

Supplement: Mobility and COVID-19 Incidence During the Omicron Surge




Fig. A. Initial Sample of 112 U.S. Counties with Population ≥ 600,000. All counties are numbered in accordance with the legend below. State boundaries are indicated by the thicker black lines. Johnson County KS (45) was excluded due to missing data on transit mobility.

#	County	State	Pop (000)	#	County	State	Pop (000)	#	County	State	Pop (000)	#	County	State	Pop (000)
1	Alameda	CA	1,671	29	Essex	MA	789	57	Maricopa	AZ	4,485	85	Prince George's	MD	909
2	Allegheny	PA	1,216	30	Essex	NI	799	58	Marion	IN	965	86	Providence	RI	639
3	Arapahoe	CO	657	31	Fairfax	VA	1,148	59	Mecklenburg	NC	1,110	87	Queens	NY	2,254
4	Baltimore	MD	827	32	Fairfield	CT	943	60	Miami-Dade	FL	2,717	88	Riverside	CA	2,471
5	Bergen	NI	932	33	Fort Bend	TX	812	61	Middlesex	MA	1,612	89	Sacramento	CA	1,552
6	Bernalillo	NM	679	34	Franklin	OH	1,317	62	Middlesex	NI	825	90	Salt Lake	UT	1,160
7	Bexar	TX	2,004	35	Fresno	CA	999	63	Milwaukee	WI	946	91	San Bernardino	CA	2,180
8	Brevard	FL	602	36	Fulton	GA	1,064	64	Monmouth	NI	619	92	San Diego	CA	3,338
9	Bronx	NY	1,418	37	Gwinnett	GA	936	65	Monroe	NY	742	93	San Francisco	CA	882
10	Broward	FL	1,953	38	Hamilton	OH	817	66	Montgomery	MD	1,051	94	San Joaquin	CA	762
11	Bucks	PA	628	39	Harris	TX	4,713	67	Montgomery	PA	831	95	San Mateo	CA	767
12	Clark	NV	2,267	40	Hartford	CT	892	68	Montgomery	TX	607	96	Santa Clara	CA	1,928
13	Cobb	GA	760	41	Hennepin	MN	1,266	69	Multnomah	OR	813	97	Shelby	TN	937
14	Collin	TX	1,035	42	Hidalgo	TX	869	70	Nassau	NY	1,357	98	Snohomish	WA	822
15	Contra Costa	CA	1,154	43	Hillsborough	FL	1,472	71	New Haven	CT	855	99	St. Louis	MO	994
16	Cook	IL	5,150	44	Hudson	NI	672	72	New York	NY	1,629	100	Suffolk	MA	804
17	Cuyahoga	OH	1,235	45	Jackson	MO	703	73	Norfolk	MA	707	101	Suffolk	NY	1,477
18	Dallas	TX	2,636	46	Jefferson	AL	659	74	Oakland	MI	1,258	102	Tarrant	TX	2,103
19	Davidson	TN	694	47	Jefferson	KY	767	75	Ocean	NI	607	103	Travis	TX	1,274
20	DeKalb	GA	759	48	Johnson*	KS	602	76	Oklahoma	OK	797	104	Tulsa	OK	652
21	Denton	TX	887	49	Kent	MI	657	77	Orange	CA	3,176	105	Utah	UT	636
22	Denver	CO	727	50	Kern	CA	900	78	Orange	FL	1,393	106	Ventura	CA	846
23	Dist. Columbia	DC	706	51	King	WA	2,253	79	Palm Beach	FL	1,497	107	Wake	NC	1,112
24	DuPage	IL	923	52	Kings	NY	2,560	80	Philadelphia	PA	1,584	108	Washington	OR	602
25	Duval	FL	958	53	Lake	IL	697	81	Pierce	WA	905	109	Wayne	MI	1,749
26	El Paso	CO	720	54	Lee	FL	771	82	Pima	AZ	1,047	110	Westchester	NY	968
27	El Paso	TX	839	55	Los Angeles	CA	10,039	83	Pinellas	FL	975	111	Will	IL	691
28	Erie	NY	919	56	Macomb	MI	874	84	Polk	FL	725	112	Worcester	MA	831

Table A below displays the estimated coefficients ($\zeta_k, k = 1, \dots, 6$) derived from the principal component analysis of Google mobility measures. The Residential measure has a negative coefficient, as increases in visits and duration of stay at residences reflect a decrease in

mobility. Aside from the Parks mobility measure, all coefficients have approximately the same absolute values.

<i>Google Mobility Measure</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>Proportion Unexplained Variance</i>
Retail & Recreation	0.4701	0.095
Grocery & Pharmacy	0.4188	0.282
Parks	0.2037	0.830
Transit Stations	0.4183	0.284
Workplaces	0.4223	0.270
Residential	-0.4571	0.145

Table B shows the estimates of the parameters (β_t , $t = 2, \dots, 13$) of the fixed-effects model of equation (1). Parameter β_1 for the reference category was set equal to 1.

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>95% Confidence Interval</i>
β_2	-0.549	-14.315, 13.247
β_3	-2.816	-16.582, 10.950
β_4	-8.810	-22.575, 4.957
β_5	-20.146	-33.913, -6.380
β_6	-9.069	-22.835, 4.607
β_7	37.663	23.896, 51.429
β_8	17.331	3.573, 31.106
β_9	19.421	5.655, 33.188
β_{10}	16.537	2.771, 30.304
β_{11}	21.235	7.469, 35.001
β_{12}	12.777	-0.989, 26.543
β_{13}	11.500	-2.266, 25.266

*Total of 1,443 observations on 111 groups (13 observations per group). $R^2 = 0.673$.
Model estimated by ordinary least squares.

Table C below shows the results of our cross-section model of equation (2). Specification A includes only the county specific change in mobility (Δx) as a covariate. Specification B adds average household size as a covariate, while specification C includes the social vulnerability index and our two indicators of vaccination participation.

Table C. Estimated Parameters of the Cross-Sectional Model of Equation (2).*			
<i>Explanatory Variable</i>	<i>Specification A</i>	<i>Specification B</i>	<i>Specification C</i>
Change in Mobility Indicator (Δx)	0.0124 (0.0032)	0.0096 (0.0032)	0.0090 (0.0033)
Average Household Size		0.2830 (0.0904)	0.2524 (0.0972)
Social Vulnerability Index			0.1643 (0.1172)
Percent Vaccine Series Complete			0.0048 (0.0030)
Booster Doses per 100 Population			-0.0007 (0.0038)
Constant Term	2.2435 (0.0959)	1.3836 (0.2897)	1.0638 (0.3405)
R^2 statistic	0.1205	0.1937	0.2243
*In all specifications, the dependent variable was the logarithm of the cumulative case incidence per 100 population between the week ending January 10, 2022 ($t = 6$) and the week ending February 28, 2022 ($t = 13$) per 100 population. There was a total of 111 observations. All models estimated by population-weighted least squares. Highlighted in bold are parameter estimates significantly different from 0 (2-sided t-test, $p < 0.05$). Standard errors are shown in parentheses below each parameter estimate.			

Table D below shows estimates of the parameters of joint causation model (3). In Specification A, which tests the bivariate relation between Δy_i and the change in mobility indicator Δx_i , the estimated parameter λ was positive and significantly different from zero (2-sided t-test, $p < 0.001$). In Specification B, which tests the bivariate relation between Δy_i and the initial acceleration of cases Δy_i^A , the estimated parameter ξ was negative and significantly different from zero (2-sided t-test, $p = 0.001$). That is, early acceleration of the Omicron wave in a particular county was associated with subsequent early reversal of reported COVID-19 incidence by January 10, 2022 ($t = 7$). However, in Specification B, inclusion of both mobility indicator Δx_i and the initial acceleration of cases Δy_i^A had a minimal effect on the estimated parameter λ , which remained positive and significantly different from zero (2-sided t-test, $p = 0.001$). Moreover, the hypothesis that λ was no different from its estimated value in Specification A could not be rejected (2-sided F-test, $p = 0.534$).

<i>Explanatory Variable</i>	<i>Specification A</i>	<i>Specification B</i>	<i>Specification C</i>
Change in Mobility Indicator (Δx)	57.650 (9.769)		51.005 (9.230)
Acceleration of Incidence (Δy^A)		-0.6454 (0.1452)	-0.5348 (0.1298)
Constant Term	1675.274 (293.168)	432.321 (124.431)	1865.563 (277.660)
R^2 statistic	0.2421	0.1535	0.2243

*In all specifications, the dependent variable was the change in reported COVID-19 incidence per 100 population between the week ending January 10, 2022 ($t = 6$) and the week ending January 17, 2022 ($t = 7$). There was a total of 111 observations. All models estimated by population-weighted least squares. Highlighted in bold are parameter estimates significantly different from 0 (2-sided t-test, $p < 0.05$). Standard errors are shown in parentheses below each parameter estimate.




Fig. B. Change in Reported Incidence Between January 10 and January 17 (Δy) Versus Change in Mobility Between December 20 and January 3 (Δx). The size of each point reflects the county population. The line identified as Spec. A shows the population-weighted least squares fit to the data from Specification A in Table D. The line identified as Spec. C shows the corresponding fit from Specification C under the assumption that the initial acceleration (Δy^A) took on its population-weighted mean value. While Specification C resulted in a slightly lower slope, the null hypothesis of equal slopes could not be rejected ($p = 0.534$).

Fig. B shows a scatterplot underlying the results of Table D. The vertical axis measures Δy_i , that is, the change in reported COVID-19 incidence per 100 population between the week ending January 10, 2022 ($t = 6$) and the week ending January 17, 2022 ($t = 7$). The horizontal axis measures Δx_i , that is, the change in mobility between December 20 and January 3. The size of each data point reflects the county population size.

The two fitted lines represent the results of Specifications A and C. The line for Specification A plots the equation $\kappa + \lambda \Delta x_i$, based upon the estimated values of κ and λ . The line for Specification C plots the equation $\kappa + \lambda \Delta x_i + \xi \overline{\Delta y^A}$, based upon the estimated values of κ , λ , and ξ , where $\overline{\Delta y^A}$ represents the population-weighted mean value of the initial acceleration Δy_i^A across counties. We can see that the two estimated fitted lines are nearly indistinguishable, and in fact, the null hypothesis of equal slopes could not be rejected ($p = 0.534$).