

# 1 Disproportionate impacts of COVID-19 2 in a large US city

3 Spencer J. Fox<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Emily Javan<sup>4</sup>, Remy Pasco<sup>5</sup>, Graham C. Gibson<sup>6</sup>, Briana Betke<sup>4</sup>,  
4 José-Luis Herrera Diestra<sup>4</sup>, Spencer Woody<sup>4</sup>, Kelly Pierce<sup>7</sup>, Kaitlyn E. Johnson<sup>8</sup>,  
5 Maureen Johnson-León<sup>4</sup>, Michael Lachmann<sup>9</sup>, Lauren Ancel Meyers<sup>4,9</sup>

- 6  
7 1 - Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, University of Georgia  
8 2 - Institute of Bioinformatics, University of Georgia  
9 3 - Center for the Ecology of Infectious Diseases, University of Georgia  
10 4 - Department of Integrative Biology, The University of Texas at Austin  
11 5 - Department of Industrial Engineering, The University of Texas at Austin  
12 6 - Los Alamos National Laboratory  
13 7 - The Texas Advanced Computing Center, The University of Texas at Austin  
14 8 - The Rockefeller Foundation  
15 9 - The Santa Fe Institute

## 16 Abstract

17 COVID-19 has disproportionately impacted individuals depending on where they live and work,  
18 and based on their race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Studies have documented  
19 catastrophic disparities at critical points throughout the pandemic, but have not yet  
20 systematically tracked their severity through time. Using anonymized hospitalization data from  
21 March 11, 2020 to June 1, 2021, we estimate the time-varying burden of COVID-19 by age  
22 group and ZIP code in Austin, Texas. During this 15-month period, we estimate an overall  
23 16.9% (95% CrI: 16.1-17.8%) infection rate and 34.1% (95% CrI: 32.4-35.8%) case reporting  
24 rate. Individuals over 65 were less likely to be infected than younger age groups (8.0% [95%  
25 CrI: 7.5-8.6%] vs 18.1% [95% CrI: 17.2-19.2%]), but more likely to be hospitalized (1,381 per  
26 100,000 vs 319 per 100,000) and have their infections reported (51% [95% CrI: 48-55%] vs 33%  
27 [95% CrI: 31-35%]). Children under 18, who make up 20.3% of the local population, accounted  
28 for only 5.5% (95% CrI: 3.8-7.7%) of all infections between March 1 and May 1, 2020 compared  
29 with 20.4% (95% CrI: 17.3-23.9%) between December 1, 2020 and February 1, 2021. We  
30 compared ZIP codes ranking in the 75th percentile of vulnerability to those in the 25th  
31 percentile, and found that the more vulnerable communities had 2.5 (95% CrI: 2.0-3.0) times the  
32 infection rate and only 70% (95% CrI: 61%-82%) the reporting rate compared to the less  
33 vulnerable communities. Inequality persisted but declined significantly over the 15-month study  
34 period. For example, the ratio in infection rates between the more and less vulnerable  
35 communities declined from 12.3 (95% CrI: 8.8-17.1) to 4.0 (95% CrI: 3.0-5.3) to 2.7 (95% CrI:  
36 2.0-3.6), from April to August to December of 2020, respectively. Our results suggest that public  
37 health efforts to mitigate COVID-19 disparities were only partially effective and that the CDC's  
38 social vulnerability index may serve as a reliable predictor of risk on a local scale when  
39 surveillance data are limited.

## 40 Introduction

41 The WHO estimates that the COVID-19 pandemic caused nearly 15 million excess deaths  
42 worldwide between its emergence in 2019 and the end of 2021. The burden fell  
43 disproportionately on countries in South-East Asia, Europe, and the Americas, with 68% of the  
44 estimated excess deaths occurring in 10 countries containing 35% of the global population [1].  
45 In the United States, pandemic burden was initially concentrated around New York City, but  
46 spread geographically after the White House issued the *Opening Up America Again* guidelines  
47 in spring of 2020 [2]. The pandemic disproportionately harmed essential workers and racial and  
48 ethnic minority groups [3–6] as well as US counties [7–10] and cities [11–13] with high social  
49 vulnerability indices [14].

50  
51 In response to these glaring disparities, scientists and public health leaders advocated for  
52 programs to support marginalized communities, including accessible testing facilities,  
53 community support programs to mitigate the socioeconomic, educational and healthcare harms  
54 resulting from lockdowns, proactive vaccination and antiviral campaigns, and effective public  
55 health communications [15–21]. Some but not all US vaccination campaigns successfully  
56 prioritized vulnerable geographic regions [22–29].

57  
58 To prevent, detect, and reduce disparities in infectious disease burden, we need to increase the  
59 geographic and temporal resolution of our surveillance efforts, while reducing biases. Published  
60 estimates of COVID-19 burden in underserved populations are often derived directly from  
61 reported case or death counts, without correcting for ascertainment biases or disentangling risks  
62 of infection from risks of severe outcomes [7–9,30–40]. When available, both serological [41,42]  
63 and hospitalization data [43] can be used to estimate reporting rates. Several studies have  
64 highlighted the disproportionate burden of COVID-19 infections within cities [44,45], but only at  
65 single time points during the pandemic .

66  
67 Here, we estimate the changing burden of COVID-19 at a local scale within a large US city  
68 throughout the first 15 months of the pandemic. Using ZIP-code and age-stratified  
69 hospitalization data, we track daily disparities in infection rates, hospitalization rates, and case  
70 reporting rates. As the SARS-CoV-2 virus continues to evolve along with our arsenal of medical  
71 and behavioral interventions, this method can help to ensure the reliability and equity of local  
72 risk assessments [46].

## 73 Methods

74 We estimate the daily age-stratified numbers of infections for each of the 46 ZIP codes in  
75 Austin, Texas from hospital list data provided by the three major local healthcare systems to  
76 Austin Public Health [47]. As described below, we first estimate age-specific infection  
77 hospitalization rates (IHRs) from state-wide COVID-19 hospitalization data and SARS-CoV-2  
78 seroprevalence data and then use the IHR estimates to infer time series of infections by age  
79 group and ZIP code using a deconvolution method similar to ref. [44].

## 80 Estimating Texas statewide infection hospitalization rates (IHRs)

81 We analyzed age-stratified statewide COVID-19 hospitalization data [48] and statewide SARS-  
82 CoV-2 antibody seroprevalence data [49] to estimate the statewide infection hospitalization rate  
83 by age. Specifically, we estimate IHR for age group,  $k$ , across the state of Texas ( $\mu_{k,state}$ ) as:

$$\mu_{k,state} = \frac{\sum_{t=t_0}^{t_1} H_{k,state}(t+11)}{NI_{k,state}(t_1 - t_0)}$$

84  
85

86 where  $t$  contains all dates between  $t_0$  (July 29, 2020) and  $t_1$  (May 27, 2021),  $H_{k,state}(t+11)$   
87 corresponds to all reported hospitalizations in age group  $k$  on day  $t+11$  to account for the delay  
88 between infection and hospitalization [50,51], and  $NI_{k,state}$  corresponds to the CDC's estimated  
89 infections for Texas between the two dates [52] estimated as:

90

$$NI_{k,state} \sim \mathcal{N}(I_{k,state}(t_1) - I_{k,state}(t_0), \sigma_{k,state}^2(t_0) + \sigma_{k,state}^2(t_1))$$

91  
92

93 where  $\sigma_{k,state}^2(t) = \left( \frac{\max\{I_{k,state,97.5\%}(t) - I_{k,state,mean}(t), I_{k,state,mean}(t) - I_{k,state,2.5\%}(t)\}}{1.96} \right)^2$

94 and corresponds to the variance of estimated infections at time  $t$  [52]. We aggregated hospital  
95 admission data, which are stratified into 0-17, 18-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, 70-79,  
96 and 80+ year age groups, to match the stratification of the seroprevalence data (0-17, 18-49,  
97 50-64, and 65+ years). For bins that do not align, we divided admissions evenly across years  
98 within a bin.

## 99 ZIP- and age-specific infection hospitalization rates (IHRs)

100 Infection hospitalization rates depend on the underlying demographic makeup of a population  
101 [53]. To estimate age- and ZIP-specific IHRs from the statewide averages estimated above, we  
102 assumed that risk differences between ZIP codes could be captured by the proportion of the  
103 population estimated to be at high risk for severe COVID-19. We used a published methodology  
104 to estimate the proportion of the population at high risk for severe COVID-19 outcomes using  
105 data available from CDC's PLACES for each ZIP code and the state on average [5,54-56]. We  
106 converted the statewide age-specific IHRs to ZIP-specific ones as:

107

$$\mu_{k,z} = \rho_{k,z} \cdot \mu_{k,state,hr} + (1 - \rho_{k,z}) \cdot \mu_{k,state,lr}$$

108  
109

110 where  $\mu_{k,z}$  is the infection hospitalization rate for age group,  $k$ , and ZIP code  $z$ ,  $\rho_{k,z}$  is the  
111 estimated age and ZIP code proportion of the population at high risk, and  $\mu_{k,state,hr}$  and  $\mu_{k,state,lr}$   
112 are the statewide estimated age-specific IHRs for those at high and low risk to severe COVID-  
113 19 outcomes respectively. We assume a fixed hospitalization risk ratio between low and high  
114 risk individuals,  $\mu_{k,state,hr} = \eta_k \cdot \mu_{k,state,lr}$ , where  $\eta_k$  is the age-specific hospitalization risk ratio  
115 estimated in [57]. For example, high risk individuals in the 20-24 and 75+ age groups are  
116 estimated to have 6.5 and 2.2 times the hospitalization risk respectively compared with low risk  
117 individuals in the same age group (Table S1). We then estimate  $\mu_{k,state,lr}$  and  $\mu_{k,state,hr}$  as:

118

119  
120  
121

$$\mu_{k,state,lr} = \frac{\mu_{k,state}}{(\eta_k - 1) \cdot \rho_{k,state} + 1}$$

$$\mu_{k,state,lr} = \eta_k \cdot \mu_{k,state}$$

122 where  $\mu_{k,state}$  is the previously estimated statewide age-specific IHR, and  $\rho_{k,state}$  is the  
123 statewide age-specific estimate for the proportion of the population at high risk for severe  
124 COVID-19. We then estimate  $\mu_{k,z}$  across Travis County using age- and ZIP-specific estimates  
125 for the proportion of the population at high risk for COVID-19. Confidence intervals for  $\mu_{k,z}$  are  
126 derived by propagating the estimated uncertainty from the age-specific statewide IHRs.

## 127 Age- and ZIP code- specific infection estimates

128 The posterior distribution for infections ( $I_{k,z}$ ) in a specific age group ( $k$ ) and ZIP code ( $z$ ) was  
129 estimated as:

130

$$p(I_{k,z} | H_{k,z}, \mu_{k,z}) \propto p(H_{k,z} | I_{k,z}, \mu_{k,z}) \cdot p(I_{k,z}) \cdot p(\mu_{k,z})$$

131  
132

133 where  $I_{k,z}$  indicates the total infection count,  $H_{k,z}$  is the reported hospital admissions, and  $\mu_{k,z}$   
134 is the age- and ZIP-specific IHR. Hospitalizations were assumed to be a binomial sample of the  
135 total infections governed by  $\mu_{k,z}$ ,  $\mu_{k,z}$  is assumed to follow a beta distribution, and  $I_{k,z}$  follows a  
136 uniform discrete prior between the age- and ZIP-specific hospitalization count  $H_{k,z}$  and  
137 population  $N_{k,z}$ .

138

$$p(\mu_{k,z}) \sim \text{beta}(a_{k,z}, b_{k,z})$$

$$p(I_{k,z}) \sim \text{unif}(H_{k,z}, N_{k,z})$$

$$p(H_{k,z} | I_{k,z}, \mu_{k,z}) \sim \text{binom}(I_{k,z}, \mu_{k,z})$$

139  
140  
141  
142

143 We estimate the parameters for the informative prior beta distribution,  $a_{k,z}$  and  $b_{k,z}$ , using the  
144 ZIP and age-specific IHR estimates estimated from seroprevalence data in the previous section.  
145 Specifically we use the equation:

146

$$a_{k,z} = \frac{b_{k,z} \cdot \mu_{k,z,mean}}{1 - \mu_{k,z,mean}}$$

147  
148

149 and identify the value of  $b_{k,z}$  that minimizes the difference between  $\mu_{k,z,2.5\%}$  and the 2.5th  
150 percentile of the resulting beta distribution,  $\text{beta}(a_{k,z}, b_{k,z})$ . In essence, we estimate the shape  
151 parameters of a beta distribution that match the mean and lower bound estimate of the IHR. We  
152 used JAGS to sample 1,000 draws from  $p(I_{k,z} | H_{k,z}, \mu_{k,z})$  across four chains thinning every two  
153 samples and with a 200 sample burn-in period [58]. Throughout the paper we summarize the  
154 posterior distributions using their mean and 95% credible intervals.

155

156 We created a distribution of the time-series of infections from the 1,000 samples of  
157  $p(I_{k,z} | H_{k,z}, \mu_{k,z})$  through the hospital admission timing and the delay distribution between

158 infection and hospital admissions. Specifically, we fit a gamma distribution to the combined  
159 distribution derived from the time to symptom onset estimated in [50] and the time between  
160 symptom onset and hospital admission estimated in [51]. The combined distribution is estimated  
161 as  $\Gamma(\text{shape} = 2.99, \text{rate} = 0.27)$ . For each infection in  $I_{k,z}$ , we draw a hospitalization timing  
162 from  $H_{k,z}(t)$ , the number of hospitalizations in an age- and ZIP code group on day  $t$  and assign  
163 an infection time from the estimated gamma distribution similar to the deconvolution method  
164 used in [44] without necessitating a smoothing function for the infection time-series. For age and  
165 ZIP code groups that had estimated infections but zero reported hospitalizations, we drew the  
166 infection timing from the full hospitalization time-series,  $H(t)$ , where  $H(t) = \sum(H_{k,z}(t))$  for  
167 day,  $t$ , summed across all age groups and ZIP codes.

## 168 Reporting rate estimates

169 We assumed reported cases are distributed binomially as given by

170

$$171 \quad p(C_j) \sim \text{binom}(I_j, r_j)$$

172

173 where  $j$  describes the specific subgroup of interest (age group,  $k$ , and/or ZIP code,  $z$ ) for a  
174 specified time period,  $I_j$  is the estimated infections, and  $r_j$  is the estimated reporting rate.

175 Assuming a uniform beta prior distribution on the reporting rate, the posterior for  $r_j$  can be  
176 calculated as:

177

$$178 \quad p(r_j | I_j, C_j) \sim \text{beta}(1 + C_j, 1 + I_j - C_j)$$

179

180 We estimated overall and subgroup reporting rates for the full study period through June 1,  
181 2021 using cumulative age-specific case counts for Travis County [59] as well as ZIP code  
182 specific counts provided by Austin Public Health (APH) [60]. Separately, we estimated the age-  
183 and ZIP-specific reporting rates from a subset of testing data provided to us directly from Austin  
184 Public Health, which included 60% of reported cases in Travis County during the time period.  
185 Similar to the seroprevalence analysis, we lagged reported cases by 11 days to account for  
186 infection reporting delays [61,62].

## 187 Infection estimate validation

188 To estimate how well our infection time-series approximate true infection rates in Travis county,  
189 we compare them to seroprevalence data for Texas estimated by the CDC [52] Regions in  
190 Texas faced different infection rates, so we adjusted Texas statewide seroprevalence estimates  
191 to Travis County as:

192

$$193 \quad SI_{Travis}(t) = SI_{Texas}(t) \cdot \frac{d_{Travis}(t)}{d_{Texas}(t)}$$

194

194

195 Where  $SI_{Texas}(t)$  is the seroprevalence infection estimate for Texas at time  $t$  corrected for the  
196 delay in antibody positivity [52],  $d_{Travis}(t)$  and  $d_{Texas}(t)$  refer to the cumulative reported deaths  
197 in Travis County and Texas corrected by 20 days to account for the delay between infection  
198 onset and mortality [63].

## 199 Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) as a predictor

200 The CDC's Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) is a single indicator based on 15 different American  
201 Community Survey (ACS) variables that estimate a community's ability to withstand  
202 environmental, biological and other stressors [14]. SVI values are given at the level of census  
203 tract as percentile ranks (range 0.0-1.0) within each state based on the 2014-2018 5-year ACS.  
204 For example, an SVI of 0.6 indicates that a census tract is more vulnerable than 60% of other  
205 census tracts in the state. Following [64], we aggregated SVI to ZIP codes using weighted  
206 averages based on the percent of residential addresses in a ZIP code that fall in each census  
207 tract [65].

208  
209 We estimated the impact of SVI on infection and reporting rates using a mixed effect poisson  
210 regression model using the lme4 R package [66]. For estimating the impact of SVI on infection  
211 rates the model can be described as:

$$212 \quad I_{z,i} \sim \text{Pois}(\exp(\beta_1 \cdot SVI_z + \beta_0 + \pi_z))$$

213  
214  
215 Where  $I_{z,i}$  is the  $i$ th infection estimate sample estimated for ZIP code,  $z$ ,  $SVI_z$  is the ZIP codes'  
216 SVI,  $\pi_z$  is the ZIP code level random effect,  $\beta_1$  is the fixed effect of SVI on infections, and  $\beta_0$  is  
217 an intercept term. We use the ZIP code population as an offset in the model to standardize  
218 infection rates. For estimating the impact of SVI on reporting rates the model can be described  
219 as:

$$220 \quad C_z \sim \text{Pois}(\exp(\beta_1 \cdot SVI_z + \beta_0 + \pi_z))$$

221  
222  
223 where  $C_z$  is the reported case count for ZIP code,  $z$ ,  $SVI_z$  is the ZIP codes's SVI,  $\pi_z$  is the ZIP  
224 code level random effect,  $\beta_1$  is the fixed effect of SVI on cases, and  $\beta_0$  is an intercept. We use  
225 the 1,000 ZIP code infection estimate samples as an offset in the model to standardize reporting  
226 rates. For the age and ZIP code-stratified analysis we also include an interaction term between  
227 age and SVI, so the equations become:

$$228 \quad I_{k,z,i} \sim \text{Pois}(\exp(\beta_{k,1} \cdot SVI_z + \beta_0 + \pi_z))$$
$$229 \quad C_{k,z} \sim \text{Pois}(\exp(\beta_{k,1} \cdot SVI_z + \beta_0 + \pi_z))$$

230  
231  
232 where  $I_{k,z,i}$  is the  $i$ th infection estimate sample in age group,  $k$  for ZIP code,  $z$ ,  $C_{k,z}$  is the  
233 reported cases in age group,  $k$  for ZIP code,  $z$ , and  $\beta_{k,1}$  is the SVI regression coefficient for age  
234 group,  $k$ . For the infection and reporting rate models we use the age- and ZIP- population and  
235 infection estimates as an offset respectively.



236

237 The SVI regression coefficients,  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_{k,1}$ , can be interpreted as inequality metrics, quantifying  
238 the relative infection and reporting risks as a function of SVI. Because there are no ZIP codes  
239 with a value of 0 or 1 for SVI in our sample, we report the relative infection and reporting rates  
240 between ZIP codes in the 25th and 75th percentile in Travis County throughout the manuscript.

## 241 Results

242 We analyzed spatial COVID-19 burdens in Austin, Texas using hospital admission data from  
243 March 11, 2020 to June 1, 2021. This period preceded the emergence of the Delta variant and  
244 included a small wave in April 2020, followed by larger waves in the summer and winter (Figure  
245 1A). As of June 1, 2021, there were 83,722 reported cases, 6,474 hospitalized patients, and  
246 1,024 deaths of COVID-19 in Travis County, which has 1.3 million residents, covering 57% of  
247 the Austin metropolitan area population. We estimate that 16.9% (95% CrI: 16.1-17.8%) of the  
248 population were infected in this time period and 34.1% (95% CrI: 32.4-35.8%) of all infections  
249 were reported. These estimates are consistent with the CDC's official seroprevalence estimates  
250 (Figure 1B).

251 Statewide, we estimate that one in 435 (95% CI: 244-625) infections in individuals aged 0-17  
252 years and one in 4.9 (95% CI: 3.0-6.8) infections in individuals over age 65 led to hospitalization  
253 (Table 1). This is consistent with published estimates from China [67] and France [43] (Figure  
254 S2). In Travis County, children aged 0-17 experienced the lowest hospitalization rate, with 50.3  
255 hospital admissions per 100,000, and adults over age 65 experienced the highest  
256 hospitalization rate of 1,381 per 100,000 (Figure 2A). In contrast, reported cases were relatively  
257 similar across age groups, ranging from 3,793 per 100,000 in children to 7,159 per 100,000 in  
258 young adults (Figure 2B).


259 **Table 1: SARS-CoV-2 infection hospitalization rate (IHR) across Texas estimated from**  
260 **statewide seroprevalence and hospitalization data from July 29, 2020 through May 27,**  
261 **2021.**

Age group	Number of COVID-19 hospital admissions [48]	Estimated infections based on seroprevalence data (95% CI) [49,52]	Estimated IHR (95% CI)
0-17	4,868	2,076,780 (1,183,462-2,970,098)	0.23% (0.16%-0.41%)
18-49	67,708	3,784,332 (2,842,976-4,725,687)	1.79% (1.43%-2.38%)
50-64	58,375	1,084,993 (708,561-1,461,425)	5.38% (3.99%-8.24%)
65+	100,671	495,141 (301,983-688,299)	20.33% (14.63%-33.34%)

262 By June 1, 2021, we estimate that 19.3% (95% CrI: 18.1-20.6%) of 18-49 year olds were  
263 infected, while only 8.0% (95% CrI: 7.5-8.6%) of individuals over age 65 were infected (Figure

264 2C). The estimated percent of cases reported increases with age, ranging from 23.4% (95% CrI:  
265 20.1-27.3%) in 0-17 year olds to 51.3% (95% CrI: 47.7-54.9%) in over 65 year olds (Figure 2D).

266




267 **Figure 1: COVID-19 hospital admissions and estimated cumulative infections for Travis**  
268 **County (Austin, TX) from March 1, 2020 to June 1, 2021. (A) Daily reported COVID-19**  
269 **hospital admissions per 1 million residents [68]. (B) Estimated cumulative infections with 95%**  
270 **credible intervals (black line and gray ribbon) compared to prior seroprevalence-based**  
271 **estimates (red points and error bars) [69].**  
272  
273

274 All age groups experienced two large waves during the study period, though the summer 2020  
275 was relatively mild for children (Figure 2E). Relative infection rates across age groups evened  
276 out over time (Figure 2F). For example, children, who account for 20.3% of the Travis county  
277 population, constituted 5.5% (95% CrI: 3.8-7.7%) of all infections between March 1, 2020 and  
278 May 1, 2020 and 20.4% (95% CrI: 17.3-23.9%) of all infections between December 1, 2020 and  
279 February 1, 2021. The proportion of infections occurring in 18-49 year olds, who make up 51.2%  
280 of the population, dropped from 69.1% (95% CrI: 66.5-71.6%) during the spring 2020 period to  
281 51.3% (95% CrI: 48.4-54.0%) during the winter 2020-2021 wave (Figure 2F and S3). Reported  
282 case and hospitalization counts do not clearly exhibit this reversal in age-specific risks (Figure  
283 S4 and S5).

284  
285  
286






287  
 288 **Figure 2. Estimated age-stratified COVID-19 burden in Travis country through June 1,**  
 289 **2021.** (A) Reported COVID-19 hospital admissions by age group. (B) Reported COVID-19  
 290 cases by age group. (C) Estimated percent infected by age group. (D) Estimated COVID-19  
 291 case reporting rates by age group up to June 1, 2021. In (A)-(D), horizontal dashed lines  
 292 indicate county-wide average rates. (E) Estimated daily infection rates (line) and 95% credible  
 293 intervals (ribbons) by age group. (F) Distribution of infections across age groups for each period  
 294 of the epidemic. The spring period refers to the two-month time period before the first major  
 295 wave from March 1, 2020 to May 1, 2020, the summer period refers to the two-month period  
 296 containing the first major wave from June 1, 2020 to August 1, 2020, and the winter period  
 297 refers to the two-month period containing the second major wave from December 1, 2020 until  
 298 February 1, 2021. Bars indicate the fraction of all infections during the time period in each Age  
 299 group, with the error bars indicating the 95% credible intervals. The horizontal colored lines in  
 300 panel F indicate the proportion of the Travis county population in the specified age group.

301

302 Estimated COVID-19 burden varies significantly across ZIP codes within Travis County, with  
 303 Interstate 35 roughly partitioning the county into high risk ZIP codes in the East and low risk ZIP  
 304 codes in the West (Figure 3A and 3B). High COVID-19 risk visibly aligns with high social  
 305 vulnerability, as measured by ZIP-code level SVI (Figure 3C). Our estimates for ZIP-code level  
 306 infection hospitalization rates exhibit the opposite geographic trend (Figure 3D) from the  
 307 absolute hospitalization rates (Figure S6). We estimate that downtown Austin (78701) had the  
 308 highest infection rate and lowest reporting rate of any ZIP code, with an estimated 39.2% (95%  
 309 CrI: 29.6-50.2%) of the ZIP code infected and only 18% (95% CrI: 14-23%) of infections  
 310 reported (Figure 3E-3F). In contrast, a Southwest Austin ZIP code (78739) had the lowest  
 311 estimated infection rate of 4.8% (95% CrI: 2.6-8.5%), and a West Austin ZIP code (78732) had  
 312 the highest reporting rate of 69% (95% CrI: 39-97%). Similar geographic patterns exist for each  
 313 of the four age groups (Figure S7-S8).

314



315  
316 **Figure 3. Reported and estimated COVID-19 burden by ZIP code for Travis County**  
317 **between March 1, 2020 and June 1, 2021.** (A) Reported COVID-19 cases per 100,000. (B)  
318 Reported COVID-19 hospitalizations per 100,000. (C) Social Vulnerability Index [14] (D)  
319 Estimated infection hospitalization rate (IHR). (E) Estimated cumulative infections as of. (F)  
320 Estimated percent of COVID-19 infections that were reported. Thin black curves indicate  
321 Interstate 35 and highway US 183.

322 The cumulative infection rates, case rates, and hospitalization rates are positively correlated  
323 with social vulnerability across Travis County's 46 ZIP codes (Figure 4A, Figure S9). We  
324 compare the relative risks for individuals living in a ZIP code at Travis County's 25th (SVI= 0.12)  
325 and 75th (SVI = 0.5) percentile by SVI, where higher SVI indicates higher social vulnerability.  
326 Controlling for random ZIP code-level effects, we estimate that ZIP codes in the 75th SVI  
327 percentile experienced 2.5 (95% CrI: 2.0-3.0) times the infection rate of those in the 25th  
328 percentile. Similar trends are observed for each age group, with all relationships estimated to be  
329 statistically significant (Figure S10, Table S2). COVID-19 burden is often estimated directly from

330 reported case or hospitalization data, without correcting for geographic biases in testing and  
331 underlying risk factors. For Travis county, we find that the subset of case data from APH  
332 provides a reasonable approximation but hospitalization data tends to inflate the estimated  
333 disparities (Table S2). We aggregate the estimated number of infections occurring in each ZIP  
334 code into four-week periods from March 1, 2020 to June 1, 2021, and measure the relationship  
335 between SVI and the relative infection risk during this period. Significant disparity (i.e., a relative  
336 risk greater than one) persisted throughout the period and was highest during the first three  
337 months of the pandemic (Figure 4B). In April 2020, individuals living in the 75th SVI percentile  
338 ZIP code had an expected 12.3 (95% CrI: 8.8-17.1) times greater infection risk than those living  
339 in the 25th percentile SVI ZIP code. This ratio declined to 4.0 (95% CrI: 3.0-5.3) in August 2020  
340 and to 2.7 (95% CrI: 2.0-3.6) in December 2020.

341 COVID-19 case reporting rates are negatively correlated with social vulnerability. We estimate  
342 that infections occurring in the 75th SVI percentile ZIP code were only 70% (95% CrI: 61%-  
343 82%) as likely to have been reported than those occurring in the 25th SVI percentile ZIP code.  
344 We further stratified by age group using a small sample of age-specific case data reported by  
345 the Austin Public Health community testing programs, which targeted vulnerable populations in  
346 East Austin (Figure S12) [70]. We found that the negative correlation between SVI and case  
347 reporting rates held for all age groups except those over 65 years, perhaps because of Austin's  
348 efforts to improve testing access for high risk individuals (Figure S11, Table S2). Throughout the  
349 study period, the estimated ratio in reporting rates between the 75th and 25th SVI percentile ZIP  
350 codes fluctuated, often dropping to levels significantly less than one (Figure 4D).

351


352

353

354

355

356



357  
358 **Figure 4. Infection and reporting rates correlate with social vulnerability in Travis County**  
359 **from March 1, 2020 to June 1, 2021.** (A) Across the 46 ZIP codes, SVI is a significant  
360 predictor of estimated cumulative infections ( $p < 0.001$ ). The blue line and ribbon indicate the  
361 mean and 95% prediction interval from the fitted Poisson mixed-effects model. (B) Using the  
362 fitted model, we compare the expected infection rates among more and less vulnerable ZIP  
363 codes (specifically, ZIP codes at the 75th and 25th percentiles in the SVI distribution,  
364 respectively). The points indicate the expected ratio between these two values calculated using  
365 the estimated SVI regression coefficient from the 4-week time period; error bars indicate 95%  
366 CI's. (C) Across the 46 ZIP codes, SVI is a significant predictor of estimated case reporting  
367 rates ( $p < 0.001$ ). The blue line and ribbon indicate the mean and 95% prediction interval from  
368 the fitted Poisson mixed-effects model. (D) Four week estimate for the inequality relationship  
369 between SVI and infection reporting rates across the 46 ZIP codes. Points and error bars show  
370 the mean and 95% CI for the relative reporting rate of individuals living in ZIP codes in the 75th  
371 SVI percentile compared with those living in the 25th SVI percentile. The red, horizontal dashed  
372 lines in B and D indicate if there were equitable infection risks or reporting rates across the 75th  
373 and 25th SVI percentile ZIP codes in the four week period. We overlay hospital admission time-  
374 series in B and D to showcase how inequality estimates compare with the progression of the  
375 local epidemic. For the final period (purple points and error bars), we removed the 10% of ZIP  
376 codes reporting zero infections to stabilize our regression estimates.

## 377 Discussion

378 In the US, the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic disproportionately harmed essential  
379 workers [5,6], residents of long-term care facilities [71], racial and ethnic minority populations  
380 [72], and socially vulnerable neighborhoods within cities [31,44,73,74]. Public health agencies  
381 and government officials have tried to address these disparities through targeted testing,  
382 vaccination, distribution of personal protective equipment, information campaigns, and paid sick  
383 leave [15–19]. Using a new method for inferring infection risks and reporting rates from COVID-



384 19 hospital admissions data, we demonstrate that disparities persist on a granular scale within a  
385 large US city throughout the first year of the pandemic.

386 Our estimates for the spatial burden of COVID-19 in Austin, Texas suggest that children  
387 were less likely to be infected than adults under age 65 during the first major wave of  
388 transmission in the summer of 2020 but not during the subsequent winter wave. This is  
389 consistent with prior estimates [53,75–77] and may be attributable to early school closures, strict  
390 compliance with social distancing measures [78], or the emergence of variants that more  
391 efficiently infect children [79,80]. We also find that individuals over age 65 generally had the  
392 lowest risks of infection, despite suffering the highest per capita hospitalization rate, which may  
393 stem from heightened precautionary behavior and other protective measures such as COVID-19  
394 screening in long-term care facilities [81]. Our age-stratified estimates of cumulative SARS-CoV-  
395 2 incidence are generally consistent with those derived from seroprevalence data [49].  
396 Reporting rates were lowest in children and highest in older adults (Figure 2), which may stem  
397 from the positive correlation between age and symptom severity [75].

398 Historically marginalized populations in the “Eastern Crescent” of Austin were  
399 disproportionately harmed throughout the first year of the pandemic [82,83], mirroring disparities  
400 reported for Santiago, Chile and New York City [44,45,73]. After controlling for the higher  
401 prevalence of underlying risk factors in more vulnerable communities, we find that the ZIP codes  
402 ranking in the 75th percentile of social vulnerability had a more than twofold higher infection rate  
403 and a roughly 70% the case reporting rate than those ranking in the 25th percentile. Our  
404 estimates for inequity in infection risk are significantly lower than those from raw hospitalization  
405 rates, which do not account for variation in the prevalence of comorbidities. The estimated ratio  
406 in infection risk between more and less vulnerable regions decreased significantly during the  
407 first four months of the pandemic, perhaps because of local efforts to increase access to SARS-  
408 CoV-2 testing, isolation facilities, critical health information, and eventually vaccines [84]. The  
409 apparent decrease in disparity may also stem from higher infection rates in vulnerable  
410 populations leading to a more rapid buildup of immunity or relatively higher infection rates in  
411 less vulnerable areas during later time periods [85,86]. As of June of 2021, however, there  
412 remained a significant gap in COVID-19 risks and burden which informed targeted efforts by  
413 Austin Public Health to increase access to tests, vaccines, information and COVID-19  
414 healthcare.

415 We note several assumptions of analysis. First, the hospital admission data are limited  
416 by the accuracy of patient ZIP codes. Fewer than 1% of patients had unknown addresses.  
417 However, the missing data may correspond to vulnerable subgroups, such as people  
418 experiencing homelessness or undocumented residents, and thus obscure critical geographic or  
419 socioeconomic hotspots in our analysis. Second, we estimated each age- and ZIP-specific  
420 group independently rather than combining information across groups. This increases the  
421 uncertainty of our estimates but avoids the challenge of incorporating the changing contact and  
422 mobility patterns within the city throughout the pandemic [87–89]. Third, although we conducted  
423 analyses at a higher spatial resolution than most prior studies of COVID-19 burden, disparities  
424 in risk often occur at even more local scale [90]. Achieving COVID-19 health equity will require  
425 more granular surveillance and risk mitigation approaches. Finally, since we restricted our  
426 analysis to the first year of the pandemic, prior to the emergence of the Delta variant, we made  
427 the simplifying assumption that the infection hospitalization rates remained constant. Any

428 estimates beyond this period would have to account for changes in severity resulting from the  
429 build up of vaccine-acquired and infection-acquired immunity and the evolution of the virus.

430 We estimate that less than 20% of the Austin, Texas population was infected by SARS-  
431 CoV-2 prior to June 1, 2021 and that vulnerable communities in East Austin bore the brunt of  
432 the first two large waves of transmission. Our study introduces a framework for tracking infection  
433 and reporting rates on a granular scale using hospitalization data and provides evidence that  
434 the CDC's social vulnerability index (SVI) is a strong predictor of risk that can inform targeted  
435 interventions.


436  
437  
438  
439

## 440 Supplemental Information

441 **Table S1: Relative hospitalization rates for high risk individuals compared with low risk**  
442 **individuals from [57].**

Age group	Relative hospitalization risk for high risk individuals
0-0.5y	6.03
0.5-4y	6.03
5-9y	6.03
10-14y	6.48
15-19y	6.48
20-24y	6.48
25-29y	6.48
30-34y	5.5
35-39y	5.5
40-44y	4.625
45-49y	4.625
50-54y	3.78
55-59y	3.78
60-64y	3.24
65-69y	3.24
70-74y	2.32
75y+	2.19






443

444 **Figure S1: Daily COVID-19 burden estimates for Travis County, Texas from March 1, 2020**  
445 **until June 1, 2021.** Daily new reported case (A) and mortality (B) counts as reported by the  
446 New York Times for Travis County, Texas [59].

447




448  
449 **Figure S2: Comparison of age-dependent estimates for infection-hospitalization rates.**  
450 Age-stratified estimates of the risk of severe COVID-19 (defined as risk for hospitalization) from  
451 China [67], France [43].

452

453


454

455



456


457 **Figure S3: Weekly estimated relative infection rates from March 1, 2020 until June 1, 2021**  
458 **across age groups.** Points and error bars indicate the median and 95% confidence interval for  
459 the weekly infection rate with the size of the population. Values of 1 (horizontal dashed line)  
460 indicate that the fraction of the infections occurring that week equals the population fraction for  
461 the specific age group, while values below or above one indicate the age group faced  
462 disproportionately low or high infection risk respectively during that week. Only the 65+ age  
463 group consistently experienced disproportionately low infection rates compared with their  
464 population size over the whole pandemic.



465


466 **Figure S4: Reported 7-day average of case counts by age group from April 22, 2020 until**  
467 **May 28, 2021.** Daily reported cases counts for each age group provided by Austin Public Health  
468 [60].

469




470

471 **Figure S5: Reported hospital admissions by age group from March 1, 2020 until June 1,**  
472 **2021. Age-specific admission data provided by Austin Public Health.**



473


474 **Figure S6: Estimated ZIP code and age-specific IHR for each ZIP code in Travis County.**  
475 Infection hospitalization rates derived from Texas-specific estimates (Table 1) using population  
476 risk estimation methodology for each age group as detailed in [5,54,55].  
477



478

479 **Figure S7: Cumulative infection estimates for each ZIP code and age group in Travis**  
480 **County using hospitalization data up to June 1, 2021.**

481



482  
483 **Figure S8: Cumulative estimated reporting rate for each ZIP code and age group in Travis**  
484 **County using reported case data up to June 1, 2021.** Testing data used for reporting rates  
485 are only a subset of all tests performed, as age and ZIP code stratified data were only available  
486 for Austin Public Health administered tests.  
487


488

489

490

491






492

493 **Figure S9: Reported case and hospitalization counts correlate with social vulnerability in**  
494 **Travis County from March 1, 2020 to June 1, 2021.** (A) Across the 46 ZIP codes, SVI is a  
495 significant predictor of reported case counts ( $p < 0.001$ ). The blue line and ribbon indicate the  
496 mean and 95% prediction interval from the fitted Poisson mixed-effects model. (B) Across the  
497 46 ZIP codes, SVI is a significant predictor of reported hospitalization counts ( $p < 0.001$ ). The  
498 blue line and ribbon indicate the mean and 95% prediction interval from the fitted Poisson  
499 mixed-effects model.

500

501

502



503

504 **Figure S10: Estimated infection rates correlate with social vulnerability in Travis County**  
505 **from March 1, 2020 to June 1, 2021 across all age groups.** Across the 46 ZIP codes, SVI is a  
506 significant predictor of reported case counts for every age group ( $p < 0.05$ , Table S2). Estimated  
507 age-specific SVI relationships from the poisson mixed effects regression model are shown in the  
508 blue line (mean) and blue ribbon (95% confidence interval).

509

510

511

512

513


514

515 **Table S2: Comparison of age-stratified risk ratio between more vulnerable (75th SVI**  
 516 **percentile) and less vulnerable (25th SVI percentile) ZIP codes for Travis county, from**  
 517 **March 1, 2020 to June 1, 2021.** Estimates based on reported COVID-19 hospitalizations are  
 518 consistently higher than those based on model-derived estimates of ZIP-code level infection  
 519 rates and observed COVID-19 case rates.

	Source of estimate			
	Estimated COVID-19 reporting rates	Observed COVID-19 case rates	Estimated COVID-19 infection rates	Observed COVID-19 hospitalizations
0-17y	0.98 (0.90-1.036)	1.9 (1.6-2.2)*	2.0 (1.9-2.1)*	3.8 (2.6-5.5)*
18-49y	0.88 (0.81-0.95)*	2.3 (1.9-2.7)*	2.5 (2.45-2.6)*	3.2 (1.9-5.2)*
50-64y	1.02 (0.94-1.11)	3.1 (2.6-3.6)*	2.95 (2.9-3.0)*	3.7 (2.2-6.0)*
65y+	1.26 (1.17-1.37)*	2.8 (2.3-3.3)*	2.11 (2.0-2.2)*	2.5 (1.5-3.9)*


\* Statistically significant (p<0.05)

520  
 521  
 522



523  
524 **Figure S11: Estimated reporting rates correlate with social vulnerability in Travis County**  
525 **from March 1, 2020 to June 1, 2021.** Across the 46 ZIP codes, SVI is a significant predictor of  
526 infection reporting rates for the 18-49 and 65+ age groups, with negative relationships estimated  
527 for all but the 65+ age group (Table S2). The blue line and ribbon indicate the mean and 95%  
528 prediction interval from the fitted Poisson mixed-effects model.

529  
530



531

532 **Figure S12: Observed biases in the subset of reported case data stratified by age and ZIP**  
533 **code.** (A) Fraction of all reported cases included in the subset of age- and ZIP-code stratified  
534 data collected through Austin Public Health's community testing programs by ZIP code. Overall,  
535 the data set covers 60% of all reported cases, but the data set, which does not include all cases  
536 identified by private testing sites, has high levels of coverage in the vulnerable ZIP codes of  
537 East Austin. (B) Reported case coverage from the dataset correlates positively with SVI. Blue  
538 line indicates the mean of a fitted linear regression model.

539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561

## 562 References

- 563 1. 14.9 million excess deaths associated with the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 and 2021.  
564 [cited 17 Jun 2022]. Available: [https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2022-14.9-million-](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2022-14.9-million-excess-deaths-were-associated-with-the-covid-19-pandemic-in-2020-and-2021)  
565 [excess-deaths-were-associated-with-the-covid-19-pandemic-in-2020-and-2021](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2022-14.9-million-excess-deaths-were-associated-with-the-covid-19-pandemic-in-2020-and-2021)
- 566 2. Bajema KL, Wiegand RE, Cuffe K, Patel SV, Iachan R, Lim T, et al. Estimated SARS-CoV-  
567 2 Seroprevalence in the US as of September 2020. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2021;181: 450–460.
- 568 3. Webb Hooper M, Nápoles AM, Pérez-Stable EJ. COVID-19 and Racial/Ethnic Disparities.  
569 *JAMA.* 2020;323: 2466–2467.
- 570 4. Romano SD, Blackstock AJ, Taylor EV, El Burai Felix S, Adjei S, Singleton C-M, et al.  
571 Trends in Racial and Ethnic Disparities in COVID-19 Hospitalizations, by Region - United  
572 States, March-December 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70: 560–565.
- 573 5. Pasco RF, Fox SJ, Johnston SC, Pignone M, Meyers LA. Estimated Association of  
574 Construction Work With Risks of COVID-19 Infection and Hospitalization in Texas. *JAMA*  
575 *Netw Open.* 2020;3: e2026373.
- 576 6. The Lancet. The plight of essential workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet.*  
577 2020;395: 1587.
- 578 7. Karmakar M, Lantz PM, Tipirneni R. Association of Social and Demographic Factors With  
579 COVID-19 Incidence and Death Rates in the US. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2021;4: e2036462.
- 580 8. Khazanchi R, Beiter ER, Gondi S, Beckman AL, Bilinski A, Ganguli I. County-Level  
581 Association of Social Vulnerability with COVID-19 Cases and Deaths in the USA. *J Gen*  
582 *Intern Med.* 2020;35: 2784–2787.
- 583 9. Dasgupta S. Association Between Social Vulnerability and a County's Risk for Becoming a  
584 COVID-19 Hotspot — United States, June 1–July 25, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.*  
585 2020;69. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6942a3
- 586 10. Hughes MM, Wang A, Grossman MK, Pun E, Whiteman A, Deng L, et al. County-Level  
587 COVID-19 Vaccination Coverage and Social Vulnerability - United States, December 14,  
588 2020-March 1, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70: 431–436.
- 589 11. Sy KTL, Martinez ME, Rader B, White LF. Socioeconomic disparities in subway use and  
590 COVID-19 outcomes in New York City. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.28.20115949
- 591 12. Carrión D, Colicino E, Pedretti NF, Arfer KB, Rush J, DeFelice N, et al. Neighborhood-level  
592 disparities and subway utilization during the COVID-19 pandemic in New York City. *Nat*  
593 *Commun.* 2021;12: 3692.
- 594 13. Kim SJ, Bostwick W. Social Vulnerability and Racial Inequality in COVID-19 Deaths in  
595 Chicago. *Health Educ Behav.* 2020;47: 509–513.
- 596 14. CDC's Social Vulnerability Index (SVI). 15 Oct 2020 [cited 21 Dec 2020]. Available:  
597 <https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/placeandhealth/svi/index.html>
- 598 15. Chiriboga D, Garay J, Buss P, Madrigal RS, Rispel LC. Health inequity during the COVID-



- 599 19 pandemic: a cry for ethical global leadership. *Lancet*. 2020;395: 1690–1691.
- 600 16. Johnson-Agbakwu CE, Ali NS, Oxford CM, Wingo S, Manin E, Coonrod DV. Racism,  
601 COVID-19, and Health Inequity in the USA: a Call to Action. *J Racial Ethn Health*  
602 *Disparities*. 2020. doi:10.1007/s40615-020-00928-y
- 603 17. Asundi A, O’Leary C, Bhadelia N. Global COVID-19 vaccine inequity: The scope, the  
604 impact, and the challenges. *Cell Host Microbe*. 2021;29: 1036–1039.
- 605 18. Wang Z, Tang K. Combating COVID-19: health equity matters. *Nat Med*. 2020;26: 458.
- 606 19. Berkowitz SA, Cené CW, Chatterjee A. Covid-19 and Health Equity - Time to Think Big. *N*  
607 *Engl J Med*. 2020;383: e76.
- 608 20. Largent EA, Persad G, Mello MM, Wenner DM, Kramer DB, Edmonds BT, et al.  
609 Incorporating Health Equity Into COVID-19 Reopening Plans: Policy Experimentation in  
610 California. *Am J Public Health*. 2021;111: 1481–1488.
- 611 21. Wrigley-Field E, Kiang MV, Riley AR, Barbieri M, Chen Y-H, Duchowny KA, et al.  
612 Geographically targeted COVID-19 vaccination is more equitable and averts more deaths  
613 than age-based thresholds alone. *Sci Adv*. 2021;7: eabj2099.
- 614 22. Dooling K, McClung N, Chamberland M, Marin M, Wallace M, Bell BP, et al. The Advisory  
615 Committee on Immunization Practices’ Interim Recommendation for Allocating Initial  
616 Supplies of COVID-19 Vaccine - United States, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*.  
617 2020;69: 1857–1859.
- 618 23. Dooling K, Marin M, Wallace M, McClung N, Chamberland M, Lee GM, et al. The Advisory  
619 Committee on Immunization Practices’ Updated Interim Recommendation for Allocation of  
620 COVID-19 Vaccine - United States, December 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*.  
621 2021;69: 1657–1660.
- 622 24. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, Health and Medicine Division,  
623 Board on Population Health and Public Health Practice, Board on Health Sciences Policy,  
624 Committee on Equitable Allocation of Vaccine for the Novel Coronavirus. *Framework for*  
625 *Equitable Allocation of COVID-19 Vaccine*. National Academies Press; 2020.
- 626 25. Schmidt H, Weintraub R, Williams MA, Miller K, Buttenheim A, Sadecki E, et al. Equitable  
627 allocation of COVID-19 vaccines in the United States. *Nat Med*. 2021;27: 1298–1307.
- 628 26. Woody S, Javan E, Johnson K, Pasco R, Johnson-León M, Lachmann M, et al. Spatial  
629 distribution of COVID-19 infections and vaccinations in Austin, Texas. 2021. Available:  
630 [https://covid-19.tacc.utexas.edu/media/filer\\_public/fe/f2/fef289f8-800c-4390-ab27-](https://covid-19.tacc.utexas.edu/media/filer_public/fe/f2/fef289f8-800c-4390-ab27-6eff3b229f59/covid_infections_and_vaccinations_-_austin_zip_codes_-_ut_-_041221.pdf)  
631 [6eff3b229f59/covid\\_infections\\_and\\_vaccinations\\_-\\_austin\\_zip\\_codes\\_-\\_ut\\_-\\_041221.pdf](https://covid-19.tacc.utexas.edu/media/filer_public/fe/f2/fef289f8-800c-4390-ab27-6eff3b229f59/covid_infections_and_vaccinations_-_austin_zip_codes_-_ut_-_041221.pdf)
- 632 27. Sacarny A, Daw JR. Inequities in COVID-19 Vaccination Rates in the 9 Largest US Cities.  
633 *JAMA Health Forum*. 2021;2: e212415–e212415.
- 634 28. Diesel J, Sterrett N, Dasgupta S, Kriss JL, Barry V, Vanden Esschert K, et al. COVID-19  
635 Vaccination Coverage Among Adults - United States, December 14, 2020-May 22, 2021.  
636 *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70: 922–927.
- 637 29. Ogilvie GS, Gordon S, Smith LW, Albert A, Racey CS, Booth A, et al. Intention to receive a

- 638 COVID-19 vaccine: results from a population-based survey in Canada. *BMC Public Health*.  
639 2021;21: 1017.
- 640 30. Adhikari S, Pantaleo NP, Feldman JM, Ogedegbe O, Thorpe L, Troxel AB. Assessment of  
641 Community-Level Disparities in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Infections and  
642 Deaths in Large US Metropolitan Areas. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3: e2016938.
- 643 31. Tortolero GA, Otto M de O, Ramphul R, Yamal J-M, Rector A, Brown M, et al. Examining  
644 Social Vulnerability and the Association With COVID-19 Incidence in Harris County, Texas.  
645 *Front Public Health*. 2021;9: 798085.
- 646 32. Rossen LM, Branum AM, Ahmad FB, Sutton P, Anderson RN. Excess Deaths Associated  
647 with COVID-19, by Age and Race and Ethnicity - United States, January 26-October 3,  
648 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69: 1522–1527.
- 649 33. Gold JAW, Rossen LM, Ahmad FB, Sutton P, Li Z, Salvatore PP, et al. Race, Ethnicity, and  
650 Age Trends in Persons Who Died from COVID-19 - United States, May-August 2020.  
651 *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69: 1517–1521.
- 652 34. Price-Haywood EG, Burton J, Fort D, Seoane L. Hospitalization and Mortality among Black  
653 Patients and White Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382: 2534–2543.
- 654 35. Jones JM, Stone M, Sulaeman H, Fink RV, Dave H, Levy ME, et al. Estimated US  
655 Infection- and Vaccine-Induced SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence Based on Blood Donations,  
656 July 2020-May 2021. *JAMA*. 2021;326: 1400–1409.
- 657 36. Fitzpatrick V, Rivelli A, Blair C, Copeland K, Richards J. Disparities in Seroprevalence of  
658 SARS-CoV-2 Immunoglobulin Antibodies in a Large Midwestern Health Care System.  
659 *Public Health Rep*. 2021;136: 361–367.
- 660 37. Anand S, Montez-Rath M, Han J, Cadden L, Hunsader P, Kerschmann R, et al. Estimated  
661 SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence in US Patients Receiving Dialysis 1 Year After the Beginning  
662 of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4: e2116572.
- 663 38. Asch DA, Islam MN, Sheils NE, Chen Y, Doshi JA, Buresh J, et al. Patient and Hospital  
664 Factors Associated With Differences in Mortality Rates Among Black and White US  
665 Medicare Beneficiaries Hospitalized With COVID-19 Infection. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4:  
666 e2112842.
- 667 39. Fu J, Reid SA, French B, Hennessy C, Hwang C, Gatson NT, et al. Racial Disparities in  
668 COVID-19 Outcomes Among Black and White Patients With Cancer. *JAMA Netw Open*.  
669 2022;5: e224304.
- 670 40. Schultes O, Lind ML, Brockmeyer J, Sosensky P, Cummings DAT, Ko AI. Closing the  
671 health inequity gap during the pandemic: COVID-19 mortality among racial and ethnic  
672 groups in Connecticut, March 2020 to December 2021. *J Epidemiol Community Health*.  
673 2022;76: 695–696.
- 674 41. Pathela, Crawley, Weiss, Maldin. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 following the largest  
675 initial epidemic wave in the United States: Findings from New York City, May 13-July 21,  
676 2020. *The Journal of*. Available: <https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/107346>

- 677 42. Mustanski B, Saber R, Ryan DT, Benbow N, Madkins K, Hayford C, et al. Geographic  
678 disparities in COVID-19 case rates are not reflected in seropositivity rates using a  
679 neighborhood survey in Chicago. *Ann Epidemiol.* 2022;66: 44–51.
- 680 43. Salje H, Tran Kiem C, Lefrancq N, Courtejoie N, Bosetti P, Paireau J, et al. Estimating the  
681 burden of SARS-CoV-2 in France. *Science.* 2020;369: 208–211.
- 682 44. Mena GE, Martinez PP, Mahmud AS, Marquet PA, Buckee CO, Santillana M.  
683 Socioeconomic status determines COVID-19 incidence and related mortality in Santiago,  
684 Chile. *Science.* 2021;372. doi:10.1126/science.abg5298
- 685 45. Yang W, Kandula S, Huynh M, Greene SK, Van Wye G, Li W, et al. Estimating the  
686 infection-fatality risk of SARS-CoV-2 in New York City during the spring 2020 pandemic  
687 wave: a model-based analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2021;21: 203–212.
- 688 46. Hunter DJ, Abdool Karim SS, Baden LR, Farrar JJ, Hamel MB, Longo DL, et al. Addressing  
689 Vaccine Inequity - Covid-19 Vaccines as a Global Public Good. *The New England journal of*  
690 *medicine.* 2022. pp. 1176–1179.
- 691 47. Health. [cited 22 Jun 2022]. Available: <https://www.austintexas.gov/department/health>
- 692 48. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. COVID-19 Reported Patient Impact and  
693 Hospital Capacity by State Timeseries. 2020. Available:  
694 [https://healthdata.gov/Hospital/COVID-19-Reported-Patient-Impact-and-Hospital-](https://healthdata.gov/Hospital/COVID-19-Reported-Patient-Impact-and-Hospital-Capa/g62h-syeh)  
695 [Capa/g62h-syeh](https://healthdata.gov/Hospital/COVID-19-Reported-Patient-Impact-and-Hospital-Capa/g62h-syeh)
- 696 49. CDC. COVID data tracker. In: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [Internet]. 28  
697 Mar 2020 [cited 23 Dec 2021]. Available: <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/>
- 698 50. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, et al. The Incubation Period  
699 of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases:  
700 Estimation and Application. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020;172: 577–582.
- 701 51. Faes C, Abrams S, Van Beckhoven D, Meyfroidt G, Vlieghe E, Hens N, et al. Time between  
702 Symptom Onset, Hospitalisation and Recovery or Death: Statistical Analysis of Belgian  
703 COVID-19 Patients. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;17. doi:10.3390/ijerph17207560
- 704 52. Havers FP, Reed C, Lim T, Montgomery JM, Klena JD, Hall AJ, et al. Seroprevalence of  
705 Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in 10 Sites in the United States, March 23-May 12, 2020. *JAMA*  
706 *Intern Med.* 2020. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.4130
- 707 53. Levin AT, Hanage WP, Owusu-Boaitey N, Cochran KB, Walsh SP, Meyerowitz-Katz G.  
708 Assessing the age specificity of infection fatality rates for COVID-19: systematic review,  
709 meta-analysis, and public policy implications. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2020;35: 1123–1138.
- 710 54. Fox SJ, Lachmann M, Tec M, Pasco R, Woody S, Du Z, et al. Real-time pandemic  
711 surveillance using hospital admissions and mobility data. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.*  
712 2022;119. doi:10.1073/pnas.2111870119
- 713 55. Wang X, Pasco RF, Du Z, Petty M, Fox SJ, Galvani AP, et al. Impact of Social Distancing  
714 Measures on Coronavirus Disease Healthcare Demand, Central Texas, USA. *Emerg Infect*  
715 *Dis.* 2020;26: 2361–2369.

- 716 56. CDC. PLACES: Local Data for Better Health. 9 Mar 2021 [cited 25 May 2021]. Available:  
717 <https://www.cdc.gov/places/index.html>
- 718 57. Stokes EK, Zambrano LD, Anderson KN, Marder EP, Raz KM, El Burai Felix S, et al.  
719 Coronavirus Disease 2019 Case Surveillance - United States, January 22-May 30, 2020.  
720 MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020;69: 759–765.
- 721 58. Plummer M. rjags: Bayesian graphical models using MCMC. R package version 3-10.  
722 Statistical software.
- 723 59. covid-19-data: An ongoing repository of data on coronavirus cases and deaths in the U.S.  
724 Github; Available: <https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data>
- 725 60. City of Austin. [cited 3 Jan 2022]. Available: <https://atc-covid19data-austin.hub.arcgis.com/>
- 726 61. Chwe H, Quintana A, Lazer D, Baum M, Ognyanova K, Perlis RH, et al. The COVID States  
727 Project #17: COVID-19 test result times. 2021. doi:10.31219/osf.io/rz34x
- 728 62. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding  
729 and transmissibility of COVID-19. Nat Med. 2020. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5
- 730 63. García-García D, Vigo MI, Fonfría ES, Herrador Z, Navarro M, Bordehore C. Retrospective  
731 methodology to estimate daily infections from deaths (REMEDID) in COVID-19: the Spain  
732 case study. Sci Rep. 2021;11: 11274.
- 733 64. Zottarelli LK, Sharif HO, Xu X, Sunil TS. Effects of social vulnerability and heat index on  
734 emergency medical service incidents in San Antonio, Texas, in 2018. J Epidemiol  
735 Community Health. 2021;75: 271–276.
- 736 65. HUD USPS ZIP code crosswalk files. [cited 22 Jun 2022]. Available:  
737 [https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/usps\\_crosswalk.html](https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/usps_crosswalk.html)
- 738 66. Linear Mixed-Effects Models using “Eigen” and S4 [R package lme4 version 1.1-29]. 2022  
739 [cited 3 May 2022]. Available: <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/lme4/index.html>
- 740 67. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, Winskill P, Whittaker C, Imai N, et al. Estimates of the  
741 severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020;20:  
742 669–677.
- 743 68. Experience. [cited 3 Oct 2022]. Available:  
744 <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/3793562ab87e4299b106e0c282bb1fc5>
- 745 69. National Center for Immunization, Division of Viral Diseases. Nationwide Commercial  
746 Laboratory Seroprevalence Survey. 2020. Available: <https://data.cdc.gov/Laboratory-Surveillance/Nationwide-Commercial-Laboratory-Seroprevalence-Su/d2tw-32xv>
- 748 70. COVID-19 Testing Options Expand in Austin-Travis County. [cited 6 Oct 2022]. Available:  
749 <https://www.austintexas.gov/news/covid-19-testing-options-expand-austin-travis-county>
- 750 71. Grabowski DC, Mor V. Nursing Home Care in Crisis in the Wake of COVID-19. JAMA.  
751 2020;324: 23–24.
- 752 72. Zelner J, Trangucci R, Narahariseti R, Cao A, Malosh R, Broen K, et al. Racial Disparities

- 753 in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Mortality Are Driven by Unequal Infection Risks.  
754 Clin Infect Dis. 2021;72: e88–e95.
- 755 73. Gozzi N, Tizzoni M, Chinazzi M, Ferres L, Vespignani A, Perra N. Estimating the effect of  
756 social inequalities on the mitigation of COVID-19 across communities in Santiago de Chile.  
757 Nat Commun. 2021;12: 2429.
- 758 74. Wadhwa RK, Wadhwa P, Gaba P, Figueroa JF, Joynt Maddox KE, Yeh RW, et al.  
759 Variation in COVID-19 Hospitalizations and Deaths Across New York City Boroughs.  
760 JAMA. 2020;323: 2192–2195.
- 761 75. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, Prem K, Jit M, CMMID COVID-19 working group, et al. Age-  
762 dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. Nat Med.  
763 2020;26: 1205–1211.
- 764 76. Viner RM, Mytton OT, Bonell C, Melendez-Torres GJ, Ward J, Hudson L, et al.  
765 Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Children and Adolescents Compared With  
766 Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Pediatr. 2021;175: 143–156.
- 767 77. Dattner I, Goldberg Y, Katriel G, Yaari R, Gal N, Miron Y, et al. The role of children in the  
768 spread of COVID-19: Using household data from Bnei Brak, Israel, to estimate the relative  
769 susceptibility and infectivity of children. PLoS Comput Biol. 2021;17: e1008559.
- 770 78. AISD Open for Learning Newsletter: First Week, Afterschool Care and More! / Boletín  
771 informativo Abierto para el aprendizaje del AISD: La primera semana, cuidados después de  
772 clases ¡y más! [cited 19 Apr 2021]. Available:  
773 [https://www.austinisd.org/announcements/2020/10/09/aisd-open-learning-newsletter-first-](https://www.austinisd.org/announcements/2020/10/09/aisd-open-learning-newsletter-first-week-afterschool-care-and-more-boletin)  
774 [week-afterschool-care-and-more-boletin](https://www.austinisd.org/announcements/2020/10/09/aisd-open-learning-newsletter-first-week-afterschool-care-and-more-boletin)
- 775 79. Laxminarayan R, Wahl B, Dudala SR, Gopal K, Mohan B C, Neelima S, et al. Epidemiology  
776 and transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in two Indian states. Science. 2020;370: 691–697.
- 777 80. Clarke KEN, Jones JM, Deng Y, Nycz E, Lee A, Iachan R, et al. Seroprevalence of  
778 Infection-Induced SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies - United States, September 2021-February  
779 2022. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2022;71: 606–608.
- 780 81. Stratil JM, Biallas RL, Burns J, Arnold L, Geffert K, Kunzler AM, et al.  
781 Non-pharmacological measures implemented in the setting of long-term care facilities to  
782 prevent SARS-CoV-2 infections and their consequences: a rapid review. Cochrane  
783 Database Syst Rev. 2021 [cited 2 May 2022]. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD015085.pub2
- 784 82. Pace KL. Forgetting Waller Creek: An Environmental History of Race, Parks, and Planning  
785 in Downtown Austin, Texas. J South Hist. 2021;87: 603–644.
- 786 83. Bixler RP, Yang E, Richter SM, Coudert M. Boundary crossing for urban community  
787 resilience: A social vulnerability and multi-hazard approach in Austin, Texas, USA.  
788 International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction. 2021;66: 102613.
- 789 84. Austin Public Health, COVID-19, and equity. [cited 2 May 2022]. Available:  
790 <https://www.austintexas.gov/aphequity>
- 791 85. Ma KC, Menkir TF, Kissler S, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Modeling the impact of racial and ethnic



- 792           disparities on COVID-19 epidemic dynamics. *Elife*. 2021;10. doi:10.7554/eLife.66601
- 793   86. Zelner J, Naraharisetti R. Declining COVID-19 mortality risk ratios must be interpreted with  
794   caution. *Journal of epidemiology and community health*. 2022. p. 840.
- 795   87. Feehan DM, Mahmud AS. Quantifying population contact patterns in the United States  
796   during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12: 893.
- 797   88. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, Wang Y, Wang W, Zhao S, et al. Changes in contact  
798   patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science*. 2020;368:  
799   1481–1486.
- 800   89. Nouvellet P, Bhatia S, Cori A, Ainslie KEC, Baguelin M, Bhatt S, et al. Reduction in mobility  
801   and COVID-19 transmission. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12: 1090.
- 802   90. Snow J. California's "Equity" algorithm could leave 2 million struggling californians without  
803   additional vaccine supply. *ACLU NorCal*. 2021. Available:  
804   [https://www.aclunc.org/blog/californias-equity-algorithm-could-leave-2-million-struggling-](https://www.aclunc.org/blog/californias-equity-algorithm-could-leave-2-million-struggling-californians-without-additional)  
805   [californians-without-additional](https://www.aclunc.org/blog/californias-equity-algorithm-could-leave-2-million-struggling-californians-without-additional)
- 806