FIELDS INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES



OECD problem: Effectiveness of Policy Interventions in Different Countries and Lessons for the Future

Extended Problem Solving Workshop Presentation Friday, 23 April 2021

A Global Pandemic?

Cumulative confirmed COVID-19 deaths per million people, Apr 21, 2021

Limited testing and challenges in the attribution of the cause of death means that the number of confirmed deaths may not be an accurate count of the true number of deaths from COVID-19.





Sacrificing Lives to Save the Economy or Saving Lives to Save the Economy?



Case studies: Lives, Economy, Stringency and Mobility

Data:

- New Death by Million (weekly average) –
 Our World in Data
- Weekly GDP Tracker (the % difference in GDP between a week and the same week a year earlier) – OECD Tracker
- Stringency Index (0-100) Government
 Response Tracker Blavatnik School of
 Government and Oxford University
- Change in time at home compared to baseline – Google Mobility Data

Our selection of Countries:

- Sweden, Norway (heterogeneity within Scandinavia)
- United States, UK (significantly impacted, not successful)
- Japan, Australia, New Zealand
 (well known success stories in Asia and Oceania)
- Hungary, Czech Rep.

(Early success stories, recent failure)

Heterogeneity within the Scandinavian group

- Both in SWE and NOR individuals shift behaviour (increasing time spent at home with respect to database) before restriction have actually been implemented. GDP starts to drop before deaths begin to rise and drop much less in the second wave.
- NOR: The Norwegian Directorate of Health introduced a number of measures from 12 March 2020. 6 April, outbreak was "under control" and the reproduction rate had dwindled to 0.7 in the country.
- SWE: there has been no general lockdown: slow down the pandemic approach. The peak of new deaths by million is around 10 times higher in SWE and the peaks lasted much longer (higher cumulative results).



Well Known Success Stories in Asia and Oceania

- JAN/2020 First COVID-19 confirmed case;
- MAR/2020 Lockdown;
- MAY/2020 Relax COVID-19 restrictions;
- JUL-NOV/2020 Renewed lockdown;
- DEC/2020 Stay-at-home order;
- FEV/2021 COVID-19 vaccination;
- Pandemic Leave Disaster Payment.

- JAN/2020 First COVID-19 confirmed case;
- MAR/2020 Several restrictions (stay at home, order closures of schools) ;
- JUL/2020 Raised the COVID-19 alert level;
- SEP/2020 Lowered the alert level;
- NOV/2020 Raised the COVID-19 alert level;
- Emergency Economic Package Against COVID-19.
- FEB/2020 First COVID-19 confirmed case;
- MAR/2020 The closure of all borders and lockdown;
- APR/2020 Supervised quarantine.
- JUN/2020 ${\rm Zero}$ active COVID-19 cases;
- COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund.

Australia

- Social distancing measures including by banning public gatherings of more than two people and shutting down non-essential businesses;
- Provided a lump sum payment to help workers during their 14-day self-isolation period.

New Zealand

- Border restriction to noncitizen/permanent residents;
- Contact tracing, testing and isolation of cases and quarantine of close contacts;
- Provided social/financial support during the COVID-19 pandemic and have existing universal health coverage.

Japan

Easy adoption of protective measures as Hand-washing, physical distancing and the wearing of masks were already a part of Japanese culture.



United States



- As discussed by **Chetty et al. (2020)**, changes in consumer behavior during the pandemic could already be observed in the beginning of March, while government-imposed restrictions were put in place only after mid-March.
 - Not only government-imposed, but also self-imposed containment measures matter!
 - Government restrictions seem to add up to pre-existent shifts in consumer behavior, strengthening their negative spillovers.
- Seasonalities

Stringency

<50 50-60

60-70

70-80

- No stimulus policies considered in the graph (blue line could look much worse).
- No clear relationship between stringency and time at home

United Kingdom



- Effect of the **UK variant** on time at home (fear?)
- The effect of vaccination and lockdown – is clear after the second wave.
- Stringency and Google Mobility Data are not always consistent with each other.

Stringency

60-70

70-80 80-90

- British population remained at home relatively more (even during summer) when compared with neighboring European countries
- Persistence of **GDP losses**

Hungary and Czech Republic: Early Success, Recent Failure



Chart: Adam Kerenyi · Source: Ourworldindata · Created with Datawrapper

Hungary and Czech Republic: Policies

Hungary

new_cases_pm total_deaths_pm ··· School Closures Normalized ··· Stay at home requirements

••• Protection of Elderly People



Czech Republic

- new_cases_pm CZE - total_deaths_pm CZE ---- School Closures Normalized



0 is the lowest 3000 is the maximum value regarding the policy measures Created with Datawrapper

0-3000 is the range regarding the normalized policy measures

Chart: Adam Kerenyi • Source: Oxford Government Policy Tracker Ourworldindata.org • Created with Datawrapper

Research question

-> Look at countries' performances during the COVID-19 pandemic up to 2021 Q1:

- RQ: Could some countries have done better? What determines their health and economic performances?
 - Role of Covid policies: Is success entirely due to policies? What are the most relevant?
 - Role of countries' structural characteristics: Are there specific factors at the country level? What are they and how do they affect the effectiveness of policies?

Methodology

- *Clustering analysis:* Group countries based on health and economic outcomes, structural characteristics, and policies. Identify success and failure stories.
- Sankey diagrams: visualize these relationships.
- *Econometric analysis:* assess what are the most relevant factors for success and failure stories.

Dataset: 46 countries, snapshot at 2021 Q1

- Total Deaths per million \rightarrow Our World in Data
- Economic Losses
 - Quarterly GDP \rightarrow OECD
 - Stimulus Data \rightarrow IMF
- Policy variables
 - Containment and Health Measures \rightarrow Gov. Response Tracker Oxford University
 - Stimulus Data \rightarrow IMF
 - Mobility (proxy for compliance) \rightarrow Google Community Mobility
- Structural Characteristics
 - World Development Indicators, Our World in Data, bilateral trade flow data (BACI-CEPII)

Hierarchical clustering

- Objective: cluster countries in groups with similar characteristics
- Method: hierarchical agglomerative clustering
 - Start from a *n x m* of *n* observations (countries) and *m* features
 - Remove features with correlation > 0.80
 - Standardized variables (z-score)
 - Use a distance metric to capture the similarity of observations
 - Form clusters based on these similarities through a *linkage function*
 - External validation of clusters
- We cluster on three objects:
- 1. Health/losses outcomes
- 2. Structural characteristics
- 3. Covid19 policies

Clustering on structural characteristics

Variables: GDP pc, borders, trade network centrality, median age, life expectancy, diabetes prevalence, hospital beds, extreme poverty, political system, debt/GDP, services, trade, health expenditure to GDP, health expenditure out of pocket, SARS, H1N1, MERS, Top10 income share

Clusters:

Cluster 1: AUS, DNK, FIN, GBR, ISL, NOR, NZL, SWE Cluster 2: ARG, BRA, CHL, COL, IDN, IND, MEX, ZAF Cluster 3: ESP, GRC, ITA, PRT Cluster 4: BGR, CZE, EST, HUN, LTU, LVA, POL, ROU, RUS, SVK, SVN Cluster 5: BEL, CHE, IRL, LUX, NLD Cluster 6: CAN, ISR, SAU, TUR, USA Cluster 7: AUT, DEU, FRA, JPN, KOR



Clustering on outcomes



Clustering on policies

Invest in Testing and Tracing!



Sankey diagram I: Countries, structure, outcomes



Sankey diagram I: Countries, structure, outcomes

- Success stories:
 - Outcome 1 → Structure A (DNK, ISL, FIN, NOR) Structure F (SAU, TUR)
- Failure stories:
 - Outcome 4 → Structure B (ARG, BRA, CHL, COL, ZAF) Structure D (BRA, CZE, BGR, MEX) Structure E (CHE, IRL, LUX, NLD)

Sankey diagram II: Countries, structure, policies, outcomes



Sankey diagram II: Countries, structure, policies, outcomes

- Success stories:
 - Outcome 1 \rightarrow Policy F & G
 - Policy F ← Structure G → Outcome 1 & 2 (DEU, KOR)
 Policy F ← Structure A → Outcome 1 & 2 (ISL, NOR)
 - Special cases:
 - France (SG-PD-O4)
 - SA-PB (AUS, NZL), SA-PC (SWE, GBR)
- Failure stories:
 - Outcome 4 \rightarrow Policy C, D & E
 - Policy C → Structure B (ARG, BRA, CHL, IND, MEX) Structure A (GBR, but also AUS, FIN, NOR)
 - Policy E → Structure B (IND) Structure D (CZE, HUN, SVK)

Regression Strategy

- Find variables that matter the most in determining a country's outcome.
- Logistic model: too many variables relative to the number of observations which produces perfectly determined results.
- Linear Probability Model (LPM): violate OLS assumptions.
- Robustness Check:
 - 1. Logistic regression on significant variables from LPM results.
 - 2. Model Selection (Lasso)



Cross-country Comparison by Four Group Clustering

Data by 25th March 2021 for 46 selected countries.



Blue: Success, Green: Lives over economy, Red: Mixed, Black: Failure. Map: Jason Wang • Source: OECD Group • Created with Datawrapper

	Blue	Green	Red	Black
Constant	2.758	0.516	-1.351	-0.923
	(2.231)	(-2.135)	(-2.874)	(0.813)
H1N1 Death	0.000	-0.000***	0.000	0.000***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
SARS Death	0.001	0.004**	-0.003	-0.001
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Tax Revnue (% of GDP)	-0.008	-0.005	0.010	0.003
	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.006)
Population density	0.087	0.040	-0.135	0.009
	(0.059)	(0.051)	(0.076)	(0.021)
Share of population above 70	-0.058*	-0.008	0.064	0.002
	(0.034)	(0.030)	(0.043)	(0.012)
Poverty rate	-0.001	0.005	-0.007	0.003
	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.003)
Cardiovascular disease	0.001	0.000	-0.001	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Diabetes prevalance	-0.102**	-0.001	0.102*	0.001
	(0.047)	(0.041)	(0.061)	(0.017)
Hospital beds	-0.069*	-0.020	0.092**	-0.004
	(0.037)	(0.032)	(0.048)	(0.013)
Trade reliance	-0.003**	-0.001	0.005**	-0.000
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Income share of top 10%	-0.038*	-0.015	0.055**	-0.002
	(0.020)	(0.018)	(0.026)	(0.007)
Digitalization	0.010	-0.005	-0.013	0.008
	(0.022)	(0.019)	(0.028)	(0.008)
Democratic rating	-0.002	0.003	-0.002	0.000
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.002)
Neighbouring countries	0.011	0.020	-0.022	-0.009
	(0.029)	(0.026)	(0.038)	(0.011)
Government debt (% of GDP)	0.001	0.002	-0.002	-0.001
25 12	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.001)
R-squared	0.855	0.842	0.822	0.916
Adjusted R-squared	0.565	0.525	0.466	0.747
F-Test (p-value)	0.0152	0.025	0.045	0.001
Number of observations	46	46	46	46

Initial conditions to look out for:

1. Learn from past pandemic experience: a lesson from SARS, H1N1 and Covid.

2. Vulnerable group needs more protection:low-income, elderly and diabetic group.

3. Countries rely heavily on trade are less likely to be successful: transmission risks through trade.

Standard Errors are reported in Parentheses.

*, **, *** indicates significance at 90%, 95% and 99% level respectively.

Table 2: LPM Regression	Results for Covid	Outcomes on Policy	Measures,	March 20	021
-------------------------	-------------------	---------------------------	-----------	----------	-----

	Blue	Green	Red	Black
School closures	0.010	0.002	-0.012	0.000
	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.004)
Workplace restrictions	-0.003	-0.006	0.009	-0.001
	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.003)
Cancelation public events	0.007	0.009	-0.016	0.001
	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.003)
Restrictions on gatherings	-0.020**	-0.009	0.030***	-0.001
	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.003)
Close public transport	-0.006	-0.001	0.008	0.000
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.002)
Stay at home requirements	0.002	0.003	-0.003	-0.001
	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.003)
Internal movement restrictions	0.002	0.004	-0.008	0.003
	(0.009)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.002)
International travel rest.	-0.002	-0.007	0.009	-0.001
	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.002)
Public information rest.	0.007	0.004	-0.013	0.002
	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.003)
Testing policy	0.020***	0.006	-0.028***	0.003
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.002)
Contact tracing	-0.003	0.002	0.002	-0.001
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.001)
Facial coverings	-0.009	-0.008	0.016**	0.000
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.002)
Protection of elderly people	-0.012**	-0.01*	0.021***	0.001
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.002)
Fiscal stimulus in Healthcare	-0.032	-0.047	-0.026	0.106***
	(0.066)	(0.058)	(0.085)	(0.024)
Fiscal stimulus in Non-Healthcare	-0.035	0.072***	-0.040	0.002
	(0.023)	(0.020)	(0.030)	(0.008)
R-squared	0.855	0.842	0.822	0.916
Adjusted R-squared	0.565	0.525	0.466	0.747
F-Test (p-value)	0.0152	0.025	0.045	0.001
Number of observations	46	46	46	46

Policy measure matters the most:

Testing: Countries implemented more testing since the beginning of Covid on average are more likely to be successful.

- More testing → More Covid information → Better policy decisions judged by outcome
- More testing → People who tested positive will self isolate

Standard Errors are reported in Parentheses.

*, **, *** indicates significance at 90%, 95% and 99% level respectively

Table 3: Logistic Regression Results for Covid Outcomes on Significant Variables, March 2021

	Blue	Red
Share of population above 70	-0.650**	
	(0.272)	
Diabetes prevalance	-0.193	0.163
	(0.278)	(0.263)
Hospital beds	-0.113	0.121
	(0.259)	(0.327)
Trade reliance	-0.018	0.091**
	(0.012)	(0.046)
Income share of top 10%	-0.514**	0.495**
	(0.249)	(0.222)
Restrictions on gatherings	-0.103*	0.193*
	(0.058)	(0.115)
Testing policy	0.092*	-0.124**
	(0.050)	(0.063)
Facial coverings		0.038
		(0.042)
Protection of elderly people	-0.078*	0.085*
	(0.044)	(0.045)
Constant	27.220	-34.442
	(10.886)	(14.775)
F-Test (p-value)	0.000	0.000
Pseudo R-squared	0.5576	0.6185
Number of observations	46	46

Standard Errors are reported in Parentheses.

*, **, *** indicates significance at 90%, 95% and 99% level respectively.

Robustness check: Logistic Regression

- Logistic regression: using significant variables from the linear model results.
- Majority of the variables are significant again.
- Conclusion on 'testing' and 'lowincome group' are very robust.

Robustness check: Model Selection (Lasso)

For previous exercise, variables were selected by us based on existing literature and economic rationality What happens if we let the data choose the variables that most explain outcome variables?

Policy Variables	Blue	Blue+Green	Total Deaths per million	Economic Losses	Structural Variables	Blue	Blue+Green	Total Deaths per million	Economic Losses
Workplace restrictions					Gross Debt General Government				
Cancellation Public Events					Manufacturing				
Restrictions on Gatherings					Services				
Close Public Transport		_			Trade				
Stay at home requirements					Median Age				
Internal Movement Restrictions					Age 70 or older		_		
International Travel Rest.					Cardiovascular death rate				
Stimulus on Health Sector					Health Expenditure - out of pocket				
Stimulus on Non-Health Sector				-	Hospital beds per 1000				
Public Information Campaigns					H1N1 deaths per million		-		
Testing Policy					Island				
Contact Tracing					Bordering Countries (#)				
Facial Coverings					East Asia and Pacific				
Protection of Elderly People					Latin America				
Time at Home					South Asia				
					Political System				

In red variables identified in main exercise Green square \rightarrow variable was selected by Lasso for that outcome variable

Taking Stock: Policy Objectives and Recommendations

- 1. Goal: Lives and Livelihoods
- 2. Structural characteristics matter for both outcome and policy
 - GDP per capita, fiscal space, population structure, geography among others



Final Remarks and Next Research Steps

✓ This is a preliminary performance analysis

- COVID is still rampant globally (55 countries more deaths in 2021 than in 2020)
- Analysis up to 2021 Q1 for 46 countries

✓ Does the timing of policy implementation matter? We believe it does!

- How has vaccination news and rollout affect a country's COVID performance?
- Does people's adaptability to the virus increases or reduces policy effectiveness?

Thank you!

We thank Alan, Matheus, and William for their guidance and thoughtful discussions during these three weeks. We also like to thank all the workshop participants that heard us and made valuable suggestions during our updates.

Pêdra Andrade, Maria Cristina Barbieri Goes, Carla Corburger, Ettore Gallo, Andrea Gurgone, Adam Kerényi, Humberto Martinez B., Enrico Maria Turco, and Jason Wang