

- 1 Manuscript Title**
- 2** US Public Opinion as to Whether “The Pandemic is Over,” September to October 2022
- 3 Authors**
- 4** Mark É Czeisler, PhD¹; Matthew D Weaver, PhD^{2,3,4}; Rashon I Lane, PhD^{2,3,5}; Shantha
- 5** MW Rajaratnam, PhD^{2,3,4,6}; Mark E Howard, MBBS, PhD^{4,6,7}; Charles A Czeisler, PhD,
- 6** MD^{2,3,4}
- 7 Affiliations**
- 8** ¹Francis Weld Peabody Society, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts,
- 9** United States
- 10** ²Division of Sleep and Circadian Disorders, Departments of Medicine and Neurology,
- 11** Brigham and Women’s Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts
- 12** ³Division of Sleep Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts
- 13** ⁴Turner Institute for Brain and Mental Health and School of Psychological Sciences,
- 14** Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia
- 15** ⁵Sutter Health, Sacramento, California
- 16** ⁶Institute for Breathing and Sleep, Austin Health, Heidelberg, Victoria, Australia
- 17** ⁷University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia
- 18 Corresponding Author:** Mark É. Czeisler, PhD, Francis Weld Peabody Society,
- 19** Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts (mark.czeisler@fulbrightmail.org).
- 20 Manuscript type:** Original Investigation
- 21 Main Text word count:** 2986 of 3000-word maximum
- 22 Submission Date:** 21 December 2022

23 Key Points

24 **Question:** As of September to October 2022, what was US public opinion as to whether
25 COVID-19 remained a pandemic?

26 **Findings:** In this demographically representative survey study of 4985 US adults, only 1
27 in 3 respondents agreed with the statement “the pandemic is over;” 43% of adults
28 disagreed. Agreement that the pandemic was over was associated with less
29 engagement in COVID-19 preventive behaviors and more political conservatism.

30 **Meaning:** As of September to October 2022, US public opinion was divided regarding
31 the status of COVID-19 as a pandemic and is associated with COVID-19-related
32 behaviors, underscoring important public health and policy implications of this
33 designation.

34

35 Abstract

36 **Importance:** US public health guidance has increasingly shifted responsibility for
37 actions to minimize ongoing impacts of COVID-19 onto individuals. During September
38 to October 2022, the World Health Organization continued to characterize COVID-19 as
39 a pandemic. Yet, public perceptions of the pandemic status of COVID-19 and its
40 associations with COVID-19-related behaviors were unknown.

41 **Objective:** To assess US public opinion on the characterization of COVID-19 as a
42 pandemic.

43 Design, Setting, and Participants: The COVID-19 Outbreak Public Evaluation (COPE)

44 Initiative internet-based surveys, administered to 4985 US adults during September to

45 October 2022. Demographic quota sampling and survey weighting were employed to

46 improve sample representativeness of the US population by age, sex, and combined

47 race and ethnicity.

48 Exposures: The COVID-19 pandemic.

49 Main Outcomes and Measures: Response to the statement, “The pandemic is over.”

50 Response options included Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neutral, Somewhat

51 disagree, and Strongly disagree.

52 Results: Overall, 5015 US adults completed The COPE Initiative surveys (response

53 rate, 56.2%), and 4985 (99.4%) provided complete information for all analyzed variables

54 and were included in this analysis. Only 1657 (33.2%) respondents agreed with the

55 statement “the pandemic is over,” while 2141 (43.0%) disagreed and the remaining

56 1187 (23.8%) were neutral about the statement. Agreement that the pandemic was over

57 was most strongly associated with having received fewer COVID-19 vaccines, lesser

58 concern about SARS-CoV-2 variant viruses, and less frequent engagement in COVID-

59 19 preventive behaviors, such as mask usage in public spaces, as well as increasingly

60 conservative political ideology, roles as unpaid caregivers of both children and adults,

61 younger age, male sex, and significant disabilities.

62 Conclusions and Relevance: As of September to October 2022, US public opinion

63 was mixed on the characterization of COVID-19 as a pandemic. Belief the pandemic

64 was over was associated with less frequent engagement in COVID-19 preventive

behaviors, highlighting the important role of public health communication. Demographic groups to prioritize tailored public health messaging about the pandemic status were identified. Continued assessment of public perceptions about the state of the pandemic is warranted entering Year 4 of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Main Text

Introduction

On March 11, 2020, the Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO) officially characterized the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak as a global pandemic.¹ Two days later, the President of the United States proclaimed that COVID-19 constituted a national emergency.² In the initial pandemic months, absent vaccines to prevent SARS-CoV-2 transmission or COVID-19 medical treatments, community COVID-19 prevention measures were implemented. Stay-at-home orders and nonessential business closures were executed worldwide for the first time in a century. Early support for and adherence with these nonpharmaceutical interventions^{3–5} waned with pressures to reopen economies and resume in-person activities.^{6–8}

Despite a better understanding of SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics, the rapid development of COVID-19 vaccines, and considerable advances in COVID-19 medical treatments, COVID-19 has remained a major cause of global morbidity and mortality in many areas worldwide, with the US among the most adversely impacted nations. Indeed, COVID-19-involved mortality and excess all-cause mortality were high in the US relative to comparator countries during the initial pandemic wave through September

2020,⁹ and throughout the Delta and winter Omicron waves during June 2021 through March 2022.¹⁰ The prolonged severity of the pandemic is due in part to the emergence of immune-evasive coronavirus variant viruses and incomplete vaccine uptake, which have thwarted achievement of sufficient population-level immunity to reduce sustained transmission. The prolonged waves of coronavirus infections and associated public health containment measures have induced pandemic fatigue and pandemic-related political polarization, lowering adherence with nonpharmaceutical interventions such as masking. Throughout the pandemic, longstanding and worsening social inequities have predisposed historically marginalized and oppressed groups to both COVID-19-involved and non-COVID-19-involved adverse health outcomes^{11,12} partly due to a higher prevalence of baseline chronic medical conditions,¹³ more frequent exposure to infections, and less access to healthcare prevention and treatment services.¹⁴

As of mid-September 2022, 18 months after the declaration of the pandemic by the WHO, there had been approximately 6.5 million COVID-19-involved deaths and 600 million SARS-CoV-2 infections documented globally, with over 1 million deaths and nearing 100 million infections occurring in the United States.¹⁵ The approximately 400,000-500,000 weekly confirmed cases documented in mid-September 2022 were higher than the 200,000-250,000 weekly confirmed cases documented in mid-September 2020 and lower than the 1 million weekly confirmed cases documented in mid-September 2021, during the wave of the highly transmissible Delta (B.1.617.2) variant.¹⁵ While comparisons are limited by the variable number and types of tests performed at different stages of the pandemic (eg, approximate weekly COVID-19 Nucleic Acid Amplification Tests reported to the CDC in mid-September 2020 [6.5 to 7

million]; 2021 [11.5-12 million]; and 2022 [3.3-3.5 million]),¹⁶ the persistence of hundreds of thousands of detected infections despite reduced reported testing serves as evidence of sustained SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the US.

Additionally, though prevalence estimates vary widely due to differing definitions of post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection—also known as Long COVID and Post-COVID Conditions—abundant emerging evidence points to long-term sequelae for a substantial percentage of people following the acute phase of infection, including pulmonary, cardiovascular, renal, hepatic, neurologic, and mental health sequelae, as well as functional mobility impairments and general and constitutional symptoms.^{17–19}

Without an official announcement from the World Health Organization or US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), on September 18, 2022, the President of the United States twice declared “the pandemic is over” on an American television news magazine broadcast. On September 20, 2022, the President addressed the controversial comments at the United Nations General Assembly, clarifying he had intended to convey that the US was in a different place due to vaccines and post-infectious immunity. At that same Assembly, the WHO Director-General stated that the pandemic was not over, and on September 22, 2022, the CDC Director neither directly agreed nor disagreed with the president's assertion.

Public perceptions about the pandemic are consequential. A recent study found that only 15% of surveyed adults living in areas with high COVID-19 transmission during May through July 2022 realized that COVID-19 transmission in their local area was high at that time.²⁰ Lower perceived local community transmission levels were associated with having received fewer COVID-19 vaccines, lower concern about SARS-CoV-2

variant viruses, and less frequent engagement in COVID-19 preventive behaviors.

Moreover, respondents indicated that they would change their behaviors in response to

levels of local COVID-19 transmission, highlighting that keeping the public fully informed

about the state of the pandemic, which is an essential tenant of public health,²¹ could

influence engagement in behaviors to reduce transmission of SARS-CoV-2.

We therefore sought to estimate the prevalence of US adults who agreed with, felt

neutral about, and disagreed with the statement, “the pandemic is over,” and to

characterize the association between agreement with the pandemic-over statement and

engagement in behaviors to reduce SARS-CoV-2 infections and prevent severe COVID-

19 illness. Additionally, we endeavored to characterize demographic associations with

agreement with the pandemic-over statement to identify groups to prioritize tailored

public health communication strategies.

Methods

Setting and Participants

During September 26 to October 15, 2022 (ie, approximately 1 to 3 weeks after the

President’s “the pandemic is over” statement), US adults aged ≥ 18 years completed

internet-based surveys through Qualtrics for The COVID-19 Outbreak Public Evaluation

(COPE) Initiative (www.thecopeinitiative.org). Demographic quota sampling and survey

weighting were employed to improve sample representativeness of the US population

by age, sex, and combined race and ethnicity. Respondents were not informed of

survey topics prior to commencement.

Key Definitions

155 *Main Outcome*

156 Respondents were asked, ‘Select your response to the statement, “The pandemic is
157 over.”’ Response options included Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neutral,
158 Somewhat disagree, and Strongly disagree.

159 *Demographic Characteristics*

160 Demographic variables included in this analysis were sex at birth, age group in
161 years, race, ethnicity, highest education attainment, experience with disability, self-rated
162 health, roles as unpaid caregivers, state of residence (categorized as 4 US Census
163 Bureau-designated regions), and political ideology. Response options and analytic
164 categorizations are detailed in the Supplement.

165 *Pandemic-related Characteristics*

166 Pandemic-related variables included in this analysis were frequency of mask usage
167 in public and avoidance of large gatherings, COVID-19 vaccine doses received, and
168 concern about the health effects of coronavirus variants circulating at the time
169 respondents were surveyed. Response options and analytic categorizations are detailed
170 in the Supplement.

171 Statistical Analyses

172 Rounded, weighted counts and percentages were used to describe the sample
173 demographics and outcomes. Multivariable Poisson regressions with robust standard
174 errors were used to estimate adjusted prevalence ratios (aPRs) and 95% CIs for
175 agreement (somewhat or strongly) that the pandemic was over when surveyed,

adjusted for the following: sex, age, combined race and ethnicity, education attainment, and unpaid caregiver roles. Separate models were run for collinear variables: disability and self-rated health, Census region and political ideology. Calculations were performed in Python (V3.7.8) and R (V4.2.0). Statistical significance was defined as 95% CIs excluding the null value.

Study Approval and Consent

The Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee approved the study protocol; participants provided informed consent electronically. Detailed Methods are in the Supplement.

Results

Overall, 5015 of 8930 invited eligible participants (56.2%) completed The COPE Initiative surveys; 4985 of these respondents (99.4%) met secondary screening criteria and were analyzed (Figure 1). Overall, 1657 (33.2%) respondents indicated that they agreed with the statement “The pandemic is over” (661 [13.3%] strongly agreed; 996 [20.0%] somewhat agreed); 2141 (43.0%) indicated that they disagreed (954 [19.1%] strongly disagreed; 1188 [23.8%] somewhat disagreed); and 1187 (23.8%) provided a neutral response (Table 1).

Responses to the pandemic-over statement also varied by demographic characteristics (Table 1). Groups in which more than 40% of respondents agreed the pandemic was over included respondents who were unpaid caregivers of both children and adults (376 of 609 respondents [53.6%]); those who reported their self-rated health as excellent (445 of 846 respondents [52.6%]); those who identified their political

ideology as very conservative (425 of 824 respondents [51.6%]) or slightly conservative (349 of 848 respondents [41.2%]); those who identified as having disabilities such that they could not do some tasks at all (187 of 379 respondents [49.3%]); and those who had education attainment of more than a bachelor's degree (399 of 879 respondents [45.3%]). Conversely, groups in which less than 25% of respondents agreed the pandemic was over included respondents who identified their political ideology as neither liberal nor conservative (327 of 1404 respondents [23.3%]); those who identified their combined race and ethnicity of Black, non-Hispanic (147 of 612 respondents [24.0%]) and other race or multiple races, non-Hispanic (31 of 129 respondents [24.4%]); those who were of age 65 years and over (260 of 1078 respondents [24.1%]); and those who self-rated their health as poor (39 of 154 respondents [25.0%]).

Responses to the pandemic-over statement also varied by COVID-19-related attitudes and behaviors (Table 2). Groups in which more than 40% of respondents agreed the pandemic was over included respondents who in the 2 weeks preceding the survey never avoided large gatherings (686 of 1707 respondents [40.2%]) or never wore a mask in public spaces (702 of 1537 respondents [45.6%]); those who had received only one COVID-19 vaccine dose (163 of 385 respondents [42.5%]); and those who were not at all concerned (487 of 934 respondents [52.2%]) or somewhat unconcerned (218 of 495 respondents [44.0%]) about current SARS-CoV-2 variant viruses. Conversely, groups in which less than 25% of respondents agreed the pandemic was over included respondents who had received four or more COVID-19 vaccine doses (155 of 852 respondents [18.2%]); those who in the 2 weeks preceding the survey had sometimes worn a face mask in public (208 of 859 respondents [24.2%])

or not gone to public places (33 of 150 respondents [21.8%]); and those who were somewhat concerned (364 of 1484 respondents [24.5%]) or neutral (293 of 1209 respondents [24.2%]) about current SARS-CoV-2 variant viruses.

The multivariable model adjusting for demographic variables only revealed higher odds of agreement with the pandemic-over statement among respondents with conservative vs liberal political ideology (eg, very conservative vs very liberal, aOR, 2.6 [95% CI, 2.1 to 3.3]); those with roles as unpaid caregivers of both children and adults vs those without caregiver roles (aOR, 2.1 [95% CI, 1.7 to 2.5]); those of male vs female sex (aOR, 1.6 [95% CI, 1.4 to 1.9]); those of younger vs older age (eg, 18 to 24 vs 65 or more years, aOR, 1.8 [95% CI, 1.3 to 2.5]); and those with disabilities such that they could not do some tasks at all vs without disabilities (aOR, 1.5 [95% CI, 1.1 to 1.9]) (Figure 2). Lower odds of agreement were found for respondents with worse self-rated health (eg, poor vs excellent, aOR, 0.4 [95% CI, 0.3 to 0.7]); those with lower education attainment (eg, high school degree or less vs more than a bachelor's degree, aOR, 0.5 [95% CI, 0.4 to 0.7]); and those who identified their combined race and ethnicity as something other than non-Hispanic White (eg, non-Hispanic Black, aOR, 0.6 [0.5 to 0.7]).

Multivariable models adjusting for demographic variables plus individual COVID-19-related variables revealed higher odds of agreement with the pandemic-over statement among respondents who in the 2 weeks preceding the survey never vs always wore masks in public spaces (aOR, 3.0 [95% CI, 2.4 to 3.7]); those who had rarely or never vs always avoided large gatherings (eg, never, aOR, 2.2 [95% CI, 1.7 to 2.7]) or had received fewer vs more COVID-19 vaccine doses (e.g., zero vs four or more doses,

aOR, 3.4 [95% CI, 2.5 to 4.6]); and who were not at all concerned or somewhat
unconcerned vs very concerned about SARS-CoV-2 variant viruses (eg, not at all
concerned, aOR, 3.2 [95% CI, 2.5 to 4.0]) (Figure 3).

Discussion

Only 1 in 3 US adults in a large scale, demographically representative survey sample
agreed “the [COVID-19] pandemic is over” in September to October 2022. In contrast,
43% of adults disagreed that the pandemic was over, while the remaining 24% were
neutral about the statement. Agreement with the pandemic-over statement was most
strongly associated with having received fewer COVID-19 vaccines, lesser concern
about SARS-CoV-2 variant viruses, and less frequent engagement in COVID-19
preventive behaviors such as mask usage in public spaces, as well as increasingly
conservative political ideology, roles as unpaid caregivers of both children and adults,
younger age, male sex, and significant disabilities. These findings demonstrate how
divided public sentiments are about the state of the COVID-19 pandemic, and reveal
associated COVID-19-related attitudes and behaviors that could compromise mitigation
efforts, as well as associated demographic characteristics that could inform tailored
messaging strategies.

Inconsistent messaging about the COVID-19 outbreak has been a persistent
challenge over the course of the pandemic. For example, through February and March
2020, many US public health leaders and the WHO advised the public against use of
face masks to reduce SARS-CoV-2 transmission, even stating that they could increase
risk of infection, and reported that asymptomatic transmission of SARS-CoV-2 was
rare.^{22–24} In April 2020, the CDC recommended public face mask use for the first time, a

stance strengthened by convincing evidence of the effectiveness of masks in reducing SARS-CoV-2 infections and COVID-19 hospitalizations and deaths.²⁵⁻²⁹ However, revision of the guidance on masking plagued widespread adherence with this affordable, noninvasive, effective behavior to reduce SARS-CoV-2 transmission due in part to the complete reversal of prior guidance and continued belief that masks were ineffective by a portion of the public.^{30,31} Similarly, in May 2021 the CDC lifted mask and social distancing recommendations for fully vaccinated individuals, citing extremely low risks of infection.³² The guidance suggested low breakthrough SARS-CoV-2 infections among vaccinated persons, even indicating that fully vaccinated persons need not test following exposures, though breakthrough infections associated with severe COVID-19 illness have occurred at non-negligible rates.³³ Mixed messages have continued to present a challenge for public health leaders for guidance regarding the return to in-person school and work, aerosolized transmission of coronaviruses, and SARS-CoV-2 variant viruses.³⁴

Most recently, there has been controversy regarding revised CDC guidelines for minimizing the impact of COVID-19, published in August 2022.³⁵ The guidelines, which do not mention the word pandemic, have been interpreted as transferring responsibility to individuals to monitor the pandemic and take actions to protect themselves from severe COVID-19 outcomes³⁶ at a time when COVID-19 media coverage has declined.³⁷ Moreover, the guidelines mention but do not discuss Long COVID, which can affect people across the spectrum of acute COVID-19 illness, including initially asymptomatic infections,³⁸ leading to considerable healthcare costs.^{39,40} Despite evidence that risk of Long COVID increases with reinfections regardless of vaccination

status,⁴¹ pandemic-related public health messaging has not yet focused on minimizing risk of Long COVID, instead focusing on strategies to mitigate severe outcomes in the acute stage of illness.

The findings of the current study are also consistent with those of a study about perceived local COVID-19 transmission levels,²⁰ as both studies found that individual behaviors aligned with peoples' perceptions of important pandemic-related information. People who agreed the pandemic was over and those who did not accurately perceive local COVID-19 transmission levels as high had received fewer COVID-19 vaccines, conveyed less concern about SARS-CoV-2 variant viruses, and reported less frequent engagement in COVID-19 preventive behaviors compared with other adults. The extent to which individuals are no longer seeking COVID-19-related information or the information is not readily available is unclear. Given the association between these beliefs and non-engagement in COVID-19-related prevention behaviors, public health communication efforts to fully inform these groups are needed.

The findings of demographic characteristics associated with agreement with the pandemic-over statement have important implications for tailored public health messaging about the pandemic. Some associations with agreement, such as more conservative political ideology, were anticipated given political polarization during the pandemic, as more conservative ideology has consistently been associated with lower levels of concern about and attention to the pandemic and less frequent engagement in COVID-19 prevention efforts.⁴²

However, the findings that agreement with the pandemic-over statement was associated with significant disabilities and roles as unpaid caregivers of both children

and adults were surprising. People with disabilities are at increased risk of severe COVID-19 outcomes, as highlighted in the CDC's guidance published in August 2022.³⁵ Indeed, COVID-19-associated hospitalization rates among disability-eligible Medicare beneficiaries are approximately 50% higher than rates among age-eligible beneficiaries.⁴³ For other major risk factors, such as age and health status, responses to the pandemic-over statement reflected risk of severe COVID-19 outcomes, as older adults and people with fair or poor vs excellent health more commonly disagreed that the pandemic was over. Perhaps not surprisingly, caregivers of children and adults, who's caregiving often puts them at higher risk of SARS-CoV-2 exposures, more commonly agreed that the pandemic was over. For caregivers of children specifically, perceptions could also be influenced by seasonal outbreaks of influenza and respiratory syncytial virus detracting attention away from COVID-19. Further investigation into the factors underlying perceptions about the pandemic within these groups is warranted.

Strengths of this analysis include use of a large, demographically representative sample of US adults and comprehensive characterization of respondents. There are limitations, including English-language-only, internet-based surveys that were administered using non-probabilistic sampling methods, limiting the generalizability of the findings; however, demographic quota sampling and survey weighting were applied to improve demographic representativeness. Additionally, associative findings from multivariable models do not reflect directionality or causality.

In conclusion, based on a large scale, demographically representative sample, we found that as of late September to mid-October 2022, only 1 in 3 US adults agreed with the statement "the pandemic is over" and that 43% of adults disagreed with that

statement. Adults who agreed with the pandemic-over statement had higher odds of being unvaccinated or under-vaccinated against COVID-19, were less concerned about SARS-CoV-2 variant viruses and were less engaged in behaviors to reduce COVID-19 transmission. We also identified demographic groups to prioritize for tailored public health messaging about the pandemic status, including people with more conservative political ideology, with significant disabilities, in roles as unpaid caregivers of both children and adults, and of younger age or male sex. Continued assessment of public perceptions about the state of the pandemic is warranted as we enter Year 4 of the COVID-19 pandemic.⁴⁴

Additional Information

Author Contributions: M. É. Czeisler had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: M. É. Czeisler, Weaver, C. A. Czeisler.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: M. É. Czeisler, Weaver.

Drafting of the manuscript: M. É. Czeisler.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors.

Statistical analysis: M. É. Czeisler.

Obtained funding: M. É. Czeisler, Weaver, Lane, Howard, Rajaratnam, C. A. Czeisler.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Weaver, Lane, C. A. Czeisler.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: All authors report institutional grants from CDC Foundation and the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Mark É Czeisler reports institutional gifts or grants from WHOOP, Inc., HopeLab Foundation, consulting fees from Vanda Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Nychthemeron, LLC, and equity interest in With Deep, Inc. Matthew D Weaver reports institutional grants from Brigham and Women's Hospital Physician's Organization, Brigham Research Institute, and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; and consulting fees from the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center, the National Sleep Foundation, and the University of Pittsburgh.

Shantha MW Rajaratnam reports institutional grants from Cooperative Research Centre for Alertness, Safety and Productivity, National Health and Medical Research Council, CSIRO, the Australian Research Council, Australasian Sleep Association, Wellcome Trust, Collingwood Football Club, Vanda Pharmaceuticals, Department of Defense, WHOOP, Inc. HopeLab Foundation; institutional consultancy fees from Teva Pharma Australia, Circadian Therapeutics, BHP, Roche, Avecho, Vanda Pharmaceuticals; institutional and personal consulting fees from Cooperative Research Centre for Alertness, Safety and Productivity; payment for expert testimony from Herbert Smith Freehills and Maurice Blackburn; Patent for Systems and Methods for Monitoring and Control of Sleep Patterns; and service as chair for the Sleep Health Foundation Board of Directors. Mark E Howard reports participation on the ResApp Health Advisory Board, and honorary board membership for the Institute for Breathing and Sleep. Charles A Czeisler serves as the incumbent of an endowed professorship provided to Harvard Medical School by Cephalon, Inc. and as chair of the Sleep Timing and Variability Consensus Panel, National Sleep Foundation; and reports institutional support for the Quality Improvement Initiative from Delta Airlines and Puget Sound Pilots; education support to Harvard Medical School Division of Sleep Medicine; support to Brigham and Women's Hospital from Jazz Pharmaceuticals PLC, Inc. and Philips Respironics, Inc; support to Brigham and Women's Hospital from Axome Therapeutics, Inc., Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, and Sanofi SA; educational funding to the Sleep and Health Education of the Harvard Medical School Division of Sleep Medicine from ResMed, Teva Pharmaceuticals Industries, Ltd., and Vanda Pharmaceuticals; royalty payments on sales of the Actiwatch-2 and Actiwatch-Spectrum devices from Philips Respironics, Inc.; personal consulting fees from With Deep, Inc. and Vanda Pharmaceuticals; honoraria for Thomas Roth Lecture of Excellence at SLEEP 2022 annual meeting and from the Massachusetts Medical Society for writing a Perspective article in the New England Journal of Medicine; payment for expert testimony from Puget Sound Pilots, Amtrak, Enterprise Rent-A-Car, Dallas Police Association, FedEx, PAR Electrical Contractors, Inc., Schlumberger Technology Corp., Union Pacific Railroad, United Parcel Service, Vanda Pharmaceuticals, and the San Francisco Sheriff's Department; travel support from the Stanley Ho Medical Development Foundation for travel to Macao and Hong Kong; advisory board membership for the Institute of Digital Media and Child Development, Klarman Family Foundation, and the UK Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council; equity interest in Vanda Pharmaceuticals, With Deep, Inc., and Signos, Inc.; and institutional receipt of educational gifts to Brigham and Women's Hospital from Johnson & Johnson, Mary Ann and Stanley Snider via Combined Jewish Philanthropies, Alexandra Drane, DR Capital, Harmony Biosciences, LLC, and to Harvard University from ResMed, Inc. No other potential conflicts of interest were disclosed.

Funding/Support: Funding for survey data collection was supported in part by a research contract from the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and NTouch-BCT Strategies, LLC, with subcontracts to Brigham and Women's Hospital, Austin Health, and Monash University.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Disclaimer: The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

References

1. World Health Organization. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020. Published 2020. Accessed June 20, 2021. <https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020>
2. The White House. Proclamation on Declaring a National Emergency Concerning the Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Outbreak – The White House. Published 2020. Accessed June 20, 2021. <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/presidential-actions/proclamation-declaring-national-emergency-concerning-novel-coronavirus-disease-covid-19-outbreak/>
3. Czeisler MÉ, Howard ME, Robbins R, et al. Early public adherence with and support for stay-at-home COVID-19 mitigation strategies despite adverse life impact: a transnational cross-sectional survey study in the United States and Australia. *BMC Public Health*. 2021;21(1):503. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-10410-x
4. Czeisler MÉ, Tynan MA, Howard ME, et al. Public Attitudes, Behaviors, and Beliefs Related to COVID-19, Stay-at-Home Orders, Nonessential Business Closures, and Public Health Guidance - United States, New York City, and Los Angeles, May 5-12, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(24):751-758. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6924e1
5. Nelson LM, Simard JF, Oluyomi A, et al. US Public Concerns About the COVID-19 Pandemic From Results of a Survey Given via Social Media. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2020;180(7):1020-1022. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.1369
6. Moreland A, Herlihy C, Tynan MA, et al. Timing of State and Territorial COVID-19 Stay-at-Home Orders and Changes in Population Movement - United States, March 1-May 31, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(35):1198-1203. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6935a2
7. Adjodah D, Dinakar K, Chinazzi M, et al. Association between COVID-19 outcomes and mask mandates, adherence, and attitudes. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(6):e0252315. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0252315

8. MacIntyre CR, Nguyen PY, Chughtai AA, et al. Mask use, risk-mitigation behaviours and pandemic fatigue during the COVID-19 pandemic in five cities in Australia, the UK and USA: A cross-sectional survey. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2021;106:199-207. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2021.03.056
9. Bilinski A, Emanuel EJ. COVID-19 and Excess All-Cause Mortality in the US and 18 Comparison Countries. *JAMA*. 2020;324(20):2100-2102. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.20717
10. Bilinski A, Thompson K, Emanuel E. COVID-19 and Excess All-Cause Mortality in the US and 20 Comparison Countries, June 2021-March 2022. *JAMA*. Published online November 18, 2022. doi:10.1001/jama.2022.21795
11. Shiels MS, Haque AT, Haozous EA, et al. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Excess Deaths During the COVID-19 Pandemic, March to December 2020. *Ann Intern Med*. 2021;174(12):1693-1699. doi:10.7326/M21-2134
12. Magesh S, John D, Li WT, et al. Disparities in COVID-19 Outcomes by Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status: A Systematic-Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(11):e2134147. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.34147
13. Price JH, Khubchandani J, McKinney M, Braun R. Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Chronic Diseases of Youths and Access to Health Care in the United States. *Biomed Res Int*. 2013;2013:787616. doi:10.1155/2013/787616
14. Boehmer TK, Koumans EH, Skillen EL, et al. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Outpatient Treatment of COVID-19 - United States, January-July 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2022;71(43):1359-1365. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7143a2
15. Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20(5):533-534. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30120-1
16. US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Trends in Number of COVID-19 Cases and Deaths in the US Reported to CDC, by State/Territory. COVID Data Tracker. Published March 28, 2020. Accessed December 2, 2022. <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker>
17. Fernández-de-las-Peñas C, Rodríguez-Jiménez J, Cancela-Cilleruelo I, et al. Post-COVID-19 Symptoms 2 Years After SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Hospitalized vs Nonhospitalized Patients. *JAMA Network Open*. 2022;5(11):e2242106. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.42106
18. Groff D, Sun A, Ssentongo AE, et al. Short-term and Long-term Rates of Postacute Sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Systematic Review. *JAMA Network Open*. 2021;4(10):e2128568. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.28568

- 478 19. Perlis RH, Santillana M, Ognyanova K, et al. Prevalence and Correlates of Long
479 COVID Symptoms Among US Adults. *JAMA Network Open*. 2022;5(10):e2238804.
480 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.38804
- 481 20. Czeisler ME, Lane RI, Orellana RC, et al. Perception of Local COVID-19
482 Transmission and Use of Preventive Behaviors Among Adults with Recent SARS-
483 CoV-2 Infection - Illinois and Michigan, June 1-July 31, 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal*
484 *Wkly Rep*. 2022;71(46):1471-1478. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7146a2
- 485 21. US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Public Health System and the
486 10 Essential Public Health Services. Public Health Professionals Gateway. Accessed
487 December 2, 2022. [https://www.cdc.gov/publichealthgateway/zz-](https://www.cdc.gov/publichealthgateway/zz-sddev/essentialhealthservices.html)
488 [sddev/essentialhealthservices.html](https://www.cdc.gov/publichealthgateway/zz-sddev/essentialhealthservices.html)
- 489 22. Miltimore J. Fauci's Mask Flip-Flop, Explained (by Economics) | Jon Miltimore.
490 Published June 3, 2021. Accessed November 25, 2022. [https://fee.org/articles/fauci-](https://fee.org/articles/fauci-s-mask-flip-flop-explained-by-economics/)
491 [s-mask-flip-flop-explained-by-economics/](https://fee.org/articles/fauci-s-mask-flip-flop-explained-by-economics/)
- 492 23. WHO's COVID backtrack leaves us wondering who to believe. Healthing.ca.
493 Accessed November 25, 2022. [https://www.healthing.ca/opinion/whos-covid-](https://www.healthing.ca/opinion/whos-covid-backtrack-leaves-us-wondering-who-to-believe)
494 [backtrack-leaves-us-wondering-who-to-believe](https://www.healthing.ca/opinion/whos-covid-backtrack-leaves-us-wondering-who-to-believe)
- 495 24. Netburn D. A timeline of the CDC's advice on face masks. Los Angeles Times.
496 Published July 27, 2021. Accessed November 25, 2022.
497 [https://www.latimes.com/science/story/2021-07-27/timeline-cdc-mask-guidance-](https://www.latimes.com/science/story/2021-07-27/timeline-cdc-mask-guidance-during-covid-19-pandemic)
498 [during-covid-19-pandemic](https://www.latimes.com/science/story/2021-07-27/timeline-cdc-mask-guidance-during-covid-19-pandemic)
- 499 25. Brooks JT, Butler JC. Effectiveness of Mask Wearing to Control Community
500 Spread of SARS-CoV-2. *JAMA*. 2021;325(10):998-999. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.1505
- 501 26. Brooks JT, Butler JC, Redfield RR. Universal Masking to Prevent SARS-CoV-2
502 Transmission-The Time Is Now. *JAMA*. 2020;324(7):635-637.
503 doi:10.1001/jama.2020.13107
- 504 27. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, et al. Physical distancing, face masks, and eye
505 protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19:
506 a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10242):1973-1987.
507 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31142-9
- 508 28. Joo H, Miller GF, Sunshine G, et al. Decline in COVID-19 Hospitalization Growth
509 Rates Associated with Statewide Mask Mandates - 10 States, March-October 2020.
510 *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70(6):212-216. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7006e2
- 511 29. Lyu W, Wehby GL. Community Use Of Face Masks And COVID-19: Evidence
512 From A Natural Experiment Of State Mandates In The US. *Health Aff (Millwood)*.
513 2020;39(8):1419-1425. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00818

- 514 30. Taylor S, Asmundson GJG. Negative attitudes about facemasks during the
515 COVID-19 pandemic: The dual importance of perceived ineffectiveness and
516 psychological reactance. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(2):e0246317.
517 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0246317
- 518 31. Rubin O, Rin Kim S, Faulders K. Mixed messages on masks from leaders during
519 pandemic has caused confusion for many. *ABC News*.
520 [https://abcnews.go.com/US/mixed-messages-masks-critical-tool-slow-pandemic-](https://abcnews.go.com/US/mixed-messages-masks-critical-tool-slow-pandemic-slowed/story?id=70526293)
521 [slowled/story?id=70526293](https://abcnews.go.com/US/mixed-messages-masks-critical-tool-slow-pandemic-slowed/story?id=70526293). Published May 6, 2020. Accessed June 28, 2021.
- 522 32. Cohen E, Bonifield J. People vaccinated against Covid-19 can go without masks
523 indoors and outdoors, CDC says. *CNBC*. Published May 13, 2021. Accessed
524 December 19, 2022. [https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/13/health/cdc-mask-guidance-](https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/13/health/cdc-mask-guidance-vaccinated/index.html)
525 [vaccinated/index.html](https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/13/health/cdc-mask-guidance-vaccinated/index.html)
- 526 33. Lipsitch M, Krammer F, Regev-Yochay G, Lustig Y, Balicer RD. SARS-CoV-2
527 breakthrough infections in vaccinated individuals: measurement, causes and impact.
528 *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2022;22(1):57-65. doi:10.1038/s41577-021-00662-4
- 529 34. Segal E. Mixed Messages From White House And CDC Could Worsen Covid
530 Crisis. *Forbes*. Accessed November 25, 2022.
531 [https://www.forbes.com/sites/edwardsegal/2021/07/30/mixed-messages-about-delta-](https://www.forbes.com/sites/edwardsegal/2021/07/30/mixed-messages-about-delta-variant-could-worsen-covid-crisis/)
532 [variant-could-worsen-covid-crisis/](https://www.forbes.com/sites/edwardsegal/2021/07/30/mixed-messages-about-delta-variant-could-worsen-covid-crisis/)
- 533 35. Massetti GM, Jackson BR, Brooks JT, et al. Summary of Guidance for Minimizing
534 the Impact of COVID-19 on Individual Persons, Communities, and Health Care
535 Systems - United States, August 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*.
536 2022;71(33):1057-1064. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7133e1
- 537 36. Sun LH, Achenbach J. CDC loosens coronavirus guidance, signaling strategic
538 shift. *Washington Post*. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2022/08/11/cdc-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2022/08/11/cdc-coronavirus-recommendations/)
539 [coronavirus-recommendations/](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2022/08/11/cdc-coronavirus-recommendations/). Published August 12, 2022. Accessed November 25,
540 2022.
- 541 37. Pearman O, Boykoff M, Osborne-Gowey J, et al. COVID-19 media coverage
542 decreasing despite deepening crisis. *Lancet Planet Health*. 2021;5(1):e6-e7.
543 doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(20)30303-X
- 544 38. Crook H, Raza S, Nowell J, Young M, Edison P. Long covid-mechanisms, risk
545 factors, and management. *BMJ*. 2021;374:n1648. doi:10.1136/bmj.n1648
- 546 39. Cutler DM. The Costs of Long COVID. *JAMA Health Forum*. 2022;3(5):e221809.
547 doi:10.1001/jamahealthforum.2022.1809
- 548 40. Cutler DM, Summers LH. The COVID-19 Pandemic and the \$16 Trillion Virus.
549 *JAMA*. 2020;324(15):1495-1496. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.19759

- 550
551
552
41. Bowe B, Xie Y, Al-Aly Z. Acute and postacute sequelae associated with SARS-CoV-2 reinfection. *Nat Med*. 2022;28(11):2398-2405. doi:10.1038/s41591-022-02051-3
- 553
554
555
42. Kerr J, Panagopoulos C, van der Linden S. Political polarization on COVID-19 pandemic response in the United States. *Pers Individ Dif*. 2021;179:110892. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2021.110892
- 556
557
558
559
43. Yuan Y, Thierry JM, Bull-Otterson L, et al. COVID-19 Cases and Hospitalizations Among Medicare Beneficiaries With and Without Disabilities - United States, January 1, 2020-November 20, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2022;71(24):791-796. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7124a3
- 560
561
44. Gostin LO. The Great Coronavirus Pandemic of 2020-7 Critical Lessons. *JAMA*. 2020;324(18):1816-1817. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.18347

Table 1. Response to the Statement “The Pandemic is Over” Among US Adults, Overall and by Demographic Characteristics, September to October 2022

	All respondents	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	P
	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	
All respondents	4985 (100)	954 (19.1)	1188 (23.8)	1187 (23.8)	996 (20.0)	661 (13.3)	
Sex							
Female	2539 (50.9)	577 (22.7)	639 (25.2)	639 (25.2)	450 (17.7)	234 (9.2)	<.001
Male	2446 (49.1)	376 (15.4)	549 (22.4)	548 (22.4)	546 (22.3)	427 (17.5)	
Age group, years							
18 to 24	581 (11.6)	85 (14.6)	118 (20.3)	176 (30.2)	132 (22.8)	70 (12.1)	<.001
25 to 44	1716 (34.4)	267 (15.6)	305 (17.8)	464 (27.1)	380 (22.2)	299 (17.4)	
45 to 64	1611 (32.3)	345 (21.4)	401 (24.9)	349 (21.7)	313 (19.4)	203 (12.6)	
65 and over	1078 (21.6)	257 (23.8)	363 (33.7)	198 (18.3)	171 (15.9)	89 (8.3)	
Combined race and ethnicity^a							
Asian, non-Hispanic	303 (6.1)	61 (20.1)	86 (28.2)	69 (22.8)	61 (20.1)	26 (8.7)	<.001
Black, non-Hispanic	612 (12.3)	160 (26.1)	148 (24.2)	158 (25.8)	99 (16.2)	48 (7.8)	
Hispanic or Latino, any race or races	844 (16.9)	170 (20.2)	190 (22.5)	207 (24.5)	161 (19.1)	116 (13.7)	
Other race or races, non-Hispanic	129 (2.6)	26 (19.8)	20 (15.7)	52 (40.0)	15 (12.0)	16 (12.4)	
White, non-Hispanic	3097 (62.1)	537 (17.3)	744 (24.0)	702 (22.6)	659 (21.3)	455 (14.7)	
Highest education attainment							
High school degree or less	1224 (24.5)	272 (22.2)	226 (18.5)	403 (32.9)	206 (16.9)	117 (9.5)	<.001
College or some college	2882 (57.8)	540 (18.7)	772 (26.8)	635 (22.0)	580 (20.1)	356 (12.3)	
More than bachelor's degree	879 (17.6)	142 (16.1)	190 (21.6)	149 (17.0)	210 (23.9)	189 (21.5)	
Experience with disability^b							
No difficulty with tasks	1954 (39.2)	364 (18.6)	471 (24.1)	491 (25.1)	377 (19.3)	252 (12.9)	<.001
Some difficulty with tasks	1678 (33.7)	366 (21.8)	484 (28.8)	338 (20.2)	316 (18.8)	174 (10.4)	
A lot of difficulty with tasks	974 (19.5)	178 (18.3)	190 (19.5)	254 (26.1)	198 (20.3)	154 (15.8)	
Cannot do some tasks at all	379 (7.6)	46 (12.0)	43 (11.3)	104 (27.3)	105 (27.7)	82 (21.6)	
Self-rated health							
Excellent	846 (17.0)	106 (12.6)	110 (13.0)	185 (21.9)	169 (20.0)	276 (32.6)	<.001
Very good	1561 (31.3)	262 (16.8)	360 (23.1)	355 (22.7)	403 (25.8)	181 (11.6)	
Good	1662 (33.3)	353 (21.2)	433 (26.1)	479 (28.8)	272 (16.4)	124 (7.5)	
Fair	761 (15.3)	184 (24.2)	242 (31.8)	143 (18.8)	124 (16.2)	68 (9.0)	
Poor	154 (3.1)	48 (31.3)	43 (27.6)	25 (16.1)	27 (17.7)	11 (7.3)	
Unpaid caregiver roles							
None	3412 (68.4)	686 (20.1)	873 (25.6)	839 (24.6)	628 (18.4)	387 (11.3)	<.001
Unpaid caregiver of adults only	540 (10.8)	140 (25.9)	119 (22.0)	115 (21.3)	102 (18.9)	64 (11.8)	

Unpaid caregiver of children only	424 (8.5)	58 (13.7)	121 (28.6)	95 (22.4)	109 (25.6)	41 (9.7)	
Unpaid caregiver of both age groups	609 (12.2)	70 (11.5)	74 (12.2)	138 (22.6)	157 (25.8)	170 (27.8)	
US Census region^c							
Northeast	935 (18.8)	175 (18.7)	207 (22.1)	237 (25.3)	182 (19.5)	134 (14.3)	>.99
Midwest	980 (19.7)	166 (16.9)	238 (24.3)	221 (22.5)	217 (22.1)	139 (14.2)	
South	1863 (37.4)	365 (19.6)	434 (23.3)	460 (24.7)	356 (19.1)	248 (13.3)	
West	1206 (24.2)	248 (20.6)	307 (25.5)	269 (22.3)	241 (20.0)	140 (11.6)	
Political ideology^d							
Very liberal	797 (16.0)	190 (23.9)	190 (23.8)	144 (18.0)	158 (19.8)	115 (14.4)	<.001
Slightly liberal	869 (17.4)	214 (24.7)	268 (30.8)	150 (17.3)	173 (19.9)	63 (7.3)	
Neither liberal nor conservative	1404 (28.2)	264 (18.8)	361 (25.7)	453 (32.2)	231 (16.4)	96 (6.8)	
Slightly conservative	848 (17.0)	117 (13.8)	210 (24.7)	173 (20.3)	226 (26.6)	123 (14.5)	
Very conservative	824 (16.5)	113 (13.7)	117 (14.2)	169 (20.5)	182 (22.0)	244 (29.6)	

Abbreviations: COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019

^a Includes “American Indian or Alaskan Native,” “Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander,” and “Other.”

^b Based on the Washington Group - Short Set of Questions on Disability. Includes difficulty seeing, hearing, walking or climbing steps, remembering or concentrating, with self-care, and communicating.

^c A single respondent living in Puerto Rico is not included in the US Census Region rows.

^d Respondents who preferred not to answer with their political ideology (n = 243) are not included in the Political ideology tables.

Table 2. Response to the Statement “The Pandemic is Over” Among US Adults, Overall and by COVID-19-Related Characteristics, September to October 2022

	All respondents	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	<i>P</i>
	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	
All respondents	4985 (100)	954 (19.1)	1188 (23.8)	1187 (23.8)	996 (20)	661 (13.3)	
Frequency of mask use in public spaces in the past 2 weeks							
Always	1007 (20.2)	329 (32.7)	219 (21.8)	183 (18.2)	157 (15.6)	118 (11.8)	<.001
Often	689 (13.8)	124 (18.0)	175 (25.4)	153 (22.3)	136 (19.7)	100 (14.6)	
Sometimes	859 (17.2)	157 (18.3)	245 (28.5)	249 (29.0)	150 (17.4)	58 (6.7)	
Rarely	743 (14.9)	103 (13.9)	228 (30.7)	209 (28.1)	158 (21.3)	45 (6.1)	
Never	1537 (30.8)	196 (12.7)	295 (19.2)	345 (22.4)	373 (24.3)	329 (21.4)	
Did not go to a public place	150 (3.0)	45 (30.0)	25 (16.7)	47 (31.5)	22 (14.9)	10 (6.9)	
Frequency of avoidance of large gatherings in the past 2 weeks							
Always	843 (16.9)	277 (32.8)	176 (20.8)	143 (16.9)	102 (12.1)	146 (17.4)	<.001
Often	852 (17.1)	197 (23.1)	216 (25.3)	199 (23.3)	166 (19.5)	75 (8.8)	
Sometimes	947 (19.0)	160 (16.9)	232 (24.5)	290 (30.7)	188 (19.8)	76 (8.1)	
Rarely	635 (12.7)	77 (12.1)	194 (30.6)	147 (23.1)	165 (26.0)	52 (8.2)	
Never	1707 (34.2)	243 (14.3)	370 (21.6)	408 (23.9)	375 (22.0)	311 (18.2)	
COVID-19 vaccine doses received							
Zero	1075 (21.6)	179 (16.6)	160 (14.9)	329 (30.6)	205 (19.1)	201 (18.7)	<.001
One	385 (7.7)	56 (14.5)	63 (16.4)	102 (26.6)	92 (23.8)	72 (18.7)	
Two	1351 (27.1)	202 (14.9)	340 (25.2)	315 (23.3)	311 (23.0)	183 (13.6)	
Three	1323 (26.5)	243 (18.4)	341 (25.8)	300 (22.7)	265 (20.0)	173 (13.1)	
Four or more	852 (17.1)	274 (32.2)	283 (33.2)	140 (16.4)	123 (14.5)	32 (3.7)	
Concern about coronavirus variants							
Not at all concerned	934 (18.7)	114 (12.2)	93 (10.0)	240 (25.7)	186 (19.9)	302 (32.3)	<.001
Somewhat unconcerned	495 (9.9)	60 (12.1)	118 (23.9)	99 (20.0)	168 (33.9)	50 (10.1)	
Neutral	1209 (24.3)	107 (8.9)	267 (22.1)	542 (44.9)	229 (18.9)	64 (5.3)	
Somewhat concerned	1484 (29.8)	343 (23.1)	574 (38.7)	203 (13.7)	299 (20.2)	65 (4.4)	
Very concerned	863 (17.3)	330 (38.3)	136 (15.7)	102 (11.9)	115 (13.3)	180 (20.9)	

Abbreviations: COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019

Figure 1. Flow of The COPE Initiative Survey Respondents, September to October 2022.




Figure 2. Adjusted Odds Ratios of Having Agreed that the Pandemic was Over by Demographic Characteristics, September to October 2022.




Figure 3. Adjusted Odds Ratios of Having Agreed that the Pandemic was Over by COVID-19-Related Characteristics, September to October 2022.

