

1 **Occupational determinants of COVID-19 cases and vaccination: an ecological analysis of**  
2 **counties in the United States as of December 2021**

3  
4 John S. Ji<sup>1\*</sup>, Yucheng Wang<sup>1</sup>, Dustin T. Duncan<sup>2</sup>,

5  
6 1. Vanke School of Public Health, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

7 2. Department of Epidemiology, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, New  
8 York City, New York

9  
10 **Corresponding author:**

11 John S. Ji, Vanke School of Public Health, Tsinghua University, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Mingli Building,

12 Beijing, 100083, China. Office: +86 512 5777 9988

13 Mobile: +1 617 858 0717

14 Email: johnji@tsinghua.edu.cn

15  
16 **Conflict of interest statement:** None declared.

17 **Financial disclosure:** No financial disclosures were reported by the authors of this paper.

18 **Funding:** no financial assistance was received in support of the study.

19 **Acknowledgements**

20 The investigators would like to acknowledge the Center for Systems Science and Engineering  
21 (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)  
22 for the public data used in this analysis.

23 **Runing Head Title:** Occupational determinants of COVID-19

24  
25

26 **Abstract**

27 **Objective**

28 We aim to study the relationship between occupation distribution within each county and  
29 COVID-19 cumulative incidence and vaccination rate in the United States.

30 **Methods**

31 We collected county-level data from January 22, 2020 up to December 25, 2021. We fit  
32 multivariate linear models to find the relationship of the percentage of people employed by 23  
33 main occupations.

34 **Results**

35 Counties with more health-related jobs, office support roles, community service, sales,  
36 production and material moving occupations had higher COVID-19 cumulative incidence.  
37 During the uptick of the “Delta” COVID variant (stratified period July 1-Dec 25), counties with  
38 more transportation occupations had significantly more COVID-19 cumulative incidence than  
39 before.

40 **Significance**

41 Understanding the association between occupations and COVID-19 cumulative incidence on an  
42 ecological level can provide information for precision public health strategies for prevention and  
43 protecting vulnerable workers.

44 **Keywords:** COVID-19; occupation; Vaccination; Ecological study; the delta variant

45

46 **Impact Statement**

47 We used data from US Census and COVID-19 data to explore the association between  
48 occupations and COVID-19 cumulative incidence and vaccination rate on an ecological level,  
49 which can provide information for precision public health strategies for prevention of spread of  
50 disease and protecting vulnerable workers.

51

## 52 **Introduction**

53 The Coronavirus Disease 19 (COVID-19) caused by the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome  
54 coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) has continued to spread. According to the Centers for Disease  
55 Control and Prevention (CDC), the total COVID-19 confirmed case number in the United States  
56 has reached 51,574,787 on December 23, 2021 (1). More COVID-19 cases were probably not  
57 captured due to limited testing availability (2). It has been postulated that social-economic status,  
58 ability to work remotely, and built environment are determinants of the infection rate (3, 4). Thus  
59 occupation becomes a risk factor for COVID-19. There is limited evidence on the spread of  
60 COVID-19 in different occupations among the general US population. Several research papers  
61 have shown that healthcare and other essential workers were more likely to be infected by  
62 SARS-CoV-2, but the risk of different non-essential workers in the general US population  
63 getting COVID-19 remains unknown (5-7). People in different occupations certainly face  
64 different levels of risk of COVID-19, depending on the workplace settings, frequency of  
65 interaction with others, ventilation environment, mask-use precautionary measures, and the  
66 ability to shelter-in-place when the local government issues such policy (8, 9). Different shelter-  
67 in-place regulations in different states or counties may cause the geographic variation in COVID-  
68 19 infection, mediated by occupational distribution.

69  
70 Simultaneously, for the COVID-19 vaccine rollout, some occupations, such as healthcare  
71 practitioners and other frontline essential workers, rank high on the list of vaccination priorities  
72 (10). Vaccine eligibility has expanded to everyone aged 5 and older in the US. Nevertheless, the  
73 difference in COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy has been observed in the general population and  
74 specific occupation groups, for example, health care personnel (11-13). Therefore, there can be a

75 disparity in vaccination rates among different occupations. Meanwhile, the disparity in  
76 vaccination exists among different counties. As of December 23, 2021, 39% of the counties  
77 whose percent of total population with at least one dose is below 50% and only 15% of the  
78 counties above 70% (14).

79  
80 Since July 3, 2021, the Delta variant of SARS-CoV-2 has been estimated to be the predominant  
81 lineage in the US (15). The Delta variant is more contagious and it is postulated that the Delta  
82 variant might cause more severe illness than previous variants in the unvaccinated (16).

83 According the CDC, from July 3 to December 11, 2021, the proportion of new cases attributed  
84 to the Delta variant is predicted to rise from 51.7% to 99% and remains the predominant variant.

85 (15, 17) Therefore, we assumed that the COVID-19 cases were mainly driven by the Delta  
86 variant from July 1 to December 25, 2021 and we did a stratified analysis to see the differential  
87 effects of occupational variables during the spread of the Delta variant. Upon the emergence of  
88 the Omicron variant, retrospective analysis on the Delta variant is still crucial to the comparison  
89 between the two variants and the prediction of the future spread of Omicron. The Omicron  
90 variant has been detected in most of the states of the US (18). Research has shown that increased  
91 risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection was associated with the emergence of the Omicron variant (19).  
92 Analyses on the occupational determinants of the spread of COVID-19 can be used to inform  
93 policy decisions of emerging variants.

94  
95 Utilizing the geographical variations in COVID-19 case rate and percentage vaccinated, we aim  
96 to assess the occupational determinants of COVID-19 infection and vaccination with an  
97 ecological analysis of county-level data in the United States accumulated from January 22, 2020

98 to December 25, 2021. We also evaluated whether our estimates for occupational determinants  
99 differed during the spread of the Delta variant from July 1 to December 25, 2021.

100

## 101 **Subjects and Methods**

### 102 **County-level COVID-19 Cases and Vaccination percentages**

103 We obtained the county-level confirmed cases accumulated from January 22, 2020 up to  
104 December 25 2021, from Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center data repository. The  
105 COVID-19 data repository is operated by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering  
106 (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University. To construct a US county-level dataset and display the  
107 cumulative COVID-19 confirmed cases on a daily basis, they aggregated data from the  
108 Department of Health of states, counties, and cities. We calculated COVID-19 cases per 100,000  
109 using county-level COVID-19 case number and county population from American Community  
110 Survey (ACS) 2019 5-year estimate. We collected data for 3194 counties across all 50 states and  
111 Puerto Rico. Some counties in Utah and Massachusetts were missing.

112 We collected the percentage of people who were fully vaccinated as of December 23, 2021 in  
113 3195 counties from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), with missing data in  
114 some counties in Massachusetts (Barnstable, Dukes, and Nantucket counties) and in Virginia.  
115 Data represents all vaccine partners, including jurisdictional partner clinics, retail pharmacies,  
116 long-term care facilities, dialysis centers, Federal Emergency Management Agency and Health  
117 Resources and Services Administration partner sites, and federal entity facilities. We used  
118 county-level COVID-19 cases per 100,000 and the percentage of people who were fully  
119 vaccinated as dependent variables.

120

## 121 **Occupational Data Ascertainment**

122 We collected the percentage of people employed by occupation using the American Community  
123 Survey (ACS) 2019 5-year estimate. ACS uses monthly samples to produce annually updated  
124 estimates for areas based on the decennial census. ACS questionnaires collected one job from  
125 respondents and categorized it into occupation classifications derived from the Standard  
126 Occupational Classification (SOC) manual: 2018.

127 Percentages of people employed by occupation in every county were estimated and we included  
128 the 23 broad occupational categories for analysis. We merged health diagnosing and treating  
129 practitioners and other technical occupations, health technologists and technicians, and  
130 healthcare support occupations into one single category as health-related occupations. Data for  
131 3220 counties were available and all the percentage occupations added up to 100% for every  
132 county.

133

## 134 **Covariates**

135 Demographic, socio-economic, environmental, and health-related variables were controlled in  
136 regression models. ACS 2019 5-year estimate provided county-level population, population  
137 density, age distribution, percentage of females, race distribution, percentage of crowded  
138 households, median household income, median housing value, percentage of high school  
139 graduates, and percentage of households with an internet subscription. We used data from the  
140 PLACES Project launched by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to control  
141 for the prevalence of smoking, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), diabetes, obesity,  
142 hypertension, and uninsured adults. We also added as a covariate percentage of taking  
143 hypertension control medication among those with high blood pressure. The Bureau of Labor

144 Statistics provided county-level unemployment rates. For environmental determinants, we used  
145 National Walkability Index from Environmental Protection Agency, Rural-Urban Continuum  
146 Codes of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, county-level long term PM2.5 level, the average  
147 daily highest temperature in summer and relative humidity in summer from an ecological  
148 analysis of air pollution and COVID-19 mortality (20). We excluded samples with missing  
149 covariates, and the final numbers of counties in our analysis on COVID-19 cases per 100,000  
150 and percentage vaccinated were 3050 and 3074, respectively.

151

## 152 **Statistical Analysis**

153 Table 1 shows all the data source we used for this paper. We described the distributions and  
154 ranges of all variables and used the Pearson correlation to see the association between each  
155 occupation percentage and other variables. We fit multivariate linear models for the regression  
156 analysis and a total of  $n=23*2*3=138$  models were used in our main analyses. We estimated the  
157 effects of every 10% increase in the percent of people employed by occupation by putting every  
158 occupational variable into the regression model separately. The outcomes were county-level  
159 COVID-19 cumulative incidence and percent of total population fully vaccinated. For every pair  
160 of the occupational variable and the outcome, three sets of covariates were added into the  
161 regression model stepwisely. Model 1 was adjusted for demographic variables (percentage aged  
162 0-14; percentage aged 15-24; percentage aged 25-34; percentage aged 35-44; percentage aged  
163 45-54; percentage aged 55-64; percentage female; percentage Hispanic; percentage black;  
164 percentage Asian; percentage of other races; quintile dummies for county population density;  
165 state fixed effects). Model 2 was adjusted for demographic and socio-economic variables  
166 (percentage of crowded households; percentage of high school graduates; percentage of



167 uninsured adults; percentage of households with internet subscription; unemployment rates;  
168 quintile dummies for median household income; quintile dummies for median housing value).  
169 Model 3 was additionally adjusted for health and environmental variables (prevalence of  
170 smoking, COPD, diabetes, obesity, and hypertension; percentage of taking hypertension control  
171 medication among those with high blood pressure; county-level PM2.5 level; long-term average  
172 daily highest temperature in summer and relative humidity in summer; county-level National  
173 Walkability Index; 8 dummies for Rural-Urban Continuum Codes).  
174 For the stratified analysis, we selected from July 1 to December 25 as the delta variant  
175 predominant period and calculated the COVID-19 cumulative incidence during this period by  
176 subtracting the accumulated case number of July 1, 2021 from the accumulated case number of  
177 December 25, 2021. For the stratified COVID-19 cumulative incidence, we used the same  
178 denominator of county population as above. We also fit the same multivariate linear models and  
179 adjusted the same covariates as above. We did all our analyses with SAS OnDemand for  
180 Academics.

181

## 182 **Results**

183 We analyzed 3050 counties in the USA in our analysis on COVID-19 cumulative incidence and  
184 3074 counties for COVID-19 vaccination rates. Means for most of these variables were close to  
185 their median except population density, median household income, and median housing value  
186 (Table 2). Therefore, these three variables were transformed into quintiles to put into the  
187 regression model (Table 3). In supplemental Table 1, we calculated the Pearson correlation  
188 between each occupation percentage and other variables. The strongest coefficient effect  
189 estimate was 0.65, between business and financial operations occupation percentage and median

190 household income. Most of the Pearson coefficients were below 0.5, so it was acceptable for the  
191 linear regression model.

192

193 Office and administrative support roles, community-based work, production workers, sales  
194 occupations, material moving occupations and health professions were related to higher COVID  
195 cumulative incidence ( $p < 0.05$ ) (Figure 1). Many professionals such as computer programmers,  
196 managers, engineers, scientists, lawyers, agricultural and construction occupations were  
197 associated with fewer COVID infections ( $p < 0.05$ ). For example, every 10% increase in health-  
198 related occupations were associated with an increase of 1581.1 (95% CI: 1132.1, 2030.1) in  
199 COVID-19 cumulative incidence and every 10% increase in computer and mathematical  
200 occupations were associated with a decrease of -4539.2 (-5846.7, -3231.7) (Supplemental Table  
201 2). White-collar jobs, food preparation, and protective service occupations were associated with  
202 a higher percentage of fully vaccinated populations ( $p < 0.05$ ) (Figure 2 and Supplemental Table  
203 3). Counties with more blue-collar jobs and management occupations had a lower percentage  
204 fully vaccinated ( $p < 0.05$ ). Among the occupations with higher COVID-19 infections, community  
205 service, material moving, and production workers were associated with lower vaccination rates at  
206 the same time. In the stratified analysis covering the Delta variant period, counties with more  
207 transportation occupations became negatively associated with COVID-19 cumulative incidence  
208 ( $p < 0.05$ ) (Figure 3 and Supplemental Table 4).

209

## 210 **Discussion**

211 We identified the link between the distribution of occupations and the county COVID-19  
212 cumulative incidence and vaccination rate. Counties with more office supportive roles,

213 community service, health-related jobs, sales, material moving and production occupations had  
214 elevated rates of COVID-19 infection. During the stratified period (to analyze the delta variant),  
215 counties with more transportation occupations had higher COVID-19 cumulative incidence.  
216 Counties with more professionals such as computer programmers, managers, engineers,  
217 scientists, lawyers, and agricultural occupations had a lower rates of COVID-19 infection.  
218 Counties with more white-collar jobs, food preparation, and protective service occupations had a  
219 higher percentage fully vaccinated. Counties with more blue-collar jobs and management  
220 occupations had a lower percentage of those fully vaccinated.

221  
222 Some research studies have explored the occupational risk of COVID-19. A prospective cohort  
223 study conducted in the UK and the USA using data from the COVID Symptom Study  
224 smartphone application found that frontline healthcare workers were at increased risk of a  
225 positive COVID-19 test, which concurs with our findings (7). An analysis of UK Biobank data  
226 found that healthcare workers were associated with a higher risk of being tested for COVID-19  
227 but were not independently associated with the risk of testing positive conditionally on being  
228 tested (5). Another analysis of UK Biobank suggested that compared to non-essential workers,  
229 healthcare workers, social and education workers, and other essential workers had a higher risk  
230 of getting severe COVID-19 (6). Some observational and descriptive studies also found that in  
231 Asian healthcare workers, drivers and transport workers, services and sales workers, cleaning  
232 and domestic workers and public safety workers had more COVID-19 cases and in  
233 Massachusetts healthcare support and transportation and material moving occupations had higher  
234 mortality rate (21, 22). Using Occupational Information Network, other researchers estimated  
235 and modeled the COVID-19 risk of different occupations, suggesting that apart from health

236 related occupations, protective service occupations, office and administrative support  
237 occupations, education occupations, community and social services occupations, and  
238 construction and extraction occupations can also be exposed to COVID-19 (8, 9).

239  
240 The literature in COVID-19 vaccination has also been rapidly growing. Some research has  
241 explored the determinants of COVID-19 vaccination hesitancy. A systematic review on global  
242 COVID-19 vaccination acceptance found significant geographical and demographic differences  
243 in terms of vaccine hesitancy in the general population and the specific subgroups (23). Among  
244 health care personnel (HCP), a cross-sectional study concluded that although the majority of  
245 HCP were vaccinated, many ancillary workers are still hesitant, which could be risky according  
246 to our finding that both health-related and supportive occupations are facing a higher risk of  
247 COVID-19 infection (13). Another study on COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among health care  
248 workers found that vaccine hesitancy was highest among black and Hispanic or Latino health  
249 care workers (11). Some other researchers explored the optimal allocation of COVID-19  
250 vaccines. One paper determined the age-occupation groups with the top vaccine priority, such as  
251 emergency medical technicians and paramedics, nurses, bus drivers, and meat and fish  
252 processing workers (24). It is assumed that firefighters at the wildfire incidents were more  
253 susceptible to SARS-CoV-2 infection because of the close living and working conditions, limited  
254 hygiene supplies, arduous work and environmental exposure to wildfire smoke (25).

255  
256 Our findings show that apart from health-related occupations, the county-level percent of people  
257 employed in other occupations were also associated with an elevated rate of COVID-19 infection.  
258 Workers in supportive office roles, community services, sales, material moving and production

259 occupations have a close distance to colleagues or clients and have limited ability to work from  
260 home (3, 8). For example, assembly line workers are unlikely to work remotely by now, and they  
261 may have to work together in a confined working room. It is also suggested that counties with  
262 more community service, material moving and production workers experienced higher level of  
263 COVID-19 infection and lower percentage of total population fully vaccinated. Occupational  
264 Safety and Health Administration of the US have issued a rule that requires workers at large  
265 companies to be vaccinated against COVID-19 or undergo weekly testing, and we suggested that  
266 if more workers in occupations with higher risk of COVID-19 infection are fully vaccinated,  
267 COVID-19 infection at the workplace settings would be effectively curtailed (26).

268  
269 Counties with more professionals such as computer programmers, businesspersons, engineers,  
270 scientists, and lawyers were often associated with a higher percentage fully vaccinated. Several  
271 possible reasons could be able to explain. First, professionals in these occupations may have  
272 more access and perhaps a better understanding of COVID-19 information and vaccine  
273 effectiveness and side effects. Second, they may have a more flexible schedule that helps book  
274 vaccine appointments. They probably have better access to vaccine uptake as these professions  
275 may live in areas with lower commute time to medical resources. Finally, they usually have more  
276 income to buffer the potential financial loss due to vaccination, such as delay of work and side  
277 effects.

278  
279 Our study has several strengths. We have included various types of occupations, estimating the  
280 effects of 23 occupation variables. We have also explored the association between occupational  
281 distribution and vaccination at the ecological level, using data of thousands of counties in the

282 United States. Besides, different kinds of covariates including demographic, socio-economic,  
283 environmental, and health-related variables were adjusted in our regression models step by step,  
284 serving as control variables and sensitivity analysis. Our analysis of the delta variant impact is  
285 unique as no published studies have examined the association of COVID-19 infection caused by  
286 the delta variant with occupations.

287  
288 Limitations also exist in our analysis. First, this is an ecological study which cannot prove  
289 causality. Second, underestimation of COVID-19 incidences may be related to occupation  
290 classification. Occupations with lower average income may have a higher possibility of not  
291 getting tested for COVID-19. Governments and public health agencies in some poorest areas do  
292 not have enough resources to conduct testing and vaccinations. These areas may also have more  
293 employees in occupations with a higher risk of COVID-19. Third, the COVID-19 pandemic is  
294 still ongoing, with the delta variant threatened to cause more cases, especially in counties with  
295 low vaccination rates, which may underestimate the county-level accumulated cases. Fourth,  
296 some counties with missing vaccination rates possibly have a lower percentage fully vaccinated.  
297 Excluding these counties may underestimate the negative effect size of some occupations with  
298 less vaccination. We also did not control for physical distancing and other public health  
299 interventions, which protects against COVID-19 (27, 28). Counties with more high-risk  
300 occupations may also have relaxed public health policies and therefore, physical distancing and  
301 other public health interventions become a confounder. While we control for a wide range of  
302 confounding covariates, including other measures of socioeconomic status, residual confounding  
303 may be a concern. We attempted to control for mobility by including National Walkability Index  
304 as an environmental covariate. Besides, county-level covariates may perform poorly in adjusting

305 for confounders since COVID-19 spreads from person to person. Modifiable Areal Unit Problem  
306 (MAUP) may also exist in our ecological data. The timing of our data sources were not up-to-  
307 date and might be subject to bias caused by rapid changes of variables.

308

### 309 **Conclusion**

310 Our findings indicate that occupational determinants of health exists for COVID-19 infection and  
311 vaccine uptake. Our research is informative for targeted public health approach in dealing with  
312 the pandemic. The workplace setting plays a part in the spreading of COVID-19. People in  
313 different occupations are subject to different levels of COVID-19 infection and social-economic  
314 status, ability to work remotely, and the built environment of workplace contribute to the  
315 differential occupational risk. Therefore, it is important to promote vaccination in some  
316 occupations that are more susceptible to COVID-19 and track the occupation of people getting  
317 COVID-19 and vaccination to have a better understanding of the occupational determinants of  
318 COVID-19 infection and vaccine uptake.

319

320 Reference:

321

322 1. Centers for Disease Control Prevention. United states covid-19 cases, deaths, and  
323 laboratory testing (NAATs) by state, territory, and jurisdiction 2021 [Available from:  
324 [https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#cases\\_casesper100klast7days](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#cases_casesper100klast7days).

325 2. Wu SL, Mertens AN, Crider YS, Nguyen A, Pokpongkiat NN, Djajadi S, et al.  
326 Substantial underestimation of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the United States. *Nature*  
327 *Communications*. 2020;11(1):4507.

328 3. Dockery M, Bawa S. Working from Home in the COVID-19 Lockdown. *BCEC*.  
329 2020;19:1-5.

330 4. Kim B, Rundle AG, Goodwin ATS, Morrison CN, Branas CC, El-Sadr W, et al. COVID-  
331 19 testing, case, and death rates and spatial socio-demographics in New York City: An  
332 ecological analysis as of June 2020. *Health Place*. 2021;68:102539.

333 5. Chadeau-Hyam M, Bodinier B, Elliott J, Whitaker MD, Tzoulaki I, Vermeulen R, et al.  
334 Risk factors for positive and negative COVID-19 tests: a cautious and in-depth analysis of UK  
335 biobank data. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2020;49(5):1454-67.

336 6. Mutambudzi M, Niedzwiedz C, Macdonald EB, Leyland A, Mair F, Anderson J, et al.  
337 Occupation and risk of severe COVID-19: prospective cohort study of 120 075 UK Biobank  
338 participants. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 2021;78(5):307.

339 7. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, Joshi AD, Guo C-G, Ma W, et al. Risk of COVID-  
340 19 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study.  
341 *The Lancet Public Health*. 2020;5(9):e475-e83.

342 8. Baker MG, Peckham TK, Seixas NS. Estimating the burden of United States workers  
343 exposed to infection or disease: A key factor in containing risk of COVID-19 infection. *PLOS*  
344 *ONE*. 2020;15(4):e0232452.

345 9. Zhang M. Estimation of differential occupational risk of COVID-19 by comparing risk  
346 factors with case data by occupational group. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*.  
347 2021;64(1):39-47.

348 10. Centers for Disease Control Prevention. How CDC is making COVID-19 vaccine  
349 recommendations 2021 [Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-  
350 ncov/vaccines/recommendations-process.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/recommendations-process.html)].

351 11. Momplaisir FM, Kuter BJ, Ghadimi F, Browne S, Nkwihoreze H, Feemster KA, et al.  
352 Racial/Ethnic Differences in COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy Among Health Care Workers in 2  
353 Large Academic Hospitals. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(8):e2121931.

354 12. Salomoni MG, Di Valerio Z, Gabrielli E, Montalti M, Tedesco D, Guaraldi F, et al.  
355 Hesitant or Not Hesitant? A Systematic Review on Global COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance in  
356 Different Populations. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2021;9(8).

357 13. Shaw J, Hanley S, Stewart T, Salmon DA, Ortiz C, Trief PM, et al. Health Care  
358 Personnel (HCP) attitudes about COVID-19 vaccination after emergency use authorization. *Clin*  
359 *Infect Dis*. 2021.

360 14. Centers for Disease Control Prevention. COVID-19 Integrated County View 2021  
361 [Available from: [https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#county-  
362 view|Vaccinations|Series\\_Complete\\_Pop\\_Pct|all](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#county-view|Vaccinations|Series_Complete_Pop_Pct|all)].

363 15. Centers for Disease Control Prevention. A Needle Today Helps Keep COVID Away  
364 2021 [Interpretive Summary for July 9, 2021]. Available from:  
365 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/covidview/past-reports/07092021.html>.



- 366 16. Centers for Disease Control Prevention. Delta Variant: What We Know About the  
367 Science 2021 [updated Aug. 26, 2021. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-  
368 ncov/variants/delta-variant.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/variants/delta-variant.html).
- 369 17. Centers for Disease Control Prevention. Variant Proportions 2021 [Available from:  
370 <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#variant-proportions>.
- 371 18. Centers for Disease Control Prevention. Omicron Variant: What You Need to Know  
372 2021 [updated Dec. 18, 2021. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-  
373 ncov/variants/omicron-variant.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/variants/omicron-variant.html).
- 374 19. Pulliam JR, van Schalkwyk C, Govender N, von Gottberg A, Cohen C, Groome MJ, et al.  
375 Increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection associated with emergence of the Omicron variant in  
376 South Africa. *MedRxiv*. 2021.
- 377 20. Wu X, Nethery RC, Sabath MB, Braun D, Dominici F. Air pollution and COVID-19  
378 mortality in the United States: Strengths and limitations of an ecological regression analysis.  
379 *Science Advances*.6(45):eabd4049.
- 380 21. Hawkins D, Davis L, Kriebel D. COVID-19 deaths by occupation, Massachusetts, March  
381 1–July 31, 2020. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*. 2021;64(4):238-44.
- 382 22. Lan F-Y, Wei C-F, Hsu Y-T, Christiani DC, Kales SN. Work-related COVID-19  
383 transmission in six Asian countries/areas: A follow-up study. *PLOS ONE*. 2020;15(5):e0233588.
- 384 23. Salomoni MG, Di Valerio Z, Gabrielli E, Montalti M, Tedesco D, Guaraldi F, et al.  
385 Hesitant or Not Hesitant? A Systematic Review on Global COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance in  
386 Different Populations. *Vaccines*. 2021;9(8).
- 387 24. Babus A, Das S, Lee S. The Optimal Allocation of Covid-19 Vaccines. *medRxiv*.  
388 2020:2020.07.22.20160143.
- 389 25. Navarro KM, Clark KA, Hardt DJ, Reid CE, Lahm PW, Domitrovich JW, et al. Wildland  
390 firefighter exposure to smoke and COVID-19: A new risk on the fire line. *Science of The Total  
391 Environment*. 2021;760:144296.
- 392 26. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. COVID–19 Vaccination and Testing;  
393 Emergency Temporary Standard In: Department of Labor, editor. Washington, DC2021. p.  
394 68560.
- 395 27. Islam N, Sharp SJ, Chowell G, Shabnam S, Kawachi I, Lacey B, et al. Physical  
396 distancing interventions and incidence of coronavirus disease 2019: natural experiment in 149  
397 countries. *Bmj*. 2020;370:m2743.
- 398 28. Kwon S, Joshi AD, Lo CH, Drew DA, Nguyen LH, Guo CG, et al. Association of social  
399 distancing and face mask use with risk of COVID-19. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12(1):3737.
- 400

401 Tables and Figures

402 Table 1. Data source of all the analysis.


403 Table 2. Descriptive statistics of all continuous variables.

404 Table 3. Descriptive statistics of all categorical variables.


405 Figure 1. Estimate (95% CI) of association of all occupational variables with COVID-19  
406 cumulative incidence.

407 Figure 2. Estimate (95% CI) of association of all occupational variables with percentage fully  
408 vaccinated against COVID-19.


409 Figure 3. Estimate (95% CI) of association of all occupational variables with COVID-19  
410 cumulative incidence during July 1-Dec 7.



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.13.22274536>; this version posted January 14, 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 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.13.22274536>; this version posted January 14, 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 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.13.22274536>; this version posted January 14, 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 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

