

1 **Non-pharmaceutical interventions to reduce influenza transmission in**
2 **households: a systematic review and meta-analysis**

3

4 Jessica Y. Wong¹, Wey Wen Lim¹, Justin K. Cheung¹, Caitriona Murphy¹, Eunice Y.
5 C. Shiu¹, Jingyi Xiao¹, Dongxuan Chen^{1,2}, Yanmin Xie¹, Mingwei Li¹, Hualei Xin¹,
6 Michelle Szeto¹, Sammi Choi¹, Benjamin J. Cowling^{1,2}

7

8 **Affiliations:**

9 1. World Health Organization Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease

10 Epidemiology and Control, School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of

11 Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative

12 Region, China

13 2. Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health Limited, Hong Kong Science and

14 Technology Park, New Territories, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region,

15 China

16

17 **Corresponding author:**

18 Prof. Benjamin J. Cowling, School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine,

19 The University of Hong Kong, 7 Sassoon Road, Pokfulam, Hong Kong

20 Tel: +852 3917 6711; Email: bcowling@hku.hk

21

22 Word count (abstract): 204

23 Word count (main text): 3,021

24

25 **ABSTRACT**

26 **Background:** Influenza pandemic plans often recommend non-pharmaceutical
27 interventions (NPIs) in household settings, including hand hygiene and face masks.

28 We reviewed the evidence supporting the recommendations of these measures to
29 prevent the spread of influenza in households.

30 **Methods:** We performed systematic reviews between 26 May and 30 August 2022 in
31 Medline, PubMed, EMBASE, and CENTRAL to identify evidence for the
32 effectiveness of selected measures recommended by representative national influenza
33 pandemic plans. We prioritized evidence from randomized controlled trials. Fixed-
34 effects models were used to estimate the overall effects. Systematic reviews were
35 registered in the OSF registry (<https://osf.io/8kyth>).

36 **Results:** We selected 9 NPIs for evidence review. We identified 9 randomized-
37 controlled trials related to hand hygiene and face masks in household settings. 2
38 studies reported that measures could delay the introduction of influenza virus
39 infections into households. However, we did not identify evidence from randomized
40 controlled trials that indicated a substantial effect of hand hygiene and face masks in
41 preventing the spread of pandemic influenza within households.

42 **Conclusion:** Limited evidence indicated that within-household measures may likely
43 be effective only when implemented before or as soon as possible after symptom
44 onset in an infected case. Improving the evidence base for NPIs in households and
45 elsewhere is a continuing priority.

46 **Funding:** World Health Organization and the Strategic Topic Grants Scheme

47 **Keywords:** Influenza, Non-pharmaceutical interventions, Households

48

49

50

51 **INTRODUCTION**

52 The threat posed by the next influenza A pandemic has not diminished in the wake of
53 the COVID-19 pandemic. It is important to adapt influenza pandemic plans in light of
54 experiences from the COVID-19 pandemic. Given the delays in the availability of
55 specific vaccines and limited stockpiles of influenza antivirals in many locations, non-
56 pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) – also referred to as public health and social
57 measures – will continue to provide the first line of defense in the next influenza
58 pandemic, just as they did at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic [1].

59

60 Influenza virus infections spread mainly through inhalation of infectious respiratory
61 particles that can occur during close contact between individuals, and one of the
62 settings responsible for a considerable fraction of all influenza transmission is
63 households [2]. In the 2009 influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 pandemic, some studies
64 estimated that around one-third of all transmission events occurred in households [3].
65 NPIs in households could, therefore, make a major contribution to containment or
66 mitigation efforts. We reviewed the scientific evidence supporting NPIs that might be
67 recommended to reduce influenza transmission in households.

68

69 **METHODS**

70 **Selection of NPIs**

71 We reviewed the websites of national public health organizations from around the
72 world to determine which NPIs might be recommended in households during
73 influenza epidemics or pandemics (Table S1). Two to three countries were selected as
74 a sample from each continent to capture snapshots of country-specific

75 recommendations for NPIs to mitigate the spread of influenza in households. From
76 this, we identified a list of NPIs that could be assessed in evidence reviews.

77

78 **Search strategy**

79 We then conducted systematic reviews between 26 May and 30 August 2022 to
80 evaluate the effectiveness of these selected measures on influenza virus transmission
81 in the household setting. These systematic reviews followed the Preferred Reporting
82 Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. The protocol
83 was registered in the Open Science Framework (OSF) registry under the registration
84 number <https://osf.io/8kyth>. Four databases (Medline, PubMed, EMBASE, and
85 CENTRAL) were searched for literature in all languages with specific search terms
86 (Table S2).

87

88 **Study selection**

89 For each review, two authors screened titles of all papers identified by the search
90 strategy independently. Abstracts for potentially relevant papers and the full texts of
91 manuscripts were assessed for eligibility. We aimed to identify studies of the efficacy
92 of each measure against laboratory-confirmed influenza outcomes in “private”
93 household settings, and defined a private household (denoted as “household”
94 hereafter) as two or more individuals living, not necessarily related, under the same
95 unit with common housekeeping (i.e. providing food for themselves) [4]. We
96 prioritized evidence from randomized controlled trials (RCTs) as they provide the
97 highest quality of evidence. For measures with a lack of RCTs with laboratory-
98 confirmed influenza outcomes, we also searched for observational studies on
99 laboratory-confirmed influenza, influenza-like illness (ILI), and respiratory illness

100 outcomes (such as acute respiratory illness or ARI). If a published systematic review
101 was identified through our search, we updated the review using pre-defined search
102 terms and evaluated literature published after the search date of the previous review.
103 Because the relative importance of modes of influenza transmission might vary in
104 different household settings, studies that were conducted in “institutional” households
105 (such as dormitories for students and homes for the elderly) whose need for shelter
106 and subsistence is being provided by a common authority were excluded.

107

108 **Statistical analysis**

109 Meta-analyses were performed for interventions with a sufficient number of studies.
110 The efficacy or effectiveness of measures in preventing laboratory-confirmed
111 influenza was measured by risk ratios (RRs). Overall effects were estimated in pooled
112 analyses with fixed-effects models. No overall effect was generated if there was
113 considerable heterogeneity based on an estimated I^2 statistic $\geq 75\%$. The Appendix
114 includes additional details of the search strategies (Tables S1 and S2), selection of
115 articles (Figures S1-S9), and summaries of the selected articles (Tables S3 and S4).

116

117 **RESULTS**

118 **National public health guidance on NPIs in households**

119 We reviewed the websites of national public health organizations from 15 countries,
120 specifically: Ghana, Nigeria and South Africa in Africa; China, Singapore and South
121 Korea in Asia; Germany, Italy and United Kingdom in Europe; Canada and United
122 States in North America; Australia and New Zealand in Oceania; and Peru and Brazil
123 in South America (Table 1). NPIs that were implemented could be broadly
124 categorized as personal protective measures, environmental measures or other

125 measures which included measures such as hand hygiene, surface disinfection or
126 physical distancing respectively. For personal protective measures, all selected
127 countries except Germany recommended hand hygiene and respiratory etiquette in
128 household settings, while around half of the countries (e.g., China, South Korea and
129 Italy) recommended the use of face masks. None of the sampled countries
130 recommended face shields. Similarly, around half of the countries (e.g., South Africa,
131 China and Germany) recommended surface and object cleaning or ventilation or both
132 as environmental measures in household settings, and none recommended
133 humidification. Finally, all countries recommended the isolation of sick individuals
134 and physical distancing in household settings during influenza epidemics or
135 pandemics.

136

137 Country-specific recommendations on NPIs during influenza epidemics or pandemics
138 were generally disseminated through national health agency websites in the form of
139 general health information or formal guidelines for influenza (Table S1) [5, 6].
140 Recommendations in four countries were updated after the A(H1N1)pdm09 pandemic
141 [6-8], while recommendations for the other 11 countries were updated during the
142 COVID-19 pandemic (Table S1) [9, 10].

143

144 **Systematic review of intervention studies**

145 From the review of national recommendations, we constructed a list of 9 NPIs
146 including those that have been recommended and some that have not (Table 2). We
147 identified a total of 23,001 articles for title and abstract screening across the 9 NPIs
148 and 800 full-text articles were retrieved and reviewed (Figures S1–S9). For hand
149 hygiene, 576 articles were reviewed, 62 full-text articles were screened, and 7

150 intervention studies were identified for the meta-analysis. For face masks, 1,890
151 articles were reviewed, 151 full-text articles were screened, and 7 intervention studies
152 were identified for the meta-analysis. No intervention studies were identified for the
153 other 7 NPIs. After removing duplicates for studies based on hand hygiene and face
154 masks, 9 unique intervention studies were included in the review (Tables 2, S3–S4).

155

156 **Personal protective measures: hand hygiene, respiratory etiquette, face masks,**
157 **and face shields**

158 We identified seven RCTs, six of which were included in the meta-analysis, to assess
159 the efficacy of hand hygiene against transmission of laboratory-confirmed influenza
160 in household settings with at least one case, with 5,118 participants (Figure 1; Tables
161 S3) [11-13]. The study by Levy et al [12] was excluded in the meta-analysis because
162 the number of secondary influenza virus infections were reported in terms of number
163 of households instead of number of individuals. An overall pooled effect of hand
164 hygiene only, hand hygiene combined with face masks, and hand hygiene with or
165 without face masks was estimated. Results from our meta-analysis on RCTs did not
166 provide evidence to support a protective effect of hand hygiene only against
167 transmission of laboratory-confirmed influenza (RR: 1.07; 95% CI: 0.85-1.35; p-
168 value: 0.58; $I^2 = 48\%$). Although the pooled analysis did not identify a significant
169 effect of hand hygiene on laboratory-confirmed influenza overall, some household
170 transmission studies reported that initiating hand hygiene intervention earlier after
171 symptom onset in the index case might be more effective in preventing secondary
172 cases in the household settings [11, 13].

173

174 In our systematic review, we identified seven RCTs that reported estimates of the
175 effectiveness of face masks in reducing laboratory-confirmed influenza virus
176 infections in household settings (Table S4) [11, 13]. Five of these trials investigated
177 the masking of all household members, regardless of symptom presentation, and we
178 were therefore unable to distinguish the potential effects of face masks worn by
179 infected vs uninfected individuals [11, 13]. Despite results not being statistically
180 significant, a trial on face masks reported a lower risk of ILI and laboratory-confirmed
181 influenza infection among those with medical mask use, and similar results were
182 reported in an earlier study. In the pooled analysis, there was no statistically
183 significant reduction in influenza transmission with the use of face masks only (RR:
184 0.59; 95% CI: 0.32-1.10; p-value 0.10; $I^2 = 16\%$) (Figure 2). Study designs in the
185 seven household studies were slightly different: one trial provided face masks and P2
186 respirators for household members only, another trial evaluated the use of face masks
187 as source control for infected individuals only, and the remaining five trials provided
188 face masks for the infected individuals as well as their household members (Table S4)
189 [11, 13]. Only two household studies reported a statistically significant reduction in
190 secondary laboratory-confirmed influenza virus infections, when face masks were
191 worn within 36 hours of symptom onset [11, 13]. Most household studies were
192 underpowered due to small sample sizes, and some studies reported suboptimal
193 adherence in the face mask group.

194

195 We did not identify any published intervention studies on the effectiveness of
196 respiratory etiquette and face shields in reducing the risk of laboratory-confirmed
197 influenza in household settings.

198

199 **Environmental measures: surface and object cleaning, ventilation,**
200 **humidification**

201 We did not identify any published intervention studies that quantified the
202 effectiveness of modifying humidity, surface and object cleaning, or ventilation in
203 reducing influenza transmission in household settings.

204

205 **Isolation of sick individuals and physical distancing**

206 We did not identify any published intervention studies on the effectiveness of
207 isolation policies for sick individuals and physical distancing measures in reducing
208 the risk of laboratory-confirmed influenza in household settings.

209

210 **DISCUSSION**

211 Prevention and control of respiratory virus infections in households is an important
212 yet relatively underexplored area of research. Guidelines for infection prevention and
213 control of seasonal and pandemic influenza in healthcare settings are well established
214 [14]. During the COVID-19 pandemic, several guidelines on infection control and
215 prevention in households using NPIs were issued by health authorities alongside
216 guidance for self-care and family care. For example, the World Health Organization
217 Q&A webpage on “Home care for families and caregivers” recommends donning
218 medical masks while sharing a space with someone with COVID-19, staying at least 1
219 meter away from the sick person, and opening windows to bring fresh air into the sick
220 person’s room where possible [15]. Although the feasibility of these measures may
221 depend on living conditions, forward planning for the possibility of having a
222 household member who is sick with an infectious disease is prudent even in inter-
223 pandemic periods [16].

224

225 Among household settings, hand hygiene, face masks, respiratory etiquette, surface
226 and object cleaning and ventilation are feasible NPIs to implement during an
227 influenza epidemic or pandemic. With hand hygiene and face masks as recommended
228 hygiene practices to limit the spread of respiratory virus infections within the
229 household, the effectiveness of such measures could be enhanced through public
230 health campaigns that boost compliance [17]. Similarly, respiratory etiquette should
231 be highly feasible in household settings, and an improvement in compliance has been
232 demonstrated among school children after piloting an educational intervention in one
233 study in elementary schools [18]. It should also be feasible to implement surface and
234 object cleaning in the household due to the low cost of implementation and
235 accessibility of common household cleaning agents. Given the potential for aerosol
236 transmission of respiratory viruses including influenza [19], improving ventilation
237 should be considered except perhaps for households in areas with poor outdoor air
238 quality or when this would substantially increase heating costs. When household
239 members are sick, it should often be feasible to isolate those sick individuals and
240 increase physical distancing, for example by avoiding spending time in the same
241 rooms or eating separately with them [20], although it may be more challenging in
242 households with crowded living conditions.

243

244 In this review, we did not find evidence to support a substantial protective effect of
245 personal protective measures, environmental measures, isolation of sick individuals or
246 physical distancing measures in reducing influenza transmission in household settings.
247 Although these measures have mechanistic plausibility of reducing influenza
248 transmission based on our knowledge of how influenza is transmitted between

249 individuals [21, 22], randomized trials of hand hygiene and face masks in household
250 settings have not demonstrated protection against laboratory-confirmed influenza.
251 There were no RCTs on respiratory etiquette, face shields, modifying humidity,
252 ventilation, isolation policies for sick individuals and physical distancing in household
253 settings.

254

255 Despite a lack of intervention studies on measures other than face masks and hand
256 hygiene, we identified an observational study on the association between indoor
257 humidity and influenza transmission, suggesting a potential role of humidification in
258 controlling transmission of influenza [23] although there are also potential harms of
259 humidification which would need to be considered, such as increasing mold. Other
260 studies suggested that surface and object cleaning using common household agents,
261 indoor ventilation and voluntary self-isolation were effective measures in reducing
262 influenza transmission by inactivating influenza viruses in the environment or
263 decreasing the transmission risk [24]. Another retrospective cohort study found that
264 daily use of chlorine or ethanol-based disinfectant was effective (OR: 0.23, 95% CI:
265 0.07, 0.84) in reducing COVID-19 household transmission, and similarly for face
266 mask use (OR: 0.21; 95% CI: 0.06, 0.79) and surface disinfection when the measures
267 were implemented before symptom onset of the primary case [20]. The disinfection of
268 surfaces also has an established impact on prevention of other infectious diseases such
269 as gastrointestinal diseases [25].

270

271 When devising strategies to reduce influenza transmission in households, it is
272 important to understand the basic transmission dynamics of influenza virus infections.
273 In the next pandemic, important information on transmission dynamics of the novel

274 strain could be provided by timely First Few Hundred studies [26] and household
275 transmission studies [27]. If the transmission dynamics of the new pandemic strain are
276 similar to that of H1N1pdm09 and current interpandemic strains, we can note the
277 following four properties. First, infectiousness is thought to peak at around the same
278 time as when symptoms appear [28]. Second, infectiousness likely declines rapidly
279 within a few days after peak based on viral culture data [29] despite viral RNA
280 continuing to be detectable by PCR typically for more than a week [30]. Third, only a
281 fraction of influenza virus infections result in fever, and while fever and cough may
282 be a relatively more specific syndrome for influenza, it is not particularly sensitive in
283 the general community as contrasted with its higher sensitivity in individuals who
284 seek medical attention with respiratory symptoms [31]. Fourth, the role of
285 asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic transmission has been controversial but recent
286 reports from South Africa [32] and Hong Kong [33] indicate that these may comprise
287 a substantial fraction of all influenza transmission, with asymptomatic and pre-
288 symptomatic transmission also playing an important role in COVID-19 transmission
289 [34]. This fundamental knowledge of infectiousness profiles would imply that early
290 intervention is essential to reduce transmission, and early intervention should not be
291 limited to individuals with a fever and cough but could be triggered by other less
292 specific symptoms. Rapid antigen tests done in the household could help to
293 distinguish influenza from other viral infections and might even be considered for use
294 in exposed individuals to identify influenza virus infection before any symptoms
295 appear.

296

297 There are a number of limitations to our review. First, in our analysis of the
298 effectiveness of face masks and hand hygiene we did not review observational data as

299 a higher level of evidence from randomized controlled trials were available. Other
300 studies have reviewed observational data and concluded that these two measures
301 likely have small to moderate effects on transmission [35]. Second, we focused on
302 measures to prevent the spread of influenza within the household in this review. There
303 is limited evidence on the degree of reductions in transmission in households when
304 personal protective measures (e.g., wearing face masks plus frequent hand hygiene)
305 are used in combination with other measures like isolation of sick household members.
306 The effectiveness of different cleaning products at different concentrations in
307 deactivating or eliminating influenza virus in household environments remains
308 unclear. Third, increased influenza activity is associated with cold temperatures, low
309 indoor humidity and rainy seasons [36]. Further investigation could clarify the
310 effectiveness of NPIs by different seasonal patterns (such as indoor crowding during
311 colder months). Finally, we observed low to moderate levels of heterogeneity in our
312 meta-analyses of hand hygiene and face masks (Figures 1-2). We could determine
313 whether these differences were artefactual or real, perhaps related to differences in the
314 adherence of measures in various populations or the time delay between symptom
315 onset of an infected case and the implementation of a measure [37]. Further work
316 could attempt to identify additional factors that explain this heterogeneity, for
317 example, by exploring very different estimates of effectiveness of measures based on
318 the same population during similar time periods, or conducting subgroup analyses by
319 the time delay between symptom onset and measure implementation.

320

321 Improved evidence is needed on all of the measures included in our review. Given the
322 effect sizes in our meta-analysis of hand hygiene and face masks (Figures 1 and 2),
323 any future RCTs of these interventions in households would likely need to be very

324 large to be adequately powered to detect a relative reduction in the risk of infection of
325 approximately 10% [38]. To avoid contamination of interventions, cluster randomized
326 trials, in which each household is randomized to receive either the intervention or
327 control, could be used to assess the effect of the intervention in reducing the
328 transmission of influenza in households [11]. A promising area for randomized trials
329 or cluster-randomized trials in the household setting is the effect of physical
330 distancing on influenza transmission, either by alternating within-home isolation
331 strategies or comparing the feasibility and effectiveness of physical distancing in
332 housing areas with different population densities. Surveys about the feasibility of each
333 measure in local contexts are also important to inform national-level
334 recommendations on home care and/or voluntary self-isolation or quarantine [39].

335

336 In conclusion, although our study found limited evidence to support a substantial
337 protective effect of personal protective measures, environmental measures, isolation
338 of sick persons or physical distancing measures in controlling influenza transmission
339 in the household setting, these measures have mechanistic plausibility based on our
340 knowledge of person-to-person transmission of influenza [21, 22]. Future
341 investigations on transmission dynamics of influenza would be helpful in preparing
342 guidelines and evidence-based recommendations for household transmission in the
343 next pandemic. Although our review focused on NPIs to be used during influenza
344 pandemics, these results could also be applicable to intense seasonal influenza
345 epidemics.

346

347

348 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

349 The authors thank Julie Au for administrative support.

350

351 **DATA SHARING STATEMENT**

352 The data that support the findings of this study are available upon request.

353

354 **FUNDING SOURCES**

355 This project was supported by a grant from the World Health Organization and the

356 Strategic Topic Grants Scheme (Project No. STG4/M-701/23-N) of the Research

357 Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

358

359 **POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

360 B.J.C. has consulted for AstraZeneca, Fosun Pharma, GlaxoSmithKline, Haleon,

361 Moderna, Novavax, Pfizer, Roche, and Sanofi Pasteur. All other authors report no

362 potential conflicts of interest.

363

364 **CONTRIBUTIONS**

365 All authors meet the ICMJE criteria for authorship. The study was conceived by BJC,

366 and JYW. JYW and JKC analyzed the data. JYW wrote the first draft of the

367 manuscript. All authors provided critical review and revision of the text and approved

368 the final version.

369

370

371 **REFERENCES**

- 372 [1] Lai S, Ruktanonchai NW, Zhou L, Prosper O, Luo W, Floyd JR, et al. Effect
373 of non-pharmaceutical interventions to contain COVID-19 in China. *Nature*.
374 2020;585(7825):410-3.
- 375 [2] Hayden FG, Belshe R, Villanueva C, Lanno R, Hughes C, Small I, et al.
376 Management of influenza in households: a prospective, randomized comparison of
377 oseltamivir treatment with or without postexposure prophylaxis. *J Infect Dis*.
378 2004;189(3):440-9.
- 379 [3] Ghani A, Baguelin M, Griffin J, Flasche S, van Hoek AJ, Cauchemez S, et al.
380 The Early Transmission Dynamics of H1N1pdm Influenza in the United Kingdom.
381 *PLoS Curr*. 2009;1:RRN1130.
- 382 [4] The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Household
383 definitions in other statistical standards [Available from: [https://www.oecd-](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/9789264194878-18-en.pdf?expires=1721030289&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=A47802DDF2046D9A7DBC0F2529D80432)
384 [ilibrary.org/docserver/9789264194878-18-](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/9789264194878-18-en.pdf?expires=1721030289&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=A47802DDF2046D9A7DBC0F2529D80432)
385 [en.pdf?expires=1721030289&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=A47802DDF2046D](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/9789264194878-18-en.pdf?expires=1721030289&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=A47802DDF2046D9A7DBC0F2529D80432)
386 [9A7DBC0F2529D80432](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/9789264194878-18-en.pdf?expires=1721030289&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=A47802DDF2046D9A7DBC0F2529D80432)]. (Accessed 16 July 2024).
- 387 [5] Ministry of Health. Influenza [Available from:
388 <https://www.moh.gov.sg/diseases-updates/influenza>]. (Accessed 26 January 2024).
- 389 [6] Nigeria Centre for Disease Control and Prevention. Nigeria National
390 Pandemic Influenza Preparedness and Response Plan [Available from:
391 https://ncdc.gov.ng/themes/common/docs/protocols/16_1490369515.pdf]. (Accessed
392 28 January 2024).
- 393 [7] Communicable Diseases Network Australia. Seasonal Influenza Infection
394 CDNA National Guidelines for Public Health Units [Available from:

- 395 <https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2022/06/influenza-infection->
396 [flu-cdna-national-guidelines-for-public-health-units.pdf](https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2022/06/influenza-infection-flu-cdna-national-guidelines-for-public-health-units.pdf)]. (Accessed 5 April 2024).
- 397 [8] Ghana Food and Drugs Authority. Frequently Asked Questions on the H1N1
398 Influenza Virus [Available from:
399 <https://www.fdaghana.gov.gh/img/reports/H1N1%20FAQs.pdf>]. (Accessed 5 April
400 2024).
- 401 [9] Public Health Agency of Canada. Flu (influenza): Prevention and risks
402 [Available from: [https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/flu-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/flu-influenza/prevention-risks.html)
403 [influenza/prevention-risks.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/flu-influenza/prevention-risks.html)]. (Accessed 26 January 2024).
- 404 [10] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Preventive Actions to Help
405 Protect Against Flu [Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/flu/prevent/actions-](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/prevent/actions-prevent-flu.htm)
406 [prevent-flu.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/prevent/actions-prevent-flu.htm)]. (Accessed 5 April 2024).
- 407 [11] Cowling BJ, Chan KH, Fang VJ, Cheng CK, Fung RO, Wai W, et al.
408 Facemasks and hand hygiene to prevent influenza transmission in households: a
409 cluster randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med.* 2009;151(7):437-46.
- 410 [12] Levy JW, Suntarattiwong P, Simmerman JM, Jarman RG, Johnson K, Olsen
411 SJ, et al. Increased hand washing reduces influenza virus surface contamination in B
412 angkok households, 2009–2010. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses.* 2014;8(1):13–6.
- 413 [13] Suess T, Remschmidt C, Schink SB, Schweiger B, Nitsche A, Schroeder K, et
414 al. The role of facemasks and hand hygiene in the prevention of influenza
415 transmission in households: results from a cluster randomised trial; Berlin, Germany,
416 2009-2011. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2012;12:26.
- 417 [14] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Prevention Strategies for
418 Seasonal Influenza in Healthcare Settings [Available from:

- 419 <https://www.cdc.gov/flu/professionals/infectioncontrol/healthcaresettings.htm>].
- 420 (Accessed 25 January 2024).
- 421 [15] World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): Home care for
- 422 families and caregivers [Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-](https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/coronavirus-disease-covid-19-home-care-for-families-and-caregivers)
- 423 [and-answers/item/coronavirus-disease-covid-19-home-care-for-families-and-](https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/coronavirus-disease-covid-19-home-care-for-families-and-caregivers)
- 424 [caregivers](https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/coronavirus-disease-covid-19-home-care-for-families-and-caregivers)]. (Accessed 25 January 2024).
- 425 [16] Geddes L. COVID-19 in the house: How to reduce the risk of transmission
- 426 [Available from: [https://www.gavi.org/vaccineswork/covid-19-house-how-reduce-](https://www.gavi.org/vaccineswork/covid-19-house-how-reduce-risk-transmission?gclid=EAIaIQobChMIzdmHvsOfgwMV thMAh1WsQ2oEAMYASAA EgJT7PD_BwE)
- 427 [risk-](https://www.gavi.org/vaccineswork/covid-19-house-how-reduce-risk-transmission?gclid=EAIaIQobChMIzdmHvsOfgwMV thMAh1WsQ2oEAMYASAA EgJT7PD_BwE)
- 428 [transmission?gclid=EAIaIQobChMIzdmHvsOfgwMV thMAh1WsQ2oEAMYASAA](https://www.gavi.org/vaccineswork/covid-19-house-how-reduce-risk-transmission?gclid=EAIaIQobChMIzdmHvsOfgwMV thMAh1WsQ2oEAMYASAA EgJT7PD_BwE)
- 429 [EgJT7PD_BwE](https://www.gavi.org/vaccineswork/covid-19-house-how-reduce-risk-transmission?gclid=EAIaIQobChMIzdmHvsOfgwMV thMAh1WsQ2oEAMYASAA EgJT7PD_BwE)]. (Accessed 25 January 2024).
- 430 [17] Islam M, Benjamin-Chung J, Sultana S, Unicomb L, Alam M, Rahman M, et
- 431 al. Effectiveness of Mass Media Campaigns to Improve Handwashing-Related
- 432 Behavior, Knowledge, and Practices in Rural Bangladesh. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.*
- 433 2021;104(4):1546-53.
- 434 [18] Sultana F, Nizame FA, Southern DL, Unicomb L, Winch PJ, Luby SP. Pilot of
- 435 an Elementary School Cough Etiquette Intervention: Acceptability, Feasibility, and
- 436 Potential for Sustainability. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2017;97(6):1876-85.
- 437 [19] Tellier R, Li Y, Cowling BJ, Tang JW. Recognition of aerosol transmission of
- 438 infectious agents: a commentary. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2019;19(1):101.
- 439 [20] Wang Y, Tian H, Zhang L, Zhang M, Guo D, Wu W, et al. Reduction of
- 440 secondary transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in households by face mask use, disinfection
- 441 and social distancing: a cohort study in Beijing, China. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2020;5(5).

- 442 [21] Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, Chan KH, McDevitt JJ, Hau BJP, et al.
443 Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nat Med*.
444 2020;26(5):676-80.
- 445 [22] Grayson ML, Melvani S, Druce J, Barr IG, Ballard SA, Johnson PD, et al.
446 Efficacy of soap and water and alcohol-based hand-rub preparations against live
447 H1N1 influenza virus on the hands of human volunteers. *Clin Infect Dis*.
448 2009;48(3):285-91.
- 449 [23] Petrie JG, Ohmit SE, Cowling BJ, Johnson E, Cross RT, Malosh RE, et al.
450 Influenza transmission in a cohort of households with children: 2010-2011. *PLoS One*.
451 2013;8(9):e75339.
- 452 [24] Aganovic A, Bi Y, Cao G, Kurnitski J, Wargocki P. Modeling the impact of
453 indoor relative humidity on the infection risk of five respiratory airborne viruses. *Sci*
454 *Rep*. 2022;12(1):11481.
- 455 [25] Sandora TJ, Shih MC, Goldman DA. Reducing absenteeism from
456 gastrointestinal and respiratory illness in elementary school students: a randomized,
457 controlled trial of an infection-control intervention. *Pediatrics*. 2008;121(6):e1555-62.
- 458 [26] Marcato AJ, Black AJ, Walker CR, Morris D, Meagher N, Price DJ, et al.
459 Learnings from the Australian first few X household transmission project for COVID-
460 19. *Lancet Reg Health West Pac*. 2022;28:100573.
- 461 [27] Tsang TK, Lau LLH, Cauchemez S, Cowling BJ. Household Transmission of
462 Influenza Virus. *Trends Microbiol*. 2016;24(2):123-33.
- 463 [28] Tsang TK, Cowling BJ, Fang VJ, Chan KH, Ip DK, Leung GM, et al.
464 Influenza A Virus Shedding and Infectivity in Households. *J Infect Dis*.
465 2015;212(9):1420-8.

- 466 [29] Ip DKM, Lau LLH, Chan KH, Fang VJ, Leung GM, Peiris MJS, et al. The
467 Dynamic Relationship Between Clinical Symptomatology and Viral Shedding in
468 Naturally Acquired Seasonal and Pandemic Influenza Virus Infections. *Clin Infect*
469 *Dis.* 2016;62(4):431-7.
- 470 [30] Hirose R, Daidoji T, Naito Y, Watanabe Y, Arai Y, Oda T, et al. Long-term
471 detection of seasonal influenza RNA in faeces and intestine. *Clin Microbiol Infect.*
472 2016;22(9):813 e1- e7.
- 473 [31] Monto AS, Gravenstein S, Elliott M, Colopy M, Schweinle J. Clinical signs
474 and symptoms predicting influenza infection. *Arch Intern Med.* 2000;160(21):3243-7.
- 475 [32] Cohen C, Kleynhans J, Moyes J, McMorrow ML, Treurnicht FK, Hellferscee
476 O, et al. Asymptomatic transmission and high community burden of seasonal
477 influenza in an urban and a rural community in South Africa, 2017-18 (PHIRST): a
478 population cohort study. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2021;9(6):e863-e74.
- 479 [33] Tsang TK, Wang C, Fang VJ, Perera R, So HC, Ip DKM, et al. Reconstructing
480 household transmission dynamics to estimate the infectiousness of asymptomatic
481 influenza virus infections. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2023;120(33):e2304750120.
- 482 [34] Gao W, Lv J, Pang Y, Li LM. Role of asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic
483 infections in covid-19 pandemic. *BMJ.* 2021;375:n2342.
- 484 [35] Gozdzielewska L, Kilpatrick C, Reilly J, Stewart S, Butcher J, Kalule A, et al.
485 The effectiveness of hand hygiene interventions for preventing community
486 transmission or acquisition of novel coronavirus or influenza infections: a systematic
487 review. *BMC Public Health.* 2022;22(1):1283.
- 488 [36] Tamerius J, Nelson MI, Zhou SZ, Viboud C, Miller MA, Alonso WJ. Global
489 influenza seasonality: reconciling patterns across temperate and tropical regions.
490 *Environ Health Perspect.* 2011;119(4):439-45.

- 491 [37] Trevas S, Manuel K, Malkani R, Hoelscher D. Mask Adherence and Social
492 Distancing in Houston, TX from January to April 2021. *Int J Environ Res Public*
493 *Health*. 2023;20(3).
- 494 [38] Cowling BJ, Leung GM. Face masks and COVID-19: don't let perfect be the
495 enemy of good. *Euro Surveill*. 2020;25(49).
- 496 [39] Ahmed F, Qualls N, Kowalczyk S, Randolph Cunningham S, Zviedrite N,
497 Uzicanin A. Feasibility, acceptability, and barriers to implementing select non-
498 pharmaceutical interventions to reduce the transmission of pandemic influenza -
499 United States, 2019. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep*. 2022;17:e209.
- 500

Continent	Country	Personal protective measures				Environmental measures			Other measures	
		Hand hygiene	Respiratory etiquette	Face masks	Face shields	Surface and object cleaning	Ventilation	Humidification	Isolation of sick individuals	Physical distancing
Africa	Ghana	✓	✓						✓	✓
	Nigeria	✓	✓						✓	✓
	South Africa	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓
Asia	China	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
	Singapore	✓	✓						✓	✓
	South Korea	✓	✓	✓					✓	✓
Europe	Germany			✓			✓		✓	✓
	Italy	✓	✓	✓					✓	✓
	United Kingdom	✓	✓						✓	✓
North America	Canada	✓	✓			✓			✓	✓
	United States	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
Oceania	Australia	✓	✓			✓			✓	✓
	New Zealand	✓	✓				✓		✓	✓
South America	Brazil	✓	✓	✓					✓	✓
	Peru	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓

Table 1: Recommendations of household-related non-pharmaceutical interventions in different countries.

Table 2: Summary of literature searches for systematic review on non-pharmaceutical interventions in household settings for influenza.

Type of measures	No. of studies identified	Main findings
Hand hygiene	7	The evidence from the RCTs suggested that hand hygiene intervention only did not exert substantial effects on influenza household transmission. However, implementing hand hygiene and face mask at early symptom onset of index patients is effective in reducing secondary transmission of viruses.
Respiratory etiquette	0	No study examining the effectiveness of respiratory etiquette on influenza transmission in household settings was found.
Face masks	7	The evidence from the RCTs suggested that wearing face masks had an effect on reducing influenza household transmission when it was implemented before or at early symptom onset of index patients.
Face shields	0	No study examining the effectiveness of face shields on influenza transmission in household settings was found.
Surface and object cleaning	0	No study examining the effectiveness of surface and object cleaning on influenza transmission in household settings was found.
Ventilation	0	No study examining the effectiveness of ventilation on influenza transmission in household settings was found.
Humidification	0	No study examining the effectiveness of humidification on influenza household transmission was found.

Isolation of sick individuals	0	No study examining the effectiveness of isolation of sick individuals on influenza household transmission was found.
Physical distancing	0	No study examining the effectiveness of physical distancing on influenza household transmission was found.

RCT: randomized controlled trial.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: Meta-analysis of risk ratios for the effect of hand hygiene with or without face mask use on laboratory-confirmed influenza from 6 randomized controlled trials with 5,118 participants. (A) Hand hygiene alone; (B) Hand hygiene and face mask; (C) Hand hygiene with or without face mask. Pooled estimates were not generated if there was high heterogeneity ($I^2 \geq 75\%$). Squares indicate risk ratio for each of the included studies, horizontal line indicates 95% CIs, dashed vertical line indicates pooled estimation of risk ratio, and diamond indicates pooled estimation of risk ratio. Diamond width corresponds to the 95% CI. The study by Levy et al was excluded in the meta-analysis but included in the review as its number of secondary infections are measured in households instead of participants [12].

Figure 2: Meta-analysis of risk ratios for the effect of face mask use with or without hand hygiene on laboratory-confirmed influenza from 7 randomized controlled trials with 4,247 participants. (A) Face mask use alone; (B) Face mask and hygiene; (C) Face mask with or without hand hygiene. Pooled estimates were not generated if there was high heterogeneity ($I^2 \geq 75\%$). Squares indicate risk ratio for each of the included studies, horizontal line indicates 95% CIs, dashed vertical line indicates pooled estimation of risk ratio, and diamond indicates pooled estimation of risk ratio. Diamond width corresponds to the 95% CI.


Hand hygiene only

Author (Year)	Hand hygiene		Control		Weight	Risk Ratio	95% C.I.
	Events	Total	Events	Total			
Cowling (2008)	5	84	12	205	5.9%	1.02	[0.37; 2.80]
Cowling (2009)	14	257	28	279	22.6%	0.54	[0.29; 1.01]
Larson (2010)	29	946	24	904	20.6%	1.15	[0.68; 1.97]
Ram (2015)	9	96	4	117	3.0%	2.74	[0.87; 8.63]
Simmerman (2011)	66	292	58	302	47.9%	1.18	[0.86; 1.61]

Fixed effect model **1675** **1807** **100.0%** **1.07** **[0.85; 1.35]**

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 48\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0807$, $p = 0.11$

Test for overall effect: $z = 0.55$ ($p = 0.58$)




Hand hygiene with mask

Author (Year)	Hand hygiene		Control		Weight	Risk Ratio	95% C.I.
	Events	Total	Events	Total			
Cowling (2009)	18	258	28	279	21.5%	0.70	[0.39; 1.23]
Larson (2010)	25	938	24	904	19.5%	1.00	[0.58; 1.74]
Simmerman (2011)	66	291	58	302	45.4%	1.18	[0.86; 1.62]
Suess (2012)	10	67	19	82	13.6%	0.64	[0.32; 1.29]

Fixed effect model **1554** **1567** **100.0%** **0.97** **[0.77; 1.22]**

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 28\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0324$, $p = 0.24$

Test for overall effect: $z = -0.27$ ($p = 0.79$)




Hand hygiene with or without mask

Author (Year)	Hand hygiene		Control		Weight	Risk Ratio	95% C.I.
	Events	Total	Events	Total			
Cowling (2008)	5	84	12	205	4.0%	1.02	[0.37; 2.80]
Cowling (2009)	32	515	28	279	21.0%	0.62	[0.38; 1.01]
Larson (2010)	54	1884	24	904	18.8%	1.08	[0.67; 1.73]
Ram (2015)	9	96	4	117	2.1%	2.74	[0.87; 8.63]
Simmerman (2011)	132	583	58	302	44.2%	1.18	[0.89; 1.55]
Suess (2012)	10	67	19	82	9.9%	0.64	[0.32; 1.29]

Fixed effect model **3229** **1889** **100.0%** **1.02** **[0.84; 1.24]**

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 49\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0616$, $p = 0.08$

Test for overall effect: $z = 0.16$ ($p = 0.87$)




Mask only

Author (Year)	Mask use		Control		Weight	Risk Ratio	95% C.I.
	Events	Total	Events	Total			
Cowling (2008)	4	61	12	205	22.1%	1.12	[0.37; 3.35]
MacIntyre (2009)	1	94	0	100	1.9%	3.19	[0.13; 77.36]
MacIntyre (2016)	0	302	1	295	6.1%	0.33	[0.01; 7.96]
Suess (2012)	6	69	19	82	69.8%	0.38	[0.16; 0.89]
Fixed effect model	526		682		100.0%	0.59	[0.32; 1.10]

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 16\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.2375$, $p = 0.31$

Test for overall effect: $z = -1.66$ ($p = 0.10$)




Mask with hand hygiene

Author (Year)	Mask use		Control		Weight	Risk Ratio	95% C.I.
	Events	Total	Events	Total			
Cowling (2009)	18	258	28	279	21.5%	0.70	[0.39; 1.23]
Larson (2010)	25	938	24	904	19.5%	1.00	[0.58; 1.74]
Simmerman (2011)	66	291	58	302	45.4%	1.18	[0.86; 1.62]
Suess (2012)	10	67	19	82	13.6%	0.64	[0.32; 1.29]
Fixed effect model	1554		1567		100.0%	0.97	[0.77; 1.22]

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 28\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0324$, $p = 0.24$

Test for overall effect: $z = -0.27$ ($p = 0.79$)



Mask with or without hand hygiene

Author (Year)	Mask use		Control		Weight	Risk Ratio	95% C.I.
	Events	Total	Events	Total			
Cowling (2008)	4	61	12	205	3.9%	1.12	[0.37; 3.35]
Cowling (2009)	18	258	28	279	19.3%	0.70	[0.39; 1.23]
Larson (2010)	25	938	24	904	17.5%	1.00	[0.58; 1.74]
MacIntyre (2009)	1	94	0	100	0.3%	3.19	[0.13; 77.36]
MacIntyre (2016)	0	302	1	295	1.1%	0.33	[0.01; 7.96]
Simmerman (2011)	66	291	58	302	40.8%	1.18	[0.86; 1.62]
Suess (2012)	16	136	19	82	17.0%	0.51	[0.28; 0.93]
Fixed effect model	2080		2167		100.0%	0.94	[0.75; 1.17]

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 27\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0640$, $p = 0.22$

Test for overall effect: $z = -0.58$ ($p = 0.56$)

