Comparative analysis of public health laws of India and Sweden with Special reference to COVID-19 Pandemic

Ms. Shilpi Burman[1], Dr. Shilpi Sharma[2]

[1]Research Scholar, AURO University, Surat, Gujarat, India
[2] Associate Professor, AURO University, Surat, Gujarat, India

Abstract: *This study examines how the public health legislation and COVID-19 pandemic responses in Sweden and India were influenced by the differences in their healthcare systems and legal frameworks. Sweden avoided rigorous lockdowns in favour of voluntary measures, public confidence, and individual accountability in its decentralized and universal healthcare system. Under the Communicable Diseases Act of 2004, the Swedish Public Health Agency took the lead in leading the nation's response, emphasizing the protection of high-risk populations while preserving economic stability. On the other hand, the Epidemic Diseases Act of 1897 and the Disaster Management Act of 2005 imposed strict lockdowns and enforcement mechanisms on India's heterogeneous healthcare system, which is marked by notable regional differences. To contain the infection, India used intensive testing, contact tracing, and digital technologies like the Aarogya Setu app. Both nations' distinct methods were also evident in their vaccination efforts. Following EU rules, Sweden gave priority to high-risk groups and rolled out the immunization program with strong public trust. Despite obstacles like vaccine scepticism and supply chain problems, India initiated a huge immunization effort employing both internationally and domestically produced vaccinations.*

This comparative analysis looks at the results and difficulties that both nations faced. Sweden's approach led to higher death rates per capita but less economic disturbance, while India's stringent efforts caused major social and economic unrest, particularly during the second wave of the virus, but initially controlled the outbreak. To effectively manage future health crises, the analysis emphasizes the significance of adaptable, context-specific public health measures and a strong healthcare infrastructure. The results give policymakers around the world important insights into the efficacy of various public health strategies during a global health emergency.

***Key Words*: Computational neuroscience, neurotechnology, brain metabolism, functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging, Electroencephalography, human health.**

Received Date: 08/07/2024 Revised Date: 19/03/2024 Acceptance Date: 06/04/2024

1. INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic is a harsh reminder of the critical role public health laws play in managing and mitigating health catastrophes. The pandemic has put public health systems across the globe to the test of their adaptation and resilience, highlighting the urgent need for sensible laws and flexible healthcare systems. In Sweden and India, two nations with very different healthcare systems, legislative frameworks, and socioeconomic circumstances, this research examines the differential approaches to public health laws and COVID-19 reactions. Relying mainly on public trust and decentralized government, Sweden is renowned for its comprehensive welfare state and universal healthcare system. The Communicable Diseases Act of 2004, which places a strong emphasis on personal accountability and voluntary compliance, frames its public health policy. Sweden's response to the COVID-19 epidemic was notable for its adherence to tax regulations.

India, on the other hand, has a more centralized legislative framework and a mixed healthcare system with notable regional disparities that influence its approach to public health. The Epidemic Diseases Act of 1897 and the Disaster Management Act of 2005, which provide the government broad authority to impose measures like lockdowns, quarantines, and movement restrictions, serve as the foundation for public health governance in India. One of the harshest lockdowns in the world, vigorous testing, contact tracing, and the use of digital tools like the Aarogya Setu app to track and control the virus's spread were all part of India's reaction to COVID-19 pandemic. These initiatives were led by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and state health departments despite difficult socioeconomic circumstances.

The purpose of this study is to compare the COVID-19 responses and public health regulations of Sweden and India, emphasizing the successes and difficulties that each nation has encountered. Through an analysis of these variations, the research aims to provide insights into the efficacy of different public health approaches in the context of a global health emergency, as well as lessons and implications for future public health policies.

2. OVERVIEW

2.1. SWEDEN

The healthcare system in Sweden is well-known for its universal coverage, guaranteeing that all citizens, irrespective of their financial situation, have access to full medical care. The country's dedication to providing equal healthcare is reflected in the fact that taxes are the main source of funding for this system. Sweden's decentralized healthcare system is noteworthy because county councils, or regional authorities, are primarily in charge of providing healthcare. To provide individualized healthcare solutions that successfully satisfy regional needs, these councils are entrusted with overseeing neighborhood hospitals, primary care clinics, and other healthcare institutions.

A significant part of the Swedish health system is the Public Health Agency. This organization oversees promoting health, controlling disease, and offering reliable advice on matters pertaining to public health. The Swedish Public Health Agency is responsible for coordinating national responses to health crises, such as the COVID-19 epidemic, by implementing actions that are grounded in scientific knowledge and public health competence. Sweden has handled public health challenges with a decentralized, scientifically based approach that aims to uphold high standards of healthcare and public well-being.:

2.2. INDIA

India, on the other hand, has a complicated healthcare system that combines the public and private sectors. State health departments oversee administering the regional implementation of public healthcare services, which are governed nationally by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. The objective of this dual system is to enable broad access to healthcare; yet, there can be considerable variations in the availability and quality of services among states and areas. Healthcare results are influenced by various factors, including population density, economic disparity, and regional government. These factors result in notable variations in healthcare quality and accessibility.

The Disaster Management Act of 2005 and the Epidemic Diseases Act of 1897 comprise India's legislative framework for handling health emergencies. These laws give the government wide authority to take the required actions in case of medical emergency. One of India's first health regulations, the Epidemic Diseases Act, permits the use of containment measures such as quarantines and travel restrictions. The Disaster Management Act unifies activities across several government sectors and levels to create a comprehensive framework for disaster response, including health emergencies.

These legislative instruments work together to provide the framework for India's public health response in times of crisis, as the COVID-19 epidemic. Despite being extensive, this structure has drawbacks because of budget constraints, regional differences, and the requirement for collaboration between public and private healthcare providers. [1]

3. PUBLIC HEALTH LAWS AND POLICIES

3.1. SWEDEN

The goal of Sweden's public health regulations is to encourage widespread public involvement and adherence to health recommendations. The Communicable Diseases Act of 2004 is the main piece of legislation that governs infectious disease management in Sweden. This legislation emphasizes the importance of public trust and personal accountability while offering a comprehensive legal framework to handle threats to public health. Sweden's response to the COVID-19 epidemic stood out because it relied more on voluntary measures than on enforcing tight lockdowns. The government published rules on social separation, personal hygiene, and remote labour, but it did not use forceful enforcement since it trusted the public to follow them. This approach was supported by a strong sense of public confidence in the government and a societal tendency to heed public health advice.

3.2. INDIA

On the other hand, the Epidemic Diseases Act of 1897 and the Disaster Management Act of 2005 serve as major pillars for India's public health response. These rules give the government the authority to impose movement restrictions, lockdowns, and quarantines, among other drastic measures, during health emergencies. India imposed some of the toughest lockdowns in the world during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic to stop the virus's spread. The government's strategy included comprehensive testing, contact tracking, and quarantine rules, all of which were strictly enforced. These rules gave India a strong foundation for managing the pandemic, but they also brought to light issues with implementation and the socioeconomic effects of such stringent regulations. [2]

4. OUTCOMES AND CHALLENGES

4.1. SWEDEN

Sweden distinguished itself in the COVID-19 pandemic response by eschewing national lockdowns and placing a

strong emphasis on voluntary compliance and personal accountability. The government focused on protecting high-risk populations like the elderly and those with pre-existing diseases, and encouraged social separation, remote work, and maintaining the running of schools and companies.

Testing and Contact Tracing

At first, Sweden was criticized for having insufficient testing resources. But the nation increased its testing capacity as the virus spread. The implementation of contact tracking was carried out, albeit less strictly than in other nations; this was indicative of Sweden's general dependence on voluntary procedures and public trust.

Vaccination Campaign

Sweden distributed vaccines in accordance with EU criteria, giving high-risk populations including healthcare workers and the elderly priority. Due to effective logistics and a high degree of public faith in the healthcare system, the immunization campaign was mostly successful.

4.2. INDIA

The Beginning in March 2020, India implemented some of the strongest lockdown measures in the world in response to COVID-19. Protocols for quarantine, contact tracing, and thorough testing were implemented by the authorities. Digital tools were crucial in controlling and monitoring the virus's transmission, especially the Aarogya Setu app.

Testing and Contact Tracing

India implemented stringent testing and contact tracing tactics. In order to detect and isolate patients and control outbreaks in highly populated areas, mobile testing equipment and extensive technology use were essential.

Vaccination Campaign

India started a massive immunization campaign, using multinational vaccinations like Covishield as well as domestically produced vaccines like Covaxin. Numerous obstacles had to be overcome for the campaign to succeed, such as supply chain problems, vaccine scepticism, logistical difficulties, and distribution discrepancies between various areas. India's immunization programs sought to reach its large and diverse population while progressively raising coverage and immunity levels despite these challenges.[3]

5. PUBLIC HEALTH COMMUNICATION

5.1. SWEDEN

Sweden placed a strong emphasis on open communication, giving regular updates from public health authorities. The plan placed a great deal of reliance on the public's adherence to voluntary standards, including social separation, hygiene, and remote work advice. [5]

5.2. INDIA

India started large-scale public health initiatives to inform people about COVID-19 and ways to avoid it. The government ensured broad adherence to lockdowns, social distance, and other public health procedures by vigorously enforcing these measures and penalizing noncompliance. This strategy sought to stop the virus's spread and lessen its effects on the population's diversity.

6. ECONOMIC IMPACT

6.1. SWEDEN

Sweden prioritized maintaining economic activity during the pandemic and put in place measures to support businesses and individuals. Even though the country experienced a recession, Sweden's strategy of eschewing harsh lockdowns had a less severe economic impact than those of nations who imposed strict limitations. [4]

6.2. INDIA

India provided relief packages that included direct cash transfers, food distribution, and support for small companies in response to the economic issues brought on by the pandemic. But the tight national lockdown that was imposed in March 2020 resulted in a significant decline in the economy, many job losses, and disruptions in the unorganized sector, underscoring the difficult trade-offs that exist between economic stability and public health in times of crisis.

7. CONCLUSIONS

The public health laws and COVID-19 responses of Sweden and India are compared, and the analysis reveals notable variations in their approaches and results. Instead of adopting harsh lockdowns, Sweden chose an approach that was based on public confidence and voluntary compliance. It also recommended remote labor, individual accountability, and social separation. This strategy attempted to safeguard vulnerable groups while preserving economic stability. But Sweden was criticized for having greater death rates than its neighbors, which highlights the difficulties in striking a balance between public health and limited limitations.

In contrast, early in the pandemic, India imposed one of the strongest statewide lockdowns in history, backed by strict enforcement measures under the Disaster Management Act

and the Epidemic Diseases Act. This strategy involved a great deal of testing, contact tracing, and the use of digital tools for control and monitoring, such as the Aarogya Setu app. Even though the virus was temporarily contained, India faced serious socioeconomic problems, such as a declining economy, job losses, and disruptions in the unorganized sector.

The significance of adaptable and context-specific public health policies amid global health emergencies is highlighted by these divergent approaches. Sweden's dependence on public trust showed how voluntary actions could reduce health hazards without compromising economic activity. While the virus was originally confined by India's centralized administration and stringent enforcement, this also brought attention to the urgent need for a strong healthcare infrastructure and fair access to healthcare services.

Looking ahead, both nations' lessons highlight the need for quick public health solutions that are adapted to local conditions and backed by robust healthcare infrastructure. To successfully manage and reduce the effects of pandemics, it will be necessary to address future health crises by integrating public health measures with economic considerations and guaranteeing fair access to healthcare resources.[6]

REFERENCES

1] COVID-19 Strategy – The Swedish Model and Lessons for India By Ashok Swain
2] Law, and Public Health Policy By R. Martin
Guest Editor (s): Harald Kristian (Kris) Heggenhougen
3] COVID's First and Second Waves in India: Lessons and Policy Implications by D. K. Srivastava, Muralikrishna Bharadwaj, and Ragini Trehan
4] How Sweden approached the COVID-19 pandemic: Summary and commentary on the National Commission Inquiry by Jonas F. Ludvigsson
5] Communicable Diseases Act (2004), Sweden
6] Disaster Management Act (2005), India