

# Public Mobility Data Enables COVID-19 Forecasting and Management at Local and Global Scales

Cornelia Ilin<sup>1,\*</sup>, Sébastien Annan-Phan<sup>2,3,\*</sup>, Xiao Hui Tai<sup>1,\*</sup>, Shikhar Mehra<sup>1</sup>,  
Solomon Hsiang<sup>2,4,†</sup>, and Joshua E. Blumenstock<sup>1,†,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Information, UC Berkeley

<sup>2</sup>Goldman School of Public Policy, UC Berkeley

<sup>3</sup>Agricultural & Resource Economics, UC Berkeley

<sup>4</sup>National Bureau of Economic Research & Centre for Economic Policy Research

\*Equal contribution as first authors

†Equal contribution as senior authors

‡Corresponding author: [jblumenstock@berkeley.edu](mailto:jblumenstock@berkeley.edu)

First version of text: April 6, 2020

This version of text: October 30, 2020

Data updated: October 30, 2020

## Abstract

Policymakers everywhere are working to determine the set of restrictions that will effectively contain the spread of COVID-19 without excessively stifling economic activity. We show that publicly available data on human mobility — collected by Google, Facebook, and other providers — can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of non-pharmaceutical interventions and forecast the spread of COVID-19. This approach relies on simple and transparent statistical models, and involves minimal assumptions about disease dynamics. We demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach using local and regional data from China, France, Italy, South Korea, and the United States, as well as national data from 80 countries around the world.

## 1 Summary

2 **Background.** Policymakers everywhere are working to determine the set of restrictions that will  
3 effectively contain the spread of COVID-19 without excessively stifling economic activity. In some  
4 contexts, decision-makers have access to sophisticated epidemiological models and detailed case  
5 data. However, a large number of decisions, particularly in low-income and vulnerable communities,  
6 are being made with limited or no modeling support. We examine how public human mobility  
7 data can be combined with simple statistical models to provide near real-time feedback on non-  
8 pharmaceutical policy interventions. Our objective is to provide a simple framework that can be  
9 easily implemented and adapted by local decision-makers.

10 **Methods.** We develop simple statistical models to measure the effectiveness of non-pharmaceutical  
11 interventions (NPIs) and forecast the spread of COVID-19 at local, state, and national levels. The  
12 method integrates concepts from econometrics and machine learning, and relies only upon publicly  
13 available data on human mobility. The approach does not require explicit epidemiological modeling,  
14 and involves minimal assumptions about disease dynamics. We evaluate this approach using local  
15 and regional data from China, France, Italy, South Korea, and the United States, as well as national  
16 data from 80 countries around the world.

17 **Findings.** We find that NPIs are associated with significant reductions in human mobility, and that  
18 changes in mobility can be used to forecast COVID-19 infections. The first set of results show the  
19 impact of NPIs on human mobility at all geographic scales. While different policies have different  
20 effects on different populations, we observed total reductions in mobility between 40 and 84 percent.  
21 The second set of results indicate that — even in the absence of other epidemiological information  
22 — mobility data substantially improves 10-day case rates forecasts at the county (20.75% error,  
23 US), state (21.82 % error, US), and global (15.24% error) level. Finally, for example, country-level  
24 results suggest that a shelter-in-place policy targeting a 10% increase in the amount of time spent  
25 at home would decrease the propagation of new cases by 32% by the end of a 10 day period.

26 **Interpretation.** In rapidly evolving disease outbreaks, decision-makers do not always have im-

27 mediate access to sophisticated epidemiological models. In such cases, valuable insight can still be  
28 derived from simple statistic models and readily-available public data. These models can be quickly  
29 fit with a population's own data and updated over time, thereby capturing social and epidemiolog-  
30 ical dynamics that are unique to a specific locality or time period. Our results suggest that this  
31 approach can effectively support decision-making from local (e.g., city) to national scales.

## 32 Introduction

33 Societies and decision-makers around the globe are deploying unprecedented non-pharmaceutical  
34 interventions (NPIs) to manage the COVID-19 pandemic. These NPIs have been shown to slow  
35 the spread of COVID-19 (Chinazzi et al., 2020; Ferguson et al., 2020; Hsiang et al., 2020; Tian  
36 et al., 2020), but they also create enormous economic and social costs (for example, Atkeson, 2020;  
37 Coibion, Gorodnichenko and Weber, 2020; Gössling, Scott and Hall, 2020; Rossi et al., 2020; Thun-  
38 ström et al., 2020). Thus, different populations have adopted wildly different containment strategies  
39 (Cheng et al., 2020), and local decision-makers face difficult decisions about when to impose or lift  
40 specific interventions in their community. In some contexts, these decision-makers have access to  
41 state-of-the-art models, which simulate potential scenarios based on detailed epidemiological models  
42 and rich sources of data (for example, Friedman et al., 2020; Ray et al., 2020).

43 In contrast, many local and regional decision-makers do not have access to state-of-the-art  
44 epidemiological models, but must nonetheless manage the COVID-19 crisis with the resources  
45 available to them. With global public health capacity stretched thin by the pandemic, thousands of  
46 cities, counties, and provinces — as well as many countries — lack the data and expertise required to  
47 develop, calibrate, and deploy the sophisticated epidemiological models that have guided decision-  
48 making in regions with greater modeling capacity (Gnanvi, Kotanmi et al., 2020; Liverani, Hawkins  
49 and Parkhurst, 2013; Loembé et al., 2020). In addition, early evidence suggests a need to adapt  
50 models to a local context, particularly for developing countries, where disease, population and other  
51 characteristics are different from developed countries, where models are primarily being developed  
52 (Evans et al., 2020; Mueller et al., 2020; Twahirwa Rwema et al., 2020).

53 Here, we aim to address this “modeling-capacity gap” by developing, demonstrating, and testing  
54 a simple approach to forecasting the impact of NPIs on infections. This approach is built on two  
55 main insights. First, we show that passively collected data on human mobility, which has previously  
56 been used to measure NPI compliance (Engle, Stromme and Zhou, 2020; Klein et al., 2020; Kraemer  
57 et al., 2020; Martín-Calvo et al., 2020; Morita, Kato and Hayashi, 2020; Pepe et al., 2020; Wellenius  
58 et al., 2020), can also effectively forecast the COVID-19 infection response to NPIs up to 10 days

59 in the future. Second, we show that basic concepts from econometrics and machine learning can be  
60 used to construct these 10-day forecasts, effectively emulating the behavior of more sophisticated  
61 epidemiological models.

62 This approach is not a substitute for more refined epidemiological models. Rather, it represents  
63 a practical and low-cost alternative that may be easily adopted in many contexts when the former  
64 is unavailable. It is designed to enable any individual with access to standard statistical software  
65 to produce forecasts of NPI impacts with a level of fidelity that is practical for decision-making in  
66 an ongoing crisis.

## 67 Data

68 Our study links information on non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs, shown in Figure 1a) to  
69 patterns of human mobility (Figure 1b) and COVID-19 cases (Figure 1c-d). All data were obtained  
70 from publicly available sources. We provide a brief summary of these data here; full details are  
71 provided in Appendix A.

### 72 Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions

73 We obtain NPI data from two sources. At the sub-national level, we use the NPI dataset compiled  
74 by Hsiang et al. (2020).<sup>1</sup> For each sub-national region in five countries, we observe the fraction of  
75 the population treated with NPIs in each location on each day. We aggregate 13 different policy  
76 actions into four general categories: Shelter in Place, Social Distance, School Closure, and Travel  
77 Ban. At the national level, we compiled data on national lockdown policies from the Organisation for  
78 Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) - Country Policy Tracker,<sup>2</sup> and crowd-sourced  
79 information on Wikipedia and COVID-19 Kaggle competitions.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Global Policy Lab, UC Berkeley, <http://www.globalpolicy.science/covid19>, website accessed on October 20, 2020.

<sup>2</sup> The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, <https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/en/#country-tracker>, website accessed on April 12, 2020.

<sup>3</sup> Kaggle, COVID-19 lockdown dates by country, <https://www.kaggle.com/jcyzag/covid19-lockdown-dates-by-country>, website accessed on April 12, 2020.

## 80 Human Mobility

81 We source publicly-available data on human mobility from Google, Facebook, Baidu and SafeGraph.  
82 These private companies provide free aggregated and anonymized information on the movement of  
83 users of their online platform (Fig 1e). Data from Google indicates the percentage change in the  
84 amount of time people spend in different types of locations (e.g., residential, retail, and workplace).<sup>4</sup>  
85 These changes are relative to a baseline defined as the median value, for the corresponding day of  
86 the week, during Jan 3–Feb 6, 2020. Facebook provides estimates of the number of trips within  
87 and between square tiles (of resolution up to 360m<sup>2</sup>) in a region.<sup>5</sup> We aggregate these data to show  
88 trips between and within sub-national units. Baidu provides similar data, indicating movement  
89 between and within major Chinese cities.<sup>6</sup> Lastly, SafeGraph dataset gives us information on  
90 average distance travelled from home by millions of devices across the US.<sup>7</sup>

## 91 COVID-19 Cases

92 For each subnational and national unit, we obtain the cumulative confirmed cases of COVID-19 from  
93 the data repository compiled by the Johns Hopkins Center for Systems Science and Engineering  
94 (JHU CSSE COVID-19 Data).<sup>8</sup>

## 95 Linking Data Sets

96 The availability of epidemiological, policy, and mobility data varies across subnational units and  
97 countries included in the analysis. We distinguish between three different levels of aggregation  
98 for administrative regions - denoted “ADM2” (the smallest unit), “ADM1”, “ADM0.” Our global  
99 analysis is conducted using ADM0 data. The country-specific analysis is determined by data avail-

<sup>4</sup> Google, COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports, <https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/>, website accessed on March 20, 2020.

<sup>5</sup> Facebook Disaster Maps: Aggregate Insights for Crisis Response and Recovery, <https://research.fb.com/publications/facebook-disaster-maps-aggregate-insights-for-crisis-response-recovery/>, website accessed on March 20, 2020.

<sup>6</sup> Baidu, Spatio-temporal Big Data Service, <https://huiyan.baidu.com>, website accessed on March 20, 2020.

<sup>7</sup> SafeGraph, Social Distancing Metrics, <https://docs.safegraph.com/docs/social-distancing-metrics>, website accessed on March 20, 2020.

<sup>8</sup> COVID-19 Data Repository by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University, <https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID-19>, website accessed on March 20, 2020.

100 ability. Results are provided at the prefecture (ADM2) and province level (ADM1) in China; the  
101 regional (ADM1) level in France; the province (ADM2) and region (ADM1) level in Italy; the  
102 province (ADM1) level in South Korea; and the county (ADM2) and state (ADM1) level in the  
103 United States.

104 We merge the sub-national NPI, mobility, and epidemiological data based on administrative  
105 unit and day to form a single longitudinal (panel) data set for each country. We merge the daily  
106 country-level observations to construct a longitudinal data sets for the portion of the world we  
107 observe.

## 108 **Methods**

### 109 **Models**

110 We decompose the impact of an NPI on infections ( $\frac{\Delta infections}{\Delta NPI}$ ) into two components that can be  
111 modeled separately: the change in behavior associated with the NPI, and the resulting change in  
112 infections associated with that change in behavior:

$$\frac{\Delta infections}{\Delta NPI} = \frac{\Delta behavior}{\Delta NPI} \times \frac{\Delta infections}{\Delta behavior}. \quad (1)$$

113 We construct models to describe each of these two factors. The “behavior model” describes how  
114 mobility behavior changes in association with the deployment of NPIs ( $\frac{\Delta behavior}{\Delta NPI}$ ). The “infec-  
115 tion model” describes how infections change in association with changes in mobility behavior  
116 ( $\frac{\Delta infections}{\Delta behavior}$ ). Both models are “reduced-form” models, commonly used in econometrics, that char-  
117 acterize the behavior of these variables without explicitly modeling the underlying mechanisms that  
118 link them (cf., Hsiang et al., 2020). Instead, these models emulate the output one would expect  
119 from more sophisticated and mechanistically explicit epidemiological models — without requiring  
120 the underlying processes to be specified. While this reduced-form approach does not provide the  
121 same epidemiological insight that more detailed models do, they demand less data and fewer as-  
122 sumptions. For example, they can be fit to local data by analysts with basic statistical training,

123 not necessarily in epidemiology, and they do not require knowledge of fundamental epidemiological  
124 parameters — some of which may differ in each context and can be difficult to determine. The  
125 performance of these simple, low-cost models can then be evaluated via cross-validation, i.e., by  
126 systematically evaluating out-of-sample forecast quality.

### 127 Behavior Model

128 For each country, we separately estimate how daily sub-national mobility behavior changes in  
129 association with the deployments of NPIs using a country-specific model. In the global model, we  
130 pool data across countries and estimate how mobility in each country changes in association with  
131 national exposure to NPIs. Each category of mobility on each day is assumed to be simultaneously  
132 influenced by the collection of NPIs that are active in that location on that day. A panel multiple  
133 linear regression model is used to estimate the relative association of each category of mobility  
134 with each NPI. Our approach accounts for constant differences in baseline mobility between and  
135 within each sub-national unit – such as differences due to regional commuting patterns, culture,  
136 or geography, and differences in mobility across days of the week. These effects are not modeled  
137 explicitly but instead are accounted for non-parametrically. Appendix B.1 contains details of the  
138 modeling approach.

### 139 Infection Model

140 As with the behavior model, we model the daily growth rate of infections at the local, national,  
141 and global scale. In each location, we model the daily growth rate of infections as a function of  
142 recent human mobility and historical infections. The approach does not require epidemiological  
143 parameters, such as the incubation period or  $R_0$ , nor information on NPIs.

144 In practice, we estimate a distributed-lag model where the predictor variables are mobility rates  
145 in that location for the prior 21 days, and the dependent variable is the daily infection growth  
146 rate, constructed as the first-difference of log confirmed infections. This approach captures the  
147 intuition that human mobility is a key factor in determining rates of infection, but does not require  
148 parametric assumptions about the nature of that dependency. The model also accounts for constant



149 differences in baseline infection growth rates within each locality — such as those due to differences  
150 in local behavior unrelated to mobility, differences across days of the week, and changes in how  
151 confirmed infections are defined or tested for. This approach is also robust to incomplete rates of  
152 COVID-19 testing, uneven patterns of testing across space, and gradual changes in testing over  
153 time (Hsiang et al., 2020).

154 We fit the model using historical data from each location, and follow stringent practices of  
155 cross-validation to ensure that the models are not ‘overfit’ to historical trends. The accuracy of  
156 the forecast is then evaluated against actual infections observed during the forecast period, but  
157 which were not used to fit the model. Models are fit at the finest administrative level where data  
158 are available and forecasts are aggregated to larger regions to evaluate the ability of the model  
159 to predict infections at different spatial scales. Appendix B.2 contains details of the modeling  
160 approach.

161 In principle, such future forecasts can be used by decision-makers who are able to influence local  
162 mobility through policy and/or NPIs, perhaps informed either by a behavioral model or observation.  
163 Here, we test the quality of the infection model to generate forecasts by simulating and evaluating  
164 what a forecaster would have predicted had they generated a forecast at a historical date. In the  
165 forecasts presented here, we assume that mobility remains at the level observed during the forecast  
166 period – although in practice we expect that decision-makers would simulate different forecasts  
167 under different mobility assumptions to inform NPI deployment and policy-making.

## 168 **Results**

169 We first present results from our behavior model, characterizing the mobility response of different  
170 populations to different NPIs. We then evaluate the infection model’s ability to forecast COVID-19  
171 infections based on these same mobility measures. We conclude by discussing how these models  
172 could be used to guide policy decisions at local and regional scales.

## 173 **Mobility response to NPIs**

174 We estimate the reduction in human mobility associated with the deployment of NPIs by linking  
175 comprehensive data on policy interventions to mobility data from several different countries at  
176 multiple geographic scales. We find that the combined impact of all NPIs reduced mobility between  
177 administrative units (Facebook/Baidu) by 73% on average across the countries with sub-national  
178 policy data (Fig 2a). The combined effects were of similar magnitude in China (-78%, se = 8%),  
179 France (-88%, se = 27%), Italy (-85%, se = 12%), and the US (-69%, se = 6%); no significant  
180 change was observed in South Korea, where mobility was not a direct target of NPIs (for example,  
181 You, 2020). Excluding South Korea, we estimate that all policies combined were associated with a  
182 decrease in mobility by 81% . The general consistency of these magnitudes across countries holds  
183 for alternative measures of mobility: using Google data we find that all NPIs combined result in an  
184 increase in time spent at home by 28% (se = 2.9), 24% (se = 1.3), and 26% (se = 1.3) in France,  
185 Italy, and the US, respectively. This was achieved, in part, by reducing time spent at workplaces  
186 by an average of 59.8% and time in commercial retail locations by an average of 78.8%.

187 We estimate the impact of each individual NPI on total trips (Facebook/Baidu) and quantity of  
188 time spent at home and other locations (Google) accounting for the estimated impact of all other  
189 NPIs. Travel bans are significantly associated with large mobility reductions in China (-70%, se  
190 = 7%) and Italy (-82%, se = 25%), where individuals stayed home for 10% more time, but not  
191 in the US (Fig 2b). School closures were associated with moderate negative impacts on mobility  
192 in the US (-26%, se = 10%) and increased time at home (4.6%, se = 0.7%) but slight positive  
193 impacts in Italy (33%, se = 7%) and France (15%, se = 7%). Other social distancing policies, such  
194 as religious closures, had no consistent impact on total trips but were associated with individuals  
195 spending more time at home in the US (11.5%, se = 1.6%) and more time in retail locations in Italy  
196 (17.6%, se = 4.8%). Similarly, the national emergency declaration was associated with significant  
197 mobility reductions in China (-62.6 %, se = 12.7 %). Shelter-in-place orders were associated with  
198 large reductions in trips for the US (-60.8%, se = 8%), Italy (-38.4%, se = 35%), and France (-  
199 91.2%, se = 13.6%), and large increases in the fraction of time spent in homes (8.9%, 22.1%, 28%,

200 respectively). Shelter in place orders did not appear to have large impacts in South Korea or China.  
201 This is consistent with earlier policies (such as the Emergency Declaration) restricting movement in  
202 China earlier than the shelter in place orders, while mobility in South Korea was never substantially  
203 affected by NPIs.

204 Globally, we find evidence that lockdown policies were associated with substantial reductions  
205 in mobility (Figure 2c). Across 80 countries, the average time spend in non-residential locations  
206 decreased by 40% (se = 2%) in response to NPIs. Time spent in retail locations is the most  
207 impacted category, declining 49.9% (se = 2%). Some of the variation in response across countries  
208 (grey dots) likely reflects different social, cultural, and economic norms; measurement error; and  
209 statistical variability. In Appendix C, we disaggregate this effect temporally, and find that the most  
210 significant reductions occur during the first eight days after a lockdown (Figure 5c).

211 In Appendix C, we further exploit the granular resolution of the mobility data to investigate  
212 whether localized policies also impacted neighboring regions (Figure 5). In the USA and Italy,  
213 the impact of NPIs on mobility was highly localized, with little evidence of spatial spillover effects  
214 (Appendix C - Figure 5a). In China, the evidence is more mixed, with some evidence of spillovers  
215 between neighboring cities (Appendix C - Fig 5b).

## 216 **Forecasting infections based on mobility**

217 We find that mobility data alone are sufficient to meaningfully forecast COVID-19 infections 7-10  
218 days ahead at all geographic scales – from counties and cities (ADM2), to states and provinces  
219 (ADM1), to countries (ADM0) and the entire world. Furthermore, identical models that exclude  
220 mobility data perform substantially worse, suggesting an important role for mobility data in fore-  
221 casting.

222 Figure 3 illustrates the performance of model forecasts in several geographic regions and at  
223 multiple scales. The true infection rate is shown as a solid line; data used to train each model  
224 are depicted in blue dots, and the forecast of our model is shown in orange, contrasted against a  
225 model with no mobility data in green. Forecasts that account for current and lagged measures of  
226 mobility generally track actual cases more closely than forecasts that do not account for mobility.

227 For example, a forecast made for the period 4/06/2020 – 4/15/2020 for California-Los Angeles on  
228 4/15/2020 without mobility projects 30,716 cases, while the same forecast accounting for mobility  
229 would be 12,650 cases, much closer to the 10,496 that was observed. Figure 3b depicts projected  
230 cases for the entire world based on this reduced-form approach, estimated using country-level data  
231 mobility data from Google.

232 Figure 4 summarizes model performance across *all* administrative subdivisions of each of the  
233 three countries we consider for the forecast analysis (China, Italy, and the United States). We show  
234 the distribution of model errors over all ADM2 and ADM1 regions at forecast lengths ranging from  
235 1 to 10 days. Table 1 summarizes each distribution using the median.

236 In all geographies and at all scales, models with mobility data perform better than models  
237 without. In general, sub-national forecasts in China benefit least from mobility data, but forecasts  
238 in Italy and the US are substantially improved by including a single measure of mobility for the 21  
239 days prior to the date of the forecast. At the local (ADM2) level in Italy, the MPE is -1.73% and  
240 13.27% for five and ten days in the future when mobility is accounted for, compared to 45.81% and  
241 167.97% when it is omitted. In the US, MPE is 7.00% (5-day) and 20.75% (10-day) accounting for  
242 mobility, and 23.79% and 79.47% omitting mobility. In China, MPE is 4.18% (5-day) and 131.09%  
243 (10-day) accounting for mobility, and 16.83% and 128.80% omitting mobility. At the regional  
244 (ADM1) level, MPE rates are similar but extreme errors are reduced, largely because positive and  
245 negative errors cancel out. Country-level forecasts, which use country-level mobility data from  
246 Google, benefit relatively less than sub-national model from including mobility information, in part  
247 because baseline forecast errors are smaller. For countries in our sample, MPE is 6.35% (5-day)  
248 and 15.24% (10-day) accounting for mobility, and 11.46% and 31.12% omitting mobility.

## 249 **Model application in decentralized management of infections**

250 Our results suggest that a simple reduced-form approach to estimating model (1) may provide  
251 useful information and feedback to decision-makers who might otherwise lack the resources to  
252 access more sophisticated scenario analysis. We imagine the approach can be utilized in two ways.  
253 First, a decision-maker considering an NPI (either deploying, continuing, or lifting) could develop

254 an estimate for how that NPI might affect behavior, based on our analysis of different policies above  
255 (Fig 2). Using these estimated changes in mobility, they could then forecast changes in infections  
256 using the infection model described above — but fit to local data.

257 Table 2 provides an example calculation for how a novel policy that increased residential time  
258 (observed in Google data) would alter future infections, using estimates from the global-level model.  
259 For example, a policy that increases residential time by 5% in a country is predicted to reduce  
260 cumulative infections ten days later, to 82.5% (CI: (78.2, 87.0)) of what they would otherwise have  
261 been. Similar tabulations can be generated by fitting infection models using recent and local data,  
262 which would flexibly capture local social, economic, and epidemiological conditions.

263 A second way that a decision-maker could use our approach would be to actually deploy a policy  
264 without *ex ante* knowledge of the effect it will have on mobility, instead simply observing mobility  
265 responses that occur after NPI deployment using these publicly available data sources. Based on  
266 these observed responses, they could forecast infections using our behavior model.

## 267 Discussion

268 The COVID-19 pandemic has led to an unprecedented degree of cooperation and transparency  
269 within the scientific community, with important new insights rapidly disseminated freely around  
270 the globe. However, the capacity of different populations to leverage new scientific insights is not  
271 uniform. In many resource-constrained contexts, critical decisions are not supported by robust  
272 epidemiological modeling of scenarios. Here we have demonstrated that freely available mobility  
273 data can be used in simple models to generate practically useful forecasts. The goal is for these  
274 models to be accessible to a single individual with basic training in regression analysis using standard  
275 statistical software. The reduced-form model we develop generally performs well when fit to local  
276 data, except in China where it cannot account for some key factors that contributed to reductions  
277 in transmission.

278 A key insight from our work is that passively observed measures of aggregate mobility are  
279 useful predictors of growth in COVID-19 cases. However, this does not imply that population

280 mobility itself is the only fundamental cause of transmission. The measures of mobility we observe  
281 capture a degree of “mixing” that is occurring within a population, as populations move about their  
282 local geographic context. This movement is likely correlated with other behaviors and factors that  
283 contribute to the spread of the virus, such as low rates of mask-wearing and/or physical distancing.  
284 Our approach does not explicitly capture these other factors — and thus should not be used to  
285 draw causal inferences — but is possible that our infection model performs well in part because the  
286 easy-to-observe mobility measures capture these other factors by proxy.

287 The simple model we present here is designed to provide useful information in contexts when  
288 more sophisticated process-based models are unavailable, but it should not necessarily displace  
289 those models where they are available. In cases where complete process-based epidemiological  
290 models have been developed for a population and can be deployed for decision-making, the model  
291 we develop here could be considered complementary to those models. Future work might determine  
292 how information from combinations of qualitatively distinct models can be used to optimally guide  
293 decision-making.

294 We also note that the reduced-form model is designed to forecast infections in a certain popu-  
295 lation at a restricted point in time. It achieves this by capturing dynamics that are governed by  
296 many underlying processes that are unobserved by the modeler. However, because these underlying  
297 mechanisms are only captured implicitly, the model is not well-suited to environments where these  
298 underlying dynamics change dramatically. In such circumstances, process-based models will likely  
299 perform better. Nonetheless, the reduced-form approach presented here can also be applied in these  
300 circumstances, but it may be necessary to refit the model based on data that is representative of  
301 current conditions. Similarly, when our reduced-form model is applied to a new population, it  
302 should be fit to local data to capture dynamics representative of the new population.

303 The approach we present here depends critically on the availability of aggregate mobility data,  
304 which is currently provided to the public by private firms that passively collect this information. We  
305 hypothesize that the approach we develop here might skillfully forecast the spread of other diseases  
306 besides COVID-19. If true, this suggests our approach could provide useful information to decision-  
307 makers for managing other public health challenges, such as influenza or other outbreaks, potentially

308 indicating a public health benefit from firms continuing to made mobility data available—even after  
309 the COVID-19 pandemic has subsided.

310




Figure 1: **Data on mobility measures, COVID-19 infections and home isolation policy adoption.** (a) Home isolation policy adoption, (b) Change in time spent at home, (c) Infection growth rate, and (d) Total confirmed cases are displayed at the county, state and country level. (e) Illustrative example of different mobility measures in California. We utilize data on trips both within and between counties (Facebook and Baidu) as well as the purpose of the trip (Google) and the average distance traveled (SafeGraph).






Figure 2: **Empirical estimates of the effect of NPIs on mobility measures.** Markers are country specific-estimates, whiskers show the 95% confidence interval. **a** Estimated combined effect of all policies on number of trips between counties (left) and time spent in specific places (right). **b** Estimated effects of individual policy or policy groups on mobility measures, jointly estimated for each country. **c** Estimated effect of lockdown on mobility the 80 countries which experienced such policy, jointly estimated for each type of mobility.




Figure 3: **Short term prediction of COVID-19 cases.** Solid line is the recorded number of COVID-19 infections, markers show data in our training sample (blue) and our predictions estimated using mobility measures (orange) versus a model without mobility (green). Model with no mobility measures consistently over-predict the number of infections and drift away quickly from the observed data. **a** This pattern is confirmed when aggregating locally estimated predictions (left) at the state (middle) and country (right) level. **b** Similarly, predictions obtained from country level estimates are significantly more accurate when a measure of mobility is included.




Figure 4: **Evaluation of forecast errors for the infection model.** For Italy, US and China, forecasts are evaluated at the finest administrative level (ADM2), as well as aggregated to larger regions (ADM1). For each ADM2 region and forecast length, the mean is taken over all available forecast dates, and the error is evaluated using that mean. Boxplots display the distribution of these percentage errors for each ADM2 region. These are then aggregated to ADM1 level (right panel), for both models including and excluding mobility variables. Similarly, for data fitted at a global level (bottom-most plot), for each country and forecast length, the mean is taken over all forecast dates.

Table 1: **Median percentage error for each model and day of forecast, as plotted in Figure 4.** The error is presented for each model and geographical region, and for 1 to 10 day forecasts.

Model	Country	Level	Median percentage error (MPE) for forecast length (days)									
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Mobility	World	ADM0	0.90	2.19	3.46	4.83	6.35	7.80	9.54	11.00	12.60	15.24
No Mobility	World	ADM0	1.50	3.84	6.32	8.70	11.46	14.42	16.91	19.75	25.28	31.12
Mobility	China	ADM1	-0.20	1.41	3.05	4.55	5.91	7.54	7.60	17.59	53.26	124.82
No Mobility	China	ADM1	1.47	5.39	8.84	14.10	18.45	23.45	26.80	45.86	64.95	112.03
Mobility	China	ADM2	-0.44	0.89	2.11	3.29	4.18	5.19	6.10	6.80	50.66	131.09
No Mobility	China	ADM2	1.37	5.17	8.59	12.48	16.83	22.33	28.14	35.70	65.09	128.80
Mobility	Italy	ADM1	0.89	2.70	5.60	5.68	8.29	6.65	9.31	6.83	14.39	34.19
No Mobility	Italy	ADM1	4.86	13.66	23.12	33.69	45.03	61.06	80.95	107.48	133.98	172.74
Mobility	Italy	ADM2	-0.87	-0.90	-0.81	-1.06	-1.73	-2.11	-2.08	-0.99	4.41	13.27
No Mobility	Italy	ADM2	4.96	14.20	23.75	35.26	45.81	61.66	73.96	95.47	128.89	167.97
Mobility	US	ADM1	1.13	2.62	3.97	5.45	6.68	8.52	11.19	14.28	17.24	21.82
No Mobility	US	ADM1	3.50	9.39	15.29	21.79	29.22	37.11	45.54	57.36	71.72	88.73
Mobility	US	ADM2	0.98	2.30	3.64	5.21	7.00	8.77	11.00	14.28	16.67	20.75
No Mobility	US	ADM2	2.80	7.72	12.62	17.79	23.79	30.34	37.37	48.43	63.31	79.47

Table 2: **Example: Estimating the effect of a mobility-reducing policy on infections for the global model (unit of observation is a country day).** The values in the table are the ratio of the cumulative number of cases after up to 10 days, if residential time over baseline was increased in a country *at day 0* by  $\Delta = 1\%$ ,  $5\%$ ,  $10\%$  or  $20\%$  from their original values. These values are estimated using coefficients of the mobility variables derived from the pooled global model (details in Appendix B.2). Note that each column compares to the value on its first row (indicated by the value 1). An example interpretation is: if a country increases residential time by  $5\%$ , cumulative infections ten days later is predicted to be  $82.5\%$  of what they would have been with no change in mobility.

$\Delta$	day = 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
.01	1	0.998	0.996	0.993	0.989	0.985	0.98	0.975	0.969	0.962
.05	0.998	0.992	0.981	0.966	0.948	0.928	0.906	0.881	0.854	0.825
.10	0.996	0.983	0.962	0.934	0.899	0.862	0.821	0.776	0.729	0.68
.20	0.992	0.967	0.926	0.873	0.808	0.743	0.674	0.603	0.532	0.463

## References

- 311
- 312 **Atkeson, Andrew.** 2020. “What will be the economic impact of covid-19 in the us? rough  
313 estimates of disease scenarios.” National Bureau of Economic Research.
- 314 **Cheng, Cindy, Joan Barceló, Allison Spencer Hartnett, Robert Kubinec, and Luca**  
315 **Messerschmidt.** 2020. “COVID-19 Government Response Event Dataset (CoronaNet v. 1.0).”  
316 Nature human behaviour, 4(7): 756–768.
- 317 **China-Data-Lab.** 2020. “Baidu Mobility Data.” Harvard Dataverse.
- 318 **Chinazzi, Matteo, Jessica T Davis, Marco Ajelli, Corrado Gioannini, Maria Litvinova,**  
319 **Stefano Merler, Ana Pastore y Piontti, Kungpeng Mu, Luca Rossi, Kaiyuan Sun, et al.**  
320 2020. “The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19)  
321 outbreak.” Science, 368(6489): 395–400.
- 322 **Coibion, Olivier, Yuriy Gorodnichenko, and Michael Weber.** 2020. “The cost of the covid-  
323 19 crisis: Lockdowns, macroeconomic expectations, and consumer spending.” National Bureau  
324 of Economic Research.
- 325 **Engle, Samuel, John Stromme, and Anson Zhou.** 2020. “Staying at home: mobility effects  
326 of covid-19.” Available at SSRN.
- 327 **Evans, Michelle V, Andres Garchitorena, Rado JL Rakotonanahary, John M Drake,**  
328 **Benjamin Andriamihaja, Elinambinina Rajaonarifara, Calistus N Ngonghala, Ben-**  
329 **jamin Roche, Matthew H Bonds, and Julio Rakotonirina.** 2020. “Reconciling model  
330 predictions with low reported cases of COVID-19 in Sub-Saharan Africa: Insights from Mada-  
331 gascar.” Global Health Action, 13(1): 1816044.
- 332 **Ferguson, Neil, Daniel Laydon, Gemma Nedjati Gilani, Natsuko Imai, Kylie Ainslie,**  
333 **Marc Baguelin, Sangeeta Bhatia, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, ZULMA Cucunuba Perez,**  
334 **Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, et al.** 2020. “Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interven-  
335 tions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand.”
- 336 **Friedman, Joseph, Patrick Liu, Emmanuela Gakidou, IHME COVID, and Model Com-**  
337 **parison Team.** 2020. “Predictive performance of international COVID-19 mortality forecasting  
338 models.” medRxiv.
- 339 **Gnanvi, Janyce E, Brezesky Kotanni, et al.** 2020. “On the reliability of predictions on  
340 Covid-19 dynamics: a systematic and critical review of modelling techniques.” medRxiv.
- 341 **Gössling, Stefan, Daniel Scott, and C. Michael Hall.** 2020. “Pandemics, tourism and global  
342 change: a rapid assessment of COVID-19.” Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 0(0): 1–20.
- 343 **Hsiang, Solomon, Daniel Allen, Sébastien Annan-Phan, Kendon Bell, Ian Bolliger,**  
344 **Trinetta Chong, Hannah Druckenmiller, Luna Yue Huang, Andrew Hultgren, Emma**  
345 **Krasovich, et al.** 2020. “The effect of large-scale anti-contagion policies on the COVID-19  
346 pandemic.” Nature, 1–9.

- 347 **Klein, Brennan, T LaRocky, S McCabey, L Torresy, Filippo Privitera, Brennan Lake,**  
348 **Moritz UG Kraemer, John S Brownstein, David Lazer, Tina Eliassi-Rad, et al.** 2020.  
349 “Assessing changes in commuting and individual mobility in major metropolitan areas in the  
350 United States during the COVID-19 outbreak.”
- 351 **Kraemer, Moritz U. G., Chia-Hung Yang, Bernardo Gutierrez, Chieh-Hsi Wu,**  
352 **Brennan Klein, David M. Pigott, Open COVID-19 Data Working Group†, Louis**  
353 **du Plessis, Nuno R. Faria, Ruoran Li, William P. Hanage, John S. Brownstein,**  
354 **Maylis Layan, Alessandro Vespignani, Huaiyu Tian, Christopher Dye, Oliver G. Py-**  
355 **bus, and Samuel V. Scarpino.** 2020. “The effect of human mobility and control measures on  
356 the COVID-19 epidemic in China.” *Science*, eabb4218.
- 357 **Liverani, Marco, Benjamin Hawkins, and Justin O Parkhurst.** 2013. “Political and insti-  
358 tutional influences on the use of evidence in public health policy. A systematic review.” *PloS one*,  
359 8(10): e77404.
- 360 **Loembé, Marguerite Massinga, Akhona Tshangela, Stephanie J Salyer, Jay K Varma,**  
361 **Ahmed E Ogwel Ouma, and John N Nkengasong.** 2020. “COVID-19 in Africa: the spread  
362 and response.” *Nature Medicine*, 1–4.
- 363 **Martín-Calvo, David, Alberto Aleta, Alex Pentland, Yamir Moreno, and Esteban**  
364 **Moro.** 2020. “Effectiveness of social distancing strategies for protecting a community from a  
365 pandemic with a data driven contact network based on census and real-world mobility data.” In  
366 *Technical Report*.
- 367 **Morita, Hiroyoshi, Hirokazu Kato, and Yoshitsugu Hayashi.** 2020. “International compar-  
368 ison of behavior changes with social distancing policies in response to COVID-19.” *Available at*  
369 *SSRN 3594035*.
- 370 **Mueller, Valerie, Glenn Sheriff, Corinna Keeler, and Megan Jehn.** 2020. “COVID-19  
371 Policy Modeling in Sub-Saharan Africa.” *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*.
- 372 **Pepe, Emanuele, Paolo Bajardi, Laetitia Gauvin, Filippo Privitera, Brennan Lake,**  
373 **Ciro Cattuto, and Michele Tizzoni.** 2020. “COVID-19 outbreak response: a first assessment  
374 of mobility changes in Italy following national lockdown.” *medRxiv*.
- 375 **Ray, Evan L, Nutch Wattanachit, Jarad Niemi, Abdul Hannan Kanji, Katie House,**  
376 **Estee Y Cramer, Johannes Bracher, Andrew Zheng, Teresa K Yamana, Xinyue**  
377 **Xiong, et al.** 2020. “Ensemble Forecasts of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the US.”  
378 *medRxiv*.
- 379 **Rossi, Rodolfo, Valentina Socci, Dalila Talevi, Sonia Mensi, Cinzia Niolu, Francesca**  
380 **Pacitti, Antinisca Di Marco, Alessandro Rossi, Alberto Siracusano, and Giorgio**  
381 **Di Lorenzo.** 2020. “COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown measures impact on mental health  
382 among the general population in Italy.” *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 11: 790.
- 383 **Thunström, Linda, Stephen C Newbold, David Finnoff, Madison Ashworth, and Ja-**  
384 **son F Shogren.** 2020. “The benefits and costs of using social distancing to flatten the curve for  
385 COVID-19.” *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis*, 1–27.

386 **Tian, Huaiyu, Yonghong Liu, Yidan Li, Chieh-Hsi Wu, Bin Chen, Moritz UG Krae-**  
387 **mer, Bingying Li, Jun Cai, Bo Xu, Qiqi Yang, et al.** 2020. “An investigation of trans-  
388 mission control measures during the first 50 days of the COVID-19 epidemic in China.” Science,  
389 368(6491): 638–642.

390 **Twahirwa Rwema, Jean Olivier, Daouda Diouf, Nancy Phaswana-Mafuya,**  
391 **Jean Christophe Rusatira, Alain Manouan, Emelyne Uwizeye, Fatou M Drame,**  
392 **Ubald Tamoufe, and Stefan David Baral.** 2020. “COVID-19 Across Africa: Epidemiologic  
393 Heterogeneity and Necessity of Contextually Relevant Transmission Models and Intervention  
394 Strategies.”

395 **Wellenius, Gregory A, Swapnil Vispute, Valeria Espinosa, Alex Fabrikant, Thomas C**  
396 **Tsai, Jonathan Hennessy, Brian Williams, Krishna Gadepalli, Adam Boulange,**  
397 **Adam Pearce, et al.** 2020. “Impacts of state-level policies on social distancing in the  
398 united states using aggregated mobility data during the covid-19 pandemic.” arXiv preprint  
399 arXiv:2004.10172.

400 **You, Jongeun.** 2020. “Lessons from South Korea’s Covid-19 policy response.” The American  
401 Review of Public Administration, 50(6-7): 801–808.

402 **Acknowledgements:** We thank Jeanette Tseng for her role in designing Fig. 1. S.A.P. is sup-  
403 ported by a gift from the Tuaropaki Trust. This material is based upon work supported by the  
404 National Science Foundation under Grant IIS-1942702. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions  
405 or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily  
406 reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. Funding was also provided by Award 2020-  
407 0000000149 from CITRIS and the Banatao Institute at the University of California. None of the  
408 authors has been paid to write this article by a pharmaceutical company or other agency. All authors  
409 had full access to the full data in the study and accept responsibility to submit for publication.

410 **Author contributions:** J.B. and S.H. conceived and led the study. C.I., J.B., S.A.P., S.H., X.H.T.,  
411 designed analysis, and interpreted results. C.I., S.A.P., S.M., and X.H.T. collected, verified, cleaned  
412 and merged data. C.I. created Figs. 3, 6 and Table 3. S.A.P. created Figs. 2, 5. S.M. created  
413 Fig. 1 and Table 6. X.H.T. created Fig.4 and Tables 1,2. X.H.T. managed literature review. All  
414 authors wrote the paper. C.I., S.A.P., and X.H.T. contributed equally and are listed in a randomly  
415 assigned order.

416 **Role of funding source:** S.A.P. is supported by a gift from the Tuaropaki Trust. This material  
417 is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant IIS-1942702, the  
418 Office of Naval Research (Minerva Initiative) under award N00014-17-1-2313, and CITRIS and the  
419 Banatao Institute at the University of California under Award 2020-0000000149. Any opinions,  
420 findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors  
421 and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation, the Office of Naval  
422 Research, or any other funding institution.

423 **Declaration of interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.



## 424 Appendices

### 425 A Data Acquisition and Processing

426 Data used in this study can be divided into three categories - Epidemiological, Policy and Mobil-  
427 ity. The sources of these data sets include various research institutions, government public health  
428 websites, regional newspaper articles and digital social media platforms.

#### 429 A.1 Epidemiological Data

430 We collected epidemiological data from the 2019 Novel Coronavirus COVID-19 (2019-nCoV) Data  
431 Repository compiled by the Johns Hopkins Center for Systems Science and Engineering (JHU  
432 CSSE).<sup>9</sup> The primary variable of interest for our study is *cum\_confirmed\_cases*, i.e., the total number  
433 of confirmed positive cases in an administrative area since the first confirmed case. We accessed it  
434 along with other relevant metadata, including:

435 *date*: The date of observation

436 *adm0\_name*: The ISO3 region (Administrative Level 0) code of the observation

437 *adm1\_name*: The name of the “Administrative Level 1” region of the observation

438 *adm2\_name*: The name of the “Administrative Level 2” region of the observation

#### 439 A.2 Policy data

440 The policy data was constructed and made available for academic research by Hsiang et al. (2020).<sup>10</sup>  
441 For each country, the relevant country-specific policies were identified and mapped to four harmo-  
442 nized policy categories - Travel Ban, School Closure, Shelter in place, and Social Distance. These  
443 category variables were created by taking an average of policy variables related to that category.

##### 444 i. Travel Ban

<sup>9</sup> <https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID-19>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.globalpolicy.science/covid19>

445           • *travel\_ban\_local*: Represents a policy that restricts people from entering or exiting the  
446           administrative area (e.g., county or province) treated by the policy.

447   ii. School Closure

448           • *school\_closure*: Represents a policy that closes school and other educational services in  
449           that area.

450   iii. Shelter In Place

451           • *home\_isolation*: Represents a policy that prohibits people from leaving their home re-  
452           gardless of their testing status. For some countries, the policy can also include the case  
453           when people have to stay at home, but are allowed to leave for work- or health-related  
454           purposes. For the latter case, when the policy is moderate, this is coded as *home\_isolation*  
455           = 0.5.

456           • *work\_from\_home* : Represents a policy that requires people to work remotely. This policy  
457           may also include encouraging workers to take holiday/paid time off.

458           • *business\_closure* : Represents a policy that closes all offices, non-essential businesses, and  
459           non-essential commercial activities in that area.

460           • *pos\_cases\_quarantine* : A policy that mandates that people who have tested positive for  
461           COVID-19, or subject to quarantine measures, have to confine themselves at home. The  
462           policy can also include encouraging people who have fevers or respiratory symptoms to  
463           stay at home, regardless of whether they tested positive or not.

464           • *welfare\_service\_closure*: A policy that mandates closure of welfare services such as day  
465           care centers for children.

466           • *emergency\_declaration*: Represents a decision made at the city / municipality, county,  
467           state / provincial, or federal level to declare a state of emergency. This allows the affected  
468           area to marshal emergency funds and resources as well as activate emergency legislation.

469   iv. Social Distance

- 470       • *social\_distance*: Represents a policy that encourages people to maintain a safety distance  
471       (often between one to two meters) from others. This policy differs by country, but  
472       includes other policies that close cultural institutions (e.g., museums or libraries), or  
473       encourage establishments to reduce density, such as limiting restaurant hours.
- 474       • *no\_gathering*: Represents a policy that prohibits any type of public or private gathering.  
475       (whether cultural, sporting, recreational, or religious). Depending on the country, the  
476       policy can prohibit a gathering above a certain size, in which case the number of people  
477       is specified by the *no\_gathering\_size* variable.
- 478       • *event\_cancel*: Represents a policy that cancels a specific pre-scheduled large event (e.g.,  
479       parade, sporting event, etc). This is different from prohibiting all events over a certain  
480       size.
- 481       • *religious\_closure*: Represents a policy that prohibits gatherings at a place of worship,  
482       specifically targeting locations that are epicenters of COVID-19 outbreak. See the section  
483       on Korean policy for more information on this policy variable.
- 484       • *no\_demonstration*: Represents a policy that prohibits protest-specific gatherings. See  
485       the section on Korean policy for more information on this policy variable.

### 486 **A.3 Mobility data**

487 Mobility data comes from three of the biggest internet companies - Google, Facebook and Baidu.  
488 These companies have millions of users accessing their social media, e-commerce and other digital  
489 platforms every day. These data are utilized to construct aggregated, anonymized user location and  
490 movement metrics for various geographic regions and countries. Descriptions follow, and Table 3  
491 contains a summary of the data used for each country.

### 492 **A.3.1 Google**

493 Google mobility data summarizes time spent by their users each day after Feb 6, 2020 in various  
494 types of places, such as residential, workplaces and grocery stores.<sup>11</sup> Specifically, it provides the  
495 percentage change in number of visits and length of stay in each type of place, compared to a  
496 baseline value. The baseline is the value on the corresponding day of the week during the 5-week  
497 period between Jan 3, 2020 and Feb 6, 2020. The metrics are available starting Feb 15, 2020 at the  
498 country (Administrative Level 0) and state level (Administrative Level 1) for over 135 countries.  
499 We also access county-level metrics (Administrative Level 2) for the US. Types of places include  
500 the following:

- 501 i. *Grocery & pharmacy*: Places like grocery markets, food warehouses, farmers markets, spe-  
502 cially food shops, drug stores, and pharmacies.
- 503 ii. *Parks*: Places like local parks, national parks, public beaches, marinas, dog parks, plazas,  
504 and public gardens.
- 505 iii. *Transit stations*: Places like public transport hubs such as subway, bus, and train stations.
- 506 iv. *Retail & recreation*: Places like restaurants, cafes, shopping centers, theme parks, museums,  
507 libraries, and movie theaters.
- 508 v. *Residential*: Places of residence.
- 509 vi. *Workplaces*: Places of work.

### 510 **A.3.2 Facebook**

511 Facebook summarizes and anonymizes its user data into useful metrics that can be used to evaluate  
512 the movement of people.<sup>12,13</sup> Our analysis uses data beginning March 5, Feb 23 and Feb 24, 2020  
513 for France, Italy and South Korea respectively. Specifically, Facebook aggregates the number of

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/>

<sup>12</sup> <https://research.fb.com/publications/facebook-disaster-maps-aggregate-insights-for-crisis-response-recovery/>

<sup>13</sup> <https://about.fb.com/news/2017/06/using-data-to-help-communities-recover-and-rebuild/>

514 trips between tiles of up to a resolution of 360 square meters. We aggregate these data to the level  
515 of administrative regions, constructing metrics for number of trips *between* as well as *within* these  
516 regions. We use the following variables from the data provided by Facebook:

- 517 i. *Date* - The day of the movement.
- 518 ii. *Starting Location* - The region or tile where the movement of the group started.
- 519 iii. *Ending Location* - The region or tile where the movement of the group ended.
- 520 iv. *Baseline Movement* - The total number of people who moved from Starting Location to  
521 Ending Location on average during the weeks before the disaster began.
- 522 v. *Crisis Movement* - The total number of people who moved from Starting Location to Ending  
523 Location during the time period specified

### 524 **A.3.3 Baidu**

525 Baidu provides aggregated user location data and mobility metrics via its Smart Eye Platform.<sup>14</sup>  
526 These data were scraped and publicly shared by the China Data Lab. The metrics represent  
527 movement in and out of major regions across China each day in terms of an aggregated mobility  
528 index (China-Data-Lab, 2020). Index values are available beginning Jan 1, 2020. Baidu does not  
529 disclose specific information regarding the construction of the index.

### 530 **A.3.4 SafeGraph**

531 SafeGraph data were generated by tracking anonymous mobile devices across US.<sup>15</sup> The mobility  
532 metrics are available starting January 1, 2020 for census block group. SafeGraph infers home  
533 location based on night time location of the device and uses that to impute average distance  
534 travelled per day by the devices in each census block. We aggregate this data to the state level  
535 (Administrative Level 1) for our analysis.

---

<sup>14</sup> <https://huiyan.baidu.com>

<sup>15</sup> <https://docs.safegraph.com/docs/social-distancing-metrics>

Table 3: **Mobility Data Sources** - Details of mobility data sources for each country. The table provides relevant dates and level of analysis used for the behavior model and infection model, respectively.

Region	Mobility Data	Level of analysis	Type of mobility	Start Date	End Date
<b>Behavior model</b>					
China	Baidu	ADM2	between	1/10/2020	3/6/2020
France	Facebook	ADM1	between	3/4/2020	4/8/2020
Italy	Facebook	ADM2	between	2/25/2020	4/8/2020
South Korea	Facebook	ADM2	between	2/23/2020	4/6/2020
United States	Google	ADM2	residential, retail, workplaces	3/3/2020	4/12/2020
World	Google	ADM0	residential, retail, workplaces	2/26/2020	3/28/2020
<b>Infection model</b>					
China	Baidu	ADM1, ADM2	between	2/12/2020	3/3/2020
France	Facebook	-	-	-	-
Italy	Facebook	ADM1, ADM2	between	3/31/2020	4/13/2020
South Korea	Facebook	-	-	-	-
United States	Google	ADM1, ADM2	-	3/17/2020	4/30/2020
World	Google	ADM0	-	mobility today $\geq$ 5%	5/29/2020 or until growth rates of new cases flatten

## 536 B Methods Summary

### 537 B.1 Behavior Model

538 The behavior model describes how human mobility changes as a result of NPIs ( $\frac{\Delta behavior}{\Delta NPI}$  in equation  
539 (1)). The model is a commonly used reduced-form approach in econometrics. Details on the model  
540 and model estimation are presented below.

#### 541 Model details:

- 542 1. The model used for each policy is  $m_t = f(policy_t, X_t) + \epsilon_t$ , where  $m_t$  is a measure of mobility  
543 behavior at time  $t$ ,  $X_t$  represents control variables, and  $\epsilon_t$  is the error.
- 544 2. The model is fit for each country at the sub-national level where granular policy and mobility  
545 data are available. For the rest of the world, use a panel regression model where the unit of  
546 observation is at the country by day level.
- 547 3. The *policy* variable is a vector with NPIs specific to each country, for each location and day.  
548 NPIs are continuous variables between 0 and 1 (inclusive) that indicate the intensity of the  
549 policy where 0 is no enforcement and 1 is fully enacted. In some instances, it may be desirable  
550 to gather multiple policies in a single variable (for example, business closure and restaurant  
551 closure) by taking the average, thus the maximum value of 1 would indicate that all policies  
552 are fully enacted.
- 553 4. The control variable  $X$  includes one-hot encodings of sub-national (or national) units and  
554 day-of-week variables. The former account for time-invariant factors (for example, socio-  
555 economic status, culture, public transportation availability) that impact mobility  $m$ , while  
556 the later control for weekly patterns in mobility (for example, less workplace related mobility  
557 on Sunday) that are common across location unit.

#### 558 Steps for model estimation:

- 559 1. Estimate the average effect on mobility in all subsequent periods,  $\hat{\beta}$ , of each policy included  
560 in each model using the model described above, and ordinary least squares.

- 561 2. Compute the combined effect of policies on human mobility by taking the sum across all  $\hat{\beta}$ .

## 562 B.2 Infection Model

563 Similar to the behavior model, the infection model is also a reduced-form approach, used to describe  
564 the relationship between infections and mobility behavior ( $\frac{\Delta infections}{\Delta behavior}$  in equation (1)). Model  
565 details, as well as steps for model estimation, forecasting and cross-validation are outlined below.  
566 Also included are steps for data selection.

### 567 Model details:

- 568 1. The model used is  $\log(\frac{I_t}{I_{t-1}}) = g(mobility_t, X_t) + \epsilon_t$ , where  $\log(\frac{I_t}{I_{t-1}})$  is the first-difference of  
569 log confirmed infections at time  $t$ ,  $X_t$  represents control variables, and  $\epsilon_t$  is the error.
- 570 2. The model is fit for each country at the sub-national level where granular infections and  
571 mobility data are available. For the global model, use a regression model where the unit of  
572 observation is at the country by day level.
- 573 3. The *mobility* variable is a vector with mobility rates specific to each country, for each location  
574 and day. Includes mobility measures averaged over lags 1-7, 8-14 and 15-21, respectively.  
575 We use Google mobility data in its original form (percentage points), and take logs for the  
576 Facebook and Baidu mobility data.
- 577 4. The control variable  $X$  includes one-hot encodings of sub-national (or national) units and  
578 day-of-week variables.

579 **Steps for model estimation:** The following steps are used to generate estimates of the average  
580 effect of each mobility variable on the growth rate of infections (see Figure 6). These are then used  
581 to estimate how a novel policy affecting mobility would alter future infections (Table 2).

- 582 1. Estimate the average effect of each mobility variable on the growth rate of infections,  $\hat{\beta}$ , using  
583 the model described above, and ordinary least squares.



- 584 2. To estimate the potential effect of a mobility-reducing policy, use  $\Delta I = h(\Delta m, \hat{\beta})$ , where  $\Delta I$   
585 is the change in number of infections,  $\Delta m$  is the anticipated change in mobility due to NPIs,  
586 and  $\hat{\beta}$  are estimated coefficients of the mobility variables.
- 587 3. Specifically, for Facebook and Baidu data, where mobility variables are in log form: at forecast  
588 day  $k$ ,  $\frac{I_{new}}{I_{original}} = e^{k(\sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{\beta}_i \log(1+\Delta m_i))}$ , where  $\Delta m_i$  is the fractional change in the  $l$ th mobility  
589 variable (number of trips for all lags involved) (e.g., if the number of trips for all lags in  
590 the  $l$ th variable is reduced by 10%,  $\Delta m_l = -.1$ ). For Google data: at forecast day  $k$ ,  
591  $\frac{I_{new}}{I_{original}} = e^{k(\sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{\beta}_i \Delta_i)}$ , where  $\Delta m_i$  is the change in residential time over baseline for the  $l$ th  
592 mobility variable (e.g.,  $\Delta m_l = .05$  means a 5% increase, say from 20% to 25% residential time  
593 over baseline, for all lags in the  $l$ th variable).

594 **Steps for forecasting and cross-validation:**

- 595 1. For a 20-day period (training data), fit a regression model as specified above, using ordinary  
596 least squares.
- 597 2. For a 10-day period (test data), multiply the coefficient estimates obtained from fitting the  
598 regression model on the training data with the observed predictor variables in the test data  
599 to obtain prediction of the infection rate.
- 600 3. For each test day, compute the percentage error compared to the ground-truth infection rate.
- 601 4. Perform cross-validation (i.e., robustness to train and test sample selection), for all 20-day  
602 training periods and 10-day forecast periods, limited by data availability.
- 603 5. Group percentage errors by day of forecast (from 1 to 10).
- 604 6. Repeat the above, using a baseline model which excludes mobility variables, i.e.,  $\log(\frac{I_t}{I_{t-1}}) =$   
605  $j(X_t) + \epsilon_t$ .

606 In other words, the baseline model simply uses past infections to predict future infections. Smaller  
607 errors using the model including mobility variables would indicate that information on mobility  
608 improves forecasts. Examples of the results are in Figure 3, and forecasting errors are in 4.

609 **Steps for data selection:**

610 The time period that we consider (see Table 3) is the “first wave” of infections, and to demon-  
611 strate the utility of the mobility model, we focus on the period in which mobility starts falling  
612 as a result of lockdown measures imposed during this first wave, until right before mobility starts  
613 increasing again. This model can be refit to the local context of interest, using data that is represen-  
614 tative of current conditions. For countries in which lockdown policy data are available, we include  
615 administrative regions after the lockdown policy has been implemented. For countries without pol-  
616 icy data available on a granular enough level (US in this case), we use a start date of March 17 (the  
617 results are robust to different start dates), or when Google residential mobility is at least 5 percent  
618 above baseline (world level). We select an end date that roughly corresponds to just before mobility  
619 picks back up. The reason for this choice is that in the phase in which mobility starts to increase,  
620 we might expect there to be other measures put in place, or other changes in behavior, such as  
621 contact tracing, mask wearing, and so forth, which justified the lifting of lockdown measures and  
622 subsequent increase in mobility. The relationship between mobility and cases might therefore be  
623 different than during the lockdown stage, suggesting that the model needs to be refit if we would  
624 like for it to be used during this period.

625 Now, we train each model using 20 days of training data, and forecast for up to 10 days into the  
626 future. To be included in the data used to train each model, we impose the following conditions  
627 at the level of the *administrative region*. For the administrative region to be included, for *all* 20  
628 training days  $t$ ,

629 1.  $I_t \geq 10$

630 2.  $I_{t-1} > 0$

631 and for the world-level analysis only:

632 3.  $\text{mobility}_t \geq 5$  percent, i.e., current day mobility is at least 5 percent above baseline.

633 4.  $\left(\log \frac{I_t}{I_{t-1}}\right)_{i,1-14} \leq .03$  percent, i.e., the 14 days rolling average of the growth rate of cumulative  
634 active cases flattens.

635 These conditions also imply that  $I_t$ ,  $I_{t-1}$  and the mobility variables have to be non-missing for  
636 all training days. These conditions have implications for predictions as well: if an administrative  
637 region is not included in the training data, predictions will not be generated for that region, because  
638 the region fixed effect would not be estimated for that region.

639 **C Additional Figures**




Figure 5: **Spatial and temporal spillover of policies.** **a-b.** Solid markers indicate the direct impact of large policies on mobility. Hollow markers show the estimated effect of a policy on neighboring regions. Policies are jointly estimated at the local level for each country. In China (**b**), we also separately estimate the effect of each policy for each time period after the policy's implementation. **c** The impact of lockdown on the time spent at home is estimated using a country-level regression with 80 countries. We report the cumulative effect over time.




Figure 6: **Impact of mobility on the growth rate of COVID-19 cases.** Estimated impact of mobility on COVID-19 infection growth rate over time. Effects are estimated for each of the preceding three weeks (lags of 1 to 21 days), where the measure of mobility is either the number of trips between administrative units (left) or the amount of time spent at home (right). The impact of mobility is gradually increasing over time and is highest after 2 weeks.