



Article

Urban Vulnerability Assessment for Pandemic surveillance: The COVID-19 case in Bogotá, Colombia

Jeisson Prieto ^{1,*} , Rafael Malagón ², Jonatan Gomez ³, and Elizabeth León ³

¹ Departamento de Matemáticas, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia; japrietov@unal.edu.co

² Departamento de Salud Colectiva, Facultad de Odontología, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia; ramalagono@unal.edu.co

³ Departamento de Ingeniería de Sistemas e Industrial, Facultad de Ingeniería, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia; jgomezpe@unal.edu.co, eleonguz@unal.edu.co

* Correspondence: japrietov@unal.edu.co

Version December 30, 2020 submitted to Sustainability

Abstract: A Pandemic devastates the life of global citizens and causes significant economic, social, and political disruption. Evidence suggests that Pandemic's likelihood has increased over the past century because of increased global travel and integration, urbanization, and changes in land use. Further, evidence concerning the urban character of the Pandemic has underlined the role of cities in disease transmission. An early assessment of the severity of infection and transmissibility can help quantify the Pandemic potential and prioritize surveillance to control of urban areas in Pandemics. In this paper, an Urban Vulnerability Assessment (UVA) methodology is proposed. UVA investigates the possible vulnerable factors related to Pandemics to assess the vulnerability in urban areas. A vulnerability index is constructed by the aggregation of multiple vulnerability factors computed on each urban area (i.e., urban density, poverty index, informal labor, transmission routes). UVA provides insights into early vulnerability assessment using publicly available data. The applicability of UVA is shown by the identification of high-vulnerable areas where surveillance should be prioritized in the COVID-19 Pandemic in Bogotá, Colombia.

Keywords: Urban vulnerability; Vulnerability assessment; Infectious diseases; Pandemic; COVID-19 vulnerability index; Spatial analysis

1. Introduction

Pandemics are large-scale outbreaks of infectious diseases that increase morbidity and mortality over a big geographic area and cause significant social, political, and economical disruption [1,2]. Previous Pandemics [1], have exposed gaps related to the timely detection of disease, tracing of contacts, availability of basic care, quarantine and isolation procedures, and health sector preparedness (i.e., global coordination and response mobilization) [3,4]. Suddenly, significant policy attention has focused on the need to identify and limit emerging outbreaks that might lead to Pandemics and to expand and sustain investment to build preparedness and health capacity [5]. Nonetheless, the timeliness of implementing these measures is paramount to control a highly contagious disease. Efficient prioritization of investigation of high-vulnerable areas would optimize the use of resources and potentially limit the size of the Pandemic [6–8].

Vulnerability Assessment describes the degree to which socioeconomic systems and physical assets in geographic areas are either susceptible or resilient to the impact of disaster (i.e. Pandemic). Once priority vulnerable areas are identified, it will be possible to understand why certain locations

30 may need to be prioritized for preventative action and response efforts (i.e., planning and coordination,
31 reducing the spread of disease, continuity of health care provision) [1,2,9,10]. In the urban context, the
32 Urban Vulnerability Assessment (UVA) helps to determine what types of preparedness and response
33 activities might help for an optimal Urban Strategic Planning (USP) to assist the decision-making
34 processes undertaken by today's urban planners [11]. Further, the recently published response
35 plan for the current COVID-19 Pandemic, UN-Habitat has underlined the urban-centric character
36 of the infectious disease [12]. It says, more than 1430 cities are affected by the Pandemic in 210
37 countries and well above 95% of the total cases are located in urban areas. Further, the World Health
38 Organization (WHO) emphasized that the first transmission in the COVID-19 Pandemic did happen in
39 the internationally connected megacities [13]. Even though there is urban universality of the disease,
40 the cities of the global south are more susceptible given their population densities, low income, risky
41 occupations, and lack of affordable health services [14].

42 Several models have been proposed to quantify vulnerable urban areas over the infectious disease
43 domain, i.e., vector-borne diseases [15], Dengue [9], malaria [16,17], and Ebola [10]. More recently,
44 in [18] a COVID-19 vulnerability index for urban areas in India is proposed, the vulnerability index
45 aggregate weighted scores of a set of variables related to COVID-19 precaution of social distance and
46 lockdown in four metro cities in India. However, an a priori knowledge or relative preferences between
47 criteria based judgments for the gathering of preferences for indicators (vulnerable factors) is needed in
48 those models. Different methodologies allow to transform the experts' knowledge into a mathematical
49 language (i.e., Analytic Hierarchy Process), but these methodologies have some limitations such as
50 a-priori knowledge, expert bias, or hierarchical criteria [19,20].

51 In this paper, a conceptual framework for Urban Vulnerability Assessment (UVA) for Pandemics
52 is proposed. UVA conducted a comprehensive review of relevant literature to identify vulnerable
53 factors influencing Pandemics. These factors are used to generate an index that allows us to identify
54 and rank potentially vulnerable urban areas. The rank is built using Borda's count aggregation method,
55 which does not need experts knowledge nor additional parameters for the construction of the ranking.
56 Then, the vulnerability rank is associated with a vulnerability index, i.e., a higher rank indicates
57 higher vulnerability. UVA is tested in the current COVID-19 Pandemic in Bogotá, the crowdest city
58 of Colombia. Using widely available data of Bogotá (i.e., from the National Department of Statistics
59 (DANE), the District Planning Secretary (SDP), and the District Mobility Secretary (SDM)), UVA creates
60 a spatially explicit COVID-19 vulnerability index of Bogotá. To our knowledge, our study is the first to
61 develop a composite measure of community-level vulnerability concerning the COVID-19 situation
62 in Bogotá. The main value of our study is the Urban sector ranking provided to policymakers to
63 prioritize resource allocation and devise effective mitigation and reconstruction strategies for affected
64 populations in Bogotá.

65 This paper is divided into four sections. Section 2 develops the methodology of Urban
66 Vulnerability Assessment (UVA) for Pandemic surveillance. Section 3 describes the applicability
67 of UVA for the current COVID-19 Pandemic in Bogotá, Colombia. Finally, section 4 discusses some of
68 the conclusions and potential future developments.

69 2. Vulnerability assessment

70 The conceptual framework of Urban Vulnerability Assessment (UVA) for Pandemics is illustrated
71 in Figure 1. UVA involves four main stages. The first stage is the identification of vulnerable factors
72 influencing Pandemics, see Figure 1(a). The second stage is to transform the raw input data from each
73 vulnerable factor into a probability distribution, see Figure 1(b). The third state groups geographic
74 areas with similar characteristics into classes to assign a vulnerability level, see Figure 1(c). After that,
75 an aggregation method is applied to create a unique rank for each class, see Figure 1(d), where a higher
76 rank is assigned to a higher vulnerability level, see Figure 1(e).




Figure 1. Schematic diagram of the urban vulnerability assessment in Pandemic disaster ¹.

77 2.1. Literature review

78 We conducted a literature search to identify a set of peer-reviewed studies that possibly examined
 79 types of vulnerability factors related to Pandemics, see Figure 1(a). The studies consider both factors
 80 related to past Pandemics (i.e, 1881 Fifth cholera, 1918 Spanish flu influenza, 1957 Asian flu influenza,
 81 2003 SARS, 2009 h1n1, 2013 West Africa Ebola) and factors found in the current COVID-19 Pandemic.
 82 The search retrieved studies for which the study's title, abstract, or keywords indicated the study
 83 examined a type of vulnerability in Pandemics. Then, a manual assessment is made for every study
 84 against eligibility criteria:

- 85 • The study provided a quantitative or conceptual analysis of a type(s) of vulnerability factors
 86 related to infectious diseases (or Pandemics).
 87 • The actual analysis or argument of the study earnestly included vulnerability.
 88 • The study focuses on urban areas.
 89 • To be eligible the study focuses more on the vulnerability analysis at geographic area than on the
 90 individual vulnerability of infectious diseases.

91 Then, the vulnerability factor the study focused on, the geographic focus of the study, and the
 92 methods used to assess the vulnerability is recorded. This involved examining the title, abstract, or
 93 keywords, or full-text version if required. We listed the country or region(s) where the study focused.
 94 For theoretical studies, studies that presented examples without a geographic focus, or studies with an
 95 unclear geographic focus, the geographic location is listed as Not Applicable (NA). Table 1 summarizes
 96 the 11 studies that were considered for the analysis of vulnerability factors related to Pandemics.

¹ Unicode emojis (book) are generated with Latex.

Table 1. Summary of studies considered to vulnerability factors related with Pandemics.

Reference	Vulnerable factor(s)	Geographic focus	Methods	Main findings
[21]	a. Essential worker b. Household size c. Age d. Gender	Singapur	Demographic, clinical, treatment, and laboratory data	Describe incidence and vulnerable factors for Pandemic in healthcare personnel
[1]	e. Geographic spark f. Geographic spread g. Burden quantification h. Disease importation	NA	Epidemiology evidence of previous infectious diseases	Covers the concerning of vulnerability, impacts, mitigation and Pandemic knowledge gaps
[22]	a. Essential worker i. Healthcare access j. Medical preconditions c. Age d. Gender	United Kingdom	Epidemiology evidence of COVID-19	How the vulnerability might vary in different population groups or settings
[23]	k. Time delay illness l. Insufficient follow-up c. Age d. Gender	China	Demographic, clinical, treatment, and laboratory data	Provides insights in early vulnerability assessment using publicly available data
[24]	i. Hospital capacity m. Water and sanitation n. Logistics o. Per capita income p. Public education	NA	Conceptual framework for epidemic preparedness and response	Epidemic Preparedness Index (EPI) for assessing resilience to epidemic and Pandemic outbreaks
[10]	i. Health infrastructure q. Urban density f. Disease dynamics r. Economic growth	NA	Literature review and expert elicitation	Identify the most vulnerable countries to infectious disease outbreaks
[25]	q. Urban density s. High-density facilities h. Worldwide movement m. Inadequate sanitation	NA	Epidemiology evidence of previous infectious diseases	Identification of specific factors responsible for disease emergence
[26]	o. Socioeconomic status c. Age t. Rural or urban living	New Zealand	Epidemiology evidence of previous infectious diseases	Description of vulnerable factors for death in an outbreak of Pandemic
[2]	u. Public transportation s. Nearby food market o. Overall poverty rate i. Healthcare access v. Public services access	NA	Vulnerable indicators for area classification	Identify geographic areas to be prioritized for preventative action and response efforts
[27]	f. Geographic spread k. Infectious period	NA	Demographic, clinical, treatment, and laboratory data	Epidemiological modeling to reduce the disease burden
[28]	p. Education levels o. Poor households t. Urbanization q. Population density m. Housing condition i. Health care availability j. Chronic morbidity	India	Epidemiology evidence of COVID-19	Social vulnerability index for management and mitigation of COVID-19

Note: Studies retrieved from the literature search. NA means not applicable.

97 2.2. Statistical data analysis

98 Let \mathcal{S} a geographical space under investigation (i.e. state, country, or city) defined in terms of a
99 finite set of N smaller spatial units (i.e. countries, census tracts, or zip codes); that is $\mathcal{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$.
100 Let \mathcal{V} a set of M vulnerable factors, and V_k the values of the N spatial units in the k -th vulnerable
101 factor $V_k = \{v_{k,1}, \dots, v_{k,N}\}$. The raw data for each factor are normed across all spatial units over the

102 range 0 (best) to 1 (worst), see Figure 1(b). Different normalization methods exists in the literature [29].
103 However, depending on the data properties, some normalization operations are inappropriate (i.e.,
104 anomalies, orthogonality, linear dependency). One solution is to build an estimation of the Probability
105 Density Function (PDF) of the data, and then transform it via its Cumulative Density Function (CDF),
106 so intervals with higher likelihood of containing data are assigned to higher portion of the normalized
107 interval [0,1]. This is call probability integral transform [30]. We estimate the PDF f_{V_k} at specific spatial
108 unit x using the Kernel Density Estimation (KDE) method.

$$f_{V_k}(x) = \frac{1}{N\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{K}_\lambda(x, v_{k,i}) \quad (1)$$

109 where \mathcal{K} is the kernel (a non-negative function) and λ is the smoothing parameter called the *bandwidth*.
110 Then, to normalize the raw data at spatial unit x over the range 0 (best) to 1 (worst) in the k -th
111 vulnerable factor, the probability integral transform is applied.

$$x' = F_{V_k}(x) \quad (2)$$

112 where F_{V_k} is the CDF of the k -th vulnerable factor.

113 2.3. Cluster Analysis

114 As a proposal to identify spatial units with possible high levels of vulnerability, a cluster analysis
115 is made to group spatial areas with similar characteristics. Cluster analysis is a multivariate analysis
116 technique that aims to organize information about variables (vulnerable factors) so that relatively
117 homogeneous clusters can be formed i.e., synthesize the spatial units into k partitions. Therefore, each
118 cluster consists of spatial areas with similar behavior from their PDF for the M vulnerable factors, see
119 Figure 1(c).

120 UVA allows the decision-maker to select the number of k partitions in which the spatial units will
121 be grouped. Each sub-set of solution $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_L\}$ obtained by a cluster algorithm (i.e., k-means)
122 contains a number N_j of spatial units of similar characteristics. In this way, the decision tool makes
123 it possible to get an affordable number of k relevant possible vulnerable assessments (i.e., $k = 3$
124 vulnerability of low, medium, and high; $k = 10$ vulnerability from 1 to 10).

125 2.4. Create vulnerability index

126 In order to assign a vulnerability level (rank) to each cluster, a Borda's count aggregation method
127 is proposed [31]. The Borda's method takes as input a set of ranks $R = \{R_1, \dots, R_M\}$ (where R_k is an
128 order of the Clusters $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_L\}$ in the k -th vulnerability factor), and produce single rank by
129 mixing the orders of all the input ranks. The number of points (weight) assigned for each ranking
130 varies depending on which of several variants of the Borda count is used. For this, let $t_{R_k}^{C_i}$ the position
131 of the Cluster C_i in the rank R_k , and w_{R_k} the weight assigned for the rank R_k . A new aggregated value
132 of ranking or the i -th Cluster is defined as:

$$\mathcal{R}(C_i) = \sum_{k=1}^M w_{R_k} \left(|\mathcal{C}| - t_{R_k}^{C_i} \right) \quad (3)$$


133 The rank built using Borda's count aggregation method does not need experts knowledge nor
134 additional parameters for the construction of the ranking (i.e., the weights could be equal for each
135 rank). However, if the rank has to be weighted in some way, the method allows assigning this
136 weight for each rank. For the vulnerability level assignation problem, a set of ordered lists or ranks
137 is calculated using the *centroid* of each cluster C_i . Therefore, Borda's count aggregation method is
138 used, that is, vulnerability factor ranks R_k were made sorted the values of each centroid for the M
139 vulnerability factors. Next, these M ranks were combined using Borda's method to construct the
140 aggregated vulnerability rank, see Figure 1(d).

141 Finally, the vulnerability rank is associated with a vulnerability index, i.e., higher rank indicates
142 higher vulnerability, see Figure 1(e).

143 3. Vulnerability index for the COVID-19 in Bogotá, Colombia

144 3.1. Study area and data sources

145 UVA is tested by the creation of a vulnerability index for the current COVID-19 Pandemic in
146 Bogotá city, the largest and crowded city in Colombia. Bogotá is a metropolitan city with 7.412.566
147 inhabitants living in an area of 1775km (995km urban and 718km rural), at an altitude 2640m, with
148 an annual temperature ranging from 6 to 20°C, and annual precipitation of over 840mm. Bogotá has
149 composed of 621 Urban Sectors². Each Urban sector belongs to one of the 112 Zonal Planning Units
150 (UPZ), see Figure 2.



(a) Zonal Planing Units (UPZ) **(b)** Urban sectors
Figure 2. Spatial distribution of Bogotá, Colombia using Zonal Planing Units (UPZ) (left) and Urban sectors (right)³.

151 Information was obtained from the National Department of Statistics (DANE), from District
152 Planning Secretary of Bogotá (SDP), and District Mobility Secretary of Bogotá (SDM). Data comprised
153 public information about demographic, transportation, socio-economic, and health conditions reported
154 from 2011 to 2020. A summary of the dataset is presented as follows:

- 155 • **MON_2017** [32,33]: Dataset provided by SDP and it contains set monographs to provide a
156 physical, demographic and socioeconomic vision of Bogotá and its districts.
- 157 • **SDM_2017** [34]: Dataset provided by SDM and it presents detailed official information of the
158 characterization of mobility in Bogotá.
- 159 • **CNPV_2018** [35]: Dataset provided by DANE and it is the national census made in 2018 and
160 provides statistics about socio-demographic information Colombia.

² Urban Sector is a cartographic division created by the National Administrative Department of Statistics (DANE for its acronym in Spanish).

³ The Bogotá's maps were created using shapes provided by [Secretaría Distrital de Planeación de Bogotá](#) for UPZ and [National Administrative Department of Statistics \(DANE\)](#) for Urban sectors.

- 161 • **DANE_2018 [36]:** Dataset provided by DANE and it contains the results of the Multidimensional
162 Poverty Index that analyze educational conditions, health, work, access home public services,
163 and housing conditions.
164 • **DANE_2020 [37]:** Dataset provided by DANE and it presents a vulnerability index based on
165 demographic and health conditions relevant for COVID-19 Pandemic.

166 Since the datasets' information are in different spatial units (i.e., Urban sectors, UPZ), the spatial
167 unit using in this study is the Urban sector (more atomic), and the information at UPZ level is then
168 transformed into Urban sectors by spatial transformation (i.e., a UPZ contains one (or more) Urban
169 sectors, then the UPZ values are assigned to the Urban sector).

170 3.2. Vulnerability domains

171 Given the public data available for Bogotá, and the vulnerable factors find in the literature review
172 (see Section 2.1) a set of domains is proposed to analyze the vulnerability in Bogotá. Throughout the
173 course of the study, we found that the most-relevant concepts and associated measures fell into three
174 common domains: (i) *Where and how he/she lives*, (ii) *Where and how he/she works*, and (iii) *Where and how*
175 *he/she gets around*⁴. Factors and associated measures within these three domains provide vulnerable
176 factors for the quantitative analysis. Table 2 shows the domains proposed and their corresponding
177 vulnerable factors associated with them.

178 3.2.1. *Where and how he/she lives*

179 Several demographic factors influence the degree of vulnerability of the Urban sector to Pandemics.
180 The relevant literature emphasizes the role of such factors as *urban density*, *age*, and the urban living
181 (i.e., *socio-spatial segregation*). The level of education or literacy, and the quality of the health care
182 system (i.e., included in the *poverty index*) can also play a helpful role in mitigating the spread and
183 effects of infectious diseases [10]. Further, most data on COVID-19 Pandemic suggest that people
184 with underlying health conditions such as respiratory and cardiovascular disease, and cancer (i.e.,
185 *comorbidities*) are more vulnerable than people without them.

186 3.2.2. *Where and how he/she works*

187 Urban sectors with high-density facilities (i.e., *educational buildings*, *cultural buildings*, *sport buildings*,
188 *food markets*, all *formal labor*) are more vulnerable to the spread of contagious diseases due to space
189 limitations within and between households, growth and mobility, and limited water, sanitation, and
190 hygiene (WASH) infrastructure. Also, the overwhelming majority of workers in the informal economy
191 (i.e., *informal labor*) have higher exposure to occupational health and safety vulnerability, no appropriate
192 protection, forced to work for daily sustenance, and out-of-pocket costs [38].

193 3.2.3. *Where and how he/she gets around*

194 Understand transmissibility, risk of geographic spread, *transmission routes*, and vulnerable factors
195 for infection (i.e., *geographic impact*) provides the baseline for epidemiological modeling that can inform
196 the planning of response and containment efforts to reduce the burden of disease [27]. As well, there
197 have been claims that the use of public transport (i.e., *public transportation dependency*) has also led to
198 the spread of infectious diseases [2]

⁴ The proposed domains are used for the convenience of the reader and could change depending on the data analysis made in the geographic area. It helps the reader to associate vulnerability factors related. These domains do not influence the process of assigning vulnerability to a spatial unit.

Table 2. Vulnerability domains for the COVID-19 case in Bogotá, Colombia.

Vulnerability domains	Vulnerability factor(s)	Definition	Dataset
Where and how he/she lives	Urban density (q.)	Number of people inhabiting a given urbanized area	CNPV_2018
	Age (c.)	Number of people aged 15–34 years (SARS-CoV-2 incidence increased [39])	CNPV_2018
	Comorbidities (j.)	Groups areas according to their demographics and comorbidities	DANE_2020
	Poverty index (p. and i.)	Multiple deficiencies in health, education and standard of living	DANE_2018
	Socio-spatial segregation (t.)	Absence of interaction between individuals of different social groups	[40] *
Where and how he/she works	Educational (s.)	Number of educational buildings (i.e., preschool, primary and high-school, research centers, technical training centers, Universities)	MON_2017
	Cultural (s.)	Number of cultural buildings (i.e., theaters, concert halls, libraries, museums, civic centers, community halls)	MON_2017
	Sports (s.)	Number of sports buildings (i.e., stadiums, coliseums, sports clubs, country, racetracks, swimming pools)	MON_2017
	Food markets (s.)	Number of food market buildings (i.e., Central market, market square)	MON_2017
	Formal Labor (s.)	Number of commercial buildings with license	MON_2017
	Informal Labor (s.)	Percentage structure of the informal employed according to the workplace	[41] *
	Public Transportation Dependency (u.)	Number of Trips generated throughout the day (trips longer than 15 min)	SDM_2017
Where and how he/she gets around	Transmission routes (f.)	Number of asymptomatic people at the peak of the Pandemic	[42] *
	Geographic impact (k.)	Number of dead people after 100 simulation days	[42] *

Note: Letters in the table refer to factors presented in the Section 2.1 (Table 1).

* Values calculated in the cited paper.

199 3.3. Vulnerability analysis

200 To understand the distribution of the vulnerability factors over the Urban sectors, the raw data for
 201 each factor are normed across all Urban sectors over the 0 (less vulnerable) to 1 (most vulnerable). The
 202 normalization was made using the probability integral transformation, and to estimate the probability
 203 density (PDF) of each vulnerable factor, the Kernel Density Estimation (KDE) was used ⁵.

⁵ KDE uses the Gaussian kernel for its estimations and Scott's Rule for the *bandwidth* selection [43].

204 Figure 3 shows the normalization for the three domains. The vulnerability value for each factor is
 205 associated with the founded distribution. The results show the spatial correlation that exists for some
 206 vulnerable factors, especially for the *Where and how she/he works* domain. In contrast to the *Where and*
 207 *how she/he lives* domain, where the spatial correlation is not clear and the vulnerability is distributed
 208 across the geography area under study (Bogotá).





Figure 3. Probability density estimation for vulnerable factors using the KDE method.

209 3.4. Vulnerability index

210 To provide better response for vulnerability assessment, UVA generates three different
 211 vulnerability index to assess vulnerability in different ways (depending on the k partitions).
 212 Vulnerability index I have three different clusters ($k = 3$) to get a vulnerability index from low
 213 to high (i.e., low, medium, high). Vulnerability index II has five different clusters ($k = 5$) to get a
 214 vulnerability index from lowest to highest (i.e., lowest, low, medium, high, highest). And, Vulnerability
 215 index III has ten clusters ($k = 10$) to get a vulnerability index from 1 to 10. Figure 4 shows the different



(a) Vulnerability index I

(b) Vulnerability index II

(c) Vulnerability index III


Figure 4. Three different proposed vulnerability indexes assess the urban Vulnerability. Vulnerability I with $k = 3$ (left panel), Vulnerability II with $k = 5$ (midst panel), Vulnerability III with $k = 10$ (right panel). For each Vulnerability index: clusters generated using the k-means method (top), its corresponding centroid values for each vulnerable factor (middle), and the unique rank generated using the Borda's count method (bottom)⁶.

216 vulnerability index (i.e., Vulnerability index I with $k = 3$ (3 clusters), Vulnerability index II with $k = 5$
 217 (5 clusters), Vulnerability index III with $k = 10$ (10 clusters)).

218 After getting the clusters for each vulnerability index (showed in Figure 4 - top), the *centroids* of
 219 the clusters (showed in Figure 4 - midst) are getting and used to sort from higher to lower values the
 220 each vulnerability factor. These vulnerability factors sorted (by the *centroids*) are assumed as vulnerable
 221 ranks that would be used for the analysis. Then, to aggregate the 14 ranks (one for each vulnerable
 222 factor in Table 2) the Borda's count aggregation method build a unique vulnerability ranking for each
 223 cluster (showed in Figure 4 - bottom).

224 A vulnerability index is assigned for each cluster based on the ranking (i.e., higher rank indicates
 225 higher vulnerability). Figure 5 shows the final vulnerability index for the three different vulnerability

⁶ The class identifier $1, \dots, k$ for the clusters of the vulnerability indexes with different k partitions ($k = 3$ left, $k = 5$ medium, $k = 10$ right) does not be the same between models (i.e., the class identifier variate from index to index).



(a) Vulnerability index I

(b) Vulnerability index II

(c) Vulnerability index III

Figure 5. Vulnerability indices generated using UVA for the current COVID-19 Pandemic in Bogotá, Colombia. Vulnerability index I has 3 levels from low to high (left); Vulnerability index II has 5 levels from lowest to highest (middle); and Vulnerability index III has 10 levels from 1 to 10 (right).


226 index constructed with UVA. For Vulnerability index I, the results show high vulnerable urban
227 sectors in the south and west part of the city. On the other hand, the Vulnerability index II shows
228 how some Urban sectors change from medium-vulnerability (in the Vulnerability index I) to low
229 or high-vulnerability. The Vulnerability index III presents an interesting scenario where the spatial
230 correlation between urban sectors is not remarkable getting a unbiased vulnerability index for COVID-19.

231 Although our intention was not to predict the risk of infection for an Urban sector, we observed
232 similarities between vulnerability indexes proposed and the current concentration of COVID-19 cases
233 confirmed in Bogotá, see Figure 6. The results show how vulnerable areas found with UVA match with
234 urban areas with more COVID-19 cases. This indicates that the UVA framework proposed could be
235 used to recommend actions for before, during, and after pandemic i.e., to planning and coordination
236 efforts through leadership and coordination across sectors, to assess if the risk of a pandemic could
237 increase in specific geographic areas.

238 4. Conclusions and Future Work

239 An Urban Vulnerability Assessment (UVA) for Pandemic surveillance is proposed. UVA highlights
240 the vulnerability based on a set of 14 vulnerable factors found in the literature. The vulnerable factors
241 are ranked for each spatial unit under study using some statistical methods like Kernel Density
242 Estimation (KDE) and Clustering Analysis. To generate a unique vulnerability index, Borda's count
243 method is used. UVA is tested in the current COVID-19 Pandemic in Bogotá city, the largest and
244 crowded city in Colombia. UVA creates not only one, but a set of vulnerability indices (i.e., low-high,
245 lowest-highest, and 1-10) to Pandemic surveillance. Surveillance is of primary importance to monitor
246 the burden of disease and will give both local authorities and the global community a chance for a
247 quick response to public health threats.

248 Our work has demonstrated how high-vulnerable level contexts contribute to increasing the
249 impact and spread of the disease at different geographic levels. This approach also enables the design
250 of comprehensive plans, implemented at the city scale, for addressing urban vulnerability at national,
251 regional, and provincial scales. Further, the results allow to build evidence for planning, modeling,
252 and epidemiological studies to better inform the public, policymakers, and international organizations
253 to where and how to improve surveillance, response efforts, and delivery of resources, which are
254 crucial factors in containing the COVID-19 Pandemic. It must concern the spatial inequality problems



(a) Vulnerability indexes proposed in UVA (b) Confirmed COVID-19 cases in Bogotá

Figure 6. Comparison between the vulnerability indexes proposed in this study (left) and the real COVID-19 cases confirmed in Bogotá (right) ⁷. The colored boxes in the right map shows the concentrations of the cases in the Bogotá, where red color indicates more confirmed COVID-19 cases and fewer cases are in yellow.

255 in multiple deprivations and other depreciating characteristics. Thus enabling equity-based urban
256 planning that vows to restrict the transmission of COVID-19 now or any similar Pandemic in the
257 future.

258

259 **Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, J.P. and R.M.; methodology, J.P. and J.G.; software, J.P.; validation,
260 R.M., J.G., and E.L.; formal analysis, J.P., J.G., and E.L.; investigation, J.P.; resources, J.P.; data curation, J.P. and
261 E.L.; writing—original draft preparation, J.P.; writing—review and editing, J.P., R.M., J.G., and E.L.; visualization,
262 J.P. and E.L.; supervision, R.M., J.G., and E.L.; project administration, J.G., and E.L. All authors have read and
263 agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

264 **Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or
265 not-for-profit sectors.

266 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

267 References

- 268 1. Madhav, N.; Oppenheim, B.; Gallivan, M.; Mulembakani, P.; Rubin, E.; Wolfe, N. Pandemics: risks,
269 impacts, and mitigation. In *Disease Control Priorities: Improving Health and Reducing Poverty*. 3rd edition; The
270 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, 2017.
- 271 2. PAHO. Leadership during a pandemic: What your municipality can do, 2009.
- 272 3. Moon, S.; Sridhar, D.; Pate, M.A.; Jha, A.K.; Clinton, C.; Delaunay, S.; Edwin, V.; Fallah, M.; Fidler, D.P.;
273 Garrett, L.; others. Will Ebola change the game? Ten essential reforms before the next pandemic. The

⁷ The real COVID-19 cases are available in the publicly available dataset provided by [Observatorio de Salud de Bogotá](https://observatorio.salud.gov.co/). The map shows the concentrations of the cases in 1000 meters on December 30, 2020.

- 274 report of the Harvard-LSHTM Independent Panel on the Global Response to Ebola. *The Lancet* **2015**,
275 386, 2204–2221.
- 276 4. Pathmanathan, I.; O'Connor, K.A.; Adams, M.L.; Rao, C.Y.; Kilmarx, P.H.; Park, B.J.; Mermin, J.; Kargbo, B.;
277 Wurie, A.H.; Clarke, K.R. Rapid assessment of Ebola infection prevention and control needs—six districts,
278 Sierra Leone, October 2014. *MMWR. Morbidity and mortality weekly report* **2014**, *63*, 1172.
- 279 5. Lederberg, J.; Hamburg, M.A.; Smolinski, M.S.; others. *Microbial threats to health: emergence, detection, and*
280 *response*; National Academies Press, 2003.
- 281 6. Ethelberg, S.; Lisby, M.; Vestergaard, L.; Enemark, H.L.; Olsen, K.; Stensvold, C.; Nielsen, H.; Porsbo, L.J.;
282 Plesner, A.M.; Mølbak, K. A foodborne outbreak of *Cryptosporidium hominis* infection. *Epidemiology &*
283 *Infection* **2009**, *137*, 348–356.
- 284 7. Ethelberg, S.; Smith, B.; Torpdahl, M.; Lisby, M.; Boel, J.; Jensen, T.; Nielsen, E.M.; Mølbak, K. Outbreak of
285 non-O157 Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* infection from consumption of beef sausage. *Clinical*
286 *infectious diseases* **2009**, *48*, e78–e81.
- 287 8. Whittaker, P.; Sopwith, W.; Quigley, C.; Gillespie, I.; Willshaw, G.; Lycett, C.; Surman-Lee, S.; Baxter, D.;
288 Adak, G.; Syed, Q. A national outbreak of verotoxin-producing *Escherichia coli* O157 associated with
289 consumption of lemon-and-coriander chicken wraps from a supermarket chain. *Epidemiology & Infection*
290 **2009**, *137*, 375–382.
- 291 9. de Mattos Almeida, M.C.; Caiaffa, W.T.; Assunção, R.M.; Proietti, F.A. Spatial vulnerability to dengue in a
292 Brazilian urban area during a 7-year surveillance. *Journal of Urban Health* **2007**, *84*, 334–345.
- 293 10. Moore, M.; Gelfeld, B.; Adeyemi Okunogbe, C.P. Identifying future disease hot spots: infectious disease
294 vulnerability index. *Rand health quarterly* **2017**, *6*.
- 295 11. Salas, J.; Yepes, V. Urban vulnerability assessment: Advances from the strategic planning outlook. *Journal*
296 *of Cleaner Production* **2018**, *179*, 544–558.
- 297 12. UN Habitat. *UN-habitat COVID-19 response plan*, 2020.
- 298 13. WHO. *Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report - 40*, 2020.
- 299 14. Mitlin, D. Dealing with COVID-19 in the towns and cities of the global South. *IIED Blogs* **2020**, *27*.
- 300 15. Hagenlocher, M.; Kienberger, S.; Lang, S.; Blaschke, T. Implications of spatial scales and reporting units for
301 the spatial modelling of vulnerability to vector-borne diseases. *GI Forum* **2014**, *2014*, 197.
- 302 16. Kienberger, S.; Hagenlocher, M. Spatial-explicit modeling of social vulnerability to malaria in East Africa.
303 *International journal of health geographics* **2014**, *13*, 1–16.
- 304 17. Hagenlocher, M.; Castro, M.C. Mapping malaria risk and vulnerability in the United Republic of Tanzania:
305 a spatial explicit model. *Population health metrics* **2015**, *13*, 1–14.
- 306 18. Mishra, S.V.; Gayen, A.; Haque, S.M. COVID-19 and urban vulnerability in India. *Habitat international*
307 **2020**, *103*, 102230.
- 308 19. Whitaker, R. Criticisms of the Analytic Hierarchy Process: Why they often make no sense. *Mathematical*
309 *and Computer Modelling* **2007**, *46*, 948–961.
- 310 20. Mu, E.; Pereyra-Rojas, M. *Practical decision making: an introduction to the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)*
311 *using super decisions V2*; Springer, 2016.
- 312 21. Chen, M.I.; Lee, V.J.; Barr, I.; Lin, C.; Goh, R.; Lee, C.; Singh, B.; Tan, J.; Lim, W.Y.; Cook, A.R.; others.
313 Risk factors for pandemic (H1N1) 2009 virus seroconversion among hospital staff, Singapore. *Emerging*
314 *infectious diseases* **2010**, *16*, 1554.
- 315 22. Jordan, R.E.; Adab, P.; Cheng, K. Covid-19: risk factors for severe disease and death, 2020.
- 316 23. Jung, S.m.; Akhmetzhanov, A.R.; Hayashi, K.; Linton, N.M.; Yang, Y.; Yuan, B.; Kobayashi, T.; Kinoshita,
317 R.; Nishiura, H. Real-time estimation of the risk of death from novel coronavirus (COVID-19) infection:
318 inference using exported cases. *Journal of clinical medicine* **2020**, *9*, 523.
- 319 24. Oppenheim, B.; Gallivan, M.; Madhav, N.K.; Brown, N.; Serhiyenko, V.; Wolfe, N.D.; Ayscue, P. Assessing
320 global preparedness for the next pandemic: development and application of an Epidemic Preparedness
321 Index. *BMJ global health* **2019**, *4*, e001157.
- 322 25. Morse, S.S. Factors in the emergence of infectious diseases. In *Plagues and politics*; Springer, 2001; pp. 8–26.
- 323 26. Summers, J.A.; Wilson, N.; Baker, M.G.; Shanks, G.D. Mortality risk factors for pandemic influenza on
324 New Zealand troop ship, 1918. *Emerging infectious diseases* **2010**, *16*, 1931.
- 325 27. Xu, B.; Kraemer, M.U.; Group, D.C. Open access epidemiological data from the COVID-19 outbreak. *The*
326 *Lancet. Infectious Diseases* **2020**.

- 327 28. Acharya, R.; Porwal, A. A vulnerability index for the management of and response to the COVID-19
328 epidemic in India: an ecological study. *The Lancet Global Health* **2020**, *8*, e1142–e1151.
- 329 29. Grus, J. *Data science from scratch: first principles with python*; O'Reilly Media, 2019.
- 330 30. Angus, J.E. The probability integral transform and related results. *SIAM review* **1994**, *36*, 652–654.
- 331 31. Emerson, P. The original Borda count and partial voting. *Social Choice and Welfare* **2013**, *40*, 353–358.
- 332 32. SDP. *Secretaría Distrital de Planeación: Monografías de las localidades Bogotá D.C. 2011*, 2011.
- 333 33. SDP. *Secretaría Distrital de Planeación: Monografías de las localidades Bogotá D.C. 2017*, 2017.
- 334 34. SDM. *Secretaría Distrital de Movilidad: Observatorio de Movilidad Bogotá D.C. 2017*, 2018.
- 335 35. DANE. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística: COLOMBIA - Censo Nacional de Población
336 y Vivienda - CNPV - 2018, 2018.
- 337 36. DANE. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística:: Pobreza multidimensional en Colombia,
338 2018.
- 339 37. DANE. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística: Índice de vulnerabilidad por manzana con
340 el uso de variables demográficas y comorbilidades, 2020.
- 341 38. ILO. COVID-19 crisis and the informal economy: immediate responses and policy challenges **2020**.
- 342 39. Goldstein, E.; Lipsitch, M. Temporal rise in the proportion of younger adults and older adolescents
343 among coronavirus disease (COVID-19) cases following the introduction of physical distancing measures,
344 Germany, March to April 2020. *Eurosurveillance* **2020**, *25*, 2000596.
- 345 40. Alfonso R, Ó.A. Densidades divergentes y segregación socio-espacial en la Bogotá de hoy: un análisis a
346 partir de un índice de calidad de la densidad. VIII Seminario Internacional de Investigación en Urbanismo,
347 Barcelona-Balneário Camboriú, Junio 2016. Departament d'Urbanisme i Ordenació del Territori. Universitat
348 Politècnica, 2016.
- 349 41. SDP. *Secretaría Distrital de Planeación: Determinantes de la distribución espacial de la informalidad laboral en*
350 *Bogotá*, 2018.
- 351 42. Gomez, J.; Prieto, J.; Leon, E.; Rodriguez, A. INFEKTA: A General Agent-based Model for Transmission of
352 Infectious Diseases: Studying the COVID-19 Propagation in Bogotá-Colombia. *medRxiv* **2020**.
- 353 43. Scott, D.W. *Multivariate density estimation: theory, practice, and visualization*; John Wiley & Sons, 2015.

354 © 2020 by the authors. Submitted to *Sustainability* for possible open access publication
355 under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license
356 (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).