The Association Between Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibitors and Angiotensin Receptor Blockers and the Number of Covid-19 Confirmed Cases and Deaths in the United States: Geospatial Study

Kyle Johnson[1], BS*, Maedeh Khayyat-Kholghi[1], DO, MSc*, Blake Johnson, MS[2], Larisa G. Tereshchenko[1], MD, PhD.

[1]Knight Cardiovascular Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR; [2]Flexport, San Francisco, CA

*Equal author contribution

Brief Title: Geospatial study of ACEI and ARB in COVID-19

Correspondence: Larisa Tereshchenko, 3181 SW Sam Jackson Park Rd; UHN62; Portland, OR, 97239. E-mail:tereshch@ohsu.edu. Phone:503-494-7400; Fax:503-494-8550.

Words: 8065

Abstract

Background—The novel coronavirus SARS-Cov2 uses the angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) receptor as an entry point to the cell. Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is a risk factor for the novel coronavirus disease (Covid-19) with poor outcomes. We hypothesized that the rate of ACE inhibitors (ACEIs) and angiotensin receptor blockers (ARBs) use is associated with the rate of Covid-19 confirmed cases and deaths.

Methods—We conducted a geospatial study using publicly available county-level data. The Medicare ACEIs and ARBs prescription rate was exposure. The Covid-19 confirmed case and death rates were outcomes. Spatial autoregression models were adjusted for the percentage of Black residents, children, residents with at least some college degree, median household income, air quality index, CVD hospitalization rate in Medicare beneficiaries, and CVD death rate in a total county population.

Results—The ACEI use had no effect on Covid-19 confirmed case rate. An average ACEIs use (compared to no-use) was associated with a higher Covid-19 death rate by 1.1 (95%CI 0.4-1.8)%. If the use of ACEIs increases by 0.5% for *all* counties, the Covid-19 death rate will drop by 0.4% to 0.7(95%CI 0.3-1.1)%; $P<0.0001$. An average ARBs use (compared to no-use) was associated with a higher Covid-19 confirmed case rate (by 4.2; 95%CI 4.1-4.3 %) and death rate (by 1.1; 95%CI 0.7-1.5 %). Each percent increase in ARBs use was associated with an increase in confirmed case rate by 0.2(0.03-0.4)% and death rate by 0.14(0.08-0.21)%.

Conclusions—ARBs, but not ACEIs use rate, is associated with Covid-19 confirmed case rate.

Key words: ACEI, ARB, COVID-19, coronavirus

Introduction

The novel coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) caused by SARS-Cov2 virus was named a pandemic officially by the World Health Organization on March 11th, 2020.[1,2] It has been shown that SARS-Cov2 uses the angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) receptor as an entry point into a cell[2-4].

With the ACE2 receptor acting as a binding site for SARS-Cov2, the Renin-Angiotensin-Aldosterone System (RAAS), and the medications affecting it become important points of discussion.[1,5-8]Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors (ACEIs) and angiotensin receptor blockers (ARBs) are two common classes of medications widely used in patients with hypertension, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease (CVD), a latent or manifest left ventricular dysfunction. Hypertension, diabetes, and CVD emerged as risk factors for severe Covid-19 cases and deaths.[9-11] Previous experiments showed that ACE2 expression is associated with susceptibility to SARS-Cov infection.[12]

Notably, available clinical studies consider ACEIs and ARBs together[5, 8]. However, the effects of ACEI and ARBs on ACE2 levels and activity are different.[8] Experimental studies showed that there is no direct effect of ACEIs on ACE2 activity.[13] While there is strong evidence that ARBs increase ACE2 expression[14-19] and augment ACE2 activity[20,21-23], only Ferrario et al[24] showed that ACEIs increase ACE2 expression, whereas other studies showed that ACEIs decrease[25] or did not change levels and activity of ACE2 in tissue.[20, 26]

The consensus is reached by all international cardiac societies about the importance of the continuation of ACEIs and ARBs use in Covid-19 pandemic.[5] However, it remains unknown whether clinically indicated use of ACEIs and ARBs improve or worsen infectivity or the course of Covid-19, and whether there are differences between ACEIs and ARBs.

In this rapidly growing pandemic, time is of an essence. To address an urgent need[5], we conducted the geospatial study. We hypothesized that in the geospatial analysis, the rate of ACEIs and ARBs use associated with the number of confirmed Covid-19 cases and deaths in the United States (US).

Methods

We conducted a geospatial disease mapping study using publicly available county-level data. The study was reviewed by the Oregon Health & Science University Institutional Review Board and assigned a determination of Not Human Research. We provided the study dataset and STATA (StataCorp, College Station, Texas) code at https://github.com/Tereshchenkolab/geospatial, allowing future replication and update of the study results as COVID-19 pandemic is unfolding.

Geographical framework

An individual county in the US was an observation unit in this study. We used a Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) county code to link the data. Data with missing FIPS codes were excluded from the study. Geographic information about each county was obtained from the cartographic boundary files (shapefiles) provided by the US Census Bureau's MAF/TIGER geographic database.[27]

Exposure: rate of ACEIs and ARBs use by the Medicare Part D beneficiaries

We used the 2017 Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) public dataset, the Medicare Provider Utilization and Payment Data: Part D Prescriber Public Use File, with information on prescription drugs prescribed by individual physicians and other health care providers and paid for under the Medicare Part D Prescription Drug Program in 2017.[28] The

dataset included the total number of prescriptions that were dispensed (total day supply), which include original prescriptions and any refills, and, therefore, reflects ACEIs and ARBs usage.

The Medicare dataset only includes city and state information and not county information. In order to map the Medicare prescription data to their corresponding FIPS Code, we used the Google Geocoding API.[29] We then loaded the Medicare data and geocoded data into the SQLite database to produce the final datasets with prescription counts per county. Prescriptions from county-equivalents (independent cities) were manually matched with their corresponding FIPS code. Medicare prescriptions with misspelled cities or prescriptions that lacked valid city and state descriptions, if unable to be assigned, were excluded. Excluded prescriptions accounted for <0.01% of the data.

We calculated a drug class use rate as a sum of total day supply in a county for all drugs comprising a particular class (Table 1), normalized by the total county population estimate. We used the US Census Annual Resident Population Estimates for July 1st, 2019.

Outcomes: COVID-19 confirmed cases and deaths

We imported the raw COVID-19 data from the Johns Hopkins GitHub repository.[30] The number of confirmed COVID-19 cases and deaths in each county as reported for May 12th, 2020 was divided by the total population in each county (2019 county population estimate) and multiplied by 100,000 to convert to cases and deaths per 100,000 population. The primary outcome was the total number of confirmed Covid-19 cases in each county per 100,000 population, as reported for May 12th, 2020. The secondary outcome was the total number of Covid-19 deaths in each county per 100,000 population, as reported for May 12th, 2020.

Covariates: Population characteristics

Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics

We used the US Census County Population Estimates, released in March 2020, and included reported deaths and births in period July 1st, 2018 to June 30th, 2019.[31] Due to known negative impact of Covid-19 on the population of nursing homes and prisons/jails, we included July 1st, 2019 Group Quarters total population estimate. Group Quarters Facilities include correctional facilities for adults, nursing homes, college/university student housing, military quarters, and group homes. Group Quarters data was gathered from an estimated 20,000 randomly selected facilities. Data was then collected through resident interviews of these selected facilities using the American Community Survey conducted by the US Census Bureau.[32] The total 2019 county population estimate[31] normalized all demographic characteristics.

To characterize socioeconomic characteristics, we used the 2018 median household income expressed as a percent of the state total, and percent of the total population in poverty, as reported by the Economic Research Service of the US Department of Agriculture.[33] Besides, we used the data compiled by the County Health Rankings & Roadmaps program, which is a collaboration between the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute.[34]

Cardiovascular disease prevalence and severity

To characterize CVD prevalence and severity, we used the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates[35] of total CVD death rate per 100,000 population (2016-18), total CVD hospitalizations (2015-17) per 1,000 Medicare beneficiaries, heart failure (HF) death rate per 100,000 population (2016-18), HF hospitalization rate per 1,000 Medicare beneficiaries (2015-17), coronary heart disease (CHD) death rate per 100,000 population (2016-18), CHD

hospitalization rate per 1,000 Medicare beneficiaries (2015-17), and age-adjusted diabetes percentage in adults (age > 20y). This data was obtained from the Interactive Atlas of Heart Disease and Stroke, published by the CDC. Within this atlas, death rates were gathered from the Deaths National Vital Statistics Program, hospitalization rates were gathered from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services Medicare Provider Analysis and Review file Part A, and diabetes percentages were collected from the Division of Diabetes Translation.[35]

To characterize the use of cardiovascular medications, we calculated the rate of cardiovascular medications use, which included original prescriptions and any refills (total day supply), as reported in the 2017 CMS Part D Medicare Prescriber Public Use File.[28] We considered the total day supply data for 20 medication groups (Table 1): ACEI, ARB, beta-blockers, alpha-and-beta-blockers, alpha-blockers, class I, III, and V antiarrhythmic medications, dihydropyridine, and non-dihydropyridine calcium channel blockers, aldosterone antagonists, central acting antihypertensive medications, vasodilators, diuretics, lipid-lowering drugs, insulins, and oral hypoglycemic agents, anticoagulants and antiplatelet medications. We normalized the cardiovascular medications day supply for each county by the 2019 county population estimate.[31]

Statistical analyses

Data are summarized as mean ± standard deviation or as the median and interquartile range (IQR) if non-normally distributed. A paired *t*-test was used to compare an average rate of ACEIs and ARBs use.

As Covid-19 is a contagious disease, incidence and mortality in neighboring counties are spatially correlated. Therefore, we used spatial autoregression model[36] that allows modeling the spatial dependence among the outcomes, covariates, and among unobserved errors.[37] The spatial

autoregression model used the generalized spatial two-stage (method-of-moment), least-squares estimator.[38] The model included spatial lags of the outcome variable, spatial lags of covariates, and spatially autoregressive errors. The lag operator was a spatial weighting (inverse-distance) matrix, which summarized spatial relationships between counties, based on the distance between county centroids. Weighting matrix was scaled so that its largest eigenvalue is 1, which guarantees nonsingularity in the model estimation. We constructed cross-sectional spatial autoregressive models. The estimator treated the errors as heteroskedastic, thus relaxing the assumption that errors represent identically distributed disturbance.

We conducted the Moran test to determine whether exposure, outcome and covariate variables are spatially dependent.

First, we constructed unadjusted spatial autoregression models, to investigate a geospatial association of the county population characteristics with the ACEIs and ARBs use rate, calculated as follows:

ACEIs use rate = ln (total ACEIs day supply/county population).

ARBs use rate = ln (total ARBs day supply/county population).

Each model included spatial lags of the outcome variable (ACEIs or ARBs use rate, one-by-one), spatial lags of the testes predictor variable (demographic, socioeconomic, and CVD prevalence characteristics, one-by-one), and spatially autoregressive errors (reflecting unobserved factors).

Next, we constructed unadjusted spatial autoregression models, to evaluate a geospatial association of the county population characteristics with the rate of Covid-19 confirmed cases and deaths. To normalize the distribution of the outcome variables, and to improve the interpretability of models, we transformed outcome variables as follows:

Covid-19 confirmed case rate = ln (1+ confirmed Covid-19 cases/100,000 population);

Covid-19 death rate = ln (1+ confirmed Covid-19 deaths/100,000 population).

Each model included spatial lags of the outcome variable (Covid-19 confirmed case rate and death rate, one-by-one), spatial lags of the tested predictor variable (demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, cardiovascular risk factors and CVD prevalence, and the rate of ACEIs or ARBs use, one-by-one), and spatially autoregressive errors (unobserved impacts).

Finally, we constructed adjusted spatial autoregression models to answer the main study question: whether there is an independent association of ACEIs and ARBs use rate with Covid-19 confirmed case and death rate. The selection of covariates for adjustment was guided by observed in this study confounders (covariates that statistically significantly associated with both predictor and outcomes variables) and model fit. We were striving to obtain the highest R^2 value and χ^2 statistic (Wald test of spatial terms). Our final models explained at least 30% of the variability in each outcome (R^2 value >0.3). We adjusted for demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of a county population (percentage of Black non-Hispanic county residents, percentage of a county residents younger than 18 years of age, percentage of residents with at least some college degree, median household income as a percent of state total), air quality index, as well as CDC-reported CVD hospitalization rate in Medicare beneficiaries, and CVD death rate in a total county population. Each model included spatial lags of the outcome variable (Covid-19 incidence and mortality, one-by-one), spatial lags of the tested predictor variable (rate of ACEIs or ARBs usage, one-by-one), spatial lags of the selected (listed above) 7 covariates (altogether) and spatially autoregressive errors (unobserved influences).

Sensitivity analyses

Cross-sectional geospatial analysis is susceptible to reverse causality bias. It is well-documented that patients with CVD and cardiovascular risk factors (hypertension, diabetes) have a higher rate of Covid-19 confirmed cases and deaths.[5] The rate of ACEIs and ARBs use indirectly indicates CVD prevalence and severity. While we adjusted our models for the broad range of confounders, including CVD mortality in a total county population, and CVD hospitalization rate among Medicare beneficiaries, reverse causality remained of concern. To assess the possibility and extend of reverse causality bias, we constructed described above spatial autoregression models for the rate of use of other cardiovascular medications, for each class of drugs separately, one-by-one.

Results

Rate of ACEI and ARB use, and their association with population characteristics

We analyzed the data of 3,141 counties and county-equivalents in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. ACEIs were the most ubiquitous medications, surpassed only by lipid-lowering drug use (Table 1). Average county characteristics are reported in Table 2. Figure 1 shows the ACEIs and ARBs total day supply rates across the US. On average, the total day supply rate was higher for ACEIs than for ARBs (10.3±6.5 vs. 6.0±4.6 days; $P<0.0001$), as shown in Figure 1C. The Moran test indicated that the rates of ACEIs and ARBs use were spatially dependent ($P<0.0001$).

In unadjusted spatial autoregression analysis (Table 3), as expected, CVD prevalence, general demographic characteristics, uninsured rate, and air quality were associated with the use of both ACEIs and ARBs. A higher percentage of adults above 65 y of age was associated with

higher use of ACEIs, but not ARBs. A higher percentage of Asians was associated with the use of ARBs, but not ACEIs.

Covid-19 confirmed case and death rate

Covid-19 confirmed case and death rate (Figure 2) had similar geographic distribution. As of May 12th, 2020, in an average county, there were median 84.8 (IQR 34.4 – 208.6) confirmed cases and median 0.35 (IQR 0 – 7.6) deaths per 100,000 population.

In unadjusted spatial autoregression analysis (Table 4), higher CVD and HF hospitalization rate among Medicare beneficiaries, a higher percentage of Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and Pacific Islanders, a greater proportion of children (age < 18y) and residents admitting excessive drinking, a higher percentage of households with high housing costs, and worse air quality were associated with a higher rate of confirmed Covid-19 cases. In contrast, a larger proportion of county residents admitting physical inactivity, a greater percentage of adults above 65 years of age and non-Hispanic Whites, greater uninsured rate, and higher CVD mortality across all ages were associated with a lower rate of confirmed Covid-19 cases (Table 4). The same factors that affected Covid-19 confirmed case rate also affected Covid-19 death rate, but the strength of the impact on mortality was lesser. As expected, we observed significant indirect (spillover) effects of socioeconomic factors coming from neighboring counties on confirmed Covid-19 case and death rate to a given county.

Association of ACEI and ARB use rate with confirmed Covid-19 case and death rate

In unadjusted analysis, as expected, both ACEI and ARB use rate had a direct and indirect impact on confirmed Covid-19 case and death rate (Table 5).

However, the association of ACEI use with Covid-19 was fully explained by confounders (Table 5). In adjusted analyses, the ACEI use rate had no effect on Covid-19 confirmed case rate,

as demonstrated by the marginsplot (Figure 3A). There was no significant observed averaged effect (the observed averaged marginal effect was +4.4%; 95%CI from -16.5 to 41.6%), and no effect from a change of ACEIs use rate in *all* counties on Covid-19 confirmed case rate, as illustrated by the perfectly flat line (Figure 3A). There was a significant observed marginal effect on Covid-19 mortality (1.08%; 95%CI 0.35-1.81%), which suggested that an average ACEIs use rate (as compared to no ACEI use) was associated with higher Covid-19 mortality, by 1.1%. If the use of ACEIs increases by 0.5% for *all* counties, Covid-19 mortality will drop by 0.36%, from 1.08(95%CI 0.35-1.81)% to 0.72(95%CI 0.34-1.10)%; $P<0.0001$ (Figure 3B).

Nevertheless, after adjustment for demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, air quality index, and CVD prevalence and mortality, the rate of ARBs use remained significantly associated with Covid-19 outcomes (Table 5). On average, an increase in ARB use rate in a given county by 1% was associated with a 0.20 % increase in Covid-19 confirmed cases and a 0.14% increase in Covid-19 deaths in that county (direct, county-own effect). There was a significant observed effect of ARBs use. The observed averaged marginal effect was 4.21 (95%CI 4.13-4.29) % on Covid-19 confirmed case rate, which suggested that an average ARBs use (as compared to no use) was associated with a significantly higher number of confirmed Covid-19 cases (Figure 3C). There was a non-significant trend towards a lower rate of confirmed cases with a higher rate of ARBs use. If the use of ARBs increases by 0.5% for *all* counties, Covid-19 confirmed cases nonsignificantly decline by 0.68% (Figure 3C). There was also a significant observed marginal effect on Covid-19 mortality, which suggested that an average ARBs use (as compared to no ARB use) was associated with higher Covid-19 mortality by 1.06% (95%CI 0.68-1.45%). If the use of ARBs increases by 0.5% for *all* counties, Covid-19

mortality will nonsignificantly decrease by 0.24% from 1.06(95%CI 0.68-1.45)% to 0.82(95%CI -0.04 to 1.67)%; *P*=0.062 (Figure 3D).

Of note, adjustment fully explained the indirect (spillover) effect of ACEIs and ARBs use rate coming from all neighboring counties on Covid-19 confirmed case and death rate to a given county, while all models confirmed strong spatial dependence (Wald test of spatial terms for all models *P*<0.00001).

Sensitivity analysis

In unadjusted analysis, the use of cardiovascular medications reflects CVD prevalence. As expected, the use of nearly all types of cardiovascular medications was associated with Covid-19 confirmed case rate (Supplemental Table 1), with few exceptions. The use of antiarrhythmic drugs (class I. III, and V), and vasodilators was associated with a lower rate of confirmed Covid-19 cases. The use of vasodilators was also associated with a lower Covid-19 death rate. Overall, an association of medications use rate with Covid-19 death rate was similar to the association of medications use rate with Covid-19 confirmed case rate but had a smaller effect size.

In adjusted analysis (Supplemental Table 2), the rate of use of the vast majority of cardiovascular medications had no association with Covid-19 confirmed case and death rate. This finding supports the validity of the primary study analyses.

Discussion

There are two main findings in this study. First, we confirmed that the rate of ACEIs use does not impact Covid-19 confirmed case rate. Moreover, an increase in the ACEIs use rate is associated with a nearly equal (~ 1:1) drop in the Covid-19 death rate. Our results highlight the safety and indicate possible benefits of ACEIs use for patients with clinical indications for ACEI

in the Covid-19 era. Our results are consistent with several other studies of ACEIs in Covid-19.[39, 40]

Second, we observed that ARBs use associated with a slightly higher rate of Covid-19 confirmed case and death rate. After adjustment for demographic and socioeconomic confounders and CVD prevalence, an increase in ARBs use by 1% was associated with a 0.20 % increase in Covid-19 confirmed cases and a 0.14% increase in Covid-19 deaths. This finding suggests that long-term use of ARBs, due to known ACE2 upregulation, may facilitate SARS-CoV-2 entry and increase infectivity. ACEIs and ARBs are frequently prescribed interchangeably for the same clinical indications. Cluster-randomized controlled trial is warranted to answer the question of whether the replacement of ARBs by ACEIs may reduce Covid-19 confirmed case rate. Importantly, in this observational geospatial study, residual confounding and reverse causality bias cannot be completely ruled out. The use of ARBs may indicate a subgroup of CVD patients who are especially vulnerable to the virus. In such a case, the use of ARBs is not a cause, but a marker of risk. Therefore, it is essential to reinforce effective Covid-19 prevention strategies in patients taking ARBs, to avoid virus exposure.

SARS-CoV-2 virus may preferentially infect individuals taking ARBs, but not ACEIs

There is strong evidence that the entry of the SARS-CoV-2 virus into the host cell depends on the SARS-CoV receptor ACE2.[41] ACE2 is a type I integral membrane glycoprotein expressed mainly in the respiratory tract, heart, kidneys, and gastrointestinal tract.[42] ACE2 tissue expression facilitates the virus entry in target cells.[12]

Clinical indications for ACEIs and ARBs are similar, and in many clinical studies, these two classes of drugs considered together under the common name “RAAS inhibitors.“ However, the effects of ACEI and ARBs on ACE2 levels and activity are different.[8] Experimental studies

showed that there is no direct effect of ACEIs on ACE2 activity.[13] In most experimental studies, ACEIs decrease[25] or did not change levels and activity of ACE2 in tissue.[20, 26] Only Ferrario et al[24] showed that ACEIs increase ACE2 expression. In contrast, numerous studies showed that ARBs increased ACE2 expression[14-19] and augmented ACE2 activity.[20,21-23]

Our findings support the hypothesis that long-term use of ARBs, but not ACEIs may facilitate SARS-CoV-2 entry and increase infectivity. Several recent studies[39, 40] reported findings pointed to the same direction.

As in any observational study, we have to emphasize that reverse causality bias should be considered. Several unmeasured confounders could be responsible for our findings. First, ARBs are indicated to patients who are intolerant to ACEIs, usually because of bradykinin-mediated cough. Second, both ACEIs and ARBs can be used together in patients with advanced HF, and thus indicate a high-risk patient population. For those patient categories, switching from ARBs to ACEIs is not an option. Nevertheless, regardless of whether ARBs indeed increase infectivity or simply indicate a high-risk patient population, it would be wise to reinforce effective Covid-19 prevention strategies, to minimize the risks of exposure to the virus.

There is no evidence that the use of ACEI and ARBs in Covid-19 impact the disease severity

Our findings support the notion of ACEIs and ARBs playing a "double-edged sword"[6, 7, 43] role. The impact of ARBs on Covid-19 death rate was smaller than on Covid-19 confirmed case rate, suggesting no adverse effect on Covid-19 disease severity. Moreover, we observed a non-significant decrease in Covid-19 death rate associated with an increase in ARBs use rate. Notably, we showed that if ACEIs use rate increases by 1% for *all* counties, Covid-19 death rate will drop by ~0.8%, demonstrating nearly 1:1 relationships.

By degrading angiotensin II, ACE2 reduces its effect on the RAAS system.[1] It has been shown[44] that ARBs may have a greater potential[45] to block the RAAS system[46] than ACEIs, and the proposed mechanism is due to the fact that about 40% of the angiotensin II is formed via non-ACE pathways. ARBs also block the excessive angiotensin-mediated AT_1R activation[47] caused by the viral infection and exert anti-inflammatory effects.[48] Our findings support current recommendations of continued use of ACEIs and ARBs in Covid-19 patients.[5]

Limitations

Although the Medicare Part D Prescriber Public Use File has a wealth of information, the dataset has several limitations. The data may not be representative of a physician's entire practice or all of Medicare as it only includes information on beneficiaries enrolled in the Medicare Part D prescription drug program (approximately two-thirds of all Medicare beneficiaries). Besides, available data were for the year 2017 and did not reflect the most recent use of medications in 2020. Nevertheless, we measured exposure before the outcome, which is essential for the interpretation of the study findings. Furthermore, we did not adjust for adherence to medications. Nevertheless, a recent geospatial study of ACEI/ARB adherence[49] showed a relatively consistent geographic distribution of ACEI/ARB adherence across the US. An observational cross-sectional geospatial study is susceptible to reverse causality bias. To address this limitation, we performed a rigorous analysis of all other classes of cardiovascular medications. The results of sensitivity analyses were logically coherent and consistent with the main study results. Finally, unobserved confounding was likely present in this observational study. The most apparent missing data included the rate of Covid-19 testing. Therefore, observed effect sizes have to be interpreted with caution. However, unobserved confounding would not affect a relative comparison of ACEIs and ARBs.

Acknowledgments:

Authors acknowledge numerous scientists and institutions that provided open data.

Funding Sources:

This research was supported in part by the National Institute of Health HL118277 (LGT).

Disclosures

None.

References

1. Brojakowska A, Narula J, Shimony R, Bander J. Clinical Implications of SARS-Cov2 Interaction with Renin Angiotensin System. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2020;10.1016/j.jacc.2020.04.028
2. Zhou P, Yang XL, Wang XG, Hu B, Zhang L, Zhang W, Si HR, Zhu Y, Li B, Huang CL, Chen HD, Chen J, Luo Y, Guo H, Jiang RD, Liu MQ, Chen Y, Shen XR, Wang X, Zheng XS, Zhao K, Chen QJ, Deng F, Liu LL, Yan B, Zhan FX, Wang YY, Xiao GF, Shi ZL. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature*. 2020;579:270-273
3. Kuba K, Imai Y, Rao S, Gao H, Guo F, Guan B, Huan Y, Yang P, Zhang Y, Deng W, Bao L, Zhang B, Liu G, Wang Z, Chappell M, Liu Y, Zheng D, Leibbrandt A, Wada T, Slutsky AS, Liu D, Qin C, Jiang C, Penninger JM. A crucial role of angiotensin converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) in SARS coronavirus-induced lung injury. *Nat Med*. 2005;11:875-879
4. Xu X, Chen P, Wang J, Feng J, Zhou H, Li X, Zhong W, Hao P. Evolution of the novel coronavirus from the ongoing Wuhan outbreak and modeling of its spike protein for risk of human transmission. *Sci China Life Sci*. 2020;63:457-460
5. Gupta AK, Jneid H, Addison D, Ardehali H, Boehme AK, Borgaonkar S, Boulestreau R, Clerkin K, Delarche N, DeVon HA, Grumbach IM, Gutierrez J, Jones DA, Kapil V, Maniero C, Mentias A, Miller PS, May Ng S, Parekh JD, Sanchez RH, Teodor Sawicki K, A SJMTR, Ann Remme C, London B. Current perspectives on Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) and cardiovascular disease: A white paper by the JAHA editors. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2020;0:e017013

6. Guo J, Huang Z, Lin L, Lv J. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) and Cardiovascular Disease: A Viewpoint on the Potential Influence of Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibitors/Angiotensin Receptor Blockers on Onset and Severity of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2020;9:e016219
7. Sommerstein R, Kochen MM, Messerli FH, Grani C. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): Do Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibitors/Angiotensin Receptor Blockers Have a Biphasic Effect? *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2020;9:e016509
8. Vaduganathan M, Vardeny O, Michel T, McMurray JJV, Pfeffer MA, Solomon SD. Renin-Angiotensin-Aldosterone System Inhibitors in Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382:1653-1659
9. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Xia J, Liu H, Wu Y, Zhang L, Yu Z, Fang M, Yu T, Wang Y, Pan S, Zou X, Yuan S, Shang Y. Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective, observational study. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2020;8:475-481
10. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, Liu L, Shan H, Lei CL, Hui DSC, Du B, Li LJ, Zeng G, Yuen KY, Chen RC, Tang CL, Wang T, Chen PY, Xiang J, Li SY, Wang JL, Liang ZJ, Peng YX, Wei L, Liu Y, Hu YH, Peng P, Wang JM, Liu JY, Chen Z, Li G, Zheng ZJ, Qiu SQ, Luo J, Ye CJ, Zhu SY, Zhong NS, China Medical Treatment Expert Group for C. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382:1708-1720
11. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, Xiang J, Wang Y, Song B, Gu X, Guan L, Wei Y, Li H, Wu X, Xu J, Tu S, Zhang Y, Chen H, Cao B. Clinical course and risk factors for

mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet*. 2020;395:1054-1062

12. Hofmann H, Geier M, Marzi A, Krumbiegel M, Peipp M, Fey GH, Gramberg T, Pohlmann S. Susceptibility to SARS coronavirus S protein-driven infection correlates with expression of angiotensin converting enzyme 2 and infection can be blocked by soluble receptor. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun*. 2004;319:1216-1221
13. Rice GI, Thomas DA, Grant PJ, Turner AJ, Hooper NM. Evaluation of angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE), its homologue ACE2 and neprilysin in angiotensin peptide metabolism. *Biochem J*. 2004;383:45-51
14. Soler MJ, Ye M, Wysocki J, William J, Lloveras J, Batlle D. Localization of ACE2 in the renal vasculature: amplification by angiotensin II type 1 receptor blockade using telmisartan. *American Journal of Physiology-Renal Physiology*. 2009;296:F398-F405
15. Lakshmanan AP, Thandavarayan RA, Watanabe K, Sari FR, Meilei H, Giridharan VV, Sukumaran V, Soetikno V, Arumugam S, Suzuki K, Kodama M. Modulation of AT-1R/MAPK cascade by an olmesartan treatment attenuates diabetic nephropathy in streptozotocin-induced diabetic mice. *Molecular and Cellular Endocrinology*. 2012;348:104-111
16. Sukumaran V, Veeraveedu PT, Lakshmanan AP, Gurusamy N, Yamaguchi K, Ma M, Suzuki K, Kodama M, Watanabe K. Olmesartan medoxomil treatment potently improves cardiac myosin-induced dilated cardiomyopathy via the modulation of ACE-2 and ANG 1-7 mas receptor. *Free Radic Res*. 2012;46:850-860

17. Igase M, Strawn WB, Gallagher PE, Geary RL, Ferrario CM. Angiotensin II AT1 receptors regulate ACE2 and angiotensin-(1-7) expression in the aorta of spontaneously hypertensive rats. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol*. 2005;289:H1013-1019
18. Zhong JC, Ye JY, Jin HY, Yu X, Yu HM, Zhu DL, Gao PJ, Huang DY, Shuster M, Loibner H, Guo JM, Yu XY, Xiao BX, Gong ZH, Penninger JM, Oudit GY. Telmisartan attenuates aortic hypertrophy in hypertensive rats by the modulation of ACE2 and profilin-1 expression. *Regul Pept*. 2011;166:90-97
19. Sukumaran V, Veeraveedu PT, Gurusamy N, Yamaguchi K, Lakshmanan AP, Ma M, Suzuki K, Kodama M, Watanabe K. Cardioprotective effects of telmisartan against heart failure in rats induced by experimental autoimmune myocarditis through the modulation of angiotensin-converting enzyme-2/angiotensin 1-7/mas receptor axis. *Int J Biol Sci*. 2011;7:1077-1092
20. Ferrario CM, Jessup J, Chappell MC, Averill DB, Brosnihan KB, Tallant EA, Diz DI, Gallagher PE. Effect of Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibition and Angiotensin II Receptor Blockers on Cardiac Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme 2. *Circulation*. 2005;111:2605-2610
21. Sukumaran V, Veeraveedu PT, Gurusamy N, Lakshmanan AP, Yamaguchi Ki, Ma M, Suzuki K, Nagata M, Takagi R, Kodama M, Watanabe K. Olmesartan attenuates the development of heart failure after experimental autoimmune myocarditis in rats through the modulation of ANG 1–7 mas receptor. *Molecular and Cellular Endocrinology*. 2012;351:208-219

22. Ishiyama Y, Gallagher PE, Averill DB, Tallant EA, Brosnihan KB, Ferrario CM. Upregulation of Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme 2 After Myocardial Infarction by Blockade of Angiotensin II Receptors. *Hypertension*. 2004;43:970-976

23. Sukumaran V, Tsuchimochi H, Tatsumi E, Shirai M, Pearson JT. Azilsartan ameliorates diabetic cardiomyopathy in young db/db mice through the modulation of ACE-2/ANG 1-7/Mas receptor cascade. *Biochemical pharmacology*. 2017;144:90-99

24. Ferrario CM, Jessup J, Chappell MC, Averill DB, Brosnihan KB, Tallant EA, Diz DI, Gallagher PE. Effect of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibition and angiotensin II receptor blockers on cardiac angiotensin-converting enzyme 2. *Circulation*. 2005;111:2605-2610

25. Hamming I, Van Goor H, Turner AJ, Rushworth CA, Michaud AA, Corvol P, Navis G. Differential regulation of renal angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) and ACE2 during ACE inhibition and dietary sodium restriction in healthy rats. *Experimental Physiology*. 2008;93:631-638

26. Burrell LM, Risvanis J, Kubota E, Dean RG, MacDonald PS, Lu S, Tikellis C, Grant SL, Lew RA, Smith AI, Cooper ME, Johnston CI. Myocardial infarction increases ACE2 expression in rat and humans. *European Heart Journal*. 2005;26:369-375

27. United States Census Bureau. Cartographic Boundary Files - Shapefile. 2018. https://www.census.gov/geographies/mapping-files/time-series/geo/carto-boundary-file.html. Accessed May 5, 2020.

28. The Medicare Provider Utilization and Payment Data: Part D Prescriber Public Use File: 2017. https://data.cms.gov/Medicare-Part-D/Medicare-Provider-Utilization-and-Payment-Data-201/77gb-8z53/data. Accessed 5/18/2020.

29. Google Geocoding API. Googles Maps Platform. https://developers.google.com/maps/documentation/geocoding/start. Accessed 5/18/2020.

30. Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20:533-534

31. U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. CO-EST2019-alldata: Annual Resident Population Estimates, Estimated Components of Resident Population Change, and Rates of the Components of Resident Population Change for States and Counties: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019. File: 7/1/2019 County Population Estimates. Release Date: March 2020. https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/datasets/2010-2019/counties/totals/. Accessed 5/18/2020.

32. The US Census Bureau. Group Quarters Information. https://www.census.gov/2018censustest/gq. Accessed 5/18/2020.

33. The United States Department of Agriculture. Economic Research Service. County-Level Data Sets. https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/county-level-data-sets/. Accessed 5/18/2020.

34. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute. County Health Rankings & Roadmaps program. https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/explore-health-rankings/rankings-data-documentation. Accesssed 5/18/2020.

35. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion , Division for Heart Disease and Stroke Prevention. https://www.cdc.gov/dhdsp/maps/atlas/data-sources.html#dataControls. https://nccd.cdc.gov/DHDSPAtlas/?state=County&tt=HI&classid=1&subid=1&hifilters=%5

B%5B9,1%5D,%5B2,1%5D,%5B3,1%5D,%5B4,1%5D,%5B7,1%5D%5D&ol=%5B10,14%5D. Accessed 5/18/2020.

36. Drukker DM, Egger P, Prucha IR. On Two-Step Estimation of a Spatial Autoregressive Model with Autoregressive Disturbances and Endogenous Regressors. *Econometric Reviews*. 2013;32:686-733
37. Lee L-F. Asymptotic Distributions of Quasi-Maximum Likelihood Estimators for Spatial Autoregressive Models. *Econometrica*. 2004;72:1899-1925
38. Kelejian HH, Prucha IR. Specification and estimation of spatial autoregressive models with autoregressive and heteroskedastic disturbances. *Journal of Econometrics*. 2010;157:53-67
39. de Abajo FJ, Rodríguez-Martín S, Lerma V, Mejía-Abril G, Aguilar M, García-Luque A, Laredo L, Laosa O, Centeno-Soto GA, Ángeles Gálvez M, Puerro M, González-Rojano E, Pedraza L, de Pablo I, Abad-Santos F, Rodríguez-Mañas L, Gil M, Tobías A, Rodríguez-Miguel A, Rodríguez-Puyol D, Barreira-Hernandez D, Zubiaur P, Santos-Molina E, Pintos-Sánchez E, Navares-Gómez M, Aparicio RM, García-Rosado V, Gutiérrez-Ortega C, Pérez C, Ascaso A, Elvira C. Use of renin–angiotensin–aldosterone system inhibitors and risk of COVID-19 requiring admission to hospital: a case-population study. *The Lancet*. 2020;10.1016/s0140-6736(20)31030-8
40. Bean D, Kraljevic Z, Searle T, Bendayan R, Pickles A, Folarin A, Roguski L, Noor K, Shek A, o'gallagher K, Zakeri R, Shah A, Teo J, Dobson RJ. ACE-inhibitors and Angiotensin-2 Receptor Blockers are not associated with severe SARS- COVID19 infection in a multi-site UK acute Hospital Trust. *medRxiv*. 2020;10.1101/2020.04.07.20056788:2020.2004.2007.20056788

41. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, Krüger N, Herrler T, Erichsen S, Schiergens TS, Herrler G, Wu NH, Nitsche A, Müller MA, Drosten C, Pöhlmann S. SARS-CoV-2 Cell Entry Depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked by a Clinically Proven Protease Inhibitor. *Cell*. 2020;181:271-280.e278
42. Zou X, Chen K, Zou J, Han P, Hao J, Han Z. Single-cell RNA-seq data analysis on the receptor ACE2 expression reveals the potential risk of different human organs vulnerable to 2019-nCoV infection. *Front Med*. 2020;10.1007/s11684-020-0754-0
43. Wang K, Gheblawi M, Oudit GY. Angiotensin Converting Enzyme 2: A Double-Edged Sword. *Circulation*. 2020;10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.120.047049
44. Hollenberg NK, Fisher ND, Price DA. Pathways for angiotensin II generation in intact human tissue: evidence from comparative pharmacological interruption of the renin system. *Hypertension*. 1998;32:387-392
45. Petrie MC, Padmanabhan N, McDonald JE, Hillier C, Connell JM, McMurray JJ. Angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) and non-ACE dependent angiotensin II generation in resistance arteries from patients with heart failure and coronary heart disease. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2001;37:1056-1061
46. Dandona P, Dhindsa S, Ghanim H, Chaudhuri A. Angiotensin II and inflammation: the effect of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibition and angiotensin II receptor blockade. *Journal of human hypertension*. 2007;21:20-27
47. de Wit E, van Doremalen N, Falzarano D, Munster VJ. SARS and MERS: recent insights into emerging coronaviruses. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*. 2016;14:523-534
48. Dandona P, Kumar V, Aljada A, Ghanim H, Syed T, Hofmayer D, Mohanty P, Tripathy D, Garg R. Angiotensin II receptor blocker valsartan suppresses reactive oxygen species

generation in leukocytes, nuclear factor-kappa B, in mononuclear cells of normal subjects: evidence of an antiinflammatory action. *The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism*. 2003;88:4496-4501

49. Han Y, Saran R, Erickson SR, Hirth RA, He K, Balkrishnan R. Environmental and individual predictors of medication adherence among elderly patients with hypertension and chronic kidney disease: A geospatial approach. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*. 2020;16:422-430

Table 1. List of studied medications and average yearly total day supply per 1 county resident

Group	Medications		Total day supply per 1 county resident(median, IQR)
ACEI	Benazepril	Moexipril	9.9(6.6-13.2)
	Captopril	Perindopril	
	Enalapril	Quinapril	
	Fosinopril	Ramipril	
	Lisinopril	Trandolapril	
ARB	Azilsartan	Valsartan	5.5(3.4-7.9)
	Candesartan	Losartan	
	Eprosartan	Olmesartan	
	Ibesartan	Sacubitril/Valsartan	
	Telmisartan	Nebivolol/Valsartan	
Beta-blockers	Acebutolol	Metoprolol	8.2(4.9-12.0)
	Atenolol	Nadolol	
	Betaxolol	Pindolol	
	Bisoprolol	Propranolol	
	Esmolol		
Alpha- and beta-blockers (beta-blockers with vasodilation effect)	carvedilol	Nebivolol	2.0(1.2-3.2)
	Labetolol		
Alpha-blockers	Alfuzosin	Tamsulosin	2.6(1.6-3.8)
	Doxazosin	Terazosin	
	Prazosin	Silodosin	
Central acting	Clonidine		0.4(0.2-0.8)
Aldosterone Antagonists	Aldactone	Eplerenone	0.7(0.4-1.1)
	Spironolactone		
Dihydropyridine Calcium Channel Blockers	Nimodipine	Amlodipine	6.3(4.2-8.8)
	Isradipine	Nisoldipine	
	Nicardipine	Clevidipine	
	Nifedipine	Levamlodipine	
	Felodipine		
Non-Dihydropyridine Calcium Channel Blockers	Verapamil	Diltiazem	1.0(0.5-1.5)
Antiarrhythmic medications class I	Quinidine	Tocainide	0.10(0.03-0.23)
	Ajmaline	Encainide	

	Procainamide	Flecainide	
	Disopyramide	Propafenone	
	Lidocaine	Moricizine	
	Mexiletine		
Antiarrhythmic medications class III	Amiodarone	Dofetilide	0.2(0.1-0.5)
	Sotalol	Dronedarone	
	Ibutilide	Vernakalant	
Antiarrhythmic medications class V	Digoxin		0.3(0.1-0.5)
Loop diuretics	Bumetanide	Furosemide	3.9(2.4-5.7)
	Ethacrynic Acid	Torsemide	
Thiazides and Other Diuretics	Chlorothiazide	Metolazone	6.6(4.3-9.0)
	Bendroflumethiazide	Indapamide	
	Hydrochlorothiazide	Chlorthalidone	
	Methyclothiazide		
Vasodilators	Nitroglycerin, Nitrates	Nesiritide	0.07(0.02-0.15)
	Hydralizine	Nitroprusside	
Lipid-lowering drugs	Fluvastatin	Ezetimibe	14.9(9.5-20.3)
	Lovastatin	Cholestyramine	
	Rosuvastatin	Colestipol	
	Pitavastatin	Colesevelam	
	Simvastatin	Gemfibrozil	
	Atorvastatin	Fenofibrate	
	Pravastatin	Clofibrate	
	Alirocumab	Fenofibric Acid	
	Evolocumab	Niacin	
Anticoagulants	Warfarin	Dalteparin	2.5(1.4-3.8)
	Apixaban	Enoxaparin	
	Edoxaban	Argatroban	
	Fondaparinux	Bivalirudin	
	Rivaroxaban	Desirudin	
	Dabigatran		
Antiplatelet medications	Abciximab	Dipyridamole	1.8(1.1-2.9)
	Eptifibatide	Prasugrel	
	Tirofiban	Ticlopidine	
	Aspirin	Ticagrelor	
	Cangrelor	Caplacizumab	
	Cilostazol	Vorapaxar	

	Clopidogrel		
Insulins	Glargine	Lispro	2.0(1.2-2.9)
	Detemir	Aspart	
	NPH	Glulisine	
	Regular		
Oral hypoglycemic agents	*Sulfonylureas*	*Biguanides*	9.0(5.9-12.1)
	Chlorpropamide	Metformin	
	Glimepiride	*Sodium-Glucose Cotransporter-2 Inhibitors*	
	Glyburide		
	Glipizide	Canagliflozin	
	Tolazamide	Dapagliflozin	
	Tolbutamide	Empagliflozin	
	Meglitinides	Ertugliflozin	
	Repaglinide	*Incretin Mimetics*	
	Nateglinide	Exenatide	
	Thiazolidinediones	Liraglutide	
	Rosiglitazone	Dulaglutide	
	Pioglitazone	Semaglutide	
	Dipeptidyl Peptidase 4 Inhibitors	Albiglutide	
	Sitagliptin	Lixisenatide	
	Saxagliptin	*Amylin Analogues*	
	Linagliptin	Pramlintide	
	Alogliptin	*Alpha-Glucosidase Inhibitors*	
		Miglitol	
		Acarbose	

Table 2. Average characteristics of counties

Characteristic	Mean±Standard Deviation
Population in 2019	104,502±333,504
Births in 2019 per 100,000 population	1098.7±240.5
Deaths in 2019 per 100,000 population	1041.3±269.8
Group Quarters population in 2019 per 100,000 population	3375.5±4411.8
% Poverty	15.2±6.1
Median household income as % of state total	89.4±20.1
% Adults with self-reported poor or fair health	17.9±4.7
% Adult smoking	17.5±3.6
% Adult obesity	32.9±5.4
% Physical inactivity	27.4±5.7
% Excessive drinking	17.5±3.1
% Uninsured(all)	11.5±5.1
% with some college education	57.9±11.8
Air pollution index	8.98±2.01
% of households with high housing costs	11.1±3.7
% Food insecurity	13.2±4.0
% Insufficient Sleep	33.0±4.2
% Population age<18y	22.1±3.5
% Population age>65y	19.3±4.7
% Non-Hispanic Black	9.0±14.3
% Native Americans	2.3±7.7
% Asians	1.6±3.0
% Pacific Islanders	0.1±0.4
% Hispanics	9.7±13.8
% Non-Hispanic White	76.0±20.2
% Female	49.9±2.2
CVD hospitalization rate per 1000 Medicare Beneficiaries	59.5±16.7
CVD death rate per 100,000 population	239.9±51.5
Heart failure hospitalization rate per 1000 Medicare Beneficiaries	15.2±6.5
Heart Failure death rate per 100,000 population	107.9±25.8
CHD hospitalization rate per 1000 Medicare Beneficiaries	13.1±4.0
CHD death rate per 100,000 population	102.7±32.1
Diabetes age-adjusted percentage (age > 20y)	10.4±3.8

Table 3. Unadjusted impact on geospatial distribution of ACEI and ARB use

	ACEI use rate				ARB use rate			
Impact factor	Direct (county-own) effect		Indirect (spillover) effect		Direct (county-own) effect		Indirect (spillover) effect	
Per 1% rate increase	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value
Births in 2019	**+0.24(0.07-0.42)**	**0.006**	-1.91(-10.01-6.2)	0.645	**+0.33(0.16-0.51)**	**<0.0001**	-2.5(-8.7-3.9)	0.417
Deaths in 2019	**+0.41(0.17-0.65)**	**0.001**	**-1.56(-2.85 to -0.26)**	**0.018**	**+0.32(0.14-0.50)**	**<0.0001**	**-1.24(-1.91 to -0.56)**	**<0.0001**
GQ population 2019	-0.003(-0.039-0.033)	0.867	**-0.38(-0.50 to -0.26)**	**<0.0001**	+0.014(-0.021-0.050)	0.426	-2.75(-13.99-8.49)	0.632
Poverty	**+0.01(0.004-0.02)**	**0.001**	-0.27(-0.82-0.29)	0.348	+0.004(-0.005-0.01)	0.383	-0.03(-0.14-0.08)	0.625
Median HH income	**-0.005(-0.006 to -0.003)**	**<0.0001**	+0.009(-0.01-0.03)	0.372	-0.001(-0.003-0.0004)	0.176	-0.05(-0.28-0.19)	0.687
Poor/Fair Health	+1.26(-10.8-13.7)	0.816	+743(-34444-35931)	0.967	+0.30(-0.80-1.39)	0.594	-17.8(-93.4-57.7)	0.644
Smoking	-0.09(-1.47)	0.900	-4.08(-37.1-28.9)	0.808	**-1.68(-3.11 to -0.26)**	**0.021**	-51.9(-711-607)	0.877
Obesity	+0.30(-0.44-1.03)	0.425	+86(-1679-1851)	0.924	-0.13(-0.72-0.46)	0.667	+11.9(-0.90-24.65)	0.068
Physical Inactivity	**+0.70(0.16-1.25)**	**0.012**	+10.5(-2.3-23.3)	0.106	+0.12(-0.44-0.68)	0.685	+13.46(-0.38-27.31)	0.685
Drinking	**-1.60(-2.76 to -0.45)**	**0.007**	+4.4(-2.2-10.9)	0.189	+0.42(-0.68-1.53)	0.452	-51.8(-482-379)	0.814
Uninsured(all)	**-2.85(-3.78 to -1.92)**	**<0.0001**	+0.87(-5.02-6.76)	0.772	**-3.73(-4.72 to -2.74)**	**<0.0001**	**+5.16(1.52-8.80)**	**0.005**
Some college	**+0.36(0.09-0.62)**	**0.009**	-26(-261-208)	0.826	**+1.08(0.81-1.35)**	**<0.0001**	**+3.83(1.17-6.48)**	**0.005**
Air pollution index	**+0.09(0.06-0.11)**	**<0.0001**	+0.27(-0.16-0.70)	0.212	**+0.12(0.10-0.13)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.06(0.02-0.11)**	**0.010**
HH with high cost	**+4.4(3.5-5.3)**	**<0.0001**	-44(-207-124)	0.598	**+5.49(4.56-6.41)**	**<0.0001**	+3.39(-2.87-9.66)	0.288
Food insecurity	**+2.72(1.78-3.67)**	**<0.0001**	+159(-783-1101)	0.741	+2.7(-49.4-54.8)	0.920	+1338(-14340-14608)	0.986
Insufficient Sleep	+0.79(-0.20-1.78)	0.120	-10.8(-83.8-62.2)	0.771	**+0.97(0.01-1.93)**	**0.047**	-6.32(-173-160)	0.941
Population age<18	-0.78(-1.88-0.32)	0.162	**+25.2(3.0-46.3)**	**0.020**	-0.67(-1.90-0.56)	0.285	+25.5(-1.10-52.1)	0.060
Population age>65	**+1.09(0.42-1.75)**	**0.001**	**+7.38(5.90-8.85)**	**<0.0001**	+0.42(-0.28-1.13)	0.240	-2.09(-14.4-10.2)	0.739
Non-Hispanic Black	**+0.47(0.14-0.79)**	**0.005**	**-7.0(-12.2 to -1.8)**	**0.008**	**+1.09(0.73-1.45)**	**<0.0001**	-5.06(-10.2-0.06)	0.053
Native Americans	**-1.1(-1.6 to -0.6)**	**<0.0001**	**-19.7(-38.5 to-1.0)**	**0.039**	**-1.68(-2.26 to -1.09)**	**<0.0001**	-49.8(-162.3-62.7)	0.386
Asians	-0.41(-2.02-1.20)	0.614	+4.21(-29.9-38.3)	0.809	**+2.47(1.02-3.92)**	**0.001**	+16.8(-12.2-45.7)	0.256
Pacific Islanders	+1.68(-2.23-5.59)	0.401	-192(-702-318)	0.462	**+10.1(6.3-13.9)**	**<0.0001**	-836(-1825-154)	0.098
Hispanics	**+0.58(0.25-0.91)**	**0.001**	**-10.7(-17.2 to -4.3)**	**0.001**	+0.57(-41.7-42.9)	0.979	-14.9(-2689-2660)	0.991
Non-Hispanic White	-0.11(-0.33-0.12)	0.380	**+2.11(1.78-2.43)**	**<0.0001**	-0.23(-0.48-0.01)	0.065	**+0.92(0.11-1.73)**	**0.027**
Female	**+7.22(5.83-8.61)**	**<0.0001**	+1.7(-18.4 -21.8)	0.867	**+8.46(7.07-9.86)**	**<0.0001**	**-13.2(-23.2 to -3.2)**	**0.010**
CVD hospitalizations	+0.002(-0.0005-0.005)	0.100	+0.008(-0.009-0.03)	0.357	+0.0008(-0.002-0.004)	0.612	**+0.01(0.004-0.02)**	**0.006**

CVD death	**+0.003(0.002-0.004)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.01(0.004-0.02)**	**0.001**	**+0.002(0.001-0.003)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.008(0.003-0.01)**	**0.003**
HF hospitalizations	+0.002(-0.004-0.008)	0.563	+0.04(-0.0007-0.08)	0.054	+0.001(-0.006-0.008)	0.751	**+0.05(0.01-0.08)**	**0.006**
HF death	**+0.003(0.002-0.004)**	**<0.0001**	+0.04(-0.01-0.09)	0.127	+0.001(-0.00006-0.003)	0.060	+0.04(-0.008-0.09)	0.103
CHD hospitalizations	**+0.02(0.009-0.03)**	**<0.0001**	-0.06(-0.36-0.25)	0.717	**+0.01(0.00001-0.02)**	**0.050**	-0.34(-3.17-2.48)	0.812
CHD death	**+0.003(0.002-0.004)**	**<0.0001**	-0.07(-0.55-0.41)	0.779	**+0.002(0.0008-0.003)**	**<0.0001**	+0.03(-0.004-0.07)	0.082
Diabetes	+0.0006(-0.009-0.01)	0.893	+0.05(-0.04-0.14)	0.258	-0.004(-0.01-0.006)	0.393	**+0.08(0.04-0.11)**	**<0.0001**

Table 4. Unadjusted impact on Covid-19 confirmed case and death rate

	Covid-19 confirmed case rate				Covid-19 death rate			
Impact factor	Direct (county-own) effect		Indirect (spillover) effect		Direct (county-own) effect		Indirect (spillover) effect	
Per 1% rate increase	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value
All CVD drugs use	**+0.20(0.13-0.27)**	**<0.0001**	**+1.22(0.84-1.60)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.10(0.06-0.14)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.18(0.11-0.25)**	**<0.0001**
Births in 2019	**+1.05(0.73-1.37)**	**<0.0001**	**-3.67(-5.03 to -2.32)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.49(0.28-0.69)**	**<0.0001**	**-0.86(-1.58 to -0.14)**	**0.019**
Deaths in 2019	**-0.40(-0.67 to -0.13)**	**0.003**	-0.92(-2.19-0.35)	0.156	**-0.23(-0.33 to -0.13)**	**<0.0001**	+0.07(-0.13-0.28)	0.490
GQ population 2019	-0.004(-0.065-0.057)	0.897	**-2.60(-3.81 to -1.38)**	**<0.0001**	+0.0001(-0.036-0.036)	0.995	**-0.39(-0.48 to -0.30)**	**<0.0001**
Poverty	+0.002(-0.009-0.012)	0.764	**+0.32(0.13-0.51)**	**0.001**	-0.002(-0.01-0.006)	0.602	**+0.08(0.06-0.11)**	**<0.0001**
Median HH income	**+0.01(0.007-0.01)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.10(0.02-0.18)**	**0.014**	**+0.007(0.005-0.009)**	**<0.0001**	+0.004(-0.001-0.009)	0.104
Poor/Fair Health	**+2.58(0.81-4.34)**	**0.004**	**+30.2(18.4-41.9)**	**<0.0001**	+0.07(-1.11-1.24)	0.912	**+6.89(4.74-9.04)**	**<0.0001**
Smoking	+0.67(-1.35-2.70)	0.514	**+30.7(13.1-48.3)**	**0.001**	**-2.23(-3.57 to-0.89)**	**0.001**	+7.22(-7.10-21.55)	0.323
Obesity	+0.63-0.51-1.76)	0.280	**+22.9(13.8-32.1)**	**<0.0001**	**-1.26(-2.16 to -0.36)**	**0.006**	**+6.30(4.49-8.11)**	**<0.0001**
Physical Inactivity	**-3.6(-4.7 to-2.5)**	**<0.0001**	**+40.0(14.6-65.4)**	**0.002**	**-2.58(-3.49 to -1.67)**	**<0.0001**	**+9.09(6.78-11.39)**	**<0.0001**
Drinking	**+7.5(4.9-10.1)**	**<0.0001**	**+43.5(9.1-77.9)**	**0.013**	**+2.90(1.09-4.71)**	**0.002**	+3.51(-0.51-7.53)	0.087
Uninsured(all)	**-2.47(-4.24 to-0.70)**	**0.006**	-375(-2440-1689)	0.721	**-2.00(-3.22 to -0.77)**	**0.001**	**+24.3(12.4-36.3)**	**<0.0001**
Some college	+0.23(-0.39-0.84)	0.472	-105(-1080-870)	0.833	**+1.15(0.77-1.53)**	**<0.0001**	+0.59(-0.22-1.40)	0.153
Air pollution index	**+0.37(0.24-0.50)**	**<0.0001**	+0.08(-0.45-0.60)	0.775	**+0.21(0.17-0.25)**	**<0.0001**	**-0.11(-0.21 to -0.004)**	**0.041**
HH with high cost	**+7.5(5.6-9.4)**	**<0.0001**	**+25.8(23.2-28.4)**	**<0.0001**	**+6.56(5.22-7.90)**	**<0.0001**	+0.63(-5.18-6.43)	0.833
Food insecurity	-0.61(-2.52-1.29)	0.528	+102(-73-277)	0.252	+0.92(-0.56-2.40)	0.223	**+8.61(5.68-11.55)**	**<0.0001**
Insufficient Sleep	**+5.2(0.9-9.6)**	**0.019**	+8.0(-0.6-16.6)	0.068	**+2.82(1.12-4.52)**	**0.001**	-0.58(-4.62-3.47)	0.780
Population age<18	**+5.9(3.9-8.0)**	**<0.0001**	**+32.6(11.5-53.9)**	**0.002**	**+2.69(1.42-3.96)**	**<0.0001**	+2.32(-0.23-4.89)	0.075
Population age>65	**-8.4(-9.8 to-7.1)**	**<0.0001**	+243(-540-1028)	0.542	**-3.96(-4.88 to -3.03)**	**<0.0001**	**+15.07(10.27-19.87)**	**<0.0001**
Non-Hispanic Black	**+2.8(2.3-3.2)**	**<0.0001**	**+5.7(1.9-9.6)**	**0.003**	**+2.46(1.87-3.05)**	**<0.0001**	**+6.13(4.80-7.46)**	**<0.0001**

Native Americans	+0.23(-0.76-1.22)	0.643	**-71.8(-103.9 to -39.6)**	**<0.0001**	+0.10(-0.53-0.73)	0.751	-410(-1784-964)	0.559
Asians	**+6.2(2.8-9.6)**	**<0.0001**	**+143(112-175)**	**<0.0001**	**+6.05(3.82-8.28)**	**<0.0001**	**+117.3(87.2-147.4)**	**<0.0001**
Pacific Islanders	**+28.0(14.6-41.4)**	**<0.0001**	+688(-827-2205)	0.373	**+9.7(1.5-17.9)**	**0.021**	**+1948(368-3528)**	**0.016**
Hispanics	**+3.6(2.8-4.4)**	**<0.0001**	**-33.5(-56.6 to -10.4)**	**0.004**	**+1.31(0.85-1.77)**	**<0.0001**	**+24.8(4.8-44.7)**	**0.015**
Non-Hispanic White	**-2.6(-3.0 to -2.1)**	**<0.0001**	-8.8(-26.3 -8.6)	0.322	**-1.45(-1.76 to -1.13)**	**<0.0001**	**+5.57(3.48-7.66)**	**<0.0001**
Female	+2.2(-0.8-5.1)	0.148	**+12.3(1.3-23.2)**	**0.029**	**+5.14(3.00-7.29)**	**<0.0001**	**-6.00(-10.63 to -1.38)**	**0.011**
CVD hospitalizations	**+0.02(0.01-0.02)**	**<0.0001**	+0.07(-0.001-0.14)	0.054	**+0.005(0.002-0.009)**	**0.006**	**+0.02(0.002-0.03)**	**0.024**
CVD death	**-0.002(-0.004 to -0.001)**	**0.001**	**+0.04(0.01-0.07)**	**0.007**	**-0.002(-0.003 to -0.0009)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.009(0.006-0.01)**	**<0.0001**
HF hospitalizations	**+0.04(0.03-0.06)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.08(0.004-0.15)**	**0.039**	+0.02(-0.03-0.07)	0.387	-0.06(-3.44-3.32)	0.973
HF death	-0.005(-0.007 to -0.003)	<0.0001	-0.25(-1.00-0.50)	0.510	**-0.004(-0.006 to -0.002)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.02(0.02-0.03)**	**<0.0001**
CHD hospitalizations	-0.003(-0.05-0.04)	0.875	+0.04(-3.22-3.31)	0.979	-0.03(-0.13-0.06)	0.506	-0.09(-6.18-6.00)	0.976
CHD death	**-0.004(-0.006(-0.003)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.13(0.05-0.21)**	**0.002**	**-0.004(-0.006 to -0.002)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.02(0.02-0.03)**	**<0.0001**
Diabetes	+0.01(-0.004-0.03)	0.141	**+0.46(0.07-0.83)**	**0.016**	-0.003(-0.06-0.05)	0.924	-0.03(-3.42-3.37)	0.988

HH=household

Table 5. Unadjusted and adjusted impact of the ACEIs and ARBs use rate on Covid-19 confirmed case and death rate

	Impact factor	Direct (county-own) effect		Indirect (spillover) effect		Direct (county-own) effect		Indirect (spillover) effect	
Model		Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value
U	ACEI	**+0.17(0.09-0.26)**	**<0.0001**	**+2.78(1.40-4.17)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.12(0.06-0.17)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.42(0.22-0.61)**	**<0.0001**
U	ARB	**+0.24(0.17-0.31)**	**<0.0001**	**+1.56(1.36-1.76)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.17(0.12-0.22)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.53(0.41-0.64)**	**<0.0001**
A	ACEI	+0.30(-7.67-8.27)	0.941	+0.23(-154.2-154.7)	0.998	+0.16(-0.12-0.43)	0.270	-0.88(-2.78-1.02)	0.365
A	ARB	**+0.20(0.03-0.37)**	**0.019**	-1.56(-6.55-3.44)	0.541	**+0.14(0.08-0.21)**	**<0.0001**	-0.64(-1.62-0.34)	0.203

U=unadjusted. A=adjusted for the percentage of Black non-Hispanic county residents, percentage of a county residents younger than 18 years of age, percentage of residents with at least some college degree, median household income as a percent of the state total, air quality index, CDC-reported CVD hospitalization rate in Medicare beneficiaries, and CVD death rate in a total county population.

Supplemental Table 1. Unadjusted impact of the use of cardiovascular medications on Covid-19 confirmed case and death rate

Impact factor	Direct (county-own) effect		Indirect (spillover) effect		Direct (county-own) effect		Indirect (spillover) effect	
	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value
Lipid-lowering drugs	**+0.25(0.17-0.33)**	**<0.0001**	-0.06(-3.04-2.93)	0.970	**+0.16(0.11-0.21)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.31(0.20-0.40)**	**<0.0001**
CCB dihydropyridine	**+0.26(0.18-0.34)**	**<0.0001**	**+1.19(0.73-1.64)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.19(0.14-0.24)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.44(0.30-0.57)**	**<0.0001**
CCB Nondihydropyridine	-0.03(-0.10-0.04)	0.348	+0.49(-1.65-2.63)	0.656	**+0.08(0.02-0.13)**	**0.006**	**+3.48(0.21-6.75)**	**0.037**
Beta-blockers	**+0.19(0.12-0.27)**	**<0.0001**	-0.02(-3.02-2.98)	0.991	**+0.13(0.08-0.18)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.43(0.16-0.69)**	**0.002**
Alpha-blockers	**+0.15(0.08-0.22)**	**<0.0001**	**+1.63(0.87-2.40)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.13(0.07-0.19)**	**<0.0001**	**+1.14(0.78-1.50)**	**<0.0001**
Alpha-and-beta-blockers	**+0.12(0.05-0.19)**	**0.001**	+1.21(-0.11-2.53)	0.072	**+0.18(0.12-0.23)**	**<0.0001**	+0.46(-4.16-5.08)	0.846
Aldosterone antagonists	-0.06(-0.13-0.01)	0.077	**-3.63(-6.71 to -0.54)**	**0.021**	**+0.06(0.003-0.11)**	**0.040**	-1.19(-3.99-1.61)	0.403
Anticoagulants	+0.05(-0.02-0.11)	0.177	-2.53(-9.56-4.51)	0.482	**+0.11(0.06-0.16)**	**<0.0001**	**+1.44(1.04-1.85)**	**<0.0001**
Anti-platelets	**+0.09(0.02-0.15)**	**0.009**	+0.99(-0.34-2.31)	0.143	**+0.16(0.10-0.21)**	**<0.0001**	+1.60(-0.28-3.48)	0.094
AAD class I	**-0.12(-0.16 to -0.07)**	**<0.0001**	**-1.08(-1.82 to -0.33)**	**0.005**	+0.01(-0.-2-0.04)	0.440	**-0.89(-1.08 to -0.70)**	**<0.0001**
AAD class III	**-0.09(-0.14 to -0.05)**	**<0.0001**	**-1.82(-2.87 to -0.78)**	**0.001**	**+0.05(0.01-0.09)**	**0.007**	**-1.33(-1.60 to -1.07)**	**<0.0001**
AAD class V	**-0.16(-0.22 to -0.11)**	**<0.0001**	**-2.98(-3.25 to -2.71)**	**<0.0001**	+0.04(-2.92-3.00)	0.980	+2.46(-183.7-188.7)	0.979
Vasodilators	**-0.19(-0.23 to -0.14)**	**<0.0001**	**-1.32(-1.68 to -0.95)**	**<0.0001**	**-0.08(-0.12 to -0.05)**	**<0.0001**	**-0.55(-0.77 to -0.34)**	**<0.0001**
Central	**-0.19(-0.26to -0.11)**	**<0.0001**	+0.84(-1.27-2.96)	0.431	-0.01(-0.06-0.05)	0.831	**-4.23(-7.41 to -1.04)**	**0.009**
Loop diuretics	+0.08(-0.001-0.16)	0.052	+8.80(-5.63-23.23)	0.232	**+0.08(0.03-0.14)**	**0.004**	**+0.88(0.68-1.08)**	**<0.0001**
Thiazides, other diuretics	**+0.20(0.11-0.29)**	**<0.0001**	-0.27(-5.85-5.32)	0.925	**+0.14(0.08-0.19)**	**<0.0001**	**+0.46(0.09-0.82)**	**0.013**
Insulins	**+0.14(0.06-0.22)**	**<0.0001**	+0.38(-2.26-3.02)	0.778	**+0.11(0.06-0.17)**	**<0.0001**	**+1.38(1.06-1.71)**	**<0.0001**
Oral hypoglycemic drugs	**+0.21(0.12-0.30)**	**<0.0001**	+6.20(-27.11-39.52)	0.715	**+0.12(0.06-0.17)**	**<0.0001**	+0.37(-0.08-0.83)	0.108

Supplemental Table 2. Adjusted impact of cardiovascular medications use on Covid-19 confirmed case and death rate

Impact factor	Direct (county-own) effect		Indirect (spillover) effect		Direct (county-own) effect		Indirect (spillover) effect	
	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value	Marginal effect (95%CI)	P-value
Lipid-lowering drugs	+0.22(-0.67-1.11)	0.622	-2.14(-25.8-21.5)	0.860	+0.17(-0.77-1.11)	0.729	-0.65(-3.49-2.19)	0.653
CCB dihydropyridine	**+0.24(0.11-0.36)**	**<0.0001**	-1.46(-3.57-0.65)	0.174	**+0.17(0.06-0.28)**	**0.002**	-0.95(-2.56-0.66)	0.246
CCB Nondihydropyridine	+0.05(-0.13-0.22)	0.590	-0.74(-2.13-0.66)	0.300	+0.11(-4.41-4.63)	0.961	+0.56(-286.7-287.8)	0.997
Beta-blockers	+0.38(-70.8-71.5)	0.992	+2.34(-1738-1743)	0.998	**+0.15(0.003-0.29)**	**0.046**	-0.62(-1.74-0.50)	0.277
Alpha-blockers	+0.17(-0.20-0.54)	0.373	-1.00(-3.11-1.11)	0.352	**+0.14(0.06-0.22)**	**0.001**	-1.05(-6.17-4.07)	0.688
Alpha-and-beta-blockers	+0.11(-0.12-0.35)	0.357	-1.21(-11.1-8.72)	0.811	**+0.14(0.06-0.22)**	**<0.0001**	-0.96(-2.90-0.99)	0.335
Aldosterone antagonists	+0.06(-0.04-0.15)	0.227	-0.74(-2.13-0.66)	0.300	+0.09(-0.19-0.38)	0.519	-0.29(-1.31-0.73)	0.579
Anticoagulants	**+0.11(0.004-0.21)**	**0.042**	-0.91(-2.32-0.51)	0.209	**+0.11(0.05-0.17)**	**<0.0001**	-0.53(-1.49-0.43)	0.280
Anti-platelets	+0.18(-7.68-8.05)	0.964	-0.81(-17.78-16.17)	0.926	**+0.15(0.07-0.23)**	**<0.0001**	-1.34(-6.92-4.25)	0.639
AAD class I	**-0.07(-0.11 to -0.02)**	**0.007**	-0.18(-0.76-0.39)	0.531	+0.01(-0.03-0.04)	0.711	+0.03(-0.46-0.52)	0.892
AAD class III	**-0.07(-0.13 to -0.01)**	**0.031**	+0.31(-3.59-4.21)	0.876	+0.03(-0.03-0.09)	0.282	-0.58(-2.37-1.21)	0.528
AAD class V	-0.06(-0.14-0.01)	0.098	+0.51(-0.41-1.42)	0.278	+0.002(-0.06-0.07)	0.954	+0.08(-0.50-0.65)	0.799
Vasodilators	**-0.09(-0.14 to -0.05)**	**<0.0001**	-0.14(-0.55-0.27)	0.494	**-0.05(-0.09 to -0.004)**	**0.031**	+0.03(-1.03-1.09)	0.953
Central	-0.11(-1.51-1.28)	0.874	+0.04(-26.8-26.9)	0.998	+0.007(-0.11-0.13)	0.901	-0.57(-3.76-2.62)	0.727
Loop diuretics	**+0.16(0.01-0.30)**	**0.037**	-1.33(-5.16-2.51)	0.499	**+0.11(0.04-0.18)**	**0.001**	-0.65(-1.83-0.54)	0.285
Thiazides, other diuretics	+0.20(-0.23-0.63)	0.369	-1.35(-8.93-6.23)	0.727	**+0.14(0.06-0.23)**	**0.001**	-1.01(-3.33-1.31)	0.395
Insulins	+0.17(-0.10-0.44)	0.214	-1.64(-14.7-11.4)	0.806	**+0.12(0.04-0.20)**	**0.002**	-0.93(-5.62-3.77)	0.699
Oral hypoglycemic drugs	+0.22(-0.04-0.49)	0.101	-1.82(-9.67-6.03)	0.650	**+0.12(0.05-0.20)**	**0.001**	-0.85(-2.81-1.12)	0.397

Figure legends

Figure 1. ACEIs (**A**) and ARBs (**B**) total day supply rate and their ratio (**C**).

Figure 2. Confirmed Covid-19 cases (**A**) and deaths (**B**) in the United States adjusted for a county population size.

Figure 3. Marginsplot of the adjusted effect of ACEI (**A, B**) and ARB (C**, D**) use rate on Covid-19 confirmed cases rate (**A, C**) and death rate (**B, D**). All variables were log-transformed and reflected the relative change. Plots show the effect of ACEI (**A, B**) and ARB (**C, D**) use rate drop and increase by 0.5%, 0.4%, 0.3%, 0.2%, 0.1% for each county. All models were adjusted for the percentage of Black non-Hispanic county residents, percentage of a county residents younger than 18 years of age, percentage of residents with at least some college degree, median household income as a percent of the state total, air quality index, CVD hospitalization rate in Medicare beneficiaries, and CVD death rate in a total county population.

Figure 1A:



Figure 1B:



Figure 1C:


(2.52409,37.17593]
(2.12368,2.52409]
(1.886059,2.12368]
(1.684291,1.886059]
(1.489787,1.684291]
(1.246567,1.489787]
[0,1.246567]

Figure 2A:



Figure 2B:



Figure 3:


Predictive Margins with 95% CIs
Predictive Margins with 95% CIs
A
B
C
D
Reduced-Form Mean COVID19 confirmed cases rate change,%
Reduced-Form Mean COVID19 death rate change, %
ACEI use rate change, %
ACEI use rate change, %
Observed
Observed
-0.5 -0.4 -0.3 -0.2 -0.1 +0.1 +0.2 +0.3 +0.4 +0.5
ARB use rate change, %
ARB use rate change, %