

1 Title

2 Infectiousness of places: The impact of human settlement and activity space in the
3 transmission of COVID-19

4
5 Infectiousness of places

6 7 Authors

8 Lun Liu^{1,2*}, Hui Wang^{3*}, Zhu Zhang¹, Weiyi Zhang¹, Shengsheng Zhuang⁴, Tingmiao
9 Lv¹, Chi On Chio¹, Yifan Wang¹, Daori Na¹, Chuchang Tang¹, On Ieng Ao-Ieong¹

10 11 Affiliations

12
13 ¹School of Government, Peking University, China.

14 ²Institute of Public Governance, Peking University, China.

15 ³School of Architecture, Tsinghua University, China.

16 ⁴Peking Union Medical College, China.

17 *Correspondence to: liu.lun@pku.edu.cn, wh-sa@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

18 19 Abstract

20 Places are fundamental factors in the spread of epidemics, as they are where people
21 agglomerate and interact. This paper explores how different types of places—activity
22 spaces at micro-level and human settlements at macro-level—impact the transmission of
23 infections using evidences from COVID-19. We examine eleven types of activity spaces
24 and find heterogeneous impacts across countries, yet we also find that non-essential
25 activity spaces tend to have larger impacts than essential ones. Contrary to common
26 beliefs, settlement size and density are not positively associated with reproduction
27 numbers. Further, the impacts of closing activity spaces vary with settlement types and are
28 consistently lower in larger settlements in all sample countries, suggesting more complex
29 pattern of virus transmission in large settlements. This work takes first steps in
30 systematically evaluating the epistemological risks of places at multiple scales, which
31 contributes to knowledge in urban resilience, health and livability.

32 33 34 Teaser

35 Activity spaces and human settlement characteristics impact the spread of epidemics in
36 multiple ways and should be considered in policy making.

37 38 MAIN TEXT

39 40 Introduction

41 Humans continue to migrate to large, dense urban settlements in the past century. The consequent
42 growth of cities brings benefits such as economies of scale and knowledge spillovers, but also
43 increases the vulnerability of human society to risks related to people's agglomeration and
44 interaction such as infectious disease, pollution and crime (1, 2), for which the on-going outbreak
45 of COVID-19 is a prominent example. In tackling these risks, places are important aspects, as the
46 human interactions giving rise to various risks are all associated with certain physical places. To

47 understand the role of different types of places in the spread of risks is important for targeted
48 policy making to contain the risks and enhance the resilience of cities.

49 In terms of places' epistemological risks, the COVID-19 pandemic provides worldwide data with
50 natural experiments to investigate the spread of infectious disease at different types of places.
51 Place characteristics at multiple scales could have an impact. At the macro-level, for instance,
52 dense settlements lead to physical proximity among residents which is likely to generate more
53 contacts, and large settlements connect more people—both might increase the dissemination of
54 diseases (3-5). At the micro-level, different activity spaces, such as restaurants, museums, sports
55 venues, are likely to be associated with different risks of disease spread, affected by the
56 socioeconomic interactions at these locations.

57 Despite of a large number of researches on the spread of COVID-19, the potentially varying
58 transmission risks at different places are still not systematically investigated. Macro-scale place
59 characteristics are rarely examined and evidences are mixed (3, 4, 6). For micro-scale places, the
60 most relevant body of research is those on the efficacy of non-pharmaceutical interventions on
61 COVID-19 which include the closure of various activity spaces (7-17). However, these works
62 mostly use broad categories when estimating the impact of activity spaces, such as “non-essential
63 businesses”, “venues” or “lock down”, which can involve a number of distinct types of spaces (7,
64 10, 14, 18, 19). Since the closure of any activity space could affect the daily life of certain groups,
65 the effect estimates on broad categories are insufficient for governments to make cost-effective
66 intervention policies. As COVID-19 persists and countries have to lock down repeatedly, it is
67 critical that we understand which types of settlements and activity spaces need more rigorous
68 interventions than other, thus refining policies in the on-going COVID-19 and similar crisis in the
69 future.

70 In this work, we take the case of COVID-19 and investigate how different types of macro-level
71 settlement characteristics and micro-level activity spaces impact the spread of infections, as well
72 as how they interact. We examine two basic characteristics of settlements—population size and
73 density—which have been found to affect many social quantities (5, 20), and eleven types of
74 activity spaces commonly included in government interventions, which are schools, childcare
75 centers, offices, non-essential retails, restaurants, bars, entertainment venues, cultural venues,
76 religious venues, indoor sports venues and outdoor sports grounds (detailed descriptions in Table
77 S1). To perform the analysis, we combine data from a variety of sources including COVID-19
78 infection case data from government data portals and open data repositories, government
79 intervention data from national and state-level government websites, and socioeconomic
80 characteristics of settlements from various official statistics (see Section S1 for details). Four
81 countries from different continents which are strongly hit by the pandemic are chosen as study
82 cases, which are Japan in Asia, the United Kingdom in Europe, the United States in North
83 America and Brazil in South America. We take settlements with population above 100,000 as
84 samples, since many smaller settlements do have enough cases to derive reliable estimates of

85 instantaneous reproduction number, which is the outcome of concern in our analysis. We use data
86 from the first pandemic wave, that is, from March to August 2020, since there could be more
87 uncertainties confounding the analysis in later periods of the pandemic including the so-called
88 “lockdown fatigue”, virus variants, and vaccination (9).

89 Ideally, we would like to take continuous built-up areas as units of analysis, which can be
90 considered as individual settlements. However, continuous built-up areas usually do not overlap
91 with administrative boundaries, based on which infection cases and other statistics are usually
92 published. Given the constraint, we choose the administrative or statistical units which are most
93 similar to continuous built-up areas and where infection case data are available as the spatial units
94 in the analysis, that are, prefectures of Japan, local authority districts of the United Kingdom,
95 metropolitan statistical areas of the United States and municipalities of Brazil (detailed
96 explanations on the choice of spatial units in Section S1.1-1.4). Note that the prefectures of Japan
97 are larger than the other spatial units and usually contain more than one continuous built-up area,
98 however, infection case data can only be consistently acquired at this level in Japan (21).

99 Nonetheless, we prove that the results are not likely to be affected by the issue (Section S3.3).
100 The spatial units in each country with population above 100,000 are taken as sample, leading to
101 45 spatial units in Japan, 234 in the United Kingdom, 308 in the United States and 319 in Brazil
102 after cleaning missing data.

103 Our methodology is based on an econometric approach called difference-in-differences (DiD),
104 which is widely used in examining causal relationship in social processes (22). We first estimate
105 the causal impacts of activity space closures on the course of the epidemic, which can also be
106 interpreted as the risks of virus transmission associated with respective spaces. This is
107 implemented by modelling the relationship between instantaneous reproduction numbers (R_t) in
108 the spatial units and the corresponding status of activity spaces, controlling for other government
109 interventions including stay-at-home-orders and gathering bans. The DiD method estimates causal
110 impact by subtracting the course of R_t in spatial units where a certain type of activity space get
111 closed or reopened with the course of R_t in spatial units where the same type of activity space
112 remain unchanged, given that R_t in the two groups should move in parallel trend absence of the
113 change. By subtracting the trends, the method can rule out the impact of common behavioral
114 changes shared by all spatial units such as increased self-protection, which could otherwise be
115 falsely attributed to activity spaces thus inflate the estimates (10). We estimate separate models on
116 each country to allow for heterogeneous impacts of activity spaces across countries, which might
117 be influenced by factors including the lifestyle, culture, urban form and building design.

118 The fact that governments might close or reopen multiple types of activity spaces together poses
119 obstacles for identifying the impact of individual types of activity spaces (14). But as time went,
120 there were more timing differences, especially in the reopening stage, to facilitate more nuanced
121 analysis. Correlation analysis shows that the Kendall’s correlation coefficients between the status
122 of activity spaces are mostly smaller than 0.8 in our study period (Fig. 1). We merge activity

123 space closures with correlation coefficients larger than 0.95 as one intervention, after which there
124 are at least 180 unit-day differences between any pair of interventions in Japan (due to only 45
125 spatial units) and 699 in the other countries. We further verify that the estimated impacts are not
126 sensitive to removing intervention variables, suggesting manageable collinearity (Section S3.2).

127 The DiD estimation is implemented through a two-way fixed effect model with fixed effects of
128 days and spatial units, which is a widely used modelling method to implement DiD analysis (23).
129 The fixed effects of spatial units can be interpreted as the intrinsic reproduction number in the
130 spatial units absence of any voluntary or compulsory behavioral changes, based on which we
131 estimate the impacts of settlement size and density while controlling for socioeconomic
132 characteristics of settlements. In addition to measuring the independent impacts of micro-level
133 activity spaces and macro-level settlement characteristics on infections, we also examine how the
134 impacts of activity space closures interact with settlement size and density. This is implemented
135 by repeating the DiD analysis on separate samples of relatively large and small, and high-and
136 low-density spatial units and then comparing the effect sizes of activity space closures. More
137 details on the specification of the models and sensitivity tests can be found in Materials and
138 Methods and Section S3.

139 **Results**

141 **Impact of micro-level activity spaces**

142 We first estimate the causal impact of closing eleven types of activity spaces on R_t by fitting a
143 two-way fixed effect model on each country's data, controlling for other government
144 interventions including gathering bans and stay-at-home orders (Fig. 2, full model results in Table
145 S2). The estimated impacts vary across countries, which could stem from varying profiles of
146 visitors to each type of activity space in different countries, varying behaviors in the activity
147 spaces, as well as varying physical conditions of relevant spaces. The activity space closures that
148 show a statistically significant impact on reducing R_t in each country are: entertainment venues
149 (53%, 4 ~ 77%) in Japan; restaurants and cultural venues (combined with indoor gathering bans
150 whose effect is inseparable, 25%, 5 ~ 41%) and indoor sports venues (43%, 13 ~ 63%) in the
151 United Kingdom; entertainment venues (17%, 1 ~ 31%) in the United States; and non-essential
152 retails (20%, 9 ~ 31%) and indoor sports venues (36%, 27 ~ 43%) in Brazil. The percentage
153 reductions in R_t are transformed from direct model outputs (as shown in Fig. 2) as $1 - e^x$, where x
154 denotes the direct outputs. These estimates can also be interpreted as the proportions of total
155 infections related to the respective activity spaces, which may either happen inside these places or
156 on the way travelling to these places.

157 Most of the activity space closures satisfy the parallel trend assumption, meaning that the
158 estimates are not biased by potentially different pre-trends of R_t in areas that close or reopen an
159 activity space and those that do not (detailed methodology and results of the parallel trend test in

160 Section S2.2 and Table S3). The estimates are also generally robust to a number of alternative
161 settings in the analysis, including withholding spatial units from the sample and increasing or
162 decreasing confounding variables in the model, suggesting that they are not likely to be affected
163 by individual influential spatial units and the correlation among variables (detailed methodology
164 and results in Section S3.1 and S3.2).

165 Considering that governments often need to devise strategies on closing a set of activity spaces in
166 an epidemic, we further estimate the combined effects of multiple activity spaces. We compute
167 the effects and uncertainties of closing all possible combinations of activity spaces in each
168 country based on the modelling results in the last step. The full results are provided on this
169 project's Github repository https://github.com/lunliu454/infect_place for readers to explore. Here
170 we present the maximum reduction in R_t that can be achieved by closing a given number of types
171 of activity spaces (Fig. 3). Our analysis suggests that the largest reductions in R_t are achieved by
172 closing two to six types of activity spaces, while more closures do not further bring reproduction
173 numbers down. Governments could resort to this kind of analysis when making cost-effective
174 intervention strategies.

175 The combinations that generate the maximum effects are: closing schools, childcare centers,
176 entertainment, religious, indoor sports venues and outdoor sports grounds in Japan (67%, 46 ~
177 80%); closing non-essential retails, restaurants, cultural venues and indoor sports venues in the
178 United Kingdom (plus banning indoor gatherings whose effect is inseparable, 75%, 45 ~ 88%);
179 closing schools, restaurants, entertainment and indoor sports venues in the United States (29%, 9
180 ~ 45%); and non-essential retails and outdoor sports grounds (27%, 13 ~ 38%) in Brazil. Closing
181 these sets of activity spaces could bring R_t below 1 for previous R_t up to 3.0 (1.9 ~ 5.0) in Japan,
182 4.0 (1.8 ~ 8.3) in the United Kingdom, 1.4 (1.1 ~ 1.8) in the United States and 1.4 (1.1 ~ 1.6) in
183 Brazil. Note that the few activity space closures not satisfying the parallel trend assumption are
184 excluded from this joint effect analysis since their impact estimates are not reliable (Table S3),
185 but they may actually be able to further contribute to the reduction of R_t .

186 **Impact of macro-level settlement characteristics**

187 The results on the relationship between settlements' population size and density and the fixed
188 effects of spatial units are fairly consistent across the four countries (Table 1). Population size is
189 negatively correlated with spatial unit's fixed effect on R_t and this is statistically significant in
190 three of the four countries, where the effect size ranges between 2.0% (1.1 ~ 3.2%) to 4.9% (2.3 ~
191 7.5%) reduction of R_t per one million increase of population. The impact of density is less clear,
192 yet none of the estimates is positively significant as suggested by the common beliefs mentioned
193 in the Introduction. These results contradict the impression that large and densely populated cities
194 tend to be epicenters and suggest that in terms of the reproduction number, large and dense cities
195 are not riskier, but even less. Explanations for the negative relationship between settlement size

196 and R_t might include better health infrastructures in large cities and people's stronger awareness
197 of the risk thus more cautious behavior (24, 25).

198 **Interaction between settlement characteristics and activity space closures**

199 We also examine the interaction between macro-level settlement characteristics and activity space
200 closures, to investigate whether the impacts of closing activity spaces would differ across
201 different types of settlements. To do this, we re-estimate the maximum joint effects of activity
202 space closures on separate samples of relatively large and small population, and separate samples
203 of relatively high and low density. The high/low samples are split by the median population size
204 (174,980 people) and density (681 people per squared kilometer) of all sample spatial units,
205 except for Japan where the population size and density are generally much higher so that we use
206 the median of its own (314,082 people and 5,671 people per squared kilometer respectively).

207 The comparisons are remarkably consistent across the four countries in terms of the interaction
208 with settlement size, that the impacts of activity space closures are larger in relatively small
209 settlements (Fig. 4A). The differences in the reductions of R_t by closing activity spaces range
210 between 3% and 18%. The impacts are also larger in relatively low-density settlements except for
211 in the United Kingdom and United States where the impacts are close to each other. The disparity
212 in effect size reflects different share of infections accounted for by the specific activity spaces in
213 different types of settlements, suggesting that a higher proportion of virus transmission in large
214 settlements is related to places other than the specific activity spaces, which might include public
215 transit, streets and other public spaces (26).

216 To test whether the results hold when the population and density thresholds change, we repeat the
217 analysis with a series of cut-off values between the first and third quantiles of population size and
218 density in each country. The results are generally stable regardless of the threshold used to split
219 the samples, and are particularly consistent in terms of settlement size: the effect sizes in
220 relatively small settlements are always bigger than in large settlements in all sample countries
221 (Fig. 4B). Similar pattern also exists with regard to density in Japan and less prominently in
222 Brazil.

223 **Discussion**

225 Our analysis quantifies the heterogenous risks of virus transmission associated with different
226 activity spaces and settlements using evidences from the COVID-19 pandemic, and takes the first
227 steps towards building systematic knowledge on the epistemological risks of places at multiple
228 scales. The results demonstrate that governments could more cost-effectively contain the
229 pandemic by closing a relatively small set of non-essential activity spaces, and such interventions
230 would be more effective in relatively small settlements. Besides, contrary to common beliefs,
231 settlements with relatively large population and density are not associated with higher risks of

232 virus transmission. To our knowledge, this study is the first to attempt to estimate the impacts of
233 closing individual types of activity spaces and to identify the varying effects of activity space
234 closures in different types of settlements.

235 Though the risk of virus transmission at different types of activity spaces can also be evaluated
236 with mechanistic modelling (27, 28), actual human behavior could be more complicated than
237 experimental settings and our work provides data-driven evaluations. Our results demonstrate that
238 closing a selected set of activity spaces could reduce R_t by 27-75% in our sample countries,
239 without imposing a full lock down. Actually, the stay-at-home order does not demonstrate a
240 statistically significant impact in reducing R_t in three of the four countries after controlling for
241 other interventions and day and unit fixed effects (Table S2). This contradicts some previous
242 findings, which however either do not rule out simultaneous voluntary behavioral changes or omit
243 certain confounders (14, 15, 19). The magnitudes of the impacts are heterogeneous across
244 countries, which could be affected by how people behave and interact at relevant places, the
245 socioeconomic profile of the visitors, the physical conditions of relevant facilities, the intensity of
246 intervention enforcement and so on. For example, the small effect size in the United States and
247 Brazil might be explained by the relatively loose enforcement and non-compliance (29, 30). The
248 heterogeneous results suggest that while some previous works seek to derive general conclusions
249 on the effectiveness of interventions across countries (8, 10), such conclusions could run the risk
250 of over-simplification and be misleading for policy making in individual countries given the
251 factors mentioned above. Despite of the heterogeneity, it is common in the four sample countries
252 that the closures of essential places including schools, childcare centers and offices do not
253 demonstrate statistically significant effects in reducing R_t and non-essential activity spaces tend to
254 be more effective, suggesting that governments could consider closing non-essential activity
255 spaces as cost-effective interventions.

256 At the macro-level, our findings on the impacts of settlement size and density on R_t contradict the
257 common belief that large and densely populated cities are more vulnerable to infectious disease
258 (31). This could either because the seemingly increased connectivity and proximity among people
259 do not actually enhance the chance for one infected person to transmit the virus to others, or such
260 effect does exist but is offset by other positive factors of large and dense cities such as more
261 healthcare resources driven by economy of scale and more cautious behavior of people. The exact
262 causal chain could also involve the demography, economy even partisanship in different types of
263 settlements (25, 32), which is subject to further study. Either way, these results lend more
264 confidence to encouraging agglomeration of people and high-density development, as in the end,
265 they are not associated with higher epistemological risks.

266 The finding that specific activity spaces account for a smaller proportion of transmission in
267 relatively large settlements suggests that the pattern of virus transmission in these settlements is
268 more complicated, which might be related to longer travel, more contacts on public transit and
269 streets, home transmission in crowded residences and so on. It indicates that governments might

270 need to take extra measures other than locking down to contain the pandemic in large cities, such
271 as contact tracing or providing assistance to those living in poor conditions.

272 There are a number of limitations associated with our methodology. In terms of the causal
273 identification strategy, the DiD method requires both parallel trend and exogeneity of the
274 treatment. While the parallel trend assumption is examined with an event-study design, the
275 exogeneity assumption could be challenged by unobserved confounders that affect both R_t and
276 activity space closures. Though we are able to rule out a number of confounders by including a
277 large set of interventions as well as unit and day fixed effects, there could still be endogeneity
278 arising from omitted unit-specific time-varying factors. For instance, a sudden outburst of cases in
279 a hotspot may affect both governments' interventions and local residents' cautionary behavior
280 which then affects R_t .

281 Second, since the impacts of closing different types of activity spaces are estimated in one model,
282 the results could be subject to the so-called "table 2 fallacy" which refers to that the coefficients
283 of confounders in a model are wrongly interpreted as full causal effects while they are actually
284 only the direct effects (33). This problem applies if decisions to close activity spaces affect each
285 other so that they become confounders. While this is possible, we suppose such relationship
286 should be weak since the decision to close or reopen activity spaces tend to be more directly
287 affected by the trends of infections, instead of the status of each other.

288 Third, we assume linear relationship between R_t and the independent variables in the entire
289 analysis, which is a convenient assumption made by many studies on intervention effects in
290 COVID-19 (8, 10, 12, 16, 18). However, the impact of closing one type of activity space may rely
291 on the status of other activity spaces, since the corresponding activities could be complementary
292 or substitutive to each other, leading to interacting effects. It is encouraging that studies which
293 examine nonlinear relationships and sequence of interventions do not find significant patterns (8,
294 19, 34), but the issue cannot be fully closed.

295 By evaluating the infection risks of places, this work contributes to an emerging literature on the
296 resilience and health of cities (35-37), as cities have become the dominant form of human
297 settlement. Actually, health concerns have been a key factor in shaping the planning and policy in
298 cities as early as the time of John Snow and Ebenezer Howard at the advent of modern cities. Our
299 findings suggest that with increased human agglomeration and interaction, controlling epidemics
300 is no longer only about confined areas such as hospitals, residences or the water supply system,
301 but also the entire urban space. Understanding the linkage between places, human activities and
302 diseases would be important for long- and short-term policy making in public health, urban
303 planning, urban economy and other relevant fields.

304
305 **Materials and Methods**

306

307 **Data.** We curate a data set combining daily infection cases, government interventions (including
308 activity space closures, stay-at-home orders and gathering bans) and the spatial, demographic and
309 economic characteristics of the spatial units in our study, from the onset of the pandemic till
310 August 15 2020. The infection case data are sourced from Japan Broadcasting Corporation's case
311 reports, the UK government, Johns Hopkins University and the Brazilian Ministry of Health. The
312 timetable of government interventions is manually collected from the websites of national and
313 state-level governments, which are the main levels of government making decisions on
314 interventions. The settlement-related information is gathered from a number of official websites.
315 More details on data sources are provided in Section S1.

316 **Estimating impacts of closing individual types of activity spaces.** The causal impacts of
317 closing individual types of activity spaces across all spatial units and subgroups of spatial units in
318 a country are estimated with a two-way fixed effect model specified as follows

$$\log(R_{c,i,t}) = \beta_c X_{c,i,t} + \theta_c Z_{c,i,t} + \alpha_{c,i} + \tau_{c,t} + \varepsilon_{c,i,t} \quad (1)$$

321 where $\log(R_{c,i,t})$ is the log-transformed instantaneous reproduction number in unit i of country c
322 on day t ; $X_{c,i,t}$ is a vector denoting the status of the eleven types of activity spaces and β_c denotes
323 the corresponding coefficients to estimate. We log-transform $R_{c,i,t}$ following the practice of
324 relevant works (10, 14), based on the plausible assumption that the reduction of $R_{c,i,t}$ by the
325 closure of activity spaces should be proportional to the proportion of contacts avoided instead of
326 an absolute value, and the impacts should be smaller when $R_{c,i,t}$ is already low. $Z_{c,i,t}$ and θ_c denote
327 the status of five other government interventions and their coefficients (detailed description of
328 these interventions in Table S1); $\alpha_{c,i}$ and $\tau_{c,t}$ denote the unit and time fixed effects, respectively;
329 and $\varepsilon_{c,i,t}$ denotes the error term. For the uncertainty over the parameters, we estimate robust
330 standard errors allowing for $\varepsilon_{c,i,t}$ to cluster at the unit level, to account for heterogeneity in the
331 treatment effects (38).

332 **Estimating joint impacts of closing multiple types of activity spaces.** The point estimates of
333 the joint impacts are computed by summing the corresponding coefficients estimated by Eq. 1:

334 $\sum_{s \in P} \beta_{c,s}$, where $\beta_{c,s}$ denotes the coefficient of closing activity space s in country c and P denotes a
335 set of activity spaces. The standard errors are computed from the robust standard errors and
336 covariances as follows

$$SE_{c,P} = \sqrt{\sum_{s \in P} SE_{c,s}^2 + 2 \times \sum_{s \in P, s' \in P, s \neq s'} COV_{c,s,s'}} \quad (2)$$

340 where $SE_{c,P}$ denotes the standard error of the joint impacts of set P in country c ; $SE_{c,s}$ denotes the
341 robust standard error of closing activity space s estimated by Eq. 1; and $COV_{c,s,s'}$ is the covariance
342 between the impacts of activity space s and s' .

343 **Estimating impacts of macro-level settlement characteristics.** We take the unit fixed effects
344 estimated by Eq. 1, which can be interpreted as the intrinsic reproduction number in each spatial
345 unit, and model their relationship with the size and density of settlements while controlling for the
346 proportion of elder population (over 65 or 60 years old depending on data availability), proportion
347 of Black and Asian (in the United Kingdom and the United States only), the average income of
348 residents and the per capita gross domestic product, using simple linear regression.

$$\alpha_{c,i} = \sigma_{c,1} DENSITY_{c,i} + \sigma_{c,2} POPULATION_{c,i} + \sigma_{c,3} OLD_{c,i} + \sigma_{c,4} BLACK_{c,i} + \sigma_{c,5} ASIAN_{c,i} + \sigma_{c,6} INCOME_{c,i} + \sigma_{c,7} GDP_{c,i} + \xi_{c,i} \quad (3)$$

350 where $DENSITY_{c,i}$, $POPULATION_{c,i}$, $OLD_{c,i}$, $BLACK_{c,i}$, $ASIAN_{c,i}$, $INCOME_{c,i}$, $GDP_{c,i}$ denote the
351 density, population size, proportion of elder population, proportion of Black, proportion of Asian,
352 residents' income and per capita gross domestic product in unit i ; $\sigma_{c,1}$ to $\sigma_{c,7}$ are their coefficients;
353 $\xi_{c,i}$ is the error term.

354 References

- 356 1. L. M. Bettencourt, J. Lobo, D. Helbing, C. Kühnert, G. B. West, Growth, innovation,
357 scaling, and the pace of life in cities. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* **104**,
358 7301-7306 (2007).
- 359 2. E. Glaeser, Cities, productivity, and quality of life. *Science* **333**, 592-594 (2011).
- 360 3. S. Hamidi, S. Sabouri, R. Ewing, Does density aggravate the COVID-19 pandemic? Early
361 findings and lessons for planners. *Journal of the American Planning Association* **86**, 495-
362 509 (2020).
- 363 4. H. V. Ribeiro, A. S. Sunahara, J. Sutton, M. Perc, Q. S. Hanley, City size and the spreading
364 of COVID-19 in Brazil. *PloS one* **15**, e0239699 (2020).
- 365 5. L. M. Bettencourt, The origins of scaling in cities. *science* **340**, 1438-1441 (2013).
- 366 6. K. T. L. Sy, L. F. White, B. E. Nichols, Population density and basic reproductive number
367 of COVID-19 across United States counties. *PloS one* **16**, e0249271 (2021).
- 368 7. N. Banholzer, E. van Weenen, A. Lison, A. Cenedese, A. Seeliger, B. Kratzwald, D.
369 Tschernutter, J. P. Salles, P. Bottrighi, S. Lehtinen, S. Feuerriegel, W. Vach, Estimating the
370 effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on the number of new infections with
371 COVID-19 during the first epidemic wave. *medRxiv*, (2021).
- 372 8. Y. Bo, C. Guo, C. Lin, Y. Zeng, H. B. Li, Y. Zhang, M. S. Hossain, J. W. Chan, D. W.
373 Yeung, K. O. Kwok, Effectiveness of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19
374 transmission in 190 countries from 23 January to 13 April 2020. *International Journal of*
375 *Infectious Diseases* **102**, 247-253 (2021).
- 376 9. M. Sharma, S. Mindermann, C. Rogers-Smith, G. Leech, B. Snodin, J. Ahuja, J. B.
377 Sandbrink, J. T. Monrad, G. Altman, G. Dhaliwal, L. Finnveden, A. J. Norman, S. B.
378 Oehm, J. F. Sandkühler, T. Mellan, J. Kulveit, L. Chindelevitch, S. Flaxman, Y. Gal, S.
379 Mishra, J. M. Brauner, S. Bhatt, Understanding the effectiveness of government
380 interventions in Europe's second wave of COVID-19. *medRxiv*, (2021).
- 381 10. J. M. Brauner, S. Mindermann, M. Sharma, D. Johnston, J. Salvatier, T. Gavenčiak, A. B.
382 Stephenson, G. Leech, G. Altman, V. Mikulik, Inferring the effectiveness of government
383 interventions against COVID-19. *Science* **371**, (2021).
- 384 11. S.-W. Cho, Quantifying the impact of nonpharmaceutical interventions during the
385 COVID-19 outbreak: The case of Sweden. *The Econometrics Journal* **23**, 323-344 (2020).
- 386 12. D. Dave, A. I. Friedson, K. Matsuzawa, J. J. Sabia, When do shelter - in - place orders

- 387 fight COVID - 19 best? Policy heterogeneity across states and adoption time. *Economic*
388 *Inquiry* **59**, 29-52 (2021).
- 389 13. J. Dehning, J. Zierenberg, F. P. Spitzner, M. Wibral, J. P. Neto, M. Wilczek, V. Priesemann,
390 Inferring change points in the spread of COVID-19 reveals the effectiveness of
391 interventions. *Science* **369**, (2020).
- 392 14. S. Flaxman, S. Mishra, A. Gandy, H. J. T. Unwin, T. A. Mellan, H. Coupland, C. Whittaker,
393 H. Zhu, T. Berah, J. W. Eaton, Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions
394 on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature* **584**, 257-261 (2020).
- 395 15. J. H. Fowler, S. J. Hill, R. Levin, N. Obradovich, The effect of stay-at-home orders on
396 COVID-19 cases and fatalities in the United States. *medRxiv*, (2020).
- 397 16. N. Islam, S. J. Sharp, G. Chowell, S. Shabnam, I. Kawachi, B. Lacey, J. M. Massaro, R. B.
398 D'Agostino, M. White, Physical distancing interventions and incidence of coronavirus
399 disease 2019: natural experiment in 149 countries. *BMJ* **370**, (2020).
- 400 17. S. Singh, M. Shaikh, K. Hauck, M. Miraldo, Impacts of introducing and lifting
401 nonpharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 daily growth rate and compliance in the
402 United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118**, (2021).
- 403 18. S. Hsiang, D. Allen, S. Annan-Phan, K. Bell, I. Bolliger, T. Chong, H. Druckenmiller, L. Y.
404 Huang, A. Hultgren, E. Krasovich, The effect of large-scale anti-contagion policies on the
405 COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature* **584**, 262-267 (2020).
- 406 19. N. Haug, L. Geyrhofer, A. Londei, E. Dervic, A. Desvars-Larrive, V. Loreto, B. Pinior, S.
407 Thurner, P. Klimek, Ranking the effectiveness of worldwide COVID-19 government
408 interventions. *Nature human behaviour* **4**, 1303-1312 (2020).
- 409 20. M. Batty, *The new science of cities* (MIT press, 2013).
- 410 21. S. Reustle, Data for covid19japan.com. (2020); [https://github.com/reustle/covid19japan-](https://github.com/reustle/covid19japan-data)
411 [data](https://github.com/reustle/covid19japan-data).
- 412 22. A. Goodman-Bacon, J. Marcus, Using difference-in-differences to identify causal effects
413 of COVID-19 policies. (2020).
- 414 23. J. D. Angrist, J.-S. Pischke, *Mostly harmless econometrics* (Princeton university press,
415 2008).
- 416 24. R. Ewing, S. Hamidi, Compactness versus sprawl: A review of recent evidence from the
417 United States. *Journal of Planning Literature* **30**, 413-432 (2015).
- 418 25. M. H. Haischer, R. Beilfuss, M. R. Hart, L. Opielinski, D. Wrucke, G. Zirgaitis, T. D.
419 Uhrich, S. K. Hunter, Who is wearing a mask? Gender-, age-, and location-related
420 differences during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Plos one* **15**, e0240785 (2020).
- 421 26. J. E. Harris, "The subways seeded the massive coronavirus epidemic in New York City"
422 (National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020).
- 423 27. Y. Li, H. Qian, J. Hang, X. Chen, P. Cheng, H. Ling, S. Wang, P. Liang, J. Li, S. Xiao,
424 Probable airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in a poorly ventilated restaurant. *Building*
425 *and Environment* **196**, 107788 (2021).
- 426 28. V. Vuorinen, M. Aarnio, M. Alava, V. Alopaeus, N. Atanasova, M. Auvinen, N.
427 Balasubramanian, H. Bordbar, P. Erästö, R. Grande, Modelling aerosol transport and virus
428 exposure with numerical simulations in relation to SARS-CoV-2 transmission by
429 inhalation indoors. *Safety Science* **130**, 104866 (2020).
- 430 29. G. Witte, Coronavirus shutdowns have gone nationwide. Many police departments aren't
431 enforcing them. (2020); [https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/coronavirus-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/coronavirus-shutdowns-have-gone-nationwide-many-police-departments-arent-enforcing-them/2020/03/25/56be5ed2-6e00-11ea-a3ec-70d7479d83f0_story.html)
432 [shutdowns-have-gone-nationwide-many-police-departments-arent-enforcing-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/coronavirus-shutdowns-have-gone-nationwide-many-police-departments-arent-enforcing-them/2020/03/25/56be5ed2-6e00-11ea-a3ec-70d7479d83f0_story.html)
433 [them/2020/03/25/56be5ed2-6e00-11ea-a3ec-70d7479d83f0_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/coronavirus-shutdowns-have-gone-nationwide-many-police-departments-arent-enforcing-them/2020/03/25/56be5ed2-6e00-11ea-a3ec-70d7479d83f0_story.html).
- 434 30. G. Mello, R. V. Gaier, Brazil lockdowns, attacked by Bolsonaro, begin to slip. (2020);
435 <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-brazil-lockdown-idUSKCN21R30B>.
- 436 31. C. E. Shoichet, A. Jones, Coronavirus is making some people rethink where they want to

- live. (2020); <https://www.cnn.com/2020/05/02/us/cities-population-coronavirus/index.html>.
32. S. K. Gadarian, S. W. Goodman, T. B. Pepinsky, Partisanship, health behavior, and policy attitudes in the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Plos one* **16**, e0249596 (2021).
33. D. Westreich, S. Greenland, The Table 2 Fallacy: Presenting and Interpreting Confounder and Modifier Coefficients. *American Journal of Epidemiology* **177**, 292-298 (2013).
34. M. Zhao, D. Holtz, S. Aral, Interdependent program evaluation: Geographic and social spillovers in COVID-19 closures and reopenings in the United States. *Science Advances* **7**, eabe7733 (2021).
35. H. Tian, S. Hu, B. Cazelles, G. Chowell, L. Gao, M. Laine, Y. Li, H. Yang, Y. Li, Q. Yang, Urbanization prolongs hantavirus epidemics in cities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**, 4707-4712 (2018).
36. J. Corburn, *Toward the healthy city: people, places, and the politics of urban planning* (Mit Press, 2009).
37. L. J. Vale, *The resilient city: How modern cities recover from disaster* (Oxford University Press, 2005).
38. A. Abadie, S. Athey, G. W. Imbens, J. Wooldridge, "When should you adjust standard errors for clustering?" (National Bureau of Economic Research, 2017).
39. National Statistics Center, Statistics of Japan (municipality data). (2021); <https://www.e-stat.go.jp/en/regional-statistics/ssdsview/municipality>.
40. National Statistics Center, Statistics of Japan (prefectural data). (2021); <https://www.e-stat.go.jp/en/regional-statistics/ssdsview/prefectures>.
41. National Statistics Center, National survey of family income, consumption and wealth. (2021); <https://www.e-stat.go.jp/en/stat-search/file-download?statInfId=000032079768&fileKind=0>.
42. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Gross Domestic Product Small regions TL3. (2021); <https://stats.oecd.org>.
43. Office for National Statistics, Estimates of the population for the UK, England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. (2020); <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland>.
44. Office for National Statistics, Ethnic group. (2014); <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/ks201uk>.
45. Office for National Statistics, Regional gross domestic product: local authorities. (2021); <https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/grossdomesticproductgdp/datasets/regionalgrossdomesticproductlocalauthorities>.
46. Public Health England, Coronavirus (COVID-19) in the UK. (2020); <https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/details/download>.
47. United States Census Bureau, Metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas population totals and components of change: 2010-2019. (2020); https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2010s-total-metro-and-micro-statistical-areas.html#par_textimage_1139876276.
48. United States Census Bureau, ua_list_all.txt. (2015); https://www2.census.gov/geo/docs/reference/ua/ua_list_all.txt.
49. United States Census Bureau, Patterns of metropolitan and micropolitan population change: 2000 to 2010 (Chapter 5 data). (2012); <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/tables/time-series/c2010sr-01/cbsa-report-chapter-5-data.xlsx>.
50. United States Census Bureau, American community survey demographic and housing estimates. (2020);

- 487 [https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?t=Race%20and%20Ethnicity&g=0100000US.310000](https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?t=Race%20and%20Ethnicity&g=0100000US.310000&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP05)
488 &tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP05.
- 489 51. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Personal Income by County, Metro, and Other Areas.
490 (2020); <https://www.bea.gov/sites/default/files/2020-11/lapi1120msa.xlsx>.
- 491 52. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Gross domestic product by metropolitan area, 2017. (2018);
492 <https://www.bea.gov/news/2018/gross-domestic-product-metropolitan-area-2017>.
- 493 53. Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University,
494 COVID-19 data repository. (2020); <https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID-19>.
- 495 54. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Statistical areas. (2020);
496 <https://apps.bea.gov/regional/docs/msalist.cfm>.
- 497 55. Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics, Estimativa 2020. (2021);
498 [https://www.ibge.gov.br/en/statistics/social/population/18448-estimates-of-resident-](https://www.ibge.gov.br/en/statistics/social/population/18448-estimates-of-resident-population-for-municipalities-and-federation-units.html?=&t=downloads)
499 [population-for-municipalities-and-federation-units.html?=&t=downloads](https://www.ibge.gov.br/en/statistics/social/population/18448-estimates-of-resident-population-for-municipalities-and-federation-units.html?=&t=downloads).
- 500 56. Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics, Censo demografico 2010 indicadores
501 sociais municipais. (2010);
502 [https://ftp.ibge.gov.br/Censos/Censo_Demografico_2010/indicadores_sociais_municipais/](https://ftp.ibge.gov.br/Censos/Censo_Demografico_2010/indicadores_sociais_municipais/Brasil.zip)
503 [Brasil.zip](https://ftp.ibge.gov.br/Censos/Censo_Demografico_2010/indicadores_sociais_municipais/Brasil.zip).
- 504 57. Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics, Average and median per capita household
505 income. (2019);
506 [https://ftp.ibge.gov.br/Indicadores_Sociais/Sintese_de_Indicadores_Sociais/Sintese_de_In-](https://ftp.ibge.gov.br/Indicadores_Sociais/Sintese_de_Indicadores_Sociais/Sintese_de_Indicadores_Sociais_2020/xls/2_Rendimento_xls.zip)
507 [dicadores_Sociais_2020/xls/2_Rendimento_xls.zip](https://ftp.ibge.gov.br/Indicadores_Sociais/Sintese_de_Indicadores_Sociais/Sintese_de_Indicadores_Sociais_2020/xls/2_Rendimento_xls.zip).
- 508 58. Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics, Gross domestic product of municipalities.
509 (2018);
510 https://ftp.ibge.gov.br/Pib_Municipios/2018/base/base_de_dados_2010_2018_xls.zip.
- 511 59. R. Fontes, Coronavirus - Brazil. (2020); [https://www.kaggle.com/unanimad/corona-virus-](https://www.kaggle.com/unanimad/corona-virus-brazil)
512 [brazil](https://www.kaggle.com/unanimad/corona-virus-brazil).
- 513 60. Ministry of Health, Coronavirus Brazil. (2020); <https://covid.saude.gov.br>.
- 514 61. T. Yabe, K. Tsubouchi, N. Fujiwara, T. Wada, Y. Sekimoto, S. V. Ukkusuri, Non-
515 compulsory measures sufficiently reduced human mobility in Tokyo during the COVID-
516 19 epidemic. *Scientific reports* **10**, 1-9 (2020).
- 517 62. A. Cori, N. M. Ferguson, C. Fraser, S. Cauchemez, A new framework and software to
518 estimate time-varying reproduction numbers during epidemics. *American journal of*
519 *epidemiology* **178**, 1505-1512 (2013).
- 520 63. Q. Li, X. Guan, P. Wu, X. Wang, L. Zhou, Y. Tong, R. Ren, K. S. Leung, E. H. Lau, J. Y.
521 Wong, Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus-infected
522 pneumonia. *New England journal of medicine*, (2020).

523
524

525 **Acknowledgments**

526 We thank the High-performance Computing Platform of Peking University for providing the
527 computation resource.

528

529 **Funding:**

530 Beijing Social Science Foundation 20GLA003 (LL)

531 National Natural Science Foundation of China 52008005 (LL)

532 Institute of Public Governance, Peking University YQZX202005 (LL)

533

534 **Author contributions:**

535 Conceptualization: LL, HW

536 Methodology: LL, HW, ZZ

537 Investigation: ZZ, WZ, TL, CC, YW, DN, CT, OA

538 Visualization: LL, ZZ

539 Writing—original draft: LL

540 Writing—review & editing: LL, HW, TL

541

542 **Competing interests:** Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

543

544 **Data and materials availability:** Code and data are available on the following Github repository:

545 https://github.com/lunliu454/infect_place. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons

546 Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license, which permits unrestricted use, distribution,


547 and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. To view a copy of

548 this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

549


550

551 **Figures and Tables**



552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560

Fig. 1. Correlation between the status of activity spaces and other government interventions. The matrices show pairwise Kendall's correlation coefficients between the status of activity spaces and other government interventions across the spatial units in each country during the study period. Bold texts indicate the activity spaces and regular texts are the other government interventions that we control for. Grey cells indicate missing data. The correlation coefficients are estimated based on samples excluding unit-day observations where the coefficient of variance for R_t estimate is larger than 0.3 (suggesting unreliable estimates).



561
562
563
564
565

Fig. 2. Estimated impacts of closing individual types of activity spaces. The numbers are direct model outputs on the relationship between activity space status (0, 0.5 or 1) and $\Delta \log(R_t)$. Full results are presented in Table S2.





Fig. 3. Maximum joint impacts of closing a number of activity spaces. We show the maximum impacts that could be achieved by closing a given number of types of activity spaces, till the maximum joint impacts are produced.

566
567
568
569
570



571
572 **Fig. 4. Impact of activity space closures in settlements with different population size and**
573 **density. The error bars and ribbons indicate 95% confidence intervals.**
574

575
576

Table 1. Settlement characteristics on the fixed effects of spatial units

| Characteristics | Japan | United Kingdom | United States | Brazil |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Size | -0.118 (0.113) | -0.029** (0.0111) | -0.0219*** (0.00531) | - 0.0506*** (0.0139) |
| Density | -0.203 (0.392) | -0.00108 (0.00539) | 0.00453 (0.0201) | -0.0184** (0.00648) |
| Proportion of elderly population | -0.102 (2.29) | -0.0325 (0.2) | 0.535*** (0.155) | -0.228 (0.387) |
| Proportion of Black | - | -0.105 (0.425) | -0.000726 (0.000542) | - |
| Proportion of Asian | - | 0.162 (0.124) | 0.00304* (0.00148) | - |
| Personal income | -0.125 (0.105) | - | - 0.00686*** (0.000926) | 0.105* (0.0435) |
| GDP per capita | 0.00494 (0.00855) | -0.00123* (0.000592) | 0.002** (0.000635) | -0.000228 (0.000374) |
| (Intercept) | 0.781 (1.68) | -0.158** (0.0514) | 0.101** (0.0386) | 0.217*** (0.0463) |
| Observations | 44 | 234 | 307 | 319 |
| R-squared | 0.294 | 0.0622 | 0.345 | 0.125 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.198 | 0.0373 | 0.329 | 0.111 |

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584

Note: Results in this table are based on samples excluding outliers (Shimane in Japan, Mendip in the United Kingdom, and Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson, Pittsfield and San Angelo in the United States), so that the residuals are normally distributed (Shapiro-Wilk test $p > 0.05$). Results on full samples are very similar (shown in Table S4). The variance inflation factors are all below 7.