

1 **The impact of transmission control measures during the first 50 days of the COVID-19**  
2 **epidemic in China**

3  
4 Huaiyu Tian<sup>1\*†</sup>, Yonghong Liu<sup>1\*</sup>, Yidan Li<sup>1\*</sup>, Chieh-Hsi Wu<sup>3\*</sup>, Bin Chen<sup>4\*</sup>, Moritz U.G.  
5 Kraemer<sup>2,5,6</sup>, Bingying Li<sup>1</sup>, Jun Cai<sup>7</sup>, Bo Xu<sup>7</sup>, Qiqi Yang<sup>1</sup>, Ben Wang<sup>1</sup>, Peng Yang<sup>8</sup>, Yujun Cui<sup>9</sup>,  
6 Yimeng Song<sup>10</sup>, Pai Zheng<sup>11</sup>, Quanyi Wang<sup>8</sup>, Ottar N. Bjornstad<sup>12,13</sup>, Ruifu Yang<sup>8†</sup>, Bryan T.  
7 Grenfell<sup>14,15†</sup>, Oliver G. Pybus<sup>2†</sup>, Christopher Dye<sup>2†</sup>

8  
9 <sup>1</sup> State Key Laboratory of Remote Sensing Science, College of Global Change and Earth System  
10 Science, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China

11 <sup>2</sup> Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

12 <sup>3</sup> Mathematical Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom

13 <sup>4</sup> Department of Land, Air and Water Resources, University of California Davis, CA, USA

14 <sup>5</sup> Harvard Medical School, Harvard University, Boston, MA, USA

15 <sup>6</sup> Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

16 <sup>7</sup> Ministry of Education Key Laboratory for Earth System Modeling, Department of Earth System  
17 Science, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

18 <sup>8</sup> Beijing Center for Disease Prevention and Control, Beijing, China

19 <sup>9</sup> State Key Laboratory of Pathogen and Biosecurity, Beijing Institute of Microbiology and  
20 Epidemiology, Beijing, China

21 <sup>10</sup> Department of Urban Planning and Design, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

22 <sup>11</sup> Department of Occupational and Environmental Health Sciences, School of Public Health,  
23 Peking University, China

24 <sup>12</sup> Center for Infectious Disease Dynamics, Department of Biology, Pennsylvania State University,  
25 University Park, Pennsylvania, USA

26 <sup>13</sup> Department of Entomology, College of Agricultural Sciences, Pennsylvania State University,  
27 University Park, Pennsylvania, USA

28 <sup>14</sup> Division of International Epidemiology and Population Studies, Fogarty International Center,  
29 National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA

30 <sup>15</sup> Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA.

31

32 \*These authors contributed equally to this work.

33 †Corresponding author. Email: [tianhuaiyu@gmail.com](mailto:tianhuaiyu@gmail.com) (H.T.); [christopher.dye@zoo.ox.ac.uk](mailto:christopher.dye@zoo.ox.ac.uk)  
34 (C.D.); [oliver.pybus@zoo.ox.ac.uk](mailto:oliver.pybus@zoo.ox.ac.uk) (O.G.P.); [grenfell@princeton.edu](mailto:grenfell@princeton.edu) (B.G.);  
35 [ruifyang@gmail.com](mailto:ruifyang@gmail.com) (R.F.Y.);

36

37 **Author contributions:** H.T., P.Z., R.F.Y., O.G.P., B.T.G., C.D. designed the study. B.C. and  
38 Y.M.S. collected and processed the Tencent's LBS data. Y.H.L., B.Y.L., B.X., Q.Q.Y., B.W., P.Y.,  
39 Y.J.C., Q.Y.W. collected the statistical data. H.Y.T., Y.L., C.H.W, and J.C. conducted the analyses.  
40 M.K., O.N.B., R.F.Y., O.G.P., B.T.G., and C.D. edited the manuscript. H.T. and C.D. wrote the  
41 manuscript. All authors read and approved the manuscript.

42

43

44 **One sentence summary**

45 Travel restrictions and the national emergency response delayed the growth and limited the size of  
46 the COVID-19 epidemic in China.

47

48 **Abstract**

49 Respiratory illness caused by a novel coronavirus (COVID-19) appeared in China during  
50 December 2019. Attempting to contain infection, China banned travel to and from Wuhan city on  
51 23 January and implemented a national emergency response. Here we evaluate the spread and  
52 control of the epidemic based on a unique synthesis of data including case reports, human  
53 movement and public health interventions. The Wuhan shutdown slowed the dispersal of infection  
54 to other cities by an estimated 2.91 days (95%CI: 2.54-3.29), delaying epidemic growth elsewhere  
55 in China. Other cities that implemented control measures pre-emptively reported 33.3%  
56 (11.1-44.4%) fewer cases in the first week of their outbreaks (13.0; 7.1-18.8) compared with cities  
57 that started control later (20.6; 14.5-26.8). Among interventions investigated here, the most  
58 effective were suspending intra-city public transport, closing entertainment venues and banning  
59 public gatherings. The national emergency response delayed the growth and limited the size of the  
60 COVID-19 epidemic and, by 19 February (day 50), had averted hundreds of thousands of cases  
61 across China.

62

63 *Key words:* novel coronavirus, COVID-19, epidemic, emergency, transmission control, Wuhan  
64 city, China

65 **Main text**

66 On 31 December 2019, less than a month before the 2020 Spring Festival holiday, including the  
67 Chinese Lunar New Year, a cluster of pneumonia cases caused by an unknown pathogen was  
68 reported in Wuhan, a city of 11 million inhabitants and the largest transport hub in Central China.  
69 A novel coronavirus (1, 2) was identified as the etiological agent (3, 4) and human-to-human  
70 transmission of the viral disease (COVID-19) has been since confirmed (5, 6). Further spatial  
71 spread of this disease was of great concern in view of the upcoming Spring Festival (“*chunyun*”)  
72 during which there are typically three billion travel movements over the 40-day holiday period,  
73 which runs from 15 days before the Spring Festival (Chinese Lunar New Year) to 25 days  
74 afterwards (7).

75  
76 As there is currently neither a vaccine nor a specific drug treatment for COVID-19, a range of  
77 public health (non-pharmaceutical) interventions has been used to control the outbreak. In an  
78 attempt to prevent further dispersal of COVID-19 from its source, all transport was prohibited in  
79 and out of Wuhan city from 10:00h on 23 January 2020, followed by the whole of Hubei Province  
80 a day later. In terms of the population covered, this appears to be the largest attempted quarantine  
81 (movement restriction) event in human history.

82  
83 On 23 January, China also raised its national public health response to the highest state of  
84 emergency — Level 1 of 4 levels of severity in the Chinese Emergency System, defined as an  
85 “extremely serious incident” (8). As part of the national emergency response, and in addition to  
86 the Wuhan city travel ban, suspected and confirmed cases have been isolated, public transport by  
87 bus and subway rail suspended, schools and entertainment venues have been closed, public  
88 gatherings banned, health checks carried out on migrants (“floating population”), travel prohibited  
89 in and out of cities, and information widely disseminated. Despite all these measures, the outbreak  
90 has continued to spread geographically, within and beyond China, with mounting numbers of  
91 cases and deaths.

92  
93 Although the spatial spread of infectious diseases has been intensively studied (9-14), including  
94 explicit studies of the role of human movement (15, 16), the effectiveness of travel restrictions and  
95 social distancing measures in preventing the spread of infection is uncertain. For COVID-19,  
96 coronavirus transmission patterns and the impact of interventions are still poorly understood (6, 7).  
97 We therefore carried out a quantitative analysis of the impact of travel restrictions and  
98 transmission control measures during the first 50 days of the COVID-19 epidemic in China, from  
99 31 December 2019 to 19 February 2020 (Fig. 1). This period embraced the 40 days of the Spring  
100 Festival holiday, 15 days before the Chinese Lunar New Year on 25 January and 25 days  
101 afterwards. The analysis is based on a unique geocoded repository of data on COVID-19  
102 epidemiology, human movement, and public health (non-pharmaceutical) interventions.

103  
104 We first investigated the effect of the Wuhan city travel ban, comparing travel in 2020 with that in  
105 previous years and exploring the consequences of holiday travel for the dispersal of infection  
106 across China. During Spring Festival travel in 2017 and 2018, there was an average outflow of 5.2  
107 million people from Wuhan city during the 15 days before the Chinese Lunar New Year. In 2020,  
108 this travel was interrupted by the Wuhan city shutdown, but 4.3 million people travelled out of the

109 city between 11 January and the implementation of the ban on 23 January (7) (Fig. 2A). In 2017  
110 and 2018, travel out of the city during the 25 days after the Chinese Lunar New Year averaged 6.7  
111 million people each year. In 2020, the travel ban prevented almost all of that movement.

112

113 The dispersal of COVID-19 from Wuhan was rapid (Fig. 3A). A total of 262 cities reported cases  
114 within 28 days. For comparison, the 2009 influenza H1N1pdm pandemic took 132 days to reach  
115 the same number of cities in China. The number of cities providing first reports of COVID-19  
116 peaked at 59 per day on 23 January, the date of the Wuhan travel ban.

117

118 The total number of cases reported from each province by 30 January, one week after the Wuhan  
119 shutdown, was strongly associated with the total number of travellers from Wuhan ( $r=0.98$ ,  
120  $P<0.01$ ; excluding Hubei,  $r=0.69$ ,  $P<0.01$ ; Figs. 2B and 2C). COVID-19 arrived sooner in those  
121 cities that had larger populations and had more travellers from Wuhan (Tables 1 and S1). However,  
122 the Wuhan travel ban delayed the arrival time of COVID-19 in other cities by an estimated 2.91  
123 days (95%CI: 2.54-3.29 days) on average (Table 1, Fig. 3B). More than 130 cities, covering more  
124 than half the geographic area and population of China, benefited from the delay.

125

126 This delay provided extra time to prepare for the arrival of COVID-19 across China but would not  
127 have curbed transmission after infection had been exported to new locations from Wuhan. Fig. 1  
128 shows the timing and implementation of emergency control measures in 342 cities across China  
129 (see also Figs. S2 and S4). School closure, the isolation of suspected and confirmed patients, plus  
130 the disclosure of information was implemented in all cities. Public gatherings were banned and  
131 entertainment venues closed in 220 cities (64.3%). Intra-city public transport was suspended in  
132 136 cities (39.7%) and inter-city travel was prohibited by 219 cities (64.0%). All three measures  
133 were applied in 136 cities (Table S2).

134

135 Cities that implemented a Level 1 response (any combination of control measures; Figs. S2 and S4)  
136 pre-emptively, before discovering any COVID-19 cases, reported 33.3% (95%CI: 11.1-44.4%)  
137 fewer laboratory-confirmed cases during the first week of an outbreak (13.0, 95%CI: 7.1-18.8,  
138  $n=125$ ) compared with cities that started control later (20.6 cases, 95%CI: 14.5-26.8,  $n=171$ ;  
139 difference between groups,  $U=8197$   $z=-3.4$ ,  $P<0.01$ ). Among specific control measures, cities that  
140 suspended intra-city public transport and/or closed entertainment venues and banned public  
141 gatherings, and did so sooner, reported fewer cases during the first week of their outbreaks (Table  
142 2, Table S3). This analysis provided no evidence that the prohibition of travel between cities,  
143 which was implemented after and in addition to the Wuhan shutdown on 23 January, reduced the  
144 number of cases in other cities across China. These results are robust to the choice of statistical  
145 regression model (Supplementary Material, Table S3).

146

147 The reported daily incidence of confirmed cases peaked in Hubei province (including Wuhan) on  
148 4 February (3156 laboratory-confirmed cases, 5.33/100,000 population in Hubei), and in all other  
149 provinces on 31 January (875 cases, 0.07/100,000 population; Fig. S1). The low level of peak  
150 incidence per capita, the early timing of the peak, and the subsequent decline in daily case reports,  
151 suggest that transmission control measures not only delayed the growth of the epidemic, but also  
152 greatly limited the number of cases. By fitting an epidemic model to the time series of cases

153 reported in each province (Supplementary Material, Fig. S3), we estimate that the (basic) case  
154 reproduction number ( $R_0$ ) was 3.15 prior to the implementation of the emergency response on 23  
155 January (Table 3). As control was scaled-up from 23 January onwards (stage 1), the case  
156 reproduction number declined to 0.97, 2.01 and 3.05 (estimated as  $C_1R_0$ ) in three groups of  
157 provinces, depending on the rate of implementation in each group (Tables 3 and S4). Once the  
158 implementation of interventions was 95% complete everywhere (stage 2), the case reproduction  
159 number had fallen to 0.04 on average ( $C_2R_0$ ), far below the replacement rate ( $\ll 1$ ) and consistent  
160 with the rapid decline in incidence (Fig. 4A, Fig. S5, Table 3, Table S4).

161  
162 Based on the fit of the model to daily case reports from each province, we investigated the  
163 aggregate effect of control measures on the trajectory of the epidemic outside Wuhan city (Fig.  
164 4B). Without the Wuhan travel ban or the national emergency response, there would have been  
165 744,000 ( $\pm 156,000$ ) confirmed COVID-19 cases outside Wuhan by 19 February, day 50 of the  
166 epidemic. The Wuhan travel ban alone would have reduced this number to 202,000 ( $\pm 10,000$ )  
167 cases, by delaying epidemic growth. The national emergency response alone would have cut the  
168 number of cases to 199,000 ( $\pm 8500$ ). Therefore neither of these interventions would, on their own,  
169 have reversed the rise in incidence by 19 February (Fig. 4B). But together and interactively, these  
170 control measures evidently did halt and reverse the rise in incidence, limiting the number of  
171 confirmed cases reported to 29,839 (fitted model estimate  $28,000 \pm 1400$  cases), a 96% reduction  
172 on the total number of cases expected in the absence of interventions.

173  
174 In summary, this early analysis suggests that transmission control (non-pharmaceutical) measures  
175 initiated during Chinese Spring Festival holiday, including the unprecedented Wuhan city travel  
176 ban and the Level 1 national emergency response, delayed the growth and limited the size of the  
177 COVID-19 epidemic in China. Urbanization and the development of rapid transport systems in  
178 China (17-20) probably accelerated the spread and magnified the challenge of controlling  
179 COVID-19, as indicated by the comparatively slow dispersal of pandemic influenza H1N1pdm in  
180 2009. In addition, the COVID-19 epidemic began just before the period of intense travel during  
181 the Spring Festival holiday. Nevertheless, the Wuhan city travel ban provided extra time to  
182 implement transmission control measures in other parts of China and, once established, these were  
183 an additional powerful force in curtailing and reversing the epidemic.

184  
185 The number of people who have developed COVID-19 during this epidemic, and therefore the  
186 number of people who were protected by control measures, is not known precisely, given that  
187 cases were almost certainly under-reported. However, in view of the small fraction of people  
188 known to have been infected by 19 February (75,532 cases, 5.41 per 100,000 population), it is  
189 unlikely that the spread of infection was halted and epidemic growth reversed because the supply  
190 of susceptible people had been exhausted. This implies that a large fraction of the Chinese  
191 population remains at risk of COVID-19; relaxing control measures could lead to a resurgence of  
192 transmission. Further investigations are needed to verify that proposition, and population surveys  
193 of infection are needed to reveal the true number of people who have been exposed to this novel  
194 coronavirus.

195  
196 We could not investigate the impact of all elements of the national emergency response because

197 many were introduced simultaneously across China. However, there is firm evidence from the data  
198 used in this analysis that suspending intra-city public transport, closing entertainment venues and  
199 banning public gatherings, which were introduced at different times in different places,  
200 contributed to the overall containment of the epidemic. Other factors are likely to have contributed  
201 to control, such as the isolation of suspected and confirmed patients, contact tracing and the  
202 closure of schools, and it is not yet clear which parts of the national emergency response were  
203 most effective. We did not find that prohibiting travel between cities or provinces reduced the  
204 numbers of COVID-19 cases outside Wuhan and Hubei, perhaps because such travel bans were  
205 implemented as a response to, rather than in anticipation of, the arrival of COVID-19.

206

207 This study has drawn inferences, not from a controlled experiment, but from statistical and  
208 mathematical analyses of the temporal and spatial variation in case reports, human mobility and  
209 transmission control measures. With that caveat, we conclude that these control measures had a  
210 major impact on the COVID-19 epidemic, averting hundreds of thousands of cases by 19 February.  
211 Whether the means and the outcomes of control can be replicated outside China, and which of the  
212 interventions are most effective, are now under intense investigation as the virus continues to  
213 spread worldwide.

214

#### 215 **Acknowledgements**

216 We thank the thousands of CDC staff and local health workers in China who collected data and  
217 continue to work to contain COVID-19 in China and elsewhere. Funding for this study was  
218 provided by the Beijing Natural Science Foundation (JQ18025); Beijing Advanced Innovation  
219 Program for Land Surface Science; National Natural Science Foundation of China (81673234);  
220 Young Elite Scientist Sponsorship Program by CAST (YESS)(2018QNRC001); HT, OGP and CD  
221 acknowledge support from the Oxford Martin School; HT acknowledges support from the Military  
222 Logistics Research Program. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis,  
223 the decision to publish, or in preparation of the manuscript.

224

#### 225 **References and Notes**

- 226 1. N. Zhu, D. Zhang, W. Wang, X. Li, B. Yang, J. Song, X. Zhao, B. Huang, W. Shi, R. Lu, P. Niu,  
227 F. Zhan, X. Ma, D. Wang, W. Xu, G. Wu, G. F. Gao, W. Tan, A Novel Coronavirus from  
228 Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *New Eng J Med*, doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001017  
229 (2020).
- 230 2. R. Lu, X. Zhao, J. Li, P. Niu, B. Yang, H. Wu, W. Wang, H. Song, B. Huang, N. Zhu, Genomic  
231 characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for virus  
232 origins and receptor binding. *Lancet*, doi:  
233 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(1020\)30251-30258](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(1020)30251-30258) (2020).
- 234 3. F. Wu, S. Zhao, B. Yu, Y.-M. Chen, W. Wang, Z.-G. Song, Y. Hu, Z.-W. Tao, J.-H. Tian, Y.-Y.  
235 Pei, A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China. *Nature*, 1-8  
236 (2020).
- 237 4. P. Zhou, X.-L. Yang, X.-G. Wang, B. Hu, L. Zhang, W. Zhang, H.-R. Si, Y. Zhu, B. Li, C.-L.  
238 Huang, A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin.  
239 *Nature*, 1-4 (2020).
- 240 5. J. Cai, B. Xu, K. K. Y. Chan, X. Zhang, B. Zhang, Z. Chen, B. Xu, Roles of Different Transport



- 241 Modes in the Spatial Spread of the 2009 Influenza A (H1N1) Pandemic in Mainland China.  
242 *Int J Environ Res Public Health* **16**, 222 (2019).
- 243 6. C. Wang, P. W. Horby, F. G. Hayden, G. F. Gao, A novel coronavirus outbreak of global  
244 health concern. *Lancet* **395**, 470-473 (2020).
- 245 7. C. Simiao, Y. Juntao, Y. Weizhong, W. Chen, B. Till, COVID-19 control in China during  
246 mass population movements at New Year. *Lancet* **395**, 764-766 (2020).
- 247 8. in *Chinadaily*. (2020), pp.  
248 [https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202001/202029/WS202005e202318a202036a3101282](https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202001/202029/WS202005e202318a202036a3101282172739c3101282172731.html)  
249 [172739c3101282172731.html](https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202001/202029/WS202005e202318a202036a3101282172739c3101282172731.html) (accessed Jan 3101282172730, 3101282172020).
- 250 9. B. T. Grenfell, O. N. Bjørnstad, J. Kappey, Travelling waves and spatial hierarchies in  
251 measles epidemics. *Nature* **414**, 716-723 (2001).
- 252 10. D. Brockmann, D. Helbing, The hidden geometry of complex, network-driven contagion  
253 phenomena. *Science* **342**, 1337-1342 (2013).
- 254 11. A. Wesolowski, N. Eagle, A. J. Tatem, D. L. Smith, A. M. Noor, R. W. Snow, C. O. Buckee,  
255 Quantifying the impact of human mobility on malaria. *Science* **338**, 267-270 (2012).
- 256 12. N. M. Ferguson, D. A. Cummings, S. Cauchemez, C. Fraser, S. Riley, A. Meeyai, S.  
257 lamsirithaworn, D. S. Burke, Strategies for containing an emerging influenza pandemic in  
258 Southeast Asia. *Nature* **437**, 209-214 (2005).
- 259 13. K. E. Jones, N. G. Patel, M. A. Levy, A. Storeygard, D. Balk, J. L. Gittleman, P. Daszak, Global  
260 trends in emerging infectious diseases. *Nature* **451**, 990-993 (2008).
- 261 14. D. M. Morens, G. K. Folkers, A. S. Fauci, The challenge of emerging and re-emerging  
262 infectious diseases. *Nature* **430**, 242-249 (2004).
- 263 15. C. Viboud, O. N. Bjørnstad, D. L. Smith, L. Simonsen, M. A. Miller, B. T. Grenfell, Synchrony,  
264 waves, and spatial hierarchies in the spread of influenza. *Science* **312**, 447-451 (2006).
- 265 16. A. Wesolowski, T. Qureshi, M. F. Boni, P. R. Sundsøy, M. A. Johansson, S. B. Rasheed, K.  
266 Engø-Monsen, C. O. Buckee, Impact of human mobility on the emergence of dengue  
267 epidemics in Pakistan. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **112**, 11887-11892 (2015).
- 268 17. N. Baum-Snow, L. Brandt, J. V. Henderson, M. A. Turner, Q. Zhang, Roads, railroads, and  
269 decentralization of Chinese cities. *Rev Econ Stat* **99**, 435-448 (2017).
- 270 18. G. F. Gao, From "A" IV to "Z" IKV: attacks from emerging and re-emerging pathogens.  
271 *Cell* **172**, 1157-1159 (2018).
- 272 19. Tian HY, Hu SX, Cazelles B, Chowell G, Gao LD, Laine M, Li YP, Yang HS, Li YD, Yang QQ,  
273 Tong X, Huang R, Bjornstad ON, Xiao H, Stenseth NC, Urbanization prolongs hantavirus  
274 epidemics in cities. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **115**, 4707-4712 (2018).
- 275 20. S. S. Morse, J. A. Mazet, M. Woolhouse, C. R. Parrish, D. Carroll, W. B. Karesh, C.  
276 Zambrana-Torrel, W. I. Lipkin, P. Daszak, Prediction and prevention of the next  
277 pandemic zoonosis. *Lancet* **380**, 1956-1965 (2012).
- 278 21. J. T. Wu, K. Leung, G. M. Leung, Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and  
279 international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a  
280 modelling study. *Lancet* **395**, 689-697 (2020).
- 281 22. B. Ripley, B. Venables, D. M. Bates, K. Hornik, A. Gebhardt, D. Firth, M. B. Ripley, Package  
282 'MASS'. *CRAN Repository*, See <http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MASS/MASS.pdf>  
283 (2013).
- 284 23. R. M. Anderson, R. M. May, *Infectious Diseases of Humans: Dynamics and Control*.

- 285 (Oxford Univ Press, Oxford, 1992).
- 286 24. A. Morton, B. F. Finkenstädt, Discrete time modelling of disease incidence time series by  
287 using Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. *J R Stat Soc C* **54**, 575-594 (2005).
- 288 25. Q. Li, X. Guan, P. Wu, X. Wang, L. Zhou, Y. Tong, R. Ren, K. S. M. Leung, E. H. Y. Lau, J. Y.  
289 Wong, X. Xing, N. Xiang, Y. Wu, C. Li, Q. Chen, D. Li, T. Liu, J. Zhao, M. Li, W. Tu, C. Chen, L.  
290 Jin, R. Yang, Q. Wang, S. Zhou, R. Wang, H. Liu, Y. Luo, Y. Liu, G. Shao, H. Li, Z. Tao, Y.  
291 Yang, Z. Deng, B. Liu, Z. Ma, Y. Zhang, G. Shi, T. T. Y. Lam, J. T. K. Wu, G. F. Gao, B. J.  
292 Cowling, B. Yang, G. M. Leung, Z. Feng, Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of  
293 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med*, doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001316  
294 (2020)10.1056/NEJMoa2001316).
- 295 26. O. N. Bjørnstad, R. A. Ims, X. Lambin, Spatial population dynamics: analyzing patterns and  
296 processes of population synchrony. *Trends Ecol Evol* **14**, 427-432 (1999).
- 297



298

299

300 **Table 1.** Impact of the Wuhan travel ban on COVID-19 dispersal to other cities in China.

301

<b>Covariates</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>P</b>
<b>Intercept</b>	25.95	(23.43, 28.48)	<0.01
<b>Longitude (degrees)</b>	-0.03	(-0.05, -0.01)	<0.01
<b>Latitude (degrees)</b>	0.03	(0.01, 0.06)	<0.05
<b>log10 (population)</b>	-0.70	(-1.12, -0.28)	<0.01
<b>log10 (total movements)</b>	-0.12	(-0.22, -0.02)	<0.05
<b>Travel ban (days)</b>	2.91	(2.54, 3.29)	<0.01

302

The dependent variable  $Y$  is the arrival time (days) of the outbreak in each city

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315 **Table 2.** Impact of the type and timing of transmission control measures evaluated by a general  
316 linear regression model.

317

<b>Covariates</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>P*</b>
<b>(Intercept)</b>	-9.41	(-9.87,-8.94)	<0.01
<b>Arrival time</b>	0.42	(0.41, 0.44)	<0.01
<b>Distance from Wuhan City (log10)</b>	0.78	(0.66,0.90)	<0.01
<b>Suspension of intra-city public transport</b>			
<b>Implementation</b>	-3.47	(-4.24, -2.70)	<0.01
<b>Timing</b>	0.11	(0.08, 0.14)	<0.01
<b>Closure of entertainment venues</b>			
<b>Implementation</b>	-0.93	(-1.62, -0.24)	<0.01
<b>Timing</b>	0.04	(0.01, 0.07)	<0.01

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332 **Table 3.** Parameter estimates of the SEIR epidemic model.

333

Parameter	Definition	Mean	95%BCI
$\rho$	Reporting rate (proportion)	0.002	0.001-0.003
$R_0$	Basic reproduction number	3.15	3.04-3.26
$1/\delta$	Mean incubation period (days)	4.90	4.32-5.47
$C_{1\_high}$	Lower effect of control at the first stage	0.97	0.94-0.99
$C_{1\_medium}$	Medium effect of control at the first stage	0.65	0.58-0.72
$C_{1\_low}$	Higher effect of control at the first stage, low	0.31	0.24-0.38
$C_2$	Effect of control at the second stage	0.01	0.001-0.03
$1/\gamma$	Infectious period before isolation (days)	5.19	4.51-5.86
$I_{w0}$	Minimum number of cases when none detected	1.12	0.91-1.32

334  $C_{1\_high}$ : Heilongjiang, Shanghai, Tianjin, Zhejiang, Hubei (exclude Wuhan)

335  $C_{1\_medium}$ : Anhui, Beijing, Fujian, Guangdong, Guangxi, Guizhou, Hunan, Jilin, Jiangsu, Jiangxi,

336 Inner Mongolia, Shandong, Tibet

337  $C_{1\_low}$ : Gansu, Hainan, Hebei, Henan, Liaoning, Ningxia, Qinghai, Shanxi, Shaanxi, Sichuan,


338 Xinjiang, Yunnan, Chongqing

339

340

341

342



343

344

345


346

347

**Figure 1.** Dates of discovery of the novel coronavirus causing COVID-19, and of the implementation of control measures in China, from 31 December 2019.

348

349



350

351


352 **Figure 2.** The dispersal of COVID-19 in China 15 days before and 25 days after the Spring  
353 Festival (Chinese Lunar New Year). (A) Movement outflows from Wuhan City during Spring  
354 Festival travel in 2017, 2018, and 2020. The vertical dotted line is the date of Spring Festival  
355 (Chinese Lunar New Year). (B) The number of recorded movements from Wuhan city to other  
356 provinces during the 15 days before the Spring Festival in 2020. The shading from light to dark  
357 represents the number of human movements from Wuhan to each province. The area of circles  
358 represents the cumulative number of cases reported by 30 January 2020, one week after the  
359 Wuhan travel ban on 23 January. (C) Association between the cumulative number of confirmed  
360 cases reported before 30 January and the number of movements from Wuhan to other provinces.

361

362

363

364



365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377


378

379

**Figure 3.** Spatial dispersal of COVID-19 in China. (A) Cumulative number of cities reporting cases by 19 February 2020. Arrival days, defined as the time interval (days) from the date of the first case in the first infected city (Wuhan) to the date of the first case in each newly infected city (a total of 324 cities), to characterize the inter-city transmission rate of COVID-19 and 2009-H1N1pdm, respectively. Dashed line shows the date of Wuhan travel ban (shutdown). (B) Before (blue) and after (red) the intervention by 30 January 2020, one week after Wuhan travel ban (shutdown). The blue line and points show the fitted regression of arrival times up to the shutdown on day 24 (23 January, vertical dashed line). Grey points show the expected arrival times after day 24, without the shutdown. The red line and points show the fitted regression of delayed arrival times after the shutdown on day 24. Each observation (point) represents one city. Error bars give  $\pm 2$  standard deviations.

380

381



382

383

384 **Figure 4.** Effect of interventions in controlling the COVID-19 outbreak across China. (A)  
385 Epidemic model (line) fitted to daily reports of confirmed cases (points) summed across 31  
386 provinces. Hubei excludes Wuhan city. (B) Expected epidemic trajectories without the Wuhan  
387 travel ban (shutdown), and with (green) or without (red) interventions carried out as part of the  
388 Level 1 national emergency response; with the Wuhan travel ban, and with (black) or without the  
389 intervention (orange). Vertical dashed lines in both panels mark the date of the Wuhan travel ban  
390 and the start of the emergency response, on 23 January. Shaded regions mark the 95% Bayesian  
391 credible intervals.

392



393 **Supplementary Material**

394

395 **The effect of transmission control measures during the first 50 days of the COVID-19**  
396 **epidemic in China**

397

398 Huaiyu Tian<sup>1\*†</sup>, Yonghong Liu<sup>1\*</sup>, Yidan Li<sup>1\*</sup>, Chieh-Hsi Wu<sup>3\*</sup>, Bin Chen<sup>4\*</sup>, Moritz U.G.  
399 Kraemer<sup>2,5,6</sup>, Bingying Li<sup>1</sup>, Jun Cai<sup>7</sup>, Bo Xu<sup>7</sup>, Qiqi Yang<sup>1</sup>, Ben Wang<sup>1</sup>, Peng Yang<sup>8</sup>, Yujun Cui<sup>9</sup>,  
400 Yimeng Song<sup>10</sup>, Pai Zheng<sup>11</sup>, Quanyi Wang<sup>8</sup>, Ottar N. Bjornstad<sup>12,13</sup>, Ruifu Yang<sup>8†</sup>, Bryan T.  
401 Grenfell<sup>14,15†</sup>, Oliver G. Pybus<sup>2†</sup>, Christopher Dye<sup>2†</sup>

402

403 Huaiyu Tian

404 [tianhuaiyu@gmail.com](mailto:tianhuaiyu@gmail.com);

405

406 Christopher Dye

407 [christopher.dye@zoo.ox.ac.uk](mailto:christopher.dye@zoo.ox.ac.uk);

408

409 Oliver G. Pybus

410 [oliver.pybus@zoo.ox.ac.uk](mailto:oliver.pybus@zoo.ox.ac.uk)

411

412 Bryan T. Grenfell

413 [grenfell@princeton.edu](mailto:grenfell@princeton.edu)

414

415 Ruifu Yang

416 [ruifuyang@gmail.com](mailto:ruifuyang@gmail.com);

417

418 **This PDF file includes:**

419

420 Supplementary text

421 Figs. S1 to S5

422 Tables S1 to S4

423 References for SI reference citations

424

425

426 **Materials and Methods**

427 **Data sources**

428 *Epidemiological, demographic and geographical data*

429 We collected data from the official reports of the health commission of 34 provincial-level  
430 administrative units and 342 city-level units. We recorded the date of the first reported case in all  
431 newly-infected cities, including daily reports from 31 December 2019 to 19 February 2020, the  
432 first 50 days of the epidemic. Only laboratory-confirmed cases of COVID-19 were used.  
433 Population sizes for each city in 2018 were obtained from the China City Statistical Yearbook  
434 (<http://olap.epsnet.com.cn/>). Using ArcGIS we calculated the great circle distance between Wuhan  
435 and each city reporting COVID-19 cases. The location of each city is geocoded by the latitude and  
436 longitude coordinates of the city centre. For the 2009 H1N1 Pandemic (2009-H1N1pdm), daily  
437 case data were collected from China Information System for Disease Control and Prevention  
438 (CISDCP) from 10 May 2009 to 30 April 2010, a total of more than 180,000 cases (5).

439

440 *Human mobility data*

441 Human movements were tracked with mobile phone data, through location-based services (LBS)  
442 employed by popular Tencent applications such as WeChat and QQ. Movement outflows from  
443 Wuhan City to other cities (i.e. records of the number of people leaving each day) by air, train and  
444 road, were obtained from the migration flows database (<https://heat.qq.com/>) (21) from 13 January  
445 2017 to 21 February 2017 (Spring Festival travel 2017), from 1 February 2018 to 12 March 2018  
446 (Spring Festival travel 2018), and from 1 January 2018 to 31 December 2018 (entire 2018). To  
447 reconstruct the movement outflow from Wuhan during the 2020 Spring Festival (from 11 January  
448 to 25 January, before the Chinese Lunar New Year), mobile phone data (provided by the  
449 telecommunications operators) were used together with the Baidu migration index  
450 (<http://qianxi.baidu.com/>); using both data sources gave the most accurate measure of movement  
451 volume. The expected movement outflows from Wuhan after the New Year festival from 26  
452 January to 19 February, had there been no travel ban, were generated by using travel volumes for  
453 2017 and 2018 and the recorded travel destinations prior to the shutdown in 2020. We assumed  
454 that the proportion of daily outflows from Wuhan to each of the other destinations in China was  
455 constant through time.

456

457 **Data analysis**

458 *Effect of the Wuhan city travel ban on the arrival time of COVID-19 in other cities*

459 In order to quantify the effect of the Wuhan travel shutdown (23 January 2020) on COVID-19  
460 spread, we used data collected between 31 December 2019 and 28 January 2020. The association  
461 between distance, human movement, interventions and timing of COVID-19 spread was assessed  
462 by regression with a general linear model (GLM). Among five possible regression models  
463 examined (Table S3), the model judged best by the Akaike Information Criterion) was:

464

$$465 Y_j = \alpha + \beta_1 \log_{10}(TotalFlow_j) + \beta_2 \log_{10}(Pop_j) + \beta_3 Lon_j + \beta_4 Lat_j + \beta_5 Shutdown_j$$

466

467 Dependent variable  $Y_j$  is the arrival time (day) of the first confirmed case in city  $j$ , a measure of the  
468 spatial spread of COVID-19. The  $\beta_i$  are the regression coefficients.  $\alpha$  is the intercept.  $TotalFlow_j$

469 represents the passenger volume from Wuhan to city  $j$  by airplane, train and road during the whole  
470 of 2018.  $Pop_j$  is the population of city  $j$ .  $Lat_j$  and  $Lon_j$  represent the latitude and longitude of city  $j$ .  
471 The binary dummy variable  $Shutdown_j$  is used to identify whether the arrival time of COVID-19  
472 in newly-infected city  $j$  is influenced by the Wuhan travel ban. For each city,  $shutdown$  was set to  
473 0 for arrival before 23 January 2020 and 1 for arrival on or after 23 January 2020. The regression  
474 analysis was performed using the R package (R version 3.4.0) MASS (22). All of the candidate  
475 models examined (Table S3) produced similar estimates for the estimated delay in the arrival time  
476 due to the shutdown.

477

478 *Effect of transmission control measures on the number of cases reported during the first week of*  
479 *an outbreak in a new location*

480 The Level 1 national emergency response required suspected and confirmed cases of COVID-19  
481 to be isolated and reported immediately in all cities. Using data for 342 cities across China, we  
482 investigated the effects of three transmission control measures: closure of entertainment venues  
483 and banning public gatherings ( $B$ ); suspension of intra-city public transport ( $S$ ); and prohibition of  
484 travel by any means to and from other cities ( $P$ ). The timing of implementation was recorded for  
485 each control measure in each city, including the delay in implementation since 31 December 2019  
486 (day 0 of the epidemic). Each city was regarded as implementing an intervention when the official  
487 policy was announced publicly (Table S1). Other transmission control measures included  
488 delineating control areas, closure of schools, isolation of suspected and confirmed cases, and the  
489 disclosure of information. The effects of these interventions could not be investigated because  
490 they were reportedly applied in all cities uniformly and without delay.

491

492 As above, we used regression analysis to investigate the effects of interventions  $B$ ,  $S$  and  $P$ . The  
493 dependent (Poisson) variable is the total number of confirmed cases that were reported during the  
494 first seven days ( $\mu$ ) of an outbreak in any city ( $i$ ). The analysis was performed using the GLM  
495 function in the statistical software R (version 3.6.2) using the model:

496

$$497 \log(\mu_i) = \alpha + \beta_1 M_{i,S} + \beta_2 M_{i,P} + \beta_3 M_{i,B} + \beta_4 T_{i,S} + \beta_5 T_{i,P} + \beta_6 T_{i,B} + \beta_7 A_i + \beta_8 D_i + \log(Q_i) + \log(F_i)$$

498

499 where population size of a city  $i$  ( $O_i$ ) and inflow from Wuhan ( $F_i$ ) are offset variables, while the  
500 distance to Wuhan and the arrival time of the infection are adjustments to control for confounding  
501 with other independent variables. The  $\beta_j$ 's are regression coefficients.  $M_{i,k}$  is a binary variable  
502 indicating whether or not control measure  $k$  is implemented in city  $i$ .  $T_{i,k}$  represents the timing of  
503 implementation of control measure  $k$  in city  $i$ .  $D_i$  is the distance from city  $i$  to Wuhan City.  $A_i$  is the  
504 arrival time of the epidemic in city  $i$  (the date of the first confirmed case).

505

506 To check and confirm the validity of results obtained with the Poisson regression model, we  
507 repeated the analysis with a log-linear model. The first step was to standardize case counts by  
508 dividing by the number of people in each city (incidence per capita) and the number of people  
509 arriving from Wuhan, giving dependent variable  $v$ . The log-linear model is then:

510

$$511 E[\log(v_i)] = \alpha + \beta_1 M_{i,S} + \beta_3 M_{i,B} + \beta_4 T_{i,S} + \beta_6 T_{i,B} + \beta_7 A_i.$$

512

513 The subscripts of the coefficients ( $\beta_j$ ) are consistent with a Poisson regression model. To avoid  
514 heteroscedasticity, variables describing the distance from Wuhan, and the implementation and  
515 timing of  $P$  (prohibiting inter-city travel) were removed. Further exploration of the model showed  
516 that these variables did not help to explain variation in  $\nu$ . Table S3 presents the results of the  
517 log-linear regression analysis, which uphold the conclusions reached from the Poisson regression  
518 model.

519

## 520 **Epidemic modelling**

521 For each province, we estimated the effect of transmission control measures by fitting an SEIR  
522 model (23) to the number of new confirmed cases reported each day from each province using  
523 Bayesian Markov Chain Monte Carlo methods (24). The model is:

524

$$525 \quad \frac{dS_i}{dt} = -I_i \frac{\beta C_{segment} S_i}{N_i}$$

$$526 \quad \frac{dE_i}{dt} = I_i \frac{\beta C_{segment} S_i}{N_i} - \delta E_i + \lambda_i$$

$$527 \quad \frac{dI_i}{dt} = \delta E_i - \gamma I_i$$

$$528 \quad \frac{dR_i}{dt} = \gamma I_i$$

529

530 where  $S$ ,  $E$ ,  $I$ , and  $R$  are the number of susceptible, exposed (latent), infectious, and removed  
531 individuals on day  $t$  in province  $i$ . This standard SEIR model makes some simplifying assumptions:  
532 for example, the human population is homogeneous (e.g. not stratified by age or sex), contacts  
533 between infectious and susceptible people are also homogeneous (e.g. not stratified by social  
534 group) and infection is fully immunizing ( $I$ ). However, the model describes the data accurately  
535 (Fig. 4A, Fig. S3) and these assumptions are unlikely to affect the principal conclusions of the  
536 analysis, which apply only to the first 50 days of the epidemic. The basic reproductive number of  
537 the model is  $R_0 = \beta/\gamma$ , where  $\beta$  is the per capita transmission rate per day and  $1/\delta$  and  $1/\gamma$  are,  
538 respectively, the mean latent and infectious periods.

539

540 Variable  $\lambda$  is the estimated number of cases imported from Wuhan City on day  $t$ :

541

$$542 \quad \lambda_i(t) = \frac{I_w}{\rho_w P_w} T_i \text{shutdown}_w$$

543

544  $I_w$  is the number of reported cases in Wuhan on day  $t$ ,  $P_w$  is the Wuhan population size, and  $\rho_w$  is  
545 the proportion of all infected people (including infectious cases) reported in Wuhan.  $T_i$  is the  
546 number of people leaving Wuhan on day  $t$  travelling to province  $i$ , derived from data describing

547 mobility 15 days before the Chinese Lunar New Year 2020. The binary variable *shutdown* is used  
548 to identify whether cases were or were not exported from Wuhan on or after 23 January 2020.

549

550 The effects of control measures at different stages of the outbreak are captured by estimated  
551 parameter  $C$  (range 0-1), which reduces transmission and  $R_0$  proportionally as a multiplicand of  $\beta$ .  
552 The timing and implementation of transmission control measures in the 342 cities and 31  
553 provinces are shown in Fig. S4. Before 22 January 2020, there were no recorded interventions thus  
554  $C_0=1$ . From 23 January onwards, provinces gradually scaled up Level 1 emergency responses  
555 (stage 1), with effects measured as  $C_1$  (Fig. S4). Because the effects of control measures varied  
556 among provinces during the scale-up,  $C_1$  was grouped into high  $C_{1\_high}$ , medium  $C_{1\_medium}$ , and low  
557  $C_{1\_low}$ . The allocation of provinces to groups was made by proposing several alternative  
558 hypotheses and testing each by model fitting (Table 3, Table S4). Stage 2 of control ( $C_2$ ) began  
559 when more than 95% of cities in a province had implemented control measures, including the  
560 closure of entertainment venues, suspension of intra-city public transport or prohibition of travel  
561 by any means to and from other cities (see above). In Hubei Province (except Wuhan city), stage 2  
562 included the use of shelter or “Fang Cang” hospitals from early February onwards.

563

564 Model fitting was performed using the Metropolis–Hastings Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)  
565 algorithm with the MATLAB (version R2016b) toolbox DRAM (Delayed Rejection Adaptive  
566 Metropolis). Prior estimates of the mean and (Gaussian) variance of  $R_0$ ,  $\delta$ , and  $\gamma$  were derived from  
567 epidemiological surveys (25). There was no evidence to inform a prior for the reporting rate  $\rho$ , the  
568 proportion of cases that were reported among all latent and infectious individuals in Wuhan.  
569 Systematic surveys of infection (e.g. by serological testing) have not yet been reported. In the  
570 absence of any guiding data,  $\rho$  was given a prior uniform distribution between 0 and 1.

571


572 After a burn-in of 1 million iterations, we ran the MCMC simulation for a further 10 million  
573 iterations, sampled at every 1000th step to avoid auto-correlation. Trace plots and Gelman and  
574 Rubin diagnostics were used to judge convergence of the MCMC chains (Fig. S4). Each fitting  
575 exercise was repeated three times to test the robustness of results, which converged to the same  
576 estimates on each occasion (Fig. S5). We used the fitted SEIR model, with posterior estimates of  
577 parameter values, to simulate outbreaks outside Wuhan, with and without the Wuhan travel ban  
578 and with and without the national emergency response (Fig. 4B).

579

580 **Supplementary Figures and Tables**

581

582



583


584

585 **Figure S1.** Patterns of COVID-19 dispersal out of Wuhan (Hubei province) to other provinces by  
586 time and geographical distance. (A) Daily reports of confirmed cases from each of 31 provinces.  
587 Provinces are ranked by decreasing volume of people leaving Wuhan for other destinations, to  
588 elsewhere in Hubei Province (top) and to Tibet (bottom). (B) Synchrony of epidemics in different  
589 provinces in relation to distance between provinces. Synchrony is measured by the correlation  
590 between the number of cases reported in two provinces on each day, using a spatial  
591 non-parametric correlation function (26).

592

593

594



595

596

597

598

599


600

**Figure S2.** Percentage of cities that implemented three kinds of transmission control measures before (blue), or on the same day or after (red), the first case was reported.



601

602



603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612


613

614

**Figure S3.** Fits of the SEIR epidemic model to time series of reported cases from 31 provinces. The numbers of confirmed cases reported (points) and estimated (lines) each day in each provinces (Hubei excludes Wuhan city). Grey areas correspond to pointwise 95% credible envelopes. The period covers the 40 days of the Spring Festival, from 15 days before to 25 days after the Chinese Lunar New Year. The Spring Festival holiday ended on 19 February, day 50 of the epidemic.

615

616



617

618

619

620

621

622


623

624

**Figure S4.** (A) The number of cities implementing three interventions by date in 342 cities (see also Fig. S2). (B) Dates (vertical axis) on which the Level 1 emergency response began (blue, start of stage 1), and on which 95% of cities had implemented transmission control measures (red, end of stage 1, beginning of stage 2), in 31 provinces.

625

626



627

628

629 **Figure S5.** Trace plots of parameter values for the epidemic model, estimated by Bayesian

630 Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods. The three different colours represent three runs of

631 the MCMC model, with one run (light blue) presented at the forefront.

632

633

634

635

636 **Table S1.** Candidate statistical models used to study the effect of the Wuhan city travel ban on the  
 637 arrival time of COVID-19 in other cities (see Table 1 of the main text).

638

Model	AIC*
<b>Y=log10(TotalFlow) + log10(AirFlow) + log10(RoadFlow) + log10(TrainFlow) + log10(Pop) + log10(Dis) + lat + lon + Shutdown</b>	113.73
<b>Y=log10(TotalFlow) + log10(AirFlow) + log10(RoadFlow) + log10(Pop) + log10(Dis) + lat + lon + Shutdown</b>	111.91
<b>Y=log10(TotalFlow) + log10(AirFlow) + log10(Pop) + log10(Dis) + lat + lon + Shutdown</b>	110.63
<b>Y=log10(TotalFlow) + log10(Pop) + log10(Dis) + lat + lon + Shutdown</b>	109.83
<b>Y=log10(TotalFlow) + log10(Pop) + lat + lon + Shutdown</b>	108.57

639

\* Akaike information criterion

640

641

642

643

644 **Table S2.** Summary of interventions and their timing across 342 cities (see Table 2 of the main  
645 text).

646

<b>Level 1 response to major public health emergencies</b>	<b>Number of cities implementing control measures</b>	<b>Average lags (days) between implementation and 31 December 2019‡</b>
<b>Identify the affected area of a city*</b>	342	0
<b>Close schools*</b>	342	0
<b>Close entertainment venues and ban public gatherings</b>	220	27.17 (2.82)
<b>Isolate patients with infectious diseases*</b>	342	0
<b>Isolate suspected patients*</b>	342	0
<b>Suspend intra-city public transport (bus and subway)</b>	136	29.00 (2.60)
<b>Prohibit inter-city travel</b>	219	27.86 (1.49)
<b>Collect, evaluate, report and publish information on public health emergencies daily*</b>	342	0
<b>Assist subdistrict, township (town), neighbourhood and village committee staff*</b>	342	25.32 (1.07)

647 \*Interventions implemented immediately were not included in the regression analysis.

648 ‡Summary statistics reported for timing are mean (standard deviation).

649

650

651

652

653

654 **Table S3.** Impact of the type and timing of transmission control measures, estimated from a  
655 log-linear regression model. This analysis checks and confirms the robustness of results in Table 2  
656 of the main text. As described in the main text, the prohibition of inter-city travel, the third  
657 intervention that was investigated in this study, did not significantly reduce the number of cases  
658 reported during the first week of city outbreaks.

659

<b>Covariates</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>P</b>
<b>(Intercept)</b>	-1.69	(-5.64, 2.26)	0.40
<b>Arrival time</b>	0.28	(0.13, 0.43)	<0.01
<b>Suspension of intra-city public transport</b>			
<b>Implementation</b>	-12.65	(-21.71, -3.60)	<0.01
<b>Timing</b>	0.46	(0.13, 0.79)	<0.01
<b>Closure of entertainment venues</b>			
<b>Implementation</b>	-3.44	(-5.75, -1.13)	<0.01
<b>Timing</b>	1.53	(0.69, 2.38)	<0.01

660

661

662

663

664

665 **Table S4.** Candidate models used to characterize the effect of control measures in different  
666 provinces (see Table 3 of the main text).

667

<b>Model</b>	<b>DIC* (mean) ‡</b>	<b>DIC (median)</b>
<b>Universal <math>C, \gamma</math></b>	117.55	38.97
<b>Universal <math>C1, C2, \gamma</math></b>	78.81	28.41
<b><math>C1_{high}, C1_{medium}, C1_{low}, C2, \gamma</math></b>	55.66	27.43
<b><math>C1_{high}, C1_{low}, C2, \gamma</math></b>	62.31	28.13
<b><math>C1_{high}, C1_{medium}, C1_{low}, \gamma</math></b>	110.95	34.76

668 \* Distribution for provinces

669 ‡ The deviance information criterio

670  $C1_{high}$ , Effect of control in stage 1, high

671  $C1_{medium}$ , Effect of control in stage 1, medium

672  $C1_{low}$ , Effect of control in stage 1, low

673  $C2$ , Effect of control in stage 2

674  $\gamma$ , Rate of removal of infectious cases before isolation

675 High, medium and low represent the efficacy of control measures in three groups of provinces.

676