

1 **Title: Quantifying the spatiotemporal dynamics of the first two epidemic waves of SARS-**  
2 **CoV-2 infections in the United States**

3 **Short Title: Dynamics of the first two epidemic waves of SARS-CoV-2 infections in US**

4  
5 **Rafael Lopes<sup>1,2,\*,#</sup>, Nicole A. Swartwood<sup>3,\*,#</sup>, Yu Lan<sup>1,2</sup>, Melanie H. Chitwood<sup>1,2</sup>, Fayette**  
6 **Klaassen<sup>3</sup>, Joshua A. Salomon<sup>4</sup>, Nicolas A. Menzies<sup>3</sup>, Joshua L. Warren<sup>5,2</sup>, Nathan D.**  
7 **Grubaugh<sup>1,2</sup>, & Ted Cohen<sup>1,2,†</sup>**

8 <sup>1</sup> Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public Health, Yale  
9 University, New Haven, Connecticut, USA

10 <sup>2</sup> Public Health Modeling Unit, Yale School of Public Health, Yale University, New Haven,  
11 Connecticut, USA

12 <sup>3</sup> Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health,  
13 Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

14 <sup>4</sup> Department of Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA

15 <sup>5</sup> Department of Biostatistics, Yale School of Public Health, Yale University, New Haven,  
16 Connecticut, USA

17

18 \* Co-first authors

19 † Senior author

20 # Corresponding Authors:

21 Rafael Lopes, 350 George Street, New Haven, CT 06511.

22 Email: [rafael.lopes@yale.edu](mailto:rafael.lopes@yale.edu) Phone (+1) 475-300-8845

23 Nicole A. Swartwood, 90 Smith Street, Boston, MA 02120.

24 Email: [nswartwood@hsph.harvard.edu](mailto:nswartwood@hsph.harvard.edu). Phone (+1) 617-432-6171.

25

26 **Abstract:**

27 SARS-CoV-2 infection rates displayed striking temporal and spatial variation during the  
28 emergence of new variants globally and within the United States. While spatiotemporal "waves"  
29 of infection have been observed, quantitative assessments of their spread remain limited. Here,  
30 we estimate and compare the speed and spatial extent of the first two major infection waves in  
31 the United States, illustrating these dynamics through detailed visualizations. Our findings reveal  
32 that the origins of these waves coincide with large gatherings and the relaxation of masking  
33 mandates. Notably, the second wave spread more rapidly than the first, driven by multiple, non-  
34 contiguous origins of infection. This highlights the role of regional heterogeneity in epidemic  
35 dynamics and underscores the importance of localized public health measures in mitigating  
36 ongoing outbreaks.

37

38 **Author Summary:**

39 Over the pandemic of SARS-CoV-2, efforts to identify and visualize the disease progression  
40 were made. However, quantitative visualization of the infections spreading are limited until  
41 today. Here we developed tools to visualize the spatial and temporal spreading of SARS-CoV-2  
42 first two waves of infections over the Contiguous United States. We generated novels figures and  
43 movies that captures the dynamics of spreading and developed a new mapping of incidence of  
44 SARS-CoV-2 that goes below county-level. These outputs can help public health understanding  
45 and control efforts of the disease.

## 46 **Introduction**

47 Person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 was confirmed in the United States (US) in late  
48 January 2020 and a national public health emergency was declared six weeks later (1,2). Spatial  
49 visualizations of observed and estimated COVID-19 cases and deaths displayed wave-like spread  
50 as new variants were introduced in the country (3,4). Previous investigations have examined the  
51 correlation between the spatiotemporal patterns of COVID-19 spread and human mobility (5–7).  
52 Other studies have estimated the effectiveness of public health measures such as lockdowns and  
53 travel restrictions in interrupting or modifying these patterns (7–9). However, efforts to quantify  
54 the speed and spatial extent of viral spread over distinct epidemic waves have been limited. Here,  
55 we apply a version of the Besag, York, and Mollié (BYM) spatial model (10,11) to temporally-  
56 and spatially-resolved estimates of SARS-CoV-2 infections derived from a previously described  
57 model (3). Based on this analysis we quantify the speed at which SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks spread  
58 during the two large waves of SARS-CoV-2 infections in the United States during March 2020 to  
59 December 2021.

60

## 61 **Materials and Methods**

62

### 63 **Data sources**

64 We used previously published daily estimates of SARS-CoV-2 infections at the county-level in  
65 the United States from a Bayesian nowcasting model that synthesized reported COVID-19 cases  
66 and deaths, accounting for both under ascertainment and time lags (3). Our dataset encompasses  
67 the period from March 2020 to December 2021. To estimate population denominators for per

68 capita analyses, we used 2019 population estimates from the US Census Bureau, which provided  
69 population size estimates for all Census Block Groups (CBGs) in the United States (12).

70

### 71 **Regularization of geographical units**

72 The smallest consistently available unit of reporting for US COVID-19 cases, hospitalizations,  
73 and deaths was at the county-level, which dictated the geographic resolution of the SARS-CoV-2  
74 infection estimates. However, as the geographic size and population density of counties differs  
75 systematically across the US (larger and less dense in the West than in the East), a county-level  
76 analysis could lead to bias in estimates of the wave speed and expansion.

77

78 To improve our ability to detect spatial patterns in the data, we first created a spatially  
79 regularized grid of infections per capita across the contiguous US. The grid is comprised of 7,665  
80 unique hexagons, each enclosing 64.75 square kilometers (25 square miles). We employed an  
81 area-weighted approach to distribute population estimates from CBGs to hexagons (**Figure 1A-**  
82 **C**), assuming a constant population throughout the analysis period. We then distributed estimated  
83 infections from counties to hexagons (12) based on the fraction of each county's population  
84 contained in each hexagon and assuming that per capita infection rates were distributed equally  
85 within a county. We combined these to produce daily estimates of SARS-CoV-2 infections per  
86 capita for each hexagon (**Figure 1D-E**).

87

### 88 **Assessment of infections per capita surfaces**

89 We fit a modified version of the BYM model as implemented in R-INLA (10), called BYM2, to  
90 estimate spatially smoothed rates of SARS-CoV-2 infections per capita across the hexagonal

91 grid. The BYM2 is a reparametrized version of the original Besag (11) model, which improves  
92 the assignment of prior distributions for the corresponding model parameters and the subsequent  
93 interpretation of parameters (10). Specifically, our model is given as

$$94 \quad Z(A_i) = \mu + \theta(A_i) + \epsilon(A_i), \quad (1)$$

95 where  $Z(A_i)$  is the infections per capita in hexagon  $A_i$ ,  $\mu$  is the global intercept,  $\theta(A_i)$  are  
96 random effects that are assigned the BYM2 prior distribution, and  $\epsilon(A_i)$  are residual error terms  
97 assumed to be statistically independent. For more details on the model and on the priors used see  
98 the **Supplementary Material**. We fit this model separately for each day over March 2020 to  
99 December 2021. The collection of all the  $\mu + \theta(A_i)$  (i.e., the global intercept plus the denoised  
100 and spatially smoothed random effects) are the modeled infections per capita, or surfaces. We  
101 then produced a daily sequence of these surfaces, which we used to calculate the speed of wave  
102 expansion and to visualize changes over time. We opted for a separate model fit on each day to  
103 avoid temporal oversmoothing effects, as the infection estimates were derived from a nowcasting  
104 model that already applied temporal smoothing.

105

## 106 **Definitions of wave and speed of expansion**

107 We defined waves as one or more sets of contiguous hexagons with relatively high infections-  
108 per-capita levels. To allow for multiple infection centers with the same wave, we did not limit  
109 our definition to a single contiguous set. Using this framework, we categorized ‘Wave 1’ as the  
110 period from September 2020 to February 2021 and ‘Wave 2’ as the period from July 2021 to  
111 November 2021. To formally determine hexagons within a wave, we defined a level of per-capita  
112 SARS-CoV-2 infection, above which we coded hexagons as being part of the infection wave. For  
113 our main analysis we used a threshold of 165 daily infections per-capita to characterize a

114 hexagon as being within a wave. This value represents the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of the infections-per-  
115 capita value distribution during the study period (**Figure S1**). We conducted sensitivity analyses  
116 using 85 and 300 infections per capita as alternative threshold values (**Supplementary Material**  
117 **Figure S2**). We calculated the speed of wave expansion as the increase in area covered by the  
118 wave each day (number of hexes recruited into a wave each day).

119

## 120 **Statistical analysis**

121 All analyses were performed using R Statistical Software (v4.3.0) (13)). We also used the **INLA**,  
122 **sf**, **sp**, **spdep**, **areal**, **rgeoda**, and **magick** R packages (14–18).

123

## 124 **Results**

125

### 126 **Spatiotemporal patterns of SARS-CoV-2 infections across the United States**

127 As described in the **Material and Methods**, we categorized infections as belonging to Wave 1  
128 (September 2020 to February 2021) or Wave 2 (July 2021 to December 2021) (**Figure 2A**).

129 **Figure 2B-I** shows the smoothed estimates of SARS-CoV-2 infections per capita from the  
130 BYM2 model on eight dates, leading up to the peak of each of the two waves analyzed. Our  
131 model estimated that Wave 1 originated with a set of hexes spanning central South Dakota,  
132 eastern North Dakota, and northeastern Montana (**Figure 2B**) in mid-September of 2020. Then  
133 the wave extended south and to both coasts from this point of origin, achieving a peak of over  
134 1.5 million infections/day by mid-November 2020 (**Figure 2C-E**). Wave 2 originated in the  
135 Ozarks (southern Missouri and northern Arkansas) (**Figure 2F**) in early July 2021, and then  
136 expanded further south (**Figure 2G-I**). Secondary centers of infection appeared later in July in

137 the Pacific Northwest (**Figure 2G**), and the wave of infections subsequently spread throughout  
138 the western United States (**Figure 2G-I**). This wave had a peak of 300 per capita infection/day  
139 by early September 2021. Animations of the infection waves are provided in **Movie 1**, which  
140 presents maps of the spatially smoothed infections across the full study period at a weekly  
141 timestep.

142

### 143 **Wave expansion and speed of expansion**

144 **Figure 3B-C** shows contour plots of the speed of expansion for each wave. At its peak, each  
145 wave involved the total contiguous United States (8,595,756 km<sup>2</sup>), but the two waves differed in  
146 the time needed to spread across the nation. Wave 1 expanded from an area of 327,780 km<sup>2</sup> to the  
147 total United States in 64 days (September 8<sup>th</sup>–November 11<sup>th</sup>, 2020) (**Figure 3B**). Wave 2  
148 expanded from an area of 246,047 km<sup>2</sup> to the total United States in 51 days (July 7<sup>th</sup> – August  
149 27<sup>th</sup>, 2021) (**Figure 3C**).

150

151 Wave 1 reached its maximal speed of expansion (~ 580,000 km<sup>2</sup>/day) 49 days after its formation  
152 and 14 days prior to its peak. Wave 2 reached its maximal speed of expansion (~ 650,000  
153 km<sup>2</sup>/day) more quickly, in only 38 days after its formation and 25 days prior to its peak (**Figure**  
154 **3C**). Sensitivity analyses using different thresholds for categorizing a hexagon as within a wave  
155 resulted in consistent estimates for speed of wave expansion and time to reach peak expansion  
156 speed (**Figure S2**). The shape and speed of wave patterns were also robust to the choice of  
157 threshold (**Figure S3** and **Figure S4**). See **Supplementary Material Figure S5** displaying the  
158 countour plot of the timing of each wave speed of expansion.

159

## 160 Discussion

161 We sought to quantify the expansion of SARS-CoV-2 infections across the United States during  
162 the first two large waves of the epidemic (**Figures 2**, **Movie1**, and **Movie2**). The two waves had  
163 unique origin sites within the United States. We estimated that Wave 1 originated in parts of  
164 northeastern Montana, eastern North Dakota, and central South Dakota in September 2020  
165 (**Figures 2B-E** and **Movie 2**). This estimated origin coincided with a motorcycle rally that  
166 brought over 460,000 individuals to Sturgis, South Dakota in August 2020 and was later  
167 epidemiologically implicated in elevated local COVID-19 rates and interstate spread of infection  
168 (19,20). Wave 2 originated in the Ozarks (**Figures 2F-I** and **Movie 2**), during a time when there  
169 was local re-opening of indoor music venues and relaxation of local masking policies (21,22).  
170 Shortly following spread in the Ozarks, secondary centers of elevated SARS-CoV-2 infections  
171 per capita were found in the Pacific Northwest. Previous work has implicated both domestic and  
172 international travel in contributing to SARS-CoV-2 transmission across United States and likely  
173 explains the rapid appearance of multiple wave centers for the second examined wave of the  
174 epidemic (23).

175  
176 While we found that Wave 2 had both a higher maximal speed of expansion and achieved this  
177 peak speed more quickly than Wave 1, the overall similarity in our estimates of the speeds of  
178 wave expansion for these first two waves is notable. This similarity in wave speed expansion is  
179 more remarkable in light of the very different viral variants in circulation (Wave 1 was initially  
180 due to wildtype SARS-CoV-2 and later the Alpha variant (24,25), while Wave 2 was due to the  
181 spread of the Delta variant (23)), regional and secular changes in nonpharmaceutical intervention  
182 policies, and the stark differences in the levels and types of infection- and vaccine-induced



183 population immunity at the time of these two waves (26). Such stability in the speed of wave  
184 expansion suggests that underlying patterns of human mobility may have had a stronger impact  
185 on the patterns of local epidemic expansion than viral variation, non-pharmaceutical  
186 interventions, and host-immunity (7,20).

187  
188 Our effort to provide quantitative estimates of speeds and locations of epidemic wave expansion  
189 required several simplifying assumptions. Importantly, we elected to use estimates of infections  
190 from a nowcasting model (rather than case notification data) as diagnosis and case reporting  
191 varied markedly in quality and completeness over the epidemic (27). To overcome potential bias  
192 associated with the irregular shapes and sizes of US counties (the smallest unit at which  
193 estimates were possible), we distributed estimated infections on a hexagonal grid before  
194 calculating the speed of wave expansion. This could have introduced bias if cases within counties  
195 were not randomly distributed, though this effect would be modest. Finally, we arbitrarily  
196 selected the threshold of infections per capita to define wave membership. However, our  
197 sensitivity analyses found that the wave speeds were similar at alternative thresholds.

198  
199 Factors that affect the magnitude and speed of epidemic waves is an area of substantial interest  
200 for other viral diseases like influenza (e.g. Viboud et al. 2006 (28), Eggo et al. 2011 (29), Gog et  
201 al. 2014 (30)). While our work on SARS-CoV-2 does not itself provide explanations for why  
202 each of these first two epidemic waves spread in the manner that they did once they were  
203 established, the development of methods to quantify the speed and extent of spread, such as  
204 those we employ here, are a necessary first step. Further research to explore the manner in which  
205 the pathogen, environment, and host characteristics affect the speeds and patterns of epidemic

206 expansion may help to predict wave expansion, and could provide valuable information for the  
207 planning of spatially defined interventions.

208

209

## 210 **Funding**

211 This project is supported by Cooperative Agreement NU38OT000297 from the Centers for Disease  
212 Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists (CSTE),  
213 SHEPherd Contract 200-2016-91779 from the CDC, and the CDC Broad Agency Announcement  
214 Contract 75D30122C14697. This work does not necessarily represent the views of the CDC or  
215 CSTE.

216

## 217 **Data availability:**

218 Daily county estimates of per capita infections used in the analysis are available at Harvard  
219 Dataverse (31). The code and the hexagonally distributed infections per capita estimates for this  
220 analysis are available at: <https://github.com/covidestim/waves>.

221

## 222 **Author contribution – CRediT Taxonomy**

223 Conceptualization: RL, NAS, TC

224 Methodology: RL, NAS, JLW, TC

225 Investigation: RL, NAS

226 Visualization: RL, NAS, YL

227 Funding acquisition: NAM, JAS, NDG, TC


228 Supervision: JAS, NAM, JLW, NDG, TC

229 Writing – original draft: RL, NAS

230 Writing – review & editing: all authors

231 **Competing interests**


232 NDG is a paid consultant for BioNTech



234 **Figure 1: United States population and estimated cumulative SARS-CoV-2 infections per**  
235 **capita distributed across the hexagonal grid.** Panel **A, B,** and **C:** United States', New  
236 England's and Connecticut's 2019 population Census estimates on the hexagonal grid. Panel **D,**  
237 **E,** and **F:** United States', New England's, and Connecticut cumulative infections per 100,000  
238 persons on the hexagonal grid (March 2020–December 2021).

239

240 Note: Numbers are given in a log 10 scale. Hexagons with no filling had no population reported  
241 or infections counts ever estimated.



243 **Figure 2: Estimated infections per capita of SARS-CoV-2 in the United States, March 2020–December 2021.** Panel A: Time  
244 series of SARS-CoV-2 infection estimates for the United States, the gray shaded areas show the first two large waves of infections.  
245 Panels **B, C, D,** and **E:** Sequence of the spatially smoothed estimates of SARS-CoV-2 infections per capita associated with Wave 1 at 4  
246 time points. Panels **F, G, H,** and **I:** Sequence of the spatially smoothed estimates of SARS-CoV-2 infections per capita associated with  
247 Wave 2 at 4 time points.

248

249

250

251

252

253

254


255

256

257

258

259



260

261

262

263



264 **Figure 3: SARS-CoV-2 infections-per-capita surfaces progression and speed of invasion for each wave.** Comparison of SARS-  
265 CoV-2 infection Wave 1 and Wave 2 speed for 56- to 7- days prior to each wave's infection peak. **See Supplementary Material**  
266 **Figure S5 for a contour plot of waves progression.**

## 267 **References**

- 268 1. List of Public Health Emergency Declarations [Internet]. [cited 2024 Dec 3]. Available from:  
269 <https://aspr.hhs.gov:443/legal/PHE/Pages/default.aspx>
- 270 2. Determination that a Public Health Emergency Exists [Internet]. [cited 2024 Dec 3]. Available  
271 from: <https://aspr.hhs.gov:443/legal/PHE/Pages/2019-nCoV.aspx>
- 272 3. Chitwood MH, Russi M, Gunasekera K, Havumaki J, Klaassen F, Pitzer VE, et al.  
273 Reconstructing the course of the COVID-19 epidemic over 2020 for US states and counties:  
274 Results of a Bayesian evidence synthesis model. *PLOS Comput Biol* [Internet]. 2022 Aug 30  
275 [cited 2023 Oct 6];18(8):e1010465. Available from:  
276 <https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1010465>
- 277 4. Gamio L, Smith M, Yourish K, Almukhtar S. Watch How the Coronavirus Spread Across the  
278 United States. *The New York Times* [Internet]. 2020 Mar 21 [cited 2023 Dec 19]; Available  
279 from: <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/03/21/us/coronavirus-us-cases-spread.html>
- 280 5. Kissler SM, Kishore N, Prabhu M, Goffman D, Beilin Y, Landau R, et al. Reductions in  
281 commuting mobility correlate with geographic differences in SARS-CoV-2 prevalence in New  
282 York City. *Nat Commun* [Internet]. 2020 Sep 16 [cited 2024 Oct 17];11(1):4674. Available  
283 from: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-18271-5>
- 284 6. Gatto M, Bertuzzo E, Mari L, Miccoli S, Carraro L, Casagrandi R, et al. Spread and dynamics  
285 of the COVID-19 epidemic in Italy: Effects of emergency containment measures. *Proc Natl  
286 Acad Sci* [Internet]. 2020 May 12 [cited 2024 Oct 14];117(19):10484–91. Available from:  
287 <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2004978117>
- 288 7. Kraemer MUG, Yang CH, Gutierrez B, Wu CH, Klein B, Pigott DM, et al. The effect of  
289 human mobility and control measures on the COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Science*  
290 [Internet]. 2020 May [cited 2024 Oct 2];368(6490):493–7. Available from:  
291 <https://www.science.org/doi/full/10.1126/science.abb4218>
- 292 8. Pepe E, Bajardi P, Gauvin L, Privitera F, Lake B, Cattuto C, et al. COVID-19 outbreak  
293 response, a dataset to assess mobility changes in Italy following national lockdown. *Sci Data*  
294 [Internet]. 2020 Jul 8 [cited 2024 Oct 2];7(1):230. Available from:  
295 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41597-020-00575-2>
- 296 9. Chinazzi M, Davis JT, Ajelli M, Gioannini C, Litvinova M, Merler S, et al. The effect of travel  
297 restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. *Science*  
298 [Internet]. 2020 Apr 24 [cited 2024 Oct 2];368(6489):395–400. Available from:  
299 <https://www.science.org/doi/full/10.1126/science.aba9757>
- 300 10. Riebler A, Sørbye SH, Simpson D, Rue H. An intuitive Bayesian spatial model for  
301 disease mapping that accounts for scaling. *Stat Methods Med Res* [Internet]. 2016 Aug 1  
302 [cited 2024 Oct 2];25(4):1145–65. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0962280216660421>

- 303 11. Besag J, York J, Mollié A. Bayesian image restoration, with two applications in spatial  
304 statistics. *Ann Inst Stat Math* [Internet]. 1991 Mar [cited 2024 Oct 2];43(1):1–20. Available  
305 from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF00116466>
- 306 12. topojson/us-atlas [Internet]. TopoJSON; 2024 [cited 2024 Aug 7]. Available from:  
307 <https://github.com/topojson/us-atlas>
- 308 13. R: The R Project for Statistical Computing [Internet]. [cited 2024 Dec 3]. Available from:  
309 <https://www.r-project.org/>
- 310 14. Prener C, Revord C. areal: An R package for areal weighted interpolation [Internet].  
311 Zenodo; 2020 [cited 2024 Aug 7]. Available from: <https://zenodo.org/records/3822534>
- 312 15. Pebesma E. Simple Features for R: Standardized Support for Spatial Vector Data. *R J*  
313 [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2024 Oct 5];10(1):439. Available from: [https://journal.r-](https://journal.r-project.org/archive/2018/RJ-2018-009/index.html)  
314 [project.org/archive/2018/RJ-2018-009/index.html](https://journal.r-project.org/archive/2018/RJ-2018-009/index.html)
- 315 16. magick: Advanced Graphics and Image-Processing in R [Internet]. [cited 2024 Oct 5].  
316 Available from: <https://ropensci.r-universe.dev/magick>
- 317 17. Bivand R. spdep: Spatial Dependence: Weighting Schemes, Statistics [Internet]. 2002  
318 [cited 2024 Oct 7]. p. 1.3-6. Available from: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=spdep>
- 319 18. Lindgren F, Rue H. Bayesian Spatial Modelling with R-INLA. *J Stat Softw* [Internet].  
320 2015 Feb 16 [cited 2024 Oct 14];63:1–25. Available from:  
321 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v063.i19>
- 322 19. Firestone MJ. COVID-19 Outbreak Associated with a 10-Day Motorcycle Rally in a  
323 Neighboring State — Minnesota, August–September 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*  
324 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2024 May 22];69. Available from:  
325 <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6947e1.htm>
- 326 20. Dave D, McNichols D, Sabia JJ. The contagion externality of a superspreading event:  
327 The Sturgis Motorcycle Rally and COVID-19. *South Econ J*. 2021 Jan;87(3):769–807.
- 328 21. Barone E. TIME. 2021 [cited 2024 May 28]. How the Delta Variant Overtook Missouri:  
329 A Lesson for the Rest of the U.S. Available from: <https://time.com/6085454/delta-variant/>
- 330 22. Daly M. How a Tiny Town With an Anti-Mask Mayor Caused COVID Chaos. *The Daily*  
331 *Beast* [Internet]. 2021 Jul 23 [cited 2024 Oct 14]; Available from:  
332 <https://www.thedailybeast.com/missouris-covid-surge-started-in-tourist-town-of-branson>
- 333 23. Bolze A, Luo S, White S, Cirulli ET, Wyman D, Dei Rossi A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 variant  
334 Delta rapidly displaced variant Alpha in the United States and led to higher viral loads. *Cell*  
335 *Rep Med* [Internet]. 2022 Mar 15 [cited 2024 Mar 26];3(3):100564. Available from:  
336 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666379122000714>

- 337 24. Alpert T, Brito AF, Lasek-Nesselquist E, Rothman J, Valesano AL, MacKay MJ, et al.  
338 Early introductions and transmission of SARS-CoV-2 variant B.1.1.7 in the United States.  
339 Cell [Internet]. 2021 May [cited 2023 May 11];184(10):2595-2604.e13. Available from:  
340 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0092867421004347>
- 341 25. Washington NL, Gangavarapu K, Zeller M, Bolze A, Cirulli ET, Barrett KMS, et al.  
342 Emergence and rapid transmission of SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 in the United States. Cell  
343 [Internet]. 2021 May 13 [cited 2024 Nov 7];184(10):2587-2594.e7. Available from:  
344 [https://www.cell.com/cell/abstract/S0092-8674\(21\)00383-4](https://www.cell.com/cell/abstract/S0092-8674(21)00383-4)
- 345 26. Klaassen F, Chitwood MH, Cohen T, Pitzer VE, Russi M, Swartwood NA, et al. Changes  
346 in Population Immunity Against Infection and Severe Disease From Severe Acute Respiratory  
347 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Omicron Variants in the United States Between December 2021 and  
348 November 2022. Clin Infect Dis [Internet]. 2023 Aug 1 [cited 2023 Oct 16];77(3):355–61.  
349 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciad210>
- 350 27. Pitzer VE, Chitwood M, Havumaki J, Menzies NA, Perniciaro S, Warren JL, et al. The  
351 Impact of Changes in Diagnostic Testing Practices on Estimates of COVID-19 Transmission  
352 in the United States. Am J Epidemiol [Internet]. 2021 Sep 1 [cited 2023 Oct 26];190(9):1908–  
353 17. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwab089>
- 354 28. Viboud C, Bjørnstad ON, Smith DL, Simonsen L, Miller MA, Grenfell BT. Synchrony,  
355 Waves, and Spatial Hierarchies in the Spread of Influenza. Science [Internet]. 2006 Apr 21  
356 [cited 2024 Feb 29];312(5772):447–51. Available from:  
357 <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.1125237>
- 358 29. Eggo RM, Cauchemez S, Ferguson NM. Spatial dynamics of the 1918 influenza  
359 pandemic in England, Wales and the United States. J R Soc Interface [Internet]. 2011 Feb 6  
360 [cited 2024 Dec 12];8(55):233–43. Available from:  
361 <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rsif.2010.0216>
- 362 30. Gog JR, Ballesteros S, Viboud C, Simonsen L, Bjornstad ON, Shaman J, et al. Spatial  
363 Transmission of 2009 Pandemic Influenza in the US. PLOS Comput Biol [Internet]. 2014 Jun  
364 12 [cited 2024 Dec 12];10(6):e1003635. Available from:  
365 <https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003635>
- 366 31. Klaassen F. covidestim updated: Estimating SARS-CoV-2 infections and immunity over  
367 the entire pandemic [Internet]. Harvard Dataverse; 2024 [cited 2024 Oct 2]. Available from:  
368 <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/G2ZXJG>

369

370

371 **Supporting Information**

372 **Figure S1 – Histogram of values for the risk surfaces and empirical cumulative density**  
373 **function of the risk surface values.** The histogram show that the distribution of values is  
374 concentrated around 0, which as expected due to for long periods we had low to no infections  
375 occurring to a great number of places. The ECDF shows that a threshold of 165 infections per  
376 capita will capture 75% of the mass of the values distribution.

377  
378 **Figure S2 – Speed of invasion for different thresholds to the infection per capita surfaces**  
379 **progression calculation.** Panel **A** is built with a threshold of 85 or more infections per capita,  
380 panel **B** is built with a threshold of 300 infections per capita. As in **Figure 3C**, we observe a  
381 maximal speed and a steep decrease after peak, and, as in **Figure 3C**, the second wave had a  
382 higher speed of invasion and encompassed a larger area at peak than the first wave.

383  
384 **Figure S3 – Infection per capita surface on a continuous scale of values.** As expected, the  
385 wave-like pattern holds independently of the scale to be displayed, and as being an output of  
386 spatial smooth model, the continuous scale gives a less defined border to the risk surface  
387 expansion.

388  
389 **Figure S4 - Infection per capita with a threshold equal to the mean of the risk values**  
390 **distribution (85 infections per capita).** With a lower threshold showing on the map, the spread  
391 process seems to happen faster.

392  
393 **Figure S5 – Contour plot of the dates for the speed of expansion.** The contour plots shows the  
394 contour surface at dates with 7 days spacing between each, up until the national curve peak.