Determinants of COVID-19 Incidence and Mortality in the US: Spatial Analysis

Niranjan J. Kathe, MS, PhD[1*] and Rajvi J. Wani, MS, PhD[2]

[1] Senior Manager, Complete HEOR Solutions, North Wales, PA, USA, 19454

[2] Real World Evidence Manager, Amgen Canada Inc, Mississauga, ON, Canada L5N 0A4

[#]*NK and RW joint first co-authorship*

***Corresponding Author:**

Niranjan J. Kathe, MS, PhD

Complete HEOR Solutions

North Wales, PA, USA 19454

niranjan.kathe@outlook.com | c: +1-402.215.5528

Running Title: Ecological Determinants of COVID-19 Incidence and Mortality

Conflicts of Interests Disclosure statement:

No conflict of interest to report. In addition, RW is an Amgen employee and the publication is a result of outside work and not related to Amgen. The opinions and viewpoints expressed by the authors do not reflect the opinions, beliefs and viewpoints of Amgen Canada Inc. NK is an employee of Complete HEOR solutions and the research presented in this paper is not related to Complete HEOR Solutions. The opinions and viewpoints expressed by the authors do not reflect the opinions, beliefs, and viewpoints of Complete HEOR Solutions.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, Coronavirus disease 2019, Public policy, Social Determinants of Health, Health status disparities, Spatial analysis

Word count of Manuscript: 2,981

Word count of Summary: 200

Tables: 2

Figures: 3

Supplementary Material: 1

Number of references: 27

Determinants of COVID-19 Incidence and Mortality in the US: Spatial Analysis

SUMMARY

The US continues to account for the highest proportion of the global coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19) cases and deaths. Amid the second wave, it is important to contextualize the spread and success of mitigation efforts. The objective of this study was to assess the ecological determinants (policy, health behaviors, socio-economic, physical environment, and clinical care) of COVID-19 incidence and mortality. Data from the New York Times' COVID-19 repository (01/21/2020-10/27/2020), 2020 County Health Rankings, 2016 County Presidential Election Returns, and 2018-2019 Area Health Resource File were used. County-level logged incidence and mortality rate/million were modelled using Spatial Autoregressive Combined model and spatial. Counties with higher proportions of Republican voters, and racial minorities, those not proficient in English, and higher population density, pollution-particulate matter, residential segregation between non-Whites & Whites were associated with high incidence rates. Subsequently, counties with higher Republican voters, excessive drinkers, children in single-parent households, uninsured adults, racial minorities, females, and high population density, pollution-particulate matter, and residential segregation between non-Whites & Whites was associated with high COVID-19 mortality rates. The study's spatial models identified length of order, population density, income, and uninsurance rate, and race/ethnicity as some important determinants of the geographic disparities in COVID-19 incidence and mortality.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, Coronavirus disease 2019, Public policy, Social Determinants of Health, Health status disparities, Spatial analysis

INTRODUCTION

The Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic continues to spread in the US and around the world. The US, as of November 16, 2020 recorded 11.5 million COVID-19 cases and 252,534 deaths, which accounted for 21% of the global cases and 19% of the global deaths [1]. The COVID-19 pandemic containment in the US was challenging actors due to virus contagion characteristics, its pathophysiology, and socio-political factors. In response to the pandemic, by the first week of April, all but two states and local authorities imposed social distancing measures and restrictions.[2] As of the writing of this study, many states who had eased restrictions are implementing lockdown policies again, which will impact future community-level transmission[2]. However, some states are now at the forefront of implementing lockdown measures again to curb the second wave of the pandemic. For example, Washington (as of November 15, 2020) has implemented full lockdown orders while Nebraska (November 13, 2020) has put Class D4E elective surgeries on hold [3,4].

Restriction measures such as the closure of business establishments, stay-at-home, and social distancing mandates had a severe impact on the economy. In response to the pandemic, the lawmakers passed the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES) Act and understanding the impact of the pandemic-related restriction measures is necessary to shape future federal relief efforts [5]. As of November 16, 2020, biopharmaceutical companies are conducting clinical trials for Fifty-four vaccine candidates, of which Moderna's and Pfizer's mRNA-based candidates have recently published promising preliminary phase III trial results [6–8]. COVID-19 vaccines may receive market approval in the near future; however, experts recommend COVID-19 safety measures to continue due to uncertainties surrounding COVID-19 vaccines (duration of immunity, effectiveness, vaccine uptake, etc.) [9]. In summary, fiscal, legislative, and scientific efforts are all underway to address the needs of the population in the current phase of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the assessment of the impact of ecological contextual factors such as health behaviors, clinical care, socio-economic, and physical environment-related characteristics are also required to understand which strategies work, to what extent, and for which groups. Having a thorough knowledge of these ecological contextual factors is critical to address the public health and economic challenges and prioritize resources.

Studies so far have generated predictive models for growth in COVID-19 cases and deaths and estimated some of the impacts of some community-level factors associated on COVID-19 incidence and mortality. Millett *et al.* and Khanijahania *et al.* had focused on assessing the ecological determinants of susceptibility to COVID-19 outcomes among predominantly black counties, while Fielding-Miller *et al.* and Peters *et al.* performed a similar assessment along the rural-urban continuum [10–13]. Few studies

had assessed the spatial determinants of COVID-19 transmission [14–16]. Recently, Sun *et al*. assessed the relationship between various county-level determinants and COVID-19 incidence while Andersen et al. also identified high [14,15]. These studies had evaluated the incidence and prevalence during the initial phase of the pandemic and limited the analysis to selected county-level factors as predictors for incidence and mortality. The goal of the current study was to assess the impact of county-level ecological factors on the cumulative incidence and mortality due to COVID-19 during the initial phase of the pandemic using the spatial econometric analysis.

METHODS

Data source and study design

The current study used county-level COVID-19 confirmed cases and deaths data from the New York Times repository extracted as of October 27, 2020, and included data up until that date [17]. The study used county-level characteristics from 2020 County Health Rankings data, 2018-2019 Area Health Resource File data, 2016 County Presidential Election Returns data, and state-level lockdown duration data was generated based on the lockdown start and end date obtained from Ballotpedia as of October 27, 2020 [18–20]. Counties from Alaska and Hawaii and counties with less than 25 cumulative cases as of October 27, 2020 were excluded from the analysis. The US counties ESRI Shapefile were obtained from the US Census Bureau [21]. The study employed a cross-sectional ecological study design to assess the association between county-level characteristics on the cumulative COVID-19 incidence cases and deaths.

Outcomes

The county-level cumulative COVID-19 cases and COVID-19 deaths as of October 27, 2020 (per million population) were the operational definition for COVID-19 incidence and mortality rate, respectively. The resulting incidence and mortality rates were log transformed due to the skewed nature of the county-level cumulative incidence and mortality rates.

Covariates

The covariates selected to predict the county-level incidence and mortality were based on the County Health Ranking framework. The framework categorizes health factors into four sub-categories, namely health behaviors, clinical care, socio-economic factors, physical environment (**Figure 1**). Each of the sub-categories is further divided into individual components. Although the County Health Ranking model assigns weights to each of the components, they were not utilized in the current analysis as no composite rank score was calculated. The individual components were used as covariates in the

regression. The final list of county-level covariates included in the model is described in **Supplementary Table 1**. In addition to the above county-level factors, length of state-level lockdown duration, and month (January/February/March) of the first reported case at the state-level were included as covariates. Finally, the county-level composition of the Republican voters was also added to determine the extent to which county's community health was associated with voting preference for the 2016 presidential elections.

Statistical Analyses

Descriptive univariate statistics of the weighted county-level characteristics. The presence of spatial correlation was confirmed by performing Moran's I test for correlation of ordinary least square regression residuals. Due to spatial correlation in the data, the current study employed spatial regression analysis approach. Two island counties were excluded from the spatial regression analysis. Prior research on spatial analysis of COVID-19 used the spatial autoregressive combined model (SAC) model to evaluate the association between period prevalence of COVID-19 and county-level characteristics [14]. The SAC model was also adopted for modeling cumulative incidence and deaths if both the spatial lag parameter (rho) and spatial error parameter (lambda) were statistically significant. However, model simplification was attempted when one of the parameters was not significant. A first order queen spatial weight matrix was employed for all spatial models. The queen matrix defines neighbor relationships if the counties either share a border or a vertex. All analysis was performed in SAS Studio University Edition (Cary, NC), QGIS v 3.16.0 (Berne, Switzerland), and RStudio (R) v 4.0.3 (Boston, Massachusetts).

RESULTS

The final analysis included data from 3,101 counties from the mainland US. Between January 20 to October 27, 2020, the population-weighted cumulative incidence and mortality rates for the mainland US were 26,576 and 632 per million, respectively. **Table 1** demonstrates descriptive statistics of the incidence and mortality rates, and county-level determinants namely, health behaviors, clinical care, socio-economic, and physical environment factors. Fifteen states had a length of lockdown of 59 days or more and 39 states reported their first case in the month of March. Overall, 2,499 counties leaned Republican (50% of the votes in the county were for the Republican presidential candidate in 2016). The weighted proportion of adult smokers, adults with obesity, adults with physical inactivity, and Medicare enrollees that were administered influenza vaccines and adults with some college education were 15%, 29%, 23%, 19%, and 65%, respectively. Premature (<75 years) age-adjusted mortality was 344 per

100,000. Among socio-economic factors, unemployment was 4%, 12% of adults were uninsured, the mean income inequality ratio was 5. About 12% were African Americans, 18% Hispanics, 1% Native Americans and 4% population not proficient in English. Mean percentage of the population older than 65 years and less than 18 years were 16% and 23%, respectively. On average, 19% counties were rural, homeownership rate was 65%, 33% of the children lived in single-parent households and 18% of households had severe housing problems. At the county-level, the rate of primary care physicians (logged) and preventable hospitalization (logged) was 4 and 8, respectively. Importantly, there was no multicollinearity-related issue in our analysis as VIF for the selected variables was less than 7.

Figure 2 presents the spatial distribution of septile of logged COVID-19 incidence rates. In the West, the Oregon High desert and Twin Falls areas, New Mexico's Navajo and Apache areas, and Spokane areas had clusters of high incidence rates. In the Midwestern region, Tribal lands and the Great Plains regions including North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska and Iowa (congruence of these borders near Sioux Falls area), Minnesota, Wisconsin (specifically Superior Upland area), and Kansas regions had clusters with high incidence rates. In the South, in the Delta region along the Mississippi river including Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee, central Alabama, and Arkansas states had clusters of high incidence rates. The Corpus Christie area and along the US-Mexico border in Texas had clusters of high incidence rates. Additionally, the high incidence rate clusters were found in the Tallahassee, Jacksonville, Savannah area and Miami-Dade county area. Conversely, the incidence rates were lower in the Pacific-Northwest areas. The spatial distribution of the logged COVID-19 mortality rates (by septiles) presented in **Figure 3** demonstrated similar patterns. However, in the Northeastern region, clusters of high mortality rates were found from the greater Philadelphia area to Boston in Massachusetts, including the Tristate area. Contrarily, the mortality rate clusters in Wisconsin's Superior Upland area were smaller.

Table 2 presents the results from spatial regression models that assessed the impact of ecological determinants on COVID-19 incidence and mortality rates (logged). The rho and lambda model parameters both were significant for the incidence rate SAC regression. However, only the rho parameter was significant for the mortality rate regression model. Therefore, the SAC model was used for incidence rate analysis, while the spatial lag model was used for mortality rate analysis. The analysis further tested the spatial correlation for the residuals of both models using Moran's I statistic. The Moran's I for the model residuals was not significant for incidence rate (SAC model) and mortality rate (spatial lag model) regression, which indicated no significant spatial autocorrelation of residuals. The length of lockdown order, a policy-related factor, was significantly associated with incidence rate.

Compared to the counties that had no orders implemented, counties with an order length of 1-27 days, 36-58 days and 59 or more days had a 0.290, 0.228 and 0.335 unit decrease in logged COVID-19-related incidence rates, respectively. Among clinical care-related factors, logged primary care physicians' rate, logged preventable hospitalization rates and logged hospital beds were all associated with 0.011, 0.045, and 0.004 unit increase in logged incidence rates, respectively. A 1% increase in influenza vaccinations and Republican political leaning was associated with 0.003 and 0.002-unit increase in logged incidence rates. Among other socio-economic factors, a 1% increase in adults with some college education, children in single parent households, and a unit increase in social association rate and logged median income, resulted in 0.004, 0.003, 0.003 and 0.158 decrease in logged incidence rates, respectively. Specifically, among the racial/ethnic factors, 1% increase in African Americans, Native Americans, Hispanics and those not proficient in English was associated with 0.007, 0.008, 0.015 and 0.010-unit increase in logged incidence rates, respectively. Conversely, 1% increase in 65 years or older and those less than 18 years of age was associated with 0.020 and 0.011 decrease in logged incidence rates. While a unit increase in black and white residential segregation , and a percentage point increase in rurality was associated with a 0.002 and 0.001 unit decrease in logged incidence rates, on the other hand a unit increase in white and non-white residential segregation and air pollution-particulate matter were associated with an 0.003 and 0.062-unit increase in these rates.

Subsequently, when compared to the counties that had no orders implemented, counties with order length of 28-35 days, 36-58 days and 59 or more days had a 0.824, 0.866 and 1.006 unit decrease in logged COVID-19-related mortality rates, respectively. Compared to counties from states that first reported COVID-19 cases in January, those with the first reported case in February were associated with 0.628-unit decrease in logged mortality rates. Among health behaviors, 1% increase in excessive drinking, influenza vaccinations resulted in 0.107 and 0.039 increase in logged mortality rates. Logged primary care physicians' rate and hospital beds resulted in 0.234 and 0.033 units increase in logged mortality rates. Among socio-economic factors, 1% increase in Republicans, females, children in single-parent households, and uninsured adults resulted in a 0.017, 0.101, 0.018, and 0.038 units increase in logged mortality rates, respectively. However, 1% increase in adults with some college education was negatively associated i.e. 0.041 decrease in logged mortality rates. Among racial/ethnic composition, 1% increase in African Americans, Native Americans, and Hispanics were associated with 0.032, 0.034, and 0.037 unit increase in logged mortality rates. Logged population density was also positively associated with incidence and mortality rates by 0.028 and 0.270-units, respectively. Additionally, 1% increase in air pollution, and residential segregation- Non-White/Whites resulted in 0.130 and 0.014 increase in

logged mortality rates. Whereas residential segregation- African Americans/White, and rurality were negatively associated with mortality rates by 0.010 and 0.014 units.

DISCUSSION

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first spatial analysis study that captured and assessed the cumulative incidence and deaths during the majority of the year 2020 (January 21 to October 28, 2020) of the COVID-19 pandemic in the US. The study found that counties with higher proportions of Republican voters, social association rates, racial minorities (African Americans, Native Americans and Hispanics), those not proficient in English and counties with higher residential segregation between non-Whites & Whites, population density, pollution-particulate matter were associated with higher incidence rates. However, counties with longer length of stay-at-home orders, higher proportion of adults with some college education, high-income, elderly, children, rurality and higher segregation between African Americans & Whites had lower incidence rates. Correspondingly, counties with higher Republican voters, excessive drinkers, children in single-parent households, uninsured adults, racial minorities (African Americans, Native Americans and Hispanics), females, and higher population density, pollution-particulate matter, and residential segregation between non-Whites & Whites had higher COVID-19 mortality rate.

Few studies have assessed the impact of different ecological factors on COVID-19 incidence and mortality rates in the US and worldwide. Similar to current study, Peters *et al.* reported higher age, population density, uninsured rate to be associated with increased susceptibility to COVID-19 outcomes [12]. Khazanchi *et al.* and Nayak *et al.* also reported a similar association between higher county-level susceptibility score and higher incidence of COVID-19 incidence and deaths [11,22]. Similar to our study, Liang *et al.* also assessed the impact of air pollution level and found increased air pollution to be associated with an increased mortality rate [23]. While Fielding-Miller *et al.* reported higher COVID-19 mortality for counties with higher non-English speaking populations, our study showed higher incidence rates among this group [13]. Also, in agreement with the current study, other studies have reported high incidence and mortality rates in counties with greater proportions of racial minorities (Native Americans, Hispanics and African Americans) [11,14,24]. Moreover, with increase in population density, incidence and mortality rates increased, which has been reported by Sun *et al.* Unlike this study, Mollalo *et al.* spatial analysis found that increase in household income was associated with increased incidence rate [25]. However, that same study reported that increase in providers (example: nurse practitioners) increased incidence rates, which was similar to our findings. Allcott *et al.* and Goolsbee *et al.* also have pointed out ‘partisanship’ as a risk factor for non-adherence to preventive guidelines and

mask use. Our study also observed that higher Republican leaning counties were associated with higher incidence and mortality [26,27]. Interestingly, similar to Sun *et al*., the current study also reported lower incidence among counties with higher proportions of people over 65 years of age [14].

The study has important limitations. First, log transforming the outcomes i.e. cumulative incidence and mortality rates as a linear dependent variable may mask the variations across counties. To our understanding, there is no software package currently available that runs a spatial lag model with a dependent variable with Poisson or Binomial distribution and thus, this study transformed the outcomes in their logarithmic form. Given the cross-sectional nature of the study, no causal inferences can be made. There are considerable differences in the testing rates across regions and counties and can influence the observed incidence rate. The list of variables is by no means comprehensive and does not include several other factors such as mobility, local restriction policies (county or city-level), compliance with local and federal prevention guidelines. The current analysis is ecological in nature and no direct inferences can be drawn at the individual level.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study are more insightful than the mere coronavirus count meters and data visualizations that depict the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic. The current spatial models incorporated a comprehensive list of factors to ensure that the results, when parsed, offer a multi-faceted explanatory power. For illustration, these models helped identify factors including policy-related factors (i.e. length of order), health behaviors (example: excessive drinking), clinical care (example: preventable hospitalization rate), socio-economic factors (example: race/ethnicity, median income, uninsurance rate, education), and physical environment (example: population density, air pollution-particulate matter, rurality, residential segregation among races, homeownership) as some of the important determinants of the geographic disparities in COVID-19 incidence and mortality. In accordance with prior research, this study reaffirms that policy restrictions have helped to limit the COVID-19 incidence and mortality. This study highlights the plausible effect of one’s residential location, vicinity, and local policymakers; and the connectivity to the neighboring counties on the incidence and mortality of COVID-19. As the country is facing the next wave of the pandemic, the study findings have important policy implications and guidance on identifying areas at greater risk of infection and mortality. As the pandemic gains momentum in the rural areas, especially in the Midwest and South, contextualized policies at the local level that align with state and federal policies will be necessary to contain the next wave.

FUNDING

The study received no funding.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no competing interests.

CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION

All authors have consented for this manuscript to be published.

COMPETING INTERESTS

None.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

NK and RW conceived and designed the study; RW collected, cleaned and curated the data; NK and RW conducted the statistical analysis. NK and RW discussed the results, interpreted the data and modified the first manuscript. NK supervised the data collection and interpreted the data. Both the authors have read and gave final approval for publication.

REFERENCES

1. **CDC**. *Cases in the U.S.* (https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/cases-in-us.html). Accessed 15 November 2020.
2. **USA Today**. *Map of COVID-19 case trends, restrictions and mobility*. 2020; Published online: 27 November 2020.
3. **Yasmeen Wafai**. *What you can and can't do under Washington's newest coronavirus stay-home restrictions*. *Seattle Times*. Seattle, 2020; Published online: 16 November 2020.
4. **Matt Olberding**. *Hospitals to further restrict elective surgeries due to COVID-19*. *Lincoln Journal Star*. Lincoln, 2020; Published online: 13 November 2020.
5. **CHAPPELOW J**. *Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act*. *Investopedia*. 2020.
6. **Corum J, Wee S-L, Zimmer C**. *Covid-19 Vaccine Tracker: Latest Updates - The New York Times*. *The New York Times*. 2020(https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-

tracker.html?auth=login-google). Accessed 27 November 2020.

7. *Pfizer's covid vaccine is more than 90 percent effective in first analysis, company reports - The Washington Post*. (https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2020/11/09/pfizer-coronavirus-vaccine-effective/). Accessed 27 November 2020.

8. *Promising Interim Results from Clinical Trial of NIH-Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine | National Institutes of Health (NIH)*. (https://www.nih.gov/news-events/news-releases/promising-interim-results-clinical-trial-nih-moderna-covid-19-vaccine). Accessed 27 November 2020.

9. **Scipioni J**. *Fauci: Why still need masks, social distancing after Covid-19 vaccine*. *CNBC Make it*. 2020; Published online: 16 November 2020.

10. **Millett GA, *et al.*** Assessing differential impacts of COVID-19 on black communities. *Annals of Epidemiology* Elsevier Inc., 2020; **47**: 37–44.

11. **Khanijahani A**. County-Level Proportions of Black and Hispanic populations, and Socioeconomic Characteristics in Association with Confirmed COVID-19 Cases and Deaths in the United States. *medRxiv* 2020; : 1–23.

12. **Peters DJ**. Community Susceptibility and Resiliency to COVID-19 Across the Rural-Urban Continuum in the United States. *Journal of Rural Health* Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2020; **36**: 446–456.

13. **Fielding-Miller RK, Sundaram ME, Brouwer K**. Social determinants of COVID-19 mortality at the county level. *medRxiv: the preprint server for health sciences* Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, 2020; : 2020.05.03.20089698.

14. **Sun F, *et al.*** A spatial analysis of the COVID-19 period prevalence in U.S. counties through June 28, 2020: where geography matters? *Annals of Epidemiology* 2020; Published online: 2020.doi:10.1016/j.annepidem.2020.07.014.

15. **Andersen LM, *et al.*** Analyzing the spatial determinants of local Covid-19 transmission in the United States. *Science of the Total Environment* 2021; **754**Published online: 2021.doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142396.

16. **Fortaleza CMCB, *et al.*** Taking the inner route: Spatial and demographic factors affecting vulnerability to COVID-19 among 604 cities from inner São Paulo State, Brazil. *Epidemiology and Infection* 2020; Published online: 2020.doi:10.1017/S095026882000134X.

17. **The New York Times**. *Coronavirus (Covid-19) Data in the United States*. *Github*. 2020.

18. **HRSA Bureau of Health Workforce**. *Area Health Resources File*. *HRSA Data Warehouse*. 2018.

19. **MIT Election Data and Science Lab**. *County Presidential Election Returns 2000-2016*. *Harvard Dataverse*. 2018.

20. **Ballotpedia**. *States that did not issue stay-at-home orders in response to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, 2020*. 2020(https://ballotpedia.org/Status_of_lockdown_and_stay-at-home_orders_in_response_to_the_coronavirus_(COVID-19)_pandemic,_2020). Accessed 15 November 2020.

21. **USCB**. *Cartographic Boundary Files - Shapefile*. 2019(https://www.census.gov/geographies/mapping-files/time-series/geo/carto-boundary-file.html). Accessed 27 October 2020.

22. **Nayak A, *et al.*** Impact of Social Vulnerability on COVID-19 Incidence and Outcomes in the United States. *medRxiv□: the preprint server for health sciences* Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Preprints, 2020; Published online: 2020.doi:10.1101/2020.04.10.20060962.

23. **Fu L, *et al.*** Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Infection* Elsevier Ltd, 2020; **80**: 656–665.

24. **Rodriguez-Diaz CE, *et al.*** Risk for COVID-19 infection and death among Latinos in the United States: examining heterogeneity in transmission dynamics. *Annals of Epidemiology* Elsevier Inc, 2020; Published online: 2020.doi:10.1016/j.annepidem.2020.07.007.

25. **Mollalo A, Vahedi B, Rivera KM**. GIS-based spatial modeling of COVID-19 incidence rate in the continental United States. *Science of the Total Environment* Elsevier B.V., 2020; **728**Published online: 2020.doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138884.

26. **Allcott H, *et al.*** *Polarization and public health: Partisan Differences in Social Distancing during the Coronavirus Pandemic*. *NBER*. 2020. Report No.: w26946.

27. **Goolsbee A, *et al.*** *COVID-19 Lockdown Policies at the State and Local Level*. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. 2020. Report No.: 2020–116.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of factors used in this study, as of October 27, 2020 (n = 3,101) using AHRF, NYT, CPER and CHR datasets.

Ecological Factors	Mean	SD
Incidence rate in per 1 Million (logged)	10.07	0.53
Incidence rate in per 1 Million	26,575.75	12,216.59
Mortality rate in per 1 Million (logged)	6.18	0.80
Mortality rate in per 1 Million	631.59	477.64
COVID-19 Policy- related factors		
Length of order (quintles) [n, %]*	***n***	***%***
0 days (No order)	438.00	14.12
1 - 27 days	469.00	15.12
28 - 35 days	717.00	23.12
36 - 58 days	714.00	23.02
59 or more days	736.00	24.60
Calendar month of the first reported case in the state [n, %]*	***n***	***%***
January	214.00	6.90
February	497.00	16.03
March	2,390.00	77.07
Health behaviors		
% Adult Smoking	15.36	3.46
% Physical Inactivity	23.25	5.37
% Excessive Drinking	18.76	2.79
% Influenza Vaccinations^	46.27	6.91
Clinical Care		
Primary Care Physicians Rate (log)	4.23	0.51
Preventable Hospitalization Rate (log)	8.38	0.29
Hospital Beds (log)	6.45	3.29
Socio-economic factors		
% Republicans	46.63	16.77
Counties leaning Republican (>50% votes) [n, %]	*2,500.00*	*80.62*

% Adult Obesity	29.23	5.45
Premature Age Adjusted Mortality[#]	343.74	92.96
Income Inequality Ratio	4.67	0.68
% Adults with Some College Education	65.28	9.79
% Unemployment	3.95	1.13
% Children in Single-parent Households	32.99	8.58
Social Association Rate	9.09	3.57
% Uninsured Adults	12.42	6.00
Median Income per $1,000 (log)	4.14	0.26
% 65 years old and over	16.05	4.08
% less than 18 years of age	22.49	2.91
% African American	12.30	12.56
% Native Americans	1.23	3.22
% Hispanic	18.06	17.19
% Female	50.72	1.22
% Not proficient in English	4.19	4.20
Physical environment		
Air pollution-particulate matter (2.5)	10.09	2.13
% Severe Housing Problem	17.72	5.41
Residential Segregation- African Americans/White	50.67	12.82
Residential Segregation- non-White/White	36.73	11.25
% Rural	19.18	24.18
% Homeownership	64.57	9.54
Population density per 100 sq. miles (log)	6.12	1.55

Abbreviations: AHRF: 2018-2019 Area Health Resource Files; 2020 NYT: New York Times; 2020 CHR: County Health Rankings; and CPER: 2016 County Presidential Election Returns; SD: Standard Deviation.

* Unweighted as this represents the number of counties; ^: Among Medicare enrollees; [#]: Number of deaths among residents under age 75 per 100,000 population (age-adjusted).

Table 2: SAC model for the incidence rates (logged) and Spatial Lag Model for mortality rates (logged) as of October 27, 2020 using NYT, AHRF, CPER and CHR datasets.

Ecological Factors	Incidence Rates			Mortality Rates		
	Estimate		SE	Estimate		SE
COVID-19 Policy- related factors						
Length of order (quintles)						
0 days (No order)	*Reference*			*Reference*		
1 - 27 days	-0.290	***	0.079	-0.483		0.257
28 - 35 days	-0.135		0.070	-0.824	***	0.218
36 - 58 days	-0.228	**	0.071	-0.866	***	0.206
59 or more days	-0.335	***	0.081	-1.006	***	0.229
Calendar month of the first reported case in the state						
January	*Reference*			*Reference*		
February	-0.056		0.092	-0.628	*	0.297
March	0.054		0.083	-0.249		0.274
Health behaviors						
% Adult Smoking	-0.003		0.005	0.036		0.033
% Physical Inactivity	0.002		0.002	0.017		0.014
% Excessive Drinking	0.000		0.005	0.107	***	0.026
% Influenza Vaccinations^	0.003	***	0.001	0.039	***	0.007
Clinical Care						
Primary Care Physicians Rate (log)	0.011	**	0.004	0.234	***	0.031
Preventable Hospitalization Rate (log)	0.045	*	0.022	0.183		0.166
Hospital Beds (log)	0.004	**	0.001	0.033	**	0.011
Socio-economic factors						
% Republicans	0.002	*	0.001	0.017	*	0.007
% Adult Obesity	-0.001		0.002	-0.007		0.013
Premature Age Adjusted Mortality#	0.000		0.000	-0.001		0.001
Income Inequality Ratio	0.018		0.011	0.120		0.094
% Adults with Some College Education	-0.004	***	0.001	-0.041	***	0.008
% Unemployment	-0.014		0.008	-0.019		0.055
% Children in Single-parent Households	-0.003	*	0.001	0.018	*	0.009
Social Association Rate	0.003	*	0.001	0.011		0.010
% Uninsured Adults	0.001		0.003	0.038	*	0.019
Median Income per $1,000 (log)	-0.158	*	0.078	-0.393		0.509

% 65 years old and over	-0.020	***	0.003	-0.043		0.025
% less than 18 years of age	-0.011	**	0.004	-0.025		0.030
% African American	0.007	***	0.002	0.032	***	0.008
% Native Americans	0.008	***	0.002	0.034	**	0.013
% Hispanic	0.015	***	0.002	0.037	***	0.009
% Female	-0.007		0.004	0.101	**	0.034
% Not proficient in English	0.010	*	0.005	-0.019		0.038
Physical environment						
Air pollution-particulate matter (2.5)	0.062	***	0.012	0.130	**	0.046
% Severe Housing Problem	0.004		0.003	0.009		0.021
Residential Segregation- African Americans/White	-0.002	**	0.001	-0.010	*	0.005
Residential Segregation- non-White/White	0.003	***	0.001	0.014	*	0.006
% Rural	-0.001	**	0.000	-0.014	***	0.003
% Homeownership	0.002		0.001	0.051	***	0.011
Population density per 100 sq. miles (log)	0.028	*	0.012	0.270	***	0.077
□ (spatial lag parameter)	-0.563	***		0.179	***	
λ (spatial error parameter)	0.936	***				
AIC	2993.60			15382.00		
Observed Moran's I for residuals	-0.032			-0.006		

Abbreviations: SAC: Spatial Autoregressive Combined; AHRF: 2018-2019 Area Health Resource Files; 2020 NYT: New York Times; CHR: 2020 County Health Rankings; 2016 CPER: County Presidential Elections Results.

^: Among Medicare enrollees; #: Number of deaths among residents under age 75 per 100,000 population (age-adjusted).

Level of significance: *p-value < 0.05, **p-value < 0.01, ***p-value <0.001.

Figure 1: Theoretical framework based on the county health rankings model to establish a relationship between COVID-19 incidence and mortality, and county-level ecological factors



Figure 2: Spatial distribution of the logged cumulative COVID-19 incidence rates by septiles, as of October 27, 2020.



Figure 3: Spatial distribution of the logged cumulative COVID-19 mortality by septiles as of October 27, 2020.