Identifying hidden Zika hotspots in Pernambuco, Brazil:

A spatial analysis

Laís Picinini Freitas ^{1,#a}, Rachel Lowe ^{2,3}, Andrew E. Koepp ^{1,4}, Sandra Valongueiro Alves ⁵, Molly Dondero ⁶, Leticia J. Marteleto ^{1,7*}

¹ Population Research Center, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, United States of America

² Centre on Climate Change and Planetary Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom

³ Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom

⁴ Department of Human Development and Family Sciences, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, United States of America

⁵ Post-graduation Program of Public Health, Centro de Ciências da Saúde, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil

⁶ Department of Sociology, American University, Washington, D.C., United States of America

⁷ Department of Sociology, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, United States of America

^{#a} Current Address: Programa de Computação Científica, Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

* Corresponding author

E-mail: marteleto@prc.utexas.edu (LJM)

24 Abstract

25 Northeast Brazil has the world's highest rate of Zika-related microcephaly. Yet, in this
 26 hard-hit region, traditional case counts of Zika cannot accurately describe Zika risk. Reporting of
 27 Zika cases only became mandatory after its association with microcephaly in neonates, when the
 28 Zika epidemic was already declining in the region. To advance the study of the Brazilian Zika
 29 epidemic and its impacts, we identified hotspots of Zika in Pernambuco state, Northeast Brazil,
 30 using *Aedes*-borne diseases (dengue, chikungunya and Zika) and microcephaly data. We used the
 31 Kulldorff's Poisson purely spatial scan statistic to detect low- and high-risk clusters and combined
 32 the results to identify the municipalities most affected by the Zika epidemic. Municipalities were
 33 classified as hotspots if they were part of any high-risk cluster, and classified according to a
 34 gradient of Zika burden during the epidemic, considering the strength of the evidence. In
 35 Pernambuco, officials confirmed 123,934 dengue cases, 167 Zika cases, and 32,983 chikungunya
 36 cases between 2014-2017, and 800 microcephaly cases between 2015-2017. We identified 26
 37 *Aedes*-borne diseases clusters (11 high-risk), and 5 microcephaly cases clusters (3 high-risk).
 38 Combining the results, sixty-three out of 184 municipalities were identified as hotspots for Zika.
 39 The northeast of Pernambuco and the Sertão region were hit hardest by the Zika epidemic. The first
 40 is the most populous area, while the second has one of the highest rates of social and economic
 41 inequality in Brazil. The identification of Sertão as a Zika hotspot was only possible because the
 42 clusters results were combined. The under-reporting of acute infectious diseases is expected to be
 43 higher in poor areas. Therefore, using only *Aedes*-borne data does not correctly identify the high-
 44 risk areas. We successfully identified hidden Zika hotspots using a simple methodology combining
 45 *Aedes*-borne diseases and microcephaly information.

46 Introduction

47 Accurately assessing a community's disease risk is a major goal in public health research
48 and is critical to the study of epidemics and their consequences. When new viral diseases emerge,
49 this task is challenging, as the reporting of cases may only be established after widespread
50 transmission has occurred. When the Zika virus (ZIKV) reached Brazil in 2014, mandatory
51 reporting of cases did not begin until 2016, at least a full year into the epidemic [1,2]. Given the
52 difficulty of accurately assessing Zika burden during the epidemic and the lack of data, identifying
53 areas that were hardest-hit remains a challenge.

54 ZIKV, a flavivirus transmitted by the *Aedes* mosquitoes, caused its first large outbreak in
55 the island of Yap (Federated States of Micronesia) in 2007 [3]. According to genomics analyses,
56 ZIKV was likely introduced in Brazil in the state of Pernambuco, possibly during 2013, and may
57 have disseminated from there to other regions and even to other countries [4,5]. Zika was
58 considered a benign disease until October 2015, when an unusual increase in the number of
59 neonates with microcephaly was detected in Pernambuco, Northeast Brazil. Microcephaly and other
60 congenital malformations were later associated with ZIKV infection during pregnancy, and the
61 congenital Zika syndrome was first described [1]. Between January 2015 and November 2016,
62 1,950 infection-related microcephaly cases were confirmed in Brazil, of which 1,487 (76.3%) were
63 in the Northeast region [2]. By the end of the Zika epidemic, nowhere else in the world had
64 microcephaly rates as high as those observed in Northeast Brazil.

65 The task of identifying high-risk areas for Zika is hampered by some important factors.
66 First, the mandatory reporting of Zika cases to Brazilian health authorities only began in 2016, a full
67 year after the epidemic began, and well after the assumed peak of cases in most of the Northeast
68 region [2,6]. As a result, the number of reported Zika cases in this region and period of time is much
69 lower than the reported cases of congenital microcephaly, despite well-established links between the
70 two [7,8]. In the absence of Zika data for 2014 and 2015, the number of microcephaly cases likely

71 helps to identify areas that experienced Zika outbreaks. It is also important to note that
 72 microcephaly cases, given the severity of the condition, are much less likely to be under-reported
 73 than Zika cases. In a previous study the incidence of Zika by municipality in Brazil was estimated
 74 from the microcephaly cases rate [7]. However, whether the number of microcephaly cases depends
 75 only on the Zika incidence is debatable, and other factors – not considered in the aforementioned
 76 study – may be acting to modify the risk of this congenital malformation [9–11].

77 Information on the distribution of other arboviruses endemic in Brazil, namely dengue and
 78 chikungunya, can also serve as indicators of Zika incidence during this period. A major factor
 79 linking the incidence of Zika, dengue, and chikungunya is the fact that they share the same disease
 80 vector, the *Aedes aegypti* mosquito [12]. By virtue of a shared carrier, a greater risk of one arbovirus
 81 in a given area implies greater risk of another arbovirus. Furthermore, it can be difficult in a clinical
 82 setting to distinguish between symptoms of Zika and symptoms of dengue and chikungunya, and
 83 cases of one are sometimes mistakenly reported as cases of another [13]. In fact, in the absence of a
 84 channel for reporting Zika cases in 2014 and 2015, the government in Pernambuco encouraged
 85 medical professionals to report Zika cases as dengue cases [14]. Thus, the distinction between Zika,
 86 dengue, and chikungunya during this period is blurred in official records for clinical as well as
 87 administrative reasons.

88 Therefore, we propose that an elevated risk of Zika during and immediately following the
 89 epidemic in Brazil (from 2014-2017) may be detected primarily by an increase in the incidence of
 90 microcephaly, as well as by increases in the incidence of dengue, chikungunya, and Zika itself.
 91 Considering these factors together represents a way to identify which areas were hit hardest by the
 92 Zika epidemic and which areas were less affected. This study sought to identify these areas in the
 93 state of Pernambuco by using Kulldorff's spatial scan statistics for identification of low- and high-
 94 risk clusters of *Aedes*-borne diseases (dengue, Zika, and chikungunya) and of microcephaly cases,

and classifying the municipalities in a gradient of Zika epidemic burden based on the combination of their cluster status.

Methods

Study site

Pernambuco is located in Northeast Brazil, and has 183 municipalities divided in five regions: Agreste, Mata, Metropolitan Region of Recife, São Francisco and Sertão (Fig 1). The state is characterized by coastal and marshy terrain, with varying climate conditions ranging from humid tropical (predominant on the coast) and semiarid (predominant in the interior). The population of Pernambuco was 8,796,448 in 2010, with 89.62 inhabitants per km² [15]. The Metropolitan Region of Recife has the highest population density, with 7,039.64 inhabitants per km² in the capital Recife [16]. Pernambuco is a poor and unequal state in Brazil, and one of the most severely affected states in the Zika epidemic, accounting for 16.8% of Brazil's reported cases of congenital Zika syndrome through the end of 2017 [17].

Fig 1. Regions and municipalities of Pernambuco state, Brazil.

113 Data

114 Data on reported confirmed cases of dengue (2013-2017), Zika (2016-2017), and
 115 chikungunya (2015-2017) were obtained from the *Sistema de Informação de Agravos de*
 116 *Notificação* [Notifiable Diseases Information System] (SINAN), Brazilian Ministry of Health ([ftp://](ftp://ftp.datasus.gov.br/dissemin/publicos/SINAN/DADOS)
 117 <ftp.datasus.gov.br/dissemin/publicos/SINAN/DADOS>). The data not publicly available (Zika and
 118 chikungunya cases data) were requested from the Ministry of Health at [<https://esic.cgu.gov.br/>](https://esic.cgu.gov.br/),
 119 by using the Law of Access to Information. We analyzed cases that were confirmed by laboratory or
 120 epidemiological criteria, aggregated by municipality of notification and year.

121 We obtained the anonymized individual records of live births from the Brazilian Ministry
 122 of Health's *Sistema de Informações sobre Nascidos Vivos* [Live Births Information System]
 123 (SINASC) from 2013 to 2017. The SINASC data are publicly available at
 124 [<ftp://ftp.datasus.gov.br/dissemin/publicos/SINASC/>](ftp://ftp.datasus.gov.br/dissemin/publicos/SINASC/). Microcephaly cases were identified as those
 125 with the 10th Revision of the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health
 126 Problems (ICD-10) code "Q02" in any position of the variable corresponding to the classification of
 127 congenital anomalies. Then, the data was aggregated by municipality of residence of the mother and
 128 year of birth. The complete data were also aggregated to obtain the number of live births by
 129 municipality and year.

130 For the spatial scan statistics, we aggregated the *Aedes*-borne diseases data for the years of
 131 2014-2017, and the microcephaly data for the years of 2015-2017. We chose these years because
 132 Zika started causing outbreaks in the state in 2014 and the first Zika-related microcephaly cases
 133 were reported in 2015.

134 Population projections by municipality estimated by Freire *et al.* were used in the analysis
 135 [18]. Shapefiles were downloaded at the *Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística* [Brazilian
 136 Institute of Geography and Statistics] (IBGE) website
 137 [.<https://www.ibge.gov.br/geociencias/organizacao-do-territorio/malhas-territoriais>](https://www.ibge.gov.br/geociencias/organizacao-do-territorio/malhas-territoriais).

138 Statistical analysis

139 For the exploratory analysis, we calculated the incidence per 100,000 inhabitants for
140 dengue, Zika and chikungunya, and the microcephaly incidence per 10,000 live births, by
141 municipality, for each year and for all years combined. We excluded Fernando de Noronha
142 municipality from the analysis as it is an island roughly 350 km away from the mainland.

143 We used the packages tidyverse (v. 1.3.0) [19] and ggplot2 (v. 3.3.0) [20] in R (v. 3.6.3)
144 [21] to organize, analyse and visualize the data.

145 Scan statistics

146 To detect low and high-risk clusters of *Aedes*-borne diseases and microcephaly we used the
147 Kulldorff's Poisson purely spatial scan statistic [22] for all years combined for i) dengue + Zika +
148 chikungunya (2014-2017), and ii) microcephaly cases (2015-2017).

149 Purely spatial scan statistics identify clusters through moving circles across space by
150 comparing the observed number of cases to the expected number of cases inside the circle [22]. The
151 municipality was considered as part of the circle if its centroid was located within the circle. The
152 clusters are ordered according to the log-likelihood ratio (LLR), where the cluster with the
153 maximum LLR is the most likely cluster, that is, the cluster least likely to be due to chance [22].
154 The LLR is calculated as follows:

$$155 \quad LLR = \left(\frac{c}{E_c} \right)^c \left(\frac{C-c}{C-E_c} \right)^{C-c} \quad (1)$$

156 where c is the number of cases inside the cluster, C is the total number of cases in the state and E_c is
157 the expected number of cases inside the circle. The E_c is calculated by:

$$158 \quad E_c = \frac{C}{P} * p \quad (2)$$

159 where P is the population of the state and p is the population inside the cluster.

160 To assess statistical significance, we performed Monte Carlo simulations (n=999) for each
161 analysis. Clusters were considered to be statistically significant if p-value<0.05. Clusters were

restricted to not overlap geographically, to have at least 5 cases, to include a maximum of 50% of Pernambuco's population at risk, and to have a maximum radius of 50 km.

SaTScan (v. 9.6) software [23] was applied within R (v. 3.6.3) [21], using the package rsatscan (v. 0.3.9200) [24]. The script of the analysis is available at <https://github.com/laispfreitas/PE_satscan>.

Zika epidemic burden classification

We combined the results from the scan statistics analysis to identify the municipalities that were most and least affected by the Zika epidemic (Table 1). Municipalities were classified as hotspots if they were part of any high-risk cluster, and as coldspots if they were part of any low-risk cluster and were not part of any high-risk cluster. We also classified the municipalities using a gradient of Zika burden during the epidemic. We considered microcephaly data to provide stronger evidence than *Aedes*-borne diseases because the latter are more likely to be under-reported. Therefore, being part of a high-risk cluster for microcephaly represented a higher Zika burden than being part of a high-risk *Aedes*-borne disease cluster.

Table 1. Criteria for classification of municipalities in terms of estimated Zika burden during the epidemic, based on cluster status for microcephaly and dengue, Zika and chikungunya (DZC).

Zika burden		Cluster type	
Classification	Gradient	Microcephaly	DZC
Hotspots	5	High-risk	High-risk
	4	High-risk	-
	3	High-risk	Low-risk
	2	-	High-risk
	1	Low-risk	High-risk
Neutral	0	-	-
Coldspots	-1	-	Low-risk
	-2	Low-risk	-
	-3	Low-risk	Low-risk

179

180 Results

181 In the state of Pernambuco between 2013 and 2017, there were 128,591 dengue cases, 167
 182 Zika cases, 32,983 chikungunya cases, and 823 microcephaly cases (S1 Table). Of the 167 Zika
 183 reported cases, 96 were in Recife. In 2016, 25 municipalities notified at least one case of Zika.
 184 Cases of dengue peaked in 2015, while cases of chikungunya peaked in 2016 (Fig 2A). In 2015 the
 185 number of microcephaly cases increased dramatically, from 12 in 2014 to 494 cases (Fig 2B).

186 **Fig 2. Reported confirmed cases of dengue, Zika and chikungunya (A) and microcephaly in**
 187 **neonates (B) in Pernambuco state, Brazil, by year.**

189 The cumulative incidence of dengue, Zika and chikungunya between 2013-2017 peaked at
 190 12056.6 cases per 100,000 inhabitants, with the highest incidence found in the Agreste region (Fig
 191 3A). In this period, four municipalities had no dengue, Zika, chikungunya or microcephaly cases.
 192 Higher microcephaly incidence rates were observed in the Sertão region, peaking at 59.4 cases per
 193 10,000 live-births (Fig 3B). Fifty out of 184 municipalities did not report any cases of
 194 microcephaly. The incidence rate per year for each disease and for microcephaly are included in the
 195 Supporting Information Material (S1-4 Fig).

196 **Fig 3. Cumulative incidence of dengue, Zika and chikungunya (DZC) per 100,000 inhabitants**
 197 **(A) and of microcephaly per 10,000 live-births (B), Pernambuco state, Brazil, 2013-2017.**

199 There were 26 clusters of dengue, Zika and chikungunya detected in 2014-2017 using the
 200 purely spatial scan statistics, with 11 high-risk and 15 low-risk clusters (S2 Table). The most likely
 201 high-risk cluster and the most likely low-risk cluster were both detected in the Metropolitan Region
 202 of Recife (Fig 4A). For microcephaly, five clusters were detected in 2015-2017, with three high-risk
 203 and two low-risk clusters (S3 Table). The most likely low-risk cluster was detected in the Agreste
 204 and Mata regions, and the most likely high-risk cluster in the Northwest of Sertão region (Fig 4B).

205

206 **Fig 4. Low and high-risk clusters of dengue, Zika, and chikungunya cases, 2014-2017 (A), and**
 207 **microcephaly, 2015-2017 (B), in Pernambuco state. Clusters are ordered by likelihood ratio.**

209 Combining the results of both scan statistics analyses (*Aedes*-borne diseases and
 210 microcephaly), of the 50 municipalities constituting high-risk microcephaly clusters, 10 were also
 211 high-risk for dengue, Zika, and chikungunya (Table 2). Of the 24 municipalities constituting low-
 212 risk microcephaly clusters, 19 were also low-risk for dengue, Zika, and chikungunya. The names of
 213 the municipalities in each category from Table 2 is available in the S4 Table.

214

Table 2. Number and percentage of municipalities by cluster type for dengue, Zika, and chikungunya (DZC) cases (2014-2017), and for microcephaly (2015-2017), Pernambuco state, Brazil.

		Microcephaly cluster type			Total
		High	No cluster	Low	
DZC cluster type	High	10 (5.4)	12 (6.5)	1 (0.5)	23 (12.5)
	No cluster	29 (15.8)	54 (29.3)	4 (2.1)	87 (47.3)
	Low	11 (6.0)	44 (23.9)	19 (10.3)	74 (40.2)
Total		50 (27.2)	110 (59.8)	24 (13.0)	184 (100.0)

In Fig 5 we combined the results from the scan statistics analysis to identify the most and least affected municipalities. The municipalities identified as probable Zika hotspots are depicted in warm colors. Sixty-three out of 184 municipalities were identified as hotspots for Zika. Municipalities in the northeast of Pernambuco state and in the Sertão region were hardest-hit by the Zika epidemic (Fig 5).

Fig 5. Estimated Zika burden classification by municipality, 2014-2017, Pernambuco state, Brazil.

228 Discussion

229 Mandatory reporting of confirmed Zika cases came late in the epidemic in Brazil,
230 hindering reliable identification of areas of high risk of Zika infection. Further issues with under-
231 reporting also prevented reliable identification of high-risk areas for Zika in the country most
232 affected by the epidemic. To address these issues, we identified spatial clusters of Zika, dengue, and
233 chikungunya – three arboviruses that share the same disease vector, the *Ae. aegypti* mosquito – and
234 of microcephaly in neonates cases to identify hidden Zika hotspots in the state of Pernambuco, one
235 of the most affected by the epidemic.

236 The two high-risk microcephaly clusters were identified on opposite sides in the state, in
237 the northeast – including parts of the Metropolitan Region of Recife, Mata and Agreste – and in a
238 more western part of the Sertão region. A recent study estimated the spatiotemporal distribution of
239 microcephaly in Pernambuco using a conditional autoregressive model and found high
240 microcephaly prevalences also in the middle portion of the state [28]. In addition to having used a
241 different methodology, the authors used data from a different source, the *Registro de Evento de*
242 *Saúde Pública* [Public Health Event Registry] (RESP) system, explaining the differences in the
243 results. The RESP system was implemented in November 2015 for the notification of cases of
244 microcephaly or any other congenital anomalies. We opt to use SINASC data because it is more
245 robust, as this system implemented in the country for many decades. In addition, the access to RESP
246 data is more restrict.

247 Of 23 municipalities constituting high-risk clusters for *Aedes*-borne diseases, ten were also
248 high-risk for microcephaly. One possible explanation is that, in these locations, dengue and/or
249 chikungunya were more prevalent than Zika. However, it has been under discussion whether higher
250 Zika incidence always translates into higher microcephaly incidence [9–11]. Microcephaly rates as
251 high as those observed in Northeast Brazil were unprecedented and not observed anywhere else in
252 the world where Zika has knowingly caused large epidemics. It seems that underlying factors may

253 be acting to modify the risk of developing microcephaly given the infection during pregnancy
254 [11,25–27]. Even today, the reason why some regions of Northeast Brazil presented such high Zika-
255 related microcephaly rates remains an open question.

256 Fifty municipalities constituted high-risk microcephaly clusters, with only ten of these also
257 constituting high-risk clusters for *Aedes*-borne diseases. Because most cases of microcephaly in the
258 region were caused by Zika [29], the pattern of high risk of microcephaly combined with a low risk
259 of dengue, Zika and chikungunya suggests that there was under-reporting of *Aedes*-borne diseases
260 in these municipalities. The under-reporting of acute infectious diseases is usually higher in poorer
261 areas. As a consequence, using only *Aedes*-borne data would bias the identification of Zika high-
262 risk areas. By combining the analyses using such data with analyses using microcephaly data, we
263 successfully identified hidden Zika hotspots. Of note, the identification of Sertão region as a Zika
264 hotspot was only possible because the scan statistics results for dengue, Zika, and chikungunya
265 were combined with the results for microcephaly.

266 The northeast of Pernambuco and the Sertão region were hit hardest by the Zika epidemic.
267 The first has the state's highest population density and urbanization rate. Because other arboviruses
268 are more frequent in urban areas, these areas might see magnified risk of Zika. A recent study in
269 Recife has described an association between precarious living conditions and higher microcephaly
270 prevalence [27]. The urban poor in Brazil often live in households and areas that lack solid
271 infrastructure, such as proper plumbing systems and waste disposal, leading to poor environmental
272 hygiene associated with mosquito breeding. The Sertão region has one of the highest rates of social
273 and economic inequality in Brazil and is also characterized by precarious health care access.

274 The coldspots need to be interpreted with caution. Further studies are needed to understand
275 whether coldspots were identified as such due to under-reporting or because, in fact, the Zika
276 burden was low in these locations. If the latter is true, the population of municipalities classified as

277 Zika coldspots may be at risk for future outbreaks. Seroprevalence studies can contribute to this
278 issue.

279 Despite its important contributions, this study has some limitations. Due to the awareness
280 surrounding the microcephaly epidemic, it is possible that microcephaly reporting was over-
281 reported and a proportion of cases was misdiagnosed. To counterbalance this, we used information
282 from the Live Births System, SINASC, instead of the RESP system, as it is more robust and less
283 prone to bias caused by disease awareness. As already mentioned, there is under-reporting and
284 misclassification of *Aedes*-borne diseases cases. To address the latter, we combined the three
285 diseases – dengue, Zika and chikungunya – in the analysis. Different levels of under-reporting
286 across the municipalities are expected, both for *Aedes*-borne diseases and microcephaly cases, and
287 could bias our results. Finally, we did not consider covariates which might help predict spatial
288 hotspots.

289 This analysis provides a much-needed classification of Zika risk in the state most affected
290 by the epidemic. In doing so, this study provides a foundation for addressing the potential double
291 jeopardy of two successive novel infectious disease outbreaks. Brazil is the country most affected
292 by the Zika epidemic and has been an epicenter of the COVID-19 pandemic, with nearly 10.5
293 million confirmed cases and more than 250 thousand deaths by February 28, 2021 [30]. The
294 Brazilian population is therefore experiencing two successive outbreaks with reproductive health
295 consequences. There is now evidence that pregnant women have higher chances of developing the
296 severe form of COVID-19 [31]. There is also evidence of increase in stillbirth and preterm delivery
297 during the pandemic [32]. Women at childbearing ages are further affected by the uncertainty and
298 stress associated with a novel infectious disease, which can also be consequential to pregnant
299 women and fetuses [33]. Such double jeopardy will directly impact how Brazilian women
300 experience reproductive health and childbearing for cohorts to come.

301 Our study provides a foundation for research investigating social and environmental
 302 factors associated with Zika risk, advancing understanding of what makes a location a “risky” place.
 303 Merging data on socioeconomic characteristics, health surveillance infrastructure, and
 304 environmental conditions at the municipality level to our classification scheme represents an
 305 important next step in addressing this question. Our study also provides an important basis for
 306 analyses that identify risk of illnesses that are historically under-reported, a common issue
 307 particularly in low- and middle-income countries. The applied methodology has the potential to be
 308 adapted to instances in which a novel disease emerges and where under-reporting is also expected.
 309 As an example, excess deaths, influenza-like illness and hospitalizations due to severe acute
 310 respiratory illness, could be used to identify and classify high-risk areas for COVID-19.

311 The identification of high-risk areas for Zika has important research and policy
 312 implications. By combining Zika with other arboviruses and microcephaly, our approach offers a
 313 broader and potentially more reliable classification scheme for identifying Zika hotspots –
 314 information that can be used to inform public health research and policy. Importantly, our analysis
 315 identifies areas that might be particularly vulnerable to under-reporting, as suggested by the clusters
 316 that had high microcephaly risk but low *Aedes*-borne diseases risk.

317

318 **Acknowledgements**

319 We would like to thank the current and former members of the Decode Zika project: Ana
 320 Paula Portella, Irene Rossetto, Karlos Ramos, Kristine Hopkins, Luiz Gustavo Fernandes Sereno,
 321 and Ryan Lloyd.

322

323 **Funding**

324 This research was supported by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child
 325 Health and Human Development (<https://www.nichd.nih.gov/>): grant R01HD091257 awarded to

LJM (PI: LJM, co-investigator: MD), and grants P2CH042849 and T32HD007081 awarded to the Population Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin. RL was supported by a Royal Society Dorothy Hodgkin Fellowship (<https://royalsociety.org/grants-schemes-awards/grants/dorothy-hodgkin-fellowship/>).

Ethics

This study was conducted under Institutional Review Board approval #2018-01-0055 from the University of Texas at Austin and the Brazilian National Commission for Research Ethics (CONEP – *Comissão Nacional de Ética em Pesquisa*) study approval CAAE: 34032920.1.0000.5149.

References

1. Lowe R, Barcellos C, Brasil P, Cruz O, Honório N, Kuper H, et al. The Zika Virus Epidemic in Brazil: From Discovery to Future Implications. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2018;15: 96. doi:10.3390/ijerph15010096
2. de Oliveira WK, de França GVA, Carmo EH, Duncan BB, de Souza Kuchenbecker R, Schmidt MI. Infection-related microcephaly after the 2015 and 2016 Zika virus outbreaks in Brazil: a surveillance-based analysis. *The Lancet*. 2017;390: 861–870. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31368-5
3. Kindhauser MK, Allen T, Frank V, Santhana RS, Dye C. Zika: the origin and spread of a mosquito-borne virus. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. 2016;94: 675-686C. doi:10.2471/BLT.16.171082
4. Costa LC, Veiga RV, Oliveira JF, Rodrigues MS, Andrade RFS, Paixão ES, et al. New Insights on the Zika Virus Arrival in the Americas and Spatiotemporal Reconstruction of the Epidemic Dynamics in Brazil. *Viruses*. 2020;13: 12. doi:10.3390/v13010012
5. Faria NR, Quick J, Claro IM, Théze J, de Jesus JG, Giovanetti M, et al. Establishment and cryptic transmission of Zika virus in Brazil and the Americas. *Nature*. 2017;546: 406–410. doi:10.1038/nature22401
6. Magalhaes T, Braga C, Cordeiro MT, Oliveira AL, Castanha PM, Maciel APR, et al. Zika virus displacement by a chikungunya outbreak in Recife, Brazil. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2017;11: e0006055.
7. Brady OJ, Osgood-Zimmerman A, Kassebaum NJ, Ray SE, de Araújo VEM, da Nóbrega AA, et al. The association between Zika virus infection and microcephaly in Brazil 2015–2017: An

- observational analysis of over 4 million births. Myers JE, editor. PLOS Medicine. 2019;16: e1002755. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002755
8. Johansson MA, Mier-y-Teran-Romero L, Reefhuis J, Gilboa SM, Hills SL. Zika and the risk of microcephaly. NEJM. 2016;375: 1–4. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1605367
9. Rodrigues LC, Paixao ES. Risk of Zika-related microcephaly: stable or variable? The Lancet. 2017;390: 824–826. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31478-2
10. Costa F, Ko AI. Zika virus and microcephaly: where do we go from here? The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2018;18: 236–237. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(17)30697-7
11. Jaenisch T, Rosenberger KD, Brito C, Brady O, Brasil P, Marques ET. Risk of microcephaly after Zika virus infection in Brazil, 2015 to 2016. Bull World Health Organ. 2017;95: 191–198. doi:10.2471/BLT.16.178608
12. Kraemer MUG, Reiner RC, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Gilbert M, Pigott DM, et al. Past and future spread of the arbovirus vectors *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus*. Nature Microbiology. 2019;4: 854–863. doi:10.1038/s41564-019-0376-y
13. Paixão ES, Teixeira MG, Costa M da CN, Barreto ML, Rodrigues LC. Symptomatic Dengue during Pregnancy and Congenital Neurologic Malformations. Emerging Infectious Diseases. 2018;24: 1748–1750. doi:10.3201/eid2409.170361
14. Brito CAA de, Brito CCM de, Oliveira AC, Rocha M, Atanásio C, Asfora C, et al. Zika in Pernambuco: rewriting the first outbreak. Revista da Sociedade Brasileira de Medicina Tropical. 2016;49: 553–558. doi:10.1590/0037-8682-0245-2016
15. IBGE. Panorama Pernambuco. [cited 3 Aug 2020]. Available: <https://cidades.ibge.gov.br/brasil/pe/panorama>
16. IBGE. Panorama Recife. [cited 3 Aug 2020]. Available: <https://cidades.ibge.gov.br/brasil/pe/recife/panorama>
17. Ministério da Saúde B. Monitoramento integrado de alterações no crescimento e desenvolvimento relacionadas à infecção pelo vírus Zika e outras etiologias infecciosas, até a Semana Epidemiológica 52 de 2017. Boletim Epidemiológico. 2018;49. Available: <https://www.saude.gov.br/images/pdf/2018/fevereiro/20/2018-003-Final.pdf>
18. Freire FHM de A, Gonzaga MR, Gomes MMF. Projeções populacionais por sexo e idade para pequenas áreas no Brasil. Revista Latinoamericana de Población. 2019;14: 124–149. doi:10.31406/relap2020.v14.i1.n26.6
19. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R, et al. Welcome to the Tidyverse. Journal of Open Source Software. 2019;4: 1686. doi:10.21105/joss.01686
20. Wickham H. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer-Verlag. 2016. Available: <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org/>
21. The R Foundation for Statistical Computing. R. The R Foundation; 2020. Available: <https://www.r-project.org/>

22. Kulldorff M. A spatial scan statistic. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*. 1997;26: 1481–1496. doi:10.1080/03610929708831995
23. Kulldorff M. SaTScan. Available: <https://www.satscan.org/>
24. Kleinman K. rsatscan: Tools, Classes, and Methods for Interfacing with SaTScan Stand-Alone Software. 2015. Available: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rsatscan>
25. Carvalho MS, Freitas LP, Cruz OG, Brasil P, Bastos LS. Association of past dengue fever epidemics with the risk of Zika microcephaly at the population level in Brazil. *Scientific Reports*. 2020;10. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-58407-7
26. Santa Rita TH, Barra RB, Peixoto GP, Mesquita PG, Barra GB. Association between suspected Zika virus disease during pregnancy and giving birth to a newborn with congenital microcephaly: a matched case-control study. *BMC Research Notes*. 2017;10. doi:10.1186/s13104-017-2796-1
27. Souza WV de, Albuquerque M de FPM de, Vazquez E, Bezerra LCA, Mendes A da CG, Lyra TM, et al. Microcephaly epidemic related to the Zika virus and living conditions in Recife, Northeast Brazil. *BMC Public Health*. 2018;18. doi:10.1186/s12889-018-5039-z
28. Alexander NDE, Souza WV, Rodrigues LC, Braga C, Sá A, Albuquerque Bezerra LC, et al. Spatiotemporal Analysis of the Population Risk of Congenital Microcephaly in Pernambuco State, Brazil. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2020;17: 700. doi:10.3390/ijerph17030700
29. de Araújo TVB, Ximenes RA de A, Miranda-Filho D de B, Souza WV, Montarroyos UR, de Melo APL, et al. Association between microcephaly, Zika virus infection, and other risk factors in Brazil: final report of a case-control study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2018;18: 328–336. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(17)30727-2
30. WHO. Weekly epidemiological update - 2 March 2021. 2021 [cited 16 Dec 2020]. Available: <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update---2-march-2021>
31. CDC C for DC and P. CDC updates, expands list of people at risk of severe COVID-19 illness. In: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [Internet]. 25 Jun 2020 [cited 8 Mar 2021]. Available: <https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2020/p0625-update-expands-covid-19.html>
32. Khalil A, von Dadelszen P, Draycott T, Ugwumadu A, O'Brien P, Magee L. Change in the Incidence of Stillbirth and Preterm Delivery During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA*. 2020 [cited 20 Jul 2020]. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.12746
33. Torche F. The Effect of Maternal Stress on Birth Outcomes: Exploiting a Natural Experiment. *Demography*. 2011;48: 1473–1491. doi:10.1007/s13524-011-0054-z

338

339