

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Title

Modelling the impact of health-related variables, age, migration, and socio-economic factors in the geographical distribution of early tested case-fatality risks associated with COVID-19 in Mexico

Authors

*Ricardo Ramírez-Aldana¹, Juan Carlos Gomez-Verjan¹, Omar Yaxmehen Bello-Chavolla¹,
Carmen García-Peña¹

Institutions

¹Research Division, Instituto Nacional de Geriatria, Mexico City, Mexico

***Corresponding Author:** Ricardo Ramirez-Aldana **e-mail:**
ricardoramirezaldana@gmail.com, Research Division, Instituto Nacional de Geriatria
(INGER), Anillo Perif. 2767, San Jerónimo Lídice, La Magdalena Contreras, 10200, Mexico
City, Mexico.

23

ABSTRACT

24 COVID-19 is a respiratory disease caused by SARS-CoV-2, which has significantly
25 impacted economic and public healthcare systems world-wide. SARS-CoV-2 is highly
26 lethal in older adults (>65 years old) and in cases with underlying medical conditions
27 including chronic respiratory diseases, immunosuppression, and cardio-metabolic
28 diseases including severe obesity, diabetes, and hypertension. The course of the COVID-
29 19 pandemic in Mexico has led to many fatal cases in younger patients attributable to
30 cardio-metabolic conditions. Here, we aimed to perform an early spatial epidemiological
31 analysis for the COVID-19 outbreak in Mexico to evaluate how tested case-fatality risks (t-
32 CFRs) are geographically distributed and to explore spatial predictors of early t-CFRs
33 considering the variation of their impact on COVID-19 fatality across different states in
34 Mexico, controlling for the severity of the disease. As results, considering health related
35 variables; diabetes and obesity were highly associated with COVID-19 fatality. We
36 identified that both external and internal migration had an important impact over early
37 COVID-19 risks in Mexico, with external migration having the second highest impact when
38 analyzing Mexico as a whole. Physicians-to-population ratio, as a representation of
39 urbanity, population density, and overcrowding households, has the highest impact on t-
40 CFRs, whereas the age group of 10 to 39 years was associated with lower risks.
41 Geographically, the states of Quintana Roo, Baja California, Chihuahua, and Tabasco had
42 higher t-CFRs and relative risks comparing with a national standard, suggesting that risks
43 in these states were above of what was nationally expected; additionally, the strength of
44 the association between some spatial predictors and the COVID-19 fatality risks variates
45 by zone depending on the predictor.

46

47 **Keywords:** COVID-19, generalized geographically weighted regression, Mexico, SARS-
48 CoV-2, spatial clusters, spatial epidemiology, spatial statistics.

49

50 INTRODUCTION

51 COVID-19 is a respiratory disease caused by SARS-CoV-2 (severe acute respiratory
52 syndrome coronavirus 2), which has caused almost twenty million cases around the world
53 and caused 790,000 deaths as of August 20th, 2020 (1). SARS-CoV-2 is a highly
54 contagious RNA virus from the Coronaviridae family, with a small genome of about 30,000
55 nucleotides closely related to the bat coronavirus (RaTG13) (2). Given its global spread,
56 there is an urgent need for scientific and health systems around the world to understand
57 the epidemiology, pathogenicity, and mechanisms of immunological defenses to develop
58 possible therapeutic and public health alternatives to fight against one of the most
59 outstanding threats to public health since *Spanish Influenza* over a hundred years ago (3).

60 According to the World Health Organization (WHO), the groups most susceptible to
61 acquire infection and develop adverse outcomes are people with underlying medical
62 conditions and older adults (>65 years old), particularly those living at nursing homes.
63 Medical conditions which have been associated with increased susceptibility for adverse
64 outcomes related to SARS-CoV-2 infection include chronic obstructive pulmonary disease
65 (COPD), chronic kidney disease (CKD), cardiovascular diseases, liver diseases, moderate
66 asthma, immunosuppression (HIV/AIDS, bone marrow transplantation, cancer treatment,
67 and genetic immune deficiencies), and particularly, severe obesity, diabetes, and
68 hypertension (4). These associations may be related to the strong link between pro-
69 inflammatory cytokines in response to infection and the pathogenesis of SARS-CoV-2,
70 which can be seen in pneumonia patients with severe COVID-19 disease exhibiting
71 systemic hyper-inflammation known as cytokine storm or as a secondary hemophagocytic
72 lymphohistocytosis (5).

73 On the other hand, accordingly to the OCDE, in the last ten years the countries with the
74 highest prevalence of cardio-metabolic conditions linked to increased risk of severe

75 COVID-19, including obesity, type 2 diabetes, and hypertension, are Mexico and the
76 United States of America (USA), when considering adults from 15 to 74 years old (6).
77 Thus, considering that the population pyramid is flattening more and more, indicating an
78 aging population structure; the high rates of diabetes and obesity in Mexico are likely to
79 increase susceptibility to higher rates of mortality attributable to COVID-19 even in
80 younger populations (7).

81 In response to SARS-CoV-2 spread worldwide, mobility restrictions have been imposed to
82 reduce community-level transmission; nevertheless, early influence of human mobility
83 particularly internal and external migration has largely driven the spread of COVID-19 (8).
84 When considering the high transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2, human mobility gains
85 relevance in early stages of spread, in which people travelling from other countries can
86 drive increased rates of transmission (9). SARS-CoV-2 spread related to human mobility is
87 relevant, particularly considering that the risk of transmission and adverse outcomes are
88 related to inequalities and suboptimal socio-economic conditions(10). In this sense, the
89 risk of becoming infected and dying might increase in areas without optimum socio-
90 economic conditions, for instance, spatial units in which people live in overcrowding
91 households or without access to potable water or drainage.

92 Spatial analyses allow us to understand how the fatality risks are distributed along a
93 territory, the presence of spatial clusters, and how the effects of the variables associated
94 with the risks variate along any given territory. In this sense, several examples of
95 geoepidemiology studies in autoinflammatory diseases, specific syndromes, infectious
96 diseases, among others, have been helpful for the development of public health policies
97 and to understand the structure of disease spread (11–13). In the present work, we
98 performed spatial analyses in order to derive spatial relationships corresponding to the
99 geographical phenomenon of the COVID-19 outbreak in Mexico and its associated fatality
100 risks, using for this task statistical methods including spatial clustering through local

101 indicators of spatial autocorrelation and generalized geographically weighted regression.
102 Additionally, we wanted to identify spatial units or regions in Mexico that should be
103 considered and analyzed with care to better understand the propagation of the disease
104 and its associated fatality risks in the early stages of COVID-19 spread.

105 **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

106 Data sources

107 We obtained state-level variables considering the 32 states in Mexico (**Table 1**). A first
108 group of variables were obtained from the epidemiological surveillance entity of Mexico
109 (Dirección General de Vigilancia Epidemiológica, Secretaría de Salud) at an individual
110 level, the data set corresponded to observations until April 21st, 2020 (14). These variables
111 concern health and very general socioeconomic information associated with people who
112 were suspected for COVID-19 in Mexico and underwent real time RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-
113 2 confirmation. Available variables include the presence of diabetes, obesity, chronic renal
114 problems (CKD), chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), pregnancy,
115 hypertension, immunosuppression, cardiovascular disease, pneumonia, as well as age,
116 and whether the patient was hospitalized, admitted to an intensive care unit (ICU), or
117 required intubation. We grouped age into groups as explained in the model selection
118 process below and we finally used three age groups: 10-39, 40-69, and 70 years old and
119 over. We also computed the risk of death due to the disease on individuals who were
120 tested for SARS-CoV-2, or tested case-fatality risks (t-CFRs), by considering as a death
121 that which was recorded after having a positive test (the information concerning positive
122 tests and death is available in the epidemiological data set), method consistent with the
123 official numbers. We aggregated all variables at a state level as counts and used them as
124 relative frequencies (rates) in all analyses.

125 Additional variables concerning socio-demographic, economic, mobility, and climatic
126 features were obtained at a state-level. In terms of socio-demographic variables, from the

127 National Institute of Geography and Statistics (INEGI), we extracted information
128 concerning clustering of individuals: population density (people per km^2) in 2015 and the
129 proportion of people in a household living in an overcrowded place in 2017; literacy rate of
130 population aged ≥ 15 years in 2015; people settled in rural areas in 2010 (%) (a location
131 was considered as rural when there are $< 2,500$ habitants); and the number of physicians
132 available by every 1000 people in 2015, which was obtained from the National institute of
133 Public Health (INSP). In terms of economic variables, we obtained from INEGI the state
134 contribution to gross domestic product (GDP) in 2018, which we modified by considering
135 only those values associated with states not containing the biggest cities in Mexico to
136 improve the linearity assumption with the transformed response. We also obtained
137 information concerning people living in poverty in 2018 (%), as it is defined and calculated
138 by CONEVAL according to a multidimensional index obtained from *per capita* income and
139 an index of social deprivation (15). In terms of mobility, we extracted from INEGI
140 information concerning internal migration, as the rate of people aged 5 years and over
141 living in another state five years before 2014, and external migration, as the rate of people
142 aged ≥ 5 years living in another country five years before 2014, both proxies of internal and
143 external mobility, respectively; and, the number of flights in 2019 by state, which we
144 calculated from information associated with the number of flights by airport in Mexico
145 (Ministry of Communication and Transport)(16). Finally, information concerning average
146 temperature ($^{\circ}C$) in March 2020 was obtained from the National Council of Water
147 (CONAGUA).

148 The risk of dying in tested individuals (t-CFRs) was chosen as the dependent variable on
149 the basis of relevant indicators of COVID-19 epidemiology in Mexico; notably, the number
150 of tests per 100,00 individuals is limited compared to other countries, which decreases
151 detection rates and given the likely under-detection of mild SARS-CoV-2 cases in this
152 setting, standardizing deaths by tested cases considers the extent of detection, which

153 could similarly be influenced by structural factors (17). The remaining variables obtained
154 and calculated from the different data sources are treated as explanatory, except for
155 hospitalization, ICU, and intubation, which we considered as control variables, being an
156 approximate measure of the presence of severe COVID-19 cases and possibly access to
157 services attending COVID-19 in a region.

158

159

160

161

162 **Table 1.** Features extracted for all the analyses by state used to predict tested case-fatality risks of COVID-19 in Mexico.

163 Abbreviations: GDP, Gross Domestic Product; COPD, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease; and ICU, Intensive Care Unit.

State	Deaths caused by COVID-19*	Number of tested individuals (offset)*	Rural 2006 (%)**	Poverty 2018 (%)***	Density 2015+	Literacy 2015 (%)+	GDP 2018 (%)+	Temperature March 2020 (°C)++	Internal migration 2014 (%)+	External migration 2014 (%)+	Physicians by 1000 people 2015+++	Overcrowding 2017 (%)+
AGUASCALIENTES	2	1070	18.84	26.18	233.70	97.00	1.31	19.30	3.60	0.70	1.33	3.90
BAJA CALIFORNIA	100	2353	6.99	23.26	46.40	97.60	3.14	14.40	3.80	1.90	1.05	6.40
BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR	9	978	15.22	18.07	9.60	96.80	0.98	19.80	8.20	0.50	1.50	10.40
CAMPECHE	4	229	26.00	46.25	15.60	92.90	2.98	28.00	4.10	0.20	1.16	16.50
COAHUILA DE ZARAGOZA	23	2472	9.95	22.49	19.50	97.10	3.50	22.10	2.10	0.40	1.44	4.50
COLIMA	2	133	12.41	30.87	126.40	95.60	0.61	26.60	5.60	1.50	1.56	10.70
CHIAPAS	4	440	52.26	76.41	71.20	84.20	1.56	25.60	1.50	0.50	0.53	20.50
CHIHUAHUA	36	705	15.51	26.28	14.40	95.00	3.20	16.70	1.20	1.20	1.11	5.60
CIUDAD DE MÉXICO	224	10183	0.35	30.55	5967.30	97.70	17.64	19.40	2.10	0.40	2.99	7.10
DURANGO	4	407	32.77	37.35	14.20	96.20	1.13	18.40	2.60	0.80	1.17	5.40
GUANAJUATO	9	2482	30.29	43.38	191.30	93.00	4.11	20.60	1.50	1.00	0.84	5.50
GUERRERO	16	583	42.44	66.47	55.60	85.50	1.37	26.20	1.90	1.10	0.64	27.60
HIDALGO	16	608	47.69	43.85	137.30	91.00	1.54	20.50	3.90	0.90	0.66	8.20
JALISCO	15	3440	13.85	28.43	99.80	95.80	6.91	22.40	2.20	1.10	1.26	5.30
MÉXICO	71	5759	12.74	42.72	724.20	95.80	8.93	16.30	2.80	0.40	0.81	8.60
MICHOACÁN	19	1124	32.06	46.04	78.20	90.80	2.43	21.70	1.70	1.20	0.72	10.10
MORELOS	14	525	13.91	50.82	390.20	94.30	1.13	24.70	3.30	0.90	1.04	10.80
NAYARIT	5	299	33.48	34.77	42.40	94.30	0.68	24.70	4.30	1.40	1.06	8.10
NUEVO LEÓN	6	4482	5.64	14.53	79.80	97.40	7.47	22.90	2.70	0.40	1.30	3.10
OAXACA	7	522	52.89	66.35	42.30	84.20	1.48	24.60	2.00	1.20	0.61	16.90
PUEBLA	53	1651	29.38	58.92	179.80	90.80	3.39	20.00	2.30	0.60	0.83	9.70

QUERÉTARO	6	630	30.13	27.58	174.40	94.70	2.33	22.00	5.60	0.90	0.85	6.90
QUINTANA ROO	47	982	14.42	27.57	33.60	95.50	1.63	26.80	8.00	0.70	0.96	17.50
SAN LUIS POTOSÍ	5	1167	37.31	43.40	44.50	92.90	2.11	24.60	2.70	0.80	0.85	6.20
SINALOA	52	1580	29.17	30.88	51.70	95.20	2.23	22.90	2.50	0.70	1.16	9.20
SONORA	13	869	14.23	28.19	15.90	96.70	3.26	17.70	2.90	1.10	1.39	7.00
TABASCO	55	1266	44.98	53.65	96.90	93.80	2.61	27.60	2.30	0.30	0.92	12.00
TAMAULIPAS	7	1210	12.74	35.07	42.90	96.00	2.82	25.20	1.80	0.30	1.20	6.90
TLAXCALA	5	587	21.77	48.38	318.40	95.20	0.56	16.30	3.40	0.60	0.81	9.50
VERACRUZ	13	1520	39.33	61.78	113.00	89.80	4.59	23.70	3.00	0.60	0.87	12.60
YUCATÁN	12	959	17.01	40.80	53.10	91.90	1.46	26.90	3.60	0.40	1.39	13.90
ZACATECAS	3	419	42.73	46.76	21.00	94.90	0.88	19.10	2.10	1.40	0.89	5.00

164

* Dirección General de Epidemiología, Secretaría de Salud (General Direction of Epidemiology, Health Ministry)

** Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública, Encuesta Nacional de la Dinámica Demográfica (National Public Health Institute, National Survey of Demographic Dynamic)

*** Estimations obtained by CONEVAL (Consejo Nacional de Evaluación de la Política de Desarrollo Social, National Council for the Evaluation of Social Development Policy) based on the ENIGH (National Survey of Household Income and Expenditure) 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2018.

+ Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (National Institute of Statistics and Geography)

++ Consejo Nacional del Agua (CONAGUA) (National Water Commission)

+++ Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública (INSP) (The National Institute of Public Health of Mexico)

165

166

Table 1(continued)

State	Diabetes (%)*	Obesity (%)*	Chronic renal problems (%)*	COPD (%)*	Pregnancy (%)*	Hyper-tension (%)*	Immuno-deficiency (%)*	Cardio-vascular (%)*	Pneumonia (%)*	ICU (%)*	Intubated (%)*	Hospitalized (%)*	Age group 10-39(%)*	Age group 40-69(%)*	Age group 70 years and over(%)*
AGUASCALIENTES	7.216	14.204	1.947	1.833	0.573	13.402	1.833	2.864	7.446	0.458	0.916	12.257	54.296	33.333	4.582
BAJA CALIFORNIA	12.420	18.059	1.570	1.713	1.071	22.484	2.355	3.854	21.485	1.213	2.784	27.195	49.179	43.683	3.854
BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR	11.350	10.763	0.978	0.978	2.544	14.677	2.153	3.131	13.503	1.566	1.370	17.613	53.816	35.225	4.892

CAMPECHE	11.111	16.239	0.000	0.855	0.000	12.821	2.137	2.137	16.667	2.137	1.282	26.923	46.581	45.299	5.556
COAHUILA DE ZARAGOZA	11.965	16.079	2.015	1.847	0.756	16.037	2.603	2.981	8.942	1.847	0.672	14.484	47.397	44.249	5.584
COLIMA	14.388	19.424	5.036	2.878	2.158	15.827	2.158	3.597	25.899	2.878	2.878	33.094	52.518	34.532	7.194
CHIAPAS	11.836	13.050	1.973	2.883	1.669	15.630	2.276	2.731	17.299	3.642	3.035	27.314	49.469	39.150	4.856
CHIHUAHUA	15.385	13.501	2.826	4.710	1.413	21.821	3.297	5.181	33.438	9.733	3.925	45.997	45.997	40.816	7.849
CIUDAD DE MÉXICO	10.796	15.511	1.658	1.872	0.618	14.970	2.688	3.049	14.670	2.044	2.113	20.356	44.619	47.926	4.767
DURANGO	15.615	13.621	2.990	4.983	0.831	24.917	4.485	5.980	19.767	2.326	2.159	33.389	43.355	39.203	13.787
GUANAJUATO	10.131	11.997	1.908	3.942	1.399	14.455	2.755	2.671	10.428	1.696	1.526	17.338	50.996	34.718	6.867
GUERRERO	15.456	17.531	2.801	3.216	1.245	17.635	1.763	3.734	26.349	5.394	4.253	33.091	43.154	44.813	7.573
HIDALGO	18.491	15.976	4.142	4.734	1.479	19.970	4.438	2.071	21.893	1.627	2.959	31.953	42.751	44.231	9.172
JALISCO	10.876	13.425	3.533	3.625	1.475	16.559	2.888	3.840	12.442	1.874	1.260	20.399	49.124	37.665	7.957
MÉXICO	12.899	15.374	2.358	2.358	0.838	15.140	2.747	3.079	24.318	2.864	3.254	33.164	45.733	44.564	5.943
MICHOACÁN	13.541	16.003	2.752	4.272	1.376	19.406	2.462	4.345	22.230	2.172	2.462	29.616	41.999	41.202	11.369
MORELOS	14.397	14.786	2.918	4.086	1.167	17.899	2.724	2.529	24.708	4.086	3.502	34.825	43.774	42.218	9.728
NAYARIT	16.188	16.449	4.178	4.700	0.261	23.760	3.394	4.439	20.888	2.350	2.350	30.548	41.253	45.431	9.922
NUEVO LEÓN	10.250	11.597	1.594	1.374	0.879	14.702	2.198	3.023	7.227	0.989	0.632	11.761	49.217	40.918	5.001
OAXACA	15.768	12.656	3.631	5.394	1.141	16.183	3.423	3.008	25.519	1.971	2.697	33.299	43.050	44.295	9.232
PUEBLA	14.850	16.630	2.948	3.281	1.001	16.407	2.169	3.504	23.637	2.503	3.003	31.535	40.712	48.498	8.343
QUERÉTARO	11.736	14.425	3.423	2.689	0.978	17.359	4.890	3.178	17.604	1.711	2.200	28.362	47.677	38.631	6.846
QUINTANA ROO	11.429	15.238	1.270	0.635	1.905	9.206	2.857	2.222	23.492	6.032	4.762	38.413	51.111	30.476	4.127
SAN LUIS POTOSÍ	12.211	11.469	2.723	4.785	1.650	16.007	2.805	3.548	16.089	2.063	1.815	24.340	48.102	35.066	9.901
SINALOA	12.863	19.911	2.218	3.549	0.641	21.883	2.661	3.401	19.961	2.366	1.676	32.134	40.069	48.053	9.463
SONORA	13.734	18.842	2.043	2.838	2.270	23.156	2.724	5.675	20.318	1.476	1.022	29.512	48.354	41.317	7.151
TABASCO	15.422	21.687	1.205	2.088	1.526	20.321	1.124	2.972	13.976	3.614	1.687	21.365	42.570	50.361	5.221
TAMAULIPAS	13.875	15.107	2.381	1.888	1.888	18.062	2.545	3.530	9.278	1.642	0.903	16.256	49.015	42.529	5.008
TLAXCALA	14.211	10.702	2.456	2.807	0.877	15.088	3.684	2.632	18.947	4.211	1.930	22.982	43.333	45.789	7.544
VERACRUZ	13.582	15.734	2.965	3.252	1.387	18.747	3.396	2.965	18.890	2.726	1.435	31.707	46.389	42.037	8.082
YUCATÁN	10.733	16.718	1.651	2.786	1.342	18.885	1.238	2.683	13.829	3.096	2.167	22.910	47.678	40.454	7.637

ZACATECAS	14.390	16.211	4.007	5.100	1.821	25.137	4.736	4.918	23.133	2.186	1.457	27.687	41.712	41.894	14.026
-----------	--------	--------	-------	-------	-------	--------	-------	-------	--------	-------	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------

* Dirección General de Epidemiología, Secretaría de Salud (General Direction of Epidemiology, Health Ministry)

** Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública, Encuesta Nacional de la Dinámica Demográfica (National Public Health Institute, National Survey of Demographic Dynamic)

*** Estimations obtained by CONEVAL (Consejo Nacional de Evaluación de la Política de Desarrollo Social, National Council for the Evaluation of Social Development Policy) based on the ENIGH (National Survey of Household Income and Expenditure) 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2018.

+ Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (National Institute of Statistics and Geography)

++ Consejo Nacional del Agua (CONAGUA) (National Water Commission)

+++ Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública (INSP) (The National Institute of Public Health of Mexico)

167 *COVID-19 t-CFRs estimation by state*

168 We obtained quantile maps associated with raw and smoothed t-CFRs of COVID-19
169 cases. The risks by state were smoothed by using an empirical Bayes estimator, which is
170 a biased estimator that improves variance instability proper of risks estimated in small-
171 sized spatial units (18); however, the analyses were performed with both raw and
172 smoothed risks to compare results. We also obtained maps concerning relative risks,
173 understanding them as a comparison of the observed number of events by state to a
174 national standard, the latter using the expected number of events considering as if risks in
175 a state were the same as those at a national level.

176 *Spatial weight estimation and spatial autocorrelation*

177 We obtained queen contiguity weights (19), which consider as neighbors those states
178 sharing at least a point in common, obtaining a squared matrix of dimension 32 with all
179 entries equal to zero or one, where a one indicates that two states are neighbors. From
180 these neighbors, weights are calculated by integrating a matrix in a row-standardized form.
181 Moran's I statistic (20) was obtained as a measure of global spatial autocorrelation and its
182 significance was assessed through a random permutation inference technique based on
183 simulations. Local indicators of spatial autocorrelation (LISA) were obtained (21) and used
184 to derive significant spatial clustering through four cluster types: High-High, Low-Low,
185 High-Low, and Low-High. For instance, the Low-Low cluster indicates states with low
186 values of a variable that are significantly surrounded by regions with similarly low values.

187 *Spatial multivariable linear model*

188 A multivariable Generalized Geographically Weighted Regression (GGWR) was fitted (22).
189 In this model, a dependent variable is measured for each spatial unit and independent
190 variables (inputs) are simultaneously considered as well, such that the corresponding
191 parameters depend on the coordinates in which the state is spatially located (centroids in
192 the case of polygons); therefore, a parameter is associated with each state and

193 independent variable. To be able to estimate such model, a weighting diagonal matrix is
194 considered, we used Gaussian spatial weighting to generate it. These weights determine
195 the relationship from any state to another in terms of the distance (Euclidean) between
196 states and a bandwidth. The bandwidth determines which spatial units are similar under
197 the GGWR and can be selected using automatized methods, we used a cross-validation
198 (CV) method with an adaptive scheme, i.e. a different bandwidth was used for each unit.
199 Since the response variable is a count (number of deaths), a GGWR with a Poisson
200 distribution and logarithm link function was used, including as offset term the number of
201 people tested with COVID-19 in a logarithmic scale, thus modelling the t-CFRs instead of
202 just the number of deaths.

203 A global multivariable model for all states, a Poisson multivariable linear model
204 (generalized linear model or GLM) with offset and a logarithmic link function, was also
205 fitted and significant variables were identified (23). To obtain the best possible model,
206 including variables with the greatest effect on the risks and satisfying as much as possible
207 all statistical assumptions, we used the following selection process: 1) We fitted
208 univariable Poisson models with offset and logarithmic link function, identified significant
209 effects, and ordered them in absolute value from highest to lowest, 2) We identified
210 variables with good and acceptable linear association with the log-transformed mortality
211 risk by obtaining scatter plots between variables and the transformed risk, including a
212 smoothed LOESS (locally estimated scatterplot smoothing) curve; and, when possible,
213 variables were transformed to improve this assumption, as for GDP as explained above, 3)
214 VIF was used to assess multicollinearity; thus, we fitted a model including variables with
215 acceptable and good linear association, and eliminated any variable with a $VIF > 10$, 4) We
216 added to the resulting model one by one significant variables in the univariable models.
217 First, we added the variable with the highest effect and fitted the associated model
218 identifying whether $VIF > 10$. If not, we added the variable, and if $VIF > 10$, the model was

219 not modified. We proceeded with the resulting model repeating the same process with the
220 second highest effect; and so on, 5) From this process, we ended with a model consisting
221 on all variables with the greatest univariable effects (0.08 and above in absolute value),
222 better linear behavior, and without multicollinearity ($VIF \leq 10$), 6) We used residuals
223 associated with other three Poisson models concerning ICU, intubated, and
224 hospitalization, including a subset of variables pertaining to the model for fatality risk as
225 inputs, thus obtaining the effects each confounder has over the risks without the effects
226 that explanatory variables have over these confounders. These residuals and the
227 corresponding estimated parameters do not have a meaning, 7) We evaluated goodness-
228 of-fit and validated all model assumptions. For age, we obtained age groups: 0-1, 2-9, 10-
229 19, ..., 80-89, and 90 years old and over, fitted the corresponding univariable Poisson
230 models with offset, and identified significant age groups and the direction of the
231 association to obtain a new set of age groups: 10-39, 40-69, and 70 and more; and
232 proceeded with these variables as with the others.

233 The GGWR with the same variables as in the GLM was fitted and multiplicative effects
234 over the t-CFRs (i.e. the exponentiated estimated parameters) associated with each
235 variable were calculated. Maps associated with these effects were obtained, presenting
236 only those associated with the explanatory variables that were significant in the global
237 model. All statistical analyses were conducted using R version 3.6.2 through the *spdep*,
238 *rgdal*, and *spgwr* packages for spatial analyses and *car* package for the correlation
239 analysis and GeoDa 1.14.0 was used also for some spatial analyses. The significance
240 level for all analyses was 5% (i.e., $\alpha=0.05$).

241 **RESULTS**

242 t-CFR description and spatial autocorrelation of COVID-19 t-CFRs between states

243 Maps for quartiles corresponding to the raw and smoothed t-CFRs are similar, except for
244 two states, Tlaxcala, which from a category using the raw risks moves to the next superior

245 one in the smoothed risks, the opposite occurring for Veracruz. Thus, only the map
246 concerning the smoothed values is shown (**Figure 1A**). We observed the largest t-CFRs
247 (above 4%) in Quintana Roo, Baja California, Chihuahua, and Tabasco, and the greatest
248 relative risks (2.00-4.00) in Baja California, Chihuahua, Quintana Roo, and Tabasco
249 (**Figure 1B**). Globally, there is a non-significant spatial autocorrelation (Moran's $I=-0.079$,
250 $p=0.390$); however, there is a noticeable Low-Low cluster on the northeast around San
251 Luis Potosi and two Low-High clusters around Yucatan and Sonora (**Figure 2**). These
252 Low-High clusters make sense since the associated states, especially Sonora, are
253 surrounded by the states with the highest t-CFRs in all the country. We verified that the
254 spatial autocorrelation value and clustering were exactly the same using both the raw
255 values or those obtained with the Bayes spatial technique.

256

257 **Figure 1. Maps associated with COVID-19 deaths in Mexico by state until April 21st,**
258 **2020.** A) Quartiles corresponding to tested case-fatality risks smoothed through an
259 empirical Bayes procedure. B) Relative risk.

260

261 **Figure 2. Spatial clustering associated with tested case-fatality risks of COVID-19 in**
262 **Mexico by state until April 21st, 2020, considering queen contiguity.** A) Significant
263 spatial clustering obtained through Local Indicators of Spatial Autocorrelation (LISA)
264 comparisons. There are four types of clusters: High-High, Low-Low, High-Low, and Low-
265 High, e.g. a Low-Low cluster (blue) indicates states with low values of a variable
266 significantly surrounded by regions with similarly low values. B) P-values associated with
267 the spatial clustering in A), C) Scatter plot associated with the smoothed risks vs. their
268 corresponding spatially lagged values, including the associated linear regression fitting,
269 whose slope is the Moran's I statistic.

270 *Fit of multivariable generalized global and geographical linear models for COVID-19*
271 *tested case-fatality risks*

272 Through a preliminary analysis obtained by fitting a Poisson multivariable linear model with
273 offset and including all variables, we found the presence of serious multicollinearity
274 problems, since we obtained Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) with values above 50 for
275 some variables. A correlation analysis between all variables was performed (**Figure 3A**),
276 including the response (raw t-CFRs) identifying very correlated variables. Thus, we
277 followed the model selection process as explained above. Our final global model included
278 as inputs: diabetes, obesity, GDP, internal and external migration, age group of 10 to 39
279 years, physicians-to-population ratio, cardiovascular disease, ICU, hospitalization, and
280 intubated. The latter three variables are confounders and to eliminate effects of other
281 variables on them, they are used as residuals associated with appropriate Poisson models
282 with independent variables: diabetes, obesity, age, physicians-to-population ratio,
283 cardiovascular disease, plus ICU for the model associated with the intubated variable.
284 Goodness-of-fit in our final model was assessed, finding that all variables were jointly
285 significant (LR=472.19, p-value<0.001). Additionally, through a PP-plot associated with the
286 standardized residuals and associated Anderson-Darling test (A=0.260, p-value = 0.689)
287 and scatter plots between the fitted values and standardized residuals, and a similar plot
288 using the root of the residuals instead, we determined that the link function and the way
289 the explanatory variables are related with the response seems correct. However, we found
290 some overdispersion (Chi-squared statistic divided by its degrees of freedom of 1.972).
291 There were not any significant pairwise interaction effects.

292 A multivariable GGWR with a Poisson distribution, adaptive kernel, and the same input
293 variables was also fitted. In **Table 2**, we present a summary of the multiplicative effects
294 over the risks, exponentiated parameters, i.e. minimum, quartiles, and maximum,
295 associated with each variable for all states in the GGWR and the global values

296 corresponding to the GLM. Pearson residuals associated with the GGWR are shown in
 297 **Figure 3B**, showing that the worst fit corresponded to two states: Veracruz and Yucatan.

298

299 **Figure 3. Figures associated with the selection and goodness-of-fit of a**
 300 **multivariable generalized geographically weighted model (GGWR); with a Poisson**
 301 **distribution, offset, and a logarithm link function, used to explain tested case-fatality**
 302 **risks.** A) Correlation plot including the raw risks, and B) Representation of Pearson
 303 residuals by state.

304 **Table 2:** Statistics by variable (minimum, maximum, and quartiles) associated with the
 305 multiplicative effects by state over the tested case-fatality risks under the GGWR and
 306 analogous effects and p-values associated with a global model (all models consider a
 307 Poisson distribution, offset term, and logarithmic link function).

Variable	Min	1st quartile	Median	3rd quartile	Max	Global	
						Effect	p-value
Intercept	0.004	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	<0.001
Diabetes	1.147	1.148	1.150	1.151	1.154	1.152	<0.001
Obesity	1.121	1.122	1.123	1.125	1.125	1.122	<0.001
ICU (residual)	1.219	1.220	1.220	1.222	1.225	1.223	<0.001
GDP (modified)	1.298	1.298	1.298	1.300	1.307	1.304	<0.001
Internal migration	1.250	1.252	1.262	1.268	1.276	1.267	<0.001
External migration	1.322	1.323	1.325	1.332	1.361	1.349	0.018
Age group 10-39	0.907	0.907	0.908	0.909	0.910	0.908	<0.001
Intubated (residual)	1.214	1.216	1.219	1.221	1.222	1.219	<0.001
Physicians' ratio	1.845	1.853	1.856	1.859	1.865	1.866	<0.001
Cardiovascular Hospitalization (residual)	0.948	0.951	0.953	0.954	0.955	0.951	0.478
	0.957	0.957	0.957	0.959	0.960	0.958	0.009

308

309 ***Predictors of COVID-19 spatial lethality in Mexico***

310 The exponentiated estimated parameters under the GGWR for each state were obtained
 311 for each variable (not shown) and maps were obtained based on the .shp file provided in

312 (24). Nevertheless, we only present the maps for those explanatory variables that
313 significantly impacted over the log-transformed t-CFRs in the global model (GLM) (**Figure**
314 **4**). These significant variables were diabetes, obesity, GDP, internal and external
315 migration, age group of 10 to 39 years, and physicians-to-population ratio. However, care
316 should be taken when the map for GDP is interpreted considering this variable
317 corresponds to GDP on states not having the biggest cities, as an interaction term
318 between GDP and a binary variable, thus having a fixed value of zero in four states, which
319 are represented as blank spaces in the map. All estimated terms were interpreted by
320 considering fixed values for all variables except the one being interpreted.

321

322 **Figure 4. Multiplicative estimated effects over the tested case-fatality risks due to**
323 **COVID-19 under a GGWR for those variables that significantly impact the response**
324 **under a global model (Poisson models with offset and a logarithmic link function).**

325

326 Age and metabolic predictors of t-CFRs in Mexico

327 Prevalence of obesity has a global (for all states) significant positive association
328 (multiplicative effect) with the COVID-19 t-CFRs (1.122; 95%CI 1.081-1.166), locally the
329 effect is between 1.120 in Quintana Roo to 1.125 in Sinaloa, having a similar effect on all
330 Mexico, though slightly larger on the north and center. For diabetes, there is also a
331 significant positive association with the t-CFRs (1.152; 95%CI 1.079-1.230) with local
332 effects between 1.147 in Colima to 1.154 in Yucatan, having a positive effect in all
333 Mexico; but specially in the center, south, and Yucatan peninsula. On the other hand, the
334 proportion of individuals between 10 and 39 years old has a significant negative
335 association with the COVID-19 t-CFRs (0.907; 95%CI 0.873-0.944), locally the effect is
336 between 0.907 in Chiapas to 0.910, thus having a similar association in all the country.

337 Mobility and socio-economic predictors of t-CFRs in Mexico

338 The percentage of internal migration in the spatial unit a patient comes from has a
339 significant positive association with the COVID-19 t-CFRs (1.267; 95%CI 1.183-1.356),
340 locally the effect is between 1.250 in Durango to 1.276 in Quintana Roo having more effect
341 in the south, center, and Yucatan peninsula. The percentage of external migration in the
342 spatial unit a patient comes from is also significantly positively associated with the COVID-
343 19 t-CFRs (1.349; 95%CI 1.052-1.728), locally the effect is between 1.322 in Morelos to
344 1.361 in Baja California, this effect exists over all Mexico, but it is stronger in the North and
345 Baja California peninsula. Physicians-to-population ratio is also significantly positively
346 associated with the t-CFRs (1.866; 95%CI 1.625-2.142), with local effects between 1.845
347 in Colima to 1.865 in Yucatan, having a slightly larger effect on the north and Yucatan
348 peninsula. Finally, GDP excluding the states having the biggest cities in the country
349 (Nuevo León, México, Ciudad de México, and Jalisco) is also significantly positively
350 associated with the t-CFRs (1.304; 95%CI 1.198-1.429), locally the effects are between
351 1.298 in Oaxaca and 1.307 in Baja California.

352 **DISCUSSION**

353 Here, we show the relevance of spatial analyses to allow us not only to understand how t-
354 CFRs are distributed along Mexico and the presence of spatial clusters related to COVID-
355 19 t-CFRs , but also how some variables are associated with these risks, with an
356 association that varies along all territory. Through our analysis, we were able to identify
357 spatial units or regions in which care could have been considered to avoid SARS-CoV-2
358 spread and its related adverse outcomes. Identifying these areas, might allow to
359 understand the propagation of the disease in other possible waves of SARS-CoV-2 spread
360 or similar infectious pathogens.

361 Considering the global results, variables that are significantly associated with an increase
362 on the COVID-19 t-CFRs include percentages associated with diabetes, obesity, external
363 and internal migration, physicians-to-population ratio, and GDP in states that do not

364 include one of the greatest four cities in Mexico, whereas the proportion of individuals
365 between 10 to 39 years old is significantly associated with a decrease on the risks. The
366 association of cardio-metabolic diseases with adverse COVID-19 outcomes has been well
367 documented and has been linked to mild, but sustained chronic inflammation, which may
368 synergize with the cytokine storm associated with severe SARS-CoV-2 infection (25).
369 Regarding other type of factors, internal and external migration have a very strong
370 association with an increase of COVID-19 mortality, being external migration the variable
371 with the second highest impact. This phenomenon is very particular for infectious diseases
372 where greater movements of people move a disease from a geographical zone to another,
373 which has occurred for instance for *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* or HIV/AIDS (26–28). The
374 other two variables are related to urbanization, density, and economic importance of the
375 states, specially physicians-to-population ratio. From the correlation plot, it can be seen
376 that there is a very large positive association between physicians-to-population ratio and
377 population density and overcrowded households, and a large negative association
378 between this variable and both the rural and poverty proportions by state. On the other
379 hand, the positive association between GDP and the fatality risks might also be related
380 with states in which, due to the importance of economic activity, mobility could not be
381 stopped after self-isolation measures, but that also do not have the health infrastructure
382 that those states with the biggest cities have, in which, in spite of having many cases,
383 there were less deaths.

384 The greatest t-CFRs, both raw and smoothed, corresponded to the states of Chihuahua,
385 Quintana Roo, Baja California, and Tabasco (raw values of 5.11%, 4.79%, 4.34%, and
386 4.25%, respectively). It is noticeable how the relative risks in all these states have values
387 between 2.5 and 3, suggesting that in these states the risks are above of what is nationally
388 expected. We observed the presence of a spatial cluster concerning states with low risks;

389 however, at least till the date associated with our dataset, there was no important
390 clustering of states with high risks using the LISA technique.

391 The fact that Quintana Roo is an important touristic center explains the presence of
392 COVID-19 cases. However, according to our models, the elevated t-CFR is mostly
393 associated with the presence of diabetes and internal migration, besides of the physicians-
394 to-population ratio, whose possible interpretation was discussed above. In Chihuahua and
395 Baja California, the variables with a particular positive association with t-CFR were
396 external migration, obesity, and GDP, whereas in Tabasco these variables correspond to
397 diabetes and internal migration.

398 Globally, physicians-to-population ratio, which is heavily associated with more urbanity,
399 overcrowding households and population density, and with less poverty, has the highest
400 positive effect on the t-CFRs, though relatively similar on all Mexico. External migration
401 has the second highest association with the t-CFRs particularly in those states in the north
402 in which the risks were the highest, whereas internal migration has the fourth highest
403 association, after GDP, with particular importance in the center, south, and Yucatan
404 peninsula. The effect of obesity and diabetes over the risks is similar; for obesity, there is
405 relatively a similar impact on all the country, whereas for diabetes there is a little higher
406 effect on the center, south, and Yucatan peninsula. Age between 10 and 39 years old was
407 the only variable associated with a less risks, which agrees with previous results analyzed
408 using Mexican data, having a relatively similar effect on all the country (4,10).

409 Economic effects, such as poverty, may be better studied in a disaggregated model
410 including it as a measure at an individual level. Unfortunately, such information is
411 unavailable in the epidemiological data set, and at most, information concerning poverty at
412 a municipality level could be attached to each individual, being state the spatial unit
413 containing municipalities. However; we would still be using aggregated values and in the
414 methodology used to calculate poverty in Mexico, the state values are estimators obtained

415 from a representative sample, whereas the municipality values are estimated through
416 small area estimation techniques; thus, being the former more reliable. In this sense, all
417 analyses were performed at a state instead of at a municipal level. The reason behind this
418 decision is that there were a lot of municipalities with zero values in the early time point we
419 chose to focus our analysis, in both the number of COVID-19 cases and mortality and
420 modelling such information with the probability distributions available for GGWR and other
421 spatial linear models would not be possible. To obtain similar results we would require
422 different tools, as zero-inflated geographical models. This could be possible future
423 research work, including the identification of what are the characteristics of those
424 municipalities with zero cases of the disease or no mortality. Additional future work
425 corresponds also to analyze the data from a spatio-temporal framework, thus, the data set
426 could be updated and the risks and associated factors followed through time for each
427 state.

428 Our results are robust in terms of the model since it fits the data well and most of the
429 statistical assumptions were satisfied; and, though there is some overdispersion, after
430 fitting a quasi-Poisson linear model, we obtained the same results except that external
431 migration was now significant at a 0.1 level. In terms of confounders, we fitted models with
432 these variables as they are, as residuals, and as the first component in a Principal
433 Component Analysis, finding in all cases that obesity, GDP, internal migration, age group
434 of 10 to 39 years, and physicians-to-population ratio were significant.

435 In terms of the response, we obtained risks with the projected population in 2020 as
436 denominator (population-fatality or mortality risks), and obtained similar results (maps) as
437 the ones we present here, in terms of which states are on the highest quantiles, and in
438 terms of similar clustering (29). Of notice is that using the projected values, we found a
439 High-High cluster we did not find before in the Baja California peninsula. In fact, through
440 the use of the Kulldorff's spatial scan statistic (30), we also identified a cluster there,

441 including three additional states (Sonora, Chihuahua, and Sinaloa); thus, it seems that a
442 cluster in the north of higher risks exists, though it was not identified using the LISA
443 methodology. Linear models using the projected values equivalent to the ones we fitted
444 provided also similar results. For instance, in a model including the same variables as in
445 our final model, we found the same variables significantly associated with the risks and
446 direction of the association, except for diabetes, which was no longer significant. Analyses
447 at an individual level were also fitted, using generalized (logistic) linear mixed models with
448 a random intercept for state, and including mostly health related variables since socio-
449 economic features are only at a state-level. We found that hospitalized status should be
450 used separately from ICU and intubated, and that after taking care of multicollinearity, the
451 results were similar as the ones at a state-level, in terms that variables significantly
452 associated with the risks were still obesity, diabetes, and age group of 10 to 39 years, plus
453 hypertension and cardiovascular.

454 It is important to notice that we are studying fatality risks associated with those individuals
455 tested for the disease (t-CFRs); thus, care should be taken if results want to be
456 extrapolated. As mentioned above, by using the projected population in 2020, instead of
457 the tested individuals to model the mortality (population-fatality) risks, we obtained similar
458 significant associations between the variables and risks, except for diabetes. However, we
459 think this analysis is somewhat inaccurate in the sense that all health-related variables
460 correspond to prevalence in individuals in the data set, which do not necessarily agree
461 with those in the population, the same for age, and if we used population values by state,
462 we would waste all the information in the epidemiological data, except for the number of
463 deaths. Another option could have been to study case-fatality risks, thus considering the
464 number of deaths and people infected; however, a similar problem arises, the real number
465 of people with the disease is much larger than those being tested and results cannot be
466 extrapolated, and this type of analysis is out of the scope of this study. Additionally, in any

467 analysis, the number of infected and/or deaths are even more poorly estimated when
468 analyzing the early spread of the disease, particularly in Mexico, in which not enough
469 population had been tested. Despite these limitations, we were able to identify some
470 spatial predictors of fatality risks associated with COVID-19 at an early stage of the
471 pandemic, likely reflecting factors which could have been addressed to mitigate SARS-
472 CoV-2 spread.

473 In conclusion, metabolic diseases, internal and external migration, physicians-to-
474 population ratio, GDP per capita in states without the biggest cities, and age group
475 between 10 to 39 years old were significantly associated with early COVID-19 fatality risks
476 in Mexico. These predictors likely influence the growth of the pandemic moving forward,
477 but variables as prevalence of metabolic diseases cannot be easily modified in the short-
478 term. However, the identification of important variables in Mexico associated with the risks
479 and in specific geographical areas, could help to decide necessary public policies which
480 could have long-term impacts on future epidemic scenarios. Even though, this is an
481 analysis in an early stage of SARS-CoV-2 spread, it allows us to understand how the
482 pandemic evolved within Mexico and the possible measures that should be addressed for
483 additional waves or similar diseases in Mexico and in specific zones of the country.

484

485 **ORCID**

486 Ricardo Ramírez-Aldana: 0000-0003-4344-2928

487 Juan Carlos Gómez-Verján: 0000-0001-7186-8067

488 Omar Yaxmehen Bello-Chavolla: 0000-0003-3093-937X

489 Carmen García Peña: 0000-0002-9380-6964

490 **Author contributions:** Conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, validation, and
491 supervision: RRA. Software and data curation: OYBC and RRA. Investigation and

492 resources: JCGV and RRA. Analyses interpretation and writing (original draft, review, and
493 editing): CGP, JCGV, OYBC, and RRA. Visualization: OYBC and RRA.

494 **Conflict of Interest:**

495 Nothing to disclose.

496 **Funding:**


497 This project was supported by a grant from the Secretaría de Educación, Ciencia,
498 Tecnología e Innovación de la Ciudad de México CM-SECTEI/041/2020 “Red
499 Colaborativa de Investigación Traslacional para el Envejecimiento Saludable de la Ciudad
500 de México (RECITES)”


501 **REFERENCES**


- 502 1. Coronavirus Update (Live): 22,787,319 Cases and 795,367 Deaths from COVID-19
503 Virus Pandemic - Worldometer [Internet]. [cited 2020 Aug 20]. Available from:
504 <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/>
- 505 2. Zhou P, Yang X-L, Wang X-G, Hu B, Zhang L, Zhang W, et al. A pneumonia
506 outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature*. 2020 Feb
507 3;579(7798):270–273.
- 508 3. Javelle E, Raoult D. COVID-19 pandemic more than a century after the Spanish flu.
509 *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020 Aug 11;
- 510 4. Bello-Chavolla OY, Bahena-López JP, Antonio-Villa NE, Vargas-Vázquez A,
511 González-Díaz A, Márquez-Salinas A, et al. Predicting Mortality Due to SARS-CoV-
512 2: A Mechanistic Score Relating Obesity and Diabetes to COVID-19 Outcomes in
513 Mexico. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2020 Aug 1;105(8).
- 514 5. McGonagle D, Sharif K, O’Regan A, Bridgewood C. The Role of Cytokines including
515 Interleukin-6 in COVID-19 induced Pneumonia and Macrophage Activation
516 Syndrome-Like Disease. *Autoimmun Rev*. 2020 Jun;19(6):102537.
- 517 6. Bello-Chavolla OY, Rojas-Martinez R, Aguilar-Salinas CA, Hernández-Avila M.
518 Epidemiology of diabetes mellitus in Mexico. *Nutr Rev*. 2017;75(suppl 1):4–12.
- 519 7. Warning For The U.S.: Diabetes And Coronavirus Cocktail Killing Young People In
520 Mexico [Internet]. [cited 2020 Aug 20]. Available from:
521 [https://www.forbes.com/sites/andrewwright/2020/05/24/warning-for-the-us-diabetes-](https://www.forbes.com/sites/andrewwright/2020/05/24/warning-for-the-us-diabetes-and-coronavirus-cocktail-killing-young-people-in-mexico/#7f3e096748fa)
522 [and-coronavirus-cocktail-killing-young-people-in-mexico/#7f3e096748fa](https://www.forbes.com/sites/andrewwright/2020/05/24/warning-for-the-us-diabetes-and-coronavirus-cocktail-killing-young-people-in-mexico/#7f3e096748fa)
- 523 8. Zhou Y, Xu R, Hu D, Yue Y, Li Q, Xia J. Effects of human mobility restrictions on the
524 spread of COVID-19 in Shenzhen, China: a modelling study using mobile phone
525 data. *The Lancet Digital Health*. 2020 Aug;2(8):e417–e424.

- 526 9. Cruz-Pacheco G, Bustamante-Castañeda JF, Caputo JG, Jiménez-Corona ME,
527 Ponce-de-León-Rosales S. Dispersion of a new coronavirus sars-cov-2 by airlines in
528 2020: temporal estimates of the outbreak in Mexico. *Rev Invest Clin*.
529 2020;72(3):138–143.
- 530 10. Bello-Chavolla OY, González-Díaz A, Antonio-Villa NE, Fermín-Martínez CA,
531 Márquez-Salinas A, Vargas-Vázquez A, et al. Unequal impact of structural health
532 determinants and comorbidity on COVID-19 severity and lethality in older Mexican
533 adults: Considerations beyond chronological aging. *J Gerontol A, Biol Sci Med Sci*.
534 2020 Jun 29;
- 535 11. Moroni L, Bianchi I, Lleo A. Geoepidemiology, gender and autoimmune disease.
536 *Autoimmun Rev*. 2012 May;11(6-7):A386–92.
- 537 12. Restrepo-Jiménez P, Molano-González N, Anaya J-M. Geoepidemiology of
538 Sjögren's syndrome in Latin America. *Joint Bone Spine*. 2019 Oct;86(5):620–626.
- 539 13. Chen WM, Zhou QR, Wang XM, Mao HS, Wang P, Zhou L, et al. [Integration of
540 spatial epidemiology and molecular epidemiology used for study on tuberculosis].
541 *Zhonghua Liu Xing Bing Xue Za Zhi*. 2016 Dec 10;37(12):1683–1686.
- 542 14. Datos Abiertos - Dirección General de Epidemiología | Secretaría de Salud |
543 Gobierno | gob.mx [Internet]. [cited 2020 Apr 18]. Available from:
544 <https://www.gob.mx/salud/documentos/datos-abiertos-152127?idiom=es>
- 545 15. Metodología para la medición de pobreza en México | CONEVAL [Internet]. [cited
546 2020 Aug 20]. Available from:
547 <https://www.coneval.org.mx/Medicion/MP/Paginas/Metodologia.aspx#:~:text=Metodo>
548 [log%C3%ADa%20para%20la%20medici%C3%B3n%20multidimensional%20de%20](https://www.coneval.org.mx/Medicion/MP/Paginas/Metodologia.aspx#:~:text=Metodo)
549 [la%20pobreza%20en%20M%C3%A9xico.&text=De%20esta%20forma%2C%20el%20](https://www.coneval.org.mx/Medicion/MP/Paginas/Metodologia.aspx#:~:text=Metodo)
550 [Consejo,y%20medici%C3%B3n%20de%20la%20pobreza.](https://www.coneval.org.mx/Medicion/MP/Paginas/Metodologia.aspx#:~:text=Metodo)
- 551 16. Secretaria de Comunicaciones y Transportes: 5.5 Estadística Operacional de
552 Aeropuertos / Statistics by Airport [Internet]. [cited 2020 Nov 18]. Available from:
553 [http://www.sct.gob.mx/transporte-y-medicina-preventiva/aeronautica-civil/5-](http://www.sct.gob.mx/transporte-y-medicina-preventiva/aeronautica-civil/5-estadistica/55-estadistica-operacional-de-aeropuertos-statistics-by-airport/)
554 [estadistica/55-estadistica-operacional-de-aeropuertos-statistics-by-airport/](http://www.sct.gob.mx/transporte-y-medicina-preventiva/aeronautica-civil/5-estadistica/55-estadistica-operacional-de-aeropuertos-statistics-by-airport/)
- 555 17. Bello-Chavolla OY, Antonio-Villa NE, Vargas-Vázquez A, Fermín-Martínez CA,
556 Márquez-Salinas A, Bahena-López JP. Profiling cases with non-respiratory
557 symptoms and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections in Mexico City. *Clin Infect Dis*.
558 2020 Aug 28;
- 559 18. Rate Transformations and Smoothing Luc Anselin | Semantic Scholar [Internet].
560 [cited 2020 Apr 17]. Available from: [https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Rate-](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Rate-Transformations-and-Smoothing-Luc-Anselin-Lozano-Koschinsky/88d8b02de84f97f556cfe0ef5a91a7df229cf363#paper-header)
561 [Transformations-and-Smoothing-Luc-Anselin-Lozano-](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Rate-Transformations-and-Smoothing-Luc-Anselin-Lozano-Koschinsky/88d8b02de84f97f556cfe0ef5a91a7df229cf363#paper-header)
562 [Koschinsky/88d8b02de84f97f556cfe0ef5a91a7df229cf363#paper-header](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Rate-Transformations-and-Smoothing-Luc-Anselin-Lozano-Koschinsky/88d8b02de84f97f556cfe0ef5a91a7df229cf363#paper-header)
- 563 19. Cressie, Noel. *Statistics For Spatial Data* (wiley Classics Library). Revised. Hoboken,
564 NJ: Wiley-interscience; 1993.
- 565 20. Moran PAP. Notes on continuous stochastic phenomena. *Biometrika*. 1950
566 Jun;37(1/2):17.

- 567 21. Anselin L. Local Indicators of Spatial Association-LISA. *Geogr Anal.* 2010 Sep
568 3;27(2):93–115.
- 569 22. Fotheringham, A. S., Brunson, C., and Charlton, M. E. (2002). *Geographically*
570 *weighted regression: the analysis of spatially varying relationships.* Chichester, West
571 *Sussex: John Wiley and Sons.*
- 572
- 573 23. Agresti A. *Categorical Data Analysis.* 3rd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley; 2012.
- 574 24. Porto Tapiquén CE. *Orogénesis Soluciones Geográficas.* Porlamar, Venezuela 2015.
575 *Estados de México". Available from <http://tapiquen-sig.jimdo.com>.*
- 576 25. Bornstein SR, Dalan R, Hopkins D, Mingrone G, Boehm BO. Endocrine and
577 *metabolic link to coronavirus infection. Nat Rev Endocrinol.* 2020;16(6):297–298.
- 578 26. Pareek M, Greenaway C, Noori T, Munoz J, Zenner D. The impact of migration on
579 *tuberculosis epidemiology and control in high-income countries: a review. BMC Med.*
580 *2016 Mar 23;14:48.*
- 581 27. Weine SM, Kashuba AB. Labor migration and HIV risk: a systematic review of the
582 *literature. AIDS Behav.* 2012 Aug;16(6):1605–1621.
- 583 28. Gross B, Zheng Z, Liu S, Chen X, Sela A, Li J, et al. Spatio-temporal propagation of
584 *COVID-19 pandemics. medRxiv.* 2020 Mar 27;
- 585 29. Datos Abiertos de México - Proyecciones de la Población de México y de las
586 *Entidades Federativas, ' ' 2016-2050 - Proyecciones de la Población de los*
587 *Municipios de México, 2015-2030 (base 2) [Internet]. [cited 2020 Nov 19]. Available*
588 *from: [https://datos.gob.mx/busca/dataset/proyecciones-de-la-poblacion-de-mexico-y-](https://datos.gob.mx/busca/dataset/proyecciones-de-la-poblacion-de-mexico-y-de-las-entidades-federativas-2016-2050/resource/ab8243f5-53b3-40bb-8784-2ad44231f642)*
589 *de-las-entidades-federativas-2016-2050/resource/ab8243f5-53b3-40bb-8784-*
590 *2ad44231f642*
- 591 30. Kulldorff M. A spatial scan statistic. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and*
592 *Methods.* 1997 Jan;26(6):1481–1496.
- 593
- 594
- 595

A**B**

A**B****C**

A**B**