

Dynamic Panel Data Modeling and Surveillance of COVID-19 in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: A Longitudinal Analysis

Theresa B Oehmke, Lori A Post, Charles B Moss, Tariq Z Issa, Michael J Boctor, Sarah B Welch, James F Oehmke

Submitted to: Journal of Medical Internet Research
on: December 01, 2020

Disclaimer: © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript..... 5

Supplementary Files..... 24

 Figures 25

 Figure 2..... 26

 Figure 1..... 27

Multimedia Appendixes 28

 Multimedia Appendix 0..... 29

 Multimedia Appendix 0..... 29

Dynamic Panel Data Modeling and Surveillance of COVID-19 in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: A Longitudinal Analysis

Theresa B Oehmke¹ MSc; Lori A Post² PhD; Charles B Moss³ PhD; Tariq Z Issa⁴ BA; Michael J Boctor⁴ BSc; Sarah B Welch² MPH; James F Oehmke² PhD

¹Department of Civil Engineering University of California, Berkeley Berkeley US

²Department of Emergency Medicine Feinberg School of Medicine Northwestern University Chicago US

³Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences University of Florida Gainesville US

⁴Feinberg School of Medicine Northwestern University Chicago US

Corresponding Author:

Theresa B Oehmke MSc
Department of Civil Engineering
University of California, Berkeley
202 O'Brien Hall
Berkeley
US

Abstract

Background: The COVID-19 pandemic has had profound and differential impacts on metropolitan areas across the United States and around the world. Within the United States, metropolitan areas that were hit earliest with the pandemic and reacted with scientifically based health policy were able to contain the virus by late Spring. For other areas that kept businesses open the 'first wave' in the US hit in mid-summer. As the weather turns colder, Universities resume classes, and people tire of lockdowns, a second wave is ascending in both metropolitan and rural areas. It becomes more obvious that additional SARS-CoV-2 surveillance is needed at the local level to track recent shifts in the pandemic, rates of increase, and persistence.

Objective: The goal of this study is to provide advanced surveillance metrics for COVID-19 transmission that account for speed, acceleration, jerk and persistence, and weekly shifts, to better understand and manage risk at the metropolitan area scale. Existing surveillance measures coupled with our dynamic metrics of transmission will inform health policy to control the COVID-19 pandemic until, and after, an effective vaccine is developed. Here, we provide metropolitan area values for novel indicators to measure the transmission of disease.

Methods: Using a longitudinal trend analysis study design, we extracted 260 days of COVID data from public health registries. We use an empirical difference equation to measure the daily number of cases in the 25 largest U.S. metropolitan areas as a function of the prior number of cases and weekly shift variables based on a dynamic panel data model that was estimated using the generalized method of moments (GMM) approach by implementing the Arellano-Bond estimator in R.

Results: Most recently, Minneapolis and Chicago have the greatest average number of daily new positive results per standardized 100,000 population, which we call speed. Extreme behavior in Minneapolis showed speed jumping from 17 to 30 (67%) in one week. The jerk and acceleration calculated for these areas also showed extreme behavior. The Dynamic Panel Data Model shows that Minneapolis, Chicago, and Detroit have the largest persistence effects, meaning that new cases one week are statistically attributable to new cases from the prior week.

Conclusions: Three of the metropolitan areas with historically early and harsh winters have the highest persistence effects out of the top 25 most populous metropolitan areas in the US at the beginning of their cold weather season. With these persistence effects, and indoor activities becoming more popular as weather gets colder, stringent COVID-19 regulations will be more important than ever to flatten the second wave of the pandemic. As colder weather grips more of the nation, southern metropolitan areas may also see large spikes in the number of cases.

(JMIR Preprints 01/12/2020:26081)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.26081>

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

✓ **Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).**

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain v

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in <http://www.jmir.org/preprint/26081>

Original Manuscript

Dynamic Panel Data Modeling and Surveillance of COVID-19 in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: A Longitudinal Analysis

Theresa B. Oehmke, Lori A. Post, Charles B. Moss, Tariq Z. Issa, Michael J. Boctor, Sarah B Welch, and James F. Oehmke.

Abstract

Background: The COVID-19 pandemic has had profound and differential impacts on metropolitan areas across the United States and around the world. Within the United States, metropolitan areas that were hit earliest with the pandemic and reacted with scientifically based health policy were able to contain the virus by late Spring. For other areas that kept businesses open the ‘first wave’ in the US hit in mid-summer. As the weather turns colder, Universities resume classes, and people tire of lockdowns, a second wave is ascending in both metropolitan and rural areas. It becomes more obvious that additional SARS-CoV-2 surveillance is needed at the local level to track recent shifts in the pandemic, rates of increase, and persistence.

Objectives: The goal of this study is to provide advanced surveillance metrics for COVID-19 transmission that account for speed, acceleration, jerk and persistence, and weekly shifts, to better understand and manage risk at the metropolitan area scale. Existing surveillance measures coupled with our dynamic metrics of transmission will inform health policy to control the COVID-19 pandemic until, and after, an effective vaccine is developed. Here, we provide metropolitan area values for novel indicators to measure the transmission of disease.

Methods: Using a longitudinal trend analysis study design, we extracted 260 days of COVID data from public health registries. We use an empirical difference equation to measure the daily number of cases in the 25 largest U.S. metropolitan areas as a function of the prior number of cases and weekly shift variables based on a Dynamic Panel Data Model that was estimated using the generalized method of moments (GMM) approach by implementing the Arellano-Bond estimator in R.

Results: Most recently, Minneapolis and Chicago have the greatest average number of daily new positive results per standardized 100,000 population, which we call speed. Extreme behavior in Minneapolis showed speed jumping from 17 to 30 (67%) in one week. The jerk and acceleration calculated for these areas also showed extreme behavior. The Dynamic Panel Data Model shows that Minneapolis, Chicago, and Detroit have the largest persistence effects, meaning that new cases one week are statistically attributable to new cases from the prior week.


Conclusions: Three of the metropolitan areas with historically early and harsh winters have the highest persistence effects out of the top 25 most populous metropolitan areas in the US at the beginning of their cold weather season. With these persistence effects, and indoor activities becoming more popular as weather gets colder, stringent COVID-19 regulations will be more important than ever to flatten the second wave of the pandemic. As colder weather grips more of the nation, southern metropolitan areas may also see large spikes in the number of cases.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2 Surveillance; Second Wave; Wave Two; Global COVID Surveillance; COVID metropolitan areas; COVID cities; US Public Health Surveillance; US COVID; US Surveillance Metrics; Dynamic Panel Data; Generalized Method of the Moments; Second Wave; Wave 2; US Econometrics; US SARS-CoV-2; US COVID Surveillance System; US COVID Transmission Speed; US COVID Transmission Acceleration; COVID Transmission Deceleration; COVID Transmission Jerk; COVID 7-Day Lag; SARS-CoV-2; Arellano-Bond Estimator; Generalized Method of Moments GMM; New York City; Los Angeles; Chicago; Dallas; Houston; Washington, DC; Miami; Philadelphia; Atlanta; Phoenix; Boston; San Francisco; Riverside; Detroit; Seattle; Minneapolis; San Diego; Tampa; Denver; St. Louis; Baltimore; Charlotte; Orlando; San Antonio; Portland.

INTRODUCTION

In December 2019, a novel coronavirus, Severe Acute Respiratory Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), leading to severe pneumonia and acute respiratory disease, was observed in Wuhan, China (Figure 1) [1–4]. On January 21, 2020, the first confirmed case of COVID-19 was recorded in the United States (U.S.) [5]. As cases began to spread globally at an alarming rate, the World Health Organization officially recognized COVID-19 as a pandemic on March 11, 2020 [6]. Around the world, countries quickly implemented public health policies to mitigate the health and economic impacts caused by the virus [7]. The U.S. federal government did not create a national unified pandemic control strategy [8–10], leading local state and city officials to implement their own public health and safety measures in attempt to “flatten the curve” [11]. However, by late May, many state and city leaders lifted their public health measures leading to another alarming rise in COVID-19 case numbers [12,13]. As of October 29, 2020, there are 8,937,926 confirmed COVID-19 cases and 228,439 COVID-19 related deaths across the U.S. [14].

Metropolitan areas largely drove the first wave of COVID-19 in the U.S. [15], with northern travel hubs such as New York City, Chicago, Boston, Detroit, and Seattle seeing early spikes in the number of cases and deaths [14] (we refer to the area by the first city in its Census Bureau designation, e.g. New York City for the New York – Newark – Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA Core Based Statistical Area). Initial outbreaks around major East and West travel hubs are particularly important because they are gateways of international travel and have high population densities [16,17]. Genomic evidence from early SARS-CoV-2 strains suggest that initial infections in the U.S. were introduced to Washington State, a hub for travel to East Asia, by travelers from China [18–20]. There is also evidence that suggests New York City likely served as a primary entry point to the U.S for the SARS-CoV-2 contagion from European hotspots in Spain and Italy early in the pandemic [19,21,22]. Chicago, Boston and Detroit were likely additional entry points because of the large number of international travelers: Detroit’s metro airport had over 1,100 flights per day to four continents including direct flights to China and Europe [23], and was the least busy of the airports.



COVID-19 became endemic in the USA at the end of March [9], when many of these northern metro areas and travel hubs saw significant uptrends in their COVID-19 caseloads. In many of these areas the first wave peaked in late March or early April after lockdown and other preventive measures were imposed. For example, Washington State recorded its first death on Feb 19, 2020 and governor Jay Inslee declared a state of emergency later that same day [24]. This led to increasingly stringent lockdown measures from Inslee, Seattle Mayor Jenny Durkan, and country executives, culminating in the Governor issuing a “Stay Home Stay Safe” lockdown on March 23 [25,26]. Michigan’s first case was recorded on March 10, and Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer imposed a “stay at home” lockdown on March 23 [27,28]. In the Seattle metropolitan area, the first wave peaked the week of 3/20 - 3/26/20, as it did in Detroit (authors’ calculations using data from USAFacts.org [29]). New York peaked the week of 3/27 - 4/2/20, Boston the week of 4/10 - 4/16/20, and Chicago the week of 4/17 - 4/24/20. The ebb from the first peak is associated with the imposition of varying degrees of lockdown measures, social distancing, and mask wearing, among other COVID-19 responses and policies [11,30–33].

The first wave of the pandemic crested in southern cities about three months later, corresponding to a U.S. peak on 7/16/20 with 77,352 new cases nationally that day [19]. Phoenix peaked the week of 7/3 - 7/9/20, with an average of 1,404 new cases per day. Los Angeles peaked the week of 7/10 - 7/16/20 with an average of 2,080 new cases per day during that week; Miami also peaked that same week with an average of 1,666 new cases per day.

The impact of the first wave on southern cities is associated with a lack of COVID-19 prevention measures in these areas [9,16,17,34,35]. For example, in Texas, on April 27, 2020, Governor Greg Abbott issued an executive order reopening the state including in-person retail and dining and prohibiting municipalities from imposing sanctions on individuals who chose not to wear a facemask [36], despite opposition from local government leaders [37,38]. On June 17, the Governor allowed local jurisdictions to require face masks and, on July 2, mandated face masks across the state [37,38]. In Dallas and Houston, the pandemic initially peaked the week of 7/10 - 7/16/20 and then ebbed (authors’ calculations based on data from USAFacts.org [29]).

The U.S. is now entering the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic [39,40]. As of November 2020, only three U.S. counties have not reported a case of COVID-19, each of which has a population of less than 1,000 people [41]. Many cities and states have reopened, citing the need to keep their economies functioning [42]. There has been considerable pushback against COVID-19 precautions, such as social distancing and facemask wearing. The pushbacks have reached the extremes of violent protests in Texas [43], and an alleged plot to kidnap the Governor of Michigan [44]. With the second – historically more deadly [45,46] – year of the pandemic coming up in a few months, surveillance of the disease will be even more relevant for determining appropriate COVID-19 precautions. The onset of the second wave requires taking initiative rather than relying on reactive public health measures, and in order to be proactive, an improved surveillance system is needed.

A robust surveillance system should answer relevant questions about the second wave: how many new cases appear in the metropolitan area per day per 100,000 population? Is the number of new cases an acceleration from the previous week, and is the acceleration indicative of explosive growth? Is there evidence of sustained transmission from new cases last week to new cases this week to new cases next week, e.g. from Halloween, from sports events, from political rallies, etc.?

The objective of this paper is to provide novel, policy-relevant surveillance information about the second wave of COVID-19 cases in the 25 largest metropolitan areas in the U.S.

This information is of critical importance to controlling the second wave because in the absence of national coronavirus policy, COVID-19 policy is made and implemented at the state and local level including the metropolitan area [9,47]. Guidelines on reopening such as a 14-day downward trend in the number of new cases per day are difficult to implement at the local level without accurate quantitative data on the number of new cases and the local, area-specific, trend. For example, in Los Angeles and New York City, day-to-day fluctuations in new case numbers were directly correlated to testing numbers rather than biological factors [48]. Additionally, there can be differences between state and local policies, leading to friction between governors and mayors with perhaps negative impacts on public adherence to social distancing, face mask wearing, and other public health guidelines and behaviors [49]. Consequently, surveillance information is needed at the metropolitan level to help inform policy needs and policy effectiveness.

METHODS

This paper uses the Dynamic Panel Data (DPD) Modeling application and surveillance approach developed by [50,51] and applied to sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and at the state level in the United States [52–54]. These methods are applied to the 25 most populous metropolitan areas in the U.S., as defined by the US Census bureau [55]. For each metropolitan area, a panel dataset is constructed using counties as the cross-sectional variable and days as the time variable.

The DPD modeling method is a novel approach to medical surveillance applications. Traditional contagion modeling techniques including agent-based modeling (ABM) and system dynamics (SD) are complex, require sophisticated software (SD), and are labor intensive, which makes them impractical for rapid surveillance across dozens of cities and counties in America, especially given the data that is readily available and easily accessible. Surveillance methods should rapidly generate understandable indicators to inform current decision making [56]. Our surveillance method can quickly be applied to existing data to generate indicators of pandemic outbreak locations and where explosive growth is likely to occur. The DPD-based modeling and surveillance method was validated in [50,51]; these references contain more detailed explanations and additional references to other methods.

Data

Data on the cumulative number of positive COVID-19 cases based on testing for each county and each day were downloaded from Usafacts.org [29] on 10/17/20 as an excel file and are complete from 1/22/20 through 10/15/20. Data from 3/20/20 to 10/15/20 were used for the statistics and tables presented in this paper, which provides 30 weeks of data from the approximate start of the pandemic in the U.S. On 3/20/20 the U.S. had 6,367 new cases, the first day in which the number of new cases exceeded 5,000 [57]. The only cleaning or processing of the data was to create the novel surveillance metrics described below based on [50]. A limitation of this data set is that it does not have data on the total number of tests reported per day at the county level.

Surveillance Methods

Following the procedures described in [50] we calculate the novel surveillance metrics of speed, acceleration, and jerk for the COVID-19 caseloads for each of the 25 most populous metropolitan areas. Speed is defined as the number of new cases per day per 100,000 population; because reporting coverage depends on the day of the week, we report a weekly average value. Acceleration is the change in speed from one week to the next. It provides the primary indication of whether the pandemic is getting worse (positive acceleration) or better (negative acceleration or deceleration). Jerk is the change in acceleration, calculated as the change in acceleration from the prior week to the current week. Jerk is the second indicator of whether the pandemic is getting worse, with a positive jerk signaling growing acceleration possibly associated with a super-spreading event, inaccurate re-opening policy, colder weather, or other behavior or environmental change. A negative jerk indicates a slowing acceleration, possibly leading to a plateau or even a peak followed by deceleration in the pandemic.

Dynamic Panel Data Regression Methods

The DPD model generates the seven-day persistence surveillance indicator. This model relies in part on discerning common trends across counties within a metropolitan area, if present, to inform the modeling of overall metropolitan area trends in general and the seven-day persistence effect in particular.

We cannot replicate the full model of [50,51] because testing data are available only on the number of positive tests administered by county. Instead, we use the abbreviated model

$$Speed_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Speed_{it-1} + \beta_2 Speed_{it-2} + \beta_3 Speed_{it-7} + I_{10.9-10.15} \beta_4 Speed_{it-7} + I_{10.2-10.8} \beta_5 Speed_{it-7} + \varepsilon_{it},$$

where the subscripts i and t denote the county within the metro area and the day of the measurement, respectively. $Speed_{it}$ is the number of new cases in county i on day t , ε_{it} is an error term, and the β_j parameters are those to be estimated. β_1 and β_2 quantify the one-day and two-day lag effects, and β_3 determines the base coefficient value for calculating the seven-day persistence effect. β_3 measures the number of new cases today that are statistically attributable to new cases seven days ago, i.e. it measures the propensity of the pandemic to travel in week-long ‘echoes’ in which people newly diagnosed a week ago also infected others a week ago, and these others are diagnosed as new cases today. These week-long echoes could be caused by idiosyncratic factors such as super-spreading events and/or by systemic factors such as systemic disregard for social distancing and mask wearing. The indicator variables $I_{10.9-10.15}$ and $I_{10.2-10.8}$ define the weeks 10/9-10/15 and 10/2-10/8 respectively, so that the coefficients β_4 and β_5 quantify weekly shifts in the seven-day persistence effect. A positive weekly shift could be caused by a super-spreading event that occurred during the week in question, by reopening, by the removal of mask-wearing requirements, or similar events.

We apply the DPD model to the 25 most populous metropolitan areas in the United States. The model is estimated using the generalized method of moments approach [59] as implemented by Arellano and Bond for DPD models and applied to the COVID-19 pandemic by Oehmke et al. [50,51]. The Wald chi-square test is administered to test model fit based on the null hypothesis that the regression contains no explanatory power. The Sargan chi-square test is applied to determine model validity by testing the null hypothesis that the model is valid [59]. Statistical significance is determined at the 5% level. All estimation is conducted in STATA MP16.1 using the xtabond

command.

Because of the use of lagged values in these formulae we report results for each of the 28 'weeks' (seven-day periods) from Friday 3/2/20 through Sunday 1/3/21 in the supplemental materials. This paper contains the results for the week of 10/9-10/15.

RESULTS

Complete data for persistence rates by International Standards Organization (ISO) week and metropolitan area are provided in an excel sheet (published with this paper). The full set of persistence results cover the week beginning on 4/06/20 through the week ending on 1/3/21. To optimize computer resources, weekly persistence rates were estimated using data for the annual quarter containing the week, e.g. persistence rates for ISO week 53 (12/28/20 - 01/03/21) are estimated from data for the fourth quarter (Q4) of 2020.

We were unable to estimate a persistence rate for Phoenix for the week ending 01/03/21 due to insufficient data at time of estimation. The metropolitan areas of Los Angeles and Riverside comprise only two counties, and San Diego comprises one county, so at times there was insufficient cross-county variation for application of PDP techniques. In this case we estimated values for the combined Southern California region (combined Los Angeles, Riverside, & San Diego metro areas). In particular, persistence rates reported for Riverside and San Diego for the fourth quarter (ISO weeks 41 through 53) are estimates for the Southern California region.

A positive persistence rate most likely indicates continuing unsafe COVID-19 behaviors that recur over time, whereby infected individuals one week transmit the infection to other individuals who appear as COVID-19 cases the next week, leading to a 'persistence' in the number of COVID-19 cases reported each week. Large positive persistence rates are associated with increasing case rates and rates greater than one are indicators of potentially explosive growth. A negative persistence rate could indicate a choppy, up-and-down movement in the number of COVID-19 cases from week to week, or a period of downturn and decline in the number of cases.

Entering 2021, the metropolitan areas with the largest persistence are New York City (1.83), Miami (1.00), Philadelphia (1.61), Tampa (1.08), Charlotte (1.29), and Orlando (1.04). These areas are at high risk for increased COVID-19 caseloads during the first full week of January, with a potential for explosive growth.

Surveillance results

We report novel surveillance results of speed, acceleration, and jerk for each of the 28 'weeks' (seven-day periods) from the week beginning on 3/2/20 through the week ending on 1/3/21 in the supplemental materials. Table 1 in this paper contains the results for the week of 10/9 - 10/15. In relationship to the timeline (Figure 1), notable findings are that for New York City and Seattle jerk turned negative the week of 3/27 - 4/2/20, one week after shutdowns. In Detroit jerk turned negative the week of 4/3 - 4/9/20, two weeks after the shutdown in Michigan. The negative jerks indicate a slowing of the pandemic acceleration; the chronological propinquity to the shutdown orders is consistent with a strong and rapid impact of these orders on the pandemic. The average number of daily new positive results for the week of 10/9 - 10/15 ranged from 19 for San Antonio to 627 for Los Angeles (Table 2). The metropolitan areas with the greatest speed were Minneapolis (30) and Chicago (21). The metropolitan areas with the slowest speed were Portland (3) and San Francisco

(5).

In the New York Metropolitan area, the first wave peaked during the week of 3/20 - 3/26/20 with an average of 12,855 new cases per day or a speed of over 68 new cases per day per 100,000 population. During the week of 4/10 - 4/16/20, this area started to gain control of the pandemic, characterized by a negative acceleration (-10) and the area's largest negative jerk (-33). The next eight weeks were characterized by negative acceleration, with speed declining to an average of 3 new cases per day per 100,000 population during the week of 5/29 - 6/4/20 and remaining at values of 3 or 4 before starting a second wave ascent the week of 9/18 - 9/24/20. This general pattern was replicated to a large degree in other northern cities hit early by the first wave.

metro	Number of daily new positive results, weekly average	SPEED: Number of daily new positive results, weekly average	ACCELERATION: change in speed between the weeks of 10/2-20/8 and 10/9-10-15	JERK: change in acceleration between the weeks of 10/2-20/8 and 10/9-10-15	7-day persistence effect: # cases this week statistically attributable to cases last week
1. New York	67	8	-1	-3	0.68
2. Los Angeles	627	8	0	0	2.90
3. Chicago	142	21	6	3	7.18
4. Dallas	101	11	1	1	1.54
5. Houston	73	8	-2	-5	2.47
6. Washington, DC	21	8	1	0	1.52
7. Miami	265	12	2	1	4.58
8. Philadelphia	65	9	2	2	1.48
9. Atlanta	26	12	1	1	1.14
10. Phoenix	255	10	2	0	2.78
11. Boston	70	9	2	1	2.16
12. San Francisco	42	5	-1	0	0.11
13. Riverside	263	11	0	0	3.51
14. Detroit	82	12	4	4	8.37
15. Seattle	94	7	1	1	5.21
16. Minneapolis	63	30	12	10	14.60
17. San Diego	286	9	0	0	2.31
18. Tampa	89	10	1	1	2.87
19. Denver	54	13	3	1	2.87
20. St.	37	22	5	12	3.18

Louis					
21. Baltimore	38	8	0	0	2.29
22. Charlotte	40	18	0	4	3.72
23. Orlando	72	10	0	-2	2.81
24. San Antonio	19	3	-6	-7	-1.96
25. Portland	29	6	0	1	0.31

Although Dallas recorded its first three cases on March 9, case counts increased relatively slowly during an early Dallas shutdown to an average of 175 new cases daily and a speed of 2.3 new cases per 100,000 during the week of 4/17 - 4/23/20. After the governor ordered Texas to reopen on 4/17/20, case counts increased noticeably but not explosively, reaching a speed of 4.9 new daily cases per 100,000 the week of 5/29/20 - 6/4/20. During that week, acceleration and jerk turned positive and stayed positive through the week of 7/10 - 7/16/20, possibly associated with hot weather that encouraged people to visit crowded beaches or otherwise break social distancing and other COVID-19 protocols [61–63], which is considered risky behavior [64]. The first wave peaked in Dallas the week of 7/10 - 7/16/20 with an average of 2,084 new cases per day that week and a speed of over 27.5 new cases per 100,000. Following the reimposition of COVID-19 prevention measures on July 2, acceleration turned negative and the number of cases declined during the weeks spanning 7/17 - 9/10/20 with the exception of the week of 8/14-8/20/20 when a spike was associated with clearing a backlog of unreported prior test results [65]. However, even the trough during the week of 9/4 - 9/10/20 had an average of 640 new cases per day and a speed of 8.4 new daily cases per 100,000, which is higher than during the early shutdown. In Dallas the pandemic has now reemerged with an average of 1,116 new cases per day and a speed of 14.7 new daily cases per 100,000. Other southern metropolitan areas including Houston, Miami, Phoenix, and Tampa experienced similar first wave patterns, although evidence of a second wave has not hit all southern cities.

X

Dynamic Panel Data Model Results

Table 1 contains the regression diagnostics for the models. The Sargan tests of model validity fail to reject the null hypothesis of validity for all metro areas except for Minneapolis ($\chi^2(5) = 531.86$, $P < .001$), showing model validity for all areas but Minneapolis. Rejection of the null hypothesis for the Sargan test for Minneapolis means that the model is not valid for this metro area and the model is insufficient to capture the rapid acceleration and jerk exhibited by Minneapolis. Minneapolis exhibited extreme behavior, with its speed jumping from an average number of 17 daily new positive results standardized per 100,000 population for the week of 10/2 to 10/8 to 30 (67% increase) for the week of 10/9 to 10/15. No other metropolitan area has exhibited that high a speed for the week of 10/9 to 10/15.

Potential risk factors for the Minneapolis increase include the advent of colder Fall weather, although the week of 10/9-10/15 was warmer than average [66], and the phase II reopening of the University of Minnesota. During the prior weeks, the number of new cases reported at the University of Minnesota increased from 4 in the beginning of September to 52 the first week in October (Figure

1), which numerically contributes to Minneapolis's rapid acceleration and large jerk. The influence of universities reopening is consistent with state-level findings reported in [50].




Figure 2 Number of positive COVID-19 cases recorded by the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

Metropolitan Area (# counties)	Wald χ^2 test of regression significance (P-value)	Sargan χ^2 test of model validity (P-value)	7-Day persistence coefficient, base effect (P-value)	7-Day persistence coefficient, shift 10/9 to 10/15 (P-value)	7-Day persistence coefficient, shift 10/2 to 10/8 (P-value)
1. New York (23)	193.68 (<.001)	636.36 (.455)	.0536 (.496)	.0220 (.736)	.2035 (.002)
2. Los Angeles (2)	25.03 (<.001)	49.87 (.597)	.3101 (<.001)	.0505 (.474)	.0459 (.530)
3. Chicago (14)	130.28 (<.001)	418.07 (.268)	-.0271 (.332)	.5085 (<.001)	.2238 (<.001)
4. Dallas (11)	48.67 (<.001)	322.71 (.355)	.4104 (<.001)	-.2602 (.003)	-.3244 (.001)
5. Houston (9)	8.79 (.118)	257.55 (.461)	.0951 (.083)	.1389 (.355)	.3367 (.087)
6. Washington, DC (25)	20.58 (.001)	736.88 (.110)	.0250 (.554)	.1931 (<.001)	.0104 (.860)
7. Miami (3)	16.63 (.005)	79.46 (.559)	.3279 (.042)	.1088 (.346)	-.0096 (.934)
8. Philadelphia	8.32 (.139)	227.22 (.484)	.0609 (.461)	.1379 (.096)	-.0097 (.900)

(8)					
9. Atlanta (28)	46.85 (<.001)	851.42 (.135)	.0929 (.017)	.0117 (.796)	-.0144 (.752)
10. Phoenix (2)	8.22 (.145)	50.58 (.569)	.0454 (.730)	.3060 (.069)	.2838 (.124)
11. Boston (7)	27.97 (<.001)	196.40 (.519)	.0973 (.288)	.1853 (.038)	.0172 (.850)
12. San Fran. (5)	10.59 (.060)	139.02 (.507)	.1751 (.054)	-.1543 (.204)	-.2584 (.086)
13. Riverside (2)	34.37 (<.001)	47.07 (.703)	.6413 (<.001)	-.3360 (.060)	-.1599 (.346)
14. Detroit (6)	245.98 (<.001)	189.22 (.137)	.5095 (.373)	.6095 (.447)	.1853 (.027)
15. Seattle (3)	24.02 (<.001)	85.39 (.377)	.1948 (.448)	.6853 (.001)	.4182 (.029)
16. Minneapolis (15)	115.52 (<.001)	531.86 (<.001)	.0300 (.552)	.8143 (<.001)	.1926 (.064)
17. San Diego (1)	2.58 (.765)	24.75 (.419)	.1719 (.286)	.1003 (.445)	.1227 (.358)
18. Tampa (4)	7.18 (.208)	113.02 (.429)	.3055 (.017)	.0307 (.774)	-.0367 (.740)
19. Denver (10)	47.41 (<.001)	268.99 (.744)	-.0811 (.477)	.3725 (.001)	.3194 (.003)
20. St. Louis (15)	7.40 (.193)	443.33 (.318)	.1025 (.130)	.0855 (.374)	-.1239 (.082)
21. Baltimore	37.22 (<.001)	212.36 (.230)	.1081 (.104)	.1774 (.011)	.2260 (.002)
22. Charlotte (11)	6.42 (.267)	314.04 (.489)	.1578 (.083)	.0525 (.592)	-.07483 (.394)
23. Orlando (4)	20.00 (.001)	111.72 (.463)	.1970 (.076)	.0747 (.367)	.1218 (.173)
24. San Antonio (8)	1.59 (.903)	224.59 (.533)	-.0396 (.555)	-.1654 (.752)	-.1714 (.790)
25. Portland (7)	2.53 (.772)	197.38 (.499)	-.2356 (.195)	.2852 (.171)	.2157 (.233)

The Wald test of model significance shows that the model explains a statistically significant proportion of the variation in the caseload for 16 of the 25 most populous metropolitan areas. The lack of statistical significance in the other 9 most populous metropolitan areas is indicative of the absence of both one-day and seven-day persistence effects, since the regression equation is designed specifically to measure these persistence effects. The lack of a persistence effect is most likely to occur when the number of new cases per day is relatively flat (constant speed). For example, the Wald test for the Tampa metropolitan area is 7.18 ($P=.208$), and for the weeks included in the regression analysis the speed was 9, 10, 8, 9, and 10, respectively. In other words, the lack of a significant persistence effect is consistent with and corroborates the finding of a low-level and flat

profile for the pandemic in the Tampa metropolitan area during those weeks. Of the nine areas where the model was not statistically significant, eight had fewer than ten counties. In the ninth area, St. Louis, the speed ranged from 17 to 24 for the past three months with no discernable upward or downward trend—in this case, a simple constant provides a reasonably good model and the DPD model adds little.

Detroit's speed increased from 59 for the week 10/2 - 10/8 to 82 in the week 10/9 - 10/15. Its persistence factor increased by .6095 for the week of 10/9 - 10/15 from .5095 to 1.290 which is indicative of explosive growth, although neither the base persistence effect nor the weekly shift effect was individually statistically significant. Chicago had one of the largest percentage increases in speed, from 87 the week of 9/25 - 10/1 to 100 for the week of 10/2 - 10/8 to 142 for the week of 10/9 - 10/15, an 80% increase in just two weeks, and Chicago's persistence for the weeks of 10/2 - 10/8 and 10/9 - 10/15 increased by .2238 and .5085, respectively. Minneapolis had the second highest increase in speed over the two weeks, from 38 at the beginning of the two-week period to 42 at the end of the second week to 63 at the end of the third week. This represents a 67% increase in just 14 days. For the week of 10/9 - 10/15 Minneapolis experienced a persistence shift of .8143, the largest persistence shift recorded during the two-week period. An increasing persistence (positive and statistically significant shift) would be expected to lead to greater speed in the next week.

DISCUSSION

The DPD model successfully represented metropolitan area COVID-19 case dynamics for all metropolitan areas, except for the Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington area that experienced extreme events. Calculating speed, acceleration, and jerk also helped with understanding case dynamics in metro areas, especially as they refer to characterizing a peak or wave progression.

The first wave of COVID-19 hit northern metropolitan areas first. These areas were able to flatten the curve by imposing shutdowns, social distancing, mask wearing, and other COVID-19 protocols. The first wave did not hit southern metropolitan areas as early or as hard as northern areas; southern metropolises reopened and only after reopening did the first wave truly hit. The current situation in the New York metropolitan area exemplifies the usefulness of the novel metrics. The second wave began to hit New York during the week of 8/28 - 9/3, based on changes in acceleration and jerk from negative to positive values. The onset was confirmed the week of 9/11 - 9/17/20, when acceleration nearly tripled from the prior week, and jerk more than quadrupled to a value of .98. However, the governors of New York and New Jersey did not impose additional restrictions until 11/11/20, and then the restrictions were primarily curfews on bars and late-night entertainment, based on information available at the time [67]. Use of novel metrics could well have influenced earlier, more forceful, and more proactive COVID-19 policy.

Our analysis including the use of novel surveillance metrics shows that the second wave of the pandemic has arrived in the United States and is accelerating, especially in northern metropolitan areas. For metropolitan areas in the Midwest, specifically Chicago, Detroit, and Minneapolis, there has been rapid and potentially explosive growth in cases during the first half of October 2020. This type of growth can be seen from the cities' speed, acceleration, and jerk, as well as the increasing 7-day persistence effects. It is critical for those cities already feeling the second wave to react swiftly and strongly. For those cities who have so far escaped the second wave, it is critically important to studiously monitor surveillance data to ascertain if and when the second wave is beginning to hit,

and then to be proactive in reimposing COVID-19 protocols. The overwhelming conclusion is that improved COVID-19 surveillance metrics can help cities be proactive in managing the pandemic, leading to fewer cases and saving lives.

References

1. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, Qu J, Gong F, Han Y, Qiu Y, Wang J, Liu Y, Wei Y. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *The Lancet* 2020;395(10223):507–513.
2. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, Ren R, Leung KS, Lau EH, Wong JY. Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020;
3. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, Zhao X, Huang B, Shi W, Lu R. A novel coronavirus from patients with pneumonia in China, 2019. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020;
4. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J, Wang B, Xiang H, Cheng Z, Xiong Y. Clinical characteristics of 138 hospitalized patients with 2019 novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *Jama* 2020;323(11):1061–1069.
5. Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, Lofy KH, Wiesman J, Bruce H, Spitters C, Ericson K, Wilkerson S, Tural A, Diaz G, Cohn A, Fox L, Patel A, Gerber SI, Kim L, Tong S, Lu X, Lindstrom S, Pallansch MA, Weldon WC, Biggs HM, Uyeki TM, Pillai SK. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United States. *New England Journal of Medicine Massachusetts Medical Society*; 2020 Mar 5;382(10):929–936. PMID:32004427
6. Mahase E. Covid-19: WHO declares pandemic because of “alarming levels” of spread, severity, and inaction. *BMJ [Internet] British Medical Journal Publishing Group*; 2020 Mar 12 [cited 2020 Oct 31];368. PMID:32165426
7. Anderson RM, Heesterbeek H, Klinkenberg D, Hollingsworth TD. How will country-based mitigation measures influence the course of the COVID-19 epidemic? *The Lancet* 2020;395(10228):931–934.
8. Maor M, Howlett M. Explaining variations in state COVID-19 responses: psychological, institutional, and strategic factors in governance and public policy-making. *Policy Design and Practice* 2020;1–14.
9. Haffajee RL, Mello MM. Thinking Globally, Acting Locally — The U.S. Response to Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020 May 28;382(22):e75. [doi: 10.1056/NEJMp2006740]
10. Kettl DF. States Divided: The Implications of American Federalism for Covid-19. *Public Administration Review* 2020;
11. Laestadius L, Wang Y, Taleb ZB, Kalan ME, Cho Y, Manganello J. Online National Health Agency Mask Guidance for the Public in Light of COVID-19: Content Analysis. *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance* 2020;6(2):e19501. [doi: 10.2196/19501]
12. Aleta A, Martín-Corral D, y Piontti AP, Ajelli M, Litvinova M, Chinazzi M, Dean NE, Halloran

- ME, Longini Jr IM, Merler S. Modelling the impact of testing, contact tracing and household quarantine on second waves of COVID-19. *Nature Human Behaviour* 2020;4(9):964–971.
13. Ngonghala CN, Iboi EA, Gumel AB. Could masks curtail the post-lockdown resurgence of COVID-19 in the US? *Mathematical biosciences* 2020;329:108452.
 14. CDC. CDC COVID Data Tracker [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 31]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#cases>
 15. Rader B, Scarpino SV, Nande A, Hill AL, Adlam B, Reiner RC, Pigott DM, Gutierrez B, Zarebski AE, Shrestha M. Crowding and the shape of COVID-19 epidemics. *Nature medicine* 2020;1–6.
 16. Chin T, Kahn R, Li R, Chen JT, Krieger N, Buckee CO, Balsari S, Kiang MV. U.S. county-level characteristics to inform equitable COVID-19 response. *medRxiv Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press*; 2020 Apr 11;2020.04.08.20058248. [doi: 10.1101/2020.04.08.20058248]
 17. Browne A, St-Onge Ahmad S, Beck CR, Nguyen-Van-Tam JS. The roles of transportation and transportation hubs in the propagation of influenza and coronaviruses: a systematic review. *J Travel Med* [Internet] Oxford Academic; 2016 Jan 1 [cited 2020 Nov 6];23(1). [doi: 10.1093/jtm/tav002]
 18. CDC COVID-19 Response Team, Jorden MA, Rudman SL, Villarino E, Hoferka S, Patel MT, Bemis K, Simmons CR, Jespersen M, Iberg Johnson J, Mytty E, Arends KD, Henderson JJ, Mathes RW, Weng CX, Duchin J, Lenahan J, Close N, Bedford T, Boeckh M, Chu HY, Englund JA, Famulare M, Nickerson DA, Rieder MJ, Shendure J, Starita LM, CDC COVID-19 Response Team, Armstrong GL, Butler JC, Coletta MA, Kite-Powell A, Bhatnagar J, Reagan-Steiner S, Tong S, Flannery B, Ferdinands JM, Chung JR. Evidence for Limited Early Spread of COVID-19 Within the United States, January–February 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020 Jun 5;69(22):680–684. [doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6922e1]
 19. Schuchat A, CDC COVID-19 Response Team. Public Health Response to the Initiation and Spread of Pandemic COVID-19 in the United States, February 24–April 21, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020 May 8;69(18):551–556. [doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6918e2]
 20. Fauver JR, Petrone ME, Hodcroft EB, Shioda K, Ehrlich HY, Watts AG, Vogels CBF, Brito AF, Alpert T, Muyombwe A, Razeq J, Downing R, Cheemarla NR, Wyllie AL, Kalinich CC, Ott IM, Quick J, Loman NJ, Neugebauer KM, Greninger AL, Jerome KR, Roychoudhury P, Xie H, Shrestha L, Huang M-L, Pitzer VE, Iwasaki A, Omer SB, Khan K, Bogoch II, Martinello RA, Foxman EF, Landry ML, Neher RA, Ko AI, Grubaugh ND. Coast-to-Coast Spread of SARS-CoV-2 during the Early Epidemic in the United States. *Cell* 2020 May 28;181(5):990-996.e5. [doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2020.04.021]
 21. Bushman D. Detection and Genetic Characterization of Community-Based SARS-CoV-2 Infections — New York City, March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* [Internet] 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 31];69. [doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6928a5]
 22. Maurano MT, Ramaswami S, Zappile P, Dimartino D, Boytard L, Ribeiro-dos-Santos AM, Vulpescu NA, Westby G, Shen G, Feng X, Hogan MS, Ragonnet-Cronin M, Geidelberg L, Marier C, Meyn P, Zhang Y, Cadley J, Ordonez R, Luther R, Huang E, Guzman E, Arguelles-Grande C, Argyropoulos KV, Black M, Serrano A, Call ME, Kim MJ, Belovarac B, Gindin T,

- Lytle A, Pinnell J, Vougiouklakis T, Chen J, Lin LH, Rapkiewicz A, Raabe V, Samanovic MI, Jour G, Osman I, Aguerro-Rosenfeld M, Mulligan MJ, Volz EM, Cotzia P, Snuderl M, Heguy A. Sequencing identifies multiple early introductions of SARS-CoV-2 to the New York City Region. medRxiv Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press; 2020 Aug 19;2020.04.15.20064931. [doi: 10.1101/2020.04.15.20064931]
23. About DTW [Internet]. Wayne County Airport Authority; 2020. Available from: <https://www.metroairport.com/about-dtw>
24. Inslee Issues COVID-19 Emergency Proclamation. Office of the Washington Governor Jay Inslee; 2020 Feb 29 [cited 2020 Nov 5]; Available from: <https://www.governor.wa.gov/news-media/inslee-issues-covid-19-emergency-proclamation>
25. Inslee announces “Stay Home, Stay Healthy” order. Office of the Washington Governor Jay Inslee; 2020 Mar 23 [cited 2020 Nov 5]; Available from: <https://www.governor.wa.gov/news-media/inslee-announces-stay-home-stay-healthy%C2%A0order>
26. McNerthney C. Coronavirus in Washington state: A timeline of the outbreak through March 2020 [Internet]. KIRO 7 News; 2020. Available from: <https://www.kiro7.com/news/local/coronavirus-washington-state-timeline-outbreak/IM65JK66N5BYTIAPZ3FUZSKMUE/>
27. Gretchen W. Executive Order 2020-21 (COVID-19) - Rescinded [Internet]. Office of Governor Gretchen Whitmer; 2020. Available from: https://www.michigan.gov/whitmer/0,9309,7-387-90499_90705-522626--,00.html
28. Haddad K. Michigan issues stay-at-home order amid coronavirus: Here’s what it means [Internet]. Click on Detroit; 2020. Available from: <https://www.clickondetroit.com/news/2020/03/23/michigan-issues-stay-at-home-order-amid-coronavirus-heres-what-it-means/>
29. US Coronavirus Cases and Deaths [Internet]. USAFacts.org. 2020 [cited 2020 Nov 1]. Available from: [/visualizations/coronavirus-covid-19-spread-map](https://visualizations.usafacts.org/coronavirus-covid-19-spread-map)
30. Javid B, Weekes MP, Matheson NJ. Covid-19: should the public wear face masks? BMJ [Internet] British Medical Journal Publishing Group; 2020 Apr 9 [cited 2020 Nov 1];369. PMID:32273278
31. Greenhalgh T, Schmid MB, Czypionka T, Bassler D, Gruer L. Face masks for the public during the covid-19 crisis. BMJ [Internet] British Medical Journal Publishing Group; 2020 Apr 9 [cited 2020 Nov 1];369. PMID:32273267
32. Cheng KK, Lam TH, Leung CC. Wearing face masks in the community during the COVID-19 pandemic: altruism and solidarity. The Lancet [Internet] 2020 Apr 16 [cited 2020 Nov 1]; [doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30918-1]
33. Dalton C, Corbett S, Katelaris A. Pre-Emptive Low Cost Social Distancing and Enhanced Hygiene Implemented before Local COVID-19 Transmission Could Decrease the Number and Severity of Cases. SSRN Journal [Internet] 2020 [cited 2020 Nov 1]; [doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3549276]
34. Weiner Z, Wong G, Elbanna A, Tkachenko A, Maslov S, Goldenfeld N. Projections and early-

- warning signals of a second wave of the COVID-19 epidemic in Illinois. medRxiv 2020;
35. Liu M, Thomadsen R, Yao S. Forecasting the Spread of COVID-19 under Different Reopening Strategies. 2020 Oct 28 [cited 2020 Nov 1]; [doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3607977]
 36. Abbott G. Executive Order No. GA-18 relating to the expanded reopening of services as part of the safe, strategic plan to Open Texas in response to the COVID- 19 disaster. [Internet]. Office of the Governor; 2020. Available from: <https://lrl.texas.gov/scanned/govdocs/Greg%20Abbott/2020/GA-18.pdf>
 37. Abbott G. Executive Order No. GA-29 relating to the use of face coverings during the COVID-19 disaster. [Internet]. Office of the Governor; 2020. Available from: <https://gov.texas.gov/uploads/files/press/EO-GA-29-use-of-face-coverings-during-COVID-19-IMAGE-07-02-2020.pdf>
 38. Friend D. COVID-19 in Texas: A Timeline of Gov. Abbott's Executive Orders and Case Numbers [Internet]. The Texan; 2020. Available from: <https://thetexan.news/covid-19-in-texas-a-timeline-of-gov-abbotts-executive-orders-and-case-numbers/>
 39. Solis J, Franco-Paredes C, Henao-Martínez AF, Krsak M, Zimmer SM. Structural vulnerability in the united states revealed in three waves of novel coronavirus disease (covid-19). The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene 2020;tpmd200391.
 40. Taskinsoy J. Coronavirus Pandemic: The US Induced Great Panic of the 21st Century. Available at SSRN 3610749 2020;
 41. Smith S. Loving county, Texas, is one of three U.S. counties with zero Covid-19 cases [Internet]. CNBC; 2020. Available from: <https://www.cnbc.com/video/2020/10/23/loving-county-texas-is-one-of-three-counties-in-the-u-s-with-zero-covid-19-cases.html>
 42. Li H-L, Jecker NS, Chung RY-N. Reopening Economies during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Reasoning about Value Tradeoffs. The American Journal of Bioethics 2020 Jul 2;20(7):136–138. [doi: 10.1080/15265161.2020.1779406]
 43. Fernandez M, Montgomery D. Coronavirus Lockdowns: Businesses Turn to Armed Defiance. The New York Times [Internet] 2020 [cited 2020 Nov 13]; Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/13/us/coronavirus-businesses-lockdown-guns.html>
 44. Justice D of. Six Arrested on Federal Charge of Conspiracy to Kidnap the Governor of Michigan [Internet]. News: USDOJ; 2020. Available from: <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/six-arrested-federal-charge-conspiracy-kidnap-governor-michigan>
 45. Akin L, Gozel MG. Understanding dynamics of pandemics. Turkish Journal of Medical Sciences 2020;50(SI-1):515–519.
 46. Johnson NPAS, Mueller J. Updating the accounts: global mortality of the 1918-1920 “Spanish” influenza pandemic. Bull Hist Med 2002;76(1):105–115. [doi: 10.1353/bhm.2002.0022]
 47. Government US. Government Response to Coronavirus, COVID-19 [Internet]. USAGov; 2020. Available from: <https://www.usa.gov/coronavirus>
 48. Bergman A, Sella Y, Agre P, Casadevall A. Oscillations in U.S. COVID-19 Incidence and


- Mortality Data Reflect Diagnostic and Reporting Factors. *mSystems* [Internet] 2020 Jul 14 [cited 2020 Oct 31];5(4). PMID:32665331
49. Greenblatt A. Will State Preemption Leave Cities More Vulnerable? [Internet]. *Governing: The Future of States and Localities*; 2020. Available from: <https://www.governing.com/now/Will-State-Preemption-Leave-Cities-More-Vulnerable.html>
 50. Oehmke JF, Moss CB, Singh LN, Oehmke TB, Post LA. Dynamic Panel Surveillance of COVID-19 Transmission in the United States to Inform Health Policy: Observational Statistical Study. *J Med Internet Res* 2020 Oct 5;22(10):e21955. [doi: 10.2196/21955]
 51. Oehmke JF, Oehmke TB, Singh LN, Post LA. Dynamic Panel Estimate-Based Health Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Rates to Inform Public Health Policy: Model Development and Validation. *J Med Internet Res* 2020 Sep 22;22(9):e20924. [doi: 10.2196/20924]
 52. Post LA, Kulasekere D, Moss CB, Murphy R, Achenbach C, Ison M, Resnick D, Singh LN, Issa TZ, Boctor MJ, Culler K, Faber J, Oehmke JF. South Asia SARS-CoV-2 Surveillance System: The Race to the Top Using Longitudinal Trend Analysis. *J Med Internet Res* 2020; [doi: 10.2196/24251]
 53. Post LA, Argaw S, Jones C, Moss CB, Resnick D, Singh LN, Murphy R, Achenbach C, White J, Issa TZ, Boctor MJ, Oehmke JF. A SARS-CoV-2 Surveillance System in Sub-Saharan Africa: Modeling Study for Persistence and Transmission to Inform Policy. *J Med Internet Res* 2020; [doi: 10.2196/24248]
 54. Post LA, Issa TZ, Boctor MJ, Moss CB, Murphy R, Ison M, Achenbach C, Resnick D, Singh LN, White J, Faber J, Oehmke JF. Public Health Surveillance is Imperative to Gain Control of the COVID-19 Pandemic in America: Longitudinal Trend Analysis of Static and Dynamic Metrics. *J Med Internet Res* 2020; [doi: 10.2196/24286]
 55. Bureau UC. Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas Totals: 2010-2019 [Internet]. The United States Census Bureau. [cited 2020 Oct 31]. Available from: <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2010s-total-metro-and-micro-statistical-areas.html>
 56. Teutsch SM, Thacker SB. Planning a public health surveillance system. *Epidemiol Bull* 1995 Mar;16(1):1–6. PMID:7794696
 57. Johns Hopkins University Coronavirus Resource Center [Internet]. Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. [cited 2020 Oct 31]. Available from: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/>
 58. The Global SARS-CoV-2 Surveillance Project (GASSP) [Internet]. [cited 2020 Dec 28]. Available from: <https://sites.northwestern.edu/covidglobalsurveillance/>
 59. Hansen LP. Large Sample Properties of Generalized Method of Moments Estimators. *Econometrica* [Wiley, Econometric Society]; 1982;50(4):1029–1054. [doi: 10.2307/1912775]
 60. Arellano M, Bond S. Some Tests of Specification for Panel Data: Monte Carlo Evidence and an Application to Employment Equations. *Rev Econ Stud Oxford Academic*; 1991 Apr 1;58(2):277–297. [doi: 10.2307/2297968]

61. Gaspar E, Goulding A, Seal E, Vonderhaar J. How Texans celebrated July Fourth during the coronavirus pandemic [Internet]. The Texas Tribune; 2020. Available from: <https://www.texastribune.org/2020/07/05/july-4-texas-coronavirus/>
62. Montgomery D, Fernandez M. 44 Texas Students Have Coronavirus After Spring Break Trip. The New York Times [Internet] The New York Times; 2020 Apr 1 [cited 2020 Nov 13]; Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/01/us/coronavirus-texas-austin-spring-break-cabo.html>
63. Mangrum D, Niekamp P. College Student Contribution to Local COVID-19 Spread: Evidence from University Spring Break Timing [Internet]. Social Science Research Network; 2020 May. Report No.: ID 3606811. Available from: <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3606811>
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Papers.cfm?abstract_id=3606811
64. CDC. Visiting Beaches and Pools [Internet]. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2020. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/daily-life-coping/beaches-pools.html>
65. Carter S. Dallas County Adds 5,000 New COVID-19 Cases to July's Count [Internet]. Dallas Observer; 2020. Available from: <https://www.dallasobserver.com/news/dallas-county-counts-5000-additional-cases-thanks-to-covid-19-testing-backlog-11935823>
66. Minneapolis, MN Weather History | Weather Underground [Internet]. [cited 2020 Nov 1]. Available from: <https://www.wunderground.com/history/monthly/us/mn/minneapolis>
67. Millman J. Cuomo Imposes Curfew on NY Bars, Restaurants and Gyms, Limits Private Home Gatherings to 10 [Internet]. NBC New York; 2020. Available from: <https://www.nbcnewyork.com/news/coronavirus/new-ny-nj-cases-soar-nearly-50-in-a-week-u-s-could-hit-20-million-cases-by-christmas/2716714/>


Supplementary Files

Figures

Number of positive COVID-19 cases recorded by the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.



Timeline illustrating important events in the COVID-19 pandemic as related to US Metropolitan Areas.



Multimedia Appendixes

Seven-day persistence by week and metropolitan area 2020.

URL: <https://asset.jmir.pub/assets/b85c35e4143f73b2e241c9b2c1cb1b6d.xlsx>

Speed, acceleration, and jerk by metropolitan area and week, 2020.

URL: <https://asset.jmir.pub/assets/2a1d8dc1c53db3505c524296f9411290.xlsx>

