

1  
2 **COVID-19 Transmission Dynamics and Effectiveness of Public Health**  
3 **Interventions in New York City during the 2020 Spring Pandemic Wave**

4 Wan Yang,<sup>1\*</sup> Jaimie Shaff,<sup>2</sup> Jeffrey Shaman<sup>3</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New  
6 York, NY, USA; <sup>2</sup>New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, New York, NY, USA;

7 <sup>3</sup>Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia  
8 University, New York, NY, USA

9 \*Correspondence to: [wy2202@cumc.columbia.edu](mailto:wy2202@cumc.columbia.edu)

10  
11 **Abstract**

12 New York City experienced a large COVID-19 pandemic wave during March – May 2020. We  
13 model the transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in the city during the pandemic and estimate the  
14 effectiveness of public health interventions (overall and for each major intervention separately)  
15 for the entire population and by age group. We estimate that the overall effective reproductive  
16 number was 2.99 at the beginning of the pandemic wave and reduced to 0.93 one week after  
17 the stay-at-home mandate. Most age groups experienced similar reductions in transmission.  
18 Interventions reducing contact rates were associated with a 70.7% (95% CI: 65.0 – 76.4%)  
19 reduction of transmission overall and >50% for all age groups during the pandemic. Face  
20 covering was associated with a 6.6% (95% CI: 0.8 – 12.4%) reduction of transmission overall and  
21 up to 20% for 65+ year-olds during the first month of implementation. Accounting for the  
22 amount of time masks are in use (i.e. mainly outside homes), these findings indicate universal  
23 masking could reduce transmission by up to 28-32% when lockdown-like measures are lifted, if  
24 the high effectiveness estimated for older adults were achieved for all ages. These estimates  
25 are verified by out-of-fit projections and support the need for implementing multiple  
26 interventions simultaneously in order to effectively mitigate the spread of COVID-19.

27 **Keywords:** COVID-19; transmission dynamics; effectiveness of intervention; social distancing;  
28 lockdown; face covering

## 30 **Introduction**

31 New York City (NYC) is the largest and most densely populated municipality in the United States  
32 with over 60 million travelers each year from places worldwide.(1) It is thus perhaps no surprise  
33 that NYC became the United States' first epidemic center of the COVID-19 (coronavirus disease  
34 2019) pandemic. NYC experienced widespread COVID-19 transmission citywide since early  
35 March and recorded over 200,000 cases and over 21,000 COVID-19 confirmed or probable  
36 deaths during the following three months. To curb this intense transmission, NY State and NYC  
37 implemented multiple intervention measures, including health promotion campaigns in early  
38 March, telecommuting and staggered work schedule recommendations beginning the week of  
39 March 8, public schools closure starting the week of March 15,(2) stay-at-home orders for non-  
40 essential workers starting the week of March 22,(3) and requirements for use of face covering  
41 in public starting the week of April 12.(4) With these overlapping and far reaching public health  
42 interventions, case diagnoses and hospitalizations peaked in April, and started to decline  
43 substantially in late April and May. NYC was able to begin its phased re-opening of industries  
44 starting the week of June 7, 2020.

45  
46 Despite the overwhelming pandemic wave in Spring 2020, serology surveys indicated that the  
47 majority of NYC residents (about 80%; as of June 13, 2020(5)) remain susceptible to infection,  
48 and thus future epidemics are possible without effective public health interventions. Similar  
49 challenges confront populations in other locales in the United States and other countries. It is  
50 thus critical to understand the transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in the Spring 2020 pandemic  
51 wave and the effectiveness of different public health interventions, in order to more effectively  
52 mitigate future COVID-19 epidemics and the devastating morbidity, mortality, and economic  
53 burden.

54  
55 In this study, we apply a model-inference system developed to support the city's COVID-19  
56 pandemic response to reconstruct the underlying transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in NYC  
57 during March 1 – June 6, 2020 (i.e. prior to the city's reopening). The inference of COVID-19  
58 transmission dynamics is challenging due to low infection detection rates (many asymptomatic

59 and mild infections do not seek care or receive testing),(6) fluctuation of those infection  
60 detection rates, differential disease manifestation by age group, and concurrent public health  
61 interventions. To address these challenges, our model-inference system simultaneously  
62 assimilates three sources of data: 1) confirmed COVID-19 case data, 2) COVID-19 associated  
63 death data (both cases and deaths are assimilated by neighborhood and age group), and 3)  
64 neighborhood-level mobility data to constrain the model system. This enables inference of the  
65 overall infection rate (i.e. including those not documented by surveillance), estimation of key  
66 transmission characteristics (e.g., the reproductive number) through time, and assessment of  
67 the effectiveness of different public health interventions, including social distancing and face  
68 covering, implemented over time. We further incorporate these estimates to project cases and  
69 deaths in the weeks beyond our study period and compare the projections to independent  
70 observations in order to evaluate the accuracy of these estimates.

71

## 72 **Results**

### 73 ***Overall Epidemic Trends***

74 Following diagnosis of the first case in NYC, confirmed COVID-19 cases in the entire population  
75 increased nearly exponentially during the first three weeks (Fig 1B) before slowing down  
76 beginning the week of March 22, 2020 when NYC implemented a stay-at-home order.  
77 However, case trajectories differed substantially by age group. Foremost, reported cases  
78 increased with age: the case trajectory for those aged 25-44 years mirrored the overall  
79 epidemic curve, those older than 45 years had higher case rates, and those under 25 years had  
80 the lowest case rates (Fig 1A and Table S1). Infants (i.e. <1 year), however, had higher case  
81 rates than 1-4 and 5-14 year-olds (Fig 1). In addition, the timing of peak case rate was mixed.  
82 Case rates in 25-44, 45-64, and 65-74 year-olds peaked earliest during the week of March 29,  
83 2020, followed by <1, 1-4, 15-24, and 75+ year-olds with a 1-week lag; in comparison, the case  
84 rate for 5-14 year-olds fluctuated with a less clear peak during the weeks of March 29 – April  
85 26, 2020.

86

87 The epidemic trends based on diagnosed cases, however, were obscured by varying infection  
88 detection rates by age and through time. COVID-19 infections are more likely to manifest as  
89 symptomatic illness and/or more severe disease in individuals with underlying conditions and in  
90 older adults.(7, 8) Such differential clinical characteristics by age thus lead to varying healthcare  
91 seeking behaviors and infection detection rates by age. In addition, testing policies varied over  
92 the course of the Spring 2020 COVID-19 pandemic in NYC. During this time, testing capacity was  
93 limited at the federal, state and local levels by guidelines for who should be tested (due, for  
94 example, to limited availability of test kits, swabbing supplies and reagents), which required  
95 prioritizing testing for severely ill patients and those highly vulnerable to severe disease. Testing  
96 capacities expanded during the week of March 8, 2020;(9) however, by late March, material  
97 shortages (including testing kits and personal protective equipment) again prompted the city to  
98 restrict testing to those severely ill.(10) Using our model-inference system, we estimated that  
99 infection detection rates increased in early March, reaching a peak of around 20% for all ages  
100 overall during the week of March 15, and declined afterwards before increasing again in mid-  
101 April.(11)

102

103 After accounting for infection detection rates to include undiagnosed infections, a different  
104 picture of the NYC spring outbreak emerges (Fig 2 and Fig S3). Estimated infection rates were  
105 highest among 25-44 and 45-64 year-olds (Fig. 2 E and F), followed by 65-74 and 75+ year-olds  
106 (Fig. 2 G and H), then 5-14 and 15-24 year-olds (Fig. 2 C and D), and were lowest among <1 and  
107 1-4 year olds (Fig. 2 A and B; Table S1). Estimated infection rates in the younger age groups (in  
108 particular, 5-14, 15-24, and 25-44 year-olds; Fig. 2 C-E) peaked during the week of March 22,  
109 2020, followed by the three older age groups (i.e. 45-64, 65-74, and 75+ year-olds; Fig. 2 F-H)  
110 about a week later.

111

### 112 ***Overall effectiveness of interventions***

113 The reproductive number at time- $t$  ( $R_t$ ) measures the average number of persons an infected  
114 individual infects and thus reflects underlying epidemic dynamics. The epidemic expands in size  
115 if  $R_t$  is above unity and subsides otherwise. In addition, when the entire population is

116 susceptible and no interventions are in place,  $R_t$ , referred to as the basic reproductive number  
117 ( $R_0$ ), reflects the transmissibility of an infection in that population. Here we estimated that  $R_t$   
118 was 2.99 [median and interquartile range (IQR): 2.32 – 3.86; Table S2] during the first week of  
119 the pandemic (i.e. the week of March 1) in NYC, similar to  $R_0$  estimates reported for other  
120 places.(12, 13) It decreased to around 2.2 during the next two weeks, when NY State declared a  
121 state of emergency and public awareness and voluntary precautionary measures (e.g. avoiding  
122 public transit(14)) increased (Fig 2A). Following the stay-at-home mandate starting the week of  
123 March 22,  $R_t$  dropped substantially to 1.37 (IQR: 1.08 – 1.68) during that first week, to 0.93  
124 (IQR: 0.73 – 1.13) a week later, and to a minimum of 0.56 (IQR: 0.45 – 0.67) during the week of  
125 April 12 (Fig 2A). These prompt decreases in  $R_t$  from mid-March to mid-April indicate that  
126 implemented public health messaging and interventions were effective in curtailing COVID-19  
127 transmission.

128  
129 Similar decreases in  $R_t$  occurred among most age groups (Fig 2 B-H). Overall,  $R_t$  among younger  
130 age groups (<45 years) decreased one or two weeks earlier than older age groups (45-64, 65-74,  
131 and 75+; Fig 2 C-F vs. Fig 2 G-L). Of note, among the four age groups with higher contact  
132 rates(15) (i.e. 5-14, 15-24, 25-44, and 45-64 year-olds),  $R_t$  dropped below 1 the earliest among  
133 5-14 year-olds (0.99, IQR: 0.74 – 1.30; Table S2) during the week of March 22. This is consistent  
134 with the earliest public health interventions to this age group: the closure of public schools  
135 beginning the week of March 15.(2)

136  
137 ***Effectiveness of reducing contact via school closure and voluntary or mandated stay-at-home***  
138 ***measures***

139 Several public health interventions were implemented around the same time (Fig. 2), and some  
140 interventions may take longer to produce an effect (e.g., due to slower compliance with the  
141 measure). It is thus challenging to separate the impact of different interventions. However, a  
142 number of measures – including voluntarily working from home during the early weeks of the  
143 pandemic, school closures, and the stay-at-home mandate – in effect reduce rates of close in-  
144 person contact, a key factor for COVID-19 transmission. Thus, here we focus on estimating the

145 impact of interventions whose primary mechanism of action is through a reduction in  
146 population contact rates. Given the difficulties measuring this quantity directly, we instead  
147 approximated population contact rates using human mobility data, which record real time  
148 population movement based on location changes of individual mobile devices (see Data).  
149 Indeed, the reduction in  $R_t$  mirrored the reduction in mobility (Fig 3). The Pearson correlation  
150 ( $r$ ) between  $R_t$  and mobility over the 14-week study period was 0.96 for all ages overall and  $\geq 0.9$   
151 for 1-4, 5-14, 15-24, and 25-44 year-olds (Table S3). Thus, we focused on mobility as a proxy for  
152 contact rates and used this quantity to estimate the corresponding changes in  $R_t$  and segregate  
153 the impact of interventions that reduce population contact rates from other concurrent  
154 interventions.

155  
156 Mobility reduced by 11.6% during the second week of the pandemic (i.e. the week of March 8),  
157 and by a further 33.5% and 17.3% in the following two weeks, respectively (Fig 3). Using  
158 observed mobility data (i.e. our proxy for population contact rates) to estimate the  
159 corresponding changes in  $R_t$ , we estimate that, for all ages overall, reductions in population  
160 contact rates were associated with  $R_t$  reductions of 10.1% (95% CI: 8.3 – 11.9%) by the second  
161 week of the pandemic, and another 29.2% (95% CI: 24.9 – 33.5%) and 15.0% (95% CI: 14.3 –  
162 15.8%) in the following two weeks, respectively (Fig 3A). By the week of April 12 when  $R_t$   
163 reached its minimum, the reduction in population contact rates was associated with an  $R_t$   
164 reduction of 70.7% (95% CI: 65.0 – 76.4%). In addition, analysis at the neighborhood level  
165 consistently showed large reductions in  $R_t$  that were likely due to reductions in population  
166 contact rates (range of median estimates: 66.1 – 90.1% across the 42 neighborhoods in NYC; Fig  
167 S4).

168  
169 In addition, transmission in four age groups (i.e., 5-14, 15-24, 25-44, and 45-64 year-olds)  
170 appeared to be most impacted by changing population contact rates (Fig 3 and Table 1). The  
171 reduction in population contact rates was associated with decreases of the age-specific  $R_t$  by  
172 83.4% (95% CI: 80.1 – 86.7%) for 5-14 year-olds, 65.4% (95% CI: 57.0 – 73.8%) for 15-24 year-

173 olds, 76.5% (95% CI: 68.5 – 84.6%) for 25-44 year-olds, and 68.9% (95% CI: 59.2 – 78.6%) for 45-  
174 64 year-olds, by the week of April 12.

175

### 176 ***Effectiveness of face covering/masking***

177 Estimated transmission rates (or probability of infection) and the infectious period also closely  
178 tracked changes in mobility (Table S3;  $r \geq 0.5$  for most age groups). Thus, it appears that reducing  
179 mobility not only reduces contact rates but also likely reduces 1) the probability of transmission  
180 per contact due to, e.g., increased public spacing and 2) the effective infectious period per  
181 infected individual due to, e.g., more time spent at home and as a result reduced time for  
182 community transmission despite likely unchanged duration of viral shedding. Given this  
183 observation, we hypothesize that the relationship between mobility and estimated  
184 transmission rates (and effective infectious period) can be used to disentangle the impact of  
185 interventions that reduce population contact rates (particularly, the stay-at-home mandate)  
186 and face covering/masking — two major public health interventions implemented in NYC  
187 during the pandemic — on transmission. We make two predictions if this hypothesis holds.  
188 First, predicted transmission rates (infectious period) using mobility data alone would be higher  
189 (longer) than those estimated by the model-inference system additionally based on case and  
190 mortality data *for weeks when face covering in public was mandated* as it would lead to further  
191 reductions in transmission (i.e., temporality and direction of the impact). Second, while the  
192 efficacy of masking (i.e., measured under ideal conditions of mask quality and correct use) likely  
193 does not vary by individual, the effectiveness of masking (i.e., measured under real-world, often  
194 imperfect conditions) and impact of this intervention could vary by subpopulation due, for  
195 example, to different usage rates of masks; as such, we expect the predictive errors to be larger  
196 for age groups with higher compliance of masking (i.e., magnitude of the impact). Our analyses  
197 largely confirmed both predictions. For the first, as shown in Fig 4, transmission rates predicted  
198 using a linear regression model with the observed mobility as the sole predictor were higher  
199 than those estimated by the model-inference system, following the face covering mandate  
200 starting the week of April 12.(4) For the latter, the discrepancies in the two model estimates  
201 (i.e. the gaps between the dashed and solid blue lines; Fig 4) appeared to increase with age and

202 were largest among the two elderly age groups who have been reported to more frequently  
203 use masks.(16-18) However, infants (<1 year) appeared to have a larger reduction than other  
204 children groups; this could have been due to transmission reduction related to their sources of  
205 infection (e.g. their caretakers and healthcare settings where they tended to be exposed).  
206 Similar patterns held for the effective infectious period (Fig 4).

207  
208 Given these observations, we further used the discrepancies in the two model estimates to  
209 approximate the impact of face covering on reducing COVID-19 transmission. Combining the  
210 reduction in the transmission rate and effective infectious period, we estimated that, for all  
211 ages combined, face covering contributed to a 6.6% (95% CI: 0.8 – 12.4%) reduction during the  
212 first month it was implemented and a 3.4% (95% CI: -1.9 – 8.6%) reduction over the entire 8  
213 weeks prior to the city's reopening (Table 1). As expected, the estimated impact varied  
214 substantially by age group. The effectiveness was 20.8% (95% CI: -0.1 – 41.6%) for 65-74 year-  
215 olds and 20.8% (95% CI: -0.9 – 42.5%) for 75+ year-olds during the first month and remained at  
216 similar levels afterwards. For 25-44 and 45-64 year-olds, two age groups with the highest  
217 infection rates (Fig 2), the effectiveness was 4.5% (95% CI: -0.6 – 9.7%) and 8.1% (95% CI: -0.1 –  
218 16.1%) in the first month, respectively; however, it reduced substantially afterwards, likely due  
219 to reversed risk behavior. Of note, in addition to the likely lower usage rate of face covering in  
220 late May – early June, increases in risky behaviors such as large gatherings at the time(19) may  
221 have partially obscured the effectiveness of masking.

222

### 223 ***Retrospective projections of cases and deaths***

224 NYC started phased reopening from the week of 6/7/2020, which allows industries to gradually  
225 reopen per a four-phase plan.(20) For instance, manufacturing industries were allowed to  
226 reopen starting the week of 6/7/2020 (dubbed "Phase 1"), whereas real estate was allowed to  
227 reopen starting the week of 6/21/2020 (dubbed "Phase 2"), and personal care services were  
228 allowed starting the week of 7/6/2020 (dubbed "Phase 3"). As such, population mobility has  
229 increased gradually during this time, which could lead to increased transmission of unknown  
230 magnitude. Such changes also offer an opportunity to test the accuracy of our estimates –



231 should the estimated effectiveness of reducing contact rates and utilizing face coverings be  
232 accurate, these estimates could be used to anticipate changes in transmission in response to  
233 the changing mobility and in turn the epidemic dynamics after reopening. We thus used these  
234 estimates to generate projections of cases and deaths for the 8 weeks beyond our study period,  
235 and compared the projections to available, independent corresponding observations. Overall,  
236 our projections underestimated the total number of cases (relative error of median projections:  
237 -27% over 8 weeks; Fig 5A) but were able to accurately estimate the total number of deaths  
238 (relative error: -2% over 8 weeks; Fig 5B). In addition, examination of age-grouped projections  
239 shows that the underestimation of cases was mostly among younger age groups whose case  
240 rates had increased in June (1-4, 5-14, 15-24 and 25-44 year-olds; Fig S5). These recent  
241 increases in young cases may have resulted from more young adults returning to work including  
242 some in service industries with high contact rates and, relatedly, sending their children to  
243 childcare and/or summer camps due to a lack of caretakers at home [information from NYC  
244 Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DOHMH) community investigation; unpublished]. In  
245 addition, increased risk behaviors of some young individuals (e.g., large parties without physical  
246 distancing(19)) may have also contributed to the increased cases among young adults in late  
247 June.(21) Consistently, COVID-19 associated mortality, mostly occurring among older adults  
248 continued to decrease and were accurately predicted for different age groups (Fig S6).

249

## 250 **Discussion**

251 The spring 2020 pandemic wave in NYC, the first epidemic center in the US, provides a test case  
252 to study COVID-19 epidemiological characteristics and the effectiveness of public health  
253 interventions. Through comprehensive modeling, we have reconstructed the transmission  
254 dynamics and estimated the effectiveness of two major interventions, social distancing and  
255 mandatory face covering in public. Our results show that reducing contact rates (mainly via  
256 school closures and voluntary or mandated stay-at-home measures) likely contributed to the  
257 largest reduction in transmission in the population overall (~70%) and for most age groups  
258 (>50% for all age groups). Widespread use of face covering likely contributed to an additional  
259 ~7% overall reduction and up to ~20% reduction among 65+ year-olds during the first month

260 face covering was mandated in public places. Our findings largely consolidate previous model  
261 estimates on the impact of lockdown-like measures(6, 22, 23) and studies on face covering in  
262 reducing COVID-19 transmission and provide insights to future COVID-19 mitigation efforts.

263  
264 Lockdown-like measures where confinement at home is encouraged or mandated through  
265 school closures, telework policies, closure of non-essential businesses, and stay-at-home orders  
266 have been a major control measure to curb COVID-19 spread. In effect, such measures reduce  
267 population contact rates and thus transmission. Previous modeling studies estimated that  
268 lockdowns reduced COVID-19 transmission (measured by  $R_t$ ) by 58% in Wuhan, China,(6) 45%  
269 (95% CI: 42-49%) in Italy,(23) and 77% (95% CI: 76-78%) in France.(22) Our estimate for NYC  
270 overall (~70%) is consistent with these previous estimates. In addition, our estimates show that  
271 reducing population contact rates effectively reduced transmission across all age groups  
272 (ranging from a 51% reduction among 1-4 year-olds to 83% among 5-14 year-olds; Table 1).  
273 Together, these findings underscore the importance of reducing contact rates through, for  
274 example, physical distancing in places with continuous community transmission of COVID-19.

275  
276 The use of surgical masks or cloth face coverings has been another major preventive measure.  
277 Studies overall have shown that surgical masks could substantially reduce onward transmission  
278 albeit with a large range of efficacy estimates across settings.(24) However, it remains unclear  
279 the overall effectiveness of universal face covering requirements at the population level,  
280 especially during a pandemic, due to several factors: 1) The overall effectiveness depends on  
281 compliance which may vary across subpopulations and time; 2) Improper use of face coverings  
282 (e.g. without covering the nose and/or mouth or improper handling(25)) can reduce the  
283 effectiveness of face covering; 3) Face coverings are required and mostly worn in public and  
284 thus likely have a lower impact in private settings, particularly in reducing household  
285 transmission; consequently, the relative impact of face covering depends on the relative  
286 contribution of different sources of transmission (e.g. household vs. community) at a given time  
287 and *vice versa*; and 4) Use of face coverings may lead to complacency and less stringent  
288 adherence to social distancing and stay-at-home behaviors. Here we estimated a ~7% reduction

289 in overall transmission during the first month of the face covering mandate. However, the  
290 estimated effectiveness varied largely across age groups with much higher effectiveness among  
291 older adults (~20% for both 65-74 and 75+ year-olds vs. <10% for other age groups). This  
292 discrepancy was likely due to the differential compliance and types of face covering used.  
293 Observational studies in Wisconsin and surveys nationwide in April/May reported about 2-fold  
294 higher rates of face covering usage among older adults versus younger adults and minors.(16-  
295 18) In addition, due to the shortage of surgical masks during March–May,(26) older adults at  
296 higher risk of severe COVID-19 infection were more likely to use surgical masks whereas  
297 younger age groups more frequently used non-medical cloth coverings, which are often less  
298 effective(27, 28) (e.g. measured ultrafine filtration efficiency is ~50% for surgical masks vs. ~10-  
299 25% for T-shirt and ~25-35% for cotton covers(28)).

300  
301 As lockdown-like measures have been gradually lifted in many places, residents spend more  
302 time outside their homes than during the lockdown. Adjusting for the time spent outside of  
303 homes (~8.3 hours in April 2020 vs. ~11.5 hours in June-July 2020 and ~13.5 hours pre-  
304 pandemic; NYC data(29)), universal face covering would have reduced overall transmission by  
305 ~9–11% (i.e., 6.6% multiplied by a factor of 1.4–1.6) during reopening, given the same rates of  
306 face covering as in April. However, if the same effectiveness among older adults were achieved  
307 among other age groups, universal face covering could reduce overall transmission by up to  
308 ~28–32% (i.e., 20% multiplied by a factor of 1.4–1.6). Thus, our findings suggest that improving  
309 rates of usage of effective face coverings, especially among younger age groups, would  
310 significantly mitigate the risk of resurgence in COVID-19 infections during re-opening. It is thus  
311 crucial for future research to understand reasons for the use/non-use and selection of face  
312 coverings by age group to inform strategies to increase consistent and correct mask use in  
313 settings where social distancing is not possible.

314  
315 It is important to note, however, that not all individuals have the same opportunities to  
316 physically distance and/or adopt face coverings during a pandemic, despite government  
317 mandates. For instance, over one million frontline workers in NYC (e.g., healthcare workers,

318 transportation workers, janitors, and grocery clerks, which comprise 25 percent of the city's  
319 workforce) had to continue their essential work during the pandemic.(30) In addition, data from  
320 the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics suggest Black and Latino communities have less  
321 opportunities to work from home.(31) Consequently, NYC neighborhoods with more frontline  
322 workers and/or Black and Latino residents tended to have lower reductions in population  
323 mobility during the pandemic.(29) In NYC, these communities also experience a number of  
324 social conditions that are thought to exacerbate COVID-19, including overcrowded  
325 multigenerational households, poverty, and high prevalence of chronic diseases. These  
326 communities, known to also carry a higher burden of underlying health conditions, suffered  
327 greater impacts from COVID-19 and have expressed fear and experiences of racialized bias  
328 when wearing a face covering.(32, 33) Further research is warranted to investigate such health  
329 disparities. In addition, future policies should take into account structural inequities in labor  
330 trends, overcrowded housing, and underlying conditions and adopt additional preventive  
331 measures to protect those vulnerable communities.

332  
333 We also note there remain large uncertainties in our estimates due to several limitations.  
334 Foremost, we used population mobility as a proxy for contact rates rather than more direct  
335 measures. Similar approximation and uncertainty applied to our estimates of the effectiveness  
336 of face covering. Future studies are thus warranted for further assessment. In addition, here we  
337 focused on estimating the effectiveness of interventions in the general population without  
338 segregating key settings with intense transmission (e.g., long-term care facilities). Future  
339 studies should assess the impact of interventions targeting such high-risk settings.

340  
341 Our study also has several strengths. In particular, our estimates were based on comprehensive  
342 model-inference incorporating multiple data streams and further evaluated using model  
343 projections. Results thus provide an assessment of two major public health interventions  
344 (reducing contact rates and face covering) at the population level where the overall  
345 effectiveness depends on multiple factors in addition to the efficacy of a given intervention.  
346 Altogether, our estimates support the need for multiple interventions (including reducing

347 contact rates by, e.g., restricting occupancy, universal face covering, and, albeit not studied  
348 here, testing, contact tracing, isolation and timely treatment of cases) in order to effectively  
349 mitigate the spread of COVID-19 as it continues to pose threats to public health.

350

## 351 **Methods**

### 352 ***Data***

353 COVID-19 cases included all laboratory-confirmed cases by week of diagnosis reported to the  
354 NYC DOHMH. Mortality data by week of death combined confirmed and probable COVID-19-  
355 associated deaths. Confirmed COVID-19-associated deaths were defined as those occurring in  
356 persons with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection, and probable COVID-19 deaths were  
357 defined as those with COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, or a similar term listed on the death certificate as  
358 an immediate, underlying, or contributing cause of death, but did not have laboratory-  
359 confirmation of COVID-19.(34) For this study, both weekly case and mortality data were  
360 aggregated by age group (<1, 1-4, 5-14, 15-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65-74, and 75+ years) for each of  
361 the 42 United Hospital Fund (UHF) neighborhoods,(35) according to the patient’s residential  
362 address. All data were retrieved on Sep 4, 2020.

363

364 The mobility data, used to model changes in population contact rates due to public health  
365 interventions implemented during the pandemic (e.g., social distancing), came from  
366 SafeGraph(29, 36) and contained counts of visitors to locations in each zip code from the same  
367 zip code and others, separately, based on mobile device locations. The released data were  
368 anonymized and aggregated in weekly intervals. We spatially aggregated these data to the UHF  
369 neighborhood level, for both intra and inter UHF neighborhood mobility. In addition, SafeGraph  
370 also provided an aggregate measure of the length of time spent outside of the home during  
371 each week.

372

373 This study was classified as public health surveillance and exempt from ethical review and  
374 informed consent by the Institutional Review Boards of both Columbia University and NYC  
375 DOHMH.

376

### 377 **Network transmission model**

378 The epidemic model used in this study was described in Yang et al. 2020(11) Briefly, the model  
379 simulated intra- and inter neighborhood transmission of COVID-19 using a susceptible-exposed-  
380 infectious-removed (SEIR) network model:

$$381 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{dS_i}{dt} = -S_i \sum_{j=1}^{j=42} b_j \beta_{city} c_{ij} I_j / N_j \\ \frac{dE_i}{dt} = S_i \sum_{j=1}^{j=42} b_j \beta_{city} c_{ij} I_j / N_j - \frac{E_i}{Z} \\ \frac{dI_i}{dt} = \frac{E_i}{Z} - \frac{I_i}{D} \\ \frac{dR_i}{dt} = \frac{I_i}{D} \end{array} \right. \text{ (Eqn 1)}$$

382

383 where  $S_i$ ,  $E_i$ ,  $I_i$ ,  $R_i$ , and  $N_i$  are the numbers of susceptible, exposed (but not yet infectious),  
384 infectious, and removed (either recovered or deceased) individuals and the total population,  
385 respectively, from a given age group in neighborhood  $i$ . Note that due to model complexity and  
386 a lack of information for parameterizing interactions among age groups, we modeled each age  
387 group separately (i.e., combining all sources of transmission to each age group; see further  
388 detail on parameter estimation below); as such, Eqn 1 describes the spatial transmission across  
389 neighborhoods without interactions among age groups.  $\beta_{city}$  is the citywide transmission rate,  
390 which incorporated seasonal variation as observed for OC43, a beta-coronavirus in humans  
391 from the same genus as SARS-CoV-2.(37) To allow differential transmission in each  
392 neighborhood, we included a multiplicative factor,  $b_i$ , to scale neighborhood local transmission  
393 rates.  $Z$  and  $D$  are the latency and infectious periods, respectively (Table S4).

394

395 The contact rates ( $c_{ij}$ ) in each neighborhood over time and connectivity among neighborhoods  
396 were computed based on mobility data. The model also accounted for delays from infection to  
397 diagnosis using two parameters (gamma distribution with mean  $T_d$  and standard deviation  $T_{sd}$   
398 estimated along with other parameters) and death (based on observed time from diagnosis to  
399 death) as well as infection detection rate using a parameter  $r$  (estimated along with other  
400 parameters). For further detail, please refer to Yang et al. 2020.(11)

401

402 **Parameter estimation**

403 To estimate model parameters (e.g.,  $b_i$ ,  $\beta_{city}$ ,  $Z$ ,  $D$ ,  $r$ , and *infection fatality risk*, for  $i=1,\dots,42$ ) and  
404 state variables (e.g., number of susceptible and infectious individuals in each neighborhood) for  
405 each week, we ran the network-model stochastically with a daily time step in conjunction with  
406 the ensemble adjustment Kalman filter (EAKF)(38) and fit to weekly case and mortality data  
407 from the week starting March 1 to the week ending June 6, 2020. The posterior distribution of  
408 each model parameter/variable was updated for that week at the same time.(38) This  
409 parameter estimation process was done separately for each of the eight age groups (i.e. <1, 1-4,  
410 5-14, 15-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65-74, and 75+ years). To include transmission from other age  
411 groups, we used measured intra and inter-group contacts from the POLYMOD study(15) to  
412 compute the total number of contacts made with each age group and adjusted the *prior* range  
413 of the transmission rate ( $\beta_{city}$ ) for each age group accordingly. The posterior estimate was  
414 computed based on cases and mortality data for each group, which included all sources of  
415 infection. Thus, the estimated transmission rate for each age group nevertheless included all  
416 sources of transmission. To account for stochasticity in model initiation, we ran the parameter  
417 estimation process independently 20 times. Results for each age group were combined from  
418 these 20 runs (each with 500 model realizations). We computed age-specific  $R_t$ , the effective  
419 reproductive number during week- $t$ , from the posterior estimates of transmission rate ( $\beta_{city}$  and  
420  $b_i$ ), infectious period ( $D$ ), contact matrix ( $c_{ij}$ ), susceptibility and population size in the  
421 neighborhood using the next generation method.(39) We computed  $R_t$ ,  $\beta_{city}$ , and  $D$  estimates  
422 for all ages overall as a weighted average of the age-specific estimates with weights equal to  
423 the population fraction in each age group.

424

425 **Estimating the effectiveness of reducing contact rates**

426 The  $R_t$  estimates from the model-inference system capture changes in transmission due to  
427 various interventions, i.e., the overall effectiveness of all implemented interventions. To  
428 separately estimate the effectiveness of interventions that reduce contact rates, we used  
429 human mobility as a measure of population contact rate to estimate the changes in  $R_t$  in  
430 response to changing population contact rates. Specifically, we regressed the  $R_t$  estimates from

431 the full model-inference system on the mobility data:  $R_t = a_0 + a_1 M_{ave,t}$  (Eqn 2), where  $M_{ave,t}$   
432 is the mean of all intra-neighborhood mobility at week- $t$ . We then computed the effectiveness  
433 of reducing contact rate based on  $\widehat{R}_t$ , the  $R_t$  estimate from this regression model solely based  
434 on the observed mobility. That is, the reduction in  $R_t$  by week- $t$ , likely due to reducing contact  
435 rate, was computed as  $(\widehat{R}_t - \widehat{R}_0)/\widehat{R}_0$  (Eqn 3). To test the robustness of our method, we  
436 performed the same analysis for individual UHF neighborhoods ( $n = 42$ ).

437

### 438 ***Estimating the effectiveness of face covering/masking***

439 In addition to changes in population contact rates, face covering/masking was another major  
440 control measure implemented beginning the week of April 12, 2020 when NYC mandated  
441 residents wear face coverings in public places. To estimate the effectiveness of face covering,  
442 we first estimated the changes in transmission rate and effective infectious period, two model  
443 parameters determining  $R_t$ , due to changes in mobility (as opposed to masking) using  
444 regression models similar to Eqn 2. Specifically, we regressed the estimated citywide  
445 transmission rate (or effective infectious period) from the full model-inference system on  
446 average mobility:  $Y_t = a_0 + a_1 M_{ave,t}$  (Eqn 4), where  $Y_t$  is  $\beta_{city}$  or  $D$ . We then computed the  
447 relative reduction in transmission rate (or effective infectious period) due to face covering as  
448  $\eta_Y = E((Y_t - \widehat{Y}_t)/Y_t)$ , where  $E(\cdot)$  gives the mean over the relevant timeframe (here we  
449 estimated two timeframes, i.e., 1 month following the mandate and over 8 weeks up to  
450 6/6/2020). Combining both reductions, we computed the effectiveness of face covering as  $\eta =$   
451  $1 - (1 - \eta_\beta)(1 - \eta_D)$ . Of note, while mechanistically face coverings act primarily by reducing  
452 the probability of transmission (i.e., transmission rate), here we included both the potential  
453 impact on the transmission rate ( $\eta_\beta$ ) and effective infectious period ( $\eta_D$ ), mainly because the  
454 multiplicative relationship of the two variables with  $R_t$  makes it challenging to separate the two  
455 effects. Nevertheless, reductions in the infectious period via face covering are possible. A  
456 recent study on animals showed that masking could reduce the severity of infection;(40) if  
457 persons with milder infection experience shorter duration of viral shedding (there is some  
458 evidence for this, e.g., from He et al.(41)), milder symptoms in individuals infected while  
459 wearing face covering could lead to shorter infectious period of these individuals.



460

461 ***Projections of cases and deaths***

462 To evaluate the accuracy of model estimates, in particular, the effectiveness of transmission  
463 reduction by reducing contact rates and use of face covering, we tested if these estimates along  
464 with the model could generate accurate predictions of cases and deaths for 8 weeks beyond  
465 the study period (i.e. from the week of 6/7/2020 to the week of 7/26/2020). We first projected  
466 the citywide transmission rate and infectious period based on observed mobility using Eqn 4;  
467 these estimates thus accounted for changes due to changes in contact rates. To incorporate the  
468 reduction in transmission by face covering, we further reduced the projected city transmission  
469 rate by a factor of  $1 - \eta_{\beta}p_{out}$  and the infectious period by a factor of  $1 - \eta_D p_{out}$ , where  $p_{out}$  is  
470 a factor to adjust for time spent outside of the home during each week. To reflect longer-term  
471 usage rates of face covering, we used  $\eta_{\beta}$  and  $\eta_D$  estimated during the entire 8 weeks face  
472 covering was required (i.e. from the week of 4/12/2020 to the week of 5/31/2020). Finally, we  
473 used estimates of population susceptibility and infection rates at the end of the week of  
474 5/31/2020 to model initial conditions and integrated the SEIR network model forward  
475 stochastically for 8 weeks using the projected transmission rate and infectious period.

476

477 **Acknowledgments:**

478 This study was supported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases  
479 (AI145883), the National Science Foundation Rapid Response Research Program (RAPID;  
480 2027369), and the NYC DOHMH. We thank the NYC DOHMH Bureau of Vital Statistics team and  
481 EpiData team; in particular, Mary Huynh, Sharon K. Greene, Alice Yeung, Anne Fine, Miranda S.  
482 Moore and Kevin Guerra, for data management and provision. We thank Jennifer Brite at NYC  
483 DOHMH for coordinating discussions on modeling COVID-19 in NYC and Alana Tornello for  
484 amplifying community voices. We also thank Columbia University Mailman School of Public  
485 Health for high performance computing, Safe Graph ([safegraph.com](https://safegraph.com)) for providing the mobility  
486 data, and Sasikiran Kandula at Columbia University for compiling the mobility data used in this  
487 study. We are also grateful to Sasikiran Kandula, Sharon K. Greene, Anne Fine, and Hannah  
488 Helmy for helpful feedback on this manuscript.

489

490 **Conflict of Interest**

491 J Shaman and Columbia University disclose partial ownership of SK Analytics. J Shaman  
492 discloses consulting for BNI. Other authors have nothing to disclose.

493

494 References:

495 1. NYC & Company, 2019 New York City Travel & Tourism Trend Report. 8/17.

496 [https://adobeindd.com/view/publications/e91e777a-c68b-4db1-a609-](https://adobeindd.com/view/publications/e91e777a-c68b-4db1-a609-58664a52cffd/7r7x/publication-web-resources/pdf/NYC_Travel&TourismTrendReport_Oct2019.pdf)

497 [58664a52cffd/7r7x/publication-web-](https://adobeindd.com/view/publications/e91e777a-c68b-4db1-a609-58664a52cffd/7r7x/publication-web-resources/pdf/NYC_Travel&TourismTrendReport_Oct2019.pdf)

498 [resources/pdf/NYC\\_Travel&TourismTrendReport\\_Oct2019.pdf](https://adobeindd.com/view/publications/e91e777a-c68b-4db1-a609-58664a52cffd/7r7x/publication-web-resources/pdf/NYC_Travel&TourismTrendReport_Oct2019.pdf)

499 2. New York City Office of the Mayor, New York City to Close All School Buildings and

500 Transition to Remote Learning. [https://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/151-](https://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/151-20/new-york-city-close-all-school-buildings-transition-remote-learning)

501 [20/new-york-city-close-all-school-buildings-transition-remote-learning](https://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/151-20/new-york-city-close-all-school-buildings-transition-remote-learning)

502 3. New York State Department of Health, New York State on PAUSE.

503 <https://coronavirus.health.ny.gov/new-york-state-pause>

504 4. New York city Office of the Mayor, Transcript: Mayor de Blasio Holds Media Availability on

505 COVID-19. [https://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/249-20/transcript-mayor-de-](https://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/249-20/transcript-mayor-de-blasio-holds-media-availability-covid-19)

506 [blasio-holds-media-availability-covid-19](https://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/249-20/transcript-mayor-de-blasio-holds-media-availability-covid-19)

507 5. N. Y. S. Government, Video, Audio, Photos & Rush Transcript: Governor Cuomo Announces

508 U.S. Open to Be Held Without Fans from August 31st to September 13th.

509 [https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/video-audio-photos-rush-transcript-governor-cuomo-](https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/video-audio-photos-rush-transcript-governor-cuomo-announces-us-open-be-held-without-fans-august)

510 [announces-us-open-be-held-without-fans-august](https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/video-audio-photos-rush-transcript-governor-cuomo-announces-us-open-be-held-without-fans-august)

511 6. R. Li, S. Pei, B. Chen, Y. Song, T. Zhang, W. Yang, J. Shaman, Substantial undocumented

512 infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science* **368**,

513 489-493 (2020).

514 7. The Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia Emergency Response Epidemiology Team, The

515 epidemiological characteristics of an outbreak of 2019 novel coronavirus diseases (COVID-

516 19)—China, 2020. *China CDC Weekly* **2**, 113-122 (2020).

- 517 8. CDC COVID-19 Response Team, Preliminary estimates of the prevalence of selected  
518 underlying health conditions among patients with coronavirus disease 2019—United  
519 States, February 12–March 28, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* **69**, 382  
520 (2020).
- 521 9. Governor.ny.gov, After Weeks of Demanding Approval, Governor Cuomo Announces FDA  
522 Gives New York State Authority to Conduct All COVID-19 Testing at Public and Private Labs.  
523 [https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/after-weeks-demanding-approval-governor-cuomo-](https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/after-weeks-demanding-approval-governor-cuomo-announces-fda-gives-new-york-state-authority)  
524 [announces-fda-gives-new-york-state-authority](https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/after-weeks-demanding-approval-governor-cuomo-announces-fda-gives-new-york-state-authority)
- 525 10. C. Y. Johnson, L. H. Sun, L. McGinley, In hard-hit areas, testing restricted to health care  
526 workers, hospital patients. 6/22/2020.  
527 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2020/03/21/coronavirus-testing-strategyshift/>
- 528 11. W. Yang, S. Kandula, M. Huynh, S. K. Greene, G. Van Wye, W. Li, H. T. Chan, E. McGibbon, A.  
529 Yeung, D. Olson, A. Fine, J. Shaman, Estimating the infection fatality risk of COVID-19 in  
530 New York City, March 1-May 16, 2020. *medRxiv*, 2020.2006.2027.20141689 (2020).
- 531 12. Q. Li, X. Guan, P. Wu, X. Wang, L. Zhou, Y. Tong, R. Ren, K. S. M. Leung, E. H. Y. Lau, J. Y.  
532 Wong, X. Xing, N. Xiang, Y. Wu, C. Li, Q. Chen, D. Li, T. Liu, J. Zhao, M. Liu, W. Tu, C. Chen, L.  
533 Jin, R. Yang, Q. Wang, S. Zhou, R. Wang, H. Liu, Y. Luo, Y. Liu, G. Shao, H. Li, Z. Tao, Y. Yang,  
534 Z. Deng, B. Liu, Z. Ma, Y. Zhang, G. Shi, T. T. Y. Lam, J. T. Wu, G. F. Gao, B. J. Cowling, B.  
535 Yang, G. M. Leung, Z. Feng, Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel  
536 Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med* **382**, 1199-1207 (2020).
- 537 13. J. T. Wu, K. Leung, G. M. Leung, Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and  
538 international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling  
539 study. *Lancet*, (2020).
- 540 14. C. Goldbaum, Coronavirus in N.Y.: Riders Ditch the Subway as Fear Spreads.  
541 <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/13/nyregion/coronavirus-subway-public-transit.html>
- 542 15. J. Mossong, N. Hens, M. Jit, P. Beutels, K. Auranen, R. Mikolajczyk, M. Massari, S. Salmaso,  
543 G. S. Tomba, J. Wallinga, J. Heijne, M. Sadkowska-Todys, M. Rosinska, W. J. Edmunds, Social  
544 contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS Med* **5**, e74  
545 (2008).

- 546 16. N. L. Arp, T. H. Nguyen, E. J. Graham Linck, A. K. Feeney, J. H. Schrope, K. L. Ruedinger, A.  
547 Gao, M. Miranda-Katz, A. E. Kates, N. Safdar, Use of face coverings by the public during the  
548 COVID-19 pandemic: an observational study. *medRxiv*, 2020.2006.2009.20126946 (2020).
- 549 17. M. H. Haischer, R. Beilfuss, M. R. Hart, L. Opielinski, D. Wrucke, G. Zircgaitis, T. D. Uhrich, S.  
550 K. Hunter, Who is wearing a mask? Gender-, age-, and location-related differences during  
551 the COVID-19 pandemic. *medRxiv*, 2020.2007.2013.20152736 (2020).
- 552 18. Z. Ritter, M. Brennan, New April Guidelines Boost Perceived Efficacy of Face Masks.  
553 [https://news.gallup.com/poll/310400/new-april-guidelines-boost-perceived-efficacy-face-](https://news.gallup.com/poll/310400/new-april-guidelines-boost-perceived-efficacy-face-masks.aspx)  
554 [masks.aspx](https://news.gallup.com/poll/310400/new-april-guidelines-boost-perceived-efficacy-face-masks.aspx)
- 555 19. V. Barone, J. Marino, Hundreds pack St. Marks Place to drink, party despite coronavirus.  
556 [https://nypost.com/2020/06/12/hundreds-pack-st-marks-place-to-drink-despite-](https://nypost.com/2020/06/12/hundreds-pack-st-marks-place-to-drink-despite-coronavirus/)  
557 [coronavirus/](https://nypost.com/2020/06/12/hundreds-pack-st-marks-place-to-drink-despite-coronavirus/)
- 558 20. New York State Government, Reopening New York City. [https://forward.ny.gov/reopening-](https://forward.ny.gov/reopening-new-york-city)  
559 [new-york-city](https://forward.ny.gov/reopening-new-york-city)
- 560 21. E. Durkin, New York City sees uptick in coronavirus cases among young adults.  
561 [https://www.politico.com/states/new-york/albany/story/2020/07/13/new-york-city-sees-](https://www.politico.com/states/new-york/albany/story/2020/07/13/new-york-city-sees-uptick-in-coronavirus-cases-among-young-adults-1300223)  
562 [uptick-in-coronavirus-cases-among-young-adults-1300223](https://www.politico.com/states/new-york/albany/story/2020/07/13/new-york-city-sees-uptick-in-coronavirus-cases-among-young-adults-1300223)
- 563 22. H. Salje, C. Tran Kiem, N. Lefrancq, N. Courtejoie, P. Bosetti, J. Paireau, A. Andronico, N.  
564 Hoze, J. Richet, C. L. Dubost, Y. Le Strat, J. Lessler, D. Levy-Bruhl, A. Fontanet, L. Opatowski,  
565 P. Y. Boelle, S. Cauchemez, Estimating the burden of SARS-CoV-2 in France. *Science* **369**,  
566 208-211 (2020).
- 567 23. M. Gatto, E. Bertuzzo, L. Mari, S. Miccoli, L. Carraro, R. Casagrandi, A. Rinaldo, Spread and  
568 dynamics of the COVID-19 epidemic in Italy: Effects of emergency containment measures.  
569 *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **117**, 10484-10491 (2020).
- 570 24. M. Liang, L. Gao, C. Cheng, Q. Zhou, J. P. Uy, K. Heiner, C. Sun, Efficacy of face mask in  
571 preventing respiratory virus transmission: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Travel*  
572 *Med Infect Dis*, 101751 (2020).
- 573 25. T. Parker-Pope, How NOT to Wear a Mask.  
574 <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/08/well/live/coronavirus-face-mask-mistakes.html>

- 575 26. L. Bernstein, A. Safarpour, Mask shortage for most health-care workers extended into May,  
576 Post-Ipsos poll shows. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/mask-shortage-for-most-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/mask-shortage-for-most-health-care-workers-extended-into-may-post-ipsos-poll-shows/2020/05/20/1ddbe588-9a21-11ea-ac72-3841fcc9b35f_story.html)  
577 [health-care-workers-extended-into-may-post-ipsos-poll-shows/2020/05/20/1ddbe588-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/mask-shortage-for-most-health-care-workers-extended-into-may-post-ipsos-poll-shows/2020/05/20/1ddbe588-9a21-11ea-ac72-3841fcc9b35f_story.html)  
578 [9a21-11ea-ac72-3841fcc9b35f\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/mask-shortage-for-most-health-care-workers-extended-into-may-post-ipsos-poll-shows/2020/05/20/1ddbe588-9a21-11ea-ac72-3841fcc9b35f_story.html)
- 579 27. E. P. Fischer, M. C. Fischer, D. Grass, I. Henrion, W. S. Warren, E. Westman, Low-cost  
580 measurement of face mask efficacy for filtering expelled droplets during speech. *Science*  
581 *Advances* **6**, eabd3083 (2020).
- 582 28. E. O'Kelly, S. Pirog, J. Ward, P. J. Clarkson, Ability of Fabric Facemasks Materials to Filter  
583 Ultrafine Particles at Coughing Velocity - for Home Made and Fabric Face Mask Creation.  
584 *medRxiv*, 2020.2004.2014.20065375 (2020).
- 585 29. SafeGraph, Weekly Patterns: Foot Traffic Data To Understand The COVID-19 Pandemic.  
586 <https://www.safegraph.com/weekly-foot-traffic-patterns>
- 587 30. S. M. Stringer, New York City's Frontline Workers.  
588 <https://comptroller.nyc.gov/reports/new-york-citys-frontline-workers/>
- 589 31. E. Gould, H. Shierholz, Not everybody can work from home: Black and Hispanic workers are  
590 much less likely to be able to telework. [https://www.epi.org/blog/black-and-hispanic-](https://www.epi.org/blog/black-and-hispanic-workers-are-much-less-likely-to-be-able-to-work-from-home/#:~:text=Less%20than%20one%20in%20five,race%20and%20ethnicity%2C%202017-2018&text=The%20data%20below%20can%20be%20saved%20or%20copied%20directly%20into%20Excel.&text=The%20next%20figure%20illustrates%20the,who%20can%20telework%20by%20wage)  
591 [workers-are-much-less-likely-to-be-able-to-work-from-](https://www.epi.org/blog/black-and-hispanic-workers-are-much-less-likely-to-be-able-to-work-from-home/#:~:text=Less%20than%20one%20in%20five,race%20and%20ethnicity%2C%202017-2018&text=The%20data%20below%20can%20be%20saved%20or%20copied%20directly%20into%20Excel.&text=The%20next%20figure%20illustrates%20the,who%20can%20telework%20by%20wage)  
592 [home/#:~:text=Less%20than%20one%20in%20five,race%20and%20ethnicity%2C%202017-](https://www.epi.org/blog/black-and-hispanic-workers-are-much-less-likely-to-be-able-to-work-from-home/#:~:text=Less%20than%20one%20in%20five,race%20and%20ethnicity%2C%202017-2018&text=The%20data%20below%20can%20be%20saved%20or%20copied%20directly%20into%20Excel.&text=The%20next%20figure%20illustrates%20the,who%20can%20telework%20by%20wage)  
593 [2018&text=The%20data%20below%20can%20be%20saved%20or%20copied%20directly%2](https://www.epi.org/blog/black-and-hispanic-workers-are-much-less-likely-to-be-able-to-work-from-home/#:~:text=Less%20than%20one%20in%20five,race%20and%20ethnicity%2C%202017-2018&text=The%20data%20below%20can%20be%20saved%20or%20copied%20directly%20into%20Excel.&text=The%20next%20figure%20illustrates%20the,who%20can%20telework%20by%20wage)  
594 [0into%20Excel.&text=The%20next%20figure%20illustrates%20the,who%20can%20telewor](https://www.epi.org/blog/black-and-hispanic-workers-are-much-less-likely-to-be-able-to-work-from-home/#:~:text=Less%20than%20one%20in%20five,race%20and%20ethnicity%2C%202017-2018&text=The%20data%20below%20can%20be%20saved%20or%20copied%20directly%20into%20Excel.&text=The%20next%20figure%20illustrates%20the,who%20can%20telework%20by%20wage)  
595 [k%20by%20wage](https://www.epi.org/blog/black-and-hispanic-workers-are-much-less-likely-to-be-able-to-work-from-home/#:~:text=Less%20than%20one%20in%20five,race%20and%20ethnicity%2C%202017-2018&text=The%20data%20below%20can%20be%20saved%20or%20copied%20directly%20into%20Excel.&text=The%20next%20figure%20illustrates%20the,who%20can%20telework%20by%20wage).
- 596 32. D. B. Taylor, For Black Men, Fear That Masks Will Invite Racial Profiling.  
597 [https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/14/us/coronavirus-masks-racism-african-](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/14/us/coronavirus-masks-racism-african-americans.html)  
598 [americans.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/14/us/coronavirus-masks-racism-african-americans.html)
- 599 33. N. G. Ruiz, J. M. Horowitz, C. Tamir, Many Black and Asian Americans Say They Have  
600 Experienced Discrimination Amid the COVID-19 Outbreak.  
601 [https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2020/07/01/many-black-and-asian-americans-say-they-](https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2020/07/01/many-black-and-asian-americans-say-they-have-experienced-discrimination-amid-the-covid-19-outbreak/)  
602 [have-experienced-discrimination-amid-the-covid-19-outbreak/](https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2020/07/01/many-black-and-asian-americans-say-they-have-experienced-discrimination-amid-the-covid-19-outbreak/)

- 603 34. New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DOHMH) COVID-19 Response  
604 Team, Preliminary Estimate of Excess Mortality During the COVID-19 Outbreak — New York  
605 City, March 11–May 2, 2020. *MMWR. Morbidity and mortality weekly report* **69**, 603-605  
606 (2020).
- 607 35. New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, NYC UHF 42 Neighborhoods.  
608 <http://a816-dohbesp.nyc.gov/IndicatorPublic/EPHTPDF/uhf42.pdf>
- 609 36. A. Lasry, D. Kidder, M. Hast, J. Poovey, G. Sunshine, K. Winglee, N. Zviedrite, F. Ahmed, K. A.  
610 Ethier, C. D. C. P. H. L. Program, H. New York City Department of, H. Mental, H. Louisiana  
611 Department of, S. Public Health, C. King, C.-R. T. San Francisco, D. Alameda County Public  
612 Health, D. San Mateo County Health, H. Marin County Division of Public, Timing of  
613 Community Mitigation and Changes in Reported COVID-19 and Community Mobility - Four  
614 U.S. Metropolitan Areas, February 26-April 1, 2020. *MMWR. Morbidity and mortality*  
615 *weekly report* **69**, 451-457 (2020).
- 616 37. W. Yang, S. Kandula, J. Shaman, Eight-week model projections of COVID-19 in New York  
617 City [https://github.com/wan-yang/COLUMBIA-COVID19-PROJECTIONS-FOR-](https://github.com/wan-yang/COLUMBIA-COVID19-PROJECTIONS-FOR-NYC/blob/master/summary_nyc.projection200316_CU_updated.pdf)  
618 [NYC/blob/master/summary\\_nyc.projection200316\\_CU\\_updated.pdf](https://github.com/wan-yang/COLUMBIA-COVID19-PROJECTIONS-FOR-NYC/blob/master/summary_nyc.projection200316_CU_updated.pdf)
- 619 38. J. L. Anderson, An Ensemble Adjustment Kalman Filter for Data Assimilation. *Mon. Weather*  
620 *Rev.* **129**, 2884-2903 (2001).
- 621 39. J. M. Heffernan, R. J. Smith, L. M. Wahl, Perspectives on the basic reproductive ratio. *J R Soc*  
622 *Interface* **2**, 281-293 (2005).
- 623 40. J. F. Chan, S. Yuan, A. J. Zhang, V. K. Poon, C. C. Chan, A. C. Lee, Z. Fan, C. Li, R. Liang, J. Cao,  
624 K. Tang, C. Luo, V. C. Cheng, J. P. Cai, H. Chu, K. H. Chan, K. K. To, S. Sridhar, K. Y. Yuen,  
625 Surgical mask partition reduces the risk of non-contact transmission in a golden Syrian  
626 hamster model for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Clinical infectious diseases : an*  
627 *official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*, (2020).
- 628 41. X. He, E. H. Y. Lau, P. Wu, X. Deng, J. Wang, X. Hao, Y. C. Lau, J. Y. Wong, Y. Guan, X. Tan, X.  
629 Mo, Y. Chen, B. Liao, W. Chen, F. Hu, Q. Zhang, M. Zhong, Y. Wu, L. Zhao, F. Zhang, B. J.  
630 Cowling, F. Li, G. M. Leung, Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of  
631 COVID-19. *Nat Med* **26**, 672-675 (2020).
- 632

633 **Table**

634 Table 1. Estimated effectiveness of reducing contact rate and face covering. Numbers are the  
635 estimated mean and 95% CIs, in percentage. Note the estimated effectiveness of contact rate  
636 reduction combined all measures that reduce contact rates, including school closures and  
637 voluntary or mandated stay-at-home measures.


Age	Estimated effectiveness of intervention (%)		
	contact rate reduction	Face covering (1 <sup>st</sup> month)	Face covering (2 months)
all	70.7 (65.0, 76.4)	6.6 (0.8, 12.4)	3.4 (-1.9, 8.6)
<1	53.8 (41.6, 66)	9.3 (-4.2, 22.9)	12.8 (0.2, 25.3)
1-4	51.0 (45.8, 56.2)	0.9 (-5.5, 7.4)	6.7 (0.6, 12.8)
5-14	83.4 (80.1, 86.7)	3.0 (-0.5, 6.6)	1.6 (-1.6, 4.8)
15-24	65.4 (57.0, 73.8)	4.3 (-2.8, 11.4)	4.0 (-2.5, 10.6)
25-44	76.5 (68.5, 84.6)	4.5 (-0.6, 9.7)	-1.0 (-5.6, 3.7)
45-64	68.9 (59.2, 78.6)	8.1 (-0.1, 16.1)	4.4 (-2.9, 11.8)
65-74	55.8 (34.5, 77.2)	20.8 (-0.1, 41.6)	18.3 (-0.2, 36.9)
75+	53.8 (32.3, 75.3)	20.8 (-0.9, 42.5)	16.2 (-3.3, 35.7)

638

639

640 **Figures**


641 **Fig 1.** Epidemic dynamics. Reported laboratory confirmed cases (A) and cumulative cases (B)  
642 per 100,000 population by week of diagnosis for all ages overall and by age group.



643




644 **Fig 2.** Estimated changes in the effective reproductive number and infection rates. Blue lines  
645 show the estimated effective reproductive number ( $R_t$ ) for each week; surrounding areas show  
646 the 50% and 95% CrIs. Superimposed boxes (right y-axis) show estimated infection rates by  
647 week: median (thick vertical lines), 50% CrIs (box edges), and 95% CrIs (whiskers).




648

649 **Fig 3.** Effectiveness of reducing contact rates. Note the estimated effectiveness combined all  
 650 measures that reduce contact rates, including school closures and voluntary or mandated stay-  
 651 at-home measures. Dark grey lines show the observed changes in mobility (right y-axis). Blue  
 652 lines show  $R_t$  estimated using a linear regression model with mobility as the sole predictor;  
 653 surrounding areas show the 95% CIs of the model estimates. The adjusted  $r^2$  for the regression  
 654 model is also shown in each plot. For comparison, dashed blue lines show  $R_t$  estimates from the  
 655 model-inference system, without accounting for susceptibility. Percentages attached to the  
 656 lines show the incremental reductions in either estimated  $R_t$  (in blue) or mobility (in grey).




657  
 658  
 659  
 660

661 **Fig 4.** Effectiveness of face covering in reducing the transmission rate and infectious period.  
662 Solid lines show the estimated transmission rate (in blue, left y-axis) and infectious period (in  
663 red, right y-axis) using the model-inference system incorporating interventions including face  
664 covering. Surrounding areas show the 50% CrIs of model estimates. Dashed lines show  
665 corresponding estimates from a linear regression model with mobility as the sole predictor (i.e  
666 without accounting for face covering).



667

668 **Fig 5.** Projections of COVID-19 cases and deaths eight weeks beyond the study period. Blue dots  
669 show confirmed cases by week of diagnosis and deaths by week of death, as observed by the  
670 surveillance system. Blue lines show model median estimates; surrounding shades show 50%  
671 and 90% CrIs. Orange lines show model projected median weekly cases and deaths;  
672 surrounding shades show 50% and 90% CIs of the projection.



673  
674

## Supplemental Tables and Figures

for

### COVID-19 Transmission Dynamics and Effectiveness of Public Health Interventions in New York City during the 2020 Spring Pandemic Wave

Wan Yang, Jaimie Shaff, Jeffrey Shaman

#### Supplemental Tables

**Table S1.** Total number of reported cases and estimated cumulative infection rate by the week of 5/31/20. Case rate was computed as the number of total cases divided by the population size of the corresponding age group. Estimated infection rate was estimated by model-inference system, normalized to the corresponding population size; numbers are median (and 95% CrIs).

Age	Total number of cases	Case rate (%)	Estimated infection rate (%)
all	205693	2.45	17.6 (13.2, 25.5)
<1	515	0.46	4.4 (2.9, 10.5)
1-4	609	0.14	1.4 (0.9, 3.7)
5-14	2646	0.28	10.5 (6.5, 24.5)
15-24	12562	1.28	12.0 (8.4, 19.5)
25-44	64764	2.45	22.7 (16.8, 31.5)
45-64	74833	3.64	23.1 (18.4, 29.6)
65-74	25469	3.64	15.2 (11.4, 21.7)
75+	24295	4.44	12.7 (9.8, 18.4)

**Table S2.** Estimated reproductive number by week and age group. Numbers are median (and interquartile range) of the posterior estimates.

date	Age Groups								
	all	<1	1-4	5-14	15-24	25-44	45-64	65-74	75+
3/1/20	2.99 (2.32, 3.86)	1.52 (1.19, 1.96)	1.56 (1.22, 2.02)	3.15 (2.47, 4.09)	2.47 (1.93, 3.22)	4 (3.1, 5.15)	2.97 (2.3, 3.86)	1.77 (1.37, 2.29)	1.75 (1.35, 2.27)
3/8/20	2.25 (1.64, 2.98)	1.43 (1.11, 1.85)	1.28 (1, 1.7)	2.35 (1.74, 3.18)	2.02 (1.53, 2.64)	2.46 (1.57, 3.48)	2.49 (1.97, 3.12)	1.98 (1.55, 2.44)	1.84 (1.48, 2.29)
3/15/20	2.14 (1.62, 2.74)	1.63 (1.32, 2)	1.17 (0.92, 1.48)	1.52 (1.13, 2.06)	2.38 (1.86, 3)	1.45 (0.97, 2.03)	2.99 (2.3, 3.68)	2.84 (2.33, 3.51)	2.87 (2.33, 3.52)
3/22/20	1.37 (1.08, 1.68)	1.59 (1.35, 1.89)	1.05 (0.85, 1.29)	0.99 (0.74, 1.3)	1.29 (1.03, 1.57)	1 (0.76, 1.26)	1.37 (1.06, 1.71)	2.58 (2.15, 3.04)	2.52 (2.06, 3.02)
3/29/20	0.93 (0.73, 1.13)	1.22 (0.97, 1.44)	1.06 (0.82, 1.3)	0.88 (0.66, 1.14)	0.96 (0.75, 1.15)	0.7 (0.52, 0.88)	0.89 (0.71, 1.06)	1.43 (1.17, 1.65)	1.46 (1.27, 1.66)
4/5/20	0.63 (0.5, 0.75)	0.74 (0.6, 0.88)	0.84 (0.65, 1.03)	0.53 (0.41, 0.68)	0.77 (0.59, 0.91)	0.44 (0.33, 0.56)	0.62 (0.5, 0.73)	0.9 (0.79, 1.02)	0.9 (0.78, 1.02)
4/12/20	0.56 (0.45, 0.67)	0.67 (0.54, 0.79)	0.69 (0.53, 0.84)	0.5 (0.38, 0.62)	0.72 (0.57, 0.83)	0.44 (0.34, 0.55)	0.57 (0.47, 0.67)	0.63 (0.55, 0.71)	0.65 (0.57, 0.74)
4/19/20	0.59 (0.48, 0.7)	0.67 (0.54, 0.8)	0.68 (0.54, 0.81)	0.57 (0.44, 0.7)	0.81 (0.66, 0.93)	0.55 (0.42, 0.68)	0.49 (0.41, 0.57)	0.6 (0.52, 0.68)	0.66 (0.58, 0.74)
4/26/20	0.62 (0.5, 0.73)	0.62 (0.5, 0.75)	0.77 (0.62, 0.91)	0.54 (0.42, 0.67)	0.75 (0.61, 0.86)	0.58 (0.45, 0.72)	0.6 (0.5, 0.71)	0.58 (0.5, 0.67)	0.63 (0.56, 0.71)
5/3/20	0.66 (0.54, 0.77)	0.7 (0.56, 0.84)	0.78 (0.62, 0.91)	0.56 (0.44, 0.67)	0.72 (0.61, 0.8)	0.68 (0.54, 0.82)	0.68 (0.56, 0.78)	0.6 (0.52, 0.67)	0.55 (0.48, 0.63)
5/10/20	0.82 (0.67, 0.95)	0.71 (0.56, 0.86)	0.75 (0.6, 0.88)	0.6 (0.47, 0.73)	0.88 (0.73, 0.98)	0.9 (0.72, 1.06)	0.88 (0.74, 0.99)	0.73 (0.64, 0.81)	0.65 (0.57, 0.74)
5/17/20	1.03 (0.83, 1.18)	0.82 (0.65, 0.99)	0.8 (0.65, 0.93)	0.73 (0.57, 0.88)	1.1 (0.89, 1.24)	1.21 (0.95, 1.42)	1.1 (0.91, 1.24)	0.78 (0.69, 0.87)	0.81 (0.72, 0.92)
5/24/20	0.89 (0.73, 1.03)	0.78 (0.61, 0.95)	0.79 (0.63, 0.91)	0.69 (0.53, 0.83)	0.94 (0.78, 1.06)	0.96 (0.76, 1.13)	0.95 (0.78, 1.08)	0.79 (0.7, 0.88)	0.89 (0.78, 0.99)
5/31/20	0.79 (0.66, 0.91)	0.71 (0.55, 0.87)	0.71 (0.56, 0.83)	0.7 (0.55, 0.86)	0.85 (0.72, 0.95)	0.79 (0.64, 0.93)	0.77 (0.65, 0.89)	0.72 (0.64, 0.79)	1.04 (0.93, 1.15)

**Table S3.** Correlation of key epidemiological parameters with population mobility during the week of March 1 – the week of May 31, 2020.

Age	Rt (ignore susceptibility)	Rt	Transmission rate	Infectious period
all	0.96	0.96	0.73	0.54
<1	0.76	0.77	0.41	0.70
1-4	0.93	0.93	0.05	0.65
5-14	0.99	0.99	0.86	0.92
15-24	0.90	0.91	0.52	-0.05
25-44	0.93	0.96	0.80	0.27
45-64	0.88	0.90	0.60	0.24
65-74	0.57	0.63	0.54	0.65
75+	0.55	0.60	0.50	0.64

**Table S4.** Prior ranges for main model parameters and variables. The spatial, temporal, and age resolution of each parameter or variable, estimated in the model-inference system, is specified in the column "Resolution". Note posterior parameter estimates can extend outside the specified prior ranges. Note this is the same as Table S1 in Yang et al.(1)

Parameter/ variable	Symbol	Resolution	Prior range	Source/rationale
Initial exposed	$E(t=0)$	neighborhood- and age-group specific, estimated for the beginning of the Week of March 1, 2020	300 – 8000 total citywide, scaled by population size for each age group and neighborhood	Large uncertainties, used very wide range
Initial infectious	$I(t=0)$	neighborhood- and age-group specific, , estimated for the beginning of the Week of March 1, 2020	150 – 4000 total citywide, scaled by population size for each age group and neighborhood	Assumed to be half the initial exposed
Initial susceptible	$S(t=0)$	neighborhood- and age-group specific, estimated for the beginning of the Week of March 1, 2020	$N - E - I$	Assumed all were susceptible except for those initially exposed/infectious
Population size in each age group and neighborhood	$N$	neighborhood- and age-group specific	N/A	NYC intercensal population estimates for 2018(2)
Citywide transmission rate	$\beta_{city}$	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[0.5, 1] per day overall; scaled by contact rate for each age group based on contact data from the POLYMOD study(3) (averaged across 8 countries)	Based on $R_0$ estimates of around 1.5-4 for SARS-CoV-2(4-6)
Scaling of neighborhood transmission rate	$b_i$	neighborhood- and age-group specific, estimated for each week	[0.8, 1.2] for age groups under 65 years; [0.5, 1.5] for age groups 65 or older	Around 1; larger variation for elderly groups based on data



Latency period	$Z$	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[2, 5] days	Incubation period: 5.2 days (95% CI: 4.1, 7)(4); latency period is likely shorter than the incubation period
Infectious period	$D$	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[2, 5] days	Time from symptom onset to hospitalization: 3.8 days (95% CI: 0, 12.0) in China,(7) plus 1-2 days viral shedding before symptom onset. We did not distinguish symptomatic/asymptomatic infections.
Multiplicative factor for mobility	$m_1$	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[1, 2] for <1 year; [0.5, 1.5] for three age groups 1-24 years; [0.1, 1.5] for age group 25-44; [1, 2.5] for age groups 45 or older	Initial model testing showed transmission rates for younger age groups were more sensitive to changes in mobility whereas the two oldest age groups were not sensitive to mobility. For age groups with contact rates lower than the average (based on the POLYMOD study(3)), we raised the diagonal elements in the mobility matrix to the power of the relative contact rate (<1) to account for insensitivity of transmission rate in these age groups to mobility.
Multiplicative factor for neighborhood connectivity	$m_2$	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[0.5, 2]	Likely around 1 but with large uncertainties
Mean of time from viral shedding to diagnosis	$T_m$	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[3, 8] days	From a few days to a week from symptom onset to diagnosis/ reporting,(7) plus 1-2 days of viral shedding (being infectious) before symptom onset

Standard deviation (SD) of time from viral shedding to diagnosis	$T_{sd}$	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[1, 3] days	To allow variation in time to diagnosis/reporting
Reporting rate	$r$	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	Starting from [0.001, 0.05] at time 0 and allowed to increase over time using space re-probing(8)	Large uncertainties
Infection fatality risk (IFR)		Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[5, 15]×10 <sup>-4</sup> for ages under 25; [5, 15]×10 <sup>-3</sup> for ages 25-44; [5, 15]×10 <sup>-2</sup> for ages 45-64; [0.01, 0.1] for ages 65-74; [0.02, 0.2] for ages 75+;	Based on previous estimates(9) but extend to have wider ranges
Time from diagnosis to death		Citywide	Gamma distribution with mean of 9.36 days and SD of 9.76 days	Based on $n=15,686$ COVID-19 confirmed deaths in NYC as of May 17, 2020.


#### Reference:

1. W. Yang, S. Kandula, M. Huynh, S. K. Greene, G. Van Wye, W. Li, H. T. Chan, E. McGibbon, A. Yeung, D. Olson, A. Fine, J. Shaman, Estimating the infection fatality risk of COVID-19 in New York City, March 1-May 16, 2020. *medRxiv*, 2020.2006.2027.20141689 (2020).
2. New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.
3. J. Mossong, N. Hens, M. Jit, P. Beutels, K. Auranen, R. Mikolajczyk, M. Massari, S. Salmaso, G. S. Tomba, J. Wallinga, J. Heijne, M. Sadkowska-Todys, M. Rosinska, W. J. Edmunds, Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS Med* **5**, e74 (2008).
4. Q. Li, X. Guan, P. Wu, X. Wang, L. Zhou, Y. Tong, R. Ren, K. S. M. Leung, E. H. Y. Lau, J. Y. Wong, X. Xing, N. Xiang, Y. Wu, C. Li, Q. Chen, D. Li, T. Liu, J. Zhao, M. Liu, W. Tu, C. Chen, L. Jin, R. Yang, Q. Wang, S. Zhou, R. Wang, H. Liu, Y. Luo, Y. Liu, G. Shao, H. Li, Z. Tao, Y. Yang, Z. Deng, B. Liu, Z. Ma, Y. Zhang, G. Shi, T. T. Y. Lam, J. T. Wu, G. F. Gao, B. J. Cowling, B. Yang, G. M. Leung, Z. Feng, Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia. *New Engl J Med*, (2020).
5. J. T. Wu, K. Leung, G. M. Leung, Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *Lancet*, (2020).


6. R. Li, S. Pei, B. Chen, Y. Song, T. Zhang, W. Yang, J. Shaman, Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science* **368**, 489-493 (2020).
7. J. Zhang, M. Litvinova, W. Wang, Y. Wang, X. Deng, X. Chen, M. Li, W. Zheng, L. Yi, X. Chen, Q. Wu, Y. Liang, X. Wang, J. Yang, K. Sun, I. M. Longini, Jr., M. E. Halloran, P. Wu, B. J. Cowling, S. Merler, C. Viboud, A. Vespignani, M. Ajelli, H. Yu, Evolving epidemiology and transmission dynamics of coronavirus disease 2019 outside Hubei province, China: a descriptive and modelling study. *The Lancet. Infectious diseases*, (2020).
8. W. Yang, J. Shaman, A simple modification for improving inference of non-linear dynamical systems. *arXiv*, 1403.6804 (2014).
9. R. Verity, L. C. Okell, I. Dorigatti, P. Winskill, C. Whittaker, N. Imai, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, H. Thompson, P. G. T. Walker, H. Fu, A. Dighe, J. T. Griffin, M. Baguelin, S. Bhatia, A. Boonyasiri, A. Cori, Z. Cucunuba, R. FitzJohn, K. Gaythorpe, W. Green, A. Hamlet, W. Hinsley, D. Laydon, G. Nedjati-Gilani, S. Riley, S. van Elsland, E. Volz, H. Wang, Y. Wang, X. Xi, C. A. Donnelly, A. C. Ghani, N. M. Ferguson, Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. *The Lancet. Infectious diseases*, (2020).

## Supplemental Figures


**Fig S1.** Model fits of reported confirmed COVID-19 cases. Blue dots show reported number of cases by age group and week of diagnosis. Boxes show the model fitted weekly number of cases by age group. Box edges, thick middle lines, and whiskers show the 2.5<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, 75<sup>th</sup>, and 97.5<sup>th</sup> percentiles of model estimates.




**Fig S2.** Model fits of reported COVID-19 associated deaths. Blue dots show reported weekly number of deaths by age group. Boxes show the model fitted weekly number of deaths by age group. Box edges, thick middle lines, and whiskers show the 2.5<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, 75<sup>th</sup>, and 97.5<sup>th</sup> percentiles of model estimates.




**Fig S3.** Estimated case rates and infection rates by age group. Blue dots show confirmed case rates by age group and week of diagnosis. Blue boxes (left y-axis) show the model fitted weekly case rates and grey boxes (right y-axis) show the model estimated weekly infection rates by age group. Box edges, thick middle lines, and whiskers show the 2.5<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, 75<sup>th</sup>, and 97.5<sup>th</sup> percentiles of model estimates.



**Fig S4.** Sensitivity analysis on the effectiveness of reducing contact rate by neighborhood. There are 42 United Hospital Fund (UHF) neighborhoods in NYC. (A) shows the changes in human mobility during the pandemic by neighborhood (each colored line). The reductions were substantial in all neighborhoods but to varying degrees. (B) shows the estimated  $R_t$  (combining all ages) for each week and neighborhood (each colored line). Note these estimates did not account for changes in susceptibility so as to restrict to changes due to interventions. (C) shows the adjusted  $r^2$  of linear regression model fitting the mobility data (A) to the  $R_t$  estimates (B), for each neighborhood, per Eqn 2 in the main text. Adjusted  $r^2$  for most neighborhoods was  $>0.9$ . (D) shows the estimated reduction in  $R_t$  by the Week of April 12, 2020 based on the Eqn 3 in the main text, for each neighborhood. The histogram is based on the median estimated reduction in  $R_t$ .



**Fig S5.** Projections of COVID-19 cases by age group eight weeks beyond the study period. Blue dots show observed confirmed cases by week of diagnosis (those after the Week of 5/31/2020 were not used in the model). Blue lines show model median estimates; surrounding shades show 50% and 90% CrIs. Orange lines show model projected median weekly cases and deaths; surrounding shades show 50% and 90% CIs of the projection.





**Fig S6.** Projections of COVID-19 associated deaths by age group eight weeks beyond the study period. Blue dots show observed weekly deaths (those after the Week of 5/31/2020 were not used in the model). Blue lines show model median estimates; surrounding shades show 50% and 90% CrIs. Orange lines show model projected median weekly cases and deaths; surrounding shades show 50% and 90% CIs of the projection.

