Question: To what extent has democracy receded due to government violations of democratic standards in response to Covid-19?

Clarification: This index estimates the amount of democratic backsliding during the Covid crisis. It builds on existing scholarship showing that a country’s vulnerability to democratic backsliding is non-monotonic in the level of democracy. At low levels of democracy, there is little room for backsliding; and at high levels, the institutions of democracy are robust. The most vulnerable countries for backsliding are those in the mid-range, namely those that are neither fully democratic nor autocratic. The PanBack Index captures such inverted U-shaped vulnerability to backsliding by weighing more heavily violations recorded in countries in the mid-range of V-Dem’s (v11.1) Liberal Democracy Index (v2x libdem) measured in 2019. Note that we use the mean of the PanDem score over all periods to calculate the PanBack Index, to capture the average risk of backsliding during the pandemic.

Scale: Interval, from low to high (0-1).

Aggregation rules: For the time-series dataset, the PanBack index is calculated by multiplying the PanDem index for the quarter by the country’s (i) liberal democracy index score from 2019 times its inverse, factored by 4 to ensure the index ranges between zero and one. The equation is:

panbackiq = 4 × pandemiq × v2x libdem 2019 × (1 − v2x libdem 2019)  
For the cross-sectional dataset, we take the average score for this index to capture the average

amount of backsliding within the fifteen month period.

Pandemic Violations of Democratic Standards Index (PanDem)

Question: To what extent have government responses to the Covid-19 pandemic violated demo- cratic standards for emergency measures?

Clarification: With this index, we aim to capture the degree to which government responses to the Covid-19 pandemic have violated democratic standards for emergency measures within the time period (see quarter and year). Specifically, we draw on international agreements about democratic standards for emergency measures (e.g. ICCPR) to categorize seven types of viola- tions (see Section F). Emergency responses are coded as no violation (0), minor violation (1),
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moderate violation (2), and major violation (3) in each of these sub types and then aggregated into the overall PanDem index.

Scale: Interval, from low to high (0-1).

Aggregation rules: For the time-series dataset, this index is calculated as the sum of observed values across all violation types (see below) for the quarter (q) divided by the maximum possible score (20) to obtain the 0-1 interval. In other words, it represents the proportion of possible violations we have observed in that case. Below is the formula:

pandemiq = (type1iq + type2iq + type3iq + type4iq + type5iq + type6iq + type7iq) /20

For the cross-sectional dataset, we take the maximum value of the PanDem index observed across all quarters.

Type 1: Discriminatory measures (type1) 是否有種族、性別、地區、語言等歧視

Type 2: Derogations from non-derogable rights (type2) 政府採取的緊急手段是否危害到人們不可被侵犯的權利（通常指生命權）

Type 3: Abusive enforcement (type3) 採取的防疫政策是否有動用肢體暴力

Type 4: No time limit (type4) 政策是否有明確的時間區間

Type 5: Limitations on the legislature (type5) 相關法規是否明確

Type 6: Official disinformation campaigns (type6) 政府是否提供正確資訊

Type 7: Restrictions on media freedom (type7) 是否有保障媒體自由