

## **Impact of small-area lockdowns for the control of the COVID-19 pandemic**

### **Supplemental Appendix**


#### **S1 - Dates of intervention and assignment to the treatment group**

The regions defined as controls in our study are Arica and Parinacota, Tarapacá, Antofagasta, Atacama, Coquimbo, Valparaíso, Libertador General Bernardo O'Higgins, Maule, Los Ríos and Aysén. Intervention regions were the Metropolitan Region, Ñuble, Biobío, Araucanía, Los Lagos, and Magallanes.

Two important considerations of the assignment of the regions to the intervention or control group were taken. First, even when we have data until April 25th, we assume that at least 10 days after lockdown enforcement is required to observe any expected results attributable to the intervention. Rationale for this was presented in the methods sections. Based on that, we did not include Arica in the intervention group for our analysis since it implemented a small-area lockdown starting on April 16th. Second, two regions have early lockdowns in remote or isolated areas, such as Eastern Island (Valparaíso) and Caleta Tortel (Aysén). In both situations, the population of the region affected by the intervention is <1% at any given time. Therefore, we assumed that these regions were not affected by the intervention in our analysis. Including them will produce biased estimates in an aggregated analysis at the regional level.

Details on the coverage of the policy over-time in the regions with at least one small-area lockdown under effect are presented in Figure S1. Policy coverage was defined as the percentage of the regional population living in an area with small-area lockdown under-effect in any given time. Regions without small-area lockdowns implemented during the study period are not presented.

**Figure S1: Coverage of small-area lockdowns among implemented regions**



## S2 – Effects of human mobility of the effective reproductive number

We estimate a model to explore the expected mediation of mobility on the case transmission measure by the effective reproductive number. For this we use four linear regression models specified in Equation 3. We do not include all mobility indicators in a single model since they are highly correlated and joint estimation could produce biased or imprecise estimates:

$$Re_{it} = \beta_1 X_{it-10} + \varphi time_t + \eta Easter + \delta_{day} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (S1)$$

With  $\beta_1$  the parameters that capture the association between mobility indicator X (workplace, retail & recreation, public transport, and residential mobility), considering a lag of 10 days between intervention and the outcome variable. This lag was chosen to account for the expected average time between contagion and case confirmation: 5 days for pre-symptomatic phase(22) and 5 days between first symptom and confirmation based on official reports of the Chilean Ministry of Health(23). The other parameters are similar to Equation 1.

The full results of these models are presented in Table S1.

**Table S1: Association of human mobility on the effective reproductive number**

<i>Variable</i>	<b>Effects of retail mobility on Re</b>		<b>Effects of public transport on Re</b>		<b>Effects of workplace mobility on Re</b>		<b>Effects of residential mobility on Re</b>	
	<i>Coef</i>	<i>Conf. Int (95%)</i>	<i>Estimates</i>	<i>Conf. Int (95%)</i>	<i>Estimates</i>	<i>Conf. Int (95%)</i>	<i>Estimates</i>	<i>Conf. Int (95%)</i>
Retail mobility	0.02 **	0.01 – 0.03						
Public transport			0.01	-0.00 – 0.02				
Workplace mobility					0.02 *	0.00 – 0.03		
Residential mobility							-0.04 **	-0.07 – -0.01
Observations	560		560		560		529	
R <sup>2</sup> / R <sup>2</sup> adjusted	0.358 / 0.330		0.351 / 0.322		0.353 / 0.324		0.350 / 0.319	

\*  $p < 0.05$  \*\*  $p < 0.01$  \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

### S3 - Sensitivity analysis

#### Instrumental variable estimation

As part of our sensitivity analysis, we developed models using an instrumental variables (IV) approach. Three strong (relevant) instruments that are expected to comply with the exclusion restriction assumption are proposed: 1) total (cumulative) COVID-19 cases and the effective reproductive number with a 10 day lag to exposure; 2) total (cumulative) COVID-19 cases with a 10 day lag to exposure and; 3) new (incident) cases 10 days before of exposure. The models are implemented in a 2-step approach, first regressing the candidate IV on the treatment assignment (lockdown) variable using a GLM logit regression model to estimate a probability of assignment. This model is used to estimate the predicted probability of being assigned to lockdown (Lockdown\_p) that is then used in the second stage of the model. Therefore,

Stage 1 model equation:

$$Lockdown_{it} = \beta_* Z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

With  $Z$  the instrumental variable. For model 1,  $Z$  is a vector including the total (cumulative) COVID-19 cases and the effective reproductive number (IV model 1). For IV model 2,  $Z$  is the total (cumulative) COVID-19 cases. For IV model 3,  $Z$  is the new (incident) cases.

The relevancy assumption for the IV models are met with F-statistic  $>10$  for each of these variables suggest that they are strong instruments: F-statistic: 152.6 for IV model 1; F-statistic: 35.27 for IV model 2, and; F-statistic: 242.6 for IV model 3.

The exclusion assumption for the IV models is theoretically justified as follows. The total cumulative COVID-19 cases, number of new cases and the effective reproductive number are expected to be uncorrelated to later  $Re$ . While at shorter time-periods this assumption does not hold (i.e.  $Re$  at time  $-1$  is highly correlated with  $Re$  at time  $t$ ), as the number of days between these candidate instrumental variables and the outcome variable increased the correlation between them fade. From all the candidate instrumental variables, the new cases at time  $-10$  is the one that better holds the exclusion assumption, since the new cases of a single day at any given time are not uncorrelated with the  $Re$  at later time. Therefore, our IV model 3 is the one that with greater probability holds the exclusion assumption.

Stage 2 model equation:

$$Re_{it} = \beta_1 School_{t-10} + \beta_2 Lockdown_{pit-10} + \beta_3 time_t + \eta Easter + \delta_{day} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

With  $School_{t-10}$  an indicator (dummy) variable for school and university closure with a 10-day lag,  $Lockdown_{pit-10}$  the predicted probability of small area lockdown implementation in the region  $i$  with a 10 day lag based on stage 1 model.  $\beta_1$  captures the association between school closure and the effective reproductive number (Re), considering a lag of 10 days between intervention and the outcome variable.  $\beta_2$  capture the causal effect of small-area lockdown on Re, considering a lag of 10 days between intervention and the outcome variable. The other variables and parameters are similar to our main models reported in the method section.

Results for IV models are presented jointly with our other model estimates to facilitate comparison in table S2. Notably, the results are robust to different sets of instrumental variables. Moreover, these results largely confirm the conclusion from our DiD model (main analysis), but with slightly smaller effect sizes.

**Table S2: Impact of small-area lockdowns on the effective reproductive number estimated by instrumental variables approach**

	Before and after model		DID model		IV model 1		IV model 2		IV model 3	
Variable	Coef.	95% CI	Coef.	95% CI	Coef.	95% CI	Coef.	95% CI	Coef.	95% CI
School closure	-2.38 ***	-3.05 – -1.71	-2.03 ***	-2.76 – -1.29	-1.23 *	-2.31 – -0.16	-2.26 ***	-2.98 – -1.54	-2.19 ***	-2.91 – -1.47
Lockdown	-0.38	-0.93 – 0.17			-0.54 ***	-0.76 – -0.32	-0.41 **	-0.66 – -0.16	-0.66 ***	-0.91 – -0.42
Lockdown RM			-0.81	-1.78 – 0.15						
Lockdown Araucania			-0.73	-1.64 – 0.18						
Lockdown Ñuble & Los Lagos			-0.63	-1.52 – 0.26						
Lockdown Punta Arenas			-0.86 *	-1.70 – -0.02						
Observations	660		660		510		615		615	
R <sup>2</sup> / R <sup>2</sup> adjusted	0.360 / 0.336		0.338 / 0.319		0.254 / 0.239		0.283 / 0.271		0.284 / 0.272	

\*  $p < 0.05$  \*\*  $p < 0.01$  \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

### Testing different time-lag assumptions

The assumption of the time-lag between exposure and outcome could greatly influence the conclusion. To assess the impact of the uncertainty of this parameter, we conducted a sensitivity analysis considering alternative time-lags. Our reference case (main analysis) was a 10-day lag, to account for the expected average time between contagion and case confirmation: 5 days for pre-symptomatic phase(22) and 5 days between first symptom and confirmation based on official reports of the Chilean Ministry of Health(23). Based on the variability of the pre-symptomatic phase reported in the literature(22) and the time from the first symptom to consultation and confirmation from other contexts(39), we tested our models with 7 to 14 days-lag.

Results are presented on table S3 for all our models. Our main conclusions do not vary based on different time-lag assumptions, but effect sizes are bigger with shorter time-lag assumptions and vice versa.

**Table S3: Impact of small-area lockdowns on the effective reproductive number assuming different time-lags between exposure and outcome**

	Before and after model		DID model		IV model 1		IV model 2		IV model 3	
Lag 7 days										
<i>Variable</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>95% CI</i>
	-2.68 ***	-3.64 – -1.72	-2.79 ***	-3.87 – -1.71	-1.07 **	-1.83 – -0.32	-2.64 ***	-3.56 – -1.72	-2.54 ***	-3.46 – -1.63
School closure										
Lockdown										
Lockdown RM			-0.94	-2.01 – 0.12						
Lockdown Araucania			-1.06	-2.14 – 0.03						
Lockdown Ñuble & Los Lagos			-0.90	-1.91 – 0.11						
Lockdown Punta Arenas			-0.96 *	-1.89 – -0.03						
Observations	660		660		555		660		660	
R <sup>2</sup> / R <sup>2</sup> adjusted	0.377 / 0.354		0.353 / 0.335		0.304 / 0.291		0.347 / 0.336		0.349 / 0.339	
Lag 14 days										
<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>95% CI</i>
School closure	-1.10 ***	-1.65 – -0.55	0.12	-0.48 – 0.71	-0.07	-0.49 – 0.35	-0.77 ***	-1.19 – -0.35	-0.73 ***	-1.15 – -0.32

	0.15	-0.35 – 0.65	0.35	-0.34 – 1.05	-0.40 **	-0.64 – -0.16	-0.31	-0.54 – -0.08	-0.58 ***	-0.82 – -0.35
Lockdown							**			
Lockdown RM			-0.52	-1.30 – 0.26						
Lockdown Araucania			-0.44	-1.20 – 0.32						
Lockdown Ñuble & Los Lagos			-0.56	-1.32 – 0.20						
Lockdown Punta Arenas			-0.83 *	-1.59 – -0.07						
Observations	660		660		450		555		555	
R <sup>2</sup> / R <sup>2</sup> adjusted	0.316 / 0.290		0.322 / 0.303		0.186 / 0.167		0.294 / 0.281		0.299 / 0.286	

\*  $p < 0.05$  \*\*  $p < 0.01$   
\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$



#### **S4 - Data and code**

Dataset collected for this study is available at this [link](#).

R Script is available at this [link](#)