Title page

Article title: Environment influences SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the absence of non-pharmaceutical interventions

Running head: SARS-CoV-2 transmission and environment

Authors: Thomas P. Smith^{1,*}, Seth Flaxman^{2,a}, Amanda S. Gallinat^{3,a}, Sylvia P. Kinoshian^{3,a}, Michael Stemkovski^{3,a}, H. Juliette T. Unwin^{4,a}, Oliver J. Watson^{4,a}, Charles Whittaker^{4,a}, Lorenzo Cattarino^{4,b}, Ilaria Dorigatti^{4,b}, Michael Tristram^{1,b}, William D. Pearse^{1,3*}

¹ Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, Silwood Park, Ascot, Berkshire, SL5 7PY, UK

² Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ.

³ Department of Biology & Ecology Center, Utah State University, 5305 Old Main Hill, Logan UT, 84322

⁴ MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Imperial College London, Norfolk Place, London, W2 1PG, UK

^a Contributed equally to analytical development of the manuscript

^b Contributed equally to the conceptual development of the manuscript

*To whom correspondence should be addressed: thomas.smith1@imperial.ac.uk and will.pearse@imperial.ac.uk

We emphasise that this pre-print manuscript has not been peer-reviewed, and thus its findings should be considered, at best, preliminary.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

As COVID-19 continues to spread across the world, it is increasingly important to understand the factors that influence its transmission. Seasonal variation driven by responses to changing environment has been shown to affect the transmission intensity of several coronaviruses. However, the impact of the environment on SARS-CoV-2 remains largely unknown, and thus seasonal variation remains a source of uncertainty in forecasts of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Here we address this issue by assessing the association of temperature, humidity, UV radiation, and population density with estimates of transmission rate (R). Using data from the United States of America, we explore correlates of transmission across USA states using comparative regression and integrative epidemiological modelling. We find that policy intervention ('lockdown') and reductions in individuals' mobility are the major predictors of SARS-CoV-2 transmission rates, but in their absence lower temperatures and higher population densities are correlated with increased SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Our results show that summer weather cannot be considered a substitute for mitigation policies, but that lower autumn and winter temperatures may lead to an increase in transmission intensity in the absence of policy interventions or behavioural changes. We outline how this information may improve the forecasting of COVID-19, its future seasonal dynamics, and inform intervention policies.

Introduction

In late 2019 a novel coronavirus originating in Wuhan City (Hubei, China)¹ began to rapidly spread through the human population. Since March 2020 this disease, COVID-19, has been recognised as a global pandemic by the World Health Organisation². The causative agent, SARS-CoV-2, is a close relative of the 2003 SARS coronavirus¹, although it appears to have several differences including a higher basic reproduction number³ (R_0 ; the average number of people infected by a carrier at the onset of an epidemic). Understanding the factors influencing SARS-CoV-2 transmission is key for understanding the current patterns of transmission and for refining predictions of the future spread of SARS-CoV-2. Other coronaviruses display seasonal cycles of transmission and up to 30% of seasonal ‘colds’ are caused by coronaviruses⁴. Thus, as many Northern-hemisphere countries relax the non-pharmaceutical interventions initially imposed to control COVID-19, there is a pressing need to understand whether seasonality will enhance or drive a ‘second wave’ of COVID-19 outbreaks as they move into autumn or winter⁵.

SARS-CoV-2 is an enveloped RNA virus which is structurally (if not phylogenetically) similar to other RNA viruses such as influenza, MERS, and HCoV-NL63⁶, that are known to display seasonal dynamics due to their physical properties. For example, high temperatures and low humidity can have a negative effect on influenza transmission by reducing the efficiency of respiratory droplet transmission^{7,8}. Similar effects are seen in transmission of coronaviruses^{9–11}, where high environmental temperatures break down viral lipid layers to inactivate virus particles that are in the air or deposited on surfaces^{10,12}. However, assessing the role of environment during a disease outbreak is challenging¹³ because human factors such as population density, herd immunity, and behaviour are likely the main drivers of transmission^{14–16}. Moreover, the non-pharmaceutical control measures and behavioural changes in response to COVID-19 have been unprecedented in the modern era. These difficulties have hindered the quantification of the impact of environment on SARS-CoV-2 transmission, making it harder to generalise and synthesise observations across regions with their differing climates. Despite these caveats, various early studies

have already reported effects of environmental variables such as temperature, humidity, UV levels, and wind-speed on the transmission of SARS-CoV-2^{17–24}. While, in general, most studies appear to support increased transmission rates under cool, dry conditions¹⁸, conflicting results have been observed^{21,25} and collectively the environmental signal appears to be weak⁵. Much of the variability in these early results is likely due to the use of inappropriate response variables (such as cases or fatalities) which fail to capture the intrinsic variations in transmission intensity driven by the effects of non-pharmaceutical intervention measures⁵. Furthermore, COVID-19 has taken hold in many places with diverse climates and there are obvious examples of high transmission rates under hot, humid conditions, *e.g.* in Brazil²⁶.

Accurate assessment of the role environmental factors have played so far in the spread of SARS-CoV-2 may provide insight into the future seasonality of the disease. This is because seasonal outbreaks of viruses are often driven by their responses to favourable (seasonal) changes in weather²⁷. Most epidemiological forecasts make use of some variant of the Susceptible–Infected–Recovered (SIR) framework and/or focus on the impacts of government-level mitigation (*e.g.* Kissler et al.²⁸, Walker et al.²⁹). Few epidemiological models incorporate environmental impacts and, when they do, they assume COVID-19 responds in a manner identical to related coronaviruses because we lack data on SARS-CoV-2’s environmental (and thus seasonal) responses (*e.g.* Baker et al.¹⁸). This is despite theoretical demonstrations of the potential role of environment in driving future seasonality of SARS-CoV-2^{22,30} and the empirical evidence in structurally-similar viruses outlined above. Efforts to incorporate climate into COVID-19 forecasting have focused on regression-type models of cases and fatalities (*e.g.* Araujo and Naimi¹⁷), which are unreliable when diseases are in the growth/expansion phase³¹. Furthermore, such models conflate environmental controls on occurrence with other drivers such as public health interventions (*e.g.*, the effects of lockdown measures to contain the pandemic)³¹ as both are changing similarly through time. Such models are unlikely to yield useful insights and may be misleading to policymakers¹³. To address this knowledge gap, there is a need for a true synthesis of environmental modelling with well-established epidemiological

96 approaches.

97 Here we investigate the role of environment in the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by incor-
 98 porating environmental factors into an existing epidemiological framework that has been
 99 applied globally^{32–34}, and to the USA in particular³⁵. The USA is a large country with
 100 great variation in climate across which case and policy intervention data are comparable,
 101 permitting us to disentangle the role of environmental drivers in SARS-CoV-2 transmis-
 102 sion. We begin by exploring associations between the environment (temperature, hu-
 103 midity, UV radiation, and population density) and transmission intensity independently
 104 estimated before and during stay-at-home orders (henceforth termed “lockdown”). We
 105 used the basic reproduction number (R_0) for our pre-lockdown transmission intensity
 106 estimates, and the time-varying reproduction number (R_t , the reproduction number, R ,
 107 at a given time, t) averaged across an appropriate time-window for our during-lockdown
 108 estimates. After confirming a potential role for the environment, we verify and more
 109 accurately quantify the relative roles of temperature and population density by integrat-
 110 ing them into an existing semi-mechanistic epidemiological framework³⁵. While we find
 111 strong evidence that temperature and population density are associated with SARS-CoV-
 112 2 transmission, we emphasise that our findings also re-confirm that the major drivers of
 113 transmission rates are public policy and individual behaviour. Through our use of exist-
 114 ing, robust sources of forecasts and models, our findings can be easily incorporated into
 115 workflows already used by policymakers, as we detail here.

Results

When analysed jointly, the R_0 of all USA states are fairly well predicted by all explanatory variables included in the regression model (*i.e.* population density, temperature, absolute humidity and UV radiation), with an overall model *adjusted* r^2 of 58% (supplementary table S1). However, UV radiation is a very weak predictor of R_0 , while temperature and absolute humidity show sufficiently strong correlations with each other ($r = 0.85$) that we cannot disentangle their contributions to R_0 due to high inflation of variances (supplementary table S1). This is further demonstrated through principal components analysis, where temperature and absolute humidity fall along the same principal component axis (supplementary figure S1). We therefore focused on temperature as the best fitting climate variable (assessed by Pearson's r , supplementary table S2).

When regressed against temperature and $\log_{10}$ -transformed population density only, we find that R_0 significantly increases with population density and decreases with temperature (fig. 1; both $p < 0.001$, table 1). We see a stark difference, however, when analysing R_t during lockdown (defined as the mean R_t recorded over the 14 day period following a stay at home order): much less of the variation in R_t is explained by the regression model (*adjusted* $r^2 = 18\%$), vastly lower model coefficients for explanatory variables (*i.e.*, much lesser correlations; supplementary table S3, but note that population density is still a significant predictor), and much lower R_t estimates overall (paired $t_{39} = 21.1$; $p < 0.001$; figure 1b). Additionally, if we regress the combined R_0 and R_t estimates against temperature and population density, using lockdown as a binary interaction term, we find a significant interaction between lockdown and temperature ($p < 0.001$, supplementary table S5), *i.e.* lockdown mediates the effects of climate on transmission.

The strong correlates of population density and temperature on R_0 across the United States were echoed in our climate-driven Bayesian modelling of daily variation in R_t . Posterior medians of the scaled coefficients of ($\log_{10}$ -transformed) population density and daily temperature were 0.68 and -0.48 , respectively. These coefficients were strongly supported (both Bayesian probabilities $> 99.9\%$), and suggest that greater population

density is approximately 1.4 times a greater driver of higher transmission than colder temperature ($\frac{0.68}{0.48} \approx 1.4$). Changes in mobility (such as those induced by stay-at-home measures) have the potential to mitigate these impacts of both population density and temperature (figure 3). Our model suggests that even quite large variation in underlying transmission driven by either variation in temperature through time, or in population density across space, can be mitigated by reductions in mobility (see also supplementary figure S2). Critically, however, the posterior distributions are skewed, particularly for population density: high population density may be difficult to mitigate except through large mobility reductions (as shown by the credibility intervals in figure 3). We emphasise that other transmission mitigation decisions, such as hand-washing, mask-wearing, and physical distancing, were not assessed in our model. We highlight that the posterior estimates of environment and average mobility were correlated (Pearson's $r = 0.30$ for temperature and $r = -0.32$ for population density). This likely results from correlated changes in mobility and temperature through time, and makes the estimated mobility reductions in figure 3 conservative (*i.e.*, we potentially report larger mobility reductions than would be necessary to mitigate environmental effects).

Table 1: Population density and temperature are drivers of R_0 at state-level in the USA. Multiple $r^2 = 0.6037$, *adjusted* $r^2 = 0.5822$, $F_{2,37} = 28.18$, $p < 0.001$. Scaled estimates are coefficients when predictors are scaled to have mean = 0 and SD = 1. Scaling our explanatory variables means our coefficients are measures of the relative importance of each variable. In contrast to our epidemiological modelling, temperature is a greater driver of pre-lockdown R_0 than population density ($\log_{10}$ -transformed). * = $p < 0.05$

	Scaled Estimate	Std. Error	<i>t</i> value	<i>p</i> -value
(Intercept)	2.5600	0.0494	51.80	< 0.001*
Temperature	-0.2801	0.0516	-5.43	< 0.001*
$\log_{10}$ (Pop density)	0.1921	0.0516	3.72	< 0.001*

Figure 1: R_0 is affected by the environment, but the impact of lockdown is greater. (a.) R_0 plotted against temperature (averaged across the two weeks prior to the R_0 estimate) and $\log_{10}$ -transformed population density (people per km^2) for each USA state (grey points). Surface shows the predicted R_0 from the regression model (table 1). Temperature has a negative effect on R_0 at state-level in the USA, whilst population density has a positive effect (table 1). (b.) The mean R_t for the two weeks following a state-wide stay-at-home mandate (*i.e.*, during lockdown) plotted against average daily temperature for the same period and $\log_{10}$ -transformed population density. The effects of temperature and population density are much weaker in the mobility-restricted data and R is reduced overall. The same colour scale, given in the centre of the figure, is used across both sub-plots.

Figure 2: The relative importance of temperature and population density as drivers of pre-lockdown R_0 . (a.) Heatmap of the regression model R_0 predictions, with USA state-level R_0 point estimates overlaid. High population densities and low temperatures drive increases in SARS-CoV-2 R_0 . This is a 2D representation of the regression plane in fig. 1a, using the same colour-scale. (b.) Residuals from a linear regression of R_0 against $\log_{10}$ -transformed population density (“Corrected R_0 ”), plotted against temperature. This illustrates that, when considering population density alone, R_0 is overestimated in cold states and underestimated in warm states. After accounting for population density, there is a significant effect of temperature upon R_0 (see table 1). In both figures, points are highlighted with standard two-letter state codes; MN and FL refer to Minnesota and Florida, respectively, and are referred to in the discussion.

Figure 3: **Average mobility reductions required to mitigate differences in population density and temperature.** This figure shows the percent reduction in average mobility (measuring retail, recreation, grocery, pharmacy, and workplace trips) needed to compensate for a given temperature (brown) or population density (blue) driven increase in R_t . These calculations assume a ‘background’ R_0 of 1 and a baseline ‘background’ mobility (defined as ‘0’ by Google³⁶). Solid lines represent the median mobility reduction required, dashed and dotted lines the 75% and 90% posterior credibility intervals respectively.

Discussion

Here, by combining epidemiological models and outputs with spatial climate data, we show that environment (specifically cold, but also the correlated low-humidity conditions) can enhance SARS-CoV-2 transmission across the USA. Critically, however, these environmental impacts are weaker than that of population density which is, itself, a weaker driver than policy intervention (*i.e.*, lockdown). Below, we suggest that the accuracy of forecasts of SARS-CoV-2 transmission, in particular across seasons, could be improved by incorporating temperature, as well as population density, in a robust, reproducible manner as we have done here.

The role that environment plays in transmission

Across these state-level USA data, we found a significant negative effect of temperature on SARS-CoV-2's R_0 and a significant positive effect of population density. An important caveat to this, however, is the collinearity between temperature, absolute humidity, and to a lesser degree, UV levels. The strong correlations between these environmental drivers mean that we are unable to discern the effects of each in a single model and therefore we focus on temperature as the most reliable environmental predictor. After accounting for the effect of population density on transmission (table 1), temperature's effect is striking (figure 2). We also tested the effects of our predictor variables on R_t for times where strict lockdown measures were in place. When these mobility restrictions are in place, we observe no significant effects of temperature on R_t , *i.e.* the effects of lockdown dampen any environmental effects so as to make them inconsequential (figure 1b; supplementary table S3). Furthermore, under lockdown conditions the overall transmission rates are vastly reduced. Through our epidemiological modelling approach we are able to account for these effects (as mobility changes are explicitly incorporated), and find that higher population densities and lower temperatures drive increased R_t . Moreover, the formulation of our epidemiological model ensures that under high mobility reductions, changes in environment have little effect on R_t , mirroring our regression findings (see Methods

187 and supplementary figure S2).

188 The precise physiological mechanisms for temperature-dependant inactivation in SARS-
 189 CoV-2 are still not known, but animal models for influenza have shown that increased
 190 viral transmission at lower temperatures can be due to effects on the host^{7,8}. In animal
 191 models, this is proposed to be due to the combined effects of higher titres of viral particle
 192 shedding and greater viral stability in nasal passages of those housed in cooler condi-
 193 tions⁸. In addition to host effects, the persistence time of the virus outside of the body
 194 is expected to be negatively affected by higher environmental temperatures, which cause
 195 viral inactivation via breakdown of their lipid layers^{10,12}. We emphasise that both the
 196 direct host effects, and the potential effects of environment on viral stability, are likely
 197 moderated (if not mitigated) by indoor heating³⁷, although the same may not always be
 198 true of humidity. Contact rate is related to population density¹⁶, and so it is unsurprising
 199 that population density was a significant factor in our analysis (figure 1a). We stress that
 200 temperature was not a driver of transmission under lockdown and the effects of popula-
 201 tion density were lessened (figure 1b): outdoor conditions and population density matter
 202 little for indoor transmission.

203 There are important methodological caveats to our findings. Dynamics and reporting
 204 between USA states are known to be variable³⁸, introducing a level of uncertainty to our
 205 findings. Furthermore, lockdown measures were (and continue to be) quite heterogeneous
 206 across the USA, with different states displaying different levels of response to COVID-
 207 19³⁹. Through our epidemiological modelling approach we are able to account for these
 208 different state-level responses using google mobility data. We can also observe other
 209 potential confounding factors in these analyses. Across the USA, the north-eastern states
 210 in the vicinity of the major transport hub of New York City (*e.g.*, NY, NJ, ME, PA, RI,
 211 and CT) tend to have generally higher R_0 than predicted, whilst west-coast states (*e.g.*,
 212 WA, CA, and OR) have lower R_0 than predicted (fig 2a). While this type of effect could be
 213 due to preemptive protective measures taken by states prior to COVID-19 outbreaks, we
 214 likely mitigated this by removing states that initiated non-pharmaceutical interventions

before our first time-step (see methods). A further confounding factor may be seen if temperature affects human behaviour, thus making it difficult to disentangle the effects of climate from changes to mobility. We do find a link between the average mobility and temperature coefficients in our Bayesian modelling, suggesting a degree of collinearity, however (perhaps surprisingly), we see no direct correlations between daily temperature and recreational mobility trends for parks (see supplementary information). Again, this highlights the importance of human behaviour as a confounding factor in analyses of environmental drivers on SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Future work should consider finer-grained population density, as well as the presence of major transport hubs in a given region.

Policy relevance of our findings

Our results comparing SARS-CoV-2 transmission rate before and during lockdown support the idea that the major driver of transmission is public health policy^{32,40,41} (see figure 1). Once stay-at-home measures were implemented across the USA, we can find no meaningful signal of temperature on transmission. This provides two important, and timely, insights for policy-makers: summer weather is no substitute for mitigation, and policy can prevent transmission in the winter. At the coarse scale of USA states, population density is a greater driver of transmission intensity than temperature in our epidemiological modelling ($\log_{10}(\text{population density}) \approx 1.4 \times$ larger scaled coefficient than temperature). It should be considered whether thresholds for adaptive and/or intermittent lockdown might be more precautionary (*i.e.*, lower) in colder, more densely-populated regions. However, we strongly suggest that this should neither be in order to allow other regions to actively relax restrictions, nor conducted without further examination of finer-scale disease dynamics. When making decisions about the relative importance of climate and population density, it is important to account for the magnitude of variation in the two variables. Temperature varies widely across the US, and that differences in transmission rates between states (contrast, for example, Minnesota and Florida in figure 2) may vary due to climate does not imply that more modest climate differences within a state drive

differences through time or across space. Regardless, our analysis is too spatially coarse to address such variation. Even quite large variations in climate are more straightforward to mitigate than population density differences (figure 3), and so we suggest that regions with higher population density should continue to be monitored carefully. Finally, we emphasise that population density and temperature are well-known to be strongly correlated across USA states (see also figure 2); this does not affect our model fitting of coefficient estimates, but it does affect their interpretation. A more densely-populated state is also likely to be warmer, and so we suggest that both factors (and others, such as mobility) should be taken into account when trying to *a priori* estimate a region's transmission rate.

These results have strong implications for modellers considering the potential impacts of seasonality on the virus. Such work has already considered the role that seasonality might play by assuming responses of structurally similar and/or related diseases are adequate proxies for SARS-CoV-2¹⁸. These assumptions are broadly correct, but here we parameterise and quantify the magnitude of this effect for SARS-CoV-2. Our findings suggest that previously unexplained variation among regions' transmission, such as in our independently-estimated R_0 data, can be accounted for by environmental factors. Further, our results support a role for daily temperature changes in transmission, but, we emphasise, do not conflict with other studies suggesting that seasonal forecasting plays a secondary role to mitigation and/or number of susceptible individuals. Such studies¹⁸ assumed SARS-CoV-2 responds to climate to broadly similar extents that we find here. What our results do suggest, however, is that future forecasting work should consider the use of the environment to enhance predictions of disease spread. In countries such as the USA with continental climates that swing between extremes of heat and cold, we suggest policy-makers should assume that transmission will increase in winter (and potentially autumn/fall). The timing of the seasons are broadly predictable, and so this is an area in which policy could be proactive, not reactive.

Conclusion

There is no single cause of, or solution to, the current COVID-19 pandemic, and all drivers must be placed in perspective. Here we suggest that both environment, and daily weather, may play a role in the transmission of SARS-CoV-2. The major driver of transmission, and our best method of controlling it, is public policy, as this and many other studies have shown^{40,41}. The role of environment in transmission has become controversial, in part because of the application of models to case prevalence, rather than fundamental epidemiological parameters such as R that we model here. We call for more researchers to work directly with epidemiologists to identify those components of epidemiological modelling that can be informed by outside specialists' areas of expertise. By working together, we can efficiently increase epidemiological research capacity to better combat and control this pandemic.

Methods

We explored the association between environmental covariates and SARS-CoV-2 transmission intensity using two approaches. First, we took existing state-level estimates of R_0 and during-lockdown R_t for the USA³⁵, and regressed them against environmental data in order to test for potential pre- and during-lockdown patterns. In the second approach, we modified and fitted the existing semi-mechanistic epidemiological model used to generate the R_0 and R_t estimates above, and fitted it to the observed death time series whilst explicitly incorporating the effects of the most important aspects of environment (temperature and population density) on the virus. This second model makes use of daily weather observations and provides a rigorous framework to quantify the drivers of SARS-CoV-2 transmission across the USA. The first approach mitigates potential biases arising from the autocorrelation of the initiation of lockdown and the cessation of winter in the USA in the second approach, since our independent regression focuses on initial transmission (*i.e.*, R_0). Below, all software packages given in *italics* are *R* packages (version 3.6.3)⁴² unless otherwise specified. Code to reproduce our analyses, download source data, and update models with new data as it becomes available, are given in both the supplementary materials and at our team's *GitHub* repository (<https://www.github.com/pearselab/tyrell>).

Data collection

We collated global population density data from the Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN)⁴³, and hourly temperature (T), relative humidity (RH) and surface UV radiation (in J m^{-2}) estimates for 2020 from the Copernicus Climate Change Service⁴⁴. All the above data were at the same spatial resolution of $0.25 \times 0.25^\circ$. The amount of water vapour air can hold increases with temperature and, since in other viruses the absolute humidity (AH) of air can drive transmission more than relative saturation^{37,45}, we calculated absolute humidity from our data using the Clausius–Clapeyron relation and the ideal gas law^{22,45}:

$$AH = 1000 \cdot \frac{e_0 \cdot e^{\frac{L}{R_v}(\frac{1}{T_0} - \frac{1}{T})} \cdot RH}{R_v \cdot T} \quad (1)$$

Where AH (g m^{-3}) is the absolute humidity, T (K) the temperature in a given cell, RH the relative humidity in a given cell (expressed as a percentage), e_0 the saturation vapor pressure (6.11mb) at reference temperature T_0 (which we set as 273.15K), L the latent heat of evaporation for water (2257 kJ kg^{-1}), and R_v the gas constant for water vapour (461.53 J $\text{kg}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1}$).

We used the Climate Data Operators program⁴⁶ to compute daily means for each of our climate variables. Finally, we averaged the value of each covariate (median) across the state-level administrative units given by GADM shapefiles⁴⁷ (the 50 USA states, plus Washington DC).

Independent validation of the impact of environment on R_0

To validate the impact of the environment on R_0 we used an existing dataset of SARS-CoV-2 transmission rate estimates for each of the states of the USA³⁵. We used the basic reproduction estimates (R_0 , before the implementation of any non-pharmaceutical interventions) as a fundamental measure of virus transmissibility in each state.

In these data, R_0 is estimated as $R_{t=0}$ where $t = 0$ occurs 30 days prior to the first 10 cumulative deaths recorded for each state^{32,35}. The date upon which R_0 is estimated therefore differs between states. To account for these temporal differences, we took the means of our daily climate variables across the 14 days prior to $t = 0$ for each state as an approximation for the conditions under which each population first experienced COVID-19. To test the impact of the environment on R_0 , we performed multiple linear regression on R_0 with temperature, absolute humidity, UV radiation, and population density as predictors. To compare environmental effects on the reproduction number under mobility restriction measures (*i.e.*, lockdown), we took the average (mean) R_t across the 14 days following a state-wide stay-at-home mandate and regressed these against

the environmental predictors averaged across the same time period. We used 14 days again here for consistency with our environmental comparison to R_0 . Although mobility restrictions may differ in magnitude between states, these effects are incorporated into the estimates for the R_t parameter. In 7 states (Arkansas, Iowa, North Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wyoming) no state-wide stay-at-home mandate was declared. In a further 4 states (Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, and Utah), $t = 0$ occurred after non-pharmaceutical interventions had already been instated. These 11 states were therefore excluded from the independent validation analyses.

Integrative modelling of the impact of environment on SARS-CoV-2 transmission

To further assess the potential impact of environment on SARS-CoV-2 transmission, we modified the semi-mechanistic Bayesian model³⁵ that generated the R_0 and R_t estimates used above to incorporate both population density and daily temperature (the best fitting climate variable; see results), as follows:

$$R_{t,m} = (\mu + c_{t,m}C + p_m P) \cdot 2\text{InvLogit}\left(-\sum_k (X_{t,m,k}\alpha_k) - X_{t,m,1}\alpha_{r(m)}^{\text{region}} - X_{t,m,2}\alpha_m^{\text{state}} - \epsilon\right) \quad (2)$$

Where μ captures overall transmission common to all states, c the coefficient for temperature ($C_{t,m}$; in degrees C) at time (t) in state m , p the coefficient for population density (P_m) of state m ($\log_{10}$ -transformed people per km^2). We standardised $c_{t,m}$ and p_m to have a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1, in order to make their absolute magnitudes measures of the relative importance of each term and thus facilitate their comparison. We placed strong, conservative priors on these new model terms, specifically:

$$c_{t,m}, p_m \sim \text{Normal}(0, 0.5) \quad (3)$$

353

$$\mu \sim Normal(3.28, 0.5) \quad (4)$$

354 For μ , this is the same as the prior used in the original (non-climate) model³⁵ (but see
 355 our caveat below about this term). The other terms are unchanged from their original
 356 definitions given in Unwin et al.³⁵, and we briefly describe them below. *InvLogit* is
 357 the inverse logit transformation applied to a series of hierarchically-nested terms (α_k ,
 358 $\alpha_{r(m)}^{region}$, and α_m^{state}) multiplied by Google mobility data³⁶ ($X_{t,m,k}$) with a weekly *AR*(2)
 359 autocorrelated error term for each state (ϵ ; see Unwin et al.³⁵ for more details). $X_{t,m,k}$ are
 360 three US-wide measures of the impact of changing mobility across states (a daily proxy
 361 for lockdown intensity) on ‘average’ across retail and recreation, grocery and pharmacy,
 362 and workplace trips ($X_{t,m,1}$), in ‘residential’ areas ($X_{t,m,2}$), and using public ‘transit’
 363 ($X_{t,m,3}$). We focus on the vector α_k , whose three entries assess the impact of mobility
 364 comparably across the country (and thus are each analogous to c and p). The terms
 365 $\alpha_{r(m)}^{region}$ and α_m^{state} address differences in average mobility across eight broad geographic
 366 regions [the Great Lakes, Great Plains, Rocky Mountains, Northeast Corridor, Pacific
 367 North-West, South Atlantic, Southern Appalachia, and the South (‘TOLA’); indexed by
 368 $r(m)$] and for transit across individual states (m), respectively. While we attempted to
 369 address comparable hierarchically-nested temperature responses in this model, we felt
 370 the correlation between changes in $X_{t,m,k}$ and $c_{t,m}$ were inducing fitting problems and
 371 so opted for a model simpler (and so more conservative) in its novel components. In
 372 this model formulation, temperature and population density essentially contribute to a
 373 latent transmission rate, which is then mediated by the mobility terms to produce the
 374 realised R_t . Although an interaction between mobility and environment (as found in our
 375 regression modelling, see Results) is not explicitly modelled, this formulation produces
 376 results analogous that finding, *i.e.* when mobility reductions are high (“lockdown”),
 377 environment has little effect on the realised R_t (see supplementary figure S2).

378 We emphasise that the model presented here differs from the original model by fitting
 379 a common μ across all states, instead of allowing each state to have a different baseline

μ that was hierarchically drawn from a common parameter (itself termed μ in Unwin et al.³⁵). This difference ensures identifiability of our model parameters, since the (latent, and hierarchically pooled) state-wise means are strongly driven by both population density and environment that are now included in the model (see results). Our model, which was directly adapted from the code in Unwin et al.³⁵, was fit using *rstan*⁴⁸ with 5 independent chains (each with 3,000 total iterations and a warm-up of 1,000). Full model coefficients and outputs are given in the supplementary materials (supplementary table S6); posterior predictive checks were performed to ensure that the predicted R_t values for each state through time were realistic and sensible and all chains had mixed and converged.

References

- [1] Peng Zhou, Xing Lou Yang, Xian Guang Wang, Ben Hu, Lei Zhang, Wei Zhang, Hao Rui Si, Yan Zhu, Bei Li, Chao Lin Huang, Hui Dong Chen, Jing Chen, Yun Luo, Hua Guo, Ren Di Jiang, Mei Qin Liu, Ying Chen, Xu Rui Shen, Xi Wang, Xiao Shuang Zheng, Kai Zhao, Quan Jiao Chen, Fei Deng, Lin Lin Liu, Bing Yan, Fa Xian Zhan, Yan Yi Wang, Geng Fu Xiao, and Zheng Li Shi. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature*, 579 (7798):270–273, 2020. ISSN 14764687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7>.
- [2] World Health Organisation. WHO Director-General’s opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020, 2020. URL <https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020>.
- [3] Ying Liu, Albert A. Gayle, Annelies Wilder-Smith, and Joacim Rocklöv. The reproductive number of COVID-19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *Journal of Travel Medicine*, 27(2):1–4, 2020. ISSN 17088305. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa021.
- [4] M. Mesel-Lemoine, J. Millet, P.-O. Vidalain, H. Law, A. Vabret, V. Lorin, N. Escriou, M. L. Albert, B. Nal, and F. Tangy. A Human Coronavirus Responsible for the Common Cold Massively Kills Dendritic Cells but Not Monocytes. *Journal of Virology*, 86(14):7577–7587, 2012. ISSN 0022-538X. doi: 10.1128/jvi.00269-12.
- [5] Albertus J. Smit, Jennifer M. Fitchett, Francois A. Engelbrecht, Robert J. Scholes, Godfrey Dzhivhuho, and Neville A. Sweijid. Winter Is Coming: A Southern Hemisphere Perspective of the Environmental Drivers of SARS-CoV-2 and the Potential Seasonality of COVID-19. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(16):5634, 2020. ISSN 1660-4601. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17165634.
- [6] Mingxuan Xie and Qiong Chen. Insight into 2019 novel coronavirus — An up-

dated interim review and lessons from SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 94:119–124, 2020. ISSN 18783511. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.03.071. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.03.071>.

[7] Anice C. Lowen, Samira Mubareka, John Steel, and Peter Palese. Influenza virus transmission is dependent on relative humidity and temperature. *PLoS Pathogens*, 3(10):1470–1476, 2007. ISSN 15537366. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.0030151.

[8] Anice C. Lowen and John Steel. Roles of Humidity and Temperature in Shaping Influenza Seasonality. *Journal of Virology*, 88(14):7692–7695, 2014. ISSN 0022-538X. doi: 10.1128/jvi.03544-13.

[9] Jianguo Tan, Lina Mu, Jiaxin Huang, Shunzhang Yu, Bingheng Chen, and Jun Yin. An initial investigation of the association between the SARS outbreak and weather: With the view of the environmental temperature and its variation. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 59(3):186–192, 2005. ISSN 0143005X. doi: 10.1136/jech.2004.020180.

[10] K. H. Chan, J. S. Malik Peiris, S. Y. Lam, L. L.M. Poon, K. Y. Yuen, and W. H. Seto. The effects of temperature and relative humidity on the viability of the SARS coronavirus. *Advances in Virology*, 2011, 2011. ISSN 16878639. doi: 10.1155/2011/734690.

[11] N. van Doremalen, T. Bushmaker, and V. J. Munster. Stability of middle east respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) under different environmental conditions. *Eurosurveillance*, 18(38):1–4, 2013. ISSN 15607917. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES2013.18.38.20590.

[12] Dewald Schoeman and Burtram C. Fielding. Coronavirus envelope protein: Current knowledge. *Virology Journal*, 16(1):1–22, 2019. ISSN 1743422X. doi: 10.1186/s12985-019-1182-0.

[13] Colin J. Carlson, Joseph D. Chipperfield, Blas M. Benito, Richard J. Telford, and

- 442 Robert B. O'Hara. Species distribution models are inappropriate for COVID-19.
443 *Nature ecology & evolution*, 4(June):770–771, 2020. ISSN 2397334X. doi: 10.1038/
444 s41559-020-1212-8. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-1212-8>.
- 445 [14] Colin J Carlson, Ana C R Gomez, Shweta Bansal, and Sadie J Ryan. Misconceptions
446 about weather and seasonality must not misguide COVID-19 response. *Nature com-*
447 *munications*, 11(1):4312, 2020. ISSN 2041-1723. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-18150-z.
448 URL <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32855406>.
- 449 [15] Hannah M Korevaar, Alexander David Becker, Ian F Miller, Bryan T Gren-
450 fell, C Jessica E Metcalf, and Michael J Mina. Quantifying the impact of
451 US state non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 transmission. *medRxiv*,
452 page 2020.06.30.20142877, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.06.30.20142877. URL [http://](http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/07/01/2020.06.30.20142877.abstract)
453 medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/07/01/2020.06.30.20142877.abstract.
- 454 [16] J. Rocklöv and H. Sjödin. High population densities catalyze the spread of COVID-
455 19. *Journal of travel medicine*, (March):1–2, 2020. ISSN 17088305. doi: 10.1093/
456 jtm/taaa038.
- 457 [17] Miguel B. Araujo and Babak Naimi. Spread of SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus likely
458 to be constrained by climate. *medRxiv*, page 2020.03.12.20034728, 2020. doi:
459 10.1101/2020.03.12.20034728. URL [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.12.20034728v3)
460 [2020.03.12.20034728v3](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.12.20034728v3).
- 461 [18] Rachel E Baker, Wenchang Yang, Gabriel A Vecchi, C Jessica E Metcalf, and
462 Bryan T Grenfell. Susceptible supply limits the role of climate in the early SARS-
463 CoV-2 pandemic. *Science*, 2020. ISSN 1095-9203. doi: 10.1126/science.abc2535.
464 URL <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32423996>.
- 465 [19] Qasim Bukhari and Yusuf Jameel. Will Coronavirus Pandemic Diminish by Summer?
466 *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2020. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3556998.
- 467 [20] Biqing Chen, Hao Liang, Xiaomin Yuan, Yingying Hu, Miao Xu, Yating Zhao, Binfen

Zhang, Fang Tian, and Xuejun Zhu. Roles of meteorological conditions in COVID-19 transmission on a worldwide scale. *medRxiv*, 11:2020.03.16.20037168, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.03.16.20037168. URL <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.16.20037168v1>.

[21] Wei Luo, Maimuna S Majumder, Dianbo Liu, Canelle Poirier, Kenneth D Mandl, Marc Lipsitch, and Mauricio Santillana. The role of absolute humidity on transmission rates of the COVID-19 outbreak. *medRxiv*, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.02.12.20022467. URL <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.02.12.20022467v1>.

[22] Yueling Ma, Yadong Zhao, Jiangtao Liu, Xiaotao He, Bo Wang, Shihua Fu, Jun Yan, Jingping Niu, Ji Zhou, and Bin Luo. Effects of temperature variation and humidity on the death of COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *Science of the Total Environment*, 724, 2020. ISSN 18791026. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138226.

[23] Cory Merow and Mark C Urban. Seasonality and Uncertainty in COVID-19 Growth Rates. *medRxiv*, (April):2020.04.19.20071951, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.04.19.20071951. URL <http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/04/22/2020.04.19.20071951.abstract>.

[24] Mohammad M. Sajadi, Parham Habibzadeh, Augustin Vintzileos, Shervin Shokouhi, Fernando Miralles-Wilhelm, and Anthony Amoroso. Temperature, Humidity, and Latitude Analysis to Estimate Potential Spread and Seasonality of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *JAMA network open*, 3(6):e2011834, 2020. ISSN 25743805. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.11834.

[25] Ye Yao, Jinhua Pan, Zhixi Liu, Xia Meng, Weidong Wang, Haidong Kan, and Weibing Wang. No association of COVID-19 transmission with temperature or UV radiation in Chinese cities. *European Respiratory Journal*, 55(5), 2020. ISSN 13993003. doi: 10.1183/13993003.00517-2020.

- [26] Darlan S. Candido, Ingra M. Claro, Jaqueline G. de Jesus, William M. Souza, Filipe R. R. Moreira, Simon Dellicour, Thomas A. Mellan, Louis du Plessis, Rafael H. M. Pereira, Flavia C. S. Sales, Erika R. Manuli, Julien Théze, Luiz Almeida, Mariane T. Menezes, Carolina M. Voloch, and Et Al. Evolution and epidemic spread of SARS-Cov-2 in Brazil. *Science*, 369(6508):1255–1260, 2020. ISSN 0038092X. doi: 10.1126/science.abd2161.
- [27] National Research Council. *Linkages Between Climate, Ecosystems, and Infectious Disease*. 2001. ISBN 0309512026. URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK222243/><http://newscenter.lbl.gov/2012/11/12/boss-quasars-early-universe/>.
- [28] Stephen M. Kissler, Christine Tedijanto, Edward Goldstein, Yonatan H. Grad, and Marc Lipsitch. Projecting the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period. *Science*, page eabb5793, 2020. ISSN 0036-8075. doi: 10.1126/science.abb5793.
- [29] Patrick GT Walker, Charles Whittaker, Oliver Watson, Marc Baguelin, Kylie E C Ainslie, Sangeeta Bhatia, Samir Bhatt, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Olivia Boyd, Lorenzo Cattarino, Zulma Cucunubá, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, Amy Dighe, Christl A Donnelly, Ilaria Dorigatti, Sabine Van Elsland, Rich Fitzjohn, Seth Flaxman, Han Fu, Katy Gaythorpe, Lily Geidelberg, Nicholas Grassly, Will Green, Arran Hamlet, Katharina Hauck, David Haw, Sarah Hayes, Wes Hinsley, Natsuko Imai, David Jorgensen, Edward Knock, Daniel Laydon, Swapnil Mishra, Gemma Nedjati-Gilani, Lucy C Okell, Steven Riley, Hayley Thompson, Juliette Unwin, Robert Verity, Michaela Vollmer, Caroline Walters, Wei Wang, Yuanrong Wang, Peter Winskill, Xiaoyue Xi, Neil M Ferguson, and Azra C Ghani. The Global Impact of COVID-19 and Strategies for Mitigation and Suppression. *Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team*, March(March):19, 2020. URL doi.org/10.25561/77735.
- [30] Jingyuan Wang, Ke Tang, Kai Feng, and Weifeng Lv. High Temperature and High

Humidity Reduce the Transmission of COVID-19. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2020.
doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3551767.

[31] Joseph D Chipperfield, Blas M. Benito, Robert B. O'Hara, Richard J. Telford, and Colin J. Carlson. On the inadequacy of species distribution models for modelling the spread of SARS-CoV-2 : response to Araújo and Naimi. *medRxiv*, 2020.

[32] Seth Flaxman, Swapnil Mishra, Axel Gandy, H. Juliette T. Unwin, Thomas A. Mellan, Helen Coupland, Charles Whittaker, Harrison Zhu, Tresnia Berah, Jeffrey W. Eaton, Mélodie Monod, Pablo N. Perez-Guzman, Nora Schmit, Lucia Cilloni, Kylie E.C. Ainslie, Marc Baguelin, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Olivia Boyd, Lorenzo Cattarino, Laura V. Cooper, Zulma Cucunubá, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, Amy Dighe, Bimandra Djaafara, Ilaria Dorigatti, Sabine L. van Elsland, Richard G. FitzJohn, Katy A.M. Gaythorpe, Lily Geidelberg, Nicholas C. Grassly, William D. Green, Timothy Hallett, Arran Hamlet, Wes Hinsley, Ben Jeffrey, Edward Knock, Daniel J. Laydon, Gemma Nedjati-Gilani, Pierre Nouvellet, Kris V. Parag, Igor Siveroni, Hayley A. Thompson, Robert Verity, Erik Volz, Caroline E. Walters, Haowei Wang, Yuanrong Wang, Oliver J. Watson, Peter Winskill, Xiaoyue Xi, Patrick Gt Walker, Azra C. Ghani, Christl A. Donnelly, Steven M. Riley, Michaela A.C. Vollmer, Neil M. Ferguson, Lucy C. Okell, and Samir Bhatt. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*, (March), 2020. ISSN 14764687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2405-7.

[33] Thomas A Mellan, Henrique H Hoeltgebaum, Swapnil Mishra, Charlie Whittaker, Ricardo P Schnekenberg, Juan Vesga, Harrison Zhu, Michael Hutchinson, Oliver Ratmann, Melodie Monod, Marc Baguelin, Sangeeta Bhatia, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Nicholas Brazeau, Giovanni Charles, V Cooper, Zulma Cucunuba, Gina Cuomo-dannenburg, Amy Dighe, Bimandra Djaafara, Jeff Eaton, L Van Elsland, Richard Fitzjohn, Keith Fraser, Katy Gaythorpe, Will Green, Sarah Hayes, Natsuko Imai, Edward Knock, Daniel Laydon, John Lees, Tara Mangal, Andria Mousa, Gemma Nedjati-gilani, Pierre Nouvellet, Daniela Olivera, Kris V Parag, Michael Pickles,

Hayley A Thompson, Robert Verity, Haowei Wang, Yuanrong Wang, Oliver J Watson, Lilith Whittles, Xiaoyue Xi, Lucy Okell, Patrick Walker, Azra Ghani, Steven Riley, Neil M Ferguson, Christl A Donnelly, and Seth Flaxman. Report 21: Estimating COVID-19 cases and reproduction number in Brazil. Technical Report May, Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team, 2020.

[34] Michaela A. C. Vollmer, Swapnil Mishra, H Juliette T Unwin, Axel Gandy, Thomas A. Mellan, Valerie Bradley, Harrison Zhu, Helen Coupland, Iwona Hawryluk, Michael Hutchinson, Oliver Ratmann, Melodie Monod, Patrick Walker, Charlie Whittaker, Lorenzo Cattarino, Constance Ciavarella, Lucia Cilloni, Kylie Ainslie, Marc Baguelin, Sangeeta Bhatia, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Nicholas Brazeau, Giovanni Charles, Laura V Cooper, Zulma Cucunuba, Gina Cuomo-Dannenburg, Amy Dighe, Bimandra Djaafara, Jeff Eaton, Sabine L van Elsland, Richard FitzJohn, Keith Fraser, Katy Gaythorpe, Will Green, Sarah Hayes, Natsuko Imai, Ben Jeffrey, Edward Knock, Daniel Laydon, John Lees, Tara Mangal, Andria Mousa, Gemma Nedjati-Gilani, Pierre Nouvellet, Daniela Olivera, Kris V Parag, Michael Pickles, Hayley A Thompson, Robert Verity, Caroline Walters, Haowei Wang, Yuanrong Wang, Oliver J Watson, Lilith Whittles, Xiaoyue Xi, Azra Ghani, Steven M Riley, Lucy Okell, Christl A. Donnelly, Neil M Ferguson, Ilaria Dorigatti, Seth Flaxman, and Samir Bhat. Using mobility to estimate the transmission intensity of COVID-19 in Italy : A subnational analysis with future scenarios. *medRxiv*, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.05.20089359. URL <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.05.20089359>.

[35] H Juliette T Unwin, Swapnil Mishra, Valerie C Bradley, Axel Gandy, A Thomas, Helen Coupland, Jonathan Ish-horowicz, Michaela A C Vollmer, Charles Whittaker, Sarah L Filippi, Xiaoyue Xi, Mélodie Monod, Oliver Ratmann, Michael Hutchinson, Harrison Zhu, Iwona Hawryluk, Philip Milton, Kylie E C Ainslie, Marc Baguelin, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Nick F Brazeau, Lorenzo Cattarino, Zulma Cucunuba, Ilaria Dorigatti, Oliver D Eales, Jeffrey W Eaton, Sabine L Van, Richard G Fitzjohn, Katy A M Gaythorpe, William Green, Wes Hinsley, Benjamin Jeffrey, Edward Knock,

Daniel J Laydon, John Lees, Gemma Nedjati-gilani, Pierre Nouvellet, Lucy Okell, Kris V Parag, Igor Siveroni, Hayley A Thompson, Caroline E Walters, Oliver J Watson, Lilith K Whittles, Azra C Ghani, M Neil, Steven Riley, Christl A Donnelly, Samir Bhatt, and Seth Flaxman. State-level tracking of COVID-19 in the United States. *medRxiv*, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.07.13.20152355.

[36] Ahmet Aktay, Shailesh Bavadekar, Gwen Cossoul, John Davis, Damien Desfontaines, Evgeniy Gabrilovich, Krishna Gadepalli, Bryant Gipson, Miguel Guevara, Chaitanya Kamath, Mansi Kansal, Ali Lange, Chinmoy Mandayam, Andrew Oplinger, Christopher Pluntke, Thomas Roessler, Arran Schlosberg, Tomer Shekel, Swapnil Vispute, Mia Vu, Gregory Wellenius, Brian Williams, and Royce J Wilson. Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports : Anonymization Process Description (version 1.0). *arXiv*, 2020.

[37] Jeffrey Shaman, Virginia E. Pitzer, Cécile Viboud, Bryan T. Grenfell, and Marc Lipsitch. Absolute humidity and the seasonal onset of influenza in the continental United States. *PLoS Biology*, 8(2), 2010. ISSN 15449173. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1000316.

[38] Emily Javan, Spencer J Fox, and Lauren Ancel Meyers. Probability of current COVID-19 outbreaks in all US counties. *medRxiv*, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.04.06.20053561. URL <http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/04/11/2020.04.06.20053561.abstract>.

[39] Georgios Neofotistos and Efthimios Kaxiras. Modeling the Covid-19 Pandemic Response of the US States. *medRxiv*, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.06.24.20138982. URL <http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/25/2020.06.24.20138982.abstract>.

[40] Christopher I. Jarvis, Kevin Van Zandvoort, Amy Gimma, Kiesha Prem, Megan Auzenberg, Kathleen O'Reilly, Graham Medley, Jon C. Emery, Rein M.G.J. Houben, Nicholas Davies, Emily S. Nightingale, Stefan Flasche, Thibaut Jombart, Joel Hellewell, Sam Abbott, James D. Munday, Nikos I. Bosse, Sebastian Funk,

Fiona Sun, Akira Endo, Alicia Rosello, Simon R. Procter, Adam J. Kucharski, Timothy W. Russell, Gwen Knight, Hamish Gibbs, Quentin Leclerc, Billy J. Quilty, Charlie Diamond, Yang Liu, Mark Jit, Samuel Clifford, Carl A.B. Pearson, Rosalind M. Eggo, Arminde K. Deol, Petra Klepac, G. James Rubin, and W. John Edmunds. Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on the transmission of COVID-19 in the UK. *BMC Medicine*, 18(1):1–10, 2020. ISSN 17417015. doi: 10.1186/s12916-020-01597-8.

[41] Hien Lau, Veria Khosrawipour, Piotr Kocbach, Agata Mikolajczyk, Justyna Schubert, Jacek Bania, and Tanja Khosrawipour. The positive impact of lockdown in Wuhan on containing the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Journal of travel medicine*, 27(3):1–7, 2020. ISSN 17088305. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa037.

[42] R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, 2020. URL <https://www.r-project.org/>.

[43] Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN). Gridded Population of the World, Version 4 (GPWv4): Population Density, Revision 11. Technical report, NASA Socioeconomic Data and Applications Center (SEDAC), Palisades, NY, 2018.

[44] Copernicus Climate Change Service. Essential climate variables for assessment of climate variability from 1979 to present. Technical report. URL <https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/cdsapp#!/dataset/ecv-for-climate-change>.

[45] Jeffrey Shaman and Melvin Kohn. Absolute humidity modulates influenza survival, transmission, and seasonality. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106(9):3243–3248, 2009. ISSN 00278424. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0806852106.

[46] Uwe Schulzweida. CDO User Guide (Version 1.9.8), 2019.

629 [47] Global Administrative Areas. GADM database of Global Administrative Areas,
630 version 3.6, 2020. URL <https://www.gadm.org>.

631 [48] Stan Development Team. RStan: the R interface to Stan., 2020. URL [http://mc-](http://mc-stan.org/)
632 [stan.org/](http://mc-stan.org/).

633 Data and Code Availability Statement

634 No new data are released as part of this project. Code to reproduce the full analysis
635 pipeline is available from our *GitHub* repository ([https://www.github.com/pearselab/](https://www.github.com/pearselab/tyrell)
636 [tyrell](https://www.github.com/pearselab/tyrell)).

637 Acknowledgements

638 This work was funded by a Natural Environment Research Council grant NE/V009710/1.
639 WDP and the Pearse Lab are also funded by National Science Foundation grants ABI-
640 1759965 and EF-1802605.