

# 1 Health inequities in influenza transmission and surveillance

2 Casey M Zipfel <sup>1\*</sup>, Shweta Bansal<sup>1</sup>

3 August 4, 2020

4 1. Department of Biology, Georgetown University, Washington DC, USA

5 \*corresponding author: Casey Zipfel (cmz27@georgetown.edu)

## 6 **Abstract**

7 The lower an individual's socioeconomic position, the higher their risk of poor health in low-  
8 , middle-, and high-income settings alike. As health inequities grow, it is imperative that we  
9 develop an empirically-driven mechanistic understanding of the determinants of health dispar-  
10 ities, and capture disease burden in at-risk populations to prevent exacerbation of disparities.  
11 Past work has been limited in data or scope and has thus fallen short of generalizable in-  
12 sights. Here, we integrate empirical data from observational studies and large-scale healthcare  
13 data with models to characterize the dynamics and spatial heterogeneity of health disparities  
14 in an infectious disease case study: influenza. We find that variation in social, behavioral,  
15 and physiological determinants exacerbates influenza epidemics, and that low socioeconomic  
16 status (SES) individuals disproportionately bear the burden of infection. We also identify ge-  
17 ographical hotspots of influenza burden in low SES populations, much of which is overlooked  
18 in traditional influenza surveillance, and find that these differences are most predicted by vari-  
19 ation in susceptibility and access to sickness absenteeism. Our results highlight that the effect  
20 of overlapping factors is synergistic and that reducing this intersectionality can significantly  
21 reduce inequities. Additionally, health disparities are expressed geographically, as targeting  
22 public health efforts spatially may be an efficient use of resources to abate inequities. The  
23 association between health and socioeconomic prosperity has a long history in the epidemi-  
24 ological literature; addressing health inequities in respiratory infectious disease burden is an  
25 important step towards social justice in public health, and ignoring them promises to pose a  
26 serious threat.

## 27 **Author summary**

28 Health inequities, or increased morbidity and mortality due to social factors, have been demon-  
29 strated for respiratory-transmitted infectious diseases, most recently evidenced by disparities in  
30 COVID-19 severe cases and deaths. Many potential causes of these inequities have been proposed,  
31 but they have not been compared, and we do not understand their mechanistic impacts. Our  
32 understanding of these issues is further hindered by epidemiological surveillance, which has been  
33 shown to overlook areas of low socioeconomic status. Here, we combine mechanistic and statistical  
34 modeling with high volume datasets to disentangle the drivers of respiratory transmitted infectious  
35 diseases, and to estimate locations where these health inequities are most severe, using influenza  
36 as a case study. We show that low socioeconomic individuals disproportionately bear the burden  
37 of influenza infection, and that all proposed factors are synergistic in causing these. Thus, public  
38 health intervention that targets any one of these drivers may alleviate other issues, as they are  
39 not mutually exclusive. Additionally, we provide geographical hotspots for improved surveillance.  
40 This work also demonstrates the imperative need to consider inequities and social drivers in data  
41 collection, epidemiological modeling, and public health work, as the most vulnerable populations  
42 may also be the most likely to be overlooked.

## 43 **Introduction**

44 Health disparities are differences in health outcomes between social groups, and they persist in all  
45 modern public health settings. Health disparities may be the result of health inequalities, which are  
46 caused by biological or cultural variations, or by health inequities, which are driven by unfair factors  
47 and are avoidable with policy action [1]. There is extensive evidence that social factors, including  
48 education, employment, income, and ethnicity have a distinct influence on how healthy a person  
49 is: the lower an individual's socioeconomic position, the higher their risk of poor health for both  
50 chronic and infectious diseases in low-, middle-, and high-income settings alike [2]. There is also a  
51 role played by geographic context: the spatial distribution of disparity in health cannot be explained  
52 by variation in social factors alone [3]. As the divide in health disparities grows wider across the

53 world and within countries, it is imperative that we continue to understand how social determinants  
54 impact health, and how this is reflected geographically [4]. Here, we integrate empirical insights  
55 from past studies to characterize the impact of social determinants on the dynamics and spatial  
56 heterogeneity in an infectious disease case study, influenza.

57 Influenza is a respiratory infectious disease that occurs in annual epidemics in temperate regions  
58 that can have severe outcomes, especially in young children and elderly individuals [5]. Several  
59 studies have demonstrated social differences in influenza morbidity and mortality [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11].  
60 For severe influenza, the most impoverished areas have been shown to experience twice the influenza  
61 hospitalizations compared to regions with the lowest rates of poverty [12], and low education has  
62 been shown to be positively associated with influenza hospitalization rates [13]. Past work has  
63 even shown that socioeconomic factors played a significant role in the morbidity and mortality  
64 caused by the 1918 influenza pandemic [14, 15, 16]. The proposed determinants of disparities  
65 in influenza burden include a number of physiological and socio-behavioral dimensions [17, 18].  
66 In particular, influenza vaccine coverage and healthcare access are higher in areas with increased  
67 levels of education and household income [19, 20]. Additionally, low socioeconomic status (SES)  
68 individuals have been shown to experience increased susceptibility to respiratory infections due to  
69 increased stress [21, 22] and have less access to paid sick leave, resulting in less school and workplace  
70 sickness absenteeism, defined as remaining home due to illness [23, 24]. Lastly, it has been proposed  
71 that the social patterns of low SES populations affect their influenza risk: larger household sizes  
72 and higher population density may lead to higher infection risk [25, 26], while a less robust social  
73 network might result in decreased exposure, but also less support during recovery if infected [18].

74 Mathematical modeling studies of social disparities in influenza burden have used a simulation  
75 approach [27, 28, 29] and have focused on the effects of material deprivation (i.e. lack of access  
76 from income, education, employment) or social deprivation (i.e. lack of social cohesion and support  
77 due to small household sizes, single parenting, divorce or widowling). Such studies are important  
78 in uncovering the mechanistic explanations of influenza disparities, but have been limited in their  
79 geographical extent, or by the use of proxy measures. For example, [27, 29] consider phenomeno-  
80 logical variation in social contact rates without empirical evidence linking vulnerable groups to that

81 variation, thus limiting insights on the mechanisms that lead influenza disparities; [28, 29] focus on  
82 dynamics within specific cities, limiting generalizability.

83 Surveillance-based statistical studies of influenza disparities have been spatial in nature and have  
84 highlighted the challenges of disease surveillance under these disparities. Surveillance systems gather  
85 the data that shapes our understanding of influenza dynamics, and in the US and most European  
86 countries, influenza-like illness (ILI) surveillance occurs through reporting by sentinel healthcare  
87 providers. Such sentinel surveillance systems have been resource-efficient means of collecting high  
88 quality data, but they do not reliably capture data for all populations, since they are dependent  
89 on health care accessibility, health care seeking behavior, and other reporting issues [30, 31]. As a  
90 result, studies that rely on healthcare data for characterizing rates of ILI sometimes find decreasing  
91 rates of disease with increasing social deprivation [18]. While this negative association may be the  
92 result of lower exposure in impoverished areas (as suggested by [18]), it is likely that there exist  
93 spatial and social heterogeneities in surveillance caused by healthcare utilization. Indeed, Scarpino  
94 et al. have shown that the most impoverished areas are blindspots in the US influenza sentinel  
95 surveillance system, ILINet, and models based on these data make the best predictions in affluent  
96 areas while making the worst predictions in impoverished locations [32]. To better understand  
97 and respond to influenza epidemics and pandemics, we must improve our capability to detect and  
98 monitor outbreaks in at-risk populations.

99 In this work, we (a) develop data-driven epidemiological models to assess how social, behav-  
100 ioral and physiological determinants impact population-level influenza transmission in a controlled  
101 manner; and (b) develop statistical ecological models from large-scale disease data to estimate la-  
102 tent influenza burden in vulnerable populations in the United States. We hypothesize that low  
103 SES populations bear a disproportionate burden of influenza infection, and that a combination of  
104 social, economic and health factors cause this disparity. We aim to identify geographic areas where  
105 burden is highest in low SES populations to provide hotspots for additional surveillance. As health  
106 disparities widen, it is imperative that we develop an empirically-driven mechanistic understanding  
107 of the determinants of health disparities, and capture disease burden in at-risk populations. Such  
108 insights can allow for improved influenza forecasting, resource allocation and targeted intervention

109 design.

## 110 **Results**

111 Here, we have evaluated the impact of social, behavioral, and physiological mechanisms on driving  
112 influenza disparities. We achieved this through epidemiological model experiments in a population  
113 network with realistic SES-based contact patterns. This increases our understanding of the role that  
114 SES-driven variation plays in determining influenza dynamics. This also allows us to disentangle the  
115 effects of multiple proposed drivers of influenza transmission among those of differing SES. We have  
116 also assessed the impacts of low SES on influenza at the population level. We estimated low SES  
117 ILI incidence rates at the county-level in half of the states in the US, accounting for transmission  
118 trends identified in the prior epidemiological model experiments, variation in social, economic and  
119 health factors, and measurement biases. This provides estimates of ILI incidence rates among low  
120 SES populations at a fine spatial scale, identifying areas which are likely currently overlooked by  
121 influenza surveillance systems. These findings also provide an understanding of SES-based factors  
122 associated with disproportionate burden at the population level, which could guide future public  
123 health efforts to reduce socioeconomic health disparities.

### 124 **Contact patterns vary by socioeconomic status**


125 Contact patterns have been demonstrated to vary by socioeconomic status [18], but we have lacked  
126 social contact networks that explicitly incorporate these differences. To enable testing of hypotheses  
127 about social contact trends, we used an egocentric exponential random graph model (ERGM) to  
128 simulate networks with realistic social contact patterns based on socioeconomic status (measured  
129 by education level, [33]) from the POLYMOD social contact survey, a large social contact survey  
130 conducted across Europe [34] (Additional model details can be found in Methods). The fitted  
131 network model is consistent with the contact heterogeneity in the data (Fig 1A), and all individual-  
132 level attributes (i.e. age, sex, contact location, and education level) are significant in predicting  
133 contact structure (Table S1). Additionally, we incorporated varying levels of low SES individuals

134 into the networks to investigate hypotheses in populations with varying SES composition (details  
135 in Methods). The resulting networks are consistent in network structure based on degree and  
136 assortative degree (number of contacts with those of the same attribute) by SES-status (Fig 1B).  
137 Thus, networks with increased representation of low SES individuals maintain the same SES-based  
138 contact patterns as the POLYMOD data. Importantly, the network model captures variation in  
139 contact structure by SES. In particular, low-SES individuals have lower mean degree and variation  
140 in degree (Fig 1C), but have higher SES-assortative degree compared to those of higher SES (Fig  
141 1D).

### 142 **Inequities increase low SES influenza transmission**

143 There appears to be variation in contact trends dependent on socioeconomic status, thus it is  
144 important to consider how this network structure impacts epidemiological dynamics. To assess the  
145 role of behavioral and physiological heterogeneity, we integrated into an epidemiological network  
146 model of influenza transmission five key hypothesized drivers of disparities in influenza burden: a)  
147 social contact differences, or fewer social contacts and higher assortativity (as represented in our  
148 empirically-informed contact network model); b) low vaccine uptake; c) low healthcare utilization,  
149 which results in less access to influenza antivirals; d) high susceptibility, which results from stressful  
150 environmental factors; and e) low sickness absenteeism from school or work. Fig 2A shows the  
151 infection burden of low SES individuals (i.e. the ratio of the number low SES infections and the  
152 number of all infections) in the presence of each factor, combined with social cohesion (included  
153 in the network structure). The results are compared against a positive control (light green), in  
154 which there is no SES-based heterogeneity in that factor, and mechanisms are randomly distributed  
155 throughout the population. Each factor results in a significant increase in the low SES infection  
156 burden in the presence of SES-based heterogeneity, and the effect is most pronounced when all  
157 the factors occur simultaneously. In contrast, the epidemic size (i.e. the ratio of the number of  
158 infections and the population size) for the positive control is larger than the SES-heterogeneous  
159 treatments, for all treatments (with the exception of the increased stress treatment) (Fig S32).

160 This combination of results can be explained by the role that low SES individuals play in the



**Figure 1: The network characteristics of the networks generated from the ERGM model based on POLYMOD data.** A: The degree distribution of the POLYMOD data (light green) compared to the simulated networks (dark green). B: The Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) statistic to evaluate the dissimilarity of the ERGM-simulated networks to the POLYMOD data as additional low education individuals are added to the network. KS statistics compare the dissimilarity of the overall degree distribution (dark green), the degree distribution of low SES nodes (light blue, solid), the degree distribution of higher SES nodes (dark blue solid), the assortative degree (e.g. the low SES contacts of low SES nodes) for low SES nodes (light blue, dashed), and the assortative degree for higher SES nodes (dark blue, dashed). Low KS values indicate similar distributions. C: The degree distribution of low SES nodes (light blue) and higher SES nodes (dark blue). D: The relative assortative degree distribution (e.g. number of low SES contacts of low SES nodes/number of low SES nodes) of low SES nodes (light blue) and other SES nodes (dark blue).




Figure 2: **Results of epidemiological simulations on ERGM networks with SES-driven behavioral and physiological differences.** A) All of the proposed SES-driven behavioral and physiological differences result in an increase in infection of low SES individuals (dark green, right of paired violin plots), compared to simulations where the differences are randomly distributed throughout the population (light green, left of paired violin plots). This difference is most pronounced when all of the mechanisms occur together. These simulations were performed on a network composed of 60% low SES, but the results are consistent across networks with different SES compositions. B) In all networks, when all SES-driven behavioral and physiological differences are present, low SES individuals (mean percent of infected population that is low SES shown in light blue dots) are disproportionately infected, relative to the expectation (light blue dashed line). High SES individuals are disproportionately underinfected compared the expectation (dark blue dots compared to dark blue dashed line).

161 network. On the one hand, low SES individuals have lower mean degree (Fig 1C). When these  
162 low degree individuals experience transmission-increasing mechanisms, this results in a smaller  
163 epidemic size, compared to the scenario where high SES, and high degree, individuals experience  
164 the same mechanisms. Thus, when SES-driven processes that increase transmission affect low SES  
165 individuals, it results in a smaller overall epidemic. On the other hand, low SES individuals have  
166 high assortativity with other low SES individuals (Fig 1D). Thus, when health disparities increase  
167 transmission for low SES individuals, they are more likely to infect other low SES individuals that  
168 are also experiencing these mechanisms, resulting in increased spread among this assortative group.  
169 This result highlights the need for surveillance and research focused on low SES populations, as the  
170 emergent high infection burden of low SES, at-risk individuals could be overlooked due to lower  
171 epidemic sizes when aggregated.

172 Next, we consider how low SES infection burden scales with an increasingly large low SES pop-  
173 ulation. We find that epidemic size increases with an increasing proportion of low SES individuals,  
174 and this effect appears to be driven by increasing infection of low SES individuals as they make up  
175 a larger component of the network (Fig S31). Indeed, low SES individuals experience a dispropor-  
176 tionately large infection burden when all SES-based behavioral and physiological factors occur (Fig  
177 2B). Additionally, high SES individuals experience a disproportionately small infection burden in  
178 the presence of the same factors.

## 179 **Low SES infection burden is spatially heterogeneous, and high in the** 180 **southeastern US**

181 Our results thus far characterize the mechanistic role that social, behavioral and physiological factors  
182 play on influenza burden in low-SES populations in data-driven controlled experiments. Here, we  
183 aim to characterize how macroscopic factors impact influenza dynamics in low-SES populations,  
184 integrating our theoretical findings with population-level data. For population-level influenza data,  
185 we used medical claims of ILI at the county level in 25 states in the US, based on sufficient data  
186 availability. This data stream has been demonstrated to provide enhanced surveillance opportunities  
187 for influenza-like illness [31, 35]. However, we find that these data suggest that ILI burden decreases

188 with increasing low SES representation (measured by proportion of low education individuals) (Fig  
189 S33). This pattern is counter to our previous mechanistic model findings and to past small scale  
190 studies, suggesting that there may be measurement biases in these surveillance data.




Figure 3: **County-level map of model estimates of low SES ILI incidence ratio per 1,000 people.** Lower values are represented in light blue, and higher values are represented in darker blue. States in white were omitted due to lack of covariate data.

191 To better estimate influenza burden in low SES populations, we fit a Bayesian spatial hierarchi-  
192 cal model that accounts for measurement biases and borrows information from spatial covariates  
193 pertaining to low SES individuals and the mechanistic modeling experiments (details in Methods).  
194 Our model estimates of the low SES ILI incidence ratio (defined as low SES ILI divided by total  
195 visits per 1,000 people) show a positive relationship with low SES population size (Fig S38), and  
196 allow us to consider spatial disparities in influenza burden. Fig 3 shows the county-level map of the  
197 low SES ILI incidence ratio. This map highlights areas with a high incidence rate among low SES  
198 individuals in the southeastern United States, which is a region where low SES population levels  
199 are high. This also demonstrates that there are significant levels of heterogeneity both within and  
200 between states. These estimates can guide targeting of improved surveillance and steps to alleviate  
201 the influenza burden in low SES populations.

202 To validate our findings, we grouped our model estimates by county-level poverty rates, and  
203 compared the incidence ratio to prior population-level studies that correlate influenza rates and

204 poverty levels, though these studies do not focus on low SES individuals, so the comparison is not  
205 direct. We find increasing low SES ILI incidence rates in areas with increasing levels of poverty,  
206 which agrees with trends in [12, 11] (Fig S39). Our results show more consistently high incidence  
207 rates compared to the larger increases between poverty rates in prior studies. We attribute this to  
208 the incorporation of the measurement process into our models, which accounts for undersurveillance  
209 of low SES infection, whereas healthcare access and healthcare seeking differences may have missed  
210 low SES cases in prior studies. Ideally, data on respiratory infection of low SES individuals would  
211 be available at a fine spatial scale to more directly assess the validity of our models, but the lack of  
212 such a dataset highlights the need for future surveillance and data collection that focuses attention  
213 on lower SES populations.




Figure 4: **Mean model coefficient estimates and credible intervals.** Points are colored by what process each covariate represents (black: measurement bias, red: susceptibility, orange: social contact differences, green: sickness absenteeism, blue: vaccination, purple: healthcare utilization).

214 **Susceptibility and sickness absenteeism differences are the strongest drivers**  
215 **of ILI in low SES populations**

216 Fig 4 shows the coefficient estimates and credible intervals resulting from the Bayesian spatial  
217 hierarchical model. Levels of poor health among low SES individuals, as a measure of susceptibility  
218 to infection, are positively related with low SES ILI incidence. Thus, areas with more reports  
219 of poor health among low SES individuals exhibit higher incidence rates of low SES ILI. Also,  
220 access to sickness absenteeism among low SES individuals, represented by the number of low SES  
221 students that are absent for more than 10 days in a school year, is negatively related to low SES ILI  
222 incidence rates. Thus, areas where more low SES students are able to be absent experience lower  
223 rates of low SES ILI. Student absenteeism may not be a perfect measure of sickness absenteeism  
224 or paid sick leave access, but other fine-scale data was lacking, and a student's ability to be absent  
225 is related to a parent's ability to be home to care for the child, and differences in access to paid  
226 sick leave by SES have been related to student sickness absenteeism levels due to influenza [36,  
227 37, 38, 39]. Additionally, while not statistically significant, the model estimates lend evidence for  
228 a negative relationship between low SES mean household size and increased low SES influenza  
229 incidence; and a positive relationship between low SES influenza vaccination and low SES influenza  
230 incidence rates. The household size result provides support to the social deprivation hypothesis  
231 that low SES individuals may have less robust social networks, and this may relate to factors that  
232 increase transmission, such as increased stress, lack of support when ill that delays recovery, or  
233 the need to attend work when ill [18]. The vaccination result is contrary to our expectations for  
234 the protective effects of vaccination. This result could reflect vaccination-seeking behavior being  
235 higher in areas where influenza rates are typically high thus increasing disease risk perception  
236 [40]. Additionally, some prior studies have shown mixed results regarding the relationship between  
237 socioeconomic status and influenza vaccination, and that these differing results may relate to the  
238 way that socioeconomic status is defined, or what location the study takes place in [41, 42]. Lastly,  
239 this may be a result of the source of our vaccination data, which has low coverage in some areas and  
240 may suffer from its own measurement biases, which highlights the need for more data on influenza

241 vaccine uptake and the characteristics of those who vaccinate.

## 242 Discussion

243 Increased infectious disease prevalence among lower socioeconomic status populations has been  
244 observed in many settings. What has been missing, however, is a better understanding of the  
245 mechanisms that drive this disparity. We used a mechanistic epidemiological network model which  
246 allowed us to assess the impacts of SES-based behavioral and physiological differences on influenza in  
247 controlled experiments. This highlighted the role played by all mechanisms in tandem to produce  
248 disproportionate disease burden in low SES populations. To address the gap that exists in our  
249 surveillance of ILI and to estimate the spatial distribution of influenza disparity, we then used  
250 a Bayesian spatial hierarchical model to estimate population-level low SES ILI at a fine spatial  
251 scale across the United States, accounting for disproportionate infection of low SES individuals,  
252 measurement biases, and county-level factors hypothesized to be associated with influenza and  
253 SES. Our results shine light on the spatial distribution of respiratory disease health disparities.

254 In our epidemiological model, disease transmission occurs over the contact network structure,  
255 which accounts for heterogeneity in contact patterns by SES. While past work has integrated con-  
256 tact heterogeneity by other socio-demographic characteristics such as age and occupation [43, 44],  
257 SES-based contact heterogeneity has not been integrated into contact network models for epidemi-  
258 ological purposes. Epidemiological simulations on the SES-heterogeneous network reveals that each  
259 hypothesized behavioral and physiological factor leads to increased infection of low SES individ-  
260 uals. Additionally, we find that communities with larger low SES populations experience larger  
261 epidemics, which is in agreement with prior studies [11, 10, 12]. The proposed drivers are not  
262 mutually exclusive, so this reveals potential effects that could not be identified in past studies that  
263 investigate the impact of a single SES-based mechanism or impacts that might be aggregated in  
264 observational studies. We note that these experiments also include SES-based variation in social  
265 cohesion (i.e. SES-based contact heterogeneity in the population model), so the effect shown in  
266 Fig 2 is the result of both mechanisms combined. In Fig S32, we also illustrate the impact of each

267 mechanism independent of social cohesion.

268 Our efforts to consider the impacts of low SES on influenza spatial heterogeneity generated  
269 county-level maps of ILI incidence in low SES populations. Our findings identify pockets of high  
270 ILI burden in low SES populations across the United States, and represent a first step in filling the  
271 gap that exists in all healthcare-based surveillance. The model also produced a set of estimates for  
272 the effect of each hypothesized ecological measure. We find that low sickness absenteeism and high  
273 susceptibility are significantly associated with influenza in low SES populations. This supports  
274 our previous finding that multiple mechanisms compound to result in disproportionate low SES  
275 influenza burden. To validate our findings, we compared the trends in our model estimates to  
276 previous estimates of influenza incidence rates, stratified by poverty level. This is not a direct  
277 comparison, as previous studies present the incidence rates for the entire population, not just for  
278 low SES individuals within those populations. SES-stratified influenza data would be important to  
279 ground truth our model estimates.

280 Our work has several limitations. The network structure of our epidemiological model is based  
281 on one social survey from 2007 in Europe, and may be less representative of the United States today.  
282 Additionally, survey data was not collected for the SES of the contacts of survey participants, which  
283 required us to make assumptions which could affect our results about SES assortativity. Additional  
284 social contact data collection across the United States that accounts for SES heterogeneity would  
285 be useful for future studies given the large socio-economic inequality in the country [45, 46]. In our  
286 spatial ecological model, we assume that disproportionate burden in low SES populations remains  
287 constant over influenza seasons. While this is a reasonable first assumption based on social and  
288 healthcare processes being consistent over our study period, there may be variation in the impact of  
289 ILI on low SES populations due to strain distribution and environmental features that do vary across  
290 seasons. Future work could focus on temporal variation in low SES ILI dynamics. Additionally,  
291 our spatial ecological model is only able to provide estimates for half of the states in the US, and  
292 the states are mostly on the coasts. This highlights the need for more data collection pertaining to  
293 low SES individuals, not only for epidemiological data, but also for a wide variety of other topics  
294 to provide covariate data and to create a better understanding of at-risk populations.

295 As the divide in health disparities grows wider across the United States, we propose the use  
296 of infectious disease case studies to improve our understanding of this challenging problem. We  
297 suggest that we move beyond studies based on proxy measures such as income and education  
298 which may provide an incomplete picture [3], and dig into the mechanisms that may be at the  
299 root of inequities. Furthermore, we advocate for the prioritization of capabilities to detect and  
300 monitor outbreaks in at-risk populations so that we may prevent exacerbation of health disparities.  
301 Addressing health inequities in respiratory infectious disease burden is an important step towards  
302 social justice in public health, and ignoring them promises to pose a serious threat to the entire  
303 population. Indeed, the damaging impacts of health inequities for respiratory infectious diseases  
304 have already been highlighted in the COVID-19 pandemic [47]. Our results suggest that (a) the  
305 effect of overlapping behavioral and social factors is synergistic and reducing this intersectionality  
306 can significantly reduce inequities; and (b) health disparities are expressed geographically and  
307 targeting public health efforts spatially may be an efficient use of resources to abate inequities.  
308 Further attention to the mechanisms and processes that lead to health inequities, and specifically  
309 health inequities that may be overlooked by our currently surveillance systems, will be important  
310 to identifying actionable steps to mitigate negative health outcomes in the future.

## 311 **Methods and Materials**

312 In this study, we use (1) a mechanistic network epidemiological model to assess influenza transmis-  
313 sion in the presence of individual-level socioeconomic status (SES)-based behavioral and physiolog-  
314 ical variation; and (2) an inferential spatial model to geographically localize influenza-like illness  
315 (ILI) burden among low-SES populations in the presence of population-level variation in social and  
316 health indicators. Data and code for the implementation of these methods is available at [48].

### 317 **Modeling Impact of Individual-Based SES factors on Disease Burden**

318 To achieve the mechanistic understanding, we (a) fitted a contact network model from empirical  
319 contact data that includes contact heterogeneity stratified by age, sex, contact location, and so-

320 cioeconomic status; and (b) performed epidemiological simulations on these networked populations  
321 integrating epidemiological differences based on SES, parameterized by empirical studies.

### 322 **Contact Network Model**

323 In a contact network model, nodes represent individuals, and edges represent epidemiologically-  
324 relevant interactions between individuals. The degree of a node is the number of edges, or contacts,  
325 of the node, and the degree distribution of a network is the frequency distribution of node degrees  
326 within the population. To generate realistic contact networks to evaluate epidemic outcomes, we  
327 used an egocentric exponential random graph model (ERGM) [49]. An egocentric ERGM allows  
328 for the construction of sociocentric networks based on egocentrically sampled data, in which par-  
329 ticipants (or *egos*) report the identity of their contacts (or *alters*), who may or may not be study  
330 participants. Our egocentric ERGM model was based on the POLYMOD dataset, a large, egocen-  
331 tric contact survey that took place across several countries in Europe to identify close interactions  
332 of over 7000 individuals across eight European countries [34].

333 Nodes in the network had the following attributes: (a) age, grouped as infants-toddlers (age  
334 0-4), school-aged children (age 5-18), adults (age 19-64), and elderly (age 65-100); (b) sex, classified  
335 as male or female; (c) contact location, in which a node can have known home contacts and known  
336 school or work contacts; (d) education level as a proxy for socioeconomic status [33], grouped as low  
337 education (less than a high school education), medium education (high school or vocational school  
338 education), or high education (any university education or beyond). Age and sex were available in  
339 the data for egos and alters, while education level was only provided for egos. Therefore, it was  
340 assumed that an ego's work contacts had the same education level based on their occupation, and  
341 that an ego's home contacts had the same education level as an indicator of household socioeconomic  
342 status. To represent communities with different SES compositions, we resampled additional low  
343 education egos from the low education sample in the POLYMOD dataset. We produce networks  
344 composed of approximately 20-60% low education individuals (Table S3).

345 The model was fit using the ERGM package [50, 51]. The best model was selected based on  
346 collinearity criteria and goodness of fit to the POLYMOD data. From the best fit ERGM model,

347 we simulated 5 networks. Additional model details, including model terms (Table S1), collinearity  
348 (Table S2), model diagnostics, and goodness of fit (Fig S5 - Fig S30) can be found in the Supplement.

349 Random regular networks of the same size and mean degree were also generated as null net-  
350 works to evaluate the effect of contact heterogeneity. We used the Networkx package for network  
351 generation and analysis [52].

### 352 **SES-based Epidemiological Model**

353 Chain binomial SEIR (Susceptible-Exposed-Infected-Recovered) simulations were performed on the  
354 networks generated by the egocentric ERGM model and the control networks to examine the spread  
355 of a respiratory infection, like influenza, through a naive population. Model parameters pertinent  
356 to seasonal influenza spread were selected from literature (Table S4) [53, 54].

357 Five hypothesized drivers for increased influenza in low SES populations were integrated into the  
358 epidemiological simulations. Each hypothesized driver represents a health behavior or physiological  
359 factor, and is represented by a single parameter, the value of which was selected from pertinent  
360 literature (Table S4). Social contact differences represents the SES-based social contact rates of  
361 individuals, and thus is represented by the ERGM-generated networks. The remaining factors are:

- 362 • Low vaccine uptake: Individuals may be vaccinated before the start of the season with a  
363 perfectly efficacious vaccine. Vaccinated nodes were randomly selected and removed from  
364 the network. Vaccination coverage is parameterized by  $\delta$  and  $\delta_{low}$  in high- and low-SES  
365 individuals, respectively. The value of delta was based on a US population survey of vaccine  
366 coverage related to education level [19].
- 367 • High susceptibility: Those who experience a more stressful environment are more susceptible  
368 to infection, and thus have a greater probability of becoming infected upon contact with  
369 an infected individual. Susceptibility is parameterized by  $\beta$  and  $\beta_{low}$  in high- and low-SES  
370 individuals, respectively. This is based on an immune challenge experiment that found that  
371 those of high SES were about half as likely to become infected with a cold compared to those  
372 of low SES [22].

- 373 • Low healthcare utilization: Infected individuals who do not seek healthcare and receive an-  
374 tivirals have a longer infectious period, based on a model of within-host and population-level  
375 dynamics [55]. The proportion of the infected population seeking healthcare is parameterized  
376 by  $\gamma$  and  $\gamma_{low}$  in high- and low-SES individuals, respectively.
  
- 377 • Low sickness absenteeism: Infected individuals may exhibit sickness absenteeism from school  
378 or work if they have access to leave and care at home. Those exhibiting sickness absenteeism  
379 remove school or work contacts. Access to sickness absenteeism is parameterized by  $\rho$  and  
380  $\rho_{low}$  in high- and low-SES individuals, respectively. These values are based on rates of paid  
381 sick leave by education level in a survey across the US [56].

382 For our experimental design, each SES-based factor was tested separately and together on each  
383 network. Disease outbreaks for each treatment were simulated 200 times on each network, with  
384 5 replicate networks. We also considered two controls to compare our experimental results: a)  
385 a homogeneous control, in which each factor was randomly distributed across a random regular  
386 network; b) a heterogeneous control, in which each factor was randomly distributed across the  
387 ERGM-generated networks.

## 388 **Modelling Impact of Disease in Low-SES Populations**

389 To achieve an inferential understanding, we (a) integrated the network model findings with empirical  
390 ILI data for an estimate of ILI burden among low-SES individuals; and (b) fitted a spatial Bayesian  
391 hierarchical model with population-level covariates to account for measurement biases and improve  
392 our estimate of low-SES ILI burden at the population-level.

### 393 **Spatial Inferential Model**

We used a Bayesian spatial hierarchical model to estimate latent ILI cases among low SES individ-  
uals, accounting for measurement biases and county-level factors associated with ILI in low SES

populations. We modeled low-SES ILI ( $Y_{it}$ ) in county  $i$  in flu season  $t$  as:

$$Y_{it}|N_i \sim \text{Binomial}(N_i, p_{i,t})$$

394 where  $p_{i,t}$  is the probability of detecting low-SES ILI cases, and  $N_i$  is the true ILI cases among  
395 low-SES individuals.

We modeled the probability of detection  $p_i$  as:

$$\text{logit}(p_{i,t}) = \alpha_0 + \sum_1^k \alpha_k z_{i,t,k} + \nu_c + \nu_s$$

396 where  $\alpha_0$  is the intercept,  $\alpha_k$  represents the measurement process predictor variables, and  $\nu_c$  and  
397  $\nu_s$  are group effects for county and state, respectively.

We modeled the latent low-SES ILI cases as:

$$N_i \sim \text{NegBin}(\lambda_i, \theta)$$

398 where the negative binomial distribution is parameterized by probability  $\lambda_i$  and size  $\theta$ .

The  $\lambda_i$  is modeled by:

$$\text{log}(\lambda_i) = \beta_0 + \sum_1^j \beta_j x_{i,j} + \mu_c + \mu_s$$

399 where  $\beta_0$  is the intercept,  $\beta_j$  represents coefficient estimates for low-SES ILI process covariates,  
400 and  $\mu_c$  and  $\mu_s$  represent county-level and state-level group effects, respectively. We performed  
401 approximate Bayesian inference using Integrated Nested Laplace Approximations (INLA) with the  
402 R-INLA package [57]. INLA has demonstrated computational efficiency for latent Gaussian models,  
403 produced similar estimates for fixed parameters as established implementations of Markov Chain  
404 Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods for Bayesian inference, and been applied to disease mapping and  
405 spatial ecology questions. We evaluated DIC, WAIC, model residuals and compared modeled and  
406 observed outcomes in order to assess model fit. Additional model details can be found in Fig S34,  
407 Fig S36, Fig S37.

## 408 Response data

409 We define the response in our model to be the observed influenza-like illness (ILI) burden in low-  
410 SES populations. In particular, we use influenza-like illness reports from a medical claims database  
411 from across the United States collected during 2002-2008. [Additional details on the dataset can  
412 be found in [31, 35]]. To normalize these observed counts, we divide ILI visits by visits for any  
413 diagnosis during the influenza season. These data are at the county-level but are not stratified by  
414 SES. This normalization was incorporated into the response data, rather than the measurement  
415 model, because the values vary greatly from season-to-season as database coverage increased, but  
416 INLA does not allow temporally varying measurement covariates [58]. To produce a county-level  
417 estimate of ILI in low-SES populations for our spatial model, we use the observed ILI burden in the  
418 total population and scale this by the proportion expected among low-SES individuals as predicted  
419 by the epidemiological model from the first part of our study (as summarized in Fig 2B). These  
420 scaled-up incidence rates were then multiplied by 1000 to be appropriately scaled for the model.

## 421 Covariate data

422 All covariate data are at the county level, and are centered and standardized. Covariate data cannot  
423 be included in a temporally-specific way in R-INLA, thus we assume that all values are constant  
424 over time from 2002-2008. We make the assumption that county characteristics remain relatively  
425 constant over time, and harness together covariate data from different years based on availability  
426 and coverage. All covariate data was evaluated for collinearity, and all included covariates had a  
427  $VIF < 2$ . First, covariate data was included for the measurement submodel to characterize database  
428 coverage and population size. For database coverage, we used the number of physicians reporting  
429 the medical claims database, which was reported by the database and averaged over reported years.  
430 Additionally, the population of low SES individuals was included since that measures the size of  
431 the considered population. Low SES population size was measured as the county population size,  
432 reported by the US Census Bureau [59], multiplied by the percent of the population with less than  
433 a high school education from County Health Rankings [60]. Then, for the process model, covariate  
434 data were included as a marker for each hypothesized driver of low SES influenza. We ensured that

435 all process covariate data pertained just to low SES populations. For a measure of susceptibility,  
436 reports of poor health in individuals with less than a high school education, divided by the sample  
437 size of low education individuals, were collected from the the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance  
438 System (BRFSS) from the CDC, which is available at the individual level and reported by county  
439 in 2012 [61]. For a measure of social cohesion, mean household size reported by those with less  
440 than a high school education was also collected from BRFSS. To measure access to healthcare, rates  
441 of reporting having health insurance, reporting having a personal doctor, and reporting avoiding  
442 healthcare due to cost by those of low education were divided by low education sample size from  
443 BRFSS. To measure sickness absenteeism, the rate of chronic sickness absenteeism, or students  
444 absent for more than 10 days, was collected from the US Department of Education [62]. This  
445 data was only available stratified by race, thus the chronic sickness absenteeism reports of Black  
446 students, divided by the number of Black students, was used due to the correlation between race  
447 and socioeconomic status in the US [63]. To measure vaccination, reports of adult vaccination in  
448 low education individuals were divided by the low education sample size in BRFSS [61]. Much of the  
449 data was available through BRFSS, which lacked coverage in many counties. Thus, counties with  
450 a low education sample size of less than 10 were omitted. Additionally, due to this sparse coverage  
451 in covariate data, we restricted our analyses to states that had complete covariate data for more  
452 than 50% of counties. This is to ensure that sparse covariate data does not skew the model, since  
453 we only want to provide inference for states that have enough data to provide reliable estimates.  
454 These challenges highlight the need for more high resolution data on low SES populations across  
455 the country. See supplement table for additional covariate data details (Table S5).

#### 456 **Imputation and Validation**

457 Based on the assumption that counties that are close to one another are similar to one another, we  
458 imputed covariate values for missing counties in states that were included in the model. The model  
459 was run with only the counties that had complete covariate data. Then, for each missing county,  
460 we took the mean of the adjacent counties for each covariate value, to assign covariate values to  
461 the missing counties. We then used these imputed covariate values to calculate model estimates

462 for the missing counties. The model estimates prior to imputation are available in Fig S35. We  
463 grouped the resulting full model estimates by county-level percent living in poverty, according to  
464 Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates reported by the US Census Bureau [64]. We collected  
465 incidence/incidence rate values reported by the same poverty level groupings from [12, 11]. Each  
466 set of incidence values was min-max normalized for comparison due to variations between reported  
467 value and population considered.

## 468 Acknowledgments

469 Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Institute Of General Medical  
470 Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number R01GM123007. The content  
471 is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of  
472 the National Institutes of Health. We also acknowledge support from the PhRMA Foundation and  
473 the Chateaubriand Fellowship Program. The funders had no role in study design, data collection  
474 and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. We thank Håvard Rue for his  
475 development of and assistance with the R-INLA package.

## 476 References

- 477 [1] Penman-Aguilar A, Talih M, Huang D, Moonesinghe R, Bouye K, Beckles G. Measurement  
478 of Health Disparities, Health Inequities, and Social Determinants of Health to Support the  
479 Advancement of Health Equity. *J Public Health Manag Pract.* 2016;22(Suppl1):S33–S42.
- 480 [2] Adler NE, Newman K. Socioeconomic disparities in health: Pathways and policies. *Health*  
481 *Affairs.* 2002;21(2):60–76.
- 482 [3] Murray CJ, Kulkarni SC, Michaud C, Tomijima N, Bulzacchelli MT, Iandiorio TJ, et al. Eight  
483 Americas: investigating mortality disparities across races, counties, and race-counties in the  
484 United States. *PLoS medicine.* 2006;3(9).

- 485 [4] Bosworth B. Increasing Disparities in Mortality by Socioeconomic Status. *Annual Review of*  
486 *Public Health*. 2018;39(1):237–251.
- 487 [5] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Influenza*; 2019.
- 488 [6] Biggerstaff M, Jhung MA, Reed C, Garg S, Balluz L, Fry AM, et al. Impact of medical and  
489 behavioural factors on influenza-like illness, healthcare-seeking, and antiviral treatment during  
490 the 2009 H1N1 pandemic — United States, 2009–2010. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2014;142(1):114–125.
- 491 [7] Lowcock EC, Rosella LC, Foisy J, McGeer A, Crowcroft N. The social determinants of health  
492 and pandemic h1n1 2009 influenza severity. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2012;102(8):51–  
493 58.
- 494 [8] Rutter PD, Mytton OT, Mak M, Donaldson LJ. Socio-economic disparities in mortality due  
495 to pandemic influenza in England. *International Journal of Public Health*. 2012;57(4):745–750.
- 496 [9] Galvin JR, Cartter ML, Sosa L. Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status Among Children Hospi-  
497 talized With Influenza: New Haven County, Connecticut, 2003-2010. *Connecticut Epidemiol-*  
498 *ogist*. 2010;30(6):21–24.
- 499 [10] Yousey-Hindes KM, Hadler JL. Neighborhood socioeconomic status and influenza hospital-  
500 izations among children: New Haven County, Connecticut, 2003-2010. *American Journal of*  
501 *Public Health*. 2011;101(9):1785–1789.
- 502 [11] Tam K, Yousey-hindes K, Hadler L. Influenza-related hospitalization of adults associated with  
503 low census tract socioeconomic status and female sex in New Haven County , Connecticut ,  
504 2007-2011. *Influenza and other Respiratory Viruses*. 2014;8(3):274–281.
- 505 [12] Hadler JL, Yousey-hindes K, Pérez A, Anderson EJ, Bargsten M. Influenza-Related Hospital-  
506 izations and Poverty Levels — United States , 2010 – 2012. *CDC Morbidity and Mortality*  
507 *Weekly Report*. 2016;65(5):101–105.

- 508 [13] Crichton EJ, Elliott SJ, Moineddin R, Kanaroglou P, Upshur R. A spatial analysis of the de-  
509 terminants of pneumonia and influenza hospitalizations in Ontario (1992-2001). *Social Science*  
510 *and Medicine*. 2007;64(8):1636–1650.
- 511 [14] Grantz KH, Rane MS, Salje H, Glass GE, Schachterle SE. Disparities in influenza mortality  
512 and transmission related to sociodemographic factors within Chicago in the pandemic of 1918.  
513 *PNAS*. 2016;.
- 514 [15] Murray CJ, Lopez AD, Chin B, Feehan D, Hill KH. Estimation of potential global pandemic in-  
515 fluenza mortality on the basis of vital registry data from the 1918–20 pandemic: a quantitative  
516 analysis. *The Lancet*. 2006;368(9554):2211–2218.
- 517 [16] Mamelund SE. 1918 pandemic morbidity: The first wave hits the poor, the second wave hits  
518 the rich. *Influenza and other respiratory viruses*. 2018;12(3):307–313.
- 519 [17] Cordoba E, Aiello AE. Social Determinants of Influenza Illness and Outbreaks in the United  
520 States. *NCMJ*. 2016;77(5):341–345.
- 521 [18] Charland KM, Brownstein JS, Verma A, Brien S, Buckeridge DL. Socio-economic disparities  
522 in the burden of seasonal influenza: The effect of social and material deprivation on rates of  
523 influenza infection. *PLoS ONE*. 2011;6(2):1–5.
- 524 [19] Linn ST, Guralnik JM, Patel KK. Disparities in Influenza Vaccine Coverage in the United  
525 States, 2008. *J Am Geriatric Soc*. 2010;58(7):1333–1340.
- 526 [20] Derigne L, Stoddard-dare P, Quinn L. Workers without Paid Sick Leave less Likely to Take  
527 Time Off For Illness or Injury Compared to those with Paid Sick Leave. *Health Affairs*.  
528 2016;35(3):520–527.
- 529 [21] Cohen F, Kemeny ME, Zegans LS, Johnson P, Kearney KA, Stites DP. Immune function  
530 declines with unemployment and recovers after stressor termination. *Psychosomatic Medicine*.  
531 2007;69(3):225–234.

- 532 [22] Cohen S, Adler N, Alper CM, Doyle WJ, Treanor JJ, Turner RB. Objective and Sub-  
533 jective Socioeconomic Status and Susceptibility to the Common Cold. *Health Psychology*.  
534 2008;27(2):268–274.
- 535 [23] Berendes D, Andujar A, Barrios LC, Hill V. Associations Among School Absenteeism , Gas-  
536 trointestinal and Respiratory Illness , and Income — United States , 2010 – 2016. *CDC*  
537 *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2019;68(9).
- 538 [24] Blendon RJ, Koonin LM, Benson JM, Cetron MS, Pollard WE, Mitchell EW, et al. Public  
539 Response to Community Mitigation Measures for Pandemic Influenza. *Emerging Infectious*  
540 *Diseases*. 2008;14(5).
- 541 [25] Cardoso MRA, Cousens SN, De Góes Siqueira LF, Alves FM, D’Angelo LAV. Crowding: Risk  
542 factor or protective factor for lower respiratory disease in young children? *BMC Public Health*.  
543 2004;4:1–8.
- 544 [26] Sloan C, Chandrasekhar R, Mitchel E, Schaffner W, Lindegren ML. Socioeconomic Disparities  
545 and Influenza Hospitalizations, Tennessee, USA. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2015;21(9).
- 546 [27] Munday JD, Van Hoek AJ, Edmunds WJ, Atkins KE. Quantifying the impact of social  
547 groups and vaccination on inequalities in infectious diseases using a mathematical model. *BMC*  
548 *Medicine*. 2018;16(1):1–12.
- 549 [28] Hyder A, Leung B. Social deprivation and burden of influenza: Testing hypotheses and gain-  
550 ing insights from a simulation model for the spread of influenza. *Epidemics*. 2015;11:71–79.  
551 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.2015.03.004>.
- 552 [29] Kumar S, Piper K, Galloway DD, Hadler JL, Grefenstette JJ. Is population structure sufficient  
553 to generate area-level inequalities in influenza rates? An examination using agent-based models.  
554 *BMC Public Health*. 2015;15(1):1–12.

- 555 [30] World Health Organization. WHO global technical consultation: global standards and  
556 tools for influenza surveillance (WHO/HSE/GIP/2011.1). 2011;(March). Available from:  
557 [http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2011/WHO\\_HSE\\_GIP\\_2011.1\\_eng.pdf?ua=1](http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2011/WHO_HSE_GIP_2011.1_eng.pdf?ua=1).
- 558 [31] Lee EC, Arab A, Goldlust SM, Grenfell B. Deploying digital health data to optimize influenza  
559 surveillance at national and local scales. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 2018;14(3):1–23.
- 560 [32] Scarpino SV, Scott JG, Eggo RM, Clements B, Dimitrov NB, Meyers LA. Socioeconomic  
561 bias in influenza surveillance. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 2020;16(7). Available from:  
562 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1804.00327>.
- 563 [33] Thomson S. Achievement at school and socioeconomic background—an edu-  
564 cational perspective. *npj Science of Learning*. 2018;3(1):5. Available from:  
565 <http://www.nature.com/articles/s41539-018-0022-0>.
- 566 [34] Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, et al. Social contacts and  
567 mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS Medicine*. 2008;5(3):0381–  
568 0391.
- 569 [35] Viboud C, Charu V, Olson D, Ballesteros S, Gog J, Khan F, et al. Demonstrating the use of  
570 high-volume electronic medical claims data to monitor local and regional influenza activity in  
571 the US. *PLoS ONE*. 2014;9(7).
- 572 [36] Nettelman MD, White T, Lavoie S, Chafin C. School Absenteeism, Parental Work Loss, and  
573 Acceptance of Childhood Influenza Vaccination. *The American Journal of Medical Sciences*.  
574 2001;321(3):178–180.
- 575 [37] Neuzil KM, Hohlbein C, Zhu Y. Illness Among Schoolchildren During Influenza Season.  
576 *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*. 2002;156(10):986.
- 577 [38] Clemans-Cope L, Perry CD, Kenney GM, Pelletier JE, Pantell MS. Access to and use of paid  
578 sick leave among low-income families with children. *Pediatrics*. 2008;122(2).

- 579 [39] Aronsson, G , Gustafsson, K , & Dallner M. Sick but yet at work. An empirical study of  
580 sickness presenteeism. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*. 2000;54:502–509.
- 581 [40] Freimuth VS, Jamison A, Hancock G, Musa D, Hilyard K, Quinn SC. The Role of Risk  
582 Perception in Flu Vaccine Behavior among African-American and White Adults in the United  
583 States. *Risk Analysis*. 2017;37(11):2150–2163.
- 584 [41] Lucyk K, Simmonds KA, Lorenzetti DL, Drews SJ, Svenson LW, Russell ML. The association  
585 between influenza vaccination and socioeconomic status in high income countries varies by the  
586 measure used: a systematic review. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2019;19(1).
- 587 [42] Endrich MM, Blank PR, Szucs TD. Influenza vaccination uptake and socioeconomic deter-  
588 minants in 11 European countries. *Vaccine*. 2009;27(30):4018–4024.
- 589 [43] Bansal S, Grenfell BT, Meyers LA. When individual behaviour matters: Homogeneous and  
590 network models in epidemiology. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*. 2007;4(16):879–891.
- 591 [44] Cauchemez S, Bhattarai A, Marchbanks TL, Fagan RP, Ostroff S, Ferguson NM, et al. Role  
592 of social networks in shaping disease transmission during a community outbreak of 2009 H1N1  
593 pandemic influenza. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2011;108(7):2825–2830.  
594 Available from: <http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1008895108>.
- 595 [45] Kennedy BP, Kawachi I, Glass R, Prothrow-Stith D. Income distribution, socioeconomic status,  
596 and self rated health in US : multilevel analysis. *British Medical Journal*. 1999;318(7195):1417–  
597 1418.
- 598 [46] Noel R. Race, Economics, and Social Status. 2018;(May):2–9.
- 599 [47] Raifman MA, Raifman JR. Disparities in the Population at Risk of Severe Illness from COVID-  
600 19 by Race/Ethnicity and Income. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*. 2020;59(1):137–  
601 139.
- 602 [48] Zipfel, C and Bansal, S. Bansal Lab Github Account; 2020. Available from:  
603 <https://github.com/bansallab/fluSES>.

- 604 [49] Krivitsky PN, Handcock MS, Morris M. Adjusting for network size and composition effects in  
605 exponential-family random graph models. *Statistical Methodology*. 2011;8(4):319–339. Avail-  
606 able from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stamet.2011.01.005>.
- 607 [50] Handcock MS, Hunter DR, Butts CT, Goodreau SM, Krivitsky PN, Morris M. *ergm: Fit,*  
608 *Simulate and Diagnose Exponential-Family Models for Networks*; 2019.
- 609 [51] Hunter DR, Handcock MS, Butts CT, Goodreau SM, Morris M. *ergm: A Package to Fit, Sim-*  
610 *ulate and Diagnose Exponential-Family Models for Networks*. *Journal of Statistical Software*.  
611 2008;24(3):1–29.
- 612 [52] Hagberg AA, Schult DA, Swart PJ. Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function  
613 using NetworkX. *Proceedings of the 7th Python in Science Conference (SciPy2008)*. 2008;Gäel  
614 Varoq:11–15.
- 615 [53] Biggerstaff M, Jhung MA, Reed C, Fry AM, Balluz L, Finelli L. Influenza-like illness, the  
616 time to seek healthcare, and influenza antiviral receipt during the 2010–11 influenza season —  
617 United States. *J Infect Dis*. 2014;210(4):535–544.
- 618 [54] Carrat F, Vergu E, Ferguson NM, Lemaître M, Cauchemez S, Leach S, et al. Timelines of  
619 infection and disease in human influenza: A review of volunteer challenge studies. *American*  
620 *Journal of Epidemiology*. 2008;167(7):775–785.
- 621 [55] Pepin KM, Riley S, Grenfell BT. Effects of Influenza Antivirals on Individual and Population  
622 Immunity Over Many Epidemic Waves. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2013;141(2):366–376.
- 623 [56] Piper K, Youk A, James AE, Kumar S. Paid sick days and stay-At-home behavior for influenza.  
624 *PLoS ONE*. 2017;12(2):1–13.
- 625 [57] Rue H, Martino S, Chopin N. Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian models using  
626 integrated nested Laplace approximations (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical*  
627 *Society, Series B*. 2009;71(2):319–392. Available from: [www.r-inla.org](http://www.r-inla.org).

- 628 [58] Meehan TD, Michel NL, Rue H. Estimating animal abundance with N-mixture models using  
629 the R-INLA package for R. 2017;(May). Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1705.01581>.
- 630 [59] Bureau UC. County Population Totals: 2010-2019. 2020;.
- 631 [60] University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute. County Health Rankings and Roadmaps;  
632 2019.
- 633 [61] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System; 2012.
- 634 [62] US Department of Education. Chronic Absenteeism in the Nation's Schools. 2019;Available  
635 from: <https://www2.ed.gov/datastory/chronicabsenteeism.html>.
- 636 [63] LaVeist TA. Disentangling race and socioeconomic status: A key to understanding health  
637 inequalities. *Journal of Urban Health*. 2005;82(SUPPL. 3).
- 638 [64] U S Census Bureau. Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) Program; 2020.  
639 Available from: <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/saipe.html>.