

COVID-19 Due to Wild-Type SARS-CoV-2 More Prevalent in Adolescents and Youth than in Older Adults Based on 19 US States in Fall 2020 Prior to Vaccine Availability

Barbara Romain^{a,b}, PhD, Moshe Schneiderman^c, BA, Allan Geliebter^d, PhD

Affiliations:

^a Department of Pediatrics, New York Medical College, Valhalla, New York, USA

^b Department of Psychology, Touro College & University System, New York, N.Y., USA

^c SUNY Downstate College of Medicine, Brooklyn, New York, USA

^d Department of Psychiatry, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, N.Y., USA

Address correspondence to: Barbara Romain, Ph.D., Department of Pediatrics, New York Medical College, 40 Sunshine Cottage Road, Valhalla, New York 10595; email: barbara.romain@touro.edu

Running Title: COVID-19 Due to Wild-Type SARS-CoV-2

Abstract

PURPOSE: In a prior study, we examined data from six US states during Summer 2020, and found that prevalence of COVID-19 for adolescents and youth was significantly greater than for older adults ($p < .00001$) as was a prevalence-related measure: Number of cases observed \div Number of cases expected ($p < .005$). We now extended our study to more states in Fall 2020 to confirm the prevalence relationships we found previously. Vaccines were still not available as of Fall 2020. Presumably, the SARS-CoV-2 strain circulating at the time was the wild-type lineage since no variants were reported in the US until the end of December 2020.

METHODS: We examined data from 19 U.S. states experiencing surges in cases to determine prevalence of COVID-19, and a prevalence-related measure: [Number of cases observed in a given age group] \div [Number of cases expected in the age group based on population demographics].

RESULTS: In 16 of the 19 states, we found that: (1) prevalence of COVID-19 for adolescents and youth was significantly greater than for older adults (p -values ranged from $p < 0.00001$ to $p = 0.0175$); (2) the ratio of cases observed to cases expected was significantly greater in adolescents and youth than in older adults (p -values ranging from $p < 0.00001$ to $p = 0.004$).

CONCLUSIONS: Our results are consistent with our previous study in Summer 2020. The finding of lower prevalence in older adults cannot be attributed to access to vaccination since our data are from Fall 2020 when vaccinations were not yet available. Our findings with the SARS-CoV-2 wild-type strain are consistent with the findings currently being reported in the UK for the delta variant. In both studies, prevalence in adolescents and youth exceeded that in older adults. The UK findings are more pronounced perhaps because that study transpired following months of vaccinations of older adults whereas ours occurred before vaccinations were available.

45

INTRODUCTION

46 The susceptibility of adolescents (10-19) and youth (15-24) to COVID-19 has been a matter
47 of controversy. In the very early studies conducted in China, Dong et al. [1], Lu et al. [2], and
48 Bi *et al.* [3] reported that adolescents were susceptible, with Bi *et al.* [3] reporting that the rate of
49 infection across all age groups was similar. However, Zhang et al. [4], in a study in Hunan
50 province, China, concluded that older adults were the most susceptible, those in the first half of
51 adolescence least susceptible, and youth (15–24) intermediate in susceptibility. Geliebter,
52 Romain & Schneiderman [5] attempted to replicate Zhang *et al.*'s statistical analyses but
53 obtained results in line with those of Bi *et al.*, indicating a similar infection rate across the age
54 groups. Nevertheless, other data from Europe also indicated that adolescents were less
55 susceptible than adults (Kuchar *et al.* in Warsaw [6]; de Lusignan *et al.* [7] in England). Also,
56 Viner et al. [8], after a meta-analysis of 32 studies, concluded that “children and adolescents
57 younger than 20 years had 44% lower odds of secondary infection with SARS-CoV-2 as
58 compared with adults 20 years and older.” Subsequently, a mathematical model by Eggo and her
59 colleagues [9], based on data from China, Italy, Japan, Singapore, Canada and South Korea,
60 estimated that the susceptibility of adolescents 10-19-year-olds (mean = .38) was less than half
61 that of older adults, ages 60+ (mean = .81), but that youth in their early 20s had a susceptibility
62 almost equal to that of older adults. However, no U.S. data were included in their model.

63 We [10] therefore decided to examine data from the U.S. We calculated the prevalence in
64 adolescents and youth compared to that of older adults in the U.S. in the summer of 2020. We
65 analyzed the health department data from six US states that were experiencing surges in cases.
66 In all six states, we found that: (1) prevalence of COVID-19 for adolescents and youth was
67 significantly greater than for older adults, $p < .00001$, as was (2) the ratio of observed to

68 expected cases, $p < .005$. Vaccines were not yet available during the time of our study, and
69 therefore, our findings were not an artifact of older adults being vaccinated first.

70 One limitation in our prior study was that it was based on data from only six U.S. states. The
71 purpose of the present study was to investigate the prevalence of COVID-19 in adolescents and
72 youth compared to that in older adults, in 19 states that met certain criteria. We also wanted to
73 confirm the relationships we found during Summer 2020 in the Fall of 2020, when states were
74 experiencing new surges in cases. Vaccines were still not available as of Fall 2020.

75 **METHODS**

76 There were two criteria for inclusion of states in our study sample:

- 77 1. The state experienced a surge during Fall 2020, defined as follows: After at least a 1-
78 month plateau in the 7-day average of daily number of new cases, there was a dramatic
79 increase of at least 75% from the plateau 2–3 months prior, which lasted at least one
80 month, as reported for the states in the New York Times “COVID Map and Case Count”
81 [11]. As an example, for Colorado, the case data are from October 22nd when there was a
82 surge. On that day, the 7-day average number of daily new cases was 1,171. Sixty days
83 prior on August 22nd, the 7-day daily average was 296, representing a 300% increase over
84 August 22nd, and the surge was at least one month in duration. For the months of June,
85 July, and through August 21, the 7-day daily average of new cases had plateaued at 200–
86 500 cases per day. Another example is Wisconsin, where the case data are from October
87 23rd. On that day the 7-day daily average was 3,547. The surge lasted at least a month
88 from October 23rd, with November 23rd reporting a 7-day average of daily new cases at
89 6,436. Sixty days prior, on August 23rd, the 7-day daily average of new cases was 708.
90 Thus, there was > 400% increase in the 7-day daily average. Prior to that, for the months

91 of June, July and August, the 7-day daily average of new cases had reached a plateau,
92 fluctuating from 300–962 cases per day. Even from the maximum of 962, the 3,547 cases
93 on October 23rd represented a 268% increase.

94 2. The pediatric data were tabulated within distinct age brackets, not amalgamated.

95 California lumped all child data 0-17 years of age together, and could not be included as
96 children under age 10 are excluded. Massachusetts lumped children 0-19 together, as did
97 Arizona. We therefore considered the following 19 states: Alabama, Alaska, Colorado,
98 South Carolina, New Mexico, Michigan, Montana, Wisconsin, Rhode Island, South
99 Dakota, Missouri, Oklahoma, North Dakota, Oregon, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Minnesota,
100 Florida, and Tennessee. We accessed online tables containing COVID-19 case data when
101 there was a surge from state Health Department websites, and tables for state population
102 data by age group. Case data were downloaded between October 22nd and December 5th,
103 at the time each of the states was experiencing a spike in cases. The websites are detailed
104 in S1 Appendix, which includes the relevant tables/figures.

105 Depending on how the data were tabulated, the case data for the 19 states were either for
106 adolescents (ages 10-19), for youth (ages 15-24), or for adolescents and youth combined.

107 *Adolescents:* In the following 13 states, data were tabulated by decade, and we examined the
108 10-19-year age bracket: Alaska, Colorado, New Mexico, Michigan, Wisconsin, Montana, South
109 Dakota, North Dakota, Oregon, Nevada, and Pennsylvania. Tennessee had a similar age bracket
110 of 11–20 years of age. Thus these 13 states provided data on adolescents.

111 *Youth:* The four states of Florida, Oklahoma, Rhode Island and Alabama, provided the data on
112 youth. The age brackets for Florida and for Oklahoma were 5–14, and 15–24 (“youth” as
113 defined by the WHO). Therefore, we used only the 15-24-year-olds for both these states. We also

114 used the 15-24 age bracket for Rhode Island. For Alabama, cases were reported for 0-4, 5-17
115 years and for 18–24 years--age bracket demarcations unlike the other states, and we used the 18-
116 24 years age bracket, since this is a subset of the “youth” age bracket.

117 *Adolescents and Youth Combined:* Minnesota and Missouri provided data on adolescents and
118 youth combined. For both Minnesota and Missouri, we considered the age bracket 10-24-year-
119 olds.

120 The case data from the Health Department websites was used to compute “Percentage of
121 Cases Observed,” calculated as the number of cases in a particular age group divided by the total
122 number of cases for all ages in the state and converted into a percentage. The “Percentage of
123 Cases Expected” was determined based on population demographics: For each age group, it was
124 the percentage of the population the given age group comprises, multiplied by the total number
125 of cases. The population demographic data were obtained from the state websites, listed in S1
126 Appendix.

127 We then calculated two measures: 1) Prevalence, and 2) “Percentage of Cases Observed” in a
128 given age group ÷ “Percentage of Cases Expected” based on population demographics as noted
129 above. For an illustration of how these measures were calculated, see Romain et al. (2021).

130 Statistics: We performed chi-square calculations to determine whether differences between the
131 adolescent/youth groups and the older adults were significant for the two outcome measures.
132 Significance level was based on 2-tailed $\alpha = .05$.

133 **RESULTS**

134 In 16 of the 19 states, we found that: (1) prevalence of COVID-19 for adolescents and youth
135 was significantly greater than for older adults, with p -values varying from $p < 0.00001$ to $p =$
136 0.0175 ; and (2) the ratio of observed number of cases to expected number of cases was

137 significantly greater in adolescents and youth than in older adults, with p -values varying from
 138 $p < 0.00001$ to $p = 0.004$, (**Table 1**), with more cases than one would expect based on the
 139 demographics of the populations. The three states that did not follow the general pattern were:
 140 South Dakota, Michigan and Pennsylvania.

141

142 **Table 1. Prevalence-related Outcome Measures by Developmental Period and Age**
 143 **Bracket in US States Experiencing Spikes in COVID-19 Cases**

Adolescence				
	Prevalence	χ^2 p-value	Observed ÷ Expected	χ^2 p-value
<i>Alaska - October 31 2020*</i>				
10-19	1,811/99,499 = 1.8%	$\chi^2= 5.65$ $p=0.0175$	1,811/2,093 = 86.5 %	$\chi^2= 10.9$ $p=0.00095$
60+	2,330/142,099 = 1.6%		2,330/2,978 = 78.2 %	
<i>Colorado - October 22 2020</i>				
10-19	9,890/731,951 = 1.35 %	$\chi^2=12.6$ $p=0.000387$	9,890/11,630 = 85.0%	$\chi^2=8.3$ $p= .004$
60+	15,476/1,199,263 = 1.29%		15,476/19139 = 80.9%	
<i>Michigan - November 17 2020</i>				
10-19	37,393/1,267,877 = 2.9%	$\chi^2 =1910.1$ $p<.00001$	37,393/49,530 = 75%	$\chi^2 = 1102.6$ $p <0.00001$
60+	92,591/2,393,510 = 3.9%		92,591/93,209 = 99%	
<i>Montana - October 23 2020</i>				
10-19	3,001/137,796 = 2.2%	$\chi^2=17.8$ $p=.000024$	3,001/13,394 = 22.4%	$\chi^2=14.7$ $p= 0.000124$
60+	5,668/286,567 = 1.97%		5,668/27,834 = 20.4	
<i>Nevada - October 30 2020</i>				
10-19	8,727/391,347 = 2.2%	$\chi^2= 31.1$ $p<0.00001$	8,727/12,857 = 67.9%	$\chi^2= 29288.5$ $p<0.00001$
60+	14107/683,039 = 2.1 %		14,107/22,373 = 63%	
<i>New Mexico - October 23 2020</i>				
10-19	4,513/285,393 = 1.6%	$\chi^2 =252.6$ $p<0.00001$	4,513/5,456 = 82.7%	$\chi^2= 62.4$ $p <0.00001$
60+	6,726/518,073 = 1.3%		6,726/9,950 = 67.6%	
<i>North Dakota - October 23 2020</i>				
10-19	4,658/97,348 = 4.78%	$\chi^2 =34.1$ $p<0.00001$	4,658/4,490 = 103.7%	$\chi^2= 18.4$ $p = 0.000018$
60+	7,143/ 167,040 = 4.28%		7,143/7,718 = 92.5 %	

Prevalence		χ^2 p-value	Observed ÷ Expected	χ^2 p-value
Oregon - October 30 2020				
10-19	4,840/504,711 = 0.96%	$\chi^2 = 226.9$ $p < 0.00001$	4,840/ 5,262 = 92.0%	$\chi^2 = 191.3$ $p < 0.00001$
60+	7,136/985,350 = .72 %		7,136/10,966 = 65.1 %	
Pennsylvania - October 30 2020				
10-19	18,319/1,568,292= 1.2%	$\chi^2 = 1907.5$ $p < 0.00001$	18,319/25,808 = 71.0 %	$\chi^2 = 1116.6$ $p < 0.00001$
60+	55,956/3,301,963 = 1.7%		55,956/53,294 = 105.0 %	
South Carolina - December 5 2020				
11-20	33,151/673,843 = 4.9%	$\chi^2 = 675.1$ $p < 0.00001$	33,151/331,243 = 106%	$\chi^2 = 80404.7$ $p < 0.00001$
61+	49,368/1,211,555 = 4.1%		49,368/56,047 = 88%	
South Dakota - October 23 2020				
10-19	4,052/117,276 = 3.5%	$\chi^2 = 2.2$ $p = \text{n.s.}$	4,052 /5,142 = 78.8 %	$\chi^2 = 14.8$ $p = 0.000118$
60+	7,569/225,553 = 3.4%		7,569/8,682 = 87.2%	
Tennessee - November 11 2020				
11-20	38,925/855,574 = 4.5 %	$\chi^2 = 2141.8$ $p < 0.00001$	38,925/38,140 = 102%	$\chi^2 = 665.7$ $p < 0.00001$
61+	52,404/1,577,807 = 3.3%		52,404/65,131 = 80%	
Wisconsin - October 23 2020				
10-19	22,857/748,773 = 3.1 %	$\chi^2 = 776.5$ $p < 0.00001$	22,857/24,572 = 93%	$\chi^2 = 412.8$ $p < 0.00001$
60+	34,286/1,428,853 = 2.4 %		34,286/46,667 = 73.5%	
Youth				
	Prevalence	χ^2 p-value	Observed ÷ Expected	χ^2 p-value
Alabama - November 13 2020				
18-24	25,413/458,530 = 5.5%	$\chi^2 = 2,712.4$ $p < 0.00001$	25,413/180,275 = 150%	$\chi^2 = 27,572.4$ $p < 0.00001$
65+	30,186/854,313 = 3.5%		30,186/854,313 = 96%	
Florida - November 12 2020				
15-24	140,515/2,555,315 = 5.5%	$\chi^2 = 28,969.7$ $p < 0.00001$	140,515/103,030 = 136 %	$\chi^2 = 14,686.4$ $p < 0.00001$
65+	126,647/4,465,169 = 2.8%		126,647/180,303 = 70%	
Oklahoma- October 22 2020				
15-24	22,499/543,700 = 4.1%	$\chi^2 = 2,350.0$ $p < 0.00001$	22,499/15,298 = 147.1%	$\chi^2 = 1186.9$ $p < 0.00001$
65+	15,853/635,222 = 2.5%		15,853/18,110 = 87.5%	
Rhode Island - October 24 2020				
15-24	4,696/145,880 = 3.2%	$\chi^2 = 104.8$ $p < 0.00001$	4,696/3,856 = 121.8%	$\chi^2 = 65.1$ $p < 0.00001$
60+	7,017/265,058 = 2.6%		7,017/7,190 = 97.6 %	

Adolescence Plus Youth				
	Prevalence	χ^2 p-value	Observed ÷ Expected	χ^2 p-value
Minnesota - October 23 2020				
10-24	32,186/1,081,469 =3.0 %	$\chi^2=3097.2$ $p<0.00001$	32,186/24,934 =129.1%	$\chi^2= 1588.2$ $p<0.00001$
65+	16,017/921,491 =1.7%		16,017/21,168 =75.7%	
Missouri - October 23 2020				
10-24	28,634/1,192,555 =2.4%	$\chi^2 = 725.7$ $p<0.00001$	28,634/23,097 =124.0%	$\chi^2 = 458.1$ $p<0.00001$
65+	19,278/1,033,964 =1.9%		19,278/20,691 =93.2 %	

144 Chi-square statistic was used to compare age brackets within each state;

145 *The date on which the cumulative data was gathered.

146

147 We now consider each developmental period separately: Adolescence, Youth, and

148 Adolescence plus Youth Combined.

149 ***Adolescence (10-19-year-olds): Data from 13 States: Alaska, Colorado, Michigan, Montana,***

150 ***Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota,***

151 ***Tennessee and Wisconsin***

152 *Prevalence.* The prevalence in adolescents was significantly greater than that in older adults

153 in 10 of the 13 states (Alaska, $p=.02$; Colorado, $p=0.004$; Montana, $p=0.0002$; Nevada, New

154 Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Wisconsin, $p< 0.00001$). For

155 South Dakota, there was no significant difference between the adolescents and older adults. For

156 Michigan and Pennsylvania, the pattern was reversed with the prevalence in older adults being

157 significantly higher than that in adolescents ($p< 0.00001$).

158 *Proportion of cases observed to cases expected.* The ratio of the number of cases observed to

159 the number of cases expected based on population demographics, was significantly greater for

160 adolescents than for older adults for 10 of the 13 states: Alaska, $p = 0.00095$; Colorado, $p=$

161 0.004 ; Montana, $p = 0.000124$; North Dakota, $p= 0.00002$; Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, South

162 Carolina, Tennessee and Wisconsin, all $p < 0.00001$. For Michigan, Pennsylvania, and South

163 Dakota, the pattern was reversed with the proportion of cases observed to cases expected being
164 significantly greater in older adults than in adolescents (for the former two states, $p < 0.00001$,
165 and for the latter one, $p = 0.000118$).

166 ***Youth (15-24-year-olds): Data from 4 States: Alabama, Florida, Oklahoma, Rhode Island***

167 *Prevalence.* In Alabama, the prevalence in youth 18-24-years-old was 157% that of older
168 adults (5.5% vs. 3.5%, $p < 0.00001$). In Florida, the prevalence in youth 15-24 years of age was
169 196% that of older adults, $p < 0.00001$; in Oklahoma, it was 164% that of older adults, $p < 0.00001$,
170 and in Rhode Island, it was 123% that of older adults, $p < 0.00001$.

171 *Proportion of cases observed to cases expected.* In Alabama, the ratio of observed to
172 expected cases was approximately in 18–24-year-olds 150% that of older adults (150% vs. 96%),
173 $p < 0.00001$; in Florida, the ratio in youth was almost 200% that of older adults (136% v. 70%),
174 $p < 0.00001$). In Oklahoma, the ratio of observed to expected cases for youth was 167% that of
175 older adults (147.1% vs. 87.5%), $p < 0.00001$. And, in Rhode Island, it was 125% that of older
176 adults (121.8% vs. 97.6%), $p < 0.00001$.

177 ***Adolescence plus Youth Combined (ages 10–24 years-old): Data from 2 States: Minnesota and***
178 ***Missouri***

179 In both Minnesota and Missouri, the prevalence of COVID-19 in 10–24-year-olds was
180 significantly greater than it was in older adults, > 65 years ($p < 0.00001$). Also, in both states, the
181 proportion of observed cases of COVID-19 to expected cases based was significantly greater for
182 the 10-24-year-olds than it was for the older adults, $p < 0.00001$.

183 In 16 of the 19 states experiencing surges of cases during Fall 2020, the prevalence of
184 COVID-19 was significantly higher in adolescents and youth than it was in older adults, $p =$
185 0.0022, sign test.

186

DISCUSSION

187 In 16 of the 19 states experiencing surges of cases during Fall 2020, we found that (i) the
188 prevalence of COVID-19 was significantly higher in adolescents and youth than in older adults,
189 and (ii) similarly the ratio of observed cases of COVID-19 to expected cases based on population
190 demographics was significantly greater ($p < 0.00001$). Our data is presumably on the original
191 wild type SARS-CoV-2 strain (i.e., the strain with no major mutations) since as of October and
192 November 2020, there were no reports of variants in the US: The first variant reported in the
193 US, the B.1.1.7, was reported at the end of December 2020 [12]. All the data are from October -
194 November 2020 except for South Carolina which is from December 5, 2020—all before the
195 report of any variants in the U.S. Moreover, our findings of lower prevalence in older adults
196 cannot be attributed to access to vaccination since our data are from Fall 2020 when vaccinations
197 were not yet available. A possible reason for our findings is that adolescents have more contacts
198 than adults [13], and another factor, is that older adults, feeling vulnerable, may be more likely to
199 adhere to masking and social distancing, which adolescents/youth may disregard. Both these
200 factors are likely operative.

201 Our findings in the six U.S. states differ from those of Zhang et al. in China, who found that
202 the infection rate in older adults, ages 65+, exceeded that in adolescents and youth, and from
203 those of Wu et al. [14], who found that of 44,672 confirmed cases of COVID in mainland China,
204 only 1% were in adolescents ages 10-19 years of age. Our findings also contradict Davies et al.'s
205 model that estimates 10-19-year-olds' susceptibility to be half that of older adults. The reason
206 for the discrepancy could be these earlier studies were conducted when schools were closed,
207 which reduced the number of contacts by adolescents and youth, and thus the number of cases.
208 Moreover, testing was not readily available early on in the pandemic, and adolescents tend to

209 have milder cases of COVID-19 that could have been missed without the availability of
210 widespread testing. In line with this reasoning is as of April 2, 2020, among 149,082 cases in all
211 age groups for which patient age was known, only 2,572 (1.7%) of these occurred in children
212 aged <18 years, with nearly 60% of these cases occurring in adolescents 10-17 years old [15].
213 Hence at that point, adolescents accounted for just 1% of the total cases. But by Sept 15, 2020, a
214 month or two before our data was collected, the number of cases in adolescents 10-19 years of
215 age had climbed to 387,000 [16]. And, as of June 24, 2021, the American Academy of Pediatrics
216 reported 4,032,782 total confirmed COVID-19 cases in children <18 years old [17] with at least
217 336 deaths.

218 We now consider the three states that were an exception and whether events occurring in
219 these states might explain the difference in findings. There were two types of events occurring.

220 The first such event, the Sturgis Motorcycle Rally held annually in South Dakota, easily
221 explains the reversal from the usual pattern that we find in South Dakota. The data from South
222 Dakota were from October 23, 2020, and followed the Sturgis Motorcycle Rally where half a
223 million bikers converged on Sturgis between August 7 and August 16, 2020. Dave et al. [18]
224 link a deluge of COVID-19 cases to this event since social distancing and mask-wearing were
225 rare in Sturgis [19, 20]. The event led to increased cases in South Dakota as well as in other
226 states from where bikers travelled to South Dakota. Using anonymized cell phone data from
227 SafeGraph Inc., the authors traced smartphone pings from non-residents and indicating that
228 visitors came to Sturgis from all parts of the US, including states that recently experienced surges
229 in COVID-19 cases. The attendees opened themselves up to infection at this super-spreader
230 event, and then contributed to increased case counts in their home states when they returned
231 home. These attendees were mostly adults who would be more likely to come into contact with

232 other adults rather than adolescents and youth, thereby increasing the number of cases in adults,
233 including older adults.

234 This explanation is bolstered by prior data on South Dakota from Summer 2020, i.e., from
235 September 4th, when the prevalence of COVID-19 in 10–19-year-olds was significantly greater
236 than it was in > 60-year-olds ($p < 0.00001$). Similarly, the proportion of cases observed to
237 expected, was significantly greater in 10-19-year-olds than in those 60+ ($p < 0.00001$). Six weeks
238 later, as more cases from the Sturgis event developed, there was no longer a significant
239 difference in the prevalence between the adolescents and older adults.

240 As for Pennsylvania and Michigan, the operative event that may have led to a reversal in the
241 expected pattern of results was the Trump rallies. Both Pennsylvania and Michigan were
242 important for Trump to win the election and were the sites of many Trump rallies, which were
243 known to be largely without masking and social distancing. In Pennsylvania, the data are from
244 October 30. From August through October 30th, between Trump and his son Don Jr., there were
245 15 Trump rallies held in Pennsylvania. Trump held nine of these rallies in Pennsylvania [21]:
246 Old Forge, Pa. (August 20, 2020); Latrobe, Pa. (September 3, 2020); Moon Township, Pa.
247 (September 22, 2020); Somerset County Sept 11, 2020); Middletown, Pa. (September 26);
248 Johnston, Pa. (October 13, 2020); Erie, Pa. (October 20, 2020); Allentown, Pa. (October 26,
249 2020); Lititz, Pa. (October 26, 2020); and Martinsburg, Pa. (October 26, 2020). Don Jr. held an
250 additional 6 of the Pennsylvania rallies [22-26] at the following locations on the following dates:
251 Blue Ridge Sportsman Club outside Harrisburg, Pa. (Sept. 16, 2020); Roxbury Park Bandshell,
252 Johnstown, Pa. (September 23, 2020); Nittany Valley/Centre County, Pa. (October 19, 2020);
253 Blair County, Pa. (October 19, 2020); York Springs, Pa. (October 30, 2020); Ambridge, Pa.
254 (October 30, 2020).

255 In Michigan, the data are from November 17, 2020, and in the months leading up to the
256 election, Trump and his son Don Jr. held 11 rallies in the state [21]. They were: Freeland, MI
257 (September 10, 2020), Muskegon, MI (October 17, 2020), Macomb County (Don Jr., on October
258 26), Lansing, MI (October 27, 2020), Waterford Township, MI (October 30, 2020), Davison, MI
259 (Don Jr., October 31, 2020), Grand Bay Marine in Traverse City (Don Jr., October 31, 2020),
260 Macomb County (November 1, 2020), Washington, MI (November 1, 2020), Traverse City, MI
261 (November 2, 2020), Grand Rapids, MI (November 2, 2020). These rallies attracted adults,
262 including older adults, rather than adolescents or youth, and with the lack of social distancing
263 and mask wearing, likely added to the caseloads of older adults. Whereas there were also Trump
264 rallies in some of the other states we examined, there were far fewer of them: There were 6 in
265 Florida, 1 in Oklahoma, 3 in Minnesota, and 6 in Wisconsin [21] by the dates for the COVID—
266 19 tabulated state data, which are 11/12/2020, 10/22/2020, 10/23/2020, and 10/23/2020,
267 respectively. The confluence of the two factors noted—the Sturgis motorcycle super-spreader
268 event and the Trump rallies—likely inflated the number of cases in the older adults.

269 Interestingly, our finding of higher prevalence in adolescents and youth for the wild-type
270 strain parallels the recent findings of the REACT-1 (REal-time Assessment of Community
271 Transmission-1) UK study at Imperial College London for the delta variant. The findings
272 indicate a five-fold higher positivity rate among 5–12-year-olds and youth 18-24 than among
273 older adults, ages 65+ [27]. The findings are being interpreted to mean that youth are driving the
274 UK surge with regards to the delta variant [28]. However, our findings indicate that the high
275 prevalence in adolescents and youth is not a novel phenomenon and was present with the wild-
276 type strain in our previous study and in the current one. One reason the UK study found a five-
277 fold difference in positivity which is greater than ours may be that their study was conducted

278 after vaccinations had been ongoing in the UK for many months for older adults, which would
279 drive down the positivity in that cohort. Our study in the US was conducted prior to the
280 availability of vaccinations, and may be the reason the difference in prevalence between the
281 adolescents/youth vs. older adults was less pronounced.

282 Our finding of the high prevalence of COVID-19 in adolescents and youth in the U.S., taken
283 together with the high virulence and high transmissibility of the delta variant currently
284 circulating in the US, should be considered in any decision about masking in these groups,
285 especially in those under 12, for whom vaccinations are not yet available.

286 **CONCLUSIONS**

287 The findings of high prevalence of COVID-19 and the other prevalence-related measure in
288 adolescents and youth in the U.S. are consistent with our earlier findings in the Summer of 2020.
289 Our findings for the wild-type strain of SARS-CoV-2, are also consistent with the findings of the
290 ongoing REACT-1 study being conducted in the UK with the delta variant. The disparity in
291 prevalence occurs even with the wild-type SARS-CoV-2 lineage, although the disparity between
292 the age groups is not as pronounced. The lower disparity may be the result of our study
293 occurring before vaccinations were available, whereas the UK study took place after months of
294 vaccinating older adults.

295

REFERENCES

- 296 1. Dong, Y., Mo, X., Hu, Y., Qi, X., Jiang, F., Jiang, Z., et al. Epidemiological characteristics of
297 2143 pediatric patients with 2019 coronavirus disease in China. *Pediatrics*. 2020 June; 145:
298 e20200702; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2020-0702>
- 299 2. Lu X, Zhang L, Du H, Zhang J, Li YY, Qu J, Zhang W, Wang Y, Bao S, Li Y, Wu C, Liu H,
300 Liu D, Shao J, Peng X, Yang Y, Liu Z, Xiang Y, Zhang F, Silva RM, Pinkerton KE, Shen K,
301 Xiao H, Xu S, Wong GWK; Chinese Pediatric Novel Coronavirus Study Team. SARS-CoV-
302 2 Infection in Children. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Apr 23;382:1663-1665. doi:
303 10.1056/NEJMc2005073.
- 304 3. Bi, Q., Wu, Y., Mei, S., Ye, C., Zou, X., et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19
305 in 391 cases and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort
306 study. *Lancet Infect. Dis*. 2020; [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30287-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30287-5)
- 307 4. Zhang, J., Litvinova, M., Liang, Y., Yan Wang, Y., Wei Wang, W. et al. Changes in contact
308 patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science*. 2020; 368: 1481-
309 1486. DOI: 10.1126/science.abb8001
- 310 5. Geliebter, A., Romain, B., & Schneiderman, M. Re: Changes in contact patterns shape the
311 dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science*. 2020 June 23. Available from:
312 <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/early/2020/05/04/science.abb8001/tab-e-letters>
- 313 6. Kuchar, E., Załęski, A., Wronowski, M. et al. Children were less frequently infected with
314 SARS-CoV-2 than adults during 2020 COVID-19 pandemic in Warsaw, Poland. *Eur J Clin*
315 *Microbiol Infect Dis* 2020. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-020-04038-9>)
- 316 7. de Lusignan S, Dorward J, Correa A, Jones N, Akinyemi O, Amirthalingam G, et al. Risk
317 factors for SARS-CoV-2 among patients in the Oxford Royal College of General
318 Practitioners Research and Surveillance Centre primary care network: a cross-sectional
319 study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020; 20:1034-1042. (doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30371-6).
- 320 8. Viner, RM, Mytton, OT, Bonell, C., Melendez-Torres, GJ, Ward, JL, Hudson, L et al.
321 Susceptibility to and transmission of COVID-19 amongst children and adolescents compared
322 with adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. Published online
323 September 25, 2020. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.4573
- 324 9. Davies, N.G., Klepac, P., Liu, Y., Prem, K., Jit, M., et al. Age-dependent effects in the
325 transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. *Nat Med*. 2020 Published June 16.
326 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0962-9>
- 327 10. Romain B, Schneiderman M, Geliebter A. (2021) Prevalence of COVID-19 in adolescents
328 and youth compared with older adults in states experiencing surges. *PLOS ONE*.
329 16(3):e0242587.
- 330 11. New York Times. COVID in the U.S.: Latest Map and Case Count. Available from
331 <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/coronavirus-us-cases.html>

- 332 12. CDC. (Jan. 28, 2021). “Science Brief: Emerging SARS-CoV-2 Variants.”
333 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/scientific-brief-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/scientific-brief-emerging-variants.html)
334 [emerging-variants.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/scientific-brief-emerging-variants.html) [Accessed June 25, 2021].
- 335 13. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, et al. Social Contacts and
336 Mixing Patterns Relevant to the Spread of Infectious Diseases. *PLoS Med.* 2008; 5: e74.
337 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074>
- 338 14. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus
339 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From
340 the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA.* 2020; 323:1239–1242.
341 doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2648
- 342 15. CDC. COVID-19 Response Team. Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Children - United States,
343 February 12-April 2, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020 Apr 10;69:422-426. doi:
344 10.15585/mmwr.mm6914e4.
- 345 16. CDC. COVID-19 Case Surveillance Public Use Data Profile. Available from
346 [https://data.cdc.gov/Case-Surveillance/COVID-19-Case-Surveillance-Public-Use-Data-](https://data.cdc.gov/Case-Surveillance/COVID-19-Case-Surveillance-Public-Use-Data-Profile/xigx-wn5e)
347 [Profile/xigx-wn5e](https://data.cdc.gov/Case-Surveillance/COVID-19-Case-Surveillance-Public-Use-Data-Profile/xigx-wn5e) [Retrieved October 09, 2020].
- 348 17. American Academy of Pediatrics. Children and COVID-19: State Data Report, A joint report
349 from the American Academy of Pediatrics and the Children’s Hospital Association.
350 Version:6/24/21. COVID-19 and Age. [https://services.aap.org/en/pages/2019-novel-](https://services.aap.org/en/pages/2019-novel-coronavirus-covid-19-infections/children-and-covid-19-state-level-data-report/)
351 [coronavirus-covid-19-infections/children-and-covid-19-state-level-data-report/](https://services.aap.org/en/pages/2019-novel-coronavirus-covid-19-infections/children-and-covid-19-state-level-data-report/)[Accessed
352 June 25, 2021].
- 353 18. Dave, D., Friedson, A.I., McNichols, D. & Sabia, J.J. (2020). “The Contagion Externality of
354 a Superspreading Event: The Sturgis Motorcycle Rally and COVID-19.” Center for Health
355 Economics & Policy Studies, San Diego State University, Working Paper No. 2020901, Sep.
356 5, 2020. [https://cheps.sdsu.edu/docs/Contagion_Externality_Sturgis_Motorcycle_Rally_9-5-](https://cheps.sdsu.edu/docs/Contagion_Externality_Sturgis_Motorcycle_Rally_9-5-20_Dave_et_al.pdf)
357 [20_Dave_et_al.pdf](https://cheps.sdsu.edu/docs/Contagion_Externality_Sturgis_Motorcycle_Rally_9-5-20_Dave_et_al.pdf)
- 358 19. Groves, Stephen (2020, August 7). “Harleys everywhere, masks nowhere: 80th Sturgis
359 Motorcycle Rally draws thousands.” *The Chicago Tribune*.
- 360 20. Walker, Mark (2020, August 7). “‘If we get it, we chose to be here’: Despite virus, thousands
361 converge on Sturgis for huge rally.” *The New York Times*.
- 362 21. Wikipedia (2021). “List of post-2016 election Donald Trump rallies.”
363 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_post-](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_post-2016_election_Donald_Trump_rallies#2020_campaign_rallies)
364 [2016_election_Donald_Trump_rallies#2020_campaign_rallies](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_post-2016_election_Donald_Trump_rallies#2020_campaign_rallies). [Accessed June 3, 2021.]
- 365 22. Wenner, D. (Sept.16, 2020). “Donald Trump Jr. goes on the attack during Dauphin County
366 stop.” [https://www.pennlive.com/news/2020/09/donald-trump-jr-takes-attack-dog-role-](https://www.pennlive.com/news/2020/09/donald-trump-jr-takes-attack-dog-role-during-dauphin-county-stop.html)
367 [during-dauphin-county-stop.html](https://www.pennlive.com/news/2020/09/donald-trump-jr-takes-attack-dog-role-during-dauphin-county-stop.html) [Accessed June 3, 2021.]

- 368 23. Slusser, T. (September 23, 2020). “Donald Trump Jr. at Roxbury Park Bandshell |
369 Johnstown, Pa.” *The Tribune-Democrat*. [https://www.tribdem.com/pennsylvania/donald-](https://www.tribdem.com/pennsylvania/donald-trump-jr-at-roxbury-park-bandshell-johnstown-pa/video_39d7a4c8-fe00-11ea-bfc6-53c6ecf65a4a.html)
370 [trump-jr-at-roxbury-park-bandshell-johnstown-pa/video_39d7a4c8-fe00-11ea-bfc6-](https://www.tribdem.com/pennsylvania/donald-trump-jr-at-roxbury-park-bandshell-johnstown-pa/video_39d7a4c8-fe00-11ea-bfc6-53c6ecf65a4a.html)
371 [53c6ecf65a4a.html](https://www.tribdem.com/pennsylvania/donald-trump-jr-at-roxbury-park-bandshell-johnstown-pa/video_39d7a4c8-fe00-11ea-bfc6-53c6ecf65a4a.html) [Accessed June 3, 2021.]
- 372 24. Pallotto, B. (October 19, 2020). “Donald Trump Jr. to return to Centre County for campaign
373 rally” *Centre Daily Times*. [https://www.centredaily.com/news/politics-](https://www.centredaily.com/news/politics-government/election/article246558018.html)
374 [government/election/article246558018.html](https://www.centredaily.com/news/politics-government/election/article246558018.html) [Accessed June 3, 2021.]
- 375 25. www.ydr.com (October 30, 2020) “Donald Trump Jr.: ‘I’ve had more blue-collar jobs than
376 Joe Biden’” *York Daily Record* [https://www.ydr.com/videos/news/2020/10/30/donald-](https://www.ydr.com/videos/news/2020/10/30/donald-trump-jr-speaks-during-maga-event-adams-county/6089353002/)
377 [trump-jr-speaks-during-maga-event-adams-county/6089353002/](https://www.ydr.com/videos/news/2020/10/30/donald-trump-jr-speaks-during-maga-event-adams-county/6089353002/) [Accessed June 3, 2021.]
- 378 26. Cassesse, S. (October 30, 2020). “Donald Trump Jr., Sean Parnell and Ted Nugent Headline
379 Rally in Beaver County.” *KDKA 2CBSPittsburgh*.
380 [https://pittsburgh.cbslocal.com/2020/10/30/donald-trump-jr-sean-parnell-and-ted-nugent-](https://pittsburgh.cbslocal.com/2020/10/30/donald-trump-jr-sean-parnell-and-ted-nugent-headline-rally-in-beaver-county/)
381 [headline-rally-in-beaver-county/](https://pittsburgh.cbslocal.com/2020/10/30/donald-trump-jr-sean-parnell-and-ted-nugent-headline-rally-in-beaver-county/) [Accessed June 3, 2021.]
- 382 27. GOV.UK. Department of Health and Social Care. (June 2021) “Independent Report:
383 REACT-1 study of coronavirus transmission: June 2021 final results.”
384 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/react-1-study-of-coronavirus-transmission-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/react-1-study-of-coronavirus-transmission-june-2021-final-results/react-1-study-of-coronavirus-transmission-june-2021-final-results)
385 [june-2021-final-results/react-1-study-of-coronavirus-transmission-june-2021-final-results](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/react-1-study-of-coronavirus-transmission-june-2021-final-results/react-1-study-of-coronavirus-transmission-june-2021-final-results)
- 386 28. NBC “Today” Show (June 22, 2021). “Dr. Anthony Fauci: Delta variant is the greatest threat
387 to eliminating COVID-19,” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Wqtc5HO-L9I> [Accessed
388 June 24, 2021.]