

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

One year of COVID-19 in Italy: are containment policies enough to shape the pandemic pattern?

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version: Panarello D., Tassinari G. (2022). One year of COVID-19 in Italy: are containment policies enough to shape the pandemic pattern?. SOCIO-ECONOMIC PLANNING SCIENCES, 79(February), 1-14 [10.1016/j.seps.2021.101120].

Availability: This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/848334 since: 2023-06-05

Published:

DOI: http://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2021.101120

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/). When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

One year of COVID-19 in Italy: are containment policies enough to shape the pandemic pattern?

3

4

5 Abstract A successful fight against COVID-19 greatly depends on citizens' adherence to the 6 restrictive measures, which may not suffice alone. Making use of a containment index, data on 7 sanctions, and Google's movement trends across Italian provinces, complemented by other sources, we investigate the extent to which compliance with the mobility limitations has affected the number 8 9 of infections and deaths over time, for the period running from 24 February 2020 to 23 February 2021. We find proof of a deterrent effect on mobility given by the increase in sanction rate and positivity 10 11 rate among the population. We also show how the pandemic dynamics have changed between the first 12 and the second wave of the emergency. Lots of people could be spared by incorporating greater 13 interventions and many more are at stake, despite the recent boost in vaccinations. Informing citizens 14 about the effects and purposes of the restrictive measures has become increasingly important throughout the various phases of the pandemic. 15

16

17

18 Keywords COVID-19 lockdown stringency; First and second wave; Google Community Mobility
19 Reports; Italian provinces and regions; Reopening of schools; Social distancing compliance.

20

22 1. Introduction

The Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus, was first identified in 23 Wuhan, China, in December 2019. On the last day of the year, the Wuhan Municipal Health 24 Commission released a briefing on its website about a pneumonia of unknown cause, with 27 25 confirmed cases; the World Health Organization's Western Pacific Regional Office was promptly 26 27 notified by the WHO's Country Office in the People's Republic of China, which had picked up the media statement from the website¹. In the following days, the disease quickly spread to the rest of 28 China and Asia, being also detected in Beijing, Shanghai, and Shenzhen, as well as in Japan, Thailand, 29 and South Korea². The city of Wuhan implemented a travel ban for its citizens on the 23rd of January, 30 as an attempt to curb the epidemic within the city (Chinazzi et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2020). The rest 31 32 of the world was silently observing the evolution of the epidemic, staying on the alert. The World 33 Health Organization finally declared the outbreak a Public Health Emergency of International Concern on 30th January 2020 (Brodeur et al., 2020). Just one day later, Italy observed two confirmed 34 cases: a couple of tourists from China². On the 1st of February, Italy suspended the issue of visas to 35 36 Chinese citizens and banned all direct flights from China².

On 21st February 2020, an Italian citizen who had not been to China was diagnosed with SARS-CoV-2 in the Italian region of Lombardy². On the same day, in the afternoon, Codogno – the town in which the hospital was located – was put into quarantine by order of the Mayor²; a few hours later, the first Italian citizen, an elderly person from Veneto, died from the infection³. One day later, the list of quarantined Municipalities in Northern Italy expanded to 11, with about 50,000 people affected⁴; on

¹ https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-health-pneumonia-idUSKBN1YZ0GP;

https://www.who.int/news/item/29-06-2020-covidtimeline

² https://www.agi.it/cronaca/news/2020-02-23/coronavirus-italia-morti-7175602/

³ https://www.corriere.it/cronache/20_febbraio_21/coronavirus-muore-uomo-77-anni-monselice-dac529f6-54f9-11ea-9196-da7d305401b7.shtml

⁴ https://www.ilsole24ore.com/art/un-mese-coronavirus-italia-paziente-1-militari-strada-ADQZqnE

the 25th of February, additional restrictive measures were imposed in six out of seven Northern Italian 42 regions⁴. New cases kept being reported throughout Italy, which soon became the country with the 43 44 highest number of COVID-19 infections outside Asia. Schools and universities were ordered to shut down in the whole country since the 5th of March and, on the 8th of March, the Lombardy region and 45 14 more provinces in Northern Italy were put into quarantine, involving about 16 million citizens and 46 47 causing a night escape of thousands of people to other regions⁴. Just a short while later, the rising number of infections caused the imposition of the "most drastic public health measures ever seen in 48 a democracy"5: the whole nation was sent into a severe lockdown since the 10th of March, with heavy 49 50 fines - and even imprisonment - planned for anyone leaving home unauthorised⁶.

The disease was ultimately declared a pandemic by the WHO on 11th March 2020 (Ocampo and 51 Yamagishi, 2020). Other Western countries soon followed Italy in implementing social distancing 52 53 measures (Kupferschmidt and Cohen, 2020): indeed, while the disease was largely unknown and no 54 vaccine was readily available, putting restrictions on people's movements was commonly seen as the 55 only feasible strategy to keep the number of infections below a critical threshold (Anderson et al., 2020; Bushman et al., 2020; Lipsitch et al., 2020). On the 19th of March, Italy finally overtook China 56 57 as the country with the highest number of reported deaths caused by COVID-19 (JHU CSSE, 2021; 58 see Dong et al., 2020). The active centre of the pandemic had moved from Asia to Europe, while 59 China successfully managed to contain the spread of the virus, finally putting the quarantine in Wuhan to an end on the 8th of April (Brodeur et al., 2020). Italy ultimately emerged from the lockdown on 60 the 4th of May, slowly starting to reopen its economic activities (Buonomo and Della Marca, 2020). 61

 $^{^{5}\} https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-not-an-outlier-in-this-global-pandemic/article-make-no-mistake-italy-is-no-mistake-is-no-mistake-is-no-mistake-is-no-mistake-is-no-mistake-is-no-mistake-is-no-mistake-is-no-mistake-is-no-mistake-is-no-mistake-is-no-mistake-is-no-mistake-is-no-mistake-is-no-mistake-is-no$

⁶ https://www.salute.gov.it/portale/nuovocoronavirus/dettaglioNotizieNuovoCoronavirus.jsp?id=4184

62 While the lockdown conveyed a message of danger, the reopening might have led citizens to perceive that the threat had come to an end (Reinders Folmer et al., 2020b). Moreover, people are shown to 63 64 be less likely to comply with the restrictive measures when their duration is longer than they expect (Briscese et al., 2020). During the lockdown, inhabitants were obliged to confine themselves under 65 66 severe penalties; after that, the issue was confidently put into citizens' hands, who were now able to choose how much they were willing to cooperate, mostly based on their level of concern about the 67 68 health crisis, their practical capacity to adhere to the measures, their social norms, and their level of 69 confidence in the authorities (Lalot et al., 2020; Nivette et al., 2020; Reinders Folmer et al., 2020a; 70 Shao and Hao, 2020). Indeed, an effective response to the pandemic strongly relies on citizens' 71 compliance with the restrictive measures put in place to halt the spread of COVID-19 (Islam et al., 72 2020; May, 2020; Sobol et al., 2020; West et al., 2020), ultimately reducing the number of deaths.

With this paper, we aim at offering new insights into how citizens' compliance with the restrictions –
measured through longitudinal data on sanctions and movement trends – has affected the number of
infections and deaths over time.

The remainder of the article is organised as follows. The next Section (2) presents a description of the data employed in the analyses; Section 3 depicts the adopted methodology; Section 4 shows the main results; finally, in Section 5, we discuss the relevant implications of our findings, along with some concluding remarks.

80

81 2. Data

Our data come from several sources of information. First, we collected the daily distribution of COVID-19 positive cases in the 107 Italian second-level institutional bodies (i.e., provinces) and of performed swabs and recorded deaths in the country's 19 regions and 2 Autonomous provinces,

85	provided by the Italian Civil Protection (Dipartimento della Protezione Civile, 2021). Furtherly, we
86	make use of the Containment and Health Index, developed by the University of Oxford's Blavatnik
87	School of Government (Hale et al., 2021), tracing the government response to the pandemic outbreak
88	over time. Moreover, we gathered the number of daily controls and fines imposed on citizens due to
89	disrespecting the restrictive measures aimed at containing the Coronavirus spread, made available by
90	the Italian Ministry of the Interior (Ministero dell'Interno, 2021). Plus, we employ Google's
91	Community Mobility Reports, capturing movement trends across different categories of places at the
92	province level (Google LLC, 2021). Additionally, we include the regional-level scores of bonding and
93	bridging social capital (Sabatini, 2005), which may play a role in explaining citizens' compliance. Lastly,
94	we complement these sources with a number of variables describing the demographic characteristics
95	of the analysed provinces (i.e., activity rate, density, population, ratio of over-65s to the total
96	population), taken from the Italian National Institute of Statistics (Istat). Some dummies portraying
97	the restrictions adopted in particular periods (i.e., lockdown, red and orange zones) are also computed.
98	For each time-varying variable, we collected 366 daily observations, pertaining to the period running

98 For each time-varying variable, we collected 366 daily observations, pertaining to the period running 99 from the 24th of February 2020 to the 23rd of February 2021 (one year). All these data are publicly 100 available. However, for the sake of transparency and reproducibility, as well as to help further research 101 on the field, we provide the ready-to-use dataset and modelling codes (Panarello and Tassinari, 2021).

- **102** Descriptive statistics of the implemented variables are shown in Table 1.
- 103

. .

- 104
- 105
- 106

107	Table 1 - Descriptive statistics, computed for the sample that is not missing for any of the variable	es (common
108	observations).	

	Total	Common	1st	25th		75th	QQth		Standard
Variable	Oba	Oba		25 ^m	Modian	/J ^m	norcontilo	Moon	Dorrightion
Pagional	Obs.	Obs.	percentile	percentile	Median	percentile	percentile	Wiean	Deviation
	20162	21696	0	21	157	720	5173	606.63	1112 42
Regional	39102	54000	0	21	157	129	5175	000.05	1112.42
swabe	30055	34686	126	1806	4296	10703	41260	7821 55	8703 77
Regional	57055	54000	120	1000	4270	10705	41200	7021.55	0195.11
deaths	39055	34686	0	1	6	26	241	22 38	46.16
Provincial	57055	51000	0	1	0	20	211	22.50	10.10
positive cases	39055	34686	0	2	17	77	845	80.26	201.80
Provincial	57055	51000	0	2	17	1.1	015	00.20	201.00
swabs	39055	34686	29.58	246 59	566 18	1238 56	9075.67	1088 87	1738 37
Provincial	57055	51000	27.50	10.07	500.10	1200.00	2013.01	1000.07	1150.51
positivity rate	38645	34686	0.000	0.005	0.030	0.088	0.500	0.068	0.137
Provincial	50010	51000	0.000	0.000	0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.107
positivity rate									
(7-day moving									
average)	38734	34686	0.000	0.007	0.036	0.091	0.375	0.063	0.085
Containment									
and Health									
Index	39162	34686	53.87	61.01	68.15	78.75	85.42	69.97	9.94
Closures and									
containment									
Index	39162	34686	37.50	50.00	62.50	77.08	92.71	65.53	17.40
Health									
measures									
Index	39162	34686	61.11	75.69	75.69	75.69	82.36	75.89	4.79
Red zone	39162	34686	0	0	0	0	1	0.070	0.255
Orange zone	39162	34686	0	0	0	0	1	0.106	0.308
Compliance									
rate	37450	34686	93.80	98.53	99.17	99.84	99.97	98.86	1.28
Google									
Mobility:									
Retail and									
recreation	39027	34686	-95	-55	-28	-12	40	-33.47	30.98
Google									
Mobility:									
Grocery and									
pharmacy	38945	34686	-94	-26	-9	0	40	-14.52	24.96

Google									
Mobility:									
Parks	36987	34686	-89	-41	-6	36	368	11.16	87.72
Google									
Mobility:									
Transit									
stations	37925	34686	-88	-56	-36	-18	65	-35.28	31.36
Google									
Mobility:									
Workplaces	39116	34686	-81	-39	-26	-19	15	-30.10	19.64
Google									
Mobility:									
Residential	39067	34686	-7	4	9	16	36	11.14	10.10
Bridging social									
capital	39162	34686	-4.34	-1.69	-0.36	1.64	3.93	0.07	2.34
Bonding social									
capital	39162	34686	-5.9	-2.82	-0.53	2.67	5.39	-0.20	3.18
Activity rate	39162	34686	37.46	45.78	50.89	54.48	60.63	49.60	5.80
Density (pop.									
per sq. km)	39162	34686	38	106	184	286	2615	277.85	392.44
Percentage of									
over-65s to									
total									
population	39162	34686	18.2	22.4	23.9	25.6	29.2	24.10	2.35

109

Concerning the distribution of daily positive cases, swabs, and deaths (Dipartimento della Protezione 110 Civile, 2021), the Italian Civil Protection provides complete data at the regional level; only cases are 111 also provided at the province level. With a view to obtaining the number of swabs at the province 112 level, we weigh the regional values by the population in each province. Positivity rate is the ratio of 113 positive cases to the total number of tests performed on a given day. As there are recurrent 114 inconsistencies and delays in reporting such data, a modest number of days is characterised by negative 115 116 values of positive cases, swabs, and deaths: this happens when, on a particular day, the count gets 117 corrected downwards after having been overestimated on the day before - e.g., due to erroneously counting duplicate data. Therefore, we correct the single negative values by means of an equally-118

119 weighted seven-period two-sided moving average approach, until achieving a positive value for each anomalous observation. In addition, we aggregate the data weekly, by computing equally-weighted 120 121 seven-period two-sided moving averages for the whole set of observations, using the transformed variable in lieu of the original one in some of the models. This strategy lets us control for the effect 122 123 produced by the daily variations in the number of swabs on a given week: much fewer tests are usually 124 performed during weekends (Ruiu and Ruiu, 2020), causing grossly underestimated reported figures 125 from Sundays to Tuesdays each week (once swabs collected on weekends ultimately get analysed and 126 reported). Data on deaths are also difficult to assess. Indeed, daily reported figures often come as the 127 result of backlogs; moreover, each region adopts a different - and sometimes not consistent - count. 128 However, during the pandemic, the number of victims has never dropped below a certain threshold.

129 We plot daily tests (in thousands), positive cases (in hundreds), and deaths in Figure 1. The number 130 of tests, which was remarkably low at the beginning of the pandemic, shows a major increase since 131 summer 2020. At this point, the deaths line starts keeping pace with the swabs one, so that the number 132 of deaths becomes close to 1 per 100 positive cases: indeed, the apparent lethality rate approaches a more realistic threshold than the one observed in the first period. As a matter of fact, the apparent 133 134 lethality rate (Case Fatality Rate, CFR) - calculated by dividing the number of deaths by the number 135 of confirmed COVID-19 cases - is strictly dependent on the testing policy and potentially much different from the real one (Infection Fatality Rate, IFR). An early analysis (Verity et al., 2020) 136 estimated the IFR for China at 0.66% and several other studies from a wide range of countries 137 demonstrate a point estimate of IFR of about 0.68% (Meyerowitz-Katz and Merone, 2020). However, 138 as the disease is lethal especially for older people, who represent a much more substantial strand of 139 140 the population in Italy than in many other countries, the Italian IFR could well be slightly higher than 1% (see Rinaldi and Paradisi, 2020). This said, when the deaths line in Figure 1 is just marginally distant 141 142 than the positive cases line, contagions are likely estimated with greater accuracy and CFR could be

- 143 considered a realistic index of COVID-19 lethality, which was utterly overestimated in the first period
- 144 of the pandemic due to a very low number of daily tests.
- 145
- 146 Figure 1 Number of swabs, positive cases and deaths over time.



147

Figure 2 shows the ratio of positive cases to the total number of tests performed on each day. This ratio – also known as positivity rate – was very high at the beginning of the pandemic, due to a low number of performed daily tests, which were only used to confirm severely symptomatic cases. Indeed, when an infected person is found, a good practice would be to buffer all the people that the individual had recently been in contact with, even if they do not show any apparent symptom attributable to the disease. On the other hand, when the number of performable tests is limited, only the most serious cases (i.e., severely symptomatic individuals) are expected to be tested and, therefore, a very high

¹⁴⁸

proportion of swabs would give positive results (Busetta et al., 2020). The positivity rate decreases in summer, when the real number of infected people was lower and it was easier to trace them more accurately, then starts increasing again in autumn, along with the "second wave" of the pandemic.

159

160 Figure 2 – Positivity rate over time.



161

As regards the spatial distribution of infections over the year, we divide the count of positive cases and the positivity rate into deciles and present them in four choropleth maps of Italy, at the NUTS-3 level of detail (provinces). Specifically, Figure 3 shows the cumulative number of positive cases detected in the period 24 February 2020 – 13 September 2020, while Figure 4 refers to the period 14 September 2020 – 23 February 2021. Then, we display the average positivity rate determined over the same two periods in Figures 5 and 6, respectively. As the maps show, infections were mostly

concentrated in the northern Italian provinces during the first wave of the pandemic, becoming 169

170 widespread throughout the country in the second period, in which both the cumulative number of

cases and the positivity rate are considerably higher. 171

172

period 24 February 2020 - 13 September 2020, divided into deciles, at the Italian NUTS-3 level.

Figure 3 - Cumulative number of positive cases in the Figure 4 - Cumulative number of positive cases in the period 14 September 2020 - 23 February 2021, divided into deciles, at the Italian NUTS-3 level.







Figure 5 - Average positivity rate in the period 24 Figure 6 - Average positivity rate in the period 14 February 2020 - 13 September 2020, divided into deciles, at the Italian NUTS-3 level.

September 2020 - 23 February 2021, divided into deciles, at the Italian NUTS-3 level.



178

The Containment and Health Index (Hale et al., 2021) was developed to measure the evolution of 179 government responses to the pandemic over time. It is a composite index made up of 14 indicators, 180 each ranging between 0 and 100, aggregated with no weighting. Deeply, the adopted indicators refer 181 to country-level data on closures and containment (closings of schools and universities, closing of 182 183 workplaces, cancelling of public events, restrictions on private gatherings, closing of public transport, stay-at-home requirements, restrictions on internal movements, restrictions on international travel) 184 185 and health measures (presence of public information campaigns, testing policy, contact tracing, facial 186 coverings policy, vaccination policy, policies for protecting elderly people). Figure 7 plots the values taken by the index over the analysed period. Of course, the values were higher in the first period due 187 to the heavy restrictions (i.e., lockdown) that took place from the 10th of March to the 3rd of May 2020. 188







Starting from the 11th of March 2020 (one day after the extension of the lockdown to the whole 192 193 country), the Italian Ministry of the Interior started delivering daily reports on the number of controls 194 carried out by the police and the number of sanctions given due to violation of lockdown dispositions (Ministero dell'Interno, 2021). We can calculate the sanction rate as the ratio between the number of 195 196 fines and the number of people who were controlled on a given day (Ruiu and Ruiu, 2020); the one's complement to this rate (Compliance rate) represents a proxy of citizens' degree of adhesion and 197 198 consent to the COVID-19 restrictive measures, which is a determining factor in the success of 199 lockdown policies (Li et al., 2020a). Indeed, not all individuals violating the lockdown norms had been 200 caught by the competent authorities; nevertheless, this ratio can still provide useful information on 201 this issue, proving its robustness in our analyses. Figure 8 shows sanctions and police controls for

each day. Controls were particularly tight during the lockdown, then loosened after the restrictions

203 had been gradually released.

204

205 Figure 8 – Number of sanctions and police controls over time.



²⁰⁷

Figure 9 shows the evolution of Italians' compliance with COVID-19 restrictions over the considered period, in percentage points. Compliance was lower during the lockdown, then increased in correspondence of the easing of surveillance services. In the latest period, as individuals' response to social distancing measures wanes over time (Hoeben et al., 2021; Jeffrey et al., 2020; Reinders Folmer et al., 2020a), compliance looks to be on the decrease again.



215

216

217 Moreover, we use Google's Community Mobility Reports (Google LLC, 2021), consisting in provincelevel aggregated daily data on human mobility trends, grouped into six different location categories 218 219 (i.e., residential areas, retail stores and recreation sites, grocery stores and pharmacies, parks, transit stations, and workplaces). These are anonymised sets of data passively collected from millions of users 220 221 who have enabled the Location History setting on their mobile devices, used in other Google's 222 products, such as Maps, to track human traffic and display popular times at various locations. Deeply, 223 these data consist in daily percentage changes from a pre-pandemic baseline, which is the median value for that day of the week, pertaining to the 5-week period 3rd January – 6th February 2020. Therefore, 224 the baseline consists in 7 individual values: one for each weekday. The residential category measures 225 226 percentage changes in the duration of stay, while the other categories quantify variations in the number of visitors: indeed, simple information on the time a person spends out of the house is not enough
for predicting infections, as movements directed to high-risk locations and solitary walks would be
considered on equal terms (Bushman et al., 2020).

230 In the considered 366 time periods, the maximum negative baseline change at the province level was 231 100% (for transit stations), while the maximum change in the positive direction was 933% (for parks). 232 As regards mean daily percentage changes, these range from a minimum of -96% (for retail stores and 233 recreation sites) to a maximum of +263% (for parks). The residential category is the one with the 234 lowest variance, while the parks category is the one with the highest variance, considering both 235 provincial data and daily means. These variations allow us to realise how each of the six categories had 236 been affected by policy action. Moreover, as each province shows different trends, restrictions had 237 better be managed at the local level.

Mean daily percentage changes for the six categories are plotted in Figure 10. Indeed, data for parks are peculiar: this category shows an intense growth in summer, due to seasonality. As regards residential areas, since the related information consists in average lengths of stay, the possible variation is bounded above: sure enough, there are only 24 hours in a day and all the people – even those who only come back home for sleeping at night – already spend a good amount of time at their places of residence.

244

- 246
- 247
- 248



249 Figure 10 – Google Community Mobility Reports for all categories over time.

250

252 A substantial stream of scientific literature has endeavoured to investigate the relationships between 253 citizens' reactions to containment policies - and, more generally, to the pandemic - by using the 254 theoretical construct of social capital (Bourdieu, 1980; Coleman, 1988; Putnam et al., 1993; Fine, 2001), implemented with different operational definitions (Alfano and Ercolano, 2020a; Bartscher et al., 255 2020; Borgonovi and Andrieu, 2020). Social interactions can reinforce the spread of infections; indeed, 256 they also determine other factors that are crucial in outlining the progress of the pandemic. In 257 258 particular, social capital can affect individual awareness of the costs and benefits associated with 259 behaviours that can contribute to the transmission of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Deeply, Alfano and 260 Ercolano (2020a) employed the conceptualisations of bridging and bonding social capital (Fine, 2001; Sabatini, 2005; 2009), obtaining significant coefficients in an econometric model aimed at analysing 261

the trend of COVID-19 infections in Italy. In brief, bridging social capital is based on trust between heterogeneous social groups, while bonding social capital is based on kinship and family groups. We expect a strong presence of bridging social capital in a particular area to have the effect of decreasing the containment policies' effectiveness; conversely, bonding social capital, by conditioning people's behaviour, should mitigate the spread of infections, thus strengthening the impact of the adopted measures. For the operational definition of the two constructs, we followed Alfano and Ercolano (2020a).

269

270 **3.** Methods

Ten models are estimated. The first three models (Models A1 to A3) are Hausman-Taylor panel 271 272 regressions, in which some covariates are allowed to be correlated with the unobserved individuallevel random effects (Hausman and Taylor, 1981). Indeed, one of the main drawbacks of fixed-effects 273 models is that they cannot incorporate time-constant covariates, as they show no variability within 274 individuals over time. On the other hand, in random-effects models, endogenous time-varying and 275 276 time-constant covariates may be correlated with the unobserved panel-level random effects. The 277 Hausman-Taylor estimator is designed to address both the time-constant issue and any potential endogeneity concerns. In these models, we use the equally-weighted seven-period two-sided moving 278 average of provincial positivity rate for day *i* and province *j* as dependent variable. As the schools' 279 reopening on the 14th of September 2020 is said to have been the primary cause of the resurgence of 280 281 the pandemic in Italy (Sebastiani and Palù, 2020), we perform our estimations on two subsamples: until the 13th of September and since the 14th of September. 282

283 Model A1 is performed on the first subsample. It includes seven time-varying covariates: the284 Containment and Health Index, the Compliance rate, as well as Google's mobility data for retail and

285 recreation, grocery and pharmacy, parks, transit stations, and workplaces. Moreover, it includes four time-constant regressors: activity rate and population density, measured at the province level, and the 286 287 regional-level scores of bonding and bridging social capital. All the time-varying covariates are measured with an 8-day lag from the dependent variable. The reason behind this choice is that the 288 289 mean incubation period (i.e., the time between the contact with a positive individual and the onset of 290 symptoms) is around 5.2 days, with a mean of approximately 5 days (Li et al., 2020b; Linton et al., 291 2020); to these 5 days, we add the median time between the onset of symptoms and the official 292 diagnosis, which was 2.6 days in the considered period (Istituto Superiore di Sanità, 2021). Google's 293 mobility regressors are assumed to be endogenous, as the variations in mobility are affected by the 294 values taken by other variables in the model. Moreover, as the dependent variable is on a different lag than the regressors in our analyses, it is assumed not to affect the independent variables, thus furtherly 295 296 allowing us to control for endogeneity. Albeit we do not control for time fixed-effects, our model still 297 allows us to manage time differences through the Containment and Health Index, measured alongside 298 citizens' compliance.

Moving on to Model A2, as the Containment and Health Index aggregates fourteen policies, it is indeed interesting to evaluate the impact of the different indicators which it is composed of. Therefore, in this model we split the Containment and Health Index into two sub-indices: the Closures and containment Index, made up of 8 indicators, and the Health measures Index, which includes 6 indicators.

Model A3 is performed on the second subsample (14th September 2020 – 23rd February 2021). This
period is characterised by a regional differentiation in the implemented containment measures: starting
from the 6th of November 2020, each Italian region and Autonomous province is assigned a colour
based on the local pandemic risk, which is updated each week. The possible colours are: white (safe);

yellow (low risk); orange (medium risk); and red (high risk). For each colour, specific restrictive measures are foreseen. Hence, when analysing the second subsample, we replace the "Closures and containment" part of the national-level Containment and Health Index with a set of dummy variables indicating the pandemic-risk colour attributed to each region: deeply, we include the Health measures Index along with two dichotomic variables, respectively indicating whether the region was attributed a red or orange classification; when both dichotomic variables take value 0, it means that the region is classified as having a low or very low pandemic risk, with mild envisaged containment policies.

315 The fourth model (Model B) is a Generalised Least Squares fixed-effects panel regression of time spent in residential areas - derived from Google data - on sanction rate (measured at lag 1), moving 316 317 average of provincial positivity rate (lag 1), and an interaction of the extended lockdown period (10th March -2^{nd} June) with the Containment and Health Index. Although the lockdown was lifted since 318 the 4th of May, most restrictions, such as limitations on movements outside the region, kept being 319 applied until the 2nd of June. Here, we assume that people react with fear in response to information 320 321 about the daily percentage of positive cases and sanctioned individuals, which would result in 322 voluntary compliance to the restrictions on the following day, thus making citizens spend more time 323 at home (see Buonomo and Della Marca, 2020; Goorah et al., 2020).

Models C1 to C3 are similar to Models A1 to A3 but estimated through Negative Binomial fixedeffects panel regressions, to account for the discrete nature of the dependent variable. Indeed, as the dependent variables in our analyses (exception made for Model B) refer to the counts of infections and deaths, the correct investigation approach is given by regression models based on the Negative Binomial distribution, which has been employed in several COVID-19-related studies (e.g., Allel et al., 2020; Basellini et al., 2021; Chaudhry et al., 2020; Pan et al., 2020; Piovani et al., 2021; Woody et al., 2020). Compared to other count regression models such as Poisson, the Negative Binomial has 331 the further advantage of being explicitly able to keep the variability of the data under control by considering overdispersion (i.e., variance being larger than the mean), which is common for 332 333 epidemiological data (Endo et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2012). This may lead to improved efficiency in estimation: as demonstrated by Chan et al. (2021), the Negative Binomial regression corresponds to 334 the best fitting model for the analysis of COVID-19-related data. Models C1 to C3 employ the count 335 336 of provincial positive cases as dependent variable. Therefore, compared to the first three models, 337 which use the moving average of provincial positivity rate as response variable, we need to include 338 some additional regressors: provincial swabs, to account for the daily number of performed tests, and 339 six dummy variables indicating the day of the week (Monday to Saturday), to account for the variability 340 in the number of reported cases over the course of each calendar week.

341 Models D1 to D3 are Negative Binomial fixed-effects panel regressions of the regional deaths count, estimated on the two subsamples 24th February 2020 - 13th September 2020 (Models D1 and D2) and 342 14th September 2020 – 23rd February 2021 (Model D3). The employed regressors are: regional positive 343 344 cases, regional swabs, Containment and Health Index (aggregated in Model D1, split into two parts in 345 Model D2, and with the "Closures and containment" part replaced by the regional-level pandemic-346 risk colour in Model D3), Compliance rate, Google's mobility data (for retail and recreation, grocery 347 and pharmacy, parks, transit stations, and workplaces), bridging and bonding social capital scores, activity rate, population density, and percentage of over-65s to the total population. Here, the time-348 varying variables are employed with a 17-day lag from the dependent variable, as we add the median 349 time from the onset of symptoms to death, which was estimated in 12 days in Italy (Gruppo della 350 Sorveglianza COVID-19, 2021), to the 5-days mean incubation period (Li et al., 2020b; Linton et al., 351 2020). 352

4. Results

355 Models A1 to A3 are Hausman-Taylor panel regressions of provincial positivity rate, the results of 356 which are shown in Table 2. As expected, higher containment scores and citizens' compliance imply a lower positivity rate. The "Health measures" feature of the Containment and Health Index is 357 358 apparently the only effective one in shaping the number of infections over time (Model A2). Moreover, 359 unsurprisingly, red zones are more successful than orange zones in limiting the spread of the disease 360 (Model A3). As regards mobility, a greater activity towards grocery stores is always correlated with 361 rising positivity rates. The same effect is given by a higher percentage change in visits to parks in the first period. Indeed, as depicted in Figure 10, parks became overcrowded with joggers and walkers 362 363 during spring and summer 2020, after the relaxation of the ban on outdoor exercise imposed during 364 the lockdown (Camporesi, 2020), which may explain this positive relationship. By contrast, going to 365 sites for retail and recreation seems to have a negative effect on the number of confirmed cases per 366 swab, which is likely due to the correlation with the closure of such activities amidst the infection 367 peaks. In the second period, characterised by the provision of strict safety protocols in workplaces 368 and public means of transportation, visits to such places are correlated with a lower positivity rate. 369 The role of bridging and bonding social capital appears to be relevant in the first period, in which 370 more connections among people are associated with a higher positivity rate. Finally, higher activity rates in the first period seem to bring about an increase in positivity rates among the population. 371

372

- 373
- 374

376 Table 2 – Results from Models A1 to A3: Hausman-Taylor panel regressions of provincial positivity rate (7-day moving

377 average).

	A1 (until 13th Sep)	A2 (until 13th Sep)	A3 (since 14th Sep)
	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
	(Robust Std. Err.)	(Robust Std. Err.)	(Robust Std. Err.)
Containment and Health Index (lag 8)	-0.003***		
	(0.0002)		
Closures and containment Index (lag 8)		-0.000	
		(0.0001)	
Health measures Index (lag 8)		-0.008***	-0.008***
		(0.0005)	(0.0006)
Red zone (lag 8)			-0.040***
			(0.0055)
Orange zone (lag 8)			-0.030***
			(0.0033)
Compliance rate (lag 8)	-0.036***	-0.018***	-0.013***
	(0.0028)	(0.0021)	(0.0025)
Google Mobility: Retail and recreation (lag 8)	-0.001***	-0.000	-0.002***
	(0.0001)	(0.0001)	(0.0002)
Google Mobility: Grocery and pharmacy (lag 8)	0.001***	0.001***	0.001***
	(0.0001)	(0.0001)	(0.0001)
Google Mobility: Parks (lag 8)	0.000***	0.000**	0.000
	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
Google Mobility: Transit stations (lag 8)	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000***
	(0.0001)	(0.0001)	(0.0001)
Google Mobility: Workplaces (lag 8)	-0.000	0.000***	-0.000***
	(0.0001)	(0.0001)	(0.0001)
Bridging social capital	0.007***	0.007***	-0.002
	(0.0018)	(0.0018)	(0.0022)
Bonding social capital	0.002**	0.002**	-0.001
	(0.0010)	(0.0009)	(0.0009)
Activity rate	0.003***	0.003***	-0.000
	(0.0008)	(0.0008)	(0.0009)
Density (pop. per sq. km)	0.000	0.000	0.000
, vi i i <i>i /</i>	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
Intercept	3.583***	2.232***	1.945***
L	(0.2790)	(0.2175)	(0.2766)
Observations	17197	17197	16803

378 Note: ** and *** stand for p < 0.05 and p < 0.01.

Model B is a Generalised Least Squares fixed-effects panel regression of time spent in residential areas. 380 381 The results, shown in Table 3, highlight that the increase in time spent at home is governed by a plurality of factors. The trend of the pandemic at the provincial level, measured by the ratio of positive 382 cases to performed tests, acts as a deterrent to mobility, while the percentage of sanctions on 383 controlled individuals signals the effectiveness of repressive measures in hindering mobility. The 384 385 Containment and Health Index confirms its effect in limiting people's movements, as was already brought to light by the results of the previous models. It is interesting to note that, with the same level 386 387 of Containment and Health Index, its effect is almost doubled by interacting it with the extended lockdown (10^{th} March – 2^{nd} June), proving the key role played by psychological factors in governing 388 389 citizens' behaviour.

390

391 Table 3 – Results from Model B: GLS fixed-effects panel regression of time spent in residential areas.

	Coefficient
	(Robust Std. Err.)
Sanction rate (lag 1)	1.488***
	(0.0503)
Provincial positivity rate (7-day moving average, lag 1)	16.445***
	(1.8710)
Containment and Health Index, extended lockdown=0	0.383***
	(0.0061)
Containment and Health Index, extended lockdown=1	0.511***
	(0.0054)
Intercept	-20.922***
	(0.3679)
Observations	37250
R ² (overall)	0.780
R ² (adjusted)	0.794

392 Note: *** stands for p < 0.01.

394 Table 4 shows the results from Models C1 to C3, which employ the count of provincial cases as dependent variable. The analysis of infections by means of Negative Binomial models (our favourite 395 396 specification) confirms the results obtained through the Hausman-Taylor panel regressions. Here, the count of provincial swabs and six dummies indicating the day of the week are added to the regressors 397 398 already appearing in Models A1 to A3. The particularly high value of the Compliance rate coefficient 399 highlights the importance of citizens' cooperation to keep down the number of infections: for a one 400 per cent increase in this rate, the difference in the logs of expected infections is likely to decrease by 401 about 0.21 - 0.37 units, given that the other regressors are held constant. Concerning parks, while the 402 first period is characterised by a positive correlation with the number of infections (as already seen in 403 Models A1 to A3), the second period – in which mobility data do not exhibit the exceptionally high 404 peaks experienced right after the lockdown - displays a negative relationship. Undeniably, outdoor 405 environments, when not overcrowded, are associated with a lower likelihood of airborne droplet 406 transmission and, thus, reduced risk of infection, due to lower density of people and lower stability of 407 the virus in the air (Morawska and Cao, 2020; Setti et al., 2020).

- 408
- 409

9 Table 4 – Results from Models C1	to C3: Negative Binomial fixed-effects	panel regressions of provincial cases.
------------------------------------	--	--

	C1 (until 13th Sep)	C2 (until 13th Sep)	C3 (since 14th Sep)
	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
	(Std. Err.)	(Std. Err.)	(Std. Err.)
Provincial swabs	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
Containment and Health Index (lag 8)	-0.017***		
	(0.0014)		
Closures and containment Index (lag 8)		0.011***	
		(0.0010)	
Health measures Index (lag 8)		-0.061***	-0.069***
		(0.0014)	(0.0018)
Red zone (lag 8)			-0.553***

Orange zone (lag 8)			-0.383***
			(0.0159)
Compliance rate (lag 8)	-0.369***	-0.209***	-0.346***
	(0.0084)	(0.0080)	(0.0155)
Google Mobility: Retail and recreation (lag 8)	-0.018***	-0.005***	-0.029***
	(0.0009)	(0.0010)	(0.0010)
Google Mobility: Grocery and pharmacy (lag 8)	0.017***	0.009***	0.015***
	(0.0007)	(0.0008)	(0.0005)
Google Mobility: Parks (lag 8)	0.001***	0.001***	-0.001***
	(0.0002)	(0.0002)	(0.0003)
Google Mobility: Transit stations (lag 8)	0.004***	0.004***	-0.001
	(0.0008)	(0.0008)	(0.0007)
Google Mobility: Workplaces (lag 8)	-0.015***	-0.013***	0.006***
	(0.0011)	(0.0010)	(0.0006)
Bridging social capital	0.074***	0.045***	-0.073***
	(0.0119)	(0.0122)	(0.0097)
Bonding social capital	0.002	-0.005	-0.020***
	(0.0053)	(0.0053)	(0.0044)
Activity rate	0.093***	0.088***	-0.012***
	(0.0053)	(0.0054)	(0.0040)
Density (pop. per sq. km)	0.000***	0.000***	-0.000***
	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
Monday dummy	-0.094***	-0.111***	-0.244***
	(0.0361)	(0.0347)	(0.0226)
Tuesday dummy	-0.243***	-0.264***	0.357***
	(0.0313)	(0.0300)	(0.0218)
Wednesday dummy	-0.003	-0.120***	0.526***
	(0.0309)	(0.0293)	(0.0216)
Thursday dummy	0.160***	0.013	0.546***
	(0.0298)	(0.0283)	(0.0210)
Friday dummy	0.103***	-0.024	0.491***
	(0.0300)	(0.0286)	(0.0209)
Saturday dummy	0.013	-0.079***	0.337***
	(0.0302)	(0.0285)	(0.0199)
Intercept	31.325***	18.995***	39.863***
	(0.8962)	(0.8188)	(1.5481)
Observations	17197	17197	16803
Log-likelihood	-44450	-43598	-89541

(0.0215)

410 Note: *** stands for p < 0.01.

Table 5 displays the results from Models D1 to D3. As regards the number of deaths (similarly analysed through Negative Binomial fixed-effects panel regression models), the involved variables are the same that were identified for the number of infections, to which is added, among the structural variables, the provincial percentage of over-65s, which turns out to be significant and positively correlated with the deaths count only in the first period. Indeed, this shows that the demographic dynamics of the pandemic have changed compared to the beginning, embracing the whole population, and that the elderly might have become more cautious in the second phase of the pandemic.

420

i indice o incounte information and incounter)	Table 5 –	Results fron	n Models D1	to D3: Negative	Binomial fixed	-effects panel	regressions of	regional deat	hs.
---	---	-----------	--------------	-------------	-----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	---------------	-----

	D1 (until 13th Sep)	D2 (until 13th Sep)	D3 (since 14th Sep)
	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
	(Std. Err.)	(Std. Err.)	(Std. Err.)
Regional positive cases (lag 17)	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
Regional swabs (lag 17)	-0.000***	-0.000***	-0.000
	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
Containment and Health Index (lag 17)	-0.016***		
	(0.0012)		
Closures and containment Index (lag 17)		0.012***	
		(0.0009)	
Health measures Index (lag 17)		-0.042***	-0.035***
		(0.0010)	(0.0017)
Red zone (lag 17)			-0.486***
			(0.0187)
Orange zone (lag 17)			-0.273***
			(0.0138)
Compliance rate (lag 17)	-0.187***	-0.133***	-0.294***
	(0.0061)	(0.0056)	(0.0125)
Google Mobility: Retail and recreation (lag 17)	-0.039***	-0.027***	-0.028***
	(0.0009)	(0.0010)	(0.0009)
Google Mobility: Grocery and pharmacy (lag 17)	0.019***	0.014***	0.016***
	(0.0007)	(0.0007)	(0.0004)
Google Mobility: Parks (lag 17)	0.003***	0.002***	-0.002***
	(0.0003)	(0.0003)	(0.0002)

Google Mobility: Transit stations (lag 17)	-0.016***	-0.013***	-0.007***
	(0.0011)	(0.0010)	(0.0006)
Google Mobility: Workplaces (lag 17)	0.006***	0.010***	0.009***
	(0.0011)	(0.0011)	(0.0006)
Bridging social capital	0.048**	0.048**	0.036***
	(0.0205)	(0.0212)	(0.0132)
Bonding social capital	0.056***	0.067***	0.029***
	(0.0100)	(0.0105)	(0.0073)
Activity rate	0.024***	0.010	-0.036***
	(0.0090)	(0.0094)	(0.0055)
Density (pop. per sq. km)	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000***
	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
Percentage of over-65s to total population	0.059***	0.062***	0.003
	(0.0122)	(0.0126)	(0.0087)
Monday dummy	0.063***	0.066***	0.031*
	(0.0214)	(0.0203)	(0.0174)
Tuesday dummy	0.042*	0.119***	0.034*
	(0.0237)	(0.0228)	(0.0184)
Wednesday dummy	-0.079**	-0.017	-0.060**
	(0.0398)	(0.0388)	(0.0238)
Thursday dummy	0.163***	0.249***	0.558***
	(0.0231)	(0.0218)	(0.0174)
Friday dummy	0.224***	0.263***	0.489***
	(0.0218)	(0.0207)	(0.0169)
Saturday dummy	0.252***	0.245***	0.324***
	(0.0215)	(0.0203)	(0.0170)
Intercept	15.551***	12.773***	33.748***
	(0.8867)	(0.8537)	(1.2912)
Observations	16900	16900	16150
Log-likelihood	-34414	-33633	-56937

421 Note: *, ** and *** stand for p < 0.10, p < 0.05 and p < 0.01.

422

As regards potential collinearity issues, after examining the correlation between regression coefficients,
we did not detect any worrying values. Moreover, in our estimates, most coefficients appear to be
significant and we obtain satisfactory standard errors as well as confidence intervals (Giacalone et al.,
2018).

427	The days with the highest number of nationally reported deaths are the 3 rd of December 2020, with
428	993 lost lives, and the 27th of March 2020, in which the number of registered fatalities amounted to
429	969. As people's mobility 17 days before these peaks may have elicited such extraordinary numbers,
430	we present two choropleth maps of Italy that portray the spatial distribution of the percentage changes
431	in time spent in residential areas on 10 th March 2020 (Figure 11) and 16 th November 2020 (Figure 12).
432	In the two selected dates, the median percentage change turns out to be the same, while the variability
433	between provinces is higher in November compared to the 10 th of March (which is also the first day
434	of the national lockdown). Territorial differences in Italy are well-known (e.g., Aiello and Scoppa,
435	2000; Ercolano, 2012) and are also reflected in the dynamics of the COVID-19 pandemic. The highest
436	decile largely embraces the provinces with the highest population (Rome, Turin, and most of the
437	Lombardy region in the first period; the Campania region in the second period), indicating that citizens
438	living in such provinces have considerably altered their mobility habits compared to the pre-pandemic
439	period. The islands of Sicily and Sardinia appear to be closer to pre-pandemic mobility values in the
440	second period compared to the first one, while a large share of provinces maintained a similar level of
441	commitment with the mobility restrictions in the two periods.

Figure 11 – Time spent in residential areas (percentage changes from baseline) on 10th March 2020, divided into deciles, at the Italian NUTS-3 level.

Figure 12 – Time spent in residential areas (percentage changes from baseline) on 16th November 2020, divided into deciles, at the Italian NUTS-3 level.



449

450

5. Discussion and conclusions

451 Our results confirm that the containment policies have had a beneficial impact on the pandemic, 452 having been able to reduce the amount of infections and deaths caused by COVID-19. This 453 corroborates the findings of a considerable number of studies (e.g., Alfano and Ercolano, 2020b; 454 Alfano and Ercolano, 2021; Balmford et al., 2020; Caselli et al., 2021; Dergiades et al., 2020; Ghosh et 455 al., 2020; Pasdar et al., 2020).

Our outcomes concerning infections are comparable when using either the Hausman-Taylor or the
Negative Binomial model. However, the latter is our preferred specification, being the ideal approach
for COVID-19 data modelling, in line with the model comparison results presented and discussed by
Chan et al. (2021). The number of infections exhibits a negative relationship with the Containment

460 and Health Index and the Compliance rate, proving that the degree of agreement to the restrictive measures and the awareness of their necessity represents the greatest leverage to limit the spread of 461 462 the pandemic. Therefore, great attention must be paid by the Government and the other authorities in informing citizens about the motives and consequences of the restrictive measures. This result is 463 464 already present in the literature (Baldwin and Di Mauro, 2020; Bargain and Aminjonov, 2020; Lalot et 465 al., 2020; McKenzie and Adams, 2020). Our results highlight the paramount importance of social 466 capital in determining the trend of the pandemic. Following Alfano and Ercolano (2020a), we 467 distinguished between bridging and bonding social capital: as regards the former, the signs of the 468 estimated coefficients are aligned with what was expected; conversely, the estimates pertaining to 469 bonding social capital also show positive signs. Indeed, the presence of a high level of bonding social 470 capital could be read as a sign of a "closed" society, which would hinder the pandemic by reducing 471 contacts between strangers. Our contrary evidence can be rationalised in light of the fact that family 472 clusters of COVID-19 are shown to have played a dominant role in the transmission of the disease (Liu et al., 2020); moreover, particularly intense outbreaks in Italy occurred in "closed" - if not 473 474 segregated - social contexts, such as prisons (Cingolani et al., 2021) and residential care homes (Ventura et al., 2021). 475

476 Some structural features of the Italian provinces help explain the number of infections experienced 477 during the first wave. Activity rate reveals a direct relationship with positive cases in the first period, 478 as a stronger productive fabric causes more contacts, therefore facilitating infections, and the same 479 effect is attributable to population density.

480 It is remarkable that the reduction in mobility, as represented by the trend concerning time spent in 481 residential places, obtained from Google data, is also due to psychological factors. On the one hand, 482 we have the effect of the provincial positivity rate, whereby citizens reduce their mobility as a consequence of its increase, which we might call the "prudence effect". On the other hand, we have the deterrent effect expressed by the sanction rate and the Containment and Health Index. It should also be noted that the effect given by the Containment and Health Index is, at the same level, stronger during the lockdown period, confirming its psychological impact on citizens' compliance level: undeniably, the lockdown conveyed a message of danger, which calls for the mobilisation of individual behaviours to contain the pandemic.

489 In relation to the model concerning the number of deaths, we estimated three distinct models, 490 differentiating the study period in order to separately analyse the different "waves" of the pandemic (Table 5). The variables that show a significant impact are the same ones that were significant in the 491 492 model concerning infections, to which the regional number of cases and the number of performed 493 tests are added, with the first one showing a positive impact on the dependent variable. Among the 494 structural variables, the share of population aged 65 or more is added to population density and activity 495 rate, with a positive sign, which reflects the known situation of higher lethality characterising the 496 elderly population (Rinaldi and Paradisi, 2020). Nevertheless, some regressors change their sign from 497 one period to the other: mobility towards parks is positive in the first period, but negative in the 498 second one, and the same goes for activity rate. Moreover, the magnitude of some coefficients changes 499 considerably. In particular, the coefficient for Compliance rate in the second period is noticeably higher than that of the first period; additionally, the set of coefficients pertaining to containment 500 measures shows a large increase, although not being straightly comparable due to the introduction of 501 red and orange zones in the second period. This means that the importance of the restrictive measures 502 and of citizens' accord on their abidance has greatly increased since the end of the summer, also 503 504 because the stringency level of such measures - as we have already seen - has critically declined, which was preparatory to the formation of the "second wave" of the pandemic. Finally, the coefficient 505

regarding the share of over-65s to the total population is only significant in the first period, whichindicates that the pandemic has extended to all age groups.

Trying to sum up our achieved outcomes, the restrictions represented by the Containment and Health Index appear essential to contain the pandemic until the vaccination campaign produces the so-called herd immunity. However, we have highlighted that such restrictions are not sufficient when they are not accompanied by citizens' consent, which translates into adherence to the mobility restrictions, detected through the reduction in Google's mobility indices: indeed, it is unrealistic to think that repressive actions are enough to enforce compliance with the new mobility rules.

If the goal is to "bend the curve", it must be borne in mind that this is a collective operation: therefore, all institutional actors should better manage communication to motivate the citizens and avoid contradictory behaviours that confuse the population. It may seem like a paradox, but COVID-19 shall be defeated in people's minds first.

But it is not just a psychological and political communication problem. The role played by the closure 518 of workplaces, except for essential activities, should also be kept in mind. The relevant contribution 519 520 of workplaces-related mobility to the deaths count throughout the pandemic leads us to question 521 whether there has been some hesitation in taking more incisive measures, such as the partial closure 522 of productive activities. With no additional interventions, the number of daily lives lost can eventually become much greater than that suffered in the very first period of the pandemic (Vollmer et al., 2020). 523 524 Moreover, timeliness in introducing further restrictive measures is crucial in order to strongly reduce 525 their required duration (Chang et al., 2020).

526 Some countries are going further than others in the way they deal with this unprecedented emergency;527 hopefully, we will not be found wanting.

529 References

- 530 Aiello, F., & Scoppa, V. (2000). Uneven regional development in Italy: explaining differences in
- 531 productivity levels. Giornale degli Economisti e Annali di Economia, 60(2), 270-298.
- 532 Alfano, V., & Ercolano, S. (2020a). Capitale sociale bonding e bridging alla prova del lockdown.
- 533 Un'analisi sulle regioni italiane. Rivista economica del Mezzogiorno, 34(3), 437-454.
- Alfano, V., & Ercolano, S. (2020b). The Efficacy of Lockdown Against COVID-19: A Cross-Country
- 535 Panel Analysis. Applied Health Economics and Health Policy, 18(4), 509–517.
- Alfano, V., & Ercolano, S. (2021). Stay at Home! Governance Quality and Effectiveness of Lockdown.
- 537 Social Indicators Research. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-021-02742-3.
- 538 Allel, K., Tapia-Muñoz, T., & Morris, W. (2020). Country-level factors associated with the early spread
- of COVID-19 cases at 5, 10 and 15 days since the onset. Global Public Health, 15(11), 1589-1602.
- 540 Anderson, R. M., Heesterbeek, H., Klinkenberg, D., & Hollingsworth, T. D. (2020). How will country-
- based mitigation measures influence the course of the COVID-19 epidemic?. The Lancet, 395(10228),931-934.
- 543 Baldwin, R., & Di Mauro, B. W. (2020). Mitigating the COVID economic crisis: Act fast and do
 544 whatever it takes. VoxEU.org eBook, CEPR Press.
- Balmford, B., Annan, J. D., Hargreaves, J. C., Altoè, M., & Bateman, I. J. (2020). Cross-country
 comparisons of COVID-19: Policy, politics and the price of life. Environmental and Resource
 Economics, 76(4), 525-551.
- 548 Bargain, O., & Aminjonov, U. (2020). Trust and compliance to public health policies in times of
 549 COVID-19. Journal of Public Economics, 192, 104316.

- 550 Bartscher, A. K., Seitz, S., Slotwinski, M., Siegloch, S., & Wehrhöfer, N. (2020). Social Capital and the
- 551 Spread of Covid-19: Insights from European Countries. IZA Discussion Paper No. 13310. Available
- at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3614257.
- 553 Basellini, U., Alburez-Gutierrez, D., Del Fava, E., Perrotta, D., Bonetti, M., Camarda, C. G., &
- 554 Zagheni, E. (2021). Linking excess mortality to mobility data during the first wave of COVID-19 in
- 555 England and Wales. SSM Population Health, 14, 100799.
- 556 Borgonovi, F., & Andrieu, E. (2020). Bowling together by bowling alone: Social capital and Covid-19.
- 557 Social Science & Medicine, 265, 113501.
- Bourdieu, P. (1980). Le capital social: Notes provisoires. Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales,
 31(1), 2-3.
- Briscese, G., Lacetera, N., Macis, M., & Tonin, M. (2020). Expectations, reference points, and
 compliance with COVID-19 social distancing measures. NBER Working Paper, 26916.
- Brodeur, A., Gray, D. M., Islam, A., & Bhuiyan, S. (2020). A Literature Review of the Economics of
 COVID-19. IZA Discussion Paper No. 13411. Available at SSRN:
 https://ssrn.com/abstract=3636640.
- Buonomo, B., & Della Marca, R. (2020). Effects of information-induced behavioural changes during
 the COVID-19 lockdowns: the case of Italy. Royal Society Open Science, 7(10), 201635.
- 567 Busetta, G., Campolo, M. G., & Panarello, D. (2020). Letalità del COVID-19 nelle regioni italiane:
 568 sottostima dei casi positivi o carenza di strutture?. Statistica & Società, 9(1).
- 569 Bushman, K., Pelechrinis, K., & Labrinidis, A. (2020). Effectiveness and compliance to social
 570 distancing during COVID-19. arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.12720.

- 571 Camporesi, S. (2020). It Didn't Have to be This Way Reflections on the Ethical Justification of the
 572 Running Ban in Northern Italy in Response to the 2020 COVID-19 Outbreak. Journal of Bioethical
 573 Inquiry, 17(4), 643-648.
- Caselli, F., Grigoli, F., & Sandri, D. (2021). Protecting Lives and Livelihoods with Early and Tight
 Lockdowns. The B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1515/bejm-20200266.
- 577 Chan, S., Chu, J., Zhang, Y., & Nadarajah, S. (2021). Count regression models for COVID-19. Physica
- 578 A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, 563, 125460.
- 579 Chang, S. L., Harding, N., Zachreson, C., Cliff, O. M., & Prokopenko, M. (2020). Modelling
- transmission and control of the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia. Nature Communications, 11(1), 1-13.
- Chaudhry, R., Dranitsaris, G., Mubashir, T., Bartoszko, J., & Riazi, S. (2020). A country level analysis
 measuring the impact of government actions, country preparedness and socioeconomic factors on
 COVID-19 mortality and related health outcomes. EClinicalMedicine, 25, 100464.
- 585 Chinazzi, M., Davis, J. T., Ajelli, M., Gioannini, C., Litvinova, M., Merler, S., ... & Vespignani, A.
- 586 (2020). The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19)
 587 outbreak. Science, 368(6489), 395-400.
- 588 Cingolani, M., Caraceni, L., Cannovo, N., & Fedeli, P. (2021). The COVID-19 Epidemic and the
 589 Prison System in Italy. Journal of Correctional Health Care, 27(1), 3-7.
- 590 Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. American Journal of Sociology,591 94, S95-S120.

- 592 Dergiades, T., Milas, C., & Panagiotidis, T. (2020). Effectiveness of Government Policies in Response
- to the COVID-19 Outbreak. Available at SSRN: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3602004.
- 594 Dipartimento della Protezione Civile (2021). COVID-19 Italia Monitoraggio situazione. Available
- 595 at: https://github.com/pcm-dpc/COVID-19.
- 596 Dong, E., Du, H., & Gardner, L. (2020). An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in
 597 real time. The Lancet Infectious Diseases, 20(5), 533-534.
- 598 Endo, A., Abbott, S., Kucharski, A. J., & Funk, S. (2020). Estimating the overdispersion in COVID-
- 599 19 transmission using outbreak sizes outside China. Wellcome Open Research, 5(67).
- Ercolano, S. (2012). Il dualismo italiano nelle analisi degli studiosi stranieri. Rivista economica del
 Mezzogiorno, 26(3), 411-444.
- Fine, B. (2001). Social Capital versus Social Theory: Political economy and social science at the turnof the millennium. Routledge, New York.
- 604 Ghosh, S. K., Ghosh, S., & Narumanchi, S. S. (2020). A Study on The Effectiveness of Lock-down
- 605 Measures to Control The Spread of COVID-19. arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.05876.
- Giacalone, M., Panarello, D., & Mattera, R. (2018). Multicollinearity in regression: an efficiency
 comparison between Lp-norm and least squares estimators. Quality & Quantity, 52(4), 1831-1859.
- 608 Google LLC (2021). Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports. Available at:
 609 https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility.
- 610 Goorah, S., Cheeneebash, J., Gopaul, A., & Ramchurn, S. (2020). Fear of COVID-19 during
- 611 confinement in Mauritius. Emerald Open Research, 2(64).

Gruppo della Sorveglianza COVID-19 (2021). Caratteristiche dei pazienti deceduti positivi
all'infezione da SARS-CoV-2 in Italia: Dati al 27 gennaio 2021. Available at:
https://www.epicentro.iss.it/coronavirus/bollettino/Report-COVID-2019_27_gennaio_2021.pdf.

- Hale, T., Anania, J., Angrist, N., Boby, T., Cameron-Blake, E., Ellen, L., Goldszmidt, R., Hallas, L.,
- 616 Kira, B., Luciano, M., Majumdar, S., Nagesh, R., Petherick, A., Phillips, T., Tatlow, H., Webster, S.,
- 617 Wood, A., & Zhang, Y. (2021). Variation in Government Responses to COVID-19. Blavatnik School
- 618 of Government, Working Paper, Version 11.0. Available at:
 619 https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/publications/variation-government-responses-covid-19.
- Hausman, J. A., & Taylor, W. E. (1981). Panel Data and Unobservable Individual Effects.
 Econometrica, 49(6), 1377-1398.
- Hoeben, E. M., Bernasco, W., Suonperä Liebst, L., van Baak, C., & Rosenkrantz Lindegaard, M.
 (2021). Social distancing compliance: A video observational analysis. PloS one, 16(3), e0248221.
- Huang, C., Wang, Y., Li, X., Ren, L., Zhao, J., Hu, Y., ... & Cao, B. (2020). Clinical features of patients
- 625 infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. The Lancet, 395(10223), 497-506.
- 626 Islam, N., Sharp, S. J., Chowell, G., Shabnam, S., Kawachi, I., Lacey, B., ... & White, M. (2020). Physical
- distancing interventions and incidence of coronavirus disease 2019: natural experiment in 149countries. BMJ, 370, m2743.
- 629 Istituto Superiore di Sanità Task force COVID-19 del Dipartimento Malattie Infettive e Servizio di
- 630 Informatica (2021). Epidemia COVID-19, Aggiornamento nazionale: 24 febbraio 2021. Available at:
- 631 https://www.epicentro.iss.it/coronavirus/bollettino/Bollettino-sorveglianza-integrata-COVID-
- 632 19_24-febbraio-2021.pdf.

- Jeffrey, B., Walters, C. E., Ainslie, K. E., Eales, O., Ciavarella, C., Bhatia, S., ... & Cuomo-Dannenburg,
 G. (2020). Anonymised and aggregated crowd level mobility data from mobile phones suggests that
 initial compliance with COVID-19 social distancing interventions was high and geographically
 consistent across the UK. Wellcome Open Research, 5(170).
- 637 JHU CSSE (2021). COVID-19 Data Repository by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering
 638 (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University. Available at: https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID639 19.
- Kupferschmidt, K., & Cohen, J. (2020). Can China's COVID-19 strategy work elsewhere?. Science,
 367(6482), 1061-1062.
- Lalot, F., Heering, M. S., Rullo, M., Travaglino, G. A., & Abrams, D. (2020). The dangers of distrustful
 complacency: Low concern and low political trust combine to undermine compliance with
 governmental restrictions in the emerging Covid-19 pandemic. Group Processes & Intergroup
 Relations, 1368430220967986.
- Lee, J. H., Han, G., Fulp, W. J., & Giuliano, A. R. (2012). Analysis of overdispersed count data:
 application to the Human Papillomavirus Infection in Men (HIM) Study. Epidemiology & Infection,
 140(6), 1087-1094.
- Li, M. H., Haynes, K. E., Kulkarni, R., & Siddique, A. B. (2020a). Determinants of Voluntary
 Compliance: COVID-19 Mitigation. Available at SSRN: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3702687.
- Li, Q., Guan, X., Wu, P., Wang, X., Zhou, L., Tong, Y., ... & Feng, Z. (2020b). Early transmission
 dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia. New England Journal of
 Medicine, 382, 1199-1207.

- Linton, N. M., Kobayashi, T., Yang, Y., Hayashi, K., Akhmetzhanov, A. R., Jung, S. M., ... & Nishiura,
 H. (2020). Incubation period and other epidemiological characteristics of 2019 novel coronavirus
 infections with right truncation: a statistical analysis of publicly available case data. Journal of Clinical
 Medicine, 9(2), 538.
- 658 Lipsitch, M., Swerdlow, D. L., & Finelli, L. (2020). Defining the epidemiology of Covid-19-studies
- 659 needed. New England Journal of Medicine, 382(13), 1194-1196.
- 660 Liu, T., Gong, D., Xiao, J., Hu, J., He, G., Rong, Z., & Ma, W. (2020). Cluster infections play important
- 661 roles in the rapid evolution of COVID-19 transmission: A systematic review. International Journal of
- **662** Infectious Diseases, 99, 374-380.
- 663 May, T. (2020). Lockdown-type measures look effective against covid-19. BMJ, 370, m2809.
- McKenzie, G., & Adams, B. (2020). A country comparison of place-based activity response toCOVID-19 policies. Applied Geography, 125, 102363.
- Meyerowitz-Katz, G., & Merone, L. (2020). A systematic review and meta-analysis of published
 research data on COVID-19 infection fatality rates. International Journal of Infectious Diseases, 101,
 138-148.
- 669 Ministero dell'Interno (2021). Coronavirus, i dati dei servizi di controllo. Available at:
 670 https://www.interno.gov.it/it/coronavirus-i-dati-dei-servizi-controllo.
- Morawska, L., & Cao, J. (2020). Airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The world should face the
 reality. Environment International, 139, 105730.
- 673 Nivette, A., Ribeaud, D., Murray, A., Steinhoff, A., Bechtiger, L., Hepp, U., ... & Eisner, M. (2020).
- 674 Non-compliance with COVID-19-related public health measures among young adults in Switzerland:
- 675 Insights from a longitudinal cohort study. Social Science & Medicine, 268, 113370.

- Ocampo, L., & Yamagishi, K. (2020). Modeling the lockdown relaxation protocols of the Philippine
 government in response to the COVID-19 pandemic: An intuitionistic fuzzy DEMATEL analysis.
 Socio-Economic Planning Sciences, 72, 100911.
- Pan, J., St Pierre, J. M., Pickering, T. A., Demirjian, N. L., Fields, B. K., Desai, B., &
 Gholamrezanezhad, A. (2020). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): A modeling study of factors
 driving variation in case fatality rate by country. International Journal of Environmental Research and
 Public Health, 17(21), 8189.
- [dataset] Panarello, D., & Tassinari, G. (2021). One year of COVID-19 in Italy: Policies, Health,
 Mobility and Structural information. Mendeley Data, v1. Available at:
 https://doi.org/10.17632/hz32zfts8d.1.
- Pasdar, Z., Pana, T. A., Ewers, K. D., Szlachetka, W. A., Perdomo-Lampignano, J. A., Gamble, D. T.,
 ... & Myint, P. K. (2020). An Ecological Study Assessing the Relationship between Public Health
 Policies and Severity of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Preprints with The Lancet. Available at SSRN:
 https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3634847.
- 690 Piovani, D., Christodoulou, M. N., Hadjidemetriou, A., Pantavou, K., Zaza, P., Bagos, P. G., ... &
- 691 Nikolopoulos, G. K. (2021). Effect of early application of social distancing interventions on COVID-
- 692 19 mortality over the first pandemic wave: An analysis of longitudinal data from 37 countries. Journal
- **693** of Infection, 82(1), 133-142.
- Putnam, R. D., Leonardi, R., & Nanetti, R. Y. (1994). Making Democracy Work. Princeton University
 Press, Princeton.
- 696 Reinders Folmer, C., Brownlee, M., Fine, A., Kuiper, M. E., Olthuis, E., Kooistra, E. B., ... & van
- 697 Rooij, B. (2020a). Social Distancing in America: Understanding Long-term Adherence to Covid-19

- Mitigation Recommendations. Amsterdam Law School Research Paper No. 2020-62. Available at:
 https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3736683.
- 700 Reinders Folmer, C., Kuiper, M. E., Olthuis, E., Kooistra, E. B., de Bruijn, A. L., Brownlee, M., ... &
- van Rooij, B. (2020b). Maintaining Compliance When the Virus Returns: Understanding Adherence
- to Social Distancing Measures in the Netherlands in July 2020. Amsterdam Law School Research
- 703 Paper No. 2020-53. Available at SSRN: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3682546.
- Rinaldi, G., & Paradisi, M. (2020). An empirical estimate of the infection fatality rate of COVID-19
- from the first Italian outbreak. medRxiv. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.18.20070912.
- 706 Ruiu, G., & Ruiu, M. L. (2020). Violation of lockdown norms and peaks in daily number of positive
- 707 cases to COVID-19 in Italy. Emerald Open Research, 2(25).
- **708** Sabatini, F. (2005). The Role of Social Capital in Economic Development: Investigating the Causal
- 709 Nexus Through Structural Equations Models. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=901361.
- 710 Sabatini, F. (2009). Social capital as social networks: A new framework for measurement and an
- empirical analysis of its determinants and consequences. The Journal of Socio-Economics, 38(3), 429442.
- 713 Sebastiani, G., & Palù, G. (2020). COVID-19 and School Activities in Italy. Viruses, 12(11), 1339.
- 714 Setti, L., Passarini, F., De Gennaro, G., Barbieri, P., Perrone, M. G., Borelli, M., ... & Miani, A. (2020).
- 715 Airborne Transmission Route of COVID-19: Why 2 Meters/6 Feet of Inter-Personal Distance Could
- 716 Not Be Enough. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(8), 2932.
- 717 Shao, W., & Hao, F. (2020). Confidence in political leaders can slant risk perceptions of COVID-19
- in a highly polarized environment. Social Science & Medicine, 261, 113235.

- Sobol, M., Blachnio, A., & Przepiórka, A. (2020). Time of pandemic: Temporal perspectives related
 to compliance with public health regulations concerning the COVID-19 pandemic. Social Science &
 Medicine, 265, 113408.
- 722 Ventura, F., Molinelli, A., & Barranco, R. (2021). COVID-19-related deaths in residential care homes
- for elderly: The situation in Italy. Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine, 80, 102179.
- 724 Verity, R., Okell, L. C., Dorigatti, I., Winskill, P., Whittaker, C., Imai, N., ... & Dighe, A. (2020).
- 725 Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. The Lancet Infectious
- 726 Diseases, 20(6), 669-677.
- 727 Vollmer, M. A., Mishra, S., Unwin, H. J. T., Gandy, A., Mellan, T. A., Bradley, V., ... & Bhatt, S. (2020).
- Report 20: Using mobility to estimate the transmission intensity of COVID-19 in Italy: a subnational
 analysis with future scenarios. medRxiv. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.05.20089359.
- West, R., Michie, S., Rubin, G. J., & Amlôt, R. (2020). Applying principles of behaviour change to
 reduce SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Nature Human Behaviour, 4, 451-459.
- 732 Woody, S., Tec, M. G., Dahan, M., Gaither, K., Lachmann, M., Fox, S., ... & Scott, J. G. (2020).
- 733 Projections for first-wave COVID-19 deaths across the US using social-distancing measures derived
- from mobile phones. medRxiv. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20068163.