

1 **Spread and control of COVID-19 in China and their associations with**
2 **population movement, public health emergency measures, and**
3 **medical resources**

4
5 Songmin Ying, M.D., Ph.D., Fei Li, M.D., Xinwei Geng, Ph.D., Zhouyang Li, M.D., Xufei Du,
6 M.D., Haixia Chen, M.D., Sisi Chen, M.D., Min Zhang, M.D., Zehua Shao, M.D., Yinfang Wu,
7 M.D., Madiha Zahra Syeda, M.D., Fugui Yan, M.D., Ph.D., Luanqing Che, M.D., Ph.D., Bin Zhang,
8 M.D., Jian Lou, M.D., Ph.D., Shaobin Wang, M.D., Zhengming Chen, Ph.D., Wen Li, M.D., Ph.D.,
9 Ye Shen, M.S., Zhihua Chen, Ph.D., and Huahao Shen, M.D., Ph.D.

10

11 The authors' affiliations are listed in the Appendix. Address reprint requests to Drs. H Shen, S Ying,
12 or Z Chen at Department of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, Second Affiliated Hospital of
13 Zhejiang University School of Medicine, or at huahaoshen@zju.edu.cn, yings@zju.edu.cn, or
14 zhihuachen@zju.edu.cn, respectively; or to Y Shen at Hangzhou Mitigenomics Technology Inc., or
15 at Shen.jack@mitigenomics.com.

16

17 Drs. S. Ying, F. Li, X. Geng, Z. Li, X. Du, H. Chen, S. Chen, and M. Zhang contributed equally to
18 this article.

19

20 **ABSTRACT**

21 **BACKGROUND** The COVID-19 epidemic, first emerged in Wuhan during December 2019, has
22 spread globally. While the mass population movement for Chinese New Year has significantly
23 influenced spreading the disease, little direct evidence exists about the relevance to epidemic and its
24 control of population movement from Wuhan, local emergency response, and medical resources in
25 China.

26 **METHODS** Spearman's correlation analysis was performed between official data of confirmed
27 COVID-19 cases from Jan 20th to Feb 19th, 2020 and real-time travel data and health resources data.

28 **RESULTS** There were 74,675 confirmed COVID-19 cases in China by Feb 19th, 2020. The overall
29 fatality rate was 2.84%, much higher in Hubei than in other regions (3.27% vs 0.73%). The index of
30 population inflow from Hubei was positively correlated with total (Provincial $r=0.9159$, $p<0.001$;
31 City $r=0.6311$, $p<0.001$) and primary cases (Provincial $r=0.8702$, $p<0.001$; City $r=0.6358$, $p<0.001$).
32 The local health emergency measures (eg, city lockdown and traffic control) were associated with
33 reduced infections nationwide. Moreover, the number of public health employees per capita was
34 inversely correlated with total cases ($r=-0.6295$, $p<0.001$) and infection rates ($r=-0.4912$, $p<0.01$).
35 Similarly, cities with less medical resources had higher fatality ($r=-0.4791$, $p<0.01$) and lower cure
36 rates ($r=0.5286$, $p<0.01$) among the confirmed cases.

37 **CONCLUSIONS** The spread of the COVID-19 in China in its early phase was attributed primarily
38 to population movement from Hubei, and effective governmental health emergency measures and
39 adequate medical resources played important roles in subsequent control of epidemic and improved
40 prognosis of affected individuals.

41

42 INTRODUCTION

43 In mid-December 2019, an unexplained mass of pneumonia cases occurred in Wuhan, Hubei province
44 of China¹. Early epidemiological investigations indicated that the cause of the infection could be
45 linked to the Wuhan South China Seafood Market². High-throughput sequencing revealed a novel
46 beta-coronavirus that was provisionally called 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV)^{3,4}, which has
47 now been officially renamed to COVID-19 by WHO^{5,6}. A number of studies showed that the
48 epidemiological, clinical, laboratory, and radiological features of COVID-19 are similar, albeit less
49 deadly, to those of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus (SARS) in 2003 and Middle East
50 respiratory syndrome (MERS) in 2012⁷⁻⁹, and evidences pointing to the human-to-human
51 transmission in hospital and family settings have now been firmly established¹⁰.

52 Due to the Chinese Lunar New Year travel rush, the COVID-19 epidemic has gradually spread across
53 the country and even worldwide within a limited time frame¹¹. In response to the situation,
54 unprecedented measures have been taken by central and local government to contain the outbreak
55 and prevent its further spread across China. On Jan 23th, the Wuhan City Epidemic Prevention and
56 Control Headquarters announced that all urban buses, subways, ferries, and long-distance passenger
57 operations were suspended, and that the passages of airports and train stations were temporarily
58 closed¹². Subsequently, major cities within Hubei province started to implement lockdown on Jan 26th
59 or 27th, 2020, except the remote Shennongjia Forestry District due to the very limited number of
60 COVID-19 cases. Unfortunately, around five million people had already left Wuhan by then since the
61 emergence of COVID-19^{13,14}. As the situation continued to deteriorate throughout China, the WHO
62 declared it as a global public health emergency on Jan 30th 2020¹⁵.

63 Several studies have already reported on the molecular, clinical and epidemiological features of
64 COVID-19^{11,16-18}. However, to date no study has quantified the role of population movement in the
65 spread of epidemics across different parts of China, or assessed the effectiveness of local public health
66 emergency response, and medical resources on control of epidemics and prognosis of the patients. To
67 help fill the evidence gap, we presented detailed analysis of available data of reported cases from Jan
68 20th to Feb 19th, 2020 in China, along with information related to population travel, public health
69 emergency measures, and available medical resource from various regions of China. The main
70 objectives of this study were to present a real-world paradigm of the importance of governmental
71 health emergency strategies in subsequent control of epidemic and the local medical resources in

72 association with the prognosis of affected cases.

73

74 **METHODS**

75 **COLLECTION OF EPITHELIAL DATA**

76 The daily data of confirmed COVID-19 cases in various regions of China from Jan 10th to Feb 19th,
77 2020, were obtained from National or Provincial Health Commission in China (NHC/PHC). Data of
78 global COVID-19 cases were collected from WHO. It included the daily new and cumulative cases
79 of confirmed patients, cured patients, and deaths. All cases included detailed epidemiological history
80 and the dates at which incidents occurred. Provinces with small number of cases or heavily weighted
81 with incomplete exposure history cases, such as Jiangxi province, were excluded.

82

83 **COLLECTION OF MEDICAL RESOURCES DATA**

84 Information on medical resources were extracted from the national and local Statistical Yearbooks in
85 2019, which included data on number of hospitals, health workers, and hospital beds per 1,000
86 population, health expenditure per capita, and local population size. After excluding those with
87 incomplete data in the Statistical Yearbooks, 9 cities of Hubei Province and 20 cities from other 14
88 provinces of China were finally included in this study (Table S1).

89

90 **POPULATION OUTFLOW/INFLOW INDEX**

91 Data on population movement were retrieved from the Chinese Lunar New Year Travel Information,
92 which was released daily by Baidu Migration Map (<http://qianxi.baidu.com>). We obtained the daily
93 outflow index in Hubei that occurred from Jan 1st to Feb 19th, 2020, which were matched with same
94 data in the previous year according to lunar dates for a direct comparison. Also, we obtained the
95 proportion of the daily outflow index from Hubei to other provincial areas and 51 cities which
96 provided detailed exposure history for the confirmed cases from Jan 10th (the start of the Lunar New
97 Year travel rush) to Jan 26th, 2020 (lockdown of major cities in Hubei).

98

99 **DAILY GROWTH RATE OF SECONDARY CASES**

100 Confirmed cases were categorized into two groups, the primary (with clear history of staying or
101 traveling in Hubei province within one incubation period) and secondary (those not known to be
102 primary) cases, by two independent researchers in a blinded manner. The daily growth rate of

103 secondary cases was calculated as new secondary daily cases divided by the cumulative number of
104 the day before. The lag time between primary and secondary cases was identified by using the
105 displacement with the highest correlation from the cross-correlation result.

106

107 **STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

108 The daily inflow index of certain provinces and cities was calculated by multiplying the daily outflow
109 index within Hubei and the corresponding proportion. We defined the total inflow index as the sum
110 of daily inflow index from Jan 10th to 26th, 2020. We used principal components analysis to reduce
111 the dimensionality of five initial parameters of medical resources, and to further obtain the synthetic
112 score of these parameters¹⁹. Factor loadings for concordance and overall satisfaction were low and
113 thus were removed. Table 2 shows 4 item factor loadings for the final two-factor solution, which
114 explained 96% of the variance. Medical resource scores equal to $comp1 * proportion1$ plus
115 $comp2 * proportion2$ (Table S2).

116 The correlations between the number of total confirmed or primary cases and total inflow index at
117 provincial or city scale, between the medical resources score and fatality or cure rates, and between
118 the employees in centers for disease control and prevention (CDC) per capita and the confirmed cases
119 or the incidence of COVID-19 were analyzed using Spearman's correlation analysis. Cross-
120 correlation of primary and secondary cases was calculated by Pearson's correlation analysis. Principal
121 components analysis was performed on Stata 14.0, and other data were analyzed using Prism
122 GraphPad 8.0. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

123

124 **Results**

125 **Time trend of COVID-19 epidemics in China**

126 As of Feb 19th, 2020, a total of 74,675 confirmed COVID-19 cases had been reported in China, with
127 83.1% (62,031) being in Hubei province (Fig. 1A). The cumulative number of confirmed cases was
128 below 1,000 before Jan 23rd, 2020, and increased by almost ten-fold by Jan 30th, 2020. There was a
129 further three-fold increase in the number of confirmed cases by Feb 6th, 2020, which continues to
130 grow until now, but at much slow pace. In Hubei province the number of daily confirmed cases
131 reached peak on Feb 4th, 2020 (Fig. 1B), while in other regions, it reached a plateau on Jan 30th, 2020,

132 and started to decline from Feb 3rd, 2020 (Fig. 1C).

133 As of Feb 19th, 2020, the overall case fatality rate was 2.84%, much higher in Hubei province than in
134 other regions (3.27% vs 0.73%), with Hubei accounted for 95.7% (2029/2121) of total deaths
135 nationwide. There was irregularity in the reported daily number of deaths over time, with a sudden
136 rise on Feb 12th, 2020, coinciding with change of diagnostic criteria (Fig. 1D). The daily number of
137 cured cases has continuously increased both in Hubei province and in other parts of China (Fig. 1E).
138 Following the first confirmed COVID-19 case outside of China in Thailand, as of Feb 19th, 2020, a
139 total of 924 cases have been reported worldwide excluding China (Fig. 1F). However, the daily
140 cumulative confirmed cases worldwide excluding China grew slowly (Fig. 1G).

141 142 **Correlation of population movement with the COVID-19 epidemic**

143 In both 2019 and 2020, the daily population outflow from Hubei started to rise steadily for 7-10 days
144 before the Lunar New Year's Day (Jan 25th, 2020) (Fig. 2A). However, starting on Jan 20th, 2020,
145 there was a sudden surge in the outflow index when it was acknowledged publicly by the government
146 the fact of human-to-human transmission. In contrast, there has been a dramatic decrease in the
147 outflow index since Jan 26th, 2020, compared with that of 2019, following the total lockdown of most
148 cities, first in Wuhan and then elsewhere, in Hubei province (Fig. 2A).

149 We correlated the daily inflow index of 30 provincial areas and 51 cities in 18 of these provinces with
150 the number of reported total or primary cases in the same areas and found a very strong correlation
151 both at province and city levels. The index of population inflow from Hubei province strongly
152 positively correlated with number of confirmed total (Provincial scale: $r=0.9159$, $p<0.001$, Fig. 2B;
153 City scale: $r= 0.6311$, $p<0.001$, Figure 2D) and primary cases (Provincial $r= 0.8702$, $p<0.001$, Fig.
154 2C; City $r= 0.6358$, $p<0.001$, Fig. 2E).

155 156 **Growth rate of secondary case across different regions and cities**

157 Overall, the ratio of secondary to primary cases (S/P ratio), a simple index for measuring the growth
158 of an epidemic, varied greatly across different provincial areas (Fig. 3A), with Heilongjiang (10.7)
159 and Hong Kong (5.5) being the highest, and Tibet (0) and Qinghai (0.2) being the lowest. However,
160 there was little correlation between total number of confirmed cases and S/P ratio. For example,

161 Guangdong had the largest number of confirmed cases (1,332) but very low S/P ratio (0.35).

162 Fig. 3B shows the heat map of the daily growth rate of secondary cases from Jan 26th to Feb 19th,
163 2020 in different provinces. We found although daily growth rate varied among different provincial
164 areas, some of them had common characteristics (Fig. 3B). Based on the daily growth rate of
165 secondary cases we further divided study regions into three categories. In the first group the maximum
166 values for daily growth rates were all <1.5, including Beijing, Guangdong, and Chongqing (Fig. 3C).
167 Second category of provinces/cities (eg, Sichuan, Hebei, and Zhejiang) showed much higher growth
168 rate in the first few days, from Jan 26th to 30th, 2020, followed by a downward trend until reaching
169 that of the first category (Fig. 3D). In the last category (eg, Heilongjiang and Tianjin) the daily growth
170 rate showed a sustained and rapid rise, especially during the 5 days after Jan 30th, 2020 (Fig. 3E).

171 We further examined the lag time, or displacement, between primary and secondary cases by area,
172 which could reflect the time delay in implementing effective local containment measures. Although
173 the lag time varied across different areas, most appeared to be about 1 week (Fig. 3F), with exceptions
174 such as Jiangsu, Henan, Tianjin, and Heilongjiang. In Jiangsu province (631 confirmed cases) and
175 Henan province (1265 confirmed cases), the lag time was only about 4 and 5 days, respectively; while
176 in Heilongjiang (476 confirmed cases) and Tianjin (130 confirmed cases) it was approximately 13
177 and 17 days, respectively.

178

179 **Correlation of prognosis and transmissibility of COVID-19 with medical resources**

180 Table S3 shows the summarized data of the numbers of CDC employees and severity of local
181 epidemic. Overall the provinces with higher number of CDC employees per 1,000 population tended
182 to have fewer confirmed cases ($r = -0.6295$, $p < 0.001$, Fig. 4A) and lower infection rate ($r = -0.4912$,
183 $p < 0.01$, Fig. 4B). Moreover, in the principal components analysis of the correlation between the
184 capacity of medical resources and the trends of fatality and cure rates, we found that the cities with
185 limited medical resources tended to have higher case fatality ($r = -0.4791$, $p < 0.01$, Fig. 4C) and lower
186 cure rates ($r = 0.5286$, $p < 0.01$, Fig. 4D).

187

188 **DISCUSSION**

189 This study presented detailed analyses of time trends of COVID-19 epidemic across different parts

190 of China and their associations with population movement, public health emergency measures, and
191 medical resources. We showed that the rapid spread of the COVID-19 epidemic across China was
192 strongly associated with the mass population movement out of Hubei province, particularly Wuhan
193 city, before the Chinese Lunar New year, which was subsequently disrupted effectively by the total
194 lockdown of Wuhan and other cities in Hubei provinces. Although there were variations in the pace
195 of control across different regions of China, the epidemic outside of Hubei province was contained
196 rapidly and effectively through various public health emergency measures. As well as public health
197 measures, local capacity including the number of public health staff and available medical resources
198 also played important roles in control of epidemic and improved prognosis of affected individuals.

199 The first case of novel COVID-19 infection was reported during early December 2019 and it was not
200 publicly acknowledged until 20 January 2020 that the virus could be transmitted from human to
201 human, which triggered rapid and drastic public health measures both in Hubei and rest of China to
202 try to contain the spread of virus. The total lockdown of Wuhan city on 23rd January 2020, followed
203 by other cities in Hubei a few days later, appeared too late to prevent the epidemic from spreading
204 into other regions of China, for by then over 5 million people had already left Wuhan. However,
205 without such drastic measures, the situation could be much worse. The data from Baidu Migration
206 Map showed that mass population movements out of Wuhan and Hubei province took place not only
207 before but throughout the whole of Chinese Lunar New Year period. Based on comparison with 2019
208 data, without lockdown an additional 15 million people could have traveled from Wuhan to other
209 regions (and overseas) plus similar or even larger number who would have travelled from other
210 regions to Wuhan. Moreover, there would have been massive internal population movement within
211 Wuhan and other cities in Hubei during the same period, further exacerbating the epidemic.

212 Expectedly the severity of COVID-19 epidemic outside of Hubei province, especially during the
213 initial phase, was strongly related to the scale of inward population movements from Wuhan.
214 However, the epidemic was rapidly brought under control in most areas by introduction of various
215 public health emergency measures, as demonstrated by decrease of the daily number of confirmed
216 cases starting from the 1st or 2nd week of February and the lack of clear correlation between S/P ratio
217 and number of total confirmed cases. Despite this, the pace with which the epidemic was contained
218 varied across different areas as assessed by various parameters examined, including S/P ratio, the
219 daily growth rate of secondary cases and lag time. For example, in Guangdong and Beijing, both of

220 which were badly affected by SARS outbreak in 2003, the epidemic was effectively contained at very
221 early stage, suggesting adequate level of local preparedness and experience in dealing with such
222 epidemics. Similarly, in Zhejiang province, doctors can pre-screen suspected patient through the
223 internet application, which greatly reduce the probability of hospital transmission. Moreover, using
224 cloud computing facilities and integrated big data platform, public health doctors in Zhejiang
225 province was also able to cross-examine every suspected case. These measures have contributed
226 importantly to a sharp and continual downward trend in the number infected after Jan 30th, 2020. On
227 the other hand, in several other areas (eg, Heilongjiang and Tianjin) there were prolonged delays in
228 containing the epidemic, reflecting probably less effective local measures in controlling the epidemic.
229 For example, in Heilongjiang, the S/P ratio approached 11, which was the highest across all regions
230 outside of Hubei, suggesting nearly 90 percent of the confirmed cases resulted from family gatherings.

231 The regional variations in the pace of epidemic containment was also evident by comparison of the
232 mean lag time between primary and secondary cases. Overall the mean lag time was about 1 week,
233 with particularly low value in Jiangsu (~ 4 days) and Henan (~5 days), and particularly high value in
234 Heilongjiang (~13 days) and Tianjin (~17 days). Henan is a neighboring province of Hubei with a
235 total population of 100 million people and extensive transport connections with Wuhan. In
236 recognition of forthcoming epidemic, the Henan provincial government introduced strong measures
237 to greatly reduce and restrict public transport from Wuhan areas into Henan even before the total
238 lockdown of the Wuhan city.

239 Although the COVID-19 shared many similar epidemiological features to those of SARS in 2003¹⁶,
240 it appeared to be much less deadly^{20,21}, with the overall case fatality rate of less than 3% as opposed
241 to ~10% for SARS. However, there was great difference in the case fatality rates between Hubei,
242 particularly Wuhan and rest of the China. As the epicenter of COVID-19 outbreak, medical and health
243 services in Hubei Province were overwhelmed and ill prepared for such a rapid and substantial
244 increase in the number of infected cases, leading to poor and inadequate management of patients,
245 hence poor prognosis. Apart from difference in the capacity of medical services, other factors,
246 including age of people affected and proportion with other comorbidities may also contribute to the
247 higher case fatality observed in Wuhan and Hubei. However, without detailed clinical data from
248 individual patients, we were not able to examine these issues directly. It is also possible that a large
249 number of minor cases were not promptly detected or diagnosed in Wuhan and Hubei, resulting in

250 higher case-fatality rate. Indeed, as the medical service started to improve gradually and large number
251 of cases were properly diagnosed the case fatality rates had started to decreased steadily over the last
252 two weeks. Outside of Hubei, although the case fatality rates were very low, we also found a
253 significant correlation between health scores and overall prognosis of patients. In recognizing the
254 burden of epidemic in Hubei province and need for providing prompt and adequate medical service
255 to those infected, the Chinese government has created a “province to city” support system, in which
256 each city in Hubei province received direct and targeted support from at least one appointed province.

257 In summary the present study showed that the spread of the COVID-19 epidemic in China (and
258 elsewhere in other countries) could be attributed primarily to the mass population movement from
259 Hubei prior to the Chinese Lunar New Year. Subsequently, effective governmental health emergency
260 measures introduced both in Hubei and elsewhere have played important roles in rapid and effective
261 control of the epidemic in China. Although many other unmeasured factors, such as local climates
262 and characteristic of individuals affected, may explain part of our findings, the present study also
263 provided good evidence that adequate levels of investments in public health (eg, number of public
264 health staff) and medical resources can lead to improved control of epidemic and better prognosis of
265 the infected individuals. Despite the rapid improvement, the COVID-19 epidemic in China and
266 elsewhere is not yet over and vigorous public health measures are still warranted in order to totally
267 eliminate the epidemic.

268

269 **FOOTNOTES**

270 Partially supported by the Zhejiang University Special Scientific Research Fund for COVID-19 Prevention and
271 Control.

272

273 **APPENDIX**

274 The authors' affiliations are as follows: the Key Laboratory of Respiratory Disease of Zhejiang Province,
275 Department of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, Second Affiliated Hospital of Zhejiang University School
276 of Medicine (S.Y., F.L., X.G., Z.L., X.D., H.C., S.C., M.Z., Z.S., Y.W., M.Z.S., F.Y., L.C., B.Z., J.L., S.W., W.L.,
277 Z.C., H.S.), and the Hangzhou Mitigenomics Technology Inc. (YS) – all in China, and the Clinical Trial Service
278 Unit & Epidemiological Studies Unit, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, United
279 Kingdom (CZ).

280

281 REFERENCES

- 282 1. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus-Infected
283 Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med* 2020.
- 284 2. Wang C, Horby PW, Hayden FG, Gao GF. A novel coronavirus outbreak of global health concern. *Lancet* 2020;
285 **395**(10223): 470-3.
- 286 3. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, et al. Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications
287 for virus origins and receptor binding. *Lancet* 2020.
- 288 4. Zhou P, Yang XL, Wang XG, et al. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat
289 origin. *Nature* 2020.
- 290 5. WHO. Novel Coronavirus(2019-nCoV): Situation Report – 22. 2020.
- 291 6. ICTV. The Coronavirus Study Group (CSG) of International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses (ICTV)
292 announced the new name SARS-CoV-2 for 2019-nCoV.
- 293 7. Mahallawi WH, Khabour OF, Zhang Q, Makhdoum HM, Suliman BA. MERS-CoV infection in humans is
294 associated with a pro-inflammatory Th1 and Th17 cytokine profile. *Cytokine* 2018; **104**: 8-13.
- 295 8. Wong CK, Lam CW, Wu AK, et al. Plasma inflammatory cytokines and chemokines in severe acute respiratory
296 syndrome. *Clin Exp Immunol* 2004; **136**(1): 95-103.
- 297 9. Zhe Xu LS, Yijin Wang, Jiyuan Zhang, Lei Huang, Chao Zhang, et al. Pathological findings of COVID-19
298 associated with acute respiratory distress syndrome. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine* 2020.
- 299 10. Chan JF, Yuan S, Kok KH, et al. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus
300 indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. *Lancet* 2020; **395**(10223): 514-23.
- 301 11. Wu JT, Leung K, Leung GM. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and international spread of
302 the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *Lancet* 2020.
- 303 12. Commission BCNH. Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for
304 virus origins and receptor binding (No 1). 2020. http://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2020-01/23/content_5471751.htm
305 (accessed January 23, 2020).
- 306 13. Chinadaily. 5 million-plus leave Wuhan: Mayor.
307 <https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202001/27/WS5e2dcd01a310128217273551.html> (accessed Jan 27 2020).
- 308 14. Ai S, Zhu G, Tian F, et al. Population movement, city closure and spatial transmission of the 2019-nCoV
309 infection in China. *medRxiv* 2020.
- 310 15. WHO. Statement on the second meeting of the International Health Regulations (2005) Emergency
311 Committee regarding the outbreak of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV). Jan 30. [https://www.who.int/news-
312 room/detail/30-01-2020-statement-on-the-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-\(2005\)-
313 emergency-committee-regarding-the-outbreak-of-novel-coronavirus-\(2019-ncov\)](https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/30-01-2020-statement-on-the-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-outbreak-of-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)) (accessed Jan 30 2020).
- 314 16. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel
315 coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet* 2020; **395**(10223): 507-13.
- 316 17. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, et al. Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus-
317 Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA* 2020.
- 318 18. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan,
319 China. *Lancet* 2020; **395**(10223): 497-506.
- 320 19. Chiu YH, Bellavia A, James-Todd T, et al. Evaluating effects of prenatal exposure to phthalate mixtures on
321 birth weight: A comparison of three statistical approaches. *Environ Int* 2018; **113**: 231-9.
- 322 20. Yin YD, Wunderink RG. MERS, SARS and other coronaviruses as causes of pneumonia. *Respirology* 2018;
323 **23**(2): 130-7.
- 324 21. Heymann DL, Shindo N. COVID-19: what is next for public health? *The Lancet* 2020.

327 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

328 **Figure 1. Epidemiological Features of COVID-19 in Hubei, China, and Worldwide**

329 (A) The spatial distribution of 74675 cases with confirmed COVID-19 infection on Feb19th, 2020 in
330 China. The color of regions represents the number of confirmed cases. Magnified image shows the
331 spatial distribution of 62031 confirmed cases in cities and regions of Hubei province. (B-C) Time
332 course of the newly confirmed COVID-19 cases in Hubei province (B) and in China excluding Hubei
333 (C). (D-E) Daily number of death (D) and cure (E) of COVID-19 patients in Hubei province and in
334 China excluding Hubei. (F) Global distribution of countries, territories, or areas with confirmed
335 COVID-19 patients Feb19th, 2020. (G) Time course of cumulative confirmed COVID-19 cases
336 (n=924) worldwide excluding China.

337

338 **Figure 2. Associations of Population Movement with the COVID-19 Prevalence in Other**
339 **Chinese Areas**

340 (A) Outflow index of Hubei province during period of Jan 1st to Feb 19th in 2019 and 2020; (B-E)
341 The correlations between the total number of or primary confirmed COVID-19 cases and the total
342 index of inflow at the provincial (B, C) and city (D, E) scale.

343

344 **Figure 3. Secondary Case Growth Rate and Lag Time in other Chinese Regions**

345 (A) Cumulative number of confirmed cases and ratio of secondary to primary cases (S/P ratio) in
346 provinces/cities/region by Feb 19th, 2020. (B) Daily growth rate of secondary cases in
347 provinces/cities/regions from Jan 26th to Feb 19th, 2020. (C-E) Three types of provincial
348 administrative areas depending on variety of daily growth rate of secondary cases. (F) Lag time
349 between primary and secondary cases in various provinces and examples of Jiangsu (~ 4 days) and
350 Tianjin (~ 17 days) from Jan 26th to Feb 19th, 2020.

351


352 **Figure 4. Correlations between the Abundance of Medical Resources and Disease Prognosis.**

353 (A, B) The correlations between confirmed cases (A) or incidence (B) and CDC employees per 1000
354 persons of provinces in China (excluding Hubei and Tibet). (C, D) Correlations between the medical
355 resources scores and the fatality (C) or the cure rate (D) of certain Chinese cities.


356

Figure 1


A




B




C




D



E



F



G






Figure 2


A




B



C



D



E




Figure 3




Figure 4







Table S1. Indexes of Health Resources for Included Cities

City	Hospitals per 1000 persons	Health workers per 1000 persons	Beds per 1000 persons	Health expenditure per capita	Population (1000 persons)	Confirmed cases	Fatality	Cure rate
*Wuhan	0.036	12.30	8.60	3522	11081	45027	3.52%	12.10%
*Xiaogan	0.012	4.92	4.63	2066	4920	3329	2.67%	20.22%
*Huanggang	0.011	5.30	5.68	2403	6330	2839	3.06%	40.47%
*Huangshi	0.015	7.72	6.36	2890	2470.7	967	2.69%	30.92%
*Jingmen	0.021	7.41	5.82	3244	2896.5	794	4.28%	25.31%
*Xianning	0.013	8.68	5.76	1298	2543.3	766	1.31%	34.99%
*Tianmen	0.012	6.47	4.76	515	1273.5	473	2.54%	28.12%
*Shiyan	0.018	8.31	8.73	1974	3406	641	0.31%	29.17%
*Enshi	0.011	5.44	5.97	978	4020.4	244	1.23%	41.80%

Wenzhou	0.016	7.21	4.59	2711	9250	504	0.00%	41.27%
Shenzhen	0.011	8.82	3.65	1465.45	13020	416	0.48%	43.75%
Chongqing	0.026	8.79	7.10	3836.11	31017.9	552	0.91%	38.22%
Shanghai	0.015	8.52	10.10	8630.3	24240	333	0.60%	55.86%
Beijing	0.034	16.33	5.73	10106.42	21542	395	1.01%	38.73%
Fuyang	0.015	5.04	4.10	1688.7	8207	155	0.00%	41.29%
Xinyu	0.014	7.81	5.00	2094.23	1160.8	130	0.00%	52.31%
Harbin	0.029	8.15	8.57	3154.5	1085.8	194	1.55%	24.74%
Bengbu	0.034	7.27	5.40	1774	3392	160	3.13%	25.00%
Ganzhou	0.050	5.28	4.89	1551.05	8507.5	76	1.32%	36.84%
Nanyang	0.052	7.93	4.70	2174.6	10013.6	155	1.29%	36.77%
Hangzhou	0.032	14.69	10.49	2929	9806	169	0.00%	63.91%
Xi'an	0.035	14.07	7.77	2048.8	10003.7	120	0.00%	35.83%

Qingdao	0.045	8.94	6.82	794	9394.8	59	1.69%	49.15%
Jinan	0.033	13.98	8.76	1513.5	7460.4	47	0.00%	36.17%
Shijiazhuang	0.023	9.61	5.54	1122.88	10951.6	28	0.00%	46.43%
Guiyang	0.039	10.13	7.73	2706.47	4881.9	36	2.78%	38.89%
Bijie	0.041	4.86	5.70	1526.23	6686.1	23	0.00%	43.48%
Zunyi	0.066	9.67	7.80	3100	6270.7	32	0.00%	50.00%
Tianjin	0.037	6.48	4.38	5554.36	15568.7	130	2.31%	41.54%

*Cites of Hubei Province

Table S2. The Results of Principal Component Analysis (PCA)

Variable	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4
Hospitals per 1,000 persons per case	0.485	0.015	0.757	0.436
Health workers per 1,000 persons per case	0.491	0.056	-0.649	0.570
Beds per 1,000 persons per case	0.510	0.022	-0.047	-0.487
Health expenditure per capita	0.510	0.022	-0.047	-0.487
Population	-0.057	0.998	0.027	-0.018
Eigenvalue	3.820	0.992	0.167	0.021
% Variance Proportion	76.41	19.83	3.34	0.42

Table S3. The Incidence of COVID-19 and CDC Employees per 1,000 Persons in Different Provinces

City	Population (10000 persons)	No. of CDC employees per 1000 persons	No. of confirmed cases	Incidence (/10 ⁵)
Qinghai	603	0.250	18	0.299
Xinjiang	2487	0.232	76	0.306
Inner Mongolia	2534	0.215	75	0.296
Yunnan	4830	0.179	172	0.356
Henan	9605	0.174	1265	1.317
Gansu	2637	0.173	91	0.345
Beijing	2154	0.171	395	1.834
Jilin	2704	0.166	91	0.337
Hainan	934	0.166	168	1.799
Shaanxi	3864	0.166	245	0.634

Ningxia	688	0.159	71	1.032
Heilongjiang	3773	0.154	476	1.262
Sichuan	8341	0.154	520	0.623
Guangxi	4926	0.152	245	0.497
Liaoning	4359	0.150	121	0.278
Guizhou	3600	0.147	146	0.406
Hunan	6899	0.140	1010	1.464
Shanxi	3718	0.131	131	0.352
Shanghai	2424	0.126	333	1.374
Tianjin	1560	0.120	130	0.833
Fujian	3941	0.112	293	0.743
Jiangxi	4648	0.109	934	2.009
Shandong	10047	0.108	546	0.543

Hebei	7556	0.107	307	0.406
Jiangsu	8051	0.101	631	0.784
Guangdong	11346	0.098	1332	1.174
Zhejiang	5737	0.096	1175	2.048
Chongqing	3102	0.094	560	1.805
Anhui	6324	0.076	987	1.561
