

Supplementary file for the study titled: " England's Lockdown vs. Sweden's Herd Immunity: A Comparison of the Daily New COVID-19 Cases and Related Deaths Using Comparative Interrupted Time Series Analysis."

Moaath K. Mustafa Ali, MD, MPH^{1†}; Yazan Samhouri, MD^{2†}; Marwa Sabha, MD³; Lynna Alnimer, MD⁴

¹ Marlene and Stewart Greenebaum Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of Maryland Medical Center, Baltimore, Maryland.

² Department of Hematology and Medical Oncology, Allegheny Health Network, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

³ Division of Rheumatology and Clinical Immunology, Department of Medicine, University of Maryland Medical Center, Baltimore, Maryland.

⁴ Department of Internal Medicine, Ascension Providence Hospital, Michigan State University, College of Human Medicine, Southfield, Michigan.

Contents:

- 1. Statistical analysis**
- 2. Results**
- 3. eTables (number: 2)**
- 4. eFigures (number: 2)**

Statistical analysis

Both linear and nonlinear polynomial models were fit for time series. We used comparative interrupted time series (ITS) regression models, as described by Linden et al[1] :

$$Y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1.T + \beta_2.X_t + \beta_3.X_t.T + \beta_4.Z + \beta_5.Z.T + \beta_6.Z.X_t + \beta_7.Z.X_t.T + \epsilon_t$$

Y_t = daily new cases or deaths counts

Z = treatment and control indicator (dummy variable)

X_t = intervention indicator (dummy variable)

T = time since the start of the study (continuous variable)

β_0 = Intercept

β_1 = slope in control before intervention

β_2 = difference in daily new cases or deaths in control before and after the intervention

β_3 = difference in the slope in control before and after the intervention

β_4 = difference in daily new cases or deaths between treatment and control before intervention

β_5 = difference in the slope between treatment and control before the intervention

β_6 = difference in daily new cases or deaths between treatment and control in the period immediately after the intervention

β_7 = difference in the slope between treatment and control after the intervention

ϵ_t = error

In this regression model, a significant β_6 or β_7 indicates the intervention effect. β_7 indicates the change in rate after intervention implementation and is the primary outcome of the interest of this study.

Results

eTables 1 shows the results of ITS regression models to estimate the effect of lockdown implemented in England compared to Sweden. Coefficient β_7 represents the intervention effect, which is the change in rates of COVID-19 daily cases or deaths per 10,000,000 person in Sweden compared to England. In this table, we used both linear and polynomial models to estimate the intervention effects. Both models resulted in similar estimates of coefficient β_7 .

eTable 1 Generalized least square regression models to estimate the effect of lockdown order on daily confirmed cases and deaths related to COVID-19 in England compared to Sweden using controlled interrupted time series analysis

Variable	Value	Standard Error	T-value	P-value
Linear model: Daily confirmed cases interrupted time series model ^μ				
Intercept (β_0)	-220.46	57.44	-3.84	< 0.001
Time (β_1)	22.54	2.92	7.72	< 0.001
Intervention (Post-lock down) (β_2)	1187.81	90.03	13.19	< 0.001
Time: Intervention (β_3)	-29.30	3.13	-9.36	< 0.001
Control (Sweden) (β_4)	23.22	64.87	0.36	0.72
Time: Control (β_5)	-7.24	2.94	-2.46	0.01
Intervention: Control (β_6)	-790.22	103.37	-7.64	< 0.001
Time: Intervention: Control (β_7)	19.38	3.08	6.30	< 0.001
Non-linear (polynomial) model: Daily confirmed cases interrupted time series model ^μ				
Intercept (β_0)	126.48	104.24	1.21	0.23
Time (β_1)	-0.75	7.39	-0.10	0.92
Time squared	0.33	0.18	1.80	0.07
Time cubic	0.00	0.00	-2.42	0.02
Intervention (Post-lock down) (β_2)	762.22	408.30	1.87	0.06
Time: Intervention (β_3)	-18.63	11.79	-1.58	0.12
Control (Sweden) (β_4)	-10.20	60.72	-0.17	0.87
Time: Control (β_5)	-7.93	2.91	-2.72	0.01
Intervention: Control (β_6)	-693.75	116.34	-5.96	< 0.001
Time: Intervention: Control (β_7)	19.39	3.38	5.73	< 0.001
Linear model: Daily deaths interrupted time series model [¥]				
Intercept (β_0)	-44.32	7.71	-5.75	< 0.001
Time (β_1)	5.66	0.37	15.23	< 0.001
Intervention (Post-lock down) (β_2)	223.04	12.77	17.46	< 0.001

Time: Intervention (β_3)	-7.19	0.41	-17.33	< 0.001
Control (Sweden) (β_4)	5.25	8.21	0.64	0.52
Time: Control (β_5)	-1.74	0.41	-4.20	< 0.001
Intervention: Control (β_6)	-53.85	15.66	-3.44	< 0.001
Time: Intervention: Control (β_7)	2.20	0.47	4.63	< 0.001
Nonlinear (polynomial model): Daily deaths interrupted time series model [¥]				
Intercept (β_0)	-27.81	7.05	-3.94	< 0.001
Time (β_1)	2.13	0.86	2.49	0.01
Time squared	0.12	0.03	4.61	< 0.001
Time cubic	0.00	0.00	-4.33	< 0.001
Intervention (Post-lock down) (β_2)	436.10	42.26	10.32	< 0.001
Time: Intervention (β_3)	-13.26	1.23	-10.82	< 0.001
Control (Sweden) (β_4)	0.91	7.61	0.12	0.91
Time: Control (β_5)	-1.55	0.35	-4.43	< 0.001
Intervention: Control (β_6)	-50.19	10.86	-4.62	< 0.001
Time: Intervention: Control (β_7)	2.02	0.35	5.74	< 0.001

[¤] In daily confirmed cases model, the intervention was delayed for five days, equal to the median COVID-19 incubation period. [¥] In the death related to the COVID-19 model, the intervention was delayed for eighteen days, equal to the sum of the COVID-19 incubation period and the median time from symptom onset to death. NB: lockdown order was implemented in England on March 23, 2020. The numbers represented in the table are adjusted for the difference in population size. In these models, both England and Sweden's population sizes were adjusted to ten billion.

To understand the relation of COVID-19 daily cases and related deaths with phases one and two of lifting restrictions in England compared to Sweden, we estimated coefficients using segmented ITS regression models (eTable 2). Coefficient β_7b represents the effect of phase one of loosening restrictions, which is the change in rates of COVID-19 daily cases or deaths per 10,000,000 person in Sweden compared to England. After phase one, Sweden experienced an acceleration of new COVID-19 cases compared to England (49 cases/ 10^7 person, 95% CI: 30-67, $P < 0.001$). There was no difference in the daily new COVID-19 cases rate after phase two (Coefficient β_7c).

Regarding mortality, there was no difference in daily deaths related to COVID-19 between England and Sweden after phase one or two of loosening restrictions (coefficient β_7b and coefficient β_7c , respectively).

Both daily COVID-19 cases and related deaths models are presented in eFigure 1 and 2, respectively.


eTable 2 Generalized least square regression models to estimate the effect of lockdown order and its reversal on daily confirmed cases and deaths related to COVID-19 in England compared to Sweden using controlled interrupted time series analysis

Variable	Value	Standard Error	T-value	P-value
Daily confirmed cases interrupted time series model ^u				
Intercept (β_0)	-219.37	49.27	-4.45	< 0.001
Time (β_1)	21.06	2.61	8.06	< 0.001
Intervention (Post-lock down) (β_2a)	898.39	120.89	7.43	< 0.001
Intervention (Post-reversal phase 1) (β_2b)	3005.91	595.91	5.04	< 0.001
Intervention (Post-reversal phase 2) (β_2c)	-141.67	781.68	-0.18	0.86
Time: Intervention (Post-lock down) (β_3a)	-22.47	3.40	-6.61	< 0.001
Time: Intervention (Post-reversal phase 1) (β_3b)	-47.20	6.53	-7.23	< 0.001
Time: Intervention (Post-reversal phase 1) (β_3c)	-17.34	7.51	-2.31	0.02
Control (Sweden) (β_4)	1.46	64.54	0.02	0.98
Time: Control (β_5)	-3.24	2.92	-1.11	0.27
Intervention: Control (β_6a)	-224.27	160.36	-1.40	0.16
Intervention: Control (β_6b)	-3928.16	838.24	-4.69	< 0.001
Intervention: Control (β_6c)	1569.70	1091.42	1.44	0.15
Time: Intervention (Post-lock down): Control (β_7a)	5.36	3.88	1.38	0.17
Time: Intervention (Post-reversal phase 1): Control (β_7b)	48.69	9.21	5.29	< 0.001
Time: Intervention (Post-reversal phase 2): Control (β_7c)	-2.74	10.05	-0.27	0.79
Daily deaths interrupted time series model ^y				
Intercept (β_0)	-47.50	7.00	-6.78	< 0.001
Time (β_1)	5.86	0.34	17.18	< 0.001
Intervention (Post-lock down) (β_2a)	242.94	15.96	15.22	< 0.001
Intervention (Post-reversal phase 1) (β_2b)	112.61	80.30	1.40	0.16
Intervention (Post-reversal phase 2) (β_2c)	129.14	158.18	0.82	0.42
Time: Intervention (Post-lock down) (β_3a)	-7.68	0.46	-16.79	< 0.001
Time: Intervention (Post-reversal phase 1) (β_3b)	-6.24	0.89	-7.00	< 0.001
Time: Intervention (Post-reversal phase 1) (β_3c)	-6.40	1.48	-4.31	< 0.001
Control (Sweden) (β_4)	5.80	7.24	0.80	0.42
Time: Control (β_5)	-1.76	0.37	-4.68	< 0.001
Intervention: Control (β_6a)	-7.68	0.46	-16.79	< 0.001
Intervention: Control (β_6b)	-6.24	0.89	-7.00	< 0.001
Intervention: Control (β_6c)	-6.40	1.48	-4.31	< 0.001
Time: Intervention (Post-lock down): Control (β_7a)	2.13	0.54	3.94	< 0.001
Time: Intervention (Post-reversal phase 1): Control (β_7b)	0.19	1.24	0.15	0.88

Time: Intervention (Post-reversal phase 2): Control (β_7c)	0.45	2.07	0.22	0.83
--	------	------	------	------


^u In daily confirmed cases model, the intervention was delayed for five days, equal to the median COVID-19 incubation period. ^v In the death related to the COVID-19 model, the intervention was delayed for eighteen days, equal to the sum of the COVID-19 incubation period and the median time from symptom onset to death. NB: lockdown order was implemented in England on March 23, 2020. Phase one of restriction loosening was implemented in England on May 13, 2020. Phase two of restriction loosening was implemented in England on June 1, 2020. The numbers represented in the table are adjusted for the difference in population size. In these models, both England and Sweden's population sizes were adjusted to ten billion.

eFigure 1 Comparative time series analysis to assess the impact of England's lockdown order, and phase one and two loosening of restrictions on daily new cases of COVID-19 compared to Sweden, adjusted for population size.



*Population size was adjusted to ten million for both countries in this figure. NB: Smoothened lines represent predicted daily cases in an interrupted time series model for each country

eFigure 1 Comparative time series analysis to assess the impact of England's lockdown order, and phase one and two loosening of restrictions on daily deaths related to COVID-19 compared to Sweden, adjusted for population size.



* Population size was adjusted to ten million for both countries in this figure. NB: Smoothened lines represent predicted daily deaths in an interrupted time series model for each country

References

1. Linden, A. and J.L. Adams, *Applying a propensity score-based weighting model to interrupted time series data: improving causal inference in programme evaluation*. J Eval Clin Pract, 2011. **17**(6): p. 1231-8.