

1 **“Association of Poor Housing Conditions with COVID-19 Incidence and Mortality Across US Counties.”**

2 Khansa Ahmad (MD), Sebhat Erqou (MD), Nishant Shah (MD), Umair Nazir (MD), Alan Morrison (MD),
3 Gaurav Choudhary (MD), Wen-Chih Wu (MD)

4 **Affiliations:** The Providence Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Lifespan Hospitals and the Warren Alpert
5 Medical School at Brown University

6 **Address for correspondence:**

7 Wen-Chih Wu, MD.

8 Providence VA Medical Center

9 Alpert Medical School at Brown University

10 Division of Cardiology

11 830 Chalkstone Avenue

12 Providence, RI 02908

13 email: wen-chih.wu@va.gov

14 **Abstract**

15 **Objective:** Poor housing conditions have been linked with worse health outcomes and infectious spread
16 in communities but its relationship with incidence and mortality of COVID-19 is unknown. Therefore, we
17 undertook this study to determine the association between poor housing condition and COVID-19
18 incidence and mortality in US counties.

19 **Methods:** We conducted cross-sectional analysis of county-level data from the US Centers for Disease
20 Control, US Census Bureau and John Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center for 3141 US counties. The
21 exposure of interest was percentage of households with poor housing conditions (one or more of:
22 overcrowding, high housing cost, incomplete kitchen facilities, or incomplete plumbing facilities).
23 Outcomes were incidence rate ratios (IRR) and mortality rate ratios (MRR) of COVID-19 across US
24 counties through 4/21/2020. Multilevel generalized linear modeling was utilized with adjustment for
25 population density and county characteristics including demographics, income, education, prevalence of
26 medical comorbidities, access to healthcare insurance and emergency rooms, and state-level COVID-19
27 test density.

28 **Results:** Across 3135 US counties, the mean percentage of households with poor housing conditions was
29 14.2% (range 2.7% to 60.2%). The mean (SD) incidence and mortality of COVID-19 were 255.68
30 (2877.03) cases and 13.90 (272.22) deaths per county, respectively. In the fully adjusted models, with
31 each 5% increase in percent households with poor housing conditions, there was a 50% higher risk of
32 COVID-19 incidence (IRR 1.50, 95% CI: 1.38 – 1.62) and a 42% higher risk of COVID-19 mortality (MRR
33 1.42, 95% CI: 1.25 – 1.61). Results remained similar using earlier timepoints (3/31/2020 and 4/10/2020).

34 **Conclusions and Relevance:** Counties with a higher percentage of households with poor housing had
35 higher incidence of, and mortality associated with, COVID-19. These findings suggest targeted health

- 36 policies to support individuals living in poor housing conditions should be considered in further efforts to
- 37 mitigate adverse outcomes associated with COVID-19.

38 Introduction

39 Coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19) is a rapidly evolving pandemic caused by the novel enveloped RNA
40 beta-coronavirus, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)(1). As of April 26,
41 2020, SARS-COV-2 has infected over 2 million people worldwide and led to >200k deaths⁽²⁾. The
42 infectivity potential of SARS-CoV-2 is a function of its high basic reproductive number (R_0) which has
43 been estimated to be from 2.2 to as high as 5.7, as compared to R_0 of 1.3 for influenza virus(3-5). Given
44 the high infectivity and lack of a vaccine, one of the important mitigation strategies employed
45 worldwide in order to decrease the rate of spread and ‘flatten’ the infection curve has been social and
46 physical distancing(3, 6). However, physical distancing can be compromised if the living environment for
47 various reasons, such as poor housing conditions, prevents the individuals to stay isolated. Problems
48 associated with poor housing include overcrowding, high housing cost, lack of kitchen facilities or lack of
49 plumbing facilities. Given the overcrowding and the inherent need to utilize communal facilities
50 (bathrooms or kitchens), physical distancing would likely be compromised in the households
51 experiencing poor housing conditions. Poor housing conditions have already been linked to an increased
52 spread of respiratory infections(7). Furthermore, there is robust literature linking poor housing
53 conditions to worse health outcomes(8-11). Given that a common mechanism of SARS-CoV-2
54 transmission is through respiratory aerosols and droplet contact, poor housing conditions can
55 potentially facilitate the spread of the infection(12). Since the relationship between poor housing
56 conditions and COVID-19 outcomes are currently unknown, we undertook a study to test the hypothesis
57 that the percentage of households with poor housing conditions in US counties are associated with
58 higher incidence and mortality of COVID-19 across 3135 counties in the United States (US).

59 **Materials and Methods**

60 We conducted a cross sectional ecological analysis of the 3141 US counties using publicly available data
61 relating poor housing conditions with COVID-19 outcomes. Counties with missing data for poor housing
62 condition (n=6) were excluded yielding a sample size of 3135 US counties. These counties were Prince of
63 Wales-Outer Ketchikan, Skagway-Hoonah-Angoon, Wrangell-Petersburg and Kusilvak from Alaska,
64 Bedford City from Virginia and Oglala Lakota from South Dakota. Counties in US territories (American
65 Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Island, Puerto Rico and US Virgin Islands) were not included in our
66 analysis. Since there is no individual identifying information, the data were in aggregate by county, and
67 publicly available from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), US census Bureau and John Hopkins
68 Coronavirus Resource Center,(2) the protocol received exemption from the Providence Veterans Affairs
69 Medical Center Institutional Review Board(2, 13, 14).

70 Exposure: The exposure of interest was the percentage of households in a county with poor housing
71 conditions which has been published as percentage of households with severe housing problems (2010
72 – 2014) by the CDC(13). These households were identified as having any of the four problems: 1)
73 overcrowding, 2) high housing cost burden, 3) incomplete kitchen facilities, and 4) incomplete plumbing
74 facilities. In further breakdown, overcrowding is defined as more than one person per room, high
75 housing cost as more than 50% of the monthly household income allocated towards housing cost
76 (including utilities), incomplete kitchen facilities as lacking a sink with running water, stove or range, or a
77 refrigerator, and incomplete plumbing facilities as lacking of hot and cold piped water, a flush toilet, or a
78 bathtub/shower(15). To facilitate interpretation, we studied the poor housing conditions as a
79 continuous variable by units of 5% increase in households with poor housing conditions, which is
80 roughly equivalent to the standard deviation (SD) of the variable. Additionally, we also categorized the
81 counties according to approximate quartiles based on percentage of households with poor housing
82 conditions (rounded values were used as cut off).

83 Outcome: The outcomes of interest were incident COVID-19 cases and COVID-19 deaths per county. We
84 obtained the COVID-19 incidence and mortality data from the John Hopkins Coronavirus Resource
85 Center, where it has been published for “public health, educational, and academic research
86 purposes.” (2) We obtained the cumulative data for three dates of 10-day intervals: March 31st, April
87 10th and April 21st, which allowed us to test the robustness of our findings across three temporal cross
88 sections of the reported data. April 21st data were utilized as the main analysis.

89 Covariates: We obtained data on county level variables related to COVID-19 spread and outcomes based
90 on literature. The data regarding total population (2010) and population density (population per square
91 miles of land area of a county) were obtained to account for the exposure pool(13). In order to account
92 for socioeconomic disparity, data on median household income of a county (2016) and percentage of
93 residents without a high school diploma (2013-2017) were included(13).

94 County demographic data was collected because male sex, older age and percent of racial minority have
95 been linked to a higher risk of, and mortality in, COVID-19(13, 16-18). This included percentage of male
96 residents (2010), median age (2010), and percentage of white, black, Hispanic or Latino, Asian, Native
97 Hawaiian or Pacific Islander; and American Indian or Alaska Native residents (2013 – 2017)(13).

98 From the very initial reports, COVID-19 was seen to drastically effect individuals with a heavier burden
99 of comorbidities(16, 17). We therefore collected data for percentage of residents diagnosed with
100 diabetes and those with obesity (2015)(13). Furthermore, Medicare hospitalization data for:
101 hypertension, ischemic stroke, myocardial ischemia, heart failure and dysrhythmia (2014 – 2016) were
102 obtained as a surrogate for cardiovascular disease burden in the county(13).

103 The morbidity and mortality associated with COVID-19 has been linked to respiratory failure(19). We
104 therefore collected variables that affect respiratory health: annual concentration of particulate matter
105 2.5 μ (pm2.5) (2014) and percentage of residents who are current smokers (2017)(13).

106 We accounted for the percentage of adults without health insurance under 65 years (2016) and number
107 of hospitals with emergency rooms (ER) (2016) in each county, as surrogates of access to care. The
108 number of hospitals may also influence the number of cases detected in the county. Furthermore, we
109 obtained the total number of tests conducted per state (cumulative up to April 21st) and calculated the
110 ratio of tests to the total population of the state (test density)(20).

111 Statistical Analysis: County covariates were described as mean \pm SD and range for continuous variables
112 and as number (%) for categorical variables. Linear regression was used to assess linear trend of the
113 county covariates across the four quartiles.

114 We graphed the correlation between poor housing and number of COVID-19 cases and COVID-19
115 deaths. Given non-normal distribution, we used log transformation ($\log x + 1$) of the exposure and
116 outcome variables for the scatter plot and calculated the Pearson's correlation coefficient.

117 We utilized generalized linear multilevel models with a negative binomial distribution family and a log
118 link function to study the association between the relative risk of each 5% change in households with
119 poor housing conditions and the incidence (first analysis) and mortality (second analysis) of COVID-19,
120 with total population of a county as denominator. To account for clustering effect due to policy, social
121 and behavioral similarities across counties within the same state, we applied a random intercept for the
122 state. The covariance matrix was specified as unstructured. We adjusted for different categories of
123 variables in the regression model in a stepwise fashion: 1) population density and test density, 2)
124 demographics (% male, median age, % white), 3) socioeconomic status (median household income, %
125 residents with lack of high school education), 4) respiratory exposure (annual ambient PM2.5, % current
126 smokers), 5) prevalence of comorbidities (% diagnosed with diabetes, % diagnosed with obesity), 6)
127 Medicare hospitalization rates (hypertension, ischemic stroke, myocardial ischemia, heart failure,
128 dysrhythmia), and 7) Access to healthcare (% adults without health insurance under 65 years and

129 number of hospitals with ER). The fully adjusted model included all the aforementioned variables. We
130 reported incidence rate ratios (IRR) and mortality rate ratios (MRR), respectively, which are
131 interpretable as the relative increase in incidence and mortality for COVID19, respectively, for each 5%
132 increase in households with poor housing conditions.

133 We conducted several sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of our findings. 1) In lieu of percent
134 white population in a county, we replaced it with the percent breakdown of the minority population:
135 black, Hispanic or Latino, Asian or Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander and American Indian or Alaska
136 Native residents per county in the fully adjusted model. 2) Quartile Analysis – we also studied quartiles
137 of percent households with poor housing conditions. We tested the quartiles in the fully adjusted model
138 as an ordinal variable (i.e. linear effect across quartiles) and as categorical (dummy) variables (using 1st
139 quartile as referent). 3) Temporal Analysis – Since the main analysis is using the most recent data (April
140 21st, 2020), we repeated our analyses in two earlier time points for COVID-19 incidence and mortality as
141 outcomes, on March 31st and April 10th, to account for and understand temporal changes, if any, in this
142 association.

143 A two-sided p value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses were conducted in Stata
144 SE statistical software (Stata Corp, Texas, v. 15.0).

145 **Results**

146 Across 3135 US counties, the mean (range) percentage of households with poor housing conditions was
147 14.2% (2.7% to 60.2%). The modified quartiles of percentage of households with poor housing
148 conditions were 2.7% to 11% (Quartile1), 11.1% to 14.0% (Quartile2), 14.1% to 17.0% (Quartile3) and
149 17.1% to 60.2% (Quartile4). Till April 21st, there were a total of 144190 confirmed COVID-19 cases
150 assigned to these 3135 US counties and 14887 COVID-19 deaths. The mean (SD) incidence and mortality
151 of COVID-19 were 255.68 (2877.03) cases and 13.90 (272.22) deaths per county, respectively. Table 1
152 describes characteristics of counties across the US, overall and stratified by quartiles of percentage of
153 households with poor housing conditions.

Variable	Overall Mean ± SD (Range) n = 3135	Quartiles of Percentage Households with Poor Housing Conditions			
		Quartile 1 (2.7% – 11%) Mean ± SD (Range) n = 679	Quartile 2 (11.1% - 14%) Mean ± SD (Range) n = 912	Quartile 3 (14.1% - 17%) Mean ± SD (Range) n = 830	Quartile 4 (17.1 – 60.2%) Mean ± SD (Range) n = 714
Total Population (2010)	98418.71 ± 313273.6 (82 – 9818605)	20417.61 ± 35194.54 (478 – 365169)	51102.02 ± 82563.37 (286 – 1223348)	93130.64 ± 158212.9 (662 – 1503085)	239180.8 ± 603202.7 (82 – 9818605)
Population Density, n/100,000	345.18 ± 3792.37 (0.04 – 168127.7)	43.16 ± 110.13 (0.16 – 2014.21)	183.96 ± 1372.22 (0.17 – 37333.46)	581.41 ± 6459.65 (0.09 ± 168127.7)	560.31 ± 3459.51 (0.04 – 79500.17)
Number of Tests (State level)	91539.76 ± 101898.8 (7618 – 633861)	NA	NA	NA	NA
Test Density (number of tests/ total population) (State Level)	0.01 ± 0.01 (0.01 – 0.04)	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male (2010), %	49.97 ± 2.22 (43.2 – 72.1)	50.37 ± 2.30 (44.8 – 68.3)	49.89 ± 1.90 (44.5 – 64.7)	49.90 ± 2.27 (43.2 – 72.1)	49.78 ± 2.41 (45.3 – 66.9)
Median Age (2010), years	40.34 ± 5.04 (22.4 – 62.7)	42.53 ± 4.27 (23.5 – 55.8)	41.13 ± 4.26 (26.3 – 62.7)	39.78 ± 4.53 (24 – 54)	37.91 ± 5.97 (22.4 – 55.9)
White (2013 – 2017), %	76.78 ± 20.04 (0.6 – 100)	87.3 ± 13.27 (5.8 – 100)	83.01 ± 14.07 (11.3 – 99.8)	75.73 ± 17.95 (12.8 – 99.1)	60.03 ± 23.10 (0.6 – 99.3)
Black (2013 – 2017), %	8.87 ± 14.45 (0 – 86.9)	2.72 ± 6.60 (0 – 60.2)	6.26 ± 9.94 (0 – 71.9)	10.52 ± 14.34 (0 – 86.3)	16.12 ± 20.27 (0 – 86.9)
Hispanic/Latino (2013 – 2017), %	9.08 ± 13.72 (0 – 99.1)	6.60 ± 11.22 (0 – 93.8)	6.57 ± 10.15 (0 – 88.4)	8.78 ± 12.75 (0 – 86.5)	14.97 ± 18.39 (0 – 99.1)
Asian Population or Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Population (2013-2017), %	1.36 ± 3.10 (0 – 62.7)	0.56 ± 0.83 (0 – 6)	0.85 ± 1.39 (0 – 17.3)	1.28 ± 2.08 (0 – 27.4)	2.85 ± 5.55 (0 – 62.7)
American Indian/Alaska Native (2013 – 2017), %	1.67 ± 7.11 (0 – 82.2)	1.01 ± 3.07 (0 – 54.6)	1.12 ± 3.53 (0 – 39.6)	1.32 ± 4.64 (0 – 55.7)	3.56 ± 13.36 (0 – 90.3)
Diagnosed Diabetes, Age-	9.83 ± 2.24	9.11 ± 1.96	10.05 ± 2.01	10.19 ± 2.16	9.84 ± 2.68

Adjusted Percentage, 20+, (2015), %	(3.6 ± 18.3)	(4.6 – 16.6)	(5.1 – 17.4)	(4.1 – 16.6)	(3.6 -18.3)
Obesity, Age-Adjusted Percentage, 20+. (2015), %	31.96 ± 4.72 (13.5 ± 49.7)	32.40 ± 3.77 (18.3 – 46.1)	32.72 ± 3.91 (16.7 – 43.8)	32.24 ±4.55 (14.7 – 49.7)	30.25 ± 6.07 (13.5 – 46.9)
Acute Myocardial Infarction Hospitalization (2014-2016) Rate per 1,000 Medicare Beneficiaries	11.82 ± 3.81 (3.6 – 36.1)	11.05 ± 3.58 (3.9 – 31.5)	12.33 ± 3.92 (3.6 – 36.1)	12.29 ±3.85 (4.8 – 29.2)	11.35 ± 3.64 (5 – 26.9)
Dysrhythmia Hospitalization (2014-2016) Rate per 1,000 Medicare Beneficiaries	58.52 ± 16.91 (16.6 ± 136.9)	51.59 ± 17.13 (16.6 – 114.6)	60.46 ± 16.72 (16.9 – 119.5)	62.64 ±16.28 (17.3 – 136.9)	57.87 ±15.55 (17.3 – 116.1)
Heart Failure Hospitalization (2014-2016) Rate per 1,000 Medicare Beneficiaries	50.89 ± 19.60 (9.3 – 148.3)	43.30 ± 18.82 (9.3 – 131.2)	52.70 ± 18.91 (9.9 – 138.2)	55.34 ± 19.47 (11.1 – 138.3)	50.65 ± 18.94 (10.2 – 139.8)
Hypertension Hospitalization (2014-2016) Rate per 1,000 Medicare Beneficiaries	132.10 ± 40.01 (32.1 – 283.2)	114.20 ± 38.47 (42.4 – 254.1)	135.23 ± 37.93 (38.6 – 276.2)	141.29 ± 39.33 (38.5 – 283.2)	134.47 ± 39.64 (32.1 – 249.5)
Ischemic Stroke Hospitalization (2014-2016) Rate per 1,000 Medicare Beneficiaries	12.68 ± 3.39 (3.6 – 35.7)	11.61 ± 3.51 (4.4 – 35.7)	13.13 ± 3.32 (4 - 33.8)	13.33 ± 3.30 (3.6 -27.8)	12.36 ± 3.17 (3.7 -22.4)
Median Household Income (2016), In thousands of \$	49.52 ± 12.89 (22 – 134.6)	51.56 ± 11.61 (24.5 – 114.7)	49.39 ± 12.23 (24.9 – 134.6)	48.67 ± 12.81 (23.1 – 115.5)	48.75 ± 14.65 (22 – 110.8)
Residents without High School Diploma, Ages 25+, (2013-2017), %	13.81 ± 6.48 (1.1 – 58.7)	11.65 ± 5.89 (1.1 – 47.5)	13.64 ± 5.95 (1.8 – 58.7)	14.32 ± 6.19 (1.9 – 41.8)	15.50 ± 7.36 (1.3 – 51.2)

Adults who are current smokers (2017), %	17.45 ± 3.58 (6 – 41)	16.49 ± 3.11 (7 – 31)	17.69 ± 3.13 (8 – 27)	17.93 ± 3.42 (6 – 30)	17.51 ± 4.46 (8 – 41)
Particulate Matter <2.5 µm (2014) Annual Average Ambient Concentrations, ug/m3	9.02 ± 1.97 (3 – 19.7)	8.39 – 2.12 (3.4 – 12.6)	9.32 ± 1.84 (3 – 13.3)	9.21 ± 1.77 (3.4 – 14.3)	9.03 ± 2.05 (3.7 – 19.7)
Adults without Health Insurance, Under Age 65, (2016), %	11.12 ± 4.92 (2.1 – 33.5)	9.94 ± 4.83 (2.9 – 31.1)	10.68 ± 4.75 (3.0 – 30.9)	11.37 ± 4.65 (2.1 – 33.5)	12.51 ± 5.18 (2.6 – 31.0)
Hospitals with Emergency Department (2016)	1.15 ± 1.89 (0 – 46)	0.68 ± 0.70 (0 – 4)	0.92 ± 0.99 (0 – 15)	1.13 ± 1.27 (0 – 10)	1.91 – 3.36 (0 – 46)
COVID 19 Cases (Up to 3/31/2020)	58.04 ± 836.02 (0 – 43119)	3.10 ± 11.48 (0 – 141)	8.82 ± 23.09 (0 – 325)	27.17 ± 98.98 (0 – 1591)	207.31 ± 1733.53 (0 – 43119)
COVID-19 Cases (Up to 4/10/2020)	156.35 ± 1851.53 (0 – 92384)	8.95 ± 31.12 (0 – 431)	26.58 ± 64.54 (0 – 825)	85.00 ± 313.08 (0 – 4511)	540.69 ± 3,824.68 (0 – 92384)
COVID-19 Cases (Up to 4/21/2020)	255.68 ± 2877.03 (0 – 144190)	15.58 ± 51.43 (0 – 615)	46.82 ± 117.92 (0 – 1635)	155.48 ± 560.40 (0 – 9621)	860.10 ± 5,933.84 (0 – 144190)
COVID-19 Deaths (Up to 3/31/2020)	0.97 ± 17.36 (0 – 932)	0.06 ± 0.33 (0 – 5)	0.20 ± 0.70 (0 – 7)	0.59 ± 3.12 (0 – 70)	3.26 ± 35.98 (0 – 932)
COVID-19 Deaths (Up to 4/10/2020)	5.76 ± 107.42 (0 – 5820)	0.27 ± 1.25 (0 – 19)	0.87 ± 2.63 (0 – 27)	2.73 ± 13.53 (0 – 282)	20.58 ± 223.13 (0 – 5820)
COVID-19 Deaths (Up to 4/21/2020)	13.90 ± 272.22 (0 – 14887)	0.62 ± 2.78 (0 – 39)	1.93 ± 5.68 (0 – 74)	7.44 ± 33.88 (0 – 506)	48.91 ± 565.70 (0 – 14887)

154 The mean number of COVID-19 cases and deaths for all time points, March 31st, April 10th and April 21st
155 increased across increasing quartiles of percentage of households with poor housing conditions (all p's
156 <0.001). Similarly, increasing quartiles of percent households with poor housing conditions were
157 associated with higher county population, population density, percentage of minority residents ,
158 percentage of residents without high school diploma, prevalence of diabetes, Medicare hospitalization
159 rates for hypertension, ischemic stroke, heart failure and dysrhythmia, percentage of current smokers,
160 annual PM2.5 levels, percentage of adults <65 years without health insurance and number of hospitals
161 with ER facilities (all p's <0.001). Conversely, a decrease in the median household income and
162 prevalence of obesity was observed across increasing quartiles of percent households with poor housing
163 conditions (both p's <0.001).

164 There was a moderately strong correlation between the log-transformed percentage of households with
165 poor housing conditions and log-transformed number of COVID-19 cases ($r = 0.44$, $p < 0.001$) and COVID-
166 19 deaths ($r = 0.47$, $p < 0.001$) across US counties (**Figure 1**).

167 **Figure 1a-b: Scatter plot of COVID-19 Cases & Deaths by percentage of Households with Poor Housing**
168 **Conditions across 3135 US counties.**

169 Using the COVID-19 data from April 21st, we found that for each 5% increase in poor housing condition
170 per county, there is a 59% increase in the relative risk of COVID-19 incidence (IRR 1.59, 95% confidence
171 interval [CI]: 1.49-1.70) (**Table 2**). The association was only slightly attenuated after adjustment for an
172 extensive list of county covariates (**Table 2**). The IRR for the fully adjusted model (Model VIII) was 1.50
173 (95% CI: 1.38 – 1.62) (**Table 2**). Secondary analyses categorizing the exposure into quartiles (**Figure 2a**)
174 or using data from March 31st and April 10th yielded comparable results (**Table 2**).

175 **Table 2: Association of county Covid-19 incidence as of April 21, 2020 with percent households with poor housing conditions.**

Model		Incidence Rate Ratio, IRR (95% Confidence Interval)
I-	Percentage Households Living with Poor housing conditions	1.59 (1.49 – 1.70)
II-	Model I + Population Density and Test Density	1.58 (1.48 – 1.68)
III-	Model II + Demographics (Male, Age, % White)	1.31 (1.21 – 1.42)
IV-	Model III + Socioeconomic Factors (Median Household Income, % Residents with Lack of High School Education)	1.48 (1.38 – 1.60)
V-	Model IV + Respiratory Exposure Variables (Annual PM25 and Percentage of Residents who reported Smoking)	1.55 (1.44 – 1.67)
VI-	Model V + County Prevalence of Comorbidities (Diabetes and Obesity)	1.52 (1.41 – 1.65)
VII-	Model VI + Hospitalization Rate per 1,000 Medicare Beneficiaries (HF, Dysrhythmia, HTN, Ischemic Stroke, MI)	1.51 (1.40 – 1.63)
VIII-	Model VII + % Adults without insurance + Number of Hospitals with ER/county (Fully Adjusted Model)	1.50 (1.38 – 1.62)
Sensitivity Analyses		
IX-	Model VIII with Minority Demographics (Male, Age, Black%, Hispanic%, Asian%, Native Americans% in lieu of White%)	1.43 (1.32 – 1.54)
X-	Model VIII with poor housing conditions Quartiles as an Ordinal Variable	1.25 (1.18 – 1.32)
XI-	Model VIII for March 31 st , 2020	1.65 (1.51 – 1.81)
XII-	Model VIII for April 10 th , 2020	1.24 (1.15 – 1.34)

Note: Incidence Rate Ratios are from: Multilevel Generalized Linear Negative Binomial Models allowing random intercepts for States. A 5% increase in households with poor housing conditions represents approximately 1-SD change.

176 **Figure 2a-b: Relative Risk Increase in Incidence and Mortality of Covid-19 with Each Quartile of**
177 **Percentage of Households with Poor housing conditions.**

178 Similarly, using the COVID-19 data from April 21st, we found a 63% increase in the relative risk of COVID-
179 19 mortality for each 5% increase in poor housing condition per county, (MRR 1.63, 95% CI: 1.48 – 1.79)
180 (Table 3). The association was only mildly attenuated after adjustment (Table 3), and remained highly
181 significant in the fully adjusted model (Model VIII), with an MRR of 1.42 (95% CI 1.25 – 1.61) (Table 3).
182 Secondary analyses categorizing the exposure into quartiles (Figure 2b) or using data from March 31st
183 and April 10th yielded comparable results (Table 3).

184 **Table 3: Association of county Covid-19 Deaths as of April 21, 2020 with percent households with poor housing conditions.**

Model		Mortality Rate Ratio, MRR (95% Confidence Interval)
I-	Percentage Households Living with Poor housing conditions	1.63 (1.48 – 1.79)
II-	Model I + Population Density and Test Density	1.62 (1.47 – 1.78)
III-	Model II + Demographics (Male, Age, White%)	1.25 (1.12 – 1.40)
IV-	Model III + Socioeconomic Factors (Median Household Income, % Residents with Lack of High School Education)	1.41 (1.26 – 1.58)
V-	Model IV + Respiratory Exposure Variables (Annual PM25 and Percentage of Residents who reported Smoking)	1.49 (1.32 – 1.67)
VI-	Model V + County Prevalence of Comorbidities (Diabetes and Obesity)	1.44 (1.27 – 1.63)
VII-	Model VI + Hospitalization Rate per 1,000 Medicare Beneficiaries (HF, Dysrhythmia, HTN, Ischemic Stroke, MI)	1.44 (1.27 – 1.64)
VIII-	Model VII + %Adults without insurance + Number of Hospitals with ER/county (Fully Adjusted Model)	1.42 (1.25 – 1.61)
Sensitivity Analyses		
IX-	Model VIII with Minority Demographics (Male, Age, Black%, Hispanic%, Asian%, Native Americans% in lieu of White%)	1.37 (1.21 – 1.56)
X-	Model VIII with poor housing conditions Quartiles as an Ordinal Variable	1.22 (1.11 – 1.34)
XI-	Model VIII for March 31 st	1.36 (1.10 – 1.67)
XII-	Model VIII for April 10th	1.31 (1.14 – 1.51)
<p>Note: Mortality Rate Ratios are from: Multilevel Generalized Linear Negative Binomial Models allowing random intercepts for States. A 5% increase in percent households with poor housing conditions represents approximately 1-SD change.</p>		

185 **Discussion**

186 To our knowledge, this is the first nationwide study to investigate county level association of COVID-19
187 incidence and mortality with percentage of households facing poor housing conditions in the US. Our
188 study showed that with each 5% increase in percent households with poor housing conditions, there
189 was a 50% higher risk of COVID-19 incidence and a 42% higher risk of COVID-19 mortality across US
190 counties. Findings remained similar in three different time points and after accounting for county-level
191 population density and state test density, demographics, socioeconomic status, prevalence of
192 comorbidities, respiratory exposure, lack of health insurance and number of ER facilities.

193
194 Of the four issues categorized under poor housing conditions, overcrowding offers the most direct
195 explanation for the higher incidence and mortality of COVID-19. Overcrowding has been associated with
196 spread of respiratory illnesses like tuberculosis and influenza which have aerosol and droplet
197 transmissions, both of which are potential modes of transmission for COVID-19(7, 12, 21-23). The World
198 Health Organization (WHO) published housing and health guidelines in 2018 identifying poor housing
199 related environmental risk factors including overcrowding, air and water quality and lack of access to
200 adequate plumbing and sanitation, as factors contributing to the burden of infectious diseases including
201 airborne respiratory illnesses(24). The 2003 spread of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS)
202 epidemic in Hong Kong was worst in the Amoy Garden estate which was overcrowded and had
203 significant plumbing and sanitation problems(25). An initial study from China investigating the initial
204 COVID-19 outbreaks also showed that 79.9% of outbreaks occurred indoors, almost all in apartment
205 settings(26). Evidence from the Influenza epidemic of 1918 showed not only increased spread but also
206 increased severity of the disease as a result of overcrowding(27). Overcrowding associated with a more
207 severe infectious disease process may offer a potential explanation of the higher mortality associated

208 with poor housing, as overcrowding leads to repeated exposure and potentially a higher viral inoculum.

209 High viral load has been linked to worse COVID-19 clinical outcomes(28-30).

210

211 Another feature of poor housing conditions is high cost burden, with more than 50% of the household

212 income going towards housing cost(15). Prior studies have shown an association between high housing

213 costs and delays in seeking healthcare(8, 31). Our study showed that counties with the highest

214 percentage of residents with poor housing conditions also had the lowest median household income

215 and highest percentage of residents without a high school diploma. There are several news reports

216 indicating that minimum wage workers have found it difficult to follow the stay-at-home guidelines, due

217 to a lack of economic resources and being part of essential work force that is mostly an exception to

218 stay-at-home guidelines(32-34). However, an important feature of our study is that although linked to

219 economic status, the associations between poor housing conditions and COVID-19 incidence, and

220 mortality, were independent of the racial composition, median household income, lack of education and

221 lack of health insurance, as the relative risk was only mildly changed and remained highly significant

222 after adjusting for these factors.

223

224 A lack of appropriate plumbing and kitchen facilities is also part of poor housing conditions. Availability

225 of appropriate plumbing facilities and in-home clean water has been linked to a decline in infectious

226 disease including lower respiratory tract infections(24, 35). Lack of appropriate facilities interferes with

227 the ability to practice good hand hygiene. Furthermore, lack of these facilities would require the

228 residents to use communal facilities, thereby increasing social contact. It is important to note that SARS-

229 CoV-2 is detectable for up to 72 hours on plastic and stainless steel materials, whereas influenza is

230 detectable for 24-48 hrs(36, 37). This poses another public health risk for transmission to other
231 individuals sharing a crowded space, in the absence of meticulous hygiene.

232

233 Our findings have health policy implications as they identify a particularly vulnerable population to be at
234 heightened risk and also the potential pathways for public health interventions during the current
235 COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, our study adds to a robust body of evidence for other disease
236 processes, which has shown that inadequate housing is a public health hazard especially in relation to
237 infectious diseases and highlights the importance of finding short (e.g. better access to clean water and
238 bathrooms) and long-term (e.g. overcrowding, cost) solutions to problems surrounding poor housing to
239 help contain or mitigate the spread of COVID-19. Health education via print or social media targeted at
240 the population at risk to improve awareness of preventative measures and hygiene, establishment of
241 hygiene protocols and increased availability of mobile bathrooms and cleaning supplies at communal
242 facilities can be considered to help mitigate the COVID-19 spread(38, 39).

243

244 The strength of this study is that this is a nationwide report of 3135 counties across US, which allows for
245 a large sample size and generalizability of our findings. Furthermore, to our knowledge, this is the first
246 study to establish an association between the incidence and mortality of COVID-19 and poor housing
247 conditions. The limitations of the study also merit consideration. First, the county-level covariate data
248 utilized were from earlier time period, and hence may have weakened the strength of the associations.
249 However, we utilized the most updated results publicly available. Furthermore, the assumption that
250 county age structure and ethnic composition does not quickly change over the span of several years is
251 the current approach shared by the US Census methodology (every 10 years). However, the consistent
252 results after accounting for extensive list of covariates and various sensitivity analyses, support the

253 robustness of the findings. Due to limitations of the data, we could not separate the distinct elements
254 (e.g. overcrowding, cost, plumbing, kitchen) that comprised poor housing for better understanding of
255 the problem and targeting of policies. This is also a cross-sectional ecological analysis and does not lend
256 itself to causal inference. Finally, despite careful adjustments and inclusion of covariates, residual
257 confounding cannot be excluded.

258 **Conclusion**

259 In a nationwide analysis of US county-level data, counties with a higher percentage of households with
260 poor housing had higher incidence of, and mortality associated with, COVID-19. These findings suggest
261 targeted health policies to support individuals living in poor housing conditions should be considered in
262 further efforts to mitigate adverse outcomes associated with COVID-19.

263

264 **Disclosures**

265 None

266

267 **Acknowledgement**

268 The views expressed in this paper represent the authors and not the Department of the Veterans

269 Affairs.


270 References

- 271 1. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China,
272 of Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(13):1199-207.
- 273 2. Yong SEF, Anderson DE, Wei WE, Pang J, Chia WN, Tan CW, et al. Connecting clusters of COVID-
274 19: an epidemiological and serological investigation. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020.
- 275 3. Shim E, Tariq A, Choi W, Lee Y, Chowell G. Transmission potential and severity of COVID-19 in
276 South Korea. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2020;93:339-44.
- 277 4. Sanche S, Lin YT, Xu C, Romero-Severson E, Hengartner N, Ke R. High Contagiousness and Rapid
278 Spread of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(7).
- 279 5. Biggerstaff M, Cauchemez S, Reed C, Gambhir M, Finelli L. Estimates of the reproduction
280 number for seasonal, pandemic, and zoonotic influenza: a systematic review of the literature. *BMC*
281 *Infect Dis*. 2014;14:480.
- 282 6. Saez M, Tobias A, Varga D, Barcelo MA. Effectiveness of the measures to flatten the epidemic
283 curve of COVID-19. The case of Spain. *Sci Total Environ*. 2020;727:138761.
- 284 7. Krieger J, Higgins DL. Housing and health: time again for public health action. *Am J Public Health*.
285 2002;92(5):758-68.
- 286 8. Stahre M, VanEenwyk J, Siegel P, Njai R. Housing Insecurity and the Association With Health
287 Outcomes and Unhealthy Behaviors, Washington State, 2011. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2015;12:E109.
- 288 9. Crisanti AS, Duran D, Greene RN, Reno J, Luna-Anderson C, Altschul DB. A longitudinal analysis of
289 peer-delivered permanent supportive housing: Impact of housing on mental and overall health in an
290 ethnically diverse population. *Psychol Serv*. 2017;14(2):141-53.
- 291 10. Dunn JR, Hayes MV. Social inequality, population health, and housing: a study of two Vancouver
292 neighborhoods. *Soc Sci Med*. 2000;51(4):563-87.
- 293 11. Faludi EG. The effect of population movement on housing as it concerns public health. *Can J*
294 *Public Health*. 1960;51:146-9.
- 295 12. Shereen MA, Khan S, Kazmi A, Bashir N, Siddique R. COVID-19 infection: Origin, transmission,
296 and characteristics of human coronaviruses. *J Adv Res*. 2020;24:91-8.
- 297 13. Pareek M, Bangash MN, Pareek N, Pan D, Sze S, Minhas JS, et al. Ethnicity and COVID-19: an
298 urgent public health research priority. *Lancet*. 2020.
- 299 14. Muniz-Rodriguez K, Chowell G, Cheung CH, Jia D, Lai PY, Lee Y, et al. Doubling Time of the
300 COVID-19 Epidemic by Province, China. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(8).
- 301 15. Severe housing problems [Available from: [https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/explore-
302 health-rankings/measures-data-sources/county-health-rankings-model/health-factors/physical-
303 environment/housing-transit/severe-housing-problems](https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/explore-health-rankings/measures-data-sources/county-health-rankings-model/health-factors/physical-environment/housing-transit/severe-housing-problems)].
- 304 16. Guan WJ, Liang WH, Zhao Y, Liang HR, Chen ZS, Li YM, et al. Comorbidity and its impact on 1590
305 patients with Covid-19 in China: A Nationwide Analysis. *Eur Respir J*. 2020.
- 306 17. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, Crawford JM, McGinn T, Davidson KW, et al. Presenting
307 Characteristics, Comorbidities, and Outcomes Among 5700 Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 in the
308 New York City Area. *JAMA*. 2020.
- 309 18. Rimmer A. Covid-19: Disproportionate impact on ethnic minority healthcare workers will be
310 explored by government. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m1562.
- 311 19. Kim ES, Chin BS, Kang CK, Kim NJ, Kang YM, Choi JP, et al. Clinical Course and Outcomes of
312 Patients with Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection: a Preliminary Report of the
313 First 28 Patients from the Korean Cohort Study on COVID-19. *J Korean Med Sci*. 2020;35(13):e142.
- 314 20. Wang MW, Zhou MY, Yu P, Cheng YR, Ye L, Chen J, et al. Quarantine hospitals are essential for
315 COVID-19 contention. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci*. 2020;24(7):3442-3.

- 316 21. Killingley B, Nguyen-Van-Tam J. Routes of influenza transmission. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*.
317 2013;7 Suppl 2:42-51.
- 318 22. Enarson DA, Beyers N, Zhang LX. The tuberculosis pandemic today: routes of transmission and
319 new target groups. *Scand J Infect Dis*. 2001;33(1):9-12.
- 320 23. Kolifarhood G, Aghaali M, Mozafar Saadati H, Taherpour N, Rahimi S, Izadi N, et al.
321 Epidemiological and Clinical Aspects of COVID-19; a Narrative Review. *Arch Acad Emerg Med*.
322 2020;8(1):e41.
- 323 24. WHO Housing and Health Guidelines. WHO Guidelines Approved by the Guidelines Review
324 Committee. Geneva2018.
- 325 25. Lau JT, Lau M, Kim JH, Tsui HY, Tsang T, Wong TW. Probable secondary infections in households
326 of SARS patients in Hong Kong. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2004;10(2):235-43.
- 327 26. Hua Qian TM, Li LIU, Xiaohong Zheng, Danting Luo, Yuguo Li. Indoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2.
328 2020.
- 329 27. Aligne CA. Overcrowding and Mortality During the Influenza Pandemic of 1918. *Am J Public*
330 *Health*. 2016;106(4):642-4.
- 331 28. Liu Y, Yan LM, Wan L, Xiang TX, Le A, Liu JM, et al. Viral dynamics in mild and severe cases of
332 COVID-19. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020.
- 333 29. Team C-I. Clinical and virologic characteristics of the first 12 patients with coronavirus disease
334 2019 (COVID-19) in the United States. *Nat Med*. 2020.
- 335 30. Zheng S, Fan J, Yu F, Feng B, Lou B, Zou Q, et al. Viral load dynamics and disease severity in
336 patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January-March 2020: retrospective
337 cohort study. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m1443.
- 338 31. Kottke T, Abariotes A, Spoonheim JB. Access to Affordable Housing Promotes Health and Well-
339 Being and Reduces Hospital Visits. *Perm J*. 2018;22:17-079.
- 340 32. Many poor Americans can't afford to isolate themselves. *The Economist*. 2020.
- 341 33. Eric Morath RF. "I Have Bills I Have to Pay." Low-Wage Workers Face Brunt of Coronavirus Crisis.
342 *The Wall Street Journal*. 2020.
- 343 34. VESOULIS A. Coronavirus May Disproportionately Hurt the Poor—And That's Bad for Everyone.
344 *TIME*. 2020.
- 345 35. Thomas TK, Ritter T, Bruden D, Bruce M, Byrd K, Goldberger R, et al. Impact of providing in-
346 home water service on the rates of infectious diseases: results from four communities in Western
347 Alaska. *J Water Health*. 2016;14(1):132-41.
- 348 36. Guo ZD, Wang ZY, Zhang SF, Li X, Li L, Li C, et al. Aerosol and Surface Distribution of Severe Acute
349 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Hospital Wards, Wuhan, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*.
350 2020;26(7).
- 351 37. Bean B, Moore BM, Sterner B, Peterson LR, Gerding DN, Balfour HH, Jr. Survival of influenza
352 viruses on environmental surfaces. *J Infect Dis*. 1982;146(1):47-51.
- 353 38. Schiavo R, May Leung M, Brown M. Communicating risk and promoting disease mitigation
354 measures in epidemics and emerging disease settings. *Pathog Glob Health*. 2014;108(2):76-94.
- 355 39. Managing Epidemics Key facts about major deadly diseases. In: Organization WH, editor.

356


Figure 1a-b: Scatter plot of COVID-19 Cases & Deaths by percentage of Households with Poor Housing Conditions across 3135 US counties



Note: Size of the bubbles represent number of deaths weighted by the total population (analytical weights). Linear regression line was fitted using analytical weights.

- 1a.** Scatter plot of log transformed COVID-19 cases (4/21/2020) against log transformed percent households with poor housing conditions (log $x+1$). Linear regression line (95% confidence interval) was fitted using analytical weights. **Correlation Coefficient = 0.45 ($p<0.001$)**
- 1b.** Scatter plot of log transformed COVID-19 deaths (4/21/2020) against log transformed percent households with poor housing conditions (log $x+1$). **Correlation Coefficient = 0.47 ($p<0.001$)**

Figure 2a-b: Relative Risk Increase in Incidence and Mortality of Covid-19 with Each Quartile of Percentage of Households with Poor housing conditions.



Note: Quartile 1 is referent. Models adjusted for 1) population density and test density, 2) demographics (% male, median age, % white), 3) socioeconomic status (median household income, % residents with lack of high school education), 4) respiratory exposure (annual ambient PM2.5, % current smokers), 5) prevalence of comorbidities (% diagnosed with diabetes, % diagnosed with obesity), 6) Medicare hospitalization rates (hypertension, ischemic stroke, myocardial ischemia, heart failure, dysrhythmia), and 7) Access to healthcare (%adults without health insurance under 65 years and number of hospitals with ER).

The quartiles were: Quartile1: 2.7% to 11%, Quartile2: 11.1% to 14.0%, Quartile3: 14.1% to 17.0% and Quartile4: 17.1% to 60.2%

2a. Incidence Rate Ratio (IRR) with 95% CI for COVID-19 cases across quartiles of percent households with poor housing conditions.

2b. Mortality Rate Ratio (MRR) with 95% CI for COVID-19 deaths across quartiles of percent households with poor housing conditions.