

# PNAS

[www.pnas.org](http://www.pnas.org)

1  
2 **Main Manuscript for**

3  
4 **Identifying US Counties with High Cumulative COVID-19 Burden and Their**  
5 **Characteristics**

6  
7 *Short Title:* US county COVID-19 disparate impacts  
8

9 Daniel Li,<sup>1,2</sup> Sheila M. Gaynor,<sup>1</sup> Corbin Quick,<sup>1</sup> Jarvis T. Chen,<sup>3</sup> Briana J.K.  
10 Stephenson,<sup>1</sup> Brent A. Coull,<sup>1,4</sup> Xihong Lin<sup>1,5,6\*</sup>

11 <sup>1</sup>Department of Biostatistics, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston MA.

12 <sup>2</sup>Ohio State University College of Medicine, Columbus OH.

13 <sup>3</sup>Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public  
14 Health, Boston MA.

15 <sup>4</sup>Department of Environmental Health, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health,  
16 Boston MA.

17 <sup>5</sup>Department of Statistics, Harvard University, Cambridge MA.

18 <sup>6</sup>Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA.

19  
20 **\*Correspondence:** Xihong Lin

21 **Email:** [xlin@hsph.harvard.edu](mailto:xlin@hsph.harvard.edu).

22 **Classification:** Social Sciences and Social Sciences; Physical Sciences and Statistics

23 **Keywords:** COVID-19, health disparities, public health  
24

25 **This PDF file includes:**

26 Main Text

27 Figures 1 to 4  
28

1     **Abstract**

2     Identifying areas with high COVID-19 burden and their characteristics can help improve  
3     vaccine distribution and uptake, reduce burdens on health care systems, and allow for  
4     better allocation of public health intervention resources. Synthesizing data from various  
5     government and nonprofit institutions of 3,142 United States (US) counties as of  
6     12/21/2020, we studied county-level characteristics that are associated with cumulative  
7     case and death rates using regression analyses. Our results showed counties that are  
8     more rural, counties with more White/non-White segregation, and counties with higher  
9     percentages of people of color, in poverty, with no high school diploma, and with  
10    medical comorbidities such as diabetes and hypertension are associated with higher  
11    cumulative COVID-19 case and death rates. We identify the hardest hit counties in US  
12    using model-estimated case and death rates, which provide more reliable estimates of  
13    cumulative COVID-19 burdens than those using raw observed county-specific rates.  
14    Identification of counties with high disease burdens and understanding the  
15    characteristics of these counties can help inform policies to improve vaccine distribution,  
16    deployment and uptake, prevent overwhelming health care systems, and enhance  
17    testing access, personal protection equipment access, and other resource allocation  
18    efforts, all of which can help save more lives for vulnerable communities.

19  
20    **Significance statement:** We found counties that are more rural, counties with more  
21    White/non-White segregation, and counties with higher percentages of people of color,  
22    in poverty, with no high school diploma, and with medical comorbidities such as  
23    diabetes and hypertension are associated with higher cumulative COVID-19 case and

1 death rates. We also identified individual counties with high cumulative COVID-19  
2 burden. Identification of counties with high disease burdens and understanding the  
3 characteristics of these counties can help inform policies to improve vaccine distribution,  
4 deployment and uptake, prevent overwhelming health care systems, and enhance  
5 testing access, personal protection equipment access, and other resource allocation  
6 efforts, all of which can help save more lives for vulnerable communities.

7

## 8 **Main Text**

### 9 **Introduction**

10 COVID-19 has had significant medical, social, and economic impacts on all  
11 communities in the United States (US), and efficient allocation of limited resources,  
12 mitigation of public health control measures, and prevention of overwhelming health  
13 care systems have been constant challenges (1–8). Concerns about access to testing  
14 and personal protective equipment (PPE) arose during Spring 2020, and existing  
15 challenges in Winter 2020-2021 include vaccine distribution, deployment and uptake (9–  
16 14). The rapidly increasing numbers of COVID-19 cases, hospitalizations, and deaths in  
17 the US present an urgent need to develop efficient vaccine distribution, deployment and  
18 uptake strategies and to craft effective public health measures. This will allow for better  
19 control of the pandemic and reduce the burden of COVID-19 on health care systems.

20 Current US national vaccine guidelines use individual-level factors to prioritize  
21 certain high-risk people, such as healthcare workers and long-term care residents first,  
22 and then certain essential workers and elderly (15, 16). However, this strategy has been  
23 shown to lead to vaccines being distributed proportional to population density, leaving

1 more sparsely populated areas at increased risk (17). Given the high vaccine efficacy of  
2 the Moderna and Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccines, vaccination implementation and  
3 compliance to increase vaccine uptake is the defining challenge in 2021(18, 19).

4 Vaccine distribution and uptake strategies that additionally account for spatial  
5 information and local community characteristics of regions with the most COVID-19  
6 cases and deaths can help more rapidly get vaccines into people's arms, save even  
7 more lives, and make the COVID-19 burden on healthcare systems more manageable  
8 (20–22).

9 It is hence of substantial interest to identify counties of high case and death rates  
10 and understand the characteristics of these counties. For a comprehensive assessment  
11 of total COVID-19 impact across all US regions, raw observed case and death counts  
12 and rates per capita (population size) at the county level are typically presented (23–  
13 25). However, 2019 US county population sizes vary from as small as 86 residents in  
14 Kalawao County, Hawaii to over 10 million residents in Los Angeles County, California.  
15 Using per capita rates, one case equivalent in Kalawao County is equivalent to  
16 approximately 117,000 cases in Los Angeles County. Crude rate estimates for small  
17 counties are unstable, and a more statistically sound framework is needed to  
18 appropriately quantify total COVID-19 case and death burdens for US counties of all  
19 population sizes. By leveraging data across different counties and accounting for  
20 uncertainty, and we can also identify county-level characteristics that are associated  
21 with county-level disease burdens.

22 In this study, we use county-level demographic, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic,  
23 and medical comorbidities variables synthesized from various data sources to build  
24 regression models that i) study county-level covariate associations with COVID-19 total

1 case and death rates, ii) provide estimates of COVID-19 total case and death rates that  
2 are more reliable than raw observed rates for all US counties, and iii) explore season-  
3 varying county-level associations with COVID-19 weekly case and death rates. Our  
4 models show disease burdens greatly vary between counties, and our models reveal  
5 common characteristics of counties with high disease burdens. Counties that are more  
6 rural, have a greater percentage of people of color, more White/non-White segregation,  
7 and more residents in poverty, with no high school diploma, and/or with medical  
8 comorbidities, such as diabetes and hypertension, are associated with higher  
9 cumulative COVID-19 case and death rates.

10 Our models provide more reliable model-based county cumulative case and  
11 death rates by leveraging information across counties and accounting for instability in  
12 estimated rates from less populated counties. Season-varying analyses revealed that  
13 urban counties with more racial minorities were associated with higher weekly case and  
14 death rates in the Spring, more rural counties were associated with higher weekly rates  
15 in the Fall, and counties with more residents with no high school diploma and  
16 comorbidities such as hypertension were associated with higher weekly rates in the  
17 Spring, Summer, and Fall. These association analysis results and county-specific case  
18 and death rate estimates can be used to identify vulnerable US counties with high-risk  
19 county-level factors and with the greatest total COVID-19 burden to date. Such counties  
20 can be prioritized for prevention and intervention efforts including but not limited to  
21 vaccine distribution and uptake, testing and resources for control measures, and  
22 management of COVID-19 burdens on local health care systems.

23  
24 *Brief Materials and Methods*

1 We obtained demographic, socioeconomic and comorbidity data from a COVID-  
2 19 GitHub repository that drew from the US Department of Agriculture, Area Health  
3 Resources Files, County Health Rankings and Roadmaps, Centers for Disease Control  
4 and Prevention, and Kaiser News Health (26). We obtained COVID-19 county cases  
5 and deaths from 1/22/20-12/21/20 from USA Facts (27) and additional demographic  
6 data from the US Census Bureau (28).

7 We used a Poisson mixed model to model cumulative case and death counts for  
8 all 3,142 US counties through 12/21/20. We included fixed effects for each state to  
9 account for state-to-state variation not explained by variables in the model (such as  
10 state testing rates), a random effect for each county to account for overdispersion and  
11 county testing rates, and an offset term for log county population (2019 US Census  
12 estimates). Model variables are listed in **Table S1** and model covariate geographic  
13 heatmaps are in **Figures S1-S2**. Continuous covariates were scaled to have mean zero  
14 and standard deviation one for modeling. County model-based estimates and  
15 confidence intervals were calculated from model output.

16 Model coefficient estimates and confidence intervals were used to explore  
17 associations between county-level covariates and COVID-19 rates. Exploratory total  
18 case fatality rate (CFR) analyses were performed by modeling total county death counts  
19 with an offset for log total case counts. Additional spatiotemporal modeling of weekly  
20 county case, death, and case fatality rates from 3/23/20-12/21/20 (40 repeated  
21 measures per county) was performed to investigate how county-level associations  
22 varied by season. Extra details about data sources and statistical methods are available  
23 in the full Materials and Methods.

## 1 Results

2 Our model estimated case and death rates matched well with the corresponding  
3 observed rates. **Figure 1** shows heatmaps of the observed rates, heatmaps of the  
4 estimated rates, and a scatterplot of observed versus estimated values by county.  
5 There was the most agreement between observed and estimated case rates (**Figure**  
6 **1A**). While there were only 3 counties reporting zero total cases as of 12/21/20, there  
7 were 111 counties reporting zero total deaths as of 12/21/20. These zero death counties  
8 can be appreciated in the left panel observed heatmaps of **Figure 1B** by the “coarse,  
9 pixelated” patterns, particularly noticeable in the central Midwest. The corresponding  
10 center panel estimated death rate map values are noticeably “smoother” in this region.  
11 These patterns are also reflected in the right panel scatterplot by the increased number  
12 of points on the y-axis.

13 Associational relative risks (RR) for the multiplicative increase in county COVID-  
14 19 cumulative case, death, and case fatality rates were calculated for a one standard  
15 deviation increase of a county-level variable. **Figure 2** shows univariable and  
16 multivariable case rate RR, and **Figure 3** shows univariable and multivariable death rate  
17 RR. Univariable analyses show that more rural counties and counties with more racial  
18 minorities, socioeconomic disadvantage, and increased health comorbidities tend to  
19 have higher total case and death rates. After adjustment in multivariable analyses, more  
20 rural counties, and counties with increased White/non-White segregation, poverty, no  
21 high school diplomas, diabetes, heart failure, and hypertension tended to have higher  
22 total case and/or death rates.

23 Many variables that were statistically significant on univariable analysis were not  
24 on multivariable analysis. **Figure S3** plots Spearman correlations for all covariates and

1 shows how many of these variables are correlated. More rural counties tend to have  
2 more males residents, residents 60+ years, and fewer minorities. Black/African  
3 American percentage tended to be positively correlated with socioeconomic and health  
4 comorbidity variables. Socioeconomic and health comorbidity variables tended to be  
5 positively correlated. Spatial patterns among different covariates also exist. **Figures S4-**  
6 **S5** show heatmaps of standardized covariate values for modeling. Black percentages,  
7 stroke, heart failure, hypertension, and kidney disease percentages are all greatest in  
8 the Southern states. Hispanic percentages are greatest along the Southwestern states.  
9 Smoking and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) percentages are elevated  
10 along the Appalachian Mountains.

11 Our model estimated rates can be used to identify states with the greatest  
12 COVID-19 burden. **Figure 4** shows **(A)** the counties with the top 30 estimated total case  
13 rates and **(B)** the counties with the top 30 estimated total death rates. States such as  
14 North Dakota, South Dakota, and Texas have multiple counties in the top 30 estimated  
15 case and/or death rates. Counties with smaller populations tend to have larger  
16 confidence intervals. For example, among case rates, Buffalo County in South Dakota  
17 has a population around 2,000 and a relatively larger confidence interval, while Hale  
18 County in Texas has a population around 33,000 and a relatively smaller confidence  
19 interval. Among death rates, Kenedy County in Texas has a population around 400 and  
20 a relatively larger confidence interval, while the Bronx Borough in New York has a  
21 population around 1.4 million and has a relatively smaller confidence interval.

22 We performed exploratory total case fatality rates (CFR) analyses. Assuming the  
23 ascertainment rates of reported cases vary by state or county, and by including fixed  
24 state effects and county random effects, the CFR and infection fatality rate (IFR)



1 regression analyses produced identical results for covariate associations (see  
2 **Supporting Information** for further discussion). Observed and estimated CFR rates  
3 matched well, similar to the death rates (**Figure S6**). The CFR results had similar  
4 directions to the primary death rate results, and counties with more residents age 60+  
5 years were associated with increased case fatality rates on both univariable and  
6 multivariable analyses (**Figure S7**). However, these analyses are likely subject to bias  
7 due to several factors, such as differential underestimation of the total number of cases  
8 by race and ethnicity selection bias of subjects who have been tested (29, 30).

9 We further explored how county-level covariate associations with COVID-19  
10 rates varied over the course of the pandemic. **Figures S8-S9** show longitudinal trends  
11 of COVID-19 county cases and deaths over time. **Figures 8A** and **9A** show total case  
12 and death counts were mostly concentrated in a few areas including the Northeast  
13 during the Spring, increased in the South during the Summer, and increased  
14 everywhere including rural areas during the Fall. **Figures 8B** and **9B** show similar  
15 patterns for case and death rates respectively, though the increased case and death  
16 rates in some Midwest States are more prominent. **Figures 8C** and **9C** show case and  
17 death rates by US Census region were highest in the Northeast during the spring,  
18 highest in the South during the summer, and highest in the Midwest during the Fall.

19 Longitudinal modeling of weekly county case and death rates was performed.  
20 **Tables S2** and **S4** show univariable season varying relative risks for weekly case and  
21 death rates respectively, and **Tables S3** and **S5** show multivariable relative risks for  
22 weekly case and death rates respectively. Similar to total rate analyses, many  
23 covariates had significant associations in univariable modeling that changed in  
24 multivariable modeling. During the Spring, more urban counties and counties with more

1 racial minorities and racial residential segregation tended to have greater case and  
2 death rates. As the pandemic progressed, during the Fall, more rural areas tended to  
3 have greater case and death rates. Socioeconomic variables such as no high school  
4 diploma and medical comorbidity variables such as hypertension were associated with  
5 increased case and death rates throughout the Fall, Summer, and Spring.

6 Lastly, we look at case fatality rates over time. **Figure S10** shows longitudinal  
7 trends of COVID-19 case fatality rates over time. **Figure S10A** shows how due to  
8 possible delays between COVID-19 testing confirmation and official recording of  
9 COVID-19 deaths, national death rates lagged by about one week peak at the same  
10 time as national case rates for USAFacts data. **Figure S10B** does not show any distinct  
11 geographic case fatality rate patterns, but case fatality rates appear to be decreasing in  
12 all regions over time. **Figures S10C** shows case fatality rates have fallen since the start  
13 of the pandemic.

14 Longitudinal modeling of case rates adjusted for the observed one-week  
15 reporting lag specific to USAFacts data (ex. weekly deaths ending on 12/21/20 were  
16 matched with weekly cases ending on 12/14/20). **Table S6** and **S7** show univariable  
17 and multivariable season-varying weekly case fatality relative risks. Counties with more  
18 residents ages 60+ years and counties with larger percentages of medical comorbidities  
19 tend to have increased case fatality relative risks throughout the Spring, Summer, and  
20 Fall. More rural areas have tended to have greater case fatality rates during the Fall.  
21 However, just as with the cumulative case fatality rate analyses, various reporting  
22 biases exist. Additional challenges include matching individuals death and case dates  
23 using aggregated data and instability from low weekly case count offsets, especially for  
24 sparsely populated areas.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## Discussion

Using county-level data obtained from various government and nonprofit sources, we provide model-based estimates of COVID-19 total case and death rates for every county in the US. Unlike observed per capita rates, our model-estimated rates are more stable in counties with smaller populations and allow for better quantification of estimate uncertainty. We also explore associations between county-level covariates and total case and death rates using our model, and we find that rural counties, counties with more White/non-White segregation, and counties with increased socioeconomic disadvantage and increased medical comorbidities all tend to have greater cumulative case and death rates. These findings and results can better inform policies for strategic vaccine distribution, deployment and uptake, mitigation of public health control measures, assessment of preparedness of health care system capacity, and reduction of health care burdens to vulnerable US counties.

The CDC's Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) releases recommendations for vaccine distribution,(15, 16) but state governments ultimately decide how to distribute vaccines and encourage vaccine uptake (31). To assist states in formulating their own vaccine distribution policies and vaccine uptake strategies, we provide observed and estimated case, death, and case fatality rates for all US counties. Tailored strategies can also target county-level factors we have identified in associational analyses. All results will be updated regularly.

We are primarily interested in studying the associations between county-level covariates and total case and death rates to identify county-level characteristics for high

1 disease burdens. These results can then be used to identify vulnerable counties so that  
2 tailored strategies can be developed to improve vaccine distribution and uptake and  
3 improve disease control measures. Our county-level association analysis results are  
4 consistent with results from various individual-level studies. Racial minorities have been  
5 found to have increased COVID-19 case, hospitalization, and death rates in the Spring  
6 (32–36). Older patients are more likely to develop severe COVID-19 symptoms and  
7 have greater mortality rates (37). Household size is known to affect COVID-19 contact  
8 and transmission rates (38). Heart failure, hypertension, and stroke are important  
9 biological and clinical risk factors for COVID-19 disease severity and mortality (37, 39).

10 We are primarily interested in this paper studying how county-level  
11 characteristics are associated with their cumulative case and death rates. These  
12 county-level associations should not be interpreted as individual level associations.  
13 Associations observed at an aggregated level may be in the same direction, different  
14 direction, or not exist at the individual level (40). As seen in **Figures S1-S2, S4-S5** and  
15 noted earlier in the results section, most county-level covariates have a clear  
16 geographic pattern that likely makes estimating individual-level effects difficult. Multiple  
17 covariates are correlated in multivariable modeling and complicate confounding issues  
18 in estimation and inference. Lastly, as with all observational studies, associational  
19 findings do not imply causality. However, the focus of our study is on estimating county-  
20 level case and death rates and identifying county-level characteristics of vulnerable  
21 counties to help counties develop tailored strategies for vaccination, public health  
22 control measure and management of health care burden, not estimating individual-level  
23 effects. Therefore, these limitations are less relevant to our primary study goals.

1 Our analyses of weekly COVID-19 case and death rates also support how  
2 COVID-19 has disproportionately affected various vulnerable populations at different  
3 times. The early stages of the pandemic in the Spring had disproportionately affected  
4 racially diverse but socioeconomically disadvantaged urban areas. More recently in the  
5 Fall, predominately white, rural, socioeconomically disadvantaged areas have been hit  
6 harder. Most research on the COVID-19 pandemic has focused on urban areas, and  
7 more studies of rural areas with individual-level data are needed to better characterize  
8 the experience of these diverse 46 million individuals (5, 41).

9 Next steps to improving our model-based estimates can include obtaining data at  
10 finer geographic resolution such as at the US census tract or zip code level. Additional  
11 variables such as neighborhood testing rates, percentage of healthcare workers,  
12 percentage of essential workers, exposure to infected individuals within households and  
13 in communities, personal protective equipment access, use of public transportation,  
14 utilization rates of available healthcare facilities/resources, access to living resources  
15 (such as a lack of access to clean water in many households of American  
16 Indian/Alaskan Native communities), health literacy, occupation and work conditions,  
17 housing conditions, basic living resources, and access to COVID-19 treatments may  
18 further improve modeling accuracy. As more counties report COVID-19 deaths and  
19 fewer counties have zero deaths, as with the case rates, our estimated death rates will  
20 likely also closer match the observed death rates. Modeling of longitudinal case and  
21 death counts can also be done using differential equations and incorporating  
22 information on unascertained and asymptomatic cases (29).

23 In summary, multi-faceted efforts are needed to combat the pandemic, optimize  
24 COVID-19 vaccine distribution, deployment and uptake and resource allocation, prevent

1 the overload health care systems, and improve mitigation of control measures. Our  
2 model-estimated case and death rates, shared characteristics of counties with high  
3 disease rates, and identified spatiotemporal patterns of disease burdens can have a  
4 significant impact in making these decisions. Increased resources, such as vaccination  
5 education, testing priority and accessible points of care, should also be allocated to  
6 more rural counties and counties with more residential racial segregation, less  
7 education infrastructure, and/or greater prevalences of medical comorbidities.  
8 Intervention measures can include policies requiring face coverings, guaranteeing  
9 workers can take paid sick leave, providing personal protective equipment to essential  
10 workers, and ensuring prioritized and robust testing, tracing, and isolation infrastructure.  
11 Outreach efforts can include vaccination education by engaging community leaders and  
12 health care providers, transportation assistance, social and community support, and  
13 increased accessibility and affordability of health care. Our model estimated county  
14 case and death rates are more reliable metrics of total COVID-19 burden and can  
15 further help optimize resource allocation, plan education efforts on public control  
16 measure and vaccination deployment and uptake, reduce burdens on health care  
17 systems, and minimize additional loss of life.

## 18 19 **Materials and Methods**

### 20 Data Sources

21 USA Facts is a non-profit organization providing data about government tax  
22 revenues, expenditures, and outcomes.(27) Area Health Resources Files is a part of the  
23 federal government's Health Resources & Services administrations that includes data  
24 on population characteristics, economics, hospital utilization, and more.(42) County

1 Health Rankings & Roadmaps is a collaboration between the Robert Wood Johnson  
2 Foundation and University of Wisconsin that provides local community health data.(43)

### 3 4 Outcome Variables

5 County-level cumulative and weekly COVID-19 cases and deaths as of 12/21/20  
6 were directly obtained from USA Facts (44). USA Facts aggregates data from the  
7 Centers of Disease Control and state and local public health agencies. County-level  
8 data were confirmed by referencing state and local agencies.

### 9 10 Covariates

11 Demographic variables were obtained from the US Census Bureau and US  
12 Department of Agriculture and included county percent ages 20-29 years, percent ages  
13 60+ years, percent male, and metro/nonmetro status classification. US Department of  
14 Agriculture rural-urban continuum codes were grouped into three categories for the  
15 metro/nonmetro categorical variable: metro, population  $\geq$  1 million (code 1); metro or  
16 near metro, population 20,000 to 1 million (codes 2-4); nonmetro, population < 20,000  
17 (codes 5-9) (45).

18 County-level population distribution by race/ethnicity, including Black/African  
19 American, Hispanic/Latino, American Indian/Native Alaskan, Asian, Native  
20 Hawaiian/Pacific Islander proportions, were directly obtained from 2019 US Census  
21 Bureau estimates (28). County residential racial segregation indices of dissimilarity were  
22 obtained from County Health Rankings & Roadmaps (46). These indices were originally  
23 calculated from data from US Census tracts from the American Community Survey

1 2014-2018. Counties with less than 100 Black/non-White residents had the index of  
2 dissimilarity set to be equal to 1.

3 Socioeconomic variables were obtained from Area Health Resource Files and  
4 included average household size, percentage of individuals between 18-64 years old  
5 without health insurance, percentage in poverty, percentage of people aged >25 years  
6 without a high school diploma, and percentage of people working in education/health  
7 care/social assistance.

8 Prevalence rates for several comorbidities were obtained from County Health  
9 Rankings & Roadmap. Comorbidities included county-level percentages for: smoking,  
10 obesity, asthma, cancer, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes, heart failure,  
11 hypertension, kidney disease, and stroke. Kaiser News provided total intensive care unit  
12 (ICU) beds and nursing home beds.

13 Log transformations were applied to heavily skewed variables. Covariate  
14 information is summarized in **Table S1**, covariate heatmaps are in **Figures S1-S2**, and  
15 covariate Spearman correlations are presented in **Figures S3**.

16

## 17 Statistical Analyses

18 Cumulative COVID-19 county case and county death counts were each modeled  
19 using a Poisson mixed effects model using log(county population size) as an offset.  
20 Models included fixed effects for covariates and indicator variables for each state to  
21 account for differences in state geography, testing rates, and other sources of  
22 variability. County specific random effects were included to account for overdispersion  
23 and county testing variability. All continuous variables were scaled to have mean 0 and  
24 standard deviation 1. Heatmaps of standardized covariates are in **Figures S4-S5**.



1 To explicitly define the cumulative case rate model, assume  $R_{ij}$  is the number of  
2 reported cases and  $P_{ij}$  is the population of county  $j$  of state  $i$ . Then the case rate  
3 Poisson mixed model can be written as

$$4 \ln(R_{ij}) = \ln(P_{ij}) + \theta_i + X'_{ij}\delta + e_{ij},$$

5 where  $\theta_i$  is the state effect,  $X_{ij}$  is a vector of covariates, and the  $e_{ij}$  are county-specific  
6 random effects. The death and case fatality rate models follow the same structure. Total  
7 death rates modeled total deaths instead of total cases. Total case rates additionally  
8 used log total cases as an offset instead of log population size. For case fatality rate  
9 models, counties with total case counts of zero were set to one so the log offset would  
10 be defined.

11 Univariable models included a single covariate for  $X_{ij}$ , and separate models were  
12 fit for each outcome and each covariate combination. Multivariable models included all  
13 covariates for  $X_{ij}$  and a single model was fit for each outcome. Predicted rates were  
14 calculated from the cumulative case and death rate models used. Predictions included  
15 estimated fixed and random effects (Best Linear Unbiased Prediction) and confidence  
16 intervals incorporated estimated standard errors for both fixed and random effects.  
17 Estimates and confidence intervals for  $\delta$  were used to explore associations between  
18 county-level covariates and COVID-19 rates.

19 We also explored including state testing rates as a covariate for modeling.  
20 However, we found this did not change any estimated effects adjusted for demographic,  
21 race/ethnicity, socioeconomic, and comorbidity variables because we already controlled  
22 for fixed state effects using state dummy variables. Adding state testing rates only  
23 changed the estimated state fixed effects through re-parametrization.

1 To explore how county-level associations have changed with time, we modeled  
2 county weekly case and death counts (40 repeated measures per county). To define our  
3 case rate model, let  $P_{ij}$  be the population size and  $R_{ijt}$  be the observed deaths in county  
4  $j$  of state  $i$  on week  $t$ . The Poisson mixed model with mean cases  $\lambda_{ijt}$  can be written as

$$\ln(\lambda_{ijt}) = \ln(P_i) + X'_{ijj}\delta + S(t)'\beta_s + \tilde{b}_{ij} + b_{ijt},$$

5  
6 where  $X_{ijt}$  is a vector of covariates including state fixed effects and covariate season  
7 interactions,  $\delta$  is a vector of regression coefficients,  $S(t)'\beta_s$  is a cubic spline basis for  
8 time with knots every 14 weeks that varies by US Census region,  $\tilde{b}_{ij}$  are independent  
9 and identically distributed (i.i.d.) county specific random effects with  $\tilde{b}_{ij} \sim N(0, V(\sigma_1))$ ,  
10 and  $b_{ijt}$  are county specific longitudinal random effects with AR-1 correlation structure  
11  $b_{ij}$  i.i.d  $N(0, V(\sigma_2))$ . Estimation and inference proceed using penalized quasi-likelihood  
12 as implemented in the “glmmPQL” command from the MASS package in R.(47–49)

13 The weekly death rate model is the same except weekly new deaths instead of  
14 weekly case counts are the outcome variable. A time-invariant population size offset is  
15 still used. For the weekly case fatality rate model, due to delays between COVID-19  
16 diagnosis and official recording of death, we introduced a one-week lag for weekly  
17 COVID-19 deaths specific to the USAFacts data. For example, weekly deaths on  
18 12/21/20 for example were shifted back to have an offset for weekly cases on 12/14/20.  
19 For case fatality rate models, counties with total case counts of zero were set to one so  
20 the log offset would be defined. Additionally, if the number of weekly deaths was greater  
21 than the number of matched weekly cases, we set the weekly cases offset to be equal  
22 to the corresponding weekly deaths outcome.

1           Univariable models included a single covariate and its' interactions with the  
2           season categorical variable for  $X_{ij}$ , and separate models were fit for each outcome and  
3           each covariate. Multivariable models included all covariates and their interactions with  
4           season for  $X_{ij}$  and a single model was fit for each outcome. Estimates and confidence  
5           intervals for  $\delta$  were used to explore season varying associations between county-level  
6           covariates and COVID-19 rates.

7           All analyses were conducted in R. The following packages were used in  
8           formatting data: data.table, dplyr. The following packages were used in formatting  
9           results and creating plots: ggplot2, usmap, gridExtra, tidyverse, plyr. The following  
10          packages were used in modeling: glmnet, geepack, geeM, lme4, splines, MASS. Code  
11          for these analyses is available as described in the code availability section.

12

### 13          **Data and code availability**

14          All materials and code for analysis are available on <https://github.com/lin-lab>.

15

16          **Acknowledgments:** Resource support was provided by the Cannon cluster supported  
17          by the FAS Division of Science, Research Computing Group at Harvard University. This  
18          work was funded by NIH grant T32-CA933739 (DL), HD092580 (JTC and BAC), and  
19          R35-CA203654-04 (XL).

20

21          **Author Contributions:** DL, SMG, CQ, and XL contributed to the conception and design  
22          of the work and to the acquisition and analysis of the data. All authors contributed to  
23          interpreting the data. DL drafted the work. All authors substantively revised the work,

1 approved the submitted work, and agreed to be personally accountable for their own  
2 contributions.

3  
4 **Competing Interest Declaration:** The authors declare no competing interests.

5  
6 **Additional Information:** Correspondence and requests for materials should be  
7 addressed to Xihong Lin.

8  
9 **References**


- 10 1. C. T. Rentsch, *et al.*, Patterns of COVID-19 testing and mortality by race and ethnicity among United States  
11 veterans: A nationwide cohort study. *PLoS Med* **17**, e1003379 (2020).
- 12 2. R. Rivera, J. E. Rosenbaum, W. Quispe, Excess mortality in the United States during the first three months  
13 of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **148**, 1–9 (2020).
- 14 3. M. Polyakova, G. Kocks, V. Udalova, A. Finkelstein, Initial economic damage from the COVID-19  
15 pandemic in the United States is more widespread across ages and geographies than initial mortality impacts.  
16 *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **117**, 27934–27939 (2020).
- 17 4. M. T. Niles, *et al.*, The Early Food Insecurity Impacts of COVID-19. *Nutrients* **12**, 2096 (2020).
- 18 5. J. T. Mueller, *et al.*, Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on rural America. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **118**  
19 (2021).
- 20 6. C. J. Worby, H.-H. Chang, Face mask use in the general population and optimal resource allocation during  
21 the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nat Commun* **11** (2020).
- 22 7. N. Laventhal, *et al.*, The Ethics of Creating a Resource Allocation Strategy During the COVID-19  
23 Pandemic. *Pediatrics* **146**, e20201243 (2020).
- 24 8. T. W. Farrell, *et al.*, AGS Position Statement: Resource Allocation Strategies and Age-Related  
25 Considerations in the COVID-19 Era and Beyond. *J Am Geriatr Soc* **68**, 1136–1142 (2020).
- 26 9. E. Livingston, A. Desai, M. Berkwits, Sourcing Personal Protective Equipment During the COVID-19  
27 Pandemic. *JAMA* **323**, 1912 (2020).
- 28 10. T. M. Cook, Personal protective equipment during the coronavirus disease (COVID) 2019 pandemic – a  
29 narrative review. *Anaesthesia* **75**, 920–927 (2020).
- 30 11. R. W. Peeling, *et al.*, Serology testing in the COVID-19 pandemic response. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*  
31 **20**, e245–e249 (2020).
- 32 12. C. Dodds, I. Fakoya, Covid-19: ensuring equality of access to testing for ethnic minorities. *BMJ* **369** (2020).
- 33 13. D. Calina, *et al.*, Towards effective COVID-19 vaccines: Updates, perspectives and challenges (Review). *Int*  
34 *J Mol Med* **46**, 3–16 (2020).

- 1 14. P. L. Reiter, M. L. Pennell, M. L. Katz, Acceptability of a COVID-19 vaccine among adults in the United  
2 States: How many people would get vaccinated? *Vaccine* **38**, 6500–6507 (2020).
- 3 15. K. Dooling, *et al.*, The Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices' Interim Recommendation for  
4 Allocating Initial Supplies of COVID-19 Vaccine — United States, 2020. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.*  
5 **69**, 1857–1859 (2020).
- 6 16. K. Dooling, Phased Allocation of COVID-19 Vaccines (2020) (December 29, 2020).
- 7 17. S. Venkatramanan, *et al.*, Optimizing spatial allocation of seasonal influenza vaccine under temporal  
8 constraints. *PLoS Comput Biol* **15**, e1007111 (2019).
- 9 18. L. A. Jackson, *et al.*, An mRNA Vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 — Preliminary Report. *N Engl J Med* **383**,  
10 1920–1931 (2020).
- 11 19. F. P. Polack, *et al.*, Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med* **383**,  
12 2603–2615 (2020).
- 13 20. A. D. Paltiel, J. L. Schwartz, A. Zheng, R. P. Walensky, Clinical Outcomes Of A COVID-19 Vaccine:  
14 Implementation Over Efficacy: Study examines how definitions and thresholds of vaccine efficacy, coupled  
15 with different levels of implementation effectiveness and background epidemic severity, translate into  
16 outcomes. *Health Affairs* (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2020.02054> (December 29, 2020).
- 17 21. J. Grauer, H. Löwen, B. Liebchen, Strategic spatiotemporal vaccine distribution increases the survival rate in  
18 an infectious disease like Covid-19. *Sci Rep* **10** (2020).
- 19 22. S. Neumann-Böhme, *et al.*, Once we have it, will we use it? A European survey on willingness to be  
20 vaccinated against COVID-19. *Eur J Health Econ* **21**, 977–982 (2020).
- 21 23. , Coronavirus in the U.S.: Latest Map and Case Count. *The New York Times* (2020) (December 29, 2020).
- 22 24. , COVID-19 Live updates. *The Wall Street Journal* (2020) (December 29, 2020).
- 23 25. , Coronavirus Is Surging: How Severe Is Your State's Outbreak? *NPR* (2020) (December 29, 2020).
- 24 26. N. Altieri, *et al.*, Curating a COVID-19 data repository and forecasting county-level death counts in the  
25 United States. *arXiv* (2020).
- 26 27. , About USA Facts. *USA Facts* (November 24, 2020).
- 27 28. , County Population by Characteristics: 2010-2018. *United States Census Bureau* (2020) (April 29, 2020).
- 28 29. X. Hao, *et al.*, Reconstruction of the full transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in Wuhan. *Nature* (2020)  
29 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2554-8> (July 29, 2020).
- 30 30. F. P. Havers, *et al.*, Seroprevalence of Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in 10 Sites in the United States, March  
31 23-May 12, 2020. *JAMA Intern Med* (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.4130> (July 29,  
32 2020).
- 33 31. J. Kates, J. Michaud, J. Tolbert, How are States Prioritizing Who Will Get the COVID-19 Vaccine First?  
34 *Kaiser Family Foundation* (2020) (December 29, 2020).
- 35 32. C. P. Gross, *et al.*, Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Population-Level Covid-19 Mortality. *J GEN INTERN*  
36 *MED* **35**, 3097–3099 (2020).

- 1 33. R. Block, A. Berg, R. P. Lennon, E. L. Miller, M. Nunez-Smith, African American Adherence to COVID-19  
2 Public Health Recommendations. *HLRP: Health Literacy Research and Practice* **4**, e166–e170 (2020).
- 3 34. C. E. Rodriguez-Diaz, *et al.*, Risk for COVID-19 infection and death among Latinos in the United States:  
4 examining heterogeneity in transmission dynamics. *Annals of Epidemiology* (2020)  
5 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2020.07.007> (November 17, 2020).
- 6 35. J. T. Moore, *et al.*, Disparities in Incidence of COVID-19 Among Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Groups in  
7 Counties Identified as Hotspots During June 5–18, 2020 — 22 States, February–June 2020. *MMWR Morb.*  
8 *Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **69**, 1122–1126 (2020).
- 9 36. R. C. Chang, C. Penaia, K. Thomas, Count Native Hawaiian And Pacific Islanders In COVID-19 Data—It’s  
10 An OMB Mandate. *Health Affairs* (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1377/hblog20200825.671245> (November 17,  
11 2020).
- 12 37. , Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): People Who Are at Higher Risk for Severe Illness. *Centers for*  
13 *Disease Control and Prevention* (2020) (May 9, 2020).
- 14 38. Q.-L. Jing, *et al.*, Household Secondary Attack Rate of COVID-19 and Associated Determinants. *medRxiv*  
15 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.11.20056010> (May 9, 2020).
- 16 39. Z. Wu, J. M. McGoogan, Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019  
17 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From the Chinese Center for  
18 Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA* **323**, 1239 (2020).
- 19 40. J. Wakefield, R. Salway, A statistical framework for ecological and aggregate studies. *Journal of the Royal*  
20 *Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* **164**, 119–137 (2001).
- 21 41. R. Paul, A. A. Arif, O. Adeyemi, S. Ghosh, D. Han, Progression of COVID-19 From Urban to Rural Areas  
22 in the United States: A Spatiotemporal Analysis of Prevalence Rates. *The Journal of Rural Health* **36**, 591–  
23 601 (2020).
- 24 42. , Area Health Resources Files. *Health Resources & Services Administration* (2020) (November 24, 2020).
- 25 43. , About Us. *County Health Rankings & Roadmaps* (November 24, 2020).
- 26 44. , Coronavirus Locations: COVID-19 Map by County and State. *USA Facts* (April 29, 2020).
- 27 45. , Rural-Urban Continuum Codes. *United States Department of Agriculture* (2019) (November 25, 2020).
- 28 46. , Residential segregation - black/white\*. *County Health Rankigs & Roadmaps* (July 3, 2020).
- 29 47. R. Schall, Estimation in Generalized Linear Models with Random Effects. *Biometrika* **78**, 719–727 (1993).
- 30 48. N. E. Breslow, D. G. Clayton, Approximate Inference in Generalized Linear Mixed Models. *Journal of the*  
31 *American Statistical Association* **18**, 9–25 (1993).
- 32 49. R. Wolfinger, M. O’connell, Generalized linear mixed models a pseudo-likelihood approach. *Journal of*  
33 *Statistical Computation and Simulation* **48**, 233–243 (1993).
- 34  
35



1




2

3 **Fig. 1. Observed and estimated case, death, and case fatality rates.** Observed and  
4 multivariable model estimated cumulative (A) case rates and (B) death rates through  
5 12/21/2020 for all 3,142 US counties. Left panels are heatmaps of observed rates.  
6 Middle panels are heatmaps of estimated rates. Right panels are scatterplots of  
7 observed vs estimated rates. The solid line (intercept zero slope one) indicates perfect  
8 agreement between observed and estimated rates. All rates are generally well  
9 estimated, though 3 counties reported 0 total cases and 111 counties reported 0 total  
10 deaths.

11

12




1

2 **Fig. 2. Univariable and multivariable case rate relative risks.** Univariable and  
 3 multivariable relative risks of demographic, socioeconomic, and health comorbidity  
 4 factors on cumulative COVID-19 case rates through 12/21/20 additionally adjust for  
 5 state fixed effects and county random effects. Boxes are point estimates and error bars  
 6 mark 95% confidence intervals. Relative risks are for a one standard deviation increase  
 7 in a variable (see **Table S1**), except for the metro/nonmetro categorical variable.

8




1



2 **Fig. 3. Univariable and multivariable death rate relative risks.** Univariable and  
3 multivariable relative risks of demographic, socioeconomic, and health comorbidity  
4 factors on cumulative COVID-19 death rates through 12/21/20 additionally adjust for  
5 state fixed effects and county random effects. Boxes are point estimates and error bars  
6 mark 95% confidence intervals. Relative risks are for a one standard deviation increase  
7 in a variable (see **Table S1**), except for the metro/nonmetro categorical variable.

8

9



1  
2  
3  
4  
5

**Fig. 4. Identifying counties with greatest COVID-19 burden.** Top 30 counties in the US with (A) the highest estimated case rates and (B) the highest estimated death rates. Circles are point estimates. Error bars are 95% model-based CIs.

# PNAS

[www.pnas.org](http://www.pnas.org)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

**Supplementary Information for**

**Identifying US Counties with High Cumulative COVID-19 Burden and Their Characteristics**

Daniel Li, Sheila M. Gaynor, Corbin Quick, Jarvis T. Chen, Briana J.K. Stephenson  
Brent A. Coull, Xihong Lin

**\*Correspondence:** Xihong Lin

**Email:** [xlin@hsph.harvard.edu](mailto:xlin@hsph.harvard.edu).

**This PDF file includes:**

- Supplementary text
- Figures S1 to S10
- Tables S1 to S7

## 1 **Supplementary Information Text**

### 2 **Case Fatality Rate and Infection Fatality Rate Regression**

3 We conducted case fatality rate (CFR) and infection fatality rate (IFR) regression  
4 analyses to investigate death rates among infected subjects. CFRs were calculated by  
5 dividing the number of deaths by the number of reported cases in each county. CFR  
6 regression was performed in a similar way to the cumulative death rate regression by  
7 fitting Poisson mixed models except for using an offset for  $\log(\text{total reported cases})$   
8 instead of  $\log(\text{population size})$ . IFR were calculated by dividing the number of deaths by  
9 the number of infected cases in each county.

10 Since county-specific number of total infected cases were not observed and  
11 would likely be underestimated by using the numbers of reported cases, we estimated  
12 the county-specific total number of infected cases by dividing the number of total  
13 reported cases by a constant ascertainment rate of cases. Since the county-specific  
14 testing data and ascertainment rates were not available, we modeled them using state-  
15 specific fixed effects and county-specific random effects and allowed the ascertainment  
16 rates to vary between states and counties.

17 To define the CFR model, assume  $R_{ij}$  is the number of reported cases and  $\mu_{ij}$  is  
18 the mean number of cumulative deaths in county  $j$  of state  $i$ . Then the CFR Poisson  
19 mixed model can be written as

$$20 \quad \ln(\mu_{ij}) = \ln(R_{ij}) + \theta_i + X'_{ij}\delta + e_{ij},$$

21 where  $\theta_i$  is the state effect,  $X_{ij}$  is a vector of covariates, and the  $e_{ij}$  are county-specific  
22 random effects to account for overdispersion.

23 For the IFR model, let  $I_{ij}$  be the unobserved total number of infected cases in  
24 county  $j$  of state  $i$ . Suppose  $a_{ij}$  is the unobserved ascertainment rate for state  $i$  and

1 county  $j$ . The estimated ascertainment rate has been estimated to be between 4% to  
2 20%(30). We have  $I_{ij} = \frac{R_{ij}}{a_{ij}}$ . Let  $a_{ij} = c_i d_{ij}$ , where  $c_i$  is the overall ascertainment rate  
3 for state  $i$  and  $d_{ij}$  is the multiplicative departure of the ascertainment rate of county  $j$   
4 from the state level ascertainment rate  $c_i$ . Then the IFR Poisson mixed model can be  
5 written as

$$6 \quad \ln(\mu_{ij}) = \ln(I_{ij}) + X'_{ij}\alpha + \beta_i + b_{ij} = \ln(R_{ij}) - \ln(c_i) + \beta_i + X'_{ij}\alpha - \ln(d_{ij}) + b_{ij},$$

7 where  $\beta_i$  is the state effect. Write  $\gamma_i = -\ln(c_i) + \beta_i$  and  $u_{ij} = -\ln(d_{ij}) + b_{ij}$ . Then we  
8 have

$$9 \quad \ln(\mu_{ij}) = \ln(R_{ij}) + \gamma_i + X'_{ij}\alpha + u_{ij}.$$


10 Assuming  $u_{ij}$  to be county-specific random effects following a normal distribution  
11  $N(0, \tau)$ , it follows that the IFR regression model is identical to the CFR regression model  
12 except that the estimated state effects and the county-specific random effects can also  
13 be interpreted as capturing the state and county-level ascertainment rates. Therefore,  
14 the identical results for CFR and IFR regressions are presented in **Figure 5**. Future  
15 work can investigate allowing the county-specific ascertainment rate to be better  
16 estimated when county-specific testing data are available.

17 The CFR/IFR results differed from the cumulative death rate results possibly  
18 because of differential underestimation of asymptomatic and mildly asymptomatic cases  
19 by race/ethnicity(29), selection bias associated with both the subjects who were tested,  
20 e.g., symptomatic subjects were more likely to be tested and to test positive, large  
21 fluctuations in the numbers of tests from county to county, and insufficient testing  
22 capacity. Additional data collection, such as county-level testing data and race/ethnicity  
23 specific case and death counts, is needed to better estimate the number of infected

1 cases. This will allow for more accurate of county-specific ascertainment rates and  
2 make IFR analysis results more reliable.

3






1  
2  
3  
4  
5

**Fig. S1. Demographic, racial, and socioeconomic covariate heatmaps.**

Demographic (yellow, aqua, blue), racial (pink, magenta, purple), and socioeconomic (red, orange) covariate heatmaps.




1  
2  
3  
4

**Fig. S2. Health covariate heatmaps.** Health (white, blue, purple) covariate heatmaps.




1



2  
3  
4  
5

**Fig. S3. Covariate correlations.** Heatmap of Spearman correlations between demographic, racial, socioeconomic, and health covariates.

1




2  
3  
4  
5  
6

**Fig. S4. Standardized demographic, racial, and socioeconomic covariate heatmaps.** Heatmaps of standardized demographic, racial, and socioeconomic covariates used in regression modeling. For presentation in these heatmaps only, standardized values are cut off at two standard deviations above and below the mean.



1



2


**Fig. S5. Standardized health covariate heatmaps.** Heatmaps of standardized health covariates used in regression modeling. For presentation in these heatmaps only, standardized values are cut off at two standard deviations above and below the mean.

3

4


5

6



1  
2 **Fig. S6. Observed and estimated case, death, and case fatality rates.** Observed  
3 and multivariable model estimated cumulative case fatality rates through 12/21/2020 for  
4 all 3,142 US counties. Left panels are heatmaps of observed rates. Middle panels are  
5 heatmaps of estimated rates. Right panels are scatterplots of observed vs estimated  
6 rates. The solid line (intercept zero slope one) indicates perfect agreement between  
7 observed and estimated rates. Rates are generally well estimated, though 3 counties  
8 reported 0 total cases (offsets were set to 1 for modeling) and 111 counties reported 0  
9 total deaths.

10  
11




1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9


**Fig. S7. Univariable and multivariable case fatality rate relative risks.** Univariable and multivariable relative risks of demographic, socioeconomic, and health comorbidity factors on cumulative COVID-19 case fatality rates through 12/21/20 additionally adjust for state fixed effects and county random effects. Boxes are point estimates and error bars mark 95% confidence intervals. Relative risks are for a one standard deviation increase in a variable (see **Table S1**), except for the metro/nonmetro categorical variable.



1




2 **Fig. S8. Weekly case rates.** (A) Heatmaps of county total cases by season. (B)  
3 Heatmaps of county total case rates by season. (C) Line plots of weekly case rates  
4 nationally and by US Census region.  
5



1 **Fig. S9. Weekly death rates.** (A) Heatmaps of county total deaths by season. (B)  
 2 Heatmaps of county total death rates by season. (C) Line plots of weekly death rates  
 3 nationally and by US Census region.  
 4





1  
 2 **Fig. S10. Weekly case fatality rates.** (A) Line plots of US national weekly case rates  
 3 and death rates lagged by one week. Solid lines mark similar peaks between weekly  
 4 case rates and lagged death rates. (B) Heatmaps of county case fatality rates by  
 5 season. (C) Line plots of weekly case fatality rates nationally and by US Census region.



1  
2

**Table S1. List of county-level variables, transformations, and sources.**

Variable Name	Date	Transformation	Source and Description
<b>Outcomes</b>			
Cumulative COVID-19 Cases	12/21/20		USA Facts
Cumulative COVID-19 Deaths	12/21/20		USA Facts
<b>Demographics</b>			
Population Size	2019	log offset	US Census Bureau
Age, 20-29 years (%)	2019		US Census Bureau
Age, 60+ years (%)	2018		US Census Bureau
Male (%)	2018		US Census Bureau
Rural Urban Continuum Code	2013		US Department of Agriculture
<b>Racial</b>			
Black/African American (%)	2019	log(x+1)	US Census Bureau
Asian (%)	2019	log(x+1)	US Census Bureau
Hispanic/Latino (%)	2019	log(x+1)	US Census Bureau
American Indian/Native Alaskan (%)	2019	log(x+1)	US Census Bureau
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	2019	log(x+1)	US Census Bureau
White Black Segregation Index	2014-2018		County Health Rankings & Roadmaps
White non-White Segregation Index	2014-2018		County Health Rankings & Roadmaps
<b>Socioeconomic</b>			
Average Household Size	2010		Area Health Resources Files
No Health Insurance, 18-64 years (%)	2017		Area Health Resources Files
Poverty (%)	2017		Area Health Resources Files
No High School Diploma, 25+ years (%)	2013-17		Area Health Resources Files
Education, Health Care, Social Assistance Workers (%)	2013-17		Area Health Resources Files
<b>Health</b>			
Smokers (%)	2017		County Health Rankings & Roadmaps
Obesity (%)	2017		County Health Rankings & Roadmaps
Asthma (%)	2017		County Health Rankings & Roadmaps
Cancer (%)	2017		County Health Rankings & Roadmaps
COPD (%)	2017		County Health Rankings & Roadmaps

Diabetes (%)	2017		County Health Rankings & Roadmaps
Heart Failure (%)	2017		County Health Rankings & Roadmaps
Hypertension (%)	2017		County Health Rankings & Roadmaps
Kidney Disease (%)	2017		County Health Rankings & Roadmaps
Stroke (%)	2017		County Health Rankings & Roadmaps
ICU Beds	2017	$\log(x+1)$	Kaiser Health News
Nursing Home Beds	2017	$\log(x+1)$	Kaiser Health News

1

1 **Table S2. Univariable weekly case rates.** Relative risks of county-level variables on  
 2 weekly case rates (40 repeated measurements per county) by season from 3/23/20-  
 3 12/21/20. Each row is a separate model and controls for state effects, US census  
 4 region-specific time varying trends, and additional county overdispersion. Parentheses  
 5 indicate 95% confidence intervals. Bold indicates confidence interval does not contain 1.  
 6 Relative risks are for a one standard deviation increase in a variable, except for the  
 7 metro/nonmetro categorical variable.

Variable	Univariable Weekly Case Rate Relative Risk		
	Spring	Summer	Fall
<b>Demographic</b>			
Age, 20-29 Years (%)	<b>1.11 (1.08, 1.14)</b>	<b>1.08 (1.06, 1.10)</b>	1.01 (0.99, 1.02)
Age, 60+ Years (%)	<b>0.73 (0.71, 0.75)</b>	<b>0.87 (0.85, 0.89)</b>	<b>0.96 (0.94, 0.97)</b>
Male (%)	<b>0.83 (0.79, 0.87)</b>	1.03 (1.00, 1.05)	<b>1.11 (1.09, 1.13)</b>
Metro, >1 million people	Ref	Ref	Ref
Metro/Near Metro, <1 million people	<b>0.72 (0.68, 0.76)</b>	0.97 (0.93, 1.01)	<b>1.14 (1.11, 1.18)</b>
Nonmetro, <20,000 people	<b>0.68 (0.63, 0.74)</b>	<b>0.88 (0.83, 0.92)</b>	<b>1.22 (1.17, 1.27)</b>
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
Black/African American (%)	<b>1.58 (1.53, 1.63)</b>	<b>1.14 (1.11, 1.17)</b>	<b>0.96 (0.94, 0.98)</b>
Hispanic/Latino (%)	<b>1.46 (1.42, 1.50)</b>	<b>1.29 (1.26, 1.32)</b>	<b>1.07 (1.05, 1.10)</b>
American Indian/Native Alaskan (%)	<b>1.13 (1.09, 1.18)</b>	1.02 (0.99, 1.06)	<b>1.06 (1.04, 1.09)</b>
Asian (%)	<b>1.18 (1.16, 1.20)</b>	<b>1.03 (1.02, 1.05)</b>	<b>0.94 (0.93, 0.95)</b>
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	<b>1.08 (1.05, 1.11)</b>	<b>1.04 (1.02, 1.06)</b>	1.01 (0.99, 1.03)
White/Black Segregation	<b>1.33 (1.28, 1.39)</b>	<b>1.11 (1.08, 1.14)</b>	0.98 (0.97, 1.00)
White/non-White Segregation	<b>1.31 (1.27, 1.35)</b>	<b>1.10 (1.07, 1.13)</b>	0.99 (0.97, 1.01)
<b>Socioeconomic</b>			
Average Household Size	<b>1.25 (1.23, 1.28)</b>	<b>1.15 (1.13, 1.17)</b>	<b>1.07 (1.05, 1.08)</b>
No Health Insurance (%)	<b>1.28 (1.23, 1.32)</b>	<b>1.28 (1.25, 1.32)</b>	<b>1.16 (1.13, 1.19)</b>
Poverty (%)	<b>1.18 (1.15, 1.22)</b>	<b>1.14 (1.12, 1.17)</b>	<b>1.07 (1.05, 1.08)</b>
No High School Diploma (%)	<b>1.39 (1.36, 1.43)</b>	<b>1.23 (1.21, 1.26)</b>	<b>1.13 (1.11, 1.15)</b>
Education, Healthcare, Social Worker (%)	<b>0.96 (0.93, 0.99)</b>	1.01 (0.99, 1.03)	1.01 (0.99, 1.02)
<b>Health</b>			
Smokers (%)	<b>0.92 (0.89, 0.95)</b>	<b>1.03 (1.01, 1.06)</b>	<b>1.12 (1.10, 1.14)</b>
Obesity (%)	<b>0.92 (0.90, 0.94)</b>	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)	<b>1.10 (1.08, 1.12)</b>
Asthma (%)	<b>1.16 (1.13, 1.19)</b>	<b>1.10 (1.07, 1.12)</b>	0.99 (0.97, 1.00)
Cancer (%)	<b>1.08 (1.06, 1.11)</b>	<b>1.03 (1.01, 1.06)</b>	<b>0.91 (0.89, 0.92)</b>
COPD (%)	<b>0.86 (0.83, 0.89)</b>	1.00 (0.98, 1.03)	<b>1.08 (1.06, 1.11)</b>
Diabetes (%)	<b>1.42 (1.38, 1.45)</b>	<b>1.23 (1.20, 1.25)</b>	<b>1.10 (1.08, 1.12)</b>
Heart Failure (%)	<b>1.28 (1.25, 1.32)</b>	<b>1.15 (1.13, 1.18)</b>	<b>1.08 (1.06, 1.10)</b>
Hypertension (%)	<b>1.38 (1.33, 1.44)</b>	<b>1.28 (1.24, 1.33)</b>	<b>1.14 (1.11, 1.17)</b>
Kidney Disease (%)	<b>1.22 (1.18, 1.26)</b>	<b>1.23 (1.21, 1.26)</b>	<b>1.07 (1.05, 1.09)</b>
Stroke (%)	<b>1.33 (1.29, 1.38)</b>	<b>1.18 (1.15, 1.21)</b>	<b>0.97 (0.95, 0.99)</b>
ICU Beds	<b>1.20 (1.17, 1.23)</b>	<b>1.09 (1.08, 1.11)</b>	<b>0.98 (0.96, 0.99)</b>
Nursing Home Beds	<b>1.10 (1.08, 1.11)</b>	<b>1.05 (1.03, 1.06)</b>	0.99 (0.98, 1.00)

1 **Table S3. Multivariable weekly case rates.** Relative risks of county-level variables on  
 2 weekly case rates (40 repeated measurements per county) by season from 3/23/20-  
 3 12/21/20. All results are from a single model that controls for state effects, US census  
 4 region-specific time varying trends, and additional county overdispersion. Parentheses  
 5 indicate 95% confidence intervals. Bold indicates confidence interval does not contain 1.  
 6 Relative risks are for a one standard deviation increase in a variable, except for the  
 7 metro/nonmetro categorical variable.

Variable	Multivariable Weekly Case Rate Relative Risk		
	Spring	Summer	Fall
<b>Demographic</b>			
Age, 20-29 Years (%)	1.00 (0.95, 1.05)	1.01 (0.98, 1.04)	0.99 (0.97, 1.02)
Age, 60+ Years (%)	<b>0.92 (0.86, 0.97)</b>	<b>0.94 (0.90, 0.98)</b>	<b>0.93 (0.90, 0.96)</b>
Male (%)	<b>1.05 (1.01, 1.10)</b>	<b>1.09 (1.06, 1.12)</b>	<b>1.04 (1.02, 1.07)</b>
Metro, >1 million people	Ref	Ref	Ref
Metro/Near Metro, <1 million people	0.94 (0.88, 1.01)	1.05 (1.00, 1.10)	<b>1.06 (1.02, 1.10)</b>
Nonmetro, <20,000 people	1.01 (0.89, 1.14)	1.04 (0.97, 1.13)	<b>1.09 (1.03, 1.14)</b>
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
Black/African American (%)	<b>1.48 (1.41, 1.56)</b>	0.97 (0.94, 1.00)	<b>0.96 (0.93, 0.98)</b>
Hispanic/Latino (%)	<b>1.18 (1.13, 1.24)</b>	<b>1.17 (1.14, 1.21)</b>	<b>1.04 (1.01, 1.07)</b>
American Indian/Native Alaskan (%)	<b>1.13 (1.08, 1.19)</b>	<b>0.95 (0.92, 0.98)</b>	1.01 (0.99, 1.04)
Asian (%)	0.97 (0.94, 1.00)	<b>0.97 (0.95, 0.99)</b>	<b>0.93 (0.91, 0.95)</b>
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.00 (0.97, 1.03)	1.02 (1.00, 1.04)	0.99 (0.97, 1.01)
White/Black Segregation	<b>1.12 (1.06, 1.18)</b>	1.01 (0.98, 1.04)	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)
White/non-White Segregation	<b>1.15 (1.10, 1.20)</b>	<b>1.07 (1.04, 1.11)</b>	1.02 (1.00, 1.04)
<b>Socioeconomic</b>			
Average Household Size	1.04 (1.00, 1.08)	1.03 (1.00, 1.06)	1.01 (0.99, 1.04)
No Health Insurance (%)	<b>0.86 (0.82, 0.91)</b>	0.99 (0.95, 1.04)	<b>0.95 (0.91, 0.99)</b>
Poverty (%)	0.95 (0.89, 1.01)	<b>1.06 (1.02, 1.11)</b>	<b>0.95 (0.92, 0.98)</b>
No High School Diploma (%)	<b>1.37 (1.29, 1.45)</b>	<b>1.10 (1.06, 1.15)</b>	<b>1.12 (1.08, 1.15)</b>
Education, Healthcare, Social Worker (%)	0.98 (0.95, 1.02)	<b>1.06 (1.03, 1.08)</b>	1.02 (1.00, 1.04)
<b>Health</b>			
Smokers (%)	<b>0.91 (0.86, 0.96)</b>	1.01 (0.97, 1.05)	0.99 (0.96, 1.03)
Obesity (%)	<b>0.95 (0.92, 0.99)</b>	1.01 (0.98, 1.03)	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)
Asthma (%)	<b>0.95 (0.92, 0.99)</b>	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)	0.99 (0.97, 1.00)
Cancer (%)	<b>1.08 (1.03, 1.12)</b>	<b>1.07 (1.04, 1.10)</b>	<b>0.96 (0.94, 0.98)</b>
COPD (%)	<b>0.90 (0.86, 0.95)</b>	<b>0.89 (0.86, 0.92)</b>	1.00 (0.97, 1.02)
Diabetes (%)	<b>1.15 (1.10, 1.21)</b>	<b>0.94 (0.90, 0.98)</b>	0.99 (0.96, 1.02)
Heart Failure (%)	0.97 (0.93, 1.02)	1.02 (0.99, 1.05)	<b>1.06 (1.04, 1.09)</b>
Hypertension (%)	<b>1.16 (1.07, 1.25)</b>	<b>1.17 (1.11, 1.24)</b>	<b>1.10 (1.05, 1.15)</b>
Kidney Disease (%)	<b>0.83 (0.79, 0.88)</b>	<b>1.05 (1.01, 1.08)</b>	1.00 (0.97, 1.02)
Stroke (%)	0.99 (0.94, 1.03)	1.03 (1.00, 1.07)	<b>0.95 (0.93, 0.97)</b>
ICU Beds	<b>0.92 (0.89, 0.96)</b>	0.99 (0.96, 1.01)	<b>1.09 (1.07, 1.11)</b>
Nursing Home Beds	<b>0.97 (0.95, 0.98)</b>	<b>1.02 (1.01, 1.03)</b>	1.00 (0.99, 1.01)

1 **Table S4. Univariable weekly death rates.** Relative risks of county-level variables on  
 2 weekly death rates (40 repeated measurements per county) by season from 3/23/20-  
 3 12/21/20. Each row is a separate model and controls for state effects, US census  
 4 region-specific time varying trends, and additional county overdispersion. Parentheses  
 5 indicate 95% confidence intervals. Bold indicates confidence interval does not contain 1.  
 6 Relative risks are for a one standard deviation increase in a variable, except for the  
 7 metro/nonmetro categorical variable.

Variable	Univariable Weekly Death Rate Relative Risk		
	Spring	Summer	Fall
<b>Demographic</b>			
Age, 20-29 Years (%)	<b>1.08 (1.05, 1.11)</b>	<b>0.94 (0.92, 0.97)</b>	<b>0.83 (0.81, 0.86)</b>
Age, 60+ Years (%)	<b>0.77 (0.74, 0.80)</b>	1.01 (0.97, 1.04)	<b>1.27 (1.24, 1.30)</b>
Male (%)	<b>0.45 (0.41, 0.48)</b>	<b>0.93 (0.88, 0.98)</b>	<b>1.21 (1.17, 1.26)</b>
Metro, >1 million people	Ref	Ref	Ref
Metro/Near Metro, <1 million people	<b>0.59 (0.55, 0.63)</b>	<b>1.08 (1.01, 1.15)</b>	<b>1.80 (1.69, 1.91)</b>
Nonmetro, <20,000 people	<b>0.53 (0.48, 0.58)</b>	<b>1.16 (1.07, 1.25)</b>	<b>2.64 (2.47, 2.82)</b>
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
Black/African American (%)	<b>2.00 (1.92, 2.08)</b>	<b>1.10 (1.06, 1.14)</b>	<b>0.76 (0.74, 0.79)</b>
Hispanic/Latino (%)	<b>1.31 (1.26, 1.36)</b>	<b>1.22 (1.18, 1.27)</b>	<b>0.85 (0.82, 0.88)</b>
American Indian/Native Alaskan (%)	<b>1.17 (1.12, 1.23)</b>	<b>1.11 (1.06, 1.17)</b>	<b>1.15 (1.10, 1.20)</b>
Asian (%)	<b>1.18 (1.16, 1.21)</b>	<b>0.94 (0.92, 0.96)</b>	<b>0.74 (0.72, 0.75)</b>
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	1.03 (0.99, 1.07)	1.00 (0.97, 1.04)	<b>0.94 (0.91, 0.98)</b>
White/Black Segregation	<b>1.48 (1.42, 1.55)</b>	<b>1.06 (1.02, 1.10)</b>	<b>0.79 (0.76, 0.81)</b>
White/non-White Segregation	<b>1.53 (1.47, 1.59)</b>	<b>1.09 (1.05, 1.13)</b>	<b>0.86 (0.83, 0.89)</b>
<b>Socioeconomic</b>			
Average Household Size	<b>1.15 (1.12, 1.19)</b>	<b>1.15 (1.12, 1.19)</b>	<b>0.90 (0.87, 0.92)</b>
No Health Insurance (%)	<b>1.32 (1.26, 1.39)</b>	<b>1.60 (1.53, 1.67)</b>	<b>1.33 (1.28, 1.39)</b>
Poverty (%)	<b>1.32 (1.28, 1.36)</b>	<b>1.32 (1.28, 1.36)</b>	<b>1.17 (1.14, 1.21)</b>
No High School Diploma (%)	<b>1.45 (1.41, 1.50)</b>	<b>1.49 (1.45, 1.53)</b>	<b>1.18 (1.15, 1.21)</b>
Education, Healthcare, Social Worker (%)	<b>0.96 (0.92, 0.99)</b>	1.02 (0.99, 1.06)	<b>1.06 (1.03, 1.09)</b>
<b>Health</b>			
Smokers (%)	<b>0.99 (0.95, 1.03)</b>	<b>1.15 (1.11, 1.19)</b>	<b>1.39 (1.34, 1.44)</b>
Obesity (%)	<b>0.86 (0.83, 0.89)</b>	<b>1.11 (1.08, 1.14)</b>	<b>1.33 (1.29, 1.36)</b>
Asthma (%)	<b>1.22 (1.18, 1.26)</b>	<b>1.06 (1.02, 1.09)</b>	<b>0.83 (0.80, 0.85)</b>
Cancer (%)	<b>1.12 (1.08, 1.16)</b>	<b>0.94 (0.91, 0.98)</b>	<b>0.78 (0.76, 0.80)</b>
COPD (%)	<b>0.88 (0.85, 0.92)</b>	<b>1.13 (1.10, 1.18)</b>	<b>1.31 (1.27, 1.35)</b>
Diabetes (%)	<b>1.62 (1.57, 1.67)</b>	<b>1.49 (1.44, 1.53)</b>	<b>1.11 (1.08, 1.14)</b>
Heart Failure (%)	<b>1.53 (1.48, 1.58)</b>	<b>1.34 (1.30, 1.39)</b>	<b>1.12 (1.09, 1.16)</b>
Hypertension (%)	<b>1.61 (1.52, 1.69)</b>	<b>1.70 (1.62, 1.79)</b>	<b>1.22 (1.17, 1.28)</b>
Kidney Disease (%)	<b>1.35 (1.30, 1.40)</b>	<b>1.43 (1.38, 1.48)</b>	1.02 (0.99, 1.05)
Stroke (%)	<b>1.57 (1.51, 1.64)</b>	<b>1.31 (1.26, 1.36)</b>	<b>0.85 (0.82, 0.88)</b>
ICU Beds	<b>1.35 (1.32, 1.39)</b>	<b>1.07 (1.04, 1.10)</b>	<b>0.81 (0.79, 0.83)</b>
Nursing Home Beds	<b>1.15 (1.12, 1.17)</b>	<b>1.04 (1.02, 1.06)</b>	<b>0.90 (0.88, 0.92)</b>

1 **Table S5. Multivariable weekly death rates.** Relative risks of county-level variables on  
 2 weekly death rates (40 repeated measurements per county) by season from 3/23/20-  
 3 12/21/20. All results are from a single model that controls for state effects, US census  
 4 region-specific time varying trends, and additional county overdispersion. Parentheses  
 5 indicate 95% confidence intervals. Bold indicates confidence interval does not contain 1.  
 6 Relative risks are for a one standard deviation increase in a variable, except for the  
 7 metro/nonmetro categorical variable.

Variable	Multivariable Weekly Death Rate Relative Risk		
	Spring	Summer	Fall
<b>Demographic</b>			
Age, 20-29 Years (%)	0.97 (0.92, 1.03)	<b>0.88 (0.84, 0.92)</b>	<b>0.94 (0.91, 0.98)</b>
Age, 60+ Years (%)	<b>1.13 (1.06, 1.21)</b>	1.05 (0.99, 1.12)	1.00 (0.95, 1.06)
Male (%)	<b>0.80 (0.75, 0.85)</b>	1.01 (0.97, 1.05)	1.04 (1.00, 1.07)
Metro, >1 million people	Ref	Ref	Ref
Metro/Near Metro, <1 million people	<b>0.90 (0.84, 0.97)</b>	1.01 (0.94, 1.08)	<b>1.23 (1.16, 1.31)</b>
Nonmetro, <20,000 people	0.91 (0.80, 1.05)	0.99 (0.89, 1.11)	<b>1.35 (1.24, 1.47)</b>
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
Black/African American (%)	<b>1.89 (1.78, 2.00)</b>	1.00 (0.95, 1.05)	<b>0.88 (0.84, 0.92)</b>
Hispanic/Latino (%)	0.97 (0.92, 1.03)	<b>1.10 (1.05, 1.16)</b>	1.00 (0.96, 1.04)
American Indian/Native Alaskan (%)	<b>1.34 (1.26, 1.41)</b>	1.03 (0.98, 1.08)	1.02 (0.98, 1.06)
Asian (%)	0.96 (0.93, 1.00)	1.01 (0.97, 1.05)	<b>0.89 (0.87, 0.92)</b>
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	<b>0.91 (0.87, 0.95)</b>	1.03 (1.00, 1.06)	1.03 (1.00, 1.06)
White/Black Segregation	<b>1.07 (1.01, 1.13)</b>	0.98 (0.94, 1.03)	<b>0.96 (0.93, 0.99)</b>
White/non-White Segregation	<b>1.09 (1.03, 1.15)</b>	<b>1.09 (1.04, 1.14)</b>	1.03 (1.00, 1.07)
<b>Socioeconomic</b>			
Average Household Size	<b>1.13 (1.08, 1.18)</b>	0.99 (0.95, 1.04)	<b>0.91 (0.88, 0.95)</b>
No Health Insurance (%)	<b>0.72 (0.67, 0.77)</b>	1.04 (0.97, 1.11)	0.99 (0.93, 1.06)
Poverty (%)	<b>1.16 (1.08, 1.25)</b>	<b>1.07 (1.01, 1.14)</b>	0.96 (0.91, 1.02)
No High School Diploma (%)	<b>1.20 (1.12, 1.29)</b>	<b>1.25 (1.18, 1.33)</b>	<b>1.15 (1.09, 1.22)</b>
Education, Healthcare, Social Worker (%)	<b>0.82 (0.79, 0.86)</b>	<b>1.11 (1.07, 1.15)</b>	<b>1.06 (1.03, 1.09)</b>
<b>Health</b>			
Smokers (%)	<b>0.84 (0.79, 0.90)</b>	<b>0.97 (0.91, 1.03)</b>	0.97 (0.92, 1.03)
Obesity (%)	<b>0.81 (0.78, 0.85)</b>	1.01 (0.97, 1.05)	<b>1.04 (1.01, 1.07)</b>
Asthma (%)	0.96 (0.93, 1.00)	0.98 (0.95, 1.02)	0.98 (0.96, 1.01)
Cancer (%)	1.01 (0.96, 1.05)	1.01 (0.97, 1.05)	<b>0.94 (0.91, 0.97)</b>
COPD (%)	<b>0.93 (0.88, 0.99)</b>	<b>0.87 (0.82, 0.91)</b>	0.98 (0.94, 1.02)
Diabetes (%)	<b>1.25 (1.18, 1.32)</b>	1.06 (1.00, 1.13)	0.99 (0.94, 1.05)
Heart Failure (%)	<b>1.08 (1.03, 1.14)</b>	1.02 (0.98, 1.06)	<b>1.13 (1.09, 1.17)</b>
Hypertension (%)	1.04 (0.95, 1.14)	<b>1.37 (1.26, 1.49)</b>	<b>1.10 (1.02, 1.17)</b>
Kidney Disease (%)	<b>0.92 (0.87, 0.97)</b>	1.02 (0.97, 1.07)	<b>1.06 (1.02, 1.10)</b>
Stroke (%)	1.00 (0.95, 1.05)	<b>1.06 (1.01, 1.11)</b>	0.99 (0.95, 1.03)
ICU Beds	0.99 (0.95, 1.04)	1.04 (1.00, 1.08)	<b>1.08 (1.05, 1.12)</b>
Nursing Home Beds	<b>0.96 (0.94, 0.98)</b>	<b>1.03 (1.01, 1.05)</b>	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)



1 **Table S6. Univariable weekly case fatality rates.** Relative risks of county-level  
 2 variables on weekly case fatality rates (39 repeated measurements per county) by  
 3 season from 3/23/20-12/21/20. Each row is a separate model and controls for state  
 4 effects, US census region-specific time varying trends, and additional county  
 5 overdispersion. Parentheses indicate 95% confidence intervals. Bold indicates  
 6 confidence interval does not contain 1. Relative risks are for a one standard deviation  
 7 increase in a variable, except for the metro/nonmetro categorical variable.

Variable	Univariable Weekly Case Fatality Rate Relative Risk		
	Spring	Summer	Fall
<b>Demographic</b>			
Age, 20-29 Years (%)	<b>0.96 (0.94, 0.99)</b>	<b>0.86 (0.84, 0.88)</b>	<b>0.85 (0.83, 0.86)</b>
Age, 60+ Years (%)	<b>1.11 (1.08, 1.15)</b>	<b>1.15 (1.12, 1.18)</b>	<b>1.30 (1.28, 1.33)</b>
Male (%)	<b>0.67 (0.65, 0.70)</b>	<b>0.88 (0.85, 0.91)</b>	<b>1.07 (1.04, 1.10)</b>
Metro, >1 million people	Ref	Ref	Ref
Metro/Near Metro, <1 million people	0.94 (0.89, 1.00)	1.01 (0.96, 1.07)	<b>1.42 (1.35, 1.49)</b>
Nonmetro, <20,000 people	<b>0.83 (0.76, 0.90)</b>	<b>1.17 (1.09, 1.25)</b>	<b>1.91 (1.80, 2.02)</b>
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
Black/African American (%)	<b>1.14 (1.10, 1.18)</b>	0.98 (0.96, 1.01)	<b>0.81 (0.79, 0.83)</b>
Hispanic/Latino (%)	<b>0.84 (0.81, 0.86)</b>	<b>0.94 (0.92, 0.97)</b>	<b>0.79 (0.77, 0.81)</b>
American Indian/Native Alaskan (%)	<b>0.94 (0.90, 0.98)</b>	<b>1.08 (1.04, 1.12)</b>	<b>1.06 (1.03, 1.10)</b>
Asian (%)	<b>0.95 (0.94, 0.97)</b>	<b>0.92 (0.90, 0.94)</b>	<b>0.80 (0.79, 0.82)</b>
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	<b>0.90 (0.87, 0.93)</b>	<b>0.94 (0.91, 0.96)</b>	<b>0.93 (0.90, 0.96)</b>
White/Black Segregation	<b>1.11 (1.07, 1.15)</b>	<b>1.01 (0.98, 1.04)</b>	<b>0.86 (0.84, 0.88)</b>
White/non-White Segregation	<b>1.12 (1.09, 1.16)</b>	1.03 (1.00, 1.07)	<b>0.91 (0.89, 0.94)</b>
<b>Socioeconomic</b>			
Average Household Size	<b>0.89 (0.87, 0.91)</b>	0.98 (0.96, 1.00)	<b>0.85 (0.84, 0.87)</b>
No Health Insurance (%)	0.99 (0.95, 1.03)	<b>1.18 (1.14, 1.23)</b>	<b>1.07 (1.03, 1.11)</b>
Poverty (%)	<b>1.10 (1.07, 1.13)</b>	<b>1.11 (1.08, 1.14)</b>	<b>1.10 (1.07, 1.12)</b>
No High School Diploma (%)	1.01 (0.98, 1.04)	<b>1.16 (1.13, 1.18)</b>	<b>1.05 (1.03, 1.08)</b>
Education, Healthcare, Social Worker (%)	1.00 (0.98, 1.03)	0.98 (0.96, 1.01)	<b>1.04 (1.02, 1.06)</b>
<b>Health</b>			
Smokers (%)	<b>1.07 (1.04, 1.10)</b>	<b>1.05 (1.01, 1.08)</b>	<b>1.18 (1.15, 1.21)</b>
Obesity (%)	0.98 (0.96, 1.01)	<b>1.05 (1.03, 1.08)</b>	<b>1.19 (1.16, 1.21)</b>
Asthma (%)	<b>1.02 (0.99, 1.05)</b>	1.00 (0.98, 1.03)	<b>0.89 (0.87, 0.91)</b>
Cancer (%)	<b>1.04 (1.01, 1.07)</b>	0.98 (0.95, 1.00)	<b>0.89 (0.87, 0.92)</b>
COPD (%)	<b>1.05 (1.01, 1.08)</b>	<b>1.10 (1.07, 1.13)</b>	<b>1.21 (1.18, 1.24)</b>
Diabetes (%)	<b>1.10 (1.07, 1.13)</b>	<b>1.20 (1.17, 1.23)</b>	<b>1.01 (0.99, 1.04)</b>
Heart Failure (%)	<b>1.15 (1.12, 1.19)</b>	<b>1.16 (1.13, 1.19)</b>	<b>1.09 (1.06, 1.11)</b>
Hypertension (%)	<b>1.11 (1.07, 1.16)</b>	<b>1.33 (1.27, 1.38)</b>	<b>1.09 (1.05, 1.14)</b>
Kidney Disease (%)	<b>1.10 (1.06, 1.13)</b>	<b>1.13 (1.10, 1.17)</b>	0.98 (0.95, 1.00)
Stroke (%)	<b>1.11 (1.07, 1.15)</b>	<b>1.15 (1.11, 1.18)</b>	<b>0.92 (0.90, 0.95)</b>
ICU Beds	<b>1.09 (1.07, 1.12)</b>	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)	<b>0.85 (0.84, 0.87)</b>
Nursing Home Beds	<b>1.03 (1.01, 1.05)</b>	1.02 (1.00, 1.04)	<b>0.94 (0.93, 0.96)</b>

1 **Table S7. Multivariable weekly case fatality rates.** Relative risks of county-level  
 2 variables on weekly case fatality rates (39 repeated measurements per county) by  
 3 season from 3/23/20-12/21/20. All results are from a single model that controls for state  
 4 effects, US census region-specific time varying trends, and additional county  
 5 overdispersion. Parentheses indicate 95% confidence intervals. Bold indicates  
 6 confidence interval does not contain 1. Relative risks are for a one standard deviation  
 7 increase in a variable, except for the metro/nonmetro categorical variable.

Variable	Multivariable Weekly Case Fatality Rate Relative Risk		
	Spring	Summer	Fall
<b>Demographic</b>			
Age, 20-29 Years (%)	1.00 (0.95, 1.05)	<b>0.85 (0.82, 0.89)</b>	<b>0.96 (0.92, 0.99)</b>
Age, 60+ Years (%)	<b>1.19 (1.12, 1.27)</b>	<b>1.07 (1.02, 1.13)</b>	<b>1.10 (1.05, 1.15)</b>
Male (%)	<b>0.77 (0.73, 0.80)</b>	<b>0.93 (0.89, 0.96)</b>	0.98 (0.96, 1.01)
Metro, >1 million people	Ref	Ref	Ref
Metro/Near Metro, <1 million people	1.01 (0.95, 1.08)	0.95 (0.89, 1.01)	<b>1.17 (1.11, 1.23)</b>
Nonmetro, <20,000 people	0.89 (0.79, 1.01)	0.94 (0.85, 1.04)	<b>1.25 (1.16, 1.35)</b>
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
Black/African American (%)	<b>1.20 (1.13, 1.26)</b>	1.00 (0.96, 1.05)	<b>0.94 (0.90, 0.97)</b>
Hispanic/Latino (%)	<b>0.79 (0.75, 0.83)</b>	0.99 (0.95, 1.04)	<b>0.95 (0.91, 0.98)</b>
Asian (%)	<b>1.08 (1.03, 1.14)</b>	<b>1.09 (1.04, 1.13)</b>	1.01 (0.97, 1.04)
American Indian/Native Alaskan (%)	<b>0.95 (0.92, 0.98)</b>	1.02 (0.98, 1.05)	0.97 (0.95, 1.00)
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (%)	0.97 (0.94, 1.01)	1.01 (0.98, 1.04)	<b>1.03 (1.01, 1.06)</b>
White/Black Segregation	1.00 (0.95, 1.06)	0.97 (0.93, 1.02)	0.97 (0.95, 1.00)
White/non-White Segregation	<b>0.94 (0.89, 0.98)</b>	1.04 (1.00, 1.08)	1.02 (0.99, 1.05)
<b>Socioeconomic</b>			
Average Household Size	<b>1.06 (1.02, 1.11)</b>	<b>0.93 (0.90, 0.97)</b>	<b>0.94 (0.91, 0.97)</b>
No Health Insurance (%)	<b>0.91 (0.86, 0.97)</b>	1.04 (0.98, 1.10)	1.00 (0.94, 1.05)
Poverty (%)	<b>1.10 (1.04, 1.17)</b>	1.04 (0.98, 1.10)	1.01 (0.97, 1.06)
No High School Diploma (%)	0.98 (0.92, 1.04)	1.04 (0.99, 1.10)	1.04 (0.99, 1.09)
Education, Healthcare, Social Worker (%)	<b>0.88 (0.85, 0.91)</b>	<b>1.04 (1.01, 1.08)</b>	1.03 (1.00, 1.06)
<b>Health</b>			
Smokers (%)	0.97 (0.91, 1.02)	0.95 (0.90, 1.00)	0.97 (0.93, 1.02)
Obesity (%)	<b>0.89 (0.86, 0.93)</b>	1.00 (0.97, 1.03)	<b>1.05 (1.02, 1.08)</b>
Asthma (%)	0.97 (0.94, 1.01)	0.97 (0.94, 1.00)	1.00 (0.97, 1.02)
Cancer (%)	<b>0.95 (0.91, 0.99)</b>	<b>0.96 (0.92, 0.99)</b>	0.99 (0.96, 1.02)
COPD (%)	1.04 (0.98, 1.09)	0.97 (0.93, 1.01)	1.02 (0.99, 1.06)
Diabetes (%)	<b>1.09 (1.04, 1.15)</b>	<b>1.16 (1.11, 1.22)</b>	0.99 (0.94, 1.03)
Heart Failure (%)	<b>1.07 (1.02, 1.12)</b>	0.97 (0.93, 1.00)	<b>1.06 (1.03, 1.10)</b>
Hypertension (%)	<b>0.87 (0.80, 0.95)</b>	<b>1.26 (1.17, 1.35)</b>	0.98 (0.92, 1.04)
Kidney Disease (%)	<b>1.06 (1.01, 1.12)</b>	0.96 (0.92, 1.00)	<b>1.07 (1.04, 1.11)</b>
Stroke (%)	1.00 (0.95, 1.04)	1.02 (0.98, 1.06)	1.04 (1.00, 1.07)
ICU Beds	<b>1.13 (1.09, 1.18)</b>	1.03 (1.00, 1.07)	0.99 (0.97, 1.02)
Nursing Home Beds	0.98 (0.97, 1.00)	1.00 (0.99, 1.02)	1.00 (0.99, 1.02)

8