

1 England's Lockdown vs. Sweden's Herd Immunity: A Comparison of the Daily New COVID-19
2 Cases and Related Deaths Using Comparative Interrupted Time Series Analysis

3

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

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

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

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

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

14

15 □ *Both are first co-authors and have contributed equally to this work.*

16

17 Corresponding author:

18 Moaath K. Mustafa Ali, MD, MPH

19 Marlene and Stewart Greenebaum Comprehensive Cancer Center

20 University of Maryland Medical Center

21 22 South Greene Street

22 Baltimore, Maryland 21201

23 USA

24 Telephone: +1 (410) 328-6841

25 Fax: +1 (410) 328-2578

26 Email: moaath_mustafa@yahoo.com

27

28 Word count: 2701

29 Short running title: COVID-19 cases and deaths in England vs. Sweden.

30 Keywords: England; Sweden; comparative interrupted time series; COVID-19; daily cases;
31 mortality

32

33 List of abbreviations:

34 UK: United Kingdom

35 ITS: interrupted time series.

36

37

38

39

40 **Abstract**

41 Background: There is a lack of empirical evidence that lockdowns decrease daily cases of
42 COVID-19 and related mortality compared to herd immunity. England implemented a delayed
43 lockdown on March 23, 2020, but Sweden did not. We aim to examine the effect of lockdown
44 on daily COVID-19 cases and related deaths during the first 100 days post-lockdown.

45 Methods: We compared daily cases of COVID-19 infection and related mortality in England and
46 Sweden before and after lockdown intervention using a comparative-interrupted time series
47 analysis. The period included was from COVID-19 pandemic onset till June 30, 2020.

48 Results: The adjusted-rate of daily COVID-19 infections was eight cases/10,000,000 person
49 higher in England than Sweden before lockdown order (95% CI: 2-14, P=0.01). On the day of
50 intervention (lagged lockdown), England had 693 more COVID-19 cases/10,000,000 person
51 compared to Sweden (95% CI: 467-920, P<0.001). Compared to the pre-intervention period, the
52 adjusted daily confirmed cases rate decreased by 19 cases/ 10,000,000 person compared to
53 Sweden (95% CI: 13-26, P<0.001). There was a rate excess of 1.5 daily deaths/ 10,000,000
54 person in England compared to Sweden pre-intervention (95% CI: 1-2, P<0.001). The increased
55 mortality rate resulted in 50 excess deaths/ 10,000,000 person related to COVID-19 in England
56 compared to Sweden on the day of lockdown (95% CI: 30-71, P<0.001). Post-intervention, the
57 rate of daily deaths in England decreased by two deaths/ 10,000,000 person compared to Sweden
58 (95% CI: 1-3, P<0.001). During phases one and two of lockdown lifting in England, there was
59 no rebound increase in daily cases or deaths compared to Sweden.

60 Conclusion: The lockdown order implemented in England on March 23, 2020, effectively
61 decreased the daily new cases rate and related mortality compared to Sweden. There was no

62 short-term increase in COVID-19 cases and related-deaths after the phases one and two of the
63 lifting of restrictions in England compared to Sweden. This study provides empirical,
64 comparative evidence that lockdowns slow the spread of COVID-19 in communities compared
65 to herd immunity.

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81 **Introduction**

82 On January 12, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) confirmed that a novel coronavirus
83 strain is the cause of a respiratory illness in Wuhan, China. As of June 3, WHO reported 277,989
84 and 38,589 confirmed cases of coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19) and 39,369 and 4,468
85 deaths in the United Kingdom (UK) and Sweden, respectively [1]. The first two cases of
86 COVID-19 in England were reported on January 31, while the first death was reported on March
87 2 [2, 3]. On March 23, the UK government announced a complete lockdown to halt the virus
88 spread, which included limiting many of the daily activities like traveling and shopping.

89 On January 31, Sweden confirmed its first case of COVID-19. The first death was reported on
90 March 11 [4]. Unlike the UK, Sweden has not imposed a lockdown. The Public Health Agency
91 issued recommendations to work from home if possible, avoid unnecessary travel, engage in
92 social distancing, and stay at home for people above 70 and for people who have even minimal
93 symptoms that could be related to COVID-19. Sweden did not close its preschools or elementary
94 schools as a preventive measure, which was highly criticized by the media [5]. Unlike the UK,
95 the "recommendations" by the Swedish government were not enforced by law, since the Swedish
96 constitution prohibits ministerial rule and mandates that the Public Health Agency must initiate
97 all necessary actions to prevent the spread of COVID-19 [6].

98 England and Sweden went in two very different directions; a delayed but complete lockdown in
99 England and a more relaxed approach without complete lockdown in Sweden. Many researchers
100 assessed the impact of lockdown on daily COVID-19 cases using predictive models or
101 measuring changes in reproduction number [7-12]. On the other hand, several newspapers
102 warned that lockdowns were ineffective in halting COVID-19 spread [13-15]. Meunier reported
103 that there was no evidence of discontinuity in COVID-19 epidemic growth rate or reproduction

104 rate trends before and after implementing full lockdowns in Italy, France, Spain, and the UK
105 [16]. Moreover, Meunier reports that countries, where less restrictive policies implemented, had
106 similar trends in pandemic evolution to countries where lockdowns implemented [16].

107 Contradictory and potentially biased messages about lockdown efficacy may confuse the public,
108 policymakers, and medical community about the potential efficacy of lockdowns in controlling
109 the pandemic spread. There is a lack of studies providing comparative data on lockdown efficacy
110 in halting COVID-19 spread. One of the methods to evaluate the causal effect of an intervention
111 is to use a quasi-experimental study design called interrupted time series (ITS) analysis [17].
112 The outcome of interest is collected at many time points before and after an intervention. This
113 design measures the effect of intervention by analyzing the trend in outcome over time using
114 regression [17]. Interrupted time series analysis is one of the rigorous methods to estimate the
115 effect of interventions when randomization is not possible or unethical [18]. This design is
116 particularly useful when health policy is implemented or in natural experiments [18]. Herein, we
117 study the effect of lockdown order in England on the daily number and rate of newly diagnosed
118 cases and deaths secondary to COVID-19 in the first 100 days after lockdown order using an ITS
119 analysis in comparison to Sweden.

120 **Methods**

121 **Study design, setting, and participants**

122 We conducted a comparative ITS to assess the causal effect of lockdown implemented in
123 England on the number of new cases and deaths secondary to COVID-19 in comparison to
124 Sweden. The study protocol was reviewed by the Alleghany Health Network Institutional

125 Review Board. Because the study used de-identified and publicly available data, it was
126 considered exempt category.

127 **Variables and Data source**

128 We obtained dates and daily counts of new cases and deaths from publicly accessible datasets.
129 The Public Health England agency publishes laboratory-confirmed newly diagnosed cases and
130 deaths of COVID-19, which is updated daily [19]. The Department for Health and Social Care
131 combines counts from the UK National Health Service mass testing and commercial partners
132 testing [19]. Death counts included patients who tested positive with COVID-19 and died,
133 regardless of the cause of death [19]. Death counts are the sum of deaths reported by National
134 Health Service, Public Health England Health Protection teams, and by linking data from
135 multiple sources as explained elsewhere [19]. In order to obtain rates adjusted for population
136 size, we used England's total population count in 2018. The Public Health Agency recommends
137 using the total population count based on 2018 mid-year estimates from the Office for National
138 Statistics [20].

139 The Public Health Agency of Sweden reports new cases and deaths secondary to COVID-19,
140 which is updated daily [21]. The numbers reported are based on laboratory-confirmed cases
141 under the Infectious Disease control act. Death counts included patients who tested positive with
142 COVID-19 and died, regardless of the cause of death [21]. We adjusted the number of new cases
143 and deaths using the Swedish population estimate in the third quarter of 2018 [22].

144 **Statistical analysis**

145 Data used in the analysis included dates, daily counts of new cases and deaths as continuous
146 variables, intervention as a dummy variable (before/after intervention), and control as a dummy

147 variable (England/Sweden). We fit regression models using dates as the independent variable
148 and daily counts and deaths as the dependent variables. For daily new cases time series, we
149 analyzed confirmed cases counts between February 23, 2020, and June 30, 2020. For the death
150 time series, we analyzed death counts between March 7, 2020, and June 30, 2020. For further
151 details regarding the regression equation used for analysis, refer to online supplementary.

152 Both linear and nonlinear polynomial models were fit for time series. We selected models using
153 performance metrics. Models with the highest R-squared and lowest Akaike's Information
154 Criteria were used. Generalized least square regression models provided by the "nlme" R
155 software package allow for errors to correlate or have unequal variance [23]. We accounted for
156 variance secondary to autocorrelation using autoregressive and moving average models. In these
157 models, previous time points predict the current time point. We used the Durbin-Watson test to
158 examine for autoregression [24]. Autocorrelation function and partial autocorrelation function
159 plots allowed to examine the autocorrelation. We modeled time series using different orders of
160 autoregression (p) and moving averages (q) and chose models with the lowest Akaike's
161 Information Criteria.

162 Because the expected change in outcome lags behind the lockdown due to the biologic behavior
163 of the virus, we shifted the intervention time point in the daily cases model and mortality model
164 [25, 26]. In the model of the daily cases, we shifted the time of intervention five days from
165 March 23, 2020, which is the median incubation period of COVID-19 [26]. In the model of
166 daily deaths, we shifted the time of intervention by eighteen days, which is the sum of the
167 median incubation period of 5 days and the median time from symptom onset to death of 13 days
168 [25, 26]. In this paper, we use lockdown and lagged lockdown interchangeably to indicate the
169 time of intervention.

170 We investigated the trends in COVID-19 cases and related deaths during phase one and phase
171 two of lockdown reversal in England compared to Sweden using a similar analytic approach as
172 described above.

173 We calculated the thirty-day incidence rate of confirmed cases and deaths in both countries and
174 compared them using the median unbiased estimation. We used the "EpiTools" R statistical
175 package to calculate the incidence rate ratio [27]. The confirmed cases count included all patients
176 who tested positive for a thirty-day duration, starting five days post lockdown. The death count
177 included all patients who died in a thirty-day duration, starting eighteen days post lockdown. For
178 each country, we obtained case fatality by dividing the sum of all deaths in thirty days, starting
179 eighteen days post lockdown by the sum of all newly diagnosed cases for thirty days period
180 starting five days post lockdown. Population size was adjusted to ten million for both countries
181 in figures and tables for ease of interpretation and because Sweden's population was estimated
182 10,207,086 in mid-2018.

183 Regression diagnostics were used to evaluate model assumptions. All statistical tests were two-
184 sided. Tests with p-value <0.05 were considered statistically significant. Investigators used R
185 statistical software (version 3.6.3) for analysis [28].

186 **Results**

187 Figures 1 and 2 show daily confirmed COVID-19 cases and daily COVID-19 related deaths in
188 England and Sweden adjusted to population size.

189 In the post-lockdown period, the thirty-day incidence rate of confirmed cases in England was
190 20,071 cases/10,000,000 person and 15,181 cases/10,000,000 person in Sweden, with a relative
191 incidence rate of 1.32 ($P<0.001$). The thirty-day incidence rate of deaths in England was 3,444

192 deaths/10,000,000 person and 2,417 deaths/10,000,000 person in Sweden, with a relative
193 incidence rate of 1.42 ($P<0.001$). Case fatality in England was 17% and in Sweden, 16%.

194 Figures 3 and 4 show ITS analysis to estimate the effect of lockdown on adjusted daily COVID-
195 19 cases and COVID-19 related deaths in England compared to Sweden adjusted to population
196 size. In the pre-lockdown period, England experienced a higher adjusted-rate of daily COVID-
197 19 infections by eight cases/10,000,000 person than Sweden (95% CI: 2-14, $P=0.01$). On the day
198 of intervention (lagged lockdown), England had 693 more COVID-19 cases/10,000,000 person
199 compared to Sweden (95% CI: 467-920, $P<0.001$). Compared to the pre-intervention period,
200 England had a lower adjusted-daily confirmed case rate by 19 cases/ 10,000,000 person
201 compared to Sweden (95% CI: 13-26, $P<0.001$). In the mortality model, there was a rate excess
202 of 1.5 daily deaths/ 10,000,000 person in England compared to Sweden pre-intervention (95%
203 CI: 1-2, $P<0.001$). The increased mortality rate resulted in 50 excess deaths/ 10,000,000 person
204 related to COVID-19 in England compared to Sweden on the day of lockdown (95% CI: 30-71,
205 $P<0.001$). Post-intervention, the rate of daily deaths in England decreased by two deaths/
206 10,000,000 person compared to Sweden (95% CI: 1-3, $P<0.001$). For further details regarding
207 regression models, refer to eTables 1 and 2. eFigures 1 and 2 show the trend and relation of
208 COVID-19 daily cases and related deaths with lockdown, and both phases 1 and 2 of lifting
209 restrictions in England compared to Sweden. There was no increase in COVID-19 daily cases or
210 deaths during the lifting restrictions phase one and two in England compared to Sweden (eTable
211 1 and eTable 2).

212

213 **Discussion**

214 Governments follow different approaches when it comes to tackling viral pandemics. One
215 controversial way is to allow for herd immunity, which is a form of indirect protection from
216 infections that occurs when a large percentage of the population has become immune to infection
217 through previous exposure, thereby protecting non-immune individuals [29]. Supporters of this
218 opinion believe that lockdown does not prevent the spread of viruses; it only delays the
219 inevitable spread at the cost of severe social and economic losses. On the other hand, many argue
220 that lockdowns decrease the reproduction number, which is the average number of secondary
221 cases each case generates, hence decreasing or eliminating human to human transmission,
222 deaths, and burden on the health system [30].

223 At the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, England and Sweden followed the herd immunity
224 approach to control the spread. Ferguson et al. at Imperial College London published a report
225 estimating that 510,000 people would die in the UK without any mitigation [30]. The UK prime
226 minister announced a complete lockdown on March 23, 2020, while Sweden continued with the
227 herd immunity. Table 1 shows the difference between England regulations and Sweden
228 recommendations during the COVID-19 pandemic [31, 32]. To understand the impact of the UK
229 lockdown on COVID-19 spread, we used an ITS and compared England outcomes with Sweden
230 as a control due to lack of lockdown. This design is useful to assess the effect of implemented
231 health policy or in natural experiments [18]. Authors elected to compare only England to Sweden
232 because its health care system is the only one that is accountable to the UK government. Wales,
233 Scotland, and Northern Ireland have their own publicly funded health care systems that are
234 accountable to their governments [33]. Moreover, there is some variation in the health system
235 and policies between the four countries [34]. Although most European countries implemented
236 lockdowns, authors compared the UK to Sweden because of the delayed lockdown in the UK,

237 which led to the rapid spread of the virus in the UK, similar to Sweden in the pre-lockdown
238 phase. The ‘similar’ trends in the pre-lockdown are essential to draw inferential estimates.
239 The estimated causal effect is the result of net anti-COVID-19 measurements implemented by
240 England but not Sweden (Table 1). During the pre-lockdown phase, the COVID-19 epidemic
241 was spreading at a higher rate in England than Sweden. The enhanced spread resulted in higher
242 COVID-19 related mortality. After lockdown implementation, the rate of daily COVID 19
243 cases decreased in England in comparison to Sweden. The decline in daily confirmed cases rate
244 after lockdown compared to pre-lockdown is estimated to be 19 fewer cases/ 10,000,000 person.
245 Because COVID-19 cases dropped in England, both countries' curves crossed over during May
246 2020 (Figure 1). Moreover, the daily COVID-19 mortality rate decreased by two
247 deaths/10,000,000 in England compared to Sweden.

248 To prevent a rebound increase in COVID-19 spread, the UK used a planned timetable to lift
249 restrictions using three phases [35]. Phase one started on May 13. During phase one, more people
250 were allowed to go to work if needed, and to drive to outdoor spaces irrespective of the distance.
251 Also, outdoor exercise time was increased. Phase two started on June 1. Children were able to
252 return to early years setting, and for Reception. Year one and year six were allowed back to
253 school in a smaller size. Non-essential retail stores were allowed to open gradually. More local
254 transport in urban areas was allowed to open. Sporting events can take place behind closed
255 doors. People were allowed to expand their household groups to include one other household.
256 This gradual reopening was always associated with reinforcement of social distancing, wearing
257 face-covering, and frequent handwashing. In this study, the trends of daily COVID-19 cases and
258 related deaths did not increase in England compared to Sweden with phases one and two of
259 lifting restrictions (eTable 2). Authors believe that this cautious, gradual reopening, in addition to

260 people's compliance with regulations, explains the absence of a second surge so far. Phase three
261 started on July 4. However, the authors did not estimate COVID-19 daily cases and deaths in this
262 phase.

263
264 Interrupted time-series analyses are difficult to interpret when outcomes follow a nonlinear
265 relation. Commonly, epidemics grow exponentially, slow down, and then decay exponentially
266 [36, 37]. This "natural evolution" was not seen universally in the COVID-19 pandemic. The
267 authors used a comparative model to control for the complex and dynamic growth of the
268 COVID-19 pandemic. Another method to estimate a health policy effect is to use difference-in-
269 difference method [38]. Authors used comparative interrupted time series analysis because it was
270 unclear if both countries would follow a parallel trend in the future and because interrupted time
271 series allows for more complex time trends using nonlinear models [38, 39]. In addition to that,
272 comparative time series analysis can adjust for non-parallel trends between groups and allows for
273 time-varying confounders [39].

274 In addition to non-randomized designs, our study has some limitations. England and Sweden are
275 geographically separated, hence other confounders or co-interventions may have affected the
276 outcomes. Time-varying confounders, including seasonality, can threaten the internal validity of
277 ITS analysis. Authors believe this is unlikely due to several reasons. Both countries used similar
278 tools to measure outcomes [19, 21]. Second, England and Sweden have a comparable life
279 expectancy (80.8 vs. 81.1 years, respectively) suggestive of similar health quality [40]. Lastly,
280 the COVID-19 pandemic started at the same time in both countries. This study only addresses
281 short-term outcomes of lockdown order; the authors analyzed data of the first 100 days post-

282 lockdown. Long-term trends in COVID-19 infection were not addressed and may increase after
283 phase 3 of lockdown loosening in England.

284 In conclusion, the lockdown implemented in England did result in a statistically and
285 epidemiologically significant reduction in the COVID-19 daily new cases rate compared to
286 Sweden. The decline in daily cases also resulted in a drop in daily death rate related to COVID-
287 19 in England. Lockdown in England has successfully halted COVID-19 transmission in the
288 short-term. However, long term outcomes are unknown, and a new epidemic during winter is
289 possible. Future research is needed to understand the long-term net outcome of the anti-COVID-
290 19 policy implemented in both countries.

291

292 **Contributors:** Dr. Mustafa Ali had full access to all the data and analysis in the study and takes
293 responsibility for the integrity of data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

294 Concept and design: Mustafa Ali, Samhouri

295 Acquisition, data analysis, and result interpretation: All authors.

296 Drafting of the manuscript: all authors.

297 Critical revision of the manuscript: all authors.

298 Statistical analysis: Mustafa Ali.

299 Administrative and technical support: Mustafa Ali, Samhouri.

300 Supervision: Mustafa Ali, Samhouri.

301 **Funding:** This study was unfunded.

302 **Competing interests:** All authors have no conflict of interest.

303 **Ethical approval:** The study protocol was reviewed by the Alleghany Health Network
304 Institutional Review Board. Because the study used de-identified and publicly available data, it
305 was considered exempt category.

306 **Data Sharing:** Data is available publicly. Statistical analysis code is available on request.

307 **Transparency statement:** Mustafa Ali affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and
308 transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been
309 omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321 **References**

- 322 1. **Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): Situation Report– 135** [[https://www.who.int/docs/default-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200603-covid-19-sitrep-135.pdf?sfvrsn=39972feb_2)
323 [source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200603-covid-19-sitrep-135.pdf?sfvrsn=39972feb_2](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200603-covid-19-sitrep-135.pdf?sfvrsn=39972feb_2)]
- 324 2. Moss P, Barlow G, Easom N, Lillie P, Samson A: **Lessons for managing high-consequence**
325 **infections from first COVID-19 cases in the UK.** *Lancet* 2020, **395**(10227):e46.
- 326 3. **Five already dead by time UK reported first coronavirus death**
327 [[https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/30/five-already-dead-by-time-uk-reported-first-](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/30/five-already-dead-by-time-uk-reported-first-coronavirus-death)
328 [coronavirus-death](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/30/five-already-dead-by-time-uk-reported-first-coronavirus-death)]
- 329 4. **First Swedish corona case clinically healthy** [[https://www.gp.se/nyheter/sverige/f%C3%B6rstas-](https://www.gp.se/nyheter/sverige/f%C3%B6rstasvenska-coronafallet-kliniskt-frisk-1.24829340)
330 [venska-coronafallet-kliniskt-frisk-1.24829340](https://www.gp.se/nyheter/sverige/f%C3%B6rstasvenska-coronafallet-kliniskt-frisk-1.24829340)]
- 331 5. **Professors' advice: Try closing schools**
332 [<https://www.aftonbladet.se/nyheter/a/xPvX6j/professorernas-rad-testa-att-stanga-skolor>]
- 333 6. **We epidemiologists have got a little too much power** [[https://www.gp.se/nyheter/sverige/vi-](https://www.gp.se/nyheter/sverige/vi-epidemiologer-har-f%C3%A5tt-lite-f%C3%B6r-stor-makt-1.26081990)
334 [epidemiologer-har-f%C3%A5tt-lite-f%C3%B6r-stor-makt-1.26081990](https://www.gp.se/nyheter/sverige/vi-epidemiologer-har-f%C3%A5tt-lite-f%C3%B6r-stor-makt-1.26081990)]
- 335 7. Gerli AG, Centanni S, Miozzo MR, Virchow JC, Sotgiu G, Canonica GW, Soriano JB: **COVID-**
336 **19 mortality rates in the European Union, Switzerland, and the UK: effect of timeliness,**
337 **lockdown rigidity, and population density.** *Minerva medica* 2020.
- 338 8. Lau H, Khosrawipour V, Kocbach P, Mikolajczyk A, Schubert J, Bania J, Khosrawipour T: **The**
339 **positive impact of lockdown in Wuhan on containing the COVID-19 outbreak in China.**
340 *Journal of travel medicine* 2020, **27**(3).
- 341 9. Alfano V, Ercolano S: **The Efficacy of Lockdown Against COVID-19: A Cross-Country**
342 **Panel Analysis.** *Applied health economics and health policy* 2020:1-9.
- 343 10. Hyafil A, Moriña D: **Analysis of the impact of lockdown on the reproduction number of the**
344 **SARS-Cov-2 in Spain.** *medRxiv* 2020:2020.2004.2018.20070862.

- 345 11. Roques L, Klein EK, Papaix J, Sar A, Soubeyrand S: **Impact of Lockdown on the Epidemic**
346 **Dynamics of COVID-19 in France.** *Frontiers in medicine* 2020, **7**:274.
- 347 12. Davies NG, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Gimma A, Edmunds WJ: **Effects of non-pharmaceutical**
348 **interventions on COVID-19 cases, deaths, and demand for hospital services in the UK: a**
349 **modelling study.** *The Lancet Public health* 2020, **5**(7):e375-e385.
- 350 13. Newey S: **Unicef warns lockdown could kill more than Covid-19 as model predicts 1.2**
351 **million child deaths.** In.: The Telegraph; 2020.
- 352 14. Jones H: **Was lockdown a waste of time? Study finds stay-at-home order was ‘ineffective’.**
353 In.: Metro; 2020.
- 354 15. STICKINGS T: **Lockdowns failed to alter the course of pandemic and are now destroying**
355 **millions of livelihoods worldwide, JP Morgan study claims.** In.: Daily Mail 2020.
- 356 16. Meunier TAJ: **Full lockdown policies in Western Europe countries have no evident impacts**
357 **on the COVID-19 epidemic.** *medRxiv* 2020:2020.2004.2024.20078717.
- 358 17. Cook TD, Campbell DT: **The design and conduct of true experiments and quasi-experiments**
359 **in field settings.** In: *Reproduced in part in Research in Organizations: Issues and Controversies.*
360 edn.: Goodyear Publishing Company; 1979.
- 361 18. Kontopantelis E, Doran T, Springate DA, Buchan I, Reeves D: **Regression based quasi-**
362 **experimental approach when randomisation is not an option: interrupted time series**
363 **analysis.** *BMJ : British Medical Journal* 2015, **350**:h2750.
- 364 19. **Coronavirus (COVID-19) cases in the UK** [<https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/about>]
- 365 20. **Estimates of the population for the UK, England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland**
366 [<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland>]
- 367 [<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland>]
- 368 21. **Confirmed cases in Sweden - daily update** [[https://www.folkhalsomyndigheten.se/smittskydd-](https://www.folkhalsomyndigheten.se/smittskydd-beredskap/utbrott/aktuella-utbrott/covid-19/bekraftade-fall-i-sverige/)
369 [beredskap/utbrott/aktuella-utbrott/covid-19/bekraftade-fall-i-sverige/](https://www.folkhalsomyndigheten.se/smittskydd-beredskap/utbrott/aktuella-utbrott/covid-19/bekraftade-fall-i-sverige/)]

- 370 22. **Population statistics** [<https://www.scb.se/en/finding-statistics/statistics-by-subject->
371 [area/population/population-composition/population-statistics/](https://www.scb.se/en/finding-statistics/statistics-by-subject-area/population/population-composition/population-statistics/)]
- 372 23. Pinheiro J, Bates D, DebRoy S, Sarkar D, Heisterkamp S, Van Willigen B, Maintainer R:
373 **Package ‘nlme’**. *Linear and nonlinear mixed effects models*, version 2017, 3.
- 374 24. **Durbin–Watson Test**. In: *The Concise Encyclopedia of Statistics*. edn. New York, NY: Springer
375 New York; 2008: 173-175.
- 376 25. **Case-Fatality Risk Estimates for COVID-19 Calculated by Using a Lag Time for Fatality**
377 [https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/6/20-0320_article#r3]
- 378 26. Linton NM, Kobayashi T, Yang Y, Hayashi K, Akhmetzhanov AR, Jung S-M, Yuan B, Kinoshita
379 R, Nishiura H: **Incubation Period and Other Epidemiological Characteristics of 2019 Novel**
380 **Coronavirus Infections with Right Truncation: A Statistical Analysis of Publicly Available**
381 **Case Data**. *J Clin Med* 2020, **9**(2):538.
- 382 27. Aragon T, Fay M, Wollschlaeger D, Omidpanah A: **EpiTools: R package for epidemiologic**
383 **data and graphics**. *R Package version 05-101* 2017.
- 384 28. R Development Core Team R: **R: A language and environment for statistical computing**. In.:
385 R foundation for statistical computing Vienna, Austria; 2019.
- 386 29. Fine P, Eames K, Heymann DL: **“Herd Immunity”: A Rough Guide**. *Clinical Infectious*
387 *Diseases* 2011, **52**(7):911-916.
- 388 30. **Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality**
389 **and healthcare demand** [[https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/mrc-](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/mrc-gida/2020-03-16-COVID19-Report-9.pdf)
390 [gida/2020-03-16-COVID19-Report-9.pdf](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/mrc-gida/2020-03-16-COVID19-Report-9.pdf)]
- 391 31. **Staying at home and away from others (social distancing)**
392 [[https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/full-guidance-on-staying-at-home-and-away-from-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/full-guidance-on-staying-at-home-and-away-from-others/full-guidance-on-staying-at-home-and-away-from-others)
393 [others/full-guidance-on-staying-at-home-and-away-from-others](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/full-guidance-on-staying-at-home-and-away-from-others/full-guidance-on-staying-at-home-and-away-from-others)]
- 394 32. **Decisions and guidelines in the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs’ policy areas to limit**
395 **the spread of the COVID-19 virus** [<https://www.government.se/articles/2020/04/s-decisions->

- 396 [and-guidelines-in-the-ministry-of-health-and-social-affairs-policy-areas-to-limit-the-spread-of-](#)
397 [the-covid-19-virusny-sida/](#)
- 398 33. **'Huge contrasts' in devolved NHS** [<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/health/7586147.stm>]
- 399 34. **NHS 'now four different systems'** [<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/health/7149423.stm>]
- 400 35. **Our plan to rebuild: The UK Government's COVID-19 recovery strategy**
401 [[https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/our-plan-to-rebuild-the-uk-governments-covid-19-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/our-plan-to-rebuild-the-uk-governments-covid-19-recovery-strategy/our-plan-to-rebuild-the-uk-governments-covid-19-recovery-strategy#our-roadmap-to-lift-restrictions-step-by-step)
402 [recovery-strategy/our-plan-to-rebuild-the-uk-governments-covid-19-recovery-strategy#our-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/our-plan-to-rebuild-the-uk-governments-covid-19-recovery-strategy/our-plan-to-rebuild-the-uk-governments-covid-19-recovery-strategy#our-roadmap-to-lift-restrictions-step-by-step)
403 [roadmap-to-lift-restrictions-step-by-step](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/our-plan-to-rebuild-the-uk-governments-covid-19-recovery-strategy/our-plan-to-rebuild-the-uk-governments-covid-19-recovery-strategy#our-roadmap-to-lift-restrictions-step-by-step)]
- 404 36. Hsieh Y-H, Fisman DN, Wu J: **On epidemic modeling in real time: An application to the 2009**
405 **Novel A (H1N1) influenza outbreak in Canada.** *BMC Research Notes* 2010, **3**(1):283.
- 406 37. Muscatello DJ, Newall AT, Dwyer DE, MacIntyre CR: **Mortality Attributable to Seasonal and**
407 **Pandemic Influenza, Australia, 2003 to 2009, Using a Novel Time Series Smoothing**
408 **Approach.** *PLOS ONE* 2013, **8**(6):e64734.
- 409 38. Dimick JB, Ryan AM: **Methods for evaluating changes in health care policy: the difference-**
410 **in-differences approach.** *Jama* 2014, **312**(22):2401-2402.
- 411 39. Lopez Bernal J, Cummins S, Gasparrini A: **Difference in difference, controlled interrupted**
412 **time series and synthetic controls.** *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2019, **48**(6):2062-
413 2063.
- 414 40. **COUNTRY COMPARISON: LIFE EXPECTANCY AT BIRTH**
415 [<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2102rank.html>]

416

417

418

419

420 **Figure legends:**

421

422 *Figure 1 Daily new cases of COVID-19 in England and Sweden adjusted for population size.*

423 * Population size was adjusted to ten million for both countries in this figure.

424

425 *Figure 2 Daily deaths related to COVID-19 in England and Sweden adjusted for population size.*

426 * Population size was adjusted to ten million for both countries in this figure.

427

428 *Figure 3 Comparative time series analysis to assess the impact of England's lockdown order on*
429 *daily new cases of COVID-19 compared to Sweden adjusted for population size.*

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

432

433

434 *Figure 4 Comparative time series analysis to assess the impact of England's lockdown order on*
435 *daily deaths related to COVID-19 compared to Sweden adjusted for population size.*

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

438

439 *Table 1 Comparison of measurements implemented by England and Sweden government to decrease the spread of COVID-19*
 440 *infection*

	England[31]	Sweden[32]
Stay at home order	<p>-People should only leave or be away from their home for very limited purposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shopping for basic necessities, for example, food and medicine, which must be as infrequent as possible. 2. One form of exercise a day, for example, a run, walk or cycle alone or with members of one's household. 3. Any medical need, including to donate blood, avoid injury or illness, escape the risk of harm, or to provide care or to help a vulnerable person. 4. Traveling for work purposes, but only where individuals cannot work from home. 	<p>-A ban on visiting all of the nation's care homes for older people has been in place since April 1, 2020.</p> <p>-Maintain social distancing by keeping a distance from each other and refraining from non-essential travel within the country.</p>
Closing certain businesses and venues	<p>-The government closed the following businesses to the public by law:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pubs, cinemas, and theatres. 2. Clothing and electronics stores; hair, beauty and nail salons, and outdoor and indoor markets (not selling food). 3. Libraries, community centers, and youth centers. 4. Indoor and outdoor leisure facilities such as bowling alleys, arcades, and soft play facilities. 5. Communal places within parks, such as playgrounds, sports courts, and outdoor gyms. 6. Places of worship (except for funerals). 7. Hotels, hostels, bed and breakfasts, campsites, caravan parks, and boarding houses for commercial/leisure use, excluding the use by those who live in them permanently and those who are unable to return home 	<p>- All venues must ensure that tables are spaced appropriately to avoid crowding.</p> <p>- People must always be seated when consuming any food or beverages.</p>

Stopping public gatherings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public gatherings of more than two people are prohibited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ban public gatherings of >500 people, this was lowered to 50 people on March 29, 2020. - Upper secondary school and University education are conducted online, but preschools and elementary schools remained open.
Going to work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People are allowed to travel for work purposes, including to provide voluntary or charitable services, where work from home is impossible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No specific recommendations, people were encouraged to refrain from non-essential travel.
Enforcing the law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The police and local authorities have the power to enforce the requirements set out in law if people do not comply with them. If people breach these regulations, the police may: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Instruct people to go home, leave an area, or disperse. - Instruct people to take steps to stop their children from breaking these rules if they have already done so. - Take an individual home or arrest an individual, where they believe it is necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The only recommendation that was subject to the penalty was banning public gatherings of more than 50; otherwise, everything else was a non-enforceable recommendation
Use of personal protective equipment including masks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No recommendations. - Start mandatory masks on public transportation on June 15, 2020. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No recommendations.

