

ACCEPTED VERSION

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Jessica Stanhope, Philip Weinstein

Travel restrictions and evidence-based decision making for novel epidemics

Medical Journal of Australia, 2020; 213(9):431-431.e1

© 2020 AMPCo Pty Ltd

which has been published in final form at

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5694/mja2.50803>

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

PERMISSIONS

<https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/Journal-Authors/licensing/self-archiving.html>

Wiley's Self-Archiving Policy

Accepted (peer-reviewed) Version

The accepted version of an article is the version that incorporates all amendments made during the peer review process, but prior to the final published version (the Version of Record, which includes; copy and stylistic edits, online and print formatting, citation and other linking, deposit in abstracting and indexing services, and the addition of bibliographic and other material.

Self-archiving of the accepted version is subject to an embargo period of 12-24 months. The standard embargo period is 12 months for scientific, technical, medical, and psychology (STM) journals and 24 months for social science and humanities (SSH) journals following publication of the final article. Use our [Author Compliance Tool](#) to check the embargo period for individual journals or check their copyright policy on [Wiley Online Library](#).

The accepted version may be placed on:

- the author's personal website
- the author's company/institutional repository or archive
- not for profit subject-based repositories such as PubMed Central

Articles may be deposited into repositories on acceptance, but access to the article is subject to the embargo period.

The version posted must include the following notice on the first page:

"This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: [FULL CITE], which has been published in final form at [Link to final article using the DOI]. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions."

The version posted may not be updated or replaced with the final published version (the Version of Record). Authors may transmit, print and share copies of the accepted version with colleagues, provided that there is no systematic distribution, e.g. a posting on a listserve, network or automated delivery.

There is no obligation upon authors to remove preprints posted to not for profit preprint servers prior to submission.

17 November 2021

<http://hdl.handle.net/2440/129329>

Travel restrictions and evidence-based decision making for novel epidemics

Travel restrictions to control severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), the virus that causes coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) were rapidly implemented in Australia. Despite its apparent efficacy, this proactive approach has been criticised as unscientific, and in breach of International Health Regulations (IHRs). Habibi et al.¹ claim that travel restrictions were implemented without supporting scientific evidence, and had “been challenged by public health researchers”, citing research on Ebola and influenza. Their interpretation is not consistent with an evidence-based approach. When managing a novel infection, evidence-based decision making should (1) use the best available *relevant* information which is generalisable to the novel infection (e.g. an infection with a similar route of transmission, i.e. not Ebola, but rather severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus (SARS-CoV), influenza, and Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome (MERS)), and (2) clearly define the outcome of interest (e.g. prevention versus delay). A recent review² of travel restrictions for emerging infectious diseases (including SARS-CoV and MERS) identified only one study regarding coronaviruses. The evidence identified supports the use of air travel bans to prevent the spread of coronavirus epidemics.² Furthermore, evidence from systematic reviews³⁻⁵ (including the review⁴ cited by Habibi et al.¹), have reported that travel restrictions delayed, but did not prevent, the spread of influenza;^{3,4} these, delays were up to four months,⁴ and up to 10 months if implemented in combination with other local strategies.⁵ At the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, this reflected the best available evidence to make evidence-based decisions regarding travel restrictions. The evidence suggests that travel restrictions may, therefore, be used to *delay and attenuate* the peak in case numbers to minimise peak stresses on the health system, allowing for preparations to be made to better manage the outbreak, which may include upskilling the health professional workforce, building new facilities, improving access to laboratory testing and ventilators, and stockpiling

personal protective equipment). This is the primary goal of travel restrictions as public health interventions. We conclude that Australia's rapid introduction of travel restrictions is consistent with an evidence-based approach that prioritises the precautionary principle and saving lives.

Authors Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Authors Contributions

Both authors conceptualised and drafted the manuscript.

References

1. Habibi R, Burci GL, de Campos TC, Chirwa D, Cinà M, Dagron S, et al. Do not violate the International Health Regulations during the COVID-19 outbreak. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10225):664–6.
2. Errett N, AL. E. An integrative review of the limited evidence on international travel bans as an emerging infectious disease disaster control measure. *J Emerg Med*. 2020;18(1):7-14.
3. Ryu S, Gao H, Wong JY, Shiu EYC, Xiao J, Fong MW, et al. Nonpharmaceutical measure for pandemic influenza in nonhealthcare settings - international travel-related measures. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(5).
4. Mateus ALP, Otete HE, Beck CR, Dolan GP, Nguyen-Van-Tam JS. Effectiveness of travel restrictions in the rapid containment of human influenza: a systematic review. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2014;92(12):868–80D.
5. Lee VJ, Lye DC, Wilder-Smith A. Combination strategies for pandemic influenza response - a systematic review of mathematical modeling studies. *BMC Medicine*. 2009;7:76.