Figure 1: Scope of infectious disease warning and response systems

* *Reactive/passive warnings: 80%, 52/65 warning and response systems.*
* *Anticipatory warnings: 9%, 6/65 warning and response systems.*
* *Prevention-centred warnings: 6%, 4/65 warning and response systems.*
* *Preparedness-centred warnings: 5%, 3/65 warning and response systems.*

Figure 2: Components involved in responding to emerging infectious diseases, a simplified analysis of the current status quo.

**Primary focus of infectious diseases strategies, warning, and response systems.**

**Secondary focus as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic.**

**Missing links to strategies focused on prevention.**

Figure 3: Schematic representation of the contrast between ecological (left) and biomedical individualist (right) conceptual frameworks for understanding the origins of SARS-CoV-2 and other zoonoses. Figure from Kenyon et al. paper (2020).

Figure 4a: Linking Theory and Practice - Adaptation from Olson et al. figure 1, graph A, from paper ‘Drivers for emerging infectious diseases as a framework for Digital Detection’.

Figure 4b: Linking Theory and Practice - Adaptation from Olson et al. figure 1, graph C from paper ‘Drivers for emerging infectious diseases as a framework for Digital Detection’.