

Association between PM2.5 air pollution, temperature, and sunlight during different infectious stages with the case fatality of COVID-19 in the United Kingdom: a modeling study

M. Pear Hossain^{1,2,3}, Wen Zhou^{4,5}, Marco Y. T. Leung⁶, and Hsiang-Yu Yuan^{1,7,*}

1. Department of Biomedical Sciences, Jockey Club College of Veterinary Medicine and Life Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

2. School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

3. Department of Statistics, Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Science and Technology University, Gopalganj, Bangladesh.

4. School of Energy and Environment, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

5. Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences & Institute of Atmospheric Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

6. School of Marine Sciences, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China

7. Centre for Applied One Health Research and Policy Advice, Jockey Club College of Veterinary Medicine and Life Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative Regions, China

*corresponding author.

Name: Hsiang-Yu Yuan

Email: sean.yuan@cityu.edu.hk

Postal address: 1A-311, 3/F, Block 1, To Yuen Building, 31 To Yuen Street, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

Abstract

1 Although the relationship between the environmental factors such as weather conditions and air
2 pollution and COVID-19 case fatality rate (CFR) has been found, the impacts of these factors to
3 which infected cases are exposed at different infectious stages (e.g., virus exposure time,
4 incubation period, and at or after symptom onset) are still unknown. Understanding this link can
5 help reduce mortality rates. During the first wave of COVID-19 in the United Kingdom (UK),
6 the CFR varied widely between and among the four countries of the UK, allowing such
7 differential impacts to be assessed.

8 We developed a generalized linear mixed-effect model combined with distributed lag nonlinear
9 models to estimate the odds ratio of the weather factors (i.e., temperature, sunlight, relative
10 humidity, and rainfall) and air pollution (i.e., ozone, NO_2 , SO_2 , CO , PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) using data
11 between March 26, 2020 and May 12, 2020 in the UK. After retrospectively time adjusted CFR
12 was estimated using back-projection technique, the stepwise model selection method was used to
13 choose the best model based on Akaike information criteria (AIC) and the closeness between the
14 predicted and observed values of CFR.

15 We found that the low temperature ($8-11^{\circ}C$), prolonged sunlight duration (11-13hours) and
16 increased $PM_{2.5}$ ($11-18 \mu g/m^3$) after the incubation period posed a greater risk of death
17 (measured by odds ratio (OR)) than the earlier infectious stages. The risk reached its maximum
18 level when the low temperature occurred one day after (OR = 1.76; 95% CI: 1.10-2.81),
19 prolonged sunlight duration 2-3 days after (OR = 1.50; 95% CI: 1.03-2.18) and increased $PM_{2.5}$
20 at the onset of symptom (OR = 1.72; 95% CI: 1.30-2.26). In contrast, prolonged sunlight duration
21 showed a protective effect during the incubation period or earlier.

22 After reopening, many COVID-19 cases will be identified after their symptoms appear. The
23 findings highlight the importance of designing different preventive measures against severe
24 illness or death considering the time before and after symptom onset.

25 **Keywords:** Case fatality rate; Air pollution; COVID-19; Weather condition.

26 **Introduction**

27 The emergence of COVID-19 has led to an unprecedented number of infections and deaths
28 worldwide. Certain environmental factors, such as weather conditions and air pollution, have
29 been shown to influence disease severity. Knowing the consequence of these factors to which
30 infected individuals are exposed at different infectious stages (e.g., virus exposure time,
31 incubation period, and at or after symptom onset) can potentially help to form guidance on
32 reducing the number of COVID-19 deaths. Unfortunately, the evidence of such differential
33 effects on case fatality rate (i.e., the probability of death after infection) remains largely
34 unknown.

35 Recent population studies have reported the association between COVID-19 deaths and weather
36 conditions, such as temperature and humidity (Benedetti et al. 2020; Ma et al. 2020; Wu et al.
37 2020b). A colder condition can increase the viability and survival of viruses during disease
38 transmission (for review, see (Mecenas et al. 2020)), leading to a higher viral load. The viral load
39 has been demonstrated to be associated with disease severity (Fajnzylber et al. 2020). Another
40 possible route to affect disease mortality by temperature and humidity is through modulating
41 immune responses. Studies have found that overreaction of immune responses, such as cytokine
42 storm, triggered by innate immunity, can lead to severe consequences after the infection.
43 Furthermore, the activity of macrophages, which drives innate immunity, has been shown to be
44 associated with temperature (Hardie et al. 1994; Hassan et al. 2020). This innate defense
45 mechanism generally began after the incubation period (Schultze and Aschenbrenner 2021).
46 Hence, exposure to environmental factors at or after symptom onset might contribute to such
47 dysregulated innate immunity.

48 In addition to temperature, sunlight exposure is another potential environmental risk factor for
49 COVID-19 deaths. Lower vitamin D levels were associated with an increased risk of infection
50 and its severity (Merzon et al. 2020; Panagiotou et al. 2020). Sunlight exposure aids in
51 synthesizing vitamin D, which is likely to reduce the severity of COVID-19 (Laird et al. 2020;
52 Martineau and Forouhi 2020). Presumably, the effect of sunlight has to occur in the early
53 infectious stages in order to influence immune response. However, no studies have shown at
54 which infectious stages, sunlight exposure is associated with COVID-19 mortality.

55 Exposure to ambient air pollution is also associated with the transmissibility, population
56 susceptibility, and severity of COVID-19 (Liang et al. 2020; Stieb et al. 2021; Woodby et al.
57 2021). The main components of air pollution are gases and particles such as carbon monoxide
58 (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), sulphur dioxide (SO_2), ozone (O_3), and particulate matter of size
59 $\leq 10 \mu m (PM_{10})$ and $\leq 2.5 \mu m (PM_{2.5})$, respectively. As a result, air pollution is considered as
60 the transport of viral particles in the air (Frontera et al. 2020; Martelletti and Martelletti 2020)
61 and within the respiratory tract. By worsening chronic respiratory diseases or modulating
62 immune responses, air pollution could increase the severity of COVID-19 (Bourdrel et al. 2021).
63 Therefore, it is important to understand the impact of air pollution on disease fatality when they
64 are exposed after the incubation period.

65 Worldwide, the United Kingdom (UK) has the second highest number of COVID-19 related
66 deaths as of May 31, 2020 (37,175 deaths) (Our World in Data 2021). After the initial spread of
67 COVID-19, a strict social distancing policy was implemented on March 26 in the UK constituent
68 countries, except Northern Ireland which two days later also adopted the same policy, to reduce
69 COVID-19 transmission. This lockdown was initially relaxed on May 13, 2020. Despite the
70 similar lockdowns, by the end of May, 2020, of its four constituent countries (England, Northern
71 Ireland, Scotland and Wales), the most significantly affected country was England.

72 This study aimed to identify risk factors among weather conditions and air pollution and quantify
73 the impacts of these factors at different stages of infections on the probability of death after
74 COVID-19 infection during the early spread in the UK. We developed a generalized linear
75 mixed-effect model with distributed lag nonlinear models (DLNM) to assess the risk of
76 environmental factors at the different stages. The results may help to inform recommendations of
77 preventive measures for reducing disease severity.

78

79 **Material and Methods**

80 **Epidemiological data**

81 We collected the daily reported cases and deaths from a publicly available source (GOV.UK
82 2021). To assess the impact of environmental factors on the severity of COVID-19, the study
83 period was defined as the time between March 26, 2020, and May 12, 2020, when the intensity
84 of non-pharmaceutical interventions was relatively stable and similar between different countries
85 in the UK (i.e., during the first lockdown period) (The Institute for Government 2020). Therefore,
86 the number of deaths was not largely affected by the changes in control measures.

87 **Environmental data**

88 Weather data were collected from the European Climate Assessment and Dataset (ECA&D)
89 project (Tank et al. 2002). The daily mean temperature was obtained from 120 UK
90 meteorological stations, while mean sunlight duration was available from 24 stations. The
91 temperature data had 1.1% values missing. To address these missing observations, we calculated
92 the average of the temperatures of the previous 7 days to replace the missing values. As relative
93 humidity data were not directly available from ECA&D at the time of data collection, we
94 collected dew point temperatures from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
95 (NOAA) (National Centers for Environmental Information 2020) to calculate relative humidity
96 following a previous method (McNoldy 2020). Air pollution data, such as CO , NO_2 , SO_2 , O_3 ,
97 PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, were collected from Air Information Resource in the Department for
98 Environment Food and Rural Affairs, UK (Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs
99 2021).

100 **Back-projection of COVID-19 deaths and estimation of instantaneous CFR**

101 In order to estimate the probability of newly confirmed infected cases who die later due to the
102 infections on a given day, instantaneous case fatality rate (iCFR) was used (Liang and Yuan
103 2022). One way to calculate iCFR is through a non-parametric back-projection approach to
104 retrospectively adjust the time of death cases (Becker et al. 1991). This reduces the possible bias
105 caused by different time points between reporting of cases and deaths when calculating the rate.

106 We assumed that COVID-19 transmission dynamics appeared in different disease status
107 including as exposed (E), symptom onset (I), cases confirmation (C) and deaths (D) (Figure 1A).

108 We assumed the time span between exposure and symptom onset to be $t_1 = 5.71$ days (referred
 109 as incubation period), and the time between symptom onset and case confirmation to be $t_2 =$
 110 4.03 days (referred as confirmation delay). Additionally, the duration between case confirmation
 111 and death (time to death) was taken to be $t_3 = 7.92$ days. These values were estimated in our
 112 recent study (Liang and Yuan 2022). Given the time to death follows a gamma distribution, with
 113 a mean of $t_3 = 7.92$ days, we retrospectively calculated the actual number of deaths, (D'), which
 114 were likely to be members of confirmed cases using an R function backprojNP (Meyer et al.
 115 2017). Finally, iCFR was calculated as a ratio of D' and C .

116 Model formulation

117 We used a generalized linear mixed-effect model (Gurka et al. 2012) with DLNM (Gasparrinia et
 118 al. 2010). We adjusted for the effects of relative humidity on the day of exposure to determine
 119 whether the iCFR was affected by it on the days when the indexed cases were exposed. We
 120 assumed the number of deaths, D' , follows a binomial distribution with a probability, π_t^k (the
 121 probability of death after infection), among confirmed cases C , i.e., $D'^k_t \sim \text{binomial}(C_t^k, \pi_t^k)$,
 122 where k indicates a particular location and t represents a day. The model was developed as
 123 follows

$$\log\left(\frac{\pi_t^k}{1 - \pi_t^k}\right) = \alpha + \alpha^k + \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{l=0}^L s_l(X_{t,l,i}^k; \beta_{l,i}) + \gamma H_{t-(t_1+t_2)}^k + \delta W_t + \varepsilon_t^k \quad (1)$$

124 where π_t^k represents the expected iCFR among newly confirmed cases on day t at location k
 125 ($k = 1, 2, 3$ or 4 ; representing the four countries of the UK), α is the overall intercept of the
 126 model and α^k is the region-specific random intercept. s_l represents a smooth function of the
 127 environmental predictor $X_{t,l,i}^k$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$; representing temperature, sunlight duration and $PM_{2.5}$)
 128 and l represents the lag days from the day of confirmation to the day of exposure. L is the
 129 maximum lag, which was defined as the sum of the incubation period and confirmation delay,
 130 i.e., $L = t_1 + t_2$. $H_{t-(t_1+t_2)}^k$ represents the relative humidity on the day of exposure at time t and
 131 location k . W_t represents the day of the week on a given day t which allows to adjust for weekly
 132 effect of COVID-19 testing whereby more test results are reported on specific days of the week
 133 (i.e., first day of the week or weekend). A random error term is represented by ε_t^k . See detailed
 134 descriptions in Supplementary Information.

135 To completely capture the overall impact of weather during the incubation period and
136 confirmation delay, we used a maximum lag of 10 days for temperature and air pollution. For
137 sunlight duration, the time between three days before virus exposure and confirmation was
138 considered under the assumption that vitamin D synthesis in individuals can happen before virus
139 exposure and affect the immune response thereafter. The odds ratio of death was calculated using
140 a reference value of each predictor. The linear effect of relative humidity was assessed on the
141 day of exposure because models using distributed lagged effects of relative humidity did not
142 show good fitting results based on Akaike information criterion (AIC).

143 **Model selection criteria**

144 To identify the best model (best-prediction model) among different combinations of predictors,
145 in a two-stage selection approach, AIC were used in the first stage to choose a set of candidate
146 models using a stepwise selection approach (details in supplementary materials). The models that
147 gave relatively lower AIC were considered the candidate models in the second stage. In the
148 second stage, we compared the model's output to the observed data. The model that produced the
149 lowest root means square errors (RMSE) was chosen as the best model.

150 **Sensitivity analysis for model validation**

151 The best model was further tested for sensitivity in terms of future prediction. We extended the
152 data until mid-September 2020 when the first alpha variant was detected (Higgins-Dunn 2020).
153 The data during the study period were trained in the model, and the data between May 13, 2020,
154 and September 15, 2020, were considered test data sets. Finally, we estimated the prediction
155 results of iCFR and compared them with the retrospectively time adjusted iCFR.

156 **Results**

157 To estimate the iCFR, we first retrospectively adjusted the daily number of reported deaths to
158 their possible confirmed data and divided this number by the daily number of confirmed cases.
159 The reported deaths were back-projected to the time of confirmation assuming that infected
160 individuals died 7.92 days on average after they were confirmed (see Methods).

161 We observed variations in both the iCFR and environmental predictors, such as weather and air
162 pollution, in the UK (Figure S1 and S2). The iCFR was highest at the beginning of the lockdown
163 in each of the UK's four countries, and the ratio gradually declined over time (Figure S1).
164 Among them, England showed a highest iCFR. Temperature, sunlight duration, and humidity
165 were low in England and Scotland at the start of the outbreak and declined later. Maximum
166 fluctuation in the concentration of $PM_{2.5}$ was found in England and Wales (Figure S2). The
167 detailed description of the variation of these factors and CFR was described in Supplementary
168 Information.

169 We compared seven models, from a baseline to more complicated models, including different
170 combinations of the weather and air pollution predictors (Table 1). The best model (Model 6),
171 including temperature, sunlight duration and $PM_{2.5}$, was selected after showing that the AIC was
172 low and the RMSE of the observed and the estimated values was the lowest than others (Table 2).
173 The model successfully captured the pattern of iCFR in each country (Figure S3).

174 **Differential risks of environmental factors**

175 We assessed the differential effects of temperature, sunlight duration and $PM_{2.5}$ during the
176 course of infection. Compared to the reference temperature of $12^{\circ}C$, low temperatures between
177 $8-11^{\circ}C$ after the incubation period were associated with a higher risk (measured by odds ratio) of
178 death (Figure 2A). A temperature of $9.5^{\circ}C$ at 7 days after the exposed to virus gave a maximum
179 OR of 1.76 (95% CI: 1.10-2.81). When temperatures were below $8^{\circ}C$, the death risk became
180 lower both during and after the incubation period. Whether infected cases changed their
181 behaviors, such as staying indoors more during those very cold days is unknown.

182 Furthermore, we found that the sunlight-fatality relationship was distinctly different before and
183 after the estimated symptom onset (i.e., during and after the incubation period) (Figure 2B). The
184 exposure to sunlight after the appearance of symptoms appeared to be more harmful. Prolonged

185 sunlight exposure (11-13h) about 2 days after symptom onset was associated with a greater risk
186 of death (OR = 1.50; 95% CI: 1.03-2.18). However, the prolonged exposure to sunlight, in
187 contrast, showed a beneficial effect during the incubation period or earlier.

188 $PM_{2.5}$ showed a significant impact around symptom onset, such that a higher $PM_{2.5}$ of 11-
189 $18\mu g/m^3$ was associated with a higher OR of death (Figure 2C). The maximum OR was
190 observed at symptom onset with a value of 1.72 (95% CI: 1.30-2.26) when $PM_{2.5}$ reached
191 $15\mu g/m^3$, compared with the reference ($PM_{2.5} = 10\mu g/m^3$). The OR of these factors at
192 specific infectious stages was described in the section *the effects of weather on the iCFR at*
193 *specific time points* in Supplementary Information (see Figure S4).

194 **Cumulative and marginal effects of environmental factors**

195 The cumulative effects of temperatures and $PM_{2.5}$ were estimated for the duration between virus
196 exposure and three days after symptom onset (or incubation period), whereas the cumulative
197 effects of sunlight duration were estimated from three days prior to the virus exposure to three
198 days after symptom onset (Figure 2D-F).

199 Overall, the cumulative effects (measured by log(OR)) of low temperatures (8-11°C) were
200 higher than zero but not statistically significant (Figure 2D). Sunlight durations of 6-8h were
201 significantly associated with a higher OR, while higher sunlight durations of >13h appear to be
202 protective (Figure 2E). The cumulative effects of low $PM_{2.5}$ ($7-10\mu g/m^3$) were significantly
203 low and the effects of high $PM_{2.5}$ ($10-18\mu g/m^3$) were substantially high (Figure 2F), suggesting
204 a positive relationship between iCFR and $PM_{2.5}$. While comparing the environmental predictors,
205 the cumulative effect of the $PM_{2.5}$ showed a larger variation than other predictors.

206 We further assessed the impacts on iCFR for one unit change in the predictor variables (Table 3).
207 The iCFR increased by 102% for each $\mu g/m^3$ rise in $PM_{2.5}$, whereas it decreased by 62% for
208 one $\mu g/m^3$ decrease. In contrast, the temperature and sunlight duration had an inverse effect on
209 the risk of death, i.e., with one unit increase in temperature and sunlight duration reducing the
210 risk of death by 8 and 69%, respectively. In comparison, a one-unit decline increases the risk by
211 51 and 98%.

212 **Model validation**

213 Finally, we validated Model 6 by predicting future iCFR between May 13, 2020 and September
214 15, 2020 (see Methods). The model was able to capture the trend among all countries. 81% of
215 observed data were successfully predicted within 95% confidence interval (Figure 3).

216

217 **Discussion**

218 Recent studies have shown that the mortality or CFR of COVID-19 was not only affected by the
219 virulence of SARS-CoV-2 but also by environmental conditions, such as weather and air
220 pollution (Benedetti et al. 2020; Liang et al. 2020; Ma et al. 2020; Wu et al. 2020b). However,
221 whether their impacts were same across different infectious stages was unknown. After using the
222 back-projection approach to obtain iCFR, we were able to provide evidence that lower
223 temperature and sunlight exposure after symptom onset and increased $PM_{2.5}$ around symptom
224 onset resulted in a higher risk of death. This study employed a distributed lag nonlinear model,
225 which enabled us to understand the lag effects of environmental variables to account for
226 individual infectious statuses of infected cases (e.g., exposure period, incubation period,
227 symptomatic period etc.). This finding suggests that different precautionary measures can be
228 taken before and after symptom onset.

229 The results suggest that a specific range of temperature (e.g., between 8-11°C) could increase the
230 risk of COVID-19 death when patients were exposed to them after the incubation period. One
231 possible reason is that exposure to cold temperature during these periods might deteriorate or
232 influence COVID-19 patients' immune responses (Liang and Yuan 2022; Schultze and
233 Aschenbrenner 2021).

234 Sunlight appeared to have an important role in mortality. It affects the production of vitamin D
235 (Haddad and Hahn 1973). Vitamin D deficiency results in impaired immune function, which can
236 increase the risk of infectious diseases, such as those caused by respiratory viruses (Hart et al.
237 2011). Recent studies showed that there are no significant differences in hospital mortality
238 between the vitamin D3 group and the placebo group (Leaf and Ginde 2021). A systemic review,
239 however, investigated seven out of nine studies indicated that the lack of vitamin D greatly
240 impacts the severity and death of COVID-19 (Yisak et al. 2021).

241 Prolonged exposure to sunlight has been found to inactivate SARS-CoV-2 (Chamary 2021;
242 Ratnesar-Shumate et al. 2020), resulting in a reduced risk of infection or disease severity.
243 However, whether prolonged exposure to sunlight may also suppress the proper functioning of
244 the immune system is unknown, especially after the incubation period (Maglio et al. 2016). Our
245 findings suggest the possible preventive effects of sunlight exposure on the disease severity of
246 COVID-19 during but not after the incubation period.

247 In the UK, studies have revealed associations between the air pollutant $PM_{2.5}$ and COVID-19
248 infection and mortality. For the existing COVID-19 cases, air pollutants, particularly $PM_{2.5}$, may
249 trigger airway inflammation. Ecological and individual-level investigation were conducted in the
250 context of an association between air pollution and COVID-19 severity and mortality (Liang et al.
251 2020; Mendy et al. 2021; Wu et al. 2020a) and observed that the frequency of illness and
252 fatalities rose significantly with the increment of the $PM_{2.5}$ (Meo et al. 2021; Travaglio et al.
253 2021).

254 ***Policy recommendations***

255 During the past few years, after close contacts of an infected case are identified, many of them
256 are quarantined until they are confirmed after testing, then immediately becoming home-isolated
257 or hospital-isolated if they are COVID-19 positive cases. There is still no clear guideline on how
258 to reduce disease severity after disease exposure besides clinical treatment. Certain
259 recommendations can be given based on our findings.

- 260 1) For COVID-19 patients after symptoms appear, adopting certain preventive measures by
261 maintaining the environment conditions (such as temperature, sunlight and $PM_{2.5}$) in
262 isolation facilities or at home may be effective in reducing the risk of severity.
- 263 2) Different preventive measures might need to be taken according to infectious stages. For
264 example, after symptoms appear, infected individuals can maintain the environment with
265 moderate or low sunlight. In contrast, during the incubation period, more sunlight shows
266 a higher protective effect.

267 ***Limitations***

268 Recently, many studies have been conducted on the association between ambient temperatures
269 and deaths where the inverse relationship was justified (Christophi et al. 2021; Liang and Yuan
270 2022; Wu et al. 2020b; Zhu et al. 2021). In contrast, at temperatures below $8^{\circ}C$, the risk of death
271 became low both before and after symptom onset. We were not able to exclude the possible
272 influences of behavioral changes in the population during a very cold time. In cold temperatures,
273 people usually stay more indoors and may be affected by the room temperatures rather than
274 ambient temperatures. Although our study did not incorporate indoor temperature, a previous
275 study suggested that indoor temperature was strongly correlated with outdoor temperature (Lee

276 and Lee 2015). Therefore, the overall pattern of the risk of temperature might likely be similar
277 even when indoor temperature is used.

278 Furthermore, the data used in this study were gathered during the initial lockdown period, which
279 spanned from March to May 2020 without large variations in interventions. This period falls in
280 the UK's winter season, with colder temperatures and reduced sunlight predominating. Moreover,
281 the study did not consider the population's behavioral changes and indoor environments. For
282 example, the use of heaters may influence the temperature in a room, etc. We suggest that further
283 studies should be carried out to understand better the effects of environmental exposures on
284 disease severity to capture all these limitations.

285 ***Conclusions***

286 For example, how to maintain proper environmental conditions, such as indoor temperature,
287 sunlight, and air quality, during quarantine or home-isolation periods to reduce the probability of
288 death is largely unknown. After many restrictions were lifted in many countries, people with
289 COVID-19 symptoms are advised to get tested and self-isolate. Understanding the relationship
290 between these environmental factors and iCFR especially after symptoms appear provides
291 important suggestions for reducing the number of severe cases.

292

Acknowledgments

The authors are indebted to the City University of Hong Kong for providing excellent research facilities. The first author is also grateful to the university grant commission of Hong Kong for providing the most prestigious Hong Kong PhD Fellowship Scheme (HKPFS). Special thanks to Professor Antonio Gasparrini at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine and Professor Linwei Tian at the School of Public Health at the University of Hong Kong for the valuable feedback on the model development and manuscript formation.

- 293 **References**
- 294 Becker NG, Watson LF, Carlin JB. 1991. A method of non-parametric back-projection and its
295 application to aids data. *Stat Med* 10:1527–1542; <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.4780101005>.
- 296 Benedetti F, Pachetti M, Marini B, Ippodrino R, Gallo RC, Ciccozzi M, et al. 2020. Inverse
297 correlation between average monthly high temperatures and COVID-19-related death rates
298 in different geographical areas. *J Transl Med* 18:251; <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12967-020-02418-5>.
- 300 Bourdrel T, Annesi-Maesano I, Alahmad B, Maesano CN, Bind MA. 2021. The impact of
301 outdoor air pollution on COVID-19: a review of evidence from in vitro, animal, and human
302 studies. *European Respiratory Review* 30:1–18; <https://doi.org/10.1183/16000617.0242-2020>.
- 304 Chamary J. 2021. Light Kills Coronavirus. Here's How It Could Help Beat Covid-19. Forbes.
305 Available: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jvchamary/2020/06/29/light-coronavirus/?sh=4534c6445853> [accessed 26 May 2021].
- 307 Christophi CA, Sotos-Prieto M, Lan FY, Delgado-Velandia M, Efthymiou V, Gaviola GC, et al.
308 2021. Ambient temperature and subsequent COVID-19 mortality in the OECD countries
309 and individual United States. *Sci Rep* 11:1–9; <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-87803-w>.
- 310 Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs. 2021. UK AIR: Air Information Resource.
311 Available: https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/data/data_selector_service?
- 312 Fajnzylber J, Regan J, Coxen K, Corry H, Wong C, Rosenthal A, et al. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 viral
313 load is associated with increased disease severity and mortality. *Nat Commun* 11:1–9;
314 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19057-5>.
- 315 Frontera A, Martin C, Vlachos K, Sgubin G. 2020. Regional air pollution persistence links to
316 COVID-19 infection zoning. *Journal of Infection* 81:318–356;
317 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JINF.2020.03.045>.
- 318 Gasparrinia A, Armstrong B, Kenward MG. 2010. Distributed lag non-linear models. *Stat Med*
319 29:2224–2234; <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.3940>.

- 320 GOV.UK. 2021. Deaths in the UK | Coronavirus in the UK. Available:
321 <https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/details/deaths> [accessed 26 May 2021].
- 322 Gurka MJ, Kelley GA, Edwards LJ. 2012. Fixed and random effects models. Wiley Interdiscip
323 Rev Comput Stat 4:181–190; <https://doi.org/10.1002/wics.201>.
- 324 Haddad JG, Hahn TJ. 1973. Natural and synthetic sources of circulating 25-Hydroxyvitamin D in
325 man. Nature 244:515–517; <https://doi.org/10.1038/244515a0>.
- 326 Hardie LJ, Fletcher TC, Secombes CJ. 1994. Effect of temperature on macrophage activation and
327 the production of macrophage activating factor by rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*)
328 leucocytes. Dev Comp Immunol 18:57–66; [https://doi.org/10.1016/0145-305X\(94\)90252-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0145-305X(94)90252-6).
- 329 Hart PH, Gorman S, Finlay-Jones JJ. 2011. Modulation of the immune system by UV radiation:
330 More than just the effects of vitamin D? Nat Rev Immunol 11:584–596;
331 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nri3045>.
- 332 Hassan IA, Renfro Z, Blake H, Rath S, Durdik JM. 2020. Effect of temperature on functional
333 activity of macrophages in three different species. The Journal of Immunology 204.
- 334 Higgins-Dunn N. 2020. The U.K. has identified a new Covid-19 strain that spreads more quickly.
335 Here's what they know. CNBC. Available: <https://www.cnbc.com/2020/12/19/the-uk-has-identified-a-new-covid-19-strain-that-spreads-more-quickly-heres-what-they-know.html>.
- 337 Laird E, Rhodes J, Kenny RA. 2020. Vitamin D and Inflammation: Potential Implications for
338 Severity of Covid-19. Ir Med J 113.
- 339 Leaf DE, Ginde AA. 2021. Vitamin D3 to Treat COVID-19: Different Disease, Same Answer.
340 JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association 325:1047–1048;
341 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.26850>.
- 342 Lee K, Lee D. 2015. The Relationship Between Indoor and Outdoor Temperature in Two Types
343 Of Residence. Energy Procedia 78:2851–2856;
344 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.EGYPRO.2015.11.647>.

- 345 Liang D, Shi L, Zhao J, Liu P, Sarnat JA, Gao S, et al. 2020. Urban Air Pollution May Enhance
346 COVID-19 Case-Fatality and Mortality Rates in the United States. *The Innovation*
347 1:100047; <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.XINN.2020.100047>.
- 348 Liang J, Yuan HY. 2022. Assessing the impact of temperature and humidity exposures during
349 early infection stages on case-fatality of COVID-19: A modelling study in Europe. *Environ*
350 *Res* 211:112931; <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENVRES.2022.112931>.
- 351 Ma Y, Zhao Y, Liu J, He X, Wang B, Fu S, et al. 2020. Effects of temperature variation and
352 humidity on the death of COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *Science of the Total Environment*
353 724:138226; <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138226>.
- 354 Maglio DHG, Paz ML, Leoni J. 2016. Sunlight Effects on Immune System: Is There Something
355 Else in addition to UV-Induced Immunosuppression? *Biomed Res Int* 2016;
356 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/1934518>.
- 357 Martelletti L, Martelletti P. 2020. Air Pollution and the Novel Covid-19 Disease: a Putative
358 Disease Risk Factor. *SN Compr Clin Med* 2:383–387; <https://doi.org/10.1007/S42399-020-00274-4/FIGURES/4>.
- 360 Martineau AR, Forouhi NG. 2020. Vitamin D for COVID-19: a case to answer? *Lancet Diabetes*
361 *Endocrinol* 8:735–736; [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587\(20\)30268-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(20)30268-0).
- 362 McNoldy B. 2020. Calculate Temperature, Dewpoint, and Relative Humidity Calculator.
363 Available: <https://bmcnoldy.rsmas.miami.edu/Humidity.html> [accessed 26 May 2021].
- 364 Mecenas P, Bastos RT da RM, Vallinoto ACR, Normando D. 2020. Effects of temperature and
365 humidity on the spread of COVID-19: A systematic review. *PLoS One* 15;
366 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238339>.
- 367 Mandy A, Wu X, Keller JL, Fassler CS, Apewokin S, Mersha TB, et al. 2021. Air pollution and
368 the pandemic: Long-term PM2.5 exposure and disease severity in COVID-19 patients.
369 *Respirology* 26:1181–1187; <https://doi.org/10.1111/RESP.14140>.
- 370 Meo SA, Abukhalaf AA, Sami W, Hoang TD. 2021. Effect of environmental pollution PM2.5,
371 carbon monoxide, and ozone on the incidence and mortality due to SARS-CoV-2 infection

- 372 in London, United Kingdom. J King Saud Univ Sci 33:101373;
373 <https://doi.org/10.1016/JJKSUS.2021.101373>.
- 374 Merzon E, Tworowski D, Gorohovski A, Vinker S, Golan Cohen A, Green I, et al. 2020. Low
375 plasma 25(OH) vitamin D level is associated with increased risk of COVID-19 infection: an
376 Israeli population-based study. FEBS J 287:3693–3702; <https://doi.org/10.1111/febs.15495>.
- 377 Meyer S, Held L, Höhle M. 2017. Spatio-temporal analysis of epidemic phenomena using the R
378 package surveillance. J Stat Softw 77:1–55; <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v077.i11>.
- 379 National Centers for Environmental Information. 2020. Global Surface Summary of the Day -
380 GSOD. Available: <https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/search/data-search/global-summary-of-the-day> [accessed 26 May 2021].
- 382 Our World in Data. 2021. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Deaths - Statistics and Research. Available:
383 <https://ourworldindata.org/covid-deaths> [accessed 26 May 2021].
- 384 Panagiotou G, Tee SA, Ihsan Y, Athar W, Marchitelli G, Kelly D, et al. 2020. Low serum 25-
385 hydroxyvitamin D (25[OH]D) levels in patients hospitalized with COVID-19 are associated
386 with greater disease severity. Clin Endocrinol (Oxf) 93:508–511;
387 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cen.14276>.
- 388 Ratnesar-Shumate S, Williams G, Green B, Krause M, Holland B, Wood S, et al. 2020.
389 Simulated Sunlight Rapidly Inactivates SARS-CoV-2 on Surfaces. J Infect Dis 222:214–
390 222; <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiaa274>.
- 391 Schultze JL, Aschenbrenner AC. 2021. COVID-19 and the human innate immune system. Cell
392 184:1671–1692; <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2021.02.029>.
- 393 Stieb DM, Evans GJ, To TM, Lakey PSJ, Shiraiwa M, Hatzopoulou M, et al. 2021. Within-City
394 variation in reactive oxygen species from fine particle air pollution and COVID-19. Am J
395 Respir Crit Care Med 204:168–177; https://doi.org/10.1164/RCCM.202011-4142OC/SUPPL_FILE/DISCLOSURES.PDF.
- 397 Tank AMGK, Wijngaard JB, Können GP, Böhm R, Demarée G, Gocheva A, et al. 2002. Daily
398 dataset of 20th-century surface air temperature and precipitation series for the European

- 399 Climate Assessment. International Journal of Climatology 22:1441–1453;
400 <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.773>.
- 401 The Institute for Government. 2020. Coronavirus lockdown rules in each part of the UK.
402 Available: <https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/explainers/coronavirus-lockdown-rules-four-nations-uk> [accessed 26 May 2021].
- 404 Travaglio M, Yu Y, Popovic R, Selley L, Leal NS, Martins LM. 2021. Links between air
405 pollution and COVID-19 in England. Environmental Pollution 268:115859;
406 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENVPOL.2020.115859>.
- 407 Woodby B, Arnold MM, Valacchi G. 2021. SARS-CoV-2 infection, COVID-19 pathogenesis,
408 and exposure to air pollution: What is the connection? Ann N Y Acad Sci 1486:15–38;
409 <https://doi.org/10.1111/NYAS.14512>.
- 410 Wu X, Nethery RC, Sabath MB, Braun D, Dominici F. 2020a. Air pollution and COVID-19
411 mortality in the United States: Strengths and limitations of an ecological regression analysis.
412 Sci Adv 6; https://doi.org/10.1126/SCIADV.ABD4049/SUPPL_FILE/ABD4049_SM.PDF.
- 413 Wu Y, Jing W, Liu J, Ma Q, Yuan J, Wang Y, et al. 2020b. Effects of temperature and humidity
414 on the daily new cases and new deaths of COVID-19 in 166 countries. Science of the Total
415 Environment 729; <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139051>.
- 416 Yisak H, Ewunetei A, Kefale B, Mamuye M, Teshome F, Ambaw B, et al. 2021. Effects of
417 Vitamin D on COVID-19 Infection and Prognosis: A Systematic Review. Risk Manag
418 Healthc Policy 178:31–38; <https://doi.org/10.2147/RMHP.S291584>.
- 419 Zhu G, Zhu Y, Wang Z, Meng W, Wang X, Feng J, et al. 2021. The association between ambient
420 temperature and mortality of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Wuhan, China: a
421 time-series analysis. BMC Public Health 21:1–10; <https://doi.org/10.1186/S12889-020-10131-7/TABLES/3>.
- 423
- 424

425 **Statement and Declarations**

426 **Funding**

427 This work was supported by the grant number #9610416. Hsiang-Yu Yuan has received the
428 support from the City University of Hong Kong.

429 **Competing Interest**

430 The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclosed.

431 **Author Contributions**

432 All authors contributed to the study conception and design. The first draft of the manuscript was
433 written by *M Pear Hossain* and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript.

434 All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

435 *M. Pear Hossain*: Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Methodology; Software;
436 Validation; Visualization; Roles/Writing – original draft; Writing – review & editing.

437 *Wen Zhou*: Methodology; Writing – review & editing.

438 *Marco Y. T. Leung*: Writing – review & editing.

439 *Hsiang-Yu Yuan*: Conceptualization; Data curation; Funding acquisition; Supervision;
440 Roles/Writing – original draft; Writing – review & editing.

441 **Data Availability**


442 The data on COVID-19 cases and deaths and air pollution are publicly available in GOV.UK
443 (<https://www.gov.uk/coronavirus>) and Air Information Resource in the Department for
444 Environment Food and Rural Affairs, UK (<https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/>) respectively. The weather
445 data is also available in the public repository European Climate Assessment and Dataset
446 (<https://www.ecad.eu/>).

447 **Ethics approval**


448 The current study did not need any ethical approval since no animal model or organ was not used
449 in this study.

450 **Consent to publish**

451 All authors give their consent to publish this article.

452 **List of figures**

453




454

455 **Figure 1. (A) Timeline of disease states and environmental risk factors.** E , I , C , D , and R represent the disease
 456 states such as exposed, symptom onset (or the end of incubation period), case confirmation, recovered and reported
 457 deaths, respectively. Number of deaths were assumed a subset of infected cases who were reported previous days.
 458 Hence, a retrospective adjustment of time was made for estimating deaths who were reported as positive cases at
 459 time C using non-parametric back-projection method. These estimated deaths were labeled as D' , and therefore
 460 for each day. Thus, the iCFR is estimated as the ratio of R and D' . **(B) and (C) reported cases and deaths in the**
 461 **UK.** Bar charts representing the daily confirmed cases and deaths, respectively. The red line in (C) represents the
 462 retrospectively estimated number of confirmed cases who later died per day and the yellow area represents the
 463 corresponding 95% confidence interval. The gray-shaded regions in (B) and (C) represent the duration of the
 464 lockdown in the UK.

465


466



467

468 **Figure 2. Risk of COVID-19 fatality under different environmental conditions and different time points**
469 **since virus exposure (A, B, C).** (A) Temperature, (B) sunlight duration and (C) particular matter ($\text{PM}_{2.5}$). The
470 vertical dashed lines in A, B, C represent the date of symptom onset (on day 5.71 since exposure). Therefore,
471 time between 0 and 5.71 days represents the incubation period. Odds ratio was estimated with respect to the
472 reference value (horizontal lines in A, B, C) of each predictor. Reference value for temperature was 12°C ,
473 sunlight duration 9h and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ $10 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. **Cumulative effects of environmental factors on the odds ratio**
474 **of COVID-19 mortality (D, E, F).** Horizontal dashed lines represent the baseline odds ratio at the reference
475 values of the environmental predictors. The shaded regions represent 95% confidence interval of the log
476 transformed odds ratio. The overall effect of temperature and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ was estimated for the duration between
477 virus exposure and the confirmation day, whereas the cumulative effects of sunlight duration was estimated
478 from three days prior to the virus exposure to the case confirmation day.

479



480
 481 **Figure 3. Sensitivity analysis of the best model (Model 6).** The panels show the model's prediction results until
 482 mid-September, the time when the first alpha variant has been detected in the UK. The points in each subplot
 483 represent the instantaneous CFR (iCFR) estimated using the back-projection method for each date. Solid lines
 484 represent the CFR estimated using the best-prediction model. The shaded regions indicate pointwise 75% and 95%
 485 prediction intervals, respectively. The vertical dashed lines represent the day until which we train the data in the
 486 model, whereas on the right side of the line are tested data.
 487

488 **List of tables**

489 Table 1. **Initial model selection.** AIC and BIC represent Akaike information criterion and Bayesian information
 490 criteria, respectively. All candidate models were adjusted for the days of the week.

No.	Model	AIC	BIC	Log-likelihood
1	$\alpha + \alpha^k + \delta W_t$ Baseline (regional random effect)	2967	2990	-1475
2	$\alpha + \alpha^k + \delta W_t + f(S)$ Regional random effect and sunlight duration	650	708	-301
3	$\alpha + \alpha^k + \delta W_t + f(S) + f(T)$ Regional random effect, temperature, and sunlight duration	595	690	-258
4	$\alpha + \alpha^k + \delta W_t + f(S) + f(T) + f(SO_2)$ Regional random effect, temperature, sunlight duration and sulfur dioxide	581	705	-238
5	$\alpha + \alpha^k + \delta W_t + f(S) + f(T) + f(PM_{10})$ Regional random effect, temperature, sunlight duration and particular matter ($\leq 10 \mu m$)	579	713	-234
6	$\alpha + \alpha^k + \delta W_t + f(S) + f(T) + f(PM_{2.5})$ Regional random effect, temperature, sunlight duration and particular matter ($\leq 2.5 \mu m$)	578	712	-233
7	$\alpha + \alpha^k + \delta W_t + f(S) + f(T) + f(PM_{2.5}) + \gamma H_{t-(t_1+t_2)}^k$ Regional random effect, temperature, sunlight duration, particular matter ($\leq 2.5 \mu m$) and humidity	579	715	-232

491

492

493

Table 2. **Model comparison.** The three candidate models (Models 5-7) were compared using predicted results.

Model	Model expression	RMSE
Model 5	$\alpha + \alpha^k + \delta W_t + f(S) + f(T) + f(PM_{10})$ Regional random effect, temperature, sunlight duration and particular matter ($\leq 10 \mu m$)	0.02040
Model 6	$\alpha + \alpha^k + \delta W_t + f(S) + f(T) + f(PM_{2.5})$ Regional random effect, temperature, sunlight duration and particular matter ($\leq 2.5 \mu m$)	0.01767
Model 7	$\alpha + \alpha^k + \delta W_t + f(S) + f(T) + f(PM_{2.5}) + \gamma H_{t-(t_1+t_2)}^k$ Regional random effect, , temperature, sunlight duration, particular matter ($\leq 2.5 \mu m$) and humidity	0.01855

494

RMSE = Root mean squared error

495

496 Table 3. Changes in CFR under different scenarios of environmental predictors.

Predictor	Predictor value	$\frac{CFR}{CFR_{ref}}$	Changes in CFR (%)
Temperature			
1 °C decrease	1.512	51	
1 °C increase	0.924	-8	
Sunlight duration			
1h decrease	1.978	98	
1h increase	0.312	-69	
PM_{2.5}			
1 $\mu g/m^3$ decrease	0.381	-62	
1 $\mu g/m^3$ increase	2.016	102	

497