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The economy-wide impact of pandemic influenza on the UK: a computable general equilibrium modelling experiment
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ABSTRACT

Objectives To estimate the potential economic impact of pandemic influenza, associated behavioural responses, school closures, and vaccination on the United Kingdom.

Design A computable general equilibrium model of the UK economy was specified for various combinations of mortality and morbidity from pandemic influenza, vaccine efficacy, school closures, and prophylactic absenteeism using published data.

Setting The 2004 UK economy (the most up to date available with suitable economic data).

Main outcome measures The economic impact of various scenarios with different pandemic severity, vaccination, school closure, and prophylactic absenteeism specified in terms of gross domestic product, output from different economic sectors, and equivalent variation.

Results The costs related to illness alone ranged between £0.5bn and £1.0bn of gross domestic product (£8.4bn to £16.8bn) for low fatality scenarios, 3.3% and 4.3% (£55.5bn to £72.3bn) for high fatality scenarios, and larger still for an extreme pandemic. School closure increases the economic impact, particularly for mild pandemics. If widespread behavioural change takes place and there is large scale prophylactic absence from work, the economic impact would be notably increased with few health benefits. Vaccination with a pre-pandemic vaccine could save 0.13% to 2.3% of gross domestic product (£2.2bn to £38.6bn); a single dose of a matched vaccine could save 0.3% to 4.3% (£5.0bn to £72.3bn); and two doses of a matched vaccine could limit the overall economic impact to about 1% of gross domestic product for all disease scenarios.

Conclusion Balancing school closure against “business as usual” and obtaining sufficient stocks of effective vaccine are more important factors in determining the economic impact of an influenza pandemic than is the disease itself. Prophylactic absence from work in response to fear of infection can add considerably to the economic impact.

INTRODUCTION

In the past century there were three major influenza pandemics (1918, 1957, and 1968-9). This century has seen an outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome (2003), H1N1 subtype of the influenza A virus (2009), and sporadic outbreaks of H5N1 influenza subtype. In addition to the direct health impacts of a serious outbreak, we should be concerned about the economic impact; especially at a time of global recession. Preparedness planning for a pandemic must therefore balance two key policy strands—maintaining “business as usual” to minimise the economic impact of a pandemic, and encouraging “social distancing” to minimise the health related impact of a pandemic—as well as using resources such as antivirals and vaccinations.

This paper considers the tension inherent in these two policy strands. It provides evidence of the economy-wide impact of each approach, as well as the impact that vaccine development may have in reconciling the two objectives of minimising both the health and economic effects of a pandemic. A key consideration in this analysis is the role of public perception and confidence, expressed by “prophylactic absenteeism,” where healthy people avoid social contact, including going to work. This response is likely to emerge at higher case fatality rates and to be moderated by the availability of effective vaccines (the current strain of H1N1 influenza seems to be highly infectious but not very deadly, and this may explain its limited economic impact to date).

METHODS

The analysis is based on a computable general equilibrium model of the UK over one year. The economy is specified in terms of several agents, including household, producers, and government, and based on data (in the form of a social accounting matrix, which represents income and expenditure in the economy by sector) for 2004 taken from the Global Trade Analysis Database and national statistics. Computable general equilibrium modelling is described in further detail by Dervis et al.
when people are kept away from the workplace to avoid infection or (b) by increasing labour supply compared with non-mitigated pandemic scenarios by reducing the number of infections and deaths and reducing the extent to which people feel the need to engage in prophylactic absenteeism.

Pandemic impact

Pandemic planning documents anticipate clinical attack rates between 25% and 35%, with a maximum of 50%. We therefore use these three values in our disease scenarios. Based on previous pandemics, predicted case fatality rates for the UK range from 0.2% to 2.5%, and the summary estimate for European pandemic preparedness plans is 0.37%. We used 0.4% as our base disease scenario and 2.3% for our severe scenario, with an extreme scenario of 10% based on severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS). We therefore have nine possible combinations of clinical attack rate and case fatality rate.

While deaths permanently remove labour from the workforce, absenteeism represents temporary removal. Illness absence will result in subsequent immunity to the virus, whereas those undertaking prophylactic absenteeism will still be vulnerable to infection. The Commission of the European Communities suggests that the duration of pandemic influenza illness is five to eight working days, and absence for seasonal flu is approximately five days. We therefore assume five days of illness for our mild scenario, seven days for severe, and 22 days for the extreme scenario, which is based on hospitalisation rates for SARS. All absences are estimated as a percentage of time lost from a working year of 220 days.

Pandemic mitigation: vaccination

Although the US recently announced that it expects to go from vaccine trial to mass vaccination within two months, and the UK has signed agreements (with GSK and Baxter) to purchase 132 million doses of pandemic-specific vaccine, specific vaccines are unlikely to be available for the first wave of infection. During this stage, pre-pandemic vaccines, based on existing virus strains, will be the only option for protection, giving approximately 20% efficacy and, when combined with other clinical countermeasures, reducing the pandemic’s impact to that of seasonal influenza. Once matched vaccines become available they are likely to have 70-80% efficacy, probably requiring two doses at an interval of three weeks. Vaccine shelf life is currently about one year.

We assumed two vaccination strategies—a pre-pandemic vaccine with 20% efficacy and a matched vaccine with 40% efficacy (single dose) and 80% efficacy (double dose). For all vaccines we assumed sufficient stocks for 60% coverage. Vaccination would have two potential impacts on a pandemic, reducing the number of infected individuals and moderating the extent of prophylactic absenteeism because people feel protected from infection.

Pandemic mitigation: school closure

School closures are believed to reduce the impact of the pandemic, since infection rates among children are high, and this is mentioned in many pandemic planning documents. Although we witnessed closure at the early stages of the H1N1 influenza pandemic, it has been suggested that closure later, when the epidemic is better established, will be more effective in delaying spread, but also inevitable if large sectors of the population adopt prophylactic absenteeism in the face of increasing reports of deaths. It is therefore important to distinguish between school closure as a reactive policy to a pandemic and school closure associated with prophylactic absenteeism.

Ferguson et al suggest that reactive school closure will result in closure for 95% of the 15 weeks of the pandemic, regardless of how often they reopen (duration of school closure associated with prophylactic absenteeism cannot, of course, be known). Previous studies have assumed school closure at the four week peak of the pandemic, allowing for some variation around the two or three week disease peak cited in the Department of Health’s pandemic plan. Any school closure policy will result in disruption for working parents and, based on peak pandemic duration and Ferguson’s estimates, we present scenarios with four weeks and 14.25 weeks of school closure. We also consider the mitigation impact of school closure, which is estimated as 2% for a 34% clinical attack rate in the Ferguson paper and up to a maximum of between

---

**Glossary of terms**

**Computable general equilibrium model**—A mathematical model of the whole economy that includes the cost minimising and profit maximising behaviour of producers, the consumption and saving behaviour of households and government, taxation mechanisms, and the use of labour, capital, and other factors in order to produce goods for investment or consumption. The model produces a benchmark solution which is then compared with alternative solutions incorporating policy change or other events simulated by the model. Counterfactual solutions can be compared with the benchmark solution to estimate the economic impact of the simulated policy or event.

**Social accounting matrix**—A matrix that represents the balanced income and expenditure flows of a regional, national, or global economy aggregated to make them a manageable size for use in a computable general equilibrium model. (The matrix rows represent income to the economy and the columns represent expenditure.)

**Global trade model**—A computable general equilibrium model of the global economy.

**Prophylactic absenteeism**—Absence from work of a healthy individual in order to avoid infection.

**Clinical attack rate**—The percentage of individuals in a population who become infected.

**Case fatality rate**—The percentage of infected individuals who die.

**Mortality rate**—Percentage of individuals in a total population who die (clinical attack rate × case fatality rate).

**Reactive school closure**—Government closure of a school to reduce infection when a (government defined) proportion of children or staff is experiencing illness.

**School closure associated with prophylactic absenteeism**—Closure of schools caused by the amount of prophylactic absence by staff.

**Transition point**—The point at which the severity of the pandemic provokes sufficient fear to invoke a sudden increase in prophylactic absenteeism within the population.
duration when their informal caregiver is ill.
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RESULTS

Model of economic impact of pandemic influenza

The accuracy of these results is subject to the scenarios

we have outlined, the model specification, and the eco-

nomic data from 2004 underlying the model. Figure 1

shows the impact of various disease and mitigation sce-

narios on gross domestic product: disease only (with

no mitigation), disease with four weeks of school clo-

sure, disease with pre-pandemic vaccine, disease with

matched vaccine (single dose), and disease with

matched vaccine (double dose). Each scenario is

plotted for low, medium, and high clinical attack rate

(25%, 35%, and 50%) and low, high, and extreme case

fatality rates (0.4%, 2.5%, and 10%), although both

rates are adjusted to allow for mitigation effects in the

mitigation scenarios.

Low case fatality rate

The first three histogram bars show the impact of a low

case fatality rate, in which variations in clinical attack

rate have little impact (loss of 0.51-1.02% of gross

domestic product). However, the impact of four

weeks of school closure is large, doubling or even tri-

pling the impact of the disease alone. The results also

show that in a low fatality pandemic a pre-pandemic
A vaccine might result in savings of 0.13-0.26% of gross domestic product, and a matched vaccine could result in savings of 0.26-0.51% for a single dose and 0.49-0.96% for a double dose. The transition point of prophylactic absenteeism is not reached in any of the scenarios with a low case fatality rate.

High case fatality rate

With a high case fatality rate, however, the transition point is reached (mortality rate becomes similar to that of the 1918 pandemic), so that individual change in behaviour to avoid infection yields large impacts of 3.3%, 3.7%, and 4.3% of gross domestic product for the low, medium, and high infection rates, respectively—emphasising that the mortality rate can, in such circumstances, be a more important determinant of economic impact than the infection rate.

The introduction of school closures in high fatality scenarios has less impact than in low fatality scenarios, with an additional impact of 0.75-0.8% of gross domestic product. A pre-pandemic vaccine would be insufficient to avoid the transition point in a high fatality pandemic and so would reduce the impact on gross domestic product by only 0.33-0.64%. A matched vaccine, even if only single dose, would have sufficient effect to avoid the transition point and could therefore result in savings of 2.6-3.2% of gross domestic product (roughly equivalent to half of the impact of the financial crisis over the past year (www.statistics.gov.uk/instantfigures.asp)). Two doses of a matched vaccine are likely to reduce the impact further, yielding savings of 3-4%.

**Extreme case fatality rate**

The extreme fatality scenarios predictably yield the largest impacts. Our assumptions dictate that for such a serious pandemic the transition point would be passed, and the low, medium, and high infection scenarios yield reductions in gross domestic product of 6.0%, 7.4%, and 9.6%, respectively. School closure increases this impact by 0.63-0.77%, which is smaller than for the less severe scenarios as the mitigation impact of school closure reduces the severity of the disease. Pre-pandemic vaccine has some effect on reducing the impact of the
school closure scenarios by 1.2-2.3%, and a single dose of matched vaccine yields slightly larger savings of 2.2-4.3%. The matched vaccine with two doses is the only mitigation strategy that avoids the transition to prophylactic absenteeism in the extreme fatality scenarios, reducing the overall impact of the pandemic to 1.1-1.2% of gross domestic product (much less than the impact of the current financial crisis).

**Alternative scenarios**

Alternatives to these scenarios have also been modelled but are not reported in detail here. In brief, schools closing for about 95% of the 15 weeks of the pandemic’s duration and assuming a mitigation equivalent to 2% if the clinical attack rate was 34%, as outlined by Ferguson et al,9 produces a 2.5% further reduction in gross domestic product compared with our four week closure scenarios; it reduces the infection rates, but the dominance of the case fatality rate in determining the transition point is such that the degree of prophylactic absenteeism remains the same.

Similarly, informal care by grandparents and friends, reducing the level of prophylactic absenteeism from 16.1% to 8.7%,20 reduces the loss to gross domestic product by 0.56-0.58% in the four week school closure scenarios and by 1.8-2.0% in the longer closure scenario. Assuming the higher mitigation rate of 13% suggested by Cauchemez et al,36 which would apply to longer school closure scenarios, the severity of the economic impact of school closures is reduced in proportion to the severity of the pandemic. This reduction is quite small—up to 0.25% of gross domestic product for non-extreme scenarios and up to 0.9% of gross domestic product in the most extreme and unmitigated scenario—so overall reductions in gross domestic product are still between 1% and 2% larger than with the four week school closure scenarios. School closure’s failure to mitigate the impact of the disease despite the assumption of its efficacy is due to the large amount of absenteeism induced by school closures, which, in our model, is not affected by the clinical attack rate.

Additional scenarios relating to the swine flu pandemic and alternative vaccine efficacy assumptions are included in an online appendix.

**DISCUSSION**

Our results show that, depending on the disease severity, pandemic influenza alone could reduce gross domestic product by 0.5-4.3%. Extending fatality rates beyond those observed in previous pandemics to a SARS-like case fatality rate of 10% yields an impact of 5.9-9.6% of gross domestic product (£99.2bn to £161.5bn). School closure, and its related absenteeism, causes a notable increase in economic loss, and caution
If increased fear caused by deaths within an individual’s social network provokes prophylactic absence from work, large economic loss could result

The strength of our findings depends on the underlying assumptions which, though based on published evidence where possible, are subject to the bias of surveys, the unpredictability of the disease and its resultant impact on policies and behavioural change. We included estimates of school closure and prophylactic absence, but their true values in the middle of a pandemic could vary widely. However, this paper extends previous work by using the best available estimates to approximate the impact of social networks on behavioural change, considering various lengths of school closure, their feedback effects on the pandemic, and the impact of informal care both in mitigating absenteeism due to school closure and in causing absenteeism by parents when informal carers are unavailable, as well as considering the impact of various vaccination strategies on disease and behaviour change.

Conclusion
Pandemic influenza itself, if it occurs within the bounds of severity outlined in pandemic plans, will not yield unprecedented economic impacts: even a high fatality pandemic with high levels of infection would reduce gross domestic product by less than 4.5%. However, two factors will compound the disease’s impact. Firstly, a pandemic in the near future would impose additional strain on an economy that is already stretched by recession, exaggerating the effect of recession and slowing economic recovery. Secondly, although the direct economic impact of disease is relatively small, school closures and prophylactic absenteeism, whether imposed by government or the result of fear of infection in the population, could greatly increase the economic impact.

In the event of a mild pandemic, long periods of school closures will not be necessary and could greatly multiply the economic impact of the disease and should therefore be minimised. In more serious pandemics, the relative economic impact of school closures decreases and the gains from school closure in mitigating the pandemic increase, so a policy of school closure should take into account the severity of the disease. However, such a policy should be limited in its duration—sufficient to maximise the lowering of peak disease levels and maintain a functioning health service, but allowing schools to open at other times. In an extreme pandemic, the relative incremental cost of school closure is small and should not influence policies that would minimise deaths.

Our “transition point” estimates provide an example of how fear induced behavioural change could greatly increase the economic impact of a pandemic while providing questionable health gains. We suggest that the overall mortality rate is the driver of this behavioural change, and vaccinations, whether pre-pandemic or matched vaccine, could be extremely important in preventing mortality rates from reaching the “transition point.” The cost of vaccinations is likely to be less than the economic savings gained from vaccination, even in the mildest of pandemics, and in the event of a high or extreme fatality pandemic a matched vaccine...
might be the only method to avoid the unprecedented economic effects of behavioural change.
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