

# Comparing Waves of COVID-19 in the US: Scale of response changes over time

Robert L. Richards<sup>a,\*</sup>, Grant Foster<sup>a,b</sup>, Bret D. Elderd<sup>a</sup>, and Tad A. Dallas<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Biological Sciences, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA

<sup>b</sup>Department of Biological Sciences, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina, USA

\*Corresponding author: robbielrichards@gmail.com

Short title: Scale of US COVID-19 response changes over time

## ABSTRACT

Local response to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic differed spatially across the United States but the drivers of this spatial variation remain unclear. We approach this open question by studying the relationship between the growth rate of subsequent waves of the pandemic at the county level during the first year of the pandemic, asking whether state or county demographics better explain variation in this relationship. We found clear spatiotemporal patterns in the relationship between the slopes of subsequent waves in a given county. Generally the standardized difference between the growth rates of waves 1 and 2 and waves 2 and 3 were strongly positively correlated over short distances and shifted to a weak negative correlation at intermediate distances. We also found that peer county health group (a categorization of counties by demographic information relevant to public health) explained variation in response better between wave 1 and 2, while state identity was most important between wave 2 and 3. Taken together, we suggest that there are identifiable spatial patterns in pandemic response across the US but that the nature of these patterns change over the course of the pandemic.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, pandemic response, spatiotemporal variation, peak detection, non-pharmaceutical interventions

## 9 INTRODUCTION

10 Beginning early in the pandemic of SARS-CoV-2 both epidemic severity and local response to  
11 the pandemic differed spatially across the United States [1, 2]. There is a long history of the study  
12 of spatial variation in the basic reproductive number of pathogens [1] but drivers of spatial patterns  
13 in pandemic response are less well studied. Much work has been done both to predict the effect  
14 of a variety of Non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) on future transmission and to measure the  
15 actual effect of NPIs implemented during the pandemic [3, 4, 5, 6, 2]. However, determining which  
16 underlying factors contribute to the response to subsequent pandemic waves in a particular location  
17 has proven challenging, partially due to the haphazard way in which NPIs were implemented and the  
18 difficulty of measuring individual compliance with state mandates [7, 8, 9]. Despite these challenges,  
19 identifying the key factors associated with good and bad pandemic responses should be both of general  
20 interest and useful for targeting of public health initiatives.

21 Spatio-temporal variation in response to the pandemic likely results from the interaction of two  
22 broad categories of factors: one local, county demographics, and the other regional, state policy. State  
23 and local governments began implementing mandated NPIs in the middle of March 2020 and first  
24 relaxed any restrictions at the end of April 2020, but the timings of implementation and relaxation and  
25 the extent of restrictions varied substantially from state to state [2]. The degree to which individuals  
26 and communities within a state enforced and complied with existing policies has also clearly varied  
27 [8, 9] and therefore may differ spatially due to local demographics. In fact, direct measurement of  
28 the effect of specific NPIs has largely relied on this inherent spatial variation in both the timing of  
29 policy implementation and the relationship between policy and actual behavior [2, 4]. If the stochastic  
30 processes of disease transmission are responsible for more variation than the local or regional factors,  
31 then there may even be no pattern in the responses. Here we consider whether state-level policies and  
32 local demographic differences are important to determining the response of a county to COVID-19 and  
33 if one category is more useful than the other.

34 Identifying the factors that contribute to especially good or especially bad pandemic response will  
35 allow us to predict areas of increased risk of repeated extreme epidemics and to begin to identify  
36 which points can be leveraged to improve pandemic response. We focus on the relative response to the  
37 pandemic by comparing the relationship between a given COVID-19 wave and the wave immediately

38 prior to it. Here we use the word “wave” to describe a period of time during which most counties in  
39 the US experienced a single peak in COVID-19 cases. Counties which tend to have smaller relative  
40 outbreaks in a subsequent peak (good responses) may have collectively improved their NPI compliance  
41 or introduced other protective behaviors while those with comparable or larger subsequent epidemics  
42 (bad responses) may have not improved or regressed in those behaviors. Although it may be interesting  
43 to simply identify which particular counties are especially good or bad at responding to subsequent  
44 pandemic waves, we also investigated to what extent patterns of response were related to state or county  
45 demographics and over what distances spatial patterns in response similarity were detectable. Because  
46 of the changing nature of attitudes and policies regarding the ongoing pandemic the relative importance  
47 of state policies and county demographics should similarly change over time. We predict that state level  
48 factors should increase in importance as time progresses because the relatively uniform policies early  
49 in the pandemic quickly broke down into a state-by-state patchwork of wildly different regulations.  
50 Similarly, we expect that county-level demographic factors should also increase in influence over  
51 time as many states rolled back restrictions and disease control relied on county level policies and  
52 behavior patterns. Finally, we predicted that spatial relationships between county responses should  
53 begin positive and decay with distance but that the shape of this decay should vary regionally due to  
54 differences in the sizes of both counties and states.

## 55 METHODS

### 56 Data

57 Case data for SARS-CoV-2 in US counties was compiled by the Center for Systems Science and  
58 Engineering at Johns Hopkins University [10]. These data were then rescaled to cases per 100,000  
59 residents based on county population estimates from the US Census Bureau and smoothed using a  
60 14 day moving average. We focused our study on three initial waves of infections. The first wave  
61 (January-May 2020) contained the first known emergence of SARS-CoV-2 into counties in the US  
62 as well as the first introductions of NPIs to slow spread, the second wave (July-September 2020)  
63 represents the first major resurgence of the virus across the US as behavioral changes began to fade  
64 over the summer, and the third wave (September 2020 - January 2021) represents the final and largest  
65 surge of cases prior to wide availability of vaccines. Counties were grouped for further analysis by  
66 state and peer county groups based on categorizations from the Community Health Indicators Project

67 which are themselves constructed according to a number of demographic criteria for the purpose of  
68 comparing health outcomes [11]. Data on seroprevalence by county were sourced from the blood  
69 donor seroprevalence survey and summarized by wave period [12] for use as an independent predictor  
70 variable in analyses.

71 **Defining waves**

72 We used a modified peak detection algorithm to identify county-level peaks of the epidemic curves in  
73 each of the 3 initial waves of COVID-19 infections in the United States prior to widespread vaccination  
74 and the spread of variants of concern [13]. Briefly, the original algorithm identifies points which are a  
75 2 standard deviations above or below the mean value of a sliding window. We extend this method by  
76 (i) identifying the largest positive “peak” in each established wave period as the top of the epidemic  
77 curve for that wave (ii) identifying the last “negative” peak prior to the top of the epidemic curve as  
78 the location of the preceding valley and (iii) identifying the start of the new wave as the first positive  
79 “peak” identified between the preceding valley and the top of the epidemic curve. This first identified  
80 “peak” is simply the first detectable positive anomaly which represents the beginning of the new upward  
81 trajectory of the epidemic wave. To estimate the severity of each wave in each county we first took the  
82 slope of each epidemic curve (height of the curve/time from the start of the curve, as defined in (iii)  
83 above, to the top of the curve) and then standardized the natural log of these slopes to  $z$ -scores within  
84 each wave:

$$z = \frac{x - \bar{x}}{\sigma}, \quad (1)$$

85 where  $x$  is the  $\ln(\text{slope})$  of a wave in a single county,  $\bar{x}$  the mean of the  $\ln(\text{slope})$  across all counties  
86 during the relevant wave, and  $\sigma$  the standard deviation of those rescaled slopes. If no positive peak  
87 was detected during a wave interval then the county was classified as having no wave.

88 **Statistical analysis**

89 We expected neighboring counties to have more similar wave-to-wave responses than more distant  
90 counties. We tested this hypothesis and estimated the distance at which wave-to-wave responses in  
91 counties were no longer positively correlated using spatial correlograms constructed with a 100 km  
92 interval with the *ncf* package [14, 15]. Spatial correlograms were restricted to the continental United

93 States and separated them by US census region. Prior to visualization, correlograms were trimmed to  
94 include only bins with at least 1% of the total number of possible county pairs.


95 In an effort to understand what factors best explain the variation in wave to wave relationships within  
96 counties we fit a suite of mixed effects models to the relationship between subsequent waves and  
97 compared their relative fit. We fit a suite of linear models with wave 2 as a dependent variable and wave  
98 1 and estimated seroprevalence during wave 2 as the independent fixed effects. The suite of models  
99 included every combination of the random intercept and random slope effects of state and peer county  
100 group. Model comparison and selection was then performed using corrected AIC (AICc). All models  
101 were fit using the package *glmmTMB* [16] and we identified the best models using the *MuMin*  
102 package to compare model AICc [17, 18]. This process was repeated for the relationship between  
103 wave 2 and wave 3. Mixed effect model analysis was limited to counties for which seroprevalence data  
104 was available.

105 Data and code to reproduce these analyses are available at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.19285379>.

## 106 RESULTS

### 107 Spatiotemporal patterns

108 Peak detection was successful in the majority of counties for all three waves and improved with later  
109 waves. Some counties (e.g. rural Utah) proved consistently challenging for successful peak detection  
110 (no positive peak detected in a wave) and are therefore excluded from further analysis. The areas of  
111 the US with the highest peaks shifted from wave to wave, mostly according to known dynamics of  
112 the pandemic. For example, the northeastern US suffered from comparatively severe first waves but  
113 comparatively smaller later waves, while in the southeast large waves occurred in spatial pockets in  
114 wave 1, the large waves expanded in wave 2, and many areas suffered comparatively smaller waves by  
115 wave 3 (Figure 1).




**Figure 1.** Relative wave slope (z-score) by county for the first 3 waves of COVID-19 in the United States. Many counties lacked large enough epidemics in the first and second waves to detect a clear wave peak. Highest relative wave peaks appear to have shifted from the northeast US (wave 1) to the southeast US (wave 2) to the plains and mountain west (wave 3).


<sup>116</sup> **Wave-to-wave comparisons**

<sup>117</sup> We found clear spatiotemporal patterns in the relationship between subsequent waves in a given  
<sup>118</sup> county (Figure 2). For example, parts of the south and midwest/plains regions of the US have strong  
<sup>119</sup> positive relationships between waves 1 and 2 (bad response; Dark blue-green in Figure 2). While much  
<sup>120</sup> of the southeast US transitions to a negative relationship between wave 2 and wave 3 (good response;

121 blue), the midwest and plains regions mostly remain high for both later waves (bad response; green  
122 and dark blue-green, Figure 2). While both southeastern and plains states tended to have more lax  
123 NPI policies the two regions seem to have responded in starkly different ways to repeated COVID-19  
124 waves. These broad regional patterns of similar responses were supported by spatial correlation  
125 analyses. The standardized difference between the slopes of both waves 1 and 2 and waves 2 and  
126 3 were strongly positively correlated over short distances, shifting to a weak negative correlation at  
127 intermediate distances (Figure 3). Interestingly, the wave 1 to wave 2 transition was characterized both  
128 by stronger positive correlations over very short distances and a return to positive correlations over  
129 long distances. The scale of these transitions seems to differ slightly by region with correlations in  
130 the northeast US decaying the most quickly with distance and the western US displaying significant  
131 positive correlations over the longest distances.




**Figure 2.** Bivariate map displaying the relationship between the relative slopes of (a) waves 1 and 2 and (b) waves 2 and 3. Deeper blues represent larger prior wave slopes and deeper greens represent larger later wave slopes. Blue areas of the map (the northeast US in wave 1-2 and southeast US in wave 2-3) show improvement in response from wave to wave. While green areas of the map (the southeast US in wave 1-2, and the plains and mountain west in wave 2-3) show regression or stagnation in response from wave to wave.



**Figure 3.** Correlograms show the spatial correlation of the difference between the standardized slopes of subsequent waves by US census region. Both neighboring counties and distant counties are much more strongly correlated in (a) their response from wave 1 to wave 2 than (b) from wave 2 to wave 3, while both figures show neutral or negative correlation at intermediate distances. Closed circles are significantly different from zero while open circles are not.

Using mixed effect models we found that the peer county health group contained slightly more information for wave 1 and wave 2, while the random effect of state contained the most information for fitting the relationship between wave 2 and wave 3. In particular, for waves 1 and 2, the best model was one with a random slope for peer county health group and only the model with no random slopes was comparable (Table 1). Similarly, in the most complex model the variance explained by the random slope of peer county group was significantly different from zero (95% CI: 0.02 - 0.22) but the random slope of state was not (95% CI: 0 - 0.16). For waves 2 and 3, comparison via AICc identified the model including random slopes of state as the best fit and the models with no random slopes and that with random slopes for both state and peer county group were the next ranked models (Table 1). This pattern was reinforced by the fact that in the most complex model the variance explained by the random slope of state was significantly different from zero (95% CI: 0.01 - 0.17) while that explained by the random slope of peer county group was not (95% CI: 0 - 0.17). Contrary to our expectations it seems

that state-level factors became more important later in the epidemic while county demographic factors dominated early. For peer county groups (groups of counties which are demographically similar) we find some negative relationships for waves 1 and 2, suggesting that those groups substantially improved their response on average (Figure 4). Notably, the most negative peer county groups (and therefore the best responders) for waves 1 and 2 include groups 1 and 2 which represent high population density urban areas (Table 2). While all states have a positive relationship between subsequent waves, the slope varies substantially for the wave 2 to wave 3 response.



**Figure 4.** Fitted slopes of the relationship between (a,b) wave 1 and wave 2 and (c,d) wave 2 and wave 3. Slopes are separated by the random effect of (a,c) state and (b,d) peer county group. Fitted relationships are based on the most complex fitted model including all random effects. (b) Peer county group was most important to the relationship between waves 1 and 2, with slopes of the relationship spanning zero, but (c) state was most important to the relationship between waves 2 and 3

Wave 1 to Wave 2	df	ΔAICc	w <sub>i</sub>
Peer County: Intercept + Slope; State: Intercept	8	0	0.619
Peer County: Intercept; State: Intercept	6	1.75	0.258
Wave 2 to Wave 3	df	ΔAICc	w <sub>i</sub>
Peer County: Intercept; State: Intercept + Slope	8	0	0.32
Peer County: Intercept + Slope; State: Intercept + Slope	10	0.52	0.247
Peer County: Intercept; State: Intercept	6	0.7	0.225
Peer County: Intercept + Slope; State: Intercept	8	0.87	0.207

**Table 1.** Ranking of mixed-effects models predicting a wave slope. All models include the slope of the prior wave and the seroprevalence during the predicted wave. In the table we specify the random effects in each ranked model. Models are ranked by ΔAICc with the number of degrees of freedom (df), and Akaike weights (w<sub>i</sub>). Only models with ΔAICc ≤ 2 are shown.

## 151 DISCUSSION

152 We estimated the county level response to the COVID-19 pandemic between subsequent waves  
153 and determined the relative importance of county demographic vs. state-level factors to predicting  
154 that response. Although we expected both state policies and county demographics to increasingly  
155 influence the response of counties to repeated waves of COVID-19 the relative importance of these  
156 two sources of variation changed over time. We found that peer county group association was most  
157 important to predicting response early in the pandemic (from wave 1-2) driven by strong patterns of  
158 learning in urban counties (Table 1, Table 2). However, state identity was more important later in the  
159 pandemic (from wave 2-3). Broadly, we found that counties which were more similar demographically  
160 or spatially were more likely to respond similarly to subsequent pandemic waves, but that the relevant  
161 axes of similarity changed over the course of the pandemic.

162 We found strong patterns of similarity in wave-to-wave responses at local to regional scales across the  
163 United States. Visual inspection of these patterns (Figure 2) reveals local areas and broad regions which  
164 improved their response after the first wave and held the line (the northeast US; blue/white), improved  
165 temporarily but then regressed (the mountain west, blue to green), responded badly between waves 1  
166 and 2 but then improved (the southeast US, green to blue), and performed increasingly poorly (central  
167 Texas and the plains states; green). These patterns broadly conform to existing understanding of the  
168 course of the extent of NPI implementation and disease incidence in 2020 [19]. We also introduced  
169 new evidence on the scale at which counties tend to behave similarly and the rate at which positive  
170 correlations in response decay with distance. In particular we found that positive correlations between

Wave 1 to Wave 2 - Best Learners	slope	Wave 2 to Wave 3 - Best Learners	slope
Group 1 (e.g. LA County, CA; Fulton County, GA; New York County, NY)	-0.185	Alabama	0.056
Group 63 (e.g. Alleghany County, VA; Fayette County, IL; Tyler County, TX)	-0.15	Pennsylvania	0.084
Group 76 (e.g. Clay County KS; Jackson County, MN; Big Horn County, WY)	-0.103	Texas	0.092
Group 2 (e.g. Denver County, CO; Arlington County, VA; Maricopa County, AZ)	-0.066	Indiana	0.111
Group 84 (e.g. Clay County, IL; Butte County, SD; Chickasaw County, IA)	-0.053	Mississippi	0.125
Wave 1 to Wave 2 - Worst Learners	slope	Wave 2 to Wave 3 - Worst Learners	slope
Group 68 (e.g. Bedford County, PA; Kenai Peninsula Borough, AK; Polk County, WI)	0.251	Kansas	0.33
Group 74 (e.g. Calaveras County, CA; Windham County, VT; Lumpkin County, GA)	0.246	Washington	0.269
Group 64 (e.g. Liberty County, FL; Johnson County, NE; Haskell County, TX)	0.225	Virginia	0.259
Group 18 (New Haven County, CT; Charleston County, SC; Honolulu County, HI)	0.194	Colorado	0.253
Group 8 (Dutchess County, NY; Fayette County, GA; El Dorado County; CA)	0.178	New Mexico	0.251

**Table 2.** County groups rank ordered by COVID-19 response between subsequent waves according to the best fit mixed effects model. Best learners have the smallest slope between a prior and subsequent wave and the worst learners have the largest slope. For wave 1 to 2 the best fit model identified peer county groups as the most useful random effect. As these peer county groups are not well known we provide a sampling of example counties. Full county lists can be found in the supplementary data.

171 counties were strongest at short distances and tended to become negative at distances between 400 and  
172 1000 km (Figure 3). Local clusters of counties are unsurprisingly similar in their response to subsequent  
173 COVID-19 waves because of similarities in state-level policies and county demographics but also  
174 because movement between neighboring counties necessarily couples the dynamics of their COVID  
175 epidemics [20, 21]. While coupling of epidemics due to proximity is still possible at intermediate  
176 distances we suggest that regional similarities in both state-level COVID policies and demographic  
177 predisposition to comply with NPIs should explain much of this remaining correlation [22]. This  
178 explanation is supported by the fact that spatial correlation patterns vary regionally with regions with  
179 smaller states, and therefore smaller county distances within states, such as the northeast crossing the  
180 zero correlation threshold more quickly with distance while regions with enormous states, such as  
181 the western US remain positively correlated over longer distances. Due to the many collinear factors  
182 interacting to drive these correlation patterns, additional analysis was required to identify probable  
183 drivers.

184 We, therefore, separated and identified likely mechanistic sources of county differences in response  
185 to subsequent COVID-19 waves. We predicted that the variance explained by both state and peer  
186 county group would increase during the pandemic as any uniformity in response to the early pandemic  
187 (if there was any to begin with) broke down along political and demographic lines [23, 19, 8]. Instead  
188 we found that peer county group was most important for the response between waves 1 and 2 but this  
189 importance decreased, replaced by state identity, between waves 2 and wave 3 (Figure 4, Table 1).  
190 As a result we conclude that any patterns of uniformity in response had largely broken down long  
191 before the advent of the second wave and that behavioral patterns driven by county demographics  
192 explained a substantial portion of the variation in COVID-19 case counts across the United States in  
193 that period. This pattern appears largely driven by a few county groups with strong patterns of good  
194 responses from wave 1 to wave 2 (Table 2). These groups are largely characterized by high population  
195 density urban areas which were hit hard in the first wave but mobilized to respond aggressively to  
196 the second wave. The transition from the importance of county demographics to the importance of  
197 state identity is mirrored by differences in the regional correlogram of wave responses. The difference  
198 between waves 1 and 2 is more positively correlated over very short distances and returns to positive  
199 correlations again at long distances, likely beyond state borders (Figure 3). Although states vary  
200 substantially in size across the US, the correlogram patterns match these size differences with the

201 point at which correlations become positive again being larger in regions with larger states. Given  
202 that these positive correlations at long distances in the wave 1 to wave 2 response are unlikely to be  
203 due to state level policies, regional level factors, or spatial disease spread they likely are the result of  
204 distant counties being more similar to each other in non-spatial ways which were only relevant early in  
205 the pandemic. The increase in the importance of state identity and regional patterns between waves  
206 2 and 3 may represent the long-term effect of divergences in COVID-19 policies between states, but  
207 it is puzzling that county demographics do not remain important, as this fracturing appears to have  
208 continued at both organizational scales [6, 24]. An alternative explanation for this pattern could be that  
209 NPI compliance behavior is driven by state and regional level reporting of COVID case counts and  
210 infection risk. This finding does not contradict the repeated finding of the enormous effect that race,  
211 socioeconomic status, and other demographic identities has on COVID-19 infection rates and outcomes  
212 [25]. Rather the county level may not be most appropriate to identify county demographic drivers  
213 of patterns of pandemic response and instead high quality finer scale data is required to understand  
214 inequities in COVID outcomes [26]. We conclude that the response between the 1st and 2nd waves  
215 at the county level was largely determined by local feasibility, acceptance, and enforcement of NPIs  
216 while the response between waves 2 and 3 was characterized by behavior based on state and regional  
217 level guidance, policies, and reporting.

218 We note that our analyses are largely phenomenological and provide only suggestions of possible  
219 mechanisms based on identified patterns. This type of analysis can easily break down if unknown or  
220 uncontrolled latent variables are in fact driving the associations that we have found. While a number of  
221 epidemiological factors could influence the patterns that we identified, the most likely culprit were  
222 spatio-temporal variation in seroprevalence and testing rates across the country [27, 12]. Counties with  
223 many cases may be naturally predisposed to have fewer cases in a subsequent wave simply because  
224 many susceptible individuals have been immunized by infection. For this reason we restricted our  
225 analysis to regions of the country for which we had reasonable estimates of seroprevalence with  
226 which to control our analysis [12]. While we solve the problem of confounding seroprevalence we do  
227 potentially create a new one by systematically removing regions of the country from our mixed effect  
228 model analysis. Although we urge caution in generalizing our mixed effect model findings to areas of  
229 the country outside the study area, congruence between the patterns found in the mixed effect models  
230 and those in the correlograms which span the entire continental US are encouraging. Additionally,

231 we note that there are known to be systematic spatial biases in testing rates and case discovery rates  
232 which complicate the use of case counts for analysis [28]. While death counts are frequently used as  
233 a more reliable metric of epidemic spread [4, 29], death counts are so low in many counties during  
234 the first two waves that peak detection proved intractable. Local testing availability and demand is  
235 strongly related to a number of underlying local geographic, demographic, and socioeconomic factors  
236 which are temporally consistent, and therefore despite spatial and temporal variation in testing rates  
237 our method of comparing counties directly to themselves likely controls for much of this variation  
238 [30, 31, 32]. So despite the clear limitations of this analysis we find that it contains useful insight into  
239 the patterns and processes of response to repeated waves of COVID-19.

240 Additionally, we note that it is highly likely that multiple variants with different transmission rates  
241 were circulating during this period and could have contributed to some of the patterns observed.  
242 Unfortunately it is beyond the scope of this work to control for variant patterns, given the available data  
243 for this time period, but we believe our analysis largely avoids these issues for two reasons. First, there  
244 is evidence that the first identified variant of concern (alternatively B.1.1.7 or Alpha) was uncommon  
245 in the US until after our study period [33]. Second, much of the problem with spatial patterning of  
246 variants comes when directly comparing case counts in two locations at the same time. As we compare  
247 locations instead at their respective epidemic peaks within a broad date window we likely sidestep  
248 much of this concern.

249 Although much has been written about the relative effectiveness of various NPIs as well as the  
250 extent of implementation across the US, many gaps remain in our understanding of how humans  
251 responded to the repeated waves of COVID-19 over the past 2 years. We found that the predictors of  
252 which communities learn (or don't learn) to deal with a pandemic tended to shift from county-level  
253 demographics to state-level policies over the course of the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic in the US.  
254 Although we focused on the pre-vaccine era of COVID-19, our findings are likely highly relevant both  
255 immediately post vaccine and especially with the rise of increasingly vaccine evasive variants, such  
256 as the omicron variant [34]. We might expect new COVID policies such as vaccination and regular  
257 antigen testing to go through a similar pattern of adoption, with early adoption being driven by county  
258 demographics and long-term trends by state-level guidance and policies. The re-implementation of  
259 familiar measures such as regular masking and social distancing for the vaccinated is an interesting

260 hybrid policy which may show an intermediate pattern. Regardless it seems clear that the landscape  
261 of pandemic response behavior is a rapidly changing one, requiring regular reassessment of the most  
262 effective policy pressure points and the most vulnerable populations.

## 263 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

264 This work has been supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation RAPID grant (NSF-DEB-  
265 2031196).

## 266 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

267 RLR, GF, TAD, and BDE conceived of the study. RLR performed performed analyses and wrote the  
268 first draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed substantively to manuscript revisions.

## 269 DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

270 Data and code to reproduce these analyses are available at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.19285379>.

## 271 COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT

272 The authors declare no competing interests.

## 273 REFERENCES

274 [1] Ives, A. R. & Bozzuto, C. Estimating and explaining the spread of COVID-19 at the county level  
275 in the USA. *Communications biology* **4**, 1–9 (2021). Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.

276 [2] Courtemanche, C., Garuccio, J., Le, A., Pinkston, J. & Yelowitz, A. Strong Social Distancing  
277 Measures In The United States Reduced The COVID-19 Growth Rate: Study evaluates the impact  
278 of social distancing measures on the growth rate of confirmed COVID-19 cases across the United  
279 States. *Health Affairs* **39**, 1237–1246 (2020).

280 [3] Baker, R. E. *et al.* The impact of COVID-19 nonpharmaceutical interventions on the future  
281 dynamics of endemic infections. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 30547–  
282 30553 (2020). Publisher: National Acad Sciences.

- 283 [4] Brauner, J. M. *et al.* Inferring the effectiveness of government interventions against COVID-  
284 19. *Science* **371**, eabd9338 (2021). URL <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abd9338>. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- 285  
286 [5] Ngonghala, C. N. *et al.* Mathematical assessment of the impact of non-pharmaceutical  
287 interventions on curtailing the 2019 novel Coronavirus. *Mathematical Biosciences* **325**,  
288 108364 (2020). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0025556420300560>.
- 289  
290 [6] Singh, S., Shaikh, M., Hauck, K. & Miraldo, M. Impacts of introducing and lifting nonphar-  
291 maceutical interventions on COVID-19 daily growth rate and compliance in the United States.  
292 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021). Publisher: National Acad Sciences.
- 293 [7] Sharma, M. *et al.* How Robust are the Estimated Effects of Nonpharmaceutical Interventions  
294 against COVID-19? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.13454* (2020).
- 295 [8] Haischer, M. H. *et al.* Who is wearing a mask? Gender-, age-, and location-related differences  
296 during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Plos one* **15**, e0240785 (2020). Publisher: Public Library of  
297 Science San Francisco, CA USA.
- 298 [9] Wright, A. L., Sonin, K., Driscoll, J. & Wilson, J. Poverty and economic dislocation reduce com-  
299 pliance with COVID-19 shelter-in-place protocols. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*  
300 **180**, 544–554 (2020). Publisher: Elsevier.
- 301 [10] Dong, E., Du, H. & Gardner, L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real  
302 time. *The Lancet infectious diseases* **20**, 533–534 (2020). Publisher: Elsevier.
- 303 [11] Kanarek, N., Bialek, R. & Stanley, J. Use of Peer Groupings to Assess County Public Health  
304 Status. *Preventing Chronic Disease* **5**, A93 (2008). URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2483569/>.
- 305  
306 [12] Jones, J. M. *et al.* Estimated US infection-and vaccine-induced SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence  
307 based on blood donations, July 2020-May 2021. *JAMA* **326**, 1400–1409 (2021). Publisher:  
308 American Medical Association.

- 309 [13] Brakel, J. Robust peak detection algorithm using z-scores" (2020).
- 310 URL <https://stackoverflow.com/questions/22583391/peak-signal-detection-in-realtime-timeseries-data>.
- 311
- 312 [14] Bjornstad, O. N. *ncf: Spatial Covariance Functions* (2020). URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ncf>.
- 313
- 314 [15] Bjørnstad, O. N., Ims, R. A. & Lambin, X. Spatial population dynamics: analyzing patterns and processes of population synchrony. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **14**, 427–432 (1999). Publisher: Elsevier.
- 315
- 316
- 317 [16] Brooks, M. E. *et al.* glmmTMB Balances Speed and Flexibility Among Packages for Zero-inflated Generalized Linear Mixed Modeling. *The R Journal* **9**, 378–400 (2017). URL <https://journal.r-project.org/archive/2017/RJ-2017-066/index.html>.
- 318
- 319
- 320 [17] Burnham, K. P. Model selection and multimodel inference. *A practical information-theoretic approach* (1998). Publisher: Springer.
- 321
- 322 [18] Bartoń, K. *MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference* (2020). URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn>.
- 323
- 324 [19] Amuedo-Dorantes, C., Kaushal, N. & Muchow, A. N. Timing of social distancing policies and COVID-19 mortality: county-level evidence from the U.S. *Journal of Population Economics* **34**, 1445–1472 (2021). URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-021-00845-2>.
- 325
- 326
- 327 [20] Keeling, M. J. & Rohani, P. Estimating spatial coupling in epidemiological systems: a mechanistic approach. *Ecology Letters* **5**, 20–29 (2002). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1046/j.1461-0248.2002.00268.x>.  
328 \_eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1046/j.1461-0248.2002.00268.x>.
- 329
- 330
- 331 [21] Grenfell, B. T., Bjørnstad, O. N. & Kappey, J. Travelling waves and spatial hierarchies in measles epidemics. *Nature* **414**, 716–723 (2001). URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/414716a>. Bandiera\_abtest: a Cg\_type: Nature Research Journals Number: 6865 Primary\_atype: Research Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- 332
- 333
- 334

- 335 [22] Wellenius, G. A. *et al.* Impacts of social distancing policies on mobility and COVID-19 case growth  
336 in the US. *Nature Communications* **12**, 3118 (2021). URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-021-23404-5>. Bandiera\_abtest: a Cc\_license\_type: cc\_by Cg\_type:  
337 Nature Research Journals Number: 1 Primary\_atype: Research Publisher: Nature Publishing  
338 Group Subject\_term: Disease prevention;Health policy;Public health Subject\_term\_id: disease-  
339 prevention;health-policy;public-health.  
340
- 341 [23] Hsiehchen, D., Espinoza, M. & Slovic, P. Political partisanship and mobility restriction dur-  
342 ing the COVID-19 pandemic. *Public Health* **187**, 111–114 (2020). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0033350620303772>.
- 343
- 344 [24] Mallinas, S. R., Maner, J. K. & Ashby Plant, E. What factors underlie attitudes regarding  
345 protective mask use during the COVID-19 pandemic? *Personality and Individual Differences* **181**,  
346 111038 (2021). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191886921004153>.
- 347
- 348 [25] Chin, T. *et al.* U.S. county-level characteristics to inform equitable COVID-19 response.  
349 *medRxiv* 2020.04.08.20058248 (2020). URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7276037/>.
- 350
- 351 [26] Labgold, K. *et al.* Estimating the unknown: greater racial and ethnic disparities in COVID-  
352 19 burden after accounting for missing race/ethnicity data. *Epidemiology (Cambridge,  
353 Mass.)* **32**, 157–161 (2021). URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8641438/>.
- 354
- 355 [27] Chiu, W. A. & Ndeffo-Mbah, M. L. Using test positivity and reported case rates to estimate  
356 state-level COVID-19 prevalence and seroprevalence in the United States. *PLOS Computational  
357 Biology* **17**, e1009374 (2021). URL <https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009374>. Publisher: Public Library of Science.
- 358
- 359 [28] Ray, E. L. *et al.* Ensemble forecasts of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the US. *MedRXiv*  
360 (2020). Publisher: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press.
- 361 [29] Candido, D. S. *et al.* Evolution and epidemic spread of SARS-CoV-2 in Brazil. *Science*

- 362 (2020). URL <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.abd2161>.  
363 Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- 364 [30] Tao, R., Downs, J., Beckie, T. M., Chen, Y. & McNelley, W. Examining spatial accessibility  
365 to COVID-19 testing sites in Florida. *Annals of GIS* **26**, 319–327 (2020). URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/19475683.2020.1833365>. Publisher: Taylor & Francis \_eprint:  
366 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19475683.2020.1833365>.
- 367  
368 [31] Rentsch, C. T. *et al.* Patterns of COVID-19 testing and mortality by race and eth-  
369 nicity among United States veterans: A nationwide cohort study. *PLOS Medicine* **17**,  
370 e1003379 (2020). URL <https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1003379>. Publisher: Public Library of Science.  
371
- 372 [32] Hu, T. *et al.* Racial Segregation, Testing Site Access, and COVID-19 Incidence Rate in Mas-  
373 sachusetts, USA. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **17**, 9528  
374 (2020). URL <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/17/24/9528>. Number: 24 Pub-  
375 lisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
- 376 [33] Paul, P. *et al.* Genomic Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 Variants Circulating in the United States,  
377 December 2020–May 2021. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* **70**, 846–850 (2021). URL  
378 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8191868/>.
- 379 [34] Collie, S., Champion, J., Moultrie, H., Bekker, L.-G. & Gray, G. Effectiveness of BNT162b2  
380 Vaccine against Omicron Variant in South Africa. *New England Journal of Medicine* **0**, null  
381 (2021). URL <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2119270>. Publisher: Massachusetts  
382 Medical Society \_eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2119270>.