

Supplementary Material: Metapopulation modeling of COVID-19 advancing into the countryside: an analysis of mitigation strategies for Brazil

Guilherme S. Costa ¹, Wesley Cota ¹, and Silvio C. Ferreira ^{1,2}

¹*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Viçosa, 36570-900 Viçosa, Minas Gerais, Brazil*

²*National Institute of Science and Technology for Complex Systems, 22290-180, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*

We present supplementary figures, tables, video and dataset descriptions.

I. SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES

In this section we present figures with counterparts in the main text for different parameter sets. Reader should consult to the parts of main text where they are cited for the discussion.




FIG. SI-1. Simulations and observations of the number of confirmed cases for the 26 federative states of Brazil considering three mitigation strategies. The total number of confirmed cases in Brazil are shown in bottom right corner. Day 0 represents 31 March 2020. Simulations were performed using none, moderate, and strong mitigations with parameters $(M, K) = (0, 0)$, $(0.4, 0.3)$, and $(0.8, 0.5)$, respectively.




FIG. SI-2. Multi-scale analysis of the epidemic incidence for the CE state at several scales of geographical organization considering a moderate mitigation with parameters $(M, K) = (0.40, 0.3)$. Epidemic curves averaged with geographical resolution increasing from top to bottom are compared with lower resolution averages: a) intermediate regions, b,c) immediate regions, d-g) municipalities. The curves presenting the earliest and latest maxima are chosen as representative within each panel. Arrows indicate curves selected for zooming. Day 0 represents 31 March 2020.




FIG. SI-3. Multi-scale analysis of the epidemic incidence for the RJ state at several scales of geographical organization. Details as in caption of Fig. SI-2.




FIG. SI-5. Multi-scale analysis of epidemic incidence for the SP state at several scales of geographical organization. Details as in caption of Fig. SI-2.




FIG. SI-4. Multi-scale analysis of epidemic incidence for the RS state at several scales of geographical organization. Details as in caption of Fig. SI-2.




FIG. SI-6. Epidemic prevalence on all intermediate regions of Brazil grouped by federative state without mitigation with parameters $(M, K) = (0, 0)$. The shaded plots represent the intermediate regions while the thick lines the averages within each state. The lower right corner plot represent an average on the whole country, and shaded plots represent the federative states.




FIG. SI-7. Same as Fig. SI-6 for moderate mitigation parameters $(M, K) = (0.3, 0.4)$.




FIG. SI-8. Same as Fig. SI-6 for strong mitigation parameters $(M, K) = (0.8, 0.5)$.




FIG. SI-9. Box plot for the peak a) time T , b) width τ , and c) prevalence ρ averaged over immediate regions for the 26 federation states without mitigation with parameters $(M, K) = (0, 0)$. Circles are data for different regions. As usual, boxes yield median, lower and upper quartiles while points outside whiskers are outliers.




FIG. SI-10. As in Fig. SI-9 for simulations using a strong mitigation with parameters $(M, K) = (0.8, 0.5)$.




FIG. SI-11. Scatter plots of days for epidemic peak vs distance from capital city for each federative state of Brazil considering a moderate mitigation scenario $(M, K) = (0.3, 0.4)$. Full lines represent linear regressions of the data.

II. SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

TABLE SI-I. Pearson coefficients r and p -value extracted for a linear statistical analysis for correlations of between the epidemic peak and distance from the capital city for the 26 federative states for a moderate mitigation.

| State | r | p -value | State | r | p -value | State | r | p -value |
|-------|------|----------------------|-------|--------|----------------------|-------|------|------------|
| AC | 0.60 | 0.29 | AL | 0.94 | 1.7×10^{-5} | AM | 0.44 | 0.17 |
| AP | 0.32 | 0.68 | BA | 0.52 | 0.47 | CE | 0.70 | 0.0016 |
| ES | 0.65 | 0.080 | GO | 0.55 | 0.0078 | MA | 0.59 | 0.0040 |
| MG | 0.50 | 1.0×10^{-5} | MS | 0.37 | 0.24 | MT | 0.62 | 0.0060 |
| PA | 0.37 | 0.099 | PB | 0.80 | 0.0032 | PE | 0.76 | 0.00026 |
| PI | 0.93 | 1.1×10^{-8} | PR | 0.11 | 0.59 | RJ | 0.65 | 0.012 |
| RN | 0.34 | 0.31 | RO | -0.047 | 0.93 | RR | 0.77 | 0.23 |
| RS | 0.52 | 0.00036 | SC | 0.62 | 0.0012 | SE | 0.91 | 0.019 |
| SP | 0.71 | 2.4×10^{-9} | TO | 0.49 | 0.13 | | | |

TABLE SI-II. Epidemic peaks and prevalence of symptomatic individuals for each federative unit and the whole country for none, moderate and strong mitigation scenarios.

| | $(M, K) = (0, 0)$ | | $(M, K) = (0.4, 0.3)$ | | $(M, K) = (0.8, 0.5)$ | |
|--------|-------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|
| | State | Capital | State | Capital | State | Capital |
| AC | 5.95% | 11.60% | 3.54% | 7.17% | 1.19% | 2.50% |
| | 37 days | 36 days | 52 days | 52 days | 93 days | 92 days |
| AL | 6.46% | 13.00% | 3.59% | 8.66% | 1.32% | 3.85% |
| | 40 days | 34 days | 51 days | 48 days | 80 days | 80 days |
| AM | 7.50% | 13.00% | 4.96% | 8.76% | 2.18% | 3.95% |
| | 26 days | 26 days | 36 days | 35 days | 56 days | 56 days |
| AP | 9.97% | 12.30% | 6.25% | 7.98% | 2.47% | 3.27% |
| | 32 days | 31 days | 44 days | 43 days | 72 days | 71 days |
| BA | 5.59% | 13.20% | 3.20% | 9.11% | 1.21% | 4.31% |
| | 34 days | 28 days | 44 days | 39 days | 65 days | 61 days |
| CE | 5.91% | 13.50% | 3.58% | 9.19% | 1.49% | 4.38% |
| | 28 days | 24 days | 34 days | 31 days | 49 days | 47 days |
| ES | 8.06% | 16.00% | 4.97% | 9.97% | 1.92% | 4.20% |
| | 31 days | 28 days | 42 days | 37 days | 66 days | 57 days |
| GO | 8.33% | 13.20% | 4.89% | 8.32% | 1.61% | 3.31% |
| | 36 days | 33 days | 50 days | 46 days | 83 days | 75 days |
| MA | 5.08% | 12.30% | 2.31% | 7.90% | 0.58% | 3.23% |
| | 48 days | 30 days | 71 days | 41 days | 68 days | 66 days |
| MG | 6.94% | 14.10% | 3.82% | 9.25% | 1.25% | 4.15% |
| | 37 days | 29 days | 48 days | 40 days | 74 days | 63 days |
| MS | 7.03% | 11.70% | 3.90% | 7.31% | 1.22% | 2.58% |
| | 39 days | 37 days | 54 days | 53 days | 93 days | 94 days |
| MT | 5.62% | 12.10% | 3.21% | 7.56% | 0.98% | 2.84% |
| | 37 days | 33 days | 51 days | 46 days | 85 days | 77 days |
| PA | 5.10% | 13.60% | 2.85% | 9.03% | 1.06% | 4.04% |
| | 38 days | 31 days | 47 days | 43 days | 73 days | 70 days |
| PB | 6.91% | 13.10% | 3.76% | 8.67% | 1.10% | 3.78% |
| | 41 days | 32 days | 54 days | 46 days | 81 days | 74 days |
| PE | 6.47% | 14.60% | 3.88% | 9.57% | 1.46% | 4.33% |
| | 33 days | 29 days | 44 days | 39 days | 67 days | 60 days |
| PI | 4.07% | 12.00% | 2.32% | 7.53% | 0.77% | 2.73% |
| | 40 days | 37 days | 55 days | 53 days | 96 days | 96 days |
| PR | 8.08% | 13.40% | 4.76% | 8.71% | 1.66% | 3.74% |
| | 33 days | 30 days | 45 days | 41 days | 71 days | 65 days |
| RJ | 10.90% | 14.00% | 6.95% | 9.35% | 2.84% | 4.24% |
| | 29 days | 27 days | 40 days | 37 days | 62 days | 57 days |
| RN | 8.13% | 13.70% | 4.71% | 9.17% | 1.78% | 4.19% |
| | 31 days | 27 days | 40 days | 36 days | 59 days | 56 days |
| RO | 5.14% | 11.60% | 2.86% | 7.18% | 0.90% | 2.49% |
| | 40 days | 38 days | 57 days | 55 days | 100 days | 98 days |
| RR | 8.66% | 12.00% | 5.44% | 7.75% | 2.11% | 3.11% |
| | 31 days | 30 days | 43 days | 43 days | 70 days | 70 days |
| RS | 6.94% | 14.00% | 3.95% | 9.00% | 1.35% | 3.80% |
| | 35 days | 30 days | 47 days | 41 days | 73 days | 65 days |
| SC | 7.88% | 13.20% | 4.51% | 8.27% | 1.46% | 3.25% |
| | 35 days | 29 days | 49 days | 40 days | 79 days | 65 days |
| SE | 7.67% | 13.20% | 4.42% | 8.58% | 1.48% | 3.70% |
| | 37 days | 33 days | 50 days | 46 days | 80 days | 75 days |
| SP | 7.95% | 13.90% | 4.94% | 9.44% | 2.02% | 4.43% |
| | 29 days | 24 days | 37 days | 33 days | 55 days | 50 days |
| TO | 5.14% | 11.10% | 2.39% | 6.75% | 0.65% | 2.16% |
| | 52 days | 39 days | 58 days | 53 days | 101 days | 96 days |
| DF | 12.40% | | 7.93% | | 3.17% | |
| | 31 days | | 43 days | | 70 days | |
| Brazil | 6.80% | | 3.98% | | 1.44% | |
| | 33 days | | 44 days | | 67 days | |

III. SUPPLEMENTARY MAPS AND VIDEOS




FIG. SI-12. Color maps with prevalence of symptomatic cases (U and C) on Brazil for no mitigation scenario with parameters $(M, K) = (0, 0)$. Dates of the simulation are shown in the upper right corner for all frames. The darker colors represent higher prevalences in a logarithm scale.




FIG. SI-13. Same as figure SI-12 for a strong mitigation scenario with parameters $(M, K) = (0.8, 0.5)$.

Video SI-1. Daily evolution of the prevalence of symptomatic individuals on Brazilian municipalities for no mitigation $(M, K) = (0, 0)$. Dates of the simulation are shown in the upper right corner for all frames. The darker colors represent higher prevalences in a logarithm scale.

Video SI-2. Same as video SI-1 for a moderate mitigation $(M, K) = (0.4, 0.3)$.

Video SI-3. Same as video SI-1 for a strong mitigation $(M, K) = (0.8, 0.5)$.

IV. COMPUTER IMPLEMENTATION

The computer implementation of the epidemic model follows the Gillespie methods based on Ref. [1].

A. Definitions

We define n_{ji}^X as the number of individuals in state X (= S,E,A,U,C, or R) within the patch i that comes from patch j such that $\tilde{n}_i^X = \sum_j n_{ji}^X$ is the number of individuals in patch i that are in state X. Thus, the number of residents of i in state X is n_{ii}^X and of nonresidents is given by $\tilde{n}_i^X - n_{ii}^X$. Also, $\tilde{n}_i = \sum_X \tilde{n}_i^X$ is the total number of individuals and $\tilde{n}_{ii} = \sum_X n_{ii}^X$ the number of residents in the patch i . Finally, the total number of individuals in compartment X is $N_X = \sum_{j=1}^{\Omega} \tilde{n}_j^X$.

B. General structure of the simulation

We divide the simulation in two big groups: mobility and epidemic events. The total rate of mobility is

$$D_{\text{tot}} = T_r^{-1} \sum_i \tilde{n}_{ii} R_i + T_r^{-1} \sum_i (\tilde{n}_i - \tilde{n}_{ii}), \quad (1)$$

where the first term is due the flux of individuals leaving from and the second returning to their patches of residence. The transitions \mathcal{T} and their respective total rates $\Gamma_{\mathcal{T}}$ are defined in Table SI-III.

TABLE SI-III. Total transition rates for different types of epidemic events.

| \mathcal{T} | $\Gamma_{\mathcal{T}}$ |
|---------------|--------------------------------|
| E→A | $\mu_A N^E$ |
| E→U | $\mu_U N^E$ |
| A→U | $\beta_U N^A$ |
| A→R | $\beta_R N^A$ |
| U→R | $\alpha_R N^U$ |
| U→C | $\alpha_C N^U$ |
| C→R | $\alpha_R N^C$ |
| S→E | $\sum_{i=1}^{\Omega} \Theta_i$ |

The infection rate in a patch i is given by ,

$$\Theta_i = \frac{\langle k \rangle_i \tilde{n}_i^S}{\tilde{n}_i} (\lambda_A \tilde{n}_i^A + \lambda_S \tilde{n}_i^U + b \lambda_S \tilde{n}_i^C), \quad (2)$$

while the total rate of epidemic events is

$$E_{\text{tot}} = \sum_{\mathcal{T}} \Gamma_{\mathcal{T}}. \quad (3)$$

In each time step, we select one mobility or epidemic event with probabilities $P_{\text{mob}} = D_{\text{tot}}/(D_{\text{tot}} + E_{\text{tot}})$ and $P_{\text{epi}} = 1 - P_{\text{mob}}$, respectively and the time increased by $\delta t = 1/(D_{\text{tot}} + E_{\text{tot}})$.

C. Mobility event

If a mobility event was chosen we proceed as follows.

- i) Choose the patch i from where an individual will leave proportionally to the total mobility rate of the patch, which occurs with probability

$$Q_i = \frac{\tilde{n}_{ii}R_i + (\tilde{n}_i - \tilde{n}_{ii})}{\sum_j [\tilde{n}_{jj}R_j + (\tilde{n}_j - \tilde{n}_{jj})]} \quad (4)$$

- ii) Choose the state X of the individual of patch i that will move with probability

$$P_i^X = \frac{\tilde{n}_i^X}{\sum_Y \tilde{n}_i^Y}. \quad (5)$$

- iii) Select if the individual to move is resident or nonresident with probabilities n_{ii}^X/\tilde{n}_i^X and $1 - n_{ii}^X/\tilde{n}_i^X$, respectively.
- iv) If the individual is resident and not symptomatic (E,A,S or R), the destination patch j is chosen with probability R_{ij}/\tilde{R}_i and if he/she is symptomatic stays in the resident patch ($j = i$). The movement is implemented as $n_{ij}^X \rightarrow n_{ij}^X + 1$ and $n_{ii}^X \rightarrow n_{ii}^X - 1$.
- v) If the individual to move is a nonresident, one patch j is chosen with probability $n_{ji}^X/(\tilde{n}_i^X - \tilde{n}_{ii}^X)$ and movement implemented as $n_{ji}^X \rightarrow n_{ji}^X - 1$ and $n_{jj}^X \rightarrow n_{jj}^X + 1$.

D. Epidemic event

If an epidemic event was chosen we proceed as follows.

- i) One of the transitions \mathcal{T} is chosen with probability

$$P_{\mathcal{T}} = \frac{\Gamma_{\mathcal{T}}}{\sum_{\mathcal{T}} \Gamma_{\mathcal{T}}} \quad (6)$$

- ii) If $\mathcal{T} = \text{S} \rightarrow \text{E}$, then we chose a patch i with probability $\Theta_i / \sum_{j=1}^{\Omega} \Theta_j$. Then, one patch j is chosen with probability n_{ji}^S/\tilde{n}_i^S such that $n_{ji}^S \rightarrow n_{ji}^S - 1$ and $n_{ji}^E \rightarrow n_{ji}^E + 1$. Notice that both resident ($i = j$) or nonresident ($i \neq j$) are reckoned in this rule.
- iii) If \mathcal{T} is a spontaneous transitions of the form $\text{X} \rightarrow \text{Y}$ then a patch i is chosen with probability \tilde{n}_i^X/N^X and the patch j of origin is chosen with probability n_{ji}^X/\tilde{n}_i^X . Then $n_{ji}^X \rightarrow n_{ji}^X - 1$ and $n_{ji}^Y \rightarrow n_{ji}^Y + 1$.

Our algorithm spends too much time with mobility of susceptible and recovered individuals since they can exist in very large number for long times. We implemented an optimization performing the mobility of susceptible and recovered in discrete times of intervals of 0.5 d. So, instead of moving one susceptible individual at a time step, we move $n_{ij}^S R_{ij}$ from i to j at once and those who were not infected while visiting patch j return to i after 0.5 d. The same is done for recovered individuals. The simulations yield the same results as the exact procedure within the statistical uncertainties.

V. DATA




FIG. SI-14. a) Number of cases reported after the 50th case of COVID-19 in Brazil (Data source: [2]). Histograms for the b) fraction of urban population, c) urban population density, and d) number of contacts k_i in different municipalities estimated with Eq. (2) of the main paper.

A. Confirmed cases used as seeds

In the file `seeds.csv` included in this supplemental material collected all municipalities in Brazil with confirmed cases on 31 March and 04 April as seeds for the model. The complete source is available in Ref. [2].

-
- [1] W. Cota and S. C. Ferreira, “Optimized Gillespie algorithms for the simulation of Markovian epidemic processes on large and heterogeneous networks,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **219**, 303 (2017).
 [2] W. Cota, “Monitoring the number of COVID-19 cases and deaths in Brazil at municipal and federative units level,” (2020), [Online; accessed 04-May-2020].