1	The necessary cooperation between governments and public in the fight against COVID-
2	19: why non-pharmaceutical interventions may be ineffective
3	
4	
5	Christielly Mendonça Borges ^{1*} , Marco Túlio Pacheco Coelho ¹ , José Alexandre Felizola Diniz-
6	Filho ¹ , Thiago Fernando Rangel ¹
7	
8	¹ Departamento de Ecologia, Universidade Federal de Goiás, Goiânia, Goiás 74.001-970, Brasil.
9	* Corresponding author: christielly@gmail.com
10	
11	Abstract
12	The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak is the biggest public health challenge in the last 100
13	years. No successful pharmaceutical treatment is yet available, thus effective public health interventions
14	to contain COVID-19 include social distancing, isolation and quarantine measures, however the
15	efficiency of these containment measures varied among countries and even within states in the same
16	country. Despite Brazil being deeply affected by coronavirus, the federal government never proposed a
17	coordinated action to control COVID-19 and Brazilian states, which are autonomous, each imposed
18	different containment measures. The state of Goiás declared strict social distancing measures in March
19	13, but gradually relaxed many of its first measures due specially to public pressure. Here we use a
20	Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) model combined with Bayesian inference and a time-dependent
21	spreading rate to assess how past state-level interventions affected the spread of COVID-19 in Goiás.
22	The interventions succeeded in decreasing the transmission rate in the state, however, after the third
23	intervention the rate remained positive and exponential. Thus, other stricter interventions were made
24	necessary to avoid the growth of new cases and a collapse in the health system. Governmental
25	interventions need to be taken seriously by the population in order for them have the proposed outcome.
26	Our results reflect the population's disregard with the measures imposed and the need for cooperation
27	between governments and its citizens in the fight against COVID-19.
28	
29	Keywords: social distancing, containment measures, epidemiological modelling, pandemics,
30	Bayesian inference, time-dependent SIR model

32 Introduction

33 The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak caught the world by surprise, as in three 34 months it went from a public health emergency of international concern to a global pandemic (1). 35 This is the first pandemic caused by a coronavirus, since the severe acute respiratory syndrome 36 coronavirus 2 (SARS-COV-2) is highly transmissible and causes a pathogenic viral infection (2). 37 Human to human spread occurs mainly through respiratory droplets and contact routes (2), but 38 the virus can remain infections in aerosols and surfaces up to days (3). While therapies and 39 vaccines are still not available, preventions of disease spread and mitigation of the pandemic 40 relies in non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPI) such as social distancing, isolation, face 41 covering and quarantine measures (4, 5).

42

Despite being recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO), the adoption of NPIs 43 varied greatly between countries. The virus emerged first in China, where strict social distancing 44 45 rules were enforced early and only three months later the spreading was contained (6, 7). Timing of intervention during the outbreak can explain discrepancies in the number of deaths in 46 European countries, where Italy had 525 deaths per million population in contrast to Germany's 47 95 deaths per million population in the same month (8). As of June, the three countries with the 48 highest number of COVID-19 related deaths are the US, Brazil and the UK (9), all countries 49 50 where heads of state and government openly spoke against social distancing measures (10-12).

51

The first confirmed COVID-19 case in Brazil was registered on February 25, in the city of São Paulo (*13*). By March, it had already reached all 26 states and the Federal District (*14*). By June SF Brazil reported over one million confirmed cases and a total of 58,314 deaths (*9*). The states with the higher and lower confirmed cases were São Paulo and Mato Grosso do Sul, with 275,145 and 7,965 cases, respectively (*9*). States are autonomous under the Brazilian constitution (*15*), nonetheless, there was no coordinated action to control COVID-19 by the federal government.

59

Most state governors enforced restrictive contact measures in mid-March, when the virus began spreading. However, the president of the Federal Government has been vocally against statelevel social distancing policies, citing frequently his fear of an economic collapse (*16*). In fact,

president Bolsonaro passed a provisional measure in April which entrusted to the Union prerogatives concerning isolation, quarantine and the interdiction of locomotion, public services and essential activities during the pandemic (*17*). This measure was quickly overruled by the Supreme Federal Court of Justice, instating the Union could legislate on the subject but must always safeguard the autonomy of states and municipalities (*17*). This political confrontation deepened an already existing rift in the population, with Bolsonaro's supporters positioning themselves against states and municipalities' COVID-19 containment measures.

70

Brazil is a continental sized country with substantial regional socioeconomic inequalities, all 71 72 factors that further reduce support for social distancing measures (14), and results in different 73 containment measures in different states. In April, while cities such as Manaus, Fortaleza, 74 Brasília, Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo faced an exponential growth of COVID-19 cases (18), 75 southern states Santa Catarina and Rio Grande do Sul started to reopen their economies without 76 many registered cases (Pellegrini, 2020; Silva et al., 2020 [in press]). The state of Goiás was 77 amongst the leaders of social isolation, registering in March over 60% of reduced mobility 78 monitored via geolocation in smartphones (21). That percentage eventually dropped and, more 79 recently, Goiás recorded only 37% of reduced mobility, one of the worst rates of isolation in the 80 country (21). As a consequence, cases and deaths started to increase fast.

81

82 The first confirmed COVID-19 case in Goiás was registered on March 12. By March 13, the 83 state government issued a decree declaring public health emergency and instituted strict social 84 distancing measures. However, due to public and economic pressure, the government gradually 85 relaxed many of its first measures (22). Thus, in this paper we seek to detect if change points in 86 the effective growth rate of COVID-19 correlates with governmental interventions made in Goiás. We use a Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) model combined with Bayesian inference 87 88 and a time-dependent spreading rate (23) to assess the early transmission dynamics and evaluate 89 the effectiveness of the state-level interventions. Short-term forecasts such as this are key to 90 estimate medical requirements and capacities, and here we use it to assess how past mitigations 91 affected the spread of COVID-19 in the state.

- 92
- 93 Methods

94 We reproduced the framework stablished Dehning al. (2020,by et. 95 https://github.com/Priesemann-Group/covid19 inference). They combined SIR models with 96 Bayesian parameter inference with Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling and 97 augmented the model by a time-dependent spreading rate, which is implemented via potential 98 change points that characterize governmental interventions (23). We adjusted the model, initially 99 created for Germany, for the state of Goiás, by choosing the three main state-level interventions 100 and parameters accordingly.

101

102 SIR models have been used broadly to model epidemic spreads (24, 25), and recently gained strength in efforts to model the spread of COVID-19 worldwide (23, 26, 27). SIR models specify 103 104 the rates that population recover and become infected by a disease. Bayesian inference with MCMC sampling assimilates prior knowledge available and accounts for data uncertainties into 105 106 forecasts. An integration between Bayesian inference and SIR models provide a better 107 assessment of more complex and realistic models (28). Here we ran (1) an SIR model for the initial onset period with stationary spreading rate (simple SIR model) and (2) a time-dependent 108 109 SIR model with weekend correction (full SIR model) (23).

110

111 *Goiás characterization and data*

112 The state of Goiás is located in the mid-west region of Brazil and has a population of 113 approximately 7 million people (29). The Federal District, along with the country's capital Brasília, is geographically embedded within the State of Goiás, but due to administrative 114 115 differences and independence of public health policies, here we analyze only data for Goiás. 116 Daily number of COVID-19 confirmed cases in Goiás came from the Goiás State Health 117 Department (SES-GO; acronym in Portuguese). SES-GO systematically monitors suspected cases throughout the state and provides daily updates of confirmed cases (30). We used data until 118 119 May 22.

120

121 Governmental interventions

122 As of May 22, Goiás had amounted 14 decrees regarding the coronavirus pandemic. Most of 123 these decrees are relaxations of the first decree, such as reopening churches and temples. To

implement and maintain the model simple, we chose the three main decrees capable ofinfluencing public behavior (Fig. 1).

126

The first intervention chosen was the first decree announced on March 13. In this decree the state declares a public health emergency and institutes strict social distancing measures, such as the shutdown of public and private events of any nature, including educational institutions at all levels, daycares, suspension of commercial activities such as malls, fairs, gyms, dental health services, religious meetings and all other non-essential services and activities (*31*).

132

The second intervention chosen was the decree from April 3rd, which was already the eighth decree announced and the fourth relaxing the measures stated in the first one. This decree accumulates all prior flexibilizations, including reopening of religious activities, beauty salons, vegetable and fruit fairs, car workshops and restaurants on highways, administrative activities in public and private educational institutions (*31*).

138

On April 19, the government launched a new decree extending the health emergency in Goiás for another 150 days. However, on April 24, they announced another decree altering the decree from 04/19, legislating on the private sphere as well (suspending activities of common use in closed condominiums), regulating a channel for reporting disobediences to any of the decrees, and legislating specific days for religious celebrations (*31*). We chose the intervention on April 24 as the third changing point, as we see it to be more rigorous than previous ones.

145

146 Simple SIR model: stationary spreading rate

147 We considered the initial onset transmission phase as being between March 6 and 20, 148 approximately seven days before and after the first confirmed COVID-19 case in Goiás. Central 149 epidemiological parameters for this model are the spreading rate (λ), recovery rate (μ), reporting delay (D) and number of initially infected people (I_0) (23). We chose informative log-normal 150 151 priors of $\lambda = 0.3$ and $\mu = 0.11$ (Table 1), as these priors cannot be estimated independently and these values maintain the effective growth rate ($\lambda^* = \lambda - \mu$) with a median of 0.19 and the basic 152 153 reproduction number ($R_0 = \lambda / \mu$) with a median of 2.72, consistent with global (32) and local (33) estimates. We chose for the reporting delay a prior that incorporates the virus' incubation 154

period between 1-14 days and the delay of infected people awaiting tests confirmation or medical appointments. Flat priors were chosen for the I_0 and scale factor.

157

158 Full SIR model: weekly reporting modulation and change points in spreading rate

To simulate the effect of governmental interventions, we use a SIR model with incorporated change points capable of altering the transmission rate (23). The aim of interventions is to reduce the effective growth rate, thus if the rate becomes negative, new infections will begin to decrease. Dehning's model assumes new spreading rates for each change point, inferred after supposed behavioral changes in the population.

164

165 We chose the same log-normal distributed priors for λ_0 , μ and D as in the simple model, with 166 added parameters for the change points and their spreading rates (Table 2). We assumed the first government intervention reduced the spreading rate by 50% from the initial estimate $\lambda_0 = 0.3$, so 167 the prior for the first change point is $\lambda_1 \sim \log Normal$ (log (0.15), 0.5). Given the flexibilizations 168 169 in the following decrees, we assumed the spreading rate would increase again by 15%, thus $\lambda_2 \sim$ 170 logNormal (log (0.22), 0.5). For the third intervention, there was more rigidity in the social 171 distancing measures, which we presumed was embraced by the population. Therefore, we 172 assumed the prior decreases the spreading rate and is closer (but slightly inferior) to the rate of 173 the first intervention $\lambda_3 \sim \log Normal (\log (0.11), 0.5)$.

174

175 We chose normal distributed priors for the timing of change points (Table 2). Respectively $t_1 \sim$ Normal (2020/03/13, 3), $t_2 \sim Normal$ (2020/04/03, 1) and $t_3 \sim Normal$ (2020/04/24, 1), where 3, 176 177 1 and 1 are the respective transient days. Following the logic of the aforementioned decrees, we 178 assumed the first intervention as a strict contact ban, the second as a mild contact ban and the 179 third as again a strict contact ban. The change points take effect after a period of time (Δt_i), for which we chose a median of 3 days. During these 3 days, spreading rates are expected to change 180 181 for interventions to take effect. Furthermore, time is needed to ensure a smooth transition capable 182 of absorbing the changes in the population's behavior (23).

183

Priors chosen for the recovery rate, reporting delay and initial number of infected people werethe same as those applied in the simple SIR model (Table 1). The number of tests and reported

186 cases varies throughout the week, with the number of records expected to be lower on weekends 187 (23). To implement the weekend effect in the model, we modulate the number of cases inferred 188 by the absolute value of a sine function with the total period of 7 days (23). This function was 189 chosen by Dehning et al. (2020) because it is a non-symmetrical oscillation, adjusting the weekly 190 variation of cases. We chose flat priors for the I_0 , scale factor and weekly modulation phase.

191

192 *Model comparison*

Following (23), we ran a model comparison using the leave-one-out (LOO) cross-validation method to avoid an over-fitting forecast. We compared four full SIR models with zero, one, two, and three change points, respectively. The full SIR model with three change points presented a better match between model and data (Table 3), as indicated by a lower LOO score. Full SIR models with zero, one and two change points performed poorly and will not be further discussed (but see Fig.S1-S2).

199

200 We also ran a model comparison with three change points but no weekend modulation and three 201 sensitivity analyses by choosing wider priors to different parameters (23). The model without a 202 weekend modulation removes the assumption that daily reporting of new cases happens mainly 203 during weekdays. The inferred parameters for this model are similar to the model that has the 204 modulation, except for the number of initial infections (Fig. S3), but had a higher LOO-score 205 when compared. For the sensitivity analysis, all parameters and priors were maintained exactly as the full SIR model, except were indicated. We ran a model with a prior four times wider for 206 207 the reporting delay (Fig. S4), a model with a prior 14 days wide for the change times (Fig. S5) 208 and a model with a prior four times wider for the change duration (Fig. S6). The full SIR model 209 with three change points and weekly modulation again performed better than other models given 210 the lower LOO-score (Table S1).

211

212 **Results**

The daily reported cases in Goiás did not present an exponential curve in the simple SIR model with stationary spreading rate (Fig.2A), and the total reported cases (accumulated cases) show a tendency to be exponential (Fig.2B). The spreading rate was adjusted by the model as $\lambda = 0.16$ (95% credible interval (CI [0.07, 0.33]; Fig.2E)) and the effective growth rate as $\lambda^* = 0.04$

217 (Fig.2H), values lower than our prior. Further, μ and *D* histograms match the priors (gray line), 218 as expected by the model (23). The data for the initial phase is scarce and noisy, partly because 219 the initial cases were not local infections, but of contaminated people arriving in Goiás. We 220 expect the initial onset phase to be better explained by another phenomenon, such as migration of 221 people coming from other states, not captured by our model. Thus, we will not be discussing 222 these results further.

223

In the full SIR model with change points and weekly reporting modulation, we found evidence of the influence of the three change points (Fig.3). First, the spreading rate decreased from $\lambda_0 = 0.28$ (CI [0.12, 0.42]) to $\lambda_1 = 0.21$ (CI [0.16, 0.29]). The date for the first change point was inferred as March 13 (CI [9, 21]), a date that marks the first state decree with strict contact ban measures. After this intervention, the effective growth rate was a median of $\lambda_0 - \mu = 0.18$ to median $\lambda_1 - \mu =$ 0.11, given μ was inferred as 0.10 (CI [0.07,0.14]).

230

At the second change point, λ_t decreased from $\lambda_1 = 0.21$ to $\lambda_2 = 0.14$ (CI [0.11, 0.19]), lower than assumed by our prior. This date was inferred as April 3 (CI [2, 6]), which marks the accumulation of flexibilizations from four decrees to first decree of March 13, including the reopening of religious events and fruit and vegetable fairs. After the second intervention, the median growth rate was $\lambda_2 - \mu = 0.04$, in the vicinity of a critical point (close to zero), but still positive.

237

The third change point increased $\lambda_2 = 0.14$ to $\lambda_3 = 0.19$ (CI [0.14, 0.25]). This change point was inferred to be April 24 (CI [23, 27]), a stricter decree compared to the previous ones. After this measure, the effective growth rate was of $\lambda_3 - \mu = 0.09$, indicating an increase in the growth, remaining above zero and thus not decreasing the number of new infections.

242

243 Discussion

Given our results, the first two state-level interventions drastically reduced the COVID-19 spreading rate in Goiás. We expected the second intervention to increase the spreading rate, given prior relaxations, but the rate dropped. A plausible explanation could be that despite the relaxations of non-essential stores and services, the population obeyed social distancing.

Nonetheless, the third intervention, although stricter than the second, brought the transmission rate back to a rate similar to that of the first intervention. We expected the third intervention to result in a similar transmission rate to that of the first intervention, but in the model, the transmission rate increased. This result probably reflects an accumulation of all fourteen statelevel decrees and the population's fatigue of being isolated, which probably resulted in more people eventually circulating in public spaces.

254

255 The transmission rates found in our model match the patterns found in a study that calculated 256 time-series of the effective reproductive number (Rt) in Goiás (Diniz-Filho, Jardim, Toscano, & 257 Rangel, 2020 [in press]). They found Rt to be around 2.0 in mid-March, dropping to 258 approximately 1.2 in mid-April and increasing slowly to 1.4-1.5 in May. If we convert our 259 transmission rates to R ($R = 1 + \lambda * 5.2$; where 5.2 is the serial interval) we get R = 2.1 for the 260 first intervention in March 13, R = 1.2 for the second intervention in April 3 and R = 1.5 for the 261 third intervention in April 24. Both our models reflect the effects of the early social distancing 262 measures implemented in Goiás in reducing the diseases' onset transmission.

263

264 When this model was applied to Germany it demonstrated that following a gradual linear path of 265 interventions, first banning major public events, later announcing mild social distancing 266 measures and finally a strict contact ban (23), aided in decreasing the transmission rate, bringing 267 it to almost zero. Goiás followed an almost inversed path, imposing a first decree with strict 268 social distancing measures at an early stage, but eventually reopening many specific services and 269 activities. Nonetheless, if no social distancing measure had been imposed in Goiás, up to 62% of the population would have been infected by June 2^{nd} (35), representing approximately 4 million 270 271 people in the state. Further, it was also estimated that the interventions in Goiás prevented 272 between 2.834 and 3.407 COVID-19 deaths (35).

273

Although state-level interventions succeeded in decreasing the transmission rate, it remained high and exponential. Thus, other stricter interventions were made necessary to avoid the growth of new cases and a collapse in the health system. Nonetheless, more restrictive measures for the containment of COVID-19 were not adopted and were only discussed again in late June, when confirmed cases spiked. Our model forecasted for June 14 approximately 8.187 total reported

cases (Fig. 3C), at that date, the state registered 7.944 confirmed cases (*30*), a difference of 243
cases that could be explained by under testing and reporting delays.

281

282 Because no countries reached herd immunity (8), second waves of infections are expected as 283 well as more interventions to control them. Unfortunately, the accordion effect in COVID-19 284 spreading rate is not exclusive to Goiás. There have been new local outbreaks in 11 European 285 countries, regions that previously lowered infection rates and were starting to lift restrictions 286 (36). Melbourne, in Australia, had to reimpose stay-at-home measures after a high increase of 287 positive cases, including a border closure (37). Governmental interventions need to be taken 288 seriously by the population in order for them have the proposed outcome. Our results reflect the 289 population's disregard with the measures imposed. In contrast, countries with non-compulsory measures, such as Japan and Uruguay, experienced relatively low numbers of confirmed cases 290 291 and deaths, as population self-isolated (38, 39).

292

293 The COVID-19 outbreak poses itself as the biggest public health challenge in the last 100 years. 294 Many countries around the world took drastic measures of social distancing and even complete 295 lockdowns to contain it. Biomedical research on COVID-19 has boosted in the last six months 296 and had many advances in clinical testing, drug repurposing and candidate vaccines (40). While 297 no effective treatment is made available, the better and safest way to successfully fight this 298 pandemic is still social distancing and isolation, perhaps for an undetermined period of time. 299 Governments (on any level) need cooperation from its citizens to succeed in containing COVID-300 19.

301

302 Authors' contributions

All authors conceived and designed the study. TFR curated the data. CMB performed the
analysis and wrote the first draft. All authors provided critical feedback, revised and approved
the manuscript's final version.

306

307 Acknowledgments

We thank Mario Joaquim dos Santos Neto for the discussions and comments on the Brazilian
legal system. We thank the Goiás State and Goiânia City Health Departments for support and
access to original data.

311

312 **References**

- WHO, Timeline of WHO's response to COVID-19. *World Heal. Organ.* (2020),
 (available at https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/29-06-2020-covidtimeline).
- 315 2. M. A. Shereen, S. Khan, A. Kazmi, N. Bashir, R. Siddique, COVID-19 infection: Origin,
 316 transmission, and characteristics of human coronaviruses. *J. Adv. Res.* 24, 91–98 (2020).
- N. van Doremalen, T. Bushmaker, D. H. Morris, M. G. Holbrook, A. Gamble, B. N.
 Williamson, A. Tamin, J. L. Harcourt, N. J. Thornburg, S. I. Gerber, J. O. Lloyd-Smith, E.
 de Wit, V. J. Munster, Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with
 SARS-CoV-1. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 382, 1564–1567 (2020).
- A. Wilder-Smith, D. O. Freedman, Isolation, quarantine, social distancing and community
 containment: Pivotal role for old-style public health measures in the novel coronavirus
 (2019-nCoV) outbreak. *J. Travel Med.* 27, 1–4 (2020).
- 5. D. K. Chu, *et. al.* Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-toperson transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and metaanalysis. *Lancet.* **395**, 1973–1987 (2020).
- G. D. Barmparis, G. P. Tsironis, Estimating the infection horizon of COVID-19 in eight
 countries with a data-driven approach. *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals.* 135 (2020),
 doi:10.1016/j.chaos.2020.109842.
- 330 7. M. U. G. Kraemer, *et al*. The effect of human mobility and control measures on the
 331 COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Science*. 368, 493–497 (2020).
- L. C. Okell, R. Verity, O. J. Watson, S. Mishra, P. Walker, C. Whittaker, A. Katzourakis,
 C. A. Donnelly, S. Riley, A. C. Ghani, A. Gandy, S. Flaxman, N. M. Ferguson, S. Bhatt,
 Have deaths from COVID-19 in Europe plateaued due to herd immunity? *Lancet.* 395,
 e110–e111 (2020).
- 336 9. JHU, Coronavirus Resource Center. John Hopkins Univ. (2020), (available at https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/).
- 10. O. Dyer, Covid-19: Trump stokes protests against social distancing measures. BMJ. 369,

- 339 m1596 (2020).
- 340 11. R. Horton, Offline: COVID-19—a reckoning. *Lancet.* **395**, 935 (2020).
- 341 12. The Lancet, COVID-19 in Brazil: "So what?" *Lancet.* **395**, 1461 (2020).
- A. J. Rodriguez-Morales, *et al.* COVID-19 in Latin America: The implications of the first
 confirmed case in Brazil. *Travel Med. Infect. Dis.* 35, 101613 (2020).
- 14. E. M. L. Aquino, I. H. Silveira, J. M. Pescarini, R. Aquino, J. A. de Souza-Filho, Social
 distancing measures to control the COVID-19 pandemic: Potential impacts and challenges
 in Brazil. *Cienc. e Saude Coletiva*. 25, 2423–2446 (2020).
- Brasil, *Art. 18* (Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1988, Brasília, DF,
 1988; https://www.senado.leg.br/atividade/const/con1988/con1988_atual/art_18_.asp).
- 34916.D. Phillips, Bolsonaro ignored by state governors amid anger at handling of Covid-19350crisis.*Guard.*(2020),(availableat
- 351 https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/01/brazil-bolsonaro-ignored-by-state-
- 352 governors-amid-anger-at-handling-of-covid-19-crisis).
- Brasil, Medida cautelar na ação direta de insconstitucionalidade 6.341 distrito federal. *Relator: Min. Marco Aurélio.* (Supremo Tribunal Federal, Brasília, DF, 2020; https://portal.stf.jus.br/processos/downloadPeca.asp?id=15342747913&ext=.pdf).
- A. C. Auler, F. A. M. Cássaro, V. O. da Silva, L. F. Pires, 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.* 729
 (2020).
- I. S. Pellegrini, Untimely reopening? Change in the number of new COVID-19 cases after
 reopening in one Brazilian state. (2020). ssrn:10.2139/ssrn.3623930.
- 20. L. Silva, A. Lima, D. Polli, P. Razia, L. Pavão, M. Cavalcanti, et al., Medidas de distanciamento social para o enfrentamento da COVID-19 no Brasil: Caracterização e análise epidemiológica por Estados. *Cad. Saude Publica* (2020), doi:[in press].
- 365 21. Inloco, Mapa brasileiro da COVID-19. *Inloco* (2020), (available at
 366 https://www.inloco.com.br/covid-19).
- 367 22. S. Túlio, V. Martins, Caiado recua sobre medidas mais rígidas e reclama de falta de apoio:
 368 "Não vale a pena fazer um decreto por fazer." *G1 GO* (2020), (available at https://g1.globo.com/go/goias/noticia/2020/05/14/governador-de-goias-recua-sobre-

- J. Dehning, J. Zierenberg, F. P. Spitzner, M. Wibral, J. P. Neto, M. Wilczek, V.
 Priesemann, Inferring change points in the spread of COVID-19 reveals the effectiveness
 of interventions. *Science*. 9789, eabb9789 (2020).
- 375 24. L. Hufnagel, D. Brockmann, T. Geisel, Forecast and control of epidemics in a globalized
 376 world. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 101, 15124–15129 (2004).
- 377 25. O. N. Bjørnstad, B. F. Finkenstädt, B. T. Grenfell, Dynamics of Measles Epidemics:
 378 Estimating Scaling of Transmission Rates Using a Time Series SIR Model. *Ecol. Monogr.*379 72, 169–184 (2002).
- 380 26. A. G. Atkeson, On Using SIR Models to Model Disease Scenarios for COVID-19. *Q. Rev.*381 *DC. Nurses. Assoc.* 41 (2020).
- W. C. Roda, M. B. Varughese, D. Han, M. Y. Li, Why is it difficult to accurately predict
 the COVID-19 epidemic? *Infect. Dis. Model.* 5, 271–281 (2020).
- 384 28. D. Clancy, P. D. O'Neill, Bayesian estimation of the basic reproduction number in
 385 stochastic epidemic models. *Bayesian Anal.* 3, 737–757 (2008).
- 386 29. IBGE, Cidades e Estados. Goiás. (2019), (available at https://www.ibge.gov.br/cidades-e387 estados/go.html).
- 388 30. SES-GO, Atualização dos casos de doença pelo coronavírus (Covid-19) em Goiás (2020),
 389 (available at http://covid19.saude.go.gov.br/).
- 390 31. G. do E. de Goiás, Conheça os decretos e normas sobre o combate à pandemia do
 391 coronavírus (2020), (available at https://www.casacivil.go.gov.br/noticias/9033392 legislação-sobre-o-coronavírus-covid-19.html).
- 393 32. Y. Liu, A. A. Gayle, A. Wilder-Smith, J. Rocklöv, The reproductive number of COVID19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *J. Travel Med.* 27, 1–4 (2020).
- 395 33. T. F. Rangel, J. A. F. Diniz-Filho, C. M. Toscano, "Nota técnica 01. Modelagem da
 approximation expansão espac □o-temporal da COVID-19 em Goiás" (Universidade Federal de Goiás,
 Goiânia, 2020), (available at http://covid.bio.br).
- 398 34. J. A. F. Diniz-Filho, L. Jardim, C. M. Toscano, T. F. Rangel, The effective reproductive
 number (Rt) of COVID-19 in Goias State and its relationship with social distancing. *Cad.*400 *Saude Publica* (2020), *[in press].*

medidas-mais-rigidas-e-reclama-de-falta-de-apoio-nao-vale-a-pena-fazer-um-decreto-por fazer.ghtml).

401	35.	T. F. Rangel,	J. A. F. Diniz	-Filho, C.	М.	Toscano,	"Nota Té	cnica 5.	Avaliac□ão	do
402		Impacto de M	ledidas de Dista	nciamento	Soci	al na Epi	demia de (COVID-1	9 em Goiás	até
403		02/06/2020"	(Universidade	Federal	de	Goiás,	Goiânia,	2020),	(available	at
404		http://covid.bi	o.br).							

- WHO, "Statement to the press by Dr Hans Henri P. Kluge, WHO Regional Director for
 Europe" (Copenhagen, 2020).
- 407 37. L. Henriques-Gomes, Coronavirus Victoria: what you need to know about Melbourne's
 408 stage 3 lockdown. *Guard.* (2020), (available at https://www.theguardian.com/australia409 news/2020/jul/07/coronavirus-victoria-what-you-need-to-know-about-melbournes410 herbolaren)
- 410 lockdown).
- 411 38. T. Yabe, K. Tsubouchi, N. Fujiwara, T. Wada, Y. Sekimoto, S. V. Ukkusuri, Non412 Compulsory Measures Sufficiently Reduced Human Mobility in Tokyo during the
 413 COVID-19 Epidemic. (2020). arXiv:2005.09423.
- 414 39. L. Taylor, How Cuba and Uruguay are quashing coronavirus as neighbours struggle. *New*415 *Sci.* (2020), (available at https://www.newscientist.com/article/2247740-how-cuba-and416 uruguay-are-quashing-coronavirus-as-neighbours-struggle/).
- 417 40. T. Carvalho, COVID-19 Research in Brief: December, 2019 to June, 2020. *Nat. Med.*418 (2020).

Parameter	Variable	Prior distribution
Spreading rate	λ	LogNormal(log (0.3), 0.5)
Recovery rate	μ	LogNormal(log (1/9), 0.2)
Reporting Delay	D	LogNormal(log (8), 0.2)
Initially infected	I_0	HalfCauchy(100)
Scale factor	σ	HalfCauchy(10)

420 **Table 1.** Priors for the simple SIR model with stationary spreading rate

422

423 **Table 2.** Priors for the full SIR model with change points and weekly reporting modulation

Parameter	Variable	Prior distribution
Change points	t ₁	Normal(2020 / 03 / 06, 3)
	t_2	Normal(2020 / 04 / 03, 1)
	t ₃	Normal(2020 / 04 / 24, 1)
Change duration	Δt_i	LogNormal(log (3), 0.3)
Spreading rates	λ_0	LogNormal(log (0.3), 0.5)
	λ_1	LogNormal(log(0.22), 0.5)
	λ_2	LogNormal(log(0.22), 0.5)
	λ_3	LogNormal(log (0.11), 0.5)
Recovery rate	μ	LogNormal(log (1/9), 0.2)
Reporting delay	D	LogNormal(log (8), 0.2)
Weekly modulation amplitude	f_w	Beta(mean = 0.7, std = 0.17)
Weekly modulation phase	Φ_w	vonMises(mean = 0, $k = 0.01$)
Initially infected	I_0	HalfCauchy(100)
Scale factor	σ	HalfCauchy(10)

424

- 426 Table 3. Leave-one-out (LOO) cross-validation for full SIR models (with weekend correction) with a different
- 427 number of change points. Lower LOO-score indicates a better match between model and data.

Model	LOO-score	Effective number of parameters (pLOO)
Zero change points	598.9 ± 13.35	9.32
One change point	597.18 ± 12.91	8.14
Two change points	595.52 ± 12.48	9.04
Three change points	592.26 ± 12.95	9.88



429

Figure 1. The cumulative cases of COVID-19 in the state of Goiás (logarithmic scale) and the 14 interventions made by the state's government (until May 22). We chose the three main decrees capable of influencing public behavior as our three main interventions (blue lines). The first intervention was on March 13; The second intervention was on April 3; and the third intervention was on April 24. Other interventions are represented by the gray lines. Black dots represent confirmed cases.





437 Figure 2. Results for the simple SIR model with stationary spreading rate during the initial onset period, **438** March 8-20. A: Daily new reported cases in Goiás and; B: Total (cumulative) reported cases in Goiás. C- **439** H: Inference of central epidemiological parameters: prior (gray) and posterior distributions (orange); C: **440** Recovery rate μ ; D: Scale-factor of the width of the likelihood distribution σ ; E: estimated spreading rate **441** λ ; G: reporting delay *D*; I: Log-likelihood distribution for different combinations of λ and μ , the black line **442** indicates a linear combination that yields the same maximal likelihood and the white dot indicates where **443** inference did not converge.



445

Figure 3. Results for the full SIR model with three change points and weekly reporting modulation. A:
Estimate of the effective spreading rate; B: Daily new reported cases (blue diamonds) and the model
(green solid line for median fit with 95% credible intervals). Green dashed line is the median forecast
with 95% CI. C: Total reported cases and the model (color representation same as in B). D-F: Inference of
central epidemiological parameters: prior (gray) and posterior distributions (green), inset values indicate
the median and 95% CI of posteriors. G: Spreading rates, change times and change duration for the three
change points, respectively.