

1 **Using publicly available data to identify priority communities for a SARS-CoV-2 testing**
2 **intervention in a southern U.S. state**

3

4 Lynn T Matthews ^{1*}, Dustin M Long ², Madeline C Pratt ¹, Ya Yuan ², Sonya L Heath ¹, Emily B
5 Levitan ³, Sydney Grooms ⁴, Thomas Creger ⁴, Aadia Rana ¹, Michael J Mugavero ^{1,4^}, Suzanne
6 E Judd ⁵, on behalf of the COVID COMET RADXUP Team [^]

7

- 8 1. Division of Infectious Disease, Department of Medicine, Heersink School of Medicine,
9 University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama, USA
- 10 2. Department of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, University of Alabama at
11 Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama, USA
- 12 3. Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Alabama at
13 Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama, USA
- 14 4. Center for AIDS Research, Heersink School of Medicine, University of Alabama at
15 Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama, USA
- 16 5. Center for the Study of Community Health, School of Public Health, University of
17 Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama, USA

18

19 * Corresponding Author:

20 Email: lynnmatthews@uabmc.edu (LTM)

21 [^] Michael Mugavero (mmugavero@uabmc.edu) is the lead author for the COVID COMET
22 RADXUP Team. Membership of the COVID COMET RADXUP Team is provided in the
23 Acknowledgements.

24

25 **Funding**

26 NIH RADx-Up initiative, UAB Center for AIDS Research, COVID COMET AL, Project

27 #P30AI027767-32S1 (PI Michael Saag)

28 The funder provided support in the form of salaries for authors [LTM, DML, YY, SH, EBL, TC,

29 MJM, and SEJ], but did not have any additional role in the study design, data collection and

30 analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. The specific roles of these authors

31 are articulated in the ‘author contributions’ section

32

33 **Contributions**

34 LTM led design, analysis, interpretation, and manuscript drafting and writing. DML contributed

35 to the analysis and interpretation. MCP was involved in project management and manuscript

36 writing. YY contributed to the analysis. SH provided scientific and analysis input. EBL provided

37 epidemiological input and contributed to the design and interpretation. SG was involved in

38 project management and manuscript writing. TC was involved in overall project management.

39 AR was involved in community partner oversight. MJM is the study’s principal investigator. SEJ

40 was involved in the design, interpretation, and manuscript writing.

41 **Abstract**

42 Background: The U.S. Southeast has a high burden of SARS-CoV-2 infections and COVID-19
43 disease. We used public data sources and community engagement to prioritize county selections
44 for a precision population health intervention to promote a SARS-CoV-2 testing intervention in
45 rural Alabama during October 2020 and March 2021.

46 Methods: We modeled factors associated with county-level SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity using
47 covariates thought to associate with SARS-CoV-2 acquisition risk, disease severity, and risk
48 mitigation practices. Descriptive epidemiologic data were presented to scientific and community
49 advisory boards to prioritize counties for a testing intervention.

50 Results: In October 2020, SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity was not associated with any modeled
51 factors. In March 2021, premature death rate (aRR 1.16, 95% CI 1.07, 1.25), percent Black
52 residents (aRR 1.00, 95% CI 1.00, 1.01), preventable hospitalizations (aRR 1.03, 95% CI 1.00,
53 1.06), and proportion of smokers (aRR 0.231, 95% CI 0.10, 0.55) were associated with average
54 SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity. We then ranked counties based on percent positivity, case
55 fatality, case rates, and number of testing sites using individual variables and factor scores. Top
56 ranking counties identified through factor analysis and univariate associations were provided to
57 community partners who considered ongoing efforts and strength of community partnerships to
58 promote testing to inform intervention.

59 Conclusions: The dynamic nature of SARS-CoV-2 proved challenging for a modelling approach
60 to inform a precision population health intervention at the county level. Epidemiological data
61 allowed for engagement of community stakeholders implementing testing. As data sources and
62 analytic capacities expand, engaging communities in data interpretation is vital to address diseases
63 locally.

64 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19 testing; population health; epidemiology; community
65 engagement

66 **Introduction**

67 From the outset of the global pandemic, the burden of COVID-19 disease has been dynamic
68 across person, time, and space. In the months of the U.S. pandemic prior to vaccine availability,
69 SARS-CoV-2 testing demand outweighed supply[1]. Further, those most vulnerable to COVID-
70 19 disease were not the most likely to be tested, and states with larger numbers of people living in
71 poverty and with poorer infrastructure for public health and workers' rights struggled to roll out
72 testing and contact tracing [2].

73 Alabama is one of the lowest ranked states in many health metrics compared to the rest of
74 the U.S. [3]. Social determinants of health (SDH) including socioeconomic status, educational
75 attainment, racial discrimination, and restrictive governmental policies underlie these poor
76 outcomes [4], with rural regions and Black communities disproportionately impacted [5-7].
77 Statewide geographic, socioeconomic, and racial disparities are reflected in how Alabama
78 experiences the COVID-19 pandemic. In mid-July 2021, prior to the start of the SARS-CoV-
79 2 delta strain surge, an estimated 11% of Alabama's nearly five million people had tested for
80 SARS-CoV-2, with approximately 4,500 tests conducted daily, or 148 per 100,000 people. The
81 case rate per 100,000 in some rural counties was nearly triple the rate of metropolitan areas such
82 as Mobile and Birmingham, with SARS-CoV-2 testing percent positivity approaching 20% in a
83 majority of rural counties in July. While 27% of Alabama's population is Black, nearly 45% of
84 the state's lab-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases and deaths are among Black people [8, 9].
85 Grounded in a legacy of slavery manifested in institutionalized racism [10], contemporary barriers
86 to health include social and structural factors that heighten risk for COVID-19 disease among
87 Black communities, particularly those in rural areas [11].

88 In Alabama and similar settings, there is a need to optimize benefits of testing without
89 exacerbating stigma and marginalization in underserved communities in order to control disease
90 spread. We were funded to collaborate with academic institutions, local service organizations, and
91 community health workers to promote SARS-CoV-2 testing in underserved communities in
92 Alabama. We planned to use publicly available data on SARS-CoV-2, including risk mitigation
93 practices and vulnerability to SARS-CoV-2 infection, to identify rural counties that would benefit
94 most from community-based testing interventions.

95 Here we describe how we used public data sources to explore strategies for identifying
96 communities most at need for SARS-CoV-2 testing in two waves of selection during October 2020
97 and March 2021. We present our considerations and how our approach evolved with the pandemic,
98 and lessons learned regarding the limitations of percent positivity in a state with inconsistent
99 testing uptake to inform future work in other more rural settings with poorer public health
100 infrastructure and healthcare.

101

102 **Methods**

103 **Setting**

104 The Alabama Department of Public Health announced the first SARS-CoV-2 positive test
105 result on March 13, 2020 [12]. As of September 7, 2021, nearly 18 months later, there have been
106 a total of 727,360 cases and 12,420 deaths in Alabama [13] and about 39% of the population is
107 vaccinated (2 doses) [13, 14]. Alabama's population is approximately 69% White, 27% Black,
108 with 86% high school graduates, and approximately 16% live in poverty [15].
109 For reference, the U.S. census estimates that the nation's population is approximately 76%
110 White, 14% Black, with 89% high school graduates, and approximately 12% live in poverty [16].

111 **SARS-CoV-2 testing data**

112 Data were downloaded periodically (approximately quarterly) from publicly available
113 websites that collated and created visual representations of data reported by the Alabama
114 Department of Public Health (ADPH). For the October 2020 county testing selections, data were
115 downloaded from bamatracker.com[17], a website that collated and displayed data from ADPH
116 through May 2021. In the March 2021 round of selections, data were downloaded from
117 bamatracker.com[13] as well as the New York Times website[18].

118 **Summary models reviewed**

119 We reviewed existing models summarizing, modeling, and predicting patterns in SARS-
120 CoV-2 testing data provided by Johns Hopkins University[19], University of Washington
121 (Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, IHME)[20], and the Pandemic Vulnerability Index
122 (PVI) from National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences [21]. We reviewed the COVID
123 Health Equity interactive dashboard summarized by Emory University[22]. None of these were
124 able to distinguish testing intervention need in Alabama at the county level as the entire state was
125 in highest risk category for COVID-19 disease with widespread need for increased SARS-CoV-2
126 testing in both rounds of selections. However, elements of data sources used in these models and
127 collated on their websites were incorporated as described in model covariates below.

128 **Model building using local data**

129 **Outcome**

130 Percent positivity, or the number of positive tests per 100 tests performed, has been
131 widely used as a measure of SARS-CoV-2 disease burden since the beginning of the pandemic,
132 providing insights into transmission within specific geographic areas[23]. The CDC recommends

133 percent positivity as a measure of disease surveillance for public health decision-making[23]. We
134 modeled factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity with the goal to identify factors
135 associated with higher percent positivity to inform intervention county selections. At the time of
136 these selections, most Alabama counties reported high percent positivity rates and were
137 uniformly identified as highest risk by the available models. We therefore intended to identify
138 factors that drove that risk and focus selections on counties based on the distributions of factors
139 associated with higher SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity. Our models differed slightly with the
140 evolution in the pandemic, knowledge of SARS-CoV-2 risk factors, and features of the ADPH
141 testing data between October 2020 and March 2021.

142 **October 2020**

143 We used linear regression models with dispersion with the primary outcome of average
144 14-day SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity summarized at the county level from October 2 –
145 October 16, 2020. Model covariates included factors associated with risk of acquiring SARS-
146 CoV-2 (Daytime Population Density [21, 24], SVI Housing Score [4, 21], % Below Poverty Line
147 [24, 25], % Unemployed [24], % Black [21], % High School graduates [24, 25], % Limited
148 English [24, 25], COVID Testing Sites [13], increased risk of COVID-19 disease severity (Air
149 pollution [21, 26], Premature Death [24], % Smoking [21, 27], % Over 65 [21], % Obese [21,
150 27], % Diabetic [21, 28], mortality due to influenza and/or pneumonia [25, 29, 30], Number
151 Preventable Hospitalization [25, 31, 32], COPD Prevalence [33], Heart Disease Prevalence [33]),
152 and factors associated with mitigation behavior (% Republican voters [34]).

153 **March 2021**

154 We used negative binomial regression modeling with dispersion to evaluate factors
155 associated with average 7-day SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity at the county level from

156 06/17/2020 -3/31/2021. Between October and March, we learned that for some months, the 14-
157 day percent positivity result produced in the state data eliminated all individuals with prior
158 SARS-CoV-2 testing data from the denominator, thus inflating the 14-day percent positivity.
159 This did not occur with the 7-day summary value. Model covariates included factors associated
160 with increased risk of acquiring SARS-CoV-2, increased risk of COVID-19 disease severity, and
161 factors associated with less risk mitigation behavior as above.

162 **Alternative Approach Using Descriptive Epidemiology**

163 In October 2020, we summarized past 14-day average SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity,
164 14-day case fatality, and 14-day cases/100k population. We also included a cross sectional
165 description of the number of testing sites per county based on collated data provided by ADPH.
166 We described the counties in the top quartile for percent positivity, case fatality, and case rates
167 and below the median for number of testing sites. We also conducted a factor analysis including
168 3-month percent SARS-CoV-2 positivity, SARS-CoV-2 case fatality rate, COVID-testing sites
169 per 100k population. One factor explained 41% of the variability and was used to provide an
170 additional ranking of counties for selection.

171 In March 2021, we summarized first quarter 2021 (01/01/2021-03/31/2021) 90-day
172 average case fatality, case rate, and overall mortality rate by county. We identified the counties in
173 the top quartile for percent positivity, case fatality, case rates, and mortality.

174 In both rounds of selections, we also described race[24, 25], poverty[24, 25], and
175 rurality[21, 24] to inform selections. In the March 2021 selections, we also described vaccine
176 uptake, reported by ADPH.

177 **Preliminary county selections**

178 For both the October 2020 and March 2021 selections, the counties with the greatest COVID-19
 179 burden as described above were shared with our Scientific and Community Advisory Boards to
 180 further hone selections and avoid overlapping outreach with other efforts (e.g., ADPH focus
 181 areas, other RADX-Up projects in the region) and to prioritize counties in need with known
 182 partners to promote community outreach efforts. Final selections were made by the Scientific
 183 and Community Advisory Boards in collaboration with the scientific leadership for this project.
 184

185 Results

186 In October 2020, we modeled the predictors of past 14-day percent SARS-CoV-2 positivity
 187 and most recent county-level estimates for clinical factors, social determinants of health, and other
 188 measures of behavioral risk mitigation strategies we expected to inform testing and case rates. No
 189 covariates were significantly associated with county level percent positivity (Table 1).

Table 1. Model outputs for SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity at two timepoints in Alabama’s 67 counties.

Variable at county level	Unit Change	October 2020		March 2021	
		Rate Ratio (95% CI)	P-value	Rate Ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Daytime Population Density [21, 24]	10 persons	0.999 (0.99, 1.01)	0.7791	0.998 (0.99, 1.01)	0.721
Air pollution [21, 26]	0.5 fine particulate matter per cubic meter	0.976 (0.89, 1.06)	0.5835	0.985 (0.9, 1.08)	0.7394
Premature Death [24]	1000 deaths	1.027 (0.96, 1.1)	0.457	1.157 (1.07, 1.25)	0.0001
% Black [21] (per 10% change)	10%	1.048 (0.87, 1.26)	0.6195	1.003 (1, 1.01)	0.0025
SVI Housing Score [4, 21]	0.1 per 0.1 unit change in score	0.987 (0.95, 1.02)	0.4712	1.008 (0.97, 1.05)	0.6968
% Smoking [21, 27]	10%	0.744 (0.33, 1.69)	0.4815	0.231 (0.1, 0.55)	0.0009
% Over 65 [21]	10%	0.657	0.3337	1.254	0.6152

		(0.28, 1.54)		(0.52, 3.03)	
% Obese [21, 27]	5%	1.031 (0.91, 1.17)	0.6431	0.937 (0.8, 1.09)	0.4019
% Diabetic [21, 28]	5%	0.954 (0.82, 1.11)	0.5283	0.923 (0.79, 1.08)	0.3181
% High School graduates [24, 25]	10%	0.813 (0.64, 1.03)	0.0845	0.972 (0.76, 1.25)	0.8231
% Limited English [24, 25]	10%	1.285 (0.73, 2.26)	0.3866	1.358 (0.73, 2.53)	0.3359
% Below Poverty Line [24, 25]	10%	0.94 (0.66, 1.34)	0.7342	1.117 (0.75, 1.66)	0.5851
% Unemployed [24]	10%	1.151 (0.48, 2.78)	0.7544	0.911 (0.34, 2.42)	0.8517
% Republican voters [34]	10%	1.081 (0.9, 1.3)	0.4111	1.227 (0.98, 1.54)	0.0801
# Influenza, Pneumonia deaths [25, 29, 30]	5	0.971 (0.94, 1)	0.059	1.016 (0.98, 1.05)	0.3326
Number Preventable Hospitalization [25, 31, 32]	500 hospitalizations	1.016 (0.99, 1.04)	0.1901	1.029 (1, 1.06)	0.0343
COPD Prevalence [33]	1%	1.433 (0.97, 2.11)	0.0686	1.419 (0.93, 2.17)	0.1052
Heart Disease Prevalence [33]	1%	0.805 (0.5, 1.3)	0.374	0.725 (0.43, 1.21)	0.2196
COVID Testing Sites [13]	1 site	0.999 (0.98, 1.01)	0.9116	1 (0.98, 1.02)	0.9732

190

191 In March 2021, we modeled predictors of average 7-day case positivity from 6/18/2020 –
 192 3/31/2021 using similar covariates (Table 1). In this adjusted model, premature death rate was
 193 associated with 16% higher SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity (aRR 1.16, 95% CI 1.07, 1.25) per
 194 1,000 deaths, 10% greater proportion of county residents identifying as Black was associated
 195 with a <1% higher in SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity (aRR 1.003, 95% CI 1.00, 1.01), and
 196 number of preventable hospitalizations was associated with a slightly higher in SARS-CoV-2
 197 percent positivity (aRR 1.03, 95% CI 1.00, 1.06) per 500 hospitalizations). A 10% higher
 198 proportion of the county population identifying as smokers was associated with a 77% lower
 199 percent positivity (aRR 0.231, 95% CI 0.10, 0.55).

200 Given the limited predictive power of the existing models and the models we built to
201 identify counties with the greatest need, our county selections were determined based on
202 descriptive epidemiology and input from scientific and community advisory boards. We
203 described the counties in the top quartile for percent positivity, case fatality and case rates and
204 below the median for number of testing sites and organized counties based on the number of
205 parameters for which they were in the top quarter of the 67 counties in the state (Table 2). Table
206 3 demonstrates the October 2020 summary of past 14-day SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity, 14-
207 day case fatality, and 14-day cases/100k population. We included a cross sectional description
208 of the number of testing sites per county based on collated data provided by ADPH.

Table 2. Descriptive epidemiology used to inform October 2020 county level selections for a SARS-CoV-2 testing intervention in Alabama

County	Testing sites/100k	3M % Positivity	3M # cases/100k	14D % pos	14D # Cases/100k	Case fatality	% AA	% Hispanic	Population	% poverty	Preventable Hospitalizations Rate per 100K	Ranking by marker of HC system quality (1=highest)
Franklin	3.2	18.49	6431.14	26.50	436.82	1.63	3.88	16.9	31363	14.80	7810	5
Clarke	4.2	13.51	5321.91	17.81	510.03	1.41	44.33	0.2	23920	18.40	5857	30
Clay	7.5	20.33	5438.79	27.00	610.17	1.99	13.83	3.1	13275	14.80	5644	35
Lawrence	3.0	16.96	2460.78	22.85	379.28	4.04	10.83	2.1	32957	13.40	6598	14
Dallas	7.8	10.37	4855.13	10.09	120.07	1.67	70.06	1	38310	24.80	6574	16
Conecuh	16.3	14.99	4528.79	13.08	114.03	2.77	45.66	0.8	12277	17.40	11309	2
Russell	3.5	12.97	3296.93	12.89	169.61	0.17	44.76	5.4	57781	15.40	4027	63
Montgomery	5.3	13.09	4349.69	16.96	265.32	2.09	58.55	3.4	225763	16.30	5809	32
Lowndes	10.0	14.71	7038.3	26.40	330.86	3.77	71.94	0.7	9974	23.40	5337	43
DeKalb	8.4	16.05	4558.38	31.42	745.25	0.88	1.45	14.4	71385	17.00	5204	45
Washington	6.1	13.03	3803.88	19.12	317.50	2.12	23.33	1.1	16378	16.30	4939	49
Limestone	3.1	14.05	2844.84	26.25	421.11	1.02	13.49	5.9	96174	10.20	5951	27
Chilton	9.1	17.20	4135.62	17.17	332.93	1.71	9.97	7.8	44153	15.30	3791	66
Morgan	2.5	12.63	3358.83	21.72	389.62	0.84	12.66	8.1	119089	12.50	5862	29
Randolph	4.4	15.39	3542.35	26.27	409.24	1.81	19.36	2.9	22725	14.30	4215	61
Lamar	7.2	13.52	3315.52	25.73	382.84	0.75	10.39	1.6	13844	15.20	5852	31
Marshall	4.2	13.12	4484.49	15.58	221.62	1.22	2.40	13.6	96109	16.20	5877	28

Darkest shaded counties met 4 of 4 criteria, next darkest met 3 of 4, lighter gray met 2 of 4. The criteria (columns in box) were top quartile for (1) case rate, (2) percent positivity, (3) case fatality, and (4) death rate.

Table 3. Top 10 counties based on Factor Analysis including case fatality rate, case positivity, SARS-CoV-2 testing sites per 100K population for the October 2020 selections

County	Factor Score	3-month SARS-CoV-2 % Positivity	Case fatality rate	SARS-CoV-2 Testing Sites per 100K population
Franklin	-1.80	18.49	1.63	3.19
Clay	-1.74	20.34	1.99	7.53
Russell	-1.37	12.97	0.17	3.46
DeKalb	-1.36	16.05	0.88	8.41
Limestone	-1.22	14.05	1.02	3.12
Chilton	-1.16	17.20	1.71	9.06
Morgan	-1.05	12.63	0.84	2.52
Randolph	-1.04	15.39	1.81	4.40
Lamar	-0.99	13.52	0.75	7.22
Marshall	-0.88	13.12	1.22	4.16


210

211 Factor scores provided a ranking of counties with respect to 3 months SARS-CoV-2
212 positivity, case fatality rate, and SARS-CoV-2 testing sites/100k population. The factor rankings
213 indicated in Table 3 can be interpreted as how much they differ from the average county on the
214 composite measure of SARS-CoV-2 test positivity, case fatality, and testing sites. For example,
215 Franklin County was estimated to be about 1.8 standard deviations worse compared to the
216 average. The factor analysis ranking is described in Table 3 and identified the top 10 counties
217 with the highest ranking based on the combined factor analysis.

218 Fig 1 indicates which counties were prioritized for the intervention when considering the
219 overlapping counties identified by the factor analysis and the descriptive epidemiology and with
220 consideration of strength of partnerships and other ongoing efforts to promote testing across the
221 state.

222

223 **Figure 1. Priority county selections**



224

225 Priority counties selected in both phases of the project based on the descriptive epidemiology and
 226 mapped by the service areas of our community partners (Area Health Education Centers, AHEC)
 227 who conducted the testing.

228 Given the ongoing lack of discrimination between counties in the models we again used
 229 descriptive epidemiology and input from scientific and community advisory boards for the March
 230 2021 selections. Table 4 demonstrates the March 2021 summaries of first quarter 2021
 231 (01/01/2021-03/31/2021) 90-day average case fatality, case rate, and overall mortality rate by
 232 county. We identified the counties in the top quartile for percent positivity, case fatality, case
 233 rates, and mortality. Fig 1 indicates the counties prioritized for the intervention when considering
 234 the descriptive epidemiology, strength of partnerships, and other ongoing efforts to promote testing
 235 across the state.

Table 4. Descriptive epidemiology used to inform March 2021 county level selections for a SARS-CoV2 testing intervention in Alabama

County	Case Fatality	Case Positivity	Case Rate	Death Rate	Rural	% AA	Population	% Poverty	% Hispanic	Preventable Hospitalizations Rate Per 100k	Rank by Preventable Hospitalizations
Fayette	14.93	51.99	43.35	0.29	6.1	11.85	16433	15.00	1.7	5503	39
Lowndes	10.93	37.42	47.09	0.25	10.0	71.94	9974	23.40	0.7	5337	43
Marengo	12.53	52.19	49.1	0.2	15.7	51.08	19066	13.10	0.6	6242	20
Marion	9.71	42.55	38.33	0.21	10.1	3.78	29763	13.10	2.5	7117	9
Bullock	3.07	43.06	42.27	0.2	9.9	69.54	10138	31.00	0.5	6767	11
Coosa	8.11	38.63	45.28	0.18	9.3	30.47	10715	8.70	0.5	4725	54
Etowah	9.10	29.31	39.2	0.27	9.8	15.48	102501	13.40	3.8	7165	8
Hale	7.51	52.74	56.1	0.3	13.6	57.80	14726	20.10	0.9	6807	10
Henry	4.88	37.38	41.75	0.22	11.6	25.83	17209	10.70	2.6	4305	58
Lawrence	8.04	40.04	30.51	0.19	3.0	10.83	32957	13.40	2.1	6598	14
Walker	9.63	39.06	31.74	0.25	7.8	6.06	63711	14.30	2.4	4301	59
Winston	10.32	36.05	37.2	0.2	8.5	0.79	23660	12.40	3.1	12415	1
Autauga	2.99	36.18	47.94	0.11	7.2	19.34	55601	12.00	2.8	6599	13
Chambers	12.15	27.6	38.37	0.18	11.9	39.57	33615	11.30	2.3	5511	37

Clarke	8.35	35.56	53.91	0.16	4.2	44.33	23920	18.40	0.2	5857	30
Coffee	9.38	29.85	39.88	0.16	7.7	17.19	51909	11.60	6.9	4614	56
Covington	10.82	27.72	35.37	0.21	5.4	12.44	36986	13.80	1.6	8193	3
Dallas	18.21	29.71	24.29	0.32	7.8	70.06	38310	24.80	1	6574	16
DeKalb	7.97	41.14	29.53	0.19	8.4	1.45	71385	17.00	14.4	5204	45
Geneva	10.72	32.45	33.38	0.23	11.4	9.31	26314	17.80	3.9	5629	36
Greene	4.02	41.77	33.09	0.19	12.1	79.61	8233	33.40	1.7	7559	7
Jefferson	3.75	41.53	38.19	0.14	4.9	43.13	659300	13.20	3.8	4236	60
Perry	3.39	46.56	34.71	0.22	32.8	67.53	9140	31.70	0.9	5789	33

Darkest shaded counties met 4 of 4 criteria, next darkest met 3 of 4, lighter gray met 2 of 4. The criteria (columns in box) were top quartile for (1) case rate, (2) percent positivity, (3) case fatality, and (4) death rate

236

237 Fig 1 highlights the priority counties selected in phase 1 in gray. This figure demonstrates
 238 how candidate counties (shades of green) were presented to the community and scientific advisory
 239 boards for the March 2021 selections, including data on the regions served by the service areas of
 240 our community partners (Area Health Education Centers, AHEC) who conducted the testing, in
 241 blue. For the March 2021 phase, the final decision was to intervene on regions rather than counties
 242 given widespread need and the nature of our community partnerships.

243

244 Discussion

245 Here we present our approach to pragmatic identification of rural counties in need of a
 246 SARS-CoV-2 testing intervention in a Southern U.S. state at the peak of the 2019-first quarter
 247 2021 phase of the U.S. SARS-CoV-2 epidemic. In order to select counties for rapid deployment
 248 of a testing intervention in a state with high testing need, we were tasked with quickly identifying
 249 priority counties using publicly-available data. Based on global and national guidance, we focused
 250 on SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity[17, 22]. As models evaluating factors associated with percent
 251 positivity did not discriminate counties for selection, we pivoted to analyses of descriptive
 252 epidemiological data to inform county selection. This approach allowed us to categorize counties

253 based upon the count of four severity criteria with four and 12 of Alabama’s 68 counties meeting
254 at least three of these criteria in October 2020 and March 2021, respectively. The presentation of
255 these data in tabular and geospatial fashion was easily interpreted by the community and scientific
256 advisory boards, and community testing implementation partners, with prioritization of counties
257 for testing further benefitting from an understanding of the local community context in identified
258 high-severity counties. Equipped with this information, as depicted in Fig 1, community testing
259 partners were able to prioritize rural counties for outreach and the identification of venues and
260 local partners for testing delivery [35]. As our data sources and analytic capacities expand in scope
261 and sophistication, leveraging traditional epidemiological data and analysis retains a vital role in
262 engaging communities to address communicable and non-communicable conditions in their local
263 context, particularly when response to emerging diseases when time for sophisticated analyses is
264 limited.

265 In October 2020, no factors were associated with percent positivity in our models. This
266 speaks to the fact that in these first waves of COVID-19 no population was immune, and testing
267 was roughly similar across the counties, so it is not surprising that specific factors driving
268 COVID transmission and positivity were not identified. In addition, more localized outbreaks
269 and “super-spreader” events were randomly distributed in time and geographic area and therefore
270 the time periods included in the models represent variable features of a dynamic epidemic. In
271 March 2021, factors associated with increases in percent positivity were county level rates of
272 premature death[24] and preventable hospitalizations[25, 31, 32]. In addition, having a higher
273 proportion of the population who identified as Black increased the likelihood of case positivity.
274 These associations may reflect that those in poorer resourced counties were at higher risk of
275 acquiring SARS-CoV-2 and also less likely to have access to or seek testing in the absence of

276 infection. In addition, an increase in the proportion of county residents who self-described as
277 smokers was associated with a decrease in the SARS-CoV-2 percent positivity. This may reflect
278 more screening on the part of smokers and those living with smokers who are at higher risk for
279 respiratory disease, in general, and possibly for SARS-CoV-2 complications [36-38]. However,
280 there are limits to this model given county level population-level associations which are broad
281 and subject to ecological fallacy. In both selection rounds, the models were not helpful in
282 informing key areas to focus outreach efforts and therefore, we pivoted to descriptive
283 epidemiology to identify areas most in need of testing with the assumption that the testing
284 intervention might improve testing, contact tracing and thus reduce disease spread, case fatality
285 and morbidity.

286 Identifying the appropriate metric to track in order to identify areas of testing demand
287 during a rapidly evolving pandemic proved to be challenging. Case positivity was originally
288 thought to be the best indicator of the next outbreak which would therefore inform aggressive
289 testing strategies[39]. This did not prove to be the case due to the often-asymptomatic nature of
290 SARS-CoV-2 and the overwhelming task of contract tracing in our strained public health setting
291 [40, 41]. In addition, (a) errors in reporting, (b) state and institutional guidance to not test if
292 household contact has tested positive at times when testing capacity was limited, (c) workers
293 unwilling to test and be forced to quarantine and lose pay, (d) poorer health resourced state
294 where people are anxious about potential test-related fees, (e) erratic approach to testing where
295 some institutions and organizations required weekly tests for workers, (f) variations in data with
296 large numbers of tests in Summer and Fall 2020 with push resumption of in-person university
297 activities in a state with over 300,000[42] university students[43] changed the meaning of case
298 positivity.

299 This team is led by HIV researchers who routinely wait years for public health data to be
300 cleaned and available, in part due to the sensitive nature of HIV testing and related data [44, 45].
301 The excitement of real-time data releases that are key to managing the COVID-19 pandemic was
302 tempered by frustrations when rapid data availability was associated with less reliable data. For
303 instance, Alabama datasets, like many other datasets, had noise related to large data dumps due
304 to institutions reporting testing data en masse (e.g. 2352 new cases reported on 3 March 2021
305 reflecting data from months prior) changing denominators, and, at times, incomplete data. Our
306 process highlights the need to proceed with caution and engage with community stakeholders
307 when using real-time, inherently messy data to inform public health interventions.

308 In recent years there has been a push for precision population health, leveraging big data
309 to identify those at greatest risk to optimize delivery of the right intervention, to the right
310 population, at the right time. Unlike diseases with more stable epidemiological and risk profiles,
311 the dynamic nature of SARS-CoV-2, over geography and time, proved challenging for a model-
312 based approach to inform precision population health tailored SARS-CoV-2 testing. A simplified
313 approach based upon descriptive epidemiological data proved informative while allowing for
314 meaningful engagement of essential community stakeholders and implementation partners
315 ultimately charged with implementing testing in their local communities. As data sources and
316 analytic capacities expand in scope and sophistication, leveraging traditional epidemiological
317 data and analysis retains a vital role in engaging communities and building trust in data in order
318 to optimally address communicable and non-communicable conditions in their local context.

319 **Limitations**

320 This is a methods paper to share lessons learned in selecting counties for a SARS-CoV-2
321 testing intervention but not an in-depth exploration of SARS-CoV-2 testing patterns and

322 epidemiology in Alabama. The findings are unlikely to generalize to all settings and will be
323 most applicable to other counties or states with strained public health systems in the U.S.
324 healthcare context. Details regarding our testing intervention and findings are published
325 elsewhere [35].

326

327 **Conclusions**

328 We present a pragmatic approach to inform an evolving, pandemic community-level
329 intervention. We also share lessons learned regarding the limits of test positivity in an outbreak
330 where testing uptake is poor and where case positivity rates generally exceeded a threshold level
331 to discern need in areas where nearly all counties had high need. Our current and future work
332 highlights the importance of community partnerships, local knowledge to inform testing outreach
333 and perhaps highlights the need for more centralized pandemic preparedness.

334

335 **Acknowledgements**

336 Community partners.

337 Larger RADxUP team:

338 Greer Burkholder, MD, MSPH ^{1,2,3}, Andrea Cherrington, MD, MPH ^{2,3}, William Curry, MD ²,
339 Latesha Elopore, MD, MSPH ^{1,2}, Faith Fletcher, PhD, MA ⁴, Eric Ford, PhD, MHHA ^{3,5}, Allyson
340 Hall, PhD ^{2,3,6}, Larry Hearld, PhD ^{2,6}, Bertha Hidalgo, PhD, MPH ^{1,2,3}, Dione King, PhD, MSW
341 ^{1,3,7}, Emily Levitan, PhD, MS ^{1,2,3}, Max Michael, MD ³, Trisha Parekh, DO ², Donna Porter, PhD
342 ^{1,2}, David Redden, PhD, MS ³, Michael Saag, MD ², Bisaka "Pia" Sen, PhD, MA ^{2,3,6}, Barbara
343 Van Der Pol, PhD, MPH ², Jeffery Walker, PhD, MA ^{3,7}

344 COVID COMET RADxUP Team Affiliations:

- 345 1. University of Alabama at Birmingham, Center for AIDS Research, School of
346 Medicine, Birmingham, Alabama, USA.
- 347 2. University of Alabama at Birmingham, School of Medicine, Birmingham, Alabama,
348 USA.
- 349 3. University of Alabama at Birmingham, School of Public Health, Birmingham,
350 Alabama, USA.
- 351 4. Baylor University, College of Medicine, Waco, Texas, USA.
- 352 5. University of Alabama at Birmingham, School of Business, Birmingham, Alabama,
353 USA.
- 354 6. University of Alabama at Birmingham, School of Health Professions, Birmingham,
355 Alabama, USA.
- 356 7. University of Alabama at Birmingham, College of Arts and Sciences, Birmingham,
357 Alabama, USA.

358

359 **Conflicts of Interest/Disclosures**

360 LT Matthews, Operational support from Gilead Sciences for unrelated projects.

361 E. Levitan. Research funding from Amgen, Inc. unrelated to this work. Personal fees for a
362 research project funded by Novartis, for work unrelated to this publication.

363 MJ Mugavero, grant support to UAB from Merck Foundation for unrelated project.

364 This is work supported by NIH: the funders had no role in the interpretation, analysis, or
365 communication of the findings.

366

367

368 **References**

369

370 1. Babiker A, Myers CW, Hill CE, Guarner J. SARS-CoV-2 Testing. *Am J Clin Pathol*.

371 2020;153(6):706-8. Epub 2020/04/01. doi: 10.1093/ajcp/aqaa052. PubMed PMID: 32227199;

372 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7184440.

373 2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Testing for COVID-19 2021. Available

374 from: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/testing.html>.

375 3. United Health Foundation. *America's Health Rankings: 2019 Annual Report*. 2021.

376 4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease

377 Registry. *CDC/ATSDR Social Vulnerability Index*. 2018.

378 5. Chi G, Shapley D, Yang TC, Wang D. Lost in the Black Belt South: health outcomes and

379 transportation infrastructure. *Environ Monit Assess*. 2019;191(Suppl 2):297. Epub 2019/06/30.

380 doi: 10.1007/s10661-019-7416-1. PubMed PMID: 31254079.

381 6. Rupp K, Riley GF. State medicaid eligibility and enrollment policies and rates of

382 medicaid participation among disabled supplemental social security income recipients. *Social*

383 *Security Bulletin*. 2016;76(17).

384 7. Streeter RA, Snyder JE, Kepley H, Stahl AL, Li T, Washko MM. The geographic

385 alignment of primary care Health Professional Shortage Areas with markers for social

386 determinants of health. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(4):e0231443. Epub 2020/04/25. doi:

387 10.1371/journal.pone.0231443. PubMed PMID: 32330143; PubMed Central PMCID:

388 PMC7182224.

389 8. Alabama's COVID-19 Data and Surveillance Dashboard. Alabama's Department of

390 Public Health Division of Infectious Diseases and Outbreaks.

- 391 2020:<https://alpublichealth.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/6d2771faa9da4a86a>
392 [509d82c8cf0f7](https://alpublichealth.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/6d2771faa9da4a86a509d82c8cf0f7).
- 393 9. World Health Organization. Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) technical guidance. 2020:
394 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance>
- 395 10. Jones CP. Levels of racism: a theoretic framework and a gardener's tale. Am J Public
396 Health. 2000;90(8):1212-5. Epub 2000/08/11. doi: 10.2105/ajph.90.8.1212. PubMed PMID:
397 10936998; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC1446334.
- 398 11. Poteat T, Millett GA, Nelson LE, Beyrer C. Understanding COVID-19 risks and
399 vulnerabilities among black communities in America: the lethal force of syndemics. Ann
400 Epidemiol. 2020;47:1-3. Epub 2020/05/19. doi: 10.1016/j.annepidem.2020.05.004. PubMed
401 PMID: 32419765; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7224650.
- 402 12. First Alabama resident confirmed as positive for COVID-19 [Internet]. Alabama Public
403 Health: Alabama Department of Public Health,; 2020; March 13, 2020. Available from:
404 <https://www.alabamapublichealth.gov/news/2020/03/13.html>
- 405 13. Alabama Public Health. Alabama's COVID-19 Dashboard Hub 2021 [cited 2021].
406 Available from:
407 [https://alpublichealth.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=d84846411471404c83](https://alpublichealth.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=d84846411471404c83313bfe7ab2a367)
408 [313bfe7ab2a367](https://alpublichealth.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=d84846411471404c83313bfe7ab2a367).
- 409 14. Edouard Mathieu. State-by-state data on COVID-19 vaccinations in the United States:
410 Our World in Data,; 2021 [cited 2021]. Available from: [https://ourworldindata.org/us-states-](https://ourworldindata.org/us-states-vaccinations)
411 [vaccinations](https://ourworldindata.org/us-states-vaccinations).
- 412 15. United States Census Bureau. QuickFacts: Alabama 2019 [cited 2021]. Available from:
413 <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/AL>.

- 414 16. U.S. Census Bureau. QuickFacts United States 2021 [6 October 2022]. Available from:
415 <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045221>.
- 416 17. Magic & Wires LLC. BAMATRACKER Alabama COVID-19 Tracking 2021. Available
417 from: <https://bamatracker.com/>.
- 418 18. The New York Times. Tracking Coronavirus in Alabama: Latest Map and Case Count
419 2021 [updated Daily]. Available from: [https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/us/alabama-](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/us/alabama-covid-cases.html)
420 [covid-cases.html](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/us/alabama-covid-cases.html).
- 421 19. Johns Hopkins University & Medicine. Coronavirus Resource Center 2021. Available
422 from: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/testing>.
- 423 20. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. COVID-19 Projections 2021. Available
424 from: <https://covid19.healthdata.org/global?view=cumulative-deaths&tab=trend>.
- 425 21. National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. COVID-19 Pandemic Vulnerability
426 Index (PVI) 2021. Available from: <https://covid19pvi.niehs.nih.gov/>.
- 427 22. Emory University. COVID-19 Health Equity Interactive Dashboard 2020. Available
428 from: <https://covid19.emory.edu/>.
- 429 23. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Calculating Percent Positivity 2021.
430 Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/calculating-percent-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/calculating-percent-positivity.html)
431 [positivity.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/calculating-percent-positivity.html).
- 432 24. U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey 2014-2018 ACS 5-year Estimates.
433 2019.
- 434 25. Surgo Ventures. COVID-19 Community Vulnerability Index 2021. Available from:
435 <https://precisionforcovid.org/ccvi>.

- 436 26. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Environmental Public Health
437 Tracking Network. National Environmental Public Health Tracking Network Data Explorer.
438 2014.
- 439 27. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Behavior Risk Factor Surveillance System
440 2017 Data. 2018.
- 441 28. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. U.S. Diabetes Surveillance System 2016.
442 2021.
- 443 29. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Wide-ranging OnLine Data for
444 Epidemiologic Research (WONDER). 2021.
- 445 30. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention NCHS. Pneumonia and Influenza Mortality
446 Surveillance from the National Center for Health Statistics Mortality Surveillance System. 2021.
- 447 31. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality USDoHaHS. Prevention Quality Indicators
448 (PQI) Composite Measures. 2020.
- 449 32. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Mapping Medicare Disparities Tool 2017
450 Data. 2021.
- 451 33. Forum One UoWPHI, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Burness,. County Health
452 Rankings and Roadmaps: Alabama 2020. 2021.
- 453 34. Alabama Secretary of State. Elections Data Downloads. 2021.
- 454 35. McCollum CG, Creger TN, Rana AI, Matthews LT, Baral SD, Burkholder GA, et al.
455 COVID Community-Engaged Testing in Alabama: Reaching Underserved Rural Populations
456 Through Collaboration. American Journal of Public Health. 2022;112(10):1399-403. doi:
457 10.2105/ajph.2022.306985. PubMed PMID: 35952331.

- 458 36. Zhao Q, Meng M, Kumar R, Wu Y, Huang J, Lian N, et al. The impact of COPD and
459 smoking history on the severity of COVID-19: A systemic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of*
460 *Medical Virology*. 2020;92(10):1915-21. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25889>.
- 461 37. Puebla Neira D, Watts A, Seashore J, Polychronopoulou E, Kuo YF, Sharma G. Smoking
462 and risk of COVID-19 hospitalization. *Respir Med*. 2021;182:106414. Epub 2021/04/30. doi:
463 10.1016/j.rmed.2021.106414. PubMed PMID: 33915414; PubMed Central PMCID:
464 PMCPMC8052507.
- 465 38. Paleiron N, Mayet A, Marbac V, Perisse A, Barazzutti H, Brocq FX, et al. Impact of
466 Tobacco Smoking on the Risk of COVID-19: A Large Scale Retrospective Cohort Study.
467 *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2021;23(8):1398-404. Epub 2021/01/10. doi: 10.1093/ntr/ntab004. PubMed
468 PMID: 33420786; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7953961.
- 469 39. Dowdy D, D'Souza G. COVID-19 Testing: Understanding the “Percent Positive”: Johns
470 Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health; 2020. Available from:
471 <https://publichealth.jhu.edu/2020/covid-19-testing-understanding-the-percent-positive>.
- 472 40. Pilny A, Huber CJ. An Egocentric Network Contact Tracing Experiment: Testing
473 Different Procedures to Elicit Contacts and Places. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(4).
474 Epub 2021/02/10. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18041466. PubMed PMID: 33557269; PubMed Central
475 PMCID: PMCPMC7916034.
- 476 41. Shelby T, Hennein R, Schenck C, Clark K, Meyer AJ, Goodwin J, et al. Implementation
477 of a volunteer contact tracing program for COVID-19 in the United States: A qualitative focus
478 group study. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(5):e0251033. Epub 2021/05/06. doi:
479 10.1371/journal.pone.0251033. PubMed PMID: 33951107; PubMed Central PMCID:

480 PMCPMC8099418 state's contact tracing program. This does not alter our adherence to PLOS
481 ONE policies on sharing data and materials.

482 42. National Center for Education Statistics. The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data
483 System: Total fall enrollment in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by state or
484 jurisdiction: Selected years, 1970 through 2019 2020.

485 43. University of Alabama. Report of the President's Advisory Committee: Plan for Return to
486 Full Operations 2020. Available from:

487 [https://pubs.ua.edu/uahealthinfo/return_plan_update/MobilePagedReplica.action?pm=1&folio=1](https://pubs.ua.edu/uahealthinfo/return_plan_update/MobilePagedReplica.action?pm=1&folio=1#pg1)
488 [#pg1](#).

489 44. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. HIV Surveillance Report, 2019. 2021 May
490 2021. Report No.

491 45. Alabama Department of Public Health. HIV Cases Among Persons Residing in Alabama
492 at Diagnosis by Public Health District and County. 2020.

493