

# 1 Title page

2 **Article title:** Environment influences SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the absence of non-  
3 pharmaceutical interventions

4 **Running head:** SARS-CoV-2 transmission and environment

5 **Authors:** Thomas P. Smith<sup>1,\*</sup>, Seth Flaxman<sup>2,a</sup>, Amanda S. Gallinat<sup>3,a</sup>, Sylvia P. Kinosian<sup>3,a</sup>,  
6 Michael Stemkovski<sup>3,a</sup>, H. Juliette T. Unwin<sup>4,a</sup>, Oliver J. Watson<sup>4,a</sup>, Charles Whittaker<sup>4,a</sup>,  
7 Lorenzo Cattarino<sup>4,b</sup>, Ilaria Dorigatti<sup>4,b</sup>, Michael Tristem<sup>1,b</sup>, William D. Pearse<sup>1,3\*</sup>

8 <sup>1</sup> Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, Silwood Park, Ascot, Berkshire,  
9 SL5 7PY, UK

10 <sup>2</sup> Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ.

11 <sup>3</sup> Department of Biology & Ecology Center, Utah State University, 5305 Old Main Hill,  
12 Logan UT, 84322

13 <sup>4</sup> MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Imperial College London, Norfolk  
14 Place, London, W2 1PG, UK

15 <sup>a</sup> Contributed equally to analytical development of the manuscript

16 <sup>b</sup> Contributed equally to the conceptual development of the manuscript

17 \*To whom correspondence should be addressed: `thomas.smith1@imperial.ac.uk` and  
18 `will.pearse@imperial.ac.uk`

19 **We emphasise that this pre-print manuscript has not been peer-reviewed, and**  
20 **thus its findings should be considered, at best, preliminary.**

## 21 Abstract

22 As COVID-19 continues to spread across the world, it is increasingly important to under-  
23 stand the factors that influence its transmission. Seasonal variation driven by responses  
24 to changing environment has been shown to affect the transmission intensity of several  
25 coronaviruses. However, the impact of the environment on SARS-CoV-2 remains largely  
26 unknown, and thus seasonal variation remains a source of uncertainty in forecasts of  
27 SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Here we address this issue by assessing the association of  
28 temperature, humidity, UV radiation, and population density with estimates of trans-  
29 mission rate ( $R$ ). Using data from the United States of America, we explore correlates  
30 of transmission across USA states using comparative regression and integrative epidemi-  
31 ological modelling. We find that policy intervention ('lockdown') and reductions in indi-  
32 viduals' mobility are the major predictors of SARS-CoV-2 transmission rates, but in their  
33 absence lower temperatures and higher population densities are correlated with increased  
34 SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Our results show that summer weather cannot be considered  
35 a substitute for mitigation policies, but that lower autumn and winter temperatures may  
36 lead to an increase in transmission intensity in the absence of policy interventions or  
37 behavioural changes. We outline how this information may improve the forecasting of  
38 COVID-19, its future seasonal dynamics, and inform intervention policies.

## 39 Introduction

40 In late 2019 a novel coronavirus originating in Wuhan City (Hubei, China)<sup>1</sup> began to  
41 rapidly spread through the human population. Since March 2020 this disease, COVID-  
42 19, has been recognised as a global pandemic by the World Health Organisation<sup>2</sup>. The  
43 causative agent, SARS-CoV-2, is a close relative of the 2003 SARS coronavirus<sup>1</sup>, although  
44 it appears to have several differences including a higher basic reproduction number<sup>3</sup>  
45 ( $R_0$ ; the average number of people infected by a carrier at the onset of an epidemic).  
46 Understanding the factors influencing SARS-CoV-2 transmission is key for understanding  
47 the current patterns of transmission and for refining predictions of the future spread of  
48 SARS-CoV-2. Other coronaviruses display seasonal cycles of transmission and up to 30%  
49 of seasonal ‘colds’ are caused by coronaviruses<sup>4</sup>. Thus, as many Northern-hemisphere  
50 countries relax the non-pharmaceutical interventions initially imposed to control COVID-  
51 19, there is a pressing need to understand whether seasonality will enhance or drive a  
52 ‘second wave’ of COVID-19 outbreaks as they move into autumn or winter<sup>5</sup>.

53 SARS-CoV-2 is an enveloped RNA virus which is structurally (if not phylogenetically)  
54 similar to other RNA viruses such as influenza, MERS, and HCoV-NL63<sup>6</sup>, that are known  
55 to display seasonal dynamics due to their physical properties. For example, high temper-  
56 atures and low humidity can have a negative effect on influenza transmission by reducing  
57 the efficiency of respiratory droplet transmission<sup>7,8</sup>. Similar effects are seen in transmis-  
58 sion of coronaviruses<sup>9–11</sup>, where high environmental temperatures break down viral lipid  
59 layers to inactivate virus particles that are in the air or deposited on surfaces<sup>10,12</sup>. How-  
60 ever, assessing the role of environment during a disease outbreak is challenging<sup>13</sup> because  
61 human factors such as population density, herd immunity, and behaviour are likely the  
62 main drivers of transmission<sup>14–16</sup>. Moreover, the non-pharmaceutical control measures  
63 and behavioural changes in response to COVID-19 have been unprecedented in the mod-  
64 ern era. These difficulties have hindered the quantification of the impact of environment  
65 on SARS-CoV-2 transmission, making it harder to generalise and synthesise observations  
66 across regions with their differing climates. Despite these caveats, various early studies

67 have already reported effects of environmental variables such as temperature, humidity,  
68 UV levels, and wind-speed on the transmission of SARS-CoV-2<sup>17-24</sup>. While, in general,  
69 most studies appear to support increased transmission rates under cool, dry conditions<sup>18</sup>,  
70 conflicting results have been observed<sup>21,25</sup> and collectively the environmental signal ap-  
71 pears to be weak<sup>5</sup>. Much of the variability in these early results is likely due to the use  
72 of inappropriate response variables (such as cases or fatalities) which fail to capture the  
73 intrinsic variations in transmission intensity driven by the effects of non-pharmaceutical  
74 intervention measures<sup>5</sup>. Furthermore, COVID-19 has taken hold in many places with  
75 diverse climates and there are obvious examples of high transmission rates under hot,  
76 humid conditions, *e.g.* in Brazil<sup>26</sup>.

77 Accurate assessment of the role environmental factors have played so far in the spread  
78 of SARS-CoV-2 may provide insight into the future seasonality of the disease. This is  
79 because seasonal outbreaks of viruses are often driven by their responses to favourable  
80 (seasonal) changes in weather<sup>27</sup>. Most epidemiological forecasts make use of some variant  
81 of the Susceptible–Infected–Recovered (SIR) framework and/or focus on the impacts of  
82 government-level mitigation (*e.g.* Kissler et al.<sup>28</sup>, Walker et al.<sup>29</sup>). Few epidemiological  
83 models incorporate environmental impacts and, when they do, they assume COVID-19  
84 responds in a manner identical to related coronaviruses because we lack data on SARS-  
85 CoV-2's environmental (and thus seasonal) responses (*e.g.* Baker et al.<sup>18</sup>). This is  
86 despite theoretical demonstrations of the potential role of environment in driving future  
87 seasonality of SARS-CoV-2<sup>22,30</sup> and the empirical evidence in structurally-similar viruses  
88 outlined above. Efforts to incorporate climate into COVID-19 forecasting have focused  
89 on regression-type models of cases and fatalities (*e.g.* Araujo and Naimi<sup>17</sup>), which are  
90 unreliable when diseases are in the growth/expansion phase<sup>31</sup>. Furthermore, such models  
91 conflate environmental controls on occurrence with other drivers such as public health  
92 interventions (*e.g.*, the effects of lockdown measures to contain the pandemic)<sup>31</sup> as both  
93 are changing similarly through time. Such models are unlikely to yield useful insights  
94 and may be misleading to policymakers<sup>13</sup>. To address this knowledge gap, there is a need  
95 for a true synthesis of environmental modelling with well-established epidemiological

96 approaches.

97 Here we investigate the role of environment in the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by incor-  
98 porating environmental factors into an existing epidemiological framework that has been  
99 applied globally<sup>32-34</sup>, and to the USA in particular<sup>35</sup>. The USA is a large country with  
100 great variation in climate across which case and policy intervention data are comparable,  
101 permitting us to disentangle the role of environmental drivers in SARS-CoV-2 transmis-  
102 sion. We begin by exploring associations between the environment (temperature, hu-  
103 midity, UV radiation, and population density) and transmission intensity independently  
104 estimated before and during stay-at-home orders (henceforth termed “lockdown”). We  
105 used the basic reproduction number ( $R_0$ ) for our pre-lockdown transmission intensity  
106 estimates, and the time-varying reproduction number ( $R_t$ , the reproduction number,  $R$ ,  
107 at a given time,  $t$ ) averaged across an appropriate time-window for our during-lockdown  
108 estimates. After confirming a potential role for the environment, we verify and more  
109 accurately quantify the relative roles of temperature and population density by integrat-  
110 ing them into an existing semi-mechanistic epidemiological framework<sup>35</sup>. While we find  
111 strong evidence that temperature and population density are associated with SARS-CoV-  
112 2 transmission, we emphasise that our findings also re-confirm that the major drivers of  
113 transmission rates are public policy and individual behaviour. Through our use of exist-  
114 ing, robust sources of forecasts and models, our findings can be easily incorporated into  
115 workflows already used by policymakers, as we detail here.

## 116 Results

117 When analysed jointly, the  $R_0$  of all USA states are fairly well predicted by all explanatory  
118 variables included in the regression model (*i.e.* population density, temperature, absolute  
119 humidity and UV radiation), with an overall model *adjusted*  $r^2$  of 58% (supplementary  
120 table S1). However, UV radiation is a very weak predictor of  $R_0$ , while temperature  
121 and absolute humidity show sufficiently strong correlations with each other ( $r = 0.85$ )  
122 that we cannot disentangle their contributions to  $R_0$  due to high inflation of variances  
123 (supplementary table S1). This is further demonstrated through principal components  
124 analysis, where temperature and absolute humidity fall along the same principal compo-  
125 nent axis (supplementary figure S1). We therefore focused on temperature as the best  
126 fitting climate variable (assessed by Pearson's  $r$ , supplementary table S2).

127 When regressed against temperature and  $\log_{10}$ -transformed population density only, we  
128 find that  $R_0$  significantly increases with population density and decreases with tempera-  
129 ture (fig. 1; both  $p < 0.001$ , table 1). We see a stark difference, however, when analysing  
130  $R_t$  during lockdown (defined as the mean  $R_t$  recorded over the 14 day period following a  
131 stay at home order): much less of the variation in  $R_t$  is explained by the regression model  
132 (*adjusted*  $r^2 = 18\%$ ), vastly lower model coefficients for explanatory variables (*i.e.*, much  
133 lesser correlations; supplementary table S3, but note that population density is still a  
134 significant predictor), and much lower  $R_t$  estimates overall (paired  $t_{39} = 21.1$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ;  
135 figure 1b). Additionally, if we regress the combined  $R_0$  and  $R_t$  estimates against tem-  
136 perature and population density, using lockdown as a binary interaction term, we find  
137 a significant interaction between lockdown and temperature ( $p < 0.001$ , supplementary  
138 table S5), *i.e.* lockdown mediates the effects of climate on transmission.

139 The strong correlates of population density and temperature on  $R_0$  across the United  
140 States were echoed in our climate-driven Bayesian modelling of daily variation in  $R_t$ .  
141 Posterior medians of the scaled coefficients of ( $\log_{10}$ -transformed) population density and  
142 daily temperature were 0.68 and  $-0.48$ , respectively. These coefficients were strongly  
143 supported (both Bayesian probabilities  $> 99.9\%$ ), and suggest that greater population

144 density is approximately 1.4 times a greater driver of higher transmission than colder  
145 temperature ( $\frac{0.68}{0.48} \approx 1.4$ ). Changes in mobility (such as those induced by stay-at-home  
146 measures) have the potential to mitigate these impacts of both population density and  
147 temperature (figure 3). Our model suggests that even quite large variation in underlying  
148 transmission driven by either variation in temperature through time, or in population  
149 density across space, can be mitigated by reductions in mobility (see also supplementary  
150 figure S2). Critically, however, the posterior distributions are skewed, particularly for  
151 population density: high population density may be difficult to mitigate except through  
152 large mobility reductions (as shown by the credibility intervals in figure 3). We emphasise  
153 that other transmission mitigation decisions, such as hand-washing, mask-wearing, and  
154 physical distancing, were not assessed in our model. We highlight that the posterior  
155 estimates of environment and average mobility were correlated (Pearson's  $r = 0.30$  for  
156 temperature and  $r = -0.32$  for population density). This likely results from correlated  
157 changes in mobility and temperature through time, and makes the estimated mobility  
158 reductions in figure 3 conservative (*i.e.*, we potentially report larger mobility reductions  
159 than would be necessary to mitigate environmental effects).

Table 1: **Population density and temperature are drivers of  $R_0$  at state-level in the USA.** Multiple  $r^2 = 0.6037$ , *adjusted*  $r^2 = 0.5822$ ,  $F_{2,37} = 28.18$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . Scaled estimates are coefficients when predictors are scaled to have mean = 0 and SD = 1. Scaling our explanatory variables means our coefficients are measures of the relative importance of each variable. In contrast to our epidemiological modelling, temperature is a greater driver of pre-lockdown  $R_0$  than population density ( $\log_{10}$ -transformed). \* =  $p < 0.05$

	Scaled Estimate	Std. Error	$t$ value	$p$ -value
(Intercept)	2.5600	0.0494	51.80	< 0.001*
Temperature	-0.2801	0.0516	-5.43	< 0.001*
$\log_{10}$ (Pop density)	0.1921	0.0516	3.72	< 0.001*




Figure 1:  $R_0$  is affected by the environment, but the impact of lockdown is greater. (a.)  $R_0$  plotted against temperature (averaged across the two weeks prior to the  $R_0$  estimate) and  $\log_{10}$ -transformed population density (people per  $\text{km}^2$ ) for each USA state (grey points). Surface shows the predicted  $R_0$  from the regression model (table 1). Temperature has a negative effect on  $R_0$  at state-level in the USA, whilst population density has a positive effect (table 1). (b.) The mean  $R_t$  for the two weeks following a state-wide stay-at-home mandate (*i.e.*, during lockdown) plotted against average daily temperature for the same period and  $\log_{10}$ -transformed population density. The effects of temperature and population density are much weaker in the mobility-restricted data and  $R$  is reduced overall. The same colour scale, given in the centre of the figure, is used across both sub-plots.




Figure 2: **The relative importance of temperature and population density as drivers of pre-lockdown  $R_0$ .** (a.) Heatmap of the regression model  $R_0$  predictions, with USA state-level  $R_0$  point estimates overlaid. High population densities and low temperatures drive increases in SARS-CoV-2  $R_0$ . This is a 2D representation of the regression plane in fig. 1a, using the same colour-scale. (b.) Residuals from a linear regression of  $R_0$  against  $\log_{10}$ -transformed population density (“Corrected  $R_0$ ”), plotted against temperature. This illustrates that, when considering population density alone,  $R_0$  is overestimated in cold states and underestimated in warm states. After accounting for population density, there is a significant effect of temperature upon  $R_0$  (see table 1). In both figures, points are highlighted with standard two-letter state codes; MN and FL refer to Minnesota and Florida, respectively, and are referred to in the discussion.




Figure 3: **Average mobility reductions required to mitigate differences in population density and temperature.** This figure shows the percent reduction in average mobility (measuring retail, recreation, grocery, pharmacy, and workplace trips) needed to compensate for a given temperature (brown) or population density (blue) driven increase in  $R_t$ . These calculations assume a ‘background’  $R_0$  of 1 and a baseline ‘background’ mobility (defined as ‘0’ by Google<sup>36</sup>). Solid lines represent the median mobility reduction required, dashed and dotted lines the 75% and 90% posterior credibility intervals respectively.

## 160 Discussion

161 Here, by combining epidemiological models and outputs with spatial climate data, we  
162 show that environment (specifically cold, but also the correlated low-humidity conditions)  
163 can enhance SARS-CoV-2 transmission across the USA. Critically, however, these envi-  
164 ronmental impacts are weaker than that of population density which is, itself, a weaker  
165 driver than policy intervention (*i.e.*, lockdown). Below, we suggest that the accuracy of  
166 forecasts of SARS-CoV-2 transmission, in particular across seasons, could be improved  
167 by incorporating temperature, as well as population density, in a robust, reproducible  
168 manner as we have done here.

### 169 The role that environment plays in transmission

170 Across these state-level USA data, we found a significant negative effect of temperature  
171 on SARS-CoV-2's  $R_0$  and a significant positive effect of population density. An important  
172 caveat to this, however, is the collinearity between temperature, absolute humidity, and  
173 to a lesser degree, UV levels. The strong correlations between these environmental drivers  
174 mean that we are unable to discern the effects of each in a single model and therefore we  
175 focus on temperature as the most reliable environmental predictor. After accounting for  
176 the effect of population density on transmission (table 1), temperature's effect is striking  
177 (figure 2). We also tested the effects of our predictor variables on  $R_t$  for times where  
178 strict lockdown measures were in place. When these mobility restrictions are in place, we  
179 observe no significant effects of temperature on  $R_t$ , *i.e.* the effects of lockdown dampen  
180 any environmental effects so as to make them inconsequential (figure 1b; supplementary  
181 table S3). Furthermore, under lockdown conditions the overall transmission rates are  
182 vastly reduced. Through our epidemiological modelling approach we are able to account  
183 for these effects (as mobility changes are explicitly incorporated), and find that higher  
184 population densities and lower temperatures drive increased  $R_t$ . Moreover, the formula-  
185 tion of our epidemiological model ensures that under high mobility reductions, changes  
186 in environment have little effect on  $R_t$ , mirroring our regression findings (see Methods

187 and supplementary figure S2).

188 The precise physiological mechanisms for temperature-dependant inactivation in SARS-  
189 CoV-2 are still not known, but animal models for influenza have shown that increased  
190 viral transmission at lower temperatures can be due to effects on the host<sup>7,8</sup>. In animal  
191 models, this is proposed to be due to the combined effects of higher titres of viral particle  
192 shedding and greater viral stability in nasal passages of those housed in cooler condi-  
193 tions<sup>8</sup>. In addition to host effects, the persistence time of the virus outside of the body  
194 is expected to be negatively affected by higher environmental temperatures, which cause  
195 viral inactivation via breakdown of their lipid layers<sup>10,12</sup>. We emphasise that both the  
196 direct host effects, and the potential effects of environment on viral stability, are likely  
197 moderated (if not mitigated) by indoor heating<sup>37</sup>, although the same may not always be  
198 true of humidity. Contact rate is related to population density<sup>16</sup>, and so it is unsurprising  
199 that population density was a significant factor in our analysis (figure 1a). We stress that  
200 temperature was not a driver of transmission under lockdown and the effects of popula-  
201 tion density were lessened (figure 1b): outdoor conditions and population density matter  
202 little for indoor transmission.

203 There are important methodological caveats to our findings. Dynamics and reporting  
204 between USA states are known to be variable<sup>38</sup>, introducing a level of uncertainty to our  
205 findings. Furthermore, lockdown measures were (and continue to be) quite heterogeneous  
206 across the USA, with different states displaying different levels of response to COVID-  
207 19<sup>39</sup>. Through our epidemiological modelling approach we are able to account for these  
208 different state-level responses using google mobility data. We can also observe other  
209 potential confounding factors in these analyses. Across the USA, the north-eastern states  
210 in the vicinity of the major transport hub of New York City (*e.g.*, NY, NJ, ME, PA, RI,  
211 and CT) tend to have generally higher  $R_0$  than predicted, whilst west-coast states (*e.g.*,  
212 WA, CA, and OR) have lower  $R_0$  than predicted (fig 2a). While this type of effect could be  
213 due to preemptive protective measures taken by states prior to COVID-19 outbreaks, we  
214 likely mitigated this by removing states that initiated non-pharmaceutical interventions

215 before our first time-step (see methods). A further confounding factor may be seen if  
216 temperature affects human behaviour, thus making it difficult to disentangle the effects  
217 of climate from changes to mobility. We do find a link between the average mobility and  
218 temperature coefficients in our Bayesian modelling, suggesting a degree of collinearity,  
219 however (perhaps surprisingly), we see no direct correlations between daily temperature  
220 and recreational mobility trends for parks (see supplementary information). Again, this  
221 highlights the importance of human behaviour as a confounding factor in analyses of  
222 environmental drivers on SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Future work should consider finer-  
223 grained population density, as well as the presence of major transport hubs in a given  
224 region.

## 225 **Policy relevance of our findings**

226 Our results comparing SARS-CoV-2 transmission rate before and during lockdown sup-  
227 port the idea that the major driver of transmission is public health policy<sup>32,40,41</sup> (see figure  
228 1). Once stay-at-home measures were implemented across the USA, we can find no mean-  
229 ingful signal of temperature on transmission. This provides two important, and timely,  
230 insights for policy-makers: summer weather is no substitute for mitigation, and policy can  
231 prevent transmission in the winter. At the coarse scale of USA states, population den-  
232 sity is a greater driver of transmission intensity than temperature in our epidemiological  
233 modelling ( $\log_{10}(\text{population density}) \approx 1.4 \times$  larger scaled coefficient than temperature).  
234 It should be considered whether thresholds for adaptive and/or intermittent lockdown  
235 might be more precautionary (*i.e.*, lower) in colder, more densely-populated regions.  
236 However, we strongly suggest that this should neither be in order to allow other regions  
237 to actively relax restrictions, nor conducted without further examination of finer-scale  
238 disease dynamics. When making decisions about the relative importance of climate and  
239 population density, it is important to account for the magnitude of variation in the two  
240 variables. Temperature varies widely across the US, and that differences in transmission  
241 rates between states (contrast, for example, Minnesota and Florida in figure 2) may vary  
242 due to climate does not imply that more modest climate differences within a state drive

243 differences through time or across space. Regardless, our analysis is too spatially coarse  
244 to address such variation. Even quite large variations in climate are more straightforward  
245 to mitigate than population density differences (figure 3), and so we suggest that regions  
246 with higher population density should continue to be monitored carefully. Finally, we  
247 emphasise that population density and temperature are well-known to be strongly cor-  
248 related across USA states (see also figure 2); this does not affect our model fitting of  
249 coefficient estimates, but it does affect their interpretation. A more densely-populated  
250 state is also likely to be warmer, and so we suggest that both factors (and others, such  
251 as mobility) should be taken into account when trying to *a priori* estimate a region's  
252 transmission rate.

253 These results have strong implications for modellers considering the potential impacts  
254 of seasonality on the virus. Such work has already considered the role that seasonality  
255 might play by assuming responses of structurally similar and/or related diseases are  
256 adequate proxies for SARS-CoV-2<sup>18</sup>. These assumptions are broadly correct, but here  
257 we parameterise and quantify the magnitude of this effect for SARS-CoV-2. Our findings  
258 suggest that previously unexplained variation among regions' transmission, such as in  
259 our independently-estimated  $R_0$  data, can be accounted for by environmental factors.  
260 Further, our results support a role for daily temperature changes in transmission, but, we  
261 emphasise, do not conflict with other studies suggesting that seasonal forecasting plays  
262 a secondary role to mitigation and/or number of susceptible individuals. Such studies<sup>18</sup>  
263 assumed SARS-CoV-2 responds to climate to broadly similar extents that we find here.  
264 What our results do suggest, however, is that future forecasting work should consider the  
265 use of the environment to enhance predictions of disease spread. In countries such as the  
266 USA with continental climates that swing between extremes of heat and cold, we suggest  
267 policy-makers should assume that transmission will increase in winter (and potentially  
268 autumn/fall). The timing of the seasons are broadly predictable, and so this is an area  
269 in which policy could be proactive, not reactive.

## 270 Conclusion

271 There is no single cause of, or solution to, the current COVID-19 pandemic, and all drivers  
272 must be placed in perspective. Here we suggest that both environment, and daily weather,  
273 may play a role in the transmission of SARS-CoV-2. The major driver of transmission,  
274 and our best method of controlling it, is public policy, as this and many other studies  
275 have shown<sup>40,41</sup>. The role of environment in transmission has become controversial, in  
276 part because of the application of models to case prevalence, rather than fundamental  
277 epidemiological parameters such as  $R$  that we model here. We call for more researchers  
278 to work directly with epidemiologists to identify those components of epidemiological  
279 modelling that can be informed by outside specialists' areas of expertise. By working  
280 together, we can efficiently increase epidemiological research capacity to better combat  
281 and control this pandemic.

## 282 Methods

283 We explored the association between environmental covariates and SARS-CoV-2 trans-  
284 mission intensity using two approaches. First, we took existing state-level estimates of  
285  $R_0$  and during-lockdown  $R_t$  for the USA<sup>35</sup>, and regressed them against environmental  
286 data in order to test for potential pre- and during-lockdown patterns. In the second  
287 approach, we modified and fitted the existing semi-mechanistic epidemiological model  
288 used to generate the  $R_0$  and  $R_t$  estimates above, and fitted it to the observed death  
289 time series whilst explicitly incorporating the effects of the most important aspects of  
290 environment (temperature and population density) on the virus. This second model  
291 makes use of daily weather observations and provides a rigorous framework to quantify  
292 the drivers of SARS-CoV-2 transmission across the USA. The first approach mitigates  
293 potential biases arising from the autocorrelation of the initiation of lockdown and the  
294 cessation of winter in the USA in the second approach, since our independent regression  
295 focuses on initial transmission (*i.e.*,  $R_0$ ). Below, all software packages given in *italics*  
296 are *R* packages (version 3.6.3)<sup>42</sup> unless otherwise specified. Code to reproduce our anal-  
297 yses, download source data, and update models with new data as it becomes available,  
298 are given in both the supplementary materials and at our team's *GitHub* repository  
299 (<https://www.github.com/pearselab/tyrell>).

## 300 Data collection

301 We collated global population density data from the Center for International Earth Sci-  
302 ence Information Network (CIESIN)<sup>43</sup>, and hourly temperature ( $T$ ), relative humid-  
303 ity ( $RH$ ) and surface UV radiation (in  $\text{J m}^{-2}$ ) estimates for 2020 from the Copernicus  
304 Climate Change Service<sup>44</sup>. All the above data were at the same spatial resolution of  
305  $0.25 \times 0.25^\circ$ . The amount of water vapour air can hold increases with temperature and,  
306 since in other viruses the absolute humidity ( $AH$ ) of air can drive transmission more  
307 than relative saturation<sup>37,45</sup>, we calculated absolute humidity from our data using the  
308 the Clausius–Clapeyron relation and the ideal gas law<sup>22,45</sup>:

$$AH = 1000 \cdot \frac{e_0 \cdot e^{\frac{L}{R_v}(\frac{1}{T_0} - \frac{1}{T})} \cdot RH}{R_v \cdot T} \quad (1)$$

309 Where  $AH$  ( $\text{g m}^{-3}$ ) is the absolute humidity,  $T$  (K) the temperature in a given cell,  $RH$   
310 the relative humidity in a given cell (expressed as a percentage),  $e_0$  the saturation vapor  
311 pressure (6.11mb) at reference temperature  $T_0$  (which we set as 273.15K),  $L$  the latent  
312 heat of evaporation for water ( $2257 \text{ kJ kg}^{-1}$ ), and  $R_v$  the gas constant for water vapour  
313 ( $461.53 \text{ J kg}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1}$ ).

314 We used the Climate Data Operators program<sup>46</sup> to compute daily means for each of our  
315 climate variables. Finally, we averaged the value of each covariate (median) across the  
316 state-level administrative units given by GADM shapefiles<sup>47</sup> (the 50 USA states, plus  
317 Washington DC).

### 318 **Independent validation of the impact of environment on $R_0$**

319 To validate the impact of the environment on  $R_0$  we used an existing dataset of SARS-  
320 CoV-2 transmission rate estimates for each of the states of the USA<sup>35</sup>. We used the  
321 basic reproduction estimates ( $R_0$ , before the implementation of any non-pharmaceutical  
322 interventions) as a fundamental measure of virus transmissibility in each state.

323 In these data,  $R_0$  is estimated as  $R_{t=0}$  where  $t = 0$  occurs 30 days prior to the first 10  
324 cumulative deaths recorded for each state<sup>32,35</sup>. The date upon which  $R_0$  is estimated  
325 therefore differs between states. To account for these temporal differences, we took the  
326 means of our daily climate variables across the 14 days prior to  $t = 0$  for each state  
327 as an approximation for the conditions under which each population first experienced  
328 COVID-19. To test the impact of the environment on  $R_0$ , we performed multiple linear  
329 regression on  $R_0$  with temperature, absolute humidity, UV radiation, and population  
330 density as predictors. To compare environmental effects on the reproduction number un-  
331 der mobility restriction measures (*i.e.*, lockdown), we took the average (mean)  $R_t$  across  
332 the 14 days following a state-wide stay-at-home mandate and regressed these against

333 the environmental predictors averaged across the same time period. We used 14 days  
334 again here for consistency with our environmental comparison to  $R_0$ . Although mobility  
335 restrictions may differ in magnitude between states, these effects are incorporated into  
336 the estimates for the  $R_t$  parameter. In 7 states (Arkansas, Iowa, North Dakota, Ne-  
337 braska, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wyoming) no state-wide stay-at-home mandate  
338 was declared. In a further 4 states (Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, and Utah),  $t = 0$  occurred  
339 after non-pharmaceutical interventions had already been instated. These 11 states were  
340 therefore excluded from the independent validation analyses.

## 341 **Integrative modelling of the impact of environment on SARS-** 342 **CoV-2 transmission**

343 To further assess the potential impact of environment on SARS-CoV-2 transmission, we  
344 modified the semi-mechanistic Bayesian model<sup>35</sup> that generated the  $R_0$  and  $R_t$  estimates  
345 used above to incorporate both population density and daily temperature (the best fitting  
346 climate variable; see results), as follows:

$$R_{t,m} = (\mu + c_{t,m}C + p_m P) \cdot 2InvLogit\left(-\sum(X_{t,m,k}\alpha_k) - X_{t,m,1}\alpha_{r(m)}^{region} - X_{t,m,2}\alpha_m^{state} - \epsilon\right) \quad (2)$$

347 Where  $\mu$  captures overall transmission common to all states,  $c$  the coefficient for temper-  
348 ature ( $C_{t,m}$ ; in degrees C) at time ( $t$ ) in state  $m$ ,  $p$  the coefficient for population density  
349 ( $P_m$ ) of state  $m$  ( $\log_{10}$ -transformed people per km<sup>2</sup>). We standardised  $c_{t,m}$  and  $p_m$  to have  
350 a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1, in order to make their absolute magnitudes mea-  
351 sures of the relative importance of each term and thus facilitate their comparison. We  
352 placed strong, conservative priors on these new model terms, specifically:

$$c_{t,m}, p_m \sim Normal(0, 0.5) \quad (3)$$

353

$$\mu \sim Normal(3.28, 0.5) \quad (4)$$

354 For  $\mu$ , this is the same as the prior used in the original (non-climate) model<sup>35</sup> (but see  
355 our caveat below about this term). The other terms are unchanged from their original  
356 definitions given in Unwin et al.<sup>35</sup>, and we briefly describe them below. *InvLogit* is  
357 the inverse logit transformation applied to a series of hierarchically-nested terms ( $\alpha_k$ ,  
358  $\alpha_{r(m)}^{region}$ , and  $\alpha_m^{state}$ ) multiplied by Google mobility data<sup>36</sup> ( $X_{t,m,k}$ ) with a weekly *AR*(2)  
359 autocorrelated error term for each state ( $\epsilon$ ; see Unwin et al.<sup>35</sup> for more details).  $X_{t,m,k}$  are  
360 three US-wide measures of the impact of changing mobility across states (a daily proxy  
361 for lockdown intensity) on ‘average’ across retail and recreation, grocery and pharmacy,  
362 and workplace trips ( $X_{t,m,1}$ ), in ‘residential’ areas ( $X_{t,m,2}$ ), and using public ‘transit’  
363 ( $X_{t,m,3}$ ). We focus on the vector  $\alpha_k$ , whose three entries assess the impact of mobility  
364 comparably across the country (and thus are each analogous to  $c$  and  $p$ ). The terms  
365  $\alpha_{r(m)}^{region}$  and  $\alpha_m^{state}$  address differences in average mobility across eight broad geographic  
366 regions [the Great Lakes, Great Plains, Rocky Mountains, Northeast Corridor, Pacific  
367 North-West, South Atlantic, Southern Appalachia, and the South (‘TOLA’); indexed by  
368  $r(m)$ ] and for transit across individual states ( $m$ ), respectively. While we attempted to  
369 address comparable hierarchically-nested temperature responses in this model, we felt  
370 the correlation between changes in  $X_{t,m,k}$  and  $c_{t,m}$  were inducing fitting problems and  
371 so opted for a model simpler (and so more conservative) in its novel components. In  
372 this model formulation, temperature and population density essentially contribute to a  
373 latent transmission rate, which is then mediated by the mobility terms to produce the  
374 realised  $R_t$ . Although an interaction between mobility and environment (as found in our  
375 regression modelling, see Results) is not explicitly modelled, this formulation produces  
376 results analogous that finding, *i.e.* when mobility reductions are high (“lockdown”),  
377 environment has little effect on the realised  $R_t$  (see supplementary figure S2).

378 We emphasise that the model presented here differs from the original model by fitting  
379 a common  $\mu$  across all states, instead of allowing each state to have a different baseline

380  $\mu$  that was hierarchically drawn from a common parameter (itself termed  $\mu$  in Unwin  
381 et al.<sup>35</sup>). This difference ensures identifiability of our model parameters, since the (la-  
382 tent, and hierarchically pooled) state-wise means are strongly driven by both population  
383 density and environment that are now included in the model (see results). Our model,  
384 which was directly adapted from the code in Unwin et al.<sup>35</sup>, was fit using *rstan*<sup>48</sup> with  
385 5 independent chains (each with 3,000 total iterations and a warm-up of 1,000). Full  
386 model coefficients and outputs are given in the supplementary materials (supplementary  
387 table S6); posterior predictive checks were performed to ensure that the predicted  $R_t$   
388 values for each state through time were realistic and sensible and all chains had mixed  
389 and converged.

## 390 References

- 391 [1] Peng Zhou, Xing Lou Yang, Xian Guang Wang, Ben Hu, Lei Zhang, Wei Zhang,  
392 Hao Rui Si, Yan Zhu, Bei Li, Chao Lin Huang, Hui Dong Chen, Jing Chen, Yun  
393 Luo, Hua Guo, Ren Di Jiang, Mei Qin Liu, Ying Chen, Xu Rui Shen, Xi Wang,  
394 Xiao Shuang Zheng, Kai Zhao, Quan Jiao Chen, Fei Deng, Lin Lin Liu, Bing Yan,  
395 Fa Xian Zhan, Yan Yi Wang, Geng Fu Xiao, and Zheng Li Shi. A pneumonia  
396 outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature*, 579  
397 (7798):270–273, 2020. ISSN 14764687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7. URL [http:  
398 //dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7).
- 399 [2] World Health Organisation. WHO Director-General’s opening remarks  
400 at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020, 2020. URL  
401 [https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-  
402 opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020).
- 403 [3] Ying Liu, Albert A. Gayle, Annelies Wilder-Smith, and Joacim Rocklöv. The repro-  
404 ductive number of COVID-19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *Journal of  
405 Travel Medicine*, 27(2):1–4, 2020. ISSN 17088305. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa021.
- 406 [4] M. Mesel-Lemoine, J. Millet, P.-O. Vidalain, H. Law, A. Vabret, V. Lorin, N. Es-  
407 criou, M. L. Albert, B. Nal, and F. Tangy. A Human Coronavirus Responsible for  
408 the Common Cold Massively Kills Dendritic Cells but Not Monocytes. *Journal of  
409 Virology*, 86(14):7577–7587, 2012. ISSN 0022-538X. doi: 10.1128/jvi.00269-12.
- 410 [5] Albertus J. Smit, Jennifer M. Fitchett, Francois A. Engelbrecht, Robert J. Scholes,  
411 Godfrey Dzhivhuho, and Neville A. Sweijd. Winter Is Coming: A Southern Hemi-  
412 sphere Perspective of the Environmental Drivers of SARS-CoV-2 and the Potential  
413 Seasonality of COVID-19. *International Journal of Environmental Research and  
414 Public Health*, 17(16):5634, 2020. ISSN 1660-4601. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17165634.
- 415 [6] Mingxuan Xie and Qiong Chen. Insight into 2019 novel coronavirus — An up-

- 416 dated interim review and lessons from SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV. *Interna-*  
417 *tional Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 94:119–124, 2020. ISSN 18783511. doi:  
418 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.03.071. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.03.071>.
- 419 [7] Anice C. Lowen, Samira Mubareka, John Steel, and Peter Palese. Influenza virus  
420 transmission is dependent on relative humidity and temperature. *PLoS Pathogens*,  
421 3(10):1470–1476, 2007. ISSN 15537366. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.0030151.
- 422 [8] Anice C. Lowen and John Steel. Roles of Humidity and Temperature in Shaping  
423 Influenza Seasonality. *Journal of Virology*, 88(14):7692–7695, 2014. ISSN 0022-538X.  
424 doi: 10.1128/jvi.03544-13.
- 425 [9] Jianguo Tan, Lina Mu, Jiaxin Huang, Shunzhang Yu, Bingheng Chen, and Jun  
426 Yin. An initial investigation of the association between the SARS outbreak and  
427 weather: With the view of the environmental temperature and its variation. *Journal*  
428 *of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 59(3):186–192, 2005. ISSN 0143005X. doi:  
429 10.1136/jech.2004.020180.
- 430 [10] K. H. Chan, J. S. Malik Peiris, S. Y. Lam, L. L.M. Poon, K. Y. Yuen, and W. H.  
431 Seto. The effects of temperature and relative humidity on the viability of the SARS  
432 coronavirus. *Advances in Virology*, 2011, 2011. ISSN 16878639. doi: 10.1155/2011/  
433 734690.
- 434 [11] N. van Doremalen, T. Bushmaker, and V. J. Munster. Stability of middle east  
435 respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) under different environmental con-  
436 ditions. *Eurosurveillance*, 18(38):1–4, 2013. ISSN 15607917. doi: 10.2807/1560-  
437 7917.ES2013.18.38.20590.
- 438 [12] Dewald Schoeman and Burtram C. Fielding. Coronavirus envelope protein: Current  
439 knowledge. *Virology Journal*, 16(1):1–22, 2019. ISSN 1743422X. doi: 10.1186/  
440 s12985-019-1182-0.
- 441 [13] Colin J. Carlson, Joseph D. Chipperfield, Blas M. Benito, Richard J. Telford, and

- 442 Robert B. O'Hara. Species distribution models are inappropriate for COVID-19.  
443 *Nature ecology & evolution*, 4(June):770–771, 2020. ISSN 2397334X. doi: 10.1038/  
444 s41559-020-1212-8. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-1212-8>.
- 445 [14] Colin J Carlson, Ana C R Gomez, Shweta Bansal, and Sadie J Ryan. Misconceptions  
446 about weather and seasonality must not misguide COVID-19 response. *Nature com-*  
447 *munications*, 11(1):4312, 2020. ISSN 2041-1723. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-18150-z.  
448 URL <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32855406>.
- 449 [15] Hannah M Korevaar, Alexander David Becker, Ian F Miller, Bryan T Gren-  
450 fell, C Jessica E Metcalf, and Michael J Mina. Quantifying the impact of  
451 US state non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 transmission. *medRxiv*,  
452 page 2020.06.30.20142877, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.06.30.20142877. URL [http://](http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/07/01/2020.06.30.20142877.abstract)  
453 [medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/07/01/2020.06.30.20142877.abstract](http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/07/01/2020.06.30.20142877.abstract).
- 454 [16] J. Rocklöv and H. Sjödin. High population densities catalyze the spread of COVID-  
455 19. *Journal of travel medicine*, (March):1–2, 2020. ISSN 17088305. doi: 10.1093/  
456 jtm/taaa038.
- 457 [17] Miguel B. Araujo and Babak Naimi. Spread of SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus likely  
458 to be constrained by climate. *medRxiv*, page 2020.03.12.20034728, 2020. doi:  
459 10.1101/2020.03.12.20034728. URL [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.12.20034728v3)  
460 [2020.03.12.20034728v3](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.12.20034728v3).
- 461 [18] Rachel E Baker, Wenchang Yang, Gabriel A Vecchi, C Jessica E Metcalf, and  
462 Bryan T Grenfell. Susceptible supply limits the role of climate in the early SARS-  
463 CoV-2 pandemic. *Science*, 2020. ISSN 1095-9203. doi: 10.1126/science.abc2535.  
464 URL <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32423996>.
- 465 [19] Qasim Bukhari and Yusuf Jameel. Will Coronavirus Pandemic Diminish by Summer?  
466 *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2020. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3556998.
- 467 [20] Biqing Chen, Hao Liang, Xiaomin Yuan, Yingying Hu, Miao Xu, Yating Zhao, Binfen

- 468 Zhang, Fang Tian, and Xuejun Zhu. Roles of meteorological conditions in COVID-  
469 19 transmission on a worldwide scale. *medRxiv*, 11:2020.03.16.20037168, 2020. doi:  
470 10.1101/2020.03.16.20037168. URL [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/  
471 2020.03.16.20037168v1](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.16.20037168v1).
- 472 [21] Wei Luo, Maimuna S Majumder, Dianbo Liu, Canelle Poirier, Kenneth D  
473 Mandl, Marc Lipsitch, and Mauricio Santillana. The role of absolute humid-  
474 ity on transmission rates of the COVID-19 outbreak. *medRxiv*, 2020. doi:  
475 10.1101/2020.02.12.20022467. URL [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/  
476 2020.02.12.20022467v1](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.02.12.20022467v1).
- 477 [22] Yueling Ma, Yadong Zhao, Jiangtao Liu, Xiaotao He, Bo Wang, Shihua Fu, Jun Yan,  
478 Jingping Niu, Ji Zhou, and Bin Luo. Effects of temperature variation and humidity  
479 on the death of COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *Science of the Total Environment*, 724,  
480 2020. ISSN 18791026. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138226.
- 481 [23] Cory Merow and Mark C Urban. Seasonality and Uncertainty in COVID-  
482 19 Growth Rates. *medRxiv*, (April):2020.04.19.20071951, 2020. doi: 10.1101/  
483 2020.04.19.20071951. URL [http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/04/22/  
484 2020.04.19.20071951.abstract](http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/04/22/2020.04.19.20071951.abstract).
- 485 [24] Mohammad M. Sajadi, Parham Habibzadeh, Augustin Vintzileos, Shervin Shokouhi,  
486 Fernando Miralles-Wilhelm, and Anthony Amoroso. Temperature, Humidity, and  
487 Latitude Analysis to Estimate Potential Spread and Seasonality of Coronavirus Dis-  
488 ease 2019 (COVID-19). *JAMA network open*, 3(6):e2011834, 2020. ISSN 25743805.  
489 doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.11834.
- 490 [25] Ye Yao, Jinhua Pan, Zhixi Liu, Xia Meng, Weidong Wang, Haidong Kan, and Weib-  
491 ing Wang. No association of COVID-19 transmission with temperature or UV radi-  
492 ation in Chinese cities. *European Respiratory Journal*, 55(5), 2020. ISSN 13993003.  
493 doi: 10.1183/13993003.00517-2020.

- 494 [26] Darlan S. Candido, Ingra M. Claro, Jaqueline G. de Jesus, William M. Souza, Filipe  
495 R. R. Moreira, Simon Dellicour, Thomas A. Mellan, Louis du Plessis, Rafael H. M.  
496 Pereira, Flavia C. S. Sales, Erika R. Manuli, Julien Théze, Luiz Almeida, Mariane T.  
497 Menezes, Carolina M. Voloch, and Et Al. Evolution and epidemic spread of SARS-  
498 Cov-2 in Brazil. *Science*, 369(6508):1255–1260, 2020. ISSN 0038092X. doi: 10.1126/  
499 science.abd2161.
- 500 [27] National Research Council. *Linkages Between Climate, Ecosystems, and Infectious*  
501 *Disease*. 2001. ISBN 0309512026. URL [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK222243/)  
502 [http://newscenter.lbl.gov/2012/11/12/boss-quasars-](http://newscenter.lbl.gov/2012/11/12/boss-quasars-early-universe/)  
503 [early-universe/](http://newscenter.lbl.gov/2012/11/12/boss-quasars-early-universe/).
- 504 [28] Stephen M. Kissler, Christine Tedijanto, Edward Goldstein, Yonatan H. Grad, and  
505 Marc Lipsitch. Projecting the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the  
506 postpandemic period. *Science*, page eabb5793, 2020. ISSN 0036-8075. doi: 10.1126/  
507 science.abb5793.
- 508 [29] Patrick GT Walker, Charles Whittaker, Oliver Watson, Marc Baguelin, Kylie E C  
509 Ainslie, Sangeeta Bhatia, Samir Bhatt, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Olivia Boyd, Lorenzo  
510 Cattarino, Zulma Cucunubá, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, Amy Dighe, Christl A Don-  
511 nelly, Ilaria Dorigatti, Sabine Van Elsland, Rich Fitzjohn, Seth Flaxman, Han Fu,  
512 Katy Gaythorpe, Lily Geidelberg, Nicholas Grassly, Will Green, Arran Hamlet,  
513 Katharina Hauck, David Haw, Sarah Hayes, Wes Hinsley, Natsuko Imai, David Jor-  
514 gensen, Edward Knock, Daniel Laydon, Swapnil Mishra, Gemma Nedjati-Gilani,  
515 Lucy C Okell, Steven Riley, Hayley Thompson, Juliette Unwin, Robert Verity,  
516 Michaela Vollmer, Caroline Walters, Wei Wang, Yuanrong Wang, Peter Winskill,  
517 Xiaoyue Xi, Neil M Ferguson, and Azra C Ghani. The Global Impact of COVID-19  
518 and Strategies for Mitigation and Suppression. *Imperial College COVID-19 Response*  
519 *Team*, March(March):19, 2020. URL [doi.org/10.25561/77735](https://doi.org/10.25561/77735).
- 520 [30] Jingyuan Wang, Ke Tang, Kai Feng, and Weifeng Lv. High Temperature and High

521 Humidity Reduce the Transmission of COVID-19. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2020.  
522 doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3551767.

523 [31] Joseph D Chipperfield, Blas M. Benito, Robert B. O'Hara, Richard J. Telford, and  
524 Colin J. Carlson. On the inadequacy of species distribution models for modelling  
525 the spread of SARS-CoV-2 : response to Araújo and Naimi. *medRxiv*, 2020.

526 [32] Seth Flaxman, Swapnil Mishra, Axel Gandy, H. Juliette T. Unwin, Thomas A.  
527 Mellan, Helen Coupland, Charles Whittaker, Harrison Zhu, Tresnia Berah, Jef-  
528 frey W. Eaton, Mélodie Monod, Pablo N. Perez-Guzman, Nora Schmit, Lucia Cilloni,  
529 Kylie E.C. Ainslie, Marc Baguelin, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Olivia Boyd, Lorenzo Cat-  
530 tarino, Laura V. Cooper, Zulma Cucunubá, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, Amy Dighe,  
531 Bimandra Djaafara, Ilaria Dorigatti, Sabine L. van Elsland, Richard G. FitzJohn,  
532 Katy A.M. Gaythorpe, Lily Geidelberg, Nicholas C. Grassly, William D. Green,  
533 Timothy Hallett, Arran Hamlet, Wes Hinsley, Ben Jeffrey, Edward Knock, Daniel J.  
534 Laydon, Gemma Nedjati-Gilani, Pierre Nouvellet, Kris V. Parag, Igor Siveroni, Hay-  
535 ley A. Thompson, Robert Verity, Erik Volz, Caroline E. Walters, Haowei Wang,  
536 Yuanrong Wang, Oliver J. Watson, Peter Winskill, Xiaoyue Xi, Patrick Gt Walker,  
537 Azra C. Ghani, Christl A. Donnelly, Steven M. Riley, Michaela A.C. Vollmer,  
538 Neil M. Ferguson, Lucy C. Okell, and Samir Bhatt. Estimating the effects of non-  
539 pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*, (March), 2020. ISSN  
540 14764687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2405-7.

541 [33] Thomas A Mellan, Henrique H Hoeltgebaum, Swapnil Mishra, Charlie Whittaker,  
542 Ricardo P Schnekenberg, Juan Vesga, Harrison Zhu, Michael Hutchinson, Oliver  
543 Ratmann, Melodie Monod, Marc Baguelin, Sangeeta Bhatia, Adhiratha Boonyasiri,  
544 Nicholas Brazeau, Giovanni Charles, V Cooper, Zulma Cucunuba, Gina Cuomo-  
545 dannenburg, Amy Dighe, Bimandra Djaafara, Jeff Eaton, L Van Elsland, Richard  
546 Fitzjohn, Keith Fraser, Katy Gaythorpe, Will Green, Sarah Hayes, Natsuko Imai,  
547 Edward Knock, Daniel Laydon, John Lees, Tara Mangal, Andria Mousa, Gemma  
548 Nedjati-gilani, Pierre Nouvellet, Daniela Olivera, Kris V Parag, Michael Pickles,

549 Hayley A Thompson, Robert Verity, Haowei Wang, Yuanrong Wang, Oliver J Wat-  
550 son, Lilith Whittles, Xiaoyue Xi, Lucy Okell, Patrick Walker, Azra Ghani, Steven  
551 Riley, Neil M Ferguson, Christl A Donnelly, and Seth Flaxman. Report 21: Esti-  
552 mating COVID-19 cases and reproduction number in Brazil. Technical Report May,  
553 Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team, 2020.

554 [34] Michaela A. C. Vollmer, Swapnil Mishra, H Juliette T Unwin, Axel Gandy,  
555 Thomas A. Mellan, Valerie Bradley, Harrison Zhu, Helen Coupland, Iwona Hawry-  
556 luk, Michael Hutchinson, Oliver Ratmann, Melodie Monod, Patrick Walker, Charlie  
557 Whittaker, Lorenzo Cattarino, Constance Ciavarella, Lucia Cilloni, Kylie Ainslie,  
558 Marc Baguelin, Sangeeta Bhatia, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Nicholas Brazeau, Gio-  
559 vanni Charles, Laura V Cooper, Zulma Cucunuba, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, Amy  
560 Dighe, Bimandra Djaafara, Jeff Eaton, Sabine L van Elsland, Richard FitzJohn,  
561 Keith Fraser, Katy Gaythorpe, Will Green, Sarah Hayes, Natsuko Imai, Ben Jeffrey,  
562 Edward Knock, Daniel Laydon, John Lees, Tara Mangal, Andria Mousa, Gemma  
563 Nedjati-Gilani, Pierre Nouvellet, Daniela Olivera, Kris V Parag, Michael Pickles,  
564 Hayley A Thompson, Robert Verity, Caroline Walters, Haowei Wang, Yuanrong  
565 Wang, Oliver J Watson, Lilith Whittles, Xiaoyue Xi, Azra Ghani, Steven M Riley,  
566 Lucy Okell, Christl A. Donnelly, Neil M Ferguson, Ilaria Dorigatti, Seth Flaxman,  
567 and Samir Bhat. Using mobility to estimate the transmission intensity of COVID-19  
568 in Italy : A subnational analysis with future scenarios. *medRxiv*, 2020. doi: 10.1101/  
569 2020.05.05.20089359. URL <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.05.20089359>.

570 [35] H Juliette T Unwin, Swapnil Mishra, Valerie C Bradley, Axel Gandy, A Thomas,  
571 Helen Coupland, Jonathan Ish-horowicz, Michaela A C Vollmer, Charles Whittaker,  
572 Sarah L Filippi, Xiaoyue Xi, Mélodie Monod, Oliver Ratmann, Michael Hutchinson,  
573 Harrison Zhu, Iwona Hawryluk, Philip Milton, Kylie E C Ainslie, Marc Baguelin,  
574 Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Nick F Brazeau, Lorenzo Cattarino, Zulma Cucunuba, Ilaria  
575 Dorigatti, Oliver D Eales, Jeffrey W Eaton, Sabine L Van, Richard G Fitzjohn, Katy  
576 A M Gaythorpe, William Green, Wes Hinsley, Benjamin Jeffrey, Edward Knock,

- 577 Daniel J Laydon, John Lees, Gemma Nedjati-gilani, Pierre Nouvellet, Lucy Okell,  
578 Kris V Parag, Igor Siveroni, Hayley A Thompson, Caroline E Walters, Oliver J  
579 Watson, Lilith K Whittles, Azra C Ghani, M Neil, Steven Riley, Christl A Donnelly,  
580 Samir Bhatt, and Seth Flaxman. State-level tracking of COVID-19 in the United  
581 States. *medRxiv*, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.07.13.20152355.
- 582 [36] Ahmet Aktay, Shailesh Bavadekar, Gwen Cossoul, John Davis, Damien Desfontaines,  
583 Evgeniy Gabrilovich, Krishna Gadepalli, Bryant Gipson, Miguel Guevara, Chaitanya  
584 Kamath, Mansi Kansal, Ali Lange, Chinmoy Mandayam, Andrew Oplinger, Christo-  
585 pher Pluntke, Thomas Roessler, Arran Schlosberg, Tomer Shekel, Swapnil Vispute,  
586 Mia Vu, Gregory Wellenius, Brian Williams, and Royce J Wilson. Google COVID-19  
587 Community Mobility Reports : Anonymization Process Description (version 1.0 ).  
588 *arXiv*, 2020.
- 589 [37] Jeffrey Shaman, Virginia E. Pitzer, Cécile Viboud, Bryan T. Grenfell, and Marc Lip-  
590 sitch. Absolute humidity and the seasonal onset of influenza in the continental United  
591 States. *PLoS Biology*, 8(2), 2010. ISSN 15449173. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1000316.
- 592 [38] Emily Javan, Spencer J Fox, and Lauren Ancel Meyers. Probability of cur-  
593 rent COVID-19 outbreaks in all US counties. *medRxiv*, 2020. doi: 10.1101/  
594 2020.04.06.20053561. URL [http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/04/11/  
595 2020.04.06.20053561.abstract](http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/04/11/2020.04.06.20053561.abstract).
- 596 [39] Georgios Neofotistos and Efthimios Kaxiras. Modeling the Covid-19 Pan-  
597 demic Response of the US States. *medRxiv*, 2020. doi: 10.1101/  
598 2020.06.24.20138982. URL [http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/25/  
599 2020.06.24.20138982.abstract](http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/25/2020.06.24.20138982.abstract).
- 600 [40] Christopher I. Jarvis, Kevin Van Zandvoort, Amy Gimma, Kiesha Prem, Megan  
601 Auzenbergs, Kathleen O'Reilly, Graham Medley, Jon C. Emery, Rein M.G.J.  
602 Houben, Nicholas Davies, Emily S. Nightingale, Stefan Flasche, Thibaut Jombart,  
603 Joel Hellewell, Sam Abbott, James D. Munday, Nikos I. Bosse, Sebastian Funk,

604 Fiona Sun, Akira Endo, Alicia Rosello, Simon R. Procter, Adam J. Kucharski, Tim-  
605 othy W. Russell, Gwen Knight, Hamish Gibbs, Quentin Leclerc, Billy J. Quilty,  
606 Charlie Diamond, Yang Liu, Mark Jit, Samuel Clifford, Carl A.B. Pearson, Ros-  
607 alind M. Eggo, Arminder K. Deol, Petra Klepac, G. James Rubin, and W. John  
608 Edmunds. Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on the transmis-  
609 sion of COVID-19 in the UK. *BMC Medicine*, 18(1):1–10, 2020. ISSN 17417015.  
610 doi: 10.1186/s12916-020-01597-8.

611 [41] Hien Lau, Veria Khosrawipour, Piotr Kocbach, Agata Mikolajczyk, Justyna Schu-  
612 bert, Jacek Bania, and Tanja Khosrawipour. The positive impact of lockdown in  
613 Wuhan on containing the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Journal of travel medicine*,  
614 27(3):1–7, 2020. ISSN 17088305. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa037.

615 [42] R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, 2020.  
616 URL <https://www.r-project.org/>.

617 [43] Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN). Gridded  
618 Population of the World, Version 4 (GPWv4): Population Density, Revision 11.  
619 Technical report, NASA Socioeconomic Data and Applications Center (SEDAC),  
620 Palisades, NY, 2018.

621 [44] Copernicus Climate Change Service. Essential climate variables for assessment  
622 of climate variability from 1979 to present. Technical report. URL [https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/cdsapp{\#}!/dataset/ecv-for-climate-change](https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/cdsapp/{\#}!/dataset/ecv-for-climate-change).  
623

624 [45] Jeffrey Shaman and Melvin Kohn. Absolute humidity modulates influenza survival,  
625 transmission, and seasonality. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*  
626 *of the United States of America*, 106(9):3243–3248, 2009. ISSN 00278424. doi:  
627 10.1073/pnas.0806852106.

628 [46] Uwe Schulzweida. CDO User Guide (Version 1.9.8), 2019.

629 [47] Global Administrative Areas. GADM database of Global Administrative Areas,  
630 version 3.6, 2020. URL <https://www.gadm.org>.

631 [48] Stan Development Team. RStan: the R interface to Stan., 2020. URL [http://mc-](http://mc-stan.org/)  
632 [stan.org/](http://mc-stan.org/).

## 633 **Data and Code Availability Statement**

634 No new data are released as part of this project. Code to reproduce the full analysis  
635 pipeline is available from our *GitHub* repository ([https://www.github.com/pearselab/](https://www.github.com/pearselab/tyrell)  
636 [tyrell](https://www.github.com/pearselab/tyrell)).

## 637 **Acknowledgements**

638 This work was funded by a Natural Environment Research Council grant NE/V009710/1.  
639 WDP and the Pearse Lab are also funded by National Science Foundation grants ABI-  
640 1759965 and EF-1802605.