

28 **Abstract**

29 ***Background***

30 The spread of COVID-19 has highlighted the long-standing health inequalities across the U.S. as

31 neighborhoods with fewer resources were associated with higher rates of COVID-19 transmission.

32 Although the stay-at-home order was one of the most effective methods to contain its spread, residents

33 in lower-income neighborhoods faced barriers to practicing social distancing. We aimed to quantify the

34 differential impact of stay-at-home policy on COVID-19 transmission and residents' mobility across

35 neighborhoods of different levels of socioeconomic disadvantage.

36

37 ***Methods***

38 This was a comparative interrupted time-series analysis at the county level. We included 2,087 counties

39 from 38 states which both implemented and lifted the state-wide stay-at-home order. Every county was

40 assigned to one of four equally-sized groups based on its levels of disadvantage, represented by the

41 Area Deprivation Index. Prevalence of COVID-19 was calculated by dividing the daily number of

42 cumulative confirmed COVID-19 cases by the number of residents from the 2010 Census. We used the

43 Social Distancing Index, derived from the COVID-19 Impact Analysis Platform, to measure the social

44 distancing practice. For the evaluation of implementation, the observation started from Mar 1st 2020 to

45 one day before lifting; and, for lifting, it ranged from one day after implementation to Jul 5th 2020. We

46 calculated a comparative change of daily trends in COVID-19 prevalence and Social Distancing Index

47 between counties with three highest disadvantage levels and those with the least level before and after

48 the implementation and lifting of the stay-at-home order, separately.

49

50 ***Results***

51 On both stay-at-home implementation and lifting dates, COVID-19 prevalence was much higher among
52 counties with the highest or lowest disadvantage level, while mobility decreased as the disadvantage
53 level increased. Mobility of the most disadvantaged counties was least impacted by stay-at-home
54 implementation and relaxation compared to counties with the most resources; however, disadvantaged
55 counties experienced the largest relative increase in COVID-19 infection after both stay-at-home
56 implementation and relaxation.

57

58 ***Conclusions***

59 Neighborhoods with varying levels of socioeconomic disadvantage reacted differently to the
60 implementation and relaxation of COVID-19 mitigation policies. Policymakers should consider investing
61 more resources in disadvantaged counties as the pandemic may not stop until most neighborhoods have
62 it under control.

63 **Keyword**

64 COVID-19 policy, COVID-19 prevalence, Area Deprivation Index, Social determinants of health, Social

65 Distancing Index, Comparative interrupted time-series analysis, Stay-at-home order

66 **Background**

67 In the US, the total number of confirmed COVID-19 cases has skyrocketed from 30 patients on Mar 1st,
68 2020 to over 6.4mil on Sep 11th with total deaths exceeding 192k.[1] With no vaccines available for
69 prevention and no proven high-efficacy drug treatments, physicians can only provide supportive care for
70 COVID-19 patients.[2] The lack of a definite treatment has also propelled healthcare professionals and
71 policymakers to further focus their efforts on preventing the transmission of the disease.

72
73 Various approaches to slowing down the COVID-19 transmission have been recommended, with a focus
74 on either self-protection or limited in-person contacts.[3, 4] In the absence of a universal mitigation
75 policy by the US federal government, state and local governments have implemented a range of social
76 distancing policies to restrict in-person contacts and limit mobility, such as restricting dine-in at
77 restaurants, closing non-essential business, and banning large gatherings.[3-5] Among a wide range of
78 mitigation policies, the stay-at-home (SAH) order has been the most restrictive policy with early studies
79 documenting various levels of effectiveness of such policy.[5-9]

80
81 Forty states, including the District of Columbia, implemented the state-wide SAH order in Mar and Apr
82 2020 during an initial surge of COVID-19 transmission.[10] Despite the effectiveness of SAH order in
83 reducing the COVID-19 transmission,[4-7, 9] its impact on economic activity was deemed detrimental.[4]
84 Consequently, as COVID-19 transmission started to slow down between Apr and Jun 2020, 38 out of 40
85 states lifted their SAH order.[10] Evaluating the impact of the SAH orders, both implementation and
86 relaxation of the orders, on COVID-19 transmission would provide useful information given the recent
87 resurgence of COVID-19 transmissions across the US.[1]

88

89 The spread of COVID-19 has highlighted the established health inequalities across the US. For example,
90 neighborhoods with higher income inequality, a higher proportion of racial or ethnic minorities, lower
91 median family income, and higher unemployment rates were associated with higher rates of COVID-19
92 transmission, hospitalization, and death.[11-14] Similar associations were observed at the individual
93 level.[15] Studies also found that residents in lower-income neighborhoods faced barriers to practicing
94 physical distancing or following mobility restriction, particularly given the need to work outside the
95 home.[16-22] These findings raise the question about the differential impact of the implementation and
96 lifting of SAH orders on neighborhoods with varying levels of disadvantage and uneven levels of COVID-
97 19 burden.

98
99 This study assesses the effectiveness of SAH policy on decreasing the COVID-19 transmission across
100 neighborhoods with different levels of socioeconomic disadvantage represented by the Area
101 Deprivation Index (ADI). We describe the differential impact of the implementation and lifting of SAH
102 order on COVID-19 prevalence and residents' mobility across counties with different levels of ADI (the
103 highest/Q4, high/Q3, low/Q2, the lowest/Q1). To take into account the association of population density
104 with social mobility and COVID-19 morbidity,[23-25] we perform additional analyses stratified by the
105 population density.

106 **Methods**

107 ***Data***

108 We compiled data from several data sources for this analysis. We derived the daily number of
109 cumulative confirmed COVID-19 cases at the county level from the COVID-19 dashboard by the Center
110 for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University.[4] We used the Social
111 Distancing Index (SDI) to measure the social distancing practice at the county level. We derived the daily
112 SDI from the COVID-19 Impact Analysis Platform (CIAP) created by the Maryland Transportation Institute
113 at the University of Maryland.[26] We determined the SES of a county using ADI.[27, 28] We derived the
114 county-specific characteristics, such as the percentage of the elderly, from the US Census American
115 Community Survey (ACS) data of 2018. We derived the population size of each county from the 2010
116 Census. We did not obtain institutional review board approval due to the use of publicly available, de-
117 identified data, per usual institutional policy.

118

119 ***Social Distancing Index (SDI)***

120 SDI uses the location data from anonymized mobile devices that are integrated with geographical
121 population data. SDI for each state and county was derived from information such as percentage of
122 people who are staying home, the average number of trips per person and average distance traveled by
123 each person.[26] SDI, ranging from 0 to 100, represented the extent residents/visitors would practice
124 social distancing: “0” indicated no social distancing in the community while “100” indicated all residents
125 were staying at home and no visitors were entering the county. The mean national county-level SDI was
126 34.1 on March 7th when SDI data first became available.

127

128 ***Area Deprivation Index (ADI)***

129 ADI is a widely used measure of socioeconomic disadvantage at various geographical levels, and
130 contains factors related to employment, income, education, and housing condition.[27-29] We took the
131 following steps to calculate the ADI using the latest Census data: (1) we used 71 independent census
132 variables from 5-year estimate American Community Survey data of 2018 to construct 17 ADI grouped
133 variables; (2) we summed up weighted 17 ADI components as total scores using Singh et al.
134 methodology;[29] and, (3) we normalized total scores to have a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of
135 20. We constructed the ADI raw scores for 52 states (i.e., continental states, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto
136 Rico) at the county level and assigned each county to one of four equally-sized ADI levels based on its
137 ADI score (the highest/Q4: 76th-100th percentile of the ADI score, high/Q3: 51st to 75th percentile, low/Q2:
138 26th to 50th percentile, and the lowest/Q1: 1st to 25th percentile).

139

140 ***State Stay-At-Home Order***

141 Out of 51 states including the District of Columbia, 11 states did not implement SAH order (Arkansas,
142 Connecticut, Iowa, Kentucky, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and
143 Wyoming) and 13 states did not lift SAH order as of Aug 3rd 2020 (the aforementioned 11 states plus
144 California and New Mexico).[10] To keep the inference population consistent between analyses of SAH
145 implementation and lifting effects, we restricted all of our analyses to the 38 states with both
146 implementing and lifting SAH orders, covering 2,087 counties and approximately 212 out of 338 (62.5%)
147 million Americans. The highest ADI score (i.e., Q4) indicated the most disadvantaged neighborhoods,
148 while lower ADI scores (Q3 to Q1) indicated lower levels of disadvantages accordingly.

149

150 ***Outcomes***

151 We included two outcomes in the analysis: COVID-19 prevalence and SDI. For each county, we
152 calculated the daily COVID-19 prevalence by dividing the daily number of confirmed COVID-19 cases by

153 the number of residents. We derived the daily SDI at the county level directly from the CIAP. To

154 minimize the fluctuations in the derived SDI, we used 7-day simple-averaged SDI (Figure 2).

155

156 ***Time Segments***

157 We used two different observation periods for the comparative analysis: (1) To assess the effect of the

158 SAH implementation, we included the observation period starting from March 1st to one day before the

159 SAH lifting date; and, (2) To assess the effect of the SAH lifting, we included the observation period

160 starting from one day after the SAH implementation date to Jul 5th (data cutoff date) of each county. We

161 obtained the dates of implementation and lifting of SAH order at the state level from the “COVID-19 US

162 state policy database” project by Raifman et al. at the Boston University School of Public Health

163 (reviewed on Aug 3rd, 2020).[10] We assigned the counties within the same state to the same dates of

164 SAH implementation and lifting.

165

166 ***Analyses***

167 We first described and compared the county characteristics within each of the four ADI levels using chi-

168 squared tests for categorical variables and Kruskal-Wallis test for continuous variables. To visualize the

169 change in trends of county-level COVID-19 prevalence and SDI, we plotted these two outcomes by

170 calendar time, averaging over counties of the same ADI level. We produced separate plots for period

171 around implementation and lifting of SAH order due to potential scale differences in outcomes. We also

172 added time frame indicating the earliest and last SAH implementation/lifting to each plot.

173

174 To compare the policy impact across counties at four ADI levels, we adopted a comparative interrupted

175 time series (ITS) framework. The comparative ITS analysis has been used to evaluate the policy impact

176 on outcomes between the case (with the policy implementation) and the control (without the policy

177 implementation).[30, 31] In our study, these observations provided a comparative change of daily
178 trends in the outcomes between counties at three higher ADI levels (Q2-Q4) and those at the lowest ADI
179 level (Q1; the reference group) before and after the implementation/lifting of SAH order. In order to
180 take into account either the anticipated or delayed effect of SAH order, we chose all actual interrupted
181 time points after examining plots of empirical trends of COVID-19 prevalence and SDI at SAH
182 implementation and lifting index date (Appendix Figure 1a and 1b).[32] Thus, we used the following
183 dates to evaluate the respective policy' impact on COVID-19 prevalence: 5 days after SAH
184 implementation and 20 days after SAH lifting date. Similarly, we used 15 days before SAH
185 implementation and 40 days before SAH lifting to evaluate their respective impact on change in SDI.
186
187 We used a linear mixed-effect model to quantify the effect of implementing and lifting SAH order on
188 each outcome. Our parameter of interest was the interaction of the ADI level indicator and the post-
189 policy day indicator, representing the effect of the policies on the rate of change (trend) from the pre-
190 policy to post-policy periods across four ADI levels. For each county, we included random effect terms
191 for intercept (e.g., baseline COVID-19 prevalence), pre-policy outcome trend (e.g., COVID-19 prevalence
192 trend before SAH implementation) and post-policy outcome trend (e.g., difference in COVID-19
193 prevalence trend after SAH implementation). We also included day of week to adjust for its time-varying
194 effect. All statistical tests were two-sided with alpha level of 0.05.
195
196 All analyses were conducted using R 4.0.

197 **Results**

198 ***Characteristics of counties by ADI level***

199 We included 2,087 counties in the analysis, with 521 or 522 counties in each level of ADI. The
200 observation time for SAH implementation ranged from 86.2 days among counties with ADI Q1 level to
201 95.8 days among counties with ADI Q3 level. The observation time for SAH lifting was about the same,
202 ranging from 89.5 days among counties with ADI Q1 level to 93.2 days among counties with ADI Q4 level.
203 We observed statistically significant differences in characteristics of counties across four levels of ADI
204 (Table 1). As the county's ADI level decreased, the population size, the population density, the median
205 family income and the percentage of residents with at least high school diploma increased while the
206 percentages of families in poverty and residents unemployed decreased. For example, the mean
207 number of residents increased from 37,381 in ADI Q4 level to 176,972 in ADI Q1 level. The mean age
208 ranged from 40.7 years old among counties with ADI Q4 level to 42.3 years old among counties with ADI
209 Q2 level.

210
211 A U-shape relationship was observed between ADI level and the COVID-19 prevalence (Table 1).
212 Counties with ADI Q4 or Q1 level had much higher COVID-19 prevalence on both SAH implementation
213 and lifting dates than those with Q3 or Q2 level. A dose-response relationship was identified between
214 the ADI level and SDI: as the ADI level increased (i.e., more disadvantaged neighborhoods), SDI
215 decreased on both SAH order implementation and lifting dates.

216
217 ***Average county-level COVID-19 prevalence by the ADI level over calendar time***

218 Figure 1 depicts the average county-level COVID-19 prevalence by the ADI level over calendar time. At
219 the SAH implementation, counties with ADI Q4 level had the largest increase in the slope of COVID-19
220 prevalence from the pre- to post-SAH implementation, while counties with ADI Q1 level seemed to have

221 the smallest increase. Eventually, counties with ADI Q4 level had the highest absolute COVID-19
222 prevalence rate. Counties with ADI Q3 or Q2 level had similar prevalence rates across the entire
223 observation period. Similarly, at the SAH lifting, counties with ADI Q4 level also had the largest increase
224 in the slope of COVID-19 prevalence from the pre- to post-SAH lifting. Counties with other three ADI
225 levels had similar trends before and after SHA lifting.

226

227 ***Average county-level SDI by the ADI level over calendar time***

228 Figure 2 shows the average county-level SDI by the ADI level over calendar time. SDI showed more
229 fluctuations than COVID-19 prevalence. SDI across all counties increased before, stayed flat during, and
230 started to decrease after the SAH implementation. SDI across all counties decreased before, continued
231 to decrease during, and started to increase after the SAH lifting. In counties with higher ADI levels, SDI
232 was lower over the entire observation period.

233

234 ***Effect of SAH Implementation***

235 Following the implementation of the SAH order, the counties with ADI Q4 level experienced a
236 statistically significantly relative increase in the daily trend of COVID-19 prevalence (0.371
237 prevalence/day, 95% Confidence Interval (CI) 0.211 to 0.532) compared to those with ADI Q1 level. The
238 counties with ADI Q2 or Q3 level did not experience such significantly relative differences (Figure 3 &
239 Appendix Table 1).

240

241 Counties with the non-Q1 ADI levels experienced statistically significantly relative reductions in the daily
242 trend of SDI compared to those with ADI Q1 level. For example, a daily relative decline of 0.592 SDI/day
243 (95% CI -0.717 to -0.467) were detected when comparing the counties with ADI Q4 to ADI Q1 level.

244 Compared to the counties with ADI Q1 level, such relative reduction was 0.335 SDI/day (95% CI -0.454 to

245 -0.215) for those with ADI Q2 level and 0.429 SDI/day (95% CI -0.549 to -0.308) for those with ADI Q3
246 level (Figure 3 & Appendix Table 1).

247
248 Results from the stratified analyses by the population density were mostly similar to those from the
249 unstratified analysis of the entire study population with some exceptions. For example, in the analyses
250 of the daily prevalence, no statistically significant associations were observed among high-density
251 counties while the significant association was also observed comparing ADI Q2 to ADI Q1 level (0.181
252 prevalence/day, 95% CI 0.031 to 0.331) among low-density counties and ADI Q3 to ADI Q1 level (0.212
253 prevalence/day, 95% CI 0.016 to 0.408) among medium-density counties. In the analyses of daily SDI, no
254 significant associations were observed comparing ADI Q2 to ADI Q1 level among low-density counties
255 and comparing ADI Q2 or Q3 to ADI Q1 level among high-density counties (Figure 3 & Appendix Table 1).

256

257 ***Effect of SAH Lifting***

258 Following the lifting of the SAH order, the counties with ADI Q4 level experienced a statistically
259 significantly relative increase in the daily trend of COVID-19 prevalence (0.449 prevalence/day, 95% CI
260 0.280 to 0.618) compared to those with ADI Q1 level. Counties with ADI Q2 or Q3 level did not
261 experience such significantly relative differences (Figure 4 & Appendix Table 2).

262

263 Counties with ADI non-Q1 levels (i.e., Q2, Q3 and Q4) experienced statistically significantly relative
264 increases in the daily trend of SDI compared to those with ADI Q1 level. For example, there was a daily
265 relative increase of 0.352 SDI/day (95% CI 0.272 to 0.433) comparing the counties with ADI Q4 to Q1
266 level. Compared to the counties with ADI Q1 level, such relative increase was 0.243 SDI/day (95% CI
267 0.171 to 0.315) for those with ADI Q2 level and 0.310 SDI/day (95% CI 0.237 to 0.383) for those with ADI
268 Q3 level (Figure 4 & Appendix Table 2).

269

270 Results from the density-stratified analyses were similar to those from the unstratified analysis of the
271 entire study population for the outcome of COVID-19 prevalence but not SDI. For example, no
272 statistically significant relative difference was detected in daily SDI comparing low-density counties with
273 the three ADI non-Q1 levels to those with Q1 level. The only statistically significant relative difference
274 among high-density counties was the daily relative reduction of 0.287 SDI/day (95% CI -0.529 to -0.045)
275 comparing ADI Q2 to Q1 level (Figure 4 & Appendix Table 2).

276 **Discussion**

277 COVID-19 has affected US neighborhoods and communities disparately, with minorities and less
278 resourceful communities taking most of the burden. Despite these initial findings, evidence on the effect
279 of neighborhood-level disparities on the effectiveness of SAH policy and COVID-19 transmission is still
280 lacking. Our study revealed the role of social disparities in compliance with the SAH order
281 implementation and relaxation and the impact on COVID-19 transmission across neighborhoods. When
282 compared to the counties with ADI Q1 level, we found a comparative increase in the COVID-19 rate
283 among counties with ADI Q4 level and relatively less increase in the social distancing among counties
284 with higher ADI after the SAH order was implemented. After the lifting of the SAH order, compared to
285 the counties with ADI Q1 level, we found a comparative increase in the COVID-19 rate among counties
286 with ADI Q4 level and relatively more social distancing among counties with higher ADI. In short,
287 mobility of counties with ADI Q4 level (i.e., most disadvantaged counties) was least impacted by SAH
288 implementation and lifting compared with Q1 level, but experienced the worst relative increase in
289 COVID-19 infection after both SAH implementation and lifting.

290
291 The differential responses to the implementation of the SAH order by neighborhoods' levels of
292 socioeconomic disadvantage have been reported in previous studies, but most studies focused on the
293 mobility rate among residence of different neighborhoods.[16, 17, 20, 21] One study found that physical
294 distancing orders were associated with less increase in staying home in low-income vs. high-income
295 neighborhoods (1.5% vs 2.4%).[17] Another study found that areas with fewer resources had more
296 subway use in New York City.[20] These findings were consistent with ours. It is likely that residents in
297 more disadvantaged neighborhoods (represented by higher ADI levels) had fewer resources to stay at
298 home. For example, they may still need to work outside the home such as essential workers.
299 Consequently, such comparative increase in residents' mobility may lead to an increase in the in-person

300 contacts, which eventually may have resulted in the relative increase in the COVID-19 prevalence in
301 disadvantaged neighborhoods (i.e., high ADI), as we observed in this study. Moreover, social distancing
302 might be more challenging in socioeconomically disadvantaged neighborhoods with high housing
303 density and overcrowding.[33-35] Additionally, communities that are mainly comprised of economically
304 challenged households are more likely to be exposed to COVID-19 due to their overrepresentation in the
305 low-wage, essential work at the front lines.[33]

306

307 We have not identified any research on the impact of lifting the SAH orders. The SAH order lifting might
308 have increased social and entertainment activities, with residents in the low ADI neighborhoods (i.e.,
309 less disadvantaged) having the means to socialize compared to those in high ADI neighborhoods. On the
310 other hand, more people in the high ADI neighborhoods (i.e., higher disadvantaged) may have lost their
311 jobs during the pandemic (decrease in mobility given no need to go out to work) or have to continue
312 working regardless of the SAH order, such as essential workers (no change in mobility). Thus, we
313 observed relatively increases in social distancing after such lifting among higher disadvantaged
314 neighborhoods. However, even with the relatively decreasing trend in mobility, neighborhoods with the
315 highest ADI still experienced a relatively increasing rate of COVID-19 cases. It is possible that residents in
316 less disadvantaged neighborhoods practiced self-protection measures better (e.g., able to purchase face
317 masks or hand sanitizers), as various studies have shown that higher-resource neighborhoods were
318 associated with less COVID-19 transmission.[11-14] Our findings also align with another study that
319 pointed out health disparities may play a more important role in COVID-19 transmission than
320 government interventions (such as SAH order) and community-level compliance to such
321 interventions.[13]

322

323 Our study had some limitations. First, this was an ecological study and results from the aggregated data
324 might not be generalizable to individuals. Second, some counties implemented various policies aiming at
325 reducing COVID-19 transmission during our study period (e.g., shelter-in-place or stay-at-home orders;
326 restricting dine-in at restaurants; closing nonessential business such as bars, entertainment venues, and
327 gyms; banning large social gatherings; and closing public schools). Although we adopted the random
328 intercept method to control for the fixed state effects, our results may not be attributed to the SAH
329 order alone. Third, we used ADI to represent the disadvantage level of a neighborhood (representing the
330 overall social determinants of health), and SDI to represent mobility. While both measures, especially
331 ADI, have been examined extensively, these measures may still not capture the concepts they aim to
332 represent completely. For example, SDI is based on mobile device data; it may not capture the mobility
333 in the extremely disadvantaged counties with low use of smartphones and/or low penetration of
334 internet.

335 **Conclusions**

336 Our study, despite having limitations, showed that neighborhoods with varying levels of disadvantage
337 reacted differently to the implementation and relaxation of COVID-19 mitigation policies. Those with the
338 highest ADI (i.e., most disadvantaged counties) observed the largest relative increases after both the
339 SAH implementation and lifting. Policymakers should consider investing more resources in these
340 disadvantaged counties to help them contain the COVID-19 transmission in future SAH implementations
341 and liftings, as the pandemic may not stop until most, if not all, neighborhoods have it under control.

342 **List of abbreviations**

343 ACS: American Community Survey

344 ADI: Area Deprivation Index

345 ITS: Interrupted time series

346 CIAP: COVID-19 Impact Analysis Platform

347 CSSE: Center for Systems Science and Engineering

348 SAH: Stay-at-home

349 SDI: Social Distancing Index

350 **DECLARATIONS**

351 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

352 The datasets we used are publicly available and de-identified information at the country level; therefore,
353 ethics review board approval for this study is not required.

354 **Consent for publication**

355 All authors have approved this manuscript for publication.

356 **Availability of data and material**

357 All data generated or analyzed during this study are included as a supplementary compressed csv file
358 named “df_SAH_policy_on_covid19.zip”.

359 **Competing interests**

360 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

361 **Funding**

362 There is no funding for this study.

363 **Authors' contributions**

364 HC and WT designed the study, managed data, did analyses, and drafted the manuscript. CK obtained
365 data, provided critical comments and revised the manuscript. EH, JP and HK provided critical comments
366 and revised the manuscript.

367 **Acknowledgements**

368 Not applicable.

369 **Reference**

- 370 1. **COVID-19 Map** [<https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>]
- 371 2. **Coronavirus COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) Trusted Information at the Point of Care Guides**
372 [[https://www.hopkinsguides.com/hopkins/view/Johns_Hopkins_ABX_Guide/540747/all/Corona](https://www.hopkinsguides.com/hopkins/view/Johns_Hopkins_ABX_Guide/540747/all/Coronavirus_COVID_19_SARS_CoV_2_)
373 [virus_COVID_19_SARS_CoV_2_](https://www.hopkinsguides.com/hopkins/view/Johns_Hopkins_ABX_Guide/540747/all/Coronavirus_COVID_19_SARS_CoV_2_)]
- 374 3. **Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) - Your Health** [[https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/index.html)
375 [ncov/your-health/index.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/index.html)]
- 376 4. Juneau C-E, Pueyo T, Bell M, Gee G, Collazzo P, Potvin L: **Evidence-Based, Cost-Effective**
377 **Interventions To Suppress The COVID-19 Pandemic: A Systematic Review.** *medRxiv*
378 2020:2020.2004.2020.20054726.
- 379 5. Teslya A, Pham TM, Godijk NG, Kretzschmar ME, Bootsma MCJ, Rozhnova G: **Impact of self-**
380 **imposed prevention measures and short-term government-imposed social distancing on**
381 **mitigating and delaying a COVID-19 epidemic: A modelling study.** *medRxiv*
382 2020:2020.2003.2012.20034827.
- 383 6. Dreher N, Spiera Z, McAuley FM, Kuohn L, Durbin JR, Marayati NF, Ali M, Li AY, Hannah TC,
384 Gometz A *et al*: **Impact of policy interventions and social distancing on SARS-CoV-2**
385 **transmission in the United States.** *medRxiv* 2020:2020.2005.2001.20088179.
- 386 7. Fowler JH, Hill SJ, Obradovich N, Levin R: **The Effect of Stay-at-Home Orders on COVID-19 Cases**
387 **and Fatalities in the United States.** *medRxiv* 2020:2020.2004.2013.20063628.
- 388 8. Furukawa NW, Brooks JT, Sobel J: **Evidence Supporting Transmission of Severe Acute**
389 **Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 While Presymptomatic or Asymptomatic.** *Emerg Infect*
390 *Dis* 2020, **26**(7).
- 391 9. Koh WC, Naing L, Wong J: **Estimating the impact of physical distancing measures in containing**
392 **COVID-19: an empirical analysis.** *medRxiv* 2020:2020.2006.2011.20128074.

- 393 10. **COVID-19 US state policy database** [www.tinyurl.com/statepolicies]
- 394 11. Abedi V, Olulana O, Avula V, Chaudhary D, Khan A, Shahjouei S, Li J, Zand R: **Racial, Economic**
395 **and Health Inequality and COVID-19 Infection in the United States.** *medRxiv*
396 2020:2020.2004.2026.20079756.
- 397 12. Bhowmik T, Tirtha SD, Iraganaboina NC, Eluru N: **A Comprehensive Analysis of COVID-19**
398 **Transmission and Fatality Rates at the County level in the United States considering Socio-**
399 **Demographics, Health Indicators, Mobility Trends and Health Care Infrastructure Attributes.**
400 *medRxiv* 2020:2020.2008.2003.20164137.
- 401 13. Jalali AM, Khoury SG, See J, Gulsvig AM, Peterson BM, Gunasekera RS, Buzi G, Wilson J,
402 Galbadage T: **Delayed Interventions, Low Compliance, and Health Disparities Amplified the**
403 **Early Spread of COVID-19.** *medRxiv* 2020:2020.2007.2031.20165654.
- 404 14. Robertson LS: **COVID-19 Confirmed Cases and Fatalities in 883 U.S. Counties with a Population**
405 **of 50,000 or More: Predictions Based on Social, Economic, Demographic Factors and**
406 **Shutdown Days.** *medRxiv* 2020:2020.2006.2025.20139956.
- 407 15. Rozenfeld Y, Beam J, Maier H, Haggerson W, Boudreau K, Carlson J, Medows R: **A model of**
408 **disparities: risk factors associated with COVID-19 infection.** *Int J Equity Health* 2020, **19**(1):126.
- 409 16. Dasgupta N, Jonsson Funk M, Lazard A, White BE, Marshall SW: **Quantifying the social**
410 **distancing privilege gap: a longitudinal study of smartphone movement.** *medRxiv*
411 2020:2020.2005.2003.20084624.
- 412 17. Jay J, Bor J, Nsoesie E, Lipson SK, Jones DK, Galea S, Raifman J: **Neighborhood income and**
413 **physical distancing during the COVID-19 pandemic in the U.S.** *medRxiv*
414 2020:2020.2006.2025.20139915.

- 415 18. Shadmi E, Chen Y, Dourado I, Faran-Perach I, Furler J, Hangoma P, Hanvoravongchai P, Obando C,
416 Petrosyan V, Rao KD *et al*: **Health equity and COVID-19: global perspectives**. *International*
417 *Journal for Equity in Health* 2020, **19**(1):104.
- 418 19. Silva DS, Smith MJ: **Social distancing, social justice, and risk during the COVID-19 pandemic**.
419 *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 2020, **111**(4):459-461.
- 420 20. Sy KTL, Martinez ME, Rader B, White LF: **Socioeconomic disparities in subway use and COVID-**
421 **19 outcomes in New York City**. *medRxiv* 2020.
- 422 21. Torres TS, Hoagland B, Bezerra DRB, Garner A, Jalil EM, Coelho LE, Benedetti M, Pimenta C,
423 Grinsztejn B, Veloso VG: **Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Sexual Minority Populations in**
424 **Brazil: An Analysis of Social/Racial Disparities in Maintaining Social Distancing and a**
425 **Description of Sexual Behavior**. *AIDS Behav* 2020.
- 426 22. Hatef E, Chang H-Y, Kitchen C, Weiner JP, Kharrazi H: **Assessing the Impact of Neighborhood**
427 **Socioeconomic Characteristics on COVID-19 Prevalence Across Seven States in the United**
428 **States**. *Frontiers in Public Health* 2020, **8**:354.
- 429 23. Krishnamachari B, Dsida A, Zastrow D, Harper B, Morris A, Santella A: **Effects of Government**
430 **Mandated Social Distancing Measures on Cumulative Incidence of COVID-19 in the United**
431 **States and its Most Populated Cities**. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.2005.2022.20110460.
- 432 24. Machida M, Nakamura I, Saito R, Nakaya T, Hanibuchi T, Takamiya T, Odagiri Y, Fukushima N,
433 Kikuchi H, Amagasa S *et al*: **The actual implementation status of self-isolation among Japanese**
434 **workers during the COVID-19 outbreak**. *Trop Med Health* 2020, **48**:63.
- 435 25. You H, Wu X, Guo X: **Distribution of COVID-19 Morbidity Rate in Association with Social and**
436 **Economic Factors in Wuhan, China: Implications for Urban Development**. *Int J Environ Res*
437 *Public Health* 2020, **17**(10).

- 438 26. Zhang L, Ghader S, Pack ML, Xiong C, Darzi A, Yang M, Sun Q, Kabiri A, Hu S: **AN INTERACTIVE**
439 **COVID-19 MOBILITY IMPACT AND SOCIAL DISTANCING ANALYSIS PLATFORM.** *medRxiv*
440 2020:2020.2004.2029.20085472.
- 441 27. Kind AJH, Buckingham WR: **Making Neighborhood-Disadvantage Metrics Accessible - The**
442 **Neighborhood Atlas.** *N Engl J Med* 2018, **378**(26):2456-2458.
- 443 28. **2015 Area Deprivation Index v2.0** [<https://www.neighborhoodatlas.medicine.wisc.edu/>]
- 444 29. Singh GK: **Area deprivation and widening inequalities in US mortality, 1969-1998.** *Am J Public*
445 *Health* 2003, **93**(7):1137-1143.
- 446 30. Rutkow L, Chang HY, Daubresse M, Webster DW, Stuart EA, Alexander GC: **Effect of Florida's**
447 **Prescription Drug Monitoring Program and Pill Mill Laws on Opioid Prescribing and Use.** *JAMA*
448 *Intern Med* 2015, **175**(10):1642-1649.
- 449 31. Chang HY, Lyapustina T, Rutkow L, Daubresse M, Richey M, Faul M, Stuart EA, Alexander GC:
450 **Impact of prescription drug monitoring programs and pill mill laws on high-risk opioid**
451 **prescribers: A comparative interrupted time series analysis.** *Drug Alcohol Depend* 2016, **165**:1-
452 8.
- 453 32. Bernal JL, Cummins S, Gasparrini A: **Interrupted time series regression for the evaluation of**
454 **public health interventions: a tutorial.** *Int J Epidemiol* 2017, **46**(1):348-355.
- 455 33. Bibbins-Domingo K: **This Time Must Be Different: Disparities During the COVID-19 Pandemic.**
456 *Ann Intern Med* 2020, **173**(3):233-234.
- 457 34. Bowleg L: **We're Not All in This Together: On COVID-19, Intersectionality, and Structural**
458 **Inequality.** *Am J Public Health* 2020, **110**(7):917.
- 459 35. **Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey**
460 [<https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.htm>]


462 Table 1: Characteristics of counties by the Area Deprivation Index level

ADI Level	Lowest / Q1	Low / Q2	High / Q3	Highest / Q4	Total
# of counties	522	522	522	521	2,087
Observation time / SAH Implementation, days	95.7 (14.2)	95.8 (13.0)	94.0 (13.4)	86.2 (10.5)	92.9 (13.4)
Observation time / SAH Lifting, days	93.2 (3.8)	92.9 (4.6)	92.3 (5.0)	89.5 (4.6)	92.0 (4.8)
# of residents	176,972 (276,383)	120,052 (356,081)	70,334 (169,653)	37,381 (110,126)	101,215 (252,467)
Density, count per squared mile	43,367 (98,615)	25,825 (96,300)	15,697 (42,369)	13,972 (68,397)	24,726 (80,604)
Low: 1 st – 10 th	65 (12.5%)	73 (14.0%)	47 (9.0%)	24 (4.6%)	209 (10.0%)
Medium: 11 th – 90 th	349(66.9%)	394 (75.5%)	450 (86.2%)	476 (91.5%)	1,669 (80.0%)
High: 91 st – 100 th	108 (20.7%)	55 (10.5%)	25 (4.8%)	20 (3.8%)	208 (10.0%)
Median age, years	41.5 (5.3)	42.3 (5.6)	42.1 (5.5)	40.7 (4.6)	41.7 (5.3)
% elderly	17.9% (5.3%)	19.2% (4.6%)	19.0% (4.3%)	17.6% (3.4%)	18.4% (4.5%)
Median family income, \$	83,408 (15,914)	65,721 (5,581)	57,718 (4691)	47,992 (5,932)	63,717 (15,940)
% families in poverty	6.1% (1.9%)	9.0% (2.0%)	11.9% (2.3%)	18.2% (4.9%)	11.3% (5.4%)
% people unemployed	4.3% (1.4%)	5.1% (1.2%)	6.3% (1.9%)	8.5% (3.3%)	6.0% (2.7%)
% people with at least high school education	92.3% (2.7%)	89.3% (2.9%)	86.3% (3.7%)	79.9% (4.5%)	87.0% (5.8%)


COVID-19 prevalence (# cases per 10,000 people)						
On March 1 st	0.0 (0.2)	0.0 (0.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0(0.1)	
At SAH implementation	1.7 (3.3)	1.0 (1.8)	0.9 (1.9)	2.6 (5.5)	1.6 (3.5)	
At SAH lifting	26.6 (37.8)	19.4 (35.9)	21.9 (59.6)	28.5 (42.6)	24.1 (45.1)	
Social Distancing Index						
On March 1 st	35.3 (7.5)	34.2 (7.1)	33.6 (7.1)	33.2 (6.9)	34.1 (7.2)	
At SAH implementation	50.6 (11.7)	44.0 (11.2)	40.6 (10.8)	32.1 (11.3)	41.8 (13.1)	
At SAH lifting	30.4 (11.6)	24.7 (10.0)	23.3 (9.2)	21.0 (8.7)	24.8 (10.5)	

463 ADI: Area Deprivation Index; SAH: Stay at Home


Trend by A21 Annual SAM implementation




Trend by A21 Annual SAM 1 Day




Event by A21 Annual SAM implementation




Event by A21 Annual SAM ending




Relative Change in Parameters Before and After LAM Implementation



Relative Change in LFI Before and After LAM Implementation



Relative Change in Prevalence of Relates available 2008-2013



Relative Change in 2013 Relates available 2008-2013

