

The Lancet Public Health

Social determinants of COVID-19 mortality at the county level

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	thelancetpublichealth-D-20-01964
Article Type:	Article (Original Research)
Keywords:	COVID-19, health disparities, spatial analyses, immigrant health
Corresponding Author:	Rebecca Fielding-Miller, PhD,MSPH University of California San Diego School of Medicine La Jolla, CA UNITED STATES
First Author:	Rebecca Fielding-Miller, PhD,MSPH
Order of Authors:	Rebecca Fielding-Miller, PhD,MSPH Maria Sundaram, PhD, MSPH Kimberly Brouwer, PhD
Manuscript Region of Origin:	UNITED STATES
Abstract:	<p>Background: The United States is currently the global epicenter of the COVID-19 pandemic. Emerging data suggests that social determinants of health may be key drivers of the epidemic, and that minorities, migrants, and essential workers may bear a disproportionate degree of risk.</p> <p>Methods: We used publicly accessible datasets to build a series of spatial autoregressive models assessing county level associations between COVID-19 mortality and (1) Percentage of Non-English speaking households, (2) percentage of individuals engaged in hired farm work, (3) percentage of uninsured individuals under the age of 65, and (3) percentage of individuals living at or below the poverty line.</p> <p>Findings: Across all counties (n=2814), counties with more residents living in poverty, higher density, and more residents over the age of 65 reported higher levels of mortality. In urban counties (n=114), only county density was significantly associated with mortality. In non-urban counties (n=2700), counties with more non-English speaking households and more farm workers had significantly higher levels of mortality, as did counties with higher levels of poverty.</p> <p>Interpretations: Individuals who do not speak English, individuals engaged in farm work, and individuals living in poverty may be at heightened risk for COVID-19 mortality in non-urban counties. Mortality among the uninsured may be being systematically undercounted in county and national level surveillance.</p> <p>Funding: This work was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health, grant K01MH112436 and a National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparity Loan Repayment Contract, L60-MD011114</p>

1 **Social determinants of COVID-19 mortality at the county level**

2 Rebecca Fielding-Miller, MSPH PhD^{1*}

3 Maria Sundaram, MSPH PhD²

4 Kimberly Brouwer, PhD¹

5

6 ¹ University of California, San Diego

7 ² Emory University

8 *Corresponding author: email at rfieldingmiller@health.ucsd.edu

9

10 **Abstract**

11 **Background:** The United States is currently the global epicenter of the COVID-
12 19 pandemic. Emerging data suggests that social determinants of health may be
13 key drivers of the epidemic, and that minorities, migrants, and essential workers
14 may bear a disproportionate degree of risk.

15 **Methods:** We used publicly accessible datasets to build a series of spatial
16 autoregressive models assessing county level associations between COVID-19
17 mortality and (1) Percentage of Non-English speaking households, (2)
18 percentage of individuals engaged in hired farm work, (3) percentage of
19 uninsured individuals under the age of 65, and (3) percentage of individuals living
20 at or below the poverty line.

21 **Findings:** Across all counties (n=2814), counties with more residents living in
22 poverty, higher density, and more residents over the age of 65 reported higher
23 levels of mortality. In urban counties (n=114), only county density was
24 significantly associated with mortality. In non-urban counties (n=2700), counties
25 with more non-English speaking households and more farm workers had
26 significantly higher levels of mortality, as did counties with higher levels of
27 poverty.

28 **Interpretations:** Individuals who do not speak English, individuals engaged in
29 farm work, and individuals living in poverty may be at heightened risk for COVID-
30 19 mortality in non-urban counties. Mortality among the uninsured may be being
31 systematically undercounted in county and national level surveillance.

32

33 **Funding:** This work was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health,
34 grant K01MH112436 and a National Institute on Minority Health and Health
35 Disparity Loan Repayment Contract, L60-MD011114

36

37

38

39

40

41 **Author Contributions:** RFM conceptualized the study, collected the data,
42 conducted the analyses, and drafted the manuscript. MS contributed to study
43 conceptualization and design, and participated in drafting the manuscript. KB
44 oversaw analyses and participated in drafting the manuscript.

45

1 **Introduction**

2 A novel coronavirus responsible for COVID-19 respiratory disease is causing a
3 global pandemic which has already resulted in nearly 5 million cases and over
4 300,000 deaths since early January¹. The United States currently has more
5 cases than any other nation in the world, with approximately 1.5 million cases
6 and 90,000 deaths as of May 18, 2020¹. Preliminary data indicates that existing
7 health inequities in the United States are likely linked to COVID-19 morbidity and
8 mortality².

9

10 Both infectious and non-communicable disease tends to impact marginalized
11 populations at disproportionate rates. While demographically disaggregated data
12 is not currently available at the national level, data from county and state level
13 entities suggest that COVID-19 may follow similar patterns. In the State of
14 California, Latinos make up approximately 39% of the total population but
15 represent just over 53% of total cases³. Similarly, in New York City, Black/African
16 American and Hispanic residents have significantly higher rates of COVID-19
17 illness and mortality than white residents, with a nearly doubled risk of mortality
18 for Black/African American residents compared to white residents⁴. While more
19 granular data are not yet available to assess which risk factors may be leading to
20 these disparities in morbidity and mortality, journalistic reporting early analyses
21 suggest that language barriers, poor working conditions among essential workers
22 – who are more likely to be immigrants and/or racial/ethnic minorities⁵ - and
23 concerns about immigration status may be creating particular risk among racial
24 and ethnic immigrants across the United States^{6,7}.

25

26 We sought to assess the associations between COVID-19 mortality and
27 immigrant and farm worker population at the county level. We hypothesized that
28 counties with more immigrants and farm workers would report higher COVID-19
29 mortality, adjusting for poverty, insurance rates, population age, and density at
30 the county level.

31

32 **Methods**

33 We built a series of spatial autoregressive models to assess county-level
34 associations between COVID-19 mortality and: (1) Percentage of Non-English
35 speaking households (defined as households in which no one 14 years or older
36 reports speaking English at least “very well”) and (2) percentage of individuals
37 engaged in hired farm work⁸ in the county as of 2018. To account for potential
38 confounders, we adjusted our analyses for the percentage of uninsured
39 individuals under the age of 65, percentage of individuals living at or below the
40 poverty line, percentage of residents age 65 or older, and county density,
41 measured as number of residents per square mile.

42
43 COVID-19 mortality data was sourced from county public health agencies,
44 aggregated and made publicly available by the New York Times⁹. The proportion
45 of households with limited English speaking ability was drawn from the American
46 Community Survey’s (ACS) 2014 5-year estimate, percentages of individuals
47 living below poverty, and percentage of residents over the age of 65 were from
48 2017 ACS data. The percentage of farmworkers was taken from the US Bureau
49 of Economic Analysis. Percent uninsured was based on the US Census Small
50 Area Health Insurance Estimates (SAHIE) program’s 2018 estimates. Density
51 was measured as number of individuals per square mile, based on US census
52 data.

53
54 In addition to hypothesized predictors and potential confounders, we adjusted our
55 models to account for the stage of the local epidemic by including a variable for
56 the number of days since a county reported its first case of COVID-19, and the
57 number of days between the 100th case in a state and the declaration of a state-
58 wide shelter in place (SIP) order. Arkansas, Iowa, Nebraska, North Dakota, and
59 Wyoming were assigned a ‘0’, denoting that they had not yet implemented an
60 SIP order at the time of these analyses.

61

62 Counties with 1000 residents or more per square mile were coded as urban,
63 counties with less than 1000 residents per square mile were coded as urban.
64 While there are many ways to classify counties, we chose to use 1000 people
65 per square mile for two reasons. First, the US census uses this cutpoint to
66 designate census blocks as urban vs. non-urban. Second we felt that doing so
67 allowed us to more clearly delineate major metropolitan areas and their
68 associated resources and public health infrastructures from neighboring
69 suburban or exurban counties.

70

71 We first built a series of simple linear regression models to assess the bivariate
72 association between number of deaths within a county and our hypothesized
73 predictors, adjusting for days since 1st case and SIP order. We then constructed
74 a spatial contiguity matrix, and checked the assumption that residuals were
75 distributed spatially using a Moran's I test.

76

77 We next built three separate spatial autoregressive models to assess the
78 association between number of deaths and our hypothesized social
79 determinants, adjusting for potential confounders, and fitted the model with a
80 spatial lag of the dependent variable based on our contiguity matrix. Our first
81 model assessed relationships across all counties. We then stratified our analyses
82 to measure the association between mortality and our hypothesized predictors in
83 urban and non-urban counties.

84

85 **Results**

86 This analysis encompassed 2,815 counties across all 50 states. As of May 6,
87 2020, the number of deaths reported in the NY Times aggregated dataset ranged
88 from 0 to 18,993 per county, with a median of 1 an interquartile range (IQR) of 0-

89 4¹. We classified 115 counties as urban and 2700 counties as non-urban. Deaths
90 in urban counties ranged from 0 – 18993, with a median of 108 and an IQR of
91 36-413. Deaths in rural counties ranged from 0-483 with a median of 1 and an
92 IQR of 0-3.

93

94 The Moran's I test was statistically significant at $p < 0.01$ in each simple (non-
95 spatial) regression, with the exception of associations between density and
96 mortality (Moran's I $p = 0.25$) and non-English speakers and mortality (Moran's I
97 p -value = 0.31) in urban counties, indicating a significant spatial pattern to
98 associations between our hypothesized predictors and mortality.

99

100 In our fully adjusted model of all counties, poverty, population density, and the
101 percentage of residents over the age of 65 were all significantly associated with
102 higher levels of COVID-19 mortality. Within a county, each additional percentage
103 of people living in poverty was associated with 2.92 additional deaths within that
104 county ($p < 0.01$), and an additional 0.35 deaths in neighboring counties via a
105 'spillover' effect ($p < 0.05$). Overall, each additional percentage increase of
106 individuals living in poverty within a county was associated with 3.27 additional
107 COVID-19 deaths ($p = 0.002$). Each additional person per square mile was
108 associated with 0.29 additional deaths within a county and 0.03 indirect deaths,
109 for a total of 0.32 additional deaths ($p < 0.001$). Across all counties, each
110 percentage increase in residents over the age of 65 was associated with 3.35
111 additional deaths ($p = 0.03$). Unlike poverty and density, the indirect, spillover,
112 effect of older residents on neighboring counties was non-significant.

113

114 In urban counties ($n=114$), only population was both significantly associated with
115 higher mortality. Similar to the effects across all counties, each additional person

¹ Within this dataset, the 5 boroughs/counties of New York are treated as a single entity. We have done the same in these analyses, assigning all 5 counties the values associated with New York County.

116 per square mile was associated with 0.33 additional deaths within a county and
117 0.02 additional deaths in neighboring counties, for a total effect of $b = 0.35$ (p
118 <0.001).

119

120 In non-urban counties, all of our hypothesized social determinants were
121 statistically significantly associated with an higher levels of mortality. Each
122 increase in the percentage of farmworkers residing in a county was associated
123 with 0.72 additional deaths ($p = 0.002$), with a significant spillover effect across
124 counties (indirect $b = 0.20$, $p <0.05$). Each additional percentage point of non-
125 English speaking households was associated with 0.32 additional deaths (p
126 <0.001). As in the all county and urban models, density, poverty, and the
127 percentage of residents over the age of 65 were all significantly associated with
128 higher mortality. Contrary to our initial hypotheses, the percentage of uninsured
129 individuals was associated with lower reported COVID19 mortality. Each
130 increase in the percentage of uninsured individuals was associated with a direct
131 effect of 0.39 fewer deaths within the county ($p <0.001$) and a spillover effect of
132 0.15 fewer deaths in neighboring counties, for a total effect of 0.54 fewer deaths
133 for additional percentage of uninsured individuals ($p <0.001$)

134

135 **Interpretation**

136 COVID-19 mortality appears to be statistically significantly associated with social
137 determinants of health at the county level, and these relationships may be more
138 pronounced in non-urban counties. Individuals who do not speak English,
139 individuals engaged in farm work, and individuals living in poverty may be at
140 heightened risk for COVID-19 mortality in non-urban counties.

141

142 Although we cannot draw conclusions about individual risk profiles, our findings
143 do suggest that that farm work may create unique risk factors and that
144 farmworkers may require additional protections, such as personal protective
145 equipment and/or targeted outreach. Immigrants provide approximately 75% of
146 all farm labor in the United States⁸. Among those engaged in crop work

147 specifically, nearly three quarters are migrants and approximately half are
148 undocumented⁸. Undocumented status may impede an individual's willingness or
149 ability to seek healthcare, or their ability to request additional protections from an
150 employer if they worry doing so could result in their own deportation or that of a
151 family member¹⁰. Farm labor is considered essential work, but there are reports
152 of inadequate personal protective equipment and inadequate social distancing
153 guidelines or enforcement⁶.

154

155 The negative association we found between insured status and mortality is a
156 point of concern. The CDC has noted higher than expected numbers of death
157 across the United States throughout April in recent months, suggesting that
158 COVID-19 mortality is potentially higher than what has thus far been captured by
159 state and county level surveillance¹¹. It is possible that this association
160 represents a gap in testing and linkage to care among the uninsured, and/or a
161 gap in ascertaining deaths due to COVID-19 among uninsured individuals.

162

163

164

165

1 Table 1: Primary predictor and covariates of interest across all counties and stratified by urban and non-urban

	All counties (n=2814)		non-urban counties (n=2700)		urban counties (n=115)	
	<i>median</i>	<i>IQR</i>	<i>median</i>	<i>IQR</i>	<i>median</i>	<i>IQR</i>
<i>deaths</i>	1	0-4	1	0-3	108	36 - 413
<i>% Farm workers</i>	2.2	0.9 – 4.4	2.3	1.0 – 4.5	0.1	0.0 – 0.1
<i>% Non-English speakers</i>	5.0	2.9 – 10.2	4.8	2.9 – 9.4	19.0	11.4 – 29.8
<i>% Residents uninsured</i>	10.4	7.4 – 14.4	10.6	7.4 – 14.5	8.3	5.9 – 12.6
<i>% Residents in poverty</i>	15.1	11.4 – 9.5	15.2	11.5 – 19.7	13.0	8.9 – 16.7
<i>Residents per square mile</i>	49.6	21.9-124.6	46.9	21.1-106.0	1754.9	1313.4-2715.3
<i>% Residents Over 65</i>	16.2	13.8-18.7	16.4	14.0-18.8	12.5	11.0-14.5

2
3
4
5

6 Table 2: Full spatial regression models for all counties and stratified by urban/rural

	All counties (n=2814)				non-urban counties (n=2700)				urban counties (n=114)			
	<i>b direct</i>	<i>b indirect</i>	<i>b total</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>b direct</i>	<i>b indirect</i>	<i>b total</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>b direct</i>	<i>b indirect</i>	<i>b total</i>	<i>p-value</i>
<i>% Farm workers</i>	3.49	0.42	3.91	0.06	0.52	0.20	0.72	0.002	2167.23	136.44	2303.67	0.10
<i>% Non-English speakers</i>	-0.35	-0.04	-0.39	0.54	0.23	0.09	0.32	<0.001	16.37	1.03	17.40	0.18
<i>% Residents uninsured</i>	-1.34	-0.16	-1.50	0.29	-0.39	-0.15	-0.54	<0.001	-55.18	-3.47	-58.65	0.15
<i>% Residents in poverty</i>	2.92	0.35	3.27	0.002	0.20	0.08	0.28	0.01	49.30	3.10	52.40	0.12
<i>Residents per square mile</i>	0.29	0.03	0.32	<0.001	0.09	0.03	0.12	<0.001	0.33	0.02	0.35	<0.001
<i>% Residents Over 65</i>	3.00	0.36	3.35	0.04	0.38	0.15	0.53	0.001	27.34	1.72	29.06	0.65

7
8

Table 1: Spatial regression models, predictors of number of deaths across urban, non-urban, and all US counties reporting at least 1 COVID-19 case as of April 26, 2020

	All counties (n=2743)		Non-urban counties (n=2629)		Urban counties (n=114)	
	<i>b</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>p-value</i>
% Farm workers	0.27	0.06	0.52	0.002	1448.56	0.12
% Non-English speakers	-0.19	0.66	0.22	<0.001	10.49	0.21
% Residents uninsured	-1.15	0.25	-0.36	0.001	-39.77	0.13
% Residents in poverty	2.23	0.002	0.20	0.02	37.6	0.08
Residents per square mile	0.21	<0.001	0.08	<0.001	0.21	<0.001
% Residents Over 65	2.27	0.05	0.35	0.01	18.96	0.23

9
10
11
12
13

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

REFERENCES

1. Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020;20(5):533-534.
2. Dorn AV, Cooney RE, Sabin ML. COVID-19 exacerbating inequalities in the US. *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10232):1243-1244.
3. Who is getting infected with COVID-10. *California Coronavirus COVID-19 Statewide Update 2020*; <https://update.covid19.ca.gov/>.
4. *Rates of cases, hospitalizations, and deaths by race/ethnicity group*. New York City Health Department; May 14, 2020 2020.
5. Bier D. *Immigrants are about 1/3 of California's "essential workers"*. The Cato Institute; March 30, 2020 2020.
6. Borunda A. Farmworkers risk coronavirus infection to keep the U.S. fed. In. *National Geographic*2020.
7. Data show COVID-19 is hitting essential workers and people of color hardest [press release]. ACLU of Massachusetts, April 8, 2020 2020.
8. Farm Labor. *Economic Research Service* 2020; <https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/farm-economy/farm-labor/-size>. Accessed May 1, 2020, 2020.
9. Data from The New York Times, based on reports from state and local health agencies. In. *The New York Times*. New York, NY2020.
10. Philbin MM, Flake M, Hatzenbuehler ML, Hirsch JS. State-level immigration and immigrant-focused policies as drivers of Latino health disparities in the United States. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2018;199:29-38.
11. Excess Deaths Associated with COVID-19. 2020; https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/vsrr/covid19/excess_deaths.htm. Accessed May 1, 2020, 2020.