Targeted Interventions Reduce the Spread of COVID-19: Simulation Study on Real Mobility Data
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Various intervention methods have been introduced worldwide to slow down the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus, by limiting human mobility in different ways. While large scale lockdown strategies are effective in reducing the spread rate, they come at a cost of significantly limited societal functions. We show that natural human mobility has high diversity and heterogeneity such that a small group of individuals and gathering venues play an important role in the spread of the disease. We discover that interventions that focus on protecting the most active individuals and most popular venues can significantly reduce the peak infection rate and the total number of infected people while retaining high levels of social activity overall. This trend is observed universally in multi-agent simulations using three mobility data sets of different scales, resolutions, and modalities (check-ins at seven different cities, WiFi connection events at a university, and GPS traces of electric bikes), and suggests that strategies that exploit the network effect in human mobility provide a better balance between disease control and normal social activities.

The global pandemic of a novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) has swept through nearly all countries since December 2019. Due to the high infection rate and therefore high demand for medical resources, most countries have adopted large-scale intervention methods such as restricted travel and movement, and closure of non-essential businesses. These intervention methods have proven to be effective, successfully reducing the number of peak daily infected
cases and the total number of infected cases so far, as shown by both direct observation from real data (1, 2) as well as indirect metapopulation models and simulations (3, 4).

While these intervention methods have successfully lowered the peak of the spread, they are not sustainable over long periods of time. One of the major challenges that many countries face now is to open up the economy and restore life close to normal, without a second, possibly larger wave. To address this immediate challenge, we must understand the effect of mobility, the efficacy of mobility interventions, and if the spread can be controlled by a less disruptive set of intervention strategies.

The relation between mobility and spread of COVID-19 has been observed in several recent studies (4–6) that show empirical evidence of correlation between aggregate degree of mobility and number of cases. These large scale observations and data, however, do not consider the social costs (7) and do not provide the insights needed for more targeted interventions (2). Models to study infection spread by agents include epidemiology models such as SIR or SEIR models (8) and their variations (3, 9, 10), data-driven models (11), and multi-agent models (12), none of which incorporate realistic mobility behaviour.

Our work takes the approach of multi-agent models but incorporates real mobility traces to study the probable spread of an infectious disease. The study involves three data sets that represent three typical social settings. (Refer to Supplementary material for detailed data description).

- **Foursquare check-ins.** We use check-in data (13, 14) from the Foursquare mobile application, which captures snapshots of human mobility in popular public spaces. The dataset includes seven major cities across the world (New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, London, Tokyo, Istanbul, and Jakarta), and contains a total of 2,293,716 check-ins from 24,068 individuals in 397,610 venues over a period of 140 days.

- **University campus (15):** WiFi log data on connections of mobile devices with nearby WiFi access points from a large university campus (Tsinghua University) is a representative case of mobility in a large University setting. The dataset contains 106,975 average daily localization points from 47,359 individuals.

- **Personal electric bikes (16):** Densely sampled GPS mobility traces of 46,078 personally owned electric bikes over the period of a month provides a unique dataset as they capture unstructured personal mobility patterns not tied to specific public spaces or institutions.

All three data sets have fine-grained location resolution of within 10s of meters, which allow us to investigate inter-personal interactions and interactions of individuals and public venues. Collectively, these datasets cover three representative slices of human mobility that play important roles in spread of infectious diseases. Infection can propagate person to person at a meeting event (when two agents are with close proximity), or through a venue (when a susceptible agent visits a venue recently visited by an infectious agent). We ran simulations on the three datasets with a variety of different intervention strategies and show their impact in slowing down the spread. We study the total number of individuals infected under various intervention strategies,
growth rate of new infections, the maximum number of infected individuals at any time (height of the peak) and the time-varying reproduction number ($R_t$). The social cost of an intervention strategy is measured as the number of check ins and meetings lost due to the strategy.

We found that mobility statistics are heterogeneous across individuals and venues (Figure 1), with few agents being highly active and some venues attracting many visitors. This heterogeneity and consequent network effects influence the spread of COVID-19. The common strategy of blanket lockdown is seen to delay the peak, but comes at a high social cost (Figure 2). High mobility agents and popular venues attract early infections and play an important role in the early spread of the infection (Figure 3). Interventions that protect these entities, such as isolating or immunizing the highly active agents, or closing the popular venues, are seen to have a large effect – both delaying the peak and reducing total infections – while still incurring a relatively small social cost (Figure 4). Finally, a social network or contact graph – that connects agents to other agents they meet frequently or to venues that they visit frequently – is seen to have the property that a similar number and group of people are infected in this static model as under the dynamic mobility simulation model (Figure 5).

**Mobility data driven infection simulation model for COVID-19.** We customize the SEIR model (8) to operate on mobility data and incorporate the properties of COVID-19 transmission as probabilistic features using the parameters from Center for Disease Control and Prevention (17, 18) (Figure 1 Part I). Similar to the SEIR model an agent in our model can be in one of the four states: susceptible, infected (or exposed), infectious, and recovered or immune. Unlike the standard model that assumes person to person disease transmission through uniformly probable contacts, we obtain person to person contacts from the mobility datasets and extend the model to disease transmission via check-ins to venues.

The simulation starts by infecting a random set of seed agents with all other agents as susceptible. The disease transmits from person to person at a meeting (in the University and the Bike dataset), or through a venue (in the Foursquare datasets) with a transmission probability, $\beta$. In the University dataset, two agents meet when they are at the same location (such as a classroom or cafeteria) at the same time. In the Bike dataset, a meeting occurs when two bikes are within 5 meters for more than 5 minutes. In the Foursquare dataset, when an infectious agent visits a venue, we mark the venue as infected and it remains infected for 48 hours. This aligns with the studies on COVID-19 lifespan on various surfaces (19).

A susceptible person is infected with probability $\beta$ when meeting an infectious person or visiting an infected venue. The value of $\beta$ is determined for each scenario based on knowledge of existing variables such as $R_0$ (see supplementary material for details). An infected person remains in incubation for $\mathcal{N}(6, 1)$ days followed by the infectious stage gaining the ability to infect other susceptible agents or venues. For COVID-19 there are a significant fraction of asymptomatic carriers (20, 21). As per CDC, we consider 35% of the infected population

\[1 \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma) \text{ denotes a sample from a normal distribution with mean } \mu \text{ and standard deviation } \sigma. \text{ The distribution models variability in the infection behavior.} \]
(randomly chosen) to be asymptomatic. A symptomatic person remains infectious for $N(5, 1)$ days before showing symptoms and subsequently enters the in-care stage such as at home self-quarantine or hospitalization. At this stage, the person ceases to infect others. After $N(13, 1)$ days in care, the agent assumed to recover and become immune. On the other hand, asymptomatic agents do not seek care, and thus they skip the in-care state and remain infectious for $N(18, 1)$ days.

We study temporal dynamics of the infection spread in four dimensions – the total number of infected people till date, number of active cases, number of new infections, and epidemiological parameters such as the time varying reproduction number ($R_t$) or growth rate ($\lambda_t$). The active cases include individuals that have been infected till date but not yet recovered. The time-varying reproduction number ($22$), $R_t$ for day $t$ is the expected number of average individuals infected by a single agent who gets infected on day $t$. The growth rate, $\lambda_t$, is the ratio of the total number of agents newly infected on day $t$ to the same number on the day $t - 1$.

The social value of an intervention strategy is measured as the inverse of the social cost - that is, the number of activities (check-ins) preserved under the intervention. The health value of an intervention is correspondingly measured as the percentage of agents who escape infection due to the intervention.

**Evaluation of baseline uniform mobility intervention strategy.** Under a lockdown or stay-at-home order, mobility drops only to a limited extent (23). We model such a partial lockdown as a baseline intervention strategy by randomly removing events with a certain probability. Figure 2 studies the realistic scenario where the intervention lasts for a limited duration, with 80% of the events removed. Thus, during intervention this retains 20% social value (experiments with other probabilities are in Figure S1). The results agree with the observations across the world – the peak of the infection is lowered and delayed (2). However, we discover that this strategy alone does not significantly reduce the total number of infections. Supplementary Figure S2 shows the effects of such a strategy applied for longer durations.

Part I of Figure 2 studies the disease spread with varied starting time of the intervention while keeping its duration fixed at 15 days. In the Foursquare NYC dataset, the intervention starts on day 9 when 5% of the population gets infected. Compared to the scenario without intervention, this strategy reduces the total number of infected agents by 8%, delays the peak of active infections by 11 days and lowers it by 6%. The peak of new infections is also delayed by 18 days. The University dataset shows a similar pattern, as the peaks in active and new infection are delayed by 22 and 19 days respectively. Other datasets show trends consistent with the above (Figure S3).

We note that when implemented for a fixed duration, an earlier lockdown is not necessarily the better strategy. An imperfect lockdown can allow the infection to survive, which then spreads rapidly on removal of the intervention and produces a high eventual peak or second wave. On the other hand, a lockdown implemented somewhat later achieves a lower peak later on, and lower total number of infections.

In Figure 2 Part II, the intervention strategy starts when 10% of the population is infected
(day 13 for the Foursquare NYC dataset and day 36 for the University dataset). The longer interventions are seen to have a more significant effect in reducing both the peak of active cases and total infections. A 30 days intervention reduces the total infected population by 27% and 5% in the Foursquare NYC dataset, the University dataset respectively. While for shorter interventions (up to 15 days), the active infection curves remain uni-modal, a longer intervention (30 days) produces two peaks and the second peak is delayed by 32 and 65 days for the Foursquare NYC and the University dataset respectively. The growth rate, $\lambda_t$ for the longer intervention does not go to zero ($\lambda_t$ reaches zero when no new person is infected), thus the disease remains in circulation for a longer period of time. Interventions up to two months (Figure S4, Part II) show similar conclusions: second peaks are observed and the cumulative number of infected people does not decrease beyond 10% compared to the setting without intervention.

Dividing a population into non-interacting cohorts has been proposed as an intervention strategy (24,25), with the idea that preventing transmission across group boundaries will reduce the spread. We find that grouping does act to delay and lower the total number of infections in Figure 6 and S5. The number of infected people is reduced by 37% in NYC and by 53% in the university with 4 groups. The effect is milder in the Foursquare datasets with larger population size, for example in the Istanbul dataset (Figure 6B). By taking the same sized population as in NYC dataset (Figure 6C), the effect appears – the total number of infected agents is reduced by 22% with 4 groups.

**Heterogeneity in mobility and contagion dynamics.** We found that the most active individuals are infected significantly earlier (Figure 3) than the average population. The activity of a person is quantified by the number of check-ins in the Foursquare datasets and number of meetings in the University and Bike datasets. The popularity of a venue is measured by the number of check-ins. Of the top 5% most active agents, approximately 60% – 80% get infected at the peak of active infections compared to the peak height about 20% – 40% for the overall population, and this peak is reached about 10 days earlier. Thus, highly active people are at a higher risk, and more likely to be propagators of the disease in the early stages. Similar results on other datasets can be seen in Figure S6.

The heterogeneity creates fundamental differences in infection spread compared to the homogeneous SEIR model. Supplementary Figure S7 shows that in comparison to the homogeneous SEIR model - where agents meet all other agents with equal probability - the data driven simulation achieves a higher peak, but a smaller total number of infections.

The heterogeneity of venues in spreading the contagion is seen in Figure 3E to G. The number of agents infected from a venue has a heavy tailed distribution for all cities in the Foursquare datasets, and the results for the NYC dataset is shown separately. Most of the venues infect a very small number of individuals, but a few venues infect a large number of agents - In the Foursquare NYC dataset, 50% people are infected from 0.05% (19 venues) most popular venues. There are 718 and 4,979 individuals who have visited the top 0.01% most popular venues in the Foursquare NYC and Istanbul datasets respectively. While these people are infected in higher proportions (by at least 12% higher), the shape of active infections remains
similar to the curve for the overall population.

**Targeted interventions on the most active individuals and the most popular venues.** We study targeted intervention schemes to put a higher level of protection on the most active agents and most popular venues, thus reducing or eliminating their contribution to spreading the virus.

Figure 4A to D use the social and health values to compare the targeted interventions against multiple other strategies including the uniform intervention of staying home, protecting a random subset of agents and closing a random subset of venues. While in Foursquare datasets, closing the most popular venues is the most effective strategy, protecting the most active agents is the most effective strategy in the University and Bike datasets.

In the NYC dataset, to achieve similar ∼ 80% social value, the strategy of closing the most popular venues shows 60% to 72% more health value than other strategies. In Istanbul dataset, to achieve 60% social value closing the most popular venue achieves at least 52% more health value than other strategies. The other cities in the dataset show consistent patterns (Figure S8). In both the University and Bike datasets, at 80% social value, protecting the most active agents achieves 30% or more health value than other strategies.

The strategy to close the most popular venues is analyzed in detail in Figure 4E, F, and Figure S9. In Foursquare NYC and Istanbul datasets, closing a few (∼ 1%) most popular venues reduces the total number of infected individuals by more than 40%, the peak number of active infections by ∼ 30% and delays the time of the peak by up to 30 days. In larger sample populations, this strategy is seen to have a smaller impact on total infections and the peak number but serves to delay the peak. In the university dataset, closing 5% of the most popular venues can reduce the total number of infected individuals by 50% and the peak number of active infections by more than 20%.

Figure 4G, H, and Figure S10 show the effect of protecting the infection of the most active agents. In the University and Bike datasets, protecting the most active 5% to 10% of the population reduces total infection by 20% to 40% and delays the peak by 90 to 110 days. Protecting the most active individuals in the Foursquare datasets has similar effects – in the NYC dataset, the total number of infected people is reduced by ∼ 30% and peak of active cases is reduced by ∼ 25% when 20% most active people are protected. However, protecting 20% most active people reduces the social value by ∼ 45%. The rest of the Foursquare datasets show similar patterns.

We study other intervention strategies where the agents and venues to protect are selected randomly in Supplementary Figures S11, S12. They are used in the comparison of different interventions in Figure 4.

**Contact graph: Social network abstraction to estimate mobility based infection spread.** We designed social network models derived from mobility data such that the spread of infection in a mobility dataset resembles that in the corresponding social network. To model person to person disease transmission as a social network, we define a graph $G$ with agents as nodes and edges connect agents who have met at least once. Each edge has a weight, $w$, as the average
number of times they met in a day. For infection spread via venues, the social network is defined using a bipartite graph where the agents and venues constitute the two sets of nodes, and they connect if a person visited a venue. The edges are weighted by the average number of daily visits.

Figure 5 compares the contagion simulation on a social network against the simulation on time ordered mobility data. The total number of infected people matches between the simulations (Figure 5, Part I). Further, nearly the same set of agents get infected starting with independent random seed agents. For all datasets, Jaccard similarity between the agents (identified by unique user identifiers in the datasets) infected in the mobility based simulation and the social network simulation reach above 65%. The peak of the active cases differs by 1% (in University) to 24% (in Istanbul). Figure S13 shows similar patterns for other Foursquare datasets.

For the person to person transmission model, Figure 5, Part II compares the total number of infected people for three intervention strategies: staying home, protecting the most active agents, and dividing people into groups. The strategies are simulated in the social network setting by preprocessing the graph, $G$. The staying home intervention of skipping a meeting with probability $\alpha$ is simulated by removing an edge with weight $w$ with probability $1 - (1 - \alpha)^w$. The activity of an agent is defined as the total weight of the edges incident on the corresponding node. The strategy to protect the most active agents translates to removing the nodes with the highest activities from $G$. The strategy to divide the population into groups is simulated by first randomly assigning the nodes to groups and then removing the edges between nodes that belong to different groups. The infection curves for mobility and social network simulations are matched for all strategies for both University and Bike datasets – the difference between two curves is always below 10%. The percentage of people infected in total goes to zero in two models with similar intervention parameters.

Robustness of results. The conclusions from the simulations are robust to changes in simulation parameters, and has been confirmed in a range of experiments using different parameter values - for infection probability ($\beta$) (Figure S14), number of seeds (Figure S15), and the probability of an agent being asymptomatic (Figure S16). Decreasing $\beta$ reduces the number of infected people and delays the peak of active infections. In the NYC dataset, 68% of the population gets infected when $\beta = 0.75$ compared to 34% at $\beta = 0.25$. In the Istanbul dataset, the peak is delayed by 10 days when $\beta$ is reduced to 0.25 from 0.75. Increasing the number of seeds – initial infected people – increase the robustness or predictability of the spread of infection, but otherwise has a relatively small effect: a moderate number of seeds shows similar behavior to a larger number of seeds – the total number of infected people differs no more than 4% across datasets for using 20 seeds compared to 1 seed. The fraction of asymptomatic carriers increases the rate of infection (since these carriers remain infectious for a longer period), but does not cause a major growth in infection – in the NYC dataset 14% more people get infected when increasing the percentage of asymptomatic people from 15% to 75%. Similar pattern is found

\[ Jaccard \text{ similarity of two sets } A, B = \frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|} \]
in the other datasets.

The conclusions are also sustained when simulations are carried out on sub-samples of data. (Figure S17). Here a fraction of the agents is randomly sampled for simulation. For the same fraction of the most active agents protected within the subsample, a larger population has a larger fraction of the total population infected. However, this growth appears to be sublinear and the effect tapers off with the size of the population. Sampling has a similar effect under the intervention of closing popular venues.

**Discussion.** We have shown that the diversity of human movement has an influence on the spread of the virus, making its behavior different from homogeneous models. The heterogeneity can be leveraged to devise less disruptive strategies of intervention. Our conclusions are complementary to other non-pharmaceutical interventions such as maintaining person to person distance, wearing masks, and avoiding contact. The analysis is based on datasets that are samples of population behavior, and thus, the infection numbers or percentages generated by the simulations should not be regarded as precise representative values but rather as patterns to expect under various interventions. The trends in relative measurements hold across multiple datasets of varying sizes and representing multiple locations, lifestyles, and geographic scales, giving us confidence that they reflect general properties of infection spread due to mobility and corresponding interventions.

Mobility in a region may be affected by policies and interventions applied to other regions such as neighboring districts (26). This spillover effect can be seen as a network effect at a larger scale, and (27) shows that spillover indeed affects aggregate mobility in US counties and thus intervention policies should be coordinated at larger scales. Our datasets do not include mobility across such administrative zones and consequent spillover effects. As more mobility data from the ongoing pandemic becomes available, it may be possible to incorporate and model such larger-scale network effects on agent mobility and infection, as well have incorporate changes in human behavior due to COVID-19 (28, 29).

In simulations, we found that the existing common strategies come with some caveats. The cohort strategy, i.e. partitioning the population into non-interacting groups (24, 25, 30) is effective in circumstances such as small populations, a large number of groups, and the specific dataset of University mobility (Figure 6), but not necessarily in other scenarios. The simulations are restricted to certain slices of the society, and in practice, it is infeasible to maintain a consistent partitioning across different communities such as residence, work, and school, which is likely to reduce the impact of this strategy. A larger number of partitions or cohorts will reduce the spread of infection, but a large number of cohorts are difficult to implement and schedule, and they come at a larger social cost of reduced interaction across cohorts. The implementation of a cohort strategy may differ by circumstances, such as separating the groups spatially (different classrooms) versus separating temporally (different time slots), which will influence the person-to-person distancing and infection propagation. For the other common strategy of a blanket lockdown, which has been implemented by many countries, the results in Figure 2 shows that the timing and duration of the action subtly influence the peak and total infections.
Since this strategy is a limited resource - in the sense that it cannot be sustained for long - it needs to be deployed with careful planning, and with consideration of available medical and economic resources.

We found targeted interventions on the most mobile agents and most popular venues to have a significant effect on pandemic control at a low social cost (Figure 4). These results are complementary to prioritizing protections for essential workers such as medical professionals (31,32), as our conclusions are for the mobility component of infection spread, which is not addressed in works such as (33). In this respect, those most at risk and likely spreaders of infection are workers whose professions require frequent movement. While isolating them from work is not practical, better protection strategies such as protective equipment, strict regulations, and early vaccinations can help to reduce infections. Closing the most popular venues such as university cafeterias (Figure S18) are also unsustainable over long durations, but modified operations and strict social distancing at these venues can help to significantly reduce infections. The influence of these various strategies relative to other non-pharmaceutical interventions remains to be investigated. It has been suggested in (26) that with more data, implicit Randomized Controlled Trials may be carried out by comparing similar localities enforcing different subsets of policies.

The difference in results for data-driven mobility and those from traditional homogeneous models (Figure S7) can be attributed to information-structural properties of human mobility, creating a complex network effect. Inclusion of social and economic considerations are likely to add to these complexities, for example, it has been argued that the worldwide food supply chain is being affected by labor shortages, trade restrictions, and factory closures (34). The relations between mobility, essential industries and economics will be important to decipher for the development of long term strategies.
Figure 1: The model for infection spread (Part I) and dataset properties (Part II to IV). The model (A) is adapted from SEIR infection spread model and the parameters (B) are from CDC for COVID-19. The model states and actions are represented by boxes and ovals respectively. Part II and III present distributions of the number of check-ins or meetings per person and per venue, depicting the heterogeneity of mobility. Part IV: Normalized check-in counts aggregated over a week for all Foursquare datasets show daily patterns with increased activity on weekends. Patterns vary across cities.
**Figure 2: Uniform lockdown for limited duration delays and lowers the peak of the infections, but often has a small effect on total infection.** Here, 80% check-in or meeting events are randomly removed. Part I: A limited duration intervention (15 days) delays (by 11 days in NYC and 22 days in the University) and lowers (by 6% in Foursquare NYC and 5% in the University) the peak of active cases, but does not reduce the total number of infected people, as the second peak is imminent. Part II: With increasing length of intervention, the number of infected people reduces (by 33% in NYC), but in the University dataset, the effect is milder.
Figure 3: Heterogeneity of mobility in venues and agents result in varied risks to catch and spread the virus. Agents with higher activity get infected with a higher proportion and earlier (A to D). In all Foursquare datasets, the number of people infected from a venue has heavy-tailed distributions (E). People who visit the most popular venues get infected in higher proportions (F, G).
Figure 4
Figure 4: Across all datasets, the most effective strategies in terms of their health and social values consider the heterogeneity of mobility (A to D) and (E to H) present the details of the best strategies. The health value quantifies the percentage of people not infected compared to without intervention scenario and the social value is the percent of check-ins or meetings remain under intervention. An ideal strategy would have both high health and social values. Across Foursquare datasets, closing the most popular venues is the most effective strategy (A, B); isolating or protecting the most active agents is the best strategy in University (C) and the Bike (D) datasets. The Bike dataset does not have venues and therefore it omits corresponding strategies. E to H show details of the best strategies. They reduce infections to a large extent (closing the most popular 1% venues results in 57% reduction in infection in the NYC dataset), delays and lowers the peak of active infections (protecting the most active 5% agents in the University dataset delays the peak by 20 days) and maintain high social values (1% most popular venues contribute to 20% check-ins in the NYC dataset).
Figure 5
Figure 5: Contagion simulation in the derived social network model infects a similar number and similar set of agents as the simulation using mobility data in both with and without intervention settings. Part I: The curves for total infection numbers, actively infected agents, and Jaccard similarity of the infected agents match under no intervention scenario (A to C). Although in the Istanbul dataset (D), two infection number curves do not match after 25 days, similar sets of people get infected in the two simulations. Part II: In person to person infection spread model, with different intervention parameters, the final infection number is similar between the two models in all three intervention strategies.
Figure 6: Diving agents into cohorts cuts off the contacts between different cohorts, like separating students into different sessions for courses and acts to reduce the spread of the disease. With the more groups, the number of infected people is reduced (by 37% in NYC and by 53% in the university with 4 groups). The large population of the Istanbul dataset produces densely connected groups that result in substantial intra-group infection spread (B). Thus, when we sample the same number of people as NYC, the effect of separating groups re-appear (C). In addition, the peaks of active cases are also delayed and flatten, especially in the University dataset.
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Data

All our datasets describe individual mobility by timestamped locations. Datasets use anonymized individual identifiers and have assorted temporal and spatial resolutions. Table S1 quantifies the datasets.

Foursquare dataset. Foursquare enables users to record their check-in times at venues and thus produce a log of users’ mobility to public places. Although the check-ins are accessible to people only within social circles, many people choose to share them on twitter. Authors in (13, 14) collected the Foursquare check-ins posted on twitter. In this work, we use a sub-sample of the available dataset containing 7 cities (New York, Tokyo, Istanbul, Chicago, Jakarta, Los Angeles, and London) with dense data distributions spanning between Apr-2012 and Aug-2012. Check-ins for a city are selected by first choosing a Geo-location bounding box containing the city, for example, we consider the venues within the box ranging between latitude [40.5378° N, 41.0131° N] and longitude [73.4532° W, 74.3074° W] are considered in the New York City dataset. Then we select the check-ins that happened in the selected venues. Essential characterizations of the datasets agree with the findings in (13, 14). The check-ins have the temporal resolution in seconds.

University dataset. The Tsinghua University campus covers an area of 4.4 km² with 47,359 students and 12,000 faculties. There are 2,346 wireless access points deployed in 114 buildings including classrooms, departments, administrative buildings, apartments, gyms, libraries, restaurants, supermarkets, and hotels. The dense deployment allows tracking the connected devices. Each connected device reports its connecting access point every 5 minutes. The dataset (15) is one week long and assuming that the weekly movement stays similar in this setting, we repeat the dataset to generate more number of days. When two agents stay in the same room within a time period, it is regarded as a meeting between them.
**Bike dataset.** Zhengzhou (China) has wireless tracking terminals that can locate and monitor electric bikes in real-time using a variety of IoT sensors, such as satellite positioning module, voltage and current detection module, and temperature sensing module. Our dataset (16) has timestamped GPS locations of 46,087 personally owned electrical bikes with the temporal granularity of 10 seconds. On average, there are more than 41,000 people traveling by electrical bikes and more than 19 million data points collected every day for a month and repeat them in the simulation. If a person stops moving in one location for more than 5 minutes, this location with the time period is regarded as a stay point of this agent. On average, there are 118,337 daily stay points and 90,144 meetings every day.

**Data resolution.** The data we operate with has a high spatial resolution, which allows us to execute detailed agent-based models. Other forms of data often used in movement analysis include cellular data - representing cell tower connections of mobile phones, which can include errors at a scale of kilometers, which is the range of cell towers. Even in the urban scenarios of dense deployments, cell towers are separated by hundreds of meters implying correspondingly low resolutions. In comparison, in the bike GPS dataset, we have errors at the level of few meters, and similarly, the errors in University WiFi dataset are bounded by a few tens of meters, which is the typical WiFi range, and connection to the same WiFi usually implies agents being in the same building. The Foursquare dataset correspondingly contains precise information of agents visiting the same venue. Compared to metapopulation models that treat the population as a set of communities, this high-resolution simulation incorporates a more dynamic and precise movement pattern. We are able to simulate movement or presence of agents with precision such as presence in the same building, and correspondingly likely infection transmission.

**Intervention Strategies**

We have investigated multiple non-pharmaceutical interventions. Some strategies referenced briefly in the main article are described below.

**Intervening random individuals and venues.** Here, the venues to close (Figure S11) and people to protect (Figure S12) are chosen uniformly at random. In the Foursquare, NYC dataset, closing 40% random venues results in \( \sim 20\% \) reduction in total infected people and 60% reduction in the social value. In other Foursquare datasets of cities such as Istanbul and Tokyo, the effect of this strategy on health value is minimal with reduction not more than \( \sim 5\% \). Other datasets show a similar trend. In the University dataset, closing 40 random venues brings 17% reduction in total infected people. Across all datasets, closing 40% random venues results in more than \( \sim 33\% \) reduction in the infected population (Figure S12).

These strategies are shown to be less effective than intervening the most active agents or most popular venues. In the Foursquare NYC dataset, to achieve the same social value (\( \sim 60\% \)), the strategy to close randomly chosen venues achieves 65% less health value compared to the
targeted strategy to close the most popular venues. In the University dataset, to achieve the same social value (≈ 80%), the strategy to protect random people obtains 55% less health value compared to the strategy to protect the most active people.

**Methods: Implementation and Experimental setup**

The Foursquare datasets contain time-ordered check-ins along with categorical unique identifiers for venues and agents. In the University and Bike datasets, meetings are computed and stored as data pre-processing steps. The meetings in the University dataset are computed first grouping the contacts by venues and then finding the overlapping staying intervals. In the Bike dataset, the spatial proximity is computed by a kd-tree, a spatial indexing structure to find the location within a given distance. The meetings are stored with the participates, location, starting, and ending time. Meetings are ordered by their starting time.

The simulation progresses sequentially over the events ordered by check-ins or meetings and keeps track of the states of the agents and venues. While the state machine for the agents is described in the main article, a venue can be in one of the two states – susceptible and infected. Initially, all venues are susceptible and a venue becomes infected once an infectious agent checks-in. Each infected venue keeps a timer that goes off after 48 hours of being infected and then the venue becomes susceptible again. If an infectious agent visits an infected venue, the timer is reset to the current check-in time. We maintain the timer by operating on it only at check-in event times.

In the person to person infection spread model, the infection probability, $\beta$, used in the simulation is derived for a particular dataset based on existing knowledge of the initial reproduction number, $R_0$ for COVID-19. $R_0$ denotes the expected number of people infected from a single person, i.e., $R_0 = c\beta T$, where $c$ is the average number of daily meetings per person, and $T$ is the average number of days an agent remains infectious. While $c$ is estimated from a dataset, model parameters in Figure 1B give the value of $T$ as 9.55 days. For the disease transmission through venues, $\beta$ has a different interpretation and does not correspond to usual parameters such as $R_0$. We evaluate a range of $\beta$ value in Figure S14 and find consistent patterns across them.

There are 10 initial infectious seeds at the beginning of each simulation. The infection probability is set as 0.75 for the Foursquare dataset and take $R_0$ as 3 to obtain the infection probability for the University and Bike dataset.

For both the person to person and via venue transmission models, the probabilistic virus transmission is simulated as follows. A uniform random number is sampled in the range $[0, 1]$ and compared against the infection probability, $\beta$. The probabilistic experiment is successful, i.e., the agent becomes infected, if the sample is less than $\beta$.

We study dynamics of the infection spread in four dimensions – the total number of infected people till date, number of active cases, number of new infections, and epidemiological parameters such as the time-varying reproduction number ($R_t$) or growth rate ($\lambda_t$). The active cases
include individuals that have been infected till date but not yet recovered. The time-varying reproduction number, $R_t$ for the day $t$ is the expected number of average individuals infected by a single agent who gets infected on the day $t$. The growth rate, $\lambda_t$, is the ratio of the total number of agents newly infected on the day $t$ to the same number on the day $t - 1$. When $\lambda_1$ above 1, the number of infections grows exponentially; when $\lambda_t$ is below 1, the number of new infections converges.

In the contact graph based study, the contagion simulation uses the same model and parameters as mobility datasets (Figure I Part I). It starts with 10 initial randomly selected infectious nodes (seeds) and all other nodes are at susceptible state. It works in synchronous and discrete time rounds – at each round, an infectious node infects its susceptible neighbors in $G$ with a probability, $p$. As both the meetings and the check-ins to venues are abstracted to counts instead of timestamped events, the contacts are considered to be distributed uniformly over the duration of the dataset and infection transmission probabilities $\beta$ are adjusted per edge as $p = (1 - (1 - \beta)^w)$. In the infection transmission model via venue, an infectious individual infects a venue with probability $\min(1, w)$ at each round, and the infected venue in-turn infects an individual with probability $p$.

Similar to mobility based simulations, in the social network setting we use $\beta = 0.75$ for transmission via venues. In the person-to-person transmission model, $\beta$ is derived from $R_0$ from the same expression, $R_0 = c\beta T$. Here, $c$ is counted as the average total weight from a node and $T$ remain the same as 9.55.

**Computation of social and health values of interventions.** The social value of an intervention strategy is measured as the percentage of activities (check-ins) preserved under the intervention. When a venue is closed or an agent is protected, the corresponding activities are canceled. The social value of a strategy is denoted by $1 - x/y$ in percentage, where $x$ and $y$ number of check-ins (for Foursquare datasets) or meetings (for University and Bike datasets) performed under the intervention and without intervention respectively. The health value of an intervention is correspondingly measured as the percentage of agents who escape infection due to the intervention. If $x$ and $y$ number of agents are infected under intervention and without intervention respectively, then the health value of the strategy is $1 - x/y$ as the percentage.

The simulations are implemented in Python and executed in standard desktop machines with Intel i7 cores and 16GB memory. The simulation is compute-efficient – all our simulations run under 5 minutes. The efficiency results from in-memory processing, pre-computation of meetings prior to simulation, and storing infection states in the data structures for venues. All of these reduce the number of operations at each discrete event timestamp. The result of a simulation contains the timestamps of new infections and recoveries.

As our simulation model is stochastic, each experiment is run 10 times to test their stability. We report the temporal dynamics in the figures with the median of 10 runs as the solid curve and the shaded regions denote the area between 25 and 75 percentiles. The figures are smoothed with 7 day rolling average. Moreover, to bring about the major trends, the growth rate and reproduction number plots are further smoothed using a standard Gaussian filter with the standard
deviation of the Gaussian kernel set as 2 days.

## Existing Models for infection spread

There are various existing models for infection spread. We discuss below the ones most relevant to us.

- **Epidemiology models:** Classical models in epidemiology include SIR (Susceptible-Infected-Recovered), SEIR (Susceptible-Exposed-Infected-Recovered) models (8) and other variations (9, 10). These models make simplistic assumptions of a homogeneous population and any two individuals have the same structure of interactions and dynamics. The model evolves by using a small number of parameters such as the chance of an infectious person infecting another one and then derives ordinary differential equations. To incorporate heterogeneity in a large population, meta-population models (3) include population structures that describe variations in age groups, behaviors, neighborhoods, but in general, these models are coarse-grained.

- **Data-driven models:** A few models such as the one from Institute of Health Metrics (IHME) (11) use a data-driven model to predict the number of new infections, based on data from other countries. This model assumes that the infection process is uniform across different countries, thus it ignores the important parameters such as the discrepancy of culture, weather, the density of population, and the life style.

- **Multi-agent models:** The models from Imperial College London (12) are individual-based multi-agent models. These models are fairly complicated with a large number of parameters describing the interactions between the agents. For example, individuals are assumed to reside in high-density residential areas from census data. Contacts with other individuals are assumed to happen within the household, at school, in the workplace, and in the wider community. The parameters of population density in these scenarios are taken as the average in published data. It is a challenge to choose these parameters and validate the choices against real data.

## Comparison with standard SEIR model

From a dataset, we count the average number of daily contacts for an agent, $c$. With the population size of $N$, there are $Nc/2$ contacts in total per day. The SEIR simulation progresses in synchronous daily rounds and $Nc/2$ contacts are randomly sampled each day. The other parameters remain similar to Figure 1.

We apply the standard SEIR model to COVID-19 parameters, i.e., consider meetings between random pairs of agents. We simulate the person to person transmission model in the University and the Bike datasets keeping the model parameters the same as Figure 1B.
the dataset, \(Nc/2\) contacts between two agents are randomly sampled. Here, we ignore the time-stamped of each meeting from the dataset. Similar to our simulation model, the simulation starts with 10 initial seeds and proceeds with probabilistic disease transmission using sampled contacts.

Figure S7 compares the infection spreads in two models for a setting without intervention. For both University and Bike datasets, a larger population gets infected by SEIR model compared to our mobility based simulation. In both the datasets, the peak of active infections in SEIR model is at least 15\% higher delayed by more than 35 days than the mobility model. This is due to heterogeneity of agents – more active agents get the virus early and infect other susceptible agents early – resulting in an early peak. Besides a large fraction of agents have a low number of meetings therefore have less risk of being infected which leads to a lower total infection number compared with SEIR model. Our observations match with the observations in (35).

The difference in meeting distributions in the two simulation models results in different distributions for the number of agents infected from an individual. While the mobility based model has a long tail distribution suggesting that the more active agents infect more people, the SEIR model does not have a long tail.
### Table S1: The statistical result for the Foursquare dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number of check-ins</th>
<th>Number of people</th>
<th>Number of venues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>202,599</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>39,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>559,966</td>
<td>8,925</td>
<td>53,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>642,687</td>
<td>4,744</td>
<td>96,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>103,432</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>23,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>402,989</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>104,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>336,386</td>
<td>3,623</td>
<td>67,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>45,657</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>12,773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table S2: The statistical result for University dataset and Bike dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th># of daily stay points</th>
<th># of people</th>
<th># of venues</th>
<th># of daily meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>106,975</td>
<td>47,359</td>
<td>2,346</td>
<td>2,476,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>118,337</td>
<td>46,087</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>90,144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure S1: Infection spreading with the intervention strategy of varying probability, with which check-in is skipped with random sampling. All interventions start when 10% of the population is infected and it lasts for 15 days. While with higher probability (i.e., stronger intervention) the peak of active infections gets delayed and lowered, the total number of infected people is independent of the probability (in Istanbul, Tokyo, Jakarta, University, and Bike datasets).
Figure S2: Infection spreading with the intervention strategy of Stay home intervention. This intervention strategy uniformly randomly ignores a check-in with a probability. This represents people reducing their social activities. Naturally, as more check-ins are skipped the infection is slowed and the social value is also reduced.
Figure S3: Infection spreading with a varied start time of uniform intervention as Part I in Figure 2. The intervention strategy uniformly randomly skips 80% of the check-in or meeting events. Intervention starts when 5%, 10%, and 15% population is infected and lasts for 15 days. This intervention strategy can reduce the total number of infected agents in some datasets, but the fraction is independent of the starting time of the intervention.
Figure S4: Infection spreading with the intervention strategy of varying intervention length similar to Part II in Figure 2. With long intervention, the total number of infected people is reduced significantly in Chicago, Los Angeles, London and Bike datasets. Here, 30 days are enough to have the infected people recovered and the second wave of infection does not occur. In the other datasets, after the intervention, there is a second wave of infection leaving a similar number of infected people. We also test longer interventions in Part II in the datasets with larger populations and the patterns in Part I hold.
Figure S5: Infection spreading with the intervention strategy of dividing people into groups. With more groups, each group has fewer agents and the connections between them become sparser. In most datasets, dividing people into 4 groups can reduce the total number of infected people significantly.
Figure S6: Tracking the more active agents similar to Figure 3. The vertical lines denote the days of the peak. All the datasets show consistent trends that the most active agents get infected with a higher proportion and earlier than the whole population.
Figure S7: Infection spreading with random meeting information and real mobility data. In the SEIR model, almost all people get infected in the end, which is a much higher percentage than in the mobility model. At the same time, the peaks of people actively infected in the SEIR model are about 35 days delayed, compared with the mobility model in two datasets. The third row shows the distribution of the number of people infected by a person. In the mobility model, an agent can infect at most 50 susceptible agents, while in the SEIR model, at most only 15 susceptible agents can be infected from one infectious agent. Thus, there is a long tail in the mobility model because there are some more active agents, who spread the disease quickly.
Figure S8: Comparison of different intervention strategies in all other Foursquare datasets similar to Figure 4. Closing popular venues is the most advantageous from both health and social value perspectives.
Figure S9: Infection spreading with the intervention strategy of closing popular venues.
With more popular venues closed, the total number of infected people is reduced. The peaks of people actively infected are delayed and become lower. In addition, closing these popular venues have a comparatively smaller influence on the social value than uniform intervention.
Figure S10: Infection spreading when protecting most active agents. The total number of infected people is reduced and the peaks of active infections are delayed and lowered with more active agents being protected.
Figure S11
Figure S11: Infection spreading with the intervention strategy of closing random venues. Compared with closing popular venues, this strategy does not have a strong intervention effect. In some cities like Istanbul, when 40% venues are closed, the total number of infected people is reduced a little, less than 10%, but the social value is reduced by about 40%.
Figure S12
Figure S12: Infection spreading with the intervention strategy of protecting random people. Compared with protecting most active people, this strategy needs to protect more people to achieve the similar health value. When 40% people are protected, the total number of people infected can be reduced by about 20%, and the social value is reduced by 40%.
Figure S13: Infection spreading between mobility network and bipartite social networks. The infection curves between the two models are matched and the infection people in common also have a large percentage.
Figure S14: Infection spreading with varied transmission probabilities. In the Foursquare datasets, the transmission probabilities are provided directly. In the University and Bike datasets, the transmission probabilities are translated from $R_0$. With higher transmission probability values, the total number of people infected increase, and the peak of active cases get higher.
Figure S15: Infection spreading with a varied number of seeds. With a small number of initial seeds, the variance of infection is very large (shaded area). In most cases, when the number of seeds is enough, the total infection numbers and the peaks of people infected actively do not have a large difference.
Figure S16: Infection spreading with the varying probabilities of being asymptomatic. With high asymptomatic probability, there will be more infected people who have a longer duration to infect other susceptible people. It leads to a high percentage of people infected in total and a higher peak of people infected actively.
Figure S17: Infection spreading with the intervention strategy for different sizes of the dataset. The sample size is in the percentage of agents sampled. Using the intervention strategies to protect the most active people and close most popular venues, the percent of infected agents decreases with sample size.
Figure S18: Closing some types of venues and constraining some activities are good intervention strategies in universities. In the university environment, there are many gathering events, especially taking courses and eating. In reality, many universities allow students to stay in the campus, but move the courses online and require students to take the meal back to dorms. So we test the spread in the university if some types of venues are closed. It shows that closing one type of venue is not enough to control the spreading. Only when we close all the classrooms and cafeteria, the total infection can be controlled under 20%, because students can also contact with each other in other venues, due to the limited number of venues.