

1 **Full Title: Effect of social distancing on COVID-19 incidence and mortality in the US**

2

3 **Short Title: Objective social distancing and COVID-19 incidence and mortality in the US**

4

5

6 Trang VoPham, PhD, MS^{1*}

7 Matthew D. Weaver, PhD^{2,3*}

8 Jaime E. Hart, ScD^{4,5}

9 Mimi Ton, MPH⁶

10 Emily White, PhD^{6,7}

11 Polly A. Newcomb, PhD, MPH^{6,7}

12

13

14 1. Epidemiology Program, Division of Public Health Sciences, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center,
15 Seattle, WA

16 2. Division of Sleep and Circadian Disorders, Departments of Medicine and Neurology, Brigham and
17 Women's Hospital, Boston, MA

18 3. Division of Sleep Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

19 4. Channing Division of Network Medicine, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Hospital and
20 Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

21 5. Exposure, Epidemiology and Risk Program, Department of Environmental Health, Harvard T.H. Chan
22 School of Public Health, Boston, MA

23 6. Cancer Prevention Program, Division of Public Health Sciences, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research
24 Center, Seattle, WA

25 7. Department of Epidemiology, University of Washington School of Public Health, Seattle, WA

26

27 * co-first-author

28

29

30 Corresponding Author

31

32 Trang VoPham, PhD, MS

33 Epidemiology Program

34 Division of Public Health Sciences

35 Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center

36 1100 Fairview Ave N, Mailstop: M4-B874, Seattle, WA 98109

37 Email: tvopham@fredhutch.org

38 Phone: 206-667-2642

39

40 **Abstract**

41 Social distancing policies were implemented in most US states as a containment strategy against severe
42 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). The effectiveness of these policy interventions on
43 morbidity and mortality remains unknown. Our analysis examined the associations between statewide
44 policies and objective measures of social distancing, and objective social distancing and COVID-19 incidence
45 and mortality. We used nationwide, de-identified smartphone GPS data to estimate county-level social
46 distancing. COVID-19 incidence and mortality data were from the Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource
47 Center. Generalized linear mixed models were used to estimate incidence rate ratios (IRRs) and 95%
48 confidence intervals (CIs) for the association between objective social distancing and COVID-19 incidence
49 and mortality. Stay-at-home orders were associated with a 35% increase in social distancing. Higher social
50 distancing was associated with a 29% reduction in COVID-19 incidence (adjusted IRR 0.71; 95% CI 0.57-
51 0.87) and a 35% reduction in COVID-19 mortality (adjusted IRR 0.65; 95% CI 0.55-0.76). These findings
52 provide evidence to inform ongoing national discussions on the effectiveness of these public health
53 measures and the potential implications of returning to normal social activity.

54

55

56 **Introduction**

57 Policies intended to increase social distancing were implemented in most US states to reduce transmission
58 of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). An increase in social distancing, through
59 prohibiting social gatherings, non-essential business closures, and stay-at-home orders, may reduce disease
60 incidence (1), but also carries personal and economic consequences. The effectiveness of the social
61 distancing interventions implemented in the US on morbidity and mortality has not been fully described (2).
62 This evidence is critical to inform ongoing public policy decisions and implement effective responses to future
63 pandemics (3). We sought to examine the associations between statewide policies and objective measures
64 of social distancing, and between objective social distancing and COVID-19 incidence and mortality in the
65 US.

66

67 **Materials and Methods**

68 We used nationwide, de-identified smartphone GPS data provided by Unacast to objectively estimate
69 county-level social distancing based on: 1) change in average distance traveled (per device), 2) change in
70 non-essential venue visitation (e.g., hair salons), and 3) the probability that two users were in close
71 proximity (i.e., spatial distance of ≤ 50 m and temporal distance of ≤ 60 minutes) (4). Smartphone GPS
72 devices were assigned to counties based on the longest recorded location. To calculate the change in
73 objective social distancing for any given day, these measures were compared to the same day of the
74 week during the pre-COVID-19 period (defined by Unacast as the four weeks prior to March 8, 2020) and
75 scored 1-5 (higher numbers indicate increased distancing relative to the pre-COVID-19 comparator).
76 Social distancing data were not provided for counties with a population less than 1,000; where less than
77 100 smartphone devices were observed for 70% of the days during the pre-COVID-19 period; or where
78 less than 5 non-essential venues or 100 non-essential venue visits occurred during the pre-COVID-19

79 period. Incidence and mortality data per county were collected from the Johns Hopkins Coronavirus
80 Resource Center (5).

81
82 For the statistical analysis, a paired t-test was used to compare objective social distancing scores before
83 and after state stay-at-home order implementation. Generalized linear mixed models with a Poisson
84 distribution accounting for counties nested within states were used to calculate incidence rate ratios
85 (IRRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs). We used the earliest available social distancing data (February
86 24, 2020) as the independent variable in the incidence and mortality models. Restricted cubic regression
87 splines were used to test for deviations from linearity. Similar results were observed using scaled
88 Poisson models accounting for overdispersion. Multivariable models were *a priori* adjusted for variables
89 associated with incidence rates or case ascertainment: county-level Hispanic ethnicity, non-white race,
90 percent aged 50 years and older (6), percent males, median household income, population density, and
91 obesity prevalence, and state-level cumulative COVID-19 testing rate. Covariate data were from the US
92 Census Bureau 2018 American Community Survey, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and University of
93 Wisconsin Population Health Institute County Health Rankings and Roadmaps, and The COVID Tracking
94 Project. The analysis encompassed the timeframe from February 24, 2020 to April 29, 2020, when some
95 states began to reopen. All tests were two-sided and $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.
96 Our study did not constitute human subjects research and was considered exempt from Institutional
97 Review Board review.

98
99 **Results**

100 Objective social distancing data were available for 3,054 counties (94%) in all 50 states and Washington,
101 D.C. Average social distancing prior to the first COVID-19 case, average social distancing before and after
102 policy changes, and COVID-19 incidence rates on April 29, 2020 by county are presented in Figure 1.

103 Forty-five states (including Washington, D.C.) implemented stay-at-home guidance. Stay-at-home orders
104 were associated with a 35% increase in social distancing (mean score 2.01 (SD 0.74) to 2.71 (SD 0.71); p
105 < 0.001). Each one-unit increase in social distancing was associated with a statistically significant
106 reduction in COVID-19 incidence (adjusted IRR 0.71; 95% CI 0.57-0.87) and mortality (adjusted IRR 0.65;
107 95% CI 0.55-0.76) (Table 1).

108
109 **Figure 1.** County-level objective social distancing prior to the first confirmed COVID-19 case, changes in
110 objective social distancing before and after stay-at-home guidance, and COVID-19 incidence in the US.

111 Social distancing (from February 24, 2020 until the date that the first confirmed COVID-19 case occurred
112 in each county) was mapped using the Unacast scoring scheme; average county-level social distancing
113 was 2.03 (SD 0.85), where higher values indicate improved social distancing. Forty-five states (including
114 Washington, D.C.) implemented stay-at-home guidance (Oklahoma and Utah enacted policies in major
115 population centers only). Social distancing before and after stay-at-home guidance was mapped using
116 Unacast data from February 24, 2020 to April 29, 2020. COVID-19 incidence (most current data acquired
117 on April 29, 2020) was mapped using quartiles based on counties with >0 cases.

118
119 **Table 1.** The adjusted association between county-level objective social distancing scores and COVID-19
120 incidence and mortality in the US

COVID-19	Adjusted IRR (95% CI) per 1-unit increase in objective social distancing score ^a	p-value
Incidence	0.71 (0.57-0.87)	< 0.001
Mortality	0.65 (0.55-0.76)	< 0.001

121

122 ^a A total of 3,054 counties were included in the analysis. Counties in which social distancing data were
123 unavailable (n=192) were excluded. Social distancing data from February 24, 2020 (earliest available for
124 all counties) and COVID-19 incidence and mortality from April 29, 2020 (when the first stay-at-home
125 guidance was lifted) were used in modeling. All models are adjusted for county-level Hispanic ethnicity,
126 non-white race, percent aged 50 years and older, percent males, median household income, population
127 density, and obesity prevalence, and state-level cumulative COVID-19 testing rate
128

129

130 **Discussion**

131 Social distancing policies implemented in states across the US resulted in meaningful behavioral change.

132 We observed a 35% increase in objective social distancing following the implementation of state-level

133 stay-at-home orders. This is consistent with emerging evidence using a different social distancing

134 methodology (Google human mobility indicators) showing that state policies reduced mobility by 37%

135 within approximately 2 weeks after their implementation (7). A separate recent effort also

136 demonstrated that state policies were associated with a 5-10% increase in the prevalence of residents

137 staying at home full-time (8). Our study builds on these findings by using a nationally representative

138 dataset that objectively assessed social distancing through GPS positioning throughout the state policy

139 implementation window, and further collected information on disease transmission and outcomes.

140

141 We found that state stay-at-home policies were successful in reducing disease. Each one-unit increase in

142 objective social distancing was associated with a 29% reduction in COVID-19 incidence and a 35%

143 reduction in COVID-19 mortality. Several studies have reported a downward deflection in the daily

144 growth rate of COVID-19 cases in selected areas following these policy interventions (9, 10), though the

145 evidence has not been entirely consistent. An analysis of bordering counties in Iowa and Illinois reported

146 that COVID-19 incidence increased more quickly in Iowa counties, where no statewide stay-at-home

147 order was enacted, compared to Illinois counties where a statewide stay-at-home order was put in place

148 (11). Other studies have reported that statewide interventions have only stabilized rather than reduced
149 disease transmission (12).

150
151 Our study was observational and we are unable to directly attribute the associations to social distancing
152 policies. There may be residual confounding and measurement error in social distancing and outcome
153 ascertainment, as testing was not widely accessible at the population level during our study time period.

154

155 **Conclusions**

156 This evidence strongly suggests that policies promoting increased social distancing were beneficial.
157 Higher social distancing was associated with marked reductions in COVID-19 incidence and mortality.
158 These findings provide evidence to inform ongoing national discussions on the effectiveness of these
159 public health measures and the potential implications of returning to normal social activity.

160

161 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures:**

162 The authors report no conflicts of interest.

163 **Funding/Support:**

164 MDW was partially supported by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health R01
165 OH011773 and the Brigham Research Institute Fund to Sustain Research Excellence. JEH was partially
166 supported by NIH/NIEHS P30 ES000002. PAN was partially supported by NIH K05 CA152715.

167 **Role of the Funder/Sponsor:**

168 The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and
169 interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit
170 the manuscript for publication.

171 **Disclaimer:**

172 The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official
173 views of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health or the National Institutes of Health.

174 **Additional Contributions:**


175 We thank Unacast, Johns Hopkins University, US Census Bureau, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation,
176 University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute, and The COVID Tracking Project for providing
177 publicly available data.

178

179 **References**

- 180 1. Prem K, Liu Y, Russell TW, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Davies N, et al. The effect of control strategies
181 to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling study.
182 *Lancet Public Health*. 2020;5(5):e261-e70.
- 183 2. Lasry A, Kidder D, Hast M, Poovey J, Sunshine G, Zviedrite N, et al. Timing of community
184 mitigation and changes in reported COVID-19 and community mobility—four US metropolitan areas,
185 February 26–April 1, 2020. 2020.
- 186 3. Walensky RP, Del Rio C. From Mitigation to Containment of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Putting the
187 SARS-CoV-2 Genie Back in the Bottle. *JAMA*. 2020.
- 188 4. Unacast Social Distancing Dataset. 2020; <https://www.unacast.com/data-for-good>. Accessed
189 version from 24 May 2020.
- 190 5. Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. 2020; <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/>. Accessed
191 version from 24 May 2020.
- 192 6. Garg S. Hospitalization rates and characteristics of patients hospitalized with laboratory-
193 confirmed coronavirus disease 2019—COVID-NET, 14 States, March 1–30, 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and*
194 *mortality weekly report*. 2020;69.
- 195 7. Abouk R, Heydari B. The immediate effect of covid-19 policies on social distancing behavior in
196 the united states. Available at SSRN. 2020.
- 197 8. Dave DM, Friedson AI, Matsuzawa K, Sabia JJ. When do shelter-in-place orders fight COVID-19
198 best? Policy heterogeneity across states and adoption time. National Bureau of Economic Research;
199 2020. Report No.: 0898-2937.
- 200 9. Courtemanche C, Garuccio J, Le A, Pinkston J, Yelowitz A. Strong Social Distancing Measures In
201 The United States Reduced The COVID-19 Growth Rate. *Health Aff (Millwood)*.
202 2020:101377hlthaff202000608.
- 203 10. Siedner MJ, Harling G, Reynolds Z, Gilbert RF, Venkataramani A, Tsai AC. Social distancing to
204 slow the US COVID-19 epidemic: an interrupted time-series analysis. *medRxiv*. 2020.
- 205 11. Lyu W, Wehby GL. Comparison of Estimated Rates of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in
206 Border Counties in Iowa Without a Stay-at-Home Order and Border Counties in Illinois With a Stay-at-
207 Home Order. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(5):e2011102.
- 208 12. Wagner AB, Hill EL, Ryan SE, Sun Z, Deng G, Bhadane S, et al. Social Distancing Has Merely
209 Stabilized COVID-19 in the US. *medRxiv*. 2020.


210



Before first confirmed COVID-19 case:
average social distancing score

1 2 3 4 5


■ Social distancing data unavailable



Before stay-at-home guidance:
average social distancing score


1 2 3 4 5

■ No stay-at-home guidance



COVID-19 incidence rate
(cases per 10,000)

0 cases 0.16 3.29 6.66 15.43 1,012.10



After stay-at-home guidance:
average social distancing score

1 2 3 4 5