

# Estimating the Effect of Social Distancing Interventions on COVID-19 in the United States

Andrew M. Olney  
University of Memphis  
aolney@memphis.edu

Jesse Smith  
Innovate Memphis  
jessesmith96.js@gmail.com

Saunak Sen  
University of Tennessee  
sen@uthsc.edu

Fridtjof Thomas  
University of Tennessee  
fthomas4@uthsc.edu

H. Juliette T. Unwin  
Imperial College London  
h.unwin@imperial.ac.uk

---

Since its global emergence in 2020, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has caused multiple epidemics in the United States. Because medical treatments for the virus are still emerging and a vaccine is not yet available, state and local governments have sought to limit its spread by enacting various social distancing interventions such as school closures and lockdown, but the effectiveness of these interventions is unknown. We applied an established, semi-mechanistic Bayesian hierarchical model of these interventions on SARS-CoV-2 spread in Europe to the United States. We estimated the effect of interventions across all states, contrasted the estimated reproduction number,  $R_t$ , for each state before and after lockdown, and contrasted predicted future fatalities with actual fatalities as a check on the model's validity. Overall, school closures and lockdown are the only interventions modeled that have a reliable impact on  $R_t$ , and lockdown appears to have played a key role in reducing  $R_t$  below 1.0. We conclude that reversal of lockdown, without implementation of additional, equally effective interventions, will enable continued, sustained transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the United States.

**Keywords:** Bayesian hierarchical model, intervention, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2, social distancing, time-varying reproduction number

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) causes coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Initially discovered in Wuhan, China in December 2019, SARS-CoV-2 rapidly spread to the rest of the world, initially through travelers from Wuhan, but later through community transmission in Asia, Europe, Australia, and North America, until it was declared a pandemic by the World Health Organization on March 11, 2020. The rapid spread of SARS-CoV-2 is attributable to its transmissibility by aerosol and fomites ([van Doremalen et al., 2020](#); [Bourouiba, 2020](#)), by presymptomatic/asymptomatic carriers ([Bai et al., 2020](#); [Furukawa et al., 2020](#)), and by the relatively mild clinical characteristics of symptomatic carriers, which often include fever, cough, and fatigue ([Guan et al., 2020](#)). However, approximately 20% of confirmed

cases develop severe or critical forms of COVID-19, including complications of respiratory failure, myocardial dysfunction, and acute kidney injury, with approximately 50% mortality for critically-ill patients (Phua et al., 2020).

As of July 2020, outbreaks or epidemics of SARS-CoV-2 have emerged in all 50 states, with over 2.5 million confirmed cases reported. Because medical treatments for and vaccinations against the virus are still emerging, state and local governments have sought to limit its spread by enacting various social distancing interventions. Social distancing interventions have varied widely both within states and across states. Within states, interventions typically have begun with public health directives like washing hands and staying home if sick, followed by restrictions on or closures of places housing vulnerable populations like nursing homes or schools, followed by successive, increasingly restrictive bans on gathering in groups, culminating in stay-at-home orders or so-called lockdown. Across states, interventions have been adopted with different speeds, such that some states moved rapidly to lockdown and other states never entered lockdown at all. Likewise, states are currently lifting lockdown and reversing social distancing interventions at different rates.

To explore the effect of social distancing interventions, we applied an established, semi-mechanistic Bayesian hierarchical model of these interventions on SARS-CoV-2 spread in Europe (Flaxman et al., 2020a; Flaxman et al., 2020b) to the United States. We estimated the effect of interventions and the time-varying reproduction number ( $R_t$ ) for each state using state-level daily case fatality counts.

## 2. METHODS

### 2.1. DATA

In this study, we used data from three different sources: state-level intervention data, infection fatality rate data, and confirmed case fatality data.

**STATE-LEVEL INTERVENTION DATA.** We created a dataset of state-level intervention dates by inspecting the executive orders, public health directives, and official communications (e.g., press releases) from state governments (Olney and Olney, 2020). For each intervention date, we used the effective date, unless the timing of the intervention was so close to midnight as to only practically have effect the next day. Interventions were only counted if they targeted the general population, e.g., restricting out-of-state travel by state employees only was not counted as a travel restriction intervention. All interventions dates are linked to their source documents with any needed commentary for data provenance. The interventions themselves closely parallel those in the European model we used, but with slightly different operationalizations which we describe in turn. *Self isolating if ill* is a recommendation to stay home if sick. *Social distancing encouraged* is a recommendation to avoid nonessential travel and/or contact; the mere words “social distancing” were not counted unless they were elaborated with examples of what social distancing entails. *Schools or universities closing* is the date at which schools partly or completely close; the earlier of schools or universities closing was used. *Sport* is the banning of sporting events or public gatherings of more than 1000 persons. *Public events* is the banning of public gatherings of more than 100 participants. Finally, *lockdown* includes banning of non-essential gatherings or business operations, which is sometimes formalized as a stay-at-home or

safer-at-home order. Notably some more restrictive interventions imply others, e.g., *lockdown* implies all other interventions, and *public events* implies *sport*.

**INFECTION FATALITY RATE DATA.** The infection fatality rate (IFR), or ratio of fatalities to true infections, was derived via the methods outlined in Flaxman et al. Briefly, IFR estimates from Verity et al. (2020) were adjusted using an age-specific UK contact matrix to account for non-uniform attack rates across age groups (see Ferguson et al. 2020 for details and previous US application). The resulting IFRs were weighted by state-level age demographics and averaged to produce estimates adjusted for both age and location. Demographic data were obtained from the 2018 ACS survey 5-year estimates (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020).

**CONFIRMED CASE FATALITY DATA.** SARS-CoV-2 fatality data was obtained from the New York Times public data repository (The New York Times, 2020), which describes the data collection process along with subtle issues in counting cases, e.g. cruise ship passengers. In general, the dataset counts confirmed cases according to where they were treated. Deaths are counted on the days they were reported up to midnight Eastern Time. Because this dataset provides cumulative counts, we transformed these into daily counts by taking the difference between successive daily cumulative counts (setting this difference to zero in the rare instances where cumulative counts were decreasing due to reporting corrections).

### 3. MODEL

We applied an established, semi-mechanistic Bayesian hierarchical model of interventions on SARS-CoV-2 spread in Europe to the United States, and the design and details of this model are presented elsewhere (Flaxman et al., 2020a; Flaxman et al., 2020b). Notably, a recent variant of this model has been applied to the United States at the state level, but this variant uses mobility data rather than interventions as the basis of predictions (Unwin et al., 2020). Briefly stated, daily death counts in the model follow a negative binomial distribution such that their expectation is a function of infections on previous days. The model is semi-mechanistic in the sense that it incorporates classical Susceptible-Infected-Removed concepts (Horsburgh and Mahon, 2008) in a Bayesian framework. The number of infected is modeled using a discrete renewal process that accounts for population saturation. Death counts are similarly linked to the number of infected based on the country (or state in the present case) IFR and the distribution of times from infection to death. Importantly, the model assumes the effect of intervention is that same regardless of location and that the implementation of an intervention instantaneously reduces  $R_t$ . Making these assumptions allows data from multiple locations to be pooled for estimating intervention effects. The model was specified using Stan (Carpenter et al., 2017), and model inference was performed using adaptive Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. We fit our model with a time series for each state 30 days before the state has experienced seven deaths<sup>1</sup>, up to April 25, 2020, when some states began reversing their interventions.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Europe model used ten deaths as a somewhat arbitrary threshold for excluding imported cases; seven is the highest number we can use and still obtain valid data for states like Alaska, which have relatively low case count, cf. Unwin et al. (2020).

Table 1: National intervention effects on  $R_t$ .

Intervention	Mean	95% CI	
		LL	UL
Self isolating if ill	.012	.000	.059
Sport	.021	.000	.102
Social distancing encouraged	.033	.000	.162
Public events	.103	.000	.379
Schools or universities closing	.271	.007	.518
Lockdown	.785	.592	.987

*Note.* Abbreviations: CI, credible interval; LL, lower limit; UL, upper limit.

## 4. RESULTS

The mean number of days between the first and last intervention of a state was 19.53 days (SD = 5.73, range: 8-31). While each of 50 states had the opportunity to implement six different social distancing interventions, only 289 or 96.33% were implemented, with lockdown being the least implemented ( $n = 43$ ). The mean IFR was 1.11% (SD = .12%, range: .76 - 1.35%). Because confirmed case fatality data increased dramatically over the time period examined, similar statistics are not reported for these data.

Estimated national intervention effects on  $R_t$  are shown in Table 1. Each estimated effect is an absolute reduction in  $R_t$ . It is evident that only schools or universities closing and lockdown have a nontrivial impact on  $R_t$ . Moreover, schools or universities closing and lockdown are the only interventions whose 95% credible interval does not cross zero.

State-level measures and estimates of the model are shown in Table 2. Of primary interest are the  $R_t$  estimates before and after lockdown and the corresponding death counts 2 weeks into the future, which are contrasted with actual deaths to assess model validity. Notably, no state had a mean  $R_t$  below 1.0 pre-lockdown, but 29 states had a  $R_t$  below 1.0 after lockdown. While lockdown had a strong effect in reducing  $R_t$  in all states that underwent lockdown, in these 29 states, lockdown appears to have been the single critical intervention allowing containment of the disease.

Predicted deaths vs. actual deaths in each state serve as a validity check on the model's estimates of intervention effects. Thirty-six states (72%) had actual deaths that were within the 95% CI of predicted deaths. Notably, the mean predicted deaths were well above actual (>100 deaths) for Connecticut, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and New York. The mean absolute error of mean predicted deaths was 50.80, and without these four states the mean absolute error was 10.08.

Table 2. State-level measures and estimates of infection, fatality, and lockdown intervention.

State	IFR (%)	Pre-Lockdown				Lockdown				Predicted Deaths <sup>a</sup>				Actual Deaths <sup>b</sup>			
		R <sub>t</sub>		95% CI		R <sub>t</sub>		95% CI		LL		95% CI		LL		95% CI	
		LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL
Alabama	1.076	1.334	1.238	1.424	1.424	1.424	.610	.476	.767	5.618	3.028	9.754	7				
Alaska	.813	1.224	.785	1.622	1.622	1.110	.558	.081	1.110	.067	.003	.324	0				
Arizona	1.147	1.667	1.558	1.768	1.768	.942	.762	.603	.942	8.993	4.702	16.065	15				
Arkansas	1.125	1.005	.715	1.336	1.336					2.081	.545	5.595	0				
California	.986	2.290	2.130	2.437	2.437	1.178	1.042	.913	1.178	84.400	49.768	136.906	82				
Colorado	.955	1.887	1.754	2.011	2.011	1.011	.859	.723	1.011	24.600	14.146	41.031	7				
Connecticut	1.190	3.100	2.892	3.292	3.292	1.617	1.411	1.227	1.617	287.897	155.970	507.397	58				
Delaware	1.221	2.542	2.293	2.766	2.766	1.457	1.157	.891	1.457	9.387	3.638	19.825	8				
Florida	1.353	1.726	1.636	1.819	1.819	.942	.789	.650	.942	40.651	23.881	66.230	46				
Georgia	.938	1.345	1.275	1.411	1.411	.732	.614	.511	.732	19.987	12.961	30.563	2				
Hawaii	1.260	1.524	1.164	1.856	1.856	.695	.695	.247	1.172	.331	.039	1.135	0				
Idaho	1.035	1.684	1.423	1.904	1.904	.944	.674	.450	.944	1.069	.349	2.599	0				
Illinois	1.070	2.781	2.580	2.964	2.964	1.438	1.265	1.102	1.438	192.095	104.828	327.349	100				
Indiana	1.062	2.210	2.061	2.349	2.349	1.183	1.007	.845	1.183	42.399	22.769	73.514	43				
Iowa	1.160	1.409	1.110	1.744	1.744					17.357	6.326	38.324	9				
Kansas	1.087	1.750	1.560	1.912	1.912	.704	.704	.521	.919	2.850	1.244	5.719	5				
Kentucky	1.090	1.799	1.650	1.938	1.938	.820	.820	.645	1.015	6.422	3.007	12.354	8				
Louisiana	1.036	1.968	1.848	2.079	2.079	.897	.897	.772	1.034	55.047	31.766	91.368	40				
Maine	1.353	1.729	1.511	1.926	1.926	.790	.790	.528	1.090	1.899	.622	4.579	1				
Maryland	1.057	2.451	2.297	2.597	2.597	1.345	1.119	.913	1.345	74.977	38.129	136.897	54				
Massachusetts	1.127	3.366	3.085	3.607	3.607	1.580	1.379	1.183	1.580	402.458	215.211	691.839	138				
Michigan	1.149	2.338	2.194	2.471	2.471	1.223	1.065	.923	1.223	204.275	115.132	347.793	133				
Minnesota	1.081	2.491	2.296	2.668	2.668	1.390	1.136	.906	1.390	21.938	10.185	42.165	24				

*Continued on next page*

Table 2 – continued from previous page

State	IFR (%)	Pre-Lockdown				Lockdown				Predicted Deaths <sup>a</sup>				Actual Deaths <sup>b</sup>			
		R <sub>t</sub>		95% CI		R <sub>t</sub>		95% CI		LL		UL		LL		UL	
		LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL
Mississippi	1.063	1.449	1.343	1.547	.662	.523	.828	6.381	3.467	11.184	12						
Missouri	1.138	1.436	1.338	1.525	.656	.523	.809	9.949	5.652	16.725	11						
Montana	1.215	1.533	1.152	1.891	.698	.237	1.201	.424	.055	1.452	0						
Nebraska	1.071	1.384	.967	1.885	.648	.505	.814	8.851	2.312	23.693	3						
Nevada	1.026	1.420	1.312	1.523	.648	.505	.814	4.370	2.308	7.962	5						
New Hampshire	1.215	1.871	1.639	2.073	.854	.586	1.167	2.519	.847	6.058	10						
New Jersey	1.117	2.949	2.747	3.137	1.342	1.184	1.512	746.096	421.014	1256.601	164						
New Mexico	1.145	2.578	2.313	2.822	1.174	.876	1.505	8.435	3.025	19.068	10						
New York	1.126	2.487	2.335	2.628	1.132	.995	1.277	1225.995	699.351	2034.672	226						
North Carolina	1.087	2.183	2.014	2.335	.996	.787	1.227	20.463	9.952	38.376	17						
North Dakota	1.072	1.310	.617	2.139				2.445	.167	10.132	2						
Ohio	1.149	2.333	2.164	2.484	1.063	.899	1.243	44.063	23.324	77.162	25						
Oklahoma	1.057	1.950	1.746	2.128	.783	.608	.982	4.921	2.241	9.761	4						
Oregon	1.141	1.534	1.381	1.674	.700	.527	.903	1.342	.541	2.881	3						
Pennsylvania	1.235	2.332	2.210	2.448	1.065	.883	1.271	165.470	89.879	285.700	69						
Rhode Island	1.188	2.155	1.950	2.343	.982	.756	1.236	13.197	5.818	26.856	19						
South Carolina	1.150	1.303	1.221	1.379	.596	.464	.744	4.460	2.431	7.613	10						
South Dakota	1.120	1.264	.337	2.316				1.525	.049	7.595	3						
Tennessee	1.088	1.149	1.052	1.239	.525	.403	.666	2.642	1.368	4.815	1						
Texas	.862	1.632	1.545	1.716	.746	.616	.893	23.321	13.971	37.848	27						
Utah	.755	1.416	1.037	1.860				6.216	1.585	16.703	5						
Vermont	1.268	1.095	.960	1.217	.500	.340	.696	.342	.119	.805	0						
Virginia	1.054	2.173	2.042	2.293	.993	.810	1.200	27.818	14.711	49.683	15						
Washington	1.032	1.191	1.125	1.253	.543	.467	.626	5.496	3.692	8.034	10						

Continued on next page

Table 2 – continued from previous page

State	IFR (%)	Pre-Lockdown		Lockdown		Predicted Deaths <sup>a</sup>		Actual Deaths <sup>b</sup>			
		R <sub>t</sub> 95% CI		R <sub>t</sub> 95% CI				95% CI			
		LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL	LL	UL		
West Virginia	1.290	2.045	1.720	2.341	.931	.546	1.361	2.020	.451	5.623	1
Wisconsin	1.144	1.600	1.466	1.722	.729	.581	.899	5.382	2.659	9.970	14
Wyoming	1.093	1.365	.267	2.531				1.690	.035	9.029	0

Abbreviations: CI, credible interval; IFR, infection fatality ratio; R<sub>t</sub>, time-varying reproductive number

<sup>a</sup> Forecasted daily deaths on May 9th, 2020

<sup>b</sup> Actual daily deaths on May 9th, 2020

## 5. DISCUSSION

Social distancing interventions are important for limiting the spread of SARS-CoV-2, because medical treatments for COVID-19 are still emerging and a vaccine is not available. To our knowledge, we are the first to apply an established, semi-mechanistic Bayesian hierarchical model of these interventions on SARS-CoV-2 spread in Europe to the United States. We estimated the effect of interventions across all states, contrasted the estimated  $R_t$  for each state before and after lockdown, and contrasted predicted future fatalities with actual fatalities as a check on the model's validity. Overall, school closures and lockdown orders are the only interventions modeled that have an estimated effect where the 95% credible interval does not include zero, i.e. no effect. No state had an estimated  $R_t$  below 1.0 before lockdown, but 29 states reached an  $R_t$  below 1.0 after lockdown. The model's ability to successfully predict future deaths supports the validity of estimated intervention effects. These results suggest that reversal of lockdown, without implementation of additional, equally effective interventions, will enable continued, sustained transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the United States.

Our study has several limitations. First, the assumption that all interventions have the same implementation and effect in all states is a strong assumption. For example, states with a stronger culture of recreational sports will likely see a greater impact of the sports intervention than states without that culture. More directly, the intervention banning public gatherings of 100 persons or more could be met by a ban on 10 persons or more or 50 persons or more; it is unlikely that such bans are truly equivalent. This limitation has since been partially addressed in the European model by allowing random effects for lockdown only. Second, the assumption that interventions are binary rather than continuously varying is also a strong assumption and clearly an oversimplification, because it does not account for time-varying compliance with intervention. Several groups are incorporating mobility data as a measure of population mixing (Unwin et al., 2020; Woody et al., 2020; Team and Murray, 2020). Third, the parameters of the model are estimated using reasonable, but still uncertain, assumptions about prior distributions. We have used the same assumptions as in the European model, but these assumptions may be contradicted by future empirical work.

Modeling of SARS-CoV-2 is emerging and rapidly diversifying, including classical SEIR models and derivatives (Pei and Shaman, 2020), deep learning (Prakash, 2020), and piecewise models for sub-exponential growth (Scire et al., 2020). State and local governments are likewise rapidly adjusting their policy decisions regarding interventions based on case data and economic concerns. As the United States adopts an increasingly fragmented response to SARS-CoV-2, modeling approaches like ours that focus on shared interventions may not be tenable. While our results give valuable insights into which interventions did and which did not change the transmission rate substantially, we recommend that future studies measure the change in behaviors resulting from interventions and then strengthen the predictive relationships between these behaviors and disease transmission.

## REFERENCES

- Yan Bai, Lingsheng Yao, Tao Wei, Fei Tian, Dong-Yan Jin, Lijuan Chen, and Meiyun Wang. 2020. Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19. *JAMA* 323, 14 (2020), 1406–1407. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.2565>
- Lydia Bourouiba. 2020. Turbulent Gas Clouds and Respiratory Pathogen Emissions: Potential Implica-



- tions for Reducing Transmission of COVID-19. *JAMA* (2020). DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.4756>
- Bob Carpenter, Andrew Gelman, Matthew Hoffman, Daniel Lee, Ben Goodrich, Michael Betancourt, Marcus Brubaker, Jiqiang Guo, Peter Li, and Allen Riddell. 2017. Stan: A Probabilistic Programming Language. *Journal of Statistical Software, Articles* 76, 1 (2017), 1–32. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.18637/jss.v076.i01>
- Neil Ferguson, Daniel Laydon, Gemma Nedjati Gilani, Natsuko Imai, Kylie Ainslie, Marc Baguelin, Sangeeta Bhatia, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, ZULMA Cucunuba Perez, and Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg. 2020. *Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand*. techreport 9. Imperial College London. <https://www.imperial.ac.uk/mrc-global-infectious-disease-analysis/covid-19/report-9-impact-of-npis-on-covid-19/>
- Seth Flaxman, Swapnil Mishra, Axel Gandy, H Unwin, H Coupland, T Mellan, H Zhu, T Berah, J Eaton, P Perez Guzman, and others. 2020a. *Estimating the number of infections and the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in 11 European countries*. techreport 13. Imperial College London. <https://www.imperial.ac.uk/mrc-global-infectious-disease-analysis/covid-19/report-13-europe-npi-impact/>
- Seth Flaxman, Swapnil Mishra, Axel Gandy, H. Juliette T. Unwin, Thomas A. Mellan, Helen Coupland, Charles Whittaker, Harrison Zhu, Tresnia Berah, Jeffrey W. Eaton, Mlodie Monod, Azra C. Ghani, Christl A. Donnelly, Steven M. Riley, Michaela A. C. Vollmer, Neil M. Ferguson, Lucy C. Okell, and Samir Bhatt. 2020b. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature* (2020), 1–8. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2405-7> Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- Nathan W. Furukawa, John T. Brooks, and Jeremy Sobel. 2020. Early Release - Evidence Supporting Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 While Presymptomatic or Asymptomatic. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 26, 7 (7 2020). DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid2607.201595>
- Wei-jie Guan, Zheng-yi Ni, Yu Hu, Wen-hua Liang, Chun-quan Ou, Jian-xing He, Lei Liu, Hong Shan, Chun-liang Lei, David S.C. Hui, Bin Du, Lan-juan Li, Guang Zeng, Kwok-Yung Yuen, Ru-chong Chen, Chun-li Tang, Tao Wang, Ping-yan Chen, Jie Xiang, Shi-yue Li, Jin-lin Wang, Zi-jing Liang, Yi-xiang Peng, Li Wei, Yong Liu, Ya-hua Hu, Peng Peng, Jian-ming Wang, Ji-yang Liu, Zhong Chen, Gang Li, Zhi-jian Zheng, Shao-qin Qiu, Jie Luo, Chang-jiang Ye, Shao-yong Zhu, and Nan-shan Zhong. 2020. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *New England Journal of Medicine* 382, 18 (2020), 1708–1720. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2002032>
- C.R. Horsburgh and B.E. Mahon. 2008. Infectious Disease Epidemiology. In *Modern epidemiology* (3 ed.), Kenneth J. Rothman, Sander Greenland, and Timothy L. Lash (Eds.). Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Chapter 27.
- Andrew M. Olney and Rachel C. Olney. 2020. US State Social Distancing Intervention Dates (valid to 4/25/20). (2020). DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3901617>
- Sen Pei and Jeffrey Shaman. 2020. Initial Simulation of SARS-CoV2 Spread and Intervention Effects in the Continental US. *medRxiv* (2020), 2020.03.21.20040303. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.21.20040303>
- Jason Phua, Li Weng, Lowell Ling, Moritoki Egi, Chae-Man Lim, Jigeeshu Vasishtha Divatia, Babu Raja Shrestha, Yaseen M. Arabi, Jensen Ng, Charles D. Gomersall, Masaji Nishimura, Younsuck Koh,

- and Bin Du. 2020. Intensive care management of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): challenges and recommendations. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine* 8, 5 (2020), 506–517. DOI :[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(20\)30161-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30161-2)
- B. Aditya Prakash. 2020. Forecasting the COVID-19 trajectory. (2020). <https://www.cc.gatech.edu/~badityap/covid.html>
- Jeremie Scire, Sarah Nadeau, Timothy Vaughan, Gavin Brupbacher, Simon Fuchs, Jrg Sommer, Katrina N. Koch, Reto Misteli, Lukas Mundorff, Thomas Gtz, Tobias Eichenberger, Carlos Quinto, Miodrag Savic, Andrea Meienberg, Thilo Burkard, Michael Mayr, Christoph A Meier, Andreas Widmer, Richard Kuehl, Adrian Egli, Hans H Hirsch, Stefano Bassetti, Christian H Nickel, Katharina S Rentsch, Werner Kbler, Roland Bingisser, Manuel Battegay, Sarah Tschudin-Sutter, and Tanja Stadler. 2020. Reproductive number of the COVID-19 epidemic in Switzerland with a focus on the Cantons of Basel-Stadt and Basel-Landschaft. *Swiss Medical Weekly* (2020). DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.4414/smw.2020.20271>
- IHME COVID-19 health service utilization forecasting Team and Christopher JL Murray. 2020. Forecasting the impact of the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic on hospital demand and deaths for the USA and European Economic Area countries. *medRxiv* (2020), 2020.04.21.20074732. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.21.20074732>
- The New York Times. 2020. [nytimes/covid-19-data](https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data). (2020). <https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data> original-date: 2020-03-24T23:41:39Z.
- H Juliette T Unwin, Swapnil Mishra, Valerie C Bradley, Axel Gandy, Michaela Vollmer, Thomas Mellan, Helen Coupland, Kylie Ainslie, Charlie Whittaker, Jonathan Ish-Horowicz, Sarah Filippi, Xiaoyue Xi, Melodie Monod, Oliver Ratmann, Michael Hutchinson, Fabian Valka, Harrison Zhu, Iwona Hawryluk, Philip Milton, Marc Baguelin, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Nick Brazeau, Lorenzo Cattarino, Giovanni Charles, Laura V Cooper, Zulma Cucunuba, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, Bimandra Djaafara, Iaria Dorigatti, Oliver J Eales, Jeff Eaton, Sabine van Elsland, Richard FitzJohn, Katy Gaythorpe, William Green, Timothy Hallett, Wes Hinsley, Natsuko Imai, Ben Jeffrey, Edward Knock, Daniel Laydon, John Lees, Gemma Nedjati-Gilani, Pierre Nouvellet, Lucy Okell, Alison Ower, Kris V Parag, Igor Siveroni, Hayley A Thompson, Robert Verity, Patrick Walker, Caroline Walters, Yuanrong Wang, Oliver J Watson, Lilith Whittles, Azra Ghani, Neil M Ferguson, Steven Riley, Christl A. Donnelly, Samir Bhatt, and Seth Flaxman. 2020. *Report 23 - State-level tracking of COVID-19 in the United States*. techreport 23. Imperial College London. <http://www.imperial.ac.uk/medicine/departments/school-public-health/infectious-disease-epidemiology/mrc-global-infectious-disease-analysis/covid-19/report-23-united-states/> Library Catalog: [www.imperial.ac.uk](http://www.imperial.ac.uk).
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2020. ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates. (2020). <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=acs&tid=ACSDP5Y2018.DP05&vintage=2018>
- Neeltje van Doremalen, Trenton Bushmaker, Dylan H. Morris, Myndi G. Holbrook, Amandine Gamble, Brandi N. Williamson, Azaibi Tamin, Jennifer L. Harcourt, Natalie J. Thornburg, Susan I. Gerber, James O. Lloyd-Smith, Emmie de Wit, and Vincent J. Munster. 2020. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *New England Journal of Medicine* 382, 16 (2020), 1564–1567. DOI :<http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2004973>
- Robert Verity, Lucy C. Okell, Iaria Dorigatti, Peter Winskill, Charles Whittaker, Natsuko Imai, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, Hayley Thompson, Patrick Walker, Han Fu, Amy Dighe, Jamie Griffin, Anne Cori, Marc Baguelin, Sangeeta Bhatia, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Zulma M. Cucunuba, Rich Fitzjohn, Katy A. M. Gaythorpe, Will Green, Arran Hamlet, Wes Hinsley, Daniel Laydon, Gemma Nedjati-Gilani, Steven Riley, Sabine van Elsland, Erik Volz, Haowei Wang, Yuanrong Wang, Xiayoue Xi,

Christl Donnelly, Azra Ghani, and Neil Ferguson. 2020. Estimates of the severity of COVID-19 disease. *medRxiv* (2020), 2020.03.09.20033357. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.09.20033357>

Spencer Woody, Mauricio Garcia Tec, Maytal Dahan, Kelly Gaither, Michael Lachmann, Spencer Fox, Lauren Ancel Meyers, and James G. Scott. 2020. Projections for first-wave COVID-19 deaths across the US using social-distancing measures derived from mobile phones. *medRxiv* (2020), 2020.04.16.20068163. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20068163>