

1 Environmental factors and mobility predict COVID-19 2 seasonality 3

4 Martijn J. Hoogeveen¹, Aloys C.M. Kroes², , and Ellen K. Hoogeveen³

- 5 1. Department Technical Sciences & Environment, Open University, the Netherlands.
- 6 2. Department of Medical Microbiology, Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC), Leiden,
7 the Netherlands.
- 8 3. Department of Internal Medicine, Jeroen Bosch Hospital, Den Bosch, the Netherlands.

9
10 Corresponding author:

11 Martijn J. Hoogeveen

12 martijn.hoogeveen@icecat.com

13 14 **Abstract**

15 **Background:** We recently showed that seasonal patterns of COVID-19 incidence and Influenza-Like
16 Illnesses incidence are highly similar, in a country in the temperate climate zone, such as the
17 Netherlands (latitude: 52°N). We hypothesize that in The Netherlands the same environmental factors
18 and mobility trends that are associated with the seasonality of flu-like illnesses are predictors of
19 COVID-19 seasonality as well.

20 **Methods:** We used meteorological, pollen/hay fever and mobility data from the Netherlands with its
21 17.4 million inhabitants. For the reproduction number of COVID-19 (R_t), we used data from the Dutch
22 State Institute for Public Health. This R_t metric is a daily estimate that is based on positive COVID-19

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 tests in the Netherlands in hospitals and municipalities. For all datasets we selected the overlapping
24 period of COVID-19 and the first allergy season: from February 17, 2020 till September 21, 2020
25 (total number of measurements: $n = 218$), the end of pollen season. Backward stepwise multiple linear
26 regression was used to develop an environmental prediction model of the R_t of COVID-19. Next, we
27 studied whether adding mobility trends to an environmental model improved the predictive power.

28 **Results:** By means of stepwise backward multiple linear regression four highly significant (p value <
29 0.01) predictive factors are selected in our combined model: temperature, solar radiation, hay fever
30 incidence, and mobility to indoor recreation locations. Our combined model explains 87.5% of the
31 variance of R_t of COVID-19 and has a good and highly significant fit: $F(4, 213) = 374.2$, p -value <
32 0.00001. The combined model had a better overall predictive performance compared to a solely
33 environmental model, which still explains 77.3% of the variance of R_t , and a good and highly
34 significant fit: $F_{(4, 213)} = 181.3$, $p < 0.00001$.

35 **Conclusions:** We conclude that the combined mobility and environmental model can adequately
36 predict the seasonality of COVID-19 in a country with a temperate climate like the Netherlands. In
37 this model higher solar radiation, higher temperature and hay fever are related to lower COVID-19
38 reproduction, and mobility to indoor recreation locations with increased COVID-19 spread.

39 **Keywords**

40 COVID-19 reproduction number, seasonality, solar radiation, allergens, allergies, mobility,
41 temperature

42 **Highlights**

- 43 • The seasonality of COVID-19 can be well-explained by environmental factors and mobility.
- 44 • A combined model explains 87.5% of the variance of the reproduction number of COVID-19
- 45 • Inhibitors of the reproduction number of COVID-19 are higher solar radiation, and seasonal
46 allergens/allergies.

- 47 • Mobility, especially to indoor recreation locations, increases the reproduction number of
48 COVID-19.
- 49 • Temperature has no direct effect on the reproduction number of COVID-19, but affects
50 mobility and seasonal allergens.
- 51 • Adding mobility trends to an environmental model improves the predictive value regarding
52 the reproduction number of COVID-19.

53

54 **1. Introduction**

55 COVID-19 appears to be subject to multi-wave seasonality [1, 2], comparable to other respiratory viral
56 infections and pandemics since time immemorial [3, 4]. It is observed that the COVID-19 community
57 outbreaks have a pattern that is similar to those of other seasonal respiratory viruses [5, 6, 7, 8],
58 whereby the seasonal dips coincide with allergy season in regions in the temperate climate zone [9, 10,
59 11]. The same factors that drive the seasonality of flu-like illnesses, appear to drive COVID-19
60 seasonality: solar radiation including ultraviolet (UV) light, temperature, relative or specific humidity,
61 seasonal allergens (pollens) and allergies, and behavior. Regarding behavior, mobility data show the
62 beneficial effect of restrictive measures on the effective reproduction number (R_t) of COVID-19 [12,
63 13, 14], but the seasonal aspects of mobility are often overlooked. For example, during nice weather
64 people spend more time outdoors. For flu-like illnesses, we previously showed that a compound
65 predictor of solar radiation and seasonal allergens is highly significant though moderately strong
66 $r(222) = -0.48$ ($p < 0.001$) [9]. It is unclear why environmental factors, such as higher solar radiation,
67 a higher level of seasonal allergens (pollens) and subsequently hay fever are consistently associated
68 with a lower R_t of COVID-19, and, thus possibly associated to COVID-19 seasonality as well.
69 Exposure to solar radiation might be associated with better COVID-19 outcomes [15], and daylight is
70 understood to regulate melatonin levels, and subsequently circadian (lung) immunity [16]. Further,
71 increased UV light levels are associated with a more rapid degradation of SARS-CoV-2 particles [17],
72 although the clinical relevance of this effect is debatable.

73 Upon the observation that allergic diseases are associated with lower rates of COVID-19
74 hospitalizations [18, 19], several pathophysiological explanations are provided, such as a lower
75 expression of membrane-bound angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE-2) [20, 21], higher eosinophil
76 counts [22, 23, 24], a reduced risk of a cytokine storm and hyper-inflammation [25], and T cell-
77 mediated immune responses to allergens which might be effective against COVID-19 as well [26]. On
78 the other hand, a recent international epidemiological study reported a positive correlation between
79 pollen concentrations and COVID-19 incidence [27]. As another study, from Spain, could not confirm
80 the latter finding [28], this is still a matter of considerable debate.

81 Further, we noticed that an estimate of R_t discriminates better between independent variables than
82 incidence metrics [9], as it appears to be a more volatile or sensitive metric, includes incubation time
83 lags, and is corrected for test bias and independent of seasonality. The reproduction number has also
84 become the standard in predictive modelling for COVID-19..

85 Our hypothesis is that a model, combining both environmental factors and mobility trends, improves
86 the prediction of the seasonality of COVID-19 compared to each factor alone. Therefore, the main
87 objective of this study is to explore a model, including both environmental factors and mobility trends
88 of people, to improve the prediction of the reproduction number for COVID-19 during spring season
89 which coincides with the low-season of flu-like respiratory diseases in a country in the temperate
90 climate zone such as the Netherlands (latitude: 52°N).

91

92 **2. Methods**

93 **2.1 Data**

94 *2.1.1 Reproduction Number for COVID-19*

95 For the observations of R_t , we used the respective dataset from the Dutch State Institute for Public
96 Health (Rijksinstituut voor Volksgezondheid en Milieu; RIVM) [29] from February 17, 2020 till
97 September 21, 2020. RIVM uses a standard method to calculate the R_t metric on the basis of the input

98 data described below [31]. RIVM's R_t metric is a daily estimate that is based on positive COVID-19
99 tests in the Netherlands in hospitals from national intensive care foundation (NICE) and from RIVM's
100 own institutes in municipalities (GGD). When the first symptomatic day of a COVID-19 infected
101 person is not known, RIVM estimates this date. Further, RIVM assumes an average 4 days delay
102 period between infection and first symptoms, and estimate the mean incubation period to be 6.4 days
103 (95% confidence interval (CI): 5.6-7.7) [30].

104 *2.1.2 Meteorological data*

105 Regarding meteorological data, we used datasets from the Royal Dutch Meteorological Institute [32]
106 from February 17, 2020 till September 21, 2020. The downloaded daily data included global solar
107 radiation in J/cm^2 , mean relative atmospheric humidity (% RH), and average temperature in degrees
108 Celsius. For comparison, and given their effects on pollen distribution, we also added precipitation
109 duration in 0.1 hour, precipitation amount in 0.1 mm, mean wind speed, minimum and maximum
110 temperatures in degrees Celsius, mean dew point temperature in degrees Celsius, and sunshine
111 duration in 0.1 hour. Additionally, we calculated the wind chill temperature per day. These datasets
112 were obtained from the KNMI's centrally located De Bilt weather station. De Bilt is traditionally
113 chosen as it provides an approximation of modal meteorological parameters in the Netherlands, which
114 is a small country. Furthermore, all major population centers in the Netherlands, which account for
115 around 70% of the total Dutch population, are within a radius of only 60 kilometers from De Bilt. We
116 therefore assumed in this study that the measurements from De Bilt are sufficiently representative for
117 the meteorological conditions typically experienced by the Dutch population.

118 *2.1.3 Mobility data*

119 We used Google mobility data for relative trends regarding visits to different types of locations in the
120 Netherlands [33] for the same period from February 17, 2020 till September 21, 2020. These location
121 types are: Residential, Workplaces, Indoor Recreation (called retail & recreation by Google, which
122 includes restaurants, cafes, retail, shopping centers, theme parks, museums, libraries, and movie
123 theaters), Outdoor Recreation (called Parks by Google, and including places such as national parks,

124 public beaches, marinas, dog parks, plazas, and public gardens), and Transit Stations (places such as
125 public transport hubs such as subway, bus, and train stations). For comparison, as these are less
126 affected by lockdowns, we also included mobility trends for grocery & pharmacy (places such as
127 grocery markets, food warehouses, farmers markets, specialty food shops, drug stores, and
128 pharmacies).

129 *2.1.4 Seasonal allergens and allergies*

130 For hay fever (allergic rhinitis) we used the data from Nivel [34], for the same period, about weekly
131 incidence reports at primary medical care level, per 100,000 citizens in the Netherlands. Primary
132 medical care is the day-to-day, first-line healthcare given by local healthcare practitioners to their
133 registered clients as typical for the Netherlands. The hay fever incidence metric is a weekly average
134 based on a representative group of 40 primary care units, and calculated using the number of hay fever
135 reports per primary care unit divided by the number of patients registered at that unit. This is then
136 averaged for all primary care units and then extrapolated to the complete population. We used
137 interpolation to generate a daily data set.

138 For comparison, we included daily mean pollen concentrations based on the data from two Dutch
139 pollen stations: Elkerliek Ziekenhuis in Helmond (latitude 51.487059, longitude 5.662036) [35], and
140 Leiden University Medical Center in Leiden (latitude 52.166309, longitude 4.477315) [36]. The mean
141 pollen concentration is measured in grains/m³, whereby we used the daily totals for the 42 types of
142 pollen particles for which by both stations the numbers are counted and averaged per day per 1 m³ of
143 air. The common Burkard spore trap is used by these stations. It was noticed before that a metric
144 including all available allergenic particle types, lower allergenic or higher allergenic, correlates
145 stronger with the incidence or R_t of COVID-19, than a metric only based on higher allergenic particle
146 types [9, 11].

147

148 **2.2 Data sets consolidation**

149 For all datasets we have selected the same overlapping period of COVID-19 and the first full allergy
150 season [8], during 2020. The overlapping period runs therefore from February 17, 2020 till September
151 21, 2020 (n = 218 days), when the total pollen concentrations structurally drop below 10 grains/m³ as
152 an indication for the end of pollen season.

153 For sensitivity analyses, we also extended the datasets to periods till June 10, 2021 (n = 480 days).

154 For mobility datasets the clearly intra-week patterns required a 7 days moving average to reduce noise.

155 Therefore, for reasons of consistency, we calculated 7 days moving averages for all other variables as
156 well.

157 **2.3 Statistical analysis**

158 Variables are presented with their sample sizes (n), means (M), and standard deviations (SD). We
159 calculated correlation coefficients to assess the strength and direction of relations of each independent
160 variable with R_t, and with each other.

161

162 Stepwise backward multiple linear regression for all independent variables on R_t was used to keep
163 only candidate predictors that are significant (p < 0.05) in the model and remove insignificant
164 predictors. Next, we removed predictors that were multicollinear as defined below. With the remaining
165 independent variables the F-value, standard deviations and errors, degrees of freedom (DF), and
166 significance level, are calculated to test the goodness of fit hypothesis for our predictive model for R_t.
167 Further, the multiple R, Multiple R squared (R²) and adjusted R² correlation coefficients are calculated
168 to estimate the predictive power of our model. Additionally, the algebraic equation to predict R_t is
169 determined, which is just to be understood as an empirical formula. Per independent variable the
170 (standard) coefficient, standard error, t-stat and its 95% CI, probability, and the variance inflation
171 factor value (VIF) are calculated.

172 Further, as linear regression assumes normality of the residuals, we applied the Shapiro-Wilk test and
173 to test the homoscedasticity requirement – homogeneity of variance of residuals– the White test is

174 applied. To analyze multicollinearity we used a VIF value of 2.5 as a threshold. Additionally, the
175 priori power is calculated of each predictor alone and compared with the full model. Although the
176 independent variable R_t assumes time lags, we also studied the autocorrelations of residuals, whereby
177 we interpret an autocorrelation beyond a time lag of 7 days as an indication that our model probably
178 might miss a key predictor. Finally, we created calibration plots to visually review the fit of the model.

179

180 For selected independent variables with a p value < 0.05 and VIF score < 2.5 , standard \log_{10} , square
181 root and quadratic ($\wedge 2$) data transformations are applied to reduce non-linearity in relations between
182 variables which helps to reduce skewness, and, especially, meet the normality and homoscedasticity
183 requirement. Such data transformations do not change the nature and direction of relations between
184 independent variables and R_t . In case of the relative mobility trend data we added a constant before
185 such data transformations to avoid loss of data because of negative numbers. For other variables that
186 was not necessary as they only included positive numbers.

187 We reported the results in APA style, adapted to journal requirements, and applied the TRIPOD
188 guidelines in so far applicable

189 All statistical analyses were done with Stats Kingdom 2021, which we benchmarked on R version 3.5.

190

191 **3. Results**

192 **3.1 Variables and their correlations**

193 The sample sizes (N), means, and SDs of the independent variables as used in our multiple linear
194 regression models are summarized in Table 1. The values are given for the data sets after applied data
195 transformations.

196 During the allergy season, the factors that negatively correlate with R_t , are in order of strength: hay
197 fever ($r(218) = -0.65$, $p < 0.00001$), solar radiation ($r(218) = -0.63$, $p < 0.00001$), pollen ($r(218) = -$
198 0.62 , $p < 0.00001$), and temperature ($r(218) = -0.12$, $p = 0.085$). Positively correlated to R_t are relative

199 humidity ($r(218) = 0.55, p < 0.00001$) and the related dew point temperature ($r(218) = 0.12, p =$
200 0.082). Further, higher relative humidity is associated with rain or fog, and thus reduced solar
201 radiation and lower temperature. Temperature and solar radiation are associated as well, although only
202 moderately strong: $r(218) = 0.39, p < .00001$).

203 Pollen and hay fever are, as to be expected, associated: $r(218) = 0.50, p < .00001$), although
204 moderately strong. We did not add allergenicity weights to different pollen particles, and the pollen
205 stations do not cover all types of allergenic particles such as, for example, mold spores. Therefore,
206 having both data sets next to each other has added value, at least for our environmental model.

207 Solar radiation is an important factor as it has, during allergy season, stimulating effects on pollen
208 ($r(218) = 0.40, p < .00001$) and subsequently hay fever ($r(218) = 0.40, p < .00001$), in addition to its
209 associations with temperature and R_t .

210

211 The mobility places that are correlated with R_t are Indoor Recreation ($n(218) = 0.761, p < .00001$),
212 Residential ($n(218) = -0.684, p < .00001$), Transit Stations ($r(218) = 0.563, p < .00001$), Workplaces
213 ($r(218) = 0.532, p < .00001$), Grocery & Pharmacy ($r(218) = 0.472, p < .00001$), and, not significantly,
214 Outdoor Recreation ($r(218) = -0.048, p = 0.5$). Indoor Recreation and Residential are most strongly
215 inverse correlated: $r(218) = -0.817, p < .00001$), and thus highly collinear ($p > 0.8$). Indoor Recreation
216 has moderately strong positive correlations with all other mobility variables, and should therefore seen
217 as a representant of a cluster.

218 Temperature and dew point temperature had a high correlation of $r(218) = 0.84 (p < 0.00001)$, and
219 appear thus to be collinear. These variables although they have, standalone, no significant correlation
220 with R_t , still play a role in our combined and environmental model, probably because of their indirect
221 effects on mobility and pollen maturation and dispersion, with their opposite associations with R_t .

222

223 **3.2 Outcomes combined model**

224 After several iterations with stepwise backward multiple linear regression, four independent variables
225 were selected from the combined pool of environmental and mobility variables that are both
226 significant ($p < 0.05$) and have a VIF value below 2.5. These selected predictors are: temperature,
227 solar radiation, hay fever, and Indoor Recreation (see Table 2). From the mobility datasets, residential
228 was significant as well but was deselected based on its very high multicollinearity with all other
229 mobility variables, homoscedasticity concerns and lowered explanatory power. In other words, staying
230 at home has a beneficial effect, but, does not explain at which out-of-home location most COVID-19
231 infections occur. Without the hay fever data, the pollen data would have been significant, but using
232 only the pollen data led to homoscedasticity concerns, which were fully mitigated when using the hay
233 fever data instead.

234 On the basis of the multiple linear regression test, we can reject the null-hypothesis (H_0) that our
235 combined predictive model with the four selected factors does not provide a good fit: $F_{(4, 213)} = 374.2$, p
236 < 0.00001 . R^2 equals 0.875, which means that our predictors explain 87.5% of the variance of R_t . The
237 adjusted R square equals 0.873, and the coefficient of multiple correlation (R) equals 0.936. A simple
238 Pearson correlation between our model's predicted and the observed values for R_t is equally strong
239 and highly significant: $r(218) = 0.996$, $p < .00001$. It means that there is a strong, and highly
240 significant, relationship between our combined model's predicted and the observed R_t of COVID-19
241 (see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2).

242 The combined predictive model's regression formula looks as follows:

$$243 \quad \hat{R}_t = (0.804 + 0.00385 \sqrt{M_R} - 0.132 \log_{10} HF - 0.0637 \log_{10} SI - 0.000561 T^2)^2$$

244 Where \hat{R}_t is the predicted effective reproduction number for COVID-19, M_R is the indexed mobility
245 trend data for Indoor Recreation locations to which the mobility constant of 60,000 is added, HF is the
246 hay fever incidence per 100K citizens, SI is the mean global solar radiation in J/cm^2 , and T is the mean
247 temperature in degrees Celsius.. In our dataset, the transformed variables only contain positive
248 numbers.

249 3.3 Statistical outcomes environmental model

250 For the environmental model we excluded mobility data. Again the solar radiation and hay fever
251 were selected as predictor of R_t . The pollen metric added explanatory power, and dew point
252 temperature was selected at the expense of its collinear, temperature (see Table 3). Relative humidity
253 was again deselected as an insignificant predictor.

254 On the basis of the multiple linear regression test, we can reject the H_0 that our environmental
255 predictive model with the four selected factors does not provide a good fit: $F_{(4, 213)} = 181.3$, $p <$
256 0.00001 , and R^2 equals 0.773 , which means that our environmental predictors explain 77.3% of the
257 variance of R_t . The adjusted R^2 equals 0.769 , and the coefficient of multiple correlation (R) equals
258 0.879 . It means that there is a very strong direct and highly significant relation between our
259 environmental model's predicted and the observed reproduction numbers of COVID-19.

260 The environmental model's regression formula looks as follows:

261

$$262 \quad \hat{R}_t = (3.00 - 0.0587 \log_{10} SA - 0.592 \log_{10} SI + 0.00674 T_d - 0.000262 HF)^2$$

263

264 Where R_t is the predicted reproduction number for COVID-19, SA is average seasonal allergens or
265 pollen concentrations in particles/m³, SI is the 7 days moving average of global solar (ir)radiation in
266 J/cm², T_d is the average dew temperature in degrees Celsius, and HF is the hay fever incidence per
267 100K citizens. In our dataset, the transformed variables only contain positive numbers.

268

269 **4. Discussion**

270 The predictive power of the combined environmental-mobility model including solar radiation, hay
271 fever, temperature and visits to Indoor Recreation locations (87.5%) surpasses the environmental
272 model (77.3%) with more than 10% . Furthermore, the improved accuracy of the combined model
273 shows that adding mobility trends not only helps to control the environmental model for lockdown
274 effects, but also clearly improves it by helping to show the importance of seasonal behavior better. For

275 example, nice weather (sun shine, warm, low humidity) in The Netherlands is related to higher pollen
276 concentrations, and more visits to crowded non-residential locations where social distancing is hard to
277 apply. The latter is in turn associated with increased COVID-19 infections. Interestingly, increased
278 visits to Outdoor Recreation locations are not associated with an increase in COVID-19 infections
279 (R_t). This finding suggests that outdoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2 is far less likely than indoor
280 transmission, and that restrictive policies that limit visiting Outdoor Recreation locations have less
281 added value.

282 Although, overall, the environmental model is weaker than the combined model, it is still somewhat
283 better at the onset of COVID-19 during February and March 2020. This is probably explained by the
284 exclusion of ski holiday locations abroad, in Italy and Austria, where many of the first patients
285 contracted COVID-19, which leads to an underestimation of both the Indoor Recreation and Outdoor
286 Recreation trend. On the other hand, the combined model is somewhat better in July when lockdown
287 restrictions were relaxed and people were less strict, which is caught well by the mobility trends
288 variable. Both models are almost equally strong in predicting the seasonal decline in March/April,
289 which indicates that the relative importance of restrictive measures was probably not the main driver
290 of that particular decline, but the seasonality effect was.

291

292 Of the non-residential locations, especially Indoor Recreation is by far the best predictor of increasing
293 COVID-19 infections (R_t), which makes sense as social distancing in busy shopping locations, bars,
294 discos and other such locations, is hard to maintain. Especially, when the seasonality effects are offset
295 by relaxed lockdown measures and social distancing discipline. Even more, if people are under the
296 influence of alcohol and party drugs in crowded party locations, social distancing becomes a distant
297 reality. Additionally, the strong inverse correlation of Residential with R_t , shows that staying at home,
298 because of lockdown measures, is effective. That all other indoor locations have a positive correlation
299 with R_t , shows basically the same: when lockdown measures are relaxed, infection rates increase as
300 people will meet more other people.

301

302 The single effect of high temperature on R_t appears to be not significant. The role of temperature can
303 be understood only when its associations with other variables such as mobility trends and pollen
304 maturation and dispersion are taken into account. Humidity in general, relative or specific (T_d),
305 appears to be positively associated to COVID-19 reproduction, as it is associated with a reduced solar
306 radiation and seasonal allergens, and more traffic to indoor locations which are associated with an
307 increase in infections. Even despite observations that, indoors, very dry air, with a low absolute
308 humidity, might favor SARS-CoV-2 transmission, which is likely caused by increased aerosolisation
309 of infectious aqueous particles. Finally, although we assume that day length is associated to solar
310 radiation, it might still be interesting to look if this solar-related variable could add something to the
311 predictive power of our models.

312

313 *Methodological concerns*

314 Test bias, especially for new viruses such as COVID-19, is a major methodological challenge. The
315 approach to use more reliable metrics such as the number of hospitalizations to generate the R_t metric
316 appears to be a good method to reduce test bias. But, the change of methodology in June 2020, when
317 more test stations were included with their fluctuating test capacities, most likely led to the
318 introduction of test bias in the R_t metric. Such reliability concerns may have reduced the predictive
319 power of our combined and environmental model.

320 The usefulness of the pollen concentration metric might be improved by taking into account the
321 allergenicity per particle type. The allergenicity classification is available, but it is not on a ratio scale
322 and there are discussions about the accuracy of this classification. Furthermore, other allergenic
323 particles like mold spores, are hardly ever covered by European pollen stations because of budget
324 constraints.

325 We observed that the Indoor Recreation and Outdoor Recreation metric might need to be expanded to
326 holiday locations in foreign countries. Unfortunately, that is something that is currently not possible
327 via the Google Mobility datasets.

328 In our research we precluded the period of intensive vaccination from January 2021 onward. On the
329 other hand, if the protective immunity would be short-lasting, we might still be confronted with
330 resurgences of COVID-19 [37], and it would be of interest to test the predictive models for such
331 events. It is likely that new waves, will be less intense and short-lived given longer lasting B-cell and
332 T-cell memory of people that have been infected or are vaccinated already. Therefore, it might be
333 good to control for herd immunity levels when testing the predictive models for subsequent allergy
334 seasons.

335 Additionally, it might be of interest to differentiate R_t per virus variant, given that genetic drift
336 typically leads to more contagious but less deadly variants, that somewhat change the dynamics of
337 COVID-19.

338 Finally, testing the predictive models for a wider geographical scope would be of interest, but would
339 require metrics that are not widely available such as a standardized metrics for R_t , hay fever incidence,
340 and pollen datasets.

341 **Conclusion**

342 The combined, mobility and environmental, model explains 87.5% of the variance of R_t of COVID-19
343 during spring season in a country in the temperate climate zone like the Netherlands, and provides a
344 very good fit ($F_{(4, 213)} = 374.2$, $p < 0.00001$), as the predicted and observed R_t correlate strongly and
345 highly significantly. The significant predictors in the combined model are temperature, solar radiation,
346 hay fever incidence, and the Indoor Recreation trend. The environmental factors are inversely
347 associated with R_t . On the other hand, more visits to Indoor Recreation locations is associated with
348 more infections (R_t). This seems to be the best mobility predictor for the effects of lockdown measures
349 on the spread (R_t) of COVID-19. On the other side of the spectrum, moving to Outdoor Recreation

350 locations is not significantly associated with changes in R_t , and including such locations in lockdown
351 regimes appears to be ineffective.

352 The solely environmental model, is around 10% less powerful than the combined model. Nevertheless,
353 the environmental model shows that pollen concentrations and dew point temperature as a collinear of
354 temperature, have an added explanatory value. Further, there are short periods in which the
355 environmental model beats the combined model.

356 **References**

- 357 1. Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Goldstein E, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Projecting the transmission
358 dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the post-pandemic period. *Science*. **2020**;368(6493): 860-
359 868, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb5793>.
- 360 2. Grech V, Cuschieri S, Gauci C. COVID-19: The possible seasonal shape of things to come.
361 *Early Hum Dev*. **2020** Nov 12: 105262, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2020.105262>.
- 362 3. Moriyama M, Hugentobler WJ, Iwasaki A. Seasonality of Respiratory Viral Infections.
363 *Annual Review of Virology*. **2020**;7:1, [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-virology-012420-](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-virology-012420-022445)
364 022445.
- 365 4. Fox SJ, Miller JC, Meyers LA. Seasonality in risk of pandemic influenza emergence. *PLoS*
366 *Comput Biol* **2017**; 13(10): e1005749, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005749>.
- 367 5. Sajadi MM, Habibzadeh P, Vintzileos A, Shokouhi S, Miralles-Wilhelm F, Amoroso A.
368 Temperature, Humidity and Latitude Analysis to Predict Potential Spread and Seasonality for
369 COVID-19. **2020** March 5, <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3550308>.
- 370 6. Poole L. Seasonal Influences On The Spread Of SARS-CoV-2 (COVID19), Causality, and
371 Forecastabililty (3-15-2020) (March 15, 2020), <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3554746>.
- 372 7. Burra P, Soto-Díaz K, Chalen I, Gonzalez-Ricon RJ, Istanto D, Caetano-Anollés G.
373 Temperature and Latitude Correlate with SARS-CoV-2 Epidemiological Variables but not

- 374 with Genomic Change Worldwide. *Evolutionary Bioinformatics*. 2021 January,
375 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1176934321989695>.
- 376 8. Hoogeveen MJ, Hoogeveen EK. Comparable seasonal pattern for COVID-19 and flu-like
377 illnesses. *One Health*. 2021 Dec;13:100277. doi: 10.1016/j.onehlt.2021.100277. Epub 2021
378 Jun 8.
- 379 9. Hoogeveen MJ, Van Gorp ECM, Hoogeveen EK. Can pollen explain the seasonality of flu-
380 like illnesses in the Netherlands? *Sci Total Environ*. 2021 Feb 10;755(Pt 2):143182,
381 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143182>.
- 382 10. Hoogeveen MJ. Pollen likely seasonal factor in inhibiting flu-like epidemics. A Dutch study
383 into the inverse relation between pollen counts, hay fever and flu-like incidence 2016–2019,
384 *Sci Total Environ*. 2020 July 20; 727:138543, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138543>.
- 385 11. Shah RB, Shah RD, Retzinger DG, Retzinger AC, Retzinger DA, Retzinger GS. Confirmation
386 of an Inverse Relationship between Bioaerosol Count and Influenza-like Illnesses, Including
387 COVID-19. On the Contribution of Mold Spores. *MedRxiv* 21251322 [preprint]. Feb 16, 2021
388 [cited March 1, 2021]. Available on: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.07.21251322>.
- 389 12. Kajitani Y, Hatayama M. Explaining the effective reproduction number of COVID-19 through
390 mobility and enterprise statistics: Evidence from the first wave in Japan. *PLoS One*. 2021 Mar
391 18;16(3):e0247186. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0247186.
- 392 13. Nouvellet P, Bhatia S, Cori A, et al. Reduction in mobility and COVID-19 transmission. *Nat*
393 *Commun*. 2021 Feb 17;12(1):1090. doi: 10.1038/s41467-021-21358-2.
- 394 14. Linka K, Peirlinck M, Kuhl E. The reproduction number of COVID-19 and its correlation
395 with public health interventions. *Comput Mech*. 2020 Jul 28:1-16. doi: 10.1007/s00466-020-
396 01880-8. Epub ahead of print.
- 397 15. Abraham J, Dowling K, Florentine S. Can Optimum Solar Radiation Exposure or
398 Supplemented Vitamin D Intake Reduce the Severity of COVID-19 Symptoms? *International*

- 399 Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2021; 18(2):740.
400 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18020740>.
- 401 16. Nosal C, Ehlers A, Haspel JA. Why Lungs Keep Time: Circadian Rhythms and Lung
402 Immunity. *Annu Rev Physiol*. 2020 Feb 10;82:391-412. doi: 10.1146/annurev-physiol-
403 021119-034602. Epub 2019 Sep 27.
- 404 17. Kumar A, Sagdeo A, Sagdeo PR. Possibility of using ultraviolet radiation for disinfecting the
405 novel COVID-19. *Photodiagnosis Photodyn Ther*. 2021 Jun;34:102234. doi:
406 10.1016/j.pdpdt.2021.102234. Epub 2021 Feb 24.
- 407 18. Larsson SC, Gill D. Genetic predisposition to allergic diseases is inversely associated with
408 risk of COVID-19. *Allergy* **2021 Dec 31**, <https://doi.org/10.1111/all.14728>.
- 409 19. Keswani A, Dhana K, Rosenthal JA, Moore D, Mahdavinia M. *Ann Allergy Asthma*
410 *Immunol*. **2020**;125(4): 479–481, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anai.2020.07.012>.
- 411 20. Jackson DJ, Busse WW, Bacharier LB, et al. Association of respiratory allergy, asthma, and
412 expression of the SARS-CoV-2 receptor, ACE2. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* **2020**;
413 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaci.2020.04.009>.
- 414 21. Wan Y et al. Receptor Recognition by the Novel Coronavirus from Wuhan: an Analysis Based
415 on Decade-Long Structural Studies of SARS Coronavirus. *J. Virol*. **2020**. [Epub ahead of
416 print]. <https://jvi.asm.org/content/94/7/e00127-20.long>
- 417 22. Licari A, Votto M, Brambilla I, Castagnoli R, Piccotti E, Olcese R., Tosca MA, Ciprandi G,
418 Marseglia GL. Allergy and asthma in children and adolescents during the COVID outbreak:
419 What we know and how we could prevent allergy and asthma flares. *Allergy*. **2020**
420 Sep;75(9):2402-2405, <https://doi.org/10.1111/all.14369>.
- 421 23. Lindsley AW, Schwartz JT, Rothenberg ME. Eosinophil responses during COVID-19
422 infections and coronavirus vaccination. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. **2020 Jul**;146(1):1-7,
423 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaci.2020.04.021>.

- 424 24. Ferastraoaru D, Hudes G, Jerschow E, Jariwala S, Karagic M, de Vos G, Rosenstreich D,
425 Ramesh M. Eosinophilia in Asthma Patients Is Protective Against Severe COVID-19 Illness. *J*
426 *Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. 2021 Mar;9(3):1152-1162.e3. doi: 10.1016/j.jaip.2020.12.045.
427 Epub 2021 Jan 23.
- 428 25. Carli G, Cecchi L, Stebbing J, Parronchi P, Farsi A. Is asthma protective against COVID-19?
429 *Allergy* **2020**;76(3): 866-868, <https://doi.org/10.1111/all.14426>.
- 430 26. Balz K, Kaushik A, Chen M et al. Homologies between SARS-CoV-2 and allergen proteins
431 may direct T cell-mediated heterologous immune responses. *Sci Rep* 11, 4792 (2021),
432 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-84320-8>.
- 433 27. Damialis A, Gilles S, Sofiev M, Sofieva V, Kolek F, Bayr D, Plaza MP, Leier-Wirtz V,
434 Kaschuba S, Ziska LH, Bielory L, Makra L, Del Mar Trigo M; COVID-19/POLLEN study
435 group, Traidl-Hoffmann C. Higher airborne pollen concentrations correlated with increased
436 SARS-CoV-2 infection rates, as evidenced from 31 countries across the globe. *Proc Natl Acad*
437 *Sci U S A*. 2021 Mar 23;118(12):e2019034118. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2019034118.
- 438 28. Moral de Gregorio AJ, Guzmán Rodríguez R, Senent Sánchez CJ, Lemus Calderón JA, Valero
439 Santiago AJ; Is environmental pollen concentration a risk factor for SARS-CoV-2 infection?
440 *Investig Allergol Clin Immunol* 2022; Vol. 32(1). doi: 10.18176/jiaci.0743.
- 441 29. [dataset] RIVM. COVID-19 reproduction number on the basis of a 95% confidence interval.
442 https://data.rivm.nl/covid-19/COVID-19_reproductiegetal.json. Accessed August 2, **2021**.
- 443 30. Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-
444 nCoV) infections among travelers from Wuhan, China, 20-28 January 2020. *Euro Surveill*.
445 2020 Feb;25(5):2000062. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.5.2000062.
- 446 31. Wallinga J, Lipsitch M. How generation intervals shape the relationship between growth rates
447 and reproductive numbers. *Proc Biol Sci*. 2007 Feb 22;274(1609):599-604. doi:
448 10.1098/rspb.2006.3754.

- 449 32. [dataset] KNMI. Daily Meteorological Data download center.
450 <https://www.daggegevens.knmi.nl/klimatologie/daggegevens>. Accessed August 2, 2021.
- 451 33. [dataset] Google. Mobility trends.
452 https://www.gstatic.com/covid19/mobility/Global_Mobility_Report.csv. Accessed August 2,
453 2021.
- 454 34. [dataset] Nivel. Hay fever incidence in the Netherlands.
455 [https://www.nivel.nl/sites/default/files/algemene-](https://www.nivel.nl/sites/default/files/algemene-content/NivelSurveillanceBulletin_2021_wk29b.pdf)
456 [content/NivelSurveillanceBulletin_2021_wk29b.pdf](https://www.nivel.nl/sites/default/files/algemene-content/NivelSurveillanceBulletin_2021_wk29b.pdf). Accessed August 2, 2021.
- 457 35. [dataset] Elkerliek. Pollen concentrations in the Netherlands.
458 <https://www.elkerliek.nl/elkerliek/hooikoorts/pollentellingen.html>. Accessed August 2, 2021.
- 459 36. [dataset] LUMC. Pollen concentrations in the Netherlands.
460 <https://www.lumc.nl/org/longziekten/patientenzorg/pollen-en-hooikoorts/pollentelling/>.
461 Accessed August 2, 2021.
- 462 37. Edridge AWD, Kaczorowska J, Hoste ACR, et al. Seasonal coronavirus protective immunity
463 is short-lasting. *Nat Med.* 2020;26(11):1691-1693. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1083-1

464

465 FIGURES AND TABLES

466 **Table 1: overview means (M), standard deviations (SDs) and skewness values**

Variable	N	Mean	SD
Hay Fever	218	131	73.8
Log ₁₀ (Hay Fever)	218	2.06	0.215
Log ₁₀ (Pollen)	218	1.84	0.464
Log ₁₀ (Solar Radiation)	218	3.15	0.273

Log ₁₀ (Solar Radiation _{7dma})	218	3.18	0.198
Temperature ²	218	221	142
Dew point temperature	218	8.56	5.70
Sqrt(Mobility: Indoor recreation)	218	214	35.8
Sqrt(R _i)	218	1.03	0.163

467 *Table 1: Overview of mean (M), and standard deviation (SD) per independent variable as used in the*
 468 *multiple linear regression models. The function Sqrt returns the square root of the variable.*

469

470 **Table 2: multiple linear regression for mobility and environmental predictors**

	<i>Coeff.</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t-stat</i>	<i>lower</i> <i>t_{0.025(213)}</i>	<i>upper</i> <i>t_{0.975(213)}</i>	<i>Stand.</i> <i>Coeff.</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>VIF</i>
<i>b</i>	0.804	0.0961	8.37	0.615	0.994	0	<0.00001	
<i>Sqrt(Mobility: Indoor recreation)</i>	0.00385	0.000174	22.1	0.0035	0.00419	0.842	<0.00001	2.48
<i>Log₁₀(Hay Fever)</i>	-0.132	0.0241	-5.46	-0.179	-0.084	-0.173	<0.00001	1.72
<i>Log₁₀(Solar Radiation)</i>	-0.0637	0.0201	-3.17	-0.103	-0.024	-0.106	0.00177	1.93
<i>Temperature²</i>	-0.000561	0.0000401	-14.0	-0.00063	-0.000482	-0.489	<0.00001	2.09

471

472 *Table 2: Overview of outcomes per predictor after multiple linear regression for both mobility and*
 473 *environmental variables. Selection of predictors is based on being (highly) significant and having*
 474 *multicollinearity (VIF) score below 2.5. The function Sqrt returns the square root of the variable.*

475 **Table 3: multiple linear regression for environmental predictors only**

476

	Coeff.	SE	t-stat	lower t _{0.025(213)}	upper t _{0.975(213)}	Stand. Coeff.	p	VIF
b	3.00	0.100	30.0	2.80	3.19	0	<0.00001	
Log ₁₀ (Pollen)	-0.0587	0.0144	-4.08	-0.0870	-0.0303	-0.167	0.0000633	1.56
Log ₁₀ (Solar radiation 7dma)	-0.592	0.0370	-16.0	-0.664	-0.519	-0.717	<0.00001	1.89
Dew point temperature	0.00674	0.00109	6.19	0.00459	0.00888	0.235	<0.00001	1.35
Hay fever	-0.000262	0.0000903	-2.91	-0.000440	-0.0000844	-0.118	0.00405	1.56


477 *Table 3: Overview of outcomes per selected environmental predictor after multiple linear regression.*
 478 *Selection of predictors is based on being (highly) significant and having multicollinearity (VIF) score*
 479 *below 2.5.*

480

481

482

Figure 1: scatter diagram predicted versus observed reproduction number




483

484 *Fig. 1: The combined mobility and environmental model is superior as its predictions (\hat{R}_t) explain*
485 *87.5% of the variance of the observed reproduction number of COVID-19 (R_t) during allergy season.*

486

487 **Figure 2. Time series predicted versus observed reproduction number COVID-19**



488

489 *Fig. 2. The time series of the predicted (\hat{R}_t) versus the observed reproduction number of COVID-19*
490 *(R_t) in the Netherlands show the very good fit of both the combined and environmental model during*
491 *allergy season in the Netherlands. However, the Combined Model predicts R_t even better. The*
492 *seasonality effect in March is visible in both model.*

493

494 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

495 Thanks to Geert H. Keetels, Bas J.H. van de Wiel of Delft University of Technology for help with dew
496 point temperature calculation, and discussing insights related to specific humidity and COVID-19.

497 Further, thanks to Letty de Weger of Leiden University Medical Center for providing pollen statistics
498 and providing useful insights.

499

500 **FOOTNOTES PAGE**

501 **Martijn Hoogeveen:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Writing,
502 Investigation, Visualization, Resources.

503 **Ellen Hoogeveen:** Methodology, Writing, Resources.

504 **Aloys Kroes:** Conceptualization, Reviewing, Data Curation.

505 **Funding**

506 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or
507 not-for-profit sectors.

508 **Declarations of interest**

509 None.

510 **Data statement**

511 The links to downloadable datasets are provided in the reference list or references to the sources are
512 included. Upon request, the data used for this manuscript is available for inspection, but for other
513 purposes we kindly refer to the respective copyright-holder(s).

514 **Corresponding author**

515 Martijn Hoogeveen, PhD

516 Attn. Marga Winnubst

517 Department of Technology & Environment

518 Open Universiteit Nederland

519 Valkenburgerweg 177

520 6419 AT Heerlen

521 the Netherlands

522 Tel: +31 (6) 54256476

523 Email: martijn.hoogeveen@icecat.com.

524