# 1 2

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

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

<sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup> Burnett School of Biomedical Sciences, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida, USA.

- 5 \*Corresponding author: Taj Azarian, Email: taj.azarian@ucf.edu
- 6

# 7 Abstract

8 During the COVID-19 pandemic, Florida reported some of the highest cases and deaths 9 in the US. County-level variation in COVID-19 outcomes has yet to be comprehensively 10 investigated. Here, we assess corelates of COVID-19 outcomes among Florida counties that explain variation in case, mortality, and case fatality rates (CFR) across pandemic 11 12 waves. County-level administrative data and COVID-19 case reports was obtained from 13 public repositories. We tested spatial autocorrelation to assess geographic clustering of 14 case rate, mortality rate, and CFR. Stepwise linear regression was employed to 15 investigate the association between COVID-19 outcomes and 18 demographic, 16 socioeconomic, and health-related county-level predictors. We found mortality rate and 17 CFR were significantly higher in rural counties compared to urban counties, among 18 which significant differences in vaccination coverage were also observed. Multivariate 19 analysis found that the percentage of the population aged over 65 years, the 20 percentage of obese people, and the percentage of the rural population were significant 21 predictors of COVID-19 case rate. Median age, vaccination coverage, percentage of 22 people who smoke, and percentage of the population with diabetes were significant 23 influencing factors for CFR. Importantly, higher vaccination coverage was significantly 24 associated with a reduction in case rate (R = -0.26, p = 0.03) and mortality (R = -0.51, p 25 < 0.001). Last, we found that spatial dependencies play a role in explaining variations in 26 COVID-19 CFR among Florida counties. Our findings emphasize the need for targeted, equitable public health strategies to reduce disparities and enhance population 27 28 resilience during public health crises.

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

# 31 Introduction

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

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

In this study, we first investigated geographic clustering of COVID-19 outcomes. We
 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

<sup>70</sup> 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

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 York Times GitHub repository (https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data), based on 76 77 reports from state and local health agencies [11]. Population statistics were obtained from the US Census Bureau (https://www2.census.gov/geo/docs/reference/ua/). Case 78 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.

#### 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, <u>www.flhealthcharts.gov</u>), 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
- 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.
- We used multivariate ordinary least squares (OLS) regression model to examine the relationship of predictor variables and COVID-19 outcomes. Then, we built multivariate
- models for each outcome using a stepwise backward procedure, starting with the fully
- saturated model, and then iteratively dropping variables. Akaike Information Criteria
- (AIC) and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) were used to assess model fit and the degree
- of collinearity among covariates, respectively. R<sup>2</sup> 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

- We calculated the global Moran I statistic to examine whether county COVID-19 case
  rate, mortality rate, and CFR were spatially autocorrelated [18]. First-order Queen
  contiguity binary neighbor list and spatial weights matrix were constructed using R
  package spdep v1.2.8. Counties were considered neighbors when they shared one
  common point or vertex [19]. Local spatial autocorrelation identified four distinctive
  categories: High-High, Low-Low, High-Low, and Low-High. Local spatial clusters of
  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 (r) 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
- parameter (I) determines how well a county's ordinary least squares (OLS) residual
- 137 correlates with the residuals of its neighbors. This spatial error parameter (I) 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].

# 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 higher percentage of the state's population (87.7%) lives in urbanized areas. By 146 147 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 heterogenicity 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,
- 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, p166 =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
- 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
- second and fifth waves (**Figure 3E**). As decreased access to SARS-CoV-2 testing
- 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%

underreporting of cases among rural counties, the CFR remained significantly higher (p= 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

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

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

rate, mortality rate, and CFR. A significant positive correlation was observed between

case rate and individuals below poverty (r = 0.36, P = 0.003) and percent of the

- 226 population of black race (r = 55, P < 0.001); significant negative correlation was
- observed between case rate and median age (r = -0.58, P < 0.001), percent of
- population insured (r = -0.32, p=0.008) and COVID-19 vaccination coverage (r = -0.26,
- 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),
- and percent of population who are smokers (r = 0.48, P < 0.001). In contrast, a
- significant negative correlation was observed between the mortality rate and median
- 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
- as a result, we retained fully vaccinated in the final analysis. For all other highly
- 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.
- 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,
- and percent of people aged over 65 years remained in the final stepwise model
- $(R^2=0.42, P < 0.01)$ . 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
- in the rural area, percent of black population, vaccination coverage, percent of
- population who smokes, and percentage of Hispanic population, which explained 37%
- 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
- linear regression model (**Table 3**).
- 256 Based on the stepwise multiple linear regression analysis, median age, acute care beds
- rate vaccination coverage, percent of the population who smokes, percent of the
- diabetes population were found to explain 65% of variation in the CFR in Florida (**Table**

3). The collinearity diagnostics (VIF < 3) suggested that the predictor variables are</li>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]. In Florida, links between geographic factors and COVID-19 outcomes have previously 284 285 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 disproportionally impact rural communities.

Higher rates of SARS-CoV-2 transmission, limited access to tertiary healthcare, high
 prevalence of commodities, and decreased vaccine uptake may contribute to observed
 differences in COVID-19 outcomes. In general, rural populations tend to be un- or
 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

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
- 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
- insights gained from this study have the potential to inform evidence-based
- 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

- Onder G, Rezza G, Brusaferro S. Case-fatality rate and characteristics of patients dying
   in relation to COVID-19 in Italy. Jama American Medical Association, 2020; 323: 1775–
   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.
- Braveman P, Gottlieb L. The social determinants of health: it's time to consider the
  causes of the causes. Public health reports SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles,
  CA, 2014; 129: 19–31.
- 408
  4. Khanijahani A, et al. A systematic review of racial/ethnic and socioeconomic disparities
  409
  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.
- 8. Reyes R, et al. Urbanization and infectious diseases: general principles, historical
  perspectives, and contemporary challenges. Challenges in infectious diseases Springer,
  2013; : 123–146.
- 420 9. FloridaHealth. Florida Rural Counties (Last Upadate: February 2023). 2023(chrome421 extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.floridahealth.gov/programs422 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/cartographicboundary.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 434 United-States-County/8xkx-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 Al, 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.
- Ramírez-Aldana R, Gomez-Verjan JC, Bello-Chavolla OY. Spatial analysis of COVIDspread in Iran: Insights into geographical and structural transmission determinants at a
  province level. PLoS neglected tropical diseases Public Library of Science San
  Francisco, CA USA, 2020; 14: e0008875.
- 45120.Anselin L, Syabri I, Kho Y. GeoDa: an introduction to spatial data analysis. Handbook of452applied spatial analysis: Software tools, methods and applications. Springer, 2009, p. 73–45389.
- 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 J acobian in G aussian 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-to462 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 18Published 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 2020Published 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 (COVID491 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.
- 50038.**Reyes MV**. The disproportional impact of COVID-19 on African Americans. Health and501human rights Harvard University Press & François-Xavier Bagnoud Center for Health502and ..., 2020; **22**: 299.
- 39. Yancy CW. COVID-19 and african americans. Jama American Medical Association,
  2020; 323: 1891–1892.
- 40. Hooper MW, Nápoles AM, Pérez-Stable EJ. COVID-19 and racial/ethnic disparities.
  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.
- 51544.Hawkins RB, Charles EJ, Mehaffey JH. Socio-economic status and COVID-19–related516cases 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.
- 46. Hernandez I, et al. Disparities in distribution of COVID-19 vaccines across US counties:
  A geographic information system–based cross-sectional study. PLoS Medicine Public
  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

# 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.



538

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









554

555 Figure 4: Trend in COVID-19 case rate among Florida counties. The heat map illustrates daily COVID-19 cases per 100,000 population with red coloration indicating 556 higher values, and blue coloration indicating lower values. Counties are sorted by rural 557 558 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 on the right side of the figure shows each county's COVID-19 case rate per 100,000 561 562 population from the pandemic's beginning to December 2022. At the top, a trend line displays the 7-day moving average of daily COVID-19 cases in Florida, with annotations 563 564 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.



576

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



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

		40 60	4	0000		4 8 12		0 400		70 85		20 35		15 30		0 30 70	3
ſ	RuralPop	-0.09	-0.06	-0.65***	0.77***	-0.57***	0.53***	-0.77***	-0.74***	-0.49***	-0.82***	0.69***	0.51***	0.64***	0.11	-0.57***	0 80
40		MedAge	0.91***	0.08	-0.01	0.26*	-0.35**	0.07	0.09	0.36**	0.25*	-0.35**	0.09	-0.10	-0.52***	-0.04	0
5		مبمغه	Aged	0.04	-0.02	0.20	-0.30*	0.05	0.07	0.30*	0.24*	-0.37**	0.15	-0.10	-0.57***	-0.03	20 6
0000		<u>.</u>	<b>S</b> .	Income	-0.77***	0.15	-0.87***	0.38**	0.31*	0.42***	0.71***	-0.66***	-0.58***	-0.40***	-0.28*	0.18	10
4(		<b>.</b>	<b>*:</b>		Diploma	-0.29*	0.58***	-0.65***	-0.59***	-0.47***	-0.80***	0.74***	0.61***	0.66***	0.07	-0.36**	20 45
4			<b>.</b>	-			-0.11	0.47***	0.48***	0.20	0.59***	-0.32**	0.02	-0.47***	-0.01	0.57***	_ 0
	*	<b>.</b>	<b>Ä</b> .		بمخيعة		Poverty	-0.27*	-0.22	-0.46***	-0.60***	0.62***	0.35**	0.27*	0.50***	-0.04	10 3
0 00			<u>.</u>	<u>.</u>	-	2	<b>.</b>	Hospitalbed	0.97***	0.46***	0.61***	-0.55***	-0.36**	-0.54***	-0.02	0.34**	0
					÷.	<u>.</u>	*	1 All and a second	Acutecare	0.42***	0.58***	-0.49***	-0.28*	-0.50***	-0.01	0.34**	0 50
6 02						<b>*</b>	and the second s			HealthCare	0.52***	-0.51***	-0.31*	-0.42***	-0.11	-0.03	
s F		. <u>.</u>				1	****	in the second se	-		Vaccinated	-0.76***	-0.45***	-0.71***	-0.21	0.49***	30 80
20 4		<b>.</b>	<b>*</b>	×.	يتحقيقها	<b>%</b>	Strate.	·	÷.			Obesity	0.58***	0.56***	0.36**	-0.36**	-
2	14 <b>1</b>	مر فیکو		<b>.</b>					÷.	-	<b>***</b>		Diabetes	0.29*	0.03	-0.19	6 18
15 11 II		<b>Å</b> .	<b>Å</b> .		بتجميع	<b>*</b>		A.		••••		<u> </u>	<u>.</u>	Smoking	-0.04	-0.52***	
Ľ.			<u> </u>	)		4	-			<u> </u>	<u></u>	مینند. د مینند		رديني	Black	-0.04	- e
0 50	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	Late		<u></u>		ممغغد	÷.					- Sec.	-				
0	60		20 50		20 35		10 25		0 300	3	30 60 90	)	6 14		10 40		

591

**Supplementary Figure S1:** Correlation matrix of covariates. Spearman's correlation coefficient was used to measure the correlation between predictor variables. The diagonal shows the distribution of each variable in the histogram. On the top are the values of the correlations with significance measures (asterisks), and the bivariate 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
Response Variables (	COVID-19 outcomes)			
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
Demographic and soc				
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
Health and behavioral	factors			
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
Race and Ethnicity				
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

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

## 603 CFR.

-	Case	Rate	Mortalit	y Rate	Case Fatality Rate		
Variable	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	0.0.042*	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.

Donondont		OLS					Spatial lag me	odel	Spatial Error model		
Variable	Variables	Adjusted R square	Estimate	Std. Error	(VIF)	Rho	Estimate	Std. Error	Lambda	Estimate	Std. Error
	(intercept)		44912***	6163			43657***	7560	-0.02	44861***	5870.21
	Rural Population		96.05**	30.53	2.15	0.04	94.27***	29.82		96.73***	29.02
	Black		199.70*	82.88	1.34		195.17*	80.69		200.80*	78.80
Case Rate	Obese	0.42	-486.22**	168.63	2.32		-482.07**	161.49		-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
	(intercept)		33.51	213.04		0.13	-25.39	209.78	0.21	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
Mortality	Black	0.07	2.90	1.90	1.54		2.85	1.79		3.09	1.80
Tate	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
	Hispanic		2.53	1.39	1.59		2.66*	1.30		3.07*	1.40
	(intercept)		-0.81	0.45			-1.03*	0.43	0.31	-0.56	0.45
	Median Age		0.05***	0.01	1.27		0.04***	0.01		0.05***	0.01
Case	Acute Care Beds		0.001***	< 0.001	1.49		0.001***	< 0.001		0.001***	<0.001
Fatality Rate	Vaccination	0.65	-0.02***	0.004	2.96	0.26	-0.01***	<0.001		-0.02***	<0.001
, talo	Smoking		0.02*	0.01	2.02		0.02*	0.01		0.02*	0.01
	Diabetes	Diabetes		0.01	1.37		0.03**	0.01		0.03*	0.01

610

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

#### 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
Intercept		-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