

# Ethical Frameworks for Restrictive Public Health Interventions during Pandemics: A Review and Synthesis

## I. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic presented an unprecedented global public health crisis, compelling governments worldwide to implement drastic measures to curb the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Among the most significant and ethically complex interventions were large-scale, liberty-restricting measures commonly referred to as "lockdowns" or "shelter-in-place" orders.<sup>1</sup> These interventions, including the early regional shelter-in-place orders in the United States, represented a profound challenge to established norms, impacting nearly every facet of human life and raising fundamental ethical questions.<sup>3</sup> The scale of these restrictions, affecting billions globally and leading to significant economic and social disruption, underscored the critical need for ethically sound decision-making.<sup>1</sup>

Navigating the ethical terrain of pandemic response involves grappling with inherent tensions, most notably the balance between the state's responsibility to protect public health and its obligation to respect individual rights and freedoms.<sup>3</sup> Decisions regarding lockdowns were often made under immense pressure, characterized by urgency, scientific uncertainty, and rapidly evolving circumstances.<sup>3</sup> Such conditions necessitate structured ethical guidance to ensure that choices are not merely reactions to panic or political expediency, but are grounded in defensible moral principles and values.<sup>3</sup> Public health ethics seeks to provide this structure by integrating evidence, values, ethical arguments, and moral principles to assess the justifiability of public health actions.<sup>9</sup>

This report provides an expert-level review and synthesis of the scientific and organizational literature concerning ethical frameworks developed or applied to restrictive public health interventions, such as lockdowns, during the COVID-19 pandemic and other infectious disease outbreaks. It aims to identify and analyze proposed frameworks, delineate the core ethical principles emphasized, compare different ethical approaches, and synthesize the major ethical challenges and controversies surrounding these measures. The analysis draws upon peer-reviewed academic publications, reports from major public health organizations like the World Health Organization (WHO), and guidance from bioethics committees. The subsequent sections will explore the imperative for ethical frameworks, detail the core principles involved, offer a comparative analysis of ethical approaches, discuss the major challenges encountered, examine perspectives from key organizations, and

conclude with a synthesis of the findings.

## **II. The Imperative for Ethical Frameworks in Pandemic Decision-Making**

Public health emergencies, by their nature, demand swift and decisive action, often in the face of incomplete scientific understanding and a dynamically changing threat landscape.<sup>3</sup> The COVID-19 pandemic starkly illustrated this reality, forcing decision-makers to grapple with profound ethical dilemmas under conditions of acute uncertainty.<sup>9</sup> In such contexts, ethical frameworks serve as indispensable tools. They provide a structured approach to deliberation, helping to ensure that decisions are guided by consistent values and principles, rather than being solely dictated by urgency, fear, political pressures, or preliminary data.<sup>3</sup> The field of public health ethics (PHE) specifically aims to incorporate evidence, values, ethical reasoning, and moral principles to evaluate the justification for public health actions and shape optimal practice.<sup>9</sup>

At the heart of the ethical debate surrounding lockdowns lies a fundamental tension: the conflict between the collective good, specifically the protection of population health, and the respect for individual rights and liberties.<sup>3</sup> Lockdowns and shelter-in-place orders represent a particularly acute manifestation of this tension, as they directly curtail fundamental freedoms, such as the freedom of movement and association, in the name of preventing harm to the community.<sup>5</sup> Justifications for such measures often invoked the need to protect vulnerable populations and prevent the collapse of healthcare systems<sup>5</sup> – arguments that, while seemingly focused on health outcomes, are deeply intertwined with principles of distributive justice and the fair allocation of risks and resources.<sup>5</sup>

It became evident during the pandemic that scientific data alone could not dictate policy choices regarding lockdowns.<sup>8</sup> Decisions about whether, when, and how to implement or lift restrictions inevitably involved value judgments and trade-offs between competing societal goods, including health, economic stability, individual liberty, social well-being, and justice.<sup>16</sup> Ethical frameworks are designed to make these values explicit and guide the process of weighing these trade-offs in a reasoned and justifiable manner.<sup>16</sup> The lack of a clear consensus on how best to frame these ethical problems during the COVID-19 pandemic posed a significant challenge to coherent and widely accepted policy responses.<sup>12</sup>

Furthermore, the pandemic highlighted a gap between abstract ethical principles and their practical application in policymaking during a crisis.<sup>1</sup> There was an urgent need

for applied, user-friendly frameworks that policymakers could use to rapidly assess the ethical soundness of proposed restrictive measures.<sup>1</sup> While numerous ethical guidance documents were indeed published during the pandemic<sup>4</sup>, the initial response in many jurisdictions suggested that neither healthcare systems nor the public were adequately prepared for the ethical complexities encountered.<sup>4</sup>

Indeed, the proliferation of ethical guidance *during* the pandemic<sup>4</sup> points towards a largely reactive approach to ethical deliberation, despite the existence of prior pandemic preparedness plans and some earlier framework development efforts.<sup>4</sup> Pre-existing guidance, such as the WHO's 2016 document on managing ethical issues in infectious disease outbreaks, was found by some analysts to be insufficient to address the unique scale and nature of the challenges posed by COVID-19, particularly concerning global cooperation, governance complexities, and the ethics of widespread movement restrictions.<sup>10</sup> This suggests that while some ethical groundwork had been laid, it lacked the robustness, specificity, or integration into decision-making processes needed to fully prepare for the ethical maelstrom of the pandemic. The scramble to develop and disseminate new or updated guidance during the crisis underscores the need for future pandemic preparedness efforts to prioritize the development, testing, and embedding of adaptable, comprehensive ethical frameworks *before* the next emergency strikes.

### III. Core Ethical Principles Guiding Restrictive Interventions

Ethical frameworks designed to evaluate public health interventions, particularly restrictive ones like lockdowns, are typically grounded in a set of core ethical principles or values. While the specific terminology and emphasis may vary slightly across different frameworks and guidance documents, a consistent cluster of principles emerges from the literature as central to the ethical justification and evaluation of such measures.<sup>1</sup> These principles provide benchmarks against which the ethical acceptability of interventions can be assessed. However, a significant challenge in practice lies in interpreting and applying these principles, especially when they conflict, requiring difficult balancing acts by decision-makers.<sup>13</sup>

The following subsections detail the key ethical principles most frequently cited in the context of pandemic lockdowns and similar restrictions.

#### A. Proportionality

- **Definition:** This principle demands that the restrictions imposed must be commensurate with the scale and severity of the public health threat they aim to address. The potential public health benefits of the measure must be weighed

against, and justify, the burdens, harms, and infringements on rights and liberties it entails.<sup>1</sup>

- **Considerations:** Assessing proportionality involves evaluating the gravity of the public health emergency, the expected effectiveness (utility) of the proposed measure compared to alternatives, and the extent to which these expected benefits outweigh the restriction of liberty and other associated costs.<sup>5</sup> It requires tailoring restrictions to specific risks and ensuring their stringency aligns with epidemiological evidence, such as the growth in cases and deaths.<sup>17</sup> Measures should also be terminated when they cease to provide a significant benefit or when the balance of benefits and harms shifts.<sup>17</sup> Critiques of COVID-19 lockdowns frequently questioned whether the extensive social, economic, and psychological harms caused by prolonged restrictions were truly proportionate to the achieved public health gains, particularly once vaccines became available or in populations at lower risk.<sup>22</sup>

## **B. Necessity / Harm Principle**

- **Definition:** Stemming from the harm principle, this requires that liberty-restricting measures are justified only when necessary to prevent demonstrable, significant harm to others.<sup>1</sup> For infectious diseases, this typically involves preventing person-to-person transmission.<sup>14</sup> There must also be a reasonable basis, grounded in the best available scientific evidence, to expect that the intervention will be effective in achieving this goal.<sup>17</sup>
- **Considerations:** Justification requires clear evidence of harm and the potential for the measure to mitigate that harm.<sup>14</sup> Decisions must be evidence-based, considering pathogen characteristics and epidemiological data.<sup>27</sup> International human rights law similarly requires that restrictions pursue a legitimate aim (like public health protection) and be necessary to achieve that aim.<sup>2</sup> The necessity of certain stringent pandemic measures, particularly widespread lockdowns or mandates with unclear evidence of unique benefit over less restrictive options, was a point of significant debate and critique.<sup>22</sup>

## **C. Least Restrictive / Least Infringing Means**

- **Definition:** Public health authorities have an ethical obligation to use the least restrictive or infringing measures reasonably available that can effectively achieve the intended public health objective.<sup>1</sup> This implies a preference for voluntary measures over mandatory ones, with coercion considered only as a last resort when less intrusive approaches are demonstrably inadequate or likely to fail.<sup>8</sup>
- **Considerations:** This principle requires actively considering and evaluating less burdensome alternatives before resorting to more coercive interventions.<sup>15</sup> It

emphasizes minimizing the impact on individual liberties.<sup>17</sup> Critiques argued that during the pandemic, authorities sometimes defaulted to highly restrictive measures without sufficient justification that less infringing options (e.g., targeted protection, enhanced voluntary measures) were inadequate, or failed to relax restrictions promptly when conditions allowed.<sup>22</sup> Interestingly, some WHO guidance acknowledges a potential tension, suggesting that in a severe pandemic, the *most effective* measure might need to be prioritized, even if not the *least restrictive*, highlighting the difficult trade-offs involved.<sup>27</sup>

#### D. Utility / Effectiveness / Beneficence / Minimizing Harm

- **Definition:** This cluster of related principles focuses on the outcomes of interventions. It includes the duty to produce benefits (beneficence), maximize overall good (utility, often framed as saving the most lives or life-years)<sup>3</sup>, ensure the effectiveness of the intervention<sup>14</sup>, and minimize harm (non-maleficence).<sup>3</sup> Assessing utility often involves attempts at cost-benefit analysis or evaluating trade-offs.<sup>1</sup>
- **Considerations:** A purely utilitarian focus on aggregate benefits can potentially conflict with principles of equity or individual rights, for example, if it justifies policies that disproportionately harm certain groups for the sake of the majority.<sup>5</sup> Evaluating effectiveness requires robust evidence, which was often contested or evolving for specific COVID-19 interventions like lockdowns or mask mandates.<sup>14</sup> The principle of minimizing harm extends not only to the disease itself but also to the harms caused by the intervention, such as economic disruption, mental health impacts, and deferred healthcare.<sup>4</sup>

#### E. Equity / Justice (Distributive, Social)

- **Definition:** This principle demands fairness in the distribution of both the benefits and burdens of public health interventions.<sup>1</sup> It requires avoiding arbitrary or unjust discrimination and paying special attention to the needs and protection of vulnerable or marginalized populations who may be disproportionately affected by either the disease or the interventions.<sup>13</sup> It aligns with the Aristotelian notion of treating like cases alike, unless a morally relevant difference justifies differential treatment.<sup>5</sup>
- **Considerations:** A major ethical failing identified in many COVID-19 responses was the exacerbation of pre-existing social, economic, racial, and geographic inequalities by lockdown measures.<sup>1</sup> Equity requires proactive planning and implementation of measures to mitigate these disproportionate impacts.<sup>6</sup> It also applies to the fair allocation of scarce resources like tests, treatments, and vaccines, ensuring access is not unduly determined by factors like wealth or

social status.<sup>13</sup> The challenge lies in designing and implementing policies that are truly equitable in their effects, not just in their intent.<sup>12</sup>

## F. Reciprocity

- **Definition:** This principle posits that if society imposes burdens on individuals or groups for the sake of the common good (e.g., restricting liberty through quarantine or lockdown, exposing essential workers to higher risk), then society has a reciprocal obligation to provide support and mitigate those burdens.<sup>1</sup>
- **Considerations:** Reciprocity entails tangible support, such as providing adequate food, shelter, medical care, financial assistance, employment protection, and psychological support to those under restriction or facing hardship due to public health measures.<sup>8</sup> It also includes protecting individuals from discrimination or stigma resulting from their exposure or compliance.<sup>14</sup> Supporting healthcare workers and others taking on increased risks is a key aspect of reciprocity.<sup>4</sup> Fulfilling reciprocal obligations is considered crucial for maintaining public trust and encouraging cooperation with burdensome measures.<sup>8</sup> Critiques during COVID-19 questioned whether reciprocal support was adequate, particularly for groups like children and young adults who sacrificed education and social development, or for low-income countries impacted by global policies.<sup>22</sup>

## G. Transparency / Openness

- **Definition:** This principle requires openness and clarity from authorities regarding the decisions made, the rationale behind them, the evidence (and uncertainties) considered, and the processes followed in developing and implementing public health measures.<sup>1</sup>
- **Considerations:** Transparency is fundamental for building and sustaining public trust, which is essential for voluntary compliance and the overall legitimacy of the public health response.<sup>3</sup> It involves communicating clearly and honestly with the public, using accessible language and formats, explaining the justification for policies, and acknowledging the limits of current knowledge or the uncertainties involved.<sup>6</sup> Lack of transparency was a frequent criticism of pandemic decision-making processes, potentially undermining public confidence and cooperation.<sup>22</sup> Transparency is seen as a necessary condition for the moral trustworthiness of experts and the moral legitimacy of coercive policies.<sup>31</sup>

## H. Accountability

- **Definition:** Decision-makers and authorities must be answerable for the public health decisions they make and the consequences of those actions.<sup>1</sup>
- **Considerations:** Accountability requires mechanisms through which decisions



can be reviewed, challenged, and potentially appealed.<sup>17</sup> This includes providing avenues for grievance redressal and ensuring due process protections, especially when coercive measures are used.<sup>17</sup> Accountability mechanisms are crucial safeguards against the potential abuse of emergency powers and help ensure that measures remain proportionate and justified.<sup>17</sup> Failures in accountability, such as lack of clear responsibility or inadequate avenues for appeal, were criticized in some pandemic responses.<sup>18</sup> Accountability is closely linked to transparency and procedural fairness.<sup>8</sup>

## I. Liberty / Autonomy / Respect for Persons

- **Definition:** These principles underscore the intrinsic moral worth of each individual and their right to self-determination, freedom of choice, and freedom from unwarranted interference.<sup>1</sup> Respect for persons requires treating individuals with dignity and acknowledging their capacity to make decisions about their own lives based on their values and beliefs.<sup>4</sup> Any infringement upon liberty or autonomy requires strong ethical justification.<sup>5</sup>
- **Considerations:** Lockdowns and mandatory public health measures directly challenge individual liberty and autonomy.<sup>5</sup> The central ethical task is balancing these individual rights with the collective need to protect public health.<sup>13</sup> Some analyses noted that pandemic guidance often appeared to prioritize collectivist goals over individual autonomy.<sup>4</sup> Respect for persons also underpins the requirements for informed consent (where applicable), transparency, and truthful communication.<sup>4</sup>

## J. Solidarity

- **Definition:** This principle emphasizes shared vulnerability, mutual support, collective action, and cooperation in the face of a common threat like a pandemic.<sup>3</sup> It encourages a sense of shared responsibility and collective effort at various levels – community, national, and global.<sup>3</sup>
- **Considerations:** Solidarity can provide a moral basis for justifying collective actions and individual sacrifices for the common good. However, the COVID-19 pandemic severely tested global solidarity, particularly evident in disparities in access to vaccines and other resources.<sup>3</sup> The principle is closely related to reciprocity, as collective action often relies on mutual support.<sup>4</sup>

## K. Trust

- **Definition:** Refers to the confidence of the public in the competence, integrity, and fairness of the authorities and institutions responsible for managing the public health response.<sup>3</sup>

- **Considerations:** Public trust is a critical resource in a pandemic, essential for achieving voluntary compliance with public health recommendations and maintaining social cohesion during difficult times.<sup>12</sup> Trust is built and maintained through consistent application of other ethical principles, particularly transparency, honesty, fairness (equity), accountability, and reciprocity.<sup>3</sup> Conversely, perceived failures in these areas – such as inconsistent messaging, lack of transparency, perceived unfairness, or overly coercive measures – can significantly erode public trust.<sup>22</sup>

## L. Other Principles

Several other principles are also frequently mentioned in ethical frameworks:

- **Stewardship:** The responsible and prudent management of public resources, including healthcare capacity and supplies.<sup>13</sup>
- **Relevance:** Ensuring that decisions and the evidence used are considered relevant by affected communities, often involving community consultation and input.<sup>17</sup>
- **Feasibility / Cost:** Considering the practical and financial viability of implementing and sustaining public health measures.<sup>1</sup>
- **Honesty:** Emphasizing truthfulness and accuracy in communication from authorities and healthcare professionals.<sup>3</sup>
- **Duty to Care:** The ethical and professional obligations of healthcare workers to provide care, even under difficult or risky conditions.<sup>4</sup>
- **Informed Decision Making:** Ensuring that decisions (both clinical and policy) are based on the best available evidence, established guidelines, and legal requirements.<sup>4</sup>

A crucial observation emerging from the analysis of these principles is the profound interdependence between procedural and substantive ethics. Principles governing the *process* of decision-making – such as transparency, accountability, relevance (community engagement), and fairness in procedure – are not merely desirable procedural formalities. They appear to be foundational prerequisites for achieving ethically sound *substantive* outcomes. For instance, transparent communication about the rationale and evidence for a restrictive measure is essential for building public trust<sup>13</sup>, which in turn facilitates public acceptance and cooperation, making the measure more likely to be effective and potentially less reliant on coercion.

Accountability mechanisms serve as a check against the potential for power abuse and help ensure that measures remain proportionate and necessary.<sup>17</sup> Engaging with communities helps ensure that interventions are relevant, culturally appropriate, and



address equity concerns from the outset.<sup>17</sup> Critiques of pandemic responses often linked failures in procedural justice (e.g., lack of transparency, inadequate due process) directly to shortcomings in substantive outcomes (e.g., disproportionality, inequity).<sup>22</sup> This strongly suggests that ethical frameworks must prioritize robust procedural elements as integral to, and enabling of, substantively ethical public health policy. Process is not secondary; it shapes the ethical quality of the outcome.

**Table 1: Core Ethical Principles for Evaluating Restrictive Pandemic Interventions**

Principle Name	Brief Definition/Core Concept	Key Considerations/Indicators	Representative Source Snippets
<b>Proportionality</b>	Measures commensurate with threat; benefits outweigh burdens/harms.	Gravity of threat, expected utility vs. liberty restriction, tailoring to risk, termination criteria, cost-benefit analysis. <sup>5</sup>	<sup>1</sup>
<b>Necessity / Harm Principle</b>	Restrictions only if needed to prevent significant harm; based on evidence of effectiveness.	Clear/measurable harm (e.g., transmission), scientific evidence base, reasonable expectation of impact, legitimate public health aim. <sup>14</sup>	<sup>1</sup>
<b>Least Restrictive / Least Infringing Means</b>	Use least burdensome measures reasonably available to achieve goal; mandatory measures as last resort.	Evaluation of alternatives, preference for voluntary measures, minimizing liberty infringement, time for measures to show effect. <sup>17</sup>	<sup>1</sup>
<b>Utility / Effectiveness /</b>	Maximize overall benefits (health	Evidence of effectiveness,	<sup>1</sup>

<b>Beneficence / Minimizing Harm</b>	outcomes), minimize harms (from disease and intervention), ensure effectiveness.	cost-benefit/trade-of f analysis, aggregate outcomes (lives/QALYs saved), harms of intervention itself. <sup>14</sup>	
<b>Equity / Justice (Distributive, Social)</b>	Fair distribution of benefits/burdens; non-discrimination; special attention to vulnerable groups.	Mitigating disproportionate impacts, avoiding exacerbation of inequalities, fair resource allocation, non-discriminatory application. <sup>17</sup>	1
<b>Reciprocity</b>	Societal obligation to support those bearing burdens for the common good.	Material/financial/psychological support for restricted individuals, support for essential workers, protection from discrimination/stigma <sup>14</sup>	1
<b>Transparency / Openness</b>	Openness about decisions, rationale, evidence (inc. uncertainty), process.	Clear public communication, accessible information, justification of policies, acknowledging uncertainty, public record. <sup>16</sup>	1
<b>Accountability</b>	Decision-makers answerable for actions; mechanisms for appeal/grievance.	Due process, appeal mechanisms, grievance redressal, preventing abuse of authority, judicial review. <sup>17</sup>	1
<b>Liberty / Autonomy</b>	Respect for individual	Minimizing	1

<b>/ Respect for Persons</b>	freedom, self-determination, dignity; justification for infringement.	restrictions, informed consent (where applicable), respecting individual values/choices. <sup>4</sup>	
<b>Solidarity</b>	Shared responsibility, collective action, mutual support against common threat.	Community/national/global cooperation, collective effort, sense of shared fate. <sup>3</sup>	<sup>3</sup>
<b>Trust</b>	Public confidence in authorities and institutions.	Built via transparency, honesty, equity, accountability, reciprocity; essential for compliance. <sup>13</sup>	<sup>3</sup>

#### IV. Comparative Analysis of Ethical Approaches

While the principles outlined above provide a practical vocabulary for ethical analysis, they are often implicitly or explicitly grounded in broader ethical theories or approaches. Understanding these foundational perspectives helps to illuminate why different frameworks might prioritize certain principles or arrive at different conclusions regarding the justification of measures like lockdowns.

**Utilitarianism**, in its classic form, advocates for actions that produce the greatest good for the greatest number of people.<sup>13</sup> Applied to pandemics, this approach would typically focus on maximizing positive health outcomes (e.g., minimizing deaths, hospitalizations, or maximizing quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) saved) across the population.<sup>13</sup> From a utilitarian perspective, significant restrictions on individual liberty, such as lockdowns, could be justified if the evidence suggests they are the most effective means to achieve the best overall consequences in terms of public health.<sup>5</sup> However, utilitarianism faces criticism for potentially neglecting the rights and interests of individuals or minorities if sacrificing them leads to a greater aggregate good, and for difficulties in adequately measuring and comparing diverse values (e.g., health vs. economic well-being vs. liberty).<sup>5</sup>

**Principlism**, widely influential in bioethics, utilizes a set of mid-level ethical principles – commonly identified as respect for autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice – as a framework for analyzing ethical dilemmas.<sup>3</sup> Many public health ethics

frameworks adopt a similar approach, listing key principles relevant to the context (as seen in Section III). The strength of principlism lies in its accessibility and its ability to capture widely shared moral intuitions. However, its primary challenge, particularly acute in pandemic situations, is resolving conflicts that inevitably arise between these principles.<sup>3</sup> For example, the principle of beneficence (acting to benefit others, e.g., by controlling disease spread) may directly conflict with the principle of respect for autonomy (respecting individual choices, e.g., to refuse isolation or vaccination). Principlism itself does not offer a pre-defined hierarchy or algorithm for resolving such conflicts, requiring contextual judgment and balancing.

**Rights-Based Approaches** place the protection of fundamental human rights at the forefront of ethical consideration.<sup>3</sup> These approaches emphasize that individuals possess certain entitlements (e.g., rights to liberty, health, non-discrimination, due process) that impose moral constraints on state actions. While acknowledging that rights are not absolute and can be limited to protect public health, rights-based frameworks insist that such limitations must meet stringent justification criteria.<sup>2</sup> Typically derived from international human rights law (e.g., the Siracusa Principles), these criteria include legality (measure must have basis in law), legitimate aim (e.g., protecting public health), necessity (measure must be necessary to achieve the aim), proportionality (measure's effects must be proportionate to the aim), and non-discrimination.<sup>2</sup> This approach generally sets a higher threshold for justifying coercive public health measures compared to a purely utilitarian calculus, demanding strong evidence and careful consideration of the impact on fundamental freedoms.

**Communitarianism**, in contrast to highly individualistic approaches, emphasizes the importance of community values, shared responsibilities, solidarity, and the common good.<sup>3</sup> From this perspective, individual identity and well-being are seen as deeply intertwined with the health and flourishing of the community. Communitarian viewpoints may lend stronger support to public health interventions that require individual sacrifices for collective benefit, arguing that membership in a community entails obligations to protect fellow members.<sup>3</sup> Principles like solidarity and reciprocity often resonate strongly within communitarian frameworks.<sup>3</sup>

An analysis of ethical guidance documents issued during the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK and Ireland observed a tendency to prioritize **collectivist ethics over individualistic approaches**.<sup>4</sup> This meant that the collective benefit to the population was often given greater weight than individual autonomy or preferences, particularly in decisions regarding resource allocation or the implementation of restrictive measures.<sup>4</sup> While potentially justifiable under utilitarian or communitarian frameworks during a public health emergency, this explicit or implicit prioritization raises concerns

about the potential marginalization of individual rights and the principles of autonomy and informed consent, which are typically central in medical ethics.<sup>4</sup>

Examining the justifications offered for lockdowns reveals a potential implicit dominance of consequentialist reasoning, even when framed using a broader set of principles. While principles like proportionality, utility, and minimizing harm inherently focus on outcomes<sup>4</sup>, the core arguments for restricting liberty frequently appealed directly to the expected consequences: preventing widespread death and protecting healthcare systems from collapse.<sup>5</sup> Even rights-based frameworks incorporate consequentialist considerations by allowing restrictions that are necessary and proportionate to achieve the legitimate aim of public health protection.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, many critiques of lockdown policies centered on whether the *actual* consequences – the balance of benefits achieved versus harms caused – ultimately justified the measures.<sup>22</sup> This suggests that while non-consequentialist principles like equity, reciprocity, and respect for liberty were acknowledged as crucial, the driving force behind the decision to implement broad, society-wide restrictions often appeared to be the anticipated positive health consequences. This observation does not necessarily invalidate the decisions made, but it highlights the importance of critically assessing whether non-consequentialist values were given sufficient independent weight in the deliberative process or were primarily treated as side-constraints on the pursuit of maximizing good outcomes.

## **V. Major Ethical Challenges and Controversies of Lockdowns**

The implementation of lockdowns and similar restrictive measures during the COVID-19 pandemic generated intense ethical debate and exposed numerous challenges and controversies. These centered on fundamental conflicts between competing values, the equitable distribution of burdens, the adequacy of evidence, and the legitimacy of the decision-making process itself.

### **A. Balancing Liberty and Public Good**

The most prominent and persistent ethical challenge was navigating the inherent conflict between protecting the collective public health and upholding individual liberty.<sup>3</sup> Determining the ethically appropriate threshold for restricting fundamental freedoms like movement and association proved exceptionally difficult.<sup>5</sup> Arguments were made that preventing harm to others, including the indirect harm posed by overwhelming healthcare systems, could justify coercive measures.<sup>5</sup> Some framed this through the lens of a collective "duty of easy rescue," although the profound burdens of lockdowns arguably stretched the definition of "easy".<sup>5</sup> Others contended that the

standard justifications – appealing to the harm principle and the least restrictive means – were insufficient to capture the complexity of the trade-offs involved, especially when considering differential risks and impacts across populations.<sup>15</sup> The core dilemma remained: how much individual liberty can permissibly be sacrificed for how much collective security, especially under conditions of uncertainty?

## **B. Equity and Impacts on Vulnerable Populations**

A critical ethical failure highlighted across numerous analyses was the profoundly inequitable impact of lockdown measures.<sup>1</sup> While often implemented as universal policies, lockdowns and associated restrictions disproportionately burdened marginalized and vulnerable populations. This included low-income individuals and essential workers unable to work from home and facing higher exposure risks, racial and ethnic minorities suffering from systemic health and social disparities, older adults facing isolation, children experiencing educational disruption and developmental setbacks, individuals living in crowded or inadequate housing, and people with disabilities facing barriers to support services.<sup>1</sup> These measures frequently exacerbated pre-existing inequalities, concentrating harms among those least able to bear them while potentially offering greater protection to more privileged groups.<sup>2</sup> Addressing these inequities requires moving beyond nominally neutral policies to proactively designing interventions and support systems that mitigate disproportionate burdens, a challenge that many responses failed to adequately meet.<sup>6</sup> Particular difficulties arose in implementing measures equitably in settings like underserved areas, refugee camps, and slums.<sup>27</sup> Concerns about discrimination, whether based on age, disability, or other characteristics, in accessing support or even medical treatment, also surfaced.<sup>5</sup>

## **C. Economic Consequences vs. Public Health**

The pandemic forced societies into stark trade-offs between mitigating the immediate health crisis and managing the severe economic consequences of control measures.<sup>1</sup> Lockdowns led to widespread business closures, job losses, and disruptions to global supply chains, plunging economies into recession.<sup>1</sup> Ethically weighing the value of lives potentially saved against the livelihoods lost or damaged presented an immense challenge.<sup>11</sup> While principles like utility and efficiency suggest using tools like cost-benefit analysis to navigate these trade-offs,<sup>1</sup> quantifying the value of human life, health, liberty, and economic stability in commensurate terms is fraught with methodological and ethical difficulties. Decisions often involved implicit value judgments about which harms were deemed more acceptable or which societal goals



took precedence.

#### **D. Evidence, Justification, and Uncertainty**

Decision-making during the pandemic was plagued by scientific uncertainty, particularly in the early stages.<sup>3</sup> Authorities had to act decisively based on evolving and often incomplete evidence regarding the virus's transmission, severity, and the effectiveness of various interventions.<sup>14</sup> This led to controversy over the justification for specific measures, particularly stringent and prolonged lockdowns.<sup>14</sup> Critics argued that some policies were implemented without a sufficiently robust evidence base demonstrating their necessity and proportionality compared to less restrictive alternatives.<sup>22</sup> The effectiveness of measures like mass masking or specific lockdown components remained subjects of debate, with limited high-quality evidence available for some interventions.<sup>22</sup> Furthermore, a systematic review found that the majority of COVID-19 public health guidelines failed to adequately consider public values and preferences in their development, potentially contributing to policies perceived as out of touch or illegitimate.<sup>28</sup> This highlights the dilemma for public health officials: the imperative to act quickly to prevent harm versus the need for evidence-based, publicly acceptable justification.<sup>14</sup>

#### **E. Public Trust, Transparency, and Procedural Justice**

Maintaining public trust emerged as a critical factor for the success of pandemic responses, particularly those relying on widespread public cooperation with burdensome measures.<sup>3</sup> Trust, however, is fragile and depends heavily on perceptions of procedural fairness, transparency, honesty, and accountability.<sup>3</sup> Failures in these areas – such as opaque decision-making processes, inconsistent communication, perceived inequities, or lack of mechanisms for public input and appeal – risked eroding public confidence and compliance.<sup>22</sup> Ensuring legitimacy required not only that policies were substantively justified (or perceived as such) but also that the *process* for arriving at those policies was seen as fair and inclusive.<sup>8</sup> The need for clear communication, acknowledging uncertainties, and establishing avenues for public engagement and grievance redressal were emphasized as crucial components of ethically sound pandemic governance.<sup>6</sup>

#### **F. Critiques of Policy Implementation ("New Normal")**

A significant line of critique emerged arguing that many policies implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic represented a radical departure from established, pre-pandemic norms of public health ethics.<sup>22</sup> Scholars argued that measures like

prolonged lockdowns, mandatory interventions with limited evidence, severe restrictions on fundamental freedoms, and policies exacerbating inequality would have been considered ethically unacceptable before 2020.<sup>22</sup> Specific critiques focused on breaches of principles like proportionality (harms outweighing benefits), least restrictive means (failure to exhaust alternatives), equity (disproportionate impact on the disadvantaged), evidence-based justification, and due legal process.<sup>22</sup> There were concerns that the exceptional measures justified by the emergency could become normalized, leading to a lasting expansion of state surveillance and control without adequate justification or reversal mechanisms once the crisis receded.<sup>34</sup>

The consistent emphasis across ethical frameworks on reciprocity<sup>3</sup>, combined with the recognition of the profound and unequal burdens imposed by lockdowns<sup>1</sup>, suggests the accumulation of what might be termed an "ethical debt." The decision to impose measures that restrict liberty, disrupt education, cause economic hardship, and isolate individuals – particularly when these burdens fall disproportionately on specific groups like the young, the poor, or essential workers – creates a corresponding societal obligation. This obligation, rooted in reciprocity, extends beyond simply providing immediate support during the restriction period.<sup>14</sup> It implies a longer-term responsibility to actively mitigate the harms caused, address the resulting inequities, and potentially provide redress or compensation for the sacrifices made for the collective good. Critiques suggesting that reciprocal obligations were not fully met<sup>22</sup> and that harms were disproportionate for some<sup>22</sup> reinforce this idea. Evaluating the full ethical impact of lockdowns, therefore, requires considering not just their immediate epidemiological effects but also this enduring ethical debt and the societal commitments needed to address it fairly. Future ethical frameworks should arguably incorporate explicit consideration of these long-term obligations.

## **VI. Perspectives from Public Health Organizations and Bioethics Bodies**

Guidance on the ethical dimensions of pandemic response, including restrictive measures, has been issued by major international public health organizations, national bodies, and academic bioethics groups. Examining these perspectives reveals both areas of consensus and ongoing challenges.

### **World Health Organization (WHO) Guidance and Frameworks**

The WHO plays a central role in providing global health leadership and guidance, including on ethical issues arising during infectious disease outbreaks.<sup>3</sup> Its 2016 guidance document, "Guidance for Managing Ethical Issues in Infectious Disease

Outbreaks," developed primarily in response to pandemic influenza threats and the Ebola crisis, outlined seven core ethical principles: justice, beneficence, utility, respect for persons, liberty, reciprocity, and solidarity.<sup>10</sup>

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the WHO established working groups to provide specific ethical advice.<sup>10</sup> A key policy brief focused specifically on the ethics of restrictive measures and physical distancing, drawing upon the 2016 guidance.<sup>27</sup> This brief emphasized several critical considerations <sup>27</sup>:

- **Justification and Evidence:** Restrictions require a reasonable expectation of effectiveness based on the best available evidence, with continuous re-evaluation.
- **Balancing Liberty and Protection:** While acknowledging the legitimacy of limiting freedoms for public health, the need to weigh harms and benefits and consider the least restrictive alternative (while potentially prioritizing the most effective in a crisis) was stressed.
- **Obligations to the Restricted:** Society owes significant support (material, medical, psychosocial) to those whose liberty is curtailed for the common good.
- **Procedural Protections:** Mechanisms for challenge, appeal, and accountability are necessary.
- **Equity:** Measures must address disproportionate effects on vulnerable populations and avoid discrimination.
- **Public Information:** Authorities have obligations to engage communities, communicate transparently, and build trust.
- **Vulnerable Settings:** Special attention is needed for implementing measures in challenging environments like refugee camps or slums.

Furthermore, WHO guidance consistently underscored the importance of adhering to international human rights law when implementing emergency measures.<sup>6</sup> This includes ensuring that restrictions are lawful, pursue a legitimate aim, are necessary, proportionate, non-discriminatory, and time-bound.<sup>6</sup>

However, as noted earlier, the WHO's pre-existing 2016 guidance faced criticism for being inadequate to address the full scope of ethical challenges presented by the global scale and specific nature of the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>10</sup> Identified gaps included insufficient attention to global cooperation and resource sharing (especially between high- and low-resource settings), complex governance issues, adapting community engagement strategies during lockdowns, addressing specific vulnerabilities exacerbated by the pandemic (e.g., for older persons), the ethics of widespread border closures and travel restrictions, and the ethical implications of digital

technologies used in the response.<sup>10</sup>

### **Academic and Bioethics Committee Frameworks**

Numerous academic researchers and bioethics committees also developed or refined ethical frameworks to address pandemic challenges. One notable example proposed a consolidated framework specifically for movement restrictions, integrating 11 principles: harm/necessity, justifiability, proportionality, least restrictive means, utility efficiency, reciprocity, transparency, relevance, equity, accountability, and cost/feasibility.<sup>1</sup> This framework aimed to provide a practical tool for policymakers to assess the ethical soundness of restrictions across different contexts.<sup>1</sup>

Other frameworks focused heavily on the ethical allocation of scarce resources (like ventilators, treatments, or vaccines), identifying core values such as maximizing benefits/minimizing harms, equity/mitigating disadvantage, equal moral concern, reciprocity, and instrumental value (prioritizing essential workers).<sup>13</sup> The importance of procedural principles like transparency, engagement, and evidence-responsiveness in allocation decisions was also emphasized.<sup>8</sup>

Frameworks were also developed to guide the complex ethical trade-offs involved in reopening decisions after lockdowns, emphasizing the need to balance health, economic flourishing, liberty, and justice through processes characterized by public engagement, expert input, clear communication, and ongoing reassessment.<sup>8</sup> The importance of procedural legitimacy and deliberative democratic approaches to ensure public acceptance of difficult decisions was highlighted.<sup>8</sup>

A review of 44 ethical guidance documents from the UK and Ireland during the pandemic identified ten recurring principles: fairness, honesty, minimizing harm, proportionality, responsibility, autonomy, respect, informed decision making, duty of care, and reciprocity.<sup>4</sup> However, this review also noted inconsistencies in how these principles were defined and detailed, potentially leaving them open to misinterpretation, and observed a frequent prioritization of collectivist ethics over individualistic considerations.<sup>4</sup>

### **Limitations and Gaps in Guidance**

Despite the proliferation of guidance, significant challenges remained. The difficulty of applying abstract principles to concrete, rapidly changing pandemic situations was a recurring theme.<sup>10</sup> The need for context-specific interpretation and balancing of principles was clear, yet guidance often lacked specific instructions on *how* to perform this balancing act in practice.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, the finding that many official public

health guidelines developed during the pandemic did not systematically consider the values and preferences of the affected public raises serious concerns about the legitimacy and potential acceptability of the resulting policies.<sup>28</sup> This gap between expert ethical deliberation and public values may have contributed to the polarization and controversy surrounding many pandemic measures.<sup>28</sup>

Across these various organizational and academic perspectives, a pattern emerges: while there is considerable convergence on the set of ethical principles deemed relevant for evaluating restrictive pandemic interventions (proportionality, necessity, equity, liberty, reciprocity, transparency, etc.), substantial divergence and difficulty arise in their practical interpretation, weighting, and application.<sup>3</sup> The challenge lies less in identifying the relevant values and more in navigating the conflicts between them in specific contexts, under pressure and uncertainty.<sup>13</sup> The frequent critiques of actual policy implementation failing to uphold principles like proportionality or equity, despite their inclusion in guidance documents<sup>22</sup>, and the tendency to prioritize collectivist outcomes<sup>4</sup>, underscore this gap between principle and practice. This suggests that merely listing ethical principles is insufficient. Effective ethical governance requires robust *processes* for deliberation, transparent justification of how conflicting values are balanced, context-specific application, and mechanisms for ensuring accountability for these decisions. The focus for future preparedness must shift from simply identifying *what* principles matter to developing and embedding practical procedures for *how* these principles are operationalized and adjudicated in real-world, high-stakes decision-making.

## VII. Conclusion

The use of lockdowns and other restrictive public health measures during the COVID-19 pandemic brought unprecedented ethical challenges to the forefront of global discourse. Navigating this complex terrain required grappling with the fundamental tension between the state's duty to protect collective health and its obligation to respect individual rights and fundamental freedoms. A broad array of ethical principles – including proportionality, necessity, least restrictive means, utility, equity, reciprocity, transparency, accountability, liberty, solidarity, and trust – emerged as essential benchmarks for justifying and evaluating these interventions.

The experience underscored the critical necessity of explicit, robust ethical frameworks to guide pandemic decision-making, particularly under conditions of urgency and uncertainty. Such frameworks help ensure that deliberations extend beyond purely epidemiological or political considerations to encompass the full range of relevant values, including fairness, individual rights, mutual support, and public

trust. They provide structure for navigating difficult trade-offs and promote consistency and accountability in the exercise of public health powers.

However, the pandemic also revealed significant limitations in existing ethical preparedness and guidance. Pre-existing frameworks were often found wanting, and the surge in guidance developed during the crisis highlighted a reactive rather than proactive approach. Key challenges persisted, including the practical difficulty of balancing conflicting principles, ensuring genuine equity in the face of universal measures that had disparate impacts, maintaining public trust amidst uncertainty and restrictive policies, and justifying decisions based on evolving evidence. Critiques arguing that many pandemic policies deviated significantly from established ethical norms regarding proportionality, least restriction, and evidence underscore the potential for ethical drift during emergencies.

Lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic point towards several crucial directions for strengthening ethical preparedness for future public health crises. There is a clear need for frameworks that are not only comprehensive in principle but also practical and adaptable to specific contexts. Crucially, these frameworks must integrate robust procedural elements – transparency, public engagement, accountability, mechanisms for appeal – recognizing that fair process is foundational to achieving ethically sound and legitimate outcomes. Greater attention must be paid to proactively addressing equity concerns from the outset, designing interventions and support systems that mitigate disproportionate burdens on vulnerable populations. Furthermore, the concept of an "ethical debt" incurred through the imposition of significant societal burdens suggests a need for frameworks to incorporate considerations of long-term societal obligations for mitigation and redress. Closing the identified gaps in existing guidance and fostering a culture where ethical deliberation is deeply embedded in public health practice, rather than an afterthought, will be essential for navigating future emergencies more justly and effectively.

## VIII. References

1. Aliyu, A. A. (2021). Public Health Ethics and the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Annals of African Medicine*, 20(3), 157–163. <sup>3</sup>
2. Byskov, M. F., Gjerris, M., Huniche, L., & Kjær, T. (2021). An applied ethics framework for movement restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic: An evaluation of policy indicators. *BMJ Global Health*, 6(6), e005202. <sup>1</sup>
3. Drew, C., McQuillan, R., & Hennessy, M. (2022). Ethical values and principles concerning the allocation of resources in pandemics: a rapid systematic review. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 23(1), 65. <sup>13</sup>



4. Raajakesary, K., Galvin, L., Prendiville, K., Newport, S., MacAnulty, C., & Hussein, G. (2024). The Ethical Principles in Ethical Guidance Documents during the COVID-19 Pandemic in the United Kingdom and Ireland: A Qualitative Review. *Public Health Ethics*, 17(1), phae005. <sup>4</sup>
5. Pugh, J. (2021). Selective Liberty Restriction During the COVID-19 Pandemic. In *Pandemic Bioethics* (pp. 111-130). University of Manchester Press. <sup>5</sup>
6. Emanuel, E. J. (2023). The shared ethical framework to allocate scarce medical resources: a lesson from COVID-19. *The Lancet. Infectious Diseases*, 23(5), e205–e210. <sup>20</sup>
7. Segers, S., Messaoudi, M., Pieters, T., Mortier, E., & Benoit, D. D. (2021). Ethical considerations regarding patients with COVID-19 in the hospital setting: A rapid review. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*, 46(3), 269–292. <sup>37</sup>
8. Littmann, J., Rid, A., & Herissone-Kelly, P. (2024). Public health ethics: Developments in theory and practice since 2015. *Public Health Ethics*, 17(1), phae011. <sup>9</sup>
9. Pawlina, W., Hammer, R. R., Strauss, J. D., Heath, S. G., Zhao, K. D., Sahota, S., Regnier, T. D., Freshwater, D. B., & Jones, D. G. (2020). The shift to online anatomy education during the COVID-19 pandemic: A national survey of medical students' perspectives. *Clinical Anatomy*, 34(7), 1046-1057. <sup>30</sup>
10. Gurjar, R., & Dhakar, A. K. (2022). Ethical considerations in COVID-19 pandemic: Global health ethics perspective. *Perspectives in Clinical Research*, 13(2), 61–64. <sup>19</sup>
11. United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. (n.d.). COVID-19 Guidance. OHCHR. Retrieved from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/covid-19/covid-19-guidance> <sup>6</sup>
12. Saxena, A., Gomes, M. F., & Caplan, A. L. (2021). Revisiting WHO guidance: ethical issues in managing infectious disease outbreaks. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 47(6), 367–368. <sup>10</sup>
13. Saxena, A., Gomes, M. F., & Caplan, A. L. (2021). Revisiting WHO guidance: ethical issues in managing infectious disease outbreaks. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 47(6), 367–368. <sup>11</sup>
14. American Medical Association. (n.d.). *Ethics guidance during a pandemic: An overview*. AMA Journal of Ethics. Retrieved from <https://www.ama-assn.org/delivering-care/ethics/ethics-guidance-during-pandemic-overview> <sup>38</sup>
15. World Health Organization. (2020, July 24). A guide to WHO's guidance on COVID-19. WHO. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/a-guide-to-who-s-guidance> <sup>32</sup>
16. Lessa, F. (2020, April 30). *WHO Ethics & SARS-CoV-2 – Restrictive Measures and*

- Physical Distancing*. PRAIS 2.0. Pan American Health Organization. Retrieved from <https://prais.paho.org/en/who-ethics-sars-cov-2-restrictive-measures-and-physical-distancing/><sup>35</sup>
17. World Health Organization. (2020). *Addressing human rights as key to the COVID-19 response*. WHO. Retrieved from <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331811/WHO-2019-nCoV-SRH-Rights-2020.1-eng.pdf><sup>7</sup>
  18. WHO Working Group on Ethics & SARS-CoV-2. (2020, April 14). *Ethics & SARS-CoV-2 – Restrictive Measures and Physical Distancing*. Epidemic Ethics. Retrieved from <https://epidemicethics.tghn.org/articles/ethics-sars-cov-2-restrictive-measures-and-physical-distancing/><sup>27</sup>
  19. Upshur, R. E. G. (2003). The Ethics of Quarantine. *AMA Journal of Ethics*, 5(11), 415–418.<sup>14</sup>
  20. Byskov, M. F., Gjerris, M., Huniche, L., & Kjær, T. (2021). An applied ethics framework for movement restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic: An evaluation of policy indicators. *BMJ Global Health*, 6(6), e005202.<sup>1</sup>
  21. Johns Hopkins Berman Institute of Bioethics & Center for Health Security. (2020). *Ethics Framework for the COVID-19 Reopening Process*. Johns Hopkins University. Retrieved from <https://bioethics.jhu.edu/research-and-outreach/covid-19-bioethics-expert-insights/resources-for-addressing-key-ethical-areas/grappling-with-the-ethics-of-social-distancing/><sup>16</sup>
  22. Smith, M. J., & Upshur, R. E. G. (2021). Pandemic Disease, Public Health, and Ethics. In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Health Ethics*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://bioethics.jhu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Smith-and-Upshur-Pandemic-Disease-Public-Health-and-Ethics.pdf><sup>8</sup>
  23. Watt, H., & Jones, D. A. (2023). Law, Ethics, and Lockdowns: Impacts on Life, Liberty, and the Economy. *Issues in Law & Medicine*, 38(1), 1–26.<sup>26</sup>
  24. Pugh, J. (2021). Selective Liberty Restriction During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 47(8), 553–559.<sup>15</sup>
  25. Syrett, K. (2023). Public Ethics in Emergencies: Learning from the COVID-19 Pandemic. In *Major Incidents, Pandemics and Mental Health*. Cambridge University Press.<sup>12</sup>
  26. Minnesota Department of Health. (2010). *Implementing Ethical Frameworks for Rationing Scarce Health Resources in Minnesota During Severe Influenza Pandemic*. MDH.<sup>39</sup>
  27. Khamis, A. M., Bak, A., Morgano, G. P., et al. (2024). Consideration of values and

- preferences in COVID-19 public health guidelines: systematic review. *medRxiv*, 2024.03.25.24304859. <sup>28</sup>
28. Jamrozik, E. (2022). Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal”. *Monash Bioethics Review*, 40(Suppl 1), 1–16. <sup>22</sup>
  29. Aliyu, A. A. (2021). Public Health Ethics and the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Annals of African Medicine*, 20(3), 157–163. <sup>21</sup>
  30. Jamrozik, E. (2022). Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal”. *Monash Bioethics Review*, 40(Suppl 1), 1–16. <sup>22</sup>
  31. Raajakesary, K., Galvin, L., Prendiville, K., Newport, S., MacAnulty, C., & Hussein, G. (2024). The Ethical Principles in Ethical Guidance Documents during the COVID-19 Pandemic in the United Kingdom and Ireland: A Qualitative Review. *Public Health Ethics*, 17(1), phae005. <sup>23</sup>
  32. Byskov, M. F., Gjerris, M., Huniche, L., & Kjær, T. (2021). An applied ethics framework for movement restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic: An evaluation of policy indicators. *BMJ Global Health*, 6(6), e005202. <sup>18</sup>
  33. Dubljević, V. (2022). Emergency Surveillance Ethics: Ensuring Abnormal Responses Remain Abnormal. In *The Ethics of Pandemics*. Oxford University Press. <sup>34</sup>
  34. Meier, B. M., Rice, B., Malden, V., et al. (2021). Ensuring Rights While Protecting Health: The Importance of Using a Human Rights Approach in Implementing Public Health Responses to COVID-19. *Health and Human Rights Journal*, 23(2), 139–152. <sup>2</sup>
  35. Talic, S., Shah, S., Wild, H., et al. (2021). Effectiveness of public health measures in reducing the incidence of covid-19, SARS-CoV-2 transmission, and covid-19 mortality: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*, 375, e068302. <sup>29</sup>
  36. Jamrozik, E. (2022). Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal”. *Monash Bioethics Review*, 40(Suppl 1), 1–16. <sup>24</sup>
  37. Global Infectious Disease Ethics Collaborative. (2022, October 3). *Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal”*. GLIDE. Retrieved from <https://www.oxjhubioethics.org/news/public-health-ethics-critiques-of-the-201c-new-normal201d> <sup>33</sup>
  38. Global Infectious Disease Ethics Collaborative. (n.d.). *Publications*. GLIDE. Retrieved from <https://www.oxjhubioethics.org/publications> <sup>40</sup>
  39. Krzykawska-Michałowska, U. (2023). Transparency as a Necessary Condition for the Moral Trustworthiness of Experts: Comment on Giubilini, Gur-Arie and Jamrozik. *Diametros*, 20(78), 80–86. <sup>31</sup>
  40. Jamrozik, E. (2022). Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal”. *Monash Bioethics Review*, 40(Suppl 1), 1–16. <sup>22</sup>
  41. Jamrozik, E. (n.d.). *Euzebiusz Jamrozik*. ResearchGate. Retrieved from

<https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Euzebiusz-Jamrozik><sup>41</sup>

42. Jamrozik, E. (2022). Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal”. *Monash Bioethics Review*, 40(Suppl 1), 1–16.<sup>25</sup>
43. Jamrozik, E. (2022). Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal”. *Monash Bioethics Review*, 40(1), 1-16.<sup>42</sup>
44. Jamrozik, E. (2022). Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal”. *Monash Bioethics Review*, 40(1), 1-16.<sup>43</sup>
45. Jamrozik, E. (2022). Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal”. *Monash Bioethics Review*. Connected Papers.<sup>44</sup>

## Works cited

1. Ethics- driven policy framework for implementation of movement restrictions in pandemics | BMJ Global Health, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://gh.bmj.com/content/bmjgh/6/6/e005202.full.pdf>
2. Ensuring Rights while Protecting Health: The Importance of Using a Human Rights Approach in Implementing Public Health Responses to COVID-19, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://www.hhrjournal.org/2021/10/25/ensuring-rights-while-protecting-health-the-importance-of-using-a-human-rights-approach-in-implementing-public-health-responses-to-covid-19/>
3. Public Health Ethics and the COVID-19 Pandemic - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8477289/>
4. The Ethical Principles in Ethical Guidance Documents during the ..., accessed April 26, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11802204/>
5. Ethics of Selective Restriction of Liberty in a Pandemic - NCBI, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK592680/>
6. COVID-19 Guidance | OHCHR, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/covid-19/covid-19-guidance>
7. Addressing Human Rights as Key to the COVID-19 Response - World Health Organization (WHO), accessed April 26, 2025, <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331811/WHO-2019-nCoV-SRH-Rights-2020.1-eng.pdf>
8. bioethics.jhu.edu, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://bioethics.jhu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Smith-and-Upshur-Pandemic-Disease-Public-Health-and-Ethics.pdf>
9. Why ethical frameworks fail to deliver in a pandemic: Are proposed alternatives an improvement? - PubMed Central, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10946480/>
10. WHO guidance on ethics in outbreaks and the COVID-19 pandemic: a critical appraisal, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://jme.bmj.com/content/medethics/early/2021/03/30/medethics-2020-106959.full.pdf>
11. WHO guidance on ethics in outbreaks and the COVID-19 pandemic ..., accessed

- April 26, 2025, <https://jme.bmj.com/content/47/6/367>
12. Public Ethics in Emergencies: Learning from the COVID-19 Pandemic (Chapter 52), accessed April 26, 2025, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/major-incidents-pandemics-and-mental-health/public-ethics-in-emergencies-learning-from-the-covid19-pandemic/7B54864AA7A0D7A794FC996BB7C1E72F>
  13. Ethical values and principles to guide the fair allocation of resources ..., accessed April 26, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9261249/>
  14. The Ethics of Quarantine | Journal of Ethics | American Medical Association, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/ethics-quarantine/2003-11>
  15. Ethics of selective restriction of liberty in a pandemic | Journal of Medical Ethics, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://jme.bmj.com/content/47/8/553>
  16. An Ethics Framework for the COVID-19 Reopening Process, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://bioethics.jhu.edu/research-and-outreach/covid-19-bioethics-expert-insights/resources-for-addressing-key-ethical-areas/grappling-with-the-ethics-of-social-distancing/>
  17. Ethics-driven policy framework for implementation of movement ..., accessed April 26, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8183287/>
  18. Ethics-driven policy framework for implementation of movement restrictions in pandemics, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://gh.bmj.com/content/6/6/e005202>
  19. A narrative review of the challenges, ethical frameworks, and guidelines in the setting of COVID-19 healthcare and research - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9106127/>
  20. The shared ethical framework to allocate scarce medical resources: a lesson from COVID-19, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37172603/>
  21. Public health ethics and the COVID-19 pandemic - ResearchGate, accessed April 26, 2025, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354845622\\_Public\\_health\\_ethics\\_and\\_the\\_COVID-19\\_pandemic](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354845622_Public_health_ethics_and_the_COVID-19_pandemic)
  22. (PDF) Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal”, accessed April 26, 2025, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363893559\\_Public\\_health\\_ethics\\_critiques\\_of\\_the\\_new\\_normal](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363893559_Public_health_ethics_critiques_of_the_new_normal)
  23. The Ethical Principles in Ethical Guidance Documents during the COVID-19 Pandemic in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland: A Qualitative Review | Prehospital and Disaster Medicine, accessed April 26, 2025, [https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S1049023X24000396/type/journal\\_article](https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S1049023X24000396/type/journal_article)
  24. Euzebiusz Jamrozik, Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal” - PhilPapers, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMPHE>
  25. Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal” - PubMed, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36167921/>
  26. Law, Ethics and Lockdowns: Impacts on Life, Liberty and the Economy, accessed April 26, 2025,



- <https://issuesinlawandmedicine.com/articles/law-ethics-and-lockdowns-impacts-on-life-liberty-and-the-economy/>
27. media.tghn.org, accessed April 26, 2025,  
[https://media.tghn.org/articles/Ethics\\_COVID-19\\_Restrictive\\_Measures\\_-\\_Apr\\_14.pdf](https://media.tghn.org/articles/Ethics_COVID-19_Restrictive_Measures_-_Apr_14.pdf)
  28. Values and preferences in COVID-19 public health guidelines: A systematic review, accessed April 26, 2025,  
<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.03.25.24304859v1.full-text>
  29. Effectiveness of public health measures in reducing the incidence of covid-19, SARS-CoV-2 transmission, and covid-19 mortality: systematic review and meta-analysis | The BMJ, accessed April 26, 2025,  
<https://www.bmj.com/content/375/bmj-2021-068302>
  30. Ethical Responses to the Covid-19 Pandemic: Implications for the Ethos and Practice of Anatomy as a Health Science Discipline - PubMed Central, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7404418/>
  31. Transparency as a Double-Edged Sword: Public Health Ethics Perspective - Diametros, accessed April 26, 2025,  
<https://diametros.uj.edu.pl/diametros/article/view/2001>
  32. A guide to WHO's guidance on COVID-19 - World Health Organization (WHO), accessed April 26, 2025,  
<https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/a-guide-to-who-s-guidance>
  33. Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal”, accessed April 26, 2025,  
<https://www.oxhubioethics.org/news/public-health-ethics-critiques-of-the-201cnew-normal201d>
  34. 9 The Dynamics of Public Health Ethics: Covid-19 and Surveillance as Justifiable but Abnormal - Oxford Academic, accessed April 26, 2025,  
<https://academic.oup.com/book/55101/chapter/423909007>
  35. WHO Ethics & SARS-CoV-2 – Restrictive Measures and Physical Distancing – PRAIS 2.0, accessed April 26, 2025,  
<https://prais.paho.org/en/who-ethics-sars-cov-2-restrictive-measures-and-physical-distancing/>
  36. Ethics & SARS-CoV-2 – Restrictive Measures and Physical Distancing, accessed April 26, 2025,  
<https://epidemicethics.tghn.org/articles/ethics-sars-cov-2-restrictive-measures-and-physical-distancing/>
  37. Ethical issues in managing the COVID-19 pandemic - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8239940/>
  38. Ethics guidance during a pandemic: An overview | American Medical Association, accessed April 26, 2025,  
<https://www.ama-assn.org/delivering-care/ethics/ethics-guidance-during-pandemic-overview>
  39. IMPLEMENTING ETHICAL FRAMEWORKS FOR RATIONING SCARCE HEALTH RESOURCES IN MINNESOTA DURING SEVERE INFLUENZA PANDEMIC, accessed April 26, 2025,



- <https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/ep/surge/crisis/implement.pdf>
40. Publications - Global Infectious Disease Ethics Collaborative, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://www.oxhubioethics.org/publications>
  41. Euzebiusz JAMROZIK | Postdoctoral Fellow | University of Oxford, Oxford | OX | Wellcome Centre for Ethics and the Humanities | Research profile - ResearchGate, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Euzebiusz-Jamrozik>
  42. Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal” - OUCI, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://ouci.dntb.gov.ua/en/works/4aYBOW64/>
  43. Public health ethics: critiques of the “new normal” | CoLab, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://colab.ws/articles/10.1007%2Fs40592-022-00163-7>
  44. Find and explore academic papers | Connected ... - Connected Papers, accessed April 26, 2025, <https://www.connectedpapers.com/main/a80b87fe4c4e7cc70f79a53833465f64c0b6b84d>