Title

COVID AMP: An Open Access Database of COVID-19 Response Policies

Authors

Rebecca Katz[1], Kate Toole[1], Hailey Robertson[1], Alaina Case[2], Justin Kerr[2], Siobhan Robinson-Marshall[1], Jordan Schermerhorn[1], Sarah Orsborn[2], Michael Van Maele[2], Ryan Zimmerman[1], Tess Stevens[1], COVID AMP Coding Team[1]*, Alexandra Phelan[1], Colin Carlson[1], Ellie Graeden[1]**

Affiliations

1. Center for Global Health Science and Security, Georgetown University, Washington DC
2. Talus Analytics LLC, Boulder, Colorado

* A full list of members appears in the Author Contributions

**corresponding author(s): Ellie Graeden (Ellie.Graeden@georgetown.edu)

Abstract

As the COVID-19 pandemic unfolded in the spring of 2020, governments around the world began to implement policies to mitigate and manage the outbreak. Significant research efforts were deployed to track and analyse these policies in real-time to better inform the response. While much of the policy analysis focused narrowly on social distancing measures designed to slow the spread of disease, here, we present a dataset focused on capturing the breadth of policy types implemented by jurisdictions globally across the whole-of-government. COVID Analysis and Mapping of Policies (COVID AMP) includes nearly 50,000 policy measures across 152 countries, 124 intermediate areas, and 235 local areas between January 2020 and June 2022. With up to 40 structured and unstructured metadata fields per policy, as well as the original source and policy text, this dataset provides a uniquely broad capture of the governance strategies for pandemic response, serving as a critical data source for future work in legal epidemiology and political science.

Background & Summary

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, governments around the world implemented a range of policies, regulations, and mandates to mitigate transmission, support the economy, and protect population health. Despite targeting similar goals, there was significant heterogeneity in how governments approached policy strategies for the pandemic response, in part because of a dearth of prior policy evidence, an evolving understanding of which governmental actions might effectively protect populations, differing access to resources required for specific policy actions, and mismatched expectations regarding adherence to stringent policies.

Most policy trackers deployed during the pandemic focused on social distancing measures with an emphasis on the ability to assess the effectiveness of these policies in limiting human movement, human-human interaction, and disease spread as quantified by reported cases, hospitalizations, and fatalities for different populations and subpopulations. [1] These efforts, while critical in performing data capture for rapid analysis of the relative value of different social distancing measures, did not capture the full breadth of policy measures implemented, limiting policymakers' ability to assess the impact of these "non-health" policies and the synergistic effects of a more integrated approach to pandemic response. [2]

To address this gap, the COVID Analysis and Mapping of Policies (COVID AMP) database tracked policy responses to COVID-19 around the world between January 2020 and June 2022. We focused on high-volume data collection in real-time during the event, which allowed us to document and retain a historical record of policy changes, even as policy and guidance was being posted and its online record replaced, risking erasure. Data collection prioritized breadth over depth, while including comprehensive data collection for a subset of specific regions and topics to facilitate comparative analysis. The database archives official legal documents and/or policy announcements at the at local, intermediate, and national levels, including metadata such as the dates they were active, tags related to public health and economic relief, and up to 40 other characteristics per policy. The coded metadata are aligned with the key sectors defined during prior outbreaks and established by existing emergency management frameworks, and the breadth of these metadata supports cross-sector and combinatorial analysis of policy impact.

With nearly 50,000 policy measures, regulations, and announcements, COVID AMP provides a new and powerful foundation for secondary analysis to better assess the impact of all policies implemented to manage the pandemic response. Taken together, these data are a critical addition to the body of work describing the policy and governance response to COVID-19 and a significant advancement in how we understand the heterogeneity of policymaking during outbreak response.

Methods

Data Collection

Beginning in April 2020, we identified policies implemented to mitigate and respond to the COVID-19 outbreak from January 2020 through June 2022. Policies were defined broadly and included signed legislation, executive orders, ministry regulations, official press releases, and social media announcements made by verified authorities. We reviewed official government websites, databases, and social media pages to source documents (e.g., public health ministry websites, legislative archives, published press releases) for each jurisdiction.

We collected policies from over 150 countries. For the United States (U.S.) and its territories, we reviewed websites for the state governor's office, Department of Health or comparable agency, and if applicable, the state legislature. Researchers consulted the Politico Pro Legislative Compass Database to identify additional state-levelCOVID-19 legislation. For other countries, researchers identified the primary authorities for health policy and reviewed their official websites for policies. In addition, researchers used search engines for COVID-19 policies in the local language. If the coder was not fluent in the local language of the jurisdiction being collected, Google Translate was used to translate policy documents. The Internet Archive was used to identify policies in circumstances where policies were removed or updated from the original site. [3] Only official government policies issued in direct response to the COVID-19 pandemic were included in the database. In cases where official policy documents were not published, no longer available, or inaccessible from the Internet Archive, we coded the record from social media records, news notices, and policy announcements describing the policy.

Data Structure & Coding Process

As we collected polices, we concurrently and iteratively developed a coding scheme to capture structured and unstructured data related to COVID-19 response policies, balancing an internally-consistent taxonomy with flexibility to describe heterogenous policy environments. Many policies include one-to-many relationships in which a single policy established more than one and often several different directives related to COVID-19 mitigation or response

management. Each row in the dataset represents an individual directive, linked by a unique identifier to the original policy document and coded by the type of policy and the target of policy, as defined as the primary population, location, or entities impacted by the policy or law, in addition to more than 40 additional metadata per directive.

Event response and event-specific mitigation efforts are only one subset of the policies needed to effectively manage and respond to large scale emergencies. [4] The National Response Framework (NRF) in the U.S. lists 12 emergency support functions and leans on a whole-of-government response framework to manage critical functions across transportation, military authorities, manufacturing, supply-chain management, first-responder housing, cross-border licensing issues for critical response personnel (e.g., nurses, electrical lineman), housing authorities, and economic support for those impacted. [5] Building on this cross-sector approach, previously identified and applied in the Georgetown Outbreak Activity Library (https://outbreaklibrary.org/), we identified five categories of policy relevant to the COVID-19 outbreak: (1) Social distancing, (2) Emergency declarations, (3) Travel restrictions, (4) Enabling and relief measures, and (5) Support for public health and clinical capacity. Over the course of data collection, five additional categories emerged from policy analysis that were added to the coding scheme to more accurately capture the range of policy actions available and pull forward specific types of policies as they gained global traction (e.g., variation in vaccination policies): (6) Face mask, (7) Contact tracing and testing, (8) Military mobilization, (9) Authorization and enforcement, and (10) Vaccinations. In addition, 71 subcategories were used to capture the type of policy actions at a more granular level. For example, the social distancing category is composed of subcategories such as “Curfews”, “Event delays or cancellations”, “Alternative election measures”, “Private sector closures”, or “Stay at home.”

As the pandemic unfolded, the policies implemented by governments to manage the response and mitigate impacts evolved. Therefore, categories, subcategories, and targets were adjusted over time to maximize the taxonomy of the dataset for exhaustiveness and usability for secondary analysis. All updates to categories or subcategories were made by consensus of the research team, and backpropagated across existing data to ensure internal consistency. For a full Data Dictionary, see Appendix 1: Table 1.

Comparison to other COVID-19 policy trackers

The COVID-19 pandemic prompted over 200 research and government initiatives aimed at tracking the policies and measures implemented in response to the outbreak. [1] Given the extensive nature of these efforts, a comprehensive evaluation of each one is beyond the scope of this article. However, we summarize the key features of COVID AMP in the context of similar datasets, including OxCGRT [6] and CoronaNet [7], to underscore the unique contributions of this effort.

One of the most significant contributions of the COVID AMP dataset is the breadth of data collected over geography and time. CoronaNet shares a similarly broad scope, identifying 20 “broad policy types” including NPIs, declarations of emergency, travel restrictions, health communication, and some public and private restrictions. [7] OxCGRT has a more limited scope with 19 indicators focused more specifically on containment, health, and economic support policies [6]. In the COVID AMP ontology, these “broad policy types” and “indicators” are equivalent to our concept of “Policy subcategory”, for which we capture 71 unique policy types.

Importantly, in contrast to OxCGRT, we do not assign quantitative values to interpret policy stringency, but instead classified policies as either restricting or relaxing based on the intended effect of the directive on the policy environment at the time of enactment. In doing so, the dataset does not use static quantitative measures of implementation impact, but instead captures a breadth of policy types in the context of which they were issued. This is a marked divergence from other policy trackers, which do not differentiate between restricting or relaxing policies with metrics defining the degree of restrictiveness. [6,7] Therefore, the COVID AMP dataset allows for in-depth analysis not only of the lockdown in response to COVID-19, but also an understanding of how reopening occurred across jurisdictions.

In addition to the type of policy captured, COVID AMP captures geographic, sector, and demographic targets for a more descriptive approach to policy. In OxCGRT, these variables are binary for each of the indicators to simply designate "targeted" or "general." [6] In CoronaNet, the geographic target can be specified with free text, and the demographic target aligns with 11 broad demographic targets or 25 special demographic targets; however, it does not capture sector targets. [7] In contrast to these databases, COVID AMP uses the terms 'authorizing areas' and 'affected areas' to define conditions in which a policy issued by one level of government applies to another geography. For example, the United Kingdom's travel restriction after the Omicron variant was identified in December 2021 targeted six countries. [8] In COVID AMP, this policy would be a single row where the United Kingdom would be the "Authorizing country" and South Africa, Botswana, Lesotho, Eswatini, Zimbabwe, and Namibia would each be listed in the "Affected country" field.

Complementing the geographic targets, the "Policy target" has 73 multi-select options to indicate the populations, sectors, or entities affected by the policy. With nearly 50,000 policies with 40 metadata, the COVID AMP dataset contains over 2 million hand-coded pieces of information without the use of machine learning software. The metadata chosen were designed to ensure a complete historical record of the policies identified and support broad secondary analysis. To our knowledge, COVID AMP is currently the largest and most descriptive policy tracking dataset by number of policies and metadata collected.

COVID AMP's coverage of jurisdictions and dates is similar to that of OxCGRT and CoronaNet. COVID AMP captures policies issued from January 2020 to June 2022, whereas OxCGRT has longer temporal coverage through December 2022 and CoronaNet has more narrow coverage through October 2021. [13, 14] Although OxCGRT and CoronaNet have broader global coverage (184 and 195 countries, respectively) extending to some subnational areas, the COVID AMP dataset captures data from 152 countries, 124 intermediate areas (i.e., states, provinces, etc.), and 235 local areas (i.e., cities, countries, etc.).

Data Records

The COVID AMP library currently contains more than 15,000 individual COVID-19-related documents issued or effective through the period January 2020 to June 2022 (and beyond for select jurisdictions), comprised of nearly 50,000 unique policies from over 150 countries. Figure 1 shows the extent of policy data coverage globally and in the U.S.

This database was specifically designed to capture the breadth of measures applied by different jurisdictions to manage and mitigate the pandemic; therefore, each measure was captured as a separate policy target and categorized by the focus or intent of the policy. Thus, each row in the database represents a uniquely identified policy directive, meaning a single policy document may be captured across many rows. For example, an executive order can

include a stay-at-home order for individuals and mandate non-essential business closures. These policy directives share a single policy name and PDF since they are part of the same larger piece of legislation, but they are captured in different lines with different unique IDs. Extensions of previous policies are also captured as a new row and linked back to the previous policy using unique IDs.

Each policy directive is tagged with a series of descriptive attributes based on a detailed review of the policy language, including the following selection of fields:

209 **Table 1.** Required data fields and definitions

Data field	**Field definition**
Unique ID	A unique identifier associated with data in each row. The data is captured so that each row represents a single policy action, per date issued, per authority, and per area affected.
Attachment for policy	PDF or image of the policy (permanently hosted in Amazon S3 bucket)
Data source for law/policy	URL from which to access the underlying law or policy, may be from the Internet Archive [0]
Policy name	The complete title of the law or policy, including any relevant numerical information
Policy number	A numeric identifier given to each policy release, including capturing co-released policies where applicable. A single policy release may contain multiple directives
Policy description	A written description of the policy and the directive by the researcher
Policy type	The type of policy that is enacted (e.g., executive order, emergency declaration, statute, etc.)
Policy relaxing or restricting	Broad designations about a policy with regard to its intended impact on the policy environment at the time the policy was issued.
Policy category	Categorization of the overall scope of the policy directive (e.g., social distancing, emergency declarations, travel restrictions, enabling and relief measures, support for public health and clinical capacity, contact tracing/testing, military mobilization, face masks)
Policy subcategory	Detailed information about the intention of the policy (e.g., face coverings, quarantine, private sector closures, school closures, etc.)
Policy target	The primary population, location, sector, or entities impacted by the policy or law (e.g., restaurants/bars, nursing homes and/or assisted living, essential workers, suspected cases, etc.)
Authorizing level of government	The level of government that authorized and/or issued the policy (e.g., global entity, country, intermediate area, local area, tribal nation)
Authorizing body	The office of the authorizing entity who issued the policy (e.g., governor, mayor, health official, president, city council, etc.)
Authorizing country name	The name of the country in which the authorizing entity is located
Affected country name	The name of the country to which the policy applies, if different from the country from which the policy was enacted
Issued date	The date on which the policy was initially announced and/or issued
Effective start date	Date on which the policy took effect or was enacted

Anticipated end date	The date on which the directive specified in the policy was intended to end
Actual end date	The data on which the directive specified in the policy was terminated, replaced, or extended

A comprehensive Data Dictionary describing each of the 40 metadata fields is available in Appendix 1: Table 1.

Figure 2 shows the distribution of policies by category over time, globally and within the U.S. Both globally and in the U.S., the greatest number of policies were initiated in April 2020; "Social distancing" was the predominant category of policies enacted by governments over the course of the pandemic, followed by "Enabling and relief measures" and "Support for public health and clinical capacity."

In conducting analysis, users should expect to see a broad, representative sample of the heterogenous policies implemented over the course of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the COVID AMP dataset is not a complete global historical record. To the best of our knowledge, the dataset contains a comprehensive set of policies implemented for each of the U.S. states, Puerto Rico, and Guam from January 2020 to June 2022, with over 19,000 policies captured at the national and state level in these jurisdictions. Researchers also documented many policies for U.S. counties (approximately 8,000) and tribal areas (approximately 1,400) with comprehensive coverage for California, Washington D.C., Maryland, Nevada, and Virginia.

For the additional 150+ countries for which we have collected data, more than 40 countries have 100+ policies coded, though this does not necessarily imply complete or comprehensive coverage for those countries. For jurisdictions other than the U.S. and its territories, there is generally better policy coverage at the national level as opposed to the intermediate area levels (e.g., state, province, etc.). Due to variations in legal systems, the significance of the total number of policies varies by state and country. For example, many entities regularly renewed the emergency authority of the health department or governor, thus renewing the same policies regularly. Policy totals tend to reflect variation in governance structure and method more than stringency or effectiveness of the policy response.

Technical Validation

Given the frequency and scale of data collection, the research team implemented a combination of manual and automated quality assurance and control (QA/QC) processes to check and correct the data. The manual QA/QC process involved a lead researcher who reviewed data for typographical errors, ensured inter-coder reliability, and confirmed record completion. Completed records included all fields specified in the "Data Records" section; records with missing fields were flagged for review and excluded until corrected. The fields, "Anticipated end date" and "Actual end date" were exceptions, as many policies did not specify the intended end date or were ongoing during data collection. Policies for which the end date is not provided may still be in place or permanent or the end date for the policy was not publicly documented. As of writing, approximately 50% of policies have an "Anticipated end date" and 70% have an "Actual end date."

In addition to manual review, automated QA/QC was applied to clean and standardize the data. Drop-down lists, with easily accessible data definitions and glossaries, were used to standardize coding selections, prevent typos, and reduce discrepancies. The Dedupe extension in Airtable was used to find and manage duplicate records based on policies with identical issued/effective start dates, authorizing/affected areas, and data sources. Where a duplicate was identified, the lead researcher merged the information from the two records, selecting the correct information from each if discrepancies in coding existed. Python (3.7.0) was used

to filter incomplete records out of the final dataset view, assign policy numbers, and standardly format dates and country names for ease of use in secondary analysis.

Usage Notes

From the implementation of mask mandates to the reduction of prison populations and alternate measures of voting during elections, the COVID AMP library contains a wide array of policy documents that historians, legal experts, economists, and epidemiologists can analyze to assess and compare the effectiveness of COVID-19 outbreak responses around the world. Pairing this tool with epidemiological data supports the evaluation of policy effectiveness and how that success relates to the affected population, authorizing entity, health infrastructure, and other extenuating factors. We also hope that this library will support policymakers in future outbreaks by providing canonical examples of policies from countries and states that had different outcomes during the pandemic.

Example Analysis

The data collected in COVID AMP provides researchers with valuable insights to understand how policy is used to respond to a global pandemic and inform policy response for the next. Figure 3 offers a visual representation of the progression of restricting and relaxing policy types over time in comparison to caseload for the U.S. We identify two informative patterns about the pandemic response in the U.S. First, despite initial concerns about the Omicron variant, the corresponding response was commensurate with that of the early days of the pandemic, where policies were primarily restrictive and gradually relaxed. Second, Figure 3 shows that restrictive policies typically preceded outbreaks by 1-2 months, highlighting the importance of global early warning systems in curbing transmission. These initial insights emphasize the importance of early and effective policy implementation, and support further use of the COVID AMP dataset to strengthen the evidence base for decision-making.

The granularity of the COVID AMP database allows for disaggregation and analysis by broad category of policy enacted, as shown in the bottom panel of Figure 3. This analysis highlights the need for nuanced policy making that includes both restricting and relaxing measures not only for policies such as face masks and social distancing, but for authorization and enforcement policies. This analysis also highlights the degree to which different categories are not clearly structured around restrictions, but instead are focused on a whole-of-government, coordinated response. Using “issued date”, “effective start date”, “anticipated end date”, and “actual end date”, as coded within COVID AMP, policymakers can use this type of analysis to evaluate when decisions were made to initially implement a policy, when the policy took effect, and the pattern by which policies were relaxed, renewed, or terminated.

COVID AMP also supports analysis of the intended targets of each policy implemented, as shown in Figure 4. For example, economists could use the data to assess specific policy types, such as “Regulatory relief”, to analyse which sectors received which types of support, and compare effects across jurisdictions and sectors. Using the date each policy was issued and became effective, analysts could, for example, assess how stock prices reacted to regulatory relief announcements. For education officials, the COVID AMP data could be combined with school test scores to understand how the timing of school closures, reopening, and distance learning impacted students’ educational performance. Public health researchers could use the data to identify a specific population, such as “Homeless shelters and individuals” and determine which policy types were (or were not) targeted toward the population, and whether it met community needs. With the ability to cross-reference policy subcategories and targets,

COVD AMP enables researchers from various fields to conduct more nuanced analyses of the impact of policies on their area of interest, whether that is a sector, population, or policy type, and encourages policy innovation for the future.

Published Research Using COVID AMP

As a library of policies collected in near real-time and continuously evolving throughout the pandemic, COVID AMP allows users to identify and access policies of interest in addition to the original text of the policy as a raw text file or PDF stored in an Amazon S3 bucket. These data can then be used to perform secondary data transformation as needed for derivative analysis. The COVID AMP dataset does not prescribe research-side assumptions such as policy stringency or policy levels to the data with the specific intent of supporting broader cross-disciplinary downstream use. The value of this approach is demonstrated by Page-Tan & Corbin (2021), who used COVID AMP data to define unique parameters of restrictiveness to test four different policy scenarios in states and localities with high social vulnerability scores using propensity score matching. [9] Additional studies used COVID AMP to validate parameter assumptions for models about the timing of intervention implementation [10, 11]. Others have used COVID AMP to analyse global differences in response strategies to the Omicron variant through specific focus on travel restrictions [8], access archived public health measures from governments, trace the progression of policy, and evaluate the role of institutions [12, 13], and assess the benefits of mask-wearing at the county-level. [14] These studies highlight the ease of use of the database and suggest that significant future work could continue to make use of COVID AMP to ask new questions about the Covid-19 pandemic.

Code Availability

COVID AMP data are available via an application programming interface (API) and are licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY Standard at: https://api.covidamp.org/docs.

We provide a public, interactive web interface for visual exploration of the dataset at: https://covidamp.org/. Within the site, data is available at: https://covidamp.org/data?type=policy. This page allows for download of the full dataset or filtered subsets of the data. Additionally, documentation of the methods, including a data dictionary and glossary, are available at: https://covidamp.org/about/doc.

In addition to this manuscript, a static version of the COVID AMP database itself can be cited directly as Zenodo DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7829169.

As of the time of submission, we have stopped policy collection for the COVID AMP dataset. All policies and directives coded within the dataset have been reviewed and technically validated. We plan to continue to host the dataset on the project website to ensure ongoing access to this resource. We hope that the dataset will support research efforts aimed at improving pandemic response strategies and inform future outbreak policy analysis.

Acknowledgements

Funding for COVID AMP provided by Rockefeller Foundation, NTI Bio, and Georgetown University.

Author contributions

Rebecca Katz conceived of the idea, designed and managed data collection, provided subject matter expertise and guidance, and reviewed the manuscript.

Ellie Graeden conceived of the idea, designed and managed data collection, provided subject matter expertise, led design and build of the data platform, and drafted the manuscript.

Kate Toole helped draft the manuscript, managed data entry, trained coders, performed QA/QC, and performed analysis.

Hailey Robertson helped draft the manuscript, performed QA/QC, prepared the dataset for publication, performed analysis, and produced visualizations.

Alaina Case managed data entry, trained coders, contributed to design of the data platform, user interface, and web access for the data.

Justin Kerr contributed to design and build of the data platform, user interface, and web access for the data, and served as subject matter expert on data structure.

Siobhan Robinson-Marshall managed data entry, trained coders, and performed QA/QC.

Jordan Schermerhorn managed data entry, trained coders, and performed QA/QC.

Sarah Orsborn managed data entry, trained coders, and performed QA/QC.

Michael Van Maele contributed to design and built the online data platform, user interface, and web access for the data.

Ryan Zimmerman contributed to design and built the online data platform.

Tess Stevens designed the data platform, user interface, and web access for the data.

Alexandra Phelan contributed to project conception and provided legal guidance.

Colin Carlson provided input on data visualization.

The **COVID AMP Coding Team** identified policy sources, reviewed and coded policies, and performed QA/QC. Team members include:
Yasser Omar Abdellatif, Omolara Adekunle, Saba Alfred, Madison Alvarez, Ariyand Aminpour, Jennifer Ayres, Alice Bolandhemat, Matthew Boyce, Anjali Britto, Josephine Bryar, Sophia Byrne, Andrea Cano, Ethan Cantrell, Tianhui Cao, Yujie Chen, Kahiau Cockett-Nagamine, Kayleigh Coppinger, Katie Dammer, Julia Damski, Nathalie Danso, Aleena Dawer, Rose Dever, Maydha Dhanuka, Roma Dhingra, Maria Victoria Dias, Thomas Diehl, Katrina Dolendo, Franklin Dorschel, George Echeverria, Jordan Falk, Ethan Fan, Sayantika Ghosh, Liam Giombetti, Kelly Goonan, Aarushi Gupta, Akshay Gupta, Paula Gutierrez, Buchen (Olivia) Han, Olympia Hatzilambrou, Ryan Houser, Manya Jain, Rachael Johnson, Raynooka Kabir, Jaden Kielty, Grace Hyemin Kim, Hannah Laibinis, Ronit Langer, Angel Lee, Ga Ram Lee, Samuel Li, Jessica Lin, Catrina Malone, Lucca Maraston Oliveira, Megan McGuire, Meghan McQuillen, Kathryn Meadows, Brenna Means, Jayce Mei, Darius Meissner, Mackenzie Moore, Shoa Moosavi, Anusha Mudigonda, Misbah Nauman, Margaret Neely, Max Palys, Meera Parikh, Iktae Park, Luka Pauwelyn, Emily Pelles, Rachel Perkins, Ilona Ponyatyshyn, Sneha Puri, Pooja Reddy, Allie Reichert, Ryan Remmel, Emily Ren, Timothy Rudolph-Math, Neilah Rustemi, Helen Ryan,

Beatrice Salas, Divya Sammeta, Grace Sander, Isabel Schaffer, Samantha Schlageter, Maclyn Senear, Kavya Shah, Emily Shambaugh, Emily Sherman, Kennedy Smith, Anna Strunjas, Alison Talty, May Tan, Joe Thomas, Krysten Thomas, Tyler Thompson, Briana Thrift, Zachary Trotzky, Allison Van Grinsven, Ileana Velez Alvarado, Danielle Venne, Sara Villanueva, Patrick Walsh, Jingxuan (Thomas) Wang, Yihao Wang, Sarah Weber, Ciara Weets, Courtney Wolf, Emily Woodrow, Theresa Worthington, Velen Wu, Wenhui Yang, Betelhem Yimer, Kayla Zamanian, Wei Zhang, Wenyu Zhu

Competing interests

We have no conflicts of interest to report.

Figures

Fig. 1. Geographic policy data coverage of the COVID-AMP database from January 2020 to June 2022 (A) Total number of policies captured for each country. As of date of submission, 152 countries have at least 1 policy coded. (B) Total number of policies captured for each U.S. state. As of date of submission, all 50 states and territories were coded comprehensively.



Fig. 2. (A) Distribution of policies by category and month, globally. (B) Distribution of policies by category and month for the United States. The month for each policy was the effective start date.



Fig. 3. Overview of the policy environment in the United States. (A) Relative proportion of policies enacted over time by policy type, compared to the number of average new cases that occurred over a 7-day period, per 100,000 people [15]. (B) Relative proportion of policies enacted over time by policy type and category.



Fig. 4. Heat map shows the co-occurrence of policy subcategories and policy targets globally, with the darkest squares representing the most overlap.



References

[1] Daly, M., Ebbinghaus, B., Lehner, L., Naczyk, M., & Vlandas, T. *Oxford Supertracker: The Global Directory for COVID Policy Trackers and Surveys.* (Department of Social Policy and Intervention, Univ. Oxford, 2020).

[2] Li, J. & Giabbanelli, P.J. in *Computational Science – ICCS 2021.* (eds. Paszynski, M., Kranzmuller, D., Krzhizhanovskaya, V.V., Dongarra, J.J., & Sloot, P. M.A.) Identifying Synergistic Interventions to Address COVID-19 Using a Large Scale Agent-Based Model. (Springer Link, 2021).

[3] The Internet Archive. Internet Archive Wayback Machine. https://web.archive.org/

[4] Katz, R., Macintyre, A., & Joseph, B. in *Emergency Care and the Public's Health* (eds. Pines, J.M., Abualenain, J., Scott, J. Shesser, R.) Chapter 10: Emergency public health. (Wiley Online Library, 2014).

[5] Federal Emergency Management Agency. *National Response Framework.* (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2019).

[6] Hale, T. et al. A global panel database of pandemic policies (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker). *Nat. Hum. Behav.* 5, p. 529-538 (2021).

[7] Cheng, C., Barceló, J., Hartnett, A., Kubinec, R., & Messerschmidt, L. COVID-19 government response event dataset (CoronaNet v.1.0). *Nat. Hum. Behav.* 4, p. 756-768 (2020).

[8] Schermerhorn, J., et al. Fifteen days in December: capture and analysis of Omicron-related travel restrictions. *BMJ Glob. Health.* 7, 3. (2022).

[9] Page-Tan, C. & Corbin, T.B. Protective policies for all? An analysis of Covid-19 deaths and protective policies among low-, medium- and high-vulnerability groups. *Disasters*. 45, p. S119S145 (2021).

[10] Kraay, A.N.M., Nelson, K.N., Zhao, C.Y., Demory, D., Weitz, J.S. & Lopman, B.A. Modeling serological testing to inform relaxation of social distancing for COVID-19 control. *Nat. Commun.* 12, 7063 (2021).

[11] Pei, S., Kandula, S., & Shaman, J. Differential effects of intervention timing on COVID-19 spread in the United States. *Sci. Adv.* 6, 49 (2020).

[12] Lau, C.S.M. et al. COVID-19 Trends in the Phoenix Metropolitan Area from a Mobile Testing Program: Last Quarter of 2020. *J. Community Health.* 46, p. 1078-1082 (2021).

[13] Witkowski, K., Yeo, J., Belligoni, S., Ganapati, N.E., Corbin, T., & Rivera, F. Florida as a COVID-19 Epicenter: Exploring the Role of Institutions in the State's Response. *Int. J. Public Adm.* (2021).

[14] Huang, J. et al. The Effectiveness of Government Masking Mandates on COVID-19 CountyLevel Case Incidence Across The United States, 2020. *Health Aff.* 41, 3 (2022).

[15] Dong, E., Du, H., & Gardner, L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. *Lancet Inf. Dis.* 20(5):533-534 (2020).

471 **Supplementary Materials**

472

473 **Table 1. COVID AMP Data Dictionary**

Column name	Definition	Allowed values
Unique ID	A unique identifier associated with data in each row. The data is captured so that each row represents a single policy, per date issued, per authority and per area affected.	Numeric: Any unique integer value
Authorizing level of government	The level of government that authorized the policy	One of: Local State / Province Country
Authorizing country name	The name of the country in which the authorizing entity of the policy is located	Text: Any country name (obtained from a pre-defined list based on ISO-3 code)
Authorizing country ISO	The ISO-3 code of the authorizing country	Text: Any 3-digit alpha-3 ISO code, as defined at https://www.iban.com/country-codes
Authorizing state/province	The name of the sub-national area (e.g., state, province district, etc.) corresponding to the country or agency which authorized the policy. This value is "NA" if the policy was issued at the country level.	Text: Any state, province, or other intermediate area name, or NA Where possible, UN LOCODE geographic area names are used as defined at https://www.unece.org/cefact/codesfortrade/codes_index.html
Authorizing local area	The name of the local area (e.g., city, country, etc.) corresponding to the country or agency which	Text: Any city, county, or other local area name, or NA

	authorized the policy. This value is “NA” if the policy was issued at the country or state/province level.	
Authorizing local area code	If available, a unique ID for the local area (e.g., city, county) corresponding to the location which authorized the policy. This value is "N/A" if the policy was issued at the country or state/province level, or "Undefined" if a unique ID is not defined in the AMP database.	Text: Any unique ID, such as a 5-digit FIPS code for USA counties, or NA or Undefined
Authorizing role	The name of the entity who authorized the policy. This value is “NA” if the information was not available or was not relevant (e.g., in the case of judicial rulings).	Text: Any role
Authorizing body	The office of the authorizing entity that issued the policy	Text: Any office name, agency, or similar entity name
Name of official	If relevant, the first and last name of the authorizing official	Text: Any name
Affected level of government	The level of government to which the policy applies.	One of: Local State / Province Country

	This information is only included if the level of government authorizing a policy - see "Authorizing level of government" - is different from that affected (e.g., a state authorizes a policy that affects specific counties).	
Affected country name	The name of the country to which the policy applies	Text: Any country name (obtained from a pre-defined list based on ISO-3 code)
Affected country ISO	The ISO-3 code of the affected country	Text: Any 3-digit alpha-3 ISO code, as defined at https://www.iban.com/country-codes
Affected state/province	The name of the sub-national area (e.g., state, province, district) affected by the policy. This value is “NA” if the affected location is the same as the authorizing location (e.g., a state authorizing policy that only affects that state).	Text: Any state, province, or other intermediate area name, or NA Where possible, UN LOCODE geographic area names are used as defined at https://www.unece.org/cefact/codesfortrade/codes_index.html
Affected local area	The name of the local area (e.g., city, county) affected by the policy/law. This value is “NA” if the affected location is the same as the authorizing location (e.g., a city authorizing policy that only affects that city).	Text: Any city, county, or other local area name, or NA
Affected local area code	If available, a unique ID for the local area (e.g., city, county)	Text: Any unique ID, such as a 5-digit FIPS code for USA counties, or NA or Undefined

	affected by the policy. This value is "N/A" if the policy was issued at the country or state/province level, or "Undefined" if a unique ID is not defined in the AMP database.	
Policy relaxing or restricting	Broad designations about a policy with regard to its intended impact on the policy environment at the time the policy was issued. Restricting: a policy where the intention is to impose limitations or regulations on behaviors or actions, for an overall reduction in what is allowed relative to before. Relaxing: a policy that aims to ease limitations or regulations on behavior or actions, for an overall increase in what is allowed relative to before. Other: All other policies that do not focus on limiting or promoting specific behaviors or actions.	One of: Relaxing Restricting Other
Policy category	Categorization of the overall scope of	One of: Authorizing and enforcement

	a policy based on its content	Contact tracing/Testing Emergency declarations Enabling and relief measures Face mask Military mobilization Social distancing Support for public health and clinical capacity Travel restrictions Vaccinations
Policy subcategory	Detailed information about the intention of the policy based on its content	Any of: **Authorization and enforcement** Authorization Enforcement **Contact tracing/Testing** Contact tracing Testing **Emergency declarations** General emergency declaration Public health emergency declaration **Enabling and relief measures** Anti-price gouging measures Budget modifications Early prison release Eviction and foreclosure delays Extension of public services Hazard pay Leave entitlement adjustments Modification of unemployment benefits Mortgage payment support Other labor protections Other relief measures Regulatory relief Relief funding Remote notarization Stimulus payments Support for essential workers Tax delay Utility payment **Face mask** Face mask required Face mask suggested Face mask exemption

		Face mask (other) **Military mobilization** Activation of military for enforcement Activation of military for logistical and/or medical support **Social distancing** Adaptation and mitigation measures Alternative election measures Curfews Distancing mandate Event delays or cancellations Face covering Health screening Isolation Lockdown Mass gathering restrictions Other forms of social distancing Quarantine Prison population reduction Private sector closures Public service closures Safer at home School closures Stay at home Visitor restrictions **Support for public health and clinical capacity** Coverage for cost of testing Crisis standards of care Elective procedure delay or cancellation Emergency use or expanded market authorization Healthcare facility licensing waivers Immunity for medical providers Medical licensing waivers Notification requirements Other measures to support public health and clinical capacity Revised "emergency personnel" designations Risk communication Support for telemedicine **Travel restrictions** Domestic travel restriction Domestic travel restrictions (interstate) Domestic travel restrictions (intrastate) International travel restriction **Vaccinations**

		Multi-vaccine policy Vaccine administration, distribution, and logistics Vaccine cost, financing, and insurance Vaccine exemption or alternative Vaccine mandate Vaccine prioritization Vaccine-related plan
Policy target	The primary population, location, sector, or entities impacted by the policy or law	Any of: All essential businesses All non essential businesses All recreation/entertainment venues All workers/employees Bars/alcohol service establishments Businesses/private sector Casinos/gambling facilities Childcare facilities (preschool or other daycare) Churches/places of worship Confirmed cases Courthouse/judiciary Criminal justice system/prisons/jails/incarcerated persons Cultural events/weddings/funerals Day camps/summer camps Essential workers Event center/convention/performance hall/fair Family entertainment/leisure activity Farmer's market/open air market Farming/agriculture/food processing Fully vaccinated individuals Funeral home/mortuary General population Grocery store Gym/fitness center/recreational sports facility Healthcare workers and allied personnel Higher education Homeless shelters/homeless individuals Hospitals/urgent care/emergency medical services Hotels/lodging Housing sector/real estate/renters/homeowners Indigenous people Insurance/banking Libraries/museums/art galleries/community centers Liquor stores Manufacturers Marginalized communities Medical offices (doctor/dentist/physical therapist) Migrant workers/refugees/asylum seekers Military

		Minors and children Night club/dance hall/karaoke Non-essential workers Non-governmental organizations Notary Nursing homes/assisted living facility Older adults/individuals with underlying medical conditions Omicron Organized adult sports Outdoor recreation/campgrounds/beaches/parks Personal care facilities Pharmacy Primary education Public administration Public sector/public buildings/government employees Public services Public transportation Restaurants/food service establishments Retail stores Secondary education Small businesses Stadiums/arenas/racetracks/sporting venues Suspected cases Swimming pools Theatres/movie theatres Transportation sector/shipping/logistics Travelers Unemployed/underemployed workers University/professional sports Unvaccinated/partially vaccinated individuals Veterinary clinics Youth/school sports/extracurricular activities
Policy description	A written description of the policy and the directive by the researcher	Text: Any English-language text
Issued date	The date on which the policy was initially announced and/or issued	Date: format mm/dd/yyyy
Effective start date	The date on which the policy took effect or was enacted	Date: format mm/dd/yyyy

Anticipated end date	The date on which the directive specified in the policy was intended to end. If a specific measure was extended beyond the initial end date, each extension is captured as a new row. Extended policies are linked back to the previous policy through the field 'Prior row ID linked to this entry'.	Date: Any date after the specified effective start date, format mm/dd/yyyy
Actual end date	The date on which the directive specified in the policy was terminated, replaced, or extended.	Date: Any date after the specified effective start date, format mm/dd/yyyy
Intended duration	A text description of the intended duration of the policy, expressed in days where applicable	Text: Any text value
Prior row ID linked to this entry	The unique ID of the prior policy that immediately preceded the specified policy. This information is included when a policy provided an update or extension of a prior policy already captured by the database or modifies the original policy in some way. This is intended to capture policies that are extended past their initial anticipated	Numeric: Blank, or any unique policy ID

	end date. In all other cases, this field will be blank.	
Linked row relationship	The type of relationship that the specified policy has to the "parent" policy linked in "Prior row ID linked to this entry."	One of: Amended Extended Rescinded Related Exemption Reinstated Superseded
Data source for policy announcement	A link to the website from which the policy data were gathered. This link may be a news report or press announcement if data were gathered from that source and not from the source policy document.	Any URL
Attachment for policy announcement	URL of permanently hosted PDF document(s) for the policy announcement	Any URL
Policy/law name	The complete title of the law, policy, or policy announcement, including any relevant numerical information.	Text: Any text value
Policy/law type	The type of law or policy that is enacted	One of: Case Declaration Directive Mandate Memorandum Non-policy guidance Order Ordinance Proclamation Regulation Statute
Data source for law/policy	Source	Any URL

	documentation for the underlying law or policy	
Attachment for policy	URL of permanently hosted PDF document(s) for the policy	Any URL(s)
Authorizing entity has authority?	Whether the entity who authorized the policy has the legal authority to do so, at the time that the policy was issued or effective. When a policy is under legal challenge, the field "Legal challenge?" will be set to Yes.	One of: Yes No Unclear
Relevant authority to make the law/policy	Title of legal authority for entity to enact the policy	Text: Any text value
Data source for authority to make the law/policy	Source documentation for the relevant authority specified above	Any URL
Legal challenge?	Whether there has been a legal challenge to the policy.	One of: Yes No
Home rule state?	Whether the state is a "Home Rule" state or a "Limited Home Rule" state Home Rule State: the state's constitution grants municipalities and/or counties the ability to pass laws to govern themselves as they see fit (subject to the state and federal constitutions)	One of: Yes Limited No

	Limited Home Rule State: a city or county must obtain permission from the state legislature if it wishes to pass a law or ordinance which is not specifically permitted under existing state legislation	
Dillon's rule state?	Whether or not a state is under Dillon's rule. If yes, the local government's power is derived from the state, and the local government is strictly limited by the state delegates.	One of: Yes Limited No Unclear

474