



Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.

infectious days on the day of travel. By this measure, the 3-day pre-travel test reduces the days of exposure to the destination population by only 20% relative to no testing, less than the reported 36% reduction that includes pre-travel exposure days.

Another confusion comes from the tally of infectious days during the 5-day post-arrival quarantine simulations. In figure B, the curve for strategy 1 in the study by Kiang and colleagues is overlaid with the curve for strategy 2 (PCR test within 3 days of departure and PCR test on day 5 after arrival, with 5 days of quarantine upon arrival). It shows that quarantine has no effect on the cumulative days of exposure until day 5 and beyond. For some reason, Kiang and colleagues included the travellers' infectious days during 5 days of quarantine in the cumulative count, even though these days are not exposing the destination population. If the infectious days during the 5-day quarantine period were excluded, the reduction in exposure to the destination population under strategy 2 would be far greater than the 70% reported in the study.

Finally, most helpful would be to add a table that shows, for each strategy, the number of infectious people on each day of travel.

I report, outside this work, grants from the Foundational Questions Institute, personal fees from *Trials*.ai, and grants and non-financial support from the Stanford Center for Computational, Evolutionary and Human Genomics and the Morrison Institute for Population and Resources Studies, Stanford University.

Lee Altenberg

altenber@hawaii.edu

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI, USA

1 Kiang MV, Chin ET, Huynh BQ, et al. Routine asymptomatic testing strategies for airline travel during the COVID-19 pandemic: a simulation study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2021; **21**: 929–38.

Authors' reply

We thank Lee Altenberg and Mohammad Shahid for their comments on our study.^{1–3} Despite efficacious COVID-19 vaccines becoming available since our study

was originally designed, the use of routine testing for SARS-CoV-2 during travel has become increasingly relevant due to: (1) groups of people who have declined vaccination, (2) vaccine-breakthrough infections (that might be symptomatic or asymptomatic), (3) new variants with higher degrees of infectiousness, and (4) lack of access to vaccination in many parts of the world.

Altenberg comments on a number of methodological points.¹ First, he suggests that we do not include the entire travel period when calculating our primary study outcome, the cumulative number of infectious days experienced by travellers. However, we deliberately included days before travel because we were interested in overall population-level transmission, which includes the origin population in addition to the destination population. Routine asymptomatic testing potentially stops transmission in the origin city as passengers become aware of a positive test and self-isolate, which is a relevant effect of this testing strategy. However, we have included the suggested analysis that excludes the pre-travel period in measuring total infectious days as a sensitivity analysis in the new appendix of the Article (p 7), with largely similar findings.

Second, Altenberg suggests not counting infectious people during their quarantine period in our primary study outcome. We agree and have made this correction to the Article.³ This update increases the effectiveness of testing strategies with post-travel quarantine, but the overall study conclusions remain similar. This estimate assumes relatively strict adherence to quarantine and therefore might represent the upper limit of benefit of post-travel quarantine. We share Altenberg's concern about the importance of providing up-to-date, context-specific modelling analyses to inform decisions on various test-and-travel strategies to control COVID-19.

We have provided all data and code underlying the analyses online since before publication and believe our paper can be used as a framework for producing these analyses for public health departments.

Finally, Altenberg requests a table with the number of infectious people on each day of travel for each strategy, and we now provide this in the appendix of the Article (p 7).

In his Correspondence,² Mohammad Shahid proposed a three-test strategy for SARS-CoV-2 to improve detection of infectious passengers during travel. The three-test strategy would include a pre-travel, day-of-travel, and post-arrival test for SARS-CoV-2. This strategy was not considered among the five strategies we evaluated, which all used either one or two tests. We agree that a three-test strategy might modestly improve the overall proportion of infectious people detected, although the additional yield is likely to be minimal, with higher logistical and resource challenges, as well as risk of false positives, as shown in our original analysis. Overall, a well timed, two-test strategy is likely to balance optimal effectiveness with resources and logistical considerations.

MVK reports a grant from the National Institute on Drug Abuse of the National Institutes of Health (K99DA051534). NCL reports grants and personal fees from WHO, grants from California Department of Public Health, and financial support from the University of California, San Francisco, outside the submitted work. ETC reports grants from the Stanford Graduate Fellowship in Science and Engineering and the National Science Foundation's Graduate Research Fellowship (DGE-1656518), outside the submitted work. BQH reports grants from the National Science Foundation (DGE-1656518) and the National Library of Medicine (T15 LM 007033), outside the submitted work. LACC declares no competing interests.

*Mathew V Kiang, Elizabeth T Chin, Benjamin Q Huynh, Lloyd A C Chapman, *Nathan C Lo*

nathan.lo@ucsf.edu

Department of Epidemiology and Population Health (MVK) and Department of Biomedical Data Science (ETC, BQH), Stanford University, Stanford,



Published Online
September 15, 2021
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(21\)00562-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00562-4)

CA, USA; Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK (LACC); Department of Medicine and Division of HIV, Infectious Diseases, and Global Medicine, San Francisco, CA 94110, USA (NCL)

- 1 Altenberg L. Addendum needed on COVID-19 travel study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2021; published online Sept 15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(21\)00454-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00454-0).
- 2 Shahid M. Two-test or three-test strategy for routine asymptomatic testing during air travel? *Lancet Infect Dis* 2021; **21**: 1214–15.
- 3 Kiang MV, Chin ET, Huynh BQ, et al. Routine asymptomatic testing strategies for airline travel during the COVID-19 pandemic: a simulation study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2021; **21**: 929–38.