medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

Zero-COVID policy or Living-with-COVID policy? Analysis Based on Percent Excess Mortality

Xiaohan Cao [1], Yan Li [2], Yunlong Zi [3, 4, *], Yuyan Zhu [1, *]

[1] Department of Applied Biology and Chemical Technology, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong, China
[2] Department of Population Health Science and Policy, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY 10029, USA
[3] Thrust of Sustainable Energy and Environment, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou), Nansha, Guangzhou, Guangdong 511400, China
[4] Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Hong Kong SAR, China
***** Corresponding to yuyan.zhu@polyu.edu.hk and ylzi@ust.hk

Abstract:

Background: Since the outbreak of the SARS-CoV-2 variant B.1.1.529 (Omicron) in late 2021, many countries adopted the living-with-COVID (LWC) policy instead of the zero-COVID (ZC) policy to restore pre-COVID-19 normalcy. However, given that the Omicron variant is much more contagious, whether the mortality burden under the LWC policy is tolerable to the society remains under debate.

Methods: In this study, four countries (Singapore, South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand) that have shifted to the LWC policy and one region (Hong Kong) with a significant Omicron outbreak were selected as research objects. Percent excess mortality (PEM), which is the percentage of excess mortality over expected mortality, was selected to assess the effectiveness of different anti-pandemic policies in controlling the mortality burden within the same country/region during the pandemic. In addition, confirmed COVID cases, COVID-associated deaths, percent COVID-excess mortality, expected and observed mortality over time were collected or calculated for further comparisons.

Results: In the examined four countries, PEM fluctuated around 0 and was lower than 10% most of the time under the ZC policy. After shifting to the LWC policy, PEM usually exceeded 10%, and countries with high population density experienced a peak PEM of 20-70%. New Zealand was the only country in our analysis that achieved approximately 10% average PEM during the Omicron outbreak under the LWC policy. Hong Kong, under a specialized ZC policy, attained a significant high PEM during the Omicron outbreak.

Conclusion: Our analysis demonstrated that PEM was significantly higher during the LWC policy period than that during the ZC policy period. Thus, the precondition of the policy transition needs to be cautiously examined, and the current LWC policy should be revised to achieve a lower PEM.

Keywords:

COVID-19; Percent excess mortality; Zero-COVID policy; Living-with-COVID policy

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/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Highlights:

1. Percent excess mortality (PEM) threshold of 10% might be set as a criterion to assess the effectiveness of anti-pandemic policies in controlling the mortality burden
2. Under the current version of living-with-COVID (LWC) policy, countries with a high population density might face a peak PEM of 20-70% and an average PEM of more than 10% during the pandemic outbreaks.
3. Omicron's contribution to PEM was not less than that of Delta within the same country.
4. Ultrahigh vaccination coverage significantly helped New Zealand to control average PEM well during the Omicron outbreak under the LWC policy.
5. PEM can serve as a useful indicator to evaluate the effectiveness of the anti-pandemic policies in controlling the mortality burden.

Abbreviations:

Percent excess mortality	PEM
Percent COVID-excess mortality	PCEM
Zero-COVID	ZC
Living-with COVID	LWC
World Health Organization	WHO

Table abstract:

Summary of percent excess mortality stratified by the zero-COVID policy and the living-with-COVID policy, including peak and average percent excess mortality for SARS-CoV-2 Delta and Omicron variants and their corresponding durations for four countries and one region.

	Zero-COVID policy	Living-with-COVID policy					
		Delta			Omicron		
		Duration	Average	Peak	Duration	Average	Peak
Singapore	0-10%	September - December 2021	24.23%	31.53%	February – March 2022	27.38%	33.94%
South Korea	0-10%	Weeks 44-52, 2021	12.71%	16.57%	Weeks 6-17, 2022	43.40%	76.71%
Australia	0-10%	/	/	/	Weeks 1-7, 2022 (1st)	44.72% (1st)	54.59% (1st)
					Week 8 onwards (2nd)	Data not released (2nd)	Data not released (2nd)
New Zealand	0-10%	/	/	/	Weeks 10-21, 2022	10.24%	16.69%
Hong Kong	0-10% mostly	/	/	/	February-May, 2022	54.06%	102.77%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Introduction:

On November 24, 2021, a new variant of SARS-CoV-2 (B.1.1.529) was reported to the World Health Organization (WHO) by South Africa which was later named Omicron [1]. Since the emergence of the Omicron variant, the world has entered a post-COVID-19 era. Compared with other variants, Delta in particular, Omicron is characterized by its relatively low pathogenicity and high transmissibility [2, 3]. The low pathogenicity considerably reduces the risks of hospitalization and fatality; however, the high transmissibility significantly increases the number of confirmed cases, which in turn, may overwhelm hospitals and cause high mortality in the end. Taken together, whether the mortality burden caused by the Omicron surge is tolerable to the society is unclear.

Besides the evolution of the SARS-Cov-2, with the accelerated vaccination coverage and the emergence of effective antiviral drugs [4-6], the case fatality rate of SARS-CoV-2 virus decreased from 80 times higher than that of influenza in April 2020 to less than 2 times higher than that of influenza in 2022 [7]. Accordingly, some countries, such as Singapore and New Zealand, transitioned step by step from a zero-COVID (ZC) policy to a living-with-COVID (LWC) policy prior to or during the Omicron outbreak [8]. By contrast, some other countries, such as China [7], continue to stick to the ZC policy because of the limited medication resources, the high transmissibility of Omicron and its tendency to escape from vaccine-induced immunity [9, 10]. The ZC policy aims at zero uncontrolled transmission of COVID-19 viruses in a specific geographic region [8] by means of control measures such as COVID mass testing, case quarantine, contact tracing, and border closure [11] to varying degrees depending on their epidemiological situations. Existing evidence showed that the ZC policy could effectively prevent the spread of the virus and significantly reduce the fatality rate by up to 96% [12, 13]. In addition, China kept positive economic growth in 2020 and 2021 under the ZC policy [14], which was not easy considering the worldwide economic hardship [15]. However, the continuation of the ZC policy has its own challenges. Taking China as an example, its current "dynamic ZC" policy is encountering enormous pressure and high costs of disease prevention, especially during the epidemic outbreak in Shenzhen, Jilin Province, and Shanghai in the first half of 2022 [16, 17]. In addition, more stringent prevention and control measures during the pandemic affect the quality of life, which is owing to the decreased social connections caused by mandated lockdowns and socially restrictive physical distancing [18, 19]. However, whether the LWC policy is appropriate to implant in all countries in the Omicron and possibly other evolving variants in the future needs further evaluations.

Mortality rate is considered as an objective indicator to assess the burden of the disease on society and is also the basis for decision-making in the public health [20]. The quantification of COVID-associated deaths varies among countries/regions due to the differences in the definition of “COVID-associated deaths”, such as the calculation of the number of cases that “die from COVID-19” and “die with COVID-19” [21]. Besides COVID-associated deaths, there might also be non-negligible deaths due to insufficient medical resources during the pandemic, which are not included in the statistics of COVID-19 deaths [21]. Thus, COVID-associated deaths alone underestimate the impact of the pandemic. By contrast, all-cause mortality is more robust and objective. To better evaluate the magnitude of COVID-19 and its effects on society, scientists proposed the use of "excess mortality,” which is defined as the net difference between observed mortality and expected mortality [22]. The recent mainstream studies [21-23] focused on comparing excess mortality/percent excess mortality (PEM) and COVID-associated deaths/death rate. These comparisons mainly reflected the differences in the measurements of deaths across countries/regions. However, the impact of different virus variants or different anti-pandemic policies on society within the same country/region has not

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

been evaluated. Therefore, there is a lack of evidence to evaluate the effectiveness of the LWC policy in saving lives during the Omicron era.

Herein excess mortality was employed to evaluate the effectiveness of different policies in protecting the lives of citizens within the same country/region during the pandemic. Based on excess mortality, this study adopted the concept of PEM for assessing the mortality burden attributed to different variants of the virus and different public health policies. PEM is the percentage of excess mortality divided by the threshold [22], which is the expected mortality in this study. Since the SARS-COV-2 variant and the vaccination rate were the dominant factors in adopting the LWC policy from the ZC policy in many areas, we selected four countries (Singapore, South Korea, Australia, New Zealand) and one region (Hong Kong) as the representative research objects. The four countries implemented the LWC policy during the Delta/Omicron era, while Hong Kong experienced an Omicron outbreak under a specialized ZC policy. The influence of natural fluctuation in expected mortality each year was eliminated via linear regression. This analysis focused on the changes in PEM within the same country/region over the entire pandemic period. Our results revealed that PEM is an important indicator to evaluate the mortality burden posed on society and as an important reference for future policy-making.

Methods:

1. Data Collection

Data on all-cause mortality were obtained for four countries (i.e., Singapore, South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand) and one region (i.e., Hong Kong) from governmental sources, including either weekly or monthly mortality data during the pandemic from January 2020 to March 2022 for Singapore, April 2022 (week 17) for South Korea, March 2022 (week 12) for Australia, June 2022 (week 24) for New Zealand and April 2022 for Hong Kong. Details were listed in Table 1. In addition, data on confirmed cases and COVID-associated deaths of four countries and one region were extracted from Google's COVID map (originally from Johns Hopkins University) [24].

Table 1: Source of all-cause mortality data by countries/regions and the time period selection for calculating expected mortality/ PEM.

Countries/Regions	Source	Time Unit	Time Period Used to Estimate Expected Mortality	Time Period Used to Calculate PEM	URL
Singapore	Singapore Deaths By Ethnic Group And Sex, Monthly [25]	Month	January 2009 – December 2019	January 2020 – March 2022	https://tablebuilder.singstat.gov.sg/table/TS/M810121
South Korea (i.e. Republic of Korea)	South Korea Human Mortality Database Short-term Mortality Fluctuations (STMF) [26]	Week	Week 1, 2010 – Week 52, 2019	Week 1, 2020 – Week 17, 2022	https://mpidr.shinyapps.io/stmortality/

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Australia	Australia Human Mortality Database Short-term Mortality Fluctuations (STMF) [26]	Week	Week 1, 2015 – Week 52, 2019	Week 1, 2020 – Week 12, 2022	https://mpidr.shinyapps.io/stmortality/
New Zealand	New Zealand Human Mortality Database Short-term Mortality Fluctuations (STMF) [26]	Week	Week 1, 2011 – Week 52, 2019	Week 1, 2020 – Week 24, 2022	https://mpidr.shinyapps.io/stmortality/
Hong Kong	Hong Kong Monthly Digest of Statistics [27]	Month	January 2009 – December 2019	January 2020 – April 2022	https://www.censtatd.gov.hk/en/EIndexbySubject.html?pcode=B1010002&scode=460

2. Calculation of expected mortality

Expected mortality is defined as deaths that occurred in a period assuming there is no pandemic and is estimated based on the past trends of all-cause mortality. This study adopted the linear regression method to estimate expected mortality. Data on all-cause mortality were obtained for four countries (i.e. Singapore, South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand) and one region (i.e. Hong Kong) from 2009 to 2019. Firstly, we examined different periods of the death data ranging from 2009 to 2019 and employed linear regression analysis. Only the data period with R^2 larger than 0.85 in the linear regression analysis was selected for further calculation (Table 1). Next, within the selected period, linear regression analysis was performed on the data of the corresponding week/month to calculate the expected mortality during the pandemic. For example, the death data of Januarys from 2009 to 2019 in Singapore were analyzed with linear regression to calculate the expected mortality in January 2021 and 2022.

3. Calculation of excess mortality and PEM

Based on expected mortality, excess mortality was calculated using the equation below:

$$\text{Excess mortality} = \text{Observed mortality} - \text{Expected mortality} \text{ [22]}$$

Accordingly, PEM was calculated using the equation below:

$$\text{PEM} = \left(\frac{\text{Excess mortality}}{\text{Expected mortality}}\right) \times 100\% \text{ [22]}$$

4. Calculation of percent COVID-excess mortality (PCEM)

PCEM is defined as the percentage of COVID-associated deaths divided by expected mortality. Data on COVID-associated deaths were obtained from Google's COVID map (originally from Johns Hopkins University) [24]. PCEM was calculated using the equation below:

$$\text{PCEM} = \left(\frac{\text{COVID-associated deaths}}{\text{Expected mortality}}\right) \times 100\%$$

By comparing PCEM with PEM, we can see the contribution of COVID-associated deaths to the overall excess mortality during the pandemic period.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Results:

1. **Singapore:** PEM in Singapore under the ZC policy fluctuated around 0 and did not exceed 10%. After shifting to the LWC policy, PEM reached over 10% with the average of 24.23% and 27.38% in response to the Delta and the Omicron variant, respectively.

Singapore had a total population of 5.69 million as of June 2020 [28] and a population density of 8019 people per square kilometer [29]. From January 2020 to July 2021, Singapore effectively implemented the ZC policy, and the total number of deaths from COVID was only 37 (Figure 1A). In August 2021, Singapore announced the implementation of the LWC policy [30]. Since then, it experienced two rounds of COVID-19 outbreaks. The first one was the Delta epidemic from September to December 2021, with a daily increase of more than 3,000 confirmed cases and 10-15 COVID-associated deaths daily at the peak (Figure 1A); the second COVID outbreak was the Omicron epidemic starting from the end of January 2022 with a daily increase of 17,000-19,000 confirmed cases but only about 10 daily COVID-associated deaths at the peak (Figure 1A). Omicron-associated cases and deaths declined in late April 2022 but resurged in May 2022 and continued to increase slightly. These above low COVID-associated death data posed Singapore as the world model for handling the COVID pandemic. However, the definition of COVID-associated deaths varies from country to country. When PEM was used to evaluate the total mortality burden under the LWC policy, the analysis as shown below suggested a different conclusion.

Using the monthly mortality data published by the Singapore government [25], a PEM curve from January 2020 to March 2022 was obtained and shown in Figure 1B. PEM in Singapore under the ZC policy before August 2021 fluctuated around 0 and did not exceed 10%. After shifting to the LWC policy in August 2021 [30], Singapore encountered the Delta outbreak. Peak PEM was as high as 31.53%, and the average during the Delta outbreak (September - December 2021) was 24.23% (Figure 1B). The Omicron outbreak began in late January 2022. PEM peaked at 33.94% in March 2022, with an average value of 27.38% (February - March 2022) (Figure 1B). Data on all-cause mortality after March 2022 have not been released by the Singapore government. The current data showed that PEM increased greatly after the policy transition. Furthermore, PCEM curve was significantly lower than PEM curve (Figure 1B), suggesting a good number of deaths were caused by COVID indirectly under the LWC policy. It may be attributed to the overwhelmed medical resources or the under-quantification of COVID-associated deaths. Also, as shown in Figure 1C, the mortality burden, indicated by the difference between observed mortality and expected mortality, rose drastically under the LWC policy. Collectively, the LWC policy in Singapore in the examined period failed to control the mortality burden well.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Figure 1



Figure 1 COVID-19 pandemic and mortality statistics in Singapore. (A) SARS-CoV-2 confirmed cases (black) and COVID-associated deaths (blue) from January 22, 2020, to July 4, 2022 [24]. (B) PEM (monthly) from January 2020 to March 2022 and PCEM (monthly) during the LWC policy period from August 2021 to March 2022. The dotted line is the 10% PEM/PCEM line. (C) Expected mortality and observed mortality from January 2020 to March 2022.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

2. **South Korea:** PEM in South Korea under the ZC policy fluctuated around 0, and most of the time, it did not exceed 10%. After shifting to the LWC policy, PEM exceeded 10% and averaged at 11.32% and 43.40% in response to the Delta and the Omicron variant, respectively.

South Korea had a population of 51.83 million as of November 1st, 2020 [31] and a population density of 532 people per square kilometer [32]. From January 2020 to November 2021, South Korea implemented the ZC policy, and the total number of COVID-19 confirmed cases and the total number of COVID-associated deaths were 368,000 and 2,874, respectively (Figure 2A). On November 1, 2021, South Korea declared to live with COVID [33]. Since then, South Korea experienced a wave of Delta outbreak from November to December 2021, with more than 7,000 daily confirmed cases and 70-80 COVID-associated deaths daily at the peak (Figure 2A). Later from February to May 2022, South Korea faced a wave of Omicron outbreak. The daily confirmed cases were about 400,000 and the daily COVID-associated deaths were 350-400 at the peak (Figure 2A).

Using the weekly mortality data in South Korea provided by the Human Mortality Database (which has been collated with the data published by the Korean government) [26], a PEM curve from January 2020 to April 2022 (week 1, 2020 - week 17, 2022) was obtained and shown in Figure 2B. PEM in South Korea under the ZC policy from January 2020 to November 1, 2021 (week 1, 2020 - week 44, 2021) fluctuated around 0, and most of the time, it did not exceed 10%. After transitioning to the LWC policy on November 1st, 2021 [33], South Korea encountered the Delta outbreak. PEM peaked at 16.57% in December 2021 (week 49, 2021), and the average was about 12.71% in November and December 2021 (weeks 44-52, 2021). Statistically, South Korea performed better than Singapore in Delta prevention under the LWC policy. However, considering the high population density in Singapore, the policies in the two countries cannot be compared by statistics only.

PEM in South Korea fell below 0% in January 2022 （Figure 2B. It could be partially due to the decline of COVID-associated death with the temporary pandemic recession, and possibly due to the limitation in estimating expected mortality for January 2022. Notably, South Korea had a significantly large number of deaths in January 2018, which exceeded 7,000 per week, whereas the number of deaths was less than 6,000 per week in January in years prior to 2018 [26]. Thus, a large number of deaths in January 2018 shifted the fitting curve upwards and increased the estimation of expected mortality. Later from February 2018 until the beginning of the pandemic, South Korea's death toll remained to be similar to that in the previous years. The reason for the sudden increase in the number of deaths in January 2018 remains unknown. If the average number of weekly deaths in January 2019-2021 was used to calculate expected mortality, PEM in January 2022 was still below 10%. Thus, the mortality burden in January 2022 is comparable to that under ZC policy.

The Omicron outbreak occurred from February to May 2022. PEM peaked at about 76.71% in February 2022 (week 12, 2022), and the average was 43.40% from February to April 2022 (weeks 6-17, 2022). Analysis of PEM in months beyond April 2022 was unavailable until the government's further release of data on all-cause mortality. The current data showed that PEM increased greatly after the policy transition. Furthermore, PECM curve was significantly lower than PEM curve during the Omicron outbreak (Figure 2B), suggesting that a good number of deaths were caused by COVID indirectly under the LWC policy when encountering the Omicron variant. It might be attributed to the overwhelmed medical resources or the underquantification of COVID-associated deaths. In addition, as shown in Figure 2C, the mortality burden, indicated by the difference between observed mortality and expected mortality, rose drastically under the LWC policy during the Omicron outbreak. Collectively,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

the LWC policy in South Korea in the examined period failed to control the mortality burden well, especially in response to the Omicron variant.

Figure 2



Figure 2 COVID-19 pandemic and mortality statistics in South Korea. (A) SARS-CoV-2 confirmed cases (black) and COVID-associated deaths (blue) from January 22, 2020, to July 4, 2022 [24]. (B) PEM (weekly) from week 1, 2020 to week 17, 2022 and PCEM (weekly) during the LWC policy period from week 44, 2021 to week 17, 2022. The dotted line is the 10% PEM/PCEM line. (C) Expected mortality and observed mortality from week 1, 2020 to week 17, 2022.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

3. **Australia:** PEM in Australia under the ZC policy fluctuated around 0, and most of the time, it did not exceed 10%. After shifting to the LWC policy, PEM reached an average of 41.79% while encountering the Omicron variant.

Australia had a population of 25.7 million as of June 30, 2020 [34], and a population density of 3 people per square kilometer [35]. From January 2020 to October 11, 2021, Australia effectively implemented the ZC policy. The total confirmed cases of COVID-19 were 131,000, and the total COVID-associated deaths were 1,461 (Figure 3A). On October 11, 2021, Australia announced the beginning of the LWC policy [36], which coincided with the Delta outbreak, leading to a daily increase of more than 2,000 confirmed cases and a daily COVID-associated deaths of 10-15 (Figure 3A). Since then, Australia experienced two waves of Omicron outbreaks. The first wave lasted from the end of December 2021 to mid-February 2022, with more than 100,000 confirmed cases per day (Figure 3A) and more than 80 COVID-associated deaths per day. The second wave started at the end of February 2022 while the first wave had not completely subsided. During the second wave of Omicron, there was a daily increase of more than 50,000 confirmed cases and a large fluctuation of daily COVID-associated deaths of about 20-50 (Figure 3A).

Using the Australian weekly death data provided by the Human Mortality Database (which has been collated with the data published by the Australian government) [26], a PEM curve from January 2020 to April 2022 (week 1, 2020 – week 16, 2022) was obtained and shown in Figure 3B. Australia only published data on all-cause mortality for 2015-2019, and the annual death data fluctuated significantly, so it was impossible to perform any effective linear fitting. Therefore, in this study, the average number of yearly deaths for 2016-2019 was used as the estimation of expected mortality. As shown in Figure 3B, PEM in Australia under the ZC policy before October 11, 2021 (week 41, 2021) fluctuated around 0 and was below 10% most of the time. After transitioning to the LWC policy on October 11, 2021 [36], Australia experienced a wave of Omicron outbreak beginning in late December 2021, and PEM rose to nearly 10% in the last two weeks of 2021. As Australia continued its LWC policy, the impact of Omicron was significantly enhanced with a peak PEM at about 54.59% in January 2022 (week 3, 2022) and an average of 44.72% from January and mid-February 2022 (weeks 1-7, 2022). Data on all-cause mortality during the second Omicron outbreak were not released. The current data showed that PEM increased greatly after the policy transition. Furthermore, PCEM curve was significantly lower than PEM curve (Figure 3B), suggesting that a good number of deaths were caused by COVID indirectly under the LWC policy. It might be attributed to the overwhelmed medical resources or the underquantification of COVID-associated deaths. In addition, as shown in Figure 3C, the mortality burden, indicated by the difference between observed mortality and expected mortality, rose drastically under the LWC policy. Collectively, the LWC policy in Australia before April 2022 failed to control the mortality burden well.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Figure 3



Figure 3 COVID-19 pandemic and mortality statistics in Australia. (A) SARS-CoV-2 confirmed cases (black) and COVID-associated deaths (blue) from January 22, 2020, to July 4, 2022 [24]. (B) PEM (weekly) from week 1, 2020 to week 16, 2022 and PCEM (weekly) during the LWC policy period from week 41, 2021 to week 16, 2022. The dotted line is the 10% PEM/PCEM line. (C) Expected mortality and observed mortality from week 1, 2020 to week 16, 2022.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

4. **New Zealand:** PEM in New Zealand under the ZC policy fluctuated around 0, and most of the time, it did not exceed 10%. After shifting to the LWC policy, PEM averaged at 10.24% in response to the Omicron variant.

New Zealand had a population of 5.09 million as of June 2020 [37] and a population density of 19 people per square kilometer [38]. From January 2020 to November 2021, New Zealand effectively implemented the ZC policy. The total confirmed cases were nearly 120,000, and the total COVID-associated deaths were 44 during this ZC policy period (Figure 4A). On December 3, 2021, New Zealand implemented the LWC policy [39]. Then it encountered the Omicron outbreak in February 2022, with more than 20,000 daily confirmed cases (Figure 4A) and 10-20 daily COVID-associated deaths.

Using the weekly death data in New Zealand provided by the Human Mortality Database (which has been collated with the data published by the New Zealand government) [26], a PEM curve from January 2020 to June 2022 was obtained and shown in Figure 4B. PEM under the ZC policy before December 2021 fluctuated around 0 and remained below 10%. After transitioning to the LWC policy on December 3, 2021 [39], New Zealand experienced a relatively long period of a steady phase from December 2021 (week 49) to late-February 2022 (week 9) until the beginning of the Omicron outbreak. Starting in week 10 in 2022, PEM exceeded 10% and continued to rise to a peak at about 16.69% in week 12. The average PEM during the Omicron outbreak (weeks 10-21, 2022) was about 10.24%.

In our analysis, New Zealand is the only country that achieved approximately 10% average PEM during Omicron outbreak under the LWC policy, which might be a result of the ultrahigh vaccination rate, especially among the elderly, as 95% of those aged ⩾60 years had received at least two doses [40]. There was no significant difference between PCEM curve and PEM curve (Figure 4B), suggesting that data on COVID-associated deaths well reflected the mortality burden attributed to COVID-19. Furthermore, as shown in Figure 4C, the mortality burden, as indicated by the difference between observed mortality and expected mortality, remained largely unchanged even during the policy transition period. Collectively, the LWC policy in New Zealand in the examined period acceptably succeeded in controlling the mortality burden.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Figure 4



Figure 4 COVID-19 pandemic and mortality statistics in New Zealand. (A) SARS-CoV-2 confirmed cases (black) and COVID-associated deaths (blue) from January 22, 2020, to July 4, 2022 [24]. (B) PEM (weekly) from week 1, 2020 to week 26, 2022 and PCEM (weekly) during the LWC policy period from week 49, 2021 to week 22, 2022. The dotted line is the 10% PEM/PCEM line. (C) Expected mortality and observed mortality from week 1, 2020 to week 22, 2022.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

5. **Hong Kong:** PEM under the ZC policy before 2022 fluctuated around 0 and remained below 10% most of the time. However, during the outbreak of the Omicron variant, PEM was 55.81% on average.

Hong Kong had a population of 7.474 million as of December 2020 [41] and a population density of 7,126 people per square kilometer [42]. Hong Kong has implemented the ZC policy since January 2020. Before Omicron struck at the beginning of February 2022, Hong Kong underwent a period of a stationary state of the pandemic with total confirmed cases of nearly 15,000 and total COVID-associated deaths of 213 (Figure 5A), proving the effectiveness of the ZC policy. Then, from February to the end of April 2022, Hong Kong experienced a major wave of Omicron outbreak, with over 1.2 million confirmed cases and more than 9000 COVID-associated deaths in total (Figure 5A).

Using the monthly death data published by the Hong Kong government for analysis [27], a PEM curve from January 2020 to May 2022 was obtained and shown in Figure 5B. PEM under the ZC policy before February 2022 fluctuated around 0 and remained below 10% most of the time. The periods with about 20% PEM mainly corresponded to several waves of SARS-CoV-2 in the first two years of the pandemic. Considering the high population density in Hong Kong, the containment measures against COVID-19 executed by the government before February 2022 were acceptable. However, the fifth wave of the Omicron variant breached the long streak of the stationary phase with a peak PEM of 102.77% in March 2022. Data on all-cause mortality from June 2022 onwards were still unavailable from the government website. Even under the ZC policy, Hong Kong failed to control the spread of the Omicron variant. The Omicron surge could be attributed to its high population density, the low vaccination rate among the elderly [40], the high contagious variant, and increased social mixing during the lunar new year. The outbreak in Hong Kong aroused endless debates on the ZC policy and its effectiveness in preventing a variant as contagious as Omicron. The current data showed that PEM increased greatly after the occurrence of the Omicron outbreak. Furthermore, PCEM curve was significantly higher than PEM curve in February and March 2022 (Figure 5B), suggesting that a good number of reported COVID-associated deaths might be overreported. It might be because Hong Kong counted patients who "died with COVID" into the pool of "COVID-associated deaths". Also, as shown in Figure 5C, the mortality burden, indicated by the difference between observed mortality and expected mortality, rose drastically during the Omicron outbreak. Collectively, the specialized ZC policy in Hong Kong was unsuccessful in controlling the mortality burden during Omicron outbreak.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Figure 5



Figure 5 COVID-19 pandemic and mortality statistics in Hong Kong. (A) SARS-CoV-2 confirmed cases (black) and COVID-associated deaths (blue) from January 22, 2020, to July 4, 2022 [24]. (B) PEM (monthly) in Hong Kong from January 2020 to May 2022 and PCEM (monthly) from January 2022 to May 2022. The dotted line is the 10% PEM/PCEM line. (C) Expected mortality and observed mortality from January 2020 to May 2022.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Discussion:

The goal of this study is to delineate a threshold of PEM as a criterion to assess the effectiveness of different anti-pandemic policies. During the implementation of the ZC policy, PEM in various countries did not exceed 10% most of the time. Occasionally it fluctuated around 10% for a short time and then quickly declined. After shifting to the LWC policy, PEM increased significantly and exceeded 10%. Thus, when PEM is kept roughly at or below 10%, the mortality burden during the COVID pandemic could be considered acceptable to the general public, government officials, and health care professionals, etc. Therefore, the PEM threshold of 10% might be set as a criterion to assess the effectiveness of anti-pandemic policies in controlling the mortality burden. Furthermore, the policy makers are suggested to control the PEM within 10% during outbreaks.

The four countries analyzed in this study can be classified into two groups: Singapore and South Korea, which are high in population density, influenced by Confucian culture, and are located in the northern hemisphere, as group A; while Australia and New Zealand, which are low in population density, influenced by Anglo-Saxon culture and are located in the southern hemisphere, as group B. Countries in group A dealt with both Delta and Omicron variants while those in Group B only dealt with the Omicron variant. Peak PEM in Group A was 16-30% and 30-70% in response to the Delta variant and the Omicron variant, respectively. Regarding countries in Group B and their responses to the Omicron variant, Australia had a PEM of about 10% at the beginning of the outbreak, which later exceeded 10% and reached over 50%. New Zealand maintained a low average PEM of almost 10%, with a peak of 16.69%. Collectively, it is relatively challenging for Group A countries to control the PEM below 10% during the Omicron era. From the mortality burden standpoint, the LWC policy during omicron outbreaks is suggested to tighten the restrictions in Group A countries/regions. While for Group B countries, New Zealand set a good model of exercising LWC policy during omicron outbreaks, which could be learned by other countries/regions with low population density.

PEM during the omicron outbreak was not less than that during Delta outbreaks in Group A countries (Figure 1B, 2B). The difference in PEM in response to the Omicron variant between Group A and New Zealand was mainly due to differences in population density [43]. In addition, the higher PEM in Group A countries can be largely attributed to the following factors. First, influenced by the Confucian culture, multigenerational households are more common, which lead to over-crowdedness and increase the risk of COVID-19 transmission and infection [44]. Second, more activities and interactions occur among humans in the northern hemisphere than southern one. Third, the northern hemisphere was experiencing winter during the Omicron outbreak, which was associated with a surge of COVID-19 infections and deaths [45]. Such association can be attributed to biological factors, including the susceptibility of COVID viruses to heat and UV-radiation [46, 47], and behavioral factors, such as the tendency of having more gatherings in crowded indoor areas in cold weather.

As a particular case, Hong Kong was also included in the study. It has been implementing a ZC policy throughout the entire period of the pandemic. As shown by statistics, Hong Kong performed well in the first two years of the pandemic; however, in response to the Omicron variant, it experienced a deadly outbreak. A tremendous and sudden increase in confirmed cases and deaths induced a great burden and even breakdown of the medical system. The surge of Omicron in Hong Kong was partially due to a low vaccination coverage, especially among the elderly populations. For those aged 60 years and above, 52% of vaccine-eligible individuals received at least one dose, and 49% received at least two doses, of which only 7% received a booster dose [40]. 96% of COVID-associated deaths during the Omicron outbreak happened to those elders aged ≥ 60 years, while 70% of this age group were unvaccinated [40]. The

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

underlying reasons for the low vaccination rate remained unclear, but it was possibly due to vaccine hesitancy caused by the inefficiency in vaccination promotion and the widespread misunderstandings on the side-effects of COVID vaccines [40, 48]. In addition, the Chinese Lunar new year, which coincided the Omicron outbreak, facilitated the spread of the virus owing to increased gatherings among families and friends, although there were tightened COVID containment measures including shortened dine-in hours and shutdown of public entertainment venues. Also, although both named the "ZC policy", the precautionary measures implemented by Hong Kong were different and less strict than those in mainland China, which might also fail to control the Omicron surge. For example, the Hong Kong never locked down the whole city to prevent imported cases when the local transmission was out of control [49], whereas Shanghai and other megacities in China experienced lockdowns more than one rounds, which successfully contained the spread of the viruses [12]. Nonetheless, PEM threshold of 10% is still applicable to assess the effectiveness of policies in controlling mortality during COVID-outbreaks.

In contrast to the low vaccination coverage in Hong Kong, New Zealand, as the only country with average PEM of 10% during the Omicron outbreak under the LWC policy in our analysis, benefited from the ultrahigh vaccination rate, especially among the elderly (96.5% were fully vaccinated for elders above 60 years old and > 90% were boosted for these above 70 years old) [50]. The vaccination rate of those aged ⩾60 years that received at least two doses was 94% [51], 90% [52], and 97.66% [53] in Singapore, South Korea, and Australia, respectively. In agreement with multiple studies, a high vaccination rate is associated with low excess mortality and is an important indicator of adjusting anti-pandemic policy [54, 55].

Since the emergence of the Omicron variant, there have been endless debates on public health policies. As the majority of countries transitioned to the LWC policy, countries/regions that insisted on the ZC policy were thrust into the limelight. Numerous papers and articles have criticized the authoritarian rules imposed on the general public by the government officials and blamed that the ZC policy lacked basic humanity, without considering the specific local conditions, such as population density, population structure, vaccination coverage, availability of healthcare resources, culture, etc. To ease the evaluation process, we proposed a PEM threshold of 10% as a standard to assess the effectiveness of any anti-pandemic policy from the perspective of whether the mortality burden of the pandemic was tolerable to the society. The analysis of PEM was simple yet efficient and provided a preliminary evaluation of the feasibility of the policy. Although collectively named the LWC policy, the content and stringency highly varied among countries/regions. Thus, it is not a matter of implementing which policy, but rather of rules and regulations that can effectively minimize the mortality burden on society during the pandemic. We suggest that the precondition of policy transition needs to be cautiously examined, and the current LWC policy failed to control the mortality burden well. In addition, as COVID pandemic will continue and the containment measures will be downregulated along the way [56], our analysis of PEM can serve as a reference for future policy making and evaluation.

In addition to the mortality burden, the economy is another main reason for shifting to the LWC policy, given that the ZC policy is tremendously costly with a risk of a collateral economic crisis. Therefore, efforts to combat the COVID-19 pandemic were challenged by a trade-off: whether saving lives or the economy [57]. However, saving lives or saving the economy should not be considered as dueling goals. Instead, strategies like public messaging in adjusting the COVID-19 control measures are suggested to mitigate health and economic losses [58].

There are some limitations in this study. First, in this study, the impact of the pandemic was assessed based on PEM which was calculated using the all-cause mortality reported by official

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

statistics. Therefore, such analysis is not applicable to countries/regions with scarce death registration systems. Second, the validity of all-cause death reports varies across countries, depending on the infrastructure and capacity to record and report mortality. Third, we used either weekly or monthly death data reported on government websites. However, they might not be directly comparable as monthly death reports tended to even out any fluctuations in weekly death reports and resulted in underestimation. Fourth, for simplifying the evaluation, we did not consider the impact of economy on health and mortality in the long run. Studies from other angels like economy and life-quality are needed to help develop appropriate policies during the pandemic.

Conclusion:

In this study, we concluded that PEM threshold of 10% could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of anti-pandemic policies in controlling mortality burden. In addition, we found that PEM during Omicron outbreaks was not less than that during Delta outbreaks, suggesting that Omicron should not be the key reason for policy transition towards LWC. In the long run, the world may eventually have to coexist with the COVID virus. Still, the preconditions of transitioning to a LWC policy need to be examined, and a high vaccination coverage is an important requirement. PEM can serve as a reference, but further research to identify more dimensions to assess the impact of the disease are needed for better policy making and implementation.

Funding sources:

This work was supported by PolyU Internal Funding (#P0030234) to Y.Z.

Notes:

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

Acknowledgements:

We thank Dr. GAO Qi from the Chinese University of Hong Kong and Prof. LU Jian from City University of Hong Kong for the insightful comments and suggestions.

References:

1. *SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.529 (Omicron) Variant - United States, December 1-8, 2021.* MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep, 2021. **70**(50): p. 1731-1734.
2. Suzuki, R., et al., *Attenuated fusogenicity and pathogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant.* Nature, 2022. **603**(7902): p. 700-705.
3. Bálint, G., B. Vörös-Horváth, and A. Széchenyi, *Omicron: increased transmissibility and decreased pathogenicity.* Signal Transduct Target Ther, 2022. **7**(1): p. 151.
4. Fan, H., et al., *The emergence of powerful oral anti-COVID-19 drugs in the post-vaccine era.* Lancet Microbe, 2022. **3**(2): p. e91.
5. Zou, H., et al., *Recent Updates in Experimental Research and Clinical Evaluation on Drugs for COVID-19 Treatment.* Front Pharmacol, 2021. **12**: p. 732403.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

6. Mahase, E., *Covid-19: Pfizer's paxlovid is 89% effective in patients at risk of serious illness, company reports.* Bmj, 2021. **375**: p. n2713.
7. Chen, J.M. and Y.Q. Chen, *China can prepare to end its zero-COVID policy.* Nat Med, 2022.
8. Zhan, Z., J. Li, and Z.J. Cheng, *Zero-Covid Strategy: What's Next?* Int J Health Policy Manag, 2022.
9. Hoffmann, M., et al., *The Omicron variant is highly resistant against antibody-mediated neutralization: Implications for control of the COVID-19 pandemic.* Cell, 2022. **185**(3): p. 447-456.e11.
10. Ai, J., et al., *Omicron variant showed lower neutralizing sensitivity than other SARS-CoV-2 variants to immune sera elicited by vaccines after boost.* Emerg Microbes Infect, 2022. **11**(1): p. 337-343.
11. Skegg, D.C. and P.C. Hill, *Defining covid-19 elimination.* Bmj, 2021. **374**: p. n1794.
12. Cheshmehzangi, A., T. Zou, and Z. Su, *Commentary: China's Zero-COVID Approach Depends on Shanghai's Outbreak Control.* Frontiers in Public Health, 2022. **10**.
13. Burki, T., *China's successful control of COVID-19.* Lancet Infect Dis, 2020. **20**(11): p. 1240-1241.
14. Wan, Z., et al., *Diagnostic strategy of SARS-CoV-2 for containment under China's zero-COVID-19 policy.* J Infect, 2022. **85**(1): p. e7-e9.
15. Habibi, Z., H. Habibi, and M.A. Mohammadi, *The Potential Impact of COVID-19 on the Chinese GDP, Trade, and Economy.* Economies, 2022. **10**(4).
16. China Daily. *China's Effective Anti-pandemic Efforts Bespeak Institutional Strength*. 2022 [cited 2022 June 30]; Available from: https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202205/07/WS6275fdd7a310fd2b29e5b36b.html.
17. Zhang, X., W. Zhang, and S. Chen, *Shanghai's life-saving efforts against the current omicron wave of the COVID-19 pandemic.* Lancet, 2022. **399**(10340): p. 2011-2012.
18. Pietromonaco, P.R. and N.C. Overall, *Applying relationship science to evaluate how the COVID-19 pandemic may impact couples' relationships.* Am Psychol, 2021. **76**(3): p. 438-450.
19. Aknin, L.B., et al., *Policy stringency and mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal analysis of data from 15 countries.* Lancet Public Health, 2022. **7**(5): p. e417-e426.
20. O'Driscoll, M., et al., *Age-specific mortality and immunity patterns of SARS-CoV-2.* Nature, 2021. **590**(7844): p. 140-145.
21. *Estimating excess mortality due to the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic analysis of COVID-19-related mortality, 2020-21.* Lancet, 2022. **399**(10334): p. 1513-1536.
22. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Excess Deaths Associated with COVID-19*. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/vsrr/covid19/excess_deaths.htm#references.
23. Németh, L., D.A. Jdanov, and V.M. Shkolnikov, *An open-sourced, web-based application to analyze weekly excess mortality based on the Short-term Mortality Fluctuations data series.* PLoS One, 2021. **16**(2): p. e0246663.
24. Google News. *Coronavirus (COVID-19)*. 2022; Available from: https://news.google.com/covid19/map?hl=en-US&gl=US&ceid=US%3Aen.
25. Department of Statistics Singapore. *Deaths by Ethnic Group and Sex*. May 9, 2022; Available from: https://tablebuilder.singstat.gov.sg/table/TS/M810121.
26. HMD. Human Mortality Database. Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research (Germany), U.o.C., Berkeley (USA), and French Institute for Demographic Studies (France), . Available from: www.mortality.org.
27. Census and Statistics Department. *Hong Kong Monthly Digest of Statistics*. 2022 [cited 2022 June 13]; Available from: https://www.censtatd.gov.hk/en/EIndexbySubject.html?pcode=B1010002&scode=460.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

28. Division, N.P.a.T. *Population in Brief 2020: Key Trends*. 2021; Available from: https://www.population.gov.sg/media-centre/articles/population-in-brief-2020-key-trends.
29. The World Bank. *Population density (people per sq. km of land area) - Singapore*. 2020 [cited 2022 July 5]; Available from: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.POP.DNST?locations=SG.
30. Ministry of Health, S. *Preparing for Our Transition Towards COVID Resilience* 2021 [cited 2022 June 6]; Available from: https://www.moh.gov.sg/news-highlights/details/preparing-for-our-transition-towards-covid-resilience.
31. Statistics Korea. *Population Census*. 2021; Available from: http://kostat.go.kr/portal/eng/pressReleases/8/7/index.board?bmode=read&bSeq=&aSeq=391585&pageNo=1&rowNum=10&navCount=10&currPg=&searchInfo=&sTarget=title&sTxt=.
32. The World Bank. *Population density (people per sq. km of land area) - The Republic of Korea*. 2020 [cited 2022 June 30]; Available from: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.POP.DNST?locations=KR.
33. Reuters. *S.Korea Eases Curbs, Imposes Vaccine Passports in 'Living with COVID-19' Campaign*. 2021 [cited 2022 July 7]; Available from: https://www.reuters.com/world/asia-pacific/skorea-eases-curbs-imposes-vaccine-passports-living-with-covid-19-campaign-2021-11-01/.
34. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *Profile of Australia's population* 2021; Available from: https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/australias-welfare/profile-of-australias-population.
35. The World Bank. *Population density (people per sq. km of land area) - Australia*. 2020 [cited 2022 July 5]; Available from: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.POP.DNST?locations=AU.
36. Reuters. *'Freedom Day': Sydney Reopens as Australia Looks to Live with COVID-19*. 2021 [cited 2022 July 7]; Available from: https://www.reuters.com/world/asia-pacific/long-100-days-sydney-reopens-australia-looks-live-with-covid-19-2021-10-10/.
37. Stats NZ - Tatauranga Aotearoa. *Estimated Population of NZ*. 2020 [cited 2022 June 29]; Available from: https://www.stats.govt.nz/indicators/population-of-nz.
38. The World Bank. *Population density (people per sq. km of land area) - New Zealand*. 2020 [cited 2022 June 29].
39. The Straits Times. *Nightclubs and Cafes Reopen in Auckland as Marathon Lockdown Ends*. 2021 [cited 2022 July 7]; Available from: https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/australianz/nightclubs-and-cafes-reopen-in-auckland-as-marathon-lockdown-ends.
40. Smith, D.J., et al., *COVID-19 Mortality and Vaccine Coverage - Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China, January 6, 2022-March 21, 2022.* MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep, 2022. **71**(15): p. 545-548.
41. The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region - Press Release. *Year-end Population for 2020*. 2021 [cited 2022 June 30]; Available from: https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202102/18/P2021021800322.htm.
42. The World Bank. *Population density (people per sq. km of land area) - Hong Kong*. 2020 [cited 2022 June 30]; Available from: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.POP.DNST?locations=HK.
43. Díaz Ramírez, M., P. Veneri, and A.C. Lembcke, *Where did it hit harder? Understanding the geography of excess mortality during the COVID-19 pandemic.* J Reg Sci, 2022.
44. Ghosh, A.K., et al., *Association between overcrowded households, multigenerational households, and COVID-19: a cohort study.* Public Health, 2021. **198**: p. 273-279.
45. Chen, S., et al., *Climate and the spread of COVID-19.* Sci Rep, 2021. **11**(1): p. 9042.
46. Chin, A.W.H., et al., *Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental conditions.* Lancet Microbe, 2020. **1**(1): p. e10.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.31.22279422; this version posted September 1, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

47. Buonanno, M., et al., *Far-UVC light (222 nm) efficiently and safely inactivates airborne human coronaviruses.* Sci Rep, 2020. **10**(1): p. 10285.
48. Yuan, S., *Zero COVID in China: what next?* Lancet, 2022. **399**(10338): p. 1856-1857.
49. Cheung, P.H., C.P. Chan, and D.Y. Jin, *Lessons learned from the fifth wave of COVID-19 in Hong Kong in early 2022.* Emerg Microbes Infect, 2022. **11**(1): p. 1072-1078.
50. Manatū Hauora Ministry of Health. *COVID-19: Vaccine Data*. 2022 [cited 2022 May 3]; Available from: https://www.health.govt.nz/covid-19-novel-coronavirus/covid-19-data-and-statistics/covid-19-vaccine-data.
51. Ministry of Health, S. *Vaccination Statistics* 2022 [cited 2022 May 3]; Available from: https://www.moh.gov.sg/covid-19/vaccination/statistics.
52. Our World in Data. *Coronavirus (COVID-19) Vaccinations*. 2022 [cited 2022 May 3]; Available from: https://ourworldindata.org/covid-vaccinations?country=KOR.
53. Australian Government, O.C.S. *COVID-19 Vaccine Roll-Out* 2022 [cited 2022 May 3]; Available from: https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2022/05/covid-19-vaccine-rollout-update-2-may-2022.pdf.
54. Chen, J.M. and Y.Q. Chen, *China can prepare to end its zero-COVID policy.* Nat Med, 2022. **28**(6): p. 1104-1105.
55. Burki, T., *Dynamic zero COVID policy in the fight against COVID.* Lancet Respir Med, 2022. **10**(6): p. e58-e59.
56. Murray, C.J.L., *COVID-19 will continue but the end of the pandemic is near.* Lancet, 2022. **399**(10323): p. 417-419.
57. Lesschaeve, C., J. Glaurdić, and M. Mochtak, *Health versus Wealth during the Covid-19 Pandemic: Saving Lives or Saving the Economy?* Public Opinion Quarterly, 2021. **85**(3): p. 808-835.
58. Nisa, C.F., et al., *Lives versus Livelihoods? Perceived economic risk has a stronger association with support for COVID-19 preventive measures than perceived health risk.* Scientific Reports, 2021. **11**(1): p. 9669.