

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 Coelho¹, José Alexandre Felizola Diniz-
6 Filho¹, Thiago Fernando Rangel¹

7
8 ¹Departamento 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

31

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

51
52 The first confirmed COVID-19 case in Brazil was registered on February 25, in the city of São
53 Paulo (13). By March, it had already reached all 26 states and the Federal District (14). By June
54 25 Brazil reported over one million confirmed cases and a total of 58,314 deaths (9). The states
55 with the higher and lower confirmed cases were São Paulo and Mato Grosso do Sul, with
56 275,145 and 7,965 cases, respectively (9). States are autonomous under the Brazilian constitution
57 (15), nonetheless, there was no coordinated action to control COVID-19 by the federal
58 government.

59
60 Most state governors enforced restrictive contact measures in mid-March, when the virus began
61 spreading. However, the president of the Federal Government has been vocally against state-
62 level social distancing policies, citing frequently his fear of an economic collapse (16). In fact,

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

70
71 Brazil is a continental sized country with substantial regional socioeconomic inequalities, all
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
87 Goiás. We use a Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) model combined with Bayesian inference
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 established by Dehning *et. al.* (2020,
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
103 strength in efforts to model the spread of COVID-19 worldwide (23, 26, 27). SIR models specify
104 the rates that population recover and become infected by a disease. Bayesian inference with
105 MCMC sampling assimilates prior knowledge available and accounts for data uncertainties into
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
108 initial onset period with stationary spreading rate (simple SIR model) and (2) a time-dependent
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
114 Brasília, is geographically embedded within the State of Goiás, but due to administrative
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
118 cases throughout the state and provides daily updates of confirmed cases (30). We used data until
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

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

126
127 The first intervention chosen was the first decree announced on March 13. In this decree the state
128 declares a public health emergency and institutes strict social distancing measures, such as the
129 shutdown of public and private events of any nature, including educational institutions at all
130 levels, daycares, suspension of commercial activities such as malls, fairs, gyms, dental health
131 services, religious meetings and all other non-essential services and activities (31).

132
133 The second intervention chosen was the decree from April 3rd, which was already the eighth
134 decree announced and the fourth relaxing the measures stated in the first one. This decree
135 accumulates all prior flexibilizations, including reopening of religious activities, beauty salons,
136 vegetable and fruit fairs, car workshops and restaurants on highways, administrative activities in
137 public and private educational institutions (31).

138
139 On April 19, the government launched a new decree extending the health emergency in Goiás for
140 another 150 days. However, on April 24, they announced another decree altering the decree from
141 04/19, legislating on the private sphere as well (suspending activities of common use in closed
142 condominiums), regulating a channel for reporting disobediences to any of the decrees, and
143 legislating specific days for religious celebrations (31). We chose the intervention on April 24 as
144 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
150 delay (D) and number of initially infected people (I_0) (23). We chose informative log-normal
151 priors of $\lambda = 0.3$ and $\mu = 0.11$ (Table 1), as these priors cannot be estimated independently and
152 these values maintain the effective growth rate ($\lambda^* = \lambda - \mu$) with a median of 0.19 and the basic
153 reproduction number ($R_0 = \lambda / \mu$) with a median of 2.72, consistent with global (32) and local
154 (33) estimates. We chose for the reporting delay a prior that incorporates the virus' incubation

155 period between 1-14 days and the delay of infected people awaiting tests confirmation or medical
156 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*

159 To simulate the effect of governmental interventions, we use a SIR model with incorporated
160 change points capable of altering the transmission rate (23). The aim of interventions is to reduce
161 the effective growth rate, thus if the rate becomes negative, new infections will begin to
162 decrease. Dehning's model assumes new spreading rates for each change point, inferred after
163 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
167 government intervention reduced the spreading rate by 50% from the initial estimate $\lambda_0 = 0.3$, so
168 the prior for the first change point is $\lambda_1 \sim \text{logNormal}(\log(0.15), 0.5)$. Given the flexibilizations
169 in the following decrees, we assumed the spreading rate would increase again by 15%, thus $\lambda_2 \sim$
170 $\text{logNormal}(\log(0.22), 0.5)$. 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 $\lambda_3 \sim \text{logNormal}(\log(0.11), 0.5)$.

174

175 We chose normal distributed priors for the timing of change points (Table 2). Respectively $t_1 \sim$
176 $\text{Normal}(2020/03/13, 3)$, $t_2 \sim \text{Normal}(2020/04/03, 1)$ and $t_3 \sim \text{Normal}(2020/04/24, 1)$, where 3,
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
180 which we chose a median of 3 days. During these 3 days, spreading rates are expected to change
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

184 Priors chosen for the recovery rate, reporting delay and initial number of infected people were
185 the 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*

193 Following (23), we ran a model comparison using the leave-one-out (LOO) cross-validation
194 method to avoid an over-fitting forecast. We compared four full SIR models with zero, one, two,
195 and three change points, respectively. The full SIR model with three change points presented a
196 better match between model and data (Table 3), as indicated by a lower LOO score. Full SIR
197 models with zero, one and two change points performed poorly and will not be further discussed
198 (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
206 as the full SIR model, except were indicated. We ran a model with a prior four times wider for
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**

213 The daily reported cases in Goiás did not present an exponential curve in the simple SIR model
214 with stationary spreading rate (Fig.2A), and the total reported cases (accumulated cases) show a
215 tendency to be exponential (Fig.2B). The spreading rate was adjusted by the model as $\lambda = 0.16$
216 (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
224 In the full SIR model with change points and weekly reporting modulation, we found evidence of
225 the influence of the three change points (Fig.3). First, the spreading rate decreased from $\lambda_0 = 0.28$
226 (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
227 March 13 (CI [9, 21]), a date that marks the first state decree with strict contact ban measures.
228 After this intervention, the effective growth rate was a median of $\lambda_0 - \mu = 0.18$ to median $\lambda_1 - \mu =$
229 0.11 , given μ was inferred as 0.10 (CI [0.07,0.14]).

230
231 At the second change point, λ_i decreased from $\lambda_1 = 0.21$ to $\lambda_2 = 0.14$ (CI [0.11, 0.19]), lower than
232 assumed by our prior. This date was inferred as April 3 (CI [2, 6]), which marks the
233 accumulation of flexibilizations from four decrees to first decree of March 13, including the
234 reopening of religious events and fruit and vegetable fairs. After the second intervention, the
235 median growth rate was $\lambda_2 - \mu = 0.04$, in the vicinity of a critical point (close to zero), but still
236 positive.

237
238 The third change point increased $\lambda_2 = 0.14$ to $\lambda_3 = 0.19$ (CI [0.14, 0.25]). This change point was
239 inferred to be April 24 (CI [23, 27]), a stricter decree compared to the previous ones. After this
240 measure, the effective growth rate was of $\lambda_3 - \mu = 0.09$, indicating an increase in the growth,
241 remaining above zero and thus not decreasing the number of new infections.

242

243 **Discussion**

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

248 Nonetheless, the third intervention, although stricter than the second, brought the transmission
249 rate back to a rate similar to that of the first intervention. We expected the third intervention to
250 result in a similar transmission rate to that of the first intervention, but in the model, the
251 transmission rate increased. This result probably reflects an accumulation of all fourteen state-
252 level decrees and the population's fatigue of being isolated, which probably resulted in more
253 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 (R_t) in Goiás (Diniz-Filho, Jardim, Toscano, &
257 Rangel, 2020 [in press]). They found R_t 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 ($R = I + \lambda * 5.2$; 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
270 the population would have been infected by June 2nd (35), representing approximately 4 million
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
274 Although state-level interventions succeeded in decreasing the transmission rate, it remained
275 high and exponential. Thus, other stricter interventions were made necessary to avoid the growth
276 of new cases and a collapse in the health system. Nonetheless, more restrictive measures for the
277 containment of COVID-19 were not adopted and were only discussed again in late June, when
278 confirmed cases spiked. Our model forecasted for June 14 approximately 8.187 total reported

279 cases (Fig. 3C), at that date, the state registered 7.944 confirmed cases (30), a difference of 243
280 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
290 measures, such as Japan and Uruguay, experienced relatively low numbers of confirmed cases
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**
303 All authors conceived and designed the study. TFR curated the data. CMB performed the
304 analysis and wrote the first draft. All authors provided critical feedback, revised and approved
305 the manuscript's final version.

306
307 **Acknowledgments**

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

311

312 **References**

- 313 1. WHO, Timeline of WHO's response to COVID-19. *World Heal. Organ.* (2020),
314 (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).
- 317 3. N. van Doremalen, T. Bushmaker, D. H. Morris, M. G. Holbrook, A. Gamble, B. N.
318 Williamson, A. Tamin, J. L. Harcourt, N. J. Thornburg, S. I. Gerber, J. O. Lloyd-Smith, E.
319 de Wit, V. J. Munster, Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with
320 SARS-CoV-1. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **382**, 1564–1567 (2020).
- 321 4. A. Wilder-Smith, D. O. Freedman, Isolation, quarantine, social distancing and community
322 containment: Pivotal role for old-style public health measures in the novel coronavirus
323 (2019-nCoV) outbreak. *J. Travel Med.* **27**, 1–4 (2020).
- 324 5. D. K. Chu, *et al.* Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-
325 person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-
326 analysis. *Lancet.* **395**, 1973–1987 (2020).
- 327 6. G. D. Barmparis, G. P. Tsironis, Estimating the infection horizon of COVID-19 in eight
328 countries with a data-driven approach. *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals.* **135** (2020),
329 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).
- 332 8. L. C. Okell, R. Verity, O. J. Watson, S. Mishra, P. Walker, C. Whittaker, A. Katzourakis,
333 C. A. Donnelly, S. Riley, A. C. Ghani, A. Gandy, S. Flaxman, N. M. Ferguson, S. Bhatt,
334 Have deaths from COVID-19 in Europe plateaued due to herd immunity? *Lancet.* **395**,
335 e110–e111 (2020).
- 336 9. JHU, Coronavirus Resource Center. *John Hopkins Univ.* (2020), (available at
337 <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/>).
- 338 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).
- 342 13. A. J. Rodriguez-Morales, *et al.* COVID-19 in Latin America: The implications of the first
343 confirmed case in Brazil. *Travel Med. Infect. Dis.* **35**, 101613 (2020).
- 344 14. E. M. L. Aquino, I. H. Silveira, J. M. Pescarini, R. Aquino, J. A. de Souza-Filho, Social
345 distancing measures to control the COVID-19 pandemic: Potential impacts and challenges
346 in Brazil. *Cienc. e Saude Coletiva*. **25**, 2423–2446 (2020).
- 347 15. Brasil, *Art. 18* (Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1988, Brasília, DF,
348 1988; https://www.senado.leg.br/atividade/const/con1988/con1988_atual/art_18_.asp).
- 349 16. D. Phillips, Bolsonaro ignored by state governors amid anger at handling of Covid-19
350 crisis. *Guard.* (2020), (available at
351 [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/01/brazil-bolsonaro-ignored-by-state-](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/01/brazil-bolsonaro-ignored-by-state-governors-amid-anger-at-handling-of-covid-19-crisis)
352 [governors-amid-anger-at-handling-of-covid-19-crisis](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/01/brazil-bolsonaro-ignored-by-state-governors-amid-anger-at-handling-of-covid-19-crisis)).
- 353 17. Brasil, *Medida cautelar na ação direta de inconstitucionalidade 6.341 distrito federal.*
354 *Relator: Min. Marco Aurélio.* (Supremo Tribunal Federal, Brasília, DF, 2020;
355 <https://portal.stf.jus.br/processos/downloadPeca.asp?id=15342747913&ext=.pdf>).
- 356 18. A. C. Auler, F. A. M. Cássaro, V. O. da Silva, L. F. Pires, Evidence that high temperatures
357 and intermediate relative humidity might favor the spread of COVID-19 in tropical
358 climate: A case study for the most affected Brazilian cities. *Sci. Total Environ.* **729**
359 (2020).
- 360 19. I. S. Pellegrini, Untimely reopening? Change in the number of new COVID-19 cases after
361 reopening in one Brazilian state. (2020). ssm:10.2139/ssrn.3623930.
- 362 20. L. Silva, A. Lima, D. Polli, P. Razia, L. Pavão, M. Cavalcanti, *et al.*, Medidas de
363 distanciamento social para o enfrentamento da COVID-19 no Brasil: Caracterização e
364 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.” *GI GO* (2020), (available at
369 <https://g1.globo.com/go/goias/noticia/2020/05/14/governador-de-goias-recua-sobre->

- 370 medidas-mais-rigidas-e-reclama-de-falta-de-apoio-nao-vale-a-pena-fazer-um-decreto-por-
371 fazer.ghtml).
- 372 23. J. Dehning, J. Zierenberg, F. P. Spitzner, M. Wibral, J. P. Neto, M. Wilczek, V.
373 Priesemann, Inferring change points in the spread of COVID-19 reveals the effectiveness
374 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).
- 382 27. W. C. Roda, M. B. Varughese, D. Han, M. Y. Li, Why is it difficult to accurately predict
383 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-e-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/9033-legislacao-sobre-o-coronavirus-covid-19.html>).
- 393 32. Y. Liu, A. A. Gayle, A. Wilder-Smith, J. Rocklöv, The reproductive number of COVID-
394 19 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
396 expansão espaço-temporal da COVID-19 em Goiás” (Universidade Federal de Goiás,
397 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
399 number (R_t) of COVID-19 in Goiás State and its relationship with social distancing. *Cad.*
400 *Saude Publica* (2020), [in press].

- 401 35. T. F. Rangel, J. A. F. Diniz-Filho, C. M. Toscano, “Nota Técnica 5. Avaliação do
402 Impacto de Medidas de Distanciamento Social na Epidemia de COVID-19 em Goiás até
403 02/06/2020” (Universidade Federal de Goiás, Goiânia, 2020), (available at
404 <http://covid.bio.br>).
- 405 36. WHO, “Statement to the press by Dr Hans Henri P. Kluge, WHO Regional Director for
406 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/australia-
409 news/2020/jul/07/coronavirus-victoria-what-you-need-to-know-about-melbournes-
410 lockdown](https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2020/jul/07/coronavirus-victoria-what-you-need-to-know-about-melbournes-lockdown)).
- 411 38. T. Yabe, K. Tsubouchi, N. Fujiwara, T. Wada, Y. Sekimoto, S. V. Ukkusuri, Non-
412 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-and-
416 uruguay-are-quashing-coronavirus-as-neighbours-struggle/](https://www.newscientist.com/article/2247740-how-cuba-and-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).
- 419

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

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)

421

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

425


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


428



429
430 **Figure 1.** The cumulative cases of COVID-19 in the state of Goiás (logarithmic scale) and the 14
431 interventions made by the state's government (until May 22). We chose the three main decrees capable of
432 influencing public behavior as our three main interventions (blue lines). The first intervention was on
433 March 13; The second intervention was on April 3; and the third intervention was on April 24. Other
434 interventions are represented by the gray lines. Black dots represent confirmed cases.
435



436
 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.
 444



445
 446 **Figure 3.** Results for the full SIR model with three change points and weekly reporting modulation. A:
 447 Estimate of the effective spreading rate; B: Daily new reported cases (blue diamonds) and the model
 448 (green solid line for median fit with 95% credible intervals). Green dashed line is the median forecast
 449 with 95% CI. C: Total reported cases and the model (color representation same as in B). D-F: Inference of
 450 central epidemiological parameters: prior (gray) and posterior distributions (green), inset values indicate
 451 the median and 95% CI of posteriors. G: Spreading rates, change times and change duration for the three
 452 change points, respectively.