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Abstract:

Objectives: Travel restrictions is an often-used tool for governments to prevent the spread of COVID-19.

Methods: We here used a simple simulation model to investigate the potential effects of travel restrictions within a country.

Results: We found that travel restrictions can delay the peak of the epidemic considerably, but do not affect the spread within the country. We also investigated the effect of implementing travel restrictions early or later in the epidemic, and found that fast implementation is crucial for delaying the epidemic.

Conclusions: Fast implementation of travel restrictions is crucial for delaying the peak of a subsequent outbreak of COVID-19 within a country.
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between regions in China are effective as short-term prevention but will not help eliminating COVID-19 within
a country. Anzai et al. (2020) used a statistical model to study the effect of restricting travelers and from
China and found that the implemented lockdown in late January 2020 delayed the epidemic two days in
Japan. Lin et al. (2020) used a global network mobility model for Europe and showed that unrestricted travel
would have accelerated the spread of COVID-19 in Central Europe. Simulation models always rely on a set of
underlying assumptions, and therefore it is important to use different models to investigate the robustness of
previous results.

We here used the case of Denmark in the early phase of the epidemic to analyze the practical effects of
travel restrictions on the peak size and time of the epidemic.

We used a simple deterministic SEIR simulation model that included domestic transmission within the
country and introduction of COVID-19 from Danish travelers returning to DK, to investigate the effects of
travel restriction. The model was a differential equation model as described in Keeling and Rohani (2011),
parameterized to fit the COVID-19 outbreak in the Danish population with 5.8 mio. people, using an infectious
period of seven days; a daily transmission rate of 0.7 (Lin et al. 2020); a latent (exposed) period of 2 days;
and we assumed that only 10% of the cases are detected. The effect of contact restrictions was estimated to
50% reduction in the transmission rate, based on the model of Chinazzi et al. (2020). We seeded the model
with 3020 persons returning to Denmark on March 12th, based on data showing that 341 persons tested pos-
tive for COVID-19 and required it from another country (https://files.ssi.dk/COVID19-overvaagningsrapport-
12032020), assuming only about 10% of these cases were detected. Based on travel estimations about 20,000
travelers (7,475,429 Danish citizens travelling per year/365 days, data for 2018 from www.dst.dk) were esti-
mated to return to Denmark each day. We assumed that only about 10% of cases are registered, and thus 10%
of susceptible travelers leaving the country would return infected if no travel ban was implemented in any
country. We simulated three scenarios; No intervention; reduced contact between Danish citizens from March
12th; reduced contact and travel ban from March 14th. We also varied the time of implanting the travel ban to
seven days earlier and later, to examine the effect of timeliness.

The model results show a clear effect of implementing the travel ban on the peak prevalence (Figure 1).
Without intervention, the simulated peak epidemic would arrive on April 17th and result in maximal 100,000
infected at the same time. Implementing reduced contact between citizens decreased the peak size to under
50,000 infected at the same time, and delayed the peak of the epidemic to May 1st (14 days delay). Imple-
menting a strategy with reduced contact restrictions and travel restrictions resulted in a delay of the peak
epidemic to May 14th (27 days delay). Hesitation with implementation of travel restrictions for 7 days resulted

Figure 1: The number of detected cases over time in the different modeled scenarios. The black line shows the
epidemic without interventions. The red line shows the reduced contact control action implemented on March
12. The blue line shows the combination of reduced contact and travel ban implemented from March 14. The
blue dotted line and dashed line shows the same, but with travel ban implemented on March 7 and March 21,
respectively.
in a peak epidemic on May 6th (8 days earlier). Implementing the travel restrictions 7 days before delayed the peak epidemic until May 23rd (9 days delay).

Given the assumptions made, these results support the findings of Aleta et al. (2020), Adekunle et al. (2020) and Lin et al. (2020), as travel restrictions are found effective for delaying the epidemic, but will not affect the peak size. Similarly, Clifford et al. (2020) found that control measures combining exit and entry screening are able to delay the epidemic 7–8 days (mean). An underlying assumption for this delay is that the transmission from incoming travelers is larger than the transmission within the country. Furthermore, as shown by Clifford et al. (2020), the delay is inversely proportional to the number of infected persons travelling into a country. This highlights the effect of preventive measures when a country opens up for international travel, which is up to a 92.1% reduction in secondary cases if 14-day isolation period of positive cases is implemented (Dickens et al. 2020).

The introduction of travel restrictions is costly for a society. Thus it is important to balance between delaying the epidemic enough to gain response time, and not delaying the epidemic too long because the costs for the control actions will be prolonged. Both extreme cases will be suboptimal. Furthermore, the optimum onset of travel restrictions is affected by many other factors such as the fraction of the population that has less susceptibility; the duration of immune status (recovered) after infection; risk of (re-)introduction from other countries; and the effectivity of preventive measures such as exit and entry screening (Clifford et al. 2020; Dickens et al. 2020).

Travel restrictions between two countries will only have an impact when prevalence differs between these countries. If two adjacent countries are able to keep transmission low, they can form a “travel bubble”, allowing free travel between them (van Tigerstrom, Halabi, and Wilson 2020). This can delay the epidemic, for instance until sufficient vaccination has been implemented. If the prevalence differs considerably between any two countries, limiting travel between them is an effective way to keep incoming cases to a minimum and delay the spread of incoming transmission. This study highlight the importance of travel restrictions so that specific restrictions and screenings aimed at reducing export from countries with high prevalence could still be effective. This theoretical study confirms that early travel restrictions is a rational choice for a government wishing to delay the epidemic in its country, and thus supports the decision of governments implementing travel restrictions.
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