

1 Can tracking mobility be used as a public health tool
2 against COVID-19 following the expiration of
3 stay-at-home mandates?

4 Peter Her^{1†}, Sahar Saeed^{2†}, Khai Hoan Tram², and Sahir R Bhatnagar^{3,4}

5 ¹Department of Medical Biophysics, University of Toronto

6 ²Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Washington
7 University School of Medicine

8 ³Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Occupational Health,
9 McGill University

10 ⁴Department of Diagnostic Radiology, McGill University

11 August 25, 2021

12 † Authors contributed equally

13 *Word count: 3404*

14 **Abstract**

15 **Background:**

16 Considering the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 variants and low vaccine access and uptake, mini-
17 mizing human interactions remains an effective strategy to mitigate the spread of SARS-CoV-2.

18 The aim of this study was to create a novel multidimensional mobility index to capture the com-

19 plexity of human interaction and evaluate its utility as an early indicator of surges in COVID-19
20 cases.

21 **Methods:**

22 We used publicly available anonymous cell phone data compiled by SafeGraph, from all coun-
23 ties in Illinois, Ohio, Michigan and Indiana between January 1st to December 8, 2020. Six
24 metrics of mobility were extracted for each county. Changes in mobility were defined as a
25 time-updated 7-day rolling average. We used an unsupervised machine learning method known
26 as functional principal component analysis (fPCA) to construct the latent mobility index (MI)
27 using the six metrics of mobility. Associations between our MI and COVID-19 cases were es-
28 timated using a quasi-Poisson hierarchical generalized additive model adjusted for population
29 density and the COVID-19 community vulnerability index.

30 **Results:**

31 Individual mobility metrics varied significantly by counties and by calendar time. More than
32 50% of the variability in the data was explained by the first principal component by each state,
33 indicating good dimension reduction. Following the expiration of stay-at-home orders, mobility
34 increased across all counties and this was particularly evident on weekends. While an individual
35 metric of mobility was not associated with surges of COVID-19, our MI was independently
36 associated with COVID-19 cases in all four states given varying time-lags.

37 **Conclusion:**

38 Following the expiration of stay-at-home orders, a single metric of mobility was not sensitive
39 enough to capture the complexity of human interactions. Monitoring mobility can be an im-
40 portant public health tool, however, it should be modelled as a multidimensional construct.

41 *Keywords:* COVID-19, Pandemic, SARS-Cov-2, Mobility, Generalized Additive Models

42 **1 Introduction**

43 While highly effective vaccines are readily available in the United States, uptake remains low [1]
44 and interventions aimed at minimizing human contact remain necessary to mitigate the spread of

1 INTRODUCTION

45 SARS-CoV-2 [2, 3, 4, 5]. Decreasing mobility patterns within populations, has been shown to
46 be an effective strategy to curb infectious disease transmission. Reducing human interactions is
47 particularly important given Delta (a variant of concern; that is highly transmissible) is the dominant
48 SARS-CoV-2 strain driving the current pandemic wave in the United States.

49 The potential of monitoring population-level mobility patterns using geo-located mobile phone data
50 as a public health tool has been demonstrated [6, 7, 8, 9]. In March 2020, worldwide adherence to
51 lockdowns was measured using various mobility metrics [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. A modelling study
52 from China showed 20-60% reductions in mobility notably controlled the spread of SARS-CoV-
53 2 [16]. A study from Canada showed that reductions in mobility strongly predict future control of
54 SARS-CoV-2 growth rates [5]. However, in the absence of social distancing interventions, the link
55 between changes in population-level mobility and COVID-19 remains unclear [8, 9].

56 Population-level mobility, as it pertains to human interaction, is multidimensional. This is partic-
57 ularly true when assessing distinct geographical areas that vary by population density and socioe-
58 conomic factors across the United States [17, 18]. While the measurement of mobility is complex,
59 studies to date have used single metrics such as the percentage of people remaining at home or
60 changes in the distance travelled to summarize human interactions and evaluate trends and asso-
61 ciations with COVID-19. These single metrics may oversimplify mobility associated with human
62 interaction. As social distancing policies loosen from strict "lock down" to business-as-normal, the
63 utility of continuously monitoring mobility will require a robust definition that is able to capture
64 the complexity of population-level movement [19]. To this end, the aim of this study was to use
65 advanced statistical methods to create a novel index that summarizes mobility as a latent construct
66 using a combination of six mobility metrics. We evaluated how our mobility index varied across
67 365 counties in 4 states as a function of time. Finally, we assessed the performance of our mobility
68 index by evaluating how mobility correlated with COVID-19 cases compared to a single metric
69 from the time stay-at-home orders expired.

70 **2 Methods**

71 **2.1 Data Sources**

72 **Mobility Metrics**

73 We used aggregated mobility data publicly available through [SafeGraph](#) from January 1st to De-
74 cember 8, 2020, via the Social Distancing Metric database. SafeGraph uses a panel of GPS pings
75 from anonymous mobile devices from a representative sample of the US Census population, to de-
76 rive metrics of mobility. This data includes a range of spatial behaviors from >45 million mobile
77 devices ($\approx 10\%$ of devices in the United States). To enhance privacy, SafeGraph excludes census
78 block group information if fewer than two devices visited an establishment in a month.

79 *A priori*, we choose six mobility metrics commonly used in the literature as a proxy of human
80 contact and that could be attributable to mobility behavior changes as associated with COVID-
81 19 infections. Each metric is defined for a given day (t) for a given county (j). The metrics (s)
82 included:

- 83 • The fraction of devices leaving home in a day
- 84 • The fraction of devices away from home for 3-6 hours (Part-time work behaviour)
- 85 • The fraction of devices away from home longer than 6 hours (Full-time work behaviour)
- 86 • The median time spent away from home
- 87 • The median distance traveled from home
- 88 • The average number of short stops (>3 stops for less than 20 min) (Delivery behaviours).

89 **COVID-19 Cases**

90 Confirmed COVID-19 cases data were retrieved from the New York Times open-source project [20].
91 This publicly available dataset aggregates county-level daily counts of diagnosed cases, from health
92 services official reports.

93 Covariates

94 Demographic variables including population size and population density for each county was col-
95 lected from the American Community Survey and the US Census Bureau. We used an aggre-
96 gate measure of social and COVID-19 specific vulnerability to summarize socioeconomic status
97 at the state and county-level, freely available as the COVID-19 community vulnerability index
98 (CCVI) [21]. Dates for when stay at home orders were enforced and lifted were obtained from
99 the State-level social distancing policies database [22]. There were several entries for each state
100 due to policy revisions or updates. We used the first entry for each state in this database.

101 2.2 Analysis

102 Population

103 Given the magnitude of the available data, we reduced the number of states in our analysis by
104 simply selecting the four most populous states in the Midwest. We used every county from each of
105 the selected states to avoid any preferential selection.

106 Mobility Index

107 We defined mobility as a change of each mobility metric relative to the average of the week before
108 (time-updated rolling average). For each county $j = 1, \dots, 365$, we index each of the 6 mobility
109 metrics $s = 1, \dots, 6$ by calendar day $t = 1, \dots, m_j$, where m_j is the total number of observed days
110 since re-opening in county j . We define the following quantities:

- 111 • $X_{j,t,s}$: the scalar value of mobility metric s measured on day t in county j .
- 112 • $\mathbf{X}_{j,t-8,\dots,t-1,s}$: the value of mobility metric s measured on days $t - 8, \dots, t - 1$, i.e., the 7
113 days prior to day t in county j . This is a vector quantity.
- 114 • $\bar{X}_{j,t-8,\dots,t-1,s}$: the average of the $\mathbf{X}_{j,t-8,\dots,t-1,s}$.

115 The change from baseline mobility metric s for day t in county j is given by

$$\Delta X_{j,t,s} = \frac{X_{j,t,s} - \overline{X}_{j,t-8,\dots,t-1,s}}{\overline{X}_{s,j,t-8,\dots,t-1}} \quad (1)$$

116 The use of a rolling average is unique to this analysis. Most studies have used a static relative
117 baseline period such as mobility trends between January until February 2020 [6, 23, 24]. This
118 common approach does not account for seasonal mobility variability or changes as a result of the
119 pandemic [25, 26, 27]. In contrast our baseline (rolling average) takes into consideration temporal
120 trends that were likely changing with evolving public health policies.

121 Since our hypothesis was each metric could be attributed to a common underlying notion of mobil-
122 ity, we used an unsupervised machine learning method known as functional principal component
123 analysis (fPCA) to create our latent mobility index [28]. Briefly, PCA is a technique for reducing
124 the dimensionality of multiple variables while minimizing information loss. This is done by cre-
125 ating new uncorrelated variables (principal components) that successively maximize variance. A
126 “functional” PCA accounts for the longitudinal nature of the data. We applied fPCA on $\Delta X_{j,t,s}$
127 separately for each county and extracted the first principal component, i.e., the linear combina-
128 tion of individual mobility metrics that explained the most variance. We denote this first principal
129 component by $fPCA_{j,t}$, a score summarizing mobility in each county (j) on a given day (t). To
130 enable comparability between counties and states, $fPCA_{j,t}$ was scaled as Z-scores, which defined
131 our mobility index (MI) given by:

$$MI_{j,t} = \frac{fPCA_{j,t} - \overline{fPCA}_{j,t}}{\sqrt{Var(fPCA_{j,t})}} \quad (2)$$

132 where $\overline{fPCA}_{j,t} = \frac{1}{m_j} \sum_{k=1}^{m_j} fPCA_{j,k}$ and $Var(fPCA_{j,t})$ are the average and variance of the
133 fPCA scores in county j over the observed time period, respectively.

134 The interpretation of MI is as follows, $MI = 0$, on average there was no change in mobility relative
135 the previous week; $MI = 1$ on average there was an increase in mobility by one standard deviation

136 relative to the last week, and $MI = -1$ on average there was a decrease in mobility by one standard
137 deviation relative to the last week. An animation was created to visualize the relative daily changes
138 of MI by counties.

139 Association with COVID-19

For each county j , let $y_{j,t}$ be the number of confirmed COVID-19 cases on day $t = 1, \dots, m_j$, and $\mathbf{q}_{j,t} = [MI_{j,t-0}, \dots, MI_{j,t-21}]$ denote the vector of lagged occurrences of our mobility index (defined in Equation (2)) with 0 days and 21 days as minimum and maximum lags, respectively. In words, the first element of $\mathbf{q}_{j,t}$ represents the value of our mobility index on day t , the second element represents the value of our mobility index one day prior to t , and so on. From the time “stay at home” orders expired until December 8th 2020, the relationship between daily counts of COVID-19 cases ($y_{j,t}$) and mobility ($\mathbf{q}_{j,t}$), accounting for up to 21 days of lag, was estimated with a quasi-Poisson hierarchical generalized additive model (HGAM) [29, 30] of the form:

$$\log(E(y_{j,t})) = \beta_0 + s(\mathbf{q}_{j,t}) + s(\text{time}_t) + s_j(\text{time}_t) + CCVI_j + \text{density}_j, \quad (3)$$

140 where β_0 is the intercept, $s(\cdot)$ are the smooth non-parametric functions of the predictor variables,
141 $CCVI_j$ is the COVID-19 community vulnerability index and density_j is the population density
142 (people per square kilometer) at the county-level. The term $s(\mathbf{q}_{j,t})$ in Equation (3) captures the
143 potentially non-linear and delayed effect of mobility on COVID-19 cases through a cross-basis
144 function [31]. We used penalized cubic regression splines [29] for both dimensions, with interior
145 knots placed at Z-scores of -3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3 for $MI_{j,t}$, and 7 and 14 days for the lag. Given the het-
146 erogeneity of COVID-19 epidemiology across counties, models included both a state level calendar
147 time effect $s(\text{time}_t)$ using thin plate regression splines [32] and a county level calendar time effect
148 $s_j(\text{time}_t)$ using a factor-smoother interaction basis [30]. Population size was used as offset in each
149 model. A separate model was run for each of the selected states.

150 There were two main advantages for using a HGAM to evaluate the association between mobil-

151 ity and COVID-19 cases: (1) it can quantify the non-linear functional relationships over time
152 where the shape of each function varies across counties, and (2) it has the capacity of modelling
153 varying lags [33]. For example, it is estimated that it takes a median of 5 days from SARS-
154 CoV-2 infection until the onset of symptoms, followed by an unknown number of days before
155 people get tested and a positive infection is confirmed. This lag can be differential at both the
156 patient-level (develop symptoms and get tested) and also at the county-level (lag in reporting tests).
157 Given this variation, we were able to control for varying lagged exposures (up to 21 days) at the
158 county-level. To evaluate the utility of our mobility index, we compared a dose response rela-
159 tionship between mobility and COVID-19 cases and goodness of fit statistics of our latent MI
160 compared to a single measure of mobility (the fractions of devices leaving the home). All anal-
161 yses were performed using R version 4.0.2 [34] along with the `mgcv` [29] and `dlnm` [35] packages.
162 Code and data for reproducing all the results, figures and animation in this paper is available at
163 <https://github.com/sahirbhatnagar/covid19-mobility>.

164 **3 Results**

165 **3.1 Mobility patterns**

166 Daily mobility changes of three hundred sixty-five counties from the four most populous states in
167 the Midwest: Illinois, Ohio, Michigan and Indiana were analyzed between January 1 2020 until
168 December 8 2020. State-level sociodemographic and economic characteristics were similar across
169 four states and are summarized in Table 1.

3 RESULTS

Table 1: The sociodemographic and economic characteristics of Illinois (IL), Ohio (OH), Michigan (MI) and Indiana (IN).

State	Order	Lift	Population	Number of counties	Median household income	Cumulative cases per capita at opening ^a	Cumulative cases per capita until Dec 8 th ^a
Illinois	March 21	April 8	12,741,080	102	\$65,030	118	6324
Ohio	March 24	April 7	11,689,442	88	\$56,111	41	4363
Michigan	March 24	April 14	9,995,915	83	\$56,697	269	4427
Indiana	March 25	April 7	6,691,878	92	\$55,746	83	5909

^a cumulative cases per 100,000 population

170 Figure 1 illustrates the average daily changes of the six mobility metrics between January and De-
171 cember 2020 of each state (average of all counties) relative to the week before. Overall, each metric
172 had a unique trajectory but trends were similar across four states. Based on the average change,
173 the number of devices not at home and delivery behavior (more than 3 stops lasting for less than
174 20 mins) remained stable throughout time. While changes in work-related metrics and the median
175 time devices remained were not at home varied more. Of the four states, mobility changes were
176 more pronounced in Ohio. Across all states, relative to the previous seven days, mobility increased
177 daily between March and May. Mobility metrics varied considerably by counties (S1, S2, S3, S4),
178 illustrating how aggregating changes at the state-level may mask granular changes at the county-
179 level.




Figure 1: The average daily changes from baseline in the six mobility metrics for all counties of each state between January and December 2020. The baseline was calculated using a rolling average of the 7 previous days. The solid vertical lines represent the date the stay-at-home orders were put in place while the dotted vertical lines represent the dates the stay-at-home orders were lifted.

3.2 First fPCA summarizes mobility patterns by counties

180 We created a latent index of mobility by counties as given by Equation (2) which is derived from
181 the first fPCA. Table 2 provides the median and inter quartile range of the proportion of variance
182 explained by the first fPCA across counties in a given state. We see that over 50% of the variance is
183 explained by the first fPCA for a majority of all the counties analyzed, indicating good dimension
184 reduction. In Supplemental Figures S5, S6, S7 and S8, we provide the absolute correlations between
185 our MI and each individual metric by county for Illinois, Ohio, Michigan and Indiana, respectively.
186 We see the correlations are particularly strong with full/part time work behaviour as well as time
187 spent away from home. Importantly, there was significant heterogeneity across counties which
188 would otherwise be missed when aggregating mobility metrics at the state level.
189

Table 2: Median (inter quartile range) of the proportion of variance explained by the first fPCA by state. n represents the number of counties in each state.

Illinois ($n = 102$)	Ohio ($n = 88$)	Michigan ($n = 83$)	Indiana ($n = 92$)
0.57 (0.50, 0.63)	0.71 (0.67, 0.74)	0.61 (0.53, 0.69)	0.65 (0.59, 0.70)

190 Figure 2 compares the changes of the MI from the day stay at home policies expired and July 4th
191 (Independence Day). Blue shades indicate MI <0 (decrease in mobility) and red shade indicate
192 MI>0 (increase in mobility). This graph provide some evidence that our MI is appropriately cap-
193 turing mobility as we would expect there to be more movement on a traditionally busy U.S. holiday
194 compared to earlier on in the pandemic when stay at home orders were lifted. In the Supplemental
195 material, we also provide an animation illustrating the daily changes from reopening to Decem-
196 ber 8th. The animation shows substantial difference in mobility patterns across counties that vary
197 from day to day. The most dramatic change over time is increases in mobility from a weekday to a
198 weekend.




Figure 2: MI values for each county of each state on the day the stay-at-home orders expired (reopen) and on July 4th, 2020. Blue shades indicate a decrease in mobility (MI < 0) and red shades indicate an increase in mobility (MI > 0).

199 3.3 Association with COVID-19

200 To evaluate the utility of the MI, we compared its association with COVID-19 cases and a commonly
201 used single metric of mobility (fraction of devices leaving home) (Figure 3). Notably, the single
202 metric was not associated with COVID-19 cases in any state at any lagged time point. While all four
203 states showed a clear dose response of MI and COVID-19 cases following a 10-21 day lag. Across
204 all four states the MI model resulted in significantly better goodness of fit statistics compared to the
205 single metric (Table 3).

3 RESULTS




Figure 3: Model results comparing the MI and its association with COVID-19 cases and a commonly used single metric of mobility (fraction of devices leaving home). For each state, the left panel summarizes the multidimensional MI; the right panel represents the percentage of devices leaving their home (x-axis); y-axis is the adjusted incidence rate ratio of COVID-19, at varying lagged response (0-21 days) (z-axis).

Table 3: Analysis of deviance table comparing the goodness of fit between the MI model (fPCA) and the fraction of devices leaving home (single) of the four states. Degrees of freedom shown is for the χ^2 test statistic.

State	Residual deviance	Degrees of freedom	Reduction in deviance for the MI model (fPCA)
Illinois (single)	152,581		
Illinois (fPCA)	149,282	3.6	3,299
Ohio (single)	123,551		
Ohio (fPCA)	112,975	8.6	10,576
Michigan (single)	261,759		
Michigan (fPCA)	250,888	7.0	10,871
Indiana (single)	83,517		
Indiana (fPCA)	80,297	1.7	3,220

4 Discussion

The COVID-19 pandemic is now fueled by highly transmissible variants of concern. Understanding the association between mobility and disease transmission can help tailor non-pharmaceutical interventions to mitigate outbreaks and potentially be used as an early indicator for surges in new infections. We leveraged freely available cell phone data with an unsupervised machine learning approach to create a multidimensional index of mobility. Results from our study suggest following the expiration of stay-at-home physical distancing policies, single metrics of mobility were not sensitive enough to capture the complexity of human mobility related to disease transmission. Our MI was correlated with COVID-19 cases for Illinois, Ohio, Michigan and Indiana. In comparison, the single metric of mobility (fraction of devices leaving home) was not associated with incident cases. Our results also demonstrate the importance of evaluating changes at a granular level as there was significant heterogeneity within states.

The use of mobility data was suggested to be a powerful tool to determine the impact of public health policies [19]. During the initial phase of the pandemic, several studies examined the asso-

220 ciation between mobility and COVID-19 [2, 36, 37, 38]. For example Lasry et al. [6] found an
221 association between changes in mobility (% personal mobile devices leaving home) at the state-
222 level and COVID-19 cases during the first COVID-19 wave. However at this time NPI were more
223 homogenous across counties and states. In contrast our study was the first to evaluate the association
224 of mobility and COVID-19 cases following the expiration of stay-at-home orders reflecting mobil-
225 ity behavior that is more reflective of typical population-level movement. We demonstrated among
226 hundreds of counties from four states, time-updated relative changes were associated with increases
227 in COVID-19 cases. Furthermore, results from our study suggest our mobility index should be con-
228 sidered an important confounder when evaluating other non-pharmaceutical interventions.

229 The strength of our study was the use multiple advanced statistical methods to measure mobility
230 and evaluate its association with COVID-19 cases. The fPCA used to create the mobility index ef-
231 fectively captured the heterogeneity of the individual metrics over time and across counties within
232 a given state. The unsupervised nature of this approach prevented the model from overfitting when
233 evaluating the association with cases. Furthermore, we modelled a non-linear functional relation-
234 ship between mobility and COVID-19 cases using a HGAM model while simultaneously fitting
235 different lagged time periods. The expectation that the lag time should vary across states was con-
236 firmed by our results. The use of these methods has been under appreciated in the epidemiological
237 and public health studies; we provide code and data to expand the use as we believe these methods
238 could have wide applications in future research.

239 Our study also has limitations. Although cell phone data was freely available and could help to
240 predict trends during the pandemic, it is only a proxy for human contact. In this study we attempted
241 to define a more robust definition of mobility, however it still remains a surrogate exposure. The
242 association between mobility and COVID-19 cases may be underestimated, given our outcome is
243 dependent on testing. Testing capacity has significantly changed throughout the pandemic in the
244 United States. Seroprevalence studies estimate case detection is underrepresented by a factor of
245 three times [39]. Although we do not believe this underrepresentation to be differential, outcomes

246 such as COVID-19 related deaths and hospitalizations may be less bias. While the advantage is
247 clear, the utility of these outcomes as a “real-time” public health tool is debatable as the latency
248 period (time of infection to outcome) is long (>21 days). As with all observational studies, associ-
249 ations should not be interpreted causally. Our model does not take into consideration confounding
250 interventions that could also increase or mitigate transmission such as the proportion of the pop-
251 ulation adhering to physical distancing guidelines, wearing masks, interactions outside vs inside
252 or air quality. To effectively measure social distancing patterns individual wearable technology or
253 trackers, would be more sensitive compared to aggregate data, but this raises ethical and privacy
254 concerns [40]. Recent reports have hypothesized the COVID-19 pandemic may not be following a
255 normal distribution but over dispersed or driven by “super spreader” transmission events which we
256 did not account for in our model [41].

257 **5 Conclusion**

258 Our study underscores the potential of using freely available cell phone data as public health tool.
259 We show changes in mobility can be used a predictor of surges in COVID-19 cases. However mon-
260 itoring mobility in the absence of strict non-pharmaceutical interventions such as “stay at home”
261 will require robust definitions.

262 **References**

- 263 [1] Tram KH, Saeed S, Bradley C, Fox B, Eshun-Wilson I, Mody A, et al. Deliberation, Dissent,
264 and Distrust: Understanding distinct drivers of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the United
265 States. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2021 07. Ciab633. Available from: [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab633)
266 [10.1093/cid/ciab633](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab633).
- 267 [2] Zipursky JS, Redelmeier DA. Mobility and Mortality During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J*
268 *GEN INTERN MED*. 2020 Oct;35(10):3100–3101.

REFERENCES

- 269 [3] Finazzi F, Fassò A. The Impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic on Italian Mobility. *Signif (Oxf)*.
270 2020 Jun;17(3):17–18.
- 271 [4] Jiang J, Luo L. Influence of Population Mobility on the Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-
272 19) Epidemic: Based on Panel Data from Hubei, China. *glob health res policy*. 2020
273 Dec;5(1):30.
- 274 [5] Brown KA, Soucy JPR, Buchan SA, Sturrock SL, Berry I, Stall NM, et al. The mobility
275 gap: estimating mobility thresholds required to control SARS-CoV-2 in Canada. *CMAJ*.
276 2021;193(17):E592–E600. Available from: [https://www.cmaj.ca/content/193/17/
277 E592](https://www.cmaj.ca/content/193/17/E592).
- 278 [6] Lasry A, Kidder D, Hast M, Poovey J, Sunshine G, Winglee K, et al. Timing of com-
279 munity mitigation and changes in reported COVID-19 and community mobility—four US
280 metropolitan areas, February 26–April 1, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*.
281 2020;69(15):451–457.
- 282 [7] Linka K, Goriely A, Kuhl E. Global and local mobility as a barometer for COVID-19 dynam-
283 ics. *Biomechanics and modeling in mechanobiology*. 2021;20(2):651–669.
- 284 [8] Xiong C, Hu S, Yang M, Younes H, Luo W, Ghader S, et al. Mobile device location data reveal
285 human mobility response to state-level stay-at-home orders during the COVID-19 pandemic
286 in the USA. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*. 2020;17(173):20200344.
- 287 [9] Khataee H, Scheuring I, Czirok A, Neufeld Z. Effects of social distancing on the spreading
288 of COVID-19 inferred from mobile phone data. *Scientific reports*. 2021;11(1):1–9.
- 289 [10] Saha J, Barman B, Chouhan P. Lockdown for COVID-19 and Its Impact on Community Mo-
290 bility in India: An Analysis of the COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports, 2020. *Children
291 and Youth Services Review*. 2020 Sep;116:105160.
- 292 [11] Abu-Rayash A, Dincer I. Analysis of Mobility Trends during the COVID-19 Coronavirus
293 Pandemic: Exploring the Impacts on Global Aviation and Travel in Selected Cities. *Energy
294 Research & Social Science*. 2020 Oct;68:101693.
- 295 [12] Eckert F, Mikosch H. Mobility and Sales Activity during the Corona Crisis: Daily Indicators

REFERENCES

- 296 for Switzerland. *Swiss Journal of Economics and Statistics*. 2020 Aug;156(1):9.
- 297 [13] Noland RB. Mobility and the effective reproduction rate of COVID-19. *Journal of Transport*
298 *& Health*. 2021;20:101016.
- 299 [14] Kuo CP, Fu JS. Evaluating the impact of mobility on COVID-19 pandemic with machine
300 learning hybrid predictions. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2021;758:144151.
- 301 [15] Nouvellet P, Bhatia S, Cori A, Ainslie KE, Baguelin M, Bhatt S, et al. Reduction in mobility
302 and COVID-19 transmission. *Nature communications*. 2021;12(1):1–9.
- 303 [16] Zhou Y, Xu R, Hu D, Yue Y, Li Q, Xia J. Effects of human mobility restrictions on the spread
304 of COVID-19 in Shenzhen, China: a modelling study using mobile phone data. *The Lancet*
305 *Digital Health*. 2020;2(8):e417–e424.
- 306 [17] Garg S, Kim L, Whitaker M, O’Halloran A, Cummings C, Holstein R, et al. Hospitaliza-
307 tion rates and characteristics of patients hospitalized with laboratory-confirmed coronavirus
308 disease 2019—COVID-NET, 14 States, March 1–30, 2020. *Morbidity and mortality weekly*
309 *report*. 2020;69(15):458.
- 310 [18] Van Dorn A, Cooney RE, Sabin ML. COVID-19 exacerbating inequalities in the US. *Lancet*
311 (London, England). 2020;395(10232):1243.
- 312 [19] Buckee CO, Balsari S, Chan J, Crosas M, Dominici F, Gasser U, et al. Aggregated Mobility
313 Data Could Help Fight COVID-19. *Science*. 2020 Apr;368(6487):145–146.
- 314 [20] The New York Times. Coronavirus (Covid-19) Data in the United States. Retrieved December
315 10, from <https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data>. 2021.
- 316 [21] Surgo Ventures. The U.S. Covid Community Vulnerability Index (CCVI); 2020. Available
317 from: <https://precisionforcovid.org/ccvi>.
- 318 [22] Adolph C, Amano K, Bang-Jensen B, Fullman N, Wilkerson J. Pandemic politics: Timing
319 state-level social distancing responses to COVID-19. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and*
320 *Law*. 2020.
- 321 [23] Sulyok M, Walker M. Community movement and COVID-19: a global study using Google’s
322 Community Mobility Reports. *Epidemiology & Infection*. 2020;148.

REFERENCES

- 323 [24] Gao S, Rao J, Kang Y, Liang Y, Kruse J. Mapping county-level mobility pattern changes in
324 the United States in response to COVID-19. *SIGSpatial Special*. 2020;12(1):16–26.
- 325 [25] Post LA, Benishay ET, Moss CB, Murphy RL, Achenbach CJ, Ison MG, et al. Surveillance
326 metrics of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in central Asia: longitudinal trend analysis. *Journal of*
327 *medical Internet research*. 2021;23(2):e25799.
- 328 [26] He Y, Wang X, He H, Zhai J, Wang B. Moving average based index for judging the peak of
329 the covid-19 epidemic. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*.
330 2020;17(15):5288.
- 331 [27] Kim EH, Bae JM. Seasonality of tuberculosis in the Republic of Korea, 2006-2016. *Epidemi-*
332 *ology and health*. 2018;40.
- 333 [28] Wang JL, Chiou JM, Müller HG. Functional Data Analysis. *Annual Review of Statistics and*
334 *Its Application*. 2016;3(1):257–295.
- 335 [29] Wood SN. *Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R*. Second edition ed. Chap-
336 man & Hall/CRC Texts in Statistical Science. Boca Raton: CRC Press/Taylor & Francis
337 Group; 2017.
- 338 [30] Pedersen EJ, Miller DL, Simpson GL, Ross N. Hierarchical Generalized Additive Models in
339 Ecology: An Introduction with Mgcv. *PeerJ*. 2019 May;7:e6876.
- 340 [31] Gasparrini A, Armstrong B, Kenward MG. Distributed lag non-linear models. *Statistics in*
341 *medicine*. 2010;29(21):2224–2234.
- 342 [32] Wood SN. Thin plate regression splines. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*
343 *(Statistical Methodology)*. 2003;65(1):95–114.
- 344 [33] Gasparrini A, Scheipl F, Armstrong B, Kenward MG. A Penalized Framework for Distributed
345 Lag Non-Linear Models. *Biometrics*. 2017;73(3):938–948.
- 346 [34] R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria;
347 2020. Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 348 [35] Gasparrini A. Distributed lag linear and non-linear models in R: the package dlnm. *Journal of*
349 *Statistical Software*. 2011;43(8):1–20. Available from: <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v43/>

REFERENCES

- 350 [i08/](#).
- 351 [36] Oztig LI, Askin OE. Human Mobility and Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Nega-
352 tive Binomial Regression Analysis. *Public Health*. 2020 Aug;185:364–367.
- 353 [37] Cartenì A, Di Francesco L, Martino M. How Mobility Habits Influenced the Spread of the
354 COVID-19 Pandemic: Results from the Italian Case Study. *Science of The Total Environment*.
355 2020 Nov;741:140489.
- 356 [38] Kraemer MUG, Yang CH, Gutierrez B, Wu CH, Klein B, Pigott DM, et al. The Effect of
357 Human Mobility and Control Measures on the COVID-19 Epidemic in China. *Science*. 2020
358 May;368(6490):493–497.
- 359 [39] Stone M, Di Germanio C, Wright DJ, Sulaeman H, Dave H, Fink RV, et al. Use of US Blood
360 Donors for National Serosurveillance of SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies: Basis for an Expanded
361 National Donor Serosurveillance Program. *medRxiv*. 2021.
- 362 [40] Anaya LS, Alsadoon A, Costadopoulos N, Prasad P. Ethical implications of user perceptions
363 of wearable devices. *Science and engineering ethics*. 2018;24(1):1–28.
- 364 [41] Chang S, Pierson E, Koh PW, Gerardin J, Redbird B, Grusky D, et al. Mobility network models
365 of COVID-19 explain inequities and inform reopening. *Nature*. 2021;589(7840):82–87.

366 **A County-level mobility metrics**

A COUNTY-LEVEL MOBILITY METRICS



Figure S1: Illinois

A COUNTY-LEVEL MOBILITY METRICS



Figure S2: Ohio

A COUNTY-LEVEL MOBILITY METRICS



Figure S3: Michigan

A COUNTY-LEVEL MOBILITY METRICS



Figure S4: Indiana

B CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MI AND INDIVIDUAL METRICS

367 **B Correlations between MI and individual metrics**

B CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MI AND INDIVIDUAL METRICS




Figure S5: Illinois

B CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MI AND INDIVIDUAL METRICS




Figure S6: Ohio

B CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MI AND INDIVIDUAL METRICS




Figure S7: Michigan

B CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MI AND INDIVIDUAL METRICS




Figure S8: Indiana