

1 **Which factors had the greatest impact on the United States COVID-19 outbreak? An ecological**
2 **assessment of mitigation behavior and policy contributions to reducing SARS-CoV-2 transmission in**
3 **the US from September 2020 through November 2021.**

4
5 Velma K Lopez, PhD, MPH^{1*}, Sarah Kada, PhD¹, Pragati V Prasad MPH², Taylor Chin PhD, MS¹, Betsy L.
6 Cadwell, MSPH³, Jessica M Healy PhD⁴, Rachel B Slayton PhD, MPH⁴, Matthew Biggerstaff ScD, MPH²,
7 Michael A Johansson PhD¹

8
9 ¹ National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases (NCEZID), Division of Vector Borne
10 Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), San Juan, PR 00920

11 ² National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Influenza Division, CDC, Atlanta, GA 30333

12 ³ Global Health Center, Division Global Health Protection, CDC, Atlanta, GA 30333

13 ⁴ NCEZID, Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion, CDC, Atlanta, GA 30333

14
15 *Corresponding author: Velma K. Lopez; oko8@cdc.gov

16
17 **Keywords:** Outbreak response; policies, personal behavior.

18
19 **Manuscript word count:** 2997 words

20

21 **Abstract**

22 *Introduction:* United States' jurisdictions implemented varied policies to slow SARS-CoV-2 transmission.
23 Understanding patterns of these policies alongside individual's behaviors can inform effective outbreak
24 response.

25 *Methods:* We estimated the time-varying reproduction number (R_t), a weekly measure of real-time
26 transmission using US COVID-19 reported cases from September 2020-November 2021. Using two multi-
27 level regression models, we then assessed the association between R_t and policies, personal COVID-19
28 mitigation behaviors, variants, immunity, and social vulnerability indicators. First, we fit a model with
29 state-level policy stringency according to the Oxford Stringency Index (OSI), a composite indicator
30 reflecting the strictness of COVID-19 policies and strength of pandemic-related communication. Our
31 second model included a subset of specific policies.

32 *Results:* Implementation of stringent observed policies (defined by OSI) was associated with an R_t
33 reduction of 6.7- 11.6% (95% Credible Interval [CI]). In the Individual Policy Model, mask mandates had a
34 null association with R_t (95% CI: -1.5-0.2%), while other policies were associated with modest
35 reductions: cancellation of public events 95% CI: 1.4-3.7%; restrictions on gathering sizes 95% CI: 0.1-
36 2.2%; stay-at-home orders 95% CI: 0.3-4.8%. The association between R_t and other covariates was
37 similar in both models. Among personal COVID-19 mitigation behaviors in the OSI Model, R_t was
38 estimated to decrease 18%-26% (95% CI) with a 50% reduction in national airline travel, 2.4-3.3% (95%
39 CI) with a 10% reduction in local movement to recreation and retail locations, and 12-15% (95% CI) with
40 self-reported mask use of 50%. Increased COVID-19 seroprevalence and vaccination were both
41 associated with reduced R_t , 28-32% (95% CI) and 20-23% (95% CI) reductions, if half of people had been
42 previously infected or fully vaccinated, respectively in the OSI Model.

43 *Conclusion:* SARS-CoV-2 transmission was reduced by layered measures. These results underscore the
44 need for policy, behavior change, and risk communication integration to reduce virus transmission
45 during epidemics.

46

47 **Key messages**

48 What is already known on this topic: When the United States responded to the COVID-19 outbreak,
49 jurisdictions took varied approaches to balance economic well-being with health and safety. Yet, the
50 impact of the pandemic was large - millions of people were infected and over a million people died – and
51 the relative roles of policies, policy-independent behavior change, and other factors remains unclear.

52 What this study adds: A retrospective analysis of policy implementation and SARS-CoV-2 transmission
53 dynamics over a year and a half indicated that social behavioral change was critical for limiting
54 transmission prior to increases in immunity due to infection and vaccination.

55 How this study might affect research, practice or policy: While policies contributed to slowing the spread
56 of COVID-19, the largest impact on transmission early in the pandemic was due to individual behavior
57 change, highlighting the importance of identifying and communicating effective control practices
58 regardless of specific policies.

59

60 **Main Text**

61 **Introduction**

62 As SARS-CoV-2 began to spread in early 2020, there was limited knowledge about transmission
63 dynamics and uncertainty regarding the most effective mitigation tools and how to best implement
64 them. Governments began to implement travel restrictions and stay-at-home orders to reduce contact
65 between individuals. These non-pharmaceutical intervention (NPI) policies rapidly evolved and
66 eventually encompassed a diverse range of strategies. NPI policies, such as stay-at-home orders, closure
67 of public facilities, limiting gathering size, and closing schools or universities, and their combinations
68 indeed slowed SARS-CoV-2 spread during the early pandemic phase [1–3]. While NPI policies,
69 particularly those targeting containment of the virus, were markedly successful at reducing transmission
70 opportunities, several exogenous factors also played important roles.

71

72 Social structure dramatically affects how people interact and cannot be ignored in disease dynamics.
73 Within the United States (US), physical distancing by staying home from work was a policy option
74 available to more wealthy and White individuals rather than frontline, essential worker populations [4],
75 who are more likely to have a lower socioeconomic status and belong to racial minoritized communities
76 [5,6]. Additionally, SARS-CoV-2 testing sites may have been disproportionately available in areas that
77 had a greater proportion of White residents [7–9]. In other words, the opportunity to know one's
78 infection status and limit interactions with others, if necessary, was only available to a privileged subset
79 of the population. Moreover, weather added further complexity to these dynamics. For example, SARS-
80 CoV-2 transmission may decrease as temperature and specific humidity increases [10]; potentially
81 weakening the viral envelope [11] and impacting when people spend time indoors, i.e., conditions more
82 favorable to viral transmission. Whether COVID-19 mitigation policies effectively reduced transmission

83 thus requires an assessment within the larger context of behavior, social factors, and weather
84 conditions.

85

86 COVID-19 mitigation policies are broadly accepted in the literature as successfully reducing SARS-CoV-2
87 transmission. However, the relative contribution of policy over long periods of time, while accounting
88 for exogenous factors that also drive transmission, is unknown. Disentangling competing drivers of US
89 SARS-CoV-2 dynamics over time can highlight opportunities to improve future public health outbreak
90 responses. US COVID-19 mitigation policies were diverse and heterogeneously implemented [12].
91 Additionally, the 55 million cases and over 820,000 deaths reported by December 31, 2021 [13], were
92 spatially patterned by existing demographics and health disparities across jurisdictions. Given these
93 patterns, we seek to understand the relative impact of COVID-19 mitigation policies on US SARS-CoV-2
94 transmission as both the pandemic and pandemic response evolved.

95

96 **Methods**

97 We conducted an ecological assessment of jurisdictional-level SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the US. The
98 analysis period (64 weeks; September 6, 2020, to November 27, 2021) and the fifty-one jurisdictions (all
99 US states and the District of Columbia; DC) analysed were selected for data availability.

100

101 *COVID-19 Time-varying Reproduction Number Estimation:* We estimated R_t , a weekly measure of real-
102 time transmission, using COVID-19 cases reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
103 (CDC). Onset dates were back-projected from case report dates using time-specific delays; infection
104 dates were sampled using a log-normal distribution for the incubation periods (log mean = 1.63 and log

105 standard deviation = 0.5 based on published data [14]). For each trajectory, we estimated R_t using the
106 methods described in Cori et al. [15]. We used a 7-day window and an uncertain serial interval (SI)
107 (mean: 5 days, standard deviation: 1 day), with 5 samples from the SI distribution and 5 samples of the
108 R_t posterior for each SI value [16]. We generated 250 R_t samples for each time point and jurisdiction and
109 used the mean estimate on each Wednesday for this analysis.

110

111 *Covariate data:* We included data on mitigation policies [17], personal mitigation behaviors [18,19], key
112 variants circulation [20], weather [21,22], immunity indicators [23,24], and vulnerability indicators [25].
113 Standardized policy data were obtained from the Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker [17].
114 The dataset includes a composite indicator, the Oxford Stringency Index (OSI), which reflects the overall
115 strictness of COVID-19 policies and strength of pandemic-related communication, as well as individual
116 policies. All data are described in the Supplemental Text. Descriptive statistics to inform model building
117 are shown in Supplemental Figures 1-5. We assessed correlation between covariates by estimating the
118 median pairwise R^2 with bivariate regression models (see Supplemental Figure 1).

119

120 *Analytical Approach:* We assessed the association between R_t and selected determinants with Bayesian
121 Gaussian multi-level regression models, using a log-link function and jurisdiction- and time-specific
122 intercepts. We assessed two models. The first focused on general government response, using the OSI, a
123 composite indicator of several different policies and communication strategies. Because we were also
124 interested in the individual impacts of some of the specific policies, we built a second model that
125 omitted the general OSI variable and included only a few specific policies that are components of OSI.
126 The second model included four individual policies: cancelation of public events, restrictions on

127 gathering sizes, stay-at-home orders, and mask mandates. Both models were adjusted for the
128 aforementioned covariates, which were selected for inclusion because of their *a priori* relationships with
129 COVID-19 transmission (see Supplemental Text for model statements, samples run, and information
130 about priors). Model convergence was assessed using the Gelman-Rubin convergence diagnostic (\hat{R}) and
131 model fit was evaluated from the predictive posteriors. Jurisdiction-specific results for the OSI model are
132 presented in Supplemental Figure 6.

133

134 We conducted several sensitivity analyses. First, we compared these models to the same two models
135 with naïve priors via leave-one-out (LOO) cross-validation [26] (Supplemental Figures 7) and compared
136 models with different structures for temporal correlation (Supplemental Figure 8). Second, we re-ran
137 the primary models using publicly available R_t estimates from the Centre for Mathematical Modeling of
138 Infectious Diseases COVID modelling group [27] and compared the model results to those presented
139 here (Supplemental Figure 9). Third, we re-ran the individual policy model without the behavior
140 covariates (Supplemental Figure 10).

141

142 Analyses were conducted using R (version 4.2.1), with the *rstanarm* package used for primary analyses.
143 R code is available in a public repository (https://github.com/cdcepi/COVID-19-Mitigation_Rt).

144

145 This activity was reviewed by CDC to be deemed not human subject research and therefore a human
146 subject review was not required. The study was conducted consistent with applicable federal law and
147 CDC policy[§].

148

149 **Results**

150 R_t estimates exhibited spatiotemporal variability between September 2020 and November 2021 (Figure
151 1). All jurisdictions experienced sustained transmission increases ($R_t > 1$) in late 2020, followed by a
152 period of fluctuations until the summer 2021 Delta wave when many had their highest R_t estimates. R_t
153 dynamics differed substantially between jurisdictions, such as transmission timing and rate increases in
154 late 2020 during the Alpha wave. The lowest mean estimated R_t over this period was for Vermont in
155 May 2021 ($R_t=0.66$) and the highest value was for DC in November 2021 ($R_t=1.62$).

156

157 All individual policies exhibited spatiotemporal variability (Figure 1) and moderate correlation
158 (maximum: 0.47, Supplemental Figure 1B). Overall, stringency of mitigation policies dipped slightly in
159 October 2020 and decreased substantially between March and June 2021 (Figure 2A). Jurisdictional
160 variation in policy stringency persisted, with the lowest median value in South Dakota (0.09; range: 0.06-
161 0.21) and the highest median value in Hawaii (0.66; range: 0.44-0.76).

162

[§] See e.g., 45 C.F.R. part 46, 21 C.F.R. part 56; 42 U.S.C. §241(d); 5 U.S.C. §552a; 44 U.S.C. §3501 et seq.

163 Personal COVID-19 mitigation behaviors also varied over time and space (Figure 2A). Reductions in
164 national airline travel and individual mobility showed similar patterns over time, though individual
165 mobility also varied by jurisdiction. Reductions in both were substantial and relatively static until March
166 2021. In August 2021, all three behavior indicators increased, with new reductions in national airline
167 travel and local mobility, as well as increased reported mask use (Figure 2A). The increased personal
168 mitigation behaviors in August 2021 coincided with the rapid increase in prevalence of the Delta variant
169 (Figure 2A, Supplemental Figure 1A). Expansion of the Alpha variant in early 2021 was generally slower,
170 more heterogeneous, and not correlated with increased mitigation behavior.

171

172 There was high heterogeneity in jurisdictional SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence. By the end of November
173 2022, seroprevalence ranged from 0.10 in Vermont to 0.46 in Wyoming (Figure 2A). The proportion of
174 the population that was fully vaccinated with an initial vaccine series increased across all jurisdictions
175 beginning with the vaccination distribution in early 2021 and ranged from 0.47 (Alabama) to 0.75
176 (Vermont) at the end of November 2021.

177

178 The average of the five Community COVID-19 Vulnerability Index (CCVI) indicators showed higher
179 vulnerability in southern jurisdictions (Figure 2B).

180

181 We fitted two regression models to assess the relationship of these factors with R_t dynamics: the OSI
182 Model and the Individual Policy Model. For both models, we assessed alternative spatiotemporal model
183 structures and found that a model with independent random effects for time and state provided the

184 best fit (see Supplement 8). With moderate values for CCVI indicators (0.5 each) and temperature
185 (12°C), estimated R_t in the absence of mitigation (i.e., the fixed effect intercept) was 2.2 for the OSI
186 Model (95% Credible Interval [CI]: 2.0-2.5) and 2.5 (95% CI 1.9-3.4) for the policy model.

187

188 Overall stringency, some of the specific individual policies, each behavioral component, and both
189 immunity indicators were associated with decreased R_t (Figure 3). Implementation of the strictest
190 policies observed in the US relative to least strict policy implementation decreased R_t by 9.2% (95% CI:
191 6.7- 11.6%). Within the individual policies model, cancellation of public events decreased R_t by 2.6%
192 (95% CI: 1.4-3.7%), restrictions on gathering sizes by 1.2% (95% CI: 0.1-2.2%), and stay-at-home orders
193 by 2.6% (95% CI: 0.3-4.8%). Mask mandates had a mean estimate corresponding to a 0.7% reduction in
194 R_t but did not reach statistical significance (95% CI: -1.5-0.2%). Strong associations were also observed
195 for personal mitigation behaviors in both models. For the OSI Model, R_t decreased by 22% (95% CI: 18%-
196 26%) if there were a 50% reduction in national airline travel, 2.9% (95% CI: 2.4-3.3%) if local movement
197 to recreation and retail locations decreased by 10%, and 14% (95% CI: 12-15%) if self-reported mask use
198 reached 50%. Seroprevalence and vaccination were both associated with reduced R_t - a 30% (95% CI: 28-
199 32%) and 22% (95% CI: 20-23%) estimated reduction if half the population had been previously infected
200 or fully vaccinated, respectively.

201

202 Community vulnerability also played an important role in transmission. Both population density and a
203 community's racial and ethnicity diversity level were associated with increases in R_t (Figure 3). However,
204 the level of policy stringency needed to reduce R_t to less than 1 differed within each of these groups. For

205 example, in jurisdictions with the highest population density (Figure 3B) and the most racial and ethnic
206 diversity (Figure 3C), even the highest OSI values were not sufficient to reduce transmission.

207

208 Sensitivity analysis showed consistent estimates for policy impacts even when personal mitigation
209 behaviors were excluded (Supplement 10). Coefficients were similar in direction for both models, with
210 or without informative priors (see Supplement 6), and minor magnitude differences were observed in
211 our sensitivity analyses with alternative R_t estimates (Supplement 9).

212

213 We estimated the proportional reduction associated with each time-varying component individually and
214 combined for each jurisdiction and nationally over time using the OSI Model estimates (Figure 4, Figure
215 5, and Supplemental Figure 6). Over the study period, personal mitigation behaviors were associated
216 with the largest proportional transmission reductions in all jurisdictions before vaccine implementation
217 and remained an important or leading contributor to reduction thereafter (median combined reduction
218 over time across locations: 44%, range: 10-62%) (Figure 5). Immunity was the second most important
219 contributor overall and of growing importance as more people were infected and vaccination coverage
220 increased. These patterns, however, were starkly different between jurisdictions (Figure 4 and
221 Supplemental Figure 6). For example, in November 2021 many jurisdictions had higher estimated
222 reductions associated with previous infections than vaccination (e.g., Wyoming). Meanwhile, other
223 jurisdictions with lower seropositivity or more vaccinations had higher estimated reductions associated
224 with vaccination (e.g., Vermont). At the end of the study period, SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and
225 vaccination were associated with a wide range of jurisdictional reductions (8-35% and 24-36%,

226 respectively). Policies and weather were also associated with transmission changes but with less overall
227 estimated magnitude than the effects of behavior and immunity.

228

229 **Discussion**

230 Deciphering SARS-CoV-2 transmission drivers throughout the pandemic can inform future mitigation
231 policies and interventions for respiratory pathogens. Our analysis integrates spatial and temporal
232 patterns of potential transmission determinants to assess associations between those determinants and
233 SARS-CoV-2 transmission. We included a wide range of determinants with the goal of assessing the
234 relative impact of each as the pandemic progressed. On aggregate, while both general and specific
235 policies and behavior were associated with reduced SARS-CoV-2 transmission, we found that vaccination
236 uptake, mask wearing, and reduced airline travel were associated with greater transmission reductions
237 than government policies or mandates. Yet, the proportional reduction on transmission varied overtime;
238 mask wearing and reduced airline travel had large impacts early on, while the relative contribution of
239 immunity - due to previous infection and vaccination - increased as the pandemic continued, and
240 behavior modification decreased. These findings imply that behavioral mitigation was critical to limiting
241 transmission, reinforce the value of vaccines in returning to more normal behavior, and indicate the
242 complexity of relationships between infection dynamics, behavioral choices, and government policies.

243

244 Early US COVID-19 mitigation strategies focused on physical distancing and masking policies. Our
245 estimates suggest that physical distancing policies reduced SARS-CoV-2 transmission, with an estimated
246 mean reduction of 1-3% for individual policies and an estimated total reduction of approximately 9% if
247 sets of policies tracked by the OSI were at the highest observed levels in the US. These reductions are
248 comparable with other, short-term, national-level assessments of NPI policies and showed reductions in

249 COVID-19 cases [28–31], transmission [32–34], and deaths [29]; there was some reduction in
250 effectiveness for policies with longer durations [29]. In contrast to our null results for masking policies,
251 jurisdiction-specific studies show short-term effectiveness of mask mandates in reducing cases [35] and
252 hospitalization growth rates [36]. Importantly, most of these early evaluations focused on the period in
253 which the NPIs were in effect and did not assess long-term effects or periods when the NPI was not
254 implemented, as was done here. There is some evidence of limited prolonged reduction in COVID-19
255 outcomes when NPI policies were lifted [37], with more socially disadvantaged communities
256 experiencing greater rebounds in COVID-19 burden than other communities [38]. Overall, the
257 association between individual policies and transmission reductions was strong but accounted for only a
258 modest overall transmission risk reduction. This finding highlights the need to better understand
259 adherence to the policies and what drivers personal behavior mitigations.

260

261 The relationships underlying policy implementation and behavior are intricate. Like others, we found
262 indicators of behavior such as local mobility, national airline travel, and self-reported mask use to be
263 associated with significant reductions in R_t although not necessarily temporally aligned with the
264 corresponding policies [39]. For example, analysis of early mobility data showed that movement
265 patterns changed drastically even before most physical distancing policies were implemented [40], with
266 continued reductions in movement after policies were in place [41]. It is plausible that broad agreement
267 within the physical distancing policies early in the pandemic [42] influenced personal choices to stay
268 home. Similarly, self-reported mask use increased, and local mobility decreased rapidly as the Delta
269 wave grew even though updated recommendations stated that vaccinated individuals could resume pre-
270 pandemic activities without wearing a mask, once again, indicating a behavioral response that was
271 independent of policy. Conversely, one example of temporal alignment between policy and behavior

272 was immediately following the May 2021 guidance update when there was a rapid decrease in reported
273 mask use and increases in local mobility, likely an effect of individuals returning to activities that had
274 previously stopped due to the pandemic.

275

276 Before the Delta wave, US vaccination rates were steadily rising, with varying geospatial, socioeconomic,
277 and race/ethnic coverage patterns [43,44]. Many jurisdictions also experienced substantial transmission
278 in 2020 and early 2021, resulting in greater infection-acquired immunity. While we did not adjust for
279 waning immunity [45] or for changing vaccine effectiveness with the appearance of new variants
280 [45,46], we found associations between infection-acquired immunity and vaccination with decreased
281 transmission. It is plausible that if we adjusted our model estimates for waning immunity, the strength
282 of the immunity-related associations would be attenuated. In most states, the relative impact of either
283 infection-acquired immunity or vaccination was as high as the decreasing impact of behavior change by
284 November 2021, when the impact of vaccination was higher than the impact of infection-acquired
285 immunity. There were also distinct jurisdictional differences, with some jurisdictions showing
286 comparable impact by late 2021 (e.g., Alabama, Arkansas) and others showing much higher impact from
287 vaccination than infection-acquired immunity (e.g., Connecticut, Hawaii). Additionally, we did not adjust
288 our model for COVID-19 testing, which may have a non-linear relationship with seropositivity since
289 testing availability and behaviors changed over time.

290

291 Social structure drives transmission patterns for all pathogens and the US COVID-19 epidemic
292 highlighted existing social fault lines that influenced not only who in society was more likely to get
293 infected, but also who was more likely to benefit from mitigation measures [47,48]. Here, we accounted

294 for multiple social vulnerability indicators and found higher transmission rates in states with higher
295 population density and greater racial and ethnic diversity. Stronger mitigation was needed to reduce R_t
296 below the critical threshold of 1 for communities with higher vulnerability. This suggest that a one-size-
297 fits all approach to mitigation is not appropriate and that more vulnerable communities may benefit
298 from intentional support. Our findings align with several results from county-level analyses. For
299 example, higher SARS-CoV-2 transmission rates occurred in low-income and racial minoritized
300 communities [49]. Additionally, counties with higher social vulnerability were more likely to become a
301 COVID-19 burden hotspot [50], that is a geographic area with elevated disease incidence [51]. Because
302 structural racism is part of the intersectional factors comprising social vulnerability, it is unsurprising
303 that hotspots were common in US counties with a greater percentage of non-White residents [52–54].
304 These findings highlight the importance of incorporating social markers of risk in infectious disease
305 transmission models [55].

306

307 Our findings do not reflect causal relationships. Establishing causality between mitigation measures and
308 transmission is complicated by a variety of risk factors, from SARS-CoV-2 variants emergence and
309 changes in human behavior to environmental conditions— which all fluctuate over time and space. First,
310 many important SARS-CoV-2 transmission determinants are correlated. To partially address this
311 limitation, we removed highly correlated variables that measured similar factors when possible.
312 However, we did choose to retain some highly correlated variables, which may have influenced the
313 findings. Determining the impact of these highly correlated variables, however, is not straightforward
314 given the directionality of the conditional associations and the correlations between the covariates
315 themselves. Second, jurisdiction-level policies may differ substantially from policies implemented at a
316 county or city level. Additionally, many different policy variations were implemented (e.g., some

317 jurisdictions required masks universally, whereas others only in certain locations or where physical
318 distancing was not possible), even within jurisdictions, and those variations were not captured here.
319 Third, we applied a regression framework, which assumes log-linear independence between covariates
320 that does not account for the observed correlation between variables. Overall, the potential causal
321 pathways between the predictors and R_t are not individually identifiable at this scale.

322

323 Ideally, the wealth of data and intervention diversity in the United States could be used to develop
324 specific recipes for control. However, the diversity and correlation between many contributing factors
325 make precise intervention estimates and/or combinations of interventions infeasible. Here, we
326 conducted an ecological analysis of key strategy types and found that personal mitigation behaviors
327 were more strongly associated with decreased transmission than policies. While most policies may not
328 be sufficient to control COVID-19 on their own, a combination of policies and communication efforts
329 that promote, support, and reinforce behavior change may be an essential pathway for mitigation. The
330 other most impactful intervention was vaccination, a nationwide intervention that was not available
331 early on but became as important as behavior modification for controlling transmission in most
332 jurisdictions by mid to late 2021 [29]. Importantly, transmission was reduced not by a single measure,
333 but by various layered measures; this indicates that no single measure is likely to control SARS-CoV-2 on
334 its own [56]. These findings demonstrate the complexity of the COVID-19 response and SARS-CoV-2
335 transmission and illustrate the ongoing importance of layered mitigation approaches integrated across
336 public health, government, and communities.

337

338 **Data Availability:** COVID-19 case data are available upon request at [https://data.cdc.gov/Case-](https://data.cdc.gov/Case-Surveillance/COVID-19-Case-Surveillance-Restricted-Access-Detai/mbd7-r32t)
339 [Surveillance/COVID-19-Case-Surveillance-Restricted-Access-Detai/mbd7-r32t](https://data.cdc.gov/Case-Surveillance/COVID-19-Case-Surveillance-Restricted-Access-Detai/mbd7-r32t). All other data are in the
340 public domain and referenced in Supplement 1.

341
342 **CDC disclaimer:** The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not
343 necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

344
345 **Acknowledgments:** This research is based on survey results from Carnegie Mellon University's Delphi
346 Group. Thank you to Prabasaj Paul for his thoughtful comments and review of this manuscript.

347
348 **Author Contributions:** MAJ and VKL designed the research question, with assistance from SK and JMH.
349 VKL designed the analysis plan, with components run by VKL, SK, PVP, and TC. VKL wrote the manuscript
350 in consultation with BLC, JMH, RBS, MB, and MAJ. All authors provided critical feedback to help shape
351 the analysis and manuscript. All authors accept full responsibility for the finished work and/or the
352 conduct of the study, had access to the data, and controlled the decision to publish.

353
354 **Patient and Public Involvement:** Because we used anonymous, public data, we did not include
355 individuals that in the design, conduct, reporting, or dissemination plans of this work.

356
357 **Competing Interest Statement:** The authors declare no competing interests.

358
359 **Funding:** N/A

360 **Ethics Approval:** No Ethics Approval needed.

361

362 References

- 363
- 364 1. Brauner JM, Mindermann S, Sharma M, Johnston D, Salvatier J, Gavenčiak T, et al. Inferring the
365 effectiveness of government interventions against COVID-19. *Science* [Internet]. 2021 Feb 19 [cited
366 2022 Dec 1];371(6531). Available from: <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abd9338>
- 367 2. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, Unwin HJT, Mellan TA, Coupland H, et al. Estimating the effects of
368 non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nat* 2020 5847820. 2020 Jun
369 8;584(7820):257–61.
- 370 3. Haug N, Geyrhofer L, Londei A, Dervic E, Desvars-Larrive A, Loreto V, et al. Ranking the
371 effectiveness of worldwide COVID-19 government interventions. *Nat Hum Behav* 2020 412. 2020 Nov
372 16;4(12):1303–12.
- 373 4. Asfaw A. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Teleworking Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic in the
374 United States: A Mediation Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2022 Vol 19 Page 4680. 2022 Apr
375 13;19(8):4680.
- 376 5. Rogers TN, Rogers CR, VanSant-Webb E, Gu LY, Yan B, Qeadan F. Racial Disparities in COVID-19
377 Mortality Among Essential Workers in the United States. *World Med Health Policy*. 2020 Sep
378 1;12(3):311–27.
- 379 6. Gaitens J, Condon M, Fernandes E, McDiarmid M. COVID-19 and Essential Workers: A Narrative
380 Review of Health Outcomes and Moral Injury. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021 Vol 18 Page 1446.
381 2021 Feb 4;18(4):1446.
- 382 7. DiMaggio P. Culture and Cognition [Internet]. Vol. 23, *Annual Review of Sociology*. Annual
383 Reviews; [cited 2018 Jan 5]. p. 263–87. Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2952552>
- 384 8. Grigsby-Toussaint DS, Shin JC, Jones A. Disparities in the distribution of COVID-19 testing sites in
385 black and Latino areas in new York City. *Prev Med*. 2021 Jun 1;147:106463.
- 386 9. Mody A, Pfeifauf K, Bradley C, Fox B, Hlatshwayo MG, Ross W, et al. Understanding Drivers of
387 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Racial Disparities: A Population-Level Analysis of COVID-19
388 Testing Among Black and White Populations. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am*. 2021 Nov
389 1;73(9):e2921–31.
- 390 10. Smith TP, Flaxman S, Gallinat AS, Kinosian SP, Stemkovski M, Juliette H, et al. Temperature and
391 population density influence SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the absence of nonpharmaceutical
392 interventions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2021 Jun 22;118(25):e2019284118.
- 393 11. Schoeman D, Fielding BC. Coronavirus envelope protein: current knowledge. *Virology* 2019 161.
394 2019 May 27;16(1):1–22.
- 395 12. Hallas L, Pyrali M, Hale T, Professor A, Brown A, Sudarmawan A, et al. Variation in US states'
396 responses to COVID-19 [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Dec 2]. Available from:
397 <https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/publications/variation-us-states-responses-covid-19>
- 398 13. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). CDC COVID Data Tracker: Home [Internet].
399 [cited 2022 Dec 2]. Available from: <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#datatracker-home>
- 400 14. McAloon C, Collins Á, Hunt K, Barber A, Byrne AW, Butler F, et al. Incubation period of COVID-19:
401 a rapid systematic review and meta-analysis of observational research. *BMJ Open*. 2020 Aug
402 1;10(8):e039652.
- 403 15. Cori A, Ferguson NM, Fraser C, Cauchemez S. A New Framework and Software to Estimate Time-
404 Varying Reproduction Numbers During Epidemics. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2013 Nov 1;178(9):1505–12.
- 405 16. Alene M, Yismaw L, Assemie MA, Ketema DB, Gietaneh W, Birhan TY. Serial interval and
406 incubation period of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2021 Dec
407 1;21(1):1–9.

- 408 17. Hale T, Angrist N, Goldszmidt R, Kira B, Petherick A, Phillips T, et al. A global panel database of
409 pandemic policies (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker). *Nat Hum Behav* 2021 54. 2021
410 Mar 8;5(4):529–38.
- 411 18. Salomon JA, Reinhart A, Bilinski A, Chua EJ, la Motte-Kerr W, Rönn MM, et al. The US COVID-19
412 Trends and Impact Survey: Continuous real-time measurement of COVID-19 symptoms, risks,
413 protective behaviors, testing, and vaccination. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* [Internet]. 2021 Dec 21 [cited
414 2022 Dec 2];118(51). Available from: /delphi-epidata/symptom-survey/
415 19. COVID-19 Trends and Impact Survey | Delphi Epidata API [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 2].
416 Available from: <https://cmu-delphi.github.io/delphi-epidata/symptom-survey/>
- 417 20. Paul P, France AM, Aoki Y, Batra D, Biggerstaff M, Dugan V, et al. Genomic Surveillance for SARS-
418 CoV-2 Variants Circulating in the United States, December 2020–May 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal*
419 *Wkly Rep.* 2021;70(23):846–50.
- 420 21. Carslaw D. Import Surface Meteorological Data from NOAA Integrated Surface Database (ISD) •
421 worldmet [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Dec 2]. Available from:
422 <https://davidcarslaw.github.io/worldmet/>
- 423 22. Global Hourly - Integrated Surface Database (ISD) | National Centers for Environmental
424 Information (NCEI) [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 2]. Available from:
425 <https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/products/land-based-station/integrated-surface-database>
- 426 23. García-Carreras B, T Hitchings MD, Johansson MA, Biggerstaff M, Slayton RB, Healy JM, et al.
427 Accounting for assay performance when estimating the temporal dynamics in SARS-CoV-2
428 seroprevalence in the U.S. [cited 2022 Dec 2]; Available from:
429 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.13.22279702>
- 430 24. COVID-19 Vaccination Trends in the United States, National and Jurisdictional | Data | Centers
431 for Disease Control and Prevention [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 2]. Available from:
432 <https://data.cdc.gov/Vaccinations/COVID-19-Vaccination-Trends-in-the-United-States-N/rh2h-3yt2>
- 433 25. Smittenaar P, Stewart N, Sutermeister S, Coome L, Dibner-Dunlap A, Jain M, et al. A COVID-19
434 Community Vulnerability Index to drive precision policy in the US. *medRxiv.* 2021 May
435 20;2021.05.19.21257455.
- 436 26. Vehtari A, Gelman A, Gabry J. Practical Bayesian model evaluation using leave-one-out cross-
437 validation and WAIC. *Stat Comput* 2016 275. 2016 Aug 30;27(5):1413–32.
- 438 27. Abbott S, Hellewell J, Thompson RN, Sherratt K, Gibbs HP, Bosse NI, et al. Estimating the time-
439 varying reproduction number of SARS-CoV-2 using national and subnational case counts. *Wellcome*
440 *Open Res* 2020 5112. 2020 Dec 8;5:112.
- 441 28. Courtemanche C, Garuccio J, Le A, Pinkston J, Yelowitz A. Strong social distancing measures in
442 the united states reduced the covid-19 growth rate. *Health Aff (Millwood).* 2020;39(7):1237–46.
- 443 29. Lurie MN, Silva J, Yorlets RR, Tao J, Chan PA. Coronavirus disease 2019 epidemic doubling time in
444 the United States before and during stay-at-home restrictions. *J Infect Dis.* 2020;222(10):1601–6.
- 445 30. Siedner MJ, Harling G, Reynolds Z, Gilbert RF, Haneuse S, Venkataramani AS, et al. Social
446 distancing to slow the US COVID-19 epidemic: Longitudinal pretest–posttest comparison group study.
447 *PLoS Med.* 2020;17(8 August):1–12.
- 448 31. Wellenius GA, Vispute S, Espinosa V, Fabrikant A, Tsai TC, Hennessy J, et al. Impacts of social
449 distancing policies on mobility and COVID-19 case growth in the US. *Nat Commun.* 2021;12(1):6–12.
- 450 32. Liu X, Xu X, Li G, Xu X, Sun Y, Wang F, et al. Differential impact of non-pharmaceutical public
451 health interventions on COVID-19 epidemics in the United States. *BMC Public Health.* 2021 Dec
452 1;21(1):1–7.
- 453 33. Dreher N, Spiera Z, McAuley FM, Kuohn L, Durbin JR, Marayati NF, et al. Policy Interventions,
454 Social Distancing, and SARS-CoV-2 Transmission in the United States: A Retrospective State-level
455 Analysis. *Am J Med Sci.* 2021 May 1;361(5):575–84.

- 456 34. Yang B, Huang AT, Garcia-Carreras B, Hart WE, Staid A, Hitchings MDT, et al. Effect of specific
457 non-pharmaceutical intervention policies on SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the counties of the United
458 States. *Nat Commun.* 2021 Jun 11;12(1):3560.
- 459 35. Van Dyke ME, Rogers TM, Pevzner E, Satterwhite CL, Shah HB, Beckman WJ, et al. Trends in
460 County-Level COVID-19 Incidence in Counties With and Without a Mask Mandate — Kansas, June 1–
461 August 23, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2022 Nov 27;69(47):1777–81.
- 462 36. Joo H, Miller GF, Sunshine G, Gakh M, Pike J, Havers FP, et al. Decline in COVID-19
463 Hospitalization Growth Rates Associated with Statewide Mask Mandates — 10 States, March–
464 October 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021 Feb 12;70(6):212–6.
- 465 37. Singh S, Shaikh M, Hauck K, Miraldo M. Impacts of introducing and lifting nonpharmaceutical
466 interventions on COVID-19 daily growth rate and compliance in the United States. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
467 *U S A.* 2021 Mar 23;118(12):e2021359118.
- 468 38. Chang HY, Tang W, Hatfeg E, Kitchen C, Weiner JP, Kharrazi H. Differential impact of mitigation
469 policies and socioeconomic status on COVID-19 prevalence and social distancing in the United States.
470 *BMC Public Health.* 2021;21(1):1–10.
- 471 39. Crane MA, Shermock KM, Omer SB, Romley JA. Change in Reported Adherence to
472 Nonpharmaceutical Interventions During the COVID-19 Pandemic, April–November 2020. *JAMA.* 2021
473 Mar 2;325(9):883–5.
- 474 40. Sanchez JN, Reyes GA, Martínez-López B, Johnson CK. Impact of social distancing on early SARS-
475 CoV-2 transmission in the United States. *Zoonoses Public Health.* 2022;(November 2021):1–11.
- 476 41. Gupta S, Nguyen T, Raman S, Lee B, Lozano-Rojas F, Bento A, et al. Tracking Public and Private
477 Responses to the COVID-19 Epidemic. <https://doi.org/10.1086/716197>. 2021 Sep 1;7(4):361–404.
- 478 42. Czeisler MÉ, Tynan MA, Howard ME, Honeycutt S, Fulmer EB, Kidder DP, et al. Public Attitudes,
479 Behaviors, and Beliefs Related to COVID-19, Stay-at-Home Orders, Nonessential Business Closures,
480 and Public Health Guidance — United States, New York City, and Los Angeles, May 5–12, 2020.
481 *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(24):751–8.
- 482 43. Berry CR, Fowler A, Glazer T, Handel-Meyer S, MacMillen A. Evaluating the effects of shelter-in-
483 place policies during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2021;118(15):1–6.
- 484 44. Pingali C, Meghani M, Razzaghi H, Mark ;, Lamias J, Weintraub E, et al. COVID-19 Vaccination
485 Coverage Among Insured Persons Aged ≥16 Years, by Race/Ethnicity and Other Selected
486 Characteristics—Eight. 2021;70(28). Available from:
487 https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/mmwr_continuingEducation.html
- 488 45. Milne G, Hames T, Scotton C, Gent N, Johnsen A, Anderson RM, et al. Does infection with or
489 vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 lead to lasting immunity? *Lancet Respir Med.* 2021 Dec
490 1;9(12):1450–66.
- 491 46. Krause PR, Fleming TR, Longini IM, Peto R, Briand S, Heymann DL, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Variants and
492 Vaccines. *N Engl J Med.* 2021 Jul 8;385(2):179–86.
- 493 47. Egede LE, Walker RJ. Structural Racism, Social Risk Factors, and Covid-19 — A Dangerous
494 Convergence for Black Americans. *N Engl J Med.* 2020 Sep 17;383(12):e77.
- 495 48. Noppert GA, Zalla LC. Who Counts and Who Gets Counted? Health Equity in Infectious Disease
496 Surveillance. *Am J Public Health.* 2021 Jun 1;111(6):1004–6.
- 497 49. Bibbins-Domingo K. This Time Must Be Different: Disparities During the COVID-19 Pandemic.
498 <https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-2247>. 2020 Apr 28;173(3):233–4.
- 499 50. Dasgupta S, Bowen VB, Leidner A, Fletcher K, Musial T, Rose C, et al. Association Between Social
500 Vulnerability and a County’s Risk for Becoming a COVID-19 Hotspot — United States, June 1–July 25,
501 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020 Oct 10;69(42):1535.
- 502 51. Lessler J, Azman AS, McKay HS, Moore SM. What is a Hotspot Anyway? *Am J Trop Med Hyg.*
503 2017 Jun 6;96(6):1270.

- 504 52. Andersen LM, Harden SR, Sugg MM, Runkle JD, Lundquist TE. Analyzing the spatial determinants
505 of local Covid-19 transmission in the United States. *Sci Total Environ.* 2021 Feb 1;754:142396.
506 53. Maroko AR, Nash D, Pavilonis BT. COVID-19 and Inequity: a Comparative Spatial Analysis of New
507 York City and Chicago Hot Spots. *J Urban Health Bull N Y Acad Med.* 2020 Aug;97(4):461–70.
508 54. Kim H, Zanobetti A, Bell ML. Temporal transition of racial/ethnic disparities in COVID-19
509 outcomes in 3108 counties of the United States: Three phases from January to December 2020. *Sci*
510 *Total Environ.* 2021 Oct 15;791:148167.
511 55. Zalla LC, Martin CL, Edwards JK, Gartner DR, Noppert GA. A Geography of Risk: Structural Racism
512 and Coronavirus Disease 2019 Mortality in the United States. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2021 Aug
513 1;190(8):1439–46.56.
514 56. Reason J. Understanding adverse events: human factors. *BMJ Quality & Safety.* 1995 Jun
515 1;4(2):80-9.

Figures

Figure 1. The jurisdiction-specific weekly COVID-19 time-varying reproduction number (R_t), 90% confidence intervals in grey, and time periods reflecting implementation of specific non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs). State-wide implementation of stay-at-home orders are in red, restrictions on gatherings in yellow, cancellation of public events in dark blue, and universal masking when physical distancing was not possible in light blue. The solid vertical line represents January 1, 2021 and the dashed horizontal line reflects an R_t value of 1.0.




Figure 2. A. Distribution of time-varying covariates, including the Oxford Stringency Index (OSI), personal COVID-19 behaviors, proportion of key SARS-CoV-2 variants in circulation, weather, and immunity to SARS-CoV-2. Lines reflect jurisdiction-level observations over time, with the median values across jurisdictions depicted by the bold line. The solid, black vertical line represents January 1, 2021. **B.** Average of the three selected Community Covid-19 Vulnerability Index (CCVI) indicators for each jurisdiction.




Figure 3. A. Percent change in the COVID-19 time-varying reproduction (R_t) number from policies, personal COVID-19 behaviors, proportion of key SARS-CoV-2 variants in circulation, weather, immunity to SARS-CoV-2, and variables affecting underlying trends in transmission. The results from two different linear regression models are shown below. Model one, in pink, included the Oxford Stringency Index (OSI). Model two, in purple, included a subset of policies used to comprise the OSI. Both regression models were gaussian with log link function and had jurisdiction and time specific intercepts. The posterior mean is represented by the point and the 95% credible intervals by the bars. **B.** The marginal mean in the COVID-19 R_t across the range of observed OSI values in jurisdictions with the highest and lowest population density. **C.** The marginal mean COVID-19 R_t , and 95% credible interval show in bands, across the range of observed OSI values in jurisdictions with the highest and lowest racial and ethnic diversity.




Figure 4. Estimates for jurisdiction-level proportional reductions in the COVID-19 time-varying reproduction number (R_t) over time for the Oxford Stringency Index (OSI) regression model. Colored lines depict the relative reduction for select sets of covariates, with the 95% credible interval in the corresponding-colored bands, and the solid vertical line represents January 1, 2021.




Figure 5. Average relative contribution of observed covariates on fitted COVID-19 time-varying reproduction number (R_t) across all jurisdictions from the OSI model. The highest values over time (i.e., the top of the pink band) represent R_t estimates including only the effects of local vulnerability and variants. The pink band represents reductions in R_t associated with changing weather. The blue bands represent reductions in R_t associated with infection-acquired immunity (dark blue) and with behavior modification (i.e., masking use, mobility, and national airline travel, combined and depicted with light blue). The green bands represent reductions in R_t associated with policies (light green) and vaccination (dark green). The fitted values from the regression model are represented with the top of the black band. The solid vertical line represents January 1, 2021.

