Title: Influenza Mortality as an Indicator of the Efficacy of COVID-Related, Non-pharmaceutical Interventions to Reduce the Spread of Respiratory Infections

Author: Robert Morris, MD, PhD
Affiliation: Scientific Director, Research Now

Abstract

Background

Non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) have been criticized as ineffective in preventing COVID. Because it is a new disease with NPIs introduced almost immediately, we have no way to easily and directly evaluate the counterfactual of non-intervention. We do, however, have excellent historic data on influenza, a respiratory disease with similar patterns of transmission and a well-established CDC surveillance system in the US. These data provide us an excellent way to indirectly evaluate the efficacy of these interventions and factors influencing that efficacy.

Results

During the three seasons prior to COVID from 2016-17 to 2018-19, the mean total US influenza mortality was 9,917 deaths per season. During the pandemic, influenza mortality was reduced by 91% in the 2020-21 and 69% in the 2021-22 influenza seasons relative to historical levels. The corresponding decreases for the pediatric population were 99% and 67%. At the state level, the average drop in mortality over the two flu seasons of the pandemic was strongly correlated with the percent of the state's 2020 presidential votes cast for Joe Biden.

Conclusions

These data provide strong evidence that COVID NPIs dramatically reduced the spread of influenza. Given its similar routes of transmission, these results support the assertion that these interventions also substantially reduced COVID transmission, morbidity, and mortality. The effectiveness of NPI's increased in proportion to the size of a state's Democratic electorate. This could reflect more effective NPI strategies in states with Democratic leanings or better compliance with NPI's in those states.

Background

From the outset of the COVID pandemic, non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to protect public health have come under heavy criticism for their impact on everything from the economy[1] to mental health[2]–[4]to education[5], [6].Furthermore, almost every intervention has, at some point, been declared ineffective including masking,[7], [8] school closures,[9]and business "lockdowns" [10], [11]. One of the challenges in evaluating the effectiveness of NPIs has been that we have no historical data related to COVID, so our means for evaluating interventions were limited. Specifically, we have no historical data to assess the counterfactual of not intervening. Instead, we have been forced to use ecological studies, with all their well-known limitations, and clinical trials, with their inability to easily capture the impact of community-wide interventions.

One way to look at the impact of COVID interventions on the spread of a respiratory pathogen is to consider their impact on a disease for which we do have considerable historical data. Specifically, we can consider data from influenza surveillance. The CDC, for example, has extensive and detailed historical data on morbidity and mortality related to the flu.

Focusing on the flu allows us to compare historical patterns of influenza incidence and mortality with those that prevailed during periods when COVID NPIs were in place. Looking at changes in those rates as a percent of pre-COVID rates allows us to use geographic areas as their own controls, eliminating time invariant confounders. We can then consider what factors might have influenced those changes. Given the association between political party and both COVID policies and COVID mortality,[12] we can look at the impact of geographic variation in political leanings on the reduction in non-COVID respiratory diseases.

Methods

Weekly counts of influenza deaths in both the entire population and in the pediatric population for the period from 2016 through 2023 were abstracted from the CDC FluView System[13]. Seasonal influenza mortality from each state over the same period were obtained from the same site.

Average annual influenza mortality rates for both populations were calculated for the pre-COVID period 2016 through 2019 and for the two flu seasons during the pandemic, 2020-21 and 2021-22. (The 2019-2020 season was excluded because it was transitional and included data from both before and during the pandemic).

At the state level, average flu season mortality was determined for the pre-COVID period and for the two pandemic flu seasons. The decrease in average flu season mortality for each state during the pandemic as compared to average mortality rates prior to the pandemic were calculated for each state.

The percent of votes in the 2020 election cast for Joe Biden were obtained from Cook political report[14] to assess each state's political leanings during the pandemic. The linear relationship

between Democratic leaning and the reduction in influenza mortality during the pandemic was assessed by simple linear regression.

Results

US total influenza mortality for 2016-2023 is shown in Figure 1. The figure shows dramatic drops in influenza mortality during the 2020-21 and 2021-22 flu seasons. A more normal flu season resumes in 2022-23. The average total mortality for the three pre-pandemic flu seasons was 9,917 deaths per season. In 2020-21, influenza deaths dropped to 931 deaths per season, a 90.6% decrease. In 2021-2022, there were 3,043 flu deaths in the US, higher than the first year of the pandemic, but 69.3% below pre-COVID levels. Overall, during the two years of the pandemic deaths average annual influenza deaths were 1987 per season or 80% below pre-COVID levels.

US pediatric influenza mortality is shown in Figure 2. The figure shows dramatic drops in influenza mortality during the 2020-21 and 2021-22 flu seasons. A more normal flu season resumed in 2022-23. The average total influenza mortality for the three pre-pandemic flu seasons was 148 deaths per season. In 2020-21, there was only one pediatric influenza death in the entire United States (a 99% decrease from pre-pandemic levels) and rose to 49 deaths per season (a 67% decrease) in 2021-22. Overall, during the two years of the pandemic deaths dropped to 25 per season or 83% below pre-COVID levels. For both adult and pediatric populations, the two pandemic flu seasons were significantly ($p<0.05$) lower than the five other (shoulder or pre-pandemic) flu seasons represented in these time series.

The total seasonal influenza mortality counts for 2016-2023 are listed in Table 1 for each US state and the District of Columbia along with the percent of votes cast for Joe Biden in 2020. The table also lists the ratio of seasonal influenza mortality during the pandemic to baseline seasonal influenza mortality. Figure 3 shows the percent decrease in influenza mortality for each as a function of the 2020 Biden vote percentage. The r^2 of 0.39 is significant at $p<0.01$.

Conclusions

The data demonstrate dramatic reductions in US influenza mortality during the COVID pandemic. Since we can reject the null hypothesis that these are simply random fluctuations reductions in flu severity, we must conclude that these changes are the result of either unexplained decreases in ascertainment or the introduction of public health measures that reduced transmission. Influenza surveillance and diagnostic tools are extremely well established by the CDC, so decreased ascertainment, particularly for mortality seems unlikely. Instead, it appears that NPIs, particularly those introduced to reduce the spread of COVID were extremely effective in reducing the transmission of influenza, a respiratory virus with similar modes of spread. This effect almost eliminated the 2020-21 flu season when the most stringent NPIs were in place in the United States. These measures were relaxed in 2021-2022, and influenza mortality rose, but was still far below pre-COVID levels. Overall, these data suggest that almost 16,000 influenza deaths were prevented by COVID NPI's were in place.

This effect was more dramatic in children than adults, with the near complete elimination of pediatric influenza mortality in 2020-21, from an average of 148 deaths to a single death. The greater mortality reduction in children (>99% vs 90%) suggests interventions in children were even more effective than interventions in adults. The major difference in NPIs for children as opposed to adults is that school closures tended to be more universal than business closures, particularly during the 2020-21 school year.

It seems likely that those NPI's produced similar percentage reductions in COVID mortality given similar patterns of transmission. Even a 50% reduction in COVID mortality would correspond to 1.1 million lives saved by NPI's.

Implementation of NPIs and the population adherence to NPIs differed widely from state to state, driven, in large part, by politics. The strong correlation of the drop in influenza mortality with the Democratic Presidential vote in 2020 suggests that political leanings of each state influenced the efficacy of NPIs. Other studies have shown associations between political leanings and both the utilization and effectiveness of NPI's for COVID.[15], [16] These results provide compelling evidence that is independent of the potential time invariant confounders from COVID studies because we have relevant baseline rates.

In sum, COVID NPI's appear to have been highly effective in reducing the spread of respiratory infections, with the magnitude of that benefit associated with the each states political leanings. Any assertion that NPIs were ineffective in reducing the spread of COVID must explain how the spread of COVID is dramatically different from the spread of influenza.



Figure 1. US weekly influenza mortality for the 2016-17 through 2022-23 flu seasons for all ages.



Figure 2. US weekly influenza mortality for the 2016-17 through 2022-23 flu seasons for children.

Table 1. Influenza mortality by state and season.

STATE	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	Pre Pandemic Average	Pandemic Average	Pandemic Influenza Mortality Decrease	2020 Biden Vote
ALABAMA	60	237	94	154	36	43	130	40	71.0%	37%
ALASKA	14	27	19	11	1	13	20	7	60.6%	43%
ARIZONA	79	329	116	162	9	67	175	38	77.8%	49%
ARKANSAS	54	215	107	108	22	32	125	27	77.7%	35%
CALIFORNIA	586	1717	630	897	57	158	978	108	88.8%	63%
COLORADO	153	249	153	152	6	88	185	47	73.4%	55%
CONNECTICUT	86	214	90	102	0	29	130	15	88.2%	59%
DELAWARE	28	41	23	22	1	6	31	4	87.7%	59%
WASHINGTON DC	10	20	8	12	1	0	13	1	96.0%	92%
FLORIDA	282	652	341	520	84	218	425	151	66.4%	48%
GEORGIA	83	325	114	246	34	91	174	63	67.4%	49%
HAWAII	38	56	38	29	2	8	44	5	87.6%	64%
IDAHO	76	114	66	42	6	28	85	17	77.2%	33%
ILLINOIS	216	630	207	249	11	78	351	45	86.3%	58%
INDIANA	151	444	179	190	16	79	258	48	80.3%	41%
IOWA	143	277	98	116	13	51	173	32	79.8%	45%
KANSAS	125	241	97	138	11	52	154	32	79.0%	42%
KENTUCKY	127	321	166	163	20	52	205	36	81.5%	36%
LOUISIANA	51	231	64	107	15	40	115	28	75.7%	40%
MAINE	76	88	52	47	4	15	72	10	85.6%	53%
MARYLAND	105	171	100	164	9	37	125	23	83.0%	65%
MASSACHUSETTS	198	309	179	203	18	92	229	55	75.3%	66%
MICHIGAN	255	463	239	299	19	111	319	65	79.3%	51%
MINNESOTA	212	328	94	163	11	59	211	35	82.4%	52%
MISSISSIPPI	30	166	48	79	34	35	81	35	57.3%	41%
MISSOURI	192	522	132	204	12	85	282	49	81.5%	41%
MONTANA	60	69	36	41	2	22	55	12	76.7%	41%
NEBRASKA	82	114	87	57	5	41	94	23	72.9%	39%
NEVADA	24	88	43	65	8	26	52	17	69.1%	50%
NEW HAMPSHIRE	50	73	47	31	2	21	57	12	77.1%	53%
NEW JERSEY	115	279	146	178	5	42	180	24	86.9%	57%
NEW MEXICO	34	80	63	76	5	27	59	16	74.7%	54%
NEW YORK	204	478	280	286	31	105	321	68	78.2%	61%
NORTH CAROLINA	310	545	272	305	22	73	376	48	86.7%	49%
NORTH DAKOTA	25	33	20	24	6	20	26	13	49.0%	32%
OHIO	277	662	284	333	18	98	408	58	85.1%	45%
OKLAHOMA	126	288	135	158	36	91	183	64	64.1%	32%
OREGON	246	259	200	96	6	23	235	15	92.8%	56%
PENNSYLVANIA	334	644	361	344	30	159	446	95	77.5%	50%
RHODE ISLAND	49	62	46	32	2	9	52	6	88.4%	59%
SOUTH CAROLINA	119	313	138	166	18	48	190	33	82.1%	43%
SOUTH DAKOTA	44	63	39	29	4	27	49	16	64.6%	36%
TENNESSEE	142	401	165	262	60	106	236	83	65.8%	37%
TEXAS	357	1165	448	640	148	260	657	204	68.7%	46%
UTAH	51	98	63	58	6	28	71	17	74.8%	38%
VERMONT	22	48	35	24	1	5	35	3	90.7%	66%
VIRGINIA	144	292	180	167	23	59	205	41	79.1%	54%
WASHINGTON	380	409	292	196	6	35	360	21	93.6%	58%
WEST VIRGINIA	46	157	66	73	1	45	90	23	73.1%	30%
WISCONSIN	186	382	126	179	7	55	231	31	85.8%	49%
WYOMING	14	25	22	11	1	8	20	5	75.0%	27%
TOTAL	6871	15414	7048	8410	905	3000	9778	1953	80.0%	



Figure 3. Average annual reduction in influenza during the 2020-21 and 2021-2022 flu seasons for US States as a function of the percent vote for Joe Biden in the 2020 Presidential election.

References

[1] K. Das, R. L. Behera, and B. Paital, "CHAPTER 8 - Socio-economic impact of COVID-19," in *COVID-19 in the Environment*, D. Rawtani, C. M. Hussain, and N. Khatri, Eds., Elsevier, 2022, pp. 153–190. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-323-90272-4.00014-2.

[2] J. Lee, "Mental health effects of school closures during COVID-19," *Lancet Child Adolesc. Health*, vol. 4, no. 6, p. 421, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30109-7.

[3] U. Panchal *et al.*, "The impact of COVID-19 lockdown on child and adolescent mental health: systematic review," *Eur. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry*, vol. 32, no. 7, pp. 1151–1177, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s00787-021-01856-w.

[4] M. Hawrilenko, E. Kroshus, P. Tandon, and D. Christakis, "The Association Between School Closures and Child Mental Health During COVID-19," *JAMA Netw. Open*, vol. 4, no. 9, p. e2124092, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.24092.

[5] T. E. Board, "Opinion | The Startling Evidence on Learning Loss Is In," *The New York Times*, Nov. 18, 2023. Accessed: Nov. 28, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.nytimes.com/2023/11/18/opinion/pandemic-school-learning-loss.html

[6] "NAEP Blog - Performance Declines in Basic Mathematics and Reading Skills Since the COVID-19 Pandemic Are Evident Across Many Racial/Ethnic Groups." Accessed: Nov. 28, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/blog/pandemic_performance_declines_across_racial_and_ethnic_groups.aspx

[7] T. B. Høeg, A. Haslam, and V. Prasad, "An analysis of studies pertaining to masks in Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report: Characteristics and quality of studies from 1978 to 2023," *Am. J. Med.*, vol. 0, no. 0, Sep. 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2023.08.026.

[8] T. Jefferson *et al.*, "Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses," *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.*, vol. 2023, no. 1, 2023, doi: 10.1002/14651858.cd006207.pub6.

[9] K. Fukumoto, C. T. McClean, and K. Nakagawa, "No causal effect of school closures in Japan on the spread of COVID-19 in spring 2020," *Nat. Med.*, vol. 27, no. 12, Art. no. 12, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1038/s41591-021-01571-8.

[10] J. Herby, L. Jonung, and S. Hanke, "A Literature Review and Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Lockdowns on COVID-19 Mortality," *Stud. Appl. Econ.*, Art. no. 200, Jan. 2022, Accessed: Nov. 28, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://ideas.repec.org//p/ris/jhisae/0200.html

[11] T. B. Hoeg, T. O. Henderson, D. Johnson, and M. Gandhi, "Our next national priority should be to reopen all America's schools for full time in-person learning," The Hill. Accessed: Mar. 30, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://thehill.com/opinion/healthcare/544142-our-next-national-priority-should-be-to-reopen-all-americas-schools-for/

[12] J. Gao and B. J. Radford, "Death by political party: The relationship between COVID-19 deaths and political party affiliation in the United States," *World Med. Health Policy*, vol. 13, no. 2, p. 224, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.1002/wmh3.435.

[13] CDC, "Weekly U.S. Influenza Surveillance Report," Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Accessed: Nov. 28, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.cdc.gov/flu/weekly/index.htm

[14] D. Wasserman, S. Andrews, L. Saenger, L. Cohen, A. Flinn, and G. Tatarsky, "2020 Popular Vote Tracker," Cook Political Report. Accessed: Nov. 28, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.cookpolitical.com/2020-national-popular-vote-tracker

[15] V. S. Huang, S. Sutermaster, Y. Caplan, H. Kemp, D. Schmutz, and S. K. Sgaier, "Social distancing across vulnerability, race, politics, and employment: How different Americans changed behaviors before and after major COVID-19 policy announcements," *medRxiv*, p. 2020.06.04.20119131, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1101/2020.06.04.20119131.

[16] N. M. Kavanagh, R. R. Goel, and A. S. Venkataramani, "Association of County-Level Socioeconomic and Political Characteristics with Engagement in Social Distancing for COVID-19," *medRxiv*, p. 2020.04.06.20055632, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1101/2020.04.06.20055632.