

Lockdown related travel behavior undermines the containment of SARS-CoV-2

Nishant Kishore^{1*}, Rebecca Kahn^{1*}, Pamela P. Martinez^{1,2}, Pablo M. De Salazar¹, Ayesha S. Mahmud³ and Caroline O. Buckee^{1 †}

¹Center for Communicable Disease Dynamics, Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

²Department of Microbiology, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Illinois, USA

³Department of Demography, University of California, Berkeley, California, USA

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

†Please send all correspondence to Dr. Caroline Buckee at cbuckee@hsph.harvard.edu

ABSTRACT

In response to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, unprecedented policies of travel restrictions and stay-at-home orders were enacted around the world. Ultimately, the public's response to announcements of lockdowns - defined here as restrictions on both local movement or long distance travel - will determine how effective these kinds of interventions are. Here, we measure the impact of the announcement and implementation of lockdowns on human mobility patterns by analyzing aggregated mobility data from mobile phones. We find that following the announcement of lockdowns, both local and long distance movement increased. To examine how these behavioral responses to lockdown policies may contribute to epidemic spread, we developed a simple agent-based spatial model. We find that travel surges following announcements of lockdowns can increase seeding of the epidemic in rural areas, undermining the goal of the lockdown of preventing disease spread. Appropriate messaging surrounding the announcement of lockdowns and measures to decrease unnecessary travel are important for preventing these unintended consequences of lockdowns.

1 Introduction

2 In response to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, unprecedented policies of travel restrictions and stay-at-home orders were enacted
3 around the world almost simultaneously. These ranged from restrictions on human movement on a local scale to travel
4 restrictions on regional and international scales. These policies were designed to reduce the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus
5 by restricting the contact between infectious and susceptible individuals and to slow the spread of the virus out of epidemic
6 hotspots.

7 Ultimately, the public's response to announcements of lockdowns - defined here as restrictions on both local movement or
8 long distance travel - will determine how effective these kinds of interventions are. Governments must give some warning to
9 the public about upcoming travel restrictions to allow for necessary preparations, but a surge of travel prior to the lockdown
10 being put in place risks the exact opposite of the desired effect, sending potentially infectious individuals out into previously
11 unaffected regions around the country or internationally. In order to design effective policies in response to resurgence of
12 SARS-CoV-2 or indeed in the context of future pandemics, understanding the human response to interventions is critical.

13 Analyses of aggregated data from mobile phones have been used to monitor movement patterns in the context of outbreaks
14 [1, 2, 3], including this pandemic [4, 5]. Studies have shown that mobility patterns on local scales correlated with transmission
15 within the city of Wuhan on a more local level [6, 7], and recent analyses have found associations between mobility and
16 SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the United States [8]. Seasonal travel related to holidays, which creates a surge of travel out of
17 cities, for example, can also have an important impact on the spread of infection [9]. Travel related to the Lunar New Year may
18 well have spread the disease across China as the epidemic started to emerge in Wuhan. Since SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals
19 are likely to be infectious prior to symptoms, and many may have no symptoms at all, the possibility of infected travelers

20 unwittingly spreading the virus during large travel movements is significant.

21 Here, we measure the impact of the announcement and implementation of lockdowns on human mobility patterns by
22 analyzing aggregated mobility data from mobile phones from multiple countries including India, France, Spain, and the USA,
23 on local and national spatial scales. We show that immediately preceding lockdowns there was a consistent surge in travel
24 out of the urban epicenters of the epidemic, or around local neighborhoods, in anticipation of restrictions. We observed
25 urban-to-rural migration in each country analyzed, and we use a simple agent-based spatial model to examine how different
26 behavioral responses to lockdown policies may spread epidemics, highlighting the importance of social considerations in the
27 implementation of travel restrictions. We find that travel surges following announcements of lockdowns can increase seeding of
28 the epidemic in rural areas, undermining the goal of the lockdown of preventing disease spread.

29 Results

30 Subject to the availability of data (see Methods), we analyzed mobility patterns in response to lockdown orders on two spatial
31 scales: i) within cities, and ii) more broadly on a national level.

32 Pre-lockdown mobility surges and depopulation of cities

33 Lockdown announcements are generally made a few days before going into effect. To understand the impact of the announcement
34 itself, we analyzed the percent change in population during the day compared to baseline in different parts of New York City
35 based on Facebook data. As shown in Figure 1, Manhattan showed a large increase in population following the announcement
36 during daytime hours, suggestive of mobility related to preparations for the lockdown, followed by a dramatic decline upon its
37 implementation. In contrast, the population in most boroughs stayed the same or increased following the announcement and
38 lockdown, consistent with stay-at-home orders that would have prevented people from commuting to other parts of the city for
39 work.

40 The decrease in daytime population in Manhattan was not only driven by fewer workers coming into the city during the
41 day, but also an exodus of residents out of the city overall, characterized by a decrease in nighttime population. In Figure 2
42 we evaluated this depletion of nighttime city populations, indicative of reduced residency, not just daytime activity, across
43 other cities in the US for which data were available around the same time period, and we found a similar decrease in nighttime
44 population. In New York City, the decline in residents overall was driven primarily by the exodus from Manhattan, and we
45 expect similar heterogeneities may characterize population changes in other cities.

46 We further evaluated changes in urban versus rural populations on a national scale in France, Spain, India, and Bangladesh;
47 four countries for which Facebook data pipelines were available to cover the timing of lockdowns. In Figure 3 regions in these
48 countries are divided into five equally sized quantiles of nightlight ($\frac{nW}{cm^2sr}$) [10], which correspond to population density and
49 reflect the urban-to-rural gradient. In each country, to varying degrees, there was a consistent decrease in population in areas
50 with the highest nightlight intensity (urban centers) and a reciprocal increase in population in less electrified regions (more rural
51 areas).

52 In Bangladesh, we find a substantial decline in population in areas with the highest nightlight intensity - primarily in the
53 capital, Dhaka, and areas with a high concentration of garment factories. The announcement of the lockdown in early March,
54 and the closing of the garments industry, was followed by large movements of people from these densely populated urban areas
55 to more rural areas [11, 12, 13]. Figure 4 shows the striking pattern of population decline in urban areas in March, followed by
56 a gradual increase as the garments industry and other workplaces opened in late April. We are unable to use Bangladesh data
57 for movement analysis or compare it directly to data from India, France and Spain as the spatial granularity of Facebook data
58 provided is of poor resolution.

59 Change in travel patterns

60 To better understand these changes, we evaluated the distribution of distances traveled around the country before, during, and
61 after the lockdown (Figure 5). France announced a lockdown on March 16th and implemented it the next day while Spain
62 implemented a state of alarm on March 13th and halted all non-essential activity on March 28th. In both countries, the vast
63 majority of travel is local, but in France we see an immediate decrease in activity on the day that lockdown was implemented,

64 while in Spain we see an initial decrease in long distance travel with a much more severe decrease once all non-essential travel
65 was restricted. It is important to note that even with lockdown measures, the baseline rate of local travel remains generally
66 unchanged, at times including trips of 50 kilometers or more in both France and Spain.

67 **Pre-lockdown travel surges lead to faster and further initial spread of the epidemic**

68 To examine the epidemiological implications of these behavioral responses to lockdowns, we implemented a metapopulation
69 model reflecting the general behaviors we measured in the Facebook data. As shown in Figure 6, which depicts results from an
70 epidemic without a lockdown or other interventions, we initiated the epidemic in an "urban" center (identified by a black outline)
71 with a higher population density and evaluated the epidemic spread across all other "non-urban" areas, with travel determined
72 by a gravity model of movement. We then varied travel and infection dynamics based on timing in relation to lockdown
73 announcements and implementations (Figure 7). In the simulations, lockdowns affect behavior in two ways: first, between
74 announcement and lockdown implementation contact rates within populations (β_1) temporarily increase, and subsequently
75 decrease once the lockdown takes effect (β_2). Second, travel from urban to rural locations also changes prior to (α_1) and
76 following (α_2) lockdown. We evaluated each possible parameter combination against a relative baseline where this is no travel
77 surge and no increased contact rate during the period between lockdown announcement and implementation.

78 While lockdowns decrease the spread of the epidemic if they are maintained effectively over time, travel surges at the
79 beginning of an epidemic can increase exportation of cases out of the epicenter (Figure 8). In fact, travel surges can initially
80 spread the disease faster than if no lockdown at all had been implemented. Changes in contact rates (β_1) and travel (α_1)
81 following the announcement of a lockdown cause this increased rate of exportation of disease, with the former contributing
82 more than the latter; however, there is a clear multiplicative effect as seen in Figure 9. Figure 9 (left) describes the relative
83 probability of having an outbreak in a region within the first 30 days of the simulation, compared to a scenario where there is no
84 change in α and β during the L_1 period. This highlights the overall risk that communities face over the course of the epidemic,
85 as well as the speed of outbreak spread. Given the novel nature of SARS-CoV-2 we have defined the detection of a single case
86 in a given location as the clearest metric of this aspect of an epidemic, since stochastic localized outbreaks and return travel
87 would subsequently complicate the spread of the virus. Figure 9 (right) evaluates the percent change in the number of days until
88 an outbreak occurs, compared to the baseline scenario. This demonstrates the relative speed with which an epidemic is able to
89 seed surrounding communities. As contact rates and travel increase, there is a corresponding increase in seeding of epidemics
90 in new locations, as well as faster spread to all locations. This occurs because an increase in β_1 results in a larger number of
91 local cases available for travel while an increase in α_1 results in an increased overall probability of those cases traveling.

92 We evaluated the probability of travel (α_0) under varying parameter values in the null model (i.e. no change in movement
93 due to lockdown) with the goal of simulating a depopulation of the location that served as the urban center that was similar to
94 what we found empirically in Figure 2. Across a variety of scenarios, an α_0 of 0.01 (baseline daily travel probability) resulted
95 in an at least 10% decrease in the population size of the urban center over the course of 60 days (Figures S1, S2 and S3).

96 **Rapid implementation of lockdowns after announcement decreases exported cases**

97 Decreasing the time between announcement and lockdown implementation reduces the number of exported cases. As shown in
98 Figure 10, an L_1 period of 0 days resulted in no discernible increase in risk of an epidemic across all locations compared to the
99 baseline. However, as we increased L_1 , the probability of having at least one case by thirty days increased in most non-urban
100 locations. This effect was especially notable in rural locations far removed from the urban center. Importantly, the speed of the
101 exportation of the epidemic was driven by both the duration of the L_1 period and modification of the travel surge as defined
102 by α_1 and β_1 . With an L_1 of 7 days, an α_{inc} of three and a β_{inc} of two, it is the locations that are closest to the urban center
103 that have an exceptional decrease in the average number of days until the first case. The choice of timing between lockdown
104 announcement and implementation must balance the increased risk of exportation from longer delays with the need to provide
105 enough warning for people to adequately prepare for the lockdown.

106 Discussion

107 Exportation to rural areas is driven by travel and local contact rates

108 Human behavior in response to announcements of restrictions affects the trajectory of outbreaks. Both travel (α) and contact
109 rates (β) play a key role in the increased risk of exportation of cases to non-urban locations following announcement of a
110 lockdown. A temporary increase in local contact rates and mobility results in more epidemic seeding in rural areas compared to
111 if the lockdown were implemented without these increases (Figure 8). Importantly, α drives the speed of the epidemic and
112 greatly reduces the time until the first case in locations close to the urban center. The effect of α is modulated by the duration
113 of the time between announcement and implementation (L_1 period), with an increase in both probability of having an epidemic
114 and the average time until the first case. The increase in risk is greater in regions that are further removed from the urban center
115 as they have the lowest risk at baseline; however, the average time until the first case in these locations does not decrease nearly
116 as much as those of locations closer to the urban center. This highlights the importance of proximity in our gravity model
117 driven mobility network.

118 Messaging surrounding the lockdown is key to reducing unintended consequences

119 This study shows that individually, the local contact rate, travel out of urban centers, or delay between announcement and
120 implementation of a lockdown do not greatly affect the risk of case exportation and the propagation of the epidemic. However,
121 the multiplicative effects of these factors can be dramatic. To decrease the probability of exportation, public health authorities
122 must consider:

- 123 1. Messaging on how to prepare for lockdowns and expectations of the local supply chain to decrease instances of panic
124 buying and hoarding, thereby decreasing the spike in local travel immediately preceding a lockdown [14].
- 125 2. Decreasing the window of time between announcement and implementation of lockdown policies to reduce both the
126 local contact rate and the probability of out migration while balancing the needs of the population. Regardless of the
127 duration of L_1 , lockdown policies which decrease α and β always resulted in smaller epidemics by the end of the study
128 period (Figure 11).
- 129 3. Communicating the exportation risks associated with migration out of epidemic regions and coordinating between
130 locations to reduce the risk of local transmission from an imported case [15]. This could include planning and resource
131 allocation for increased surveillance and testing to account for the potential excess risk.
- 132 4. Providing the resources needed for people to stay. Strategies for mitigating travel surges will greatly depend on the
133 reasons behind people's movement. Movement of people back home from urban centers due to sudden lack of work from
134 the pandemic [11] will require different interventions and messaging than people choosing to leave crowded cities for
135 more remote second homes [16].

136 Supporting epidemiologic data

137 Mobility and epidemiologic data support the findings from our model of increased exportation and seeding of epidemics
138 as a result of travel surges. The mobility data provide evidence that lockdown announcements and implementation trigger
139 travel surges and changes in travel patterns relative to pre-lockdown movement. In the simulations, we have shown how these
140 changes in mobility can lead to increased introductions of cases in rural areas. Similarly, genomics analyses have found that
141 many outbreaks across the United States were seeded by travelers from New York City [17]. Case data from Spain [18] also
142 show increases in cases across a wide range of locations following the lockdown implementation. While many factors likely
143 contributed to the similarities in the epidemic curves across locations, the increase in travel in the mobility data suggests seeding
144 from urban areas may have played a role.

145 Implications for Rural Areas

146 There are longstanding, global disparities in access to healthcare between urban and rural areas [19, 20], which have been
147 further exacerbated by the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic [21]. If successful at reducing contact rates and travel, lockdowns can be an

148 important tool for slowing the spread of an epidemic. However, the initial surges the lockdowns catalyze can cause the epidemic
149 to spread further and faster to places outside of urban centers that may be less equipped to deal with an epidemic. Travel surges
150 thus necessitate increased surveillance, testing, and treatment in areas that historically are understaffed and under resourced.

151 Through the course of a partially controlled epidemic in a susceptible population, our simulation shows that rural areas will
152 still be affected, albeit at a later date (Figure 12). Appropriate messaging to decrease the spike in local contact rates and exodus
153 out of epidemic areas along with inter-region coordination of movement can help decrease the burden of disease experienced by
154 rural areas.

155 **Limitations**

156 Many simplifying assumptions were made in the simulation model, including homogeneous mixing within locations on the
157 lattice, a gravity model for connectivity, and the inclusion of only one urban center. Additionally, we assumed transmission
158 dynamics were the same between symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals. Individuals in the I compartment are not able to
159 travel immediately upon entering the I compartment, which may underestimate the amount of travel that would occur prior to
160 symptom onset; however, given that those in A are able to travel, this likely will not impact the overall dynamics. We further
161 assumed that increases in movement observed in the data following lockdown announcements coincided with increased contact
162 rates, particularly in light of the anecdotal evidence of "panic buying". However, in future outbreaks, interventions such as
163 masks and social distancing, which were not consistently implemented in many places when lockdowns were first initiated,
164 may reduce the correlation between movement and contact rates. Finally, the mobility analyses absorb the limitations of the
165 Facebook data, which are limited to Facebook users with location services enabled. Despite these limitations, our results
166 highlight the need for careful implementation of lockdowns to mitigate their potential unintended consequences.

167 **Methods**

168 **Mobility Data**

169 Facebook's Data for Good team developed and provides access to the Geoinsights portal to provide movement and population
170 level data in response to crises [22]. This interface allows researchers and response workers to request aggregated and
171 anonymized datasets generated by an open cohort of individuals who are: 1) Facebook users; 2) have a smartphone, and; 3)
172 are providing information through the Facebook app by having location services enabled. Data are requested for a geospatial
173 region and defined by a spatial bounding box. For this analysis we used the movement and population datasets.

174 When the data aggregation pipeline is initiated, all individuals who are in the cohort described above and inside the bounding
175 box contribute information to the datasets. For each user, location information is collected, and user location is categorized
176 to Bing Tiles. The resolution of the Bing Tiles used varies by type of dataset with population data being offered at a higher
177 resolution than movement data due to computational restrictions. Data are then aggregated into 8-hour bins. Population is
178 determined by the modal location for each individual during this 8-hour bin. Movement for a given 8-hour bin is defined as a
179 vector of transition with the destination being the modal location in the current 8-hour bin and the origin being the modal local
180 for the preceding 8-hour bin. For each population tile and movement vector, Facebook provides a baseline which is calculated
181 as the average number of users who were categorized as being in a given location (population) or who had made a given
182 directional transition (movement) during the baseline period, conditional on day of week and time of day. The baseline period
183 is defined as the 45-day period preceding the initiation of the pipeline for movement data and the 90-day period preceding the
184 initiation of the pipeline for the population data.

185 **Selection of data sources**

186 On February 27th, Facebook's Data for Good team initiated the data collection pipeline for major cities in the United States of
187 America. In the following weeks bounding boxes, and subsequent pipelines, were generated for regions as requested, including
188 internationally. Our analyses are constrained to the locations with available data for the relevant time periods, and we use a
189 combination of Facebook mobility data and nightlight data in different areas, as described below.

190 We restricted our sub-city analysis to New York City as 1) there are clear geographic borders (boroughs) with heterogeneity
191 in the demographics of the population and land use in each region, 2) there were a large number of users included in the

192 Facebook data set for each region, and; 3) the boroughs are of a large enough spatial scale to allow Facebook to capture highly
193 granular movement and population data. City level analyses were restricted to the United States as Facebook initiated a city
194 specific data collection pipeline for select cities on February 27th, well before the implementation of lockdown measures.
195 Country level analyses were restricted to Spain, India, and France as all three countries quickly implemented strict lockdown
196 measures, and Facebook initiated data collection pipelines for the whole country before these measures were put into place.

197 Model Initialization

198 To assess the impact of different lockdown implementations and travel restrictions, we developed a simple metapopulation
199 model, consisting of 100 communities, evenly spaced on a ten-by-ten lattice. One community in the center represents an
200 “urban” area with a higher population size and population density than the other 99 “non-urban” locations. We make the
201 simplifying assumption that all non-urban locations are homogeneous in terms of size and density and only differ in their
202 distance from the urban. We seed an epidemic in the urban center with five initial cases. Within each community, the epidemic
203 follows a density-dependent stochastic Susceptible- Exposed- Infectious(Asymptomatic)- Infectious(Symptomatic)- Recovered
204 natural history. At each time step, all susceptible individuals have a chance of infection from the infectious individuals in
205 their community, based on the parameter beta (i.e., force of infection). Asymptomatic and symptomatic cases are assumed to
206 have the same beta, meaning the only difference between them in the model is whether or not they show symptoms. Detailed
207 parameters of the outbreak are listed in Table 1. Individuals that are symptomatic (I) or asymptomatic (A) proceed through their
208 disease history and approximately 10% of each compartment are removed into the recovered (R) compartment each time step
209 for an average recovery period of 10 days [23].

210 Following the time step specific movement through the disease generation process individuals in each community are given
211 a chance to travel. This travel is driven by three factors: 1) the probability that an individual travels out of a given community,
212 α_0 ; 2) the probability that an individual from community i travels to community j , given that they will travel out of community
213 i , $p_{ij} | \alpha_0$ and; 3) the disease status of the individual. All individuals that are in the S, E, A and R compartments are able to
214 travel. Here we assume that individuals who are symptomatic and infectious will self-isolate and not travel. We first calculate
215 the number of individuals that leave each compartment in each community, and then distribute them into the same compartment
216 in another community, depending on the probabilities described above. As seen in Figure 2 and 3, we see wide ranging levels
217 of depopulation in urban areas. In the most acute cases, such as in Manhattan in Figure 1, we see an approximate 40% decrease
218 in the nighttime population. However, in country level analyses this can vary significantly. We have tuned the α_0 parameter in
219 our model to result in an approximately 10% reduction in our “urban” population over the length of our model run. The value
220 $p_{ij} | \alpha_0 = \frac{M_{ij}\alpha_0}{\sum_1^J M_{ij} | \alpha_0}$ where M_{ij} is the i specific normalized value of a simple gravity model defined as:

$$M_{ij} | \alpha_0 = \frac{pop_i * pop_j}{(|row_i - row_j| + |col_i - col_j|)^2}$$

221 Here the values for row and col return the row and column number of the community in our ten-by-ten lattice. Given that an
222 individual moves, the location that they move to is determined by a gravity model with locations that are closer and locations
223 which are more heavily populated (i.e. the urban center) receiving a higher probability of travel.

224 Timing and tuned parameters

225 We designed our model to describe three distinct periods of time: 1) L_0 , the period before any lockdown measures are announced
226 or implemented, 2) L_1 , the period of time after announcement of lockdown, but before implementation; and, 3) L_2 , the period of
227 time after the implementation of the lockdown (Figure 7). As described above, the initial parameters of the disease generation
228 process and movement were controlled with α_0 and β_0 , which were tuned empirically. We varied six parameters which
229 influenced these initial parameters to evaluate the impact of differential implementation of lockdowns as shows in Figure 7.

- 230 • α_{inc} : A multiplicative factor which describes the increase in α_0 during the L_1 period resulting in α_1 . We used this variable
231 to simulate the increase in movement out of urban areas. α_{inc} is assumed to be constant throughout the L_1 period.
- 232 • α_{dec} : A multiplicative factor which describes the decrease in α_0 during the L_2 period resulting in α_2 . We used this
233 variable to simulate the reduction in movement between all locations resulting from the implementation of a lockdown.

- 234 • β_{inc} : A multiplicative factor which describes the increase in β_0 during the L_1 period resulting in β_1 . We used this variable
235 to increase the force of infection in areas where an epidemic had already started to simulate the increase in the contact
236 rate between individuals due to greater local movement.
- 237 • β_{dec} : A multiplicative factor which describes the decrease in β_0 during the L_2 period resulting in β_2 . We used this
238 variable to decrease the force of infection in the areas where an epidemic had already started to simulate the decrease in
239 the contact rate likely after the implementation of lockdown measures.
- 240 • δ : The number of local symptomatic cases necessary for announcement and implementation of lockdown measures.
241 Here we assumed that all symptomatic cases were immediately identified.
- 242 • ω : The amount of time between announcement of a lockdown and implementation.

243 Metrics

244 We simulated the stochastic epidemic 100 times. In each of the 100 communities, we calculated the proportion of simulations in
245 which that community had at least one case by day 30. We also calculated the average time to first infection across simulations
246 in each community. We compared these two metrics across variations of the six parameters described above. For our primary
247 analysis we held δ constant as it did not directly affect our question of interest. We subsequently varied δ to evaluate the
248 sensitivity of our model.

249 **Tables and Figures**

Parameter	Value
Number of communities	100
Size of urban center	4000
Size of "non-urban" areas	2500
Area of urban center	4
Area of "non-urban" areas	10
Number of initial infections	5
Latent period	5 days
Infectious period	10 days
Proportion symptomatic	0.5
α_0 (travel)	0.01
α_{inc}	1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3
α_{dec}	0.5, 1
β (force of infection)	0.0015
β_{inc}	1, 1.5, 2
β_{dec}	0.5, 1
ω (days between announcement and lockdown)	0, 3, 7
δ (cases to trigger lockdown)	10, 30
Time steps	60 days

Table 1. Simulation Parameters





Figure 1. Percent change in population of Facebook users per region by day for boroughs in New York City, divided into times of day. The leftmost vertical black line is March 8th, 2020, the day that a number of schools began announcing closures. The rightmost vertical black line is the day that Governor Cuomo of New York ordered all New York City Schools closed.



*Compared to the 45 day period preceding Feb 25th / Weekday nights exclude Friday and Saturday
Red line: National Emergency Declared - March 13th

Figure 2. Percent change in weekday nighttime population of Facebook users by city. We can see that all cities included in the Facebook sample experience a decrease in nighttime population over the period of interest.




Figure 3. Percent change in population of Facebook users categorized by five equally sized quantiles of nightlight by country with data aggregated at the ADMIN3 level of spatial granularity.




Figure 4. Percent change in population of Facebook users categorized by five equally sized quantiles of nightlight in Bangladesh with data aggregated at the ADMIN2 level of spatial granularity.




Figure 5. Number of trips made by distance. Here we can see that in all three countries, long distance trips decreased significantly in the immediate aftermath of lockdown implementation. However, local travel, including trips that ranged 50-200 km remained during lockdown. This data is not available for Bangladesh. 19/28




Figure 6. Results of a simulation evaluating: probability of at least one case by 30 days (right) and the average day that the first case appeared (left). The location outlined in black is the "urban" center with a larger population size and density. All other locations are "non-urban" with the same population size and density.




Figure 7. Diagram of the lockdown process and the values used for disease generation in communities and movement between communities.




Figure 8. Average proportion of communities with an imported case. Initially the epidemic spread quicker in simulations with a large or small surge, however, simulations with no lockdown result in a larger overall epidemic size and eventually spread more rapidly.




Figure 9. Percent change in probability of having at least 1 case by 30 days (left); Percent change in the number of days till the first case (right).




Figure 10. Top row, left to right: The percent change in the probability of having at least one case by 30 days in each location with an L_1 period (time between lockdown announcement and implementation) of 0, 3 and 7 days respectively. Bottom row, left to right: The percent change in the average number of days till the first case in each location within an L_1 period of 0, 3 and 7 days respectively.




Figure 11. Overall epidemic size as over varying parameters. In all situations an epidemic with a lockdown (ie where there is a decrease in post lockdown travel) results in a smaller total epidemic size.




Figure 12. Average time of first case. Communities that are further away from the urban center are generally seeded later.

250 References

- 251 1. Wesolowski, A., Buckee, C. O., Engø-Monsen, K. & Metcalf, C. J. E. Connecting Mobility to Infectious Diseases: The
252 Promise and Limits of Mobile Phone Data. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* **214**. eprint: [https://academic.oup.com/jid/article-](https://academic.oup.com/jid/article-pdf/214/suppl_4/S414/7717556/jiw273.pdf)
253 [pdf/214/suppl_4/S414/7717556/jiw273.pdf](https://academic.oup.com/jid/article-pdf/214/suppl_4/S414/7717556/jiw273.pdf), S414–S420. ISSN: 0022-1899. [https://doi.org/10.1093/](https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiw273)
254 [infdis/jiw273](https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiw273) (2016).
- 255 2. Wesolowski, A. *et al.* Quantifying seasonal population fluxes driving rubella transmission dynamics using mobile
256 phone data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**. Publisher: National Academy of Sciences eprint:
257 <https://www.pnas.org/content/112/35/11114.full.pdf>, 11114–11119. ISSN: 0027-8424. [https://www.pnas.org/](https://www.pnas.org/content/112/35/11114)
258 [content/112/35/11114](https://www.pnas.org/content/112/35/11114) (2015).
- 259 3. Buckee, C. O. *et al.* Aggregated mobility data could help fight COVID-19. *Science* **368** (ed Sills, J.) Publisher: American
260 Association for the Advancement of Science eprint: <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/368/6487/145.2.full.pdf>,
261 145–146. ISSN: 0036-8075. <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/368/6487/145.2> (2020).
- 262 4. Zhou, Y. *et al.* Effects of human mobility restrictions on the spread of COVID-19 in Shenzhen, China: a modelling study
263 using mobile phone data. *The Lancet Digital Health* **2**, e417–e424 (2020).
- 264 5. Pullano, G., Valdano, E., Scarpa, N., Rubrichi, S. & Colizza, V. Population mobility reductions during COVID-19
265 epidemic in France under lockdown. *medRxiv*. eprint: [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/01/2020.05.29.20097097.full.pdf)
266 [06/01/2020.05.29.20097097.full.pdf](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/01/2020.05.29.20097097.full.pdf). [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/01/2020.05.29.20097097)
267 [06/01/2020.05.29.20097097](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/01/2020.05.29.20097097) (2020).
- 268 6. Chinazzi, M. *et al.* The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. *Sci-*
269 *ence* **368**. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science eprint: <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/368/6489/395>
270 395–400. ISSN: 0036-8075. <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/368/6489/395> (2020).
- 271 7. Kraemer, M. U. G. *et al.* The effect of human mobility and control measures on the COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Science*
272 **368**. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science eprint: <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/368/6490/493.full>.
273 493–497. ISSN: 0036-8075. <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/368/6490/493> (2020).
- 274 8. Badr, H. S. *et al.* Association between mobility patterns and COVID-19 transmission in the USA: a mathematical
275 modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* (2020).
- 276 9. Mahmud, A. S. *et al.* Megacities as drivers of national outbreaks: the role of holiday travel in the spread of infectious dis-
277 eases. *bioRxiv*. Publisher: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory eprint: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2019/08/16/737379.full.pdf>.
278 <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2019/08/16/737379> (2019).
- 279 10. Noor, A. M., Alegana, V. A., Gething, P. W., Tatem, A. J. & Snow, R. W. Using remotely sensed night-time light as a
280 proxy for poverty in Africa. *Population Health Metrics* **6**, 5 (2008).
- 281 11. Al Amin, M. Covid-19 job cuts forcing people to leave Dhaka. *Dhaka Tribune*. [https://www.dhakatribune.com/](https://www.dhakatribune.com/health/coronavirus/2020/07/02/covid-19-job-cuts-forcing-people-to-leave-dhaka)
282 [health/coronavirus/2020/07/02/covid-19-job-cuts-forcing-people-to-leave-dhaka](https://www.dhakatribune.com/health/coronavirus/2020/07/02/covid-19-job-cuts-forcing-people-to-leave-dhaka)
283 (July 2020).
- 284 12. *Dhaka deserted as coronavirus-forced holiday begins* Dhaka Tribune. Section: Dhaka. [https://www.dhakatribune.](https://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/dhaka/2020/03/26/dhaka-empties-amid-coronavirus-forced-govt-holiday)
285 [com/bangladesh/dhaka/2020/03/26/dhaka-empties-amid-coronavirus-forced-govt-](https://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/dhaka/2020/03/26/dhaka-empties-amid-coronavirus-forced-govt-holiday)
286 [holiday](https://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/dhaka/2020/03/26/dhaka-empties-amid-coronavirus-forced-govt-holiday) (2020).
- 287 13. Savage, S. *Bangladesh starts to reopen clothing industry after lockdown* [https://www.ft.com/content/](https://www.ft.com/content/3de3f84e-548d-474e-b3a4-0a1182532780)
288 [3de3f84e-548d-474e-b3a4-0a1182532780](https://www.ft.com/content/3de3f84e-548d-474e-b3a4-0a1182532780) (2020).
- 289 14. Sim, K., Chua, H. C., Vieta, E. & Fernandez, G. The anatomy of panic buying related to the current COVID-19 pandemic.
290 *Psychiatry Research* **288**, 113015. ISSN: 0165-1781. [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7158779/)
291 [PMC7158779/](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7158779/) (2020) (June 2020).
- 292 15. Krisberg, K. Public health messaging: How it is said can influence behaviors: Beyond the facts. en. *The Nation's*
293 *Health* **44**. Publisher: American Public Health Association Section: Nation, 1–20. ISSN: 0028-0496. [https://](https://thenationshealth.aphapublications.org/content/44/6/1.1)
294 thenationshealth.aphapublications.org/content/44/6/1.1 (2020) (Aug. 2014).
- 295 16. Tully, T. & Stowe, S. The wealthy flee coronavirus. Vacation towns respond: stay away. *The New York Times*, March **25**
296 (2020).
- 297 17. Carey, B. & Glanz, J. *Travel From New York City Seeded Wave of U.S. Outbreaks* May 2020. [https://www.nytimes.](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/07/us/new-york-city-coronavirus-outbreak.html)
298 [com/2020/05/07/us/new-york-city-coronavirus-outbreak.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/07/us/new-york-city-coronavirus-outbreak.html).

- 299 18. <https://cneccovid.isciii.es/covid19/#ccaa>.
- 300 19. Douthit, N., Kiv, S., Dwolatzky, T. & Biswas, S. Exposing some important barriers to health care access in the rural USA. *Public health* **129**, 611–620 (2015).
- 301
- 302 20. Scheil-Adlung, X. *Global evidence on inequities in rural health protection: new data on rural deficits in health coverage for 174 countries* tech. rep. (International Labour Organization, 2015).
- 303
- 304 21. Hirko, K. A. *et al.* Telehealth in Response to the Covid-19 Pandemic: Implications for Rural Health Disparities. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* (2020).
- 305
- 306 22. Maas, P. *Facebook Disaster Maps: Aggregate Insights for Crisis Response & Recovery* en. in *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining - KDD '19* (ACM Press, Anchorage, AK, USA, 2019), 3173–3173. ISBN: 978-1-4503-6201-6. <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=3292500.3340412> (2020).
- 307
- 308
- 309
- 310 23. He, X. *et al.* Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nature medicine* **26**, 672–675 (2020).
- 311

312 **Supplementary Materials**




Figure S1. Depopulation of urban center with α_0 of 0.001.




Figure S2. Depopulation of urban center with α_0 of 0.005.




Figure S3. Depopulation of urban center with α_0 of 0.01.