

# 1 Homophily in risk and behavior complicate understanding the COVID-19 epidemic curve

2  
3 Nina H. Fefferman,<sup>1,2\*</sup> Matthew J. Silk,<sup>1</sup> Dana K. Pasquale,<sup>3</sup> James Moody<sup>3</sup>

4  
5  
6 <sup>1</sup>National Institute of Mathematical and Biological Synthesis (NIMBioS), University of Tennessee,  
7 Knoxville, TN, USA

8 <sup>2</sup>Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA

9 <sup>3</sup>Department of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA

10  
11 \* Corresponding author. Email: [nina.h.fefferman@gmail.com](mailto:nina.h.fefferman@gmail.com)

## 12 13 Abstract

14 New COVID-19 diagnoses have dropped faster than expected in the United States.  
15 Interpretations of the decrease have focused on changing factors (e.g. mask-wearing,  
16 vaccines, etc.), but predictive models largely ignore heterogeneity in behaviorally-driven  
17 exposure risks among distinct groups. We present a simplified compartmental model with  
18 differential mixing in two behaviorally distinct groups. We show how homophily in  
19 behavior, risk, and exposure can lead to early peaks and rapid declines that critically do  
20 not signal the end of the outbreak. Instead, higher exposure risk groups may more rapidly  
21 exhaust available susceptibles while the lower risk group are still in a (slower) growth  
22 phase of their outbreak curve. This simplified model demonstrates that complex incidence  
23 curves, such as those currently seen in the US, can be generated without changes to  
24 fundamental drivers of disease dynamics. Correct interpretation of incidence curves will  
25 be critical for policy decisions to effectively manage the pandemic.  
26  
27

## 28 Introduction

29  
30 Early winter saw a rapid and rise in incidence of COVID-19 leading to unprecedented  
31 levels of hospitalizations and deaths (1). Although many epidemiological models  
32 predicted that the US winter outbreak would peak in January, the case counts have  
33 dropped much more precipitously than anticipated in late winter (Figure 1). The wide  
34 swings in infection rates have led to broad pronouncements about causes (2), ranging from  
35 changes in social distancing policies (3, 4), seasonality (5), and disease strains (6, 7).  
36

37 Largely absent from such popular accounts is any recognition of the role of heterogenous  
38 population mixing and resulting differences in natural spread within groups, each with  
39 somewhat different epidemic thresholds, cumulative caseloads, and potential to approach  
40 (local) herd immunity. In a large, heterogenous population like the United States with  
41 wildly different approaches to masking, closures, and social distancing we would expect  
42 spread to be similarly uneven, though these sorts of features are often lost in national  
43 trends. Here, we present a simplified two-group model based on differential mixing that  
44 correlates with transmission risk (of course, real-world cases likely involve multiple  
45 populations, each with different behavior and risk profiles). This demonstration model is  
46 intended to highlight the simplest case for how homophily in behavior, risk, and contact  
47 makes compound epidemics with multiple “waves” likely by generating population(s)

48 where the epidemic moves quickly loosely coupled with other population(s) where the  
49 epidemic creeps along much more slowly.

## 50 Background

51  
52  
53 *Explanations for wildly varying incidence rates.* Naturally, decreases in case incidence  
54 under the complex and shifting realities of the pandemic are unlikely to be the result of  
55 any sole cause. The explanations already being offered are compelling and likely influence  
56 observed incidence. There are undeniable impacts on transmission from the timing of the  
57 winter holidays, including the rise and drop in travel (8), increased propensity to gather  
58 with family despite restrictions (9), and also increased willingness to be tested despite not  
59 yet experiencing being symptomatic to allow travel and family gathering (10). The last of  
60 these may have meaningfully altered how effective we were as a nation at interrupting  
61 asymptomatic spread for a small period of time. Given the recent estimates of how much  
62 transmission may be driven by asymptomatic infections (11), this by itself may have had a  
63 profound impact on curtailing community spread and contributed greatly to current  
64 decreases in ways also not being discussed.

65  
66 There may also be a nontrivial impact of seasonality on the transmissibility of COVID-19  
67 due to virological features, impacted either by temperature and humidity in both outdoor  
68 and HVAC-controlled environments or else to crowding patterns and similar behavioral  
69 changes (12). The increasing availability of vaccines, especially among those who may  
70 have acted as conduits for transmission (e.g. essential workforce) is undoubtedly  
71 beginning to limit spread somewhat. Even winter weather challenges in testing and  
72 reporting may contribute to decreased observability in cases, on top of actual reduction in  
73 disease incidence (13).

74  
75 Beyond mixing changes due to the holidays or weather-related behavior, there are also  
76 likely ongoing gradual changes in local adoption rates of mask wearing or social  
77 distancing, especially as local case incidence created greater local awareness of potential  
78 disease severity than may have been believed before direct observable outcomes due to  
79 differences in national reporting and media consumption (14-17). These regional  
80 differences in behavior lead to differences in community vulnerability, causing a potential  
81 feedback loop between behavior and local outbreak severity (18). Certainly, there have  
82 been some areas of the country that have experienced such high prevalence that the  
83 number of individuals with natural immunity after recovery should now begin to slow  
84 transmission (19). This is especially true in regions where ongoing super-spreader  
85 facilities have raged uncontrolled, continually seeding additional infection into the broader  
86 community, such as jails, workplaces, congregate living environments, etc. (20-24).

87  
88 While all of these features likely affect spread to one degree or another, people are  
89 remarkably consistent over time in who they interact with (with holidays being the  
90 obvious exception that proves the rule). As we show below, homophily in social contact  
91 can be sufficient in itself -- holding disease and context dynamics constant -- to generate  
92 widely varying disease incidence profiles.

93  
94 *Heterogenous social mixing.* Social segregation due to homophily is probably the single  
95 most well-known feature governing American social contact. For both strong and weak  
96 ties, people tend to come into contact with those who are like themselves at much higher  
97 rates than those with whom they differ, across multiple dimensions (25). These patterns

98 are reinforced by strong ethnic, educational, and geographic correlates in occupations (26,  
99 27). While homophily causes social segregation, it can take remarkably little social  
100 contact to enable infectious disease to spread quickly across such boundaries, with super-  
101 spreader events or rare high-activity nodes sufficient to bridge populations (28).

102  
103 Attribute homophily is generally well-correlated with behavior homophily, which in the  
104 context of contagious disease modeling means that we would expect people in close  
105 contact with each other to share general practices, cautions and behaviors relevant for  
106 disease spread. For example, mask wearing might become *de rigueur* in some  
107 neighborhoods while largely spurned in others for a variety of reasons (29-31). Similarly,  
108 people who work in high-contact settings at highest risk likely have friends, contacts and  
109 family members working in similar situations, themselves also at higher risk.

110  
111 These simple baseline features of social contact networks imply heterogenous  
112 transmission dynamics -- close contact networks with risk-behavior homophily should  
113 lead to rapid spread within groups that take on “Dangerous” behavior profiles, while the  
114 disease should spread slowly in those with “Safer” profiles.

115  
116 To illuminate how homophily in COVID-19 risk behavior can drive complex case  
117 dynamics, we used a simplified heterogenous social system with two relevant groups: a  
118 group of Dangerous actors who have high susceptibility and transmission rates and a  
119 group of Safer actors who have lower transmission rates (Figure 2). The system is then  
120 governed by three sets of parameters: (1) the relative size of the two populations, (2)  
121 differences in transmission rates within & between populations, (3) contact rates between  
122 populations.

## 123 124 **Results**

125  
126 To illustrate how these dynamics work, we start with a simple baseline scenario, as  
127 specified in Table 1 (see Figure 3a). In our baseline scenario there is a faster infection rate  
128 for the Dangerous population than the Safer, but the two are highly correlated in time and  
129 build on each other smoothly, resulting in a single-phase total infection curve. We then  
130 consider differences in well-known health disparities by assuming that the populations ( $x$   
131 and  $y$ ) differ in underlying health risks and access to care, captured by a longer infectious  
132 period in the Dangerous population ( $0.8 * \gamma_{Safer}$ ) and higher death rates ( $1.2 * \omega_x$ ). Here we  
133 again see a smooth overall transmission pattern with rapid Dangerous population spread  
134 (Fig. 3b).

135  
136 If we now assume that mixing across populations is lower than mixing within populations,  
137 i.e. homophily such that  $\kappa_{x,y} = 0.01 * \kappa_{x,x}$ , we effectively allow spread to be much more  
138 highly compartmentalized (Fig. 3c). Adding homophily in this way leads to a classic  
139 “double hump” incidence curve with the Dangerous population leading infection early in  
140 the outbreak and a later, smaller peak in prevalence (slow burn outbreak) among the Safer  
141 population (see Figure 3c).

142  
143 If we include both homophily and concomitant differential health and recovery risks for  
144 the Dangerous population, we see a less pronounced second “hump”, though there is still a  
145 critical plateau after the decrease from the initial peak as case incidence falls (Fig. 3d). In  
146 this particular case, the peak is lower and slightly earlier, but then transitions from an

147 outbreak primarily among the Dangerous population into a “longer slow burn” outbreak  
148 among the Safer population.

149  
150 The examples above are draws from a much wider space of potential models governed by  
151 the between-group differences in transmissibility and relative sizes of the two populations.  
152 We can examine the wider state space by sweeping a wide range of potential values (Fig.  
153 4 and explored further in Supplementary Information).

154  
155 In Figure 4a we see that when transmission within groups is much higher than  
156 transmission between groups (low half of the figure), we get a quick outbreak among the  
157 Dangerous population that starts to burn out before the Safer population peaks, leading to  
158 a double-hump epidemic (Fig. 4d). As transmissibility between groups becomes more  
159 similar to transmission within groups this double-hump becomes of a plateau (Fig. 4c) and  
160 then is lost entirely (Fig. 4b).

161  
162 The shape of the compound epidemic curve will also depend on the relative sizes of the  
163 different populations. In our case, a double-hump epidemic occurred when the Safer  
164 population was similar in size or bigger than the Dangerous population (Fig. 5). When a  
165 substantial majority of individuals were in the Safer population it was possible for the  
166 second epidemic peak of a double-hump epidemic to be higher (Fig. 5c).

167  
168 One further complication in the observed incidence from aggregated populations with  
169 different health protective behaviors is that they may also have different rates of  
170 observability due to differences in testing access and willingness to be tested. Essential  
171 workers, for example, facing financial strain if diagnosed may have an incentive to avoid  
172 testing (32) or simply have little access to testing (33-36). The models thus far have  
173 assumed a transparent and complete disease detection system, however, to demonstrate  
174 this further potential confounder, we demonstrate one case that incorporates lower case  
175 detection rates within the Dangerous population.

176  
177 The lower detection of course does not change the underlying spread pattern in these  
178 models, so this creates a situation where rapid, early spread goes somewhat unnoticed, but  
179 the spillover infections to other populations is detected at higher rates. This situation can  
180 be particularly problematic if the rise in infectivity among Safer populations could be  
181 attributed to new variants or other underlying disease dynamics, when in fact all we have  
182 is differential observability (Fig. 6).

### 183 *Summary of results*

184  
185 Our simplified model demonstrates that myriad complex incidence curves can be  
186 generated without changes to fundamental disease dynamics or even overall changes in  
187 people’s everyday behavior. Rather, disease spread in America may simply reflect (at  
188 least in part) the underlying inequalities and social segregation of Americans’ daily  
189 activities. These interaction patterns govern who spreads disease to whom, who has access  
190 to healthcare and prevention tools, and who is likely to be tested. Hence inequalities can  
191 lead simultaneously to differences in the way the disease spreads and is observed.

## 192 **Discussion**

197 Explanations for the current trends in spread have been characterized largely by  
198 exogenous features. Some of these include policies aimed at increasing social distancing  
199 or incentivizing masking and testing. Others focus on policy-independent extrinsic factors,  
200 such as seasonality in transmissibility due to climactic factors, or temporal patterns in  
201 travel and interaction rates within the US population due to holiday travel. While such  
202 features are certainly likely to be relevant, there is also a fundamental mixing assumption  
203 built into these explanations that should be examined. A simplified mixing model that  
204 distinguishes groups by risk can account for complex observed incidents curves without  
205 reference to radical policy, disease, or behavior change.

206  
207 *Limitations of the study.* Our goal is to demonstrate the potential impact of homophily on  
208 observed dynamics, rather than to make concrete quantitative predictions about actual  
209 reported incidence curves. Consequently, the model presented is only meant as a  
210 simplified example, and many potentially critical details are omitted, such as demographic  
211 or socioeconomic correlates with group behaviors. We also do not explicitly model the  
212 alternative explanations for the current trends. We do not mean to suggest that these  
213 factors are not playing a (large) role in the US COVID-19 pandemic, but aim to highlight  
214 a largely un-discussed, and potentially very important, additional influence of homophily  
215 among groups.

216  
217 We have here demonstrated the impact of homophily in only two behaviorally distinct  
218 groups, though of course the reality is likely the composite contribution of many distinct  
219 groups that may vary in both behavior and/or physiological susceptibility (37).  
220 Sociocultural factors may also play a critical role in the rates at which different groups  
221 interact, since even beyond the percentage of households with economic or “essential  
222 workforce” constraints against protective behaviors, crowded neighborhoods and  
223 multigenerational homes also complicate the ability to minimize exposure risks (38).  
224 While heterogeneous mixing among such distinct etiological and behavioral cohorts is  
225 certainly not the only factor influencing currently observed trends, it would be a mistake  
226 to ignore the potential contribution of this effect going forwards. If these heterogeneities  
227 are sufficiently distinct, as they well may be (39, 40), the current rate of decline in new  
228 cases may easily slow, or even reverse, leading to additional future waves as an inevitable  
229 feature of social dynamics and disease behavior in the United States. Without including  
230 heterogeneous social mixing patterns into our considered factors, such dynamics may be  
231 attributed directly and completely to the gradual failures of previously successful  
232 mitigations, or to the emergence of new variants that are capable of overcoming available  
233 behavioral protections and/or vaccines. Health policy reactions to misattributed patterns  
234 could inadvertently abandon successful strategies, or even erode public trust and  
235 adherence without any shift in policy from leadership. It is therefore critically important to  
236 understand the contribution of such factors to potentially inevitable dynamics in patterns  
237 of incidence as the COVID-19 pandemic continues to unfold.

## 238 239 **Conclusions**

240  
241 Homophily between sub-populations that vary in their behavior and susceptibility to an  
242 infectious disease can drive compound epidemics with multiple waves even in the absence  
243 of behavioral change, seasonality, or antigenic escape. Consequently, correctly accounting  
244 for the impact of homophily will be vital in unpacking the success of non-pharmaceutical  
245 interventions or impact of new variants of concern, and so critical to forming effective  
246 health policy that retains broad political and public support.



## Materials and Methods

### *Experimental design*

*SIR simulation modeling.* There is a long tradition of using simplified mass-action compartmental models for disease spread (41-43), which are generally quite effective for diseases spread easily such as influenza or coronavirus related diseases. Such models assume subsets of a population can be divided into compartments with uniform transitions across disease states. Transitions between states are then governed by a set of transmission rates with the entire population system governed by a set of transmission rates. Using mass-action models to accurately fit for real-world data is complex, though versions are being used for short-term forecasting of the current pandemic (44, 45). However, simpler models remain effective as ways to build insights into the interdependencies of hypothesized system behavior, through building on a long social simulation tradition (46, 47).

*A Behavior-correlated Two Population Mixing Model.* The system is designed as a two-population Susceptible-Exposed-Infected-Recovered-Dead (SEIRD) compartmental model with rates across states governed by a set of ordinary differential equations.

$$\frac{dS_x}{dt} = -\beta_{x,x}S_xI_x - \beta_{y,x}S_xI_y \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{dE_x}{dt} = \beta_{x,x}S_xI_x + \beta_{y,x}S_xI_y - \eta_xE_x \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{dI_x}{dt} = \eta_xE_x - \gamma_xI_x - \omega_xI_x \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{dR_x}{dt} = \gamma_xI_x \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{dD_x}{dt} = \omega_xI_x \quad (5)$$

Where  $\beta_{x,y} = \kappa_{x,y} \cdot \min(\lambda_{x,x}, \lambda_{y,y})$  defined such that  $\kappa_{x,y}$  is the probability of contact between an individual in population x and population y (the two groups), and  $\lambda_{x,x}$  is the probability of transmission given that contact occurs between two individuals within the same group, x. In this way, we assumed that transmission risks were dependent on the behavior of the individual who was adhering to the most disease protective behavior in any interaction. (For simplicity, this model did not include either infectious pre-symptomatic or asymptomatic individuals, though COVID-19 is known to involve such dynamics.)

The implementation of these equations was initially parameterized as the Baseline Model (see Table 1) and then altered as per case described in each reported scenario in the Results and Supplementary Materials.

## References

1. The New York Times. "Coronavirus (COVID-19) Data in the United States," (2021) Accessed 23-Feb-2021; <https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data>.

- 289 2. C. Maxouris, H. Yan. "Here's Why Some Covid-19 Numbers Keep Improving. (Hint: It's  
290 Not Widespread Vaccinations)", CNN.com, (2021) Accessed 25-Feb-2021;  
291 <https://web.archive.org/web/20210219112359/https://www.cnn.com/2021/02/15/health/us>  
292 [-coronavirus-monday/index.html](https://web.archive.org/web/20210219112359/https://www.cnn.com/2021/02/15/health/us).
- 293 3. D. Lazer, A. Quintana, R. H. Perlis, M. A. Baum, K. Ognyanova, M. Santillana, J.  
294 Druckman, J. Green, M. Simonson, A. Gitomer, A. A. Uslu, J. Lin, H. Chwe, "*The*  
295 *COVID States Project: A 50-State COVID-19 Survey: Report #31: Update on the*  
296 *Trajectory of Health-Related Behaviors*" (2021);  
297 <https://kateto.net/covid19/COVID19%20CONSORTIUM%20REPORT%2031%20DISTA>  
298 [NCING%20Jan%202021.pdf](https://kateto.net/covid19/COVID19%20CONSORTIUM%20REPORT%2031%20DISTA)).
- 299 4. J. Raifman, K. Nocka, D. Jones, J. Bor, S. Lipson, J. Jay, P. Chan. "*COVID-19 US State*  
300 *Policy Database (Cusp)*," (2020) Accessed 25-Feb-2021; [www.tinyurl.com/statepolicies](http://www.tinyurl.com/statepolicies)  
301 and <https://github.com/USCOVIDpolicy/COVID-19-US-State-Policy-Database>.
- 302 5. P. Burra, K. Soto-Diaz, I. Chalen, R. J. Gonzalez-Ricon, D. Istanto, G. Caetano-Anolles,  
303 Temperature and Latitude Correlate with SARS-CoV-2 Epidemiological Variables but  
304 Not with Genomic Change Worldwide. *Evol Bioinform Online* **17**, 1176934321989695  
305 10.1177/1176934321989695 (2021).
- 306 6. N. L. Washington, K. Gangavarapu, M. Zeller, A. Bolze, E. T. Cirulli, K. M. Schiabor  
307 Barrett, B. B. Larsen, C. Anderson, S. White, T. Cassens, S. Jacobs, G. Levan, J. Nguyen,  
308 J. M. Ramirez, C. Rivera-Garcia, E. Sandoval, X. Wang, D. Wong, E. Spencer, R. Robles-  
309 Sikisaka, E. Kurzban, L. D. Hughes, X. Deng, C. Wang, V. Servellita, H. Valentine, P. De  
310 Hoff, P. Seaver, S. Sathe, K. Gietzen, B. Sickler, J. Antico, K. Hoon, J. Liu, A. Harding,  
311 O. Bakhtar, T. Basler, B. Austin, M. Isaksson, P. Febbo, D. Becker, M. Laurent, E.  
312 McDonald, G. W. Yeo, R. Knight, L. C. Laurent, E. de Feo, M. Worobey, C. Chiu, M. A.  
313 Suchard, J. T. Lu, W. Lee, K. G. Andersen, Genomic Epidemiology Identifies Emergence  
314 and Rapid Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 in the United States. *medRxiv*,  
315 10.1101/2021.02.06.21251159 (2021).
- 316 7. T. Alpert, E. Lasek-Nesselquist, A. F. Brito, A. L. Valesano, J. Rothman, M. J. MacKay,  
317 M. E. Petrone, M. I. Breban, A. E. Watkins, C. B. F. Vogels, A. Russell, J. P. Kelly, M.  
318 Shudt, J. Plitnick, E. Schneider, W. J. Fitzsimmons, G. Khullar, J. Metti, J. T. Dudley, M.  
319 Nash, J. Wang, C. Liu, P. Hui, A. Muyombwe, R. Downing, J. Razeq, S. M. Bart, S.  
320 Murphy, C. Neal, E. Laszlo, M. L. Landry, P. W. Cook, J. R. Fauver, C. E. Mason, A. S.  
321 Lauring, K. St George, D. R. MacCannell, N. D. Grubaugh, Early Introductions and  
322 Community Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Variant B.1.1.7 in the United States. *medRxiv*,  
323 10.1101/2021.02.10.21251540 (2021).
- 324 8. Transportation Security Administration. "*Tsa Checkpoint Travel Numbers (Current*  
325 *Year(S) Versus Prior Year/Same Weekday)*" (2021) Accessed 23-Feb-2021;  
326 <https://www.tsa.gov/coronavirus/passenger-throughput>.
- 327 9. K. Brulliard. "At Dinner Parties and Game Nights, Casual American Life Is Fueling the  
328 Coronavirus Surge as Daily Cases Exceed 150,000," (*The Washington Post*; 2020)  
329 Accessed 24-Feb-2021;  
330 <https://web.archive.org/web/20210225161247/https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/20>  
331 [20/11/12/covid-social-gatherings/](https://web.archive.org/web/20210225161247/https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/20).
- 332 10. C. C. Miller, K. J. Wu, M. Sanger-Katz. "No, a Negative Coronavirus Test Does Not  
333 Mean You Can Safely Socialize," (*New York Times*; 2021) Accessed 24-Feb-2021;  
334 <http://web.archive.org/web/20210225161633/https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/21/upsho>  
335 [t/coronavirus-test-thanksgiving-plans.html](http://web.archive.org/web/20210225161633/https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/21/upsho).
- 336 11. M. A. Johansson, T. M. Quandelacy, S. Kada, P. V. Prasad, M. Steele, J. T. Brooks, R. B.  
337 Slayton, M. Biggerstaff, J. C. Butler, SARS-CoV-2 Transmission from People without

- 338 COVID-19 Symptoms. *JAMA Netw Open* **4**, e2035057  
339 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.35057 (2021).
- 340 12. S. Mallapaty, Why COVID Outbreaks Look Set to Worsen This Winter. *Nature* **586**, 653  
341 [https://media.nature.com/original/magazine-assets/d41586-020-02972-4/d41586-020-](https://media.nature.com/original/magazine-assets/d41586-020-02972-4/d41586-020-02972-4.pdf)  
342 [02972-4.pdf](https://media.nature.com/original/magazine-assets/d41586-020-02972-4/d41586-020-02972-4.pdf) (2020).
- 343 13. M. Pergrem. "Winter Weather Impacts People Going to Get a COVID-19 Test,"  
344 (*Mountain News wynt*; 2021) Accessed 24-Feb-2021;  
345 [https://web.archive.org/web/20210220003357/https://www.wynt.com/2021/02/19/winter-](https://web.archive.org/web/20210220003357/https://www.wynt.com/2021/02/19/winter-weather-impacts-people-going-to-get-a-covid-19-test/)  
346 [weather-impacts-people-going-to-get-a-covid-19-test/](https://web.archive.org/web/20210220003357/https://www.wynt.com/2021/02/19/winter-weather-impacts-people-going-to-get-a-covid-19-test/).
- 347 14. A. Thorpe, A. M. Scherer, P. K. J. Han, N. Burpo, V. Shaffer, L. Scherer, A. Fagerlin,  
348 Exposure to Common Geographic COVID-19 Prevalence Maps and Public Knowledge,  
349 Risk Perceptions, and Behavioral Intentions. *JAMA Netw Open* **4**, e2033538  
350 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.33538 (2021).
- 351 15. S. Carrignon, R. A. Bentley, M. Silk, N. H. Fefferman, The 'Icarus Effect' of Preventative  
352 Health Behaviors. *medRxiv*, 10.1101/2020.06.08.20126029 (2020).
- 353 16. N. H. Fefferman, E. T. Lofgren, N. Li, P. Blue, D. J. Weber, A.-A. Yakubu, Fear, Access,  
354 and the Real-Time Estimation of Etiological Parameters for Outbreaks of Novel  
355 Pathogens. *medRxiv*, 10.1101/2020.03.19.20038729 (2020).
- 356 17. E. Kim, M. E. Shepherd, J. D. Clinton, The Effect of Big-City News on Rural America  
357 During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **117**, 22009-22014  
358 10.1073/pnas.2009384117 (2020).
- 359 18. M. J. Silk, S. Carrignon, R. A. Bentley, N. H. Fefferman, Improving Pandemic Mitigation  
360 Policies across Communities through Coupled 2 Dynamics of Risk Perception and  
361 Infection. *medRxiv*, 10.1101/2020.07.09.20146985 (2020).
- 362 19. A. V. Tkachenko, S. Maslov, A. Elbanna, G. N. Wong, Z. J. Weiner, N. Goldenfeld,  
363 Time-Dependent Heterogeneity Leads to Transient Suppression of the COVID-19  
364 Epidemic, Not Herd Immunity. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2008.08142.pdf> (2021).
- 365 20. M. A. Waltenburg, C. E. Rose, T. Victoroff, M. Butterfield, J. A. Dillaha, A. Heinzerling,  
366 M. Chuey, M. Fierro, R. H. Jervis, K. M. Fedak, A. Leapley, J. A. Gabel, A. Feldpausch,  
367 E. M. Dunne, C. Austin, C. S. Pedati, F. S. Ahmed, S. Tubach, C. Rhea, J. Tonzel, A.  
368 Krueger, D. A. Crum, J. Vostok, M. J. Moore, H. Kempfer, J. Scheftel, G. Turabelidze, D.  
369 Stover, M. Donahue, D. Thomas, K. Edge, B. Gutierrez, E. Berl, M. McLafferty, K. E.  
370 Kline, N. Martz, J. C. Rajotte, E. Julian, A. Diedhiou, R. Radcliffe, J. L. Clayton, D.  
371 Ortbahn, J. Cummins, B. Barbeau, S. Carpenter, J. C. Pringle, J. Murphy, B. Darby, N. R.  
372 Graff, T. K. H. Dostal, I. W. Pray, C. Tillman, D. A. Rose, M. A. Honein, C. Cdc, T.  
373 Emergency Response, Coronavirus Disease among Workers in Food Processing, Food  
374 Manufacturing, and Agriculture Workplaces. *Emerg Infect Dis* **27**,  
375 10.3201/eid2701.203821 (2021).
- 376 21. S. A. Goldberg, J. Lennerz, M. Klompas, E. Mark, V. M. Pierce, R. W. Thompson, C. T.  
377 Pu, L. L. Ritterhouse, A. Dighe, E. S. Rosenberg, D. C. Grabowski, Presymptomatic  
378 Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 among Residents and  
379 Staff at a Skilled Nursing Facility: Results of Real-Time Polymerase Chain Reaction and  
380 Serologic Testing. *Clin Infect Dis* **72**, 686-689 10.1093/cid/ciaa991 (2021).
- 381 22. T. M. McMichael, D. W. Currie, S. Clark, S. Pogosjans, M. Kay, N. G. Schwartz, J.  
382 Lewis, A. Baer, V. Kawakami, M. D. Lukoff, J. Ferro, C. Brostrom-Smith, T. D. Rea, M.  
383 R. Sayre, F. X. Riedo, D. Russell, B. Hiatt, P. Montgomery, A. K. Rao, E. J. Chow, F.  
384 Tobolowsky, M. J. Hughes, A. C. Bardossy, L. P. Oakley, J. R. Jacobs, N. D. Stone, S. C.  
385 Reddy, J. A. Jernigan, M. A. Honein, T. A. Clark, J. S. Duchin, H.-S. Public, E. King  
386 County, C. C.-I. Team, Epidemiology of Covid-19 in a Long-Term Care Facility in King  
387 County, Washington. *N Engl J Med* **382**, 2005-2011 10.1056/NEJMoa2005412 (2020).



- 388 23. K. T. Schnepel, "COVID-19 in U.S. State and Federal Prisons: December 2020 Update"  
389 (2020).
- 390 24. E. Lofgren, K. Lum, A. Horowitz, B. Madubuonwu, K. Myers, N. H. Fefferman, The  
391 Epidemiological Implications of Jails for Community, Corrections Officer, and  
392 Incarcerated Population Risks from COVID-19. *medRxiv*, 10.1101/2020.04.08.20058842  
393 (2021).
- 394 25. M. McPherson, L. Smith-Lovin, J. M. Cook, Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social  
395 Networks. *Annu Rev Sociol* **27**, 415-444 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2678628> (2001).
- 396 26. O. D. Duncan, B. Duncan, A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indexes. *American*  
397 *Sociological Review* **29**, 210-217 (1955).
- 398 27. D. S. Massey, N. A. Denton, The Dimensions of Residential Segregation. *Social Forces*  
399 **67**, 281-315 (1988).
- 400 28. D. J. Watts, *Small Worlds: The Dynamics of Networks between Order and Randomness*  
401 (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1999).
- 402 29. M. H. Haischer, R. Beilfuss, M. R. Hart, L. Opielinski, D. Wrucke, G. Zirgaitis, T. D.  
403 Uhrich, S. K. Hunter, Who Is Wearing a Mask? Gender-, Age-, and Location-Related  
404 Differences During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *PLoS One* **15**, e0240785  
405 10.1371/journal.pone.0240785 (2020).
- 406 30. S. Kramer, "More Americans Say They Are Regularly Wearing Masks in Stores and Other  
407 Businesses" (Pew Research Center, 2020; <https://pewrsr.ch/32ttrRi>).
- 408 31. E. D. Vargas, G. R. Sanchez, "American Individualism Is an Obstacle to Wider Mask  
409 Wearing in the US" (The Brookings Institution, 2020;  
410 [https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2020/08/31/american-individualism-is-an-](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2020/08/31/american-individualism-is-an-obstacle-to-wider-mask-wearing-in-the-us/)  
411 [obstacle-to-wider-mask-wearing-in-the-us/](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2020/08/31/american-individualism-is-an-obstacle-to-wider-mask-wearing-in-the-us/)).
- 412 32. J. F. Reyes. "Essential Workers Exposed to COVID-19 Are Reporting to Work When  
413 They Can't Get Paid to Quarantine," (*The Philadelphia Inquirer*, Philadelphia, PA; 2021)  
414 Accessed; [https://www.inquirer.com/jobs/labor/covid-19-quarantine-paid-leave-essential-](https://www.inquirer.com/jobs/labor/covid-19-quarantine-paid-leave-essential-workers-20210120.html)  
415 [workers-20210120.html](https://www.inquirer.com/jobs/labor/covid-19-quarantine-paid-leave-essential-workers-20210120.html).
- 416 33. L. J. Blumberg, S. Corlette, M. Simpson, "Imposing the Costs of Workplace Coronavirus  
417 Testing on Group Plan Coverage Would Place an Excessive Burden on Essential  
418 Workers". (Health Affairs Blog, 2020).
- 419 34. S. R. Kim, M. Vann, L. Bronner, G. Manthey. "Which Cities Have the Biggest Racial  
420 Gaps in COVID-19 Testing Access? ," (*FiveThirtyEight*; 2020) Accessed 25-Feb-2021;  
421 [https://web.archive.org/save/https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/white-neighborhoods-](https://web.archive.org/save/https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/white-neighborhoods-have-more-access-to-covid-19-testing-sites/)  
422 [have-more-access-to-covid-19-testing-sites/](https://web.archive.org/save/https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/white-neighborhoods-have-more-access-to-covid-19-testing-sites/).
- 423 35. D. Madland, S. J. Glynn, J. Leibenluft, S. Workman, "How the Federal Government Can  
424 Protect Essential Workers in the Fight against Coronavirus" (Center for American  
425 Progress, 2020;  
426 [https://web.archive.org/web/20210225172632/https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/e-](https://web.archive.org/web/20210225172632/https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/news/2020/04/08/482881/federal-government-can-protect-essential-workers-fight-coronavirus/)  
427 [conomy/news/2020/04/08/482881/federal-government-can-protect-essential-workers-](https://web.archive.org/web/20210225172632/https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/news/2020/04/08/482881/federal-government-can-protect-essential-workers-fight-coronavirus/)  
428 [fight-coronavirus/](https://web.archive.org/web/20210225172632/https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/news/2020/04/08/482881/federal-government-can-protect-essential-workers-fight-coronavirus/)).
- 429 36. S. Varney. "She Went to the Er to Try to Get a Coronavirus Test and Ended up \$1,840 in  
430 Debt", in *Morning Edition* 30-June, 5:05am EST, from National Public Radio (NPR).  
431 (2020) Accessed 25-Feb-2021;  
432 [https://web.archive.org/web/20210225171414/https://www.npr.org/sections/health-](https://web.archive.org/web/20210225171414/https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2020/06/30/885053457/essential-worker-shoulders-1-840-debt-for-trying-to-get-tested-for-covid-19)  
433 [shots/2020/06/30/885053457/essential-worker-shoulders-1-840-debt-for-trying-to-get-](https://web.archive.org/web/20210225171414/https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2020/06/30/885053457/essential-worker-shoulders-1-840-debt-for-trying-to-get-tested-for-covid-19)  
434 [tested-for-covid-19](https://web.archive.org/web/20210225171414/https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2020/06/30/885053457/essential-worker-shoulders-1-840-debt-for-trying-to-get-tested-for-covid-19).
- 435 37. N. H. Fefferman, E. N. Naumova, Combinatorial Decomposition of an Outbreak  
436 Signature. *Math Biosci* **202**, 269-287 10.1016/j.mbs.2006.03.012 (2006).

- 437 38. J. A. Patel, F. B. H. Nielsen, A. A. Badiani, S. Assi, V. A. Unadkat, B. Patel, R.  
438 Ravindrane, H. Wardle, Poverty, Inequality and COVID-19: The Forgotten Vulnerable.  
439 *Public Health* **183**, 110-111 [10.1016/j.puhe.2020.05.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2020.05.006) (2020).
- 440 39. B. Rader, L. F. White, M. R. Burns, J. Chen, J. Brilliant, J. Cohen, J. Shaman, L. Brilliant,  
441 M. U. G. Kraemer, J. B. Hawkins, S. V. Scarpino, C. M. Astley, J. S. Brownstein, Mask-  
442 Wearing and Control of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission in the USA: A Cross-Sectional  
443 Study. *The Lancet Digital Health* **3**, e148-e157 [10.1016/s2589-7500\(20\)30293-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2589-7500(20)30293-4) (2021).
- 444 40. A. V. Maltsev, M. D. Stern, Social Heterogeneity Drives Complex Patterns of the  
445 COVID-19 Pandemic: Insights from a Novel Stochastic Heterogeneous Epidemic Model  
446 (Shem). *Frontiers in Physics* **8**, [10.3389/fphy.2020.609224](https://doi.org/10.3389/fphy.2020.609224) (2021).
- 447 41. R. M. Anderson, R. M. May, *Infectious Diseases of Humans* (Oxford University Press,  
448 1991).
- 449 42. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. "COVID-19 Projections," (2020);  
450 <https://covid19.healthdata.org/united-states-of-america>.
- 451 43. Predictive Healthcare at Penn Medicine. "COVID-19 Hospital Impact Model for  
452 Epidemics (Chime)," (2020); <https://penn-chime.phl.io/>.
- 453 44. B. Adams, R. Billock, A. Breskin, M. A. Brookhart, H. Campbell, S. Heiser, M. Holmes,  
454 S. N. Levintow, P. D. MacDonald, A. McKethan, K. A. Powers, S. Rhea, "COVID-19 in  
455 North Carolina: Hospital Capacity and the COVID-19 Epidemic in North Carolina:  
456 Preliminary Estimates" (2020; [https://files.nc.gov/covid/documents/latest-updates/NC-  
457 Covid-Brief-1-4-6-20.pdf](https://files.nc.gov/covid/documents/latest-updates/NC-Covid-Brief-1-4-6-20.pdf)).
- 458 45. Colorado COVID-19 Modeling Group, "Colorado COVID-19 Mathematical Model  
459 Documentation" (2021; <https://agb85.github.io/covid-19/SEIR%20Documentation.pdf>).
- 460 46. T. Schelling, Dynamic Models of Segregation. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* **1**, 143-  
461 186 (1971).
- 462 47. T. C. Schelling, *Micromotives and Macrobehavior* (W. W. Norton & Company, 1978).

## 463 464 465 466 **Acknowledgments**

### 467 468 **Funding:**

469 National Science Foundation award DEB 2028710 (NHF)

470 National Science Foundation award 2029790 (JM, DKP)

471 James S. McDonnell Foundation award 220020397 (JM)

### 472 473 **Author contributions:**

474 Conceptualization: NHF, JM

475 Methodology: NHF, JM, MJS

476 Investigation: NHF, MJS

477 Visualization: MJS

478 Writing—original draft: JM


479 Writing—review & editing: JM, NHF, MJS, DKP

480  
481 **Competing interests:** Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

482  
483 **Data and materials availability:** All data needed to evaluate the conclusions in the paper  
484 are present in the paper and/or the Supplementary Materials.

## 485 **Figures and Tables**


488



489  
490  
491  
492  
493

**Fig 1. Trends in COVID-19 incidence in the US.** Estimated daily new SARS-CoV-2 cases in the United States from January 2020 to March 2021.

494  
495



496  
497

498

499


500

501

502

503

**Fig 2. Simplified model schematic.** A schematic of the simplified model of disease dynamics in two groups, one Safer with regard to behaviors affecting exposure risks and the other more Dangerous.




504  
505 **Fig 3. The impact of homophily and health disparities between the Safer and Dangerous**  
506 **Groups on observed case incidence. (A)** The Baseline scenario with two groups that have  
507 different levels of behavioral exposure risk, but make contact across groups as often as within  
508 their group. **(B)** Building on the Baseline Scenario, the groups have uniform contact with each  
509 other, but now the Dangerous population also includes assumed increase in prevalence of  
510 underlying health conditions that increase the probability of severe infection outcomes. **(C)**  
511 Departing from the Baseline scenario, there is now homophily in group contact rates, rather than  
512 uniform contact across the groups. **(D)** Departing from the Baseline scenario, there are now both  
513 differential underlying health conditions and homophily.

514



515



516

517

518

519


520

521

522


523

**Fig 4. Varying between-group transmissibility.** The effect of the difference of the between-group transmission rate (relative to the transmission rate in the Safer group) on epidemic curves when the transmission rate in the Dangerous group is 20 times that in the Safer group and each group makes up half the total population. Current prevalence in shown by color in panel (A) with panels (B-D) showing the epidemic curve for the parameter values indicated.



524

525 **Fig 5. Varying relative group size.** The effect of the relative sizes of Dangerous and Safer  
526 groups on epidemic curves. Current prevalence is shown by color in panel (A) with panels (B-D)  
527 showing the epidemic curve for the parameter values indicated.  
528  
529



530  
531 **Fig 6. Differential observability.** Observed incidence curves with high in-group homophily such  
532 that mixing across groups is lower than mixing within groups (equivalent to Figure 3c above) but  
533 also assuming that new cases of infection in individuals in the Dangerous group are only 60% as  
534 likely to be tested (and therefore reported) as individuals in the Safer group. While the infection  
535 dynamics are not altered by the observability of the cases, the surveillance curves are.  
536  
537

538

<b>Table 1. Values used in the Baseline Model presented in the main text. (For sensitivity of disease dynamics to these choices, see Supplementary Materials.)</b>		
<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Meaning</b>	<b>Value Used</b>
$\beta_{x,y}$	Composite probability of contact and transmission between individuals in groups x and y	$\beta_{x,x} = 0.001$ $\beta_{x,y} = 20 \cdot \beta_{x,x}$ $\beta_{x,y} = \beta_{y,x} = \begin{cases} \beta_{x,x} & \text{under Baseline} \\ 0.01 \cdot \beta_{x,x} & \text{under Homophily} \end{cases}$ Where here, x is the Safer group and y is the Dangerous group
$\eta_x$	The rate of developing symptoms after catching the disease	$\eta_x = \eta_y = 1/14$
$\gamma_x$	The rate of recovery from infection	$\gamma_x = \gamma_y = 1/10$
$\omega_x$	The rate of death from infection	$\omega_x = \omega_y = 1/1000$
<b>States</b>	<b>Initial Condition</b>	<b>Value Used</b>
$S_x$	$S_x = S_y$	499
$I_x$	$I_x = I_y$	1
$E, R, \text{ and } D$	$E_x = E_y, R_x = R_y, \text{ and } D_x = D_y$	0

539  
540