

Group structure

To obtain a better insight into the nature of the effects of PS coupling, we performed three additional parameter sweeps in Figure S1 along the example of Denmark, separately varying the occurrence of the strictest government intervention (Figure S1A), PS coupling strength (Figure S1B) and strength of group structure (Figure S1C). An implementation for Germany shows the same results. In all three panels the time evolution of the number of susceptible and infected individuals (S and I) is plotted, together with the reproduction number R_0 , and the time-course of interventions J in the first one, and the affective state ϕ in the other two panels. The simulations of Figure S1A were performed by varying the timing of the strictest government interventions from 20 days earlier than it has actually occurred, up to 20 days later. The results show that besides the extreme case of the very late intervention (red), a very early intervention would also lead to a large peak later on, after the eventual relaxation occurs. However, there seems to be a preferable timeslot for interventions, which is around the time of the actual one (green). Besides shifting the peak to allow time for more preparation, these interventions also flatten it more than the two extremes, by avoiding the large initial peak as well as a late second overshoot, keeping the number of infected people over time small, allowing the system to prepare best available resources. The simulations of Figure 5B were performed as a function of sweeps of γ with no group structure. As the PS coupling strength γ increases, the influence of PS variables upon the mixing behavior becomes stronger, advancing systematically the peak of the second wave of infections to earlier time points and increasing its size. The time courses of S and I show two convergent regimes, towards very small and large values of γ . For S , it expresses itself as increased densities of lines at the blue and red ends of the spectrum. Equivalently, a bimodal organization of I appears in blue for vanishing γ and red for strong PS influence. The organization in two apparent limit cases is a consequence of the interaction of political interventions J and PS dynamics. Given a duration of a lock-down, the sensitivity towards the variation of γ is particularly strong in the regimes of $\gamma = 0.15-0.7$, but very small below or above this window, as the effects accumulate in the high and low-coupling modes (the clustered blue and red lines in S and I). The value of coupling strength γ is thus an important nation-specific indicator for a recommended lock-down duration, which will vary from country to country for the same intervention strength J . Figure S1C shows the cause-effect scenarios due to group structure for Denmark. The strength of PS coupling is set constant to the value estimated from the Danish data, and the heterogeneity of the groups is linearly increased from fully homogeneous ($c_1=c_2=1$, $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2 = 1$) to strongly separated groups ($c_1=1$, $c_2=30$, $\Gamma_1 = 1$, $\Gamma_2 = 30$). Differences in vulnerability show large effects upon affective state ϕ_i and subsequently in the number of infected cases per group. Small differences in heterogeneity result in similar infection numbers for both populations; but the larger the group differences, the bigger effects upon both groups, with larger numbers of infections in the vulnerable population. It needs to be stressed that all other parameters are identical and only the group differences are present causing the acceleration and increase of numbers of epidemic stress. This clearly highlights the influence of societal organization with regard to different levels of PS variables (e.g., risk perceptions) on epidemic transmission. The effect of group structure is very pronounced and remains robust across parameter sweeps.




Figure S1. Covid-19 spread and cause-effect scenarios under variation of lock-down duration, PS coupling strength and societal heterogeneity. Parameter sweeps for (A) the government interventions, (B) coupling strength of the PS system, and (C) the group specific parameters. The results for the default parameters are always green. For clarity, the impact of seasonality is not included and only the current interventions are used to better identify the impact of the government interventions and the PS subsystem and its heterogeneity. All simulations are performed for Denmark.




Figure S2: Estimated strengths of Interventions on infectious spread for Germany (same as in Figure 4C).

It is debatable whether the measures we aggregated above capture all aspects of PS variables linked to (perceived) vulnerability and resilience. We assessed this using additional measures of subjective psychological well-being and resilience (collectively PSY/RES, see Table 1 in the Appendix for details) that were collected for a subset of the waves (March 24 and 31, April 21, May 26 in the German data, and March 24 and 30, April 6, 14 and 22 in the Danish data). We used PSY/RES measures to relate to the aggregate of AFFECT, POLICY, and TRUST measures (AFFECT aggregate) to first determine the strength of the relation and, second, whether that relation changed across time. We found the higher levels of AFFECT (i.e., more concern with COVID-19) were related to less resilience (Figure 5). Importantly, this relation did not show an appreciable change across waves, suggesting the AFFECT aggregate does relate to psychological well-being and resilience.




Figure S3. Relationship between subjective psychological well-being and resilience and PS indicators. First latent variables (both $p < 0.001$) of a multivariate PLS analysis relating psychological well-being (PSY/RES) to the AFFECT aggregate in German (A-B) and Danish (C-D) COSMO data. Pearson correlation coefficients (A and C) show a stable relationship across time. See Supplementary Table S1 for a complete list of variables. Bootstrap ratios are singular value weight divided by their standard error and are roughly equivalent to a z-score.




Figure S4. Age differences in PS indicators. The dominant latent variable (both $p < 0.001$ by permutation test) of a multivariate PLS analysis of mean change over time of PS indicators in German (A-B) and Danish (C-D) COSMO data by age group. Subjects were grouped into three equally sized bins of age categories. In the German data, age categories were 18-37, 38-55 and 56-87 years. In Danish data, age categories were 18-49, 50-63 and 64-92 years. AFFECT (AFF), POLICY (POL) and TRUST variables were included if data were available from all waves in each of the COSMO datasets. See Supplementary Table S1 for a complete list of variables. Error bars: 95% CI.

Sample descriptions:

Sample Size by groups from COSMO data from Germany by acquisition wave (week).

	Young (18-37yrs)	Middle (38-55yrs)	Old (56-87yrs)		Males	Females
March 3	270	274	278		425	397
March 10	250	310	274		410	424
March 17	305	307	289		455	446

March 24	298	274	377		491	458
March 31	279	350	291		467	453
April 7	300	332	297		474	455
April 14	341	302	317		473	487
April 21	275	324	310		451	458
April 28	341	301	293		451	484
May 5	319	306	274		462	437
May 12	309	287	311		445	462
May 19	346	280	251		438	439
May 26	307	259	261		400	427

Sample Size by groups from COSMO data from Denmark by acquisition wave (week).

	Young (18-49yrs)	Middle (50-63yrs)	Old (64-92yrs)		Males	Females
March 24	198	156	155		217	292
March 30	151	133	137		173	248
April 8	128	131	141		166	234
April 14	161	153	161		213	262
April 22	202	165	194		237	324
April 28	164	170	205		228	311
May 5	170	196	194		236	324
May 13	190	171	218		280	299
Jun 2	207	208	312		336	391
Jun 16	161	179	201		246	295

Partial Least Squares (PLS): PLS is a multivariate statistical analysis method similar to canonical correlation analysis. We used it here to first determine if there was a linear combination of PS indicators that differed by group. For this analysis, COSMO data were grouped according to sex for one analysis and into three age groups for the second of about the same sample size. The age bins in the German data, age categories were 18-37, 38-55 and 56-87 years. In Danish data, age categories were 18-49, 50-63 and 64-92 years. Data were then grand mean-centered and decomposed using singular value decomposition (SVD), yielding two matrices of singular vectors (U, V) and a diagonal matrix of singular values (S). The singular vectors in V contain the weights for groups by wave, and U contains the weights for the PS indicators. For each pair of vectors in U and V, the value in S is essentially a covariance indicating the strength of the

relationship between the U and V vectors. The statistical significance of the relationship between vectors is assessed using permutation tests where each observation is randomly reassigned group and the mean-centering the SVD done for the permuted data. The permutation is performed 1000 times to create a distribution of S. For each pair, the corresponding original value of S is compared to the permuted distribution and assigned a probability value based on the number of times a permuted S was greater than or equal to the original value. A complementary resampling assessment is done for the weights in U and V using bootstrap. Here resampling is done with replacement maintaining the group assignment, but assessing how reliable the parameter estimates in U and V are depending on which subjects are in the sample. The resampling is done 1,000 times, producing a distribution of the parameters in U and V, are used to estimate confidence intervals or standard errors. The ratio of a singular vector weight by its standard error is termed a “bootstrap ratio” and is similar to a z-score, but interpreted more as indication of parameter stability rather than null hypothesis testing. The latter is done at the level of the singular value using permutation testing.

Table 1. COSMO PS and psychological well-being indicators included for analysis.

Variable name	Survey question	Included in dataset from:	
		Germany	Denmark
AFFECT (AFF_)	<i>To me, the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) feels...</i>		
DISTANCE	Close to me (1) Far away from me (7)	X	X
FEAR	Terrifying (1) Not terrifying at all (7)	X	X
HYPE	Overly covered in the media (1) Not enough coverage in the media (7)	X	X
SPREAD	Like it spreads slowly (1) Like it spreads quickly (7)	X	X
THINK	Like something I think of all the time (1) Like something I don't think about at all (7)	X	X
WORRY	Like something to worry about (1) Like something not to worry about (7)	X	X
NOVELTY	New (1) Old (7)		X
SCIENCE	Not at all scientifically described (1) Completely scientifically described (7)		X
HELPLESS	Like something that makes me feel helpless (1) Like something I can combat with my own actions (7)		X
POLICY (POL_)	<i>Please indicate the extent to which you disagree (1) or agree (7) with the following statements.</i>		
FREEDOM	It makes sense that the government restricts personal liberty rights to combat the novel coronavirus (COVID-19).	X	X
INTERNET	The government should restrict access to the Internet and social media to combat the spread of misinformation about the novel coronavirus.	X	

EXAGGERATE	I think the measures that are currently being taken are greatly exaggerated.	X	X
SCHOOL	As a precaution, community facilities such as schools or kindergartens should be closed.	X	
VACCINE	If a vaccine against the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) becomes available, I would get it.		X
TRAVEL	It makes sense that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs discourages all non-essential travel.		X
TREATMENT GUARANTEES	It makes sense that guarantees for treatment and examination within the health care system has been suspended by law.		X
EPI LAW	It makes sense that epidemic legislation has been tightened so that the authorities have the right to impose sanctions on individuals they believe might spread infection.		X
FORCE TREATMENT	It makes sense that the authorities have the power to coerce people to compulsory treatment if there is suspicion of infection with the novel coronavirus (COVID-19).		X
FORCE VACCINE	It makes sense that the authorities have the power to force people to get vaccinated against the novel coronavirus (COVID-19).		X
FORCE QUARANTINE	It makes sense that the authorities have the power to force people to quarantine if there is suspicion of infection with the novel coronavirus (COVID-19).		X
POLICE FORCE	It makes sense that the police have the power to use the necessary power to enforce the new legislation adopted in the fight against the novel coronavirus (COVID-19).		X
FORBID ACCESS	It makes sense that the authorities have the possibility to ban access to public institutions, supermarkets and shops, public and private nursing homes and hospitals, as well as the possibility to put restrictions on transportation.		X
TRUST	<i>How much trust do you have in the people and organizations below that they are able to handle the new type of coronavirus properly and correctly? (Very little: 1, A lot of trust: 7)</i>		
FEDERAL HEALTH	The Federal Ministry of Health	X	
HOSPITAL	Hospitals	X	

MEDIA	The media	X	
RKI	The Robert Koch Institute for Public Health	X	
STATE HEALTH	Your state's Ministry of Health	X	
POLICE	The police		X
LOCAL BUSINESS	Private businesses		X
HOSPITALS DOCTORS	Hospitals and doctors		X
GOVERNMENT	State authorities		X
EXPERTS	Experts (e.g., researchers)		X
POLITICIANS	Politicians		X
PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING	<p><i>Germany: Below are descriptions of how you may have felt or behaved most recently. Please choose the answer that best suits or complies with your condition during the past week.</i></p> <p><i>Denmark: Questions concerning your psychological state.</i></p>	<p>1: Not at all or <1 day 2: 1-2 days 3: 3-4 days 4: 5-7 days</p>	<p>1: Not at all 5: Extremely so</p>
NERVOUS	I felt nervous, anxious or tense.	X	
DEPRESSED	I felt down/depressed.	X	
LONELY	I felt lonely.	X	
HOPEFUL	I thought about the future with hope.	X	
STRESSED	I feel stressed out at the moment		X
ISOLATED	I feel isolated at the moment		X
LONELY	I feel lonely at the moment		X
BORED	I am bored at the moment.		X
OPTIMISTIC	I am very optimistic when I think about the future.		X
SATISFIED	Overall, how satisfied are you with your life at the moment?		X

RESILIENCE	<i>Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. (1: Do not agree at all, 5: Completely agree)</i>		
HARD TIMES	I tend to recover quickly from difficult times.	X	X
EVENTS	I find it difficult to endure stressful events.	X	X
RECOVERY	It does not take me a lot of time to recover from a stressful event.	X	X
NORMAL	It is hard for me to get back to my usual self after something unpleasant has happened.	X	X
MANAGE	I usually manage difficult times without great difficulty.	X	X
SETBACKS	I tend to take a long time to recover from setbacks in my life.	X	X