COVID-19 scenarios for the United States

3 IHME COVID-19 Forecasting Team

1 2

4

5 The United States (US) has not been spared in the ongoing pandemic of novel coronavirus disease^{1,2}. 6 COVID-19, caused by the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), continues to 7 cause death and disease in all 50 states, as well as significant economic damage wrought by the non-8 pharmaceutical interventions (NPI) adopted in attempts to control transmission³. We use a deterministic, Susceptible, Exposed, Infectious, Recovered (SEIR) compartmental framework^{4,5} to 9 model possible trajectories of SARS-CoV-2 infections and the impact of NPI⁶ at the state level. Model 10 performance was tested against reported deaths from 01 February to 04 July 2020. Using this SEIR 11 12 model and projections of critical driving covariates (pneumonia seasonality, mobility, testing rates, 13 and mask use per capita), we assessed some possible futures of the COVID-19 pandemic from 05 July 14 through 31 December 2020. We explored future scenarios that included feasible assumptions about 15 NPIs including social distancing mandates (SDMs) and levels of mask use. The range of infection, 16 death, and hospital demand outcomes revealed by these scenarios show that action taken during the 17 summer of 2020 will have profound public health impacts through to the year end. Encouragingly, we 18 find that an emphasis on universal mask use may be sufficient to ameliorate the worst effects of 19 epidemic resurgences in many states. Masks may save as many as 102,795 (55,898–183,374) lives, 20 when compared to a plausible reference scenario in December. In addition, widespread mask use may 21 markedly reduce the need for more socially and economically deleterious SDMs.

The zoonotic origin of the novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)⁷ in 22 Wuhan, China⁸, and the global spread of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19)^{2,9} promises to be the 23 defining global health event of the twenty-first century. This pandemic has already resulted in extreme 24 societal, economic, and political disruption across the world and in the United States (US)^{3,10}. The 25 establishment of SARS-CoV-2 and its rapid spread in the US has been dramatic¹¹. Since the first case in 26 the US was identified on 20 January 2020¹² (first death on 06 February 2020¹³), SARS-CoV-2 has spread 27 to every state and resulted in more than 15.7 million cases and 127,868 deaths as of 4 July 2020^{14–16}. 28 There remains no approved vaccine for the prevention of SARS-CoV-2 infection and few 29 pharmaceutical options for the treatment of the COVID-19 disease^{17,18}. The most optimistic 30 commentators do not predict the availability of new vaccines or therapeutics before 2021¹⁹. Non-31 32 pharmaceutical interventions (NPI) are, therefore, the only available policy levers to reduce transmission²⁰. Several such NPI have been put in place across the US in response to the epidemic (Fig. 33 34 1), including the dampening of transmission through the wearing of face masks and social distancing 35 mandates (SDM) aimed at reducing contacts through school closures, restrictions of gatherings, stay at home orders, and the partial or full closure of non-essential businesses. Increased testing and isolation 36 of infected individuals will also have had an impact⁶. These NPI are credited with a reduction in disease 37 transmission^{21,22}, along with a host of other hypotheses on environmental, behavioral, and social 38 39 determinants of the course of the epidemic at the state level. 40 In the US, decisions to impose SDM or require mask use are generally made at the state level by

government officials. These executives need to balance net losses from the societal turmoil, economic
damage, and indirect effects on health caused by NPI with the direct benefits to human health of
controlling the epidemic, all within a complex political environment. Control has usually been defined as
the restriction of infections to below a specified level at which health services are not overwhelmed by
demand and the loss of human health and life is minimized²³.

46	In the first stages of the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in the US, states sequentially enacted increasingly
47	restrictive SDMs meant to reduce transmission (by reducing human-to-human contact) 1 at the same
48	time as there was conflicting advice on the use of masks by the general public ²⁴ . At that early stage,
49	relatively simple statistical models of future risk were sufficient to capture the general patterns of
50	transmission ²⁵ . As different behavioral responses to SDM began to emerge, and more importantly, as
51	some states began to remove SDM (Fig. 1), a modeling approach that directly quantifies transmission
52	and could be used to explore these developing scenarios was necessary ²⁵ . As states variously remove
53	and reinstate SDM (Fig. 1) or begin to issue mandatory mask use orders ²⁶ amid resurgences of COVID-
54	19 ²⁷ , there is an urgent need for evidence-based assessments of the likely impact of the NPI options
55	available to decision-makers.
56	There is now a growing consensus that face masks, whether cloth or medical-grade, can
57	considerably reduce the transmission of respiratory viruses like SARS-CoV2, thereby limiting spread of
58	COVID-19 ^{28–30} . While medical-grade masks may provide enhanced protection, cloth face coverings
59	(homemade or manufactured), have been found to be comparably effective in non-medical settings ²⁸ , as
60	well as being simple, widely accessible, and available commonly at relatively low cost. We updated a
61	recently published review ²⁸ to generate a novel meta-analysis (Supplementary Information section 3.4)
62	of both peer-reviewed studies and pre-prints to assess mask effectiveness at preventing respiratory viral
63	infections in humans ³¹ . This analysis suggested a reduction in infection (from all respiratory viruses) for
64	mask-wearers by one-third (Relative Risk = 0.65 (0.47-0.92)) relative to controls. This is suggestive of a
65	considerable population health benefit to mask wearing that may be particularly effective in the US,
66	where currently only 41.1% of Americans have reported always wearing a mask in public
67	(Supplementary Information section 3.4) ³² .
68	Here we provide a state-level descriptive epidemiological analysis of the introduction of SARS-

69 CoV-2 infection across the US, from the first recorded case, through to 04 July 2020. We use these

70 observations to learn about epidemic progression and thereby model the first wave of transmission 71 using a deterministic Susceptible, Exposed, Infectious, Recovered (SEIR) compartmental framework^{4,5}. 72 This observed, process-based understanding of how NPI affect epidemiological processes is then used to 73 make inferences about the future trajectory of COVID-19 and how different combinations of existing NPI 74 might affect this course. Three SEIR-driven scenarios, along with covariates that inform them, were then 75 projected until 31 December 2020 (see methods). We use these scenarios as a sequence of experiments to describe a range of model outputs including $R_{effective}$ (the change over time in the average number 76 of secondary cases per infectious case in a population where not everyone is susceptible^{4,5,33}), infections, 77 deaths, and hospital demand outcomes which might be expected from plausible subsets of the policy 78 79 options applied in the summer and fall of 2020 (see methods, Supplementary Information section 6.1 for 80 more rationale on scenario construction and considerations).

81 Briefly, we forecast the expected outcomes if states continue to remove SDMs at the current 82 pace ("mandates easing"), with resulting increases in population mobility and number of contacts. This 83 is an alternative scenario to the more probable situation, where states are expected to respond to an 84 impending health crisis by re-imposing some SDMs. In that plausible reference scenario, we model the 85 future progress of the pandemic assuming that states would move to once again shut down social 86 interaction and economic activity at a threshold for the daily death rate; when 8 daily deaths per million population is reached – the 90th percentile of the observed distribution of when states previously 87 88 implemented SDM (Fig. 1, Supplementary Information section 3) – we assume reinstatement of SDM for 89 six weeks. In addition, newly available data on mask efficacy enabled the exploration of a third, 90 "universal mask" scenario to investigate the potential population-level benefits of increased mask use in 91 addition to a threshold-driven reinstatement of SDM. In this scenario, "universal" was defined as 95% of 92 people wearing masks in public, based on the current highest rate of mask use globally (in Singapore),

93 during the COVID-19 pandemic to date (Supplementary Information section 3.4). All scenarios presume
94 an increase in mobility associated with the opening of schools across the country.

95 Observed COVID-19 trends

96 The COVID-19 epidemic has progressed unevenly across states. Since the first death was recorded in the 97 US in early February 2020, cumulative through 04 July 2020, 127,868 deaths from COVID-19 have been 98 reported in the US (Fig. 2); a quarter of those (24.5%) occurred in New York alone. Washington and 99 California issued the first sets of state-level mandates on 11 March that prohibited gatherings of 250 100 people or more in certain counties, and by 23 March, all 50 states initiated some combination of SDM 101 (Fig. 1). The highest levels of daily deaths at the state level between February and June of 2020 occurred 102 in New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts at 935.3, 330.2, and 168.1 deaths per day (Fig. 3, Extended 103 Data Fig. 1). At the end of June, the highest level of daily deaths was in California at 73.5 deaths per day. 104 A critical policy need at this stage of the modeling was the forecasting of hospital demand in the US in 105 the states with the worst effective transmission rates (Hawaii, South Carolina, and Florida; Fig. 4). The 106 highest peak demand was observed as 5969 hospital ICU beds in New York on April 8 and 3073 ICU beds 107 in New Jersey on April 19; health care capacity was exceeded in 11 states (New York, New Jersey, 108 Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Maryland, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Delaware, 109 District of Columbia) (Extended Data Figs 2,3). Demand had receded to within capacity levels across the 110 US by the end of May.

111 Predicted COVID-19 trends

Under a scenario where states continue with planned removal of SDMs ("mandates easing"), our model
projects that cumulative total deaths across the US could reach 430,494 (288,046–649,582) by 31
December 2020 (Fig. 2, Table 1). At the state level, contributions to that death toll would not be evenly
distributed across the US. Greater than 60% of the deaths projected between July and December 2020

116	in this scenario would occur across just five states: California, Florida, Texas, Massachusetts, and
117	Virginia; the highest cumulative death rates (per 100,000) between July and December 2020 are
118	projected to occur in Massachusetts (465.0 (302.4–659.9) deaths per 100,000)), Florida (272.4 (117.3–
119	551.0) deaths per 100,000), Virginia (214.9 (78.4–468.8) deaths per 100,000), and New Jersey (207.2
120	(191.5-235.0) deaths per 100,000) (Extended Data Fig. 4, Table 1). By 03 November 2020 – when many
121	Americans may need to queue in public for national elections – a total of four states are predicted to
122	exceed a threshold of daily deaths of 8 deaths per million (Fig. 3), and a total of 41 states would have an
123	$R_{effective}$ greater than one (Fig. 4), presenting a possible increased risk of spread if preventive
124	measures are not taken at that time. By 31 December 2020, a total of 24 states are predicted to exceed
125	that threshold and 47 states would reach an $R_{effective}$ of greater than one before the end of the year
126	(Table 1; Fig. 4). This scenario results in an estimated total of 67,485,279 (41,003,799–101,794,827)
127	infections across the United States by the end of year (Extended Data Fig. 5). The highest infection levels
128	in states relative to their population are estimated to occur in Massachusetts (58.0% (39.9–74.9%)
129	infected), Virginia (37.5% (13.8–68.0%) infected), and Washington (37.1% (15.0–67.0%) infected)
130	(Extended Data Fig. 6). Further results for hospital resource use needs are presented in Extended Data
131	Figs 2,3 and forecast infections under this scenario are presented in Extended Data Figs 7,8.
132	When we model the future course of the epidemic assuming that states will move to once again
133	shut down social interaction and economic activity when daily deaths reach a threshold of 8 deaths per
134	million (the plausible "reference" scenario), the projected cumulative death toll across the US is forecast
135	to be lower than under the "mandates easing" scenario, with 294,565 (233,885–398,397) deaths by 31
136	December 2020 (Fig. 2). Thus, across the 24 states that are projected to exceed 8 deaths per million
137	under the "mandates easing" scenario by the end of 2020 (Table 1), the re-imposition of SDM could save
138	135,929 (49,669–278,666) lives. This scenario results in 30,336,701 (12,044,797–55,506,392) fewer
139	estimated infections across the United States by the end of year (Extended Data Fig. 5) compared to the

140 "mandates easing" scenario, with the highest rates of infections estimated to occur in New Jersey 141 (24.9% (21.8–30.8%) infected), Massachusetts (21.2% (18.0–27.8%) infected), and Louisiana (19.4% 142 (12.6–33.8%) infected) (Extended Data Fig. 6). As with the previous scenario, even with the re-143 imposition of SDM when daily deaths exceed 8 per million population, 47 states would reach an $R_{effective}$ greater than one before the end of the year (Fig. 4, Table 1). Further results for hospital 144 145 resource use needs are presented in Extended Data Figs 2,3 and forecast infections under this scenario 146 are presented in Extended Data Figs 7,8. 147 The scenario where the population of each state was assumed to adopt and maintain the maximum observed level of mask use observed globally (see methods) - in addition to states re-148 149 imposing SDM if a threshold daily death rate of 8 deaths per million population was exceeded – resulted 150 in the lowest projected cumulative death toll across US states, with a total of 191,771 (175,160– 151 223,377) deaths forecast to occur by 31 December 2020 (Fig. 2, Table 1). Under this scenario, at the time 152 of the US national election on 3 November 2020, no states will have exceeded a daily death rate of 8 153 deaths per million (Fig. 3), although 38 states are still estimated to exceed an Reffective of one at some 154 point between 4 July and 31 December 2020, and 33 states would have an $R_{effective}$ greater than one 155 on 31 December (Fig. 4). Through the end of the year, the daily death rate is forecast to exceed 8 deaths 156 per million in just three states (California, Massachusetts, and Virginia) (Table 1) saving 102,795 157 (55,898–183,374) lives when compared to the plausible reference scenario and 238,723 (112,886– 158 426,205) lives when compared to the "mandates easing" scenario. Universal mask use combined with 159 threshold-driven imposition of SDM results in 12,920,928 (7,136,980–22,826,322) fewer estimated 160 infections across the United States by the end of year compared to the plausible reference scenario, and 161 43,257,629 (19,744,352–74,125,020) fewer estimated infections compared to the "mandates easing" 162 scenario (Extended Data Fig. 5). The highest infection rates under the mask use scenario are estimated 163 to occur in Massachusetts (21.0% (17.3–29.9%) infected), New Jersey (20.7% (19.3–22.5%) infected),

and New York (17.8% (16.8–18.7%) infected) (Extended Data Fig. 6). Further results for hospital resource
use needs are presented in Extended Data Figs 2,3 and forecast infections under this scenario are
presented in Extended Data Figs 7,8.

167 Discussion

168 We delimit three possible futures (continued removal of SDM, plausible reference, and universal mask-169 use scenarios), to help frame and inform a national discussion on what actions can be taken during the 170 summer of 2020 and the profound public health, economic, and political influences these decisions will 171 have for the rest of the year. Under all scenarios, the US is likely to face a continued public health challenge from the COVID-19 pandemic through December 2020 and beyond, with populous states in 172 173 particular facing high levels of illness, deaths, and hospital demands from the disease. The 174 implementation of SDMs as soon as individual states reach a threshold of 8 daily deaths per million can 175 dramatically ameliorate the effects of the disease; achieving near universal mask use could delay or 176 prevent this threshold from being reached in many states and has the potential to save the most lives 177 while minimizing damage to the economy. National and state-level decision makers can use these 178 forecasts of the potential health benefits of available NPI alongside considerations of economic and 179 other social costs to make the most informed decisions on how to confront the COVID-19 pandemic at 180 the local level. Our findings indicate that mask use, a relatively affordable and low-impact intervention, 181 has the potential to serve as a priority life-saving strategy in all US locations.

New epidemics, resurgences, and second waves are not inevitable. Several countries have sustained reductions in COVID-19 cases over time³². Early indications that seasonality may play a role in transmission, with increased spread during colder winter months as is seen with other respiratory viruses^{34–37}, highlight the importance of taking action both before and during the pneumonia season in the US. While it is yet unclear if COVID-19 seasonality will match that of pneumonia in general, the

187 strong association observed so far should be heeded as a plausible warning of what is to come. Toward 188 the end of 2020, masks could contain a second wave of resurgence while reducing the need for frequent 189 and widespread imposition of SDMs. Such an approach has the potential to save lives while minimizing 190 the economic and societal disruption associated with both restrictive SDMs and the pandemic itself. 191 Although 95% mask use across the population may seem like a high threshold to achieve and maintain, 192 this value represents a level that has been achieved elsewhere (see methods and Supplementary 193 Information section 3.4). Where mask use has been widely adopted, in South Korea, Hong Kong, Japan, and Iceland, among others, transmission has declined and in some cases halted³². These examples serve 194 as additional natural experiments³⁸ of the likely impact of masks and support the findings from the 195 universal mask use scenario. Long-term, the future of COVID-19 in the US will be determined by the 196 evolution of herd immunity through progressive pandemic waves over seasons and/or through the 197 198 deployment of an efficacious vaccine or therapeutic approaches.

199 Mask use has emerged as a contentious issue in the US. At the same time, although well below the rates seen in other countries, about 41% of US residents have reported that they "always" wear a 200 201 $mask^{31}$. The highest proportions of mask use were reported in the northeast of the country, where several states had estimated mask use greater than 60% on 26 June 2020³¹. The potential life-saving 202 203 benefit of increasing mask use in the coming summer and fall cannot be overstated. Recent large-scale 204 outdoor gatherings, such as the massive marches and protests against police brutality and racism that 205 took place in June 2020 in the US, seem to have had a negligible effect on SARS-CoV-2 infection rates³⁹ possibly due to high levels of mask use⁴⁰. As Americans prepare to head to the polls in November, local 206 207 policy makers should consider the health implications of long lines at polling places and the role of mask 208 use (or alternatives such as mail-in voting) in mitigating disease spread. Several states have already 209 postponed primary elections in an effort to avoid increased transmission. Mandatory mask laws have also been introduced in many states^{38,41}, but compliance appears to be variable, indicating that 210

211 mandates alone may be insufficient to substantially alter behavior. In certain locations, such as prisons, 212 mask use alone may not be sufficient to prevent transmission, social distancing may not be feasible, and 213 alternate solutions to protect these vulnerable populations may be needed⁴². Ultimately, US residents 214 will need to choose between higher levels of mask use or risking the frequent redeployment of more 215 stringent and economically damaging SDMs; or, in the absence of either measure, face a reality of a 216 rising death toll⁴³.

217 This work represents the outputs of a class of models that aim to abstract the disease 218 transmission process in populations to a level that is tractable for understanding, and, in this case, that 219 can be used for predictions. A clear consequence of any such exercise is that it will be limited by data 220 (disease and relevant covariates), the model of understanding developed, and the length of time 221 available to the model to learn/train the important dynamics. We have therefore tried to benchmark 222 our model against alternative models of the COVID-19 pandemic and fully document our predictive performance with a range of measures⁴⁴. In addition, we have provided the reader all the data and 223 224 model code to enable full reproducibility and increased transparency and presented a range of likely 225 futures in the form of a continued removal of mandates, plausible reference, and universal mask use 226 scenario for decision makers to review. In addition, triangulation of other outputs of the SEIR model, 227 such as the proportion of the population that are affected, are also provided and tested against 228 independent data, in this case seroprevalence surveys (Extended Data Fig. 9). Finally, because 229 uncertainty compounds with distance into the future predicted, the data, model, and its assumptions 230 will be iteratively updated as the pandemic continues to unfold.

As we extend this work to investigate the impact of mask use and other NPI on the global pandemic, we are hopeful that masks will be sufficient in all states to avoid a COVID-19 resurgence in the US and avoid further economic damage. The US can reduce a potential second wave, if its residents decide to do so.

235 Online content

- Results for each state are accessible through a visualization tool at <u>http://covid19.healthdata.org</u>. The
- estimates presented in this tool will be iteratively updated as new data are incorporated and will
- 238 ultimately supersede the results in this paper.
- 239

240 **References**

- 1. Miller, I. F., Becker, A. D., Grenfell, B. T. & Metcalf, C. J. E. Disease and healthcare burden of COVID-
- 242 19 in the United States. *Nat. Med.* 1–6 (2020) doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0952-y.
- 243 2. World Health Organization. *Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) situation report 163*.
- 244 https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200701-covid-19-
- 245 sitrep-163.pdf?sfvrsn=c202f05b_2 (2020).
- 246 3. Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., Hendren, N., Stepner, M. & The Opportunity Insights Team. How did
- 247 COVID-19 and stabilization policies affect spending and employment? A new real-time economic
- 248 tracker based on private sector data. (2020).
- 4. Bjørnstad, O. N., Shea, K., Krzywinski, M. & Altman, N. The SEIRS model for infectious disease
- 250 dynamics. *Nat. Methods* **17**, 557–558 (2020).
- 5. Bjørnstad, O. N., Shea, K., Krzywinski, M. & Altman, N. Modeling infectious epidemics. *Nat. Methods*17, 455–456 (2020).
- Peak, C. M., Childs, L. M., Grad, Y. H. & Buckee, C. O. Comparing nonpharmaceutical interventions
 for containing emerging epidemics. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 4023–4028 (2017).
- 255 7. Andersen, K. G., Rambaut, A., Lipkin, W. I., Holmes, E. C. & Garry, R. F. The proximal origin of SARS-
- 256 CoV-2. *Nat. Med.* **26**, 450–452 (2020).

- 257 8. World Health Organization. *Novel coronavirus disease (2019-nCoV) situation report 1*.
- 258 https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200121-sitrep-1-2019-
- 259 ncov.pdf?sfvrsn=20a99c10_4 (2020).
- 260 9. World Health Organization. WHO coronavirus disease (COVID-19) dashboard. WHO Coronavirus
- 261 *Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard* https://covid19.who.int/ (2020).
- 10. Spluttering Tracking the economic impact of covid-19 in real time. *The Economist*.
- 263 11. Council on Foreign Relations. Timeline of the coronavirus. *Think Global Health*
- 264 https://www.thinkglobalhealth.org/article/updated-timeline-coronavirus (2020).
- 12. Holshue, M. L. et al. First case of 2019 novel coronavirus in the United States. N. Engl. J. Med. 382,
- 266 929–936 (2020).
- 267 13. County of Santa Clara Emergency Operations Center. County of Santa Clara identifies three
- additional early COVID-19 deaths Novel coronavirus (COVID-19). Santa Clara County Public Health
- 269 https://www.sccgov.org/sites/covid19/Pages/press-release-04-21-20-early.aspx (2020).
- 14. Xu, B. et al. Open access epidemiological data from the COVID-19 outbreak. Lancet Infect. Dis. 20,
- 271 534 (2020).
- 272 15. Xu, B. *et al.* Epidemiological data from the COVID-19 outbreak, real-time case information. *Sci. Data*273 7, 1–6 (2020).
- 16. Johns Hopkins University Center for Systems Science and Engineering. COVID-19 dashboard. *Johns*
- 275 Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html (2020).
- 17. Beigel, J. H. *et al.* Remdesivir for the treatment of Covid-19 Preliminary report. *N. Engl. J. Med.*
- 277 (2020) doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2007764.
- 18. Boulware, D. R. *et al.* A randomized trial of hydroxychloroquine as postexposure prophylaxis for
- 279 Covid-19. *N. Engl. J. Med.* (2020) doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2016638.

- 19. Callaway, E. Coronavirus vaccine trials have delivered their first results but their promise is still
 unclear. *Nature* 581, 363–364 (2020).
- 282 20. Anderson, R. M., Heesterbeek, H., Klinkenberg, D. & Hollingsworth, T. D. How will country-based
- 283 mitigation measures influence the course of the COVID-19 epidemic? *The Lancet* **395**, 931–934
- 284 (2020).
- 285 21. Ngonghala, C. N. *et al.* Mathematical assessment of the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions
 286 on curtailing the 2019 novel coronavirus. *Math. Biosci.* **325**, 108364 (2020).
- 287 22. Lasry, A. Timing of community mitigation and changes in reported COVID-19 and community
- 288 mobility Four U.S. metropolitan areas, February 26–April 1, 2020. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly.*
- 289 *Rep.* **69**, (2020).
- 23. McKee, M. & Stuckler, D. If the world fails to protect the economy, COVID-19 will damage health not
 just now but also in the future. *Nat. Med.* 26, 640–642 (2020).
- 292 24. Jingnan, H. Why there are so many different guidelines for face masks for the public. *NPR.org*.
- 293 25. IHME COVID-19 Forecasting Team. Predictive performance of international COVID-19 mortality
- 294 forecasting models. *Nature* **MS ID: 2020-06-10908.**, (2020).
- 26. Kim, A., Andrew, S. & Froio, J. These are the states requiring people to wear masks when out in
 public. *CNN*.
- 297 27. U.S. reports nearly 50,000 new coronavirus cases, another single-day record. *The New York Times*298 (2020).
- 28. Liang, M. *et al.* Efficacy of face mask in preventing respiratory virus transmission: A systematic
 300 review and meta-analysis. *Travel Med. Infect. Dis.* 101751 (2020).
- 29. Leung, N. H. L. *et al.* Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nat. Med.* 26, 676–680 (2020).

- 30. Chu, D. K. *et al.* Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person
- transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet* **395**,

305 1973–1987 (2020).

- 306 31. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. Technical briefing: Curbing the spread of COVID-19: The
- 307 effectiveness of face masks.
- 308 32. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. COVID-19 projections. https://covid19.healthdata.org/.
- 309 33. Cintrôn-Arias, A., Castillo-Chavez, C., Bettencourt, L. M. A., Lloyd, A. L. & Banks, H. T. The estimation
- of the effective reproductive number from disease outbreak data. *Math. Biosci. Eng.* 6, 261–282
- 311 (2009).
- 312 34. Wang, J., Tang, K., Feng, K. & Lv, W. High temperature and high humidity reduce the transmission of
- 313 COVID-19. SSRN Electron. J. (2020) doi:10.2139/ssrn.3551767.
- 314 35. Kissler, S. M., Tedijanto, C., Goldstein, E., Grad, Y. H. & Lipsitch, M. Projecting the transmission
- dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period. *Science* **368**, 860–868 (2020).
- 316 36. Killerby, M. E. *et al.* Human coronavirus circulation in the United States 2014–2017. J. Clin. Virol.
- 317 **101**, 52–56 (2018).
- 318 37. Shaman, J., Pitzer, V. E., Viboud, C., Grenfell, B. T. & Lipsitch, M. Absolute humidity and the seasonal
- onset of influenza in the continental United States. *PLOS Biol.* **8**, e1000316 (2010).
- 320 38. Lyu, W. & Wehby, G. L. Community use of face masks and COVID-19: Evidence from a natural
- experiment of state mandates in the US. *Health Aff. (Millwood)* 10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00818 (2020)
- 322 doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00818.
- 323 39. Dave, D., Friedson, A., Matsuzawa, K., Sabia, J. & Safford, S. *Black lives matter protests, social*
- 324 *distancing, and COVID-19*. w27408 http://www.nber.org/papers/w27408.pdf (2020)
- 325 doi:10.3386/w27408.
- 40. Silva, C. Parties not protests are causing spikes In Coronavirus. *NPR.org*.

- 41. Littler Mendelson & 2020. Facing your face mask duties A list of statewide orders, as of June 26,
- 328 2020. *Littler Mendelson P.C.* https://www.littler.com/publication-press/publication/facing-your-
- 329 face-mask-duties-list-statewide-orders (2020).
- 42. Malloy, G. S., Puglisi, L., Brandeau, M. L., Harvey, T. D. & Wang, E. A. The effectiveness of
- interventions to reduce COVID-19 transmission in a large urban jail. *medRxiv* (2020).
- 43. López, L. & Rodó, X. The end of social confinement and COVID-19 re-emergence risk. *Nat. Hum.*
- 333 Behav. 1–10 (2020) doi:10.1038/s41562-020-0908-8.
- 44. Flaxman, S. et al. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in
- 335 Europe. *Nature* 1–8 (2020) doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2405-7.

337 Figure legends

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

Figure 1. Number of social distancing mandates by state in the US on a timeline starting on 01 February 2020 through to 04 July 2020. States are ordered by decreasing population size on the y-axis.

Figure 2. Cumulative deaths from 01 February to 31 December 2020. The inset map displays the cumulative deaths under the "plausible reference" scenario on 31 December 2020. A light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series, before and after 04 July. The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red line is the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and the green line the "universal mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and UIs for the plausible reference scenario on dates highlighted. The UIs are not shown for the "mandates easing" and "universal mask" scenarios for clarity. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the highest value (CA here), and range from zero to 62,000 sumulative deaths. This map was generated with B Studio (B Version 2.6.2)

- and range from zero to 68,000 cumulative deaths. This map was generated with R Studio (R Version 3.6.3).
- Figure 3. Daily deaths from 01 February to 31 December 2020. The inset map displays the daily deaths under the
- 351 "plausible reference" scenario on 31 December 2020. A light yellow background separates the observed and
- predicted part of the time series, before and after 04 July. The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020.
- The red line is the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and the green
- line the "universal mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and UIs for the plausible reference scenario on dates
- highlighted. The UIs are not shown for the "mandates easing" and "universal mask" scenarios for clarity. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in panels and the
- 350 panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-retter state abbreviations are provided in panels and the 357 inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban agglomerations
- 358 exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the highest value (CA here),
- and range from zero to 2,500 daily deaths. This map was generated with R Studio (R Version 3.6.3).
- Figure 4. Time series for values of R_{effective} by state in the US. Inset maps display the value of R_{effective} on 03
- 361 November and 31 December 2020; time series of R_{effective} are presented for each state as separate panels. A light
- 362 yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series, before and after 04 July. The
- dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red line is the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line
- the "plausible reference" scenario, and the green line the "universal mask" scenario. The UIs are not shown for the
- 365 "mandates easing" and "universal mask" scenarios for clarity. State panels are ordered by decreasing population
- 366 size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in panels and the inset maps. An asterisk next to state
- 367 abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons. For legibility
- purposes, the y-axes of the state panels are displayed from 0.25 to 4 and the x-axes from 01 March to 31
- 369 December 2020. These maps were generated with R Studio (R Version 3.6.3).
- **Table 1.** Cumulative deaths 04 July 2020 through 31 December 2020, maximum estimated daily deaths per million
- population, date of maximum daily deaths, and estimated R_{effective} on 31 December 2020 for three scenarios.
- 372
- 373

374 Methods

375	Our analysis strategy supports two main and interconnected objectives: (1) generate predictions of
376	COVID-19 deaths, infections, and hospital resource needs for all US states; and (2) explore alternative
377	scenarios on the basis of changes in state-imposed social distancing mandates or population levels of
378	mask use. The modeling approach to achieve this is summarized in Supplementary Information section 2
379	and can be divided into four stages: (1) identification and processing of COVID-19 data, (2) exploration
380	and selection of key drivers or covariates, (3) modelling deaths and cases across three scenarios of SDM
381	in US states using an SEIR framework, and (4) modeling heath service utilization as a function of forecast
382	infections and deaths within those scenarios. This study complies with the Guidelines for Accurate and
383	Transparent Health Estimates Reporting (GATHER) statement (Supplementary Information).
384	
385 386	Data identification and processing IHME forecasts include data from local and national governments, hospital networks and associations,
387	the World Health Organization, third-party aggregators, and a range of other sources. Data sources and
388	corrections are described in detail in the Supplementary Information. Briefly, daily confirmed case and
389	death numbers due to COVID-19 are collated from the Johns Hopkins University (JHU) data repository;
390	we supplement and correct this dataset as needed to improve the accuracy of our projections and
391	adjust for reporting-day biases (see Supplementary Information Table 4). Testing data are obtained from
392	the Our World in Data COVID tracking project and supplemented with data from additional government
393	websites (Supplementary Information Table 8). Social distancing data are obtained from a number of
394	different official and open sources, which vary by state (Supplementary Information Table 7). Mobility
395	data are obtained from Facebook Data for Good, Google, SafeGraph, and Descartes Labs
396	(Supplementary Information section 3.2). Mask use data are obtained from the Facebook Global
397	Symptom Survey (in collaboration with the University of Maryland Social Data Science Center) and

PREMISE (Supplementary Information section 3.4). Specific sources for data on licensed bed and ICU
capacity and average annual utilization in the United States are detailed in the Supplementary
Information section 2.

Before modeling, observed cumulative deaths are smoothed using a spline-based smoothing algorithm with randomly placed knots. Uncertainty is derived from bootstrapping and resampling of the observed deaths. The time series of case data is used as a leading indicator of death based on an infection fatality ratio (IFR) and a lag from infection to death. These smoothed estimates of observed deaths by location are then used to create estimated infections based on an age-distribution of infections and on age-specific IFRs. The age-specific infections were collapsed into total infections by day and state and used as data inputs in the SEIR model. Detailed descriptions of data smoothing and

408 transformation steps are provided in the Supplementary Information.

409

410 Covariate selection

411 Covariates for the compartmental transmission SEIR model are predictors of the β parameter in the 412 model that affects the transition from Susceptible to Exposed state. Covariates were evaluated on the 413 basis of biologic plausibility and on the impact on the results of the SEIR model. Given limited empirical 414 evidence of population-level predictors of SARS-CoV-2 transmission, biologically plausible predictors of 415 pneumonia such as population density (percentage of the population living in areas with more than 416 1000 individuals per square kilometer), tobacco smoking prevalence, population-weighted elevation, 417 lower respiratory infection mortality rate, and particulate matter air pollution were considered. These 418 covariates are representative at a population level and are time-invariant. Spatially resolved estimates for these covariates are derived from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019⁴⁵. Time-varying 419 420 covariates include pneumonia excess mortality seasonality, diagnostic tests per capita, population-level 421 mobility, and personal mask use. These are described in the following sections.

422 Pneumonia seasonality

423	We used weekly pneumonia mortality data from the National Center for Health Statistics Mortality
424	Surveillance System ⁴⁶ from 2013 to 2019 by US state. Pneumonia deaths included all deaths classified by
425	the full range of ICD codes in J12–J18.9. We pooled data over available years for each state and found
426	the weekly deviation from the annual, state-specific mean mortality due to pneumonia. We then fit a
427	seasonal pattern using a Bayesian meta-regression model with a flexible spline and assumed annual
428	periodicity (Supplementary Information section 3.5). For locations outside the United States, we used
429	vital registration data where available. Locations without vital registration data had weekly pneumonia
430	seasonality predicted based on latitude from a model pooling all available data (Supplementary
431	Information section 3.5).
432	
433 434	Testing <i>per capita</i> We considered diagnostic testing for active SARS-CoV-2 infections as a predictor of the ability for a state
435	to identify and isolate active infections. We assumed that higher rates of testing are negatively
436	associated with SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Our primary sources for US testing data were compiled by the
437	COVID Tracking Project (Supplementary Information section 3.3 and SI Table 8). Unless testing data
438	existed before the first confirmed case in a state, we assumed that testing is non-zero after the date of
439	the first confirmed case. Before producing predictions of testing per capita, we smoothed the input data
440	by using the same smoothing algorithm used for smoothing daily death data prior to modeling
441	(previously described). Testing per capita projections for unobserved future days were based on linearly
442	extrapolating the mean day-over-day difference in daily tests per capita for each location. We put an
443	upper limit on diagnostic tests per capita of 500 per 100,000 based on the highest observed rates in
444	June 2020.
445	

446 Social distancing mandates

447 Social distancing mandates (SDMs) were not used as direct covariates in the transmission model. Rather, 448 SDMs were used to predict population mobility (see below) which is subsequently used as a covariate in 449 the transmission model. We collected the dates of state-issued mandates enforcing social distancing as 450 well as the planned or actual removal of these mandates. The measures that we included in our model 451 were 1) severe travel restrictions, 2) closing of public educational facilities, 3) closure of non-essential 452 businesses, 4) stay at home orders, 5) restrictions on gathering size. Generally, these came from state 453 government official orders or press releases. 454 To determine the expected change in mobility due to social distancing mandates, we used a 455 Bayesian, hierarchical meta-regression model with random effects by location on the composite mobility 456 indicator to estimate the effects of social distancing policies on changes in mobility (Supplementary 457 Information section 3.1).

458

459 Mobility

460 We used four data sources on human mobility to construct a composite mobility indicator. Those 461 sources were Facebook, Google, SafeGraph, and Descartes Labs (Supplementary Information section 462 3.2). Each source has a slightly different way of capturing mobility, so before constructing a composite 463 mobility indicator, we standardized these different data sources (Supplementary Information section 464 3.2). Briefly, this first involved determining the change in a baseline level of mobility for each location by 465 data source. Then, we determined a location-specific median ratio of change in mobility for each 466 pairwise comparison of mobility sources, using Google as a reference and adjusting the other sources by 467 that ratio. The time series for mobility was estimated using a Gaussian process regression model using 468 the standardized data sources to get a composite indicator for change in mobility for each location-day. 469 We calculated the residuals between our predicted composite mobility time series and input 470 composite time series, and then applied a first-order random walk to the residuals. The random walk

was used to predict residuals from 01 January 2020 to 01 January 2021, which were then added to the
mobility predictions to produce a final time series with uncertainty: "past" changes in mobility from 01
January 2020 to 27 June 2020, and projected mobility from 27 June 2020 to 01 January 2021.

474

475 Masks

476 We performed a meta-analysis of 40 peer-reviewed scientific studies in an assessment of mask 477 effectiveness for preventing respiratory viral infections (Supplementary Information section 3.4). The studies were extracted from a preprint publication²⁸. In addition, we considered all articles from a 478 second meta-analysis³⁰ and one supplemental publication⁴⁷. These studies included both persons 479 480 working in health care and the general population – especially family members of those with known 481 infections. The studies indicate overall reductions in infections due to masks preventing exhalation of 482 respiratory droplets containing viruses, as well as some prevention of inhalation by those uninfected. 483 The resulting meta-regression calculated log-transformed relative risks and corresponding log-484 transformed standard errors based on raw counts and used a continuity correction for studies with zero 485 counts in the raw data (0.001). Whereas the other meta-analyses reported one outcome per study, we 486 extracted all relevant outcomes per study. Additionally, we included additional specifications and 487 characteristics to account for differences in characteristics of individual studies and to identify important 488 factors impacting mask effectiveness. These include the type of population using masks (general 489 population versus health care population), country of study (Asian countries versus non-Asian 490 countries), type of mask (paper, cloth, or non-descript masks versus medical masks and N95 masks), type of control group (no use versus infrequent use), type of disease (SARS-CoV 1 or 2 versus H1N1, 491 492 influenza, or other respiratory pathogens), and type of diagnosis (clinical versus laboratory). 493 We used MR-BRT – a meta-regression tool developed at the Institute for Health Metrics and

494 Evaluation (meta-regression, Bayesian, regularized, trimmed) (Supplementary Information section 2.5) –

to perform a meta-analysis that considered the various characteristics of each study. We accounted for between-study heterogeneity and quantified remaining between-study heterogeneity into the width of the uncertainty interval. We also performed various sensitivity analyses to verify the robustness of the modeled estimates and found that the estimate of the effectiveness of mask use did not change significantly when we explored four alternative analyses, including changing the continuity correction assumption, using odds ratio versus relative risk from published studies, using a fixed effects versus a mixed effects model, and including studies without covariate information.

502 We estimated the proportion of people who self-reported always wearing a face mask when 503 outside in public for both US and global locations using data from PREMISE (US) and Facebook (non-US). 504 We again used the same smoothing model as for COVID-19 deaths and testing per capita to produce 505 estimates of observed mask use. This smoothing process averaged each data point with its neighbors. 506 Tails are an average of the change in mask use over the three following days (left tail) and three 507 preceding days (right tail). The level of mask use starting on 26 June 2020 (or the last day of processed 508 and analyzed data) is assumed to be flat. Among states without state-specific data, a regional average 509 was used.

510 Deterministic modeling framework

511 Model specification is provided in detail in the Supplementary Information and summarized in a 512 schematic (SI Fig. 1). In order to fit and predict disease transmission dynamics, we include a susceptible-513 exposed-infected-recovered (SEIR) component in our multi-stage model. In particular, each location's 514 population is tracked through the following system of differential equations:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta(t)\frac{S(I_1 + I_2)^{\alpha}}{N}$$
$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \beta(t)\frac{S(I_1 + I_2)^{\alpha}}{N} - \sigma E$$

$$\frac{dI_1}{dt} = \sigma E - \gamma_1 I_1$$
$$\frac{dI_2}{dt} = \gamma_1 I_1 - \gamma_2 I_2$$
$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \gamma_2 I_2$$

where α represents a mixing coefficient to account for imperfect mixing within each location, σ is the rate at which infected individuals become infectious, γ_1 is the rate at which infectious people transition out of the pre-symptomatic phase, and γ_2 is the rate at which individuals recover. This model does not distinguish between symptomatic and asymptomatic infections but has two infectious compartments (I_1 and I_2) to allow for interventions that would avoid focus on those who could not be symptomatic; I_1 is thus the pre-symptomatic compartment. Using the next-generation matrix approach, we can directly calculate both the basic reproductive

number under control $(R_c(t))$ and the effective reproductive number $(R_{effective}(t))$ as (see

523 Supplementary Information section 5.1 for derivation):

$$R_c(t) = \alpha \cdot \beta(t) \cdot \left(I_1(t) + I_2(t)\right)^{\alpha - 1} * \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \frac{1}{\gamma_2}\right)$$

524 and

$$R_{effective}(t) = R_c(t) \cdot \frac{S(t)}{N}$$

525

526 By allowing $\beta(t)$ to vary in time, our model is able to account for increases in transmission intensity as

527 human behavior shifts over time (e.g., changes in mobility, adding or removing SDM, changes in

528 population mask use). Briefly, we combine data on cases (correcting for trends in testing),

529 hospitalizations, and deaths into a distribution of trends in daily deaths.

To fit this model, we resample 1000 draws of daily deaths from this distribution for each state (see Supplementary Information section 5). Using an estimated IFR by age (Supplementary Information section 4.2) and the distribution of time from infection to death (Supplementary Information section

4.3), we then use the daily deaths to generate 1000 distributions of estimated infections by day from 10 January to 04 July 2020. We then fit the rates at which infectious individuals may come into contact and infect susceptible individuals (denoted as $\beta(t)$) as a function of a number of predictors that affect transmission. Our modeling approach acts across the overall population (i.e., no assumed age structure for transmission dynamics), and each location is modeled independently of the others (i.e., we do not account for potential movement between locations).

539 We detail the SEIR fitting algorithm in the Supplementary Information section 5.1, but in brief, 540 by draw we first fit a smooth curve to our estimates of daily new infections. Then, sampling γ_2 , σ , and α 541 from defined ranges from literature (see SI) and using $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2}$, we then sequentially fit the *E*, I_1 , I_2 , and 542 *R* components in the past. We then algebraically solve the above system of differential equations for 543 $\beta(t)$.

The next stage of our model fits relationships between past changes in $\beta(t)$ and covariates described above: mobility, testing, masks, pneumonia seasonality, others. As detailed in Supplementary Information section 3, the time-varying covariates are forecast from 01 July to 31 December 2020. The fitted regression is then used to estimate future transmission intensity $\beta_{pred}(t)$. The final future transmission intensity is then an adjusted version of $\beta_{pred}(t)$ based on the average fit over the recent past (where the window of averaging varies by draw from 2 to 4 weeks; see Supplementary Information section 5 for more details).

Finally, we use the future estimated transmission intensity to predict future transmission (using, for each draw, the same parameter values for all other SEIR parameters). In a reversal of the translation of deaths into infections, we then use the estimated daily new infections to calculate estimated daily deaths (again using the location-specific IFR). We also use the estimated trajectories of each SEIR compartment to calculate R_c and $R_{effective}$.

- 556 A final step to take predicted infections and deaths and a hospital use microsimulation to
- 557 estimate hospital resource need for each US state is described in greater detail in the Supplementary
- 558 Information section 7 and the results presented online (https://covid19.healthdata.org/united-states-of-

559 <u>america</u>).

- 560 Forecasts/scenarios
- 561 Policy responses to COVID-19 can be supported by the evaluation of impacts of various scenarios of
- those options, against a background of business as usual assumption, to explore fully the potential
- 563 impact of policy levers available.

564 We estimate the trajectory of the epidemic by state under a "mandates easing" scenario that 565 models what would happen in each state if the current pattern of easing social distancing mandates 566 continues and new mandates are not imposed. This should be thought of as a worst-case scenario, 567 where regardless of how high the daily death rate gets, SDM will not be re-introduced and behavior 568 (including population mobility and mask use) will not vary before 31 December 2020. In locations where 569 the number of cases is rising, this leads to very high predictions by the end of the year. 570 As a more plausible scenario, we use the observed experience from the first phase of the 571 pandemic to predict the likely response of state and local governments during the second phase. This 572 plausible reference scenario assumes that in each location the trend of easing SDM will continue at its 573 current trajectory until the daily death rate reaches a threshold of 8 deaths per million. If the daily death 574 rate in a location exceeds that threshold, we assume that SDM will be reintroduced for a six-week

575 period. The choice of threshold (of a rate of daily deaths of 8 per million) represents the 90th percentile

of the distribution of daily death rate at which US states implemented their mandates during the first

- 577 months of the COVID-19 pandemic. We selected the 90th percentile rather than the 50th percentile to
- 578 capture an anticipated increased reluctance from governments to re-impose mandates because of the
- economic effects of the first set of mandates. In locations that do not exceed the threshold of a daily

580	death rate of 8 per million, the projection is based on the covariates in model and the forecasts for these
581	to 31 December 2020. In locations were the daily death rate exceeded 8 per million at the time of our
582	final model run for this manuscript (04 July 2020), we are assuming that mandates will be introduced
583	within seven days.
584	The scenario of universal mask wearing models what would happen if 95% of the population in
585	each state always wore a mask when they were in public. This value was chosen to represent the highest
586	observed rate of mask use in the world so far during the COVID-19 pandemic (see Supplementary
587	Information section 3.4). In this scenario, we also assume that if the daily death rate in a state exceeds 8
588	deaths per million, SDMs will be reintroduced for a six-week period.
589	
590	Model validation
591	Model performance was tested against reported deaths from 01 February to 30 June 2020 ²⁴ . Out-of-
592	sample predictive validity was assessed periodically for all model versions against subsequently
593	observed trends in COVID-19 weekly and cumulative mortality. The IHME hybrid SEIR model described
594	here was found to have a median absolute percent error of 9.9% at four weeks after the last available
595	input data ²⁵ . This work provides a comprehensive and reproducible platform for testing model

performance for the model presented here and all other models that have published and archived

597 similar predictions.

The increasing number of population-based serology surveys conducted also provide a unique opportunity to cross-validate our prior predictions with modeled epidemiological outcomes. In Extended Data Fig. 9 we compare these serology surveys (such as the Spanish ENE-COVID study⁴⁸) to our estimated population seropositivity time-indexed to the date that the survey was conducted. In general, across the varied locations that have been reported globally, we note a high degree of agreement

between the estimated and surveyed seropositivity. As more serology studies are conducted and
published, especially in the US, this will allow an ongoing and iterative assessment of model validity.

605

606 Limitations

607 Epidemics progress based on complex non-linear and dynamic biological and social processes that are 608 difficult to observe directly and at scale. Mechanistic models of epidemics, formulated either as ordinary 609 differential equations or as individual-based simulation models, are a useful tool for conceptualizing, 610 analyzing, or forecasting the time course of epidemics. In the COVID-19 epidemic, effective policies and 611 the responses to those policies have changed the conditions supporting transmission from one week to 612 the next, with the effects of policies realized typically after a variable time lag. Each model approximates 613 an epidemic, and whether used to understand, forecast, or advise, there are limitations on the quality 614 and availability of the data used to inform it and the simplifications chosen in model specification. It is 615 unreasonable to expect any model to do everything well, so each model makes compromises to serve a 616 purpose, while maintaining computational tractability.

617 One of the largest determinants of the quality of a model is the corresponding quality of the input 618 data. Our model is anchored to daily COVID-19-related deaths, as opposed to daily COVID-19 case 619 counts, due to the assumption that death counts are a less biased estimate of true COVID-19-related 620 deaths than COVID-19 case counts are of the true number of SARS-CoV-2 infections. Numerous biases 621 such as treatment-seeking behavior, testing protocols (such as only testing those who have traveled 622 abroad), and differential access to care greatly influence the utility of case count data. Moreover, there 623 is growing evidence that inapparent and asymptomatic individuals are infectious as well as individuals 624 who eventually become symptomatic being infectious before the onset of any symptoms. As such, our 625 primary input data for our model are counts of deaths; death data can likewise be fallible, however, and

where available, we combine death data, case data, and hospitalization data together to estimate

627 COVID-19 deaths.

628 Beyond the basic input data, there are a large number of other data sources with their own 629 potential biases that are incorporated into our model. Testing, mobility, and mask use are all imperfectly 630 measured and may or may not be representative of the practices of those that are susceptible and/or 631 infectious. Moreover, any forecast of the patterns of these covariates is associated with a large number of assumptions (detailed in the corresponding sections of the Supplementary Information), and as such, 632 633 care must be taken in the interpretation of estimates farther into the future, as the uncertainty 634 associated with the numerous sub-models that go into these estimates increases in time. 635 For practical purposes, our transmission model has made a large number of simplifying assumptions. 636 Key among these is the exclusion of movement between locations (e.g., importation) and the absence of 637 age structure and mixing within location (e.g., we assume a well-mixed population). It is clear that there 638 are large, super-spreader-like events that have occurred throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, and our 639 current model is unable to fully capture these dynamics within our predictions. Another important 640 assumption to note is that of the relationship between pneumonia seasonality and SARS-CoV-2 641 seasonality. To date, across both the northern and southern hemisphere, there is a strong association 642 between COVID-19 cases and deaths and general seasonal patterns of pneumonia deaths (SI Section 643 3.5). Our predictions through the end of 2020 are immensely influenced by the assumption that this 644 relationship will maintain through the year and that SARS-CoV-2 seasonality will be well approximated 645 by pneumonia seasonality. While we assess this assumption to the extent possible (see Supplementary 646 Information), we have not yet experienced a full year of SARS-CoV-2 transmission, and as such cannot 647 yet know if this assumption is valid.

Finally, the model presented herein is not the first model our team has developed to predict current
and future transmission of SARS-CoV-2. As the outbreak has progressed, we have attempted to adapt

650	our modeling framework to both the changing epidemiological landscape as well as the increase in data
651	that could be useful to inform a model ⁴⁹ . Changes in the dynamics of the outbreak overwhelmed both
652	the initial purpose and some key assumptions of our first model, requiring evolution in our approach.
653	While the current SEIR formulation is a more flexible framework (and thus less likely to need to be
654	wholly reconfigured as the outbreak progresses further), we fully expect the need to adapt our model to
655	accommodate future shifts in patterns of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Incorporating movement within and
656	without locations is one example, but resolving our model at finer spatial scales as well as accounting for
657	differential exposure and treatment rates across sexes and races are other dimensions of transmission
658	modelling we currently do not account for but expect will be necessary additions in the coming months.
659	As we have done before, we will continually adapt, update, and improve our model based on need and
660	predictive validity.
661	

662 Data availability statement

663 All estimates can be further explored through our customized online data visualization tools 664 (https://covid19.healthdata.org/united-states-of-america). The findings of this study are supported by data 665 available in public online repositories, data publicly available upon request of the data provider, and data not publicly available owing to restrictions by the data provider. Non-publicly available data were 666 667 used under license for the current study but may be available from the authors upon reasonable request 668 and with permission of the data provider. Detailed tables and figures of data sources and availability can be found in SI Figures 1-4, and SI Tables 1-11. All maps presented in this study are generated by the 669 670 authors using RStudio (R Version 3.6.3) and no permissions are required to publish them. Administrative 671 boundaries were retrieved from the Database of Global Administrative Areas (GADM). Land cover was 672 retrieved from the online Data Pool, courtesy of the NASA EOSDIS Land Processes Distributed Active

- Archive Center (LP DAAC), USGS/Earth Resources Observation and Science (EROS) Center, Sioux Falls,
- 674 South Dakota. Populations were retrieved from WorldPop (https://www.worldpop.org).
- 675
- 676 Code availability statement
- 677 Our study follows the Guidelines for Accurate and Transparent Health Estimate Reporting (GATHER;
- 578 Supplementary Information). All code used for these analyses is publicly available online
- 679 (<u>http://github.com/ihmeuw/</u>).
- 680
- 681 Methods References
- 45. Global Burden of Disease Collaborative Network. *Global Burden of Disease Study 2015 (GBD 2015)*
- 683 *Covariates 1980-2015*. http://ghdx.healthdata.org/record/ihme-data/gbd-2015-covariates-1980-
- 684 2015 (2016).
- 685 46. National Center for Health Statistics Mortality Surveillance System.
- 686 https://gis.cdc.gov/grasp/fluview/mortality.html.
- 47. Wang, X., Pan, Z. & Cheng, Z. Association between 2019-nCoV transmission and N95 respirator use.
- 688 J. Hosp. Infect. **105**, 104–105 (2020).
- 48. Pollán, M. *et al.* Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based
- 690 seroepidemiological study. *The Lancet* S0140673620314835 (2020) doi:10.1016/S0140-
- 691 6736(20)31483-5.
- 49. Murray, C. J. L. Op-Ed: My research team makes COVID-19 death projections. Here's why our
- 693 forecasts often change. Los Angeles Times (2020)

695 Acknowledgments

- 696 We thank the various Departments of Health and frontline health professionals who are not only
- 697 responding to this epidemic daily, but also provide the necessary data to inform this work IHME wishes
- 698 to warmly acknowledge the support of these and others
- 699 (<u>http://www.healthdata.org/covid/acknowledgements</u>) who have made our COVID-19 estimation
- roo efforts possible. This work was supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, as well as funding
- from the state of Washington and the National Science Foundation (2031096). We also extend a note of
- 702 particular thanks to John Stanton and Julie Nordstrom for their generous support.

703 Competing interests

- This study was funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The funders of the study had no role in
- study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, writing of the final report, or decision to
- publish. The corresponding author had full access to all of the data in the study and had final
- responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

708 Additional information

- 709 Supplementary Information is available for this paper: Supplementary Text on data and methods,
- 710 Supplementary Model descriptions, Supplementary References, Supplementary Figures 1-4, and
- 711 Supplementary Tables 1-11.
- 712

713 Extended Data Figure Legends

EDF 1. Estimated daily COVID-19 death rate (per 100,000 population) by state for three scenarios.

715 The inset map displays the estimated peak in daily deaths from COVID-19 death per 100,000 population by state

- between 04 July and 31 December. The light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the
- 717 time series, before and after 04 July. The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red line is the
- 718 "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and the green line the "universal 719 mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference scenario on dates
- highlighted. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in
- 720 night filled. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in 721 panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban
- agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the highest
- value (WA here), ranging from zero to 7.2. This map was generated with RStudio (R Version 3.6.3).
- 724 EDF 2. Estimated total hospital beds needed for COVID-19 patients by state from 01 February to 31
- 725 December, 2020 for three scenarios.
- 726 The inset map displays the estimated peak number of all COVID-19 beds above capacity by state between 04 July
- and 31 December. The light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series,
- before and after 04 July. The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The purple line shows the time
- trend in estimated total hospital beds needed for COVID-19 patients under the "plausible reference" scenario; the
- horizontal red line identifies estimated total COVID-19 bed capacity for each state. Numbers are the means and
- 731 uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference scenario on dates highlighted. State panels are ordered by
- 732 decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk
- next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons.
- 734 State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the most available all COVID beds (TX here), ranging from
- zero to 30,000. This map was generated with RStudio (R Version 3.6.3).
- 736 **EDF 3.** Estimated total ICU beds needed for COVID-19 patients by state from 01 February to 31
- 737 December 2020, for three scenarios.
- The inset map displays the estimated peak number of all ICU COVID-19 beds above capacity by state between 04
- July and 31 December. The light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series,
- before and after 04 July. The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The purple line shows the time
- trend in estimated total ICU beds needed for COVID-19 patients under the "plausible reference" scenario; the
- horizontal red line identifies estimated COVID-19 ICU bed capacity for each state. Numbers are the means and
- 743 uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference scenario on dates highlighted. State panels are ordered by
- decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk
- next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons.
- 746 State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the most ICU COVID beds needed (NY here), ranging from
- zero to 6,300. This map was generated with RStudio (R Version 3.6.3).
- Function 748 **EDF 4.** Estimated cumulative deaths from COVID-19 per 100,000 population from 01 February to 31
 December 2020, by state, for three scenarios.
- 750 The inset map displays the cumulative deaths under the "plausible reference" scenario on 31 December 2020. The
- 751 light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series, before and after 04 July. The
- dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red line represents the estimated time trend for deaths in
- 753 the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and the green line the
- 754 "universal mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference
- 755 scenario on dates highlighted. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state

- abbreviations are provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state
- with one or more urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate
- the state with the highest value (MA here), ranging from zero to 500 deaths per 100,000. This map was generated
- with RStudio (R Version 3.6.3).
- For three scenarios.
 For three scenarios.
- The inset map displays the cumulative infections under the "plausible reference" scenario on 31 December 2020.
- The light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series, before and after 04 July.
- The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red line represents the estimated time trend for
- infections in the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and the green line
- the "universal mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference
- 767 scenario on dates highlighted. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state
- abbreviations are provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodat
- with one or more urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate
 the state with the highest value (CA here), ranging from zero to 14,000,000. This map was generated with RStudio
- 771 (R Version 3.6.3).
- **EDF 6.** Estimated cumulative SARS-CoV-2 infection rate (per 100,000 population) by state for three
 scenarios.
- The inset map displays the estimated peak in cumulative infections from COVID-19 per 100,000 population by state between 04 July and 31 December. The light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series, before and after 04 July. The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red is the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and green line the "universal mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference scenario on dates highlighted. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in
- highlighted. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in
 panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban
- 781 agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the highest
- value (MA here), ranging from zero to 60,000. This map was generated with RStudio (R Version 3.6.3).
- 783 EDF 7. Estimated daily infections from SARS-CoV-2 from 01 February to 31 December 2020 by state
 784 for three scenarios.
- 785The inset map displays the daily infections under the "plausible reference" scenario on 31 December 2020. The786light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series, before and after 04 July. The787dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red line represents the estimated time trend for daily788infections in the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and the green line789the "universal mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference790scenario on dates highlighted. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state791abbreviations are provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state
- with one or more urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate
- the state with the highest value (CA here), ranging from zero to 350,000. This map was generated with RStudio (R
- 794 Version 3.6.3).
- 795 **EDF 8.** Estimated daily SARS-CoV-2 infection rate (per 100,000 population) by state for three scenarios.
- The inset map displays the estimated peak in daily infections from COVID-19 per 100,000 population by state
 between 04 July and 31 December. The light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the
 time series, before and after 04 July. The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red is the

- 799 "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and green line the "universal
- 800 mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference scenario on dates
- 801 highlighted. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in
- panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban
- agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the highest
- value (WA here), ranging from zero to 900. This map was generated with RStudio (R Version 3.6.3).
- 805 **EDF 9.** Modeled SARS-CoV-2 infection prediction totals compared with survey-derived seroprevalence
- 806 rates in select locations.

Fig. 1 Number of social distancing mandates by state in the US on a timeline starting on
01 February 2020 through to July 04 2020. States are ordered by decreasing population
size on the y-axis.



810

Fig. 2 Cumulative deaths from 01 February to 31 December 2020.

The inset map displays the cumulative deaths under the "plausible reference" scenario on 31 December 2020. A

814 light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series, before and after 04 July. The

- dashed vertical line is 03 November. The red line is the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible
- 816 reference" scenario, and green line the "universal mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and UIs for the
- plausible reference scenario on dates highlighted. The UIs are not shown for "mandates easing" and mask use
- 818 scenario for clarity. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are 819 provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more
- 819 provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one of more 820 urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the
- highest value (CA here), ranging from zero to 68,000 cumulative deaths. This map was generated with RStudio (R
- 822 Version 3.6.3).



Fig. 3 Daily deaths from 01 February to 31 December 2020.

The inset map displays the daily deaths under the "plausible reference" scenario on 31 December 2020. A light

826 yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series, before and after 04 July. The

- dashed vertical line is 03 November. The red line is the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible
 reference" scenario, and the green line the "universal mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and UIs for the
- reference" scenario, and the green line the "universal mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and UIs for the plausible reference scenario on dates highlighted. The UIs are not shown for the "mandates easing" and "universal
- mask^o scenarios for clarity. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations
- are provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more
- urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the
- highest value (CA here), ranging from zero to 2,500 daily deaths. This map was generated with RStudio (R Version
 3.6.3).
 - SE 6750 со 6000 ess than 1 to 6 6 to 20 20 to 45 45 to 90 hed daily 0 or mor 1.569 (801 - 2.878) 3750 2250 899 (514 - 1.638 1500 75 Feb 01 Mar 0 Apr 0 May 01 Jun 01 Jul 01 Aug 01 Sen 0 Oct 0 Nov 0 Dec 0 Dec 31 CA FL* OH* GA' 2400 1920 TX NY* IL* PA NC 1440 2400 1920 WA* AZ* MA* MO* MI NJ VA TN IN 1440 960 WI* CO* SC 2400 MD* MN AL LA KΥ OR 192 2400 OK CT* NV UT IA AR MS KS NM 1440 960 2400 1920 WV ID HI ME NH* RI MT DE NE 1440 2400 1920 DC* SD ND VT WY AK 1440 960

- 836 Fig. 4 Time series for values of R_{effective} by state in the US. Inset maps display the value
- of R_{effective} on 03 November and 31 December 2020; time series of R_{effective} are
 presented for each state as separate panels.
- Time series for values of R_{effective} by state in the US. Inset maps display the value of R_{effective} on 03 November and 31
- 840 December 2020; time series of R_{effective} are presented for each state as separate panels. A light yellow background
- separates the observed and predicted part of the time series, before and after 04 July. The dashed vertical line is
- 842 03 November. The red line is the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario,
- and green line the "universal mask" scenario. The UIs are not shown for "mandates easing" and mask use scenario
- 844 for clarity. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in
- panels and the inset maps. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban
- agglomerations exceeding two million persons. For legibility purposes, the y-axes of the state panels go from 0.25
 to 2 and the x-axes go from 01 March to 31 December. These maps were generated with RStudio (R Version 3.6.3).

Dec 31

Nov 03

0.65 to 0.85 0.65 to 0.85 0.85 10 1 0.85 to 1 1 to 1.1 1 10 1.1 1.1 to 1.2 1.1 to 1.2 WA TΝ OR 0.64 UT MT ND WY 5

EDF 1. Estimated daily COVID-19 death rate (per 100,000 population) by state for three scenarios.

- The inset map displays the estimated peak in daily deaths from COVID-19 death per 100,000 population by state
- between 04 July and 31 December. The light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the
- time series, before and after 04 July. The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red line is the
- 854 "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and the green line the "universal
- 855 mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference scenario on dates
- highlighted. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in
- 857 panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban
- agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the highest
- value (WA here), ranging from zero to 7.2. This map was generated with RStudio (R Version 3.6.3).



EDF 2. Estimated total hospital beds needed for COVID-19 patients by state from 01 February to 31 December 2020 for three scenarios.

863 The inset map displays the estimated peak number of all COVID-19 beds above capacity by state between 04 July 864 and 31 December. The light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series, 865 before and after 04 July. The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The purple line shows the time 866 trend in estimated total hospital beds needed for COVID-19 patients under the "plausible reference" scenario; the 867 horizontal red line identifies estimated total COVID-19 bed capacity for each state. Numbers are the mean and uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference scenario on dates highlighted. State panels are ordered by 868 869 decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk 870 next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons. 871 State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the most available all COVID beds (TX here), ranging from 872 zero to 30,000. This map was generated with RStudio (R Version 3.6.3).



EDF 3. Estimated total ICU beds needed for COVID-19 patients by state from 01 February to 31 December 2020 for three scenarios.

- The inset map displays the estimated peak number of all ICU COVID-19 beds above capacity by state between 04
- July and 31 December. The light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series,
- before and after 04 July. The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The purple line shows the time
- trend in estimated total ICU beds needed for COVID-19 patients under the "plausible reference" scenario; the
- 880 horizontal red line identifies estimated COVID-19 ICU bed capacity for each state. Numbers are the mean and
- uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference scenario on dates highlighted. State panels are ordered by
- 882 decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk
- 883 next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons.
- State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the most ICU COVID beds needed (NY here), ranging from
 zero to 6,300. This map was generated with RStudio (R Version 3.6.3).



EDF 4. Estimated cumulative deaths from COVID-19 per 100,000 population from 01 February to 31 December 2020 by state for three scenarios.

The inset map displays the cumulative deaths under the "plausible reference" scenario on 31 December 2020. The

890 light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series, before and after 04 July. The

dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red line represents the estimated time trend for deaths in

- the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and the green line the
- 893 "universal mask" scenario. Numbers are the mean and uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference scenario
- 894 on dates highlighted. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are
- 895 provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more 896 urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the
- urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the
 highest value (MA here), ranging from zero to 500 deaths per 100,000. This map was generated with RStudio (R
- 898 Version 3.6.3).



EDF 5. Estimated cumulative infections from SARS-CoV-2 from 01 February to 31 December 2020 by state for three scenarios.

902 The inset map displays the cumulative infections under the "plausible reference" scenario on 31 December 2020.

903 The light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series, before and after 04 July.

- 904 The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red line represents the estimated time trend for
- infections in the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and the green line
- the "universal mask" scenario. Numbers are the mean and uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference
- scenario on dates highlighted. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state
 abbreviations are provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates
- abbreviations are provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state
 with one or more urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate
- 910 the state with the highest value (CA here), ranging from zero to 14,000,000. This map was generated with RStudio
- 911 (R Version 3.6.3).



914 **EDF 6.** Estimated cumulative SARS-CoV-2 infection rate (per 100,000 population) by

915 state for three scenarios.

- 916 The inset map displays the estimated peak in cumulative infections from COVID-19 per 100,000 population by
- 917 state between 04 July and 31 December 31. The light yellow background separates the observed and predicted
- part of the time series, before and after 04 July. The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red line
- 919 is the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and green line the "universal
- 920 mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference scenario on dates
- highlighted. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in
- panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban
- agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the highest
- value (MA here), ranging from zero to 60,000. This map was generated with RStudio (R Version 3.6.3).



EDF 7. Estimated daily infections from SARS-CoV-2 from 01 February to 31 December 2020 by state for three scenarios

- 928 The inset map displays the daily infections under the "plausible reference" scenario on 31 December 2020. The
- 929 light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the time series, before and after 04 July. The
- dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red line represents the estimated time trend for daily
- 931 infections in the "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and the green line
- 932 the "universal mask" scenario. Numbers are the mean and uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference
- 933 scenario on dates highlighted. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state
- abbreviations are provided in panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state
- with one or more urban agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate
- the state with the highest value (CA here), ranging from zero to 350,000. This map was generated with RStudio (R
- 937 Version 3.6.3).



EDF 8. Estimated daily SARS-CoV-2 infection rate (per 100,000 population) by state for three scenarios

- 941 The inset map displays the estimated peak in daily infections from COVID-19 per 100,000 population by state
- 942 between 04 July and 31 December. The light yellow background separates the observed and predicted part of the
- 943 time series, before and after 04 July. The dashed vertical line identifies 03 November 2020. The red is the
- 944 "mandates easing" scenario, the purple line the "plausible reference" scenario, and green line the "universal
- 945 mask" scenario. Numbers are the means and uncertainty interval (UI) for the plausible reference scenario on dates
- 946 highlighted. State panels are ordered by decreasing population size. Two-letter state abbreviations are provided in
- 947 panels and the inset map. An asterisk next to state abbreviation indicates a state with one or more urban
- agglomerations exceeding two million persons. State panels are scaled to accommodate the state with the highest
- value (WA here), ranging from zero to 900. This map was generated with RStudio (R Version 3.6.3).







Table 1. Cumulative deaths 04 July 2020 through 31 December 2020, maximum estimated daily deaths per million population, date of maximum daily deaths, and 956 estimated R_{effective} on 31 December 2020 for three scenarios reprint doi: h 957

	"Mandates easin	g" scenario (SDM reinstated)	ar e r em ov	ed and not	"Reference" scenario (SDM imposed at daily death rate threshold of 8/million population)				"Universal mask use" scenario (95% of populat بالمنتقق wears masks and SDM re-imposed at daily death rate threshold of 8/million)				
Location	Cumulative deaths through 31 December 2020	Maximum estimated daily deaths per million	Date of maxim um daily deaths	Estimated R _{effective} on 31 December 2020	Cumulative deaths through 31 December 2020	Maximum estimated daily deaths per million	Date of maximum daily deaths	Estimated R₀ffective on 31 December 2020	Cumulative deaths through 31 December 2020	Maximum estimated daily deaths per million 큖	Deer Coversion of maximum	Estimated R _{effective} on 31 December 2020	
United States of	430494 (288,046 -	22.6 (9.4 -	12/31/		294,565 (233,885 -	5.6 (2.7 -			191,771 (175,160 -	E	32		
America	649,582)	42.1)	20	NA	398,397)	10.9)	12/5/20	NA	223,377)	3.1 (1.4 - 6.5)		NA	
	65408 (29,525 -	56.4 (15.7 -	12/31/	0.98 (0.65 -	37,016 (21,755 -	17.2 (6.0 -		0.77 (0.68 -	20,900 (15,189 -	a U	he he		
California	146,665)	135.1)	20	1.15)	73,145)	46.2)	12/5/20	0.81)	33,133)	10.3 (3.6 - 27.5) 🛓	a 🖓 12/31/20	0.60 (0.55 - 0.64)	
	57685 (24,841 -	32.1 (11.4 -	12/27/	0.90 (0.73 -	18,868 (12,371 -	10.4 (4.1 -		1.07 (0.95 -	15,335 (10,655 -	lap			
Florida	116,664)	60.8)	20	0.99)	34,415)	27.1)	10/3/20	1.17)	28,367)	6.9 (2.6 - 19.7) 🗖	12/31/20	1.00 (0.87 - 1.14)	
	43336 (20,081 -	33.5 (11.6 -	12/31/	0.96 (0.76 -	24,687 (13,871 -	12.6 (4.7 -		0.85 (0.76 -			uno		
Texas	86,964)	66.5)	20	1.08)	47,796)	30.9)	11/24/20	0.90)	10,038 (7,776 - 14,920)	4.1 (1.9 - 9.0) d	Q 12/31/20	1.09 (0.94 - 1.27)	
	33462 (32,770 -		12/31/	1.22 (1.04 -	33,462 (32,770 -			1.22 (1.04 -	32,440 (32,202 -	يم ا			
New York	34,377)	2.6 (1.3 - 4.9)	20	1.45)	34,377)	2.6 (1.3 - 4.9)	12/31/20	1.45)	32,746)	1.0 (0.9 - 1.1) 🗧 🏻	20 ± 7/4/20	1.08 (0.95 - 1.24)	
	30990 (20,155 -	55.9 (29.6 -	12/20/	0.80 (0.63 -	13,223 (11,236 -	12.1 (5.4 -		1.17 (1.07 -	12,794 (10,761 -	ġ	halis		
Massachusetts	43,981)	90.6)	20	0.94)	17,357)	28.8)	10/17/20	1.22)	17,887)	15.6 (5.7 - 42.2)	ເຈັ້ອີ້ 12/23/20	0.54 (0.45 - 0.62)	
	18731 (17,314 -	7.7 (3.5 -	12/31/	1.21 (1.04 -	18,731 (17,314 -	7.7 (3.5 -		1.21 (1.04 -	16,787 (16,296 -		graio		
New Jersey	21,245)	17.0)	20	1.43)	21,245)	17.0)	12/31/20	1.43)	17,502)	4.0 (3.6 - 4.6)	7/4/20	1.16 (1.02 - 1.33)	
	18687 (6,815 -	49.1 (13.8 -	12/31/	0.93 (0.65 -	8,508 (4,226 -	13.8 (3.2 -		0.90 (0.79 -		e	å o r		
Virginia	40,765)	98.1)	20	1.17)	19,351)	44.9)	11/17/20	0.95)	4,860 (3,003 - 10,307)	9.7 (1.8 - 36.9) 🚆	ลีตี 12/31/20	0.63 (0.54 - 0.68)	
	18089 (10,377 -	26.1 (5.5 -	12/31/	1.14 (0.82 -	15,913 (9,900 -	15.2 (3.4 -		0.69 (0.57 -		g			
Pennsyl vani a	44,570)	88.1)	20	1.40)	35,021)	57.3)	12/17/20	0.75)	9,378 (8,158 - 12,926)	3.2 (1.0 - 11.2)	Ž 등 12/31/20	1.17 (1.01 - 1.39)	
	13715 (5,491 -	67.1 (19.9 -	12/31/	0.96 (0.64 -	6,803 (3,690 -	16.2 (5.5 -		0.86 (0.75 -			a 14		
Washington	29,757)	136.1)	20	1.17)	13,342)	41.5)	11/30/20	0.91)	2,474 (1,979 - 3,323)	5.4 (2.0 - 12.3)	Ω _N 12/31/20	1.22 (1.04 - 1.45)	
	11928 (6,927 -	33.5 (11.9 -	12/31/	1.07 (0.87 -	8,819 (5,580 -	13.2 (5.7 -		0.79 (0.71 -		C.	ns 02		
Arizona	22,146)	76.3)	20	1.25)	15,392)	30.0)	12/4/20	0.84)	4,249 (3,464 - 5,605)	6.2 (4.2 - 9.3)	°°, 7/15/20	1.09 (0.93 - 1.28)	
	11032 (9,198 -	5.8 (2.3 -	12/31/	1.14 (0.99 -	11,032 (9,198 -	5.8(2.3 -		1.14 (0.99 -			od		
Illinois	14,450)	13.7)	20	1.33)	14,450)	13.7)	12/31/20	1.33)	8,336 (7,939 - 8,893)	2.6 (2.1 - 3.1)	<u>ຮັດ</u> 7/4/20	0.98 (0.88 - 1.09)	
	10045 (4,849 -	12.6 (1.6 -	12/31/	1.10 (0.89 -	10,037 (4,849 -	12.3 (1.6 -		0.64 (0.51 -			ap		
Ohio	29,965)	51.9)	20	1.30)	29,965)	50.6)	12/30/20	0.70)	4,053 (3,604 - 5,020)	2.4 (1.6 - 3.5)	±,;; 7/18/20	1.01 (0.88 - 1.18)	
	9540 (4,408 -	42.0 (15.8 -	12/31/	0.98 (0.77 -	5,706 (2,987 -	12.5 (4.1 -		0.96 (0.87 -			ep		
Alabama	18,994)	86.2)	20	1.19)	11,537)	32.4)	11/21/20	1.01)	1,852 (1,489 - 2,590)	3.5 (2.3 - 5.4)	<u>ē</u> 7/18/20	1.12 (1.00 - 1.27)	
	9412 (4,064 -	28.5 (9.6 -	12/31/	0.98 (0.82 -	5,121 (2,590 -	10.4 (3.2 -		0.95 (0.83 -			prir		
South Carolina	19,281)	58.3)	20	1.13)	10,405)	28.1)	11/8/20	1.01)	1,838 (1,329 - 2,936)	3.9 (2.4 - 6.0)	T 7/19/20	1.08 (0.97 - 1.22)	
	8221 (7,177 -	3.7 (1.0 -	12/31/	1.09 (0.96 -	8,221 (7,177 -	3.7 (1.0 -		1.09 (0.96 -			י p p		
Michigan	11,999)	17.1)	20	1.27)	11,999)	17.1)	12/31/20	1.27)	6,889 (6,691 - 7,297)	1.2 (0.9 - 1.5)	erpe p 7/14/20	0.94 (0.82 - 1.12)	
Louisiana	7059 (4,670 -	23.3 (5.7 -	12/31/	1.14 (0.87 -	6,720 (4,591 -	16.0 (3.8-	12/22/20	0.76 (0.64 -	4,064 (3,754 - 4,633)	3.6 (2.3 - 5.5)	tuity. 7/16/20	1.14 (0.99 - 1.32)	

	"Mandates easing	;" scenario (SDM reinstated)	ar e r em ove	ed and not	"Reference" scenario (SDM imposed at daily death rate threshold of 8/million population)				ع ومع "Universal mask use" scenario (95% of population) death rate threstهاؤeof 8/million)				
1 8 1	Cumulative deaths through 31	Maximum estimated daily deaths	Date of maxim um daily	Estimated R _{effective} on 31 December	Cumulative deaths through 31	Maximum estimated daily deaths	Date of maximum	Estimated R _{effective} on 31 December	Cumulative deaths through 31 December	Maximum estimated daily deaths per	Propriete of maximum	Estimated R _{effective} on	
Location	December 2020		deaths	2020	December 2020	per minion	dany deaths	2020	2020	million		31 December 2020	
	12,576)	66.0) 7.5 (3.4 -	20 12/31/	1.39) 1.17 (1.01 -	11,496)	45.8) 7.5 (3.4 -		0.81)			ied by		
Maryland	5012 (4,291 - 6,616)	18.3)	20 12/31/	1.38) 1.10 (0.98 -	5,012 (4,291 - 6,616)	18.3)	12/31/20	1.38) 1.10 (0.98 -	3,754 (3,625 - 3,960)	1.9 (1.6 - 2.1)	0. 7/4/20	1.04 (0.94 - 1.17)	
Connecticut	5010 (4,671 - 5,915)	2.7 (0.8 - 9.1) 3.9 (0.6 -	20 12/31/	1.28) 1.15 (1.00 -	5,010 (4,671 - 5,915)	2.7 (0.8 - 9.1) 3.9 (0.6 -	12/31/20	1.28) 1.15 (1.00 -	4,629 (4,536 - 4,798)	1.7 (1.4 - 2.0)	7/4/20	0.96 (0.85 - 1.11)	
Georgia	4970 (3,528 - 9,578) 4521 (2,471 -	16.8) 8.7 (2.0 -	20 12/31/	1.35) 1.17 (1.00 -	4,970 (3,528 - 9,578) 4,521 (2,471 -	16.8) 8.7 (2.0 -	12/31/20	1.35) 0.64 (0.56 -	3,521 (3,206 - 4,143)	1.9 (1.4 - 2.4) S	01/2/20	1.03 (0.90 - 1.18)	
North Carolina	11,537)	33.3) 5.0 (2.2 -	20 12/31/	1.40) 1.14 (1.00 -	11,537)	33.3) 5.0 (2.2 -	12/31/20	0.70) 1.14 (1.00 -	1,974 (1,737 - 2,499)	1.2 (1.2 - 1.2) to	the 7/4/20 ه	1.07 (0.94 - 1.23)	
Indiana	4371 (3,605 - 5,904) 4038 (1,420 -	12.4) 11.7 (1.7 -	20 12/31/	1.32) 1.12 (0.95 -	4,371 (3,605 - 5,904) 4,038 (1,420 -	12.4) 11.7 (1.7 -	12/31/20	1.32) 0.70 (0.60 -	3,025 (2,902 - 3,199)	1.8 (1.6 - 2.0)	uthor/ 7/4/20	0.94 (0.85 - 1.04)	
Tennessee	10,235) 3738 (1,039 -	40.1) 26.7 (3.2 -	20 12/31/	1.32) 1.07 (0.73 -	10,235)	40.1) 13.6 (1.5 -	12/31/20	0.75) 0.76 (0.57 -	1,087 (861 - 1,565)	1.7 (1.0 - 2.8) und	Tunde 7/17/20	1.08 (0.98 - 1.16)	
Nevada	11,987)	80.1) 12.9 (4.0 -	20 12/31/	1.36) 1.07 (0.92 -	2,750(909 - 8,884)	54.0) 11.7 (3.7 -	12/8/20	0.83) 0.70 (0.60 -	846 (665 - 1,452)	1.3 (0.6 - 2.6) מ מ	, 7/18/20	1.14 (0.99 - 1.36)	
Mississippi	3702 (2,275 - 7,113)	34.0) 4.4 (0.7 -	20 12/31/	1.24) 1.16 (1.01 -	3,674 (2,264 - 7,046)	32.3) 4.4 (0.7 -	12/27/20	0.75) 1.16 (1.01 -	1,798 (1,531 - 2,302)	5.0 (3.4 - 7.6) G	his 7/18/20	1.01 (0.91 - 1.15)	
Missouri	2470 (1,487 - 5,199)	18.2) 2.7 (0.2 -	20 12/31/	1.36) 1.18 (0.99 -	2,470 (1,487 - 5,199)	18.2) 2.7 (0.2 -	12/31/20	1.36) 1.18 (0.99 -	1,452 (1,278 - 1,744)	1.4 (0.9 - 2.1) + 5	grant 7/11/20	1.01 (0.89 - 1.15)	
Colorado	2280 (1,812 - 4,656)	15.8) 24.8 (3.1 -	20 12/31/	1.41) 1.20 (0.84 -	2,280 (1,812 - 4,656)	15.8) 19.0 (2.5 -	12/31/20	1.41) 0.73 (0.60 -	1,855 (1,761 - 2,092)	0.7 (0.5 - 1.1)	ed me	1.01 (0.82 - 1.23)	
Oregon	2277 (651 - 8,715)	107.1) 5.0 (1.2 -	20 12/31/	1.45) 1.15 (1.00 -	2,142 (635 - 8,215)	89.0) 5.0 (1.2 -	12/26/20	0.79) 1.15 (1.00 -	422 (326 - 619)	1.1 (0.3 - 2.9)		1.21 (1.01 - 1.49)	
Wisconsin	2216 (1,344 - 4,966)	19.1)	20	1.34) 1.11 (1.00 -	2,216 (1,344 - 4,966)	19.1)	12/31/20	1.34) 1.11 (1.00 -	1,107 (1,004 - 1,308)	1.1 (0.7 - 1.6)	ali, 7/17/20	0.99 (0.89 - 1.12)	
Minnesota	2202 (1,847 - 3,507)	1.5 (1.2 - 1.7) 6.1 (0.9 -	7/5/20 12/31/	1.28) 1.11 (0.95 -	2,202 (1,847 - 3,507)	1.5 (1.2 - 1.7) 6.1 (0.9 -	7/5/20	1.28) 1.11 (0.95 -	1,788 (1,706 - 1,926)	1.5 (1.2 - 1.7) 👸	9020 7/5/20 e t	0.90 (0.79 - 1.06)	
Kentucky	1944 (920 - 5,652)	25.1) 18.7 (0.9 -	20 12/31/	1.29) 1.17 (0.80 -	1,944 (920 - 5,652)	25.1) 14.6 (0.7 -	12/31/20	1.29) 0.68 (0.48 -	867 (716 - 1,250)	1.0 (0.5 - 1.8)	0 TF 7/19/20 dist	1.02 (0.90 - 1.18)	
New Mexico	1930 (694 - 7,359)	82.3) 14.2 (1.5 -	20 12/31/	1.47) 1.16 (0.91 -	1,829 (684 - 6,791)	67.9) 14.2 (1.5 -	12/24/20	0.75) 0.65 (0.51 -	724 (602 - 1,039)	1.9 (0.9 - 3.6)	olay th	1.11 (0.90 - 1.34)	
Kansas	1619 (516 - 5,697)	60.5) 12.4 (4.8-	20 12/31/	1.41) 1.20 (1.04 -	1,619 (516 - 5,697)	60.5) 12.4 (4.8 -	12/31/20	0.71) 0.56 (0.48 -	400 (338 - 524)	0.9 (0.5 - 1.4)	7/18/20 Pre pre	1.15 (1.03 - 1.28)	
Rhode Island	1604 (1,304 - 2,231)	31.5) 23.3 (3.3 -	20 12/31/	1.41) 1.12 (0.83 -	1,604 (1,304 - 2,231)	31.5) 14.3 (2.0 -	12/31/20	0.61) 0.69 (0.56 -	1,193 (1,118 - 1,314)	5.0 (4.3 - 5.8)	print 7/4/20	1.14 (1.02 - 1.29)	
New Hampshire	1506 (625 - 4,212)	80.0) 5.6 (0.2 -	20 12/31/	1.38) 1.14 (1.00 -	1,303 (594 - 3,484)	55.3) 5.6 (0.2 -	12/17/20	0.75) 1.14 (1.00 -	579 (467 - 841)	2.1 (2.1 - 2.1)	n of 7/4/20 Pet:	1.15 (1.01 - 1.36)	
Arkansas	1232 (459 - 3,495)	25.4)	20	1.31)	1,232 (459 - 3,495)	25.4)	12/31/20	1.31)	476 (377 - 675)	1.7 (1.3 - 2.3)	s 7/4/20 s preprint	1.06 (0.91 - 1.16)	

	"Mandates easin	g" scenario (SDM reinstated)	ar e rem ov	ed and not	"Reference" scenario (SDM imposed at daily death rate threshold of 8/million population)				لا بالمنافق علي المنافق المنافق المنافق death rate thresh المنافق علي المنافق علي المنافق المنافق المنافق المنافق المنافق المنافق المنافق المنافق المناف المنافق المنافق			
	Cumulative deaths through 31	Maximum estimated daily deaths	Date of maxim um daily	Estimated R _{effective} on 31 December	Cumulative deaths through 31	Maximum estimated daily deaths	Date of maximum	Estimated R _{effective} on 31 December	Cumulative deaths through 31 December	Maximum estimated daily deaths per	ware of maximum	Estimated R _{effective} on
Location	December 2020	per million	deaths	2020	December 2020	per million	daily deaths	2020	2020	million	🚆 daily deaths	31 December 2020
Utah	1163 (427 - 3,705)	11.9 (2.0 - 48.4) 9.9 (1.2 -	12/31/ 20 12/31/	1.19 (0.94 - 1.47) 1.15 (0.99 -	1,163 (427 - 3,705)	11.9 (2.0 - 48.4) 9.9 (1.2 -	12/31/20	0.53 (0.40 - 0.59) 0.61 (0.53 -	268 (230 - 339)	0.7 (0.5 - 0.8)	Titps://do	1.19 (1.05 - 1.33)
Nebraska	1068 (478 - 2,743)	37.8)	20	1.36) 1.05 (0.92 -	1,068 (478 - 2,743)	37.8)	12/31/20	0.66) 1.05 (0.92 -	436 (371 - 564)	1.6 (1.2 - 2.2)	Per 7/4/20	1.04 (0.89 - 1.19)
lowa	889 (815 - 1,057)	0.9 (0.7 - 1.0) 3.2 (0.7 -	7/4/20 12/31/	1.24) 1.19 (1.01 -	889 (815 - 1,057)	0.9 (0.7 - 1.0) 3.2 (0.7 -	7/4/20	1.24) 1.19 (1.01 -	813 (788 - 851)	0.9 (0.7 - 1.0)		0.82 (0.68 - 0.98)
Oklahoma District of	888 (589 - 1,862)	12.5) 5.1 (1.1 -	20 12/31/	1.42) 1.13 (0.99 -	888 (589 - 1,862)	12.5) 5.1 (1.1 -	12/31/20	1.42) 1.13 (0.99 -	522 (480 - 600)	0.6 (0.4 - 0.8)	3 3 9 7/11/20 3 120 7/11/20	1.00 (0.87 - 1.16)
Columbia	759(649-1,122)	20.2)	20 12/31/	1.32) 1.04 (0.91 -	759 (649 - 1,122)	20.2)	12/31/20	1.32) 1.04 (0.91 -	633 (609 - 679)	3.0 (2.5 - 3.5) a a	20.07 20.07	1.00 (0.88 - 1.18)
Delaware	668 (592 - 876)	1.9 (0.5 - 6.7) 8.6 (0.8 -	20 12/31/	1.22) 1.19 (1.02 -	668 (592 - 876)	1.9 (0.5 - 6.7) 8.6 (0.8 -	12/31/20	1.22) 0.52 (0.43 -	587 (565 - 625)	1.5 (1.1 - 1.9) ag	7/4/20	0.86 (0.74 - 1.03)
South Dakota	428(162-1,194)	35.0)	20 12/31/	1.40) 1.27 (1.09 -	428 (162 - 1,194)	35.0)	12/31/20	0.57) 1.27 (1.09 -	165 (130 - 227)	1.6 (0.8 - 2.9)	01511 01511	1.05 (0.89 - 1.21)
ldaho	150(107-305)	0.8 (0.0 - 4.5)	20	1.53) 1.09 (0.99 -	150(107-305)	0.8 (0.0 - 4.5)	12/31/20	1.53) 1.09 (0.99 -	107 (102 - 118)	0.2 (0.1 - 0.3)	9 7/9/20	1.14 (0.99 - 1.26)
Maine	132 (117 - 175)	0.2 (0.1 - 0.3)	7/7/20 12/31/	1.24) 1.13 (1.01 -	132 (117 - 175)	0.2 (0.1 - 0.3)	7/7/20	1.24) 1.13 (1.01 -	119 (115 - 127)	0.2 (0.1 - 0.3)	has (1.00 (0.83 - 1.09)
West Virginia	129 (105 - 190)	0.2 (0.0 - 0.9)	20 7/11/2	1.31) 0.89 (0.68 -	129 (105 - 190)	0.2 (0.0 - 0.9)	12/31/20	1.31) 0.89 (0.68 -	108 (102 - 117)	0.2 (0.1 - 0.3)	grante	1.02 (0.85 - 1.12)
North Dakota	103 (92 - 125)	0.3 (0.2 - 0.5)	0 12/31/	1.08) 1.40 (1.14 -	103 (92 - 125)	0.3 (0.2 - 0.5)	7/11/20	1.08) 1.40 (1.14 -	94 (90 - 100)	0.3 (0.2 - 0.5)	000 7/11/20 m to	0.68 (0.50 - 0.83)
Vermont	64 (58-81)	0.4 (0.0 - 2.2)	20	1.78) 0.90 (0.53 -	64 (58-81)	0.4 (0.0 - 2.2)	12/31/20	1.78) 0.90 (0.53 -	59 (58 - 60)	0.0 (0.0 - 0.1)		1.29 (1.12 - 1.51)
Montana	22 (21 - 24)	0.1 (0.0 - 0.2)	7/4/20	1.20) 0.76 (0.36 -	22 (21 - 24)	0.1 (0.0 - 0.2)	7/4/20	1.20) 0.76 (0.36 -	22 (21 - 24)	0.1 (0.0 - 0.2)	a 1 7/4/20	0.72 (0.40 - 1.04)
Wyoming	18 (18 - 19)	0.1 (0.0 - 0.1)	7/4/20	1.12) 0.97 (0.55 -	18 (18 - 19)	0.1 (0.0 - 0.1)	7/4/20	1.12) 0.70 (0.46 -	18 (18 - 19)	0.1 (0.0 - 0.1)	no 7/4/20	0.57 (0.26 - 0.88)
Ha waii	18 (17 - 19)	0.0 (0.0 - 0.1)	7/4/20	1.23) 0.87 (0.64 -	18 (17 - 19)	0.0 (0.0 - 0.1)	7/4/20	0.79) 0.87 (0.64 -	18 (17 - 19)	0.0 (0.0 - 0.1)	o disp	1.00 (0.71 - 1.28)
Alaska	14 (13 - 15)	0.1 (0.1 - 0.2)	7/4/20	1.16)	14 (13 - 15)	0.1 (0.1 - 0.2)	7/4/20	1.16)	14 (13 - 15)	0.1 (0.1 - 0.2)	ရွှဲမှ 7/4/20	0.73 (0.51 - 1.00)

The copyright holder for this preprint in display the preprint in perpetuity.