Overview on COVID-19 outbreak indicators across Brazilian federative units

Elvira Maria Guerra-Shinohara^{1,2,3,4*}, Simone Schneider Weber^{1,5,6}, Clóvis Paniz⁷, Guilherme Wataru Gomes⁴, Eduardo Jun Shinohara⁸, Tiago Borges Ribeiro Gandra⁹, Indira Correia Pereira², Karine Gomes Jarzem³, Renato Ferreira de Almeida Zanre⁵, Acácia Gimenez Barreto⁵, Alessandro Diogo De Carli^{5,10}

1. Faculdade de Ciências Farmacêuticas, Alimentos e Nutrição (FACFAN), Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul, Campo Grande, MS, Brazil
2. Programa de Pós-Graduação *Stricto Sensu* em Ciências Farmacêuticas, Faculdade de Ciências Farmacêuticas, Alimentos e Nutrição, Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul, Campo Grande, MS, Brazil
3. Programa de Pós-Graduação *Stricto Sensu* em Enfermagem, Instituto Integrado de Saúde, Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul, Campo Grande, MS, Brazil
4. Programa de Pós-Graduação *Stricto Sensu* em Farmácia (Fisiopatologia e Toxicologia), Faculdade de Ciências Farmacêuticas da Universidade de São Paulo, SP, Brazil
5. Programa de Pós-Graduação *Stricto Sensu* em Saúde da Família, Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul, Campo Grande, MS, Brazil
6. Instituto de Ciências Exatas e Tecnologia, Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Itacoatiara, AM, Brazil
7. Departamento de Análises Clínicas e Toxicológicas, Centro de Ciências da Saúde, Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Santa Maria, RS, Brazil
8. Companhia Ambiental do Estado de São Paulo, CETESB, SP, Brazil
9. Instituto Federal de Educação Ciência e Tecnologia do Rio Grande do Sul, Rio Grande, RS, Brazil
10. Faculdade de Odontologia, Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul, Campo Grande, MS, Campo Grande, Brazil

*Corresponding author:

E-mail: elvira.guerra@ufms.br or emguerra@usp.br (EMGS)

Abstract

Background. The 2019 coronavirus disease pandemic (COVID-19) spread rapidly across Brazil. The country has 27 federative units, with wide regional differences related to climate, lifestyle habits, socioeconomic characteristics and population density. Therefore, we aimed to document and monitor the increase in COVID-19 cases across each federative unit in Brazil, by tracking its progression from inception to 15 May 2020. **Methods.** Observational study. **Results.** The first confirmed COVID-19 case in the country was notified in São Paulo on 26 February, while the first death occurred on 17 March, in Rio de Janeiro. Since then, there has been a dramatic increase in both confirmed cases and deaths from the disease. São Paulo, in the Southeast region, was initially considered the COVID-19 epidemic epicentre in Brazil. However, 10 states in the North and Northeast regions were ranked among the 14 highest incidences (over 100 cases per 100,000 people) observed on 15 May. Higher incidence rates (>100 cases per 100,000) were associated to higher rates of inadequate water supply and sewerage (OR, 5.83 (95% CI, 1.08–29.37, P=0.041)). North and Northeast states with the highest social vulnerability index scores had higher increases in the incidence rate between 14 April and 15 May. States with medium human development index (HDI) showed higher incidence increases from 14 April to 15 May, being seven of them with ratios in the range from 27.49 to 63.73 times. **Conclusion.** Spreading of COVID-19 in Brazil differs across both regions and federative units, being influenced by different socioeconomic contexts.

Keywords: coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, epidemic, public health, nursing, pharmaceutical sciences, Human Development Index, Social Vulnerability Index

69

70 Introduction

71 This year 2020 will go down in world history due to the coronavirus disease of 2019
72 (COVID-19) pandemic. The first suspected case of COVID-19 was reported in Wuhan, the
73 capital of Hubei Province, China, on 1 December 2019 [1-3]. The peak of the epidemic in
74 China occurred on 19 February 2020, and a month later the number of deaths in China
75 reached 3,242 out of a total of 81,174 confirmed cases [4].

76 In a health crisis unprecedented in recent history, cases of severe acute respiratory
77 syndrome by coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) crossed the country's borders and rapidly spread
78 across the world, leading to the official declaration of a global pandemic and public health
79 emergency by the World Health Organization (WHO) in 11 March 2020 [5, 6].

80 Person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from asymptomatic patients was first
81 documented in Germany and Vietnam clusters during early February 2020 [7, 8]. However,
82 Wu and McGoogan (2020) described that 81% of initial patients notified in China
83 experienced only mild disease, which could have contributed to an asymptomatic
84 transmission [9]. In addition, recent reports have pointed out that virus incubation may be
85 longer than the 14 days period used by the WHO to guide quarantine policies [10, 11]. Taken
86 together, these factors are undoubtedly contributing to the rapid spread of SARS-CoV-2 over
87 the world [12-14].

88 Since early March 2020, a rapid increase in the number of cases in Italy, Spain,
89 France, Germany and Iran has been observed. According to data from WHO (situation report
90 123) on 22 May 2020, most reported cases occurred in the United States of America
91 (1,525,186 cases with 91,527 deaths), the Russian Federation (326,448 cases with 3,249
92 deaths) followed by Brazil in third position [15].

93 In Brazil, the first confirmed case of COVID-19 was notified in São Paulo state on 26
94 February, while the first death was registered on 17 March 2020 in Rio de Janeiro state.
95 Since then, the incidence of COVID-19 has increased very rapidly in the country, reaching a

total of 330,890 confirmed cases with 21,048 deaths, by the cut-off date for data compilation in this study, 22 May 2020 [16].

In this context, epidemiological studies conducted early in the course of an epidemic are important to guide public health decision-making. Monitoring numbers of COVID-19 cases, deaths, as well as regional differences in incidence, is critical for understanding community risks and making decisions about strategic allocation of health care resources and the control of social distancing during the disease outbreak. Thus, the aim of this study was to document and monitor the increase of COVID-19 cases across each federative unit in Brazil, by following the progression of notified cases from inception to 15 May 2020, as well as their determinants and health indicators.

Material and Methods

Study Design

This is an observational study that tracked data on notified cases of COVID-19 in Brazil, from inception to 15 May 2020.

Data collection

Data on the numbers of both COVID-19 cases and deaths from the disease were obtained from the official website of the Ministry of Health of Brazil, from 14 April 2020 onwards [16]. When the data from the Brazilian government website were consulted, care was taken to select the date of the first notification of COVID-19 and the data on 14 April. From that date, a daily follow-up of cases was conducted in each federative unit until 15 May 2020.

Sociodemographic data (population and number of elderly people) by cities and states were estimated by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) based on the

121 index-date of 1 July 2019, from the last census conducted in Brazil in 2010 [17]. Per capita
122 income was extracted from the demographic census conducted in 2010 [18].

123 Data on health determinants, such as percentage of inadequate water supply and
124 sewerage, and the number of hospital beds and intensive treatment units, were obtained
125 from DATASUS, the IT Department of the Brazilian Unified Health System, and IBGE [18,
126 19]. In addition, social isolation rates were obtained from Inloco website [20].

127 The incidence rate of COVID-19 was obtained based on the estimated population of
128 each federative unit in 2019 and it was presented as cases per 100,000. The case fatality
129 was calculated and presented as a percentage.

130 The Human Development Index (HDI) scores were obtained from the Brazilian Atlas of
131 Human Development, produced by United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Institute
132 of Applied Economic Research (IPEA) and João Pinheiro Foundation [21]. HDI is a
133 development indicator that aggregates economic data from the per capita gross domestic
134 product with other data related to education [adult literacy rate and schooling (combined
135 primary, secondary, and higher education)] and health (mean life expectancy at birth). HDI
136 scores can range from 0 to 1, and the 27 Brazilian federative units are grouped into four
137 development categories, depending on their HDI score: very high for $HDI \geq 0.800$, high from
138 0.700 to 0.799, average from 0.550 to 0.699 and low when HDI is below 0.550 [21].

139 The Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) was developed by IPEA. SVI scores were
140 calculated based on the 2010 Brazil census variables. This tool is particularly useful for
141 emergency response planners and public health authorities, as it can identify and map
142 communities most likely to need support before, during, and after a hazardous event. SVI
143 scores can vary from 0 to 1, with higher values associated to higher social vulnerability. SVI
144 scores for each municipality were classified in five levels: very low, from 0 to 0.200; low, from
145 0.201 to 0.300; medium, from 0.301 to 0.400; high, from 0.401 to 0.500; and very high,
146 above 0.501 to 1 [22].

147 In addition, data were organized and made available at a geospatial data platform
148 called PIE-COVID, which has numerous georeferenced variables of all cases of COVID-19 in
149 Brazilian cities and states [23].

150

151

152

153

154 **Ethics**

155 In this study, only public domain data was used, without identifying personal data.
156 According to the Resolution number 510/2016 from Brazilian legislation of the National
157 Health Council (*Conselho Nacional de Saúde (CNS)*), no ethical approval is required under
158 Ethics Committee on Research (*Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa (CEP)*) and National Ethics
159 Commission (*Comissão Nacional de Ética (Conep)*) [24].

160

161 **Statistical analyses**

162 Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 22.0 (IBM, USA) and
163 GraphPad Prism™ version 5.04 (GraphPad Software, Inc., USA).

164 Spearman's correlations between COVID-19 incidence on 31 April and SVI, and
165 between incidence ratio (15 May/14 April) and SVI, were calculated for each of the 27
166 federative units.

167 Incidence rates of COVID-19 on 15 May were divided into two groups, according to
168 median rate (cut-off point, >100). Water supply and sewerage inadequacy rates (%) were
169 also categorized in two groups, according to median rate (cut-off point, ≥9.0%).

170 The increase in incidence rate over the course of a month was obtained by the ratio
171 between incidence rates registered on 15 May and 14 April 2020. In addition, increases in
172 incidence rates were classified into quartiles (1st quartile, 2.83 to 5.94; 2nd quartile, 5.95 to
173 13.38; 3rd quartile, 13.39 to 27.48; and 4th quartile, 27.49 to 63.73).

174 The chi-square test or the likelihood ratio were used to analyse frequencies of
175 categorical variables, with a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$.

176

177 **Results**

178 The first case of COVID-19 in Brazil was reported in São Paulo city on 26 February, a
179 person who had returned from a trip to Italy some days before. On this date, Brazil became
180 the first country to report a case of COVID-19 in Latin America.

181 Among the capitals of Brazilian federative units, 25 out of 27 had cases of COVID-19
182 in March. Only the capitals of the states of Piauí (Teresina) and Tocantins (Palmas) reported
183 cases in April. In Piauí, two cities had cases in March (Parnaíba and São José do Divino),
184 and in Tocantins only Araguaína had a case on 27 March 2020.

185 In this study, we decided to present data according to the five politic regions of Brazil:
186 North, Northeast, Southeast, South and Midwest.

187 North region consists of seven states: Rondônia (RO), Acre (AC), Amazonas (AM),
188 Roraima (RR), Pará (PA), Amapá (AP), and Tocantins (TO). The first case of COVID-19
189 recorded in this region was on 15 March 2020 in AM, the state with the worst social
190 vulnerability index (SVI) and one of the worst Human Development Index (HDI) scores
191 among North states.

192 Furthermore, AM together with the small state of AP registered on 30 April 2020 the
193 highest incidence of COVID-19 in the North. On 15 May 2020, the incidence rate of COVID-
194 19 in these states (AM, 443.76; and AP, 429.21) was more than three times that of São
195 Paulo (127.13), Federal District (125.59), and Rio de Janeiro (115.77), Fig 1. The North
196 region had 40,473 cases and 2,762 deaths, ranking third among all five regions. Information
197 about population, health determinants and indicators and about notification of COVID-19 of
198 North region from the beginning of pandemic until 15 May 2020 is shown in Table 1 and Fig
199 1 and 2.

200

201 **Figure 1. Incidence rate of COVID-19 (cases per 100,000) and case fatality (%) in**
 202 **Brazilian federative units on 14 (A and B) and 30 (C and D) April 2020; incidence rate of**
 203 **COVID-19 on 15 May 2020 (E); and inadequate water supply and sewerage rates (F),**
 204 **2010. Figure F shows federative units in decreasing order of COVID-19 incidence,**
 205 **according to data from 15 May 2020.** AC: Acre, AL: Alagoas, AP: Amapá, AM: Amazonas, BA: Bahia,
 206 CE: Ceará, DF: Distrito Federal, ES: Espírito Santos, GO: Goiás, MA: Maranhão, MT: Mato Grosso, MS: Mato
 207 Grosso do Sul, MG: Minas Gerais, PA: Pará, PB: Paraíba, PR: Paraná, PE: Pernambuco, PI: Piauí, RJ: Rio de
 208 Janeiro, RN: Rio Grande do Norte, RS: Rio Grande do Sul, RO: Rondônia, RR: Roraima, SC: Santa Catarina, SP:
 209 São Paulo, SE: Sergipe, TO: Tocantins.

210

211

212

Table 1. Notification of COVID-19 in the North and Northeast regions of Brazil until 15 May 2020

NORTH	RO	AC	AM	RR	PA	AP	TO	Total		
Population¹	1,777,225 9.64%	881,935 4.79%	4,144,597 22.49%	605,761 3.29%	8,602,865 46.68%	845,731 4.59%	1,572,866 8.53%	18,430,980 100%		
Elderly (≥65 y)¹	107,581	45,712	202,464	25,770	506,893	36,085	112,964	1,037,469		
Total number of cities	52	22	62	15	144	16	139	450		
Per capita income (R\$)	670.82	522.15	539.80	605.59	446.76	598.98	586.62			
Inadequate water supply and sewerage (%)	12.43	28.09	20.98	12.44	29.05	21.51	8.07			
SVI	0.319	0.443	0.488	0.366	0.469	0.404	0.336			
HDI	0.690	0.663	0.674	0.707	0.646	0.708	0.699			
Hospital Beds in SUS	3,360	1,350	4,914	1,064	10,240	953	2,327	24,208		
ICU beds in SUS	287	133	691	87	1,081	91	235	2,605		
Total hospital beds	4,286	1,484	5,700	1,113	13,483	1,098	3,072	30,256		
Population/hospital beds	415	594	727	535	638	770	512	609		
Date of 1 st case	20.03.20	19.03.20	15.03.20	22.03.20	19.03.20	20.03.20	19.03.20	15.03.20		
Total cases, March	8	42	175	16	32	10	11	294		
Deaths, March	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	4		
Social isolation (%) in 14 April 2020	37.89	39.70	47.90	38.06	44.78	47.31	35.54			
Cases until 14 April 2020	42	90	1,276	113	311	244	26	2,102		
Deaths until 14 April 2020	2	3	71	3	14	6	0	99		
Incidence on 14 April 2020*	2.36	10.20	30.79	18.65	3.62	28.85	1.65	11.40		
Social isolation (%) in 30 April 2020	46.8	50.9	52.6	48.2	57.9	60.0	48.3			
Cases until 30 April 2020	502	404	5,254	519	2,876	1,080	137	10,772		
Deaths until 30 April 2020	16	19	425	7	208	34	3	712		
Incidence on 30 April 2020*	28.25	45.81	126.77	85.68	33.43	127.7	8.71	58.45		
Cases until 15 May 2020	1,789	1,785	18,392	1,589	12,109	3,630	1,179	40,473		
Deaths until 15 May 2020	62	57	1,331	40	1,145	103	24	2,762		
Incidence on 15 May 2020	100.66	202.40	443.76	262.31	140.76	429.21	74.96	219.59		
NORTHEAST	MA	PI	CE	RN	PB	PE	AL	SE	BA	Total
Population¹	7,075,181 12.40%	3,273,227 5.74%	9,132,078 16.00%	3,506,853 6.14%	4,018,127 7.04%	9,557,071 16.75%	3,337,357 5.85%	2,298,696 4.03%	14,873,064 26.06%	57,071,654 100%

Elderly (≥65 y) ¹	503,654	285,899	816,935	315,584	393,136	845,808	254,662	172,546	1,335,027	4,923,251
Total number of cities	217	224	184	167	223	185	102	75	417	1,794
Per capita income (R\$)	360.34	416.93	460.63	545.42	474.94	525.64	432.56	523.53	496.73	
Inadequate water supply and sewerage (%)	23.99	8.15	10.99	9.4	11.75	10.83	13.07	11.02	9.35	
SVI	0.521	0.403	0.378	0.349	0.385	0.414	0.461	0.393	0.403	
IDH	0.639	0.646	0.682	0.684	0.658	0.673	0.631	0.665	0.660	
Hospital Beds in SUS	12,204	6,470	14,350	5,958	6,425	15,644	4,807	2,376	22,947	91,181
ICU beds in SUS	784	392	1,243	473	671	1,404	488	348	1,772	7,575
Total hospital beds	13,778	7,460	18,510	7,250	8,147	20,945	5,891	3,212	28,960	114,153
Population/hospital beds	514	439	493	484	493	456	567	716	514	500
Date of 1 st case	21.03.20	20.03.20	17.03.20	13.03.20	19.03.20	12.03.20	08.03.20	15.03.20	06.03.20	06.03.20
Total cases March	31	18	390	82	17	87	18	19	213	875
Deaths March	1	4	7	1	0	6	1	0	2	22
Social isolation (%) in 14 April 2020	47.54	47.95	49.97	85.86	46.81	50.60	44.25	47.00	46.30	
Cases until 14 April 2020	479	58	1911	333	136	1146	51	45	722	4,881
Deaths until 14 April 2020	32	8	100	17	16	101	4	4	22	304
Incidence on 14 April 2020*	6.77	1.77	20.93	9.50	3.38	11.99	1.53	1.96	4.85	8.55
Social isolation (%) in 30 April 2020	59.6	59.0	57.9	55.7	55.3	58.5	-	53.2	52.9	
Cases until 30 April 2020	3,190	513	7,606	1,177	814	6,876	1,044	447	2,851	24,518
Deaths until 30 April 2020	184	24	482	56	62	565	47	12	104	1,536
Incidence on 30 April 2020*	45.09	15.67	83.29	33.56	20.26	71.95	31.28	19.45	19.17	42.96
Cases until 15 May 2020	10,739	1,905	22,490	2,786	3,739	16,209	3,212	2,868	8,128	72,076
Deaths until 15 May 2020	496	60	1,476	122	170	1,381	187	50	281	4,223
Incidence on 15 May 2020	151.78	58.2	246.27	79.44	93.05	169.60	96.24	124.77	54.65	126.29

¹ Data estimated by the IBGE for the year 2019. All indicators were based on IBGE 2010 data. Federative units in the North region of Brazil are RO, Rondônia; AC, Acre; AM, Amazonas; RR, Roraima; PA, Pará; AP, Amapá; and TO, Tocantins; and in the Northeast region of Brazil are MA, Maranhão; PI, Piauí; CE, Ceará; RN, Rio Grande do Norte; PB, Paraíba; PE, Pernambuco; AL, Alagoas; SE, Sergipe; and BA, Bahia. SVI, Social vulnerability index; HDI, Human Development index; SUS, Brazilian Unified Public Health System; ICU, Intensive Care United. *Incidence was shown by cases per 100,000 people, according to population data estimated by the IBGE for the year 2019.

219 **Figure 2. Data on the incidence of COVID-19 in Brazil until 15 May 2020. (A) Increase in**
 220 **cases over a period of 31 days, using the ratio between incidences per 100,000 on 15**
 221 **May and 14 April 2020. (B) Association between the incidence of COVID-19 on 15 May**
 222 **(classified into two groups, according to the median) and percentage of inadequate**
 223 **water supply and sewerage (classified into two groups, according to the median). (C)**
 224 **Association between quartiles of increase in the incidence of COVID-19 (incidence**
 225 **ratio) and scores on the Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) (classified into SVI scores $\leq$**
 226 **“mean” and SVI scores “high” or “very high”). (D) Association between quartiles of**
 227 **increase in the incidence of COVID-19 (incidence ratio) and scores on the Human**
 228 **Development Index (classified into “very high” (≥ 0.800), “high” (0.700 to 0.799) and**
 229 **“medium” (0.550 to 0.699)). B. Chi-square test. C and D. Likelihood ratio. AC, Acre; AL,**
 230 **Alagoas; AP, Amapá; AM, Amazonas; BA, Bahia; CE, Ceará; DF, Distrito Federal; ES, Espírito Santos; GO,**
 231 **Goiás; MA, Maranhão; MT, Mato Grosso; MS, Mato Grosso do Sul; MG, Minas Gerais; PA, Pará; PB, Paraíba;**
 232 **PR, Paraná; PE, Pernambuco; PI, Piauí; RJ, Rio de Janeiro; RN, Rio Grande do Norte; RS, Rio Grande do Sul;**
 233 **RO, Rondônia; RR, Roraima; SC, Santa Catarina; SP, São Paulo; SE, Sergipe; TO, Tocantins.**

235 Regarding the Northeast region, it is composed of nine states, namely: Maranhão
 236 (MA), Piauí (PI), Ceará (CE), Rio Grande do Norte (RN), Paraíba (PB), Pernambuco (PE),
 237 Alagoas (AL), Sergipe (SE), and Bahia (BA). The first case in this region was described on 6
 238 March 2020, in BA. As of 15 May 2020, 72,076 cases and 4,223 deaths were reported in
 239 Northeast, with CE and PE showing both the highest incidence rates and deaths numbers.
 240 Until the last data collection for this study, the cities in Northeast with the highest numbers of
 241 confirmed cases and deaths were Fortaleza (CE), Recife (PE), and São Luis (MA). Detailed
 242 information on population, health determinants and indicators, and on notification of COVID-
 243 19 cases in the Northeast region from the first case reported until 15 May 2020 are shown in
 244 Table 1.

245 Southeast region includes the states of Minas Gerais (MG), Espírito Santo (ES), Rio
 246 de Janeiro (RJ) and São Paulo (SP), with a large number of municipalities (1,668). Both the
 247 first confirmed case and death by COVID-19 registered in this region were also the first ones
 248 reported in the country. On 15 May 2020, the southeastern region ranks first in the number of
 249 cases (88,759) and deaths (7,345) in Brazil.

250 In this region, São Paulo state shows the highest number of cases (58,378) with
251 4,501 deaths until 15 May 2020. In the city of São Paulo alone, 33,992 cases were confirmed
252 with 2,674 deaths, making it the most affected municipality in the Southeast, followed by Rio
253 de Janeiro, with 11.715 cases and 1,631 deaths on 15 May. In MG, the city with the highest
254 number of cases and deaths, Belo Horizonte, had 1,088 confirmed cases and 29 deaths,
255 while in ES the largest number of cases occurred in Vila Velha, a city very close to the capital
256 (Vitória), with 1,305 and 43 deaths. Complete data on population, health determinants and
257 indicators, as well as on notification of COVID-19 cases in the Southeast region, from the
258 beginning of pandemic until 15 May 2020, are shown in Table 2.

259 The South region comprises the states of Paraná (PR), Santa Catarina (SC) and Rio
260 Grande do Sul (RS). The first confirmed patient with COVID-19 in the region was in the city
261 of Campo Bom, RS. In this region, the state of SC stands out with the highest incidence in
262 the South on 14 April and the highest increase until 15 May. Information about population,
263 health determinants and indicators and about notification of COVID-19 cases in the South
264 region, from the first registered case until 15 May 2020, are shown in Table 3.

265 Finally, the Midwest region is composed of the states of Mato Grosso (MT), Mato
266 Grosso do Sul (MS), Goiás (GO) and the Federal District (DF). The first confirmed case in
267 the region occurred on 7 March 2020, in DF. On 15 May 2020, DF had 3,787 confirmed
268 cases and 55 deaths. Complete data for this region is also showed in Table 3 and Fig 1 and
269 2.

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

Table 2. Notification of COVID-19 in the Southeast region of Brazil until 15 May 2020

SOUTHEAST	MG	ES	RJ	SP	Total
Population ¹	21,168,791	4,018,650	17,264,943	45,919,049	88,371,433
	23.95%	4.55%	19.54%	51.96%	100%
Elderly (≥65 y) ¹	2,288,973	382,976	1,998,280	4,792,036	9,462,265
Total number of cities	853	78	92	645	1,668
Per capita income (R\$)	749.69	815.43	1039.3	1084.46	
Inadequate water supply and sewerage (%)	1.84	0.99	1.67	0.6	
SVI	0.282	0.274	0.323	0.297	
HDI	0.731	0.740	0.761	0.783	
Hospital beds in SUS	26,896	5,100	21,108	52,302	105,406
ICU beds in SUS	3,478	641	2,612	7,331	14,062
Total hospital beds	40,675	7,929	32,736	90,146	171,486
Population/hospital beds	520	507	527	509	515
Date of 1 st case	08.03.20	06.03.20	05.03.20	26.02.20	26.02.20
Total cases, March	275	84	708	2339	3,406
Deaths, March	2	0	23	136	161
Social isolation (%) in 14 April 2020	43.35	44.49	48.59	46.8	
Cases until 14 April 2020	870	463	3,220	9,263	4,553
Death until 14 April 2020	25	17	182	695	224
Incidence on 14 April 2020*	4.11	11.52	18.65	20.17	5.15
Social isolation (%) in 30 April 2020	51.0	51.3	54.4	51.4	
Cases until 30 April 2020	1,827	2,465	9,453	28,698	42,443
Death until 30 April 2020	82	83	854	2,375	3,394
Incidence on 30 April 2020*	8.63	61.34	54.75	62.5	48.03
Cases until 15 May 2020	4,196	6,198	19,987	58,378	88,759
Death until 15 May 2020	146	260	2,438	4,501	7,345
Incidence on 15 May 2020	19.82	154.23	115.77	127.13	100.44

¹ Data estimated by the IBGE for the year 2019. All indicators were based on IBGE 2010 data. Federative units in the Southeast region of Brazil are MG, Minas Gerais; ES, Espírito Santo; RJ, Rio de Janeiro; and SP, São Paulo. SVI, Social vulnerability index; HDI, Human Development index; SUS, Brazilian Unified Public Health System; ICU, Intensive Care Unit. *Incidence was shown as cases per 100,000 people, according to population data estimated by the IBGE for the year 2019.

Table 3. Notification of COVID-19 in the South and Midwest regions of Brazil until 15 May 2020

SOUTH	PR	SC	RS	Total	
Population¹	11,433,957 38.14%	7,164,788 23.90%	11,377,2%39 37.95%	29,975,984 100%	
Elderly (≥65 y)¹	1,175,396	703,354	1,441,194	3,319,944	
Total number of cities	399	295	497	1,191	
Per capita income (R\$)	890.89	983.9	959.24		
Inadequate water supply and sewerage (%)	0.97	0.78	0.89		
SVI	0.252	0.192	0.234		
HDI	0.749	0.774	0.746		
Hospital Beds in SUS	18,494	10,921	20,366	49,781	
ICU beds in SUS	2,303	1,027	2,188	5,518	
Total hospital beds	27,502	15,322	30,123	72,947	
Population/hospital beds	416	468	378	411	
Date of 1 st case	12.03.20	13.03.20	10.03.20	10.03.20	
Total cases, March	179	219	274	672	
Deaths, March	3	2	4	9	
Social isolation (%) in 14 April 2020	42.64	41.93	45.37		
Cases until 14 April 2020	755	814	685	2,254	
Deaths until 14 April 2020	32	26	17	75	
Incidence on 14 April 2020*	6.60	11.36	6.02	7.52	
Social isolation (%) in 30 April 2020	48.4	47.2	50.5		
Cases until 30 April 2020	1,407	2,085	1,466	4,958	
Deaths until 30 April 2020	83	46	51	180	
Incidence on 30 April 2020*	12.31	29.1	12.89	16.54	
Cases until 15 May 2020	2,139	4,597	3,597	10,333	
Deaths until 15 May 2020	120	79	126	325	
Incidence on 15 May 2020	18.71	64.16	31.62	34.47	
MIDWEST	MS	MT	GO	DF	Total
Population¹	2,778,986 17.05%	3,484,466 21.38%	7,018,354 43.07%	3,015,268 18.50%	16,297,074 100%

Elderly (≥ 65 y) ¹	238,889	243,822	560,233	217,292	1,260,236
Total number of cities	79	141	246	1	467
Per capita income (R\$)	799.34	762.52	810.97	1715.11	
Inadequate water supply and sewerage (%)	3.93	5.16	3.38	0.72	
SVI	0.289	0.277	0.331	0.294	
HDI	0.729	0.725	0.735	0.824	
Hospital Beds in SUS	3,667	5,113	10,552	3,959	23,291
ICU beds in SUS	403	487	969	383	2,242
Total hospital beds	5,586	7,156	17,445	6,705	36,892
Population/hospital beds	497	487	402	450	442
Date of 1 st case	16.03.20	20.03.20	13.03.20	07.03.20	07.03.20
Total cases, March	48	25	65	332	470
Deaths, March	1	0	1	3	5
Social isolation (%) in 14 April 2020	36.69	37.8	50.22	55.9	
Cases until 14 April 2020	113	131	233	641	1,118
Deaths until 14 April 2020	4	4	15	15	38
Incidence on 14 April 2020*	4.07	3.76	3.32	21.26	6.86
Social isolation (%) in 30 April 2020	44.0	47.7	61.0	61.0	
Cases until 30 April 2020	255	297	781	1,356	2,689
Deaths until 30 April 2020	9	11	29	30	79
Incidence on 30 April 2020*	9.18	8.52	11.13	44.97	16.50
Cases until 15 May 2020	479	779	1,572	3,787	6,617
Deaths until 15 May 2020	14	26	67	55	162
Incidence on 15 May 2020	17.24	22.36	22.40	125.59	40.60

¹ Data estimated by the IBGE for the year 2019. All indicators were based on IBGE 2010 data. Federative units in the South region of Brazil are PR, Paraná; SC, Santa Catarina; and RS, Rio Grande do Sul; and in the Midwest region of Brazil are MS, Mato Grosso do Sul; MT, Mato Grosso; GO, Goiás; and DF, Distrito Federal. SVI, Social vulnerability index; HDI, Human Development index; SUS, Brazilian Unified Public Health System; ICU, Intensive Care Unit. *Incidence was shown as cases per 100,000, according to population data estimated by the IBGE for the year 2019.

Incidence rates and case fatality rates (%) in three time points (14 and 30 April, and 15 May), ranked in decreasing order, as well as SVI scores and inadequate water supply and sewerage rates (%), by federative unit, are demonstrated in Fig 1. Regarding incidence rates (cases per 100,000), the top five federative units in 14 April 2020, in decreasing order, were AM and AP (North), DF (Midwest), CE (Northeast) and SP (Southeast), all with more than 20 cases per 100,000, Fig 1A. In 30 April 2020, the states with highest incidence rates were AP, AM and RR (North), CE and PE (Northeast), all with incidence rates above 70 cases per 100,000. As for fatality rates, considering all 27 states in the country, RJ and SP had the highest scores, followed by PE, AM and PB. It is important to highlight that, despite PB is just the 17th of 27 states in terms of incidence, it appears as the fifth when lethality is measured (Fig 1C). In the last evaluation, the top of five federative units in 15 May 2020, in decreasing order, were AM (incidence: 443.76), AP (429.21) and RR (262.31) (North), CE with incidence 246.27 (Northeast) and AC (246.27) (North). Fourteen states had incidences greater than 150 per 100.00 on that date Fig 1E.

The increase in cases over the course of a month, based on the ratio between incidences per 100,000 on 15 May and 14 April 2020, is shown in Fig 2A. Considering the increasing in incidence rates of COVID-19 cases during this period, the states with the highest levels, in decreasing order, were SE, AL, TO, PA and PI.

When federative units were stratified into two groups according to the rate of inadequate water supply and sewerage (< 9% or ≥ 9%), those with rates >9% were 5.63 times more likely to have an incidence greater than 30 cases/100,000 (P=0.041), as shown in Fig 2B.

Stratifying increases in cases over this one-month period into quartiles revealed how SVI and HDI scores were strongly associated with higher values of incidence ratio in North and Northeast states (Fig 2C and D).

The SVI data for the 27 federative units were moderately and directly correlated with the incidence of cases on 15 May ($r_0 = 0.575$ and $P = 0.002$). There was a strong and direct

correlation between increases in the incidence rate during the one-month period covered in the study and SVI scores ($rh_0 = 0.727$ and $P < 0.001$).

Finally, updated data on numbers of cases, incidence rates, number of deaths, and case-fatality, until 22 May 2020 is presented in Fig 3. Data about incidence rate of COVID-19 on 22 May 2020 could be found in S1 Fig.

Figure 3. Distribution of cases and incidence rates (A), deaths and case-fatality (B) in the 27 federative units of Brazil on 22 May 2020 [16]. * Incidence rates were calculated according to Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics estimative to Brazilian population in the year 2019 [17].

Discussion

Brazil is the fifth largest country in the world, with an area of 8,514,876 square kilometres divided into 27 federative units (26 states and 1 federal district), and a total of 5,570 cities [17]. Partly because of its large dimension, Brazil is a very heterogeneous country, with wide regional differences related to climate, lifestyle habits, socioeconomic characteristics, human development, social vulnerability, rates of inadequate water supply and sewage, population density across the states, and education level of the population [25]. Therefore, a single curve in the number of cases over time would not be representative of the whole country, due to a slower spread to the interior in some federative units. Thus, our main results are presented according to the five regions that comprise it.

Despite being the last of the five Brazilian regions to register a first case of COVID-19, the North region was one of the first to have a city with a health system overload. Currently, this is the case of Manaus, the capital of AM, where the mayor acknowledged a “collapse in the health system” and many patients are not getting access to proper health care, several of them dying at home [26]. This situation is even worse because Manaus is the only city in AM (the biggest state in the country) that has beds in intensive care units and, therefore, concentrates all intensive care in the state. This state also has few roads, and transport is mainly by rivers. The high incidences of COVID-19 in AM and AP, seen on 15

346 May, place these two states at the top of national ranking, as compared to states with the
347 highest incidence rates in other regions. In addition, four of the seven states in the North,
348 including AM and AP, present high SVI scores, and the worst rate of hospital beds per
349 population over the country is found precisely in these two states, which would partly explain
350 their worse performance, a chaotic situation in health assistance in Manaus and why the
351 North has shown the highest incidence of COVID-19 among Brazilian regions until 15 May
352 2020.

353 The fight against COVID-19 becomes even more worrying because AM has a
354 population of approximately 168,000 indigenous natives, representing 20% of the total
355 indigenous population in Brazil. These populations are known to be more susceptible to
356 epidemics and vulnerable to the occurrence of health conditions in general due to
357 unfavourable socioeconomic conditions [27]. Furthermore, indigenous communities usually
358 live in isolated areas, far from medical posts, doctors, and access to basic medicines [26].

359 Northeast is the second most populous region in the country. Although social isolation
360 rates in the Northeast states on 15 May were among the highest of the entire country, the
361 region also has the second highest number of cases and deaths by COVID-19. Two states in
362 this region, CE and PE, had incidence increases and lethality rates due to COVID-19 in 15
363 May higher than SP, the state from Southeast region with the highest numbers cases and
364 deaths due to this disease. It is important to note that both CE and PE have higher SVI
365 scores and inadequate water supply and sewerage rates than SP, which may explain, at
366 least in part, those differences. These observations suggest that socioeconomic context and
367 social inequality play a role in the spread of COVID-19 in Brazil, as observed in the North.
368 Supporting this hypothesis, states in the North and Northeast with higher SVI scores showed
369 greater increases in the incidence rate from 14 April to 15 May. Khalatbari-Soltani et al.
370 (2020) highlight the role that socioeconomic characteristics may play in transmission,
371 incidence and health outcomes in COVID-19, as well as the need for high-quality data on
372 socioeconomic factors, which can be useful in the development and implementation of public
373 health actions [28].

374 The Southeast region includes the three largest metropolitan areas in Brazil, that is,
375 the cities of São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro and Belo Horizonte; and the main industrialized
376 areas. It is also the region with the biggest population among the five Brazilian political
377 regions, as well as the one with the highest numbers of cases and deaths by COVID-19. The
378 first case reported in Brazil, in São Paulo city, occurred on a date very close to the Carnival
379 party (21 to 26 February 2020). The arrival and the beginning of the spread of COVID-19 in
380 the Brazilian capitals may have occurred at the time of this party.

381 Brazilian carnival is well known all over the world and attracts many foreigners to the
382 main cities of the country. In this traditional Brazilian party, most of the population takes to
383 the streets in immense agglomerations, to the sound of typical local rhythms, mainly samba.
384 Although Carnival took place before the first reported case of COVID-19 in Brazil, many
385 people may have been infected at that time and some of them may have had asymptomatic
386 illness or mild flu, which was not reported.

387 South region has the lowest numbers of cases and deaths, as well as the lowest
388 incidence rates of COVID-19, along with the Midwest region, which may be reflect the fact
389 that both regions have the smallest populations among the five Brazilian political regions. At
390 least in the South, this may be explained, in part, by the rate of inadequate water supply and
391 sewerage, less than 1% in all three states, and by the low scores on SVI. There are concerns
392 about the effects of winter, which is more pronounced in this region and whose coldest
393 months are just ahead (May to August). While data on SARS-CoV-2 seasonality is not yet
394 clear, routine diagnostics records show a strong and consistent seasonal variation of the four
395 previous coronavirus epidemics (229E, HKU1, NL63, OC43) [29]. In this line, a study based
396 on data from 130 Chinese cities, between 20 January and 2 March 2020, pointed out that
397 lower temperature and humidity are likely to favour the transmission of COVID-19 [30]. Thus,
398 concerns about increased spread during the winter months seem to make a lot of sense. On
399 the other hand, a recent study evaluating meteorological factors related to the spread of
400 COVID-19, conducted in five cities of Brazil, showed it is favoured by higher mean
401 temperatures (27.5°C) as well as intermediate relative humidity (in the range of 80%),

402 although the study was carried out entirely before winter in Brazil [31]. Although these
403 meteorological conditions are compatible with those observed in Manaus, AM, in the North,
404 in this study we demonstrated that other factors, such as health indicators, are more
405 important to explain the greater numbers of cases and deaths in this region.

406 Two states in the Midwest, MT and MS, had reported less than 800 cases of COVID-
407 19 on 15 May 2020, while GO had 1,572 cases on the same date. These three states had
408 low incidence rates, ranging 17.24 to 22.40 per 100,000 individuals. DF is an exception in
409 Midwest region, with the highest number of cases (3,787) and incidence rate (125.59 per
410 100,000). The lower numbers of cases in MT and MS may be related to the presence of a
411 large rural area and to the closure of borders between federative units, since these states
412 presented the lowest social isolation rates in the county (less than 40%). On the other hand,
413 as it contains the Brazilian capital (Brasília), DF has a greater circulation of people compared
414 to the rest of the Midwest region, with a greater number of both national and international
415 flights, which may explain part of this higher incidence within Midwest.

416 We believe that, in Brazil, cases of COVID-19 may be underreported, since the
417 number of diagnostic tests available is much lower than necessary. In addition, testing for
418 COVID-19 has been reduced only to people admitted to hospitals, and yet it is not enough for
419 everyone. Many Brazilians died in their homes, which may cause fatal cases of COVID-19 to
420 be underreported in our country. No widespread testing on all suspected cases has been
421 performed. In a population-based study conducted in the state of RS, in April 2020, reported
422 cases represented only around 10% of all detected cases [32]. In addition, states registries
423 show higher numbers of deaths than Ministry of Health reports, which may indicate that
424 fatality cases are underestimated. According to this data, since the epidemic beginning in
425 Brazil, registries reported 58,839 deaths caused by SARS, respiratory failure and
426 pneumonia, and only 12,344 deaths by COVID-19. In this regard, other studies have
427 highlighted the potential for undocumented cases and low estimation due to limited testing in
428 China to the spread of SARS-CoV-2 [33], and also in Brazil whose numbers of cases and
429 deaths can be much higher than the official data released [34].

430 The main results of our study are in line with other previously published reports,
431 showing that disadvantaged socioeconomic regions and poor health indicators perform
432 worse during sanitary crises, with higher risks of disease and mortality [28, 35]. There is no
433 reason to believe that the COVID-19 pandemic is an exception; as we showed here, regions
434 of poor health determinants performed worse against the disease.

435 In low-income populations, where absolute poverty is a major problem, access to
436 basic needs, such as clean water, sanitation and food, will have a substantial impact on how
437 easily people can practice any social distancing measures. Furthermore, in low- and middle-
438 income regions, people are more likely to live in overcrowded homes or neighbourhoods,
439 making it impossible to isolate elderly or vulnerable people [28].

440 Before COVID-19 pandemic, Brazil was already facing an economic crisis, with 11.6
441 million unemployed in the fourth quarter of 2019 [36]. As of March 2020, during the
442 outbreak of the SARS-CoV-2, there were more than 38 million informally self-employed
443 people in Brazil, with no Social Security coverage or any other forms of protection [37].
444 Although emergency financial support has been settled by Federal Government for informal
445 workers, the amount granted is less than 60% (about \$ 110 US dollars) of the minimal
446 income established in the country. This circumstance may have reduced the rate of social
447 isolation, especially among the lower middle- and low-income people. A delay in the
448 implementation of social policies leads to an aggravation of this health crisis and we believe
449 it may also have influenced people to a lower adhesion to social isolation and, consequently,
450 to the increase in the spread of COVID-19.

451 Furthermore, the Brazilian Federal Government took a stand against WHO
452 recommendations regarding social isolation during COVID-19 pandemic, with several
453 speeches neglecting the severity of the disease and the need for social isolation, in favour of
454 the country's economic development. We believe that these speeches may also have
455 influenced people to a lower adhesion to social isolation and, consequently, to the increase
456 in cases and deaths due to COVID-19.

457 When the history of COVID-19 is told, Brazil will likely be remembered as the country
458 with the highest number of cases in Latin America (330,890 cases with 21,048 deaths as of
459 22 May) [16]. Unfortunately, this sad historical data will describe countless deaths and a
460 drastic increase in unemployment and hunger, as well as each measure taken by the
461 governments of the countries affected by COVID-19. During this pandemic, people in Brazil
462 find themselves divided between two different guidelines on what they should do: on the one
463 hand, a strong campaign by the media, the minister of Health, governors and mayors, urging
464 people to maintain social isolation and stay home. On the other hand, the attitudes of the
465 President of Brazil, sowing confusion, openly disrespecting and discouraging sensible
466 measures of physical distancing and lockdown, and stimulating frequent political crises
467 during this period, as very well described and documented in a recent editorial published in
468 The Lancet [38].

469 The limitations of this study include those related to incomplete information from
470 government databases, which depend on inputs from thousands of different cities about
471 cases and deaths, and the data of Brazilian last census, carried out in 2010. In addition,
472 there is a restriction of tests for SARS-CoV-2 in the Brazilian population, which produces
473 underestimated information.

474 Data presented in 15 May 2020 demonstrate that Brazil is still far from reaching the
475 epidemic peak and suggest that actions to support the disadvantaged population by the
476 government should be improved, since a large number of Brazilians live in poverty, in small
477 houses with a great number of people, who share the same rooms, where social isolation is
478 unfeasible. Despite this, in line with WHO recommendations, we believe that social isolation
479 should be encouraged by the government and employers as far as possible, in order to
480 prevent the spread of COVID-19 and further increases in cases and deaths.

481

482 **Acknowledgements**

483 EMG-S thanks the Universidade Federal Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS) for the opportunity of
 484 being a visiting professor (contract PROGEP/RTR No 2019/000230). This study was partly
 485 financed by the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel - Brazil
 486 (Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES)), through the
 487 granting of scholarships to postgraduate students. We thank the Federal University of Mato
 488 Grosso do Sul (UFMS) for the support for language revision and payment of publication
 489 charge by EDITAL PROPP / UFMS N° 143/2019.

490

491 **Authors' contributions**

492 EMG-S designed the research study, analysed the data, performed statistical analysis, and
 493 wrote the paper. CP, GWG, SSW, EJS and TBRG collaborated in the writing of the
 494 manuscript. Acquisition of data and references, EJS, ICP, KGJ, RFAZ, and AGB. Analysis
 495 and interpretation of data were also performed by EMG-S, SSW, EJS, CP, and GWG. Critical
 496 revision, EMG-S, CP, GWG, TBRG, SSW, and ADC.

497

498 **Disclosure statement**

499 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528

References

529

530

- 531 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from
532 Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(8):727-33. Epub
533 2020/01/24. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001017. PubMed PMID: 31978945; PubMed Central
534 PMCID: PMCPMC7092803.
- 535 2. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in
536 Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med*.
537 2020;382(13):1199-207. Epub 2020/01/29. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001316. PubMed PMID:
538 31995857; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7121484.
- 539 3. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, Qu J, Gong F, Han Y, et al. Epidemiological and clinical
540 characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a
541 descriptive study. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):507-13. Epub 2020/01/30. doi: 10.1016/S0140-
542 6736(20)30211-7. PubMed PMID: 32007143; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7135076.
- 543 4. WHO. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Situation Report - 59. Geneva: World
544 Health Organization; 2020.
- 545 5. Cucinotta D, Vanelli M. WHO Declares COVID-19 a Pandemic. *Acta Biomed*.
546 2020;91(1):157-60. Epub 2020/03/19. doi: 10.23750/abm.v91i1.9397. PubMed PMID:
547 32191675.
- 548 6. Lippi G, Sanchis-Gomar F, Henry BM. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): the
549 portrait of a perfect storm. *Ann Transl Med*. 2020;8(7):7.
- 550 7. Rothe C, Schunk M, Sothmann P, Bretzel G, Froeschl G, Wallrauch C, et al.
551 Transmission of 2019-nCoV Infection from an Asymptomatic Contact in Germany. *N Engl J*
552 *Med*. 2020;382(10):970-1. Epub 2020/01/30. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2001468. PubMed PMID:
553 32003551; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7120970.
- 554 8. Phan LT, Nguyen TV, Luong QC, Nguyen HT, Le HQ, Nguyen TT, et al. Importation
555 and Human-to-Human Transmission of a Novel Coronavirus in Vietnam. *N Engl J Med*.
556 2020;382(9):872-4. Epub 2020/01/28. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2001272. PubMed PMID:
557 31991079; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7121428.
- 558 9. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the
559 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314
560 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA*. 2020. Epub
561 2020/02/24. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.2648. PubMed PMID: 32091533.
- 562 10. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, et al. Clinical Characteristics of
563 Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med*. 2020. Epub 2020/02/28. doi:
564 10.1056/NEJMoa2002032. PubMed PMID: 32109013; PubMed Central PMCID:
565 PMCPMC7092819.
- 566 11. Bai Y, Yao L, Wei T, Tian F, Jin DY, Chen L, et al. Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier
567 Transmission of COVID-19. *JAMA*. 2020. Epub 2020/02/21. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.2565.
568 PubMed PMID: 32083643; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7042844.
- 569 12. Zhang L, Shen FM, Chen F, Lin Z. Origin and evolution of the 2019 novel
570 coronavirus. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020. Epub 2020/02/03. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa112. PubMed
571 PMID: 32011673; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7108176.

13. Shen Z, Xiao Y, Kang L, Ma W, Shi L, Zhang L, et al. Genomic diversity of SARS-CoV-2 in Coronavirus Disease 2019 patients. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020. Epub 2020/03/04. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa203. PubMed PMID: 32129843; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7108196.
14. Yu P, Zhu J, Zhang Z, Han Y, Huang L. A familial cluster of infection associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating potential person-to-person transmission during the incubation period. *J Infect Dis*. 2020. Epub 2020/02/18. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiaa077. PubMed PMID: 32067043; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7107453.
15. WHO. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19). Situation Report - 123. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020.
16. BRASIL. Painel Coronavírus. Brasília: Ministério da Saúde; 2020.
17. IBGE. Population estimates with reference to July 1, 2019. Rio de Janeiro: Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics 2019.
18. IBGE. Brazil Demographic Census 2010. Rio de Janeiro: Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics; 2010.
19. BRASIL. Departamento de Informática do Sistema Único de saúde (DATASUS). Brasília: Ministério da Saúde; 2020.
20. Mapa brasileiro da COVID-19 [Internet]. Inloco. 2020 [cited 14 April 2020]. Available from: <<https://www.inloco.com.br/pt/covid-19?hsCtaTracking=5a87f305-e68e-49be-b04c-f3afec6d948c%7C91d9a390-f6a7-4e9e-abc0-b26f84f1d519>>.
21. Human Development Atlas Brasil [Internet]. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Institute of Applied Economic Research (IPEA), João Pinheiro Foundation (FJP). 2013 [cited 14 April 2020]. Available from: <<http://www.atlasbrasil.org.br/2013/en/>>.
22. Costa MA, Marguti BO. Atlas de vulnerabilidade social dos municípios brasileiros. In: República SdAEdPd, editor. Brasília: IPEA; 2015.
23. Plataforma de Informações Espaciais da COVID-19 (PIE-COVID). Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia do Rio Grande do Sul. 2020.
24. BRASIL. Resolução nº 510, de 07 de abril de 2016. Brasília: Conselho Nacional de Saúde; 2016.
25. Paim J, Travassos C, Almeida C, Bahia L, Macinko J. The Brazilian health system: history, advances, and challenges. *Lancet*. 2011;377(9779):1778-97. Epub 2011/05/09. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60054-8. PubMed PMID: 21561655.
26. Ferrante L, Fearnside PM. Protect Indigenous peoples from COVID-19. *Science*. 2020;368(6488):251. doi: 10.1126/science.abc0073. PubMed PMID: 32299940.
27. Castro DB, Pinto RC, Albuquerque BC, Sadahiro M, Braga JU. The Socioeconomic Factors and the Indigenous Component of Tuberculosis in Amazonas. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(6):e0158574. Epub 2016/06/30. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0158574. PubMed PMID: 27362428; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7194892.
28. Khalatbari-Soltani S, Cumming RG, Delpierre C, Kelly-Irving M. Importance of collecting data on socioeconomic determinants from the early stage of the COVID-19 outbreak onwards. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2020. Epub 2020/05/08. doi: 10.1136/jech-2020-214297. PubMed PMID: 32385126.
29. Neher RA, Dyrda R, Druelle V, Hodcroft EB, Albert J. Potential impact of seasonal forcing on a SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. *Swiss Med Wkly*. 2020;150:w20224. Epub 2020/03/16. doi: 10.4414/sm.w.2020.20224. PubMed PMID: 32176808.
30. Liu J, Zhou J, Yao J, Zhang X, Li L, Xu X, et al. Impact of meteorological factors on the COVID-19 transmission: A multi-city study in China. *Sci Total Environ*. 2020;726:138513. Epub 2020/04/09. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138513. PubMed PMID: 32304942; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7194892.
31. Auler AC, Cássaro FAM, da Silva VO, Pires LF. Evidence that high temperatures and intermediate relative humidity might favor the spread of COVID-19 in tropical climate: A case study for the most affected Brazilian cities. *Sci Total Environ*. 2020;729:139090. Epub 2020/04/28. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139090. PubMed PMID: 32388137.

- 625 32. EPICOV19. Epidemiologia da COVID-19 no Rio Grande do Sul. Estudo de base
626 populacional. In: Secretaria de Planejamento, Orçamento e Gestão do Estado do Rio
627 Grande do Sul. Porto Alegre: Governo do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul; 2020.
- 628 33. Li R, Pei S, Chen B, Song Y, Zhang T, Yang W, et al. Substantial undocumented
629 infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science*.
630 2020;368(6490):489-93. Epub 2020/03/16. doi: 10.1126/science.abb3221. PubMed PMID:
631 32179701; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7164387.
- 632 34. Requena WJ, Kondo EK, Adams MD, Gold DR, Struchiner CJ. Risk of the Brazilian
633 health care system over 5572 municipalities to exceed health care capacity due to the 2019
634 novel coronavirus (COVID-19). *Sci Total Environ*. 2020;730:139144. Epub 2020/05/01. doi:
635 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139144. PubMed PMID: 32380368.
- 636 35. Solis J, Franco-Paredes C, Henao-Martínez AF, Krsak M, Zimmer SM. Structural
637 Vulnerability in the United States Revealed in Three Waves of Novel Coronavirus Disease
638 (COVID-19). *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2020. Epub 2020/05/07. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.20-0391.
639 PubMed PMID: 32383432.
- 640 36. IBGE. Desemprego. Rio de Janeiro: Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics;
641 2020.
- 642 37. IBGE. Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicílios Contínua (PNAD Contínua). Rio
643 de Janeiro: Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics; 2020.
- 644 38. Editorial. COVID-19 in Brazil: "So what?". *Lancet*. 2020;395(10235):1. doi:
645 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31095-3.

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669 **S1 Figure. (A) Incidence rate of COVID-19 on 22 May 2020, (B) Percentage of**
 670 **inadequate water supply and sewerage, (C) Social Vulnerability Index (SVI), and (D)**
 671 **Human Development Index (HDI) in the Brazilian federative units. Figure B, C and D**
 672 **show federative units in decreasing order of COVID-19 incidence, according to data**
 673 **from 22 May 2020 (A). Lines in Figure 1C represents values of SVI classified as very**
 674 **low (0 to 0.200), low (0.201 to 0.300), medium (0.301 to 0.400), high (0.401 to 0.500), and**
 675 **very high (0.501 to 1) [22]. Lines in Figure 1D represents values of HDI classified as**
 676 **very high (≥ 0.800), high (0.700 to 0.799), medium (0.550 to 0.699) and low (< 0.550)**
 677 **[21].** AC, Acre; AL, Alagoas; AP, Amapá; AM, Amazonas; BA, Bahia; CE, Ceará; DF, Distrito Federal; ES,
 678 Espírito Santos; GO, Goiás; MA, Maranhão; MT, Mato Grosso; MS, Mato Grosso do Sul; MG, Minas Gerais; PA,
 679 Pará; PB, Paraíba; PR, Paraná; PE, Pernambuco; PI, Piauí; RJ, Rio de Janeiro; RN, Rio Grande do Norte; RS,
 680 Rio Grande do Sul; RO, Rondônia; RR, Roraima; SC, Santa Catarina; SP, São Paulo; SE, Sergipe; TO,
 681 Tocantins.

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718

719
720
721
722
723
724
725

726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747

S2 Figure. Increase in cases over a period of 16 days in April, using the ratio between incidences per 100,000 on 30 and 14 April 2020. B. Chi-square test. C and D. Likelihood ratio. AC: Acre, AL: Alagoas, AP: Amapá, AM: Amazonas, BA: Bahia, CE: Ceará, DF: Distrito Federal, ES: Espírito Santos, GO: Goiás, MA: Maranhão, MT: Mato Grosso, MS: Mato Grosso do Sul, MG: Minas Gerais, PA: Pará, PB: Paraíba, PR: Paraná, PE: Pernambuco, PI: Piauí, RJ: Rio de Janeiro, RN: Rio Grande do Norte, RS: Rio Grande do Sul, RO: Rondônia, RR: Roraima, SC: Santa Catarina, SP: São Paulo, SE: Sergipe, TO: Tocantins.

Cases and incidence rates*

Rondônia	2,774	156.09
Acre	3,343	379.05
Amazonas	27,038	652.37
Roraima	2,306	380.68
Pará	21,469	249.56
Amapá	5,655	668.65
Tocantins	2,205	140.19
Maranhão	17,212	243.27
Piauí	3,074	93.91
Ceará	34,573	378.59
Rio Grande do Norte	4,251	121.22
Paraíba	6,882	171.27
Pernambuco	25,760	269.54
Alagoas	5,302	158.87
Sergipe	4,922	214.12
Bahia	12,557	84.43
Minas Gerais	5,995	28.32
Espírito do Santo	9,520	236.9
Rio de Janeiro	33,589	194.55
São Paulo	76,871	167.41
Paraná	2,939	25.70
Santa Catarina	6,458	90.14
Rio Grande do Sul	5,918	52.02
Mato Grosso do Sul	805	28.97
Mato Grosso	1,220	35.01
Goiás	2,304	32.83
Distrito Federal	5,948	197.26

Deaths and case-fatality (%)

Rondônia	106	3.82
Acre	80	2.39
Amazonas	1,669	6.17
Roraima	83	3.60
Pará	1,937	9.02
Amapá	157	2.78
Tocantins	49	2.22
Maranhão	693	4.03
Piauí	93	3.03
Ceará	2,251	6.51
Rio Grande do Norte	181	4.26
Paraíba	248	3.60
Pernambuco	2,057	7.99
Alagoas	280	5.28
Sergipe	82	1.67
Bahia	399	3.18
Minas Gerais	201	3.35
Espírito do Santo	397	4.17
Rio de Janeiro	3,657	10.89
São Paulo	5,773	7.51
Paraná	146	4.97
Santa Catarina	100	1.55
Rio Grande do Sul	172	2.91
Mato Grosso do Sul	17	2.11
Mato Grosso	37	3.03
Goiás	93	4.04
Distrito Federal	90	1.51

A **B** **C** **D**