

# An ecological study of COVID-19 outcomes among Florida counties

Sobur Ali<sup>1</sup>, Taj Azarian<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Burnett School of Biomedical Sciences, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida, USA.

\*Corresponding author: Taj Azarian, Email: [taj.azarian@ucf.edu](mailto:taj.azarian@ucf.edu)

## Abstract

During the COVID-19 pandemic, Florida reported some of the highest cases and deaths in the US. County-level variation in COVID-19 outcomes has yet to be comprehensively investigated. Here, we assess correlates of COVID-19 outcomes among Florida counties that explain variation in case, mortality, and case fatality rates (CFR) across pandemic waves. County-level administrative data and COVID-19 case reports was obtained from public repositories. We tested spatial autocorrelation to assess geographic clustering of case rate, mortality rate, and CFR. Stepwise linear regression was employed to investigate the association between COVID-19 outcomes and 18 demographic, socioeconomic, and health-related county-level predictors. We found mortality rate and CFR were significantly higher in rural counties compared to urban counties, among which significant differences in vaccination coverage were also observed. Multivariate analysis found that the percentage of the population aged over 65 years, the percentage of obese people, and the percentage of the rural population were significant predictors of COVID-19 case rate. Median age, vaccination coverage, percentage of people who smoke, and percentage of the population with diabetes were significant influencing factors for CFR. Importantly, higher vaccination coverage was significantly associated with a reduction in case rate ( $R = -0.26$ ,  $p = 0.03$ ) and mortality ( $R = -0.51$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Last, we found that spatial dependencies play a role in explaining variations in COVID-19 CFR among Florida counties. Our findings emphasize the need for targeted, equitable public health strategies to reduce disparities and enhance population resilience during public health crises.

**Keywords:** COVID-19, Florida, Urban rural, Socioeconomic, Regression analysis, CFR

## 31 **Introduction**

32 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), responsible for the  
33 pandemic of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), has posed an unprecedented  
34 crisis to public health worldwide. As of December 2023, COVID-19 has resulted in 103  
35 million cases and 1.14 million deaths in the US. As the pandemic unfolded, it became  
36 increasingly evident that demographic, socioeconomic, and health-related risk factors  
37 play crucial roles in influencing the COVID-19 outcome among communities in the  
38 United States (US) [1,2].

39 Socioeconomic predictors, including income, education, employment, and access to  
40 healthcare services, have long been recognized as critical determinants of health  
41 outcomes [3]. These factors may be associated with an individual's capacity to adhere  
42 to public health guidelines, access healthcare resources, and implement preventive  
43 measures, which can impact the spread and severity of infectious diseases such as  
44 COVID-19. Furthermore, individuals residing in rural counties, characterized by  
45 socioeconomic challenges such as higher poverty rates, limited access to healthcare  
46 services, and lower educational attainment, have been found to be particularly  
47 vulnerable to COVID-19 [4,5]. However, variations in study time periods, population  
48 demographics, risk factors assessed, and endpoints have resulted in mixed findings  
49 among studies investigating the influence of demographic and socioeconomic risk  
50 factors on COVID-19 incidence rates [6].

51 Florida, one of the most populous states in the US, is notable for its unique  
52 demographic composition, high rates of immigration, recognition as a popular tourist  
53 destination, and climate. The diverse population, ranging from densely populated urban  
54 centers to sparsely populated rural counties, contributes to a complex web of potential  
55 influences on disease transmission and outcomes [7,8]. Considering the socioeconomic  
56 variation among counties in Florida, it is crucial to examine how these factors may have  
57 influenced COVID-19 outcomes.

58 In this study, we first investigated geographic clustering of COVID-19 outcomes. We  
59 then analyzed variation in case rate, mortality rate, and CFR across epidemic waves

60 and assessed the association of demographic, socioeconomic, and health-related  
61 factors, and COVID-19 outcomes. Our results show that demographic, socioeconomic,  
62 and health-related differences explain a significant proportion of the variation in COVID-  
63 19 outcomes and that those inequalities disproportionately affected rural counties in  
64 Florida.

65

## 66 **Methods**

### 67 **Map data**

68 Florida Rural counties designations were obtained from the Florida Department of  
69 Health (FDOH) [9]. FDOH defines rural as (i) a county with a population of 75,000 or  
70 less, (ii) a county with a population of 125,000 or less which is contiguous to a county of  
71 75,000 or less, (iii) any municipality within a county as described above [9]. County-level  
72 cartographic boundary Shapefiles were downloaded from the US Census Bureau  
73 TIGER Geodatabase [10].

### 74 **COVID-19 Outcome Data**

75 County-level confirmed COVID-19 case and death data were obtained from The New  
76 York Times GitHub repository (<https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data>), based on  
77 reports from state and local health agencies [11]. Population statistics were obtained  
78 from the US Census Bureau (<https://www2.census.gov/geo/docs/reference/ua/>). Case  
79 rates represent the number of cumulative cases per 100,000 population and the  
80 mortality rate the number reported cumulated deaths from COVID-19 per 100,000  
81 population as of December 2022. Each county's CFR was determined by dividing the  
82 cumulative deaths associated with COVID-19 by cumulative COVID-19 cases [12].

83 We categorized the pandemic into five epidemic waves, delineated based on the  
84 epidemic curve and coinciding with the emerge of notable variants of concern during  
85 specific date ranges. The initial wave occurred from June 1, 2020, to September 30,  
86 2020, corresponding to the onset of the pandemic and the original strain. Subsequent  
87 waves included the second wave from October 1, 2020 to May 30, 2021, associated  
88 with the Alpha variant; the third wave from July 1, 2021, to October 31, 2021, marked by  
89 the Delta variant; the fourth wave from December 1, 2021 to February 28, 2022,  
90 characterized by the emergence of the Omicron variant (mainly BA.1, BA.2 subvariant);  
91 and the fifth wave from April 1, 2022 to October 31, 2022, comprised largely of Omicron  
92 sub-variants BA.4 and BA.5.

93

## 94 **Covariates**

95 Eighteen demographics, socioeconomic, and health-related factors were included in the  
96 study (**Table 1**). Data were collected from the Florida Community Health Assessment  
97 Resource Tool Set (CHARTS, [www.flhealthcharts.gov](http://www.flhealthcharts.gov)), maintained by FDOH. Data for  
98 the percent of the population in the county within rural blocks in Florida was obtained  
99 from the US Census Bureau and COVID-19 vaccination data for Florida counties from  
100 the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) [13]. Age-adjusted deaths from all  
101 causes per 100,000 population were collected from Florida CHARTS. Age-adjusted  
102 rates, which accounts to variation in county age structure, were calculated as described  
103 here (<https://www.flhealthcharts.gov/charts/OpenPage.aspx?tn=665>). All data used in  
104 this study were retrieved from publicly available databases.

## 105 **Statistical Analysis**

106 All variables were reported as mean and standard deviation, and the coefficient of  
107 variation (CV) was calculated to assess the relative dispersion. Spread and collinearity  
108 of the predictor variables were assessed through histograms, bivariate scatterplots, and  
109 Spearman correlation coefficients using R-package psych v2.3.6 [14]. Correlation  
110 coefficients were calculated for each predictor with the outcome using Spearman or  
111 Pearson correlation according to data type and distribution. Florida county-level case  
112 rates, mortality rates, and CFR were visualized in the map using ggplot2 v3.4.3 and sf  
113 v1.0.14 package in R v4.3.1.

114 We used multivariate ordinary least squares (OLS) regression model to examine the  
115 relationship of predictor variables and COVID-19 outcomes. Then, we built multivariate  
116 models for each outcome using a stepwise backward procedure, starting with the fully  
117 saturated model, and then iteratively dropping variables. Akaike Information Criteria  
118 (AIC) and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) were used to assess model fit and the degree  
119 of collinearity among covariates, respectively.  $R^2$  was calculated for the final model [15].  
120 All statistical analysis and visualization were performed using R v4.3.1 [16] with Rstudio  
121 v2023.06.1 [17] statistical software.

122

## 123 **Spatial autocorrelation**

124 We calculated the global Moran I statistic to examine whether county COVID-19 case  
125 rate, mortality rate, and CFR were spatially autocorrelated [18]. First-order Queen  
126 contiguity binary neighbor list and spatial weights matrix were constructed using R  
127 package spdep v1.2.8. Counties were considered neighbors when they shared one  
128 common point or vertex [19]. Local spatial autocorrelation identified four distinctive  
129 categories: High-High, Low-Low, High-Low, and Low-High. Local spatial clusters of  
130 COVID-19 outcome were measured using GeoDa v1.22 software [20].

131 We compared the final selected ordinary least squares (OLS) model and two spatial  
132 regression models: spatial lag model (SLM) and spatial error model (SEM). SLM  
133 examines how the adjacent counties influence an index county's outcome variable. The  
134 spatial lag parameter ( $\rho$ ) estimates the association between the average logged period  
135 rate in nearby counties and the logged period rate in the index county. In SEM, the  
136 parameter ( $\lambda$ ) determines how well a county's ordinary least squares (OLS) residual  
137 correlates with the residuals of its neighbors. This spatial error parameter ( $\lambda$ ) represents  
138 the strength of the association between the average residuals or errors in nearby  
139 counties and the residual or error of the current county [21]. We used the R "lagsarlm"  
140 and "errorsarlm" functions from spatialreg package to perform spatial regression  
141 analysis [22].

142

## 143 **Results**

### 144 **Descriptive mapping of COVID-19 outcomes in Florida**

145 Florida comprises 67 counties (**Figure 1A**) with a population of 21 million, where a  
146 higher percentage of the state's population (87.7%) lives in urbanized areas. By  
147 December 2022, Florida reported around seven million confirmed cases and around  
148 84,000 COVID-19 associated deaths. Visualization of cumulative rates across the five  
149 waves showed geographical heterogeneity in COVID-19 case rate, mortality rate, and  
150 CFR across Florida counties. Seminole, Miami-Dade, and Broward Counties had the  
151 highest case rate, while Glades, St. Johns, and Sumter Counties exhibited lower rates  
152 (**Figure 1B**). Union, Suwannee, Citrus Counties had the highest death rate, whereas  
153 Orange, Monroe, and St. Johns Counties had the lowest mortality rate (**Figure 1C**).  
154 Citrus, Highlands, and Union counties had the highest CFR and Leon, Orange, Monroe  
155 counties had lowest CFR (**Figure 1D**).

156 **Table 1** presents the summary and descriptive statistics of COVID-19 outcome  
157 variables and independent variables, and CV, which informs dispersion of the data.  
158 Mortality rate and CFR were more dispersed than case incidence rate. Demographic,  
159 socioeconomic, and health-related risk factors vary widely among counties. The  
160 percentage of people in the rural areas, hospital bed rate, Hispanic population, and  
161 poverty rate are the most heterogeneous factors.

### 162 **Spatial autocorrelation of COVID-19 outcome between Florida counties**

163 Moran's I statistics were calculated to variables among Florida counties. Assessment of  
164 spatial autocorrelation in COVID-19 outcomes indicated significant but weak positive  
165 spatial autocorrelation for case rate ( $I = 0.12$ ,  $p = 0.037$ ), mortality Rate ( $I = 0.22$ ,  $p$   
166  $=0.001$ ), and CFR ( $I = 0.3$ ,  $p < 0.00$ ). The Local Moran test was conducted to examine  
167 spatial clustering in more detail. The "High-High" category signifies areas with high  
168 values neighboring other counties with high values, "High-Low" counties with high  
169 values neighboring counties with low values, and "Low-Low" counties with low values  
170 neighboring other counties with low values. Orange County (Orlando, FL) belonged to a  
171 High-High case rate cluster, and Flagler, Putnam, Marion, Citrus and Hernando

172 County a Low-Low cluster (**Figure 2A**). Madison, Suwannee, Lafayette, Gilchrist, and  
173 Columbia Counties belonged to a High-High mortality rate cluster, and Okaloosa,  
174 Collier, and Miami-Dade Counties a Low-Low cluster (**Figure 2B**). For CFR, we  
175 identified one High-High cluster consisting of Marion, Citrus, Sumter, and Hernando  
176 Counties and a Low-Low cluster consisting of four additional counties (**Figure 2C**).

### 177 **Trends in COVID-19 case and mortality rates**

178 Our analysis revealed higher case rates in the first and third waves in rural counties  
179 compared to urban counties. However, no significant difference in case rates was  
180 observed for the second and fourth waves (**Figure 3A**). Furthermore, we observed a  
181 noteworthy temporal difference. Over the five pandemic waves, rural counties appeared  
182 to experience a more acute increase in COVID-19 case incidence, while urban areas  
183 described by a more protracted epidemic curve (**Figure 4**). Our analysis indicates that,  
184 despite the differences in epidemic trajectories, cumulative COVID-19 case rates did not  
185 differ significantly between urban and rural counties (**Figure 3B**).

186 We further assessed mortality rates in urban and rural counties across five pandemic  
187 waves in the context of SARS-CoV-2 variants (**Figure 5**). We found that the mortality  
188 rates in rural counties was significantly higher than in urban counties during the second,  
189 third, and fifth waves (**Figure 3C**). While the difference in mortality rate between urban  
190 and rural counties during the first and fourth waves was not significant, the overall  
191 mortality rate was significantly higher among rural counties (**Figure 3D**). Variation in the  
192 case and mortality rate trends across the five waves of the pandemic was also  
193 observed. In particular, the third wave (Delta variant) exhibited the highest mortality  
194 rate, while the fourth wave (Omicron variant) showed a significantly higher case rate.  
195 CFR was significantly higher ( $p = 0.02$ ) in rural counties than in urban (**Figure 3F**).  
196 However, we observed inconsistent patterns among urban and rural counties when we  
197 assessed CFR differences during the five waves. In the first wave, CFR was  
198 significantly higher in urban counties, whereas in rural counties CFR was higher in the  
199 second and fifth waves (**Figure 3E**). As decreased access to SARS-CoV-2 testing  
200 among rural counties may have resulted in an under estimation of case rates, we  
201 conducted a sensitivity analysis finding that even after accounting for a 2.6%



202 underreporting of cases among rural counties, the CFR remained significantly higher (p  
203 = 0.04).

204 Lastly, we extended our investigation to include age-adjusted all-cause mortality rates,  
205 comparing urban and rural Florida counties before and during the pandemic. We  
206 observed higher all-cause mortality among rural counties than urban counties before  
207 and during the pandemic (**Figure 6A**). Our analysis also indicated that the difference in  
208 death rates between urban and rural counties increased during the pandemic (**Figure**  
209 **6A**). By calculating the percent change in the age-adjusted all-cause death rate from  
210 2019 (pre-pandemic) to subsequent pandemic years (2020, 2021 and 2022), we found  
211 a consistent and statistically significant trend: rural counties experienced a higher mean  
212 percentage change in age-adjusted all-cause mortality than urban counties across the  
213 analyzed years (**Figure 6B**).

#### 214 **Vaccination disparities between urban and rural counties in Florida**

215 To investigate the role of vaccination on the trajectory of the pandemic, we analyzed  
216 differences in vaccination coverage, finding significantly lower vaccination coverage in  
217 rural counties compared to urban counties (**Figure 7A**). Further, when considering  
218 vaccination trends, a persistent pattern became evident. Urban counties (Mean: 69.48,  
219 95% CI: 66.55-72.41) consistently had ~ 20% higher vaccination coverage than rural  
220 counties (Mean: 45.94, 95% CI: 42.39-49.50) (**Figure 7B**). However, several rural  
221 counties were outliers, exhibiting higher vaccination rates than certain urban counties.

#### 222 **Correlation analysis**

223 We evaluated the correlation between selected influencing factors and COVID-19 case  
224 rate, mortality rate, and CFR. A significant positive correlation was observed between  
225 case rate and individuals below poverty ( $r = 0.36$ ,  $P = 0.003$ ) and percent of the  
226 population of black race ( $r = 0.55$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ); significant negative correlation was  
227 observed between case rate and median age ( $r = -0.58$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), percent of  
228 population insured ( $r = -0.32$ ,  $p=0.008$ ) and COVID-19 vaccination coverage ( $r = -0.26$ ,  
229  $P = 0.03$ ). We also found a significant positive correlation between mortality rate and  
230 percent of rural population ( $r = 0.53$ ,  $P = <0.001$ ), percent of population with obesity

231 (BMI>30) ( $r = 0.34$ ,  $P = 0.006$ ), percent of population with diabetes ( $r = 0.43$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ),  
232 and percent of population who are smokers ( $r = 0.48$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). In contrast, a  
233 significant negative correlation was observed between the mortality rate and median  
234 household income ( $r = -0.52$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ) and vaccination coverage ( $r = -0.51$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ).  
235 The CFR is significantly correlated with median age ( $r = 0.43$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), rural  
236 population ( $r = 0.41$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), diabetes ( $r = 0.50$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), and smoking ( $r = 0.39$ ,  $P$   
237  $= 0.001$ ) (**Table 2**).

### 238 **Multivariate analysis**

239 The spread and collinearity of covariates were assessed (**Supplementary Figure S1**).  
240 COVID-19 vaccination with one dose and fully vaccinated was positively correlated, and  
241 as a result, we retained fully vaccinated in the final analysis. For all other highly  
242 correlated variables, such as hospital and acute care beds, which are both proxies for  
243 healthcare access, we retained only one variable for the multivariate analysis.

244 In the final model for case rate, the percentage of the population in counties with rural  
245 blocks, percent of black population, percent of obese population, Hispanic population,  
246 and percent of people aged over 65 years remained in the final stepwise model  
247 ( $R^2=0.42$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). A low value of VIF ( $< 3$ ) suggested that the covariates in the final  
248 model did not have significant multi-collinearity and have substantial power to explain  
249 maximum model variation (**Table 3**).

250 For the mortality rate, the final selected model included median age, percent of people  
251 in the rural area, percent of black population, vaccination coverage, percent of  
252 population who smokes, and percentage of Hispanic population, which explained 37%  
253 of variation of mortality rate in Florida. The result of collinearity diagnostics ( $VIF < 5$ )  
254 indicated that the collinearity between predictor variables was acceptable in this multiple  
255 linear regression model (**Table 3**).

256 Based on the stepwise multiple linear regression analysis, median age, acute care beds  
257 rate vaccination coverage, percent of the population who smokes, percent of the  
258 diabetes population were found to explain 65% of variation in the CFR in Florida (**Table**

259 **3).** The collinearity diagnostics ( $VIF < 3$ ) suggested that the predictor variables are  
260 relatively independent of each other in the final model.

### 261 **Spatial regression**

262 We compared the final OLS models for case rate, mortality rate, and CFR with SLM and  
263 SEM to assess spatial association between the predictor covariates and outcome  
264 variables. For the case rate and mortality rate, coefficients of the OLS and SEM models  
265 are closer than SLM (**Table 3**). However, AIC values were lowest for the OLS model  
266 compared to the spatial models, indicating that case and mortality rate can be explained  
267 better by OLS (**Table 4**). We then explored SLM and SEM models to account for spatial  
268 dependencies in CFR. Notably, the estimates and significance of the covariates in the  
269 SLM model remained consistent with the OLS model, indicating that the spatial lag  
270 effects did not significantly alter the relationships between predictors and CFR. The  
271 SLM also estimated a spatial lag coefficient ( $\rho$ ) of 0.26, informing the extent to which  
272 neighboring counties' CFR values influence each other. As with SLM models, the  
273 predictor variables of SEM exhibit estimates and significance similar to the OLS model.  
274 Even after accounting for these predictor variables, the SEM estimated a spatial error  
275 coefficient ( $\lambda$ ) of 0.31, indicating persistent spatial variation in CFR (**Table 3**). The  
276 AIC values further informed our model selection, with the SLM having the lowest AIC,  
277 indicating the best trade-off between model fit and complexity. The SEM followed  
278 closely, while the OLS model had the highest AIC (**Table 4**). Therefore, spatial  
279 dependencies play a role in explaining variations in COVID-19 CFR among Florida  
280 counties.

## 281 Discussion

282 Socioeconomically disadvantaged communities often bear a greater burden during  
283 epidemics [23,24], and disparities were evident during the COVID-19 pandemic [25,26].  
284 In Florida, links between geographic factors and COVID-19 outcomes have previously  
285 been identified [27,28]. Here, we further explore these associations by comprehensively  
286 investigating the interplay between demographic, socioeconomic, and public health  
287 factors. Through our analysis, we observed significant temporospatial variations in  
288 county-level COVID-19 outcomes, which are explained in part by variation in  
289 socioeconomic and health-related risk factors as well as vaccination coverage.

290 While Florida's epidemic from the onset of the pandemic until December 2022 followed  
291 the US trend, subsequent county-level analysis revealed several notable trends. Rural  
292 counties experienced higher case rates in the first and third waves than their urban  
293 counterparts. Moreover, during the pandemic's second and fourth wave, rural counties  
294 experienced significantly higher mortality than urban counties as well as significantly  
295 higher cumulative CFRs, a finding consistent with other US-based studies [29,30].  
296 Variation in CFR was also observed across the five waves, highlighting differences in  
297 epidemic trajectories between rural and urban counties, which corresponded with  
298 differences in vaccine uptake. Specifically, CFR remained elevated among rural  
299 counties during the fourth and fifth waves after the introduction of COVID-19 vaccines,  
300 which are highly efficacious in reducing mortality [31]. Mirroring the trend in CFR, all-  
301 cause mortality, which is robust to potential variation in COVID-19 mortality reporting  
302 among rural and urban counties, followed the same pattern. Together, these  
303 observations elucidate a broader and potentially longer-lasting impact of the pandemic.  
304 Detrimental collateral effects of the pandemic on the diagnosis and management of  
305 chronic health conditions have been described [32], and these effects often  
306 disproportionately impact rural communities.

307 Higher rates of SARS-CoV-2 transmission, limited access to tertiary healthcare, high  
308 prevalence of comorbidities, and decreased vaccine uptake may contribute to observed  
309 differences in COVID-19 outcomes. In general, rural populations tend to be un- or  
310 under-insured, older, more likely to live farther away from tertiary medical facilities and

311 have underlying health conditions, which increase their likelihood for adverse outcomes  
312 [33]. Indeed, here we find that median income, adult obesity, smoking rates, and  
313 diabetes were associated with higher county-level mortality rates. Obesity, diabetes,  
314 and smoking are well-recognized risk factors for COVID-19 severity and mortality  
315 [34,35]. In univariate analysis, number of acute care and hospital beds and the  
316 proportion uninsured in a county were inversely associated with all COVID-19  
317 outcomes, suggesting that access to care contributed to the observed disparities.

318 The relationship between race and ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and health is well  
319 established. Higher rates of crowding and increased household size are often observed  
320 among African American and Latinx communities [36], which in turn may result in more  
321 frequent person-to-person contact and increased SARS-CoV-2 transmission [37].  
322 Furthermore, African Americans have higher prevalence of cardiovascular disease,  
323 obesity, diabetes and hypertension, which may contribute to COVID-19 severity [38,39].  
324 Throughout the pandemic, race has been a consistent factor associated COVID-19  
325 outcomes [40,41]. Here, we found a significant positive association between the  
326 percentage of Black persons in a county with case rate and CFR. Interestingly, while  
327 previous studies have reported increased COVID-19 cases and mortality rates among  
328 Hispanic/Latinx population in US [42,43], we did not observe a significant association  
329 between the percent Hispanic population in a county and increased morbidity and  
330 mortality in our study. However, we found that both the percentage of Black and  
331 Hispanic populations were significantly and positively associated with county-level  
332 immunization rates. As higher immunization rates were protective in multivariable  
333 models of mortality and CFR, this may partially explain the lack of association between  
334 Hispanic percentage and COVID-19 outcomes, while raising questions about why the  
335 percentage Black population remained associated with increased morbidity and  
336 mortality. Further research is required to better understand the factors of the observed  
337 variation in COVID-19 outcomes in Latinx and Black populations. Overall, pandemic  
338 preparedness should recognize the substantial impact of systemic flaws within the  
339 structural framework of American society, encompassing issues related to healthcare  
340 accessibility and the availability of community-level resources [44].

341 Our analysis also indicates that rural counties had slower vaccine uptake and  
342 significantly lower vaccination coverage than urban counties, which may have resulted  
343 in excess mortality during later pandemic waves. Indeed, county vaccination rates  
344 remained significantly associated with lower mortality rates when controlling for social  
345 and demographic variables. These findings align with recent studies conducted in the  
346 US [45,46]. Several factors may contribute to variation in vaccination coverage. First,  
347 healthcare access in rural counties remains a challenge, with residents of rural areas  
348 more likely to report decreased satisfaction with healthcare facilities than those in urban  
349 areas. Decrease healthcare access may have limited accessibility of COVID-19  
350 vaccination [33]. Second, there are potential differences in knowledge and attitudes  
351 between urban and rural areas regarding the severity of COVID-19 and the  
352 implementation of mitigation strategies, which are influenced by different political  
353 ideologies and sociocultural identities [33]. Third, rural areas have historically higher  
354 vaccine hesitancy for routine vaccines, which likely contributed to reduced COVID-19  
355 vaccination coverage. For example, during the pandemic, rural adults in the US were  
356 reported to be nearly three times more likely than urban adults to respond that they  
357 “definitely won’t” get vaccinated against COVID-19 [47]. Our multivariate analysis of  
358 county level predictors of vaccination coverage indicates that all these factors likely  
359 contributed to low vaccination rates (Supplementary Table S1). Further, our finding that  
360 increased county-level vaccination coverage was associated with decreased mortality  
361 rate and CFR indicates that a targeted approach to increasing vaccine confidence is  
362 needed to close the gap in vaccination coverage between rural and urban communities.

363 While this study provides valuable insights, several limitations warrant consideration.  
364 The use of cross-sectional data limits the ability to infer causal relationships.  
365 Additionally, other unmeasured factors, such as variation in county-level interventions,  
366 population mobility, and cultural practices, may also shape COVID-19 outcomes. In  
367 Florida in particular, there was significant variation in county-level mitigation strategies  
368 such as non-pharmaceutical interventions due to the absence of state-level policies.  
369 Therefore, our analysis did not account for differences in mask mandates, stay-at-home  
370 orders, or school-based interventions. Last, an underlying assumption of our analysis is  
371 that case, death, and vaccine reporting was consistent among Florida counties. In

372 particular, differences in testing capacity between rural and urban counties may have  
373 led to underreporting of cases among rural counties and a subsequent over-estimation  
374 of the CFR [48]. However, our sensitivity analysis suggests that our results are robust to  
375 modest differences in testing and case reporting, and our assessment of all-cause  
376 mortality in addition to COVID-19 mortality supports the observed disparities.

## 377 **Conclusion**

378 In conclusion, this study contributes to our understanding of the dynamics of the  
379 COVID-19 pandemic in Florida and accentuates the vulnerability of rural communities to  
380 health crises. Spatial variation and associations between demographic, socioeconomic,  
381 and health factors emphasize the need for tailored and equitable public health  
382 strategies addressing infectious diseases and the broader determinants of health. The  
383 insights gained from this study have the potential to inform evidence-based  
384 interventions aimed at reducing health disparities and enhancing overall population  
385 resilience in the face of public health crises.

386 **Authorship contribution**

387 **Sobur Ali:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation,  
388 Methodology, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing  
389 **Taj Azarian:** Conceptualization, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Writing  
390 – review & editing

391

392 **Funding**

393 There was no funding associated with this study.

394

395 **Competing interest**

396 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal  
397 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.



## 398 References


- 399 1. **Onder G, Rezza G, Brusaferro S.** Case-fatality rate and characteristics of patients dying  
400 in relation to COVID-19 in Italy. *Jama American Medical Association*, 2020; **323**: 1775–  
401 1776.
- 402 2. **Grasselli G, et al.** Baseline characteristics and outcomes of 1591 patients infected with  
403 SARS-CoV-2 admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy Region, Italy. *Jama American Medical*  
404 *Association*, 2020; **323**: 1574–1581.
- 405 3. **Braveman P, Gottlieb L.** *The social determinants of health: it's time to consider the*  
406 *causes of the causes.* Public health reports SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles,  
407 CA, 2014; **129**: 19–31.
- 408 4. **Khanijahani A, et al.** A systematic review of racial/ethnic and socioeconomic disparities  
409 in COVID-19. *International journal for equity in health BioMed Central*, 2021; **20**: 1–30.
- 410 5. **Marmot M, Allen J.** COVID-19: exposing and amplifying inequalities. *J Epidemiol*  
411 *Community Health BMJ Publishing Group Ltd*, 2020; **74**: 681–682.
- 412 6. **Martins-Filho PR, et al.** Socio-economic inequalities and COVID-19 incidence and  
413 mortality in Brazilian children: a nationwide register-based study. *Public Health Elsevier*,  
414 2021; **190**: 4–6.
- 415 7. **Neiderud C-J.** *How urbanization affects the epidemiology of emerging infectious*  
416 *diseases.* *Infection ecology & epidemiology Taylor & Francis*, 2015; **5**: 27060.
- 417 8. **Reyes R, et al.** *Urbanization and infectious diseases: general principles, historical*  
418 *perspectives, and contemporary challenges.* *Challenges in infectious diseases Springer*,  
419 2013; : 123–146.
- 420 9. **FloridaHealth.** Florida Rural Counties (Last Update: February 2023). 2023(chrome-  
421 extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgicfindmkaj/[https://www.floridahealth.gov/programs-](https://www.floridahealth.gov/programs-and-services/community-health/_documents/Rural_Counties_February_2023.pdf)  
422 [and-services/community-health/\\_documents/Rural\\_Counties\\_February\\_2023.pdf](https://www.floridahealth.gov/programs-and-services/community-health/_documents/Rural_Counties_February_2023.pdf)).  
423 Accessed 1 August 2023.
- 424 10. **USCensus.** United States Census Bureau, Cartographic Boundary Files.  
425 2022([https://www.census.gov/geographies/mapping-files/time-series/geo/cartographic-](https://www.census.gov/geographies/mapping-files/time-series/geo/cartographic-boundary.html)  
426 [boundary.html](https://www.census.gov/geographies/mapping-files/time-series/geo/cartographic-boundary.html)). Accessed 1 August 2023.
- 427 11. **The New York Times.** Coronavirus (Covid-19) Data in the United States. The New York  
428 Times. 2021(<https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data>). Accessed 10 July 2023.
- 429 12. **Cao Y, Hiyoshi A, Montgomery S.** COVID-19 case-fatality rate and demographic and  
430 socioeconomic influencers: worldwide spatial regression analysis based on country-level  
431 data. *BMJ open British Medical Journal Publishing Group*, 2020; **10**: e043560.
- 432 13. **CDC.** COVID-19 Vaccinations in the United States,County. Centers for Disease Control  
433 and Prevention. 2023([https://data.cdc.gov/Vaccinations/COVID-19-Vaccinations-in-the-](https://data.cdc.gov/Vaccinations/COVID-19-Vaccinations-in-the-United-States-County/8xxkx-amqh)  
434 [United-States-County/8xxkx-amqh](https://data.cdc.gov/Vaccinations/COVID-19-Vaccinations-in-the-United-States-County/8xxkx-amqh)). Accessed 1 August 2023.

- 435 14. **Revelle W.** Psych: procedures for psychological, psychometric, and personality research.  
436 Northwestern University (2020). Evanston, Illinois, R package 2023; Published online:  
437 2023.
- 438 15. **Middya AI, Roy S.** Geographically varying relationships of COVID-19 mortality with  
439 different factors in India. Scientific reports Nature Publishing Group UK London, 2021; **11**:  
440 7890.
- 441 16. **Team RC.** R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna: R  
442 Foundation for Statistical Computing. (No Title) 2021; Published online: 2021.
- 443 17. **RStudio T.** RStudio: integrated development for R. Rstudio Team, PBC, Boston, MA  
444 URL <http://www.rstudio.com> 2020; Published online: 2020.
- 445 18. **Getis A.** Spatial autocorrelation. Handbook of applied spatial analysis: Software tools,  
446 methods and applications. Springer, 2009, p. 255–278.
- 447 19. **Ramírez-Aldana R, Gomez-Verjan JC, Bello-Chavolla OY.** Spatial analysis of COVID-  
448 19 spread in Iran: Insights into geographical and structural transmission determinants at a  
449 province level. PLoS neglected tropical diseases Public Library of Science San  
450 Francisco, CA USA, 2020; **14**: e0008875.
- 451 20. **Anselin L, Syabri I, Kho Y.** GeoDa: an introduction to spatial data analysis. Handbook of  
452 applied spatial analysis: Software tools, methods and applications. Springer, 2009, p. 73–  
453 89.
- 454 21. **Sun F, et al.** A spatial analysis of the COVID-19 period prevalence in US counties  
455 through June 28, 2020: where geography matters? Annals of epidemiology Elsevier,  
456 2020; **52**: 54–59.
- 457 22. **Bivand R, Hauke J, Kossowski T.** Computing the Jacobian in Gaussian Spatial  
458 Autoregressive Models: An Illustrated Comparison of Available Methods. Geographical  
459 Analysis Wiley Online Library, 2013; **45**: 150–179.
- 460 23. **Meara ER, Richards S, Cutler DM.** The gap gets bigger: changes in mortality and life  
461 expectancy, by education, 1981–2000. Health affairs Project HOPE-The People-to-  
462 People Health Foundation, Inc., 2008; **27**: 350–360.
- 463 24. **Ottersen OP, et al.** The political origins of health inequity: prospects for change. The  
464 Lancet Elsevier, 2014; **383**: 630–667.
- 465 25. **Karmakar M, Lantz PM, Tipirneni R.** Association of social and demographic factors with  
466 COVID-19 incidence and death rates in the US. JAMA network open American Medical  
467 Association, 2021; **4**: e2036462–e2036462.
- 468 26. **Bollyky TJ, et al.** Assessing COVID-19 pandemic policies and behaviours and their  
469 economic and educational trade-offs across US states from Jan 1, 2020, to July 31, 2022:  
470 an observational analysis. The Lancet Elsevier, 2023; **401**: 1341–1360.
- 471 27. **Backer S, et al.** Socioeconomic determinants of COVID-19 incidence and mortality in

- 472 Florida. *Cureus Cureus*, 2022; **14**Published online: 2022.
- 473 28. **Khan MM, Odoi EW**. Geographic disparities in COVID-19 testing and outcomes in  
474 Florida. *BMC Public Health BioMed Central*, 2023; **23**: 1–13.
- 475 29. **Pro G, et al**. Differences in US COVID-19 case rates and case fatality rates across the  
476 urban-rural continuum. *Rural and remote health NIH Public Access*, 2020; **20**: 6074.
- 477 30. **Iyanda AE, et al**. Racial/ethnic heterogeneity and rural-urban disparity of COVID-19 case  
478 fatality ratio in the USA: a negative binomial and GIS-based analysis. *Journal of racial  
479 and ethnic health disparities Springer*, 2022; **9**: 708–721.
- 480 31. **Mohammed I, et al**. The efficacy and effectiveness of the COVID-19 vaccines in  
481 reducing infection, severity, hospitalization, and mortality: a systematic review. *Human  
482 vaccines & immunotherapeutics Taylor & Francis*, 2022; **18**: 2027160.
- 483 32. **Hacker KA, et al**. Peer reviewed: COVID-19 and chronic disease: the impact now and in  
484 the future. *Preventing chronic disease Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*, 2021;  
485 **18**Published online: 2021.
- 486 33. **Ullrich F, Mueller K**. COVID-19 cases and deaths, metropolitan and nonmetropolitan  
487 counties over time (update). *Policy File Rural Health Research Gateway*, 2021;  
488 **2020**Published online: 2021.
- 489 34. **Kim L, et al**. Risk factors for intensive care unit admission and in-hospital mortality  
490 among hospitalized adults identified through the US coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-  
491 19)-associated hospitalization surveillance network (COVID-NET). *Clinical infectious  
492 diseases Oxford University Press US*, 2021; **72**: e206–e214.
- 493 35. **Shang J, et al**. Cell entry mechanisms of SARS-CoV-2. *Proceedings of the National  
494 Academy of Sciences National Acad Sciences*, 2020; **117**: 11727–11734.
- 495 36. **U.S. Census Bureau**. America’s families and living arrangements: 2020 – Table AVG1.  
496 2020(<https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2020/demo/families/cps-2020.html>). Accessed  
497 19 February 2024.
- 498 37. **Shah M, Sachdeva M, Dodiuk-Gad RP**. COVID-19 and racial disparities. *Journal of the  
499 American Academy of Dermatology Elsevier*, 2020; **83**: e35.
- 500 38. **Reyes MV**. The disproportional impact of COVID-19 on African Americans. *Health and  
501 human rights Harvard University Press & François-Xavier Bagnoud Center for Health  
502 and ...*, 2020; **22**: 299.
- 503 39. **Yancy CW**. COVID-19 and african americans. *Jama American Medical Association*,  
504 2020; **323**: 1891–1892.
- 505 40. **Hooper MW, Nápoles AM, Pérez-Stable EJ**. COVID-19 and racial/ethnic disparities.  
506 *Jama American Medical Association*, 2020; **323**: 2466–2467.
- 507 41. **Golestaneh L, et al**. The association of race and COVID-19 mortality. *EClinicalMedicine*

- 508 Elsevier, 2020; **25**Published online: 2020.
- 509 42. **Khanijahani A.** Racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic disparities in confirmed COVID-19  
510 cases and deaths in the United States: a county-level analysis as of November 2020.  
511 *Ethnicity & health* Taylor & Francis, 2021; **26**: 22–35.
- 512 43. **Glance LG, Thirukumaran CP, Dick AW.** The unequal burden of COVID-19 deaths in  
513 counties with high proportions of Black and Hispanic residents. *Medical care* Wolters  
514 Kluwer Health, 2021; **59**: 470.
- 515 44. **Hawkins RB, Charles EJ, Mehaffey JH.** Socio-economic status and COVID-19–related  
516 cases and fatalities. *Public health* Elsevier, 2020; **189**: 129–134.
- 517 45. **Saelee R, et al.** Disparities in COVID-19 vaccination coverage between urban and rural  
518 counties—United States, December 14, 2020–January 31, 2022. *Morbidity and Mortality*  
519 *Weekly Report* Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2022; **71**: 335.
- 520 46. **Hernandez I, et al.** Disparities in distribution of COVID-19 vaccines across US counties:  
521 A geographic information system–based cross-sectional study. *PLoS Medicine* Public  
522 Library of Science San Francisco, CA USA, 2022; **19**: e1004069.
- 523 47. **Sparks G, et al.** COVID-19 Vaccine Monitor: Differences in Vaccine Attitudes Between  
524 Rural, Suburban, and Urban Areas. Kaiser Family Foundation, 2022; Published online:  
525 2022.
- 526 48. **Souch JM, Cossman JS.** A commentary on rural-urban disparities in COVID-19 testing  
527 rates per 100,000 and risk factors. *The Journal of Rural Health* Wiley-Blackwell, 2021; **37**:  
528 188.
- 529
- 530


531 **Figures**



532

533 **Figure 1:** (A) Florida map showing geographic distribution of urban and rural counties.  
534 Statewide distribution of county-level COVID-19 confirmed cases per 100,000  
535 population (B), mortality per 100,000 population (C), case fatality rate (D) in Florida from  
536 March 2020 to December 2022.


537



538


539 **Figure 2:** Spatial autocorrelation of COVID-19 outcomes by Florida county considering  
540 queen contiguity weights. Significant spatial clustering for case rate (B), mortality rate  
541 (C), and CFR (D) was observed. The High-High cluster (red) indicates counties with  
542 high values of a variable that are significantly surrounded by regions with similarly high  
543 values. The "Low-Low" cluster (blue) refers to counties where low COVID-19 outcome is  
544 surrounded by other counties with low COVID-19 outcome.

545



546


547 **Figure 3:** Variation in COVID-19 outcomes in Florida. (A) Variation of case rate in urban  
 548 and rural counties in five pandemic waves and (B) difference in cumulative case rate (B)  
 549 in urban and rural counties. (C) Variation of mortality rate in urban and rural counties in  
 550 five pandemic waves and (D) difference in cumulative mortality rate. (E) Difference in  
 551 CFR in urban and rural counties in five pandemic waves and (F) difference in overall  
 552 CFR in Florida. Significance was assessed using a t-test. Data distributions are  
 553 presented as box plots. Each dot point indicates the data of each county.



554


555 **Figure 4:** Trend in COVID-19 case rate among Florida counties. The heat map  
556 illustrates daily COVID-19 cases per 100,000 population with red coloration indicating  
557 higher values, and blue coloration indicating lower values. Counties are sorted by rural  
558 population percentage, with higher percentages at the top and lower percentages at the  
559 bottom. County names are color-coded, with orange indicating urban counties and blue  
560 representing rural counties, as defined by the Florida Health Department. The bar plot  
561 on the right side of the figure shows each county's COVID-19 case rate per 100,000  
562 population from the pandemic's beginning to December 2022. At the top, a trend line  
563 displays the 7-day moving average of daily COVID-19 cases in Florida, with annotations  
564 marking five significant pandemic waves as of December 2022.





565  
566 **Figure 5:** Trend in COVID-19 mortality rates among Florida counties. The heat map  
567 illustrates daily COVID-19 deaths per 100,000 population with red coloration indicating  
568 higher values, and blue coloration indicating lower values. Counties are sorted by  
569 population percentage within rural blocks, with the county having the highest  
570 percentage at the top. County names are color-coded, with orange indicating urban  
571 counties and sky blue representing rural counties, as defined by the Florida Health  
572 Department. At the top, a trend line displays the 7-day moving average of daily COVID-  
573 19 associated deaths in Florida, with annotations marking five significant pandemic  
574 waves. The right side presents the county-wise mortality rate as of December 2022.


575



576

577 **Figure 6:** Age-adjusted all-cause death rate (per 100k population) in Florida during pre-  
578 pandemic and pandemic times. (A) Violin plots and boxplots of the age-adjusted all-  
579 causes death rates in urban (orange) and rural (sky-blue) counties in pre-pandemic  
580 (2018-19) and pandemic years (2020-22). (B) Boxplot presents the age-adjusted all-  
581 cause death rate change from pre-pandemic (2019) to pandemic times (2020-22) in  
582 urban and rural counties. For the t-test between urban and rural counties, significant  
583 differences are represented with asterisks (\*,  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*,  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*,  $p < 0.001$ ).


584



585

586 **Figure 7:** The variation of vaccination coverage in Florida. (A) Boxplot shows the  
587 vaccination coverage in urban counties(orange) and rural counties (sky-blue) in Florida.  
588 (B) The trend of COVID-19 vaccination coverage in urban and rural counties from  
589 December 2020 to December 2022.

590



591

592 **Supplementary Figure S1:** Correlation matrix of covariates. Spearman's correlation  
 593 coefficient was used to measure the correlation between predictor variables. The  
 594 diagonal shows the distribution of each variable in the histogram. On the top are the  
 595 values of the correlations with significance measures (asterisks), and the bivariate  
 596 scatter plots are shown at the bottom. p-value: \*\*\* < 0.001; \*\* < 0.01; \* < 0.05.

597 **Table 1:** Definition and Summary statistics of different variables and COVID-19 outcomes in 67  
 598 countries in Florida. Mean, standard deviation (SD) and Coefficient of Variation (CV) of  
 599 variables are listed.

Variable	Description	Mean	SD	CV
<b>Response Variables (COVID-19 outcomes)</b>				
Case rate	Confirmed cases per 100,000 population	30368	7163	23.59
Mortality rate	Reported deaths per 100,000 population	460.30	147.47	32.04
Case fatality rate	Case Fatality Rate in percentage	1.55	0.49	31.79
<b>Demographic and socioeconomic factors</b>				
Median age	Population median age	44.03	6.54	14.85
Aged	% of people aged over 65 years	22.96	7.93	34.54
Income	Median household income in Doller	51290	10300	20.08
Diploma	% Individuals with a high school diploma (aged 25 years and older)	33.25	7.20	21.65
Rural population	% of the population in the county within rural blocks	37.50	32.26	86.02
Unemployment rate	Unemployment rate, % of labor force	6.64	1.53	23
Poverty rate	% of total population, poverty rate	15.18	5.10	33.6
Below poverty level	% of total population, individuals below poverty level	14.96	5.03	33.59
<b>Health and behavioral factors</b>				
Hospital beds	Hospital beds, rate per 100,000 population	209.14	141.73	67.77
Acute care beds	Acute care beds, rate per 100,000 population	173.37	111.53	64.33
Health Insurance	% of population, with any type of health care insurance coverage	82.61	4.31	5.22
Vaccinated one dose	% of population who received one dose of vaccine	68.45	17.37	25.38
Fully vaccinated	% of population fully vaccinated	58.24	14.95	25.67
Obesity	% of total population, who are obese	32.46	6.07	18.69
Diabetes	% of total population, who have ever been told they had diabetes	13.37	3.09	23.11
Smoking	% of total population, who are current smokers	19.14	5.08	26.55
<b>Race and Ethnicity</b>				
Black	% of Population Black (of total population)	14.86	9.38	48.24
Hispanic	% of Population Hispanic (of total population)	14.59	13.09	89.75

600

601

602 **Table 2:** Univariate correlation analysis with predictor variables for case rate, mortality rate, and  
 603 CFR.

Variable	Case Rate		Mortality Rate		Case Fatality Rate	
	Correlation Coefficient	P value	Correlation Coefficient	P value	Correlation Coefficient	P value
Median age	-0.58	<0.001***	0.11	0.367	0.43	<0.001***
Aged	-0.62	<0.001***	0.12	0.332	0.44	<0.001***
Median income	-0.2	0.11	-0.52	<0.001***	-0.47	<0.001***
High school diploma	0.19	0.123	0.55	<0.001***	0.49	<0.001***
Rural population	0.24	0.056	0.53	<0.001***	0.41	<0.001***
Unemployment Rate	-0.15	0.221	-0.18	0.143	-0.12	0.303
Poverty rate	0.36	0.003**	0.29	0.017*	0.15	0.237
Below poverty level	0.34	0.004**	0.26	0.032*	0.13	0.282
Hospital beds	-0.17	0.179	-0.24	0.049*	-0.13	0.282
Acute care beds	-0.13	0.289	-0.17	0.178	-0.09	0.471
Health insurance	-0.32	0.008**	-0.24	0.0042*	0.02	0.819
Vaccination one dose	-0.26	0.035*	-0.51	<0.001***	-0.39	0.001**
Fully vaccinated	-0.26	0.035*	-0.51	<0.001***	-0.38	0.001**
Adult obesity	0.29	0.019*	0.34	0.006**	0.23	0.067
Diabetes	0.03	0.807	0.43	<0.001***	0.5	<0.001***
Smoking	0.1	0.423	0.48	<0.001***	0.39	0.001**
Black	0.55	<0.001***	-0.07	0.591	-0.24	0.047*
Hispanic	0.03	0.833	-0.29	0.017*	-0.33	0.006**

604 Notes: \* p < 0.05 significant at 0.05 level

605 \*\* p < 0.01 significant at 0.01 level

606 \*\*\* p < 0.001 significant at 0.001 level

607 **Table 3:** Multivariable regression models of the association between socioeconomic characteristics and risk factors with the COVID-19  
608 outcome variables. The three outcome variables included are case rate, death rate, and case fatality rate. All are calculated per 100,000  
609 people, and data was included up to December 2022.

Dependent Variable	Variables	OLS			Spatial lag model			Spatial Error model			
		Adjusted R square	Estimate	Std. Error	(VIF)	Rho	Estimate	Std. Error	Lambda	Estimate	Std. Error
Case Rate	(intercept)		44912***	6163			43657***	7560		44861***	5870.21
	Rural Population		96.05**	30.53	2.15		94.27***	29.82		96.73***	29.02
	Black		199.70*	82.88	1.34		195.17*	80.69		200.80*	78.80
	Obese	0.42	-486.22**	168.63	2.32	0.04	-482.07**	161.49	-0.02	-485.75**	160.94
	Age over 65 years		-372.39***	101.07	1.42		-370.53***	96.66		-372.62***	95.99
	Hispanic		220.59***	58.65	1.3		219.72***	55.99		220.28***	55.55
Mortality rate	(intercept)		33.51	213.04			-25.39	209.78		17.37	201.87
	Median Age		10.95***	2.97	1.82		10.86***	2.81		11.61***	2.96
	Rural Population		-0.34	0.83	3.48		-0.50	0.79		-0.64	0.78
	Black		2.90	1.90	1.54	0.13	2.85	1.79	0.21	3.09	1.80
	Vaccination	0.37	-5.40**	1.97	4.18		-5.30**	1.86		-5.75**	1.89
	Smoking		10.03*	4.43	2.44		10.06*	4.16		10.46*	4.25
Case Fatality Rate	Hispanic		2.53	1.39	1.59		2.66*	1.30		3.07*	1.40
	(intercept)		-0.81	0.45			-1.03*	0.43		-0.56	0.45
	Median Age		0.05***	0.01	1.27		0.04***	0.01		0.05***	0.01
	Acute Care Beds		0.001***	< 0.001	1.49		0.001***	< 0.001		0.001***	< 0.001
	Vaccination	0.65	-0.02***	0.004	2.96	0.26	-0.01***	< 0.001	0.31	-0.02***	< 0.001
	Smoking		0.02*	0.01	2.02		0.02*	0.01		0.02*	0.01
Diabetes		0.04**	0.01	1.37		0.03**	0.01		0.03*	0.01	

610 Notes: \* p < 0.05 significant at 0.05 level  
611 \*\* p < 0.01 significant at 0.01 level  
612 \*\*\* p < 0.001 significant at 0.001 level

613 Table 4: Comparison of AIC values in OLS, SLM and SEM models for case rate, mortality rate and  
 614 CFR

Outcome variables	OLS	SLM	SEM
Case Rate	1350.8	1352.7	1352.8
Mortality Rate	836.8	838.2	837.8
Case Fatality Rate	32.3	29.9	31.2

615

616

617 **Supplementary Table S1.** Multivariable regression models of the association between  
 618 socioeconomic characteristics and risk factors with the vaccination coverage for COVID-19.  
 619 Vaccination coverage is measured per 100 people, and data was included from December 2020 to  
 620 December 2022.

Variables	Adjusted R square	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )	VIF
<b>Intercept</b>		-5.56	9.14	-0.61	0.545	
Median Income		< 0.001	< 0.001	6.57	< 0.001***	1.91
Unemployment Rate		2.03	0.69	2.93	0.004**	2.07
Rural population (%)	0.85	-0.15	0.04	-4.07	< 0.001***	2.69
% of black population		0.32	0.09	3.55	< 0.001***	1.37
Aged over 65 years		0.64	0.11	5.81	< 0.001***	1.43
% of Hispanic population		0.23	0.07	3.10	0.003**	1.79

621