

24 respiratory viruses, such like SARS-CoV-2, has turned into a widespread pandemic, with large
25 fractions of infected patients suffering from acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) and
26 needing non-invasive and invasive mechanically ventilated interventions[1]. While the virus
27 persisted throughout the year of 2020, hospitalizing thousands of patients all across the United
28 States, many researchers claimed that the pattern of rise-fall-rise (winter-summer-winter) of the
29 rate of daily infections indicates that the respiratory virus has a strong correlation with the
30 seasonality, particularly with the changes in temperature, relative humidity (RH), absolute
31 humidity (AH) and host behavior[2]–[4].

32 Because of the potential resemblance of typing of SARS-CoV-2, researchers have studied
33 surrogate models to find out the survivability under different environmental settings. Typical
34 healthcare environments with varying relative humidity (RH) but an ambient temperature (AT) at
35 around 20C showed that potential surrogate virus types like transmissible gastroenteritis virus
36 (TGEV) and mouse hepatitis virus (MHV) loose very small infectivity within a period of two days.
37 Studies also indicated that TGEV and human coronavirus 229E survivability at low temperature
38 and medium and low RH is rather enhanced.

39 A recent COVID-19 study [5] on droplet dynamics showed that the spreading and concentration
40 of contaminated droplets' have strong and significant correlation to weather temperature and
41 humidity. Their numerical simulations of droplet spreading through coughing and sneezing has
42 shown that at low temperatures (0°C) the spread of contaminated respiratory droplets would be
43 quite wider and larger in spatial sense, compared to the spread of droplets at 20C to 40C. Similarly,
44 at high RH (50% ~ 90%), the contaminated droplets would thin out less compared to the spread at
45 low RH (10% ~ 30%). Therefore, in terms of temperature and relative humidity there is a strong
46 correlation between high relative humidity at low temperature and the increased spread of

47 concentrated and contaminated virus borne droplets. Another study [6] on the evaporation
48 modelling of coughing droplets in high humid areas, where it was found that dry conditions
49 enhance droplet travelling more efficiently than in wet conditions. The evaporation model study
50 arrived in another major conclusion that smaller droplets are not affected by higher relative
51 humidity (60% to 90%) compared to bigger droplets. Their final impression is that even though
52 the evaporation model shows significant increase in evaporation rate with bigger droplets, the
53 scarcity of study on the dilution and inactivation of small droplets in low humidity condition makes
54 it difficult to assess the certainty of spreading and suspension of virus borne coughs and sneezes
55 in different regions of the world. Iqbal et al. [7] and Bukhari et al. [8] concluded that coronavirus
56 spread was faster in colder regions compared to warmer region and that there is close relationship
57 between daylight hours, average temperature and risk of COVID infection rate. In different parts
58 of the world, researchers found that there indeed positive correlation between COVID infection
59 rate and humid climate. For instance, Pani et al. [9] found that along with temperature and weaker
60 correlation with relative humidity, dew point and water vapor has positive correlation with
61 COVID-19 in Singapore, a predominantly “hot and humid climate with abundant rainfall”. On the
62 other hand, Takagi et al.[10] found negative association of temperature, pressure and UV with
63 COVID-19 prevalence in Japan and exclaimed that the finding of no association of Covid-19 with
64 climatic conditions in China [11] can be possibly argued. Both research papers were published
65 based on the studies done in early period of COVID pandemic in specific geo locations (Chinese
66 cities: Yao et al. [11], published in April 2020 and Japanese cities: Takagi et al. [10] published in
67 August 2020). Similarly, a supportive study results from Japan showed that the epidemic growth
68 has strong correlation to increase in daily temperature[12]. A very recent study done by Zhu et al.
69 [13] looked across various regions in South America but concluded that among other factors,

70 absolute humidity was highly negatively correlated to the COVID-19 spread. Across the 122 cities
71 in China, Xie et al. [14] found that at certain threshold temperature of 3C, the mean temperature
72 has positive linear relationship with infection cases and in Iran, humid provinces has higher rate
73 of increase in infection rate and extreme dry regions have proved a reverse relationship[15]. Both
74 in Brazil and Indonesia, Auler et al. [16] and Tosepu et al. [17] found that higher mean temperature
75 and humidity has positive correlation in infection spreading which is in contrast to many other
76 studies done in colder European and US regions[18]. Auler et al. [16] also reported that among the
77 five Brazilian cities, Sao Paulo was the city with highest confirmed cases but with the lowest mean
78 temperature and highest relative humidity. But with further statistical analysis they arrived at the
79 conclusion that the disease transmission rate was favored by high temperature and relatively high
80 humidity. Therefore, it can be assumed from their study that there is no strong correlation but
81 rather several anomalies within a given region, and therefore a sole factor cannot be singled out to
82 have strong impact on the increasing infection rate. In Victoria, Mexico [19] temperature was
83 found to be negatively correlated to the spread of the infection and their study spanned from March
84 2020 till June 2020 but consequently did not include the sharp rise in infection rate of the second
85 wave in other Mexican cities. Another study on tempered climate stated that tropical climate slows
86 spreading of COVID-19 local transmission, and also reported to have negative association between
87 temperature and local positive cases[20]. A case study based on New Jersey by Doğan et al. [21]
88 produced results indicating that humidity has positive relationship and temperature has negative
89 relationship to COVID-19 based on data collected and analyzed from late February to late July of
90 2020. They also pointed out that their study outcome is in contradiction to the study by Ahmadi et
91 al. [15] in Iran, which stated that there exist strong correlation between COVID infection and
92 humidity, temperature and wind. An associative study has explored the pathway of COVID-19

93 spread in Oslo Norway a little differently, where Menebo et al. [22] implied that sunny weather
94 makes people come out of home and rainy weather makes people stay indoors, and hence warm
95 climate triggers an increase in infection and spreading events. Many studies found strong
96 temperature association based on low COVID cases in different countries, as pointed out by [23]
97 and there remains the question as to what happened afterwards with regards to exponential global
98 growth in infection and death inherently affecting different individual regions. Bashir et al. [24]
99 indicated that scientific evidence does not support that warm weather would bring down the
100 epidemic spread contrary to popular misbelief pointed out by many researchers [25] when
101 compared to different influenza and COVID variants [26], [27]. In Spain[28], Iran[29] and in 50
102 US cities[25], studies conducted between February and March showed that there exists no
103 correlation between weather variables and COVID-19, which contradicts to the other studies that
104 found some correlation as discussed before. Even recent observations by Pan et al. [30] implicated
105 that meteorological factors, including temperature, did not exhibit significant association and
106 would not help in reducing COVID-19 transmission. Several other studies that studied the mixed
107 combination of different climatological factors have either found unconvincing or very weak
108 correlation to COVID transmission [31]–[33].

109 It is also relevant to mention that several studies have [11], [34]–[38]. On the other hand, many
110 studies have confuted weather factors that were deemed strongly correlated to the rate of spread
111 of the infection and argued the weaknesses of different studies[39]. Certain researchers pointed
112 out that the factors like population density, emergency care and medical treatment, socio-economic
113 conditions of different locations could be coupled with climatic factors and thus disassociating or
114 considering outside temperature or humidity to be a single controlling factor would give false
115 perception, conception and pretense on how SARS-CoV-2 spreads[23], [40].

116 In this study, our approach to understand and elaborate the difference in correlation between
117 climatic conditions and the coronavirus transmission is based on a total of four countries, two
118 countries that have relatively dry colder climates and two that have tropical humid climates during
119 the period of October to December of 2020. In the later part of the paper, we would demonstrate,
120 as many other research studies already pointed out, that a *single* climatic factor is not solely
121 responsible for the spread of the coronavirus infection among different types of climate regions.

122 Part of the problem with statistical correlation is always related to the degree of uncertainty
123 and the risk of over-confidence in statistical representation of the results. While many of the
124 statistical studies are done with relatively low spread of infection (compare to the spread and
125 infection rate of COVID during the summer in US) researchers publishing data based on the late
126 winter (February to April) and Summer is not totally indicative of the link between climate and
127 COVID infection. This became more apparent in our study where we found that the weather model
128 and the rise in infection in cold climatic regions (for instance in Italy, France) is totally opposite
129 to tropical regions (like Brazil and Colombia) during the months of November and December. We
130 acknowledge that climatic factors like outside temperature and humidity alone cannot predict viral
131 transmissibility and the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 infection, rather physiological factors through
132 means of aerosol and infected droplets causing membranous fusion and are found to be dependent
133 on wet-bulb temperature which in turn is a function of indoor/outdoor room temperature, absolute
134 and relative humidity, as investigated by JD Runkle et al. [41] and Dougherty [42], are the active
135 route of transmission for the virus. What is more important to understand is, measure of social
136 distance, mask mandates and part of governing policy regulation including lockdowns are key
137 factors that dictate the rate of infections, not the weather as believed by many including policy
138 makers.

139 **2. Methods**

140 ***2.1 Data Collection and Validation***

141 For this study, weather data is collected from Integrated Surface Database (ISD) from NOAA's
142 National Climatic Data Center (NCDC) [43] . The ISD data from more than 20,000 stations
143 worldwide and consists of different weather identifying subsets including, but not limited to,
144 World Meteorological Organization(WMO), Weather Bureau Army Navy (WBAN), Climate
145 Reference Network (CRN), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Automated Surface
146 Observing System (ASOS), and Automated Weather Observing System (AWOS) [44]. With
147 extensive hourly and daily data including air temperature, dew point temperature, maximum and
148 minimum recorded temperatures for the day, and wind speed, this study used the ISD provided
149 data for the entire year of 2020. Several sources are used to collect the daily infection data for each
150 of the four countries: Brazil[45], Italy[46], France[47], and Colombia [48]. Datasets have been
151 crosschecked and validated with John Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center [49], The New York
152 Times [50], Google [51] and Microsoft Bing[52].

153 ***2.2 Calculation based on Longitude, Latitude and of Relative Humidity (%RH)***

154 An extensive algorithm has been developed in MATLAB to study the spreading of COVID
155 infection in two tropical countries Brazil and Colombia, as well as two temperate climate countries,
156 Italy, and France. Regions/cities with highest reported cases in each country were picked and close
157 proximal stations were identified using the longitude and latitude data, while cross checked with
158 the Hourly/Sub-Hourly Observational Data Map [53]. The location and daily COVID
159 cases/hospitalization information were very critical, since some of the hourly data were not
160 available for some of the stations and some of the COVID data had lapses (unreported, erroneous

161 or skipped reporting). Therefore, careful consideration has been made to locate correct
162 WMO/WBAN stations within the given latitude and longitude combinations for each of the 36
163 regions/states and the weather data were accurately collected and matched with the COVID
164 datasets using the MATLAB algorithm. Using the outside temperature and dewpoint temperature,
165 the Relative Humidity (%RH) was calculated using the following relationship:

$$166 \quad RH = 100 \times \frac{e^{\left(\frac{17.625 * T_{dewpoint}}{243.04 + T_{dewpoint}}\right)}}{e^{\left(\frac{17.625 * T_{ambient}}{243.04 + T_{ambient}}\right)}}$$

167 **2.3 Analysis**

168 Weather data and infection rate (in some countries reported as number of cases with
169 Hospitalization) are analyzed from October 1st to December 31st. Spearman correlation coefficients
170 with bivariate, two-tailed analysis stating 95% confidence interval are also reported for each region
171 where the infection and the weather patterns are plotted. (See **Supplemental Information** for
172 Temperature and Relative Humidity data plotted against highest recorded infection/hospitalization
173 cases for a total of thirty six regions of each of the four countries.)

174 **3. Results and Discussion**

175 Since October 1st, the outside air temperature started to fall in France and Italy, but a similar pattern
176 was not observed in the two tropical countries considered, namely Brazil and Colombia. Because
177 of the geolocation of Colombia, which is very close to the equator line, the seven-day averaged
178 temperature did not deviate much. For instance, in between October to December, Bogota
179 observed temperature change from 13°C to 11.5°C; Cartagena observed 28°C to 27°C. Except
180 Tolima, all other regions reported very weak to almost no correlation coefficient ($r < 0.30$) in
181 between air temperature and daily reported cases. Throughout Colombia, the weather classified by

182 **Köppen–Geiger** moves from tropical savanna climate (Aw/As) to tropical monsoon (Am) to
183 tropical rainforest climate (Af) the further the reference location moves from the equator line.
184 While Bogotá and Antioquia weathers are classified as oceanic climate (Cfb) and warm tropical
185 (Af) respectively, with outside temperature steadied at 13°C and 27°C and relative humidity
186 ranging well within RH~ 72% to 80%, the infection rate kept a steady record regardless of the
187 outside air temperature and relative humidity. Considering only relative humidity (RH), for the
188 highest recording nine departments of Colombia, shows no correlation ($r_{\%RH} < 0.20$), even though
189 the relative humidity for Valle del Cauca, Norte de Santander, Huila, and Tolima were within the
190 range of RH < 71% and Cartagena, Santander and Atlantico had steady record of RH > 80%. Thus,
191 in both cases of air temperature and relative humidity, throughout Colombia there was very little
192 correlation between weather and the spread of the second wave of COVID-19 infection through
193 the months of October till December.

194 In Brazil, a widely varying climate is observed across all the regions, and in between October 1st
195 and December 31st, except for Santa Catarina and Rio Grande do Sul, the temperature varied in
196 between 35°C to 25°C. Outside temperature for Santa Catarina and Rio Grande do Sul distributed
197 between 25°C and 15°C, and the **Köppen–Geiger** classification for both states is considered as
198 Aw (tropical savanna climate) and Cwa (dry-winter humid subtropical climate). In both states from
199 mid-October to the end of December, the recorded infection/hospitalization rose from average of
200 2000 to 5000 and the Spearman correlation coefficient indicated a no correlation ($r_{T, \text{Santa Catarina}} \sim$
201 0.18 , $p\text{-value} > 0.05$) to weak correlation ($r_{T, \text{Rio Grande do Sul}} \sim 0.41$, $p\text{-value} < 0.05$). Rio de Janeiro,
202 Goias, and Ceara, all within the Aw (tropical savanna climate with dry-winter characteristics) has
203 experienced an average of 3700 daily cases with little deviation from mean. With Ceará having
204 hot-overall weather throughout region, the COVID infection kept spreading when the weather was

205 within the overall dryer climate. On the other hand, in Goiás, the second wave was within the rainy
 206 season (October-April), but the infection rate soared throughout the time. Relative humidity for
 207 both Ceará and Goiás fluctuated between 40% to 60% while in Rio de Janeiro the average RH ~
 208 80%, but calculated correlation coefficient were still very insignificant ($r_{\%RH}$, Rio de Janeiro, Goiás, Ceará
 209 ~ -0.07, -0.23, -0.03, p -value>0.05). In Rio de Janeiro, weather moved from spring to hot-humid
 210 summer from October to December, but infection record remained within 3700 cases every day.
 211 In no correlation (r_T , Rio de Janeiro, Goiás , Ceará ~ -0.11, 0.21, -0.02, p -value>0.05) between the
 212 temperatures and the infection cases, thus the spread of COVID infection has very little correlation
 213 within this study period for Brazil.

214

Colombia	Spearman's correlation coefficient		Population	Population Density(/km²)	Reported Cases	Reported Case / Per Capita
	r_T	$r_{\%RH}$				
<i>Bogotá, Capital District</i>	0.03	0.01	7,412,566	17,994	471,155	N/A
<i>Antioquia</i>	-0.01	-0.08	6,407,102	100	261,592	N/A
<i>Valle del Cauca</i>	-0.1	0.19	4,475,886	200	137,867	N/A
<i>Atlántico</i>	-0.04	-0.04	2,535,517	75	93,975	N/A
<i>Santander</i>	0.01	0.12	2,184,837	72	67,114	N/A
<i>Norte de Santander</i>	-0.16	0.17	1,491,689	69	40347	N/A
<i>Cartagena, Bolivar</i>	0.01	-0.03	914,552	1,600	51799	N/A
<i>Tolima</i>	-0.35	0.19	1,330,187	56	44138	N/A
<i>Huila</i>	-0.02	-0.13	1,100,386	55	34880	N/A


215

Brazil	Spearman's correlation coefficient		Population	Population Density(/km²)	Reported Cases	Reported Case / Per Capita
	r_T	$r_{\%RH}$				
<i>Minas Gerais</i>	0.09	-0.07	21,168,791.00	33.00	536044	2,555
<i>Sao Paulo</i>	0.04	0.29	12,176,866.00	8006.00	1452078	3,202
<i>Bahia</i>	0.07	-0.10	14,873,064.00	25.00	490538	3,318
<i>Rio de Janeiro</i>	-0.11	-0.07	6,718,903.00	2706.00	428373	2,504
<i>Parana</i>	0.1	0.23	11,433,957.00	52.00	412627	3,650
<i>Santa Catarina</i>	0.18	0.25	7,164,788.00	75.00	489069	6,957
<i>Rio Grande do Sul</i>	0.41	-0.08	11,286,500.00	39.00	444212	3,930
<i>Goiás</i>	0.21	-0.23	7,018,354.00	18.00	308202	4,483
<i>Ceara</i>	-0.02	-0.03	9,132,078.00	58.00	332462	3,674

216

217 Figure 1: Spearman's Correlation for Temperature and Relative Humidity vs Nine states/regions
 218 with highest COVID infection by the end of December 31st, 2020 of a) Top: Colombia and b)
 Bottom: Brazil

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).




219

220 Figure 2: Comparison between recorded outside temperature patterns and the COVID infection
 221 of four different regions for two different climate types:

222 *Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil* ($r=0.41$); *Bourgogne-Franche-Comte, France* ($r=-0.40$);

223 *Tolima, Colombia* ($r=-0.35$); *Sicilia, Italy* ($r=-0.39$)



224

225 Figure 3: Köppen–Geiger classification of four countries: Top: Brazil (left), Colombia (right)
226 Bottom: France (left), Italy (right) [54]–[58]

227

228 For colder climates, by the end of the year 2020, France and Italy recorded a total of 2.64 million
229 (3.94% of the total population) and 2.14 million cases (3.55% of the total population), respectively.

230 On the other hand, Colombia had an estimated of 1.67 million cases (3.28% of the total population)
231 and Brazil had 7.72 million cases of infected people (3.62% of the total population). All four

232 countries considered in this study have varying climate patterns, as shown in Figure 3, even though
233 the proportions of people infected with the virus by the end of 2020 are approximately very similar.

234 From the very beginning of October till mid-December, nine of the regions with the most recorded
235 COVID cases in France, observed a constant fall in temperature, with an average shift of mean
236 temperature from 13°C to 7°C. This observation is reflected in the correlation coefficient,

237 especially in Auvergne-Rhone-Alpes (ARA), Grand Est (GE), and Bourgogne-Franche-Comte
 238 (BFC) regions, the Spearman's correlation reported within a range of ($r_{T,ARA,GE,BFC} \sim -0.32, -0.56,$
 239 $-0.40, p\text{-value}<0.001$). COVID cases, except in the case of Grand Est, is not significantly
 240 correlated to the reported related humidity.

France	Spearman's correlation coefficient		Population	Population Density(/km ²)	Reported Cases	Reported Case / Per Capita
	r_T	$r_{\%RH}$				
<i>Ile-de-France</i>	-0.11	-0.18	12,278,210	52	71596	583
<i>Auvergne-Rhone-Alpes</i>	-0.32	-0.06	7,948,287	110	38,925	477
<i>Grand Est</i>	-0.56	0.34	5,549,586	97	30,215	538
<i>Provence-Alpes-Cote d'Azur</i>	-0.09	-0.16	5,007,977	160	24,807	491
<i>Hauts-de-France</i>	-0.21	0.06	6,009,976	190	24,693	407
<i>Bourgogne-Franche-Comte</i>	-0.4	0.28	2,811,423	59	14,265	499
<i>Occitanie</i>	-0.05	0.06	5,839,867	80	13,582	227
<i>Normandie</i>	-0.23	0.07	3,322,757	110	8,460	252
<i>Pays de la Loire</i>	-0.27	0.11	3,553,352	110	8,354	216

241


Italy	Spearman's correlation coefficient		Population	Population Density(/km ²)	Reported Cases	Reported Case / Per Capita
	r_T	$r_{\%RH}$				
<i>Lombardia</i>	-0.06	0.31	10,103,969	420	478,903	4,760
<i>Veneto</i>	-0.68	0.10	4,865,380	260	253,875	5,175
<i>Piedmonte</i>	-0.08	0.07	4,322,805	170	197,828	4,541
<i>Campania</i>	-0.04	0.25	5,869,029	430	189,673	3,269
<i>Emilia-Romagna</i>	-0.55	0.35	4,446,220	200	171,512	3,846
<i>Lazio</i>	-0.13	0.13	5,864,321	340	163,051	2,773
<i>Toscana</i>	0.13	-0.04	3,722,729	160	120,328	3,226
<i>Sicilia</i>	-0.39	0.32	4,969,147	190	93,644	1,873
<i>Puglia</i>	-0.71	0.65	4,063,888	210	90,964	2,258

242

243 Figure 4: Spearman's Correlation for Temperature and Relative Humidity vs Nine states/regions
 244 with highest COVID infection by the end of December 31st, 2020 of a) Top: France and b)
 245 Bottom: Italy

246 The COVID second wave in Italy has indicated an overall strong to moderate correlation in regions
 247 like Veneto ($r_{T, Veneto} \sim -0.68, p\text{-value}>0.05$), Emilia-Romagna ($r_{T, Emilia-Romagna} \sim -0.55, p\text{-}$
 248 $value<0.05$), Sicilia ($r_{T, Sicilia} \sim -0.39, p\text{-value}<0.05$), Puglia ($r_{T, Puglia} \sim -0.71, p\text{-value}<0.05$). In all
 249 Veneto and Emilia-Romagna, the outside weather dropped from 16C to 6C, whereas in Sicilia the
 250 temperature dropped from 21C to 13C and in Puglia 20C to 7C. In Veneto and Emilia-Romagna,
 251 the cases rose from 1000/cases per day to 2000/cases per day, and in Sicilia and Puglia, the cases
 252 rose from 250/cases per day to 1000/cases per day. Both in France and Italy, regions like Grand
 253 Est (Fr), Bourgogne-Franche-Comte (Fr), Lombardia (Italy) and Emili-Romagna (Italy), infection
 254 rate has weak correlation to relative humidity ($r_{\%RH} < 0.35, p\text{-value}<0.05$).

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



255

256 Figure 5: Comparison between relative humidity (%RH) and the COVID infection of four

257 different regions for two different climate types:

258 *São Paulo, Brazil* ($r=0.29$); *Grand Est, France* ($r=0.34$);

259 *Valle del Cauca, Colombia* ($r=0.19$); *Puglia, Italy* ($r=0.65$)

260

261 Even though a thorough study has been made available through this study, a wider look into the
262 dryer climates in middle east, or a varying climatic zone of Australia and colder climates in Canada
263 and Russia could have strengthen the findings and help build a more extensive study on the effect
264 of weather patterns and the spread of COVID infection. A further look into a combination of
265 weather and relative humidity, such like wet-bulb temperature, or other factors like absolute
266 humidity, heat index in dry climate areas should be further explored.

267 **4. Conclusion**

268 This study sheds light into the detail of more than 36 regions with widely varying weather patterns.
269 While outside temperature may seem to hold good correlation and might support the hypothesis
270 that outside temperature effects the rate of spread of COVID infection in cold climates such like
271 Italy and France, this hypothesis across warmer humid tropical climates does not hold to be true.
272 With a falling seven-day average outside temperature seemingly causes a rise in infection rate in
273 Italy and France, a very little fluctuation in temperature could not stop the spread of COVID-19 in
274 Colombia. While many of the recent scientific research exploring the strength of correlation
275 between weather and the spread of SARS-CoV-2 may seem to be producing conjectures that are
276 quite convincing, based on this literature findings the notion that COVID-19 is heavily dependable
277 on climate pattern is not convincible and therefore remains quite debatable.

278

279

280

281

282 **Credit authorship contribution statement**

283 **Ahmed Islam:** Algorithm Development, Resources and Data collection and analysis, Writing -
284 original draft.

285 **Declaration of competing interest**

286 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal
287 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300 **References**

- 301 [1] M. Cevik, C. G. G. Bamford, and A. Ho, “COVID-19 pandemic-a focused review for
302 clinicians,” *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 842–847, Jul. 2020, doi:
303 10.1016/j.cmi.2020.04.023.
- 304 [2] D. Fisman, “Seasonality of viral infections: Mechanisms and unknowns,” *Clinical
305 Microbiology and Infection*. 2012, doi: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2012.03968.x.
- 306 [3] M. Moriyama, W. J. Hugentobler, and A. Iwasaki, “Seasonality of Respiratory Viral
307 Infections,” *Annu. Rev. Virol.*, 2020, doi: 10.1146/annurev-virology-012420-022445.
- 308 [4] A. C. Lowen, S. Mubareka, J. Steel, and P. Palese, “Influenza virus transmission is
309 dependent on relative humidity and temperature,” *PLoS Pathog.*, 2007, doi:
310 10.1371/journal.ppat.0030151.
- 311 [5] T. Dbouk and D. Drikakis, “Weather impact on airborne coronavirus survival,” *Phys.
312 Fluids*, 2020, doi: 10.1063/5.0024272.
- 313 [6] H. Li, F. Y. Leong, G. Xu, Z. Ge, C. W. Kang, and K. H. Lim, “Dispersion of evaporating
314 cough droplets in tropical outdoor environment,” *Phys. Fluids*, 2020, doi:
315 10.1063/5.0026360.
- 316 [7] M. M. Iqbal, I. Abid, S. Hussain, N. Shahzad, M. S. Waqas, and M. J. Iqbal, “The effects
317 of regional climatic condition on the spread of COVID-19 at global scale,” *Sci. Total
318 Environ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140101.
- 319 [8] Q. Bukhari, J. M. Massaro, R. B. D’agostino, and S. Khan, “Effects of weather on
320 coronavirus pandemic,” *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2020, doi:
321 10.3390/ijerph17155399.

- 322 [9] S. K. Pani, N. H. Lin, and S. RavindraBabu, “Association of COVID-19 pandemic with
323 meteorological parameters over Singapore,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2020, doi:
324 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140112.
- 325 [10] H. Takagi *et al.*, “Higher Temperature, Pressure, and Ultraviolet Are Associated With
326 Less COVID-19 Prevalence: Meta-Regression of Japanese Prefectural Data,” *Asia-Pacific
327 Journal of Public Health*. 2020, doi: 10.1177/1010539520947875.
- 328 [11] Y. Yao *et al.*, “No association of COVID-19 transmission with temperature or UV
329 radiation in Chinese cities,” *European Respiratory Journal*. 2020, doi:
330 10.1183/13993003.00517-2020.
- 331 [12] K. Azuma, N. Kagi, H. Kim, and M. Hayashi, “Impact of climate and ambient air
332 pollution on the epidemic growth during COVID-19 outbreak in Japan,” *Environ. Res.*,
333 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2020.110042.
- 334 [13] L. Zhu *et al.*, “Meteorological impact on the COVID-19 pandemic: A study across eight
335 severely affected regions in South America,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2020, doi:
336 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140881.
- 337 [14] J. Xie and Y. Zhu, “Association between ambient temperature and COVID-19 infection in
338 122 cities from China,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138201.
- 339 [15] M. Ahmadi, A. Sharifi, S. Dorosti, S. Jafarzadeh Ghouschi, and N. Ghanbari,
340 “Investigation of effective climatology parameters on COVID-19 outbreak in Iran,” *Sci.
341 Total Environ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138705.
- 342 [16] A. C. Auler, F. A. M. Cássaro, V. O. da Silva, and L. F. Pires, “Evidence that high

- 343 temperatures and intermediate relative humidity might favor the spread of COVID-19 in
344 tropical climate: A case study for the most affected Brazilian cities,” *Sci. Total Environ.*,
345 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139090.
- 346 [17] R. Tosepu *et al.*, “Correlation between weather and Covid-19 pandemic in Jakarta,
347 Indonesia,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138436.
- 348 [18] H. Li, X. L. Xu, D. W. Dai, Z. Y. Huang, Z. Ma, and Y. J. Guan, “Air pollution and
349 temperature are associated with increased COVID-19 incidence: A time series study,” *Int.*
350 *J. Infect. Dis.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.076.
- 351 [19] E. Tello-Leal and B. A. Macías-Hernández, “Association of environmental and
352 meteorological factors on the spread of COVID-19 in Victoria, Mexico, and air quality
353 during the lockdown,” *Environ. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2020.110442.
- 354 [20] F. Méndez-Arriaga, “The temperature and regional climate effects on communitarian
355 COVID-19 contagion in Mexico throughout phase 1,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2020, doi:
356 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139560.
- 357 [21] B. Doğan, M. Ben Jebli, K. Shahzad, T. H. Farooq, and U. Shahzad, “Investigating the
358 Effects of Meteorological Parameters on COVID-19: Case Study of New Jersey, United
359 States,” *Environ. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2020.110148.
- 360 [22] M. M. Menebo, “Temperature and precipitation associate with Covid-19 new daily cases:
361 A correlation study between weather and Covid-19 pandemic in Oslo, Norway,” *Sci. Total*
362 *Environ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139659.
- 363 [23] D. Paraskevis *et al.*, “A review of the impact of weather and climate variables to COVID-

- 364 19: In the absence of public health measures high temperatures cannot probably mitigate
365 outbreaks,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144578.
- 366 [24] M. F. Bashir *et al.*, “Correlation between climate indicators and COVID-19 pandemic in
367 New York, USA,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138835.
- 368 [25] S. Gupta, G. S. Raghuwanshi, and A. Chanda, “Effect of weather on COVID-19 spread in
369 the US: A prediction model for India in 2020,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2020, doi:
370 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138860.
- 371 [26] L. M. Casanova, S. Jeon, W. A. Rutala, D. J. Weber, and M. D. Sobsey, “Effects of air
372 temperature and relative humidity on coronavirus survival on surfaces,” *Appl. Environ.
373 Microbiol.*, 2010, doi: 10.1128/AEM.02291-09.
- 374 [27] K. Bloom-Feshbach *et al.*, “Latitudinal Variations in Seasonal Activity of Influenza and
375 Respiratory Syncytial Virus (RSV): A Global Comparative Review,” *PLoS ONE*. 2013,
376 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0054445.
- 377 [28] Á. Briz-Redón and Á. Serrano-Aroca, “A spatio-temporal analysis for exploring the effect
378 of temperature on COVID-19 early evolution in Spain,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2020, doi:
379 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138811.
- 380 [29] M. Jahangiri, M. Jahangiri, and M. Najafgholipour, “The sensitivity and specificity
381 analyses of ambient temperature and population size on the transmission rate of the novel
382 coronavirus (COVID-19) in different provinces of Iran,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2020, doi:
383 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138872.
- 384 [30] J. Pan *et al.*, “Warmer weather unlikely to reduce the COVID-19 transmission: An

- 385 ecological study in 202 locations in 8 countries,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2021, doi:
386 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142272.
- 387 [31] P. Jüni *et al.*, “Impact of climate and public health interventions on the COVID-19
388 pandemic: A prospective cohort study,” *CMAJ*, 2020, doi: 10.1503/cmaj.200920.
- 389 [32] M. A. Zoran, R. S. Savastru, D. M. Savastru, and M. N. Tautan, “Assessing the
390 relationship between surface levels of PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ particulate matter impact on
391 COVID-19 in Milan, Italy,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2020, doi:
392 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139825.
- 393 [33] M. F. F. Sobral, G. B. Duarte, A. I. G. da Penha Sobral, M. L. M. Marinho, and A. de
394 Souza Melo, “Association between climate variables and global transmission of SARS-
395 CoV-2,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138997.
- 396 [34] S. Kodera, E. A. Rashed, and A. Hirata, “Correlation between COVID-19 morbidity and
397 mortality rates in Japan and local population density, temperature, and absolute humidity,”
398 *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijerph17155477.
- 399 [35] Y. Zhu and J. Xie, “Association between ambient temperature and COVID-19 infection in
400 122 cities from China,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2020.
- 401 [36] B. F. Zaitchik *et al.*, “A framework for research linking weather, climate and COVID-19,”
402 *Nature Communications*. 2020, doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-19546-7.
- 403 [37] Á. Briz-Redón and Á. Serrano-Aroca, “The effect of climate on the spread of the COVID-
404 19 pandemic: A review of findings, and statistical and modelling techniques,” *Prog. Phys.*
405 *Geogr.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0309133320946302.

- 406 [38] C. J. Carlson, A. C. R. Gomez, S. Bansal, and S. J. Ryan, “Misconceptions about weather
407 and seasonality must not misguide COVID-19 response,” *Nature Communications*. 2020,
408 doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-18150-z.
- 409 [39] E. A. Rashed, S. Kodera, J. Gomez-Tames, and A. Hirata, “Influence of absolute
410 humidity, temperature and population density on COVID-19 spread and decay durations:
411 Multi-prefecture study in Japan,” *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2020, doi:
412 10.3390/ijerph17155354.
- 413 [40] M. T. P. Coelho *et al.*, “Exponential phase of covid19 expansion is driven by airport
414 connections,” *medRxiv*. 2020, doi: 10.1101/2020.04.02.20050773.
- 415 [41] Runkle, Jennifer D., et al. "Short-term effects of specific humidity and temperature on
416 COVID-19 morbidity in select US cities." *Science of the Total Environment* 740 (2020):
417 140093.
- 418 [42] R. Dougherty, *Wet-Bulb Temperature Modulates SARS-CoV-2 Superspreading Events*.
419 2020.
- 420 [43] NOAA, “Global Summary of the Day,” *Index of/pub/data/g sod/2020/*.
421 <ftp://ftp.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/g sod/2020/>.
- 422 [44] A. Smith, N. Lott, and R. Vose, “The integrated surface database: Recent developments
423 and partnerships,” *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 2011, doi: 10.1175/2011BAMS3015.1.
- 424 [45] H. Moraes, “<https://github.com/elhenrico/covid19-Brazil-timeseries>.”
425 <https://github.com/elhenrico/covid19-Brazil-timeseries>.
- 426 [46] P. del C. dei M.-D. della P. Civile, “Dati COVID-19 Italia.” <https://github.com/pcm->

- 427 dpc/COVID-19.
- 428 [47] Institut National des Statistiques et des Études Économiques, “Institut National des
429 Statistiques et des Études Économiques.” <https://github.com/rozierguillaume/covid-19>.
- 430 [48] I. N. de Salud and M. de T. de la I. y las Comunicaciones, “Instituto Nacional de Salud;”
431 <https://www.gov.co/home/>.
- 432 [49] Johns Hopkins University & Medicine, “Coronavirus Resource Center Johns Hopkins
433 University & Medicine.” <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/>.
- 434 [50] The New York Times, “NYTIMES: Coronavirus (Covid-19) Data in the United States.”
435 <https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data>.
- 436 [51] Google Cloud Platform, “COVID-19 Open-Data.”
437 <https://github.com/GoogleCloudPlatform/covid-19-open-data>.
- 438 [52] Microsoft; Bing, “Microsoft Bing COVID-19 Data.” [https://github.com/microsoft/Bing-
439 COVID-19-Data/blob/master/data/Bing-COVID19-Data.csv](https://github.com/microsoft/Bing-COVID-19-Data/blob/master/data/Bing-COVID19-Data.csv).
- 440 [53] NOAA, “Hourly/Sub-Hourly Observational Data Map.”
441 <https://gis.ncdc.noaa.gov/maps/ncei/cdo/hourly>.
- 442 [54] M. Kottek, J. Grieser, C. Beck, B. Rudolf, and F. Rubel, “World map of the Köppen-
443 Geiger climate classification updated,” *Meteorol. Zeitschrift*, 2006, doi: 10.1127/0941-
444 2948/2006/0130.
- 445 [55] M. C. Peel, B. L. Finlayson, and T. A. McMahon, “Updated world map of the Köppen-
446 Geiger climate classification,” *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 2007, doi: 10.5194/hess-11-1633-
447 2007.

- 448 [56] R. Geiger, “Classificação climática de Köppen- Geiger,” *Creat. Commons Attrib. Alike*
449 *3.0 Unported*, 1936.
- 450 [57] F. Rubel and M. Kottek, “Observed and projected climate shifts 1901-2100 depicted by
451 world maps of the Köppen-Geiger climate classification,” *Meteorol. Zeitschrift*, 2010, doi:
452 10.1127/0941-2948/2010/0430.
- 453 [58] B. Warf, “Köppen-Geiger Climate Classification,” in *Encyclopedia of Geography*, 2014.
- 454
- 455
- 456
- 457
- 458
- 459