

1 Strong effect of socioeconomic levels on the spread and treatment of the 2019 novel
2 coronavirus (COVID-19) in China

3 Zelong Zheng¹, MD, Chloe Michelle^{2*}, PhD, Xiangfeng Li²

4 ¹Guangzhou First People's Hospital, School of Medicine, South China University of Technology,
5 510180, PR China

6 ²Cloudnova Technology Co. , Ltd., Beijing 100012, PR China.

7 *Corresponding author: Chloe Michelle (michellechloe007@gmail.com)

8 **Abstract**

9 **Background** Global response to the COVID-19 epidemic presents strengths and weaknesses
10 in national and regional social governance capacities to address public health challenges. The
11 emergence, detection, spread, treatment and containment of infectious diseases shows the
12 considerable political and economic impacts in a highly interconnected world. We aimed to
13 estimate the effects of socioeconomic levels on the spread and treatment of COVID-19 in China.

14 **Methods** We obtained daily COVID-19 cases at a city level in China. We used migration data
15 from the major cities in Hubei Province, and macroeconomic data at city and province levels.
16 We obtained social management measures in response to COVID-19 outbreak. We assessed
17 the association between measures, migration and COVID-19 spread, and the association
18 between socioeconomic levels and COVID-19 treatment capacity.

19 **Findings** On January 1, 2020, COVID-19 spread that affected by management measures and
20 migration started across China. After Wuhan lockdown, the case number reached peak in 12
21 days, and COVID-19 outbreak was basically contained in China in four weeks due to intensive
22 measures. Guangdong, Jiangsu and Zhejiang Provinces showed the most excellent COVID-19

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 treatment capacities. Socioeconomic levels in these provinces ranked top in China. Guangdong
24 achieved the largest decline in severe case rate by 22.1%. Jiangsu had the lowest average rate
25 of severe cases (1.7%) and zero death. Among the regions with top case number, Zhejiang
26 showed the highest rate of cured cases on confirmed cases (96.3%), the lowest average rate of
27 severe cases (7.7%), and one death. The COVID-19 treatment capacities were strongly affected
28 by regional economics and measures on control, detection and treatment.

29 **Interpretation** Socioeconomic levels had strong effect on the spread and treatment of COVID-
30 19 in China. Further investigations are needed on the effectiveness of Chinese measures and
31 the effects of socioeconomic levels on COVID-19 treatment outside China.

32 **Fund** None

33

34 Research in context

35 **Evidence before this study**

36 We searched PubMed for articles published in any language up to April 24, 2020, with the
37 search terms “COVID-19 AND (socioeconomic OR measure) AND (spread OR treatment)”.
38 We identified 334 articles. Some researchers are dedicated to debating the effect of social
39 management measures on the spread of COVID-19 epidemic. All previous studies focused on
40 the effect of the individual measure on COVID-19 spread over time. We identified several
41 mathematical modelling studies exploring the effect of management measures, mainly
42 focusing on Wuhan lockdown in China, on COVID-19 spread. However, social management
43 measures not only involve prevention and control of virus spread, but also virus detection and
44 patient treatment. No study used methods that would allow the assessment of effect of several
45 management measures on the spread, detection, and treatment of COVID-19 at various time
46 milestones over the entire course of COVID-19 outbreak. Some scholars advocated that
47 health equity cannot be ignored to contain the global COVID-19 epidemic. They did not
48 provide epidemical and economic data analysis to assess the effect of socioeconomic
49 gradients in health at individual or regional levels. No study estimated the effects of
50 socioeconomic levels on national and regional COVID-19 treatment.

51 **Added value of this study**

52 We found that on January 1, 2020, COVID-19 spread that affected by management measures
53 and migration started across China. After Wuhan lockdown, COVID-19 outbreak was
54 basically contained in China in four weeks due to intensive measures. The intensive measures
55 mainly include movement restriction, wearing masks in public, nationwide joint prevention

56 and control at a community level, four early strategies, and information disclosure. We, for
57 the first time, estimated the effect of socioeconomic levels on spread and treatment of
58 COVID-19 in China. The management measures, including Fangcang shelter hospitals,
59 medical assistance nationwide, and continuously updated diagnosis and treatment plan for
60 COVID-19, greatly improved COVID-19 treatment capacities in China, particularly in Hubei
61 Province. The COVID-19 treatment capacities were strongly affected by regional economics
62 and measures on control, detection and treatment.

63 **Implications of all the available evidence**

64 The Chinese experience provides important insights into how to design effective management
65 strategies of COVID-19 or other epidemic. Further efforts are needed on the effectiveness of
66 Chinese management measures and the effects of socioeconomic levels on COVID-19
67 treatment outside China.

68

69

70 1. Introduction

71 Starting in December 2019, the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) broke out in Wuhan City,
72 Hubei Province of China. From 31 December 2019 through 3 January 2020, a total of 44 cases
73 with novel coronavirus pneumonia (NCP) of unknown etiology were reported to the World
74 Health Organization (WHO) by the Chinese health authorities¹⁻³. Confirmed cases were
75 consecutively reported in 34 provinces, municipalities, and special administrative regions in
76 China⁴. As of 20 April 2020, there have been 8,4201 confirmed cases of COVID-19 infection
77 and 4642 deaths in China. Outside China, there have been 2,157,577 cases and 147,909 deaths
78 in at least 215 countries and regions⁵. The COVID-19 pandemic is sweeping the world and
79 delivers array of cybersecurity challenges, i.e., overload the healthcare system and disrupt the
80 socioeconomic system⁶⁻⁸. The global response to the COVID-19 epidemic presents strengths
81 and weaknesses in national and regional social governance capacities to address public health
82 challenges. The emergence, detection, spread, treatment and containment of infectious diseases
83 shows the considerable political and economic impacts in a highly interconnected world⁹.
84 Understanding how the socioeconomic levels respond to the spread and treatment of COVID-
85 19 is of great significance for the success of combating the coronavirus epidemic.

86 Social and economic circumstances affect the spread and treatment of infectious diseases.
87 Conventionally, social governance measures, such as travel ban, social distancing and
88 gathering reduction, play a major role in preventing and controlling the rapid spread of the
89 epidemic in response to public health emergencies¹⁰. COVID-19 continues to immediately
90 spread through migration-this was the case in Wuhan of China at the beginning of the pandemic
91 and is now the cases all over China and the World^{5,11}. Population migration and mobility is

92 linked to increases in economic growth, wages, income and innovation as well as virus
93 spread^{12,13}. The lockdown of cities was adopted by many countries in succession after Wuhan
94 was closed on 23 January 2020¹⁴. This measure aimed to mitigate the spread of COVID-19 and
95 limit the number of patients that health systems have to manage. The most recent studies show
96 that approximately 15-20 per cent of patients with COVID-19 require hospitalisation and six
97 per cent require intensive care for a duration of between 3 and 6 weeks. Confirmation of the
98 COVID-19 diagnosis requires laboratory and/or medical imaging capabilities that are only
99 available in reference structures, like teaching hospitals¹⁵. Even in wealthy nations, U.S. and
100 EU, they have strong, well-funded health services and the hospital system was quickly
101 overwhelmed by the rapid increase in COVID-19 cases. Many poorer nations in Africa and
102 Asia, such as Pakistan and Iraq, are facing larger difficulties³. These countries are equipped
103 with under-developed infrastructure, inadequate pathogen detection capability and poor health
104 care service, and they cannot afford the fewer patients in comparison with developed nations.
105 The disruption of the health care systems led to a low rate of cure, high severity and mortality
106 rates of the COVID-19 patients⁷. Furthermore, COVID-19 pandemic is likely to cause the
107 disruption of basic medical services and emergency facilities, the de-prioritisation of treatment
108 for other life-threatening diseases, conditions and for other chronic infectious diseases (e.g.,
109 cardiovascular and cerebrovascular diseases, tuberculosis and malignancy) everywhere but
110 especially in some developing economies, where the health system is already fragile¹⁶. Thus,
111 improved understanding of the spread and treatment capacities of COVID-19 that affected by
112 socioeconomic levels is crucial to examining the effectiveness of control interventions.

113 In this study, we aim to estimate the effects of socioeconomic levels on the spread and

114 treatment of the COVID-19 in China. The spatial and temporal patterns of the spread and
115 treatment of the COVID-19 at city and province levels across China were identified. The effects
116 of social management measures and migration on COVID-19 spread, and the effects of
117 management measures and economic levels on COVID-19 treatment were assessed.

118 2. Materials and Methods

119 2.1 COVID-19 case data

120 From December 31, 2019, the centers of disease control (CDC)s at all levels in China jointly
121 launched the COVID-19 investigation. COVID-19 was identified as a statutory B infectious
122 disease in China on January 20, 2020. Legally, all cases were required to be reported
123 immediately through the Infectious Disease Information System (IDIS). Individual case
124 information was submitted into the system by local hospitals and CDC personnel who
125 investigated and collected possible exposure information. All case records have personal
126 identification numbers, and all cases are not duplicated in the system. We collected the
127 COVID-19 cases on a daily basis that reported by the CDCs at all levels as of March 4, 2020,
128 in the cities of 31 provinces, municipals and autonomous regions in Mainland China. These
129 data and management measures were obtained from the websites of local health commissions.
130 All cases were included in this study, and the sampling of a predetermined sample size was not
131 required, and the case inclusion criteria was not considered¹⁷.

132 Terms with respect to COVID-19 cases in China were defined based on treatment plan of
133 COVID-19 that issued by Chinese authorities^{17,18}. If the case has been in close contact with the
134 Huanan Seafood Market, who was identified as an exposure linked to the Huanan Seafood
135 Market. Symptom severity of the cases was classified as mild, severe, and critical. Mild cases

136 were not our focus. We focused on confirmed cases, cured cases, and severe (i.e., severe and
137 critical) cases. Suspected cases were determined based on the symptoms (e.g., fever, cough,
138 fatigue and diarrhea) and exposures (if the patient lived or traveled in Wuhan, or had close
139 contact with a person who has been to Wuhan recently, who was identified as Wuhan related
140 exposure) for clinical diagnosis. Confirmed cases referred to suspected cases with positive
141 results of nucleic acid testing through respiratory tract samples (e.g., throat swabs). Clinically
142 diagnosed cases were those suspected cases with pneumonia imaging features (only applicable
143 in Hubei Province). Cured cases referred to the cases that were cured and discharged. Severe
144 cases referred to the cases that manifest dyspnea with respiratory frequency ≥ 30 / min, blood
145 oxygen saturation $\leq 93\%$, $\text{PaO}_2 / \text{FiO}_2$ ratio < 300 , and / or lung infiltration $> 50\%$ within 24 to
146 48 hours. Critical cases referred to those cases with respiratory failure, septic shock and / or
147 multiple organ dysfunction / failure.

148 2.2 Socioeconomic data

149 Data of migration from Wuhan and the other cities in Hubei Province on a daily basis
150 were obtained from Qianxi Baidu website (<https://qianxi.baidu.com/>), ranging from January 1
151 to January 28 in 2019 and 2020. The top 20 cities in the migration size were assessed.

152 Macroeconomic data were collected from two levels: city and province level. At the
153 province level, the data from the 31 provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions outside
154 Hubei Province were obtained from China health statistics yearbook in 2019, and comprised
155 the indicators of population, total health expenditure (billion Yuan), gross domestic product
156 (GDP) (billion Yuan), total health expenditure in GDP (%), No. of hospitals, No. of top
157 hospitals, No. of doctors, No. of nurses, No. of beds in general hospitals, and public expenditure

158 (billion Yuan). At the city level, the data were obtained from China city statistics yearbook in
159 2019, and were available for the 292 cities outside Hubei Province. These data comprised the
160 indicators of population, GDP (billion Yuan), No. of hospitals, No. of doctors, No. of hospital
161 beds, and public expenditure (billion Yuan). The statistical indicators of macroeconomic and
162 medical resource data at different levels were different. Spatial patterns of the indicators
163 representing macroeconomic levels at city and province levels in China were illustrated using
164 Arcgis Desktop 10.2 (Figure 7, 8 and 9). As the COVID-19 outbreak overloaded the health
165 care system in Hubei Province, and a total number of 3,8478 health care workers in other
166 provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions of China assisted Hubei (Chinese Health
167 commission news). The treatment capacity in Hubei Province is difficult to be evaluated.
168 Therefore, Hubei Province was excluded to estimate the effects of regional socioeconomics on
169 the COVID-19 treatment. Spatial pattern of the number of health care workers in other
170 provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions of China that assisted Hubei were illustrated
171 using Arcgis Desktop 10.2 (Figure 6).

172 2.3 Social management measures in response to COVID-19 epidemiologic pattern

173 Social management measures in response to COVID-19 epidemiologic patterns were
174 illustrated in Figure 1. On December 31, 2019, a cluster of pneumonia cases with unknown
175 etiology were reported in Wuhan, Hubei province, China, which attracted great attention of
176 health authorities. Wuhan Health Commission (WHC) declared novel coronavirus pneumonia
177 (NCP) outbreak, and National Health Commission (NHC) China and Chinese CDC
178 participated in investigation and response. The epidemiologic investigation pointed out that the
179 case infection may be associated with exposures in Huanan Seafood Market in Wuhan. On

180 January 1, 2020, Huanan Seafood Market was closed. On January 8, 2020, the pathogen
181 causing the viral pneumonia among affected individuals was identified as a new coronavirus
182 COVID-19. On January 15, 2020, China CDC started the public health emergency response
183 level to Level 1 (the highest level). On January 20, 2020, COVID-19 was identified as a
184 statutory B infectious disease in China. Human to human transmission was confirmed by
185 Zhongnanshan, MD. Wuhan is located in central China and has a wide range of transportation
186 links, including airplanes, trains, interstate buses, and private transportation. On January 23,
187 2020, Wuhan was closed to prevent and control COVID-19 spread. On January 24-28, 2020,
188 the other cities in Hubei province were closed in succession. On January 27, 2020, Lunar New
189 Year national holiday was extended. On January 29, 2020, 31 provinces, municipalities and
190 regions in China started primary response to major public health, and return to work and school
191 across China was delayed. On February 13, 2020, the number of clinically diagnosed cases of
192 COVID-19 was included in Hubei Province, and the number of confirmed cases increased
193 sharply. On February 17, 2020, workers started to return to work nationwide outside Hubei.
194 Starting on February 24, 2020, the response levels of public health downgraded outside Hubei.
195 Chinese government adopted intensive measures to contain COVID-19. i.e., Wuhan
196 lockdown, movement restriction and home self-isolation, masking in public, national joint
197 prevention and control, information disclosure, timely and sufficient COVID-19 detection.
198 Masking in public is to protect oneself from infection. Since COVID-19 was proved to be
199 transmitted mainly through droplets, wearing a mask is effective in preventing virus
200 transmission. National joint prevention and control was launched down to the community level.
201 Information transparency was guaranteed. i. e., real-time announcement of the number of

202 confirmed and suspected cases every day in each city across China. COVID-19 was detected
203 timely and quantitatively. Nucleic acid detection was carried out in all close contact including
204 those without symptoms. Four early strategies were suggested: early protection (social
205 distancing), early detection, early diagnosis, and early isolation. Management measures
206 targeting COVID-19 treatment comprised: four early strategies, Fangcang shelter hospital
207 construction, health care assistance from other regions of China to Hubei, and determination
208 of designated hospitals for the COVID-19 treatment.

209 2.4. Statistical analysis

210 Epidemiologic patterns of COVID-19 outbreak in China were identified at the city and
211 province levels on a daily basis. The outbreak period ranged from December 8, 2019, the date
212 of case onset to February 24, 2020, the date of notable case decrease. The number of daily
213 confirmed cases in China that were linked and unlinked to Huanan Seafood Market were
214 plotted by the date of diagnosis. At four key time nodes of COVID-19 outbreak, January 27,
215 February 1, February 4, and February 24, 2020, the number of confirmed and suspected cases
216 in the 34 provinces (including Hubei), municipalities and regions were illustrated (Figure 1).
217 Spatial patterns of confirmed cases at a city level across China on January 27, February 4 and
218 March 4, 2020 were presented using Arcgis Desktop 10.2 (Figure 2).

219 To assess the effects of management measures on COVID-19 spread, COVID-19
220 epidemiologic curve was made by the dates of the milestones that were associated with
221 management measures. The impact of management measures on COVID-19 related migration
222 in Wuhan, Huanggang, Jingzhou and Xiaogan cities in Hubei province were examined.

223 The relationship between migration from these cities and confirmed cases of COVID-19
224 in China (outside Hubei province) was examined. Daily migration scale index from these cities
225 from January 1 to 28 in 2019 and 2020, respectively were calculated and compared. We selected
226 this period because a significant increase in migration size occurred in Wuhan in 2020 in
227 comparison with that in 2019. The management measures responded COVID-19 outbreak in
228 Wuhan that may cause the abnormal increase in migration. Specifically, On January 1, 2020,
229 The Huanan Seafood Market was closed because of COVID-19 outbreak. On January 8, 2020,
230 the pathogen was identified as COVID-19. On January 15, 2020, China CDC started the public
231 health emergency response level to Level 1. On January 20, 2020, COVID-19 was identified
232 as a statutory B infectious disease in China, and human to human transmission was first
233 confirmed. On January 23, 2020, Wuhan was closed. On January 24-28, 2020, other cities in
234 Hubei province were closed in succession. These dates were the milestones when significant
235 changes in the time series of migration scale index for Wuhan were identified. We thus divided
236 the period, January 1 to 28, into five sub-periods: January 1 to 8, January 9 to 15, January 16
237 to 20, January 21 to 23 and January 24 to 28. The correlations between migration scale index
238 in Wuhan, Huanggang, Jingzhou and Xiaogan cities in these five sub-periods and confirmed
239 cases in China (outside Hubei province) on January 27, February 4 and March 4, 2020 were
240 calculated. Huanggang, Jingzhou and Xiaogan cities were used because the migration scale
241 index of these cities in Hubei province during the same period ranked secondary to Wuhan.
242 There may be potential risk of COVID-19 spread in Huanggang, Jingzhou and Xiaogan cities
243 through migration. Sankey maps of migration from Wuhan, Huanggang, Jingzhou and Xiaogan
244 cities to top 20 cities for the five sub-periods were obtained using ECHARTS 4.7.0.

245 For each city in China, migration scale index (M_{index}) was calculated as follows:

$$246 \quad M_{\text{index}} = \frac{N_{ij}}{N_t} \quad (1)$$

247 Where M_{index} denote migration scale index, and N_{ij} denotes the number of population
248 migrated from departure city i to destination city j , and N_t denotes the total number of
249 migration from departure city i .

250 To assess the effects of socioeconomic levels on COVID-19 treatment across China, we
251 examined the correlation between socioeconomic levels and confirmed cases, cured cases and
252 the rate of severe cases at the city and province levels (with an α value of 0.05). Hubei province
253 was excluded. Economic levels related to health care were described including population, total
254 health expenditure (billion Yuan), GDP (billion Yuan), total health expenditure in GDP (%),
255 the number of hospitals, the number of top hospitals, the number of doctors, the number of
256 nurses, the number of beds in general hospitals, and public expenditure (billion Yuan). Spatial
257 patterns of the number of confirmed and cured cases and the rates of severe cases across 31
258 regions and 292 cities of China as of March 4, 2020 were presented using Arcgis Desktop 10.2.

259 For each province, the rate of severe cases was calculated as follows:

$$260 \quad T_s = \frac{N_s}{N_c} \times 100\% \quad (2)$$

261 Where T_s denotes the rates of severe cases for province i , N_s and N_c denote the number
262 of severe and confirmed cases in province i , respectively. Here, the number of severe cases
263 consisted of severe and critical cases. Hubei province were excluded from the calculation of
264 the rate of severe cases. The average rate of severe cases in the provinces, municipalities and
265 autonomous regions outside Hubei Province from January 21 to March 7, 2020 was calculated.
266 Temporal changes in the rates of severe cases were obtained using EXCEL 2013.

267 3. Results

268 3.1 Epidemiologic patterns of the COVID-19 outbreak in China

269 Confirmed COVID-19 cases indicates an exponential growth by human to human transmission
270 since late December, 2019, and a slight decline from January 9, 2020. This decline was not an
271 inflection point but due to the time lag between infection and diagnosis. An average incubation
272 period was 1 to 14 days¹⁹, and the COVID-19 suspected cases were diagnosed by viral nucleic
273 acid testing. The first epidemic peak occurred on January 8, 2020, and the cases focused in
274 Wuhan. Starting on January 20, 2020, the case number indicates an explosive increase
275 nationwide, and the second epidemic peak occurred on January 27. On 31 January, a total of
276 875 confirmed cases, 0.07/100,000 person all over China outside Hubei Province was shown.
277 The case number continued to boom, and the third epidemic peak occurred on February 4 (3156
278 laboratory-confirmed cases, 5.33/100,000 person in Hubei Province). Afterwards, the cases
279 gradually reduced. Notably, on February 12 and 13, the case peak was not real but due to the
280 number of clinically diagnosed cases was included in Hubei Province. As of February 24, the
281 cases were reported across 319 cities of 34 provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions
282 in China. After Wuhan lockdown, the number of cases reached peak in 12 days, and the
283 COVID-19 pandemic was basically contained in China in four weeks (Figure 1).

284 Temporal and spatial patterns of suspected and confirmed cases at a province level show
285 that outside Hubei Province, top five provinces in the number of confirmed cases were
286 presented in a decreasing order: Guangdong, Henan, Zhejiang, Hunan and Anhui Province.
287 Top five provinces in the growth rates of confirmed cases were indicated in a decreasing order:
288 Zhejiang, Guangdong, Henan, Hunan and Jiangxi Province (Figure 1). Temporal and spatial

289 patterns of confirmed cases at a city level show that COVID-19 continued to spread from
290 Wuhan to the whole China (Figure 2). Regarding connection characteristics, COVID-19 cases
291 had apparent geographical agglomeration. Wuhan was the single center of agglomeration, and
292 the cases gradually reduced with the increase of geographical distance within a certain range.
293 The cases in Wuhan had an extremely strong connection with those in other cities of Hubei,
294 and had the largest radiation range in Hubei. Additionally, the cases in Wuhan had a strong
295 radiation range in other provinces, and indicate a strong connection with the neighborhood
296 cities and the major cities in other provinces. Regarding the grades of the case number, the
297 differences in the grade gradients between cities were obvious.

298 3.2 Effect of social management measures and migration on the COVID-19 spread in China

299 A total number of 4.3 million people left from Wuhan between January 11 and 23, 2020¹¹.
300 On January 23, Wuhan was closed, by that time, approximately 5 million people had already
301 left for hometowns for the Chinese Lunar New Year, for holidays, and for keeping away from
302 COVID-19²⁰. From January 1 to 10, 2020, a total number of 0.7 million people was assessed
303 to leave from Wuhan. Migration from Wuhan indicates an abnormal increase since January 1,
304 2020 in comparison with that during the same period in 2019. Migration from other cities in
305 Hubei does not indicate an abnormal increase (Figure 3). The migrations from Wuhan in five
306 sub-periods (Figure 3 and 4) were associated with social management measures (Figure 1).
307 Specifically, the first sub-period was for COVID-19 onset between January 1 and 8, 2020.
308 WHC declared COVID-19 outbreak and Huanan Seafood Market was closed on December 31,
309 2019 and January 1, 2020, respectively. On January 8, 2020, COVID-19 was identified as the
310 pathogen. Due to fear of COVID-19, migration from Wuhan indicates an abnormal increase in

311 comparison with that during the same period in 2019. The second sub-period was for the first
312 COVID-19 epidemic peak between January 8 and 15, 2020. During the period, China CDC
313 started public emergency response level to the highest level. Migration from Wuhan indicates
314 a mild fluctuation, however still an abnormal increase in comparison with that during the same
315 period in 2019. Migration from Wuhan reached the first peak on January 8, 2020 due to
316 increasing fear of COVID-19. The third sub-period between January 16 and 20, 2020 was for
317 the COVID-19 turning phase from Wuhan to the whole China. During the period, COVID-19
318 was identified as a statutory B infectious disease in China. On January 20, human to human
319 transmission was confirmed, and population started to flee from Wuhan. The fourth sub-period
320 was for the COVID-19 outbreak across China between January 21 and 24, 2020. Migration
321 indicates a sharp increase in comparison with that during the same period in 2019, and peaked
322 on January 23, which was the date Wuhan was closed. The fifth sub-period was between
323 January 24 and 28, 2020. During the period, other cities in Hubei were closed. Migration from
324 Wuhan and other cities in Hubei gradually fell to zero.

325 The average migration scale index of Wuhan in the five sub-periods were 5.4, 6.5, 7.2, 11.2,
326 and 1.3, respectively (Figure 3). As shown in Figure 4, top 20 hot destination cities that
327 migrated from Wuhan for these sub-periods were Changsha, Chongqing, Beijing, Xinyang,
328 Shanghai, Zhengzhou, Guangzhou, Chengdu, Shenzhen, Jiujiang, Yueyang, Nanyang,
329 Changde, Zhumadian, Nanchang, Nanjing, Hefei, Dongguan, Fuyang, and Zhoukou. These
330 cities were also the top destination cities that migrated from other cities in Hubei for the same
331 period. Migration from Wuhan had a strong radiation range in other provinces, and indicates a
332 strong connection with the neighborhood cities and the major cities in other provinces. Spatial

333 patterns of migration in Wuhan and other cities in Hubei were consistent with those of
334 confirmed cases outside Hubei. A large number of COVID-19 carriers gradually migrated from
335 Wuhan during the five sub-periods, and many people in other cities in Hubei, other provinces,
336 municipalities or autonomous regions of China were infected by close contact with these
337 migration. The cases that occurred in December 2019 were likely to be a small-scale exposure
338 transmission mode in Wuhan, and since January 2020, the cases were likely to be a spread
339 transmission mode in China.

340 Temporal patterns of migration in Wuhan, Huanggang, Jingzhou and Xiaogan cities in
341 Hubei indicate significantly positive correlation with those of the case number outside Hubei
342 of China (Table 1). Migration scale indices between January 1 and 8, 9 and 15, 16 and 20, 21
343 and 23 from Wuhan were significantly correlated with confirmed cases outside Hubei on
344 January 27, February 4 and March 4 ($p < 0.01$) (Table 1). Among the correlations, migration
345 scale indices between January 1 and 8, 9 and 15 from Wuhan were best correlated with
346 confirmed cases outside Hubei on January 27, and the correlation coefficients r were 0.75 and
347 0.76, respectively ($p < 0.01$). Migration scale indices between January 24 and 28 from
348 Huanggang, Jingzhou and Xiaogan cities indicate significant correlations with confirmed cases
349 outside Hubei. The correlations between confirmed cases and migration were found to be a
350 time lag of approximately 20-30 days or even 50-60 days, while the incubation period of
351 COVID-19 was estimated to be 1-14 days in general¹⁹. Thus, the COVID-19 outbreak outside
352 Hubei of China was delayed due to the effects of a series of social management measures. The
353 analysis above suggests that since January 1, 2020, 23 days before Wuhan lockdown, the
354 COVID-19 spread that affected by social management measures and migration started across

355 China. The low level of peak incidence per capita, the early timing of the peak, and the effective
356 control of case number, suggest that management measures were associated with a delay in
357 COVID-19 outbreak and a notable decline in case number in China.

358 3.3 Effect of socioeconomic levels on the COVID-19 treatment in China

359 Outside Hubei Province, confirmed and cured patients were significantly positively
360 correlated with population, GDP, public expenditure, the number of hospitals, hospital beds
361 and doctors at a city level ($p < 0.01$) (Table 2). At a province level, confirmed and cured cases
362 were well positively correlated with total health expenditure and the share in GDP, GDP,
363 public expenditure, the number of hospitals, top hospitals, beds in general hospitals, nurses
364 and doctors ($p < 0.01$) (Table 3). Spatial patterns of confirmed and cured patients indicate
365 good spatial consistency with those of population, GDP, public expenditure, the number of
366 hospitals, hospital beds and doctors at a city level (Figure 7). Similarly, spatial patterns of
367 confirmed and cured patients indicate good spatial consistency with those of total health
368 expenditure and the share in GDP, GDP, public expenditure, the number of hospitals, top
369 hospitals, beds in general hospitals, nurses and doctors at a province level (Figure 7 and 8).

370 The rate of severe cases was negatively correlated with total health expenditure, GDP and
371 the number of doctors and nurses ($p < 0.05$) (Table 3). Spatial pattern of the severe rates
372 indicates good spatial consistency with that of total health expenditure, GDP and the number
373 of doctors and nurses at a province level. Top average rates of severe cases were presented in
374 a decreasing order: Tianjin city (26.9%), Xinjiang (22.6%), Anhui Province (19.2%), Hunan
375 Province (14.5%), Heilongjiang Province (14.2%), Liaoning Province (13.7%) and Qinghai
376 Province (13.3%). The rates of severe cases in these regions were close to or exceeded 15%.

377 Among these regions, Tianjin city, Xinjiang and Heilongjiang Province had relatively large
378 rates of death on confirmed cases, with the values of 3/136 person, 3/23 person and 13/500
379 person, respectively. Xinjiang had the highest rate of death on confirmed cases and the second
380 high rate of severe cases in China (Figure 5). The regions with high rates of severe cases were
381 also the regions that invested the least fund in health care in China. Qinghai Province, Tianjin
382 City, Xinjiang, Gansu Province and Hainan Province that were equipped with the least number
383 of doctors and nurses at a province level in China, had relatively high rates of severe cases.
384 Particularly in Qinghai province, the number of doctors and nurses were the least in China,
385 with the values of 13725 and 17577, respectively. Qinghai Province also had the least GDP
386 among all regions in China.

387 Considering the number of confirmed, cured and death cases and the rates of severe cases,
388 the regions with the most confirmed cases (more than one thousand) were presented in a
389 decreasing order: Guangdong Province, Henan province, Zhejiang Province and Hunan
390 Province. Zhejiang and Guangdong showed the most excellent performance in COVID-19
391 treatment capacity. The highest rate of cured cases on the confirmed (96.3%), the lowest
392 average rate of severe cases (7.7%), and the fewest death, only one person in Zhejiang were
393 indicated. Guangdong achieved the largest decline in severe case rate from 31.8% to 9.7% in
394 China. The regions with the confirmed case number between 500 and 1000 were presented in
395 a decreasing order: Anhui Province, Jiangxi Province, Shandong Province, Jiangsu Province,
396 and Heilongjiang Province. Notably, Jiangsu had the lowest average rate of severe cases (1.7%)
397 and zero death among all regions in China. Guangdong, Jiangsu and Zhejiang Provinces, which
398 ranked the top three GDP in China, showed the most excellent treatment capacity of COVID-

399 19 (Figure 5). These three provinces were equipped with relatively more abundant health care
400 resources and investment, and provided the most health care assistance to Hubei. The difference
401 in the number of health care workers that assisted Hubei roughly illustrates the difference in
402 health care levels among regions in China (Figure 6).

403 4. Discussions

404 4.1 Effect of the socioeconomic levels on COVID-19 spread in China

405 Our results indicate that migration and management measures had a powerful impact on the
406 COVID-19 spread in China. Affected by a series of measures against COVID-19, e.g., the
407 announcement of a new virus outbreak, etiology identification, upgrade of public health
408 emergency level and confirmation of human to human transmission, an abnormal migration
409 from Wuhan occurred between January 1 and 23, 2020 due to fear of COVID-19. Temporal
410 and spatial patterns of migration from Wuhan were consistent with those of COVID-19 cases
411 outside Hubei. Starting on January 23, 2020, affected by management measures, e.g., Wuhan
412 lockdown, movement restriction and home stay throughout China, population mobility and
413 gatherings were reduced, thus containing COVID-19 spread in China. Additionally, Chinese
414 government launched a series of more intensive measures, e.g., wearing masks in public,
415 nationwide joint prevention and control to screening at a community level, four early strategies,
416 and information disclosure. These measures at various levels in China were superimposed, and
417 effectively controlled COVID-19 spread within four weeks after Wuhan lockdown. The
418 findings of Tian, Liu ¹¹ based on modelling were similar to our results based on observational
419 data, and they found that the national emergency response appears to have delayed the growth
420 and limited the size of COVID-19 epidemic in China. With the rapid COVID-19 spread, the

421 United States, Italy and Spain is becoming the epicenters. At present, the countries with serious
422 COVID-19 epidemic also adopted intensive measures, e.g., lockdown, wearing masks in public,
423 social distancing, detection and information disclosure, to control and reverse COVID-19²¹.

424 4.2 Effect of the socioeconomic levels on COVID-19 treatment in China

425 Our results suggest that social management measures on monitoring, communication,
426 response, research, epidemiologic survey and clinical practice adopted in China improved
427 COVID-19 treatment. For example, four early strategies, early protection (social distancing),
428 early detection, early diagnosis and early isolation, were implemented across China. As the
429 COVID-19 outbreak threatened to overload the healthcare system and disrupt the global
430 socioeconomic system. The aim of four early strategies is not only to reduce the case number
431 but also to spread them over time, avoiding congestion in health care system and intensive care
432 units. As is often the case during this type of pandemic, health care workers themselves are
433 particularly exposed to infection. Between mid-January and mid-February in China 1716 health
434 care workers were infected with COVID-19 (accounting for 3.8% of all patients)¹⁷. Four early
435 strategies, Fangcang shelter hospitals, medical assistance nationwide, and continuously
436 updated diagnosis and health care plan for COVID-19 were together carried out. These
437 strategies greatly improved COVID-19 treatment capacities in China, particularly in Hubei
438 Province. Specifically, confirmed, suspected patients and close contacts of confirmed patients
439 were identified, and these people were classified and managed in a centralized way. A large
440 number of mild cases were thus treated timely, and the possibility of turning into severe cases
441 was reduced²². These strategies laid a good foundation for increasing the cure rate and reducing
442 the mortality rate. The Fangcang shelter hospitals provided basic health care and clinical triage,

443 and mild, moderate and severe patients were differently treated. It is suitable for the
444 management of a large number of patients and the burden on general hospitals was reduced.
445 Time and economic cost of Fangcang shelter hospital construction is low²³. With the
446 strengthening force of national medical support and treatment experience, health care resources
447 and capacities were greatly improved.

448 Our results suggest that COVID-19 treatment capacities outside Hubei in China were
449 greatly affected by regional socioeconomic levels. COVID-19 treatment capacities in
450 Guangdong, Jiangsu and Zhejiang Provinces ranked top three in China, which was consistent
451 with the GDP ranking. Strong economic support is the guarantee of health care level. Strong
452 health care level was the foundation of zero death and extremely low rate of severe cases in
453 Jiangsu Province. Despite a large number of COVID-19 confirmed cases (631 cases) in Jiangsu,
454 early detection, early treatment, and rapid recovery were achieved in the context of sufficient
455 healthcare resources, and the rate of severe cases was the lowest in China. Additionally, the
456 total number of medical members from Jiangsu assisting Hubei is 2,757, which was the largest
457 among the regions in China (Figure 6). The Jiangsu medical team took over treatment work in
458 Xiaogan City, Hubei Province, and focused on the intensive care units. The confirmed cases
459 (3518 cases) in Xiaogan was secondary to Wuhan in Hubei Province. In Wuhan, there were
460 five key hospitals that received the severe and critical patients. Jiangsu medical team
461 participated in three of these hospitals as the main force²⁴. These aspects manifested powerful
462 treatment capability of Jiangsu Province.

463 Guangdong was the second largest province to provide medical assistance to Hubei.
464 Nevertheless the number of COVID-19 confirmed cases in Guangdong was the largest, the rate

465 of severe cases in Guangdong decreased the most by 22.1% among the regions in China. This
466 large decrease may be mainly due to continuously improved diagnosis and treatment
467 experience since COVID-19 outbreak. Guangdong established a comprehensive screening
468 system for the key COVID-19 cases. The screening team is composed of medical experts from
469 the Department of Infectious Diseases, Respiratory Medicine, Intensive Medicine, and Imaging.
470 This screen was performed on confirmed patients every day to examine if these patients had
471 the tendency to convert to severe or critical cases and take remedy measures. The number of
472 severe and critical cases was thus gradually declined. Besides, timely and effective publicity
473 measures were conducive to early detection of patients and avoided illness deterioration.

474 The excellent treatment capacity of COVID-19 in Zhejiang Province was mainly
475 presented from these aspects: early prevention and control, early development of detection
476 reagents, strong detection capability, and centralized treatment strategies. Specifically,
477 Zhejiang started the first level response of public health emergency and took the strictest
478 measures of joint prevention and control at the earliest. On January 10, 2020, Zhejiang
479 Provincial Health Commission carried out hospital-infection arrangements for hypothesized
480 epidemic outbreak in medical institutions across the province. Zhejiang CDC was the first
481 provincial disease control laboratory to successfully isolate COVID-19 coronavirus strains in
482 China, and an automated whole-genome detection and analysis platform was launched to speed
483 up COVID-19 detection. Many institutions in Zhejiang had the detection ability at the initial
484 phase of COVID-19 outbreak, with a daily detection capacity of 12,000 person. At the same
485 time, a third-party testing agency in Zhejiang undertook a total number of 75,000 nucleic acid
486 testing in neighboring provinces by mid-February 2020²⁵. With the support of screening at

487 fever clinics and nucleic acid detection, early treatment was achieved. Moreover, four
488 centralization strategies were adopted in treatment in Zhengjiang. Patients and medical
489 resources were centralized, and medical experts and treatment were centralized. Treatment was
490 centralized based on disease severity. The four centralization could save medical resources,
491 improve the treatment efficiency and the rate of cured cases, and reduce the rates of severe
492 cases and mortality.

493 Regarding COVID-19 detection, the above three provinces showed strong nucleic acid
494 detection capabilities and had the ability to assist the detection in other provinces of China. In
495 China, most of famous enterprises of nucleic acid detection kit development are located in
496 Guangdong, Jiangsu and Zhejiang Provinces, for instance, Jinyu and Huada in Guangdong,
497 Shuoshi and Suzhou Medical Workers in Jiangsu, Dean and Adicon in Zhejiang. To improve
498 detection efficiency, at the beginning of COVID-19 outbreak, a three-party joint test, "CDC +
499 medical institution + the third-party enterprise", was carried out in these three provinces. The
500 testing results could be produced on the same day, and there was no problem of backlog of
501 suspected patients due to timely diagnosis. Additionally, Tianjin city, Xinjiang and Qianghai
502 Province had higher rates of severe cases and mortality in comparison with other regions in
503 China. Because these regions had a relatively low level of economic investment in health care,
504 and the treatment capacities of COVID-19 were thus relatively poor.

505 Our key finding is that socioeconomic levels had strong effects on the spread and
506 treatment of COVID-19 in China. Future work on the individual effect of each management
507 measure on the spread and treatment of COVID-19 at a province level could be carried out
508 outside Hubei Province, both quantitatively and qualitatively. The effect of each management

509 measure could be examined separately and the dominant measure could be examined. A
510 comparative analysis using control experiments and model simulation on the effects of these
511 management measures at a province or country scale could be performed. Additionally, the
512 limitation of this study lied in data unavailability. For an improved understanding of
513 socioeconomic effect on COVID-19 treatment in China, case reports of severe and dead
514 patients at a city level, including gender, age, weight, medical history and length of hospital
515 stay could be added. Socioeconomic factors, e.g., the number of beds, doctors and nurses in
516 intensive care units, the number of key medical resources in all top hospitals, e.g., negative
517 pressure ambulances, Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation (ECMO), ventilator and other
518 key treatment equipment at a city level could be supplemented. COVID-19 spread in China
519 was effectively curbed, and the spread to other countries was notably reduced. The
520 effectiveness of these Chinese measures in controlling transmission and treatment of COVID-
521 19 in other countries of the world requires intensive examination. The Chinese experience
522 provides important insights into how to design effective management strategies of COVID-19
523 or other epidemic outside China.

524
525
526
527

528 Acknowledgements

529 Pay tribute to the workers who are fighting on the front line of the prevention and control of

530 COVID-19 all over the world. Thank you very much to all the staff who participated in the

531 prevention and control of COVID-19, including treatment, detection and diagnosis,

532 epidemiologic investigation, close contact management, and scientific research, etc.

533

534 Contributors

535 Qi Wang designed the study concept. Zelong Zheng and Qi Wang collected data and checked
536 data sources. Qi Wang, Xiangfeng Li analyzed data and prepared results. Zelong Zheng wrote
537 the first draft of the manuscript and Qi Wang contributed to subsequent drafts.

538

539

540 Conflicts of interest

541 We declare that we have no conflicts of interest.

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569 Table 1 Correlation between migration scale indices from Wuhan, Huanggang, Jingzhou and
 570 Xiaogan cities and confirmed cases outside Hubei Province of China

	Cases 1.27.2020	Cases 2.4.2020	Cases 3.4.2020
Migration between January 1 and 8 from Wuhan	0.75**	0.70**	0.71**
Migration between January 9 and 15 from Wuhan	0.76**	0.70**	0.70**
Migration between January 16 and 20 from Wuhan	0.67**	0.62**	0.63**
Migration between January 21 and 23 from Wuhan	0.51**	0.52**	0.56**
Migration between January 24 and 28 from Xiaogan	0.43**	0.43**	0.48**
Migration between January 24 and 28 from Jingzhou	0.15*	0.35*	0.38*
Migration between January 24 and 28 from Huanggang	0.16*	0.29*	0.30*

571 **0.01 significance level

572 *0.05 significance level

573

574

575

576

577 Table 2 Correlation between socioeconomic levels and treatment capacities of COVID-19 at a
578 city level in China

City	Population	GDP (billion Yuan)	Public expenditure (billion Yuan)	No. of hospitals	No. of hospital beds	No. of doctors
Cured	0.66**	0.68**	0.67**	0.71**	0.67**	0.68**
Confirmed	0.67**	0.71**	0.70**	0.73**	0.70**	0.72**

579 **0.01 significance level

580 *0.05 significance level

581

582

583






584 Table 3 Correlation between socioeconomic levels and treatment capacities of COVID-19 at a
585 province level in China

Province	Total health expenditure (billion Yuan)	Total health expenditure in GDP (%)	No. of hospitals	No. of top hospitals	No. of doctors	No. of nurses	No. of beds in general hospitals	GDP (billion Yuan)	Public expenditure (billion Yuan)
Cured	0.66**	0.50**	0.47*	0.47**	0.67**	0.68**	0.64**	0.65**	0.58**
Confirmed	0.72**	0.52**	0.52**	0.52**	0.72**	0.73**	0.68**	0.70**	0.64**
Rate of severe cases	-0.37*	0.16	-0.16	-0.31	-0.35*	-0.38*	-0.26	-0.33*	-0.31

586 **0.01 significance level

587 *0.05 significance level

588



589


590 Figure 1 Epidemiologic patterns corresponding to milestones of confirmed and suspected cases

591 of COVID-19 in China. The number of daily confirmed cases that were linked (blue) and

592 unlinked (pink) to Huanan Seafood Market were plotted by the date of diagnosis. The time

593 ranged from December 8, 2019, the date of case onset to February 24, 2020, the date of notable
594 case decrease. The dates were used as a timeline of primary social management measures in
595 response to COVID-19 outbreak in China. Social management measures taken by the Chinese
596 authorities are shown in green boxes. The incidence of COVID-19 cases was few as of January
597 20, 2020, and these cases are indicated in the inset. The outlines of two peaks, January 27 and
598 February 4, 2020 were highlighted in red. Social management measures on COVID-19 spread
599 were highlighted in red, and the measures on COVID-19 treatment were highlighted in purple.
600 At four key time nodes of COVID-19 cases, the number of confirmed (blue) and suspected
601 (orange) cases in the 34 provinces (including Hubei), municipalities and autonomous regions
602 were illustrated. (This figure was modified based on Wu and McGoogan ¹⁷)

603
604
605
606




607

608 Figure 2 Spatial patterns of confirmed cases at a city level across China on January 27, February

609 4 and March 4, 2020

610

611



612

613


614 Figure 3 Daily migration scale index of the cities in Hubei Province from January 1 to February 17 in

615 2019 and 2020. The solid lines denote the migration scale index in 2020, and the dotted lines denote


616 that index in 2019.

619 Xiaogan and Jingzhou cities of Hubei Province in five sub-periods: January 1 to 8, January 9
620 to 15, January 16 to 20, January 21 to 23 and January 24 to 28 in 2020.
621
622

623
624



Temporal change in the rates of severe cases




625
626

627 Figure 5 Spatial patterns of confirmed and cured cases at city and province levels, the rates of
 628 severe cases and the number of death at a province level outside Hubei of China. Temporal
 629 change in the rates of severe cases in the regions with more than 500 confirmed cases.

630

631




632

633 Figure 6 Number of aid physicians and nurses to Hubei Province from other provinces, municipalities,

634 and autonomous regions in China

635



636

637 Figure 7 Spatial patterns of the indicators representing macroeconomic levels at a city level in

638 China. The indicators comprised population, GDP (billion Yuan), No. of hospitals, No. of


639 doctors, No. of hospital beds, and public expenditure (billion Yuan).

640

641

642

643



644

645


646 Figure 8 Spatial patterns of the indicators representing macroeconomic levels at a province level

647 in China. The indicators comprised total health expenditure (billion Yuan), GDP (billion Yuan),

648 No. of doctors and No. of nurses.

649

650



651

652

653 Figure 9 Spatial patterns of the indicators representing macroeconomic levels at a province level

654 in China. The indicators comprised population, total health expenditure in GDP (%), No. of

655 hospitals, No. of top hospitals, No. of beds in general hospitals, and public expenditure (billion

656 Yuan).

657

658

659

660 References

- 661 1. Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, et al. A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China. *Nature*
662 2020; **579**(7798): 265-9.
- 663 2. Zhu N, Zhang DY, Wang WL, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *New*
664 *Engl J Med* 2020; **382**(8): 727-33.
- 665 3. Sohrabi C, Alsafi Z, O'Neill N, et al. World Health Organization declares global emergency: A review of the
666 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19). *International Journal of Surgery* 2020; **76**: 71-6.
- 667 4. Wang C, Horby PW, Hayden FG, Gao GF. A novel coronavirus outbreak of global health concern. *The Lancet*
668 2020; **395**(10223): 470-3.
- 669 5. WHO. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports: WHO, 2020.
- 670 6. Zandifar A, Badrfam R. Fighting COVID-19 in Iran; Economic Challenges Ahead. *Arch Iran Med March* 2020;
671 **23**(4): 284-.
- 672 7. Armocida B, Formenti B, Ussai S, Palestra F, Missoni E. The Italian health system and the COVID-19 challenge.
673 *The Lancet Public health* 2020.
- 674 8. Fernandes N. Economic Effects of Coronavirus Outbreak (COVID-19) on the World Economy. *SSRN* 2020.
- 675 9. DL H, G. R. SARS: Lessons from a new disease. In: Knobler S, Mahmoud A, Lemon S, Mack A, Sivitz L,
676 Oberholtzer K, eds. Learning from SARS: Preparing for the Next Disease Outbreak: Workshop Summary.
677 Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2004.
- 678 10. Chinazzi M, Davis JT, Ajelli M, et al. The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel
679 coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. *Science* 2020.
- 680 11. Tian H, Liu Y, Li Y, et al. An investigation of transmission control measures during the first 50 days of the
681 COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Science* 2020.
- 682 12. Cauchemez S, Fraser C, Van Kerkhove MD, et al. Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus:
683 quantification of the extent of the epidemic, surveillance biases, and transmissibility. *The Lancet Infectious*
684 *diseases* 2014; **14**(1): 50-6.
- 685 13. Labonte R, Mohindra K, Schrecker T. The growing impact of globalization for health and public health
686 practice. *Annual review of public health* 2011; **32**: 263-83.
- 687 14. Cheng SO, Khan S. Europe's response to COVID-19 in March and April 2020 - A letter to the editor on "World
688 Health Organization declares global emergency: A review of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19)" (Int J Surg
689 2020;76:71-6). *International Journal of Surgery* 2020; **78**: 3-4.
- 690 15. Nicola M, O'Neill N, Sohrabi C, Khan M, Agha M, Agha R. Evidence Based Management Guideline for the
691 COVID-19 Pandemic - Review article. *International Journal of Surgery* 2020.
- 692 16. Purcell LN, Charles AG. An Invited Commentary on "World Health Organization declares global emergency:
693 A review of the 2019 novel Coronavirus (COVID-19)": Emergency or new reality? *International Journal of Surgery*
694 2020; **76**: 111.
- 695 17. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-
696 19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and
697 Prevention. *JAMA* 2020; **323**(13): 1239-42.
- 698 18. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, et al. Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus-
699 Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA* 2020.
- 700 19. Guan W-j, Ni Z-y, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *New Engl J Med*
701 2020.
- 702 20. Ma J. 5 million left Wuhan before lockdown, 1,000 new coronavirus cases expected in city. WND News

- 703 Services. 2020 2020 Jan 26.
- 704 21. Heever Avd. Toward a risk-based strategy for managing the COVID-19 epidemic: A modelling analysis.
705 Maverick Citizen/Daily Maverick. 2020.
- 706 22. Chinese Health Commission. Novel coronavirus pneumonia "four early" technical proposal. In: Commission
707 CH, editor. <http://www.nhc.gov.cn/jkj/s3577/202002/69b3fdbcbb61f499ba50a25cdf1d5374e.shtml>: Chinese
708 Health Commission; 2020.
- 709 23. Chen S, Zhang Z, Yang J, et al. Fangcang shelter hospitals: a novel concept for responding to public health
710 emergencies. *Lancet* 2020; **395**(10232): 1305-14.
- 711 24. Phoenix. Xiaogan supported by medical teams in different cities of Jiangsu Province. Phoenix. 2020 February
712 10, 2020.
- 713 25. Sohu. The cure rate of novel coronavirus pneumonia in Zhejiang is high. How did it do this? Sohuneews. 2020
714 February 25, 2020.
- 715