- 1 Title: Severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) mathematical models and disease
- 2 parameters: a systematic review and meta-analysis
- 3
- 4 **Authors**: Christian Morgenstern^{1,*,#}, Thomas Rawson^{1,*}, Isobel Routledge¹, Mara Kont¹,
- 5 Natsuko Imai-Eaton¹, Janetta Skarp¹, Patrick Doohan¹, Kelly McCain¹, Rob Johnson¹, H.
- 6 Juliette T. Unwin^{4,1}, Tristan Naidoo¹, Dominic P Dee¹, Kanchan Parchani¹, Bethan N
- 7 Cracknell Daniels¹, Anna Vicco¹, Kieran O. Drake¹, Paula Christen¹, Richard J
- 8 Sheppard¹, Sequoia I Leuba¹, Joseph T Hicks¹, Ruth McCabe¹, Rebecca K Nash¹, Cosmo
- 9 N Santoni¹, *Pathogen Epidemiology Review Group*^m, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg¹, Sabine
- 10 van Elsland¹, Sangeeta Bhatia^{$1,3,^{\wedge}$}, and Anne Cori^{$1,2^{\wedge}$}
- 11

12 Affiliations:

- ¹³ ¹MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis & WHO Collaborating Centre for
- 14 Infectious Disease Modelling, Jameel Institute, School of Public Health, Imperial
- 15 College London, UK
- 16 ²Health Protection Research Unit in Modelling and Health Economics
- ¹⁷ ³Modelling and Economics Unit, UK Health Security Agency, London, UK
- ⁴School of Mathematics, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
- 19
- 20 ^{*, ^} Contributed equally
- ^m Membership of group authorship is listed in the Supplementary Information
- 22 [#]Corresponding author: c.morgenstern@imperial.ac.uk
- 23
- 24

25 Abstract

- 26 We conducted a systematic review (PROSPERO CRD42023393345) of severe acute
- 27 respiratory syndrome (SARS) transmission models and parameters characterising its
- 28 transmission, evolution, natural history, severity, risk factors and seroprevalence. Information
- 29 was extracted using a custom database and quality assessment tool.
- 30 We extracted 519 parameters, 243 risk factors, and 112 models from 288 papers. Our
- analyses show SARS is characterised by high lethality (case fatality ratio 10.9%),
- 32 transmissibility (R₀ range 1.1-4.59), and is prone to superspreading (20% top infectors
- 33 causing up to 91% of infections). Infection risk was highest among healthcare workers and
- 34 close contacts of infected individuals. Severe disease and death were associated with age and
- 35 existing comorbidities. SARS's natural history is poorly characterised, except for the
- 36 incubation period and mean onset-to-hospitalisation.
- 37 Our associated R package, epireview, contains this database, which can continue to be
- 38 updated to maintain a living review of SARS epidemiology and models, thus providing a key
- 39 resource for informing response to future coronavirus outbreaks.
- 40 Keywords: SARS-CoV-1, systematic review, epidemiological parameters, transmissibility,
- 41 mathematical model.
- 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59

60 Introduction

- 61 The COVID-19 pandemic re-emphasised the threat posed by coronaviruses to global health.
- 62 Three coronaviruses to date, SARS-CoV-1, MERS-CoV, and SARS-CoV-2, have caused
- 63 large disruptive epidemics affecting multiple countries (1–3). SARS-CoV-2 is now endemic
- 64 in humans, as are four other coronaviruses (HCoV-229E, -NL63, -OC43, and -HKU1),
- 65 jointly contributing to a large respiratory infection burden globally (4).
- 66 SARS-CoV-1 (or SARS-CoV) is the first documented coronavirus to have caused an acute
- 67 epidemic in humans. Cases of atypical pneumonia were reported in November 2002 (5), with
- the World Health Organization (WHO) issuing a global alert in mid-March 2003 for Severe
- 69 Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS). Later that month, a new airborne coronavirus, SARS-
- 70 CoV-1, was identified as its likely cause (5). A large epidemic ensued, with major health and
- economic impacts (6), including over 8,400 reported cases (with ~20% among healthcare
- 72 workers (HCWs)) across 32 countries up to mid-2003 (7–9). The epidemic was characterised
- by superspreading events, in which many infections occurred in a short timeframe in the
- same setting (e.g. hospitals or housing estates), and high fatality, with over 900 deaths
- reported globally (10,11). Although no pharmaceutical countermeasures were available at the
- time, the epidemic was contained within a few months using traditional control measures,
- including risk communication, contact tracing, isolation and quarantine (12,13). These proved
- reffective, likely due to SARS's natural history, namely limited transmission from
- asymptomatic and presymptomatic individuals (6).
- 80 In July 2003, the WHO declared the outbreak contained. A few sporadic cases, some due to
- 81 laboratory infections, emerged after 2003-2004. Nonetheless, SARS-CoV-1 still constitutes a
- 82 public health threat, currently on the WHO's list of priority pathogens for research and
- 83 development (15). Re-emergence of the virus from animals (bats being its main reservoir
- 84 (16)) or from laboratories are concerning prospects. Indeed, there is still no effective
- treatment (17), and despite promising advances (18,19), there is no approved vaccine.
- 86 Many studies have investigated the epidemiology and transmission of SARS, leveraging
- 87 high-quality data on cases analysed with modern infectious disease epidemiology and
- 88 modelling approaches (20). Although multiple SARS systematic reviews have been published
- 89 (21–24) (Supplementary Material (SM) appendix E), they mainly focused on narrow aspects
- 90 of SARS epidemiology (e.g. serial intervals, incubation periods or intervention effectiveness),
- and their static nature means there is no up-to-date resource providing a live picture of the
- 92 latest knowledge on SARS epidemiology and modelling. Our study aims to fill this gap: we
- 93 systematically reviewed published peer-reviewed SARS models and key epidemiological
- 94 parameters. The extracted data are available in a flexible database that can be updated as new
- 95 information is produced.
- 96 Synthesising estimates of key epidemiological parameters is critical to support the response
- 97 to future SARS outbreaks. Robust epidemiological parameter estimates are also key inputs to
- 98 mathematical models, which will likely be integral to future outbreak responses. Early
- analyses of the COVID-19 pandemic relied on assumptions that the natural history of SARS-
- 100 CoV-2 was similar to those of SARS-CoV-1 or MERS-CoV (25,26). Our database will

101 provide vital information to support early modelling efforts for future epidemics of SARS

102 and novel coronaviruses more broadly.

103

104 Methods

- 105 We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
- 106 (PRISMA) guidelines. We registered our study protocol with PROSPERO (International
- 107 Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews, #CRD42023393345).

108 Search strategy and selection criteria

- 109 We searched PubMed and Web of Science for studies published from database inception up
- 110 to March 8, 2019. We repeated the search to include publications up to June 24, 2024.
- 111 Results were imported into Covidence (2024) (27) and de-duplicated. Titles and abstracts,
- 112 and then full texts were independently screened by two reviewers (selected from CM, TR, IR,
- 113 MR, NIE, JS, PD, HJTU, TN, DPD, AC, SB), and conflicts were resolved by consensus.
- 114 Non-peer-reviewed literature and non-English language studies were excluded. See
- 115 Supplementary Material (SM) A.1 for further details on study selection, SM-Table A.1 for
- 116 full inclusion and exclusion criteria and SM-section D for the PRISMA checklists.

117 Data extraction

- 118 21% of full texts (n total=288) meeting the inclusion criteria were randomly selected and
- 119 double-extracted to validate the extraction process. A consensus on discordant results was
- 120 established, after which 20 reviewers (CM, TR, PD, KM, RJ, HJTU, TN, DPD, KP, BNCD,
- 121 AV, KOD, PC, RJS, SIL, JTH, RM, RKN, AC, SB) independently conducted single
- 122 extraction on the remaining full texts. Data on publication details, quality assessment (using a
- 123 customised questionnaire, see Data analysis section and SM-A.5), transmission model details,
- 124 basic and effective reproduction numbers, any epidemiological delays (e.g. incubation period
- 125 or symptom-onset-to-hospitalisation or -outcome delays), case fatality ratios (CFRs), attack
- 126 rates, growth rates, overdispersion, seroprevalence, and risk factors, were extracted using a
- 127 Microsoft Access database (version 2305). For risk factors, we extracted only whether-or-not
- 128 a factor was statistically significant, as reported in the articles, and if an analysis was adjusted
- 129 for other covariates. This is because differences in reference groups and stratification made it
- 130 unsuitable to compare other measures (e.g. odds ratios) across studies. We excluded
- 131 systematic reviews from our study but used them to cross-check that all eligible studies were
- 132 included (SM-section E). Full details of the data extraction process (SM-section A.2),
- 133 database structure (SM-tables B.6-B.7) and extracted data (SM-tables B.8-B.13) are provided
- 134 in SM.

- 136 Given there is a single documented SARS epidemic, we also analysed information on case
- 137 and death numbers reported by country from the final report of the Hong Kong SARS Expert
- 138 Committee (HKSEC) (10) to assess the global burden of the epidemic from a single source
- 139 without redundancy.
- 140

141

142 Data analysis

- 143 The risk of bias was assessed using a bespoke quality assessment (QA) questionnaire, with
- 144 QA scores for each article calculated as the proportion of 'Yes' responses to applicable
- 145 questions. A local polynomial regression was used to analyse temporal trends in QA scores
- 146 (SM-Figure B.1). All manuscript figures show extracted parameters from "high QA" studies
- 147 only, i.e. those with a QA score >50% (as in previous work (28)). Results from all studies are
- shown in SM Section B.5.1. For each parameter, we declare the total number of parameter
- 149 extractions and studies and the number of high QA parameter extractions and studies.
- 150 Analyses were conducted in *R* (version 4.2.2) (29); curated data on outbreaks, models, and
- 151 epidemiological parameters were added to the *epireview* R package (30) (SM-section C).
- 152 See SM section A.3.4 for how uncertainty is defined across all parameters.
- 153 Meta-analyses of published estimates were conducted using the *meta* R package (31) for the
- 154 mean incubation period and the mean symptom-onset-to-hospital-admission delay. Common
- and random effects models were used to generate pooled delay estimates with 95%
- 156 confidence interval (CI) and I^2 heterogeneity estimates (SM-A.3). We did not perform meta-
- analyses for other parameters due to insufficient estimates of central tendency paired with
- 158 sample uncertainty.
- 159 In addition to our review, we used data from the final HKSEC report (10), including the
- 160 number of SARS cases, hospitalisations, deaths, recoveries, imported cases by country, and
- 161 the onset dates for the first and last probable cases. We used this dataset to identify countries
- 162 with local transmission and calculate CFRs for each country. We used mixed-effect logistic
- 163 regression to obtain a pooled CFR estimate (Figure 2, SM-A.3.2).
- 164

165 **Results**

- 166 The search returned 28,356 potentially relevant articles. De-duplication retained 14,929
- 167 articles for title/abstract screening. 878 studies were retained for full-text screening, with 288
- 168 studies meeting the criteria for final inclusion (SM-Table A.1). As shown in Figure 1, the
- 169 main reasons for study exclusion were "no reported parameters or models of interest"
- 170 (n=220) and "no original estimates" (n=138). We report Cohen's kappa for the screening and
- 171 full-text review (SM-Figure B.13).
- 172 We extracted 519 parameters and 243 risk factors from 186 articles (SM-Tables B.3-4, B.8-
- 173 13 and SM-Figure B.2) and 112 models from 108 articles (SM-Table B.5 and SM-Figure174 B.3).
- 175

[FIGURE 1 here]

- 176 Figure 2 illustrates the global burden of the 2003-2004 SARS epidemic, as estimated from
- 177 the HKSEC final report (10). China reported the most cases (5327), followed by Hong Kong
- 178 (1755), Taiwan (665), Canada (251), Singapore (238), and Vietnam (63). Local transmission
- 179 was not documented elsewhere, though cases were reported in other countries.

180	[FIGURE 2 here]
181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196	We extracted 34 basic reproduction number (R_0) estimates from 25 studies in total and 25 effective reproduction number (R_t) estimates from 13 studies (SM-Tables B.4, B.8). R_0 measures transmission without interventions and population immunity, whilst R_t captures transmissibility, including as influenced by immunity, control measures, and behavioural changes (32). Central R_0 estimates from 13 high-QA studies ranged between 1.1 and 88.3 (n=16). We omit two outlying estimates from our main analysis of 88.3 (33) and 12.985 (34) due to their unique study contexts: one pertains to a nosocomial setting, and the other is from a study investigating the impact of priors on Bayesian inference. The remaining 14 R_0 central estimates from 1.1 to 4.59, with uncertainty intervals spanning 0.25-5.31 (Figure 3A). R_0 estimates were similar across countries and the outbreak phase they were estimated from (Figure 3A and SM-B.4, B.8). As expected, R_t estimates tended to be lower. Of the 17 R_t estimates from 8 high-QA studies, 11 had a central value below or at the threshold R_t =1, indicating a controlled epidemic, with the remaining six central R_t estimates ranging from 2.4 to 4.8 (Figure 3B). All R_t estimates from the start of the outbreak (n=5) were above 1, while four mid-outbreak, two end-outbreak, and two control-measure period estimates were below 1.
197	[FIGURE 3 here]
198 199	Five growth-rate estimates were extracted from three studies, 33 attack rates (AR) from 22 studies, and nine secondary attack rates from eight studies (SM-Tables B.4, B.8).
200 201 202 203	Growth rate central estimates ranged from 4.22%, corresponding to the midpoint of the range of captured estimates in Zhang et al (35), to 16% per day (four estimates from two high-QA studies, all estimated in the presence of control measures, Figure 4C), corresponding to a doubling time between 4 and 16 days (SM-A.3).
204 205 206 207 208 209 210	AR estimates from the general population exclusively were generally low, with all but one central estimate of high-QA studies ranging from 0 to 5.18%, corresponding to the mid-point of the range of captured estimates of Rea et al (36) (n=11 from six studies) and one higher estimate at 16.4% (Figure 4A). ARs in HCWs were substantially higher, with central estimates ranging from 0.47 to 35.15% (n=7 from seven high-QA studies), as were ARs in persons under investigation (close contacts or targeted studies), with central estimates ranging from 0 to 40.5% (n=5 from four high-QA studies).
211 212 213 214 215 216	Secondary ARs showed a similar trend, with high estimates for HCWs (two central estimates from two high-QA studies ranging from 18.7 - 19%) and persons under investigation (two central estimates from two high-QA studies - 10.2 and 42.6%%, corresponding to the midpoint of the range of captured estimates of Shen et al (37)), and lower estimates in other settings (three central estimates from two high-QA studies ranging from 6.2 to 14.9%, Figure 4B).
217 218 219	Overdispersion characterises heterogeneity in the number of secondary cases generated by one individual, with lower overdispersion estimates indicating more heterogeneity or superspreading. We extracted eight estimates of overdispersion from four studies (SM-B.8);

220	seven estimates for the three high-QA studies had centr	al estimates ranging from $7.52 * 10^{-7}$	
-----	---	--	--

- to 0.285, with uncertainty extending as high as 1.48 (Figure 4D).
- 222

 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 	We extracted 12 parameters detailing genetic mutation from six studies in total. Filtering for only high QA studies, we extracted two mutation rate (evolutionary rate) estimates from two studies, one of which also reported three substitution rate estimates (Figure 4E-F, SM-Table B.8). Central estimates ranged from 14 to 30.15×10^{-4} substitutions per site per year (s/s/y) for the evolutionary rate and from 15.90 to 50.15×10^{-4} s/s/y for the substitution rate, where the central estimate corresponds to the mid-point of the range of captured estimates for each study. Uncertainty around those was not reported, but ranges of point estimates were provided, e.g. reflecting different fragments of the genome considered: one study reported central evolutionary rate estimates ranging from 4.2 to 23.4 x 10^{-4} s/s/y, and three studies reported wide ranges of central substitution rates estimates, from 0 to 92.20 x 10^{-4} s/s/y.
233	
234	[FIGURE 4 here]
 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 	Seroprevalence estimates varied widely across studies, again depending on the population being investigated (SM-Table B12), with low seroprevalence in the general population and children and mixed groups outside hospital settings (8 seroprevalence estimates from 0 to 12.04% across five high-QA studies), moderate in HCWs (13 seroprevalence estimates from 0 to 88.9% across 11 high-QA studies), and high in persons under investigation (nine seroprevalence estimates from 0.19 to 100% across nine high-QA studies).
242 243 244 245 246 247	37 studies (31 high-QA) examined risk factors for SARS infection (SM-Table B.13, SM-Figure B.11-12). Most risk factors considered were found to be both non-significant and significant across different studies. Close or household contact with an infected individual and occupation were more frequently significantly (vs. non-significantly) associated with infection (SM-Figure B11 A). In contrast, age, sex and comorbidity were more likely to be non-significantly (vs. significantly) associated with infection.
248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260	We extracted 116 CFR estimates from 77 articles (86 estimates from 56 high-QA studies) (SM-Table B.4 and B.11, SM-Figure B.2). Half of these (n=57 estimates from 42 studies) were computed using a naïve approach (i.e. dividing the number of deaths by the number of cases), which leads to biased estimates if some cases have unknown final status. This can often be the case in real-time analyses (38). Many studies did not explicitly specify the CFR estimation method (n=37 estimates from 24 studies). Of those which corrected for right censoring (n=22 estimates from 14 studies), CFR estimates ranged from 0.1 to 30.8%. Many studies were for the same countries (e.g., nine CFR estimates from four studies for China); hence, estimates were likely not independent. We, therefore, also estimated the CFR retrospectively from data in the HKSEC final report (10); the CFR varied by country, from 6.6% (95% confidence interval (CI) 5.9-7.2%) in mainland China to 27.1% (95% CI 23.7-30.6%) in Taiwan, with a pooled random effect estimate of 13.8% (95% CI 9.2-20.3%) and a pooled common effect estimate of 10.9% (95% CI 10.3-11.6%, Figure 2).
200	r

261 Many studies considered potential risk factors for severe disease (21 analyses from eight 262 studies, SM-Figure B.11 B, ten analyses from three high-QA studies) or death (82 analyses 263 from 36 studies, SM-Figure B.11 C, 62 from 27 high-QA studies). Age, comorbidities and 264 sex were the most studied risk factors for both severe disease and death (SM Figure B.10). 265 Most analyses found age and comorbidities to be significant risk factors for severe disease 266 and death. Most studies that considered sex as a risk factor for severe disease found it to be 267 significant; there was mixed evidence of sex being a risk factor for death (14 studies 268 significant versus 12 studies not significant). Contacts with infected individuals, in or outside 269 the household, were not found to be a significant risk factor for severe disease (n = 1 analysis 270 from one study), but close contact was identified as a significant risk factor for death in three 271 out of four analyses from three studies. Occupation and hospitalisation were often identified 272 as significant risk factors for death (10 analyses from eight studies and three analyses from 273 two studies, respectively).

274

We extracted three estimates of mean serial interval (SI) from two studies and seven

estimates of the infectious period from seven studies (Figure 5A-B and SM-Table C.10). The

three SI estimates (all from high-QA studies) were broadly consistent, albeit uncertainty was
 large, encompassing values from 6.77 to 18.55 days. Four central estimates of the infectious

large, encompassing values from 6.77 to 18.55 days. Four central estimates of the infectious
 period across four high-QA studies ranged from 4.84 to 10 days (uncertainty range 5.8-14.3)

279 benot across rout high-QA studies ranged non 4.64 to 10 days (uncertainty range 5.6-14.5 280 days; note not all studies report uncertainty), with a fifth high-QA study yielding a much

higher central estimate of 21.6 days (uncertainty 14.9 to 26.8 days).

282

283 We extracted 49 incubation period estimates from 39 studies, with 42 estimates from 32 high-

284 QA studies, including 17 estimates with sufficient information for inclusion in a meta-

analysis (Figure 5D and SM-Table B.10). The pooled mean incubation period estimate was

286 5.03 days (95% CI 4.87-5.18) using a common effects (CE) model, and 5.42 days (95% CI

4.75-6.09) using a random effects (RE) model. The high I^2 (93%) suggests substantial

heterogeneity across studies. Meta-analyses restricted to specific study populations (general population, HCWs, mixed groups, and persons under investigation) highlighted small

289 population, HCWs, mixed groups, and persons under investigation) highlighted small 290 differences in the mean incubation period across populations, with high I^2 throughout,

291 indicating high heterogeneities between studies within each subgroup. The mean incubation

period was shortest in persons under investigation (RE estimate 4.93 days, 95% CI 4.01-5.85)

- and longest in the general population (6.33, 95% CI 4.86-7.80).
- 294

We extracted 38 estimates of the delay from onset of symptoms to hospitalisation from 33
studies, including 29 estimates from 25 high-QA studies eligible for inclusion in metaanalysis (Figure 5E and SM-Table B.10). The estimated mean onset-to-hospitalisation delay
was 3.48 days (95% CI 3.34-3.62 days) using the CE model and 3.99 days (95% CI 3.29-4.69
days) using the RE model, with a high I² (95%) suggesting large heterogeneity across studies.

We extracted 21 estimates from14 studies characterising the delay from hospitalisation to
 outcome (i.e. death or recovery, Figure 5C and SM-Table B.10). Central estimates ranged
 from 9.4 to 35.9 days for the mean time from hospitalisation to death (seven estimates from

six high-QA studies) and from 19 to 29.7 days for the mean time from hospitalisation to
recovery (six estimates from six high-QA studies). We also extracted 15 estimates from 14
studies of mean time in hospital, with central estimates ranging from 3 to 23 days across

- 307 seven high-QA studies.
- 308 We conducted our meta-analyses using only high-QA studies. None of the lower-QA studies
- 309 provided sufficient information to be included in our meta-analyses; hence, these did not
- 310 affect our results (SM-Figure B.6).
- 311 312

[FIGURE 5 here]

313 112 SARS transmission models were extracted from 108 studies (SM-Figure B.3, SM-Tables

- B.5, B.9). Compartmental models were the most frequent model type (n=63 from 62 studies),
- followed by individual-based models (n=9 from nine studies), and branching processes (n=7
- 316 from seven studies). Most compartmental models (n=43 of 63) were deterministic.
- 317 Approximately half of the extracted models had been calibrated using observed data. Models
- 318 captured a wide range of interventions, including quarantine and contact tracing, as well as
- behaviour changes (SM-Figure B.3(F)). No model had publicly available code.
- 320

321 **Discussion**

- 322 In this systematic review, we compiled and analysed published epidemiological parameter
- 323 estimates and mathematical models of SARS-CoV-1. SARS epidemiology has been well
- 324 characterised overall, with 519 epidemiological parameters, 243 risk factors, and 112
- 325 mathematical models extracted in this review, covering multiple geographic regions affected
- by the 2003-2004 epidemic (Figure 2, SM-Figure B2). Synthesising this information in a
- 327 central dynamic database, as we have done in the R package *epireview*, is critical to prepare
- 328 for potential future outbreaks of SARS-CoV-1, a high-threat virus on the 2024 WHO list of
- 329 priority pathogens (39). This central resource will also be useful for epidemic preparedness,
- to characterise the epidemiology of existing coronaviruses and anticipate the potential
- and epidemiological profile of future ones.
- 332 SARS was first detected in China and then affected multiple other countries. Unlike with
- 333 SARS-CoV-2, however, international spread was limited, with local transmission only
- identified in a handful of countries.
- However, SARS transmissibility in the affected regions was high, with growth rate estimates
- translating into a doubling of cases every 4 to 16 days (Figure 4 growth rates converted to
- doubling times (SI A.3)), and R_0 estimates broadly ranging from 1.1-4.59 (Figure 3A). These
- R_0 estimates were obtained using varied statistical approaches and data types. They were
- 339 reported in very heterogeneous formats, sometimes without any characterisation of
- $340 \quad \text{uncertainty, making comparison and synthesis across studies challenging. These R_0 estimates}$
- 341 are comparable to those for the SARS-CoV-2 wildtype (~2.5) (40) and generally slightly
- higher than for pandemic influenza (typically 1-2.5) (41–43). Detection of the SARS
- 343 epidemic and the subsequent WHO global alert rapidly prompted interventions, including
- quarantine, isolation, strict hygiene measures in hospitals and social distancing (13,44). These
- 345 eventually led to a decline in cases, consistent with a reduction of R_t : estimates at the start of
- the epidemic broadly align with the basic reproduction number, ranging from 2-4 (Figure

347 3B), whilst estimates later in the epidemic suggest interventions were effective, bringing R_t 348 below 1.

349 However, transmission was highly heterogeneous: overdispersion estimates suggest

350 significant variations in the number of secondary infections generated by each case.

Following the approach of Lloyd-Smith et al. (45), the range of central overdispersion

estimates (between 7.52×10^{-7} (post interventions) and 0.285 (pre interventions), Figure 4)

353 suggests that approximately 91% of SARS-CoV-1 transmission can be attributed to the 20%

most infectious individuals in the pre-intervention period but this increases to 99% in the 1.5

355 post-intervention period (SI A.3.3). Hence, superspreading in SARS-CoV-1 is more 356 prominent than for many other viruses (45), including SARS-CoV-2 (46). This character

prominent than for many other viruses (45), including SARS-CoV-2 (46). This characteristic
 makes SARS particularly threatening, as higher levels of superspreading make epidemics

358 harder to control.

359 Attack rate, secondary attack rate, and seroprevalence estimates extracted in this review show

that SARS-CoV-1 transmissibility highly depended on the sub-population considered, as

361 observed during the COVID-19 pandemic (47). General population studies reported SARS-

362 CoV-1 attack rates and seroprevalence generally under 1% (Figure 4A and SM-Table B.12),

363 whilst estimates among HCWs were substantially higher, with central estimates ranging from

364 1.2% to 35.15%.

365 We extracted risk factors associated with infection (SM-Figure B.11). Unsurprisingly, close

366 contact with confirmed cases was frequently identified as a significant risk factor for

367 infection. Occupation, including HCWs, was also often reported as a significant risk factor

368 for infection, in line with higher attack rates, secondary attack rates, and seroprevalence

369 estimated among HCWs.

Published estimates of CFR suggest high severity, with >10% of cases fatal (SM-Table B.11

and Figure 2). This is one order of magnitude higher than SARS-CoV-2 (CFR up to ~2% for

the most severe variants (48) (40)) and pandemic influenza (CFR up to ~1-3% for the 1918

373 influenza pandemic (49)). Such high severity likely aided case identification and intervention

targeting. However, combined with a relatively high transmissibility and high

375 superspreading, it emphasises the threat posed by SARS-CoV-1 and potential future

376 coronaviruses that could share these characteristics.

377 Risk factors for hospitalisation and death were aligned with those previously identified for

378 respiratory viruses, including age and comorbidities. Sex demonstrated mixed results, with

379 studies equally identifying it as a significant and non-significant risk factor for SARS

380 mortality. For COVID-19, the CFR is higher for men than for women (50). Being an HCW

381 was frequently identified as being significantly associated with the risk of death. However,

382 these results should be interpreted with caution as we did not extract the direction of the 383 association.

384 The natural history of SARS was less well-characterised. We identified only three estimates

for the central estimate of the SI, all with considerable uncertainty (Figure 5A) and one

386 estimate for the generation time. The few estimates for the infectious period suggested a

387 duration of around a week. However, some uncertainty and an outlier again suggested a much

388 longer infectious period of several weeks (Figure 5B). The mean incubation period was better

389 characterised, enabling a meta-analysis yielding a pooled RE model estimate of 5.42 days

- 390 (95% CI 4.75-6.09, Figure 5D), similar to estimates for SARS-CoV-2 (51). Subgroup
- analyses suggested variations in mean incubation periods across populations, although this
- 392 may reflect differences in study designs and associated biases. Although not a focus of our
- 393 systematic review, very little evidence was found to suggest a role of asymptomatic
- transmission for SARS. This suggests that most SARS-CoV-1 infectious individuals were
- 395 symptomatic, and their infectiousness started after symptoms, meaning that the latent period
- would be at least as long as the incubation period (52,53). Little or no asymptomatic
- transmission enables containment, as infectious individuals can be effectively isolated
- following symptom onset. This contrasts with SARS-CoV-2, where asymptomatic
- transmission has been widely documented, limiting the effectiveness of control measures that
- 400 rely on symptom-based case identification and isolation (54).
- 401 Delay from symptom onset to hospitalisation is also an important marker of epidemic
- 402 management, with shorter delays characterising epidemics where cases are isolated more
- 403 promptly and which are more likely to be controlled. Our meta-analysis estimated a relatively
- 404 short mean time from symptoms to hospitalisation of 3.99 days (95% CI 3.29-4.69) for the
- 405 RE model. However, there were substantial variations between studies, with no clear
- 406 indications of what factors may drive such heterogeneity (Figure 5E, SM-Figure B.8), except
- 407 that the delay reduced over time due to improved population awareness (55). Further studies
- 408 into drivers of delayed hospitalisation may help to control outbreaks of SARS-CoV-1 and
- 409 other coronaviruses. Estimates of mean time in hospital were also highly variable between
- 410 studies, even when considering only individuals who die or only individuals who recover
- 411 (Figure 5C). Similarly, further investigation of drivers of such heterogeneity would help
- 412 adequately prepare increased healthcare capacity for future coronavirus outbreaks.
- 413 We identified only two high-QA studies reporting estimates of the substitution and
- 414 evolutionary rates for SARS-CoV-1, with widely ranging estimates for different genome
- sections. The paucity of estimates is unsurprising given that the SARS epidemic happened
- 416 early in the 21^{st} century when genetic sequencing was not yet commonly utilised. The higher
- 417 end of those ranges, with evolutionary rates up to $8*10^{-3}$ substitutions per site per year,
- 418 emphasises the potential for SARS and similar coronaviruses to evolve rapidly, possibly even
- 419 faster than SARS-CoV-2 (56).
- 420 SARS modelling studies have been continuously published since 2003. Most modelling
- 421 studies contemporary with the 2003-2004 epidemic sought to infer epidemiological
- 422 parameters and forecast epidemic trends based on data. In contrast, more recent modelling
- 423 studies have predominantly been theoretical, using SARS as a case study to explore
- 424 methodological questions. While the QA scores of non-modelling studies remained broadly
- 425 constant, we noted a decline in QA scores of modelling studies over time (SM-Figure B1
- 426 (C)), possibly reflecting this shifting focus.
- 427 None of the modelling studies provided associated model code, in line with recent estimates
- 428 that only 0.5% of medical studies to date provide public-access code (57). The absence of
- 429 code also likely reflects a less widespread practice of open-source code in 2003 compared to
- 430 2024, with journals and funders requiring open-source code only recently (58).

- 431 Our work has limitations. Firstly, we excluded non-peer-reviewed literature and studies not in
- 432 English from our review. Restriction to peer-reviewed papers ensures our review adheres to
- 433 high-quality standards. The language restriction means that we may have excluded relevant
- 434 studies, particularly those in Chinese (SM-Table F.17). Secondly, to keep this review
- 435 manageable given the volume of peer-reviewed studies on SARS-CoV-2, we added a
- 436 "SARS-CoV-2" exclusion term to our search criteria. Therefore, studies comparing SARS-
- 437 CoV-1 and SARS-CoV-2 will have been omitted. Overall, given that the literature on SARS
- 438 is based on a single well-documented epidemic, it is unlikely that these restrictions left out
- 439 substantial pieces of knowledge not otherwise covered. Moreover, further relevant literature
- 440 not covered here could, in the future, be added to our `epireview' R package, where all
- 441 information extracted in this review is already publicly available (30).
- 442 When SARS-CoV-2 was first identified, initial assessments of potential epidemic impact and
- intervention options were informed by epidemiological and modelling analyses which, in the
- 444 absence of characterisation of the new coronavirus, assumed that its natural history and 445 epidemiology (e.g. degree of superspreading) would be similar to those of SARS-CoV-1 an
- epidemiology (e.g. degree of superspreading) would be similar to those of SARS-CoV-1 and
- 446 MERS-CoV (25,26,59–61). Similar assumptions may need to be made in future outbreaks.
- 447 Our systematic review and dynamic database will provide a critical resource to support the
- timely development and robust parameterisation of mathematical models in future epidemics
- 449 of SARS and novel coronaviruses.
- 450

451 Declarations

452 Funding All authors acknowledge funding from the Medical Research Council (MRC) Centre for Global 453 Infectious Disease Analysis (MR/X020258/1) funded by the UK MRC and carried out in the frame of the Global 454 Health EDCTP3 Joint Undertaking supported by the EU; the NIHR for support for the Health Research 455 Protection Unit in Modelling and Health Economics, a partnership between the UK Health Security Agency 456 (UKHSA), Imperial College London, and London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (grant code 457 NIHR200908). AC was supported by the Academy of Medical Sciences Springboard scheme, funded by the 458 Academy of Medical Sciences, the Wellcome Trust, the UK Department for Business, Energy, and Industrial 459 Strategy, the British Heart Foundation, and Diabetes UK (reference SBF005\1044) and acknowledges research 460 funding from the Sergei Brin foundation. CM acknowledges the Schmidt Foundation for research funding (grant 461 code 6-22-63345). PD, TN, KP acknowledge funding from Community Jameel. RJ acknowledges funding from 462 CEPI. GC-D acknowledges funding from the Royal Society. KD acknowledges research funding from the 463 Wellcome Trust (220885/Z/20/Z). RKN acknowledges research funding from the MRC Doctoral Training 464 Partnership (grant MR/N014103/1). KM acknowledges research funding from the Imperial College President's 465 PhD Scholarship. The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data 466 interpretation, or writing of the report. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a 'Creative 467 Commons Attribution' (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this 468 submission.

469 Availability of data and materials

- 470 https://github.com/mrc-ide/epireview/tree/main/data
- 471 Code availability https://github.com/mrc-ide/epireview; https://github.com/mrc-ide/priority-pathogens
- 472 **PROSPERO** CRD42023393345
- 473 (https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?RecordID&RecordID=393345)
- 474 Competing interests AC reports payment from Pfizer for teaching mathematical modelling of infectious

475 diseases. PD reports payment from WHO for consulting on integrated modelling. RM has received payment 476 from WHO for work on MERS-CoV. HJTU reports payment from the Moderna Charitable Foundation (paid 477 directly to institution for an unrelated project). All other authors declare no competing interests. The views 478 expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the National Institute for Health and Care 479 Research (NIHR), UK Health Security Agency, or the Department of Health and Social Care. NI-E is currently 480 employed by Wellcome. However, Wellcome had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, 481 management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and 482 decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

483 Authors' contributions

484 SB, SvE, AC, and NI-E conceptualised this systematic review. CM, TR, IR, MR, NIE, JS, HJTU, AC, and SB 485 searched the literature and screened the titles and abstracts. CM, TR, IR, MR, JS, PD, HJTU, TN, DPD, and AC 486 reviewed all full-text articles. CM, TR, PD, KM, RJ, HJTU, TN, DPD, KP, BNCD, AV, KOD, PC, RJS, SIL, 487 JTH, RM, RKN, AC, and SB extracted the data. CM, TR, AC and SB formally analysed, visualised, and 488 validated the data. CM, TR, TN, CNS, and SB were responsible for software infrastructure. AC acquired 489 funding. CM, TR, and AC were responsible for project administration. GC-D, HJTU, and RKN were 490 responsible for training individuals on accessing Covidence and designing the Access system. CM and AC 491 supervised the systematic review. CM, TR, AC, and SB wrote the original manuscript draft. All authors were 492 responsible for the methodology and review and editing of the manuscript. All authors debated, discussed, 493 edited, and approved the final version of the manuscript. All authors had final responsibility for the decision to 494 submit the manuscript for publication.

495

496 **References**

497 1. Chowell G, Fenimore PW, Castillo-Garsow MA, Castillo-Chavez C. SARS outbreaks
498 in Ontario, Hong Kong and Singapore: the role of diagnosis and isolation as a control
499 mechanism. J Theor Biol. 2003 Sep;224(1):1–8.

Cotten M, Watson SJ, Kellam P, Al-Rabeeah AA, Makhdoom HQ, Assiri A, et al.
 Transmission and evolution of the Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus in Saudi
 Arabia: a descriptive genomic study. The Lancet. 2013 Dec;382(9909):1993–2002.

503 3. CMMID COVID-19 Working Group, Liu Y, Morgenstern C, Kelly J, Lowe R, Jit M.
504 The impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on SARS-CoV-2 transmission across 130
505 countries and territories. BMC Med. 2021 Dec;19(1):40.

506 4. Corman VM, Muth D, Niemeyer D, Drosten C. Hosts and Sources of Endemic
507 Human Coronaviruses. In: Advances in Virus Research [Internet]. Elsevier; 2018 [cited 2024
508 Jun 17]. p. 163–88. Available from:
509 https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0065352718300010

510 5. CDC. CDC SARS Response Timeline [Internet]. 2013. Available from:
511 https://archive.cdc.gov/www_cdc_gov/about/history/sars/timeline.htm#:~:text=SARS%3A%
512 20Key%20Events,was%20stopped%20in%20July%202003.

513 6. Lee JW, McKibbin WJ. Learning from SARS: Preparing for the Next Disease514 Outbreak: Workshop Summary. [Internet]. National Academies Press; 2004. Available from:

515 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK92473/

- 516 7. Xiao J, Fang M, Chen Q, He B. SARS, MERS and COVID-19 among healthcare 517 workers: A narrative review. J Infect Public Health. 2020 Jun;13(6):843–8.
- 8. WHO. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) [Internet]. Available from:
 https://www.who.int/health-topics/severe-acute-respiratory-syndrome#tab=tab_1
- 520 9. WHO. SARS outbreak contained worldwide [Internet]. WHO; 2003 Jul. Available
 521 from: https://www.who.int/news/item/05-07-2003-sars-outbreak-contained-worldwide
- 522 10. Hong Kong SARS Expert Committee. SARS in Hong Kong: from Experience to 523 Action. Chapter 4 - Commentary on Key Issues [Internet]. 2003. Available from:
- Action, Chapter 4 Commentary on Key Issues [Internet]. 2003. Available from:
 https://www.sars-expertcom.gov.hk/english/reports/reports/files/e_chp4.pdf
- 525 11. Sever Actute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) Epidemiology Working Group.
 526 Consensus document on the epidemiology of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS)
 527 [Internet]. WHO; 2003. Report No.: WHO/CDS/CSR/GAR/2003.11. Available from:
 528 https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/70863/WHO_CDS_CSR_GAR_2003.11_eng.pdf
 529 ?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- 12. Riley S, Fraser C, Donnelly CA, Ghani AC, Abu-Raddad LJ, Hedley AJ, et al.
 Transmission Dynamics of the Etiological Agent of SARS in Hong Kong: Impact of Public
 Health Interventions. Science. 2003 Jun 20;300(5627):1961–6.
- 533 13. Bell DM, World Health Organization Working Group on Prevention of International
 534 and Community Transmission of SARS. Public Health Interventions and SARS Spread,
 535 2003. Emerg Infect Dis. 2004 Nov;10(11):1900–6.
- 536 14. Fraser C, Riley S, Anderson RM, Ferguson NM. Factors that make an infectious
 537 disease outbreak controllable. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2004 Apr 20;101(16):6146–51.
- 538 15. WHO. Prioritizing diseases for research and development in emergency contexts
- 539 [Internet]. Available from: https://www.who.int/activities/prioritizing-diseases-for-research-
- 540 and-development-in-emergency-contexts
- 541 16. Wang LF, Shi Z, Zhang S, Field H, Daszak P, Eaton B. Review of Bats and SARS.
 542 Emerg Infect Dis. 2006;12(12):1834–40.
- 543 17. Stockman LJ, Bellamy R, Garner P. SARS: Systematic Review of Treatment Effects.
 544 Low D, editor. PLoS Med. 2006 Sep 12;3(9):e343.
- 545 18. Cankat S, Demael MU, Swadling L. In search of a pan-coronavirus vaccine: next546 generation vaccine design and immune mechanisms. Cell Mol Immunol. 2023 Dec
 547 26;21(2):103–18.
- 548 19. Martin JE, Louder MK, Holman LA, Gordon IJ, Enama ME, Larkin BD, et al. A

549 SARS DNA vaccine induces neutralizing antibody and cellular immune responses in healthy 550 adults in a Phase I clinical trial. Vaccine. 2008 Nov;26(50):6338–43.

551 20. Olowokure B, Merianos A, Leitmeyer K, Mackenzie JS. Focus: SARS. Nat Rev
552 Microbiol. 2004 Feb;2(2):92–92.

553 21. Vink MA, Bootsma MCJ, Wallinga J. Serial Intervals of Respiratory Infectious
554 Diseases: A Systematic Review and Analysis. Am J Epidemiol. 2014 Nov 1;180(9):865–75.

Lessler J, Reich NG, Brookmeyer R, Perl TM, Nelson KE, Cummings DA. Incubation
periods of acute respiratory viral infections: a systematic review. Lancet Infect Dis. 2009
May;9(5):291–300.

Teasdale E, Santer M, Geraghty AWA, Little P, Yardley L. Public perceptions of nonpharmaceutical interventions for reducing transmission of respiratory infection: systematic
review and synthesis of qualitative studies. BMC Public Health. 2014 Dec;14(1):589.

561 24. Kwok KO, Tang A, Wei VWI, Park WH, Yeoh EK, Riley S. Epidemic Models of
562 Contact Tracing: Systematic Review of Transmission Studies of Severe Acute Respiratory
563 Syndrome and Middle East Respiratory Syndrome. Comput Struct Biotechnol J.
564 2019;17:186–94.

565 25. Imai N, Dorigatti I, Cori A, Riley S, Ferguson N. Estimating the potential total 566 number of novel Coronavirus cases in Wuhan City, China [Internet]. Imperial College 567 Jul 23]. London: 2020 Jan [cited 2024 Available from: 568 http://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/77149

569 26. Imai N, Cori A, Dorigatti I, Baguelin M, Donnelly C, Riley S, et al. Report 3:
570 Transmissibility of 2019-nCoV [Internet]. Imperial College London; 2020 Jan [cited 2024 Jul
571 23]. Available from: http://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/77148

572 27. Veritas Health Innovation. Covidence systematic review software [Internet].
573 Melbourne, Australia: Veritas Health Innovation; 2024. Available from: www.covidence.org
574 28. Nash RK, Bhatia S, Morgenstern C, Doohan P, Jorgensen D, McCain K, et al. Ebola
575 virus disease mathematical models and epidemiological parameters: a systematic review.

576 Lancet Infect Dis. 2024 Aug;S1473309924003748.

577 29. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing [Internet].

578 Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020. Available from:
579 https://www.R-project.org/

30. Nash R, Morgenstern C, Santoni C, Bhatia S, Sheppard R, Hicks J, et al. epireview:
Tools to update and summarise the latest pathogen data from the Pathogen Epidemiology
Review Group (PERG) [Internet]. 2024. Available from: https://mrc-ide.github.io/epireview/

583 31. Balduzzi S, Rücker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a 584 practical tutorial. Evid Based Ment Health. 2019;(22):153–60.

- 585 32. Fraser C. Estimating Individual and Household Reproduction Numbers in an 586 Emerging Epidemic. Galvani A, editor. PLoS ONE. 2007 Aug 22;2(8):e758.
- 587 33. Kwok KO, Leung GM, Lam WY, Riley S. Using models to identify routes of
 588 nosocomial infection: a large hospital outbreak of SARS in Hong Kong. Proc R Soc B Biol
 589 Sci. 2007 Mar 7;274(1610):611–8.
- 590 34. Moser CB, Gupta M, Archer BN, White LF. The Impact of Prior Information on
- 591 Estimates of Disease Transmissibility Using Bayesian Tools. Van Boven M, editor. PLOS
- 592 ONE. 2015 Mar 20;10(3):e0118762.
- 593 35. Zhang Z. The outbreak pattern of SARS cases in China as revealed by a mathematical
- 594 model. Ecol Model. 2007 Jun;204(3–4):420–6.
- 595 36. Rea E, Laflèche J, Stalker S, Guarda BK, Shapiro H, Johnson I, et al. Duration and
- 596 distance of exposure are important predictors of transmission among community contacts of
- 597 Ontario SARS cases. Epidemiol Infect. 2007 Aug;135(6):914–21.
- 598 37. Shen Z, Ning F, Zhou W, He X, Lin C, Chin DP, et al. Superspreading SARS Events,
 599 Beijing, 2003. Emerg Infect Dis. 2004 Feb;10(2):256–60.
- Ghani AC, Donnelly CA, Cox DR, Griffin JT, Fraser C, Lam TH, et al. Methods for
 Estimating the Case Fatality Ratio for a Novel, Emerging Infectious Disease. Am J
 Epidemiol. 2005 Sep 1;162(5):479–86.
- 39. WHO. Pathogens prioritization: a scientific framework for epidemic and pandemic
 research preparedness [Internet]. 2024. Available from:
 https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/pathogens-prioritization-a-scientific-framework-
- 606 for-epidemic-and-pandemic-research-preparedness
- 40. Perez-Guzman PN, Knock E, Imai N, Rawson T, Elmaci Y, Alcada J, et al.
 Epidemiological drivers of transmissibility and severity of SARS-CoV-2 in England. Nat
 Commun. 2023 Jul 17;14(1):4279.
- 41. Balcan D, Hu H, Goncalves B, Bajardi P, Poletto C, Ramasco JJ, et al. Seasonal
 transmission potential and activity peaks of the new influenza A(H1N1): a Monte Carlo
 likelihood analysis based on human mobility. BMC Med. 2009 Dec;7(1):45.
- 42. Mills CE, Robins JM, Lipsitch M. Transmissibility of 1918 pandemic influenza.
 Nature. 2004 Dec;432(7019):904–6.
- 43. Boëlle P, Ansart S, Cori A, Valleron A. Transmission parameters of the A/H1N1
 616 (2009) influenza virus pandemic: a review. Influenza Other Respir Viruses. 2011

- 617 Sep;5(5):306–16.
- 618 44. WHO. Disease Outbreak News, 2003 China [Internet]. 2003 Jul. Available from:
- 619 https://www.who.int/emergencies/disease-outbreak-news/item/2003_07_04-en
- 45. Lloyd-Smith JO, Schreiber SJ, Kopp PE, Getz WM. Superspreading and the effect of
 individual variation on disease emergence. Nature. 2005 Nov;438(7066):355–9.
- 46. Wegehaupt O, Endo A, Vassall A. Superspreading, overdispersion and their implications in the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) pandemic: a systematic review and metaanalysis of the literature. BMC Public Health. 2023 May 30;23(1):1003.
- 625 47. Ferland L, Carvalho C, Gomes Dias J, Lamb F, Adlhoch C, Suetens C, et al. Risk of
- 626 hospitalization and death for healthcare workers with COVID-19 in nine European countries,

627 January 2020–January 2021. J Hosp Infect. 2022 Jan;119:170–4.

- 48. Luo G, Zhang X, Zheng H, He D. Infection fatality ratio and case fatality ratio of
 629 COVID-19. Int J Infect Dis. 2021 Dec;113:43–6.
- 49. Napoli C, Fabiani M, Rizzo C, Barral M, Oxford J, Cohen JM, et al. Assessment of
 human influenza pandemic scenarios in Europe. Eurosurveillance [Internet]. 2015 Feb 19
- 632 [cited 2024 Jul 20];20(7). Available from:
 633 https://www.eurosurveillance.org/content/10.2807/1560-7917.ES2015.20.7.21038
- 634 50. Green MS, Nitzan D, Schwartz N, Niv Y, Peer V. Sex differences in the case-fatality
 635 rates for COVID-19—A comparison of the age-related differences and consistency over
 636 seven countries. Flacco ME, editor. PLOS ONE. 2021 Apr 29;16(4):e0250523.
- 637 51. Alene M, Yismaw L, Assemie MA, Ketema DB, Gietaneh W, Birhan TY. Serial
 638 interval and incubation period of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC
 639 Infect Dis. 2021 Dec;21(1):257.
- Anderson RM, Fraser C, Ghani AC, Donnelly CA, Riley S, Ferguson NM, et al.
 Epidemiology, transmission dynamics and control of SARS: the 2002–2003 epidemic. May
 RM, McLean AR, Pattison J, Weiss RA, editors. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2004
 Jul 29;359(1447):1091–105.
- 644 53. Peiris J, Chu C, Cheng V, Chan K, Hung I, Poon L, et al. Clinical progression and
 645 viral load in a community outbreak of coronavirus-associated SARS pneumonia: a
 646 prospective study. The Lancet. 2003 May;361(9371):1767–72.
- 54. Buitrago-Garcia D, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, Hossmann S, Imeri H, Ipekci AM, et
 al. Occurrence and transmission potential of asymptomatic and presymptomatic SARS-CoV2 infections: A living systematic review and meta-analysis. Ford N, editor. PLOS Med. 2020
- 650 Sep 22;17(9):e1003346.

55. Donnelly CA, Ghani AC, Leung GM, Hedley AJ, Fraser C, Riley S, et al.
Epidemiological determinants of spread of causal agent of severe acute respiratory syndrome
in Hong Kong. The Lancet. 2003 May;361(9371):1761–6.

- 654 56. Markov PV, Ghafari M, Beer M, Lythgoe K, Simmonds P, Stilianakis NI, et al. The
 655 evolution of SARS-CoV-2. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2023 Jun;21(6):361–79.
- 656 57. Hamilton DG, Hong K, Fraser H, Rowhani-Farid A, Fidler F, Page MJ. Prevalence
 657 and predictors of data and code sharing in the medical and health sciences: systematic review
 658 with meta-analysis of individual participant data. BMJ. 2023 Jul 11;e075767.
- 659 58. UKRI. UKRI open access policy [Internet]. 2023. Available from:
 660 https://www.ukri.org/publications/ukri-open-access-policy/
- 59. Imai N, Dorigatti I, Cori A, Donnelly C, Riley S, Ferguson N. Report 2: Estimating
 the potential total number of novel Coronavirus cases in Wuhan City, China [Internet].
 Imperial College London; 2020 Jan [cited 2024 Jul 23]. Available from:
 http://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/77150
- 665 60. Volz E, Baguelin M, Bhatia S, Boonyasiri A, Cori A, Cucunuba Perez Z, et al. Report
 666 5: Phylogenetic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 [Internet]. Imperial College London; 2020 Feb
 667 [cited 2024 Jul 23]. Available from: http://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/77169
- 668 61. Dorigatti I, Okell L, Cori A, Imai N, Baguelin M, Bhatia S, et al. Report 4: Severity of
- 669 2019-novel coronavirus (nCoV) [Internet]. Imperial College London; 2020 Feb [cited 2024
- G70 Jul 23]. Available from: http://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/77154

671

- 673
- 674



Figure 1: Study selection according to PRISMA guidelines and criteria described in SM-Table B.1. (Reasons for abstract exclusion not provided by Covidence).



which reported confirmed SARS cases. Inset tables are shown for all locations with reported local SARS-CoV-1 transmission, indicating total cases, median age (except for China, for which median age was not reported), CFR, percentage of imported cases and dates of symptom onset of first and last case. In the bottom left corner, we report the mixed-effect logistic regression

estimates of adjusted CFRs for locations with local transmission: red squares indicate location-specific estimates. Red diamonds represent overall common effect estimates - in which all aggregated data are assumed to come from a single data-generating process with one common CFR, and overall random effect estimates - that allow the CFR to vary by location and

accordingly give different weights to each location in the overall estimate (SM-A.3.2). The "Events" column indicates the reported number of deaths. GLMM=generalised linear mixed-effects

model (SM-A.3.2).



690Figure 3: Overview of estimated SARS-CoV-1 (A) basic reproduction numbers (R_0) and (B) effective reproduction numbers (R_i). Circles represent mean estimates, and triangles represent691unspecified central estimates. Thin black solid lines represent uncertainty estimates, and solid shaded bars represent ranges of central estimates reported, e.g. when disaggregated by certain692characteristics (e.g. age, sex, region, time) or using different estimation methods. Colours represent when during the outbreak the study was conducted, as extracted by reviewers. The vertical693dashed line indicates the threshold value of 1. Estimates are labelled with the country of study. CHN = China, HKG = Hong Kong, SGP = Singapore, CAN = Canada, TWN = Taiwan, VNM =694Vietnam. Outlying estimates from Kwok (2007) (33) and Moser (2015) (34) are not displayed. Only parameters from studies with a QA score > 0.5 are plotted.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.13.24311934; this version posted August 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.



Figure 4: Overview of estimated SARS (A) attack rates, (B) secondary attack rates, (C) growth rates, (D) overdispersion, (E) evolutionary rates, (F) substitution rates. Circles represent mean estimates, and triangles represent unspecified central estimates. Thin solid lines represent uncertainty estimates, and solid shaded bars represent ranges of central estimates reported, e.g. when disaggregated by certain characteristics (e.g. age, sex, region, time) or using different estimation methods (e.g. compartmental, branching process models, etc). Colour represents (A & B) the study population considered, (C & D) when during the outbreak the study was conducted, with "control measures" referring to a time in the outbreak when interventions were reported to be in place, (E & F) long (L)/short (S) gene segment. In E and F, s/s/y refers to nucleotide substitutions per site per year. Only parameters from studies with a QA score > 0.5 are plotted.



Figure 5: Overview of SARS epidemiological delays: estimates of (A) mean serial interval, (B) mean infectious period, (C) mean duration from hospital admission to final health outcome (i.e. death or recovery); and meta-analysis of epidemiological delays: estimates of (D) mean incubation period, (E) mean duration from symptom onset to hospital admission. In panels A, B, & C, circles represent mean estimates, squares represent median estimates, and triangles represent unspecified central estimates. Thin solid lines represent uncertainty estimates, and solid shaded bars represent the range of central estimates reported, e.g. when disaggregated by certain characteristics (e.g. age, sex, region, time) or using different estimation methods. In plot C, colour represents different final health outcomes. In D, blue squares indicate common effect and random effect estimates across different study populations, and blue diamonds represent: overall

711	common effect estimates - in which all aggregated data are assumed to come from a single data-generating process, and overall random effect estimates. In E, blue squares represent study-
712	specific estimates, and blue diamonds represent overall common effect and random effect estimates. Only parameters from studies with a QA score > 0.5 are plotted.
713	