

Assessing the nationwide impact of COVID-19 mitigation policies on the transmission rate of SARS-CoV-2 in Brazil

Daniel C. P. Jorge^{a,j}, Moreno S. Rodrigues^{b,j}, Mateus S. Silva^{a,j}, Luciana L. Cardim^c, Nívea B. da Silva^{c,d}, Ismael H. Silveira^e, Vivian A. F. Silva^c, Felipe A. C. Pereira^f, Arthur R. de Azevedo^d, Alan A. S. Amad^g, Suani T. R. Pinho^a, Roberto F. S. Andrade^{a,c}, Pablo I. P. Ramos^c, Juliane F. Oliveira^{c,h,i}

^a*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, Bahia, Brazil*

^b*Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Porto Velho, Rondônia, Brazil*

^c*Center for Data and Knowledge Integration for Health (CIDACS), Instituto Gonçalo Moniz, Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Bahia, Brazil*

^d*Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, Bahia, Brazil*

^e*Instituto de Saúde Coletiva, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, Bahia, Brazil*

^f*Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil*

^g*College of Engineering, Swansea University, Swansea, Wales, United Kingdom*

^h*Centre of Mathematics of the University of Porto (CMUP), Department of Mathematics, Porto, Portugal*

ⁱ*Correspondence: Juliane F. Oliveira (julianlanzin@gmail.com).*

^j*These authors contributed equally to this work and are listed in alphabetical order.*

Abstract

COVID-19 is now identified in almost all countries in the world, with poorer regions being particularly more disadvantaged to efficiently mitigate the impacts of the pandemic. In the absence of efficient therapeutics or vaccines, control strategies are currently based on non-pharmaceutical interventions, comprising changes in population behavior and governmental interventions, among which the prohibition of mass gatherings, closure of non-essential establishments, quarantine and movement restrictions. In this work we analyzed the effects of 707 published governmental interventions, and population adherence thereof, on the dynamics of COVID-19 cases across all 27 Brazilian states, with emphasis on state capitals and remaining inland cities. A generalized SEIR (Susceptible, Exposed, Infected and Removed) model with a

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

March 16, 2021

time-varying transmission rate (TR), that considers transmission by asymptomatic individuals, is presented. We analyze the effect of both the extent of enforced measures across Brazilian states and population movement on the changes in the TR and effective reproduction number. The social mobility reduction index, a measure of population movement, together with the stringency index, adapted to incorporate the degree of restrictions imposed by governmental regulations, were used in conjunction to quantify and compare the effects of varying degrees of policy strictness across Brazilian states. Our results show that population adherence to social distance recommendations plays an important role for the effectiveness of interventions and represents a major challenge to the control of COVID-19 in low- and middle-income countries.

Keywords: Brazil; COVID-19; mathematical modeling; non-pharmaceutical interventions; public policies; transmission rate.

1. Introduction

COVID-19, a disease caused by the SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus, emerged in December 2019 in China and was recognized as a pandemic by the World Health Organization on March 11, 2020 [1]. At that moment, Brazil had already confirmed 53 cases. On March 20, with 972 confirmed cases, the Brazilian Ministry of Health recognized community transmission of COVID-19 throughout the national territory, 24 days after the first confirmed case of COVID-19 was identified [2]. Brazil is a country with 209.5 million individuals and stark socioeconomic disparities throughout its territory. It is the largest country in South America and the fifth largest nation in the world. Accordingly, the many challenges imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic are unprecedented in this country.

The political-administrative organization of Brazil comprises three spheres of governance: The Union (federal government), the 27 states (including the Federal District, where the capital city, Brasilia, is located) and 5,570 municipalities. To reduce the transmission of SARS-CoV-2, federal, state and city governments implemented a series of interventions by means of government decrees [3]. This included recommendations to identify and isolate confirmed cases and contacts; to restrict unnecessary movements; to practice social distancing; to increase hygiene awareness; to follow respiratory etiquette; to

21 wear masks in public, among others. In the absence of more intensive miti-
22 gation policies implemented by the federal government (such as lock-downs
23 and movement restrictions), most measures were adopted by local govern-
24 ments (state/municipalities) [3]. However, adherence to these policies varied
25 greatly throughout the country, and while some regions enacted more strict
26 controls, others have been more lax.

27 The COVID-19 crisis has called attention to the importance of mathemat-
28 ical modeling to inform governmental policies and in quantifying the effects
29 of the pandemic at multiple levels [4]. Models have been adapted to ad-
30 dress questions such as the role of asymptomatic individuals to SARS-CoV-2
31 transmission chains [5], to assess the effectiveness of testing and quarantine
32 strategies in informing economic reopening [6] and epidemic suppression by
33 partial lockdown strategies [7], to quantify the needs for hospital beds under
34 various social distancing scenarios [8, 9, 10], among others, eg. [11, 12, 13, 14].
35 By drawing on a generalized SEIR model that simulates the dynamics of vi-
36 ral spread in a population entirely susceptible to the new virus, it is possible
37 to define and estimate the transmission rate (TR) at which an infected in-
38 dividual will transmit the disease to a susceptible person [15]. Therefore,
39 the higher this rate, the greater the number of new cases in a region over
40 time. Downward changes on the TR are expected with the implementation
41 of mitigation policies such as non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPI), the
42 only option to limit the spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the absence of effective
43 therapies or vaccination with sufficient population coverage.

44 In this work, we comparatively analyze the evolution of the COVID-19
45 transmission rate and effective reproduction number across all 27 Brazilian
46 states, with emphasis on state capitals and remaining inland cities, estab-
47 lishing links with measures of governmental restrictions (NPIs) implemented
48 in each region together with the human behavior response, particularly the
49 adherence to recommendations of social distancing. The varying degree of en-
50 forced policies across the country offers an opportunity to study the impacts
51 of interventions, including their breadth and timing, on the TR of SARS-
52 CoV-2 throughout Brazilian states. These findings can be extrapolated to
53 similar settings in other low- and middle-income countries to drive improve-
54 ments in mitigation policies against subsequent waves of SARS-CoV-2 and
55 other potentially pandemic pathogens.

56 2. Methodology

57 *Data sources*

58 The number of confirmed cases of COVID-19 for each Brazilian munic-
59 ipality, up to May 22, 2020, was obtained from the Ministry of Health of
60 Brazil and are publicly available [16, 17]. Since the capitals of each state have
61 different dynamics and largely concentrated COVID-19 cases in the initial
62 wave of the epidemic (an assumption informed by previous works [18, 19]),
63 we analyzed the transmission dynamics for each state in the following way:
64 1) The entire state, 2) the state capital alone; and 3) the remaining state
65 municipalities grouped as a single place by summing up their reported cases.
66 Throughout the text we refer to the latter as inland cities, although strictly
67 not all of these are distant from the shore.

68 To evaluate state-wide enforced governmental measures, we collated gov-
69 ernment decrees and resolutions scattered throughout various state govern-
70 ment gazettes and other official repositories up to May 22, 2020, since each
71 state uses different platforms to communicate their legislation. We anno-
72 tated the type of measure enforced, the implementation date, the duration
73 and whether it was valid to the whole state or limited to specific regions (see
74 Supplementary Material).

75 In addition to state level decrees we also collated COVID-19-related fed-
76 eral regulations, which affect equally all states [20]. However, federal-level
77 regulations did not interfere on measures enforced by state or municipalities,
78 and most of them were later repealed. Indeed, on April 8, 2020 the Brazilian
79 Federal Supreme Court ruled in favor of the decentralization of operations
80 aimed at controlling COVID-19 in the country, empowering the actions of
81 state and municipal governments [21]. The evaluation of municipal-level reg-
82 ulations was not performed due to the large number of Brazilian cities, a total
83 of 5,570, each having their own system for publications of legislation, with
84 variable degrees of update frequency and usually providing unstructured data
85 and burdensome access options, which would make their manual processing
86 unpractical. For this reason, in this work we only considered regulations
87 issued by the 27 state governments, which totaled 707 decrees.

88 As a proxy of the population adherence to recommendations of social
89 distancing, we used information from InLoco [22], a Brazilian technology
90 start-up that developed an index of social mobility, which seeks to help in
91 fight the pandemic in Brazil. Data for the index construction is obtained
92 from the unidentified, aggregated geo-movement patterns extracted from 60

93 million mobile devices throughout the country. The index ranges from 0 to
94 100% and measures the proportion of devices from a given municipality that
95 remained within a 450 meter radius from the location identified as home by
96 the device. The higher the index, the greatest the population adherence to
97 social distancing recommendations. The data is available at [22]. Examples
98 of other works that used the Social mobility reduction index (SMRI) can be
99 found in [23, 24].

100 *Stringency Index*

101 To comparatively evaluate the governmental measures implemented by
102 the Brazilian states, we constructed a stringency index, denoted by ι , simi-
103 larly to that implemented in [25]. To score each employed policy we adapted
104 the methodology to the Brazilian context by taking into account the specific
105 measures established by the different state governments and described in the
106 Data Sources section.

107 Measures were classified into two categories: Ordinal and cumulative.
108 Ordinal class of measures, denoted by O , are those in which there is a clear
109 order on the intensity of the restriction, so that there are less possibilities
110 of reclassification. For instance, a decree prohibiting agglomerations of more
111 than 100 people, followed by a second decree restricting to 500 people, belong
112 to the ordinal category, where the first is more intense than the second.
113 Cumulative class of measures, denoted by C , are those with no clear order of
114 intensity, allowing for a wide range of possibilities to classify the restriction.
115 For instance, closure of malls and prohibition to accessing parks and beaches
116 have no clear order to which of these measures is more intense and may lead
117 to subjective classification.

118 Every class of measures is a collection of sub-measures depending on how
119 each government decided to response and enforce measures. In this work
120 we have seven classes of measures, of which four are ordered and three are
121 cumulative, further described in Supplementary Table 1. Cancellation of
122 public events (O_1) presents six sub-measures. Similarly, health etiquette
123 policies (C_1) has two sub-measures.

124 The evaluation of the ordered class of measures varies from 0 (when no
125 measure is applied) to j (when the most stringent sub-measure is applied),
126 where the index j varies from 0 to N_{O_i} , the number of sub-measures of the
127 ordinal class of measures O_i (we similarly denote N_{C_i} , as the number of sub-
128 measures for the cumulative class). For the cumulative class of measures,
129 we evaluate each sub-measure as 0 if the sub-measure was not applied or

130 1 otherwise, so that the value of the class will be the sum of points of the
 131 sub-measures s_{C_i} . Additionally, to take into account whether the measure
 132 was enforced for the whole state or limited to a particular region, each class
 133 has a target G . If the measure is ordinal, then we consider $G = G_{O_i}$, taking
 134 either the value 0, if the most stringent sub-measure is applied for specific
 135 areas of the state, or 1, if it is enforced for the whole state. If the measure
 136 is cumulative, and since it will be a sum of the sub-measures, then $G = G_{C_i}$
 137 is the sum of targets for each sub-measure $s_{G_{C_i}}$, which again is either 0 if
 138 the sub-measure is applied to specific areas or 1 if it is applied to the whole
 139 state without exceptions. A summary of the seven measures, as well as their
 140 number of sub-measures and targets are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Classification of governmental responses to COVID-19 in Brazil (state-wide).

Measure adopted	Type	Class of measures	Targeting index	Number of sub-classes N
Cancellation of public events	ordinal	O_1	G_{O_1}	6
Closure of schools/universities	ordinal	O_2	G_{O_2}	2
Home-office for governmental employees	ordinal	O_3	G_{O_3}	4
Isolation	ordinal	O_4	G_{O_4}	2
Closure of non-essential businesses and public activities	cumulative	C_1	G_{C_1}	7
Transport lock	cumulative	C_2	G_{C_2}	6
Health etiquette policies	cumulative	C_3	G_{C_3}	2

141 The index for the ordinal classes is given by

$$\iota_{O_i} = \frac{j}{N_{O_i}(2 - G_{O_i})}.$$

142 Thus, the value of the stringency ι_{O_i} is the value of the most stringent mea-
 143 sured applied, j , normalized by the number of sub-classes, N_{O_i} , multiplied
 144 by the term $(2 - G_{O_i})$, which is 1 when the target is for the whole state or 2
 145 otherwise (that is, the stringency ι_{O_i} is divided by two).

146 For the cumulative classes the index is defined by

$$\iota_{C_i} = \frac{s_{G_{C_i}} + \frac{(s_{C_i} - s_{G_{C_i}})}{2}}{N_{C_i}},$$

147 where the sum $s_{G_{C_i}}$ reflects the measures that were applied to the whole state,
 148 and the term $(s_{C_i} - s_{G_{C_i}})/2$ evaluates the measures that were not applied for
 149 the whole state. Lastly, the whole expression is normalized by the number
 150 of sub-classes N_{C_i} .

151 Therefore, the total state index ι , for a given day, will be taken as the
152 average of the value of the classes ι_{O_i} and ι_{C_i} , yielding

$$\iota = 100 \times \frac{\sum_{i=1}^4 \iota_{O_i} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \iota_{C_i}}{7}.$$

153 Examples of these estimates are given in Supplementary Note 1.

154 *The mathematical model*

155 We generalize the usual SEIR model by separating the infectious compart-
156 ment into two: Asymptomatic/non-detected and symptomatic cases, denoted
157 by I_a and I_s , respectively, following our previous modeling strategy [8]. It
158 is reasonable to consider that the compartment I_a encompasses many of the
159 sub-notified cases since the majority of asymptomatic and mild cases are
160 not accounted for in the official data, in spite of their important role to the
161 SARS-CoV-2 transmission chain [5]. The system of differential equations
162 reads:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{-\beta(t)SI_s - \beta(t)\delta SI_a}{N} \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \frac{-\beta(t)SI_s - \beta(t)\delta SI_a}{N} - \kappa E \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{dI_a}{dt} = (1 - p)\kappa E - \gamma_a I_a \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{dI_s}{dt} = p\kappa E - \gamma_s I_s \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \gamma_a I_a + \gamma_s I_s \quad (5)$$

163 The epidemiological parameters presented in Equations (1 - 5) are described
164 in Table 2, along with their estimates (or search ranges, when fitted), which
165 were informed by previous works.

166 As described in [8], the parameter δ , a factor associated with the infec-
167 tivity of asymptomatic/non-detected infections, plays an important role on
168 the viral transmission dynamics. As described by equation 1, it influences
169 the non-linear term, and thus cannot be neglected from the system, unless it
170 is assumed that the infectivity of asymptomatic individuals is equivalent to
171 that of symptomatic cases, ie. $\delta = 1$. However, several studies suggest $\delta < 1$
172 [5, 29, 32], which guided our modeling choice that defined the search interval
173 for this parameter (Table 2).

Table 2: Key epidemiological parameters used in the SEIR model, with their respective value (when fixed) or the search intervals used for parameter estimations, informed by the literature.

Parameter	Description	Search interval	Fixed	Reference
β	Transmission rate	[0,2]	-	[5, 26, 27, 28]
t_i	Time of when transmission rate change	Defined in the Result section	-	[27, 28]
δ	Asymptomatic infectivity	[0,0.7]	-	[5, 29, 30, 9, 31, 32]
p	Proportion of latent (E) that proceed to I_s	-	0.2	[5, 31, 33]
κ	Mean exposed period, or incubation time	-	1/4	[5, 30, 34, 35, 36]
γ_a	Mean asymptomatic period	-	1/3.5	[5]
γ_s	Mean symptomatic period	-	1/4	[5, 26, 37]

174 Additionally, to account for variations in the TR over time, we assume
 175 that the TR β is a function given by:

$$\beta(t) = \beta_0 \mathcal{H}(t_1 - t) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_i \mathcal{H}(t_{i+1} - t) \mathcal{H}(t - t_i) + \beta_n \mathcal{H}(t - t_n), \quad (6)$$

176 where $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n\}$ represent a set of points in time defining the change on
 177 the TR, β_i are TRs in the interval $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$, and $\mathcal{H}(x) = 1$ if $x > 0$, $\mathcal{H}(x) = 0$
 178 if $x < 0$ and $\mathcal{H}(x) = 1/2$ if $x = 0$.

179 The key novelty here is that the influence of governmental measures on
 180 social mobility and human behavior can dictate changes on the TR (β_i 's) on
 181 inferred points t_i 's. To do so, we assume that the t_i 's change in an inter-
 182 val search based on variations in stringency and social mobility, described
 183 previously. Additionally, to evaluate if one or more changes to the transmis-
 184 sion rate was required, we assessed the value obtained using the Bayesian
 185 information criterion (BIC) as well as by visual evaluation of the fitted re-
 186 sults. The visual evaluation is important since the calculation of the BIC
 187 may yield small variations when the number of parameters is increased due
 188 to the inherent noise in the data.

189 The time of changing transmission rate and the rate itself, as well as the
 190 δ parameter are estimated using the Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO)
 191 metaheuristic. Under the PSO framework, we used maximum likelihood es-
 192 timation to optimize the model to the series of daily confirmed cases for
 193 each state, capital cities and remaining inland cities up to May 22, 2020.
 194 PSO was implemented using `pyswarms` library version 1.1.0 for Python 3
 195 (<http://python.org>) [38], and was executed with 150 particles through 500
 196 iterations with cognitive parameter 0.1, social parameter 0.3, inertia pa-
 197 rameter 0.9, evaluating five closest neighbors through Euclidean (or L2)

198 distance metric. In addition to the point estimates obtained by the PSO
199 method, percentile confidence intervals were also estimated for these param-
200 eters. The intervals were constructed using the weighted non-parametric
201 bootstrap method, considering 100 replicates of the original series of new
202 cases. Similar work to evaluate the impact of non-pharmaceutical measures
203 on the TR and dynamic spread of the disease are presented in [27, 28, 39].
204 The parameters $p, \kappa, \gamma_a, \gamma_s$ were informed by the literature and kept fixed.
205 The remaining estimated model parameters and search intervals were in-
206 formed both by the literature and the analyses presented in this work, and
207 are presented in Table 2.

208 *Basic and effective reproduction number*

209 Based on the obtained parameter values we also evaluated the basic repro-
210 ductive number \mathcal{R}_0 and the effective reproductive number $\mathcal{R}(t)$, also denoted
211 by \mathcal{R}_t , as described in [8]. The basic reproductive number \mathcal{R}_0 characterizes
212 the disease spread during the very early time interval after it has been in-
213 troduced, thus it is evaluated on the first transmission rate estimated by the
214 model. Its expression is given by (see [8, 40, 41]):

$$\mathcal{R}_0 = \frac{\beta_0 p}{\gamma_s} + \frac{\beta_0 \delta(1-p)}{\gamma_a}. \quad (7)$$

215 We also obtain the time series of the effective reproductive number $\mathcal{R}(t)$,
216 which indicate the current trend of the epidemic. Details of this calculation
217 can be found in Supplementary Note 5 of our previous work [8]. By writing
218 the infection-age structured epidemic model of our system of equations (1)
219 to (5) [40, 42], we obtain:

$$\mathcal{R}(t) = \frac{S(t)}{S(0)} \frac{\delta(1-p)\beta(t)}{\gamma_a} + \frac{S(t)}{S(0)} \frac{p\beta(t)}{\gamma_s}. \quad (8)$$

220 Equation (8) would be similar to the general form given by $\mathcal{R}(t) = \mathcal{R}_0 S(t)$
221 only for a portion of the evaluated period, since we consider changes on time
222 in the transmission rate β and the \mathcal{R}_0 expression only takes into account the
223 transmission rate before the first change, that is, for $t < t_1$.

224 Additionally, equation (8) can be also given by:

$$\mathcal{R}(t) = \frac{b(t)}{\int_0^\infty b(t-x)g(x)dx}, \quad (9)$$

225 where the numerator b represents daily number of new cases and the de-
226 nominator corresponds to the convolution on b and g , that is the disease
227 probability distribution function for the time interval between the infection
228 of an individual and its secondary cases. The function g is derived from the
229 differential equations of the model and receives contributions from the three
230 compartments E , I_a , I_s that impact the evaluation of \mathcal{R}_0 and $\mathcal{R}(t)$, as pre-
231 sented in [8]. The advantage of equation (9) is that it allow us to evaluate
232 the effective reproduction number directly on the available data and g , a
233 probability distribution function that can take different shapes and makes
234 our result more flexible to compare directly with the data, being δ the only
235 estimated necessary parameter used to feed equation (9).

236 Finally, since the data are reported as daily case counts, to calculate
237 expression (9), we discretize the generation time distribution g , such that
238 $\sum_{t_i} g(t_i) = 1$, see [42]. Thus,

$$\mathcal{R}(t) = \frac{b(t_i)}{\sum_i b(t_{i-j})g(t_i)}. \quad (10)$$

239 *Visualization app*

240 To facilitate visualizing the results of the analysis performed in this
241 work, a web-based application was developed using R/Shiny (<http://shiny.rstudio.com>). The application can be found at https://modelingtaskforce.shinyapps.io/transmission_rate_app/.

244 *Data availability*

245 Codes used to produce the results presented herein and related datasets
246 are available as supplementary material and in a public GitHub reposi-
247 tory [43]. Case series data, stringency and SMRI series, model fits and
248 details of estimates can be found in the on-line web page app at https://modelingtaskforce.shinyapps.io/transmission_rate_app/.

250 *Ethics statement*

251 This study was conducted with publicly available data from the COVID-
252 19 epidemic, published by the Ministry of Health of Brazil or third parties.
253 Therefore, no approval by an ethics committee was required, according to
254 Resolutions 466/2012 and 510/2016 (article 1, sections III and V) from the
255 National Health Council (CNS), Brazil.

256 3. Results

257 *The entry of SARS-CoV-2 in the Brazilian states*

258 Brazil had a total of 334,555 registered COVID-19 cases up to May 22,
259 2020. The first confirmed case of COVID-19 in Brazil occurred in the state of
260 São Paulo, southeastern region, on February 26, 2020. Within an interval of
261 seven to 12 days (from March 4 to March 9) the states¹⁰ of ES, DF, BA, AL,
262 RJ and MG had confirmed cases of COVID-19. From March 10 to March 25
263 the disease spread to the remaining 20 Brazilian states (Figure 1A).

264 By the moment that state authorities were unable to relate confirmed
265 cases through chains of transmission, SARS-CoV-2 community transmission
266 began to be declared in each region (Figure 1A; Supplementary Table 2).
267 Supplementary Figure 1 shows the temporal variation from the first reported
268 case to the declaration of community transmission in the state. As depicted
269 in Supplementary Figure 1, 40.7% (11/27) of the states took between 0 and
270 10 days to declare community transmission, 51.9% (14/27) took between 11
271 and 30 days, while only two states (Tocantins and Roraima), corresponding
272 to 7.5%, took more than 30 days to declare community transmission. This
273 scenario is further complicated by the delays in reporting cases. Although
274 each state declared community transmission at some point, there are uncer-
275 tainties around these dates due to delays in both the registration of cases and
276 the communication from the local level (municipality) to state authorities,
277 as exemplified in the states of Paraná and Roraima [44, 45].

278 In the supplemental web-page (see Data availability section), we present
279 the incidence of COVID-19 for each state, capitals and inland cities. As
280 shown, in the early stage of the pandemic in Brazil, the North region was
281 the most affected, accounting for the highest incidence, followed by CE and
282 MA in the Northeastern region. Once the entry of the virus was confirmed
283 within each state, the capitals were the most affected cities initially [19, 18],
284 emerging as the epicenter of the epidemic in each state (see Supplementary
285 Figures 2 and 3). Subsequently, SARS-CoV-2 disseminated throughout the

¹⁰Two-letter state abbreviations are as follows: AC, Acre; AL, Alagoas; AP, Amapá; AM, Amazonas; BA, Bahia; CE, Ceará; DF, Distrito Federal; ES, Espírito Santo; GO, Goiás; MA, Maranhão; MT, Mato Grosso; MS, Mato Grosso do Sul; MG, Minas Gerais; PA, Pará; PB, Paraíba; PR, Paraná; PE, Pernambuco; PI, Piauí; RJ, Rio de Janeiro; RN, Rio Grande do Norte; RS, Rio Grande do Sul; RO, Rondônia; RR, Roraima; SC, Santa Catarina; SP, São Paulo; SE, Sergipe; TO, Tocantins.




Figure 1: A) A timeline of events associated with the spread of SARS-CoV-2 across the 27 Brazilian states. The dates of first registered cases are shown (red dots), followed by the moment that community transmission was declared in each state (blue dots). The dates when the TR were observed to change ($\beta_0 \rightarrow \beta_1$ and, when applicable, $\beta_1 \rightarrow \beta_2$, are shown as triangles). The orange segments indicate the interval between the initial NPIs enforced by states and the first observed peak in stringency. Dates refer to the year 2020. B) Estimates of R_0 (and corresponding 95% confidence intervals) for each state, their capitals and remaining inland cities. Data for the Federal District (DF), the smallest Brazilian federal unit and the only one that has no municipalities, is only shown at the state-level.

286 inland cities with a different speed, as shown in the top panel plots of Sup-
 287 plementary Figures 2 and 3, where the incidence of COVID-19 is reported
 288 for the Brazilian states, capitals and inland cities.

289 *Governmental measures and population adherence*

290 Next, we evaluated the timing of governmental interventions on the num-
 291 ber of cases, the breadth of these interventions as measured by the stringency
 292 index, and their effects on influencing people's behavior, particularly adhe-

293 sion to social distancing recommendations.

294 A total of 707 regulations published by the 27 Brazilian state governments
295 were annotated according to the methods described to construct the stringency
296 index. The first measures enforcement of the state governments were
297 implemented between March 11 and March 24, with exception of MT that
298 present a larger time window interval, as shown in Figure 1A and Supple-
299 mentary Table 2. The states of TO, RR, PI, PA, MT, AP, RO, MA, PB and
300 AC adopted measures even before the first registered case. In contrast, some
301 regions which were first affected by COVID-19 were among those that de-
302 layed the implementation of measures to contain viral spread. For instance,
303 São Paulo adopted measures only 2 weeks after the confirmation of the first
304 case, on March 13, the same day of community transmission declaration in
305 the state. A similar scenario occurred in Rio de Janeiro, where the first re-
306 striction measures were only implemented in parallel to the declaration of
307 community transmission.

308 Among the measures classified in Table 1, strict quarantine measures
309 (O_4), restrictions on public transportation (C_3) and mandatory use of mask
310 (C_3) were the most weakly implemented measures enforced by the states.
311 Such measures contributed to an average level of 14% in stringency in the
312 studied period, and were adopted only partially in AP, BA, CE, MA and MT.
313 Only an average of 16.9% of public transportation measures were applied in
314 states. In the collected decrees, SP, DF and MS did not enact restrictions on
315 public transport and PA, PB, PI, RN, GO and ES had a very low average
316 of 4% in such measures. On the other hand, the mandatory use of masks
317 contributed, in average, to 33% of the index, with only one state (MS) failing
318 to enact such measures (Supplementary Table 3).

319 To assess the dynamics of implementation, continuance and lifting of NPIs
320 by Brazilian states, Figure 2 shows the variation of the stringency index over
321 time for each region relative to the number of confirmed COVID-19 deaths
322 per 100,000 inhabitants. All states increased stringency after an incidence of
323 10 cases per 100k inhabitants. In addition, the states of AP, AM, RR, CE
324 and PE displayed the highest stringency index in the last period evaluated.
325 Of note, those states were close to reaching full occupancy of their health
326 care systems, with more than 75% of ICU occupation [46]. These results
327 evidenced that heightening the level of measures only when the number of
328 cases and hospitalizations is already mounting represents a flawed strategy
329 unable to avert the impacts of a surge of COVID-19 in healthcare demands.

330 Variable adherence to social isolation recommendations was seen across




Figure 2: Evolution of the governmental measures adopted for each Brazilian state with respect to COVID-19 death incidence. The figure shows the variation of the stringency index over time for each state relative to the number of confirmed death per 100,000 inhabitants. The number of confirmed deaths per 100,000 population is shown in logarithmic scale on the x-axis.

331 the states, with values of the SMRI close to 30% at the beginning of March,
332 followed by a peak to around 60% at the end of that month. This was
333 observed in both state capitals and inland cities. The evolution of the strin-
334 gency index for each state, as well as the SMRI for capitals and inland cities
335 is presented in the lower panel plots of Supplementary Figure 2 and 3, as well
336 as in the supplementary web-page. Used in conjunction, both measures offer
337 a quantitative evaluation of the degree of policies enforced by Brazilian
338 state governments, as well as their effectiveness in reducing the circulation
339 of people, which lead to decreased contacts. Our results showed that, once
340 the SMRI reached its maximum, it was followed by a decreasing trend even
341 with the maintenance of measures by state governments.

342 With respect to the breadth and intervention period of governmental
343 measures, our results led to the identification of three stringency index pat-

344 terns: 1) Increase-and-decrease (ID), where the stringency index increases
345 initially, but is followed by the lifting of measures leading to its reduction
346 (such as Santa Catarina in Figure 3a); 2) Increase-and-steady (IS), where
347 stringency measures reach a peak that remains constant over time (depicted
348 by São Paulo in Figure 3b); 3) Increase-and-increase (II), where the stringency
349 index increases successively, probably a mechanism to cope with the
350 accelerated growth of the epidemic in some regions (illustrated by Amapá in
351 Figure 3c). Seven states, all located in the North (AC, AP and AM) and
352 Northeast (BA, CE, PE and PI), followed the II pattern, while seven states,
353 distributed throughout the Midwest (GO, MT), South (RS, SC), Southeast
354 (ES) and North (RO, TO) regions conform to the ID pattern (Supplementary
355 Figure 2 and 3). The remaining 13 states (AL, DF, MA, MG, MS, PA,
356 PB, PR, RJ, RN, RR, SE and SP), distributed in all regions, followed the IS
357 pattern. In addition, our results indicated that the reduction of the SMRI
358 was smaller in states that followed both IS and II patterns (median reduction
359 of -7.55% and -5.88%, respectively), compared to states that relaxed
360 their measures according to the ID pattern (median reduction of -9.03%)
361 (Figure 3d).

362 Of note, even states that promoted relaxation of policies, such as those
363 that followed an ID pattern, maintained an average SMRI in the last week of
364 May corresponding to $40.1 \pm 2.0\%$, a value higher than that corresponding
365 to the pre-pandemic SMRI in the first week of February, corresponding to a
366 value of $28.7 \pm 1.4\%$.

367 *Varying transmission rates of SARS-CoV-2 in Brazil*

368 Lastly, we sought to comparatively evaluate the effects of governmental
369 measures and population adherence to social distancing recommendations in
370 the TR of SARS-CoV-2 throughout Brazilian states.

371 As shown earlier, states reported initial cases of COVID-19 and an-
372 nounced community transmission at different moments. Then, all regions
373 reached a peak of measures implemented and corresponding SMRI on March,
374 2020. By evaluating these metrics in all of the 81 regions analyzed (state,
375 capitals, inland cities), we defined the search interval for a possible first
376 change in the transmission rate from March 13, to May 15, to include the
377 date of the first measure enforced and the last announcement of community
378 transmission (see Figure 1a). When more than one change in the TR took
379 place, we defined the search interval to the last month of the studied period,




Figure 3: Illustrative examples of a general pattern observed for the behavior of stringency measures over time in Brazil. Upper panels show COVID-19 incidence and bottom panels exhibit the social mobility reduction and the stringency indexes over time for a) Santa Catarina (increase-and-decrease, ID), b) São Paulo (increase-and-steady, IS) and c) Amapá (increase-and-increase, II). The social mobility index is considered separately for capitals, inland cities and the whole state. Plots for the remaining Brazilian states are shown in Supplementary Figure 2 and 3. The average reduction in the SMRI according to the stringency pattern for all states is shown in panel d. For each category, the median is shown as a solid horizontal bar.

380 i.e. from April 22 to May 22, 2020. More than two points of time changes
 381 were not considered in the time interval of study.

382 In Supplementary Table 4, we detail the number of days elapsed from the
 383 date of first implemented measure to the estimated date of TR change, and
 384 the variation from the first to the second (β_0 , β_1) TR obtained by the SEIR

385 model. Our results show that 26% of the states (BA, RN, DF, MG, RJ, RS
386 and SC) presented a noticeable change in the TR up to 15 days after the
387 implementation of the first NPI, 40.7% between 16 and 30 days, 14.8% (PA,
388 PB, PE, PI) between 31 and 45 days and the remaining 18.5% (AC, RO, RR,
389 AL and MS) of the states had a TR change only more than 46 days since the
390 first implemented measure. Estimate TR changes occurred first in capitals,
391 followed by inland cities (Supplementary Table 4).

392 The dynamic behaviour post intervention can be classified into DDD,
393 DDI, DID, IDI and III, corresponding to decrease or increase in TR in the
394 state as a whole, capital and inland, respectively. Around 62% of the states
395 presented a DDD behavior, that is a decrease on the TR in the state, capital
396 and inland cities. These states had an average TR decrease higher in the
397 capitals (-49.67%) compared to the inland cities (-40.43%). The states of
398 AP, RO, AL and RS (14.8%) displayed a DDI pattern, with an increase in
399 cases observed for inland cities in May, 2020. On the other hand, the states of
400 PI and SC showed an increase of the TR in capitals and an observed decrease
401 in both state-level and inland cities (DID pattern). AC was the only state
402 with an IDI pattern, while the remaining states (TO, SE and MS) presented
403 with an III pattern. However, TO and SE later resembled a DDD pattern
404 with a second change in TR. Furthermore, all states with an increase in TR
405 in any of its regions (state, capital or inland cities) had either an ID or IS
406 for the stringency index (as noted in the previous subsection).

407 In Figure 1B we show values for the basic reproduction number for each
408 region. The lowest values of \mathcal{R}_0 were for the regions that presented an in-
409 creased TR, as showed before. For instance, TO and SE presented values of
410 $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$. This indicates the lower transmission in the early stage of the dis-
411 ease spread in these states. The state of MS, that also had and III pattern,
412 and the inland cities of SC all had the following lowest values of \mathcal{R}_0 (less than
413 1.5). The inland cities of AC, AL, RO and RS showed values between 1.5 and
414 2. The remaining states that presented with a DDD pattern for the TR had
415 $\mathcal{R}_0 > 2$. Additionally, we can see that states that implemented the measures
416 before the first reported case usually experienced delayed changes in the TR
417 (after 8 April) compared to the remaining states and, with exception of AP,
418 these states were the ones with an average lower value of \mathcal{R}_0 as well.

419 To conclude, changes in the TR also impacted on the effective repro-
420 duction number causing an average reduction of -56.44% in capitals and of
421 -46.43% in inland cities, after the first TR change In Figure 4 we show this
422 impact for each state, their capitals and inland cities. Although a decrease

423 in the average \mathcal{R}_t after the first TR reduction was observed in most of the
 424 states, in none of the regions the values of \mathcal{R}_t fell below one. Moreover, after
 425 the first TR change, the average level of \mathcal{R}_t was equal to 1.86 in the inland
 426 cities compared to 1.53 in capitals.




Figure 4: Impact of measures and popular adherence on the effective reproduction number in each Brazilian state. The plot depicts the decrease of the average of \mathcal{R}_t before and after the first TR change.

427 More details regarding the fitting of the data to the SEIR model produced
 428 in this work can be found in the supplementary web-page, for both capitals
 429 and inland cities of each state, as well as the entire state (Supplementary
 430 Figure 4). We highlight, in each plot, as vertical dashed red lines, the dates
 431 of transition from β_0 to β_1 (and β_1 to β_2 , when applicable) (Supplementary
 432 Figure 4B). The blue dashed and full lines represent the evolution of the
 433 epidemic with a fixed transmission rate β_0 and with both β_0 and β_1 (where

434 β_2 is included when suitable), respectively (Supplementary Figure 4B). The
435 effective reproductive number is also presented for each state, capitals and
436 inland cities (Supplementary Figure 4C). The black line represents the \mathcal{R}_t
437 calculated with reported number of new cases; the blue dashed line repre-
438 sents the \mathcal{R}_t calculated with the new number of simulated cases obtained
439 from the model. The variation of the TR highlights the variations of the
440 trends of the effective reproductive number. Also shown are the estimates
441 for stringency for each region and state (Supplementary Figure 4D), the mo-
442 ments of changes in β (Supplementary Figure 4D) and the goodness-of-fit
443 (Supplementary Figure 4F), along with tables describing all these results
444 (Supplementary Figure 4G). Finally, post assessment for all fit performances
445 are available to evaluate reliability of the forecasts for a 15 day-period beyond
446 May 22.

447 4. Discussion

448 In this work we evaluated the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions
449 and social mobility reduction patterns on the spread dynamics of SARS-
450 CoV-2 throughout the 27 Brazilian states, by employing an underlying SEIR
451 model to estimate the transmission rate of SARS-CoV-2. Our results show
452 that the measures adopted, combined with the population adherence to re-
453 strict circulation (and therefore decrease contacts), contributed to the low-
454 ering of the TR in almost all states, an effect that was perceived in both
455 capitals and inland cities. However, in spite of the continued maintenance of
456 governmental restrictions in most regions, population adherence to isolation
457 recommendations gradually decreased over time, even with the expansion of
458 cases throughout the country. This was reflected in the $\mathcal{R}(t)$ values, which
459 we observed to have decreased in all states, but still insufficiently to consider
460 SARS-CoV-2 transmission controlled in the country, as it remained above 1
461 for all Brazilian states, capital and inland cities in the studied period. Thus,
462 public cooperation constitutes a particularly important challenge for tackling
463 COVID-19 in low- and middle-income countries.

464 The analysis performed on the sub-measures implemented reveal that the
465 Brazilian states lacked to endure measures restricting transportation (or did
466 so in a very lax manner), strict lock-downs (as adopted by other countries),
467 and even the mandatory use of masks at some places, the latter a low cost
468 measure that plays an important rule to reduce the spread of the disease.
469 Such restrictive policies have shown to significantly decrease the number of

470 cases, deaths, and viral transmission in other countries [47, 48]. On the
471 other hand, the economical costs imposed by harsher interventions is even
472 more burdensome to developing countries, where large economical segments
473 rely on consumption and services, usually involving physical contact, such as
474 informal workers, tourism, service and retail businesses.

475 Once the entry of the virus was confirmed within each state, the capitals
476 were the most affected initially, as shown by others as well [19, 18]. Then,
477 viral spread continued at different rates, with most of inland cities presenting
478 an average effective reproduction number higher than the capital after the
479 first TR change. This is a concerning trend considering the large inequalities
480 in the access to health services as well as their distribution in Brazil [49,
481 50], which tend to concentrate near state capitals. We also observed that
482 downward changes on TRs occurred first in the capitals, followed by the
483 remaining cities. This effect can also be due to the flux between cities,
484 which was not accounted in our modeling approach. Accordingly, the TR
485 observed in capitals should also affect that of inland cities, as suggested by
486 a meta-population compartmental model [51], but the possibility of further
487 waves of COVID-19 in these smaller cities, particularly with the lifting of
488 measures, should not be ruled out. These results highlight the major role of
489 state capitals as seeding spots, followed by the entry of cases towards smaller,
490 inland cities. Capitals also tend to centralize international airports, ports,
491 population density and industries [52, 53, 18, 54].

492 We identified common trends in the stringency index that allowed the
493 disclosure of three patterns, with the majority of states conforming to an
494 increase-and-steady pattern, in which the set of governmental policies adopted
495 remained unaltered over time. States that enforced and maintained mitiga-
496 tion measures were likely to observe a less pronounced relaxation of stay-at-
497 home advises by their population, as measured by the SMRI. These results
498 suggest the intimate relationship between the magnitude of governmental
499 measures and the population adherence to such measures, particularly since
500 higher values of stringency implicate in decreased opportunities of public
501 activities. However, individuals throughout all states, in both capitals and
502 inland cities, still reduced their adherence to social isolation in the course of
503 time. The politicization of COVID-19 in Brazil [55] could have had an impact
504 on people's behavior and compliance with sanitary recommendations, partic-
505 ularly when individuals downplay the health risks imposed by SARS-CoV-2,
506 as has been suggested for other countries [56].

507 We also observed that even in states that conformed to an increase-and-

508 decrease stringency index pattern, at least a part of the population still
509 maintained adherence to isolation. More studies are warranted to evaluate if
510 this trend associates with specific age-groups, such as the elderly, employment
511 status, such as individuals that have the possibility to continue working from
512 home, education level or perception of risks around COVID-19.

513 The present study confirmed the findings about early implementation of
514 interventions to mitigate the disease spread [28, 39]. In fact, the states that
515 anticipated applied restriction of the population were the ones with lower
516 value of \mathcal{R}_0 , representing a more controlled situation if compared to the
517 other states. Nevertheless, with few exceptions, they were states that had
518 an ID or IS pattern of mobility, and therefore the efforts were not sufficient
519 to bring the transmission rate to control levels, as assessed by the \mathcal{R}_t val-
520 ues. However, even with late TR change detection in these states, overall
521 delays must be noticed. In fact, in the scenario of an unfolding epidemic,
522 the delay in notification systems impacts the perception of the usefulness of
523 implemented measures. Our results reveal the magnitude of this perception,
524 where only 26% of the states showed a change on the TR with a maximum
525 delay of 15 days for the perception of the first peak of enforced policies,
526 with the remaining states having a significantly larger delay. These results
527 call attention to this problem and highlight the importance of improving the
528 surveillance system to better evaluate the impact of implemented measures
529 and optimise their strictness specially in countries with very low resource
530 levels [57].

531 Our work has some limitations. First, in order to estimate TRs (and
532 changes thereof) we relied upon a generalized form of the SEIR model which
533 explicitly considers asymptomatic/non-detected infections. Thus, albeit the
534 estimates of model parameters (or their respective search intervals) were in-
535 formed by the literature for other countries, they could be different from
536 the reality of the ongoing epidemic in Brazil. However, while the true ex-
537 tent of SARS-CoV-2 transmission by asymptomatic/non-detected and pre-
538 symptomatic individuals is still debated, current reports conclude that it is
539 an important route of transmission [5, 58, 33]. It is important to note that
540 levels of COVID-19 detection may vary over time due to the differing testing
541 capacity of each region, a data that to our knowledge is currently unavail-
542 able for the country. Our reflects this issue by the parameter p . However, the
543 availability of data about the number of tests performed over time is a lim-
544 itation. Also, there are noticeable notification delays that also present with
545 different magnitudes throughout the regions in Brazil. In fact, Brazil has a

546 total of 5,570 municipalities, this generates heterogeneities on the reporting
547 date of the case notification. A systematic analysis to infer the reporting de-
548 lay would require availability of data to at least measure a mean report delay
549 interval, as others have done [28]. Additionally, this delay may change over
550 time due to improvement or deterioration in the healthcare system. These are
551 key points that should be included to overcome this type of bias and correctly
552 estimate its uncertainties. This limitation may impact on the perception of
553 the implemented measures as well as compromise the planning of new ones.
554 However, our work further motivates the importance of an improved notifi-
555 cation system for Brazil and other countries, which will contribute to better
556 mitigate the current and future pandemics.

557 We used mobility data from mobile phones as proxies of social isolation
558 as measured by the SMRI. In particular, the sample space of devices moni-
559 tored using this technology cannot be considered a representative population
560 sample, as state/cities with superior economic status will probably exhibit
561 increased technology adoption by their populations, leading to better accu-
562 racy of the mobility patterns in these regions. This is in contrast to rural
563 areas, for instance, where mobile phone usage is limited [59]. However, con-
564 sidering the general widespread use of mobile phones in the country (with
565 estimates that 60% of adults report owning a smartphone [60]), the general
566 trends observed in our work should not be drastically altered by more accu-
567 rate measurements of social mobility reduction. Lastly, the evaluation of all
568 measures enforced is not trivial, and in our work we have only included the
569 use of mask as health etiquette policies, with other NPIs such as sanitary
570 cleaning of public and private places, the obligatory availability of 70% alco-
571 hol in stores, as well as economic measures such as emergency payments for
572 the self-employed, reduction of taxes and others were not evaluated. Still,
573 proper evaluation of these categories should be assessed.

574 In sum, our results point to the importance of timely deployment of in-
575 terventions in curbing the first-wave of the COVID-19 epidemic in Brazil.
576 Yet, population adherence represents a crucial factor for the success of this
577 effort and represents a major challenge in low- and middle-income countries.

578 **Acknowledgements**

579 This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento
580 de Pessoal de Nível Superior – Brazil (CAPES) – Finance Code 001. STRP
581 was supported by an International Cooperation grant (process number


582 INT0002/2016) from Bahia Research Foundation (FAPESB). STRP and
583 RFSA were supported by the National Institute of Science and Technol-
584 ogy - Complex Systems from CNPq, Brazil. JFO was supported by the
585 Center of Data and Knowledge Integration for Health (CIDACS) through
586 the Zika Platform - a long-term surveillance platform for Zika virus and
587 microcephaly (Unified Health System (SUS), Brazilian Ministry of Health).
588 DCJ acknowledges a Scientific Initiation scholarship from CNPq (process
589 number 117568/2019-8).MSS acknowledges a Scientific Initiation scholar-
590 ship from CNPq (process number 116731/2019-2). The authors acknowl-
591 edge the helpful suggestions from members of the CoVida Network (<http://covid19br.org>),
592 in special to contributors to the Rede CoVida Mod-
593 elling Task-force: Aureliano S. S. Paiva, Caio P. Castro, Gabriela L. Borges,
594 Gervásio F. Santos, José G. B. Castro, José G. V. Miranda, Maira L. Souza,
595 Maria Yury Ichihara, Matheus F. Torquato, Maurício L. Barreto, Raphael
596 S. do Rosário, Rafael V. Veiga and Rosemeire L. Fiaconne. We acknowledge
597 the InLoco team, namely José Luciano Melo, Raíza Oliveira, Afonso Del-
598 gado, Abel Borges, André De'Carli, Hector Pinheiro, Lucas Rufino, Gabriel
599 Teotonio and Luiza Botelho for providing raw files of the Social mobility
600 reduction data used here. We also acknowledge the open data initiative of
601 Brasil.io (<https://brasil.io/datasets/>).

602 **Authors' contributions**


603 Conceptualization: LLC, NBS, FACP, PIPR, JFO Data curation: DCPJ,
604 MSR, MSS, VAFS, FACP, ARA, PIPR, JFO Formal analysis: DCPJ, MSR,
605 MSS, LLC, NBS, IHS, VAFS, FACP, ARA, ASSA, STRP, RFSA, PIPR,
606 JFO Investigation: LLC, NBS, FACP, PIPR, JFO Methodology: DCPJ,
607 MSR, MSS, LLC, NBS, VAFS, FACP, ASSA, STRP, RFSA, PIPR, JFO
608 Project administration: STRP, RFSA, PIPR, JFO Software: DCPJ, MSR,
609 MSS, FACP, ARA, ASA, JFO Validation: DCPJ, MSR, MSS, LLC, NBS,
610 VAFS, FACP, ARA, ASSA, STRP, RFSA, PIPR, JFO Visualization: MSR,
611 MSS, ARA, PIPR, JFO Writing - original draft: LLC, STRP, PIPR, JFO
612 Writing - review and editing: DCPJ, MSR, MSS, LLC, NBS, VAFS, FACP,
613 ARA, ASSA, STRP, RFSA, PIPR, JFO

614


Supplementary Figures




Supplementary Figure 1: Dissemination of COVID-19 in Brazil. (a) Date of first confirmed COVID-19 case per state and (b) number of days elapsed from the first identified case to the establishment of community transmission in the state. Two-letter state abbreviations are as follows: AC, Acre; AL, Alagoas; AP, Amapá; AM, Amazonas; BA, Bahia; CE, Ceará; DF, Distrito Federal; ES, Espírito Santo; GO, Goiás; MA, Maranhão; MT, Mato Grosso; MS, Mato Grosso do Sul; MG, Minas Gerais; PA, Pará; PB, Paraíba; PR, Paraná; PE, Pernambuco; PI, Piauí; RJ, Rio de Janeiro; RN, Rio Grande do Norte; RS, Rio Grande do Sul; RO, Rondônia; RR, Roraima; SC, Santa Catarina; SP, São Paulo; SE, Sergipe; TO, Tocantins.



Supplementary Figure 2: COVID-19 incidence per state, their capitals and remaining inland cities (upper plots). The bottom subplots exhibit the Social mobility reduction index, considered separately for capitals, inland cities and the whole state, and the stringency index, for the state measures, over time.



Supplementary Figure 3: COVID-19 incidence per state, their capitals and remaining inland cities (upper plots). The bottom subplots exhibit the Social mobility reduction index, considered separately for capitals, inland cities and the whole state, and the stringency index, for the state measures, over time.



Supplementary Figure 4

615

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1: Classification of the measures implemented in Brazilian states as a response to the COVID-19 spread.

ID	Name	Coding Instructions
O_1	Cancel public events	0 - No measures 1 - Ban of public events and public facilities 2 - Restrictions on very large gatherings (above 500 people) 3 - Restrictions on gatherings between 100-499 people 4 - Restrictions on gatherings between 50-99 people 5 - Restrictions on gatherings between 5-49 people 6 - Total ban on crowded events or activities
		0 - Targeted or conditional 1 - General
O_2	Closure of schools/universities	0 - No measures 1 - Suggests closure 2 - Require closing
		0 - Targeted or conditional 1 - General
O_3	Home-office for government employees	0 - No measures 1 - Home-office for those with symptoms or from some risk groups 2 - Optional home-office 3 - Strategic scheduling work 4 - Mandatory home-office
		0 - Targeted or conditional 1 - General
O_4	Isolation	0 - No measures 1 - Vertical isolation 2 - Horizontal isolation
		0 - Targeted or conditional 1 - General
C_1	Closure of non-essential businesses and public activities	0 - No measures Closure of malls Suspension of non-essential businesses Suspension of bars and restaurants Ban of activities in public spaces (beaches, parks, etc) Suspension of religious activities Closure of cultural places (theater, cinema, museum) Closure of gyms
		The sum of the measures that was general
C_2	Transport lock <small>*Considering only road and river transportation</small>	0 - No measures Suspension on city buses Suspension on inter-cities buses Suspension on inter-state buses Total transportation suspension in the city Total transportation suspension inter cities Total transportation suspension inter states
		The sum of the measures that was general
C_3	Health etiquette policies <small>*Corresponding only to mandatory use of masks</small>	0 - No measures Mandatory use in establishments Mandatory use in transport
		The sum of the measures that was general

Supplementary Table 2: SARS-CoV-2 entry in Brazil and association with NPIs and peak stringency

State	Date of first case	Date of community transmission	Interval between initial NPIs and first stringency peak (days) [†]
Acre	Mar/17	Apr/09 [61]	Mar 16-20 (4 days)
Amazonas	Mar/13	Mar/28 [62]	Mar 16-23 (7 days)
Amapá	Mar/20	Mar/28 [63]	Mar 17-22 (5 days)
Pará	Mar/18	Mar/30 [64]	Mar 16-20 (4 days)
Rondonia	Mar/20	Mar/31 [65]	Mar 17-20 (3 days)
Roraima	Mar/21	May/02 [45]	Mar 16-22 (6 days)
Tocantins	Mar/18	Apr/24 [66]	Mar 16-21 (5 days)
Alagoas	Mar/08	Mar/28 [67]	Mar 13-23 (10 days)
Bahia	Mar/06	Mar/19 [68]	Mar 16-21 (5 days)
Ceará	Mar/16	Mar/20 [69]	Mar 16-20 (4 days)
Maranhão	Mar/20	Mar/30 [70]	Mar 16-21 (5 days)
Paraíba	Mar/18	Apr/04 [71]	Mar 17-22 (5 days)
Pernambuco	Mar/12	Mar/17 [72]	Mar 14-23 (9 days)
Piauí	Mar/19	Mar/20 [2]	Mar 16-24 (8 days)
Sergipe	Mar/14	Mar/25 [73]	Mar 16-24 (8 days)
Rio Grande do Norte	Mar/12	Mar/20 [2]	Mar 13-24 (11 days)
Goiás	Mar/12	Mar/15 [74]	Mar 13-24 (11 days)
Distrito Federal	Mar/07	Mar/26 [75]	Mar 11-21 (10 days)
Mato Grosso	Mar/20	Mar/31 [76]	Mar 16-31 (15 days)
Mato Grosso do Sul	Mar/14	Apr/04 [77]	Mar 16-23 (7 days)
Espírito Santo	Mar/06	Mar/30 [78]	Mar 17-21 (4 days)
Minas Gerais	Mar/08	Mar/18 [79]	Mar 16-23 (7 days)
Rio de Janeiro	Mar/05	Mar/13 [80]	Mar 13-16 (3 days)
São Paulo	Feb/26	Mar/13 [80]	Mar 13-20 (7 days)
Paraná	Mar/12	Apr/09 [44]	Mar 16-23 (7 days)
Rio Grande do Sul	Mar/10	Mar/20 [81]	Mar 16-21 (5 days)
Santa Catarina	Mar/12	Mar/18 [82]	Mar 16-19 (3 days)

All dates refer to the year 2020; †, interval between the first NPIs enacted by states and the first peak of the stringency index.

Supplementary Table 3: Summary of the stringency index and subindexes for each state.

State	ι			O_1			O_2			O_3			O_4			C_1			C_2			C_3		
	Mean	Max	SD	Mean	Max	SD	Mean	Max	SD	Mean	Max	SD	Mean	Max	SD	Mean	Max	SD	Mean	Max	SD	Mean	Max	SD
AC	0.52	0.68	0.23	0.68	1.00	0.36	0.83	1.00	0.37	0.86	1.00	0.35	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.81	1.00	0.39	0.21	0.25	0.09	0.25	0.50	0.25
AM	0.49	0.74	0.23	0.49	0.83	0.25	0.84	1.00	0.36	0.80	1.00	0.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.79	1.00	0.40	0.27	0.33	0.13	0.21	1.00	0.41
AP	0.59	0.96	0.29	0.28	1.00	0.31	0.91	1.00	0.37	0.90	1.00	0.38	0.16	1.00	0.35	0.89	1.00	0.39	0.48	0.75	0.20	0.54	1.00	0.50
PA	0.47	0.61	0.13	0.78	0.83	0.20	0.94	1.00	0.24	0.47	0.50	0.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.83	0.93	0.24	0.03	0.17	0.06	0.23	1.00	0.42
RO	0.59	0.73	0.20	0.74	0.83	0.26	0.93	1.00	0.26	0.89	1.00	0.31	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.78	1.00	0.34	0.22	0.25	0.08	0.55	1.00	0.50
RR	0.53	0.57	0.16	0.94	1.00	0.24	0.93	1.00	0.26	0.87	1.00	0.34	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.74	0.86	0.29	0.14	0.17	0.06	0.06	1.00	0.24
TO	0.30	0.49	0.12	0.29	1.00	0.45	0.94	1.00	0.24	0.27	0.75	0.14	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.05	0.50	0.15	0.14	0.25	0.09	0.30	1.00	0.46
AL	0.47	0.67	0.22	0.83	1.00	0.35	0.78	1.00	0.42	0.42	0.50	0.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.82	1.00	0.38	0.13	0.17	0.07	0.31	1.00	0.47
BA	0.39	0.67	0.19	0.57	0.67	0.24	0.85	1.00	0.36	0.21	0.25	0.09	0.12	0.50	0.21	0.38	1.00	0.18	0.20	0.25	0.10	0.42	1.00	0.47
CE	0.52	0.75	0.25	0.83	1.00	0.36	0.83	1.00	0.37	0.71	1.00	0.41	0.15	0.50	0.23	0.74	1.00	0.36	0.26	0.58	0.22	0.12	0.25	0.13
MA	0.58	0.72	0.18	0.94	1.00	0.24	0.93	1.00	0.26	0.89	1.00	0.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.66	0.86	0.26	0.16	0.33	0.13	0.48	1.00	0.50
PB	0.39	0.53	0.14	0.31	0.33	0.09	0.9	1.00	0.3	0.70	0.75	0.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.37	0.43	0.15	0.03	0.17	0.06	0.40	1.00	0.46
PE	0.45	0.55	0.13	0.91	1.00	0.23	0.91	1.00	0.28	0.23	0.25	0.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.77	0.86	0.25	0.18	0.50	0.17	0.11	0.25	0.12
PI	0.31	0.74	0.13	0.04	1.00	0.16	0.94	1.00	0.24	0.02	1.00	0.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.74	1.00	0.29	0.03	0.17	0.06	0.43	1.00	0.50
SE	0.60	0.76	0.18	0.91	1.00	0.26	0.94	1.00	0.24	0.89	1.00	0.28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.78	1.00	0.25	0.24	0.33	0.15	0.43	1.00	0.50
RN	0.52	0.67	0.17	0.75	0.83	0.22	0.93	1.00	0.26	0.89	1.00	0.28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.70	0.79	0.25	0.07	0.08	0.03	0.30	1.00	0.46
GO	0.55	0.64	0.13	0.98	1.00	0.16	0.93	1.00	0.25	0.73	0.75	0.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.62	0.86	0.22	0.05	0.17	0.08	0.52	1.00	0.50
DF	0.54	0.70	0.22	0.84	1.00	0.31	0.91	1.00	0.29	0.80	1.00	0.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.78	1.00	0.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.43	1.00	0.50
MT	0.52	0.62	0.18	0.91	1.00	0.26	0.85	1.00	0.36	0.68	0.75	0.21	0.17	0.50	0.24	0.33	0.86	0.33	0.21	0.25	0.09	0.49	1.00	0.50
MS	0.27	0.31	0.09	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.88	1.00	0.30	0.91	1.00	0.27	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.13	0.14	0.04	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ES	0.30	0.41	0.14	0.25	0.50	0.25	0.82	1.00	0.37	0.21	0.25	0.09	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.48	0.64	0.23	0.05	0.08	0.04	0.27	1.00	0.44
MG	0.54	0.66	0.17	0.74	0.83	0.26	0.91	1.00	0.28	0.94	1.00	0.24	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.34	0.43	0.13	0.29	0.33	0.11	0.55	1.00	0.50
RJ	0.48	0.53	0.08	0.98	1.00	0.16	0.98	1.00	0.16	0.49	0.50	0.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.60	0.79	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.04	0.16	0.50	0.24
SP	0.57	0.71	0.16	0.95	1.00	0.20	0.94	1.00	0.24	0.90	1.00	0.28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.90	1.00	0.28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.30	1.00	0.46
PR	0.45	0.56	0.14	0.63	0.67	0.16	0.94	1.00	0.24	0.47	0.50	0.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.50	0.57	0.19	0.17	0.33	0.09	0.41	1.00	0.50
RS	0.47	0.57	0.15	0.78	1.00	0.26	0.9	1.0	0.3	0.48	0.50	0.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.63	0.79	0.24	0.26	0.33	0.11	0.27	1.00	0.45
SC	0.51	0.64	0.15	0.93	1.00	0.26	0.9	1.0	0.3	0.44	0.50	0.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.59	1.00	0.44	0.46	0.50	0.13	0.27	0.50	0.25

Supplementary Table 4: SARS-CoV-2 spread throughout 27 Brazilian states and effects on the transmission rate

State	Region	Date of first implemented measure	Date of the first change	Lags in days from the first implemented measure and the date of first change	Percentage variation from β_0 to β_1
Acre	State	20/03/16	20/05/17	62	46.0 ↑
	Capital	-	20/05/05	50	-32.62 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/05/18	63	129.08 ↑
Amazonas	State	20/03/16	20/04/06	21	-50.01 ↓
	Capital	-	20/04/06	21	-51.86 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/04/29	44	-36.94 ↓
Amapá	State	20/03/17	20/04/09	23	-52.591 ↓
	Capital	-	20/04/10	24	-54.63 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/05/18	62	62.79 ↑
Pará	State	20/03/16	20/04/20	35	-28.26 ↓
	Capital	-	20/04/17	32	-37.17 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/04/24	39	-22.56 ↓
Roraima	State	20/03/17	20/05/02	46	-33.60 ↓
	Capital	-	20/05/05	49	-37.55 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/05/02	46	19.08 ↑
Tocantins	State	20/03/16	20/05/05	50	-36.62 ↓
	Capital	-	20/05/05	50	-33.64 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/05/13	58	-60.65 ↓
Alagoas	State	20/03/16	20/04/09	24	182.22 ↑
	Capital	-	20/04/09	24	166.24 ↑
	Inland cities	-	20/04/09	24	294.64 ↑
Bahia	State	20/03/13	20/04/28	46	-32.13 ↓
	Capital	-	20/04/29	47	-42.05 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/05/19	67	37.13 ↑
Ceará	State	20/03/16	20/03/30	14	-40.40 ↓
	Capital	-	20/04/01	16	-41.64 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/04/03	18	-36.36 ↓
Maranhão	State	20/03/16	20/04/02	17	-62.15 ↓
	Capital	-	20/04/04	19	-65.67 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/04/16	31	-22.12 ↓
Paraíba	State	20/03/16	20/04/15	30	-44.69 ↓
	Capital	-	20/04/17	32	-57.31 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/05/08	53	-34.04 ↓
Pernambuco	State	20/03/17	20/04/28	42	-15.68 ↓
	Capital	-	20/04/29	43	-36.97 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/05/12	56	-5.15 ↓
Piauí	State	20/03/14	20/04/14	31	-50.09 ↓
	Capital	-	20/04/15	32	-46.92 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/04/16	33	-43.59 ↓
Sergipe	State	20/03/16	20/04/29	44	-29.77 ↓
	Capital	-	20/05/08	54	118.35 ↑
	Inland cities	-	20/04/26	41	-29.95 ↓
Rio Grande do Norte	State	20/03/16	20/04/05	20	125.66 ↑
	Capital	-	20/04/06	21	159.91 ↑
	Inland cities	-	20/04/02	17	239.06 ↑
Goiás	State	20/03/13	20/03/28	15	-51.03 ↓
	Capital	-	20/04/01	19	-42.96 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/03/28	15	-54.95 ↓
Distrito Federal	State	20/03/13	20/04/04	22	-30.54 ↓
	Capital	-	20/04/05	23	-32.92 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/05/11	59	31.95 ↓
Mato Grosso do Sul	State	20/03/11	20/03/23	12	-63.69 ↓
	Capital	20/03/16	20/04/04	19	-59.99 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/04/04	19	-59.64 ↓
Espírito Santo	State	-	20/04/06	21	-58.45 ↓
	Capital	20/03/16	20/05/06	55	33.95 ↑
	Inland cities	-	20/05/13	58	49.44 ↑
Minas Gerais	State	-	20/05/03	48	47.86 ↑
	Capital	20/03/17	20/04/14	28	-45.88 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/04/15	29	-33.34 ↓
Rio de Janeiro	State	-	20/04/15	29	-43.30 ↓
	Capital	20/03/16	20/03/22	6	-62.50 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/03/25	9	-71.71 ↓
São Paulo	State	-	20/03/23	7	-49.12 ↓
	Capital	20/03/13	20/03/25	12	-60.17 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/03/23	9	-60.30 ↓
Paraná	State	-	20/05/17	65	-92.28 ↓
	Capital	20/03/13	20/04/01	19	-55.06 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/03/31	18	-56.62 ↓
Rio Grande do Sul	State	-	20/04/04	23	-55.89 ↓
	Capital	20/03/16	20/04/03	18	-65.97 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/04/05	20	-66.07 ↓
Santa Catarina	State	-	20/04/02	19	-63.45 ↓
	Capital	20/03/16	20/03/20	4	-57.01 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/03/25	9	-75.60 ↓
Distrito Federal	State	-	20/05/17	62	64.15 ↑
	Capital	20/03/16	20/03/24	8	-64.41 ↓
	Inland cities	-	20/05/17	62	135.58 ↑
Distrito Federal	State	-	20/03/24	8	-61.91 ↓
	Capital	-	-	-	-
	Inland cities	-	-	-	-

Supplementary Table 5

N. of changes on the TR	State	BIC	Difference between BICs	Capital	BIC	Difference between BICs	Inland	BIC	Difference between BICs
0	AC	1928.9004727029371	-		1826.9011190617762			961.5413806073585	
1	AC	1882.9544538988064	45.946018804130745		1715.8440158143344	111.05710324744177		932.4297579241561	29.111622683202427
2	AC	1883.1010692761765	-0.1466153773701535		1695.018072736167	20.825943040717675		871.9461803866287	60.48357753752737
0	AL	1514.5752058188764			1701.4476804344995			489.7830462840868	
1	AL	1183.3780344931324	331.19717132574397		1181.5562679530312	519.8914124814683		486.94196381110044	2.841082472986386
2	AL	1113.9325766699033	69.44545782322916		1114.9481866976303	66.60808125540098		488.27009024300673	-1.3281264319062984
0	AP	2552.8208801293163			2623.960542222063			1030.6925882742444	
1	AP	2192.2244974265755	360.5963827027408		2206.598924535525	417.361617686538		941.3239691887856	89.36861908545882
2	AP	2173.970860851863	18.253636574712345		2175.6524857514305	30.94643874094426		805.6275270129926	135.69644217579298
0	AM	9226.433031041272			7721.243779416523			3359.8847983549945	
1	AM	4274.891159144144	4951.541835897127		4250.521751799182	3470.7220276173402		1891.3242126817263	1468.5605856732682
2	AM	3953.5196892956983	321.37150584844585		4102.4444918196305	148.07725997955185		1896.8401942540079	-5.515981572281589
0	BA	5698.904929434813			6128.746770238839			1970.0961312697505	
1	BA	5150.666096274456	548.238833160357		5492.926360695703	635.8204095431365		1778.965688629071	191.13044264067935
2	BA	5151.396595490736	-0.7304992162798953		5163.353242177982	329.573117917721		1673.1765894360994	105.78909919297166
0	CE	23048.702754027414			16588.26169879826			8194.88186609315	
1	CE	11664.031574955246	11384.671179072167		6560.09356722382	10028.164342075877		810.357012355055	84.52480425380963
2	CE	11658.561137310017	5.380437645229904		6327.513678124845	232.58367859753707		7903.202627436526	207.1543849189793
0	DF	1736.6909290406522							
1	DF	1490.7778627711566	245.91306626949563						
2	DF	1303.7921606967004	186.98570207445619						
0	ES	4261.347818353947			849.6743923650711			3226.302776512647	
1	ES	2132.5933748552447	2128.7544434987026		809.9651163473932	39.709276017677894		1764.6964915066806	1461.6062850059606
2	ES	2102.8371931638435	29.756181691401252		811.2234583047805	-1.2583419573873016		1799.755327110417	-35.06104120436112
0	GO	1545.6710314688473			1280.3428780269094			1087.7278011428227	
1	GO	1524.7413895326058	20.929641936241524		1273.6526438767464	6.690234186163025		1067.001450042842	20.726351099980775
2	GO	1444.8753872936175	79.8660223898836		1246.2217139909533	27.430929885793148		1066.1049631574904	0.896488853515782
0	MA	5064.580548813872			5592.696301485631			2018.712729452786	
1	MA	1791.466853863552	3273.11369495032		1937.9290775063141	3654.767223979317		1122.413684677178	896.2990882681006
2	MA	1802.7604677332015	-11.293613869649562		1815.750353742688	122.17827376362607		1104.467389358666	17.946295318512057
0	MT	621.9833674232406			433.163751152009			494.39164318144503	
1	MT	624.7333297168257	-2.7499622935850994		408.2515581205832	24.912196994617716		494.5646557276992	-0.1730125462541423
2	MT	576.0335727924162	48.699756924409485		386.3293363553258	21.92221765257405		490.4044954016889	4.160163026010271
0	MS	536.8137441659723			425.25609404676			442.79777737975328	
1	MS	505.14471196430685	31.669032201665402		425.4985175965779	-0.2424211919019399		410.7812107568273	32.01656304070548
2	MS	481.1695246886038	23.97518727503036		421.271772894889	4.226744757089023		404.7430009867286	6.03820977009871
0	MG	2357.597734617079			1760.418137694286			1397.4215701698574	
1	MG	1463.9613035267068	893.6364310903721		1336.2661334524125	424.15200424241357		1265.171126272758	132.25044389709933
2	MG	1446.2185018014346	17.74280244527222		1372.2504125005305	-35.98427904811797		1243.584383756405	21.586742516293043
0	PA	7916.1466434763315			3583.3221165656605			4911.24694978734	
1	PA	6922.817428938381	993.3292145379501		2984.935116965003	598.3869996591602		4783.387089194202	127.85985578453165
2	PA	6716.003993759987	206.81343517839468		2997.305730444723	-12.372413538222645		4674.349382431416	109.037706762786
0	PB	726.6167388614913			1093.525542968023			764.8295094100467	
1	PB	693.5333126662483	33.083426195242964		934.8201902119321	158.7053527548702		761.248535221143	3.580974188903724
2	PB	698.1488054829008	-4.615492816652477		942.9928281292824	-8.17263791350357		767.945591690352	-6.697055947892181
0	PR	2270.920360335889			956.3867807942163			1432.3123317402294	
1	PR	1208.860110495116	1062.0602498407732		703.031653575415	253.35512721880127		993.0405709137148	439.27176082651465
2	PR	948.5606889199986	260.299442157511744		663.895223135199	39.136431261895154		827.7780702681339	165.26250064558087
0	PE	12713.71076253032			9591.53004437572			8288.889960719764	
1	PE	5727.308425144793	6986.402337385527		6705.236122302195	2886.2972922073523		6320.374430403682	1968.5155303160818
2	PE	5781.666486224302	-54.36006107950925		6695.74482838834	9.488783841879922		6268.201732512732	52.172697890950076
0	PI	807.301012208105			741.2296347403176			524.5833042421092	
1	PI	696.68035681624	110.62065539186506		647.1087365614654	94.12089817885214		496.34760278973806	28.23570145237113
2	PI	705.1576540961183	-8.477297279878371		612.643492299098	34.4652442624556		500.0446567788589	-3.697053989120832
0	RJ	19929.18190212293			13064.065565052866			19862.71500482139	
1	RJ	11373.321952805341	8555.85994931759		8983.95421102726	4080.1113540256065		18128.041177735042	1734.6738270863498
2	RJ	10778.81335822917	594.5085945824248		7101.265845716592	1882.688365310668		15665.695091844485	2462.3460858905564
0	RN	3063.2996730166883			1509.062797386876			1890.0708494188214	
1	RN	2893.5537388800562	169.74593413663206		1484.224114685645	24.83838591831136		1835.812516705059	54.25833271376246
2	RN	2826.641974305393	66.91176457466327		1467.8457599714009	16.378651497163673		1797.7650448081051	38.047471896953766
0	RS	5632.30526087812			1377.2818186318827			5038.404801729472	
1	RS	5391.219226311523	241.08603456659694		842.0534838768671	535.2283347550157		4896.848946093703	141.55585563576915
2	RS	4614.950782848869	776.2684434626544		837.1030934460208	4.950390430846255		4507.166748657985	389.68219743571717
0	RO	1620.2431007018254			1411.6075203635733			602.8447115899148	
1	RO	1482.2667898932434	137.97631080858196		1279.2218506773245	132.38560968624878		594.4269513560223	8.417760233892523
2	RO	1488.5236050309109	-6.256815137667445		1287.3080653010568	-8.086214623732303		596.1201411295592	-1.6931897735369148
0	RR	2544.62566369985			2134.489570604409			797.9229643734618	
1	RR	2365.681388057872	178.94427564197804		2047.7895077862	86.69997982578889		739.7479849723121	58.1749794011497
2	RR	2374.561245212316	-8.879857154443926		2037.36701536101	10.422575417610005		724.9721808253014	14.775804147010171
0	SC	5678.122663067467			1742.571689031685			4369.703730870379	
1	SC	4503.880430796653	1174.2422328708144		1648.1034270953512	94.46826193633387		3586.5012900870092	783.2024407833071
2	SC	4291.715755384977	212.16467514116764		1405.1141751410285	242.98925195432275		3492.0531946934	94.44809593369094
0	SP	63005.862762560544			39744.75977394712			21354.082375030204	
1	SP	23674.026721406935	39331.83604115361		15154.25024181806	24590.509532129057		9658.755768281066	11695.326606749139
2	SP	23300.967386099765	373.05933530717084		14998.939001821152	155.3112399969068		9516.493143567795	142.26262471327027
0	SE	1631.1164699249782			1314.153104123224			811.4811794539461	
1	SE	1449.3127120602132	181.80375786476498		1021.654511588726	292.498592534498		799.7177211676982	11.763458286247896
2	SE	1329.835119833263	119.47759222695026		927.6584588067939	93.99605278193212		781.966742932474	17.750978874450766
0	TO	801.8161266253144			378.6409817200618			668.923796893811	
1	TO	775.8544212856434	25.96170533967097		380.70124126318916	-2.0602595431273585		623.0621469816792	45.86164870710875
2	TO	757.3304780381493	18.523943247494117		375.94803140996095	4.753209853228213		589.6150389855895	33.4471079960897

616

Supplementary Note 1

Stringency index calculation: examples

617 **Stringency index calculation: examples**

618 *Ordered measure*

619 In this type of measure there is a well-defined order, it is a simple calculation. Scenarios for an ordered measure with $N = 3$ is shown in Supplementary
620 Table 6.
621

Supplementary Table 6

Scenario 1		Scenario 2		Scenario 3		Scenario 4	
j	G_O	j	G_O	j	G_O	j	G_O
0	1	1	1	2	1	3	0
$\iota_O = 0/3 * (2 - 1) = 0$		$\iota_O = 1/3 * (2 - 1) = 0.33$		$\iota_O = 2/3 * (2 - 1) = 0.66$		$\iota_O = 3/3 * (2 - 0) = 0.5$	

622 A more restrictive measure applied in only in few regions has less value
623 than a slightly less restrictive measure applied across the state, as we see in
624 scenarios 3 and 4 above.

625 *Cumulative measure*

626 In this case, the evaluation of the cumulative measure C_i is the sum of
627 the restrictions applied, and G_{c_i} is the sum of the targets, N is the number
628 of possible restrictions, counting with no restrictions. An example for a
629 cumulative measure is shown in Supplementary Table 7.

Supplementary Table 7

Restriction to:	Restricted (1) / Open (0)	General (1) / Target to a specific region (0)
Shoppings	1	0
Open markets	1	1
Bar and restaurants	1	1
Gymns	0	0
Parks and beaches	1	0
Religious Temples	1	1
Theaters and cinemas	1	0
$N = 7$	$s_C = 6$	$s_{G_c} = 3$
$\iota_C = (3 + 1.5)/(7 - 1) = 0.75$		

630

Supplementary Note 2

Parameter sensitivity analysis

631 **Parameter sensitivity analysis**

632 In this section, a sensitivity analysis is performed to evaluate the effects
 633 of the mathematical model parameters in the dynamics of S , E , I_a , I_s and
 634 R compartments over time. By using an statistical variance-based method,
 635 described by Sobol (2001) [83], the sensitivity analysis of the SEIR model
 636 considers the following parameter vector

$$\theta := (\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \delta, t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{R}^6, \quad (11)$$

637 assuming that its elements are uniformly distributed (\mathcal{U}) in proper intervals:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0 &\sim \mathcal{U}(0, 2), & \beta_1 &\sim \mathcal{U}(0, 2), & \beta_2 &\sim \mathcal{U}(0, 2), \\ \delta &\sim \mathcal{U}(0, 0.7), & t_1 &\sim \mathcal{U}(t_1^i, t_1^f), & t_2 &\sim \mathcal{U}(t_2^i, t_2^f). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

638 Note that the range of uniform distribution with respect to t_1 and t_2 varies
 639 according to the Brazilian states. In Fig. 5, the analysis is performed con-
 640 sidering the Brazilian state of *Distrito Federal* as an example. For this ex-
 641 ample, the intervals for t_1 and t_2 are given as follows: $t_1 \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 50)$ and
 642 $t_2 \sim \mathcal{U}(30, 57)$. Despite the different dates of community transmission be-
 643 tween the Brazilian states, the influence of the analyzed parameters presented
 644 in Fig. 5, remains equivalent in relation to the other states.

645 *The method*

646 To apply the statistical variance-based method, sample values is gener-
 647 ated for the input factors shown in Eq. (11) by creating matrices A and B ,
 648 each with size $N \times n$, where N is the number of samples and $n = 6$ is the
 649 number of parameters being analyzed, given by

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1^{(A1)} & \theta_2^{(A1)} & \dots & \theta_i^{(A1)} & \dots & \theta_n^{(A1)} \\ \theta_1^{(A2)} & \theta_2^{(A2)} & \dots & \theta_i^{(A2)} & \dots & \theta_n^{(A2)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ \theta_1^{(AN)} & \theta_2^{(AN)} & \dots & \theta_i^{(AN)} & \dots & \theta_n^{(AN)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

650 and

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1^{(B1)} & \theta_2^{(B1)} & \dots & \theta_i^{(B1)} & \dots & \theta_n^{(B1)} \\ \theta_1^{(B2)} & \theta_2^{(B2)} & \dots & \theta_i^{(B2)} & \dots & \theta_n^{(B2)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ \theta_1^{(BN)} & \theta_2^{(BN)} & \dots & \theta_i^{(BN)} & \dots & \theta_n^{(BN)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

651 We then create n matrices A_B^i , where column i comes from matrix B and all
 652 other $n - 1$ columns come from matrix A :

$$A_B^i = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1^{(A1)} & \theta_2^{(A1)} & \dots & \theta_i^{(B1)} & \dots & \theta_n^{(A1)} \\ \theta_1^{(A2)} & \theta_2^{(A2)} & \dots & \theta_i^{(B2)} & \dots & \theta_n^{(A2)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ \theta_1^{(AN)} & \theta_2^{(AN)} & \dots & \theta_i^{(BN)} & \dots & \theta_n^{(AN)} \end{pmatrix}$$

653 In the matrices A , B and A_B^i , each row represents a set of parameter to
 654 be used as an input for the model. Numerical simulations are performed, and
 655 the output of the sample matrices A , B and A_B^i are stored as the vectors

$$Y_A = \begin{pmatrix} Y(A^{(A1)}) \\ Y(A^{(A2)}) \\ \vdots \\ Y(A^{(AN)}) \end{pmatrix}; \quad Y_B = \begin{pmatrix} Y(B^{(B1)}) \\ Y(B^{(B2)}) \\ \vdots \\ Y(B^{(BN)}) \end{pmatrix}; \quad Y_{A_B^i}. \quad (15)$$

656 where Y_A , Y_B and $Y_{A_B^i}$ are output vectors.

657 The final step involves the calculation of the sensitivity indices, using the
 658 samples generated during the sampling scheme. We computed the total effect
 659 indices, given by

$$S_{T_i} = 1 - \frac{Y_A \cdot Y_B - f^2}{Y_A \cdot Y_A - f^2} \quad (16)$$


660 where f is defined as

$$f := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N Y_A^{(j)}. \quad (17)$$

661 This index indicates the contribution of the parameter to the output of the
 662 model. The importance of each parameter i is proportional to the value of
 663 S_{T_i} , meaning that higher S_{T_i} leads to a higher contribution to the model
 664 output [84]. Parameters with higher S_T need a more carefully calibration, as
 665 small error during the calibration can lead to larger errors to the predictions
 666 generated by the model. The total effect takes into account higher-order
 667 interactions among model variables; thus, correlation between variables can
 668 also be identified using this method. In addition, we also evaluated the influ-
 669 ence of first-order effects, which do not consider interactions among variables,
 670 to the model output.

671 *Parameter sensitivity analysis: discussion*

672 In Figure 5, the result of the sensitivity analysis over time is presented.
673 The numerical simulations were performed using SALib library [85]. The
674 experiment was conducted generating $N = 15,000$ parameter combinations,
675 totaling 120,000 simulations of the model, and the result shows the evolution
676 of the parameters according to S , E , I_a , I_s and R compartments.



Supplementary Figure 5: Sensitivity analysis study for S , E , I_a , I_s and R compartments over time. The total effect index S_{T_i} is shown for each evaluated parameter in each compartment of the SEIR model.

677 **References**

- 678 [1] Organization WH. WHO Director-General’s opening remarks at the
679 media briefing on COVID-19-11 March 2020. 2020;.
- 680 [2] Ministério da Saúde declara transmissão comunitária nacional;. Avail-
681 able from: [https://www.saude.gov.br/noticias/agencia-saude/
682 46568-ministerio-da-saude-declara-transmissao-comunitaria-nacional](https://www.saude.gov.br/noticias/agencia-saude/46568-ministerio-da-saude-declara-transmissao-comunitaria-nacional).
- 683 [3] Aquino EM, Silveira IH, Pescarini JM, Aquino R, Souza-Filho JAd.
684 Social distancing measures to control the COVID-19 pandemic: po-
685 tential impacts and challenges in Brazil. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*.
686 2020;25:2423–2446.
- 687 [4] Panovska-Griffiths J. Can mathematical modelling solve the current
688 Covid-19 crisis? *BMC Public Health*. 2020;.
- 689 [5] Li R, Pei S, Chen B, Song Y, Zhang T, Yang W, et al. Substantial un-
690 documented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coron-
691 avirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science*. 2020;368(6490):489–493.
- 692 [6] Berger DW, Herkenhoff KF, Huang C, Mongey S. Testing and reopening
693 in an SEIR model. *Review of Economic Dynamics*. 2020;in press.
- 694 [7] Roche B, Garchitorea A, Roiz D. The impact of lockdown strategies
695 targeting age groups on the burden of COVID-19 in France. *Epidemics*.
696 2020;33:100424.
- 697 [8] Oliveira JF, Jorge DC, Veiga RV, Rodrigues MS, Torquato MF, da Silva
698 NB, et al. Evaluating the burden of COVID-19 on hospital resources
699 in Bahia, Brazil: A modelling-based analysis of 14.8 million individuals.
700 *Nature Communications*. 2021;12:333.
- 701 [9] Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin
702 M, et al. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce
703 COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand; 2020.
- 704 [10] Moghadas SM, Shoukat A, Fitzpatrick MC, Wells CR, Sah P, Pandey
705 A, et al. Projecting hospital utilization during the COVID-19 outbreaks
706 in the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
707 2020;117(16):9122–9126.

- 708 [11] Prem K, Liu Y, Russell TW, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Davies N, et al.
709 The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of
710 the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *The*
711 *Lancet Public Health*. 2020;5:e261–e270.
- 712 [12] Leung K, Wu JT, Liu D, Leung GM. First-wave COVID-19 transmis-
713 sibility and severity in China outside Hubei after control measures, and
714 second-wave scenario planning: a modelling impact assessment. *The*
715 *Lancet*. 2020;.
- 716 [13] Weitz JS, Beckett SJ, Coenen AR, Demory D, Dominguez-Mirazo M,
717 Dushoff J, et al. Modeling shield immunity to reduce COVID-19 epi-
718 demic spread. *Nature Medicine*. 2020;26:849–854.
- 719 [14] Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Goldstein E, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Projecting
720 the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic
721 period. *Science*. 2020;3(21):433. doi:10.1126/science.abb5793.
- 722 [15] Keeling MJ, Rohani P. *Modeling infectious diseases in humans and*
723 *animals*. Princeton University Press; 2011.
- 724 [16] Coronavírus P. Dataset of cases of COVID-19 in Brazil; 2020. <https://covid.saude.gov.br/>.
- 725
- 726 [17] Io B. Dataset of cases of COVID-19 in Brazil; 2020. [https://brasil.](https://brasil.io/datasets/)
727 [io/datasets/](https://brasil.io/datasets/).
- 728 [18] Candido DS, Claro IM, de Jesus JG, Souza WM, Moreira FRR, Delli-
729 cou S, et al. Evolution and epidemic spread of SARS-CoV-2 in Brazil.
730 *Science*;369:1255–1260.
- 731 [19] Candido DDS, Watts A, Abade L, Kraemer MU, Pybus OG, Croda J,
732 et al. Routes for COVID-19 importation in Brazil. *Journal of Travel*
733 *Medicine*. 2020;27(3):taaa042.
- 734 [20] BOLSONARO JM. Federal level decrees to overcome COVID-
735 19 pandemic; 2020. [https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/](https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2019-2022/2020/decreto/d10282.htm)
736 [_ato2019-2022/2020/decreto/d10282.htm](https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2019-2022/2020/decreto/d10282.htm).
- 737 [21] System BJ; 2020. [http://www.stf.jus.br/arquivo/cms/](http://www.stf.jus.br/arquivo/cms/noticiaNoticiaStf/anexo/ADPF672liminar.pdf)
738 [noticiaNoticiaStf/anexo/ADPF672liminar.pdf](http://www.stf.jus.br/arquivo/cms/noticiaNoticiaStf/anexo/ADPF672liminar.pdf).

- 739 [22] InLoco; 2020. <https://mapabrasileirodacovid.inloco.com.br/pt/>.
- 740 [23] Peixoto PS, Marcondes D, Peixoto C, Oliva SM. Modeling future spread
741 of infections via mobile geolocation data and population dynamics. An
742 application to COVID-19 in Brazil. *PLOS One*. 2020;15(7):e0235732.
- 743 [24] Ajzenman N, Cavalcanti T, Da Mata D. More than words: Leaders'
744 speech and risky behavior during a pandemic; 2020.
- 745 [25] Thomas Hale APTP Sam Webster, Kira B. Oxford COVID-19 Govern-
746 ment Response Tracker. 2020;.
- 747 [26] Lin Q, Zhao S, Gao D, Lou Y, Yang S, Musa SS, et al. A conceptual
748 model for the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in Wuhan,
749 China with individual reaction and governmental action. *International*
750 *journal of infectious diseases*. 2020;93:211–216.
- 751 [27] Chowell G, Hengartner NW, Castillo-Chavez C, Fenimore PW, Hyman
752 JM. The basic reproductive number of Ebola and the effects of public
753 health measures: the cases of Congo and Uganda. *Journal of theoretical*
754 *biology*. 2004;229(1):119–126.
- 755 [28] Dehning J, Zierenberg J, Spitzner FP, Wibral M, Neto JP, Wilczek M,
756 et al. Inferring change points in the spread of COVID-19 reveals the
757 effectiveness of interventions. *Science*. 2020;369(6500).
- 758 [29] Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Goldstein E, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Projecting
759 the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic
760 period. *Science*. 2020;.
- 761 [30] Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, Zhao L, Nurtay A, Abeler-Dörner L,
762 et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests epidemic control
763 with digital contact tracing. *Science*. 2020;368(6491).
- 764 [31] Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A, Chowell G. Estimating the asymp-
765 tomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on
766 board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Euro-*
767 *surveillance*. 2020;25(10):2000180.
- 768 [32] Cheng HY, Jian SW, Liu DP, Ng TC, Huang WT, Lin HH. Contact trac-
769 ing assessment of COVID-19 transmission dynamics in Taiwan and risk

- 770 at different exposure periods before and after symptom onset. *JAMA*
771 *Internal Medicine*. 2020;180:1156–1163.
- 772 [33] Nishiura H, Kobayashi T, Miyama T, Suzuki A, Jung Sm, Hayashi
773 K, et al. Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus
774 infections (COVID-19). *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*.
775 2020;94:154.
- 776 [34] Sanche S, Lin YT, Xu C, Romero-Severson E, Hengartner N, Ke R.
777 High Contagiousness and Rapid Spread of Severe Acute Respiratory
778 Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2020;26(7).
- 779 [35] Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early transmission
780 dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia.
781 *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382:1199–1207.
- 782 [36] Linton NM, Kobayashi T, Yang Y, Hayashi K, Akhmetzhanov AR, Jung
783 Sm, et al. Incubation period and other epidemiological characteristics
784 of 2019 novel coronavirus infections with right truncation: a statistical
785 analysis of publicly available case data. *Journal of clinical medicine*.
786 2020;9(2):538.
- 787 [37] Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Goldstein E, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Projecting
788 the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic
789 period. *Science*. 2020;368(6493):860–868.
- 790 [38] Miranda L. PySwarms: a research toolkit for particle swarm optimiza-
791 tion in Python. *Journal of Open Source Software*. 2018;3(21):433.
- 792 [39] Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, Unwin HJT, Mellan TA, Coupland
793 H, et al. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on
794 COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*. 2020;584(7820):257–261.
- 795 [40] Wallinga J, Lipsitch M. How generation intervals shape the relationship
796 between growth rates and reproductive numbers. *Proceedings of the*
797 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2007;274(1609):599–604.
- 798 [41] Van den Driessche P, Watmough J. Reproduction numbers and sub-
799 threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease trans-
800 mission. *Mathematical biosciences*. 2002;180(1-2):29–48.

- 801 [42] Fraser C. Estimating individual and household reproduction numbers
802 in an emerging epidemic. *PloS one*. 2007;2(8):e758.
- 803 [43] Jorge DC, Rodrigues MS, Silva MS, Cardim LL, da Silva
804 NB, Silveira IH, et al.. Assessing the nationwide impact of
805 COVID-19 mitigation policies on the transmission rate of SARS-
806 CoV-2 in Brazil; 2020. [https://github.com/Julian-sun/
807 Assessing-the-nationwide-impact-of-COVID-19-mitigation-policies-on-the-transmission-rate](https://github.com/Julian-sun/Assessing-the-nationwide-impact-of-COVID-19-mitigation-policies-on-the-transmission-rate)
808 [git](https://github.com/Julian-sun/Assessing-the-nationwide-impact-of-COVID-19-mitigation-policies-on-the-transmission-rate).
- 809 [44] Bittar W. Paraná já registra casos de transmissão comunitária do novo
810 coronavírus; 2020. [https://cbncuritiba.com/parana-ja-registra-casos-de-
811 transmissao-comunitaria-do-novo-coronavirus/](https://cbncuritiba.com/parana-ja-registra-casos-de-transmissao-comunitaria-do-novo-coronavirus/).
- 812 [45] Araújo R. Roraima tem transmissão comunitária de
813 coronavírus, diz secretária-adjunta de Saúde; 2020.
814 [https://g1.globo.com/rr/roraima/noticia/2020/05/02/roraima-tem-
815 transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus-diz-secretaria-adjunta-de-
816 saude.ghtml](https://g1.globo.com/rr/roraima/noticia/2020/05/02/roraima-tem-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus-diz-secretaria-adjunta-de-saude.ghtml).
- 817 [46] PAULO FDS. Maioria dos estados já tem mais de
818 70% de ocupação de UTI para Covid-19; 2020.
819 [https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/cotidiano/2020/05/maioria-dos-
820 estados-ja-tem-mais-de-70-de-ocupacao-de-uti-para-covid-19.shtml](https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/cotidiano/2020/05/maioria-dos-estados-ja-tem-mais-de-70-de-ocupacao-de-uti-para-covid-19.shtml).
- 821 [47] Tobías A. Evaluation of the lockdowns for the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic
822 in Italy and Spain after one month follow up. *Science of the Total
823 Environment*. 2020; p. 138539.
- 824 [48] Alfano V, Ercolano S. The Efficacy of Lockdown Against COVID-19: A
825 Cross-Country Panel Analysis. *Applied Health Economics and Health
826 Policy*. 2020; p. 1.
- 827 [49] Travassos C, Oliveira EXG, Viacava F. Desigualdades geográficas e
828 sociais no acesso aos serviços de saúde no Brasil: 1998 e 2003. *Ciência
829 Saúde Coletiva*. 2006;11:975 – 986.
- 830 [50] Garcia-Subirats I, Vargas I, Mogollón-Pérez AS, De Paepe P, Da Silva
831 MRF, Unger JP, et al. Inequities in access to health care in different
832 health systems: a study in municipalities of central Colombia and north-
833 eastern Brazil. *International Journal for Equity in Health*. 2014;13(1):10.

- 834 [51] Costa G, Cota W, Ferreira SC. Outbreak diversity in epidemic waves
835 propagating through distinct geographical scales. *Physical Review Re-*
836 *search*. 2020;2:043306.
- 837 [52] Jesus JGd, Sacchi C, Candido DdS, Claro IM, Sales FCS, Manuli ER,
838 et al. Importation and early local transmission of COVID-19 in Brazil,
839 2020. *Revista do Instituto de Medicina Tropical de São Paulo*. 2020;62.
- 840 [53] Xavier J, Giovanetti M, Adelino T, Fonseca V, Costa AVBd, Ribeiro AA,
841 et al. The ongoing COVID-19 epidemic in Minas Gerais, Brazil: insights
842 from epidemiological data and SARS-CoV-2 whole genome sequencing.
843 *Emerging Microbes Infections*. 2020;9(1):1824–1834.
- 844 [54] Forster P, Forster L, Renfrew C, Forster M. Phylogenetic network anal-
845 ysis of SARS-CoV-2 genomes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
846 *Sciences*. 2020;117(17):9241–9243.
- 847 [55] Lancet T. COVID-19 in Brazil: “So what?”. *Lancet (London, England)*.
848 2020;395(10235):1461.
- 849 [56] Rothgerber H, Wilson T, Whaley D, Rosenfeld DL, Humphrey M, Moore
850 A, et al. Politicizing the Covid-19 pandemic: Ideological differences in
851 adherence to social distancing; 2020. Available from: [doi10.31234/
852 osf.io/k23cv](https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/k23cv).
- 853 [57] Pataro IM, Oliveira JF, Morato MM, Amad AA, Ramos PI, Pereira FA,
854 et al. A control framework to optimize public health policies in the
855 course of the COVID-19 pandemic. *medRxiv*. 2021;.
- 856 [58] He X, Lau EH, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics
857 in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nature Medicine*.
858 2020;26(5):672–675.
- 859 [59] Malaquias RF, Silva AF. Understanding the use of mobile banking in
860 rural areas of Brazil. *Technology in Society*. 2020; p. 101260.
- 861 [60] Pew Research Center. Smartphone Ownership Is Growing Rapidly
862 Around the World, but Not Always Equally; 2019.
- 863 [61] Valle L. Transmissão comunitária de coronavírus no Acre já é uma
864 realidade e proteção a grupos de riscos deve ser reforçada, alerta

- 865 médico; 2020. [https://agencia.ac.gov.br/transmissao-comunitaria-de-](https://agencia.ac.gov.br/transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus-no-acre-ja-e-uma-realidade-e-protecao-a-grupos-de-riscos-deve-ser-reforcada-alerta-medico/)
866 [coronavirus-no-acre-ja-e-uma-realidade-e-protecao-a-grupos-de-riscos-](https://agencia.ac.gov.br/transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus-no-acre-ja-e-uma-realidade-e-protecao-a-grupos-de-riscos-deve-ser-reforcada-alerta-medico/)
867 [deve-ser-reforcada-alerta-medico/](https://agencia.ac.gov.br/transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus-no-acre-ja-e-uma-realidade-e-protecao-a-grupos-de-riscos-deve-ser-reforcada-alerta-medico/).
- 868 [62] de Estado de Saúde do Amazonas S. Amazonas registra 111 casos
869 do novo coronavírus e passa a ter transmissão comunitária; 2020.
870 <http://www.saude.am.gov.br/visualizar-noticia.php?id=4381>.
- 871 [63] Coutinho C. Amapá confirma 1^a transmissão local de
872 coronavírus; pacientes não têm sintomas graves; 2020.
873 [https://g1.globo.com/ap/amapa/noticia/2020/03/28/amapa-confirma-](https://g1.globo.com/ap/amapa/noticia/2020/03/28/amapa-confirma-1a-transmissao-local-de-coronavirus-pacientes-nao-tem-sintomas-graves.ghtml)
874 [1a-transmissao-local-de-coronavirus-pacientes-nao-tem-sintomas-](https://g1.globo.com/ap/amapa/noticia/2020/03/28/amapa-confirma-1a-transmissao-local-de-coronavirus-pacientes-nao-tem-sintomas-graves.ghtml)
875 [graves.ghtml](https://g1.globo.com/ap/amapa/noticia/2020/03/28/amapa-confirma-1a-transmissao-local-de-coronavirus-pacientes-nao-tem-sintomas-graves.ghtml).
- 876 [64] Lira M. Pará já tem transmissão comunitária do novo Coronavírus e
877 26 casos confirmados; 2020. [http://www.saude.pa.gov.br/para-ja-tem-](http://www.saude.pa.gov.br/para-ja-tem-transmissao-comunitaria-do-novo-coronavirus-e-26-casos-confirmados/)
878 [transmissao-comunitaria-do-novo-coronavirus-e-26-casos-confirmados/](http://www.saude.pa.gov.br/para-ja-tem-transmissao-comunitaria-do-novo-coronavirus-e-26-casos-confirmados/).
- 879 [65] Redação. Morte de idosa é o primeiro caso de trans-
880 missão comunitária do Coronavírus em Porto Velho; 2020.
881 [https://www.rondoniagora.com/geral/morte-de-idosa-e-o-primeiro-](https://www.rondoniagora.com/geral/morte-de-idosa-e-o-primeiro-caso-de-transmissao-comunitaria-do-coronavirus-em-porto-velho)
882 [caso-de-transmissao-comunitaria-do-coronavirus-em-porto-velho](https://www.rondoniagora.com/geral/morte-de-idosa-e-o-primeiro-caso-de-transmissao-comunitaria-do-coronavirus-em-porto-velho).
- 883 [66] de Saúde de Palmas-Tocantins SM; 2020. [https:](https://coronavirus.palmas.to.gov.br/storage/reports/LUbPAX3B1Bu5Jz0FPysEvGKvG3BevrpnalDmBgfo.pdf)
884 [//coronavirus.palmas.to.gov.br/storage/reports/](https://coronavirus.palmas.to.gov.br/storage/reports/LUbPAX3B1Bu5Jz0FPysEvGKvG3BevrpnalDmBgfo.pdf)
885 [LUbPAX3B1Bu5Jz0FPysEvGKvG3BevrpnalDmBgfo.pdf](https://coronavirus.palmas.to.gov.br/storage/reports/LUbPAX3B1Bu5Jz0FPysEvGKvG3BevrpnalDmBgfo.pdf).
- 886 [67] de Saúde de Alagoas S. Informe Epidemiológico; 2020.
887 [https://www.saude.al.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Informe-](https://www.saude.al.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Informe-COVID-19-nº-41-16-DE-ABRIL-14h49.pdf.pdf)
888 [COVID-19-nº-41-16-DE-ABRIL-14h49.pdf.pdf](https://www.saude.al.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Informe-COVID-19-nº-41-16-DE-ABRIL-14h49.pdf.pdf).
- 889 [68] Brandão J. Bahia tem primeiros casos de
890 transmissão comunitária de coronavírus; 2020.
891 [https://www.metro1.com.br/noticias/bahia/89207,bahia-tem-](https://www.metro1.com.br/noticias/bahia/89207,bahia-tem-primeiros-casos-de-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus)
892 [primeiros-casos-de-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus](https://www.metro1.com.br/noticias/bahia/89207,bahia-tem-primeiros-casos-de-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus).
- 893 [69] do Estado do Ceará G. Nota Técnica n 1; 2020. [https:](https://www.saude.ce.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/2020/02/NOTA_TECNICA_COVID19_21_03_20.pdf)
894 [//www.saude.ce.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/2020/](https://www.saude.ce.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/2020/02/NOTA_TECNICA_COVID19_21_03_20.pdf)
895 [02/NOTA_TECNICA_COVID19_21_03_20.pdf](https://www.saude.ce.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/2020/02/NOTA_TECNICA_COVID19_21_03_20.pdf).

- 896 [70] Rafaelle Fróes AB. Maranhão tem casos de transmissão co-
897 munitária por coronavírus, diz secretário de Saúde; 2020.
898 [https://g1.globo.com/ma/maranhao/noticia/2020/03/30/maranhao-](https://g1.globo.com/ma/maranhao/noticia/2020/03/30/maranhao-tem-casos-de-transmissao-comunitaria-por-coronavirus-diz-secretario-de-saude.ghtml)
899 [tem-casos-de-transmissao-comunitaria-por-coronavirus-diz-secretario-](https://g1.globo.com/ma/maranhao/noticia/2020/03/30/maranhao-tem-casos-de-transmissao-comunitaria-por-coronavirus-diz-secretario-de-saude.ghtml)
900 [de-saude.ghtml](https://g1.globo.com/ma/maranhao/noticia/2020/03/30/maranhao-tem-casos-de-transmissao-comunitaria-por-coronavirus-diz-secretario-de-saude.ghtml).
- 901 [71] do Estado da Paraíba G. Governo reforça necessidade de no-
902 tificação imediata de casos suspeitos Covid-19 pelos municípios;
903 2020. [https://paraiba.pb.gov.br/noticias/governo-reforca-necessidade-](https://paraiba.pb.gov.br/noticias/governo-reforca-necessidade-de-notificacao-imediata-de-casos-suspeitos-covid-19-pelos-municipios)
904 [de-notificacao-imediata-de-casos-suspeitos-covid-19-pelos-municipios](https://paraiba.pb.gov.br/noticias/governo-reforca-necessidade-de-notificacao-imediata-de-casos-suspeitos-covid-19-pelos-municipios).
- 905 [72] Amanda Azevedo CL. Pernambuco tem primeiro
906 caso de transmissão comunitária de coronavírus;
907 2020. [https://jc.ne10.uol.com.br/colunas/saude-e-bem-](https://jc.ne10.uol.com.br/colunas/saude-e-bem-estar/2020/03/5602589-pernambuco-tem-primeiro-caso-de-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus.html)
908 [estar/2020/03/5602589-pernambuco-tem-primeiro-caso-de-transmissao-](https://jc.ne10.uol.com.br/colunas/saude-e-bem-estar/2020/03/5602589-pernambuco-tem-primeiro-caso-de-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus.html)
909 [comunitaria-de-coronavirus.html](https://jc.ne10.uol.com.br/colunas/saude-e-bem-estar/2020/03/5602589-pernambuco-tem-primeiro-caso-de-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus.html).
- 910 [73] de Estado da Saúde Sergipe S. Sergipe tem mais um caso confirmado de
911 coronavírus; 2020. [https://www.saude.se.gov.br/sergipe-tem-mais-um-](https://www.saude.se.gov.br/sergipe-tem-mais-um-caso-confirmado-de-coronavirus/)
912 [caso-confirmado-de-coronavirus/](https://www.saude.se.gov.br/sergipe-tem-mais-um-caso-confirmado-de-coronavirus/).
- 913 [74] de Estado da Saúde Goiás S. Governo de Goiás destaca
914 que união de esforços pode conter novo coronavírus; 2020.
915 [https://www.saude.go.gov.br/coronavirus/noticias-coronavirus/10578-](https://www.saude.go.gov.br/coronavirus/noticias-coronavirus/10578-governo-de-goias-destaca-que-uniao-de-esforcos-pode-conter-novo-coronavirus)
916 [governo-de-goias-destaca-que-uniao-de-esforcos-pode-conter-novo-](https://www.saude.go.gov.br/coronavirus/noticias-coronavirus/10578-governo-de-goias-destaca-que-uniao-de-esforcos-pode-conter-novo-coronavirus)
917 [coronavirus](https://www.saude.go.gov.br/coronavirus/noticias-coronavirus/10578-governo-de-goias-destaca-que-uniao-de-esforcos-pode-conter-novo-coronavirus).
- 918 [75] de Saúde do Distrito Federal S. Boletim Epidemiológico; 2020.
919 [http://www.saude.df.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/](http://www.saude.df.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/26-Boletim-COVID_DF-26.03.2020_2vers~ao-1.pdf)
920 [26-Boletim-COVID_DF-26.03.2020_2vers~ao-1.pdf](http://www.saude.df.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/26-Boletim-COVID_DF-26.03.2020_2vers~ao-1.pdf).
- 921 [76] MT G. Governo reconhece que há transmissão comu-
922 nitária de coronavírus em três municípios de MT; 2020.
923 [https://g1.globo.com/mt/mato-grosso/noticia/2020/04/01/governo-](https://g1.globo.com/mt/mato-grosso/noticia/2020/04/01/governo-reconhece-que-ha-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus-em-tres-municipios-de-mt.ghtml)
924 [reconhece-que-ha-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus-em-tres-](https://g1.globo.com/mt/mato-grosso/noticia/2020/04/01/governo-reconhece-que-ha-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus-em-tres-municipios-de-mt.ghtml)
925 [municipios-de-mt.ghtml](https://g1.globo.com/mt/mato-grosso/noticia/2020/04/01/governo-reconhece-que-ha-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus-em-tres-municipios-de-mt.ghtml).
- 926 [77] Ângela Kempfer. Com transmissão comunitária, MS
927 já tem 113 casos e 4 mortes por coronavírus; 2020.

- 928 <https://www.campograndenews.com.br/cidades/capital/com->
929 [transmissao-comunitaria-ms-ja-tem-113-casos-e-4-mortes-por-](https://www.campograndenews.com.br/cidades/capital/com-transmissao-comunitaria-ms-ja-tem-113-casos-e-4-mortes-por-)
930 [coronavirus](https://www.campograndenews.com.br/cidades/capital/com-transmissao-comunitaria-ms-ja-tem-113-casos-e-4-mortes-por-coronavirus).
- 931 [78] do Estado do Espírito Santo G. NOTA TÉCNICA
932 COVID-19 N° 04/2020 – GEVS/SESA/ES; 2020.
933 <https://coronavirus.es.gov.br/Media/Coronavirus/NotasTecnicas>.
- 934 [79] do Estado de Minas Gerais G. BOLETIM INFORMATIVO DIÁRIO;
935 2020. [https://coronavirus.saude.mg.gov.br/images/boletim/](https://coronavirus.saude.mg.gov.br/images/boletim/03-marco/18032020_Boletim_epidemiologico_COVID-19_MG.pdf)
936 [03-marco/18032020_Boletim_epidemiologico_COVID-19_MG.pdf](https://coronavirus.saude.mg.gov.br/images/boletim/03-marco/18032020_Boletim_epidemiologico_COVID-19_MG.pdf).
- 937 [80] Amorim F. Brasil confirma transmissão comunitária de coronavírus;
938 entenda o que é; 2020. [https://noticias.uol.com.br/saude/ultimas-](https://noticias.uol.com.br/saude/ultimas-noticias/redacao/2020/03/13/brasil-confirma-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus-entenda-o-que-e.htm)
939 [noticias/redacao/2020/03/13/brasil-confirma-transmissao-comunitaria-](https://noticias.uol.com.br/saude/ultimas-noticias/redacao/2020/03/13/brasil-confirma-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus-entenda-o-que-e.htm)
940 [de-coronavirus-entenda-o-que-e.htm](https://noticias.uol.com.br/saude/ultimas-noticias/redacao/2020/03/13/brasil-confirma-transmissao-comunitaria-de-coronavirus-entenda-o-que-e.htm).
- 941 [81] Secom R. RS confirma transmissão comunitária do novo coro-
942 navírus; 2020. Available from: [https://estado.rs.gov.br/](https://estado.rs.gov.br/rs-confirma-transmissao-comunitaria-do-novo-coronavirus)
943 [rs-confirma-transmissao-comunitaria-do-novo-coronavirus](https://estado.rs.gov.br/rs-confirma-transmissao-comunitaria-do-novo-coronavirus).
- 944 [82] do Estado de Saúde Santa Catarina S. CORO-
945 NAVÍRUS EM SC: GOVERNO CONFIRMA 14 CA-
946 SOS E TRANSMISSÕES COMUNITÁRIAS; 2020.
947 [https://www.saude.sc.gov.br/coronavirus/CORONAVIRUS-EM-](https://www.saude.sc.gov.br/coronavirus/CORONAVIRUS-EM-SC-GOVERNO-CONFIRMA-14-CASOS-E-TRANSMISSOES-COMUNITARIAS.html)
948 [SC-GOVERNO-CONFIRMA-14-CASOS-E-TRANSMISSOES-](https://www.saude.sc.gov.br/coronavirus/CORONAVIRUS-EM-SC-GOVERNO-CONFIRMA-14-CASOS-E-TRANSMISSOES-COMUNITARIAS.html)
949 [COMUNITARIAS.html](https://www.saude.sc.gov.br/coronavirus/CORONAVIRUS-EM-SC-GOVERNO-CONFIRMA-14-CASOS-E-TRANSMISSOES-COMUNITARIAS.html).
- 950 [83] Sobol IM. Global sensitivity indices for nonlinear mathematical mod-
951 els and their Monte–Carlo estimates. *Mathematics and Computers in*
952 *Simulation*. 2001;55(1-3):271–280.
- 953 [84] Saltelli A, Ratto M, Andres T, Campolongo F, Cariboni J, Gatelli D,
954 et al. *Global Sensitivity Analysis: The Primer*. John Wiley & Sons;
955 2008.
- 956 [85] Herman J, Usher W. SALib: An open-source Python library for Sen-
957 sitivity Analysis. *The Journal of Open Source Software*. 2017;2(9).
958 [doi:10.21105/joss.00097](https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00097).