APPENDIX

A Additional Results

We present the results from additional tests in Section A. First, we report the test results for the proportionality hazards assumption in Section A.1. Second, we estimate models with alternative specifications OLS models in Section A.2. All models are the variants of Table 1. Third, we estimate the effects of China-specific entry restrictions on monthly passenger volume from China in Section A.3. Fourth, we estimate the effects of the entry restrictions on the number of confirmed COVID-19 cases and deaths in Section A.4.

A.1 Cox-Proportional Hazards Models

In **Table A1**, we first present the results of the tests of the non-zero slopes on the Schoenfeld residuals to check the proportionality hazards assumption. We performed the test focusing on Model (5) in **Table 1**. The results show that all variables meet the assumption within 95% confidence interval. As the p-value on *Trade with Others (% of GDP)* is slightly above 0.05, we also estimate an additional model by adding an interaction variable of time and *Trade with Others (% of GDP)* to account for the possibility of non-proportionality. **Table A2** shows that our main findings remain robust to this alternative specification.

Table A1: Diagnostic Tests for the Proportionality Assumption

Variables	ρ	χ^2	p-values
Chinese contract workers	-0.10	0.56	0.45
Chinese labor services workers	0.15	1.01	0.31
Chinese international students	0.12	0.77	0.38
Chinese migration stock	-0.15	1.24	0.27
Total migration stock	0.04	0.16	0.69
GDP (logged)	0.12	1.59	0.21
GDP (per capita)	-0.06	0.37	0.54
Resources rents (per capita, logged)	0.11	0.75	0.39
Polity score	-0.02	0.03	0.87
Health expenditure (% of GDP)	0.06	0.52	0.47
Distance to China	0.13	0.96	0.33
Trade with China (% of GDP)	-0.02	0.02	0.89
Trade with others (% of GDP)	0.18	2.92	0.09
COVID-19 deaths (7 day average)	0.13	0.49	0.48

Table A2: Category 1 Entry Restrictions (Interaction with Time Added)

	(A1)
Chinese contract workers	0.952**
	(0.333)
Chinese labor services workers	0.519+
	(0.305)
Chinese international students	0.338
	(0.472)
Chinese migration stock	0.020
	(0.098)
Total Migration Stock (%)	-0.009
	(0.014)
Chinese investment (per capita)	-0.000
	(0.000)
GDP (logged)	-0.095
	(0.137)
GDP (per capita, logged)	0.138
	(0.241)
Trade with China (% of GDP)	0.012
	(0.014)
Trade with Others (% of GDP)	-0.035*
	(0.015)
Resource rent (per capita, logged)	0.069
	(0.089)
Polity score	-0.031
	(0.035)
Health Expenditure (% of GDP)	0.031
	(0.100)
Distance to China	-0.093*
	(0.044)
Time * Trade with Others	0.001+
	(0.000)
Covid-19 Deaths	-27.665
	(17.744)
Observations	7402

Note: Robust standard errors presented in parentheses $+p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

A.2 Alternative Model Specifications

We estimate models with alternative specifications in **Tables A3 and A4**, with each country as the unit of observations. In **Table A3**, the dependent variable takes the value of 1 if a given country placed the Category 1 entry ban as of March 27, 2020 and 0 otherwise. In **Table A4**, we count the number of days it took for a given country to impose the Category 1 entry ban from January 15, 2020 to March 27, 2020. For a country that did not impose the Category 1 ban until March 27, 2020, this variable is coded as 73. We use the negative binomial model because the dependent variable is over-dispersed count data.The results show that our main findings are not sensitive to model specifications.

Table A3: Binary Probit: Category 1 Entry Restrictions

	(A2)	(A3)	(A4)	(A5)
Chinese contract workers	1.568^{+}			1.584^{+}
	(0.844)			(0.914)
Chinese labor services workers		1.600		0.916
		(1.346)		(1.212)
Chinese international students			-0.027	0.389
			(0.205)	(0.540)
Chinese migration stock	0.017	0.011	0.014	-0.027
	(0.038)	(0.053)	(0.041)	(0.099)
Total Migration Stock (%)	-0.001	0.000	0.005	-0.003
	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.015)
Chinese investment (per capita)	0.000	-0.000	0.000	-0.001
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)
GDP (logged)	0.008	-0.035	-0.047	-0.006
	(0.104)	(0.106)	(0.100)	(0.108)
GDP (per capita, logged)	0.213	0.209	0.257	0.213
	(0.187)	(0.200)	(0.190)	(0.197)
Trade with China (% of GDP)	0.008	0.005	0.011	0.007
	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)
Trade with Others (% of GDP)	-0.007	-0.006	-0.008	-0.006
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Resource rent (per capita, logged)	-0.012	0.033	0.017	0.005
	(0.070)	(0.071)	(0.069)	(0.074)
Polity score	-0.019	-0.020	-0.018	-0.017
	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.030)
Health Expenditure (% of GDP)	0.099	0.090	0.081	0.104^{+}
	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.060)	(0.063)
Distance to China	-0.058	-0.061	-0.065^{+}	-0.061
	(0.037)	(0.040)	(0.037)	(0.039)
Covid-19 Deaths	-2.400**	-2.465*	-2.635**	-2.264*
	(0.930)	(1.004)	(0.982)	(0.942)
Observations	122	122	122	122

Note: Marginal effects. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses $^{+}p < 0.10$, $^{*}p < 0.05$, $^{**}p < 0.01$

Table A4: Negative Binomial: Number of Days to Category 1 Entry Restrictions

	(A6)	(A7)	(A8)	(A9)	(A10)	(A11)
Number of Days to Category 1 Restriction						
Chinese contract workers	-0.362**			-0.358**	-0.540**	-0.521**
	(0.109)			(0.114)	(0.151)	(0.146)
Chinese labor services workers		-0.016		-0.030	-0.067	-0.075
		(0.037)		(0.051)	(0.092)	(0.094)
Chinese international students			-0.055	-0.119	-0.200	-0.163
			(0.063)	(0.094)	(0.153)	(0.158)
Chinese migration stock	-0.030**	-0.027+	-0.026**	-0.017	-0.003	-0.005
	(0.007)	(0.014)	(0.007)	(0.019)	(0.032)	(0.032)
Total Migration Stock (%)	0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.001	0.003	0.003
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Chinese investment (per capita)					-0.000	0.000
					(0.000)	(0.000)
GDP (logged)	0.013	0.025	0.029	0.016	0.003	0.024
	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.023)	(0.026)	(0.027)
GDP (per capita, logged)	0.014	0.010	0.004	0.010	0.002	-0.040
	(0.037)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.038)	(0.044)	(0.046)
Trade with China (% of GDP)					-0.003	-0.005
					(0.004)	(0.004)
Trade with Others (% of GDP)						0.002**
						(0.001)
Resource rent (per capita, logged)	-0.019	-0.032*	-0.028+	-0.016	0.002	0.004
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Polity score	-0.006	-0.004	-0.002	-0.005	0.001	0.002
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.009)	(0.008)
Health Expenditure (% of GDP)	-0.001	0.004	0.007	0.001	-0.003	-0.002
	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.023)	(0.022)
Distance to China	0.018*	0.019+	0.018+	0.018*	0.012	0.017+
	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.010)
Covid-19 Deaths	0.002*	0.002+	0.002+	0.002+	0.002	0.002+
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Observations	148	148	148	148	122	122

Note: Robust standard errors presented in parentheses $^{+}p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

A.3 Entry Restrictions and Monthly Passenger Volume

We estimate the correlation coefficients between entry restrictions and monthly passenger volume from January to March, 2020. We transformed the entry restriction variables into monthly data, indicating the percentage of days during which a restriction is in place per month. The results in **Table A5** show that Category 1 (i.e., entry bans) measures are particularly effective at reducing passenger volume from China. Category 2 (i.e., entry bans only on travel from Hubei) appears much less effective since passengers could use other domestic airports in China or third-country airports to gain entry.

Table A5: Entry Restrictions by Category and Monthly Passenger Volume (Jan-Mar)

	(A12)	(A13)	(A14)
Category 1 Restriction	-1.621**	-0.296	-0.296
	(0.273)	(0.255)	(0.255)
Category 2 Restriction	-1.404^{+}	-0.207	-0.207
	(0.793)	(0.665)	(0.665)
Category 3 Restriction	-0.973**	0.392	0.392
	(0.279)	(0.266)	(0.266)
Month Fixed Effects			✓
Country Fixed Effects		✓	✓
Observations	469	469	469

Note: Robust standard errors presented in parentheses $^{+}p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

A.4 Entry Restrictions and COVID-19 Cases

With country-by-date as the unit of analysis, we examine the short-term effects of introducing entry restrictions against China on the number of COVID-19 confirmed cases and deaths in **Table A6**. The dependent variable is the number of confirmed cases (deaths) reported by the day divided by the size of population (in million). All models control for a linear time trend, its squared and cubed terms to account for the increasing pattern of COVID-19 cases. Fixed effects for countries are included in some models.

We lag the introduction of entry restrictions by 7 days in Models (A15) and (A17) and 14 days in Models (A16) and (A18). The results show that the introduction of entry restrictions is negatively correlated with the number of COVID-19 cases at least for the short term. However, the results should be interpreted with caution because the number of confirmed cases might have been underestimated especially for those countries without testing capacity. Also, these countries might have decided to impose the entry bans early due to the lack of alternative policy measures to contain the spread of the COVID-19.

Table A6: Impact of Entry Restrictions on COVID-19 Confirmed Cases and Deaths

	Confirmed Cases		Deaths	
	(A15)	(A16)	(A17)	(A18)
Category 1 (t-7)	-4.179**		-0.246**	
	(0.469)		(0.050)	
Category 2 (t-7)	-1.927		-0.152	
	(1.203)		(0.127)	
Category 3 (t-7)	-2.433**		-0.273**	
	(0.482)		(0.051)	
Category 1 (t-14)		-4.256**		-0.249**
		(0.540)		(0.057)
Category 2 (t-14)		-1.275		-0.136
		(1.466)		(0.156)
Category 3 (t-14)		-2.646**		-0.302**
		(0.569)		(0.060)
Country FE	✓	✓	✓	✓
Time Trend	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	12672	11328	12672	11328

Note: Robust standard errors presented in parentheses $^{+}p < 0.10$, $^{*}p < 0.05$, $^{**}p < 0.01$