

# Effects of social distancing on the spreading of COVID-19 inferred from mobile phone data

Hamid Khataee<sup>1</sup>, Istvan Scheuring<sup>2,3</sup>, Andras Czirok<sup>4,5</sup>, and Zoltan Neufeld<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Mathematics and Physics, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia,  
Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia

<sup>2</sup>Evolutionary Systems Research Group, Centre for Ecological Research, Hungarian  
Academy of Sciences, Tihany, Hungary

<sup>3</sup>MTA-ELTE Theoretical Biology and Evolutionary Ecology Research Group,  
Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary

<sup>4</sup>Department of Biological Physics, Eotvos University, Budapest, 1053, Hungary

<sup>5</sup>Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology, University of Kansas Medical Center,  
Kansas City, KS 66160, USA

\*Corresponding author: z.neufeld@uq.edu.au

June 26, 2020

## Abstract

A better understanding of how the COVID-19 epidemic responds to social distancing efforts is required for the control of future outbreaks and to calibrate partial lock-downs. We present quantitative relationships between key parameters characterizing the COVID-19 epidemiology and social distancing efforts of nine selected European countries. Epidemiological parameters were extracted from the number of daily deaths data, while mitigation efforts are estimated from mobile phone tracking data. The decrease of the basic reproductive number ( $R_0$ ) as well as the duration of the initial exponential expansion phase of the epidemic strongly correlates with the magnitude of mobility reduction. Utilizing these relationships we decipher the relative impact of the timing and the extent of social distancing on the total death burden of the epidemic.

## 1 Introduction

The COVID-19 epidemic started in late 2019 and within a few months it spread around the World infecting 9 million people, out of which half a million succumbed to the disease. As of June 2020, the transmission of the disease is still progressing in many countries, especially in the American continent. While there have been big regional differences in the extent of the epidemic, in most countries of Europe and Asia the initial exponential growth has gradually transitioned into a decaying phase. An epidemic outbreak can recede either due to reduction of the transmission probability, or due to a gradual build up of immunity within the population. According to currently available immunological data [1, 2] at most locations only a relatively small fraction of the population was infected, typically well below 10%, thus the receding disease mostly reflects changes in social behavior and the associated reduction in disease transmission. Changes in social behavior can include state-mandated control measures as well as voluntary reduction of social interactions. However, especially with the view of potential future outbreaks, it is important to better understand how the timing and extent of social distancing can impact the dynamics of the COVID-19 epidemic.

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

Previous studies estimated the effect of social distancing on the dynamics of COVID-19 epidemics either by direct data analysis or by modeling methods. A statistical analysis of the

42 number of diagnosed cases, deaths and patients in intensive care units (ICU) in Italy and Spain have  
43 indicated that the epidemic started to decrease only after the introduction of strict lock-down action  
44 [3]. This was especially visible in Italy, where the final strict social distancing has been reached  
45 in a number of consecutive steps. A statistically more comprehensive analysis of hospitalized and  
46 ICU patients in France identified a 77% decrease in the growth rate of these numbers after the  
47 introduction of the lock-down [4]. The comparison of social distancing efforts in China, South  
48 Korea, Italy, France, Iran and USA [5] revealed that the initial doubling time of identified cases  
49 was about 2 days which was reduced substantially by the various restrictions introduced in these  
50 countries. Epidemic models are widely used to estimate how various intervention strategies affect  
51 the transmission rate, however, the quantitative relationship between social interventions and  
52 epidemic parameters are hardly known. [6, 7].

53 In this paper, we quantitatively characterise the time course of the COVID-19 epidemic using  
54 daily death data from nine selected European countries [8]. Statistical data on COVID-19-related  
55 deaths are considered to be more robust than that of daily cases of new infections. The latter is  
56 affected by the number of tests performed as well as by the testing strategy – e.g. its restriction  
57 to symptomatic patients – which may be highly variable across countries and often changes during  
58 the course of the epidemic. The time course of daily deaths can be considered as a more reliable  
59 indirect delayed indicator of daily infections. We thus do not address apparent differences in the  
60 case fatality ratio, and restrict our focus to the recorded COVID-19-associated death toll.

61 Our choice of countries was motivated by the requirements that each of these countries (i)  
62 had a relatively large disease-associated death toll (i.e. typically above 10/day and more than 2000  
63 overall) so we can assume that the deterministic component of the epidemic dynamics dominates  
64 over random fluctuations. (ii) The selected countries spent a suitably long time in the decaying  
65 phase of the epidemic, thus allowing its precise characterisation. Based on these two criteria,  
66 we analysed data from the following, socio-economically similar countries, each implementing a  
67 somewhat distinct social distancing response: Italy, Spain, France, UK, Germany, Switzerland,  
68 Netherlands, Belgium and Sweden.

69 To characterise social distancing responses we used mobile phone mobility trend data from  
70 Apple Inc. [9]. Our aim is to quantitatively determine the characteristic features of the progression  
71 of the epidemic, such as initial growth rate, timing of the peak, and final decay rate and investigate  
72 how these parameters are determined by the timing and strictness of social distancing measures.  
73 We demonstrate that the overall death burden of the epidemic can be well explained by both the  
74 timing and extent of social distancing, often organized voluntarily well in advance of the state-  
75 mandated lock-down, and present quantitative relationships between changes in epidemiological  
76 parameters and mobile phone motility data.

## 77 2 Characterization of the epidemic

78 Daily COVID-19 death data,  $D(t)$ , is presented in Fig. 1 for the nine countries analysed. We  
79 selected the  $t = 0$  reference time point as the date when the daily death rate first exceeded 5  
80 deaths. In each country  $D(t)$  indicates the presence of a well defined exponential growth phase,  
81 followed by a crossover region and later an exponential decay stage. The initial growth and final  
82 decay regions are characterized by fitting the exponential  $\tilde{D}(t)$  as

$$\tilde{D}(t) = \tilde{D}_0 \exp(\alpha t) = \tilde{D}_0 \exp[\gamma(R_0 - 1)t], \quad (1)$$

83 where the fitted functions are distinguished from the actual time series using a tilde,  $R_0$  is the  
84 basic reproductive number (i.e. number of new secondary infections caused by a single infected in  
85 a fully susceptible population) [10] and  $\gamma$  is the inverse average duration of the infectious period.  
86 For calculating the basic reproductive number we use  $\gamma = 0.1 \text{ day}^{-1}$ . The exact value of  $\gamma$  is  
87 somewhat uncertain at present [11, 12], however our analysis and results do not rely on the value  
88 of this parameter.

89 The values  $R_{0_1}$  and  $R_{0_2}$ , as given in Table 1, thus characterize the growth and decay phases,  
90 respectively. The initial growth rate  $R_{0_1}$  is similar in the selected countries except in Sweden where

91 it is substantially lower. This difference may reflect weaker social mixing, different cultural habits  
92 or a somewhat lower population density – an interesting problem outside of the scope of this report.  
93 The reproductive number in the decaying phase  $R_{0_2}$  is more variable across the different countries:  
94 in particular the decay is significantly slower in Sweden and somewhat slower in the UK.

95 A third parameter characterizes the transition from the growth to decay phases, i.e., the  
96 peak of the epidemic in terms of deaths. We define  $(t_c, \tilde{D}_c)$  as the intersection point of the two fitted  
97 exponential functions. This is a more robust estimator than the actual maximum in daily deaths  
98  $D_c$  as at the time of transition daily deaths can exhibit a plateau, hence the value and location  
99 of the maximum is sensitive to stochastic fluctuations. The gradual transition from exponential  
100 growth to decay in the actual data  $D(t)$  can be due to gradual implementation of social distancing  
101 as well as to the case-to-case variability of the time elapsed from infection to death.

102 The total death toll of the disease can be estimated analytically using the three parameters  
103  $\alpha_1 = (R_{0_1} - 1)\gamma$ ,  $\alpha_2 = (1 - R_{0_2})\gamma$  and  $\tilde{D}_c$  as

$$\tilde{D}_{\text{tot}} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{D}(t) dt = \tilde{D}_c \left( \frac{1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \right). \quad (2)$$

104 As Fig. 2 demonstrates, despite the substantial variation in death toll among the nine countries,  
105 it can be fairly well estimated by the expression (2). Specifically, details of the cross-over region,  
106 which do not fit well to the two exponential functions, contribute only around 10% to the overall  
107 death toll, while variations in the three epidemiological parameters can change the death burden  
108 by an order of magnitude.




Figure 1: Daily death and mobility data for 9 European countries (a-i). Time 0 corresponds to the day when a country first reported  $\geq 5$  daily deaths. Top: Growth and decay phases (red and blue lines) were fitted using Equation (1) to the data points highlighted by red and blue, respectively. Vertical line: national lock-down date  $t_{NL}$ . Bottom: Mobile phone tracking data, normalized by the average values before the epidemic ( $M_1$ ). Quantitative parameters were extracted by a fit (dashed line) to the mean mobility data (green circles, average of walking, driving, and transit data) calculated using Equation (3). Dotted vertical line indicates the effective lock-down date  $t_{eff}$  calculated using Equation (4). Fit parameters are summarised in Tables S2 and S3.

Table 1: Key parameters of the daily COVID-19 death toll and social distancing.

Country	$R_{0_1}$	$R_{0_2}$	$t_c$	$t_{\text{eff}}$	$t_c - t_{\text{NL}}$	$t_c - t_{\text{eff}}$	$\mu$
Italy (ITA)	3.52	0.68	19.07	0.004	10.07	19.07	0.12
Spain (ESP)	3.54	0.54	19.03	0.38	16.03	18.65	0.09
France (FRA)	3.22	0.42	24.66	1.47	19.66	23.19	0.16
Great Britain (GBR)	3.24	0.70	22.60	-0.2	15.60	23.42	0.32
Germany (GER)	3.00	0.54	20.32	-7.33	17.32	27.65	0.41
Belgium (BEL)	3.04	0.44	19.17	-10.09	24.17	29.26	0.31
Netherlands (NLD)	3.16	0.48	17.77	-6.59	12.77	24.36	0.35
Switzerland (SWL)	2.88	0.36	16.32	-9.26	24.32	25.58	0.41
Sweden (SWE)	2.40	0.82	17.23	-16.53	-	33.76	0.63




Figure 2: Analytical estimate of the total number of COVID-19 deaths  $\tilde{D}_{\text{tot}}$  versus  $D_{\text{tot}}$ , the actual total death toll (a). (b) The same data are presented as per million (1M) population. The dashed and solid lines represent the identity and a linear regression, respectively. The slope of the linear regression is  $0.85 \pm 0.01$  (a) and  $0.84 \pm 0.02$  (b). Pearson coefficients of determination are (a)  $r^2 = 0.99$  ( $p < 0.001$ ) and (b)  $r^2 = 0.98$  ( $p < 0.001$ ).

### 109 3 Characterization of social distancing

110 The timing and strictness of the often voluntary social distancing is quantified from the average  
 111 mobility data (green circles in Fig. 1), by fitting the following piece-wise linear function:

$$M(t) = \begin{cases} M_1 & t < t_1 \\ \frac{M_2 - M_1}{t_2 - t_1}(t - t_1) + M_1 & t_1 \leq t \leq t_2 \\ M_2 & t > t_2 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

112 where  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are the average mobility levels before and after social distancing (i.e., before  
 113  $t_1$  and after  $t_2$ ), respectively. To fit Equation (3) to the mobility data, we used the data recorded  
 114 over 90 days starting from 13-January-2020. In this period the data indicates the mobility levels  
 115 before and after implementing the social distancing. The walking, driving and transit data are  
 116 first averaged, then Equation (3) was fitted to the average mobility level. The mobility data with  
 117 average pre-epidemic value scaled to unity,  $M(t)/M_1$ , is shown in Fig. 1. We characterize the  
 118 extent of social distancing by the ratio  $\mu = M_2/M_1 < 1$ . A strict restriction of social interaction  
 119 is expected to be reflected as  $\mu \approx 0$ .

120 Using the fitted parameters  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  obtained from Equation (3), an effective social dis-  
 121 tancing date (Table 1) is estimated as

$$t_{\text{eff}} = \frac{t_1 + t_2}{2}. \quad (4)$$

122 The fitted values of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  as well as of  $t_{\text{eff}}$  are presented in Fig. 1. It is noteworthy that  $t_{\text{eff}}$   
 123 often *preceded* the official national lock-down  $t_{\text{NL}}$ .

### 124 4 The effect of social distancing on epidemic parameters

125 Next, we investigate how the timing and extent of the social distancing changes the epidemic  
 126 parameters, and as a consequence, the total death toll. First, we note that surprisingly neither the  
 127 date of the official national lock-down  $t_{\text{NL}}$  nor the effective date of social distancing predicts well  
 128 – in itself – the time of the epidemic peak  $t_c$  (Fig. 3). As the average time between infection and  
 129 succumbing to COVID-19 is 18 days [13], a delay of approximately 18 days is expected (dashed  
 130 line in Fig. 3) between the introduction of social distancing and the change in the trend of the  
 131 daily death count. Instead, we find that the time to the peak from the official national lock-down  
 132  $t_c - t_{\text{NL}}$  varies in a range from 10 days in Italy to more than 3 weeks in case of Switzerland, and  
 133 the time from the change in mobility to the peak,  $t_c - t_{\text{eff}}$ , ranges from 19 days (Italy and Spain)  
 134 up to 34 days (Sweden) as shown in Table. 1.




Figure 3: The time of the peak in daily deaths  $t_c$  versus the official national lock-down date  $t_{\text{NL}}$  and the effective social distancing date  $t_{\text{eff}}$ . The correlation is weak with  $r^2 = 0.45$  ( $p = 0.06$ ) for  $t_{\text{eff}}$ , and  $r^2 = 0.12$  ( $p = 0.37$ ) for  $t_{\text{NL}}$ . Neither correlations are statistically significant. Dashed line: time (identity line) with a delay of 18.5 days.

135 Furthermore, neither the time of the peak  $t_c$  nor the parameters characterising the time  
 136 and strength of social distancing  $t_{\text{eff}}, t_{\text{NL}}, \mu$  correlates – as a single parameter – well with the

137 total number of deaths (Fig. 4). For example, Belgium registers a very high per capita death toll  
 138 despite an early official lock-down, 5 days before the reference time  $t = 0$ , and even earlier change  
 139 is observed in mobility data ( $t_{\text{eff}} = -10$  days). On the other hand, a moderate social distancing  
 140 in Germany, indicated by the mobility ratio  $\mu = 0.4$ , led to the lowest death toll within this  
 141 group of countries. Thus, we decided to investigate more carefully how social distancing affects  
 142 the three epidemic parameters  $R_{0_1}$ ,  $R_{0_2}$  and  $\bar{D}_c$  – with the hypothesis that the non-linear, multi-  
 143 factor relationship (2) effectively masks correlations between the death toll and any single control  
 144 parameter.




Figure 4: Actual total number of deaths per million (1M) population versus  $t_c$ , the peak time of daily deaths (a),  $t_{\text{NL}}$  national lock-down date (b),  $t_{\text{eff}}$  effective lock-down date (c), and  $1 - \mu$ , the relative mobility drop (d). Pearson correlation coefficients are (a)  $r^2 = 0.01$  ( $p = 0.77$ ), (b)  $r^2 = 0.06$  ( $p = 0.52$ ), (c)  $r^2 = 0.002$  ( $p = 0.92$ ), and (d)  $r^2 = 0.04$  ( $p = 0.62$ ) indicating that there is no statistically significant correlation among these epidemic characteristics.

145 As Fig. 5 indicates, we found two strong relationships between the epidemiological paramet-  
 146 ters and measures of social distancing. Figure 5(a) indicates a strong positive correlation between  
 147 the drop in basic reproductive number,  $R_{0_1} - R_{0_2}$  and the restriction of mobility  $\mu$ . The relationship  
 148 can be well approximated by the quantitative formula:

$$R_{0_2} = R_{0_1} - \beta(1 - \mu)^\rho \quad (5)$$

149 with  $\rho = 0.56 \pm 0.09$  and  $\beta = 3.18 \pm 0.11$ . Furthermore, the time elapsed between the peak and  
 150 the social distancing,  $t_c - t_{\text{eff}}$ , correlates negatively with the severity of the mobility restrictions  
 151 (Fig. 5(b)) as

$$t_c - t_{\text{eff}} = \tau_0(1 + \eta\mu) \quad (6)$$

152 where  $\tau_0 = 17.04 \pm 1.62$  days is comparable with the mean value of patient survival in fatal COVID-  
 153 19 disease [13], and  $\eta = 1.50 \pm 0.40$  is the factor characterizing the lengthening of the delay for

154 less severe reduction of mobility. Thus, the peak follows strict lock-downs (small  $\mu$  as in Italy and  
 155 Spain) by around 18 days. For less restrictive social distancing ( $\mu \approx 0.6$  as in Sweden), however,  
 156 the peak can be delayed by as much as 5 weeks. This delay is of crucial importance, as the peak  
 157 of the daily death toll  $\tilde{D}_c$  is determined as

$$\tilde{D}_c = \tilde{D}(t_{\text{eff}}) \exp(\alpha_1(t_c - t_{\text{eff}})), \quad (7)$$

158 where  $\tilde{D}(t_{\text{eff}})$  is a natural measure of how early the social distancing took place relative to the  
 159 dynamics of the epidemics. As  $\tilde{D}(t)$  is the exponential fit equation (1) instead of the actual daily  
 160 death count  $D(t)$ , unfortunately it is difficult to know in real-time. The country-specific values of  
 161  $\tilde{D}(t_{\text{eff}})$  are listed in Table 2.

162




Figure 5: Relationships between key parameters of the COVID-19 epidemics and mobility data. (a) Change of basic reproductive number  $R_{0_2} - R_{0_1}$  (left axis) and  $\alpha_2 - \alpha_1$  (right axis) versus the motility drop  $1 - \mu$ . Solid line indicates a power-law fit  $-\beta(1 - \mu)^\rho$ , where  $\beta = 3.18 \pm 0.11$  and  $\rho = 0.56 \pm 0.09$ .  $r^2 = 0.85$ , ( $p = 0.0005$ ). (b) Elapsed time between the epidemic peak and the effective lock-down,  $t_c - t_{\text{eff}}$ , versus the motility drop  $1 - \mu$ . Solid line indicates the linear fit Equation (6), where  $\tau_0 = 17.04 \pm 1.62$  and  $\eta = 1.50 \pm 0.40$ .

Table 2: Parameters characterising the death toll of the epidemic.

Country	$\tilde{D}_c$	$\tilde{D}(t_{\text{eff}})$	$\tilde{D}(t_{\text{eff}})/1\text{M pop}$	$\tilde{D}_{\text{tot}}$	$D_{\text{tot}}$	$D_{\text{tot}}/1\text{M pop}$
ITA	1213.91	9.93	0.16	42751.85	35962.90	594.74
ESP	1233.78	10.80	0.23	31678.69	28161.83	602.35
FRA	1658.78	9.60	0.14	36071.61	28273.72	433.23
GBR	1356.96	8.22	0.12	51289.68	44869.96	661.22
GER	426.31	1.69	0.02	11399.04	8861.81	105.79
BEL	498.03	1.33	0.12	11334.73	9405.82	811.83
NLD	338.14	1.71	0.10	8068.08	6048.42	353.05
SWL	112.80	0.90	0.11	2362.52	1617.92	187.04
SWE	117.50	1.04	0.10	7366.98	6883.67	643.82

163 Our analysis thus indicates that social distancing has two effects: it reduces the basic repro-  
 164 duction number of the infection as expected, and shortens the time required for the epidemic to  
 165 peak. This latter effect is unexpected, as changes in behavior should reduce transmission imme-  
 166 diately, which, after a fixed delay – involving manifestation of symptoms and in a fraction of the  
 167 patients death – should also appear in the daily death toll  $D(t)$ . We propose that the increased  
 168 time between the peak and the time of the social distancing may indicate the presence of subpop-  
 169 ulations in which the disease continues to propagate with the initial reproduction number  $R_{0_1}$ . In  
 170 these populations the transmission is eventually blocked, not by the overall social distancing efforts  
 171 within the society, but by some other means. As a likely mechanism, we suggest that the local  
 172 outbreak can reach such a magnitude that it either triggers an intervention or allows the establish-  
 173 ment of herd immunity. Prominent examples of such events that collectively expand the duration  
 174 of the initial growth phase are outbreaks in nursing homes, meat processing plants, warehouses and  
 175 prisons – which become more likely when the overall social distancing is weak. Furthermore, weak  
 176 overall social distancing could also fail to protect and segregate these vulnerable subpopulations  
 177 specifically, thus increase the effective size of such subpopulations.

## 178 5 Discussion

179 In this paper we analysed the interdependence of epidemic and mobility data and identified a  
 180 quantitative relation between parameters of social distancing and key characteristics of the COVID-  
 181 19 epidemic. Our sample consisted of 9 European countries where suitable data was available at  
 182 current time. We found that the total death toll does not correlate well with any single parameter  
 183 such as the timing of the official lock-down or the strictness of social distancing extracted from  
 184 mobile phone location data. The total death toll, however, could be well estimated by a non-linear  
 185 combination of three parameters: exponents characterising (i) the initial exponential growth rate  
 186 (or reproductive number,  $R_{0_1}$ ) and (ii) the final decay rate of the epidemic,  $R_{0_2}$ , and (iii) the peak  
 187 death rate  $\tilde{D}_c$  which separates the two stages. The initial growth rate is an intrinsic parameter  
 188 which may vary somewhat across different countries, but is not affected by control measures or  
 189 social responses to the epidemic. Based on our data analysis we find that the two remaining  
 190 parameters,  $R_{0_2}$  and  $\tilde{D}_c$  can be related to the timing ( $t_{\text{eff}}$ ) and strength ( $\mu$ ) of social distancing.

191 Since the estimated daily death toll at the peak increases exponentially with the difference  
 192 between the effective lock-down time ( $t_{\text{eff}}$ ) and time of the peak ( $t_c$ ), small changes in  $t_c - t_{\text{eff}}$   
 193 can yield substantial differences in the total death toll. The per capita values of  $\tilde{D}(t_{\text{eff}})$  are fairly  
 194 similar: within the range 0.1-0.16 for 7 of the countries analysed, suggesting that social distancing  
 195 started at similar stages of the epidemic. The important exception is Germany, where a much  
 196 smaller value of 0.02 corresponds to roughly a week earlier response. According to the analysis  
 197 presented here, this explains the substantially lower German death toll, in spite of the relatively  
 198 moderate social distancing. The slightly higher value of  $\tilde{D}(t_{\text{eff}})/\text{population}$  in Spain (0.23) was  
 199 compensated by a strict lock-down (lower  $\mu$ ).

200 The higher death toll in Belgium cannot be explained by the proposed set of parameters  
201 ( $R_{01}, D(t_{\text{eff}}), \mu$ ) as all three values are close to the average of the sample. This anomaly can be  
202 traced to Fig. 5(b), where the deviation of the Belgian data point from the fitted curve indicates  
203 that the peak of the epidemic was delayed by approximately 4 days compared to what could be  
204 expected based on the proxy measure for social distancing  $\mu$ . While the high Belgian death toll is  
205 often attributed to the different methodology of recording COVID-19 related fatalities, including  
206 suspected deaths which were not confirmed by lab analysis, such a difference in methodology  
207 cannot explain the markedly high time distance between the effective date of social distancing  
208 ( $t_{\text{eff}}$ ) and the epidemic peak ( $t_c$ ); see Fig. 5(b). As we propose that  $t_c - t_{\text{eff}}$  reflects the presence of  
209 subpopulations in which the disease can spread unmitigated by social distancing efforts, we suggest  
210 that such groups were relatively larger in Belgium than in the other countries within our sample.

211 While in the case of Sweden the initial growth rate was the slowest and even the timing  
212 ( $D(t_{\text{eff}})$ ) was similar to other countries the weakness of the mobility restriction (i.e. large  $\mu$ ) led  
213 to high death toll resulting from a strongly delayed peak. We would like to emphasize, that this  
214 delay was unexpected at the time of social distancing efforts, and still unaccounted by the typical  
215 SIR-based epidemiological models [10].

216 In the case of the UK the timing of the social distancing ( $D(t_{\text{eff}})$ ) is similar to other countries,  
217 however the mobility restriction appears to be weaker (i.e. higher  $\mu$ ) compared to similar countries  
218 (Spain, Italy and France) which results in a slower decay of the epidemic.

219 The phone mobility data is an indirect measure of the social distancing and disease transmis-  
220 sion probabilities. However, it can be compared to more traditional measures in the Netherlands,  
221 where a study directly determined the number of daily personal interactions before and after the  
222 lock-down. Using questionnaires, the study identified a 71% decrease in interactions on average,  
223 which is fairly close to the 65% drop estimated from the phone mobility data [14]. While mobile  
224 phone tracking data thus can characterize the relatively early stages of social distancing efforts, it  
225 may be less useful to detect more subtle efforts like wearing masks or staggered working shifts at  
226 later stages of the epidemic.

227 In conclusion, we demonstrated a quantitative relation between social distancing efforts and  
228 statistical parameters describing the current COVID-19 epidemic. We identified an unexpected  
229 extension of the exponential growth phase when social distancing efforts are weak, which can  
230 substantially increase the death toll of the disease. Future studies are required to extend this  
231 analysis to countries with a markedly different socio-economical arrangements.

## 232 References

- 233 [1] Brotons, Carlos, Jordi Serrano, Diana Fernandez, Carlos Garcia-Ramos, Begona Ichazo, Jean-  
234 nine Lemaire, Patricia Montenegro et al. "Seroprevalence against COVID-19 and follow-up of  
235 suspected cases in primary health care in Spain." medRxiv (2020).
- 236 [2] Wise Jacqui. Covid-19: Surveys indicate low infection level in community BMJ 2020; 369  
237 :m1992
- 238 [3] Tobías A. Evaluation of the lockdowns for the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in Italy and Spain after  
239 one month follow up. Sci Total Environ. 2020;725:138539. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138539
- 240 [4] Salje H, Tran Kiem C, Lefrancq N, et al. Estimating the burden of SARS-CoV-2 in France [pub-  
241 lished online ahead of print, 2020 May 13]. Science. 2020;eabc3517. doi:10.1126/science.abc3517
- 242 [5] Hsiang, S., Allen, D., Annan-Phan, S. et al. The effect of large-scale anti-contagion policies on  
243 the COVID-19 pandemic. Nature (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2404-8>
- 244 [6] Flaxman, S., Mishra, S., Gandy, A. et al. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical inter-  
245 ventions on COVID-19 in Europe. Nature (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2405-7>

- 246 [7] Giordano, G., Blanchini, F., Bruno, R. et al. Modelling the COVID-19 epidemic and  
247 implementation of population-wide interventions in Italy. *Nat Med* 26, 855–860 (2020).  
248 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0883-7>
- 249 [8] Max Roser, Hannah Ritchie, Esteban Ortiz-Ospina and Joe Hasell (2020) - "Coron-  
250 avirus Pandemic (COVID-19)". Published online at [OurWorldInData.org](https://ourworldindata.org). Retrieved from:  
251 '<https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus>' [Online Resource]
- 252 [9] <https://www.apple.com/covid19/mobility>
- 253 [10] Anderson, R.M. and May, R.M., 1992. *Infectious diseases of humans: dynamics and control*.  
254 Oxford University Press.
- 255 [11] Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391 cases and  
256 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*.  
257 2020;S1473-3099(20)30287-5. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30287-5
- 258 [12] He, X., Lau, E.H.Y., Wu, P. et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility  
259 of COVID-19. *Nat Med* 26, 672–675 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5>
- 260 [13] Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients  
261 with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study [published correction appears in  
262 *Lancet*. 2020 Mar 28;395(10229):1038]. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10229):1054-1062. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
263 6736(20)30566-3
- 264 [14] Jantien A. Backer, Liesbeth Mollema, Don Klinkenberg, Fiona R.M. van der Klis,  
265 Hester E. de Melker, Susan van den Hof, Jacco Wallinga The impact of physical  
266 distancing measures against COVID-19 transmission on contacts and mixing patterns  
267 in the Netherlands: repeated cross-sectional surveys medRxiv 2020.05.18.20101501; doi:  
268 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.18.20101501>

## 269 6 Supplemental Material

Table S1: Calendar dates associated with the daily deaths and mobility data.

Country	Time 0	$t_{NL}$	$t_{eff}$
ITA	March 3	March 12	March 3
ESP	March 11	March 14	March 11
FRA	March 12	March 17	March 13
GBR	March 16	March 23	March 15
GER	March 20	March 23	March 12
BEL	March 22	March 17	March 11
NLD	March 18	March 23	March 11
SWL	March 21	March 13	March 11
SWE	March 27	-	March 10

Time 0: the day when a country first reported  $\geq 5$  daily deaths.  $t_{NL}$ : national lock-down date.  $t_{eff}$ : effective lock-down date.

Table S2: Parameters from fitting Equation (1), to the number of daily deaths data during the exponential growth and exponential decay phases. Parameter values correspond to mean  $\pm$  SE.

Country	$D_{0_1}$	$\alpha_1$	$D_{0_2}$	$\alpha_2$
ITA	$9.934 \pm 0.86$	$0.25 \pm 0.01$	$2207.08 \pm 75.03$	$-0.032 \pm 0.002$
ESP	$9.818 \pm 0.79$	$0.25 \pm 0.01$	$2987.16 \pm 321.018$	$-0.046 \pm 0.002$
FRA	$6.95 \pm 0.50$	$0.22 \pm 0.01$	$6970.80 \pm 388.52$	$-0.058 \pm 0.002$
GBR	$8.59 \pm 0.81$	$0.22 \pm 0.01$	$2739.04 \pm 89.85$	$-0.030 \pm 0.002$
GER	$7.32 \pm 0.47$	$0.20 \pm 0.01$	$1089.01 \pm 48.01$	$-0.046 \pm 0.002$
BEL	$9.97 \pm 0.61$	$0.20 \pm 0.01$	$1433.01 \pm 69.99$	$-0.056 \pm 0.002$
NLD	$7.28 \pm 0.31$	$0.22 \pm 0.01$	$851.46 \pm 49.79$	$-0.052 \pm 0.002$
SWL	$5.25 \pm 0.46$	$0.19 \pm 0.01$	$321.90 \pm 25.24$	$-0.064 \pm 0.002$
SWE	$10.53 \pm 0.61$	$0.14 \pm 0.01$	$151.46 \pm 11.16$	$-0.018 \pm 0.002$

Table S3: Parameters from fitting Equation (3) to the mobility data over a period of 90 days starting from 13-January-2020. Parameter values correspond to mean  $\pm$  SE.

Country	$M_1$	$t_1$	$M_2$	$t_2$
ITA	$116.07 \pm 1.74$	$-11.00 \pm 1.03$	$14.45 \pm 2.08$	$11.01 \pm 1.06$
ESP	$123.87 \pm 1.94$	$-2.75 \pm 0.72$	$10.80 \pm 2.77$	$3.51 \pm 0.69$
FRA	$101.22 \pm 1.24$	$-1.69 \pm 0.62$	$16.27 \pm 1.87$	$4.63 \pm 0.62$
GRB	$115.37 \pm 1.51$	$-6.84 \pm 1.09$	$36.64 \pm 2.51$	$5.20 \pm 1.05$
GER	$112.40 \pm 1.30$	$-13.44 \pm 1.05$	$46.14 \pm 1.96$	$-1.21 \pm 1.12$
BEL	$126.14 \pm 1.74$	$-13.81 \pm 0.93$	$39.36 \pm 2.52$	$-6.37 \pm 0.91$
NLD	$112.78 \pm 1.22$	$-11.78 \pm 0.87$	$39.86 \pm 1.78$	$-1.40 \pm 0.87$
SWL	$108.10 \pm 1.00$	$-15.25 \pm 0.80$	$44.72 \pm 1.46$	$-3.28 \pm 0.87$
SWE	$112.53 \pm 0.95$	$-21.00 \pm 1.18$	$70.60 \pm 1.33$	$-12.06 \pm 1.19$

$M_1$ : average mobility level before social distancing.  $t_1$ : when the mobility started to decrease due to social distancing.  $M_2$ : average mobility after the social distancing.  $t_2$ : end of the transition period to social distancing.