medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Impact of public health measures to control SARS-CoV-2 Outbreak: a data-driven analysis

Hugues Turbé[1,2,*], Mina Bjelogrlic[1,2], Arnaud Robert[1,2], Christophe Gaudet-Blavignac [1,2] & Christian Lovis[1,2]

[1]*Division of Medical Information Sciences - University Hospitals of Geneva (HUG), Switzerland*
[2]*Department of radiology and medical informatics - University of Geneva (UNIGE), Switzerland*
**Email of corresponding author: hugues.turbe@unige.ch*

With the rapid spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus since Fall 2019, governments took various measures to contain the propagation of the pandemic, declared on March, 2020. This study introduces a novel method to estimate the reproductive number using Bayesian inference with time-dependent priors. By inferring the infection dates from incidence time series, the developed approach allows direct comparison between reproductive number and introduction of public health measures in a specific country. First a specific period between the onset of the symptoms and a case being declared as dead is derived on data available in Switzerland. Focussing on the measures taken by 31 European countries, this study shows that most countries required tough state interventions with a stringency index equal to 83.6 out of 100 to reduce the reproductive number below one and hence control the development of the epidemy. In addition, it is shown that there is a direct correlation between the time taken to introduce restrictive measures and the time required to contain the spread of the epidemy with a median time of 8 days between the introduction of initial restrictive measures and the reproductive rate reducing below one.

Introduction

Since being first observed in Wuhan in late 2019, the outbreak of the 2019 SARS-CoV-2 virus has caused global concerns on health and economy. The transmission rate, pressure on the healthcare system and lack of effective treatment lead countries to take various measures to limit the spread of the virus, among them confinement measures ranging from banning gatherings to complete lockdowns and closing borders [1,2]. In this research, the impact of these measures is evaluated through their influence on the effective reproduction number R_t and its evolution in time. The effective reproduction number aims to quantify the number of secondary infections caused by an individual over the time at which this person is infected. It is important to make the distinction between the

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

effective and basic reproduction rate. The basic reproduction R_0 refers to the evolution of the disease when the population is fully susceptible to the disease while the effective reproductive rate R_t factors the immunity acquired within the population [3]. The reproduction rate is a key parameter to evaluate the evolution of an epidemic. Any value below 1 indicates that the spread is decreasing, any value above one indicates that the spread is increasing. In addition, the reproductive number allows a direct comparison of the epidemiologic profiles observed in different countries with largely different characteristics (population, testing methods, etc), thus considering temporality and populational characteristics.

Numerous methods have been developed to compute the reproductive rate and its evolution over time[4]. Initial methods derived the reproductive rate from transmission model similar to the SIR model [5–9]. However, these models require assumptions about the epidemiology of the disease and are dependent on the recovered cases which are very often difficult to evaluate. Later models, including the Wallinga and Teunis approach[10], use a likelihood-based estimation procedure to reconstruct infection patterns. These methods were however found to exhibit large variations when using daily data [11]. Approaches which aimed to correct these fluctuations were very sensitive to the selected smoothing parameters [11,12]. Cory et al. developed an additional method to mitigate these drawbacks and their method showed special robustness to underreporting[13].

Since the start of the pandemic, various studies have looked at the impact of public health interventions on the evolution of the COVID-19 at a regional or national level. Studies first focussed on China, demonstrating the importance of control strategies to reduce the reproductive rate[14,15]. These studies used mechanistic transmission models to obtain the reproductive number with the drawbacks associated with these models described earlier. Further studies focussed on how state interventions prevented ICU capacity to be overwhelmed as well as the impact of these measures on fatalities in the UK[16], Germany[17] and France[18]. While these researches focussed on individual country, a report published by Flaxman et al.[19] aimed to demonstrate the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions in 11 European countries. This study assumed that the various interventions had the same effect across countries and that their impact was independent of the timing of the measure. In addition, this study assumed the reproductive number is fixed between the different measures. However, a recent research shows that community changes also play a role in slowing the evolution of the virus[20].

The aim of this work is to extend previous researches by focussing on the effects of state

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

interventions in 31 European countries. As the evolution of the reproductive number is a function of both the introduction of restrictive measures as well as changes in behaviours with specific societal properties, we do not aim to quantify the effect of each measure. Instead, we aim to show how these combined interventions and their temporality have influenced the spread of the virus.

Evaluating the reproductive number from incidence data

The number of infected individuals at a given time can be estimated as follows:

$$E[I(t)] = R(t) \sum_{s=1}^{t} w_s I(t-s) \tag{1}$$

where w_s is the serial interval. The distribution of w_s for the SARS-CoV-2 virus was found by Nishiura et al.[21] to have a mean of 4.8 days and a standard deviation of 2.3 days.

Given the time at which an infection I(t) occurred is not available, the number of confirmed cases and deaths on a given day are used as proxies, keeping in mind that the developed method is able to deal with underreporting. Linton et al.[22] derived the incubation period (from illness onset to hospitalization) at 2.7 days from confirmed infection and diagnosis outside of the epicentre of Hubei Province, China, based on official reports from governmental institutes. The period between the onset of the symptoms and a case being declared as confirmed in Switzerland, was estimated to 5.6 days by a study performed in Basel, Switzerland[23]. Incubation, Onset to confirmed, and Onset to death periods were assumed to be gamma distributed and their mean and standard deviation are summarised in table 1.

Table 1: Incubation and waiting time distribution

Period	Mean [days]	Standard deviation [days]
Incubation (Linton et al.[22])	4.6	2.6
Onset to confirmed (Scire et al.[23])	5.6	4.2
Onset to death (our study)	15.3	6.7

From the latter periods it is possible to calculate a posterior distribution of R_t based on the inferred infection dates extracted from the cases being reported as confirmed or dead. For the cases declared on each day, a shift following a gamma distribution between the defined cases (confirmed or dead) and the time of infection is randomly generated. For each case, the new date of infection

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 2: Distribution model and AIC for test to death period

Distribution	**Gamma**	Weibull	Lognormal
AIC	**8997**	9026	9085

then becomes the date at which the case was reported minus the generated shift. This procedure is then performed iteratively with the mean of the obtained infections on each day over the simulations being retained thus increasing the robustness of our proposed method by naturally smoothing the incidence data. This step is critical in order to deal with infrequently published data. In addition, the infections for the most recent days are corrected (Scire et al.[23]) to factor the fact that some of the infections which occurred on this day will be reported in the future (see Methods). Our method to estimate the reproductive rate is a variation of the one proposed by Cori et al.[13]. While their method assumes a constant gamma distribution for the prior distribution, the presented model takes advantage of the information gained in time by updating the prior distribution for each window with the previous posterior (see Methods). R_t was estimated using incidence data for confirmed cases and death published in the *COVID-19 Data Repository* by Johns Hopkins University (JHU CSSE). Data regarding the various state interventions were retrieved from the *Coronavirus government response tracker (OxCGRT)* developed by the Blavatnik School of Government, Oxford University. The stringency index provided in this dataset tracks government's policies and interventions across different categories and provides a score between 0 and 100 evaluating the overall stringency of the measures taken in a given country[24]. Combining these two datasets, the full set of data was obtained for 33 European countries. For our analysis, Russia and Ukraine were removed from our dataset as the reported daily death are still increasing for these two countries when we are interested in countries which have successfully contained the evolution of the pandemic before the 23rd of May 2020. We were therefore left with a set of 31 European countries listed in Appendix A.

Determining the period between a positive case and death

In this study, the period between a case being reported positive and the death of the individual was extracted from 1430 cases provided by the Swiss Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH). Our result provide a distribution on a much larger dataset than the one built by Linton et al.[22] which used 33 cases. We tested three different distributions: lognormal, Weibull and gamma with the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) being used to identify the best distribution. The results are summarised in table 2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

A gamma distribution with a mean and a standard deviation equal respectively to 10.7 and 6.73 days was found to best fit the data from infection to death. The distribution along the extracted data are shown in figure 1. This distribution was then combined with the incubation period provided by Linton et al.[22] to obtain the period between onset and death shown in table 1.



Figure 1: Distribution of the period between a positive test and the death of the patient

The importance of taking measures early

The evolution of the reproductive rate in Austria is shown in figure 2. The daily observed confirmed cases and deaths are shown in the top part with blue and violet bars respectively. The same colour code is applied in the top part for the estimated daily infections date inferred from these cases and on the bottom part, the derived reproductive rates. These results are shown along the state interventions taken in the respective countries with vertical bars at the date of applicability with red and green unified short descriptions for beginning and termination of restrictive measures respectively (see Petherick et al.[24] for more details on terminology and corresponding scores of the measures).

Austria provides a good analysis case as it was one of the first country in Europe to impose lockdown measure, as early as on the 13th of March, but also to ease restrictions in mid-April. It is interesting to note that the reproductive rate started to decline before the introduction of restrictive measures. The reductions was however steeper after a set of measure was introduced between the 13th and 17th of March. The reproductive rate then plateaued at around 0.65 during the lockdown.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 2: Evolution of the reproductive rate (mean and 95% confidence interval) in Austria. Top plot: reported deaths and confirmed cases shown with bars, inferred estimated infection distributions shown as solid lines. Bottom plot: vertical black lines mark the introduction (red name) and removal (green name) of measures. The solid lines represent the mean of the estimated reproductive rate and the shaded area the 95% CI (see Methods)

Recently the reproductive rate has been oscillating around one. This last phase shows the difficulty to reduce the number of cases below a certain threshold with the emergence of localised clusters whose identification will be critical to contain the evolution of the virus.

The stringency index developed by Petherick et al.[24] was used to assess the role of state interventions in controlling the epidemy. This index was compared with the evolution of the reproductive rate rather than the incidence of confirmed or dead cases. Indeed, differences in testing or reporting policies between countries make it very difficult to compare these variables directly. While the reproductive rate is also subject to variations in these policies, it depends on the change in confirmed and death cases therefore allowing comparison between countries with different policies. The measures as well as the stringency index each country had in place when their reproductive rate based on the confirmed cases dropped below one is analysed. The intention is to determine which measures allowed countries to contain the evolution of the virus. The stringency index of the countries included in our analysis are presented in figure 3. When countries managed to reduce their reproductive rate below one they had a mean stringency index of 83.6 out of 100 with a standard deviation of 13.5. When R_t dropped below one, the median severity of the measures for each category defined in the OxCGRT dataset was the following. Countries had completely closed their school as well as non-essential workplace. All public events were cancelled and gathering

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

with more than 10 people were banned. Finally, the median country required not to leave the house apart than for specific activities and internal movements were severely restricted.



Figure 3: Stringency index per country when R_t dropped below 1. The median value is indicated with the dotted line

In order to assess the impact of taking restrictive measures early in the crisis, the time taken to introduce initial restrictive measures was compared to the period taken to control the epidemy. The time until the introduction of restrictive measure was defined as the period between the 5th death in a given country and the stringency index reaching a score of 35. The stringency index corresponds to the lowest score observed when Andorra reached a R_t smaller than one. The time required to control the epidemy was then defined as the period between the 5th death and the reproductive rate based on the confirmed cases dropping below one. The results along a linear regression are presented in figure 4. A Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.762 was found between the two variables indicating that there is indeed a positive benefit of taking early measures to control the epidemy. The United Kingdom can serve as an interesting example. The UK had initially planned to build "targeted herd immunity" delaying the introduction of restrictive measure. As a results of this delay, the UK were only able to contain the epidemy 30 days after the fifth death occurred in the country when the median time for the countries included in our analysis was of eight days. There are three outliers in our analysis being Andorra, Sweden and Iceland. Sweden has decided not to introduce a complete lockdown. While true that Sweden has achieved a reproductive rate oscillating around one, it currently stands with one of the highest daily death incidence in Europe having 5.34 deaths per million people per day on the 23th of May when the mean for the countries included in our analysis is 0.82 on the same day (as retrieved from Our World in Data).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 4: Period required to contain the epidemy as a function of the period to introduce initial restrictive measures.

Conclusions

First, an improved estimation of the time spent between a positive test and the death of a patient was derived using 1430 cases reported in Switzerland. This is an essential parameter to predict the occupancy of ICU units and models are very sensitive to it. Second, we propose a new method, that allows to estimate a sequence of reproduction numbers, where information acquired by previous reproduction numbers is transferred to more recent reproduction number estimates via Bayesian inference. By retrieving the infection date, this method allows direct comparison between the introduction of restrictive measures and their effect on the reproduction rate. Our analysis on 30 European countries shows that all countries apart from three required state interventions to control the epidemy. It was finally shown that countries which took restrictive measures earlier managed to control the epidemy in a shorter time frame indicating these measures were indeed effective in limiting the number of casualties in Europe as of the 23rd of May 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

References

1. Mandal, M. *et al.* A model based study on the dynamics of COVID-19: Prediction and control. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **136**, 109889 (2020).

2. Huang, L. *et al.* Rapid asymptomatic transmission of COVID-19 during the incubation period demonstrating strong infectivity in a cluster of youngsters aged 16-23 years outside Wuhan and characteristics of young patients with COVID-19: A prospective contact-tracing study. *Journal of Infection* **80**, e1–e13 (2020).

3. Delamater, P. L., Street, E. J., Leslie, T. F., Yang, Y. T. & Jacobsen, K. H. Complexity of the Basic Reproduction Number (R_0). *Emerging Infectious Diseases* **25**, 1–4 (2019).

4. van den Driessche, P. Reproduction numbers of infectious disease models. *Infectious Disease Modelling* **2**, 288–303 (2017).

5. Perasso, A. An Introduction to The Basic Reproduction Number in Mathematical Epidemiology. *ESAIM: Proceedings and Surveys* **62**, 123–138 (2018).

6. Cintrón-Arias, A., Castillo-Chávez, C., Bettencourt, L. M. A., Lloyd, A. L. & Banks, H. T. The Estimation of the Effective Reproductive Number from Disease Outbreak Data. Tech. Rep. (2020). `http://arxiv.org/abs/2004.06827`, `2004.06827`.

7. Bettencourt, L. M. A. & Ribeiro, R. M. Real Time Bayesian Estimation of the Epidemic Potential of Emerging Infectious Diseases. *PLoS ONE* **3**, e2185 (2008).

8. Riley, S. Transmission Dynamics of the Etiological Agent of SARS in Hong Kong: Impact of Public Health Interventions. *Science* **300**, 1961–1966 (2003).

9. Gani, R. & Leach, S. Transmission potential of smallpox in contemporary populations. *Nature* **414**, 748–751 (2001).

10. Wallinga, J. Different Epidemic Curves for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Reveal Similar Impacts of Control Measures. *American Journal of Epidemiology* **160**, 509–516 (2004).

11. Hens, N. *et al.* Estimating the effective reproduction number for pandemic influenza from notification data made publicly available in real time: A multi-country analysis for influenza A/H1N1v 2009. *Vaccine* **29**, 896–904 (2011).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

12. Cauchemez, S., Boëlle, P.-Y., Thomas, G. & Valleron, A.-J. Estimating in Real Time the Efficacy of Measures to Control Emerging Communicable Diseases. *American Journal of Epidemiology* **164**, 591–597 (2006).

13. Cori, A., Ferguson, N. M., Fraser, C. & Cauchemez, S. A New Framework and Software to Estimate Time-Varying Reproduction Numbers During Epidemics. *American Journal of Epidemiology* **178**, 1505–1512 (2013).

14. Prem, K. *et al.* The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: A modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health* **5**, e261–e270 (2020).

15. Zhang, Y., Jiang, B., Yuan, J. & Tao, Y. The impact of social distancing and epicenter lockdown on the COVID-19 epidemic in mainland China: A data-driven SEIQR model study. Preprint, Epidemiology (2020). http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.03.04.20031187.

16. Davies, N. G. *et al.* The effect of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 cases, deaths and demand for hospital services in the UK: A modelling study. Tech. Rep. (2020). http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.01.20049908.

17. Khailaie, S. *et al.* Estimate of the development of the epidemic reproduction number Rt from Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 case data and implications for political measures based on prognostics. Preprint, Epidemiology (2020). http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.04.20053637.

18. Roux, J., Massonnaud, C. & Crépey, P. COVID-19: One-month impact of the French lockdown on the epidemic burden. Preprint, Epidemiology (2020). http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.22.20075705.

19. Flaxman, S. *et al.* Report 13: Estimating the number of infections and the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in 11 European countries. Tech. Rep., Imperial College London (2020). http://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/77731.

20. Brzezinski, A., Deiana, G., Kecht, V. & Dijcke, D. V. The COVID-19 Pandemic: Government vs. Community Action Across the United States. *INET Oxford Working Paper* 2020–06 (2020).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

21. Nishiura, H., Linton, N. M. & Akhmetzhanov, A. R. Serial interval of novel coronavirus (COVID-19) infections. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* **93**, 284–286 (2020).

22. Linton, N. M. *et al.* Epidemiological characteristics of novel coronavirus infection: A statistical analysis of publicly available case data. Preprint (2020). http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.01.26.20018754.

23. Scire, J. *et al.* Reproductive number of the COVID-19 epidemic in Switzerland with a focus on the Cantons of Basel-Stadt and Basel-Landschaft. Tech. Rep. (2020). https://doi.emh.ch/smw.2020.20271.

24. Petherick, A., Kira, B., Angrist, N., Hale, T. & Philips, T. Variation in government responses to COVID-19. *Blavatnik School of Government Working Paper* **31** (2020).

Competing Interests The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests.

Correspondence Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to H.T. or M.B.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Methods

Correcting the number of infections The infections for the most recent days are corrected (Scire et al. [23]) to factor the fact that some of the infections which occurred on this day will be reported in the future:

$$\bar{I}(t) = \frac{I(t)}{\hat{F}(l)} \tag{2}$$

where $\hat{F}$ is the cumulative distributive function of the period between an infection and a case being reported as positive or dead, l is the time between t and the last reported case, $\hat{I}(t)$) and $I(t)$ are respectively the corrected and initial infections which took place on a given day.

Estimation of the reproductive rate The method presented in this report is a variation of the one proposed by Cori et al[13]. Assuming the incidence at time t, I_t, is Poisson distributed so that the likelihood of the incidence I_t given R_t and conditional on previous incidence $I_0, \ldots, I_{t-1}$:

$$P\left(I_t | I_0, \ldots, I_{t-1}, w, R_t\right) = \frac{\left(R_t \Lambda_t\right)^{I_t}}{I_t!} \tag{3}$$

with $\Lambda = \sum_{s=1}^{t} w_s I_{t-s}$

The posterior of the reproductive number R_t conditional on previous incidences is:

$$P\left(R_t | I_0, \ldots, I_{t-1}, I_t, w\right) \propto P(I_t | I_0, \ldots, I_{t-1}, w, R_t)\, P(R_t) \tag{4}$$

While the method developed by Cori et al[13] assumes a constant gamma distribution for the prior distribution, the presented model takes advantage of the information gained in time by updating the prior distribution for each window with the previous posterior:

$$P(R_t) = P(R_{t-1} | I_0, \ldots, I_{t-2}, I_{t-1}, w) \tag{5}$$

The 95% CI is then derived by computing the 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles.

The reproductive number R_t based on the confirmed cases is reported up to 9 days before the last date at which results are available. This corresponds to the median time for confirmed cases to be reported. Using the same method, R_t based on the cases reported as dead is reported up to 19 days before the last day on which deaths were reported for a given country.

Code availability The codes are available upon request to the corresponding author.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Data availability The incidence data for the confirmed and death cases were recovered from: Johns Hopkins University Center for Systems Science and Engineering, COVID-19 data repository, Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE): https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID-19 [accessed on 23/05/2020].

Data regarding the state interventions were retrieved from: Thomas Hale, Sam Webster, Anna Petherick, Toby Phillips, and Beatriz Kira. (2020). Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker, Blavatnik School of Government: https://github.com/OxCGRT/covid-policy-tracker [accessed on 23/05/2020].

The daily incidence for the death cases per million people was retrieved from: Max Roser, Hannah Ritchie, Esteban Ortiz-Ospina and Joe Hasell, Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19), Our World in Data, https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus [accessed on 24/05/2020]

Data related to the period between a positive test and the death of an individual were retrieved from: Swiss Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH), Cas confirmés en laboratoire : distribution géographique, https://covid-19-schweiz.bagapps.ch/fr-1.html [accessed on 06/05/2020]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Appendices

A List of countries along dates characterising the evolution of the epidemy

	Date			Days from 5th death to:	
	5th death	Stringency index ≥ 35	$R_t \leq 1$	Stringency index ≥ 35	$R_t \leq 1$
Albania	26/03/2020	09/03/2020	31/03/2020	-17	5
Andorra	29/03/2020	16/03/2020	24/03/2020	-13	-5
Austria	19/03/2020	11/03/2020	22/03/2020	-8	3
Belgium	17/03/2020	14/03/2020	04/04/2020	-3	18
Bosnia and Herzegovina	29/03/2020	11/03/2020	02/04/2020	-18	4
Bulgaria	28/03/2020	13/03/2020	29/03/2020	-15	1
Croatia	29/03/2020	14/03/2020	26/03/2020	-15	-3
Czechia	25/03/2020	11/03/2020	26/03/2020	-14	1
Denmark	19/03/2020	06/03/2020	01/04/2020	-13	13
Estonia	02/04/2020	12/03/2020	28/03/2020	-21	-5
Finland	27/03/2020	12/03/2020	04/04/2020	-15	8
France	05/03/2020	13/03/2020	08/04/2020	8	34
Germany	13/03/2020	10/03/2020	26/03/2020	-3	13
Greece	19/03/2020	12/03/2020	26/03/2020	-7	7
Hungary	22/03/2020	11/03/2020	09/04/2020	-11	18
Iceland	06/04/2020	16/03/2020	23/03/2020	-21	-14
Ireland	23/03/2020	12/03/2020	10/04/2020	-11	18
Italy	24/02/2020	22/02/2020	20/03/2020	-2	25
Luxembourg	21/03/2020	12/03/2020	22/03/2020	-9	1
Netherlands	13/03/2020	12/03/2020	05/04/2020	-1	23
Norway	18/03/2020	12/03/2020	23/03/2020	-6	5
Poland	22/03/2020	12/03/2020	06/04/2020	-10	15
Portugal	20/03/2020	16/03/2020	29/03/2020	-4	9
Romania	23/03/2020	08/03/2020	09/04/2020	-15	17
Serbia	28/03/2020	15/03/2020	11/04/2020	-13	14
Slovakia	15/04/2020	10/03/2020	13/04/2020	-36	-2
Slovenia	26/03/2020	16/03/2020	25/03/2020	-10	-1
Spain	07/03/2020	10/03/2020	26/03/2020	3	19
Sweden	16/03/2020	30/03/2020	19/04/2020	14	34
Switzerland	13/03/2020	13/03/2020	21/03/2020	0	8
United Kingdom	10/03/2020	22/03/2020	09/04/2020	12	30

The stringency index is extracted from the Coronavirus government response tracker (OxCGRT) and measures the degree of government's interventions on a scale from 0 to 100. Negative days indicate that the given event occurred before the fifth death in this country.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.10.20126870; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

B Stringency index when $R_t \leq 1$

Country	Stringency Index when $R_t \leq 1$
Albania	84
Andorra	35
Austria	85
Belgium	84
Bosnia and Herzegovina	88
Bulgaria	75
Croatia	97
Czechia	83
Denmark	84
Estonia	75
Finland	75
France	89
Germany	75
Greece	88
Hungary	78
Iceland	57
Ireland	92
Italy	93
Luxembourg	82
Netherlands	85
Norway	76
Poland	84
Portugal	87
Romania	88
Serbia	100
Slovakia	91
Slovenia	81
Spain	78
Sweden	45
Switzerland	79
United Kingdom	80