Quantitative Analysis of the Effectiveness of Public Health Measures on COVID-19 Transmission

Thiago Christiano Silva*

Universidade de São Paulo, Ribeirão Preto, Brazil

Universidade Católica de Brasília, Brasília, Brazil

Leandro Anghinoni

Universidade de São Paulo, São Carlos, Brazil

Liang Zhao

Universidade de São Paulo, Ribeirão Preto, Brazil

Abstract

Although COVID-19 has spread almost all over the world, social isolation is still a controversial public health policy and governments of many countries still doubt its level of effectiveness. This situation can create deadlocks in places where there is a discrepancy among municipal, state and federal policies. The exponential increase of the number of infectious people and deaths in the last days shows that the COVID-19 epidemics is still at its early stage in Brazil and such political disarray can lead to very serious results. In this work, we study the COVID-19 epidemics in Brazilian cities using early-time approximations of the SIR model in networks. Different from other works, the underlying network is constructed by feeding real-world data on local COVID-19 cases reported by Brazilian cities to a regularized vector autoregressive model, which estimates directional COVID-19 transmission channels (links) of every pair of cities (vertices) using spectral network analysis. Our results reveal that social isolation and, especially, the use of masks can effectively reduce the transmission rate of COVID-19 in Brazil. We also build counterfactual scenarios to measure the human impact of these public health measures in terms of reducing the number of COVID-19 cases at the epidemics peak. We find that the efficiency of social isolation and of using of masks differs significantly across cities. For instance, we find that they would potentially decrease the COVID-19 epidemics peak in São Paulo (SP) and Brasília (DF) by 15% and 25%, respectively. We hope our study can support the design of further public health measures.

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, health policy, network, VAR, SIR

1. Introduction

The quick spread of the COVID-19 across countries has evidenced the high degree of interconnectedness worldwide. In less than six months, the COVID-19 epicenter traveled around the globe, starting in China, then moving to Italy, and to the US. The [Coronavirus Resource Center at the John Hopkins](#)

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

*Corresponding author. Email: thiago.christiano.silva@usp.br. Address: Universidade Católica de Brasília, SGAN 916 Módulo B Avenida W5, CEP 70790-160, Asa Norte, Brasília, DF.

University registers more than 4 million cases of the COVID-19 spread around 187 affected countries, i.e., roughly 96% of all countries recognized by the United Nations. Factors of such a rapid spreading include large flows of international air transportation, enabling cross-country jumps of the new coronavirus. Recently, the airline industry has been experiencing large drops in revenue mainly because of international border closures implemented by governments worldwide to detain “imported transmissions” of the virus. However, COVID-19 cases still substantially grow inside borders and represent a serious health concern of several countries across the globe. In this scenario, we can say that concerns about cross-country transmission have reduced and the understanding of the COVID-19 domestic transmission has gained much relevance.

This paper focuses on the COVID-19 domestic transmission in Brazil, which already registers cases in all 27 states as depicted in Figure 1a. We analyze the efficiency of public health measures—such as social isolation/quarantine and use of masks—in mitigating the COVID-19 transmission in the country using an innovative network-based approach that accounts for intra and intercity COVID-19 transmission channels. There are several unique features that make Brazil an important case study. First, there is a political confusion about the effectiveness of social isolation by the Brazilian federal and state governments [1]. The exponential increase in the number of infectious people and deaths in the last days indicates that such political disarray can lead to very serious results. Second, Brazil contains the 6th largest population in the world. Thus, the human impact of the COVID-19 can be substantial if not properly mitigated and a second wave of cross-country spillovers could be potentially sizable in the future.¹ Third, Brazil has significant socioeconomic and cultural disparities across its 5,570 cities. Therefore, COVID-19 transmission and mortality rates may largely differ across cities, such as evidenced in Figures 1a–1b. The model proposed in this paper is able to estimate these city-specific COVID-19 transmission rates, thus accounting for their distinctive aspects. Fourth, WHO reports show that Latin America will most probably be the next epicenter of the COVID-19 outbreak. Since Brazil is the largest Latin American country and borders 83% of all South American countries, an understanding of the regional aspects of the COVID-19 transmission is crucial for designing public health measures.

Most countries in the Americas are still facing the early stages of the COVID-19 and Brazil is no different. While it is important to have a full picture of the pandemic in each country to better design government policies aimed at mitigating the COVID-19 spread considering their local particularities, the omission of the government in taking effective measures at the onset of the epidemics can have large human and economic effects in the long term. Some eastern countries, such as China, South Korea and Singapore, may be an indication that having previous organized policies and mask usage culture are key to successfully mitigate the death toll. In this work, we consider only the availability of early-time data on the COVID-19 dynamics, thus better reflecting the real-world conditions that most governments are facing.

The dynamic of the COVID-19 epidemics is not only determined by the local aspects of cities. There is a continuous flow of persons from and to different cities either through roadways, domestic airlines, or sea routes that could transport the disease. However, these intercity transmission spillovers are not limited to biological risk factors. For instance, economic activities could also be related to the propensity of acquiring the virus from other places, such as when households or firms buy supplies abroad that are conditioned on surfaces that the virus is viable for long periods without proper sanitation.²

¹In [2], the authors projects recurrent wintertime outbreaks of SARS-CoV-2 will occur after the initial pandemic wave. They argue that prolonged or intermittent social distancing could be necessary up to 2022. Even with apparent elimination, the authors state that the resurgence in contagion could be possible as late as 2024.

²Studies have show that the virus is more stable on smooth surfaces, such as plastic and stainless steel (detectable up to 7 days), and is very sensitive to temperature (the inactivation time is reduced to 5 mins at 70 degrees Celsius)[3]. The aerosol and surface stability of SARS-CoV-2 is similar to SARS-CoV-1, with a half-life of about 1hr in the form of aerosol and up to 7hrs on plastic surfaces. Other surfaces, such as copper, cardboard and stainless steel have also long half-life values, ranging from 1 to 6 hours [4].

Figure 1: COVID-19 geographical spreading pattern in Brazil in terms of (a) COVID-19 cases at the city level and (b) mortality rate at the state level as of May 8, 2020. Gray areas represent cities that have not reported any COVID-19 epidemiological bulletin. We evaluate mortality rates by taking the ratio of the number of deaths due to COVID-19 to the number of infectious persons. Mortality rates are probably upward biased because the number of observed infectious persons is likely to be underestimated, as the COVID-19 may pass unnoticed for some cases (mild or no adverse conditions at all). We report mortality rates at the state rather than city level because there are many cities with few COVID-19 cases and deaths, which would distort the estimated mortality rates.

This transmission dynamic renders each city subject not only to its inherent “COVID-19 natural transmission rate” dictated by the local aspects of the city itself—such as demography, culture, law, and weather—but also from outside the city. Our model permits to estimate transmission rates of each city while accounting for infectious factors from the outside using the Susceptible-Infectious-Recovered (SIR) model in a special type of transmission network among cities.

We take an innovative approach to construct the underlying COVID-19 transmission network among cities. Even though we apply the model for the COVID-19 propagation inside Brazil, the model is general and could be applied for any networked environment, such as in cross-country studies or even more granular approaches than at the city level. We model such network using a weighted directed graph. Vertices are cities and links represent potential COVID-19 contagion/spillovers from one city to another. To estimate the links, we consider a panel-format data³ composed of city-specific COVID-19 infectious counts of locals over time. We then use a vector autoregressive (VAR) model to find directional COVID-19 transmissions of every pair of cities in the network. Since the seminal paper of [5], VARs have provided key empirical input into substantive economic and financial aspects. Despite the robustness of the model, their use in epidemiology is still a new topic. Here, we design a VAR model that explicitly considers the temporal ordering of the disease spreading. We let every city-specific infectious count be dependent not only on its own past value but also from all other cities. The weights of past values of each city j that influence the current city i 's infectious local count are the links in our network. Such links are estimated by fitting the entire network structure to temporal

³A panel data is composed of n multivariate time series, each representing the evolution of COVID-19 cases of a specific city. It is a mixture of *cross-sectional data*—in which we observe n cities all in a specific time point—and *time series data*—in which we observe a single individual over time.

city-specific infectious count data. We mitigate concerns with parameter overfitting by using an elastic net regularization scheme during training time⁴ and one-step ahead rolling validation methodologies borrowed from the machine learning literature.⁵

An interesting property of the early-time dynamics of a SIR model is that it still enables us to estimate the transmission rate β of the model. Given the recovery rate γ of infectious persons,⁶ then the model can be completely described [11], including late-time dynamics and infectious peak. It is worth mentioning that the rate γ can be divided into two parts, the time from onset to death and the time from onset to recovery. Both can vary from country to country, since they are highly correlated to demographics, health care system and the treatments available. The onset to recovery time is, however, invariant to the topological structure of the system and, therefore, we use an average value of 14 days in all scenarios of our study

In early-time dynamics, the effective transmission rate β of an *isolated SIR* and a *networked SIR* model differs by the spectrum of the estimated COVID-19 transmission network. When we do not consider the network environment, we are effectively supposing the existence of a single large city composed of all cities in the model. In this way, the susceptibility of being infected depends on the total number of infected (all cities). The introduction of multiple cities effectively reduces this propensity by imposing that the likelihood of being infected is higher inside cities rather than across cities. The network spectrum corresponds to the largest eigenvalue of the network adjacency matrix. If the isolated SIR has a transmission rate β , then the networked SIR will have an effective transmission rate of $\beta_{\text{eff}} = \lambda_{\text{max}}\beta$, in which λ_{max} is the largest eigenvalue of the network. The network spectrum encodes all the graph structure in terms of its ability of spreading and amplifying intercity contagion at early time.

In this paper, we also analyze the efficiency of health policy measures implemented by the Brazilian government to mitigate the COVID-19 propagation. Social isolation and quarantine measures were adopted by several states at different time scales. Following that, the Brazilian Health Ministry recommended the use of masks at the federal level. Political disagreements on the effectiveness of quarantine measures by the federal and state governments were on display and may have lead the population into confusion, thus affecting the efficacy of such measures. Our work contributes to this discussion by estimating the joint efficacy of these measures.

We find that the quarantine and use of masks measures decreased the growth rate of the spectrum of the COVID-19 transmission network over time, suggesting that the measures were effective. To get a sense, Figure 2 portrays the average COVID-19 growth rate of cities in the state of São Paulo segregated in terms of their average social distancing index in the period.⁷ First, after the use of masks recommendation, the COVID-19 growth rate, in general, decreased. However, it decreased more in cities of São Paulo with low social distancing measures. This may be due to the fact that these cities

⁴The elastic net is composed of a convex combination of the Lasso (L_1) and Ridge (L_2 norm) regularization. We refer the reader to the seminal work of [6] for further details.

⁵Parameter overfitting becomes a serious concern when we have several cities in the model. For instance, we apply our method to Brazilian data, which is a country with vast territorial dimensions and with more 5,570 cities (end of 2019). In this case, we would have to estimate $5,570 \times 5,570 \approx 31$ million parameters with only a few time points (because we only have early-time data). Ensuring regularization is vital to have reasonable out-of-sample estimates. See [7] for more details on regularization of VAR models.

⁶The recovery rate can be estimated from the timeline between the appearance of symptoms and the case resolution. Several ongoing studies report estimates for the recovery rate. For instance, the authors in [8] assumes that the duration of the infection ranges from 15 to 20 days. Data from the outbreak in Wuhan show an onset-to-death time of 17.8 days and an onset-to-recovery time of 24.7 days [9]. This results are, however, biased to higher values due to the overwhelmed health care system in Wuhan in the early days of the outbreak and the sub-notification of the outcome of mild-cases. Reports from WHO indicate a recovery time of 14 days for mild cases and 21-42 days for severe cases. Among those who die the onset to outcome ranges from 14 to 56 days [10]. Since the mild cases account for most of the cases, we set gamma to 14 days in this study.

⁷Such index represents the extent of compliance of the population to the quarantine measures.

Figure 2: Average COVID-19 growth rate in cities of the state of São Paulo, Brazil, with low, medium, and high social-distancing indices. Available data goes until May 8, 2020. The first vertical line is the beginning of SP quarantine, while the second represents the use of mask recommendation by the federal government. Data from social distancing is public and comes from the [São Paulo State Government](#) (in Portuguese). To alleviate week seasonality, we use 7-day moving averages to construct the average growth rates. The low, medium, and high social-distancing indices represent the bottom, middle, and upper terciles of the corresponding distribution. Data from the number of infectious persons per each city is discussed in Section 4.1.

could have more potential close human-to-human contact and therefore the use of masks is crucial to detain the COVID-19 transmission. To get a sense of the human impact of such measures, we build counterfactual scenarios in which we consider that none of these measures were taken by the government. By running the SIR model in networks, we find that the quarantine and the use of masks recommendation reduced the peak of the COVID-19 epidemics, on average, in 15% in São Paulo (SP) and almost 25% in Brasília (DF), when we look at the average effect in the last week of available data (May 2 to 8, 2020). This reduction is explained by the flattening of the epidemics curve: São Paulo (SP) and Brasília (DF) have peak date shifts from July 7 to July 24 and August 29 to September 28, respectively.

Our results show the increasing trend of infectious cases in the last days, which is confirmed by the updated official data in Brazil. This situation is consistent with the decreasing social isolation rate shown by Figure 2, which, in turn, probably caused by the political discrepancy in public health measure application.

2. Related background and literature

In this section, we present relevant background on SIR models in networks and the related literature about our work.

2.1. Relevant background: early-time dynamic of SIR models in networks

In this section, we present relevant background on the Susceptible-Infectious-Recovered (SIR) model in networks. We refer the reader to [11] for a comprehensive analysis on epidemiological models and to [12] for the seminal paper on the original SIR model. Since we focus on the early-time dynamics of the SIR models, we can assume that the number of births and deaths are much smaller than the population, in a way that the closed population hypothesis holds.

Define as $s_i(t)$, $x_i(t)$, and $r_i(t)$ the share of susceptible, infectious, and recovery persons of city i relative to the local population at time t . In a closed population, the SIR model in networks is governed by the following differential equations:

$$\frac{d}{dt} s_i(t+1) = -\beta \cdot s_i(t) \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} A_{ij} x_j(t) \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} x_i(t+1) = \beta \cdot s_i(t) \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} A_{ij} x_j(t) - \gamma \cdot x_i(t) \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} r_i(t+1) = \gamma \cdot x_i(t) \quad (3)$$

$$1 = s_i(t) + x_i(t) + r_i(t) \quad (4)$$

$\forall i \in \mathcal{V}$ and $t \geq 0$. We can substitute (4) into (2), yielding:

$$\frac{d}{dt} x_i(t+1) = \beta \cdot (1 - x_i(t) - r_i(t)) \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} A_{ij} x_j(t) - \gamma \cdot x_i(t) \quad (5)$$

In early time, i.e., we can assume that $x_i(t) \ll 1$ and $r_i(t) \approx 0$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{V}$. Therefore, we can ignore second-order $x_i(t)$ terms and effectively set $r_i(t)$ to 0. With these modifications, Equation (5) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} x_i(t+1) &= \beta \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} A_{ij} x_j(t) - \gamma \cdot x_i(t) \\ &= \beta \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} \left(A_{ij} - \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \delta_{ij} \right) x_j(t), \\ &= \beta \left(\mathbf{A} - \left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta} \right) \mathbf{I} \right) \mathbf{x}(t) \\ &= \beta \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

in which $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix, $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{A} - \left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta} \right) \mathbf{I}$ is the adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}$ with a homogeneous perturbation of $\frac{\gamma}{\beta}$ in the main diagonal, and $\delta_{ij} = 1$ if $i = j$, and $\delta_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Equation (6) is a standard differential linear system whose solution can be written in terms of the eigenvector basis of the adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}$:

$$\mathbf{x}_i(t) = \sum_{k=1}^V \mathbf{a}_{i,k}(0) e^{(\lambda_k \beta - \gamma)t} \mathbf{v}_{i,k}, \quad (7)$$

in which $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{v}_k = \lambda_k \mathbf{v}_k$ holds $\forall k \in \{1, \dots, V\}$. The term λ_k is the k -th eigenvalue of $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{v}_{i,k}$ is the i -th entry of the eigenvector associated with the k -th eigenvalue. The parameter $\mathbf{a}_{i,k}(0)$ in (7) is a scaling constant that depends on the initial condition of city i .

In early time, the growth rate of equation (7) is government by the exponent term with the largest eigenvalue $\lambda_1 = \lambda_{\max}$ of matrix $\mathbf{A}$, which is a well-known measure from spectral graph theory denominated graph spectrum [13]. Therefore:

$$x_i(t) \approx v_{i,1} e^{(\lambda_{\max}\beta - \gamma)t}, \quad (8)$$

i.e., the growth rate is $\lambda_{\max}\beta - \gamma$ and the probability of contagion is proportional to the eigenvector associated with the largest eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max}$, v_1 , which corresponds to the eigenvector centrality measure of the graph, according to the spectral graph theory [13].

2.2. Relative literature

Basically, there are two strategies to prevent epidemic spreading in networks [14]. One is the efficient immunization protocols and the other is to find out relevant spreaders and activation mechanisms.

Immunization strategies are methods for identification of nodes that shall be immunized, taking into account the network structure. Immunized nodes and all the incident links can be removed from the epidemic network. Immunization can not only protect immunized individuals, but can also reduce the epidemic threshold, precluding the outbreak of the disease. Among various immunization strategies, random immunization protocol is the simplest one, where a fraction of randomly selected nodes are made immune. However, in this case, the immunization threshold tends to be 1 in heterogeneous networks, indicating that almost the whole network must be immunized to suppress the disease [15]. Target immunization protocol considers special nodes to be immunized. In [16, 15], the authors show that the immunization threshold can be exponentially small over a large range of the spreading rate if considers the immunization of a fraction of nodes with the largest degree. Other approaches consider not only the critical nodes, but also the entire prevalence curve (the so-called viral conductance) [17, 18].

Although immunization is a fundamental strategy in the epidemic study, the research community pays also much attention to find out which nodes, links and local structures are most influential or effective in the spreading process [19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26]. These findings aimed at understanding network measures on nodes and links, such as degree, betweenness, K-core index, closeness, link property on spreading dynamics. Besides of finding superspreaders, some researchers also worked on the identification of how topological features influence global epidemics [27, 28, 29].

However, the above mentioned strategies require the discovery of vaccine or at least partial knowledge on the epidemic network under consideration. With the mass and quick spreading of COVID-19, neither of them is a practical method to prevent the outbreak. Therefore, global intervention methods, like social isolation, even lockdown, have already been proven to be efficient. For this reason, we study the effectiveness of public intervention methods. Our results provide strong evidence on the effectiveness of public health measures, such as quarantine and use of masks, to reduce the increasing rate of infection even without detailed information of the highly dynamical population network.

3. Methodology

This section discusses the underpinnings of our methodology. Our analysis consists of the following stages:

1. *Network construction*: we construct the COVID-19 network transmission network by fitting the network links to real data.
2. *COVID-19 epidemics estimation using the SIR model*: we use the network estimated in Step 1 and simulate the COVID-19 evolution in every city of the network.
3. *Effectiveness evaluation of public health policy*: we change the network structure so as to simulate the omission of public health policies and run our epidemics model in Step 2 without the government intervention. We estimate the efficiency of the public health policies by inspecting the change in the COVID-19 epidemics peak.

3.1. Network construction using panel data

Consider the weighted directed graph $\mathcal{G} = \langle \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E} \rangle$ in which $\mathcal{V}$ is the set of vertices and $\mathcal{E}$ is the set of links. There are $V = |\mathcal{V}|$ vertices and $E = |\mathcal{E}|$ links in the network. In our epidemiological application, vertices can represent cities, states, countries, or any well-defined entity or geographical circumscription (neighborhood, street, house etc.). For simplicity and with no loss of generality, we denominate the vertices as cities. We assume as given the set of cities/vertices $\mathcal{V}$. In contrast, links between cities i and j connote potential COVID-19 transmission from i to j and are *a priori* unknown. In the context of cities, city-to-city contagion could happen for a series of reasons, such as when infectious persons visit or migrate or even from intercity transportation of supplies covered in surfaces that the SARS-CoV-2 is viable for long periods. Therefore, the network $\mathcal{G}$ encodes all potential transmission paths between cities be through organic or non-organic media. The goal of this section is to estimate the set of links $\mathcal{E}$, i.e., the intercity COVID-19 transmission channels.

Let $\mathbf{x}(t) = [x_1(t), x_2(t), \dots, x_V(t)]$ denote the vector with shares of infectious persons relative to the local population of every city $i \in \mathcal{V}$ in the network at discrete time $t \geq 0$. Specifically, we denote as $x_i(t) \in [0, 1]$ the share of infectious persons within city i at time t . That is, we take the ratio between the number of infectious persons to the total local population in the city. When $x_i(t) = 1$, then all population in the city is infectious. When $x_i(t) = 0$, none is infectious. In-between values represent partial shares of infectious population. Define the column vector $\mathbf{x}_i = [x_i(0), x_i(1), \dots, x_i(T)]'$ as the COVID-19 time series evolution in city i up to time T , in which the superscript $'$ is the transpose operator. Since we perform an early-time analysis of the epidemics, T is likely to not be large. Let also the matrix $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_V]$, $\dim(\mathbf{X}) = T \times V$, be all the cities' time series with the shares of infectious persons stacked in columns over all period with available data (panel data).

To construct the network, we consider the temporal ordering of the COVID-19 spread across different cities. We attempt to describe the current share of infectious persons vector $\mathbf{x}_t$ with the same vector immediately at the previous time step, i.e., $\mathbf{x}_{t-1}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \boldsymbol{\kappa} + \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t, \quad (9)$$

$\forall t \in \{0, 1, \dots, T\}$. The term $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$, $\dim(\boldsymbol{\kappa}) = V \times 1$, is an intercept column vector; $\mathbf{A}$, $\dim(\mathbf{A}) = V \times V$, is the adjacency matrix encoding the set of links $\mathcal{E}$ of the graph; and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t \sim (0, \Sigma_{\epsilon})$ is the unobservable zero mean white noise vector process (serially uncorrelated or independent) with time-invariant covariance matrix Σ_{ϵ} . Let A_{ij} be the (i, j) -entry of $\mathbf{A}$, $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$. When $A_{ij} > 0$, then city i can spillover COVID-19 to city j . The larger A_{ij} is, the stronger is such contagion. Then, the set of links is given by $\mathcal{E} = \{i, j \in \mathcal{V} : A_{ij} > 0\}$.

The terms $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$, $\mathbf{A}$ in Equation (9) are unknown and are estimated using a fitting process to the observed data $\mathbf{X}$. Equation (9) describes a VAR(1) model. To ensure that the system is stable, the companion matrix must have roots inside the complex unit circle. To guarantee such property, our variables $x_i, i \in \mathcal{V}$, must be stationary. Since they are lower- and upper-bounded—i.e., $x_i \in [0, 1]$ —then they are stationary by construction. Specifically, we minimize the following regularized loss function L [7] using the coordinate descent algorithm [30]:

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \min_{\boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{A}} \sum_{t=0}^T \|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t\|_F^2 + \text{Regularization}(\mathbf{A}) \\ &= \min_{\boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{A}} \sum_{t=0}^T \|\mathbf{y}_t - (\boldsymbol{\kappa} + \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_{t-1})\|_F^2 + \lambda (\alpha \|\mathbf{A}\|_1 + (1 - \alpha) \|\mathbf{A}\|_2), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

in which $\lambda \geq 0$ is the *elastic net* regularization term and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ is the tradeoff parameter between Lasso (L_1 norm) and Ridge (L_2 norm) regularizations. We notate $\|\cdot\|_F$, $\|\cdot\|_1$, $\|\cdot\|_2$ as the Frobenius, L_1 , and L_2 norms, respectively. Larger values of λ encourage sparser networks. The first term represents minimization of the error term $\epsilon_t, \forall t \in 0, 1, \dots, T$, and ensures that the estimated adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}$ better reflects the COVID-19 transmission dynamics over time. The second term is a regularization term over the adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}$ introduced to prevent overfitting and ensure that the estimation is numerically tractable. We do not regularize the intercept vector κ because it conceptually adapts to the city-specific average values of our data.

There is an empirical challenge in fitting the adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}$ to the panel data $\mathbf{X}$ when we are dealing with large-scale networks in which the number of cities V largely surpasses the number of available time points T , i.e., when $V \gg T$. Such problem is aggravated when we only have early-time information about the disease, i.e., T is small. In this case, we would incur in overparametrization and overfitting is a concern. The regularization term in (10) mitigates such concern. We opt for an *elastic net* regularization scheme because it is a robust regularizer that combines positive features of Lasso and Ridge regularizations [30].

Due to the temporal dependency of the panel data, the usual k -fold cross-validation is not well-suited for our model selection procedure. Following [7], we optimize the penalty parameters λ and α in (10) using a h -step ahead mean-square forecast error (MSFE). Due to data availability, we keep $h = 1$ so as to minimize further data losses. We divide the data into three equally-spaced and contiguous periods: (i) initialization ($t \in \{0, \dots, T_1\}$), (ii) training ($t \in \{T_1 + 1, \dots, T_2\}$), and (iii) forecast evaluation ($t \in \{T_2 + 1, \dots, T\}$), in which $T_1 = \lfloor \frac{T}{3} \rfloor$ and $T_2 = \lfloor \frac{2T}{3} \rfloor$. We also use a rolling validation process as follows. We first fit the model using all data up to time T_1 and forecast $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{T_1+1}^{(\lambda_c, \alpha_c)}$, in which λ_c and α_c are fixed candidate penalty terms. We then sequentially add one observation at a time and repeat this process until $T_2 - 1$. Then, we choose the penalty terms λ and α that minimize the one-step ahead MSFE given by:

$$MSFE(\lambda, \alpha) = \frac{1}{T_2 - T_1} \sum_{t=T_1}^{T_2-1} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}^{(\lambda, \alpha)} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1} \right\|_F^2. \quad (11)$$

Finally, we estimate the one-step ahead forecast accuracy using data points in $t \in \{T_2, \dots, T\}$, which have not been used in the model selection procedure. To better assess the potentiality of the network in amplifying contagion across different municipalities, we remove the self-loops in the estimated network, which correspond to the influence of the local infectious population on its own future value.

3.2. Estimating transmission rate in early-time epidemics networks

In this section, we assume the network structure $\mathcal{G} = \langle \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E} \rangle$ as given, i.e., the set of vertices and links are already established in accordance with the network construction described in Section 3.1. We start from the results of the early-time dynamic of SIR models in networks described in Section 2.1. Therein, we show that the growth rate at early time is determined by $\lambda_{\max} \beta - \gamma$ (see Equation (8)). Therefore, the graph spectrum $\lambda_{\max}$ modulates the transmission rate parameter by either amplifying or dampening the contagion speed.

If $\lambda_{\max} \beta > \gamma$, then Equation (8) grows exponentially, while it decays when $\lambda_{\max} \beta < \gamma$. Therefore, the reproduction number (critical point) is $R_0 = \frac{\lambda_{\max} \beta}{\gamma}$. Recall that the reproduction number in the SIR model without network is $R_0 = \frac{\beta}{\gamma}$ [12]. Therefore, the reproduction numbers of both models differ by the graph spectrum of $\mathbf{A}$, $\lambda_{\max}$.

Equation (8) assumes that every city in the model has a single growth rate dynamics dictated by the term

$\lambda_{\max}\beta - \gamma$. Changes in the epidemics spreading for each city would then be fully determined by their eigenvector centralities, because growth rates are identical across cities (see Equation (8)). However, studies show that the transmission rate parameter β is dependent on local aspects of cities [11]. In contrast, the recovery rate parameter is much less variable across different places. As mentioned earlier in this study, WHO indicates an average recovery time of 14 days for mild cases. Therefore, we consider a different transmission rate for each city in the network β_i while letting fixed the recovery rate γ for all cities. We can still apply the classical framework of SIR in networks because, even though transmission rates are city specific, they tend to be normally distributed around some mean natural value. That is, large deviations are unusual. We empirically find this fact using our application to the Brazilian case. Mathematically, we rewrite (8) as follows:

$$x_i(t) \approx v_{i,1} e^{(\lambda_1 \beta_i - \gamma)t}. \quad (12)$$

We can linearize (12) by simply taking the $\log(\cdot)$ at both sides of the equation for each city i in the network:

$$\log(x_i(t)) = \log(v_{1,i}) + (\lambda_1 \beta_i - \gamma)t, \quad (13)$$

$\forall i \in \mathcal{V}$. The LHS and RHS are always non-negative, because $x(0) \geq 0$ and is non-decreasing (early-time assumption), $e^{(\lambda_1 \beta_i - \gamma)t} \geq 0$ (asymptotically speaking), and $v_{1,i} \geq 0$ [13]. We can then apply the $\log(\cdot)$ without any restrictions. We can estimate (13) for all cities i at once by adding dummies for the constant and time-dependent term for each city in the model (2 dummies per each city). We end up with a set of $2n - 1$ dummy variables, because the last one is the reference dummy. Since we have a panel data with temporal dependencies (the same city appears multiple times), we use a linear panel-data estimation model [31] as follows:

$$x_i(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} \delta_{ij} [\alpha_j + \rho_j \cdot t] + \epsilon_i(t), \quad (14)$$

$\forall i \in \mathcal{V}$, in which α_i and ρ_i are the constant and time-variant dummy terms for city i , and $\epsilon_i(t)$ is the residual from the least square estimation with dummies. We cluster the errors at the city level, such as to mitigate concerns with heteroskedasticity and serial correlation, which could bias our coefficient estimates. Equations (13) and (14) are linked by the following identities:

$$\alpha_i = \log(v_{1,i}) \Rightarrow v_{1,i} = e^{\alpha_i}, \quad (15)$$

$$\rho_i = \lambda_1 \beta_i - \gamma \Rightarrow \beta_i = \frac{\rho_i + \gamma}{\lambda_{\max}}. \quad (16)$$

Given the recovery rate γ —which is assumed to not change over time nor across cities—we can fully identify the eigenvector centrality and the local transmission rate of every city i using (15) and (16), respectively. We only take city-specific estimations of $v_{1,i}$ and β_i that are statistically significant at the 10% level. Otherwise, we set the estimated coefficients to zero.

3.3. Assessing efficiency of health policy measures in epidemics spreading

With our framework, we can analyze the speed of the epidemics spreading through the network at early time by simply inspecting the graph spectrum $\lambda_{\max} = \lambda_1$ for different time horizons using the methodology described in Section 3.1. Since the reproduction number of the epidemics is proportional to the graph spectrum, then large graph spectra indicate a higher speed of contagion. Any changes of the graph spectrum can be attributed to a “net effect” of public policies of the government in the entire network. Since we use the share of infectious persons of each Brazilian city, then this “net effect” comprises not only federal policies, but also state- and even city-level policies.

Moreover, we can estimate the human impact of these policies in terms of changes in the number of infectious persons at the peak by running the SIR model described in Section 3.2 for each estimated city-specific transmission rate parameter β_i defined in (16) and for different values of the graph spectrum. We use a conservative approach and compare the largest observed graph spectrum with the most recent graph spectrum in our dataset. We assume that the largest graph spectrum occurs when public policies were still latent and were not having effects in the epidemics spreading. Most recent values of the graph spectrum are assumed to represent transmission dynamic after public policies were in, as was the case in Brazil who adopted quarantine and recommended the use of masks in the period that we have available data.

4. Application

In this section, we apply our model to Brazilian data at the city level.

4.1. Data

We use daily data on the number of infectious persons per each city in Brazil using COVID-19 epidemiological bulletins of 27 State Health Departments from February 25, 2020, to May 8, 2020.⁸ Each Brazilian state compiles local reports from cities inside their geographical circumscription. We end up with 60,021 city-time epidemiological bulletins comprising 2,754 (out of 5,570) cities affected by COVID-19 in Brazil.

Our data is representative because local hospitals are required by law to register any COVID-19 events to the local government while cities and states must notify the federal government. However, there may be substantial sub-notifications due to persons that acquire the COVID-19 and recover unnoticed or without hospitalization.

We also collect city-level population estimates in the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), which is the agency responsible for official collection of statistical, geographic, cartographic, geodetic and environmental information in Brazil. We evaluate the share of infectious persons by taking the ratio of COVID-19 cases reported in the local health bulletin and the local population size. The use of shares in our estimation models is important because it is a stationary variable.

We apply a three-day smoothing filter on the number of infectious persons in each municipality to alleviate concerns with late contamination reports or short-term rectifications by the local health government that could compromise our estimations. In our network construction procedure (see Section 3.1), we keep only cities that reported COVID-19 cases in at least 20% of the available time frame. Our results remain qualitatively the same if we do not apply this filtering criterion. In our estimation of the SIR parameters (see Section 3.2), we center all time points in relation to the occurrence of the first death in the city.

⁸This data is scattered around a large quantity of state government sites. In general, the bulletins are not standardized across different states and not even cities. We use the compiled dataset from [Brasil.io](https://brasil.io) for this task.

⁸Asymptomatic and mild-cases can represent up to 80% of the cases according to China reported numbers. This cases tend not to be tested in Brazil.

Figure 3: COVID-19 evolution in six of the most affected cities in Brazil (a) in absolute terms (number of infectious persons) and (a) as a share of the local population size. Horizontal axis represent the relative day in terms of the first observed death due to the COVID-19.

Figures 3a–3b portray the COVID-19 evolution in six of the most affected cities in Brazil relatively to the first reported death in terms of the number of COVID-19 cases and as a share of the local population size, respectively. São Paulo (SP) has the highest number of infectious persons. However, there is strong size effect: São Paulo (SP) has almost 12.2 million residents while the second largest city, Rio de Janeiro (RJ), has almost half of that (6.8 million). To get a sense of the local COVID-19 criticality, we can look at its evolution as a share of the local population. In this case, we note that COVID-19 transmission speed is much larger in Manaus (AM) and Fortaleza (CE). Brasília (DF) and Porto Alegre (RS) have smaller transmission rates and local COVID-19 criticality. However, mortality rates may not follow such incidence criticality, because they correlate with local health quality and demography characteristics.

4.2. Results

This section presents the main empirical results of the paper. We first build the COVID-19 intercity transmission network and analyze its propensity of amplifying the COVID-19 in different cities. Then, we analyze the net effectiveness of public health measures adopted by the Brazilian government.

4.2.1. Intercity COVID-19 transmission network in Brazil

Figure 4 shows the graph spectrum of the COVID-19 intercity transmission network of Brazil over time. For each time point (horizontal axis), we run the network construction through the fitting process in Section 3.1 with data from the beginning of the sample up to that specific time point. Even though our sample starts in February 25, 2020, we start the fitting process from March 13, 2020, such as to have enough data for the fitting process. That is, we start with 18 time points for each Brazilian city. Therefore, we initially divide the panel data in three equally-sized groups with 6 time points for model training, model selection (parameters and penalty terms), and model evaluation. These group sizes increase as we add more time points. We perform the network construction estimation daily from March 13 to May 8, 2020, in an independent manner.

In Figure 4, we add a shaded area indicating the timing window in which quarantine measures were adopted by the most affected Brazilian states. Since São Paulo is the COVID-19 epicenter in Brazil as it encloses 57.4% of all the COVID-19 infections in Brazil, we also add a vertical dashed red line indicating the beginning of the quarantine adopted by the São Paulo State Government. We also draw the use of masks recommendation beginning date by the Federal Health Ministry in Brazil as a dashed blue line enacted. While quarantine measures are at the state level, the use of masks recommendations goes at the federal level and encompasses all the 5,570 cities and 27 states in Brazil. São Paulo is the most central city in the transmission network. Therefore, it practically shapes the graph spectrum of the intercity transmission network.

Figure 4: Graph spectrum of the COVID-19 intercity transmission network of Brazil (see Section 3.1). The shaded area indicating the timing window in which quarantine measures were adopted by the most affected Brazilian states. The red dashed line indices the beginning of the quarantine in São Paulo, the COVID-19 epicenter in Brazil. The blue dashed line indices the beginning of the use of masks recommendation by the Federal Health Ministry. For each time point (horizontal axis), we build the network with city-specific shares of infectious persons with data up to that point.

We observe a reduction in the growth rate of the graph spectrum after the quarantine measures precisely two days after the measure. However, the growth rate still persisted at positive rates, indicating that the COVID-19 transmission speed kept increasing after such measure, but with a slower pace. After the incubation period following the use of masks recommendation, we observe a drastic change in the graph spectrum. The growth rate changed sign and started to reduce, showing that the set of health policy measures taken by the government was efficient. However, after April 23, 2020, the graph spectrum again started to increase. This can be due to several factors, such as social confusion in following health guidelines in view of the political disarray that Brazil is facing, or even non-compliance with quarantine and use of masks measures. Our model does not permit to have an isolated causal impact of the use of masks recommendation nor of the quarantine measures. However, it enables us to understand how the set of all policy measures affected the COVID-19 transmission rate across cities over time. Combining Figures 2 and 4, it seems that the reduction in the COVID-19 growth rates after the use of masks recommendation was more apparent in cities with relative low social distancing indices. This may be due to the fact that these cities have more potential close human-to-human contact and therefore the use of masks is crucial to detain the COVID-19 transmission.

To understand the topological aspects of the COVID-19 intercity transmission network, Figure 5 plots the PageRank centrality for the top 5 most central cities in each of the five regions in Brazil. We normalize the PageRank with respect to the most central city: São Paulo (SP) on May 8, 2020. As the city centrality becomes higher, the more it contributes to spreading the COVID-19 throughout the network. The top 5 most central cities in the country are the following state capitals (in decreasing order): (i) São Paulo (SP), (ii) Rio de Janeiro (RJ), (iii) Fortaleza (CE), (iv) Recife (PE), and (v) Manaus (AM). These cities all have airports and are strongly interconnected to the remainder of cities in Brazil through roadways and are likely to be the hubs for the COVID-19 spread to other nearby cities in Brazil, especially countryside municipalities. The centrality of São Paulo (SP) in the Southeast monotonically increases over the entire sample. The same roughly occurs with Manaus (AM) in the North, Fortaleza (CE) in the Northeast. Porto Alegre (RS) in the South and Brasília (DF) in the Midwest have the highest centralities in their region but with a negative growth rate in the last days of the sample. Overall, there is a very heterogeneous profile of the city centralities over time, showing the underlying non-trivial patterns in the COVID-19 transmission network.

4.2.2. Measuring the human impact of health policy measures to mitigate the COVID-19 propagation

In this section, we run the SIR in networks (see Equations (1)–(4)) with different transmission rate parameters for each city in Brazil, in accordance with (16). We first estimate the city-specific ρ_i using the panel-data information on counts of the share of infectious persons in each city in Brazil via (14).

Figure 5: Evolution of the normalized PageRank centrality measure in the COVID-19 transmission network (see Section 3.1 for the network construction details). We only report the top 5 cities with highest PageRank at each Brazilian region. For each time point (horizontal axis), we build the network with city-specific shares of infectious persons with temporal data up to that point. Each label is composed of the city name followed by its state inside parentheses.

Figure 6: Distribution of the efficiency of health policy measures along all affected cities in Brazil over time. We plot the efficiency distribution as a function of (a) time and (b) the city's distance to the capital within the same state it resides. Since states in Brazil have substantial differences in their sizes, we normalize the city's distance to the capital to the most distant city within the state.

Then, we estimate the transmission rate parameter β_i of each city $i \in \mathcal{V}$ in Brazil by fixing the recovery rate parameter as $\gamma = 1/14$. We use the remaining parameter $\lambda_{\max}$ —the graph spectrum—to evaluate the effectiveness of the set of health policy measures in detaining the COVID-19 in Brazil. We take as baseline model the graph spectrum reached in April 10, 2020, which is the maximum observed value. We assume that this graph spectrum would have not changed afterwards in case the set of health policy measures were not taken.⁹ We then run several SIR models with the observed graph spectrum values in Figure 4 after the graph spectrum maximum in April, 10, 2020.

Figure 6a shows a comparison of the infectious peaks of the baseline SIR model—i.e., the hypothetical scenario in which health policy measures were not introduced—and the ones with graph spectrum values observed daily after that maximum. The vertical axis shows the relative change in these infectious peaks of the baseline and the observed model day by day, which can be interpreted in terms of the potential share of spared infections at the infectious peak due to the introduction of the set of health policy measures. Since we have data from each city affected by the COVID-19, we plot the median, percentiles 75% (0.25 distant from the median) and 90% (0.40) of this distribution. In the Supplementary Material, we provide the effectiveness of public health policies for each affected municipality in Brazil. In April 10, 2020, the share of spared infections in the epidemics peak is zero, because the baseline model is compared with itself. Then, as we move forward in time and use smaller graph spectrum values, as shown in Figure 4, the potential share of spared infectious increases. The share of spared infectious persons in the epidemics peak reaches a median value 40% lower than that of the baseline model when we use the graph spectrum in April, 24, 2020, suggesting high effectiveness of the quarantine and use of masks health policies. After this point, the share of spared persons decreases—reflecting the increase in the graph spectrum in Figure 4—giving more room for the spread of the COVID-19. The effectiveness of the health policy measures, however, remains positive throughout the entire sample.

The first case of the COVID-19 in Brazil was reported in São Paulo (SP) on February 25, 2020. After that, it spread to several Brazilian state capitals probably through air transportation (most of the airports in Brazil are in the state capitals and capitals are far from each other). The epidemics took some time before reaching the first case in countryside cities. Figure 6b displays the distribution of the potential

⁹This is a conservative approach, because we can observe a positive momentum of the graph spectrum growth rate prior to reaching April 10, 2020. However, we cannot be sure whether such graph spectrum would still increase if these policies were not in place. Therefore, we keep the conservative approach and consider such point as the maximum.

Figure 7: Efficiency of public health measures over time as a function of (a) the share of the spared local population and (b) the spared number of persons (in millions). We depict curves only for six capital cities that are being substantially affected by the COVID-19: Belém (PA), Fortaleza (CE), Rio de Janeiro (RJ), Brasília (DF), Manaus (AM), and São Paulo (SP).

share of spared infections in terms of the city distance to the state capital. Since Brazilian states are very different in size, we normalize the distance to the most distant city within the state. We observe a positive relationship between potential share of spared infectious and distance to the capital, suggesting that health public policies are most effective in cities that are distant from the capital. This may reflect not only the temporal delay of the COVID-19 in reaching the countryside, which puts the local COVID-19 at very early time in these regions, but also demography aspects, such as lower population density, and agricultural economic activities that do not require large conglomerates of persons.

Figure 7a shows the effectiveness of the set of public health measures for six of the most affected Brazilian capitals. In particular, Brasília (DF) reaches a 50% lower share of infectious persons at the peak when we compare peaks reached with the graph spectrum value on April 24, 2020 (against the baseline in April 10, 2020). Figure 7b shows the number of potential spared infectious persons due to the set of health policy measures. This figure is constructed by simply multiplying the share of spared infectious with the local population size of each of the six cities. Since São Paulo (SP) is the largest city, it would potentially spare more persons when the COVID-19 epidemics reach its peak.

5. Conclusions

At the current stage of the COVID-19 infection, many countries have stopped the entrance of foreigners. Therefore, the study of virus transmission dynamics inside each country gains relevance. In the last few days, Brazil has become one of the most infectious countries in the world. In this work, we present a general epidemics transmission model and apply it to the Brazilian case. Our method has three steps. First, we construct the COVID-19 transmission network by fitting city-specific COVID-19 cases over time to calibrate the network links, which represent intercity COVID-19 transmission. Second, we gauge the network propensity of spreading COVID-19 throughout the cities using a spectral graph analysis. Third, we propose a methodology to quantify the effectiveness of public health policies using the dynamics of early-time SIR model and spectral network theory.

Our spectral network analysis indicates that social isolation and the use of masks can effectively reduce the transmission rate of the COVID-19 in Brazil. The COVID-19 propagation dynamics seems to decrease following these public health policies when we also consider an incubation period, which lags the effect of any COVID-19 mitigation measure. Moreover, our empirical analysis supports the view that use of masks seems to be more effective than social isolation, which is further corroborated by what is being occurring in Austria [32]. With no vaccine up to date, public health intervention is

still the main method of epidemic control. We hope our study can help the government make correct decisions.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported in part by the São Paulo State Research Foundation (FAPESP) under grant numbers 2015/50122-0 and 2013/07375-0, the Brazilian Coordination of Superior Level Staff Improvement (CAPES), the Pro-Rector of Research (PRP) of University of São Paulo under grant number 2018.1.1702.59.8, and the Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) under grant numbers 303199/2019-9, 308171/2019-5, and 408546/2018-2.

Authors contributions statement

T.C.S., L.A. and L.Z. conceived the study idea and researched the related work. T.C.S. designed the method and conducted the experiments. T.C.S. and L.A. gathered the datasets. L.Z. supervised the research scheme. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

- [1] The Lancet, COVID-19 in Brazil: “so what?”, 2020. The Lancet Editorial.
- [2] S. M. Kissler, C. Tedijanto, E. Goldstein, Y. H. Grad, M. Lipsitch, Projecting the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period, *Science* (2020) eabb5793.
- [3] A. Chin, J. Chu, M. Perera, K. Hui, H.-L. Yen, M. Chan, M. Peiris, L. Poon, Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental conditions, *The Lancet* (2020). DOI: [10.1016/S2666-5247\(20\)30003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30003-3).
- [4] N. van Doremalen, T. Bushmaker, D. H. Morris, M. G. Holbrook, A. Gamble, B. N. Williamson, A. Tamin, J. L. Harcourt, N. J. Thornburg, S. I. Gerber, J. O. Lloyd-Smith, E. de Wit, V. J. Munster, Aerosol and surface stability of SARS-CoV-2 as compared with SARS-CoV-1, *New England Journal of Medicine* 382 (2020) 1564–1567.
- [5] C. Sims, Macroeconomics and reality, *Econometrica* 48 (1980) 1–48.
- [6] H. Zou, T. Hastie, Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 67 (2005) 301–320.
- [7] W. B. Nicholson, D. S. Matteson, J. Bien, VARX-L: Structured regularization for large vector autoregressions with exogenous variables, *International Journal of Forecasting* 33 (2017) 627–651.
- [8] A. Remuzzi, G. Remuzzi, COVID-19 and Italy: what next?, *The Lancet* (2020).
- [9] R. Verity, L. C. Okell, I. Dorigatti, P. Winskill, C. Whittaker, N. Imai, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, H. Thompson, P. G. Walker, H. Fu, et al., Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis, *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* (2020). DOI: [10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30243-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30243-7).

- [10] World Health Organization, China joint mission on coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), <https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/who-china-joint-mission-on-covid-19-final-report.pdf>, 2020. Online, Accessed: 2020-05-05.
- [11] M. J. Keeling, K. T. Eames, Networks and epidemic models, *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* 2 (2005) 295–307.
- [12] W. O. Kermack, A. G. McKendrick, A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A* 115 (1927) 700–721.
- [13] F. R. Chung, F. C. Graham, *Spectral graph theory*, American Mathematical Society, 1997.
- [14] R. Pastor-Satorras, C. Castellano, P. Van Mieghem, A. Vespignani, Epidemic processes in complex networks, *Reviews of Modern Physics* 87 (2015) 925–979.
- [15] R. Pastor-Satorras, A. Vespignani, Immunization of complex networks, *Physical Review E* 65 (2002) 036104.
- [16] R. Pastor-Satorras, A. Vespignani, Epidemic spreading in scale-free networks, *Physical Review Letters* 86 (2001) 3200–3203.
- [17] M. Youssef, R. Kooij, C. Scoglio, Viral conductance: Quantifying the robustness of networks with respect to spread of epidemics, *Journal of Computational Science* 2 (2011) 286–298.
- [18] P. V. Mieghem, The viral conductance of a network, *Computer Communications* 35 (2012) 1494–1506.
- [19] D. Chen, L. Lü, M.-S. Shang, Y.-C. Zhang, T. Zhou, Identifying influential nodes in complex networks, *Physica A* 391 (2012) 1777–1787.
- [20] D.-B. Chen, R. Xiao, A. Zeng, Y.-C. Zhang, Path diversity improves the identification of influential spreaders, *Europhysics Letters* 104 (2013) 68006.
- [21] F. Bauer, J. T. Lizier, Identifying influential spreaders and efficiently estimating infection numbers in epidemic models: A walk counting approach, *Europhysics Letters* 99 (2012) 68007.
- [22] L. Hébert-Dufresne, A. Allard, J.-G. Young, L. J. Dubé, Global efficiency of local immunization on complex networks, *Scientific Reports* 3 (2013) 2171.
- [23] A. Zeng, C.-J. Zhang, Global efficiency of local immunization on complex networks, *Physics Letters A* 377 (2013) 1031–1035.
- [24] P. Holme, T. Takaguchi, Time evolution of predictability of epidemics on networks, *Physical Review E* 91 (2015) 042811.
- [25] R. Yi-Run, L. Song-Yang, X. Yan-Dong, W. Jun-De, B. Liang, Identifying influence of nodes in complex networks with coreness centrality: Decreasing the impact of densely local connection, *Chinese Physics Letters* 33 (2016) 028901.
- [26] J. T. Matamalas, A. Arenas, S. Gómez, Effective approach to epidemic containment using link equations in complex networks, *Science Advances* 4 (2018) eaau4212.
- [27] C. Castellano, R. Pastor-Satorras, Competing activation mechanisms in epidemics on networks, *Scientific Reports* 2 (2012) 371.

- [28] C. Stegehuis, R. van der Hofstad, J. S. H. van Leeuwen, Epidemic spreading on complex networks with community structures, *Scientific Reports* 6 (2016) 29748.
- [29] F. Iannelli, A. Koher, D. Brockmann, P. Hovel, I. M. Sokolov, Effective distances for epidemics spreading on complex networks, *Physical Review E* 95 (2017) 012313.
- [30] J. Friedman, T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent, *Journal of Statistical Software* 33 (2010) 1–22.
- [31] J. M. Wooldridge, *Econometric analysis of cross section and panel data*, MIT Press, 2002.
- [32] Reuters, Austria says reopening shops has not accelerated coronavirus infections, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-austria-idUSKBN22H1HP>, 2020. Accessed: 2020-05-08.

Supplementary Material

This Supplementary Material presents additional results of our empirical application to Brazil.

Table A1: Estimated share of the local population with COVID-19 in Brazil at the peak and the corresponding month and day in 2020. We report the peak date and share of infectious persons to the local population of the city with and without health policy measures (see Section 4.2 for details). This simulation uses data up to May 8, 2020. We only report estimates for cities in which the simulated infectious peak with policy is higher than 5% of the local population.

Row Number	Region	State	Name	No Policy (Peak)		With Policy (Peak)		Reduction (%)
				Date	Infectious (%)	Date	Infectious (%)	
1	Southeast	São Paulo	Ourinhos	Oct 17	10.42	Nov 30	7.03	36.57
2	Midwest	Mato Grosso	Mirassol d'Oeste	Sep 29	10.96	Nov 06	7.49	35.10
3	South	Paraná	Santa Fé	Oct 10	9.65	Nov 29	6.33	34.82
4	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Tio Hugo	Sep 19	10.43	Oct 26	7.03	34.66
5	Southeast	São Paulo	Laranjal Paulista	Oct 08	10.46	Nov 23	7.04	33.14
6	North	Pará	Cachoeira do Arari	Sep 29	10.97	Nov 02	7.67	32.55
7	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Porto Alegre	Oct 03	9.78	Nov 22	6.45	32.12
8	South	Paraná	Fazenda Rio Grande	Oct 17	9.61	Nov 22	6.83	31.72
9	Northeast	Ceará	Acopiara	Sep 20	14.79	Oct 21	11.03	31.70
10	Southeast	São Paulo	Araçatuba	Sep 26	13.25	Oct 31	9.56	31.48
11	South	Paraná	Pato Branco	Oct 01	12.13	Nov 10	8.53	31.18
12	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	Nísia Floresta	Sep 08	14.59	Oct 06	10.83	31.05
13	Southeast	São Paulo	São Roque	Sep 12	14.30	Oct 13	10.56	31.04
14	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Vacaria	Oct 31	10.45	Dec 21	7.04	30.44
15	South	Santa Catarina	Balneário Arroio do Silva	Sep 27	10.18	Nov 06	6.80	30.44
16	Northeast	Bahia	Feira de Santana	Oct 13	10.13	Nov 29	6.76	30.21
17	South	Santa Catarina	Pedras Grandes	Sep 10	9.88	Oct 20	6.54	30.19
18	Northeast	Paraíba	Junco do Seridó	Sep 07	11.71	Oct 13	8.15	30.02
19	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Barra do Piraí	Sep 30	10.70	Nov 11	7.26	29.75
20	South	Santa Catarina	Balneário Camboriú	Sep 07	10.25	Oct 12	6.87	29.54
21	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Canoas	Oct 23	10.12	Dec 14	6.76	29.49
22	Southeast	São Paulo	Lavrinhos	Aug 31	17.11	Sep 25	13.22	29.47
23	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Belo Horizonte	Sep 25	10.59	Nov 10	7.17	28.79
24	Northeast	Piauí	Piracuruca	Sep 12	12.03	Oct 18	8.44	28.63
25	Northeast	Ceará	Alto Santo	Aug 23	16.80	Sep 16	12.91	28.07
26	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	Tenente Ananias	Sep 15	11.61	Oct 24	8.08	28.06
27	Midwest	Mato Grosso do Sul	Campo Grande	Sep 23	12.55	Oct 31	8.92	27.80
28	South	Paraná	Paranaguá	Sep 26	12.47	Nov 06	8.84	27.79
29	Southeast	São Paulo	Angatuba	Sep 20	14.95	Oct 23	11.13	27.76
30	South	Paraná	Araruna	Aug 09	15.44	Aug 30	11.60	27.71
31	Southeast	São Paulo	Atibaia	Sep 22	11.80	Oct 30	8.25	27.42
32	Northeast	Pernambuco	Lagoa dos Gatos	Sep 16	13.36	Oct 21	9.66	27.06
33	South	Paraná	Campo Mourão	Sep 07	12.32	Oct 14	8.72	26.93
34	Southeast	São Paulo	São José do Rio Preto	Sep 23	11.69	Nov 04	8.15	26.89
35	Southeast	São Paulo	Jacareí	Oct 05	11.12	Nov 16	7.65	26.72
36	South	Santa Catarina	Florianópolis	Aug 26	12.78	Sep 28	9.13	26.70
37	Midwest	Mato Grosso	Rondonópolis	Sep 12	12.88	Oct 17	9.22	26.66
38	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	Parnamirim	Aug 31	13.00	Sep 28	9.33	26.41
39	Southeast	São Paulo	Taubaté	Sep 11	15.38	Oct 09	11.55	26.39
40	Southeast	São Paulo	Barra Bonita	Sep 09	14.92	Oct 05	11.30	26.22
41	Southeast	São Paulo	Peruibe	Sep 05	13.89	Sep 28	10.77	26.19
42	South	Paraná	Umuarama	Sep 29	15.47	Oct 25	12.27	26.17
43	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Paraty	Sep 19	12.63	Oct 24	9.00	26.04
44	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Novo Hamburgo	Oct 04	13.51	Nov 16	9.79	25.84
45	Southeast	São Paulo	Marília	Oct 19	11.32	Dec 06	7.85	25.77
46	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Patos de Minas	Sep 15	13.92	Oct 21	10.17	25.52
47	Southeast	São Paulo	Nazaré Paulista	Aug 20	17.97	Sep 12	14.00	25.47
48	South	Paraná	Cascavel	Sep 10	14.14	Oct 17	10.38	25.33
49	Southeast	São Paulo	São José dos Campos	Sep 05	12.83	Oct 09	9.18	25.33
50	Northeast	Bahia	Itagibá	Aug 25	12.90	Sep 25	9.25	25.27
51	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Nova Friburgo	Sep 03	13.96	Oct 03	10.21	24.92
52	Southeast	São Paulo	Mococa	Oct 24	10.49	Dec 15	7.04	24.88
53	Southeast	São Paulo	Araçatuba	Aug 28	14.64	Sep 24	10.84	24.85
54	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Varginha	Sep 18	13.44	Oct 25	9.74	24.80
55	Midwest	Distrito Federal	Brasília	Aug 26	13.12	Sep 30	9.45	24.79
56	South	Santa Catarina	Itapema	Aug 20	17.43	Sep 12	13.47	24.62
57	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Alvorada	Sep 22	14.16	Oct 30	10.40	24.55
58	Southeast	São Paulo	Bragança Paulista	Sep 01	13.45	Oct 04	9.75	24.32
59	Northeast	Bahia	Itapetinga	Sep 19	14.78	Oct 27	10.97	24.20
60	Northeast	Pernambuco	Catende	Sep 28	12.96	Nov 09	9.32	24.11
61	Northeast	Bahia	Uruçuca	Aug 20	13.57	Sep 19	9.87	24.05
62	South	Santa Catarina	Itajaí	Aug 29	13.50	Oct 01	9.80	24.01
63	Northeast	Bahia	Lauro de Freitas	Sep 01	13.38	Oct 04	9.70	23.89

Continued on next page

Table A1 – continued from previous page

Row Number	Region	State	Name	No Policy (Peak)		With Policy (Peak)		Reduction (%)
				Date	Infectious (%)	Date	Infectious (%)	
64	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Patrocínio	Aug 24	16.43	Sep 20	12.51	23.82
65	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Mangaratiba	Sep 17	12.50	Oct 26	8.91	23.79
66	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Juiz de Fora	Sep 02	13.69	Oct 05	9.98	23.64
67	Southeast	São Paulo	Eldorado	Sep 17	12.77	Oct 26	9.16	23.63
68	Northeast	Bahia	Camaçari	Sep 17	13.30	Oct 21	9.64	23.62
69	Southeast	Minas Gerais	São Sebastião do Paraíso	Oct 26	12.13	Dec 14	8.58	23.59
70	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	São Pedro da Aldeia	Sep 03	14.94	Oct 03	11.12	23.55
71	Southeast	São Paulo	São Carlos	Sep 16	15.65	Oct 20	11.78	23.44
72	Midwest	Goiás	Goiandira	Aug 14	14.83	Sep 10	11.02	23.37
73	Southeast	São Paulo	Lençóis Paulista	Oct 17	10.91	Dec 03	7.52	23.35
74	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Uberlândia	Sep 05	14.41	Oct 10	10.64	23.11
75	South	Paraná	Guairacá	Oct 15	9.29	Aug 25	6.71	23.01
76	Midwest	Mato Grosso	Barra do Garças	Nov 12	9.31	Jan 05	6.00	22.93
77	South	Paraná	Maringá	Aug 30	15.89	Oct 02	12.01	22.91
78	Northeast	Pernambuco	Aliança	Aug 24	15.34	Sep 20	11.50	22.88
79	Midwest	Goiás	Pires do Rio	Sep 01	16.06	Oct 01	12.16	22.86
80	Southeast	São Paulo	Mineiros do Tietê	Aug 19	15.97	Sep 13	12.08	22.82
81	Southeast	São Paulo	Ferraz de Vasconcelos	Aug 20	14.72	Sep 16	10.92	22.81
82	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Bom Jardim	Aug 30	14.24	Sep 29	10.49	22.80
83	Southeast	São Paulo	Leme	Oct 01	14.99	Nov 09	11.17	22.79
84	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	Açu	Aug 09	16.04	Sep 01	12.15	22.70
85	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	São Gonçalo do Amarante	Aug 13	16.13	Sep 08	12.23	22.50
86	South	Rio Grande do Sul	São Leopoldo	Aug 30	14.77	Sep 30	10.97	22.50
87	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Pouso Alegre	Aug 31	14.81	Oct 02	11.01	22.48
88	Northeast	Pernambuco	Belo Jardim	Aug 31	17.17	Sep 26	13.21	22.41
89	Northeast	Pernambuco	Carnaíba	Aug 28	16.53	Sep 25	12.61	22.36
90	Southeast	São Paulo	Monte Alto	Aug 22	17.17	Sep 17	13.20	22.29
91	South	Santa Catarina	Sombrio	Aug 11	15.00	Sep 06	11.19	22.27
92	Southeast	São Paulo	Cravinhos	Aug 24	16.85	Sep 21	12.91	22.25
93	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Uberaba	Aug 25	16.58	Sep 21	12.66	22.24
94	South	Santa Catarina	Criciúma	Aug 16	14.66	Sep 15	10.87	22.22
95	Southeast	São Paulo	Presidente Venceslau	Aug 20	16.58	Sep 17	12.66	22.06
96	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Ouro Fino	Sep 08	14.71	Oct 13	10.93	21.98
97	Northeast	Sergipe	Itabaianinha	Aug 31	15.77	Sep 29	11.90	21.83
98	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Belmiro Braga	Aug 29	12.74	Sep 30	9.18	21.79
99	Southeast	São Paulo	Vinhedo	Aug 08	18.61	Aug 28	14.58	21.74
100	Northeast	Bahia	Gongogi	Aug 02	18.52	Aug 23	14.50	21.74
101	Northeast	Ceará	Aquiraz	Sep 19	11.44	Aug 17	8.69	21.65
102	Southeast	São Paulo	Vargem Grande Paulista	Aug 20	16.77	Sep 19	12.84	21.60
103	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Divinópolis	Aug 16	16.73	Sep 12	12.79	21.58
104	Southeast	São Paulo	Jaboticabal	Aug 16	17.30	Sep 12	13.33	21.56
105	Southeast	São Paulo	Capão Bonito	Aug 17	22.13	Sep 05	18.05	21.56
106	South	Santa Catarina	São Ludgero	Aug 02	15.58	Aug 27	11.73	21.48
107	Midwest	Goiás	Valparaíso de Goiás	Sep 13	14.62	Oct 17	10.85	21.41
108	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Extrema	Aug 09	15.33	Sep 01	11.51	21.40
109	Southeast	São Paulo	Caieiras	Aug 06	16.60	Aug 31	12.67	21.35
110	Southeast	São Paulo	São Caetano do Sul	Jul 26	16.58	Aug 19	12.66	21.17
111	Southeast	São Paulo	Ribeirão Pires	Aug 04	17.85	Aug 24	13.85	21.02
112	Northeast	Pernambuco	Machados	Aug 12	17.94	Sep 04	13.94	21.00
113	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Miguel Pereira	Aug 03	16.94	Aug 31	12.99	20.94
114	Southeast	São Paulo	Tatuí	Sep 03	16.11	Sep 28	12.44	20.86
115	Southeast	São Paulo	Rio Claro	Aug 26	18.81	Sep 23	14.77	20.84
116	Southeast	São Paulo	Assis	Sep 02	16.11	Oct 03	12.23	20.75
117	Northeast	Pernambuco	Salgueiro	Aug 20	17.41	Sep 10	13.65	20.69
118	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Araruama	Aug 11	18.87	Sep 03	14.83	20.65
119	Northeast	Pernambuco	Chã de Alegria	Jul 26	20.66	Aug 10	16.59	20.60
120	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Poços de Caldas	Aug 30	16.90	Sep 27	12.96	20.49
121	Northeast	Maranhão	Raposa	Aug 14	17.14	Sep 06	13.19	20.40
122	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Bom Jesus do Itabapoana	Aug 10	17.86	Sep 03	13.86	20.39
123	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Resende	Aug 17	18.32	Sep 10	14.30	20.24
124	North	Acre	Plácido de Castro	Jul 29	16.18	Aug 19	12.30	20.22
125	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Serafina Corrêa	Aug 13	14.84	Sep 09	11.07	20.14
126	Southeast	São Paulo	Cotia	Jul 29	18.26	Aug 22	14.24	19.91
127	South	Santa Catarina	Cocal do Sul	Aug 18	19.55	Sep 09	15.48	19.89
128	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	Mossoró	Aug 01	18.03	Aug 26	14.03	19.87
129	South	Santa Catarina	Balneário Gaivota	Aug 06	17.14	Aug 31	13.19	19.84
130	South	Santa Catarina	Urussanga	Aug 13	16.24	Sep 08	12.36	19.79
131	Northeast	Pernambuco	Frei Miguelinho	Sep 07	12.72	Oct 10	9.18	19.72
132	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Novo Cruzeiro	Aug 15	22.42	Sep 03	18.26	19.69
133	Northeast	Sergipe	Simão Dias	Aug 11	19.56	Sep 01	15.48	19.60
134	Southeast	São Paulo	Miracatu	Aug 13	18.82	Sep 03	14.78	19.56
135	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Barra Mansa	Aug 18	17.47	Sep 12	13.51	19.55
136	Northeast	Maranhão	São José de Ribamar	Jul 25	18.87	Aug 13	14.83	19.55

Continued on next page

Table A1 – continued from previous page

Row Number	Region	State	Name	No Policy (Peak)		With Policy (Peak)		Reduction (%)
				Date	Infectious (%)	Date	Infectious (%)	
137	Northeast	Bahia	Ipiaú	Sep 17	11.60	Nov 04	8.27	19.54
138	Midwest	Goiás	Paraúna	Jul 30	20.78	Aug 18	16.67	19.45
139	Southeast	São Paulo	Cruzeiro	Sep 01	16.77	Oct 01	12.85	19.44
140	Northeast	Pernambuco	Itapetim	Sep 20	14.96	Sep 06	11.56	19.43
141	Southeast	Minas Gerais	São Romão	Aug 01	22.90	Aug 16	18.97	19.36
142	Northeast	Paraíba	Marizópolis	Jul 16	28.95	Jul 28	24.77	19.34
143	South	Santa Catarina	Palhoça	Aug 14	20.13	Sep 08	16.03	19.34
144	Northeast	Pernambuco	Lagoa de Itaenga	Aug 14	19.96	Sep 04	15.88	19.30
145	Southeast	São Paulo	São Manuel	Aug 10	17.89	Sep 03	13.91	19.27
146	South	Santa Catarina	Gaspar	Aug 06	18.11	Aug 30	14.11	19.25
147	Southeast	São Paulo	Águas de Lindóia	Aug 05	19.40	Aug 28	15.33	19.21
148	Midwest	Goiás	Goiânia	Aug 06	19.51	Aug 29	15.43	19.09
149	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Itabira	Aug 15	21.14	Sep 07	17.00	19.00
150	North	Pará	Vigia	Aug 13	16.46	Sep 06	12.59	18.84
151	Northeast	Ceará	Russas	Aug 22	16.07	Sep 17	12.23	18.83
152	Southeast	São Paulo	Botucatu	Aug 04	19.37	Aug 26	15.31	18.81
153	Midwest	Mato Grosso	Lucas do Rio Verde	Sep 06	16.18	Oct 11	12.34	18.81
154	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Mariana	Jul 31	20.33	Aug 22	16.23	18.66
155	Northeast	Ceará	Tanguá	Aug 24	17.94	Sep 22	13.95	18.62
156	Southeast	Espírito Santo	Linhares	Aug 01	20.61	Aug 22	16.50	18.61
157	Northeast	Ceará	Ipueiras	Aug 13	19.66	Sep 05	15.58	18.59
158	Midwest	Goiás	Luziânia	Aug 13	20.85	Sep 09	16.72	18.58
159	Southeast	Espírito Santo	São Mateus	Aug 10	18.98	Sep 04	14.94	18.55
160	Northeast	Ceará	Sobral	Jul 27	19.92	Aug 13	15.84	18.44
161	Northeast	Ceará	Jaguaribe	Jul 31	21.01	Aug 22	16.88	18.43
162	Southeast	São Paulo	Mairiporã	Aug 05	19.35	Aug 29	15.29	18.41
163	Southeast	São Paulo	Santo André	Jul 23	20.00	Aug 13	15.91	18.33
164	Midwest	Mato Grosso	Cáceres	Aug 15	19.85	Sep 08	15.77	18.23
165	Southeast	São Paulo	Santos	Jul 15	20.55	Aug 03	16.44	18.23
166	Northeast	Alagoas	Murici	Jul 27	19.40	Aug 10	16.02	18.21
167	South	Paraná	Guaira	Jul 21	23.31	Aug 07	19.11	18.09
168	Southeast	São Paulo	Monte Mor	Nov 04	10.63	Aug 13	8.54	18.07
169	Northeast	Ceará	Santa Quitéria	Aug 04	20.02	Aug 28	15.93	18.05
170	Southeast	Espírito Santo	Presidente Kennedy	Jul 19	22.25	Aug 03	18.08	18.03
171	Southeast	São Paulo	Mirandópolis	Aug 24	16.44	Sep 20	12.61	17.96
172	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	Natal	Jul 23	20.83	Aug 12	16.70	17.89
173	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Arraial do Cabo	Jul 28	20.80	Aug 19	16.68	17.88
174	Northeast	Pernambuco	Palmares	Aug 14	19.91	Sep 08	15.83	17.85
175	Southeast	São Paulo	Itaquaquecetuba	Jul 25	23.11	Aug 10	18.93	17.80
176	Southeast	São Paulo	Mauá	Jul 26	21.31	Aug 13	17.17	17.78
177	North	Pará	São João do Araguaia	Nov 13	10.15	Jul 20	8.28	17.58
178	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Teresópolis	Jul 30	21.75	Aug 17	17.60	17.58
179	Northeast	Alagoas	Matriz de Camaragibe	Nov 28	8.86	Jul 13	7.24	17.57
180	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Iguaba Grande	Jul 17	21.89	Aug 04	17.73	17.54
181	Southeast	São Paulo	Indaiatuba	Aug 03	23.92	Aug 20	19.72	17.52
182	Southeast	São Paulo	Paulínia	Aug 06	21.31	Aug 24	17.17	17.51
183	Southeast	Espírito Santo	Fundão	Jul 17	21.28	Jul 28	17.84	17.48
184	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Tanguá	Jul 24	22.62	Aug 11	18.44	17.45
185	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Rio de Janeiro	Jul 17	21.50	Aug 07	17.35	17.44
186	Northeast	Ceará	São Luís do Curu	Aug 15	16.19	Sep 10	12.41	17.41
187	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	Canguaretama	Jul 26	21.25	Aug 13	17.12	17.40
188	Northeast	Piauí	Pedro II	Aug 09	22.84	Aug 29	18.66	17.39
189	Southeast	São Paulo	Santana de Parnaíba	Jul 17	21.57	Aug 01	17.43	17.39
190	South	Santa Catarina	Concórdia	Jul 20	20.82	Jul 31	17.39	17.37
191	Southeast	São Paulo	Valinhos	Aug 01	22.04	Aug 21	17.88	17.37
192	Northeast	Pernambuco	Caruaru	Aug 12	21.24	Sep 04	17.10	17.33
193	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Maricá	Jul 24	21.85	Aug 12	17.70	17.32
194	Southeast	São Paulo	Mogi Guaçu	Aug 08	22.24	Aug 30	18.07	17.32
195	Southeast	São Paulo	Avaré	Aug 06	21.66	Aug 27	17.51	17.29
196	Northeast	Maranhão	Zé Doca	Aug 15	18.99	Sep 06	14.97	17.23
197	Northeast	Ceará	Cratêus	Aug 12	19.08	Sep 02	15.06	17.23
198	South	Santa Catarina	Joinville	Jul 24	22.19	Aug 13	18.03	17.22
199	Southeast	São Paulo	Embu das Artes	Aug 02	21.86	Aug 25	17.70	17.17
200	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Niterói	Jul 18	22.20	Aug 09	18.03	17.07
201	Northeast	Ceará	Ocara	Aug 17	16.51	Sep 11	12.71	17.07
202	Southeast	São Paulo	Araraquara	Jul 28	23.39	Aug 15	19.19	16.99
203	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Nilópolis	Jul 21	22.72	Aug 05	18.54	16.94
204	Southeast	São Paulo	São Bernardo do Campo	Jul 17	22.39	Aug 06	18.22	16.91
205	Southeast	São Paulo	Votorantim	Aug 06	22.26	Aug 26	18.09	16.91
206	Northeast	Pernambuco	Abreu e Lima	Jul 13	24.35	Jul 27	20.14	16.89
207	Southeast	São Paulo	Catanduva	Aug 13	22.05	Sep 06	17.89	16.85
208	Midwest	Mato Grosso do Sul	Três Lagoas	Jul 20	24.26	Aug 04	20.04	16.78
209	South	Santa Catarina	Braço do Norte	Jul 01	22.61	Jul 14	18.43	16.64

Continued on next page

Table A1 – continued from previous page

Row Number	Region	State	Name	No Policy (Peak)		With Policy (Peak)		Reduction (%)
				Date	Infectious (%)	Date	Infectious (%)	
210	Northeast	Pernambuco	Araçoiaba	Jul 18	25.23	Jul 31	21.02	16.54
211	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Cabo Frio	Jul 22	25.16	Aug 06	20.93	16.47
212	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Volta Redonda	Jul 12	23.30	Jul 31	19.11	16.45
213	Southeast	São Paulo	Itanhaém	Jul 23	25.53	Aug 08	21.29	16.43
214	Southeast	Espírito Santo	Guarapari	Jul 21	25.70	Aug 03	21.71	16.42
215	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Magé	Jul 21	23.12	Aug 07	18.92	16.40
216	Northeast	Pernambuco	Macaparana	Jul 19	24.02	Aug 06	19.81	16.28
217	Northeast	Pernambuco	Arcoverde	Jul 26	22.97	Aug 14	18.78	16.27
218	North	Pará	Óbidos	Aug 03	24.36	Aug 21	20.14	16.22
219	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Queimados	Jul 18	24.11	Aug 03	19.89	16.20
220	Southeast	Espírito Santo	Aracruz	Jul 22	25.14	Aug 06	20.91	16.20
221	North	Pará	Igarapé-Açu	Jul 18	25.25	Jul 28	21.73	16.18
222	Northeast	Pernambuco	Ribeirão	Jul 25	26.77	Aug 08	22.56	16.16
223	Northeast	Bahia	Salvador	Jul 13	23.39	Aug 01	19.19	16.13
224	Southeast	São Paulo	Nova Odessa	Jul 31	22.32	Aug 22	18.16	16.10
225	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	Encanto	Jul 04	25.53	Jul 16	21.29	15.99
226	Southeast	Espírito Santo	Vitória	Jul 05	24.08	Jul 20	19.87	15.99
227	Southeast	São Paulo	Diadema	Jul 13	23.97	Jul 31	19.75	15.95
228	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Governador Valadares	Aug 01	24.07	Aug 21	19.85	15.94
229	Northeast	Maranhão	Davinópolis	Aug 08	20.75	Aug 29	16.72	15.94
230	Northeast	Ceará	Fortaleza	Jun 30	23.92	Jul 16	19.71	15.89
231	Northeast	Ceará	Iguatu	Jul 23	24.35	Aug 10	20.13	15.86
232	Southeast	São Paulo	Itapetininga	Aug 02	23.22	Aug 22	19.03	15.85
233	Northeast	Alagoas	São Miguel dos Milagres	Aug 08	18.78	Aug 31	14.79	15.84
234	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Rio Bonito	Jul 12	24.15	Jul 30	19.94	15.83
235	Northeast	Pernambuco	Ipojuca	Jul 19	24.52	Aug 04	20.30	15.80
236	Southeast	São Paulo	Franca	Aug 09	24.26	Aug 29	20.04	15.74
237	Southeast	São Paulo	Arujá	Jul 12	24.18	Jul 29	19.96	15.74
238	Southeast	São Paulo	Itapeverica da Serra	Jul 15	24.50	Aug 01	20.27	15.72
239	Northeast	Pernambuco	Panelas	Aug 01	25.63	Aug 17	21.40	15.65
240	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Macaé	Jul 19	26.10	Aug 04	21.85	15.63
241	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Nova Iguaçu	Jul 16	25.32	Aug 03	21.09	15.61
242	Southeast	São Paulo	Campinas	Jul 20	24.86	Aug 08	20.63	15.58
243	North	Pará	Santa Cruz do Arari	Jul 21	21.63	Aug 05	17.52	15.56
244	South	Santa Catarina	Indaial	Jul 22	24.37	Aug 08	20.15	15.56
245	Northeast	Bahia	Ilhéus	Jul 04	25.29	Jul 18	21.05	15.55
246	Southeast	São Paulo	Dracena	Jul 23	23.75	Aug 11	19.54	15.53
247	Northeast	Pernambuco	Limoeiro	Jul 20	25.51	Aug 05	21.27	15.52
248	Southeast	São Paulo	Poá	Jul 12	25.12	Jul 29	20.89	15.51
249	North	Amazonas	Manaus	Jul 03	24.79	Jul 20	20.56	15.50
250	Northeast	Ceará	Amontada	Sep 18	16.62	Sep 04	13.32	15.50
251	Southeast	São Paulo	Mogi das Cruzes	Jul 13	24.83	Jul 30	20.60	15.50
252	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Araxá	Nov 04	12.40	Jul 28	10.28	15.48
253	Southeast	São Paulo	Francisco Morato	Jul 20	24.64	Aug 07	20.41	15.47
254	Southeast	São Paulo	Várzea Paulista	Jul 28	25.13	Aug 13	20.89	15.46
255	Southeast	São Paulo	Ribeirão Preto	Aug 03	25.12	Aug 26	20.89	15.43
256	North	Amazonas	Itapiranga	Jul 01	27.65	Jul 09	24.12	15.41
257	Southeast	São Paulo	Sumaré	Sep 29	15.18	Aug 17	12.65	15.40
258	Southeast	São Paulo	Itu	Jul 20	28.21	Aug 03	23.95	15.39
259	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Petrópolis	Jul 10	25.49	Jul 28	21.25	15.39
260	Northeast	Ceará	Limoeiro do Norte	Jul 19	24.45	Aug 05	20.24	15.38
261	North	Tocantins	Palmas	Jul 26	23.06	Aug 13	18.88	15.34
262	Southeast	São Paulo	Barueri	Jul 03	24.90	Jul 18	20.67	15.33
263	North	Pará	Marituba	Jul 14	26.54	Jul 28	22.28	15.32
264	Northeast	Pernambuco	Bom Jardim	Jul 17	25.93	Aug 03	21.68	15.28
265	Northeast	Pernambuco	Bonito	Jul 23	27.46	Aug 06	23.19	15.28
266	Northeast	Pernambuco	Garanhuns	Jul 30	25.83	Aug 18	21.58	15.20
267	Northeast	Pernambuco	São Lourenço da Mata	Jul 07	26.14	Jul 22	21.89	15.17
268	South	Paraná	Paranavaí	Jul 18	24.02	Aug 03	19.81	15.12
269	Southeast	Espírito Santo	Vila Velha	Jun 30	25.87	Jul 15	21.62	15.06
270	North	Roraima	Alto Alegre	Jul 17	24.05	Aug 03	19.84	15.04
271	North	Amazonas	Manicoré	Jul 28	24.17	Aug 16	19.96	15.04
272	North	Pará	Curionópolis	Sep 13	16.94	Aug 29	13.49	15.03
273	Northeast	Piauí	Buriti dos Lopes	Sep 04	20.18	Aug 17	16.61	15.02
274	North	Pará	Santarém	Jul 31	25.23	Aug 22	20.99	15.00
275	Southeast	São Paulo	São Paulo	Jul 02	25.84	Jul 20	21.60	15.00
276	Southeast	São Paulo	Santa Bárbara d'Oeste	Aug 07	25.38	Aug 25	21.14	14.96
277	North	Amazonas	Novo Airão	Jul 27	21.65	Aug 17	17.54	14.88
278	Northeast	Pernambuco	Paudalho	Jul 11	26.22	Jul 27	21.97	14.78
279	Northeast	Pernambuco	Lagoa do Carro	Jul 17	23.35	Aug 05	19.17	14.76
280	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	Apodi	Jul 14	24.46	Jul 30	20.25	14.75
281	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Santos Dumont	Aug 09	21.85	Aug 29	17.72	14.74
282	Northeast	Ceará	Pacatuba	Jul 19	23.00	Aug 03	18.83	14.71

Continued on next page

Table A1 – continued from previous page

Row Number	Region	State	Name	No Policy (Peak)		With Policy (Peak)		Reduction (%)
				Date	Infectious (%)	Date	Infectious (%)	
283	Southeast	São Paulo	Presidente Prudente	Jul 24	25.90	Aug 11	21.65	14.65
284	Southeast	São Paulo	Mongaguá	Jul 15	28.05	Jul 29	23.78	14.64
285	Northeast	Ceará	Horizonte	Jul 08	25.44	Jul 22	21.20	14.64
286	Southeast	São Paulo	Guarujá	Jul 09	28.02	Jul 22	23.75	14.60
287	North	Roraima	Boa Vista	Jun 30	26.40	Jul 15	22.14	14.58
288	Southeast	São Paulo	Taboão da Serra	Jul 16	27.36	Aug 03	23.09	14.55
289	Northeast	Ceará	Capistrano	Jul 19	24.87	Aug 05	20.64	14.54
290	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Rio das Ostras	Jul 09	26.91	Jul 25	22.65	14.52
291	Southeast	São Paulo	Araras	Jul 30	24.63	Aug 14	20.65	14.46
292	Southeast	São Paulo	Itapevi	Jul 09	26.83	Jul 24	22.57	14.46
293	Northeast	Bahia	Itabuna	Jul 03	28.64	Jul 15	24.36	14.40
294	Northeast	Maranhão	Paço do Lumiar	Jul 03	27.30	Jul 17	23.03	14.36
295	Northeast	Pernambuco	Paulista	Jun 29	27.43	Jul 11	23.16	14.34
296	Northeast	Ceará	Maracanaú	Jul 03	27.05	Jul 17	22.78	14.34
297	Northeast	Ceará	Massapê	Aug 19	17.96	Sep 14	14.11	14.32
298	Northeast	Piauí	Canto do Buriti	Aug 15	22.75	Sep 06	18.93	14.29
299	Southeast	São Paulo	Praia Grande	Jul 08	27.67	Jul 23	23.40	14.26
300	Southeast	São Paulo	Limeira	Jul 20	27.26	Aug 05	23.00	14.24
301	Southeast	São Paulo	Franco da Rocha	Jul 02	27.80	Jul 17	23.53	14.22
302	Southeast	São Paulo	Campo Limpo Paulista	Jul 11	28.92	Jul 25	24.65	14.18
303	Southeast	São Paulo	Embu-Guaçu	Jul 07	29.87	Jul 18	25.59	14.15
304	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Marau	Jun 25	27.43	Jul 07	23.16	14.15
305	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Belford Roxo	Jul 16	28.10	Aug 02	23.83	14.15
306	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Guapimirim	Jul 17	28.81	Jul 29	24.79	14.14
307	Southeast	São Paulo	São Lourenço da Serra	Jul 07	30.04	Jul 19	25.77	14.13
308	North	Acre	Rio Branco	Jul 02	26.11	Jul 17	21.86	14.10
309	Southeast	São Paulo	Agudos	Jul 07	28.88	Jul 21	24.60	14.10
310	Northeast	Alagoas	Maragogi	Jul 15	28.37	Jul 25	24.82	14.10
311	Southeast	Espírito Santo	Cariacica	Jul 05	27.50	Jul 19	23.23	14.09
312	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Duque de Caxias	Jul 10	28.26	Jul 26	23.98	14.03
313	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Garibaldi	Jul 04	29.01	Jul 14	24.74	14.03
314	South	Santa Catarina	Penha	Jul 19	27.59	Aug 03	23.32	14.01
315	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Itaboraí	Jul 03	27.09	Jul 17	22.83	13.98
316	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Paracambi	Jul 10	27.46	Jul 22	23.19	13.95
317	Northeast	Sergipe	Aracaju	Jul 12	25.35	Jul 28	21.12	13.95
318	Southeast	São Paulo	Suzano	Jul 08	28.35	Jul 23	24.07	13.95
319	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	São Gonçalo	Jul 11	28.09	Jul 27	23.82	13.94
320	Southeast	São Paulo	Pindamonhangaba	Jul 20	28.63	Aug 04	24.35	13.89
321	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	Ipanguaçu	Jul 01	32.44	Jul 11	28.18	13.85
322	North	Pará	Castanhal	Jul 07	28.51	Jul 18	24.23	13.83
323	North	Pará	Marapanim	Jul 15	26.37	Jul 25	22.83	13.82
324	Southeast	São Paulo	Piracicaba	Jul 14	27.43	Jul 29	23.16	13.82
325	Southeast	Espírito Santo	Serra	Jun 28	28.66	Jul 11	24.38	13.82
326	Northeast	Pernambuco	Tabira	Jul 31	25.28	Aug 17	21.07	13.80
327	Northeast	Pernambuco	Moreno	Jul 03	29.51	Jul 15	25.22	13.77
328	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Cachoeiras de Macacu	Jul 11	28.30	Jul 25	24.02	13.75
329	Southeast	São Paulo	Piracaia	Jul 13	30.11	Jul 25	25.83	13.69
330	Southeast	São Paulo	Carapicuíba	Jul 02	28.38	Jul 17	24.10	13.69
331	Southeast	São Paulo	Itatiba	Jul 18	28.04	Aug 04	23.77	13.69
332	North	Pará	Parauapebas	Jul 06	29.87	Jul 18	25.59	13.61
333	Northeast	Pernambuco	Glória do Goitá	Jul 04	31.22	Jul 15	26.94	13.60
334	Northeast	Paraíba	Cabedelo	Jul 10	27.49	Jul 26	23.22	13.59
335	Northeast	Paraíba	Patos	Jul 12	27.61	Jul 29	23.34	13.59
336	Southeast	São Paulo	Jandira	Jul 08	28.37	Jul 22	24.09	13.57
337	North	Pará	Canaã dos Carajás	Jul 15	28.22	Jul 30	23.94	13.56
338	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Passo Fundo	Jun 29	28.71	Jul 12	24.44	13.54
339	Southeast	São Paulo	Sorocaba	Jul 13	28.91	Jul 29	24.62	13.52
340	Southeast	São Paulo	Registro	Jul 25	27.18	Aug 10	22.92	13.51
341	Southeast	São Paulo	Osasco	Jul 08	28.88	Jul 25	24.60	13.50
342	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Nova Serrana	Aug 06	25.82	Aug 25	21.59	13.50
343	North	Amapá	Macapá	Jun 27	28.81	Jul 11	24.52	13.50
344	Northeast	Pernambuco	Cabo de Santo Agostinho	Jul 12	28.30	Jul 28	24.03	13.49
345	North	Pará	Santo Antônio do Tauá	Jun 28	29.17	Jul 07	24.89	13.45
346	Northeast	Pernambuco	Carpina	Jul 08	33.15	Jul 18	28.89	13.43
347	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	São José de Mipibu	Jul 02	32.22	Jul 11	27.95	13.32
348	Northeast	Pernambuco	Nazaré da Mata	Jul 08	31.08	Jul 18	27.05	13.30
349	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	São João de Meriti	Jul 10	30.06	Jul 25	25.77	13.25
350	North	Amazonas	Manacapuru	Jun 19	29.70	Jul 01	25.42	13.21
351	Northeast	Piauí	Teresina	Jun 30	28.95	Jul 15	24.68	13.16
352	Southeast	São Paulo	Guarulhos	Jul 06	29.89	Jul 22	25.60	13.13
353	Southeast	São Paulo	Jundiaí	Jul 04	29.90	Jul 18	25.61	13.12
354	Southeast	São Paulo	Americana	Jul 04	30.70	Jul 18	26.41	13.12
355	Northeast	Paraíba	João Pessoa	Jun 30	29.48	Jul 13	25.20	13.10

Continued on next page

Table A1 – continued from previous page

Row Number	Region	State	Name	No Policy (Peak)		With Policy (Peak)		Reduction (%)
				Date	Infectious (%)	Date	Infectious (%)	
356	Northeast	Pernambuco	Timbaúba	Jul 11	30.69	Jul 24	26.41	13.10
357	North	Rondônia	Ji-Paraná	Jul 03	31.99	Jul 14	27.70	13.07
358	Northeast	Pernambuco	Camargibe	Jun 26	30.48	Jul 09	26.19	13.06
359	Southeast	São Paulo	Bauru	Jul 09	30.51	Jul 23	26.22	13.06
360	North	Pará	Santa Izabel do Pará	Jun 25	32.94	Jul 04	28.67	13.03
361	Southeast	São Paulo	São Sebastião	Jun 30	28.18	Jul 15	23.91	13.03
362	Northeast	Paraíba	Campina Grande	Jul 11	31.34	Jul 23	27.06	12.99
363	Southeast	Espírito Santo	Santa Maria de Jetibá	Jul 10	30.19	Jul 22	25.91	12.99
364	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Japeri	Jul 04	31.67	Jul 16	27.39	12.99
365	Northeast	Pernambuco	Goiana	Jul 03	29.37	Jul 17	25.09	12.94
366	Southeast	São Paulo	Barretos	Jul 03	31.74	Jul 14	27.46	12.93
367	North	Amapá	Oiapoque	Jun 30	30.19	Jul 10	25.93	12.91
368	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Mesquita	Jul 08	31.20	Jul 23	26.91	12.90
369	North	Amazonas	Itacoatiara	Jun 24	32.06	Jul 04	27.78	12.89
370	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Lajeado	Jun 24	31.45	Jul 03	27.16	12.84
371	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Itaguaí	Jul 03	30.80	Jul 15	26.51	12.83
372	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Montes Claros	Jul 18	30.59	Aug 03	26.30	12.78
373	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	Alexandria	Jun 26	37.70	Jul 04	33.51	12.73
374	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Sapucaia	Jun 26	30.32	Jul 07	26.03	12.73
375	Northeast	Ceará	Quixeramobim	Jul 03	29.12	Jul 17	24.84	12.72
376	Northeast	Paraíba	Taperoá	Aug 01	22.21	Aug 23	18.16	12.72
377	North	Pará	Ananindeua	Jun 29	30.87	Jul 10	26.58	12.70
378	Southeast	São Paulo	Hortolândia	Jul 20	27.43	Aug 03	23.20	12.70
379	Northeast	Sergipe	Itaporanga d'Ajuda	Jul 21	27.16	Aug 05	22.91	12.69
380	Northeast	Pernambuco	Sertânia	Jul 06	30.20	Jul 19	25.91	12.69
381	Midwest	Goiás	Aparecida de Goiânia	Jul 13	31.02	Jul 27	26.73	12.61
382	Southeast	São Paulo	Cajamar	Jun 29	30.01	Jul 11	25.72	12.60
383	North	Pará	Belém	Jun 24	31.08	Jul 06	26.80	12.55
384	Northeast	Ceará	Bela Cruz	Jul 14	26.71	Jul 25	22.71	12.52
385	Northeast	Paraíba	Santa Rita	Jun 30	30.23	Jul 12	25.94	12.51
386	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Venâncio Aires	Jul 03	35.03	Jul 13	30.78	12.50
387	North	Pará	Paragominas	Jul 01	35.46	Jul 10	31.23	12.49
388	Northeast	Pernambuco	Amaraji	Jul 04	31.59	Jul 15	27.30	12.49
389	Northeast	Maranhão	Bacabal	Jul 01	34.43	Jul 11	30.18	12.48
390	North	Amapá	Santana	Jun 30	30.79	Jul 13	26.50	12.47
391	Southeast	São Paulo	São Vicente	Jun 30	32.44	Jul 13	28.16	12.41
392	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	São Francisco de Itabapoana	Jul 04	31.61	Jul 16	27.32	12.32
393	Southeast	São Paulo	Lins	Jul 04	34.21	Jul 16	29.95	12.31
394	Southeast	São Paulo	Juquitiba	Jul 05	32.36	Jul 17	28.07	12.27
395	North	Amazonas	São Paulo de Olivença	Jun 25	30.06	Jul 07	25.77	12.23
396	Northeast	Pernambuco	Jaboatão dos Guararapes	Jun 27	32.38	Jul 09	28.10	12.21
397	Northeast	Maranhão	São Luís	Jun 19	32.59	Jul 01	28.31	12.09
398	Northeast	Rio Grande do Norte	São Rafael	Jun 23	33.99	Jul 02	29.70	12.09
399	Southeast	São Paulo	Salesópolis	Jul 16	28.92	Jul 29	24.65	12.07
400	Northeast	Paraíba	Cajazeiras	Jul 07	33.28	Jul 18	29.00	11.92
401	Northeast	Ceará	Caucaia	Jun 23	32.69	Jul 04	28.41	11.90
402	Southeast	São Paulo	Santa Isabel	Jul 05	33.08	Jul 16	28.80	11.89
403	Northeast	Alagoas	Paripueira	Sep 21	18.12	Jul 24	15.24	11.84
404	Southeast	Espírito Santo	Viana	Jun 25	32.14	Jul 06	27.86	11.83
405	Southeast	São Paulo	Caraguatatuba	Jun 27	33.21	Jul 10	28.93	11.82
406	Northeast	Pernambuco	Itapissuma	Jul 16	26.95	Jul 29	22.96	11.78
407	Southeast	São Paulo	Lucélia	Jul 08	30.50	Jul 19	26.21	11.75
408	Northeast	Pernambuco	Vitória de Santo Antão	Jun 24	34.38	Jul 05	30.12	11.73
409	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Três Pontas	Jul 02	35.96	Jul 12	31.71	11.71
410	North	Pará	Capanema	Jun 27	33.88	Jul 05	29.63	11.70
411	North	Amazonas	Iranduba	Jun 13	34.15	Jun 21	29.88	11.65
412	North	Amazonas	Parintins	Jun 16	32.17	Jun 28	27.88	11.63
413	North	Pará	São Miguel do Guamá	Jun 28	33.16	Jul 07	28.87	11.58
414	Northeast	Piauí	Parnaíba	Jun 27	32.56	Jul 11	28.28	11.55
415	Northeast	Pernambuco	Recife	Jun 12	33.78	Jun 24	29.50	11.54
416	Northeast	Maranhão	Cururupu	Jul 03	34.12	Jul 14	29.85	11.49
417	Northeast	Ceará	Itaitinga	Jun 21	33.93	Jul 03	29.65	11.48
418	Northeast	Alagoas	Marechal Deodoro	Jun 25	34.17	Jul 05	29.89	11.48
419	North	Amazonas	Autazes	Jun 13	39.32	Jun 19	35.17	11.45
420	Northeast	Ceará	Pedra Branca	Jun 30	33.41	Jul 11	29.13	11.45
421	North	Amazonas	Borba	Jul 07	33.62	Jul 14	30.07	11.42
422	Northeast	Ceará	Maranguape	Jun 23	35.27	Jul 03	31.00	11.38
423	Northeast	Paraíba	Bayeux	Jul 02	34.23	Jul 14	29.96	11.36
424	North	Amazonas	Maués	Jun 24	35.68	Jul 04	31.42	11.35
425	Northeast	Maranhão	Imperatriz	Jun 23	34.44	Jul 03	30.17	11.22
426	North	Pará	Benevides	Jun 21	37.73	Jun 28	33.51	11.19
427	North	Rondônia	Porto Velho	Jun 19	34.43	Jul 01	30.16	11.18
428	North	Pará	Cametá	Jul 04	32.31	Jul 18	28.02	11.18

Continued on next page

Table A1 – continued from previous page

Row Number	Region	State	Name	No Policy (Peak)		With Policy (Peak)		Reduction (%)
				Date	Infectious (%)	Date	Infectious (%)	
429	Northeast	Pernambuco	Pombos	Jun 18	35.87	Jun 27	31.62	11.14
430	Northeast	Ceará	Cascavel	Jun 27	34.50	Jul 07	30.23	11.14
431	South	Paraná	São João do Caiuá	Jun 08	38.46	Jun 13	34.24	11.06
432	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Tunas	Jun 21	39.07	Jun 28	35.13	11.05
433	Northeast	Ceará	Pindoretama	Jun 25	36.54	Jul 04	32.31	11.00
434	Northeast	Paraíba	Conde	Jun 18	39.68	Jun 25	35.50	10.97
435	Northeast	Pernambuco	Itaquitinga	Jun 28	37.43	Jul 07	33.20	10.79
436	North	Amazonas	Beruri	Jun 22	39.10	Jun 30	34.91	10.76
437	North	Pará	Barcarena	Jun 26	38.44	Jul 05	34.22	10.75
438	Northeast	Pernambuco	Igarassu	Jun 21	36.99	Jul 01	32.74	10.75
439	North	Pará	Marabá	Jun 28	37.72	Jul 07	33.50	10.67
440	Southeast	São Paulo	Guararema	Jul 26	25.91	Aug 12	22.02	10.66
441	Northeast	Alagoas	Maceió	Jun 15	36.01	Jun 26	31.75	10.60
442	North	Tocantins	Paraíso do Tocantins	Jul 10	33.05	Jul 23	28.76	10.50
443	Northeast	Ceará	Eusébio	Jun 11	37.05	Jun 21	32.80	10.47
444	North	Amazonas	Barcelos	Jul 07	33.37	Jul 18	29.08	10.46
445	North	Amapá	Laranjal do Jari	Jun 17	37.99	Jun 24	33.79	10.45
446	Northeast	Pernambuco	Olinda	Jun 13	37.55	Jun 23	33.31	10.41
447	Northeast	Sergipe	Rosário do Catete	Jun 27	37.67	Jul 05	33.46	10.40
448	North	Pará	Viseu	Sep 20	21.82	Jul 22	18.90	10.38
449	Northeast	Pernambuco	Água Preta	Jun 26	38.68	Jul 04	34.50	10.37
450	North	Amazonas	Manaquiri	Jun 19	42.75	Jun 26	38.65	10.27
451	Southeast	Espírito Santo	Afonso Cláudio	Jun 18	40.63	Jun 26	36.47	10.20
452	Northeast	Pernambuco	São José da Coroa Grande	Jun 15	38.38	Jun 24	34.15	10.13
453	Northeast	Maranhão	Mirinzal	Jun 18	42.98	Jun 25	38.88	10.13
454	North	Amazonas	Coari	Jun 10	41.64	Jun 16	37.49	10.08
455	North	Pará	Bragança	Jun 22	38.53	Jun 29	34.31	10.06
456	Northeast	Maranhão	Anajatuba	Jun 23	38.13	Jul 02	33.89	9.95
457	Northeast	Pernambuco	Trindade	Jun 24	41.12	Jul 02	36.95	9.92
458	Northeast	Maranhão	Santa Rita	Jun 18	36.87	Jun 24	33.34	9.76
459	Southeast	São Paulo	Pariquera-Açu	Jun 11	41.34	Jun 17	37.17	9.74
460	North	Amazonas	Presidente Figueiredo	Jun 11	38.84	Jun 19	34.62	9.74
461	Midwest	Goiás	Planaltina	Jun 26	41.66	Jul 05	37.49	9.54
462	Northeast	Ceará	Pacajus	Jun 22	38.11	Jun 28	34.59	9.48
463	Northeast	Ceará	Trairi	Jun 26	38.38	Jul 05	34.15	9.36
464	Northeast	Ceará	Umirim	Jul 02	35.27	Jul 13	31.00	9.29
465	North	Pará	Limoeiro do Ajuru	Jun 24	38.19	Jul 03	33.96	9.29
466	Southeast	Rio de Janeiro	Campos dos Goytacazes	Jun 20	42.22	Jun 28	38.07	9.27
467	South	Paraná	Santo Antônio do Caiuá	Jun 02	44.72	Jun 06	40.64	9.16
468	Northeast	Maranhão	Arari	Jun 12	43.74	Jun 19	39.62	9.14
469	Northeast	Ceará	São Gonçalo do Amarante	Jun 11	43.73	Jun 18	39.61	8.68
470	Southeast	São Paulo	Serrana	Jun 25	39.36	Jul 04	35.13	8.67
471	North	Amazonas	Tabatinga	Jun 05	42.88	Jun 12	38.75	8.65
472	North	Pará	Ponta de Pedras	Jun 13	44.19	Jun 19	40.09	8.61
473	North	Amazonas	Careiro	Jun 06	44.39	Jun 13	40.27	8.57
474	Northeast	Pernambuco	Custódia	Jun 15	46.14	Jun 22	42.08	8.53
475	South	Rio Grande do Sul	Bento Gonçalves	Jun 11	47.34	Jun 16	43.59	8.47
476	Northeast	Ceará	Solonópole	Jun 08	49.18	Jun 13	45.26	8.30
477	Northeast	Maranhão	Lago da Pedra	Jun 18	45.01	Jun 25	40.92	8.29
478	Northeast	Paraíba	Sapé	Jun 09	45.89	Jun 16	41.84	8.25
479	Southeast	Minas Gerais	São Francisco	Jun 12	48.72	Jun 18	44.75	8.23
480	Southeast	Minas Gerais	Mário Campos	Aug 07	31.06	Jun 25	28.08	8.20
481	Northeast	Maranhão	Morros	Jun 19	42.01	Jun 24	38.55	8.18
482	Northeast	Piauí	Picos	Jun 09	46.83	Jun 15	42.82	8.17
483	North	Amazonas	Tefé	Jun 08	44.59	Jun 15	40.49	8.11
484	North	Amazonas	Urucará	Jun 07	45.59	Jun 12	41.53	7.93
485	North	Amazonas	Rio Preto da Eva	May 29	50.58	Jun 02	46.70	7.74
486	North	Pará	Breves	Jun 08	48.58	Jun 13	44.60	7.65
487	North	Pará	São Caetano de Odivelas	Jun 10	46.87	Jun 16	42.81	7.60
488	Northeast	Ceará	Acaraú	Jun 02	52.90	Jun 08	49.04	7.04
489	North	Amazonas	Carauari	May 20	56.60	May 24	52.91	6.40
490	Northeast	Ceará	Viçosa do Ceará	Jun 01	58.12	Jun 05	54.51	5.91
491	Northeast	Paraíba	Mari	May 29	62.13	Jun 01	58.73	5.57