ECONOMICS DISCUSSION PAPER 20.07 **ISSN 1179-8823 (Online)**
May 2020

This series contains work in progress at the

The Dynamic of COVID-19 New Infections under Different Stringent Policies*

W A Razzak

School of Economics and Finance, Massey University, PN, New Zealand

May 2020

Abstract

We estimate an unrestricted VAR to summarize the dynamics of the stringency of policy and COVID-19 infections in New Zealand, Australia, Denmark, Sweden, and the U.S. using the newly published Stringency Index by the Blavatnik School of Government at the University of Oxford, Hale et al. (2020). The stringency of the policy responds positively to the number of new infections, and new infection cases respond negatively to the increase in the stringency of the policy. New Zealand and Australia followed slightly different stringent policies, but both managed the pandemic remarkably well. Denmark, Sweden, and the U.S. adopted different policies in terms of stringency and timing. Had Denmark, Sweden, and the U.S. adopted the New Zealand's stringent policy they coul Tent

1. INTRODUCTION

Countries responded differently to COVID-19. Some countries have been following relatively less stringent policies than others have. While some countries followed very stringent policies such as strict social distancing and lockdowns early on, others waited before they ratcheted up their responses. There is a debate about the efficacy of stringent policies. It is unclear what "better" means; perhaps the advocates of fewer restrictions had the economic cost of lockdown and herd immunity in mind. At this stage, the efficacy of different policies are measurable because data on new infections, deaths, and recoveries are available, albeit with questionable qualities, while the costs are still unclear because the data are not fully published.

Hale et al. (2020) published the COVID-19 Government Response Tracker (OxCGRT), which is described as a simple, additive un-weighted index, as a baseline measure for 150 countries from Jan 1 to Apr 23, 2020. This data set makes it possible to study the policy dynamic. The authors provide a systematic method to track the stringency of government responses to COVID-19 across countries and time. The index combines a number of measures of government responses. The report is from publicly available information on nine indicators of government response.[1] The indicators are of three types, ordinal, which measure policies on a simple scale of severity / intensity; numeric, which measure a specific number, typically the value in USD; and text, which is a "free response" indicator that records other information of interest.

The main components of the stringency index include information about policies of school closure, public event cancellation, workplace closure, school closure, public places closure, domestic and international travel bans, public transport restrictions, etc. The Stringency Index captures variation in containment and closure policies only. For each policy response measure above, a score is created, by taking the ordinal value and adding a weighted constant if the policy is general rather than targeted, if applicable. A rescale is applied by the maximum value to create a score between 0 and 100, with a missing value contributing zero.

[1] They have 19 indicators in total, but the indicators for the economic and health system were not used in calculating the Stringency Index. The question of the effect of these policies on the economy is a question that could not be answered satisfactorily at this stage because of the lack of economic data on the outcomes such as GDP and other variables. GDP data, and many other macroeconomic data, are quarterly and the response of various polices would not probably show in the data until June. Although, we could have mixed-frequency econometric estimation, we do not have enough degrees of freedom just yet.

The data, except for the U.S., confirm that policy stringency responds positively to the number of new infections. The higher the rate of infections the more stringent the policy response is. However, the infection rate responds negatively to policy that is more stringent. We show that New Zealand and Australia managed the pandemic remarkably well even though they followed a slightly different stringent policies. Both countries ran successful yet different stringent policies to reduce the daily newly confirmed cases to zero. Therefore, stringency, maybe necessary, but it is not a sufficient condition to mitigate the problem. We show that Denmark, Sweden, and the U.S. could have reduced the number of daily newly confirmed cases of COVID-19 significantly had they adopted the New Zealand stringent policy early on. However, they could not have reduced infections to zero as in New Zealand and Australia. We interpret this as evidence that the policy response is endogenous country-specific.

Next, we present the model. Section (3) describes the data. Section (4) presents the estimation's results. In section (5), we produce dynamic stochastic projections. Section (6) includes some projections under policy scenarios. Section 7 is a conclusion.

2. THE MODEL

We use a VAR to study the dynamic. The standard Vector Auto-regression (VAR) is a stationary K-dimensional VAR(p) process is given by:

$$y_t = A_1 y_{t-1} + \cdots + A_p y_{t-p} + u_t, \qquad (1)$$

where, y_t is a $K \times 1$ vector of endogenous variables. $A_1, \ldots, A_p$ is a $K \times K$ matrix of lag coefficients, and u_t is $K \times 1$ white noise innovation process with the classic assumptions. $E(u_t) = 0$; $E(u_t u_t') = \Sigma_u$; $E(u_t, u_s') = 0$ for $t \neq s$. We have two variables: the daily newly confirmed cases of COVID-19, and the Stringency Index. The time series are daily data from January 1 to April 23, but there are missing data that vary by country because countries first reported cases at different dates.[3]

[3] Hale *et al.* (2020) report the cumulative daily newly confirmed cases. To get the daily newly confirmed cases we first difference the data.

3. THE DATA

We plot Hale *et al.* (2020) data of the Stringency Index for New Zealand, Australia, Denmark, Sweden, and the U.S. in figure (1). New Zealand started imposing restriction earlier than most countries, on Feb 2. Australia and Denmark imposed restrictions at the same level as New Zealand, on Feb 24 and Feb 27 respectively. Then, New Zealand had zero confirmed cases, Australia had a few confirmed cases, and Denmark had one confirmed case. Sweden, however, did not impose any restrictions until Mar 9, where it had 203 confirmed cases. The U.S. on the other hand began implementing polices on Feb. 2 while its first confirmed case was reported on Jan. 21.

New Zealand increased the stringency of policy in a step fashion, up. However, Australia and Denmark ratcheted up the stringency of the policy at once. Sweden's policy remained relatively lax until now, i.e., the value of the Index is relatively smaller. The U.S. Stringency Index is in between New Zealand and Australia. Figures (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) plot the Stringency Index and the daily newly confirmed cases of infections. Australia and New Zealand have the typical rise, peak, and declining number of infections to near zero, Denmark and Sweden do not. The U.S. daily newly confirmed cases must have peaked already and began to fall, but far away from zero. While New Zealand had zero cases reported on Apr 23, Australia had seven, Denmark and Sweden had 217 and 628 by Apr 23 respectively. The question is whether stringent policies reduce infections and how many days the number of infections takes to respond to policy.

Next, we estimate the dynamics. However, there is a caveat regarding the measurements of

4. ESTIMATING THE VAR

We focus on estimating an unrestricted VAR for each of the four countries, New Zealand, Australia, Denmark, Sweden, and the U.S. We report the *Generalized Impulse Response functions* in Figure (6), (Pesaran and Shin, 1998).[4]

For New Zealand, the VAR has seven lags chosen using a number of commonly used Information Criteria.[5] The number of the daily newly confirmed infection cases declines significantly 7 days after the increase in the Stringency policies, and remains low and stable. Stringency increases with infections because it is a response to the infection. Figure (7a) plots the impulse response functions for New Zealand.[6]

For Australia, the VAR has three lags according to the Information Criteria. Unlike New Zealand, the Australian number of the daily newly confirmed infection cases declines in response to the increase in stringency policy about 12 days later. Stringency increases with infections. See figure (7b).[7]

For Denmark, we fit a VAR with six lags. The number of daily newly confirmed cases declines in response to the increase in the Stringency Index, but it does not stay low for long. At the end, it had increased again. Like New Zealand and Australia, the stringency of policy responds to the increase in the infections. The response of the daily newly confirmed cases of infections shows a decline 4 days after the increase in the stringency of the policies remained low for 6 days, and then increases again. This response is quite different from the case of New Zealand, where the infection numbers remained low. The number of infections like New

[4] It resolves, “the ordering” of the variables problem in cases where no further identifying restrictions are imposed as in our case.

[5] We use the LR, sequential test, Final Prediction Error, Akaike, Schwarz, and Hannan-Quinn Information Criteria.

[6] The VAR has the following order, the number of daily newly confirmed cases and the Stringency Index. The F statistics are 11.7 and 37.7 respectively. The null hypothesis that the coefficients are jointly equal zero is rejected.

[7] The VAR has the following order, the number of daily newly confirmed cases and the Stringency Index. The F statistics are 10.5 and 151.4 respectively. The null hypothesis that the coefficients are jointly equal zero is rejected.

Zealand and Australia drives the strength of the stringency policy. The impulse response functions for Denmark are in figure (7c).[8]

For Sweden, the VAR has six lags. Sweden’s daily newly confirmed infection cases response to the stringency of policy is very different from Denmark and different from New Zealand

For Denmark, Sweden, and the U.S., however, the baseline projections are not zero. Figures (8), (9) and (10) plot the data. The baseline projections for Denmark are almost flat but slightly falling, significantly increasing with time in Sweden, and declining very slowly in the U.S. Without change in the stringency of the policy, fast occurring herd immunity, or a vaccine, none of these projections expected to hit zero in the near future.

6. A POLICY SCENARIO

We assume a scenario, whereby Denmark, Sweden, and the U.S. adopted New Zealand's stringent policy, and then we make dynamic stochastic projections over the period up to the end of June. Figures (11), (12), and (13) show that Denmark, Sweden, and the U.S. could have cut the daily infection cases significantly had they adopted a stringent policy such as the New Zealand policy.

However, none of the projections of the daily newly confirmed cases could fall to zero as they did in New Zealand because the policy response is endogenous; it is country-specific and responds to the country's number of new infections. It is highly certain that New Zealand would move back to level 3 or 4, more stringent policy, if new infections occur after moving to level 2 or if a second wave of infections occurs in the future. Therefore, although a stringent policy response reduces infections significantly in these three countries, it is not a one size fits all. Australia's outcomes are just as good as New Zealand, but with a much less stringent policy. Apparently, stringency itself is necessary bt7f6TDl5adrently, st

Figure (1)

Figure (4)



Figure (5)

Figure (6)

Figure (7) – Generalized Impulse Response Function
Response to Generalized One S.D. Innovation 2

(a) New Zealand



(b) Australia



(c) Denmark



(d) Sweden


Response of infections to stringency
50
40
30
20
10
0
-10
2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20
Response of stringency to infections
4
3
2
1
0
2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20

(e) U.S.


Response of infections to stringency
2,000
1,000
0
-1,000
2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20
8
4
0
-4
2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20

Data Appendix

Aruba, Afghanistan, Angola, Albania, Andorra, United Arab Emirates, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Burundi, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Belize, Bermuda, Bolivia, Brazil, Barbados, Brunei, Botswana, Canada, Switzerland, Chile, China, Cameroon, DRC, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany, Djibouti, Dominica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Algerian, Ecuador, Egypt, Spain, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, United Kingdom, Ghana, Gambia, Greece, Greenland, Guatemala, Guam, Guyana, Hong Kong, Honduras, Croatia, Hungary, Indonesia, India, Ireland, Iran, Iraq, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyz Republic, South Korea, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Sri Lanka, Lesotho, Luxemburg, Macao, Moldova, Madagascar, Mexico, Mali, Myanmar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Mauritania, Mauritius, Malawi, Malaysia, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Nicaragua, Netherlands, Norway, New Zealand, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippians, PNG, Poland, Puerto Rico, Portugal, Paraguay, Palestine, Qatar, Kosovo, Romania, Russia, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Singapore, Sierra Leone, El Salvador, San Marino, Serbia, South Sudan, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden, Eswatini, Seychelles, Syria, Chad, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Taiwan, Tanzania, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay, USA, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Vietnam, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.