

1 **An examination of COVID-19 mitigation efficiency**
2 **among 23 countries**

3

4 Yi-Tui Chen¹, Shih-Heng Yu², Emily Chia-Yu Su^{3,4,*}

5

6 ¹Department of Health Care Management, National Taipei University of Nursing and
7 Health Sciences, Taipei, Taiwan

8 ²Department of Business Management, National United University, Miaoli, Taiwan

9 ³Graduate Institute of Biomedical Informatics, College of Medical Science and
10 Technology, Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan

11 ⁴Clinical Big Data Research Center, Taipei Medical University Hospital, Taipei,
12 Taiwan

13

14 *Corresponding author: emilysu@tmu.edu.tw(E.C.-Y.S.)

15

16

17 **Abstract**

18 The purpose of this paper is to compare the relative mitigation efficiency of
19 COVID-19 transmission among 23 selected countries, including 19 countries in the
20 G20, two heavily infected countries (Iran and Spain), and two highly populous
21 countries (Pakistan and Nigeria). This paper evaluated the mitigation efficiency for
22 each country at each stage by using data envelopment analysis (DEA) tools and
23 analyzed changes in mitigation efficiency across stages. Pearson correlation tests were
24 conducted between each change to examine the impact of efficiency ranks in the
25 previous stage on subsequent stages. An indicator was developed to judge epidemic
26 stability and was applied to practical cases involving lifting travel restrictions and
27 restarting the economy in some countries.

28 The results showed that Korea and Australia performed with the highest
29 efficiency in preventing the diffusion of COVID-19 for the whole period covering 120
30 days since the first confirmed case, while the USA ranked at the bottom. China, Japan,
31 Korea and Australia were judged to have recovered from the attack of COVID-19 due
32 to higher epidemic stability.

33

34 **Keywords:** COVID-19; stay-at-home order; mitigation efficiency; epidemic stability

35

36 **Introduction**

37 The COVID-19 pandemic has been raging across the world since the beginning of
38 2020, resulting in a substantial death toll. At the present time (2020/07/12), the World
39 Health Organization (WHO) has indicated that more than 216 countries, areas or
40 territories have been found to have 12,552,765 confirmed cases associated with
41 561,617 deaths [1]. The number of daily, newly confirmed cases in some countries has
42 fallen to single or double digits, but in some other countries, it has not reached its
43 peak and continues to increase. This shows that the response strategies adopted in
44 each country may have different effects on the mitigation of COVID-19 transmission.

45 In this paper, we attempt to measure the relative efficiency in preventing the
46 spread of COVID-19 by using the data envelopment analysis (DEA) technique. In
47 practice, the DEA technique has been widely used in various applications, including
48 health industries (e.g., Yaya *et al.* [2]; Cavalieri *et al.* [3]), energy sectors (e.g.,
49 Balitskiy *et al.* [4]; Cruz *et al.* [5]; Vazhayil and Balasubramanian [6]), cement
50 industries (e.g., Oggioni *et al.* [7]), agricultural production (e.g., Mousavi-Avval *et al.*
51 [8]; Mohammadi *et al.* [9]), and manufacturing sectors (e.g., Egilmez *et al.* [10]), and
52 DEA has proven to be an effective approach in identifying the best practice frontiers.

53 In the field of medical services, DEA has also been widely used to measure the
54 efficiency of hospitals in association with patient visits, surgeries and discharges. For
55 example, Khushalani and Ozcan [11] employed a dynamic network DEA to examine
56 the efficiency of producing quality in hospitals and found that urban and teaching
57 hospitals were less likely to improve quality production efficiency. Deily and McKay
58 [12] used efficiency scores obtained from a DEA analysis as explanatory variables to
59 determine hospital efficiency. In other fields, Oggioni *et al.* [7] employed DEA to

60 analyze efficiency by using energy as an input and one desired output accompanied by
61 undesired outputs (CO₂ emissions). Mousavi-Avval *et al.* [8] and Mohammadi *et al.*
62 [9] applied the DEA technique to measure the efficiency of agricultural production to
63 identify wasteful energy. Vazhayil and Balasubramanian [6] showed that the
64 weight-restricted stochastic DEA method was appropriate to optimize power sector
65 strategies.

66 To compare the mitigation efficiency among countries on a fair basis, the time
67 period for each stage was calculated from the date of the first confirmed case in each
68 country. The whole period covers 120 days from the first confirmed case and was
69 divided into 6 stages. In addition to the measurement of overall efficiency covering
70 120 days, the efficiency at each stage was also evaluated. The trends in efficiency
71 ranks across stages for each country were analyzed. Eventually, an indicator for
72 epidemic stability was developed to judge the status of epidemic stability for each
73 country.

74 **Research methods**

75 To compare the relative prevention efficiency to reduce the spread of COVID-19,
76 a total of 23 countries were selected, including 19 countries in the G20 and the other
77 four representative countries, as listed in Table 1. The reasons for the selection of Iran
78 and Spain was due to their high levels of confirmed cases and deaths. Pakistan and
79 Nigeria were chosen due to their large populations, which reached 212.2 million and
80 195.9 million, respectively, at the end of 2018 [13].

81 The WHO [1] has divides the stages of transmission into (1) no cases reported or
82 observed (Stage 0); (2) imported cases (Stage 1); (3) localized community
83 transmission (Stage 2); and (4) large-scale community transmission (Stage 3). As the

84 date of the first confirmed case varied across countries, the period of each stage was
 85 not based on the same date among these countries but was calculated from the first
 86 confirmed case in each country. The date of the first confirmed case was identified
 87 based on the daily situation report released by the WHO [1] starting on 21 January
 88 2020. Among the 23 countries selected, China, Japan, and Korea reported having
 89 confirmed cases of COVID-19 before 21 January 2020. The information released
 90 from the WHO [1] demonstrated that some cases of pneumonia of unknown etiology
 91 were detected in Wuhan City, Hubei Province, China, on 31 December 2019. On 7
 92 January 2020, a new type of coronavirus was isolated and identified. Thus, the first
 93 case in China may be considered to have occurred at the end of 2019. According to
 94 the WHO [1], the first confirmed cases of COVID-19 in Japan and Korea were
 95 reported on 15 and 20 January 2020, respectively.

96 The overall efficiency was compared based on the whole period covering 120
 97 days since the first confirmed case for each country. This paper separated the
 98 development process of COVID-19 spread into 6 stages. Stage 1 covers the first 30
 99 days after the first confirmed case in each country. Each stage from Stage 2 to Stage 6
 100 covered 15 days each. In summary, the starting and ending dates of each stage for
 101 each country are listed in Table 1.

102 **Table 1. The starting and ending dates of each stage for each country.**

	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Stage 5	Stage 6
China	2019/12/ 31- 2020/1/3 0	2020/1/3 1- 02/14	02/15-02/ 29	02/30-03/ 15	03/16-03/ 30	03/31-04/ 14
Japan	01/15-02/ 14	02/15-02/ 29	03/01-03/ 15	03/16-03/ 30	03/31-04/ 14	04/15-04/ 29
Korea	01/20-02/ 19	02/20-03/ 05	03/06-03/ 20	03/21-04/ 04	04/05-04/ 19	04/20-05/ 04
USA	01/23-02/ 22	02/23-03/ 08	03/09-03/ 23	03/24-04/ 07	04/08-04/ 22	04/23-05/ 07

Australia, France	01/25-02/ 24	02/25-03/ 10	03/11-03/ 25	03/26-04/ 09	04/10-04/ 24	04/25-05/ 09
Canada	01/27-02/ 26	02/27-03/ 12	03/13-03/ 27	03/28-04/ 11	04/12-04/ 26	04/27-05/ 11
Germany	01/28-02/ 27	02/28-03/ 13	03/14-03/ 28	03/29-04/ 12	04/13-04/ 27	04/28-05/ 12
India	01/30-02/ 29	03/01-03/ 15	03/16-03/ 30	03/31-04/ 14	04/15-04/ 29	04/30-05/ 14
Italy	01/31-03/ 01	03/02-03/ 16	03/17-03/ 31	04/01-04/ 15	04/16-04/ 30	05/01-05/ 15
Russia, Spain, UK	02/01-03/ 02	03/03-03/ 17	03/18-04/ 01	04/02-04/ 16	04/17-05/ 01	05/02-05/ 16
Iran	02/20-03/ 21	03/22-04/ 05	04/06-04/ 20	04/21-05/ 05	05/06-05/ 20	05/21-06/ 04
Brazil, Pakistan	02/27-03/ 28	03/29-04/ 12	04/13-04/ 27	04/28-05/ 12	05/13-05/ 27	05/28-06/ 11
Nigeria	02/28-03/ 29	03/30-04/ 13	04/14-04/ 28	04/29-05/ 13	05/14-05/ 28	05/29-06/ 12
Mexico	02/29-03/ 30	03/31-04/ 14	04/15-04/ 29	04/30-05/ 14	05/15-05/ 29	05/30-06/ 13
Indonesia	03/02-04/ 01	04/02-04/ 16	04/17-05/ 01	05/02-05/ 16	05/17-05/ 31	06/01-06/ 15
Saudi Arabia	03/03-04/ 02	04/03-04/ 17	04/18-05/ 02	05/03-05/ 17	05/18-06/ 01	06/02-06/ 16
Argentina	03/04-04/ 03	04/04-04/ 18	04/19-05/ 03	05/04-05/ 18	05/19-06/ 02	06/03-06/ 17
Spain	03/06-04/ 05	04/06-04/ 20	04/21-05/ 05	05/06-05/ 20	05/21-06/ 04	06/05-06/ 19
Turkey	03/12-04/ 11	04/12-04/ 26	04/27-05/ 11	05/12-05/ 26	05/27-06/ 10	06/11-06/ 25

103

104 **The DEA model**

105 In this paper, the DEA model was employed to measure the mitigation efficiency
106 regarding the spread of COVID-19 at each stage for each country. The DEA was
107 pioneered by Charnes *et al.* [14] based on the theoretical concept of frontier
108 production developed by Farrell [15]. It is a linear programming technique to estimate
109 production or cost efficiency by measuring the ratio of total inputs employed to total

110 output produced for each decision-making unit (DMU). The mitigation of the
111 COVID-19 transmission in each country was executed by a technology whereby N
112 countries in terms of DMUs transform multiple inputs $X \equiv (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \mathfrak{R}_+^m$ into
113 multiple outputs $Y \equiv (y_1, \dots, y_s) \in \mathfrak{R}_+^s$. This paper employed the basic DEA
114 model of Charnes, Coopers, and Rhodes (CCR) to calculate the mitigation efficiency
115 of COVID-19 transmission. The CCR model, under the hypothesis of constant returns
116 to scale, is expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 117 \quad & \text{Min} \quad \theta \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \theta x_0 - X\lambda \geq 0 \\ 118 \quad & \quad Y\lambda \geq y_0 \\ & \quad \lambda \geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

119 where y_0 is the output, x_0 is the input, X, Y are the data sets in the matrices,
120 λ is a semipositive vector, and θ represents the technical efficiency.

121 After the efficiency at each stage was obtained, Pearson correlation tests were
122 conducted between the different stages at a p value < 0.01 to examine the variation in
123 efficiency ranks across stages. The correlation tests were used to explain the impact of
124 the efficiency ranks at previous stages on subsequent stages.

125 **The variables**

126 Efficiency is described as the relative performance regarding the reduction in the
127 COVID-19 transmission, was measured in this paper by the DEA method, and is
128 stated in the form of an output/input ratio. The objective of the authority
129 administration was to minimize the total confirmed cases that occurred in each stage
130 with a given amount of resources used. Cooper *et al.* [16] suggested that the DEA

131 technique can be easily applied to a multiple input–output framework to compare the
132 relative efficiency among various DMUs. The information produced from the DEA
133 analysis is valuable for identifying specific efficient units for future learning [17].

134 Neiderud [18] suggested that the rise of megacities may yield potential risks for
135 new epidemics and become a threat in the world. The high human population density
136 and close human-to-human contact are the major sources for the rapid spread of
137 respiratory diseases or avian flu. The growth and density of the human population
138 may work as an incubator for infectious diseases, and urbanization as a driver of
139 disease may have a negative effect on public health (Lienhardt [19]; Hayward *et*
140 *al.*[20]). Thus, the input and output variables included (1) newly confirmed cases n , (2)
141 population density d , and (3) urbanization degree u in each country. As more
142 confirmed cases represent less efficiency, the total newly confirmed cases in each
143 stage was considered the output variable of mitigation inefficiency. High population
144 density and urbanization degree in a country may present a greater chance of being
145 infected; thus, population and urbanization degree are seen as input variables of
146 mitigation inefficiency. Since mitigation efficiency is the inverse of mitigation
147 inefficiency, newly confirmed cases n was treated as an output variable in this paper,
148 and population density d and urbanization degree u were treated as output variables
149 for the measurement of mitigation efficiency.

150 **Data collection**

151 The data for accumulated confirmed cases were extracted from the daily situation
152 reports from the WHO [1], and the total confirmed cases in each stage were calculated
153 by the difference in the accumulated confirmed cases on the last day of each stage and
154 the previous stage. The population density data for each country were provided by

155 Worldometer [21], and the urbanization degree data were extracted from the World
156 Bank [13]. The descriptive statistics for the total accumulated confirmed cases across
157 the 6 stages (i.e., 120 days since the first confirmed case), population density and
158 urbanization degree are presented in Table 2. By the end of Stage 6 (i.e., 120 days
159 since the first confirmed case), the USA had 1,193,452 confirmed cases, ranking at the
160 top of the 23 countries, while Australia had the lowest number (6,914) of confirmed
161 cases. Korea has the highest population density at 527.30 persons per km² while
162 Australia has a much lower population density at 3.32 persons per km². Argentina has
163 the largest urbanization degree at 92% and ranked at the top. In contrast, the
164 urbanization degree of India is much less than the average of 71.48% based on the
165 other countries and was only 34%.

166

167 **Table 2. Descriptive statistics of study variables.**

Variables	Total confirmed cases n	Population density d (person per km ²)	Urbanization degree u (%)
Max.	1,193,452	527.30	92.00
Min.	6,914	3.32	34.00
Average	190,093	151.40	71.48
Standard deviation	260,495	146.28	15.45

168

169 The efficiency score was calculated through the assistance of the software DEA
170 solver 13.

171 **Results**

172 The mitigation efficiency of the COVID-19 epidemic covering the first 120 days
173 after a confirmed case for each of these countries is depicted in Fig 1. Australia and
174 Korea rank at the top of mitigation efficiency. In contrast, the USA ranks at the

175 bottom, followed by Brazil and Russia. The major cause affecting the efficiency ranks
176 may be attributed to the number of total confirmed cases occurring over the whole
177 period. The total confirmed cases in Australia and Korea in the whole period
178 (covering 120 days since the first confirmed case) were only 6,667 cases and 10,801
179 cases, respectively, while the USA, Brazil, and Russia had 1,193,452, 739,503, and
180 272,043 cases, respectively.

181

182 **Fig 1. Mitigation efficiency scores among the 23 countries.**

183

184 The efficiency scores and ranks at each stage for each country were also
185 calculated according to Eq. (1). Based on the shape of the efficiency ranking trend,
186 this paper classifies these countries into 5 types:

187 Type (1): An inverted U-shaped pattern including Korea, China, Italy, Spain, UK,
188 Germany and France

189 This pattern in the efficiency rank trends, depicted in Fig 2, was characterized by
190 a continual decline in mitigation efficiency from Stage 1, and after reaching the
191 lowest point of in their efficiency ranks, these scores continued to improve until the
192 last stage (Stage 6). Efforts to mitigate newly confirmed cases through the
193 implementation of response strategies may have eventually achieved a certain effect.
194 Basically, the mitigation efficiency in Type (1) gradually deteriorated in the middle
195 stages. Passing through the peak of daily newly confirmed cases, the COVID-19
196 transmission was then reduced, and the efficiency started to improve through the last
197 stage. For example, Italy ranked 14th in Stage 1 and then dropped to 20th in Stage 2.
198 Italy reached a peak of daily confirmed cases, amounting to 6,557 cases on 22 March
199 2020, which occurred in Stage 3. After Stage 3, the COVID-19 transmission in Italy

200 improved, and the efficiency ranks rose to 13th place in Stage 6. The efficiency ranks
201 for China after Stage 3 and Korea after Stage 2 showed great improvement and
202 attained a relatively more stable state. China ranked 21st place and 22nd place at Stage
203 1 and Stage 2, respectively, but the efficiency ranks were improved to 2nd place at
204 Stage 4 and 3rd place at Stage 5 and 6 through a great number of emergency response
205 strategies. Similar to China, Korea ranked in 10th place and 13th place for mitigation
206 efficiency at Stages 1 and 2, respectively, and efficiency was improved to 6th place at
207 Stage 3 and first place at Stage 4 which was subsequently maintained to the final stage.
208 The other countries showed similar processes, but the degree of efficiency
209 improvement was different.

210

211 **Fig 2. The trends in efficiency ranks for Type (1) countries.**

212

213 Type (2): An inverted N-shaped pattern including Japan and Australia

214 The trend in efficiency ranks for Type (2) countries is depicted in Fig3. Basically,
215 efficiency ranks fluctuated across stages, with initial improvements followed by
216 deterioration in the middle stages, but eventually efficiency ranks improved in the
217 final stages. For example, the efficiency ranks for Japan improved continuously from
218 12th place in Stage 1 to 6th place in Stage 2 to first place in Stage 3, then dropped to 4th
219 place in Stage 4 and 6th place in Stage 5, and eventually improved to 4th place again.

220

221 **Fig 3. The trends in efficiency ranks for Type (2) countries.**

222

223 Type (3): Continual decreases in efficiency ranks including Russia and India

224 The trend pattern in efficiency ranks for Type (3) countries depicted in Fig 4 is

225 characterized by the gradual deterioration in mitigation efficiency. The efficiency
226 ranks are not bad in the earlier stages but worsen. For example, Russia performed at
227 the highest level regarding mitigation efficiency in Stage 1 and was ranked in first
228 place. Unfortunately, Russia do not maintain this advantage, but its ranks continued to
229 deteriorate to 4th place in Stage 2 and finally 21st place in Stage 6.

230

231 **Fig 4. The trends in efficiency ranks for Type (3) countries.**

232

233 Type (4): U-shaped pattern including the USA, Iran, Turkey, Indonesia, Pakistan,
234 South Africa, Argentina and Brazil

235 This trend pattern in the efficiency ranks depicted in Fig 5 is characterized by
236 some improvements in mitigation efficiency in the middle stages, but eventually
237 rebounded back to a worse state. For example, the response in the USA to avoid
238 COVID-19 transmission was not bad in Stages 1 and 2, as it ranked in 8th place and
239 5th place, respectively. However, its efficiency continually and dramatically dropped
240 after Stage 2 and fell to 23rd place (the bottom of the ranking) in Stages 5 and 6. The
241 efficiency improvement from Stage 1 to Stage 2 in the USA may be attributed to its
242 prompt travel restrictions on China from 2 February 2020 and additional travel
243 restrictions on Iran, Italy, and Korea on 29 February (Garda world, 2020). The gradual
244 deterioration in efficiency ranking in the later stages in the USA implies that its
245 response strategies may be ineffective for avoiding the epidemic.

246

247 **Fig 5. The trends in efficiency ranks for Type (4) countries.**

248

249 The trend pattern in the efficiency ranking for Brazil provides a different story.

250 From Stage 1 to Stage 6, the efficiency ranks for Brazil were not good. On 25 June
251 2020 (the final observation point in Stage 6) in Brazil, newly confirmed cases
252 remained at a high level of 39,436 cases. This implies that the response strategies
253 adopted by Brazil contained flaws.

254 Type (5): N-shaped and W-shaped patterns including Mexico, Nigeria and Saudi
255 Arabia.

256 An N-shaped pattern for Mexico and W-shaped patterns for Nigeria and Saudi
257 Arabia are categorized and depicted in Fig 6. At the middle stages, the efficiency
258 ranks for these Type (5) countries fluctuated very much. For example, Mexico ranked
259 13th place at Stage 1 and then dropped and rose in the middle stages, eventually
260 dropping again to 17th place in Stage 6. As the efficiency for these two patterns drops
261 again in the last stages, this implies that the mitigation efficiency is not stable and that
262 the future trends for these countries is not optimistic.

263

264 **Fig 6. The trends in efficiency ranks for Type (5) countries.**

265 **Discussions**

266 The DEA analysis in this paper finds that Korea, Australia and Japan had better
267 mitigation efficiency by 27 June 2020, while the USA, Brazil and Russia performed
268 less efficiently and were ranked at the bottom. Michael [22] suggested that the
269 successful experience in Korea to defeat COVID-19 may be attributed to the massive
270 testing and effective contact tracking system. Individuals testing positive for the
271 infection after viral tests were hospitalized at special facilities. The people who had
272 been in contact with the infected were to remain self-quarantined for 14 days. The
273 availability of personal protective equipment was ensured to have sufficient supply to

274 avoid further infection at the onset of COVID-19 in Korea. In contrast, the testing
275 capacity have not been sufficient to support the policies of a gradual reopening of the
276 economy planned in many US states [23].

277 The trend patterns in efficiency ranks also revealed information about future
278 trends regarding epidemic mitigation. Type (1) and Type (2) countries may have more
279 optimism regarding recovery from the attack of COVID-19, as the efficiency ranks of
280 Type (1) and Type (2) countries were good in Stage 6.

281 The Type (1) countries included the following 7 countries: Korea, China, Italy,
282 Spain, the UK, Germany and France.

283 In addition to Korea, the other countries implemented effective responsive
284 strategies, including extensive viral tests, lockdown, social distancing, temporary
285 cessation of sports events, school closures, and wearing masks. In China, testing
286 policies were promoted by expanding testing of individuals from persons with
287 symptoms to the open public on 12 February 2020, and all levels of school were
288 closed on 26 January 2020 [24]. China has successfully slowed the transmission of
289 COVID-19 through a combination of lockdown, viral tests, contacting tracing and
290 other minor strategies, including street sanitization, school closures and wearing
291 masks. Strict lockdown and strict checks to avoid close contact between people were
292 implemented in China after the outbreak. In less than three months, China has
293 gradually released the strict policy of the lockdown and started to motivate the
294 opening of economic activities. The strict lockdown, wearing masks, and social
295 distancing implemented in China may be the major contributor to the effective
296 prevention of transmission in a short time.

297 In contrast, the response of European countries such as Italy was not as prompt
298 and urgent as that in Korea or China, and their efficiency ranks after Stage 4 were

299 worse. For example, Italy closed their schools on 2 March 2020, asked their people to
300 stay at home, with exceptions for daily exercise and grocery shopping, on 23 February
301 2020. However, the testing policy adopted in Italy focused on testing anyone with
302 COVID-19 symptoms after 26 February [24]. However, the efficiency ranks for the
303 UK in the later stages (Stage 4-6) were much worse than those of other European
304 countries. In March 2020, the UK attempted to reduce the impact of COVID-19 by
305 means of herd immunity, but later, it denied the claims of herd immunity and argued
306 that herd immunity is a natural by-product of an epidemic [25]. Given this situation,
307 the strategy to fight against the epidemic was delayed, and thus, the effect was
308 reduced.

309 Type (2) countries consisted of only Japan and Australia with overall efficiency
310 ranks of first and third place, respectively. In the middle stages, the efficiency ranks
311 initially improved and then got worse. A possible cause for these changes in efficiency
312 ranks may be explained by the low levels of viral testing in the earlier stages.

313 Extensive viral tests have been performed in Australia and amounted to nearly
314 1000 tests per 100,000 people in the population by 31 March 2020 [26]. This number
315 continued to increase and reached 2081 tests per 100,000 people on 28 April 2020 and
316 3119 tests per 100,000 people on 9 May 2020 (the final observation point in Stage 6
317 for Australia). The high testing rate in Australia may have been a major factor in
318 mitigating the increase in new cases and had the best overall efficiency among these
319 23 countries.

320 In contrast, the trend in efficiency ranks for Type (3) countries showed with
321 continual deterioration in mitigation efficiency. Compared to other countries, the
322 coronavirus testing rate per capita in India was very low, reaching a total of 144,910
323 tests in a population with more than 1.3 billion people by 9 April 2020 [27]. On 14

324 May 2020 (the final observation point in Stage 6 for India), the viral testing rate was
325 only 1.41 tests per 1,000 people [24]. The low testing rate may be a key factor in
326 explaining the good performance based on the high efficiency ranking from Stage 1 to
327 Stage 4. Without testing, no data are generated; thus, higher efficiency scores are
328 obtained. On 27 June 2020, the total confirmed cases in India reached 508,953 cases,
329 approximately 6.5 times the total confirmed cases in the whole period examined in
330 this study.

331 At the onset of the outbreak, Russia announced temporarily banning Chinese
332 citizens from entering Russia on 20 February 2020 [28]. This strategy may have been
333 effective in preventing infection through imported cases from China in Stage 1 and
334 Stage 2. Extensive testing had been conducted in Russia, including 0.32 tests per
335 1,000 people on 5 March 2020, 1.12 tests per 1,000 people on 22 March 2020, 4.38
336 tests per 1,000 people on 4 April 2020, 11.06 tests per 1,000 people on 16 April 2020,
337 27.04 tests per 1,000 people on 2 May 2020, and 45.61 tests per 1,000 people on 16
338 May 2020 (the last day of Stage 6). However, Russia's health department admitted
339 that the test kits were often wrong and provided false negative results. Therefore, the
340 tested people with the virus were allowed to go home and infect other people. Thus,
341 the real number of infected individuals was more than triple the official figure [29].
342 The ineffective tests may explain the continual deterioration in efficiency scores for
343 Russia.

344 Type (4) countries contained the following 9 countries: the USA, Iran, Turkey,
345 Canada, Indonesia, Pakistan, South Africa, Argentina and Brazil. Basically, if the
346 current trends continue into the future, there is not much optimism regarding the
347 epidemic, and these countries need to devote more effort to improving mitigation in
348 newly confirmed cases as the efficiency ranks were bad in the final stages. Some Type

349 (4) countries lacked testing capacity in the earlier stages of the pandemic, and thus,
350 the amount of testing that was performed was much less than needed. Due to less viral
351 testing than the actual need, underestimation of newly confirmed cases may have
352 taken place and led to the illusion of efficiency improvements but eventually
353 efficiency ranks dropped in the final stages.

354 In the USA, the total number of tests performed relative to the size of the
355 population before 7 March 2020 was very low, less than 0.01 tests per 1,000 people,
356 and the situation gradually improved in March 2020 (in Stage 3). The testing rate
357 increased to 0.23 tests per 1,000 people by the end of March 2020 (in Stage 4) and
358 then quickly increased to 10.43 tests per 1,000 people on 16 April 2020 (in Stage 5).
359 On the day of the final observation point at Stage 6 (7 May 2020), the testing rate rose
360 to 24.63 tests per 1,000 people, which seems to be a good figure compared to other
361 countries. However, several experts have criticized that the testing levels were not
362 sufficient to meet the need for a gradual reopening by 1 May 2020 [23]. In addition,
363 existing flaws in other response strategies also blocked improvements in efficiency
364 ranks for the USA. For example, the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
365 (CDC) emphasized the importance of mask wearing, but Trump continued to reject
366 being photographed in public wearing a mask [30]. Some experts have suggested that
367 guidelines for mask wearing have been confusing. Thus, many protesters across the
368 country are described as people who refuse to wear a mask [31].

369 In fact, the USA has not been positively and seriously prepared for epidemic
370 mitigation since the first confirmed case occurred on 23 January 2020. On 23 April
371 2020, Trump suggested injecting powerful disinfectant into coronavirus patients as a
372 possible cure for COVID-19. This news resulted in criticism from many scholars and
373 reporters and disbelief and derision worldwide [32].

374 The trends in efficiency ranks for Type (5) countries, including Mexico, Nigeria,
375 and Saudi Arabia, fluctuated more than the other country types. The testing rate in
376 Mexico ranged from 0.01 to 3.1 tests per 1,000 people during the whole period, which
377 was much lower than that in other countries. Thus, the mitigation efficiency of
378 Mexico ranked 17th among the 23 countries in Stage 5 and Stage 6. On 13 June 2020
379 (the final day of Stage 6 for Nigeria), the testing rate was 0.44 tests per 1,000 people.
380 Nigeria had a lower testing rate than Mexico, but the efficiency ranks for Nigeria were
381 not bad. This paper reasonably suspects that the high efficiency ranks of Nigeria may
382 be caused by an underestimation due to low viral testing rates.

383 The trends in efficiency ranks in Figures 2-6 also demonstrate high variation in
384 efficiency ranking across stages for some countries. To examine the impact of
385 efficiency ranks at the previous stage on the subsequent stage, a Pearson correlation
386 test of efficiency scores between different stages was conducted. The results listed in
387 Table 3 indicate that the correlation coefficient between two adjacent stages was
388 higher and that the correlation coefficients between Stage 1 and each stage after Stage
389 3 were low and negative. The negative or near zero correlation coefficients between
390 Stage 1 and Stages 4-6 implies that the efficiency ranking of the sampled countries at
391 Stages 4-6 had been reorganized and completely differed from Stage 1. This implies
392 that at Stage 1, some countries started to implement effective response strategies such
393 as extensive viral testing, lockdown, wearing masks, etc. to prevent the spread of
394 COVID-19 and thus created improved effects at Stages 4-6. In contrast, some
395 countries purposely neglected the serious and emergent impacts arising from
396 COVID-19 and failed to take any measures in response to the emergence of the
397 epidemic.

398

399

400 **Table 3. Correlations of mitigation efficiency between different stages.**

	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Stage 5	Stage 6
Stage 1	1					
Stage 2	0.6739*	1				
Stage 3	0.4048*	0.5666*	1			
Stage 4	-0.1433*	0.0210*	0.4297*	1		
Stage 5	-0.0982*	0.1918*	0.2002*	0.7884*	1	
Stage 6	-0.0824*	0.1401*	0.1783*	0.7602*	0.9828*	1

401 * Marks statistical significance at the 95% confidence level

402

403 In contrast, the correlation coefficient was 0.788 between Stage 4 and Stage 5,
 404 0.760 between Stage 4 and Stage 6, and 0.983 between Stage 5 and Stage 6. These
 405 high correlation coefficients imply that the relative efficiency ranks among these
 406 countries became stable because their response strategies had stabilized.

407 The efficiency ranks in some countries showed a high degree of fluctuation
 408 across stages, especially the Type (5) countries. The high fluctuation in efficiency
 409 ranks implied that good efficiency rankings at a particular stage were only temporary
 410 and may have deteriorated in the next stage. The mitigation efficiency rankings for
 411 Type (3) countries continually worsened from Stage 1 to Stage 6. Thus, the Type (3)
 412 countries cannot recover from the attack of COVID-19 in a short time and have to
 413 adopt stricter response policies to mitigate the spread of COVID-19. Type (4)
 414 countries executed a U-shaped pattern, demonstrating temporarily improved ranks in
 415 the middle stages but eventually the ranking turned bad in the final stages.

416 Both an inverted U-shaped (Type 1) and an inverted N-shaped (Type 2) pattern
 417 in the trends in efficiency ranks seemed to be a good sign of improvement as the
 418 efficiency ranks increased in the last stages. The probability of recovering from the
 419 attack of COVID-19 for Type (1) and (2) patterns is higher than other patterns.

420 Nevertheless, the overall efficiency was calculated based on the whole period
421 covering 120 days since the first confirmed case. The efficiency obtained was only
422 temporary and may change for the better or worse if the assessment stage was
423 extended to cover more days.

424 In the beginning of June 2020, the infectious disease COVID-19 remained a high
425 risk in the world, but many countries have attempted to lift the state of lockdown,
426 restart the economy and take actions, as their governments have considered that the
427 number of confirmed cases was greatly reduced and that newly diagnosed cases may
428 be considered sporadic cases. For example, Trump attempted to end the lockdown and
429 the stay-at-home order and to reopen schools at the beginning of June 2020.

430 There was a high correlation between efficiency scores in two adjacent stages,
431 but it was still difficult to predict the epidemic stability of the next stage based on the
432 previous stage. Thus, the data of the newly confirmed cases for the current dates are
433 only for reference to determine the timing of restarting the economy.

434 This paper suggests that an epidemic stability indicator in combination with a
435 trend pattern of efficiency ranks such as Type (1) or (2) may be employed to judge the
436 appropriateness of any measures to lift the response strategies such as travel
437 restrictions, stay-at-home orders, and mask wearing. In this paper, epidemic stability
438 (*ES*) is defined as the recovery status from the epidemic, and the indicator *ES* is
439 presented by measuring an average increase in proportion of confirmed cases to
440 population (PCCP) during the period of the last day of Stage 6 and a day designated to
441 restart the economies, expressed as follows:

$$442 \quad ES = \frac{S_f - S_0}{\Delta t} \quad (2)$$

443 where S_f and S_0 denote the PCCP on the last day of Stage 6 and the designated day,
444 respectively, and Δt represents the period between the two dates.

445 A numerical example is presented in this paper. As an example, if it was
446 proposed that the travel restrictions are lifted on the designed date of 27 June 2020,
447 ES , S_f , S_0 and Δt were calculated according to Eq. (2) for these 23 countries, and
448 the result is listed in Table 4, where S_f and S_0 are measured by cases per 100,000
449 persons, Δt in days, and ES by cases per 1,000,000 persons.

450 **Table 4. The epidemic stability for each country by ranks.**

DMU	S_0	S_f	Δt	ES	Ranks
China	5.81	5.92	74	0.01	1
Japan	12.04	14.47	59	0.46	2
Korea	21.07	24.68	54	0.68	3
Australia	27.11	29.78	30	0.89	4
Nigeria	7.06	11.3	15	2.83	5
Indonesia	13.99	18.74	12	3.95	6
Germany	203.51	230.64	46	5.90	7
Italy	368.99	396.88	43	6.49	8
India	5.65	36.88	44	7.10	9
Spain	492.32	530.22	42	9.02	10
France	209.24	239.23	30	10.00	11
Turkey	227.25	230.63	2	16.92	12
Canada	180.16	271.9	47	19.52	13
Pakistan	54.12	90.04	16	22.45	14
UK	348.69	455.71	42	25.48	15
Iran	191.32	259.22	21	32.33	16
Mexico	103.91	157.41	14	38.21	17
Argentina	72.54	116.07	10	43.53	18
Russia	186.41	430.09	42	58.02	19
USA	360.56	727.36	51	71.92	20
South Africa	141.45	210.07	8	85.78	21
Saudi Arabia	379.3	501.46	13	93.97	22
Brazil	347.9	577.77	16	143.67	23

451

452 Table 4 indicates that India has the lowest value of S_0 (PCCP in 120 days),
453 amounting to 5.65 cases per 100,000 persons, and slightly lower value than China

454 (5.81 cases per 100,000 persons). In contrast, Spain and Saudi Arabia have the highest
455 value of S_0 , amounting to 492.32 and 379.30 cases per 100,000 persons, respectively,
456 which is much higher than the average of 172.19 cases per 100,000 persons. However,
457 the ranking of the PCCP on 27 June 2020 (S_f) changes very much. China ranks at the
458 top with the lowest S_f , amounting to 5.92 cases per 100,000 persons. The PCCP in
459 India increases very much from 5.65 at S_0 to 36.88 cases per million at S_f . The USA
460 has the highest value at S_f , amounting to 727.37 cases per 100,000 persons.

461 Table 4 also demonstrates that the ES in China, Japan, Korea and Australia is
462 much better than that in the other countries, amounting to 0.01, 0.46, 0.68, and 0.89
463 cases per million persons per day during the period between the last day of Stage 6
464 and 27 June 2020. In contrast, the ES in Brazil, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and the
465 USA reaches 143.67, 93.97, 85.78 and 71.92 cases per million persons per day,
466 respectively. Based on the value of ES , it is suggested that the future trends regarding
467 the pandemic in Brazil, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and the USA are not optimistic,
468 and it is full of challenges.

469 Low values of epidemic stability imply that the trend regarding the epidemic has
470 attained a stable state and approached zero confirmed cases. Thus, China, Japan,
471 Korea and Australia seem to have recovered from the attack of COVID-19, while
472 Brazil, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and the USA remain engaged in the battle fighting
473 against COVID-19 and are required to devote more effort to create new opportunities.
474 On 27 June 2020, China, Japan, Korea, and Australia had 24, 100, 51, 37 daily newly
475 confirmed cases (WHO, 2020), much lower than the peak of newly confirmed cases
476 for each country. In contrast, at the end of June 2020, Brazil and the USA have
477 continually set new records for daily, newly confirmed cases. The number of newly
478 confirmed cases on 27 June 2020 was 39,483, 3,938, 6,215, and 40,526 cases for

479 Brazil, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and the USA, respectively [1].

480 On 30 June 2020, the European Council announced the release of travel
481 restrictions from 1 July 2020 for residents of recommended countries, including
482 Australia, Japan, Korea, China and Canada [33]. As indicated in Table 4, China, Japan,
483 Korea and Australia ranked first to fourth in epidemic stability. Canada is slightly
484 behind in 13th place. To examine the appropriateness of lifting the travel restrictions at
485 the external borders for residents of these countries, this paper uses the data for 27
486 June 2020 as an example. On that day, the number of newly confirmed cases in China,
487 Japan, Korea, Australia and Canada was 24, 100, 51, 37, and 380, respectively,
488 equivalent to the stability of 0.0168, 0.791, 0.995, 1.451 and 10.068 cases per million
489 per day. The *ES* on 27 June 2020 in China, Japan, Korea and Australia was much
490 lower than the value of Germany's *ES* (Table 4). This implies that the spread of
491 COVID-19 has been controlled in these countries and is more stable than in Germany.
492 The *ES* value on 27 June 2020 for Canada was nearly the same as that for France, as
493 indicated in Table 4. However, Canada has executed a U-shaped pattern for the trend
494 in efficiency ranks, and this paper suggests that the EU wait and observe the
495 efficiency trend and the newly confirmed cases for Canada. Thus, this paper suggests
496 that the lifting of travel restriction for these countries, with the exception of Canada, is
497 quite reasonable based on the indicator of epidemic stability and the trends in
498 efficiency ranking presented in this paper.

499 **Conclusions**

500 At the onset of COVID 19 infection in a population, a massive testing program
501 and effective tracing system on infected people were implemented in some countries,
502 such as China and Korea. Based on the trends in efficiency ranks and the epidemic

503 stability indicators, China, Korea, Japan and Australia have performed better than
504 other counties. Thus, this paper suggests massive testing together with other strategies,
505 such as contact tracing, lockdown, mask wearing, and social distancing is
506 significantly effective in mitigating the transmission of COVID-19. Testing suspected
507 persons identified through contact tracing and reducing interpersonal contacts through
508 complete or partial lockdown also play important roles in reducing the number of
509 confirmed cases. Castillo *et al.* [34] examined the effect of the stay-at-home policy on
510 COVID-19 infection rates and found that the infection rate decreased from 0.113/day
511 pre policy to 0.047/day post policy. Ferguson *et al.* [35] found that a lockdown may
512 result in an average reduction in COVID-19 transmission by 50%, school closure by
513 20%, and other measures by approximately 10% (cited from Willis *et al.* [36]). Some
514 other studies have also presented the same conclusions that nonpharmaceutical
515 interventions may effectively prevent the spread of infection [37, 38].

516 Pearson's correlation tests were also performed in this paper to examine the impact
517 of efficiency at earlier stages on subsequent stages and found that efficiency ranks for
518 each country dramatically changed across stages. Thus, the data of newly confirmed
519 cases occurring at the present time are only for reference. The major contribution of
520 this paper was to develop an epidemic stability measure integrating the trends in
521 efficiency ranks to judge the appropriateness to reopen economies. Having not
522 reached an appropriate level of epidemic stability, economic reopening may damage
523 the anti-epidemic achievements from the earlier stages and lead to a second wave of
524 epidemic with exponential growth in the number of newly confirmed cases.

525 **References**

526 1. WHO (World Health Organization). Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Situation

- 527 Reports [Internet]. Who.int. 2020 [cited 2020]. Available from:
528 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports>
529 [ts](#)
- 530 2. Yaya S, Xi C, Xiaoyang Z, Meixia Z. Evaluating the efficiency of China's
531 healthcare service: A weighted DEA-game theory in a competitive environment.
532 Journal of Cleaner Production. 2020;270:122431.
- 533 3. Cavalieri M, Guccio C, Rizzo I. On the role of environmental corruption in
534 healthcare infrastructures: An empirical assessment for Italy using DEA with
535 truncated regression approach. Health Policy. 2017;121(5):515-524.
- 536 4. Balitskiy S, Bilan Y, Strielkowski W, Štreimikienė D. Energy efficiency and
537 natural gas consumption in the context of economic development in the European
538 Union. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews. 2016;55:156-168.
- 539 5. Cruz N, Carvalho P, Marques R. Disentangling the cost efficiency of jointly
540 provided water and wastewater services. Utilities Policy. 2013;24:70-77.
- 541 6. Vazhayil J, Balasubramanian R. Optimization of India's power sector strategies
542 using weight-restricted stochastic data envelopment analysis. Energy Policy.
543 2013;56:456-465.
- 544 7. Oggioni G, Riccardi R, Toninelli R. Eco-efficiency of the world cement industry:
545 A data envelopment analysis. Energy Policy. 2011;39(5):2842-2854.
- 546 8. Mousavi-Avval S, Rafiee S, Mohammadi A. Optimization of energy consumption
547 and input costs for apple production in Iran using data envelopment analysis.
548 Energy. 2011;36(2):909-916.
- 549 9. Mohammadi A, Rafiee S, Mohtasebi S, Mousavi Avval S, Rafiee H. Energy
550 efficiency improvement and input cost saving in kiwifruit production using Data
551 Envelopment Analysis approach. Renewable Energy. 2011;36(9):2573-2579.


- 552 10. Egilmez G, Kucukvar M, Tatari O. Sustainability assessment of U.S.
553 manufacturing sectors: an economic input output-based frontier approach. Journal
554 of Cleaner Production. 2013;53:91-102.
- 555 11. Khushalani J, Ozcan Y. Are hospitals producing quality care efficiently? An
556 analysis using Dynamic Network Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA).
557 Socio-Economic Planning Sciences. 2017;60:15-23.
- 558 12. Deily M, McKay N. Cost inefficiency and mortality rates in Florida hospitals.
559 Health Economics. 2006;15(4):419-431.
- 560 13. The world bank. Urban population (% of total population) - Iceland [Internet].
561 Data.worldbank.org. 2020 [cited 30 June 2020]. Available from:
562 [https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.URB.TOTL.IN.ZS?end=2018&locations=](https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.URB.TOTL.IN.ZS?end=2018&locations=IS&start=1987)
563 [IS&start=1987](https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.URB.TOTL.IN.ZS?end=2018&locations=IS&start=1987)
- 564 14. Charnes A, Cooper W, Rhodes E. Measuring the efficiency of decision making
565 units. European Journal of Operational Research. 1978;2(6):429-444.
- 566 15. Farrell M. The Measurement of Productive Efficiency. Journal of the Royal
567 Statistical Society Series A (General). 1957;120(3):253-281.
- 568 16. Cooper W, Seiford L, Tone K. Data Envelopment Analysis: A Comprehensive Text
569 with Models, Applications, References and DEA-Solver Software. Boston, MA:
570 Springer; 2007.
- 571 17. Hawdon D. Efficiency, performance and regulation of the international gas
572 industry—a bootstrap DEA approach. Energy Policy. 2003;31(11):1167-1178.
- 573 18. Neiderud C. How urbanization affects the epidemiology of emerging infectious
574 diseases. Infection Ecology & Epidemiology. 2015;5(1):27060.

- 575 19. Lienhardt C. From Exposure to Disease: The Role of Environmental Factors in
576 Susceptibility to and Development of Tuberculosis. *Epidemiologic Reviews*.
577 2001;23(2):288-301.
- 578 20. Hayward A, Darton T, Van-Tam J, Watson J, Coker R, Schwoebel V.
579 Epidemiology and control of tuberculosis in Western European cities. *The*
580 *International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease*. 2003;7(8):751-757.
- 581 21. Worldometer. Countries in the world by population (2020) [Internet]. Worldometer.
582 2020 [cited 2020]. Available from:
583 <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/population-by-country/6>
- 584 22. Michael A. How South Korea flattened the coronavirus curve with technology
585 [Internet]. *The Conversation*. 2020 [cited 21 April 2020]. Available from:
586 [https://theconversation.com/how-south-korea-flattened-the-coronavirus-curve-](https://theconversation.com/how-south-korea-flattened-the-coronavirus-curve-with-technology-136202)
587 [with-technology-136202](https://theconversation.com/how-south-korea-flattened-the-coronavirus-curve-with-technology-136202)
- 588 23. Ferrier K, Hwang S. How South Korea Is Building Influence Through COVID-19
589 Testing Kits [Internet]. *The Diplomat.com*. 2020 [cited 30 April 2020]. Available
590 from:
591 [https://thediplomat.com/2020/04/how-south-korea-is-building-influence-through-c](https://thediplomat.com/2020/04/how-south-korea-is-building-influence-through-covid-19-testing-kits/)
592 [ovid-19-testing-kits/](https://thediplomat.com/2020/04/how-south-korea-is-building-influence-through-covid-19-testing-kits/)
- 593 24. Ritchie H, Ortiz-Ospina E, Beltekian D, Mathieu E, Hasell J, Macdonald B et al.
594 *Statistics and Research: Coronavirus (COVID-19) Testing* [Internet]. *Our World in*
595 *Data*. 2020 [cited 12 May 2020]. Available from:


- 596 <https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus-data>
- 597 25. Barr S. Coronavirus: what is herd immunity and is it an option for dealing with the
598 UK coronavirus outbreak? [Internet]. The Independent. 2020 [cited 15 April 2020].
599 Available from:
600 [https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/health-and-families/coronavirus-herd-im](https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/health-and-families/coronavirus-herd-immunity-meaning-definition-what-vaccine-immune-covid-19-a9397871.html)
601 [munity-meaning-definition-what-vaccine-immune-covid-19-a9397871.html](https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/health-and-families/coronavirus-herd-immunity-meaning-definition-what-vaccine-immune-covid-19-a9397871.html)
- 602 26. Tadros E, McIlroy T, Margo J. Australia's virus testing rate leads world [Internet].
603 Australian Financial Review. 2020 [cited 10 July 2020]. Available from:
604 [https://www.afr.com/politics/federal/australia-s-testing-is-key-to-slower-infection-](https://www.afr.com/politics/federal/australia-s-testing-is-key-to-slower-infection-rate-20200401-p54fx7)
605 [rate-20200401-p54fx7](https://www.afr.com/politics/federal/australia-s-testing-is-key-to-slower-infection-rate-20200401-p54fx7)
- 606 27. Vaidyanathan G. People power: How India is attempting to slow the coronavirus
607 [Internet]. Nature.com. 2020 [cited 12 April 2020]. Available from:
608 <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-01058-5>
- 609 28. Garda world. Russia: Chinese citizens to be barred entry into Russia from
610 February 20 /update 7 [Internet]. GardaWorld. 2020 [cited 2 July 2020]. Available
611 from:
612 [https://www.garda.com/crisis24/news-alerts/315171/russia-chinese-citizens-to-be-](https://www.garda.com/crisis24/news-alerts/315171/russia-chinese-citizens-to-be-barred-entry-into-russia-from-february-20-update-7)
613 [barred-entry-into-russia-from-february-20-update-7](https://www.garda.com/crisis24/news-alerts/315171/russia-chinese-citizens-to-be-barred-entry-into-russia-from-february-20-update-7)
- 614 29. Tsvetkova M. False negative: officials say Russian virus tests often give wrong
615 result [Internet]. U.S. 2020 [cited 8 May 2020]. Available from:
616 [https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-russia-tests/false-negative-o](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-russia-tests/false-negative-officials-say-russian-virus-tests-often-give-wrong-result-idUSKBN22J347)
617 [fficials-say-russian-virus-tests-often-give-wrong-result-idUSKBN22J347](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-russia-tests/false-negative-officials-say-russian-virus-tests-often-give-wrong-result-idUSKBN22J347)
- 618 30. Wibawa T. Wearing a mask in the United States is political, but Republicans are
619 speaking out as coronavirus cases grow [Internet]. Abc.net.au. 2020 [cited 10 July
620 2020]. Available from:

- 621 <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-07-01/coronavirus-masks-are-political-in-us-do>
622 [nald-trump-rejects-them/12403962](https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-07-01/coronavirus-masks-are-political-in-us-do-nald-trump-rejects-them/12403962)
- 623 31. Prasad R. Coronavirus: Why is there a US backlash to masks? [Internet]. BBC
624 News. 2020 [cited 10 July 2020]. Available from:
625 <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-52540015>
- 626 32. Eaton M, Borden King A, Emma K, Seigler A. Trump Suggested ‘Injecting’
627 Disinfectant to Cure Coronavirus? We’re Not Surprised [Internet]. Nytimes.com.
628 2020 [cited 26 April 2020]. Available from:
629 [https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/26/opinion/coronavirus-bleach-trump-autism.ht](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/26/opinion/coronavirus-bleach-trump-autism.html)
630 [ml](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/26/opinion/coronavirus-bleach-trump-autism.html)
- 631 33. European Council. Council agrees to start lifting travel restrictions for residents of
632 some third countries [Internet]. Consilium.europa.eu. 2020 [cited 30 June 2020].
633 Available from:
634 <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2020/06/30/council-agre>
635 [es-to-start-lifting-travel-restrictions-for-residents-of-some-third-countries/](https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2020/06/30/council-agre)
- 636 34. Castillo R, Staguhn E, Weston-Farber E. The effect of state-level stay-at-home
637 orders on COVID-19 infection rates. American Journal of Infection Control.
638 2020;48(8):958-960.
- 639 35. Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati-Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin M et al.
640 Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19

- 641 mortality and healthcare demand. London: Imperial College COVID-19 Response
642 Team; 2020.
- 643 36. Willis M, Díaz V, Prado-Rubio O, von Stosch M. Insights into the dynamics and
644 control of COVID-19 infection rates. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*.
645 2020;138:109937.
- 646 37. Aledort J, Lurie N, Wasserman J, Bozzette S. Non-pharmaceutical public health
647 interventions for pandemic influenza: an evaluation of the evidence base. *BMC*
648 *Public Health*. 2007;7(1).
- 649 38. Torner N, Soldevila N, Garcia J, Launes C, Godoy P, Castilla J, Domínguez A.
650 Effectiveness of non-pharmaceutical measures in preventing pediatric influenza: a
651 case–control study. *BMC Public Health*. 2015;15(1):543.




Ranks




China Korea Italy Spain UK Germany France


Ranks



Ranks



Ranks



USA Iran Turkey Indonesia Pakistan South Africa

Ranks

