

# Appendix to Are We #Stayinghome to Flatten the Curve?

First Version April 5, 2020. This Version May 25, 2020

## A Data Discussion

### A.1 Location Data

Each device on a given date was assigned to the state where that device spent the longest time on that day. This assignment rule captures short-term travel across state borders and allows for temporary reassignment when travel takes a resident out of state for a longer period of time. It also allows for people to move their place of residence during the observation period and be reassigned to the new state. The pre-COVID-19 period is defined as the four weeks prior to and inclusive of March 8, 2020. The COVID-19 period therefore begins on March 9. Our mobility data sample period begins February 24, 2020 and ends April 29, 2020.

#### A.1.1 Average Distance Traveled

To capture the change in overall travel activity, we employ a measure of the change in average distance traveled per day during the COVID-19 period. To the extent that individuals in a given state are engaging in social distancing, working from home, or adhering to stay-at-home mandates, we expect average travel distances to fall relative to pre-COVID-19 norms. Travel activity is measured as the overall distance a device traveled in a day and is therefore independent of home location. The average distance traveled per day in a state is then given by the average across all devices assigned to that state on a given day:

$$\overline{ADT}_{it} = \frac{1}{N_{it}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{it}} Dist_{jit}$$

Where  $Dist_{jit}$  is the distance traveled by individual  $j$  in region  $i$  on date  $t$  and  $N_{it}$  is the number of mobile devices assigned to region  $i$  on date  $t$ . To obtain a relative measure of travel distance changes, a baseline is constructed. For each day of the week, the weekday-specific baseline is computed as the average distance traveled for that weekday in the pre-COVID-19 period:

$$\overline{ADT}_{iw}^B = \frac{1}{N_{iw}} \sum_{\ell \in L_w^B} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{i\ell}} Dist_{jil}$$

where  $L_w^B$  is the set of dates for day of week  $w$  in the pre-COVID-19 period and  $N_{iw}$  is the total number of users observed in region  $i$  on the four dates for weekday  $w$  during this period. As the pre-COVID-19 period contains four dates for each weekday,  $\overline{ADT}_{iw}^B$  is an average of all travel activity over those four days.

Then, for each COVID-19 date, the change in average distance traveled ( $\dot{ADT}$ ) in a given region is constructed as the percentage point change in travel activity relative to that day of week's baseline:

$$\dot{ADT}_{it} = \left( \frac{\overline{ADT}_{it}}{\overline{ADT}_{iw}^B} - 1 \right) \times 100 \quad (1)$$

A value of  $\dot{ADT}_{it} = 0$  indicates that the average distance traveled for individuals in state  $i$  on date  $t$  was identical to the pre-COVID-19 distance for that day of the week. A value of  $-7$  conveys that, on average, devices assigned to the state traveled an average distance 7 percentage points shorter than during the pre-COVID-19 baseline. This approach allows us to account for differences in travel potential by day of week, making sure our comparison accurately reflects the average conditions for that day of the week prior to behavior and policy changes due to COVID-19.

### A.1.2 Non-Essential Visits

Our utilized measure of the change in visits to non-essential businesses ( $\dot{NEV}$ ) offers a similar comparison targeted at travel to the types of businesses most heavily impacted by stay-at-home mandates. As travel to essential businesses (i.e. supermarkets and pharmacies) is not restricted by state stay-at-home mandates, the measure focuses only on visitations to points of interest likely affected by non-essential business closures. Businesses likely to be deemed “non-essential” include department stores, spas and salons, fitness facilities, event spaces, and many others; non-essential businesses are defined according to group definitions in both the Unacast SDK and the OpenStreetMaps POI’s to improve accuracy (see Table 1 for a complete list of included business types). Visitations to these businesses are then extracted from visitation data available in the Unacast SDK. The metric  $\dot{NEV}$  is constructed similarly to  $\dot{ADT}$ , replacing the average distance traveled per day with the average visitations to non-essential businesses:

$$\dot{NEV}_{it} = \left( \frac{\overline{NEV}_{it}}{\overline{NEV}_{iw}^B} - 1 \right) \times 100 \quad (2)$$

Where the baseline is again constructed as the average for a given weekday in the pre-COVID-19 period for a given state. A value of  $\dot{NEV}_{it} = 2$  indicates a two percentage point increase in visitations to non-essential businesses relative to baseline norms for that weekday in a given state.

### A.1.3 Measurement Concerns

Our utilized measure of changes in non-essential visits captures observed travel behavior to the types of businesses likely affected by state stay-at-home mandates and reflects both closures and modified business practices. While some categories of businesses were closed with near uniformity across state policies (i.e. casinos), others included exceptions for certain subgroups or under particular types of activity. For example, the particular restrictions across states on whether restaurants were required to suspend operation entirely or could continue offering orders for drive-through, curbside pickup, or delivery varied highly, with many states heavily restricting but still allowing home improvement stores to operate. In this manner, visitations to non-essential visits will never hit zero. While we do not expect to perfectly capture the particulars of each states’ policies, this measure is intended to provide a proxy that can speak to changes in observed behavior.

Further, the measure’s definition and our empirical approaches are able to control for many of the suspected sources of bias. The comparison to the pre-COVID-19 baseline for a given day of the week normalizes the value relative to visitation levels at a time not yet affected by COVID-19 concerns. In addition, our difference-and-differences and weighted event study are identified using residual variation remaining after partially off the averages for a given state, day of week, and date or state-specific cubic time trends. This eliminates measurement error concerns arising from differences in classification errors state to state, as our approach controls for any fixed distribution of business types in a state. General variation in classification error across states would introduce a source of attenuation bias that would drive our estimated treatment effects toward zero. One remaining scenario in which our estimates would be biased would be the case in which systematic variation existed over time in classification error that was correlated with travel to these stores and with the adoption of stay-at-home policies (or in the weighted event study case with time elapsed post-implementation). If our sample included an extensive period during which many states were modifying or eliminating their stay-at-home mandates, then we would be concerned with falsely attributing visitation changes due to mandate easings to their implementations. However, this would serve to introduce upward bias to our ATT estimates, leading to underestimation of the reductions in visitations due to stay-at-home mandates.

### A.1.4 Human Encounter Rate

The Unacast metric for human encounters follows that of [6] and is defined as

$$ENC_{it} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_{it}} Encounters_{jit} / Land Area_i}{E\bar{N}C^B}$$

Where  $Encounters$  is the sum of unique encounters across all devices  $N_{it}$  assigned to state  $i$  on date  $t$  and  $Land Area$  measures the square kilometers of land area for the state. An encounter is counted when two users from the same geographic area are observed within a 50 meter radius circle of each other for no more than 60

Table 1: Non-Essential Business Type

Category	Business Type
Unacast POIs	Restaurant (multiple kinds), Department Store, Clothing (multiple kinds), Footwear, Discount Stores, Jewelry, Computers + Consumer Electronics, Gifts, Seasonal, Books, Office Supplies, Hair, Cosmetics + Beauty Supplies, Gyms + Fitness Facilities, Communications, New/Used Car Dealers, Hotels, Used Products, “Crafts, Toys, and Hobbies”, Travel, “Spa, Massage, + Aesthetics”, Sports + Recreation, Weight Loss, Furnishings, Home + Housewares, Home Improvement + Building Supplies, “Printing, Copying + Publishing”, Theatres, Music, Amusement, Furnishing Rentals, Shared Offices + Coworking, Car Wash, Cannabis Retail, Flowers
OpenStreetMap “amenity” POIs	bar, pub, cafe, restaurant, theatre, nightclub, cinema, casino
OpenStreetMap “leisure” POIs	bowling_alley, fitness_centre, cafe, restaurant, theatre, nightclub
OpenStreetMap “shop” POIs	department_store, mall, clothes, shoes, doityourself, furniture, sports

minutes. In this way the numerator provides a normalized measure of encounters that is reflective of typical patterns for both rural and urban environments.

Encounters per square kilometer are then divided by the baseline encounter rate before subtracting off one. In contrast to the changes in average distance traveled and non-essential visits, Unacast uses “the national average encounter density during the 4 weeks that immediately precede COVID-19 outbreak (February 10th - March 8th)” (Ngo 2020). An absolute baseline is used here to better reflect the potential for infection in more densely populated areas. As a result,  $ENC_{it}$  is interpreted as the percentage point change in the encounter rate relative to the national pre-COVID-19 average. An encounter rate equal to that of the national baseline rate results in a value of  $ENC_{it} = 0$ , while a value of  $ENC_{it} = -12$  indicates a 12 percentage point reduction in the encounter rate for state  $i$  on date  $t$  relative to the “business-as-usual” national baseline. To convert the unique human encounter rate to a relative measure, we divide the Unacast-provided encounter rate for a given state and day by that state’s average for the observed portion of the baseline period (February 24 to March 8):

$$ENC_{it} = \left( \frac{\overline{ENC}_{it}}{\overline{ENC}_i^B} - 1 \right) \times 100 \quad (3)$$

In this way our employed encounter rate normalizes the encounter rate ratio relative to the baseline for a given state, reflecting the extent to which residents of a given state are reducing their encounter rate relative to that states’ pre-COVID-19 level.

## A.2 Health Data

We obtain information on hospitalizations and deaths from COVID-19 by state from the COVID Tracking Project [1]. Published values are obtained directly from the respective public health authorities, supplemented with additions from press conferences or trusted news sources. Controversy exists about how to measure deaths and whether all those that are truly COVID 19-related are being captured in existing counts, or only those for which the patient has been tested, which would result in the new daily death rate data we use to be under reported, but these are the most up to date health data available. In terms of the hospitalization data, there are 12 states and Washington D.C. that do not report a consistent time series of hospitalizations due to COVID-19, including three of the first four adopters: California, Delaware, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, Nebraska, New Jersey, Nevada, Texas, and Washington., resulting in missing values for the hospitalization analysis.

We provide here additional patterns for the evolution of average death and hospitalization rates by day across states. We split states into two groups and report the averages separately for states that exhibit larger than median and lower than median drops in mobility and encounter rates. Looking at the time patterns for states that experience the largest reductions in mobility and distinguish from the average death rates for

the states that experience the lowest mobility reductions (lower than the median drop), as measured by daily changes in average distance traveled, we show in Figure 1 that the increase in death rates is steeper for those states that have the smallest reductions in mobility. The hospitalization evolution is noisier as show in the bottom panel. The patterns are similar for the break down by reductions in encounter rates as shown in both panels in Figure 2.




Figure 1: Source: Health Data source COVID-19 Tracking Project. The evolution is broken up by two groups of states, those with drops in the change in average distance traveled ( $\dot{ADT}$ ) larger than the median drop by state, and those with drops lower than the median (where the median drop is -30.9%). The states with higher than median drop in CADT are: AK, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, HI, IL, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, NH, NJ, NV, NY, OH, PA, RI, VT, WA, WI. The red vertical line indicates March 19, the date the first state policy was implemented in California.

### A.3 Health Data Quality

While all states report both the change and running total of deaths, reporting of hospitalizations is less consistent and often incomplete. Tables 2 and 3 summarize the data quality and coverage for deaths and hospitalizations across all states and Washington D.C. for states reporting and not reporting hospitalization data, respectively. As of May 2, 37 states report at least two days of hospitalization data while 13 and Washington D.C. report no hospitalization data. While state consistently report between 30 and 60 days of death data as both daily changes and running totals, hospitalization data is much more sparse and reported in different ways by different states. Alaska and Connecticut report hospitalization as both the daily change and running total, while the remaining 35 states only report the cumulative number of hospitalization by date. Hospitalization data coverage ranges from a minimum of 2 days (Connecticut) to a maximum of 42 days (Colorado, Florida, Massachusetts, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, and Oklahoma). As we utilize the daily change per 100 million residents as outcomes of interest in our main analyses, we convert all hospitalization data provided as sums only to the daily change before dividing by 100 million population.

## Evolution of Death and Hospitalization Rates by Encounter Rate drops




Figure 2: Source: Health Data source COVID-19 Tracking Project. The evolution is broken up by two groups of states, those with drops in the change in the rate of unique human encounters ( $\dot{E}ND$ ) larger than the median drop by state, and those with drops lower than the median (where the median drop is  $-71.6\%$ ). The states with drops smaller than the median are AK, AZ, DC, DE, IA, ID, IN, KS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, OH, SC, SD, UT, VA, WV, WY. The red vertical line indicates March 19, the date the first state policy was implemented in California.

To evaluate overall data quality by state, CVT assigns a quality grade. This letter grade is assigned by analyzing 16 different factors across 5 categories. These factors include reporting characteristics (“Is the state’s official COVID-19 website the best source that exists for that state’s consistent, reliably updated data,” and “Does the state format its COVID-19 data in a machine-readable way?”), testing data completeness (“Is the state reporting the total number of positive test results,” “Is the state reporting the total number of negative test results,” and “Is the state reporting the total number of tests conducted?”), reporting on patient outcomes (“Is the state reporting how many patients are hospitalized with COVID-19,” “Is the state reporting how many patients with COVID-19 are being treated in ICUs,” “Is the state reporting how many patients with COVID-19 are on ventilators,” and “Is the state reporting how many patients have recovered from COVID-19?”), demographic reporting (“Is reported data broken down by patients’ pre-existing conditions,” “Does the state break down reported COVID-19 cases into racial categories,” “Does the state break down reported COVID-19 cases into ethnic categories,” “Does the state break down reported COVID-19 deaths into racial categories,” and “Does the state break down reported COVID-19 deaths into ethnic categories”), along with whether the state reports hospital capacity and report data in the form of line lists [1]. As the grades combine reporting for testing with mortality and morbidity and demographic reporting, these grades are best interpreted as a measure of the completeness of reporting.

Mortality and morbidity data obtained from CVT correlate strongly with other sources of COVID-19 health data. We chose CVT as our main source of health outcome data as they were found to balance transparency with coverage and stood as the most complete source of hospitalization data. To provide evidence for the insensitivity of our health findings to our choice of data source, we next compare our utilized mortality data

to that from two other major sources. In Table 4 we present the correlations of COVID-19 mortality data from three sources: CVT, the New York Times’ “Coronavirus (Covid-19) Data in the United States” project [5], and the COVID-19 Data Repository by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University [4].

Table 2: Health Data Quality, States Reporting Hospitalization Data

	State /District	Quality Grade	Days of Death Data	Form of Death Data	Days of Hosp. Data	Form of Hosp. Data
1	Alabama	B	48	Change and Sum	28	Sum only
2	Alaska	C	57	Change and Sum	33	Change and Sum
3	Arizona	A+	50	Change and Sum	8	Sum only
4	Arkansas	B	41	Change and Sum	27	Sum only
5	Colorado	B	49	Change and Sum	42	Sum only
6	Connecticut	B	44	Change and Sum	2	Change and Sum
7	Florida	C	52	Change and Sum	42	Sum only
8	Georgia	A+	50	Change and Sum	38	Sum only
9	Hawaii	B	31	Change and Sum	39	Sum only
10	Idaho	C	41	Change and Sum	35	Sum only
11	Iowa	A	38	Change and Sum	16	Sum only
12	Kansas	A	49	Change and Sum	36	Sum only
13	Kentucky	A	47	Change and Sum	22	Sum only
14	Maine	B	36	Change and Sum	33	Sum only
15	Maryland	A	44	Change and Sum	37	Sum only
16	Massachusetts	A	45	Change and Sum	42	Sum only
17	Minnesota	A	42	Change and Sum	41	Sum only
18	Mississippi	B	43	Change and Sum	41	Sum only
19	Montana	C	35	Change and Sum	37	Sum only
20	New Hampshire	C	39	Change and Sum	39	Sum only
21	New Mexico	C	38	Change and Sum	18	Sum only
22	New York	B	48	Change and Sum	42	Sum only
23	North Dakota	C	50	Change and Sum	42	Sum only
24	Ohio	B	43	Change and Sum	42	Sum only
25	Oklahoma	A	44	Change and Sum	42	Sum only
26	Oregon	A	45	Change and Sum	41	Sum only
27	Pennsylvania	B	45	Change and Sum	11	Sum only
28	Rhode Island	A+	34	Change and Sum	19	Sum only
29	South Carolina	B	47	Change and Sum	38	Sum only
30	South Dakota	C	45	Change and Sum	32	Sum only
31	Tennessee	B	40	Change and Sum	38	Sum only
32	Utah	C	48	Change and Sum	32	Sum only
33	Vermont	C	43	Change and Sum	13	Sum only
34	Virginia	B	48	Change and Sum	38	Sum only
35	West Virginia	C	48	Change and Sum	17	Sum only
36	Wisconsin	A+	43	Change and Sum	32	Sum only
37	Wyoming	C	36	Change and Sum	36	Sum only

This table summarizes the quality and coverage of health data obtained from the Covid Tracking Project (CVT) for states reporting hospitalization data. *Quality Grade* reports the letter grade assigned by CVT representing the overall data quality based on 16 categories (see the Data Appendix discussion for these categories). *Sum* indicates that the State health authority only reports the cumulative total, while *Change and Sum* indicates they report both the daily change and running total.

Table 5 provides rankings of states on counts of health outcomes and intensities per million. The gray rows reflect the first four states to adopt statewide stay-at-home mandates, with the table reporting the 15 states with the highest overall incidences of mortality and morbidity from COVID-19.

Table 3: Health Data Quality, States Not Reporting Hospitalization Data

	State /District	Quality Grade	Days of Death Data	Form of Death Data	Days of Hosp. Data	Form of Hosp. Data
1	California	B	51	Change and Sum	0	NA
2	Delaware	B	44	Change and Sum	0	NA
3	Illinois	A	46	Change and Sum	0	NA
4	Indiana	A+	49	Change and Sum	0	NA
5	Louisiana	B	48	Change and Sum	0	NA
6	Michigan	A+	44	Change and Sum	0	NA
7	Missouri	A	49	Change and Sum	0	NA
8	Nebraska	D	44	Change and Sum	0	NA
90	Nevada	D	47	Change and Sum	0	NA
10	New Jersey	A+	52	Change and Sum	0	NA
11	North Carolina	B	47	Change and Sum	0	NA
12	Texas	B	46	Change and Sum	0	NA
13	Washington	B	66	Change and Sum	0	NA
14	Washington D.C.	B	44	Change and Sum	0	NA

This table summarizes the quality and coverage of health data obtained from the Covid Tracking Project (CVT) for states not reporting hospitalization data. *CVT Quality Grade* reports the letter grade assigned by CVT representing the overall data quality based on 16 categories (see the Data Appendix discussion for these categories). *Sum* indicates that the State health authority only reports the cumulative total, while *Change and Sum* indicates they report both the daily change and running total.

Table 4: Correlation of COVID-19 Deaths by State and Sources

State	Cor(CVT, NYT)	Cor(CVT, JH)	Cor(JH, NYT)	Cor(CVT, NYT)	Cor(CVT, JH)	Cor(JH, NYT)
AK	0.9993	0.9999	0.9991	0.9958	1	0.9958
AL	0.9999	0.9998	0.9998	0.9993	0.9992	0.9994
AR	0.9997	0.9991	0.9991	0.9989	0.9983	0.9995
AZ	1	1	1	0.9999	0.9987	0.9986
CA	0.9994	0.9995	0.9999	0.9994	0.9995	0.9999
CO	0.9993	0.999	0.9992	0.9973	0.9971	0.9991
CT	0.9997	0.9998	0.9999	0.9998	0.9999	1
DC	1	1	1	1	1	1
DE	0.9993	0.9993	1	0.9991	0.9991	0.9999
FL	0.9998	0.9998	0.9999	0.9996	0.9996	0.9998
GA	0.9996	0.9999	0.9995	0.9994	0.9998	0.9993
HI	0.9988	0.9974	0.9968	0.987	0.9924	0.9915
IA	1	1	1	0.9997	0.9999	0.9995
ID	0.9968	0.9995	0.9977	0.9973	0.9996	0.9972
IL	1	1	1	1	1	1
IN	1	1	1	0.9988	0.9991	0.9982
KS	0.9998	0.9995	0.9998	0.9995	0.9987	0.9994
KY	0.9991	0.9992	0.9991	0.999	0.9989	0.9992
LA	1	1	1	1	0.9997	0.9997
MA	0.9996	0.9994	0.9999	0.9899	0.9861	0.9992
MD	1	1	1	1	0.9931	0.9931
ME	1	0.9996	0.9996	1	0.9994	0.9994
MI	0.998	0.998	1	1	0.9997	0.9997
MN	1	0.9999	0.9999	1	0.9999	0.9999
MO	1	0.9997	0.9997	0.9968	0.9973	0.9978
MS	1	1	1	1	1	1
MT	0.999	0.9995	0.9987	0.995	0.9965	0.9939
NC	1	0.9999	0.9999	0.9995	0.999	0.9989
ND	1	0.9997	0.9998	0.999	0.9949	0.9947
NE	0.9986	0.9983	0.9995	0.9958	0.999	0.9955
NH	0.9991	0.9984	0.9985	0.9964	0.9974	0.9964
NJ	1	1	1	1	0.9999	0.9999
NM	0.9993	0.9988	0.9991	0.9983	0.9981	0.9978
NV	0.9998	0.9996	0.9997	0.9989	0.9993	0.9985
NY	1	1	1	1	0.9975	0.9975
OH	0.9997	0.9997	1	1	0.9999	0.9999
OK	1	0.9999	0.9999	1	1	1
OR	0.9998	0.9995	0.9995	0.9989	0.999	0.9991
PA	0.9998	0.9998	1	0.9954	0.997	0.9994
RI	1	0.9993	0.9993	0.997	0.9965	0.9989
SC	0.9994	0.9994	0.9999	0.9975	0.9972	0.9992
SD	1	1	1	0.9991	0.9991	1
TN	0.9998	0.9992	0.9992	0.9992	0.9987	0.9987
TX	0.9998	0.9998	0.9999	0.9996	0.9996	0.9997
UT	1	0.9999	0.9999	1	0.9979	0.9979
VA	1	1	1	1	0.9998	0.9998
VT	0.9999	0.9999	1	0.9991	0.9997	0.9989
WA	0.9989	0.9987	0.9996	0.9971	0.9968	0.9998
WI	1	0.9999	0.9999	0.9997	0.9996	0.9998
WV	0.9995	0.9997	0.9993	0.9983	0.9982	0.9983
WY	0.9839	0.9711	0.9774	1	0.9746	0.9746

This table reports the correlations in death counts by state from the Covid Tracking Project (CVT), The New York Times (NYT), and the COVID-19 Data Repository at Johns Hopkins University (JH).



Table 5: State Ranks on Mortality and Morbidity from COVID-19

State	SAH Date	1st Case	1st Death	Tests Count	Tests /M	Cases Count	Cases /M	Hosp. /M	Deaths /M
WA	3-23	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	1
NY	3-22	8	6	2	5	2	3	5	5
CA	3-19	3	2	3	21	4	26	11	11
MA	3-24*	5	28	7	15	6	4	13	13
OR	3-23	6	12	17	16	21	21	4	4
FL	4-03	9	3	14	36	7	18	8	8
NJ	3-21	13	4	22	42	5	7	6	6
IL	3-21	2	17	8	23	8	14	20	20
LA	3-23	37	11	20	29	9	5	2	2
MI	3-24	36	22	4	12	1	1	33	33
SD	NA	40	5	26	6	46	28	3	3
ME	4-02	41	45	12	3	27	9	31	31
VT	3-25	28	25	19	4	42	11	48	48
NM	3-24	39	40	6	2	35	27	40	40
AZ	3-31	4	32	46	49	38	49	23	23

This table presents the timing of state stay-at-home mandates and rankings on health outcome counts and intensities per million residents for the pre-mandate period of February 24 to March 18. A ranking of 6 indicates the state was the sixth earliest to report its first case or death, or had the sixth highest count or level per million residents over the period. \*Massachusetts Governor Charlie Baker issued a stay-at-home “advisory” on March 24 that fell short of a formal order.

## B Decomposition of the Difference-in-Differences Mandate Effect

To better understand how our stay-at-home mandate effect estimates are weighted combinations of all possible two-by-two ATT estimates, we decompose the treatment effects for the staggered difference-in-differences estimator into their component two-by-two DD effects following ???. For analyses using variation in treatment timing for only early adopters, the obtained treatment effect can be decomposed into 9 component two-by-two effects:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{CA vs. Untreated: } \hat{\beta}_{1U} &= (\bar{Y}_1^{Post(1)} - \bar{Y}_1^{Pre(1)}) - (\bar{Y}_U^{Post(1)} - \bar{Y}_U^{Pre(1)}) \\
 \text{IL, and NJ vs. Untreated: } \hat{\beta}_{2U} &= (\bar{Y}_2^{Post(2)} - \bar{Y}_2^{Pre(2)}) - (\bar{Y}_U^{Post(2)} - \bar{Y}_U^{Pre(2)}) \\
 \text{NY vs. Untreated: } \hat{\beta}_{3U} &= (\bar{Y}_3^{Post(3)} - \bar{Y}_3^{Pre(3)}) - (\bar{Y}_U^{Post(3)} - \bar{Y}_U^{Pre(3)}) \\
 \text{CA vs. IL and NJ, Early: } \hat{\beta}_{12}^1 &= (\bar{Y}_1^{Mid(1,2)} - \bar{Y}_1^{Pre(1)}) - (\bar{Y}_2^{Mid(1,2)} - \bar{Y}_2^{Pre(1)}) \\
 \text{CA vs. NY, Early: } \hat{\beta}_{13}^1 &= (\bar{Y}_1^{Mid(1,3)} - \bar{Y}_1^{Pre(1)}) - (\bar{Y}_3^{Mid(1,3)} - \bar{Y}_3^{Pre(1)}) \\
 \text{IL and NJ vs. NY, Early: } \hat{\beta}_{23}^2 &= (\bar{Y}_2^{Mid(2,3)} - \bar{Y}_2^{Pre(2)}) - (\bar{Y}_3^{Mid(2,3)} - \bar{Y}_3^{Pre(2)}) \\
 \text{IL and NJ vs CA, Late: } \hat{\beta}_{12}^2 &= (\bar{Y}_2^{Post(2)} - \bar{Y}_2^{Mid(1,2)}) - (\bar{Y}_1^{Post(2)} - \bar{Y}_1^{Mid(1,2)}) \\
 \text{NY vs. IL and NJ, Late: } \hat{\beta}_{23}^3 &= (\bar{Y}_3^{Post(3)} - \bar{Y}_3^{Mid(2,3)}) - (\bar{Y}_2^{Post(3)} - \bar{Y}_2^{Mid(2,3)}) \\
 \text{NY vs. CA, Late: } \hat{\beta}_{13}^3 &= (\bar{Y}_3^{Post(3)} - \bar{Y}_3^{Mid(1,3)}) - (\bar{Y}_1^{Post(3)} - \bar{Y}_1^{Mid(1,3)})
 \end{aligned}$$

$\hat{\beta}_{1U}$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_{2U}$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_{3U}$  report the difference-in-difference estimators obtained by comparing each group of early adopters (CA, IL and NJ, and NY) in turn to states that never adopt a stay-at-home mandate during the sample period, with pre and post-periods defined relative to the date of that group's mandate implementation.  $\hat{\beta}_{12}^1$  is the DD estimator obtained by comparing California's outcome to the average for IL and NJ, restricting to the period before California's mandate went into effect (*Pre(1)*, February 24 to March 18) and the period between California's implementation and the day before IL and NJ's implementation (*Mid(1, 2)*, March 19-22).  $\hat{\beta}_{13}^1$  and  $\hat{\beta}_{23}^2$  report DD estimates for equivalent comparisons for CA to NY, and IL and NJ to NY, respectively.  $\hat{\beta}_{12}^2$  is the DD estimate for the comparison of IL and NJ to California for the periods after IL and NJ's implementations (*Post(2)*, March 22-April 29) and the period between California and IL/NJ's implementation (*Mid(1, 2)*, March 19-22).  $\hat{\beta}_{23}^3$  and  $\hat{\beta}_{13}^3$  are equivalent estimates for the comparisons of NY to IL and NJ and NY to CA during these later periods, respectively. Table 6 summarizes the components of these two-by-two estimators for the two-way fixed effects control scheme presented in the main body.

Table 6: Components of Goodman-Bacon (2019) two-by-two DD Estimators

Group	Description
$k = 1$	California ( $t_1^* = \text{March 19}$ )
$k = 2$	Illinois and New Jersey ( $t_2^* = \text{March 22}$ )
$k = 3$	New York ( $t_3^* = \text{March 23}$ )
U	States that adopt later or never adopt SAH mandates (46)
Period	Description
<i>Post(1)</i>	March 19 - April 29
<i>Post(2)</i>	March 22 - April 29
<i>Post(3)</i>	March 23 - April 29
<i>Pre(1)</i>	February 24 - March 18
<i>Pre(2)</i>	February 24 - March 21
<i>Pre(3)</i>	February 24 - March 22
<i>Mid(1, 2)</i>	March 19 - March 21
<i>Mid(1, 3)</i>	March 19 - March 22
<i>Mid(2, 3)</i>	March 22

This table reports components of the two-by-two difference-in-differences estimators resulting from the Goodman-Bacon (2019) decomposition. Treatment is defined as equal to one when each of the first 4 adopters of stay-at-home mandates has their mandate in place, and is equal to zero otherwise. The estimated model includes state and date fixed effects.

Figures 3 to 5 plot the simple two-by-two estimates by magnitude and weight, while Tables 7, 8, and 9 report these estimates and discuss the variation used for comparison. Across all three measures of travel activity we see that the overwhelming majority of the overall DD estimator’s weight is coming from the comparison of treatment cohorts to late adoption states and pure control states. These “Treated vs Untreated” comparisons contribute 99% of the DD estimators for each outcome.<sup>1</sup> As is typical of the staggered DD estimator, the units adopting first or last receive less weight than those adopting in the middle, with the comparison of Illinois and New Jersey to control units receiving 50% of the estimator’s weight, relative to 24% and 25% for equivalent comparisons for California and New York, respectively. Given that variation in adoption timing within the first four adopters only spans the period March 19 - March 23, it is reasonable to expect both noisier estimates and low weights for these within-treatment group comparisons.

---

<sup>1</sup>As each outcome uses the same panel data with identical adoption timing, the timing cohorts and comparisons are the same across models, resulting in identical weights across the outcomes.

Figure 3: Composite Two-by-Two ATT Estimators for Early Adopters' Stay-at-Home Mandates, Average Distance Traveled




Table 7: Goodman-Bacon Decomposition of Early Mandate Effect for Changes in Average Daily Distance Traveled

Comparison	Type	Estimate	Weight
CA vs. Late/Never Mandate	Treated vs Untreated	-0.413	0.240
IL and NJ vs. Late/Never Mandate	Treated vs Untreated	-4.562	0.502
NY vs. Late/Never Mandate	Treated vs Untreated	-8.079	0.254
IL and NJ vs. CA	Later vs Earlier Treated	-5.070	0.001
NY vs. CA	Later vs Earlier Treated	-6.786	0.001
CA vs. IL and NJ	Earlier vs Later Treated	-0.144	0.001
NY vs. IL and NJ	Later vs Earlier Treated	-7.762	0.0004
CA vs. NY	Earlier vs Later Treated	2.579	0.0005
IL and NJ vs. NY	Earlier vs Later Treated	-3.617	0.0003

This table reports the two-by-two Difference-in-Difference estimates obtained through the Goodman-Bacon (2019) decomposition of the staggered Difference-in-Differences estimate.

### B.0.1 Non-Essential Visits

Figure 4: Composite Two-by-Two ATT Estimators for Early Adopters' Stay-at-Home Mandates, Non-Essential Visits




Table 8: Goodman-Bacon Decomposition of Early Mandate Effect for Changes in Visits to Non-essential Businesses

Comparison	Type	Estimate	Weight
CA vs. Late/Never Mandate	Treated vs Untreated	-3.234	0.240
IL and NJ vs. Late/Never Mandate	Treated vs Untreated	-6.059	0.502
NY vs. Late/Never Mandate	Treated vs Untreated	-8.880	0.254
IL and NJ vs. CA	Later vs Earlier Treated	-2.607	0.001
NY vs. CA	Later vs Earlier Treated	-7.314	0.001
CA vs. IL and NJ	Earlier vs Later Treated	0.642	0.001
NY vs. IL and NJ	Later vs Earlier Treated	-10.463	0.0004
CA vs. NY	Earlier vs Later Treated	-1.259	0.0005
IL and NJ vs. NY	Earlier vs Later Treated	-7.189	0.0003

This table reports the two-by-two Difference-in-Difference estimates obtained through the Goodman-Bacon (2019) decomposition of the staggered Difference-in-Differences estimate.

## B.0.2 Human Encounter Rate

Figure 5: Composite Two-by-Two ATT Estimators for Early Adopters' Stay-at-Home Mandates, Human Encounter Rate




Table 9: Goodman-Bacon Decomposition of Early Mandate Effect for Changes in Human Encounters

Comparison	Type	Estimate	Weight
CA vs. Late/Never Mandate	Treated vs Untreated	-7.493	0.240
IL and NJ vs. Late/Never Mandate	Treated vs Untreated	-5.158	0.502
NY vs. Late/Never Mandate	Treated vs Untreated	-9.824	0.254
IL and NJ vs. CA	Later vs Earlier Treated	-1.765	0.001
NY vs. CA	Later vs Earlier Treated	-4.692	0.001
CA vs. IL and NJ	Earlier vs Later Treated	-3.586	0.001
NY vs. IL and NJ	Later vs Earlier Treated	-6.216	0.0004
CA vs. NY	Earlier vs Later Treated	-1.527	0.0005
IL and NJ vs. NY	Earlier vs Later Treated	-1.222	0.0003

This table reports the two-by-two Difference-in-Difference estimates obtained through the Goodman-Bacon (2019) decomposition of the staggered Difference-in-Differences estimate.

## B.1 All States

The following Figures 6, 7, and 8 replicate the Goodman-Bacon decomposition for analyses identifying the ATT using variation in stay-at-home mandate adoption for all states that ever adopt such a mandate. Tables 10, 11, and 12 report the number, weight, and average ATT for each of the three comparison types. As there is much more variation timing when comparing across all 43 adopters, the staggered DD ATT can now be decomposed into 324 unique two-by-two estimators. Across all three travel behavior variables, considerably more weight is now placed on within-treatment group comparisons. Weight of 0.22 is placed on the 153 unique DD estimates for comparisons of earlier versus later treated states while 0.21 of the weight falls on later versus earlier treated comparisons. The remaining 0.56-0.57 weight is placed on pairwise comparisons of each of the 18 treatment timing cohorts to the eight states that never adopt statewide stay-at-home mandates. The greater heterogeneity in policy timing and characteristics across states is clear in the greater variation of simple DD estimates for each type of comparison. However, while some positive comparisons are obtained, they represent a small fraction of the total estimates. For example, only 2 positive ATT estimates are obtained across all 54 Treated vs Untreated comparisons for the three outcomes. Further, the mean ATT for each type of comparison is negative for all groups and all outcomes, with estimates narrowed to each comparison group spanning a maximum of -2.4 and a minimum of 6.2. Taken together, results of the decomposition provide evidence that our overall travel activity ATT estimates are not dependent on a single outlier or a single type of comparison, and instead reflect a weighted average of three types of overwhelmingly negative comparisons for both early adopters and all statewide stay-at-home mandates.

B.1.1 ADT

Figure 6: Composite Two-by-Two ATT Estimators for All Stay-at-Home Mandates, Average Distance Traveled




Table 10: Goodman-Bacon Decomposition of Stay-at-Home Mandate Effect for Changes in Average Daily Distance Traveled

Comparison	# Estimates	Mean ATT	Comparison Weight
Earlier vs Later Treated	153	-4.35725611053187	0.222993516414937
Later vs Earlier Treated	153	-2.94084195412212	0.212906914901793
Treated vs Untreated	18	-6.23110265912831	0.56409956868327

This table reports the two-by-two Difference-in-Difference estimates obtained through the Goodman-Bacon (2019) decomposition of the staggered Difference-in-Differences estimate.



Figure 7: Composite Two-by-Two ATT Estimators for All Stay-at-Home Mandates, Non-Essential Visits




Table 11: Goodman-Bacon Decomposition of Stay-at-Home Mandate Effect for Changes in Visits to Non-essential Businesses

Comparison	# Estimates	Mean ATT	Comparison Weight
Earlier vs Later Treated	153	-5.21461683816542	0.222993516414937
Later vs Earlier Treated	153	-3.57701462714068	0.212906914901793
Treated vs Untreated	18	-4.74305651148359	0.56409956868327

This table reports the two-by-two Difference-in-Difference estimates obtained through the Goodman-Bacon (2019) decomposition of the staggered Difference-in-Differences estimate.

Figure 8: Composite Two-by-Two ATT Estimators for All Stay-at-Home Mandates, Human Encounter Rate




Table 12: Goodman-Bacon Decomposition of Stay-at-Home Mandate Effect for Changes in Human Encounters


Comparison	# Estimates	Mean ATT	Comparison Weight
Earlier vs Later Treated	153	-5.6064735884707	0.220057481496554
Later vs Earlier Treated	153	-2.42647924157108	0.210214411069003
Treated vs Untreated	18	-4.75096341281997	0.569728107434443

This table reports the two-by-two Difference-in-Difference estimates obtained through the Goodman-Bacon (2019) decomposition of the staggered Difference-in-Differences estimate.

## C Weighted Event Study Estimates across $\nu$

Figures 9, 10, and 11 plot the overall ATT estimates for each travel outcome across possible values of  $\nu$ , illustrating how a shift from separate to pooled SCM weights affect our conclusions. Estimates across all three mobility measures remain highly stable for any choice of  $\nu$ . When fitting separate synthetic controls to each state ( $\nu = 0$ ), we obtain an overall ATT estimate for average distance traveled of  $-7.29$ . As the weighting shifts to pool SCM weights, the ATT estimate rises slightly before reaching its maximum at  $-6.47$  with  $\nu = 0.48$  and falling to  $-6.52$  for a purely pooled SCM control. Estimated mandate effects for non-essential visits yield a similar shape, beginning with a minimum of  $-4.38$  for separate SCM, peaking at  $-4.14$  at  $\nu = 0.2$  with one-fifth weight on the pooled weights, and remaining within 0.05 percentage points for values of  $\nu$  up to and including one. The human encounter rate begins highly stable as  $\nu$  rises, ranging between  $-5.87$  and  $-5.8$  for values of  $\nu$  up to 0.8. The point estimate rises more rapidly as the weight rests even further on the pooled SCM weights, reaching a maximum of  $-4.98$  for the perfectly pooled case.

Figure 9: Overall Weighted Event Study ATT Estimates by  $\nu$ , Average Distance Traveled




## D Complementary Analysis Using Google's COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports

To understand how our findings persist across alternate measures of travel activity and social distancing, we next replicate results using data obtained from Google's COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports [3].

### D.1 Correlations of Google Measures and Unacast Measures

First, we provide a comprehensive comparison of the Unacast data to the Google Mobility Report data [3]. We provide evidence that the data we employ is nearly perfectly correlated with this other source, such that our findings are not likely due to spurious measurement in the specific source of data used.

Figure 10: Overall Weighted Event Study ATT Estimates by  $\nu$ , Non-Essential Visits




We compare the Unacast measures to comparable data from google, as a full correlation analysis between each of the three Unacast measures and the available google mobility trend measures. The correlation tables are provided here and referenced in the main paper when we discuss how Unacast data-set compares to other available data, attesting to the quality of the measures used in the paper.

The change in distance traveled measure we use displays very high correlations with travel data produced by other sources. To investigate the validity of our measures, we compare all the three Unacast measures with the mobility report measures from the Google’s COVID-19 Community Mobility Report for the relative change for retail and recreation travel.<sup>2</sup> Table 13 reports the minimum, average, and maximum correlations between state specific Unacast and google mobility measures. In column 1 we focus on the correlations between changes in average distance traveled (CADT) and the Google measure related to recreation and retail. Column 2 focuses on correlations between Unacast measure for non essential visits (NEV) and the google recreation and retail measure. We see that the lowest state correlation between CADT and google is for the state of Wyoming, with a correlation of 0.75, and the lowest state correlation between NV and google is for the state of Mississippi, with a correlation of 0.961.

The full set of correlations by state is given in Table 14. Overall the levels of correlation are very high, and do not vary systematically between states that adopt mandates and those that never adopt such policies. For instance, for California we observe a correlation of 0.97, while for New York we observe a correlation of 0.98. The activity measures remain highly correlated when considering all the states. These strong relationships across data providers suggest that our results are indicative of general mobility patterns and not spurious, arising from anomalies of our chosen data source.

<sup>2</sup>Google. 2020. “COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports.” Accessed March 27, 2020.

Figure 11: Overall Weighted Event Study ATT Estimates by  $\nu$ , Human Encounter Rate



## E Complementary Analysis of Stay-at-Home Mandate Effects using Google Mobility Data

We estimate the model of changes in mobility measures as a function of mandate treatment controlling for state-specific trends. Tables 15 and 16 present the results for all mandates and for the first four mandates separately. We see in Table 15 the estimated average treatment effects for the early first 4 mandates, where each column corresponds to each of the six categories of google mobility measures. The category of grocery/pharmacy travel experiences a significant drop of 14.8 percentage points due to early implemented first 4 state mandates, the change for the park’s category is not significant, retail and recreation category mobility drops significantly by 4.9 percentage points, and work mobility measure also drops significantly by 2.3 percentage points. There is no significant change in the transit category mobility measure and finally the measure for staying at home increases significantly by 1.4 percentage points due to the first 4 early mandates.

Turning now to using all state mandates, we see in Table 16 the estimated average treatment effects for all mandates, where each column corresponds to each of the six categories of google mobility measures. The category of grocery/pharmacy travel experiences a significant drop of 8.8 percentage points due to implemented

Table 13: Average, Min, and Max Correlations by State, Unacast and Google Activity Measures

	Google and $\dot{A}DT$	Google and $\dot{N}EV$
Min	0.750	0.962
Average	0.949	0.981
Max	0.988	0.993

Source: Google and Unacast. This table presents minimum, average, and maximum correlations by states between the Google “Retail and Recreation” measure and the utilized measures of changes in average distance traveled ( $\dot{A}DT$ ) and non-essential visits ( $\dot{N}EV$ ) obtained from Unavast. The minimum correlation for  $\dot{A}DT$  is WY, and the minimum correlation for  $\dot{N}EV$  is for MS.

Table 14: Correlations Between Google Retail and Rec Measure and Unacast Measures by State

State	corr(Google,CADT)	corr(Google,NEV)
AK	0.956	0.963
AL	0.952	0.966
AR	0.931	0.963
AZ	0.976	0.984
CA	0.976	0.983
CO	0.979	0.988
CT	0.970	0.983
DC	0.980	0.988
DE	0.962	0.983
FL	0.988	0.987
GA	0.965	0.979
HI	0.943	0.985
IA	0.907	0.976
ID	0.907	0.978
IL	0.960	0.987
IN	0.926	0.985
KS	0.955	0.976
KY	0.937	0.982
LA	0.964	0.971
MA	0.979	0.985
MD	0.972	0.986
ME	0.936	0.978
MI	0.968	0.987
MN	0.963	0.982
MO	0.956	0.977
MS	0.956	0.962
MT	0.886	0.986
NC	0.956	0.977
ND	0.911	0.987
NE	0.943	0.980
NH	0.938	0.976
NJ	0.977	0.979
NM	0.938	0.982
NV	0.984	0.993
NY	0.980	0.989
OH	0.945	0.986
OK	0.962	0.974
OR	0.950	0.987
PA	0.957	0.988
RI	0.969	0.979
SC	0.956	0.980
SD	0.906	0.981
VA	0.973	0.985
VT	0.961	0.978
WA	0.967	0.983
WI	0.934	0.980
WV	0.941	0.983
WY	0.750	0.980

Source: Google and Unacast. Min correlation CADT and google is WY, and the minimum correktion between NEV and google measure MS.

Table 15: Effect of Early States' Stay-at-Home Mandates, Google Analysis

	(1) Gro/Phar	(2) Park	(3) Ret/Rec	(4) Transit	(5) Work	(6) Home
$SAH_{it}$	-0.148*** (0.026)	-0.111 (0.083)	-0.049*** (0.018)	0.014 (0.015)	-0.023* (0.013)	0.014** (0.006)
$N$	2856	2856	2855	2856	2855	2856
$R^2$	0.910	0.481	0.976	0.973	0.962	0.974
F	170.801	14.651	868.500	753.952	2107.570	942.221

Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ . These models estimate the effect of the first four statewide stay-at-home mandates on Google's measures of travel activity from their COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports. The dependent variables measure the change in percentage points for the same day of the week relative to baseline levels for Grocery and Pharmacy (1), Parks (2), Retail and Recreation (3), Transit Stations (4), Workplace (5), Residential (6). All columns include state-specific cubic trends, state fixed effects, and day fixed effects.

Table 16: Effect of All States' Stay-at-Home Mandates, Google Analysis

	(1) Gro/Phar	(2) Park	(3) Ret/Rec	(4) Transit	(5) Work	(6) Home
$SAH_{it}$	-0.088*** (0.007)	-0.182*** (0.033)	-0.062*** (0.005)	-0.026*** (0.005)	-0.029*** (0.003)	0.017*** (0.002)
$N$	2856	2856	2855	2856	2855	2856
$R^2$	0.917	0.487	0.977	0.973	0.962	0.974
F	184.717	14.552	933.192	769.751	2269.409	996.257

Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ . These models estimate the effect of all statewide stay-at-home mandates on Google's measures of travel activity from their COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports. The dependent variables measure the change in percentage points for the same day of the week relative to baseline levels for Grocery and Pharmacy (1), Parks (2), Retail and Recreation (3), Transit Stations (4), Workplace (5), Residential (6). All columns include state-specific cubic trends, state fixed effects, and day fixed effects.

state mandates, the change for the parks category is significant and results in a drop of 18.2 percentage points, retail and recreation category mobility drops significantly by 6.2 percentage points, transit station mobility drops by 2.6 percentage points, and work mobility measure also drops significantly by 2.9 percentage points. Finally the measure for staying at home increases significantly by 1.7 percentage points due to the mandates.



## F Complementary Analysis of Health Effects using Lagged Google Mobility Data

We next estimate the effects of lagged mobility Google measures on health outcomes using the same methodology used for the Unacast measures in the main body.

Table 17: Effect of Past Changes in Google Mobility by Category on Daily New COVID-19 Death Rate per 100 Million by State

	(1) Gro/Phar	(2) Park	(3) Resid	(4) Ret/Rec	(5) Transit	(6) Work
Change 1 week prior	-130.028 (82.817)	1.936 (14.267)	97.788 (304.701)	-52.015 (101.072)	-36.282 (100.747)	-100.401 (145.646)
Change 2 weeks prior	222.577** (94.908)	20.151 (16.686)	-711.403** (314.916)	133.273 (100.097)	175.050* (93.116)	233.826** (103.133)
Change 3 weeks prior	60.420 (107.164)	35.198** (16.639)	-28.957 (247.368)	108.014 (98.454)	48.500 (83.158)	29.176 (66.844)
Num of Obs.	1530	1530	1530	1529	1530	1529
R squared	0.92	0.92	0.91	0.92	0.92	0.92
F	46.51	46.51	46.41	46.29	46.36	46.37
<i>LTI</i>	152.97	57.29	-642.572*	189.27	187.27	162.60
F of <i>LTI</i> = 0	0.65	1.44	2.73	0.46	1.91	1.52
p-value	0.42	0.23	0.09	0.5	0.16	0.22
<i>ATT</i>	-0.09	-0.18	0.02	-0.062	-0.026	-0.029
<i>LTI</i> × <i>ATT</i>	-13.46	-10.43	-10.62	-11.73	-4.87	-4.72

Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ . The top panels of this table display estimates from the model estimating the effect of changes in Google mobility measures on COVID-19 mortality. The dependent variable in all columns is death rates per 100 million population, with the explanatory variable of interest the change in percentage points for the Google trends for Grocery and Pharmacy (1), Parks (2), Retail and Recreation (3), Transit Stations (4), Workplace (5), Residential (6). All columns include state-specific cubic trends, state fixed effects, and day fixed effects. In the bottom panel *LTI* denoted the long-term impact, the sum of lagged coefficients. *ATT* reports the difference-in-differences estimates from regressing each Google mobility measure in turn on stay-at-home mandate adoption under the same control scheme. *LTI* × *ATT* reports the expected long-term change in deaths per day for a reduction in activity equal to the average mandate effect.

We see in Table 17 using data for all states that past changes in mobility are significantly correlated with changes in death rates for all the categories, with the only significant long-term impact for increases in time spent at home (residence, column 3). We estimate that an increase in the relative time spent at home over the prior 3 weeks equal to the reduction induced by stay-at-home mandates ( $-.017$ ) is associated with significant drops in the number of deaths by 10.6 per 100 million per day. For the other measures, the long-term impact point estimate sign means that a drop in mobility in other categories decreases death rates in the future, but the long-term impacts are not statistically significant. The same patterns remain if we estimate the model using only the mandate states as seen in Table 18 but none of the long-term impact effects are significant.

Table 18: Effect of Past Changes in Google Mobility by Category on Daily New COVID-19 Death Rate per 100 Million by State, Mandate States Only

	(1) Gro/Phar	(2) Park	(3) Resid	(4) Ret/Rec	(5) Transit	(6) Work
Change 1 week prior	-156.604 (98.979)	4.256 (17.200)	181.281 (367.755)	-76.133 (121.997)	-36.795 (124.488)	-119.683 (168.112)
Change 2 weeks prior	238.424** (116.913)	19.849 (19.688)	-756.785** (373.755)	135.963 (121.338)	194.168* (115.658)	279.565** (119.829)
Change 3 weeks prior	49.989 (135.501)	34.295* (19.575)	-28.352 (288.433)	124.399 (120.343)	47.326 (100.054)	33.970 (76.773)
$N$	1290	1290	1290	1289	1290	1289
$R^2$	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.91618	0.92	0.91
F	46.26901	46.23	46.16	46.05	46.12	46.19
$LTI$	131.81	58.40	-603.86	184.23	204.70	193.85
F of $LTI = 0$	0.32	1.16	1.67	0.18	1.64	1.62
p-value	0.57	0.28	0.19	0.67	0.2	0.23
$ATT$	-0.09	-0.18	0.02	-0.182	-0.026	-0.029
$LTI \times ATT$	-11.60	-10.63	-10.27	-33.53	-5.32	-5.62

Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ . The top panels of this table display estimates from the model estimating the effect of changes in Google mobility measures on COVID-19 mortality using data for all states that ever adopt a statewide stay-at-home mandate. The dependent variable in all columns is death rates per 100 million population, with the explanatory variable of interest the change in percentage points for the Google trends for Grocery and Pharmacy (1), Parks (2), Retail and Recreation (3), Transit Stations (4), Workplace (5), Residential (6). All columns include state-specific cubic trends, state fixed effects, and day fixed effects. In the bottom panel  $LTI$  denoted the long-term impact, the sum of lagged coefficients.  $ATT$  reports the difference-in-differences estimates from regressing each Google mobility measure in turn on stay-at-home mandate adoption under the same control scheme.  $LTI \times ATT$  reports the expected long-term change in deaths per day for a reduction in activity equal to the average mandate effect.

## G Complementary Analysis of Health Effects using Lagged Joint Measures of Mobility in all States

Here we consider and estimate a multiple linear regression specification of lagged mobility on death rates. Given that we found that previous changes in non-essential visits had a significant effect on future death rates, we estimate a model here where we also control for lagged encounter rate measures.<sup>3</sup> Let the coefficient  $\alpha$  be a constant,  $\sum_0^3 \gamma_{js} t^j$  be state specific cubic trends controlling for time-variant state characteristics that affect health outcomes, and  $\delta_d$  date fixed effects controlling for common time shocks measured relative to the first period, then in a first joint model we have

$$Deaths_{sd} = \alpha + \sum_{k=0}^3 \gamma_{ks} t^k + \delta_d + N\dot{E}V_{s,-j} \beta_{1,nev} + E\dot{N}C_{s,-j} \beta_{2,enc} + \varepsilon_{sd}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\beta_{1,nev}$  is a vector of coefficients pertaining to the correlation between changes in non-essential visits in previous weeks and current death rates, controlling for lagged changes in encounter rates and state-specific cubic time trends. Similarly,  $\beta_{2,enc}$  is the equivalent vector of correlations between changes in past encounter rates and current health outcomes. The disturbance  $\varepsilon_{sd}$  contains unobserved determinants of death rates that vary over time within a given state that cannot be explained by the flexible trend and the other variables included in the model.

The coefficients of interest are in the vectors  $\beta_{1,nev}$  and  $\beta_{2,enc}$  that each contain the coefficients for one, two and three week lags of the corresponding measure of non essential visits and encounters (i.e.  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ). For example, the coefficient  $\beta_{1,nev}$  for  $N\dot{E}V_{s,-1}$  gives the correlation between changes in non-essential visits one week prior on the current death rate, controlling for other non-essential visits' lags, for lagged changes in encounter rates, and for state-specific trends. We also estimate the above model for hospitalization rates and the estimates are presented in Table 19.

Table 19 is organized into two columns, the first for the death rates and the second for hospitalization rates. Starting with column 1, we see that changes in non-essential visits three weeks prior are significantly related to current changes in death rates, controlling for changes in non-essential visits two and one week prior, equivalent changes in human encounters, and other controls. Looking at hospitalizations, changes in lagged encounter rates two weeks prior have a significant effect on current rates of hospitalizations. When we test for significance of the long-term impacts, we cannot reject the null of no long-term impact of lagged changes in encounter rates, nor of lagged changes in non-essential visits on the current hospitalization rates.

Table 20 presents the implied long-term impacts from the above estimates of death rates. Column 1 is for all states and column 2 for mandate states only. The table has two main panels. The elements of the coefficient vectors for lagged changes in non-essential visits are in the first three rows of the top panel, followed by the estimated long term impact ( $LTI$ ) in row four, which is the sum of the three lagged coefficients. Then the F statistic and associated p-value for the null hypothesis of the long-term impact being zero are reported below that. Finally, the estimated mandate average treatment effects on the treated ( $ATT$ ) for the measure in is reported and the multiplication of the long-term impact and the  $ATT$  mandate effect is reported in the bottom row of each panel. The bottom panel of this table reports similar rows for the lagged encounter rate measure.

Starting with the model using data on all states in column 1 and in the top panel looking at the long-term impact of non-essential visits, controlling for changes in lagged encounter rates and also state-specific cubic time trends, we estimate that a drop of non-essential visits of one percentage point three weeks prior has a long-term impact of reducing death rates by 8.2 deaths per 100 million. We reject the null of no long-term impact given the F statistic of 4.95 (p value of 0.02). In column 1 and in the bottom panel looking at the long-term impact of encounter rates, we estimate that a one percentage point drop in encounter rates three weeks prior has a long-term impact of reducing death rates by 1.54 deaths per 100 million but we cannot reject the null of no long-term impact (p-value of 0.55). Looking at column 2 using data for mandate states only, we cannot reject the null of no long-term impact for either measure (p-values of 0.25 and 0.62).

---

<sup>3</sup>We do not control for CADT because of multicollinearity; lagged  $ADT$  are highly correlated with lagged non-essential visits, preventing estimation of a specification containing both measures of travel activity changes.

Table 19: Effect of Past Changes in Google Mobility by Category on Daily New COVID-19 Death Rate per 100 Million by State, Mandate States Only

	(1) Deaths	(2) Hospitalizations
$\dot{N}EV$ 1 week prior	-1.532 (2.614)	7.669 (17.151)
$\dot{N}EV$ 2 weeks prior	2.959 (2.333)	21.015 (15.092)
$\dot{N}EV$ 3 weeks prior	6.753*** (2.275)	-1.021 (14.625)
$\dot{E}NC$ 1 week prior	2.099 (2.562)	-15.414 (19.182)
$\dot{E}NC$ 2 weeks prior	-0.288 (1.622)	-21.845* (11.631)
$\dot{E}NC$ 3 weeks prior	-0.274 (1.267)	-3.116 (8.761)
$N$	2150	1165
$R^2$	0.82058	0.63710
F	14.94589	1.89407

Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ . This table presents estimates from the model estimating the effect of changes in Google mobility measures on COVID-19 mortality and morbidity by day and by state. The dependent variables are death and hospitalization rates per 100 million population, with the explanatory variables of interest the lagged changes non-essential visits and unique human encounters one, two, and three weeks prior. All columns include state fixed effects, day fixed effects, and state-specific cubic time trends.

Table 20: Conditional Correlations of Death Rate with Lagged Mobility and Encounter Measures for All State and Mandate States

	All States	Mandate States
<u>Non-Essential Visits</u>		
1 Week	-1.50	4.47
2 Weeks	2.95	7.66
3 Weeks	6.75	25.07
<i>LTI</i>	8.20*	37.20
F of <i>LTI</i> = 0	4.95	1.32
p-value	0.02	0.25
Non-Essential Visits Change due to Mandate	-16.75	-16.75
<i>LTI</i> × <i>ATT</i>	-137.33**	-622.99
<u>Human Encounters</u>		
1 Week	2.09	-7.76
2 Weeks	-0.28	19.19
3 Weeks	-0.27	0.31
<i>LTI</i>	1.54	11.74
F of <i>LTI</i> = 0	0.36	0.24
p-value	0.55	0.62
Encounter Rate Change due to Mandate	-8.98	-8.98
<i>LTI</i> × <i>ATT</i>	-13.83	-105.41

This table presents estimates of the long-term impact on COVID-19 mortality and morbidity by day and by state for the model of joint changes in mobility. The dependent variables are death and hospitalization rates per 100 million population per day, with the explanatory variables of interest the lagged changes in non-essential visits and unique human encounters one, two, and three weeks prior. All columns include state fixed effects, day fixed effects, and state-specific cubic time trends. *LTI* denotes the long-term impact, the sum of lagged coefficients. *ATT* reports the difference-in-differences estimates from jointly regressing changes in mobility measures on stay-at-home mandate adoption under the same control scheme. *LTI* × *ATT* reports the expected long-term change in deaths per day for a reduction in activity equal to the average mandate effect.

## H Complementary Analysis of Health Effects using Lagged Joint Measures of Mobility in Mandate States

Here we repeat analysis from Appendix F, instead specifying a model of lagged mobility changes in average distance traveled and encounter rates:

$$Deaths_{sd} = \alpha + \sum_0^3 \gamma_{ks} t^k + \delta_d + \dot{ADT}_{s,-j} \beta_{1,adt} + \dot{ENC}_{s,-j} \beta_{2,enc} + \varepsilon_{sd}, \quad (5)$$

Table 21 reports the estimated lagged effects of changes in average distance traveled and unique human encounter rates, along with the corresponding long-term impacts for changes in average distance traveled when limiting the sample to regions that ever adopted a statewide stay-at-home mandate (all but 8 states).

Table 21: Robustness Check: Effect of Changes in Average Distance Traveled in Mandate States on Daily New COVID-19 Death Rates per 100 Million by State and Day

	(1) Deaths - Mandate States	(2) Deaths - Mandate States
$\dot{ADT}$ 1 week prior	4.633 (23.501)	20.499 (27.426)
$\dot{ADT}$ 2 weeks prior	6.348 (25.043)	-1.980 (26.377)
$\dot{ADT}$ 3 weeks prior	59.382** (26.194)	49.842* (28.526)
$\dot{ENC}$ 1 week prior		-12.620 (23.023)
$\dot{ENC}$ 2 weeks prior		15.805 (14.396)
$\dot{ENC}$ 3 weeks prior		4.087 (9.277)
$N$	156	156
$R^2$	0.92303	0.92460
F	10.03625	9.42670
$LTI$ of $\dot{ADT}$	70.36**	68.36*
F of $LTI = 0$	4.46	4.45
p-value	0.04	0.05

This table presents estimates of the long-term impact on COVID-19 mortality and morbidity by day and by state for the model of joint changes in mobility. The dependent variables are death and hospitalization rates per 100 million population per day, with the explanatory variables of interest the lagged changes in non-essential visits and unique human encounters one, two, and three weeks prior. All columns include state fixed effects, day fixed effects, and state-specific cubic time trends.  $LTI$  denotes the long-term impact, the sum of lagged coefficients.

Table 21 is organized into two columns, the first repeats the lagged average distance traveled effects on death rates for mandate states and the second column controls also for lagged changes in encounter rates. Looking at both columns we see that changes in lagged ADT three week prior have a significant effect on current rates of deaths. In terms of long-term impacts of changes in ADT, which is the sum of all three lagged coefficients, we test for the long-term impact being equal to zero. In column 1 we reject the null followed by the estimated long term impact ( $LTI$ ) in row 4, which is the sum of the three lagged coefficients: the estimated long term impact is less 70.63 deaths per 100 million with an F statistic equal to 4.46 (p value 0.04). When controlling also for lagged Encounters, the estimated long term impact of CADT is 68.36, which is statistically significant (F stat of 4.45 and p value 0.05). This suggests that the estimated  $LTI$  for the lagged changes in ADT is robust to controlling for lagged changes in encounter rates.

## References

- [1] The COVID Tracking Project. 2020. “Most Recent Data.” Accessed March 27, 2020. <https://covidtracking.com/data>
- [2] Goodman-Bacon, Andrew. 2018. “Difference-in-Differences with Variation in Treatment Timing.” *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series* No. 25018. doi: 10.3386/w25018
- [3] Google. 2020. “COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports.” Accessed March 27, 2020. <https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/>
- [4] Johns Hopkins University. 2020. “COVID-19 Data Repository by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University.” Accessed April 15. <https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID-19>
- [5] The New York Times. 2020 “Coronavirus (Covid-19) Data in the United States.” Accessed April 17. <https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data>
- [6] Pepe, Emanuele, Paolo Bajardi, Laetitia Gauvin, Filippo Privitera, Ciro Cattuto, and Michele Tizzoni. 2020. “COVID-19 Outbreak Response: First Assessment of Mobility Changes in Italy Following Lockdown.” medRxiv 2020.03.22.20039933; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.22.20039933>