medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Border closure and travel restrictions to control the spread of COVID-19: an update to a Cochrane review

Review authors: Ahmed M. Abou-Setta[1,2]
Otto LT Lam[1]
Viraj Kasireddy[1]
Nicole Askin[3]
Andrea C. Tricco[4]

Affiliations:
[1] George & Fay Yee Centre for Healthcare Innovation, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba, Manitoba, Canada
[2] Department of Community Health Sciences, Max Rady College of Medicine, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba, Manitoba, Canada
[3] Neil John Maclean Health Sciences Library, University of Manitoba, Manitoba, Canada
[4] Epidemiology Division, Dalla Lana School of Public Health & Institute of Health, Management, and Policy Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

Corresponding author: Ahmed M. Abou-Setta, MD, PhD
Director, Knowledge Synthesis
George & Fay Yee Centre for Healthcare Innovation
University of Manitoba

Room 367, 3rd floor Chown building,
753 McDermot Ave, Winnipeg, MB R3E 0T6
Canada
p: +1 (204) 296.55246 • f: +1 (204) 594.5394
e: ahmed.abou-setta@umanitoba.ca

Running title: Border and travel restrictions for COVID-19

Funding sources: World Health Organization and SPOR Evidence Alliance

Key words: Coronavirus disease 2019, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, border, transmission, systematic review

Document data:
Text: 16,722 words; Figures: 01; Tables: 06; Appendix: 01

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Background: COVID-19 has proven to be more difficult to manage for many reasons including its high infectivity rate. One of the potential ways to limit its spread is by limiting free travel across borders, including via air travel. The objective of this systematic review is to identify, critically-appraise and summarize evidence on border closures and travel restrictions.

Methods: This review is based on the Cochrane review: "International travel-related control measures to contain the COVID-19 pandemic" and followed the same methodology. In brief, we searched for clinical and modelling studies in general health and COVID-19-specific bibliographic databases. The primary outcome categories were (i) cases avoided, (ii) cases detected, and (iii) a shift in epidemic development. Secondary outcomes were other infectious disease transmission outcomes, healthcare utilisation, resource requirements and adverse effects if identified in studies assessing at least one primary outcome.

Results: We included 43, mostly modelling, studies that met our inclusion criteria. Fourteen new studies were identified in the updated search, as well as updated companions (e.g., peer-reviewed publications that were previously only available as pre-prints). Most studies were of moderate to high quality. The added studies did not change the main conclusions of the Cochrane review nor the quality of the evidence (very low to low certainty). However, it did add to the evidence base for most outcomes.

Conclusions: Weak evidence supports the use of border closures to limit the spread of COVID-19 via air travel. Real-world studies are required to support these conclusions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Background

In humans, coronaviruses may cause respiratory infections ranging from the common cold to severe disease. The 2003 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS), the 2012 Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome (MERS), and the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) are all notable pandemics caused by coronaviruses.

COVID-19 has proven to be more difficult to manage, compared to previous epidemics, for many reasons including its high infectivity rate. The mean reproductive number (R_0), which represents the speed of spread or transmissibility, of SARS-CoV-2 (the virus that causes COVID-19) has been estimated to be around 3.28,[1] which is higher than that for SARS (1.7–1.9) and MERS (<1).[2]

To combat the transmission of SARS-CoV-2, governments and public health organizations/ officials have implemented polices to decrease the disease spread including border closures and travel restrictions. A recent Cochrane review[3] showed that there was little evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of such policies.

The objective of this systematic review is to identify, critically-appraise and summarize evidence on border closures and travel restrictions to control the spread of SARS-CoV-2 transmission between countries and regions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Methods

As this is an update to a Cochrane review,[3] we conducted this review according to guidelines enumerated in the Methodological Expectations of Cochrane Intervention Reviews (MECIR), and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines.[4] We included randomized trials, non-randomized trials, observational studies, and modelling studies on the effects of travel related control measures affecting human travel during the COVID 19 pandemic. The interventions for this review were border closure and travel restrictions to control the spread of COVID-19. The non-randomized, observational, and modelling studies could be single arm or with a control group, including but not limited to prospective or retrospective cohort studies, case-controlled studies, cross-sectional studies, interrupted time series, or mathematical modelling studies. Modelling studies could use a theoretical comparison. We excluded case reports/ series, opinion papers, editorials, study protocols and trial registries.

The primary outcome categories were (i) cases avoided, (ii) cases detected, and (iii) a shift in epidemic development. Secondary outcomes were other infectious disease transmission outcomes, healthcare utilisation, resource requirements and adverse effects if identified in studies assessing at least one primary outcome.

Search strategy for identification of studies

The Cochrane review[3] search was adapted by excluding terms not related to COVID-19 (e.g., MERS, H1N1, SARS01) and an updated search conducted from Nov 2020 to Jun 2021 without any language restrictions. The search was conducted in general health and COVID-19-specific

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

bibliographic databases [PubMed (NLM), Cochrane Covid (https://covid-19.cochrane.org/), Medrxiv (https://connect.Medrxiv.org/relate/content/181), and BioRXiv. We conducted searches in general purpose databases (e.g., Google), government and public health websites (e.g., WHO), preprint servers (arxiv.org) and news outlets for additional unpublished or grey literature. Each database was searched using an individualized search strategy. Finally, the reference lists of relevant narrative and systematic reviews and included studies were hand-searched for relevant citations. We performed reference management in EndNote™ (version X9, Thomson Reuters, Carlsbad, CA, USA).

Study selection

We used a two-stage process for study screening and selection using standardized and piloted screening forms. Two reviewers independently screened the titles and abstracts of search results to determine if a citation met the inclusion criteria. Full texts of all included citations were reviewed independently, and in duplicate. All conflicts were resolved through discussion, consensus or by a third researcher, as required.

Data abstraction and management

One reviewer summarized the findings from included study reports, and a second researcher reviewed the summaries for accuracy and completeness. Discrepancies between the two reviewers were resolved by discussion and consensus. Data management was performed using Microsoft Excel™ 2010 (Excel version 14, Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA, USA).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Assessment of methodological quality and potential risk of bias

Evidence from modelling studies was assessed using the tools proposed by Jaime Caro et al., 2014.[5] Nonrandomized comparative studies were assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale.

Data summary

All data is summarized narratively and in tabular format.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Results

From 4,462 unique citations, we included 43 studies that met our inclusion criteria (Figure 1). In addition to the 31 studies[6-36] previously identified by the Cochrane review,[3] in the updated search, we identified 12 new studies[37-48] that met the inclusion criteria; of which five studies were specific to air travel restrictions/ bans[39,40,44,45,48] and seven were general travel restrictions/ bans, including air travel.[37,38,41-43,46,47]

Study designs

We included 35 modelling studies[,6-36,40,42,43,48] of which four studies[40,42,43,48] were identified in the updated search. One of the newly included studies was a nonrandomized comparative study.[38] Neither the Cochrane review[3] nor the updated search identified any additional observational studies.

Quality appraisal

None of the included modelling studies fulfilled all the quality appraisal items; all had moderate to major concerns. Fifty-seven percent of the studies (n = 24) fulfilled (i.e., no to minor concerns) at least 50% of the items. The most concerns were regarding internal validation: “Has the internal validation process been described?”, “Has the model been shown to be internally valid?” and “Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?”. The quality assessments for the included studies are summarized in Table 3 and 4, with individual study assessment for the studies identified in the updated search presented in Appendix 1.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

For the nonrandomized comparative study,[38] the individual quality assessment domains are presented in Table 5. Overall, this study received 6 out of 8 stars, making it of good quality.

Travel restrictions reducing or stopping cross-border travel:

Similar to the Cochrane review,[3] we did not attempt to differentiate between a complete border closure versus travel restrictions (leading to varying degrees of difficulty in crossing borders), and instead report these in a combined intervention category. Studies reported on (1) 'cases avoided due to the measure' (n = 30),[6-10,12-14,16,18-21,23-25,28,29,32-39,41,42,46,47] (2) the shift in epidemic development (n = 19),[8,10,11,14,15,17,18,21,22,26,27,30,31,36,40,42,44,45,48] (3) cases detected due to the measure (n = 3),[43,46,48] and (4) secondary outcomes (n = 1).[19] The newly identified studies add to the body of the evidence, but do not change the conclusions of the Cochrane review;[3] usually positive direction of effect with travel restrictions/ border closures (low to very low-certainty evidence).

1. Cases avoided due to the measure

This outcome is subclassified into:

a. number or proportion of cases in the community
b. number or proportion of imported or exported cases
c. number or proportion of cases seeded by imported cases
d. probability of an imported case not infecting anyone
e. number or proportion of deaths
f. risk of importation or exportation
g. proportion of secondary cases.

a. Number or proportion of cases in the community

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Five new studies[37,38,41,42,47] was identified in the updated search. In total, we included 17 modelling studies,[7,9,10,12,14,16,18,19,21,25,33,35-38,41,42,47] with most (n = 13) reporting fewer new cases (1.8%[10] to 97.8%[18]) with travel restrictions; four studies[25,33,36,37] reported no significant positive effect (very low□certainty evidence).

b. Number or proportion of imported or exported cases

Three new studies[38,39,46] were identified in the updated search. In total, we included 12 modelling studies,[6,8,12-14,20,23,28,32,38,39,46] with most (n = 11) reporting decreased cases (18%[20] to 99%[12] reductions) with travel restrictions; one study[6] reported mixed results (very low□certainty evidence).

c. Number or proportion of cases seeded by imported cases

No studies were identified by the Cochrane review[3] or in the updated search.

d. Probability of an imported case not infecting anyone

No studies were identified by the Cochrane review[3] or in the updated search.

e. Number or proportion of deaths

No new studies were identified in the updated search. The Cochrane review[3] identified three modelling studies[10,14,19] with all reporting decreased deaths (4.3%[10] to 98%[14]) with travel restrictions (very low□certainty evidence).

f. Risk of importation or exportation

No new studies were identified in the updated search. The Cochrane review[3] identified three modelling studies.[24,29,34] Two studies[24,34] reported decreased risk with travel restrictions; however, no direct effect estimates were reported. One study[29] reported mixed results (very

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

low certainty evidence); lessening restrictions led to an increased risk of importation at some airports, but a decreased risk at other airports.

g. Proportion of secondary cases

No studies were identified by the Cochrane review[3] or in the updated search.

2. Shift in epidemic development

This outcome is subclassified into:

a. probability of eliminating the epidemic
b. effective reproduction number
c. time to outbreak
d. risk of an outbreak
e. number or proportion of cases at peak
f. median time to peak
g. epidemic curve peak
h. epidemic growth acceleration
i. exportation growth rate.

a. Probability of eliminating the epidemic

No new studies were identified in the updated search. The Cochrane review[3] identified one modelling study[10] reporting mixed results (very low-certainty evidence).

b. Effective reproduction number (Rt)

One new study[40] was identified in the updated search. In total, we included three modelling studies,[21,30,40] with most (n = 2) reporting benefit with travel restrictions; one study[30] reported mixed results (dependent on the severity of the border closures) (very low-certainty evidence).

The newest-identified study[40] reported a beneficial change under a low reproduction number (Ro) of 1.4. The border control measure would have reduced 90% of the passenger numbers and gained an extra 32.5 days of outbreak arrival time. The effect of border control was weaker under a medium Ro (1.68); nevertheless, it still resulted in 20.0 extra days under the same control level. However, under a high Ro (2.92), only 10 extra days were obtained.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

c. Time to outbreak

Four new studies[18,44,45,48] were identified in the updated search. In total, we included 10 modelling studies,[8,15,17,18,22,26,36,44,45,48] with most reporting benefits (e.g., <1 day[8] to 26 weeks[48]) with travel restrictions; three studies[17,36,44] reported mixed results (very low-certainty evidence).

d. Risk of an outbreak

No new studies were identified in the updated search. The Cochrane review[3] identified two modelling studies[8,11] with one study[8] reporting benefits (1% to 37%) with travel restrictions, while the second study[11] reported mixed results (very low-certainty evidence).

e. Number or proportion of cases at peak

No new studies were identified in the updated search. The Cochrane review[3] identified two modelling studies;[10,17] one study[17] reported benefits with travel restrictions (0.3% to 8% at peak) and the other study[10] reported that an early implementation of border restrictions or a delayed border closure would lead to 79 (95% CI 67 to 97) and 91 (95% CI 77 to 110) daily cases at the epidemic peak, respectively (low-certainty evidence).

f. Median time to peak

One new study[42] was identified in the updated search. This modelling study[42] assessed the time to peak which equalled 31 days from the first death reported in each country, with a comparable mean (31.32 ± 13.94 days) (low-certainty evidence). In the multivariate analysis, border closure day was significantly associated with time to peak deaths (0.297).

g. Epidemic curve peak

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

One new study[14] was identified in the updated search. This modelling study[14] assessed that travel restrictions will delay the epidemic curve about 50 days in time (low-certainty evidence).

h. Epidemic growth acceleration

No new studies were identified in the updated search. The Cochrane review[3] identified one modelling study[31] reporting benefits from travel restrictions (-6.05% change) (low-certainty evidence).

i. Exportation growth rate

No new studies were identified in the updated search. The Cochrane review[3] identified one modelling study[27] reporting benefits from travel restrictions (within China) (low-certainty evidence).

3. Cases detected due to the measure

This outcome is subclassified into:

a. days at risk of transmission
b. number or proportion of cases detected
c. positive predictive value (PPV)
d. probability of releasing an infected individual into the community.

a. Days at risk of transmission

No studies were identified by the Cochrane review[3] or in the updated search.

b. Number or proportion of cases detected

Two new modelling studies[43,48] were identified in the updated search. These studies reported mixed effects in terms of the proportion of cases detected. The first study[43] investigated the effect of international travel restrictions by difference in policy levels between the government and agent in 216 countries. It was found that earlier agent lockdowns (when

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

compared to government lockdown policy) were associated with a more rapid acceleration in cases. In contrast, earlier government closure of the border compared to the agent was not necessarily associated with a slower acceleration of cases. These results indicated that local transmission may have a greater effect on disease burden compared to imported cases.

The second study[48] assessed the effect of border control policies, in combination with internal measures (model with built-in imported risk and [1-tier] contact tracing). The curve remained flattened in G2 countries, provided that there was a sufficient confining domestic control policy (R<1 without the imported cases) and that the imported risk was not increasing over time. In a scenario in which two G2 entities had completely open borders toward each other and no quarantine or screening policies, both entities experienced decreasing numbers of cases, similarly to the use of a closed border policy. Both entities were also able to withstand the risk of importation and maintain a decreasing trend for the number of newly identified cases and hospitalized patients over time if the number of infected people upon arrival was doubled. This conclusion could not be made for a G2 entity that opened its border to a G3 entity. The effort of the G2 entity to contain the COVID-19 outbreak was jeopardized by increasing the number of imported cases from G3. Additional border control policies would be required for travelers from G3 entities. Therefore, individual measures when implemented alone may not be able to avoid another lock down within half a year if vaccines are still not widely deployed. However, the combination of pre-departure screening with test-and-isolate and/or self-quarantine may be sufficient for risk management. Even without any border controls towards multiple G2 and G3 entities (at a constant rate of 1000 imported cases per week), a G2 entity would be able to keep infections under control (albeit at a relatively high level of 14000 new cases per week or 2000 new cases per day).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

c. Positive predictive value (PPV)

No studies were identified by the Cochrane review[3] or in the updated search.

d. Probability of releasing an infected individual into the community

One study was identified in the updated search.[46] This study investigated the effects of a travel ban for non-Hong Kong residents from overseas and testing and quarantine for those permitted to travel. The results indicated that tightening travel measures to 21-day quarantine reduced the risk of releasing infectious travellers to 0 for all examined countries or regions.

4. Secondary outcomes

This outcome is subclassified into:

a. infectious disease transmission outcomes
b. healthcare utilisation
c. resource requirements
d. adverse effects (if identified in studies assessing at least one primary outcome).

a. Infectious disease transmission outcomes

No studies were identified by the Cochrane review[3] or in the updated search.

b. Healthcare utilisation

No new studies were identified in the updated search. The Cochrane review[3] identified one modelling study[19] reporting benefits from travel restrictions on secondary outcomes related to healthcare utilisation. They showed that border closures alone, while beneficial, can not prevent hospitals from eventually reaching their capacity.

c. Resource requirements

No studies were identified by the Cochrane review[3] or in the updated search.

d. Adverse effects (if identified in studies assessing at least one primary outcome)

No studies were identified by the Cochrane review[3] or in the updated search.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Conclusions

In addition to the 31 studies identified by the Cochrane review, we identified 12 additional studies, mostly modelling studies (e.g., simulated border closures), that compared the effectiveness of limiting travel as a measure to reduce the spread of COVID-19. The added studies did not change the main conclusions of the Cochrane review nor the quality of the evidence (very low to low certainty). However, it did add to the evidence base for most outcomes and provided evidence for 'reproduction number' and 'number or proportion of cases detected' that were not available in the Cochrane review[3]. Due to the nature of GRADEing the certainty of the evidence, it is unlikely that more studies will change the quality of the evidence.

In conclusion, weak evidence supports the use of border closures to limit the spread of COVID-19 from region to regions. Real-world studies are required to support these conclusions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram.



Table 1. Study characteristics of studies identified in the updated search.

	Gankin 2021	Gwee 2021	Han 2021	Hossain 2020	Ip 2021
Study design:	Modelling study	Comparative study	Modelling study	Modelling study	Mathematical modeling study
Description:	Epidemiological study analyzing the characteristics of the first months of the epidemic in Ukraine using agent-based modelling and phylodynamics.	Comparative analysis was conducted on Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong and South Korea's COVID-19 response. Data on COVID-19 cases, travel-related and community interventions, socio-economic profile were consolidated. Trends on imported and local cases were analyzed using computations of moving averages, rate of change, particularly in response to distinct waves of travel-related interventions due to the outbreak in China, South Korea, Iran & Italy, and Europe.	This modeling study included flight routes between 48 origins, including Hong Kong, Macau, and Taiwan in China and 45 foreign countries, and 44 destination cities in China with international airports. The daily number of international flights for each origin-destination pair were aggregated. A destination- and time-specific abroad infection index was constructed, and a counterfactual analysis was performed.	SIR meta-population model with a mobility matrix (contact mixing at the population level). The SIR model was embedded with analytical expressions that could stratify the imported cases and the secondary cases produced by the imported cases along with other infected individuals with border control and quarantine measures.	This modeling study assessed policies introduced by the Australian government using a generalised space-time autoregressive model which incorporated multiple exogenous variables and delay effects.
Travel□related control measure(s):	Border closure	Border closure, quarantine	Mandatory testing at customs, centralized quarantine, and a ban on the entry of foreigners and the "five one" international flight restrictions	Border control and quarantine measures	International border restrictions
Country implementing measure(s):	Ukraine	Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong, South Korea	China	Wuhan, China	Australia
Outcome(s):	Time to outbreak, Number or proportion of cases in the community	Proportion of imported cases, number or proportion of cases in the community	Abroad infection index	Outbreak arrival time	Number of cases
Follow□up:	Mar 12 to Aug 1, 2020	Mar to Apr 5, 2020	Mar 18 to Apr 2, 2020	14 days	A "few days" after policy implementation
Funding:	Non-industry	Non-industry	Non-industry	Non-industry	Non-industry funding
COI	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Jablonska 2021	Kwak 2021	Sun 2021	Yang 2021	Yang 2021
Study design:	Modelling study	Modelling study	Mathematical modeling study	Modeling study	Modeling study
Description:	Univariate and multivariate generalised linear models using different selection algorithms (forward, backward, stepwise, and genetic algorithm)	Deep reinforcement learning along with dueling Double Deep Q-Network algorithm were used	Network based SEIR model, inspired by the Global Epidemic and Mobility Model, was used to analyze flight data for 2020-2021 to determine whether existing flight bans were effective against newly emerged variants of concern.	A Bayesian framework was used to model disease progress of COVID-19 and the effectiveness of travel measures using data on passengers arriving in Hong Kong and laboratory-confirmed imported cases.	Data from 165 countries was analyzed to determine the effectiveness of international travel controls in delaying epidemic peaks.
Travel□related control measure(s):	Travel restrictions reducing or stopping cross-border travel	International travel restrictions by difference in policy levels between the government and agent	Flight bans	Travel bans for non-Hong Kong residents from overseas. Testing and quarantine for those permitted to travel.	Closing borders, screening of inbound travelers, quarantine
Country implementing measure(s):	34 countries in Europe	216 countries	China, India, USA, Pakistan, Indonesia, Brazil, Mexico, France, UK, Italy, Germany, Japan, Russia, Nigeria, Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Philippines, Egypt, Vietnam, Congo, Turkey, Thailand, Iran, South Africa, Tanzania	Hong Kong	165 countries
Outcome(s):	Time to outbreak, number of deaths at peak	Proportion of cases detected	Delay in arrival time of COVID-19 variant	Imported cases, percentage of infectious travellers mixing with the community, risk of releasing infectious travelers	Time to outbreak
Follow□up:	Not reported	Jan 2020 to Nov 2020	2020-2021	April 1 to July 31, 2020	Time from January 1, 2020, to the first epidemic peak (which was identified from the modal daily case counts within any 53-day sliding window)
Funding:	Not funded	Not funded	Non-industry funding	Non-industry funding	Non-industry funding
COI	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	Industry consultant	Industry consultant

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Yu 2021	Zhu 2021
Study design:	Modeling study	Modelling study
Description:	This study reconstructed COVID-19 transmission from historical data and simulated the effects of three different border-reopening policies.	SUIHR model with the following features: 1) explicit modeling of the importation of infected individuals from one entity to another, to facilitate the assessment of the effect of border control policies; 2) model focused on the undetected spreading of virus from mainly presymptomatic or asymptomatic people (The Infectious state in the SIR models were deliberately split into unidentified Infectious and Identified Infectious states, to account for the characteristics of a reopening phase compared to the initial outbreak control phase); 3) contact tracing was built into the model (during a reopening phase, "trace & isolate" was preferred over lockdowns as it is less disturbing to daily life and hence more sustainable); and 4) constraints such as new case targets and medical resources were incorporated into the model framework as part of the policy optimization process. Solutions to the model were obtained via linear programming.
Travel□related control measure(s):	Daily quota for inbound travelers, contact tracing	Border control policies, in combination with internal measures (model with built-in imported risk and (1-tier) contact tracing)
Country implementing measure(s):	Hong Kong	G1 to G3 countries
Outcome(s):	Cumulative cases during first 60 days	Delay of outbreak, weekly new identified cases
Follow□up:	60 days	Not reported
Funding:	Non-industry funding	Not reported
COI	No COIs reported	No COIs reported

COI: Conflicts of interest; SIR: Susceptible, Infected, and Recovered

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Study characteristics of studies identified in the original Cochrane review.

	Adekunle 2020	Anderson 2021	Anzai 2020	Banholzer 2021	Binny 2021
Study design:	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study
Description:	Stochastic meta-population SEIR model * Global stochastic meta-population SEIR model with two infectious stages (both symptomatic, one with lower infectiousness) using migration patterns based on international flight travel volumes to estimate the impact of a travel ban.	Extended Bayesian SEIR model * Complex Bayesian SEIR model with a compartment for quarantine and two exposed stages (non-infectious and infectious). Includes modelling of a fixed proportion of the population participating in social distancing behaviour and is estimated separately for each jurisdiction.	Counterfactual projection model based on Poisson process * The model assumes a Poisson process determining exported cases to destination countries from China and the probability of a major epidemic in destination countries based on a negative binomial distribution of generated secondary cases. This counterfactual projection is compared to observed exported cases. Model allows for untraced cases and imperfect contact tracing.	Bayesian hierarchical model * The number of new cases (modeled based on a negative binomial distribution) is linked to the number of existing cases, country and time parameters and the presence of any NPIs (assumed to have the same effectiveness in each country). The model then, under a counterfactual scenario, estimates the relative reduction in new cases.	Continuous□time stochastic branching process model of COVID□19 transmission and control developed for New Zealand * Initial seed cases represent overseas arrivals replicating real case data. * At each time step (day) individuals produce a Poisson distributed number of secondary infections with the mean corresponding to an equation of transmission parameters. * Transmission parameters are based on theoretical and empirical distributions. * Interventions are modeled based on change in transmission parameters. * Several alternative timing scenarios and components of New Zealand's strategy are compared.
Travel□related control measure(s):	Border closure • Wuhan lockdown and travel ban on China • Travel bans on Iran, South Korea and Italy • Date of implementation: different travel bans implemented progressively since Jan 24, 2020	Border closure • Relaxation of the closure of national borders • Date of implementation: not specified	Multiple measures • Complete border closure • Travel restrictions • Quarantine of travellers • Entry screening for all incoming travellers Date of implementation: Jan 23 2020	Border closure • Closure of national borders for individuals Date of implementation: varied in 12 countries implementing the measure	Border closure and quarantine of travellers • Applied to all except returning citizens and residence • Mandatory home quarantine of all international arrivals for 14 days Date of implementation:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Adekunle 2020	Anderson 2021	Anzai 2020	Banholzer 2021	Binny 2021
					11 □ 15 March 2020
Country implementing measure(s):	Australia	California, Sweden, Ontario, Washington, UK, Quebec, British Columbia, New York, Germany, Belgium, NZ, Japan	Japan	Austria, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Finland, Italy, Norway, Switzerland, Spain, US	New Zealand
Outcome(s):	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: number of imported cases avoided	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: number of additional cases introduced when one infected traveller enters • Follow-up: 6 weeks after relaxation	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome 1: number of exported out cases from China * Follow-up: 28 Jan – 6 Feb 2020 Shift in epidemic development • Outcome 2: absolute risk reduction in the probability of major epidemic * Follow-up: 28 Jan – 6 Feb 2020	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: relative reduction in number of new cases	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome 1: maximum number of daily new reported cases • Outcome 2: cumulative number of cases * Follow□up: 10 March □ 12 May 2020 Shift in epidemic development • Outcome 3: number of daily cases at peak • Outcome 4: probability of eliminating epidemic * Follow□up: 10 March □ 12 May 2020
Follow□up:	1 Dec - 24 Mar, 2020	6 weeks after relaxation	28 Jan 28 – 6 Feb 2020	Through 15 Apr 2020	10 Mar □ 12 May 2020
Funding:	Not reported	Not reported	Non-industry	Non-industry	Not reported
COI	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported

	Boldog 2020	Chen 2020	Chinazzi 2020	Costantino 2020	Davis 2020
Study design:	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study
Description:	Time-dependant SEIR model as input for global transportation network model and Galton-Watson branching process in destination. * A time-dependent SEIR model is used to model transmission dynamics and estimate the cumulative number of cases, which is then used	Modified deterministic SEIR model	Individual-based, stochastic, and spatial meta-population epidemic model *The global epidemic and mobility model (GLEAM) uses a meta-population network approach which divides the real-world population in subpopulations centered around transportation	Description: Poisson process and age-specific, deterministic extended SEIR model * The model assumes a Poisson process to estimate the possible true epidemic curve in China and then calculates the number of infected entering the country. An age-specific deterministic	Description: established individual-based, stochastic, and spatial epidemic model: Global Epidemic and Mobility Model (GLEAM) * Global population is divided into 3200 sub-populations in 200 countries/territories. * Transmission dynamics

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Boldog 2020	Chen 2020	Chinazzi 2020	Costantino 2020	Davis 2020
	as an input parameter for a global transportation network model which generates probability distributions of the number of exported cases at each destination. Finally, a Galton-Watson branching process in each destination country estimates the probability of a major outbreak. * Gamma distributed incubation and infectious period based on SARS-study.		hubs. Ground and air travel mobility flows are estimated from real-world data and transmission dynamics are estimated in each subpopulation using a SEIR model. Model assumes the detection of imported cases to not be lower than 40% and travel probabilities, susceptibility and contact patterns to be homogenous.	compartmental (susceptible (S), latent traced (Et), latent untraced (Eu), infectious (I), isolated (Q), recovered (R) and dead (D)) is then used to estimate transmission dynamics due to imported cases. The proportion of asymptomatic infections is assumed to be 34.6% and notified cases reflect only 10% of real infections per day.	in subpopulation assume a SLIR model. * Individuals transition between compartments through stochastic chain binomial processes.
Travel□related control measure(s):	International travel restrictions and entry screening Date of implementation: Not reported	Quarantine of travellers and entry restrictions • Quarantine of travellers crossing national borders • Entry restrictions at national borders for different intensity of restriction * Target group: all inbound passengers and symptomatic travellers only Date of implementation: 13 Mar 2020: new visitors from Italy, France, Germany and Spain were not allowed entry into Singapore; 23 Mar 2020: all short-term visitors were prohibited from entering or transition through Singapore	International travel restrictions • International travel restrictions on China, including suspension and limitation of flights to and from China Date of implementation: Wuhan travel ban implemented on 23 Jan 2020; China travel restrictions implemented on 1 Feb 2020.	International travel restrictions/bans • No travel ban; complete travel ban followed by complete lifting of the ban; complete travel ban followed by partial lifting of the ban (allowing university students, but not tourists, to enter the country) Date of implementation: 1 Feb 2020	International travel restrictions Date of implementation: 2 Feb 2020
Country implementing measure(s):	USA, Canada, Thailand, and South Korea	China, Singapore	Not reported	Australia	USA
Outcome(s):	Shift in epidemic	Cases avoided due to the	Cases avoided due to the	Cases avoided due to the	Shift in epidemic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Boldog 2020	Chen 2020	Chinazzi 2020	Costantino 2020	Davis 2020
	development • Outcome: risk of major outbreak	measure • Outcome 1: number of cases in community • Outcome 2: number of imported cases	measure • Outcome: number of imported cases	measure • Outcome 1: number of exported cases from China • Outcome 2: number of cases in Australia • Outcome 3: number of deaths in Australia * Follow-up: 400 days Shift in epidemic development • Outcome 4: delay of the epidemic outbreak	development_ • Outcome: time to onset of local transmission (defined as 100 new infections per day)
Follow□up:	Not reported	21 May 2020	1 Jan – 1 Mar 2020	400 days	5 Jan - 5 Mar 2020
Funding:	Non-industry	None	Industry and non-industry funding	No funding	Industry and non-industry funding
COI	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported

	Deeb 2020	Grannell 2020	Kang 2020	Kwok 2021	Liebig 2021
Study design:	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study
Description:	Description: SEIR model of situation in Lebanon adapted to account for incoming travellers * Time-varying R(t) represents local social distancing measures in place in Lebanon * Various rates of increased incoming travellers used to predict effect of relaxation of travel restriction	Description: two region SEIR model for the Island of Ireland * Standard four compartments are used (susceptible, exposed, infected, and recovered) * Model accounts for interaction between the border regions of Ireland and Northern Ireland	Description: synthetic control design * Uses outcome data and key confounders from the intervention countries with travel bans and from non-intervention countries to construct a 'synthetic' country as counterfactual * 39 countries were part of the non-intervention donor pool	SEIR Model with different localized patches with travel in-between * Covers Hong-Kong dynamics with travel from China * No specific changes in dynamical equations * Temperature dependent R0 controls dynamics	Unspecified * Expected number of arrivals into Australia assuming no travel restrictions were implemented are predicted by fitting a seasonal autoregressive integrated moving average model on data between Jan 2015 and Dec 2019 * Ascertainment rates are estimated by fitting a Binomial distribution to the number of infected individuals among the arrivals into Australia * The expected number of importations into Australia is calculated based on the length of overseas stay of a traveller and the daily incidence rates of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Deeb 2020	Grannell 2020	Kang 2020	Kwok 2021	Liebig 2021
					COVID-19 in the country
Travel□related control measure(s):	International travel restriction • Airport closure Date of implementation: Not reported	Border closure • Closing of border from the first day of the epidemic for international travelers Date of implementation: first day of the epidemic	Border closure Date of implementation: Australia: 1 Feb 2020; Singapore: 2 Feb 2020; US: 2 Feb 2020; Vietnam: 3 Feb 2020; Taiwan: 7 Feb 2020; Hong Kong: 8 Feb 2020	Border closure • Reduction in number of daily travellers from 200,000 to 0 Date of implementation: 8 Feb 2020	Border closure and its relaxation Date of implementation: 1 Feb - 20 Mar 2020: different levels of travel ban; Oct 2020: relaxation.
Country implementing measure(s):	Lebanon	Ireland and Northern Ireland	Australia, Singapore, US, Vietnam, Taiwan, Hong Kong	Hong Kong, China	Australia
Outcome(s):	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: cumulative number of cases	Shift in epidemic development due to the measure • Outcome 1: days to epidemic peak • Outcome 2: Proportion of population infected at peak	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: cumulative number of cases	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome 1: Cumulative number of cases • Outcome 2: number of deaths	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: proportion of imported cases
Follow□up:	130 days	Not reported	Until 29 Feb 2020	8 Feb - 14, Jun 2020	
Funding:	Not reported	Not reported	None	No funding	Non-industry funding
COI	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported

	Linka 2020a	Linka 2020b	McLure 2021	Nakamura 2020	Nowrasteh 2020
Study design:	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study
Description:	Description: SEIR model combined with mobility network model * Per country discretized SEIR model based on a network graph representation of Europe to integrate travel and transmission dynamics and estimate daily increments in each compartment in each country using mobility coefficients.	SEIR model combined with mobility network model * Discretised SEIR model based on a network graph representation of North America to integrate travel and transmission dynamics and estimate daily increments in each compartment in Newfoundland and Labrador	modified version of the model proposed by Costantino_2020.Poisson process and age specific, deterministic extended SEIR model * An age-specific deterministic compartmental (susceptible (S), latent traced (Et), latent untraced (Eu), infectious (I), isolated (Q), recovered (R) and dead (D)) is used to estimate transmission	unspecified * Calculation of risk of importation and exportation of COVID-19 between 1491 airports based on a passenger flow matrix proposed by Huang et al. (2010, Plos One), data on confirmed COVID-19 cases until Mar 14 2020, provided by World Pop and a risk flow calculation proposed by Gilbert et al. (2020, The Lancet)	synthetic control design * Uses outcome data and key confounders from the USA and from countries without a ban on travel from China to construct a 'synthetic' country as counterfactual * 13 countries were part of the non-intervention donor pool

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Linka 2020a	Linka 2020b	McLure 2021	Nakamura 2020	Nowrasteh 2020
			dynamics due to imported cases. * The proportion of asymptomatic infections is assumed to be 34.6% and notified cases reflect only 10% of real infections per day. * Modification: Excluded cases from Hubei after the severe lockdown of Hubei starting on 23 Jan as this lockdown made it very unlikely that citizens from Hubei travelled to Australia		
Travel□related control measure(s):	Border closure Date of implementation: 17 Mar 2020	Border closure Date of implementation: 1 Jul 2020	International travel restrictions/bans • No travel ban; complete travel ban followed by complete lifting of the ban; complete travel ban followed by partial lifting of the ban (allowing university students, but not tourists, to enter the country) Date of implementation: 1 Feb 2020	International travel restrictions • Reductions of air travel by 90% (for the airports in the 1st quartile area with regard to cumulative COVID-19 incidence in airport area), 60% (for the airports in the 2nd quartile) and 30% (for the airports in the 3rd quartile)	Border closure • Banning the entry of all aliens who were physically present in China during the 14-day period preceding their entry or attempted entry into the US, with some exceptions for U.S. lawful permanent residents and those closely related to American citizens Date of implementation: 2 Feb 2020
Country implementing measure(s):	27 countries of the EU	Canada, Newfoundland/ Labrador	Australia	Not reported	USA
Outcome(s):	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome 1: proportion of infectious individuals in the population Shift in epidemic development • Outcome 2: time from introduction of travel restriction until inflection	Shift in epidemic development • Outcome: days to infection of 0.1 percent population	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: number of imported cases	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: risk of importation and exportation	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome 1: cumulative number of cases • Outcome 2: cumulative cases per million • Outcome 3: number of new cases • Outcome 4: number of new cases per million

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Linka 2020a	Linka 2020b	McLure 2021	Nakamura 2020	Nowrasteh 2020
	point in R(t)				
Follow□up:	23 Mar - 20 Apr 2020 (outcome 1) R(t) tracked from intro-duction of specific travel measure until inflection point (outcome 2)	150 days	26 Jan - 4 Apr 2020	Not reported	22 Jan - 9 Mar 2020
Funding:	Non-industry funding	Non-industry funding	Non-industry funding	No funding	Not reported
COI	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported

	Odendaal 2020	Pinotti 2020	Russell 2021	Shi 2020	Sruthi 2020
Study design:	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study
Description:	• Description: unspecified * Data-driven approach. The model uses observed data to fit an exponential curve and project the cumulative number of infected into the future. Asymptomatic infections are assumed to become contagious some time after the moment of infection from exposure and the average person who has been infected will show symptoms after the average incubation period.	• Description: mathematical model using empirical distributions of transmission parameters * Gamma distribution is fitted to model detection delay as a function of the day the case arrived at destination * Case arrival accounts for detected and undetected cases. The expected number of imported cases follows a Poisson distribution with an exponential growth parameter which varies with the location of origin and with containment measures in place in the location of origin * Index case detection model: multinomial model in which the number of observed clusters with imported index cases, the number of known imported cases causing no onward transmission is	• Description: comparison of total incidence and imported cases * Imported cases via international air travel considered * Prevalences were adjusted for country-specific under-ascertainment	• Description: survival Time analysis of time until county detects first case * Country-specific, time-constant hazard function * Spread by air travel from Wuhan, characterized by concept of effective distance	• Description: data -driven AI-approach * Counts of reported cases in Swiss cantons used to estimate weekly infection rates * Effect of different contributions of non-pharmaceutical interventions on reproduction number

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Odendaal 2020	Pinotti 2020	Russell 2021	Shi 2020	Sruthi 2020
		compared to the number of clusters for which no index case was identified to estimate the number of undetected imported cases causing no onward transmission (latent variable) and the case detection probability			
Travel□related control measure(s):	Border closure Date of implementation: 31 Jan 2020	International travel restrictions • Travel restrictions were modeled by assuming a discontinuity in the growth rate Date of implementation: 23 Jan 2020: Hubei; 29 Jan 2020: rest of China	International travel restrictions, border closure or quarantine of travellers • Defined as any measure that completely or almost completely prevents international arrivals from contributing to local transmission, such as entry bans and compulsory 14-day facility-based quarantines Date of implementation: Not reported	Border closure and international travel restrictions • Defined as_ entry or exit travel bans for travellers to/from China, visa restrictions as total or partial suspensions for travellers from China; _ flight suspensions as governmental bans to or from China. Travel restrictions reduced 25%, 50%, and 75% of flights from China to countries in which restrictions were in place. Date of implementation: varied across 80 countries	Border closure • Full restriction of travel in and out; partial relaxation - land-border to Schengen countries opened Date of implementation: full restrictions: Mar 2020; partial relaxation: middle of Jun 2020
Country implementing measure(s):	USA	Not reported	Multiple countries (142)	Multiple countries (80)	Switzerland
Outcome(s):	Shift in epidemic development • Outcome: delay of community transmission	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: exportation growth rate	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: proportion of imported cases in overall cases	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: risk of case importation	Shift in epidemic development • Outcome: time varying reproduction rate
Follow□up:	3 months	5 Jan - 27 Feb 2020	May 2020	8 Dec 2019 - 26 Feb 2020	9 Mar - 13 Sep 2020
Funding:	Not reported	Non-industry funding	Non-industry funding	Not reported	Not reported
COI	Not reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported

	Utsunomiya 2020	Wells 2020	Yang 2020	Zhang C 2020	Zhang L 2020
Study design:	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study	Modelling study

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Utsunomiya 2020	Wells 2020	Yang 2020	Zhang C 2020	Zhang L 2020
Description:	• Description: moving Regression (MR) and Hidden Markov Model (HMM) * Data-driven approach. Framework for the real-time decomposition of infection growth curves into growth rate and acceleration and classification of stages (“lagging”, “exponential”, “deceleration”, “stationary”) which can be used to track intervention effects over time. Assumes that changes in cases per day are solely attributable to intervention.	• Description: custom model based on Maximum Likelihood Methods * Daily probability that an infected person travels abroad is fitted to observed data and the distribution of incubation period is used to predict importation to other countries weighted by international flight data. Time to the first transmission event was then estimated using the distribution of the serial interval and the incubation period.	• Description: SEIR Model describing the case data internationally as one global system • Includes mobility data, social distancing, case isolation * Stochastic approach with time dependent parameters	Description: linear model incorporating effect of travel restrictions * Travel between 22 countries * Also considers internal movement restrictions	• Description: index for case importation risk on international flights is established
Travel□related control measure(s):	International travel restrictions • International travel restrictions as defined by the Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker (Ox-CGRT) Date of implementation: Not reported	Border closure • Lockdown of Wuhan and 15 other cities in Hubei Date of implementation: 23 Jan 2020: Wuhan; 24 Jan 2020: other cities in China	Border closure • Shutdown in Wuhan; complete international travel ban was executed from different time points Date of implementation: Jan - Oct 2020 with various simulations using different start dates	Border closure and international travel restrictions • International travel restriction and entry ban to reduce human mobility between countries (varying in the 22 countries) Date of implementation: 22 Jan - 24 Apr 2020	International travel restrictions • All inbound international flights were cancelled Date of implementation: 29 Mar 2020
Country implementing measure(s):	Multiple countries (62)	All countries other than China	Hubei, China, US, Switzerland, Sweden, Austria, France, UK, Germany, Spain, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark	USA, Spain, Italy, France, Germany, UK, Turkey, Iran, China, Russia, Brazil, Belgium, Canada, Netherlands, Switzerland, India, Portugal, Ecuador, Japan, South Korea, Australia, South Africa	China
Outcome(s):	Shift in epidemic development • Outcome: average	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome 1: number of	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: number of	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: daily new	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome: imported case

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Utsunomiya 2020	Wells 2020	Yang 2020	Zhang C 2020	Zhang L 2020
	change in epidemic growth acceleration after intervention implementation	exported cases from China * Follow-up: 6 Dec 2019 - 15 Feb 2020 Cases detected due to the measure • Outcome 2: number of cases exported from China detected by airport screening	daily cases	cases	risk index
Follow□up:	Not reported	6 Dec 2019 - 15 Feb 2020	Jan - Oct 2020	22 Jan - 24 Apr 2020	4 Mar - 16 Apr 2020
Funding:	Not funded	Not reported	Non-industry funding	Not reported	Non-industry funding
COI	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported	No COIs reported

	Zhong 2020
Study design:	Modelling study
Description:	
Travel□related control measure(s):	Border closure and international travel restrictions • Radical travel restrictions of different levels (i.e., entry ban, global travel ban, and lockdown) Date of implementation: 21 Jan_ - 04 Apr 2020
Country implementing measure(s):	249 geographic areas
Outcome(s):	Cases avoided due to the measure • Outcome 1: number of cumulative cases in community • Outcome 2: days to epidemic arrival
Follow□up:	21 Jan - 4 Apr 2020
Funding:	Non-industry funding
COI	No COIs reported

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 3. Outcomes of studies identified in the updated search.

	Outcome	Overview of effect	Comparison used	Effect direction
Gankin 2021	Number or proportion of cases in the community	A travel ban was established on Mar 16, 2020, for foreign citizens and on Mar 17, 2020, for all travelers with the exception of Ukrainian citizens returning from abroad. Three out of seven lineages were most likely introduced into the country after the travel ban date, as indicated by their introduction confidence intervals. Similarly, a single lineage was likely imported before that date; for three remaining lineages the travel ban date falls into their confidence intervals, preventing a decisive conclusion, even though the date lies closer to the left ends of all intervals. Thus, the results support the hypothesis that the travel restrictions had a limited effect on virus importation control.	Measure versus no measure	No change/mixed effects/conflicting findings (◀▶)
Gwee 2021	Number or proportion of cases in the community	No consistent trend was observed in the rate of change of local cases following each wave of intervention against the emergence of local epidemics. A decreasing rate of change could only be observed in our analysis of 14 days after the final wave of interventions. No discernable correlation was observed between imported and local cases in all four countries following each wave of intervention, thus indicating the lack of any delay in rate of change of local cases because of travel bans.	Measure versus no measure	No change/mixed effects/conflicting findings (◀▶)
	Proportion of imported cases	The rate of change of imported cases fell by 1.08–1.43 in Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong and South Korea following the first wave of travel restrictions on departures from China, and by 0.22–0.52 in all countries except South Korea in the fifth wave against all international travellers. A fall in rate of imported cases was observed only until mid- Feb. This suggests that preventing importation of cases from epidemic regions through travel restrictions was effective only for a short duration before scattered cases from the epidemic regions streamed in from other regions.	Measure versus no measure	Positive (▲)
Han 2021	Proportion of imported cases	The coefficient of the abroad infection index increased from insignificant to 0.298 (95% CI: 0.120 to 0.459) on Mar 18, 2020, the day on which all new cases in China were imported. The coefficient returned to insignificant on Apr 2, reflecting the implementation of mandatory testing at customs, centralized quarantine, and a ban on the entry of foreigners and the "five one" international flight restrictions.	Measure versus no measure	Positive (▲)
Hossain 2020	Time to outbreak	Under a low reproduction number (Ro) of 1.4, the border control measure reduced 90% of the passenger numbers and gained an extra 32.5 days of outbreak arrival time. The effect of border control was weaker under a medium Ro (1.68); nevertheless, it still resulted in 20.0 extra days under the same control level. However, under a high Ro (2.92), only 10 extra days were obtained. Under a low Ro, if individuals were quarantined immediately (1 day after the person became infectious), the gain time increased up to 44.0 days. Under a medium Ro (1.68), the quarantine effect was approximately half that of the low Ro scenario (24.1 days) using the same time to quarantine. However, under a high Ro (2.92), the effect of quarantine was much lower, with a gain of only 10.0 days.	Measure versus no measure	Positive (▲)
Ip 2021	Number or proportion of cases in the community	International border control reduced the number of cases by 0.15 standard deviations of the transformed variable. Border restrictions are helpful in reducing the number of new cases a few days after implementation.	Measure versus no measure	Positive (▲)
Jablonska 2021	Number or proportion of cases in the community	Mean 490.54 ± 1116.56; Median 83.39 (IQR 21.53, 245.88) (per 1 million inhabitants)	Measure versus no measure	Positive (▲)
	Time to outbreak	The median time to the peak equaled 31 days from the first death reported in each country, with a comparable mean (31.32, standard deviation =13.94). In the multivariate analysis, border closure day was significantly associated with time to peak deaths (0.297, P = 0.008) (in addition to all-bed capacity per 1 million inhabitants, population size in	Measure versus no measure	Positive (▲)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Outcome	Overview of effect	Comparison used	Effect direction
		millions, and number of foreign tourists per inhabitant).		
Kwak 2021	Proportion of cases detected	Earlier agent lockdowns when compared to government lockdown policy was related to a more rapid acceleration in cases. In contrast, earlier government closure of border compared to agent was not necessarily associated with slower acceleration of cases. This may reflect local transmission having greater influence on burden of disease when compared to imported cases.	More versus less stringent measure	No change/mixed effects/conflicting findings (◀▶)
Sun 2021	Time to outbreak	Assessment of the flight reduction factor f, ranging from 0.00 (not cutting any flights) to 0.99 (cutting all flights by 99%) showed that the influence of f was rather small for a wide range of values. A significant increase in the progation time was only observed when f reached values close to 0.9. For example, the propagation time was approximately doubled with f = 0.95. This assumed that all international air transport worldwide would be reduced by 95%. Therefore, partial flight reductions were only able to postpone epidemic spread, and only for a short period of time. Based on this model, the predicted international arrival time window of a new variant in a country is less than 1 month.	More versus less stringent measure	No change/mixed effects/conflicting findings (◀▶)
Yang 2021	Proportion of imported cases	The total number of estimated imported cases from these eight counties or regions was 7 (95% CrI, 3-14) under the Q14/T12 control strategy (i.e., release after 14-day quarantine with a test-negative on day 12, which was the regimen in force in Hong Kong during the study period), compared with 237 (95% CrI, 184-305) under a "no quarantine strategy", corresponding to 97% (95% CrI, 94- 99%) effectiveness. Testing on-arrival could prevent an average of 40-42% of infectious travellers at the airport from mixing with the community.	Measure versus no measure	Positive (▲)
Yang 2021	Time to outbreak	In countries that had enacted any international travel controls before their first COVID-19 case, the first peak was reached an average of 36 days (95% CI 10–61 days) later than it was in countries that did not enact controls until after their first case was reported (p<0.01). Countries that implemented their strictest international travel controls before detecting any COVID-19 cases reported their first case a median of 57 days (95% CI 14–70 days) later than countries that imposed their strongest controls after the first case was reported (p = 0.04). The average time to detection of the first case occurred 1.22 (95% CI 1.06–1.41) times later in countries that implemented any restrictions than in countries that implemented no travel restrictions. This time ratio was extended to 1.31 (95% CI 1.02–1.68) if countries implemented their strongest travel restrictions. The results of this study indicated that implementing international travel controls earlier delayed the initial epidemic peak by approximately 5 weeks. Although travel restrictions did not prevent the virus from entering most countries, delaying its introduction bought valuable time for local health systems and governments to prepare to respond to local transmission.	Time to outbreak	Positive (▲)
Yu 2021	Number or proportion of cases in the community	With no daily quota for inbound travelers (and no community NPIs or contact tracing), the cumulative cases during the first 60 days (95% CI) were 132,243 (41,353–220,293). With 50% of the historical inflow of inbound travelers (and no community NPIs or contact tracing), the cumulative cases during the first 60 days were 60,598 (18,690–98,721). With a daily quota of 10,000 for inbound travelers (and no community NPIs or contact tracing), the cumulative cases during the first 60 days were 5618 (1063–11,676).	More versus less stringent measure	Positive (▲)
Zhu 2021	Time to outbreak	In G1 countries, even very strict border control measures (mandatory test upon arrival with isolation of positive test cases, and a 14-day home quarantine for everyone else (t=0, B=0.6) (and assuming another lockdown when identified new cases exceed 40,000 per week [~6,000 per day]) were not enough to prevent another outbreak, but only delay it for about 26 weeks (23 weeks without the home quarantine); another lockdown would be required if tighter measures were not introduced.	Measure versus no measure	Positive (▲)
	Proportion of cases detected	In G2 countries, given a sufficient confining domestic control policy (R<1 without the imported cases), the curve was kept flattened, provided that the imported risk was not increasing over time. If infectious free people had the same probability of traveling as healthy people, it was possible for G2 entities to open borders towards G1 and other G2 entities. In these two cases, screening and quarantine were not required to keep virus spreading in check;	Measure versus no measure	No change/mixed effects/conflicting findings (◀▶)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Outcome	Overview of effect	Comparison used	Effect direction
		nevertheless, these measures significantly reduced the number of new cases. In a scenario in which two G2 entities had complete open borders toward each other and no quarantine or screening policies, both entities experienced decreasing numbers of cases, similarly to the use of a closed border policy. Both entities were also able to withstand the risk of importation and maintain a decreasing trend for the number of identified new cases and hospitalized patients over time if the number of infected people upon arrival was doubled. The same conclusion could not be drawn for a G2 entity that opened its border to a G3 entity; the effort of the G2 entity to contain the virus outbreak was jeopardized by increasing the number of imported cases from G3. Therefore, additional border control policies would be required for travelers from G3 entities. Individual measures when implemented alone may not be able to avoid another lock down within half a year if vaccines are still not widely deployed. However, the combination of pre-departure screening with test-and-isolate and/or self-quarantine may be sufficient for risk management. Even without any border controls towards multiple G2 and G3 entities (at a constant rate of 1000 imported cases per week), a G2 entity would be able to keep infections under control (albeit at a relatively high level of 14000 new cases per week or 2000 new cases per day).		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 4. Quality assessment of modelling studies identified in the updated search.

	Questions	Gankin 2021	Han 2021	Hossain 2020	Ip 2021	Jablonska 2021	Kwak 2021
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective, and scope of the model?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	No	No	No	No	No
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Questions	Sun 2021	Yang 2021	Yang 2021	Yu 2021	Zhu 2021
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective, and scope of the model?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	No	No	No	No
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	No	No	No	No
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	No	No	No	No

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 5. Quality assessment of nonrandomized studies identified in the updated search.

	Selection 1	Selection 2	Selection 3	Selection 4	Comparability 1	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Total
Gwee 2021	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	6

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 6. Quality assessment of modelling studies identified in the original Cochrane review.

	Questions	Adekunle 2020	Anderson 2021	Anzai 2020	Banholzer 2021	Binny 2021	Boldog 2020
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective, and scope of the model?	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	No	No	No	No	No
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Questions	Chen 2020	Chinazzi 2020	Costantino 2020	Davis 2020	Deeb 2020	Grannell 2020
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective, and scope of the model?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	No	No	No	No	No
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	No	No	No	No	No

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Questions	Kang 2020	Kwok 2021	Liebig 2021	Linka 2020a	Linka 2020b	McLure 2021
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective, and scope of the model?	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	No	No	No	No	No
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	No	No	No	No	Yes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Questions	Nakamura 2020	Nowrasteh 2020	Odendaal 2020	Pinotti 2020	Russell 2021	Shi 2020
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective, and scope of the model?	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	No	No	No	No	No
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Questions	Sruthi 2020	Utsunomiya 2020	Wells 2020	Yang 2020	Zhang 2021	Zhang 2020
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective, and scope of the model?	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Questions	Zhong 2021
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	No
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective, and scope of the model?	Yes
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	No
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	Yes
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	No
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	Yes
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	Yes
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	No
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. Liu Y, Gayle AA, Wilder-Smith A, Rocklov J. The reproductive number of COVID-19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *J Travel Med.* Mar 2020;27(2).

2. Petrosillo N, Viceconte G, Ergonul O, Ippolito G, Petersen E. COVID-19, SARS and MERS: are they closely related? *Clinical Microbiology and Infection.* 2020;26(6):729-734.

3. Burns J, Movsisyan A, Stratil JM, et al. Travel-related control measures to contain the COVID-19 pandemic: a rapid review. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.* 2020;2020(9).

4. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ.* 2021;372:n71.

5. Jaime Caro J, Eddy DM, Kan H, et al. Questionnaire to assess relevance and credibility of modeling studies for informing health care decision making: an ISPOR-AMCP-NPC Good Practice Task Force report. *Value in health : the journal of the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research.* Mar 2014;17(2):174-182.

6. Adekunle A, Meehan M, Rojas-Alvarez D, Trauer J, McBryde E. Delaying the COVID-19 epidemic in Australia: evaluating the effectiveness of international travel bans. *Australian and New Zealand journal of public health.* Aug 2020;44(4):257-259.

7. Anderson SC, Mulberry N, Edwards AM, et al. How much leeway is there to relax COVID-19 control measures? *Epidemics.* 2021/06/01/ 2021;35:100453.

8. Anzai A, Kobayashi T, Linton NM, et al. Assessing the Impact of Reduced Travel on Exportation Dynamics of Novel Coronavirus Infection (COVID-19). *J Clin Med.* 2020;9(2):601.

9. Banholzer N, van Weenen E, Lison A, et al. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on the number of new infections with COVID-19 during the first epidemic wave. *PLOS ONE.* 2021;16(6):e0252827.

10. Binny RN, Baker MG, Hendy SC, et al. Early intervention is the key to success in COVID-19 control. *Royal Society open science.* Nov 2021;8(11):210488.

11. Boldog P, Tekeli T, Vizi Z, Dénes A, Bartha FA, Röst G. Risk Assessment of Novel Coronavirus COVID-19 Outbreaks Outside China. *Journal of clinical medicine.* Feb 19 2020;9(2).

12. Chen T, Huang S, Li G, et al. Quantitative Effects of Entry Restrictions and Travel Quarantine on the Next Wave of COVID-19: Case Studies of China and Singapore. *SSRN.* 2020.

13. Chinazzi M, Davis JT, Ajelli M, et al. The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. *Science (New York, N.Y.).* Apr 24 2020;368(6489):395-400.

14. Costantino V, Heslop DJ, MacIntyre CR. The effectiveness of full and partial travel bans against COVID-19 spread in Australia for travellers from China during and after the epidemic peak in China. *J Travel Med.* 2020;27(5):taaa081.

15. Davis JT, Chinazzi M, Perra N, et al. Estimating the establishment of local transmission and the cryptic phase of the COVID-19 pandemic in the USA. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.2007.2006.20140285.

16. Deeb OE, Jalloul M. The dynamics of COVID-19 spread: evidence from Lebanon. *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering.* 2020;17(5):5618-5632.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

17. Grannell JJ, Grannell JR. A Two-Region SEIR COVID-19 Epidemic Model for the Island of Ireland. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.2010.2031.20223727.

18. Kang N, Kim B. The Effects of Border Shutdowns on the Spread of COVID-19. *J Prev Med Public Health.* 2020;53(5):293-301.

19. Kwok W-C, Wong C-K, Ma T-F, et al. Modelling the impact of travel restrictions on COVID-19 cases in Hong Kong in early 2020. *BMC Public Health.* 2021/10/18 2021;21(1):1878.

20. Liebig J, Najeebullah K, Jurdak R, Shoghri AE, Paini D. Should international borders re-open? The impact of travel restrictions on COVID-19 importation risk. *BMC Public Health.* 2021;21(1):1573-1573.

21. Linka K, Peirlinck M, Kuhl E. The reproduction number of COVID-19 and its correlation with public health interventions. *Comput Mech.* 2020a:1-16.

22. Linka K, Rahman P, Goriely A, Kuhl E. Is it safe to lift COVID-19 travel bans? The Newfoundland story. *Comput Mech.* 2020b:1-12.

23. McLure A, Lau CL, Furuya-Kanamori L. Has the effectiveness of Australia's travel bans against China on the importation of COVID-19 been overestimated? *J Travel Med.* 2021;28(2):taaa191.

24. Nakamura H, Managi S. Airport risk of importation and exportation of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Transp Policy (Oxf).* 2020;96:40-47.

25. Nowrasteh A, Forrester AC. *How US Travel Restrictions on China Affected the Spread of COVID-19 in the United States.* JSTOR; 2020.

26. Odendaal WG. A Method to Model Outbreaks of New Infectious Diseases with Pandemic Potential such as COVID-19. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.2003.2011.20034512.

27. Pinotti F, Di Domenico L, Ortega E, et al. Tracing and analysis of 288 early SARS-CoV-2 infections outside China: A modeling study. *PLoS Med.* 2020;17(7):e1003193-e1003193.

28. Russell TW, Wu JT, Clifford S, et al. Effect of internationally imported cases on internal spread of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Public Health.* 2021;6(1):e12-e20.

29. Shi S, Tanaka S, Ueno R, et al. Travel restrictions and SARS-CoV-2 transmission: an effective distance approach to estimate impact. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2020;98(8):518-529.

30. Sruthi CK, Biswal MR, Saraswat B, Joshi H, Prakash MK. How Policies on Restaurants, Bars, Nightclubs, Masks, Schools, and Travel Influenced Swiss COVID-19 Reproduction Ratios. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.2010.2011.20210641.

31. Utsunomiya YT, Utsunomiya ATH, Torrecilha RBP, Paulan SdC, Milanesi M, Garcia JF. Growth Rate and Acceleration Analysis of the COVID-19 Pandemic Reveals the Effect of Public Health Measures in Real Time. *Front Med (Lausanne).* 2020;7:247-247.

32. Wells CR, Sah P, Moghadas SM, et al. Impact of international travel and border control measures on the global spread of the novel 2019 coronavirus outbreak. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2020;117(13):7504-7509.

33. Yang T, Liu Y, Deng W, Zhao W, Deng J. SARS-Cov-2 trajectory predictions and scenario simulations from a global perspective: a modelling study. *Scientific reports.* 2020;10(1):18319-18319.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

34. Zhang L, Yang H, Wang K, Zhan Y, Bian L. Measuring imported case risk of COVID-19 from inbound international flights --- A case study on China. *J Air Transp Manag.* 2020;89:101918-101918.

35. Zhang C, Qian L-X, Hu J-Q. COVID-19 Pandemic with Human Mobility Across Countries. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of China.* 2021/06/01 2021;9(2):229-244.

36. Zhong L, Diagne M, Wang W, Gao J. Country distancing increase reveals the effectiveness of travel restrictions in stopping COVID-19 transmission. *Communications Physics.* 2021/06/04 2021;4(1):121.

37. Gankin Y, Nemira A, Koniukhovskii V, et al. Investigating the first stage of the COVID-19 pandemic in Ukraine using epidemiological and genomic data. *Infection, genetics and evolution : journal of molecular epidemiology and evolutionary genetics in infectious diseases.* Nov 2021;95:105087.

38. Gwee SXW, Chua PEY, Wang MX, Pang J. Impact of travel ban implementation on COVID-19 spread in Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong and South Korea during the early phase of the pandemic: a comparative study. *BMC infectious diseases.* Aug 11 2021;21(1):799.

39. Han X, Xu Y, Fan L, Huang Y, Xu M, Gao S. Quantifying COVID-19 importation risk in a dynamic network of domestic cities and international countries. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* Aug 3 2021;118(31).

40. Hossain MP, Junus A, Zhu X, et al. The effects of border control and quarantine measures on the spread of COVID-19. *Epidemics.* 2020;32:100397.

41. Ip RHL, Demskoi D, Rahman A, Zheng L. Evaluation of COVID-19 Mitigation Policies in Australia Using Generalised Space-Time Autoregressive Intervention Models. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* Jul 13 2021;18(14).

42. Jabłońska K, Aballéa S, Toumi M. Factors influencing the COVID-19 daily deaths peak across European countries. *medRxiv.* 2021:2020.2011.2004.20225656.

43. Kwak GH, Ling L, Hui P. Deep reinforcement learning approaches for global public health strategies for COVID-19 pandemic. *PloS one.* 2021;16(5):e0251550.

44. Sun X, Wandelt S, Zhang A. Delayed reaction towards emerging COVID-19 variants of concern: Does history repeat itself? *Transportation research. Part A, Policy and practice.* Oct 2021;152:203-215.

45. Yang B, Sullivan SG, Du Z, Tsang TK, Cowling BJ. Effectiveness of International Travel Controls for Delaying Local Outbreaks of COVID-19. *Emerging infectious diseases.* Oct 13 2021;28(1).

46. Yang B, Tsang TK, Wong JY, et al. The differential importation risks of COVID-19 from inbound travellers and the feasibility of targeted travel controls: A case study in Hong Kong. *The Lancet regional health. Western Pacific.* Aug 2021;13:100184.

47. Yu Z, Zhu X, Liu X, et al. Reopening International Borders without Quarantine: Contact Tracing Integrated Policy against COVID-19. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* Jul 14 2021;18(14).

48. Zhu Z, Weber E, Strohsal T, Serhan D. Sustainable border control policy in the COVID-19 pandemic: A math modeling study. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* 2021;41:102044.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Appendix 1. Details for quality assessment decisions.

1. Gankin, Infect Genet Evol, 2021

	Questions	Decision	Reason
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Stochastic model.
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective and scope of the model?	Yes	No to minor concerns.
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Input parameters were justified.
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Input parameters were probably reasonable.
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	Yes	No to minor concerns.
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	Yes	No to minor concerns. The reported and model-produced data from April 22, 2020, to July 12, 2020 were used for model calibration, and from July 13, 2020 to August 1, 2020 – for model validation. The data before April 22, 2020, were used solely for the initial conditions to increase the model fit robustness, since the initial number of cases was relatively small in comparison to subsequent periods. The August 1, 2020, has been selected as the end date of our simulations to agree with the dates of genomic analysis based on available analyzed SARS-CoV-2 sequences collection times.
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	Moderate concerns
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	Yes	No to minor concerns.
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	Moderate concerns. The uncertainty estimates for the stochastic estimates are wider, which may be since stochastic model has more parameters and higher variability in the outputs while phylodynamic models has strong priors. Even so, the code use to run the model was not provided.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

2. Han, Proc Natl Acad Sci USA, 2021

	Questions	Decision	Reason
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Different change points for each of the transmissibility parameters were allowed for and identified via a Bayesian approach.
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective and scope of the model?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. The number of daily newly confirmed cases of origin k on day t were sourced from sourced from the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control.
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	Yes	To validate the linear model, the authors ran an estimation assuming a conditional Poisson distribution on yit's, using a sub-sample between April 8th to April 28th, the period during which the total newly confirmed cases for all cities become non-negative.
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	Yes	No to minor concerns.
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	Yes	No to minor concerns. To alleviate the concern about the uncertainty of incubation period and reporting delay, the authors conducted some robustness checks using a 7-day lag centered average and a 14-day lag centered average, respectively.
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	Moderate concerns. The code use to run the model was not provided.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

3. Hossain, Epidemics, 2020

	Questions	Decision	Reason
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Based on the Susceptible, Infected, and Recovered (SIR) meta-population model.
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective and scope of the model?	Yes	No to minor concerns. "…assumed that infected cases could pass the border screening or move to another location only during their incubation period (referred to as exposed cases)."
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. "Airline passenger data were collected from the International Air Transport Association database."
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	No to minor concerns. "We collected the actual passenger data for the top 10 visiting cities leaving from Wuhan Tianhe International Airport before the lockdown of Wuhan city from 30 Dec to 20 Jan, 2020. Note that we did not have data for railroad and other forms of transport, and thus made an assumption that the total number of travelers is 4 times higher than that of air transport except for certain cities on Hainan Island that have no road connections to Wuhan. We made this assumption because that the number of train passengers is few times higher than that of airline in China (Statista, 2018) and the results from a population migration database suggested a similar ratio (The Tencent database, 2020)."
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	Yes	No to minor concerns.
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	Yes	The predicted reporting delay was very close to the actual reporting lag. Overall, the predicted cumulative number of both imported and secondary cases after adjusted by the reporting lag time of top 10 visiting cities demonstrated a similar increasing trend in cumulative numbers of confirmed cases during each early emergence period.
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	No	Major concerns. Not reported.
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	Moderate concerns. The code use to run the model was not provided.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

4. Ip, Int J Environ Res Public Health, 2021

	Questions	Decision	Reason
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. GSTARX was based on previous studies.
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective and scope of the model?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. COVID-19 case data from 25 January 2020 to 12 September 2020 were obtained from the webpage of the Department of Health, Australia Government and the Australian Bureau of Statistics.
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	No	Major concerns. Not reported.
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	Yes	No to minor concerns.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

5. Jablonska, medRxiv, 2021

	Questions	Decision	Reason
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Loess regression based on prior literature.
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective and scope of the model?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. "Data on COVID-19 deaths, infections, the number of tests, bed capacity, government restrictions, population size and urban population size were taken from the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. Missing dates of government restrictions, if officially issued, were found on Wikipedia. Mobility scores were uploaded from Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports"
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	No	No to minor concerns. Sensitivity analyses were performed using a variety of selection algorithms: stepwise, backward, forward and genetic algorithm, to limit the number of covariates, increase model precision and improve model fit.
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	Moderate concerns. The code use to run the model was not provided.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

6. Kwak, PloS one, 2021

	Questions	Decision	Reason
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Use of reinforcement learning agent and seeking of an optimal policy with the Dueling Double Deep Q-Network and use of SIRD model was based on prior literature.
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective and scope of the model?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Use of real-world data: "For each country and territory, index case date (date of the first locally confirmed patient), the numbers tested, confirmed infection, recovered and dead were collected from Johns Hopkins coronavirus data repository, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's reports and WHO's case reports. Population size, population density, population mid-year (aged 15 to 65 years old), gross domestic product (GDP), geological information (longitude, latitude) and life expectancy from the United Nations database, Wikipedia, and official announcements through the news were used in our algorithm for the country and territory specific population characteristics and healthcare setting"
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	Yes	No to minor concerns.
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	Yes	No to minor concerns. "For policy validation, we used an evaluation technique to estimate how the differences between the government and agent policies relate to accelerated infection, death and recovery cases [32, 33]. The total acceleration was calculated and derived in relation to the difference at the policy level. In general, earlier agent lockdowns when compared to government lockdown policy was related to a more rapid acceleration in cases"
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	No	Major concerns. Not reported.
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	Yes	No to minor concerns.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

7. Sun, Transp Res Part A Policy Pract, 2021

	Questions	Decision	Reason
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Susceptible–Exposed–Infectious–Recovered (SEIR) model extended onto a network structure, based on the concepts of the GLobal Epidemic and Mobility (GLEaM) Model
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective and scope of the model?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Based on reported cases of variants from https://cov-lineages.org. Real word commuting flow data obtained from prior study.
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Sensitivity analysis on variable, ranging from 0.00 (equal to not cutting any flights) and 0.99 (equal to cutting all flights by 99%).
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	Moderate concerns. The code use to run the model was not provided.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

8. Yang, Emerg Infect Dis, 2021

	Questions	Decision	Reason
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Use of previously established Kaplan–Meier survival curve and accelerated failure time model.
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective and scope of the model?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Publicly available case data from Jan 1 to July 31, 2020 were used.
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	Yes	"For some countries had many fluctuations over the study period (e.g., Guyana) or experienced a much larger outbreak during the later of our study period (e.g., Argentina), which could result in right-censoring for the first epidemic peak (i.e., no epidemic peak was observed according to the peak measurement). To validate if our results would be greatly affected by these issues, we used the reaching a certain threshold for cumulative incidence. We believe using the alternative outcome measurements could overcome the abovementioned misclassifications or right-censoring issues, although for some countries with low COVID-19 circulation it could introduce right-censoring as well"
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	Yes	No to minor concerns.
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Authors "performed a sensitivity analysis by fitting the AFT and Cox models with data that excluding Asian countries, where tended to have stricter enactment, higher adherence and more precautious when implementing these control measures"
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	Moderate concerns. The code use to run the model was not provided.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

9. Yang, Lancet Reg Health West Pac, 2021

	Questions	Decision	Reason
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. A Bayesian framework was used to model the disease history of infected travellers and the travel measures that were in force.
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective and scope of the model?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Use of previously established model.
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Data on laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases whose exposure risk was listed as travel outside Hong Kong were obtained from the Department of Health. Assumption that 30% of symptomatic cases who developed symptoms before travel would board (counter to travel requirements) was based on previous studies. Assumption that test sensitivity for asymptomatic individuals was 62% that of symptomatic individuals was based on a prior study.
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	Yes	To validate the model, the authors conducted a simulation study to illustrate that the estimation algorithm could provide unbiased estimates of parameters. The model recovered the true values for travel volume and prevalence in 96% and 94% of simulations, respectively.
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	Yes	No to minor concerns.
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	Yes	No to minor concerns. For the sensitivity analysis, the authors used the time-varying test sensitivity from an alternative source to repeat the estimations of COVID-19 prevalence among inbound travellers and the importation risks across different control regimens.
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	Moderate concerns. The code use to run the model was not provided.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

10. Yu, Int J Environ Res Public Health, 2021

	Questions	Decision	Reason
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. The SEIR model has been extensively employed to simulate and analyze the dynamics of COVID-19 pandemic in Hong Kong.
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective and scope of the model?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. This study used the daily reported COVID-19 cases from 27 January 2020 up to 5 May 2021 provided by the Centre for Health Protection (CHP) of the Department of Health in Hong Kong, which released the COVID-19 data and made it freely accessible on the government's open-data platform.
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	No to minor concerns. See above.
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	No	Major concerns. Not reported.
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	Moderate concerns. The code use to run the model was not provided.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.22.22269686; this version posted January 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

11. Zhu, Travel medicine and infectious disease, 2021

	Questions	Decision	Reason
Model structure	1. Are the structural assumptions transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. "Extension to the Markov transition based SIR and SEIR models that have long been used to model epidemic spreading and control measures such as lockdowns and vaccines"
	2. Are the structural assumptions reasonable given the overall objective, perspective and scope of the model?	Yes	No to minor concerns. "In general, unidentified and identified infectious, and recovered individuals can either be free or isolated/quarantined. However, with our focus on reopening phases, we optimistically assume that anyone who has been identified as infectious will be isolated immediately to avoid virus spreading. Hospitalized people are also automatically isolated in the model. Assuming only people in the state of unidentified infectious and free to move can travel, only a small percentage of travelers are infectious upon arrival. This percentage, denoted by a, is mainly determined by the COVID-19 severity at the origin and the pre-travel screening policies (e.g., people must provide RNA/antibody test results prior to travel)."
	3. Are the input parameters transparent and justified?	Yes	No to minor concerns. "We use T = 0.91 with mandatory test for everyone upon arrival [25]. In the absence of such a test, T = 0."
	4. Are the input parameters reasonable?	Yes	No to minor concerns. Table 1- Transitional probability matrix estimation values based on prior literature.
Validation (external)	5. Has the external validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	6. Has the model been shown to be externally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Validation (internal)	7. Has the internal validation process been described?	No	Not reported.
	8. Has the model been shown to be internally valid?	No	Moderate concerns.
Uncertainty	9. Was there an adequate assessment of the effects of uncertainty?	No	Major concerns. Not reported.
Transparency	10. Was technical documentation, in sufficient detail to allow (potentially) for replication, made available openly or under agreements that protect intellectual property?	No	Moderate concerns. The code use to run the model was not provided.