

1 **Public reporting guidelines for outbreak data: Enabling**
2 **accountability for effective outbreak response by developing**
3 **standards for transparency and uniformity**

4 **Vanessa Grégoire, MSc**

5 Analyst, Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security, Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg
6 School of Public Health

7 Research Associate, Department of Environmental Health and Engineering, Johns Hopkins
8 University Bloomberg School of Public Health

9 **Alex W. Zhu, MSPH**

10 Analyst, Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security, Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg
11 School of Public Health

12 Research Associate, Department of Environmental Health and Engineering, Johns Hopkins
13 University Bloomberg School of Public Health

14 **Catherine M. Brown, DVM, MSC, MPH**

15 State Epidemiologist and State Public Health Veterinarian, Massachusetts Department of Public
16 Health

17 **John S. Brownstein, PhD**

18 Professor, Harvard Medical School

19 Chief Innovation Officer, Boston Children's Hospital

20 **Denise Cardo, MD, PhD**

21 Principal, Cardo MD Consultants, LLC

22 Former Director, Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion, U.S. Centers for Disease Control
23 and Prevention

- 24 **Fergus Cumming, DPhil**
- 25 UK Health Security Agency, and Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
- 26 **Richard Danila, PhD, MPH**
- 27 Deputy State Epidemiologist, Minnesota Department of Health
- 28 **Christl A. Donnelly, MSc, ScD**
- 29 Professor of Applied Statistics, Department of Statistics and Pandemic Sciences Institute,
30 University of Oxford
- 31 **Jeffrey S. Duchin, MD**
- 32 Health Officer, Public Health - Seattle & King County
- 33 Professor in Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, University of Washington
- 34 Adjunct Professor, School of Public Health
- 35 **Mary-Margaret A. Fill, MD, MPH**
- 36 Deputy State Epidemiologist, Division of Communicable and Environmental Diseases and
37 Emergency Preparedness, Tennessee Department of Health
- 38 **Christophe Fraser, PhD**
- 39 Pandemic Sciences Institute, University of Oxford
- 40 **Katie Fullerton, MPH**
- 41 Senior Advisor, Surveillance and Data Modernization, Office of Readiness and Response, U.S.
42 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
- 43 **Sebastian Funk, PhD**
- 44 London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
- 45 **Dylan George, PhD**
- 46 Director, Center for Forecasting and Outbreak Analytics, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and
47 Prevention
- 48 **Susan Hopkins, FMedSci**

49 UK Health Security Agency

50 **Moritz U.G. Kraemer, DPhil**

51 Department of Biology, University of Oxford

52 Pandemic Sciences Institute, University of Oxford

53 **Marcelle Layton, MD**

54 Chief Medical Officer, Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists

55 **Justin Lessler, PhD**

56 Department of Epidemiology, University of North Carolina Gillings School of Global Public
57 Health

58 UNC Carolina Population Center

59 Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health

60 **Ruth Lynfield, MD**

61 State Epidemiologist and Medical Director, Minnesota Department of Health

62 **James M. McCaw, PhD**

63 Professor of Mathematical Biology, School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of
64 Melbourne

65 Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health,
66 University of Melbourne

67 **Tristan D. McPherson, MD**

68 Medical Director, Bureau of Communicable Diseases, New York City Department of Health and
69 Mental Hygiene

70 Clinical Assistant Professor, Divisions of Infectious Diseases and Immunology, New York
71 University Grossman School of Medicine

72 **Zack Moore MD, MPH**

73 State Epidemiologist, North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services, Division of
74 Public Health

75 **Oliver Morgan, PhD, MSc, PgDip**

76 Director, Pandemic and Epidemic Intelligence Systems, World Health Organization

77 **Steven Riley, MSc, DPhil**

78 Director General for Data, Analytics and Surveillance, UK Health Security Agency

79 Professor of Infectious Disease Dynamics, School of Public Health, Imperial College London

80 **Roni Rosenfeld, PhD**

81 Professor, Machine Learning Department, School of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon
82 University

83 **Erika Samoff, MPH, PhD**

84 HIV/STD/Hepatitis B and C Surveillance Manager, North Carolina Department of Health and
85 Human Services, Division of Public Health

86 **William Schaffner, MD**

87 Professor of Preventive Medicine and Infectious Diseases, Vanderbilt University Medical Center

88 **Julie Shaffner, MS, MPH**

89 Career Epidemiology Field Officer assigned to the Tennessee Department of Health, U.S.
90 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

91 **Roberta Sturm, MPH, MA**

92 Director, Communicable and Environmental Disease and Emergency Preparedness, Knox
93 County Health Department

94 **Dawn Terashita, MD, MPH**

95 Associate Director, Acute Communicable Disease Control Program, Los Angeles County
96 Department of Public Health

97 **Henry Walke, MD, MPH**

98 Director, Office of Readiness and Response, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

99 **Raynard E. Washington, PhD, MPH**

100 Health Director, Mecklenburg County Public Health

101 **Caitlin M. Rivers, PhD, MPH**

102 Senior Scholar, Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security, Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg
103 School of Public Health

104 Associate Professor, Department of Environmental Health and Engineering, Johns Hopkins
105 University Bloomberg School of Public Health

106 **Abstract**

107 Currently, there are few standards for what essential information about an infectious disease
108 outbreak should be reported to the public and when. The content and timeliness of public
109 reporting (e.g. situation reports) is at the discretion of the jurisdiction overseeing the outbreak
110 response, resulting in a substantial heterogeneity in available information. To address this
111 problem, we undertook a consensus process to develop recommendations for what
112 epidemiological information public health authorities should report to the public during an
113 outbreak, including the administrative level and frequency of reporting. We first assembled a
114 steering committee of nine experts representing federal public health, state public health,
115 academia, and international partners to develop a candidate list of reporting items. We then
116 invited 45 experts, 35 of whom agreed to participate in a Delphi panel. Of those, 25 participated
117 in voting in the first round, 25 participated in voting in the second round, and 25 participated in
118 voting in the third round, demonstrating consistent engagement in the consensus-building
119 process. The final stage of the Delphi process consisted of a hybrid consensus meeting to finalize
120 the voting items. This resulted in a final list of nine reporting items representing the minimum set
121 of information to include in publicly available situation reports: Numbers of new confirmed
122 cases, new hospital admissions, new deaths, cumulative confirmed cases, cumulative hospital
123 admissions, and cumulative deaths, each reported weekly and at Administrative level 1 (typically
124 state or province), and stratified by sex, age group, and race/ethnicity. This minimum reporting
125 standard creates a strong framework and guidance for uniform sharing of outbreak information
126 and promotes consistency of data between jurisdictions to enable prompt and effective response.

127 **Key Words**

128 Epidemic, Outbreak, Data Reporting, Reporting Guidelines, Reporting Standards, Public
129 Reporting

130 **Introduction**

131 Situation reports are the regular updates that jurisdictions issue to describe the latest
132 developments in infectious disease outbreaks. Situation reports, as well as other forms of public
133 reporting, serve as vital sources of information for public health professionals in other
134 jurisdictions, elected leaders, researchers, media, and the public.^{1,2} These reports often provide
135 information that can guide the development and implementation of disease spread control
136 measures.^{1,2} During the early days of the COVID-19 outbreak, for example, the information
137 published by each jurisdiction was critical for helping other communities increase situational
138 awareness and better understand the nature and trajectory of the growing pandemic.³⁻⁵

139 Currently, no guidelines exist to assist jurisdictions in deciding what and when to
140 report.^{6,7} This has resulted in substantial heterogeneity in the information available across
141 jurisdictions for various outbreaks. More uniform reporting would allow more consistent and
142 reliable information to be available to stakeholders, enhancing the ability of decision makers to
143 prepare for and respond to outbreaks.

144 To address this gap in guidance, we undertook a consensus process to develop
145 recommendations for what epidemiological information public health authorities should report
146 during an outbreak, including the administrative level and frequency of reporting. The Outbreak
147 Reporting Best Practices in Transparency (ORBIT) guidelines aim to set a minimum standard for
148 publicly available information during an outbreak to augment data reporting consistency and
149 transparency. As part of this process, the research team also developed recommendations for
150 types of outbreak situations where these guidelines would apply. However, we recognize the
151 need for flexibility and professional judgment in these decisions.

152 As part of our efforts, we undertook a literature review to identify previous efforts to
153 develop reporting guidelines. Although the research team identified several papers prioritizing
154 epidemiological information, we did not find guidelines overlapping or conflicting with our
155 project aim in the systematic review. To our knowledge, practitioners have only recently started
156 developing standards for public reporting. The CORHA Principles and Practices for Healthcare

157 Outbreak Response, for example, provide guidance to public health and healthcare practitioners
158 on when and what to notify patients and the public when an outbreak occurs in a healthcare
159 setting, including how to communicate information in a way that helps mitigate risk.⁸ Additional
160 information about the companion systematic review is available at
161 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.22.24307752>.

162 **Methods**

163 We followed the steps outlined in the Equator network's guidance for the development of
164 health research reporting guidelines.⁹ First, we assembled a steering committee of nine experts
165 representing federal public health, state public health, academia, and international partners. Due
166 to scheduling conflicts that precluded synchronous meetings, the principal investigator and
167 secretariat met with steering committee members individually or in small groups to plan and
168 finalize the project methodology.

169 The secretariat developed a preliminary list of candidate reporting items, which was
170 informed by the literature review. Items proposed at this stage, for example, included confirmed,
171 probable and suspected cases and deaths. We shared the draft list with steering committee
172 members, who provided feedback regarding the relevance and wording of proposed items.
173 Steering committee members also offered new candidate items for inclusion in the draft list.

174 After finalizing the preliminary list of candidate items, the research team assembled a
175 Delphi¹⁰ panel to develop consensus on reporting items. This panel included 45 experts from
176 various jurisdictions, expertise and career stages, who were invited via email to participate in a
177 four-phase Delphi panel. Of the 45 invitees, 35 agreed to participate (Table 1 and Table 2). The
178 secretariat sent each confirmed participant a spreadsheet with the candidate items. Participants
179 were asked to assign each item on a scale of one to ten, with one being not important and ten
180 being most important. Participants were instructed to vote only on the importance and
181 practicality of each item, not the wording, and to remember that the list only represents the
182 minimum set of reporting items. Of the 35 individuals that agreed to participate, 31 submitted a
183 voting sheet and/or attended the consensus meeting.

Jurisdictions		Number of individuals that agreed to participate
Australia		1
Hong Kong		1
South Africa		1
United States	HHS Region 1	2
	HHS Region 2	1
	HHS Region 3	1
	HHS Region 4	8
	HHS Region 5	2
	HHS Region 8	1
	HHS Region 9	1
	HHS Region 10	2
	U.S. Federal	4
United Kingdom		7
World Health Organization		1
Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists		2
Total		35

184 **Table 1.** Participant jurisdictions. This table provides a broad overview of the countries and
 185 regions represented in the Delphi panel. The United States jurisdiction was further broken down
 186 into U.S. Federal and the respective Health and Human Services (HSS) Regions.

Expertise	Number of individuals that agreed to participate
Administrative Level 0 (Federal)	6
Administrative Level 1 (typically state or province)	9
Administrative Level 2 (Local)	6
Academic	11
International	1
National	2
Total	35

187 **Table 2.** Participant expertise. This table provides a broad overview of the range of expertise
 188 represented in the Delphi panel.

189 After a one-month voting period, the secretariat calculated the mean score for each item.
 190 Items that received a score of at least eight were judged to have reached consensus, and therefore
 191 admitted to the final stage of candidacy. Similarly, items that received a mean score less than or

192 equal to five were dropped. Items with a score between five and eight were sent to participants
193 for a second round of voting. This process was repeated for a total of three rounds of voting.

194 Of the expert participants who agreed to participate in the project, 25 participated in
195 voting in the first round. Twenty-five participants returned round two spreadsheets, and 25
196 returned round three spreadsheets, demonstrating consistent engagement in the consensus-
197 building process. Across all three rounds, 30 unique individuals participated in voting.

198 Following the three rounds of emailed voting, a final consensus meeting was held to
199 finalize the reporting items. All Delphi participants were invited to attend the hybrid meeting in
200 January 2024. Fifteen participants attended in person and seven participated online. The meeting
201 aimed to discuss the remaining items that asynchronous voting had not resolved. The agenda also
202 included time for participants to suggest changes to the wording of each item and to develop
203 justifications for why each reporting item is important.

204 Meeting participants also discussed the types of outbreaks where these recommendations
205 would be applicable. To resolve uncertainty, they engaged in a 45-minute discussion followed by
206 a vote on the final wording of the recommendation. Items that received a score of at least eight
207 were included in the final list. Therefore, the recommendations reflect the majority view, not the
208 unanimous agreement of those present.

209 This study did not qualify as human subjects research according to the Johns Hopkins
210 Bloomberg School of Public Health Institutional Review Board (IRB00023808).

211 **Recommendations**

212 This process resulted in a final list of nine reporting items to include in publicly available
213 situation reports:

214 1. The number of new confirmed cases registered during the previous reporting period. This item
215 represents the number of new confirmed cases, as defined by the case definition (which should
216 be published with the reporting items), reported to public health authorities since the last report.
217 Although the diagnosis date is preferred, especially for epidemiological modeling and analytics,
218 most jurisdictions will find that the reporting date is most feasible. Therefore, Delphi participants

219 determine this to be an acceptable option and encourages readers to refer to Council of State and
220 Territorial Epidemiologists (CSTE) guidance.¹¹

221 2. The number of new hospital admissions related to the outbreak (among confirmed cases)
222 registered during the previous reporting period. This item represents the number of new hospital
223 admissions among confirmed cases, as defined by the case definition, reported to public health
224 authorities since the last report.

225 3. The number of new deaths related to the outbreak (among confirmed cases) registered during
226 the previous reporting period. This item represents the number of new deaths among confirmed
227 cases, as defined by the case definition, reported to public health authorities since the last report.

228 4. The number of cumulative confirmed cases registered throughout each reporting period. This
229 item represents the total number of confirmed cases, as defined by the case definition, reported to
230 public health authorities since the start of the outbreak.

231 5. The number of cumulative hospital admissions related to the outbreak (among confirmed
232 cases) registered throughout each reporting period. This item represents the total number of
233 hospital admissions among confirmed cases, as defined by the case definition, reported to public
234 health authorities since the start of the outbreak.

235 6. The number of cumulative deaths related to the outbreak (among confirmed cases) registered
236 throughout each reporting period. This item represents the total number of deaths among
237 confirmed cases, as defined by the case definition, reported to public health authorities since the
238 start of the outbreak.

239 7. Establish weekly reporting. This item specifies that public health authorities should, at a
240 minimum, report to the public weekly. This is a minimum recommendation; jurisdictions may
241 exceed these standards at their discretion (e.g., report every day, every other day, etc.).

242 8. Establish Administrative level 1 (typically state or province) reporting of the final reporting
243 items. This item specifies that public health authorities should, at minimum, report the data items
244 to the public with state, province, or equivalent level geographic granularity.

245 9. Stratify reporting items by sex, age group, and race/ethnicity. This item specifies that public
246 health authorities should stratify the reporting items by sex, age group, race/ethnicity, when

247 doing so would not compromise privacy or confidentiality. Where and when the data is available,
248 public health authorities should refer to their jurisdiction's census bureau stratification for sex,
249 age group, race/ethnicity.

250 **Deciding When to Apply the ORBIT Guidelines**

251 Participants discussed and voted on the applicability of the ORBIT reporting guidelines.
252 There was general agreement among participants that small, point-source outbreaks, such as an
253 outbreak of foodborne illness in a restaurant, did not merit a public-facing situation report. On
254 the other hand, participants expressed a reluctance to limit reporting to the most serious
255 outbreaks, such as the novel coronavirus, in recognition that reliable reporting of more moderate
256 outbreaks allows neighboring jurisdictions to take proactive preparedness and control measures
257 based on early information.

258 Ultimately, participants reached consensus that an outbreak that necessitates reporting
259 under the International Health Regulations (IHR) (2005) should trigger use of the reporting
260 guidelines. Participants also recommend that for other outbreaks, the decision to trigger the
261 reporting guidelines falls to in-country public health authorities.

262 Under Article 6 of the IHR (2005), State Parties must report events constituting potential
263 public health emergencies of international concern (PHEIC) to the World Health Organization
264 (WHO) if the situation of concern meets two of the following four criteria:^{12,13}

- 265 1. Is the public health impact of the event serious?
- 266 2. Is the event unusual or unexpected?
- 267 3. Is there a significant risk of international spread?
- 268 4. Is there a significant risk of international travel or trade restrictions?

269 The WHO Director-General may then choose to declare a PHEIC based on advice from
270 the IHR Emergency Committee, information provided by State Parties, scientific expert
271 recommendations, and risks posed to human health, international disease spread and
272 international travel.^{12,14}

273 Participants agreed that this scenario adequately captures emerging outbreaks of high
274 consequence. The definition also provides sufficient room for in-country public health authorities
275 to exercise their judgment on emerging outbreaks that have not reached an international level of
276 concern under the IHR (2005) but may evolve to outbreaks of higher consequence or still pose a
277 significant risk of jurisdictional spread.

278 **Defining Confirmed Cases**

279 Participants discussed the role of case definitions in the reporting guidelines extensively.
280 They emphasized the need for nuance and flexibility in defining confirmed cases, depending on
281 the outbreak stage. The ability to confirm cases often depends on the availability of laboratory
282 tests. However, this may not be possible at the start of an outbreak with novel pathogens. For
283 example, the first U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) diagnostic test kits for
284 SARS-CoV-2 were approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) on February 4,
285 2020, about two months after the WHO was notified of the first COVID-19 cases in China.^{15,16}

286 Relying solely on laboratory confirmation assumes that tests are accessible and equitably
287 distributed, which is often not the case. Unequal access to testing across U.S. cities and in low-
288 and middle-income countries demonstrates this issue. Therefore, probable cases are important
289 indicators to capture outbreak trends when confirmed diagnoses are difficult.¹⁷⁻¹⁹

290 To reflect this in the ORBIT guidelines, participants agreed that public health authorities
291 should release information about probable or suspected cases at their discretion, considering
292 outbreak timing, evolving case counts, and testing capacity. They also stressed the importance of
293 coordination and transparency among federal, state and local authorities to ensure consistency
294 across jurisdictions.

295 **Best Practices**

296 These consensus guidelines provide public health jurisdictions with a minimum standard
297 for what information to include in their regular reporting to the public. Public health jurisdictions
298 may, however, choose to report additional data items at their discretion to further inform the
299 public. Additional reporting recommendations discussed and generally supported amongst the
300 participants include:

- 301 1. The median number of days from sample collection to the earliest known confirmed test
302 result. This item represents an indicator for testing lag and has the potential to be subject to right
303 truncation bias in an exponentially growing epidemic.²⁰
- 304 2. Administrative level 2 (county or equivalent) reporting of the final reporting items. This item
305 suggests that public health authorities should report the data items to the public with county or
306 equivalent level geographic granularity when permissible considering the protection of privacy
307 and preservation of confidentiality. As the consensus guidelines represent a minimum viable data
308 set, jurisdictions may choose to exceed the reporting standards at their discretion by reporting
309 county or equivalent level data alongside state, province, or equivalent data.
- 310 3. When the data is available and considerations of privacy and confidentiality permit it, public
311 health authorities should report the onset date, followed by the specimen collection date and the
312 diagnosis date, as per CSTE guidance, when reporting the number of new confirmed cases
313 registered during the previous reporting period.¹¹

314 **Public Health Implications**

315 This set of minimum recommended reporting items creates a framework for uniform
316 sharing of epidemic information and consistency of data between jurisdictions. The goal is to
317 enable a more prompt and effective response by ensuring that the public, media, researchers,
318 healthcare providers, and governments can access detailed information about an unfolding
319 epidemic. As reporting needs may change over the course of an outbreak, we encourage
320 coordination among public health authorities to maintain uniformity and comparability of
321 reporting.

322 In future work, we will consider disease-specific iterations of these minimum reporting
323 recommendations to increase reporting uniformity and usability. Additionally, we intend to align
324 our current recommendations with other relevant efforts, such as those advanced by the U.S.
325 CDC's Data Modernization Initiative.²¹

326 Our guidelines were developed with input primarily from the United States and the
327 United Kingdom, and participation from the WHO. We invite colleagues from other regions to
328 develop similar processes that reflect their local contexts.

329 There are some limitations associated with the ORBIT guidelines. Participants
330 contributing to the development process may have been influenced by their experiences with
331 recent outbreaks, including COVID-19 and mpox, which may not fully reflect the needs of future
332 outbreaks. Additionally, while collecting individual data, such as sex, age group, race/ethnicity,
333 typically allows for more nuanced analysis than aggregate data, it also poses greater privacy and
334 confidentiality risks. Race/ethnicity data, for instance, should be collected and communicated
335 thoughtfully, with consideration for the protection of vulnerable groups. Lastly, the ORBIT
336 guidelines remain a minimum standard. We encourage jurisdictions to consider reporting
337 additional data that is most relevant and beneficial to the communities they serve.

338 In conclusion, these guidelines represent a minimum standard for what public health
339 jurisdictions should include in their regular reporting to the public during an outbreak that meets
340 IHR (2005) criteria or when in-country public health authorities have otherwise decided to
341 trigger use of the guidelines. The standards detail minimum reporting items (e.g., the number of
342 new confirmed cases), the frequency, and administrative level of reporting. We hope these
343 standards facilitate timely, standardized reporting for critical public health events in recognition
344 that such events pose a risk to the public and other public health jurisdictions who may wish to
345 develop response plans.

346 **Acknowledgements**

347 The authors would like to acknowledge Erin Fink and Clint Haines for their contributions to data
348 collection in the early stages of the project.

349 **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

350 **Funding**

351 This work was supported by the Open Philanthropy Project.

352 M.U.G.K. acknowledges funding from The Rockefeller Foundation, Google.org, the Oxford
353 Martin School Programmes in Pandemic Genomics & Digital Pandemic Preparedness, European
354 Union's Horizon Europe programme projects MOOD (#874850) and E4Warning (#101086640),
355 the John Fell Fund, a Branco Weiss Fellowship and Wellcome Trust grants 225288/Z/22/Z,

356 226052/Z/22/Z & 228186/Z/23/Z, United Kingdom Research and Innovation (#APP8583) and
357 the Medical Research Foundation (MRF-RG-ICCH-2022-100069). The contents of this
358 publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of
359 the European Commission or the other funders.

360 **References**

361 1. Blendon RJ, Benson JM, DesRoches CM, Raleigh E, Taylor-Clark K. The Public's Response
362 to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome in Toronto and the United States. *Clinical Infectious*
363 *Diseases*. 2004;38(7):925-931. doi:10.1086/382355

364 2. Lipsitch M, Santillana M. Enhancing Situational Awareness to Prevent Infectious Disease
365 Outbreaks from Becoming Catastrophic. In: Inglesby TV, Adalja AA, eds. *Global Catastrophic*
366 *Biological Risks*. Springer International Publishing; 2019:59-74. doi:10.1007/82_2019_172

367 3. Information Sharing. ASPR TRACIE. Accessed March 14, 2024.
368 <https://asprtracie.hhs.gov/technical-resources/80/information-sharing/77>

369 4. Jones T, Hedberg C. The CDC Field Epidemiology Manual: Coordination of Multiple States
370 and Federal Agencies. Published September 25, 2019. Accessed March 14, 2024.
371 <https://www.cdc.gov/eis/field-epi-manual/chapters/Coordinating-Agencies.html>

372 5. Heymann DL. Data sharing and outbreaks: best practice exemplified. *Lancet*.
373 2020;395(10223):469-470. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30184-7

374 6. Chatterjee P. Is India missing COVID-19 deaths? *The Lancet*. 2020;396(10252):657.
375 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31857-2

376 7. U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. What is Case Surveillance? Published March
377 27, 2023. Accessed March 14, 2024. <https://www.cdc.gov/nndss/about/index.html>

378 8. The Council for Outbreak Response: Healthcare Associated Infections and Antimicrobial
379 Resistance. CORHA Principles and Practices for Healthcare Outbreak Response: Notification
380 and Communication.; January 2021. Updated October 2022. Accessed June 24, 2024.
381 <https://www.corha.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/CORHA-PP-Chapter-8-1.pdf>

382 9. Moher D, Schulz KF, Simera I, Altman DG. Guidance for Developers of Health Research
383 Reporting Guidelines. *PLoS Med*. 2010;7(2):e1000217. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000217

384 10. Dalkey NC. Delphi. RAND Corporation; 1967. Accessed May 22, 2024.
385 <https://www.rand.org/pubs/papers/P3704.html>

- 386 11. Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists. Data Standardization: Dates of Importance
387 to Public Health Surveillance Illness (Symptom) Onset Date, Report Dates, Laboratory-Related
388 Dates, (Clinical) Diagnosis Date. 2023. Accessed March 13, 2024.
389 [https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.cste.org/resource/resmgr/briefs/DSWG_Dates_of_PH_Importance](https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.cste.org/resource/resmgr/briefs/DSWG_Dates_of_PH_Importance_.pdf)
390 [_pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.cste.org/resource/resmgr/briefs/DSWG_Dates_of_PH_Importance_.pdf)
- 391 12. World Health Organization. International Health Regulations (2005). Accessed March 12,
392 2024. <https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/246107/9789241580496-eng.pdf?sequence=1>
- 393 13. Emergencies: International health regulations and emergency committees. Accessed March
394 26, 2024. [https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/emergencies-](https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/emergencies-international-health-regulations-and-emergency-committees)
395 [international-health-regulations-and-emergency-committees](https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/emergencies-international-health-regulations-and-emergency-committees)
- 396 14. U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. International Health Regulations (IHR).
397 Published July 25, 2022. Accessed March 12, 2024.
398 <https://www.cdc.gov/globalhealth/healthprotection/ghs/ihr/index.html>
- 399 15. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. CDC's Internal Control Weaknesses Led to
400 Its Initial COVID-19 Test Kit Failure, but CDC Ultimately Created a Working Test Kit.
401 Accessed March 14, 2024. <https://oig.hhs.gov/oas/reports/region4/42002027.asp>
- 402 16. U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC Museum COVID-19 Timeline.
403 Published March 15, 2023. Accessed March 14, 2024.
404 <https://www.cdc.gov/museum/timeline/covid19.html>
- 405 17. Connor A, Hariharan N, Carson S, et al. Access To COVID-19 Testing In Low- And Middle-
406 Income Countries Is Still Critical To Achieving Health Equity. Accessed March 14, 2024.
407 [https://www.healthaffairs.org/content/forefront/access-covid-19-testing-low--and-middle-](https://www.healthaffairs.org/content/forefront/access-covid-19-testing-low--and-middle-income-countries-still-critical-achieving)
408 [income-countries-still-critical-achieving](https://www.healthaffairs.org/content/forefront/access-covid-19-testing-low--and-middle-income-countries-still-critical-achieving)
- 409 18. Mullachery PH, Li R, Melly S, et al. Inequities in spatial accessibility to COVID-19 testing
410 in 30 large US cities. *Soc Sci Med.* 2022;310:115307. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.115307
- 411 19. Batista C, Hotez P, Amor YB, et al. The silent and dangerous inequity around access to
412 COVID-19 testing: A call to action. *EClinicalMedicine.* 2022;43:101230.
413 doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101230
- 414 20. Park SW, Akhmetzhanov AR, Charniga K, et al. Estimating epidemiological delay
415 distributions for infectious diseases. Published online January 13, 2024:2024.01.12.24301247.
416 doi:10.1101/2024.01.12.24301247
- 417 21. U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Data Modernization Initiative. Accessed
418 March 25, 2024. <https://www.cdc.gov/surveillance/data-modernization/index.html>