

1 Short Report

2

3 **Early and massive testing saves lives: COVID-19 related infections and deaths in the**
4 **United States during March of 2020**

5

6 James B. Hittner¹, Folorunso O. Fasina^{2*}, Almira L. Hoogesteijn³, Renata Piccinini⁴, Prakasha
7 Kempaiah⁵, Stephen D. Smith⁶, and Ariel L. Rivas⁷

8

9 ¹Department of Psychology, College of Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina, United States of
10 America; ²Food and Agriculture Organization, Dar es Salam, Tanzania; ³Human Ecology,

11 Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados (CINVESTAV), Mérida, México;

12 ⁴Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Milan, Milan, Italy; ⁵Loyola University

13 Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois, United States of America; ⁶Institute for Resource Information

14 Science, College of Agriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, United States of America;

15 ⁷Center for Global Health, Department of Internal Medicine, Medical School, University of New

16 Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, United States of America

17

18 * **Correspondence to:** Folorunso O. Fasina, FAO ECTAD Tanzania & Department of
19 Veterinary Tropical Diseases, University of Pretoria, South Africa; Email:

20 Folorunso.fasina@fao.org; Tel.: +255 686 132 852

21

22 **Running head:** Early and massive COVID-19 testing saves lives

23 **Summary**

24 To optimize epidemiologic interventions, predictors of mortality should be identified. The US
25 COVID-19 epidemic data –reported up to 3-31-2020– were analyzed using kernel regularized
26 least squares regression. Six potential predictors of mortality were investigated: (i) the number of
27 diagnostic tests performed in testing week I; (ii) the proportion of all tests conducted during
28 week I of testing; (iii) the cumulative number of (test-positive) cases through 3-31-2020, (iv) the
29 number of tests performed/million citizens; (v) the cumulative number of citizens tested; and (vi)
30 the apparent prevalence rate, defined as the number of cases/million citizens. Two metrics
31 estimated mortality: the number of deaths and the number of deaths/million citizens. While both
32 expressions of mortality were predicted by the case count and the apparent prevalence rate, the
33 number of deaths/million citizens was ≈ 3.5 times better predicted by the apparent prevalence rate
34 than the number of cases. In eighteen states, early testing/million citizens/population density was
35 inversely associated with the cumulative mortality reported by 31 March, 2020. Findings support
36 the hypothesis that early and massive testing saves lives. Other factors –e.g., population density–
37 may also influence outcomes. To optimize national and local policies, the creation and
38 dissemination of high-resolution geo-referenced, epidemic data is recommended.

39

40 **Bullet points**

- 41 • A multidimensional –numerical, geographic, demographic and temporal– approach that
- 42 emphasizes interactions is used to identify predictors of COVID-19 related mortality.
- 43 • A combinatorial template helps detect the impact of early testing on mortality.
- 44 • This rapidly conducted, policy-oriented analysis applies to many geographic scales.

45

46 To control a pandemic associated with a substantial mortality –such as COVID-19–,
47 WHO recommends massive testing [1]. In spite of its relevance, the power of testing-related
48 variables to predict mortality has not yet been empirically investigated in this disease.

49 To predict and identify when and where mortality is likely to occur, at least three types of
50 metrics may be considered, which focus on: (i) cases (counts), (ii) disease prevalence in a
51 specific geographic location and/or time, and (iii) the demographic density of infected locations
52 [2]. However, assessing the actual prevalence of a disease characterized by a substantial number
53 of asymptomatic infections –such as COVID-19– is not possible, unless 100% of the population
54 is tested with a highly sensitive test, repeatedly [3, 4]. Consequently, we use the term *apparent*
55 *prevalence* to describe the ratio of test-positive cases to all tested individuals. If expressed per
56 million residents, the apparent prevalence can compare different geographical units, e.g., each
57 and all states of the US.

58 Unfortunately, to conduct comprehensive studies that investigate numerous states, a
59 protracted research program is required. To rapidly provide policy-makers with usable
60 information, here a quasi-real time assessment was designed, which captures both nationwide
61 and state-specific dimensions. Analyzing the epidemic data reported in all 50 states of the USA,
62 during March of 2020 (the month when testing started), we investigated whether testing-related
63 variables –including massive and early testing– predict mortality.

64 Six variables were assessed as possible predictors of fatalities: (i) the number of
65 diagnostic tests performed in week I of testing; (ii) the proportion of all tests conducted during
66 the first week of testing; (iii) the cumulative number of (test-positive) cases through 3-31-2020,
67 (iv) the number of tests performed/million citizens; (v) the cumulative number of citizens tested;
68 and (vi) the apparent prevalence rate, defined as the number of cases/million citizens. To

69 examine the predictive ability of these variables, we modeled the data using a nonparametric
70 machine learning approach known as kernel regularized least squares (KRLS) regression [5]. To
71 implement the procedure we used the KRLS *R* software package [6]. KRLS is appropriate when
72 linear regression assumptions –such as linearity and additivity– are not met and the precise
73 functional association between the predictors and criterion is unknown.

74 Because there is no prior knowledge on the use of these composite variables, no pre-
75 established method or criterion was chosen to analyze the data. Instead, recognition of patterns
76 observed after the data were collected was adopted. When distinct patterns were observed –such
77 as L-shaped data distributions [9]–, thresholds were selected to match the upper limit of a data
78 segment linearly distributed so that the intersection of two orthogonal lines would identify three
79 groups of data.

80 A public source was used to collect the overall US and state-specific data on the COVID-
81 19 pandemic, which was complemented with state-specific population data [7, 8]. All analyses
82 included data from each state of the US (Supplemental Table 1).

83 The six predictors accounted for 93.5% of the variance in number of deaths and 86.7% of
84 the variance in deaths/million cases (Supplemental Tables 2A, 2B). Of the six predictors, two
85 were statistically significant: cumulative number of confirmed cases and apparent prevalence
86 rate. These two variables were comparable predictors of mortality count. However, for predicting
87 deaths per million citizens, the apparent prevalence rate was a 3.5 times stronger predictor than
88 was the number of confirmed cases (Supplemental Table 2B).

89 In addition, the number of tests administered during week one of testing/million
90 citizens/population density distinguished three groups of states when the number of
91 deaths/million citizens was the outcome variable (Fig. 1A). Two of these groups exhibited

92 statistically significantly different medians ($p < 0.001$, Mann-Whitney test, Fig. **1B**).

93 Whether cases or fatalities are considered, findings indicate that reporting COVID-19
94 data as counts is not as informative as reporting metrics that consider two or more interacting
95 quantities, such as the apparent prevalence rate and the number of deaths/million citizens. While
96 isolated metrics –e.g., counts– ignore dynamics as well as geographical factors (including
97 population density), composite metrics integrate numerous dimensions that facilitate
98 geographically-specific interventions [3].

99 Although the KRLS regression method is a powerful and flexible approach to modeling
100 predictive associations, to rapidly generate results, here it was used to only provide a snapshot-
101 like assessment. If shorter time intervals were used, the KRLS approach could capture epidemic
102 dynamics.

103 As evidenced by our nonparametric regression results, the variables analyzed offer a
104 combinatorial template that highlights the importance of investigating metrics consisting of
105 interacting quantities. For example, a recombination of those variables (the number of tests
106 performed in week I/million citizens/population density) empirically demonstrate that massive
107 and early testing may save lives (Figs. **1A** and **B**). Such a finding is likely to also be influenced
108 by several factors, including, but not limited to (i) availability of diagnostic kits, equipment,
109 reagents, and trained personnel, (ii) availability of hospital beds and/or Intensive Care Units, and
110 (iii) local and regional demographic and geographical interactions. For example, regions with a
111 higher population density (more abundant and closer contacts among infected and susceptible
112 citizens) tend to be associated with a higher connectivity (more highways, ports and/or airports),
113 which foster epidemic spread [3].

114 While composite metrics could address pandemics as a group of local and regional

115 interacting processes, the COVID-19 related information currently found in the press as well as
116 national and international governmental agencies tends to lack point-based (high-resolution),
117 geo-referenced information. While surface-based data are usually provided (e.g., state--related
118 data), this type of data is an aggregate of geographical points and lines and, consequently,
119 internal processes –those affecting specific cities or neighborhoods– are missed [10]. To better
120 identify when and where interventions are most effective, point- (city- or neighborhood-related)
121 and line-based (road-related) data are needed. To optimize these approaches and reduce the
122 COVID-19 related mortality, the collection and reporting of high-resolution, geo-temporal data
123 constructed as interactions is recommended.

124

125 **Acknowledgements**

126 The authors appreciate the data gathering efforts of those citizens who contributed to Covid-19
127 tracking (<https://covidtracking.com>) and the comments provided by Dr. Ravi Durvasula (Loyola
128 University Medical School-Chicago).

129

130 **Financial support**

131 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit
132 sectors.

133

134 **Conflict of Interest**

135 None.

136

137

138 **Author contributions**

139 JBH and ALR designed the study. ALH, RP, PK, SDS and FOF extracted the data and reviewed
140 the literature. JBH conducted the statistical analyses. All authors contributed to writing of the
141 report.

142

143 **References**

- 144 1. World Health Organization ([https://www.who.int/blueprint/priority-diseases/key-](https://www.who.int/blueprint/priority-diseases/key-action/Global_Research_Forum_FINAL_VERSION_for_web_14_feb_2020.pdf?ua=1)
145 [action/Global Research Forum FINAL VERSION for web 14 feb 2020.pdf?ua=1](https://www.who.int/blueprint/priority-diseases/key-action/Global_Research_Forum_FINAL_VERSION_for_web_14_feb_2020.pdf?ua=1) ,
146 accessed April 4, 2020).
- 147 2. Rivas AL, *et al.* Connecting network properties of rapidly disseminating epizoonotics. *PLoS*
148 *ONE* 2012; **7**:e39778. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0039778
- 149 3. Nishiura H, Linton NM, Akhmetzhanov AR Serial interval of novel coronavirus (COVID-
150 19) infections. *Int J Inf Dis* 2020; **93**: 284–286. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.02.060
- 151 4. Klompas M. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): protecting hospitals from the invisible.
152 *Ann Intern Med* [published online, 11 March 2020]. doi:10.7326/M20-0751.
- 153 5. Hainmueller J, Hazlett C. Kernel Regularized Least Squares: reducing misspecification
154 bias with a flexible and interpretable machine learning approach. *Political Analysis* 2014;
155 **22**:143–168. doi:10.1093/pan/mpt019
- 156 6. R project (<https://www.r-project.org/>)
- 157 7. Covidtracking (<https://covidtracking.com/>, accessed April 1, 2020)
- 158 8. World Population Review (<https://worldpopulationreview.com/states>, accessed April 1,
159 2020)
- 160 9. Bradley JV. The insidious L-shaped distribution. *Psychon Bull Rev* 1982; **20**: 85–88

- 161 10. Ortiz-Pelaez A *et al.*. Use of social network analysis to characterize the pattern of animal
162 movements in the initial phases of the 2001 foot and mouth disease (FMD) epidemic in the
163 UK. *Prev Vet Med* 2006; **76**: 40–55. doi:10.1016/j.prevetmed.2006.04.007
164

165 **Figure legend**

166 **Recognition of COVID-19 mortality-related patterns across the United States.** Even a small
167 number of variables, such as the ones reported in Supplemental Table 1, provide a combinatorial
168 template that can reveal additional relationships. For example, when the number of tests
169 performed in the first week of testing (adjusted to state-specific population, expressed per million
170 citizens, and also adjusted to state-specific population density) was plotted against the number of
171 deaths per million citizens reported throughout March of 2020, two perpendicular data segments
172 were observed and the upper limit of each data segment was used as a threshold, that is, the
173 intersection of two perpendicular lines differentiated three groups of states (vertical and
174 horizontal lines, **A**): (i) eleven states that conducted a low number of tests in week I and reported
175 a high number of deaths, (ii) seven states that displayed the opposite pattern, and (iii) the
176 remaining states (**A**). The medians of the variables analyzed differed ≥ 16 times between the
177 group of states characterized by conducting many tests and reporting few deaths and the group of
178 states that exhibited the opposite pattern ($p < 0.001$, inserts, **B**).

179

180

181

Supplemental Files

182 **Table 1. Epidemic data collected in all states of the US in March, 2020.**

183

| State | <i>Tests wk I</i> | <i>Total tests</i> | <i>Wk I/ all tests</i> | <i>Pop (mill)</i> | <i>Pop dens</i> | <i>Tested/ mill</i> | <i>Cases</i> | <i>Cases/ mill inh</i> | <i>Deaths (count)</i> | <i>Deaths/ mill</i> |
|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| New York | 1661 | 172360 | 0.96 | 19.440 | 137.5 | 8866.2 | 59513 | 3061.37 | 965 | 49.63 |
| New Jersey | 284 | 35602 | 0.79 | 8.936 | 395.5 | 3984.1 | 13386 | 1497.99 | 161 | 18.01 |
| California | 4260 | 90657 | 4.69 | 39.937 | 94.2 | 2270.0 | 5708 | 142.93 | 123 | 3.07 |
| Washington | 4415 | 59206 | 7.45 | 7.797 | 42.2 | 7593.4 | 4310 | 552.78 | 189 | 24.24 |
| Michigan | 274 | 17379 | 1.57 | 10.045 | 40.1 | 1730.1 | 5486 | 546.14 | 132 | 13.14 |
| Florida | 1380 | 48998 | 2.81 | 21.992 | 129.1 | 2228.0 | 4950 | 225.08 | 59 | 2.68 |
| Illinois | 1622 | 27762 | 5.84 | 12.659 | 84.4 | 2193.1 | 4596 | 363.06 | 66 | 5.21 |
| Massachusetts | 171 | 39066 | 0.43 | 6.976 | 255.2 | 5600.1 | 4955 | 710.29 | 48 | 6.88 |
| Louisiana | 368 | 27871 | 1.32 | 4.645 | 34.2 | 6000.2 | 3540 | 762.11 | 151 | 32.50 |
| Georgia | 48 | 12596 | 0.38 | 3.991 | 25.9 | 3156.1 | 2683 | 672.26 | 80 | 20.04 |
| Pennsylvania | 403 | 33455 | 1.20 | 12.820 | 107.4 | 2609.6 | 3394 | 264.74 | 38 | 2.96 |
| Colorado | 938 | 14470 | 6.48 | 5.845 | 21.7 | 2475.6 | 2307 | 394.70 | 47 | 8.04 |
| Texas | 48 | 25760 | 0.18 | 29.472 | 42.4 | 874.0 | 2552 | 86.59 | 34 | 1.15 |
| Connecticut | 551 | 11900 | 4.63 | 3.563 | 248.2 | 3339.9 | 1993 | 559.36 | 34 | 9.54 |
| Tennessee | 73 | 20574 | 0.35 | 6.897 | 63.2 | 2983.0 | 1537 | 222.85 | 7 | 1.01 |
| Ohio | 148 | 20665 | 0.71 | 11.747 | 101.2 | 1759.2 | 1653 | 140.72 | 29 | 2.46 |
| Wisconsin | 259 | 17662 | 1.46 | 5.851 | 34.5 | 3018.6 | 1112 | 190.05 | 13 | 2.22 |
| N. Carolina | 17 | 19072 | 0.08 | 10.611 | 76.1 | 1797.3 | 1167 | 109.98 | 5 | 0.47 |
| Indiana | 149 | 9830 | 1.51 | 6.745 | 71.5 | 1457.4 | 1514 | 224.46 | 32 | 4.74 |
| Arizona | 373 | 13872 | 2.68 | 7.378 | 25.0 | 1880.2 | 919 | 124.56 | 17 | 2.30 |
| S. Carolina | 97 | 3789 | 2.56 | 5.210 | 62.8 | 727.3 | 774 | 148.56 | 16 | 3.07 |
| Oklahoma | 206 | 1634 | 12.60 | 3.954 | 21.8 | 413.2 | 429 | 108.50 | 16 | 4.04 |
| N Hampshire | 232 | 5396 | 4.29 | 1.371 | 56.6 | 3935.8 | 258 | 188.18 | 3 | 2.18 |
| N Mexico | 488 | 11179 | 4.36 | 2.096 | 5.9 | 5333.5 | 237 | 113.07 | 2 | 0.95 |
| Delaware | 129 | 3701 | 3.48 | 0.982 | 152.3 | 3768.8 | 236 | 240.33 | 6 | 6.11 |

184

185

186 **Table 1. Epidemic data collected in all states of the US in March, 2020 (cont'd)**

| State | <i>Tests wk I</i> | <i>Total tests</i> | <i>Wk I/ all tests</i> | <i>Pop (mill)</i> | <i>Pop dens</i> | <i>Tested/ mill</i> | <i>Cases</i> | <i>Cases/ mill inh</i> | <i>Deaths (count)</i> | <i>Deaths / mill</i> |
|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Maryland | 447 | 13593 | 3.28 | 6.083 | 189.3 | 2234.6 | 1239 | 203.68 | 10 | 1.64 |
| Nevada | 262 | 10534 | 2.48 | 3.139 | 10.9 | 3355.8 | 920 | 293.08 | 15 | 4.77 |
| Missouri | 236 | 14107 | 1.67 | 6.169 | 34.2 | 2286.7 | 903 | 146.37 | 12 | 1.94 |
| Virginia | 314 | 10609 | 2.95 | 8.626 | 77.9 | 1229.9 | 890 | 103.17 | 22 | 2.55 |
| Alabama | 352 | 5014 | 7.02 | 4.908 | 36.1 | 1021.6 | 830 | 169.11 | 4 | 0.81 |
| Mississippi | 969 | 3318 | 29.20 | 2.989 | 23.8 | 1110.1 | 758 | 253.59 | 14 | 4.68 |
| Utah | 279 | 13993 | 1.99 | 3.282 | 14.9 | 4263.6 | 719 | 219.07 | 2 | 0.60 |
| Oregon | 1023 | 11426 | 8.95 | 4.301 | 16.9 | 2656.6 | 548 | 127.41 | 13 | 3.02 |
| Minnesota | 889 | 17657 | 5.03 | 5.700 | 25.3 | 3097.7 | 503 | 88.24 | 9 | 1.57 |
| Kentucky | 207 | 6018 | 3.43 | 4.499 | 43.0 | 1337.6 | 439 | 97.57 | 9 | 2.00 |
| Arkansas | 115 | 3453 | 3.33 | 3.038 | 22.1 | 1136.6 | 426 | 140.22 | 6 | 1.97 |
| Iowa | 330 | 5349 | 6.16 | 3.179 | 21.8 | 1682.6 | 336 | 105.69 | 4 | 1.25 |
| Kansas | 167 | 4513 | 3.70 | 2.910 | 13.7 | 1550.9 | 319 | 109.62 | 6 | 2.06 |
| Idaho | 427 | 4706 | 9.07 | 1.826 | 8.4 | 2577.2 | 310 | 169.77 | 6 | 3.28 |
| R. Island | 550 | 3134 | 17.54 | 1.056 | 263.9 | 2967.8 | 294 | 278.40 | 3 | 2.84 |
| Maine | 272 | 3647 | 7.45 | 1.345 | 14.7 | 2711.5 | 253 | 188.10 | 3 | 2.23 |
| Vermont | 291 | 3701 | 7.86 | 0.628 | 25.2 | 5893.3 | 235 | 374.20 | 12 | 19.10 |
| Hawaii | 12 | 8013 | 0.14 | 1.412 | 49.9 | 5674.9 | 175 | 123.93 | 0 | 0 |
| Montana | 160 | 4069 | 3.93 | 1.086 | 2.8 | 3746.8 | 161 | 148.25 | 1 | 0.92 |
| W. Virginia | 38 | 3108 | 1.22 | 1.778 | 28.3 | 1748.0 | 124 | 69.74 | 0 | 0 |
| Nebraska | 272 | 2345 | 11.59 | 1.952 | 8.9 | 1201.3 | 120 | 61.47 | 2 | 1.02 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----|------|-------|-------|-----|--------|-----|--------|---|------|
| Alaska | 227 | 3654 | 6.21 | 0.734 | 0.4 | 4978.2 | 114 | 155.31 | 3 | 4.08 |
| N. Dakota | 393 | 3724 | 10.55 | 0.761 | 4.2 | 4893.6 | 98 | 128.77 | 1 | 1.31 |
| S. Dakota | 185 | 3218 | 5.74 | 0.903 | 4.5 | 3563.7 | 90 | 99.66 | 1 | 1.10 |
| Wyoming | 308 | 1641 | 18.76 | 0.567 | 2.2 | 2894.2 | 87 | 153.43 | 0 | 0 |

187

188 Predictors

- 189 1. *Tests wk I*: number of tests performed in the first 7 days of testing.
 190 2. *Total tested*: total number of people tested.
 191 3. *Wk I / all tests*: tests wk I / total tested, i.e., the proportion of all tests that were
 192 conducted during the first week of testing, expressed as a percentage.
 193 4. *Pop (mill)*: the population of each state, expressed in million inhabitants.
 194 5. *Pop dens*: state population density (inhabitants per sq km).
 195 5. *Tested/mill*: number of tests performed per 1 million inhabitants.
 196 6. *Cases*: cumulative number of confirmed (test-positive) infections (through 3-31-2020).
 197 7. *Cases / mill inh*: the apparent prevalence, calculated by dividing the number of cases by
 198 the population (expressed in million inhabitants).

199

200 Outcomes (cumulative values through 3-31-2020)

- 201 1. *Mortality count*: number of deaths (raw count).
 202 2. *Deaths / mill*: number of deaths per 1 million citizens.

203

204 **Table 2. KRLS regression of potential predictors of COVID-19 related mortality**

205

206 **A – Predictors of the mortality count**

207

| Predictors | Estimate | Standard error | <i>t</i> value | Pr (> <i>t</i>) (<i>p</i> -value) |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Tests wk I</i> | 0.009 | 0.010 | 0.926 | 0.36 |
| <i>Total tested</i> | 0.0002 | 0.003 | 0.650 | 0.52 |
| <i>Wk I / all tests (%)</i> | -104.35 | 118.8 | -0.878 | 0.38 |
| <i>Tested/mill</i> | -0.004 | 0.003 | -1.153 | 0.25 |
| <i>Cases</i> | 0.002 | 0.0007 | 3.430 | <0.01 |
| <i>Cases/mill inh</i> | 69104 | 21607.2 | 3.198 | <0.01 |

208 Estimates are sample-average partial derivatives. Predictors accounted for 93.5% of the variance
 209 in mortality count (R^2 : 0.9347)

210

211

212 **B – Predictors of deaths per million citizens**

213

| Predictors | Estimate | Standard error | <i>t</i> value | Pr (> <i>t</i>) (<i>p</i> -value) |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Tests wk I</i> | 0.00061 | 0.0009 | 0.611 | 0.54 |
| <i>Total tested</i> | <-0.0001 | <0.0001 | -1.314 | 0.19 |
| <i>Wk I / all tests (%)</i> | 1.99 | 11.1 | 0.179 | 0.86 |
| <i>Tested/mill</i> | 0.0002 | 0.0003 | 0.773 | 0.44 |
| <i>Cases</i> | 0.0001 | <0.0001 | 2.214 | 0.03 |
| <i>Cases/ mill inh</i> | 15623.3 | 2017.1 | 7.746 | <0.0001 |

214 Estimates are sample-average partial derivatives. Predictors accounted for 86.7% of the variance
 215 in deaths per million citizens (R^2 : 0.8675).

216

217

218

219

