Spatial Inequities in COVID-19 Testing, Positivity, Confirmed Cases and Mortality in 3 US Cities: an Ecological Study

Usama Bilal PhD[1,2], Loni P. Tabb, PhD[1,2], Sharrelle Barber ScD[1,2], Ana V. Diez Roux PhD[1,2]

1.- Urban Health Collaborative, Drexel Dornsife School of Public Health, Philadelphia, PA

2.- Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Drexel Dornsife School of Public Health, Philadelphia, PA

Corresponding Author:

Usama Bilal, MD MPH PhD

Address: 3600 Market St. Suite 730, Philadelphia, PA, 19104

Email: ubilal@drexel.edu

Phone: +1 267-359-6378

Word count: 3322; 248 abstract; 1 table, 4 figures; 52 references

Drexel Internal Data

Abstract

Background: Preliminary evidence has shown inequities in COVID-19 related cases and deaths in the US.

Objective: We explored the emergence of spatial inequities in COVID-19 testing, positivity, confirmed cases, and mortality in New York City, Philadelphia, and Chicago during the first six months of the pandemic.

Design: Ecological, observational study at the zip code tabulation area (ZCTA) level from March to September 2020.

Setting: Chicago, New York City and Philadelphia.

Participants: All populated ZCTAs in the three cities.

Measures: Outcomes were ZCTA-level COVID-19 testing, positivity, confirmed cases, and mortality cumulatively through the end of September. Predictors were the CDC social vulnerability index and its four domains, obtained from the 2014-2018 American Community Survey. We examined the spatial autocorrelation of COVID-19 outcomes using global and local Moran's I and estimated associations using spatial conditional autoregressive negative binomial models.

Results: We found spatial clusters of high and low positivity, confirmed cases and mortality, co-located with clusters of low and high social vulnerability. We also found evidence for the existence of spatial inequities in testing, positivity, confirmed cases and mortality for the three cities. Specifically, neighborhoods with higher social vulnerability had lower testing rates, higher positivity ratios, confirmed case rates and mortality rates.

Drexel Internal Data

Limitations: ZCTAs are imperfect and heterogeneous geographical units of analysis. We rely on surveillance data, which may be incomplete.

Conclusion: We found spatial inequities in COVID-19 testing, positivity, confirmed cases, and mortality in three large cities of the US.

Registration: N/A

Funding source: NIH (DP5OD26429) and RWJF (77644)

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-COV-2, urban health, health disparities, spatial inequities, neighborhoods, health equity

Drexel Internal Data

46 **Introduction**

47 As of the end of 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic had taken the lives of more than 1.5 people
48 worldwide, while in the US deaths have surpassed 350,000 (1). Cities across the globe have
49 emerged as especially vulnerable to COVID-19. Cities are characterized by diverse populations
50 and are home to pronounced differences in health by race and socioeconomic position, often
51 referred to as health inequities because they are avoidable and unjust(2). The presence of
52 large racial and ethnic differences in COVID19 within US cities has already been documented.
53 For example in New York City, both Blacks and Hispanics have double the age-adjusted
54 mortality rate as compared to non-Hispanic whites(3), in Chicago 50% of deaths have occurred
55 in Blacks, who make up only 30% of the population(4), while in Philadelphia, age-specific
56 incidence, hospitalization, and mortality rates for Blacks and Hispanics are 2-3 times higher
57 than for non-Hispanic whites(5). These stark differences by race are consistent with racial
58 health inequities in many health outcomes and likely reflect multiple interrelated processes
59 linked to structural inequity, historical racist policies, and residential segregation(6-8).

60 US cities are characterized by strong residential segregation by both race/ethnicity and
61 income, one of the most visible manifestations of structural racism(9). Residential segregation
62 results in stark differences across neighborhoods in multiple factors that could be related to
63 both the incidence and severity of COVID-19, including factors related to transmission (e.g.
64 overcrowding, jobs that do not allow social distancing) and factors related to severity of
65 diseases (higher prevalence of chronic health conditions related to neighborhood
66 environments, greater air pollution exposures and limited access to quality health care)(6-

Drexel Internal Data

8,10,11). Few studies have systematically characterized spatial inequities in COVID related outcomes in cities over the course of the pandemic.

Characterizing social and spatial inequities in cities is critical to developing appropriate interventions and policies to prevent COVID-19 deaths in the future and mitigate economic and racial inequities. We used data from three large US cities, Chicago, New York City, and Philadelphia, to characterize spatial and social inequities in testing, positivity, confirmed cases, and mortality.

Drexel Internal Data

Methods

Setting

We used data on total numbers of tests, confirmed cases, and deaths by zip code tabulation area (ZCTA) of residence from Chicago, New York City (NYC), and Philadelphia. For Chicago, we downloaded data from the Chicago Department of Public Health(12), including cumulative data from through October 3rd, 2020. For NYC, we downloaded cumulative data made available by NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene in their GitHub repository(13) through October 1st, 2020. For Philadelphia, we downloaded data from the Philadelphia Department of Public Health made available in OpenDataPhilly (5), including cumulative data through October 1st (5).

Outcomes

Study outcomes included four COVID-19 indicators: (1) testing rates (total tests/population); (2) positivity ratio (14) (confirmed cases/total tests); (3) confirmed case rates (confirmed cases/population); and (4) mortality rates (deaths/population). For all indicators, we computed rates cumulatively through the end of the period.

Predictors

To obtain a summary of social conditions in each area of residence we used the 2018 CDC's Social Vulnerability Index (SVI)(15). Recent research has found the SVI is predictive of COVID-19 incidence and mortality at the county level(16). The SVI reflects the community's ability to prevent human suffering and financial loss in the event of disaster, including disease outbreaks(15). It includes four domains: socioeconomic status, household composition & disability, minority status & language, and housing type & transportation, along with a summary score with all four domains. The four domains and summary score were calculated by

Drexel Internal Data

the CDC at the census tract level using data from 15 variables from the 2014-2018 American Community Survey. Census tracts were ranked according to the values of each of the 15 variables, and percentile ranks were computed for each census tract within each state (in this case, Illinois, New York, and Pennsylvania). See **Appendix** for more details.

To aggregate the SVI to the ZCTA level, we used the Census Bureau's ZCTA to Census Tract Relationship File, and computed a weighted mean of the SVI by ZCTA, using the population of the census tract in the ZCTA as the weight. A higher value of the SVI or of its component scores signifies higher vulnerability, either overall or in its four domains. For example, a higher vulnerability in the "socioeconomic status" domain reflects a higher proportion of people living in poverty, unemployed, with lower income or without a high school diploma. A higher vulnerability in the "housing type & transportation" domain reflects a higher number of people living in multi-unit structures, mobile homes, in crowded situations, without a vehicle, or living in group quarters.

Since the SVI represents the rank of each census tract (or ZCTA) within each state, we transformed the SVI to make coefficients comparable across cities. We first excluded all ZCTAs that were not part of each city, and then standardized SVI and its domain scores by subtracting the mean and dividing by the standard deviation (SD) for each city separately.

<u>Analysis</u>

We conducted our analysis in three steps. First, we explored the spatial distribution of each of the five predictors (four domains and summary score) and the four outcomes (testing, positivity, confirmed cases and mortality) cumulative through the end of September, using choropleth maps. To explore whether there was spatial autocorrelation, we computed global

Drexel Internal Data

Moran's I(17,18). To show the location of spatial clusters, we computed the local indicator of spatial association (LISA) or local Moran's I(17,18) and display clusters with a p-value<0.05.

Global Moran's I statistic estimates the overall degree of spatial correlation, i.e., the degree to which the ZTCA rates of interest, such as testing, tend to be geographically located close together, far apart, or distributed randomly across the larger area, in this case each city. Moran's I ranges from −1 to 1, with positive values suggesting spatial autocorrelation and negative values suggesting dispersion (i.e., similar rates located far from each other), and values close to 0 indicating a random distribution. Significant p-values indicate evidence of departures from complete randomness.

The local Moran's I index for each individual ZTCA reflects similarity of rates with those of nearby areas and can help identify outliers. These local indexes are relative measures with dimensions interpretable only by z-scores and their associated p-values. Hot (cold) spots are contiguous areas with consistently high (low) testing rates, while outliers would, for example, be areas with high (or low) testing rates surrounded primarily by areas with lower (or higher) testing rates. Here, we refer to hot and cold spots as high-high and low-low areas, respectively, and to outliers as high-low and low-high areas.

Second, we examined the relations between SVI and each of the outcomes through the end of the study period using scatterplots and smoothed loess lines. Third, to estimate the strength of the association between each predictor and outcome we considered using a Poisson model. However, after exploring the distribution of the outcomes, and after checking for overdispersion in Poisson models using the approach by Gelman and Hill(19), we opted for a negative binomial model. Negative binomial models relax the assumption of equality between

Drexel Internal Data

141 the mean and variance, allowing for overdispersion. We fitted a separate model for each city
142 and included the five predictors (four domains and summary score) in separate models. To
143 account for the role of age in determining testing practices, influencing the probability of
144 transmission, and its causal role on mortality, we adjusted all models by the % of people aged
145 65 or above in the ZCTA.

146 To account for spatial autocorrelation of the outcomes, we fitted a Besag-York-Mollie
147 (BYM)(20) conditional autoregressive model, including a structured and unstructured ZCTA
148 random effect, both following an intrinsic Gaussian Markov random field (IGMRF)(20). The
149 structured spatial random effect takes into consideration that ZCTAs are more similar to other
150 neighboring ZCTAs as compared to those further away. We defined neighboring ZCTAs based on
151 regions with contiguous boundaries, defined as sharing one or more boundary point. We fitted
152 this model using integrated nested Laplace approximations (INLA), a method approximating
153 Bayesian inference(20,21). While this approach is an approximation-based method, it has
154 previously shown accuracy and minimizes computational time(20-22). Details on model
155 specification are provided in the **Appendix**. Results are shown as rate ratios associated with a
156 one SD higher value of the SVI or its domains, separately for each city.

157 All analyses were conducted using R v4.0.2(23). Spatial analysis were conducted using
158 the R package spdep(24) and R-INLA(25). More details on data management, the social
159 vulnerability index, and the models are available on **the Appendix**. Code for replication is
160 available at: https://github.com/usamabilal/COVID_Disparities

Drexel Internal Data

This study was funded with support from the NIH under grant DP5OD26429 and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation under grant RWJF 77644. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript

Drexel Internal Data

Results

We included a total of 58, 177, and 46 zip codes in Chicago, NYC and Philadelphia, respectively. From the beginning of the outbreak up to the latest available date (October 3rd in Chicago and October 1st in NYC and Philadelphia), a total of 674,929, 2,383,919, and 411,559 tests had been conducted in Chicago, New York City and Philadelphia, respectively. There were 81,657, 233,397, and 37,307 confirmed cases, and 2974, 19,149, and 1,803 COVID-19 deaths, respectively.

We found that testing, positivity, confirmed cases, and mortality were spatially autocorrelated in the three cities (global Moran's I ranging from 0.198 to 0.803, $p<0.001$ in all cases except confirmed cases in Philadelphia, with $p=0.011$, for the null hypothesis of no spatial autocorrelation), with the exception of mortality in Philadelphia for which we did not find evidence for significant spatial autocorrelation (global Moran's I=0.062, $p=0.140$). These patterns held after taking into consideration the spatial distribution of the SVI (global Moran's I ranging from 0.127 to 0.705, $p<0.05$ in all cases), with the exception of confirmed cases and mortality for Philadelphia, that did not show significant spatial autocorrelation after controlling for the SVI (Moran's I=-0.011 and -0.058, $p=0.440$ and 0.630). The **Appendix** shows global Moran's I and associated Moran's scatterplots for the three cities and four outcomes.

Figures 1-3 shows the spatial patterning of clusters of testing, positivity, confirmed cases, mortality, and social vulnerability in Chicago, New York City, and Philadelphia, respectively. Generally, clusters of high positivity and confirmed cases were spatially co-located with clusters of high social vulnerability.

Drexel Internal Data

186 Areas of the West and South sides of Chicago have clusters of high positivity, confirmed
187 cases and mortality (**Figure 1**). For example, ZCTAs 60636 and 60644 in the South and West
188 Side, respectively, are significant clusters of high positivity (local Moran's I=5.32 and 2.81,
189 p<0.001 and =0.018), confirmed cases (local Moran's I=5.55 and 3.65, p=0.007 and 0.013), and
190 mortality (local Moran's I=4.61 and 3.26, p=0.020 and 0.024). Conversely, the Central and North
191 sides of Chicago had clusters of low positivity, confirmed cases and mortality, along with high
192 testing (**Figure 1**). For example, ZCTA 60601 in Central Chicago is a cluster of high testing, low
193 positivity, confirmed cases and mortality (local Moran's I=5.50, 9.53, 5.88 and 6.78, p=0.003,
194 0.004, <0.001 and 0.001), while ZCTA 60661 in the North side is a cluster of low positivity and
195 mortality (local Moran's I=4.09 and 6.22, p=0.015 and <0.001).
196 In NYC, there were clusters of high positivity, confirmed cases and mortality in The
197 Bronx and Queens (**Figure 2**). For example, ZCTAs 10467 and 11368 in The Bronx and Queens
198 are statistically significant clusters of high positivity (local Moran's I=6.02 and 6.36, p=0.019 and
199 0.010), confirmed cases (local Moran's I=14.2 and 11.46, p<0.001) and mortality (local Moran's
200 I=6.17 and 13.54, p=0.016 and <0.001). There were also a number of clusters of high testing and
201 low positivity, confirmed cases and mortality in Manhattan and the adjacent areas of Brooklyn
202 (**Figure 2**). For example, ZCTA 10014 in Manhattan is a cluster of high testing, low positivity,
203 confirmed cases and mortality (local Moran's I=7.08, 7.15, 8.71 and 4.10, p<0.001, <0.001,
204 <0.001 and =0.008), while ZCTA 11238 in Brooklyn is a cluster of low positivity and confirmed
205 cases (local Moran's I=6.97 and 5.17, p=0.009 and <0.001).
206 In Philadelphia, we found clusters of high testing and low positivity and confirmed cases
207 in Center City, including ZCTAs 19102 (local Moran's I=18.87, 3.90 and 11.04, p<0.001, <0.001

Drexel Internal Data

208 and =0.037) and 19103 (local Moran's I=5.44, 5.35, and 7.341, p=0.002, 0.002 and <0.001).
209 Most of North and Northeast Philadelphia was contained in a cluster of low testing and high
210 positivity. For example, ZCTAs 19124 and 19149 are significant clusters of low testing (local
211 Moran's I=8.02 and 4.43, p<0.001 and =0.009) and high positivity (local Moran's I=5.51 and
212 7.70, p=0.010 and <0.001).

213 We visually explored the relationship between the SVI and cumulative testing rates,
214 positivity ratios, confirmed case rates and mortality rates for the three cities (**Figure 4**). Testing
215 rates were slightly lower in areas of higher vulnerability in Chicago, NYC and Philadelphia.
216 Positivity, confirmed cases, and mortality all increased monotonically with increasing social
217 vulnerability in Chicago. A similar pattern was observed in NYC, but the increase was less
218 marked in ZCTAs above mean vulnerability. Similar patterns were observed in Philadelphia for
219 positivity and confirmed cases but the SVI was not consistently associated with mortality.

220 **Table 1** shows rate ratios of each outcome (cumulatively across the full study period),
221 associated with a one SD higher value of the SVI index and its four domains, after adjusting for
222 the % of the population aged 65 or above. A higher social vulnerability was associated with
223 13%, 3%, and 9% lower testing rates in the three cities, although confidence intervals crossed
224 the null. Associations of SVI with positivity, confirmed cases, and mortality were similar in the
225 three cities. A 1 SD higher SVI was associated with 40%, 37% and 40% higher positivity in
226 Chicago, NYC and Philadelphia, 22%, 33%, and 27% higher confirmed cases, and 44%, 56%, and
227 58% higher mortality. For the three cities, we found that the social vulnerability domains of
228 socioeconomic status, household composition & disability, minority status & language were

Drexel Internal Data

associated with the study outcomes similarly to the overall index. However, weaker or even opposite associations were observed for the housing type & transportation component.

Drexel Internal Data

232 **Discussion**

233 We documented large spatial inequities in COVID-19 through the end of September 2020 in
234 three large US cities, Chicago, NYC and Philadelphia, with more vulnerable neighborhoods
235 having a higher positivity, confirmed cases and mortality, and lower testing rates. We also
236 found clusters of high and low positivity, confirmed cases, and mortality, co-located with areas
237 of high and low vulnerability, respectively. Notably we observed very strong inequities in
238 mortality, with mortality rates increasing by ~50% for each SD higher SVI index.
239 Findings from this study are consistent with other studies that have examined inequities in
240 COVID-19 incidence by ZCTA in other cities. For example, Chen & Krieger reported a monotonic
241 increase in confirmed cases in ZCTAs of Illinois and NYC with decreasing levels of area-level
242 socioeconomic status(10). Analysis at the county level by the same authors showed similar
243 gradients(10), consistent with other research(26,27), including a study using the SVI as a
244 predictor at the county level(16). We found that, within these large cities, clusters of high and
245 low positivity and confirmed cases that were mostly co-located with clusters of high and low
246 vulnerability, respectively. These include areas of concentrated poverty and with a history of
247 extreme racial segregation(7), including West and North Philadelphia, the West Side of Chicago,
248 and The Bronx in NYC. Notably Chicago, Philadelphia, and NYC are among the top 10 most
249 segregated cities in the country (28).

250 As others have noted(6-8) potential explanations for neighborhood inequities in
251 incidence may include differential exposure to the virus and as well as differential susceptibility
252 to infection. Residents of higher SVI neighborhoods likely have higher exposure to the virus
253 because of the types of jobs they have (such as essential workers within the healthcare,

Drexel Internal Data

254 personal care, production, or service industries(29), personal care or service occupations(30)),
255 lack of telecommuting options(31), dependence on mass transit use(32), and because of
256 overcrowding within households(33). Whether there are factors associated with differential
257 susceptibility to infection is still unclear, but prior research on respiratory viruses has
258 documented that stress linked to disadvantage may increase the likelihood of developing
259 disease after exposure(34,35).

260 We also found narrow inequities in testing, accompanied by wider inequities in
261 positivity. The inequities in positivity suggest that, despite apparently small inequities in testing,
262 testing may actually be lower than it needs to be in neighborhoods with high SVI and possibly
263 higher incidence. Barriers to testing can include unequal location of testing sites(36), lack of
264 vehicle ownership(37), lack of health insurance(38), a usual source of care for referrals(39), and
265 potential mistrust of the medical system(40). It is possible that the social patterning of infection
266 has been changing over time as the pandemic progressed, beginning in wealthier areas
267 (possibly linked to business travel(41)) and subsequently shifting to more deprived areas. As
268 more longitudinal data becomes available, understanding longitudinal patterns may help in the
269 preparedness for future outbreaks. Our ability to adequately characterize inequities in
270 incidence necessarily requires equal access to testing.

271 A major finding was the substantially higher mortality rate in neighborhoods with a
272 higher SVI. Vulnerability to severe disease and death by COVID-19 are related to the presence
273 of previous comorbidities, such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes and hypertension(42). Since
274 these comorbidities are more prevalent in people of lower socioeconomic status and
275 racial/ethnic minorities(43,44), it is expected that, at equal levels of exposure, these groups will

Drexel Internal Data

276 suffer more severe consequences from COVID-19. Other factors may also affect the severity of
277 disease and the case-fatality rates including access to and quality of health care and the role of
278 other factors including co-occurring social factors (e.g. stressors) and environmental factors
279 (e.g. air pollution). In fact, a study with 17 million records in the UK has shown that, even after
280 adjusting for a number of comorbidities, racial/ethnic minorities and people living in
281 socioeconomically deprived areas had a higher risk of death after infection(42). However, two
282 recent studies using data from Michigan and the Veteran Affairs health system suggest that
283 inequities in mortality are driven by differences in infection rates, rather than differential
284 vulnerability(45,46). In our study, we found that the relative risks of mortality associated with
285 higher zip code social vulnerability were slightly higher than those observed for confirmed
286 cases, but underestimation of the underlying incidence in higher SVI neighborhoods (because of
287 lower testing) could partly explain this difference.

288 We found that the domain of social vulnerability due to housing type & transportation
289 showed inconsistent associations as compared to the other domains or the overall summary
290 social vulnerability index. This domain includes variables detailing the proportion of the
291 population living in multi-unit structures, mobile homes, group quarters, in crowded situations,
292 or without a vehicle. It is possible that these variables do not relate to differences in COVID-19
293 outcomes within cities because either they are not heterogeneous enough or they simply do
294 not capture true underlying determinants.

295 An important limitation of our study is the likely underestimation of inequities in
296 confirmed case rates due to the lack of systematic widespread testing. We also lack individual-
297 level data, and rely on aggregated surveillance data. In addition, ZCTAs are very imperfect

Drexel Internal Data

298 proxies for neighborhoods(47). Heterogeneity in the sociodemographic composition within zip
299 codes may have led to underestimation of inequities(48). However, zip codes represent easy-
300 to-collect data in the middle of a public health emergency when more detailed geocoding is less
301 available.

302 **Conclusion**

303 We found large spatial inequities in COVID-19 testing, positivity, confirmed cases and mortality
304 in three large cities of the US and strong associations of COVID-19 positivity, confirmed cases,
305 and mortality with higher neighborhood social vulnerability. These within-city neighborhood
306 differences in COVID-19 outcomes emerge from differences across neighborhoods generated
307 and reinforced by residential segregation linked to income inequality and structural racism(49-
308 51), coupled with decades of systematic disinvestment in segregated neighborhoods(7-
309 10,50,52). Addressing these structural factors linked to income inequality, racism and
310 segregation will be fundamental to minimizing the toll of the pandemic but also to promoting
311 population health and health equity across many other health conditions.

312

Drexel Internal Data

313 **References**

314 1. Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real
315 time. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2020.
316 2. Braveman PA, Kumanyika S, Fielding J, Laveist T, Borrell LN, Manderscheid R, et al.
317 Health disparities and health equity: the issue is justice. American journal of public
318 health. 2011;101 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S149-S55.
319 3. COVID-19: Data, New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene 2020;
320 Accessed https://www1.nyc.gov/site/doh/covid/covid-19-data.page on December 15th
321 2020.
322 4. THE FIRST 100: COVID-19 Took Black Lives First. It Didn't Have To., Eldeib D, Gallardo A,
323 Johnson A, Waldman A, Martin N, Buford T, et al. 2020; Accessed
324 https://features.propublica.org/chicago-first-deaths/covid-coronavirus-took-black-lives-
325 first/ on May 18th 2020.
326 5. COVID-19 Testing and data, Philadelphia Department of Public Health 2020; Accessed
327 https://www.phila.gov/programs/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/testing-and-data/
328 on December 8th 2020.
329 6. Bailey ZD, Moon JR. Racism and the Political Economy of COVID-19: Will We Continue to
330 Resurrect the Past? Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law. 2020.
331 7. Barber S, Headen I, Branch B, Tabb LT, Yadeta K. COVID-19 in Context: Racism,
332 Segregation and Racial Inequities in Philadelphia. Drexel University Urban Health
333 Collaborative; 2020.

Drexel Internal Data

334 8. Berkowitz RL, Gao X, Michaels EK, Mujahid MS. Structurally vulnerable neighbourhood
335 environments and racial/ethnic COVID-19 inequities. Cities & Health. 2020:1-4.
336 9. Williams DR, Collins C. Racial residential segregation: a fundamental cause of racial
337 disparities in health. Public health reports (Washington, D.C. : 1974). 2001;116(5):404-
338 16.
339 10. Chen J, Krieger N. Revealing the unequal burden of COVID-19 by income, race/ethnicity,
340 and household crowding: US county vs. ZIP code analyses. Harvard Center for
341 Population and Development Studies Working Paper Series. 2020;19(1).
342 11. McClure ES, Vasudevan P, Bailey Z, Patel S, Robinson WR. Racial Capitalism within Public
343 Health: How Occupational Settings Drive COVID-19 Disparities. American Journal of
344 Epidemiology. 2020.
345 12. COVID-19 Cases, Tests, and Deaths by ZIP Code, Chicago Department of Public Health
346 2020; Accessed https://data.cityofchicago.org/Health-Human-Services/COVID-19-Cases-
347 Tests-and-Deaths-by-ZIP-Code/yhhz-zm2v on October 7th 2020.
348 13. NYC Coronavirus (COVID-19) data, New York City Department of Health and Mental
349 Hygiene 2020; Accessed https://github.com/nychealth/coronavirus-data on October 1st
350 2020.
351 14. Randhawa AK, Fisher LH, Greninger AL, Li SS, Andriesen J, Corey L, et al. Changes in
352 SARS-CoV-2 Positivity Rate in Outpatients in Seattle and Washington State, March 1-
353 April 16, 2020. JAMA. 2020.

Drexel Internal Data

15. Flanagan BE, Hallisey EJ, Adams E, Lavery A. Measuring Community Vulnerability to Natural and Anthropogenic Hazards: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Social Vulnerability Index. Journal of environmental health. 2018;80(10):34-6.

16. Khazanchi R, Beiter ER, Gondi S, Beckman AL, Bilinski A, Ganguli I. County-Level Association of Social Vulnerability with COVID-19 Cases and Deaths in the USA. Journal of general internal medicine. 2020;35(9):2784-7.

17. Getis A. B3: Spatial Autocorrelation. In: Fischer MM, Getis A, eds. Handbook of Applied Spatial Analysis: Software Tools, Methods and Applications: Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2009:255-74.

18. Bivand RS, Pebesma E, Gómez-Rubio V. Chapter 9.2 Testing for Spatial Autocorrelation. Applied Spatial Data Analysis with R, second edition: Springer New York; 2013:275-87.

19. Gelman A, Hill J. Chapter 6.2: Poisson regression, exposure, and overdispersion. Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models: Cambridge university press; 2006:110-5.

20. Blangiardo M, Cameletti M. Chapter 6: Spatial modeling. Spatial and spatio-temporal Bayesian models with R-INLA: John Wiley & Sons; 2015:173-234.

21. Blangiardo M, Cameletti M, Baio G, Rue H. Spatial and spatio-temporal models with R-INLA. Spatial and Spatio-temporal Epidemiology. 2013;7:39-55.

22. Tabb LP, Ballester L, Grubesic TH. The spatio-temporal relationship between alcohol outlets and violence before and after privatization: A natural experiment, Seattle, Wa 2010–2013. Spatial and spatio-temporal epidemiology. 2016;19:115-24.

Drexel Internal Data

375 23. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria:
376 R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020.
377 24. Bivand R, Anselin L, Berke O, Bernat A, Carvalho M, Chun Y, et al. spdep: Spatial
378 Dependence: Weighting Schemes, Statistics. R package version 1.1-5, URL
379 http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=spdep; 2020.
380 25. The R-INLA project, R-INLA Development Team 2020; Accessed www.r-inla.org/home on
381 August 30th 2020.
382 26. Millett GA, Jones AT, Benkeser D, Baral S, Mercer L, Beyrer C, et al. Assessing Differential
383 Impacts of COVID-19 on Black Communities. Annals of Epidemiology. 2020.
384 27. Rodriguez-Diaz CE, Guilamo-Ramos V, Mena L, Hall E, Honermann B, Crowley JS, et al.
385 Risk for COVID-19 infection and death among Latinos in the United States: Examining
386 heterogeneity in transmission dynamics. Annals of Epidemiology. 2020.
387 28. Massey DS, Tannen J. A Research Note on Trends in Black Hypersegregation.
388 Demography. 2015;52(3):1025-34.
389 29. Chou R, Dana T, Buckley DI, Selph S, Fu R, Totten AM. Epidemiology of and Risk Factors
390 for Coronavirus Infection in Health Care Workers: A Living Rapid Review. Annals of
391 Internal Medicine. 2020.
392 30. Tomer A, Kane JW. How to protect essential workers during COVID-19. Brookings
393 Report, Brookings Institute March. 2020.
394 31. Valentino-DeVries J, Lu D, Dance GJX. Location Data Says It All: Staying at Home During
395 Coronavirus Is a Luxury. The New York Times; 2020.
396 32. Anderson M. Who relies on public transit in the US. Pew Research Center. 2016.

Drexel Internal Data

397 33. Burr JA, Mutchler JE, Gerst K. Patterns of residential crowding among Hispanics in later
398 life: Immigration, assimilation, and housing market factors. Journals of Gerontology
399 Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences. 2010;65(6):772-82.
400 34. Cohen S, Tyrrell DAJ, Smith AP. Psychological Stress and Susceptibility to the Common
401 Cold. New England Journal of Medicine. 1991;325(9):606-12.
402 35. Kiecolt-Glaser JK, Glaser R, Gravenstein S, Malarkey WB, Sheridan J. Chronic stress alters
403 the immune response to influenza virus vaccine in older adults. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.
404 1996;93(7):3043-7.
405 36. Rader B, Astley CM, Sy KTL, Sewalk K, Hswen Y, Brownstein JS, et al. Geographic access
406 to United States SARS-CoV-2 testing sites highlights healthcare disparities and may bias
407 transmission estimates. Journal of Travel Medicine. 2020;In Press.
408 37. Percent of households without a vehicle by race/ethnicity: United States, 2015, National
409 Equity Atlas 2020; Accessed https://nationalequityatlas.org/indicators/Car_access.
410 38. Sohn H. Racial and ethnic disparities in health insurance coverage: Dynamics of gaining
411 and losing coverage over the life-course. Population research and policy review.
412 2017;36(2):181-201.
413 39. Ganguli I, Shi Z, Orav EJ, Rao A, Ray KN, Mehrotra A. Declining use of primary care
414 among commercially insured adults in the United States, 2008–2016. Annals of Internal
415 Medicine. 2020;172(4):240-7.
416 40. King WD. Examining African Americans' mistrust of the health care system: expanding
417 the research question. Commentary on" Race and trust in the health care system".
418 Public Health Reports. 2003;118(4):366.

Drexel Internal Data

41. Forster P, Forster L, Renfrew C, Forster M. Phylogenetic network analysis of SARS-CoV-2 genomes. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2020;117(17):9241-3.

42. Williamson E, Walker AJ, Bhaskaran KJ, Bacon S, Bates C, Morton CE, et al. OpenSAFELY: factors associated with COVID-19-related hospital death in the linked electronic health records of 17 million adult NHS patients. medRxiv. 2020:2020.05.06.20092999.

43. Kershaw KN, Albrecht SS. Racial/ethnic residential segregation and cardiovascular disease risk. Current cardiovascular risk reports. 2015;9(3):10.

44. Raifman M, Raifman J. Disparities in the population at risk of severe illness from covid-19 by race/ethnicity and income. American Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2020.

45. Zelner J, Trangucci R, Naraharisetti R, Cao A, Malosh R, Broen K, et al. Racial disparities in COVID-19 mortality are driven by unequal infection risks. medRxiv. 2020:2020.09.10.20192369.

46. Rentsch CT, Kidwai-Khan F, Tate JP, Park LS, King JT, Jr., Skanderson M, et al. Patterns of COVID-19 testing and mortality by race and ethnicity among United States veterans: A nationwide cohort study. PLOS Medicine. 2020;17(9):e1003379.

47. Grubesic TH, Matisziw TC. On the use of ZIP codes and ZIP code tabulation areas (ZCTAs) for the spatial analysis of epidemiological data. Int J Health Geogr. 2006;5:58.

48. Krieger N, Chen JT, Waterman PD, Soobader MJ, Subramanian SV, Carson R. Geocoding and monitoring of US socioeconomic inequalities in mortality and cancer incidence: does the choice of area-based measure and geographic level matter?: the Public Health Disparities Geocoding Project. Am J Epidemiol. 2002;156(5):471-82.

Drexel Internal Data

49. Bailey ZD, Krieger N, Agénor M, Graves J, Linos N, Bassett MT. Structural racism and health inequities in the USA: evidence and interventions. The Lancet. 2017;389(10077):1453-63.

50. Rothstein R. The color of law: A forgotten history of how our government segregated America: Liveright Publishing; 2017.

51. Williams DR, Collins C. Racial residential segregation: a fundamental cause of racial disparities in health. Public health reports. 2016.

52. Trounstine J. Segregation by design: Local politics and inequality in American cities: Cambridge University Press; 2018.

Drexel Internal Data

Reproducible research statement

Protocol: not available

Statistical Code: Available at https://github.com/usamabilal/COVID_Disparities

Data: Available at https://github.com/usamabilal/COVID_Disparities

Acknowledgements

The authors want to acknowledge help by Alyssa Furukawa on data collection, and Dr. Rene Najera for useful code to calculate spatial autocorrelation.

Funding

UB was supported by the Office of the Director of the National Institutes of Health under award number DP5OD26429. UB, SB, and ADR were also supported by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation under award number 77644. The funding sources had no role in the analysis, writing or decision to submit the manuscript.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Preprint server

This article was published and updated on medRxiv on February 1st, 2021:

https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.01.20087833

Drexel Internal Data

Table 1: Relative rates of testing, positivity, confirmed cases, and mortality associated with zip code tabulation area (ZCTA) social vulnerability index (SVI) and its four domains in Chicago, NYC, and Philadelphia.

City	Variable	Testing	Positivity	Incidence	Mortality
Chicago	**Social Vulnerability Index**	**0.87(0.74;1.01)**	**1.40(1.25;1.58)**	**1.22(1.04;1.42)**	**1.44(1.15;1.80)**
	Socioeconomic Status	0.87(0.74;1.02)	1.46(1.30;1.65)	1.27(1.09;1.49)	1.52(1.21;1.91)
	Household composition & disability	0.86(0.74;1.02)	1.34(1.16;1.55)	1.17(0.98;1.39)	1.46(1.14;1.87)
	Minority status & language	0.95(0.82;1.09)	1.34(1.20;1.49)	1.27(1.11;1.45)	1.33(1.08;1.64)
	Housing type & transportation	0.95(0.82;1.11)	0.95(0.82;1.10)	0.89(0.76;1.05)	0.91(0.71;1.16)
New York City	**Social Vulnerability Index**	**0.97(0.94;1.00)**	**1.37(1.29;1.46)**	**1.33(1.26;1.41)**	**1.56(1.46;1.67)**
	Socioeconomic Status	0.94(0.91;0.97)	1.47(1.39;1.56)	1.39(1.32;1.46)	1.62(1.51;1.73)
	Household composition & disability	0.98(0.96;1.01)	1.35(1.27;1.42)	1.32(1.26;1.38)	1.39(1.30;1.48)
	Minority status & language	0.94(0.91;0.97)	1.36(1.28;1.45)	1.28(1.21;1.35)	1.51(1.41;1.63)
	Housing type & transportation	1.10(1.07;1.12)	0.84(0.78;0.90)	0.92(0.86;0.98)	1.01(0.93;1.10)
Philadelphia	**Social Vulnerability Index**	**0.91(0.82;1.02)**	**1.40(1.25;1.55)**	**1.27(1.15;1.42)**	**1.58(1.24;2.00)**
	Socioeconomic Status	0.90(0.80;1.01)	1.41(1.26;1.59)	1.27(1.14;1.43)	1.49(1.16;1.91)
	Household composition & disability	0.90(0.80;1.00)	1.37(1.23;1.53)	1.23(1.10;1.37)	1.31(1.03;1.67)
	Minority status & language	0.94(0.85;1.05)	1.26(1.13;1.42)	1.20(1.08;1.33)	1.47(1.13;1.91)
	Housing type & transportation	1.03(0.93;1.15)	1.01(0.88;1.15)	1.03(0.92;1.16)	1.28(1.02;1.60)

Footnote: Rate ratios (95% CrI) for a 1 SD higher value of the SVI and its four domains. All models are adjusted for the % of the population in the ZCTA aged 65 or above. Data is cumulative through October 1st, 2020 (NYC and Philadelphia) and October 3rd, 2020 (Chicago).

rexel Internal Data

Figure 1: Spatial distribution and clusters of COVID-19 testing, positivity, confirmed cases, mortality, and social vulnerability in ZCTAs of Chicago.



Footnote: clusters calculated using local Moran's I statistic; clusters have a p-value <0.05. SD: standard deviation.

rexel Internal Data

480 **Figure 2: Spatial distribution and clusters of COVID-19 testing, positivity, confirmed cases, mortality, and social vulnerability in**

481 **ZCTAs of New York City**.



482

483 Footnote: clusters calculated using local Moran's I statistic; clusters have a p-value <0.05. SD: standard deviation.

484

rexel Internal Data

485 **Figure 3: Spatial distribution and clusters of COVID-19 testing, positivity, confirmed cases, mortality, and social vulnerability in**

486 **ZCTAs of Philadelphia.**

487

488 Footnote: clusters calculated using local Moran's I statistic; clusters have a p-value <0.05. SD: standard deviation.

489

rexel Internal Data

490 **Figure 4: Scatterplots showing the relationship between the social vulnerability index and COVID-19 testing, positivity, confirmed**

491 **cases and mortality at the ZCTA-level in Chicago, NYC, and Philadelphia.**



492

493 Footnote: solid lines are loess smoothers for each city separately. **The SVI has been standardized for each city, so that its units are**

494 **standard deviations (SD)** of the SVI, for each city separately.

rexel Internal Data