Title: Estimating effects of physical distancing on the COVID-19 pandemic using an urban mobility index

Authors: Jean-Paul R. Soucy[1,*], Shelby L. Sturrock[1], Isha Berry[1], Duncan J. Westwood[2], Nick Daneman[3,4,5], Derek R. MacFadden[6], Kevin A. Brown[1,7,8]

Affiliations:

[1]Division of Epidemiology, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

[2]Sunnybrook Research Institute, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, Toronto, Canada.

[3]Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.

[4]Division of Infectious Diseases, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, Toronto, Ontario.

[5]Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences, Toronto, Ontario.

[6]Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada.

[7]Public Health Ontario, Toronto, Canada.

[8]Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

*Correspondence to: Jean-Paul R. Soucy (jeanpaul.soucy@mail.utoronto.ca).

Abstract: Governments have implemented population-wide physical distancing measures to control COVID-19, but metrics evaluating their effectiveness are not readily available. We used a publicly available mobility index from a popular transit application to evaluate the effect of physical distancing on infection growth rates and reproductive numbers in 40 jurisdictions between March 23 and April 12, 2020. A 10% decrease in mobility was associated with a 14.6% decrease (exp(β) = 0.854; 95% credible interval: 0.835, 0.873) in the average daily growth rate and a -0.061 (95% CI: -0.071, -0.052) change in the instantaneous reproductive number 2 weeks later. Our analysis demonstrates that decreases in urban mobility were predictive of declines in epidemic growth. Mobility metrics offer an appealing method to calibrate population-level physical distancing policy and implementation.

One sentence summary: An urban mobility index may be used as a proximal measure of COVID-19 case growth and reproductive number 2 weeks later.

Main text: Policies limiting contact between individuals outside of households, via school closure, voluntary tele-commuting, and shelter-at-home orders, have been implemented throughout most of the world to reduce the transmission of COVID-19. Physical distancing (previously termed social distancing) policies have helped control previous epidemics of respiratory infections (*1*, *2*) and played a significant role in reducing COVID-19 transmission in China (*3*, *4*). Many regions have since adopted physical distancing measures, incrementally increasing restrictions and enforcement over time; some forms of physical distancing are likely to continue into the near future in order to control the pandemic (*5*). A proximal indicator of future infection rates (at a known time lag) is urgently needed to guide the future implementation and modification of physical distancing and other non-pharmaceutical interventions. In this analysis, we demonstrate that a mobility index based on regular users of a web-based transit

application can capture the effect of physical distancing on the reproductive number and growth rate of COVID-19 in 40 states and countries spanning 5 continents.

We used a daily city-level mobility index to (a) measure adherence to large-scale movement restrictions, and (b) predict the COVID-19 growth rate and instantaneous reproductive number at the national and sub-national level. The mobility index was provided by a public transit application (app) and uses the number of trips planned in the app to estimate the percentage of each city that is commuting relative to an internal reference from a recent usage period. The index is available from March 2nd to present and includes all 41 cities where the app operates. Importantly, outbreaks in major urban centers (like those in the dataset) represent a large proportion of total COVID-19 cases at national and sub-national (regional) levels (*6*). As a result, reduced mobility in these cities should have a significant impact on infection growth rates at larger geographies. Further, changes in the city-level mobility index are related to physical distancing interventions, many of which were implemented at the national or sub-national level (*7*); thus, reduced mobility in major urban centers should serve as a reasonable proxy for larger-scale behavior change.

Nearly all cities experienced substantial reductions in mobility during the month of March (March 2: mean = 97.6%, SD = 19.0; March 29: mean = 12.7%, SD = 10.4) (Fig. 1). Decreases were less pronounced in Hong Kong and Seoul, where mobility was already substantially reduced at the beginning of the month. Cities within Europe, Australia, and the Americas showed strikingly similar patterns in mobility reduction that corresponded to the dates of national or sub-national physical distancing mandates, including restrictions on public gatherings or mandatory closures (Table S1). Increasingly restrictive physical distancing policies were adopted in an incremental fashion following the index date and thus continued declines in mobility were expected through the remainder of the month. Messaging from public health authorities and news media likely contributed to changes in behavior prior to the index date.

Based on evidence suggesting an average incubation period (time from infection to symptom onset) of 5.1 days (*8*) and reporting delays (time between symptom onset and reporting) of at least 6.4 days (*9*), we would expect changes in mobility to be reflected in case growth rates approximately 2 weeks later. Most cities implemented their first major physical distancing policies throughout the second week of March (March 9–March 15). Thus, we compared average weekly mobility (for the weeks of March 9, March 16, and March 23) to the growth rate of cases 2 weeks later (the weeks of March 23, March 30, and April 6, respectively), both aggregated by week, for 40 states and countries. For most countries in the dataset, this period represents the growth and/or early peak phases of the epidemic (*6*).

The mean mobility index was associated with the logarithm of the growth rate of cumulative cases 2 weeks later (Fig. 2). A 10% lower mean mobility index was associated with a 14.6% lower mean daily growth rate 2 weeks later (exp(β) = 0.854; 95% credible interval (CI): 0.835, 0.873) (Table 1). When the model was adjusted for days since the 100th case (a measure of epidemic timing), the association was attenuated (exp(β) = 0.955; 95% CI: 0.926, 0.985). However, epidemic timing and mobility are closely related.

Our findings were robust to estimation of median daily growth rate (exp(β) = 0.862; 95% CI: 0.844, 0.880), which reduces the influence of outliers. Since reporting delay is unknown and variable across geographies, we also ran a model using a 3-week lag for mobility, which produced a similar strength of association (Table 1). We were unable to exclude imported cases, which were likely most prevalent

during the first week of case data (March 23). Re-running models to exclude this week produced relatively comparable results (Table S2).

The mobility index was associated with the estimated instantaneous reproductive number 2 weeks later (Fig. 3). A 10% lower mean mobility index was associated with a decrease in the instantaneous reproductive number of 0.061 2 weeks later (β = -0.061; 95% CI: -0.071, -0.052). When the model was adjusted for days since the 100th case, the association persisted but was attenuated (β = -0.029; 95% CI: -0.044, -0.014). Using a 3-week lag for mobility produced a slightly weaker strength of association (Table 1). Excluding the first week of case data (March 23) produced relatively comparable results (Table S2).

We found that a mobility index of public transit users in cities spanning 5 continents predicted growth in reported cases of COVID-19 2 to 3 weeks later. Such an index could be used by public health and governments attempting to understand the impacts of physical distancing and mobility restriction measures during the COVID-19 pandemic.

While the metric we evaluated is predictive, its availability is limited to a handful of cities located mainly in Europe and North America. The index also reflects the movement of a limited portion of the population—transit users—and provides no insight into the number and distribution of close contacts that could lead to transmission. Although we have justified the use of a city-level mobility metric above, this inevitably introduces measurement error for an outcome aggregated at the national or sub-national level. Variation across countries and regions in the delay between symptom onset and public reporting of cases adds uncertainty regarding the correct lag between changes in mobility and the resulting effects on growth rates. This should become less of an issue as more rapid and standardized testing is implemented across regions.

Our study had other limitations. Our analysis does not confirm a causal pathway through mobility, but rather a strong association that warrants further evaluation. For example, it is possible that countries successfully enforcing physical distancing are also more successfully implementing interventions such as contact tracing or widespread testing, which may also contribute to the observed association. We also did not account for imported cases in the calculation of the instantaneous reproductive number; however, locally acquired cases were certainly undercounted during this period, and likely to a greater degree than imported cases due to the increased attention on international travelers. Further, imported cases are expected to account for an increasingly small proportion of total cases in the latter two weeks (March 30 and April 6) due to the implementation of travel restrictions in mid–late March. Re-running the models to exclude the first week (March 23) of case data produced relatively similar results to the full models (for both growth rate and reproductive number), suggesting that imported cases do not drive our results.

Additional measures of human mobility and physical distancing are urgently needed in order to better understand the impacts of these policies on transmission dynamics. Corporations such as Google and Apple have recently released mobility data that may contain a greater variety of contact and mobility patterns. We call for all organizations with access to mobility data to publicly release them. These metrics need not necessarily be granular, as physical distancing measures are usually implemented at a broad scale. Further evaluation of the utility of these metrics in guiding population interventions are needed, particularly for supporting the steps necessary to keep the reproductive number of the disease below 1.

Though necessary, these strategies are already proving to have dire consequences on other aspects of health and well-being (*10–13*). The value of mobility metrics is set to increase dramatically as countries consider a transition toward intermittent or cyclical physical distancing measures that aim to minimize

these negative consequences without producing surges in COVID-19 (*14*). Finally, we hope our results will be helpful to reassure the public that, despite the immense economic, social and psychological costs, their continued cooperation will have powerful long-term benefits.

References and Notes:

1. M. W. Fong, H. Gao, J. Y. Wong, J. Xiao, E. Y. C. Shiu, S. Ryu, B. J. Cowling, Nonpharmaceutical Measures for Pandemic Influenza in Nonhealthcare Settings—Social Distancing Measures. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. **26** (2020).

2. P. Caley, D. J. Philp, K. McCracken, Quantifying social distancing arising from pandemic influenza. *J. R. Soc. Interface*. **5**, 631–639 (2008).

3. M. U. G. Kraemer, C.-H. Yang, B. Gutierrez, C.-H. Wu, B. Klein, D. M. Pigott, O. C.-19 D. W. Group†, L. du Plessis, N. R. Faria, R. Li, W. P. Hanage, J. S. Brownstein, M. Layan, A. Vespignani, H. Tian, C. Dye, O. G. Pybus, S. V. Scarpino, The effect of human mobility and control measures on the COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Science* 10.1126/science.abb4218 (2020).

4. R. Li, S. Pei, B. Chen, Y. Song, T. Zhang, W. Yang, J. Shaman, Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV2). *Science* 10.1126/science.abb3221 (2020).

5. G. J. Tellis, A. Sood, N. Sood, How Long Should Social Distancing Last? Predicting Time to Moderation, Control, and Containment of COVID-19, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3562996 (2020).

6. E. Dong, H. Du, L. Gardner, An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, S1473309920301201 (2020).

7. S. Flaxman, S. Mishra, A. Gandy, H. J. T. Unwin, H. Coupland, T. A. Mellan, T. Berah, J. W. Eaton, P. N. P. Guzman, N. Schmit, L. Cilloni, K. E. C. Ainslie, I. Blake, A. Boonyasiri, O. Boyd, L. Cattarino, C. Ciavarella, L. Cooper, Z. Cucunubá, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, A. Dighe, B. Djaafara, I. Dorigatti, S. van Elsland, R. FitzJohn, H. Fu, K. Gaythorpe, L. Geidelberg, N. Grassly, W. Hinsley, B. Jeffrey, D. Jorgensen, E. Knock, D. Laydon, G. Nedjati-Gilani, K. Parag, I. Siveroni, H. Thompson, R. Verity, E. Volz, P. G. Walker, H. Wang, Y. Wang, O. Watson, X. Xi, P. Winskill, C. Whittaker, C. A. Donnelly, S. Riley, L. C. Okell, M. A. C. Vollmer, N. M. Ferguson, S. Bhatt, "Estimating the number of infections and the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in 11 European countries" (2020; https://www.imperial.ac.uk/mrc-global-infectious-disease-analysis/covid-19/report-13-europe-npi-impact/).

8. S. A. Lauer, K. H. Grantz, Q. Bi, F. K. Jones, Q. Zheng, H. R. Meredith, A. S. Azman, N. G. Reich, J. Lessler, The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 10.7326/M20-0504 (2020).

9. A. Tariq, Y. Lee, K. Roosa, S. Blumberg, P. Yan, S. Ma, G. Chowell, Real-time monitoring the transmission potential of COVID-19 in Singapore, March 2020, https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026435v7 (2020).

10. S. Galea, R. M. Merchant, N. Lurie, The Mental Health Consequences of COVID-19 and Physical Distancing: The Need for Prevention and Early Intervention. *JAMA Intern Med* 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.1562 (2020).

11. C. Bradbury-Jones, L. Isham, The pandemic paradox: The consequences of COVID-19 on domestic violence. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 10.1111/jocn.15296 (2020).

12. G. Miller, Social distancing prevents infections, but it can have unintended consequences. *Science* (2020).

13. D. Gura, A record 6.6 million Americans filed for unemployment last week. *NBC News* (2020), https://www.nbcnews.com/business/economy/record-6-6-million-americans-filed-unemployment-last-week-n1174776.

14. S. M. Kissler, C. Tedijanto, M. Lipsitch, Y. Grad, Social distancing strategies for curbing the COVID-19 epidemic, https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.22.20041079v1 (2020).

15. Stan Development Team, RStan: the R interface to Stan (2020) (available at http://mc-stan.org/).

16. B. Goodrich, J. Gabry, I. Ali, S. Brilleman, rstanarm: Bayesian applied regression modeling via Stan (2020) (available at https://mc-stan.org/rstanarm).

17. R Core Team, *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing* (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2020; https://www.R-project.org/).

18. C. Fraser, Estimating Individual and Household Reproduction Numbers in an Emerging Epidemic. *PLOS ONE*. **2**, e758 (2007).

19. A. Cori, *EpiEstim: Estimate Time Varying Reproduction Numbers from Epidemic Curves* (2019; https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=EpiEstim).

20. A. Cori, N. M. Ferguson, C. Fraser, S. Cauchemez, A New Framework and Software to Estimate Time-Varying Reproduction Numbers During Epidemics. *Am J Epidemiol*. **178**, 1505–1512 (2013).

21. Z. Du, X. Xu, Y. Wu, L. Wang, B. J. Cowling, L. A. Meyers, Serial Interval of COVID-19 among Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **26** (2020).

22. T. Hale, S. Webster, A. Petherick, T. Phillips, B. Kira, Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker, Blavatnik School of Government (2020), https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/coronavirus-government-response-tracker.

Funding: No external funding was received for this study.

Author contributions: KAB and J-PRS conceived of the study. J-PRS, SLS, IB, and DJW curated the data. J-PRS and KAB performed the analysis. J-PRS, SLS, KAB, and IB wrote the initial draft. All authors contributed to and approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests: Authors declare no competing interests.

Data and materials availability: Data and code to reproduce the analysis are available at: https://github.com/jeanpaulrsoucy/covid-19-mobility. This study used exclusively publicly available data (sources listed in the supplementary material).

Supplementary materials:

Materials and Methods

Figures S1–S2

Tables S1–S3

References (15–22)



Fig. 1. Mobility index in 41 cities over a 4-week period in March 2020, before (solid lines) and after (dashed lines) the first major state- or country-level physical distancing intervention was announced.



Fig. 2. The association between mean daily growth rate (aggregated by week) and mean mobility index 2 weeks prior for 40 states and countries. Each pair of weeks (labeled according to the week growth rate was measured) is plotted separately for a model fit on all 3 weeks of data. The 95% prediction interval is shown in gray. AU = Australia; CA = Canada; DE = Germany; ES = Spain; IT = Italy; UK = United Kingdom; US = United States.



Fig. 3. The association between the mean instantaneous reproductive number (aggregated by week) and mean mobility index 2 weeks prior for 40 states and countries. Each pair of weeks (labeled according to the week the reproductive number was estimated) is plotted separately for a model fit on all 3 weeks of data. The 95% prediction interval is shown in gray. AU = Australia; CA = Canada; DE = Germany; ES = Spain; IT = Italy; UK = United Kingdom; US = United States.

Table 1. Model coefficients (with 95% credible intervals) for the association between a 10% decrease in the mobility index and the mean daily growth rate and instantaneous reproductive number (both aggregated by week) assuming a lag of 2 or 3 weeks. Model coefficients are presented with and without adjustment for days since 100th case. Models include 3 weeks of outcome data (March 23–April 12) for 40 countries and states (39 in the adjusted models). CI = credible interval.

	Mean daily growth rate (%) (exp(β))		
Mobility index	**Unadjusted (95% CI)**	**Adjusted (95% CI)**[a]	
	Mobility[b]	**Mobility**[b]	**Days since 100 cases**[c]
2-week lag	0.854 (0.835, 0.873)	0.955 (0.926, 0.985)	0.558 (0.490, 0.639)
3-week lag	0.865 (0.851, 0.880)	0.941 (0.913, 0.969)	0.620 (0.534, 0.720)
	Instantaneous reproductive number (β)		
Mobility index	**Unadjusted (95% CI)**	**Adjusted (95% CI)**[a]	
	Mobility[b]	**Mobility**[b]	**Days since 100 cases**[c]
2-week lag	-0.061 (-0.071, -0.052)	-0.029 (-0.044, -0.014)	-0.169 (-0.233, -0.108)
3-week lag	-0.052 (-0.060, -0.044)	-0.020 (-0.035, -0.005)	-0.183 (-0.261, -0.108)

[a] Excludes the Principality of Monaco.

[b] Coefficient for a 10% decrease in the mobility index.

[c] Coefficient for a 10-day increase since the 100th reported case.