or threat with the
140 potential to overwhelm or otherwise disrupt routine local capacities due to their timing, scale or
141 unpredictability [21-23]. Only English-language records were included.

142 Records were excluded if they: a) focused on non-preparedness components of emergency
143 management (i.e., response, recovery and mitigation); b) described an emergency of non-infectious
144 origins; c) described a framework limited to country or federal-level roles relevant to Canada and
145 countries with similar health system organization (i.e., travel or international border measures); or d)
146 focused on health care system (e.g., primary care, acute care) preparedness without public health
147 system considerations [16]. Commentaries were excluded.

148 Results of the indexed literature search were screened by two authors. A random selection of 100
149 records were first screened independently in duplicate to check agreement and trial the eligibility
150 criteria, which achieved 84% agreement. This allowed the two authors to discuss discrepancies and
151 reach consensus on the articles, leading to enhanced understanding and consistency in how the
152 remaining records were screened. Single author screening occurred for the remainder of indexed
153 literature results, and a third author was consulted for uncertainties related to inclusion of specific
154 studies when required. The grey literature search and screening were conducted by two authors. Similar
155 to the process for indexed literature, a third author was consulted for uncertainties related to the
156 inclusion of grey literature records when required.

157 *2.4 Data extraction, summary and synthesis*

158 The following details were extracted from the included publications: year, country/jurisdiction, relevant
159 jurisdictional level (e.g., national, provincial, regional, or local/municipal), type of infectious disease
160 emergency (i.e., COVID-19, any infectious disease), study and/or framework design and objective(s),
161 description of the framework's elements or components, and description of the framework indicators (if
162 applicable). For records related to all-hazards PHEP, only details relevant to infectious diseases were
163 extracted.

164 The first step in analysis was identifying emergent themes from the literature. For the purposes of
165 synthesizing the results in this scoping review, we refer to the high-level topic areas related to public
166 health preparedness for infectious disease emergencies as themes, which could be associated with
167 related actions or indicators. Sources included in this report used various terms including “principles”,
168 “domains”, “elements”, “dimensions”, “key areas”, “categories” and others. In this first step, the
169 previous research by Khan et al. was used as a reference point for synthesizing PHEP elements and
170 emergent themes we identified in the literature [16, 17]. Although Khan et al.'s work examined
171 preparedness for all-hazards emergencies, the scope of this review was focused on identifying emerging
172 themes related to public health preparedness for infectious disease emergencies, including pandemics.
173 The elements of the Resilience Framework for PHEP were also used as a reference point to identify new
174 areas of preparedness that have emerged in the literature. Ethics and values were considered as part of
175 the 11 elements, rather than separate, consistent with the Resilience Framework for PHEP [15].

176 In the second step, identified themes were compared and contrasted with the elements of the
177 Resilience Framework for PHEP to examine similarities and/or differences [15]. We identified elements
178 of the Resilience Framework for PHEP that were described in the literature, and preparedness themes
179 that have emerged since the previous scoping review and indicator development work of Khan, et al.
180 [16, 17], and since the COVID-19 pandemic. Where alignment was observed, we report how frequently

181 each of the 11 elements were observed across included publications. When themes did not overlap with
182 the Resilience Framework for PHEP, these were recorded as “emergent themes” that expand upon the
183 framework. The emergent themes were assessed for similarities, then synthesized into overarching
184 topics. The indexed and grey literature were synthesized separately. Team members compared their
185 lists of emergent themes, and where appropriate, aligned the language to describe common emergent
186 themes. We also included examples of preparedness activities relevant to various PHEP elements and
187 emergent themes.

188 The final step was to examine included studies for indicators or actions/activities that could be used to
189 inform the development of indicators. Indicators were defined as succinct measures that help
190 understand, compare and improve systems [24]; they are generally found in frameworks, assessment
191 tools or checklists. For the purposes of this review, broad areas of measurement (e.g., vaccination) were
192 synthesized rather than specific indicators (e.g., vaccinate specific proportion of the population) from a
193 given framework or publication.

194 **3.0 Results**

195 From the 3,603 records identified through the peer-reviewed and pre-print literature database searches,
196 315 full-text records were assessed for eligibility and 26 studies were included in this scoping review. Of
197 the records identified from searching organizational or government databases in the grey literature
198 search, 179 were assessed for eligibility and 10 grey literature publications were included in this scoping
199 review (see PRISMA diagram in figure 1). In summary, 36 records were examined for this scoping review.

200 **Figure 1. Flow chart of included records from indexed databases and grey literature searches**

201 [Figure 1 inserted here]

202 *3.1 Characteristics of included publications*

203 Methods and study designs varied widely across the 26 indexed literature studies, including systematic
204 literature reviews [25-27], mixed-methods studies (i.e., a paper that describes a literature review,
205 concept mapping and key informant interviews) [28-43], descriptive case studies [44-46], qualitative
206 studies [47, 48], a cross-sectional study [49], and a regression analysis [50]. Ten studies described a
207 PHEP-related framework, tool or model [30-34, 36-39, 41], and 16 studies included content relevant to
208 PHEP priority areas and/or activities but did not explicitly describe a PHEP framework, tool, model or set
209 of indicators [25-29, 35, 40, 42-50]. All studies from the indexed literature described PHEP concepts for
210 infectious disease outbreaks, pandemic influenza and/or the COVID-19 pandemic.

211 A total of 10 grey literature publications were identified, including four that described PHEP frameworks
212 or conceptual models [51-54], three that described assessment tools [55-57], and three that focused on
213 indicators for PHEP [58-60]. All ten grey literature publications described public health preparedness
214 actions for infectious disease outbreaks, COVID-19 pandemic or zoonotic disease outbreaks. Of the ten
215 documents identified, seven were produced by the WHO [51-57].

216 *3.2 Elements from the Resilience Framework for PHEP that appeared in the included publications*

217 After the first and second steps in analysis of the included studies, at least one element from the
218 Resilience Framework for PHEP was observed in the 26 indexed studies [25-50], and seven of the ten
219 grey literature records [51-57], with many studies making reference to multiple elements (see Table 1).
220 The 11 elements, listed from most to least frequently observed across the included publications, were:
221 collaborative networks, community engagement, risk analysis, communication, planning process,
222 governance and leadership, surveillance and monitoring, resources, workforce capacity, learning and
223 evaluation, and practice and experience.

224 **Table 1. Publications according to emergency type and corresponding Resilience Framework for PHEP**
225 **elements**

226 [Table 1 inserted here]

227 *3.3 Emerging preparedness themes that expand on the elements in the Resilience Framework for PHEP*

228 After comparing and contrasting as part of analysis, our synthesis resulted in the identification of ten
229 themes that expand on the elements in the Resilience Framework for PHEP [15], all with a focus on
230 infectious disease emergency preparedness (see Table 2). Five themes that expand on the framework
231 were observed across both the indexed and grey literature; ordered from most to least common
232 according to the number of publications in which they appear, these themes were: mitigating inequities,
233 vaccination, research and evidence-informed decision making, laboratory and diagnostic system
234 capacity, and infection prevention and control (IPAC) capacity. There were three themes that expand on
235 the Resilience Framework for PHEP that emerged solely from the indexed literature (climate and
236 environmental health, public health legislation, phases of preparedness) and two that emerged solely
237 from the grey literature (financial investment in infrastructure, and health system capacity).

238 **Table 2. Publications according to emergency type and emergent themes expanding on the Resilience**
239 **Framework for PHEP**

240 [Table 2 inserted here]

241 Most publications described activities that should take place while planning or preparing for infectious
242 disease emergencies to operationalize priority areas of preparedness [25-29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38-40, 42-
243 46, 48, 49, 51, 52, 55, 57]. Activities correspond with various preparedness priority areas and exemplify
244 actions that would be taken during infectious disease emergency preparedness processes. These
245 activities were described in publications in addition to or in place of indicators. Activities were described

246 in a variety of ways across publications, and included steps, actions, suggestions, outcomes or outputs of
247 infectious emergency preparedness planning processes.

248 Multiple studies from the indexed literature described activities related to the operationalization of
249 preparedness [25-29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38-40, 42-46, 48, 49]. For example, Jesus et al. (2021)'s model for
250 disability-inclusiveness in pandemic preparedness provided several preparedness activities, some of
251 which included developing intersectoral disability-inclusive pandemic preparedness, using evidence on
252 how to reduce disability disparities to inform planning, and the reinforcement of disability-rights in
253 health professionals' education [33]. AuYoung et al. (2022) developed general strategies for COVID-19
254 vaccine hesitancy among marginalized communities relevant to future public health emergencies [44].
255 Examples of AuYoung et al.'s strategies include increasing community and academic capacity to enhance
256 community-academic partnerships, investing in trusted messengers, increasing the trustworthiness of
257 academic institutions and developing long-term cross-site partnerships [44]. Tan et al. (2021)
258 investigated qualitative factors related to pandemic preparedness and identified strategies to achieve a
259 more holistic and equitable approach to preparedness [40]. According to Tan et al., the ongoing
260 translation of changing scientific evidence into policy actions and the development of trusted
261 communication through effective knowledge translation practices are essential strategies to achieve
262 evidence-informed decision-making in pandemic preparedness [40]. Tan et al. also put forward
263 suggestions related to ecological determinants of health which overlap with disaster risk reduction
264 strategies [61, 62], including addressing the effect of health services on the environment, recognizing
265 the impact of climate and environmental degradation on risk of zoonotic disease, and setting climate
266 goals [40].

267 Several preparedness frameworks identified in the grey literature included preparedness activities,
268 outputs or outcomes [51, 52, 55, 57]. The WHO's *Strategic Preparedness, Readiness and Response Plan*

269 *to End the Global COVID-19 Emergency in 2022* describes approaches to managing misinformation, such
270 as peer-to-peer interventions to help communities identify accurate vaccine information by building
271 resilience against misinformation [51]. The WHO's *Strategic Toolkit for Assessing Risks for All-hazards*
272 *Emergencies* lists expected activities and outputs of applying the toolkit's six steps, one such activity is a
273 gap analysis that can inform health and public health workforce capacity building [55]. The WHO's *Risk*
274 *Communication and Community Engagement* tool included a list of open-ended questions intended for
275 use within focus group discussions or key informant interviews to support preparedness planning for risk
276 communication and community engagement [57]. Together, these activities and outputs help to
277 operationalize priority areas of infectious disease preparedness.

278 *3.4 Preparedness Indicators*

279 In the final step of analysis we examined studies for available indicators or actions/activities to inform
280 indicator development. Compared to the literature identified on frameworks and priority areas for
281 preparedness, there were comparatively fewer indexed and grey literature records identified that
282 describe qualitative and quantitative preparedness indicators. Five indexed studies [30, 31, 34, 37, 41]
283 and three grey literature documents [58-60] either included or focused on describing indicators for
284 pandemic and infectious disease preparedness. It is worth noting that the quantitative indicators
285 identified in the publications (i.e., budget, vaccination targets) largely did not provide specific
286 quantitative thresholds, allowing them to be tailored to various public health agencies' contexts (e.g.,
287 local, regional or provincial).

288 The types of infectious disease preparedness indicators identified in this scoping review measured or
289 assessed various areas of preparedness including the equity impacts of emergencies [31, 41, 59], core
290 public health and government capacities for emergency preparedness and response [30, 60], population
291 and healthcare system vulnerabilities during pandemics [37], community readiness [34], and

292 benchmarks to strengthen health systems during outbreaks [58]. Some examples of indicators related to
293 public health and health system readiness or capacity include: adequate public health budget [59, 60],
294 capacity to deliver vaccines and the proportion of the population getting vaccinated [30, 58, 60],
295 licensed nurses' ability to practice in other regions or states [60], oversight of research on dangerous
296 pathogens [58], and enhanced training for the safe transportation of biohazards [58].

297 Some examples of equity-related preparedness indicators identified through this review are: proportion
298 of population in a defined region who are racialized or first-generation immigrants [31], benchmarks for
299 public health agency plans to embed the needs of racialized or marginalized populations [59],
300 proportion of population with access to internet and technology [41], ratio of residential and nursing
301 homes per 10,000 population aged over 70 years old [37], proportion of population with access to clean
302 water [60], and the proportion of households with at least one of the following: no kitchen, no
303 plumbing, high cost of living, or overcrowded living conditions [34].

304 **4.0 Discussion**

305 This scoping review examined the recent literature on conceptualizing, defining and measuring PHEP,
306 which is of relevance to public health agencies as they continue to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic,
307 and remain ready for future infectious disease emergencies. Recent literature on infectious disease
308 emergencies was compared with an evidence-based Resilience Framework for PHEP, which
309 encompasses both infectious and non-infectious emergencies [15, 16]. In general, there was alignment
310 between the themes that emerged from the studies identified and the elements in the Resilience
311 Framework for PHEP. In particular, collaborative networks, community engagement, risk analysis and
312 communication were the framework elements frequently observed across the publications included in
313 this review. This review also revealed emergent themes that expand on the Resilience Framework for
314 PHEP, including mitigating inequities, scientific capacity (research and evidence-informed decision

315 making) and public health capacity (vaccination, laboratory capacity, IPAC capacity). These emergent
316 themes represent areas of PHEP that warrant enhanced consideration for infectious disease emergency
317 preparedness.

318 Mitigating inequities emerged as an important theme across many included publications. Population
319 health inequities were present and known prior to the COVID-19 pandemic; however, the pandemic re-
320 focused attention on the need for equity-oriented actions due to the inequitable burden of COVID-19
321 morbidity and mortality, and disproportionate impact of both implementation and removal of
322 pandemic-related response measures among marginalized communities [7-9]. Several publications
323 highlighted the importance of anticipating and mitigating inequitable impacts resulting from infectious
324 disease emergencies and related emergency response measures on marginalized populations. Studies
325 described a variety of equity considerations for preparedness, including the importance of monitoring
326 baseline population characteristics, fostering community trust, and planning for material or financial
327 supports for those inequitably impacted. In addition, infectious disease preparedness frameworks
328 identified in the grey literature provided examples of preparedness activities that help to mitigate
329 inequities related to infectious public health emergencies, including the engagement of trusted
330 community members to ensure communications reach marginalized populations [63]. The Resilience
331 Framework for PHEP includes ethics and values as a concept that is core to all elements in the
332 framework, and included some indicators within the elements to support ethics-informed preparedness
333 actions for local/regional public health agencies. The emergent theme of mitigating inequities in this
334 scoping review reinforces that equity should also be explicitly incorporated as a foundational
335 component of future preparedness frameworks, efforts and actions.

336 Research and evidence-informed decision-making are central concepts in public health practice and
337 important for emergency preparedness. This theme was often discussed in the indexed literature and

338 was the most frequently observed theme in the grey literature. These publications discussed the
339 importance of knowledge-sharing networks, building capacities for data collection, analysis, and
340 research generation to ensure that infectious disease preparedness activities are evidence-informed.
341 This emergent theme is an example of how themes identified through this scoping review intersect and
342 overlap with other emergent themes as well as elements of the Resilience Framework for PHEP [15, 16].
343 For example, building capacity for research and evidence-informed decision-making across
344 governments, communities and non-governmental agencies requires action related to mitigating
345 inequities, communication, community engagement, collaborative networks, surveillance and
346 monitoring, among others.

347 Vaccination, laboratory capacity, climate health, and public health legislation are additional
348 preparedness considerations that reflect changes to PHEP planning that were in progress before the
349 pandemic and have received renewed attention during the COVID-19 pandemic. Public confidence in
350 vaccination is an example of the need for management of public health misinformation that pre-dates,
351 and was further exacerbated by, the COVID-19 pandemic. Several publications discussed vaccination and
352 laboratory systems as key components of the COVID-19 response as well as important priority areas for
353 future pandemic planning. Considerations for climate and environmental health and public health
354 legislation are broad topics that have garnered renewed attention for preparedness in light of the
355 COVID-19 pandemic. Publications that included climate or environmental considerations noted the
356 complex relationship between these issues and potential future pandemics due to climate change and
357 environmental degradation increasing the risk of zoonotic diseases crossing over to humans, and the
358 contributions of healthcare and pandemic response operations to waste, emissions and potential
359 environmental contamination. While governance and leadership is a cross-cutting element in the
360 Resilience Framework for PHEP, the COVID-19 pandemic has renewed an interest in clearly articulating

361 public health emergency roles and responsibilities in public health legislation; thus, providing legislative
362 or policy support for public health emergency decision-making [64].

363 Themes that expand on the Resilience Framework for PHEP [15, 16] represent potential areas for
364 improvement in the public health and the health system in general, and are not all specific to infectious
365 disease and pandemic preparedness. For example, the domains of financial investment in infrastructure,
366 and health system capacity are areas of focus with population-level health benefits that extend beyond
367 preparedness for public health emergencies and infectious diseases. Several publications highlighted the
368 need for investments to build strong and resilient health and public systems to mitigate the impacts of a
369 health emergency and reduce disruption to essential health and public health services. The COVID-19
370 pandemic may have exposed these areas of weakness; however, these aspects of the public health
371 system required attention and improvement prior to and beyond the pandemic as noted in previous
372 reports on the impact of the SARS-CoV-1 pandemic [65, 66]. While pandemic and emergency-specific
373 surge capacities and plans are needed, an adequate and resilient baseline is also required.

374 This scoping review identified emerging priority areas for action in infectious disease emergency
375 preparedness; however, there were comparatively fewer records identified that describe qualitative and
376 quantitative preparedness indicators published since evidence-based indicator development by Khan et
377 al [17]. Detailed analysis, evaluation and indicator development was beyond the scope of this review,
378 although the findings suggest areas of focus that should be considered in future planning. Of note, an
379 exploratory analysis of pandemic preparedness compared with pandemic outcomes posited that some
380 existing preparedness indices are not well suited to predicting pandemic outcomes, but instead are
381 better served as tools to highlight gaps in pandemic capacities [67]. Further work is needed in
382 development of indicators, and also their validation in relation to relevant outcomes. In addition,
383 continued work is needed to ensure preparedness is reinforced as a dynamic, adaptive concept,

384 consistent with complex adaptive systems theory. Anchoring preparedness, planning, and readiness as
385 upstream activities to support resilience of the system can support the concept of the work as
386 continuous improvement and adaptation [16]. The COVID-19 pandemic continues to evolve globally, and
387 jurisdictions are still engaged in the pandemic response and may not yet have capacity to explore how
388 the pandemic might change their approach to emergency planning moving forward. In the coming
389 months and years, there will likely be additional evidence to shape future preparedness planning that
390 will include elements and/or indicators that will support effective infectious disease emergency
391 preparedness. This future work should be revisited, examined and documented to ensure that learning
392 from the pandemic response is included in future preparedness planning domains, activities and
393 indicators.

394 *4.1 Limitations*

395 A limitation of this scoping review, common to review methodology, is that some relevant records may
396 not have been included. Further, any ongoing work in jurisdictions and academia to update
397 preparedness plans may not be publicly available since the pandemic response is ongoing, or may not be
398 available in English. Although the search strategy employed was detailed and developed by library
399 informational specialists, any key terms not included in the search may have led to some documents
400 being excluded from our findings.

401 **5.0 Conclusion**

402 The 11 elements of an evidence-based pre-COVID-19 pandemic, all-hazards Resilience Framework for
403 PHEP developed in Canada relevant to local or regional public health agencies continue to be reflected
404 in the literature identified in this scoping review. In the studies identified in this review, the following
405 elements in the Resilience Framework for PHEP were represented in descending order of frequency:
406 collaborative networks, community engagement, risk analysis, communication, planning process,

407 governance and leadership, surveillance and monitoring, resources, workforce capacity, learning and
408 evaluation, and practice and experience. With the recent global experience of the COVID-19 pandemic, a
409 focus for local/regional public health agency preparedness oriented towards the 11 elements in the
410 Resilience Framework for PHEP, with enhancements for infectious disease preparedness noted in this
411 synthesis, is supported by evidence. This scoping review focused on infectious disease emergencies and
412 through our analysis identified areas for action for ongoing preparedness that pertain to the themes of
413 mitigating inequities, public health capacities, scientific capacities, and considerations for health system
414 capacity. Future work can advance knowledge related to the areas for action identified, into evidence-
415 informed indicators. Strategies and indicators for mitigating inequities should be considered an urgent
416 focus for action to support the reduction of health inequities anticipated for future emergencies.

417 **List of abbreviations**

418 COVID-19 – Coronavirus Disease 2019

419 IPAC – Infection Prevention and Control

420 OECD – Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development

421 PHEP – Public health emergency preparedness

422 PHO – Public Health Ontario

423 SARS – Severe acute respiratory syndrome

424 WHO – World Health Organization

425 **Declarations**

426 ***Ethics approval and consent to participate***

427 Not applicable.

428 ***Consent for publication***

429 Not applicable.

430 ***Availability of data and materials***

431 Not applicable.

432 ***Competing interests***

433 The authors declare they have no competing interests.

434 ***Funding***

435 Not applicable. This study received no specific grant or funding.

436 ***Author information***

437 *Public Health Ontario*

438 Jessica M Lee, Rachel Jansen, Kate E Sanderson, Fiona Guerra, Sue Keller-Olaman, Brian Schwartz, Laura

439 E Bourns, Yasmin Khan

440 *University of Ottawa*

441 Tracey L O'Sullivan

442 *Brock University*

443 Madelyn P Law

444 *Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health, Government of Ontario*

445 Michelle Murti

446 ***Authors' contributions***

447 YK, JML, RJ, KES, FG, SKO and MM conceptualized the scoping review. JML, RJ, KES and FG identified,

448 selected, extracted data in the included studies. JML, RJ, KES and FG wrote the manuscript of the
449 scoping review with critical inputs and appraisal from YK and SKO. The manuscript was then reviewed by
450 LEB, BS, MPL, MM and TLOS. All authors have read and approved the manuscript.

451 ***Acknowledgements***

452 The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of Public Health Ontario's Library Information
453 Specialists, for their contributions to the indexed database and grey literature search strategies. The
454 authors also acknowledge reviewers of earlier versions of this work, including Lori McKinnon of Public
455 Health Ontario.

456 ***References***

- 457 1. Stoddard M, Sarkar S, Yuan L, Nolan RP, White DE, White LF, et al. Beyond the new normal:
458 assessing the feasibility of vaccine-based suppression of SARS-CoV-2. PLOS One. 2021;16(7):e0254734.
- 459 2. Our World in Data. Cumulative confirmed COVID-19 deaths. Global Change Data Lab, Oxford.
460 2022. [https://ourworldindata.org/explorers/coronavirus-data-
461 explorer?zoomToSelection=true&time=2020-03-
462 01..latest&facet=none&pickerSort=desc&pickerMetric=total_cases&hideControls=true&Metric=Confirm
463 ed+deaths&Interval=Cumulative&Relative+to+Population=false&Color+by+test+positivity=false&count
464 y=~OWID_WRL](https://ourworldindata.org/explorers/coronavirus-data-explorer?zoomToSelection=true&time=2020-03-01..latest&facet=none&pickerSort=desc&pickerMetric=total_cases&hideControls=true&Metric=Confirmed+deaths&Interval=Cumulative&Relative+to+Population=false&Color+by+test+positivity=false&country=~OWID_WRL). Accessed 11 Oct 2022.
- 465 3. Fussell E, Sastry N, Vanlandingham M. Race, socioeconomic status, and return migration to New
466 Orleans after Hurricane Katrina. Popul Environ. 2010;31(1-3):20-42.
- 467 4. Tricco AC LE, Soobiah C, Perrier L, Straus SE. Impact of H1N1 on socially disadvantaged
468 populations: systematic review. PLoS ONE. 2012;7(6):e39437.

- 469 5. Wellesley Institute. Tracking COVID-19 through race-based data. Wellesley Institute, Toronto.
470 2021. <https://www.wellesleyinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Tracking-COVID-19-Through->
471 [Race-Based-Data_eng.pdf](https://www.wellesleyinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Tracking-COVID-19-Through-Race-Based-Data_eng.pdf). Accessed 16 May 2022.
- 472 6. Khanijahani A, Iezadi S, Gholipour K, Azami-Aghdash S, Naghibi D. A systematic review of
473 racial/ethnic and socioeconomic disparities in COVID-19. *Int J Equity Health*. 2021;20(1):248.
- 474 7. Public Health Agency of Canada; Tam T. From risk to resilience: an equity approach to COVID-19.
475 Public Health Agency of Canada, Ottawa. 2020. [https://www.canada.ca/en/public-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/corporate/publications/chief-public-health-officer-reports-state-public-health-canada/from-risk-resilience-equity-approach-covid-19.html)
476 [health/corporate/publications/chief-public-health-officer-reports-state-public-health-canada/from-risk-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/corporate/publications/chief-public-health-officer-reports-state-public-health-canada/from-risk-resilience-equity-approach-covid-19.html)
477 [resilience-equity-approach-covid-19.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/corporate/publications/chief-public-health-officer-reports-state-public-health-canada/from-risk-resilience-equity-approach-covid-19.html). Accessed 15 Aug 2022.
- 478 8. Ismail SJ, Tunis MC, Zhao L, Quach C. Navigating inequities: a roadmap out of the pandemic. *BMJ*
479 *Global Health*. 2021;6(1):e004087.
- 480 9. McGrail K, Morgan J, Siddiqi A. Looking back and moving forward: addressing health inequities
481 after COVID-19. *Lancet Reg Health Am*. 2022;9:100232.
- 482 10. Sabin NS, Calliope AS, Simpson SV, Arima H, Ito H, Nishimura T, et al. Implications of human
483 activities for (re)emerging infectious diseases, including COVID-19. *J Physiol Anthropol*. 2020;39(1):29.
- 484 11. Venkatesan P. Re-emergence of infectious diseases associated with the past. *Lancet Microbe*.
485 2021;2(4):e140.
- 486 12. McCloskey B, Dar O, Zumla A, Heymann DL. Emerging infectious diseases and pandemic
487 potential: status quo and reducing risk of global spread. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2014;14(10):1001-10.
- 488 13. Khan Y, Fazli G, Henry B, de Villa E, Tsamis C, Grant M, et al. The evidence base of primary
489 research in public health emergency preparedness: a scoping review and stakeholder consultation. *BMC*
490 *Public Health*. 2015;15:432.

- 491 14. World Health Organization. A strategic framework for emergency preparedness. World Health
492 Organization, Geneva. 2017. [https://extranet.who.int/sph/sites/default/files/document-](https://extranet.who.int/sph/sites/default/files/document-library/document/Preparedness-9789241511827-eng.pdf)
493 [library/document/Preparedness-9789241511827-eng.pdf](https://extranet.who.int/sph/sites/default/files/document-library/document/Preparedness-9789241511827-eng.pdf). Accessed 27 Apr 2022.
- 494 15. Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion (Public Health Ontario). Public health
495 emergency preparedness framework and indicators: a workbook to support public health practice.
496 King's Printer for Ontario, Toronto. 2020. [https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/Documents/W/2020/workbook-emergency-preparedness.pdf?sc_lang=en)
497 [/media/Documents/W/2020/workbook-emergency-preparedness.pdf?sc_lang=en](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/Documents/W/2020/workbook-emergency-preparedness.pdf?sc_lang=en). Accessed 27 Apr
498 2022.
- 499 16. Khan Y, O'Sullivan T, Brown A, Tracey S, Gibson J, Génereux M, et al. Public health emergency
500 preparedness: a framework to promote resilience. *BMC Public Health*. 2018;18(1):1344.
- 501 17. Khan Y, Brown AD, Gagliardi AR, O'Sullivan T, Lacarte S, Henry B, et al. Are we prepared? The
502 development of performance indicators for public health emergency preparedness using a modified
503 Delphi approach. *PLoS ONE*. 2019;14(12):e0226489.
- 504 18. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *Int J Soc Res*
505 *Methodol*. 2005;8(1):19–32.
- 506 19. Peters MD, Godfrey CM, Khalil H, McInerney P, Parker D, Soares CB. Guidance for conducting
507 systematic scoping reviews. *Int J Evid Based Healthc*. 2015 Sep;13(3):141-6.
- 508 20. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. *Implement Sci*.
509 2010;5(1):69.
- 510 21. Khan Y, Sanford S, Sider D, Moore K, Garber G, de Villa E, et al. Effective communication of
511 public health guidance to emergency department clinicians in the setting of emerging incidents: a
512 qualitative study and framework. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2017;17(1):312.
- 513 22. Nelson C, Lurie N, Wasserman J, Zakowski S. Conceptualizing and defining public health
514 emergency preparedness. *Am J Public Health*. 2007;97 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S9-11.

- 515 23. Paek HJ, Hilyard K, Freimuth V, Barge JK, Mindlin M. Theory-based approaches to understanding
516 public emergency preparedness: implications for effective health and risk communication. *J Health*
517 *Commun.* 2010;15(4):428-44.
- 518 24. United Kingdom. National Health Service Institute for Innovation and Improvement. The good
519 indicators guide: understanding how to use and choose indicators. National Health Service, London.
520 2017. [https://www.england.nhs.uk/improvement-hub/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2017/11/The-](https://www.england.nhs.uk/improvement-hub/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2017/11/The-Good-Indicators-Guide.pdf)
521 [Good-Indicators-Guide.pdf](https://www.england.nhs.uk/improvement-hub/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2017/11/The-Good-Indicators-Guide.pdf). Accessed 27 Apr 2022.
- 522 25. Savoia E, Lin L, Bernard D, Klein N, James LP, Guicciardi S. Public health system research in public
523 health emergency preparedness in the United States (2009–2015): actionable knowledge base. *Am J*
524 *Public Health.* 2017;107(S2):e1-e6.
- 525 26. Williams BE, Kondo KK. Preventing unequal health outcomes in COVID-19: a systematic review
526 of past interventions. 2021;5(1):856-71.
- 527 27. Yoon YK, Lee J, Kim SI, Peck KR. A systematic narrative review of comprehensive preparedness
528 strategies of healthcare resources for a large resurgence of COVID-19 nationally, with local or regional
529 epidemics: present era and beyond. *J Korean Med Sci.* 2020;35(44).
- 530 28. Aruru M, Truong HA, Clark S. Pharmacy emergency preparedness and response (PEPR): a
531 proposed framework for expanding pharmacy professionals' roles and contributions to emergency
532 preparedness and response during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond. *Res Social Adm Pharm.*
533 2021;17(1):1967-77.
- 534 29. Bardosh KL, de Vries DH, Abramowitz S, Thorlie A, Cremers L, Kinsman J, et al. Integrating the
535 social sciences in epidemic preparedness and response: a strategic framework to strengthen capacities
536 and improve global health security. *Global Health.* 2020;16(1):120.
- 537 30. Boyce MR, Katz R. Rapid urban health security assessment tool: a new resource for evaluating
538 local-level public health preparedness. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2020;5(6):e002606.

- 539 31. Brakefield WS, Ammar N, Olusanya OA, Shaban-Nejad A. An urban population health
540 observatory system to support COVID-19 pandemic preparedness, response, and management: design
541 and development study. *JMIR Public Health Surveill.* 2021;7(6):e28269.
- 542 32. de Rooij D, Belfroid E, Eilers R, Roßkamp D, Swaan C, Timen A. Qualitative research: institutional
543 preparedness during threats of infectious disease outbreaks. *Biomed Res Int.* 2020;
544 doi:10.1155/2020/5861894.
- 545 33. Jesus TS, Kamalakannan S, Bhattacharjya S, Bogdanova Y, Arango-Lasprilla JC, Bentley J, et al.
546 PREparedness, REsponse and SySTemic transformation (PRE-RE-SyST): a model for disability-inclusive
547 pandemic responses and systemic disparities reduction derived from a scoping review and thematic
548 analysis. *Int J Equity Health.* 2021;20(1):204.
- 549 34. Links JM, Schwartz BS, Lin S, Kanarek N, Mitrani-Reiser J, Sell TK, et al. COPEWELL: a conceptual
550 framework and system dynamics model for predicting community functioning and resilience after
551 disasters. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep.* 2018;12(1):127-37.
- 552 35. Maqbool A, Khan NZ. Analyzing barriers for implementation of public health and social measures
553 to prevent the transmission of COVID-19 disease using DEMATEL method. *Diabetes Metab Syndr.*
554 2020;14(5):887-92.
- 555 36. Meyer D, Bishai D, Ravi SJ, Rashid H, Mahmood SS, Toner E, et al. A checklist to improve health
556 system resilience to infectious disease outbreaks and natural hazards. *BMJ Glob Health.*
557 2020;5(8):e002429.
- 558 37. Nicodemo C, Barzin S, Cavalli N, Lasserson D, Moscone F, Redding S, et al. Measuring
559 geographical disparities in England at the time of COVID-19: results using a composite indicator of
560 population vulnerability. *BMJ Open.* 2020;10(9):e039749.

- 561 38. Sell TK, Shearer MP, Meyer D, Chandler H, Schoch-Spana M, Thomas E, et al. Public health
562 resilience checklist for high-consequence infectious diseases-informed by the domestic ebola response
563 in the United States. *J Public Health Manag Pract*. 2018;24(6):510-8.
- 564 39. Tagarev T, Ratchev V. A taxonomy of crisis management functions. *Sustainability*.
565 2020;12(12):5147.
- 566 40. Tan MMJ, Neill R, Haldane V, Jung A-S, De Foo C, Tan SM, et al. Assessing the role of qualitative
567 factors in pandemic responses. *BMJ*. 2021;375:e067512.
- 568 41. Wong EY, Schachter A, Collins HN, Song L, Ta ML, Dawadi S, et al. Cross-sector monitoring and
569 evaluation framework: social, economic, and health conditions impacted during the COVID-19
570 pandemic. *Am J Public Health*. 2021;111(S3):S215-S23.
- 571 42. Choi H, Kim S-Y, Kim J-W, Park Y, Kim M-H. Mainstreaming of health equity in infectious disease
572 control policy during the COVID-19 pandemic era. *J Prev Med Public Health*. 2021;54(1):1-7.
- 573 43. Glover RE, van Schalkwyk MCI, Akl EA, Kristjansson E, Lotfi T, Petkovic J, et al. A framework for
574 identifying and mitigating the equity harms of COVID-19 policy interventions. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
575 2020;128:35-48.
- 576 44. AuYoung M, Rodriguez Espinosa P, Chen W-T, Juturu P, Young M-EDT, Casillas A, et al.
577 Addressing racial/ethnic inequities in vaccine hesitancy and uptake: lessons learned from the California
578 alliance against COVID-19. *J Behav Med*. 2022.
- 579 45. Blouin Genest G, Burlone N, Champagne E, Eastin C, Ogaranko C. Translating COVID-19
580 emergency plans into policy: a comparative analysis of three Canadian provinces. *Policy Des Pract*.
581 2021;4(1):115-32.
- 582 46. Schulze C, Welker A, Kühn A, Schwertz R, Otto B, Moraldo L, et al. Public health leadership in a
583 VUCA world environment: lessons learned during the regional emergency rollout of SARS-CoV-2
584 vaccinations in Heidelberg, Germany, during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Vaccines*. 2021;9(8).

- 585 47. Reddin K, Bang H, Miles L. Evaluating simulations as preparation for health crises like CoVID-19:
586 insights on incorporating simulation exercises for effective response. *Int J Disaster Risk Reduct.*
587 2021;59:102245.
- 588 48. Schoch-Spana M, Ravi S, Meyer D, Biesiadecki L, Mwaungulu GJ. High-performing local health
589 departments relate their experiences at community engagement in emergency preparedness. *J Public*
590 *Health Manag Pract.* 2018;24(4):360-9.
- 591 49. Schoch-Spana M, Nuzzo J, Ravi S, Biesiadecki L, Mwaungulu G, Jr. The local health department
592 mandate and capacity for community engagement in emergency preparedness: a national view over
593 time. *J Public Health Manag Pract.* 2018;24(4):350-9.
- 594 50. Lee CT, Buissonnière M, McClelland A, Frieden TR. Association between preparedness and
595 response measures and COVID-19 incidence and mortality. *medRxiv.* 2021.
596 doi:10.1101/2021.02.02.21251013.
- 597 51. World Health Organization. Strategic preparedness, readiness and response plan to end the
598 global COVID-19 emergency in 2022. World Health Organization, Geneva. 2022.
599 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-WHE-SPP-2022.1>. Accessed 27 Apr 2022.
- 600 52. World Health Organization. Framework and toolkit for Infection prevention and control in
601 outbreak preparedness, readiness and response at the national level. World Health Organization,
602 Geneva. 2021. [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/345251/9789240032729-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/345251/9789240032729-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
603 [eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/345251/9789240032729-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y). Accessed 27 Apr 2022.
- 604 53. World Health Organization. Framework for strengthening health emergency preparedness in
605 cities and urban settings. World Health Organization, Geneva. 2021.
606 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240037830>. Accessed 27 Apr 2022

- 607 54. World Health Organization. Pandemic influenza preparedness (PIP) framework for the sharing of
608 influenza viruses and access to vaccines and other benefits, second edition. World Health Organization,
609 Geneva. 2022. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240024854>. Accessed 27 Apr 2022.
- 610 55. World Health Organization. Strategic toolkit for assessing risks: a comprehensive toolkit for all-
611 hazards health emergency risk assessment. World Health Organization, Geneva. 2021.
612 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240036086>. Accessed 27 Apr 2022.
- 613 56. World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Joint risk
614 assessment operational tool (JRA OT): an operational tool of the tripartite zoonoses guide. World Health
615 Organization, Geneva. 2020.
616 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/340005/9789240015142-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/340005/9789240015142-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
617 [eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/340005/9789240015142-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y). Accessed 27 Apr 2022
- 618 57. World Health Organization. Risk communication and community engagement action plan
619 guidance: COVID-19 preparedness & response. World Health Organization, Geneva. 2020.
620 [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/risk-communication-and-community-engagement-\(rcce\)-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/risk-communication-and-community-engagement-(rcce)-action-plan-guidance)
621 [action-plan-guidance](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/risk-communication-and-community-engagement-(rcce)-action-plan-guidance). Accessed 27 Apr 2022.
- 622 58. Bell JA, Nuzzo JB, Britsol N, Essix G, Isaac C, Kobokovich A, et al. Global health security index
623 2021: advancing collective action and accountability amid global crisis. John's Hopkins Center for Health
624 Security, Baltimore. 2021. [https://www.centerforhealthsecurity.org/our-](https://www.centerforhealthsecurity.org/our-work/publications/GHSindex2021)
625 [work/publications/GHSindex2021](https://www.centerforhealthsecurity.org/our-work/publications/GHSindex2021). Accessed 18 July 2022.
- 626 59. National Collaborating Centre for Infectious Diseases. Measuring what counts in the midst of the
627 COVID-19 pandemic: equity indicators for public health [Internet]. National Collaborating Centre for
628 Infectious Diseases, Winnipeg. 2021. [https://nccid.ca/publications/measuring-what-counts-in-the-midst-](https://nccid.ca/publications/measuring-what-counts-in-the-midst-of-the-covid-19-pandemic-equity-indicators-for-public-health/)
629 [of-the-covid-19-pandemic-equity-indicators-for-public-health/](https://nccid.ca/publications/measuring-what-counts-in-the-midst-of-the-covid-19-pandemic-equity-indicators-for-public-health/). Accessed 18 Jul 2022.

- 630 60. Trust For America's Health. Ready or not 2022: protecting the public's health from diseases,
631 disasters, and bioterrorism. Trust for America's Health, Washington. 2022. [https://www.tfah.org/report-](https://www.tfah.org/report-details/ready-or-not-2022/)
632 [details/ready-or-not-2022/](https://www.tfah.org/report-details/ready-or-not-2022/). Accessed 18 July 2022.
- 633 61. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. Sendai framework for disaster risk reduction
634 2015-2030. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, Geneva. 2015.
635 <https://www.undrr.org/publication/sendai-framework-disaster-risk-reduction-2015-2030>. Accessed 30
636 Sep 2022.
- 637 62. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Paris Agreement. United Nations
638 Framework Convention on Climate Change, Geneva. 2015. [https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-](https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement#:~:text=The%20Paris%20Agreement%20is%20a,compared%20to%20pre%2Dindustrial%20levels)
639 [paris-agreement/the-paris-](https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement#:~:text=The%20Paris%20Agreement%20is%20a,compared%20to%20pre%2Dindustrial%20levels)
640 [agreement#:~:text=The%20Paris%20Agreement%20is%20a,compared%20to%20pre%2Dindustrial%20le-](https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement#:~:text=The%20Paris%20Agreement%20is%20a,compared%20to%20pre%2Dindustrial%20levels)
641 [vels](https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement#:~:text=The%20Paris%20Agreement%20is%20a,compared%20to%20pre%2Dindustrial%20levels). Accessed 03 Sep 2022.
- 642 63. World Health Organization. Commission on social determinants of health final report. World
643 Health Organization, Geneva. 2008. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241563703>.
644 Accessed 06 Sept 2022.
- 645 64. Network for Public Health Law and National Association of County and City Health Officials.
646 Proposed limits on public health authority: dangerous for public health. Network for Public Health Law,
647 Edina. 2021. [https://www.naccho.org/uploads/downloadable-resources/Proposed-Limits-on-Public-](https://www.naccho.org/uploads/downloadable-resources/Proposed-Limits-on-Public-Health-Authority-Dangerous-for-Public-Health-FINAL-5.24.21pm.pdf)
648 [Health-Authority-Dangerous-for-Public-Health-FINAL-5.24.21pm.pdf](https://www.naccho.org/uploads/downloadable-resources/Proposed-Limits-on-Public-Health-Authority-Dangerous-for-Public-Health-FINAL-5.24.21pm.pdf). Accessed 21 Sep 2022.
- 649 65. Health Canada. Learning from SARS: renewal of public health in Canada. Her Majesty the Queen
650 in Right of Canada, Ottawa. 2003. [https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/phac-aspc/migration/phac-](https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/phac-aspc/migration/phac-aspc/publicat/sars-sras/pdf/sars-e.pdf)
651 [aspc/publicat/sars-sras/pdf/sars-e.pdf](https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/phac-aspc/migration/phac-aspc/publicat/sars-sras/pdf/sars-e.pdf). Accessed 06 Sept 2022.

652 66. Campbell A. The SARS commission: SARS and public health in Ontario. Commission to Investigate
 653 the Introduction and Spread of SARS in Ontario, Toronto. 2006.
 654 http://www.archives.gov.on.ca/en/e_records/sars/report/index.html. Accessed 06 Sept 2022.

655 67. COVID-19 National Preparedness Collaborators. Pandemic preparedness and COVID-19: an
 656 exploratory analysis of infection and fatality rates, and contextual factors associated with preparedness
 657 in 177 countries, from Jan 1, 2020, to Sept 30, 2021. *Lancet*. 2022 Apr 16;399(10334):1489-1512.

658 **Figures, tables and additional files**

659 **Figure 2.** [submitted in separate file]

660 Title: Flow chart of included records from indexed databases and grey literature searches

661 File format: Microsoft Word (.docx)

662 **Table 2. Publications according to emergency type and corresponding Resilience Framework for PHEP**
 663 **elements**

Preparedness elements from the Resilience Framework for PHEP that appeared in the included publications	Description of element from the Resilience Framework for PHEP [15]	Type of emergency and number of citations	
		<i>Infectious emergency preparedness</i> (n=20)	<i>COVID-19 pandemic preparedness</i> (n=13)
Collaborative networks (22 publications)	Develop relationships, partnerships, and strong networks	N = 13 [25, 29, 30, 32, 36, 38, 39, 48, 49, 53, 56]	N = 9 [27, 35, 40, 41, 44-46, 51, 57]
Community engagement (21 publications)	Understand and engage with the community	N = 11 [25, 26, 30, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 48, 49, 53]	N = 10 [27, 31, 35, 40, 42, 44-46, 51, 57]
Risk analysis (19 publications)	Robust understanding of community hazards and risks	N = 13 [25, 26, 30, 32-34, 36-39, 54-56]	N = 6 [31, 40-44]
Communication	A strategy to deliver clear, consistent messaging across	N = 10	N = 8

Preparedness elements from the Resilience Framework for PHEP that appeared in the included publications	Description of element from the Resilience Framework for PHEP [15]	Type of emergency and number of citations	
		<i>Infectious emergency preparedness</i> (n=20)	<i>COVID-19 pandemic preparedness</i> (n=13)
(18 publications)	networks and the public	[25, 26, 30, 32, 36, 38, 39, 52, 53, 56]	[35, 40, 42, 44-46, 50, 57]
Planning process (16 publications)	Develop a plan through a dynamic, collaborative planning process	N = 9 [25, 26, 28-30, 32, 33, 36, 39]	N = 7 [27, 35, 42, 43, 45, 46, 50]
Governance and leadership (15 publications)	Integrated structures, partnerships and accountabilities with clear leadership	N = 8 [25, 30, 32, 36, 38, 39, 53, 54]	N = 7 [27, 35, 40, 42, 45, 46, 50]
Surveillance and monitoring (14 publications)	Timely information to provide situational awareness and guide action	N = 9 [25, 26, 30, 34, 36-39, 54]	N = 5 [27, 31, 45, 50, 54]
Resources (14 publications)	Ensure dedicated resource capacity and mobilization capacity	N = 8 [25, 28-30, 32, 36, 38, 39]	N = 6 [27, 35, 42, 45, 46, 50]
Workforce capacity (11 publications)	Develop and support knowledgeable and resilient staff	N = 10 [25, 28-30, 32, 36, 38, 39, 52, 55]	N = 1 [27]
Learning and evaluation (10 publications)	Evaluation as a strategy to build resilience	N = 7 [25, 29, 32, 36, 39, 47, 52]	N = 3 [43, 51, 57]
Practice and experience (6 publications)	Invest in testing and practicing plans and processes	N = 5 [25, 32, 36, 39, 47]	N = 1 [40]

664

665 **Table 2. Publications according to emergency type and emergent themes expanding on the Resilience**
 666 **Framework for PHEP**

Emergent themes from the included publications	Description of emergent theme	Type of emergency and number of citations	
		<i>Infectious emergency preparedness (n=18)</i>	<i>COVID-19 pandemic preparedness (n=11)</i>
Mitigating inequities (19 publications)	The anticipation and mitigation of inequitable impacts of emergencies and public health measures implemented on marginalized, racialized, or other high-risk populations.	N = 10 [25, 26, 33, 34, 36-39, 49, 53]	N = 9 [31, 35, 40-45, 51]
Research and evidence-informed decision making (8 publications)	Building capacity for knowledge-sharing networks and the integration of data-, scientific- and evidence-informed decision-making when preparing and planning for infectious disease emergencies.	N = 5 [29, 39, 53-55]	N = 3 [27, 40, 51]
Vaccination (7 publications)	Preparation for vaccine research, procurement, distribution, education, prioritization of administration to population groups, and any processes related to vaccine policies.	N = 2 [30, 54]	N = 5 [40, 44-46, 51]
Laboratory and diagnostic system capacity (5 publications)	Expanded and clearly defined roles for laboratory and diagnostic systems in infectious disease preparedness plans.	N = 2 [30, 54]	N = 3 [27, 50, 51]
Infection prevention and control (IPAC) capacity (5 publications)	Expanded and clearly defined roles for IPAC capacities, supplies and education.	N = 4 [32, 36, 38, 52]	N = 1 [51]
Financial investment in infrastructure (3 publications)	Adequate preparedness capacities require financial resources to establish critical infrastructure, including sustainable commitment and funding.	N = 2 [53, 54]	N = 1 [57]
Health system capacity	Health system planning should consider the system's surge capacity to safely and effectively care for patients during	N = 2	N = 1

Emergent themes from the included publications	Description of emergent theme	Type of emergency and number of citations	
		<i>Infectious emergency preparedness</i> (n=18)	<i>COVID-19 pandemic preparedness</i> (n=11)
(3 publications)	an infectious disease emergency, the capacity to maintain essential health services, as well as determining monitoring mechanisms to assess the capacity to continue delivering essential health services throughout the pandemic.	[53, 55]	[51]
Climate and environmental health considerations (3 publications)	Consider expanded and defined roles for climate and environmental health expertise in PHEP (i.e., One Health, such as considering the impact of environmental degradation on risk of zoonotic disease with pandemic potential; impact of waste generated by pandemic response operations on the environment).	N = 2 [38, 39]	N = 1 [40]
Public health legislation (3 publications)	Understand the scope, limitations and implications of public health laws, policies and authorities of the region (e.g., emergency use authorization), and how these may interface with other authorities.	N = 3 [25, 38, 39]	N = 0
Phases of preparedness (2 publications)	Delineating operational phases within the preparedness component of the cycle may support the organization and operationalization of preparedness to prioritize and implement PHEP activities.	N = 2 [32, 39]	N = 0

667


668 **Additional File 1** [submitted in separate file]

669 Title: Indexed database and grey literature search queries

670 File format: Microsoft Word (.docx)

671 Description: Details of the search strategies employed in the indexed literature and grey literature.

672



*MEDLINE (n=2,034), Embase, Scopus and Business Continuity & Disaster Recovery Reference Center (n=1,260), and National Institutes of Health COVID-19 Portfolio for Preprints (n=436)

**Using Google custom search engines authors searched 27 organizational or government websites (i.e., World Health Organization, Centers for Disease Prevention and Control, United states state/local government, Canadian health departments) and reviewed the first 5-10 pages of Google pages retrieved by each search query as the relevancy of the results tends to drop after the first few pages.

Adapted from: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71. For more information, visit: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>