medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

Spatio-temporal epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 virus lineages in Teesside, UK, in 2020: effects of socio-economic deprivation, weather, and lockdown on lineage dynamics

Moss, E.D.[1], Rushton, S.P.[2], Baker, P.[3], Bashton, M.[4], Crown, M.R.[4], dos Santos, R.N.[5], Nelson, A.[5], O'Brien, S.J.[2], Richards, Z.[5], Sanderson, R.A.[2*], Yew, W.C.[5], Young, G.R.[4], McCann, C.M.[4] and Smith, D.L.[4**]

[1] Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University – Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
[2] School of Natural and Environmental Sciences, Newcastle University – Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
[3] South Tees Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust – Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
[4] Hub for Biotechnology in the Built Environment, Northumbria University – Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
[5] Department of Applied Sciences, Northumbria University – Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

*Corresponding author
Correspondence: roy.sanderson@newcastle.ac.uk
**On behalf of the COVID-19 Genomics UK (COG-UK) consortium. See Supplementary Material for full list of COVID-19 Genomics UK Consortium names and affiliations.

Abstract

Background: SARS-CoV-2 emerged in the UK in January 2020. The UK government introduced control measures including national 'lockdowns' and local 'tiers' in England to control virus transmission. As the outbreak continued, new variants were detected through two national monitoring programmes that conducted genomic sequencing. This study aimed to determine the effects of weather, demographic features, and national and local COVID-19 policies on disease spread at a local scale.

Methods: We analysed the spatio-temporal dynamics of COVID-19 in Teesside, UK, from January to December 2020, capturing the first two waves of the epidemic. We used a combination of disease mapping and mixed-effect modelling to analyse the dynamics of total positive tests, and those of the eight most common virus lineages, in response to potential infection risk factors: socio-economic deprivation, population size, temperature, rainfall, government interventions, and a government restaurant subsidy ("Eat Out to Help Out").

Results: Total positive tests of SARS-CoV-2 were decreased by temperature and the first national lockdown (the only one to include school closures), while rainfall, deprivation, population, the second national lockdown, and the local tiered interventions all increased

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

cases. The restaurant subsidy had no apparent effect. The relationships between positive tests and covariates varied greatly between lineages, likely due to the strong heterogeneity in their spatio-temporal distributions. Cases during the second wave appeared to be higher in areas that recorded fewer first-wave cases, however, an additional model showed the number of first-wave cases was not predictive of second-wave cases.

Discussion: National and local government interventions appeared to be ineffective at a local level if they did not include school closures. Examination of viral lineages at a local scale was less useful in terms of investigating transmissibility but may be more useful for tracking spread within communities. Our study highlights the importance of analysing the spatio-temporal dynamics of COVID-19 at the optimum spatial and temporal scales for the research objectives and the relevant epidemiological processes.

Keywords: COVID-19, variant, spatio-temporal models, non-pharmaceutical interventions, local transmission

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

Introduction

COVID-19 is a highly transmissible acute respiratory disease that spread across the globe rapidly in 2019 and 2020 and caused a devastating pandemic. It is widely understood that many factors can affect COVID-19 transmission via social and/or epidemiological mechanisms, including weather, lineage of SARS-CoV-2 (the virus causing COVID-19), mask wearing, and government control measures (non-pharmaceutical interventions) that limit social contact (Bo et al., 2021; Volz et al., 2021; Ganslmeier et al., 2021; Ge et al., 2022). The risk of contracting COVID-19 can also be affected by demographic factors such as socio-economic deprivation and race (Whittle & Diaz-Artiles, 2020; Brainard et al., 2022; Holt et al., 2022). However, these relationships are complex and there is considerable variation in the observed impact of these factors between different countries, at national vs. regional scales, and during different waves of the pandemic (Gao et al., 2021; Bo et al., 2021; Hunter et al., 2021; Ganslmeier et al., 2021; Brainard et al., 2022; Ge et al., 2022). It is imperative that these relationships are better understood to improve future pandemic/epidemic responses, especially in countries like the United Kingdom, which experienced high case numbers and excess deaths relative to its neighbours (Islam et al., 2021; Hunter et al., 2021). While there is evidence that nationwide UK interventions during the first wave reduced COVID-19 cases and mortality (Hunter et al., 2021), there has been very little evaluation at local or regional scales or during subsequent epidemic waves. In addition, there is an insufficient understanding of how weather, socio-economic deprivation, and viral lineage affected the spatio-temporal dynamics of the COVID-19 epidemic in the UK.

The first recorded cases of COVID-19 in the UK were in January 2020. After cases rose rapidly in March, a complete social and economic lockdown was introduced in England on 23/03/2020 (UK Government, 2020a), which led to a swift reduction in cases (Covid-19 control measures differed in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland and were decided by their own devolved parliaments). A second major outbreak in autumn 2020 led to the introduction of further interventions in England: a heterogenous "tier" system applied at local scales (UK Government, 2020c), and a short national lockdown in November 2020 (UK Government, 2020d). When these failed to reduce hospital admissions and deaths, a further national lockdown was introduced in January 2021 (UK Government, 2021). The positive impact of the national interventions during the first wave of the pandemic is also seen in other countries, with school closures and measures that reduce social gatherings proving the most effective (Brauner et al., 2021; Hunter et al., 2021; Mendez-Brito et al., 2021; Ge et al., 2022). However, the picture is less clear for later waves of the pandemic, as the effectiveness of control measures changed and as countries diverged in terms of both the implementation of interventions and patterns of cases (Pozo-Martin et al., 2021; Mendez-Brito et al., 2021; Ge et al., 2022). The epidemic response in the England is complicated further by a government subsidy that encouraged people to eat in restaurants during August 2020, which appears to have increased COVID-19 transmission and infections (Fetzer, 2022).

The relationship between socio-economic deprivation and COVID-19 mortality has been well-documented, with a majority of studies demonstrating increased mortality in areas of high deprivation, including in the UK (Brainard et al., 2022; McGowan & Bambra, 2022). This is due to a combination of underlying factors that can be summarised as unequal exposure due to employment and living conditions and unequal vulnerability due to pre-existing health conditions (McGowan & Bambra, 2022). However, the relationship between deprivation and COVID-19 infection is more complicated and less clear; the UK context is typical of the broader picture with some studies finding an increase in infections linked to higher deprivation while others find the opposite or no relationship (Niedzwiedz et al., 2020; Brainard et al., 2022; McGowan & Bambra, 2022).

The relationship between COVID-19 infection and weather is also complex. Higher temperatures have been associated with a reduction in cases in many countries including the UK (Ganslmeier et al., 2021; Alaniz et al., 2023; Nottmeyer et al., 2023), though a minority of studies have reported a positive effect (Tan & Schultz, 2022). Increased rainfall effects are more uncertain due to less research focus, with a meta-analysis finding evidence of increased infections (Tan & Schultz, 2022), while other research detected no relationship (Ganslmeier et al., 2021). The impacts of weather on COVID-19 infections are complicated by the interaction between several mechanisms. Weather can affect transmission directly, e.g. increased temperatures reduce the viability of the virus particles (Ganslmeier et al., 2021), and also

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

indirectly via social behaviours, e.g. colder temperatures or higher rainfall could discourage outdoor socialising and reduce transmission, or encourage indoor socialising and increase transmission. Several studies have also shown that the presence and strength of these indirect effects is mediated by other factors, such as how closely the timing of weather patterns and events coincides with mealtimes and the presence/absence of government control measures (Ganslmeier et al., 2021; Fetzer, 2022).

Previous research has demonstrated that transmissibility of COVID-19 varies greatly between different lineages of the SARS-CoV-2 virus, which can explain how some lineages become dominant at certain points in time (Volz et al., 2021; Panovska-Griffiths et al., 2022). For example, lineage B.1.1.7 (the Alpha variant) has been estimated to be between 20-100% more transmissible than the wild type (estimates vary by study), which likely explains how this lineage became dominant across the UK in autumn/winter 2020 (Volz et al., 2021; Hinch et al., 2022; Panovska-Griffiths et al., 2022). However, there are also examples of lineages that became dominant despite no, or only a small, increase in transmissibility, like that of lineage B.1.177 during autumn 2020 in the UK (Hodcroft et al., 2021; Vöhringer et al., 2021; Hinch et al., 2022). Establishment of a lineage is subject to epidemiological factors as well as transmissibility, such as the number of introductions (Grubaugh et al., 2020), which could be facilitated by a relaxation of travel restrictions (Hodcroft et al., 2021). It seems likely that other non-pharmaceutical interventions and other environmental factors could also affect the number of cases of different COVID-19 lineages, regardless of whether they demonstrate increased transmissibility. While some research has investigated the impact of interventions and vaccinations on the spread of specific lineages (Hinch et al., 2022; Panovska-Griffiths et al., 2022), there has been very little comparison across many lineages, and no investigations that also incorporate other factors like weather and socio-economic deprivation.

Our aim was to investigate the spatio-temporal dynamics of COVID-19 disease spread at a local scale and determine how this was affected by a range of variables that might influence transmission and disease risk. We examined longitudinal records of COVID-19 cases in the Teesside area of North East England during 2020. Teesside is an area that contains a mixture of urban, suburban, and rural environments, some of which have high levels of socio-economic deprivation, and while it has good local and national transport links it is relatively far (about 350 km) from London. Teesside provides a good case study for investigating a local-scale context that is distant from the political and economic capital of England; this allows us to evaluate the effectiveness of national policies at a local scale. We used Generalised Linear Mixed Effect Models (GLMMs) to investigate how government interventions, weather, socio-economic deprivation, and the government restaurant subsidy impacted: 1) the total number of COVID-19 cases during 2020 in Teesside; and 2) the number of cases of each of the most common lineages in Teesside during 2020. We also used Bayesian spatial models to determine patterns of disease risk across Teesside during 2020.

Methods

Data collation

The UK government introduced two 'pillars' of COVID-19 testing. Pillar 1 testing was of hospital patients and health and care workers, while pillar 2 was community testing and was introduced later (Dept. Health & Social Care, 2021). Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) analyses were conducted on tests from both pillars, which permitted genomic sequencing to characterise genetic lineages of SARS-CoV-2 in individual cases (COVID-19 Genomics UK (COG-UK) Consortium, 2020). We collated records of positive tests in the Teesside area during 2020, from the Covid-19 Genomics UK (COG-UK) dataset, which provided the dates and postcodes of all positive tests for SARS-CoV-2 from January 2020 to January 2021. We summarised the number of cases for all lineages, and each lineage separately, by week of year and individual postcode districts (TS1 to TS29, see Figure 1). In addition, we also summarised the total number of cases of each lineage recorded by each pillar during the period when sampling was run contemporaneously for both pillars (from week of year 19 to 53) and ran a correlation on the two pillars. This was to check for a sampling bias for different lineages between the two pillars, as only pillar 1 tested the most severely ill patients, and illness severity can vary between lineages (Sievers et al., 2022; Goethem et al., 2022).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

We used recent demographic data on socio-economic deprivation (Index of Multiple Deprivation IMD (UK Government, 2019)) to calculate the proportion of the population in each postcode district that was in the most deprived category (10th decile), relative to England as a whole (Figure 1 and Table S1 in Supplementary Material). Mean weekly temperature and rainfall values were summarised from raw daily data (calculated from daily means and daily totals respectively) obtained from weather stations in Teesside International Airport (temperature) and Hartlepool (rainfall). We collated the start and end dates of both the national government interventions (lockdowns) and the local "tier" system of interventions (where higher tiers had greater restrictions) as applied to Teesside. The tier system was applied at the local government level, but during 2020 the same tier restrictions were applied to all local authority areas in Teesside. We also collated the start/end dates of the government restaurant subsidy ("Eat Out to Help Out Scheme") that was introduced to support hospitality businesses, which provided customers with a 50% discount at participating restaurants. The interventions and subsidy dates were converted to week of year format, where values counted the number of weeks since the measure was introduced (weeks before introduction and after stoppage were given a value of zero). The national lockdowns in England were defined by: stay-at-home orders, closure of all non-essential businesses, prohibition of all social gatherings and events (UK Government, 2020a), and the first lockdown also included school closures (UK Government, 2020b) (Table 1). The local tier 2 and 3 restrictions in England (Local Covid Alert Levels 'High' and 'Very High') allowed for some non-essential businesses to remain open and permitted outdoor socialising in small groups (UK Government, 2020c) (see Table 1 for details). The end date of the first lockdown is complicated, as different restrictions were lifted at different times (Table 2). We used the earliest end date applicable to Teesside to define the final week of the first lockdown (week 23).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .



Figure 1 - Labelled map of the 29 Teesside postcode districts ("TS" prefixes have been omitted for clarity and colours are purely to aid discrimination between polygons), and maps of the total resident population and proportion of the population within the 10th decile of the Index of Multiple Deprivation (when assessed at the scale of England as a whole) for each Teesside postcode district (Source: Office for National Statistics licensed under the Open Government Licence v.3.0).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

Table 1 - Summary of the control measures included in each national and local restriction category in England. Business closures during tier 3 varied across England, those shown below were applied to Teesside during 2020.

Included measures	1st Lockdown	2nd Lockdown	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4
Stay at home orders	X	X				X
School closures	X					
Face masks indoors in public spaces		X	X	X	X	X
Business/venue closures:						
Pubs, bars, and restaurants	X	X			X	X
Retail	X	X				X
Personal care	X	X				X
Leisure and entertainment	X	X			X	X
Gyms	X	X				X
Places of worship	X	X				
Prohibition of social gatherings:						
Indoors up to 6 people	X	X		X	X	X
Indoors more than 6 people	X	X	X	X	X	X
Outdoors up to 6 people	X	X				X

Table 2 - First and last dates of government control measures applied in Teesside, restaurant subsidy, and school and university terms in Teesside during 2020.

Event	First date	Last date	First week	Last week
National lockdown:	23/03/2020	08/06 - 03/07/2020	13	23-27
Business closures (hospitality, entertainment etc.)	21/03/2020	03/07/2020	12	27
Other non-essential businesses	23/03/2020	15/06/2020	13	25
Teesside school closures	23/03/2020	07-14/06/2020	13	23-24
Restrictions on social gathering	23/03/2020	01/06/2020	13	23
Restaurant subsidy	04/08/2020	26/08/2020	32	35
Local Tier 2 (Teesside)	14/10/2020	04/11/2020	42	44
National lockdown	05/11/2020	01/12/2020	45	48
Local Tier 3 (Teesside)	02/12/2020	30/12/2020	49	53
Local Tier 4 (Teesside)	31/12/2020	--	53	--
Teesside school autumn term dates	01/09/2020	23/10/2020	36	43
	02/11/2020	18/12/2020	45	51
Teesside University term dates	21/09/2020	18/12/2020	39	51

Disease mapping

To help us define the spatial dynamics of COVID-19 in Teesside, we used Bayesian spatial models (Riebler et al., 2016) to assess the area-specific relative risk of a positive test in each postcode district across the study period. We separately modelled all disease cases (regardless of lineage), and cases of each of the most common lineages in Teesside that had sufficient data. We used the most recent version of the Besag, York, Mollie "BYM" model (Besag et al., 1991), the "BYM2" (Riebler et al., 2016), which is a conditional autoregressive model that adjusts for spatial dependency between adjacent spatial units, as numbers of cases in one district are likely to be partially dependent on those arising in neighbouring districts, with which there may be contact leading to enhanced transmission. We included the expected

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

number of cases for each postcode district (calculated using district population sizes, total population across all districts, and total cases in all districts) in our models to allow the output to be converted to the risk of a positive test in each district relative to the overall risk across all districts (Blangiardo & Cameletti, 2015). These models were fitted using Integrated Nested Laplace Approximation via the "INLA" package (Rue et al., 2009) in R version 4.2.2 (R Core Team, 2022). The response variables in these models are aggregated counts or rates, therefore we compared Poisson and negative binomial error distributions and evaluated their fits to the data via DIC (Blangiardo & Cameletti, 2015); this indicated Poisson to be the better fit. The shapefiles for the Teesside postcode districts that were used in this analysis (and figures) were downloaded from: https://www.opendoorlogistics.com/data/.

Mixed-effect modelling

We used generalised linear mixed-effect models (GLMMs) to investigate the role of socio-economic deprivation (proportion of the population in the 10th Decile of IMD), weather (mean weekly temperature and rainfall), UK government interventions (national lockdowns and local tiers), and government restaurant subsidy on the dynamics of positive PCR tests recorded each week of 2020 in each postcode district. We separately modelled all disease cases (regardless of lineage), cases of each of the most common lineages in Teesside that had sufficient data, and the total cases of the most common second wave lineages. We included postcode district as a random variable (random intercept) to account for repeated measures of postcodes across time and for unmeasured geographical variation that might have influenced the recording of cases (except for two lineages where the model was singular (random effect variance was 0), which were refit with only fixed effects). We controlled for population size and time (of positive test) by including district total population and week of year as fixed effects. We fitted an additional model to the all-case data, including all the same fixed effects and a random gradient for week for each postcode district, which allowed us to map and compare the rate of change in cases reported each week across the different postcodes. The second-wave lineages model also included the total cases of the most common first wave lineages for each postcode district as a fixed effect, which allowed us to investigate the potential for increased immunity between successive waves of the epidemic due to previous infections. To account for variation in symptom onset and testing delay after infection, we applied a two-week time lag to all temporal variables (temperature, rainfall, and the government interventions and subsidy) (Hunter et al., 2021). As our response variable (positive tests) is a count, we fit our models with Poisson and negative binomial distributions before validating them with the "DHARMa" R package (Hartig, 2022), which demonstrated negative binomial to be a superior fit for the data in all models. We chose to retain all variables in the models regardless of AIC or significance as they are all biologically/epidemiologically meaningful. Predictor variables were only removed if the variance inflation factor (VIF) (calculated using the "performance" R package (Lüdecke et al., 2021)) indicated multicollinearity between several of the variables, when we followed the procedure defined by Zuur et al. (2010) of removing variables sequentially until none of the recalculated VIF values were above 3. All regression models were fit using the package "glmmTMB" (Brooks et al., 2017) in R version 4.2.2.

Results

Data and trends

The Teesside postal area had a population of 599,600 people across the 29 postcode districts, with considerable variation in the proportion of the total population in the 10th IMD decile (Figure 1, Table S1). The populations of urban postcode districts of central Middlesbrough (TS1, TS4 and TS3) all had high proportions of their populations in the 10th decile for IMD, whereas many of the suburban and rural postcode districts had little to none of their population in this decile. There were 2,328 positive COVID-19 tests for all lineages of which 1,073 were pillar 1 and 1,255 were pillar 2. Temperature was highest in summer while rainfall was generally lowest in spring and summer, but there were also periods of heavy rain in early and late summer (Figure 2a).

The overall temporal trend in positive tests was bimodal with a first wave in spring (cases peaked in week 14, early April 2020) followed by a decline through the summer after introduction of the first lockdown, before the onset of the second wave of the epidemic in the early autumn (week 36) (Figure 2b). There was a large spike in cases around week 40 that were mainly detected via pillar 2 community

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

testing (Figure 2c), which coincided with the start of school and university autumn terms in Teesside (Table 2). There was a strong positive correlation between the total number of cases of each lineage that were recorded by the two different pillars (rho=0.65, S=14017, df=60, P<0.001), suggesting that both pillars were reflecting similar patterns of infection across Teesside.

Out of 86 distinct lineages recorded in Teesside during 2020, only 8 were recorded more than 60 times: B.1.1.1, B.1.1.119, B.1.1.309, B.1.1.315, B.1.1.37, B.1.1.7, B.1.177 and B.1.177.10 (Figure 2d). These 8 lineages were recorded elsewhere in the UK before being recorded in Teesside. There were two dominant lineages in the first wave of the epidemic, B.1.1.1 and B.1.1.119, records for which declined to minimal levels during the late spring and summer. Patterns for other lineages were more complex in the second wave. B.1.177 and B.1.1.315 both increased in frequency during weeks 32 to 45 before declining during the second lockdown. However, after the end of this lockdown, B.1.177 increased substantially whilst B.1.1.315 did not. The highly transmissible SARS-CoV-2 variant, B.1.1.7 (Alpha variant; VoC 202012/1), was first detected in the UK in December 2020 (Public Health England, 2021) and cases increased rapidly in Teesside after the end of the second national lockdown.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .



Figure 2 - Trends in weather and positive tests of COVID-19 over the course of 2020, in Teesside. (a) Mean temperature and rainfall per week. (b) Total positive tests per week (across all lineages), coloured areas represent the periods of different interventions: national lockdown, weak local restrictions (Local tier 2), stricter local restrictions (Local tier 3), and the 'Eat out to help out' government subsidy to promote eating within restaurants. (c) Positive tests detected via the two testing regimes per week. (d) Positives tests of the eight most commonly detected lineages in Teesside per week.

Disease mapping

The relative risk of a positive test for COVID-19 in each Teesside postcode varied greatly amongst the 8 most common lineages and between the two waves of the epidemic (Figure 3). The spatial pattern of risk of a positive test for any lineage was highest in some of the central areas, particularly in central Middlesbrough (40-60% higher in TS4), while the lowest risks were in the more rural eastern and western districts (20-60% lower). The spatial pattern does not follow a clear urban-rural divide however, as some

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

urban and suburban areas had relative risks up to 20% lower than the overall risk across all districts (e.g., Thornaby (TS17), Redcar (TS10), and Eston (TS6)). During the first wave of the pandemic (lineages B.1.1.1 and B.1.1.119), risk was highest in the central areas of Teesside, particularly Middlesbrough (TS4, TS1, TS3, and TS8) and Guisborough (TS14), while northern and western districts had a very low risk. Three of the second wave lineages (B.1.1.309, B1.1.315, and B.1.1.37) showed a more homogenous pattern, whereby risk was not elevated or lowered much in any area (Figure S1 in Supplementary Material also shows the higher risk values to be more uncertain). Relative risk for lineage B.1.177 was also more homogenous, except for a high risk in central Middlesborough (TS4), though there is a higher degree of uncertainty around this value (Figures S1, S2). The remaining two lineages (B.1.1.7 and B.1.177.10) are those that occurred mainly towards the end of 2020; the spatial risk pattern for these lineages is less uniform and more focussed in northern districts with the highest risks in Hartlepool (TS24, TS25, and TS26) and Thornaby (TS17), where the relative risk increase likely exceeds 50% (Figures S1, S2).



Figure 3 - Area-specific relative risk of a positive test for any SARS-CoV-2 lineage, and the 8 most common lineages, in each Teesside postcode district during 2020 (from the spatial CAR models). Values are a ratio: green colours indicate a risk of infection that is lower than the overall risk for the entire study area (< 1), while purple colours indicate a higher risk (>1), and colour intensity indicates the strength of this effect. See Figures S1 and S2 in Supplementary Material for corresponding exceedance probabilities.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

Mixed-effect modelling

All GLMMs had at least one fixed effect covariate with a VIF value > 3, so all models reported here are the simplified ones where these fixed effects have been dropped (see Supplementary Materials for model output from both the full and simplified versions).

There were significant negative relationships between total positive tests of COVID-19 and mean weekly temperature and the time since imposition of the first lockdown (Figure 4, Table S2). There were significant positive relationships between cases and total population, socio-economic deprivation (proportion of the population in the most deprived IMD decile), mean weekly rainfall, and the time since imposition of local tier 2, the second national lockdown, and tier 3, while the restaurant subsidy had no significant effect. The rate of increase in the total number of cases over time relative to the mean, was slower in areas that experienced higher case numbers during the first wave, and faster in areas that experienced more records during the second wave (Figures 5, 3 and S4, Table S5, see Figure S3 for observed records per week per postcode).

The relationships between cases and covariates for the two first wave lineages (B.1.1.1 and B.1.1.119) were similar, with significant negative relationships for temperature, and the second lockdown and tier 3 for B.1.1.1 (cases of B.1.1.119 dropped to 0 before the autumn interventions were imposed), while there were significant positive relationships for deprivation (for B.1.1.119), population, the first lockdown, and the restaurant subsidy (for B.1.1.1) (Figure 4, Table S6). Rainfall and tier 2 had no significant effect.

The patterns for the second wave lineages are less uniform, but there are some consistencies; deprivation had no significant effects, while population showed a significant positive association in all models (Figure 4, Table S6). Temperature had a significant negative relationship with cases of B.1.177.10, and a positive relationship with cases of B.1.1.37. There were significant negative relationships between Rainfall and cases of B.1.1.37 and B.1.1.7, and positive relationships with cases of B.1.1.309, B.1.1.315, and B.1.177. Cases significantly increased over time (week of year) for B.1.1.7 and B.1.177.10. Cases were significantly decreased in relation to the restaurant subsidy for B.1.1.315 and B.1.177, while cases were significantly increased in relation to tier 2 for the same lineages. The only significant relationship between cases and the second lockdown was a positive one for B.1.177. Cases of B.1.1.315 were significantly decreased in relation to tier 3, while they were significantly increased for B.1.177. Finally, the second-wave lineages model showed no relationship between the total number of cases of the six second wave lineages (B.1.1.309, B.1.1.315, B.1.1.37, B.1.1.7, B.1.177, and B.1.177.10) and the total number of cases of the two first wave lineages (B.1.1.1 and B.1.1.119) (see Table S7 for model output).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .



Figure 4 - Fixed effects estimates and 95% confidence intervals from the simplified versions of the GLMMs examining all cases and the 8 most common lineages in Teesside. All models include a random intercept for postcode, except where the model was singular (B.1.1.309 and B.1.1.37). Black diamonds indicate variables that were dropped from the models due to VIF values > 3 (remaining absent values represent non-overlap between some of the lineages and temporal variables (see Figure 2)). Display order of fixed effects is as follows: spatial variables, continuous temporal variables, transient temporal variables (in chronological order of imposition). Estimates are on the original model scale (log), asterisks indicate significance (see Tables S2 and S6 for full model summary values).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .



Figure 5 - Random gradient estimates from the all-cases GLMM that included a random gradient for week for each postcode district, showing (a) the estimates on a map, and (b) the estimates with their 95% confidence intervals. Values represent the rate of change in the number of cases over time relative to the mean, where blue values are higher than the mean and a faster rate of increase (a steeper and more curved gradient), and red values are lower and a slower rate of increase (a shallower and less curved gradient) (see Figure S4 for predicted rate of change curves for each postcode district from the same model). Estimates are on the original model scale (log) (see Table S5 for full random effect summary values).

Discussion

Our analyses indicate there was considerable spatial and temporal variation in occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 in Teesside during 2020 and that the patterns were related to demographic features, weather, and government interventions. These results must be interpreted with caution due to several limitations. Firstly, positive test ascertainment differed between the two epidemic waves during 2020. Community testing (pillar 2) was not introduced until late into the first wave and did not become widespread until later in the year, which means that testing during the first wave will be biased towards symptomatic individuals, healthcare workers, and those who sought help from primary care. While the positive correlation between the number of pillar 1 vs pillar 2 tests for each lineage suggests that this bias did not affect the detection of different lineages, it is possible that it could have contributed to differences in the covariate associations that we found between the two waves. Secondly, the resolution of the data aggregation may have been too coarse to detect some relationships. Aggregation was essential to ensure anonymity of records. However, the spatial resolution of postcode districts and the temporal resolution of one week, may have been too coarse to capture the spatial and temporal variation in the underlying epidemiological processes of transmission or other social and environmental drivers. And finally, many covariates associated with disease transmission, including proximity to infectious individuals and social contacts, could not be measured. The covariates used in our models were therefore surrogates for the underlying mechanisms associated with disease transmission and spread.

The spatial variation in total positive SARS-CoV-2 tests across the Teesside area was caused (at least in part) by demographic factors, as we found the number of positive tests was increased in postcode districts with a higher population and those with higher levels of socio-economic deprivation. These are

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

logical outcomes as transmission is more likely to occur in more densely-populated areas and amongst people who have higher exposure due to employment and living conditions (Niedzwiedz et al., 2020; Whittle & Diaz-Artiles, 2020; McGowan & Bambra, 2022). We observed no clear pattern of risk of, or rate of increase in, positive tests in relation to how urban or rural the postcode districts are. Research conducted in the US has found higher case rates in more rural areas (Huang et al., 2021; Rifat & Liu, 2022), while evidence from pillar 1 testing during the first wave in the East of England region has found higher risks of infection in more urban areas (Brainard et al., 2022). This disparity could be due to differences in transportation habits and differences in social contact between urban and rural environments in the two countries. It is possible that the size of our spatial units were too large and heterogenous in terms of their social environments to be able to detect a relationship like that found by Brainard et al. (2022), however, it is also possible that our longer timescale and inclusion of community testing collected a more representative sample of positive tests, or that this relationship does not hold in more urban and deprived areas like Teesside.

Our findings indicate that weather variables affected the temporal dynamics of total positive tests across Teesside in 2020. We found positive tests were reduced by higher temperatures, in accordance with previous research (Ganslmeier et al., 2021; Alaniz et al., 2023; Nottmeyer et al., 2023). This is probably due to both indirect and direct mechanisms, as warmer weather encourages outdoor (rather than indoor) socialising and increased indoor ventilation, while also reducing transmissibility of the virus particles (Ganslmeier et al., 2021). We also found that positive tests were increased by higher rainfall, which has also been documented in other studies conducted in Europe (Tan & Schultz, 2022). This is likely an indirect effect as rainfall has the opposite influence on socialising behaviours, favouring indoors rather than outdoors. There is also evidence indicating that the effects of weather variables on positive tests are stronger during periods that facilitate transmission, such as mealtimes and when there are low/no restrictions on movement and socialising (Ganslmeier et al., 2021; Fetzer, 2022). Therefore, a finer temporal resolution than was used in this study is required to clarify the links between weather, transmission, and cases. It is also likely that the temporal resolution we used was too coarse to detect an impact of the government restaurant subsidy on cases, as the effects would have been limited to days when the subsidy applied (Monday-Wednesday) and mealtimes. Other research has found that cases were increased by the subsidy, but this effect was weaker when high rainfall coincided with mealtimes (Fetzer, 2022).

The government interventions introduced to manage COVID-19 cases during 2020 had mixed impacts on the total number of positive tests in Teesside. The first lockdown was successful in reducing cases, while all of the later interventions appeared to have the opposite effect. The only difference between the two national lockdowns in terms of the control measures they mandated, was that the first lockdown included school closures, whereas the second did not. A growing body of evidence has demonstrated that school closures were one of the most important interventions in controlling COVID-19 (Brauner et al., 2021; Davies et al., 2021; Hunter et al., 2021; Ge et al., 2022; Torres et al., 2022). The length of the second lockdown was also shorter than the first one, but in Teesside it was immediately followed by tier 3 restrictions, which only differed in terms of the reopening of non-essential businesses that were not hospitality/entertainment. The closure of such businesses has been shown to provide only modest or no additional benefits (Brauner et al., 2021; Hunter et al., 2021), which suggests that school closures were the main driver of the success of the first lockdown relative to the failure of the second. The apparent positive effect of the second lockdown and the tier 2 and 3 restrictions could be due to the timing of imposition coinciding with one or more events that are epidemiologically important, such as the introduction of more transmissible lineages of the virus, like B.1.177 and B.1.1.7 (Volz et al., 2021; Hinch et al., 2022; Panovska-Griffiths et al., 2022); or temporary changes in social behaviour or movement that facilitated transmission, like the reopening of retail businesses during the Christmas season.

Our findings suggest that the local tier system of interventions was less effective at reducing cases than national lockdowns, especially when lockdowns included school closures, which has also been found in other studies (Davies et al., 2021; Torres et al., 2022). This suggests that if there are any positive benefits to applying local-scale interventions in response to local-scale cases (rather than cases in a distant region), they are masked by the significance of school closures. Another possibility is that the tiered restrictions were not followed as rigorously, either intentionally due to “pandemic fatigue” or

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

accidentally due to poor communication (Smith et al., 2022; Delussu et al., 2022), especially as the tier levels in the UK could change at short notice and were not applied consistently across locations.

The analyses of positive tests of the eight most common SARS-CoV-2 lineages in Teesside demonstrated different spatio-temporal relationships between the lineages, which also differed to those of total positive tests, with differences in both magnitude and direction. Some of this disparity could be explained by the relatively small sample sizes of the lineage models; for example, the effect of socio-economic deprivation was significant for only one lineage (B.1.1.119), but the error bars for this variable were very large in all models. It seems likely that most of the differences between the total cases model and the separate lineages models are caused by the restricted spatial or temporal presence of the individual lineages when compared to all cases. For example, positive tests of lineage B.1.1.37 were positively related to temperature, but case numbers were very low and the only peak in cases occurred two weeks after a peak in temperature. While it is likely that some of the differences we observed in the spatio-temporal patterns between the different lineages are due to differences in transmissibility, particularly for B.1.1.7 (the alpha variant) (Volz et al., 2021; Hinch et al., 2022; Panovska-Griffiths et al., 2022), differences in the timing, location, and number of introductions are also likely to be a factor (Vöhringer et al., 2021). While the utility of examining covariate relationships for individual lineages over small geographic areas (with low numbers of positive tests) may appear to be low, the use of genomic sequencing to track community spread over such local scales holds great potential. Such forensic tracking could be used to further increase epidemiological understanding and perhaps target local interventions more effectively.

It has been well documented by large-scale studies that previous infections can confer natural immunity to subsequent infections (Flacco et al., 2022; Hall et al., 2022; Murugesan et al., 2022). Therefore, it is possible that natural immunity could explain some of the different spatio-temporal patterns between lineages in our data, particularly as the relative risk and the rate of increase in cases during the second wave were higher in areas that had low relative risk and case numbers during the first wave. However, the number of cases of first wave lineages was not related to the number of cases of second wave lineages in our model. It seems likely that we were not able to detect a natural immunity effect because of the low numbers of positive tests in our study. This suggests that natural immunity, and possibly other disease processes, are easier to detect at larger spatial scales with larger populations.

Our study has demonstrated the effects of weather and government interventions on the spatio-temporal dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 positive tests at a local scale in Teesside, UK. The number of COVID-19 cases was negatively related to temperature and the first national lockdown. There were positive relationships between cases and total population, socio-economic deprivation, rainfall, the second lockdown, and local tiered restrictions. While further research is needed to investigate these relationships during different waves of the epidemic and in different locations, we feel confident to make several recommendations regarding future epidemic policy responses, based on both ours and other's findings. Firstly, school closures are one of the most important interventions in controlling transmission and mortality (Brauner et al., 2021; Davies et al., 2021; Hunter et al., 2021; Ge et al., 2022; Torres et al., 2022), therefore school closures should be included in national and local/regional lockdowns. Secondly, transmission is promoted by social gatherings and in restaurants (Brauner et al., 2021; Hunter et al., 2021; Fetzer, 2022), therefore governments should avoid issuing hospitality promotions and subsidies. Thirdly, transmission at the national and regional scale is dependent on introductions (da Silva Filipe et al., 2021; Lane et al., 2021; Vöhringer et al., 2021), particularly during periods of low restrictions (Lemey et al., 2021), so long-distance domestic and international travel restrictions should be imposed quickly at the start of an epidemic and the latter maintained. And finally, regional and local transmission is dependent on both the transmissibility, location, and number of introductions of different lineages (da Silva Filipe et al., 2021; Lane et al., 2021; Vöhringer et al., 2021), therefore the possibility of using genomic sequencing to conduct forensic tracking of community spread should be investigated.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank colleagues within COG-UK for constructive comments on earlier versions of this manuscript.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

Data, scripts, code, and supplementary information availability

Data are available online: at https://doi.org/10.25405/data.ncl.23815077 . Supplementary material referenced in the text is also available at https://doi.org/10.25405/data.ncl.23815077 and at https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279

Conflict of interest disclosure

The authors declare that they comply with the PCI rule of having no financial conflicts of interest in relation to the content of the article.

Funding

This research was funded under COG-UK; this is supported by funding from the Medical Research Council (MRC) part of UK Research & Innovation (UKRI), the National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) [grant code: MC_PC_19027], and Genome Research Limited, operating as the Wellcome Sanger Institute.

Ethics approval

The surveillance activities within which this study was conducted are part of Public Health England's responsibility to monitor COVID-19 during the current pandemic. Public Health England has legal permission, provided by Regulation 3 of The Health Service (Control of Patient Information) Regulations 2002 to process confidential patient information under Sections 3(i) a–c, 3(i) d(i and ii), and 3(iii) as part of its outbreak response activities. This study falls within the research activities approved by the Public Health England Research Ethics and Governance of Public Health Practice Group. Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study. No individual patient data in any form is included in this manuscript.

References

Alaniz AJ, Carvajal MA, Carvajal JG, Vergara PM (2023) Effects of air pollution and weather on the initial COVID-19 outbreaks in United States, Italy, Spain, and China: A comparative study. *Risk Analysis*, **43**, 8–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.14080

Besag J, York J, Mollié A (1991) Bayesian image restoration, with two applications in spatial statistics. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **43**, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00116466

Blangiardo M, Cameletti M (2015) *Spatial and Spatio-temporal Bayesian Models with R - INLA*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK.

Bo Y, Guo C, Lin C, Zeng Y, Li HB, Zhang Y, Hossain MS, Chan JWM, Yeung DW, Kwok KO, Wong SYS, Lau AKH, Lao XQ (2021) Effectiveness of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 transmission in 190 countries from 23 January to 13 April 2020. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, **102**, 247–253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.10.066

Brainard J, Rushton S, Winters T, Hunter PR (2022) Spatial Risk Factors for Pillar 1 COVID-19 Excess Cases and Mortality in Rural Eastern England, UK. *Risk Analysis*, **42**, 1571–1584. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13835

Brauner JM, Mindermann S, Sharma M, Johnston D, Salvatier J, Gavenčiak T, Stephenson AB, Leech G, Altman G, Mikulik V, Norman AJ, Monrad JT, Besiroglu T, Ge H, Hartwick MA, Teh YW, Chindelevitch L, Gal Y, Kulveit J (2021) Inferring the effectiveness of government interventions against COVID-19. *Science*, **371**, eabd9338. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abd9338

Brooks ME, Kristensen K, Benthem KJ van, Magnusson A, Berg CW, Nielsen A, Skaug HJ, Maechler M, Bolker BM (2017) glmmTMB Balances Speed and Flexibility Among Packages for Zero-inflated Generalized Linear Mixed Modeling. *The R Journal*, **9**, 378–400. https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2017-066

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

COVID-19 Genomics UK (COG-UK) Consortium (2020) An integrated national scale SARS-CoV-2 genomic surveillance network. *The Lancet Microbe*, **1**, e99–e100. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30054-9

Davies NG, Barnard RC, Jarvis CI, Russell TW, Semple MG, Jit M, Edmunds WJ (2021) Association of tiered restrictions and a second lockdown with COVID-19 deaths and hospital admissions in England: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, **21**, 482–492. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30984-1

Delussu F, Tizzoni M, Gauvin L (2022) Evidence of pandemic fatigue associated with stricter tiered COVID-19 restrictions. *PLOS Digital Health*, **1**, e0000035. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000035

Dept. Health & Social Care (2021) COVID-19 testing data: methodology note. *https://web.archive.org/web/20200905041538/https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-testing-data-methodology/covid-19-testing-data-methodology-note*.

Fetzer T (2022) Subsidising the spread of COVID-19: Evidence from the UK'S Eat-Out-to-Help-Out Scheme*. *The Economic Journal*, **132**, 1200–1217. https://doi.org/10.1093/ej/ueab074

Flacco ME, Acuti Martellucci C, Baccolini V, De Vito C, Renzi E, Villari P, Manzoli L (2022) Risk of reinfection and disease after SARS-CoV-2 primary infection: Meta-analysis. *European Journal of Clinical Investigation*, **52**, e13845. https://doi.org/10.1111/eci.13845

Ganslmeier M, Furceri D, Ostry JD (2021) The impact of weather on COVID-19 pandemic. *Scientific Reports*, **11**, 22027. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-01189-3

Gao Y, Ding M, Dong X, Zhang J, Kursat Azkur A, Azkur D, Gan H, Sun Y, Fu W, Li W, Liang H, Cao Y, Yan Q, Cao C, Gao H, Brüggen M-C, van de Veen W, Sokolowska M, Akdis M, Akdis CA (2021) Risk factors for severe and critically ill COVID-19 patients: A review. *Allergy*, **76**, 428–455. https://doi.org/10.1111/all.14657

Ge Y, Zhang W-B, Liu H, Ruktanonchai CW, Hu M, Wu X, Song Y, Ruktanonchai NW, Yan W, Cleary E, Feng L, Li Z, Yang W, Liu M, Tatem AJ, Wang J-F, Lai S (2022) Impacts of worldwide individual non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 transmission across waves and space. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*, **106**, 102649. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2021.102649

Goethem NV, Vandromme M, Oyen HV, Haarhuis F, Brondeel R, Catteau L, André E, Cuypers L, Surveillance BCG on C-19 H, Consortium C-19 GB, Blot K, Serrien B (2022) Severity of infection with the SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 lineage among hospitalized COVID-19 patients in Belgium. *PLOS ONE*, **17**, e0269138. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0269138

Grubaugh ND, Hanage WP, Rasmussen AL (2020) Making Sense of Mutation: What D614G Means for the COVID-19 Pandemic Remains Unclear. *Cell*, **182**, 794–795. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.06.040

Hall V, Foulkes S, Insalata F, Kirwan P, Saei A, Atti A, Wellington E, Khawam J, Munro K, Cole M, Tranquillini C, Taylor-Kerr A, Hettiarachchi N, Calbraith D, Sajedi N, Milligan I, Themistocleous Y, Corrigan D, Cromey L, Price L, Stewart S, de Lacy E, Norman C, Linley E, Otter AD, Semper A, Hewson J, D'Arcangelo S, Chand M, Brown CS, Brooks T, Islam J, Charlett A, Hopkins S (2022) Protection against SARS-CoV-2 after Covid-19 Vaccination and Previous Infection. *New England Journal of Medicine*, **386**, 1207–1220. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2118691

Hartig F (2022) DHARMa: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-Level / Mixed) Regression Models. R package version 0.4.6. *https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DHARMa*.

Hinch R, Panovska-Griffiths J, Probert WJM, Ferretti L, Wymant C, Di Lauro F, Baya N, Ghafari M, Abeler-Dörner L, The COVID-19 Genomics UK (COG-UK) Consortium, Fraser C (2022) Estimating SARS-CoV-2 variant fitness and the impact of interventions in England using statistical and geo-spatial agent-based models. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **380**, 20210304. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2021.0304

Hodcroft EB, Zuber M, Nadeau S, Vaughan TG, Crawford KHD, Althaus CL, Reichmuth ML, Bowen JE, Walls AC, Corti D, Bloom JD, Veesler D, Mateo D, Hernando A, Comas I, González-Candelas F, Stadler T, Neher RA (2021) Spread of a SARS-CoV-2 variant through Europe in the summer of 2020. *Nature*, **595**, 707–712. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03677-y

Holt H, Talaei M, Greenig M, Zenner D, Symons J, Relton C, Young KS, Davies MR, Thompson KN, Ashman J, Rajpoot SS, Kayyale AA, Rifai SE, Lloyd PJ, Jolliffe D, Timmis O, Finer S, Iliodromiti S, Miners A, Hopkinson NS, Alam B, Lloyd-Jones G, Dietrich T, Chapple I, Pfeffer PE, McCoy D, Davies G, Lyons RA,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

Griffiths C, Kee F, Sheikh A, Breen G, Shaheen SO, Martineau AR (2022) Risk factors for developing COVID-19: a population-based longitudinal study (COVIDENCE UK). *Thorax*, **77**, 900–912. https://doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2021-217487

Huang Q, Jackson S, Derakhshan S, Lee L, Pham E, Jackson A, Cutter SL (2021) Urban-rural differences in COVID-19 exposures and outcomes in the South: A preliminary analysis of South Carolina. *PLOS ONE*, **16**, e0246548. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0246548

Hunter PR, Colón-González FJ, Brainard J, Rushton S (2021) Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions against COVID-19 in Europe in 2020: a quasi-experimental non-equivalent group and time series design study. *Eurosurveillance*, **26**, 2001401. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.28.2001401

Islam N, Shkolnikov VM, Acosta RJ, Klimkin I, Kawachi I, Irizarry RA, Alicandro G, Khunti K, Yates T, Jdanov DA, White M, Lewington S, Lacey B (2021) Excess deaths associated with covid-19 pandemic in 2020: age and sex disaggregated time series analysis in 29 high income countries. *BMJ*, **373**, n1137. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n1137

Lane CR, Sherry NL, Porter AF, Duchene S, Horan K, Andersson P, Wilmot M, Turner A, Dougall S, Johnson SA, Sait M, Gonçalves da Silva A, Ballard SA, Hoang T, Stinear TP, Caly L, Sintchenko V, Graham R, McMahon J, Smith D, Leong LE, Meumann EM, Cooley L, Schwessinger B, Rawlinson W, van Hal SJ, Stephens N, Catton M, Looker C, Crouch S, Sutton B, Alpren C, Williamson DA, Seemann T, Howden BP (2021) Genomics-informed responses in the elimination of COVID-19 in Victoria, Australia: an observational, genomic epidemiological study. *The Lancet Public Health*, **6**, e547–e556. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00133-X

Lemey P, Ruktanonchai N, Hong SL, Colizza V, Poletto C, Van den Broeck F, Gill MS, Ji X, Levasseur A, Oude Munnink BB, Koopmans M, Sadilek A, Lai S, Tatem AJ, Baele G, Suchard MA, Dellicour S (2021) Untangling introductions and persistence in COVID-19 resurgence in Europe. *Nature*, **595**, 713–717. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03754-2

Lüdecke D, Ben-Shachar MS, Patil I, Waggoner P, Makowski D (2021) performance: An R Package for Assessment, Comparison and Testing of Statistical Models. *Journal of Open Source Software*, **6**, 3139. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.03139

McGowan VJ, Bambra C (2022) COVID-19 mortality and deprivation: pandemic, syndemic, and endemic health inequalities. *The Lancet Public Health*, **7**, e966–e975. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(22)00223-7

Mendez-Brito A, El Bcheraoui C, Pozo-Martin F (2021) Systematic review of empirical studies comparing the effectiveness of non-pharmaceutical interventions against COVID-19. *Journal of Infection*, **83**, 281–293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2021.06.018

Murugesan M, Mathews P, Paul H, Karthik R, Mammen JJ, Rupali P (2022) Protective effect conferred by prior infection and vaccination on COVID-19 in a healthcare worker cohort in South India. *PLOS ONE*, **17**, e0268797. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0268797

Niedzwiedz CL, O'Donnell CA, Jani BD, Demou E, Ho FK, Celis-Morales C, Nicholl BI, Mair FS, Welsh P, Sattar N, Pell JP, Katikireddi SV (2020) Ethnic and socioeconomic differences in SARS-CoV-2 infection: prospective cohort study using UK Biobank. *BMC Medicine*, **18**, 160. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-020-01640-8

Nottmeyer L, Armstrong B, Lowe R, Abbott S, Meakin S, O'Reilly KM, von Borries R, Schneider R, Royé D, Hashizume M, Pascal M, Tobias A, Vicedo-Cabrera AM, Lavigne E, Correa PM, Ortega NV, Kynčl J, Urban A, Orru H, Ryti N, Jaakkola J, Dallavalle M, Schneider A, Honda Y, Ng CFS, Alahmad B, Carrasco-Escobar G, Holobâc IH, Kim H, Lee W, Íñiguez C, Bell ML, Zanobetti A, Schwartz J, Scovronick N, Coélho M de SZS, Saldiva PHN, Diaz MH, Gasparrini A, Sera F (2023) The association of COVID-19 incidence with temperature, humidity, and UV radiation – A global multi-city analysis. *Science of The Total Environment*, **854**, 158636. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.158636

Panovska-Griffiths J, Swallow B, Hinch R, Cohen J, Rosenfeld K, Stuart RM, Ferretti L, Di Lauro F, Wymant C, Izzo A, Waites W, Viner R, Bonell C, Fraser C, Klein D, Kerr CC, null null (2022) Statistical and agent-based modelling of the transmissibility of different SARS-CoV-2 variants in England and impact of different interventions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **380**, 20210315. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2021.0315

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

Pozo-Martin F, Weishaar H, Cristea F, Hanefeld J, Bahr T, Schaade L, El Bcheraoui C (2021) The impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 epidemic growth in the 37 OECD member states. *European Journal of Epidemiology*, **36**, 629–640. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-021-00766-0

Public Health England (2021) *Variant Of Concern 202012/01: Technical Briefing 2. Investigation of novel SARS-CoV-2 variant*. *https://web.archive.org/web/20210210034324/https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/959361/Technical_Briefing_VOC202012-2_Briefing_2.pdf*.

R Core Team (2022) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. *http://www.R-project.org/*.

Riebler A, Sørbye SH, Simpson D, Rue H (2016) An intuitive Bayesian spatial model for disease mapping that accounts for scaling. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, **25**, 1145–1165. https://doi.org/10.1177/0962280216660421

Rifat SAA, Liu W (2022) One year into the pandemic: the impacts of social vulnerability on COVID-19 outcomes and urban–rural differences in the conterminous United States. *International Journal of Environmental Health Research*, **32**, 2601–2619. https://doi.org/10.1080/09603123.2021.1979196

Rue H, Martino S, Chopin N (2009) Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian models by using integrated nested Laplace approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **71**, 319–392. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2008.00700.x

Sievers C, Zacher B, Ullrich A, Huska M, Fuchs S, Buda S, Haas W, Diercke M, Heiden M an der, Kröger S (2022) SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variants BA.1 and BA.2 both show similarly reduced disease severity of COVID-19 compared to Delta, Germany, 2021 to 2022. *Eurosurveillance*, **27**, 2200396. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.22.2200396

da Silva Filipe A, Shepherd JG, Williams T, Hughes J, Aranday-Cortes E, Asamaphan P, Ashraf S, Balcazar C, Brunker K, Campbell A, Carmichael S, Davis C, Dewar R, Gallagher MD, Gunson R, Hill V, Ho A, Jackson B, James E, Jesudason N, Johnson N, McWilliam Leitch EC, Li K, MacLean A, Mair D, McAllister DA, McCrone JT, McDonald SE, McHugh MP, Morris AK, Nichols J, Niebel M, Nomikou K, Orton RJ, O'Toole Á, Palmarini M, Parcell BJ, Parr YA, Rambaut A, Rooke S, Shaaban S, Shah R, Singer JB, Smollett K, Starinskij I, Tong L, Sreenu VB, Wastnedge E, Holden MTG, Robertson DL, Templeton K, Thomson EC (2021) Genomic epidemiology reveals multiple introductions of SARS-CoV-2 from mainland Europe into Scotland. *Nature Microbiology*, **6**, 112–122. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-020-00838-z

Smith LE, Potts HWW, Amlôt R, Fear NT, Michie S, Rubin GJ (2022) Tiered restrictions for COVID-19 in England: knowledge, motivation and self-reported behaviour. *Public Health*, **204**, 33–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2021.12.016

Tan L, Schultz DM (2022) How Is COVID-19 Affected by Weather? Metaregression of 158 Studies and Recommendations for Best Practices in Future Research. *Weather, Climate, and Society*, **14**, 237–255. https://doi.org/10.1175/WCAS-D-21-0132.1

Torres AR, Rodrigues AP, Sousa-Uva M, Kislaya I, Silva S, Antunes L, Dias C, Nunes B (2022) Impact of stringent non-pharmaceutical interventions applied during the second and third COVID-19 epidemic waves in Portugal, 9 November 2020 to 10 February 2021: an ecological study. *Eurosurveillance*, **27**, 2100497. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.23.2100497

UK Government (2019) English indices of deprivation 2019. *https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019*.

UK Government (2020a) Prime Minister's statement on coronavirus (COVID-19): 23 March 2020. *https://web.archive.org/web/20200325010057/https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-address-to-the-nation-on-coronavirus-23-march-2020*.

UK Government (2020b) Prime Minister's statement on coronavirus (COVID-19): 22 March 2020. *https://web.archive.org/web/20200324014333/https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-statement-on-coronavirus-22-march-2020*.

UK Government (2020c) Local COVID alert levels: what you need to know. *https://web.archive.org/web/20201014194215/https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-covid-alert-levels-what-you-need-to-know#history*.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.05.22269279; this version posted August 2, 2023. 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 .

UK Government (2020d) New National Restrictions from 5 November. *https://web.archive.org/web/20201105234705/https://www.gov.uk/guidance/new-national-restrictions-from-5-november.*

UK Government (2021) Prime Minister's address to the nation: 4 January 2021. *https://web.archive.org/web/20210105084446/https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/prime-ministers-address-to-the-nation-4-january-2021.*

Vöhringer HS, Sanderson T, Sinnott M, De Maio N, Nguyen T, Goater R, Schwach F, Harrison I, Hellewell J, Ariani CV, Gonçalves S, Jackson DK, Johnston I, Jung AW, Saint C, Sillitoe J, Suciu M, Goldman N, Panovska-Griffiths J, Birney E, Volz E, Funk S, Kwiatkowski D, Chand M, Martincorena I, Barrett JC, Gerstung M (2021) Genomic reconstruction of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in England. *Nature*, **600**, 506–511. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-04069-y

Volz E, Mishra S, Chand M, Barrett JC, Johnson R, Geidelberg L, Hinsley WR, Laydon DJ, Dabrera G, O'Toole Á, Amato R, Ragonnet-Cronin M, Harrison I, Jackson B, Ariani CV, Boyd O, Loman NJ, McCrone JT, Gonçalves S, Jorgensen D, Myers R, Hill V, Jackson DK, Gaythorpe K, Groves N, Sillitoe J, Kwiatkowski DP, Flaxman S, Ratmann O, Bhatt S, Hopkins S, Gandy A, Rambaut A, Ferguson NM (2021) Assessing transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Nature*, **593**, 266–269. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03470-x

Whittle RS, Diaz-Artiles A (2020) An ecological study of socioeconomic predictors in detection of COVID-19 cases across neighborhoods in New York City. *BMC Medicine*, **18**, 271. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-020-01731-6

Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Elphick CS (2010) A protocol for data exploration to avoid common statistical problems. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **1**, 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210X.2009.00001.x