

# **The effect of COVID-19 on the economy: evidence from an early adopter of localized lockdowns**

Kenzo Asahi PhD<sup>1,2</sup>, Eduardo A. Undurraga PhD<sup>1,3,4\*</sup>, Rodrigo Valdés PhD<sup>1,5</sup>, Rodrigo Wagner PhD<sup>6,7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Escuela de Gobierno, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Región Metropolitana, Chile.

<sup>2</sup>Centre for Sustainable Urban Development (CEDEUS), Chile

<sup>3</sup>Millennium Nucleus for the Study of the Life Course and Vulnerability (MLIV), Santiago, Chile

<sup>4</sup>Millennium Initiative for Collaborative Research in Bacterial Resistance (MICROB-R), Santiago, Chile

<sup>5</sup>Research Center for Integrated Disaster Risk Management (CIGIDEN), Santiago, Chile

<sup>6</sup>Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez, Santiago, Chile

<sup>7</sup>Growth Lab, Center for International Development, Harvard, Cambridge, USA

Emails: [kasahi@uc.cl](mailto:kasahi@uc.cl), [eundurra@uc.cl](mailto:eundurra@uc.cl), [rodrigo.valdes@uc.cl](mailto:rodrigo.valdes@uc.cl), [rodrigo.wagner@uai.cl](mailto:rodrigo.wagner@uai.cl)

**\*Address for correspondence:** Eduardo A. Undurraga, Escuela de Gobierno, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. Vicuña Mackenna 4860, Macul CP 7820436, Región Metropolitana, Chile; email: [eundurra@uc.cl](mailto:eundurra@uc.cl); phone: +56 (2) 2354 9536. ORCID: 0000-0002-4425-1253

## 16 **Abstract**

17 **Background.** Governments worldwide have implemented large-scale non-pharmaceutical interventions,  
18 such as social distancing or school closures, to prevent and control the growth of the COVID-19  
19 pandemic. These strategies, implemented with varying stringency, have imposed substantial social and  
20 economic costs to society. As some countries begin to reopen and ease mobility restrictions, lockdowns in  
21 smaller geographic areas are increasingly being considered as an attractive policy intervention to mitigate  
22 societal costs while controlling epidemic growth. However, there is a lack of empirical evidence to  
23 support these decisions.

24 **Methods.** Drawing from a rich dataset of localized lockdowns in Chile, we used econometric methods to  
25 measure the reduction in local economic activity from lockdowns when applied to smaller or larger  
26 geographical areas. We measured economic activity by tax collection at the municipality-level.

27 **Findings.** Results show lockdowns were associated with a 10-15% drop in local economic activity, a two-  
28 fold reduction compared to municipalities not under lockdown. A three-to-four-month lockdown had a  
29 similar effect on economic activity than the year of the 2009 great recession. We found that costs are  
30 proportional to the population under lockdown, without differences when lockdowns were measured at  
31 the municipality or city-wide levels.

32 **Conclusions.** Our findings suggest that localized lockdowns have a large effect on local economic  
33 activity, but these effects are proportional to the population under lockdown. Our results suggest that  
34 epidemiological criteria should guide decisions about the optimal size of lockdown areas; the proportional  
35 effects of lockdowns on the economy seem to be unchanged by scale.

36

37 **Keywords:** COVID-19, economic activity, lockdowns, non-pharmaceutical interventions

38

39 **JEL codes:** I10, I15, I18, H2

## 40 **Introduction**

41 Non-pharmaceutical interventions are still the main strategies to control viral transmission in the COVID-  
42 19 pandemic [1-3]. These interventions range from individual-level recommendations, such as the use of  
43 facemasks or frequent hand-washing, to large-scale regulations and policies, such as large-scale  
44 quarantines or lockdowns and non-essential business closures [4,5]. Several countries have achieved some  
45 control over the COVID-19 based on a combination of non-pharmaceutical interventions and high levels  
46 of testing and isolation of infected people [6-12]. However, there is a substantial risk of a resurgence of  
47 the epidemic [13-15]. Understanding the impacts of these interventions is critical because they will most  
48 likely continue until an effective vaccine becomes available for a substantial proportion of the population  
49 [16]. There is still limited empirical evidence of the effects of interventions to prevent viral transmission  
50 [1,17]; most impact has been estimated using mathematical models [16,18,19]. The COVID-19 pandemic  
51 has already imposed an enormous global burden, with about 30 million cases and one million deaths  
52 reported so far [20], and substantial social and economic costs from epidemic control measures [21-27].

53  
54 As countries begin to reopen and ease mobility restrictions, localized lockdowns are increasingly  
55 considered a critical element of a non-pharmaceutical toolkit to control COVID-19 resurgence  
56 [6,7,19,28,29]. In contrast to nation-wide lockdowns, localized lockdowns are implemented over a limited  
57 geographical area, ranging from a neighborhood to a city, including suburbs, districts, or towns. Localized  
58 lockdowns are appealing to policy-makers because, in principle, they would allow countries to reopen and  
59 reclose specific jurisdictions based on local virus transmission dynamics. Large-scale lockdowns are  
60 unsustainable because of the high costs they impose on the population [12]. Thus, compared to large-scale  
61 interventions, localized lockdowns may control transmission hotspots while mitigating some social and  
62 economic costs. Policy-makers need to make decisions about COVID-19 control strategies, considering  
63 their epidemiological, social, and economic effects.


64

65 Epidemiological evidence is one amongst several criteria for decision-making regarding non-  
66 pharmaceutical interventions. For example, a policy-maker would want to understand if costs of foregone  
67 economic activity are proportional to the population under lockdown, or whether costs are mitigated or  
68 amplified when lockdowns are implemented at different administrative levels (e.g., municipality, city,  
69 state, country). On the one hand, demand spillovers would suggest that people in a municipality could buy  
70 in stores of the neighboring municipality and, through substitution, limit the economic fallout in the city  
71 as a whole. On the other hand, the fall in economic activity could be more than proportional if a lockdown  
72 affects supply chains, such as when workers cannot work in a neighboring municipality because of  
73 mobility restrictions in their municipality of residence. The answer to this question is mostly empirical, as  
74 there are good arguments to both sides. However, there is limited and non-conclusive evidence on the  
75 economic costs of non-pharmaceutical interventions. Researchers in the United States have examined  
76 how non-pharmaceutical interventions have impacted unemployment insurance, employment, or store  
77 client traffic. Some research suggests that lockdowns explain a small share of the total economic activity  
78 decline [22,30-32]. Others [24,33,34] have found that lockdowns play a relevant role in explaining the  
79 drop in economic activity. We test these effects in a setting where localized lockdowns were implemented  
80 intermittently at different administrative levels, thus allowing us to identify the impact of localized  
81 lockdowns on economic activity.

82

83 The World Health Organization declared South America as the new epicenter of COVID-19 on May 22,  
84 2020 [35]. Despite implementing several epidemic control strategies early in the pandemic, including  
85 travel restrictions, school closures, and mandatory lockdowns [36], the pandemic has imposed a massive  
86 toll in the region. As of September 13, South America has reported more than 240 thousand deaths;  
87 Colombia, Brazil, Peru, and Chile are among the ten countries with most reported COVID-19 infections  
88 globally and the spread is far from controlled [20,37,38]. While mostly failing to stop viral spread  
89 [37,39], Latin America is now facing the social and economic costs of large-scale non-pharmaceutical  
90 interventions. Since the beginning of the epidemic, Chile has implemented localized lockdowns at the

91 municipality level, the smallest administrative subdivision in the country, at various points in time (Figure  
92 1). The government roughly defined the criteria for implementing localized lockdowns as a function of  
93 disease burden, growth in transmission, and healthcare capacity, but did not define specific thresholds  
94 [40]. Epidemiological evidence suggests localized lockdowns reduce epidemic growth[41], but are  
95 heavily affected by spillovers from neighboring communities [17] and income [42,43]. Localized  
96 lockdowns have helped contain the transmission of the virus in isolated areas. Still, they cannot control  
97 the epidemic in highly interdependent areas, such as municipalities within a metropolitan area.



98

99 **Figure 1. Illustration of localized lockdowns at the municipality level, Greater Santiago, Chile,**  
100 **March-May 2020.** To control COVID-19 growth, the Ministry of Health implemented localized lockdowns at the  
101 municipality level, the smallest administrative subdivision in the country. The figure illustrates these lockdowns  
102 implemented in Greater Santiago (A in gray), and different points in time: March 30 (B), April 30 (C), and May 30  
103 (D). Localized lockdowns were implemented at the municipality-level across the country.

104 Drawing on a rich integrated dataset, including value-added tax (VAT) revenues, population data, and  
105 daily incidence of lab-confirmed COVID-19 cases, we use econometric methods to empirically estimate

106 the economic costs of these localized lockdowns in Chile. We hope these results will help inform policy  
107 implementation decisions in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 108 **Methods**

### 109 **Data**

110 Value-added tax (VAT) applies to all goods with a flat rate of 19% in Chile. VAT is collected and paid  
111 monthly to the Chilean tax authority (Servicio de Impuestos Internos). Our data includes VAT at the  
112 municipality level, by all firms registered in the Chilean tax authority, for 2018-2020. VAT collection has  
113 a tight one-to-one relationship with GDP; it is, therefore, a good proxy for economic activity. Both  
114 variables cointegrate in time series and panel analysis; error correction models suggest that half-life  
115 deviations vanish in less than a year [44].

116

117 We used Chile's 2017 National Census [45] to estimate the population in each municipality, and  
118 epidemiological surveillance records for COVID-19 from Chile's Ministry of Health [40,46]. We  
119 obtained mobility data from the Data Science Institute at Universidad del Desarrollo [47]. Data on  
120 COVID-19, mobility, and population are publicly available on institutional websites [45-47]. The data on  
121 VAT used for this study is available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request and with  
122 permission of the tax authority.

123


### 124 **Analysis**

125 We used the collection of the VAT as our dependent variable. Our lockdown variable corresponds to the  
126 proportion of days that a municipality  $i$  is in quarantine in a given month  $t$ :

127

$$Lockdown_{i,t} = \frac{\sum \text{quarantine days}_{i,t}}{\text{Total month's days}_t}$$

128 We limited our analysis of the 170 municipalities with above-median total VAT in 2018, excluding  
 129 mostly small and rural municipalities. This preferred sample of municipalities includes 97% of Chile’s  
 130 2018 VAT and 89% of the population (Figure 2). Our sample also excluded the three municipalities that  
 131 concentrate large-company headquarters (Santiago, Las Condes, and Providencia), such as banks and  
 132 mining companies, because VAT data in these municipalities do not reflect local economic activity.



133  
 134 **Figure 2. VAT and population cumulative distribution across all municipalities.** Panel (a) shows the  
 135 proportion of total 2018 VAT considered in our baseline sample. We sorted the 343 municipalities in our dataset in  
 136 ascending order by 2018 VAT, and we calculated the accumulated tax from the one with the lowest to the one with  
 137 the highest level of VAT. Municipalities not considered in our baseline sample account for 2.9% of the total 2018  
 138 VAT (darker area), while the remaining 97.1% (lighter area) is in our preferred sample. Panel (b) shows the  
 139 proportion of the total population according to the 2017 Census within our preferred sample. In this case, we sorted  
 140 the municipalities in ascending order. We then calculated the accumulated percentage of the total population that is  
 141 not considered in our sample, which is 10.9% (darker area). Hence, the remaining 89.1% (lighter area) is in our  
 142 sample.

143 Our main empirical specification is a two-way fixed-effects model:

144 
$$\Delta\%VAT_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 lockdown_{it} + \beta_2 X_{it} + \gamma_i + \delta_t + \epsilon_{it}$$

145 where  $\Delta\%VAT_{it}$  corresponds to the percent variation of total VAT collected in municipality  $i$  at month  $t$  in  
 146 2020 relative to the same month in 2019.  $lockdown_{it}$  is our variable of interest and represents the  
 147 proportion of days in a month that a municipality was under lockdown.  $\gamma_i$  and  $\delta_t$  correspond to

148 municipality and time fixed-effects, respectively. A distinctive feature of our setting is that  $lockdown_{it}$   
149 effectively changes by municipality and month, providing a variation that allows for a plausible estimate  
150 of effects (Figure 1). We controlled for threat or risk perception [48] and social distance by adding  
151 COVID-19 cases or deaths in the municipality  $i$  at time  $t$  (variable  $X_{it}$ ) as a covariate. For instance, people  
152 may not open their businesses or spend in the local economy because they fear COVID-19 contagion,  
153 independent of whether their municipality is under lockdown or not.

154

155 Similar to virus transmission spillovers [17], the economic effects of localized lockdowns within a city or  
156 in a conurbation may differ from more relatively isolated municipalities with no neighboring urban areas  
157 (“standalone” municipalities). To examine whether the impact of lockdowns on economic activity is  
158 heterogeneous depending on whether municipalities belong to a conurbation or are a standalone  
159 municipality, we used the following regression specification:

$$160 \quad \Delta\% VAT_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 lockdown_{it} + \beta_2 standalone_i + \beta_3 standalone_i \times lockdown_{it} + \gamma_i + \delta_t + \varepsilon_{it}$$

161 where  $standalone_i$  takes a value of one for standalone municipalities and zero otherwise.

162

163 The economic effects of localized lockdowns may also differ depending on the area under lockdown—for  
164 example, at the municipality or conurbation level. To examine this question, we also ran our analysis  
165 comparing all municipalities within a conurbation with standalone municipalities. We weighted the  
166 number of days in quarantine in month  $t$  of each municipality  $i$  belonging to the conurbation  $c$  according  
167 to the total 2018 VAT:

$$168 \quad lockdown_{ct} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^c lockdown_{it} * VAT_i}{Total\ Month'_s\ days\ \sum_{i=1}^c VAT_i}$$



169 We estimated deaths and COVID-19 cases as a weighted average of deaths in municipalities within the  
170 conurbation, using the municipality's population as the weight. Hence, the equation describing per capita  
171 COVID deaths in each conurbation is as follows:

$$172 \quad \text{Per capita COVID deaths}_{ct} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^C \text{COVID deaths}_{it}}{\sum_{i=1}^C \text{Population}_i}$$

173 Last, we investigate how mobility at the municipality-level affects economic activity. We used a mobility  
174 index based on cellphone data.

175

## 176 **Results**

### 177 **Descriptive statistics**

178 Table 1 shows the main descriptive statistics of our sample. Figure 3 shows the longitudinal effects of  
179 lockdown. Municipalities without a localized lockdown saw a 15% drop in VAT collection in April-May.

180 By contrast, municipalities in lockdown suffered a more massive decline of 25-30% in VAT collection.

181 Figure 4 shows a cross-section, considering month and municipality fixed-effects. The figure shows a  
182 clear relationship between the extent of lockdowns and the decline in VAT.


183

184 **Table 1.** Descriptive statistics related to localized lockdowns in Chilean municipalities, March-May 2020


|  | N   | Municipalities | Mean   | St. Dev. |
|--|-----|----------------|--------|----------|
| VAT year-over-year growth rate. Periods:   |     |                |        |          |
| Before the outbreak: January–February 2020 | 340 | 170            | 0.083  | 0.423    |
| During the pandemic: March–May 2020        | 510 | 170            | -0.139 | 0.319    |
| Lockdown (% of days)                       |     |                |        |          |
| March–May 2020                             | 510 | 170            | 0.082  | 0.227    |
| Conditional on one day at least            | 153 | 51             | 0.273  | 0.348    |
| Mobility index (mobile phones)             |     |                |        |          |
| Before COVID-19 (March 1–15)               | 170 | 170            | 8.03   | 3.24     |
| During COVID-19 (March 16–May 31)          | 510 | 170            | 6.12   | 2.57     |
| COVID-19 deaths per million population     |     |                |        |          |
| Mar 2020                                   | 170 | 170            | 2.13   | 6.61     |
| April 2020                                 | 170 | 170            | 20.32  | 27.90    |
| May 2020                                   | 170 | 170            | 108.95 | 147.54   |
| COVID-19 incidence per million population  |     |                |        |          |
|  |     |                | Wh59.5 |          |
| March 2020                                 | 168 | 168            | 4      | 119.57   |
| April 2020                                 | 170 | 170            | 633.38 | 729.48   |
| May 2020                                   | 170 | 170            | 3160.5 | 4319.0   |

185 **Notes.** VAT: Value-added tax. The VAT year-over-year growth rate is the growth rate for each month and each  
 186 municipality relative to 12 months before. In the VAT growth rate for “March–May 2020” we include the growth  
 187 rate for each month-municipality in that period. We consider that the disruption of the COVID-19 pandemic on  
 188 mobility occurred on March 16 because the government closed all schools on that date [40].

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



189  
190 **Figure 3. Median of the real value-added-tax (VAT) year-on-year growth rates.** The graphs shows the median  
191 of VAT growth rates for municipalities that were under lockdown in May 2020 (blue) and municipalities that were  
192 not under lockdown (red). The median of the value-added-tax (VAT) growth rate in May 2020 for municipalities  
193 with and without lockdown is 2.67 and 5.37 standard deviations lower than the mean of such medians in the 2006-  
194 2019 period. The sample of municipalities includes municipalities over the 50th percentile of the total 2018 VAT.



195  
196 **Figure 4. Effect of lockdown on value-added-tax (VAT) collection for January 2020 through May 2020,**  
197 controlling for month and municipality fixed effects. The results show the association between lockdown on VAT  
198 collection for January 2020 through May 2020, controlling for month and municipality fixed effects. We group the  
199 municipalities of our baseline sample into equal-sized bins according to days of lockdown between January 2020  
200 and May 2020. Each dot represents the mean of VAT collection growth rate (y-axis) and the mean of deviation from  
201 lockdown as a percentage of a month (x-axis), within each bin. Each bin has 17 municipalities. The red dashed line  
202 represents the population regression line.

## 203 **Multivariate analysis**

### 204 **Municipality level**

205 Table 2 presents our baseline results for the effect of lockdowns on economic activity. Table 2, column  
206 (1) shows that one month of lockdown decreases monthly VAT around 12.5% ( $\beta$ :-0.125; 95% CI:-0.220,-  
207 0.031;  $p < 0.01$ ). The coefficient or the effect of lockdowns has about the same magnitude when restricting  
208 the sample to municipalities with at least 50% of the urban population (Table 2, column 2;  $\beta$ : -0.132; 95%  
209 CI:-0.228,-0.035;  $p < 0.01$ ). Table 2, column (3) shows the results for municipalities with less than 50% of  
210 the rural population and excluding observations from Greater Santiago. To assess the robustness of our  
211 estimates, we excluded municipalities in Greater Santiago, the conurbation in Chile with the highest  
212 proportion of municipalities in lockdown between March and May 2020. We found that VAT decreases  
213 16 percentage points for each month of lockdown, but the coefficient is only significant at the 90% level  
214 ( $\beta$ =-0.162; 95% CI:-0.350,0.0268;  $p < 0.10$ ).

215

216 **Table 2.** Regressions results for the effect of one month localized lockdown on total VAT collection, estimated  
 217 with two-way fixed effects at the municipality level, January-May 2020

| Dependent variable:<br>VAT growth    | Baseline             | Excluding rural units | Excluding Greater Santiago | Conurbations        | Conurbations excluding Greater Santiago | Conurbations and standalone municipalities | As in (1) controlling for deaths | As in (1) controlling for cases |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                                      | (1)                  | (2)                   | (3)                        | (4)                 | (5)                                     | (6)  | (7)                              | (8)                             |
| Lockdown                             | -0.125***<br>(0.048) | -0.132***<br>(0.049)  | -0.162*<br>(0.096)         | -0.161**<br>(0.064) | -0.153<br>(0.130)                       | -0.230***<br>(0.059)                       | -0.125*<br>(0.071)               | -0.135***<br>(0.052)            |
| Standalone × lockdown                |                      |                       |                            |                     |   | -0.059<br>(0.104)                          |                                  |                                 |
| Standalone                           |                      |                       |                            |                     |   | -0.005<br>(0.038)                          |                                  |                                 |
| Death per 100,000 population         |                      |                       |                            |                     |   |  | 0.00004<br>(0.002)               |                                 |
| Log Incidence per 100,000 population |                      |                       |                            |                     |   |  |                                  | 0.002<br>(0.005)                |
| Observations                         | 850                  | 785                   | 570                        | 360                 | 195                                     | 455  | 850                              | 850                             |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>              | 0.352                | 0.369                 | 0.356                      | 0.352               | 0.278                                   | 0.171                                      | 0.351                            | 0.351                           |
| Time effect                          | YES                  | YES                   | YES                        | YES                 | YES                                     | YES  | YES                              | YES                             |
| Municipalities                       | 170                  | 157                   | 114                        | 72                  | 39                                      | 91   | 170                              | 170                             |

218 **Notes.** All specifications have both geography and time fixed effects. VAT: Value-added tax. Robust standard errors in  
 219 parenthesis. Column (1) shows regression results for the baseline sample (i.e., municipalities over 50th percentile of total  
 220 2018 VAT). Column (2) excludes units with over fifty percent of rural population. Column (3) is the same as (2) but  
 221 excluding municipalities in Greater Santiago, the capital. Columns (4) includes only municipalities that are part of a large  
 222 conurbation. Column (5) is the same as column (4), excluding municipalities in Greater Santiago. Column (6) includes  
 223 municipalities that are part of large conurbations and standalone municipalities (Angol, Antofagasta, Arica, Aysén, Calama,  
 224 Castro, Chañaral, Colina, Copiapó, Curicó, Osorno, Ovalle, Puerto Montt, Puerto Natales, Punta Arenas, Valdivia, and  
 225 Vallenar). Columns (7) and (8) consider the baseline sample and controls for contemporaneous COVID-19 deaths and  
 226 incidence per 100,000 population, respectively, at the municipality level.

227 .We then limited our sample to urban municipalities (n=72) that are part of a conurbation (Table 2, column  
228 4). One month of lockdown results in a monthly VAT decrease of 16 percentage points ( $\beta=-0.161$ ; 95%  
229 CI:-0.287,-0.034;  $p=0,013$ ). We found similar results when excluding Greater Santiago (Table 2, column  
230 5;  $\beta=-0.153$ ; 95% CI:-0.410,0.103;  $p=0.240$ ).

231  
232 We added an interaction term to examine whether lockdowns had a different effect on VAT in  
233 municipalities that are part of a conurbation or in standalone municipalities. The results in Table 2, column  
234 (6) show a 23% decline in monthly VAT collection due to a one-month lockdown ( $\beta=-0.230$ ; 95% CI:-  
235 0.345,-0.115;  $p<0.01$ ). However, we did not find evidence of a differential effect for standalone  
236 municipalities relative to municipalities in conurbations.

237  
238 Last, we examined whether perceived threat or risk from COVID-19 deaths or cases could be an omitted  
239 variable bias in the effect of local lockdowns on economic activity. Table 2, Column (7) includes the  
240 municipality's one-month lagged per-capita COVID deaths per 100,000 population as control. The effect  
241 of lockdown is roughly the same as in column 1 ( $\beta=-0.125$ ; 95% CI:-0.265,0.013;  $p<0.10$ ). Controlling  
242 for COVID-19 monthly incidence per 100,000 population Table 2, Column (8) shows that one month of  
243 lockdown results in a thirteen percent decrease in VAT collection ( $\beta=-0.135$ ; 95% CI:-0.237,-0.033;  
244  $p=0.01$ ). Results are robust to using one-month lagged COVID-19 deaths and cases.

245  
246 Overall, Table 2 suggests that one month of lockdown would reduce economic activity by 10-15%, robust  
247 to several model specifications. Notably, the effect size is not affected when controlling for COVID-19  
248 deaths or case incidence, suggesting that the lockdown effect in this sample goes over and above the  
249 impact of perceived threat or risk of contagion.

250

## 251 **Conurbations and standalone municipalities**

252 Next, we examined the effects of lockdowns on VAT when analyzed for conurbations or standalone  
253 municipalities (Table 3). The objective was to test whether the effects of lockdowns were different when  
254 there were no spillovers from closely interdependent neighboring areas. For the analysis, we collapsed  
255 municipalities into conurbations. Our sample now had eighteen conurbations and seventeen standalone  
256 municipalities in our baseline sample.

257

258 Table 3, column (1), shows a statistically significant decline in monthly VAT collection of around 18%  
259 ( $\beta=-0.184$ ; 95% CI:-0.360,-0.009;  $p<0,050$ ). Because Greater Santiago had the largest number of  
260 municipalities with lockdown, we dropped Greater Santiago from the sample to test our results (Table 3,  
261 column 2). The magnitude of the effect remained but was significant only at the 90% level ( $\beta=-0.188$ ;  
262 95% CI:-0.382, 0.051;  $p=0,056$ ). In Table 3, column 3, we examined whether there was a differential  
263 effect for standalone municipalities. The results show that one month of lockdown results in a significant  
264 decrease of 24% of VAT collection ( $\beta=-0.243$ ; 95% CI:-0.370,-0.117;  $p<0,001$ ); we did not find evidence  
265 for a differential effect in standalone municipalities. However, the coefficient in Table 3, column 3 was  
266 not statistically different from the coefficient in Table 3, columns (1) and (2).

267

268 Last, we examined whether the lockdown effect was different from the perceived threat or risk from  
269 COVID-19. In Table 3, columns (4) and (5) show lockdowns were no longer statistically significant at  
270 conventional levels ( $p=0.240$  and  $p=0.175$ , respectively). However, the coefficient's sign was still  
271 negative and about the same magnitude as the coefficient in Table 3, columns (7) and (8). The joint  
272 significance test for the proportion of the month under lockdown and lagged per capita COVID-19 deaths  
273 and incidence was significant ( $F=3.84$ ,  $p<0.05$ ;  $F=2.81$ ,  $p=0.064$ , respectively). Thus, working with data  
274 at the conurbation-level instead of the municipality-level makes it harder to disentangle the effect of  
275 lockdowns. This is partly explained by insufficient statistical power and, from limited variation in the

276 lockdown variable. The last columns of Table 3 reinforce the advantage of our baseline setting at the  
 277 municipal level, with more sizable variation in the lockdown (key) variable.

278 **Table 3.** Regressions results for the effect of one month localized lockdown on total VAT collection,  
 279 estimated with two-way fixed effects for conurbations and standalone municipalities, January-May 2020

| Dependent variable:<br>VAT growth                  | All<br>Conurbations<br>and standalone<br>municipalities | Excluding<br>Greater<br>Santiago | As in (1)<br>interacting<br>lockdown &<br>standalone | As in (1)<br>with per<br>capita<br>deaths | As in (1)<br>with log per<br>capita<br>incidence |
|--|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
|  | (1)   | (2)                              | (3)  | (4)                                       | (5)  |
| Lockdown   | -0.184**<br>(0.089)                                     | -0.188*<br>(0.020)               | -0.243***<br>(0.064)                                 | -0.126<br>(0.106)                         | -0.157<br>(0.116)                                |
| Standalone   |   |                                  | -0.00294<br>(0.044)                                  |   |  |
| Standalone × lockdown                              |   |                                  | -0.042<br>(0.105)                                    |   |  |
| Lagged per capita deaths<br>per 100,000 population |   |                                  |  | -0.007<br>(0.006)                         |  |
| Log incidence<br>per 100,000 population            |   |                                  |  |   | -0.014<br>(0.027)                                |
| Observations                                       | 175   | 170                              | 175  | 175                                       | 175  |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>                            | 0.325   | 0.322                            | 0.101  | 0.326                                     | 0.323  |
| Units  | 35  | 35                               | 35   | 35  | 35   |
| Conurbations                                       | 18  | 18                               | 18   | 18  | 18   |
| Standalone municipalities                          | 17  | 17                               | 17   | 17  | 17   |

280 **Notes.** All specifications have both geography (conurbation, standalone municipalities) and time fixed-effects.  
 281 VAT: Value-added tax. Robust standard errors in parenthesis. Localized lockdowns at the conurbation level are  
 282 aggregated and weighted by total 2018 VAT. COVID-19 deaths and cases are calculated at the conurbation level.



283  
284 Table A1 in the Supplemental material also shows that our baseline results are robust to controlling for a  
285 measure of cellphone-based mobility. However, we also argue that it might be misleading to control for  
286 mobility since it is one of the main mediating channels by which lockdown affects economic activity (see  
287 Supplemental material for further discussion).

## 288 **Discussion**

289 Our results suggest that a full-month lockdown explains a drop in activity of the order of 10-15  
290 percentage points, almost twice the reduction for non-locked down areas. While the expected sign of the  
291 effect of lockdowns on economic activity might be obvious, its magnitude is not.

292  
293 These estimates are large. Our estimates suggest that a three-to-four-months lockdown would reduce  
294 economic activity by approximately the same amount that the recession affected the Chilean economy in  
295 the (whole) year 2009. During the 2009 Great Recession, GDP declined by 1.1% instead of growing by  
296 3.7% [49]. These three to four months only consider the additional effect of lockdowns. If one considered  
297 the whole drop in economic activity, the magnitude would be twice as much (in two months under  
298 lockdown in 2020 the drop in GDP is comparable to the annual drop in 2009).

299  
300 Another way of thinking quantitatively about the magnitude and implications of our baseline estimate in  
301 terms of employment. Assuming a standard short-run labor-to-economic activity elasticity of around 0.3-  
302 0.5, as suggested by an OECD study [34], a one-month lockdown would imply a drop of about 6% in  
303 monthly employment. We estimate this illustrative 6% fall in monthly employment, by multiplying the  
304 coefficient of -0.15 in Table 2 by an average short-run labor-to-economic activity elasticity of 0.4.

305

306 It is also useful to contrast our results with the polar case of South Korea, without lockdowns. Aum et al.  
307 [24] found that a one-per-thousand increase in the infection rate was associated with an employment loss  
308 of 2-3%. Extrapolating this result to the United States and the United Kingdom, which had large-scale  
309 lockdowns, Aum et al. [24] argue that only half of the 5-6% drop in job losses in these Western  
310 economies might be attributable to lockdowns. The rest would be from social panic, some other large-  
311 scale non-pharmaceutical intervention, such as school closures, or demand effects. This similar effect of  
312 areas with and without lockdown seems consistent with our findings. Importantly, we obtained our results  
313 from a direct test in the same sample, instead of extrapolating across countries. The relatively large effect  
314 of lockdowns has not yet been found empirically in the United States. For instance, Bartik et al. [30]  
315 found that the relative impact of lockdowns was smaller, explaining 1/6 of the total fall during the  
316 COVID-19 pandemic. Our results show that lockdowns explain half of the effect, both in the raw time  
317 series (Figure 3) and in the main regressions (Table 2). Thus, we offer a qualification to Brzezinski et al.  
318 [50], who found that not imposing lockdowns barely improves economic performance, while drastically  
319 increasing medical costs. This baseline drop probably includes threat or risk perception and includes other  
320 economic channels, like lower spending [25].

321  
322 Epidemiological evidence suggests localized lockdowns reduce epidemic growth [41], but their  
323 effectiveness is affected by spillovers from neighboring areas where there is economic interdependence,  
324 such as in a city [17]. From an epidemiological standpoint, governments should implement localized  
325 lockdowns at the city-level, where “buffer” zones exist to minimize transmission networks [28]. We  
326 examined localized lockdowns at different scales to understand their relative economic costs,  
327 understanding that this is only one portion of the relevant cost calculation. Our findings suggest no  
328 disproportionate economic gains from unlocking a part of the city. Our estimated effects of lockdowns on  
329 the economy are unchanged by scale. The plausible channels that mitigate or amplify the economic  
330 impact in the case of a widespread vis-à-vis a local lockdown do not seem critical, at least in our study

331 setting, enforcing the convenience of implementing localized lockdowns at the city or commuting area  
332 levels.

333

334 Economic problems could also feedback into health through several channels. For instance, a drop in  
335 economic activity of 10-15 percentage points is relevant because lockdowns can affect government  
336 budgets, even in the long term. For example, Frenier et al. [51] argue that several states in the USA will  
337 probably face severe budget deficits from reductions in tax revenue from the pandemic. Further, an  
338 economic downturn may prompt many deaths of despair and mental illness from unemployment and  
339 isolation [52].

340 Our estimates have limitations. First, we used a tax payment as a proxy for economic activity.

341 Nonetheless, we also have VAT and survey-based employment at the regional level in Chile. We found a  
342 statistically significant elasticity of 0.3 between the drop in VAT and the decline in total employment  
343 (including self-employed), consistent with short-run output-employment elasticities in the literature (34).

344 Another limitation is that informal economic activity is, by its very nature, not directly captured in our  
345 measures of VAT. This is a more general limitation globally. However, compared to Latin America, Chile  
346 has relatively low informality [53].

347 Our study may also have other confounders. For instance, the government gave some leeway on when to  
348 pay taxes, and we could only examine monthly-level observations. Nevertheless, there are no apparent  
349 reasons why these confounders may interact with lockdowns. These confounders may have also  
350 introduced measurement error in our tax measures. This would have increased our standard errors,  
351 making it more difficult to get statistical significance. Nevertheless, we did get relevant and robust  
352 estimates across various specifications, which mitigates the concerns related to measurement error.

353

## 354 **Conclusions**

355 We used a rich dataset of localized lockdowns in Chile to measure their effect on economic activity. We  
356 find sizeable impacts of lockdowns, doubling the drop in economic activity compared to non-treated  
357 municipalities, and robust to several model specifications and controls. As many countries are beginning  
358 to reopen and ease mobility restrictions, localized lockdowns can be a critical tool to control COVID-19  
359 resurgence while minimizing economic impact. We found no evidence that localized lockdowns generate  
360 a proportionally larger or smaller effect in the economy when applied to areas of different sizes.  
361 Critically, our results suggest that epidemiological criteria should guide decisions about the optimal size  
362 of lockdown areas; the proportional effects of lockdowns on the economy seem to be unchanged by scale.

## 363 **Acknowledgments**

364 We thank Sebastian Piña (Universidad de Chile) for research assistance, Paula Aguirre (Pontificia  
365 Universidad Católica de Chile) for help with Figure 1, and the Servicio de Impuestos Internos (Chilean  
366 Tax Authority) for the local Value-added-tax data.

## 367 **Funding information**

368 This research was supported by the Agencia Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo (ANID) Millennium  
369 Science Initiative / Millennium Initiative for Collaborative Research on Bacterial Resistance (MICROB-  
370 R) [NCN17\_081] and Millennium Nucleus for the Study of the Life Course and Vulnerability (MLIV) to  
371 EU; Fondo Nacional de Desarrollo Científico y Tecnológico (FONDECYT) [Grant 11191206] to RW;  
372 Centro de Desarrollo Urbano Sustentable (CEDEUS), ANID Fondo de Financiamiento de Centros de  
373 Investigación en Áreas Prioritarias (FONDAP) [Grant 15110020] to KA; and Centro de Investigación  
374 para la Gestión Integrada del Riesgo de Desastres (CIGIDEN), ANID FONDAP [Grant 15110017] to RV.

## 375 **Conflicts of interest**

376 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## 377 **Authorship contributions**

378 K.A., E.U., R.V., and R.W. contributed to the design and implementation of the research, to the analysis  
379 of the results and to the writing of the manuscript.

## 380 **Ethics approval**

381 Our research uses publicly available administrative data collected by the Chilean government; data are  
382 aggregated at the municipality-level and subjects cannot be identified directly or through identifiers. It is  
383 considered exempt by the Comité Ético Científico of Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.

## 384 **References**

- 385 1 Hsiang S, Allen D, Annan-Phan S, Bell K, Bolliger I, Chong T, et al. The effect of large-scale  
386 anti-contagion policies on the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature*. 2020;584:262-7.
- 387 2 Walker PGT, Whittaker C, Watson OJ, Baguelin M, Winskill P, Hamlet A, et al. The impact of  
388 COVID-19 and strategies for mitigation and suppression in low- and middle-income countries.  
389 *Science*. 2020;369:413-22.
- 390 3 Wiersinga WJ, Rhodes A, Cheng AC, Peacock SJ, Prescott HC. Pathophysiology, Transmission,  
391 Diagnosis, and Treatment of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Review. *JAMA*.  
392 2020:Online ahead of print.
- 393 4 Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, Unwin HJT, Mellan TA, Coupland H, et al. Estimating the  
394 effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*. 2020;584:257-61.
- 395 5 Davies NG, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Gimma A, Edmunds WJ, Jombart T, et al. Effects of non-  
396 pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 cases, deaths, and demand for hospital services in the  
397 UK: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2020.
- 398 6 Lavezzo E, Franchin E, Ciavarella C, Cuomo-Dannenburg G, Barzon L, Del Vecchio C, et al.  
399 Suppression of a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in the Italian municipality of Vo'. *Nature*. 2020:1-.
- 400 7 Hao X, Cheng S, Wu D, Wu T, Lin X, Wang C. Reconstruction of the full transmission dynamics  
401 of COVID-19 in Wuhan. *Nature*. 2020;584:420-4.
- 402 8 Cousins S. New Zealand eliminates COVID-19. *Lancet*. 2020;395:1474.
- 403 9 Cowling BJ, Ali ST, Ng TWY, Tsang TK, Li JCM, Fong MW, et al. Impact assessment of non-  
404 pharmaceutical interventions against coronavirus disease 2019 and influenza in Hong Kong: an  
405 observational study. *Lancet Public Health*. 2020;5:e279-e88.
- 406 10 Pan A, Liu L, Wang C, Guo H, Hao X, Wang Q, et al. Association of Public Health Interventions  
407 With the Epidemiology of the COVID-19 Outbreak in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*. 2020;323:1915-23.

408 11 Lai S, Ruktanonchai N, Zhou L, Prosper O, Luo W, Floyd J, et al. Effect of non-pharmaceutical  
409 interventions to contain COVID-19 in China. *Nature*. 2020;585:410-3.

410 12 Rudan I. Answering 20 more questions on COVID-19 (March-April 2020). *J Glob Health*.  
411 2020;10:020102.

412 13 Shimizu K, Wharton G, Sakamoto H, Mossialos E. Resurgence of covid-19 in Japan. *BMJ*.  
413 2020;370:m3221.

414 14 Ruktanonchai NW, Floyd J, Lai S, Ruktanonchai CW, Sadilek A, Rente-Lourenco P, et al.  
415 Assessing the impact of coordinated COVID-19 exit strategies across Europe. *Science*. 2020.

416 15 Wise J. Covid-19: Risk of second wave is very real, say researchers. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m2294.

417 16 Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Goldstein E, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Projecting the transmission  
418 dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period. *Science*. 2020;368:860-8.

419 17 Li Y, Undurraga EA, Zubizarreta JR. Effectiveness of Localized Lockdowns in the SARS-CoV-2  
420 Pandemic. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.08.25.20182071.

421 18 Shea K, Runge MC, Pannell D, Probert WJM, Li S-L, Tildesley M, et al. Harnessing multiple  
422 models for outbreak management. *Science*. 2020;368:577-9.

423 19 Karatayev VA, Anand M, Bauch CT. Local lockdowns outperform global lockdown on the far  
424 side of the COVID-19 epidemic curve. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2020:202014385.

425 20 Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time.  
426 *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20:P533-P4.

427 21 World Bank. The Economy in the Time of CoVID-19. 2020. Available: <https://bit.ly/35B2r3y>.  
428 Accessed.

429 22 Baek C, McCrory PB, Messer T, Mui P. Unemployment effects of stay-at-home orders: Evidence  
430 from high frequency claims data. Institute for Research on labor and employment working paper.  
431 2020.

- 432 23 Lozano-Rojas F, Jiang X, Montenovolo L, Simon KI, Weinberg BA, Wing C. Is the cure worse  
433 than the problem itself? immediate labor market effects of covid-19 case rates and school closures  
434 in the us. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020 0898-2937.
- 435 24 Aum S, Lee SYT, Shin Y. COVID-19 Doesn't Need Lockdowns to Destroy Jobs: The Effect of  
436 Local Outbreaks in Korea. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020 0898-2937.
- 437 25 Gupta S, Montenovolo L, Nguyen TD, Rojas FL, Schmutte IM, Simon KI, et al. Effects of social  
438 distancing policy on labor market outcomes. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020 0898-  
439 2937.
- 440 26 Pfefferbaum B, North CS. Mental Health and the Covid-19 Pandemic. *N Engl J Med*. 2020.
- 441 27 de Girolamo G, Cerveri G, Clerici M, Monzani E, Spinogatti F, Starace F, et al. Mental Health in  
442 the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Emergency—The Italian Response. *JAMA Psychiatry*.  
443 2020;77:974-6.
- 444 28 Chowdhury R, Luhar S, Khan N, Choudhury SR, Matin I, Franco OH. Long-term strategies to  
445 control COVID-19 in low and middle-income countries: an options overview of community-  
446 based, non-pharmacological interventions. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2020;epub ahead of print.
- 447 29 Mahase E. Covid-19: How does local lockdown work, and is it effective? *BMJ*. 2020;370:m2679.
- 448 30 Bartik AW, Bertrand M, Lin F, Rothstein J, Unrath M. Measuring the labor market at the onset of  
449 the COVID-19 crisis. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020 0898-2937.
- 450 31 Forsythe E, Kahn LB, Lange F, Wiczer D. Labor Demand in the time of COVID-19: Evidence  
451 from vacancy postings and UI claims. *J Public Econ*. 2020;189:104238.
- 452 32 Goolsbee A, Syverson C. Fear, lockdown, and diversion: Comparing drivers of pandemic  
453 economic decline 2020. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020 0898-2937.
- 454 33 Coibion O, Gorodnichenko Y, Weber M. The cost of the covid-19 crisis: Lockdowns,  
455 macroeconomic expectations, and consumer spending. National Bureau of Economic Research,  
456 2020 0898-2937.

- 457 34 Görg H, Hornok C, Montagna C, Onwordi G. Employment to output elasticities & reforms  
458 towards flexicurity: Evidence from OECD countries. 2018.
- 459 35 Taylor L. How South America became the new centre of the coronavirus pandemic. *New Sci.*  
460 2020 10 June.
- 461 36 Burki T. COVID-19 in Latin America. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020;20:547-8.
- 462 37 de Souza WM, Buss LF, Candido DdS, Carrera J-P, Li S, Zarebski AE, et al. Epidemiological  
463 and clinical characteristics of the COVID-19 epidemic in Brazil. *Nat Hum Behav.* 2020.
- 464 38 Moreira RM, Montoya ACV, Araujo SLS, Trindade RA, da Cunha Oliveira D, de Oliveira  
465 Marinho G. How prepared is Brazil to tackle the COVID-19 disease? *J Glob Health.*  
466 2020;10:020321.
- 467 39 Taylor L. How Latin America is fighting covid-19, for better and worse. *BMJ.* 2020;370:m3319.
- 468 40 Ministerio de Salud (MINSAL). Plan de acción por coronavirus. 2020. Available:  
469 <https://www.gob.cl/coronavirus/plandeaccion/>. Accessed.
- 470 41 Cuadrado C, Monsalves MJ, Gajardo J, Bertoglia MP, Najera M, Alfaro T, et al. Impact of small-  
471 area lockdowns for the control of the COVID-19 pandemic. *medRxiv.* 2020.
- 472 42 Bennett M. All Things Equal? Heterogeneity in Policy Effectiveness against COVID-19 Spread  
473 in Chile. *World Dev.* 2020;in press.
- 474 43 Gil M, Undurraga EA. CoVID-19 has exposed how ‘the other half’ (still) lives *Bull Lat Am Res.*  
475 2020;in press.
- 476 44 Aguirre P, Asahi K, Díaz-Rioseco D, Riveros I, Valdés R. Medium-run Local Economic Effects  
477 of a Major Earthquake. Unpublished Manuscript, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. 2020.
- 478 45 Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas (INE). Estimaciones y proyecciones de la población de Chile  
479 1992-2050. 2017. Available: <https://www.censo2017.cl/>. Accessed.
- 480 46 Ministerio de Salud (MINSAL). Cifras Oficiales COVID-19. 2020. Available:  
481 <https://www.gob.cl/coronavirus/cifrasoficiales/>. Accessed.



- 482 47 Ministerio de Ciencia T, Conocimiento, e Innovación (Minciencias). Base de datos CoVID-19.  
483 2020. Available: <http://www.minciencia.gob.cl/covid19>. Accessed.
- 484 48 Bavel JJV, Baicker K, Boggio PS, Capraro V, Cichocka A, Cikara M, et al. Using social and  
485 behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nat Hum Behav.* 2020;4:460-71.
- 486 49 Banco Central de Chile. Cuentas Nacionales 2003-2009, Cuadro 1.3. 2010. Available:  
487 [https://si3.bcentral.cl/estadisticas/Principal1/Informes/CCNN/ANUALES/ccnn\\_2003\\_2009.pdf](https://si3.bcentral.cl/estadisticas/Principal1/Informes/CCNN/ANUALES/ccnn_2003_2009.pdf).  
488 Accessed.
- 489 50 Brzezinski A, Kecht V, Van Dijcke D. The Cost of Staying Open: Voluntary Social Distancing  
490 and Lockdowns in the US. Brzezinski, Adam, Kecht, Valentin, and Van Dijcke, David (2020)"  
491 The Cost of Staying Open: Voluntary Social Distancing and Lockdowns in the US" Economics  
492 Series Working Papers. 2020;910.
- 493 51 Frenier C, Nikpay SS, Golberstein E. COVID-19 Has Increased Medicaid Enrollment, But Short-  
494 Term Enrollment Changes Are Unrelated To Job Losses: Study examines influence COVID-19  
495 may have had on Medicaid enrollment covering the period of March 1 through June 1, 2020 for  
496 26 states. *Health Aff.* 2020;10.1377/hlthaff. 2020.00900.
- 497 52 Case A, Deaton A. Deaths of Despair and the Future of Capitalism: Princeton University Press;  
498 2020.
- 499 53 Levy-Yeyati E, Valdés R. COVID-19 in Latin America: How is it different than in advanced  
500 economies? In: Djankov S, Panizza U, editors. COVID-19 in Developing Economies CEPR Press  
501 VoxEU.org eBook; 2020.  
502

503 **Supplementary material**

504 **Appendix Table S1.** Regressions results for the effects of mobility and localized lockdown on VAT  
 505 growth using ordinary least squares regressions and two-stage least squares fixed effects estimates,  
 506 January to May 2020

| <b>Panel A: Two stages least squares</b> | (1)                 | (2)              | (3)                  |
|--|---------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Dependent variable: VAT growth           | OLS 2WFE            | OLS 2WFE         | IV 2WFE              |
| Lockdown as a percentage of a month      | -0.131**<br>(0.053) |                  |                      |
| Log mobility                             | -0.036<br>(0.140)   | 0.043<br>(0.130) | 0.791**<br>(0.032)   |
| Observations                             | 850                 | 850              | 850                  |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>                  | 0.351               | 0.349            |                      |
| Municipalities                           | 170                 | 170              | 170                  |
| <b>Panel B: First stage</b>              |                     |                  |                      |
| Dependent variable: Log Mobility         | (1)                 | (2)              | (3)                  |
| Lockdown as a percentage of a month      |                     |                  | -0.159***<br>(-5.83) |
| Observations                             |                     |                  | 850                  |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>                  |                     |                  | 0.970                |
| Municipalities                           |                     |                  | 170                  |

507 **Notes.** VAT: Value-added tax. Robust standard errors in parenthesis. OLS: Ordinary least squares. 2WFE:  
 508 two-way fixed effects. Panel A shows the impact of mobility and lockdown on VAT growth using OLS and  
 509 two-stage least squares fixed effects estimates for the baseline sample. We consider a mobility index as an  
 510 endogenous variable for January to May that reacts to lockdowns. For each municipality in January and  
 511 February, we imputed the mean of the daily mobility index during Marc’s first fifteen days. Column (1)  
 512 controls for mobility using the logarithm of the daily average of the mobility index at the municipality level.  
 513 Column (2) uses the mobility index to explain variations in VAT with OLS 2WFE. In column (3), we use  
 514 lockdown as an instrumental variable for mobility.  
 515

## 516 **Mobility**

517 We investigated whether mobility affects economic activity (Table S1). In a simple regression, with and  
518 without controlling for lockdowns, the mobility index had a non-significant effect on economic activity.  
519 Table S1, column (1) suggests that lockdowns continue having sizable effects even after controlling for  
520 mobility. We found no significant effects of mobility on economic activity (Table S1, column 2).

521 Since lockdowns and mobility could work in the same mechanism, in column (3) of Table S1, we use the  
522 method of instrumental variables. This is a method to analyze how lockdown-induced shocks to mobility  
523 impact economic activity. For expositional purposes, this is done in two stages. In the bottom panel of  
524 column (3), the so-called first-stage has a good fit, meaning that lockdowns impact mobility. On the top  
525 panel, the second stage regresses VAT on the lockdown-induced changes in mobility which were  
526 calculated in the first stage above. This second stage has a large and significant coefficient of 0.79. To get  
527 correct standard errors, these two stages are jointly estimated.

528 Importantly, this method of instrumental variables tries to decompose the effect on lockdowns on  
529 mobility and the subsequent impact of mobility on economic activity. The first coefficient means that a  
530 month of lockdown changes monthly mobility by minus 15%. The second coefficient means that  
531 lockdown-induced mobility changes VAT by +79%. The multiplication of these effects gives a sense of  
532 the net impact of lockdowns on VAT. The multiplication ( $-0.15 \times 0.79$ ) yields a minus 0.11. This is  
533 reassuring, since it falls within the range of our baseline estimates in Table 2. Notably, while there could  
534 be transmission mechanisms by which lockdowns affect economic activity beyond mobility, these results  
535 suggest that mobility is the leading mechanism.

536