

1 **Does behavior mediate the effect of weather on SARS-CoV-2 transmission? Evidence from cell-**  
2 **phone data**

3 **Authors: Elise N. Grover <sup>a</sup>, Andrea G. Buchwald <sup>b</sup>, Debashis Ghosh <sup>c</sup>, Elizabeth J. Carlton <sup>a\*</sup>**

4 <sup>a</sup> *Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, Colorado School of Public Health, University of*  
5 *Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, USA*

6 <sup>b</sup> *Center for Vaccine Development and Global Health, University of Maryland School of Medicine,*  
7 *Baltimore, MD, United States*

8 <sup>c</sup> *Department of Biostatistics & Informatics, Colorado School of Public Health, University of Colorado*  
9 *Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, USA*

\*Corresponding author:           email: Elizabeth.Carlton@cuanschutz.edu  
  post: Department of Environmental and Occupational Health,  
  Colorado School of Public Health,  
  17001 E 17<sup>th</sup> Pl., B119  
  Aurora, CO 80045, USA

10

11

12 **Declaration of interest:** The authors declare that they have no competing financial or non-financial  
13 interests.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30 **Abstract**

31 **Background:** There is growing evidence that weather alters SARS-CoV-2 transmission, but it remains  
32 unclear what drives the phenomenon. One prevailing hypothesis is that people spend more time indoors  
33 in cooler weather, leading to increased spread of SARS-CoV-2 related to time spent in confined spaces  
34 and close contact with others. However, the evidence in support of that hypothesis is limited and, at  
35 times, conflicting.

36 **Objectives:** We aim to evaluate the extent to which weather impacts COVID-19 via time spent away-  
37 from-home in indoor spaces, as compared to a direct effect of weather on COVID-19 hospitalization,  
38 independent of mobility.

39 **Methods:** We use a mediation framework, and combine daily weather, COVID-19 hospital surveillance,  
40 cellphone-based mobility data and building footprints to estimate the relationship between daily indoor  
41 and outdoor weather conditions, mobility, and COVID-19 hospitalizations. We quantify the direct health  
42 impacts of weather on COVID-19 hospitalizations and the indirect effects of weather via time spent  
43 indoors away-from-home on COVID-19 hospitalizations within five Colorado counties between March 4<sup>th</sup>  
44 2020 and January 31<sup>st</sup> 2021.

45 **Results:** We found evidence that changes in 12-day lagged hospital admissions were primarily via the  
46 direct effects of weather conditions, rather than via indirect effects by which weather changes time spent  
47 indoors away-from-home. Sensitivity analyses evaluating time at home as a mediator were consistent  
48 with these conclusions.

49 **Discussion:** Our findings do not support the hypothesis that weather impacted SARS-CoV-2  
50 transmission via changes in mobility patterns during the first year of the pandemic. Rather, weather  
51 appears to have impacted SARS-CoV-2 transmission primarily via mechanisms other than human  
52 movement. We recommend further analysis of this phenomenon to determine whether these findings  
53 generalize to current SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics and other seasonal respiratory pathogens.

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

## 63 Introduction

64 Since the earliest days of the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been speculation regarding  
65 whether SARS-CoV-2 would follow the typical seasonal pattern of respiratory viruses seen in temperate  
66 climates, where transmission tends to increase in winter and wane during the summer.<sup>1</sup> Four years after  
67 the discovery of SARS-CoV-2, a growing body of evidence suggests that SARS-CoV-2 is impacted by  
68 weather, similar to what is observed for seasonal respiratory infections such as influenza.<sup>2-6</sup> Literature to  
69 date suggests evidence of increased SARS-CoV-2 transmission at cooler temperatures,<sup>7</sup> and to a slightly  
70 lesser extent, at lower humidity.<sup>8</sup> However, it is less clear what drives these relationships.

71 A paradox in the seasonal transmission of respiratory illnesses is that year-round the average  
72 person spends the majority of their time indoors.<sup>9</sup> Additionally, SARS-CoV-2 transmission is primarily  
73 linked to indoor environments where crowding and lack of ventilation facilitate transmission. This begs the  
74 question: how are respiratory viruses such as SARS-CoV-2 linked to weather when people spend little  
75 time exposed to outdoor meteorological conditions and transmission primarily occurs in indoor,  
76 conditioned spaces? A common explanation is that weather alters human movement patterns, leading  
77 people to spend more or less time indoors, altering the frequency and length of time spent in close  
78 contact with others.<sup>10-13</sup> Here the ostensible relationship is that as weather becomes more unfavorable,  
79 people spend more time indoors and in indoor, confined spaces, increasing close contact with others and  
80 the probability of respiratory virus transmission. Despite its plausibility, the evidence for these phenomena  
81 is limited and conflicting. For example, while researchers in Belgium found a significant increase in long  
82 duration (>1 hour) social contact on low temperature work days as compared to high temperature days,  
83 they also found that the total number of social contacts that a person experienced during the workday did  
84 not significantly change with temperature.<sup>13</sup> Likewise, surveys of American and Canadian activity  
85 patterns have demonstrated that people tend to spend more time indoors during the winter than the  
86 summer,<sup>10</sup> but a 2019 study from the US northwest demonstrated that snowfall-related school and  
87 workplace closures led to reduced social contact and subsequent reductions in cumulative respiratory  
88 virus incidence.<sup>14</sup>

89 There is considerable evidence that human mobility impacts SARS-CoV-2 transmission, including  
90 evidence that human mobility patterns are a stronger driver of transmission than weather. Studies

91 estimating the relative contribution of mobility-related indicators (e.g., mobility index, countrywide  
92 lockdown, homestay) versus various weather conditions have found that mobility indicators were stronger  
93 contributors to SARS-CoV-2 transmission and COVID-19 pandemic growth than any weather conditions  
94 on their own<sup>15-17</sup> Similarly, two panel studies reporting the net effect of mobility and weather on SARS-  
95 CoV-2 transmission within countries with high confirmed COVID-19 cases during the first six months of  
96 the pandemic highlighted the potential suppression effect of mobility,<sup>18,19</sup> which occurs in mediation  
97 analyses when the direct and indirect (i.e., mediated) effects have opposite signs.<sup>20</sup> That is, any  
98 reductions in SARS-CoV-2 transmission that may have resulted from the negative association between  
99 temperature (or solar radiation) and SARS-CoV-2 were ultimately counteracted by warm temperature-  
100 related rises in mobility and the subsequent rises in mobility-related SARS-CoV-2 transmission.<sup>18,19</sup>

101 There are several plausible pathways by which weather can directly impact transmission outside  
102 of mobility. For example, studies have demonstrated that a host's innate immune response tends to be  
103 improved at higher temperatures,<sup>21</sup> while lower temperature and humidity have been found to impair  
104 airway tissue repair and mucous production for capturing and transporting invaders.<sup>22-25</sup> Studies have also  
105 suggested that lower sun exposure and subsequent lower levels of Vitamin D is associated with a  
106 decrease in host immunity and increased respiratory viruses during winter months.<sup>26,27</sup> Ambient  
107 temperature and humidity determine how quickly particles ejected by a cough or sneeze evaporate, which  
108 has the potential to affect the average distance travelled and the time that particles remain airborne.<sup>28</sup>  
109 While several factors are important to consider when it comes to the transmissibility of ejected particles –  
110 such as particle size, speed of ejection, ventilation, floor plan, etc.,– in general the effectiveness of  
111 airborne transmission is likely to increase when temperature and relative humidity are lower.<sup>28-30</sup>  
112 Furthermore, lower temperatures and humidity have been associated with greater viral viability, stability  
113 and survival.<sup>31,32</sup> One comparison of virus survival at room temperature versus summer temperatures  
114 found much more rapid decay at summer temperatures,<sup>33</sup> while other studies have demonstrated that the  
115 SARS-CoV-2 deactivation rate related to sunlight and solar radiation is slower during the winter  
116 season.<sup>34,35</sup>

117 We conducted a mediation analysis to test the hypothesis that meteorological conditions impact  
118 COVID-19 transmission via changes in human mobility patterns. We use daily COVID-19 hospital

119 admissions in five Colorado counties between March 2020 and January 2021, daily weather data,  
120 building footprints, and cellphone-based mobility data to distinguish time spent indoors versus outdoors,  
121 and time spent at home versus away-from-home. Using the mediation analysis framework shown in  
122 Figure 1, we evaluate the extent to which weather directly influenced COVID-19 hospitalizations during  
123 the first year of the pandemic, as compared to an indirect mediation effect in which weather impacts  
124 mobility, which subsequently influences COVID-19 transmission. Instead of using absolute measures of  
125 weather, mobility and COVID-19 hospitalizations in this analysis, we standardize our weather variables  
126 and mean-center our mediators (i.e., mobility metrics) and outcome (i.e., COVID-19 hospitalizations) by  
127 county and season, such that the results could be interpreted as change relative to the county-season  
128 mean. This approach allowed us to account for season- and location-specific variability in our definitions  
129 of meaningful changes in weather, mobility and COVID-19 transmission. Additionally, we used publicly  
130 available indoor and outdoor climate data to evaluate the relationship between indoor and outdoor  
131 weather conditions. Through this analysis we test an often cited, yet largely suppositious hypothesis, with  
132 the goal of improving our understanding of the complex interplay of weather and behavior on a respiratory  
133 pathogen.

## 134 **Methods**

### 135 **Study period and population**

136 We combine daily measures of indoor and outdoor weather conditions, mobility data from mobile  
137 devices, and COVID-19 hospitalization data for five Colorado counties between March 4<sup>th</sup> 2020 and  
138 January 31<sup>st</sup> 2021. March 4<sup>th</sup> was selected as our study's start date, as this corresponded with the first  
139 confirmed COVID-19 hospitalization in Colorado. We focus on Boulder, Denver, Douglas, El Paso and  
140 Mesa counties because of the availability of both indoor and outdoor weather and mobility data for the  
141 length of the study period. These counties all have populations above 150,000 people and are among the  
142 most populous in the state. Due to rapidly changing transmission dynamics related to increasing  
143 vaccinations, the rise of highly transmissible SARS-CoV-2 variants in the late winter of 2021, and an end  
144 to our access to the mobility data, we end the dataset on January 31, 2021. We analyze the data by  
145 season using the following definitions: Spring from March 4<sup>th</sup> to May 31<sup>st</sup>; Summer from June 1<sup>st</sup> to August  
146 31<sup>st</sup>; Fall from September 1<sup>st</sup> to November 30<sup>th</sup>; and Winter from December 1<sup>st</sup> to January 31<sup>st</sup>

147 **Indoor vs. outdoor climate**

148 We compile data from PurpleAir monitors (<https://api.purpleair.com/>) to assess the relationship  
149 between indoor and outdoor weather conditions at different times of year. PurpleAir monitors report  
150 temperature, humidity and air quality readings for monitors located both inside and outside. We  
151 generated estimates of the county-wide mean, standard deviation, 10<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile values for  
152 indoor and outdoor temperature and humidity conditions each day using 10-minute interval readings from  
153 1) all indoor monitors located in each county, and 2) all outdoor monitors located in each county. All  
154 monitors have two sensors that enable users to gauge the reliability of the readings. We omitted data  
155 when the two sensors were not within 10 units (degrees F and percent relative humidity) of each other or  
156 when the air quality reading of one sensor was at least three times greater than the other. We also omit  
157 all data from a single monitor if greater than 20% of its readings are outside of a plausible range, defined  
158 as greater than 100% or less than 0% for relative humidity, and temperatures higher or lower than the  
159 record high and low temperatures observed in Colorado for a given month. Notably, heat generated by  
160 the WiFi module of PurpleAir monitors causes them to be on average 8°F higher than the ambient  
161 temperature, and 4% lower than the ambient relative humidity.<sup>36</sup>

162 **Climate data**

163 We use gridMET data<sup>37</sup> to supplement daily outdoor weather conditions across each county  
164 because it is more accurate and reliable than the purple air sensors. GridMET is a gridded reanalysis  
165 dataset estimating daily surface meteorological conditions across the continental US at high spatial  
166 resolution (~4-km, 1/24<sup>th</sup> degree) that spans our study period.<sup>37</sup> We collect daily estimates of shortwave  
167 solar radiation ( $W/m^2$ ), and the minimum and maximum temperature (°F), relative humidity (%) and  
168 absolute humidity ( $g/m^3$ ), as these are the weather variables that have been the most consistently  
169 associated with COVID-19 to date.<sup>7,8,38</sup> Additionally, we also evaluated daily precipitation (mm) and daily  
170 average windspeed (m/s), as some studies have highlighted these meteorological factors as being  
171 potentially associated with COVID-19, albeit with more variable findings than what's been found to date  
172 for solar radiation, temperature and humidity.<sup>39-46</sup> We calculate the average value of each weather metric  
173 on each day within a county to produce a county-day dataset.

174 As we were interested in relative (as opposed to absolute) changes in weather for a given  
175 location and season, each meteorological variable was standardized by county and season. To do this,  
176 the mean and standard deviation for each county-season was estimated. The county-season mean was  
177 then subtracted from each observation from a given county and season, and the resulting value was  
178 divided by the county-season standard deviation. Mean-centering by county and season allowed us to  
179 focus on location-specific variability in weather within each season, and facilitated a simple and uniform  
180 standard deviation-based definition of the “treatment” level of each weather variable for mediation  
181 analyses.

## 182 **Behavioral determinants data**

183 We use mobile device data from X-mode ([https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/seller-](https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/seller-profile?id=4e8835bd-89dc-4ae7-818d-52c22fedcbb9)  
184 [profile?id=4e8835bd-89dc-4ae7-818d-52c22fedcbb9](https://aws.amazon.com/marketplace/seller-profile?id=4e8835bd-89dc-4ae7-818d-52c22fedcbb9)) consisting of timestamped geolocated points (i.e.,  
185 device breadcrumbs). X-mode is one of many mobile device location data providers whose data have  
186 been used to study mobility patterns during the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>47</sup> We use the mobile device data to  
187 estimate the average daily percentage of time that county residents spent indoors away-from-home. We  
188 use this measure as our primary description of transmission-relevant behavior because SARS-CoV-2  
189 overwhelmingly occurs indoors,<sup>48,49</sup> and, while the home environment is a key source of SARS-CoV-2  
190 transmission, contacts outside of the home are necessary for introduction of the virus into the home.<sup>50</sup>  
191 Additionally, we conducted a sensitivity analysis using time at home as an alternate measure of  
192 transmission-relevant behavior, due to concern over potential misclassification that could arise when  
193 differentiating between time spent indoors versus outdoors.

194 Mobile device location was divided into five categories: indoors at home; outdoors at home;  
195 indoors not-at-home; outdoors not-at-home; and in transit. To determine if a mobile device was indoors or  
196 outdoors, we used a database of Colorado building footprints from Microsoft  
197 (<https://github.com/microsoft/USBuildingFootprints>). We classified the device as indoors if it met the  
198 following conditions: 1) the device remained within an 80-meter radius for at least 2 minutes; and 2) The  
199 geometric median of the pings within that radius rested within 1-meter of a building footprint. When a  
200 device was moving at a speed greater than 10 miles per hour, we classified that device as “in transit”. We  
201 classified all other device activity – static, not within 1-meter of a building footprint, or moving less than 10

202 miles per hour – as outdoors. To determine when the device was away-from-home, we assigned two  
203 “home locations” per day per device: the “primary home” – the most common nighttime location for the  
204 device over the past 6 weeks – and the “current home” – the device’s primary location from the prior  
205 night. We considered a device to be away-from-home if it was observed more than 60-meters from both  
206 its primary and current home.

207 To generate daily estimates of where time was spent for each device, we expressed time spent in  
208 each of our five device location categories as a percentage, using the total amount of time a device was  
209 observed each day as the denominator. We then calculate a county-wide average of the percent of time  
210 spent in each of the five location categories for each study county. Finally, to facilitate comparisons  
211 across counties and seasons that account for intra- county and season variability in what constitutes  
212 “typical” mobility behaviors, we mean-centered each of our “percent of time spent” variables such that a  
213 value of “0” represented the county and season average percent of time spent in a given location, while a  
214 negative/positive number indicated lower/higher than average percent of time spent in that location, given  
215 the county and season.

#### 216 **COVID-19 hospitalization data**

217 We used reported case data from the Colorado Electronic Disease Reporting System (CEDRS)  
218 provided by the Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment (CDPHE) to calculate the  
219 daily number of people admitted to the hospital with SARS-CoV-2 in each county. We used COVID-19  
220 hospitalizations as our outcome instead of reported cases because we suspect cases reflect a variable  
221 proportion of infections over time due to changes in access to testing and test-seeking behaviors across  
222 our study period. To approximate a normal distribution and to facilitate interpretation across counties and  
223 seasons that account for intra- county and season variability in COVID-19 hospitalizations, we mean-  
224 centered hospitalizations for each county and season such that a value of “0” represented the average  
225 number of hospitalizations for a given county and season, while a negative/positive number indicated the  
226 degree to which daily hospitalizations were below/above the county and season average.

227 We hypothesized that meteorological conditions impact behavior immediately, leading to SARS-  
228 CoV-2 transmission events. COVID-19 hospitalizations, however, occur days after such transmission  
229 events. We lag hospitalizations by 12-days. This 12-day lag is the sum of a literature-based estimate of



230 the average incubation period for SARS-CoV-2 of 4-days,<sup>51,52</sup> plus our data-based average of 8-days  
231 between reported symptom onset and hospitalization for our study population and period, based on an  
232 analysis of the CEDRS data.<sup>53</sup>

### 233 **Statistical analysis**

234 **Indoor vs. outdoor weather.** First, to evaluate the relationship between indoor and outdoor  
235 weather conditions, we calculated Pearson’s correlation coefficients between daily estimates of indoor  
236 and outdoor mean temperature, relative humidity and absolute humidity for each 3-month season derived  
237 from the Purple Air sensors, using the benchmark values outlined by Schober et al., (2018) to indicate  
238 strong (0.70 – 0.89) and very strong (0.90 – 1.00) correlation.<sup>54</sup> Scatter plots were also used to visualize  
239 the relationship between indoor and outdoor conditions across the study period.

240 **Mediation screening.** We then conducted a mediation analysis to evaluate evidence that  
241 meteorological variables impact COVID-19 hospitalizations directly or via changes in human mobility.  
242 Mediation analysis is recommended only when there is evidence of an association between the exposure  
243 and mediator, the exposure and outcome, and the mediator and outcome. We first screen each weather  
244 variable for evidence of an association with the mediator and with the outcome, using an approach that  
245 allowed us to consider a wide range of candidate weather variables, as described in the sections below.

246 **Nonlinear effects of weather.** Recognizing that the relationship between weather and behavior,  
247 and weather and COVID-19 may be non-linear, we converted each of our standardized meteorological  
248 variables into 3-category versions to capture “high”, “middle” and “low” values across their distributions.  
249 This allowed us to avoid assumptions of linearity and to generate data-informed definitions of our  
250 treatment variables for the mediation analyses. Lowess plots were used to examine the shape of the  
251 relationship between weather and human mobility, as well as weather and COVID-19 hospitalizations.<sup>55</sup>  
252 As the default, we used  $\pm 1$  SD as cut points for generating 3-category weather variables (i.e.,  $<-1$  SD,  $-1$   
253  $- 1$  SD,  $>1$  SD), though in some instances, alternative cut points were selected based on the relationships  
254 indicated via the Lowess plots.

255 **Weather vs. human mobility.** Once we determined the cut points to use for each categorical  
256 weather variable, we assessed its independent relationship with human mobility (i.e., time spent indoors,  
257 away-from-home) using linear regression models. For each linear regression model, we used Beta

258 coefficients ( $\beta$ ), a 95% confidence interval (CI) and a probability value (p-value) of  $<0.05$  to indicate  
259 whether above (e.g.,  $> 1$  SD) or below average (e.g.,  $< -1$  SD) weather conditions (relative to the mid-  
260 range values of  $-1$  to  $+1$  SD) were significantly associated with county-season averaged percent of time  
261 spent indoors away-from-home.

262 Each of our linear regression models used time spent indoors away-from-home (mean-centered  
263 by county-season) as the outcome, included a single meteorological variable (to avoid issues with  
264 multicollinearity), an auto-correlation term (i.e., yesterday's value for time-spent indoors, away-from  
265 home) as well as three variables hypothesized to be sources of confounding: day type, stay-at-home  
266 orders, and rising Colorado hospitalizations last week. Day type was a binary variable generated to  
267 account for potential changes in behavior associated with different days of the week/month, indicating  
268 whether a given day was a weekday (Monday – Friday) versus a weekend (Saturday/Sunday) or a  
269 common 2020 US holiday (New Years Day, MLK, President's Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day,  
270 Labor Day, Columbus Day, Veteran's Day, Thanksgiving Day, Black Friday, Christmas Eve, Christmas  
271 Day, New Year's Eve). To account for potential shifts in behavior and hospitalizations during the early  
272 stage of the pandemic when COVID-19 lockdown mandates were in place in Colorado counties, we used  
273 a binary indicator of whether each county was under a stay-at-home order for a given day (March 26<sup>th</sup> –  
274 April 26<sup>th</sup> for Douglas, El Paso and Mesa counties; March 26<sup>th</sup> – May 8<sup>th</sup> for Boulder and Denver counties).  
275 Finally, to account for potential behavioral changes in response to perceived risk of COVID-19 during  
276 times of rising transmission, we compiled hospitalization census data (indicating total COVID-19  
277 hospitalizations each day) to calculate an average weekly number of hospitalizations (*avhosp*) across the  
278 entire state of Colorado. This was used to generate a binary indicator of whether Colorado  
279 hospitalizations were increasing last week (*hospgrowth*), as compared to the week prior, calculated as  
280 follows:

$$hospgrow = 1 \text{ if } \frac{(avhosp\_wk_{n-1} - avhosp\_wk_{n-2})}{avhosp\_wk_{n-1}} > 0, \text{ else } hospgrow = 0$$

281 Recognizing that the direction and shape of the relationship between human mobility and weather  
282 could vary by season, we evaluated the evidence for seasonal effect modification by comparing the  
283 results of all-season (using season as a covariate) to season-stratified linear regression models. We

284 considered there to be evidence of effect modification when the stratum specific coefficient estimates  
285 from our regression models changed directions, or shifted by more than  $\pm 25\%$  between any two stratum.

286 **Weather vs. COVID-19 hospitalizations.** We again used linear regression to evaluate evidence  
287 of an association between the same set of weather variables and COVID-19 hospital admissions. Here  
288 we modeled COVID-19 hospital admissions (mean-centered by county-season to approximate a normal  
289 distribution) as the outcome and included a single 3-category meteorological variable as the  
290 treatment/exposure variable, an auto-correlation term (i.e., yesterday's value for COVID-19 hospital  
291 admissions), as well as the aforementioned potential confounders: day type, stay-at-home orders, and  
292 rising Colorado hospitalizations in the previous week. For each linear regression model, we used  $\beta$ -  
293 coefficients ( $\beta$ ), a 95% CI and a p-value of  $<0.05$  to indicate whether above (e.g.,  $> 1$  SD) or below  
294 average (e.g.,  $< -1$  SD) weather conditions (as compared to mid-range values of  $-1$  to  $+1$  SD) were  
295 significantly associated with county-season averaged COVID-19 hospital admissions. Again, we  
296 evaluated the evidence of seasonal effect modification by comparing the results of all-season (using  
297 season as a covariate) to season-stratified linear regression models.

298 **Mediation analysis.** The results from the aforementioned linear regression models between  
299 weather and human behavior, and between weather and COVID-19 hospital admissions were used as a  
300 2-step screening tool to determine which weather variables and "treatment" definitions to assess in the  
301 mediation analysis. We included only those weather variables whose comparison of "treatment" vs  
302 "control" (either high vs. middle, low vs. middle, or both) was significantly associated (p-value $<0.05$ ) with  
303 both time spent indoors away-from-home and COVID-19 hospital admissions in the mediation analysis. In  
304 the event that our regression models suggested a significant association at only one treatment level (e.g.,  
305 high vs. middle, but not low vs. middle), only that treatment level was assessed in the mediation model.  
306 For those weather variables that passed the 2-step screening, we then applied a mediation framework to  
307 determine the degree to which the total effect on COVID-19 hospital admissions was attributable to  
308 indirect effects (i.e., via time spent indoors away-from-home), versus via direct effects (i.e., via the  
309 weather variable). For each mediation model, we used the "mediate" command available in Stata 18.<sup>56</sup>  
310 We defined the "treatment" weather group as either the "low" or "high" category (depending on which  
311 category was highlighted as being significantly different from the "middle" category in our regression

312 models), while our default control group was always the “middle” category. Each mediation model also  
313 included the auto-correlation terms and the three control variables from our linear regression models  
314 (weekend/holiday, stay- at-home order, perceived risk), as well as an additional interaction term to  
315 account for interaction between the mediator and the treatment variable in each model. The latter  
316 decision is based on the guidelines laid out by VanderWeele (2015), wherein researchers are advised to  
317 include the interaction term by default, removing it only if its inclusion does not substantially change effect  
318 estimates.<sup>57</sup>

319 **Sensitivity analyses.** We included three sensitivity analyses in this assessment. First, we  
320 assessed percent of time spent at home (both indoors and outdoors) as the mediator and compared  
321 these results to that of the results from the primary assessment of time spent indoors away-from-home as  
322 the mediator. Second, we assessed each of our meteorological variables as continuous (instead of  
323 categorical) exposure/treatment variables (using  $\pm 1$  SD as the “treatment” group in the mediation  
324 analysis, and 0 as the “control” group), and compared the results with those from the primary  
325 assessment. Third, we also reran our mediation models to exclude the “hospgrowth” variable and  
326 compared the results with those models that included them to determine whether its inclusion resulted in  
327 any substantial changes in our results. Stata 18 was used for all analyses.

## 328 **Results**

329 Between March 4<sup>th</sup> 2020 and January 31<sup>st</sup> 2021, there were a total of 8,827 COVID-19 hospital  
330 admissions within our five Colorado study counties (Table 1). The number of daily COVID-19 hospital  
331 admissions reported by each county was highest in the winter (Mean = 9.0, Standard Deviation (SD) =  
332 7.6), and lowest in the summer (Mean = 1.7, SD = 2.2). A plot of COVID-19 hospitalizations within each  
333 county during our study period is available in Figure 2.

334 On average, people spent the most time away-from-home in indoor spaces during the fall (mean  
335 = 5.6%, SD = 1.2), and the most time at home during the spring (mean = 77.1%, SD = 5.0). Notably, the  
336 spring season corresponded with the executive “stay-at-home” order, which lasted from March 26<sup>th</sup>– April  
337 26<sup>th</sup> 2020 for all Colorado counties and was extended by Denver and Boulder counties through May 8th.

338 The weather within our five study counties was characteristic of temperate and dry climate types  
339 across the study period (Table 1). The mean maximum daily temperature was highest in the summer

340 (mean maximum temperature = 85.2, SD = 6.9) and lowest in the winter (mean maximum temperature =  
341 41.7, SD = 10.1), with the largest variance experienced during the spring (mean maximum temperature =  
342 61.4, SD = 13.5) and fall (mean maximum temperature = 63.9, SD = 16.8). Relative humidity tended to be  
343 lowest during the summer (mean minimum relative humidity = 16.0, SD = 8.5; mean maximum relative  
344 humidity = 57.8, SD = 17.2) and highest during the winter (mean minimum relative humidity = 34.1, SD =  
345 17.6; mean maximum relative humidity = 74.9, SD = 18.9), while absolute humidity was highest during the  
346 summer (mean minimum absolute humidity = 1.7, SD = 0.9; mean maximum absolute humidity = 17.0,  
347 SD = 4.7) and lowest during the winter (mean minimum absolute humidity = 0.9, SD = 0.4; mean  
348 maximum absolute humidity = 5.2, SD = 1.6).

### 349 **Comparing indoor and outdoor weather conditions**

350 A comparison of indoor and outdoor environmental conditions indicated that indoor conditions  
351 overlapped most with outdoor conditions between late spring and mid-fall (Figure 3). Indoor temperature  
352 and relative humidity were relatively stable across the year, though indoor temperature deviated from  
353 outdoor temperature between late fall and early spring (Figure 3, Panels A and B). Indoor absolute  
354 humidity showed greater variability and was closely correlated with outdoor absolute humidity (Figure 3,  
355 Panel C).

356 In Figure 4, correlation matrices comparing indoor and outdoor PurpleAir data demonstrate that  
357 the indoor and outdoor measures for mean temperature and absolute humidity were more strongly  
358 correlated than relative humidity across our study period. Correlation between indoor and outdoor  
359 temperature, relative humidity and absolute humidity was lowest during the winter season.

### 360 **Weather vs. Mobility and Weather vs. COVID-19 hospitalizations**

361 The results of our linear regression models suggested that both above and below average  
362 weather conditions were frequently associated with the county-season average amount of time spent  
363 indoors away-from-home, but less frequently associated with 12-day lagged hospital admissions (Table  
364 2). For example, when compared to mid-ranged minimum temperature, lower than average minimum  
365 temperature ( $< -1$  SD) was significantly associated with an increase in the county-season mean percent  
366 of time spent indoors away-from-home in the all-season model ( $\beta = 0.09$ , 95% CI: 0.01, 0.17) and the  
367 spring model ( $\beta = 0.30$ , 95% CI: 0.11, 0.48), and a significant decrease in time spent indoors away-from-

368 home in the winter model ( $\beta = -0.32$ , 95 CI: -0.47, -0.17) and the summer model ( $\beta = -0.08$ , 95% CI: -0.16,  
369 -0.00). Meanwhile, lower than average minimum temperature was not significantly associated with 12-day  
370 lagged COVID-19 hospital admissions in any of the season-stratified or all-season linear regression  
371 models.

372 Only four weather conditions were associated with both time spent indoors away-from-home and  
373 12-day lagged COVID-19 hospital admissions in one or more season: high minimum temperature (all-  
374 season), low maximum temperature (spring), low minimum absolute humidity (winter), and high solar  
375 radiation (all-season & winter), which are highlighted in gray in Table 2. As our ultimate interests in the  
376 linear regression models were to 1) identify candidate weather variables (and their associated seasons)  
377 that were appropriately suited to a mediation analysis (i.e., those that were associated with both time  
378 spent indoors away-from-home and 12-day lagged COVID-19 hospital admissions), and 2) to determine  
379 the anticipated direction of association for those that met the conditions of mediation analysis. Table 2  
380 includes only those regression results pertaining to the subset of weather variables that met those  
381 conditions. For further details on the association between time spent indoors away-from-home or COVID-  
382 19 hospital admissions and other weather variables (e.g., relative humidity, precipitation, wind speed) or  
383 the control variables, see Supplemental Table S1.

#### 384 **Mediation analysis**

385 In our all-season mediation models, change in the county-season average 12-day lagged COVID-  
386 19 hospital admissions was largely due to mechanisms other than the indirect route of time spent indoors  
387 away-from-home (Table 3). When minimum temperature was above average ( $> 0.5$  SD) in the all-season  
388 model, there was a small, but statistically non-significant increase in the average COVID-19 hospital  
389 admissions that was attributable to the indirect route of weather via time spent indoors away-from-home  
390 ( $\beta = 0.02$ , 95% CI: -0.01, 0.04). By contrast, the estimated direct effect of above average minimum  
391 temperature on average COVID-19 hospital admissions by county-season was an average decrease of  
392 0.46 COVID-19 hospital admissions (95% CI: -0.82, -0.11). Thus, the resulting total effect of higher-than-  
393 average minimum temperature and time spent indoors away-from-home in the all-season model was an  
394 average decrease of 0.45 hospital admissions (95% CI: -0.80, 0.10) by county-season. In other words,  
395 there was a suppression effect, meaning the estimated impact of temperature-associated changes in

396 mobility on COVID-19 hospitalizations was in the opposite direction of the estimated direct effect of  
397 temperature on COVID-19 hospitalizations. In a similar vein, when compared to mid-range solar radiation  
398 (-1.5 SD – 0 SD) in the all-season model, above average solar radiation (>0 SD) was associated with a  
399 small but statistically non-significant increase in COVID-19 hospital admissions via the indirect route of  
400 the associated changes in the average time spent indoors away-from-home ( $\beta=0.03$ , 95% CI: -0.00,  
401 0.07), but a significant decrease in COVID-19 hospital admissions via the direct route of higher than  
402 average solar radiation ( $\beta= -0.88$ , 95% CI: -1.23, -0.53).

403           Similar to the estimates from the all-season models, our season-stratified spring model suggested  
404 opposing effects of low maximum temperature and time spent indoors away-from-home: we found a non-  
405 significant increase in hospital admissions via the indirect route of time spent indoors away-from-home,  
406 but a statistically significant decrease in county-season average COVID-19 hospital admissions due to  
407 other mechanisms associated with lower than average maximum temperatures in the spring. In our two  
408 season-stratified winter models of the effects of low minimum absolute humidity and high solar radiation,  
409 we found that both the indirect effects and direct effects of these weather conditions each had a negative  
410 effect (albeit statistically non-significant for all but the direct effects of high solar radiation) on county-  
411 season averaged COVID-19 hospital admissions.

412           In several instances, our indirect effect estimates yielded results that ran counter to the  
413 hypothesis that the indirect effect of spending more time indoors away-from-home would be an increase  
414 in COVID-19 hospital admissions (and vice versa). For example, in the case of higher-than-average  
415 minimum temperature in our all-season models, the linear regression models (Table 2) suggested that  
416 above average minimum temperature (>0.5 SD) was associated with a significant decrease in the county-  
417 season average percent of time spent indoors away-from-home ( $\beta = -0.09$ , 95 CI: -0.16, -0.01). By  
418 contrast, our mediation model highlighted a small increase (albeit statistically non-significant) in average  
419 COVID-19 hospitalizations attributed to temperature-induced changes in time spent indoors away-from-  
420 home, demonstrating a direct conflict with our hypothesis that a decrease in time spent indoors away-  
421 from-home would result in decreased risk of COVID-19 hospitalization.

## 422 **Sensitivity analyses**

423 In a sensitivity analysis, we re-ran the analysis using time at home (either indoors or outdoors) as  
424 the mediator, hypothesizing that seasonal weather conditions would influence the amount of time spent at  
425 home, and that any time spent at home would be protective against COVID-19. Compared to the linear  
426 regression results from the primary analysis, the results from this sensitivity analysis suggested that  
427 seasonal weather conditions were more strongly associated with time spent at home than with time spent  
428 indoors away-from-home (Supplemental Table S2). The mediation analysis showed similar results to that  
429 of our primary mediation analysis, demonstrating that changes in the county-season average 12-day  
430 lagged COVID-19 hospital admissions were primarily a result of mechanisms other than changes in time  
431 spent at home (Supplemental Table S3).

432 In an additional sensitivity analysis, we re-ran our linear regression models using continuous  
433 versions of weather variables. In our assessments concerning time indoors away-from-home, none of the  
434 continuous weather variables in the season-stratified models were statistically significantly associated  
435 with both the county-average percent of time spent indoors away-from-home and 12-day lagged COVID-  
436 19 hospital admissions (Supplemental Table S4). Among the all-season models, only minimum  
437 temperature was statistically significantly associated with both the county-average percent of time spent  
438 indoors away-from-home and 12-day lagged COVID-19 hospital admissions. The mediation analysis  
439 assessing the direct effects of continuous maximum temperature and the indirect effect of continuous  
440 maximum temperature via time spent indoors away-from-home yielded nearly identical results to that of  
441 the primary analysis (Supplemental Table S5). Similarly, when we repeated this analysis using  
442 continuous versions of the weather variables on time at home and COVID-19 hospital admissions, we  
443 again found that only the all-season minimum temperature was statistically significantly associated with  
444 both the county-average percent of time at home and 12-day lagged COVID-19 hospital admissions  
445 (Supplemental Table S6, Supplemental Table S7).

446 In a final sensitivity analysis, we compared two sets of mediation models: those that included the  
447 “hospgrowth” variable to account for potential behavioral changes in response to perceived risk of  
448 COVID-19 during times of rising transmission, and those that excluded it. The results did not change  
449 substantially with the exclusion of the hospitalization growth variable for either the time spent indoors



450 away-from-home (Supplemental Table S8) or time spent at home (Supplemental Table S9) mediation  
451 models.

## 452 **Discussion**

453 In our analysis, we did not find evidence that weather impacted COVID-19 hospital admissions  
454 via changes in time spent indoors, away-from-home during the first year of the pandemic. Using a  
455 mediation framework, we found instead that the direct effects of weather on hospital admissions were far  
456 more influential than the indirect route whereby weather changes mobility behaviors. This has important  
457 implications, as it runs counter to the popular belief that seasonality in winter-dominant respiratory viruses  
458 is primarily a result of increased time spent indoors. We found minimal variability in time spent indoors  
459 away-from-home across seasons. Within and across seasons, we found that changes in time spent  
460 indoors away-from-home associated with weather had little to no effect on county-season averaged  
461 COVID-19 hospital admissions. By contrast, we found that relative changes in weather – specifically,  
462 above average minimum temperature and solar radiation across all seasons, below average maximum  
463 temperature in the spring, and above average solar radiation in the winter –were each directly associated  
464 with a decrease in county-season averaged COVID-19 hospital admissions.

465 This study has implications for the potential mechanisms by which weather impacts respiratory  
466 infections, and how we build models of respiratory disease systems. In mathematical models of infectious  
467 disease transmission, the spread of infections from infected to susceptible individuals is defined as the  
468 product of the contact rate between susceptible and infected individuals, and the transmission probability  
469 if there is a contact. The common theory that weather impacts respiratory illnesses through changes in  
470 human behavior implies that weather alters contact rates. Our analysis suggests that, in the first year of  
471 the COVID-19 pandemic, weather instead impacted the spread of SARS-CoV-2 by altering transmission  
472 probabilities. Below, we discuss the plausibility of this finding, as well as some caveats in the  
473 interpretation of this analysis.

474 One of the paradoxes in explaining the direct impacts of weather on transmission is explaining  
475 how outdoor temperatures directly impact the probability of transmission of a pathogen that is primarily  
476 spread in indoor environments. There is a body of evidence linking SARS-CoV-2 survival to ambient  
477 conditions, particularly evidence that SARS-CoV-2 survives longer at cooler temperatures and in drier

478 conditions and that UV radiation accelerates virus decay.<sup>6,7,58</sup> However, we know that people spend most  
479 of their time indoors and that SARS-CoV-2 spreads most effectively in poorly ventilated indoor  
480 environments. Our comparison of indoor and outdoor weather conditions showed both indoor temperature  
481 and absolute humidity were strongly correlated with outdoor temperature and absolute humidity in all but  
482 the winter season (Figure 4). These patterns are consistent with Colorado weather, which typically require  
483 internal climate controls during the cold winter season and may also reflect people's willingness to open  
484 windows and/or limit indoor climate controls when the outside weather is comfortable. This high degree of  
485 correlation between indoor and outdoor weather conditions for much of the year may help to explain the  
486 stronger than anticipated direct effects of weather in our mediation analyses. For example, our all-season  
487 regression models indicated that high minimum temperature was associated with a decrease in 12-day  
488 lagged COVID-19 hospitalizations, which align with the existing body of evidence on the temperature-  
489 dependence of SARS-CoV-2 and the negative impacts that higher temperatures can have on virus  
490 survival and transmission.<sup>7,33</sup> By contrast, we also found that when absolute humidity was low during the  
491 winter season, there was a significant decrease in COVID-19 hospitalizations. This runs counter to the  
492 findings of other studies which have suggested that cold, dry conditions are likely to promote COVID-19  
493 transmission, particularly in winter and in drier climates.<sup>59</sup> Given the low levels of correlation between  
494 indoor and outdoor absolute humidity during the winter in our study (see Figures 3 and 4), our findings  
495 may suggest a mitigating effect of indoor climate controls.

496 Our analysis, and the work of others, has found evidence that weather may impact mobility  
497 patterns in ways that act counter to observed relationships between weather and SARS-CoV-2  
498 transmission. For example, we found the direct effects of high minimum temperature and high solar  
499 radiation was a significant reduction in 12-day lagged COVID-19 hospitalizations, whereas their indirect  
500 effects via time spent indoors away-from-home was a small increase in 12-day lagged COVID-19  
501 hospitalizations. This aligns with the findings of similar studies conducted early in the pandemic, which  
502 reported a negative association between temperature/solar radiation and COVID-19, but a positive  
503 association between temperature/solar radiation and human mobility concluding, like our study, that the  
504 impact of weather-driven mobility on COVID-19 may be counter to the direct effects of weather on  
505 mobility.<sup>18,19,60</sup> However, whereas these prior studies indicated that the strength of the indirect effects may

506 be enough to offset any direct effects of weather, we found that the strength of the direct effects of  
507 weather far outweighed any suppression effects via human mobility. Another notable difference in our  
508 study was that our linear regression models also suggested that higher temperatures/solar radiation were  
509 associated with a significant decrease in time spent indoors away-from-home. This suggest that the effect  
510 of high minimum temperature/solar radiation was a reduction in time spent indoors away-from-home, and  
511 a subsequent increase in lagged COVID-19 hospitalizations, which runs counter to our hypothesis that  
512 reducing time spent indoors away-from-home would be protective against COVID-19 hospitalization risk.

513 An alternative explanation for our findings is that our measure of time spent indoors away-from-  
514 home did not accurately capture time spent indoors versus out, leading to misclassification. We relied on  
515 Colorado building footprints from Microsoft (<https://github.com/microsoft/USBuildingFootprints>) to classify  
516 an individual as indoors or outdoors. The majority of the imagery used to build footprints for our study  
517 area was from 2019 – 2020, though footprints were also generated from older images when 2019 – 2020  
518 data was not available,<sup>61</sup> creating the possibility of misclassification bias, particularly in areas that have  
519 undergone rapid development in recent years. A comparison of our data to that of the United States'  
520 National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS) highlights that our study population spent significantly  
521 less time indoors during our study period than the average American in the 1990s: in our study we  
522 estimated that people spent 53.8% of their time indoors, whereas NHAPS estimated that Americans  
523 spent 87% of time spent in enclosed buildings.<sup>9</sup> While some of this difference is likely related to COVID-  
524 related stay-at-home mandates, we expected to see a larger uptick in time spent indoors away-from-  
525 home between spring and fall of 2020 – which shifted from 4.3% in the spring, to 5.6% in the fall – as  
526 schools and workplaces began resuming pre-pandemic operations.

527 To address this potential limitation, we reran the mediation analysis with time at home as the  
528 primary mediator. This measure was estimated based on the most common nighttime location and did not  
529 rely on building footprints, eliminating this potential source of misclassification. Our findings were  
530 consistent with the primary analysis, highlighting a strong direct effect of weather on COVID-19  
531 hospitalizations, and a minor, if any, indirect effect of weather via changes in time at home. This suggests  
532 that our results are robust to our measure of mobility.

533           A key limitation of our study is the generalizability of our findings to transmission of SARS-CoV-2  
534 today. We ended our study on January 31, 2021 because our access to the mobility data ended, and  
535 because of concerns about changing transmission dynamics due to the growing availability of  
536 vaccinations and the rise of highly transmissible SARS-CoV-2 variants in the late winter of 2021. During  
537 the first year of the pandemic, population immunity was very low and there were large alterations in  
538 human contact patterns due to widespread use of non-pharmaceutical interventions. This provided a  
539 unique opportunity to evaluate the mechanisms by which weather impacts an emerging pathogen. More  
540 research is needed to understand how these findings apply to more recent transmission dynamics of  
541 SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory pathogens, as population immunity and contact patterns are distinct  
542 from our period of study. Nevertheless, the fact that the any direct weather or indirect mobility effects  
543 were discernible in this analysis in spite of the upheaval of mobility patterns suggests there is reason to  
544 investigate the generalizability of our findings to later phases of SAR-CoV-2 transmission.

545           Additional limitations include the ecological nature of our study. It is possible that individuals that  
546 were most likely to alter their weather-related mobility patterns were also those that had a lower risk of  
547 COVID-19 hospitalization, a phenomenon we were unable to investigate with our data. However, our  
548 results suggest that weather-related mobility changes – whether they are the result of more or less time  
549 indoors, outdoors, at home or away – had a small impact on COVID-19 hospitalizations, and were  
550 ultimately less influential than the direct impacts of weather. Given the relatively short study period, our  
551 analysis may have been underpowered to detect effect modification by season. Notably, only our all-  
552 season mediation models showed marginally statistically significant ( $p$ -value < 0.2) indirect effects, which  
553 may be a reflection of limited power for our season-stratified models.

554           In this study, we set out to evaluate the extent to which weather impacts SARS-CoV-2  
555 transmission via changes in mobility patterns, as measured using cell-phone data and building footprints.  
556 We found evidence that weather, including temperature, absolute humidity and solar radiation directly  
557 impacted COVID-19 hospitalizations during the first year of the pandemic, and that the indirect mediation  
558 effect in which weather impacts mobility, and subsequently influences the likelihood of infection and  
559 hospitalization was either modest or null, in contrast to the direct effect. While other recent analyses have  
560 also highlighted similar direct effects of weather on SARS-CoV-2 and evidence of a suppression effect of

561 weather via human mobility,<sup>18,19,60</sup> our results indicated that the strength of the direct effects of weather on  
562 COVID-19 hospitalizations far outweighed any suppression effects. This has important implications, as it  
563 suggests weather may impact SARS-CoV-2 by altering transmission probabilities rather than contact  
564 patterns, and therefore measures that reduce the probability of transmission, via, for example vaccination  
565 or improved ventilation may be needed to reduce weather-driven changes in the spread of SARS-CoV-2.  
566 We recommend further analysis of this phenomenon to determine whether these findings generalize to  
567 current SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics wherein population immunity is high and human socialization  
568 and mobility patterns have largely returned to pre-pandemic levels.

### 569 **Acknowledgements**

570 The authors would like to thank Kris Karnaskis for his help with developing appropriate measures of daily  
571 weather estimates for use in this analysis. Thank you to Jude Bayham for providing methodological and  
572 analytical feedback throughout this work. Thanks are also due to Gal Koss and David Johnson for  
573 cleaning and compiling the PurpleAir and X-mode data for use in this assessment, as well as to Brittney  
574 Contreras for designing figures for this article. This work was made possible by the following third parties,  
575 who collected and shared the data used in this analysis: Colorado Department of Public Health and  
576 Environment (CDHPE), gridMET, PurpleAir, Microsoft, and X-Mode. Data on reportable diseases in  
577 Colorado is made available upon request from CDPHE. The gridMET daily meteorological summary  
578 dataset is available for download at <https://www.climatologylab.org/gridmet.html>. PurpleAir data can be  
579 obtained from: <https://api.purpleair.com/>. Colorado Building Footprints data is made available by  
580 Microsoft here: <https://github.com/microsoft/USBuildingFootprints>. X-Mode data was obtained under a  
581 research use agreement by Vanadata.io, who also processed the data. Inquiries about access to X-Mode  
582 data can be made at: <https://xmode.io/>.

583 This research was supported through the MIDAS Coordination Center (MIDASSUP2020-3) by a grant  
584 from the National Institute of General Medical Science (3U24GM132013-02S2), and by Cooperative  
585 Agreement number NU38OT000297 from The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the  
586 Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists (CSTE) and does not necessarily represent the views of  
587 CDC and CSTE. The authors receive funding from the Colorado Department of Public Health and  
588 Environment.

## 589 REFERENCES

- 590
- 591 1. Moriyama M, Hugentobler WJ, Iwasaki A. Seasonality of Respiratory Viral Infections. *Annual*  
592 *review of virology*. Mar 20 2020;doi:10.1146/annurev-virology-012420-022445
- 593 2. Kang D, Ellgen C, Kulstad E. Possible effects of air temperature on COVID-19 disease severity  
594 and transmission rates. *Journal of medical virology*. Sep 2021;93(9):5358-5366. doi:10.1002/jmv.27042
- 595 3. Paireau J, Charpignon ML, Larrieu S, et al. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions, weather,  
596 vaccination, and variants on COVID-19 transmission across departments in France. *BMC infectious*  
597 *diseases*. Mar 30 2023;23(1):190. doi:10.1186/s12879-023-08106-1
- 598 4. Sposato B, Serafini A, Simoncini E, et al. COVID-19 severity appears to be reduced in  
599 spring/summer. *Epidemiologia e prevenzione*. Jan-Apr 2023;47(1-2):34-46. In primavera/estate la gravità  
600 del COVID-19 appare ridotta. doi:10.19191/ep23.1.A503.016
- 601 5. Wiemken TL, Khan F, Puzniak L, et al. Seasonal trends in COVID-19 cases, hospitalizations, and  
602 mortality in the United States and Europe. *Scientific reports*. Mar 8 2023;13(1):3886. doi:10.1038/s41598-  
603 023-31057-1
- 604 6. Weaver AK, Head JR, Gould CF, Carlton EJ, Remais JV. Environmental Factors Influencing  
605 COVID-19 Incidence and Severity. *Annual review of public health*. Apr 5 2022;43:271-291.  
606 doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-052120-101420
- 607 7. McClymont H, Hu W. Weather Variability and COVID-19 Transmission: A Review of Recent  
608 Research. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. Jan 6  
609 2021;18(2)doi:10.3390/ijerph18020396
- 610 8. Romero Starke K, Mauer R, Karskens E, et al. The Effect of Ambient Environmental Conditions  
611 on COVID-19 Mortality: A Systematic Review. *International journal of environmental research and public*  
612 *health*. Jun 21 2021;18(12)doi:10.3390/ijerph18126665
- 613 9. Klepeis NE, Nelson WC, Ott WR, et al. The National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS): a  
614 resource for assessing exposure to environmental pollutants. *Journal of exposure science &*  
615 *environmental epidemiology*. 2001/07/01 2001;11(3):231-252. doi:10.1038/sj.jea.7500165
- 616 10. Leech JA, Nelson WC, Burnett RT, Aaron S, Raizenne ME. It's about time: a comparison of  
617 Canadian and American time-activity patterns. *Journal of exposure analysis and environmental*  
618 *epidemiology*. Nov 2002;12(6):427-32. doi:10.1038/sj.jea.7500244
- 619 11. Eames KT, Tilston NL, Brooks-Pollock E, Edmunds WJ. Measured dynamic social contact  
620 patterns explain the spread of H1N1v influenza. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2012;8(3):e1002425.
- 621 12. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, et al. Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of  
622 infectious diseases. *PLoS medicine*. 2008;5(3):e74.
- 623 13. Willem L, Van Kerckhove K, Chao DL, Hens N, Beutels P. A Nice Day for an Infection? Weather  
624 Conditions and Social Contact Patterns Relevant to Influenza Transmission. *PloS one*.  
625 2012;7(11):e48695. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0048695
- 626 14. Jackson ML, Hart GR, McCulloch DJ, et al. Effects of weather-related social distancing on city-  
627 scale transmission of respiratory viruses: a retrospective cohort study. *BMC infectious diseases*.  
628 2021/04/09 2021;21(1):335. doi:10.1186/s12879-021-06028-4
- 629 15. Jamshidi S, Baniasad M, Niyogi D. Global to USA County Scale Analysis of Weather, Urban  
630 Density, Mobility, Homestay, and Mask Use on COVID-19. *International journal of environmental research*  
631 *and public health*. Oct 26 2020;17(21)doi:10.3390/ijerph17217847
- 632 16. Smith TP, Flaxman S, Gallinat AS, et al. Temperature and population density influence SARS-  
633 CoV-2 transmission in the absence of nonpharmaceutical interventions. *Proceedings of the National*  
634 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. Jun 22  
635 2021;118(25)doi:10.1073/pnas.2019284118
- 636 17. Kulkarni H, Khandait H, Narlawar UW, Rathod P, Mamtani M. Independent association of  
637 meteorological characteristics with initial spread of Covid-19 in India. *The Science of the total*  
638 *environment*. Apr 10 2021;764:142801. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142801
- 639 18. Shao W, Xie J, Zhu Y. Mediation by human mobility of the association between temperature and  
640 COVID-19 transmission rate. *Environmental research*. Mar 2021;194:110608.  
641 doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.110608
- 642 19. Damette O, Mathonnat C, Goutte S. Meteorological factors against COVID-19 and the role of  
643 human mobility. *PloS one*. 2021;16(6):e0252405. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0252405

- 644 20. MacKinnon DP, Krull JL, Lockwood CM. Equivalence of the mediation, confounding and  
645 suppression effect. *Prevention science : the official journal of the Society for Prevention Research*. Dec  
646 2000;1(4):173-81.
- 647 21. Foxman EF, Storer JA, Fitzgerald ME, et al. Temperature-dependent innate defense against the  
648 common cold virus limits viral replication at warm temperature in mouse airway cells. *Proceedings of the  
649 National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. Jan 20 2015;112(3):827-32.  
650 doi:10.1073/pnas.1411030112
- 651 22. Donaldson GC, Seemungal T, Jeffries DJ, Wedzicha JA. Effect of temperature on lung function  
652 and symptoms in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *The European respiratory journal*. Apr  
653 1999;13(4):844-9. doi:10.1034/j.1399-3003.1999.13d25.x
- 654 23. Li M, Li Q, Yang G, Kolosov VP, Perelman JM, Zhou XD. Cold temperature induces mucin  
655 hypersecretion from normal human bronchial epithelial cells in vitro through a transient receptor potential  
656 melastatin 8 (TRPM8)-mediated mechanism. *The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology*. Sep  
657 2011;128(3):626-34.e1-5. doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2011.04.032
- 658 24. Even-Tzur N, Zaretsky U, Grinberg O, et al. Climate chamber for environmentally controlled  
659 laboratory airflow experiments. *Technology and health care : official journal of the European Society for  
660 Engineering and Medicine*. 2010;18(3):157-63. doi:10.3233/thc-2010-0577
- 661 25. Kudo E, Song E, Yockey LJ, et al. Low ambient humidity impairs barrier function and innate  
662 resistance against influenza infection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United  
663 States of America*. May 28 2019;116(22):10905-10910. doi:10.1073/pnas.1902840116
- 664 26. Cannell JJ, Vieth R, Umhau JC, et al. Epidemic influenza and vitamin D. *Epidemiology and  
665 infection*. Dec 2006;134(6):1129-40. doi:10.1017/s0950268806007175
- 666 27. Klingberg E, Oleröd G, Konar J, Petzold M, Hammarsten O. Seasonal variations in serum 25-  
667 hydroxy vitamin D levels in a Swedish cohort. *Endocrine*. Aug 2015;49(3):800-8. doi:10.1007/s12020-  
668 015-0548-3
- 669 28. Tellier R. Aerosol transmission of influenza A virus: a review of new studies. *J R Soc Interface*.  
670 Dec 6 2009;6 Suppl 6(Suppl 6):S783-90. doi:10.1098/rsif.2009.0302.focus
- 671 29. Lowen Anice C, Steel J, Mubareka S, Palese P. High Temperature (30°C) Blocks Aerosol but Not  
672 Contact Transmission of Influenza Virus. *Journal of virology*. 2008;82(11):5650-5652.  
673 doi:10.1128/jvi.00325-08
- 674 30. Lowen AC, Mubareka S, Steel J, Palese P. Influenza Virus Transmission Is Dependent on  
675 Relative Humidity and Temperature. *PLOS Pathogens*. 2007;3(10):e151.  
676 doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.0030151
- 677 31. Yang W, Elankumaran S, Marr LC. Relationship between humidity and influenza A viability in  
678 droplets and implications for influenza's seasonality. *PLoS one*. 2012;7(10):e46789.  
679 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0046789
- 680 32. Polozov IV, Bezrukov L, Gawrisch K, Zimmerberg J. Progressive ordering with decreasing  
681 temperature of the phospholipids of influenza virus. *Nat Chem Biol*. Apr 2008;4(4):248-55.  
682 doi:10.1038/nchembio.77
- 683 33. Magurano F, Baggieri M, Marchi A, Rezza G, Nicoletti L. SARS-CoV-2 infection: the  
684 environmental endurance of the virus can be influenced by the increase of temperature. *Clinical  
685 microbiology and infection : the official publication of the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and  
686 Infectious Diseases*. Feb 2021;27(2):289.e5-289.e7. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.10.034
- 687 34. Ratnesar-Shumate S, Williams G, Green B, et al. Simulated Sunlight Rapidly Inactivates SARS-  
688 CoV-2 on Surfaces. *The Journal of infectious diseases*. Jun 29 2020;222(2):214-222.  
689 doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa274
- 690 35. Sagripanti JL, Lytle CD. Estimated Inactivation of Coronaviruses by Solar Radiation With Special  
691 Reference to COVID-19. *Photochem Photobiol*. Jul 2020;96(4):731-737. doi:10.1111/php.13293
- 692 36. PurpleAir. PurpleAir Sensors Functional Overview. Updated July 19, 2023. Accessed February 1,  
693 2024, 2024. <https://community.purpleair.com/t/purpleair-sensors-functional-overview/150>
- 694 37. Abatzoglou JT. Development of gridded surface meteorological data for ecological applications  
695 and modelling. *International Journal of Climatology*. 2013;33(1):121-131.  
696 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.3413>
- 697 38. Byun WS, Heo SW, Jo G, et al. Is coronavirus disease (COVID-19) seasonal? A critical analysis  
698 of empirical and epidemiological studies at global and local scales. *Environmental research*. May  
699 2021;196:110972. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2021.110972

- 700 39. Alkhowailed M, Shariq A, Alqossayir F, Alzahrani OA, Rasheed Z, Al Abdulmonem W. Impact of  
701 meteorological parameters on COVID-19 pandemic: A comprehensive study from Saudi Arabia. *Inform*  
702 *Med Unlocked*. 2020;20:100418. doi:10.1016/j.imu.2020.100418
- 703 40. Adekunle IA, Tella SA, Oyesiku KO, Oseni IO. Spatio-temporal analysis of meteorological factors  
704 in abating the spread of COVID-19 in Africa. *Heliyon*. Aug 2020;6(8):e04749.  
705 doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04749
- 706 41. Pani SK, Lin NH, RavindraBabu S. Association of COVID-19 pandemic with meteorological  
707 parameters over Singapore. *The Science of the total environment*. Oct 20 2020;740:140112.  
708 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140112
- 709 42. Guo C, Bo Y, Lin C, et al. Meteorological factors and COVID-19 incidence in 190 countries: An  
710 observational study. *The Science of the total environment*. Feb 25 2021;757:143783.  
711 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143783
- 712 43. Rosario DKA, Mutz YS, Bernardes PC, Conte-Junior CA. Relationship between COVID-19 and  
713 weather: Case study in a tropical country. *International journal of hygiene and environmental health*. Aug  
714 2020;229:113587. doi:10.1016/j.ijheh.2020.113587
- 715 44. Menebo MM. Temperature and precipitation associate with Covid-19 new daily cases: A  
716 correlation study between weather and Covid-19 pandemic in Oslo, Norway. *The Science of the total*  
717 *environment*. Oct 1 2020;737:139659. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139659
- 718 45. Gupta A, Banerjee S, Das S. Significance of geographical factors to the COVID-19 outbreak in  
719 India. *Model Earth Syst Environ*. Jun 17 2020:1-9. doi:10.1007/s40808-020-00838-2
- 720 46. Sobral MFF, Duarte GB, da Penha Sobral AIG, Marinho MLM, de Souza Melo A. Association  
721 between climate variables and global transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *The Science of the total*  
722 *environment*. Aug 10 2020;729:138997. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138997
- 723 47. Crawford FW, Jones SA, Cartter M, et al. Impact of close interpersonal contact on COVID-19  
724 incidence: Evidence from 1 year of mobile device data. *Science Advances*. 2022;8(1):eabi5499.  
725 doi:doi:10.1126/sciadv.abi5499
- 726 48. Qian H, Miao T, Liu L, Zheng X, Luo D, Li Y. Indoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Indoor Air*. May  
727 2021;31(3):639-645. doi:10.1111/ina.12766
- 728 49. Bulfone TC, Malekinejad M, Rutherford GW, Razani N. Outdoor Transmission of SARS-CoV-2  
729 and Other Respiratory Viruses: A Systematic Review. *The Journal of infectious diseases*. Feb 24  
730 2021;223(4):550-561. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa742
- 731 50. Wu J, Huang Y, Tu C, et al. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2, Zhuhai, China, 2020. *Clin*  
732 *Infect Dis*. Nov 19 2020;71(16):2099-2108. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa557
- 733 51. Zeng K, Santhya S, Soong A, et al. Serial Intervals and Incubation Periods of SARS-CoV-2  
734 Omicron and Delta Variants, Singapore. *Emerging Infectious Disease journal*. 2023;29(4):814.  
735 doi:10.3201/eid2904.220854
- 736 52. Wu Y, Kang L, Guo Z, Liu J, Liu M, Liang W. Incubation Period of COVID-19 Caused by Unique  
737 SARS-CoV-2 Strains: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Network Open*.  
738 2022;5(8):e2228008-e2228008. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.28008
- 739 53. Buchwald A, Bayham J, Adams J, et al. Estimating the Impact of Statewide Policies to Reduce  
740 Spread of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Real Time, Colorado, USA. *Emerging*  
741 *Infectious Disease journal*. 2021;27(9)doi:10.3201/eid2709.204167
- 742 54. Schober P, Boer C, Schwarte LA. Correlation Coefficients: Appropriate Use and Interpretation.  
743 *Anesthesia & Analgesia*. 2018;126(5)
- 744 55. Cleveland WS. Robust Locally Weighted Regression and Smoothing Scatterplots. *Journal of the*  
745 *American Statistical Association*. 1979/12/01 1979;74(368):829-836.  
746 doi:10.1080/01621459.1979.10481038
- 747 56. StataCorp. Stata: Causal Inference and Treatment-Effects Estimation Reference Manual,  
748 Release 18. 2023. Available from: <https://www.stata.com/manuals/causal.pdf>
- 749 57. VanderWeele T. *Explanation in causal inference: methods for mediation and interaction*. Oxford  
750 University Press; 2015.
- 751 58. Carleton T, Cornet J, Huybers P, Meng KC, Proctor J. Global evidence for ultraviolet radiation  
752 decreasing COVID-19 growth rates. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*  
753 *States of America*. Jan 7 2021;118(1)doi:10.1073/pnas.2012370118



754 59. Lin G, Hamilton A, Gatalo O, Haghpanah F, Igusa T, Klein E. Investigating the effects of absolute  
755 humidity and movement on COVID-19 seasonality in the United States. *Scientific reports*. 2022/10/06  
756 2022;12(1):16729. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-19898-8  
757 60. Zhao W, Zhu Y, Xie J, Zheng Z, Luo H, Ooi OC. The moderating effect of solar radiation on the  
758 association between human mobility and COVID-19 infection in Europe. *Environmental science and*  
759 *pollution research international*. Jan 2022;29(1):828-835. doi:10.1007/s11356-021-15738-w  
760 61. Microsoft Maps. US Building Footprints Accessed February 6, 2024.  
761 <https://github.com/microsoft/USBuildingFootprints>

762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805

806 **Table 1. Summary of hospitalizations, behavior and weather for five Colorado counties between**  
 807 **March 4<sup>th</sup> 2020 and January 31<sup>st</sup> 2021.**

	<b>All-season</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>	<b>Fall</b>	<b>Winter</b>
<b>Five county data summary</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>
Total observations (county-days)	1670	445	460	455	310
Total COVID-19 hospital admissions	8827	1956	775	3307	2789
<b>Hospitalizations</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>
Average daily hospital admissions, by county	5.3 (7.3)	4.4 (6.7)	1.7 (2.2)	7.3 (9.1)	9.0 (7.6)
<b>Mobility</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>
Mean percent of time indoors, away-from-home (%)	5.2 (1.6)	4.3 (2.2)	5.4 (0.9)	5.6 (1.2)	5.3 (1.1)
Mean percent of time outdoors, away-from-home (%)	7.9 (1.5)	7.1 (1.8)	9.1 (0.6)	8.2 (1.2)	7.1 (0.9)
Mean percent of time indoors, at home (%)	48.6 (3.0)	50.0 (3.9)	47.9 (2.2)	48.3 (2.7)	48.3 (2.2)
Mean percent of time outdoors, at home (%)	25.5 (2.4)	27.1 (2.7)	23.9 (1.5)	24.8 (1.7)	26.3 (1.8)
Mean percent of time spent in transit (%)	6.8 (1.4)	5.7 (1.5)	7.9 (0.7)	6.9 (1.1)	6.5 (0.7)
<b>Outdoor weather</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>
Minimum daily temperature (°F)	36.8 (15.5)	34.2 (9.8)	54.4 (5.5)	34.4 (12.3)	17.8 (6.4)
Maximum daily temperature (°F)	65.0 (19.3)	61.4 (13.5)	85.2 (6.9)	63.9 (16.8)	41.7 (10.1)
Minimum daily relative humidity (%)	22.8 (15.9)	25.3 (15.1)	16.0 (8.5)	19.8 (16.6)	34.1 (17.6)
Maximum daily relative humidity (%)	65.0 (19.4)	69.0 (17.3)	57.8 (17.2)	61.4 (20.0)	74.9 (18.9)
Minimum daily absolute humidity (g/m <sup>3</sup> )	1.2 (0.7)	1.3 (0.6)	1.7 (0.9)	0.9 (0.6)	0.9 (0.4)
Maximum daily absolute humidity (g/m <sup>3</sup> )	10.8 (5.6)	9.9 (4.1)	17.0 (4.7)	9.3 (3.8)	5.2 (1.6)
Mean downward shortwave radiation (W/m <sup>2</sup> )	207.5 (78.6)	242.5 (52.7)	284.9 (30.4)	168.3 (47.6)	100.1 (13.8)
Mean wind velocity (m/s)	8.3 (3.1)	8.5 (2.5)	7.7 (2.8)	8.5 (3.5)	8.8 (3.8)
Total daily precipitation (mm)	0.9 (2.7)	1.3 (3.9)	1.0 (2.1)	0.6 (2.3)	0.5 (1.2)

808  
 809 N = Number  
 810 SD = Standard Deviation

811  
 812  
 813  
 814  
 815  
 816  
 817  
 818  
 819  
 820  
 821  
 822  
 823

824 **Table 2. Relationship between meteorological variables and time spent indoors, away-from-home**  
 825 **and COVID-19 hospital admissions estimated using linear regression.**

Categorical weather conditions <sup>a</sup>		Daily county-mean percent of time spent indoors, away-from-home			12-day lagged hospitalization admissions (mean-centered by county-season)		
		$\beta$	95 % CI	p-value	$\beta$	95 % CI	p-value
<b>Minimum temperature</b>							
<b>All-season <sup>b</sup></b>							
	<-0.5 vs. mid	0.09	0.01 – 0.17	0.028*	0.14	-0.25 – 0.53	0.490
	>0.5 vs. mid	-0.09	-0.16 - -0.01	0.020* <sup>c</sup>	-0.41	-0.78 - -0.03	0.034* <sup>c</sup>
Spring							
	<-0.5 vs. mid	0.30	0.11 – 0.48	0.002*	-0.18	-0.78 – 0.42	0.557
	>0.5 vs. mid	-0.19	-0.41 – 0.04	0.099	-0.23	-0.96 – 0.49	0.526
Summer							
	<-0.5 vs. mid	-0.08	-0.16 - -0.00	0.039*	-0.35	-0.77 – 0.07	0.102
	>0.5 vs. mid	-0.09	-0.16 - -0.03	0.004*	-0.14	-0.47 – 0.19	0.394
Fall							
	<-1 vs. mid	-0.05	-0.18 – 0.08	0.452	0.61	-0.56 – 1.78	0.306
	>1 vs. mid	-0.08	-0.20 – 0.04	0.210	-0.03	-1.12 – 1.06	0.959
Winter							
	<-1 vs. mid	-0.32	-0.47 – -0.17	<0.001*	0.26	-0.69 – 1.21	0.589
	>1 vs. mid	0.04	-0.13 – 0.22	0.640	1.19	-0.01 – 2.40	0.053
<b>Maximum temperature</b>							
<b>All-season <sup>b</sup></b>							
	<-1 vs. mid	0.08	-0.00 – 0.17	0.060	-0.19	-0.62 – 0.23	0.374
	>1 vs. mid	-0.11	-0.20 – 0.01	0.024*	-0.28	-0.74 – 0.19	0.241
Spring							
	<-1 vs. mid	0.23	0.03 – 0.44	0.028* <sup>c</sup>	-0.73	-1.41 - -0.04	0.037* <sup>c</sup>
	>1 vs. mid	-0.12	-0.42 – 0.18	0.448	-0.62	-1.58 – 0.33	0.201
Summer							
	<-1 vs. mid	-0.05	-0.14 – 0.04	0.303	-0.48	-0.94 - -0.02	0.039*
	>1 vs. mid	-0.08	-0.16 – -0.00	0.954	-0.18	-0.59 – 0.23	0.390
Fall							
	<-1 vs. mid	-0.09	-0.21 – 0.03	0.145	0.32	-0.78 – 1.41	0.567
	>1 vs. mid	-0.13	-0.26 - -0.01	0.041*	-0.28	-1.42 – 0.86	0.632
Winter							
	<-1 vs. mid	-0.23	-0.37 - -0.08	0.003*	0.40	-0.59 – 1.39	0.431
	>1 vs. mid	0.13	-0.03 – 0.30	0.120	0.23	-0.91 – 1.37	0.691
<b>Minimum absolute humidity</b>							
<b>All-season <sup>b</sup></b>							
	<-1 vs. mid	0.14	0.05 – 0.24	0.004*	0.08	-0.40 – 0.56	0.740
	>1 vs. mid	-0.09	-0.18 – 0.00	0.053*	-0.31	-0.77 – 0.15	0.183
Spring							
	<-1 vs. mid	-0.03	-0.26 – 0.20	0.813	0.45	-0.33 – 1.22	0.259
	>1 vs. mid	-0.38	-0.63 - -0.13	0.003*	0.07	-0.76 – 0.90	0.865
Summer							
	<-1 vs. mid	0.07	-0.02 – 0.15	0.133	-0.03	-0.48 – 0.41	0.892
	>1 vs. mid	-0.10	-0.17 - -0.02	0.011*	-0.16	-0.55 – 0.22	0.401
Fall							
	<-1 vs. mid	0.18	0.04 – 0.33	0.014*	0.68	-0.66 – 2.01	0.320
	>1 vs. mid	0.07	-0.07 – 0.20	0.349	0.07	-1.14 – 1.29	0.910
Winter							
	<-1 vs. mid	0.22	0.03 – 0.40	0.017* <sup>c</sup>	-1.28	-2.50 - -0.07	0.039* <sup>c</sup>
	>1 vs. mid	-0.12	-0.32 – 0.07	0.209	-0.43	-1.70 – 0.84	0.509
<b>Solar Radiation</b>							
<b>All-season <sup>b</sup></b>							
	<-1.5 vs. mid	0.02	-0.11 – 0.14	0.798	-0.77	-1.41 - -0.14	0.017*
	>0 vs. mid	-0.12	-0.19 - -0.05	0.001* <sup>c</sup>	-0.74	-1.09 - -0.39	<0.001* <sup>c</sup>
Spring							
	<-0.5 vs. mid	0.39	0.16 – 0.62	0.001*	-0.49	-1.20 – 0.23	0.183
	>0.5 vs. mid	-0.37	-0.62 - -0.11	0.004*	-0.26	-1.09 – 0.58	0.544
Summer							
	<-1 vs. mid	-0.07	-0.16 – 0.02	0.129	0.03	-0.47 – 0.54	0.903
	>1 vs. mid	-0.21	-0.27 - -0.14	<0.001*	-0.14	-0.48 – 0.19	0.396
Fall							
	<-1.5 vs. mid	0.03	-0.16 – 0.21	0.793	-1.24	-2.92 – 0.43	0.146
	>0 vs. mid	-0.01	-0.10 – 0.08	0.795	-1.49	-2.39 - -0.61	0.001*
Winter							

<-1.5 vs. mid	-0.11	-0.31 – 0.10	0.317	-0.78	-2.18 – 0.62	0.276
>0 vs. mid	0.26	0.13 – 0.39	<0.001* <sup>c</sup>	-1.07	-1.94 - -0.20	0.016* <sup>c</sup>

826  $\beta$  = Beta coefficient

827 CI = Confident Interval

828 \* p-value < 0.05

829 <sup>a</sup> The beta coefficient, 95% confidence interval and p-value presented for each independent weather variable correspond with the  
 830 adjusted models assessing the impact of each treatment variable on the mean percent of time indoors away-from-home (left) and  
 831 12-day lagged COVID-19 hospital admissions (right), controlling for holidays and weekends, the stay-at-home order, increasing  
 832 Colorado hospitalizations, as well as an auto-correlation term indicating yesterday's response variable's value

833 <sup>b</sup> Models that were not stratified by season instead included season as a covariate to account for season as a confounder

834 <sup>c</sup> Weather variables that were associated with both mean percent of time spent indoors away-from-home and 12-day lagged  
 835 hospitalizations are highlighted in gray, as these criteria was used to determine which variables to assess in the mediation analysis

836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864

865 **Table 3. Models assessing time indoors away-from-home as mediators between weather**  
 866 **conditions and COVID-19 hospital admissions.**

			Estimate of the mediating effects of time indoors, away-from-home on 12-day lagged COVID-19 hospital admissions		
	Treatment level <sup>a</sup>	Effect	$\beta$	95% CI	P-Value
<b>All-seasons</b>					
High minimum temperature	>0.5 SD vs. -0.5 – 0.5 SD	Natural Indirect Effect	0.02	-0.01 – 0.04	0.144
	>0.5 SD vs. -0.5 – 0.5 SD	Natural Direct Effect	-0.46	-0.82 – -0.11	0.011
	>0.5 SD vs. -0.5 – 0.5 SD	Total Effect	-0.45	-0.80 – -0.10	0.013
High solar radiation	>0 SD vs. -1.5 – 0 SD	Natural Indirect Effect	0.03	-0.00 – 0.07	0.054
	>0 SD vs. -1.5 – 0 SD	Natural Direct Effect	-0.88	-1.23 – -0.53	<0.001
	>0 SD vs. -1.5 – 0 SD	Total Effect	-0.85	-1.19 – -0.51	<0.001
<b>Spring</b>					
Low maximum temperature	<-1 SD vs. -1 – 1 SD	Natural Indirect Effect	0.01	-0.03 – 0.05	0.542
	<-1 SD vs. -1 – 1 SD	Natural Direct Effect	-0.78	-1.42 – -0.13	0.018
	<-1 SD vs. -1 – 1 SD	Total Effect	-0.76	-1.39 – -0.14	0.017
<b>Winter</b>					
Low minimum absolute humidity	<-1 SD vs. -1 – 1 SD	Natural Indirect Effect	-0.10	-0.35 – 0.16	0.462
	<-1 SD vs. -1 – 1 SD	Natural Direct Effect	-1.19	-2.44 – 0.06	0.063
	<-1 SD vs. -1 – 1 SD	Total Effect	-1.29	-2.59 – 0.01	0.052
High solar radiation	>0 SD vs. -1.5 – 0 SD	Natural Indirect Effect	-0.09	-0.26 – 0.08	0.300
	>0 SD vs. -1.5 – 0 SD	Natural Direct Effect	-0.95	-1.82 – -0.09	0.030
	>0 SD vs. -1.5 – 0 SD	Total Effect	-1.04	-1.87 – -0.21	0.014

867  
 868  $\beta$  = Beta Coefficient  
 869 CI = Confident Interval

870 <sup>a</sup> Seasonal weather conditions were categorized into three groups by examining Lowess plots between the weather variable and  
 871 both the mediator (time indoors away-from-home) and outcome (12-day lagged hospital admissions) in this analysis. Linear  
 872 regression analyses compared the association of “high” and “low” weather categories (versus the mid-range) on both the mediator  
 873 and outcome. Those seasonal weather conditions were significantly associated with both are included in this table

874  
 875  
 876  
 877  
 878  
 879  
 880  
 881  
 882  
 883  
 884  
 885  
 886  
 887  
 888  
 889  
 890  
 891  
 892

893 **Figure Captions**

894

895 **Figure 1 Caption:** *The hypothesized mechanisms by which outdoor weather can impact SARS-CoV-2.*  
896 *The indirect effect hypothesis is that weather changes human mobility patterns, specifically time spent in*  
897 *indoor spaces away from home where the virus can spread, leading to an increase in infections. An*  
898 *alternative, direct effect hypothesis is that weather directly impacts the spread of the virus by altering virus*  
899 *survival and transmission probability.*

900

901 **Figure 2 Caption:** *Comparison of daily COVID-19 hospitalization admissions between five Colorado*  
902 *counties between March 4<sup>th</sup> 2020 and January 31<sup>st</sup> 2021.*

903

904 **Figure 3 Caption:** *Scatter plots comparing indoor environmental conditions (blue circle) to outdoor*  
905 *environmental conditions (red triangle) between March 4<sup>th</sup> 2020 and January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2021 in five Colorado*  
906 *counties obtained from Purple Air. Vertical dotted lines indicate where one season ends and the next*  
907 *begins.*

908

909 **Figure 4 Caption:** *Correlation matrices showing Pearson's correlation coefficients and the strength of*  
910 *correlation between indoor and outdoor weather conditions between March 4<sup>th</sup> 2020 – January 31<sup>st</sup> 2021,*  
911 *and by season for five Colorado counties. Stronger correlation between outdoor and indoor measures are*  
912 *shown with darker tones.*

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923


924

925

926






927

Figure 1.



**Figure 1 Caption:** The hypothesized mechanisms by which outdoor weather can impact SARS-CoV-2. The indirect effect hypothesis is that weather changes human mobility patterns, specifically time spent in indoor spaces away from home where the virus can spread, leading to an increase in infections. An alternative, direct effect hypothesis is that weather directly impacts the spread of the virus by altering virus survival and transmission probability.


**Figure 2.**





**Figure 2 Caption:** *Comparison of daily COVID-19 hospitalization admissions between five Colorado counties between March 4<sup>th</sup> 2020 and January 31<sup>st</sup> 2021.*

Figure 3.



**Figure 3 Caption:** Scatter plots comparing indoor environmental conditions (blue circle) to outdoor environmental conditions (red triangle) between March 4<sup>th</sup> 2020 and January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2021 in five Colorado counties obtained from Purple Air. Vertical dotted lines indicate where one season ends and the next begins.



**Figure 4.**

	All-seasons	Winter	Spring	Summer	Fall
<b>Mean Temperature</b>					
All county	0.7497	0.2512	0.4387	0.2113	0.6610
Boulder	0.8973	0.7252	0.3848	0.8460	0.9133
Denver	0.9282	0.2347	0.8318	0.5562	0.9117
Douglas	0.9067	0.0179	0.8312	0.5504	0.8448
El Paso	0.7899	0.6901	0.7991	0.7358	0.8086
Mesa	0.8541	0.1507	0.9449	0.7877	0.8769
<b>Mean Relative Humidity</b>					
All county	0.0821	0.0743	0.2898	0.2172	0.1561
Boulder	0.5109	0.3276	0.4041	0.9111	0.6474
Denver	0.1808	0.4456	0.5431	0.6728	0.0844
Douglas	0.5263	0.2441	0.5023	0.6679	0.5238
El Paso	-0.0021	-0.0267	0.1494	0.6678	-0.0207
Mesa	-0.0976	0.2133	0.8493	0.6985	0.1470
<b>Mean Absolute Humidity</b>					
All county	0.7889	-0.0185	0.7679	0.5265	0.7292
Boulder	0.9369	0.2296	0.9259	0.9676	0.8413
Denver	0.8652	0.4299	0.8667	0.8320	0.9395
Douglas	0.8056	0.0771	0.4791	0.8059	0.6464
El Paso	0.8307	0.2377	0.8759	0.7578	0.7849
Mesa	0.8823	0.5470	0.9276	0.8528	0.8532
<b>Interpretation key</b>					
0.00 – 0.10	Negligible correlation				
0.10 – 0.39	Weak correlation				
0.40 – 0.69	Moderate correlation				
0.70 – 0.89	Strong correlation				
0.90 – 1.00	Very strong correlation				

**Figure 4 Caption:** Correlation matrices showing Pearson’s correlation coefficients and the strength of correlation between indoor and outdoor weather conditions between March 4<sup>th</sup> 2020 – January 31<sup>st</sup> 2021, and by season for five Colorado counties. Stronger correlation between outdoor and indoor measures are shown with darker tones.