

1 **Title:** Trends in SARS-CoV-2 detection during social relaxation measures over ten
2 months of COVID-19 pandemic in the metropolitan area of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

3 **Authors:** Fábio de O. M. Alonso, Bruno D. Sabino, Marcia Soraya C. de Oliveira,
4 Fabiana B. Knackfuss, Rafael B. Varella *

5 **Affiliations:**

6 Contraprova Diagnósticos, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. (FOM. Alonso, BD. Sabino)

7 Universidade Federal Fluminense, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. (RB. Varella, MSC. Oliveira)

8 Universidade do Grande Rio, Duque de Caxias, Brazil. (FB. Knackfuss)

9

10 ***Address for correspondence:** Dr. Rafael Brandão Varella. Laboratory of Virology,
11 Biomedical Institute-UFF, Brazil. 24210-130. e-mail: rvarella@id.uff.br.

12

13 **Abstract**

14 We analyzed the effects of sequential reopening events during COVID-19
15 pandemic, based on 76,419 SARS-CoV-2 molecular tests performed from April 2020 to
16 January 2021 in Rio de Janeiro metropolitan area, Brazil, third largest in South
17 America. Post-opening events provoked different impacts on cases and deaths, but
18 showing limited temporary effect.

19 **Key-words:** SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; social distancing; diagnosis

20

21

22

23 Several authors have assessed the impact of social relaxation events in the
24 COVID-19 pandemic before vaccination was implemented. In general, the proposed
25 analyzes are based on projections by epidemiological models (1,2), shorter follow-up
26 periods (3), or using data from government databases (4). Such information is crucial,
27 providing projections on the pandemic in different scenarios. However, model
28 projections can be conflicting (5) or do not correspond to the observed reality (6), and
29 short assessments based on secondary data can generate biased analyzes. On the other
30 hand, empirical data obtained from a primary source can provide a closer approximation
31 to reality (7), although they are time consuming and carried out *a posteriori*.

32 Brazil was one of the most affected countries by COVID-19 pandemic (8). Its
33 enormous territory combined with variable social conditions, and the adoption of
34 decentralized policies, produced a complex epidemiological scenario (9). Rio de Janeiro
35 is the second most populated metropolitan area in Brazil, third in South America,
36 characterized by its high population density, huge variation in income and access to
37 health services. The area accumulated about 348,000 cases of SARS-CoV-2 in period
38 studied (10). In mid-March 2020, the state adopted contingency measures that
39 intensified as the pandemic unfolded, gradually reopening circulation from May 5
40 (epidemiological week, EW, 20) onward. This study allowed us to identify which events
41 did or did not impact the series of SARS-CoV-2 and their temporality.

42 **The study**

43 We assess trends in cases of SARS-CoV-2 considering the opening events
44 (Appendix) implemented over ten months of COVID-19 pandemic [April/2020 (EW17)
45 to January/2021 (EW4)]. To this end, we rely on the temporal analysis of 76,419
46 molecular tests for SARS-CoV-2 (Appendix) applied in residents and workers of the
47 metropolitan area of Rio de Janeiro.

48 Statistical analyzes included Rt data over 41 weeks (EW17/2020 - EW4/2021),
49 considering the number of positive, negative and total cases in the database. The
50 confirmed cases in the laboratory per EW were listed and plotted. For comparison
51 purposes, the official data for the metropolitan area were plotted considering cases and
52 deaths. Descriptive statistical analyzes were performed using SPSS 25.0 (IBM).
53 Initially, the frequency of positive and negative cases was compared by EW using the
54 chi-square test for bilateral significance test with a significance level of 0.01.
55 Subsequently, the chi-square test for trend was used to verify fluctuations in frequencies
56 over a set of weeks.

57 The percentile value of the number of positives varied from 4.1% (EW41) to
58 59.3% (EW17) and the highest number of positives were EW19, 18 and 48,
59 respectively. Also, the temporal evolution of new cases varied between EW (Table 1). It
60 was possible to observe an increase with a significant trend ($p < 0.01$) of cases (EW20-
61 22, EW 29-31, EW 41-43, EW 44-46) and a decrease (EW 38-40, EW 50-52, EW 53-
62 4/2021), indicating that the opening events resulted in temporary and non-cumulative
63 effects (Table 2 and Figure). Opening events that occurred in EW20, EW30, EW41 and
64 EW45, perhaps combined with other factors, may have contributed for the upward trend
65 in the set of weeks following these events.

66 Comparing the official government data of COVID-19 cases over the EW, it was
67 possible to observe that the data from this study responded more accurately to the
68 reopening events (Figure). Official deaths followed the trend of cases, with two
69 prominent peaks in April/May and November/December, which correspond to the
70 beginning of the pandemic and a resurgence in the cases, respectively. Between these
71 two peaks (May to October), several relaxation measures were taken, although deaths
72 remain stable (median of 473; IQR: 454-515).

73 **Conclusions**

74 In contrast to different authors (*1,3,4,11*), our data showed that most social
75 relaxing events including the opening of bars and restaurants, gyms, beauty salons,
76 shopping centers, transportation, among others (EW 20 to 41), had a limited effect on
77 SARS-CoV-2 cases. Although it was possible to observe an increase in cases after some
78 of the opening events, our results indicate that such measures had a temporary and not a
79 cumulative effect, which was also reflected in the stability of reported deaths, the most
80 important and stable outcome, not subject to testing variations, testing policy and
81 infrastructure (*8*). We also corroborate the results obtained by a modeling study that
82 indicated a delay of 2 to 3 weeks in the increase of cases after opening (*1*), following a
83 drop of 3-4 weeks after the peak, which was confirmed by the trend analysis (Table 2).

84 After November (EW 45), however, we observed a significant increase in cases
85 (a "second wave"), also seen across the country. Although we cannot pinpoint the
86 specific cause, the release of festive and social events of high agglomeration in closed
87 places such as cinema and theater rooms, parties, birthdays, concerts, etc., in
88 concomitance with the national electoral campaign for mayors and councilors, may have
89 been crucial to this phenomenon. In addition, the increased flexibility of the quarantine
90 in several states and municipalities in Brazil, favored physical isolation rates returned to
91 pre-pandemic levels (*12*).

92 Not least, the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 variants were detected in the state at
93 the time (*13*), although its transmissibility has not been proven to be major, nor has it
94 been a homogeneous event in the country. It is possible that the sum of all these events
95 was responsible for the "dark November". Even in this most dramatic scenario, after
96 about 3 weeks, cases started to fall as previously, even without the imposition of a

97 lockdown. The reasons for this temporal pattern are not entirely clear but are probably
98 due to characteristics of the transmission dynamics of the virus, network of social
99 contacts, environment, immunity, and others (14). We hypothesized the first opening
100 events kept the social network relatively stable within the communities (15), preventing
101 a significant increase in cases. This situation was disturbed by the post-EW 45 events,
102 where an overlap of social groups occurred, leading to an explosion of cases.
103 Nonetheless, this temporary post-opening pattern is difficult to observe from projection
104 analysis (6).

105 A closer trend was observed between our data and the relaxation measures
106 implemented. This higher sensitivity was probably due to the use of molecular
107 methodology throughout the research, while official data is based on different
108 diagnostic approaches, including rapid tests and clinical examination, less accurate than
109 PCR-based tests.

110 Our study has limitations. We did not directly observe the effects of social
111 relaxation on hospitalizations and their outcomes. As previously stated, variations in
112 testing availability, groups and geographical areas, also cause artificial variations in
113 frequency of viral detection. The opening of schools, considered a relevant aspect in the
114 pandemic according to some models (1), was not evaluated because it remained closed
115 during the study. In addition, municipalities had some flexibility in decision-making,
116 not always strictly following state decrees.

117 While vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 is unfolding worldwide, doubts on
118 social relaxation strategies remain due to conflicting or scarce data. In fact, it is still
119 unclear which events significantly impact the pandemic. To the best of our knowledge,
120 this is one of the longest follow-up of reopening events during the COVID-19 pandemic
121 based on empirical data. Our study provides valuable data on the case series of SARS-

122 CoV-2 after a sequence of social relaxation events, which can be useful for decision
123 making.

124 **Acknowledgments**

125 Varella RB was partially supported by National Council for Scientific and
126 Technological Development – CNPq. The authors report no conflicts of interest.

127 **References**

128 1. Li Y, Campbell H, Kulkarni D, Harpur A, Nundy M, Wang X, et al. The temporal
129 association of introducing and lifting non-pharmaceutical interventions with the time-
130 varying reproduction number (R) of SARS-CoV-2: a modelling study across 131
131 countries The Lancet Infect Dis. 2020 Oct;21(2):193-202.
132 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30785-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30785-4)

133 2. Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Goldstein E, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Projecting the
134 transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period. Science.
135 2020 May 22;368(6493):860-868. [https://doi: 10.1126/science.abb5793](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb5793)

136 3. Tsai AC, Harling G, Reynolds Z, Gilbert RF, Siedner MJ. COVID-19 transmission in
137 the U.S. before vs. after relaxation of statewide social distancing measures. Clin Infect
138 Dis. 2020 Oct 3;ciaa1502. [https://doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1502](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1502)

139 4. Kaufman BG, Whitaker R, Mahendraratnam N, Smith VA, McClellan MB.
140 Comparing Associations of State Reopening Strategies with COVID-19 Burden. J Gen
141 Intern Med. 2020 Dec;35(12):3627-3634. [https://doi: 10.1007/s11606-020-06277-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-020-06277-0)

142 5. Rice K, Wynne B, Martin V, Ackland GJ. Effect of school closures on mortality from
143 coronavirus disease 2019: old and new predictions. BMJ. 2020 Oct 7;371:m3588.
144 [https://doi: 10.1136/bmj.m3588](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m3588)

- 145 6. Ioannidis JPA, Cripps S, Tanner MA. Forecasting for COVID-19 has failed. *Int J*
146 *Forecast*. 2020 Aug 25. [https://doi: 10.1016/j.ijforecast.2020.08.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2020.08.004)
- 147 7. Campello de Souza, Bruno and Campello de Souza, Fernando Menezes, Does Social
148 Isolation Really Curb COVID-19 Deaths? Direct Evidence from Brazil that it Might do
149 the Exact Opposite. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3706464>
- 150 8. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) dashboard. [cited 2020
151 Nov. 20]. <https://covid19.who.int/table>
- 152 9. Cavalcante JR, Cardoso-Dos-Santos AC, Bremm JM, Lobo AP, Macário EM,
153 Oliveira WK, França GVA. COVID-19 in Brazil: evolution of the epidemic up until
154 epidemiological week 20 of 2020. *EpidemiolServSaude*. 2020;29(4):e2020376.
155 <http://10.5123/s1679-49742020000400010>
- 156 10. CoronavirusPanel RJ. Rio de Janeiro state, Brazil. [cited 2021 Feb 20].
157 <http://painel.saude.rj.gov.br/monitoramento/covid19.html#>
- 158 11. Hussein NR, Naqid IA, Saleem ZSM, Almizori LA, Musa DH, Ibrahim N. A sharp
159 increase in the number of COVID-19 cases and case fatality rates after lifting the
160 lockdown in Kurdistan region of Iraq. *Ann Med Surg (Lond)*. 2020 Jul 24;57:140-142.
161 [https://doi: 10.1016/j.amsu.2020.07.030](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2020.07.030)
- 162 12. AsaiG, Kuroiva A, Terra ML. Brazilian model estimation for SARS-CoV-2 peak
163 contagion (BMESPC). *Medrxiv*. 2021 (6): 1-18.
164 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.02.20248940>
- 165 13. Voloch C, Ronaldo F, Almeida L, Cardoso C, Brustolini O, Gerber A, et al.
166 Genomic characterization of a novel SARS-CoV-2 lineage from Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
167 *Medrxiv*. 2020. <https://10.1101/2020.12.23.20248598>

168 14. Thurner S, Klimek P, Hanel R. A network-based explanation of why most COVID-
169 19 infection curves are linear. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2020 Sep 15;117(37):22684-
170 22689. [https://doi: 10.1073/pnas.2010398117](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2010398117)

171 15. Li Y, Wang X, Nair H. Global Seasonality of Human Seasonal Coronaviruses: A
172 Clue for Postpandemic Circulating Season of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
173 Coronavirus 2? J Infect Dis. 2020 Sep 1;222(7):1090-1097. [https://doi:](https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiaa436)
174 [10.1093/infdis/jiaa436](https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiaa436)

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

Table 1. SARS-CoV-2 cases detected by epidemiological week in metropolitan area of Rio de Janeiro-Brazil

Epidemiological week	Not detected	Detected	Total	% total	Chi Square	P value
17	127	185	312	59.3	55	<0.01
18	674	514	1188	43.3	49.0954	<0.01
19	1229	769	1998	38.5	527.4324	<0.01
20	1570	393	1963	20.0	74.9224	<0.01
21	1191	413	1604	25.7	33.8257	<0.01
22	1018	365	1383	26.4	775.3159	<0.01
23	2179	227	2406	9.4	376.0861	<0.01
24	1515	152	1667	9.1	286.0496	<0.01
25	1397	131	1528	8.6	214.9698	<0.01
26	1557	168	1725	9.7	236.6959	<0.01
27	2254	245	2499	9.8	262.5591	<0.01
28	2679	251	2930	8.6	140.5692	<0.01
29	2137	218	2355	9.3	182.9477	<0.01
30	2165	167	2332	7.2	56.4049	<0.01
31	1544	169	1713	9.9	29.2377	<0.01
32	1221	147	1368	10.7	20.2133	<0.01
33	1364	179	1543	11.6	14.2454	0.0002
34	1352	185	1537	12.0	11.1775	0.0008
35	1597	228	1825	12.5	46.6116	<0.01
36	1976	219	2195	10.0	24.0065	<0.01
37	1699	207	1906	10.9	41.6312	<0.01
38	1831	194	2025	9.6	63.7629	<0.01
39	1567	129	1696	7.6	120.1396	<0.01
40	1524	73	1597	4.6	117.5575	<0.01
41	1464	63	1527	4.1	38.5327	<0.01
42	1351	114	1465	7.8	93.9699	<0.01
43	1701	95	1796	5.3	68.5363	<0.01
44	1525	94	1619	5.8	21.1144	<0.01
45	1348	126	1474	8.5	1.805	0.18
46	1386	220	1606	13.7	81.5763	<0.01
47	2023	470	2493	18.9	45.0609	<0.01
48	2476	512	2988	17.1	40.7328	<0.01
49	2137	451	2588	17.4	110.0876	<0.01
50	1745	463	2208	21.0	26.9376	<0.01
51	2088	431	2519	17.1	0.0087	0.92
52	2076	327	2403	13.6	1.2138	0.27
53	1201	174	1375	12.7	2.4302	0.12
1	1637	232	1869	12.4	20.9581	<0.01
2	1902	216	2118	10.2	72.219	<0.01
3	1701	122	1823	6.7	58.2821	<0.01
4	1178	75	1253	6.0		
TOTAL	66306	10113	76419	-	-	-

189 *the epidemiological weeks in bold correspond to the opening dates

190

191

192

193

Table 2. Trend analysis of SARS-CoV-2 detection per epidemiological week in the metropolitan area of Rio de Janeiro-Brazil

Epidemiological week	A	Trend	Chi Square	p
20, 21, 22	88,31	A>0 (growing)	12,47	0,0004
23, 24, 25	-14,7	A<0 (decreasing)	0,68	0,41
26, 27, 28	-26,39	A<0 (decreasing)	36,2	0,17
29, 30 , 31	124,2	A>0 (growing)	36,9	<0,0001
32, 33, 34	16,35	A>0 (growing)	0,89	0,34
35, 36, 37	-26,96	A<0 (decreasing)	27,81	0,16
38, 39, 40	-88,95	A<0 (decreasing)	27,81	<0,0001
41 , 42, 43	51,27	A>0 (growing)	15,13	<0,0001
44, 45 , 46	116,32	A>0 (growing)	48,87	<0,0001
47, 48, 49	-30,46	A<0 (decreasing)	1,21	0,87
50, 51, 52	-144,63	A<0 (decreasing)	31,03	<0,0001
53, 1 , 2, 3 , 4	-255,09	A<0 (decreasing)	53,00	<0,0001

194 *the epidemiological weeks in bold correspond to the opening dates.

195

196

197


198

199

200

201

202 Figure. Temporal trend of confirmed cases and deaths by COVID-19 in the
203 metropolitan region of Rio de Janeiro.



204

205 * Arrows correspond to opening epidemiological weeks