

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

State and County-Level Factors Associated with the Effectiveness of Stay-At-Home Orders Issued in the United States in Response to COVID-19

Forrest DL Barker,¹ Ali Mirzadadeh,² Neelam Sekhri Feachem^{3*}

¹Institute of Global Health Sciences, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California, United States of America

² Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Institute for Global Health Sciences, University of California San Francisco, California, United States of America

³ Institute of Global Health Sciences, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California, United States of America

*Corresponding author

21 **ABSTRACT**

22 **Title**

23 State and County-Level Factors Associated with the Effectiveness of Stay-At-Home Orders
24 Issued in the United States in Response to COVID-19

25 **Background**

26 To slow the spread of COVID-19 and protect medical facilities from overflowing, Stay-At-Home
27 Orders (SAHOs) were issued in the United States during the spring of 2020. These orders had
28 variable levels of effectiveness and profound consequences that continue to manifest long after
29 their termination. This study aimed to assess if state and county-level population characteristics
30 could explain variability in SAHO effectiveness as measured by the effective reproductive
31 number (R_t).

32 **Methods**

33 We calculated the R_t for the 40 states which enacted SAHOs, and also for a sample of 289
34 counties that issued SAHOs in 2020, using EpiEstim R Package based on the states' and
35 counties' daily case data. We determined SAHOs to be effective if, three weeks after their
36 implementation, R_t was equal to or less than one. Wilcoxon rank sum tests and logistic
37 regression were used to determine if population characteristics (age, income, level of education,
38 political orientation, percent of non-English speaking people, racial and ethnic compositions),
39 and percentage of frontline workers, percent of eligible people vaccinated by July 2021, level of
40 viral transmission, and other Non-Pharmaceutical-Interventions (NPI) enacted before the SAHO,
41 were associated with effectiveness of SAHOs.

42 **Results**

43 SAHOs were effective in 20 (50%) states. No significant differences were found in the
44 characteristics studied between states with effective and ineffective SAHOs. SAHOs were
45 effective in 54% of counties. Counties with effective SAHOs had fewer days of NPIs before the
46 SAHOs in comparison to counties with ineffective SAHOs (Median 24 vs. 34, p-value 0.005). All
47 other characteristics considered showed non-significant differences. In multivariate analysis,
48 days of NPIs before the SAHOs remained the only significant factor for effective SAHOs in
49 studied counties.

50 **Conclusion**

51 Our analysis suggests that SAHO effectiveness may be influenced by the implementation of
52 prior public health interventions but is not likely to be related to the other characteristics studied.
53 These findings should be considered when assessing when and how to implement SAHOs in
54 future epidemics to limit the spread of an infectious respiratory disease.

55 INTRODUCTION

56 In early December 2019, a cluster of idiopathic pneumonia cases was reported in Wuhan,
57 China.¹ These are thought to be the first identified cases of a disease called COVID-19 caused
58 by a novel coronavirus named Severe Acute Respiratory Coronavirus Syndrome-2 (SARS-CoV-
59 2) or colloquially the COVID-19 virus.² By the end of January 2020, COVID-19 was classified as
60 a public health emergency of international concern and cases had been detected in 21 countries
61 spread across Asia, Europe, North America, and Oceania. A few weeks later, the World Health
62 Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic.³ As of April 1, 2023, the WHO had
63 globally recorded 761,402,282 confirmed cases and 6,887,000 confirmed deaths, making
64 COVID-19 one of the most severe pandemics in history.⁴ In the United States (U.S.) alone the
65 COVID-19 virus has infected over 100 million individuals, more than one million of whom have
66 died.⁵

67 The number of active COVID-19 cases has periodically spiked, causing hospitals to reach and
68 surpass their capacity. This in turn has forced care and resources to be rationed.⁶⁻¹⁰ For
69 example, medical facilities in the U.S. have, at times, needed to suspend non-emergent
70 services to prioritize resources for overflowing emergency rooms and intensive care units
71 (ICUs). At the same time medical supply chains have been disrupted by excessive demand and
72 supply shortages.¹¹⁻¹³ This was particularly true at the start of the pandemic when treatments for
73 COVID-19 were unrefined and vaccines were unavailable, leaving populations particularly
74 vulnerable. The lack of pharmaceutical protection forced nations to implement Non-
75 Pharmaceutical Interventions (NPI's) to reduce transmission of COVID-19 and avert the
76 collapse of their medical systems. In the U.S. this effort was termed “flattening the curve”.¹⁴
77 Without such measures, hospitals would overflow, and patients would be left untreated,
78 drastically increasing all-cause mortality.

79 Throughout the pandemic many NPI's have been utilized to reduce transmission with varying
80 levels of success.^{15,16} Common NPIs have include mask wearing, quarantine (confinement of
81 individuals who may be infected), isolation (confinement of individuals who are infected),
82 restricting travel, prohibiting gatherings, requiring individuals to maintain distance between each
83 other, closing schools, closing non-essential businesses, and full lockdowns or Stay-at-Home
84 Orders (SAHOs). Implementation of these NPIs has come at the cost of reducing personal
85 liberties and economic activity, increasing inequality, and a myriad of unintended public health
86 side effects such as increased consumption of drugs and alcohol, higher rates of mental health
87 disorders, and rising rates of child abuse and intimate partner violence.¹⁷⁻²²

88 Prior to COVID-19, the efficacy and consequences of NPIs were poorly researched and largely
89 based on theoretical knowledge.²³ However, throughout the pandemic, countries have
90 implemented and relaxed various NPI's in response to rising and falling infection rates. This has
91 created a natural experiment which allows for real world assessment of the efficacy of
92 interventions. As a result, an enormous amount of research on the subject has been conducted
93 in the last few years. Assessments have utilized numerous methodologies including
94 mathematical models, surveys, opinions, direct observations and measurements, and indirect
95 observations via proxy data. In addition to the multitude of methodologies for assessing NPI
96 effectiveness, there is substantial variability in the metrics used for quantification, making it
97 challenging to compare analyses. In general, it has been found that effectiveness of NPIs varies
98 between locations and that multiple interventions have stronger effects than any single
99 intervention.^{23,24}

100 SAHOs, which inherently include other NPI's, have been found to be very effective at reducing
101 transmission of COVID-19. However, it is also estimated that SAHOs in the US resulted in up to
102 \$64 billion a week in lost revenue and brought a grim set of unintended consequences.^{21,22,25-28}

103 Often described as a blunt instrument or last resort, the far-reaching impacts of SAHOs warrant
104 an in-depth investigation into the state and county-level factors that influence their efficacy. A
105 number of investigations have shown that SAHO's are effective at reducing population mobility
106 and that SAHO's are associated with a decrease in transmission and mortality at a state and
107 county level.²⁹ However, it has not been determined if certain population characteristics are
108 associated with more or less effective SAHO's. This paper investigates whether various state or
109 county level factors could have influenced the efficacy of SAHOs issued in the U.S. during the
110 spring of 2020. The threat of a future pandemic requiring lockdowns has drawn the attention of
111 the world. Information presented here may help inform how future SAHOs can be coordinated in
112 a manner that maximizes their impact while minimizing their duration and harm.

113 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

114 We performed an independent cross-sectional analysis looking for differences in communities
115 with effective and ineffective SAHOs during the spring of 2020. Effective SAHOs were defined
116 by communities achieving a local R_t (i.e., basic reproductive number at a point in time to
117 measure transmissibility of the virus), of ≤ 1 after three weeks of a SAHO. Ineffective SAHOs
118 were defined by having an $R_t > 1$ three weeks after order implementation. We initially proposed
119 quantifying SAHO effectiveness as a continuous variable defined by the change in R_t from the
120 first week of SAHO implementation to the third week of the SAHO, however, we found this
121 definition favored communities with higher initial values of R_t and did not accurately describe
122 whether a SAHO accomplished the goal of reducing the number of cases in a community.

123 Factors we assessed for possibly influencing SAHO effectiveness included:

- 124 • Percentage of essential workers
- 125 • R_t when order was enacted.
- 126 • Time between first case and SAHO enactment

- 127 • Average population age
- 128 • Average population income
- 129 • Political affiliation
- 130 • Average educational attainment
- 131 • Other NPI orders in place prior to and during SAHO
- 132 • Cumulative days of other NPI orders prior to SAHO
- 133 • Percentage of non-English speaking individuals
- 134 • Percentage of individuals identifying as African American
- 135 • Percentage of individuals identifying as Hispanic

136 We originally proposed to also study whether community mobility influenced SAHO
137 effectiveness. However, this analysis was conducted and published by Wellenius et al. while we
138 were conducting our investigation.³⁰ As the influence of mobility on SAHOs was no longer a
139 novel investigation we removed it from our list of variables, to prioritize others.

140 All 40 states that issued SAHOs were included in this sample. For county level analysis a
141 sample of 429 counties was obtained from the American Community Survey (ACS). This
142 sample is designed to be representative of the population of the US. The sample was filtered to
143 remove counties without SAHOs during the study period, where there were too few cases of
144 COVID-19 for accurate calculations of R_t , and where the first case was not reported until after
145 the start of the SAHO. This filtering yielded a final sample of 289 counties spread across the
146 U.S.

147 The reproductive number R_t was calculated based on confirmed cases of COVID-19 reported in
148 the Johns Hopkins University Coronavirus Resource Center Database.³¹ This dataset included
149 cumulative daily anonymized COVID-19 cases aggregated by county. New daily cases were
150 defined as the change in cumulative cases from one day to the next. Dates with negative total

151 daily cases were adjusted to zero cases for that day. For state level analysis, the daily case
152 data for all counties in each state were summed. An attempt was made to remove cases known
153 to have occurred in congregate living settings such as prisons and nursing homes. However,
154 available data on these cases were insufficient to make a robust adjustment. R version 4.0.2.
155 and R Studio were used for organization and manipulation of case data. EpiEstim R Package
156 was then used to calculate R_t for states and counties based on daily case data. A serial interval
157 (SI) of 5.2 days with a standard deviation of 0.7 days, as reported in the meta-analysis by Alene
158 et al, was used in calculating R_t .³² For each state and county, R_t was measured at two time
159 points, the week following the start of the SAHO and the week 21 to 27 days following the start
160 of the SAHO. These time points are estimated to represent viral reproductive number during the
161 week preceding the SAHO implementation and two weeks post implementation, accounting for
162 the 6.5 day mean incubation period also reported by Alene et al.³² R_t was calculated as an
163 average over a seven-day time period to account for lower case reporting on weekends
164 compared to weekdays. Locations where fewer than ten cases were reported during either of
165 the seven-day periods used for calculating R_t were excluded as so few cases did not allow for
166 accurate calculation of R_t . Additionally, calculated R_t values that were greater than 2 standard
167 deviations above the mean were excluded as outliers. These outliers were thought to represent
168 either an outbreak in a congregate setting, or a batch of previously unreported cases and thus
169 not representative of community transmission.

170 Dates of public health orders including the start of SAHOs were retrieved from the CUSP
171 database maintained by Boston University.³³ For each location, we identified NPI's that
172 preceded SAHO implementation. The number of days each NPI was in place prior to the SAHO
173 were then summed to give a cumulative number of days with prior NPI orders. For example, if a
174 location had one order that began ten days before the SAHO and another began five days
175 before the SAHO, that location would be classified as having 15 days of prior NPI orders. The

176 orders included in this measurement were: declaring a state of emergency, school closures,
177 business closures, and prevention of large gatherings.

178 The IPUMS database was used to access and organize a five-year sample (2015-2019) of the
179 census bureau's ACS community survey, which is designed to be 5% of the U.S. population.
180 This sample contained over 15.9 million unique responses including data on individuals' sex,
181 income, age, race, ethnicity, occupational industry, ability to speak English, educational
182 attainment, county and state of residence, and the weight each response should carry to
183 represent the state population. Responses were filtered to exclude entries where county of
184 residence was not reported. Data were then aggregated at both the state and county level and
185 further filtered to only include locations with SAHOs and a sufficient number of reported cases.
186 The final sample contained 5,787,898 responses across 289 counties, with responses from a
187 mean of 2.8% of the population in each county (1.5% minimum and 5% maximum).

188 For each county and state/territory, the mean value was calculated for age and years of
189 education. Years of education were coded from 0-11 where 0 represents no schooling, 1
190 represents schooling up to fourth grade, 2 represents schooling up to eighth grade, 3-10 each
191 represent one additional grade or year of schooling above eighth grade, 11 represents five or
192 more years of college. The median value was calculated for income as these data had outliers
193 with high earnings. Income data were also altered by the ACS survey which reports incomes
194 over \$999,999 as \$999,999. This is done to protect anonymity of respondents. The percentage
195 of respondents who reported speaking little to no English was calculated and used to estimate
196 percent of non-English speaking individuals. Similarly, the percentage of respondents who
197 identified as Hispanic, and who identified as African American were calculated.

198 In the ACS survey, industry is logged as a 5-digit code based on the North American Industrial
199 Classification System (NAICS). We identified 22 NAICS codes that contained most front-line

200 workers including: essential consumer business such as grocery stores, transportation workers,
201 first responders, and medical practitioners. The codes included were 4470, 4971, 4972, 5070,
202 5391, 6080, 6180, 6170, 6390, 6370, 7690, 7970, 8090, 8170, 8180, 8191, 8192, 8270, 8290,
203 8370, 8380, and 8470. The percentage of respondents who reported working in one of these
204 industries was then calculated as an estimate for the community's percent of front-line workers.
205 We identified front line workers based on industry rather than occupation because industry has
206 a larger influence on whether someone is a front-line worker. For example, a manager at a
207 grocery store is a front-line worker while a manager of a software company is not. In this
208 example the occupation of manager is not indicative of whether a job is front-line while industry,
209 in this case, grocery store or software development, is.

210 The ACS survey lists response weights which indicate how many people in the population each
211 response represents. These weights are based on state population data. Weighting was utilized
212 for state level calculations but not for county level calculations. The unweighted calculations at
213 the county level allowed us to capture intra-state variability better than the weighted sample.

214 Data on vaccination rates in each location was collected from the U.S. Centers for Disease
215 Control and Prevention's COVID-19 Data Tracker.⁵ Data on the percentage of people who voted
216 for Trump in 2020 was obtained from MIT's Election Lab Database.³⁴

217 Utilizing R Version 4.0.2 and R Studio, we ran Wilcoxon rank sum tests with all the above-
218 mentioned variables to compare their distribution in populations with successful or unsuccessful
219 SAHOs. We utilized an alpha value of 0.05 as our rejection criteria. The Wilcoxon test was
220 utilized for hypothesis testing because data on the variables did not have a normal distribution
221 or contained outliers which could not be excluded as they represented valuable data points on
222 unique communities. We then created logistic regression models controlling for each of the 12
223 factors assessed to determine if any factors were functioning as confounders or effect modifiers

224 of other factors. We chose to classify variables as having a significant effect if their presence in
 225 the logistic regression model reduced the p-value of other variables by more than 10%.

226 RESULTS

227 A summary of the sample of ACS data used for our analysis is shown in Table 1. Variables that
 228 were not from the ACS survey, such as percent of eligible population vaccinated, were derived
 229 from the whole population rather than a sample. Thus, the demographics of these population-
 230 based variables are not detailed.

231 **Table 1: ACS survey sample responses (n=5,787,898)**

232	Sex – no. (%)	
	Male	2,832,597 (48.94)
	Female	2,955,301 (51.06)
233	Race and ethnicity – no. (%)	
	White	4,234,838 (73.17)
	Black	612,182 (10.58)
234	American Indian or Alaska Native	33,890 (0.59)
	Chinese	118,888 (2.05)
	Japanese	21,174 (0.37)
235	Other or not reported	766,926 (13.25)
	Hispanic	983,002 (16.98)
236	Non-Hispanic	4,804,896 (83.02)
	Age – median (IQR)	44 (27)
237	Educational attainment code – median (IQR)	7 (4)
	Front-line workers – no (%)	1,120,470 (19.36)
	Income – median (IQR)	36,711 (54,728)
238	English Speaking – no. (%)	
	Speaks no English/does not speak well	237,856 (4.11)
239	Speaks English well	555,0042 (95.89)

240 Figure 1 shows the locations of the
 241 counties which made up our sample for analysis at the county level.

242 **(See Separate File for All Figures)**

243 **Figure 1: Counties included in analysis n=289**

244 For state level analysis, we first grouped states into effective or ineffective SAHOs. States that
 achieved an R_t value of one or lower after three weeks of SAHO were said to have effective

245 orders while states that did not achieve an R_t value of less than one during the same time period
 246 were classified as having ineffective SAHOs. Based on these criteria it was found that, of the 40
 247 states with SAHOs, 50% were successful. Table 2 shows the variation of characteristics we
 248 assessed for states with effective and ineffective SAHOs.

249 **Table 2: Difference in state level characteristics by SAHO effectiveness**

	Effective (n=20)		Non-effective (n=20)		Wilcoxon rank sum test	
	Median	IQR	Median	IQR	W	p-value
Time between first case and SAHO start (days)	18.5	9.5	23	7.5	254.5	0.144
Rt at Start of SAHO	1.96	0.99	1.96	1.26	179	0.583
Cumulative days of NPI orders (days)	26	14.8	30	14.5	226.5	0.311
Front-line workers (%)	20.0	2.3	20.8	2.1	209	0.138
Educational attainment	7.70	0.31	7.74	0.43	164	0.950
Non-English speaking (%)	1.62	2.24	1.94	1.88	163	0.975
Income (2019 USD)	37,859	6,366	38,300	5,088	149	0.704
Age (years)	44	1	44	1.5	184.5	0.461
Eligible population vaccinated (%)	68.6	15.7	62.9	18.5	192.5	0.850
Voted for Trump in 2020 presidential election (%)	45.4	14.7	48.8	12.8	216	0.478
Identify as Hispanic (%)	8.35	2.70	7.24	7.34	143	0.573
Identify as African American (%)	11.9	12.7	10.4	10.9	164	0.950

250
 251 As with states, our sample of counties was split into two groups, those with effective SAHOs
 252 and those with ineffective SAHOs. Effectiveness was determined based on the same criteria as
 253 states. Of the 289 counties in our sample, 158 (54%) were determined to be successful. Table 3
 254 shows the variation in characteristics of counties with successful SAHOs and those with
 255 unsuccessful SAHOs.

256 **Table 3: Difference in county level characteristics by SAHO effectiveness**

	Effective (n=185)		Non-effective (n=127)		Wilcoxon rank sum test	
	Median	IQR	Median	IQR	W	p-value
Time between first case and SAHO start (days)	14	8.8	15	9.5	10678	0.642

Rt at Start of SAHO	2.07	1.57	1.91	1.36	9494	0.227
Cumulative days of NPI orders (days)	24	22	34	20	12044	0.005
Front-line workers (%)	19.9	3.6	20.0	3.8	10264	0.905
Educational attainment	7.78	0.64	7.72	0.68	9539	0.252
Non-English speaking (%)	1.27	1.72	1.47	1.92	10810	0.515
Income (2019 USD)	37,769	10,384	36,652	9,766	9294	0.136
Age (years)	45	4	45	3	9207	0.104
Eligible population vaccinated (%)	54.6	13.8	51.5	17.0	9111.5	0.080
Voted for Trump in 2020 presidential election (%)	44.8	23.5	45.9	20.5	10300	0.895
Identify as Hispanic (%)	6.40	7.26	5.94	6.99	9864	0.493
Identify as African American (%)	7.43	13.1	7.77	12.1	11143	0.262

257

258

259 The characteristics assessed were factors or proxies for factors we hypothesized could have
 260 influenced how well populations complied with SAHOs, and how effective SAHOs were at
 261 reducing transmission of COVID-19. Wilcoxon rank sum tests were utilized to test the null
 262 hypothesis that there was not a difference in the distribution of characteristics between
 263 communities with successful versus unsuccessful SAHOs. We utilized an alpha value of 0.05 as
 264 the rejection criteria.

265 Figures 2 through 13 show the distribution of data points at the state and county levels. Each
 266 graph shows how a characteristic varied among locations with successful SAHOs (green) and
 267 unsuccessful SAHOs (red). For clarity, data points on these graphs have been binned into 30
 268 distinct groups evenly distributed along the Y axis.

269 • **Days between first case and SAHO start**

270 The first factor we considered was the number of days between the first case and the start of a
 271 SAHO. We suspected that as this time period grew, so would the number of undetected cases
 272 of COVID-19. Greater numbers of individuals with undetected cases could lead to increased
 273 household transmission once SAHOs were put in place, causing them to be less effective at
 274 reducing R_t . However, we did not find a difference in the distribution of this time period between

275 communities (states or counties) with effective versus ineffective SAHOS ($p=0.144$ states; $p=$
276 0.642 counties).

277 **Figure 2: Days between first case and SAHO Start. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on**
278 **the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.**

279

280 • **R_t value at start of SAHO**

281 We then considered the viral reproductive value at the start of SAHOs. Other studies have
282 reported that NPIs, including SAHOs, can reduce R_t by finite amounts which would make it
283 easier for SAHOs to be effective in communities with lower initial R_t values. Comparison of R_t
284 distribution between groups yielded non-significant results ($p=0.583$ states; $p=0.227$ counties).
285 Thus, we could not reject the null hypothesis that the distribution of initial viral reproduction
286 values was the same for communities with effective versus ineffective SAHOs.

287 **Figure 3: R_t calculated for the first week of SAHO. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on**
288 **the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.**

289 • **Cumulative days of NPI orders prior to SAHO start**

290 After looking at initial R_t values, we assessed if the cumulative number of days of alternate NPI
291 orders, before SAHOs were implemented could have influenced effectiveness. Other studies
292 have reported that multiple NPI orders were more effective than a single NPI order. Based on
293 this we expected that a greater number of days of other NPI orders before a SAHO began
294 would result in a SAHO being more likely to drop the R_t value to below 1. When we tested this
295 hypothesis at the state level, we did not find a difference in the distribution of days of prior NPI
296 orders between effective and ineffective SAHOs ($p=0.311$). However, we found a significant
297 difference between these groups of SAHOs at the county level ($p=0.005$). Surprisingly this
298 difference was not in our hypothesized direction. Rather we found that the median number of

299 days of prior NPI orders in counties with effective SAHOs was lower than the median in counties
300 with ineffective SAHOs.

301 **Figure 4: The cumulative number of days other NPI orders were in place before the start**
302 **of a SAHO. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are**
303 **shown on the right in green.**

304

305 • **Percent of front-line workers**

306 The next characteristic we considered was the percent of front-line workers. The jobs of these
307 workers were not affected by SAHOs, and they continued to have high levels of interaction and
308 contact with other community members. Thus, we expected that the effectiveness of SAHOs
309 would be reduced in communities with a greater proportion of front-line workers. Our analysis,
310 however, did not find a difference in SAHO effectiveness for either states or counties based on
311 the percent of front-line workers ($p=0.138$ states; $p=0.905$ counties).

312 **Figure 5: The percent of ACS survey respondents who reported working in industries**
313 **identified as front-line. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful**
314 **SAHOs are shown on the right in green.**

315 • **Educational attainment**

316 Educational attainment has commonly been associated with behavioral differences. For
317 example, studies have found correlations between college education and political affiliations.
318 We hypothesized that the level of education in a community could influence how that community
319 responds to public health orders. We tested the null hypothesis that there was no difference in
320 distribution of educational attainment between communities with successful and unsuccessful
321 SAHOs and found that there was not a significant difference ($p=0.950$ states; $p=0.252$ counties).

322 **Figure 6: Educational scores relating to the highest level of education attained by**
323 **respondents of ACS survey. On this scale 0 represents no schooling and 11 represents**
324 **5+ years of college. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful**
325 **SAHOs are shown on the right in green.**

326

327 • **Non-English-speaking population.**

328 Public health messaging in the US was largely carried out in English. This messaging spread
329 awareness of SAHOs and gave explanations of their purpose, goals, and guidelines. It is
330 possible that non-English speaking individuals were not exposed to this messaging, which could
331 have altered their behavior while SAHOs were in effect. We assessed if the proportion of
332 individuals in states or counties who spoke little to no English differed between effective and
333 ineffective SAHOs. Our tests did not find a significant difference in English speaking abilities
334 based on the successfulness of SAHOs ($p=0.975$ states; $p=0.515$ counties).

335 **Figure 7: The percent of ACS survey participants who reported they did not speak**
336 **English or did not speak English well. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in**
337 **red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.**

338

339 • **Income**

340 The financial consequences of SAHOs issued in spring of 2020 were enormous. Compliance
341 with SAHOs for many individuals meant loss of income and financial security while the
342 businesses where they worked were closed or operating at reduced capacity. Additionally, many
343 individuals and families faced large costs associated with working and schooling from home. To
344 assess whether financial security could have influenced compliance with SAHOs thereby
345 altering their effectiveness, we looked for a difference in the distribution of median incomes in
346 states and counties with successful versus unsuccessful SAHOs. These tests yielded
347 insignificant results, suggesting that the distribution of income is similar between the two groups
348 at both the state and county level ($p=0.704$ states; $p=0.136$ counties).

349 **Figure 8: Median income in thousands of US Dollars reported in ACS survey responses**
350 **(adjusted for inflation to match 2019 USD value). Unsuccessful SAHOs are shown on the**
351 **left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.**

352

353 • **Age**

354 Age has a profound impact on individuals' behavior including mobility and social practices.

355 Studies have found that SAHO effectiveness is negatively correlated with mobility and number
356 of social interactions. Given this finding we expected that the median age of a population could
357 influence whether a SAHO could reduce the viral reproductive value to less than one after three
358 weeks. Contrary to our expectation, analysis did not show any difference in the median age of
359 populations based on SAHO successfulness ($p=0.461$ states; $p=0.104$ counties).

360 **Figure 9: Median age of ACS survey respondents. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on**
361 **the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.**

362 • **Proportion of eligible population vaccinated.**

363 The COVID-19 pandemic has been plagued with mistrust of government officials and the
364 medical community. This mistrust has led to a lack of compliance with public health orders and
365 recommendations, such as SAHOs or receiving vaccinations. Because no quantification of
366 mistrust in government and medical communities exists at the locational specificity needed for
367 this analysis, we utilized the percentage of individuals who had received at least one dose of a
368 COVID vaccine as a proxy for this mistrust. We expected that communities with unsuccessful
369 SAHOs would have lower vaccination rates. To assess this, we tested the null hypothesis that
370 the distribution of vaccination rates as of July 15, 2021, was the same in communities with
371 effective and ineffective SAHOs. These tests yielded non-significant results, and the null
372 hypothesis was not rejected ($p=0.850$ states; $p=0.080$ counties). This result can be extrapolated
373 to suggest that mistrust in government and public health systems likely did not influence SAHO
374 effectiveness.

375 **Figure 10: The percent of eligible individuals vaccinated as of July 15, 2021.**
376 **Unsuccessful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the**
377 **right in green.**

378

379 • **Proportion of population who voted for Trump in 2020 presidential elections.**

380 Leading up to and during SAHOs in the spring of 2020 there were stark differences in how
381 politicians discussed the threat of COVID-19, and the types of NPI's they supported. This
382 difference is commonly credited with affecting how populations responded to public health
383 orders. Numerous media articles and scientific studies suggest that individuals who identified as
384 Republican or supported Trump were less likely to adhere to public health orders such as mask
385 mandates and SAHOs. We utilized the voting records from the 2020 presidential election to
386 estimate the proportions of people who supported Trump or the Republican party. As with other
387 variables, we then looked to see if the distribution of the percent of people who voted for Trump
388 was different in communities based on SAHO effectiveness. Surprisingly, a significant difference
389 was not found suggesting that support for Trump did not have a significant influence on SAHO
390 effectiveness ($p=0.478$ states; $p=0.895$ counties).

391 **Figure 11: Percent of population that voted for Trump in the 2020 general election. Non-**
392 **successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the**
393 **right in green.**

394

395 • **Proportion of population who identify as Hispanic and African American.**

396 The pandemic has highlighted and deepened the stark inequities that exist along racial and
397 ethnic lines. Studies have shown that COVID-19 has disproportionately affected Black and
398 Hispanic individuals. For example, both Black and Hispanic communities have seen a larger
399 drop in life expectancy during the pandemic than white individuals.³⁵ The larger impact of
400 COVID-19 on these communities should not be attributed to racial or ethnic differences but
401 rather the multitude of structural and systemic variables that disadvantage these individuals
402 relative to white individuals. These structural and systemic variables, however, are too
403 numerous and difficult to quantify for this analysis. For this reason, we utilized the percent of a

404 population identifying as African American and the percent of a population identifying as
405 Hispanic as a proxy for the structural and systemic variables which have created a larger
406 burden of COVID-19 in these communities. We tested the null hypothesis that the percentage of
407 individuals identifying as African American or Hispanic in a community was equally distributed
408 between communities with successful and unsuccessful SAHOs. These tests yielded non-
409 significant results, suggesting that whether a SAHO was effective in a community was not
410 associated with the proportion of African American individuals ($p=0.573$ states; $p=0.493$
411 counties) or Hispanic individuals ($p=0.950$ states; $p=0.262$ counties) in that community.

412 **Figure 12: The percent of individuals who identified themselves as African American on**
413 **the ACS survey. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs**
414 **are shown on the right in green.**

415 **Figure 13: The percent of individuals who identified themselves as Hispanic on the ACS**
416 **survey. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are**
417 **shown on the right in green.**

418
419 After completing a bivariate analysis of these population characteristics, we conducted a
420 multivariate logistic regression analysis to assess whether some of the variables were
421 confounders or effect modifiers. In R Studio we controlled for each of the 12 variables and found
422 that none of them had more than a 10% impact on any of the other variables. This suggests that
423 there is no confounding or effect modification taking place amongst the variables considered.
424 The cumulative number of days of prior NPI orders remained the only significant result in our
425 multivariate model.

426 **DISCUSSION**

427 The burden of COVID-19 has varied substantially across the US. Media reports, case studies,
428 and scientific literature, have all commonly pointed to the characteristics of local populations as
429 possible explanations for this variability.^{36–38} Our study aimed to determine which factors may
430 have influenced the effectiveness of SAHOs issued in the U.S. in the spring of 2020. To answer

431 this question, we assessed whether the distribution of 12 characteristics was different in
432 communities with successful versus unsuccessful SAHOs. The characteristics considered were:
433 the time between the first case of COVID-19 and start of a SAHO, the value of R_t at start of a
434 SAHO, the cumulative number of days of alternate NPIs prior to the SAHO, the proportion of
435 front-line workers in a community, the educational attainment of a community, the proportion of
436 individuals who lack fluency in English, the median income of a population, the mean age of a
437 population, the proportion of adults who had received at least one dose of a COVID-19 vaccine
438 by July 15th 2021, the percentage that voted for Trump in the 2020 general elections, the
439 proportion of a community that identifies as African American, and the proportion of a
440 community that identifies as Hispanic.

441 We expected our results to show that SAHOs were more effective in populations with
442 characteristics such as high median income compared to populations with contrasting
443 characteristics such as low median income. This would have been in line with other reports
444 linking population characteristics to variations in the burden of COVID-19. However, we found
445 that the only characteristic with a significant difference was the cumulative number of days of
446 alternate NPI orders prior to a SAHO; this showed that a fewer number of days of prior NPI
447 orders positively correlated with SAHO effectiveness. Interestingly, this result was found at the
448 county but not at the state level. When interpreting this result, it is important to recognize the
449 substantial variation in the data. The county data show that while the medians of the two groups
450 may be different, there are still many effective SAHOs which have a greater number of days of
451 prior NPI orders than ineffective SAHOs. Given the variability in the data it is possible our
452 finding is the result of an opportune sample and not representative of the population. If,
453 however, this finding is representative of the population, a possible explanation for the
454 difference could be fatigue. Counties that had endured a greater number of days of restrictive
455 public health orders prior to SAHO start may have already been stressed or fatigued to the point

456 where complying with SAHOs was not feasible. This reduction in compliance could have caused
457 a reduction in order effectiveness. Another, and perhaps more likely, explanation would be that
458 prior NPI's minimized the impact of COVID-19 on communities. This could have caused
459 communities with more days of prior NPIs to view SAHOs as unnecessary or an overreaction. It
460 follows that such a perspective could lead populations to be less compliant with a SAHO
461 thereby reducing the order's effectiveness. This explanation would be in line with other studies
462 that found combinations of less invasive NPIs were almost as effective at reducing spread of
463 COVID as SAHOs.^{23,39}

464 Our findings should encourage those assessing the variable burden of COVID-19 to look
465 beyond the convenient explanations of demographics. Rather they should consider more
466 complex and detailed structural and systemic variables. Our assessment supports the idea that
467 greater in-depth research is necessary to explain the variation in the success of SAHOs. More
468 detailed assessment is particularly important given that polarization of the American public has
469 been increasing and negatively impacting public health.⁴⁰ Inappropriately attributing health
470 outcomes, such as SAHO effectiveness, to factors that contrast communities could deepen the
471 division between them and build further inequity. This would result in undermining the efforts of
472 the public health community.

473 **Limitations**

474 While our findings highlight the importance of detailed assessment into structural and systemic
475 factors, the study also has significant limitations. This analysis is based on cases reported in the
476 Johns Hopkins University Coronavirus Resource Center Database. While this dataset is thought
477 to be one of the most complete records of COVID-19 cases in the US, it is still far from
478 representing the true number of COVID-19 infections. This is due to a multitude of factors
479 impacting our ability to identify cases throughout the pandemic. Early in the pandemic, a lack of

480 available tests left many people possibly infected with COVID-19 undiagnosed. This effect was
481 compounded by restrictive CDC guidelines which outlined who should get tested for COVID-19.
482 In early 2020 these guidelines restricted testing to individuals with multiple symptoms and travel
483 history to various hot spots such as China, Italy, or Iran.⁴¹ Tests were also not equally available
484 to all populations, creating testing deserts where fewer cases were detected.⁴² It is also well
485 established that a large proportion of COVID-19 cases are asymptomatic and often undetected.
486 One study found that in New York City, 82%-87% of cases were asymptomatic.⁴³ Complicating
487 this further, a higher proportion of asymptomatic cases occur in young and healthy individuals
488 compared to older individuals and people with comorbidities. These factors and others have
489 caused a substantial under-reporting of the number of COVID-19 cases in all datasets, including
490 the one used in this analysis. Studies have attempted to map the proportion of unreported cases
491 across the US.⁴⁴ Such data could be used to adjust case numbers in the Johns Hopkins
492 Database; however, this modification would lack the locational and temporal precision
493 necessary for this analysis. The result of these sources of error in the case data is a
494 measurement bias where cases are ubiquitously under-reported, however, the degree of under-
495 reporting cannot be assumed to be uniform throughout time or between locations.

496 To further assess the quality of case data, we compared how reported cases in the Johns
497 Hopkins dataset compared to reported cases in the CDC's data set. Surprisingly we found
498 substantial differences between the two. In some locations there was more than a 20%
499 difference in cumulative cases reported. These differences are thought to stem from methods of
500 data collection. Johns Hopkins actively collects case data from sources, while the CDC
501 passively has public health departments send case data to them. This distinction led us to
502 believe that the Johns Hopkins database is more accurate.

503 Variations in daily reported cases greatly influence our calculations of the viral reproductive
504 number. The influence of errors in the number of reported cases is especially large when
505 relatively few cases have been reported. Generally, the smaller communities in our sample
506 reported fewer cases which caused them to be disproportionately affected by errors in case
507 numbers. Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine how errors in case reporting influenced
508 R_t calculations without knowing how under-reporting varied temporally and geographically.

509 Another important limitation of our study is that calculations of R_t are heavily dependent on the
510 serial interval (SI) of the virus. SI is a measure of how long it takes one infected individual to
511 pass the infection to another person. We used a serial interval of 5.2 days with a standard
512 deviation of 0.7 days which was derived from a meta-analysis.³² However, other studies have
513 found that SI varies substantially with location and is also influenced by various public health
514 orders.⁴⁵ For example, a serial interval in a congregate living environment such as a prison
515 would be expected to be lower than the SI for a rural farming community. Similarly, an order
516 prohibiting group gatherings would be expected to increase the SI as the order would reduce
517 the opportunities for individuals to pass viral particles among each other. Knowing this we
518 performed a sensitivity analysis of the SI and its standard deviation. Surprisingly we found that
519 varying the SI by one day from 5.2 to 4.2 or 6.2 altered our values of R_t by up to 50%. Varying
520 the SI's standard deviation by one day also impacted our values of R_t , in some cases by more
521 than 20%. Notably, these variations also created substantial changes in which communities had
522 effective and ineffective SAHO's. Published literature on the COVID-19 virus' reproductive value
523 utilizes a wide range of SI's which suggests that there may be lack of comparability between
524 these studies, and that reported R values may not be accurate if the SI was not derived from
525 cases geographically and temporally pertinent to the analysis. Numerous studies such as this
526 one, have used a single SI value to derive R values for a range of times and locations. Our
527 findings suggest that these methods are insufficient for generalized analyses, and such reports

528 should be considered with caution. We recommend that future research identifies a more
529 robust method for either calculating R_t or qualifying SAHO effectiveness in a manner that is not
530 dependent on SI values. This is especially important given that policy makers have used R
531 values throughout the pandemic to help inform decisions with profound consequences, such as
532 when to end a SAHO.

533 **CONCLUSION**

534 This analysis is a first look into which factors influence the effectiveness of SAHOs. We found
535 that the cumulative number of days of prior NPI orders may have negatively influenced SAHO
536 effectiveness; however, all other characteristics assessed likely had no impact. It is possible that
537 variability in SAHO effectiveness is derived from systemic (for example access to public health
538 messaging) or structural factors (for example, the financial burden created by a SAHO). It is
539 also possible that the methods used for calculating R_t were not sufficiently robust to accurately
540 identify effective and ineffective SAHOs, causing associations to be missed.

541 If SAHOs become necessary again in the future, policy makers should recognize that the
542 effectiveness of orders issued in spring of 2020 was variable, and that further research is
543 needed to identify the factors responsible for that variability. Given the extreme impact of
544 SAHOs on communities, determining factors that increase or decrease their effectiveness
545 remains imperative. The threat of a future pandemic requiring lockdowns has drawn the
546 attention of the world. Information presented here may help inform how future SAHOs can be
547 implemented in a manner that maximizes their impact while minimizing their duration and harm.

548

549 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

550 Dr. Yea-Hung Chen has provided extremely valuable input and insight into how to accomplish
551 the goals of this paper. This project required an enormous amount of data organization and
552 manipulation. Dr. Chen's guidance was essential to accomplishing this. Additionally, Dr. Chen's
553 encouragement and enthusiasm for determining factors that impacted performance of
554 communities during the pandemic brought life to the project.

555 Dr. Brooke Jarvie has contributed to this project substantially by providing feedback,
556 entertaining brainstorming discussions.

557 Dr. Kelly Sanders has also been a consistent supporter of this project. Her feedback on, and
558 enthusiasm for this project has greatly improved it. Dr. Sanders' willingness to invest time into
559 this project has been tremendously appreciated and valued.

560 REFERENCES

- 561 1 Amawi H, Abu Deiab GI, A Aljabali AA, Dua K, Tambuwala MM. COVID-19 pandemic: An
562 overview of epidemiology, pathogenesis, diagnostics and potential vaccines and
563 therapeutics. *Ther. Deliv.* 2020; **11**: 245–68.
- 564 2 Naming the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) and the virus that causes it.
565 [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-2019)-and-the-virus-that-causes-it)
566 [guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-\(covid-2019\)-and-the-virus-that-causes-it](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-2019)-and-the-virus-that-causes-it)
567 (accessed March 7, 2021).
- 568 3 Timeline of WHO’s response to COVID-19.
569 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/interactive-timeline/>
570 (accessed Nov 29, 2020).
- 571 4 WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard | WHO Coronavirus Disease
572 (COVID-19) Dashboard. <https://covid19.who.int/> (accessed April 1, 2023).
- 573 5 CDC COVID Data Tracker. [https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#cases_casesper100klast7days)
574 [tracker/#cases_casesper100klast7days](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#cases_casesper100klast7days) (accessed March 1, 2023).
- 575 6 Mexico City hospitals ‘completely saturated’ as COVID-19 surges | Reuters.
576 [https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-mexico-hospitals/mexico-city-](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-mexico-hospitals/mexico-city-hospitals-completely-saturated-as-covid-19-surges-idUSKBN29D2OS)
577 [hospitals-completely-saturated-as-covid-19-surges-idUSKBN29D2OS](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-mexico-hospitals/mexico-city-hospitals-completely-saturated-as-covid-19-surges-idUSKBN29D2OS) (accessed Feb 16,
578 2021).
- 579 7 How coronavirus overwhelmed one of Italy’s premier hospitals.
580 <https://www.advisory.com/daily-briefing/2020/03/19/italian-hospitals> (accessed Feb 16,
581 2021).
- 582 8 The Coronavirus Pandemic Peaks in New York’s Hospitals | The New Yorker.
583 [https://www.newyorker.com/news/our-local-correspondents/the-coronavirus-pandemic-](https://www.newyorker.com/news/our-local-correspondents/the-coronavirus-pandemic-peaks-in-new-yorks-hospitals)
584 [peaks-in-new-yorks-hospitals](https://www.newyorker.com/news/our-local-correspondents/the-coronavirus-pandemic-peaks-in-new-yorks-hospitals) (accessed Feb 16, 2021).

- 585 9 As COVID-19 Cases Soar, Overwhelmed California Hospitals Worry About Rationing
586 Care : NPR. [https://www.npr.org/2020/12/20/948523206/as-covid-19-cases-soar-](https://www.npr.org/2020/12/20/948523206/as-covid-19-cases-soar-overwhelmed-california-hospitals-worry-about-rationing-ca)
587 [overwhelmed-california-hospitals-worry-about-rationing-ca](https://www.npr.org/2020/12/20/948523206/as-covid-19-cases-soar-overwhelmed-california-hospitals-worry-about-rationing-ca) (accessed Feb 16, 2021).
- 588 10 Ranney ML, Griffeth V, Jha AK. Critical Supply Shortages — The Need for Ventilators
589 and Personal Protective Equipment during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *N Engl J Med* 2020;
590 **382**: e41.
- 591 11 Khullar D, Bond AM, Schpero WL. COVID-19 and the Financial Health of US Hospitals.
592 *JAMA - J Am Med Assoc* 2020; **323**: 2127–8.
- 593 12 Jeffery MM, D’Onofrio G, Paek H, *et al.* Trends in Emergency Department Visits and
594 Hospital Admissions in Health Care Systems in 5 States in the First Months of the
595 COVID-19 Pandemic in the US. *JAMA Intern Med* 2020; **180**: 1328–33.
- 596 13 Blecker S, Jones SA, Petrilli CM, *et al.* Hospitalizations for Chronic Disease and Acute
597 Conditions in the Time of COVID-19. *JAMA Intern Med* 2020.
598 DOI:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3978.
- 599 14 COVID-19: What Does It Really Mean to Flatten the Curve? | AdventHealth.
600 <https://www.adventhealth.com/blog/covid-19-what-does-it-really-mean-flatten-curve>
601 (accessed Feb 16, 2021).
- 602 15 Esra R, Jamieson L, Fox MP, *et al.* Evaluating the impact of non-pharmaceutical
603 interventions for SARS-CoV-2 on a global scale. DOI:10.1101/2020.07.30.20164939.
- 604 16 Dehning J, Zierenberg J, Spitzner FP, *et al.* Inferring change points in the COVID-19
605 spreading reveals the effectiveness of interventions. *Science (80-)* 2020; **369**.
606 DOI:10.1126/science.abb9789.
- 607 17 Cutler DM, Summers LH. The COVID-19 Pandemic and the \$16 Trillion Virus. *JAMA - J.*
608 *Am. Med. Assoc.* 2020; **324**: 1495–6.
- 609 18 Zaremba A, Kizys R, Aharon DY, Demir E. Infected Markets: Novel Coronavirus,

- 610 Government Interventions, and Stock Return Volatility around the Globe. *Financ Res Lett*
611 2020; **35**: 101597.
- 612 19 Bradbury-Jones C, Isham L. The pandemic paradox: The consequences of COVID-19 on
613 domestic violence. *J Clin Nurs* 2020; **29**: 2047–9.
- 614 20 Jacobson NC, Lekkas D, Price G, *et al*. Flattening the mental health curve: COVID-19
615 stay-at-home orders are associated with alterations in mental health search behavior in
616 the United States. *JMIR Ment Heal* 2020; **7**. DOI:10.2196/19347.
- 617 21 Slavova S, Rock P, Bush HM, Quesinberry D, Walsh SL. Signal of increased opioid
618 overdose during COVID-19 from emergency medical services data. *Drug Alcohol Depend*
619 2020; **214**: 108176.
- 620 22 Pollard MS, Tucker JS, Green HD. Changes in Adult Alcohol Use and Consequences
621 During the COVID-19 Pandemic in the US. *JAMA Netw open* 2020; **3**: e2022942.
- 622 23 Perra N. Non-pharmaceutical interventions during the COVID-19 pandemic: A review.
623 *Phys Rep* 2021; published online Feb 13. DOI:10.1016/j.physrep.2021.02.001.
- 624 24 Hsiang S, Allen D, Annan-Phan S, *et al*. The effect of large-scale anti-contagion policies
625 on the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature* 2020; **584**: 262–7.
- 626 25 Strong A, Welburn J. An Estimation of the Economic Costs of Social-Distancing Policies.
627 RAND Corporation, 2020 DOI:10.7249/rra173-1.
- 628 26 The Double Pandemic Of Social Isolation And COVID-19: Cross-Sector Policy Must
629 Address Both | Health Affairs.
630 <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hblog20200609.53823/full/> (accessed March 10,
631 2021).
- 632 27 Li HOY, Huynh D. Long-term social distancing during COVID-19: A social isolation crisis
633 among seniors? *CMAJ*. 2020; **192**: E588.
- 634 28 Sikali K. The dangers of social distancing: How COVID-19 can reshape our social

- 635 experience. *J. Community Psychol.* 2020; **48**: 2435–8.
- 636 29 Fowler JH, Hill SJ, Levin R, Obradovich N. Stay-at-home orders associate with
637 subsequent decreases in COVID-19 cases and fatalities in the United States. *PLoS One*
638 2021; **16**: 1–15.
- 639 30 Wellenius GA, Vispute S, Espinosa V, *et al.* Impacts of social distancing policies on
640 mobility and COVID-19 case growth in the US. *Nat Commun* 2021 121 2021; **12**: 1–7.
- 641 31 Sunshine G, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention USD of H and HS. U.S. State,
642 Territorial, and County Stay-At-Home Orders: March 15-May 5 by County by Day.
643 Centers Dis. Control Prev. Data.CDC.gov. 2021; published online Feb 20.
644 [https://data.cdc.gov/Policy-Surveillance/U-S-State-Territorial-and-County-Stay-At-Home-](https://data.cdc.gov/Policy-Surveillance/U-S-State-Territorial-and-County-Stay-At-Home-Orde/qz3x-mf9n)
645 [Orde/qz3x-mf9n](https://data.cdc.gov/Policy-Surveillance/U-S-State-Territorial-and-County-Stay-At-Home-Orde/qz3x-mf9n).
- 646 32 Alene M, Yismaw L, Assemie MA, Ketema DB, Gietaneh W, Birhan TY. Serial interval
647 and incubation period of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
648 DOI:10.1186/s12879-021-05950-x.
- 649 33 Raifman J, Nocka K, Jones D, Bor J, Lipson S, Jay J CP. COVID-19 US state policy
650 database (CUSP). Bost. Univ. 2020. www.tinyurl.com/statepolicies. (accessed Feb 16,
651 2021).
- 652 34 Data I MIT Election Lab. <https://electionlab.mit.edu/data> (accessed May 11, 2021).
- 653 35 Andrasfay T, Goldman N. Reductions in 2020 US life expectancy due to COVID-19 and
654 the disproportionate impact on the Black and Latino populations. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S*
655 *A* 2021; **118**: e2014746118.
- 656 36 Demographic perspectives of the impact of COVID-19 pandemic - DemCOVID - IIASA.
657 [https://iiasa.ac.at/web/home/research/researchPrograms/WorldPopulation/Research/CO](https://iiasa.ac.at/web/home/research/researchPrograms/WorldPopulation/Research/COVID-19.html)
658 [VID-19.html](https://iiasa.ac.at/web/home/research/researchPrograms/WorldPopulation/Research/COVID-19.html) (accessed July 21, 2021).
- 659 37 Sekhri Feachem N, Sanders K, Barker F. Response to COVID-19. A Case Study.

- 660 Prepared for the Independent Panel for Pandemic Preparedness and Response. 2021,
661 Institute for Global Health Sciences, University of California San Francisco.
- 662 38 Franz B, Dhanani LY. Beyond political affiliation: an examination of the relationships
663 between social factors and perceptions of and responses to COVID-19. *J Behav Med*
664 *2021* 2021; **1**: 1–12.
- 665 39 Hsiang S, Allen D, Annan-Phan S, *et al.* The effect of large-scale anti-contagion policies
666 on the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature* 2020; **584**: 262–7.
- 667 40 Allcott H, Boxell L, Conway JC, Gentzkow M, Thaler M, Yang DY. Polarization and Public
668 Health: Partisan Differences in Social Distancing during the Coronavirus Pandemic. 2020;
669 published online April 13. DOI:10.3386/W26946.
- 670 41 Willman D. The CDC’s failed race against covid-19: A threat underestimated and a test
671 overcomplicated - The Washington Post. Washington Post. 2020.
672 [https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/cdc-covid/2020/12/25/c2b418ae-4206-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/cdc-covid/2020/12/25/c2b418ae-4206-11eb-8db8-395dedaaa036_story.html?utm_campaign=wp_post_most&utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter&wpisrc=nl_most&carta-url=https%3A%2F%2Fs2.washingtonpost.com%2Fcar-ln-tr%2F)
673 [11eb-8db8-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/cdc-covid/2020/12/25/c2b418ae-4206-11eb-8db8-395dedaaa036_story.html?utm_campaign=wp_post_most&utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter&wpisrc=nl_most&carta-url=https%3A%2F%2Fs2.washingtonpost.com%2Fcar-ln-tr%2F)
674 [395dedaaa036_story.html?utm_campaign=wp_post_most&utm_medium=email&utm_sou](https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/cdc-covid/2020/12/25/c2b418ae-4206-11eb-8db8-395dedaaa036_story.html?utm_campaign=wp_post_most&utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter&wpisrc=nl_most&carta-url=https%3A%2F%2Fs2.washingtonpost.com%2Fcar-ln-tr%2F)
675 [rce=newsletter&wpisrc=nl_most&carta-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/cdc-covid/2020/12/25/c2b418ae-4206-11eb-8db8-395dedaaa036_story.html?utm_campaign=wp_post_most&utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter&wpisrc=nl_most&carta-url=https%3A%2F%2Fs2.washingtonpost.com%2Fcar-ln-tr%2F)
676 [url=https%3A%2F%2Fs2.washingtonpost.com%2Fcar-ln-tr%2F](https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/cdc-covid/2020/12/25/c2b418ae-4206-11eb-8db8-395dedaaa036_story.html?utm_campaign=wp_post_most&utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter&wpisrc=nl_most&carta-url=https%3A%2F%2Fs2.washingtonpost.com%2Fcar-ln-tr%2F) (accessed Dec 28,
677 2020).
- 678 42 Meyer R, Madrigal AC. Exclusive: The Strongest Evidence Yet That America Is Botching
679 Coronavirus Testing. Atl. 2020. [https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2020/03/how-](https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2020/03/how-many-americans-have-been-tested-coronavirus/607597/)
680 [many-americans-have-been-tested-coronavirus/607597/](https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2020/03/how-many-americans-have-been-tested-coronavirus/607597/).
- 681 43 Subramanian R, He Q, Pascual M. Quantifying asymptomatic infection and transmission
682 of COVID-19 in New York City using observed cases, serology, and testing capacity.
683 *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2021; **118**. DOI:10.1073/PNAS.2019716118.
- 684 44 Wu SL, Mertens AN, Crider YS, *et al.* Substantial underestimation of SARS-CoV-2

685 infection in the United States. *Nat Commun* 2020 11: 1–10.


686 45 Ali ST, Yeung A, Shan S, *et al.* Serial intervals and case isolation delays for COVID-19: a

687 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021; published online May 26.

688 DOI:10.1093/CID/CIAB491.

689

Figure 1: Counties included in analysis n=289



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.04.27.23289229>; this version posted April 28, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 2: Days between first case and SAHO Start. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.




Figure 3: R_t calculated for the first week of SAHO. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.




Figure 4: The cumulative number of days other NPI orders were in place before the start of a SAHO. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.




Figure 5: The percent of ACS survey respondents who reported working in industries identified as front-line. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.





Figure 6: Educational scores relating to the highest level of education attained by respondents of ACS survey. On this scale 0 represents no schooling and 11 represents 5+ years of college. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.04.27.23289229>; this version posted April 28, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Figure 7: The percent of ACS survey participants who reported they did not speak English or did not speak English well. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.




Figure 8: Median income in thousands of US Dollars reported in ACS survey responses (adjusted for inflation to match 2019 USD value). Unsuccessful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.




Figure 9: Median age of ACS survey respondents. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.




Figure 10: The percent of eligible individuals vaccinated as of July 15, 2021. Unsuccessful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.




Figure 11: Percent of population that voted for Trump in the 2020 general election. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.




Figure 12: The percent of individuals who identified themselves as African American on the ACS survey. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.




Figure 13: The percent of individuals who identified themselves as Hispanic on the ACS survey. Non-successful SAHOs are shown on the left in red, successful SAHOs are shown on the right in green.

