

1

2 Supporting Information for:

3 Environment influences SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the absence of non-pharmaceutical
4 interventions

5 **Authors:** Thomas P. Smith^{1,*}, Seth Flaxman², Amanda S. Gallinat³, Sylvia P. Kinoshian³,
6 Michael Stemkovski³, H. Juliette T. Unwin⁴, Oliver J. Watson⁴, Charles Whittaker⁴,
7 Lorenzo Cattarino⁴, Ilaria Dorigatti⁴, Michael Tristram¹, William D. Pearse^{1,3*}

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

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

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

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

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

17 **Contents**

| | | | |
|----|----------|---|----------|
| 18 | 1 | Collinearity of Climate Variables | 3 |
| 19 | 2 | Effects of environment during lockdown | 4 |
| 20 | 3 | Lockdown as an interaction term | 4 |
| 21 | 4 | Effect of environment on recreational mobility | 6 |
| 22 | 5 | Bayesian model fit | 7 |
| 23 | 6 | Contribution of Bayesian model terms to R_t | 9 |

1 Collinearity of Climate Variables

As stated in the main text, correlations between the climate variables (temperature, absolute humidity, UV radiation levels) mean that we could not disentangle each variable's contributions to R_0 in multiple regression analysis. This can be seen in the high variance inflation factors for all climate variables when these predictors are regressed together (table S1).

Table S1: Multiple regression with all climate variables results in high inflation of variance. Multiple $r^2 = 0.5951$, *adjusted* $r^2 = 0.5524$, $F_{4,38} = 13.96$, $p < 0.001$. Scaled estimates are coefficients when predictors are scaled to have mean = 0 and SD = 1. The variance of environmental parameters are inflated due to their strong collinearity (VIF = variance inflation factor). * = $p < 0.05$

| | Scaled Estimate | Std. Error | <i>t</i> value | <i>p</i> -value | VIF |
|---------------------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|-----------------|-------|
| (Intercept) | 2.5600 | 0.0496 | 51.59 | < 0.001* | - |
| Temperature | -0.3925 | 0.1292 | -3.04 | 0.0045* | 6.608 |
| Abs. Humidity | 0.0863 | 0.1157 | 0.75 | 0.4604 | 5.299 |
| UV radiation | 0.0982 | 0.0753 | 1.30 | 0.2006 | 2.242 |
| \log_{10} (Pop density) | 0.2229 | 0.0570 | 3.91 | < 0.001* | 1.285 |

To further illustrate this, we perform a principal components analysis (PCA) on the three climate variables in our dataset, plus population density. Eigenvalues of the first two components of the combined datasets together accounted for 83% of the total variance. Temperature and absolute humidity fall mainly along the axis of PC1, which accounts for 55% of the variation. This close relationship is expected given that absolute humidity is a function of temperature (see main text eq. 1). UV radiation is correlated with temperature and humidity, but less so, and contributes more to PC2 which also comprises population density and explains 28% of the variance (fig. S1).

For further analysis we therefore chose the best fitting climate variable, assessed by Pearson's r (table S2). Based on this, we used temperature as our climate variable in further analyses.




Figure S1: **Results of PCA (PC1 vs PC2) carried out on climate variables and population density for each state.** Arrows correspond to each of the analysis variables. The proportion of variance explained by each axis is shown on the axis labels. The climate variables condense mainly into PC1, whilst population density explains more of the variance in PC2.

Table S2: **Assessment of the best fitting climate variable.** Comparison of correlation coefficients between R_0 and each of the climate variables; temperature, absolute humidity and surface UV levels. Temperature shows the highest correlation with R_0 .

| Variable | Pearson's r |
|-------------------|---------------|
| Temperature | -0.675 |
| Absolute humidity | -0.561 |
| UV | -0.357 |

2 Effects of environment during lockdown

When regressing lockdown R_t (mean R_t across the two weeks following a state-wide stay-at-home mandate) against temperature and \log_{10} -transformed population density, we find no significant effect of temperature, and a much lower coefficient for population density than in the R_0 regression model (table S3).

3 Lockdown as an interaction term

Here we combine the pre-lockdown R_0 and during-lockdown R_t data for the USA and perform multiple linear regression with lockdown as an additional parameter, to further

Table S3: **Lockdown reduces the effects of environment on R .** Multiple $r^2 = 0.2197$, *adjusted* $r^2 = 0.1775$, $F_{2,37} = 5.209$, $p = 0.0102$. Scaled estimates are coefficients when predictors are scaled to have mean = 0 and SD = 1

| | Scaled Estimate | Std. Error | t value | p-value |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------|---------|----------|
| Intercept | 1.1253 | 0.0374 | 30.12 | < 0.001* |
| Temperature | -0.0017 | 0.0392 | -0.04 | 0.9665 |
| $\log_{10}(\text{Pop density})$ | 0.1217 | 0.0392 | 3.10 | 0.0037* |

investigate the impact of mobility restrictions (*i.e.* lockdown) compared to the environment. We restrict the environmental parameters to temperature and population density due to the collinearity between temperature, UV radiation and humidity (see section 1). We first incorporate lockdown as a binary (*i.e.* in lockdown, or not in lockdown) additive effect and test the effects on R :

$$R \sim \text{Temperature} + \log_{10}(\text{Population density}) + \text{Lockdown}$$

As expected, we find that lockdown has a significant effect on R , with an order of magnitude greater strength than either environmental parameter (table S4).

Table S4: **Lockdown has a stronger effect on R than environment** Multiple $r^2 = 0.8637$, *adjusted* $r^2 = 0.8583$, $F_{3,76} = 160.5$, $p < 0.001$. Scaled estimates are coefficients when predictors are scaled to have mean = 0 and SD = 1

| | Scaled Estimate | Std. Error | t value | p-value |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------|---------|----------|
| (Intercept) | 2.47351 | 0.05279 | 46.854 | < 0.001* |
| Temperature | -0.17529 | 0.04124 | -4.251 | < 0.001* |
| $\log_{10}(\text{Pop density})$ | 0.15151 | 0.03580 | 4.232 | < 0.001* |
| Lockdown | -1.26176 | 0.08001 | -15.770 | < 0.001* |

Subsequently we ask whether lockdown mediates the environmental effects by incorporating this as an interaction term, *i.e.*:

$$R \sim \text{Temperature} + \log_{10}(\text{Population density}) + \text{Lockdown} + \\ \text{Temperature} : \text{Lockdown} + \log_{10}(\text{Population density}) : \text{Lockdown}$$

Here we find that there is a significant interaction between lockdown and temperature,

Table S5: **Lockdown conditions mediate the effects of environment on R .** Multiple $r^2 = 0.8927$, adjusted $r^2 = 0.8854$, $F_{5,74} = 123.1$, $p < 0.001$. Scaled estimates are coefficients when predictors are scaled to have mean = 0 and SD = 1

| | Scaled Estimate | Std. Error | t value | p-value |
|--|-----------------|------------|---------|----------|
| (Intercept) | 2.41331 | 0.04992 | 48.346 | < 0.001* |
| Temperature | -0.29734 | 0.04852 | -6.128 | < 0.001* |
| log ₁₀ (Pop density) | 0.19084 | 0.04541 | 4.202 | < 0.001* |
| Lockdown | -1.28701 | 0.07222 | -17.822 | < 0.001* |
| Temperature:Lockdown | 0.29527 | 0.07524 | 3.924 | < 0.001* |
| log ₁₀ (Pop density):Lockdown | -0.06995 | 0.06442 | -1.086 | 0.281 |

59 but not population density (table S5), *i.e.* the effects of temperature on R are dependant
60 upon lockdown status. This interaction model is preferred over the purely additive model
61 (ANOVA, $F_{2,74} = 9.996$, $p < 0.001$).

62 4 Effect of environment on recreational mobility

63 Mobility trends for parks were omitted from estimates of R_t both from the datasets
64 that we used our external validation exercise, as well as our own Bayesian modelling
65 (as significant contact events are assumed to be negligible). However, here we further
66 investigate the impacts of environmental temperature on outdoor recreational mobility
67 levels as a potential confounding factor in these types of analysis (*i.e.* “do people go to
68 the park more when it’s warm?”). We first detrend the data using the `diff()` function in R,
69 as the effects of policy are expected to have a large impact on the realised mobility levels.
70 This allows us to compare whether an increase in environmental temperature at the daily
71 level causes a similar increase in recreational mobility. When we compare daily changes
72 in mobility against daily changes in temperature across all US states, between February
73 and June 2020, we find no significant correlation ($t_{5276} = -0.64628$, $r = -0.0089$, $p =$
74 0.518).

75 **5 Bayesian model fit**

76 Here we provide the full Bayesian model coefficients and results of posterior predictive
77 checks to ensure that all chains had mixed and converged (table S6).

| | mean | se_mean | sd | 2.5% | 25% | 50% | 75% | 97.5% | n_eff | \hat{r} |
|----------------------------|-------|---------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|-----------|
| α_1 | 2.14 | 0.01 | 0.45 | 1.21 | 1.85 | 2.16 | 2.46 | 2.98 | 1394.56 | 1.00 |
| α_2 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.27 | -0.51 | -0.17 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.55 | 2401.50 | 1.00 |
| α_3 | 0.89 | 0.01 | 0.50 | -0.10 | 0.55 | 0.90 | 1.23 | 1.87 | 3778.68 | 1.00 |
| α_1^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | -0.67 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.66 | 11062.97 | 1.00 |
| α_2^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | -0.63 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.66 | 13676.39 | 1.00 |
| α_3^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.65 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.65 | 12106.48 | 1.00 |
| α_4^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.64 | -0.10 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.65 | 12138.84 | 1.00 |
| α_5^{state} | -0.04 | 0.00 | 0.27 | -0.67 | -0.14 | -0.01 | 0.07 | 0.49 | 4508.57 | 1.00 |
| α_6^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | -0.61 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.64 | 14340.61 | 1.00 |
| α_7^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.65 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.66 | 13683.76 | 1.00 |
| α_8^{state} | -0.02 | 0.00 | 0.24 | -0.56 | -0.12 | -0.00 | 0.09 | 0.50 | 6369.54 | 1.00 |
| α_9^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.65 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.64 | 11822.21 | 1.00 |
| α_{10}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.67 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.10 | 0.64 | 13655.71 | 1.00 |
| α_{11}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | -0.67 | -0.12 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.66 | 12288.08 | 1.00 |
| α_{12}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.66 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.63 | 10459.35 | 1.00 |
| α_{13}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | -0.65 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.63 | 11717.81 | 1.00 |
| α_{14}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.65 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.65 | 11918.50 | 1.00 |
| α_{15}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.26 | -0.56 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.57 | 7866.88 | 1.00 |
| α_{16}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | -0.68 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.66 | 12413.47 | 1.00 |
| α_{17}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.66 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.66 | 12689.82 | 1.00 |
| α_{18}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.68 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.66 | 15471.48 | 1.00 |
| α_{19}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | -0.64 | -0.10 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.65 | 12943.23 | 1.00 |
| α_{20}^{state} | -0.03 | 0.00 | 0.25 | -0.61 | -0.14 | -0.01 | 0.07 | 0.48 | 4880.30 | 1.01 |
| α_{21}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.26 | -0.56 | -0.10 | -0.00 | 0.10 | 0.57 | 6802.89 | 1.00 |
| α_{22}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | -0.64 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.64 | 14606.26 | 1.00 |
| α_{23}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.66 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.66 | 12520.77 | 1.00 |
| α_{24}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.66 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.10 | 0.66 | 11048.15 | 1.00 |
| α_{25}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.64 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.65 | 10151.39 | 1.00 |
| α_{26}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.66 | -0.12 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.64 | 12545.84 | 1.00 |
| α_{27}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | -0.64 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.64 | 14688.05 | 1.00 |
| α_{28}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | -0.65 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.63 | 13422.73 | 1.00 |
| α_{29}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.64 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.10 | 0.65 | 11528.96 | 1.00 |
| α_{30}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.67 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.65 | 13951.41 | 1.00 |
| α_{31}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.67 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.65 | 12860.85 | 1.00 |
| α_{32}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.26 | -0.54 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.10 | 0.56 | 6629.28 | 1.00 |
| α_{33}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | -0.65 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.62 | 13174.63 | 1.00 |
| α_{34}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | -0.64 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.64 | 13039.06 | 1.00 |
| α_{35}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.67 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.65 | 12938.33 | 1.00 |
| α_{36}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | -0.63 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.62 | 14181.21 | 1.00 |
| α_{37}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | -0.64 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.64 | 11528.17 | 1.00 |
| α_{38}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.64 | -0.10 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.67 | 13059.82 | 1.00 |
| α_{39}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.65 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.10 | 0.65 | 13000.12 | 1.00 |
| α_{40}^{state} | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.63 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.65 | 12361.29 | 1.00 |
| α_{41}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | -0.63 | -0.10 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.67 | 13882.77 | 1.00 |
| α_{42}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | -0.70 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.66 | 11855.58 | 1.00 |
| α_{43}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | -0.65 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.68 | 13618.33 | 1.00 |
| α_{44}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.66 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.63 | 11607.65 | 1.00 |
| α_{45}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | -0.66 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.69 | 9386.17 | 1.00 |
| α_{46}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.65 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.66 | 12808.94 | 1.00 |
| α_{47}^{state} | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.26 | -0.54 | -0.09 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.62 | 8309.47 | 1.00 |
| α_{48}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.64 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.66 | 12433.56 | 1.00 |
| α_{49}^{state} | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | -0.63 | -0.11 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.67 | 13553.05 | 1.00 |
| α_{50}^{state} | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | -0.65 | -0.11 | -0.00 | 0.11 | 0.63 | 11518.66 | 1.00 |
| α_{51}^{state} | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.27 | -0.39 | -0.04 | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.76 | 1068.15 | 1.01 |
| $\alpha_{r(1),1}^{region}$ | 0.48 | 0.01 | 0.32 | -0.06 | 0.23 | 0.47 | 0.71 | 1.09 | 563.06 | 1.01 |
| $\alpha_{r(1),2}^{region}$ | 0.32 | 0.01 | 0.57 | -0.63 | -0.04 | 0.21 | 0.63 | 1.67 | 2569.76 | 1.00 |
| $\alpha_{r(2),1}^{region}$ | 0.46 | 0.01 | 0.31 | -0.06 | 0.22 | 0.46 | 0.68 | 1.06 | 644.11 | 1.01 |
| $\alpha_{r(2),2}^{region}$ | 0.41 | 0.01 | 0.53 | -0.40 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 0.71 | 1.68 | 1578.49 | 1.00 |
| $\alpha_{r(3),1}^{region}$ | 0.39 | 0.01 | 0.34 | -0.15 | 0.11 | 0.36 | 0.63 | 1.10 | 642.92 | 1.01 |
| $\alpha_{r(3),2}^{region}$ | -0.02 | 0.01 | 0.54 | -1.14 | -0.30 | -0.01 | 0.25 | 1.13 | 8663.30 | 1.00 |
| $\alpha_{r(4),1}^{region}$ | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.28 | -0.44 | -0.14 | 0.01 | 0.23 | 0.67 | 1127.36 | 1.01 |
| $\alpha_{r(4),2}^{region}$ | 0.27 | 0.01 | 0.56 | -0.63 | -0.08 | 0.15 | 0.56 | 1.63 | 2519.12 | 1.00 |
| $\alpha_{r(5),1}^{region}$ | 0.42 | 0.01 | 0.28 | -0.04 | 0.21 | 0.41 | 0.61 | 0.98 | 761.66 | 1.01 |
| $\alpha_{r(5),2}^{region}$ | 0.78 | 0.02 | 0.66 | -0.13 | 0.24 | 0.68 | 1.20 | 2.31 | 740.39 | 1.01 |
| $\alpha_{r(6),1}^{region}$ | 0.58 | 0.01 | 0.35 | -0.02 | 0.31 | 0.58 | 0.83 | 1.26 | 560.77 | 1.01 |
| $\alpha_{r(6),2}^{region}$ | 0.33 | 0.01 | 0.53 | -0.53 | -0.02 | 0.23 | 0.62 | 1.58 | 2917.65 | 1.00 |
| $\alpha_{r(7),1}^{region}$ | 0.49 | 0.01 | 0.31 | -0.04 | 0.25 | 0.49 | 0.71 | 1.09 | 595.74 | 1.01 |
| $\alpha_{r(7),2}^{region}$ | 0.30 | 0.01 | 0.50 | -0.49 | -0.02 | 0.21 | 0.58 | 1.46 | 2151.45 | 1.00 |
| $\alpha_{r(8),1}^{region}$ | 0.32 | 0.01 | 0.28 | -0.16 | 0.10 | 0.31 | 0.52 | 0.91 | 718.72 | 1.01 |
| $\alpha_{r(8),2}^{region}$ | 0.52 | 0.02 | 0.64 | -0.36 | 0.05 | 0.38 | 0.87 | 2.09 | 1158.01 | 1.00 |
| μ | 2.59 | 0.02 | 0.40 | 1.98 | 2.28 | 2.55 | 2.85 | 3.44 | 496.29 | 1.01 |
| c | -0.49 | 0.00 | 0.14 | -0.80 | -0.58 | -0.48 | -0.40 | -0.25 | 1026.26 | 1.01 |
| p | 0.69 | 0.01 | 0.19 | 0.35 | 0.56 | 0.68 | 0.81 | 1.07 | 1021.97 | 1.00 |

Table S6: **Summary of posterior distribution from model fit.** Each row is a coefficient defined in equation 2 (main text) with terminology as described in the text. Each column is a descriptor of the posterior distribution of that coefficient across all five chains, specifically: its mean, standard error, standard deviation, 2.5th, 25th, 50th (median), 75th, 97.5th, number of effective samples, and the \hat{r} estimator of chain convergence¹.

78 **6 Contribution of Bayesian model terms to R_t**

79 Here we provide a visualisation showing the influence of our various model terms on R_t
80 for each state through time (fig S2). When reductions in mobility are strong, R_t is largely
81 driven by the mobility terms in the model, however when mobility reductions are weak,
82 temperature and population density are much greater drivers of R_t . See for example New
83 York: when mobility was close to baseline in February and March, fluctuating temper-
84 atures cause large spikes in R_t , which is also generally driven upwards by the relatively
85 high population density of the state. However, after stay-at-home measures were imple-
86 mented, R_t drops and closely tracks changes in mobility, with temperature fluctuations
87 having much lesser an effect. This shows that although we don't explicitly model an
88 interaction between environment and mobility, our model represents this effect.




Figure S2: **Relative contribution of model terms driving changes in R_t through time.** The black dotted line shows the “basic R_0 ” term, which is constant through time for all states. The dashed lines represent temperature (blue), population density (red), combined mobility reductions (orange) and the autoregressive term (purple) and show what R_t would be estimated at if the model only considered each of these terms alone. The grey solid line shows the realised R_t estimated by the model. Essentially this shows the relative contribution of the model terms in pulling R_t away from the baseline R_0 (black dotted) to the realised R_t (grey solid).

89 **References**

- 90 [1] Andrew Gelman and Donald B. Rubin. Inference from Iterative Simulation Using
91 Multiple Sequences. *Statistical Science*, 7(4):457–511, 1992.