medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.11.21251580; this version posted February 24, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Mandatory public health measures for COVID-19 are associated with improved mortality, equity and economic outcomes

Corresponding author: Brita E. Lundberg, MD; Lundberg Health Advocates, 1180 Beacon St., #4B, Brookline, MA 02446; brita@lundberghealthadvocates.com; 617-651-1078

Kathyrn McDonald, PhD, MM, Bloomberg Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins Carey Business School and Schools of Medicine and Nursing; kmcdonald@jhu.edu

Manuscript length: 690 words

Author statement:

a) The manuscript has been read and approved by both authors. There are no ethical issues.

Abstract:

We review approaches to the COVID-19 pandemic in a systematic way by comparing countries/states representative of the mandatory vs. voluntary approach to non-pharmaceutical interventions in Europe and the US. We use a comparative tabular format to examine differences in mortality, economic impact and equity between regions with mandatory versus voluntary policies. Mandatory shelter-in-place policies were associated with 3 to 4 fold lower population adjusted mortality in the US model and 11 fold lower in the European one. We conclude that voluntary policies are less effective, based on historical precedent and the current analysis. Moreover, effects on health equity mirrored the increased mortality outcomes of voluntary policies and there was no apparent economic benefit associated with voluntary measures.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.11.21251580; this version posted February 24, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction. Public health interventions to address the COVID-19 pandemic including shelter-in-place, quarantine, isolation and travel restrictions, have varied from no policy to mandatory enforcement. We studied the relationship between mandatory compared to voluntary enforcement of shelter-in-place policies and COVID-19 mortality, equity and economic outcomes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.11.21251580; this version posted February 24, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods. We analyzed mortality data from regions with similar demographics and comprehensive health data but markedly contrasting public health policies. In the US, we compared Colorado and Washington, which implemented early mandatory shelter-in-place orders, and Massachusetts, which issued this measure as a voluntary health advisory. In Europe, we compared Norway's mandatory shelter-in-place policy to Sweden's voluntary one.

Results. We found differences in the number of cases and mortality rates in the two groups (**Table**). Demographic characteristics known to be risk factors for COVID-19, including age, obesity, lower socioeconomic status (as measured by Gini coefficient), and percent nonwhite, were not statistically different between the comparison groups with the exception of density. In the United States, higher population density is associated with decreased mortality from COVID-19.[1] Yet population-dense Massachusetts experienced a higher case burden and mortality than either Colorado or Washington, with a 4.7-fold higher population-adjusted mortality rate than Washington and 3.7-fold higher than Colorado ($p<0.0001$; **Figure**). Sweden recorded a population-adjusted mortality rate 11.4-fold higher than Norway ($p<0.0001$). Mortality among non-Whites was also worse in Massachusetts compared to the two States with stricter public health measures ($p<0.0001$).

Economic impacts. Economic impact as measured by GDP was not markedly different between regions that practiced mandatory public health measures compared to those implementing voluntary ones (Table). Sweden's GDP fell 8.6% in the second quarter, compared to Norway's 7.4% [Table]; somewhat greater losses in GDP contribution were observed in Massachusetts compared to Colorado or Washington. As measured by VSL (value of a statistical life), the $97.5 billion economic cost to Massachusetts was significantly higher than the $22.6 and $21.8 billion recorded by Washington and Colorado respectively. This difference was pronounced for Sweden, whose economic losses as measured by VSL were 21.3 times that of Norway.

Discussion. Shelter-in-place has been shown to be essential to containing the COVID-19 epidemic[2] and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.11.21251580; this version posted February 24, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

mandatory isolation and quarantine key to halting its exponential growth.[3] In the influenza epidemic of 1918, adoption of mandatory public health control measures at the beginning of the epidemic and resumption of those measures when cases began to rise resulted in lower mortality rates.[4] In the COVID-19 pandemic, our results show that adoption of mandatory public health shelter-in-place orders resulted in lower mortality rates and a fewer deaths both in the United States and in Europe.

Other restrictions. In the US, isolation and quarantine of known/exposed cases were mandatory only in the first month of the pandemic, and only for returning travelers.[5] Mandatory travel restrictions were imposed in Norway and in some parts of Colorado; however, it is plausible that travel restrictions imposed by neighboring jurisdictions may effectively have further locked down Sweden and Washington State and likely contributed to improved mortality outcomes compared to the expected trajectory from internal policy actions. Norway's substantial success may be further attributed to the mandatory enforcement of all four public health policies: shelter-in-place, quarantine or isolation of exposed / known cases, and travel restrictions.

Economic benefits. The benefits in the US from social distancing were estimated at the beginning of the pandemic to outweigh the costs to gross domestic product (GDP) by roughly $5.2 trillion,[6] yet preserving economic health has been used as a justification to refrain from mandatory public health policies. Our results show that both Sweden and Massachusetts adopted voluntary shelter-in-place measures yet experienced far greater VSL losses, especially, in Massachusetts, among minority populations, and somewhat greater losses to GDP.

We conclude that mandatory enforcement of public health measures in response to COVID-19 is likely a critical contributor to decreased mortality and attenuated economic impact of the epidemic. When case numbers rise, mandatory measures should be reinstated in an equitable, thoughtful manner that promotes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.11.21251580; this version posted February 24, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

public engagement and supports livelihoods in order to limit viral spread, prevent death, decrease inequities and preserve economic health.

Limitations: Study limitations include reliance on provisional data and assumptions applied to the model.

Funding: There are no funding disclosures.
***Conflicts of interest*: None declared.** There are no financial or other relationships that might lead to a conflict of interest.

Key points:

- Mandatory enforcement of public health measures in response to COVID-19 is likely a critical contributor to decreased mortality and attenuated economic impact of the epidemic.
- Mandatory measures should be adopted in an equitable, thoughtful manner that promotes public engagement and supports livelihoods in order to limit viral spread, prevent death, decrease inequities and preserve economic health.

References

1. Hamidi S, Ewing R and Sabouri S. Longitudinal analyses of the relationship between development density and the COVID-19 morbidity and mortality rates: early evidence from 1,165

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.11.21251580; this version posted February 24, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

metropolitan counties in the United States. *Health Place* 2020; 64: 102378.

2. Declines in SARS-CoV-2 Transmission, Hospitalizations, and Mortality After Implementation of Mitigation Measures— Delaware, March–June 2020. *MMWR*. 69: November 6, 2020.
3. Pan A, Liu L, Wang C et al. Association of public health interventions with the epidemiology of the COVID-19 outbreak in Wuhan, China. *JAMA* 2020: 323 (19):1915-1923.
4. Bootsma M and Ferguson N. The effect of public health measures on the 1918 influenza epidemic. *PNAS*. 2007: 104 (18): 7588-7593.
5. CDC Daily Key Points, Coronavirus Disease 2019 ("COVID-19") Outbreak: March 06, 2020. https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.movma.org/resource/resmgr/attachments_for_emails/cdc_covid_19_key_points_0306.pdf.
6. Thunstrom L, Newbold S, Finnoff D, Ashworth A and Shogren J. The Benefits and Costs of Using Social Distancing to Flatten the Curve for COVID-19. *J Benefit Cost Ana*. 2020; 28: 1–17.

Differences between states and countries implementing voluntary vs. mandatory NPIs

	Norway	**Washington**	**Colorado**	**Sweden**	**Massachusetts**
NPIs (non-pharmaceutical interventions)					
Date of mandatory shelter-in-place order or voluntary advisory	Order (3/12/20)	Order (3/23/20)	Order (3/24/20)	Advisory (3/16/20)	Advisory (3/25/20)
Specific NPIs, March-May 2020	**Mandatory:** • Shelter-in-place • Home quarantine for exposure • Home isolation if symptoms of COVID-19; • Travel restrictions • School closure • Businesses closed	**Mandatory:** • Shelter-in-place • No public gatherings of any size • All non-essential businesses closed; • School closure	**Mandatory:** • Shelter-in-place • No public gatherings of any size • All non-essential businesses closed • School closure • Some travel restrictions	**Mandatory**: • No public gatherings over 50 • Banned visits to nursing homes • Secondary schools and universities closed	**Mandatory:** • No public gatherings over 10 • Non-essential businesses closed • All schools closed • Masks (5/1/2020)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.11.21251580; this version posted February 24, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

	Voluntary: • hand hygiene • work from home, • refrain from using public transport • Refrain from visits to nursing homes/ vulnerable populations • Masks (mandatory since 10/2/2020 in airports, public transport and if in quarantine)	**Voluntary:** • Home isolation if sick • Home quarantine if exposed • Travel restrictions* • Masks (became mandatory 7/7/2020) *External restrictions: March 16th: Canada closed border with US	**Voluntary:** • Home isolation if sick • Home quarantine if exposed • Masks (mandatory since 7/16/2020)	**Voluntary:** • Shelter-in-place: encouraged employees to work from home if possible; those over 70 encouraged to stay home. • Home isolation if sick • Home quarantine if exposed • Masks • No travel restrictions* within Sweden; Swedes advised not to travel abroad (5/29/2020)	**Voluntary:** • Shelter-in-place • Home isolation if sick • Home quarantine if exposed • No travel restrictions for state residents • Encouraged to not visit relatives in nursing homes
REGIONAL BASELINES					

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.11.21251580; this version posted February 24, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Population	5.7 million	7.6 million	5.7 million	10.2 million	6.8 million
% population non-white	21% (ethnic/immigrant)	32.%	32%	14% (ethnic/immigrant)	28.9%
Density	14.8/mi2	113.4/mi 2	55/mi 2	64/mi 2	884/mi 2
Obesity, prevalence	23%	28.3%	23.8%	20%	25.2%
Age >65	17%	16%	15%	20%	17%
CASES/MORTALITY					
COVID-19 cases	16,136	102,005	86,374	103,200	144,488
COVID-19 deaths	278	2,264	2,180	5,918	9,753
Mortality rate per 100,000 population	5.1	29.7	37.9	58.5	141.7
Case Fatality Ratio (#deaths/#cases)	1.7%	2.21%	2.52%	5.7%	6.75%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.11.21251580; this version posted February 24, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

ECONOMICS					
GDP[‡], second and third quarters	-7.4 (Q2); +.6 (Q3)	-25.5	-28.1	-8.6 (Q2); +.3 (Q3)	-31.6
Economic cost of lives lost based on VSL(billions)[§]	0.83	22.6	21.8	17.7	97.5
EQUITY					
Number non-white deaths [#]/total non-white population; %[‖]	Not available	634/2,474,840; 0.025%	806/1,860,071; 0.043%	Not available	2311/1,991,933; 0.1%
Economic cost, non-white lives lost (billions), based on VSL	Not available	6.3	8.1	Not available	23.1
Gini coefficient[¶]	0.26	0.46	0.46	0.28	0.48
Average distance/time to hospital [**]	79% of population within 10 miles of a hospital	11.4 minutes	13.7 minutes	95% within 30 miles	13.0 minutes

All data, unless otherwise specified, is extracted from the Johns Hopkins COVID data map: https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html; and from federal, state, and country public health websites: https://www.census.gov; https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/6a652e6b53594e42ba9aeedacc73a68f/immigration-and-integration-2018-2019-report-for-norway.pdf; https://www.ofm.wa.gov/washington-data-research/statewide-data/washington-trends/population-changes/population-race; https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/sweden-population; https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/region/us/colorado; https://www.mass.gov/info-details/covid-19-response-reporting. Specific NPIs extracted from The New York Times news reports.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.11.21251580; this version posted February 24, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

*External travel restrictions on Sweden: March 12/14: Norway, Denmark closed borders to Sweden; May 6th Swedes excluded from traveling to 19 other European countries. External travel restrictions on Washington State: Canada closes border with Washington, March 18, 2020.

[†] COVID-19 deaths include deaths in which COVID-19 was identified as the underlying cause of death or a contributing cause (among multiple causes). P value for all comparisons p<0.0001, except Washington State vs Colorado.

[‡]Note: US typically reports GDP changes in annualized rates, whereas European countries typically report GDP changes as percentage change from previous quarter, or annual percentage change. Data for gross domestic product (GDP) for US: the US Bureau of Economic Analysis; https://www.bea.gov/news/2020/gross-domestic-product-state-2nd-quarter-2020; for Sweden and Norway: Statistics Sweden https://www.scb.se/en/finding-statistics/statistics-by-subject-area/national-accounts/national-accounts/national-accounts-quarterly-and-annual-estimates/pong/statistical-news/national-accounts-second-quarter-2020/ and Norwegian government: https://www.ssb.no/en/knr

[§]Value of a statistical life (VSL) US = $10 million; VSL for Sweden/Norway = $3 million. https://cdn2.sph.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/94/2017/01/Robinson-Hammitt-OKeeffe-VSL.2018.03.23.pdf

[||] Non-white includes Hispanic, Asian non-Hispanic, Black non-Hispanic, Pacific Islander, Native American; https://covidtracking.com/race/dashboard. The chi-square statistic is highly significant (p<0.00001) for comparisons between Massachusetts vs. Colorado and Washington.

[¶] The Gini coefficient measures the degree of inequality in the distribution of income in a country or state. OECD report 2019:https://data.oecd.org/inequality/income-inequality.htm; us.census.gov

[**] Measure of access to care: in the US, measured as minutes drive of the nearest hospital; Sweden, within 30 miles of a hospital; Norway, within 10 miles of a hospital. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/12/12/how-far-americans-live-from-the-closest-hospital-differs-by-community-type/ Sweden: https://cinch.uni-due.de/fileadmin/content/research/workingpaper/1501_CINCH-Series_avdic.pdf; Norway: https://tidsskriftet.no/en/2014/11/travel-time-and-distances-norwegian-out-hours-casualty-clinics-0

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.11.21251580; this version posted February 24, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.11.21251580; this version posted February 24, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .