



24 Phone (585) 275-3276

25 Fax (585) 461-4532

26 E-mail: [yue\\_li@urmc.rochester.edu](mailto:yue_li@urmc.rochester.edu)

27 Twitter handle: [@HsrYueli](https://twitter.com/HsrYueli)

28

29 Running head: State social distancing policies vs nursing home outcomes

30

### 31 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

32 **Conflicts of Interest**: no conflict of interest for any author.

33

34 **Author Contributions**: Li, Cheng, Cai, Mao, Temkin-Greener: conception and design,  
35 acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation of data, critical revision for important intellectual  
36 content, and final approval of the version to be published. Li: drafting of article.

37

38 **Sponsor's Role**: The research of the authors was funded by the National Institute of Health  
39 (NIH) under grant R01MH117528 and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)  
40 under grants R01HS026893 and R01HS024923. The views expressed in this article are those of  
41 the authors and do not necessarily represent the view of the NIH or the AHRQ. The NIH and the  
42 AHRQ have no role in study design, data collection, analyses, or interpretation of results.

43

44

45 **Abstract**

46           The COVID-19 poses a disproportionate threat to nursing home residents. Although  
47 recent studies suggested the effectiveness of state social distancing measures in the United States  
48 on curbing COVID-19 morbidity and mortality among the general population, there is lack of  
49 evidence as to how these state orders may have affected nursing home patients or what potential  
50 negative health consequences they may have had. In this longitudinal study, we evaluated  
51 changes in state strength of social distancing restrictions from June to August of 2020, and their  
52 associations with the weekly numbers of new COVID-19 cases, new COVID-19 deaths, and new  
53 non-COVID-19 deaths in nursing homes of the US. We found that stronger state social  
54 distancing measures were associated with improved COVID-19 outcomes (case and death rates),  
55 reduced across-facility disparities in COVID-19 outcomes, but more deaths due to non-COVID-  
56 19 reasons among nursing home residents.

57

58 **Keywords:** state policy, COVID-19, coronavirus, nursing home, race and ethnicity.

59

## 60 INTRODUCTION

61 The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) poses a disproportionate threat to older adults  
62 especially those residing in long-term care (LTC) facilities such as nursing homes or assisted  
63 living facilities.<sup>1-5</sup> COVID-19 is known to have been present in almost all of the more than  
64 15,500 nursing homes in the United States. By December 23, 2020, over 905,000 coronavirus  
65 cases and 113,000 associated deaths were reported in LTC facilities, representing 6% and 39% of  
66 total COVID-19 cases and deaths, respectively.<sup>6</sup>

67 Recent studies suggest that racial/ethnic disparities in COVID-19 morbidity and mortality  
68 among LTC residents<sup>2,4,7,8</sup> largely mirror the disparities found in the general population.<sup>9-12</sup> In a  
69 national study of nursing homes, Li and colleagues revealed that COVID-19 cases and deaths per  
70 facility were 2 to 4 times higher in nursing homes with highest proportions of racial/ethnic  
71 minority residents than in nursing homes with low proportions.<sup>7</sup> These disparities are largely a  
72 result of system-level inequalities and segregation of care in that older residents of color are  
73 disproportionately cared for in facilities that are located in marginalized communities, have  
74 inadequate resources and limited abilities to respond to outbreaks of emerging infections, and  
75 provide care of poorer quality.<sup>13</sup>

76 During the pandemic, deaths from non-COVID-19 causes, such as Alzheimer disease,  
77 diabetes, and heart disease, also increased markedly, mostly among older adults.<sup>14,15</sup> Delay or  
78 avoidance of necessary medical care because of concerns about COVID-19 and social distancing  
79 restrictions increases morbidity and mortality risk associated with the health conditions of older  
80 adults, and may contribute to reported excess deaths.<sup>16,17</sup> Moreover, disruptions of in-person  
81 social activities during the pandemic have led to increase in social isolation and loneliness

82 among older adults, another serious public health issue that is associated with psychological  
83 suffering, unmet personal and health care needs, and deaths.<sup>18-21</sup>

84 Starting from early March, most states in the US implemented non-pharmaceutical public  
85 health interventions to contain coronavirus transmission. These policies took a variety of forms  
86 – such as statewide shelter-in-place orders, closure of non-essential businesses, and bans on large  
87 and small-group gatherings – and were implemented at different times and with different levels  
88 of enforcement across states.<sup>22</sup> Recent studies suggested the effectiveness of these state social  
89 distancing measures on curbing COVID-19 cases, hospitalizations, and associated deaths among  
90 the general population.<sup>22-26</sup> However, there is lack of evidence as to how these state orders may  
91 have affected the most vulnerable groups, such as LTC patients, or what potential negative health  
92 consequences they may have had, such as excess mortality due to reasons other than COVID-19  
93 infection.

94 In this longitudinal study, we evaluated changes in state strength of social distancing  
95 restrictions from June to August of 2020, and their associations with the weekly numbers of new  
96 COVID-19 cases, new COVID-19 deaths, and new non-COVID-19 deaths in nursing homes  
97 nationally. We hypothesized that stronger state COVID-19 restrictions led to reduced COVID-19  
98 case and death rates, reduced disparities in COVID-19 case and death rates between nursing  
99 homes with high and low proportions of racial/ethnic minorities, but increased non-COVID-19  
100 mortality rate among nursing home residents.

101

## 102 **RESULTS**

### 103 **Descriptive characteristics of the sample**

104 Table 1 presents that among the 14,046 nursing homes that submitted the COVID-19 data  
105 for the week of August 17-23 (one week after state COVID-19 restrictions were ranked on  
106 August 11), 6,829 nursing homes (48.6%) were in states with low COVID-19 restrictions and  
107 7,217 (51.4%) were in states with high restrictions. Nursing homes in states with high COVID-  
108 19 restrictions tended to be larger, for-profit facilities with slightly better nurse staffing and five-  
109 star ratings. They also tended to have higher cumulative numbers of COVID-19 cases (among  
110 residents and staff) and deaths (among residents) before state social distancing restrictions were  
111 ranked, and to be located in larger counties with more COVID-19 cases and deaths as well as  
112 states with higher COVID-19 death rates. Supplementary Table S1 shows that nursing homes  
113 with higher proportions of racial/ethnic minority residents tended to be larger, for-profit, and  
114 chain facilities that serve a higher proportion of Medicaid residents, have lower nurse staffing  
115 and five-star ratings, and are located in larger counties with more COVID-19 cases and deaths.

116

### 117 **Association of state COVID-19 restrictions with nursing home COVID-19 outcomes**

118 For the week of August 17-23, and compared to nursing homes in states with low  
119 COVID-19 restrictions, nursing homes in states with high COVID-19 restrictions had fewer new  
120 COVID-19 confirmed cases among residents (0.49 vs 0.70 per facility on average) and among  
121 staff (0.42 vs 0.59 per facility on average), as well as fewer new COVID-19 related deaths  
122 among residents (0.08 vs 0.12 per facility on average; Table 1). Similar differences were found  
123 for other study weeks (results not shown).

124 Multivariable longitudinal analyses (Table 2) confirmed that nursing homes in states with  
125 stronger social distancing restrictions had both the reduced likelihood of having at least one  
126 weekly reported new case (or death) and, among nursing homes with  $\geq 1$  case (or death), fewer

127 new cases (or deaths). For example, high (vs low) state COVID-19 restrictions was  
128 independently associated with a 19% reduced likelihood (odds ratio [OR]=0.81, 95% confidence  
129 interval [CI] 0.76-0.87,  $p<0.001$ ) of having  $\geq 1$  new resident case and among nursing homes with  
130  $\geq 1$  case, a 15% reduction (incidence rate ratio [IRR]=0.85, 95% CI 0.79-0.91,  $p<0.001$ ) in new  
131 cases. On average, higher stringency of state social distancing measures helped to reduce weekly  
132 new cases among residents by 0.13 cases/facility ( $p<0.001$ ; from 0.67 to 0.54 cases/facility) as  
133 shown in Figure 1, panel A. Sensitivity analyses confirmed the robustness of these results when  
134 state policy rankings were specified as a continuous variable or categorized as tertiles  
135 (Supplementary Tables S2 and S3).

136

### 137 **Association of state COVID-19 restrictions with disparities in nursing home COVID-19**

#### 138 **outcomes**

139 Existing evidence suggests across-facility disparities in COVID-19 case and death  
140 rates.<sup>2,4,7,8</sup> Table 3 shows that stronger state COVID-19 restrictions may help reduce such  
141 disparities by reducing the likelihood of having 1 or more new cases (or deaths) in a reporting  
142 week and reducing the number of cases (or deaths) for nursing home serving disproportionately  
143 more racial/ethnic minority residents. For example, although high (vs low) state COVID-19  
144 restrictions was not associated with the likelihood of having  $\geq 1$  case (OR=1.05, 95% CI 0.89-  
145 1.25,  $p=0.536$ ) or the conditional count of cases (IRR=0.85, 95% CI 0.70-1.04,  $p=0.112$ ) among  
146 residents for nursing homes with low concentrations of minority residents, the corresponding  
147 associations (OR=0.72, 95% CI 0.65-0.80,  $p<0.001$ ; and IRR=0.78, 95% CI 0.70-0.87,  $p<0.001$ )  
148 were evident for nursing homes with high concentrations of minority residents, leading to a 31%  
149 (95% CI -17% to -44%,  $p<0.001$ ) reduced disparity in the likelihood of having  $\geq 1$  case between

150 the two groups, although the reduced disparity in conditional count (9%) were not statistically  
151 significant (95% CI -27% to 14%,  $p=0.435$ ). In Figure 1, we similarly show stronger state policy  
152 effect on reduced numbers of cases and deaths among nursing homes with a higher proportion of  
153 racial/ethnic minority residents.

154

### 155 **Association of state COVID-19 restrictions with non-COVID-19 deaths among residents**

156 For the week of August 17-23, non-COVID-19 death rates were higher in nursing homes  
157 in states with low compared to those in states with high COVID-19 restrictions (0.45 vs 0.38 per  
158 facility on average; Table 1). Similar differences were found for other study weeks (results not  
159 shown).

160 Multivariable longitudinal analyses (Table 2) confirmed that high (vs low) state COVID-  
161 19 restrictions was not independently associated with the likelihood of having  $\geq 1$  new non-  
162 COVID-19 death (OR=1.02, 95% CI 0.98-1.07,  $p=0.315$ ); however, it was independently  
163 associated with a 9% increase in non-COVID-19 death count (IRR=1.09, 95% CI 1.00-1.19,  
164  $p=0.051$ ) among nursing homes with  $\geq 1$  new non-COVID-19 death. The two-part model  
165 predicted that high strength of state social distancing measures on average led to increased  
166 weekly non-COVID-19 death rate among residents by 0.10 cases/facility (0.41 and 0.51  
167 deaths/facility for nursing homes in states with low and high COVID-19 restrictions, respectively;  
168  $p=0.090$  for difference).

169 Sensitivity analyses did not suggest an association between state COVID-19 restrictions  
170 and non-COVID-19 deaths when state rankings were included in the model as a continuous  
171 variable (Supplementary Table S2), but suggested such an association (with marginal statistical  
172 significance) when state rankings were categorized as tertiles (Supplementary Table S3).

173 Compared to nursing homes in the 1<sup>st</sup> tertile group, nursing homes in the 3<sup>rd</sup> tertile group has an  
174 OR of 0.95 (95% CI 0.90-1.02, p=0.139) for the likelihood of having  $\geq 1$  non-COVID-19 death  
175 and an IRR of 1.10 (95% CI 0.98-1.23, p=0.105) for conditional count of non-COVID-19 deaths.  
176 The predicted difference in overall count of non-COVID-19 deaths between the two groups was  
177 0.10 (0.39 and 0.49 deaths/facility for nursing homes in the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 3<sup>rd</sup> tertile group,  
178 respectively; p=0.090 for difference).

179

## 180 **DISCUSSION**

181 This study found that stronger state social distancing measures were associated with  
182 lower weekly rates of new COVID-19 confirmed cases and related deaths among nursing home  
183 residents, as well as lower weekly COVID-19 new confirmed case rate among nursing home  
184 staff, from June to September of 2020. The magnitude of these associations was larger for  
185 nursing homes serving disproportionately more racial/ethnic minority residents, suggesting that  
186 stronger state social distancing measures also helped reduce disparities in COVID-19 outcomes  
187 between nursing homes with higher and lower proportions of minority residents as reported in  
188 recent studies. Our analyses also found that stronger state social distancing measures were  
189 associated with a somewhat increased rate of non-COVID-19 mortality among nursing home  
190 residents, suggesting a potential unintended consequence of restrictions on in-person social  
191 activities on excess mortality.

192 Since early March and in the wake of the novel coronavirus outbreak at a skilled nursing  
193 facility in Washington state,<sup>1</sup> the CMS, in coordination with state agencies and the Centers for  
194 Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), has immediately refocused their quality of care  
195 inspections in nursing homes on compliance with infection control policies and practices.<sup>27</sup> The

196 CMS and the CDC also released guidelines and rules to combat the surge of COVID-19  
197 infections and deaths in LTC facilities such as restrictions on nursing home visitors including  
198 non-essential health care personnel;<sup>28</sup> cancellation of all group activities and communal dining in  
199 nursing homes; implementation of active screening of residents and health care personnel for  
200 fever and respiratory symptoms;<sup>29</sup> and a mandate to separate staff members dedicated to the care  
201 of residents with COVID-19 from those caring for residents without (or whose COVID-19 status  
202 is unknown).<sup>30</sup>

203 In addition to these federal guidelines specifically designed to curb transmission of the  
204 virus in LTC facilities, most states in the US implemented social distancing measures to contain  
205 the growth rate of infections among the general population following the experiences of  
206 countries attacked earlier by the pandemic.<sup>22-24</sup> The details of these social distancing restrictions,  
207 and their implementation or enforcement, vary over states and over time as the pandemic  
208 progresses; for example, many states partially reopened non-essential businesses in early summer  
209 but closed these businesses again due to surges of COVID-19 in the second wave of the  
210 pandemic. Although recent studies examined variations of these state social distancing measures  
211 and demonstrated their effectiveness on reducing COVID-19 related morbidity and mortality,<sup>22-26</sup>  
212 the state COVID-19 policies examined in these studies were generally limited to the early stage  
213 of the pandemic (i.e. March to May of 2020). It thus remains uncertain if the effect of strong  
214 state COVID-19 restrictions has been maintained as the pandemic continues to evolve, and if  
215 prolonged restrictions may lead to serious negative health consequences such as excess mortality.

216 These expected state policy effects, positive or negative, would likely manifest first and  
217 strongest among nursing home residents who represent the most vulnerable group and who are  
218 hit the hardest throughout different stages of the pandemic. However, thus far, there has been a

219 lack of studies to determine the effect of early state (and federal) responses to the pandemic on  
220 COVID-19 outcomes among nursing home residents, largely due to the absence of nursing home  
221 COVID-19 data nationally during early period of the pandemic.

222 In an effort to fill this information gap, the CMS released guidance on April 19 that  
223 required nursing homes to report COVID-19 cases and deaths directly to the CDC,<sup>31</sup> and a later  
224 interim final rule of the CMS on May 1 marked the formal start of this national data submission  
225 process. These data were first publicly published on June 4, containing facility-level counts of  
226 COVID-19 cases and deaths since late May; they continue to be updated weekly by the CMS.  
227 Taking advantage of this new data reporting system and state variations in the restrictiveness of  
228 their social distancing policies, this study found stronger state COVID-19 restrictions were  
229 associated with reduced nursing home COVID-19 infection and fatality rates, results that one  
230 would expect to see. Of note, this study was not able to determine the effect of above-mentioned  
231 federal responses to the COVID-19 outbreaks in LTC facilities. These federal guidelines and  
232 rules likely helped avoid a large number of COVID-19 cases and deaths in all nursing homes in  
233 the US, but their exact effects are difficult, if not impossible, to determine due to the lack of a  
234 comparison group (e.g. nursing homes not subjecting to these federal rules). The variation in  
235 state COVID-19 restrictions provide a natural experiment for investigating the effect of state  
236 policies. In addition, several features of this study, such as its longitudinal design and the control  
237 of the secular trend and the cumulative number of COVID-19 cases (or deaths) right before state  
238 COVID-19 policies were ranked in multivariable analyses, allowed us to estimate the  
239 independent effect of state COVID-19 policies that is above and beyond the effect of federal  
240 guidelines and rules designed to curb coronavirus transmissions in all nursing homes.

241           The stronger effect of state COVID-19 policies on improved COVID-19 outcomes for  
242 nursing homes that disproportionately care for more racial/ethnic minority residents suggests an  
243 additional disparity reduction effect of these state policies. Since the beginning of the global  
244 COVID-19 pandemic in March, compelling evidence has indicated that racial/ethnic minority  
245 persons are at higher risk of COVID-19 infections, hospitalizations, and deaths, compared to  
246 non-Hispanic whites.<sup>9-12</sup> A most recent study of the Kaiser Family Foundation<sup>12</sup> has analyzed  
247 electronic health records of 50 million patients and estimated that although there is little  
248 difference in the testing rates by race and ethnicity, Black, Hispanic, and Asian patients are about  
249 two-to-three times as likely to test positive as Whites. Moreover, hospitalization and death rates  
250 are at least twice as high among people of color as among White patients, and these disparities  
251 persist after accounting for differences in sociodemographic characteristics and underlying health  
252 conditions.

253           Racial/ethnic disparities in outcomes of nursing home care have existed long before the  
254 COVID-19 pandemic,<sup>13,32,33</sup> largely due to system-level inequalities and segregation of care.  
255 These disparities persisted in the past several decades despite evidence of overall improved  
256 quality of care and outcomes for all residents and nursing homes over time. The across-facility  
257 disparities in COVID-19 morbidity and mortality reported by recent studies<sup>2,7,8</sup> are just another  
258 manifestation of the structural inequalities in nursing home care that have existed for decades.  
259 For example, nursing homes serving disproportionately non-white residents tend to be faced with  
260 serious resource constraints and operate within local healthcare systems that are also resource  
261 strained and thus easily overwhelmed by the pandemic.

262           The Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act enacted on March 27,  
263 2020 intended to blunt the impact of economic downturn due to pandemic through financial aid

264 to businesses, individuals, and healthcare institutions.<sup>34</sup> Under the Provider Relief Fund  
265 authorized by the CARES Act, the federal government has allocated \$10 billion to nursing  
266 homes thus far which helped all facilities in the nation to address shortages in personal protective  
267 equipment (PPE) and staff and to improve testing capacities.<sup>35</sup> Nevertheless, these federal funds  
268 are “color blind” and do not explicitly target systemic inequalities in nursing home care under  
269 the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>36</sup> It is unknown if and how this federal aid may help to address the  
270 across-facility disparities in COVID-19 outcomes.

271 Our findings of the reduced disparities in nursing home COVID-19 outcomes as a result  
272 of stronger state social distancing stipulations suggest the possibility that broadly targeted policy  
273 and public health interventions are able to both mitigate coronavirus transmissions and redress  
274 outcome disparities due to enduring system-level inequalities. Although the exact mechanism  
275 through which disparities are reduced is not clear, it appears that certain level of stringency in  
276 social distancing restrictions are particularly necessary for the subgroups of minority-serving and  
277 resource poor nursing homes to effectively reduce virus transmissions among their residents and  
278 staff. It is also possible that in states with low strength of COVID-19 restrictions, the weekly  
279 COVID-19 case and mortality rates for nursing homes caring for low proportions of racial/ethnic  
280 minority residents were already very low (0.23/facility and 0.04/facility, respectively; Figure 1)  
281 compared to nursing homes caring for high proportions of such residents (1.30/facility and  
282 0.24/facility, respectively). Thus, stronger state social distancing policies may not be able to  
283 further reduce case and mortality rates for the former group of nursing homes due to floor effects.

284 Concerns about the downside effect of prolonged social distancing restrictions have been  
285 expressed, although empirical evidence is limited on how these restrictions affect the physical  
286 and mental health outcomes of individuals.<sup>14-17,21</sup> Deaths in the US attributed to noninfectious

287 causes, such as heart disease and dementia, increased throughout the spring and summer surges  
288 in COVID-19 cases,<sup>14,15</sup> possibly due to disruptions in medical care access and delivery  
289 subsequent to shelter-in-place orders. It is conceivable that compared to community-living older  
290 adults, nursing home residents are more vulnerable to disrupted care routines given their  
291 advanced ages, complex morbidity patterns, and highly impaired functional status. In addition,  
292 many older adults during the pandemic have experienced exacerbated social isolation and  
293 feelings of loneliness due to disrupted in-person social activities.<sup>21</sup> The negative consequences of  
294 disrupted social and family connectedness, which include death in worst case scenarios,<sup>19,20</sup> may  
295 be particularly salient to nursing home residents, and may underlie the finding of this study that  
296 stronger state COVID-19 restrictions were associated with heightened risk of non-COVID-19  
297 mortality among nursing home residents. This finding suggests that, going forward, state public  
298 health experts and officials should weight the health benefits of more restrictive social distancing  
299 orders (eg, reduced virus transmission) against the negative health consequences due to sustained  
300 social disconnectedness. Although the exact balance is largely unknown to us, the recent  
301 availability of coronavirus vaccines may make feasible less restrictive shelter-in-place rules for  
302 nursing home residents during the remainder of the pandemic.

303         This study has several limitations. First, we were only able to track state social-distancing  
304 measures and nursing home COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 outcomes starting in June due to the  
305 lack of national data in early period of the pandemic. Second, although we demonstrated that in  
306 aggregate, stronger state social distancing measures had both positive and negative health  
307 consequences on nursing home residents, we cannot determine the effect of individual state  
308 policies or orders. Finally, our ability to adjust for nursing home, county, and state covariates  
309 may be somewhat limited in multivariable analyses. Therefore, the estimated associations may

310 be partially mediated by unmeasured factors that affect COVID-19 outcomes and non-COVID-  
311 19 deaths among nursing home residents.

312 In conclusion, we found that stronger state social distancing measures were associated  
313 with improved COVID-19 outcomes (case and death rates), reduced across-facility disparities in  
314 COVID-19 outcomes, but more non-COVID-19 deaths among nursing home residents. More  
315 restrictive mitigation rules may lead to both health benefits and unintended health consequences.

316

## 317 **METHODS**

### 318 **Data and sample**

319 The first source of data is the Nursing Home COVID-19 Public File published and  
320 updated by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS, available at  
321 <https://data.cms.gov/stories/s/COVID-19-Nursing-Home-Data/bkwz-xpvg>). This file contains  
322 weekly counts of incident COVID-19 cases and deaths among nursing home residents and staff  
323 separately, starting from May 25, as submitted by individual nursing homes through CDC's  
324 National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) system (COVID-19 LTC Facility Module). These  
325 counts were also reported for the week ending on May 24; however, numbers reported for that  
326 week may include both new cases (or deaths) in the week and cases (or deaths) identified before  
327 that week, which makes the data inappropriate for analyses due to unknown starting dates of  
328 reporting for individual nursing homes.<sup>7</sup> For subsequent weeks, nursing homes reported only  
329 new cases and deaths identified in each reporting week. CMS and CDC performed data quality  
330 checks to ensure the accuracy of the reported numbers.

331 We also obtained data on the stringency of state social distancing measures from  
332 [wallethub.com](http://wallethub.com), based on 17 state COVID-19 policy metrics (e.g. mandatory face masking in

333 public, reopening of restaurants and bars, and workplace temperature screenings). Each metric  
334 was graded, by an expert panel, using a 100-point scale, with higher scores representing fewer  
335 restrictions; the panel then determined the weighted average across all metrics for each state and  
336 used the overall scores to rank-order all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The overall  
337 weighted scores and rank orderings were published and updated every 2 to 3 weeks  
338 (<https://wallethub.com/edu/states-coronavirus-restrictions/73818>) starting from May. We  
339 downloaded data of state rankings on COVID-19 restrictions in 5 consecutive updates on the  
340 following dates: June 9, June 23, July 7, July 21, and August 11.

341 We linked these state data to nursing home COVID-19 reports assuming a 1-week lag of  
342 state policy effect on new nursing home cases (e.g. state rankings on June 9 linked to nursing  
343 home case counts for the week of June 15 to June 21; and state rankings on August 11 linked to  
344 nursing home case counts for the week of August 17 to August 23), and a 3-week lag on new  
345 deaths (e.g. state rankings on June 9 linked to nursing home death counts for the week of June 29  
346 to July 5; and state rankings on August 11 linked to nursing home death counts for the week of  
347 August 31 to September 6). We assumed lagged effects of change in state COVID-19 restrictions  
348 because it is estimated that the median incubation period of COVID-19 is 5 days<sup>37</sup> and the  
349 median time from illness to death is 18.5 days.<sup>38</sup>

350 We then linked this longitudinal database to several other data files including: (1) the  
351 CMS Nursing Home Compare (NHC) data files (updated in August of 2020) to obtain important  
352 covariates of nursing home organizational, staffing, and quality of care measures;<sup>39</sup> (2) the  
353 LTCFocus file created by the Brown University for additional nursing home characteristics; (3)  
354 the Area Healthcare Resource File for key county covariates; and (4) the numbers of lab-  
355 confirmed COVID-19 cases and deaths for all counties and states obtained from the national

356 database published by the New York Times (<https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data>). These  
357 numbers have been compiled and updated in real time by the Times based on reports from state  
358 and local public health agencies.

359

## 360 **Variables**

361 The 4 outcomes of interest included nursing home weekly numbers of: (1) new,  
362 laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases among residents; (2) new, lab-confirmed COVID-19  
363 cases among staff; (3) new COVID-19 related deaths among residents; and (4) new non-  
364 COVID-19 related deaths among residents, for each of the 5 reporting weeks described above.

365 The key independent variable was state rankings on COVID-19 restrictions, which, for  
366 ease of presentation, was dichotomized as 1 for states with high stringency (rankings of 26<sup>th</sup>-51<sup>st</sup>)  
367 and 0 for states with low stringency (rankings of 1<sup>st</sup>-25<sup>th</sup>). In sensitivity analyses state rankings  
368 were included as a continuous variable and, alternatively, were re-categorized as tertile groups in  
369 regression analyses. Another key independent variable for the analyses on across-facility  
370 disparities in COVID-19 cases and deaths was percentage of racial/ethnic minority residents  
371 (African Americans, Hispanics, Asians or Pacific Islanders, and American Indians or Alaskan  
372 Natives) in the nursing home (obtained from the LTCFocus file) which was originally defined  
373 using the race and ethnicity information from the Minimum Data Set and Medicare enrollment  
374 databases. We categorized nursing homes into quartiles to capture possible nonlinear  
375 associations between racial composition and COVID-19 outcomes: nursing homes with low  
376 proportions of racial/ethnic minority residents (<2.94%, the 25th percentile), medium  
377 proportions (2.94%–11.11%, the median), medium-high proportions (11.11%–29.79%), and high  
378 proportions ( $\geq$ 29.79%, the 75th percentile).

379           The following nursing home covariates that were found important to COVID-19  
380 infections or deaths<sup>2-5,7,8</sup> were included in regression analyses: number of beds, average daily  
381 resident census, ownership status (for-profit, non-profit, or government-owned), chain affiliation,  
382 hospital affiliation, percentage of Medicare residents, percentage of Medicaid residents, a  
383 facility-level case mix index, average staffing levels (hours per resident day) for registered nurse  
384 (RN) and for all nursing staff (including RN, licensed practical/vocational nurse [LPN/LVN],  
385 and certified nursing assistant [CNA]) in 2019, and five-star ratings for overall quality of care.  
386 RN and other nurse staffing levels were calculated based on daily resident census and CMS’  
387 Payroll-Based Journal system through which nursing homes electronically submit the number of  
388 hours that agency and contract staff are paid to work each day.<sup>40</sup> The five-star ratings aggregate  
389 ratings of nursing home quality measures on three domains – deficiency citations assigned  
390 during on-site inspections, care processes and outcomes of residents, and nurse staffing to  
391 resident ratios – into a rating system of one to five stars, with more stars indicating better  
392 quality.<sup>41</sup> Additional nursing home covariates included the cumulative numbers of COVID-19  
393 cases and COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 deaths among residents before state COVID-19  
394 policies were evaluated, which were calculated for the period from May 25 to 2 days before the  
395 strength of the state social distancing measures was ranked.

396           County-level covariates included cumulative number of COVID-19 confirmed cases,  
397 cumulative number of COVID-19 deaths, and county population size. State-level covariates  
398 included cumulative number of COVID-19 confirmed cases per 1000 population, cumulative  
399 number of COVID-19 deaths per 1000 population, percentage of older population ( $\geq 65$  years),  
400 and percentage of non-white population. All county and state cumulative counts were calculated

401 for the period from May 25 to 2 days before the strength of the state social distancing measures  
402 was ranked.

403

#### 404 **Statistical analyses**

405 We compared differences in nursing home, county, and state characteristics by strength  
406 of state COVID-19 restrictions (high vs low) and by nursing home quartile groups of  
407 racial/ethnic compositions. T-tests or analyses of variance for continuous variables and chi-  
408 square tests for categorical variables were used for statistical inference.

409 In multivariable analyses we fit separate longitudinal two-part models, with unit of  
410 analysis being the nursing home week, to account for the fact that a large number of nursing  
411 homes had zero cases (or deaths) in each study week.<sup>42</sup> The first part of the models was a  
412 generalized linear model with a logit link function and an assumed binomial distribution, which  
413 estimated the likelihood of a nursing home to have at least one new confirmed case (or death)  
414 reported in the week. The second part of the two-part models is a count model that assumed  
415 negative binomial distribution to account for the over-dispersion of event occurrence and  
416 estimated the number of nursing home new cases (or deaths) conditional on at least one new case  
417 (or death) confirmed in the reporting week.

418 Both parts of the models had an indicator for high vs low strength of state COVID-19  
419 restrictions as the independent variable and controlled for the same nursing home, county, and  
420 state covariates, as well as a set of indicators for study weeks (secular trend). In estimating the  
421 associations of state policy with across-facility disparities in COVID-19 related outcomes, the  
422 two-part models further included interaction between the state policy indicator and indicators for  
423 medium, medium-high, and high concentrations of racial/ethnic minority residents in nursing

424 homes (the low concentration group serving as the reference group). All coefficient estimates  
425 were based on Huber–White robust standard errors to correct for the correlation of nursing home  
426 outcome when it was repeatedly observed over 5 weeks.<sup>43</sup> After model estimation, we obtained  
427 the predicted event counts and plotted each predicted count against different levels of state policy  
428 stringency and nursing home racial composition groups.  
429

430 **REFERENCE**

- 431 1. McMichael TM, Currie DW, Clark S, et al. Epidemiology of Covid-19 in a Long-Term  
432 Care Facility in King County, Washington. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(21):2005-2011.
- 433 2. Li Y, Temkin-Greener H, Shan G, Cai X. COVID-19 Infections and Deaths among  
434 Connecticut Nursing Home Residents: Facility Correlates. *J Am Geriatr Soc.*  
435 2020;68(9):1899-1906.
- 436 3. Harrington C, Ross L, Chapman S, Halifax E, Spurlock B, Bakerjian D. Nurse Staffing  
437 and Coronavirus Infections in California Nursing Homes. *Policy Polit Nurs Pract.*  
438 2020;21(3):174-186.
- 439 4. Temkin-Greener H, Guo W, Mao Y, Cai X, Li Y. COVID-19 Pandemic in Assisted  
440 Living Communities: Results from Seven States. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2020;68(12):2727-  
441 2734.
- 442 5. Ouslander JG, Grabowski DC. COVID-19 in Nursing Homes: Calming the Perfect Storm.  
443 *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2020;68(10):2153-2162.
- 444 6. KFF. Kaiser Family Foundation. *State Data and Policy Actions to Address Coronavirus.*  
445 Available at [https://www.kff.org/health-costs/issue-brief/state-data-and-policy-actions-to-](https://www.kff.org/health-costs/issue-brief/state-data-and-policy-actions-to-address-coronavirus/)  
446 [address-coronavirus/](https://www.kff.org/health-costs/issue-brief/state-data-and-policy-actions-to-address-coronavirus/). Dec 23, 2020.
- 447 7. Li Y, Cen X, Cai X, Temkin-Greener H. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in COVID-19  
448 Infections and Deaths Across U.S. Nursing Homes. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2020;68(11):2454-  
449 2461.
- 450 8. He M, Li Y, Fang F. Is There a Link between Nursing Home Reported Quality and  
451 COVID-19 Cases? Evidence from California Skilled Nursing Facilities. *J Am Med Dir*  
452 *Assoc.* 2020;21(7):905-908.

- 453 9. Azar KMJ, Shen Z, Romanelli RJ, et al. Disparities In Outcomes Among COVID-19  
454 Patients In A Large Health Care System In California. *Health Aff (Millwood)*.  
455 2020;39(7):1253-1262.
- 456 10. Hooper MW, Nápoles AM, Pérez-Stable EJ. COVID-19 and Racial/Ethnic Disparities.  
457 *JAMA*. 2020;323(24):2466-2467.
- 458 11. Wadhera RK, Wadhera P, Gaba P, et al. Variation in COVID-19 Hospitalizations and  
459 Deaths Across New York City Boroughs. *JAMA*. 2020;323(21):2192-2195.
- 460 12. Rubin-Miller L, Alban C, Artiga S, Sullivan S. COVID-19 Racial Disparities in Testing,  
461 Infection, Hospitalization, and Death: Analysis of Epic Patient Data. Published: Sep 16,  
462 2020. Available at [https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/covid-19-racial-](https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/covid-19-racial-disparities-testing-infection-hospitalization-death-analysis-epic-patient-data/)  
463 [disparities-testing-infection-hospitalization-death-analysis-epic-patient-data/](https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/covid-19-racial-disparities-testing-infection-hospitalization-death-analysis-epic-patient-data/).
- 464 13. Smith DB, Feng Z, Fennell ML, Zinn JS, Mor V. Separate and unequal: racial  
465 segregation and disparities in quality across U.S. nursing homes. *Health Aff (Millwood)*.  
466 2007;26(5):1448-1458.
- 467 14. Weinberger DM, Chen J, Cohen T, et al. Estimation of Excess Deaths Associated With  
468 the COVID-19 Pandemic in the United States, March to May 2020. *JAMA internal*  
469 *medicine*. 2020;180(10):1336-1344.
- 470 15. Woolf SH, Chapman DA, Sabo RT, Weinberger DM, Hill L, Taylor DDH. Excess  
471 Deaths From COVID-19 and Other Causes, March-July 2020. *JAMA*.  
472 2020;324(15):1562-1564.
- 473 16. Lange SJ, Ritchey MD, Goodman AB, et al. Potential Indirect Effects of the COVID-19  
474 Pandemic on Use of Emergency Departments for Acute Life-Threatening Conditions -  
475 United States, January-May 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(25):795-800.

- 476 17. Czeisler ME, Marynak K, Clarke KEN, et al. Delay or Avoidance of Medical Care  
477 Because of COVID-19-Related Concerns - United States, June 2020. *MMWR Morb*  
478 *Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(36):1250-1257.
- 479 18. Gerst-Emerson K, Jayawardhana J. Loneliness as a public health issue: the impact of  
480 loneliness on health care utilization among older adults. *Am J Public Health.*  
481 2015;105(5):1013-1019.
- 482 19. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Baker M, Harris T, Stephenson D. Loneliness and social  
483 isolation as risk factors for mortality: a meta-analytic review. *Perspect Psychol Sci.*  
484 2015;10(2):227-237.
- 485 20. Hoogendijk EO, Smit AP, van Dam C, et al. Frailty Combined with Loneliness or Social  
486 Isolation: An Elevated Risk for Mortality in Later Life. *J Am Geriatr Soc.*  
487 2020;68(11):2587-2593.
- 488 21. Kotwal AA, Holt-Lunstad J, Newmark RL, et al. Social Isolation and Loneliness Among  
489 San Francisco Bay Area Older Adults During the COVID-19 Shelter-in-Place Orders. *J*  
490 *Am Geriatr Soc.* 2020.
- 491 22. Hsiang S, Allen D, Annan-Phan S, et al. The effect of large-scale anti-contagion policies  
492 on the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature.* 2020;584(7820):262-267.
- 493 23. Courtemanche C, Garuccio J, Le A, Pinkston J, Yelowitz A. Strong Social Distancing  
494 Measures In The United States Reduced The COVID-19 Growth Rate. *Health Aff*  
495 *(Millwood).* 2020;39(7):1237-1246.
- 496 24. Lyu W, Wehby GL. Shelter-In-Place Orders Reduced COVID-19 Mortality And Reduced  
497 The Rate Of Growth In Hospitalizations. *Health Aff (Millwood).* 2020;39(9):1615-1623.

- 498 25. Padalabalanarayanan S, Hanumanthu VS, Sen B. Association of State Stay-at-Home  
499 Orders and State-Level African American Population With COVID-19 Case Rates.  
500 *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020;3(10):e2026010.
- 501 26. Liu Y, Mattke S. Association between state stay-at-home orders and risk reduction  
502 behaviors and mental distress amid the COVID-19 pandemic. *Prev Med.*  
503 2020;141:106299.
- 504 27. CMS. Center for Clinical Standards and Quality/Quality, Safety & Oversight Group.  
505 *Suspension of Survey Activities. March 4, 2020. Available at*  
506 <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/qso-20-12-allpdf.pdf-1>.
- 507 28. CMS. Center for Clinical Standards and Quality/Quality, Safety & Oversight Group.  
508 *Guidance for Infection Control and Prevention of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)*  
509 *in Nursing Homes (REVISED). March 13, 2020. Available at*  
510 <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/3-13-2020-nursing-home-guidance-covid-19.pdf>.
- 511 29. CDC. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Coronavirus Disease 2019:  
512 *Preparing for COVID-19: Long-term Care Facilities, Nursing Homes. Available at*  
513 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/long-term-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/long-term-care.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Fhealthcare-facilities%2Fprevent-spread-in-long-term-care-facilities.html)  
514 [care.html?CDC\\_AA\\_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/long-term-care.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Fhealthcare-facilities%2Fprevent-spread-in-long-term-care-facilities.html)  
515 [ncov%2Fhealthcare-facilities%2Fprevent-spread-in-long-term-care-facilities.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/long-term-care.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Fhealthcare-facilities%2Fprevent-spread-in-long-term-care-facilities.html).
- 516 30. CMS. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. COVID-19 Long-Term Care Facility  
517 Guidance, April 2, 2020. Available at [https://www.cms.gov/files/document/4220-covid-](https://www.cms.gov/files/document/4220-covid-19-long-term-care-facility-guidance.pdf)  
518 [19-long-term-care-facility-guidance.pdf](https://www.cms.gov/files/document/4220-covid-19-long-term-care-facility-guidance.pdf).
- 519 31. CMS. Center for Clinical Standards and Quality/Quality, Safety & Oversight Group.  
520 *Upcoming Requirements for Notification of Confirmed COVID-19 (or COVID19 Persons*

- 521            *under Investigation) Among Residents and Staff in Nursing Homes. April 19, 2020.*
- 522            Available at <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/qso-20-26-nh.pdf>.
- 523    32.    Li Y, Yin J, Cai X, Temkin-Greener J, Mukamel DB. Association of race and sites of  
524            care with pressure ulcers in high-risk nursing home residents. *JAMA*. 2011;306(2):179-  
525            186.
- 526    33.    Li Y, Mukamel DB. Racial disparities in receipt of influenza and pneumococcus  
527            vaccinations among US nursing-home residents. *Am J Public Health*. 2010;100 Suppl  
528            1:S256-262.
- 529    34.    Moss K, Wexler A, Dawson L, Long M, Kates J. *The Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and*  
530            *Economic Security Act: Summary of Key Health Provisions. Available at*  
531            [https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/the-coronavirus-aid-relief-and-](https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/the-coronavirus-aid-relief-and-economic-security-act-summary-of-key-health-provisions/)  
532            [economic-security-act-summary-of-key-health-provisions/](https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/the-coronavirus-aid-relief-and-economic-security-act-summary-of-key-health-provisions/). April 9, 2020.
- 533    35.    Berklan JM. *Feds increase COVID-19 funding dedicated to nursing homes to nearly \$10*  
534            *billion. Available at* [https://www.mcknights.com/news/breaking-feds-increase-covid-19-](https://www.mcknights.com/news/breaking-feds-increase-covid-19-funding-dedicated-to-nursing-homes-to-nearly-10-billion/)  
535            [funding-dedicated-to-nursing-homes-to-nearly-10-billion/](https://www.mcknights.com/news/breaking-feds-increase-covid-19-funding-dedicated-to-nursing-homes-to-nearly-10-billion/). July 22, 2020.
- 536    36.    Dowling MK, Kelly RL. Policy Solutions for Reversing the Color-blind Public Health  
537            Response to COVID-19 in the US. *JAMA*. 2020;324(3):229-230.
- 538    37.    Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019  
539            (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Ann*  
540            *Intern Med*. 2020;172(9):577-582.
- 541    38.    Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult  
542            inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet*.  
543            2020;395(10229):1054-1062.

- 544 39. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Nursing Home Compare, available at  
545 <https://www.medicare.gov/nursinghomecompare/Data/About.html>.
- 546 40. Geng F, Stevenson DG, Grabowski DC. Daily Nursing Home Staffing Levels Highly  
547 Variable, Often Below CMS Expectations. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2019;38(7):1095-1100.
- 548 41. CMS. *Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Design for Nursing Home Compare*  
549 *Five-Star Quality Rating System, Technical users' guide*. April 2018. Available at  
550 [https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Provider-Enrollment-and-](https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Provider-Enrollment-and-Certification/CertificationandCompliance/downloads/usersguide.pdf)  
551 [Certification/CertificationandCompliance/downloads/usersguide.pdf](https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Provider-Enrollment-and-Certification/CertificationandCompliance/downloads/usersguide.pdf).
- 552 42. Cameron AC, Trivedi PK. *Regression Analysis of Count Data*. 2nd ed. Cambridge:  
553 Cambridge University Press. 2013.
- 554 43. White H. A heteroskedasticity-consistent covariance matrix estimator and a direct test for  
555 heteroskedasticity. *Econometrica*. 1980;48:817-830.

556

557

558 **Table 1.** Nursing home, county, and state characteristics by strength of state social distancing  
 559 measures reported on August 11, 2020

Nursing home characteristic	All nursing homes, counties, or states	Strength of state social distancing measures*	
		Low	High
		Mean±SD or N (%)	
Number of nursing homes	14,046	6,829 (48.62)	7,217 (51.38)
Weekly number of new Covid-19 confirmed cases among residents <sup>a</sup>	0.59±2.80	0.70±2.94	0.49±2.66
0	12,142 (86.44)	5,745 (84.13)	6,397 (88.64)
1-10	1,532 (10.91)	890 (13.03)	642 (8.90)
>10	372 (2.64)	194 (2.84)	178 (2.47)
Weekly number of new Covid-19 confirmed cases among staff <sup>a</sup>	0.51±1.63	0.59±1.72	0.42±1.52
0	10,981 (78.18)	5,151 (75.43)	5,830 (80.78)
1-10	2,835 (20.18)	1,562 (22.87)	1,273 (17.64)
>10	230 (1.64)	116 (1.70)	114 (1.58)
Weekly number of new Covid-19 related deaths among residents <sup>b</sup>	0.10±0.55	0.12±0.60	0.08±0.49
0	13,125 (93.44)	6,316 (92.49)	6,809 (94.35)
1-5	744 (5.30)	429 (6.28)	315 (4.36)
>5	177 (1.26)	84 (1.23)	93 (1.29)
Weekly number of new non-Covid-19 related deaths among residents <sup>b</sup>	0.41±1.84	0.38±1.37	0.45±2.20
0	10,382 (73.92)	5,073 (74.30)	5,309 (73.56)
1-5	3,463 (24.66)	1,667 (24.41)	1,796 (24.89)
>5	200 (1.42)	88 (1.29)	112 (1.55)
Total number of certified beds	106.24±55.86	101.23±49.96	110.98±60.54
Number of residents	85.69±48.48	79.15±41.75	91.89±53.35
Ownership			
For-profit	9,862 (70.21)	4,632 (67.83)	5,230 (72.47)
Non-profit	3,295 (23.46)	1,677 (24.56)	1,618 (22.42)
Government owned	889 (6.33)	520 (7.61)	369 (5.11)
Chain affiliated	8,272 (58.89)	4,042 (59.19)	4,230 (58.89)
Hospital affiliated	541 (3.85)	230 (3.37)	311 (4.31)
Percentage of Medicaid residents, %	59.84±23.08	59.65±22.40	60.03±23.70

Percentage of Medicare residents, %	13.80±13.31	13.20±13.09	14.37±13.48
Case mix index score	1.29±0.16	1.26±0.14	1.31±0.18
RN hours per resident day	0.67±0.48	0.64±0.44	0.70±0.51
Total nurse hours per resident day	3.83±0.88	3.76±0.82	3.89±0.93
Overall five-star rating	3.19±1.41	3.14±1.40	3.24±1.42
Cumulative number of Covid-19 confirmed cases among residents before August 11 <sup>c</sup>	2.68±8.81	2.18±8.06	3.16±9.44
Cumulative number of Covid-19 confirmed cases among staff before August 11 <sup>c</sup>	2.46±7.11	2.07±7.77	2.84±6.41
Cumulative number of Covid-19 deaths among residents before August 11 <sup>c</sup>	0.76±2.82	0.52±2.34	0.98±3.20
<b>County characteristic</b>			
Cumulative number of Covid-19 cases before August 11, x1k <sup>c</sup>	3.67±12.47	1.58±4.55	5.68±16.65
Cumulative number of Covid-19 deaths before August 11, x1k <sup>c</sup>	0.09±0.26	0.04±0.13	0.15±0.34
Total populationx100k	8.25±17.94	4.35±9.35	11.93±22.72
<b>State characteristic</b>			
Cumulative rate of Covid-19 cases before August 11 (per one thousand) <sup>c</sup>	3.56±3.11	3.82±3.31	3.30±2.88
Cumulative rate of Covid-19 deaths before August 11 (per one thousand) <sup>c</sup>	0.10±0.08	0.08±0.05	0.13±0.10
Percentage population ≥65 years, %	14.86±2.00	15.19±1.73	14.56±2.19
Percentage of non-white population, %	30.40±10.78	29.26±10.45	31.49±10.98

560 \* All p-values were <0.001 for comparisons of group differences based on t-tests for continuous variables  
 561 and chi-square tests for categorical variables, except for the following characteristics: weekly number of  
 562 new non-Covid-19 related deaths among residents, three categories (p=0.320); chain affiliated (p=0.487);  
 563 hospital affiliated (p=0.004); and percentage of Medicaid residents (p=0.326).

564 <sup>a</sup> Numbers are for the reporting week ending on August 23 (Monday August 17 to Sunday August 23).

565 <sup>b</sup> Numbers are for the reporting week ending on September 6 (Monday August 31 to Sunday September  
 566 6).

567 <sup>c</sup> Cumulative numbers are reported for the period from May 25 to August 9, 2020.

568 SD=standard deviation; RN=registered nurse.

569

570

571

572 **Table 2.** Associations between the strength of state social distancing measures and nursing home COVID-19 and non-COVID-19  
 573 outcomes.<sup>a</sup>

<b>Two-part model for confirmed COVID-19 cases among residents</b>	<b>β-coefficient</b>	<b>OR or IRR<sup>b</sup> (95% CI)</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 case</b>			
High vs low strength of state restrictions	-0.21	0.81 (0.76-0.87)	<0.001
<b>Part 2: count of cases conditional on ≥1 case</b>			
High vs low strength of state restrictions	-0.17	0.85 (0.79-0.91)	<0.001
<b>Two-part model for confirmed COVID-19 cases among staff</b>			
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 case</b>			
High vs low strength of state restrictions	-0.28	0.76 (0.72-0.79)	<0.001
<b>Part 2: count of cases conditional on ≥1 case</b>			
High vs low strength of state restrictions	-0.16	0.85 (0.81-0.90)	<0.001
<b>Two-part model for COVID-19 related deaths among residents</b>			
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 death</b>			
High vs low strength of state restrictions	-0.46	0.63 (0.58-0.69)	<0.001
<b>Part 2: count of deaths conditional on ≥1 death</b>			
High vs low strength of state restrictions	0.00	1.00 (0.94-1.07)	0.948
<b>Two-part model for non-COVID-19 deaths among residents</b>			
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 death</b>			
High vs low strength of state restrictions	0.02	1.02 (0.98-1.07)	0.315
<b>Part 2: count of deaths conditional on ≥1 death</b>			
High vs low strength of state restrictions	0.09	1.09 (1.00-1.19)	0.051

574 <sup>a</sup> Based on two-part models for confirmed cases and deaths separately that adjusted for nursing home, county, and state covariates, time trend,  
 575 and the clustering of repeated observations of nursing homes.

576 <sup>b</sup> ORs are reported for part 1 of the two-part models and IRR are reported for part 2 of the two-part models.

577

578 OR=odds ratio; IRR=incidence rate ratio; 95% CI=95% confidence interval.

579

580

581  
582  
583

**Table 3.** Associations between the strength of state social distancing measures and disparities in COVID-19 outcomes across nursing homes (NHs) serving different proportions of racial/ethnic minority residents.<sup>a</sup>

Two-part model for confirmed COVID-19 cases among residents	β-coefficient	OR or IRR <sup>b</sup> (95% CI)	P-value	Relative change in disparity due to high strength of state restrictions	
				Estimate (95% CI)	P-value
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 case</b>					
Effect of high (vs low) strength of state restrictions on NHs with					
Low concentrations of minority residents	0.05	1.05 (0.89-1.25)	0.536	Reference	
Medium concentrations of minority residents	-0.26	0.77 (0.68-0.88)	<0.001	-27% (-10%, -41%)	0.004
Medium-high concentrations of minority residents	-0.17	0.85 (0.76-0.94)	0.003	-20% (-2%, -34%)	0.004
High concentrations of minority residents	-0.32	0.72 (0.65-0.80)	<0.001	-31% (-17%, -44%)	<0.001
<b>Part 2: count of cases conditional on ≥1 case</b>					
Effect of high (vs low) strength of state restrictions on NHs with					
Low concentrations of minority residents	-0.15	0.85 (0.70-1.04)	0.112	Reference	
Medium concentrations of minority residents	-0.18	0.84 (0.72-0.98)	0.027	-2% (-23%, 26%)	0.880
Medium-high concentrations of minority residents	-0.07	0.94 (0.83-1.06)	0.305	10% (-13%, 38%)	0.433
High concentrations of minority residents	-0.25	0.78 (0.70-0.87)	<0.001	-9% (-27%, 14%)	0.435
<b>Two-part model for confirmed COVID-19 cases among staff</b>					
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 case</b>					
Effect of high (vs low) strength of state restrictions on NHs with					
Low concentrations of minority residents	-0.13	0.88 (0.78-0.98)	0.019	Reference	
Medium concentrations of minority residents	-0.23	0.79 (0.72-0.87)	<0.001	-9% (-22%, 5%)	0.181
Medium-high concentrations of minority residents	-0.28	0.76 (0.69-0.83)	<0.001	-13% (-25%, 0%)	0.046
High concentrations of minority residents	-0.43	0.65 (0.60-0.71)	<0.001	-26% (-35%, -14%)	<0.001
<b>Part 2: count of cases conditional on ≥1 case</b>					
Effect of high (vs low) strength of state restrictions on NHs with					
Low concentrations of minority residents	-0.02	0.98 (0.88-1.11)	0.797	Reference	
Medium concentrations of minority residents	-0.19	0.83 (0.75-0.91)	<0.001	-16% (-28%, -3%)	0.020
Medium-high concentrations of minority residents	-0.18	0.84 (0.77-0.92)	<0.001	-15% (-26%, -1%)	0.032
High concentrations of minority residents	-0.19	0.83 (0.76-0.89)	<0.001	-16% (-27%, -4%)	0.013
<b>Two-part model for COVID-19 related deaths among residents</b>					
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 death</b>					
Effect of high (vs low) strength of state restrictions on NHs with					
Low concentrations of minority residents	-0.26	0.77 (0.60-0.99)	0.043	Reference	

Medium concentrations of minority residents	-0.46	0.63 (0.52-0.77)	<0.001	-18% (-40%, 13%)	0.221
Medium-high concentrations of minority residents	-0.38	0.68 (0.59-0.79)	<0.001	-11% (-34%, 19%)	0.424
High concentrations of minority residents	-0.58	0.56 (0.49-0.64)	<0.001	-28% (-46%, -4%)	0.026
<b>Part 2: count of deaths conditional on ≥1 death</b>					
Effect of high (vs low) strength of state restrictions on NHs with					
Low concentrations of minority residents	0.09	1.09 (0.90-1.32)	0.365	Reference	
Medium concentrations of minority residents	0.02	1.02 (0.89-1.17)	0.806	-7% (-26%, 17%)	0.553
Medium-high concentrations of minority residents	-0.01	0.99 (0.90-1.11)	0.921	-9% (-26%, 13%)	0.402
High concentrations of minority residents	-0.02	0.98 (0.87-1.10)	0.709	-10% (-28%, 12%)	0.331

584 <sup>a</sup> Based on two-part models for confirmed cases and deaths separately that adjusted for nursing home, county, and state covariates, time trend,  
 585 and the clustering of repeated observations of nursing homes.


586 <sup>b</sup> ORs are reported for part 1 of the two-part models and IRR are reported for part 2 of the two-part models.

587


588 OR=odds ratio; IRR=incidence rate ratio; 95% CI=95% confidence interval.

589


590



591  
592  
593



594  
595



596  
597

598 **Figure 1.** Predicted numbers of (A) weekly new laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases among  
599 residents, (B) new weekly laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases among staff, and (C) new  
600 weekly COVID-19 related deaths among residents reported in U.S. nursing homes for the week  
601 of July 5, 2020 (Monday June 29 to Sunday July 5) to the week of September 6, 2020 (Monday  
602 August 31 to Sunday September 6), by strength of state social distancing measures (high vs  
603 low). Predicted numbers are presented for all nursing homes and by nursing home groups with  
604 different percentages of racial and ethnic minority residents.

605 Note: \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ , and NS=not significant ( $p \geq 0.05$ ). P-values indicate the  
606 statistical significance of reductions in predicted numbers between nursing homes in states with  
607 high strength of social distancing measures and nursing homes in states with low social  
608 distancing measures, and were derived from the joint tests of the two-part regression models.  
609 Two-part models were used to derive the predicted numbers and their differences due to state  
610 policy effect. All two-part models adjusted for nursing home, county, and state covariates, time  
611 trend, and the clustering of repeated observations of nursing homes.

612

613

## Supplements

614

615 **Supplementary Table S1.** Nursing home characteristics by nursing home quartile groups of  
616 proportion of racial/ethnic minority residents

Nursing home characteristic	All nursing homes, counties, or states	Nursing homes by proportion of racial/ethnic minority residents*			
		Low	Medium	Medium-high	High
	Mean±SD or N (%)				
Number of nursing homes	13,581	3,390 (24.96)	3,417 (25.16)	3,385 (24.92)	3,389 (24.95)
Weekly number of new Covid-19 confirmed cases among residents <sup>a</sup>	0.59±2.8	0.31±2.12	0.48±2.40	0.80±3.42	0.79±2.03
0	11,748 (86.50)	3,153 (93.01)	3,037 (88.88)	2,846 (84.08)	2,712 (80.02)
1-10	1,482 (10.91)	187 (5.52)	319 (9.34)	417 (12.32)	559 (16.49)
>10	351 (2.58)	50 (1.47)	61 (1.78)	122 (3.60)	118 (3.48)
Weekly number of new Covid-19 confirmed cases among staff <sup>a</sup>	0.51±1.63	0.34±1.39	0.41±1.33	0.66±1.86	0.62±1.79
0	10,621 (78.20)	2,869 (84.63)	2,774 (81.18)	2,505 (74.00)	2,473 (72.97)
1-10	2,745 (20.21)	485 (14.31)	611 (17.88)	811 (23.96)	838 (24.73)
>10	215 (1.58)	36 (1.06)	32 (0.93)	69 (2.04)	78 (2.30)
Weekly number of new Covid-19 related deaths among residents <sup>b</sup>	0.10±0.55	0.06±0.47	0.08±0.54	0.13±0.58	0.13±0.60
0	12,693 (93.46)	3,249 (95.84)	3,248 (95.05)	3,102 (91.64)	3,094 (91.30)
1-5	725 (5.34)	117 (3.45)	141 (4.13)	234 (6.91)	233 (6.88)
>5	163 (1.20)	24 (0.71)	28 (0.82)	49 (1.45)	62 (1.83)
Weekly number of new non-Covid-19 related deaths among residents <sup>b</sup>	0.41±1.84	0.47±2.11	0.45±1.97	0.44±2.09	0.32±1.11
0	9,984 (73.52)	2,449 (72.24)	2,455 (71.87)	2,489 (73.53)	2,591 (76.45)
1-5	3,409 (25.10)	905 (26.70)	929 (27.20)	839 (24.79)	736 (21.72)
>5	187 (1.38)	36 (1.06)	32 (0.94)	57 (1.68)	62 (1.83)
Total number of	106.24±55.86	86.26±44.67	103.32±53.46	116.44±56.46	124.40±58.46

certified beds					
Number of residents	85.69±48.78	70.04±39.74	82.57±46.57	92.86±49.10	101.65±50.69
Ownership					
For-profit	9,576 (70.51)	1,712 (50.50)	2,347 (68.69)	2,643 (78.08)	2,874 (84.80)
Non-profit	3,150 (23.19)	1,368 (40.35)	851 (24.90)	563 (16.63)	368 (10.86)
Government owned	855 (6.30)	310 (9.14)	219 (6.41)	179 (5.29)	147 (4.34)
Chain affiliated	8,045 (59.24)	1,757 (51.83)	2,065 (60.43)	2,121 (62.66)	2,102 (62.02)
Hospital affiliated	427 (3.14)	182 (5.37)	97 (2.84)	66 (1.95)	82 (2.42)
Percentage of Medicaid residents, %	59.84±23.08	52.02±22.50	56.95±22.18	62.82±20.44	69.33±19.89
Percentage of Medicare residents, %	13.80±13.31	12.60±12.20	14.58±13.09	14.24±12.39	11.81±9.80
Case mix index score	1.29±0.16	1.27±0.11	1.29±0.12	1.29±0.14	1.31±0.21
RN hours per resident day	0.67±0.48	0.76±0.41	0.68±0.37	0.60±0.37	0.52±0.35
Total nurse hours per resident day	3.83±0.88	3.95±0.83	3.82±0.77	3.71±0.74	3.69±0.80
Overall five-star rating	3.19±1.41	3.64±1.32	3.31±1.37	2.99±1.39	2.76±1.39
Cumulative number of Covid-19 confirmed cases among residents before August 11 <sup>c</sup>	2.68±8.81	1.07±4.96	1.89±7.17	3.08±9.48	4.74±11.87
Cumulative number of Covid-19 confirmed cases among staff before August 11 <sup>c</sup>	2.46±7.11	1.15±3.63	1.99±5.29	2.88±10.00	3.86±7.72
Cumulative number of Covid-19 deaths among residents before August 11 <sup>c</sup>	0.76±2.82	0.38±1.97	0.65±2.78	0.84±2.76	1.16±3.44
<b>County characteristic</b>					
Cumulative number of Covid-19 cases before August 11, x1k <sup>c</sup>	3.67±12.47	0.76±4.02	1.39±5.71	2.88±9.31	8.57±19.58
Cumulative number of Covid-19 deaths before August 11, x1k <sup>c</sup>	0.09±0.26	0.03±0.12	0.05±0.14	0.08±0.20	0.20±0.40
Total populationx100k	8.25±17.94	2.41±6.43	4.01±7.99	7.23±13.30	17.49±27.29
<b>State characteristic</b>					
Cumulative rate of	3.56±3.11	2.96±2.37	3.20±2.85	3.76±3.38	4.26±3.52

Covid-19 cases before August 11 (per one thousand) <sup>c</sup>					
Cumulative rate of Covid-19 deaths before August 11 (per one thousand) <sup>c</sup>	0.10±0.08	0.11±0.08	0.11±0.09	0.10±0.09	0.10±0.08
Percentage population ≥65 years, %	14.86±2.00	15.38±1.61	15.08±1.87	14.73±2.18	14.34±2.13
Percentage of non-white population, %	30.40±10.78	24.43±9.46	27.43±9.43	31.75±9.38	37.09±9.76

617 \* All p-values were <0.001 for comparisons of group differences based on analyses of variance for  
 618 continuous variables, and chi-square tests for categorical variables.

619 <sup>a</sup> Numbers are for the reporting week ending on August 23 (Monday August 17 to Sunday August 23).

620 <sup>b</sup> Numbers are for the reporting week ending on September 6 (Monday August 31 to Sunday September  
 621 6).

622 <sup>c</sup> Cumulative numbers are reported for the period from May 25 to August 9, 2020.

623 SD=standard deviation; RN=registered nurse.

624

625

626 **Table S2.** Associations between the strength of state social distancing measures and nursing home COVID-19 and non-COVID-19  
 627 outcomes – **sensitivity analyses in which rankings of state social distancing measures are a continuous variable.**<sup>a</sup>

<b>Two-part model for confirmed COVID-19 cases among residents</b>	<b>β-coefficient</b>	<b>OR or IRR<sup>b</sup> (95% CI)</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 case</b>			
Ranking of state social distancing measures x 10	-0.06	0.94 (0.92-0.96)	<0.001
<b>Part 2: count of cases conditional on ≥1 case</b>			
Ranking of state social distancing measures x 10	-0.04	0.96 (0.94-0.99)	<0.001
<b>Two-part model for confirmed COVID-19 cases among staff</b>			
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 case</b>			
Ranking of state social distancing measures x 10	-0.08	0.92 (0.90-0.94)	<0.001
<b>Part 2: count of cases conditional on ≥1 case</b>			
Ranking of state social distancing measures x 10	-0.04	0.96 (0.94-0.97)	<0.001
<b>Two-part model for COVID-19 related deaths among residents</b>			
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 death</b>			
Ranking of state social distancing measures x 10	-0.13	0.88 (0.85-0.91)	<0.001
<b>Part 2: count of deaths conditional on ≥1 death</b>			
Ranking of state social distancing measures x 10	0.01	1.01 (0.99-1.03)	0.488
<b>Two-part model for non-COVID-19 deaths among residents</b>			
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 death</b>			
Ranking of state social distancing measures x 10	-0.003	1.00 (0.98-1.01)	0.706
<b>Part 2: count of deaths conditional on ≥1 death</b>			
Ranking of state social distancing measures x 10	0.01	1.01 (0.98-1.05)	0.484

628 <sup>a</sup> Based on two-part models for confirmed cases and deaths separately that adjusted for nursing home, county, and state covariates, time trend,  
 629 and the clustering of repeated observations of nursing homes.

630 <sup>b</sup> ORs are reported for part 1 of the two-part models and IRR are reported for part 2 of the two-part models.

631  
 632 OR=odds ratio; IRR=incidence rate ratio; 95% CI=95% confidence interval.

633  
 634  
 635

636 **Table S3.** Associations between the strength of state social distancing measures and nursing home COVID-19 and non-COVID-19  
 637 outcomes – **sensitivity analyses in which rankings of state social distancing measures are categorized as tertile groups.**<sup>a</sup>

<b>Two-part model for confirmed COVID-19 cases among residents</b>	<b>β-coefficient</b>	<b>OR or IRR<sup>b</sup> (95% CI)</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 case</b>			
2 <sup>nd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	-0.07	0.94 (0.87-1.01)	0.091
3 <sup>rd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	-0.18	0.84 (0.78-0.91)	<0.001
<b>Part 2: count of cases conditional on ≥1 case</b>			
2 <sup>nd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	-0.10	0.90 (0.83-0.99)	0.022
3 <sup>rd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	-0.13	0.88 (0.81-0.96)	0.003
<b>Two-part model for confirmed COVID-19 cases among staff</b>			
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 case</b>			
2 <sup>nd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	-0.07	0.93 (0.88-0.99)	0.015
3 <sup>rd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	-0.27	0.76 (0.72-0.81)	<0.001
<b>Part 2: count of cases conditional on ≥1 case</b>			
2 <sup>nd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	-0.02	0.98 (0.92-1.05)	0.645
3 <sup>rd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	-0.14	0.87 (0.82-0.93)	<0.001
<b>Two-part model for COVID-19 related deaths among residents</b>			
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 death</b>			
2 <sup>nd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	-0.14	0.87 (0.78-0.96)	0.008
3 <sup>rd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	-0.30	0.74 (0.66-0.83)	<0.001
<b>Part 2: count of deaths conditional on ≥1 death</b>			
2 <sup>nd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	0.03	1.03 (0.95-1.12)	0.424
3 <sup>rd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	0.04	1.04 (0.96-1.12)	0.331
<b>Two-part model for non-COVID-19 deaths among residents</b>			
<b>Part 1: likelihood of ≥1 death</b>			
2 <sup>nd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	-0.09	0.91 (0.86-0.97)	0.003
3 <sup>rd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	-0.05	0.95 (0.90-1.02)	0.139
<b>Part 2: count of deaths conditional on ≥1 death</b>			
2 <sup>nd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	0.06	1.06 (0.95-1.20)	0.293
3 <sup>rd</sup> tertile in strength of state social distancing measures <sup>c</sup>	0.09	1.10 (0.98-1.23)	0.105

638 <sup>a</sup> Based on two-part models for confirmed cases and deaths separately that adjusted for nursing home, county, and state covariates, time trend,  
 639 and the clustering of repeated observations of nursing homes.

640 <sup>b</sup> ORs are reported for part 1 of the two-part models and IRR are reported for part 2 of the two-part models.

641 <sup>c</sup> Compared to the 1<sup>st</sup> tertile group.

642  
643 OR=odds ratio; IRR=incidence rate ratio; 95% CI=95% confidence interval.

644

645

646

647