

1 **Late surges in COVID-19 cases and varying transmission potential partially due to public**
2 **health policy changes in 5 Western states, March 10, 2020-January 10, 2021**

3
4
5 Xinyi Hua†, MPH; Aubrey R. D. Kehoe†, MPH; Joana Tome†, MPH; Mina Motaghi†, MD,
6 MPH; Sylvia K. Ofori, MPH; Po-Ying Lai, MS; Sheikh Taslim Ali, PhD; Gerardo Chowell,
7 PhD; Anne C. Spaulding, MD, MPH; Isaac Chun-Hai Fung*, PhD.

8
9 **Affiliations:**

- 10 1. Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Environmental Health Sciences, Jiann-
11 Ping Hsu College of Public Health, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA, USA
12 (X. Hua, A. R. D. Kehoe, J. Tome, M. Motaghi, S. K. Ofori, I.C.H. Fung)
13 2. Department of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Boston University, Boston, MA,
14 USA (P.Y. Lai)
15 3. WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Control, Division
16 of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, LKS Faculty of Medicine,
17 The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (S.T.
18 Ali)
19 4. Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health, Hong Kong Science and Technology Park,
20 Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (S.T. Ali)
21 5. Department of Population Health Sciences, School of Public Health, Georgia State
22 University, Atlanta, GA, USA (G. Chowell)
23 6. Department of Epidemiology, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University,
24 Atlanta, GA, USA (A.C. Spaulding)

25 *Corresponding author: Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, PhD. Email: cfung@georgiasouthern.edu

26 † Xinyi Hua, Aubrey R. D. Kehoe, Joana Tome and Mina Motaghi serve as co-first authors.

27
28
29
30 **Word count of the main text: 3906**

31
32 **Conflict of interest statement:** ACS reports grants through her institution from the National
33 Science Foundation, Cellex and Gilead Sciences. Via a subcontract with Einstein School of
34 Medicine, she has received funding from the National Institutes of Health. She has received
35 personal fees from, and served on an advisory board for, Gilead Sciences. She reports honoraria
36 through third parties funded by Gilead, AbbVie, and Merck; personal fees from National
37 Commission on Correctional Health Care, National Sheriff's Association, Harris County
38 Sheriff's Office and California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation; and travel
39 expenses from bioLytical Sciences and Guardian.

43 **Abstract (200 words, max. 200 words)**

44 **Objective:** This study investigates how the SARS-CoV-2 transmission potential varied in North Dakota,
45 South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho from March 2020 through January 2021.

46 **Methods:** Time-varying reproduction numbers, R_t , of a 7-day-sliding-window and of non-overlapping-
47 windows between policy changes were estimated utilizing the instantaneous reproduction number
48 method. Linear regression was performed to evaluate if per-capita cumulative case-count varied across
49 counties with different population size.

50 **Results:** The median 7-day-sliding-window R_t estimates across the studied region varied between 1 and
51 1.25 during September through November 2020. Between November 13 and 18, R_t was reduced by
52 14.71% (95% credible interval, CrI, [14.41%, 14.99%]) in North Dakota following a mask mandate;
53 Idaho saw a 1.93% (95% CrI [1.87%, 1.99%]) reduction and Montana saw a 9.63% (95% CrI [9.26%,
54 9.98%]) reduction following the tightening of restrictions. High-population counties had higher per-capita
55 cumulative case-count in North Dakota at four time points (June 30, August 31, October 31, and
56 December 31, 2020). In Idaho, North Dakota, and South Dakota, there was a positive correlation between
57 population size and per-capita weekly incident case-count, adjusted for calendar time and social
58 vulnerability index variables.

59 **Conclusions:** R_t decreased after mask mandate during the region's case-count spike suggested reduction
60 in SARS-CoV-2 transmission.

61

62 **Keywords:** Ecological study, Facemask, COVID-19, Reproduction number, SARS-CoV-2

63

64 **Abbreviation list:**

- 65 1. Coronavirus disease 2019 = COVID-19
- 66 2. Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 = SARS-CoV-2
- 67 3. Social Vulnerability Index = SVI
- 68 4. United States = U.S.

69

70

71 **INTRODUCTION**

72 A case of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) reported in the state of Washington on
73 January 21, 2020 heralded the arrival of the pandemic in the United States (U.S.), but
74 neighboring states were spared for over a month. While Idaho borders Washington, it and four
75 other contiguous western states—North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming—did
76 not report a single case until 49 days later.¹ All five states are sparsely populated.² Due to
77 demographic heterogeneity, and the division of power between federal and state governments,
78 the reaction to various phases of the pandemic have differed in type and timing by region,
79 resulting in dissimilar patterns of disease spread around the country.³ More regional studies are
80 needed to assess the variation in the spatial heterogeneities of the transmission of the severe
81 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and the distribution of disease burden.
82 In this paper, we will analyze the disease pattern in North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana
83 and Wyoming to provide insight for epidemiologists and to help policy makers with future
84 decision-making processes.

85 Orders from the executive branch of federal and state governments and state health
86 officer orders regarding the COVID-19 pandemic included social distancing, quarantine and
87 isolation, mask mandates, closure of businesses, and COVID-19 testing requirements. These
88 were implemented in different time frames across this 5-state region. Evaluating the existing data
89 to explore the impact of policy implementation on COVID-19 pandemic may provide insight on
90 the policies with high impact in reducing the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection, morbidity
91 and mortality. Quantifying epidemiologic characteristics of the COVID-19 pandemic in these
92 states, so that we can document the potential effect of policies and non-pharmaceutical
93 interventions that reduce COVID-19 transmission and mortality, may make us better prepared
94 for the emergence of future infectious disease epidemics.

95 Central to the description of an epidemic's transmission potential is the reproduction
96 number. The basic reproduction number, also called R_0 , shows the transmissibility of an
97 infectious agent at the beginning of an outbreak; it is calculated as the average number of
98 secondary cases generated by a primary case in a completely susceptible population, prior to any
99 behavioral changes or public health interventions.⁴ On the other hand, the time-varying
100 reproduction number, also known as R_t , is a time-dependent estimate of the average number of
101 secondary cases that are generated from one case at time t , after there are behavioral changes,
102 depletion of the susceptible population, and implementation of disease control policies.^{5,6}

103 An R_t larger than one indicates sustained transmission and the epidemic is expected to
104 expand in the population. An R_t less than one indicates that the epidemic will tend to decline.
105 Therefore, it is used as an indication of the effectiveness for infection control measures.^{4,5}
106 Calculating R_t over the course of pandemic, from March 2020 through January 2021, this study
107 aims to investigate the time-dependent variability in transmission potential of SARS-CoV-2 in
108 these five states in different time periods, and explore their relationship with the changes in the
109 states' public health policies.

110
111 **METHODS**

112 We used time-series data for the COVID-19 pandemic during March 10, 2020 – January
113 10, 2021, in the states of North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming. A
114 detailed list and description of all counties (North Dakota's 53 counties, South Dakota's 66

115 counties, Idaho's 44 counties, Montana's 56 counties, and Wyoming's 23 counties) are provided
116 in **Supplementary Table 1**.

117 118 **DATA ACQUISITION**

119 We downloaded the cumulative confirmed case count during March 10, 2020 – January
120 10, 2021, for all five states, including the counties located in each state from the New York
121 Times GitHub data repository.⁷ The first case of each state was reported during the same week,
122 on March 10 (South Dakota), March 11 (North Dakota and Wyoming), and March 13 (Idaho and
123 Montana) respectively. Our cutoff point for all five states was January 10, 2021. Our timeframe
124 covered nearly ten months from the first reported case in those states. We obtained the daily
125 number of newly confirmed COVID-19 cases from the reported cumulative case count numbers
126 (**Appendix A**). We also retrieved 2019 county-level estimated population data for all five states
127 from the U.S. Census Bureau.⁸

128
129 We collected and assessed the executive orders from the governors' offices of the five
130 states and identified the timing of the orders to implement and the announcements permitting
131 relaxation of public health interventions in each state respectively (**Supplementary Table 2**).

132 133 **STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

134 We estimated the time-varying reproduction number, R_t , using the instantaneous
135 reproduction number method with parametric definition of the serial intervals as proposed by
136 Cori et al.⁶ as implemented in the R package 'EpiEstim' version 2.2-3. The instantaneous
137 reproduction number is one of a few definitions of R_t . It is an estimate of the transmissibility of
138 the disease at current time t , assuming that it is the same as the transmissibility of prior cases that
139 result in the number of their secondary cases at current time t . An average R_t can be estimated
140 using a fixed sliding window or non-overlapping time windows defined by the user. R_t is a time
141 varying measure of transmissibility and defined as the ratio between the number of incident cases
142 at the time t , and the total infectiousness of all infected individuals at the time t accounted during
143 their infectious periods. As county-level data may give information of health inequities, or
144 crucial information in differences in COVID-19 transmission rate,⁹ we conducted our analysis
145 based on county level data. We first reconstructed the date of infection according to Gostic et
146 al.,¹⁰ by shifting the time series by nine days backward (assuming a mean incubation period of 6
147 days and a median delay to testing of 3 days).¹¹ We assumed the serial interval distribution with
148 a mean of 4.60 days and a standard deviation of 5.55 days.¹² Besides using the default 7-day
149 sliding window, we also estimated R_t by the non-overlapping time periods when different
150 combinations of non-pharmaceutical interventions (i.e., face masking, social distancing, school
151 and business closure, etc.) have been implemented (we call them policy change R_t thereafter).
152 The policy change R_t is the average of the daily R_t over the non-overlapping time period between
153 two major policy changes.

154
155 Percentage change is often utilized to help identify the magnitude and direction of change
156 in a statistic. We calculated percentage change for both the 7-day sliding window R_t and the
157 policy change R_t (**Table 1**). This was calculated utilizing percentage change = $\frac{t_2 - t_1}{t_1} \times 100$, at
158 the date of each policy implementation and face-to-face school resumption. For 7-day sliding
159 window R_t each date of interest is considered time 2 (t_2) and the previous 7-day period was
160 utilized as time 1 (t_1); for the policy change R_t each time window was compared to the previous

161 window. We utilized EpiEstim “sample from the posterior R distribution” function to sample
162 1000 estimates of R_t for each t_1 and t_2 then estimate the 95% credible intervals (2.5 and 97.5
163 percentile) of the calculated percentage change through bootstrapping.

164
165 As a note, R_t percentage change was calculated for the fall implemented interventions of
166 North Dakota on November 13 (Mask order), Idaho on November 14 (Stay Health Order-Stage
167 2: Gatherings of no more than 10 people, and vulnerable population were strongly recommended
168 to stay at home), and Montana on November 18 (Additional mitigation measures were
169 implemented including reduced size of gatherings to no more than 25). Since neither South
170 Dakota nor Wyoming ever ordered interventions during the same time period, for comparison
171 purposes we calculated the 7-day-sliding-windows R_t percentage change for both states with
172 November 13-18, 2020 as t_2 and November 6-11, 2020 as t_1 .

173
174 We assessed the power-law relationship between the cumulative case count of COVID-
175 19 and the population size of the counties. Cumulative case count would be exactly proportional
176 to population size if the per capita cumulative case count remained the same across all counties
177 of different population size (**Appendix B**). We ran a linear regression model between \log_{10} -
178 transformed per capita cumulative case count and \log_{10} -transformed population size. Counties
179 with lower population sizes would have a higher per capita cumulative case count if the slope of
180 the regression line was negative, and a lower per capita cumulative case count if the slope was
181 positive.¹³⁻¹⁶ We conducted the log-linear regression considering four different dates: June 30th,
182 August 31st, October 31st and December 31st, 2020.

183
184 To further explore the relationship between the per capita weekly incident case count and
185 county’s population size, log linear analysis was performed as univariable and multivariable
186 analysis. Multivariable models were adjusted for time (more specifically a categorical variable of
187 each 7-day period from March 2020 to January 2021) and other factors that may impact this
188 association. Those other factors were variables that we chose from the CDC Social Vulnerability
189 Index (SVI), which was created by Geospatial Research, Analysis & Services Program to
190 identify and map the most vulnerable communities with a need for support in emergency
191 events.¹⁷ CDC utilizes the U.S. census data to estimate the social vulnerability for every census
192 tract and every county in each state. The SVI is composed of many variables which are
193 categorized in four different themes (socio-economic status, household composition and
194 disability, race/ethnicity/languages, and housing type/transportation). In times of COVID-19, it
195 becomes meaningful to account for social vulnerability variables when assessing the relationship
196 between weekly incident case count per capita and population size. Those variables may partially
197 explain the variability of weekly incident case count per capita. Among many variables included
198 in the SVI database, we chose those variables we thought were more representative and had less
199 collinearity with each other. The chosen variables were the percentage of people living below the
200 poverty threshold, the percentage of people without a high school diploma, the percentage of
201 people 65 and older, the percentage of the civilian non-institutionalized population with a
202 disability, the percentage of minorities (all people excluding white, non-Hispanic) estimate, and
203 the percentage of occupied housing units with more people than rooms estimate. We obtained
204 our data from the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.¹⁸

205 All statistical analyses were performed using R version 4.0.3 (R Core Team, R
206 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). Maps (**Figure 1 and Figure 2**) were

207 created using R version 3.5.1 (R Core Team, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
208 Austria). The significance level was set a priori at $\alpha=0.05$.

209

210 **ETHICS**

211 The Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board made a non-human subject
212 determination for this project (H20364) under the G8 exemption category according to the Code
213 of Federal Regulations Title 45 Part 46.

214

215 **RESULTS**

216

217 **R_t ESTIMATES AT THE STATE LEVEL**

218 From March 10, 2020 to January 10, 2021, the daily number of new cases showed at least
219 one peak in the Fall across all five states, except Idaho which had a summer peak (**Figure 3, left**
220 **panel**). All five states had a very similar qualitative trajectory. For instance, as of January 10,
221 2021, Idaho had reported 149,742 cases, the highest cumulative numbers of COVID-19 cases
222 among five states. South Dakota had reported 113,318 cases, North Dakota 94,724 cases,
223 Montana 86,324 cases, and Wyoming 46,832 cases. **Figure 2** presents the geospatial dynamics
224 of cumulative cases number and cumulative case number per 1000 population (incidence) by
225 county in five states at four different dates of report between March 10, 2020 and January 10,
226 2021: June 30th, August 31st, October 31st, and December 31st, respectively.

227

228 The 7-day-sliding-window R_t estimates were between 2 and 3, in the beginning of the
229 pandemic across all five states. In Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, the 7-day-sliding-window R_t
230 estimates dropped below 1 in the early-April; and in North Dakota and South Dakota, the 7-day-
231 sliding-window R_t estimates briefly drop below 1 in mid-May. Then the 7-day-sliding-window R_t
232 estimates steadily stayed above 1 between September and December which correspond to the
233 fall/winter surges in five states. At the end of the study period, the 7-day-sliding-window R_t
234 estimates were slightly above 1 (Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming) or around 1 (North Dakota and
235 South Dakota), demonstrating the extensive community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in those
236 states.

237

238 As of September 7, 2020 all students in K-12 grades resumed face-to-face instruction in
239 all five states. Compared to the week prior, the 7-day-sliding-window R_t increased in Montana,
240 Wyoming, Idaho, South Dakota; whereas North Dakota saw a reduction in R_t (**Table 1 & Figure**
241 **3, right panel**). Thus, these five states experienced an average of 11.55% increase in the 7-day-
242 sliding-window R_t .

243

244 Following the region's fall surge in cases, North Dakota implemented a mask mandate on
245 November 13th (Policy E) which contributed to a 14.71% decrease in R_t . Idaho saw a 1.93%, and
246 Montana a 9.63% decrease in R_t following the implementation of stricter policies (Policy E
247 respectively). Meanwhile in mid-November 2020, neither Wyoming nor South Dakota
248 implemented any additional restrictions seeing differing effects on R_t ; Wyoming's R_t decreased
249 by 13.22% where South Dakota's R_t increased by 2.8%.

250

251 Percentage change in policy change R_t were computed by comparing each time window
252 (between each major policy change) to the previous (**Table 1**). Detailed description of R_t for
253 each state can be found in **Appendices C and D**.

254

255 **POWER-LAW RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CUMULATIVE CASE NUMBER AND** 256 **POPULATION SIZE**

257 **Figure 4** presents a linear regression relationship between the \log_{10} -transformed per
258 capita cumulative case number and the \log_{10} -transformed population size for a total of 242
259 counties in North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming. Each panel
260 corresponds to an assessed date (date of report), June 30th, August 31st, October 31st, and
261 December 31st, 2020, respectively; each regression line represents a state in a specific assessed
262 date. The slope, m , and its 95% confidence interval of every regression line are presented in
263 **Supplemental Table 3**. North Dakota was the only state that had significant slopes at all four
264 time points ($m=0.2758, 0.2171, 0.0729, 0.0986$; $p=0.0034, 0.0018, 0.046, 0.0024$; respectively).
265 Overall, the slopes of regression lines at four different assessed dates were found slightly
266 positive in June and August assessments but very close to zero in October and December
267 assessments as the pandemic unfolded, except that of Montana on June 30th, 2020. This meant
268 towards the end of 2020, there was no heterogeneity of per capita cumulative case count across
269 242 counties with different population size, suggesting an extensive community transmission of
270 SARS-CoV-2 as the pandemic progressed. However, as we mentioned previously, the slope of
271 Montana's June regression line (-0.1423) was slightly less than zero. When $m<0$, it suggests
272 counties with lower population sizes would experience a higher per capita cumulative case count.
273 In other words, the rural counties in Montana experienced a slightly higher impact of the
274 COVID-19 pandemic than other counties in the same state by mid-2020. **Figures S1-S5**
275 (**Appendix E**) present the same regression analyses, separately for each state, with outliers in
276 log-transformed per capita cumulative case number highlighted.

277

278 **MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS BETWEEN PER CAPITA WEEKLY INCIDENT CASE** 279 **COUNT AND POPULATION SIZE, ADJUSTED FOR SVI VARIABLES**

280 Linear regression results for evaluating the relationship between \log_{10} -transformed per
281 capita weekly incident case count and \log_{10} -transformed population size is shown in **Table 2**.
282 Each ten-fold increase in population size, after adjusting for the time of data collection (therefore
283 adjusting for different policies running in the state or different stages of the pandemic), was
284 associated with an increase of 0.06—0.27 in the \log_{10} -transformed per capita weekly incident
285 case count, in the studied states and all these changes were statistically significant. After
286 controlling for SVI confounders, in addition to time, a positive trend was found in the association
287 between population size and per capita weekly incident case count in Idaho, North Dakota, and
288 South Dakota. However, these coefficients were not statistically significant for Montana and
289 Wyoming.

290 **DISCUSSION**

291 From March 2020 through January 2021, North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana,
292 and Wyoming have taken various approaches on implementing both policy and health guidelines
293 to reduce the community transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Utilizing both the 7-day-sliding window
294 R_t and policy change R_t , we estimate the change in transmission potential over time and after

295 each major policy change. Throughout the initial spring and summer surges across the U.S.
296 coastal and major metropolitan areas, limited community spread of the virus was observed in the
297 five states. Although we did not observe a corresponding surge in reported case numbers in
298 South Dakota in August, the 7-day-sliding-window R_t has a small peak, suggesting there was
299 community transmission related to Sturgis Motorcycle Rally, that was held in Meade County,
300 South Dakota, August 7-16, 2020. Dave et al.,¹⁹ and Carter et al.,²⁰ assessed the nationwide
301 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 following the Sturgis Motorcycle Rally and identified it as a
302 superspreading event. However, entering fall 2020, this region began to see an uptick in case
303 counts ultimately leading a peak seen in late November. During the summer, reopening orders
304 were given and between mid-August and September 1st, all five states resumed face-to-face K-12
305 schooling. Many of the universities also began in-person instruction. By September 7th the R_t in
306 all five states had increased by an average of 11.55%.

307
308 This paper used 7-day sliding window R_t estimates and policy change R_t estimates to
309 assess and evaluate the various non-pharmaceutical interventions and policy changes at the state
310 level for North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming. A few studies have
311 accessed the effectiveness of mitigation measures, especially regarding face mask mandate and
312 school reopening.²¹⁻²³ Among the five states, North Dakota, Montana and Wyoming
313 implemented the mask mandate and followed with the R_t reduction, which echoed with the
314 current existing body of research on the efficacy of face masking in preventing the transmission
315 of SARS-CoV-2.²⁴⁻²⁶ However, South Dakota and Idaho also experienced the R_t reduction
316 without adopting the mask mandate, perhaps due to voluntary adoption of facemasks, which will
317 require further investigation.

318
319 Furthermore, we observed an increase in R_t after schools (K-12 schools, colleges, and
320 universities) reopened in South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, except North Dakota.
321 The detailed R_t description for all five states regarding school reopening are provided in
322 **Appendix C**. School closure and suspended in-person instruction were considered to be one of
323 the major public health interventions, and its effectiveness was widely discussed and researched.
324 Our research results suggest that school reopening is correlated with an increase in R_t estimates;
325 however, the results contradicted with the existing studies that the in-person instruction posed a
326 low risk of transmission of SARS-CoV-2.²⁷⁻²⁹ This might reflect a concurrent change in social
327 contact patterns when parents returned to workplaces after their children went back to schools.
328 School closure as a mitigation strategy requires further research on its effectiveness since it is
329 highly related to school-aged children, adolescents, and young adults' physical health, mental
330 health, and quality of life.³⁰

331
332 North Dakota had a higher cumulative case count per capita in the more densely
333 populated counties; however, the reason of why North Dakota was the only state of the 5 states
334 under study that had statistically significant slopes (m) at all four assessed time points requires
335 further investigation. Additional analysis found that 8 out of 20 slopes were very close to 0
336 ($0 < m < 0.1$), and the per capita cumulative case count did not vary by different population sizes.

337
338 When adjusting for SVI variables, our study found a positive significant association
339 between \log_{10} -transformed per capita weekly incident case count and \log_{10} -transformed
340 population size for Idaho, North Dakota, and South Dakota, with borderline significance for

341 Wyoming, and no significance for Montana. Concretely, a 10-fold increase in population size
342 was associated with a 0.106 increase in \log_{10} -transformed per capita incident case count in Idaho,
343 0.195 increase in North Dakota, and 0.127 increase in South Dakota. This positive significant
344 association means that high-population counties have a higher per capita incident case count than
345 low-population counties. This finding is supported by Wong & Li³¹ study where U.S. counties
346 with more people were more likely to have larger numbers of cases especially in late Spring and
347 early Summer 2020, or by McLaughlin et al.³² who emphasized the association of COVID-19
348 case rate with densely populated counties, urban counties and crowded housing.

349

350 **LIMITATIONS**

351 There are some limitations in our study. First, upticks in cases may be due to external
352 events attracting large crowds, such as a July 4, 2020 outdoor rally by the then President Trump
353 at Mt. Rushmore, South Dakota, and a motorcycle rally in Sturgis, South Dakota in August 2020.
354 It is impossible to distinguish local cases that were associated with the Sturgis Motorcycle Rally
355 from those that were not using the aggregate data. Others have found evidence suggesting that
356 the motorcycle rally might be a superspreading event, leading to at least 649 cases nationally that
357 were associated with transmission chains traced back to the event, and Meade County (where the
358 Rally was) experiencing a faster rate of growth in case rate than the rest of South Dakota, a week
359 after the close of the Rally.^{19,20} The latter event occurred just before school opening and its
360 independent effect on R_t increase may be difficult to tease out. Second, the date of symptom
361 onset or the date of (unobserved) infection was not available for our dataset. Only the date of
362 report was available. To correct for the time lag, we shifted the epidemic curve by nine days in
363 order to correct for the incubation period and the delay to test results. Third, our dataset lacked
364 information to distinguish between local and foreign imported cases. However, such distinction
365 was mostly important in the early stages of the epidemic and since April 2020 community
366 transmission was the main driver for the epidemic. Therefore, we argue that the absence of this
367 distinction would not have significantly affected R_t estimates since April 2020. Fourth, we used
368 aggregated numbers of reported cases by political jurisdictions instead of separate data on
369 different facilities or settings, while each setting might demonstrate a different dynamic than that
370 of community transmission. Fifth, underreporting due to the limits on testing capacity was
371 especially acute at the beginning of the pandemic. The majority of the states issued orders to
372 increase testing capacities between March and April 2020, and thus overcome this challenge.
373 However, mild and asymptomatic cases are unlikely to get tested and confirmed. Thus, state-
374 reported data cannot be used to measure the extent to which asymptomatic spread has progressed
375 during the pandemic. Lastly, government orders to undertake a mitigation practice, and actual
376 compliance, may differ, which is a recognized limitation in the data.^{33,34}

377 **CONCLUSIONS**

378 In North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, new cases of
379 COVID-19 started to rise in November and peaked in November-December 2020. From March
380 2020 to January 2021, the R_t for North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming
381 fluctuated around one (with a range of 0.5 to 1.5 starting from June). Various social distancing
382 policies including stay-at-home order and closing businesses and other protective interventions
383 such as mask requirements appeared to be associated with a reduction in the spread of SARS-
384 CoV-2 and keeping the R_t at a low level in the states studied in this paper. On May 13, 2021, the
385 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention updated their guidelines regarding face coverings
386 indicating that fully vaccinated people do not have to wear masks or practice physical distancing

387 except where required by federal, state, local, tribal, or territorial laws, rules, and regulations.³⁵
388 Since individuals fully vaccinated with COVID-19 vaccine still have a small chance becoming
389 infected, this updated guideline is controversial among some healthcare professionals and
390 requires further investigation.³⁶ While we await the vaccination of more people so that the herd
391 immunity threshold can be reached, government agencies may consider the continuation of the
392 above-mentioned policies to manage transmission and keep the R_t below 1.0.

393
394

395 References:

396

- 397 1. Johns Hopkins University. COVID-19 United States Cases by County
398 <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/us-map>. Published 2021. Accessed February 28, 2021.
- 399 2. The United States Census Bureau. 2020 Census: 2020 Resident Population for the 50
400 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. United States Census Bureau.
401 [https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/2021/dec/2020-resident-population-](https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/2021/dec/2020-resident-population-map.html)
402 [map.html](https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/2021/dec/2020-resident-population-map.html). Published 2021. Accessed June 30, 2021.
- 403 3. Bergquist S, Otten T, Sarich N. COVID-19 pandemic in the United States. *Health Policy*
404 *Technol.* 2020;9(4):623-638.
- 405 4. Vynnycky E, White RG. *An Introduction to Infectious Disease Modelling*. Oxford
406 University Press; 2010.
- 407 5. Thompson RN, Stockwin JE, van Gaalen RD, et al. Improved inference of time-varying
408 reproduction numbers during infectious disease outbreaks. *Epidemics.* 2019;29:100356.
- 409 6. Cori A, Ferguson NM, Fraser C, Cauchemez S. A new framework and software to
410 estimate time-varying reproduction numbers during epidemics. *Am J Epidemiol.*
411 2013;178(9):1505-1512.
- 412 7. New York Times/covid-19 data. <https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data> Published
413 2021. Accessed January 11, 2021.
- 414 8. The United States Census Bureau. County population totals 2010-2019. United States
415 Census Bureau. [https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2010s-](https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2010s-counties-total.html)
416 [counties-total.html](https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2010s-counties-total.html). Published 2019. Accessed January 11, 2021.
- 417 9. Richmond HL, Tome J, Rochani H, Fung IC, Shah GH, Schwind JS. The Use of
418 Penalized Regression Analysis to Identify County-Level Demographic and
419 Socioeconomic Variables Predictive of Increased COVID-19 Cumulative Case Rates in
420 the State of Georgia. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;17(21):8036.
- 421 10. Gostic KM, McGough L, Baskerville EB, et al. Practical considerations for measuring the
422 effective reproductive number, R_t . *PLoS Comput Biol.* 2020;16(12):e1008409.
- 423 11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID-19 Pandemic Planning Scenarios.
424 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios.html>. Published
425 2020. Accessed November 12, 2020.
- 426 12. You C, Deng Y, Hu W, et al. Estimation of the time-varying reproduction number of
427 COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Int J Hyg Environ Health.* 2020;228:113555.
- 428 13. Chowell G, Bettencourt LM, Johnson N, Alonso WJ, Viboud C. The 1918-1919
429 influenza pandemic in England and Wales: spatial patterns in transmissibility and
430 mortality impact. *Proc Biol Sci.* 2008;275(1634):501-509.
- 431 14. Fung IC-H, Zhou X, Cheung C-N, et al. Assessing Early Heterogeneity in Doubling
432 Times of the COVID-19 Epidemic across Prefectures in Mainland China, January–
433 February, 2020. *Epidemiologia.* 2021;2(1):95-113.

- 434 15. Ogwara CA, Mallhi AK, Hua X, et al. Spatially refined time-varying reproduction
435 numbers of COVID-19 by health district in Georgia, USA, March - December, 2020.
436 *Epidemiologia*. 2021;2(2):179-197.
- 437 16. Politis MD, Hua X, Ogwara CA, et al. Spatially refined time-varying reproduction
438 numbers of SARS-CoV-2 in Arkansas and Kentucky, March - November, 2020.
439 Unpublished Work. In:2021.
- 440 17. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. CDC Social Vulnerability Index.
441 <https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/placeandhealth/svi/index.html>. Published 2020. Accessed
442 March 27, 2021.
- 443 18. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. CDC SVI Data and Documentation
444 Download.
445 https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/placeandhealth/svi/data_documentation_download.html.
446 Published 2018. Accessed April 11, 2021.
- 447 19. Carter RJ, Rose D, Sabo R, et al. Widespread SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Among
448 Attendees at a Large Motorcycle Rally and their Contacts, 30 US Jurisdictions, August-
449 September, 2020. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021.
- 450 20. Dave D, McNichols D, Sabia JJ. The contagion externality of a superspreading event:
451 The Sturgis Motorcycle Rally and COVID-19. *South Econ J*. 2020.
- 452 21. Muniz-Rodriguez K, Chowell G, Schwind JS, et al. Time-varying Reproduction Numbers
453 of COVID-19 in Georgia, USA, March 2, 2020 to November 20, 2020. *The Permanente*
454 *Journal* 2021;25(20):232.
- 455 22. Wang Y, Siesel C, Chen Y, et al. Transmission of COVID-19 in the state of Georgia,
456 United States: Spatiotemporal variation and impact of social distancing. In.
457 MedRxiv2020.
- 458 23. Leung K, Wu JT, Leung GM. Real-time tracking and prediction of COVID-19 infection
459 using digital proxies of population mobility and mixing. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12(1):1501.
- 460 24. Herstein JJ, Degarege A, Stover D, et al. Characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission
461 among Meat Processing Workers in Nebraska, USA, and Effectiveness of Risk
462 Mitigation Measures. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2021;27(4):1032-1038.
- 463 25. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, et al. Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to
464 prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic
465 review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10242):1973-1987.
- 466 26. Liang M, Gao L, Cheng C, et al. Efficacy of face mask in preventing respiratory virus
467 transmission: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Travel Med Infect Dis*.
468 2020;36:101751.
- 469 27. Fricchione MJ, Seo JY, Arwady MA. Data-Driven Reopening of Urban Public Education
470 Through Chicago's Tracking of COVID-19 School Transmission. *J Public Health Manag*
471 *Pract*. 2021;27(3):229-232.
- 472 28. Gillespie DL, Meyers LA, Lachmann M, Redd SC, Zenilman JM. The Experience of 2
473 Independent Schools With In-Person Learning During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Sch*
474 *Health*. 2021;91(5):347-355.
- 475 29. Zimmerman KO, Akinboyo IC, Brookhart MA, et al. Incidence and Secondary
476 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Schools. *Pediatrics*.
477 2021;147(4):e2020048090.

- 478 30. McGuine TA, Biese KM, Petrovska L, et al. Mental Health, Physical Activity, and
479 Quality of Life of US Adolescent Athletes During COVID-19-Related School Closures
480 and Sport Cancellations: A Study of 13 000 Athletes. *J Athl Train*. 2020;56(1):9.
481 31. Wong DWS, Li Y. Spreading of COVID-19: Density matters. *PLoS One*.
482 2020;15(12):e0242398.
483 32. McLaughlin JM, Khan F, Pugh S, et al. County-Level Predictors of COVID-19 Cases and
484 Deaths in the United States: What Happened, and Where Do We Go from Here? *Clin*
485 *Infect Dis*. 2020;XX(XX):ciaa1729.
486 33. Nivette A, Ribeaud D, Murray A, et al. Non-compliance with COVID-19-related public
487 health measures among young adults in Switzerland: Insights from a longitudinal cohort
488 study. *Soc Sci Med*. 2021;268:113370.
489 34. Crane MA, Shermock KM, Omer SB, Romley JA. Change in Reported Adherence to
490 Nonpharmaceutical Interventions During the COVID-19 Pandemic, April-November
491 2020. *JAMA*. 2021;325(9):883-885.
492 35. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Guidance for Fully Vaccinated People.
493 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/fully-vaccinated-guidance.html>.
494 Published 2021. Accessed May 19, 2021.
495 36. Rabin RC. A major nurses' union condemns the C.D.C.'s new mask advice for
496 vaccinated people. *New York Times*.
497 <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/15/world/nurses-union-cdc-mask-vaccinated.html>.
498 Published 2021. Accessed May 15, 2021.
499
500
501
502

Table 1: Percentage change of R_t and 95% credible intervals (CrI) at policy implementation and important dates calculated with both 7-day sliding window and non-overlapping window.

State	Date (2020)		Percentage Change and 95% CrI			
			7-Day Sliding Window		Non-Overlapping Window	
North Dakota	16-Mar	Policy A	8.86%	[-22.86%, 52.67%]	-18.01%	[-39.68%, 10.12%]
	30-Mar	Policy B	-10.96%	[-15.3%, -10.46%]	-21.43%	[-32.18%, -8.84%]
	26-May	Policy C	6.98%	[-1.61%, 16.12%]	4.30%	[0.47%, 8.19%]
	7-Sep	School Open**	-8.03%	[-8.23%, -7.83%]		
	21-Sep	Policy D	0.17%	[0.01%, 0.33%]	0.82%	[-0.82, 2.49%]
	13-Nov	Policy E	-14.71%	[-14.99%, -14.41%]	-27.27%	[-28.24%, -26.09%]
	21-Dec	Policy F	32.44%	[26.53%, 38.09%]	20.85%	[16.86%, 25.10%]
South Dakota	13-Mar	Policy A	94.16%	[-9.05%, 404.87%]	89.99%	[7.91%, 285.91%]
	6-Apr	Policy B	-38.85%	[-43.80%, -33.50%]	-42.62%	[-47.18%, -38.20%]
	28-Apr	Policy C	37.34%	[24.20%, 51.22%]	9.64%	[7.00%, 12.28%]
	13-Aug	Policy D	16.47%	[7.06%, 26.37%]	7.59%	[7.09%, 8.08%]
	7-Sep	School Open**	12.36%	[8.07%, 16.72%]		
	25-Sep	Policy E	18.84%	[18.19%, 19.48%]	-10.38%	[-12.00%, -8.86%]
	Nov 13-18	Average*	2.80%	[-7.85%, 34.52%]		
Idaho	25-Mar	Policy A	-59.94%	[-60.57%, -59.31%]	-62.67%	[-65.75%, -59.49%]
	1-May	Policy B	11.14%	[10.38%, 11.98%]	41.97%	[35.64%, 48.05%]
	13-Jun	Policy C	8.68%	[-0.84%, 19.05%]	-5.02%	[-9.42%, -0.83%]
	7-Sep	School Open**	13.14%	[12.52%, 13.73%]		
	27-Oct	Policy D	2.60%	[2.27%, 2.91%]	-2.67%	[-4.09%, -1.24%]
	14-Nov	Policy E	-1.93%	[-1.99%, -1.87%]	-6.24%	[-7.64%, -4.83%]
Montana	13-Mar	Policy A	-3.99%	[-38.99%, 49.24%]	-51.24%	[-66.21%, -27.83%]
	7-May	Policy B	-14.92%	[-65.10%, 107.88%]	22.60%	[10.14%, 35.95%]
	15-Jul	Policy C	-12.43%	[-12.55%, -12.31%]	-16.17%	[-17.27%, -15.08%]
	1-Sep	Policy D	34.83%	[33.82%, 35.85%]	8.52%	[5.54%, 11.28%]
	7-Sep	School Open**	20.73%	[10.90%, 30.98%]		
	18-Nov	Policy E	-9.63%	[-9.98%, -9.26%]	-17.58%	[-18.75%, -16.38%]
Wyoming	13-Mar	Policy A	15.46%	[-29.23%, 91.29%]	-32.95%	[-54.24%, 2.84%]
	28-Apr	Policy B	-29.99%	[-46.75%, -6.23%]	-5.13%	[-5.79%, -4.48%]
	10-Jun	Policy C	1.17%	[-1.03%, 3.64%]	5.69%	[-4.57%, 16.99%]
	13-Jul	Policy D	0.30%	[-0.76%, 1.43%]	1.96%	[-2.99%, 6.41%]
	7-Sep	School Open**	19.56%	[1.66%, 39.27%]		
	14-Oct	Policy E	-1.98%	[-2.64%, -1.33%]	-8.84%	[-11.03%, -6.78%]
	Nov 13-18	Average*	-13.22%	[-29.76%, 21.92%]		
	7-Dec	Policy F	10.58%	[10.34%, 10.83%]	-13.25%	[-15.30%, -10.97%]

*Note: neither South Dakota nor Wyoming had any policy change during this time-period of interest so bootstrapping was performed on the average of the 6-day range of policy implementation from the other three states.

**Note: As of September 7th, 2020, all states had resumed face-to-face K-12 education.

Policy labels: **North Dakota:** A = Schools closed; B = Promote physical distancing; C = Testing order; D = Lifted travel and quarantine order; E = Mask order; F = Allow all restaurants and bars to resume normal hours. **South Dakota:** A = State of Emergency declared; B = Minnehaha and Lincoln stay at home order; C = All citizens shall implement 'back to normal plan'; D = All K-12 schools were mandated to start in-person classes again; E = long-term facilities began to relax visitor restrictions. **Idaho:** A = Statewide stay home order; B = Stay Healthy Order-Stage 1. Businesses and governmental agencies resumed operations at physical locations; C = Stay Health Order-Stage 4. Gatherings of any size were allowed and non-essential travel could resume; D = Stay Health Order-Stage 3. Patrons of bars, nightclubs, and restaurants must remain seated. Face coverings were required at long-term care facilities; E = Stay Health Order-Stage 2. Gatherings of no more than 10 people, and vulnerable population were strongly recommended to stay at home. **Montana:** A = State of Emergency declared; B = School reopened; C = Statewide mask requirement; D = School's Fall semester started; E = Additional mitigation measures were implemented including reduced size of gatherings to no more than 25. **Wyoming:** A = All businesses and schools were closed; B = Gymnasiums and childcare facilities were reopened; C = K-12 schools, colleges, universities, and trade schools resumed on-site instructions; D = Removed some conditions and restrictions were applicable to restaurants; E = Additional mitigation measures were implemented including reduced size of gatherings to no more than 50; F = Required face coverings in certain places with exceptions.

Table 2. The linear regression analysis between log₁₀-transformed per capita weekly incident case count and log₁₀-transformed population size for North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, March 2020 -January 2021.*

	Unadjusted Model		Adjusted for Weeks		Adjusted for all Variables†	
	Parameter Estimate	(95% CI)	Parameter Estimate	(95% CI)	Parameter Estimate	(95% CI)
North Dakota	0.066	(-0.009,0.141)	0.190	(0.148, 0.233)*	0.195	(0.131, 0.259)*
South Dakota	-0.018	(-0.092,0.056)	0.143	(0.099, 0.187)*	0.127	(0.069, 0.185)*
Idaho	0.005	(-0.071,0.080)	0.155	(0.108, 0.201)*	0.106	(0.049, 0.164)*
Montana	-0.222	(-0.299, -0.145)*	0.061	(0.017, 0.105)*	0.029	(-0.021, 0.079)
Wyoming	0.212	(0.054, 0.369)*	0.271	(0.182, 0.360)*	0.153	(-0.007, 0.313)

*p<0.05 †Note: Adjusted for below poverty variable, the percentage of people without high school diploma, the percentage of minority, the percentage of people with a disability, the percentage of crowding, the percentage of people 65 years and older, and for weeks.

504
505
506

507 **Figure Titles and Legends**

508

509 **Figure 1.** County-level population map (2019) of North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana,
510 and Wyoming, USA.

511

512 **Figure 2.** County-level maps of North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming by
513 cumulative case count (top four maps), and cumulative case counts per 1000 population (bottom
514 four maps) on June 30, August 31, October 31, and December 31, 2020 (date of report).

515


516 **Figure 3.** The daily number of new cases by their assumed date of infection (left panel), 1-week
517 sliding window R_t estimates (middle panel), and non-overlapping window R_t estimates by policy
518 change (right panel) of North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, USA,
519 March 10, 2020 – January 10, 2021 (date of report).

520 **North Dakota:** A = Schools closed; B = Promote physical distancing; C = Testing order; D =
521 Lifted travel and quarantine order; E = Mask order; F = Allow all restaurants and bars to resume
522 normal hours. **South Dakota:** A = State of Emergency declared; B = Minnehaha and Lincoln
523 stay at home order; C = All citizens shall implement ‘back to normal plan’; D = All K-12 schools
524 were mandated to start in-person classes again; E = long-term facilities began to relax visitor
525 restrictions. **Idaho:** A = Statewide stay home order; B = Stay Healthy Order-Stage 1. Businesses
526 and governmental agencies resumed operations at physical locations; C = Stay Health Order-
527 Stage 4. Gatherings of any size were allowed and non-essential travel could resume; D = Stay
528 Health Order-Stage 3. Patrons of bars, nightclubs, and restaurants must remain seated. Face
529 coverings were required at long-term care facilities; E = Stay Health Order-Stage 2. Gatherings
530 of no more than 10 people, and vulnerable population were strongly recommended to stay at
531 home. **Montana:** A = State of Emergency declared; B = School reopened; C = Statewide mask
532 requirement; D = School’s Fall semester started; E = Additional mitigation measures were
533 implemented including reduced size of gatherings to no more than 25. **Wyoming:** A = All
534 businesses and schools were closed; B = Gymnasiums and childcare facilities were reopened; C
535 = K-12 schools, colleges, universities, and trade schools resumed on-site instructions; D =
536 Removed some conditions and restrictions were applicable to restaurants; E = Additional
537 mitigation measures were implemented including reduced size of gatherings to no more than 50;
538 F = Required face coverings in certain places with exceptions.


539

540 **Figure 4.** Linear regression between \log_{10} -transformed per capita cumulative case number (ccn)
541 and \log_{10} -transformed population size by county (grouped in states) for North Dakota, South
542 Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming on June 30th, August 31st, October 31st, and December
543 31st, 2020 (date of report).



Population




30 June 2020





31 August 2020




30 October 2020





31 December 2020




30 June 2020





31 August 2020


















30 October 2020



31 December 2020




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.04.21259992>; this version posted July 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.04.21259992>; this version posted July 6, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).


30 June, 2020




31 August, 2020



31 October, 2020



31 December, 2020



state Idaho Montana North Dakota South Dakota Wyoming

Supplementary material: Late surges in COVID-19 cases and varying transmission potential partially due to public health policy changes in 5 Western states, March 10, 2020-January 10, 2021

Xinyi Hua†, MPH; Aubrey R. D. Kehoe†, MPH; Joana Tome†, MPH; Mina Motaghi†, MD, MPH; Sylvia K. Ofori, MPH; Po-Ying Lai, MS; Sheikh Taslim Ali, PhD; Gerardo Chowell, PhD; Anne C. Spaulding, MD, MPH; Isaac Chun-Hai Fung*, PhD.

Affiliations:

1. Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Environmental Health Sciences, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA, USA (X. Hua, A. R. D. Kehoe, J. Tome, M. Motaghi, S. K. Ofori, I.C.H. Fung)
2. Department of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA (P.Y. Lai)
3. WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Control, Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, LKS Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (S.T. Ali)
4. Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health, Hong Kong Science and Technology Park, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (S.T. Ali)
5. Department of Population Health Sciences, School of Public Health, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA (G. Chowell)
6. Department of Epidemiology, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA (A.C. Spaulding)

*Corresponding author: Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, PhD. Email: cfung@georgiasouthern.edu

† Xinyi Hua, Aubrey R. D. Kehoe, Joana Tome, and Mina Motaghi serve as co-first authors.

Appendix A. Data cleaning: handling negative incident case counts

Dates with negative case counts were identified (i.e., when public health agencies made corrections to their cumulative case counts at a specific date or dates). Daily case counts were adjusted to remove negative counts that were created when states adjusted their positive cases; for instance, a state would record negative cases in order to account for a previous over-count. To remove these negative counts all data was reviewed, and negative counts were transformed into a zero count by removing this number from the previous days with positive cases until there was no discrepancy. We adjusted the negative daily case counts at both state and county levels in all five states in this study.

Appendix B. Assessing power-law relationship using linear regression of log-transformed per capita cumulative case count and log-transformed population size.

If we assume that a power-law relationship exists between the cumulative case count (C) and the population size (N), with an exponent g , i.e., $C = N^g A$, and that per capita cumulative case count, $A = C/N$, then,

$$g = \frac{\log C}{\log N} = \frac{\log (AN)}{\log N} = \frac{\log A}{\log N} + \frac{\log N}{\log N} = \frac{\log A}{\log N} + 1$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\log A}{\log N} = g - 1 = m$$

Where m is the slope of the regression line between the \log_{10} -transformed per capita cumulative case count and the \log_{10} -transformed population size.

Appendix C. The detailed description for R_t in North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming.

North Dakota. The daily reported cases of COVID-19 in North Dakota started to increase since July 2020, reaching a peak of 2,270 new cases in early November and 2,340 new cases in early December (Figure 3). The 7-day-sliding-window R_t stayed above 1 almost all year around and went below 1 in late May and in December. The governor's executive orders and State Health Officers' orders (Supplemental Table 2) throughout 2020 were chosen to create the policy change R_t throughout the year (Figure 3). From March 16, 2020 till April 4, 2020, the 7-day-sliding-window R_t decreased toward 1 but was still above 1 meaning that the promotion of physical distance was working. On April 18, 2020, the State Health Officer released the quarantine order for the Grand Forks county, and subsequently on May 14, 2020, they issued the testing order for Grand Forks county. In late May, the 7-day-sliding-window R_t fell below 1 where the coverage of the testing order expanded further. From June till November both the 7-day-sliding-window R_t and policy change R_t maintained a level above 1 which corresponded to the lifted quarantine order, the rescinded close contact quarantine order, and the permission of health care workers who are asymptotically infected with SARS-CoV-2 to work in care facilities. From mid-November, the 7-day-sliding-window R_t and policy change R_t fell below 1, which corresponded to the release of the first mask order, and the allowance of team practice, bars and restaurant to resume normal hours.

South Dakota. From March 1, 2020 through January 1, 2021 South Dakota had 103,318 confirmed COVID-19 cases cumulatively. The daily reported cases of South Dakota had one late surge, peaking in November 2020 (Figure 3). Within South Dakota, there were eight policies or recommendations for COVID-19 precautions were implemented, five major ones can be found in Supplemental Table 2. The 7-day-sliding window R_t estimate fell below 1 on April 4, 2020 following the closure of the Smithfield pork processing plant in Sioux Falls, Minnehaha, South Dakota.¹ The policy change R_t estimate remained below 1 until April 28, 2020 when South Dakota implemented their *Back to Normal Plan* which largely focuses on good hygiene practices and limiting persons in large numbers. From August 13 till September 25, 2020 the policy change R_t estimates increased to above 1 when South Dakota K-12 school reopened in person. The 95% credible intervals (CrI) of 7-day-sliding window R_t estimates in March 2020 were wide due to the small numbers of daily new cases. Meanwhile, during the periods between April 28, 2020 and August 13, 2020 and between September 25, 2020 and January 10, 2021 there were very few policy changes; the policy change R_t estimates may not accurately depict the true R_t estimates during those periods.

Idaho. From March 1, 2020 to January 1, 2021, Idaho's daily reported case number revealed two major surges of new cases in July and November 2020 (Figure 3). The policy change R_t estimates based on statewide policy changes demonstrate the effectiveness of the non-pharmaceutical interventions (face masking, social distancing, prohibited gathering of more than 10 people, etc.) of controlling the spread of COVID-19 within the state of Idaho. The policy change R_t estimates dropped below 1 after the Statewide Stay Home order was in place between March 25, 2020 and April 30, 2020. The statewide policy change R_t estimates increased above 1 between May 1, 2020 and October 26, 2020, with the Stay Healthy Order relaxation of the controlling measures from stage 1 (encourage vulnerable individuals to stay at home,

avoid public and private gathering, and avoid and minimize non-essential travels) to stage 4 (open all business, allow public gathering with any size and resume non-essential travel). With the Stay Healthy Order stage 3 in effect on October 27, 2020, the policy change R_t estimates dropped again and continued to drop below one, after the Stay Healthy Order moved from stage 3 back to stage 2 with more restrictions on November 14, 2020. Overall, Idaho demonstrated an extensive community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the study period.

Montana. The number of incident cases in Montana had a surge in November 2020 with up to 1,622 daily cases in mid-November (Figure 3). The 7-day-sliding-window R_t curve and the policy change R_t curve show some significant changes over time parallel with implementing different COVID-19 related policies (Figure 3). There was a drastic drop in the 7-day-sliding-window R_t estimates after closing businesses and the *stay-at-home* orders at the end of March, leading to R_t estimates under 1 from late March until early May. An increase in 7-day-sliding-window R_t was observed in the first days of May as the state lifted the *stay-at-home* order, reopened schools and started the first phase of reopening businesses (such as some retails, restaurants, casinos, and bars). There was a decrease in policy change R_t estimates in mid-July after the statewide mask requirement was applied, with a slight rise in September, probably due to the start of schools' Fall semester. In November after applying new restrictions on gatherings and also placing time and capacity limitations for bars and restaurants, the policy change R_t estimates dropped again below 1 and remained low, mostly till late December.

Wyoming. From March 1, 2020 to January 1, 2021, Wyoming's daily reported case number revealed one major surge of new cases in October and November 2020 (Figure 3). The policy change R_t estimates based on statewide policy changes demonstrated the necessity of the non-pharmaceutical interventions (face masking, social distancing, reduction in the size of public gathering, etc.) of controlling the spreading of COVID-19 within the state of Wyoming. For instance, the R_t estimates stayed around and above 1 while the state opened up all businesses without face mask mandate and public gathering restrictions. The 7-day-sliding-window R_t estimates then dropped below 1 after the Seventeenth Continuation and Modification Statewide Public Health Order regarding the public gathering with no more than 25 people on November 19, 2020. With the first public health order regarding mandatory face covering in effect on December 7, 2020, the policy change R_t estimates maintained below one. Overall, Wyoming demonstrated an extensive community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the study period.

Appendix D: Detailed R_t description for North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming regarding School reopening.

North Dakota. North Dakota decided to reopen schools and universities on June 1st, 2020.² There are around 21 universities in the state located in Cass, Grand Forks, Ward, Burleigh, Stark, Stutsman, Trail, Mountrail, Bottineau, Benson, Barnes, Pierce, Dickey, Sioux, and Rolette counties.³ During the year of 2020, in most of the counties, the case number starts to increase at the end of the summer, peaking in November. Concretely, in Ward, Burleigh, Stark, Trail, and Sioux counties, the reported cases started to increase in July; in Cass, Grand Forks, Stutsman, Barnes counties, the reported cases started to increase in August; in Mountrail, Bottineau, and Benson counties the reported cases started to increase in September, while for the Pierce, Dickey, and Rolette counties, the daily reported case count started to increase in October, peaking in November. For most of the counties, the R_t stays at one during all the summer-fall period, except for some fluctuations (above and below one) in Grand Forks, and an R_t greater than one for Burleigh (where the state capital is located), and Dickey or Pierce (over one till the end of October). This description may be related to college students returning to school because the increase in the daily

reported case count corresponds to the start of the fall semester in North Dakota. However, after November, new cases infected with SARS-CoV-2 and R_t starts to fall, which correspond to the issued mask order.

South Dakota. Some South Dakota schools began to offer in-person classes in June, but most schools did not begin face-to-face instruction for the mid-August fall semester.⁴ The state is home to four technical institutes, six state universities, six tribal colleges and universities, and six private colleges and universities; of these, six located in Minnehaha county, three in Pennington county, two schools located in Davison and Brown counties respectively, and one in Lawrence, Lake, Codington, Yankton, Oglala Lakota, Todd, Roberts, Brookings, and Clay counties respectively.⁵ Following the mid-August openings nine of these counties had an R_t that remained above 1 for between 7-14 days and four had R_t values that fluctuated both below and above 1. However, it is important to note that many of these counties have a very small population with small daily incident case count, which resulted in wide CrIs for R_t estimates around this time period. This initial increases in R_t and case count might be related to the return of students to in-person learning. In most counties with colleges and universities the epidemiologic increases seen in mid-August transitioned into the overall state-level fall surge that peaked around November. It is also noteworthy that the Sturgis Motorcycle Rally was held in Meade County, South Dakota, August 7-16, 2020, which coincide with the school reopening on August 13, 2020. Therefore, it is difficult to attribute the increase in R_t to a single policy decision (schools reopening) or a single mass gathering (Sturgis Motorcycle Rally). Both could have been factors involved; please refer to the discussion in the Limitations section in the main text.

Idaho. Idaho schools opened on-site instruction for the fall 2020 semester with a framework on decision making based on four different levels of community transmission.⁶ The state is home for four public colleges and 4-year universities, four regional community colleges, and eight private colleges and universities. Of these, four located in Boise, two in Moscow, two in Nampa, two in Idaho Falls, and one in Rexburg, Caldwell, Meridian, Twin Falls, Pocatello, Lewiston, McCall, and Coeur d'Alene respectively.⁷ Following the mid-August openings, Boise County had an R_t fluctuated below and above 1 but mainly above 1; however, the daily case counts were very small, less than 15, therefore the CrI of R_t was wide. Boise County is a college town for four colleges and universities. These small daily case counts may relate to effective non-pharmaceutical interventions or issues of underreporting.

Montana. Montana was one of the 2 states that resumed in-person instructions in schools in the academic year 2019-2020, on May 7, 2020.⁸ As seen in Figure 3, R_t rose above one from early May and stayed high until mid-July which reflected the impact of this policy in the state, in contrast to most of the other states of the country. There are more than 20 colleges and universities in Montana, with approximately 40,000 students, in Gallatin county, Yellowstone county, Hill county, Missoula county, Silver Bow county, Beaverhead county, Dawson county, Flathead county, Custer county, Lewis and Clark county, Cascade county, and tribal colleges in the counties of Blaine, Glacier, Rosebud, Roosevelt, Big Horn, Lake and Hill.⁹ Fall semester 2020 started in the second half of August in almost all of these academic institutions with online and on campus courses, using new guidelines to improve safety of students. No significant change in R_t was observed in these counties after the Fall openings.

Wyoming. Wyoming K-12 schools, colleges and universities, and trade schools were reopened in limited on-site instructions on May 7, 2020, and later fully opened for face-to-face on-site instruction on June 10, 2020.¹⁰ The state is home for one 4-year university, eight public colleges, one tribal college, and two private colleges. Except for the University of Wyoming and Wyoming Technical Institute located in Laramie, the rest of the colleges scatter across different counties.¹¹ Following the reopening in June, Laramie County had an R_t spike of 4 and R_t fluctuated below and above 1 but mainly above 1 between June and December, and R_t dropped below 1 between December and January. The largest daily case count

was 246 on November 14, 2020. The trend of R_t and case count increase might be related to the school resumed face-to-face instruction in June and following fall semester.

Appendix E: Linear regression between \log_{10} -transformed per capita cumulative case number (ccn) and \log_{10} -transformed population size by county for North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, on June 30th, August 31st, October 31st, and December 31st, 2020 (date of report) are presented in Figures S1-S5.

Figure S1. Linear regression between \log_{10} -transformed per capita cumulative case number (ccn) and \log_{10} -transformed population size by county for North Dakota (53 counties), on June 30th, August 31st, October 31st, and December 31st, 2020 (date of report). Counties that were outliers (defined as below 2.5 percentile or above 97.5 percentile of the distribution of the \log_{10} -transformed per capita ccn) were marked in red.

North Dakota




Figure S2. Linear regression between \log_{10} -transformed per capita cumulative case number (ccn) and \log_{10} -transformed population size by county for South Dakota (66 counties), on June 30th, August 31st, October 31st, and December 31st, 2020 (date of report). Counties that were outliers (defined as below 2.5 percentile or above 97.5 percentile of the distribution of the \log_{10} -transformed per capita ccn) were marked in red.

South Dakota




Figure S3. Linear regression between \log_{10} -transformed per capita cumulative case number (ccn) and \log_{10} -transformed population size by county for Idaho (44 counties), on June 30th, August 31st, October 31st, and December 31st, 2020 (date of report). Counties that were outliers (defined as below 2.5 percentile or above 97.5 percentile of the distribution of the \log_{10} -transformed per capita ccn) were marked in red.

Idaho




Figure S4. Linear regression between \log_{10} -transformed per capita cumulative case number (ccn) and \log_{10} -transformed population size by county for Montana (56 counties), on June 30th, August 31st, October 31st, and December 31st, 2020 (date of report). Counties that were outliers (defined as below 2.5 percentile or above 97.5 percentile of the distribution of the \log_{10} -transformed per capita ccn) were marked in red.

Montana





Figure S5. Linear regression between \log_{10} -transformed per capita cumulative case number (ccn) and \log_{10} -transformed population size by county for Wyoming (23 counties), on June 30th, August 31st, October 31st, and December 31st, 2020 (date of report). Counties that were outliers (defined as below 2.5 percentile or above 97.5 percentile of the distribution of the \log_{10} -transformed per capita ccn) were marked in red.

Wyoming



Supplemental Table 1. List of counties in North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming (organized by state).¹²

State	Counties
North Dakota (53 counties)	Adams, Barnes, Benson, Billings, Bottineau, Bowman, Burke, Burleigh, Cass, Cavalier, Dickey, Divide, Dunn, Eddy, Emmons, Foster, Golden Valley, Grand Forks, Grant, Griggs, Hettinger, Kidder, LaMoure, Logan, McHenry, McIntosh, McKenzie, McLean, Mercer, Morton, Mountrail, Nelson, Oliver, Pembina, Pierce, Ramsey, Ransom, Renville, Richland, Rolette, Sargent, Sheridan, Sioux, Slope, Stark, Steele, Stutsman, Towner, Traill, Walsh, Ward, Wells, Willams.
South Dakota (66 counties)	Aurora, Beadle, Bennett, Bon Homme, Brookings, Brown, Brule, Buffalo, Butte, Campbell, Charles Mix, Clark, Clay, Codington, Corson, Custer, Davison, Day, Deuel, Dewey, Douglas, Edmunds, Fall River, Faulk, Grant, Gregory, Haakon, Hamlin, Hand, Hanson, Harding, Hughes, Hutchinson, Hyde, Jackson, Jerauld, Jones, Kingsbury, Lake, Lawrence, Lincoln, Lyman, McCook, McPherson, Marshall, Meade, Mellette, Miner, Minnehaha, Moody, Oglala, Lokota, Pennington, Perkins, Potter, Roberts, Sanborn, Spink, Stanley, Sully, Todd, Tripp, Turner, Union, Walworth, Yankton, Ziebach.
Idaho (44 counties)	Ada, Adams, Bannock, Bear Lake, Benewah, Bingham, Blaine, Boise, Bonner, Bonneville, Boundary, Butte, Camas, Canyon, Caribou, Cassia, Clark, Clearwater, Custer, Elmore, Franklin, Fremont, Gem, Gooding, Idaho, Jefferson, Jerome, Kootenai, Latah, Lemhi, Lewis, Lincoln, Madison, Minidoka, Nez Perce, Oneida, Owyhee, Payette, Power, Shoshone, Teton, Twin Falls, Valley, Washington.
Montana (56 counties)	Beaverhead, Big Horn, Blaine, Broadwater, Carbon, Carter, Cascade, Chouteau, Custer, Daniels, Dawson, Dear Lodge, Fallon, Fergus, Flathead, Gallatin, Garfield, Glacier, Golden Valley, Granite, Hill, Jefferson, Judith Basin, Lake, Lewis and Clark, Liberty, Lincoln, McCone, Madison, Meagher, Mineral, Missoula, Musselshell, Park, Petroleum, Phillips, Pondera, Powder River, Powell, Prairie, Ravalli, Richland, Roosevelt, Rosebud, Sanders, Sheridan, Silver Bow, Stillwater, Sweet Grass, Teton, Toole, Treasure, Valley, Wheatland, Wibaux, Yellowstone.
Wyoming (23 counties)	Albany, Big Horn, Campbell, Carbon, Converse, Crook, Fremont, Goshen, Hot Springs, Johnson, Laramie, Lincoln, Natrona, Niobrara, Park, Platte, Sheridan, Sublette, Sweetwater, Teton, Uinta, Washakie, Weston.

Supplemental Table 2: Control measures implemented by state government agencies in North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, USA

	Label	Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Implemented measure(s)
North Dakota	A	03/16/2020	Executive Order 2020-04.1. The governor amended school closure order for certain schools and programs. ¹³
	B	03/30/2020	Executive Order 2020-10.1. The governor enabled remote participation for public meetings to promote physical distancing. He amended school facilities closure to accommodate child care needs and suspended deadlines for livestock auctions, pesticide applicators, and public libraries. ¹⁴
	C	05/26/2020	Testing Order Long Term Care. The State Health Officer Order for testing for 2019-nCoV/COVID-19 as a Disease Control Measures to prevent the spread 2019-nCoV/COVID-19. ¹⁵
	D	09/21/2020	Order #2020-02.4 Lifted Travel Quarantine Order. The State Health Officer Order lifted the 14-day quarantine order for those returning from international travel. ¹⁶
	E	11/13/2020	Order #2020-08 Mask Order. The mask order required face coverings in indoor businesses and indoor public settings, as well as in outdoor business and public settings when it was not possible to maintain physical distancing. ¹⁷ Executive Order 2020-43. The governor enacted mitigation measures for food service, events, sports, and extracurricular activities. ¹⁸
	F	12/21/2020	The governor amended the order to allow restaurants and bars to resume normal hours. ¹⁹
South Dakota	A	3/13/2020	State of emergency declared, executive state government workers given work from home order and restricted out of state travel (EO# 2020-05); K-12 schools closed for the rest of the year; higher education encouraged to close campus; and long-term care facilities implemented visitor restrictions. ²⁰
	B	4/6/2020	All residents shall review and practice CDC COVID-19 guidelines; all employers, local, and municipal government shall implement CDC COVID-19 guidelines to encourage telework, social distancing, and reduced numbers; all healthcare workers shall prepare for increased COVID-19 cases (EO# 2020-12) ²¹ ; stay-at-home order except for essential workers and essential outings for all Minnehaha and Lincoln “vulnerable individuals” (EO# 2020-13). ²²
	C	4/28/2020	All citizens shall implement “back to normal plan” leaving COVID-19 precautions up to each resident, employers, and schools; ended Minnehaha and Lincoln “vulnerable individuals” stay-at-home order; (EO# 2020-20). ²³
	D	8/13/2020	All K-12 schools were mandated by the South Dakota Governor to start in-person classes again. ²⁴
	E	9/25/2020	Long-term care facilities began to relax visitor restrictions. ²⁴
Idaho	A	3/25/2020	Statewide stay-home order. This isolation order required Idaho residents to stay and work from home as much as possible while ensuring all essential services and business remain available. This isolation order did not prohibit outdoor activity such as walking, hiking, running, and biking, but a safe distance of six (6) feet must be kept between those who do not live in the same household. ²⁵
	B	5/1/2020	Stay Healthy Order-Stage 1: Businesses and governmental agencies resumed operations at physical locations in the state of Idaho except for those businesses identified in this order. All businesses must adhere to the social distancing and sanitation requirement. Certain individuals entering Idaho required self-quarantine for 14 days. Gathering, both public and private, should be avoided. Non-essential travel should be avoided or minimized. ²⁶
	C	6/13/2020	Stay Healthy Guidelines-Stage 4: Gathering of any sizes were allowed but should adhere to the physical distancing and sanitation requirements. Non-essential travel could resume. ²⁷
	D	10/27/2020	Stay Health Order-Stage 3: Indoor and outdoor gathering, both public and private must adhere to the requirement identified in this order. Patrons of bars, nightclubs, and restaurants must remain seated. Face coverings were required at long-term care facilities. ²⁸

	E	11/14/2020	Stay Health Order-Stage 2: Gathering of more than 10 people, both public and private, were prohibited, including attendance at extracurricular activities such as sporting events. People at increased risk for severe illness living in the state of Idaho were strongly encouraged to stay home and limit their movement outside of their place of residence. ²⁹
Montana ³⁰	A	3/13/2020	State of Emergency declared and directive implementing Executive Orders 2-2020 and 3-2020 and providing for measures to combat the spread of COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus. Court closure.
	B	5/7/2020	School reopened.
	C	7/15/2020	Statewide mask requirement required individuals to wear masks inside certain businesses and at outdoor gatherings of greater than 50 people where social distancing was not possible.
	D	9/1/2020	Schools' Fall semester began.
	E	11/18/2020	Additional mitigation measures. Gatherings were limited to 25 people when social distancing is not possible. Bars, restaurants, and casinos will have a 10 p.m. curfew every night and were limited to 50% capacity.
Wyoming	A	3/13/2020	Statewide Public Health Order #1. Closed all restaurants, bars, theaters, gymnasiums, childcare facilities, K-12 schools, colleges, universities, and trade schools, in the State of Wyoming, with certain exceptions. This Order was effective immediately and shall remain in effect until April 3, 2020. ³¹
	B	4/28/2020	Statewide Public Health Order, 3rd Continuation and Modification. This order authorized gymnasiums and childcare facilities to reopen under certain conditions. This order was effective on May 1, 2020 and shall remain in effect through May 15, 2020. Forbade gathering for 10 people or more. ^{32,33}
	C	6/10/2020	Statewide Public Health Order, 6th Continuation and Modification. This order authorized K-12 schools, colleges, universities, and trade schools to provide on-site instruction to students and allow others to use of their facilities under certain conditions. Forbade gathering for 50 people or more. ^{10,34}
	D	7/13/2020	Statewide Public Health Order, 8th Continuation and Modification. This order removed some conditions and restrictions that were applicable to restaurants. ^{35,36}
	E	10/14/2020	Statewide Public Health Order, 13th Continuation and Modification. This order required patrons at different tables (at restaurants/bars) to be seated at least 6 feet apart and did not apply to booths, and patrons could be in groups up to 8 instead of 6. This order also authorized groups of attendees seated or standing together during an event in groups of 8 instead of 6. Forbade gathering for 50 people or more. ^{37,38}
	F	12/7/2020	Statewide Public Health Order #4. Required face coverings in certain places, with exceptions. This order was effective on December 9, 2020, and shall remain in effect through January 8, 2021. ³⁹

Supplemental Table 3. The slope (and 95% Confidence Intervals) of the regression line between log₁₀-transformed per capita cumulative case count and log₁₀-transformed population size, by states, North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, USA, on June 30, August 31, October 31, and December 31, 2020.

	June 30, 2020	August 31, 2020	October 31, 2020	December 31, 2020
North Dakota	0.2758 (0.0961, 0.4554)	0.2171 (0.0846, 0.3496)	0.0729 (0.0014, 0.1443)	0.0986 (0.0366, 0.1605)
South Dakota	0.1603 (-0.0766, 0.3972)	0.2322 (0.1018, 0.3627)	0.0052 (-0.0794, 0.0898)	0.0186 (-0.0402, 0.0774)
Idaho	0.2398 (-0.1067, 0.5863)	0.1857 (0.0261, 0.3497)	0.0662 (-0.0498, 0.1822)	0.0798 (0.0150, 0.1446)
Montana	-0.1423 (-0.3975, 0.1130)	0.1741 (-0.0028, 0.3510)	0.0129 (-0.1170, 0.1428)	0.0359 (-0.0397, 0.1116)
Wyoming	0.2765 (-0.1647, 0.7178)	0.3043 (-0.0544, 0.6630)	0.2210 (0.0659, 0.3761)	0.1206 (0.0274, 0.2138)

Supplemental Table 4. The adjusted linear regression model between log₁₀-transformed per capita incident case count and log₁₀-transformed population size for Idaho, March 2020 -January 2021*

Variables	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	t-Statistic	P-value
Population	0.106	0.030	3.606	0.0003
Below poverty estimate percentage	0.007	0.003	2.252	0.0244
No high school diploma percentage	0.005	0.006	0.827	0.4086
Age 65+ percentage	-0.014	0.005	-2.780	0.0055
Population with disability percentage	0.009	0.005	1.873	0.0613
Minority percentage	0.010	0.003	3.039	0.0024
Crowding percentage	-0.030	0.010	-2.921	0.0035

*Note: adjusted for weeks

Supplemental Table 5. The adjusted linear regression model between log₁₀-transformed per capita incident case count and log₁₀-transformed population size for Montana, March 2020 - January 2021*

Variables	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	t-Statistic	P-value
Population	0.0290	0.026	1.136	0.2561
Below poverty estimate percentage	-0.017	0.004	-4.401	0.0000
No high school diploma percentage	0.008	0.004	2.196	0.0282
Age 65+ percentage	-0.001	0.004	-0.304	0.7614
Population with disability percentage	-0.007	0.005	-1.373	0.1698
Minority percentage	0.008	0.002	4.703	0.0000
Crowding percentage	0.015	0.008	1.820	0.0689

*Note: adjusted for weeks

Supplemental Table 6. The adjusted linear regression model between log₁₀-transformed per capita incident case count and log₁₀-transformed population size for North Dakota, March 2020 - January 2021*

Variables	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	t-Statistic	P-value
Population	0.195	0.033	5.961	0.0000
Below poverty estimate percentage	-0.0002	0.004	-0.069	0.9454
No high school diploma percentage	0.007	0.005	1.608	0.1079
Age 65+ percentage	-0.003	0.005	-0.635	0.5258
Population with disability percentage	0.009	0.006	1.543	0.1230
Minority percentage	-0.001	0.002	-0.597	0.5507
Crowding percentage	0.017	0.011	1.449	0.1475

*Note: adjusted for weeks

Supplemental Table 7. The adjusted linear regression model between log₁₀-transformed per capita incident case count and log₁₀-transformed population size for South Dakota, March 2020 - January 2021*

Variables	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	t-Statistic	P-value
Population	0.127	0.030	4.278	0.0000
Below poverty estimate percentage	-0.008	0.002	-3.373	0.0008
No high school diploma percentage	0.015	0.005	3.167	0.0016
Age 65+ percentage	-0.009	0.004	-2.383	0.0172
Population with disability percentage	0.0004	0.005	0.079	0.9374
Minority percentage	0.004	0.001	2.657	0.0079
Crowding percentage	-0.010	0.004	-2.392	0.0168

*Note: adjusted for weeks

Supplemental Table 8. The adjusted linear regression model between log₁₀-transformed per capita incident case count and log₁₀-transformed population size for Wyoming, March 2020 - January 2021*

Variables	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	t-Statistic	P-value
Population	0.153	0.081	1.879	0.0606
Below poverty estimate percentage	0.0006	0.006	0.107	0.9145
No high school diploma percentage	-0.026	0.012	-2.206	0.0277
Age 65+ percentage	0.000	0.007	0.012	0.9901
Population with disability percentage	0.030	0.010	2.937	0.0034
Minority percentage	0.012	0.005	2.562	0.0106
Crowding percentage	0.090	0.018	5.017	0.0000

*Note: adjusted for weeks

References:

1. Smithfield Foods. Smithfield Foods To Close Sioux Falls, SD Plant Indefinitely Amid COVID-19. <https://www.smithfieldfoods.com/press-room/company-news/smithfield-foods-to-close-sioux-falls-sd-plant-indefinitely-amid-covid-19>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021, 2021.
2. School responses in North Dakota to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic during the 2020-2021 school year. [https://ballotpedia.org/School_responses_in_North_Dakota_to_the_coronavirus_\(COVID-19\)_pandemic_during_the_2020-2021_school_year](https://ballotpedia.org/School_responses_in_North_Dakota_to_the_coronavirus_(COVID-19)_pandemic_during_the_2020-2021_school_year). Accessed March 1, 2021.
3. National Center for Education Statistics. College Navigator for North Dakota. <https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?s=ND&pg=1>. Accessed March 1, 2021.
4. Toman J, Mercer T. Public Universities Adjust Fall Semester Schedule <https://www.sdbor.edu/mediapubs/New%20Press%20Releases/060320FallAdjust.pdf>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
5. South Dakota Board of Regents Public Universities & Special Schools. Higher Education Institutions Web site. <https://www.sdbor.edu/administrative-offices/infogovtrelations/Pages/South-Dakota-Higher-Education-Institutions.aspx>. Published 2021. Accessed February 28, 2021.
6. Idaho State Board of Education. Idaho Back to School Framework Published 2021. Accessed February 28, 2021.
7. Idaho State Government. Colleges and Universities <https://www.idaho.gov/education/colleges-universities/>. Accessed February 28, 2021.
8. School responses to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic during the 2020-2021 academic year [https://ballotpedia.org/School_responses_to_the_coronavirus_\(COVID-19\)_pandemic_during_the_2020-2021_academic_year](https://ballotpedia.org/School_responses_to_the_coronavirus_(COVID-19)_pandemic_during_the_2020-2021_academic_year). Published 2021. Accessed February 28, 2021.
9. Montana University System. Colleges and Universities <https://mus.edu/Universities/>. Accessed February 28, 2021.
10. Wyoming State Health Officer. Statewide Public Health Order, 6th Continuation and Modification. . <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1sQJbSSvr0ZnRkuKQ0kNbqsyYhYe99OzG/view>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
11. List of Colleges and Universities in Wyoming. <https://myschoolhelp.com/colleges-in-wyoming/>. Accessed February 28, 2021.
12. The United States Census Bureau. County population totals 2010-2019. United States Census Bureau. <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2010s-counties-total.html>. Published 2019. Accessed January 11, 2021.
13. North Dakota State Government. Executive Order 2020-04.1. <https://www.governor.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/executive-orders/Executive%20Order%202020-04.1%20COVID-19.pdf>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
14. North Dakota State Government. Executive Order 2020-10.1. <https://www.governor.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/executive->

- [orders/Executive%20Order%202020-10.1.pdf](#). Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
15. State of north Dakota Department of Health. Testing orders, Long Term Care. <https://www.health.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/Files/MSS/coronavirus/State%20Health%20Officer%20Orders/05-27-2020%20Testing%20Orders.pdf>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
 16. State of North Dakota Department of Health. Lifted Travel Quarantine Order https://www.health.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/Files/MSS/coronavirus/State%20Health%20Officer%20Orders/2020_02.4_Lifted_Travel_Order.pdf. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
 17. State of North Dakota Department of Health. Mask Order. https://www.health.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/Files/MSS/coronavirus/State%20Health%20Officer%20Orders/2020-08_Mask_Order.pdf. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
 18. North Dakota State Government. Executive Order 2020-43. https://www.health.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/Files/MSS/coronavirus/State%20Health%20Officer%20Orders/2020-08_Mask_Order.pdf. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
 19. North Dakota State Government. Executive Order 2020-43.3. <https://www.governor.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/Executive%20Order%202020-43.3.pdf>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
 20. State of South Dakota Office of the Governor. Executive Order 2020-05. <https://covid.sd.gov/docs/2020-05.pdf>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
 21. State of South Dakota Office of the Governor. Executive Order 2020-12. <https://covid.sd.gov/docs/2020-12.PDF>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
 22. State of South Dakota Office of the Governor. Executive Order 2020-13. <https://covid.sd.gov/docs/2020-13.PDF>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
 23. State of South Dakota Office of the Governor. Executive Order 2020-20. <https://covid.sd.gov/docs/2020-20.pdf>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
 24. Documenting South Dakota's path to recovery from the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, 2020-2021. [https://ballotpedia.org/Documenting_South_Dakota%27s_path_to_recovery_from_the_coronavirus_\(COVID-19\)_pandemic,_2020-2021](https://ballotpedia.org/Documenting_South_Dakota%27s_path_to_recovery_from_the_coronavirus_(COVID-19)_pandemic,_2020-2021). Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
 25. Idaho Department of Health and Welfare. Statewide Stay Home Order. https://coronavirus.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/statewide-stay-home-order_032520.pdf. Published 2020 Accessed February 28, 2021.
 26. Idaho Department of Health and Welfare. Stay Healthy Order, Stage 1. <https://coronavirus.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/stay-healthy-order-stage1.pdf>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
 27. Idaho Department of Health and Welfare. Stay Healthy Guidelines, stage 4. <https://rebound.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/stage4-stay-healthy-guidelines.pdf>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
 28. Idaho Department of Health and Welfare. Stay Healthy Order, Stage 3 Modified https://coronavirus.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/stay-healthy-order-stage3_2020oct27.pdf. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.

29. Idaho Department of Health and Welfare. Stay Healthy Order, Stage 2 Modified <https://coronavirus.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/stage-2-modified-order.pdf>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
30. Documenting Montana's path to recovery from the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, 2020-2021. [https://ballotpedia.org/Documenting_Montana%27s_path_to_recovery_from_the_coronavirus_\(COVID-19\)_pandemic,_2020-2021](https://ballotpedia.org/Documenting_Montana%27s_path_to_recovery_from_the_coronavirus_(COVID-19)_pandemic,_2020-2021). Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
31. Wyoming State Health Officer. Statewide Public Health Order #1, Closures. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qZ4MrBFvBxAXnyi4-vNo6CHCfGgS1wgO/view>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
32. Wyoming State Health Officer. Statewide Public Health Order, 3rd Continuation and Modification. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1kDaNfjmewmUSuGscRQII93SRPCzDduX_/view. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
33. Wyoming State Health Officer. Statewide Public Health Order, 3rd Continuation and Modification (Gathering). <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1BrGn4eoQCHG3-Prm87sqUOxG2Vp-whlM/view>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
34. Wyoming State Health Officer. Statewide Public Health Order, 6th Continuation and Modification (Gathering). <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WBQpBzmWL3neZJKSdHlo-lin8C1msEqw/view>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
35. Wyoming State Health Officer. Statewide Public Health Order, 8th Continuation and Modification. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1rDsIe2HHxZYybtuXpABimw8rUFoSyOIq/view>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
36. Wyoming State Health Officer. Statewide Public Health Order, 8th Continuation and Modification (Gathering) https://drive.google.com/file/d/1LIIm6_UudyJEbTK3NGL_x6KamMDzIZ4jl/view. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
37. Wyoming State Health Officer. Statewide Public Health Order, 13th Continuation and Modification. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1J6VGUYFN3-N4I8NNO8-ci5_TwrheA1IT/view. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
38. Wyoming State Health Officer. Statewide Public Health Order, 13th Continuation and Modification (Gathering). <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1D-fu6mv72ZXIrcHJTdlrM3jzNyceXUQV/view>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.
39. Wyoming State Health Officer. Statewide Public Health Order#4: Requiring Face Coverings in Certain Places, with Exceptions. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1zDkPo6KLZ2HnJAZFYQNH87wHS5jxCTq/view>. Published 2020. Accessed February 28, 2021.