

# Decline in mitigation readiness facilitated second waves of SARS-CoV-2

Kai Wirtz

<sup>1</sup>*Helmholtz Centre Geesthacht, Geesthacht, Germany*

Societal responses crucially shape the course of a pandemics but are difficult to predict. Mitigation dynamics is introduced here as an integral part of an epidemiological model, which is applied to the ongoing SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. Unperturbed simulations accurately reproduce diverse epidemic and social response trajectories from 2020 to 2021 reported from 11 European countries, Iran, and 8 US states. High regional variability in the severity and duration of the spring lockdown and in peak mortality rates of the first SARS-CoV-2 wave can be explained by differences in mitigation readiness  $H$  which is here mathematically defined as the value of human lives in relation to business-as-usual contact rates.  $H$  entails a suite of political, social, and psychological aspects of decision making. The simulations also suggest that a subsequent decrease in  $H$  much intensified the second wave and slowed down its decay. With less effective lockdowns, vaccination became the primary mitigation strategy in 2021. Retardation of vaccination relative to a 3-month scheme is projected to provoke an average toll of 1.5 deaths per million and delayed day. This toll particularly rises in regions with high numbers of old and still susceptible people, which is relevant for revising current policies of vaccine distribution.

Societies struck by the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemics in early 2020, mostly in Western industrialized countries, managed to reduce infection rates through non-pharmaceutical mitigation such as social distancing [1, 2]. After these societies started to lift lockdowns in May 2020 [3, 4], some reached very low case numbers, while others faced continuously high mortality caused by the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Later in autumn and winter 2020/21, all these regions were hit by a second wave. Despite the experiences

26 gained during the first lockdown [5], finding appropriate mitigation measures remained a difficult  
task [6,3]. The situation was further complicated in early 2021 by *SARS-CoV-2* spike mutations [7]  
28 and by the arrival of vaccines with uncertain distribution scheduling and public acceptance [8].

The lack of reliable mid-term future scenarios guiding the defense against *SARS-CoV-2*  
30 [9, 10] stimulated the development of predictive tools. However, societal mitigation as a ma-  
jor control of the spreading dynamics was largely absent in classical epidemiological models.  
32 Simulation studies hence increasingly incorporated human agency [11, 12, 13, 14], with diverse  
modeling approaches comprising rule-based, fitted, extrapolated, or pre-defined scenario settings  
34 [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20]. Yet, no model could reproduce the observed re-adjustments in social  
distancing measures [21, 13] across different countries in a forecast mode. Here, I seek to explain  
36 regional variability in viral spread dynamics and in societal responses by introducing an integrated  
societal epidemiological model. Numerical experiments covering the period 2020 to 2021 seek  
38 to provide insights and scenarios for supporting the ongoing battle against the pandemic and the  
attempts to reduce its devastating impacts on human lives and livelihood.

40 The mechanistic approach is built on a susceptible-infected-recovered (SIR) model, which  
resolves seven age groups, and is the first model that features (age-specific) contact rates as prog-  
42 nostic and adaptive variables. Adaptive changes in social mixing underlying the *SARS-CoV-2*  
transmission are here proposed to be driven by three pressures describing the benefits and costs  
44 of social distancing: (i) individual avoidance of own infection and mortality, (ii) social coherence  
in reducing overall infection levels, and (iii) costs of social distancing (see derivation in Meth-  
46 ods). Changes in contact rates are then determined by the balance between the associated shift in

COVID-19 mortality  $M$  – or the benefit of less mixing– and in the multifaceted socio-economic  
48 consequences  $C$  – or the costs of less mixing. Induced transmission shifts minimize integral social  
and mortality costs ( $M + C$ ): during a pandemic, optimal contact rates are much reduced com-  
50 pared to business-as-usual (BAU) social mixing but still remain non-zero (Fig. 1a). For integrating  
 $M$  and  $C$  in the same metric, this work introduces the social trait  $H$  that quantifies the relevance  
52 of avoiding deaths versus keeping BAU contact rates (thus denoting a ”human value”). This trait  
describes a full suite of aspects and dimensions in societal decision-making: the priority of govern-  
54 ments to safeguard the economy, their facilitation of partisan polarization [22], capacity of elites  
and people to extrapolate in time (see Sec. S3), presence of misinformation and scepticism vs. ef-  
56 fective science communication [23, 14], group (in-)coherence and (non-)conformity to norms [23],  
individualistic vs. community oriented norms [23], psychological resilience vs. fatigue [23, 24],  
58 or other individual attitudes such as patience, altruism, trust in institutions [25, 23, 14]. These as-  
pects can in addition be mutually dependent such as norm adherence of individuals being linked  
60 to socio-economic inequalities [24]. In total, the aspects determine the *mitigation readiness* of a  
society during a pandemics. Societies characterized by a low mitigation readiness  $H$  tolerate a  
62 higher death toll before restricting mixing and mobility compared to those with a higher  $H$ . At  
low  $H$ , elevated social costs  $C$  curtail social distancing to small deviations from the BAU baseline  
64 (Fig. 1b). The mitigation readiness  $H$  is the only adjustable parameter of the model to address  
regional differences in the response to *SARS-CoV-2* throughout the entire simulation period. It  
66 is treated differently within two model variants: either  $H$  is kept constant at a base value  $H_0$ , or  
steadily declines after the first lockdown from  $H_0$  at the degradation rate  $r_H$ .

68 In addition, fixed regional traits here describe differences in seasonality, BAU mixing pat-

terns, and in age structure. Age affects epidemiological characteristics such as attack rates [15, 26,  
70 10] and infection fatality ratio (IFR) which both are elevated in older age classes (Sec. S2). As a  
result, higher death tolls in aged populations will favor stronger social distancing (Fig. 1c).

72 At a given level of contact, viral transmission is assumed to decrease due to individual be-  
havior and environmental factors. For example, moving everyday life outdoors or the wearing of  
74 face masks can effectively reduce exposure to viral infection (see Methods).

This study considers the COVID-19 associated mortality rate not only as part of the utility  
76 function but also as a major variable used for validation. Mortality data make a more reliable  
indicator for the infection state than the number of confirmed cases [10, 27, 28]. Selected by  
78 their high mortality rates in spring 2020, 20 regions were examined in this study, comprising 11  
European countries, Iran, and 8 US states (see Tab. S1 and Methods).

## 80 **Model skill**

Across the 20 regions, simulated COVID-19 associated death counts were consistent with the  
82 existing data (Fig. 2). Until Sep 2020, simulated mortality and data accurately match, and also  
the subsequent wave was reproduced by the model with only moderate deviations and time lags,  
84 including the occurrence of third waves for Louisiana, Georgia, and Iran. Fitting of the second  
and third waves can be further improved by calibrating three instead of one parameter (Fig. S1).  
86 The overall agreement is remarkable because mortality trajectories differed greatly among regions  
[10, 27] and model runs represent true hindcasts: apart from a superimposed synchronous initiation  
88 of the first lockdown (see Methods) simulations were not corrected or tuned. This indicates a high



predictive capability even in the mid to long term.

## 90 **Lockdown severity and mitigation readiness**

The ratio between the reported intensity of social distancing and mortality during the first wave  
92 constrains regional values of the base mitigation readiness  $H_0$  (see Eq.(5) in Methods). High  $H_0$   
were calibrated for many European countries that had faced a strong and enduring spring lock-  
94 down (Fig. 3) independent of their peak mortality rate (Fig. 2). To the contrary, inverse modeling  
attributed a relatively low  $H_0$  for most US states with their often milder lockdowns despite elevated  
96 mortality (Fig. 2, S2, Tab. S1). Values for US states, apart for Washington, lay in a narrow range  
(1.3–4.2  $10^4$ ), which may point to a small variability of this aggregate social trait within coun-  
98 tries. In regions with small  $H_0$  and lacking intense first lockdowns, mortality either decayed much  
slower compared to the average of all regions such as in Sweden, or a second wave built up already  
100 in summer 2020 such as in Louisiana (Fig. 2). The simulations well captured not only regional  
differences in lockdown severity, comprising a lockdown mobility above 50% of pre-pandemic  
102 levels (e.g., in Sweden or Georgia) or below 20% (e.g., UK or Italy), but also the different rates of  
recovery in mobility such as a fast return to BAU mobility in New Jersey versus a slower one in  
104 Washington (Fig. 3). The single calibration parameter  $H_0$  hence appeared to infer a realistic mu-  
tual interdependency of mobility and mortality patterns across regions so that mobility trajectories  
106 were overall in high quantitative agreement with the data.

## Decreasing readiness promoted the second wave

108 Contrary to first waves, second or third waves do not reach the actual death tolls if mitigation  
readiness stays constant in the model. Hindcasted peak mortality rates raising in autumn 2020  
110 were on average by roughly a factor three lower than the reported ones. Only the model variant  
including a catchup mechanism generated by a steady post-lockdown decline in  $H$  (degradation  
112 rate  $r_H > 0$ , Fig. S2) enables a quantitative reproduction of peak death tolls, albeit in part with a  
temporal shift of up to 10 weeks such as for Ireland where data of late January (not shown) agree  
114 with the forecasted peak height (Fig. 2). Only for France and the Netherlands, the second wave  
seems to be better fitted by the first model variant, however at the cost of overestimating mobility  
116 in winter 2020/21 (Fig. 3). When extending the regional calibration to more parameters, COVID-  
19 mortality rates also of these countries were best reconstructed using non-zero degradation rates  
118 (Fig. S1). The model variant with  $r_H > 0$  ( $H < H_0$ ) in general reproduces the strong social  
mixing during late 2020 in the data more accurately than the variant with  $H=H_0$  (Fig. 3). Better  
120 performance of the variant with  $r_H > 0$  is also found for the third waves in Louisiana and Georgia  
(Fig. 2). These cases are particularly interesting to compare with an extensive US-wide study by  
122 the IHME forecasting team [20], which used a pre-defined scenario of mitigation measures. Peak  
mortalities of US states were either well predicted, or underestimated such as for Michigan, Indi-  
124 ana, and Massachusetts – or the two US states with a third wave (i.e. Louisiana and Georgia). For  
example, peak January mortality for Georgia reached  $7 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{d}^{-1}$  in their reference run, in contrast  
126 to the approximately  $20 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{d}^{-1}$  actually reported. The model presented here predicted  $4 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{d}^{-1}$   
when  $H=H_0$ , but 14 or  $20 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{d}^{-1}$  for  $H < H_0$  using the base or extended calibration, respec-  
128 tively (Fig. 2, S1). In the latter calibration, a late onset date (mid Nov) was used. This together

with the initialization of the free IHME simulations at autumn 2020 point to a rather delayed and  
130 late decline of mitigation readiness in some regions (see also time lags for, e.g. Ireland, New York,  
or Sweden). The simple scheme proposed here (Fig. S2) thus requires refinements, which should  
132 also include mechanistic reasoning. Nonetheless, the overall enhanced model accuracy using a de-  
clining  $H$  can be interpreted as an indication for an actual relaxation to BAU normality, facilitated  
134 by the political, socio-economic, and psychological processes outlined above.

### **Alternative pathways for industrialized countries**

136 The moderate autumn/winter death toll in the model variant with constant  $H=H_0$  raises the ques-  
tion as to whether different mitigation strategies in the study regions could have led to practical ex-  
138 tinction of the pathogen as realized by few Asian countries such as China [29]. The post-lockdown  
 $H$  was therefore shifted upwards in consecutive numerical experiments (and then kept constant).  
140 Increasing the mitigation readiness lowered the total post-lockdown death count; after raising  $H$   
by about one order of magnitude, viral infection was eradicated across regions (Fig. S3, S4).

142 It can be doubted that Western societies would have tolerated deeper and longer cuts into  
individual rights of privacy and movement or into economic operations at nearly invisible infection  
144 density in summer-autumn 2020. However, magnitudes of the upwards shifts in  $H$  required for  
a full termination of the epidemics well correspond to the magnitudes of (dynamic) downward  
146 shifts reconstructed for the same period (Fig. S2). Hence, the necessary changes towards elevated  
mitigation readiness would not have been more radical *per se*, but directed towards the opposite  
148 direction compared to the actual decline in readiness.

Limited ability to fully prevent subsequent epidemic waves is implicitly hardwired in the  
150 model through the optimality assumption Eq.(7) targeting the least costly adjustment to the threat.  
While this approach is capable of "flattening the curve", there may be more sustainable strategies  
152 aiming at total eradication of the pathogen [29]. A thorough "zero Covid" mitigation strategy is  
here induced by a huge value of every single case ( $H > 10^6$ , Fig. S4), not necessarily because of  
154 the appreciation of the individual life (morality) but because of the exponentially growing number  
of –avoided– cases (see "expectation capacity" above).

156 Along these lines, in an otherwise non-preventive strategy also a full travel ban cannot much  
improve the situation. To the contrary, without imported cases,  $\gamma=0$  in Eq.(1), simulated peak  
158 mortality rates of the second wave even increased in regions with low number of cases during  
summer (Fig. S5). This surprising phenomenon follows from the threat inherent to very low but  
160 non-zero case numbers at  $\gamma=0$ : When viral infection strikes from those very low levels, spreading  
rates can develop faster compared to the reference scenario ( $\gamma > 0$ ). Yet, faster spreading rates are  
162 harder to defend against, which evokes higher peak mortality rates.

### **Role of young people**

164 Social distancing in the simulations similarly affected all age groups such that age distributions of  
cases were rather flat (Fig. S6), in qualitative agreement with first seroprevalence studies [30, 31].  
166 The decline of BAU contact rates from the younger to the elderly seems to be well compensated  
by the model setting of lower attack rates of the younger. As a result, young and medium aged  
168 cohorts can maintain finite contact rates during the lockdown, especially in low  $H$  regions such as

the US (Fig. S7 and Fig. S6). Contagion within younger adults during summer 2020 fueled the  
170 epidemic rebound in all study regions (Fig. S8). The low IFR of young adults also explains why  
the ubiquitously higher case numbers of the second wave (Fig. S8) coincided with lower mortality  
172 in most of the regions [32].

The shift toward younger ages during summer is confirmed by US and German monitoring  
174 data [33, 34], albeit there the cohort from age 15 to 30 (yr) appears most prominent whereas sim-  
ulated infection levels were highest among adults older than 30 (Fig. S6). This discrepancy may  
176 indicate a lower conformity with mitigation measures within young cohorts than assumed by the  
optimal transmission regulation of the model, which is corroborated by studies revealing stronger  
178 non-conform attitudes among adolescents and young adults during the pandemics [35, 36, 37, 38].

Higher behavioral exposure ( $e_b$ ) of young people together with their increasing dominance  
180 of the case distribution can induce a net shift in averaged  $e_b$  toward less protective behavior, even  
if the willingness to cooperate (e.g., by wearing face masks) stays invariant for each cohort as  
182 suggested by polls [39], redrawn in Fig. S9. This net exposure change was captured by the simu-  
lated relaxation of  $e_b$  (Fig. S9), although there is no explicit connection between age structure and  
184 behavioral changes in the model.

Changes in the frequency distribution inducing less defensive social traits (here represented  
186 by  $e_b$  and  $H$ ) run contrary to selection for disease resistance as common in non-human populations.  
There, increasing dominance of more defended organisms reflects a correlation between infection  
188 and fitness. This correlation may be weak or absent in the case of the *SARS-CoV-2* pandemics  
affecting human populations, also because selective mortality of the elderly coincides with larger

190 absence of multigenerational households, at least in Western countries (Sec. S7). Infected individ-  
uals younger than 50 not only experience a low risk of severe symptoms or fatality, but also exert  
192 little direct harm on their kin. Consequently, individuals with non-conform attitudes promoting  
exposure and susceptibility [22] lack the incentive to change these attitudes even after having been  
194 infected themselves – which actually is more likely than for conformists. This decoupling of vari-  
ations in attitudes and their remote impacts may in part explain the reconstructed shift towards less  
196 defensive social traits in Western countries.

### **Behavior and seasonality matter**

198 During the course of the spring lockdowns, decreasing behavioral exposure  $e_b$  significantly helped  
to combat the first wave in the simulations (see also Fig. S10), a finding that underlines the rel-  
200 evance of using face masks [40, 41]. The reduction of  $e_b$  occurred at different intensity among  
regions ranging from rather inert behavior (e.g., Iran, Georgia, or Sweden) to shifts by more than  
202 50% (e.g., Ireland, Spain, or New York; Fig. S9). Readiness to improve behavioral protection  
appeared to increase under high peak mortality and/or high  $H$  value since both conditions cause  
204 intense (model) lockdowns that are here linked to behavioral shifts.

Even in regions displaying relatively inert behavioral adaptation, effective exposure  $e$  (=   
206  $e_b \cdot e_E$ ) markedly decreased in late spring 2020, which in the model follows from the transition  
to spread-reducing environmental conditions ( $e_E$ ). The decreases in  $e_E$  condense multiple bio-  
208 physical and behavioral processes driven by higher temperature and intensity of solar radiation  
such as effects on viral viability, or on placing activities from indoor to outdoor. Conversely, as

210 also anticipated by virologists [42, 43], returning autumn/winter conditions much contributed to  
the arrival of the second wave (Fig. S10), also visible from the synchronized dynamics of  $e$  and  $I$   
212 (Fig. S9 and S8). Seasonality effects are, against expectation, most evident for regions at relatively  
low latitude such as Louisiana and Iran, where the increase in  $e_E$  already started during summer  
214 (Fig. S9) due to supra-optimal temperatures and was furthermore accompanied by high values of  
behavioral exposure  $e_b$  as mentioned above (see also Fig. S10).

### 216 **Inequality of vaccination and mortality rates**

Higher behavioral as well as environmental exposure together with softer social distancing in win-  
218 ter 2020/21 considerably slowed down the decay of the second wave in comparison to the first  
wave (Fig. 2). In this situation, Western societies turned to vaccination to become the primary  
220 mitigation strategy as vaccines were approved and available from Dec 2020 onwards. However,  
vaccine rollout in 2021 will likely be hindered by, e.g., limited vaccine production, inefficient  
222 logistics, purchasing conditions, and low acceptance among the public [8, 44]. All these factors  
differ between the study regions, not to speak of the announced completion targets of 3 months  
224 for USA and UK vs. 9 months for member states of the European Community. This motivated a  
set of scenario runs where the length of the vaccination period and the acceptance ratio was varied  
226 (see Methods). As expected, simulated death toll in 2021 increases with extending the vaccination  
period, and also with decreasing acceptance ratio (Fig. 4). A delay by 6 months in average costs  
228 nearly four times more lives, which is equivalent to 1.5 deaths per million and delayed day. For an  
aging country such as Germany this number amounts to 2.1 corresponding to an extra absolute loss  
230 of 178 deaths per delayed day, with a maximal mortality difference in March 2021 (Fig. S1). For

comparison, a 30% drop in acceptance/efficacy within a 9-month scheme in average exacerbates  
232 the death toll by 17%, from 403 to 470 per million. Regional differences in death tolls projected for  
2021 were found to cover a factor of about 8 from the lowest (Iran, Belgium) to the highest values  
234 (Portugal) at a 3 month period and a factor of 4-8 (Spain or Iran vs. Portugal) at a 9 month period.  
These stark differences mainly correlate with the product of (1) the mortality rate at vaccination  
236 start and (2) the fraction of susceptible and old individuals (Fig. S1). The large inequalities in vac-  
cination effects question the prevailing vaccine partition among countries or regions as it neglects  
238 the current infection state of the population or abundance of the elderly that are still susceptible to  
*SARS-CoV-2*.

#### 240 **Short forecast horizon of state-of-the-art models**

In all simulations, infection waves were halted by transmission reduction – or by vaccination – and  
242 not by depletion of susceptibles as forecasted by many state-of-the-art models. SIR models cannot  
seamlessly produce flat infection curves due to their mathematical structure combined with the  
244 lack of human agency, which in part explains why SIR models (alike statistical models) typically  
have a forecast horizon of only few weeks [9, 45].

246 First attempts to extend epidemiological dynamics by macroeconomic factors [46, 26, 47, 25]  
use a utility function similar to the approach presented here, and also distinguish between different  
248 types of agents such as ”private individuals” (cf. here the selfish pressure) or the ”social plan-  
ner” (community pressure). However, economic models rely on equilibrium assumptions and on  
250 strictly quantifiable (monetary) units and, thus neglect potentially important non-economic aspects



of societal decision-making such as learning under uncertainty, psychological fatigue, or political  
252 partisanism [14, 23, 22]. The negligence of sensible and dynamic control processes may be respon-  
sible for why the regular outcome of economic approaches remained within the herd immunization  
254 scenario of SIR models. In the presented model, the value of human lives ( $H$ ) is defined in rela-  
tion to an essential mitigation quantity during a pandemics which is social distancing, and not a  
256 monetary unit; furthermore, the results shown here suggest a high relevance for models to resolve  
societal responses dynamically.

258 Rather than social *dynamics* other recent approaches emphasize social *actions*: they are  
based on semi-heuristic rules of social distancing such as piecewise re-fitting of transmission  
260 [48, 19], imposing pre-defined or rule-based shifts [17, 18, 20], relaxing transmission [27], and  
by relaxation cycles [15, 10]. These approaches may be very supportive tools for short-term deci-  
262 sion problems, but need to become more mechanistic with respect to their mitigation module, and  
also need to be validated at a monthly or longer time scale. More validation effort is also required  
264 for the model presented here, for example through applications to a broader range of societies,  
particularly those of non-Western countries, for testing model generality and suitability for sup-  
266 porting strategic planning. As for any model used for decision making, also this model has to be  
taken with caveats, which are briefly summarized in Sec. S10.

## 268 **Blueprint for adaptation problems**

This study highlights social response and individual behavior and their possible deterioration as  
270 critical controls of the *SARS-CoV-2* pandemics. The unprecedented model skill over nearly one

year across many regions may indicate (1) that the model captured governing principles of viral  
272 and social dynamics during a pandemic and (2) that societal responses display a high adaptive  
significance insofar minimizing both social costs and death tolls.

274 However, adaptive capacity is also an attribute of viruses. Mutations in *SARS-CoV-2* started  
to impact spread trajectories [49, 50, 51, 7]. These mutational drifts in parameters of *SARS-CoV-2*  
276 virulence and incubation behavior can be resolved very analogue to the adaptive dynamics imple-  
mented in the social model (Eq.(7) in Methods). This extended framework would facilitate mod-  
278 eling studies on the evolutionary arm races between human societies and *SARS-CoV-2* or other  
viruses. The framework can further be used as a blueprint for related problems, such as Climate  
280 Change assessments, which share, e.g., the balancing of environmental pressures with costly adap-  
tation and mitigation efforts, or the need for extrapolating aspects of the utility function into the  
282 future. During pandemics and Climate Change, human agency is not an external boundary setting  
but an integral part of the system dynamics.




Figure 1: COVID-19 associated losses depending on contact rate. (a) Social costs  $C$  (red line) including, e.g., economic downturn, cultural loss, political instability, and psychological pressure, are inversely related to the value of social contacts vs. human lives ( $H$ ).  $C$  is assumed to have a minimum at "business-as-usual" (BAU) contact rates and to increase non-linearly with growing distance from those BAU contact rates; mortality  $M$  (violet line) linearly increases with contact rate. The minimum of the sum loss  $M + C$  (brown line) is in the model approached by an adaptive adjustment in social mixing. (b) Younger societies will often feature a lower  $H$  due to lacking buffer mechanisms and lower fraction of people at risk compared to older societies. The resulting high social costs of social distancing keep the contact rate close to the BAU value. (c) In contrast, aged societies will have on average a higher infection fatality ratio and, concomitantly, mortality rate, which motivates stricter lockdowns.




Figure 2: Daily mortality rate simulated either in a variant with constant  $H=H_0$  (olive line,  $r_H=0$  in Eq.(4)) or one with decreasing  $H$  ( $r_H > 0$ ) after the first lockdown (red line). Uncertainty in model trajectories (shaded areas) arises from simulations with close-to-optimal  $H_0$  values as well as a range in external input ( $\gamma$ ). From the reported and corrected mortality data (see Methods, blue line) only the first 180 entries were used for calibration of  $H_0$  (dark blue line), while the second half of the time-series is shown for comparison (light blue line). Note the different scaling of the y-axis as also visualized by the grey line at  $M=10^{-5}d^{-1}$ , which roughly corresponds to the mortality rate at starting capacity limitation of ICU hospitalization. European countries are labelled in blue, US states in red. The ordering of regions from left to right reflects increasing base  $H_0$  (defined in Eq.(5); grey numbers to the right top, relative to  $10^4$ ), and from top to bottom the decreasing product of the initial spread rate  $\beta'_0$  (Eq.(S6)) and the awareness  $\Delta t$  (Eq.(S3)).




Figure 3: Mobility in 2020-2021 measured based on routing requests from mobile Apple devices (blue line), compared with the summed contact rate (Eq.(S8) in Sec. S7) in the reference simulation with constant  $H=H_0$  (olive line) and the simulation with decreasing  $H$  (red line, see Fig. 2). Severity of the spring lockdown is displayed as blue area below a mobility of 50% of the base level in Feb 2020.




Figure 4: (a) Susceptible people in the oldest age group ( $S_7$ , % of total population; brown line) and mortality rate ( $M$ , black line), both simulated for the vaccination start on Dec 25, 2020 (see also Fig. S1). The rescaled product of the two quantities (grey line) defines the ordering of regions from left to right. (b) Integrated projected death tolls from February to end of 2021 for three vaccination schemes characterized by vaccination period  $\Delta T_{\text{vacc}}$  and vaccine efficacy: (1)  $\Delta T_{\text{vacc}}=3$  months (100% efficacy, red bars), (2)  $\Delta T_{\text{vacc}}=9$  months (100%, light blue), and (3)  $\Delta T_{\text{vacc}}=9$  months (70%, purple).

## 284 **Material and methods**

### **The societal-epidemiological model**

286 The epidemiological section of the model resembles a SIR model as it distinguishes between susceptible and recovered people and those infected by *SARS-CoV-2*. For seven age classes  $i = 1 \dots 7$ ,  
288 it resolves the fraction of infected individuals  $I_i$  of age group  $i$  relative to the total population size.  $I_i$  increases when susceptible people in that age class ( $S_i$ ) contract the virus and decreases at specific recovery rate  $r$  (Tab. S2):

$$\frac{dI_i}{dt} = \beta_i S_i - r I_i + \gamma_i \quad \text{with} \quad \beta_i = e \sum_j \beta_{ji} I_j \quad (1)$$

A global external input rate  $\gamma$  into a region (e.g., from travelers) is parametrized in Sec. S8. At  
292 simulation start, the fraction of susceptible individuals  $S_i$  equals the population fraction  $\varphi_i$  of the age cohort and thereafter declines due to infection and subsequent immunization or fatality,  $S_i =$   
294  $\varphi_i e^{-\int \beta_i dt}$ . Group transmission rates  $\beta_i$  comprise variations in the effective exposure  $e = e_b \cdot e_E$  by behavioral changes  $e_b$  and environmental factors  $e_E$  (see below and Sec. S9) and changes in  
296 contacts between age cohort  $i$  and all age groups. The specific transmission rate  $\beta_{ji}$  describes the probability *per individual* of potentially *contagious* encounter, and has to be distinguished from  
298 the contact rate  $m_{ij}$ , which is the probability *per age group* of *physical* encounter,

$$\varphi_i \beta_{ij} = \alpha_i \alpha_j m_{ij} \quad (2)$$

with specific attack rates  $\alpha_i$  (Sec. S2). Infection described by Eq.(1) leads to a (lagged) mortality  
300 rate  $M$  caused by COVID-19 given by

$$M = \sum_i \omega_i \beta_i S_i \quad (3)$$

with age-specific IFR  $\omega_i$  (Sec. S2).

302 Reductions in mixing and transmission by social distancing or other related restrictive mea-  
sures induce a multi-faceted "social cost" ( $C$ ) [52]. This quantity aggregates over various damages  
304 of social distancing on economic and psychological well-being, political stability, or cultural di-  
versity [1, 16, 53, 52, 54]. Social cost  $C$  of mitigation is here assumed to rise with increasing social  
306 distance (denoted as SD), which sums over all differences of contact rates  $m_{ij}$  to their values  $m_{ij,0}$   
before the epidemic, weighed by  $m_{ij,0}$  and sizes of interacting age classes.

$$C = H^{-1} \cdot \text{SD} \quad \text{with} \quad \text{SD} = \sum_i \sum_{j \leq i} \varphi_i \varphi_j m_{ij,0} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{m_{ij}(\beta_{ij})}{m_{ij,0}}\right)^2 \quad (4)$$

308 The quadratic dependency on contact rate ratios (being linearly related to  $M$ ) resembles the rela-  
tion between GDP loss and mortality at variable social distancing found by economic models [26].  
310 It encompasses tolerance against small deviations but strong effects of downturning contacts to  
their minimum. The inverse proportionality coefficient, the mitigation readiness  $H$ , determines  
312 the height of mitigation costs perceived by a society in units of the mortality rate. Delayed and  
accumulating impacts on societal, economic, and psychological well-being [55, 53, 56, 54] and con-  
314 sequential shifts in prioritization are here captured by a steady decrease of  $H$  at the "degradation"  
rate  $r_H$ , activated on the day  $t_{\text{reset}}$  when net infection at low case numbers returns from a negative  
316 to a positive rate after the first lockdown,

$$H = H_0 \cdot \frac{1 + e^{-x}}{1 + c_H + e^{-x}} \quad \text{with} \quad x = r_H (t - t_{\text{reset}}) \quad (5)$$

with reduction factor  $c_H$ . The functional form derives from inverting (cf.  $H^{-1}$  in Eq.(4)) the  
318 logistic function that is a classical descriptor used in societal and economic theory [57]. A zero or  
non-zero degradation rate  $r_H$  distinguishes the two model variants used in this study.



320  $H$  serves as a central linkage between the socio-economic part of the model and the epidemiological one or, more specifically, between the different meanings of the two loss functions  $C$  and  
322  $M$ . This enables to define the total loss  $L$ , which as the utility function of the integrated model guides societal responses during the pandemic:

$$L = C + M \quad (6)$$

324 Avoidance of pathogenic transmission (by lowering  $\beta_{ji}$ ) and, as a consequence, reduced COVID-19-associated death toll has to be traded off with associated social costs. Societal transmission  
326 regulations are here suggested to be rational in terms of minimizing the combined loss  $L$ . The existence of the utility function  $L(\beta_{ij})$  allows to describe social regulations as adaptive dynamics  
328 of specific transmission rates  $\beta_{ij}$ . Following the adaptive trait dynamics approach [58], once even applied to societal dynamics [59], this is formulated as an evolution equation for  $\beta_{ij}$  entailing a  
330 "responsiveness"  $\delta$  times the marginal dependence of  $L$  on changes in  $\beta_{ij}$ .

$$\frac{d\beta_{ij}}{dt} = -\delta \cdot \frac{dL}{d\beta_{ij}} = -\delta \cdot \left[ \frac{\partial C}{\partial \beta_{ij}} + \frac{\partial M}{\partial \beta_{ij}} + \frac{dM}{dI} \frac{dI}{d\beta_{ij}} \right] \quad (7)$$

In a physical analogue, responsiveness  $\delta$  describes the conductivity of how fast emerging threats  
332 induce new societal rules, and the bracketed derivative expression as a pressure acting on social traits, which is divided into three parts (see also Sec. S3): the first term in Eq.(7) can be directly  
334 calculated from Eq.(4) to be proportional to  $\beta_{ij,0} - \beta_{ij}$  and hence seeks to relax societal life to the pre-pandemic state. The second term in Eq.(7) quantifies the demand of life protection and simply  
336 follows from the mortality dependence on infection rates in Eqs.(1)–(3). This term is proportional to the IFR  $\omega_j$  of the target age group, which strongly decreases in younger cohorts (Sec. S2).  
338 As a consequence, only interactions with and among senior groups would experience high reduction pressure; however, these contacts among or with the elderly cannot be shut down entirely (see

340 Sec. S7), so that virulence among the young people can persistently contaminate the old ones. This  
side effect of isolated regulation in individual age-groups necessitates the extension of the adaptive  
342 dynamic framework by the third, "community-oriented" derivative term in Eq.(7) based on aver-  
aged target variables ( $I$  instead of  $I_i$ ). This term represents the responsibility of governments and  
344 the population as a whole, and requires sociality of young, non-risk groups (Sec. S3).

In addition to the adaptive shifts in contact rates, the model includes variations in the behav-  
346 ioral reduction of exposure  $e_b$ . For example, wearing face masks or keeping sufficient interpersonal  
spatial distance up to self-isolation further lowers the infection risk at a given frequency of phys-  
348 ical contact. The difficulty in formulating a reasonable cost function for behavior changes leads  
to a heuristic dynamics linked to social distancing (SD, defined in Eq.(4)): people are assumed to  
350 be more prone to adopt new behavioral rules at higher reductions in mobility and livelihood. This  
is expressed by a relaxation where  $e_b$  seeks to approach a target value  $e^*$  that decreases from its  
352 pre-pandemic value  $e^*=1$  with increasing SD

$$\frac{de_b}{dt} = r_b \cdot (e^* - e_b) \quad \text{with} \quad e^* = 1 - \epsilon \cdot \sqrt{\text{SD}} \quad (8)$$

with specific adoption rate  $r_b$  and specific behavioral sensitivity  $\epsilon$ . The square root dependency  
354 reverts the squaring in Eq.(4) in order to create sensitivity already to small variations in SD.

### Data integration and region selection

356 Fatality data were downloaded on Jan, 16, 2021 from the Johns Hopkins CSSE COVID-19 Dataset  
[32] and smoothed by 7-day averaging. A regional correction factor was applied that averages  
358 the temporal means of the CSSE data and of the estimated excess deaths for US states [60] and

for European countries [61]. Regions were selected if they had  $>700$  death cases by April 25,  
360 2020, and a relative mortality above the threshold  $M_{\text{crit}}=7 \cdot 10^{-7} \text{d}^{-1}$  by Mar, 25, 2020. China was  
excluded owing to data irregularities and to its pioneering role in handling the epidemic. For  
362 Ireland, old cases from retirement homes reported on April 24 were re-distributed to the preceding  
time series. Iranian mortality data were multiplied with a higher and initially dynamic correction  
364 factor to comply with media reports [62]. Tab. S1 provides a full list of countries and states,  
correction factors, and demographic or regional characteristics.

366 For all study regions except for Iran, mobility has been reported from routing requests of  
Apple mobiles [63], which is taken as a measure for the intensity of social distancing [64, 65]. For  
368 7 of the selected European countries and USA at the country level, survey data on the willingness  
to wear face masks in the public [39] were used as a qualitative proxy to compare with simulated  
370 changes in behavioral exposure.

## Numerical experiments

372 This study is based on a systematic model calibration and three numerical experiments:

(A) For each region, the model was run over 400 days from 21 days before the date when  
374 reported daily mortality matches  $M_{\text{crit}}$ . Initial cases  $I_i(0)$  were set proportional to (i) the regional  
age distribution  $\varphi_i$  and (ii) the critical onset mortality  $M_{\text{crit}}$ . Initial transmissions  $\beta_{ij}(0) = \beta_{ij,0}$   
376 were derived from reported age–contact data and corrected using the slope of the mortality curve  
at the start of simulation (Sec. S6). The social trait  $H$  and the awareness factor  $\Delta t$  (Sec. S3)  
378 were systematically varied in 800 simulations for each region. Epidemiological parameters were

estimated from literature sources (see Sec. S2). The calibration of  $\Delta t$  assured a rather synchronous  
380 lockdown timing of Western industrialized countries in mid-March [66]. The reported lockdown  
onset was anticipated by one week for Italy and Iran, and delayed by 5 days for all US states. Best  
382 fitting  $H_0$ s were retrieved according to minimal root-mean-squared (RMS) deviation to mortality  
and mobility data while only the first 180 days of data were used.  $H_0$  values revealing a RMS  
384 error below 120% of the minimum were used to estimate uncertainty ranges. These close-to-  
optimal  $H_0$  were combined with a range in external input  $\gamma'$  varied from 0 to  $3 \cdot 10^3$  (thus two times  
386 the reference value, see Tab. S2) to calculate the corresponding uncertainty in model trajectories.  
Reference settings for  $f_C > 0$  were applied in all subsequent experiments apart of a single run  
388 without decline in  $H$  ( $r_H=0$  in Eq.(4), thus  $H=H_0$ ).

(B) The calibration in (A) was repeated with the the full data set; the RMS error for the late  
390 Dec (2020) to mid Jan (2021) data was weighed ten times higher than for the preceding period  
in order to achieve a reconstruction at elevated accuracy of the second wave before vaccination  
392 started. Also, three global settings of the reference run were systematically calibrated for each  
region: degradation rate  $r_H$ , external input  $\gamma'$ , and degradation date  $t_{\text{reset}}$ . Using the extended  
394 parametrization, series of 2-year simulations were conducted with different vaccination schedul-  
ing and vaccine effect. Vaccination period  $\Delta T_{\text{vacc}}$  was set either to 3 or 9 months to encompass  
396 the range of announced plans also accounting for a short immunization period. Vaccine effect de-  
scribes the acceptance ratio and the (uncertain) vaccine efficacy and was here set to either to 0.7  
398 or 1. Vaccines were in particular assumed to prevent transmission despite lacking evidence so far.  
Their application followed a common protocol prioritizing the elderly: starting from  $i = 7$ , the  
400 relative fraction of age group  $i$  was reduced by  $1/\Delta T_{\text{vacc}}$  per day until being empty; then  $i$  was

counted down to start with the next cohort.

402 (C) A series of 1.5-year simulations was run across the 20 regions in which  $H$  was systemati-  
cally increased from the regional reference value. Import rate  $\gamma'$ , vaccination rate, and degradation  
404 rate  $r_H$  were set zero.

(D) Model sensitivity for two regions (Louisiana and Belgium) was assessed by varying 12  
406 parameters 50% up and down from their reference value in Tab. S2.

## References

- 408 1. Chawla, S. & Saxena, S. K. Preparing for the perpetual challenges of pandemics of coronavirus  
410 infections with special focus on SARS-CoV-2. In *Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)*,  
165–186 (Springer, 2020).
- 412 2. Hsiang, S. *et al.* The effect of large-scale anti-contagion policies on the COVID-19 pandemic.  
*Nature* (2020). doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2404-8.
- 414 3. Yamana, T., Pei, S., Kandula, S. & Shaman, J. Projection of COVID-19 cases  
and deaths in the US as individual states re-open May 4, 2020. *medRxiv* (2020).  
416 doi:10.1101/2020.05.04.2009067.
- 418 4. Altmann, D. M., Douek, D. C. & Boyton, R. J. What policy makers need to know about  
COVID-19 protective immunity. *Lancet* **395**, 1527–1529 (2020).

5. Brauner, J. M. *et al.* Inferring the effectiveness of government interventions against COVID-19. *Science* (2020). doi:10.1126/science.abd9338.  
420
6. Kupferschmidt, K. The lockdowns worked—but what comes next? *Science* (2020).  
422 doi:10.1126/science.abc2507.
7. Volz, E. *et al.* Evaluating the effects of SARS-CoV-2 Spike mutation D614G on transmissibility and pathogenicity. *Cell* **184**, 1–12 (2021).  
424
8. Kim, J. H., Marks, F. & Clemens, J. D. Looking beyond COVID-19 vaccine phase 3 trials. *Nature Med.* (2021). doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01230-y.  
426
9. Reich, N. G. *et al.* A collaborative multiyear, multimodel assessment of seasonal influenza forecasting in the United States. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **116**, 3146–3154 (2019).  
428
10. Murray, C. & service utilization forecasting team, I. C. H. Forecasting the impact of the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic on hospital demand and deaths for the USA and European economic area countries. *medRxiv* (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.04.21.20074732.  
430
- 432 11. Enserink, M. & Kupferschmidt, K. With COVID-19, modeling takes on life and death importance. *Science* **367**, 1414–1415 (2020).
- 434 12. Kraemer, M. U. *et al.* The effect of human mobility and control measures on the COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Science* **368**, 493–497 (2020).
- 436 13. Eubank, S. *et al.* Commentary on Ferguson, et al., “Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand”. *Bull. Math. Biol.* **82**, 1–7  
438 (2020).

14. Moya, C., Kline, M., Smaldino, P. *et al.* Dynamics of behavior change in the COVID world.  
440 *American Journal of Human Biology* (2020). doi:10.1002/ajhb.23485.
15. Ferguson, N. M. *et al.* Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team. Impact of non-  
442 pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand.  
*Imperial College London (Report)* (2020). doi:0.25561/77482.
- 444 16. Chowdhury, R. *et al.* Dynamic interventions to control COVID-19 pandemic: a multivariate  
prediction modelling study comparing 16 worldwide countries. *Europ. J. Epidemiol.* **35**, 389–  
446 399 (2020).
17. Davies, N. G. *et al.* Effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 cases,  
448 deaths, and demand for hospital services in the UK: a modelling study. *Lancet* (2020).  
doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30133-X.
- 450 18. Pei, S., Kandula, S. & Shaman, J. Differential effects of intervention timing on COVID-19  
spread in the United States. *medRxiv* (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.05.15.20103655.
- 452 19. Dehning, J. *et al.* Inferring change points in the spread of COVID-19 reveals the effectiveness  
of interventions. *Science* (2020). doi:10.1126/science.abb9789.
- 454 20. IHME COVID-19 forecasting team. Modeling COVID-19 scenarios for the United States.  
*Nature Med.* **27**, 94–105 (2021).
- 456 21. Halloran, M. E. *et al.* Modeling targeted layered containment of an influenza pandemic in the  
United States. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **105**, 4639–4644 (2008).

- 458 22. Charron, N., Lapuente, V. & Rodriguez-Pose, A. Uncooperative society, uncoop-  
erative politics or both? how trust, polarization and populism explain excess mor-  
460 tality for COVID-19 across European regions. *U Goeteborg working paper* (2020).  
<https://gupea.ub.gu.se/handle/2077/67189>.
- 462 23. Van Bavel, J. J. *et al.* Using social and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic  
response. *Nature Human Behav.* (2020). doi:10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z.
- 464 24. Reicher, S. & Drury, J. Pandemic fatigue? How adherence to Covid-19 regulations has been  
misrepresented and why it matters. *BMJ* **372** (2021). doi:10.1136/bmj.n137.
- 466 25. Alfaro, L., Faia, E., Lamersdorf, N. & Saidi, F. Social interactions in pandemics: Fear, altru-  
ism, and reciprocity. *NBER working paper* (2020). doi:10.3386/w27134.
- 468 26. Acemoglu, D., Chernozhukov, V., Werning, I. & Whinston, M. D. A multi-risk SIR model  
with optimally targeted lockdown. *NBER Working Paper* (2020). doi:10.3386/w27102.
- 470 27. Fernández-Villaverde, J. & Jones, C. I. Estimating and simulating a SIRD model of COVID-19  
for many countries, states, and cities. *NBER Working Paper* (2020). doi:10.3386/w27128.
- 472 28. Wu, S. L. *et al.* Substantial underestimation of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the United States.  
*Nature Comm.* **11**, 1–10 (2020).
- 474 29. Priesemann, V. *et al.* Calling for pan-European commitment for rapid and sustained reduction  
in SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Lancet* (2020). doi:10.1016/ S0140-6736(20)32625-8.
- 476 30. Streeck, H. *et al.* Infection fatality rate of SARS-CoV2 in a super-spreading event in Germany.  
*Nature Comm.* **11**, 1–12 (2020).



- 478 31. Poustchi, H. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 antibody seroprevalence in the general population and high-  
risk occupational groups across 18 cities in Iran: a population-based cross-sectional study.  
480 *Lancet Infectious Diseases* (2020). doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30858-6.
32. Johns Hopkins University Center for Systems Science and Engineering (JHU  
482 CSSE). Global COVID-19 data (2020). [https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID-19/blob/master/csse\\_covid\\_19\\_data/csse\\_covid\\_19\\_time\\_series/time\\_series\\_covid19\\_deaths\\_global.csv](https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID-19/blob/master/csse_covid_19_data/csse_covid_19_time_series/time_series_covid19_deaths_global.csv).
- 484 33. Boehmer, T. K. *et al.* Changing age distribution of the COVID-19 pandemic—United States,  
May–August 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* **69**, 1404 (2020).
- 486 34. Robert-Koch-Institut (2021). [https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges\\_Coronavirus/Daten/Altersv](https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/Daten/Altersv)
35. Belot, M. *et al.* Unequal consequences of Covid 19 across age and income: Representative  
488 evidence from six countries. *CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP14908* (2020).
36. Lee, L. Y.-k. *et al.* Practice and technique of using face mask amongst adults in the community:  
490 a cross-sectional descriptive study. *BMC Pub. Health* **20**, 1–11 (2020).
37. Haischer, M. H. *et al.* Who is wearing a mask? Gender-, age-, and location-related differences  
492 during the COVID-19 pandemic. *medRxiv* (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.07.13.20152736.
38. Rader, B. *et al.* Mask wearing and control of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the United States.  
494 *Lancet* (2020). doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(20)30293-4.
39. YouGov (2020). <https://in.yougov.com/en-hi/news/2020/04/20/yougovs-international-covid-19-tracker-reveals-cha>.  
496

40. Wang, Y. *et al.* Reduction of secondary transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in households by face  
498 mask use, disinfection and social distancing: a cohort study in Beijing, China. *BMJ Global  
Health* **5**, e002794 (2020).
- 500 41. Leung, N. H. *et al.* Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks.  
*Nature Med.* **26**, 676–680 (2020).
- 502 42. Anderson, R. M., Heesterbeek, H., Klinkenberg, D. & Hollingsworth, T. D. How will country-  
based mitigation measures influence the course of the COVID-19 epidemic? *Lancet* **395**,  
504 931–934 (2020).
43. Xu, S. & Li, Y. Beware of the second wave of COVID-19. *Lancet* **395**, 1321–1322 (2020).
- 506 44. Ferguson, C. & Hao, K. This is how America gets its vaccines. MIT Technology Review  
(2021). <https://www.technologyreview.com>.
- 508 45. Friedman, J., Liu, P., Gakidou, E., COVID, I. & Team, M. C. Predictive per-  
formance of international COVID-19 mortality forecasting models. *medRxiv* (2020).  
510 doi:10.1101/2020.07.13.20151233.
46. Eichenbaum, M. S., Rebelo, S. & Trabandt, M. The macroeconomics of epidemics. *NBER*  
512 *working paper* (2020). doi:10.3386/w26882.
47. Jones, C. J., Philippon, T. & Venkateswaran, V. Optimal mitigation policies in a pandemic:  
514 Social distancing and working from home. *NBER working paper* (2020). doi:10.3386/w26984.
48. Martinez-Loran, E. R., Naveja, J. J., Bello-Chavolla, O. Y. & Contreras-Torres, F. F.  
516 Multinational modeling of SARS-CoV-2 spreading dynamics: Insights on the heterogene-

- ity of COVID-19 transmission and its potential healthcare burden. *medRxiv* (2020).  
518 doi:10.1101/2020.04.14.20064956.
49. van Dorp, L. *et al.* Emergence of genomic diversity and recurrent mutations in SARS-CoV-2.  
520 *Infect. Gen. & Evol.* (2020). doi:10.1016/j.meegid.2020.104351.
50. Day, T., Gandon, S., Lion, S. & Otto, S. P. On the evolutionary epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2.  
522 *Current Biology* (2020). doi:10.1016/j.cub.2020.06.031.
51. Bloom, D. E., Canning, D., Mansfield, R. K. & Moore, M. Demographic change, social  
524 security systems, and savings. *Nature* **585**, 174–177.
52. Ceylan, R. F., Ozkan, B. & Mulazimogullari, E. Historical evidence for economic effects of  
526 COVID-19. *Europ. J. Health Econ.* (2020). doi:0.1007/s10198-020-01206-8.
53. Azevedo, J. P., Hasan, A., Goldemberg, D., Iqbal, S. A. & Geven, K. Simulating the potential  
528 impacts of Covid-19 school closures on schooling and learning outcomes: A set of global  
estimates (2020). doi:10.1596/1813-9450-9284.
- 530 54. Di Giuseppe, M. *et al.* Psychological impact of Coronavirus Disease 2019 among  
Italians during the first week of lockdown. *Frontiers in Psychiatry* **11** (2020).  
532 doi:10.3389/fpsy.2020.576597.
55. Asahi, K., Undurraga, E. A., Valdes, R. & Wagner, R. The effect of COVID-19 on  
534 the economy: evidence from an early adopter of localized lockdowns. *medRxiv* (2020).  
doi:10.1101/2020.09.21.20198887.

- 536 56. Gan, Y. *et al.* Immediate and delayed psychological effects of province-wide lockdown and  
personal quarantine during the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Psychological Medicine* 1–12  
538 (2020). doi:10.1017/S0033291720003116.
57. Modis, T. *Predictions: Society's telltale signature reveals the past and forecasts the future*  
540 (Simon and Schuster, 1992).
58. Wirtz, K. W. & Eckhardt, B. Effective variables in ecosystem models with an application to  
542 phytoplankton succession. *Ecol. Mod.* **92**, 33–53 (1996).
59. Wirtz, K. W. & Lemmen, C. A global dynamic model for the Neolithic transition.  
544 *Clim. Change* **59**, 333–367 (2003).
60. NYTimes (2020). [https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/04/28/us/coronavirus-death-](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/04/28/us/coronavirus-death-toll-total.html)  
546 [toll-total.html](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/04/28/us/coronavirus-death-toll-total.html).
61. Economist. Tracking covid-19 excess deaths across countries (2020).  
548 [https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/2020/04/16/tracking-covid-19-excess-deaths-](https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/2020/04/16/tracking-covid-19-excess-deaths-across-countries)  
[across-countries](https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/2020/04/16/tracking-covid-19-excess-deaths-across-countries).
- 550 62. BBC. Coronavirus: Iran cover-up of deaths revealed by data leak (2020).  
<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-53598965>.
- 552 63. Apple. Mobility trend reports (2020). <https://www.apple.com/covid19/mobility>.
64. Oliver, N. *et al.* Mobile phone data for informing public health actions across the COVID-19  
554 pandemic life cycle. *Science Adv.* (2020). doi:10.1126/sciadv.abc0764.

65. Glogowsky, U., Hansen, E. & Schächtele, S. How effective are social distancing poli-  
556 cies? Evidence on the fight against COVID-19 from Germany. *SSRN working paper* (2020).  
doi:10.2139/ssrn.3619845.
- 558 66. Flaxman, S. *et al.* Report 13: Estimating the number of infections and the im-  
pact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in 11 European countries (2020).  
560 doi:10.25561/77731.

### **Acknowledgments**

562 The author would like to thank Carsten Lemmen for a critical reading, and Jochen Metzger, Max-  
imilian Schäfer, and Detlef Gronenborn for helpful comments. Apple, Google, and YouGov are  
564 acknowledged for making aggregated data available.

### **Code availability**

566 The code required to produce all model results is available at: <https://github.com/kaiwirtz/CovidSocMod>

### **Supplementary materials**

568 Supplementary Text

Figs. S1 to S11

570 Tables S1 to S2