

1 **Evidence of the effectiveness of travel-related measures during the early phase of the COVID-**  
2 **19 pandemic: a rapid systematic review**

3  
4  
5 **Authors:**

6  
7 Karen A. Grépin, PhD, School of Public Health, University of Hong Kong, China<sup>a</sup>

8  
9 Tsi Lok Ho, Faculty of Medicine, University of Hong Kong, China

10  
11 Zhihan Liu, MPH, School of Public Health, University of Hong Kong, China

12  
13 Summer Marion, PhD, School of Public Policy, University of Maryland, USA

14  
15 Julianne Piper, MIA, Faculty of Health Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Canada

16  
17 Catherine Z. Worsnop, PhD, School of Public Policy, University of Maryland, USA

18  
19 Kelley Lee, PhD, Faculty of Health Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Canada

20

21

**Abstract**

22 **Objective** To review evidence of the effectiveness of travel measures implemented during the  
23 early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic in order to recommend change on how evidence is  
24 incorporated in the International Health Regulations (2005) (IHR).

25

26 **Design** We used an abbreviated preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-  
27 analysis protocol (PRISMA-P) and a search strategy aimed to identify studies that investigated  
28 the effectiveness of travel-related measures (advice, entry and exit screening, medical  
29 examination or vaccination requirements, isolation or quarantine, the refusal of entry, and  
30 entry restrictions), pre-printed or published by June 1, 2020.

31

32 **Results** We identified 29 studies, of which 26 were modelled (vs. observational). Thirteen  
33 studies investigated international measures while 17 investigated domestic measures (one  
34 investigated both), including suspended transportation (24 studies), border restrictions (21),  
35 and screening (5). There was a high level of agreement that the adoption of travel measures  
36 led to important changes in the dynamics of the early phases of the COVID-19 pandemic.  
37 However, most of the identified studies investigated the initial export of cases out of Wuhan,  
38 which was found to be highly effective, but few studies investigated the effectiveness of  
39 measures implemented in other contexts. Early implementation was identified as a  
40 determinant of effectiveness. Most studies of international travel measures failed to account

---

<sup>a</sup> Corresponding author: 7 Sassoon Road, Pokfulam, Hong Kong SAR, China; [kgrepin@hku.hk](mailto:kgrepin@hku.hk)

1 for domestic travel measures, and thus likely led to biased estimates. Poor data and other  
2 factors contributed to the low quality of the studies identified.

3  
4 **Conclusion** Travel measures, especially those implemented in Wuhan, played a key role in  
5 shaping the early transmission dynamics of the COVID-19 pandemic, however, the effectiveness  
6 of these measures was short-lived. There is an urgent need to address important evidence gaps,  
7 but also a need to review the way in which evidence is incorporated in the IHR in the early  
8 phases of a novel infectious disease outbreak.

9  
10

#### 11 **What is already known on this subject?**

- 12 • Previous reviews of the evidence from outbreaks of influenza and other infectious disease have  
13 generally found that there is limited evidence that travel-measures are effective at containing  
14 outbreaks.
- 15 • However, it is unclear if the lessons from other infectious disease outbreaks would be relevant  
16 in the context of COVID-19.
- 17 • Based on evidence at the time, WHO did not recommend any travel restrictions when it  
18 declared COVID-19 a Public Health Emergency of International Concern.

19

#### 20 **What does this study add?**

- 21 • This study rapidly reviews the evidence on the effectiveness of travel measures implemented in  
22 the early phase of the pandemic on epidemiological countries.
- 23 • The study investigated both international and domestic travel measures and a wide range of  
24 travel measures.
- 25 • The study finds that the domestic travel measures implemented in Wuhan were effective at  
26 reducing the importation of cases internationally and within China. The study also finds that  
27 travel measures are more effective when implemented earlier in the outbreak.
- 28 • The findings generate recommendations on how to incorporate evidence into the International  
29 Health Regulations and highlights important research gaps that remain.

30

#### 31 **How might this affect future outbreaks?**

- 32 • The findings of this study suggest the need to decouple recommendations of travel measures  
33 from the declaration of a public health emergency of international concern.
- 34 • Highlights the need to evaluate the potential effectiveness of travel measures for each outbreak,  
35 and not just assume effectiveness based on past outbreak scenarios.

36

37

## 1 Introduction

2 On January 31, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared the outbreak of SARS-  
3 CoV-2 a Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC). Based on information  
4 available at the time, the International Health Regulations 2005 (IHR) Emergency Committee  
5 explicitly did not recommend “any travel or trade restriction”.<sup>1</sup> The IHR state that State Parties  
6 should avoid unnecessary interference with international traffic in the adoption of measures  
7 and that the measures should not be “more restrictive of international traffic and not more  
8 invasive or intrusive to persons than reasonably available alternatives that would achieve the  
9 appropriate level of health protection” (Article 43). Moreover, measures adopted should be  
10 based on “scientific principles,” evidence and/or WHO guidance.

11  
12 As early as December 31, 2019, the same day that China Centre for Disease Control first notified  
13 WHO of a cluster of atypical pneumonia cases in Wuhan, some authorities (including Taiwan,  
14 Russia, and Macau) began to impose targeted travel-related measures, mainly airport screening  
15 of travellers from Wuhan.<sup>2</sup> Within weeks, additional locations also restricted flights to or  
16 suspended entry from Wuhan, including Mongolia, Australia, and North Korea. On January 23, a  
17 *cordon sanitaire* was drawn around Wuhan, effectively suspending all international and  
18 domestic travel in and out of the city.<sup>3</sup> A day later, the measures were extended to all of Hubei  
19 province. By March 2020, despite WHO’s recommendations, virtually all IHR (2005) States  
20 Parties had implemented some form of cross-border travel-related measure in response to the  
21 COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>4</sup> This is, by far, the largest number of countries adopting such measures  
22 during a PHEIC: only about a quarter of countries had imposed such measures during the 2009

1 H1N1 pandemic and the 2014 Ebola outbreak in West Africa.<sup>5-7</sup> It is estimated that there was a  
2 65% drop in international travel in the first half of 2020 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>8</sup>  
3  
4 The near universal adoption of travel-related measures, especially in light of the potentially  
5 large economic and social consequences, raises questions as to whether such measures can be,  
6 and have been, effective at reducing international transmission of the virus during the  
7 pandemic. Previous studies have suggested that certain travel-related measures have only  
8 limited, or at best modest, effectiveness in containing outbreaks of influenza. A systematic  
9 review of the effectiveness of international travel measures (screening, travel restrictions, and  
10 border closures) to control pandemic influenza identified only 15 studies and found that  
11 measures implemented early could delay local transmission by a few days or weeks, slow  
12 international spread, and delay the epidemic peak in isolated locations by reducing the number  
13 of seeding events.<sup>9</sup> The review did not identify any evidence that screening methods were  
14 effective but it did find that border closures had been effective in preventing virus introduction  
15 to small island states during the 1918 influenza pandemic. However, the authors also concluded  
16 that the overall evidence base on which they drew their conclusions was small and of low  
17 quality.  
18  
19 A related but larger review of a broader range of measures, including travel advice, screening,  
20 internal travel restrictions, and border closures, for both epidemic and pandemic influenza, also  
21 found that travel restrictions could delay the arrival and spread of epidemics and that select  
22 isolated locations may benefit from border closures. Once again, however, the overall size of

1 the effects was relatively small and the quality of evidence was found to be very low.<sup>10</sup> Another  
2 review of both international and domestic travel restrictions concluded that such measures  
3 could delay, but not contain, dissemination of both pandemic and seasonal influenza after it  
4 emerged.<sup>11</sup> Based on the 23 studies identified, the review concluded that internal and  
5 international border restrictions could delay the spread of an outbreak by one week and two  
6 months, respectively, and that such restrictions could delay the spread and peak of epidemics  
7 from between a few days to up to four months. However, the timing of the introduction of such  
8 measures was key – the extent of the delay of spread was greatly reduced when restrictions  
9 were imposed more than six weeks after the onset of an epidemic.

10

11 Beyond influenza, evidence from other infectious disease outbreaks is more limited. A  
12 modelling study of travel restrictions implemented during the West African Ebola outbreak  
13 estimated that they may have delayed further international transmission by a few weeks for  
14 some countries.<sup>12</sup> Given the low proportion of all international travellers originating in Ebola-  
15 affected countries at that time, another study suggested that exit screening measures in  
16 affected countries were likely to be more effective at reducing onward international  
17 transmission than travel restrictions,<sup>13</sup> a finding that was supported by another similar study.<sup>14</sup>  
18 The travel advisories issued by WHO during the 2003 SARS outbreak, which led to substantial  
19 declines in international travel to Hong Kong and Mainland China, were estimated to have  
20 delayed the export of cases by only a few days.<sup>15</sup> Importantly, other studies have suggested  
21 that travel measures during outbreaks can be counter-productive by preventing countries from  
22 launching effective epidemic responses,<sup>16</sup> undermining the detection of cases, and causing

1 widespread economic effects on the travel industry itself.<sup>17</sup> Since the onset of the pandemic, it  
2 has become clear that the clinical features of COVID-19 make it more challenging than previous  
3 infectious diseases to detect and contain,<sup>18</sup> raising questions about whether evidence of  
4 effectiveness from previous studies is even relevant for COVID-19.<sup>19</sup>

5  
6 The goal of this paper is to review evidence of the effectiveness of travel-related measures  
7 implemented during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic, a time of many unknowns  
8 regarding the clinical and epidemiological features of the novel coronavirus. Since the  
9 emergence of COVID-19, dozens of studies have been published or made available that  
10 evaluate the effectiveness of travel-related measures in the context of the pandemic. A recent  
11 Cochrane review of the literature on the effectiveness of international travel-related measures  
12 to contain COVID-19, severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), and Middle-East respiratory  
13 syndrome (MERS) identified 36 unique studies, of which only 25 were specific to COVID-19. The  
14 review concluded that cross-border travel measures may limit the spread of disease across  
15 national borders, specifically in terms of reducing the number of imported cases and delaying  
16 or reducing epidemic development, although it found that the certainty of the reviewed  
17 evidence was low to very low. Importantly, it did not consider travel-related measures adopted  
18 within China at the outset of the pandemic or studies that evaluate interventions implemented  
19 in combination. Given the widespread adoption of travel restrictions, and the likely enormous  
20 economic and social consequences resulting from them, a fuller understanding of the  
21 effectiveness of all of the measures adopted during the early phase of the outbreak is

1 warranted. While the question of whether the adoption of these measures is compliant with  
2 the IHR has received attention in the literature,<sup>20,21</sup> it is beyond the scope of this paper.

3

#### 4 **Methods**

5 To conduct this review, we adopted an abbreviated version of the preferred reporting items for  
6 systematic reviews and meta-analysis protocol (PRISMA-P) using the 17-point checklist.<sup>22</sup> The  
7 rationale for the study was the widespread adoption of travel-measures despite consensus view  
8 at the time that such measures were largely ineffective, and in order to strengthen the  
9 application of the IHR during this and future pandemics. The objectives were to rapidly review  
10 evidence of the effectiveness of the full range of travel-measures adopted during the early  
11 stage of the COVID-19 pandemic from both published and unpublished studies. We further  
12 elaborate on other methods of the study below.

13

#### 14 *2.1 Search Strategy*

15 Our search strategy was designed to be as inclusive as possible of all studies (as of June 1, 2020)  
16 that provide new evidence of the effectiveness of any travel-related measure adopted during  
17 the early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic. According to the IHR, travel-related measures  
18 include travel advice, entry and exit screening of travellers, medical examination or vaccination  
19 requirements for travellers, isolation or quarantine of suspected or affected persons, the  
20 refusal of entry of travellers, and restrictions on travellers from affected areas.<sup>1</sup> While only  
21 those measures that are applied by State Parties at the level of an international border are  
22 covered by the IHR, many of these measures have also been applied to domestic travellers (e.g.

1 at the level of inter-provincial or inter-state borders). Private companies, such as airlines and  
2 cruise ships, have also implemented travel measures, which, while also not subject to the IHR,  
3 further restricted travel during this pandemic. We did not restrict the search to specific  
4 outcomes (e.g. epidemiological or otherwise), or any specific methodological approach, or any  
5 specific geography. We only identified one study that looked at non-epidemiological  
6 outcomes,<sup>23</sup> so while we include it in our description of the search and screening strategies, we  
7 exclude it from our main analysis below.

8  
9 Given the rapidly evolving nature of the outbreak, as well as the rapidly expanding published  
10 literature on COVID-19, our search strategy targeted both pre-print and published articles, with  
11 the strategies to identify each differing slightly. Keywords were identified based on both  
12 inductive iterative testing of potential keywords, as well as deductively through papers  
13 identified through other channels. Search terms were then refined to minimize overlap and to  
14 maximize the number of studies that could be identified. While we did not impose a language  
15 restriction, we did not specifically search in non-English sources.

16  
17 For pre-print papers, we searched the BioRxiv and MedRxiv servers, which offer limited search  
18 functionality, using the following keywords in the title field: travel\*, flight\*, airline\*, border\*,  
19 airport\*, passenger or air traffic. We restricted the sample to papers that also included at least  
20 one COVID-19 keyword, either related to the virus itself (e.g. coronavirus, corona virus,  
21 coronavirinae, coronaviridae, betacoronavirus, covid19, covid 19, covid-19, nCoV, CoV 2, CoV2,  
22 sarscov2, 2019nCoV, novel CoV, OR Wuhan virus), the location of the early outbreak (e.g.



1 Wuhan, Hubei or Hunan) or less specific but widely used terms (severe acute respiratory OR  
2 pneumonia AND outbreak). We used the same travel-related keywords to search the WHO's  
3 COVID-19 global research database but did not impose a COVID-19 search term as theoretically  
4 all articles in this database were on this topic.<sup>b</sup>

5  
6 For published papers, we searched PubMed with the following search strategy: studies must  
7 include at least one COVID-19 keyword mentioned above or one of the location-specific terms  
8 mentioned above combined with either ("severe acute respiratory" OR pneumonia AND  
9 outbreak) or one of the following MESH terms (Coronavirus, Coronavirus Infections, or  
10 Betacoronavirus) or the Supplementary Concept (COVID-19 or severe acute respiratory  
11 syndrome coronavirus 2). All studies must in addition include at least one travel-related  
12 measure term in the title or abstract (e.g. screening, travel advice, travel advisory, cordon  
13 sanitaire, ban, restrict\*, prohib\*, or clos\*) as well as one travel-related term in the title or  
14 abstract (travel\*, cruis\*, ship\*, terrest\*, airplane, flight, plane, migrant, passenger, return,  
15 outflow, outbound, inbound, inflow, traffic, arrival, train, trains, bus, buses, transit, port\*,  
16 airport\*, tourist\*, international importation, international exportation, case importation,  
17 imported cases, exported cases, or border).

18

## 19 *2.2. Screening strategy*

20 As of June 1, 2020, we identified a total of 312 articles, and during the review process, we  
21 identified another 8 articles through other sources (see Figure 1). From all identified studies

---

<sup>b</sup> <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/global-research-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov>

1 (n=320), we removed duplicates, which left 300 articles to be screened. We uploaded the  
2 abstracts into Covidence<sup>c</sup>, software developed for systematic reviews, to perform a title and  
3 abstract screen. Our inclusion criteria were that studies must investigate the COVID-19  
4 pandemic and at least one travel-related measure (applied either at an international or  
5 domestic border), must be empirical (i.e. modelled or observational), and must evaluate a  
6 specific outcome (epidemiological or other). Measures could have been undertaken by either a  
7 public (i.e. a government) or a private actor (e.g. an airline). We excluded articles that were  
8 news reports, review articles, commentaries or editorials, or conjecture (i.e. did not provide  
9 new data or evidence) about the effectiveness of travel measures. Each article was screened by  
10 2 independent reviewers (TLH, LZH). Where there was disagreement among the reviewers, a  
11 third reviewer (KAG) resolved any disagreement.

12  
13 After screening, we were left with 79 articles. The full texts of each were obtained and again  
14 uploaded into Covidence. Two reviewers again screened each article to determine if the article  
15 still met the inclusion criteria. Any disagreements by the two reviewers were again by a third  
16 reviewer (KAG) who was not otherwise involved in the screening process. After the full-text  
17 screening, we were left with 30 studies that met all of our selection criteria. Of these, one study  
18 investigated socio-economic outcomes, which we exclude from this analysis given the lack of  
19 overlap in outcomes.

20

21 *2.3 Updating strategy*

---

<sup>c</sup> <https://www.covidence.org/>

1 We continued to search the relevant databases for any newly published papers or to identify  
2 papers that had originally been identified as pre-prints but were subsequently published, until 1  
3 June 2020. We retained the subsequently published versions of such papers.

4

#### 5 *2.4 Data extraction*

6 For the remaining 29 studies, we extracted the title, authors, article source, publication date,  
7 whether it was a pre-print or published (or had previously been a pre-print) article, country  
8 context in which the study was conducted (or global), country(ies) implementing the measure,  
9 the country(ies) affected by the travel measure, specific measure(s) adopted, the timing of the  
10 measures, the duration of the measures, whether the study was modeled or based on  
11 observational data, the type of model used, epidemiological assumptions made in the models,  
12 the specific outcomes observed, the overall findings, the way in which cases/deaths were  
13 recorded, whether there was any description of diagnostic methods used to identify  
14 cases/deaths, whether the study made assumptions about asymptomatic cases, whether the  
15 study also accounted for secondary transmission, the extent to which the model also accounted  
16 for other measures imposed around the same time, the data sources used in the study, and the  
17 stated limitations of each study. For modelled studies, we also collected the name of the model  
18 used if an existing model was used, whether the model used was a dynamic or static model,  
19 whether the model used was a stochastic or deterministic model, and whether it was an  
20 individual vs. population-based model. A full list of the papers is presented in Appendix Table 2.

21

#### 22 *2.5. Analysis of travel measures*

1 We characterized the investigated travel-related measures into four groups: suspended  
2 transportation, border restrictions, entry or exit screening, and entry quarantine, which are  
3 summarized in Table 1. Papers may have investigated more than one measure and thus may  
4 contribute more than once to the table. In our analysis, we grouped studies according to  
5 whether the measure affected international (Table 2) or domestic travellers (Table 3). One  
6 study fit both criteria and thus is listed twice in the analysis. We used a narrative approach to  
7 synthesize the evidence of effectiveness. Two studies,<sup>24,25</sup> despite study design and state  
8 objectives to investigate the impact of travel related measures, did not present their findings in  
9 such away that allowed us to extract the evidence generated in the study. These are  
10 summarized in appendix table 2 but not in tables 2 or 3.

11

## 12 *2.6. Analysis of outcome measures*

13 Outcomes included the number of observed cases, date of the epidemic peak, risk of  
14 transmission, case growth rate, doubling time, time of arrival in a new country, the  
15 reproductive number ( $R_0$  or  $R_t$ ), and projected cumulative cases. Details are listed in Table 2 and  
16 Table 3, which summarize papers that investigate international and domestic travel measures  
17 respectively. One article that evaluated the effectiveness of both types of measures,<sup>26</sup> appears  
18 in both tables.

19

## 20 *2.7 Assessment of bias*

21 Individual articles were assessed for bias using a proprietary scoring system consisting of three  
22 tiers: low, moderate, and high risk of bias. Low scores were given when the author had

1 adequately addressed the domain, moderate when it had been either partially or incompletely  
2 addressed, or high when it was not or only poorly addressed. Articles were assessed with  
3 regards to their ability to form a clear and precise definition of the research question, travel  
4 restriction measures included in the analysis, comprehensiveness of outcome, suitable  
5 mathematical modelling, model assumptions described, confounding factors, model validation,  
6 and uncertainty assessment.<sup>27</sup> A detailed summary of our bias assessment is presented in  
7 Appendix Table 1.

8

## 9 **Results**

10 Of the 29 identified studies in this rapid review, 24 had been published by September 1, 2020,  
11 while the rest were pre-print studies (see Table 1). Almost all of the studies (26) were modelled  
12 studies with few observational studies (3). Given the timing of the studies, almost all of the  
13 studies focused on the initial exportation of cases from Wuhan either domestically within China  
14 or internationally. Among the travel-related measures adopted, the most commonly  
15 investigated were suspended transportation (24), border restrictions (21), and screening (5).  
16 Only four studies investigated entry quarantine.

17

### 18 *Effectiveness of travel-related measures on the international spread of COVID-19*

19 In Table 2, we present the summary of evidence generated from the papers that investigated  
20 the impact of international travel measures. All but one<sup>28</sup> were modelled studies. Four studies  
21 directly investigated the impact of the Wuhan travel ban on the initial export of cases  
22 internationally.<sup>26,29-31</sup> Comparing the observed number of exported cases to scenario-based

1 modelled estimates without the ban, studies consistently found that these measures were  
2 highly effective at reducing exportation of cases. Anzai et al. estimated a 70% reduction in  
3 exported cases globally in the week following the introduction of the ban,<sup>29</sup> Chinazzi et al.  
4 estimated that the ban led to a 77% reduction in imported cases,<sup>26</sup> while Wells et al. estimated  
5 that it reduced the risk of exportation by about 80% through mid-February.<sup>30</sup> Kucharski  
6 estimated that transmission rates outside of China were reduced by about half in the two  
7 weeks following the introduction of the ban.<sup>31</sup> However, Anzai et al., which focused on the  
8 impact of the ban on the outbreak in Japan, estimated that the absolute risk of a major  
9 outbreak was only modestly delayed due to the Wuhan travel ban and that the median time  
10 delay in a major outbreak was only 1-2 days.<sup>29</sup>

11  
12 Beyond the direct effect of the Wuhan travel ban, Chinazzi et al. estimated that the application  
13 of additional travel-related restrictions, on travellers to and from Mainland China by receiving  
14 countries, led to additional reductions in imported cases globally, though the extent of  
15 reduction varied by country.<sup>26</sup> Adiga et al. investigated the impact of government or airline-  
16 imposed travel-related measures and estimated that these led to a delay in the importation of  
17 the virus by about 4-5 days on average and up to 10 days in select countries.<sup>32</sup> This study,  
18 however, did not directly control for the impact of the Wuhan lockdown, which happened  
19 around the same time as many of the measures investigated.

20  
21 In terms of specific country case studies, Adekunle et al. found that Australia's ban on air travel  
22 to and from China may have prevented 82% of imported cases through February 2.<sup>33</sup> Similarly,

1 Costantino et al. estimated that it may have led to a 79% reduction in imported cases through  
2 March 2.<sup>34</sup> Linka et al. estimated that the travel restrictions implemented both at the external  
3 and internal borders of the European Union significantly decreased the speed of virus spread  
4 across member states, especially in Central European countries.<sup>35</sup> These last two studies, both  
5 of which focused on an earlier period in the pandemic, failed to account for the impact of the  
6 Wuhan lockdown in addition to the restrictions evaluated.

7  
8 Studies that investigated the effectiveness of screening found that only very highly effective  
9 screening could reduce [or decrease] the risk of importation or exportation. Clifford et al. found  
10 that when the number of cases was low in the exporting country, screening may delay the  
11 onset of the epidemic in the importing country by up to a week<sup>36</sup> while Mandal et al. found that  
12 if screening could detect 90% of asymptomatic individuals, it could delay the average time of  
13 the epidemic by up to 20 days in select countries.<sup>37</sup> Assuming that self-identification of cases  
14 was effective, another study suggested that such measures could identify a large proportion of  
15 infected travellers. However, this assumes that screening is effective but does not study this  
16 directly.<sup>30</sup>

17  
18 A single observational study identified in this review investigated the impact of border  
19 restrictions, in combination with mandatory quarantine and screening, for incoming travellers  
20 to Hong Kong. Cowling et al. concluded that the application of quarantine measures of  
21 incoming travellers into the region was an important element of their successful public health

1 response, but the study does not specifically estimate its impact independent of other  
2 measures including travel-related measures.<sup>28</sup>

3

#### 4 *Effectiveness of travel-related measures on the domestic spread of COVID-19 within China*

5 In Table 3, we present the findings from the studies that investigated the impact of the Wuhan  
6 travel restrictions, on the domestic export of cases to other parts of China. By comparing actual  
7 observed cases to counterfactual scenarios where such measures had not been imposed,  
8 Chinazzi et al. predicted that the travel ban led to a 10% reduction of exported cases within the  
9 first 7 days,<sup>38</sup> Fang et al. estimated a 39.3% reduction over one month,<sup>38</sup> Shi et al. similarly  
10 identified a 39% reduction in cases over one month,<sup>39</sup> while Tian et al. estimated a 73%  
11 reduction through mid-February.<sup>40</sup> Tang et al. found that the Wuhan travel ban led to a 91.1%  
12 reduction in imported cases in Beijing over 7 days.<sup>41</sup> Similarly, Kraemer et al. also found that  
13 these travel measures dramatically reduced the transmission of the outbreak across the  
14 country, with areas which had greater pre-lockdown connectivity with Wuhan experiencing a  
15 greater decline.<sup>42</sup> Aleta et al. estimated that the measures were effective in reducing the  
16 exportation of cases, but only in the short term.<sup>43</sup> Yuan also found the lockdown to be effective  
17 at reducing the number of cases outside of Wuhan but notes that the timing also coincided with  
18 a nationwide stay at home campaign imposed by the central Chinese government.<sup>44</sup>

19

20 Studies also investigated the impact of the travel ban on the domestic timing of the outbreak.  
21 Tian et al. estimated the ban delayed outbreaks within China by 2.91 days,<sup>40</sup> while Chinazzi et al.  
22 estimated a delay of 3 to 5 days.<sup>26</sup> Studies also investigated the impact of the travel ban on the



1 effective reproductive rate, the doubling time, and other measures. Hou et al. found that the  
2 ban quickly reduced the reproductive rate of the virus outside of Wuhan,<sup>45</sup> similarly Li et al.  
3 found that the reproductive number dropped by more than half within 2 weeks of the  
4 introduction of the ban,<sup>46</sup> Using observational data, Lau et al found that the doubling time of  
5 the virus increased from 2 days to 4 days after the travel ban was imposed.<sup>47</sup> Another study  
6 found substantial declines in transmission routes between Chinese provinces within weeks of  
7 the introduction of the Hubei travel bans.

8  
9 The timing of travel-related measures, again, appears to be important in predicting  
10 effectiveness. Both Lai et al. and Liu et al., the former a modelled study and the latter an  
11 observational study, estimated that the Wuhan travel ban would have been substantially more  
12 effective if implemented 1-3 weeks earlier.<sup>48,49</sup> This is supported by Wu et al. who found that  
13 the travel ban had a relatively minor effect on the overall speed of transmission of the outbreak  
14 in areas of China outside of Wuhan, largely because a large number of cases had already been  
15 exported before the travel ban, limiting its effectiveness.<sup>50</sup>

16  
17 Finally, a few studies evaluated domestic travel bans in combination with other travel-related  
18 measures. For example, one modelled study estimated that if major cities within China had  
19 imposed additional measures, they could have further reduced their epidemic risk.<sup>51</sup>

20

21 *Quality of available evidence*

1 Our review of the risk of bias in the included studies (Appendix Table 1) suggests that, apart  
2 from a few exceptions, while most of the studies had clear research questions, descriptions of  
3 the travel-related measure(s) evaluated, and discussions of the outcomes, few of the studies  
4 made efforts to adequately control for the presence of other public health or travel-related  
5 measures implemented at the same time, or for other contextual factors that could influence  
6 the impact of travel-related measures. One important challenge common to all of the studies  
7 was the quality of data on detected cases early on in the pandemic and only a small number of  
8 the studies allowed for their estimates to vary based on potential ranges of the number of true  
9 cases that were actually detected early in the outbreak (e.g. Chinazzi et al. estimated 24.4% of  
10 all cases were undetected,<sup>26</sup> Fang et al. estimated 42.0- 80.0% were undetected,<sup>38</sup> Kucharski et  
11 al. predicted that there were at least ten times as many cases as were confirmed in Wuhan in  
12 early February<sup>31</sup>). The studies also varied markedly in their efforts to validate their models or  
13 provide uncertainty analysis around their estimates. Also, with the exception of a few studies,  
14 most studies did not discuss the potential measurement error associated with case data  
15 collected during the early phases of the pandemic which likely did not capture most  
16 asymptomatic cases. The overall quality of the studies to evaluate effectiveness was thus  
17 relatively low.

18

## 19 **Discussion**

20 Despite WHO's recommendations against travel restrictions, and given limited evidence of the  
21 effectiveness of such measures at the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been an  
22 unprecedented adoption of such measures, both domestically and internationally, which has

1 led to dramatic declines in international travel. This paper reviews the emergent evidence on  
2 the effectiveness of travel-measures adopted during the early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic.  
3  
4 A number of key findings emerge from this rapid review of the effectiveness of measured  
5 adopted in the early phase of the pandemic. First, there was a high level of agreement among  
6 the studies that the adoption of travel measures played an important role in shaping the early  
7 transmission dynamics of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, almost all the studies in this  
8 review focused on either domestic or international travel bans imposed on Wuhan, and to a  
9 lesser extent the rest of China, during the early period of the pandemic. This review does not  
10 identify substantial new evidence of the effectiveness of travel-related measures aimed at  
11 controlling spread to and from other parts of the world.  
12  
13 Second, the evidence suggests that the Wuhan travel measures were likely effective at reducing  
14 the initial exportation of the virus within China and abroad. At the international level, studies  
15 consistently estimated that these measures led to a 70-80% reduction in cases exported in the  
16 first few weeks, and likely had a smaller effect within Mainland China, where estimates of  
17 effectiveness ranged from 10-70%. Also, the Wuhan travel ban likely led to delays of up to a  
18 few weeks in the importation of cases to other countries. However, most of the studies also  
19 concurred that the effects were short-lived. This suggests travel-related measures alone are  
20 unlikely to significantly change the trajectory of the outbreak unless commensurate domestic  
21 measures are also implemented. This is supported by evidence that once four or more

1 infections are introduced into a new location, there is an over 50% chance that a major  
2 outbreak will occur.<sup>31</sup>

3

4 Third, the studies reviewed suggest a key factor influencing the effectiveness of travel-related  
5 measures was timing. Within China, had the same policies been implemented a few weeks  
6 earlier, it is likely there may have been substantially less seeding of new outbreaks across the  
7 country and internationally. While the measures aimed at Wuhan significantly reduced the  
8 exportation of cases from the province, over time other provinces became the source of most  
9 of the internationally exported cases. Where authorities are not able or willing to adopt such  
10 measures at a sufficiently early stage of an outbreak, once again, this suggests the need to give  
11 commensurate attention to strengthening the role of other domestic measures such as testing,  
12 contact tracing, and physical distancing.

13

14 Fourth, many of the studies focused on international travel failed to account for the  
15 implementation of the domestic Wuhan travel ban. Although this was a domestic policy, and  
16 thus outside the remit of the IHR, evidence suggests restricting travel to and from Wuhan  
17 dramatically changed the outflow of cases from the region at a crucial time period. Studies that  
18 did not account for the Wuhan travel ban in their estimates, or reviews that excluded domestic  
19 travel measures, thus likely overestimated the effectiveness of international travel measures.  
20 The notable exception was Chinazzi et al. who conclude that the additional measures provided  
21 a benefit above and beyond the effect of the Wuhan measures, at least in the short run.<sup>26</sup>

22

1 Fifth, during the early phase of the pandemic there were likely large numbers of undetected  
2 cases globally, and although some studies allowed for their estimates to vary based on assumed  
3 proportions of undetected cases, the validity of the estimated effects in all of these studies is  
4 likely affected by data quality issues. Also, given that symptomatic individuals may be more  
5 likely to curb their travel than asymptomatic travellers, especially internationally and after the  
6 introduction of travel-related measures aimed at detecting symptomatic cases, modelled  
7 effectiveness studies may also be biased if they do not account for this difference. In addition,  
8 it is also possible that some of the travel-related measures adopted (e.g. screening) could have  
9 actually led to increased detection of cases,<sup>46</sup> which could further complicate the ability of  
10 studies to evaluate effectiveness as the measurement of the outcome is influenced by the  
11 intervention itself and few studies acknowledged this limitation.

12

13 Finally, while this study identified a relatively large number of studies, we assess the quality of  
14 these studies overall to be low. Almost all of the studies identified in this review were  
15 modelled studies, and therefore the results depend upon important parameter assumptions,  
16 which varied considerably. Given the rapidly evolving and dynamic nature of the pandemic, it is  
17 unclear how close to reality these assumptions were. Comparability across the studies is also  
18 undermined by a lack of standardized terminology. Furthermore, few studies attempted to  
19 isolate the potential effect of international travel-related measures from a range of domestic  
20 measures implemented concurrently, as well as from other social, political, or economic  
21 characteristics of the implementing or target locations or populations.

22

1 This systematic review also has several important limitations of its own. First, while we aimed  
2 to be systematic in our search strategy as well as inclusion criteria, the rapidly expanding  
3 literature on COVID-19 pandemic almost certainly means that we likely overlooked some  
4 relevant studies. Second, although we aimed to focus on the early phase of the outbreak, it is  
5 unclear when the appropriate time was to end our review. Newer studies that have been  
6 published since we ended searching the literature may present a different picture on the  
7 effectiveness of travel measures and thus the evidence from this study must be evaluated in  
8 this context. Third, assessments of bias in studies is challenging and is inherently subjective in  
9 nature.

10

11 In recent months, a process has commenced to review and strengthen the IHR. The universal  
12 use of travel-related measures by States Parties during the COVID-19 pandemic will be a major  
13 focus of discussion on the limitations of the current treaty. Based on this review, we make the  
14 following recommendations. First, the findings of this review suggest that it is difficult to know  
15 in the early phases of an infectious disease outbreak how effective travel measures are likely to  
16 be, based on evidence from previous studies. Overall, the findings of the review suggest that  
17 while it is likely that travel measures can affect the early dynamics of an infectious disease  
18 outbreak, their effectiveness in delaying or reducing international spread is likely to be limited  
19 on their own and short-lived. But the review also finds that the way in which these measures  
20 are adopted likely influences their effectiveness. This highlights the need to from blanket  
21 assessments of the effectiveness of travel-related measures (“travel measures don’t work”), to

1 context-specific assessments of effectiveness based on scenarios of transmission risk (“when  
2 might such measures be effective”?).

3

4 Second, it is also clear that the effectiveness of travel-measures cannot be estimated using a  
5 single fixed parameter. The effectiveness of measures will vary based on the setting, which  
6 other measures are also implemented, the extent to which they are implemented, and the  
7 speed at which they are implemented. All of these factors, weighed against potential harms,  
8 need to be taken into consideration in discussions about the potential effectiveness of  
9 international travel measures.

10

11 Third, this study finds that measures implemented early were likely more effective than those  
12 implemented late. In this pandemic, the WHO did not make any recommendations on travel  
13 restrictions until it had issued the PHEIC, weeks after when many countries had already  
14 implemented such measures, and when it did, it had recommended against such measures  
15 based on the limited evidence available at the time. In addition, the IHR require State Parties to  
16 provide evidence for any additional health measures that they implement. In the context of an  
17 outbreak of a novel infectious disease agent, it is unclear what justifies evidence in the early  
18 phases of the outbreak. The role of evidence in the IHR in such settings therefore needs to be  
19 reconsidered.

20

21 This review also highlights areas where more research is urgently needed to understand the  
22 appropriate role of travel measures during PHEICs. First, a greater understanding of

1 effectiveness of travel measures adopted globally, and at stages beyond the early phases of the  
2 pandemic are urgently needed. Second, there is also a need to better understand the broad  
3 range of measures affecting travel and trade beyond those covered in the reviewed studies,  
4 including the role of testing, which was not widely available during the early phase of the  
5 pandemic. Third, lack of data on true case numbers remains an underlying challenge across all  
6 of the study reviewed, and thus needs to be taken more seriously in future studies. Fourth,  
7 models need to better account for the way in which travel measures work in tandem with other  
8 measures implemented concurrently, including domestic travel measures and other public  
9 health measures. Fifth, studies need to better account for the possibility that some locations  
10 see grater benefit from travel measures than others based on geographic and socioeconomic  
11 factors. Finally, one of the rationales against the use of travel measures is their economic and  
12 social impacts, yet few studies in the early phases evaluated their non-epidemiological  
13 outcomes.

14  
15 At the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a widely held belief that travel measures  
16 were unlikely to play much of a role in curbing international spread of the virus. However, the  
17 widespread adoption, and persistent use of such measures, globally, as well as some of the  
18 evidence identified in this review, challenge this belief. While this review emphasizes that the  
19 quality of evidence remains low and highlights a number of methodological shortcomings in the  
20 reviewed studies, this review also identified new evidence of the impact of such measures  
21 during the early phase of the pandemic. These findings suggest such measures did play an  
22 important role in shaping early dynamics of the pandemic, even if they were unable to contain



1 the virus globally on their own. Like with so many things that COVID-19 has transformed, and  
2 the pandemic has also challenged our views of what constitutes evidence of effectiveness of  
3 public health measures.<sup>52</sup>

4

5

## 1 **Role of the Funding Agency**

2 The authors are funded by the New Frontiers in Research Fund (Grant NFRFR-2019-00009)  
3 through an operating grant awarded under the Canadian Institutes of Health Research Rapid  
4 Research Funding Opportunity. The funders were not involved in the design or writing of this  
5 study.

6

## 7 **Contributions**

8 KG developed the study methodology, drafted the manuscript, and oversaw data analysis. ZL  
9 and TLH conducted the systematic review search, article screening, data extraction, and data  
10 analysis. KL, CZW, and SM contributed to the design of the study and provided input into the  
11 manuscript.

12

## 13 **Conflicts of interest**

14 KL was a member of two donor-funded reviews of WHO in 1995 and 1997. She has previously  
15 received funding from WHO to conduct research on global health governance and global  
16 tobacco control, and review evidence on the impacts of globalization and infectious diseases.  
17 CZW was a member of a WHO guideline development group and technical consultation in 2019.

18

## 1   **References**

2

3   1. WHO. Statement on the second meeting of the International Health Regulations (2005)  
4   Emergency Committee regarding the outbreak of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV).

5   [https://www.who.int/news/item/30-01-2020-statement-on-the-second-meeting-of-the-](https://www.who.int/news/item/30-01-2020-statement-on-the-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-outbreak-of-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov))  
6   [international-health-regulations-\(2005\)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-outbreak-of-](https://www.who.int/news/item/30-01-2020-statement-on-the-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-outbreak-of-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov))  
7   [novel-coronavirus-\(2019-ncov\)](https://www.who.int/news/item/30-01-2020-statement-on-the-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-outbreak-of-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)) (2020).

8   2. Control, T. C. for D. In response to pneumonia outbreak in Wuhan, China and related test  
9   results, Taiwan CDC remains in touch with China and World Health Organization and Taiwan  
10   maintains existing disease control and prevention efforts Facebookshare to Facebook(open in  
11   new window)Lineshare to Line(open in new window)Printprint(open in new window).

12   <https://www.cdc.gov.tw/En/Bulletin/Detail/4N96uF-2yK-d7dEFFcwa0Q?typeid=158> (2020).

13   3. Levenson, M. Scale of China’s Wuhan Shutdown Is Believed to Be Without Precedent. (2020).

14   4. Lee, K., Worsnop, C. Z., Grépin, K. A. & Kamradt-Scott, A. Global coordination on cross-border  
15   travel and trade measures crucial to COVID-19 response. *Lancet* (2020) doi:10.1016/s0140-  
16   6736(20)31032-1.

17   5. Worsnop, C. Z. Concealing Disease: Trade and Travel Barriers and the Timeliness of Outbreak  
18   Reporting. *Int Stud Perspect* **20**, 344–372 (2019).

19   6. Rhymer, W. & Speare, R. Countries’ response to WHO’s travel recommendations during the  
20   2013-2016 Ebola outbreak. *B World Health Organ* **95**, 10–17 (2016).

21   7. Worsnop, C. Z. Provoking Barriers: The 2014 Ebola Outbreak and Unintended Consequences  
22   of WHO’s Power to Declare a Public Health Emergency. *Global Health Governance* **XI**, 1–26  
23   (2017).

24   8. UNWTO. UNWTO World Tourism Barometer. **18**, (2020).

25   9. Ryu, S. *et al.* Nonpharmaceutical Measures for Pandemic Influenza in Nonhealthcare  
26   Settings—International Travel-Related Measures. *Emerg Infect Dis* **26**, 961–966 (2020).

27   10. WHO. *Non-pharmaceutical public health measures for mitigating the risk and impact of*  
28   *epidemic and pandemic influenza.* (2019).

29   11. Mateus, A. L., Otete, H. E., Beck, C. R., Dolan, G. P. & Nguyen-Van-Tam, J. S. Effectiveness of  
30   travel restrictions in the rapid containment of human influenza: a systematic review. *B World*  
31   *Health Organ* **92**, 868-880D (2014).

- 1 12. Poletto, C. *et al.* Assessing the impact of travel restrictions on international spread of the  
2 2014 West African Ebola epidemic. *Eurosurveillance* **19**, (2014).
- 3 13. Bogoch, I. I. *et al.* Assessment of the potential for international dissemination of Ebola virus  
4 via commercial air travel during the 2014 west African outbreak. *Lancet* **385**, 29–35 (2014).
- 5 14. Otsuki, S. & Nishiura, H. Reduced Risk of Importing Ebola Virus Disease because of Travel  
6 Restrictions in 2014: A Retrospective Epidemiological Modeling Study. *Plos One* **11**, e0163418  
7 (2016).
- 8 15. Hollingsworth, T. D., Ferguson, N. M. & Anderson, R. M. Will travel restrictions control the  
9 international spread of pandemic influenza? *Nat Med* **12**, 497–499 (2006).
- 10 16. Nuzzo, J. B., Cicero, A. J., Waldhorn, R. & Inglesby, T. V. Travel Bans Will Increase the  
11 Damage Wrought by Ebola. *Biosecurity Bioterrorism Biodefense Strategy Pract Sci* **12**, 306–309  
12 (2014).
- 13 17. Vaidya, R., Herten-Crabb, A., Spencer, J., Moon, S. & Lillywhite, L. Travel restrictions and  
14 infectious disease outbreaks. *J Travel Med* (2020) doi:10.1093/jtm/taaa050.
- 15 18. He, X. *et al.* Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med*  
16 **26**, 672–675 (2020).
- 17 19. Anderson, R. M., Heesterbeek, H., Klinkenberg, D. & Hollingsworth, T. D. How will country-  
18 based mitigation measures influence the course of the COVID-19 epidemic? *Lancet* (2020)  
19 doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30567-5.
- 20 20. Tigerstrom, B. von & Wilson, K. COVID-19 travel restrictions and the International Health  
21 Regulations (2005). *Bmj Global Heal* **5**, e002629 (2020).
- 22 21. Worsnop, C. Z. *et al.* Legal compliance is not enough: cross-border travel and trade  
23 measures and COVID-19. (2020).
- 24 22. Group, P.-P. *et al.* Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis  
25 protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev* **4**, 1 (2015).
- 26 23. Iacus, S. M., Natale, F., Santamaria, C., Spyrtatos, S. & Vespe, M. Estimating and Projecting  
27 Air Passenger Traffic during the COVID-19 Coronavirus Outbreak and its Socio-Economic Impact.  
28 *Safety Sci* 104791 (2020) doi:10.1016/j.ssci.2020.104791.
- 29 24. Boldog, P. *et al.* Risk Assessment of Novel Coronavirus COVID-19 Outbreaks Outside China. *J*  
30 *Clin Medicine* **9**, 571 (2020).

- 1 25. Klausner, Z., Fattal, E., Hirsch, E. & Shapira, S. C. A single holiday was the turning point of the  
2 COVID-19 policy of Israel. *Medrxiv* 2020.03.26.20044412 (2020)  
3 doi:10.1101/2020.03.26.20044412.
- 4 26. Chinazzi, M. *et al.* The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel  
5 coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. *Science* eaba9757 (2020) doi:10.1126/science.aba9757.
- 6 27. Pitman, R. *et al.* Dynamic Transmission Modeling. *Med Decis Making* **32**, 712–721 (2012).
- 7 28. Cowling, B. J. *et al.* Impact assessment of non-pharmaceutical interventions against  
8 coronavirus disease 2019 and influenza in Hong Kong: an observational study. *Lancet Public*  
9 *Heal* **5**, e279–e288 (2020).
- 10 29. Anzai, A. *et al.* Assessing the Impact of Reduced Travel on Exportation Dynamics of Novel  
11 Coronavirus Infection (COVID-19). *J Clin Medicine* **9**, 601 (2020).
- 12 30. Wells, C. R. *et al.* Impact of international travel and border control measures on the global  
13 spread of the novel 2019 coronavirus outbreak. *Proc National Acad Sci* **117**, 7504–7509 (2020).
- 14 31. Kucharski, A. J. *et al.* Early dynamics of transmission and control of COVID-19: a  
15 mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect Dis* **20**, 553–558 (2020).
- 16 32. Evaluating the impact of international airline suspensions on the early global spread of  
17 COVID-19. (n.d.).
- 18 33. Adekunle, A. I., Meehan, M., Alvarez, D. R., Trauer, J. & McBryde, E. Delaying the COVID-19  
19 epidemic in Australia: Evaluating the effectiveness of international travel bans. (n.d.)  
20 doi:10.1101/2020.03.22.20041244.
- 21 34. Costantino, V., Heslop, D. J. & MacIntyre, C. R. The effectiveness of full and partial travel  
22 bans against COVID-19 spread in Australia for travellers from China. *Medrxiv*  
23 2020.03.09.20032045 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.03.09.20032045.
- 24 35. Linka, K., Peirlinck, M., Costabal, F. S. & Kuhl, E. Outbreak dynamics of COVID-19 in Europe  
25 and the effect of travel restrictions. *Comput Method Biomec* 1–8 (2020)  
26 doi:10.1080/10255842.2020.1759560.
- 27 36. Clifford, S. *et al.* Effectiveness of interventions targeting air travellers for delaying local  
28 outbreaks of SARS-CoV-2. *J Travel Med* taaa068- (2020) doi:10.1093/jtm/taaa068.
- 29 37. Mandal, S. *et al.* Prudent public health intervention strategies to control the coronavirus  
30 disease 2019 transmission in India: A mathematical model-based approach. *Indian J Med Res* **0**,  
31 **0** (2020).

- 1 38. FANG, H., WANG, L. & YANG, Y. Human Mobility Restrictions and the Spread of the Novel  
2 Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in China. *Medrxiv* 2020.03.24.20042424 (2020)  
3 doi:10.1101/2020.03.24.20042424.
- 4 39. Shi, Z. & Fang, Y. Temporal relationship between outbound traffic from Wuhan and the  
5 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) incidence in China. *Medrxiv* 2020.03.15.20034199 (2020)  
6 doi:10.1101/2020.03.15.20034199.
- 7 40. Tian, H. *et al.* An investigation of transmission control measures during the first 50 days of  
8 the COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Science* **368**, 638–642 (2020).
- 9 41. Tang, B. *et al.* Estimation of the Transmission Risk of the 2019-nCoV and Its Implication for  
10 Public Health Interventions. *J Clin Medicine* **9**, 462 (2020).
- 11 42. Kraemer, M. U. G. *et al.* The effect of human mobility and control measures on the COVID-  
12 19 epidemic in China. *Science* **368**, 493–497 (2020).
- 13 43. Aleta, A., Hu, Q., Ye, J., Ji, P. & Moreno, Y. A data-driven assessment of early travel  
14 restrictions related to the spreading of the novel COVID-19 within mainland China. *Chaos*  
15 *Solitons Fractals* **139**, 110068 (2020).
- 16 44. zheming, Y. & Yuan, C. A simple model to assess Wuhan lock-down effect and region efforts  
17 during COVID-19 epidemic in China Mainland. *Medrxiv* 2020.02.29.20029561 (2020)  
18 doi:10.1101/2020.02.29.20029561.
- 19 45. Hou, J. *et al.* Changing transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in China: a nationwide  
20 population-based piecewise mathematical modelling study. *Medrxiv* 2020.03.27.20045757  
21 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.03.27.20045757.
- 22 46. Li, R. *et al.* Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel  
23 coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science* **368**, 489–493 (2020).
- 24 47. Lau, H. *et al.* The positive impact of lockdown in Wuhan on containing the COVID-19  
25 outbreak in China. *J Travel Med* **27**, (2020).
- 26 48. Lai, S. *et al.* Effect of non-pharmaceutical interventions to contain COVID-19 in China.  
27 *Nature* 1–4 (2020) doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2293-x.
- 28 49. Liu, K. *et al.* Population Movement, City Closure in Wuhan, and Geographical Expansion of  
29 the COVID-19 Infection in China in January 2020. *Clin Infect Dis* (2020) doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa422.
- 30 50. Wu, J. T., Leung, K. & Leung, G. M. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and  
31 international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling study.  
32 *Lancet* **395**, 689–697 (2020).

- 1 51. Su, L. *et al.* Evaluation of the Secondary Transmission Pattern and Epidemic Prediction of  
2 COVID-19 in the Four Metropolitan Areas of China. *Frontiers Medicine* **7**, 171 (2020).
- 3 52. Greenhalgh, T. Will COVID-19 be evidence-based medicine's nemesis? *Plos Med* **17**,  
4 e1003266 (2020).
- 5

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .






Table 1. Summary Statistics

This preprint is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Date of pre-print submission/ publication	Pre-Print	Published	Total
January	0	1	1
February	0	4	4
March	4	11	15
April	0	3	3
May	1	5	6
<b>Study design</b>			
Modelled	5	21	26
Observational	0	3	3
<b>Level of region affected by travel measures</b>			
Mainland China	3	14	17
Other single country	1	4	5
Multi-countries or global	1	6	7
<b>Level of travel measures imposed</b>			
International	2	10	12
Interprovincial	3	13	16
Both <sup>a</sup>	0	1	1
<b>Travel measures analysed<sup>b</sup></b>			
Suspended transportation	4	20	24
Border restrictions	3	18	21
Screening	0	5	5
Entry quarantine	1	3	4

Note:

<sup>a</sup> papers evaluating the impact of both international and interprovincial measures.

<sup>b</sup> papers may analyse effects of multiple restrictions.

Author	Setting	Study design	Model	Key findings	Intervention	Outcome	Timing	Notes
Anzari et al. (2020)	Global	Modelled	Poisson regression model	Mean incubation period of 5 days	Wuhan travel restrictions	Number of reported cases	Travel restrictions effective Jan 23	From 28 Jan to 6 Feb, 226 cases (95% CI: 86, 449) were prevented from being exported globally (70% reduction).
	Japan	Modelled	Negative binomial model; Hazard function	R0: 1.5, 2.2, 3.7; Contract tracing: 10%, 30%, or 50% of contacts isolated.	Wuhan travel restrictions	Probability of a major outbreak	Presence of travel restriction and with 10%/30%/50% of contacts traced and isolated.	R0 (2.2): absolute risk reduction was 7%, 12%, and 20% for contract tracing levels 10%, 30%, and 50% respectively. Largest effect when R0 (1.5) and 50% of contacts traced led to 37% absolute risk reduction. Median time delay was less than 1 day when R0=2.2-3.7, and 1-2 days when R0 is 1.5.
Chinazzi et al. (2020)	Global	Modelled	Individual-based, stochastic global epidemic and mobility model (GLEAM)	Epidemic start date Nov 15-Dec 1 2019; R0: 2.57 (90% CI: 2.37 to 2.78); Tg: 7.5 days; Td: 4.2 days; Global detection of cases can be as low as 40%. Doubling time: 4.2 (90% CI: 3.8 to 4.7)	Wuhan travel restrictions	Relative risk of case importation	Travel restrictions effective Jan 23	A 77% reduction in cases imported from China to other countries in early February. Prior to Jan 23, 86% of international cases originated in Wuhan, afterwards most cases came from other Chinese cities.
					International travel restrictions: 59 airlines suspended or limited flights to Mainland China and several countries (USA, Russia, Australia, and Italy) imposed travel restrictions.	Number of internationally imported and detected cases	40-90% overall traffic reduction to and from mainland China; transmissibility reduction in China 0%	The number of imported cases is initially reduced by 10x, but returns to 170-35 detected cases a day by Mar 1 (40-90% traffic reductions, respectively).
						Number of internationally imported and detected cases	40-90% overall traffic reduction to and from mainland China; transmissibility reduction in China 25%.	The number of imported cases is initially reduced by 10x, but returns to 26-5 detected cases a day by Mar 1 (40-90% traffic reductions, respectively).
						Number of internationally imported and detected cases	40-90% overall traffic reduction to and from mainland China; transmissibility reduction in China 50%.	The number of imported cases is initially dramatically reduced, epidemic growth in China delayed, and number of internationally imported cases remains in single digits by Mar 1.
Adiga et al. (2020)	Global	Modelled	Linear regression models	NS	Suspension of flight routes by airlines (voluntary or mandated by travel bans)	Arrival times of first case	Actual airline suspensions, based on IATA data.	An increase in estimated arrival time of approximately 4 to 5 days. Ethiopia and Qatar observe an increase >10 days.
Wells et al. (2020)	Global	Modelled	Maximum likelihood approach	NS	Wuhan and Hubei-travel restrictions	Exportation risk and exported cases	Travel restrictions were implemented in Wuhan on Jan 23 and Hubei on Jan 24	Reduced exportation risk by 81.3% (95% CI: 80.5 to 82.1%) and averted 70.5% (95% CI: 68.8 to 72.0%) of exported cases by February 15, 2020.
Kucharski et al. (2020)	Global	Modelled	Stochastic transmission dynamic model	100% of cases become symptomatic	Wuhan travel restrictions	Transmission dynamics outside of Wuhan	Travel restrictions effective Jan 23	The transmission reduced by about half in the 2 weeks following introduction but does not directly test effectiveness of such measures
Costantino et al. (2020)	Australia	Modelled	Poisson regression model; age-specific deterministic model	R0: 2.2; Infectious period: 12.2 days; Effectiveness of home quarantine: 50%; Home quarantine: 14 days; Excludes Diamond Princess Cruise ship effects.	Australia's ban on flights from China coupled with home quarantine of entering travellers.	Imported cases to Australia from China	Complete travel ban from Feb 2-Mar 8, then full lifting of ban.	32, 43 and 36 infected cases every 2 weeks would be averted from Jan 26 onwards.
						Total cases and deaths in Australia	Complete travel ban from Feb 2-Mar 8, then full lifting of ban. Complete travel ban from Feb 2-Mar 8, then partial lifting of ban for students.	Similar to above An estimate 87% reduction in cases and deaths Similar to above
Adekunle et al. (2020)	Australia	Modelled	Stochastic meta-population model	China R0: 2.63 (Dec 1, 2019-Jan 31, 2020) and 1.73 (afterwards).	Australia's travel ban on flights from China. Australia's travel ban on flights from Iran, South Korea, and Iran.	Imported cases and onset of widespread transmission in Australia	Travel bans begin on Jan 24	By Mar 2, 79% reduction in expected cases and delayed onset of widespread transmission by 4 weeks.
						Imported cases	Travel bans begin on Mar 2	Negligible impact on imported cases or local transmission.
Linka et al. (2020)	European Union	Modelled	Mathematical deterministic SEIR model	R0: 4.62 ± 1.32 (mean, across all states) or a range from 2.7 (Denmark) - 8.7 (Austria); Latent period 2.56; Infectious periods 17.82.	Travel restrictions introduced in the European Union (all external, and some internal).	Number of exposed, infectious, and recovered patients by country	Restrictions were implemented on Mar 17	Travel restriction slowed faster spread of the virus, especially in Central Europe, Spain, and France.
Screening Clifford et al. (2020)	Theoretical	Modelled	Non-homogenous poisson process with intensity function; mathematical model	R0: 1.4 - 3.9; Others listed in Table 1.	Syndromic exit/entry screening plus traveller sensitization to self-isolate if they develop symptoms.	Delay in the outbreak	Screening in the context of 1 or 10 or 100 infected travellers per week	With 1 infected traveller per week, the outbreak is delayed by 4 days (10 travelers/1 day)
							Screening plus sensitization in the context of 1 or 10 or 100 infected travellers per week	With 1 infected traveller per week, the outbreak is delayed by 8 days (10 travelers/2 days).
Mandal et al. (2020)	India	Modelled	Mathematical model	R0: 2.4	Port-of-entry based screening on travelers from China to India	Time to reach a 1000 cases in India	Screening of both symptomatic and asymptomatic cases is feasible	Additional detection of 90% asymptomatic individuals was required to delay the epidemic by 20 days, but unclear if this is even feasible.
Wells et al. (2020)	Worldwide	Modelled	Maximum likelihood approach, Monte Carlo simulations	NS	Self-identification upon arrival of symptomatic travelers	Probability of identification	With only symptomatic cases were detected	Could potentially identify up to 95% of infected travelers, assuming effectiveness of the questionnaire.
<b>Broad measures including travel restrictions</b>								
Cowling et al. (2020)	Hong Kong SAR	Observational	Time series study	NS	Border restrictions in combination with quarantine and isolation as well as social distancing and school closures.	Effective reproductive number	January through end of March in Hong Kong	Demonstrates that together the measures were effective at reducing the effective reproductive number but were not able to isolate impact of border restrictions.

Notes:  
NS: Not specified.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

**Table 3: Effect of Implementation of Interprovincial Travel Measures**

Author	Study design	Model type	Epidemiological assumptions	Travel measure(s)	Outcomes investigated	Scenarios of Intervention	Estimated effect(s)
Aleta et al. (2020)	Modelled	Stochastic SEIR-metapopulation model	Generation time: 7.5 days; R0: 2.4; later period: 3 days	Wuhan travel measures	Cases in Mainland China outside of Wuhan	Travel measures implemented on Jan 23	A reduced number of cases but only in the short term.
Chinazzi et al. (2020)	Modelled	Individual-based, stochastic global epidemic and mobility model (GLEAM)	R0: 2.57; doubling time: 4.2; no changes in transmissibility within China	Wuhan travel measures	Cases in Mainland China outside of Wuhan Timing of epidemic peak	Travel measures implemented on Jan 23	Reduction of cases was approximately 10% by 31 January (range 1 to 58%). Wuhan travel ban delayed epidemic progression by 3 to 5 days in China.
Fang et al. (2020)	Modelled	Dynamic distributed lag regression model	Incubation period: up to 22 days	Wuhan travel measures	Number of cases in cities outside of Hubei from Jan 23-Feb 29	Travel measures implemented on Jan 23	COVID-19 cases would be 64.81% higher in 347 cities outside Hubei (20,810 v. 12,626), and 52.64% higher in 16 other cities in Hubei as of 29 February (23,400 v. 15,330).
Shi et al. (2020)	Modelled	Autoregressive integrated moving average (ARIMA) model	Incubation period: 4-6 days	Wuhan travel measures	Cumulative number of confirmed cases outside Wuhan by Feb 29	Travel measures implemented on Jan 23	Travel ban may have prevented approximately 19,768 (95% CI: 13589, 25946) cases outside of Wuhan by Feb 29 (39% reduction).
Tian et al. (2020)	Modelled	Deterministic SEIR model	R0: 3.15	Wuhan travel measures	Arrival times in cities across Mainland China by Feb 19 Cases in Mainland China outside of Wuhan by Feb 19	Travel measures implemented on Jan 23	Delayed arrival time by 2.91 days (95% CI: 2.54, 3.29). National number of cases decreased from 744,000 (±156,000) to 202,000 (±10,000) (72.8% decrease).
Kraemer et al. (2020)	Modelled	Generalized linear model	Doubling time: 4.0 days (outside Hubei), 7.2 days (inside Hubei); incubation period 5.1 days	Wuhan travel measures	Cases in Mainland China outside of Wuhan by end of Feb	Travel measures implemented on Jan 23	Travel measures reduced growth rates outside, which became negative after Jan 23; Provinces with greater mobility from Wuhan displayed more rapidly declining growth rates.
Tang et al. (2020)	Modelled	Deterministic SEIR model	R0: 6.47	Wuhan travel measures	Cases in select locations outside of Wuhan	Travel measures implemented on Jan 23	Travel restriction reduced the number of infected individuals in Beijing over 7 days by 91.14%.
Hou et al. (2020)	Modelled	Deterministic SEIR model	Incubation period: 7 days	Wuhan travel measures	Effective reproductive rate	Travel measures implemented on Jan 23	Travel measures significantly changed transmission dynamics within China
Li et al. (2020)	Modelled	Stochastic SEIR model	R0 at the beginning of the epidemic to be 2.38	Wuhan travel measures	Reproductive number	Travel measures implemented on Jan 23	Travel measure reduced the reproductive number from 2.38 down to 1.34 and 0.98, in the 1 and 2 week period immediately following their introduction.
Lau et al. (2020)	Observational	Retrospective regression model	R0: 2.2-3.9; mean incubation period: 5.1 days	Wuhan travel measures	Doubling time	Travel measures implemented on Jan 23	Significant increase in doubling time from 2 to 4 days after lockdown.
Wu et al. (2020)	Modelled	Deterministic SEIR model	R0=2.6, zoonotic force=86/day until Jan 1 market closure	Wuhan travel measures	Exported cases in the rest of Mainland China	Travel restrictions led to either a 0% or 50% reduction in travel outside of Wuhan	Even a 50% reduction in inter-city mobility would have a negligible effect on the epidemic dynamics.
Liu et al. (2020)	Observational	Linear regression	Incubation period: 3-7 days	Wuhan travel measures	Cases exported outside of Wuhan	Travel measures implemented on Jan 23 Travel measures implemented 2 days earlier Travel measures implemented 2 days later	A mean values of 129 cases exported per 10,000 people who left Wuhan An estimated 1420 (95% CI: 1059, 1833) cases would have been prevented. An estimated 1462 (95% CI: 1059, 1833) additional cases would have happened.
Yuan et al. (2020)	Modelled	Regression model	Incubation period: 5 days	Wuhan travel measures in combination with a stay at home movement	Cases in 44 regions outside of Wuhan by Feb 27 Cases in 44 regions outside of Wuhan by Feb 27	Travel measures implemented on Jan 23 Travel measures implemented three days earlier	Reduced the number of cases outside of Wuhan from 41,477 to 30,765. Further reduce the number of cases to between 15,768-21,245.
Su et al. (2020)	Modelled	Deterministic SEIR model	R0 = 2.91, 2.78, 2.02, and 1.75 for Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou, and Shenzhen respectively	Wuhan travel measures in combination with other non-pharmaceutical interventions	Transmission rates in four metropolitan areas of China	Different contract rates were assumed to result from reduced population flow.	Travel restrictions contributed to a reduction in the contract rate and reduced the time to peak and the number of cases.
Jiang et al. (2020)	Modelled	Time-varying sparse vector autoregressive model	Incubation period: 10 days	Travel measures introduced in 5 cities of Hubei (Wuhan, Huanggang, Ezhou, Chibi and Zhijiang)	Daily transmission routes from Hubei to other provinces through Feb 19	Travel measures started to be implemented on Jan 23	Travel restrictions reduced transmission between provinces
Lai et al. (2020)	Modelled	Stochastic SEIR model	R0: 2.2; incubation period: 5.2 days	Wuhan travel measures in combination with other non-pharmaceutical interventions	Cases in Mainland China outside of Wuhan Cases in Mainland China outside of Wuhan Total number of cases outside of Wuhan	Travel measures implemented on Jan 23 If travel restrictions of same magnitude were implemented one, two, or three weeks earlier If travel restrictions of same magnitude were implemented one, two, or three weeks later.	Early detection and isolation of cases more effective than travel restrictions; travel restricts reduced the number of cases outside of Wuhan as well as its geographic spread. If interventions were conducted one, two, or three weeks earlier, cases will reduce by 66%, 86%, or 95% respectively. If interventions were conducted one, two, or three weeks later, cases may increase 3-fold, 7-fold, or 18-fold respectively
Hossain et al. (2020)	Modelled	Meta-population model	R0: 2.92; latent period: 5.2 days; generation time: 8.4 days	Border control and quarantine	Arrival time outside of Wuhan	Theoretical application of measures	Arrival time is delayed by 32.5 days and 44 days under a low R0 (1.4) but under higher R0 (2.92) only 10 extra days can be gained.

Appendix Table 1: Risk of Bias Assessment

Authors	Clear and precise definition of research question	Travel restriction measures included in analysis	Outcomes	Suitable mathematical modelling	Major model assumptions described	Other related factors adjusted	Model validated	Uncertainty analysis
Anzai et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	High	High
Adekunle et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Low	Low
Adiga et al. (2020)	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	High
Aleta et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	High	Low	Low
Boldog et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	High	Low
Chinazzi et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Clifford et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	High	High	Low
Costantino et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate
Cowling et al. (2020)	Low	High	Low	Low	NA	High	NA	NA
Fang et al. (2020)	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Hossain et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	High
Hou et al. (2020)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low
Jiang et al. (2020)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low
Klausner et al. (2020)	Low	High	High	High	High	High	High	High
Kraemer et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Kucharski et al. (2020)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low
Lai et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Lau et al. (2020)	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	High	NA	NA
Li et al. (2020)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low
Linka et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	High	High	Low
Liu et al. (2020)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low
Mandal et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	High	Low
Shi et al. (2020)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low
Su et al. (2020)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	High
Tang et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low
Tian et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Wells et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Wu et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Low
Yuan et al. (2020)	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Low	High	Low	High

## Notes:

Domains of risk of bias: low means the author had adequately addressed the domain; moderate represents that the domain was addressed spartial or incompletely; high means the domain was poorly addressed.

NA: Not applicable.

Author	Published/Pre-printed	Modelled	Geographical context	Geographical context	Location(s) implementing measure(s)	Traveler(s) affected by measures	Travel Measures
Anzai et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	International	Global	Wuhan	Travelers from Mainland China, specifically travelers to Japan	Suspended air transportation
Adekunle et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	International	Australia	Australia	Travelers from China, Iran, Italy, and South Korea to Australia	Suspended air transportation; Provincial border closure
Adiga et al. (2020)	Pre-printed	Modelled	International	Global	Airlines in 24 countries	Outbound travelers from China	Suspended air transportation
Aleta et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Provincial border closure
Boldog et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	International	Global	Wuhan and other countries	Outbound travelers from China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Entry screening
Chinazzi et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	Both	Global	Wuhan and other countries	Outbound travelers from China	Suspended air transportation; Provincial border closure
Clifford et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	International	Global	Destination countries	Inbound travelers	Entry and exit screening
Costantino et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	International	Australia	Australia	Travellers from China to Australia	Suspended air transportation
Cowling et al. (2020)	Published	Observational	International*	Hong Kong SAR	Hong Kong SAR	Inbound travelers	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Entry screening; Entry quarantine
Fang et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan	Travelers to 363 cities in China from Wuhan	Provincial border closure
Hossain et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan	Travelers to major cities in China from Wuhan	Provincial border closure; Entry quarantine
Hou et al. (2020)	Pre-printed	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Provincial border closure
Jiang et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Provincial border closure
Klausner et al. (2020)	Pre-printed	Modelled	International	Israel	Israel	Inbound travelers, especially those from China	Entry quarantine
Kraemer et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Hubei and other provinces	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Provincial border closure
Kucharski et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	International	Mainland China	Wuhan	Outbound international travelers from Wuhan	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Provincial border closure
Lai et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan and other cities within China	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Provincial border closure
Lau et al. (2020)	Published	Observational	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Provincial border closure
Li et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Provincial border closure
Linka et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	International	Europe	European Union member countries	Travelers within the European Union	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; National border closure
Liu et al. (2020)	Published	Observational	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; National border closure
Mandal et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	International	India	India	Inbound travelers to India	Entry screening
Shi et al. (2020)	Pre-printed	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Provincial border closure
Su et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Provinces within China	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Provincial border closure
Tang et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Provincial border closure
Tian et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended air transportation; Provincial border closure
Wells et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	International	Global	Wuhan	Inbound international travelers from China	Suspended air transportation; Provincial border closure; Entry Screening; Entry Quarantine
Wu et al. (2020)	Published	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan and Hubei province	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Provincial border closure
Yuan et al. (2020)	Pre-printed	Modelled	Interprovincial	Mainland China	Wuhan	Travelers within Mainland China	Suspended land, air, sea transportation; Provincial border closure

\* Also includes measures to control border with Mainland China but does not distinguish between international and within China travelers so only listed in the international table.