

1 **Mobility changes following COVID-19 stay-at-home policies varied by socioeconomic**  
2 **measures: An observational study in Ontario, Canada**  
3

4  
5 Siyi Wang<sup>1</sup>, Linwei Wang<sup>1</sup>, Stefan D Baral<sup>2</sup>, Gary Moloney<sup>1</sup>, Jaimie Johns<sup>3</sup>, Carmen Huber<sup>3</sup>, Jaydeep Mistry<sup>3</sup>,  
6 Kamran Khan<sup>1,3</sup>, Amrita Rao<sup>2</sup>, Naveed Janjua<sup>4,5,6</sup>, Tyler Williamson<sup>7,8</sup>, Alan Katz<sup>9</sup>, Huiting Ma<sup>1</sup>, Mathieu Maheu-  
7 Giroux<sup>10</sup>, Rafal Kustra<sup>11,12†</sup>, Sharmistha Mishra<sup>1,13,14,15,16†\*</sup>  
8

9 <sup>1</sup> MAP-Centre for Urban Health Solutions, St. Michael's Hospital, Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

10 <sup>2</sup> Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, United States

11 <sup>3</sup> BlueDot, Toronto, ON, Canada

12 <sup>4</sup> British Columbia Centre for Disease Control, Vancouver, BC, Canada

13 <sup>5</sup> School of Population and Public Health, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

14 <sup>6</sup> Centre for Health Evaluation and Outcome Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

15 <sup>7</sup> Department of Community Health Sciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

16 <sup>8</sup> Centre for Health Informatics, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

17 <sup>9</sup> Departments of Community Health Sciences and Family Medicine, Manitoba Centre for Health Policy, Rady Faculty  
18 of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

19 <sup>10</sup> Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Population and Global Health, McGill University, Montréal,  
20 QC, Canada

21 <sup>11</sup> Division of Biostatistics, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

22 <sup>12</sup> Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

23 <sup>13</sup> Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

24 <sup>14</sup> Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

25 <sup>15</sup> Institute of Health Policy, Management, and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

26 <sup>16</sup> Institute of Medical Sciences, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada.  
27

28 \* Corresponding author

29 Sharmistha Mishra, MD, MSc, PhD

30 E-mail: [sharmistha.mishra@utoronto.ca](mailto:sharmistha.mishra@utoronto.ca) (SM)

31 †These authors contributed equally to this work.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

## 49 **Abstract**

50 In Canada, lower income households and essential workers and were disproportionately at risk  
51 of SARS-CoV-2. Early in the pandemic, stay-at-home restriction policies were used to limit virus  
52 transmission. There remains an evidence gap in how changes in mobility, in response to the  
53 policies, varied across socioeconomic measures in Canada. The study objective was to  
54 describe the variability in mobility change to two restrictions, by neighborhood-level income and  
55 by proportion essential workers across five regions in Ontario, Canada. The first restriction was  
56 implemented on March 17, 2020 in all five regions; and the second restriction was implemented  
57 in November 23, 2020 in two of the regions. Using cell-phone mobility data aggregated to the  
58 census tract, we compared the average mobility (% of devices that travelled outside their  
59 “primary location”) three weeks before and after each restriction. We defined the adjusted  
60 mobility change via pre-restriction mobility subtracted from post-restriction, adjusted for 2019  
61 levels. We used difference-in-differences analysis to quantify effect modification of the second  
62 restriction’s effect by socioeconomic measures. With the first restriction, crude mobility fell from  
63 77.7% to 41.6% across the five regions. The adjusted mobility change to the first restriction was  
64 largest in the highest-income neighborhoods (-43.3% versus -38.4%) and in neighborhoods with  
65 the fewest essential workers (-44.5% versus -37.6%). The overall adjusted mobility change to  
66 the second restriction was small: -0.96% (95% confidence intervals, -1.53 to -0.38%). However,  
67 there was evidence of effect modification by socioeconomic measures (less pronounced  
68 decrease in lower-income neighborhoods and more essential workers). The findings suggest a  
69 temporal saturation effect of restrictions over subsequent waves, and a saturation effect by  
70 income and occupation, leading to prevention gaps across populations by socioeconomic  
71 measures. Findings highlight the need for tailored approaches at the intersections of income  
72 and occupation when addressing epidemics of novel and resurging respiratory pathogens.

## 73 Introduction

74 In Canada, as within countries across the world, SARS-CoV-2 infections were disproportionately  
75 concentrated among people and communities experiencing social and economic marginalization  
76 [1]. The response during the first year of the pandemic centered on public health measures to  
77 reduce contact rates as a means to halt the spread of SARS-CoV-2. Measures included  
78 mandates to close non-essential business alongside limits on indoor gatherings and activities.  
79 These restriction policies were met with early concerns about whom these policies could and  
80 could not reach [2, 3].

81  
82 At the start of the pandemic, 60% of working-age adults in Canada were employed in jobs which  
83 could not be done remotely [4]. The front-facing jobs were also more likely to be lower-paid,  
84 classified as essential services during the pandemic, and included jobs in sales, trades,  
85 agriculture, manufacturing, transport, and the food industry [5]. The public health measures  
86 were designed as a universal policy, but individuals working in essential services would have to  
87 go to, and spend time at, their place of onsite work [1]. Estimating the direction and magnitude  
88 of mobility changes to restriction policies, at different pandemic phases, could offer insights into  
89 not only what worked –but for whom. In doing so, results could offer insights into future  
90 pandemic planning, shaping the implementation of swift non-pharmacological responses to  
91 mitigate spread but without amplifying health inequities.

92  
93 Across countries, emerging data suggest socioeconomic differences in mobility and measures  
94 of ability to uptake, or “adhere to”, restriction policies. Huang et al. refer to the phenomena as  
95 the “*luxury of social distancing*” [6]. Among the earliest studies that used area-level mobility  
96 metrics from cell-phone data were in the United States [7, 8]. These studies found that lower-  
97 income areas and counties were associated with smaller reductions in mobility following the  
98 policies [7, 8]]. Findings were similar in the province of Ontario (Canada): higher levels of area  
99 economic dependency (a composite measure with age-structure, work-force participation, and  
100 dependency on social assistance) was associated with reduced responsiveness to restrictive  
101 policies implemented during the first year of the pandemic [9]. However, this Canadian study did  
102 not have the available data to account for expected differences in baseline mobility across  
103 socioeconomic factors; nor to compare regions in the province with and without restriction  
104 policies [9] – an important comparator used in other studies to better attribute mobility changes  
105 to specific policies [8]. Finally, composite measures of socioeconomic factors are commonly

106 used because they capture clustering or latent features, but raw measures such as household  
107 income may provide further clarity when drawing inference. For example, pathways by which  
108 restriction policies take effect could be masked with a composite exposure measure (e.g.  
109 restriction policies would work differently for younger versus older individuals supported by  
110 social assistance). For the same reason, raw measures are commonly used to characterize  
111 patterns of SARS-CoV-2 risks [1, 10].

112  
113 To address these knowledge gaps, we used area-level cell-phone based mobility and  
114 socioeconomic data in five regions in Ontario (Canada) to: (1) describe variability in the mobility  
115 response by income and by occupation in essential services following two restriction policies;  
116 and (2) estimate the extent to which these two area-level socioeconomic measures modified the  
117 mobility response, accounting for expected differences over time in the absence of restrictions  
118 using regions without restrictions as the control group.

119

## 120 **Methods**

### 121 **Study design, setting, and population**

122 We conducted a retrospective, observational study in accordance with the STROBE  
123 (Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology) recommendations [11]  
124 (**S1 Checklist**). The study population comprises all census tracts in the five public health units  
125 (Toronto, Peel, Halton, York, and Durham [12], **S1 Fig**) in Ontario, Canada's most populous  
126 province and epicenters of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. The five public health units make up the  
127 Greater Toronto Area (population over 7.1 million [13]) which is the largest metropolitan area in  
128 Canada. Census tracts are Statistics Canada geographic units that are only used within  
129 metropolitan areas [14]. The province of Ontario is served by a single-payer, province-wide  
130 health care system and COVID-19 related policy measures, including the restrictions, were  
131 implemented at the level of the public health unit [15]. Our analyses were conducted at the unit  
132 of census tract. We excluded census tracts with missing population size or mobility data (**S2**  
133 **Fig**).

134

135 The first case of COVID-19 was reported on January 23, 2020 in the Greater Toronto Area [16].  
136 The first province-wide restrictions were implemented on March 17, 2020 and thus, across all  
137 five public health units (**Fig 1**) [17]. Restrictions were eased over the subsequent months. The  
138 second restriction was implemented on November 23, 2020 in only two public health units

139 (Toronto, Peel; total population 4.1 million) [18]. **S1 Table** details the nature of the restriction  
140 policies.

141  
142 **Fig 1. COVID-19 epidemic curve and the timing of the restrictions for the Greater Toronto**  
143 **Area between February 23, 2020 and December 13, 2020.** The vertical dashed lines depict  
144 the timelines for two restriction policies. The first restriction was enacted March 17, 2020 across  
145 all five public health units (Toronto, Peel, Halton, York, and Durham) in the Greater Toronto  
146 Area. The second restriction enacted on November 23, 2020 in Toronto and Peel public health  
147 units and in the remaining public health units on December 14 or 26, 2020. The shaded areas in  
148 blue represent the three-week periods used in the analysis before the restrictions, and the  
149 shaded areas in red represent the three-week periods after the respective restriction was  
150 enacted. The week in which each restriction policy was enacted was excluded from the  
151 analyses. The weekly cases comprise diagnosed cases, and exclude cases among residents of  
152 long-term care homes.

153

## 154 **Data sources and measures**

### 155 **Mobility metric (crude and adjusted)**

156 We used the aggregate mobility data made available by the Ontario Ministry of Health through  
157 the COVID-19 Ontario Modelling Consensus Table [19], generated by BlueDot from the data  
158 vendor Veraset (**S1 Text**). Veraset data comprises geographic position system location data  
159 across apps on different platforms with users' consent on the use of their anonymized data, and  
160 reflects approximately 13% of the Canadian population [20]. BlueDot averaged mobility data by  
161 epidemiological week from the daily mobility metric and aggregated the data at the census-tract-  
162 level, resulting in a census-tract-level weekly average mobility metric, capturing weekly average  
163 proportion of devices that went outside their "primary location" for at least 30 minutes in a day,  
164 within each census tract. **S1 Text** details how the mobility metric was spatially and temporally  
165 aggregated.

166

167 We used the census-tract-level weekly average mobility metric (hereafter referred to as crude  
168 mobility metric) as one of our primary outcomes of interest. To account for the potential  
169 seasonal fluctuations, we generated an adjusted mobility metric in 2020 as another primary  
170 outcome of interest, by subtracting the crude mobility metric in 2019 from the crude mobility  
171 metric in 2020.

## 172 **Pre-restriction and post-restriction periods**

173 We defined pre- and post-restriction periods as three weeks before and after policy  
174 implementation, respectively; and excluded the week of implementation [8]. Consistent with  
175 previous studies, we selected a three-week period to capture potential lags between policy  
176 implementation and ability of individuals to respond [7]. Thus, for the first restriction, pre-  
177 restriction period captures February 23 to March 8, 2020; and post-restriction period captures  
178 March 22 to April 5, 2020. For the second restriction, pre-restriction period captures November  
179 1 to November 15, 2020 and post-restriction period captures November 29 to December 13,  
180 2020.

181

## 182 **Socioeconomic measures**

183 Other primary covariates of interest included two census-tract-level socioeconomic measures,  
184 generated using 2016 Canadian census data and Postal Code Conversion File Plus: income  
185 (defined by the after-tax income per-person equivalent) and the proportion of essential workers  
186 (defined based on national occupation categories and to include occupations that were not  
187 amenable to remote work: trades, transport, and equipment operation; sales and services;  
188 manufacturing and utilities; and resources, agriculture, and production [1, 10]; **S2 Table**). We  
189 excluded the health care category as it encompasses a wide range of professions with  
190 heterogeneous socioeconomic strata, and our rationale for the study was to characterize  
191 mobility patterns in the context of lower-wage essential services.

192

193 The socioeconomic measures were categorized into quintiles by ranking census tracts across  
194 the five public health units, weighted by census tract population size (**S3 Fig**). Each quintile  
195 therefore has similar population size and a different number of census tracts (**S3 Table**). For the  
196 income measure, quintile 1 refers to the highest income group. For the essential worker  
197 measure, quintile 1 refers to the lowest proportion of essential workers.

198

## 199 **Other data sources**

200 To describe the epidemic curves of COVID-19 cases, we used anonymized, person-level data  
201 on laboratory-confirmed cases (excluding residents of long-term care homes) from the provincial  
202 surveillance data (Ontario's Case and Contact Management) between February 23, 2020 and  
203 December 13, 2020 (details in **S2 Text**) [19].

204

## 205 **Ethical approval**

206 The University of Toronto Health Sciences Research Ethics Board (protocol no. 39253)  
207 approved the study.

208

## 209 **Descriptive analysis: mobility change and epidemic curves**

210 We first examined the representativeness of the mobility metric by socioeconomic measures by  
211 comparing the average census tract-level mobile device coverage across each socioeconomic  
212 measure.

213

214 To contextualize mobility changes in the context of the local epidemic, we visualized the  
215 epidemic curve alongside the crude mobility metrics overall and for each socioeconomic  
216 quintile. For the epidemic curve, we calculated weekly new lab-confirmed COVID-19 cases  
217 between February 23 and December 13, 2020. We plotted the weekly crude mobility metric for  
218 the corresponding calendar weeks in 2019 and 2020, respectively.

219

220 We examined the overall average mobility change across census tracts following each  
221 restriction by calculating the absolute difference in the mobility metrics pre- and post- each  
222 restriction. For the second restriction, we limited our analysis to Toronto and Peel only. We first  
223 calculated a weekly average mobility within each census tract (averaged over the three weeks)  
224 for each period (pre and post). We then subtracted the pre-restriction weekly average mobility  
225 from the post-restriction mobility to obtain mobility change for each census tract. We finally  
226 calculated the mean mobility change across census tracts. We repeated this for both the crude  
227 and adjusted mobility metrics.

228

229 We then examined the absolute mobility change (for crude and adjusted metrics, respectively)  
230 stratified by socioeconomic measures.

231

## 232 **Difference-in-differences analysis: overall impact of the** 233 **second restriction on mobility**

234 First, we conducted a difference-in-differences analysis [21] to estimate the overall influence of  
235 the second restriction on mobility in all five public health units using a mixed-effect linear model  
236 (**Model 1**) (**S3 Text**). We leveraged data from Halton, York, and Durham (regions without

237 restriction) as the control group to account for expected mobility change over time in the  
238 absence of a restriction. Toronto and Peel which received the second restriction were treated as  
239 the ‘intervention’ group. The outcome was the adjusted mobility metric within each census tract  
240 for each epidemiological week (a total of 6 weeks data: 3 weeks pre-restriction and 3 weeks  
241 post-restriction). **S4 Fig** displays the timing of the second restriction and periods that we used  
242 for the difference-in-differences analysis. We included the following fixed effects in the model:  
243 the week index as a categorical variable reflecting each of the six weeks; the intervention  
244 indicator as a binary variable which was set to one for census tracts within ‘intervention’ group  
245 (Toronto, Peel), and set to zero for the census tracts within the control group (Halton, York,  
246 Durham). The time-dependent restriction indicator as a binary variable which was set to one if a  
247 given census tract was under restriction in a given week, and otherwise set to zero. We  
248 accounted for variances clustered at the levels of the census tract and at the public health unit  
249 by including random intercepts at the census tract and public health unit, respectively.  
250

## 251 **Difference-in-differences analysis: impact of the second** 252 **restriction on mobility stratified by socioeconomic measures**

253 To examine the effect modification by socioeconomic measures on the relationship between the  
254 second restriction and mobility, we fitted two additional difference-in-differences mixed-effect  
255 linear models to examine the effect modification by census-tract-level income (**Model 2A**), and  
256 census-tract-level proportion of essential workers (**Model 2B**), respectively (**S3 Text**). In each  
257 of **Model 2A** and **Model 2B**, besides fixed and random effects already shown in **Model 1**, we  
258 added socioeconomic quintiles as an additional covariate, the its interactions with every other  
259 covariates in **Model 1**. We conducted the two-way analysis of variance to test whether there  
260 was evidence of effect modification on the restriction effect by socioeconomic measures. We  
261 herein refer to a census tract as a neighborhood in the following sections.  
262

## 263 **Results**

264 The five public health units in the current study include 1,261 census tracts, with population  
265 sizes ranging from 484 to 23,401. We excluded 7 census tracts with missing population size  
266 data and another 14 census tracts with missing mobility data (**S2 Fig**). Of 1240 census tracts  
267 included, the mean device coverage was lower in neighborhoods with the lower income (**S4**  
268 **Table**).



## 269 **Epidemic curves**

270 Following the first restriction, the epidemic rapidly diverged along socioeconomic quintiles such  
271 that neighborhoods with lower-income and neighborhoods with higher proportion essential  
272 workers experienced higher number of COVID-19 cases (**Fig 2A-B**). In August 2020, the  
273 number of weekly new lab-confirmed cases were small across all socioeconomic quintiles  
274 before diverging by mid-September 2020, with the highest number of cases in lowest-income  
275 neighborhoods and in neighborhoods with highest proportion of essential workers. The number  
276 of cases remained divergent along socioeconomic quintiles prior to and following the second  
277 restriction.

278

279 **Fig 2. Epidemic curves and mobility change stratified by neighborhood-level income and**  
280 **essential worker quintiles in the Greater Toronto Area, Canada (February 23, 2020 to**  
281 **December 13, 2020).** Panel A and B describe weekly new lab-confirmed COVID-19 cases  
282 (excluding residents of long-term care homes) by neighborhood-level income quintile (Panel A)  
283 and proportion of the working population engaged in essential services (Panel B). Panel C and  
284 D depict the weekly crude mobility metric by neighborhood-level income quintile (Panel C) and  
285 proportion essential workers (Panel D). The horizontal dashed lines in Panel C and D represent  
286 2019 mobility as pre-pandemic mobility reference, while the solid lines represent 2020 mobility  
287 data. The vertical dashed lines depict the two COVID-19 restriction policies under examination:  
288 the first restriction enacted March 17, 2020 across all five public health units (Toronto, Peel,  
289 Halton, York, and Durham) in the Greater Toronto Area; and the second restriction enacted  
290 November 23, 2020 in Toronto and Peel public health units within the Greater Toronto Area.  
291 Income reflects the per-person equivalent income in the household. Essential services include:  
292 trades, transport, and equipment operation; sales and services; manufacturing and utilities; and  
293 resources, agriculture, and production. Neighborhood level is defined at the level of the census  
294 tract. Quintiles are weighted by neighborhood-level population.

295

## 296 **Descriptive analysis: mobility change following the first** 297 **restriction**

298 Higher-income neighborhoods consistently demonstrated greater mobility throughout 2019 and  
299 2020 (**Fig 2C**). In 2019, the crude mobility ranged between 80-90% in the highest-income  
300 neighborhoods and 70-75% in the lowest-income neighborhoods. In early 2020 (pre-restriction

301 period), the crude mobility was higher in higher-income neighborhoods (e.g., 80.6% in the  
 302 highest-income and 73.7% in the lowest-income neighborhoods) (**Table 1**).

303

304 **Table 1. Mobility metric of pre-restriction<sup>a</sup> and post-restriction<sup>b</sup> periods for the first**  
 305 **restriction in Greater Toronto Area<sup>c</sup> stratified by neighborhood-level<sup>d</sup> socioeconomic**  
 306 **measures.**

	Mobility <sup>e</sup>					
	Pre-restriction		Post-restriction		Mobility change <sup>f</sup>	
	Crude <sup>g</sup>	Adjusted <sup>h</sup>	Crude	Adjusted	Crude	Adjusted
Overall	77.7	2.2	41.6	-38.8	-36.1	-41.0
Income <sup>i</sup> Quintiles <sup>j</sup>						
Q1 (highest)	80.6	2.8	42.1	-40.4	-38.5	-43.3
Q2	79.5	2.9	42.6	-38.9	-36.9	-41.8
Q3	78.1	2.7	42.0	-38.5	-36.1	-41.2
Q4	76.6	2.1	41.5	-38.3	-35.2	-40.4
Q5 (lowest)	73.7	0.8	40.1	-37.6	-33.7	-38.4
% Essential worker <sup>k</sup> Quintiles						
Q1 (lowest %)	78.5	2.1	39.0	-42.3	-39.5	-44.5
Q2	79.1	2.8	40.9	-40.6	-38.2	-43.4
Q3	78.3	2.2	43.1	-37.5	-35.2	-39.7
Q4	77.6	2.6	42.7	-37.4	-34.9	-40.0
Q5 (highest %)	75.3	1.6	42.6	-36.1	-32.7	-37.6

307

308 <sup>a</sup>Pre-restriction = three weeks before restriction implementation, and excluded the week of  
 309 implementation (i.e. February 23 to March 8, 2020 for the first restriction);

310 <sup>b</sup>Post-restriction = three weeks after restriction implementation, and excluded the week of  
 311 implementation (i.e. March 22, 2020 to April 5, 2020 for the first restriction);

312 <sup>c</sup>Greater Toronto Area comprised of five public health units (Toronto, Peel, Halton, York, and  
 313 Durham);

314 <sup>d</sup>Neighborhood-level variables are at the level of census tract;

315 <sup>e</sup>Mobility = average % of devices that went outside “home” location;

316 <sup>f</sup>Mobility change = the post-restriction mobility metric minus the pre-restriction mobility metric;

317 <sup>g</sup>Crude = mobility metric in 2020;

318 <sup>h</sup>Adjusted = crude mobility in 2020 minus crude mobility in 2019;

319 <sup>l</sup>Income = after-tax income per-person equivalent in the household, aggregated at neighborhood  
320 level;

321 <sup>j</sup>Quintile (Q) was calculated across five public health units, weighted by neighborhood-level  
322 population in terms of the socioeconomic variables;

323 <sup>k</sup>% Essential worker = proportion of the working population engaged in essential services.  
324 Essential services include: trades, transport, and equipment operation; sales and services;  
325 manufacturing and utilities; and resources, agriculture, and production.

326

327 The overall crude mobility declined sharply at the onset of the first restriction from 77.7% to  
328 41.6% (**S5 Fig; Table 1; S6A-B Fig**). All income quintiles experienced a decline in mobility  
329 following the restriction; however the higher-income neighborhoods experienced larger  
330 reductions than lower-income neighborhoods (**Fig 2C**). In the post-restriction period, the crude  
331 mobility was similar across income quintiles (ranging from 40.1% to 42.6%). After accounting for  
332 seasonal fluctuations, the adjusted mobility change (reduction) following the first restriction was  
333 43.3% in the highest-income and 38.4% in the lowest-income neighborhoods with a dose-  
334 response pattern (**Table 1**).

335

336 The mobility pattern for proportion essential workers mimicked (inversely) the pattern with  
337 income (**Fig 2C-D**). The adjusted mobility reduction was 44.5% and 37.6% in neighborhoods  
338 with the lowest and highest proportion essential workers, respectively.

339

## 340 **Descriptive analysis: mobility change following the second** 341 **restriction**

342 After the large reduction following the first restriction, mobility resumed steadily since early April  
343 and reached a plateau in July through November 2020 across the five public health units (**S5**  
344 **Fig**). During this plateau, mobility remained the lowest in the lowest-income neighborhoods (**Fig**  
345 **2C**).

346

347 Following the second restriction in Toronto and Peel, the overall crude mobility experienced a  
348 small reduction (-2.8%) (**Table 2; S6C-D Fig**). After accounting for seasonal fluctuations, the  
349 adjusted mobility reduction in these two public health units were small (-0.8%) (**Table 2**). The  
350 adjusted mobility reduction was larger in the higher-income neighborhoods (-2.7% in the  
351 highest-income neighborhoods and -0.1% in the lowest-income neighborhoods). The patterns in

352 mobility change by essential worker quintiles were similar, with the largest reduction in adjusted  
 353 mobility observed in the neighborhoods with lowest proportion essential workers (-2.3%).  
 354 However, we did not observe a clear dose-response pattern across other essential worker  
 355 quintiles (**Table 2**).

356  
 357 **Table 2. Mobility metric of pre-restriction<sup>a</sup> and post-restriction<sup>b</sup> periods for the second**  
 358 **restriction in two public health units (Toronto, Peel) stratified by neighborhood-level<sup>c</sup>**  
 359 **socioeconomic measures.**

	Mobility <sup>d</sup>					
	Pre-restriction		Post-restriction		Mobility change <sup>e</sup>	
	Crude <sup>f</sup>	Adjusted <sup>g</sup>	Crude	Adjusted	Crude	Adjusted
Overall	61.7	-16.5	58.8	-17.3	-2.8	-0.8
Income <sup>i</sup> Quintiles <sup>j</sup>						
Q1 (highest)	63.5	-17.4	59.3	-20.1	-4.2	-2.7
Q2	63.8	-17.0	60.5	-18.2	-3.4	-1.1
Q3	62.1	-16.9	59.0	-18.0	-3.1	-1.1
Q4	61.5	-16.8	58.9	-17.1	-2.6	-0.2
Q5 (lowest)	59.8	-15.1	57.9	-15.2	-2.0	-0.1
% Essential worker <sup>k</sup> Quintiles						
Q1 (lowest %)	60.2	-19.3	55.9	-21.6	-4.2	-2.3
Q2	61.5	-17.7	58.7	-18.0	-2.7	-0.3
Q3	63.0	-15.8	59.3	-17.7	-3.7	-1.9
Q4	62.3	-15.6	60.2	-15.7	-2.1	-0.1
Q5 (highest %)	62.0	-14.2	60.4	-13.9	-1.6	0.3

360  
 361 <sup>a</sup>Pre-restriction = three weeks before restriction implementation, and excluded the week of  
 362 implementation (i.e. November 1 to November 15, 2020 for the second restriction);  
 363 <sup>b</sup>Post-restriction = three weeks after restriction implementation, and excluded the week of  
 364 implementation (i.e. November 29 to December 13, 2020 for the first restriction);  
 365 <sup>c</sup>Neighborhood-level variables are at the level of census tract;  
 366 <sup>d</sup>Mobility = average % of devices that went outside “home” location;  
 367 <sup>e</sup>Mobility change = the post-restriction mobility metric minus the pre-restriction mobility metric;  
 368 <sup>f</sup>Crude = mobility metric in 2020;  
 369 <sup>h</sup>Adjusted = crude mobility in 2020 minus crude mobility in 2019;

370 <sup>l</sup>Income = after-tax income per-person equivalent in the household, aggregated at neighborhood  
371 level;

372 <sup>j</sup>Quintile (Q) was calculated across five public health units, weighted by neighborhood-level  
373 population in terms of the socioeconomic variables;

374 <sup>k</sup>% Essential worker = proportion of the working population engaged in essential services.  
375 Essential services include: trades, transport, and equipment operation; sales and services;  
376 manufacturing and utilities; and resources, agriculture, and production.  
377

## 378 **Difference-in-differences analysis: mobility change following** 379 **the second restriction**

380 The difference-in-difference analyses in Model 1 showed that after accounting for seasonal  
381 fluctuation, and expected changes over time in the absence of the restriction, the second  
382 restriction was associated with a small overall reduction in the adjusted mobility: -0.96% (95%  
383 confidence interval (CI): (-1.53; -0.38)).  
384

385 There was effect modification by income quintiles ( $p < 0.05$  in **Model 2A**) and by essential  
386 worker quintiles ( $p < 0.05$  in **Model 2B**) on the relationship between the second restriction and  
387 adjusted mobility. Neighborhoods with lower income and higher proportion essential workers  
388 dampened the magnitude of adjusted mobility change, consistent with the descriptive findings.  
389 However, given the small magnitude of the associations, a consistent dose-response pattern  
390 was not observed (**Fig 3; S5 Table**).  
391

392 **Fig 3. Adjusted mobility change following the second restriction by neighborhood-level**  
393 **socioeconomic measures in the Greater Toronto Area.** Panel A shows the estimates of the  
394 adjusted mobility change following the second set of restrictions by income quintiles. Panel B  
395 shows the estimates of the adjusted mobility following the second set of restrictions by essential  
396 worker quintiles. The error bars represent the 95% confidence interval. The Greater Toronto  
397 Area comprised of five public health units (Toronto, Peel, Halton, York, and Durham). Income  
398 reflects the per-person equivalent income in the household. Essential services include: trades,  
399 transport, and equipment operation; sales and services; manufacturing and utilities; and  
400 resources, agriculture, and production. Neighborhood level is defined at the level of the census  
401 tract. Quintiles (Q) are weighted by neighborhood-level population.  
402

## 403 Discussion

404 Using an ecological study of neighborhood-level mobility measures in Ontario, Canada during  
405 2020, we found that the first COVID-19 restriction led to large (30-40%) reductions in crude  
406 mobility. Reduction in mobility following the first restriction was largest in the highest-income  
407 neighborhoods and neighborhoods with the fewest essential workers. In contrast, a very small  
408 (<1%) reduction in mobility could be attributed to the second restriction. However, there was still  
409 evidence of effect modification by income and proportion essential workers.

410  
411 The large effect of the first restriction followed by a much smaller effect of the second restriction  
412 is consistent with findings that demonstrate a similar temporal saturation effect of public health  
413 measures over subsequent COVID-19 waves [22, 23]. The first restriction occurred during a  
414 time of large uncertainty. Then, even as some elements of the restrictions were lifted, there  
415 remained an overall – and relatively stable – level of mobility that was a third lower than levels in  
416 2019. This “new normal” in 2020 reflected a shift from in-person to online shopping, education,  
417 socializing, and especially working – via occupations amenable to remote work and across  
418 businesses that were able to shift to largely remote production [24]. This time-period was also  
419 marked by a 4.8% loss of employment in the province [25]. When the second restriction was  
420 implemented to try and mitigate rising cases of COVID-19 during Ontario’s second epidemic  
421 wave, it had very little effect on mobility in the context of the “new normal” that had been  
422 established. For example, workplaces that could transition to remote work had already done so.  
423 A similar saturation effect of increasing levels of stringency of COVID-19 measures on cases  
424 was observed across multiple provinces in Canada, with little effect of stringency measures  
425 during the second COVID-19 waves that occurred between August and December 2020 [23].  
426 Taken together, the findings highlight the importance of anticipating how the timing of  
427 restrictions and the wider context of what is already in place could influence the impact of the  
428 restriction.

429  
430 The mobility changes to the first and second restriction varied by income and by occupation,  
431 and suggest a saturation effect of restrictions by socioeconomic characteristics. The mobility  
432 change was lower in lower-income neighborhoods, and in those with higher proportion essential  
433 workers. This finding was consistent with prior studies from the United States, Italy, and Canada  
434 that had examined income [7, 9, 26, 27], and from survey data in Canada that similarly reported  
435 lower levels of ability to “shelter in place” among lower-income households [28]. Our study

436 separated the analyses of income from that of occupation, and confirmed a similar pattern with  
437 occupation to that of income. That is, as hypothesized, neighborhoods with higher proportion  
438 essential workers experienced a smaller mobility change to the restrictions. This smaller mobility  
439 change occurred against a pre-pandemic background wherein neighborhoods with more  
440 essential workers, and lower income, already had lower levels of mobility. The 2019 mobility  
441 patterns capture non-occupational travel, including travelling outside the home for shopping and  
442 recreation and suggests that people living in lower-income have less access to the latter at  
443 baseline [29]. This baseline difference means that individuals in lower-income neighborhoods  
444 and in neighborhoods with higher proportion essential workers may have already had fewer  
445 non-occupational activities to limit when restrictions were put into place. Indeed, mobility data  
446 from the US suggest that although people living in lower-income neighborhoods were more  
447 likely to work outside the home during the pandemic, they were less likely to have access to and  
448 visit recreational venues such as parks [29]. Such findings [29] may help also explain why  
449 despite variability in the mobility change by income and occupation, the magnitude of difference  
450 between socioeconomic levels was small – especially after the second restriction. That is, in  
451 addition to baseline lower levels of mobility (presumably from non-occupational travel),  
452 individuals may have reduced mobility in other ways to make up for having to work onsite.  
453 Although neighborhood-level income and proportion essential workers are somewhat correlated  
454 [10], they represent related but distinct social determinants of mobility. For example, the  
455 pathways by which the restriction acts (i.e. its “mechanisms of action”) on mobility across  
456 income levels is complex and, in addition to occupation-related travel, can also be related to  
457 household size (larger households offer more opportunities for cellular signals of travelling  
458 outside the home), caregiver roles (intergenerational household dependents who may require  
459 healthcare visits), access to services (e.g. grocery chains for home delivery) and access to  
460 household greenspace (backyards). Taken together, baseline (pre-pandemic) variability in  
461 mobility combined with differences in one’s ability to transition to remote work by income and by  
462 occupation highlight the saturation effect of restrictions by socioeconomic characteristics [8].  
463 This socioeconomic saturation effect stems from the extent to which a policy or intervention is  
464 designed to reach and work across subsets of the population.

465  
466 Our study was not designed to quantify the impact of differential mobility change on differential  
467 rates of SARS-CoV-2 cases. However, the small magnitude of difference in mobility reduction  
468 by socioeconomic characteristics, especially after the second restriction, suggests that  
469 differential mobility may be insufficient to explain the difference in SARS-CoV-2 cases by

470 socioeconomic characteristics in the region. The implication would be residual risks of  
471 exposures and transmission that were not addressed by the restrictions in 2020, including  
472 onsite workplace exposures intersecting with high-density and multigenerational households [1,  
473 30]. The findings surrounding extant but small differences in mobility change alongside large  
474 disparities in SARS-CoV-2 cases suggests the need for additional, tailored approaches to  
475 address residual risks, such as outreach testing and comprehensive isolation support,  
476 vaccination, and changes in policies such as paid sick leave [31, 32].

477  
478 Our study has several limitations. First, our outcome of interest was a mobility metric, which  
479 served as a proxy for contacts between people. The metric (proportion of devices that travelled  
480 outside “primary location”) undervalues contacts within households (an important space where  
481 transmission occurs) and simultaneously overvalues what happens outside the home (i.e.  
482 leaving home but not coming into close contact with others). The restriction was only designed  
483 to reduce contacts outside the home. If our metric is a proxy for contacts outside the home, then  
484 our study may have underestimated the magnitude of variability in mobility reduction by  
485 socioeconomic levels. For example, our metric for mobility may be more likely to capture travel  
486 for onsite work among individuals living in lower-income neighborhoods as compared to  
487 individuals living in higher-income neighborhoods, where our metric may be more likely to  
488 capture mobility for non-occupational travel. If that were the case, and mobility for onsite work is  
489 related to more workplace contacts than travel outside the home for other reasons, then there  
490 may exist an even larger socioeconomic difference in contacts outside the home than our  
491 analyses would suggest. Data are emerging from self-reported data on contacts between  
492 people and their correlation with area-level mobility metrics derived from cell-phones. [33]; these  
493 correlations, particularly if they differ by socioeconomic levels, offer an opportunity for potential  
494 bias-adjustment or correction factors when using cell-phone mobility metrics to evaluate the  
495 impact of restriction policies on mobility changes, or downstream outcomes such as SARS-CoV-  
496 2 cases [34]. A second limitation that could underestimate variability in our outcome of interest  
497 stems from undersampling of mobility measures in lower-income neighborhoods. We also restricted  
498 our study to a mobility metric commonly used across prior research and public health teams  
499 [35]. Future work could benefit from examining other mobility measures, such as proportion of  
500 time away from home. The magnitude of change in contact rates (and thus, its proxy – the  
501 mobility metric) that is needed to reduce transmission depends on the underlying transmission  
502 potential at the time. That is, how much of a reduction is needed is different at different stages  
503 of an epidemic and in different contexts of underlying risks. A smaller reduction in contacts may



504 be needed among high-income households with less crowding and lack of occupational SARS-  
505 CoV-2 risks. Finally, we were restricted to neighborhood-level aggregated information. This  
506 means that both the socioeconomic variables and the mobility metrics were averaged over a  
507 population and may not reflect individual-level patterns. However, individual-level survey data  
508 suggest the ecological findings from our study are consistent with self-reported data on income  
509 and mobility in response to public health restrictions in Canada [28].

510  
511 In summary, restrictions used in the COVID-19 public health response in 2020 demonstrated a  
512 temporal saturation effect over subsequent waves. Restrictions also demonstrated a saturation  
513 effect by income and occupation. However, the magnitude of difference between socioeconomic  
514 levels was small – especially after the second restriction. At the same time, there was a  
515 consistent and large difference in SARS-CoV-2 cases by socioeconomic characteristics which  
516 suggest residual transmission risks along socioeconomic margins. Findings highlight the need  
517 for additional approaches to reduce health inequities at the intersections of income and  
518 occupation when addressing large epidemics of novel and resurging respiratory pathogens.

519

## 520 **Acknowledgements**

521 We thank Dr. Alexander Watts (BlueDot) for insights and support on the mobility data. We thank  
522 Samantha Lo (Unity Health Toronto) and Kristy Yiu (Unity Health Toronto) for support with  
523 research coordination. SM is supported by Tier 2 Canada Research Chair (CRC) in  
524 Mathematical Modeling and Program Science (CRC no. 950-232643). MMG is supported by a  
525 Tier 2 Canada Research Chair in Population Health Modeling.

## 526 References

- 527 1. Xia Y, Ma H, Moloney G, García HAV, Sirski M, Janjua NZ, et al. Geographic  
528 concentration of SARS-CoV-2 cases by social determinants of health in metropolitan areas in  
529 Canada: a cross-sectional study. *CMAJ*. 2022;194(6):E195-E204.
- 530 2. Mishra S, Kwong JC, Chan AK, Baral SD. Understanding heterogeneity to inform the  
531 public health response to COVID-19 in Canada. *Cmaj*. 2020;192(25):E684-E5.
- 532 3. Gonzalez CJ, Aristega Almeida B, Corpuz GS, Mora HA, Aladesuru O, Shapiro MF, et  
533 al. Challenges with social distancing during the COVID-19 pandemic among Hispanics in New  
534 York City: A qualitative study. *BMC Public Health*. 2021;21(1):1-8.
- 535 4. Messacar D, Morissette R, Deng Z. Inequality in the Feasibility of Working from Home  
536 during and after COVID-19. *Statistics Canada= Statistique Canada*; 2020.
- 537 5. Rao A, Ma H, Moloney G, Kwong JC, Jüni P, Sander B, et al. A disproportionate  
538 epidemic: COVID-19 cases and deaths among essential workers in Toronto, Canada. *Annals of*  
539 *epidemiology*. 2021;63:63-7.
- 540 6. Huang X, Li Z, Jiang Y, Ye X, Deng C, Zhang J, et al. The characteristics of multi-source  
541 mobility datasets and how they reveal the luxury nature of social distancing in the US during the  
542 COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Digital Earth*. 2021;14(4):424-42.
- 543 7. Weill JA, Stigler M, Deschenes O, Springborn MR. Social distancing responses to  
544 COVID-19 emergency declarations strongly differentiated by income. *Proceedings of the*  
545 *national academy of sciences*. 2020;117(33):19658-60.
- 546 8. Jay J, Bor J, Nsoesie EO, Lipson SK, Jones DK, Galea S, et al. Neighbourhood income  
547 and physical distancing during the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States. *Nature Human*  
548 *Behaviour*. 2020;4. doi: 10.1038/s41562-020-00998-2.
- 549 9. Long JA, Ren C. Associations between mobility and socio-economic indicators vary  
550 across the timeline of the Covid-19 pandemic. *Computers, environment and urban systems*.  
551 2022;91:101710.
- 552 10. Mishra S, Ma H, Moloney G, Yiu KCY, Darvin D, Landsman D, et al. Increasing  
553 concentration of COVID-19 by socioeconomic determinants and geography in Toronto, Canada:  
554 an observational study. *Annals of Epidemiology*. 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.annepidem.2021.07.007.
- 555 11. Von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The  
556 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement:  
557 guidelines for reporting observational studies. *The Lancet*. 2007;370(9596):1453-7.
- 558 12. Public Health Units: Association of Local Public Health Agencies; [cited 2023 19 March].  
559 Available from: <https://www.alphaweb.org/page/PHU>.
- 560 13. Ontario population projections: Government of Ontario; 2021 [cited 2022 August 11].  
561 Available from: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontario-population-projections>.
- 562 14. Census Profile, 2016 Census: Statistics Canada; 2017 [cited 2022 July 12]. Available  
563 from: <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E>.
- 564 15. Ontario Public Health System Public Health Ontario [cited 2022 July 12]. Available from:  
565 <https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/About/News/2020/Ontario-Public-Health-System#:~:text=Public%20Health%20Ontario,-Public%20Health%20Ontario&text=Our%20expertise%20spans%20the%20following,prevention%2C%20infectious%20disease%20and%20microbiology>.
- 566 16. Urrutia D, Manetti E, Williamson M, Lequy E. Overview of Canada's answer to the  
567 COVID-19 pandemic's first wave (January–April 2020). *International Journal of Environmental*  
568 *Research and Public Health*. 2021;18(13):7131.
- 569 17. Nielsen K. A timeline of COVID-19 in Ontario. *Global News*. April 24, 2020.
- 570 18. Ontario declares second provincial emergency to address COVID-19 crisis and save  
571 lives: Government of Ontario; 2021 [cited 2022 July 15]. Available from:
- 572
- 573
- 574

- 575 [https://news.ontario.ca/en/release/59922/ontario-declares-second-provincial-emergency-to-](https://news.ontario.ca/en/release/59922/ontario-declares-second-provincial-emergency-to-address-covid-19-crisis-and-save-lives)  
576 [address-covid-19-crisis-and-save-lives.](https://news.ontario.ca/en/release/59922/ontario-declares-second-provincial-emergency-to-address-covid-19-crisis-and-save-lives)
- 577 19. Hillmer MP, Feng P, McLaughlin JR, Murty VK, Sander B, Greenberg A, et al. Ontario's  
578 COVID-19 Modelling Consensus Table: mobilizing scientific expertise to support pandemic  
579 response. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*. 2021;112(5):799-806.
- 580 20. COVID-19 Risk Assessment: Social Distancing in Canada, prepared by BlueDot, March  
581 27th, 2020. 2020.
- 582 21. Wing C, Simon K, Bello-Gomez RA. Designing difference in difference studies: best  
583 practices for public health policy research. *Annual review of public health*. 2018;39:453-69.
- 584 22. Kim J, Kwan M-P. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on people's mobility: A  
585 longitudinal study of the US from March to September of 2020. *Journal of Transport Geography*.  
586 2021;93:103039.
- 587 23. Vickers DM, Baral S, Mishra S, Kwong JC, Sundaram M, Katz A, et al. Stringency of  
588 containment and closures on the growth of SARS-CoV-2 in Canada prior to accelerated vaccine  
589 roll-out. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2022;118:73-82.
- 590 24. Clarke S. Working from home during the Covid-19 pandemic: How rates in Canada and  
591 the United States compare: Statistics Canada= Statistique Canada; 2022.
- 592 25. COVID-19 Pandemic Causes Record Job Loss. Financial Accountability Office of  
593 Ontario, 2021.
- 594 26. Bonaccorsi G, Pierri F, Cinelli M, Flori A, Galeazzi A, Porcelli F, et al. Economic and  
595 social consequences of human mobility restrictions under COVID-19. *Proceedings of the*  
596 *National Academy of Sciences*. 2020;117(27):15530-5.
- 597 27. Marwah A, Feldman J, Moineddin R, Thomas A. Population mobility and socioeconomic  
598 indicators in California, USA and Ontario, Canada during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International*  
599 *Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2022;116:S25-S6.
- 600 28. Lavoie KL, Gosselin-Boucher V, Stojanovic J, Voisard B, Szczepanik G, Boyle JA, et al.  
601 Determinants of adherence to COVID-19 preventive behaviours in Canada: Results from the  
602 iCARE Study. *MedRxiv*. 2021:2021.06.09.21258634.
- 603 29. Jay J, Heykoop F, Hwang L, Courtepatte A, de Jong J, Kondo M. Use of smartphone  
604 mobility data to analyze city park visits during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Landscape and Urban*  
605 *Planning*. 2022;228:104554.
- 606 30. Ma H, Yiu KC, Baral SD, Fahim C, Moloney G, Darwin D, et al. COVID-19 Cases Among  
607 Congregate Care Facility Staff by Neighborhood of Residence and Social and Structural  
608 Determinants: Observational Study. *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance*. 2022;8(10):e34927.
- 609 31. Kiran T, Eissa A, Mangin D. Brief on Primary Care Part 1: The roles of primary care  
610 clinicians and practices in the first two years of the COVID-19 pandemic in Ontario. *Science*  
611 *Briefs of the Ontario COVID-19 Science Advisory Table*. 2022; 3 (67). 2022.
- 612 32. Adam Nagy AMC, Margaret Bourdeaux. Organizing, Budgeting, and Implementing  
613 Wraparound Services for People in Quarantine and Isolation Harvard University: Berkman Klein  
614 Center for Internet & Society; 2021 [cited 2023 October 18, 2023]. Available from:  
615 [https://cyber.harvard.edu/story/2021-03/organizing-budgeting-and-implementing-wraparound-](https://cyber.harvard.edu/story/2021-03/organizing-budgeting-and-implementing-wraparound-services-people-quarantine-and)  
616 [services-people-quarantine-and.](https://cyber.harvard.edu/story/2021-03/organizing-budgeting-and-implementing-wraparound-services-people-quarantine-and)
- 617 33. Barrios JM, Benmelech E, Hochberg YV, Sapienza P, Zingales L. Civic capital and  
618 social distancing during the Covid-19 pandemic☆. *Journal of public economics*.  
619 2021;193:104310.
- 620 34. Tomori DV, RübSamen N, Berger T, Scholz S, Walde J, Wittenberg I, et al. Individual  
621 social contact data and population mobility data as early markers of SARS-CoV-2 transmission  
622 dynamics during the first wave in Germany—an analysis based on the COVIMOD study. *BMC*  
623 *medicine*. 2021;19:1-13.
- 624 35. Brown KA, Soucy J-PR, Buchan SA, Sturrock SL, Berry I, Stall NM, et al. The mobility  
625 gap: estimating mobility thresholds required to control SARS-CoV-2 in Canada. *CMAJ* :

626 Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne.  
627 2021;193. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.210132. PubMed PMID: 33827852.

## 628 **Supporting Information captions**

629 **S1 Text. Definition of the mobility metric: % of devices that went outside home location**

630 **S2 Text. Source of COVID-19 person-level data**

631 **S3 Text. Model equations for difference-in-differences analysis with mixed-effect models**  
632 **for the 2<sup>nd</sup> restriction policy**

633 **S1 Table. Measures for 1<sup>st</sup> restriction and 2<sup>nd</sup> restriction of COVID-19 in Ontario**

634 **S2 Table. Socioeconomic variables from Statistics Canada 2016 Census of Population**

635 **S3 Table. Neighborhood-level socioeconomic characteristics across 1254 census tracts**  
636 **in the Greater Toronto Area.**

637 **S4 Table. Device penetration in 1240 census tracts within the Greater Toronto Area**  
638 **stratified by neighborhood-level socioeconomic measures during the pre-restriction and**  
639 **post-restriction periods related to the two restrictions examined in the study.**

640 **S5 Table. Difference-in-differences analysis of the second restriction with mixed-effect**  
641 **modeling in Greater Toronto Area by area-level socioeconomic measures.**

642 **S1 Fig. Five public health units consist of census tracts within the Greater Toronto Area.**

643 **S2 Fig. Flow diagram for data process and for descriptive analyses and difference-in-**  
644 **differences analyses by mixed-effect model.**

645 **S3 Fig. The geographic distribution of income quintiles and essential worker quintiles at**  
646 **the census tract level in five public health units within the Greater Toronto Area.**

647 **S4 Fig. Epidemic curve and the restriction policy timing for the intervention group**  
648 **(Toronto and Peel) and the control group (York, Durham and Halton) in Greater Toronto**  
649 **Area.**

650 **S5 Fig. Mobility trajectories for 2019 and 2020 with the timing of two restrictions in the**  
651 **Greater Toronto Area.**

652 **S6 Fig. Maps for the three-week average mobility before and after 1<sup>st</sup> restriction in five**  
653 **public health units within the Greater Toronto Area, and three-week average mobility**  
654 **before and after 2<sup>nd</sup> restriction in Toronto and Peel public health units.**

655 **S1 Checklist. STROBE Statement**

656






Fig 1


A



B



C



D




Fig2





**A****B**

Fig3