

1 **Early evaluation of transmission control measures in response to the 2019 novel coronavirus**
2 **outbreak in China**

3
4 Huaiyu Tian^{1*†}, Yonghong Liu^{1*}, Yidan Li^{1*}, Moritz U.G. Kraemer^{2,3,4*}, Bin Chen^{5*}, Chieh-Hsi
5 Wu^{6*}, Jun Cai^{7*}, Bingying Li¹, Bo Xu⁷, Qiqi Yang¹, Ben Wang¹, Peng Yang⁸, Yujun Cui⁹, Yimeng
6 Song¹⁰, Pai Zheng¹¹, Quanyi Wang⁸, Ottar N. Bjornstad^{12,13}, Ruifu Yang^{8†}, Bryan T. Grenfell^{14,15†},
7 Oliver G. Pybus^{2†}, Christopher Dye^{2†}

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

11 ² Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

12 ³ Harvard Medical School, Harvard University, Boston, MA, USA

13 ⁴ Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

14 ⁵ Department of Land, Air and Water Resources, University of California Davis, CA, USA

15 ⁶ Mathematical Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom

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

18 ⁸ Beijing Center for Disease Prevention and Control, Beijing, China

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

21 ¹⁰ Department of Urban Planning and Design, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

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

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

26 ¹³ Department of Entomology, College of Agricultural Sciences, Pennsylvania State University,
27 University Park, Pennsylvania, USA

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

30 ¹⁵ Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA.

31
32 *These authors contributed equally to this work.

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

36
37 **Author contributions:** H.T., P.Z., R.F.Y., O.G.P., B.G., C.D. designed the study. B.C. and Y.M.S.
38 collected and processed the Tencent's LBS data. Y.H.L., B.Y.L., B.X., Q.Q.Y., B.W., P.Y., Y.J.C.,
39 Q.Y.W. collected the statistical data. H.Y.T., Y.L., C.H.W. and J.C. conducted the analyses. M.K.,
40 O.B., R.F.Y., O.G.P., B.G., and C.D. edited the manuscript. H.T. and Y.D.L. wrote the manuscript.
41 All authors read and approved the manuscript.

42
43
44

45 **Summary**

46 **Background**

47 An ongoing outbreak of a novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) was first reported in December
48 2019 in Wuhan city, Hubei Province, and has spread throughout China and to other countries. On
49 23 January 2020, in an attempt to contain the epidemic, non-essential travel was prohibited in and
50 out of Wuhan city, a major transport hub and conurbation of 11 million people. Since then China
51 has implemented nationwide its highest level (Level 1) of emergency response to further contain
52 the spread of infection within and among cities.

53

54 **Methods**

55 We used generalized linear regression models to investigate the effect of the type and timing of
56 transmission control measures on the spread of COVID-19 from Wuhan city, and on the growth of
57 the epidemic in 296 other cities across China. In addition to the Wuhan city shutdown, as part of
58 the emergency response, entertainment venues were closed, public gatherings banned, intra-city
59 public transport (bus and subway rail) suspended, and travel to and from other cities prohibited.

60

61 **Findings**

62 The Wuhan city travel ban slowed the dispersal of infection to other cities by an estimated 2.91
63 days (95% CI: 2.54-3.29) on average. Among the other urban centres across mainland China,
64 cities that implemented control measures pre-emptively, before the first case was reported, had 37%
65 fewer cases in the week following the first reported case (13.0, 95%CI 7.1-18.8) compared with
66 cities starting control after the first case (20.6, 95%CI: 14.5-26.8). Among individual control
67 measures investigated, the most effective were suspending intra-city public transport, and closing
68 entertainment venues and banning public gatherings.

69

70 **Interpretation**

71 The implementation of transmission control measures slowed the dispersal of infection from its
72 origin in Wuhan city and reduced the numbers of cases reported during the early stages of the
73 epidemic in hundreds of other Chinese cities.

74

75 *Key words:* 2019 novel coronavirus; interventions; Wuhan; spatiotemporal transmission; China

76

77

78 **Research in context**

79 **Evidence before the study**

80 We searched PubMed and preprint servers (medRxiv) using the terms “coronavirus”, “outbreak”
81 and “intervention” regardless of language and date. 551 of the 571 results were unrelated to public
82 health (“nonpharmaceutical interventions”). 13 studies of the remaining 20 studies used
83 mathematical modelling to simulate the outbreak under various intervention scenarios; 5 were
84 empirical analyses investigating the effect of interventions on disease in one or more cities,
85 including the effect of traffic restrictions, school closure and influenza on the incidence of
86 COVID-19. Two other papers evaluated the effect of transmission control measures in multiple
87 cities on the 1918–19 influenza pandemic.

88

89 **Added value of this study**

90 Our study is among the first study to evaluate the effects of an unprecedented, large-scale attempt
91 to contain a rapidly-spreading, novel viral disease (COVID-19), including shutdown of the city of
92 origin (Wuhan, 11 million inhabitants), followed by the closure of entertainment venues, the
93 banning of public gatherings, the suspension of within-city public transport, and prohibition of
94 travel to and from other cities across China. The results are derived from a large, newly compiled
95 and geocoded repository of population and epidemiological data relevant to COVID-19.

96

97 **Implications of all the available evidence**

98 Transmission control measures slowed the dispersal of COVID-19 from Wuhan city and reduced
99 case numbers in hundreds of other cities as they became infected. All control measures appeared
100 to reduce case numbers but the most effective were suspending public transport, closing
101 entertainment venues and banning public gatherings. This analysis will help to inform the
102 response to the epidemic in China and in other affected countries around the world.

103

104

105

106

107

108

109 **Introduction**

110 On 31 December 2019, less than a month before the Chinese New Year (Spring Festival), a cluster
111 of pneumonia cases caused by an unknown pathogen were reported in Wuhan City, the largest
112 transport hub in Central China. A novel coronavirus (COVID-19)^{1,2} was identified as the
113 etiological agent^{3,4} and human-to-human transmission of COVID-19 has been since confirmed^{5,6}.
114 The increasing movement of people for the Chinese New Year was expected to spread the virus
115 further in China and elsewhere, and by 13 February 2020 more than 50,000 COVID-19 cases had
116 been reported from all provinces. To prevent further diffusion of COVID-19 from its source,
117 Wuhan prohibited all transport in and out of the city from 10:00h on 23 January. To our
118 knowledge, this is the largest attempted movement restriction or quarantine in human history with
119 the aim of preventing infectious disease spread. By 23 January, China had raised its public health
120 response level to its highest state of emergency (Level 1 of 4 levels of severity in the Chinese
121 Emergency System, defined as an “extremely serious incident”).⁷ Here we present a quantitative
122 analysis of the consequences and importance of some of the transmission control measures on the
123 ongoing spread of COVID-19 across China.

124

125 As there is currently neither a vaccine nor a specific drug treatment for COVID-19, a range of
126 public health (non-pharmaceutical) interventions has been used to control and mitigate the
127 outbreak. To control transmission, suspected and confirmed cases have been isolated, public
128 transport by bus and subway rail suspended, schools and entertainment venues have been closed,
129 public gatherings banned, health checks carried out on migrants (“floating population”), travel
130 prohibited in and out of cities, and information widely disseminated. Despite these measures, the
131 epidemic has continued to spread geographically with mounting numbers of cases and deaths.

132

133 The measurement and evaluation of the effects of large-scale interventions are crucial to guide the
134 response to this and future epidemics⁸⁻¹³. To this end we have investigated, using the largest
135 geocoded repository of population and city-level data relevant to COVID-19, the effect of control
136 measures on the dispersal of infection from Wuhan city and on the number of cases reported from
137 cities across China.

138

139 **Methods**

140 **Data sources**

141 *Epidemiological and demographic data*

142 We collected raw data from the daily official reports of the health commission of 34
143 provincial-level administrative units and 342 city-level units. Only laboratory-confirmed cases
144 were used. We constructed a real-time database recording the date of the first reported case in all
145 newly-infected cities with daily updates from 31 December 2019 to 6 February 2020. Population
146 sizes for each city in 2018 were collected from the China City Statistical Yearbook
147 (<http://olap.epsnet.com.cn/>). Using ArcGIS we calculated the great circle distance between Wuhan
148 and each city reporting COVID-19 cases. The location of each city is geocoded by the latitude and
149 longitude coordinates of the city centre.

150

151 *Human mobility data*

152 Human movement can be observed directly from mobile phone data, through the location-based
153 services (LBS) employed by popular Tencent applications, such as WeChat and QQ. Movement
154 outflows from Wuhan City to other cities, by air, train, and road, were calculated from the
155 migration flows database (<https://heat.qq.com/>)¹⁴ over the entire 2018.

156

157 *Transmission control measures*

158 After the Level I response was imposed, suspected and confirmed cases of COVID-19 were
159 isolated and reported immediately in all cities. Given that available data for the city-level
160 interventions in China are largely complete, we used the data for three transmission control
161 measures : (i) closure of entertainment venues (169 cities with active interventions, 127 inactive),
162 (ii) suspension of intra-city public transport (89 active, 207 inactive), and (iii) prohibition of travel
163 by any means to and from other cities (171 active, 125 inactive). Cities that had reported cases for
164 less than 7 days were not included, a total of 45 cities (plus Wuhan) were excluded. Each city was
165 regarded as implementing an intervention when the official policy was announced to the public.
166 Other transmission control measures, such as delineating control areas, closure of schools,
167 isolation of suspected and confirmed cases, disclosure of information, were not investigated in our
168 analysis because they were reported to have been implemented in all cities uniformly and without
169 delay. The timing of different control measures implemented in each city was recorded, including
170 the implementation time delay since 31 December 2019; a shorter time delay corresponds to
171 earlier implementation.

172

173 *Data analysis*

174 *Effect of the Wuhan city shutdown on the spread of infection to other cities*

175 In order to quantify the effect of the Wuhan travel shutdown (23 January 2020) on COVID-19
176 epidemic spread, we used data collected between 31 December 2019 and 28 January 2020. The
177 association between distance, human movement, interventions and epidemic timing of COVID-19
178 was assessed with a regression analysis using a General Linear Model (GLM). Among five
179 possible regression models examined, the best model (judged by the Akaike Information Criterion)
180 was:

181

$$182 \quad Y_j = \alpha + \beta_1 \log_{10}(TotalFlow_j) + \beta_2 \log_{10}(Pop_j) + \beta_3 Lon_j + \beta_4 Lat_j + \beta_5 Shutdown_j \quad [1]$$

183

184 where $TotalFlow_j$ represents the passenger volume from Wuhan City to city j by airplane, train,
185 and road. Pop_j is the population in city j . Lat_j and Lon_j represent *latitude* and *longitude* of city j .
186 The dummy variable $shutdown_j$ is used to identify whether the arrival time of the newly infected
187 city j is influenced by the shutdown of Wuhan, where 0 represents a “no intervention scenario”
188 and 1 represents intervention. The dependent variable Y_j is the arrival time of the epidemic in city j ,
189 which measures the spatial spread of COVID-19. The β_i are the regression coefficients.

190

191 *Effect of transmission control measures adopted by other cities*

192 In this early evaluation, carried out as the epidemic unfolds, the effect of control was measured in
193 terms of the total number of cases confirmed during the first week of the epidemic in each city,

194 starting from the day on which the first case was reported. Mann-Whitney U tests were used to
195 compare the total numbers of cases in cities that implemented control measures before and after
196 the first case was reported.

197

198 The association between the type and timing of transmission control measure (TCM) and
199 epidemic intensity was evaluated with a Poisson regression model. Controlling for city population
200 size and the influx of travellers from Wuhan:

201

$$202 \quad \log(\mu_i) = \alpha + \sum_j \beta_{1j} TCM_{ji} + \sum_j \beta_{2j} TTCM_{ji} + \sum_j \beta_{3j} TCM_{ji} \times TTCM_{ji} + \beta_4 Dis_i + \beta_5 ArrT_i \quad [2]$$

203

204 where i is a given city and j refers to each TCM. The dependent variable μ is the total number of
205 cases reported during the first week of the epidemic in each city. The β_i and β_{ji} are regression
206 coefficients. The binary variable TCM_j is used to identify whether the j^{th} transmission control
207 measure was implemented by the corresponding city (0 represents no-intervention and 1
208 represents intervention). $TTCM_j$ represents the timing of the j^{th} control measure. $TCM_j \times TTCM_j$
209 models the interaction between the timing and implementation of each TCM. Dis is the
210 great-circle distance from city i to Wuhan City. $ArrT$ is the arrival time of the epidemic in city i ,
211 which measures the spatial spread of COVID-19. The regression analysis was performed using the
212 MASS routine in the R package (R version 3.4.0).

213

214 **Results**

215 Between 31 December 2019 and 6 February 2020, interventions were adopted by 342 cities in
216 China, including Wuhan (Figure 1). In order to quantify the effect of the Wuhan travel shutdown
217 on epidemic spread we analysed the arrival time of COVID-19 from Wuhan to each city as a
218 function of geographic distance (between city centres) and of human movement by air, train, and
219 road, as recorded by Tencent's location-based services database. The dispersal of COVID-19 was
220 rapid (Figure 2A): 262 cities reported cases within 28 days. For comparison, the influenza
221 H1N1pdm pandemic in 2009 took 132 days to reach the same number of cities in China (Figure
222 2A). Most cities with early arrival dates were in southeast China among which there is greater
223 mobility and higher population density. The number of cities providing first reports of COVID-19
224 peaked at 59 on 23 January (the day of the Wuhan travel ban).

225

226 We quantified the degree to which the Wuhan city travel ban slowed disease spread (Table 1).
227 COVID-19 arrived sooner in those cities that had larger populations and had more travellers from
228 Wuhan. On average, the Wuhan city shutdown delayed the arrival time of COVID-19 in other
229 cities by 2.91 days (95% CI 2.54-3.29 days). Without the shutdown, the expected arrival time of
230 COVID-19 from Wuhan would have been 22.3 days (95% CI 20.6-24.0 days) from 31 December
231 2019 (Figure 2B). More than 130 cities, covering more than half the geographic area and
232 population of China, benefited from this intervention (Fig. 2C).

233

234 Table 2 shows the timing and implementation of transmission control measures in the 342 cities.
235 Each city adopted at least one category of control measure and 136 cities applied all three
236 measures (Figure 3). School closure combined with the isolation of suspected and confirmed
237 patients and with the disclosure of information was implemented in all 342 cities. Public

238 gatherings were banned and entertainment venues closed in 220 cities (64.3%). Intra-city public
239 transport was suspended in 136 cities (39.7%) and inter-city travel prohibited by 219 cities
240 (64.0%).

241

242 Cities that implemented a Level 1 response (any combination of control measures) before the first
243 case was confirmed had 37% fewer cases in the week following that first case (13.0 cases, 95% CI:
244 7.1-18.8, n=125) compared with cities that started control after the first case was confirmed (20.6
245 cases, 95% CI: 14.5-26.8, n=171) ($U=8197$ $z=-3.4$, $P<0.01$; Figures 4 and 5). Cities that suspended
246 intra-city public transport and/or closed entertainment venues and banned public gatherings, and
247 did so sooner, reported, fewer cases during the first week (Table 3). There is no evidence that the
248 prohibition of travel between cities, which was implemented after the Wuhan shutdown on 23
249 January, reduced the number of cases in other cities across China (Table 3).

250

251 **Discussion**

252 This is the first study, to our knowledge, to evaluate the effects of an unprecedented and
253 large-scale attempt to contain the spread of COVID-19. Interventions included shutdown of the
254 city of origin (Wuhan), followed by the closure of entertainment venues, the suspension of
255 within-city public transport, and prohibition of travel to and from 341 other cities across China.

256

257 These results are derived from a large geocoded repository of population and epidemiological data
258 relevant to COVID-19. They suggest that the combination of transmission control measures
259 slowed the dispersal of COVID-19 from Wuhan city and reduced the numbers of cases reported in
260 hundreds of other Chinese cities in the first week after those cities had recorded their first
261 COVID-19 cases. All control measures had significant effects within cities but the most effective,
262 according to this analysis, were suspending public transport and closing entertainment venues.
263 These control measures may not have reduced the overall size of the epidemic, but they did give
264 some extra time to reinforce the response.

265

266 At least three caveats must be attached to this early evaluation of control measures. First, we
267 cannot prove that the control measures investigated here caused the reported effects because these
268 interventions may have stimulated other unrecorded behavioural changes that mitigated the spread
269 of infection. Second, we could not investigate the effects of control measures that were said to
270 have been implemented uniformly and without delay in all cities. Among these were: the
271 identification of affected areas in cities, school closures, and the isolation of suspects and other
272 patients with infectious diseases. Third, the interventions that we could investigate explained only
273 part of the variation in case numbers reported among Chinese cities. Further data and analysis are
274 therefore needed in order to distinguish the impact of individual control measures, and to
275 understand the causes of the remaining variation.

276

277 Urbanization and the development of rapid transport systems in China¹⁵⁻¹⁸ probably accelerated
278 the spread of COVID-19 across China, as suggested by the comparatively slow dispersal of
279 pandemic influenza H1N1pdm in 2009. The control measures reported here have significantly
280 slowed the COVID-19 epidemic, but additional measures are clearly needed, including more rapid
281 detection and isolation of patients with any signs or symptoms (rather than waiting for a

282 confirmed diagnosis), more intensive contact tracing, and the rapid detection of cases as they
283 appear in new locations in China.

284

285 **Acknowledgements**

286 We thank the many thousands of CDC staff and local health workers in China who collected data
287 and continue to strive to contain COVID-19 in China and elsewhere. Funding for this study was
288 provided by the Beijing Natural Science Foundation (JQ18025); Beijing Advanced Innovation
289 Program for Land Surface Science; National Natural Science Foundation of China (81673234);
290 Young Elite Scientist Sponsorship Program by CAST (YESS)(2018QNRC001); HT, OGP and CD
291 acknowledge support from the Oxford Martin School; H.T. acknowledges support from the
292 Military Logistics Research Program. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and
293 analysis, the decision to publish, or in preparation of the manuscript.

294

295 **References**

- 296 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in
297 China, 2019. *New Eng J Med* 2020: doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001017.
- 298 2. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, et al. Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel
299 coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor binding. *Lancet* 2020: doi:
300 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30251-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30251-8).
- 301 3. Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, et al. A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease
302 in China. *Nature* 2020: 1-8.
- 303 4. Zhou P, Yang X-L, Wang X-G, et al. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new
304 coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature* 2020: 1-4.
- 305 5. Cai J, Xu B, Chan KKY, et al. Roles of Different Transport Modes in the Spatial Spread of
306 the 2009 Influenza A (H1N1) Pandemic in Mainland China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*
307 2019; **16**: 222.
- 308 6. Wang C, Horby PW, Hayden FG, Gao GF. A novel coronavirus outbreak of global health
309 concern. *Lancet* 2020: DOI:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30185-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30185-9).
- 310 7. Tibet activates highest-level public health alert. Chinadaily. 2020 Jan 29;Sect.

- 311 <https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202001/29/WS5e318a36a3101282172739c1.html>.
- 312 8. Anderson RM, May RM. Infectious Diseases of Humans: Dynamics and Control. Oxford:
313 Oxford Univ Press; 1992.
- 314 9. Grenfell BT, Pybus OG, Gog JR, et al. Unifying the epidemiological and evolutionary
315 dynamics of pathogens. *Science* 2004; **303**: 327-32.
- 316 10. Metcalf CJE, Lessler J. Opportunities and challenges in modeling emerging infectious
317 diseases. *Science* 2017; **357**: 149-52.
- 318 11. Ferguson NM, Cummings DA, Cauchemez S, et al. Strategies for containing an emerging
319 influenza pandemic in Southeast Asia. *Nature* 2005; **437**: 209-14.
- 320 12. Jones KE, Patel NG, Levy MA, et al. Global trends in emerging infectious diseases.
321 *Nature* 2008; **451**: 990-3.
- 322 13. Morens DM, Folkers GK, Fauci AS. The challenge of emerging and re-emerging
323 infectious diseases. *Nature* 2004; **430**: 242-9.
- 324 14. Wu JT, Leung K, Leung GM. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and
325 international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling
326 study. *Lancet* 2020; doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30260-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30260-9).
- 327 15. Baum-Snow N, Brandt L, Henderson JV, Turner MA, Zhang Q. Roads, railroads, and
328 decentralization of Chinese cities. *Rev Econ Stat* 2017; **99**: 435-48.
- 329 16. Gao GF. From “A” IV to “Z” IKV: attacks from emerging and re-emerging pathogens. *Cell*
330 2018; **172**: 1157-9.
- 331 17. Tian HY, Hu SX, Cazelles B, et al. Urbanization prolongs hantavirus epidemics in cities.
332 *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2018; **115**: 4707-12.

333 18. Morse SS, Mazet JA, Woolhouse M, et al. Prediction and prevention of the next pandemic

334 zoonosis. *Lancet*2012; **380**: 1956-65.

335

336

337

338

339

340 **Table 1.** Estimating the impact of the Wuhan travel ban on COVID-19 dispersal to other cities in
341 China.
342

Covariates	Coefficient	95% CI	P
(Intercept)	25.95	(23.43, 28.48)	<0.01
Longitude	-0.03	(-0.05, -0.01)	<0.01
Latitude	0.03	(0.01, 0.06)	<0.05
log10.Population	-0.70	(-1.12, -0.28)	<0.01
log10.Total flow	-0.12	(-0.22, -0.02)	<0.05
Shutdown intervention (days)	2.91	(2.54, 3.29)	<0.01

343
344
345
346

347 **Table 2.** Summary of interventions and their timing across 342 cities.

348

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

349

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

351 [‡]Summary statistics reported for timing are mean and standard deviation.

352

353

354 **Table 3.** Effect of the type and timing of transmission control measures.

355


Covariates	Coefficient	95% CI	P
(Intercept)	-8.51	(-9.04, -7.96)	<0.01
Arrival time*	0.38	(0.37, 0.40)	<0.01
Distance to Wuhan City (Log₁₀)	0.66	(0.55, 0.78)	<0.01
Suspend intra-city public transport			
Implementation (binary)	-3.94	(-4.75, -3.13)	<0.01
Timing (continuous)	-0.04	(-0.05, -0.04)	<0.01
Implementation × Timing (interaction)	0.18	(0.15, 0.21)	<0.01
Prohibit inter-city travel			
Implementation	2.84	(1.80, 3.89)	<0.01
Timing	0.005	(-0.0005, 0.011)	0.07
Implementation × Timing	-0.09	(-0.13, -0.05)	<0.01
Close entertainment venues			
Implementation	-4.39	(-5.10, -3.67)	<0.01
Timing	0.04	(0.03, 0.04)	<0.01
Implementation × Timing	0.13	(0.10, 0.16)	<0.01

356 *Arrival time is defined as the number of days between 31 December 2019 and the date of the first
 357 confirmed case in a city.

358

359

360




361

362 **Figure 1** Timeline of implementation of transmission control measures against COVID-19 in
 363 China.

364

365

366



367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383


384

385

386

Figure 2 Spatial diffusion of COVID-19 in China. (A) Cumulative number of cities reporting disease by 28 January 2020. Arrival days, defined as the time interval (days) from the date of the first case in the first infected city (Wuhan) to the date of the first case in each newly infected city (a total of 262 cities), to characterize the inter-city transmission rate of COVID-19 and 2009-H1N1pdm, respectively. Dashed line shows the date of Wuhan shutdown. (B) Before (blue) and after (red) the intervention. The blue line and points show the fitted regression of arrival times up to the shutdown on day 24 (23 January, vertical dashed line). Grey points show the expected arrival times after day 24, without the shutdown. The red line and points show the fitted regression of delayed arrival times after the shutdown on day 24. Each observation (point) represents one city. Error bars give ± 2 standard deviations. (C) Map of arrival time delayed by the shutdown of Wuhan. Colors represent the change in arrival time (days) after 23 January. The arrival time is estimated using the data before the shutdown of Wuhan. (D) Human movement outflows from Wuhan city to other cities in 2018. The warmer and thick lines denote higher volume of outflows (high-connectivity) while the cool and thin lines denote a lower volume of outflows (low-connectivity).

387



388


389

390 **Figure 3** Transmission control measures and the epidemic intensity in each city of China. Colors,
391 from dark to light, represent the time lag between timing of implementation and 31 December
392 2019, from low to high. Epidemic intensity is defined as the total number of cases in each city
393 during the first week after the first case was reported in that city.

394

395

396



397

398


399

400

401

Figure 4 Percentage of cities that implemented transmission control measures before (blue) or on the same day or after (orange) the first case was reported.

402



403

404

405 **Figure 5** The effect of the timing of transmission control measures on the total number of cases
406 reported during the first week in each city. Each point represents a city that implemented control
407 measures before (blue) or on the same day or after the first case was reported (orange).

408

409