

1 **Title page**

2 **Article title:** Environmental drivers of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 transmission in England,
3 October to December 2020.

4 **Authors:** Thomas P. Smith^{1*}, Ilaria Dorigatti², Swapnil Mishra², Erik Volz², Patrick G. T.
5 Walker², Manon Ragonnet-Cronin², Michael Tristem¹, William D. Pearse^{1,3*}

6 ¹ Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, Silwood Park, Ascot, Berkshire, SL5
7 7PY, UK

8 ² MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Imperial College London, Norfolk
9 Place, London, W2 1PG, UK

10 ³ Department of Biology & Ecology Center, Utah State University, 5305 Old Main Hill, Logan
11 UT, 84322

12 * To whom correspondence should be addressed: thomas.smith1@imperial.ac.uk and
13 will.pearse@imperial.ac.uk

14 **Word-count:** 1,368 (excluding figure legends and tables and references)

15 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2; lineage B.1.1.7; transmission; environment; population density;
16 climate

17 **Conflict of interests:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

18 **Funding Statement:** This work was funded by a Natural Environment Research Council
19 grant NE/V009710/1 and by the Imperial College COVID-19 Research Fund.

20

21

22 **We emphasise that this pre-print manuscript has not been peer-reviewed, and thus**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

24

25 **Environmental drivers of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 transmission in** 26 **England, October to December 2020.**

27 **Abstract**

28 **Previous work has shown that environment affects SARS-CoV-2 transmission, but it**
29 **is unclear whether emerging strains show similar responses. Here we show that**
30 **lineage B.1.1.7 spread with greater transmission in colder and more densely**
31 **populated parts of England. We also find evidence of B.1.1.7's transmission**
32 **advantage at warmer temperatures versus other strains, implying that spring**
33 **conditions may facilitate B.1.1.7's invasion in Europe and across the Northern**
34 **hemisphere, undermining the effectiveness of public health interventions.**

35 **Environmental drivers of SARS-CoV-2 transmission**


36 A year into the COVID-19 pandemic, quantifying the factors driving SARS-CoV-2
37 transmission is still key for the optimal implementation of control strategies. SARS-CoV-2
38 transmission is influenced by local environmental conditions [1], and we have previously
39 shown that colder temperatures and higher population densities explain spatial and
40 temporal variation in transmission intensity [2]. A critical insight from previous work has
41 been that human behaviour drives SARS-CoV-2 transmission, and that environment only
42 plays a marginal effect when effective non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) are in place
43 [1,2]. While several studies have investigated the impact of environmental factors on SARS-
44 CoV-2 transmission during the early stages of the pandemic, numerous new variants have
45 recently emerged (in for example, the UK [3], Brazil [4], and South Africa [5]) with greater
46 transmissibility than strains present during the early stages of the pandemic [6,7]. Any
47 effect of environment must therefore be re-assessed in the context of a landscape of
48 emerging viral lineages.

49 **Impacts of environment on SARS-CoV-2 transmission in England**

50 The UK SARS-CoV-2 'Variant of Concern' (VOC; also known as lineage B.1.1.7 [3]) rapidly
51 spread through the UK population in late 2020, showing greater transmission intensity (as
52 measured by the reproduction number, R) than other circulating strains [7]. The wealth of
53 data collected for this strain makes the VOC a strong test-case for investigating
54 environmental effects in the context of emerging lineages. To assess the impact of
55 environment on VOC transmission, we extracted weekly R estimates calculated for fine-
56 grained regions of England (Lower Tier Local Authorities; LTLAs) [8], and regressed these
57 against VOC frequency, temperature, and population density for each LTLA. Population
58 density and daily temperature data were averaged across each LTLA, using the same
59 methods as Smith et al. [2]. Daily temperatures were combined into weekly mean
60 temperatures, corresponding to each of the weekly R estimates. The weekly VOC
61 frequencies were calculated for each LTLA as the percentage of true positive rate (TPR)-
62 adjusted S-gene target negative test to positive test results, as in Volz et al. [7]. We assessed
63 the impact of the environment by investigating the association between weekly R estimates
64 and the predictors (*i.e.*, spatial variation in R), for sequential weeks. To account for the

65 VOC's emergence in the South-East (which is among the warmest and most densely
66 populated parts of England), and its subsequent spread into colder, less densely populated
67 parts of the country, we incorporated interactions between VOC frequency and each of
68 temperature and population density. Without including this interaction, any effect of
69 temperature or population density on R might be compounded or masked by spatial
70 autocorrelation with VOC frequency. Following Volz et al. [7], we measured the effects of
71 the weekly predictors on R in the subsequent week, to account for the generation time of
72 SARS-CoV-2.

73 As observed by Volz et al. [7], we find a strong positive effect of VOC frequency on
74 transmission intensity, particularly during the initial emerging phase when VOC frequency
75 was less consistent among regions (Table 1). While the UK's national lockdown initially
76 decreased SARS-CoV-2 transmission intensity, as the VOC spread, R increased across
77 regions (Figure 1). We find that the impact of the environment on transmission is mediated
78 by VOC frequency, and it is only at higher VOC frequencies that the effects of temperature
79 and population density are pronounced (Table 2 and Figure 1). Furthermore, we find a
80 greater environmental effect after the UK moved from full lockdown to a (less strict) tiered
81 system, confirming our previous observations that the effect of temperature becomes
82 pronounced when NPIs are relaxed [2]. Thus, the effects of environmental drivers, and
83 even those of the increased transmissibility of the VOC, are secondary to differences in
84 human behaviour driven by differences in NPIs. As the VOC has now spread to dominate
85 the country's viral population, we now expect environmental factors to become the
86 dominant driver of spatial variation in R , with colder areas facing higher transmission
87 intensities than warmer regions, unless NPIs or the accumulation of immunity (either
88 naturally acquired or vaccine derived) sufficiently reduce transmission.



89

90 **Figure 1: Transmission dynamics during emergence and spread of SARS-CoV-2 lineage**

91 **B.1.1.7. (A.) Median (bold) and interquartile range (box) of the transmission intensity**

92 **estimates (R) for weeks 43-50 of 2020, with point estimates for each LTLA overlaid. Points are**

93 **coloured by the frequency of the VOC in positive COVID-19 tests (%), boxplots are coloured by**

94 **the median VOC frequency across all LTLAs. The first date of each week is given within**

95 **parentheses. As the VOC emerged, the UK entered a national lockdown, leading to an initial**

96 **decrease in R across regions. However, as the VOC spread through space to become the**

97 **dominant lineage, R increased across regions despite the national lockdown. When the UK re-**

98 **entered a tiered NPI system on the 2nd of December 2020, average R further increased across**

99 **regions. Panels B and C show the observed (points) and expected (background) effects of**

100 **temperature and VOC frequency on R during early (week 46) and late (week 50) phases of the**

101 **variant sweep, respectively (legend shared across both plots).**

102

103

104 **Table 1. VOC frequency is the strongest driver of transmission during early stages of**
 105 **the VOC sweep (week 46, starting 9 November 2020).** Linear regression model with VOC
 106 frequency, temperature, and population density as predictors of R_t , $r^2 = 48\%$, $F_{5,293} = 53.5$,
 107 $p < 0.001$. Predictors were scaled to have mean = 0 and SD = 1 and thus coefficients are
 108 measures of the relative importance of each variable. Frequency of the variant is a
 109 comparably strong driver of R . * = $p < 0.05$.

	Coefficient	Std. Error	t value	p value
Intercept	0.97	0.11	8.53	< 0.001*
VOC Frequency	0.62	0.17	3.54	< 0.001*
Temperature	0.10	0.09	1.17	0.244
Population density (\log_{10})	-0.03	0.02	-1.83	0.067
VOC Frequency \times Temperature	-0.40	0.13	-3.02	0.003*
VOC Frequency \times Population density	-0.01	0.03	-0.42	0.677

110

111 **Table 2. Both temperature and population density significantly interact with VOC**
 112 **frequency during late stages of the VOC sweep (week 50, starting 7 December 2020).** r^2
 113 = 55%, $F_{5,298} = 71.6$, $p < 0.001$. Predictors were scaled to have mean = 0 and SD = 1.
 114 Significant interaction effects between variant frequency and environmental parameters are
 115 observed. Significant interactions show that at high VOC frequencies, there is a negative effect
 116 of temperature and a positive effect of population density on R_t . * = $p < 0.05$.

	Coefficient	Std. Error	t value	p value
Intercept	1.12	0.06	19.0	< 0.001*
VOC Frequency	0.06	0.05	1.24	0.216
Temperature	0.02	0.05	0.34	0.736
Population density (\log_{10})	0.02	0.02	1.17	0.244
VOC Frequency \times Temperature	-0.09	0.04	-2.07	0.039*
VOC Frequency \times Population density	0.06	0.01	5.75	< 0.001*

117

118 The role of natural immunity

119 To investigate the potential role of immunity in our results, we perform a sensitivity
 120 analysis and re-run our regression analyses on R estimates corrected for the relative attack
 121 rate (AR) estimates. This accounts for the potential slowdown in R due to the accumulation
 122 of natural immunity across the population through time. We obtain qualitatively identical
 123 results in the AR-corrected analyses, but generally lower correlation (additive decrease in
 124 r^2 of 16% in weeks 45 and 46) as the VOC emerged, versus in the later stages (average
 125 decrease in r^2 of only 3%, Supplementary Table S1). Note that the timeframe of our

126 analyses was prior to mass vaccination of the UK public and even in the latest timepoint
127 (week 50), median attack rate across regions was less than 10% (Supplementary Figure
128 S1).

129 **Environmental response of lineage B.1.1.7 transmission**

130 We additionally investigated whether the VOC may respond differently to the environment
131 as compared to non-VOC strains. Volz et al. [7] estimated the transmission intensity of VOC
132 vs non-VOC strains and here we regressed the ratios of VOC R to non-VOC R against
133 temperature, to understand under which environmental conditions the VOC may have an
134 advantage. This was performed at a larger spatial scale than our LTLA analyses (English
135 NHS sustainability and transformation partnerships – STP regions). We found a small,
136 negative correlation between temperature and the R ratio (Supplementary Table S2), *i.e.*, at
137 warmer temperatures the VOC was *even more* transmissible than non-VOC strains, than in
138 colder conditions. This may be expected, as differences in fitness between strains are likely
139 to be magnified in harsher environments where fitness is reduced overall [9]. This effect
140 may have played into the dynamics of the spread of the VOC in the South East of England by
141 enhancing its spread even more in regions where previous strains' transmission intensities
142 were lower.

143 **Discussion**

144 Whereas, previously, a central question has been whether winter conditions would
145 enhance SARS-CoV-2 transmission, in the context of these new strains it is important to ask
146 whether warmer summer conditions could slow transmission. Here we have shown that
147 temperature can drive variation in transmission intensity between regions and between
148 variants, but this effect is likely secondary to the overall increased transmission intensity of
149 the new variant. Our results show that variant B.1.1.7 is more transmissible in colder areas.
150 Using the model fitted to the week 50 data, our results suggest that when the variant
151 accounts for 100% of SARS-CoV-2 cases in the population, R increases by approximately
152 0.12 per °C of temperature decrease. However, we also find that in warmer conditions, the
153 difference in transmissibility between VOC and non-VOC strains is greater. Our results
154 suggest that for each °C of temperature increase, the ratio of VOC to non-VOC R may
155 increase by approximately 0.12-0.22 (Supplementary Table S2).

156 While we caution against extrapolating from winter to summer conditions, our results
157 highlight that there is no reason to suppose that summer weather alone will slow down the
158 invasion dynamics of B.1.1.7 and significantly reduce the transmission intensity of SARS-
159 CoV-2. Thus, it is imperative to quantify and continue to monitor the impact of
160 interventions (*e.g.*, vaccines and NPIs) to inform policy. In that regard, the speed with
161 which the VOC has spread through the UK, while concerning from a public health
162 perspective, provides the perfect opportunity to parameterise models of its responses.
163 Importantly in the context of new strains, transmission of respiratory viruses in tropical
164 climates (such as Brazil, where a new variant has arisen [4]) are often more sensitive to
165 rainfall than temperature [10]. Better characterisation of past, and new potential

166 relationships between environment and transmission, as new variants emerge and spread
167 internationally, is a research priority.

168 **References**

169

170 1. Poirier C, Luo W, Majumder MS, Liu D, Mandl KD, Mooring TA, et al. The Role of
171 Environmental Factors on Transmission Rates of the COVID-19 Outbreak: An Initial
172 Assessment in Two Spatial Scales. *Sci Rep* 2020;10:17002.

173 2. Smith TP, Flaxman S, Gallinat AS, Kinoshian SP, Stemkovski M, Watson OJ, et al.
174 Environment influences SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the absence of non-pharmaceutical
175 interventions. *medRxiv* [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2021 Mar 9]. Available from:
176 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.12.20193250v1> doi:
177 10.1101/2020.09.12.20193250

178 3. Rambaut A, Loman N, Pybus O, Barclay W, Barrett J, Carabelli A, et al. Preliminary
179 genomic characterisation of an emergent SARS-CoV-2 lineage in the UK defined by a novel
180 set of spike mutations. *Virological*. 2020 [cited 2021 Mar 9]. Available from:
181 <https://virological.org/t/563>

182 4. Voloch CM, da Silva RF Jr, de Almeida LGP, Cardoso CC, Brustolini OK, Gerber AL, et al.
183 Genomic characterization of a novel SARS-CoV-2 lineage from Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
184 *medRxiv* [preprint]. 2020 [cited 2021 Mar 9]. Available from:
185 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.12.23.20248598v1> doi:
186 10.1101/2020.12.23.20248598

187 5. Tegally H, Wilkinson E, Giovanetti M, Iranzadeh A, Fonseca V, Giandhari J, et al.
188 Emergence and rapid spread of a new severe acute respiratory syndrome-related
189 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) lineage with multiple spike mutations in South Africa.
190 *medRxiv* [preprint]. 2020 [cited 2021 Mar 9]. Available from:
191 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.12.21.20248640v1> doi:
192 10.1101/2020.12.21.20248640

193 6. Faria NR, Mellan TA, Whittaker C, Claro IM, Candido DS, Mishra S, et al. Genomics and
194 epidemiology of a novel SARS-CoV-2 lineage in Manaus, Brazil. *medRxiv* [preprint]. 2021
195 [cited 2021 Mar 9]. Available from:
196 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252554v1> doi:
197 10.1101/2021.02.26.21252554

198 7. Volz E, Mishra S, Meera Chand, Barrett JC, Johnson R, Geidelberg L, et al. Transmission of
199 SARS-CoV-2 Lineage B.1.1.7 in England: Insights from linking epidemiological and genetic
200 data. *medRxiv* [preprint]. 2021 [cited 2021 Mar 9]. Available from:
201 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.12.30.20249034v2> doi:
202 10.1101/2020.12.30.20249034

- 203 8. Mishra S, Scott J, Zhu H, Ferguson NM, Bhatt S, Flaxman S et al. A COVID-19 Model for
204 Local Authorities of the United Kingdom. medRxiv [preprint]. 2021 [cited 2021 Mar 9].
205 Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.11.24.20236661v1> doi:
206 10.1101/2020.11.24.20236661
- 207 9. Soberon J, Peterson AT. Interpretation of Models of Fundamental Ecological Niches and
208 Species' Distributional Areas. *Biodiversity Informatics* 2005;2:1-10.
- 209 10. Pica N, Bouvier NM. Environmental factors affecting the transmission of respiratory
210 viruses *Curr Opin Virol.* 2012;2(1):90–95.