

# Supplementary material 3: Method details and robustness analyses

This document contains supplementary material to “Behavioral changes before lockdown, and decreased retail and recreation mobility during lockdown, contributed most to the successful control of the COVID-19 epidemic in 35 Western countries” by Koen Deforche, Jurgen Vercauteren, Viktor Müller, and Anne-Mieke Vandamme.

## 1 Method details

### 1.1 Epidemiological model

Incidence of diagnosed cases  $C(t)$  and deaths  $D(t)$  were derived from the state of the SEIR model by convolving a normal density function  $\mathcal{N}(\mu_t, \sigma_t)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(\mu_d, \sigma_d)$  over the number of new infections (transitioning from  $S$  to  $E$  compartment), with a rate of  $\rho_t$  (test rate) and  $\rho_d$  (infection fatality rate).

$$C(t) = -\rho_t \frac{dS(t)}{dt} * \mathcal{N}(\mu_t, \sigma_t)$$
$$D(t) = -\rho_d \frac{dS(t)}{dt} * \mathcal{N}(\mu_d, \sigma_d)$$

The average generation time  $G$  was calculated as  $T_{\text{lat}} + 1/(2T_{\text{inf}})$  ( $I$ ). For the likelihood calculation for each incidence data point (number of cases or number of deaths) a negative binomial distribution was used with  $\mu$  equal to the expected count, and a suitable dispersion parameter  $r$ . Death incidence data was considered more trustworthy than case reporting (which is influenced also by a possibly changing testing strategy). Therefore, a low value  $r_c = 3$  was used to reflect a low weight given to case data, while a higher value for the dispersion parameter  $r_d = 60$  was used since the data for incidence of deaths is expected to be more reliable, but accounting for observed variance due to clustering effects and outliers (presumably caused by back-reported deaths) seen in several countries. For the reestimated model of Slovakia, an even lower dispersion parameter  $r_c = 0.5$  was used to rule out any influence of a possibly increased testing policy during lockdown to the estimates of dates  $d_3$  and  $d_4$ . Table 1 lists the model parameters and their initial values or prior distributions.

### 1.2 Statistical analyses

The average effect of mobility changes related to retail and recreation on  $R_{t,2}$  was estimated by applying the estimated effect (-0.07 +/- 0.02 per 10% mobility reduction) to the median mobility reduction in the 35 analyzed countries (-66%). Similarly, the upper bound of the impact of increased mobility to parks was estimated by applying the estimated effect (-0.018 +/- 0.009 per 10% mobility increase) to the 95% upper quantile of the mobility in the 35 analyzed countries (+53%).

To evaluate whether the  $R_{t,2}$  value in Sweden could equally be explained by the linear model using changes in mobility, the influence of the data for Sweden was diagnosed using `lm.influence` (leave-one-out cross-validation) and the residual error of the model prediction was compared to the residual error distribution.

## 2 Robustness to different assumptions of the duration of the latent period

To assess the robustness of the findings to different assumptions of latent period duration  $T_{\text{lat}}$  (which was assumed to be 3 days), models were re-estimated using an assumption of 2 and 4 days, by keeping generation time the same (and thus by varying  $T_{\text{inf}}$  as well). Table 2 shows the parameter estimates for each of the three assumptions of duration of the latent period. Since the duration of the infectious period decreased as latent period increased, the main observation is a reduction of  $R_t$  values larger than 1, and an increase of  $R_t$  values smaller than 1.

Univariate associations between different independent predictors (mobility changes in different categories and test rate) showed the same trend and had the same statistical significance using different assumed periods for  $T_{\text{lat}}$  (Tables 3 and 4).

Parameter	Description	Initial value
$N$	population size	ECDC
$R_{t,0}$	initial basic reproduction number $R_0$ until $d_0$	uni(0, 8)
$R_{t,1}$	basic reproduction number at $d_1$	uni(0, 8)
$R_{t,2}$	basic reproduction number at $d_2$	uni(0, 8)
$R_{t,1} - R_{t,0}$	change in $R_t$ from $d_0$ to $d_1$	$\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$
$R_{t,2} - R_{t,1}$	change in $R_t$ from $d_1$ to $d_2$	$\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$
$G$	generation time	5.2 days (2)
$T_{\text{lat}}$	latent period duration	3 days (3)
$\rho_t$	test rate	uni(0, $\infty$ )
$\rho_d$	infection fatality rate	0.007 (4)
$S[0]$	initial Susceptible count	$N - 1$
$E[0]$	initial Exposed count	1
$I[0]$	initial Infectious count	0
$R[0]$	initial Removed count	0
$\mu_c$	mean test latency	uni(5, 30)
$\sigma_c$	test latency uncertainty	5
$\mu_d$	death latency	$\mathcal{N}(21, 4)$
$\sigma_d$	death latency uncertainty	5
$d_0$	date of transition from $R_0$	$d_1 + \mathcal{N}(0, 10)$
$d_1$	date of start of mobility changes	estimated from mobility report
$d_2$	date of start of lockdown	estimated from mobility report

Table 1: Model parameters and their initial values for fixed parameters, or prior distribution for estimated parameters.

Variable	$T_{\text{lat}} = 2$	$T_{\text{lat}} = 3$	$T_{\text{lat}} = 4$
$R_{t,0}$	3.7 (2.6 – 5.3)	3.6 (2.5 – 4.9)	3.3 (2.2 – 4.4)
$R_{t,1}$	2.4 (1.6 – 3.0)	2.3 (1.7 – 3.0)	2.1 (1.5 – 2.6)
$R_{t,2}$	0.76 (0.55 – 1.04)	0.77 (0.58 – 1.03)	0.80 (0.62 – 1.03)
$1 - R_{t,1}/R_{t,0}$ (%)	35 (9 – 61)	33 (9 – 56)	32 (5 – 56)
$1 - R_{t,2}/R_{t,1}$ (%)	67 (51 – 78)	65 (54 – 77)	61 (47 – 73)
$d_1 - d_0$ (days)	7 (-7 – 23)	6 (-7 – 21)	6 (-7 – 22)

Table 2: Comparison of estimated parameters across all countries for different assumed durations of latent period  $T_{\text{lat}}$  (median values, 95% IQR).

### 3 Robustness to different assumptions of the duration of generation time

To assess the robustness of the findings to different assumptions of generation time  $G$  (which was assumed to be 5.2 days), models were re-estimated using an assumption of 4.5 and 5.9 days, by keeping latent period duration the same (and thus by changing  $T_{\text{inf}}$ ). Table 5 shows the parameter estimates for each of the three assumptions of duration of the latent period. Since the duration of the infectious period increased as generation time increased, the main observation is an increase of  $R_t$  values larger than 1, and an decrease of  $R_t$  values smaller than 1.

Univariate associations between different independent predictors (mobility changes in different categories and test rate) showed the same trend and had the same statistical significance using different assumed periods for  $T_{\text{lat}}$  (Tables 6 and 7).

## References

- Åke Svensson. A note on generation times in epidemic models. *Mathematical Biosciences* **208**, 300 – 311 (2007). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0025556406002094>.
- Ganyani, T. *et al.* Estimating the generation interval for coronavirus disease (covid-19) based on symptom onset data, march 2020. *Eurosurveillance* **25** (2020). URL <https://www.eurosurveillance.org/content/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.17.2000257>.

Variable	$T_{\text{lat}} = 2$	$T_{\text{lat}} = 3$	$T_{\text{lat}} = 4$
Retail and recreation	0.04 +/- 0.01 **	0.04 +/- 0.01 **	0.03 +/- 0.01 **
Grocery and pharmacy	0.02 +/- 0.02	0.02 +/- 0.02	0.01 +/- 0.02
Parks	0.004 +/- 0.007	0.004 +/- 0.006	0.003 +/- 0.005
Transit stations	0.04 +/- 0.02 .	0.03 +/- 0.02	0.03 +/- 0.02
Workplaces	0.06 +/- 0.02 **	0.06 +/- 0.02 **	0.05 +/- 0.02 **
Residential	-0.12 +/- 0.04 **	-0.11 +/- 0.04 **	-0.10 +/- 0.03 **
$R_{t,1}$	0.06 +/- 0.06	0.05 +/- 0.06	0.05 +/- 0.06

Table 3: Univariate association (estimate +/- standard deviation) of mobility changes during lockdown (per 10% mobility change) compared to baseline, with  $R_{t,2}$ , for different assumptions of  $T_{\text{lat}}$ . \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; .  $p < 0.1$

Variable	$T_{\text{lat}} = 2$	$T_{\text{lat}} = 3$	$T_{\text{lat}} = 4$
Retail and recreation	0.08 +/- 0.03 **	0.07 +/- 0.02 **	0.07 +/- 0.02 **
Grocery and pharmacy	-0.04 +/- 0.03	-0.04 +/- 0.03	-0.03 +/- 0.02
Parks	-0.021 +/- 0.010 *	-0.018 +/- 0.009 *	0.016 +/- 0.008 .
Workplaces	0.05 +/- 0.04	0.04 +/- 0.03	0.02 +/- 0.03
$R_{t,1}$	0.02 +/- 0.06	0.02 +/- 0.05	0.02 +/- 0.05

Table 4: Multivariate models (estimate +/- standard deviation) of mobility changes during lockdown (per 10% mobility change) compared to baseline, with  $R_{t,2}$ , for different assumptions of  $T_{\text{lat}}$ . Mobility data related to transit stations and residential places were left out from the multivariate analysis since these variables were highly correlated with mobility data related to work. \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; .  $p < 0.1$

Variable	$G = 4.5$	$G = 5.2$	$G = 5.9$
$R_{t,0}$	3.2 (2.1 – 4.3)	3.6 (2.5 – 4.9)	3.9 (2.7 – 5.6)
$R_{t,1}$	2.1 (1.6 – 2.6)	2.3 (1.7 – 3.0)	2.5 (1.7 – 3.2)
$R_{t,2}$	0.82 (0.67 – 1.03)	0.77 (0.58 – 1.03)	0.75 (0.56 – 1.04)
$1 - R_{t,1}/R_{t,0}$ (%)	34 (5 – 52)	33 (9 – 56)	38 (12 – 62)
$1 - R_{t,2}/R_{t,1}$ (%)	61 (45 – 70)	65 (54 – 77)	69 (56 – 79)
$d_1 - d_0$ (days)	6 (-7 – 22)	6 (-7 – 21)	7 (-9 – 22)

Table 5: Comparison of estimated parameters across all countries for different assumed durations of generation period  $G$  by allowing changes in infectious period duration  $T_{\text{inf}}$  (median values, 95% IQR).

Variable	$G = 4.5$	$G = 5.2$	$G = 5.9$
Retail and recreation	0.03 +/- 0.01 **	0.04 +/- 0.01 **	0.04 +/- 0.01 **
Grocery and pharmacy	0.01 +/- 0.02	0.02 +/- 0.02	0.02 +/- 0.02
Parks	0.003 +/- 0.005	0.003 +/- 0.006	0.004 +/- 0.007
Transit stations	0.03 +/- 0.02	0.03 +/- 0.02	0.04 +/- 0.02 .
Workplaces	0.05 +/- 0.02 **	0.05 +/- 0.02 **	0.07 +/- 0.02 **
Residential	-0.09 +/- 0.03 **	-0.11 +/- 0.04 **	-0.13 +/- 0.04 **
$R_{t,1}$	0.05 +/- 0.06	0.05 +/- 0.06	0.05 +/- 0.06

Table 6: Univariate association (estimate +/- standard deviation) of mobility changes during lockdown (per 10% mobility change) compared to baseline, with  $R_{t,2}$ , for different assumed durations of generation period  $G$  by allowing changes in infectious period duration  $T_{\text{inf}}$ . \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; .  $p < 0.1$

Variable	$G = 4.5$	$G = 5.2$	$G = 5.9$
Retail and recreation	0.06 +/- 0.02 **	0.07 +/- 0.02 **	0.08 +/- 0.03 **
Grocery and pharmacy	-0.03 +/- 0.02	-0.04 +/- 0.03	-0.04 +/- 0.03
Parks	-0.015 +/- 0.07 .	-0.018 +/- 0.009 *	0.022 +/- 0.010 *
Workplaces	0.03 +/- 0.03	0.04 +/- 0.03	0.05 +/- 0.04
$R_{t,1}$	0.01 +/- 0.05	0.02 +/- 0.05	0.02 +/- 0.05

Table 7: Multivariate models (estimate +/- standard deviation) of mobility changes during lockdown (per 10% mobility change) compared to baseline, with  $R_{t,2}$ , for different assumed durations of generation period  $G$  by allowing changes in infectious period duration  $T_{inf}$ . Mobility data related to transit stations and residential places were left out from the multivariate analysis since these variables were highly correlated with mobility data related to work. \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; .  $p < 0.1$

- 54 3. He, X. *et al.* Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of covid-19. *Nature Medicine* **26**, 672–675  
55 (2020). URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5>.
- 56 4. Verity, R. *et al.* Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. *The Lancet Infectious*  
57 *Diseases* (2020). URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30243-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30243-7).