

Supplementary Appendix

Supplement to: RAJ Post, M Regis, Z Zhan et al. How did governmental interventions affect the spread of COVID-19 in European countries? 2020;

A Governmental interventions and data sources

The governmental measures presented in the results section can be found in Table S1. Per country the date the measure was announced (DA) and the date on which the measure can influence the effective-contact rate (DS) are stated. Interventions were often implemented during press conferences in the evening. In that case we decided to let the interventions influence the effective-contact rate from the next day onwards. Furthermore, the sources from where this information is obtained are presented. The data sources for the hospitalization data are presented in Table S2. The hospitalization data was not available for Sweden, but the intensive care unit (ICU) occupation was recorded. We used the (constant) ratio between the Netherlands and Belgium between the hospitalization numbers and the ICU numbers to estimate the hospitalization numbers in Sweden.

	Intervention	DA	DS	Source
NL	Events with >100 participants banned Work from home when possible	12 /3	13 /3	https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/coronavirus-covid-19/coronavirus-beeld-en-video/videos-persconferenties
	Schools and daycares closed Bars and restaurants closed Work from home encouraged	15 /3	16 /3	“ ”
	Gathering >3 forbidden Fines introduced	23 /3	24 /3	“ ”
DE	Stricter border control Events ban		15 /3	https://www.deutschland.de/en/news/coronavirus-in-germany-informations
	Schools and daycares closed Railways reduce traffic	15 /3	16 /3	
	Lockdown Bavaria	15 /3	16 /3	
	Gatherings>2 forbidden Bars and restaurants closed	22 /3	23 /3	“ ”
IT	Schools closed Lombardy Events banned Lombardy		23 /3	http://www.governo.it/it/coronavirus-normativa
	Lockdown Lombardy		1 /3	
	Schools closed	4 /3	5 /3	“ ”
	Events banned Restrictions bars and restaurants		8 /3	“ ”
	Lockdown Italy Bars and restaurants closed	10 /3	11 /3	“ ”
	Army assists police forces		19 /3	https://edition.cnn.com/2020/03/20/europe/italy-military-coronavirus-intl/index.html
	Non-essential production halted	21 /3	22/3	https://www.lavanguardia.com/politica/20200328/48136764563/gobierno-trabajadores-servicios-no-esenciales-30-de-marzo-9-de-abril-semana-santa-pedro-sanchez-coronavirus.html
	Higher fines for violation lockdown rules		24/3	https://www.thelocal.it/20200324/italy-announces-fines-of-up-to-3000-for-breaking-quarantine-rules
ES	Events banned, Madrid		10/3	https://elpais.com/cultura/2020-03-11/coronavirus-el-mundo-de-la-cultura-pone-en-mayo-sus-esperanzas-tras-el-aluvion-de-cancelaciones.html
	Schools closed, Madrid		11 /3	https://english.elpais.com/society/2020-03-09/madrid-basque-city-close-schools-as-coronavirus-continues-spread-in-spain.html
	Schools closed	12 /3	13 /3	https://elpais.com/sociedad/2020-03-12/suspendidas-las-clases-en-todos-los-centros-educativos-de-euskadi.html
	Lockdown Bars and restaurants closed	13 /3	14 /3	https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/mar/14/spain-government-set-to-order-nationwide-coronavirus-lockdown
	Police force supervise stricter		23 /3	https://www.eldiario.es/politica/FyCSE-realizado-propuestas-sancion-respetar_0_1008599690.html

	Non-essential workers should stay home	28 /3	30 /3	https://www.lavanguardia.com/politica/20200328/48136764563/gobierno-trabajadores-servicios-no-esenciales-30-de-marzo-9-de-abril-semana-santa-pedro-sanchez-coronavirus.html
BE	Schools closed Events banned Restaurants closed	12/3	13 /3	https://www.info-coronavirus.be/en/news/phase-2-maintained-transition-to-the-federal-phase-and-additional-measures/
	Lockdown	17 /3	18 /3	https://web.archive.org/web/20200319160812/https://www.belgium.be/en/news/2020/coronavirus_reinforced_measures
	Closure of borders	20 /3	21 /3	https://www.vrt.be/vrtnews/en/2020/03/20/borders-closed-to-non-essential-travel/
	People arriving at Brussels Airport should be quarantined		25 /3	https://www.vrt.be/vrtnews/en/2020/03/25/people-arriving-in-belgium-quarantined-for-a-fortnight/
	Measures extended		27 /3	https://www.vrt.be/vrtnews/en/2020/03/27/measure-to-curb-the-spread-of-the-novel-coronavirus-to-remain-in/
UK	National risk level raised to high		12 /3	https://www.gov.uk/government/news/covid-19-government-announces-moving-out-of-contain-phase-and-into-delay
	Citizens should avoid non-essential travel	15 /3	16 /3	https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-51917562
	Schools closed Bars and restaurants closed	18 /3	20 /3	https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-51952314 https://web.archive.org/web/20200323004800/http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2020/327/pdfs/uksi_20200327_en.pdf
	Lockdown Events ban	23 /3	24 /3	https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-address-to-the-nation-on-coronavirus-23-march-2020
	Warning letters send out by government	29 /3	30 /3	https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-52079922
SW	Events >500 banned	11/3	12/3	https://www.gp.se/nyheter/sverige/klart-inga-evenemang-med-fler-%C3%A4n-500-bes%C3%B6kare-1.25224161
	No doctor's certificate needed to stay home	13/3	14/3	https://www.svt.se/nyheter/inrikes/regeringen-kravet-pa-lakarintyg-vid-sjukdom-avskaffas
	Universities and secondary schools closed	17/3	18/3	https://www.svd.se/presstraff-i-dag-med-utbildningsministern
	Restrictions bars and restaurants	24/3	25/3	https://www.svt.se/nyheter/inrikes/nya-forbudet-endast-bordsservering-tillats-pa-restauranger-och-barer
	Events >50 banned	27/3	28/3	https://www.svd.se/stefan-lofven-och-rikspolischefen-haller-presstraff

Table S1 Governmental interventions. Short description of governmental intervention, the date the intervention was announced (DA), the date from which we assumed the measure could affect the ECR (DS), and the source of the information per country. Interventions in grey do not belong to the four groups of measures we focused on in this study.

Italy	http://www.salute.gov.it/imgs/C_17_notizie_4445_0_file.pdf
Spain	https://www.mscbs.gob.es/en/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov-China/documentos/Actualizacion_66_COVID-19.pdf
Germany	https://www.rki.de/DE/Home/homepage_node.html
United Kingdom	https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/slides-and-datasets-to-accompany-coronavirus-press-conferences#history
Netherlands	https://www.rivm.nl/coronavirus-covid-19/actueel
Belgium	https://epistat.wiv-isp.be/covid/
Sweden	https://www.folkhalsomyndigheten.se/smittskydd-beredskap/utbrott/aktuella-utbrott/covid-19/bekraftade-fall-i-sverige/

Table S2 Hospitalization data sources.

B Parameter estimation

In order to obtain an ECR profile per country, we estimated $\beta(t)$ at day $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We imposed the restriction that the ECR profile is non-increasing: $\beta(t) = \sum_{i=t}^n \exp(\alpha_i)$, with α_i an unknown parameter. We estimated the ECR from the following set of equations:

$$(1) \quad \mathbb{E}[\Delta Y(t)] = \sum_{i=0}^t p_{t-i} \cdot \rho \cdot \Delta E^+(i) = \sum_{i=0}^t p_{t-i} \cdot \rho \cdot I(i) \cdot \beta(i) \cdot S(i)/N,$$

where Δ is the symbol for daily change in the values, i.e. $\Delta U(t) = U(t) - U(t-1)$, $E^+(t) = E(t) + Y(t) + I_{NT}(t) + R_{NT}(t)$ and p_t is the discretized Weibull probability that a susceptible individual becomes infectious t days after the beginning of the exposure. The daily number of susceptible individuals $S(t)$ and the daily number of infectious individuals $I(t)$ at day t are both unknown and need to be calculated from the observed data $Y(t)$ (or $\Delta Y(t)$) and $\Delta H^+(t)$.

By adding up (1) over t and rearranging the elements of the totals we find

$$(2) \quad \mathbb{E}[Y(t)] = \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbb{E}[\Delta Y(i)] = \sum_{i=1}^t \rho (\mathbb{E}[\Delta E^+(i)] \cdot \sum_{j=i}^t p_{t-j}),$$

by taking into account the discretized Weibull distributed incubation time in the exposed state. Assuming that the Weibull probability is almost zero for the first 24 hours (which fits with the reported results¹) and that ρ is known, the daily expected new exposures $\Delta E^+(t)$ can be iteratively calculated from (2). To stabilize these calculations, we first smoothed the daily cumulative number of confirmed infections $Y(t)$ using a three-parameter logistic growth curve². Having calculated the daily number of newly exposed individuals, we were able to calculate the daily number of susceptible individuals $S(t)$, assuming that the total population is susceptible³, i.e. $S(t) = N - E^+(t)$.

The number of tested infectious individuals $I_T(t)$ at day t can be obtained directly from the observed data $Y(t)$ and $\Delta H^+(t)$ by the equality $\mathbb{E}[I_T(t)] = \sum_{i=1}^t (\Delta Y(i) - \Delta H^+(i)) \cdot \pi_{t-i}$, where π_t is the probability that an infectious individual remains contagious for more than t days. Since none of the untested infectious individuals are being hospitalized, the expected total number of infectious individuals at day t can be calculated by assuming that the proportion of tested individuals ρ is known, and $\mathbb{E}[I(t)] = \sum_{i=1}^t (\Delta Y(i)/\rho - \Delta H^+(i)) \cdot \pi_{t-i}$.

Finally, we assumed that the number of newly exposed individuals $\Delta E^+(t)$ at day t is Poisson distributed with expectation $0.5(I(t) + I(t+1)) \cdot \beta(t) \cdot 0.5(S(t) + S(t+1))/N$. We averaged out the infectious and susceptible individuals at the start and end of day t to improve our estimation. Then, $\Delta Y(t)$, is also Poisson distributed with mean $\mathbb{E}[\Delta Y(t)] = \rho \sum_{i=0}^t p_{t-i} \cdot [I(i) + i(i+1)] \cdot \beta(i) \cdot [S(i) + S(i+1)]/(4N)$. To estimate $\beta(t)$, we fitted for each country a Poisson regression model to the daily increases of tested infected individuals $\Delta Y(t)$, selecting the data from the day of the first COVID-19 fatality in the country. We assumed that $\beta(t)$ did not change on the last day of our data and included ρ as a separate parameter in the regression analysis. If $\hat{\alpha}_t$ was smaller than -4 (such that $\exp \hat{\alpha}_t < 0.02$), then we set $\hat{\beta}(i)$ equal to $\hat{\beta}(i-1)$ to overcome numerical issues. Finally, we obtained confidence intervals for the estimates by means of the multivariate delta method. All estimations have been performed in R version 3.6.3.

C Sensitivity analysis

As a reference ECR profile we kept the same settings as in the main analysis, but fixing the fraction of tested individuals to $\rho = 0.1$. Our sensitivity analysis did investigate different values of ρ ($\rho = 0.01$), alternative distributions of the infectious period, Gamma (shape parameter equal to 2) instead of Exponential, different expected lengths of the infectious periods (4.6 days instead of 2.3 days) and the possibility of pre-symptomatic transmission⁴⁻⁶ during which the ECR equals 10% of the ECR after the incubation time. The latter change resulted in a higher number of infectious individuals, and thus in a decreased absolute value of $\beta(t)$, but the change points did not shift. This change in the absolute value of the ECR is also observed when assuming that the expected length of the infectious periods is longer. A small shift in the change points was observed when assuming an Exponential incubation time instead of the Weibull distribution. Such a small shift in the change points is also observed when we vary the parameters of the incubation time to the parameters obtained in the Backer et al. study¹ ($n = 88$, mean is 6.40). The parameter for the incubation time used in the main analyses was taken from their preliminary results ($n = 33$) and did align better with other studies reporting a mean incubation time equal to 5.6⁷, 5.5⁸, 5.2⁵ and 5.2⁶ respectively. If the mean incubation time was longer, then the change points would be delayed, while the opposite would happen if the mean was shorter. A slightly shorter incubation time could thus explain the reason why we estimate change points the day before measures were implemented, as happens for Italy, Germany, the UK and Spain. However, the latter point could also be explained by the variability in the data as well as the definition of the moment the measure was implemented. The ECR profiles per country for the different sensitivity scenarios are presented together with the ECR profile under the assumptions of the main analysis, but fixing $\rho = 0.1$ in Figures S1-S7. For each country the reference curve is very similar to the one presented in the main results, but since the ρ was taken fixed we could perform the regression on all available ΔY data in the considered time window. For Germany and the United Kingdom this results in an uninformative decrease in the last two days.




Figure S1: Sensitivity analysis Italy. The ECR profile estimates under the assumptions of the different sensitivity analysis scenarios. The $\rho = 0.1$ analysis is presented as reference curve (grey) in each plot.




Figure S2: Sensitivity analysis Spain. The ECR profile estimates under the assumptions of the different sensitivity analysis scenarios. The $\rho = 0.1$ analysis is presented as reference curve (grey) in each plot.




Figure S3: Sensitivity analysis Germany. The ECR profile estimates under the assumptions of the different sensitivity analysis scenarios. The $\rho = 0.1$ analysis is presented as reference curve (grey) in each plot.




Figure S4: Sensitivity analysis United Kingdom. The ECR profile estimates under the assumptions of the different sensitivity analysis scenarios. The $\rho = 0.1$ analysis is presented as reference curve (grey) in each plot.




Figure S5: Sensitivity analysis Netherlands. The ECR profile estimates under the assumptions of the different sensitivity analysis scenarios. The $\rho = 0.1$ analysis is presented as reference curve (grey) in each plot.




Figure S6: Sensitivity analysis Belgium. The ECR profile estimates under the assumptions of the different sensitivity analysis scenarios. The $\rho = 0.1$ analysis is presented as reference curve (grey) in each plot.




Figure S7: Sensitivity analysis Sweden. The ECR profile estimates under the assumptions of the different sensitivity analysis scenarios. The $\rho = 0.1$ analysis is presented as reference curve (grey) in each plot.

D Fraction of infectious individuals tested

From the sensitivity analysis presented in Appendix B we found that the fraction of tested infectious individuals did not influence the ECR profile. The latter can be explained by the fact that $\mathbb{E}[\Delta Y(t)] \approx \sum_{i=0}^t p_{t-i} \cdot I_T(i) \cdot \beta(i) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{E(i)+I(i)}{N}\right)$, where only the last term of the product depends on ρ , but at the same time will be close to 1 since in the first phase of the epidemic the vast majority of the population is still susceptible. In the main analysis we did estimate ρ which did thus result in highly variable estimates presented in Table S3.

	$\hat{\rho}$
Italy	0.454 (0.104)
Spain	0.365 (0.047)
Germany	0.780 (0.432)
United Kingdom	0.043 (0.030)
Netherlands	0.207 (0.123)
Belgium	0.369 (0.194)
Sweden	0.028 (0.010)

Table S3 Estimated percentage of tested infectious individuals.

E Google mobility data

In the discussion we did compare some of our findings with the data on mobility made available by Google⁹. Here the relative decrease of mobility was provided, regarding retail and recreation, grocery and pharmacy, parks, transit stations, workplaces and residential, with respect to the average activity in the period before the COVID-19 outbreak. The fraction of this baseline activity is presented together with the dates of governmental interventions (the same symbols introduced in Figure 2) for each country in Figures S8-S15.




Figure S8: Mobility data Italy. Moments of governmental interventions and the change in mobility activity as a fraction of the baseline (before the COVID-19 outbreak) activity provided by Google⁹.




Figure S9: Mobility data Spain. Moments of governmental interventions and the change in mobility activity as a fraction of the baseline (before the COVID-19 outbreak) activity provided by Google⁹.




Figure S10: Mobility data Germany. Moments of governmental interventions and the change in mobility activity as a fraction of the baseline (before the COVID-19 outbreak) activity provided by Google⁹.




Figure S11: Mobility data United Kingdom. Moments of governmental interventions and the change in mobility activity as a fraction of the baseline (before the COVID-19 outbreak) activity provided by Google⁹.




Figure S12: Mobility data Netherlands. Moments of governmental interventions and the change in mobility activity as a fraction of the baseline (before the COVID-19 outbreak) activity provided by Google⁹.




Figure S13: Mobility data Belgium. Moments of governmental interventions and the change in mobility activity as a fraction of the baseline (before the COVID-19 outbreak) activity provided by Google⁹.




Figure S14: Mobility data Sweden. Moments of governmental interventions and the change in mobility activity as a fraction of the baseline (before the COVID-19 outbreak) activity provided by Google⁹.

References

- 1 Backer J, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. The incubation period of 2019-nCoV infections among travellers from Wuhan, China. *Eurosurveillance* 2020; **25**: 2000062.
- 2 Ahuja JC, Nash SW. The Generalized Gompertz-Verhulst Family of Distributions. *Sankhyā Indian J Stat Ser A* 1967; **29**: 141–56.
- 3 Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). 2020 [who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/who-china-joint-mission-on-covid-19-final-report.pdf](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/who-china-joint-mission-on-covid-19-final-report.pdf).
- 4 Nishiura H, Linton NM, Akhmetzhanov AR. Serial interval of novel coronavirus (COVID-19) infections. *Int J Infect Dis* 2020; **93**: 284–6.
- 5 Li DQ, Guan X, Wu P, *et al*. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia. *Public Health* 2020; **13**: 1199–207.
- 6 Zhang J, Litvinova M, Wang W, *et al*. Evolving epidemiology and transmission dynamics of coronavirus disease 2019 outside Hubei province, China: a descriptive and modelling study. *Lancet Infect Dis* DOI:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30230-9.
- 7 Linton NM, Kobayashi T, Yang Y, *et al*. Incubation Period and Other Epidemiological Characteristics of 2019 Novel Coronavirus Infections with Right Truncation: A Statistical Analysis of Publicly Available Case Data. *J Clin Med* 2020; **9**: 538.
- 8 Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, *et al*. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Ann Intern Med* 2020; **172**: 577–82.
- 9 Google LLC. Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports. 2020. [google.com/covid19/mobility/](https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/) (accessed May 5, 2020).