Do Lockdowns Bring about Additional Mortality Benefits or Costs? Evidence based on Death Records from 300 Million Chinese People

Jinlei Qi[1*], Dandan Zhang[2*], Xiang Zhang[2], Peng Yin[1], Jiangmei Liu[1], Yuhang Pan[3], Tanakao Takana[4], Peiyu Xie[2], Zhaoguang Wang[2], Shuocen Liu[5], George F. Gao[6†], Guojun He[3,4,7†], Maigeng Zhou[1†]

*These authors contributed equally to this work.
† These authors are co-correspondence.

Affiliations:

1 National Center for Chronic and Noncommunicable Disease Control and Prevention, Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 27 Nanwei Road, Xicheng District, 100050 Beijing, China (J Qi PhD, P Yin PhD, J Liu MPH, M Zhou PhD)

2 National School of Development, Peking University, 5 Yiheyuan Road, Haidian District, 100871 Beijing, China (D Zhang PhD, X Zhang BA, P Xie MA, Z Wang MA)

3 Division of Environment and Sustainability, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong SAR, China (Y Pan MPhil, G He PhD)

4 Division of Social Science, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong SAR, China (T Takana MPhil, G He PhD)

5 Peking University HSBC Business School, Peking University, University Town, Nanshan District, 518055 Shenzhen, Guangdong Province, China (S. Liu MA)

6 Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 155 Changbai Road, Changping District, 102206 Beijing, China (George Gao DPhil)

7 Department of Economics, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong SAR, China (G He PhD)

Correspondence to: Dr. Maigeng Zhou, National Center for Chronic Noncommunicable Disease Control and Prevention, Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Beijing 100050, China (zhoumaigeng@ncncd.chinacdc.cn); or Dr. Guojun He, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong SAR, China (gjhe@ust.hk); or Dr. George F. Gao, Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Beijing 102206, China (gaofu@chinacdc.cn),

Abstract:

After the COVID-19 outbreak, China immediately adopted stringent lockdown policies to contain the virus. Using comprehensive death records covering around 300 million Chinese people, we estimate the impacts of city and community lockdowns on non-COVID-19 mortality outside of Wuhan. Employing a difference-in-differences method, we find that lockdowns reduced the number of non-COVID-19 deaths by 4.9% (cardiovascular deaths by 6.2%, injuries by 9.2%, and non-COVID-19 pneumonia deaths by 14.3%). The health benefits are likely driven by significant reductions in air pollution, traffic, and human interactions. A back-of-the-envelope calculation shows that more than 32,000 lives could have been saved from non-COVID-19 diseases/causes during the 40 days of the lockdown on which we focus. The results suggest that the rapid and strict virus countermeasures not only effectively controlled the spread of COVID-19 but also brought about massive unintended public health benefits. These findings can help better inform policymakers around the world about the benefits and costs of city and community lockdowns policies in dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic.

Keyword: Lockdown; Anti-contagion policy; COVID-19; China

Introduction

By the end of June 2020, COVID-19 had affected more than 216 countries and caused more than 550, 000 deaths worldwide[1]. Facing this unprecedented crisis, different countries adopted various measures to mitigate its impacts, ranging from one extreme, where governments imposed draconian measures to restrict human mobility immediately after the outbreak, to the other extreme, where governments were reluctant to adopt any serious disease preventive measures and explicitly resorted to herd immunity. Effective policies not only depend on the social preferences of people and the capacity of government but also depend on our accurate understanding of the costs and benefits of different counter-COVID-19 measures. However, relatively little is known about the broader impacts of these policies.

A key component when evaluating the welfare implications of the anti-contagion policies is their overall public health consequences. Multiple studies have shown that strict social distancing and human mobility restrictions can effectively control the spread of COVID-19 and thus save lives from the virus[2-6]. However, it remains unknown to researchers and policymakers how such interventions affect disease patterns and deaths from other causes. On the one hand, hospitals may decline nonurgent service requests (especially when the system is overburdened by COVID-19)[7] and the fear of getting infected by COVID-19 may make patients reluctant to visit hospitals. This could impact the quality of health services and delay medical treatment, which would negatively impact the population health. Additionally, in many countries, the strict virus containment policies led to sudden and sharp economic disruption, causing massive layoffs[8]. As documented in the previous literature, such economic downturns and high unemployment could also damage population healtht[9-15]. All these factors would increase the mortality when strict counter-virus measures were enforced. On the other hand, because the virus containment policies significantly

improved air quality, restricted human-to-human interactions, and reduced traffic volume, it is also possible that a large number of people could be saved from dying from air pollution, other types of communicable diseases, and traffic accidents[17-19]. Therefore, it is of great scientific and policy relevance to assess whether the counter-virus measures bring about additional public health gains or additional public health losses.

Using data from China, we examine how city and community lockdown policies affect non-COVID-19 mortality. We focus on China because the country mandated strict social distancing and lockdown policies to control the virus. Within a few weeks after the COVID-19 outbreak in Wuhan, a large number of cities enforced strict quarantines, traced close contacts, prohibited public gatherings, mandated social distancing, and limited human mobility. A large number of cities were locked down even though they had less than 100 confirmed cases (Supplementary Fig 1 and Supplementary Fig 2). Exploiting the staggered introduction of city and community lockdowns in different cities of China, we estimate the impacts of lockdowns on the number of deaths from various causes and explore the channels through which these impacts are manifested. These results will help policymakers around the world design effective measures to mitigate the damages from the pandemic.

The core of our empirical analysis uses the comprehensive deaths record from China's Disease Surveillance Points (DSPs) system, covering more than 324 million people in 605 DSP's districts/counties in 321 cities, which accounts for 24.3% of the country's population[20, 21]. This dataset includes cause-specific deaths, which allows us to examine the mechanism of lockdowns' impacts on non-COVID-19 mortality. Each city's lockdown information is collected from news media and government announcements (Fig 1). There are two types of lockdowns: city lockdown and community lockdown. The former is defined as mobility being restricted across different cities,

and the latter is defined as restriction of mobility within a city. Matching these datasets, we construct a daily DSP site-level panel dataset from January 1 to March 14, 2020, which is the period largely overlapping with the coronavirus outbreak in China. Our dataset includes 393,133 death records that were reported to the DSPs system by May 15, 2020 (Supplementary Table 1). Note that we exclude 3 DSPs in Wuhan from the baseline analysis because the city is the epicenter of the outbreak in China, and we are concerned that its death reporting process could have been affected during the study period[22].

To quantify the impacts of lockdowns on mortality, we employ a difference-in-differences (DiD) approach, which is an econometric approach and is widely used to infer causal impacts of various policies and events using observational data[23]. An advantage of this approach is that it compares the policy effects relative to the plausible counterfactuals. While the results from a before-and-after comparison could be driven by different mortality trends or other unobserved confounders, DiD compares the changes in mortality between the locked-down DSPs (treatment group) and the non-locked-down DSPs (control group) before and after the enforcement of lockdown policies. In other words, the control group can serve as a counterfactual, mimicking what would have happened in locked down DSPs in the absence of the lockdown, which essentially allows us to compare the policy effects relative to business as usual. Note that a key assumption of the DiD is that the treatment and the control group follow parallel trends in the number of deaths in the absence of the lockdown policies. We examine whether this assumption is likely to hold using an event-study test. We describe the model in more detail in the Materials and Methods.

Results

Impacts of City and Community Lockdowns on Non-COVID-19 Deaths

Fig. 1 summarizes the baseline regression results by fitting the DiD model (Materials and Methods: Equation A1; full results are in Supplementary Table 2). Panel A reports the effects on the number of deaths, while Panel B reports the percentage change. In row (1), we find that lockdowns overall have a negative impact on non-COVID-19 mortality. After human mobility is restricted, the DSP-level daily number of deaths decreased by 0.429 (or 4.92%), as compared to the control group.

In rows (2) to (7), motivated by several factors that could potentially affect population health during the lockdown period, we separately examine the effects on different causes of death. We are especially interested in the following three outcome variables: cardiovascular diseases (CVD), injuries, and (non-COVID-19) pneumonia deaths. Existing literature on the acute effects of air pollution suggests that elevated air pollution levels can significantly increase deaths from strokes, myocardial infarction, and other types of cardiovascular diseases[24-25]. We thus expect the number of deaths from CVDs may decrease due to the improved air quality[27]. As shown in row (2) of Fig. 1, we find that cardiovascular deaths were reduced by 6.2% (0.27 in levels) after lockdown. Relatedly, as the lockdown policies restrict production, social activities, and traffic, we expect the number of deaths from injuries (which include workplace injuries, traffic accidents, etc.) to also drop. The result in row (3) of Fig. 1 confirms this conjecture; we observe that the number of deaths caused by injuries decreased by 9.2% (0.044 in levels). In addition, as human mobility is greatly restricted during the lockdown period, this should reduce the likelihood of people getting infected by and dying from other types of bacteria and viruses that cause pneumonia. The result in column

(4) shows that deaths from non-COVID pneumonia were reduced by a large margin of 14.7% (0.022 in levels) during the lockdown period.

In rows (5) to (7), we report the findings on several other causes of death that are less likely to be affected by short-term restrictions on human activities. They include deaths from neoplasms, chronic respiratory diseases, and other diseases. While the coefficients for these causes of death are also negative, they are all statistically significant. We thus conclude the temporary human mobility restrictions during China's lockdowns primarily reduce the deaths caused by acute diseases and accidents and have a weaker impact on people with chronic diseases and cancers.

Some additional analyses complement our main findings. A key assumption of the DiD is that the treatment and the control group follow parallel trends in the number of deaths in the absence of the lockdown policies. Using an event-study approach, we show that this assumption is likely to be held (Fig. 2 and Supplementary Note 1 and Supplementary Table 3). Also, we find that our results are robust to the inclusion of additional controls, adoption of different weighting, and sampling (Supplementary Note 2, Supplementary Table 4, and Supplementary Fig. 3). Finally, we further disaggregate the data into more specific causes/diseases (Supplementary Table 5). For example, in the cardiovascular disease category, we observe that deaths from myocardial infarction, strokes, and other types of cardiovascular diseases all significantly decreased after the lockdown.

Heterogeneity

In Fig 3, we examine the heterogeneous impacts of lockdowns on mortality. Here we report our findings on the total number of non-COVID-19 deaths and explore the following dimensions: baseline income (measured by per capita GDP in 2018), healthcare resources (measured by hospital beds per thousand people in 2018), air pollution levels (measured by average $PM_{2.5}$

concentrations in 2019), industrial structure (measured by the share of employment in manufacturing industries in 2015), and initial health status (measured by mortality rate in 2019).

To do so, we interact the lockdown indicator separately with each of the heterogeneity dimensions in the regression (Supplementary Table 6), and then plot the predicted impacts and their 95% confidence intervals in Fig 4. We observe significant heterogeneities with respect to the air pollution level, the employment shares in the manufacturing industries, and the baseline mortality level. Specifically, the health benefit of lockdowns on mortality is greater when a DSP is more polluted and more industrialized, and when the initial health status is worse.

We also repeat this exercise separately for deaths from specific causes: cardiovascular diseases, injuries, and non-COVID-19 pneumonia (Supplementary Fig 4). Several patterns stand out: (1) for cardiovascular diseases, there exist significant heterogeneities for air pollution and industrial structure, with more polluted and more industrialized cities seeing fewer deaths from cardiovascular diseases during lockdowns relative to other cities (Panel a); (2) for injuries, the more industrialized the DSP, the higher its initial injury mortality, and, as expected, the greater the impact of the lockdown (Panel b); (3) for pneumonia, we only observe significant heterogeneity with respect to initial mortality rate, *i.e.*, cities with a higher initial pneumonia mortality rate are more strongly affected by lockdowns (Panel c). Across all the causes of death, per capita GDP and availability of healthcare resources do not seem to play an important role in terms of magnitude, although occasionally they are statistically significant. The corresponding regression results are reported in Supplementary Tables 7-9. As a side note, we also examined many other dimensions of heterogeneity, including the severity of the COVID-19 outbreak, alternative measures of health care resources, other measures of economic structure, etc. However, we do not observe strong heterogeneities along these dimensions and thus do not report them in the paper.

Finally, we investigate which age group(s) are driving the overall reduction in mortality. We expect older people and younger people to be sensitive to the overall lockdown policies, while we expect adults to be vulnerable to injuries and accidents. Supplementary Fig 5 summarizes the results. We find that children (-10.6% in row 1) and the elderly (-5.5% in row 5) are indeed more likely than adults (-2.5% in row 2) to be saved by the lockdown policies. If we further examine different causes of death, we find that the elderly is saved both from air pollution-related disease (-6.6% in row 6) and infectious disease (-17.0% in row 8), and younger adults are protected from injuries (-14.7% in row 4). These results are generally consistent with our understanding of the threats of various diseases to different age groups. More detailed results are represented in Supplementary Table 10.

Back-of-the-envelope calculation

In Fig 5, using the estimates in our analyses, we calculate the averted non-COVID-19 deaths in the whole nation due to the lockdown policies during our study period. In Panel a, we plot the predicted average daily deaths. The red and blue lines respectively represent the predicted deaths with and without lockdown policies. Therefore, the differences between these lines can be regarded as the lockdown effects. We see that these two lines start to diverge as more cities implement lockdown policies, and the difference remains stable throughout mid-March.

Because our dataset includes around a quarter of the Chinese population, we apply our estimates to the entire Chinese population, in Panel b. During our study period, 486 DSPs (80.7%) eventually implemented lockdowns, with an average of 38.5 days. We apply our estimates to all the cities that implemented the lockdown policies and calculate the number of averted deaths during our study period. We find that the lockdown policies brought about considerable health

benefits: as many as 32,023 lives may have been saved. If we look at the cause-specific effects, we find that cardiovascular diseases account for 62.9% (20,129) of overall averted deaths. Deaths from injury also declined by 10.2% (3,261), pneumonia by 5.0% (1,607), respiratory by 7.4% (2,373), and cancer by 8.5% (2,726).

Discussion

When COVID-19 spread across the globe, we observed a large variation in the public responses in mitigating its impacts: some countries immediately adopted harsh counter-virus measures while others delayed the launch of the policies. As an example of prompt and stringent responses to the COVID-19 outbreak, we investigate the mortality consequences of community and city lockdowns using data from China (excluding Wuhan). Here, we discuss several important implications of our findings.

First and foremost, our findings demonstrate that the China's unprecedented lockdowns not only effectively controlled the spread of COVID-19, but also brought about substantial unintended benefits to population health during this period. We find that such policies reduced non-COVID-19 deaths by 4.92%, which corresponds to 32,000 averted deaths in the nation during 40 days of lockdown. Given the increasingly heated cost-benefit debates regarding different counter-COVID-19 policy choices across the world, our results provide a benchmark to understand the health consequences of the lockdown policies. Besides China, several other countries have managed to take the COVID-19 threat under control after one to two months' strict social distancing, largely because they dealt with the COVID-19 seriously and decisively. We believe these stringent measures should also be better appreciated by policymakers around the world, particularly in countries where the COVID-19 is out of control.

Second, our research points out the directions to improve population health after the pandemic. In particular, we observe a significant reduction in the number of cardiovascular deaths during the lockdown periods, and the effect is larger in cities with higher levels of initial air pollution. A back-of-the-envelope calculation suggests that the total number of averted premature deaths from cardiovascular diseases in the locked-down DSPs alone has far exceeded the total number of deaths caused by COVID-19 in China. This result suggests that air pollution imposed a significant health risk to the Chinese population and it is critically important for the government to continue to improve the environmental quality even when the lockdown is lifted[28-29]. Besides, the finding on pneumonia mortality confirms that reducing human contacts and raising awareness of preventive measures (such as wearing masks) not only helps control the spread of COVID-19, but also other infectious diseases. These measures should be more appreciated by both public health practitioners and governments.

Third, our results also serve as corroborating evidence that China's data on the number of COVID-19 deaths are largely reliable, especially those outside of Wuhan. The logic is the following: if the deaths from COVID-19 were intentionally classified as other causes, such as pneumonia or other unclassified diseases, we might observe an unexplainable hike in those causes of death in the locked-down cities (presumably, there were few cases of COVID-19 in the control group). Our results suggest this is not the case; we find that the lockdown reduces all these causes of death in the locked-down cities (using data outside Wuhan), suggesting that COVID-19 deaths are unlikely to be misreported in a substantial way. For Wuhan, however, we do have suggestive evidence of potential misclassification of COVID-19 deaths, as including Wuhan in the regression reverses the sign for deaths from non-COVID-19 pneumonia.

Finally, while the literature has emphasized that economic downturns are usually associated with increased mortality (particularly in less affluent countries), our analyses show that the negative health effects of income shocks during China's lockdowns were offset by unintended benefits to population health, at least in the short run. While economic collapse is likely to seriously harm public health in the long run, we believe that countries currently affected by COVID-19 can maintain overall population health for a short time by containing the virus as quickly as possible through strict social distancing/mobility restrictions. Future research is needed to understand the long-term welfare implications of different ways to handle the COVID-19 pandemic.

Materials and methods

Materials

DSP Data: The Disease Surveillance Points (DSPs) system is managed by the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. The system collects death records from the surveillance locations to understand death and disease patterns in China. The system was established in 1978 and has gradually increased its geographical coverage over the past four decades. In 2013, the system got a major upgrade and expanded its coverage from 161 points to 605 points, making the data representative both at the provincial and national levels. Each surveillance point represents a district (if in urban areas) or a county (if in rural areas). For each surveillance point, deaths that occurred in both hospitals and homes are reported, and the causes of death are determined according to a standard protocol by trained staff located in local hospitals or CDC branches. The DSPs system covers more than 324 million people in China, which accounts for 24.3% of the country's population (*18*, *19*). The quality control procedures include annual training of standard workflow, random checking of the accuracy of disease classification and duplication, retrospective surveys on underreporting, and logic checks on the completeness and accuracy of disease codes. These quality checks are required to be done at the county, province, and national levels. The causes of death are coded in accordance with the International Classification of Diseases-10th revision (ICD-10). We classified the main underlying causes of deaths into 6 categories: I00-I99 for cardiovascular diseases (CVD), V01-Y89 for injuries, J12-J15, J18.9 and J98.4 for pneumonia (excluding COVID-19), C00-C97 for neoplasms, J30-J98 for chronic respiratory diseases, and other causes (remaining ICD-10 codes for all other causes). We further disaggregate cardiovascular diseases, injuries, and pneumonia deaths into specific diseases/causes. Cardiovascular diseases include stroke (I60-I62, I67, and I69), myocardial infarction (I20-I25),

and other cardiovascular diseases. Injuries include traffic accidents (V01-V04, V06, V09, V87, V89, and V99), suicide (X60-X84 and Y87), and other injuries. Pneumonia includes mycoplasma pneumonia (J18.9), viral and bacterial pneumonia (J12-J15), and pulmonary infection (J98.4). We also divide the daily number of deaths into three age groups (0-15, 15-64, and ≥65). All death data are analyzed at the aggregated level. In our baseline analysis, we exclude three points (districts) in Wuhan due to concerns that the data might be unrepresentative because the pandemic started there.

In addition to the DSPs system, the Chinese CDC also manages the Communicable Disease Surveillance (CDS) system. The DSPs system is used for death registration, while the CDS system is used to monitor the development of infectious diseases, including COVID-19. These two systems are managed by different subsidiaries in the Chinese CDC and have separate administrative structures. Because the purpose of the DSPs system is to understand the overall cause-of-death patterns in China, and because the death registration process carries no political stake, there is no incentive for local hospitals or CDC branches to hide regular death information from the central government.

Lockdown Data: We collected local governments' lockdown information city by city from news media and government announcements. Most of the cities' lockdown policies were directly issued by the city-level governments, while a few were promulgated by the provincial governments. There are two types of lockdowns: city lockdown and community lockdown. The former is defined as human mobility being restricted across different cities, and the latter is defined as mobility being restricted within a city. At the early stage of the outbreak, to prevent the virus from spreading outside Hubei province, city lockdowns were adopted in Wuhan and its neighboring cities. The purpose of city lockdowns was to restrict people in the epicenter of coronavirus from traveling to other cities. Later, as more cases were identified in other cities,

community lockdowns were implemented to further control the spread of the coronavirus within cities. The time lag between city lockdowns and community lockdowns was typically one to two weeks. The evolution of different DSPs' lockdown status is presented in Supplementary Fig 1, 2. In Supplementary Table 11, we further provide a complete list of cities that adopted different lockdown policies at different times. The lockdowns gradually spread to different surveillance districts/counties between January 23 and February 20. By the end of February, 486 out of 602 surveillance points had lockdown policies.

Weather Data: Weather variables include daily temperature, atmospheric pressure, relative humidity, wind speed, and precipitation. The data are obtained from the China Meteorology Administration (CMA). We aggregate station-level air pollution data to city-level data using the inverse squared distance (to city centers) as the weights. Stations closer to the population center are given higher weights so that city-level weather data can be representative of people dwelling in the city.

Air Pollution Data: We obtain air pollution data from the Ministry of Ecology and Environment. The original dataset includes hourly air quality readings from over 2,000 monitoring stations covering 338 prefectural cities in China. We follow the same procedure to aggregate station level air pollution data to the city level. As an omnibus measure of the overall air quality, we use $PM_{2.5}$ concentration in our regressions. Our results are quantitatively unchanged if we use the Air Quality Index or PM_{10}.

Socio-Economic Conditions: We assemble the socio-economic data at the city or county level from the 2018 China City Statistical Yearbook and 2018 China County Statistical Yearbook, including GDP, population, and the number of hospital beds per 1,000 people. We also obtain data

on the employment share of the manufacturing and service industries using the 10% sample of the 2015 1% Population Sampling Survey in China.

Summary Statistics: We report the summary statistics of mortality, lockdown status, and other covariates for 602 DSP counties in Supplementary Table 1. In Panel A, we report the summary statistics of the DSPs data. The average daily total number of deaths at the county level is 8.7, with a standard deviation of 0.025. We use DSPs data from January 1 to March 14, 2020, which include 393,133 death records that were reported to the DSPs system by May 15, 2020.The leading cause of death during this period is cardiovascular diseases, which account for 49.7% of all deaths. The second leading cause of death is neoplasms (22.3%), followed by chronic respiratory diseases (8.7%), and injuries (5.5%). In Panel B, we report the summary statistics of several other variables. The $PM_{2.5}$ concentration during our study period is 50 μg/m^3, five times higher than the WHO standard (10 μg/m^3 for annual mean, and 25 μg/m^3 for a daily mean). The average share of employment in the manufacturing industries was 24.2% as of 2015.

Statistical Analysis

We use a generalized Difference-in-Differences (DiD) model to identify the impact of counter-COVID-19 measures on mortality. First, in our baseline regression, we estimate the relative change in the number of deaths between the treated and control DSPs using the following model:

$$D_{ijt} = \alpha + \beta \cdot lockdown_{jt} + \lambda_i + \pi_t + \mathcal{E}_{ijt} \qquad (A1)$$

where D_{ijt} denotes the daily number of deaths in DSP *i* in city *j* on date *t*, and $lockdown_{jt}$ is a dummy variable indicating whether a city/community lockdown is in place in city *j* on date *t*. The lockdown dummy takes the value one if either city lockdown or community lockdown was

implemented, and zero otherwise. Thus, the coefficient β measures the average effect of three types of lockdown policies: mobility restrictions across cities (city lockdown), mobility restrictions within a city (community lockdown), and both restrictions (city lockdown + community lockdown). To understand how the city and community lockdowns affect health outcomes differently, we separately estimate these effects (Supplementary Table 5). λ_i are DSP-fixed effects and π_t indicate date fixed effects. ε_{ijt} is the error term.

The county fixed effects, λ_i, which are a set of DSP-specific dummy variables, can control for time-invariant confounders specific to each DSP. For example, the DSP's geographical conditions, short-term industrial and economic structure, income, and natural endowment can be controlled by introducing the DSP fixed effects. The date fixed effects, π_t, are a set of dummy variables that account for shocks that are common to all DSPs in a given day, such as the nationwide holiday policies, macroeconomic conditions, and the national time trend for mortality. As both location and time fixed effects are included in the regression, the coefficient β estimates the difference in the number of deaths between the treated (locked down) and the control cities before and after the enforcement of the lockdown policy. We also add a set of control variables in the regressions to check the robustness of the results (Supplementary Fig. 3).

The underlying assumption for the DiD estimator is that lockdown and control cities would have parallel trends in the number of deaths in the absence of the event. Even if the results show that mortality declines in the treatment counties after the lockdown, the results may not be driven by the lockdown policy, but by systematic differences in treatment and control cities. This assumption is untestable because we cannot observe the counterfactual: what would happen to the mortality levels in the locked-down counties if such policies were not enforced. Nevertheless, we can still examine the trends in mortality for both groups before the lockdown and investigate

whether the two groups are indeed comparable. To do so, we conduct the event study and fit the following equation:

$$D_{ijt} = \alpha + \sum_{m=k,m\neq-1}^{M} \beta^k \cdot lockdown_{ijt,k} + \lambda_i + \pi_t + \mathcal{E}_{ijt} \qquad (A2)$$

where $lockdown_{jt,k}$ are a set of dummy variables indicating the treatment status at different periods. Here, we put 7 days (one week) into one bin ($bin\ m \in M$), so that the trend test is not affected by the high volatility of the daily number of deaths.

The dummy for $m = -1$ is omitted in Equation (A2) so that the post-lockdown effects are relative to the period one week before the launch of the policy. The parameter of interest β^k estimates the effect of lockdown m weeks after the implementation. We include leads of the treatment dummy in the equation, testing whether the treatment affects the air pollution levels before the launch of the policy. Intuitively, the coefficient β^k measures the difference in the number of deaths between cities under lockdown and otherwise in period k relative to the difference two weeks before the lockdown. If lockdown reduces mortality, β^k would be negative when $k \geq -1$. If the pre-treatment trends are parallel, β^k would be close to zero when $k \leq -2$.

We feel confident in using the estimates from our main results to calculate the averted deaths in the entire country, because our dataset includes around one-quarter of the Chinese population and are representative. To do so, we predict the number of deaths in two scenarios: with/without lockdown policies. Taking the difference between these two predicted deaths, we can calculate the number of saved lives from the lockdown policies. To do so, we first predict the number of deaths with lockdown policies in each DSP county/district in each day by fitting the following model:

$$\widehat{D}_{ijt} = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} \cdot lockdown_{jt} + \hat{\lambda}_{\mathrm{i}} + \hat{\pi}_t \qquad (A3)$$

where $\widehat{D}_{ijt}$ denotes the predicted deaths with lockdown policies in each DSP county/district i in city j. $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\beta}$, $\hat{\lambda}_{\mathrm{i}}$, and $\hat{\pi}_t$ are the fitted values from Equation (A1). In this function, predicted deaths in each DSP, denoted by $\widehat{D}_{ijt}$, can be affected by the lockdown status (represented by $lockdown_{jt}$).

We then predict the counterfactual, i.e., the number of deaths that would have occurred without lockdowns in any DSP, by fitting the following equation:

$$\widehat{D}_{ijt}(0) = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} \cdot lockdown_{jt}(0) + \hat{\lambda}_{\mathrm{i}} + \hat{\pi}_t \qquad (A4)$$

where $\widehat{D}_{ijt}(0)$ denotes the predicted averted deaths without any lockdown policies. $lockdown_{jt}(0)$ always takes a value of zero so that this function is not affected by the policies. Taking the differences between $\widehat{D}_{ijt}$ and $\widehat{D}_{ijt}(0)$, we can calculate how many non-COVID-19 deaths are saved from the lockdown policies in each DSP in each day.

Because lockdowns were implemented for 38.5 days on average, we estimate the following model to obtain the averted deaths in the whole country during our study period:

$$\widehat{D}_{all} = \frac{Chpop^{LD}}{DSPpop^{LD}} * \sum_{i \epsilon I} \widehat{D}_{ijt} - \widehat{D}_{ijt}(0) \qquad (A5)$$

where $\widehat{D}_{all}$ denotes the averted deaths in the entire county during our study period, $Chpop^{LD}$ denotes the total Chinese population in locked-down cities (around 1,161 million), and $DSPpop^{LD}$ represents the total population in locked-down DSPs counties/districts in our dataset (around 291 million in 486 DSPs). The difference between the scenarios with and without lockdowns, denoted by $\widehat{D}_{ijt} - \widehat{D}_{ijt}(0)$, is totaled from January 1 to March 14, which is our study period ($i \epsilon I$). Note that, in our main text, we repeat these steps to estimate the averted deaths from each cause and disease to understand how many averted deaths can be attributed to different diseases/causes.

References

1. World Health Organization, *WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard*. https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019 (accessed July 5,2020)
2. Tian H, Liu Y, Li Y, et al. An investigation of transmission control measures during the first 50 days of the COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Science* 2020; **368**: 638-42.
3. Qiu Y, Chen X, Shi W. Impacts of social and economic factors on the transmission of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China. *J Popul Econ* 2020: 1-46.
4. Chinazzi M, Davis JT, Ajelli M, et al. The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. *Science* 2020; **368**: 395-400.
5. Hsiang S, Allen D, Annan-Phan S, et al. The effect of large-scale anti-contagion policies on the COVID-19 pandemic [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jun 8]. *Nature* 2020.
6. Lai S, Ruktanonchai NW, Zhou L, et al. Effect of non-pharmaceutical interventions to contain COVID-19 in China [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 4]. *Nature* 2020.
7. Coibion, Gorodnichenko, Yuriy O, Webe M. Labor Markets During the Covid-19 Crisis: A preliminary view. National Bureau of Economic Research 2020.
8. Gordon SH, Sommers BD. Recessions, Poverty, and Mortality in the United States: 1993-2012. *Am J Health Econ* 2016; **3**: 489-510.
9. Baird S, Friedman J, Schady N. Aggregate Income Shocks and Infant Mortality in the Developing World. *Rev Econ Stat* 2011; **3**: 847-56.
10. Jérôme A, Von Gaudecker H, Bank J. The Impact of Income Shocks on Health: Evidence from Cohort Data. *J Eur Econ Assoc* 2009;**6**: 1361-99.
11. Snyder SE, Evans WN. The effect of income on mortality: evidence from the social security notch. *Rev Econ Stat* 2006; **3**: 482-95.
12. Cutler DM, Knaul F, Lozano R, Zurita OMAB. Financial crisis, health outcomes and ageing: Mexico in the 1980s and 1990s. *J Public Econ* 2002;(NO.2): 279-303.
13. Vlachadis N, Vrachnis N, Ktenas E, Vlachadi M, Kornarou E. Mortality and the economic crisis in Greece. *Lancet* 2014; **383**: 691.
14. Falagas ME, Vouloumanou EK, Mavros MN, Karageorgopoulos DE. Economic crises and mortality: a review of the literature. *Int J Clin Pract* 2009; **63**: 1128-35.
15. Lundin A, Lundberg I, Hallsten L, Ottosson J, Hemmingsson T. Unemployment and mortality--a longitudinal prospective study on selection and causation in 49321 Swedish middle-aged men. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2010; **64**: 22-8.
16. World Health Organization, *COVID-19 significantly impacts health services for noncommunicable diseases*. https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/01-06-2020-covid-19-significantly-impacts-health-services-for-noncommunicable-diseases(accessed July 5,2020).
17. He, G. Pan, Y. & Tanaka, T., The short-term impacts of COVID-19 lockdown on urban air pollution in China. *Nature Sustainability*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-0581-y
18. Chen K, Wang M, Huang C, Kinney PL, Anastas PT. Air pollution reduction and mortality

benefit during the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Lancet Planet Health*. 2020;**4**:e210-e212.

19. Shilling F, Waetjen D. "Special Report (Update): Impact of COVID19 Mitigation on Numbers and Costs of California Traffic Crashes". Road Ecology Center 2020 (accessed June 14, 2020).

20. Liu S, Wu X, Lopez AD, et al. An integrated national mortality surveillance system for death registration and mortality surveillance, China. *Bull World Health Organ* 2016; **94**: 46-57.

21. Yang G, Hu J, Rao KQ, Ma J, Rao C, Lopez AD. Mortality registration and surveillance in China: History, current situation and challenges. *Popul Health Metr* 2005; **3**: 3.

22. The Wall Street Journal, Wuhan's Coronavirus Death Toll Surges by 50% After China Revision. https://www.wsj.com/articles/wuhans-coronavirus-death-toll-surges-by-50-after-china-reviews-data-11587110435 (accessed June 14, 2020).

23. Angrist JD, Pischke J. Mostly harmless econometrics: An empiricist's companion. Princeton university, 2008.

24. Chen R, Yin P, Meng X, et al. Fine Particulate Air Pollution and Daily Mortality. A Nationwide Analysis in 272 Chinese Cities. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2017; **196**: 73-81.

25. Shah AS, Lee KK, McAllister DA, et al. Short term exposure to air pollution and stroke: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2015; **350**: h1295.

26. Mustafic H, Jabre P, Caussin C, et al. Main air pollutants and myocardial infarction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2012; **307**: 713-21.

27. Yin P, He G, Fan M, et al. Particulate air pollution and mortality in 38 of China's largest cities: time series analysis. *BMJ* 2017; **356**: j667.

28. He G, Fan M, Zhou M. The effect of air pollution on mortality in China: Evidence from the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games. *Journal of Environmental Economics & Management* 2016: 18-39.

29. Ebenstein A, Fan M, Greenstone M, He G, Zhou M. New evidence on the impact of sustained exposure to air pollution on life expectancy from China's Huai River Policy. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2017; **114**: 10384-9.

Funding

The project is funded by the National Key R&D Program of China (2018YFC1315301), Peking University Research Grant (7100602966) and HKUST School-Based Initiative (SBI17HS02).

Acknowledgments

We thank all the staff who work in the primary health facilities, hospitals, and Center for Disease Control and Prevention for death reporting at county/district, city, province, and national levels. We also thank Yun Qiu for sharing the community lockdown data with us. Wei Wang and Yaxuan Liu provided for research assistance.

Figures



Fig 1. Lockdown status of the DSPs from January to February 2020. The figure shows the map of DSPs in the different periods indicating their lockdown status. The numbers of locked-down DSPs in the four panels are respectively 26, 160, 460, and 486.



Fig 2. The impacts of city/community lockdowns on deaths from different causes. Each row in the figure represents a separate DiD regression (Equation (A1)). The number of observations for each regression is 44,548 covering 602 DSPs except for 3 DSPs in Wuhan. The outcome variable is the daily number of non-COVID-19 deaths. We use mortality data from January 1 to March 14, 2020. The explanatory variable is a dummy indicating whether the DSP site is locked down on a particular date. In Panel A, we report the results on the lockdown's impacts on number of deaths (except for deaths from COVID-19). DSP fixed effect and date fixed effect are included in each regression, and the standard errors are clustered at DSP level. The red dots and the lines refer to the point estimates and their 95% confidence intervals. Panel B presents the lockdown's impacts on percentage changes for different causes of death. The blue dots and lines refer to the point estimates and their 95% confidence intervals, respectively. We compute the numbers in Panel B by combining the estimates from Panel A and the mean values for each cause of death; for example, the number -4.92% in the first row of Panel B is computed by -0.429/8.721*100%.



Fig 3. Tests for parallel trends assumption. This figure summarizes the results using the event-study approach (SM: Equation A2). We include leads and lags of the start of the lockdown dummy in the regressions. The dummy variable indicating one week before the lockdown policies is omitted from the regressions. The estimated coefficients and their 95% confidence intervals are plotted. The vertical lines refer to the reference week.



Fig 4. The heterogeneous impacts of city/community lockdowns on deaths. Each row in the figure represents the predicted impacts of lockdown at different baseline socio-economic conditions, and their 95% confidence intervals. The heterogeneous dimension is shown in two scenarios: one standard deviation larger (+SD) / smaller (-SD) than mean. The prediction is based on the estimates from Supplementary Table 5. The top blue dot and line represent the baseline point estimates and 95% confidence interval, respectively.



Fig 5. Estimated averted covid-19 unrelated deaths from lockdown policies. This figure summarizes how lockdown policies affect the number of deaths relative to the counterfactual (without lockdown policies). In Panel A, the red line and blue line represent the predicted average deaths per DSP per day with and without lockdown policies. The difference between these two lines is regarded as the effects of lockdown policies. The red circle is observed deaths and the gray bar is the cumulative percentage of DSPs with lockdown policies in each day. In Panel B, using the entire nation's population in the locked-down cities, we estimate how many lives are saved due to lockdown policies from each disease in all of China.

Supplemental Materials for

Do Lockdowns Bring about Additional Mortality Benefits or Costs? Evidence based on 300 million Chinese People's Death Records

Jinlei Qi[1*], Dandan Zhang[2*], Xiang Zhang[2], Peng Yin[1], Jiangmei Liu[1], Yuhang Pan[3], Tanakao Takana[4], Peiyu Xie[2], Zhaoguang Wang[2], Shuocen Liu[5], George F. Gao[6†], Guojun He[3,4,7†], Maigeng Zhou[1†]

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

†Corresponding authors. Email: zhoumaigeng@ncncd.chinacdc.cn (M.Z.), gjhe@ust.hk (G.H.) and gaofu@chinacdc.cn.

Table of Contents

Supplementary Notes 2
Supplementary Note 1: Tests for Pre-Treatment Prallel Trends 2
Supplementary Note 2: Robustness Checks and Placebo Tests 3
Supplementary Figures 6
Supplementary Fig 1. Distribution of lockdown dates for the DSPs 6
Supplementary Fig 2. COVID-19 and city lockdowns outside of Wuhan in China. 7
Supplementary Fig 3. Robustness checks 8
Supplementary Fig 4. Heterogeneity analysis: CVD, injury, and pneumonia. 9
Supplementary Fig 5. The impacts of city/community lockdowns on deaths: by age group 10
Supplementary Tables 11
Supplementary Table 1. Summary statistics 11
Supplementary Table 2. The impacts of city/community lockdowns on deaths from different causes ..... 13~~12~~
Supplementary Table 3. Event study estimation results ..... 14~~13~~
Supplementary Table 4. The impacts of lockdowns on cause-specific deaths ..... 15~~14~~
Supplementary Table 5. Robustness checks and placebo test ..... 16~~15~~
Supplementary Table 6. The heterogeneous impacts of city/community lockdowns on deaths ..... 17~~16~~
Supplementary Table 7. The heterogeneous impacts of lockdowns on CVD deaths ..... 18~~17~~
Supplementary Table 8. The heterogeneous impacts of lockdown on deaths from injuries ..... 19~~18~~
Supplementary Table 9. The heterogeneous impacts of lockdown on deaths from pneumonia ..... 20~~19~~
Supplementary Table 10. The impacts of city/community lockdowns on deaths: by age group ..... 21~~20~~
Supplementary Table 11. Lockdown status of Chinese cities ..... 22~~21~~

Supplementary Notes

Supplementary Note 1: Tests for Pre-Treatment Prallel Trends

The underlying assumption for the DiD estimates in Fig. 1 is that lockdown and non-lockdown DSPs have parallel trends in mortality without the lockdown policies. To test how likely this assumption is to hold, we conduct an event study and investigate whether the two groups of cities have parallel pre-treatment mortality (Materials and Methods: Equation A2). Fig. 2 plots our findings. Here we focus on the four outcomes (total deaths, and deaths from cardiovascular diseases, injuries, and pneumonia) that are statistically significant in Fig. 1.

In Panel a, we compare the total number of non-COVID-19 deaths between the treatment and control groups before and after lockdowns. The difference between the two groups one week before the lockdown is set as the reference group (*i.e.*, the zero coefficient for week -1), so the post-lockdown effects are relative to the period one-week before the launch of the policy. We do not observe systematic difference in the trends of mortality between the two groups one week before the city/community lockdown, *i.e.*, the estimated coefficients for the lead terms ($k \leq -2$) are positive or close to zero and statistically insignificant. This finding implies that the parallel trend assumption is likely to hold in our setting. In comparison, the trends break after the lockdown policies were enforced, *i.e.*, the lagged terms ($k \geq 1$) become negative and statistically significant. In addition, we observe that the difference becomes larger as more lags are included, suggesting an accumulating health benefit of city/community lockdowns.

In Panels b, c, and d of Fig. 2, we repeat this exercise to investigate the trends in deaths from cardiovascular diseases, injuries, and non-COVID-19 pneumonia before and after lockdowns. The results suggest the parallel trend assumption holds for all these outcomes as well. The corresponding regression results are reported in Supplementary Table 2.

Supplementary Note 2: Robustness Checks and Placebo Tests

We conduct a variety of robustness checks and show that our results are not qualitatively affected by several decisions we make in the baseline analysis (Supplementary. Fig 5 and Supplementary Table 6). First, we add weather variables into the baseline regressions, including daily average temperature, humidity, wind speed, and air pressure (R1), and find that the results are quantitatively unchanged. To further control for the differences in time trends between the treatment and control groups, we also include interactions of time-invariant variables (*i.e.*, per capita GDP, number of hospital beds per thousand people, and total population) with a third-order polynomial function of time in the regressions (R2). The estimates remain similar. These results suggest that the lockdown policies are uncorrelated with these factors and lend additional credibility to our baseline findings.

Second, we weight regressions by population in each DSP (R3). Intuitively, this allows us to estimate the lockdown effects on an average individual, instead of an average DSP. Without weighting, cities with smaller populations could drive the baseline results. We find that the results remain very similar, suggesting that this is unlikely to be the case.

Third, we exclude 22 DSPs in Hubei province from the regression (R4). COVID-19 was first identified in Wuhan city in Hubei province. Thus, the DSPs in the province could be very different. We find that the results are quantitatively similar to the baseline. Next, we include the three DSPs (districts) located in Wuhan in the regressions and find the effects generally become weaker (R5). In addition, the sign for non-COVID-19 pneumonia is reversed and becomes positive (statistically insignificant) (Panel d). This finding suggests that some COVID-19 deaths could be misclassified as deaths caused by other types of pneumonia in Wuhan. Wuhan was the epicenter of COVID-19 in China and contributed to nearly half of the country's COVID-19 cases. During the first few

weeks after the outbreak, the city faced severe medical resource shortages, and many patients could not get immediate diagnoses and treatments. As a result, it would not be surprising to see that some people dying from COVID-19 in the city had been misclassified as dying from other types of pneumonia. In fact, a retrospective survey was recently conducted by the Chinese government, aiming to better classify causes of death in Wuhan. We thus exclude Wuhan from our baseline analysis.

Next, we separately estimate the effects of two types of lockdowns, *i.e.*, city lockdowns and community lockdowns, on the number of deaths (Panel f in Supplementary Table 6). Shortly after the COVID-19 outbreak, a dozen cities around Wuhan (covering 65 DSPs) launched city lockdowns (mostly in late January). Later, as the virus started to spread outside Hubei province, more cities began to enforce community lockdown policies (including those that initially implemented city lockdowns). We include two policy dummies, *i.e.*, city lockdowns and "city+community" lockdowns, into the regressions. The results show that "city+community" lockdowns play a more important role in reducing the number of total deaths, as well as deaths from cardiovascular diseases and non-COVID-19 pneumonia. In other words, restricting human mobility within cities seems critical to explaining our results. City lockdowns have an immediate effect on deaths from injuries, likely because people were not allowed to travel to other cities after city lockdowns.

Finally, one potential threat to our empirical results is the large-scale travel across different cities during the study period. The COVID-19 outbreak coincided with China's Spring Festival, during which many people leave the cities where they work and travel to their hometowns. If the death patterns are somehow correlated with this travel pattern, our results may be confounded. To address this issue, we conduct a placebo test using data from 2019 (Panel g in Supplementary

Table 6). We assign the lockdown status to the same DSP in 2019 and compare changes in the number of deaths between the treatment and control DSPs before and after the "placebo" lockdowns. We find the "placebo" lockdowns do not have any impact on mortality in 2019, suggesting that our findings are not confounded by different mortality trends between the treatment and control groups related to the spring holiday travel.

Supplementary Figures



Supplementary Fig 1. Distribution of lockdown dates for the DSPs This graph shows the timing of the start of the city/community lockdowns other than Wuhan. Panel A reports the timing of community lockdowns and city lockdowns. In Panel B, we draw the distribution of confirmed cases a day before the implementation of city lockdowns. Because the confirmed COVID-19 cases are only available at the city level, the graph is based on city-level information.



Supplementary Fig 2. COVID-19 and city lockdowns outside of Wuhan in China This graph shows the confirmed COVID-19 cases in each city. We drop data from Wuhan in both panels. Panel A describes the total confirmed cases, recovered cases, active cases, and deaths in the entire nation. The red bar graph shows the timing of the launch of lockdown policies. Panel B reports the confirmed cases in each city. The blue line denotes cities in Hubei province, and the red line denotes some other major cities in China. The grey dashed line indicates the date (February 20) when Hubei changed its diagnostic and reporting criteria on COVID-19.



Supplementary Fig 3. Robustness checks Each column in each figure represents a separate DiD regression. In R0, we report the baseline results. In R1, the regression includes weather controls: daily average temperature, humidity, wind speed, and air pressure. R2 includes socio-economic status controls: interactions between time-invariant variables and a third-order polynomial function of time. In R3, the regression is weighted by the population. In R4, DSPs in Hubei province are excluded, while, in R5, three DSPs in Wuhan are included in the regression. DSP fixed effect and date fixed effect are both included in each regression. The standard errors are clustered at the DSP level.



Supplementary Fig 4. Heterogeneity analysis: CVD, injury, and pneumonia Each row in the figure represent the predicted impacts of lockdown at different baseline socio-economic conditions, and their 95% confidence intervals. The heterogeneous dimension is shown in two scenarios: one standard deviation larger (+SD) / smaller (-SD) than mean. The prediction is based on the estimates from Supplementary Table 6-8. The top blue dot and line represent the baseline point estimates and 95% confidence interval for each disease/cause category, respectively. DSP fixed effect and date fixed effect are both included in each regression. The total number of observations for each regression is 44,548 covering 602 DSP counties. The standard errors are clustered at the DSP level.



Supplementary Fig 5. The impacts of city/community lockdowns on deaths: by age group We examine the impacts of lockdowns on the number of deaths from different age groups. Each row represents a separate DiD regression. DSP fixed effect and date fixed effect are included in all the regressions. The number of observations for each regression is 44,548 covering 602 DSP counties except for 3 DSP sites in Wuhan. Corresponding results are reported in Supplementary Table 9.

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1. Summary statistics

Panel A: Daily Mortality (Person)	(1)	(2)
Total	8.72	[7.32]
CVD	4.33	[4.02]
Injury	0.48	[0.85]
Pneumonia	0.15	[0.45]
Neoplasms	1.94	[2.18]
Chronic respiratory diseases	0.76	[1.19]
Others	1.07	[1.37]
Panel B: Other Variables		
Number of hospital bed per thousand people	15.95	[31.33]
$PM_{2.5}$ concentration (μg/m³)	50.14	[40.68]
GDP per capita (10,000 RMB)	5.97	[3.89]
Share of employment in manufacturing (%)	24.20	[12.00]
Daily average air pressure (hPa)	962.96	[100.45]
Daily average wind speed (m/s)	2.67	[1.50]
Daily average temperature (°C)	4.72	[9.16]
Daily average humidity (%)	69.46	[18.38]
# of DSP counties	602	

Supplementary Table 2. The impacts of city/community lockdowns on deaths from different causes

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Total # of Deaths	**CVD**	**Injury**	**Non-COVID-19 Pneumonia**	**Neoplasms**	**Chronic Respiratory Diseases**	**Other Causes**
	Mean = 8.721	Mean = 4.330	Mean = 0.476	Mean = 0.150	Mean = 1.944	Mean = 0.756	Mean = 1.066
Lockdown	-0.429***	-0.270***	-0.044***	-0.022**	-0.037	-0.032	-0.026
	[0.102]	[0.060]	[0.014]	[0.009]	[0.032]	[0.022]	[0.023]
DSP Fixed Effect	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Date Fixed Effect	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs.	44548	44548	44548	44548	44548	44548	44548
Adjusted R-Square	0.788	0.683	0.315	0.220	0.563	0.440	0.390
# of DSP Counties	602	602	602	602	602	602	602

Each cell in the table represents a separate DiD regression. All DSP districts/counties are included in the analysis except 3 from Wuhan. The outcome variable is the daily number of non-COVID-19 deaths from the DSP districts/counties. We use mortality data from January 1 to March 14, 2020 for this analysis; the data were extracted from the DSP system on May 15, 2020. The explanatory variable is a dummy indicating whether a city associated with a DSP had a lockdown policy on a particular date. The standard errors clustered at the DSP level are reported below the estimates. * significant at 10% ** significant at 5% *** significant at 1%.

Supplementary Table 3. Event study estimation results

	(1) Total	(2) CVD	(3) Injury	(4) Non-COVID-19 Pneumonia
>= 7 Weeks Before	0.191	0.476	0.063	-0.01
	[0.894]	[0.621]	[0.117]	[0.032]
6 Weeks Before	-0.165	-0.159	0.041	0.007
	[0.300]	[0.183]	[0.040]	[0.023]
5 Weeks Before	-0.089	-0.112	0.04	0.013
	[0.198]	[0.123]	[0.029]	[0.019]
4 Weeks Before	-0.08	-0.09	0.028	0.033**
	[0.154]	[0.100]	[0.025]	[0.016]
3 Weeks Before	0.049	-0.034	0.061***	0.029**
	[0.130]	[0.089]	[0.023]	[0.013]
2 Weeks Before	-0.068	-0.055	0.036*	0.035***
	[0.105]	[0.069]	[0.021]	[0.013]
Week of Lockdown Policy	-0.213**	-0.169**	-0.01	-0.007
	[0.092]	[0.065]	[0.018]	[0.013]
1 Week Later	-0.329***	-0.272***	-0.019	0.003
	[0.117]	[0.079]	[0.021]	[0.013]
2 Weeks Later	-0.524***	-0.364***	-0.029	0.011
	[0.134]	[0.086]	[0.024]	[0.014]
3 Weeks Later	-0.749***	-0.491***	-0.008	-0.012
	[0.166]	[0.102]	[0.024]	[0.013]
4 Weeks Later	-0.906***	-0.525***	-0.041	-0.016
	[0.186]	[0.113]	[0.027]	[0.014]
5 Weeks Later	-1.301***	-0.689***	-0.073**	-0.033**
	[0.232]	[0.141]	[0.032]	[0.017]
>= 6 Weeks Later	-1.314***	-0.792***	-0.016	-0.050**
	[0.361]	[0.224]	[0.066]	[0.025]
DSP Fixed Effect	YES	YES	YES	YES
Date Fixed Effect	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs.	44548	44548	44548	44548
Adjusted R-Square	0.789	0.683	0.315	0.220
# of DSP Counties	602	602	602	602

Notes: We include leads and lags of the start of the lockdown dummy in the regressions to test the parallel trend assumption. The dummy variable indicating one week before the lockdown is omitted from the regressions. The standard errors clustered at the DSP level are reported below the estimates. * significant at 10% ** significant at 5% *** significant at 1%.

Supplementary Table 4. The impacts of lockdowns on cause-specific deaths

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Panel A: CVD				
	CVD	**Myocardial Infarction**	**Stroke**	**Other CVDs**
	Mean = 4.330	Mean = 1.769	Mean = 1.818	Mean = 0.743
Lockdown	-0.270***	-0.128***	-0.086***	-0.056***
	[0.060]	[0.032]	[0.033]	[0.022]
Panel B: Injury				
	Injury	Traffic	Suicide	Other Injuries
	Mean = 0.476	Mean = 0.102	Mean = 0.073	Mean = 0.301
Lockdown	-0.044***	-0.023***	0.003	-0.024**
	[0.014]	[0.006]	[0.005]	[0.012]
Panel C: Non-COVID-19 Pneumonia				
	Pneumonia	Pneumonia Organism	Viral Pneumonia & Bacterial Pneumonia	Pulmonary Infection
	Mean = 0.150	Mean = 0.065	Mean = 0.037	Mean = 0.061
Lockdown	-0.022**	-0.023***	0.002	-0.001
	[0.009]	[0.006]	[0.006]	[0.004]

Notes: Each cell in the table represents a separate DiD regression. All DSP districts/counties are included in the analysis except 3 DSP counties/districts from Wuhan. The outcome variable is the daily number of non-COVID-19 deaths from the DSP districts/counties. We use mortality data from January 1 to March 14 2020 for this analysis; the data were extracted from the DSP system on May 15 2020. The explanatory variable is a dummy indicating whether a city associated with a DSP had a lockdown policy on a particular date. DSP fixed effect and date fixed effect are both included in each regression. The total number of observations for each regression is 44,548 covering 602 DSP counties. The standard errors clustered at the DSP level are reported below the estimates. * significant at 10% ** significant at 5% *** significant at 1%.

Supplementary Table 5. Robustness checks and placebo test

`	(1) Total	(2) CVD	(3) Injury	(4) Pneumonia
Panel A: With weather controls (R1 in Supplementary Fig 5)				
Lockdown	-0.426***	-0.266***	-0.042***	-0.021**
	(0.102)	(0.061)	(0.014)	(0.010)
Panel B: With weather and socio-economic controls (R2 in Supplementary Fig 5)				
Lockdown	-0.391***	-0.250***	-0.043***	-0.019**
	[0.101]	[0.060]	[0.014]	[0.009]
Panel C: Weighting by populations (R3 in Supplementary Fig 5)				
Lockdown	-0.431**	-0.290***	-0.041*	-0.026
	(0.176)	(0.102)	(0.024)	(0.017)
Panel D: Dropping cities in Hubei (R4 in Supplementary Fig 5)				
Lockdown	-0.455***	-0.295***	-0.037***	-0.028***
	(0.106)	(0.062)	(0.014)	(0.009)
Panel E: Include Wuhan (R5 in Supplementary Fig 5)				
Lockdown	-0.254	-0.226***	-0.038**	0.050
	[0.159]	[0.067]	[0.015]	[0.050]
Panel F: Change the definition of lockdown				
Only city lockdown	-0.250	0.002	-0.125***	0.046
	[0.193]	[0.125]	[0.043]	[0.034]
City+community lockdown	-0.448***	-0.299***	-0.035**	-0.029***
	[0.106]	[0.062]	[0.014]	[0.009]
Panel G: Use 2019 deaths				
Lockdown	0.088	0.102	0.002	-0.011
	[0.101]	[0.063]	[0.016]	[0.009]

Notes: Each cell in the table represents a separate DiD regression. In Panel A, the regression includes weather controls: daily average temperature, humidity, wind speed, and air pressure. In Panel B, the regression includes socio-economic status controls: interactions between time-invariant variables and a third-order polynomial function of time. In Panel C, the regression is weighted by the population. In Panel D, DSPs in Hubei province are excluded, while, in Panel E, three DSPs in Wuhan are included in the regression. DSP fixed effect and date fixed effect are both included in each regression. These results are presented in Supplementary Fig 5. In Panel F, we define lockdown in a different way. The DSPs are classified into 1) being placed under the city lockdown, 2) being placed under both the city lockdown and the community lockdown, or 3) without any lockdowns. DSP fixed effect and date fixed effect are both included in each regression. Panel G uses day-to-day matched 2019 death tolls as dependent variables and includes the controls of a set of time-varying variables. DSP fixed effect and date fixed effect are both included in each regression. The total number of observations for each regression is 44,548 covering 602 DSP counties. The standard errors clustered at the DSP level are reported below the estimates. * significant at 10% ** significant at 5% *** significant at 1%.

Supplementary Table 6. The heterogeneous impacts of city/community lockdowns on deaths

	Total # of (non-COVID-19) Deaths					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Lockdown	-0.425***	-0.467***	-0.421***	-0.397***	-0.409***	-0.396***
	[0.102]	[0.112]	[0.102]	[0.100]	[0.102]	[0.110]
Lockdown*GDP per capita	-0.024					0.026
	[0.020]					[0.025]
Lockdown*hospital beds per 1000 people		0.002				0.001
		[0.002]				[0.002]
Lockdown*$PM_{2.5}$ concentration			-0.010***			-0.007**
			[0.003]			[0.003]
Lockdown*share of employment in manufacturing				-0.032***		-0.037***
				[0.009]		[0.011]
Lockdown*2019 total mortality rate					-0.001***	-0.001***
					[0.000]	[0.000]
DSP Fixed Effect	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Date Fixed Effect	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs.	44548	44548	44548	44548	44548	44548
Adjusted R-Square	0.788	0.788	0.789	0.789	0.789	0.789
# of DSP Counties	602	602	602	602	602	602

Notes: Each cell in the table represents a separate DiD regression. We interact the treatment dummy with baseline socio-economic variables to understand the heterogeneity impacts of lockdowns. The standard errors clustered at the DSP level are reported below the estimates. * significant at 10% ** significant at 5% *** significant at 1%.

Supplementary Table 7. The heterogeneous impacts of lockdowns on CVD deaths

	# of CVD Deaths					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Lockdown	-0.270***	-0.311***	-0.264***	-0.258***	-0.259***	-0.276***
	[0.060]	[0.065]	[0.060]	[0.060]	[0.060]	[0.064]
Lockdown*GDP per capita	0.002					0.016
	[0.010]					[0.014]
Lockdown*hospital beds per 1000 people		0.002**				0.002
		[0.001]				[0.001]
Lockdown*$PM_{2.5}$ concentration			-0.008***			-0.006***
			[0.002]			[0.002]
Lockdown*share of employment in manufacturing				-0.012***		-0.015***
				[0.004]		[0.005]
Lockdown*2019 mortality rate of CVD					-0.001***	-0.001***
					[0.000]	[0.000]
DSP Fixed Effect	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Date Fixed Effect	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs.	44548	44548	44548	44548	44548	44548
# of DSP Counties	602	602	602	602	602	602

Notes: Each cell in the table represents a separate DiD regression. We interact the treatment dummy with baseline socio-economic variables to understand the heterogeneity impacts of lockdowns. The standard errors clustered at the DSP level are reported below the estimates. * significant at 10% ** significant at 5% *** significant at 1%.

Supplementary Table 8. The heterogeneous impacts of lockdown on deaths from injuries

	# of Deaths from Injuries					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Lockdown	-0.043***	-0.046***	-0.044***	-0.041***	-0.042***	-0.035**
	[0.014]	[0.015]	[0.014]	[0.014]	[0.014]	[0.015]
Lockdown*GDP per capita	-0.004					0.001
	[0.002]					[0.003]
Lockdown*hospital beds per 1000 people		0.000				-0.000
		[0.000]				[0.000]
Lockdown*$PM_{2.5}$ concentration			-0.000			-0.000
			[0.000]			[0.000]
Lockdown*share of employment in manufacturing				-0.003***		-0.003***
				[0.001]		[0.001]
Lockdown*2019 mortality rate of injuries					-0.002***	-0.002***
					[0.001]	[0.001]
DSP Fixed Effect	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Date Fixed Effect	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs.	44548	44548	44548	44548	44548	44548
# of DSP Counties	602	602	602	602	602	602

Notes: Each cell in the table represents a separate DiD regression. We interact the treatment dummy with baseline socio-economic variables to understand the heterogeneity impacts of lockdowns. The standard errors clustered at the DSP level are reported below the estimates. * significant at 10% ** significant at 5% *** significant at 1%.

Supplementary Table 9. The heterogeneous impacts of lockdown on deaths from pneumonia

	# of Deaths from Non-COVID-19 Pneumonia					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Lockdown	-0.020**	-0.004	-0.022**	-0.020**	-0.020**	-0.014
	[0.009]	[0.010]	[0.009]	[0.009]	[0.009]	[0.010]
Lockdown*GDP per capita	-0.008***					-0.004**
	[0.002]					[0.002]
Lockdown*hospital beds per 1000 people		-0.001***				-0.000
		[0.000]				[0.000]
Lockdown*$PM_{2.5}$ concentration			0.000			-0.000
			[0.000]			[0.000]
Lockdown*share of employment in manufacturing				-0.001***		-0.000
				[0.001]		[0.001]
Lockdown*2019 mortality rate of pneumonia					-0.004***	-0.004***
					[0.001]	[0.001]
DSP Fixed Effect	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Date Fixed Effect	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Obs.	44548	44548	44548	44548	44548	44548
# of DSP Counties	602	602	602	602	602	602

Notes: Each cell in the table represents a separate DiD regression. We interact the treatment dummy with baseline socio-economic variables to understand the heterogeneity impacts of city lockdowns. The standard errors clustered at the DSP level are reported below the estimates. * significant at 10% ** significant at 5% *** significant at 1%.

Supplementary Table 10. The impacts of city/community lockdowns on deaths: by age group

	Age 0-14	Age 15-65	Age >65
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Panel A. Total # of non-COVID-19 Deaths			
	Y Mean = 0.062	Y Mean = 1.925	Y Mean = 6.737
Lockdown	-0.007	-0.047	-0.369***
	[0.005]	[0.030]	[0.087]
Adjusted R-Square	0.041	0.452	0.767
Panel B. # of Deaths from CVD			
	Y Mean = 0.002	Y Mean = 0.682	Y Mean = 3.646
Lockdown	-0.000	-0.031	-0.239***
	[0.001]	[0.019]	[0.052]
Adjusted R-Square	0.005	0.260	0.663
Panel C. # of Deaths from Injuries			
	Y Mean = 0.014	Y Mean = 0.200	Y Mean = 0.262
Lockdown	-0.003	-0.029***	-0.012
	[0.002]	[0.009]	[0.010]
Adjusted R-Square	0.0141	0.124	0.293
Panel D. # of Deaths from Non-COVID-19 Pneumonia			
	Y Mean = 0.003	Y Mean = 0.018	Y Mean = 0.129
Lockdown	-0.003**	0.003	-0.022***
	[0.001]	[0.004]	[0.008]
Adjusted R-Square	0.006	0.024	0.215

Notes: We examine the impacts of lockdowns on the number of deaths from different age groups in this table. Each cell represents a separate DiD regression. DSP fixed effect and date fixed effect are both included in each regression. The number of observations for each regression is 44,548 covering 602 DSP counties. The standard errors clustered at the DSP level are reported below the estimates. * significant at 10% ** significant at 5% *** significant at 1%.

Supplementary Table 11. Lockdown status of Chinese cities

City Name	City Lockdown	Community Lockdown	City Name	City Lockdown	Community Lockdown
Huanggang	2020/1/23	2020/2/1	Wuhai	2020/2/12	2020/1/28
Ezhou	2020/1/23	2020/2/4	Lvliang		2020/1/29
Wuhan	2020/1/23	2020/2/10	Ganzhou	2020/2/6	2020/1/30
Xianning	2020/1/24	2020/2/5	Wuzhong		2020/1/31
Yichang	2020/1/24	2020/2/10	Sanmenxia		2020/1/31
Municipal County	2020/1/24	2020/2/10	Yinchuan	2020/1/31	2020/1/31
Jingmen	2020/1/24	2020/2/10	Xinyang	2020/2/6	2020/1/31
Shiyan	2020/1/24	2020/2/10	Lishui		2020/2/1
Enshi	2020/1/24	2020/2/10	Anshun	2020/2/5	2020/2/1
Jingzhou	2020/1/24	2020/2/10	Southeast Guizhou		2020/2/2
Xiaogan	2020/1/24	2020/2/10	Xinzhou		2020/2/2
Huangshi	2020/1/24	2020/2/11	Jinhua		2020/2/2
Qinhuangdao	2020/1/25	2020/2/8	Liupanshui		2020/2/2
Tangshan	2020/1/28	2020/2/6	Guiyang		2020/2/2
Xiangyang	2020/1/28	2020/2/10	Yulin		2020/2/2
Dongying	2020/1/30	2020/2/10	Wenzhou	2020/2/2	2020/2/2
Chongqing	2020/1/31	2020/2/8	Fangchenggang	2020/2/8	2020/2/2
Jining	2020/2/3	2020/2/7	Bayannur	2020/2/12	2020/2/2
Ningbo	2020/2/4	2020/2/5	Hohhot	2020/2/12	2020/2/2
Zaozhuang	2020/2/4	2020/2/12	Xilin Gol League	2020/2/12	2020/2/2
Panjin	2020/2/5	2020/2/6	Zunyi		2020/2/3
Fuxin	2020/2/5	2020/2/6	Guigang		2020/2/3
Dalian	2020/2/5	2020/2/6	Jincheng		2020/2/3
Fushun	2020/2/5	2020/2/6	Huai'an		2020/2/3
Chaoyang	2020/2/5	2020/2/6	Binzhou		2020/2/3
Jinzhou	2020/2/5	2020/2/6	Taizhou		2020/2/3
Tieling	2020/2/5	2020/2/6	Southwest Guizhou		2020/2/3
Shenyang	2020/2/5	2020/2/6	Zhoushan		2020/2/3
Yangzhou	2020/2/5	2020/2/6	Fuzhou	2020/2/6	2020/2/3
Dandong	2020/2/5	2020/2/6	Wuxi	2020/2/9	2020/2/3
Liaoyang	2020/2/5	2020/2/6	Ulanqab	2020/2/12	2020/2/3
Municipal District	2020/2/9	2020/2/10	Erdos	2020/2/12	2020/2/3
Shuangyashan		2020/2/4	Lu'an		2020/2/5
Zigong		2020/2/4	Maoming		2020/2/5
Zhenjiang		2020/2/4	Huaihua		2020/2/5
Anshan		2020/2/4	Ganzi		2020/2/5
Lianyungang		2020/2/4	Liuzhou		2020/2/5
Wuhu		2020/2/4	Suqian		2020/2/5
Songyuan		2020/2/4	Kaifeng		2020/2/5
Huainan		2020/2/4	Meizhou		2020/2/5
South Guizhou		2020/2/4	Pingdingshan		2020/2/5
Tongren		2020/2/4	Nanchong		2020/2/5
Bengbu		2020/2/4	Quzhou		2020/2/5
Nanyang		2020/2/4	Lijiang		2020/2/5
Xi'an		2020/2/4	Heihe		2020/2/5
Wenshan		2020/2/4	Suizhou		2020/2/5
Dezhou		2020/2/4	Fuyang		2020/2/5
Fuzhou	2020/2/4	2020/2/4	Weifang		2020/2/5
Hangzhou	2020/2/4	2020/2/4	Huzhou		2020/2/5
Harbin	2020/2/4	2020/2/4	Zhuhai		2020/2/5
Zhumadian	2020/2/4	2020/2/4	Hengshui		2020/2/5
Nantong	2020/2/4	2020/2/4	Guilin		2020/2/5
Changzhou	2020/2/4	2020/2/4	Meishan		2020/2/5

Supplementary Table 11 (continued). Lockdown status of Chinese cities

City Name	City Lockdown	Community Lockdown	City Name	City Lockdown	Community Lockdown
Zhengzhou	2020/2/4	2020/2/4	Daxinganling		2020/2/5
Linyi	2020/2/4	2020/2/4	Yichun		2020/2/5
Jingdezhen	2020/2/4	2020/2/4	Quanzhou		2020/2/5
Nanjing	2020/2/4	2020/2/4	Liaocheng		2020/2/5
Xuzhou	2020/2/4	2020/2/4	Zhoukou		2020/2/5
Jiujiang	2020/2/6	2020/2/4	Daqing		2020/2/5
Yingtan	2020/2/6	2020/2/4	Jiaxing		2020/2/5
Huaibei	2020/2/9	2020/2/4	Yancheng		2020/2/5
Bijie		2020/2/5	Sanya		2020/2/5
Hechi		2020/2/5	Zhaoqing		2020/2/5
Haikou		2020/2/5	Luzhou		2020/2/5
Wuzhou		2020/2/5	Chengde		2020/2/5

Notes: Panel A lists the cities that were under city lockdown earlier than the community lockdown. Panel B lists the cities that enforced community lockdown earlier than the city lockdown. The effective dates of the two lockdown policies are both listed.