Impact of national and regional lockdowns on COVID-19 epidemic waves: Application to the 2020 spring wave in France

Jonathan Roux[1], Clément Massonnaud[1,2], Vittoria Colizza[3], Simon Cauchemez[4], Pascal Crépey[1,*]

[1] Univ Rennes, EHESP, REPERES « Recherche en Pharmaco-Epidémiologie et Recours aux Soins » – EA 7449, 15 avenue du Professeur-Léon-Bernard, CS 74312, 35043 Rennes, France.

[2] Rouen University Hospital, Department of Biomedical Informatics, 76000 Rouen, France

[3] INSERM, Sorbonne Université, Institut Pierre Louis d'Epidémiologie et de Santé Publique IPLESP, F75012 Paris, France

[4] Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases Unit, Institut Pasteur, UMR2000, CNRS, Paris, France

Corresponding author

Pascal Crépey

EHESP

15, Avenue du Professeur Léon-Bernard

CS 74312

35043 RENNES Cedex

pascal.crepey@ehesp.fr

Number of words: 2830

Abstract

Background

The efficacy of national lockdowns to control COVID-19 epidemics has been demonstrated. This study aimed at assessing the impact of national and regional lockdowns, in the context of quickly growing pandemic waves, considering the French first wave of the COVID-19 epidemic as a case study.

Methods

We developed a compartmental epidemic model considering the demographic and age profile of the population of the 13 regions of metropolitan France. We assessed the impact on morbidity, mortality, and hospital resources of simulated national and regional lockdowns starting at different time.

Results

In a regional lockdown scenario aimed at preventing intensive care units (ICU) saturation in continental France in March 2020, almost all regions would have had to implement a lockdown within 10 days from the actual date of the nationwide implementation. By this date, 97% of ICU capacities would have been used and almost 7000 more lives would have been lost, compared to the March 17 lockdown which limited the mortality burden in hospital to 18 130 deaths. For slowly growing epidemics, with a lower reproduction number, the expected delays between regional lockdowns increases. However, the public health costs associated with these delays tend to grow exponentially with time.

Conclusions

In a quickly growing pandemic wave, defining the timing of lockdowns at a regional rather than national level delays by a few days the implementation of a nationwide lockdown but leads to substantially higher morbi-mortality and stress on the healthcare system.

Keywords COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, France, regional lockdown, national lockdown, burden

Key messages

- In a quickly growing pandemic wave, defining the timing of lockdowns at a regional level delays the implementation of a nationwide lockdown by a few days, but leads to substantially higher morbi-mortality and stress on the healthcare system.
- The impact of a delayed regional lockdown greatly depends on the reproduction number in the region, with morbi-mortality costs growing exponentially with the delay.
- If delayed regional lockdowns are necessary to ensure population acceptability, slowing down the epidemic ahead of the measure may decrease the morbi-mortality associated with this delay.

Introduction

After it was first identified in December 2019, the novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) that causes the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) quickly spread over the world, challenging health systems. To contain this pandemic, countries implemented control strategies of different intensities for example travel restrictions, closing of schools, shops, stay-at-home orders and lockdowns, at national or regional levels.[1–3] Combinations of these interventions led to important reductions of the effective reproduction number of the epidemic in a number of countries before the Summer 2020.[1,2,4,5] France was one of the European countries most affected by the first pandemic wave, along with Italy, Spain and the UK. The first cases of COVID-19 due to importations were confirmed on January 24, 2020.[6] They were followed by several clusters mostly located in the eastern regions of France (Grand-Est and Bourgogne-Franche-Comté) and Ile-de-France (the most populated French region including the city of Paris). The seeding of the epidemic in these regions mean that they were ahead of other regions in terms of the number of COVID-19 patients admitted into intensive care units (ICU) (mean of 53 and 31 daily ICU admissions from March 11 to March 17 in Ile-de-France and Grand-Est, respectively, compared to 1 to 12 in other French regions).[5,7] To avoid saturation of the healthcare system, the French government ordered a national lockdown starting on March 17, 2020.

The efficacy of lockdown strategies to control COVID-19 epidemics has been internationally demonstrated at the national [1,2,5,8,9] and county levels.[10] However, some have argued that the nationwide application in France of such measures was unnecessary and that lockdowns restricted to the two or three most impacted French regions would have been sufficient to contain the pandemic wave. The present study aimed at retrospectively comparing the impact of the nationwide lockdown on March 17 to regional lockdowns on the number of COVID-19 hospitalizations, occupied ICU beds, life-years gained, and deaths avoided during the first pandemic wave in France.

Methods

Mathematical model

We used a deterministic, age-structured, compartmental epidemic model based on demographic and age profile of the population of the 13 administrative regions of metropolitan France. Model description, equations, and parameter values are presented in supplementary materials. The transmission model was implemented in C++. Data collection, data management, simulations, results analysis and reporting were performed using R.[11]

Analysis of national and regional lockdowns

For each region, we estimated the reproduction number before the lockdown ($R_{prelockdown}$), and after its implementation ($R_{lockdown}$). Then, in order to simulate a regional lockdown, we used the $R_{prelockdown}$ up to the starting date of the measure; and the $R_{lockdown}$ estimated in the region after that date. We assumed that the transmission rate remained constant until July 1. We also assumed that the epidemic dynamic was driven by local behaviour within regions and that interactions between regions had no impact on local reproduction numbers.

We simulated national lockdowns starting on all dates from March 10 to March 31, thus exploring other dates of start beyond the actual date of March 17. We then simulated asynchronous regional lockdowns, in which each region could be locked down independently of other regions, on different dates. We considered the following epidemic thresholds as starting dates of regional lockdowns: either (1) the date on which the estimated incidence of hospital admissions in the region reached the level of the most affected region during the first wave (i.e. Grand-Est, here called GES threshold), or (2) the last date on which a lockdown would allow the region to stay below its ICU capacity limit (here called ICU capacity threshold).

Outcomes

For each simulation, we computed at the national and regional levels the cumulative numbers of hospital and ICU admissions, maximum occupied ICU beds, deaths, life years and quality-adjusted life years (QALY) lost between March 1 and July 1 and computed the relative change compared to the outcomes obtained when the real lockdown date was used.

Scenario with a slower epidemic growth

To better understand how the reproduction number affect the estimated impact of the lockdown, we analysed scenarios where $R_{prelockdown}$ is in the range 1.1 to 1.5. This corresponds to the reproduction numbers observed in France at the start of 2021. In this analysis, we kept the previously estimated $R_{lockdown}$ for each region during the lockdown.

Results

Pre-lockdown and lockdown epidemiological dynamics

Table 1 presents estimates of the reproduction number before $R_{prelockdown}$ and during the lockdown period $R_{lockdown}$ by region (see Supplementary Figures S1 to S4 for the fitting of hospital admissions, ICU admissions, occupied ICU beds and deaths). The median regional reproduction number before the national lockdown was 2.66 with a minimum of 1.96 (95% confidence interval [1.79-2.13]) in Hauts-de-France and a maximum of 4.17 [3.44-5.03] in Centre-Val de Loire (Table 1). After the implementation of the lockdown, the median reproduction number was estimated at 0.70.

The lockdown was implemented on March 17, 2020 at a time when there were 6.09 daily hospital admissions per 100 000 inhabitants in the Grand-Est region (reference region). Using the pre-lockdown reproduction number, we found that the date when this threshold would have been reached without lockdown ranged from March 18 for Ile-de-France to April 7 for Bretagne (Table 1, GES threshold). Using the same process, we found that all regions but Bretagne would have implemented a lockdown by March 27, 2020 in order to avoid ICU saturation (Table 1, ICU capacity threshold).

Impact of a national lockdown

At the national level, setting a national lockdown one day later than the observed lockdown, i.e on March 18, would have led to an increase of 1445 ICU admissions, the need for 820 additional ICU beds, and 1839 deaths (i.e. 2 ICU admissions and 3 deaths per 100 000 inhabitants); corresponding to a loss of almost 16 600 QALY (Figure 1 – regional results are presented in Supplementary Tables S1 and S2 and Supplementary Figure S5). It would have led to an increase in the maximum number of occupied ICU beds at the peak between 8% and 21% at the regional level (Figure 2); in hospital admissions between 7% and 18%; in ICU admissions between 7% and 18%; and in deaths between 7% and 19% (Supplementary Figures S6 to S8). A national lockdown one week after the official start, i.e. on March 24, would have led to 12 963 additional ICU admissions and 16 536 additional deaths (i.e. 20 ICU admissions and 26 deaths per 100 000 inhabitants); corresponding to 148 000 QALY lost. Moreover, 14 982 ICU beds would have been needed to accommodate all ICU admissions and would have led to an overrun of ICU capacity with 138% occupancy of ICU beds (Figure 1 and 2).

Starting the lockdown one day earlier, i.e. on March 16 instead of March 17, would have led to 1327 fewer ICU admissions and 1689 fewer deaths, corresponding to around 15 200 QALY saved. In addition, 6495 ICU beds would have been needed at peak, corresponding to 740 fewer ICU beds than what was observed. Locally, it would have led to a reduction in the range 7%-16% for the number of deaths and 7-16% for the number of ICU admissions (Supplementary Figures S7 and S8). If the global lockdown had started 7 days earlier on March 10, it would have led to 7218 fewer ICU admissions, 9194 fewer deaths and around 83 000 QALY saved. Moreover, 3881 fewer ICU beds would have been needed at peak, corresponding to approximately half the number of ICU beds used at the peak of the wave.

Impact of regional lockdowns

The first scenario, where the start of the lockdown is delayed in each region according to the GES threshold (the date on which the estimated incidence of hospital admissions reached 6.09 per 100 000

inhabitants in the region), would have led to 16 906 additional ICU admissions, 19 066 additional deaths and the need for 15 434 ICU beds at the national level. Approximately 239 000 life-years and 172 200 QALY would have been lost with this delay. It would have resulted in a peak of daily hospital admissions ranging from 406 in Bretagne to 1736 in Ile-de-France (Supplementary Figure S9). This scenario would have led to the saturation of ICU capacities in some regions (Figure 2).

In the scenario where each region implements a lockdown no later than the moment allowing them to remain within its ICU capacity (ICU capacity threshold), three regions (Grand-Est, Ile-de-France and Bourgogne-Franche-Comté) would have had to be locked down from the start of the study period, on March 17, and one region (Bretagne) could have been locked down three weeks later on April 2, 2020. However, all regions but Bretagne would have had to implement a lockdown by March 27, 2020. By this date, a maximum of 96.8% of national ICU capacities would have been used, instead of less than 70% with the observed national lockdown 10 days earlier, and almost 7000 more lives would have been lost (Figure 3).

Scenario with a slower epidemic growth

The sensitivity analysis showed that the lockdown impact depends not only on timing but also on the pre-lockdown reproduction number $R_{prelockdown}$ observed in the region (Supplementary Figure S10).

For example, delaying the national lockdown two weeks later on March 31 would have led to 1218 additional deaths with $R_{prelockdown}$=1.1 but 5439 additional deaths with $R_{prelockdown}$=1.5. In addition, for any given reproduction number, the cost of delaying the lockdown increases exponentially with time, for all outcomes. As an example, a synchronized lockdown on March 10 with a reproduction number equal to 1.5 would have led to 1896 fewer deaths, whereas on March 24 it would have led to 2421 additional deaths.

Discussion

This study aimed at comparing the impact of lockdown strategies where the timing of the lockdown is defined at the national vs at the regional scale, in the context of a quickly growing pandemic wave. This was done thanks to a compartmental model that reproduced the epidemic dynamics of the Spring 2020 pandemic wave in France and simulated several counterfactual scenarios to that of the nationwide lockdown implemented on March 17.

Using our model, we estimated that, at the time of the first national lockdown, all regions were not at the same epidemic stage. Indeed, the threshold of 6.09 hospital admissions per 100,000 inhabitants estimated in the most affected region at the time lockdown took place (Grand-Est region), would have been reached in other regions within 1 day (Ile-de-France) - 21 days (Bretagne) after March 17, in the absence of lockdown. As expected, delaying the lockdown would have led to additional hospital and ICU admissions, and deaths, independently of the region. Waiting to reach this threshold in each region would have resulted in an increase of 16 906 ICU admissions and 19 066 deaths at the national level, comparable to the total number of ICU admissions and deaths registered in the country until July 1.[7] This delay would have resulted in a 7-fold increase of deaths in some regions (Nouvelle-Aquitaine) compared to the observed outcome. Moreover, these numbers do not take into account the additional deaths due to healthcare system congestion. Therefore, it is likely that the lockdown would have been implemented before the saturation of all regions. On the other hand, starting the national lockdown one week earlier would have resulted into up to 9194 fewer deaths, corresponding to around 83 000 QALY lost at the national level. The reduction was higher in regions where the reproduction number was high, highlighting the importance of this parameter in the decision to start a lockdown.

We also analysed the impact of regional lockdowns. Using a threshold based on the number of hospital admissions to trigger a regional lockdown failed to prevent regions from exceeding their ICU capacity. This is easily explained by different ICU capacities per inhabitant by region, and because the impact of lockdown timing depends not only on the incidence but also on the epidemic dynamics, described by the reproduction number R. Depending on R, the same level of incidence in two regions on a given day can lead to very different dynamics in the following days, as shown in the scenario with a slower

epidemic growth. The higher the reproduction number, the higher the cost of delaying the lockdown. Our simulations showed that regional lockdowns, where each lockdown is started on the last date that allows the region to stay within its ICU capacity, would have led to 7000 additional deaths compared to the observed lockdown. In this scenario, all regions but one would have been locked down within 10 days. Although each region would have stayed within its ICU capacities, 97% of national ICU capacities would have been used at peak. These assessments are performed retrospectively. In real-time, it would be difficult to precisely estimate the date when the lockdown should be implemented to avoid the saturation of local ICUs. As a consequence, there is a real risk that the regional approach would have led to the saturation of ICUs in some locations.

Considering the latest information on SARS-CoV-2 and its characteristics, our estimated values of reproduction number were similar to the ones obtained by other researchers before and after the lockdown.[4,12,13] Regarding the computation of outcomes of interest (hospital requirements and deaths), we considered the whole care pathway of patients inside hospital settings (Figure S13). In addition, all these estimations were based on observed parameters (lengths of stay, ICU admission risk, and death risk) in real settings and modulated for each region with specific estimated coefficients to account for regional disparities. However, some differences may remain, mainly due to change in hospitalization strategies during the crisis. Concerning the quantification of the impact of a delayed lockdown, we chose Grand-Est as the reference region, as it was the first impacted region of the first wave of the epidemic in France, and thus the number of hospitalizations in this region at lockdown start was a good threshold for comparisons.[5]

The mortality estimates presented in this study do not consider deaths occurring outside hospitals (at home – estimated to be around 5% of all COVID-related deaths[14] – or in nursing homes –10 497 deaths recorded as of July 2, 2020)[15] as we limited our analysis to hospital settings. Moreover, our model also does not account for the excess mortality that would have resulted from hospital saturation. Given the important excess hospital and ICU admissions that would have occurred with a delayed lockdown, it is likely that the saturation of the health care system would have resulted in an important excess

mortality. This was avoided in France thanks to the transfer of 658 patients from highly affected to less affected regions, which remained less infected thanks to the national lockdown (personal communication). Therefore, our analysis may underestimate the number of deaths, life years and QALY lost in scenarios where delays in the implementation of the lockdown increase substantially the stress on the healthcare system. In addition, QALY lost were only estimated based on the deaths of infected individuals, whereas it would be interesting to take into account the lost QALY due to severe COVID-19 leading to hospitalization and ICU admissions, since there may still be after-effects for these individuals.[16] However, to our knowledge, no study has been done in France to provide utility measures in these cases. Regarding the estimation of ICU occupancy, the maximum ICU capacity in each region corresponded to the maximum number of beds that could be mobilised during the pandemic, which was higher than the normal number of ICU beds at the national level. Without this mobilisation of new ICU beds, ICU saturation would have been reached much earlier. Finally, our study relied on the hypothesis that implementing regionals lockdowns is doable and acceptable by the population. Some European countries such as Italy,[3,17] Germany[3] or United Kingdom[18] have implemented such measures. In France, spatially targeted measures were introduced only after the first wave and for less restrictive measures than a full lockdown.[19] On one hand it allows to limit the implementation of strong control measures in areas where the infection risk is high, and potentially acknowledged by the population. On the other hand, it raises questions regarding the consequences related to population movements that may occur following or preceding the lockdown of a region.[10] In addition, some studies have shown that localized mitigation measures, less strict than national lockdown (curfew in specific metropolitan area, closing of shops or schools), have led to a reduction in the French population mobility[20] and a slowdown of the epidemic in non-restricted areas.[19]

This study highlights that the impact of a delayed regional lockdown greatly depends on the reproduction number in the region, with costs in terms of morbi-mortality growing exponentially with the delay. It also shows that in a quickly growing pandemic wave such as the one observed in Spring 2020 in France, defining the timing of lockdowns at a regional rather than national level delays by only

a few days the implementation of a nationwide lockdown but leads to substantially higher morbi-mortality and stress on the healthcare system.

Funding

This work was supported by the French national research agency (ANR), through the SPHINx (Spread of Pathogens on Healthcare Institutions Networks) project [grant number SPHINX-17-CE36-0008-01].

Data availability

The data and code underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Conflict of interest

None declared.

Table 1 Estimated values of $R_{prelockdown}$ and $R_{lockdown}$ and dates when GES threshold and ICU capacity threshold would have been reached.

Region	R before lockdown [95%CI]	R during lockdown [95%CI]	GES threshold date	ICU capacity threshold date
GES	2.13 [1.91-2.38]	0.78 [0.68-0.89]	March 17	March 18
IDF	2.66 [2.45-2.88]	0.74 [0.67-0.81]	March 18	March 16
BFC	2.60 [2.28-2.96]	0.70 [0.60-0.82]	March 24	March 17
ARA	2.97 [2.65-3.32]	0.69 [0.60-0.78]	March 26	March 20
CVL	4.17 [3.44-5.03]	0.75 [0.60-0.92]	March 26	March 18
HDF	1.96 [1.79-2.13]	0.73 [0.65-0.81]	March 26	March 21
PAC	2.32 [2.07-2.60]	0.74 [0.64-0.84]	March 27	March 26
PDL	3.54 [2.94-4.26]	0.68 [0.55-0.84]	March 29	March 24
NOR	2.97 [2.55-3.44]	0.65 [0.55-0.78]	March 30	March 24
OCC	2.79 [2.44-3.19]	0.64 [0.54-0.74]	March 31	March 25
NAQ	3.29 [2.74-3.94]	0.67 [0.54-0.82]	April 1	March 27
BRE	2.26 [1.85-2.74]	0.69 [0.54-0.85]	April 7	April 2

95%CI: 95% Confidence Interval. GES threshold date: The date on which the estimated incidence of hospital admissions reached 6.09 per 100 000 inhabitants in the region. ICU capacity threshold date: The last date on which a lockdown would allow the region to stay below its ICU capacity limit.

GES: Grand-Est, IDF: Ile-de-France, BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté, ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, CVL: Centre-Val de Loire, HDF: Hauts de France, PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, PDL: Pays de la Loire, NOR: Normandie, OCC: Occitanie, NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine, BRE: Bretagne.



Figure 1 Impact of the change of the lockdown date on the national number of (A) hospital admissions, (B) ICU admissions, (C) deaths, (D) life years, (E) quality-adjusted life years lost per 100 000 inhabitants compared to the observed lockdown date and on (F) the ICU occupancy.



Figure 2 Relative change in the number of occupied ICU beds at the peak for each French metropolitan region (in %) according to lockdown date compared to the observed national lockdown. (GES: Grand-Est, IDF: Ile-de-France, BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté, ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, CVL: Centre-Val de Loire, HDF: Hauts de France, PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, PDL: Pays de la Loire, NOR: Normandie, OCC: Occitanie, NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine, BRE: Bretagne)



Figure 3 ICU beds occupancy in case of regional lockdowns to avoid regional ICU saturation. Vertical dashed lines indicate the moment when regions have to be locked down to avoid a saturation of their ICU capacity. Three regions (GES, IDF, BFC) would be locked from the start of the study period. One region (BRE) could have been locked on April 2, 2020, all others would have been locked before March 27, 2020.

(GES: Grand-Est, IDF: Ile-de-France, BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté, ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, CVL: Centre-Val de Loire, HDF: Hauts de France, PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, PDL: Pays de la Loire, NOR: Normandie, OCC: Occitanie, NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine, BRE: Bretagne)

Supplementary information

Supplementary materials

Transmission model

We used a deterministic, age-structured, compartmental epidemic model based on demographic and age profile of the population administrative regions of metropolitan France (Supplementary Figure S11). We considered that individuals were susceptible (S), and then potentially exposed to the virus but not infectious (E). As observed in clinical practice, we set children and adolescents to be less susceptible to infection than other age groups.[21] Exposed individuals stay in their compartment for an average of 2.72 days[22] before moving to either asymptomatic (A) or pre-symptomatic (I_{ps}) compartment according to observed risk of being asymptomatic.[21] We considered that asymptomatic individuals were 45% less infectious than pre-symptomatic individuals were[23] and we assumed they stayed in the compartment for an average of 10.91 days before moving to the removed compartment (R) of patients that are cured or dead from COVID-19. Pre-symptomatic individuals will become infected symptomatic (I_s) after an average duration of 2.38 days. This choice of parameters gave a mean incubation period of 5.1 days,[1] within around 2 days of pre-symptomatic transmissions. Then they become after an average of 5 days (assumption) either hospitalized (I_h) or remain within the community (I_{nh}) according to age-dependent hospitalization risks.[4] We assumed that hospitalized individuals were no more infectious because of their hospitalization whereas non-hospitalized keeps spreading the disease with the same intensity as symptomatic individuals. We assumed the average duration in I_{nh} compartment was 3.53 days to match the total duration in the asymptomatic compartment. Finally, both hospitalized and non-hospitalized individuals moved to the removed compartment.

To match the epidemic dynamics and reproduce the Erlang distributions of durations in each compartment of the transmission model, we subdivided each compartments having a role in the

infection process into sub-compartments. This subdivision had no impact on the mean duration spent in each compartment. A sensitivity analysis testing several combinations revealed that 10 sub-compartments in each compartment permitted to approach the observed dynamics of the epidemic (Supplementary Figure S12).

Model parametrization

The population was divided into 17 age groups: 16 age-band of 5 years from 0 to 80 years, and a last group for people aged 80 years and older. The population structure of each region was inferred from hospital catchment areas from 2016 and 2017 census data provided by the French National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (Insee).[24,25] To simulate age and location-dependent mixing, we used inter-individual contacts matrices for the French population estimated by Prem et al.[26]

We retrieved epidemiological regional data related to the COVID-19 epidemic in metropolitan France gathered by the French National Public Health Agency (SpF-'Santé publique France')[7] daily number of hospital admissions (general and intensive care unit (ICU) wards), daily number of ICU admissions, daily number of occupied ICU beds, and daily number of deaths in hospitals (deaths in nursing homes and at home were not considered). All these epidemiological data were corrected for reporting delays following the same procedure as Salje et al.[4] We also obtained data on the maximum ICU beds capacity per French region from the 'Direction de la Recherche, des Études, de l'Évaluation et des Statistiques' (Drees) regarding the situation during the March 2020 lockdown (personal communication) (Supplementary Table S3).

Estimation of hospital-related outcomes

Based on the estimated number of new infected hospitalized cases per day provided by our epidemiological model, we inferred outcomes related to hospital requirements, namely ICU admissions, ICU occupied beds, and deaths.

We divided the hospital settings in two parts: general ward and ICU ward (Supplementary Figure S13). The epidemiological transmission model estimated the daily number of new hospitalized cases due to COVID-19 infection, regardless of the ward (i.e. ICU and general wards). Once admitted to hospital, infected cases could either remain in the general ward until the end of their stay or go into ICU, if they became severe cases. We assumed that cases admitted in ICU entered ICU ward the same day as they were admitted in hospital (pre-ICU length of stay equal to 0 day). Once in ICU, cases could either die or stay in ICU until their discharge to general ward. Cases in general ward could either die or stay in general ward until their discharge to home.

We used age-dependent ICU admission risks for hospitalized patients estimated by Salje et al.[4] We also used age-specific lengths of stay in ICU to estimate the number of occupied ICU beds.[27] We estimated the number of deaths using hospital and ICU death risks estimated by the Drees on all the hospitalized cases of the first wave of epidemic in France (March-June 2020).[27] Deaths were delayed in time using the time from hospital or ICU admission to death.[27] Lengths of stay in general ward before discharge, lengths of stay in general ward before death and post-ICU lengths of stay in general ward were not used as we did not estimated the total number of hospital beds needed. This had no impact on the results provided by the model.

We also estimated the number of life years and quality-adjusted life years (QALY) lost for each death using life tables provided by INSEE for 2012-2016[28] and utility measures of each age-group in France.[29]

Statistical framework

We estimated region-specific model parameters by maximum likelihood in a two-step process using the *bbmle* R package.[30] First, on the period stretching from March 14 to May 10, 2020, corresponding to the evolution of the epidemic until the end of the national lockdown, we estimated the value of the transmission parameter β, governing the value of R_0, the initial state in each compartment per age group on March 1, 2020 and the effects of the national lockdown. The latter was estimated through a transmission reduction parameter, hereafter called c_β, and multiplied the transmission parameter

(and thus contact matrices) to reproduce the several mitigation measures implemented and their consequences on the regional propagation. We jointly estimated these parameters by fitting the daily de-seasonalized time series of hospital admissions (hereafter denoted Hosp) using the likelihood L_β defined in Equation 1.

$$L_\beta = \prod_t NBin\left(Hosp_{observed}(t) \middle| Hosp_{predicted}(t)\right) \qquad \text{(Eq. 1)}$$

where NBin(.|X) is a negative binomial distribution of mean X and overdispersion X^δ, δ being a parameter specific to each region to be estimated. Confidence intervals of these two parameters were estimated using likelihood profiling methods.[30]

In a second step, we jointly estimated three regional coefficients adjusting age-specific risks of ICU admissions, risk of deaths and lengths of stay in ICU (including ICU stays leading to death). They were estimated by simultaneously fitting the time series of ICU admissions (hereafter denoted ICU), deaths (both smoothed using 7-day centered moving average) and occupied ICU beds (hereafter denoted BedICU) from March 14 to May 10, 2020 using the likelihood $L_{ICU-deaths}$ defined in Equation 2.

$$L_{ICU-deaths} = \prod_t NBin\left(ICU_{observed}(t) \middle| ICU_{predicted}(t)\right) . NBin\left(deaths_{observed}(t) \middle| deaths_{predicted}(t)\right) . NBin\left(BedICU_{observed}(t) \middle| BedICU_{predicted}(t)\right) \qquad \text{(Eq. 2)}$$

where NBin(.|X) is a negative binomial distribution of mean X and overdispersion X^δ, δ being a parameter estimated for each region.

Supplementary Table S1 Impact of the change of the lockdown date on the number of hospital and ICU admissions, deaths, life years lost and quality-adjusted life years lost per 100 000 inhabitants compared to the observed lockdown date per French Region.

Region	Outcome	March 10	March 15	March 16	March 17	March 18	March 19	March 24	March 31
GES	Hosp.	-119	-38	-20	0	20	42	161	356
	ICU	-14	-5	-2	0	2	5	19	42
	Deaths	-23	-8	-4	0	4	8	32	72
	LY	-286	-92	-47	0	49	101	391	869
	QALY	-206	-67	-34	0	36	73	281	625
IDF	Hosp.	-148	-50	-26	0	28	57	228	514
	ICU	-21	-7	-4	0	4	8	32	71
	Deaths	-29	-10	-5	0	5	11	45	103
	LY	-357	-122	-63	0	67	138	552	1249
	QALY	-257	-88	-45	0	48	99	398	900
BFC	Hosp.	-80	-29	-15	0	16	34	147	380
	ICU	-11	-4	-2	0	2	5	21	53
	Deaths	-17	-6	-3	0	4	7	32	84

	LY	-215	-77	-40	0	44	92	398	1032
	QALY	-155	-55	-29	0	32	66	287	743
ARA	Hosp.	-73	-27	-14	0	16	34	155	426
	ICU	-10	-4	-2	0	2	5	22	60
	Deaths	-13	-5	-3	0	3	6	28	78
	LY	-162	-61	-32	0	36	76	346	956
	QALY	-117	-44	-23	0	26	55	249	689
CVL	Hosp.	-84	-34	-19	0	22	46	231	692
	ICU	-14	-6	-3	0	4	8	38	111
	Deaths	-15	-6	-3	0	4	8	43	132
	LY	-192	-79	-42	0	49	106	533	1612
	QALY	-139	-57	-31	0	36	77	384	1161
HDF	Hosp.	-62	-20	-11	0	11	23	91	213
	ICU	-11	-4	-2	0	2	4	16	37
	Deaths	-13	-4	-2	0	2	5	19	45
	LY	-166	-55	-28	0	30	61	243	572

	QALY	-120	-39	-20	0	21	44	176	413
PAC	Hosp.	-64	-22	-11	0	12	26	109	275
	ICU	-9	-3	-2	0	2	3	15	37
	Deaths	-8	-3	-2	0	2	3	15	38
	LY	-106	-37	-19	0	21	43	182	464
	QALY	-76	-27	-14	0	15	31	132	334
PDL	Hosp.	-47	-19	-10	0	12	25	127	406
	ICU	-6	-2	-1	0	2	3	17	53
	Deaths	-8	-3	-2	0	2	4	23	73
	LY	-103	-41	-22	0	26	55	281	901
	QALY	-74	-30	-16	0	19	40	202	649
NOR	Hosp.	-38	-14	-8	0	9	19	90	275
	ICU	-7	-3	-1	0	2	3	16	50
	Deaths	-7	-3	-1	0	2	4	17	54
	LY	-94	-36	-19	0	22	46	223	686
	QALY	-68	-26	-14	0	16	33	161	495

OCC	Hosp.	-36	-14	-7	0	8	17	81	244
	ICU	-7	-3	-1	0	2	3	16	47
	Deaths	-5	-2	-1	0	1	3	12	37
	LY	-70	-26	-14	0	16	33	158	476
	QALY	-50	-19	-10	0	11	24	114	343
NAQ	Hosp.	-28	-11	-6	0	7	15	75	251
	ICU	-4	-2	-1	0	1	2	11	38
	Deaths	-4	-2	-1	0	1	2	12	42
	LY	-57	-23	-12	0	14	30	155	521
	QALY	-41	-16	-9	0	10	22	112	376
BRE	Hosp.	-23	-8	-4	0	5	10	43	121
	ICU	-4	-1	-1	0	1	2	7	20
	Deaths	-4	-1	-1	0	1	2	8	22
	LY	-53	-19	-10	0	11	23	102	284
	QALY	-38	-14	-7	0	8	17	73	205

GES: Grand-Est, IDF: Ile-de-France, BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté, ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, CVL: Centre-Val de Loire, HDF: Hauts de France, PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, PDL: Pays de la Loire, NOR: Normandie, OCC: Occitanie, NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine, BRE: Bretagne.

Hosp.: Hospital admissions, ICU: ICU admissions, LY: Life years lost, QALY: Quality-adjusted life years lost.

Supplementary Table S2 Impact of the change of the lockdown date on the regional occupation of ICU beds and the maximum ICU beds needed at the peak per French region

Region	Outcome	March 10	March 15	March 16	March 17	March 18	March 19	March 24	March 31
GES	Occupancy (%)	49	74	80	86	93	100	142	214
	Max ICU beds	599	900	973	1052	1135	1222	1733	2610
IDF	Occupancy (%)	49	86	95	106	118	130	207	345
	Max ICU beds	1412	2475	2755	3061	3393	3752	5964	9949
BFC	Occupancy (%)	43	77	86	97	109	121	208	407
	Max ICU beds	145	261	293	329	368	412	706	1379
ARA	Occupancy (%)	23	46	52	60	69	78	148	325
	Max ICU beds	264	527	604	691	790	902	1704	3736
CVL	Occupancy (%)	20	52	62	75	91	109	263	747
	Max ICU beds	53	139	168	203	245	294	711	2016
HDF	Occupancy (%)	42	62	66	72	77	83	119	188
	Max ICU beds	344	509	549	592	638	688	985	1558

PAC	Occupancy (%)	21	35	38	42	47	52	83	154
	Max ICU beds	203	340	376	415	459	506	817	1504
PDL	Occupancy (%)	9	22	26	31	36	43	95	263
	Max ICU beds	43	100	118	140	165	194	432	1201
NOR	Occupancy (%)	13	27	31	36	42	48	94	230
	Max ICU beds	66	134	155	178	204	235	463	1130
OCC	Occupancy (%)	13	25	29	33	37	42	80	185
	Max ICU beds	126	243	277	315	359	409	773	1787
NAQ	Occupancy (%)	7	16	18	21	25	29	63	174
	Max ICU beds	60	132	155	181	211	247	531	1465
BRE	Occupancy (%)	10	16	18	20	22	25	41	81
	Max ICU beds	39	65	72	80	89	98	162	320

GES: Grand-Est, IDF: Ile-de-France, BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté, ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, CVL: Centre-Val de Loire, HDF: Hauts de France, PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, PDL: Pays de la Loire, NOR: Normandie, OCC: Occitanie, NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine, BRE: Bretagne.

Occupancy: Occupancy of ICU beds. Max ICU beds: Maximum number of ICU beds needed.

Supplementary Table S3 Maximum number of ICU beds available per region in March 2020

Region	Maximum number of ICU beds
GES	1219
IDF	2885
BFC	339
ARA	1150
CVL	270
HDF	827
PAC	980
PDL	456
NOR	492
OCC	967
NAQ	844
BRE	397
France	10 826

GES: Grand-Est, IDF: Ile-de-France, BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté, ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, CVL: Centre-Val de Loire, HDF: Hauts de France, PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, PDL: Pays de la Loire, NOR: Normandie, OCC: Occitanie, NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine, BRE: Bretagne.



Supplementary Figure S1 Prediction of the number of new hospital admissions per French region between March 15 and July 1, 2020.



Supplementary Figure S2 Prediction of the number of new ICU admissions per French region between March 15 and July 1, 2020.



Supplementary Figure S3 Prediction of the number of occupied ICU beds per French region between March 15 and July 1, 2020.



Supplementary Figure S4 Prediction of the number of new deaths per French region between March 15 and July 1, 2020.



Supplementary Figure S5 Impact of the change of the lockdown date on the regional number of (A) hospital and (B) ICU admissions, (C) deaths, (D) life years and (E) quality-adjusted life years lost per 100 000 inhabitants compared to the observed lockdown date.

GES: Grand-Est, IDF: Ile-de-France, BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté, ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, CVL: Centre-Val de Loire, HDF: Hauts de France, PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, PDL: Pays de la Loire, NOR: Normandie, OCC: Occitanie, NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine, BRE: Bretagne.



Supplementary Figure S6 Relative change in the number of hospital admissions (in %) according to lockdown date compared to the real lockdown for each French metropolitan region.

GES: Grand-Est, IDF: Ile-de-France, BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté, ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, CVL: Centre-Val de Loire, HDF: Hauts de France, PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, PDL: Pays de la Loire, NOR: Normandie, OCC: Occitanie, NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine, BRE: Bretagne.



Supplementary Figure S7 Relative change in the number of ICU admissions (in %) according to lockdown date compared to the real lockdown for each French metropolitan region.

GES: Grand-Est, IDF: Ile-de-France, BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté, ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, CVL: Centre-Val de Loire, HDF: Hauts de France, PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, PDL: Pays de la Loire, NOR: Normandie, OCC: Occitanie, NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine, BRE: Bretagne.



Supplementary Figure S8 Relative change in the number of deaths (in %) according to lockdown date compared to the real lockdown for each French metropolitan region.

GES: Grand-Est, IDF: Ile-de-France, BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté, ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, CVL: Centre-Val de Loire, HDF: Hauts de France, PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, PDL: Pays de la Loire, NOR: Normandie, OCC: Occitanie, NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine, BRE: Bretagne.



Supplementary Figure S9 Prediction of the number of new hospital admissions per French region between March 10 and July 1, 2020 with a lockdown start on March 10 (blue), March 17 (black) and GES threshold date (the date on which the estimated incidence of hospital admissions per 100 000 inhabitants in the region reached 6.09) (red). The dashed lines correspond to the starting dates of each lockdown and the red points to the observed values.


A
Hospital admissions
40
20
0
Mar 10
Mar 17
Mar 24
Mar 31
B
ICU admissions
5.0
2.5
0.0
-2.5
Mar 10
Mar 17
Mar 24
Mar 31
C
Deaths
9
6
3
0
-3
Mar 10
Mar 17
Mar 24
Mar 31
D
Life years lost
80
40
0
-40
Mar 10
Mar 17
Mar 24
Mar 31
E
QALY lost
75
50
25
0
-25
Mar 10
Mar 17
Mar 24
Mar 31
Lockdown date
Prelockdown R
1.1
1.2
1.3
1.4
1.5

Supplementary Figure S10 Impact of the change of the lockdown date on the national number of (A) hospital and (B) ICU admissions, (C) deaths, (D) life years and (E) quality-adjusted life years lost per 100 000 inhabitants compared to the observed lockdown date according to the pre-lockdown value of the reproduction number $R_{prelockdown}$ ranging from 1.1 to 1.5.



Supplementary Figure S11 Diagram of the SARS-CoV epidemiological model



Supplementary Figure S12 Sensitivity analysis on the number of sub-compartments in each compartment of the transmission model



Supplementary Figure S13 Diagram of the care pathway in hospital settings of a hospitalized COVID-19 infected individual

References

1. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, et al. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*. 2020 Aug 13;**584**(7820):257–261.
2. Li Y, Campbell H, Kulkarni D, et al. The temporal association of introducing and lifting non-pharmaceutical interventions with the time-varying reproduction number (R) of SARS-CoV-2: a modelling study across 131 countries. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020 Oct;
3. Post RAJ, Regis M, Zhan Z, Heuvel ER van den. How did governmental interventions affect the spread of COVID-19 in European countries? *BMC Public Health*. 2021 Dec 26;**21**(1):411.
4. Salje H, Tran Kiem C, Lefrancq N, et al. Estimating the burden of SARS-CoV-2 in France. *Science (80-)*. American Association for the Advancement of Science; 2020 Jul 10;**369**(6500):208–211.
5. Cauchemez S, Kiem CT, Paireau J, Rolland P, Fontanet A. Lockdown impact on COVID-19 epidemics in regions across metropolitan France. *Lancet*. 2020 Oct;**396**(10257):1068–1069.
6. Bernard Stoecklin S, Rolland P, Silue Y, et al. First cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in France: surveillance, investigations and control measures, January 2020. *Eurosurveillance*. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control; 2020 Feb 13;**25**(6):2000094.
7. Santé Publique France. Données hospitalières relatives à l'épidémie de COVID-19 [Internet]. [cited 2021 Feb 8]. Available from: https://www.data.gouv.fr/fr/datasets/donnees-hospitalieres-relatives-a-lepidemie-de-covid-19/
8. Roux J, Massonnaud C, Crépey P. COVID-19: One-month impact of the French lockdown on the epidemic burden. *medRxiv*. 2020 Jan 1;2020.04.22.20075705.
9. Sofonea MT, Reyné B, Elie B, et al. Epidemiological monitoring and control perspectives: application of a parsimonious modelling framework to the COVID-19 dynamics in France. *medRxiv*. 2020 Jan 1;2020.05.22.20110593.
10. Bittihn P, Hupe L, Isensee J, Golestanian R. Local measures enable COVID-19 containment with fewer restrictions due to cooperative effects. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2021 Feb;**32**:100718.

11. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria; 2020.

12. Domenico L Di, Pullano G, Sabbatini CE, Boelle P-Y, Colizza V. Impact of lockdown on COVID-19 epidemic in Île-de-France and possible exit strategies. *BMC Med*. 2020;**18**:240.

13. Prague M, Wittkop L, Collin A, et al. Multi-level modeling of early COVID-19 epidemic dynamics in French regions and estimation of the lockdown impact on infection rate. *medRxiv*. 2020 Jan 1;2020.04.21.20073536.

14. Pison G, Meslé F. France 2020: 68,000 excess deaths attributable to COVID-19. *Popul Soc*. 2021;**587**:4.

15. Santé publique France. COVID 19 - Point épidémiologique hebdomadaire du 2 juillet 2020. Saint-Maurice; 2020.

16. Cortinovis M, Perico N, Remuzzi G. Long-term follow-up of recovered patients with COVID-19. *Lancet*. 2021;**397**(10270):173–175.

17. Li C, Romagnani P, Anders H-J. Novel Criteria for When and How to Exit a COVID-19 Pandemic Lockdown. *Front Big Data*. 2020 Jul 24;**3**.

18. Kirby T. New variant of SARS-CoV-2 in UK causes surge of COVID-19. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2021 Feb;**9**(2):e20–e21.

19. Spaccaferri G, Larrieu S, Pouey J, et al. Early assessment of the impact of mitigation measures to control COVID-19 in 22 French metropolitan areas, October to November 2020. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020 Dec 17;**25**(50).

20. Pullano G, Valdano E, Scarpa N, Rubrichi S, Colizza V. Evaluating the effect of demographic factors, socioeconomic factors, and risk aversion on mobility during the COVID-19 epidemic in France under lockdown: a population-based study. *Lancet Digit Heal*. 2020 Dec;**2**(12):e638–e649.

21. Davies N, Klepac P, Liu Y, et al. Age-dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. *Nat Med*. 2020;**26**:1205–1211.

22. Tindale L, Coombe M, Stockdale JE, et al. Transmission interval estimates suggest pre-

symptomatic spread of COVID-19. *medRxiv*. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press; 2020;

23. Li R, Pei S, Chen B, et al. Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science (80-)*. American Association for the Advancement of Science; 2020;**368**(6490):489–493.

24. INSEE. Base de données de la structure de la population en France par âge et sexe issues du recensement INSEE 2016.

25. INSEE. Population légale 2017 en vigueur au 1er janvier 2020.

26. Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact surveys and demographic data. Halloran B, editor. *PLOS Comput Biol*. 2017 Sep 12;**13**(9):e1005697.

27. Courtejoie N, Dubost C-L. Parcours hospitalier des patients atteints de la Covid-19 lors de la première vague de l'épidémie - Les dossiers de la Drees. Paris, France; 2020.

28. INSEE. Tables de mortalité par niveau de vie [Internet]. 2018. Available from: https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/3311422?sommaire=3311425

29. Chevalier J, Pouvourville G de. Valuing EQ-5D using Time Trade-Off in France. *Eur J Heal Econ*. 2013 Feb 21;**14**(1):57–66.

30. Bolker B, R Development Core Team. bbmle: Tools for General Maximum Likelihood Estimation. 2020.