

1 **SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Potential and Policy Changes in South Carolina, February**  
2 **2020 – January 2021**

3 Margaret R. Davies, MPH†; Xinyi Hua, MPH†; Terrence D. Jacobs, MPH; Gabi I. Wiggill; Po-  
4 Ying Lai, MS; Zhanwei Du, PhD; Swati DebRoy, PhD; Sara Wagner Robb, PhD; Gerardo  
5 Chowell, PhD; Isaac Chun Hai Fung, PhD\*

6 Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Environmental Health Sciences, Jiann-Ping Hsu  
7 College of Public Health, Georgia Southern University (M. R. Davies, X. Hua, T. D. Jacobs,  
8 Gabi I. Wiggill, I.C.H. Fung); Department of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Boston  
9 University (P.Y. Lai); Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, LKS  
10 Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong (Z. Du); School of Science and  
11 Mathematics, University of South Carolina Beaufort (S. DebRoy); Department of Public Health  
12 Sciences, Clemson University (S. Wagner Robb); Department of Population Health Sciences,  
13 School of Public Health, Georgia State University (G. Chowell)

14  
15 Corresponding author: Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, PhD. Email: cfung@georgiasouthern.edu

16  
17 † MRD and XH contributed equally and they are co-first authors.

18  
19 Author contributions: Conceptualization: MRD, XH, ICHF; Data analysis: MRD, XH; Literature  
20 review: MRD, XH, TDJ, GIW; Map creation: PYL; Writing the first draft of the manuscript:  
21 MRD; Major revision of the manuscript: XH, ICHF; Manuscript Editing: ZD, SD, SWR, GC,  
22 ICHF; Mentoring student authors: ICHF.

23  
24 Conflict of interest: No conflicts of interest are declared.

25 Funding statement: No external funding was provided.

26 Acknowledgement: The authors thank Prof. Anne C. Spaulding for her review of an earlier draft  
27 of the manuscript and for her helpful suggestions.

28  
29 Number of figures and tables: 4 figures and 2 tables in the main text. 5 supplemental figures and  
30 2 supplemental tables in the supplementary materials.

31  
32 Word count: 4190

33  
34 List of abbreviations:

35 COVID-19 Coronavirus disease 2019

36 NPIs Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions

37  $R_0$  Basic reproduction number

38  $R_t$  Time-varying reproduction number

39 SARS-CoV-2 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2

40 SoE State of Emergency

41

42 **Abstract (n = 200; max. 200 words)**

43

44 *Introduction:* We aimed to examine how public health policies influenced the dynamics of  
45 COVID-19 time-varying reproductive number ( $R_t$ ) in South Carolina from February 26, 2020 to  
46 January 1, 2021.

47

48 *Methods:* COVID-19 case series (March 6, 2020 - January 10, 2021) were shifted by 9 days to  
49 approximate the infection date. We analyzed the effects of state and county policies on  $R_t$  using  
50 EpiEstim. We performed linear regression to evaluate if per-capita cumulative case count varies  
51 across counties with different population size.

52

53 *Results:*  $R_t$  shifted from 2-3 in March to  $<1$  during April and May.  $R_t$  rose over the summer and  
54 stayed between 1.4 and 0.7. The introduction of statewide mask mandates was associated with a  
55 decline in  $R_t$  (-15.3%; 95% CrI, -13.6%, -16.8%), and school re-opening, an increase by 12.3%  
56 (95% CrI, 10.1%, 14.4%). Less densely populated counties had higher attack rate ( $p < 0.0001$ ).

57

58 *Conclusion:* The  $R_t$  dynamics over time indicated that public health interventions substantially  
59 slowed COVID-19 transmission in South Carolina, while their relaxation may have promoted  
60 further transmission. Policies encouraging people to stay home, such as closing non-essential  
61 businesses, were associated with  $R_t$  reduction, while policies that encouraged more movement,  
62 such as re-opening schools, were associated with  $R_t$  increase.

63

64 **Keywords:** COVID-19, epidemiology, non-pharmaceutical interventions, mask mandate,  
65 reproduction number

66 **Introduction**

67 In late December 2019, a novel virus was reported in Wuhan, China. By January 2020,  
68 this virus had been identified as severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-  
69 2), the causative agent of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19).<sup>1</sup> The disease was first reported  
70 in the United States in January 2020.<sup>2</sup>

71 With an estimated population of 5,190,705, South Carolina is in the southeastern United  
72 States, along the Atlantic coast, and shares borders with North Carolina and Georgia.<sup>3</sup> South  
73 Carolina reported the first case of COVID-19 in the state on March 6, 2020. On March 13, 2020,  
74 the Governor of South Carolina declared a State of Emergency.<sup>4</sup> By April 2, 2020, every county  
75 in South Carolina had reported at least one case. Here we report on cases through January 10,  
76 2021, by which point 361,254 cases had been reported, of whom 5,811 died.

77 Central to infectious disease epidemiology is the concept of the reproduction number ( $R_0$ )  
78 – the average number of secondary cases that a primary case can infect absent any public health  
79 intervention in a completely susceptible population.<sup>5</sup> Before the appearance of the highly  
80 transmissible Delta (B.1.617.2) variant, the  $R_0$  for COVID-19 was estimated to lie between 2.2,<sup>6</sup>  
81 and 4.4.<sup>7</sup> In contrast, the time-varying reproduction number ( $R_t$ ) describes the transmission  
82 potential at a given timepoint as behavior changes and as public health interventions are  
83 implemented.<sup>8</sup> This makes  $R_t$  a better measure of disease spread over time as populations put  
84 interventions into effect.<sup>9,10</sup> Public health policies regarding non-pharmaceutical interventions  
85 (NPIs) have been examined for their impact on the  $R_t$ .<sup>11</sup> South Carolina put various policies into  
86 place from March 16, 2020, through October 5, 2020, primarily in the form of executive orders.

87 The purpose of this paper is to examine the change in the transmission potential of  
88 SARS-CoV-2 in South Carolina over time, especially before and after state or county-level  
89 public health policy interventions were put in place. We report the associations of  $R_t$  with these  
90 policies.

91  
92 **Methods**

93  
94 This paper uses historic COVID-19 data from March 6, 2020 – January 10, 2021 from all  
95 46 counties of South Carolina. South Carolina’s Department of Health and Environmental  
96 Control divides the state into four regions: Upstate, Midlands, Pee Dee, and Low Country. A  
97 map of all counties in South Carolina by health region is provided in **Supplemental Figure 1**.  
98 Population by county is presented in **Supplemental Figure 2**. Cumulative case count and  
99 cumulative case count per 100,000 population, in April, August, October and December 2020 are  
100 presented in **Supplemental Figure 3**.

101 Information about policies enacted in South Carolina was obtained from Executive  
102 Orders published online by the government of South Carolina. County level policies were  
103 obtained from county health departments. Information about school openings was obtained from  
104 school district websites, and in cases where schools had staggered openings (for example middle  
105 schools starting before high schools), the earlier date was used. Detailed information on these  
106 policies including the date of the implementation and relaxation of public health interventions is  
107 presented in **Table 1**.

108  
109 *Data acquisition*

110

111 From the New York Times GitHub repository,<sup>12</sup> we downloaded the cumulative  
112 confirmed COVID-19 case count from March 6, 2020 - January 10, 2021. Data for the daily  
113 incidence were cleaned at the county level to eliminate any dates with negative incidence  
114 (**Appendix A**). We selected a starting point of March 6, 2020 since the first case in South  
115 Carolina was reported on this date and a cutoff date of January 10, 2021 for all analyses. A nine-  
116 day backward shift was used to estimate the date of infection, accounting for a 6-day incubation  
117 period and a 3-day delay in testing. The error of this simple approach is considered tolerable if  
118 the delay to observation is not highly variable and if the mean delay is known.<sup>8</sup> This translated  
119 into the assumed date of infection from February 26, 2020 to January 1, 2021. Our choice of the  
120 cut-off point allowed us to complete the time series by the end of winter holiday season  
121 (Christmas to New Year). A sensitivity analysis was conducted using a lower boundary of 4 days  
122 and an upper boundary of 15 days based on incubation data reported by McAloon et al.,<sup>13</sup> and  
123 CDC reports on testing delays.<sup>14</sup> We assessed the 2019 county-level population data for South  
124 Carolina from the U.S. Census Bureau<sup>15</sup> and examined the power-law relationship between  
125 cumulative case count and population size through linear regression between the log<sub>10</sub>-  
126 transformed per capita cumulative case number and log<sub>10</sub>-transformed population size for each  
127 county.

### 128 129 *Statistical Analysis*

130  
131 To calculate  $R_t$ , we used the instantaneous reproduction number method in the R package  
132 *EpiEstim* with the parametric option. This measure of the  $R_t$  was defined by Cori et al.<sup>16</sup> as the  
133 ratio between  $I_t$ , the number of incident cases at the time  $t$ , and the total infectiousness of all  
134 infected individuals at the time  $t$ . This  $R_t$  was used to describe the burden of COVID-19 at a state  
135 level and throughout certain counties.

136 The  $R_t$  is presented in two ways in this paper. The first way is to take the average of the  
137 daily  $R_t$  estimates over a 7-day sliding window. The second way is to take the average of the  
138 daily  $R_t$  estimates over a non-overlapping time window between two time points of policy  
139 changes (hereafter, known as policy change  $R_t$  in this paper).

140 The policy change  $R_t$  was used to establish associations with policies. We calculated the  
141 percentage change for the policy change  $R_t$  for South Carolina (**Supplemental Table 1**), using  
142 the median policy change  $R_t$  estimate at each policy interval. For instance, the median policy  
143 change  $R_t$  estimate at each policy interval will be compared to the previous policy interval, as in  
144  $100\% \times (t_2 - t_1) / t_1$ . We utilized *EpiEstim sample from the posterior R distribution* function to obtain  
145 a sample of 1000 estimates of  $R_t$  for each  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  then estimate the credible intervals (2.5 and  
146 97.5 percentile) of the percentage change. We also calculated the percentage change of the policy  
147 change  $R_t$  for Beaufort, Calhoun, Charleston, Colleton, Georgetown, Oconee, Orangeburg,  
148 Richland, and Williamsburg counties in South Carolina (**Supplemental Table 2**). These nine  
149 counties were selected because they are the only counties with an active mask ordinance during  
150 the study period.

151 We characterized the power-law relationship between the county-level cumulative  
152 number of COVID-19 cases and population size, following  $C \sim N^g$  ( $C$ , cumulative case count;  $N$ ,  
153 population size;  $g$ , exponent).<sup>17</sup> We performed linear regression analysis between the log<sub>10</sub>-  
154 transformed per capita cumulative case count and the log<sub>10</sub>-transformed population size, i.e.,  
155  $\log_{10}(C/N) = m \log_{10}(N)$  where  $m = g - 1$ .<sup>17-19</sup> We computed linear regression between the log<sub>10</sub>-

156 transformed per capita cumulative case count and the log<sub>10</sub>-transformed population size, at four  
157 different dates: June 30<sup>th</sup>, August 31<sup>st</sup>, October 31<sup>st</sup>, and December 31<sup>st</sup>.

158 When per capita cumulative case count is proportional to population size, then there was  
159 no heterogeneity of per capita cumulative case count across geographic units (counties) of  
160 different population sizes (i.e., when  $m=0$  and thus  $g=1$ ). Geographical units with lower  
161 population sizes would have a higher per capita cumulative case count if  $m<0$  (i.e.,  $g<1$ ) and  
162 those with lower population sizes would have a lower per capita cumulative case count if  $m>0$   
163 (i.e.,  $g>1$ ).<sup>18,19</sup> See **Appendix B** for details.

164 Statistical analysis was performed using R 4.0.3 (R Core Team, R Foundation for  
165 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). **Supplemental Figures 1, 2 and 3** were created using R  
166 3.5.1 (R Core Team, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

### 167 168 *Ethics*

169 The Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board made a non-human subject  
170 determination for this project (H20364) under the G8 exemption category according to the Code  
171 of Federal Regulations Title 45 Part 46.

### 172 173 174 **Results**

#### 175 176 *State Level - General*

177 The daily new case count rose at the beginning of June 2020, and the peak of the first  
178 wave of cases arrived by mid-July. Case counts then started falling but remained higher than the  
179 beginning of the pandemic. By late September, case count rose again, and continued to rise  
180 through the end of the study period. Several days were reported with 0 cases, as data was not  
181 reported on federal holidays (Thanksgiving, Christmas Day, and New Year's Day). **Figure 1**  
182 displays daily incident case count, 7-day sliding window  $R_t$ , and the policy change  $R_t$ , all right-  
183 adjusted for nine days at the state level. The 7-day sliding window  $R_t$  throughout the state  
184 fluctuated between 2 and 3 in early March, and decreased to  $<1$  during parts of April and May  
185 2020. Over the summer, the  $R_t$  rose and continued to fluctuate between 0.7 and 1.4 throughout  
186 the state. At the end of the study period, the  $R_t$  was still above 1.0 indicating continued spread of  
187 the virus.

#### 188 189 *Policy Impacts – State Level*

190  
191  $R_t$  fluctuated with policy changes at the state level. The  $R_t$  presented in this section refers  
192 to the policy change  $R_t$ . (**Figure 1**: lower panel, **Supplemental Table 1**). Prior to the  
193 introduction of any policies, the  $R_t$  was 1.991 (95% credible interval, CrI, 1.787, 2.21). The first  
194 policy introduced was the closure of schools on March 16<sup>th</sup>.<sup>20</sup> Between the closure of schools and  
195 the closure of non-essential businesses, the  $R_t$  was 1.285 (95% CrI, 1.24, 1.33), a decrease of  
196 35.59% (95% CrI, 27.9%, 42.7%).

197 The closure of non-essential businesses was ordered on April 3,<sup>21</sup> indicated by the label  
198 'N' in **Figure 1**.  $R_t$  dropped to 1.028 (95% CrI, 1.01, 1.05), a decrease of 20.01% (95% CrI,  
199 18.8%, 21.1%), although the policy window was short. Some non-essential businesses were  
200 allowed to begin re-opening on May 22, following the issue of Executive Order 37.<sup>22</sup> The  $R_t$

201 associated with this timeframe was 1.05 (95% CrI, 1.04, 1.06), a statistically insignificant  
202 increase of 2.07% (95% CrI, -0.217 %, 4.2%).

203 The next Executive Order we examined was passed on August 2, 2020 mandating masks  
204 in government building, restaurants, and large venues.<sup>23</sup> This was associated with the first  
205 occurrence of  $R_t$  dropping below 1.0 in our policy examination. During this timeframe, the  $R_t$   
206 was 0.889 (95% CrI, 0.873, 0.905), a decrease of 15.3% (95% CrI, 13.6%, 16.8%).

207 Our proxy date for school openings was August 17, 2020. This was based on the earliest  
208 reported dates for school openings. The  $R_t$  rose following this date to 0.998 (95% CrI, 0.989,  
209 1.01), an increase of 12.3% (95% CrI, 10.1%, 14.4%). The final policy in this analysis was  
210 enacted on October 2, allowing restaurants to reopen for indoor dining and lifting capacity  
211 limits.<sup>24</sup> This was followed by an increase in  $R_t$  to 1.098 (95% CrI, 1.09, 1.1), increasing by  
212 9.994% (95% CrI, 9.47%, 10.5%). This indicated sustained transmission of COVID-19 in South  
213 Carolina.

214 Sensitivity analysis was conducted to examine the effect of the assumption of the time  
215 lag. A 15-day time lag (**Supplemental Figure 4**) and a 4-day time lag (**Supplemental Figure 5**)  
216 were applied to the time series of the state-level case count data and no major differences  
217 between the main results and the lagged results were observed.

218  
219

#### 220 *Mask Mandates – County Level*

221

222 The wearing of masks has been advised for the general public since early April of 2020.<sup>25</sup>  
223 However, the requirement for face mask wearing was left up to each state, likely due to the  
224 federal polity of the U.S. and the political atmosphere in 2020.<sup>26</sup> For the purposes of this paper a  
225 “mask mandate” is any order given by authority for residents of a certain area to wear a mask or  
226 face covering while in specified locations. In South Carolina, the first Executive Order to  
227 mandate masks was issued on August 3, 2020.<sup>20</sup> This Order only mandated masks in government  
228 buildings, restaurants, and large venues.

229 Several counties (Beaufort, Charleston, Georgetown, Orangeburg, Richland, and  
230 Williamsburg) issued their own mask mandates before the state. Three counties (Calhoun,  
231 Colleton, and Oconee) issued a mask mandate after the statewide order was passed. We showed  
232 the policy change  $R_t$  for these counties in **Figure 2** and **Figure 3**. These nine counties were the  
233 only counties with an active mask ordinance during the study period (**Supplemental Table 2**).

234 The first counties we examined were those that passed the county-level mask ordinance  
235 before the state mandate. Beaufort county passed its ordinance on July 3<sup>rd</sup> 2020.<sup>27</sup> The  $R_t$   
236 decreased from 1.2283 (95% CrI, 1.17, 1.29) to 0.9856 (95% CrI, 0.946, 1.027), a decrease of  
237 19.76% (95% CrI, 16.7%, 22.9%). Charleston county passed its first mask ordinance on July 1<sup>st</sup>,  
238 2020.<sup>28</sup> After the county ordinance passed, the  $R_t$  dropped from 1.2526 (95% CrI, 1.22, 1.28) to  
239 0.8774 (95% CrI, 0.855, 0.90), decreasing by 29.95% (95% CrI, 29.9%, 30.0%). Georgetown  
240 County’s mask ordinance passed on July 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2020.<sup>29</sup> The  $R_t$  decreased to 0.9596 (95% CrI,  
241 0.891, 1.032) from 1.1980 (95% CrI, 1.11, 1.29), a decrease of 19.89% (95% CrI, 12.8%,  
242 26.5%). Orangeburg County passed its Face Mask Ordinance on July 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2020,<sup>30</sup> and its  $R_t$   
243 estimates decreased from 1.2002 (95% CrI, 1.13, 1.28) to 0.9585 (95% CrI, 0.908, 1.011) with a  
244 decrease of 20.16% (95% CrI, 13.5%, 26.7%). Richland County passed its Face Mask Ordinance  
245 on July 6<sup>th</sup>, 2020,<sup>31</sup> and its  $R_t$  estimates decreased from 1.1729 (95% CrI, 1.14, 1.21) to 0.9529  
246 (95% CrI, 0.922, 0.984), a decrease of 18.76% (95% CrI, 18.7%, 18.8%). Finally, Williamsburg

247 County's  $R_t$  decreased after the introduction of their mask mandate on July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2020,<sup>32</sup> from  
248 1.1342 (95% CrI, 1.02, 1.26) to 1.0013 (95% CrI, 0.912, 1.069), a decrease of 11.75% (95% CrI,  
249 1.1%, 21.4%).

250 Calhoun, Colleton, and Oconee counties had their county level mask mandates passed  
251 after the August 3<sup>rd</sup> state mask mandate (**Figure 3**, top panel). Among them, Oconee County  
252 passed a county-level mask ordinances on August 18<sup>th</sup> before the school re-opening.<sup>33</sup> After the  
253 county-level mandate passed, the  $R_t$  further decreased from 1.0591 (95% CrI, 0.901, 1.235) to  
254 1.0259 (95% CrI, 0.89, 1.17), a decrease of 3.16% (95% CrI, 1.21%, 4.91%). However, Calhoun  
255 County and Colleton County passed their county-level face mask ordinances much later than the  
256 state level mask mandate and months after the schools reopened in the Fall. Colleton County  
257 passed the county-level face mask ordinances on November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2020,<sup>34</sup> and the  $R_t$  increased by  
258 9.0% (95% CrI: -0.719%, 19.01%) from 1.0353 (95% CrI: 0.943, 1.133) to 1.1287 (95% CrI:  
259 1.05, 1.21), but the increase was statistically insignificant. Lastly Calhoun County passed their  
260 county-level face mask ordinances on December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2020,<sup>35</sup> and the  $R_t$  increased from 1.0737  
261 (95% CrI: 0.965, 1.19) to 1.101 (95% CrI: 0.941, 1.278), but the increase of 2.82% (95% CrI, -  
262 12.8%, 22.0%) was statistically insignificant.

### 263 264 *School Openings*

265  
266 School openings were examined in both **Figures 1, 2 and 3**. In **Figure 1**, school re-  
267 opening is indicted by label 'S', where we used a proxy date of August 17<sup>th</sup>, the earliest reported  
268 school opening date across the state. It is important to note that these school openings are based  
269 on K through 12 schools' starting dates and not college starting dates. Some schools reopened in  
270 a staggered way by grade. Following school openings, the  $R_t$  in South Carolina rose by 12.3%  
271 (95% CrI, 10.1%, 14.4%) from 0.889 (95% CrI, 0.873, 0.91) to 0.998 (95% CrI, 0.989, 1.01).

272 At the county level (**Figures 2 and 3**),  $R_t$  increased when schools were re-opened in most  
273 counties. In Beaufort County, the increase was 22.57% (95% CrI, 16.7%, 27.7%) from 0.8903  
274 (95% CrI, 0.839, 0.944) to 1.0916 (95% CrI, 1.06, 1.12). Calhoun County's  $R_t$  increased from  
275 0.6857 (95% CrI, 0.461, 0.974) to 1.0737 (95% CrI, 0.965, 1.19), an increase of 56.29% (95%  
276 CrI, 9.66%, 127.21%). In Charleston County, the  $R_t$  rose by 13.03% (95% CrI, 10.9%, 15.1%)  
277 from 0.9621 (95% CrI, 0.927, 0.998) to 1.0878 (95% CrI, 1.07, 1.11). The Colleton County  $R_t$   
278 increased by 17.77% (95% CrI, -1.33%, 38.12%) from 0.8782 (95% CrI, 0.74, 1.03) to 1.0353  
279 (95% CrI, 0.943, 1.133), but the increase was statistically insignificant. The  $R_t$  in Georgetown  
280 County rose from 0.8468 (95% CrI, 0.762, 0.937) to 1.1016 (95% CrI, 1.06, 1.14), increasing by  
281 29.9% (95% CrI, 15.6%, 45.1%).

282 Oconee County had a statistically insignificant increase of 4.25% (95% CrI, -9.85%,  
283 20.29%) in  $R_t$  from 1.0259 (95% CrI, 0.89, 1.17) to 1.0710 (95% CrI, 1.04, 1.11). Orangeburg  
284 County had an increase in  $R_t$  from 0.8447 (95% CrI, 0.763, 0.932) to 1.0972 (95% CrI, 1.06,  
285 1.14), an increase of 29.67% (95% CrI, 16.0%, 44.1%). In Richland County, the  $R_t$  increased  
286 slightly from 1.0434 (95% CrI, 1.01, 1.08) to 1.0439 (95% CrI, 1.03, 1.06), but the increase of  
287 0.016% (95% CrI, -1.78%, 1.79%) was statistically insignificant. Williamsburg County's  $R_t$   
288 increased to 1.1264 (95% CrI: 1.07, 1.19) from 0.8692 (95% CrI: 0.767, 0.98), an increase of  
289 29.54% (95% CrI: 12.4%, 48.3%).

### 290 291 *Power-law Relationship between Cumulative Case Number and Population Size*

292

293 **Figure 4** presents the linear regression models between the  $\log_{10}$ -transformed per capita  
294 cumulative case number and the  $\log_{10}$ -transformed population size for a total of 46 counties in  
295 South Carolina at four different dates of report, June 30<sup>th</sup>, August 31<sup>st</sup>, October 31<sup>st</sup>, and  
296 December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2020, respectively. Each regression line represents a specific assessed date (date  
297 of report); and the slopes,  $m$ , of four regression lines were calculated and documented in **Table**  
298 **2**. Slopes of four regression lines were negative ( $m < 0$ ) and statistically significant ( $m = -2.0236$ ,  
299  $-1.2164$ ,  $-1.0220$ ,  $-1.0577$ ;  $p < 0.0001$  respectively). A negative slope suggests that counties with  
300 lower population sizes (i.e., rural counties) would have a higher per capita cumulative case  
301 count. This result suggests the existence of potential health disparities between urban and rural  
302 counties.

## 303 **Discussion**

304 This paper examined the associations between SARS-CoV-2  $R_t$  and public health policy  
305 changes throughout South Carolina from February 2020 to January 2021. We specifically  
306 examined the impacts of mask mandates at a county level and the resumption of in-person school  
307 activities (**Figures 2 and 3**). We found that mask mandates were frequently associated with a  
308 decrease in  $R_t$  while school re-openings were frequently associated with an increase in  $R_t$ .

309 We found that in Beaufort, Charleston, Georgetown, Oconee, Orangeburg, Richland, and  
310 Williamsburg counties, where a mask mandate was introduced at the county level prior to the  
311 state level mandate, a decrease in  $R_t$  was associated with the introduction of the policy. This  
312 suggested that county-level facemask mandate did have its utility in dampening SARS-CoV-2  
313 transmission. In Oconee County, the state-level facemask mandate happened before the county-  
314 level facemask mandate. The county-level mandate apparently led to a slight further decrease in  
315  $R_t$ .

316 In two counties, Calhoun and Colleton, the introduction of a county-level mask mandate  
317 happened late in 2020, after the introduction of the state-level mask mandate and the re-opening  
318 of schools. In both cases,  $R_t$  dropped below 1 after the state mask mandate but increased to levels  
319 above 1 after schools reopened. Our results suggest that the county-level mandates were  
320 introduced too late to have a significant impact on  $R_t$ . The increased  $R_t$  after the county-level  
321 mask mandate should be interpreted as a continuation of an increase in  $R_t$  despite the county-  
322 level mask mandate. Additionally, by late 2020 adherence fatigue<sup>36</sup> might also impact how well  
323 facemask mandates were followed.

324 We also examined school re-openings in counties that had county level mask mandates in  
325 place (**Figures 2 and 3**). In these counties, the  $R_t$  fell when the county mask mandate was put in  
326 place. In most places the  $R_t$  lowered again when the state mandate was put into place, although in  
327 Charleston and Richland counties the  $R_t$  did rise after the state mandate. This may be due to  
328 adherence fatigue<sup>37</sup> in the summer months. Richland county includes Columbia, the state capital.  
329 Columbia is highly populated and is the site of the University of South Carolina main campus.  
330 Case counts here might be impacted by the university opening (such as student parties that  
331 turned out to be super-spreading events).<sup>38</sup> Charleston is a tourist destination, so potentially an  
332 increase in late summer tourism could have driven the  $R_t$  higher despite the statewide mask  
333 mandate, especially as the mandate only required masks in government buildings, restaurants, or  
334 large venues. Similar observations can be said of Beaufort County, where the tourist destination  
335 Hilton Head Island is located. While the county's and state's mask mandates were associated  
336 with  $R_t$  decreasing to below 1 in Beaufort,  $R_t$  increased after school re-opening in September.  
337  
338



339 Other literature supports the notion that mask mandates may slow the transmission of  
340 SARS-CoV-2.<sup>39</sup> Hua et al. found that a mask mandate was associated with a decrease in  $R_t$  by  
341 27% in North Dakota, by 16% in Montana and by 13% in Wyoming.<sup>40</sup> Politis et al. found  
342 facemask mandate was associated with a decrease in  $R_t$  by 11% and 6%, respectively, in  
343 Arkansas and Kentucky.<sup>10</sup> Thus, our findings in South Carolina are consistent with findings in  
344 other states that a mask mandate was associated with slowing epidemic growth.

345 The role of school re-openings in COVID-19 transmission has been examined as  
346 well.<sup>37,41-44</sup> A high school in Israel reported a COVID-19 outbreak shortly after a school  
347 reopened in May 2020.<sup>42</sup> Another study modeled school re-opening, and found that reduction in  
348 capacity and mask wearing could reduce community transmission, whereas higher capacity and  
349 non-adherence to mask wearing could drive COVID-19 spread in the school's community.<sup>44</sup>  
350 According to our analyses (**Figures 2 and 3**), the percentage changes of policy change  $R_t$   
351 estimates increased in eight of nine selected counties, except Richland County. This observation  
352 echoes existing studies that school re-openings have the potential to spread COVID-19 in the  
353 local communities.<sup>37,42-44</sup> Similar to our findings, Hua et al. found an increase in  $R_t$  in Idaho  
354 (13%), Montana (21%), South Dakota (12%) and Wyoming (20%) after school reopened on  
355 September 7, 2020; however, the same study found a decrease in  $R_t$  by 8% in North Dakota after  
356 school re-opening on the same date.<sup>40</sup> Politis et al. found that after school reopened,  $R_t$  increased  
357 by 12% and 9% in Arkansas and Kentucky, respectively.<sup>10</sup> Thus, our findings in South Carolina  
358 are consistent with findings in other states in general, that school re-opening in August and  
359 September 2020 was associated with increased SARS-CoV-2 transmission as evidenced in an  
360 increase in  $R_t$ .

361 In addition, rural counties in South Carolina were found to have a higher per capita  
362 cumulative case count at four different assessed dates in 2020. This result suggests that rural  
363 counties bore a higher disease burden than urban counties. Future research may investigate the  
364 cause and related factors of such health disparities.

365 The focus of this study was on public health and social policy involving mandates of  
366 NPIs. Our study period ended in early 2021 before the vaccination campaign could make an  
367 impact to slow SARS-CoV-2 transmission in South Carolina. Future research may study whether  
368 certain highly transmissible variants of concern may trigger COVID-19 resurgence.<sup>45</sup> While this  
369 is out of scope for this study, further research into the effect of policy mandates that target  
370 special populations such as residents of long-term care facilities and their caretakers may be  
371 conducted.<sup>46</sup>

372

### 373 *Limitations*

374 There are a number of limitations in this study. First, this analysis was based on  
375 aggregate data reported by the surveillance system of COVID-19 in South Carolina. The data  
376 was arranged by date of report. Even though we shifted the date backward by 9 days to  
377 approximate the date of infection, this remained an estimation. Second, date of report is affected  
378 by holidays, on which days cases were not reported. Third, the effects of viral variants on  
379 transmission potential<sup>45</sup> cannot be shown in this study. The first two cases of the Beta (B.1.351)  
380 variant in the U.S. were detected in South Carolina after the study period ended,<sup>47</sup> so this may  
381 not be a severe limitation. Fourth, while re-opening of schools was staggered by grade in South  
382 Carolina, we lumped the re-openings together as we chose the first date of the re-opening as the  
383 date of policy change. However, for the county-level policy change analysis, we had specific  
384 school re-opening dates for all nine selected counties (**Figures 2 and 3**). And finally, we do not

385 examine the impact of vaccinations on the transmission potential in South Carolina; however,  
386 our study period ended by January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2021 (date of report), by which point there were minimal  
387 numbers of people fully vaccinated.

388 Although we examined the impact of policy mandates, we did not examine the extent to  
389 which these policies were adhered on the ground. Behavioral variation in some places might  
390 impact the effectiveness of policies. However, as we attempted to examine the real-world effects  
391 of interventions on COVID-19 transmission potential, this would not be a serious limitation to  
392 the paper.

393

### 394 *Conclusions*

395 The pandemic affected South Carolina starting with the first cases confirmed in early  
396 March 2020, and data suggest ongoing transmission from late February 2020 through the end of  
397 the study period (the beginning of 2021). Our findings suggest that public health policies that  
398 encourage the adoption of NPIs, such as mask mandates, were found to be associated with a  
399 decrease in  $R_t$ . In contrast, policies that encouraged more social interaction and population  
400 movement, such as re-opening schools for in-person instruction, were typically followed by an  
401 increase in  $R_t$ . In general, mask mandates appeared to work better in counties that implemented it  
402 early on than those that implemented it after the incidence trajectory had risen to a high level.  
403 Our paper provided a state and county-level analysis that could support evidence-based decision-  
404 making in the adoption of NPIs at the population level against COVID-19. Our findings could  
405 prove useful for shaping future outbreak responses.

406

### 407 **References**

- 408 1. Allam Z. The first 50 days of COVID-19: A detailed chronological timeline and extensive review of  
409 literature documenting the pandemic. In: *Surveying The Covid-19 Pandemic and Its Implications*.  
410 Elsevier; 2020:1-7.
- 411 2. Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, et al. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United  
412 States. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(10):929-936.
- 413 3. U.S. Census Bureau. QuickFacts: South Carolina <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/SC>.  
414 Published 2021. Accessed February 27, 2022.
- 415 4. South Carolina Office of the Governor. Executive Order No. 2020-08.  
416 [https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Executive-Orders/2020-03-13%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-08%20-%20State%20of%20Emergency%20Due%20to%20Coronavirus%20\(COVID-19\).pdf](https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Executive-Orders/2020-03-13%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-08%20-%20State%20of%20Emergency%20Due%20to%20Coronavirus%20(COVID-19).pdf).  
417 Published 2020. Accessed April 10, 2021.
- 418 5. Vynnycky E, White RG. *An Introduction to Infectious Disease Modelling*. Oxford University Press;  
419 2010.
- 420 6. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus-  
421 Infected Pneumonia. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(13):1199-1207.
- 422 7. Muniz-Rodriguez K, Fung IC, Ferdosi SR, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus  
423 2 Transmission Potential, Iran, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(8):1915-1917.
- 424 8. Gostic KM, McGough L, Baskerville EB, et al. Practical considerations for measuring the effective  
425 reproductive number,  $R_t$ . *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2020;16(12):e1008409.
- 426 9. Fung IC-H, Hung Y, Ofori SK, Muniz-Rodriguez K, Lai P-Y, Chowell G. SARS-CoV-2  
427 transmission in Alberta, British Columbia, and Ontario, Canada, December 25, 2019 - December  
428 1, 2020. *Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness*. 2021:1 - 27.
- 429 10. Politis MD, Hua X, Ogwara CA, et al. Spatially refined time-varying reproduction numbers of  
430 SARS-CoV-2 in Arkansas and Kentucky and their relationship to population size and public health  
431 policy, March - November 2020. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2022;68:37-44.
- 432
- 433

- 434 11. You L, Harry C, Durga K, et al. The temporal association of introducing and lifting non-  
435 pharmaceutical interventions with the time-varying reproduction number (R) of SARS-CoV-2: a  
436 modelling study across 131 countries. *Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020;21:193-202.  
437 12. New York Times/covid-19 data. <https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data> Published 2021.  
438 Accessed January 11, 2021.  
439 13. McAloon C, Collins Á, Hunt K, et al. Incubation period of COVID-19: a rapid systematic review  
440 and meta-analysis of observational research. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(8):e039652.  
441 14. Centers for Disease Control. COVID-19 Pandemic Planning Scenarios.  
442 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios.html>. Published 2020.  
443 Accessed 3/10/2021, 2021.  
444 15. U.S. Census Bureau. QuickFacts South Carolina. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/SC>.  
445 Published 2019. Accessed 2021.  
446 16. Cori A, Ferguson NM, Fraser C, Cauchemez S. A new framework and software to estimate time-  
447 varying reproduction numbers during epidemics. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2013;178(9):1505-1512.  
448 17. Chowell G, Bettencourt LM, Johnson N, Alonso WJ, Viboud C. The 1918-1919 influenza  
449 pandemic in England and Wales: spatial patterns in transmissibility and mortality impact. *Proc*  
450 *Biol Sci*. 2008;275(1634):501-509.  
451 18. Fung IC-H, Zhou X, Cheung C-N, et al. Assessing Early Heterogeneity in Doubling Times of the  
452 COVID-19 Epidemic across Prefectures in Mainland China, January–February, 2020.  
453 *Epidemiologia*. 2021;2(1):95-113.  
454 19. Ogwara CA, Mallhi AK, Hua X, et al. Spatially refined time-varying reproduction numbers of  
455 COVID-19 by health district in Georgia, USA, March - December, 2020. *Epidemiologia*.  
456 2021;2(2):179-197.  
457 20. South Carolina Office of the Governor. Executive Order No. 2020-09.  
458 [https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Executive-Orders/2020-03-  
459 15%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-  
460 09%20-%20Closing%20Schools%20Cancelling%20Elections%20Other%20Provisions%20Due%  
461 20to%20COVID-19.pdf](https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Executive-Orders/2020-03-15%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-09%20-%20Closing%20Schools%20Cancelling%20Elections%20Other%20Provisions%20Due%20to%20COVID-19.pdf). Published 2020. Accessed April 10, 2021.  
462 21. South Carolina Office of the Governor. Executive Order No. 2020-18.  
463 [https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Images/2021-04-  
464 07%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202021-  
465 18%20-%20State%20of%20Emergency.pdf](https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Images/2021-04-07%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202021-18%20-%20State%20of%20Emergency.pdf). Published 2020. Accessed April 10, 2021.  
466 22. South Carolina Office of the Governor. Executive Order No. 2020-37.  
467 [https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/2020-05-  
468 21%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-  
469 37%20-%20Additional%20Incremental%20Modification%20of%20Non-  
470 Essential%20Business%20Closures.pdf](https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/2020-05-21%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-37%20-%20Additional%20Incremental%20Modification%20of%20Non-Essential%20Business%20Closures.pdf). Published 2020. Accessed April 10, 2021.  
471 23. South Carolina Office of the Governor. Executive Order No. 2020-50.  
472 [https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Executive-Orders/2020-08-  
473 02%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-  
474 50%20-%20Initiating%20Additional%20Emergency%20Measures%20%26%20Consolidating%20  
475 Previous%20Orders.pdf](https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Executive-Orders/2020-08-02%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-50%20-%20Initiating%20Additional%20Emergency%20Measures%20%26%20Consolidating%20Previous%20Orders.pdf). Published 2020. Accessed April 10, 2021.  
476 24. South Carolina Office of the Governor. Executive Order No. 2020-63.  
477 [https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Executive-Orders/2020-10-  
478 02%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-  
479 63%20-%20Amending%20%26%20Consolidating%20Emergency%20Measures.pdf](https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Executive-Orders/2020-10-02%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-63%20-%20Amending%20%26%20Consolidating%20Emergency%20Measures.pdf). Published  
480 2020. Accessed April 10, 2021.  
481 25. Dwyer C, Aubrey A. CDC now recommends Americans consider wearing cloth face coverings in  
482 public. NPR. [https://www.npr.org/sections/coronavirus-live-  
483 updates/2020/04/03/826219824/president-trump-says-cdc-now-recommends-americans-wear-  
484 cloth-masks-in-public](https://www.npr.org/sections/coronavirus-live-updates/2020/04/03/826219824/president-trump-says-cdc-now-recommends-americans-wear-cloth-masks-in-public). Published 2020. Accessed.  
485 26. Balmford B, Annan JD, Hargreaves JC, Altoè M, Bateman IJ. Cross-Country Comparisons of  
486 Covid-19: Policy, Politics and the Price of Life. *Environmental and Resource Economics*.  
487 2020;76(4):525-551.

- 488 27. Beaufort County. Face masks to be required in unincorporated Beaufort County.  
489 [https://www.beaufortcountysc.gov/news/2020/07/face-masks-to-be-required-in-unincorporated-](https://www.beaufortcountysc.gov/news/2020/07/face-masks-to-be-required-in-unincorporated-beaufort-county.html)  
490 [beaufort-county.html](https://www.beaufortcountysc.gov/news/2020/07/face-masks-to-be-required-in-unincorporated-beaufort-county.html). Published 2020. Accessed April 12, 2021.
- 491 28. City of Charleston. City of Charleston Coronavirus Updates. [https://www.charleston-](https://www.charleston-sc.gov/2408/City-of-Charleston-Coronavirus-Updates)  
492 [sc.gov/2408/City-of-Charleston-Coronavirus-Updates](https://www.charleston-sc.gov/2408/City-of-Charleston-Coronavirus-Updates). Accessed April 12, 2021.
- 493 29. City of Georgetown South Carolina. Face Mask Ordinance. [https://georgetownsc.gov/face-mask-](https://georgetownsc.gov/face-mask-ordinance/)  
494 [ordinance/](https://georgetownsc.gov/face-mask-ordinance/). Published 2020. Accessed April 12, 2021.
- 495 30. City of Orangeburg South Carolina. City Face Mask Ordinance 6-30-20.  
496 [https://www.orangeburg.sc.us/sites/default/files/uploads/images/covid-19/2020-](https://www.orangeburg.sc.us/sites/default/files/uploads/images/covid-19/2020-04_city_face_mask_ordinance_6-30-20.pdf)  
497 [04\\_city\\_face\\_mask\\_ordinance\\_6-30-20.pdf](https://www.orangeburg.sc.us/sites/default/files/uploads/images/covid-19/2020-04_city_face_mask_ordinance_6-30-20.pdf). Published 2020. Accessed April 12, 2021.
- 498 31. Richland County South Carolina. Richland County Council Adopts Emergency COVID-19 Mask  
499 Ordinance [https://www.richlandcountysc.gov/Home/News/ArtMID/479/ArticleID/2054/Richland-](https://www.richlandcountysc.gov/Home/News/ArtMID/479/ArticleID/2054/Richland-County-Council-Adopts-Emergency-COVID-19-Mask-Ordinance)  
500 [County-Council-Adopts-Emergency-COVID-19-Mask-Ordinance](https://www.richlandcountysc.gov/Home/News/ArtMID/479/ArticleID/2054/Richland-County-Council-Adopts-Emergency-COVID-19-Mask-Ordinance). Published 2020. Accessed April  
501 12, 2021.
- 502 32. Laudenslager C. Williamsburg County passes mask ordinance  
503 <https://www.counton2.com/news/local-news/williamsburg-county-passes-mask-ordinance/>.  
504 Published 2020. Accessed April 12, 2021.
- 505 33. Oconee County South Carolina. State of South Carolina County of Oconee Ordinance 2020-  
506 14(E). <https://oconeelibrary.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2020/05/Ordinance-2020-14-E.pdf>.  
507 Published 2020. Accessed April 12, 2021.
- 508 34. Colleton County South Carolina. Emergency Ordinance No.20-O-11.  
509 [https://www.colletoncounty.org/Data/Sites/1/media/covid-19/20-o-11-mask-ordinance-november-](https://www.colletoncounty.org/Data/Sites/1/media/covid-19/20-o-11-mask-ordinance-november-10,-2020.pdf)  
510 [10,-2020.pdf](https://www.colletoncounty.org/Data/Sites/1/media/covid-19/20-o-11-mask-ordinance-november-10,-2020.pdf). Published 2020. Accessed April 12, 2021.
- 511 35. Harris B. Calhoun County approves face mask ordinance  
512 [https://thetandd.com/news/local/government-and-politics/calhoun-county-approves-face-mask-](https://thetandd.com/news/local/government-and-politics/calhoun-county-approves-face-mask-ordinance/article_80a5baf8-4e6f-5881-a4ca-761a8927d233.html)  
513 [ordinance/article\\_80a5baf8-4e6f-5881-a4ca-761a8927d233.html](https://thetandd.com/news/local/government-and-politics/calhoun-county-approves-face-mask-ordinance/article_80a5baf8-4e6f-5881-a4ca-761a8927d233.html). Published 2020. Accessed.
- 514 36. Rahmandad H, Lim TY, Sterman J. Behavioral dynamics of COVID-19: estimating  
515 underreporting, multiple waves, and adherence fatigue across 92 nations. *Syst Dyn Rev.*  
516 2021;37(1):5-31.
- 517 37. Fantini MP, Reno C, Biserni GB, Savoia E, Lanari M. COVID-19 and the re-opening of schools: a  
518 policy maker's dilemma. *Ital J Pediatr.* 2020;46(1):79.
- 519 38. S.C. College Bar Packed to the Gills...Not the Corona You Want.  
520 <https://www.tmg.com/2020/09/04/college-students-pack-bar-south-carolina-covid/>. Published  
521 2020. Accessed Aug 15, 2021.
- 522 39. Cheng VC-C, Wong S-C, Chuang VW-M, et al. The role of community-wide wearing of face mask  
523 for control of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) epidemic due to SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of*  
524 *Infection.* 2020;81(1):107-114.
- 525 40. Hua X, Kehoe. ARD, Tome J, et al. Late surges in COVID-19 cases and varying transmission  
526 potential partially due to public health policy changes in 5 Western states, March 10, 2020-  
527 January 10, 2021. *medRxiv.* 2021.
- 528 41. Kuehn BM. COVID-19 Rates Increased Where In-Person College Classes Were Held. *Journal of*  
529 *the American Medical Association.* 2021;325(8):714-714.
- 530 42. Stein-Zamir C, Abramson N, Shoob H, et al. A large COVID-19 outbreak in a high school 10 days  
531 after schools' reopening, Israel, May 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25(29):2001352.
- 532 43. Leeb RT, Price S, Sliwa S, et al. COVID-19 Trends Among School-Aged Children - United States,  
533 March 1-September 19, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(39):1410-1415.
- 534 44. España G, Cavany S, Oidtman R, et al. Impacts of K-12 school reopening on the COVID-19  
535 epidemic in Indiana, USA. *Epidemics.* 2021;37:100487.
- 536 45. Darby AC, Hiscox JA. Covid-19: variants and vaccination. *The BMJ.* 2021;372:n771.
- 537 46. Lai CC, Wang JH, Ko WC, et al. COVID-19 in long-term care facilities: An upcoming threat that  
538 cannot be ignored. *Journal of microbiology, immunology, and infection = Wei mian yu gan ran za*  
539 *zhi.* 2020;53(3):444-446.
- 540 47. Department of Health and Environmental Control. South Carolina Public Health Officials Detect  
541 Nation's First Known Cases of the COVID-19 Variant Originally Detected in South Africa.  
542 [https://scdhec.gov/news-releases/south-carolina-public-health-officials-detect-nations-first-known-](https://scdhec.gov/news-releases/south-carolina-public-health-officials-detect-nations-first-known-cases-covid-19)  
543 [cases-covid-19](https://scdhec.gov/news-releases/south-carolina-public-health-officials-detect-nations-first-known-cases-covid-19). Published 2021. Accessed April 2, 2021.

544 48. South Carolina Office of the Governor. Executive Order No.2020-14.  
545 [https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Executive-Orders/2020-03-](https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Executive-Orders/2020-03-27%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-14%20-%20Self-Quarantine%20for%20Individuals%20from%20High-Risk%20Areas.pdf)  
546 [27%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-14%20-%20Self-](https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Executive-Orders/2020-03-27%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-14%20-%20Self-Quarantine%20for%20Individuals%20from%20High-Risk%20Areas.pdf)  
547 [Quarantine%20for%20Individuals%20from%20High-Risk%20Areas.pdf](https://governor.sc.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/Executive-Orders/2020-03-27%20FILED%20Executive%20Order%20No.%202020-14%20-%20Self-Quarantine%20for%20Individuals%20from%20High-Risk%20Areas.pdf). Published 2020.  
548 Accessed April 10, 2021.

549

550  
551  
552

**Table 1.** Policies enacted in South Carolina either by Executive Order or by local school districts, in the case of school re-opening. The labels correspond to Figures 1, 2, and 3 where appropriate.

<b>Label</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Policy Declaration</b>	<b>Start</b>	<b>End</b>
C	Executive Order #9 <sup>20</sup>	Schools closed	Mar 16, 2020	Aug through Sep 2020
	Executive Order #14 <sup>48</sup>	Self-quarantine required for travelers from high-risk areas	Mar 27, 2020	May 1, 2020
N	Executive Order #18 <sup>21</sup>	Closure of Other Nonessential Businesses (clarification)	Apr 3, 2020	May 22, 2020
R	Executive Order #37 <sup>22</sup>	Re-opening of some non-essential businesses	May 22, 2020	Until end of State of Emergency
M	Executive Order #50 <sup>23</sup>	Masks in government offices, restaurants, & large venues	Aug 2, 2020	Until superseded
S	Schools re-open	Schools reopened in Clarendon, Florence, Calhoun, and Jasper counties. These were the earliest re-opening dates in South Carolina.	Aug 17, 2020	N/A
L	Executive Order #63 <sup>24</sup>	1. Individuals were required to wear face coverings and practice social distancing. 2. Restaurants were required to limit the seating at each table to no more than eight customers and patron except for members from the same household. 3. The size of public gathering shall not exceed 50 percent of the location's occupancy limit or 250 persons.	Oct 2, 2020	Until end of State of Emergency

553  
554

555 **Table 2.** The slope (and 95% Confidence Intervals) of the regression line between log<sub>10</sub>-transformed per  
556 capita cumulative count and log<sub>10</sub>-transformed population size by county in South Carolina, USA, on June  
557 30th, August 31st, October 31st, and December 31st, 2020 (date of report).  
558

Date of case report	Slope (m) and 95% CI	P-value
June 30th, 2020	-2.0236 (-2.8233, -1.2239)	p<0.0001
August 31st, 2020	-1.2164 (-1.6712, -0.7615)	p<0.0001
October 31st, 2020	-1.0220 (-1.4088, -0.6352)	p<0.0001
December 31st, 2020	-1.0577 (-1.4456, -0.6697)	p<0.0001

559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564

565 **Figure Titles and Legends**

566 **Figure 1.** Daily number of new cases, 7-day sliding window  $R_t$ , and Policy Change  $R_t$  for the  
567 state of South Carolina. All case count data have been shifted backwards by 9 days to  
568 approximate the date of infection. Data were not reported on holidays (Thanksgiving, Christmas,  
569 and New Year’s Day). Policy Change  $R_t$  labels: C: Closure of schools (Mar 16, 2020), N:  
570 Closure of non-essential businesses (Apr 3, 2020), R: Re-opening of non-essential businesses  
571 (May 22, 2020), M: State level mask mandate (Aug 2, 2020), S: Re-opening of schools using  
572 earliest reported date (Aug 17, 2020), L: Capacity limits on public gathering changed to 250 (Oct  
573 2, 2020).

574  
575 **Figure 2.** Policy change  $R_t$  in counties with mask mandates in South Carolina. Labels – C:  
576 Closure of schools (Mar 16, 2020), N: Closure of non-essential businesses (Apr 3, 2020), R: Re-  
577 opening of nonessential businesses (May 22, 2020), A: County level mask mandate (Jul 3, 2020),  
578 M: State mask mandate (Aug 2, 2020), S: Start of school, based on the earliest date in the county  
579 (Sep 8, 2020). County locations can be found in Supplemental Figure 1.


580  
581 **Figure 3.** Median percentage change (95% CrI) of policy change  $R_t$  estimates for nine selected  
582 counties organized by non-pharmaceutical interventions (county-level mask ordinance, state-  
583 level mask mandate, and school re-openings). The vertical line at zero percentage change on the  
584 x-axis indicated an increase in  $R_t$  (positive percentage changes) to its right and a decrease in  $R_t$   
585 (negative percentage changes) to its left.

586  
587 **Figure 4.** Linear regression between  $\log_{10}$ -transformed per capita cumulative case number (ccn)  
588 and  $\log_{10}$ -transformed population size by county for South Carolina on June 30th, August 31st,  
589 October 31st, and December 31st, 2020. Each plus sign represents a county in South Carolina.


590




### South Carolina












### South Carolina




### South Carolina




**Beaufort****Calhoun****Charleston****Colleton****Georgetown****Oconee****Orangeburg****Richland****Williamsburg**


## County-level Mask Ordinance




## State-level Mask Mandate




## School reopenings




June 30th, 2020




August 31st, 2020



October 31st, 2020



December 31st, 2020



**Supplemental Materials: SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Potential and Policy Changes in South Carolina, February 2020 – January 2021**

Margaret R. Davies, MPH<sup>†</sup>, Xinyi Hua, MPH<sup>†</sup>, Terrence D. Jacobs, MPH, Gabi I. Wiggill, Po-Ying Lai, MS, Zhanwei Du, PhD, Swati DebRoy, PhD, Sara Wagner Robb, PhD, Gerardo Chowell, PhD, Isaac Chun Hai Fung, PhD\*

Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Environmental Health Sciences, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health, Georgia Southern University (M. R. Davies, X. Hua, T. D. Jacobs, Gabi I. Wiggill, I.C.H. Fung); Department of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Boston University (P.Y. Lai); Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, LKS Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong (Z. Du); School of Science and Mathematics, University of South Carolina Beaufort (S. DebRoy); Department of Public Health Sciences, Clemson University (S. Wagner Robb); Department of Population Health Sciences, School of Public Health, Georgia State University (G. Chowell)

Corresponding author: Isaac Chun-Hai Fung, PhD. Email: cfung@georgiasouthern.edu

<sup>†</sup> MRD and XH contributed equally and they are co-first authors.

## Appendix A: Handling of negative incident case count

A negative incident case count means the daily number of new cases reported being negative. This happened when the local public health department made an adjustment to the previously reported data by removing the duplicated cases or cases introduced by human errors. This usually resulted in a cumulative case count of the day being lower than the cumulative case count of the previous day, which translates into a negative incident case count. When negative cases appeared in the downloaded data, we used the previous day's case data to bring the negative incidence to zero. In the instance when the previous day did not have enough cases to make the negative incidence zero, we worked backward until there were enough cases brought to the negative case count to equal it to zero.

## Appendix B: Cumulative case count and Population size of a County

The power-law relationship between the county-level cumulative number of COVID-19 cases and population size can be transformed into a linear relationship between the  $\log_{10}$ -transformed cumulative case count and the  $\log_{10}$ -transformed population size as follows<sup>1,2</sup>:

$$\begin{aligned}C &= N^g \\ \log_{10} C &= g \log_{10} N \\ \log_{10} C - \log_{10} N &= g \log_{10} N - \log_{10} N \\ \log_{10}(C/N) &= (g - 1) \log_{10} N \\ \log_{10} A &= m \log_{10} N\end{aligned}$$

where the per capita cumulative case count  $A=C/N$  and the slope of the regression line,  $m = g-1$ .

In this paper, we performed linear regression models between  $\log_{10}$ -transformed per capita cumulative case count and  $\log_{10}$ -transformed population size of counties in South Carolina. The data analyzed were by the dates of report of June 30, August 31, October 31 and December 31, 2020. If the slope  $m$  is positive, it implies that counties with higher populations (i.e., urban counties) had a higher attack rate. If the slope is negative, it implied that counties with lower populations (i.e., rural counties) had a higher attack rate. If the slope is 0 (or if the 95% confidence interval includes 0), it implied that the attack rate was the same across the counties regardless of their population size.

## References

1. Ogwara CA, Mallhi AK, Hua X, et al. Spatially Refined Time-Varying Reproduction Numbers of COVID-19 by Health District in Georgia, USA, March–December 2020. *Epidemiologia*. 2021;2(2):179-197.
2. Fung IC-H, Zhou X, Cheung C-N, et al. Assessing Early Heterogeneity in Doubling Times of the COVID-19 Epidemic across Prefectures in Mainland China, January–February, 2020. *Epidemiologia*. 2021;2(1):95-113.

**Supplemental Table 1.** Difference in Policy Change  $R_t$  as policies changed at South Carolina (state level).

State	Median $R_t$ & 95%CrI	Median $R_t$ difference percentage changes comparing with previous policy interval & 95%CrI
Before policy C 1	1.991 (1.787, 2.21)	
C → N 1,2	1.285 (1.24, 1.33)	-35.59% (-27.9%, -42.7%)
N → R 2,3	1.028 (1.01, 1.05)	-20.01% (-18.8% -21.2%)
R → M 3,4	1.05 (1.04, 1.06)	2.07% (-0.217%, 4.2%)
M → S 4,5	0.889 (0.873, 0.905)	-15.3% (-13.6%, -16.8%)
S → L 5,6	0.998 (0.989, 1.01)	12.3% (10.1%, 14.4%)
Beyond L 6+	1.098 (1.09, 1.1)	9.994% (9.47%, 10.5%)

CrI, credible intervals. Policy Change  $R_t$  labels: C: Closure of schools, N: Closure of non-essential businesses, R: Reopening of non-essential businesses, M: state level mask mandate, S: Re-opening of schools (earliest reported date), L: Capacity limits on public gathering changed to 250.

**Supplemental Table 2.** Difference in Policy Change  $R_t$  as policies changed at county levels in selected counties South Carolina. These nine counties were the only counties with an active mask ordinance during the study period.

	Median $R_t$ & 95%CrI	Median $R_t$ difference percentage changes comparing with previous policy interval & 95%CrI
<b>Beaufort</b>		
Before policy C	1.5853 (0.985, 2.392)	
C → N	1.1551 (0.99, 1.34)	-26.74% (-54.6%, 16.9%)
N → R	1.0214 (0.881, 1.175)	-11.58% (-11.0%, -12.1%)
R → A	1.2282 (1.17, 1.29)	20.04% (2.54%, 40.03%)
A → M	0.9856 (0.946, 1.027)	-19.76% (-16.7%, -22.9%)
M → S	0.8903 (0.839, 0.944)	-9.65% (-5.07%, -13.29%)
S →	1.0916 (1.06, 1.12)	22.57% (16.7%, 27.7%)
<b>Calhoun</b>		
Before policy C	0.6787 (0.0248, 3.6122)	
C → N	1.2254 (0.426, 2.687)	82.83% (-74.7%, 3840.2%)
N → R	1.6951 (0.841, 2.995)	39.55% (-50.2%, 331.3%)
R → M	1.0495 (0.945, 1.161)	-38.51% (-66.4%, 24.1%)
M → S	0.6857 (0.461, 0.974)	-34.53% (-6.73%, -54.98%)
S → A	1.0737 (0.965, 1.19)	56.29% (9.66%, 127.21%)
A →	1.1009 (0.941, 1.278)	2.82% (-12.8%, 22.0%)
<b>Charleston</b>		
Before policy C	2.4407 (1.73, 3.33)	
C → N	1.1092 (0.987, 1.24)	-54.63% (-37.5%, -67.2%)
N → R	0.9840 (0.873, 1.104)	-11.28% (-11.0%, -11.6%)
R → A	1.2526 (1.22, 1.28)	27.20% (12.3%, 42.8%)
A → M	0.8774 (0.855, 0.9)	-29.95% (-29.9%, -30.0%)
M → S	0.9621 (0.927, 0.998)	9.68% (8.48%, 10.93%)
S →	1.0878 (1.07, 1.11)	13.03% (10.9%, 15.1%)
<b>Colleton</b>		
Before policy C	N/A	
C → N	1.3111 (0.75, 2.1)	
N → R	1.2956 (1.04, 1.59)	-0.39% (-41.5%, 76.4%)
R → M	1.0228 (0.95, 1.10)	-21.20% (-2.42%, -35.47%)
M → S	0.8782 (0.74, 1.03)	-13.97% (-27.06%, 0.89%)
S → A	1.0353 (0.943, 1.133)	17.78% (-1.33%, 38.12%)
A →	1.1287 (1.05, 1.21)	9.0% (-0.72%, 19.01%)
<b>Georgetown</b>		
Before policy C	N/A	
C → N	1.3747 (0.938, 1.93)	
N → R	0.9440 (0.689, 1.256)	-31.32% (-49.23%, -8.12%)
R → A	1.1980 (1.11, 1.29)	26.38% (-5.19%, 69.56%)
A → M	0.9596 (0.891, 1.032)	-19.90% (-12.8%, -26.5%)
M → S	0.8468 (0.762, 0.937)	-11.70% (-1.96%, -20.34%)



S→	1.1016 (1.06, 1.14)	29.90% (15.6%, 45.1%)
<b>Oconee</b>		
Before policy C	N/A	
C→ N	1.2685 (0.674, 3.497)	
N→ R	1.0058 (0.718, 2.06)	-20.10% (-58.8%, 60.5%)
R→ M	1.0645 (0.992, 1.362)	5.19% (-21.9%, 44.3%)
M→ A	1.0591 (0.901, 1.235)	-0.31% (-14.8%, 16.0%)
A→ S	1.0259 (0.89, 1.17)	-3.16% (-1.21%, -4.91%)
S→	1.0710 (1.04, 1.1)	4.25% (-9.85%, 20.29%)
<b>Orangeburg</b>		
Before policy C	1.7667 (0.745, 3.459)	
C→ N	1.0927 (0.746, 1.534)	-38.22% (-71.0%, 49.6%)
N→ R	1.1872 (1.0, 1.39)	8.24% (-22.3%, 52.5%)
R→ A	1.2002 (1.13, 1.28)	0.86% (-13.8%, 18.7%)
A→ M	0.9585 (0.908, 1.011)	-20.16% (-13.5%, -26.7%)
M→ S	0.8447 (0.763, 0.932)	-11.86% (-0.553%, -21.27%)
S→	1.0972 (1.06, 1.14)	29.67% (16.0%, 44.1%)
<b>Richland</b>		
Before policy C	1.7828 (1.31, 2.36)	
C→ N	1.3423 (1.22, 1.47)	-24.77% (-0.05%, -43.81%)
N→ R	0.9701 (0.911, 1.031)	-27.73% (-19.2%, -35.8%)
R→ A	1.1729 (1.14, 1.21)	20.86% (15.3%, 26.0%)
A→ M	0.9529 (0.922, 0.984)	-18.76% (-18.7%, -18.8%)
M→ S	1.0434 (1.01, 1.08)	9.49% (9.39%, 9.6%)
S→	1.0439 (1.03, 1.06)	0.016% (-1.78%, 1.79%)
<b>Williamsburg</b>		
Before policy C	N/A	
C→ N	1.2495 (0.715, 2.001)	
N→ R	1.0775 (0.941, 1.227)	-13.65% (-48.1%, 52.1%)
R→ A	1.1342 (1.02, 1.26)	5.21% (-2.99%, 13.39%)
A→ M	1.0013 (0.912, 1.096)	-11.75% (-1.1%, -21.4%)
M→ S	0.8692 (0.767, 0.98)	-13.14% (-1.43%, -23.29%)
S→	1.1264 (1.07, 1.19)	29.54% (12.4%, 48.3%)

CrI, credible intervals. Labels – C: Closure of schools, N: Closure of non-essential businesses, R: reopening of nonessential businesses, A: County level mask mandate, M: state mask mandate, S: start of school, based on earliest date in the county. \*N/A indicates there is no reported case before Policy C (school closure) in the data after the 9-day shift to approximate the date of infection.

## Supplemental Figure Captions and Legends


**Supplemental Figure 1:** South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) region map. Regions are shown by color. Counties are labeled by name.


**Supplemental Figure 2.** Population map of South Carolina. The Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) health regions are outlined by color as shown in the previous figure.

**Supplemental Figure 3:** Maps of South Carolina counties group in Public Health Districts (county line color: Low Country: Green; Midlands: Blue; Pee Dee: Red; Upstate: Yellow) by cumulative case count (top 4 maps), and cumulative case counts per 100,000 population (bottom 4 maps) in April, August, October, and December, 2020.

**Supplemental Figure 4: Sensitivity analysis:** The incidence data is shifted backward by 15 days to approximate the date of infection, assuming a combined 15-day time lag of the incubation period and delay in testing.


**Supplemental Figure 5: Sensitivity analysis:** The incidence data is shifted backward by 4 days to approximate the date of infection, assuming a combined 4-day time lag of the incubation period and delay in testing.









April 2020




August 2020




October 2020




December 2020




April 2020




August 2020




October 2020




December 2020




### South Carolina




### South Carolina




### South Carolina



### South Carolina



### South Carolina



### South Carolina

