

Celidoni, Martina; Costa-i-Font, Joan; Salmasi, Luca

Working Paper

Mobility Restrictions and Alcohol Use during Lockdown: "A Still and Dry Pandemic for the Many"?

CESifo Working Paper, No. 10527

Provided in Cooperation with:

Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

Suggested Citation: Celidoni, Martina; Costa-i-Font, Joan; Salmasi, Luca (2023) : Mobility Restrictions and Alcohol Use during Lockdown: "A Still and Dry Pandemic for the Many"?, CESifo Working Paper, No. 10527, Center for Economic Studies and Ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/279277>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Mobility Restrictions and Alcohol Use during Lockdown: “A Still and Dry Pandemic for the Many”?

Martina Celidoni, Joan Costa-Font, Luca Salmasi

Impressum:

CESifo Working Papers

ISSN 2364-1428 (electronic version)

Publisher and distributor: Munich Society for the Promotion of Economic Research - CESifo GmbH

The international platform of Ludwigs-Maximilians University's Center for Economic Studies and the ifo Institute

Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany

Telephone +49 (0)89 2180-2740, Telefax +49 (0)89 2180-17845, email office@cesifo.de

Editor: Clemens Fuest

<https://www.cesifo.org/en/wp>

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- from the SSRN website: www.SSRN.com
- from the RePEc website: www.RePEc.org
- from the CESifo website: <https://www.cesifo.org/en/wp>

Mobility Restrictions and Alcohol Use during Lockdown: “A Still and Dry Pandemic for the Many”?

Abstract

Unexpected mobility disruptions during lockdown during the first wave of COVID-19 became ‘tipping points’ with the potential to alter pre-pandemic routines sensitive to socialisation. This paper investigates the impact of lockdown exposure on alcohol consumption. We document two findings using information from the Google Mobility Report and longitudinal data from the Understanding Society in the United Kingdom. First, we find a sharp reduction in both actual mobility and alcohol use (consistent with a “still and dry pandemic for the many” hypothesis). However, we document an increase in alcohol use among heavy drinkers, implying a split behavioural response to COVID-19 mobility restrictions based on alcohol use prior to the pandemic. Second, using the predictions of the prevalence-response elasticity theory, we find that the pandemic’s reduction in social contacts is responsible for a 2.8 percentage point reduction in drinking among men.

JEL-Codes: I130, I180.

Keywords: health behaviours, lockdown, mobility restrictions, alcohol use, routines, mobility, difference in differences, COVID-19.

Martina Celidoni
Department of Economics and Management
University of Padova / Italy
martina.celidoni@unipd.it

Joan Costa-Font
Department of Health Policy, London School of
Economics and Political Science (LSE) / UK
j.costa-font@lse.ac.uk

Luca Salmasi
Department of Economics and Finance
Catholic University of Rome / Italy
luca.salmasi@unicatt.it

1 Introduction

The effect of socialisation and mobility restrictions on health-related behaviour that depends heavily on individual socialisation is an important question that has received limited attention. The COVID-19 pandemic offers an important quasi-natural experiment encompassing unexpected changes in behaviour. Indeed, from 23 March 2020 until 10 May 2020, a lockdown and a series of restrictions to mobility were introduced in the United Kingdom (UK) and people were only permitted to leave their homes for essential purposes, which included shopping and exercising, reducing opportunities for social drinking. However, since off-trade premises were still open, individuals spending more time at home are more exposed to a stressful environment due to the pandemic and might have been more inclined to consume alcohol. This paper will examine evidence to take this proposition to the data.

Previous studies document mixed evidence of the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on alcohol consumption. According to Jackson et al. (2021) and Stevely et al. (2021) a considerable number of respondents stopped drinking completely during the lockdown, whilst heavy drinkers were more likely to report increasing intake of alcohol. However, evidence from Kilian et al. (2021) suggests an average decrease in alcohol consumption, driven by a reduced frequency of heavy episodic drinking events, based on data collected through a multi-country survey that includes the UK. Using US mortality data from the National Center for Health Statistics, White et al. (2022) compared numbers and rates of alcohol-related and all-cause deaths among all individuals 16 years or older in 2019 and 2020 and found an increase in alcohol-related deaths by approximately 25% between 2019 and 2020.

We argue that such evidence might be driven by different empirical approaches and samples analysed where specific mechanisms might dominate over others. Better understanding the underlying factors affecting alcohol consumption during the pandemic is important because it helps identify more appropriate policy responses.

We contribute to the literature by documenting evidence of new difference-in-differences (DD) estimates that complement previous the existing pre-post analysis. Our empirical approach suggests relevant mechanisms underlying the overall effects.

We exploit two sources of evidence. More specifically, we examine the first COVID-19 wave

of Understanding Society (the UK Household Longitudinal Study) alongside evidence from Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports (GCMR). We then complement this information with regional statistics on new COVID cases to define treated and controls. More precisely, we define our *treated* regions as those exhibiting above median new daily COVID-19 cases before the announcement, and the introduction of mobility restrictions, which are defined with respect to a pre-determined characteristic with respect to the nationwide lockdown. Our estimates suggest that men living in treated regions reduced alcohol participation by 2.48 percentage points more compared to the control group.

Next, using mobility data, we show that in treated regions, individuals exhibited less mobility to workplaces, retail and recreation and public transportation, and higher mobility to residences and parks than the controls. No significant differences are estimated when examining variables capturing other potential channels, such as income. We also provide stratified estimates, suggesting a limited role played by the fear of the health consequences of COVID-19 among those subgroups of the population who are likely to be more vulnerable due to their fragile health conditions.

Our estimates are robust to a series of checks as follows. First, we exclude observations from March 9, 2020, to March 16, 2020, to consider possible anticipatory effects based on the first lockdown in Italy. Second, since DD estimates of health behaviours rely on a different level of aggregation, i.e. NUTS1 rather than NUTS3, we ran the analysis at the same level of aggregation to check whether our baseline estimates were consistent. Furthermore, we have expanded equation 3 with NUTS3-specific linear trends as well as a common quadratic component to test that no other NUTS3-specific time-varying factors explain the variations in mobility. Finally, we have checked the sensitivity of our results to the choice of different thresholds to define the treatment variable.

We interpret our results as evidence of a stronger socialization effect - that we capture through changes in mobility behaviour - rather than other competing mechanisms such as income.

The paper is structured as follows. The next section describes the institutional background, the conceptual framework and identification. Section 3 presents the data used in the analysis; section 4 illustrates the empirical strategy. Section 5 reports the results, and a final section concludes.

2 Background and identification

The literature on the effect of the pandemic restrictions on alcohol consumption in the UK has focused mainly on the pre-post comparison, providing mixed results to date (see Jackson et al. (2021) and Stevely et al. (2021) Roberts et al. (2021) Pollard et al. (2020) White et al. (2022)). However, a pre-post comparison of drinking patterns can potentially give rise to misleading conclusions insofar as there may be other observable and unobservable factors. Indeed, individuals may react to an actual or expected reduction in income, by reducing consumption, especially for those goods that are not consumed frequently and that the consumer may feel are unnecessary, e.g. alcohol consumption for occasional drinkers. Under this framework, adopting a pre-post comparison, we would not be able to identify the effect of the actual (or expected) income loss from that of restrictions. Another reason for such difference is driven by differences in empirical approaches or samples analysed where some channels dominate other competing explanations, such as changes in income, expectations and/or preferences. To shed light on the mechanisms behind the whole effect, we exploit pre-determined conditions at the regional level to define treated and controls and estimate a DD model.

Our identification strategy relies on the *prevalence-response elasticity* theory (Fenichel 2013), which supports the idea that the spread of an outbreak depends on pre-existing conditions or characteristics alongside the endogenous response of other individuals and authorities.¹ That is, although authorities in the UK put forward nationwide mobility restrictions, it is plausible to assume that individuals might have reacted differently depending on their local conditions. In this paper, we test the implications of the prevalence-response elasticity theory using mobility data: individuals living in regions above the median new COVID-19 cases before the introduction of restrictions were more likely to stay at home, hence reducing their social activities, including alcohol use. This means that if individuals perceive to be at higher risk from the pandemic because they live in an area where COVID-19 is more prevalent, they will react by complying more seriously with pandemic restrictions compared to individuals living in regions less exposed to COVID-19. Our identification strategy relies on the following assumptions. First, we focus on the first

¹The prevalence-response elasticity has been examined in many contexts (Oster 2012, Mullahy 1999, Ahituv et al. 1996, Philipson 1996) and was recently analysed using COVID-19 data from Lombardy, which is one of the Italian regions mostly affected by the pandemic (Battiston & Gamba 2020).

wave of the pandemic, as mobility restrictions were unanticipated shocks imposed at the aggregate level that might have heterogeneous effects depending on pre-determined local conditions.

Second, both individuals in treated and control groups can be distinguished based on their exposure to COVID-19 daily cases on the 16th of March when the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contact should be avoided. Assignment into treatment is pre-determined, and hence independent of the restrictions' announcement (the 23rd of March). That is, it is independent of the current level of new daily cases in the region. Our cut-off date refers to the date of the announcement of the mobility restrictions rather than its actual implementation insofar as individuals might have already anticipated such restrictions, and hence adjusted their behaviours. Heckman & Smith (1995) provides a discussion on similar issues in other contexts illustrating that only the announcement can be regarded as endogenous to individuals' behaviours.

Figure 1 reports the timeline of the main events and announcements that can have influenced individuals' mobility and social interactions during the first wave of COVID-19 in the UK. The World Health Organization (WHO) declared the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020, and four Chief Medical Officers (CMO) in each of the UK countries raised the country risk level from low to moderate. On the 10-th of March 2020, the UK saw the first deaths due to COVID-19, and the number of cases rose higher than 300. Two days later, i.e. the 12-th of March, the UK Prime Minister (PM) stated that "now is the time for everyone to stop non-essential contact and travel", and more than a week later, on the 23-rd of March, the first lockdown was announced. However, the actual implementation took place a couple of days later, on the 26-th of March.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that given our DD set-up, we rely on the standard parallel trend assumption to estimate the parameters of interest and provide, within an event-study framework, suggestive evidence about individuals from treated and control regions behaving similarly before the announcement of mobility restrictions in terms of mobility and alcohol drinking. It's worth mentioning that excise duty is charged on each of these categories at a fixed rate – a number of pence per litre. The rate of duty is set in relation to alcoholic strength. Strength is measured as alcohol by volume (ABV) – the percentage of an alcohol product's volume comprised of pure alcohol.

3 Data

We use data from various sources. First, we exploit information from Understanding Society, a longitudinal multidisciplinary survey run by the Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER) at the University of Essex (University of Essex & Economic Research 2020*b*). The survey, in its regular version, collects information on several aspects of people’s lives in the UK, e.g. health, behaviours, sociodemographic characteristics and economic aspects. In April 2020, Understanding Society respondents were invited to participate in a short web survey asking how the pandemic affected their lives. A telephone interview was offered to respondents willing to participate but living in a household where no one was a regular internet user (University of Essex & Economic Research 2020*a*). The special COVID-19 survey was repeated each month until July 2020; from September 2020 to September 2021, fieldwork was planned every two months.

Compared to the standard questionnaire, the COVID web survey is shorter and composed of two sets of questions: a core set to track changes in socio-demographic characteristics and economic conditions and a rotating content changing over time. We are especially interested in health behaviours data gathered through the first COVID-19 wave of April 2020. Such data allow us to understand how the pandemic affected lifestyles. In this paper, we merge the special COVID-19 survey and previous regular surveys from 2015 to 2019 to provide evidence about the common pre-trend assumption.

Our second source of data draws on mobility indicators using the freely-available Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports (GCMR) dataset provided by Google LLC (2020). The data reveals mobility changes at the regional level for the following types of visits: (i) workplaces, (ii) own residences, (iii) grocery stores & pharmacies, (iv) retail & recreation, (v) parks, and (vi) public transportation. Mobility indicators are expressed as changes with respect to a baseline value, which is the median value, for the corresponding day of the week, during the 5 weeks Jan 3–Feb 6, 2020. Changes are computed using the same aggregated and anonymized data to identify popular places in Google Maps. Mobility indicators are calculated based on data from users who have opted-in to Location History for their Google Account, representing a sub-sample of Google users that might be selected.² Mobility data are collected daily for the regions listed in the Appendix. We

²The selection of the sample poses an issue in our framework only if it changes differently for treated and control regions after the mobility restriction, which is unlikely to occur.

aggregate the information at the NUTS3 level³, by computing regional daily averages for each mobility indicator, and also at the NUTS1 level to perform some robustness checks. Finally, we use information from the Office for National Statistics (ONS), which provides the number of total and new cases at the NUTS 3 level in the United Kingdom and deaths at the local authority district level. We aggregated death records at the NUTS3 (regional) level, which allows us to identify deaths attributable to COVID-19 as a share of all deaths within a specific region weekly. According to the ONS, a specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if they correspond to death 28 days after a positive COVID test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate. As highlighted by the WHO and other international Institutions, the classification of COVID-19 deaths is crucial but widely debated, especially when comparing pandemic statistics across countries. In our case, this is less of a concern since the reporting of COVID-19-related information is homogeneous across different UK regions. The COVID-19 death rate is computed as the ratio between COVID-19 deaths and total weekly deaths.

4 Empirical Strategy

Our empirical strategy is designed to complement existing evidence on the effect of the pandemic on alcohol consumption, exploiting different regional pre-determined conditions to define treated and control groups within a DD model.

4.1 Effects on alcohol use

To estimate the effect of the pandemic on alcohol consumption, we specify the following model:

$$Drink_{i,t}^k = \delta + \nu post_t \times treated_r + \mu X_{i,t} + \iota_i + \tau_t + \rho_{r,w} \quad (1)$$

³The Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics, abbreviated NUTS (from the French version Nomenclature des Unités territoriales statistiques) is a geographical nomenclature subdividing the economic territory of the European Union (EU) into regions at three different levels (NUTS 1, 2 and 3 respectively, moving from larger to smaller territorial units). NUTS 1 corresponds to macro-regions, NUTS 2 to regions and NUTS1 to provinces. Above NUTS 1, there is the 'national' level of the Member States. The NUTS is based on Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 May 2003 on the establishment of a common classification of territorial units for statistics (NUTS), which is regularly updated.

where $Drink_{i,t}^k$, with $k = 1, 2$, represents drinking participation (1 if respondent drinks and 0 otherwise) and intensity (1 if respondent drinks more than 4 times per week and 0 otherwise). $treated_r$ regions are NUTS1⁴ areas with new daily COVID-19 cases - measured before the announcement of the restrictions - above the median. ν measures the differential effect of living in treated regions on drinking behaviours after the announcement. In equation (1), ι_i and τ_t refer to individual and time-specific fixed effects respectively. $post_t$ indicates whether the information was collected from the Understanding Society COVID-19 survey, i.e. after 2020, or in a regular round. $X_{i,t}$ is a vector of individual level covariates. For a detailed description of the covariates used in our model, see Table A.1 in the appendix.

Our DD approach relies on the assumption that individuals in treated and control regions would have had the same trend in health behaviours in the absence of treatment. This assumption is untestable because we cannot observe counterfactuals. Still, we can investigate drinking behaviour before introducing mobility restrictions for both groups and provide evidence supporting the idea that they are indeed comparable. To this end, we use an event study approach as follows:

$$Drink_{i,t}^k = \gamma + \sum_{j=2}^J \eta_j (Lag_j)_{i,t} + \sum_{k=1}^K \mu_k (Lead_k)_{i,t} + \lambda_i + \psi_t + \xi_{i,t} \quad (2)$$

Lags and Leads are defined as in Clarke & Schythe (2020) and can be interpreted as post-treatment and anticipatory effects, respectively. λ_i and ψ_t represent individual and year-fixed effects. If leads coefficients are not significantly different from zero, as we will see later, this can be considered as evidence supporting the parallel trend assumption discussed above. Based on the available data from the UK Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS) also known as "Understanding Society", we can estimate two leads (i.e. 2017 and 2015 compared to 2019) and one lag (2020).

4.2 Effects on mobility

To analyse mobility behaviour, we estimate the following equation:

$$m_{r,d}^k = \gamma + \eta post_d \times treated_r + \lambda_r + \psi_w + \xi_{r,d} \quad (3)$$

⁴The NUTS1 level, i.e., the finest territorial level in the Understanding Society survey.

$m_{r,d}^k$ is one of the $k = 1, \dots, 6$ mobility indicators collected from GMR, i.e., mobility to workplaces, own residences, grocery stores and pharmacies, retail and recreation, parks and public transportation. We include day (ω_d) and NUTS3 (δ_r) fixed effects to account for unobservable differences in NUTS3 areas and the pandemic diffusion during the first wave. $post_d$ denotes observations collected after the UK’s first announcement about mobility restrictions, on the 16th of March, e.g., the day the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contacts should be avoided. The coefficient of interest here is η , identifying the differential post-announcement effect on mobility between treated and control regions.

Also, in this case, our estimates are based on the parallel trend assumption between treated and controls. To provide evidence in this regard, we estimate the following:

$$m_{r,d}^k = \gamma + \sum_{j=2}^J \eta_j (Lag_j)_{r,d} + \sum_{k=1}^K \mu_k (Lead_k)_{r,d} + \lambda_r + \psi_d + \xi_{r,d} \quad (4)$$

Lags and Leads are defined as in Clarke & Schythe (2020), in terms of days from and to the lockdown announcement date. λ_r and ψ_d represent NUTS3 and day fixed effects.

5 Results

5.1 Preliminary evidence

Figure 4 shows the time variation for the mobility indicators described above. In particular, we show the time series of changes in mobility with respect to the baseline (pre-COVID-19) value⁵. In each graph, we report two dashed lines. The first one corresponds to the 16th of March, e.g., the day on which the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contact should be avoided. The second one to the 23-rd of March, i.e. the date when the prime minister announced the first lockdown⁶ in the UK. We decided to use the former to define the treatment timing because, as evident from the Figure, it is much closer to the tipping point for almost all mobility patterns across the UK. Notice that even the 16th of March does not correspond exactly to the observed

⁵The baseline value is defined as the median value, for the corresponding day of the week, during the 5 weeks Jan 3–Feb 6, 2020

⁶Lockdown measures came into force the 26-th of March in the UK. However, we decided to focus on the dates relative to the most relevant announcements because we believe that most people are more likely to react to such announcements rather to the official introduction of measures.

decline in mobility. In other words, individuals seemed to anticipate the UK prime minister's decisions. A reason for this may be connected to the adoption of containment measures in geographically close countries, like Italy and Spain, which implemented lockdown measures on the 9th and the 15th of March of 2020. Individuals in the UK may have thus partially reacted to such measures. For this reason, as a robustness check, we will re-run our DD models on mobility variations excluding observations between the Italian lockdown and the UK's first announcement.

Concerning workplace mobility, Figure 4, panel a, displays evidence of a significant variation at the time of the COVID-19 restrictions announcement date, in which workplace mobility drops by 60%. The other mobility indicators also point to behavioural changes after the UK-COVID-19 restrictions announcement date. Figure 4, panel b, shows a significant increase in mobility to own residences after the announcement, with an average increase of more than 20% with respect to the pre-announcement period. Regarding mobility to grocery stores and pharmacies and to retail and recreation 4, panels c and d, we can notice that the announcement of restrictions has generated a sharp drop comparable to workplace mobility.

We document an upward trend in mobility to grocery stores right before the lockdown announcement (23rd of March) in the UK, which might be compatible with the stockpiling phenomenon documented in the news. Also, in this case, the drop in mobility is close to 40%. Mobility to retail and recreation places shows a decrease even larger than that observed for workplaces. In fact, in this case, the recorded variation is 80% with respect to the pre-announcement period. At the bottom of Figure 4, we show graphically the estimated variations in mobility patterns related to public transportation (right-hand side) and parks (left-hand side). Again, we document a significant drop on March 16th for the former and a less clear variation for the latter. However, it must be stressed that going to parks was still allowed if people respected the social distancing.

Next, we graphically infer if there exists a correlation between mobility reductions and COVID-19 cases and deaths. Figure 2 shows the average variation in mobility to specific destinations, estimated during the entire analysis period, by NUTS3 regions. The darker the colour in the map, the more negative the variation in mobility. For instance, the top-left map shows that London and neighbouring areas exhibit the highest mobility reductions to workplaces. The top-centre map shows that, in such areas, we find the

highest positive increase in mobility to residential destinations. Similar conclusions can be reached by looking at other mobility indicators, except for mobility parks, which do not show a similar pattern. This is reasonable as going to the park does not necessarily represent a risk to an individual's health. Figure 3 depicts the geographical variability in the average value of COVID-19 total cases, new cases and death ratio between COVID-19 deaths and total deaths by NUTS3 areas. The darker the colour, the higher the value for the number of totals, new cases and the death ratio. These two Figures reveal a correlation between mobility and COVID-19 cases and deaths. In particular, the higher the death ratio or the presence of total and new cases, the higher the contraction in mobility to workplaces and the higher the increase in mobility.

In Table A.2, we display the descriptive statistics for our regional variables on mobility and COVID-19 cases and deaths before and after the COVID-19 restrictions announcement of the 16th of March for treated and control regions. COVID-19 total and new daily cases increased after the announcement.⁷ The ratio between COVID-19 and total deaths increased from 0 to 0.19 and from 0 to 0.25 in *control* and *treated* regions, respectively. In *treated* regions, mobility to workplaces decreased by 54.97 (-57.89+2.92) percentage points, whereas in *control* regions, it decreased by 51.98 (-54.08+2.1) percentage points. The average pre-post decrease in *treated* regions is larger by almost 3 percentage points than in *control* regions. The same is true also for mobility to grocery stores and pharmacies (27.11 - 26.36 = 0.75 percentage points), retail and recreation (69.13 - 67.42 = 1.71 percentage points) and public transportation (61.38 - 53.98 = 7.4 percentage points). Instead, according to mobility to own residences and parks, the average pre-post increase in *treated* regions is larger by almost 1.88 (21.56 - 19.68) and 11.22 (-9.36 + 20.58) percentage points than in *control* regions.

Next, we report in Figure 5 graphical evidence of the trends in total and new daily cases and the ratio between COVID-19 and total deaths for treated and control regions separately. Figure 5 displays evidence that treated regions, starting after week 9 (i.e. two weeks before the COVID-19 restrictions announcement) reveal a positive number of COVID-19 total and new daily cases, whereas control regions documented several totals and new daily cases very close to 0. Right after the COVID-19 restrictions announcement

⁷More specifically, the former increased from 0.34 to 145.51 and from 2.09 to 432.35 in *control* and *treated* regions, respectively, whereas the latter increased from 0.05 to 5.22 and from 0.44 to 12.9 in *control* and *treated* regions, respectively.

date also, control regions started to reveal a positive number of COVID-19 total and new daily cases, but always lower than treated regions. Finally, looking at the ratio between COVID-19 deaths and all deaths from week 11 (i.e. the week corresponding to the COVID-19 restrictions announcement) treated regions exhibit a positive number of COVID-19-related deaths. Such graphical analysis provides an empirical justification for the definition of our treatment and control groups based on the idea that regions where the pandemic started earlier, are also those more likely to respect COVID-19 restrictions. This second part will be extensively tested in the following sections.

5.2 Effects on alcohol use

In this section, we report estimates of the effect of mobility restrictions on health behaviours. Our outcome of interest is represented by drinking frequency and consumption. The parameters of interest are associated with the dummy identifying the 2020 year, labelled *post* in the table, measuring the overall post-restrictions variation in drinking behaviours and $Treatment \times post$, capturing the differential post-restriction effect for individuals living in *treated* regions. We show results from these estimates in Table 1, where the first two columns present estimates for drinking participation for men (col. 1) and women (col. 2) separately, whereas columns 3 and 4 refer to drinking frequency (having more than 4 drinks per week), again for men (col. 3) and women (col. 4) separately. Interestingly, after the restrictions were called, alcohol use decreased by 11.45 percentage points for men and 15.14 percentage points for women. In contrast, drinking intensity increased by 13.93 percentage points for men and 16.08 percentage points for women. As expected, drinking behaviours in 2019 are very similar to those of the base year (i.e. 2017). However, we find a significant negative effect on drinking participation among men in treated regions: point estimates suggest a decrease in the probability of drinking by 2.48 percentage-points.

Table 3 shows that treated and control individuals have the same pre-restriction drinking behaviour, supporting the parallel trend assumption.

5.3 Effects on mobility

Table 4 shows estimates of equation 3. We find that treated regions significantly decreased mobility towards workplaces, retail and recreation and public transportation and significantly increased mobility towards own residences and parks compared to control regions. The estimated effects are -2.97, -1.77, and -5.39 percentage points for workplaces, retail and recreation, and public transportation and 2.19 and 10.98 percentage points when looking at mobility to own residences and parks, respectively. Such estimates are non-negligible since they represent 110.41%, 211.72%, 322.75%, 203.72% and 492.37% of the pre-lockdown variation in mobility to workplaces, retail and recreation, public transportation, own residences, and parks, respectively but are indeed much smaller than those shown in Figure 4, proving the importance of the DD analysis. The same analysis is also shown graphically in Figure 5, where we show the results from the event study analysis where lags and leads are included to estimate post-treatment and anticipatory effects. Here we focus first on the latter to verify the common trend assumption. When we turn to examine mobility to all places, with the exception of own residences, we find evidence of positive leads values decreasing right before the announcement of COVID-19 restrictions, i.e. the 16-th of March. In contrast, mobility to own residences shows the opposite behaviour. We find evidence of negative leads increasing right before the 16-th of March. The presence of these trends right before the COVID-19 restrictions' announcement date can be interpreted as evidence of the possibility of an additional anticipation effect, which may depend on the fact that some people in treated regions modified their mobility behaviours already before that date. ⁸ Figure 7 provides additional event study evidence moving the date identifying the post-treatment period to the 9th of March, i.e. the date of the Italian lockdown. In this case, almost all the leads are not statistically different from 0, meaning that treated and control regions have the same behaviour in terms of mobility.

Figure 7 depicts the 9th of March effects on the mobility indicators used in the analysis. We show that mobility to workplaces (panel a) starts to decrease gradually in treated regions, dropping to -5 percentage points around the 18th of March, i.e. a couple of days after the announcement of restrictions in the UK. After this date, the effect decreases for

⁸A plausible explanation could be connected to the fact that other European countries already implemented restrictions on mobility before the UK, and people in our treated regions may have partly reacted to these measures.

a week and then stabilizes around -3 percentage points after the 25th of March, a couple of days after the announcement of the first COVID-19 lockdown in the UK. Mobility to own residences mirrors mobility to workplaces but with variations of opposite signs. Panel b) of Figure 7 suggests that mobility to own residences slightly increases during the first lags but jumps to almost +2.5 percentage points from the 16th of March, lag(9), and then remains stable, except for Saturdays and Sundays, when mobility to own residences in treated regions is close to that of control regions.

Next, mobility to retail and recreation (panel c) in treated regions decreases significantly until the 23rd of March and then converges to pre-restriction values. Consistently, mobility to grocery stores and pharmacies (panel d) increases significantly in treated regions during the 17th and 18th of March, suggesting a possible stockpiling effect in treated regions a couple of days after the announcement of mobility restrictions and then shows a mobility pattern similar to control regions. Mobility to public transportation (panel e) starts to decrease after the 9th of March. It continues to drop until the 22nd of March, settling on a negative variation of about 5 percentage points with respect to the pre-restrictions period. Mobility to parks in treated regions (panel f) shows an almost stable behaviour until lag(13), i.e. the 22nd of March, settling on a positive variation of about 10 percentage points with respect to the pre-restrictions period. The empirical evidence on mobility data can be interpreted as individuals in treated regions being more likely to decrease social contacts and social drinking.

5.4 Other potential explanations

One caveat of our analysis is that individuals in treated regions may be more likely to reduce drinking because of the fear of the health consequences of COVID-19 rather than the decrease in social contact. We try to shed light on this aspect by estimating the model presented in equation 1 on various subsamples of individuals more at risk if exposed to COVID-19. Table 2 presents heterogeneous effects for individuals over the age of 65 (columns 1 and 2), who had COVID-19 symptoms (columns 3 and 4), with high blood pressure (columns 5 and 6), and with previous health conditions (columns 7 and 8). The upper panel of Table2 shows estimates when the outcome is drinking participation, whereas the lower panel considers drinking intensity. If we find statistically different coefficients from those estimated in the overall population, results may be driven by fear

of COVID-19 consequences. Otherwise, it should suggest evidence of the socialisation explanation.

Focusing on drinking participation, Table 2 confirms the significant decrease observed in the overall population for both men and women with comparable coefficients with respect to those presented in Table 1. The additional effect of living in a treated region is confirmed in almost all male subsamples, except for men who experienced COVID-19 symptoms, with estimated coefficients ranging from 4.13 to 5.90 percentage points. These values are very close to the overall effect estimated for men in Table 1. In addition, Table 2 highlights that women with high blood pressure and a previous health condition decreased drinking participation by 4.01 and 2.03 percentage points, respectively, meaning that the health channel could be more relevant among women. Looking at the lower panel of Table 2, we find again that drinking intensity increased in 2020, i.e., the COVID-19 pandemic. Still, we do not find evidence of additional effects for men or women living in treated regions. Estimates without including observable covariates are shown in the appendix. See Tables A.3, A.4.

Another potential explanation in line with changes in drinking behaviour might be a decrease in household income more pronounced in treated regions compared to control regions. We test this competing effect using the probability of being employed or furloughed as well as net income as an outcome and verify that they do not change differently between treated and control regions after the introduction of mobility restrictions. As shown in Table A.5, all coefficients associated with DD estimates (Treated post) are not statistically different from zero for both men and women.

5.5 Robustness

In this section, we perform several robustness checks to test the validity and stability of our estimates.

First, we re-run our estimates after excluding observations from March 9, 2020, to March 16, 2020. Looking at Figure 4, we noticed that mobility starts to decrease after March 9, i.e. the date of the Italian lockdown. Italy was the first European country to implement a strict lockdown. This could have induced people in other countries to respond by decreasing their mobility, possibly leading to a downward bias in estimating the lockdown effect on mobility. We show these estimates in Table A.7. After excluding these observations,

the estimated effects from the DD model are generally in line with those presented in Table 4. Still, we document larger differences for mobility to retail and recreation and public transportation, which now are -2.18 and -5.83 percentage points rather than -1.77 and -5.39 percentage points before excluding observations, respectively.

Second, since DD estimates of health behaviours rely on a different level of aggregation, i.e. NUTS1 rather than NUTS3, we run the analysis at the same level of aggregation to check whether our baseline estimates were consistent. We list these estimates in Table A.6. As we can see, results align with those already presented in the analysis, ensuring that our identification strategy can also be applied at the more aggregated NUTS1 territorial level.

Furthermore, we test in Tables A.8 that no other NUTS3-specific time-varying factors explain the variations in mobility. We include in equation 3 NUTS3-specific linear trends plus a common quadratic component. This demanding specification accounts for the effect of other unobservable variables at the NUTS3 level that may be responsible for the observed decrease in mobility. Results from this analysis, Table A.8, reveal that even accounting for NUTS3-specific linear trends, estimated coefficients are very close to those estimated in Table 4, apart from mobility to parks, which becomes non significantly different from zero when using this specification.

Finally, we check the sensitivity of our results to the choice of different thresholds to define the treatment variable. Table A.9 shows results from this analysis. As we can see, the effect of treatment on mobility is stronger when we consider higher thresholds to define our treatment group. Looking at workplaces, the estimated effect ranges from -2.16 to -5.96 percentage points, using the 10-th and the 90-th percentiles, respectively. The decrease in mobility towards workplaces reaches -8.39 percentage points when comparing regions above the 90-th percentiles of pre-announcement new COVID-19 daily cases with regions below the 10-th percentile of pre-announcement new COVID-19 daily cases. We highlight very similar patterns are also for the other mobility indicators adopted in the analysis. Interestingly, the effect on grocery stores and pharmacies also becomes negative and significant when using the 75-th percentile of pre-announcement new COVID-19 daily cases.

6 Conclusion

This paper studies the effects of mobility restrictions during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic on alcohol use in the United Kingdom (UK). We document a polarised post-restriction effect, that is, alcohol use increased among heavy drinkers and reduced among low to moderate drinkers. This result is in line with what was found by some other studies in the literature (Jackson et al. 2021, Stevely et al. 2021). Two factors can explain the decrease in participation: (i) the variation in actual or expected earnings implied by the pandemic or (ii) a decrease in social gatherings. In contrast, the increase in the number of heavy drinking is explained by the higher stress levels during the pandemic. Next, we exploit the predictions from the *prevalence-response elasticity* theory to isolate the effect of socialisation from that of other unobservable confounders. We document that socialisation matters more for men than for women. That is, consistently with a 'still and dry hypothesis' drinking participation decreased by 2.48 percentage points among men confined in their homes for longer hours alongside no opportunities for social drinking. We find no significant effects for women.

Our results are robust to a series of robustness checks. First, our results are not driven by the fear of the health consequences of COVID-19 but rather by the reduction in social contact. When we re-estimate our baseline model at different subsamples of individuals depending on their risk exposure to COVID-19 we find that, for men, coefficients are always not statistically different from those estimated in the overall population, whilst we find some differences among women. Drinking decreases by a respective additional 4.01 and 2.03 percentage points when considering women with high blood pressure or a previous health condition.

In examining different mechanisms we document that, after the lockdown, mobility decreased sharply in all the indicators considered, including mobility to workplaces. When we compare mobility reductions among those in treated and control regions, we find an extra-reduction in mobility in the former areas. People living in areas with more cases before the introduction of mobility restrictions are more likely to respect national guidelines regarding social distancing after lockdown reducing their mobility.

These results are consistent with a 'still and dry pandemic for the many' hypothesis, namely a reduction in alcohol use among social drinkers. However, we identify a rise in

alcohol use among heavy drinkers ("the few"), suggesting evidence of 'risky drinking' in which higher risk exposure, namely higher risk exposure drives some people to drink as a coping mechanism.

Our findings suggest that mobility restrictions can exert several potential effects beyond influencing mobility, such as restricting alcohol use for some, which is more common among individuals for whom alcohol use is a means to socialise (Rosenquist et al. 2010). These estimates suggest policy implications, that is, that availability and social effects have an important influence on alcohol use. Hence, restricting opportunities to drink socially can help individuals reduce their alcohol consumption.

References

- Ahituv, A., Hotz, V. J. & Philipson, T. (1996), ‘The responsiveness of the demand for condoms to the local prevalence of aids’, *The Journal of Human Resources* **31**(4), 869–897.
- Battiston, P. & Gamba, S. (2020), ‘Covid-19: R0 is lower where outbreak is larger’, *Health Policy* .
- Clarke, D. & Schythe, K. T. (2020), Implementing the Panel Event Study, IZA Discussion Papers 13524, Institute of Labor Economics (IZA).
URL: <https://ideas.repec.org/p/iza/izadps/dp13524.html>
- Fenichel, E. P. (2013), ‘Economic considerations for social distancing and behavioral based policies during an epidemic’, *Journal of Health Economics* **32**(2), 440 – 451.
- Google LLC (2020), ‘Google covid-19 community mobility reports’.
URL: <https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/> Accessed: 30/12/2020.
- Heckman, J. & Smith, J. (1995), Ashenfelter’s Dip and the Determinants of Participation in a Social Program: Implications for Simple Program Evaluation Strategies, Technical report.
- Jackson, S. E., Garnett, C., Shahab, L., Oldham, M. & Brown, J. (2021), ‘Association of the covid-19 lockdown with smoking, drinking and attempts to quit in england: an analysis of 2019–20 data’, *Addiction* **116**(5), 1233–1244.
- Kilian, C., Rehm, J., Allebeck, P., Braddick, F., Gual, A., Barták, M., Bloomfield, K., Gil, A., Neufeld, M., O’Donnell, A. et al. (2021), ‘Alcohol consumption during the covid-19 pandemic in europe: a large-scale cross-sectional study in 21 countries’, *Addiction* .
- Mullahy, J. (1999), ‘It’ll only hurt a second? microeconomic determinants of who gets flu shots’, *Health Economics* **8**(1), 9–24.
- Oster, E. (2012), ‘Hiv and sexual behavior change: Why not africa?’, *Journal of Health Economics* **31**(1), 35 – 49.
- Philipson, T. (1996), ‘Private vaccination and public health: An empirical examination for u.s. measles’, *The Journal of Human Resources* **31**(3), 611–630.

- Pollard, M. S., Tucker, J. S. & Green, H. D. (2020), ‘Changes in adult alcohol use and consequences during the covid-19 pandemic in the us’, *JAMA network open* **3**(9), e2022942–e2022942.
- Roberts, A., Rogers, J., Mason, R., Siriwardena, A. N., Hogue, T., Whitley, G. A. & Law, G. R. (2021), ‘Alcohol and other substance use during the covid-19 pandemic: A systematic review’, *Drug and alcohol dependence* **229**, 109150.
- Rosenquist, J. N., Murabito, J., Fowler, J. H. & Christakis, N. A. (2010), ‘The spread of alcohol consumption behavior in a large social network’, *Annals of internal medicine* **152**(7), 426–433.
- Stevely, A. K., Sasso, A., Alava, M. H. & Holmes, J. (2021), ‘Changes in alcohol consumption in scotland during the early stages of the covid-19 pandemic’, *Series Changes in alcohol consumption in Scotland during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic, Public Health Scotland, Edinburgh* .
- University of Essex, I. f. S. & Economic Research, NatCen Social Research, K. P. (2020*a*), ‘Understanding society: Covid-19 study, 2020. [data collection]. 4th edition. uk data service. sn: 8644, 10.5255/ukda-sn-8644-4.’.
- University of Essex, I. f. S. & Economic Research, NatCen Social Research, K. P. (2020*b*), ‘Understanding society: Waves 1-10, 2009-2019 and harmonised bhps: Waves 1-18, 1991-2009. [data collection]. 13th edition. uk data service. sn: 6614, <http://doi.org/10.5255/ukda-sn-6614-14>.’.
- White, A. M., Castle, I.-J. P., Powell, P. A., Hingson, R. W. & Koob, G. F. (2022), ‘Alcohol-related deaths during the covid-19 pandemic’, *Jama* **327**(17), 1704–1706.




Figure 1: Timeline of UK government containment measures during March 2020.

Notes: This Figure shows the timeline of the main events and announcements that can have influenced individuals' mobility and social interactions during the first wave of COVID-19 in the UK.




Figure 2: Territorial distribution of changes in mobility. Average values for the period 15/2 - 19/5 of 2020.

Notes: This Figure shows the average variation in mobility to specific destinations, estimated during the entire analysis period, by NUTS3 regions. The darker the colour in the map, the more negative the variation in mobility.




Figure 3: Geographical variability for the ratio between COVID-19 deaths and deaths for other causes.

Notes: This Figure shows geographical dispersion for the average value of the ratio between COVID-19 deaths and deaths for other causes during the period 15/2 - 19/5 of 2020. Information about deaths is available from the ONS weekly. A specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if it corresponds to a death that occurred 28 days after a positive COVID-19 test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate.




Figure 4: Mobility trends during the period 15/2 - 19/5 of 2020.

Notes: This Figure shows time series of changes in mobility towards i) workplaces, ii) own residences, iii) grocery stores and pharmacies, iv) retail and recreation, v) parks and vi) public transportation. All series are smoothed using a median smoother of odd span using 5 observations. The data shows the visitor variation in a given day compared to a reference, defined as the average level of mobility calculated immediately before the COVID-19 outbreak, i.e. from January 3 to February 6, 2020.




Figure 5: Weekly values of COVID-19 cases, COVID-19 new cases, COVID-19 deaths, all deaths, and share of COVID-19 deaths on all deaths.

Notes: This Figure shows weekly values of COVID-19 cases, COVID-19 new cases, COVID-19 deaths, all deaths, and share of COVID-19 deaths on all deaths during the period 15/2 - 19/5 of 2020. Information about cases is available from the ONS daily. Information about deaths is available from the ONS weekly. A specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if it corresponds to a death that occurred 28 days after a positive COVID-19 test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate.




Figure 6: event estimates of the effect of living, during the UK COVID-19 restrictions, in regions with the ratio between COVID-19 deaths and deaths for other causes higher than the country average on mobility.

Notes: This Figure shows event estimates of the effect of living during the UK COVID-19 restrictions in regions with the ratio between COVID-19 deaths and deaths for other causes higher than the country average on mobility towards i) workplaces, ii) own residences, iii) grocery stores and pharmacies, iv) retail and recreation, v) parks, vi) public transportation. The vertical line is set on the day before the 16-th of March, i.e. the day the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contact should be avoided. The date of the official COVID-19 restrictions in the UK is the 23-rd of March.




Figure 7: event estimates of the effect of living, during the UK COVID-19 restrictions, in regions with the ratio between COVID-19 deaths and deaths for other causes higher than the country average on mobility.

Notes: This Figure shows event estimates of the effect of living during the UK COVID-19 restrictions in regions with the ratio between COVID-19 deaths and deaths for other causes higher than the country average on mobility towards i) workplaces, ii) own residences, iii) grocery stores and pharmacies, iv) retail and recreation, v) parks, vi) public transportation. The vertical line is set on the day before the 9-th of March, i.e. the day Italy implemented a national lockdown.

Table 1: Effect of COVID-19 restrictions on drinking habits in UK.

	Drinking			
	participation		intensity	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
post	-0.1145*** (0.007)	-0.1514*** (0.007)	0.1393*** (0.011)	0.1608*** (0.009)
Treated \times post	-0.0248*** (0.009)	-0.0081 (0.008)	-0.0194 (0.013)	-0.0034 (0.011)
Constant	0.8145*** (0.017)	0.8028*** (0.014)	0.2205*** (0.021)	0.1340*** (0.015)
Mean of Y	0.800	0.734	0.231	0.151
SD of Y	0.400	0.442	0.422	0.358
Number of individuals	17,036	21,292	13,937	16,169
Observations	28,707	37,331	23,286	28,012

*Notes: This Table shows DD estimates of COVID-19 restrictions on drinking habits of individuals living in treated regions, compared to controls using Understanding Society data. All specification control for individual and year fixed effects and individual level covariates. For a detailed description of the covariates used in our model, see Table A.1 in the appendix. We defined as treated, NUTS1 regions with a pre-COVID-19 restrictions death ratio above average, whereas control regions have a ratio below average. The death ratio is calculated as the ratio between deaths attributable to COVID-19 and deaths for other causes in NUTS1 regions before the imposition of COVID-19 restrictions, i.e. before the 16-th of March - the day in which the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contacts should be avoided. The date of the official COVID-19 restrictions in the UK is the 23-rd of March. Information about deaths is available from the ONS weekly. A specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if it corresponds to a death that occurred 28 days after a positive COVID-19 test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate. Standard errors clustered at the individual level. The post takes the value 1 for observations collected during the first COVID-19 wave of Understanding Society released in April 2020 and 0 for observations collected in the previous waves, i.e. 2019, 2017 and 2015. Significant levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$*

Table 2: Effect of COVID-19 restrictions on drinking habits in the UK - heterogeneous effects by age and health status.

	Over 65				Blood pressure				Previous health condition					
	Had symptoms		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)						
				Drinking participation										
post	-0.1171*** (0.013)	-0.1776*** (0.016)	-0.1060*** (0.023)	-0.1481*** (0.022)	-0.0865*** (0.014)	-0.1598*** (0.017)	-0.1219*** (0.010)	-0.1719*** (0.010)						
Treated × post	-0.0567*** (0.018)	-0.0169 (0.020)	-0.0171 (0.025)	0.0070 (0.024)	-0.0590*** (0.018)	-0.0401* (0.022)	-0.0413*** (0.013)	-0.0203* (0.012)						
Constant	0.9412*** (0.069)	0.8670*** (0.106)	0.8698*** (0.044)	0.8984*** (0.046)	0.8541*** (0.068)	0.8342*** (0.064)	0.8790*** (0.034)	0.8706*** (0.027)						
Mean of Y	0.807	0.699	0.839	0.796	0.842	0.750	0.827	0.760						
SD of Y	0.395	0.459	0.368	0.403	0.365	0.433	0.378	0.427						
Number of individuals	4,106	4,814	792	1,167	1,369	1,319	3,328	4,466						
Observations	6,818	7,596	2,155	3,165	3,839	3,737	9,264	12,395						
				Drinking intensity										
post	0.0949*** (0.019)	0.1225*** (0.021)	0.1875*** (0.034)	0.1490*** (0.029)	0.1211*** (0.023)	0.1789*** (0.022)	0.1293*** (0.015)	0.1509*** (0.013)						
Treated × post	-0.0270 (0.025)	-0.0058 (0.025)	-0.0447 (0.039)	-0.0086 (0.032)	-0.0429 (0.028)	-0.0715 (0.077)	-0.0284 (0.018)	-0.0056 (0.016)						
Constant	0.4689*** (0.084)	0.1587** (0.065)	0.2067*** (0.052)	0.0977** (0.043)	0.3771*** (0.063)	0.2794*** (0.074)	0.3207*** (0.037)	0.1890*** (0.028)						
Mean of Y	0.337	0.223	0.264	0.169	0.345	0.225	0.320	0.198						
SD of Y	0.473	0.416	0.441	0.375	0.475	0.418	0.467	0.398						
Number of individuals	3,393	3,456	708	1,038	1,239	1,115	2,984	3,830						
Observations	5,578	5,465	1,817	2,536	3,245	2,820	7,695	9,472						

Notes: This Table shows DD estimates by age and health status recorded before the pandemic, of COVID-19 restrictions on drinking habits of individuals living in treated regions, compared to controls, using Understanding Society data. All specification control for individual and year fixed effects and individual level covariates. For a detailed description of the covariates used in our model, see Table A.1 in the appendix. We defined as treated, NUTS1 regions with a pre-COVID-19 restrictions death ratio above average, whereas control regions have a ratio below average. The death ratio is calculated as the ratio between deaths attributable to COVID-19 and deaths for other causes in NUTS1 regions before the imposition of COVID-19 restrictions, i.e. before the 16-th of March - the day in which the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contacts should be avoided. The date of the official COVID-19 restrictions in the UK is the 23-rd of March. Information about deaths is available from the ONS weekly. A specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if it corresponds to a death that occurred 28 days after a positive COVID-19 test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate. Standard errors clustered at the individual level. The post takes the value 1 for observations collected during the first COVID-19 wave of Understanding Society released in April 2020 and 0 for observations collected in the previous waves, i.e. 2019, 2017 and 2015. Significant levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table 3: Pre-trend for drinking habits before the imposition of COVID-19 restrictions in UK.

	Drinking			
	participation		intensity	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Lead(-5)	0.0104 (0.010)	0.0010 (0.011)	0.0370 (0.023)	0.0227 (0.032)
Lead(-3)	0.0005 (0.006)	0.0036 (0.006)	0.0107 (0.010)	-0.0006 (0.008)
Constant	0.9013*** (0.022)	0.8486*** (0.002)	0.2950*** (0.030)	0.1647*** (0.002)
Number of pidp	6,611	8,979	5,903	7,693
Observations	22,565	22,273	16,077	14,411

*Notes: This Table shows event estimates of COVID-19 restrictions on drinking habits for individuals living in treated regions, compared to controls to test the common pre-trend assumption for the DD model using Understanding Society data. All specification control for individual and year fixed effects and individual level covariates. For a detailed description of the covariates used in our model, see Table A.1 in the appendix. We defined as treated, NUTS1 regions with a pre-COVID-19 restrictions death ratio above average, whereas control regions have a ratio below average. The death ratio is calculated as the ratio between deaths attributable to COVID-19 and deaths for other causes in NUTS1 regions before the imposition of COVID-19 restrictions, i.e. before the 16-th of March - the day in which the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contacts should be avoided. The date of the official COVID-19 restrictions in the UK is the 23-rd of March. Information about deaths is available from the ONS weekly. A specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if it corresponds to a death that occurred 28 days after a positive COVID-19 test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate. Standard errors clustered at the individual level. The post takes the value 1 for observations collected during the first COVID-19 wave of Understanding Society released in April 2020 and 0 for observations collected in the previous waves, i.e. 2019, 2017 and 2015. Significant levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$*

Table 4: Effect of COVID-19 restrictions on mobility in UK.

	Workplace	Residential	Grocery	Retail	Parks	Public transports
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Treated \times post	-2.9683*** (0.683)	2.1906*** (0.357)	-0.7858 (0.736)	-1.7680** (0.682)	10.9818*** (2.849)	-5.3901*** (1.536)
Constant	-3.7280*** (0.265)	2.3008*** (0.159)	-6.0386*** (0.214)	-10.8058*** (0.406)	-35.4700*** (0.920)	-11.0692*** (0.763)
Mean of Y before 16/3	-2.692	1.075	2.438	0.836	2.239	-1.676
SD of Y before 16/3	5.723	1.204	5.263	6.782	18.85	7.224
Number of NUTS3	179	176	179	179	175	178
Observations	16,927	15,126	16,828	16,739	15,176	16,753

*Notes: This Table shows DD estimates of COVID-19 restrictions on changes in mobility towards i) workplaces, ii) own residences, iii) grocery stores and pharmacies, iv) retail and recreation, v) parks, vi) public transportation during the period 15/2 - 19/5 of 2020 for individuals living in treated regions, compared to controls (equation 3) using Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports data. All specification control for day and NUTS3 fixed effects. We defined as treated, NUTS3 regions with a pre-COVID-19 restrictions death ratio above average, whereas control regions have a ratio below average. The death ratio is calculated as the average ratio between deaths attributable to COVID-19 and deaths for other causes in the period before the imposition of COVID-19 restrictions, i.e. before the 16-th of March, i.e. the day in which the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contacts should be avoided. The date of the official COVID-19 restrictions in the UK is the 23-rd of March. Information about deaths is available from the ONS weekly. A specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if it corresponds to a death that occurred 28 days after a positive COVID-19 test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate. Standard errors clustered at the NUTS3 level. Significant levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$*

Appendix

Table A.1: Descriptive statistics - Understanding Society.

	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.
2020						
Drinking: No	6,653	0.26	0.44	9,329	0.32	0.47
Yes	6,653	0.74	0.44	9,329	0.68	0.47
Drinking 4 or more times per week: No	4,938	0.6	0.49	6,337	0.7	0.46
Yes	4,938	0.4	0.49	6,337	0.3	0.46
Age	7,206	52.04	16.61	10,097	48.91	16.74
Other condition	7,206	0.41	0.49	10,097	0.42	0.49
Employed	7,206	0.59	0.49	10,097	0.58	0.49
Hours worked	7,167	15.42	19.58	10,036	12.28	17.25
Furloughed: No	7,202	0.9	0.31	10,091	0.9	0.3
Yes	7,202	0.1	0.31	10,091	0.1	0.3
Single	6,490	0.24	0.43	8,907	0.27	0.44
Couple	6,490	0.67	0.47	8,907	0.58	0.49
Divorced	6,490	0.07	0.25	8,907	0.11	0.31
Widowed	6,490	0.02	0.13	8,907	0.04	0.2
Less than 65 years	7,206	0.73	0.44	10,097	0.79	0.4
More than 65 years	7,206	0.27	0.44	10,097	0.21	0.4
Did not have symptoms	7,206	0.88	0.33	10,097	0.87	0.34
Had symptoms	7,206	0.12	0.33	10,097	0.13	0.34
Normal blood pressure	7,206	0.8	0.4	10,097	0.86	0.34
High blood pressure/Hypertension	7,206	0.2	0.4	10,097	0.14	0.34
No health condition	7,206	0.51	0.5	10,097	0.52	0.5
At least one health condition	7,206	0.49	0.5	10,097	0.48	0.5
2017-2019						
Drinking : No	30,669	0.19	0.39	38,005	0.25	0.43
Yes	30,669	0.81	0.39	38,005	0.75	0.43
Drinking 4 or more times per week: No	24,865	0.8	0.4	28,378	0.88	0.32
Yes	24,865	0.2	0.4	28,378	0.12	0.32
Age	34,532	48.07	18.14	40,803	47.8	17.87
Other condition	25,525	0.36	0.48	31,046	0.42	0.49
Employed	25,525	0.64	0.48	31,046	0.58	0.49
Hours worked	25,406	9.42	17.75	30,967	6.41	13.76
Furloughed: No	34,532	1	0	40,803	1	0
Yes	34,532	0	0	40,803	0	0
Single	31,821	0.32	0.47	39,476	0.29	0.46
Couple	31,821	0.58	0.49	39,476	0.53	0.5
Divorced	31,821	0.07	0.25	39,476	0.1	0.3
Widowed	31,821	0.03	0.17	39,476	0.07	0.26
Less than 65 years	34,532	0.78	0.41	40,803	0.79	0.41
More than 65 years	34,532	0.22	0.41	40,803	0.21	0.41
Did not had symptoms	34,532	0.96	0.2	40,803	0.95	0.22
Had symptoms	34,532	0.04	0.2	40,803	0.05	0.22
Normal blood pressure	34,532	0.92	0.27	40,803	0.94	0.24
High blood pressure/Hypertension	34,532	0.08	0.27	40,803	0.06	0.24
No health condition	34,532	0.82	0.39	40,803	0.79	0.41
At least one health condition	34,532	0.18	0.39	40,803	0.21	0.41

Notes: This Table shows descriptive statistics about observable characteristics of individuals recorded in the Understanding Society Surveys used as covariates in the analysis.

Table A.2: Descriptive statistics. COVID-19 cases and deaths and mobility indicators.

	Observations	Mean	Std dev	Observations	Mean	Std dev
	Before the 16-th of March			After the 16-th of March		
Treated regions						
COVID-19 cases	3,885	2.09	5.63	8,414	432.35	476.37
COVID-19 new cases	3,743	0.44	1.39	8,388	12.9	13.46
Share of COVID19 deaths	3,765	0	0	8,154	0.25	0.16
Workplaces	3,870	-2.92	5.73	8,402	-57.89	15.82
Own residences	3,704	1.11	1.23	7,600	22.67	7.29
Grocery stores and pharmacies	3,868	2.22	5.21	8,305	-24.89	16.49
Retail and recreation	3,838	0.42	6.84	8,278	-68.71	17.33
Parks	3,589	1.2	18.04	7,784	-8.16	26.94
Public transportation	3,801	-2.13	7.01	8,301	-61.38	15.54
Control regions						
COVID-19 cases	1,470	0.34	0.78	3,185	145.51	211.95
COVID-19 new cases	1,421	0.05	0.31	3,185	5.22	7.21
Share of COVID19 deaths	1,020	0	0	2,210	0.19	0.13
Workplaces	1,470	-2.1	5.67	3,185	-54.08	15.65
Own residences	1,333	0.98	1.13	2,489	20.66	6.49
Grocery stores and pharmacies	1,470	3	5.36	3,185	-23.36	15.93
Retail and recreation	1,470	1.92	6.51	3,153	-65.5	18.14
Parks	1,182	5.39	20.82	2,621	-15.19	26.73
Public transportation	1,466	-0.51	7.62	3,185	-54.49	15.77

Notes: This Table shows descriptive statistics about COVID-19 deaths, deaths for other causes and changes in mobility towards i) workplaces, ii) own residences, iii) grocery stores and pharmacies, iv) retail and recreation, v) parks, vi) public transportation in the period 15/2 - 19/5 of 2020. Information about deaths is available from the ONS weekly. A specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if it corresponds to a death that occurred 28 days after a positive COVID-19 test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate. The 16-th of March, i.e. the day in which the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contact should be avoided. The date of the official COVID-19 restrictions in the UK is the 23-rd of March.

Table A.3: Effect of COVID-19 restrictions on drinking in the UK - no covariates.

	Drinking			
	participation		intensity	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
post	-0.0038 (0.002)	-0.0049** (0.002)	0.0155*** (0.004)	0.0155*** (0.003)
Treated \times post	-0.1122*** (0.006)	-0.1442*** (0.006)	0.1581*** (0.010)	0.1645*** (0.008)
Constant	0.8240*** (0.001)	0.7655*** (0.001)	0.2011*** (0.002)	0.1156*** (0.002)
Mean of Y	0.800	0.734	0.231	0.151
SD of Y	0.400	0.442	0.422	0.358
Number of individuals	19,127	23,416	15,619	17,787
Observations	37,322	47,334	29,803	34,715

*Notes: This Table shows DD estimates of COVID-19 restrictions on drinking habits of individuals living in treated regions, compared to controls, using Understanding Society data. All specification control for individual and year-fixed effects. We defined as treated, NUTS1 regions with a pre-COVID-19 restrictions death ratio above average, whereas control regions have a ratio below average. The death ratio is calculated as the ratio between deaths attributable to COVID-19 and deaths for other causes in NUTS1 regions before the imposition of COVID-19 restrictions, i.e. before the 16-th of March - the day in which the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contacts should be avoided. The date of the official COVID-19 restrictions in the UK is the 23-rd of March. Information about deaths is available from the ONS weekly. A specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if it corresponds to a death that occurred 28 days after a positive COVID-19 test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate. Standard errors clustered at the individual level. The post takes the value 1 for observations collected during the first COVID-19 wave of Understanding Society released in April 2020 and 0 for observations collected in the previous waves, i.e. 2019, 2017 and 2015. Significant levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$*

Table A.5: Effect of COVID-19 restrictions on employment and income.

	Employment		Hours worked		Furlough		Net income	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
post	-0.0916*** (0.006)	-0.0668*** (0.005)	11.4434*** (0.389)	10.8783*** (0.255)	0.1077*** (0.006)	0.1013*** (0.005)	93.8727** (38.429)	27.4318 (46.526)
Treated \times post	-0.0092 (0.007)	0.0017 (0.006)	-0.0636 (0.452)	-0.1202 (0.306)	-0.0094 (0.007)	-0.0088 (0.006)	45.5829 (40.447)	-105.0273 (96.017)
Constant	0.6482*** (0.002)	0.5837*** (0.002)	4.4466*** (0.079)	1.4956*** (0.060)	0.0003 (0.000)	0.0007 (0.000)	3,590.7628*** (23.492)	3,505.7183*** (42.024)
Mean of Y	0.627	0.570	8.583	5.711	0.0127	0.0140	3647	3495
SD of Y	0.484	0.495	17.10	13.19	0.112	0.118	4211	5496
Number of individuals	21,285	24,780	21,241	24,764	21,946	25,366	21,708	24,998
Observations	50,110	61,669	49,889	61,484	59,113	71,420	58,467	70,298

Notes: This Table shows DD estimates of COVID-19 restrictions on employment and income of individuals living in treated regions, compared to controls, using Understanding Society data. All specification control for individual and year fixed effects. We defined as treated, NUTS1 regions with a pre-COVID-19 restrictions death ratio above average, whereas control regions have a ratio below average. The death ratio is calculated as the ratio between deaths attributable to COVID-19 and deaths for other causes in NUTS1 regions before the imposition of COVID-19 restrictions, i.e. before the 16-th of March - the day in which the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contacts should be avoided. The date of the official COVID-19 restrictions in the UK is the 23-rd of March. Information about deaths is available from the ONS weekly. A specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if it corresponds to a death that occurred 28 days after a positive COVID-19 test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate. Standard errors clustered at the individual level. The post takes the value 1 for observations collected during the first COVID-19 wave of Understanding Society released in April 2020 and 0 for observations collected in the previous waves, i.e. 2019, 2017 and 2015. Significant levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Table A.6: Effect of COVID-19 restrictions on mobility in UK.

	Workplace	Residential	Grocery	Retail	Parks	Public transports
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Treated \times post	-1.0229*	0.9201*	-1.5071	-1.2474	4.6114*	-3.2187*
	(0.559)	(0.498)	(1.140)	(1.026)	(2.632)	(1.834)
Constant	-3.7920***	2.3254***	-6.0131***	-10.8625***	-36.1395***	-11.2795***
	(0.248)	(0.141)	(0.311)	(0.965)	(1.283)	(1.043)
Mean of Y before 16/3	-2.692	1.046	2.480	1.045	2.766	-1.541
SD of Y before 16/3	5.584	1.126	4.583	5.627	15.52	5.298
Number of NUTS 1	12	12	12	12	12	12
Observations	1,140	1,140	1,140	1,140	1,140	1,140

*Notes: This Table shows DD estimates of COVID-19 restrictions on changes in mobility towards i) workplaces, ii) own residences, iii) grocery stores and pharmacies, iv) retail and recreation, v) parks, vi) public transportation in the period 15/2 - 19/5 of 2020 for individuals living in treated regions, compared to controls (equation 3) using Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports data. All specification control for day and NUTS1 fixed effects. We defined as treated, NUTS1 regions with a pre-COVID-19 restrictions death ratio above average, whereas control regions have a ratio below average. The death ratio is calculated as the average ratio between deaths attributable to COVID-19 and deaths for other causes in the period before the imposition of COVID-19 restrictions, i.e. before the 16-th of March, i.e. the day in which the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contacts should be avoided. The date of the official COVID-19 restrictions in the UK is the 23-rd of March. Information about deaths is available from the ONS weekly. A specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if it corresponds to a death that occurred 28 days after a positive COVID-19 test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate. Bootstrap standard errors (1,000 replications). Significant levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$*

Table A.7: Effect of COVID-19 restrictions on mobility in the UK - excluding observations between 9-th and 16-th of March.

	Workplace	Residential	Grocery	Retail	Parks	Public transports
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Treated \times post	-3.0538*** (0.707)	2.2403*** (0.367)	-0.8203 (0.747)	-2.1761*** (0.682)	10.0959*** (2.777)	-5.8308*** (1.595)
Constant	-3.7253*** (0.269)	2.3014*** (0.161)	-6.0394*** (0.216)	-10.7999*** (0.403)	-35.4638*** (0.939)	-11.0649*** (0.766)
Mean of Y before 9/3	-2.692	1.075	2.438	0.836	2.239	-1.676
SD of Y before 9/3	5.723	1.204	5.263	6.782	18.85	7.224
Number of NUTS3	179	176	179	179	175	178
Observations	16,396	14,649	16,294	16,206	14,683	16,227

*Notes: This Table shows DD estimates of COVID-19 restrictions on changes in mobility towards i) workplaces, ii) own residences, iii) grocery stores and pharmacies, iv) retail and recreation, v) parks, vi) public transportation in the period 15/2 - 19/5 of 2020 for individuals living in treated regions, compared to controls (equation 3), using Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports data. All specification control for day and NUTS1 fixed effects. We defined as treated, NUTS3 regions with a pre-COVID-19 restrictions death ratio above average, whereas control regions have a ratio below average. The death ratio is calculated as the average ratio between deaths attributable to COVID-19 and deaths for other causes in the period before the imposition of COVID-19 restrictions, i.e. before the 16-th of March, i.e. the day in which the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contacts should be avoided. The date of the official COVID-19 restrictions in the UK is the 23-rd of March. Information about deaths is available from the ONS weekly. A specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if it corresponds to a death that occurred 28 days after a positive COVID-19 test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate. Bootstrap standard errors (1,000 replications). Significant levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$*

Table A.8: Effect of COVID-19 restrictions on mobility in the UK - with NUTS3-specific linear trends and common quadratic component, and NUTS3-specific week fixed effects.

	Workplace	Residential	Grocery	Retail	Parks	Public transports
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
NUTS3-specific trends						
Treated \times post	-3.4388*** (0.692)	2.0609*** (0.360)	0.4786 (0.633)	-1.5187** (0.590)	-0.4000 (1.676)	-3.8003*** (1.065)
Constant	-3.8673*** (0.137)	2.3305*** (0.057)	-5.9564*** (0.187)	-10.7173*** (0.390)	-34.7897*** (0.823)	-11.0412*** (0.470)
Mean of Y before 16/3	-2.692	1.075	2.438	0.836	2.239	-1.676
SD of Y before 16/3	5.723	1.204	5.263	6.782	18.85	7.224
Number of NUTS3	179	176	179	179	175	178
Observations	16,927	15,126	16,828	16,739	15,176	16,753

*Notes: This Table shows DD estimates of COVID-19 restrictions on changes in mobility towards i) workplaces, ii) own residences, iii) grocery stores and pharmacies, iv) retail and recreation, v) parks, vi) public transportation in the period 15/2 - 19/5 of 2020 for individuals living in treated regions, compared to controls (equation 3), using Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports data. All specification control for day and NUTS3 fixed effects, and in addition, panel a) controls also for NUTS3-specific linear trends and a common quadratic component, whereas panel b) includes NUTS3-specific week fixed effects. We defined as treated, regions with a pre-COVID-19 restrictions death ratio above average, whereas control regions have a ratio below average. The death ratio is calculated as the average ratio between deaths attributable to COVID-19 and deaths for other causes in the period before the imposition of COVID-19 restrictions, i.e. before the 16-th of March, i.e. the day in which the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contacts should be avoided. The date of the official COVID-19 restrictions in the UK is the 23-rd of March. Information about deaths is available from the ONS weekly. A specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if it corresponds to a death that occurred 28 days after a positive COVID-19 test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate. Standard errors clustered at the NUTS3 level. Significant levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$*

Table A.9: Effect of COVID-19 restrictions on mobility in UK - different thresholds to define the treatment variable

	Workplace	Residential	Grocery	Retail	Parks	Public transports
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Treated (above 10-th perc) × post	-2.1565*** (0.772)	2.2333*** (0.435)	-0.4267 (1.206)	-1.4774* (0.851)	11.1674** (4.325)	-6.3507*** (1.768)
Treated (above 25-th perc) × post	-2.8506*** (0.664)	2.0682*** (0.390)	-0.5227 (0.536)	-1.4483*** (0.654)	5.9485*** (2.193)	-4.7366*** (1.333)
Treated (above 50-th perc) × post	-2.9683*** (0.683)	2.1906*** (0.357)	-0.7858 (0.736)	-1.7680** (0.682)	10.9818*** (2.849)	-5.3901*** (1.536)
Treated (above 75-th perc) × post	-4.1811*** (0.805)	2.9416*** (0.505)	-1.5777*** (0.514)	-1.7368*** (0.561)	5.8237*** (1.893)	-6.0688*** (1.394)
Treated (above 90-th perc) × post	-5.9556*** (1.092)	4.7132*** (0.584)	-2.4695*** (0.504)	-2.8206*** (0.471)	4.0460*** (1.510)	-8.5287*** (0.945)
Treated (above 90-th perc vs below 10-th) × post	-8.3962*** (1.123)	6.3172*** (0.719)	-2.5372* (1.273)	-3.8755*** (0.865)	13.4463*** (4.336)	-13.1839*** (1.742)
Treated (above 75-th perc vs below 25-th) × post	-5.6097*** (0.922)	3.8144*** (0.555)	-1.7000** (0.789)	-2.5808*** (0.756)	12.5342*** (2.883)	-8.4349*** (1.758)

Notes: This Table shows DD estimates of COVID-19 restrictions on changes in mobility towards i) workplaces, ii) own residences, iii) grocery stores and pharmacies, iv) retail and recreation, v) parks, vi) public transportation during the period 15/2 - 19/5 of 2020 for individuals living in treated regions, compared to controls (equation 3) using Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports data. All specification control for day and NUTS3 fixed effects. We defined as treated, NUTS3 regions with a pre-COVID-19 restrictions death ratio above average, whereas control regions have a ratio below average. The death ratio is calculated as the average ratio between deaths attributable to COVID-19 and deaths for other causes in the period before the imposition of COVID-19 restrictions, i.e. before the 16-th of March, i.e. the day in which the UK Prime Minister stated that unnecessary travel and social contacts should be avoided. The date of the official COVID-19 restrictions in the UK is the 23-rd of March. Information about deaths is available from the ONS weekly. A specific death case is attributed to COVID-19 if it corresponds to a death that occurred 28 days after a positive COVID-19 test, and hence COVID-19 is mentioned in the death certificate. Standard errors clustered at the NUTS3 level. Significant levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$