**[Kurt Dejgaard](https://www.facebook.com/groups/245022543354264/user/767788372/?__cft__%5b0%5d=AZVJ7AymFAyB5W-wEffUjvYw1co3UaZiRIOOQRx7MPYqDPJifygTmaA8QbMY_VMWz5l4K77rFJnatWiXVeB1fvVaXlvoVHi34TzhvZub4jmACkorNBO2fDCfGlQuZAodAkdVP_1k4W0QwHxL5h_Qdd8U&__tn__=-%5dC%2CP-R)**

**har delt et link.**

[1ft3toh Saftponsof.red](https://www.facebook.com/groups/245022543354264/permalink/453385825851267/)  ·

[https://indblik.net/smid-sikkerhedsudstyret-her-er.../](https://indblik.net/smid-sikkerhedsudstyret-her-er-hvorfor-vi-skal-genaabne-mere/?fbclid=IwAR25lU8hRe26TarO9uO6RBbf1n0MHIDIt009GOamo32oxeQa7-uKWWEWNxs)

Igen ser vi et litteraturstudie, begået af Jonas Herby, brugt som "bevis" (her, af Jonas Herby selv) for at nedlukninger ikke virker.

[https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3764553](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3764553&fbclid=IwAR2T5q8UBG9kCEB48m8hJGOWbhG4yZdIuyup1Ag8mp4-87Z38BzlmU_ruKE)

Jeg er gået Herbys litteraturstudie lidt i bedene. Og en del af de referencer som Herby benytter i litteraturstudiet synes ikke at bekræfte det han citerer dem for, hvis man faktisk tjekker efter. Tværtimod.

F.eks. tilskrives Bonardi et al i Herbys Tabel 2 at opgøre bidraget fra nedlukninger til 0%

Hvad Bonardi et al faktisk skriver i den refererede artikel (citat):

"Our data cover 184 countries from December 31st 2019 to May 4th 2020, and identifies when lockdowns were adopted, along with confirmed cases and deaths. We find that reducing movements within countries has been effective in developed economies – averting about 650,000 deaths" ([https://www.researchgate.net/.../343889174\_Fast\_and\_local...](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343889174_Fast_and_local_How_lockdown_policies_affect_the_spread_and_severity_of_covid-19?fbclid=IwAR0IdJZzl5f4qWTxVaeVHGiHcYMm7y9Hhmvr3Vy9-TFWciGUwjI6_XXC9ko))

Og Chaudhry et al tilskrives i samme Tabel 2 at opgøre bidraget fra nedlukninger til 0%.

Hvad Chaudhry et al faktisk skriver i den refererede artikel (citat):

"[...] full lockdowns (RR=2.47: 95%CI: 1.08–5.64) and reduced country vulnerability to biological threats (i.e. high scores on the global health security scale for risk environment) (RR=1.55; 95%CI: 1.13–2.12) were significantly associated with increased patient recovery rates." ([https://www.sciencedirect.com/.../pii/S258953702030208X](https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.sciencedirect.com%2Fscience%2Farticle%2Fpii%2FS258953702030208X%3Ffbclid%3DIwAR3_gU5v5WFPv9C2KDfkfyosYDjKA4LI4Qj7PuIaNRYal2Sdt7y_QVmp5xI&h=AT09Pxy_Xsnx77FF3tZJs1L-ZcxkLvFZYNTi3lrXiAo5NChmXclmEDhgnvZzL2JbALMpwYmHWlC0syLxRiCddePBWVnxW06YF0od2SJwTOf0qelpIhi80gwlnlP0hl9YNg&__tn__=-UK-R&c%5b0%5d=AT2C2jNQKzK0qzh5F-MLjgUp8_qTtzgsF4o8GbxL-TNCQYSCPN7ULL8hL13ZEKlhOFmZgkMyyLVJOUsEs_RbJVm4nudoJ0YbZEStKeuca6BuBqXG5R-68bsKJ7aaFEozzEdbcNh2G2IQdjgsywiN5msYhQkddCGQPyM))

Courtemanche et al tilskrives i samme Tabel 2 at opgøre bidraget fra nedlukninger til 19% og frivillig adfærdsændringer tilskrives 81%.

Hvad Courtemanche et al faktisk skriver i den refererede artikel (citat):

"Adoption of government-imposed social distancing measures reduced the daily growth rate of confirmed COVID-19 cases by 5.4 percentage points after one to five days, 6.8 percentage points after six to ten days, 8.2 percentage points after eleven to fifteen days, and 9.1 percentage points after sixteen to twenty days. Holding the amount of voluntary social distancing constant, these results imply that there would have been ten times greater spread of COVID-19 by April 27 without shelter-in-place orders (ten million cases) and more than thirty-five times greater spread without any of the four measures (thirty-five million cases)" ([https://www.healthaffairs.org/.../10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00608](https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.healthaffairs.org%2Fdoi%2Ffull%2F10.1377%2Fhlthaff.2020.00608%3Ffbclid%3DIwAR3EqJJsSlBh06cnJbzrm-pEGmmUMR0wwPSMvx5ds6nFfei1Xk1-gSY2FKs&h=AT2C-48Hj7nIVT5qFV41Hr0vyo11bo13STEyBXvHq4Oz2590B8YtY_O8N-yMI6DEXTbQT1QLpYaJ71--cx6bwa95Scb4KtYuXEU0bJuWZIYnzS-OJ-ihCJuuTCr-DB0GfA&__tn__=-UK-R&c%5b0%5d=AT2C2jNQKzK0qzh5F-MLjgUp8_qTtzgsF4o8GbxL-TNCQYSCPN7ULL8hL13ZEKlhOFmZgkMyyLVJOUsEs_RbJVm4nudoJ0YbZEStKeuca6BuBqXG5R-68bsKJ7aaFEozzEdbcNh2G2IQdjgsywiN5msYhQkddCGQPyM))

(D.v.s. en faktor 10 reduktion via påtvungne hårde restriktioner og en faktor 35 uden påførte restriktioner ialt, inklusive nedlukninger)

Referencen Gapen et al tilskrives i Tabel 2 af Herby at vise at bidraget fra frivillighed er 93% og påførte restriktioner, 7%

Jeg finder ikke nogen differentiering i Gapen et als data der tillader denne konklussion på tal. Hvad Gapen et al faktisk siger i artiklen:

[...] Reductions in personal mobility on the scale of those achieved in March and April can reduce the reproduction rate by about a half [...] Our results support the conventional wisdom that lockdowns are a very effective temporary tool to buy time while more sustainable remedial measures are developed.

Gapen et al skriver endvidere

Citat: " [...] the effective reproduction number in the vicinity of 2.3 during February and the first half of March, prior to mitigation measures implemented by many states. The rate began to plunge rapidly in mid March, when the hardest-hit states (including California and New York) began to enact stay-at-home orders, plunging to around 0.9 by mid-April, with nearly all states adopting similar lockdown measures. After lingering somewhat below 1.0 for about a month, the rate began to climb during May and much of June, when most states took measures to relax restrictions." (Citat slut).

Ergo var det påførte restriktioner der var hovedansvarlig for at bringe smitten ned. Og den begyndte gradvist at stige igen, som restriktioner blev løftet.

Gapen et al opstiller herefter modeller for hvad kan gøres med tvungen maskebæring og lukning af restauranter, en 4-dobling af testaktivitet m.m. (altså overvejende påførte restriktioner) for at holde Covid reproduktionsraten nede.

Referencen Chernozhukov et al tilskrives i Tabel 2 en effekt af hårde nedlukninger på 43%. Men samme reference tilskrives at vurdere den relative effekt af frivillige bidrag til 100%.

-En relativ effekt på 143%? Hvor blev det "relative" så af?

Kort sagt: Litteraturstudiet er sjusket lavet og synes at indeholde en del fejlcitater og udeladelser af den litteratur den satte sig for at undersøge. Jeg gad nok vide hvad en peer reviewer ville sige til det...