

Supplemental Materials: Fine-Grained Forecasting of COVID-19 Trends at the County Level in the United States

Tzu-Hsi Song , Leonardo Clemente , Xiang Pan , Junbong Jang , Mauricio
Santillana^{*} , and Kwonmoo Lee^{**}

^{*}Mauricio Santillana: m.santillana@northeastern.edu

^{**}Kwonmoo Lee: Kwonmoo.Lee@childrens.harvard.edu

This PDF File includes:

- Tables S1 to S4
- Figures S1 to S7

Table S1: Comparison of Forecasting Models with different training format at State Level

Models	1 st day		7 th day		14 th day	
	RMSE	RRMSE(%)	RMSE	RRMSE(%)	RMSE	RRMSE(%)
Autoregressive*	2919.32±20428.46	78.63±686.99	3600.42±1.31x10 ¹³	101.39±5.41x10 ¹¹	15141.28±5.32x10 ²³	591.01±2.45x10 ²²
GRU*	2614.1±5706.59	75.69±38.71	2681.13±5703.73	76.08±42.74	2905.47±5716.06	82.43±34.63
LSTM*	2769.32±5701.13	71.69±19.52	2764.88±5721.4	72.11±18.9	2940.21±5707.36	79.55±16.32
biLSTM*	2340.29±5475.5	68.51±15.85	2521.58±5473.84	70.93±16.95	2743.3±5483.12	77.91±19.24
biLSTM	371±1047.57	12.44±15.04	1189.43±1806.38	28.9±14.01	1940.18±3216.91	49.46±17.18
FIGI-Net	290.31±908.81	9.17±13.59	1149.66±1850.66	26.94±14.48	1935.36±3458.21	49.12±16.47

*: directly use State data for model training

Table S2: Comparison of FIGI-Net against the baseline models in 1 week horizons at the county level.

Models	RMSE	RRMSE
Autoregressive	212.18±2.44x10 ¹⁰	83.32±4.16x10 ⁹
Persistence	81.24±302.06	37.38±14.77
GRU	48.4±254.14	26.32±88.23
LSTM	52.09±240.49	26.69±61.04
TC-LSTM	57.32±281.55	28.39±19.87
TC-biLSTM	40.4±222.56	20.27±16.62
biLSTM	36.63±180.55	18.57±57.39
FIGI-Net	34.16±190.24	17.13±16.49
CDC	157.49±1285.95	76.24±78.71

Table S3: Comparison of FIGI-Net and baseline models for the 2 week horizon task at the county level

Models	RMSE	RRMSE
Autoregressive	99.79±6.78x10 ⁵	45.25±1.17x10 ⁵
Persistence	125.12±510.7	61.67±11.62
GRU	63.89±305.64	33.3±116.39
LSTM	72.64±317.59	32.85±48.7
TC-LSTM	71.7±334.39	36.8±25.69
TC-biLSTM	69.59±311.8	34.03±22.64
biLSTM	59.25±283.61	29.88±31.89
FIGI-Net	58.43±282.14	29.36±21.21
CDC	157.58±1090.97	76.49±66.24

Table S4: Comparison of training duration identification for the proposed model across 1-week and 2-week forecasting horizons

Training Length	1 week		2 week	
	RMSE	R ²	RMSE	R ²
30 days	24.45±14.31	0.864	29.79±11.45	0.861
45 days	26.28±14.49	0.944	26.42±13.33	0.912
60 days	19.04±13.28	0.968	24.97±14.59	0.933
75 days (Optimal)	14.39±11.23	0.977	22.71±12.46	0.937
90 days	12.74±9.66	0.978	20.26±12.66	0.943




Figure S1: Comparison of Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE), relative RMSE, and error reduction across various models is conducted for a 14-day forecast horizon, analyzed at both (a) county and (b) state levels. The performance assessment reveals that the deep learning-based model exhibits comparable forecasting capability within the 14-day horizon. Furthermore, the FIGI-Net model demonstrates a significant reduction in forecasting errors, approximately 35% at the county level and 50% at the state level, when compared to the persistence model.

: p-value < 0.005
 *: p-value < 0.001




Figure S2: Comparison of RMSE between FIGI-Net and biLSTM across various forecast horizons. Our results indicate that our model yields lower prediction errors for infection numbers within the first 7 days of prediction compared to biLSTM (as indicated by the red line).




Figure S3: Comparison of various models at the county level across 1 and 2 week ahead horizons. The models are sorted in descending order based on their RMSE values. Notably, our FIGI-Net model demonstrates accurate prediction performance and places among the top 2 with lowest RMSE.

*: p-value < 0.001




Figure S4: Evolution of prediction error for FIGI-Net at state level. Each column represents the average relative RMSE (each average is computed using a non-overlapping 15-day period between April 2020 and April 2022) across US states for the 1-day and 14-day horizons, compared to the national reported infection trend. We can clearly observe that Missouri, Montana, and Nebraska have large RRMSE values during March 2021 to May 2021 in 1-day ahead prediction. In addition, we can observe that the RRMSE errors increase before the early stage of the next outbreaks (red rectangle).




Figure S5: COVID-19 Critical Time Periods for each state in US (Part I). The critical time periods were created by independently quantifying the trend of COVID-19 confirmed cases across each state, and identifying the time periods when the value of the trend exceeded the threshold of 1.0 (marked with a red-dash line in every figure).




Figure S6: COVID-19 Critical Time Periods for each state in US (Part II).




Figure S7: COVID-19 Critical Time Periods for each state in US (Part III).