

1 **Role of air temperature and humidity in the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the United**
2 **States**

3 Yiqun Ma^{1,2}, Sen Pei^{3*}, Jeffrey Shaman³, Robert Dubrow^{1,2}, Kai Chen^{1,2*}

4 1 Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Yale School of Public Health, 60 College Street, New
5 Haven, CT, 06520-8034, USA

6 2 Yale Center on Climate Change and Health, Yale School of Public Health, 60 College Street, New
7 Haven, CT, 06520-8034, USA

8 3 Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University,
9 New York, NY 10032, USA.

10

11 *Corresponding authors: K. Chen, Yale School of Public Health, 60 College Street, New Haven, CT,
12 06511, USA, kai.chen@yale.edu; S. Pei, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New
13 York, NY 10032, USA, sp3449@cumc.columbia.edu

14

15 **Abstract**

16 Improved understanding of the effects of meteorological conditions on the transmission of SARS-CoV-2,
17 the causative agent for COVID-19 disease, is urgently needed to inform mitigation efforts. Here, we
18 estimated the relationship between air temperature or specific humidity (SH) and SARS-CoV-2
19 transmission in 913 U.S. counties with abundant reported infections from March 15 to August 31, 2020.
20 Specifically, we quantified the associations of daily mean temperature and SH with daily estimates of the
21 SARS-CoV-2 reproduction number (R_t) and calculated the fraction of R_t attributable to these
22 meteorological conditions. Both lower temperature and lower SH were significantly associated with
23 increased R_t . The fraction of R_t attributable to temperature was 5.10% (95% eCI: 5.00 - 5.18%), and the
24 fraction of R_t attributable to SH was 14.47% (95% eCI: 14.37 - 14.54%). These fractions generally were
25 higher in northern counties than in southern counties. Our findings indicate that cold and dry weather are
26 moderately associated with increased SARS-CoV-2 transmissibility, with humidity playing a larger role
27 than temperature.

28

29 **Introduction**

30 Since emerging in Wuhan, China, the novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-
31 CoV-2), the causative agent of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), has produced a major global
32 pandemic. As of November 12, 2020, approximately 10.6 million COVID-19 cases and 243 thousand
33 deaths had been reported in the U.S.¹, more than any other country. The decreased stability of SARS-
34 CoV-2 in warmer temperatures and higher humidity in laboratory experiments^{2,3}, and the documented
35 seasonality of influenza⁴ and infections caused by other coronaviruses⁵⁻⁷, lead to the hypothesis that lower
36 air temperature and lower humidity are associated with increased SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Quantifying
37 this effect on a population level is urgently needed to help inform public health control efforts, including
38 transmission prevention and communication with the public⁸.

39 Numerous preliminary studies have found either positive or negative associations of air temperature and
40 humidity with COVID-19 cases⁹⁻¹³. However, given the large number of undocumented SARS-CoV-2
41 infections¹⁴, the variations in the lag between infection and symptom onset, and the inconsistent lag
42 between testing and reporting, using daily new confirmed cases may not be optimal for examining
43 meteorological effects¹⁵. As a result, a few studies have used the reproduction number to estimate SARS-
44 CoV-2 transmissibility¹⁶⁻¹⁸. One study reported high daily air temperature and high daily relative humidity
45 (RH) to be associated with a reduced daily effective reproduction number (the mean number of new
46 infections caused by a single infected person in a population in which some individuals may no longer be
47 susceptible due to acquired immunity¹⁹) for SARS-CoV-2 in both China and the U.S.¹⁶. However, two
48 early studies focused on the first few of months of the pandemic found no association between
49 temperature or humidity and the basic reproduction number (the mean number of new infections caused
50 by a single infected person in a population in which everyone is assumed to be susceptible and no public
51 health measures have been implemented)^{17,18}.

52 Early analyses, in particular, should be interpreted with caution⁸, as the range of temperature and
53 humidity measurements during the short observation period at the beginning of the pandemic was

54 relatively narrow in most studies^{9-12,16-18}, thus limiting the ability to detect associations between these
55 meteorological variables and SARS-CoV-2 transmission. In addition, many previous studies (whether
56 using COVID-19 cases or reproduction number as the outcome) controlled for no or only a few potential
57 confounders^{9-13,17,18}, which include other environmental factors, socioeconomic factors, temporal changes
58 in population immunity, and implementation of public health interventions.

59 Furthermore, although most early studies found an association between air temperature or humidity and
60 COVID-19 incidence, the fraction of cases or deaths attributable to meteorological conditions remains
61 unclear. One modeling study predicted that as long as most of the population is susceptible to infection,
62 any role of humidity in SARS-CoV-2 transmission would be overwhelmed by the lack of population
63 immunity²⁰. This prediction is supported by the rapid transmission of SARS-CoV-2 regardless of climate
64 zone, including warmer locations such as tropical Brazil, India and southern states in the U.S. during the
65 northern hemisphere summer¹.

66 Here we investigate the association between air temperature or specific humidity (SH; the mass of water
67 vapor in a unit mass of moist air [g/kg]) and SARS-CoV-2 transmission, as measured by the reproduction
68 number R_t (the mean number of new infections caused by a single infected person, given the public health
69 measures in place, in a population in which everyone is assumed to be susceptible). We estimate R_t in the
70 913 counties with at least 400 cumulative cases as of August 31, 2020 and calculate the fraction of R_t
71 attributable to temperature or SH, adjusting for a wide range of potential confounders.


72 **Results**

73 ***Distribution of meteorological factors and R_t***


74 From March 15 to August 31, 2020, a total of 4,903,520 cases of COVID-19 were reported in the 913
75 study counties (Extended Data Table 1). We estimated the county-specific R_t using a dynamic
76 metapopulation model informed by human mobility data that represents the transmission of SARS-CoV-2
77 in the U.S. (see Methods). Mean daily R_t averaged over all counties and days during the study period was
78 1.40 and ranged from 0.46 to 5.43. Daily air temperature and SH also ranged widely (air temperature: -
79 14.61 - 39.98 °C; SH: 0.99 - 22.15 g/kg). Union County, New Jersey had the highest R_t averaged over the

80 study period (Fig. 1a). The largest number of cumulative cases per 100,000 people was observed in
81 Chattahoochee County, Georgia, while Taylor County, Florida had the lowest number (Fig. 1b). Southern
82 counties generally were hotter and more humid than northern counties; whereas the western U.S., coastal
83 counties generally were cooler and more humid than inland counties (Fig. 1c-d).


a. Average reproduction number




b. Cumulative cases per 100,000 population



c. Average air temperature



d. Average specific humidity




84
85 **Fig. 1. Map of the distribution of reproduction number, cumulative cases, air temperature**
86 **and specific humidity in study counties.**

87 These maps display the distribution of the daily reproduction number (R_t), daily air temperature, and daily
88 specific humidity (SH) averaged over the study period, and the cumulative cases per 100,000 population,
89 in 913 U.S. counties.

90

91 ***Associations between meteorological factors and R_t***

92 We estimated the complex non-linear and temporally delayed associations of meteorological factors with
93 the SARS-CoV-2 R_t using a generalized additive mixed model adjusting for spatiotemporal variations in
94 R_t and potential measured confounders, described in detail in Methods. We then calculated the optimum
95 values of temperature and SH, which correspond to the lowest R_t . We found an approximately linear
96 inverse temperature- R_t relationship (Fig. 2a), with lower air temperatures significantly associated with
97 increased transmission of SARS-CoV-2 when below the optimum temperature (32.57 °C). No significant
98 associations were observed for temperatures above the optimum value. The relationship between SH and
99 R_t was non-linear (Fig. 2b). Higher SH was significantly associated with decreased transmission, except
100 for an increasing trend from approximately 9 to 15 g/kg. The optimum SH was estimated to be 19.78
101 g/kg. Compared with the optimum value, the 10th percentile of the distribution of air temperature (8.8 °C)
102 or SH (4.5 g/kg) was associated with a 14.10% (95% CI: 8.59 - 19.89%) and 27.49% (95% CI: 21.93 -
103 33.30%) increase of R_t , respectively. Effect estimates showed a decreasing trend in the lag dimension,
104 diminishing to a small non-significant effect on lag day 13 (Extended Data Fig. 1). Sensitivity analyses
105 showed the estimated relationships between air temperature or SH and R_t were generally consistent under
106 different modeling choices (Fig. 2a-b).



107

108 **Fig. 2. The associations of air temperature (°C) and specific humidity (g/kg) with R_t , under**
109 **different choices of model.**

110 This figure shows the estimated exposure-response curves for the associations of air temperature (°C) and
111 specific humidity (g/kg) with reproduction number (R_t) for SARS-Cov-2, with different modelling
112 choices: (1) main model with 95% confidence interval (grey area): tensor product smooths to control for
113 the temporal and spatial variations, and a cross-basis term for air temperature and SH, which is defined by
114 natural cubic splines with 3 df for both the exposure-response and lag-response association, with a
115 maximum lag of 13 days; (2) redefine the lag dimension using a natural cubic spline and 3 equally placed
116 internal knots in the log scale; (3) change the df to 4 in the cross-basis term for air temperature or SH in
117 the exposure-response function; (4): use a thin plate spline to control for geographical coordinates and
118 time instead of using the tensor product smooths.

119


120 *Fractions of R_t attributable to meteorological factors*

121 Based on the estimated exposure-response curves and daily county-specific R_t , we further calculated the
122 fraction of R_t attributable to temperature or SH (i.e., the attributable fraction (AF), which can be
123 interpreted as the fraction of R_t attributable to the deviation of temperature or SH from the optimum
124 value). Across all 913 counties over the entire study period, the AF for temperature was 5.10% (95%


125 empirical confidence intervals [95% eCI]: 5.00 - 5.18%), and the AF for SH was 14.47% (95% eCI: 14.37
126 - 14.54%) (Extended Data Table 2). The AF for temperature showed an increasing trend from south to
127 north (Fig. 3a). The county with the highest AF for temperature was Whatcom County, Washington
128 (12.88%) and the county with the lowest AF for temperature was Hidalgo County, Texas (0.52%). The
129 AF for SH showed an increasing trend from south to north in the eastern U.S., whereas in the western
130 U.S., the AF for SH was lower in counties in coastal states than in counties in interior states (Fig. 3b). The
131 county with the highest AF for SH was Nye County, Nevada (27.47%), and the county with the lowest
132 AF for SH was Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana (7.24%). The AF for temperature was the largest in March
133 and April, and the lowest in July and August (Fig. 3c). The AF for SH showed a modest decline between
134 March and August (Fig. 3d).

135 Sensitivity analyses indicate that the AF for air temperature remains robust when excluding
136 socioeconomic factors and when additionally adjusting for smoking and obesity prevalence, long-term air
137 pollution, or short-term air pollution (Extended Data Table 2). However, the estimated AF for
138 temperature decreased from 5.11% to 3.55% after additionally adjusting for daily ultraviolet (UV). The
139 AF for SH was robust across all sensitivity analyses.


a. AF to air temperature by county




c. AF to air temperature by month



b. AF to specific humidity by county



d. AF to specific humidity by month



140

141 **Fig. 3. Fractions of R_t attributable to meteorological factors by county and month**

142 a, b: the distribution of the fraction of reproduction number (R_t) attributable to temperature or specific
143 humidity (i.e., attributable fraction [AF]) in each county; c, d: the distribution of AF across months in the
144 study period. The black lines represent the 95% confidence interval, which were calculated by 1000
145 Monte Carlo simulations.

146

147 Discussion

148 Using estimated reproduction numbers for 913 U.S. counties and controlling for temporal and spatial
149 trends and other potential confounders, we assessed the associations of air temperature and SH with the
150 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and estimated the fractions of R_t attributable to temperature and SH. We
151 found both lower air temperature and lower SH to be significantly associated with increased R_t . During

152 the study period, 5.10% of R_t was attributable to the deviation of temperature from its optimum value and
153 14.47% of R_t was attributable to the deviation of SH from its optimum value. Temperature and SH
154 contributed more to transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in colder and drier counties and months than in warmer
155 and more humid counties and months. In March (the coldest month of our study period of March-
156 August), the AF for temperature was 11.00% and the AF for SH was 18.22% (Fig. 3). We can anticipate
157 higher AFs during the colder and drier months of January and February.

158 Associations of lower temperature and lower humidity with increased COVID-19 outcomes have been
159 reported by many previous studies. An early study in Wuhan, China reported that higher temperature and
160 RH were associated with decreased COVID-19 deaths²¹. Many multicity analyses in China also supported
161 such negative associations^{9,11,12,22}. For example, using data of daily confirmed case counts from 30
162 provincial capital cities of China, Liu et al. found that lower temperature and lower absolute humidity
163 were associated with higher COVID-19 case counts¹¹. Later, with the rapid spread of COVID-19 around
164 the world, studies in other countries emerged²³⁻²⁵. In the early stages of this pandemic in the U.S., a state-
165 level study of daily COVID-19 case counts observed a declining trend of reported cases with increasing
166 temperature up to 52 °F²³. Based on data from 166 countries worldwide, another study reported that a
167 1 °C increase in temperature and a 1% increase in RH were associated with a 3.08% and 0.85% reduction
168 in daily new cases, respectively²⁵. However, many of these earlier studies were limited by short study
169 periods (e.g. 1-2 months), use of daily confirmed cases or deaths across countries for which there were
170 varying reporting biases, failure to account for the time lag between observed weather conditions and
171 when cases or deaths were recorded, or failure to account for time delays between infection acquisition
172 and case confirmation¹⁵.

173 By representing the transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2, the estimated daily reproduction number serves as a
174 better outcome than daily case counts. While case counts are subject to the influence of reporting delay
175 and underreporting, which vary across locations and are thus difficult to control, the reproduction number
176 is a direct estimate of the transmission rate of SARS-CoV-2, quantifying the average number of infections

177 caused by one infection in the population. A small number of studies previously analyzed the association
178 between temperature or humidity and reproduction number¹⁶⁻¹⁸. Wang et al. found that a 1 °C increase in
179 temperature was associated with a reduction in the effective reproduction number by 0.023 in China and
180 0.020 in the U.S., and a 1% increase in RH was associated with a reduction in the effective reproduction
181 number by 0.0078 in China and 0.0080 in the U.S.¹⁶. These associations are consistent with our findings
182 but were not supported by two studies in China that examined the basic reproduction number: the first
183 found no association between temperature and SARS-CoV-2 transmission¹⁸; the second found no
184 association between absolute humidity and SARS-CoV-2 transmission¹⁷. However, these early studies
185 were limited by short observation periods at the beginning of the pandemic, and they did not account for
186 variations of testing capacity, reporting, human mobility, and population susceptibility in estimating
187 SARS-CoV-2 transmissibility.

188 In our study, R_t was estimated using a dynamic metapopulation model informed by human mobility data.
189 This mechanistic model accounted for unreported infections, reporting delays, and county-to-county
190 movement. We explicitly estimated the population susceptibility in each county, and removed its
191 influence in the calculation of R_t ²⁶ (see Methods). Further, model estimated population susceptibility has
192 been validated against independent seroprevalence studies²⁶. Thus, our estimations account for spatial
193 heterogeneity in population immunity.

194 Another strength of our study was adjustment for a wide range of demographic and socioeconomic factors
195 in the main analysis, as well as for smoking and obesity, air pollution, and UV radiation in sensitivity
196 analyses. We also thoroughly controlled for spatially and temporally heterogenous unmeasured
197 confounders, such as implementation of and compliance with public health measures²⁶, by simultaneously
198 controlling for temporal and spatial variations and including a random intercept to further account for
199 unmeasured county-level confounding (see Methods). This approach accounted for substantial differences
200 in the epidemic curves among counties (see Extended Data Fig. 2).

201 Our findings are supported by laboratory evidence on the stability of SARS-CoV-2 as a function of
202 temperature and humidity. It has been reported that the virus' half-life in human nasal mucus and sputum
203 is shorter under conditions of higher temperature and RH than under conditions of lower temperature and
204 RH². Similar findings were reported by other studies testing virus stability in virus transport medium³, in
205 aerosols, and on various surfaces²⁷. Further, the SARS-CoV-2 half-life was found to be longer at lower
206 temperatures, and at both 22 °C and 27 °C, the half-life decreased as RH increased from 40% to 65% but
207 increased as RH increased from 65% to 85%²⁸. This result is consistent with the non-linear relationship
208 between SH and R_t observed in our study (Fig. 2b), in which there was an increasing trend of R_t from 9 to
209 15 g/kg of SH superimposed on the overall decreasing trend.

210 The associations between temperature and humidity and SARS-CoV-2 transmissibility may be mediated
211 by airway antiviral defenses. Inhalation of cold and dry air can impair mucociliary clearance, a crucial
212 mechanism for elimination of inhaled pathogens²⁹. Further, during the colder winter months people spend
213 more time indoors, which may facilitate virus transmission³⁰. During these months, whether indoors or
214 outdoors, people are exposed to less UV radiation from the sun and therefore may produce less vitamin D
215 and other UV-induced mediators of immune function³¹.

216 We found that SH contributes more to SARS-CoV-2 transmission than temperature, which is consistent
217 with studies of influenza³². SH is more strongly associated with the observed seasonality of influenza in
218 temperate regions than either temperature or RH³²⁻³⁴. In developed countries, such as the U.S., people
219 spend approximately 90% of their time indoors³⁵, especially during winter³⁰. Although indoor temperature
220 is usually controlled, indoor humidity generally is not, and closely mirrors outdoor levels³⁶⁻³⁸, perhaps
221 explaining why ambient outdoor SH is more strongly associated with SARS-CoV-2 transmission than
222 ambient outdoor temperature. However, it remains unclear whether SH is the causative modulator of
223 SARS-CoV-2 transmission or is simply a useful indicator of the indoor environment and the combined
224 effects of temperature and RH.

225 In the sensitivity analyses, after adjusting for daily UV radiation, the estimated AF for temperature
226 decreased by about 30% (Extended Data Table 2), indicating that UV radiation acted as a confounder.
227 This result is consistent with a recent study that found higher levels of solar UV radiation have a stronger
228 association than temperature or humidity with a decreased growth rate (exponential increase in cases) of
229 COVID-19³⁹. In contrast, the fraction of Rt attributable to SH remained stable after adjusting for UV
230 radiation. Although it is unclear why UV radiation would serve as a confounder for temperature, but not
231 for SH, this result does suggest that SH is a more robust predictor than temperature.

232 Several limitations should be noted. First, this is an ecological rather than an individual-level study, thus
233 making the study susceptible to the ecological fallacy. Second, due to the high correlation between
234 temperature and SH, we were unable to explore whether the effects of temperature and humidity are
235 independent. Third, our study period was restricted to March-August; if we had been able to include an
236 entire year, including the colder months of November-February, our AF estimates for the entire study
237 period would likely have been larger.

238 **Conclusion**

239 Our findings indicate that cold and dry weather are moderately associated with increased SARS-CoV-2
240 transmissibility in the U.S., with absolute humidity (i.e., SH) playing a greater role than temperature.
241 More extensive public health interventions are needed to mitigate the increased transmissibility of SARS-
242 CoV-2 in winter months.

243 **Methods**

244 ***Data collection***

245 We extracted hourly air temperature and SH from the North America Land Data Assimilation System
246 project⁴⁰, a near real-time dataset with a $0.125^\circ \times 0.125^\circ$ grid resolution. We spatially and temporally
247 averaged these data into daily county-level records. SH is the mass of water vapor in a unit mass of moist
248 air (g/kg).

249 Other characteristics of each county, including geographic location, population density, demographic
250 structure of the population, socioeconomic factors, intensive care unit (ICU) bed capacity, health risk
251 factors, and long-term and short-term air pollution were collected from multiple sources. Geographic
252 coordinates, population density, median household income, percent of people older than 60 years, percent
253 black residents, percent Hispanic residents, percent owner-occupied housing, and percent residents aged
254 25 years and over without a high school diploma were collected from the U.S. Census Bureau⁴¹. The
255 prevalence of smoking and obesity among adults in each county was obtained from the Robert Wood
256 Johnson Foundation's 2020 County Health Rankings⁴². Total ICU beds in each county were derived from
257 Kaiser Health News⁴³. We extracted annual PM_{2.5} concentrations in the U.S. from 2014 to 2018 from the
258 0.01° × 0.01° grid resolution PM_{2.5} estimation provided by the Atmospheric Composition Analysis
259 Group⁴⁴, and calculated average PM_{2.5} levels during this 5-year period for each county to represent long-
260 term PM_{2.5} exposure (Extended Data Fig. 3). Short-term air quality data during the study period, including
261 daily mean PM_{2.5} and daily maximum 8-hour O₃, were obtained from the United States Environmental
262 Protection Agency⁴⁵. Daily downward UV radiation at the surface was extracted from the European
263 Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts ERA5 climate reanalysis⁴⁶, with data available before
264 August 2020.

265 ***Estimation of reproduction number***

266 We estimated the daily reproduction number (R_t) in all 3,142 U.S. counties using a dynamic
267 metapopulation model informed by human mobility data²⁶. R_t is the mean number of new infections
268 caused by a single infected person, given the public health measures in place, in a population in which
269 everyone is assumed to be susceptible. In the metapopulation model, two types of movement were
270 considered: daily work commuting and random movement. The transmission dynamics are depicted by a
271 set of ordinary differential equations²⁶.

272 We explicitly simulated reported and unreported infections, for which separate transmission rates are
273 defined, and allowed transmission rates and ascertainment rates to vary across different counties. To infer

274 key epidemiological parameters, we fit the transmission model to county-level daily cases and deaths
275 reported from March 15, 2020 to August 31, 2020. The estimated reproduction number is computed as
276 $R_t = \beta D[\alpha + (1 - \alpha)\mu]$, where β is county-specific transmission rate, μ is the relative transmissibility of
277 unreported infections, α is the county-specific ascertainment rate, and D is the average duration of
278 infectiousness. To avoid possible inaccurate estimation for counties with few cases, we inferred R_t in the
279 913 U.S. counties with at least 400 cumulative confirmed cases as of August 31, 2020 (Fig. 1). Details of
280 the model fitting and R_t estimation are reported elsewhere²⁶.

281 ***Statistical analysis***

282 All statistical analyses were conducted with R software (version 3.6.1) using the *mgcv* and *dlm* package.

283 **Exposure-response curves**

284 Given the potential non-linear and temporally delayed effect of air temperature or SH, a distributed lag
285 non-linear model (DLNM)⁴⁷ combined with generalized additive mixed models (GAMM) was applied to
286 estimate the associations of daily mean temperature or daily mean SH with SARS-CoV-2 R_t . Because of
287 the high correlation between air temperature and SH ($r = 0.80$, Extended Data Table 3), we analyzed
288 these two variables separately. The full model can be expressed as:

289 $\log(E(R_{i,t})) = \alpha + te(s(\text{latitude}_i, \text{longitude}_i, k=30), s(\text{time}_t, k=30)) + \text{cb.temperature (or cb.SH) +}$
290 $\beta_1(\text{population density}_i) + \beta_2(\text{percent black residents}_i) + \beta_3(\text{percent Hispanic residents}_i) + \beta_4(\text{percent people}$
291 $\text{older than 60 years}_i) + \beta_5(\text{median household income}_i) + \beta_6(\text{percent owner-occupied housing}_i) + \beta_7(\text{percent}$
292 $\text{residents older than 25 years without a high school diploma}_i) + \beta_8(\text{number of ICU beds per 10,000}$
293 $\text{people}_i) + u_i$

294 where $E(R_{i,t})$ refers to the expected R_t in county i on day t , and α is the intercept. The time trend was
295 controlled by a flexible natural cubic spline over the range of study dates with a maximum of 30 knots; a
296 thin plate spline with a maximum of 30 knots was used to control the coordinates of the centroid of each
297 county. Due to the unique pattern of the non-linear time trend of R_t in each county (Extended Data Fig.

298 2), we constructed tensor product smooths (te) of the splines of geographical coordinates and time, to
299 better control for the temporal and spatial variations. $Cb.temperature$ or $cb.SH$ is a cross-basis term for the
300 mean air temperature or mean SH. We modeled exposure-response associations using a natural cubic
301 spline with 3 degrees of freedom (df), and modeled the lag-response association using a natural cubic
302 spline with an intercept and 3 df with a maximum lag of 13 days. We adjusted for county-level
303 characteristics, including population density, percent black residents, percent Hispanic residents, percent
304 people older than 60 years, median household income, percent owner-occupied housing, percent residents
305 older than 25 years without a high school diploma, and number of ICU beds per 10,000 people. The
306 random effect of county (u_i) was considered in the model to further control for unmeasured county-level
307 confounding. To obtain more precise estimates, we excluded from the analysis days during which R_t was
308 less than 0.2.

309 Based on the estimated exposure-response curves, between the 1st and the 99th percentiles of the
310 distribution of air temperature and SH, we determined the value of exposure associated with the lowest R_t
311 to be the optimum temperature or the optimum SH, respectively. The natural cubic spline functions of the
312 exposure-response relationship were then re-centered with the optimum temperature and SH as reference
313 values. We report the cumulative relative risk of R_t associated with daily temperature or SH exposure in
314 the previous two weeks (0 to 13 lag days) as the percent changes of R_t when comparing the daily
315 exposure with the optimum reference values (i.e., the cumulative relative risk of R_t equals one and the
316 percent change of R_t equals zero when the temperature or SH exposure is at its optimum value).

317 **Attribution of R_t to temperature or SH**

318 We used the optimum value of temperature or SH as the reference value for calculating the fraction of R_t
319 attributable to temperature or SH; i.e., the attributable fraction (AF). For these calculations, we assumed
320 that the associations of temperature and SH with R_t were consistent across the counties. For each day in
321 each county, based on the cumulative lagged effect (cumulative relative risk) corresponding to the
322 temperature or SH of that day, we calculated the attributable R_t in the current and next 13 days, using a

323 previously established method⁴⁸. Specifically, in a given county, the Rt attributable to a temperature or a
324 SH (x_t) for a given day t was defined as the attributable absolute excess of Rt ($AE_{x,t}$, the excess
325 reproduction number on day t attributable to the deviation of temperature or SH from the optimum value)
326 and the attributable fraction of Rt ($AF_{x,t}$, the fraction of Rt attributable to the deviation of temperature or
327 SH from the optimum value), each accumulated over the current and next 13 days. The formula can be
328 expressed as

329 $AF_{x,t} = 1 - \exp(-\sum_{l=0}^{13} \beta_{x_t,l})$ and $AE_{x,t} = AF_{x,t} \times \sum_{l=0}^{13} \frac{n_{t+l}}{13+l}$, where n_t is the Rt on day t , and $\sum_{l=0}^{13} \beta_{x_t,l}$

330 is the overall cumulative log-relative risk for exposure x_t on day t obtained by the exposure-response
331 curves re-centered on the optimum values. Then, the total absolute excess of Rt attributable to
332 temperature or SH in each county was calculated by summing the absolute excesses of all days during the
333 study period, and the attributable fraction was calculated by dividing the total absolute excess of Rt for the
334 county by the sum of the Rt of all days during the study period for the county. The attributable fraction for
335 the 913 counties combined was calculated in a similar manner at the national level. We derived the 95%
336 empirical confidence intervals (95% eCI) for the attributable absolute excess and attributable fraction by
337 1000 Monte Carlo simulations⁴⁸. We also calculated the attributable fractions by month in the study
338 period.

339 **Sensitivity analyses**

340 We conducted several sensitivity analyses to test the robustness of our results: a) the lag dimension was
341 redefined using a natural cubic spline and three equally placed internal knots in the log scale; b) an
342 alternative four df was used in the cross-basis term for air temperature or SH in the exposure-response
343 function; c) time trend and geographical coordinates were controlled by a thin plate spline, instead of the
344 tensor product smooth; d) all demographic and socioeconomic variables were excluded from the model;
345 e) adjustment for the prevalence of smoking and obesity among adults was included in the model; f)
346 additional adjustment was made for the average $PM_{2.5}$ concentration in each county during 2014-2018⁴⁹;

347 g) additional adjustment was made for daily mean PM_{2.5}, daily maximum 8-hour O₃, and daily downward
348 UV radiation at the surface. For daily covariates with available data in only some of the counties or study
349 period, the results of sensitivity analyses were compared to the main model re-run on the same partial
350 dataset.

351 **Acknowledgements**

352 Y.M. received funding from the China Scholarship Council (201906320022). S.P. and J.S. acknowledged
353 funding from the National Institutes of Health (GM110748) and the National Science Foundation (DMS-
354 2027369), as well as a gift from the Morris-Singer Foundation. R.D. received funding from the High Tide
355 Foundation.

356 **Author contributions**

357 K.C. conceived of and supervised the conduct of this study and edited the manuscript. J.S. and R.D.
358 contributed to the study design, interpretation of results, and manuscript revision. S.P. estimated the
359 reproduction number and contributed to the writing. Y.M. conducted formal analyses and drafted the
360 manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of this manuscript.

361 **Competing interests**

362 J.S. and Columbia University disclose partial ownership of SK Analytics. J.S. discloses consulting for
363 BNI. All other authors declare no competing interests.

364 **Data availability**

365 Estimates of county-level reproduction number are available at [https://github.com/shaman-](https://github.com/shaman-lab/Counterfactual)
366 [lab/Counterfactual](https://github.com/shaman-lab/Counterfactual)

367 The data sets used in the study are publicly available from the following locations:

368 Hourly air temperature and specific humidity data:

369 https://disc.gsfc.nasa.gov/datasets/NLDAS_FORA0125_H_002/summary?keywords=NLDAS

370 Population density, median household income, percent of people older than 60 years, percent black
371 residents, percent Hispanic residents, percent owner-occupied housing, and percent residents aged 25
372 years and over without a high school diploma: <https://www.census.gov/data/tables.html>

373 U.S. county boundary: [https://www.census.gov/geographies/mapping-files/time-series/geo/cartographic-](https://www.census.gov/geographies/mapping-files/time-series/geo/cartographic-boundary.html)
374 [boundary.html](https://www.census.gov/geographies/mapping-files/time-series/geo/cartographic-boundary.html)

375 Prevalence of smoking and obesity among adults in each county:
376 <https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/explore-health-rankings/rankings-data-documentation>

377 Total ICU beds in each county: [https://khn.org/news/as-coronavirus-spreads-widely-millions-of-older-](https://khn.org/news/as-coronavirus-spreads-widely-millions-of-older-americans-live-in-counties-with-no-icu-beds/)
378 [americans-live-in-counties-with-no-icu-beds/](https://khn.org/news/as-coronavirus-spreads-widely-millions-of-older-americans-live-in-counties-with-no-icu-beds/)

379 Annual PM_{2.5} concentrations in the U.S. from 2014 to 2018:
380 http://fizz.phys.dal.ca/~atmos/martin/?page_id=140

381 Short-term daily mean PM_{2.5} and daily maximum 8-hour O₃: [https://www.epa.gov/outdoor-air-quality-](https://www.epa.gov/outdoor-air-quality-data/download-daily-data)
382 [data/download-daily-data](https://www.epa.gov/outdoor-air-quality-data/download-daily-data)

383 Daily downward UV radiation at the surface:
384 <https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/cdsapp#!/dataset/reanalysis-era5-single-levels?tab=overview>

385 **Code availability**

386 R code for this analysis will be available at <https://github.com/CHENlab-Yale/COVID-Climate>
387

388 Reference

- 389 1. Dong, E., Du, H. & Gardner, L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real
390 time. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* **20**, 533-534 (2020).
- 391 2. Matson, M.J., *et al.* Effect of environmental conditions on SARS-CoV-2 stability in human nasal
392 mucus and sputum. *Emerg Infect Dis* **26**, 2276–2278 (2020).
- 393 3. Chin, A.W.H., *et al.* Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental conditions. *Lancet*
394 *Microbe* **1**, e10 (2020).
- 395 4. Sooryanarain, H. & Elankumaran, S. Environmental role in influenza virus outbreaks. *Annu Rev*
396 *Anim Biosci* **3**, 347-373 (2015).
- 397 5. Tan, J., *et al.* An initial investigation of the association between the SARS outbreak and weather:
398 with the view of the environmental temperature and its variation. *J Epidemiol Community Health*
399 **59**, 186-192 (2005).
- 400 6. Abdul-Rasool, S. & Fielding, B.C. Understanding human coronavirus HCoV-NL63. *Open Virol J*
401 **4**, 76-84 (2010).
- 402 7. Esper, F., Weibel, C., Ferguson, D., Landry, M.L. & Kahn, J.S. Coronavirus HKU1 infection in
403 the United States. *Emerg Infect Dis* **12**, 775-779 (2006).
- 404 8. Carlson, C.J., Gomez, A.C.R., Bansal, S. & Ryan, S.J. Misconceptions about weather and
405 seasonality must not misguide COVID-19 response. *Nat Commun* **11**, 4312 (2020).
- 406 9. Shi, P., *et al.* Impact of temperature on the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Sci*
407 *Total Environ* **728**, 138890 (2020).
- 408 10. Prata, D.N., Rodrigues, W. & Bermejo, P.H. Temperature significantly changes COVID-19
409 transmission in (sub)tropical cities of Brazil. *Sci Total Environ* **729**, 138862 (2020).
- 410 11. Liu, J., *et al.* Impact of meteorological factors on the COVID-19 transmission: A multi-city study
411 in China. *Sci Total Environ* **726**, 138513 (2020).
- 412 12. Xie, J. & Zhu, Y. Association between ambient temperature and COVID-19 infection in 122
413 cities from China. *Sci Total Environ* **724**, 138201 (2020).
- 414 13. Pani, S.K., Lin, N.H. & RavindraBabu, S. Association of COVID-19 pandemic with
415 meteorological parameters over Singapore. *Sci Total Environ* **740**, 140112 (2020).
- 416 14. Li, R., *et al.* Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel
417 coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science* **368**, 489-493 (2020).
- 418 15. Smit, A.J., *et al.* Winter is coming: a southern hemisphere perspective of the environmental
419 drivers of SARS-CoV-2 and the potential seasonality of COVID-19. *Int J Environ Res Public*
420 *Health* **17**, 5634 (2020).
- 421 16. Wang, J., *et al.* High temperature and high humidity reduce the transmission of COVID-19. *SSRN*
422 (2020).
- 423 17. Luo, W., *et al.* The role of absolute humidity on transmission rates of the COVID-19 outbreak.
424 *medRxiv*, 2020.2002.2012.20022467 (2020).
- 425 18. Yao, Y., *et al.* No association of COVID-19 transmission with temperature or UV radiation in
426 Chinese cities. *Eur Respir J* **55**, 2000517 (2020).
- 427 19. Gostic, K.M., *et al.* Practical considerations for measuring the effective reproductive number, Rt.
428 *medRxiv* (2020).
- 429 20. Baker, R.E., Yang, W., Vecchi, G.A., Metcalf, C.J.E. & Grenfell, B.T. Susceptible supply limits
430 the role of climate in the early SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. *Science* **369**, 315-319 (2020).
- 431 21. Peak, C.M., *et al.* Individual quarantine versus active monitoring of contacts for the mitigation of
432 COVID-19: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* (2020).
- 433 22. Qi, H., *et al.* COVID-19 transmission in Mainland China is associated with temperature and
434 humidity: A time-series analysis. *Sci Total Environ* **728**, 138778 (2020).
- 435 23. Sehra, S.T., Saliccioli, J.D., Wiebe, D.J., Fundin, S. & Baker, J.F. Maximum daily temperature,
436 precipitation, ultra-violet light and rates of transmission of SARS-Cov-2 in the United States.
437 *Clin Infect Dis* (2020).

- 438 24. Runkle, J.D., *et al.* Short-term effects of specific humidity and temperature on COVID-19
439 morbidity in select US cities. *Sci Total Environ* **740**, 140093 (2020).
- 440 25. Wu, Y., *et al.* Effects of temperature and humidity on the daily new cases and new deaths of
441 COVID-19 in 166 countries. *Sci Total Environ* **729**, 139051 (2020).
- 442 26. Pei, S., Kandula, S. & Shaman, J. Differential effects of intervention timing on COVID-19 spread
443 in the United States. *Science Advances*, eabd6370 (2020).
- 444 27. van Doremalen, N., *et al.* Aerosol and surface stability of SARS-CoV-2 as compared with SARS-
445 CoV-1. *N Engl J Med* **382**, 1564-1567 (2020).
- 446 28. Morris, D.H., *et al.* The effect of temperature and humidity on the stability of SARS-CoV-2 and
447 other enveloped viruses. *bioRxiv*, 2020.2010.2016.341883 (2020).
- 448 29. Moriyama, M., Hugentobler, W.J. & Iwasaki, A. Seasonality of respiratory viral infections.
449 *Annual Review of Virology* **7**, 83-101 (2020).
- 450 30. Shaman, J. & Galanti, M. Will SARS-CoV-2 become endemic? *Science*, eabe5960 (2020).
- 451 31. Hart, P.H., Gorman, S. & Finlay-Jones, J.J. Modulation of the immune system by UV radiation:
452 more than just the effects of vitamin D? *Nature Reviews Immunology* **11**, 584-596 (2011).
- 453 32. Shaman, J. & Kohn, M. Absolute humidity modulates influenza survival, transmission, and
454 seasonality. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **106**, 3243-3248 (2009).
- 455 33. Shaman, J., Goldstein, E. & Lipsitch, M. Absolute humidity and pandemic versus epidemic
456 influenza. *Am J Epidemiol* **173**, 127-135 (2011).
- 457 34. Shaman, J., Pitzer, V.E., Viboud, C., Grenfell, B.T. & Lipsitch, M. Absolute humidity and the
458 seasonal onset of influenza in the continental United States. *PLoS Biol* **8**, e1000316 (2010).
- 459 35. Klepeis, N.E., *et al.* The National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS): a resource for
460 assessing exposure to environmental pollutants. *J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* **11**, 231-252
461 (2001).
- 462 36. Shaman, J., Kandula, S., Yang, W. & Karspeck, A. The use of ambient humidity conditions to
463 improve influenza forecast. *PLoS Comput Biol* **13**, e1005844 (2017).
- 464 37. Quinn, A. & Shaman, J. Indoor temperature and humidity in New York City apartments during
465 winter. *Science of The Total Environment* **583**, 29-35 (2017).
- 466 38. Nguyen, J.L., Schwartz, J. & Dockery, D.W. The relationship between indoor and outdoor
467 temperature, apparent temperature, relative humidity, and absolute humidity. *Indoor Air* **24**, 103-
468 112 (2014).
- 469 39. Merow, C. & Urban, M.C. Seasonality and uncertainty in global COVID-19 growth rates.
470 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 202008590 (2020).
- 471 40. Cosgrove, B.A., *et al.* Real-time and retrospective forcing in the North American Land Data
472 Assimilation System (NLDAS) project. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*
473 **108**(2003).
- 474 41. United States Census Bureau. Tables. (2020).
- 475 42. Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. 2020 County Health Rankings. (2020).
- 476 43. Kaiser Health News. Millions Of Older Americans Live In Counties With No ICU Beds As
477 Pandemic Intensifies. (2020).
- 478 44. van Donkelaar, A., Martin, R.V., Li, C. & Burnett, R.T. Regional estimates of chemical
479 composition of fine particulate matter using a combined geoscience-statistical method with
480 information from satellites, models, and monitors. *Environ Sci Technol* **53**, 2595-2611 (2019).
- 481 45. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Outdoor Air Quality Data. (2020).
- 482 46. European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts. ERA5 hourly data on single levels from
483 1979 to present. (2018).
- 484 47. Gasparrini, A., Armstrong, B. & Kenward, M.G. Distributed lag non-linear models. *Stat Med* **29**,
485 2224-2234 (2010).
- 486 48. Gasparrini, A. & Leone, M. Attributable risk from distributed lag models. *BMC Med Res*
487 *Methodol* **14**, 55 (2014).

- 488 49. Wu, X., Nethery, R.C., Sabath, M.B., Braun, D. & Dominici, F. Air pollution and COVID-19
489 mortality in the United States: Strengths and limitations of an ecological regression analysis. *Sci*
490 *Adv* 6(2020).
- 491
- 492

493 **Extended Data Fig. 1. Lag-response relationships of air temperature (°C) or specific**
494 **humidity (g/kg) with reproduction number (R_t).**

495 These curves are computed for the 10th percentile of air temperature and specific humidity vs. the
496 optimum values on different lag days; the grey areas display the 95% confidence interval. The effect
497 estimates show a decreasing trend in the lag dimension, diminishing to a small non-significant effect on
498 lag day 13.

499 **Extended Data Fig. 2. Daily R_t from March 15 to August 31 in the largest county in each**
500 **state.**

501 Black dots represent the daily value of reproduction number (R_t) in the largest county in each U.S. state.
502 Blue lines show the trend of R_t through time, fitted by local polynomial regression; the light blue areas
503 display the 95% confidence interval.

504 **Extended Data Fig. 3. Distribution of average PM_{2.5} concentration during 2014-2018.**

505 This map displays the county-level average PM_{2.5} concentration during 2014-2018, extracted from the
506 PM_{2.5} estimation provided by Atmospheric Composition Analysis Group.

507