

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

Guilherme S. Costa <sup>1</sup>, Wesley Cota <sup>1</sup>, and Silvio C. Ferreira <sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Viçosa, 36570-900 Viçosa, Minas Gerais, Brazil*

<sup>2</sup>*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 mentioned in the main text for complementary information and 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 is 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 prevalence 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 prevalence 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 prevalence 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 prevalence 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 represents an average over 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 plots for the peak a) time  $T$ , b) width  $\tau$ , and c) prevalence  $\rho$  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 of correlations between the epidemic peak and distance from the capital city for the 26 federative states with a moderate mitigation.

State	$r$	$p$ -value	State	$r$	$p$ -value	State	$r$	$p$ -value
AC	0.60	0.29	AL	0.94	$1.7 \times 10^{-5}$	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	$1.0 \times 10^{-5}$	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	$1.1 \times 10^{-8}$	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	$2.4 \times 10^{-9}$	TO	0.49	0.13			

TABLE SI-II. Epidemic peak and prevalence of symptomatic individuals for each federative unit and the whole country for none, moderate and strong mitigation scenarios with parameters  $(M, K) = (0, 0)$ ,  $(0.4, 0.3)$  and  $(0.8, 0.5)$ , respectively.

	$(M, K) = (0, 0)$		$(M, K) = (0.4, 0.3)$		$(M, K) = (0.8, 0.5)$	
	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

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

in which the first term represents the 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 ,

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

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 is 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  $R_{ij}/\tilde{R}_i$ . 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  $n_{ji}^{\text{S}}/\tilde{n}_i^{\text{S}}$  such that  $n_{ji}^{\text{S}} \rightarrow n_{ji}^{\text{S}} - 1$  and  $n_{ji}^{\text{E}} \rightarrow n_{ji}^{\text{E}} + 1$ . Notice that both resident ( $i = j$ ) or nonresident ( $i \neq j$ ) are considered 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  $\tilde{n}_i^{\text{X}}/N^{\text{X}}$  and the patch  $j$  of residence is chosen with probability  $n_{ji}^{\text{X}}/\tilde{n}_i^{\text{X}}$ . Then  $n_{ji}^{\text{X}} \rightarrow n_{ji}^{\text{X}} - 1$  and  $n_{ji}^{\text{Y}} \rightarrow n_{ji}^{\text{Y}} + 1$ .

This 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 0.5 d. So, instead of moving one susceptible individual at a time step, we move  $n_{ii}^{\text{S}}R_{ij}$  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` of this supplemental material yield all municipalities in Brazil with confirmed cases on 31 March and 04 April 2020 as seeds for the model. The complete source is available elsewhere [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,” *SciELOPreprints:362* (2020), 10.1590/scielopreprints.362.