

1 **How have mathematical models contributed to understanding**
2 **the transmission and control of SARS-CoV-2 in healthcare**
3 **settings? A systematic search and review**

4
5 **Authors:** David R M Smith^{*1,2,3}, Sophie Chervet^{*1,2,4}, Théo Pinettes^{3,5}, George Shirreff^{1,2,3},
6 Sofía Jijón^{3,5}, Ajmal Oodally^{1,2,3}, Kévin Jean^{3,5}, Lulla Opatowski^{**1,2}, Solen Kernéis^{**4,6}, Laura
7 Temime^{**3,5}

8 *Contributed equally

9 **Contributed equally

10

11 **Institutional affiliations :**

12 ¹ Institut Pasteur, Epidemiology and Modelling of Antibiotic Evasion (EMAE), Paris, France

13 ² INSERM, Centre de recherche en épidémiologie et santé des populations (CESP), UMR
14 1018, "Anti-infective Evasion and Pharmacoepidemiology" team, UVSQ, Université Paris-
15 Saclay, Montigny-Le-Bretonneux, France

16 ³ Conservatoire national des Arts et Métiers, Laboratoire Modélisation, épidémiologie et
17 surveillance des risques sanitaires (MESuRS), Paris, France

18 ⁴ INSERM, Infection, Antimicrobials, Modelling, Evolution (IAME), UMR 1137, Université
19 Paris-Cité, Paris, France

20 ⁵ Conservatoire national des Arts et Métiers, Institut Pasteur, Unité Pasteur-Cnam sur les
21 Risques Infectieux et émergents (PACRI), Paris, France

22 ⁶ AP-HP, Hôpital Bichat, Equipe de Prévention du Risque Infectieux (EPRI), Paris, France

23 **Abstract**

24 **Background:** Since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, mathematical models have been
25 widely used to inform public health recommendations regarding COVID-19 control in
26 healthcare settings.

27 **Objectives:** To systematically review SARS-CoV-2 transmission models in healthcare
28 settings, and summarise their contributions to understanding nosocomial COVID-19.

29 **Methods:** Systematic search and review.

30 **Data sources:** Published articles indexed in PubMed.

31 **Study eligibility criteria:** Modelling studies describing dynamic inter-individual transmission
32 of SARS-CoV-2 in healthcare settings, published by mid-February 2022.

33 **Participants and interventions:** Any population and intervention described by included
34 models.

35 **Assessment of risk of bias:** Not appropriate for modelling studies.

36 **Methods of data synthesis:** Structured narrative review.

37 **Results:** Models have mostly focused on acute care and long-term care facilities in high-
38 income countries. Models have quantified outbreak risk across different types of individuals
39 and facilities, showing great variation across settings and pandemic periods. Regarding
40 surveillance, routine testing – rather than symptom-based testing – was highlighted as
41 essential for COVID-19 prevention due to high rates of silent transmission. Surveillance
42 impacts were found to depend critically on testing frequency, diagnostic sensitivity, and turn-
43 around time. Healthcare re-organization was also found to have large epidemiological
44 impacts: beyond obvious benefits of isolating cases and limiting inter-individual contact,
45 more complex strategies such as staggered staff scheduling and immune-based cohorting
46 reduced infection risk. Finally, vaccination impact, while highly effective for limiting COVID-
47 19 burden, varied substantially depending on assumed mechanistic impacts on infection

48 acquisition, symptom onset and transmission. Studies were inconsistent regarding which
49 individuals to prioritize for interventions, probably due to the high diversity of settings and
50 populations investigated.

51 **Conclusions:** Modelling results form an extensive evidence base that may inform control
52 strategies for future waves of SARS-CoV-2 and other viral respiratory pathogens. We
53 propose new avenues for future models of healthcare-associated outbreaks, with the aim of
54 enhancing their efficiency and contributions to decision-making.

55 **Introduction**

56 SARS-CoV-2 transmission in healthcare settings has contributed significantly to the global
57 health-economic burden of COVID-19. Healthcare settings are particularly vulnerable to
58 COVID-19, due to dense concentrations of frail patients, high frequencies of at-risk medical
59 procedures, and high rates of inter-individual contact. Both patients and healthcare workers
60 (HCWs) have been at high risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection throughout the pandemic, resulting
61 in major nosocomial outbreaks worldwide [1,2]. In England, for instance, an estimated 20%
62 of patients hospitalized with COVID-19 before August 2020 acquired their infection in
63 hospital [3], while 95,000-167,000 patients became infected during their hospital stay
64 between June 2020 and March 2021 [4]. Further, HCWs have experienced an estimated 1.6-
65 to 3.4-fold higher risk of infection relative to the general population [5,6]. Long-term care
66 facilities (LTCFs) have been most severely impacted, with one- to two-thirds of COVID-
67 related deaths in Europe by May 2020 estimated to have occurred among LTCF residents
68 [7].

69 Healthcare facilities have undergone extensive organizational changes to combat SARS-
70 CoV-2 transmission, particularly during local surges in COVID-19 cases. Many facilities have
71 adopted non-pharmaceutical infection prevention and control (IPC) measures, including
72 social distancing, reinforced contact precautions and hand hygiene procedures, use of
73 personal protective equipment (PPE), banning of visitors, and systematic test-trace-isolate
74 protocols. HCWs and residents of LTCFs have also been among the first populations
75 targeted for vaccination. However, despite these interventions, nosocomial COVID-19 risk
76 has not been eliminated, as evidenced by ongoing outbreaks in healthcare facilities
77 worldwide. A key barrier to effective COVID-19 prevention in healthcare settings is imperfect
78 understanding of transmission routes among patients and HCWs, and of the relative impacts
79 of different control strategies, which depend on setting-specific organizational and
80 demographic characteristics, immunological histories of the specific population concerned,
81 and virological properties of locally circulating variants.

82 Throughout the pandemic, mathematical models (Box 1) have proven useful both to better
83 understand the epidemiological processes underlying SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks and to
84 support public health decision-making. Modelling studies focusing on nosocomial risk in
85 particular, although less publicized than those focusing on community risk, have addressed
86 a broad range of epidemiological questions [8] and aided public health decision-making [9].
87 However, epidemiological insights and public health recommendations from nosocomial
88 SARS-CoV-2 models have not previously been reviewed or synthesized systematically.
89 Here, we systematically search and review mathematical models developed to investigate
90 SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics and control strategies in healthcare settings over the
91 critical phase of the pandemic, present their main contributions, synthesize their conclusions,
92 and discuss their limits.

93 **Methods**

94 We conducted a systematic search and review of mathematical/mechanistic models of inter-
95 individual SARS-CoV-2 transmission within healthcare settings published up to February 14,
96 2022. Details on the search, inclusion and exclusion criteria, screening process and data
97 extraction are provided in the Supplementary File, and results are reported according to the
98 PRISMA guidelines [10] (see Supplementary File).

99 **Results**

100 **Model characteristics**

101 Overall, our search identified 1,431 studies, of which 59 were included after title, abstract
102 and full-text screening (Suppl. Fig. S1 and Suppl. Table). Most (43/59) were posted in a
103 publicly accessible pre-print server, with a median delay of 8 months (range: 1 to 24 months)
104 between initial preprint posting and publication.

105 The majority of models were stochastic (85%; 50/59), and about half were agent-based or
106 network models (53%; 31/59). At early stages of the pandemic, when testing resources were
107 highly limited, most studies focused on surveillance and healthcare organization (Fig. 1A).

108 By comparison, impacts of PPE have been assessed less frequently, and vaccination
109 strategies only began to be explored towards the end of 2020, as the first vaccines became
110 available.

111 While models were mostly developed by teams from the USA, the UK, and other European
112 countries, these models explored locations representing a wider range of countries
113 worldwide (Fig. 1B). Acute care facilities and long-term care facilities were the main types of
114 healthcare facilities considered, although this varied depending on the country of study (Fig.
115 1C) and the subject addressed (Fig. 1D).

116 **Insights on SARS-CoV-2 acquisition routes and transmission risk**

117 Few studies have attempted to estimate the reproduction number of SARS-CoV-2 in
118 healthcare settings, despite evidence that nosocomial and community risk may differ widely
119 [11]. Estimates of nosocomial R_0 range from 0.45 (0.36-0.56) in English acute care hospitals
120 using a relatively simple approach [12] to 8.72 (5.14-16.32) in a French LTCF using a
121 stochastic dynamic model accounting for imperfect surveillance [13]. Interestingly, in the
122 latter study, R_0 was estimated to drop to 1.33 (0.68-2.04) after introduction of control
123 measures.

124 Several models have quantified the relative burden of SARS-CoV-2 infection and
125 transmission among patients and HCWs over the course of the pandemic. HCWs were
126 identified as being at high risk of occupational exposure to infection, either from colleagues
127 or patients [14–16]. During the first wave in early 2020, they have been estimated to be the
128 most important source of onward nosocomial transmission, both to patients and other HCWs
129 [17,18]. However, other studies found that patient infection could result primarily from
130 transmission from other patients [4,16,18].

131 **Insights on SARS-CoV-2 infection control**

132 ***Evaluating and optimizing surveillance strategies***

133 Models have been widely used to assess and compare the epidemiological impacts of
134 SARS-CoV-2 testing strategies. Because SARS-CoV-2 spreads extensively through pre-
135 symptomatic and asymptomatic transmission [19,20], the identification of non-symptomatic
136 infections is a key component of nosocomial IPC. Several studies have highlighted difficulty
137 controlling outbreaks when targeting only symptomatic individuals for testing [21–28].
138 Limited impact of only testing patients upon their admission has also been identified,
139 suggesting that more thorough screening methods are required to limit SARS-CoV-2
140 introductions from the community, visitors, HCWs or ancillary staff [24,27,29,30].

141 Many studies have evaluated the impact of routine testing of non-symptomatic individuals.
142 The most universal finding is that more frequent testing leads to greater reductions in
143 nosocomial transmission [12,14,21,23,24,30–40]. Similarly, increasing daily testing capacity
144 has been found to limit nosocomial transmission [27,41]. In the context of limited test
145 availability early in the pandemic, effective strategies identified for optimizing nosocomial
146 outbreak detection include pooling samples via group testing [27] and distributing tests over
147 several batches instead of using them all at once [42].

148 Modelling results are less consistent concerning which subpopulations to target for routine
149 non-symptomatic testing. Many conclude that targeting HCWs is most effective
150 [12,25,32,43], while others suggest targeting facility patients or residents [22,27,39].
151 Divergence owes to underlying modelling assumptions on how patients and HCWs differ,
152 regarding their infectiousness, susceptibility to infection, contact behaviour, and degree of
153 interaction with visitors and other individuals in the community. For instance, testing staff
154 proved more effective in a model of English care homes where the main source of SARS-
155 CoV-2 introductions was staff members infected in the community [25]. Conversely, testing
156 patients was more effective in models of a French rehabilitation hospital in which high rates
157 of contact among ambulatory patients translated to high rates of patient-to-patient
158 transmission [27,39]. In nursing homes, patient testing likely becomes increasingly important
159 when visitors or other interactions with the community are permitted [33].

160 Lastly, in addition to testing frequency, studies have quantified the critical impact of the
161 sensitivity and turnaround time of the test being used [24,28,30,32,33,37,38,44–47]. Several
162 studies have identified that gains in turnaround time tend to outweigh gains in test sensitivity,
163 explaining why rapid diagnostic tests (e.g. Ag-RDT) may be more effective than laboratory-
164 based tests (e.g. RT-PCR) for routine non-symptomatic testing [23,25,32,39]. Conversely, if
165 same-day test results are achievable, or if individuals effectively isolate while awaiting test
166 results, more sensitive laboratory tests likely outperform rapid tests [33,34,44].

167 ***Evaluating impacts of personal protective equipment (PPE)***

168 Several studies have found that, when available, PPE use is highly effective for reducing
169 infection risk among both HCWs and patients. Although predicted reductions in infection risk
170 naturally depend on assumptions underlying PPE's impact on viral transmissibility, which
171 vary considerably across studies and for which data are sorely lacking, several studies
172 suggest that widespread PPE use remains a key SARS-CoV-2 prevention strategy, even
173 when conferring comparatively low levels of protection [15,29,37,48–50]. By preventing
174 infection, PPE use has also been shown to reduce HCW workplace absence [37] and
175 workday loss [22]. Very few studies have tackled the question of who should be given priority
176 to PPE access when in limited supply, although PPE has been shown to be particularly
177 effective when accessible to all HCWs [48].

178 Regarding different types of PPE that may be used, Hüttel et al. [15] found hand sanitizer to
179 be an effective means of reducing risk as a supplement to other strategies. Regarding
180 timing, earlier introduction of PPE was found to allow a much more efficient response [22]
181 and to enable prevention of large outbreaks [25]. However, further analyses suggest that the
182 level of protection PPE confers can be occasionally overwhelmed in the context of large
183 numbers of infected people in a room [51]. Finally, waning PPE adherence due to pandemic
184 fatigue could significantly impact the efficacy of PPE-based interventions [52].

185 ***Evaluating and optimizing healthcare organization***

186 Many modelling studies have assessed the epidemiological impacts of healthcare facilities
187 adapting their structures of care and workplace organization. Larger facilities have been
188 found to be at greater risk of nosocomial SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks [43], and splitting facilities
189 into smaller independent units has been shown to reduce the total number of infected
190 individuals [36,48], except when transmissibility is high [53]. Forbidding visitors was
191 identified as not having a significant effect on outbreak probability [25], except when infection
192 prevalence among visitors' contacts in the community is higher than that of HCW community
193 contacts [54].

194 Models have highlighted that rapid isolation of positive cases is an effective strategy for
195 infection prevention [36,55,56]. Interestingly, models suggest that intermixing recovered
196 individuals with potentially susceptible individuals could reduce outbreak size [32], and that
197 sufficient spacing between patient beds is needed to limit transmission risk [36]. Results are
198 less consistent regarding isolation upon admission. Models have highlighted the efficacy of
199 isolating all newly admitted patients for a given duration [29] or while awaiting test results
200 [12]. Conversely, others report no additional benefit of front-door screening or quarantine
201 upon admission when other strategies are already in place [43,55].

202 Regarding staff organization, models have demonstrated benefits of cancelling HCW
203 gatherings [57,58] and of forcing shorter and fewer patient-HCW interactions [51,58],
204 although surprisingly this latter result was not confirmed by others [22]. Reducing between-
205 ward staff sharing also seems to reduce both the number of wards with infected individuals
206 [55] and the global reproduction number [37]. More complex staffing strategies have also
207 shown potential benefits, like splitting staff into two teams that do not interact [59,60],
208 synchronizing rather than staggering staff rotations [61], or immunity-based staffing [32,35],
209 e.g. assigning recovered staff to infected patients [35]. Finally, admitting all COVID-19
210 patients to specialized quarantine hospitals in which HCWs continuously resided for 1-to-2
211 week-long shifts did not necessarily increase occupational HCW risk [62].

212 ***Evaluating vaccination strategies***

213 All models exploring vaccination found that it could help reduce COVID-19 morbidity and
214 mortality, especially in LTCFs [23,28,31,33,52,63–67]. However, some studies also noted
215 that vaccination benefits could be hindered by high levels of community SARS-CoV-2
216 circulation [31,65] or by reduced adherence to contact precautions within facilities
217 concomitant with vaccine rollout, for instance due to pandemic fatigue or risk compensation
218 [52].

219 A major focus of these models has been evaluation of which groups of individuals to target
220 or prioritize for vaccination in a context of limited vaccine availability, yielding sometimes
221 inconsistent results. Some found that LTCF residents should be prioritized over staff,
222 especially in LTCFs with low adherence to IPC measures [33,52]. Conversely, staff
223 vaccination was shown to be particularly effective for decreasing the overall attack rate,
224 especially in the absence of a testing protocol [64]. Targeting staff for vaccination may also
225 be preferable when the risk of virus importation from the community is high [31]. Finally, it
226 has been shown that vaccine rollout should first target staff members most exposed to
227 potential COVID-19 patients (e.g. staff from emergency departments) [63].

228 It should be noted that the conclusions reached by these models depend strongly on
229 modelling assumptions underlying vaccine action. Across models, assumed mechanisms
230 related to vaccination effectiveness included one or several of the following: a reduction in
231 acquisition risk, a reduction in symptom risk, and a reduction in the infectiousness of infected
232 vaccinated individuals. For instance, it was shown that if a vaccine only reduces symptom
233 risk, then increasing vaccination among nursing home staff leads to an increase in the
234 proportion of asymptomatic infections among staff, which subsequently leads to increased
235 infection risk for residents [23]. Additionally, no model considered vaccine impact over the
236 long-term, which is particularly relevant in the context of waning immunity and the
237 emergence of novel variants with vaccine-escape properties.

238 **Discussion**

239 Mathematical models have become ubiquitous tools to help understand the dynamics of
240 infectious disease outbreaks and to support public health decision-making. Here, we have
241 reviewed how models have helped to inform COVID-19 risk management in healthcare
242 settings, in particular by providing a better understanding of nosocomial transmission
243 dynamics and control strategy effectiveness.

244 The generation of *in silico* evidence to inform infection control strategies has been the
245 leading motivation for nosocomial SARS-CoV-2 transmission modelling. Although real-world
246 evidence collected during randomized controlled trials is the gold-standard, such data are
247 extremely difficult to generate in the context of a rapidly evolving epidemic. Beyond the
248 obvious costs and time involved, great heterogeneity in population characteristics and
249 exposure risk across different healthcare settings means that a large number of centres
250 must be enrolled to achieve sufficient cluster randomisation. Several high-impact
251 randomized controlled trials have nonetheless been successfully conducted in healthcare
252 settings despite these challenges, in particular to evaluate COVID-19 vaccines, therapies
253 and pre- or post-exposure prophylactic agents [68–71]. However, trials evaluating impacts of
254 common IPC interventions, including surveillance testing, PPE and healthcare
255 reorganization, are scarce [72,73].

256 In this context, mathematical modelling approaches have been particularly helpful to
257 investigate critical IPC questions in (near) real-time, since they allow for the simulation of
258 diverse scenarios at relatively high speed and low cost, while accounting for all available
259 knowledge and uncertainty at a given place and time. Model-based evaluations also allow
260 for levels of granularity in intervention arms that may be infeasible in real trial designs. Our
261 review highlights the range of modelling studies published before the end of 2020, at a time
262 when the scientific and medical communities were in particularly great need of evidence to
263 inform optimal allocation of limited infection prevention resources, including RT-PCR tests,
264 face masks and, later, vaccines.

265 However, two common means of SARS-CoV-2 transmission prevention with important
266 implications for the field have been notably under-addressed. First, modelling studies on the
267 relative impact of different types of face masks (e.g. surgical masks, N95 respirators) are
268 scarce [74], tied to a lack of precise data on how they impact viral transmissibility, as well as
269 their potential indirect roles as transmission vectors. Second, although ubiquitous in practice
270 at various stages of the pandemic, explicit social distancing interventions have rarely been
271 assessed [22,39]. This is probably because accurate modelling of social distancing requires
272 fine-scaled simulation of inter-individual contact networks, typically using an agent-based
273 approach, which is beyond the scope of most models. When faced with both epistemic
274 uncertainty and a need for relative computational simplicity, modelers may be reluctant to
275 include and formalize specific interventions that require arbitrary, highly sophisticated and/or
276 potentially wrongheaded assumptions about their mechanistic impacts on SARS-CoV-2
277 transmission. Instead, a common modelling strategy has been to include generic non-
278 pharmaceutical interventions that simply reduce the viral transmission rate, and which are
279 assumed to represent any combination of basic infection prevention interventions, including
280 face masks, gloves, gowns, face shields, hand hygiene or social distancing.

281 Relative to the evaluation of infection control strategies, modelling studies have more rarely
282 focused on the estimation of epidemiological parameters using statistical inference. In
283 particular, in the event of the sudden emergence of a novel infectious disease, R_0 estimation
284 is essential for epidemic forecasting and emergency response planning, and relies largely on
285 mathematical modelling approaches. Although estimates of R_0 quickly became available for
286 SARS-CoV-2 across various community settings in early 2020, [75], estimates specific to
287 healthcare settings remain scarce. Yet there is a great need for robust estimates across
288 diverse settings, as underlying levels of epidemic risk vary substantially across facilities due
289 to their intrinsic heterogeneity (e.g. types of care provided, population sizes, contact
290 behaviour of these populations). For instance, assuming $R_0=3.5$ in the community, Temime
291 et al. [11] estimated that nosocomial R_0 could range from 0.7 to 11.7, depending on the type

292 of ward and the density of contacts among and between patients and HCWs. This
293 heterogeneity in nosocomial R_0 is consistent with the range of estimates derived from
294 models described in this review [12,13], and has critical implications, informing which
295 facilities and populations are most at risk for explosive outbreaks and thus most in need of
296 urgent infection control measures.

297 This lack of evidence likely stems from both data limitations and remaining uncertainty about
298 the relative importance of precise paths of transmission (e.g. through direct person-to-person
299 contact; transient viral carriage on hands, garments or shared medical devices; stagnant air
300 in poorly ventilated spaces). Particularly early in the pandemic, nosocomial COVID-19 data
301 came primarily from contexts of emergency outbreak management rather than routine data
302 collection through stable surveillance systems. For future waves of SARS-CoV-2 and other
303 infectious diseases, the estimation of epidemiological parameters may be made easier by
304 harnessing large databases that systematically gather patient and HCW tests results,
305 administrative data and healthcare exposures across diverse healthcare facilities over time.

306 Researchers have faced significant challenges when developing SARS-CoV-2 transmission
307 models. First, data limitations, particularly early in the pandemic, forced many modelers to
308 make assumptions that oversimplify healthcare facility structure, population behaviour and
309 SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics, limiting the applicability of some results to real-world
310 settings. Second, the shifting epidemiological landscape – characterized not only by the
311 rapid spread of SARS-CoV-2, but also rapid change in population behaviours, sudden
312 resource shortages, consecutive changes in public health recommendations, rapid approval
313 of novel diagnostics, therapies and vaccines, and the successive emergence of distinct
314 variants of concern – required researchers to continually adapt their models in order to
315 remain useful, with relevant data required to parameterize these updates often lagging
316 behind.

317 Greater interdisciplinarity will be required to maximize the utility of mathematical modelling in
318 the future. More direct lines of contact between modelers, hospital infection control teams,

319 clinicians and decision-makers should guide modelers in their research. First, this may help
320 to steer studies towards the questions that are most clinically relevant, as informed by the
321 needs and issues faced in real clinical settings. Second, this may help modelers to evaluate
322 strategies that are feasible in practice, considering logistical constraints such as workforce or
323 equipment availability and hospital structure. Third, these discussions may inspire modelers
324 to account for outcomes beyond transmission risk and infection burden, such as cost-
325 effectiveness or mental health. Indeed, interventions such as visitor restrictions or staff re-
326 organization can have a great impact on the social isolation of patients or workload of
327 HCWs, which is difficult to take into account explicitly in mathematical models. Cost-
328 effectiveness is increasingly considered in modelling studies; for instance, several studies
329 have quantified the health-economic efficiency of frequent non-symptomatic testing
330 [12,24,38,39,45]. However, more frequent estimation of health-economic outcomes may
331 increase their usefulness for decision-makers, who must balance the competing priorities of
332 maximizing population health and minimizing monetary cost. Finally, increased
333 communication across disciplines may facilitate more timely sharing of modelling results to
334 those who may benefit from them most, including infection control teams and hospital
335 administrators. The use of social media and the surge in posting of articles on pre-print
336 repositories during the COVID-19 pandemic have helped to facilitate the timely sharing of
337 results, but there remains an onus on academic publishers to ensure a timely peer review
338 process so that modelling results are shared quickly enough to maximize their impact.

339 This review has several limitations. First, we chose to exclude all statistical, mathematical, or
340 computational models not including inter-individual SARS-CoV-2 transmission.
341 Consequently, other types of models such as physical or biomechanical models of airborne
342 transmission were excluded [76–78]. Second, we excluded articles posted on public archives
343 such as arXiv, medRxiv or biorXiv [79], which are not subject to peer review and can be
344 difficult to track. Although we did include some preprints in our review, we were unable to
345 systematically explore these archives. Third, we may have missed articles published in

346 journals not referenced in PubMed (e.g. computer science or mathematical journals).
347 However, since our focus was on epidemiological insights and public health
348 recommendations, we do not believe that this significantly impacted our main findings.

349 **Conclusion**

350 Often developed in the face of great epidemiological uncertainty, mathematical models have
351 come to form a rich evidence base describing how SARS-CoV-2 spreads in healthcare
352 settings and informing which nosocomial COVID-19 control strategies are optimal, in
353 particular with regards to healthcare reorganization and the allocation of limited supplies of
354 PPE, diagnostic testing and vaccines. Into the future, epidemiological models may continue
355 to inform control strategies for outbreaks of SARS-CoV-2 and other viral respiratory
356 pathogens, but increased collaboration should be sought between modelers, hospital
357 infection control teams, clinicians, and public health decision-makers to help maximize their
358 utility.

359 **Conflict of interest**

360 Authors report no conflict of interest.

361 **Funding**

362 This study received funding from the MODCOV project from the Fondation de France (Grant
363 106059) as part of the alliance framework “Tous unis contre le virus”, the Université Paris-
364 Saclay (AAP Covid-19 2020) and the French government through its National Research
365 Agency project SPHINX-17-CE36-0008-01 and the “Investissement d’Avenir” program,
366 Laboratoire d’Excellence “Integrative Biology of Emerging Infectious Diseases” (Grant ANR-
367 10-LABX-62- IBEID). The work was also supported directly by internal resources from the
368 French National Institute for Health and Medical Research (Inserm), Institut Pasteur, le
369 Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, and l’Université Versailles Saint-Quentin-en-
370 Yvelines/Université Paris-Saclay.

371 **Author contributions**

372 LO, LT, SK conceived the study, LO and LT acquired the funding. Screening of the articles
373 was performed by DRMS, SC, GS, SJ, KJ, LO and LT. Data extraction and analysis were
374 performed by DRMS, SC, GS, SJ, LO and LT. DRMS, SC and TP rendered figures and
375 statistics. All authors contributed to writing.

376 **References**

- 377 [1] Zhou Q, Gao Y, Wang X, Liu R, Du P, Wang X, et al. Nosocomial infections among
378 patients with COVID-19, SARS and MERS: a rapid review and meta-analysis. *Ann*
379 *Transl Med* 2020;8:629. <https://doi.org/10.21037/atm-20-3324>.
- 380 [2] Leclerc QJ, Fuller NM, Knight LE, CMMID COVID-19 Working Group, Funk S,
381 Knight GM. What settings have been linked to SARS-CoV-2 transmission clusters?
382 *Wellcome Open Res* 2020;5:83. <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15889.2>.
- 383 [3] Knight GM, Pham TM, Stimson J, Funk S, Jafari Y, Pople D, et al. The contribution
384 of hospital-acquired infections to the COVID-19 epidemic in England in the first half
385 of 2020. *BMC Infect Dis* 2022;22:556. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-022-07490-4>.
- 386 [4] Cooper B, Evans S, Jafari Y, Pham TM, Lim C, Pritchard M, et al. The burden and
387 dynamics of hospital-acquired SARS-CoV-2 in England. *Res Sq* 2021.
388 <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1098214/v1>.
- 389 [5] Iversen K, Bundgaard H, Hasselbalch RB, Kristensen JH, Nielsen PB, Pries-Heje M,
390 et al. Risk of COVID-19 in health-care workers in Denmark: an observational cohort
391 study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020;20:1401–8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30589-2)
392 [3099\(20\)30589-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30589-2).
- 393 [6] Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, Joshi AD, Guo C-G, Ma W, et al. Risk of
394 COVID-19 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a
395 prospective cohort study. *Lancet Public Health* 2020;5:e475–83.
396 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30164-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30164-X).
- 397 [7] ECDC Public Health Emergency Team, Danis K, Fonteneau L, Georges S, Daniau C,
398 Bernard-Stoecklin S, et al. High impact of COVID-19 in long-term care facilities,
399 suggestion for monitoring in the EU/EEA, May 2020. *Euro Surveill* 2020;25.
400 <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.22.2000956>.
- 401 [8] Zhang W, Liu S, Osgood N, Zhu H, Qian Y, Jia P. Using simulation modelling and
402 systems science to help contain COVID-19: A systematic review. *Syst Res Behav Sci*
403 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2897>.

- 404 [9] Opatowski L, Temime L. Contributions of modelling for the control of COVID-19
405 nosocomial transmission. *Anaesth Crit Care Pain Med* 2022;41:101054.
406 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accpm.2022.101054>.
- 407 [10] Page, McKenzie, Bossuyt, Boutron, Hoffmann, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA
408 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*
409 2021;372:n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>.
- 410 [11] Temime L, Gustin M-P, Duval A, Buetti N, Crépey P, Guillemot D, et al. A
411 conceptual discussion about the basic reproduction number of severe acute respiratory
412 syndrome coronavirus 2 in healthcare settings. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021;72:141–3.
413 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa682>.
- 414 [12] Evans S, Agnew E, Vynnycky E, Stimson J, Bhattacharya A, Rooney C, et al. The
415 impact of testing and infection prevention and control strategies on within-hospital
416 transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in English hospitals. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B*
417 *Biol Sci* 2021;376:20200268. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0268>.
- 418 [13] Shirreff G, Zahar J-R, Cauchemez S, Temime L, Opatowski L, EMEA-MESuRS
419 Working Group on the Nosocomial Modelling of SARS-CoV-2. Measuring Basic
420 Reproduction Number to Assess Effects of Nonpharmaceutical Interventions on
421 Nosocomial SARS-CoV-2 Transmission. *Emerging Infect Dis* 2022;28:1345–54.
422 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2807.212339>.
- 423 [14] Sanchez-Taltavull D, Castelo-Szekely V, Murugan S, Hamley JID, Rollenske T,
424 Ganal-Vonarburg SC, et al. Regular testing of asymptomatic healthcare workers
425 identifies cost-efficient SARS-CoV-2 preventive measures. *PLoS ONE*
426 2021;16:e0258700. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0258700>.
- 427 [15] Hüttel FB, Iversen A-M, Bo Hansen M, Kjær Ersbøll B, Ellermann-Eriksen S,
428 Lundtorp Olsen N. Analysis of social interactions and risk factors relevant to the
429 spread of infectious diseases at hospitals and nursing homes. *PLoS ONE*
430 2021;16:e0257684. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0257684>.
- 431 [16] Evans S, Stimson J, Pople D, Bhattacharya A, Hope R, White PJ, et al. Quantifying
432 the contribution of pathways of nosocomial acquisition of COVID-19 in English
433 hospitals. *Int J Epidemiol* 2022;51:393–403. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyab241>.
- 434 [17] Abbas M, Robalo Nunes T, Cori A, Cordey S, Laubscher F, Baggio S, et al.
435 Explosive nosocomial outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 in a rehabilitation clinic: the limits of
436 genomics for outbreak reconstruction. *J Hosp Infect* 2021;117:124–34.
437 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2021.07.013>.
- 438 [18] Lindsey BB, Villabona-Arenas ChJ, Campbell F, Keeley AJ, Parker MD, Shah DR, et
439 al. Characterising within-hospital SARS-CoV-2 transmission events: a retrospective
440 analysis integrating epidemiological and viral genomic data from a UK tertiary care
441 setting across two pandemic waves. *MedRxiv* 2021.
442 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.15.21260537>.

- 443 [19] Buitrago-Garcia D, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, Hossmann S, Imeri H, Ipekci AM, et
444 al. Occurrence and transmission potential of asymptomatic and presymptomatic
445 SARS-CoV-2 infections: A living systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med*
446 2020;17:e1003346. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003346>.
- 447 [20] Yanes-Lane M, Winters N, Fregonese F, Bastos M, Perlman-Arrow S, Campbell JR,
448 et al. Proportion of asymptomatic infection among COVID-19 positive persons and
449 their transmission potential: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE*
450 2020;15:e0241536. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0241536>.
- 451 [21] Chin ET, Huynh BQ, Chapman LAC, Murrill M, Basu S, Lo NC. Frequency of
452 Routine Testing for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in High-risk Healthcare
453 Environments to Reduce Outbreaks. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021;73:e3127–9.
454 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1383>.
- 455 [22] Huang Q, Mondal A, Jiang X, Horn MA, Fan F, Fu P, et al. SARS-CoV-2
456 transmission and control in a hospital setting: an individual-based modelling study. *R*
457 *Soc Open Sci* 2021;8:201895. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.201895>.
- 458 [23] Kahn R, Holmdahl I, Reddy S, Jernigan J, Mina MJ, Slayton RB. Mathematical
459 Modeling to Inform Vaccination Strategies and Testing Approaches for Coronavirus
460 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Nursing Homes. *Clin Infect Dis* 2022;74:597–603.
461 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab517>.
- 462 [24] Litwin T, Timmer J, Berger M, Wahl-Kordon A, Müller MJ, Kreutz C. Preventing
463 COVID-19 outbreaks through surveillance testing in healthcare facilities: a modelling
464 study. *BMC Infect Dis* 2022;22:105. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-022-07075-1>.
- 465 [25] Rosello A, Barnard RC, Smith DRM, Evans S, Grimm F, Davies NG, et al. Impact of
466 non-pharmaceutical interventions on SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks in English care homes: a
467 modelling study. *BMC Infect Dis* 2022;22:324. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-022-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-022-07268-8)
468 [07268-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-022-07268-8).
- 469 [26] Schmidt AJ, García Y, Pinheiro D, Reichert TA, Nuño M. Using Non-Pharmaceutical
470 Interventions and High Isolation of Asymptomatic Carriers to Contain the Spread of
471 SARS-CoV-2 in Nursing Homes. *Life (Basel)* 2022;12.
472 <https://doi.org/10.3390/life12020180>.
- 473 [27] Smith DRM, Duval A, Pouwels KB, Guillemot D, Fernandes J, Huynh B-T, et al.
474 Optimizing COVID-19 surveillance in long-term care facilities: a modelling study.
475 *BMC Med* 2020;18:386. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-020-01866-6>.
- 476 [28] Vilches TN, Nourbakhsh S, Zhang K, Juden-Kelly L, Cipriano LE, Langley JM, et al.
477 Multifaceted strategies for the control of COVID-19 outbreaks in long-term care
478 facilities in Ontario, Canada. *Prev Med* 2021;148:106564.
479 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2021.106564>.
- 480 [29] Baek YJ, Lee T, Cho Y, Hyun JH, Kim MH, Sohn Y, et al. A mathematical model of
481 COVID-19 transmission in a tertiary hospital and assessment of the effects of

- 482 different intervention strategies. PLoS ONE 2020;15:e0241169.
483 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0241169>.
- 484 [30] Tsoungui Obama HCJ, Adil Mahmoud Yousif N, Alawam Nemer L, Ngougoue
485 Ngougoue PM, Ngwa GA, Teboh-Ewungkem M, et al. Preventing COVID-19 spread
486 in closed facilities by regular testing of employees-An efficient intervention in long-
487 term care facilities and prisons? PLoS ONE 2021;16:e0249588.
488 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249588>.
- 489 [31] Gómez Vázquez JP, García YE, Schmidt AJ, Martínez-López B, Nuño M. Testing
490 and vaccination to reduce the impact of COVID-19 in nursing homes: an agent-based
491 approach. BMC Infect Dis 2022;22:477. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-022-07385-4>.
- 492 [32] Holmdahl I, Kahn R, Hay JA, Buckee CO, Mina MJ. Estimation of Transmission of
493 COVID-19 in Simulated Nursing Homes With Frequent Testing and Immunity-Based
494 Staffing. JAMA Netw Open 2021;4:e2110071.
495 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.10071>.
- 496 [33] Lasser J, Zuber J, Sorger J, Dervic E, Ledebur K, Lindner SD, et al. Agent-based
497 simulations for protecting nursing homes with prevention and vaccination strategies. J
498 R Soc Interface 2021;18:20210608. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2021.0608>.
- 499 [34] Love J, Wimmer MT, Toth DJA, Chandran A, Makhija D, Cooper CK, et al.
500 Comparison of antigen- and RT-PCR-based testing strategies for detection of SARS-
501 CoV-2 in two high-exposure settings. PLoS ONE 2021;16:e0253407.
502 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253407>.
- 503 [35] Lucia-Sanz A, Magalie A, Rodriguez-Gonzalez R, Leung C-Y, Weitz JS. Modeling
504 shield immunity to reduce COVID-19 transmission in long-term care facilities. Ann
505 Epidemiol 2023;77:44–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2022.10.013>.
- 506 [36] Martos DM, Parcell BJ, Eftimie R. Modelling the transmission of infectious diseases
507 inside hospital bays: implications for COVID-19. Math Biosci Eng 2020;17:8084–
508 104. <https://doi.org/10.3934/mbe.2020410>.
- 509 [37] Pham TM, Tahir H, van de Wijgert JHHM, Van der Roest BR, Ellerbroek P, Bonten
510 MJM, et al. Interventions to control nosocomial transmission of SARS-CoV-2: a
511 modelling study. BMC Med 2021;19:211. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-021-02060-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-021-02060-y)
512 [y](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-021-02060-y).
- 513 [38] See I, Paul P, Slayton RB, Steele MK, Stuckey MJ, Duca L, et al. Modeling
514 Effectiveness of Testing Strategies to Prevent Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)
515 in Nursing Homes-United States, 2020. Clin Infect Dis 2021;73:e792–8.
516 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab110>.
- 517 [39] Smith DRM, Duval A, Zahar JR, EMAE-MESuRS Working Group on Nosocomial
518 SARS-CoV-2 Modelling, Opatowski L, Temime L. Rapid antigen testing as a reactive
519 response to surges in nosocomial SARS-CoV-2 outbreak risk. Nat Commun
520 2022;13:236. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-27845-w>.

- 521 [40] Zhang Y, Cheng S-R. Evaluating the Need for Routine COVID-19 Testing of
522 Emergency Department Staff: Quantitative Analysis. *JMIR Public Health Surveill*
523 2020;6:e20260. <https://doi.org/10.2196/20260>.
- 524 [41] Ding Y, Agrawal SK, Cao J, Meyers L, Hasenbein JJ. Surveillance Testing for Rapid
525 Detection of Outbreaks in Facilities. *ArXiv* 2021.
526 <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2110.00170>.
- 527 [42] Yuval J, Nitzan M, Tannenbaum NR, Barak B. Optimizing testing policies for
528 detecting COVID-19 outbreaks. *ArXiv* 2020.
- 529 [43] Nguyen LKN, Howick S, McLafferty D, Anderson GH, Pravinkumar SJ, Van Der
530 Meer R, et al. Evaluating intervention strategies in controlling coronavirus disease
531 2019 (COVID-19) spread in care homes: An agent-based model. *Infect Control Hosp*
532 *Epidemiol* 2021;42:1060–70. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2020.1369>.
- 533 [44] Kendall EA, Arinaminpathy N, Sacks JA, Manabe YC, Dittrich S, Schumacher SG, et
534 al. Antigen-based Rapid Diagnostic Testing or Alternatives for Diagnosis of
535 Symptomatic COVID-19: A Simulation-based Net Benefit Analysis. *Epidemiology*
536 2021;32:811–9. <https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0000000000001400>.
- 537 [45] Stevenson M, Metry A, Messenger M. Modelling of hypothetical SARS-CoV-2
538 point-of-care tests on admission to hospital from A&E: rapid cost-effectiveness
539 analysis. *Health Technol Assess* 2021;25:1–68. <https://doi.org/10.3310/hta25210>.
- 540 [46] Stevenson M, Metry A, Messenger M. Modelling of hypothetical SARS-CoV-2 point
541 of care tests for routine testing in residential care homes: rapid cost-effectiveness
542 analysis. *Health Technol Assess* 2021;25:1–74. <https://doi.org/10.3310/hta25390>.
- 543 [47] Wilmlink G, Summer I, Marsyla D, Sukhu S, Grote J, Zobel G, et al. Real-Time
544 Digital Contact Tracing: Development of a System to Control COVID-19 Outbreaks
545 in Nursing Homes and Long-Term Care Facilities. *JMIR Public Health Surveill*
546 2020;6:e20828. <https://doi.org/10.2196/20828>.
- 547 [48] Qiu X, Miller JC, MacFadden DR, Hanage WP. Evaluating the contributions of
548 strategies to prevent SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the healthcare setting: a modelling
549 study. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e044644. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-044644>.
- 550 [49] Jang H, Polgreen PM, Segre AM, Pemmaraju SV. COVID-19 modeling and non-
551 pharmaceutical interventions in an outpatient dialysis unit. *PLoS Comput Biol*
552 2021;17:e1009177. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009177>.
- 553 [50] Procter SR, Abbas K, Flasche S, Griffiths U, Hagedorn B, O'Reilly KM, et al. SARS-
554 CoV-2 infection risk during delivery of childhood vaccination campaigns: a modelling
555 study. *BMC Med* 2021;19:198. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-021-02072-8>.
- 556 [51] Dy LF, Rabajante JF. A COVID-19 infection risk model for frontline health care
557 workers. *Netw Model Anal Health Inform Bioinform* 2020;9:57.
558 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13721-020-00258-3>.

- 559 [52] Love J, Keegan LT, Angulo FJ, McLaughlin JM, Shea KM, Swerdlow DL, et al.
560 Continued need for non-pharmaceutical interventions after COVID-19 vaccination in
561 long-term-care facilities. *Sci Rep* 2021;11:18093. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-97612-w)
562 97612-w.
- 563 [53] Nguyen LKN, Megiddo I, Howick S. Hybrid simulation modelling of networks of
564 heterogeneous care homes and the inter-facility spread of Covid-19 by sharing staff.
565 *PLoS Comput Biol* 2022;18:e1009780. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009780>.
- 566 [54] Nguyen LKN, Howick S, McLafferty D, Anderson GH, Pravinkumar SJ, Van Der
567 Meer R, et al. Impact of visitation and cohorting policies to shield residents from
568 covid-19 spread in care homes: an agent-based model. *Am J Infect Control*
569 2021;49:1105–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2021.07.001>.
- 570 [55] Oodally A, Hammami P, Reilhac A, Guérineau de Lamérie G, Opatowski L, Temime
571 L. Hospital-level work organization drives the spread of SARS-CoV-2 within
572 hospitals: insights from a multi-ward model. *MedRxiv* 2021.
573 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.09.21262609>.
- 574 [56] Saurabh S, Kumar R, Kumar N, Bhardwaj P, Nag VL, Garg MK, et al. Dynamics of
575 SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Among Indian Nationals Evacuated From Iran. *Disaster*
576 *Med Public Health Prep* 2022;16:627–33. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dmp.2020.393>.
- 577 [57] Tofighi M, Asgary A, Merchant AA, Shafiee MA, Najafabadi MM, Nadri N, et al.
578 Modelling COVID-19 transmission in a hemodialysis centre using simulation
579 generated contacts matrices. *PLoS ONE* 2021;16:e0259970.
580 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0259970>.
- 581 [58] Cardinal RN, Meiser-Stedman CE, Christmas DM, Price AC, Denman C, Underwood
582 BR, et al. Simulating a Community Mental Health Service During the COVID-19
583 Pandemic: Effects of Clinician-Clinician Encounters, Clinician-Patient-Family
584 Encounters, Symptom-Triggered Protective Behaviour, and Household Clustering.
585 *Front Psychiatry* 2021;12:620842. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2021.620842>.
- 586 [59] Sánchez-Taltavull D, Castelo-Szekely V, Candinas D, Roldán E, Beldi G. Modelling
587 strategies to organize healthcare workforce during pandemics: Application to COVID-
588 19. *J Theor Biol* 2021;523:110718. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2021.110718>.
- 589 [60] Cheng T, Liu J, Liu Y, Zhang X, Gao X. Measures to prevent nosocomial
590 transmissions of COVID-19 based on interpersonal contact data. *Prim Health Care*
591 *Res Dev* 2022;23:e4. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1463423621000852>.
- 592 [61] Kluger DM, Aizenbud Y, Jaffe A, Parisi F, Aizenbud L, Minsky-Fenick E, et al.
593 Impact of healthcare worker shift scheduling on workforce preservation during the
594 COVID-19 pandemic. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2020;41:1443–5.
595 <https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2020.337>.
- 596 [62] Jijón S, Al Shafie A, Hassan E, EMAE-MESuRS working group on nosocomial
597 SARS-CoV-2 modeling, Temime L, Jean K, et al. Estimating the risk of incident
598 SARS-CoV-2 infection among healthcare workers in quarantine hospitals: the

- 599 Egyptian example. *Sci Rep* 2022;12:19773. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-23428-x)
600 23428-x.
- 601 [63] Bosbach WA, Heinrich M, Kolisch R, Heiss C. Maximization of Open Hospital
602 Capacity under Shortage of SARS-CoV-2 Vaccines-An Open Access, Stochastic
603 Simulation Tool. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2021;9. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9060546>.
- 604 [64] Fosdick BK, Bayham J, Dillio J, Ebel GD, Ehrhart N. Model-based evaluation of
605 policy impacts and the continued COVID-19 risk at long term care facilities. *Infect*
606 *Dis Model* 2022;7:463–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idm.2022.07.003>.
- 607 [65] Holmdahl I, Kahn R, Slifka KJ, Dooling K, Slayton RB. Modeling the impact of
608 vaccination strategies for nursing homes in the context of increased severe acute
609 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 community transmission and variants. *Clin Infect*
610 *Dis* 2022;75:e880–3. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciac062>.
- 611 [66] Blumberg S, Lu P, Kwan AT, Hoover CM, Lloyd-Smith JO, Sears D, et al. Modeling
612 scenarios for mitigating outbreaks in congregate settings. *PLoS Comput Biol*
613 2022;18:e1010308. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1010308>.
- 614 [67] Liu T, Bai Y, Du M, Gao Y, Liu Y. Susceptible-Infected-Removed Mathematical
615 Model under Deep Learning in Hospital Infection Control of Novel Coronavirus
616 Pneumonia. *J Healthc Eng* 2021;2021:1535046.
617 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/1535046>.
- 618 [68] Boulware DR, Pullen MF, Bangdiwala AS, Pastick KA, Lofgren SM, Okafor EC, et
619 al. A Randomized Trial of Hydroxychloroquine as Postexposure Prophylaxis for
620 Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:517–25. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2016638>.
- 621 [69] Simonovich VA, Burgos Pratz LD, Scibona P, Beruto MV, Vallone MG, Vázquez C,
622 et al. A Randomized Trial of Convalescent Plasma in Covid-19 Severe Pneumonia. *N*
623 *Engl J Med* 2021;384:619–29. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2031304>.
- 624 [70] Abella BS, Jolkovsky EL, Biney BT, Uspal JE, Hyman MC, Frank I, et al. Efficacy
625 and Safety of Hydroxychloroquine vs Placebo for Pre-exposure SARS-CoV-2
626 Prophylaxis Among Health Care Workers: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*
627 *Intern Med* 2021;181:195–202. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.6319>.
- 628 [71] Abarca K, Iturriaga C, Urzúa M, Le Corre N, Pineda A, Fernández C, et al. Safety
629 and Non-Inferiority Evaluation of Two Immunization Schedules with an Inactivated
630 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine in Adults: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Vaccines (Basel)*
631 2022;10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines10071082>.
- 632 [72] Jafari Y, Yin M, Lim C, Pople D, Evans S, Stimson J, et al. Effectiveness of infection
633 prevention and control interventions, excluding personal protective equipment, to
634 prevent nosocomial transmission of SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review and call for
635 action. *Infection Prevention in Practice* 2022;4:100192.
636 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infpip.2021.100192>.

- 637 [73] Chou R, Dana T, Jungbauer R, Weeks C, McDonagh MS. Masks for Prevention of
638 Respiratory Virus Infections, Including SARS-CoV-2, in Health Care and Community
639 Settings: A Living Rapid Review. *Ann Intern Med* 2020;173:542–55.
640 <https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-3213>.
- 641 [74] Ferris M, Ferris R, Workman C, O'Connor E, Enoch DA, Goldesgeyme E, et al.
642 Efficacy of FFP3 respirators for prevention of SARS-CoV-2 infection in healthcare
643 workers. *ELife* 2021;10. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.71131>.
- 644 [75] Du Z, Liu C, Wang C, Xu L, Xu M, Wang L, et al. Reproduction Numbers of Severe
645 Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Variants: A Systematic
646 Review and Meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis* 2022;75:e293–5.
647 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciac137>.
- 648 [76] Zhou Y, Ji S. Experimental and numerical study on the transport of droplet aerosols
649 generated by occupants in a fever clinic. *Build Environ* 2021;187:107402.
650 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.107402>.
- 651 [77] Prajapati S, Mehta N, Chharia A, Upadhyay Y. Computational fluid dynamics-based
652 disease transmission modeling of SARS-CoV-2 Intensive Care Unit. *Mater Today*
653 *Proc* 2022;56:2967–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2021.11.013>.
- 654 [78] Saw LH, Leo BF, Nor NSM, Yip CW, Ibrahim N, Hamid HHA, et al. Modeling
655 aerosol transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from human-exhaled particles in a hospital
656 ward. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int* 2021;28:53478–92. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-14519-9>.
- 658 [79] Fraser N, Brierley L, Dey G, Polka JK, Pálffy M, Nanni F, et al. The evolving role of
659 preprints in the dissemination of COVID-19 research and their impact on the science
660 communication landscape. *PLoS Biol* 2021;19:e3000959.
661 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000959>.

662

663 **Figure captions:**


664 ***Box 1: Mathematical models of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in health care settings***

665 ***Figure 1: Characteristics of identified models of SARS-CoV-2 transmission within***
666 ***healthcare settings.*** (A) Cumulative number of modelling studies made accessible per
667 month since March 2020, stratified by primary focus(es) addressed. The date used is the
668 date of first publication, either on a public archive or in a journal. Studies addressing several
669 subjects are counted several times. (B) Geographical distribution of countries on which the
670 modelling is focused. (C) Distribution of modelled healthcare settings per studied country.

671 (D) Distribution of addressed subjects, depending on the type of healthcare setting. Studies

672 addressing several subjects are counted several times.

673



Mathematical models are theoretical constructs that mechanistically formalize the dynamic processes underlying SARS-CoV-2 transmission. A typical model splits the individuals present in a healthcare facility into sub-populations, including one or more categories of patients (or residents) and HCWs. Mathematical or statistical tools are used to describe the natural history of infection through the definition of different infection states or “compartments”. For instance, in the specific case of SARS-CoV-2, which is characterized by an incubation period subsequent to exposure and the acquisition of (partial) immunity after infection, the main compartments considered are: Susceptible to infection (S), Exposed to infection or incubating (E), Infectious (I), and Recovered or immunized (R). As a large share of infectious individuals may be asymptomatic, the I compartment is often subdivided into asymptomatic (IA) and symptomatic (IS) compartments. Various other sources of heterogeneity may also be considered, including different levels of viral shedding among infectious individuals, or different trajectories of care among symptomatic individuals (e.g., isolation, mechanical ventilation, admission to intensive care, death). Specific contact patterns between individuals of different sub-populations and infection statuses can further be accounted for through the definition of contact matrices.

Compartmental models are most frequent, but agent-based models (also known as individual-based models) are another common formalism, in which each unique individual in the population is explicitly modelled. This enables more detailed integration of heterogeneity in contact patterns, disease progression, transmission risk and other epidemiological processes. Models can further be categorized as either deterministic or stochastic. In deterministic models, there is no randomness in epidemiological processes, and a particular set of initial conditions always results in identical outbreaks. By contrast, in stochastic models, it is possible to account for randomness in the parameters or processes included, resulting in different outbreak trajectories each time the model is run. Stochasticity is particularly relevant in models of healthcare settings, where population sizes are small and randomness can have a strong impact on outbreak dynamics.

Models are used for a variety of purposes. They are widely used to simulate virus transmission in specific settings and populations, allowing for the quantification of virus burden in particular epidemiological scenarios (e.g. after the introduction of a novel SARS-CoV-2 variant into a hospital via newly admitted patients, short-stay visitors, or members of staff infected in the community). Models are also used to enable the *in silico* assessment of public health interventions through the mechanistic implementation of interventions (e.g. testing, isolation, PPE provisioning, contact restrictions, vaccine deployment). Intervention impact can then be evaluated by simulating counterfactual outbreaks with and without the intervention in place. Finally, models are key to analysing reported data from real outbreaks (e.g. time series data, individual line lists of SARS-CoV-2 cases), accounting not only for unobserved processes (e.g., virus transmission) but also incomplete infection data, whether due to the presence of asymptomatic infections, imperfect reporting, or limited surveillance capacity. This allows for the retrospective assessment of true disease burden from a given outbreak (e.g., cumulative infection incidence) as well as estimation of important epidemiological parameters such as R_0 , the basic reproduction number, which describes the average number of secondary cases caused by an index case in an immunologically naïve population. R_0 is particularly helpful to understand the epidemic potential of an emerging pathogen, though its value may vary across distinct sub-populations and settings, such as particular groups of patients and HCWs in particular healthcare facilities.

