

1 Article type: Original Research report

2

3 Article title: **Statistical Modeling of deaths due to COVID-19 influenced by social**
4 **isolation in Latin American countries**

5 Rafael André da Silva^{*1#}, Luiz Philipe de Souza Ferreira^{2#}, Jean Michel Rocha Sampaio Leite^{3#},
6 Fernanda Assunção Tiraboshi⁴, Thiago Maciel Valente⁴, Vinicius Moraes de Paiva Roda¹,
7 Jeniffer Johana Duarte Sanchez⁵.

8 Affiliation

9

- 10 1. Institute of Biomedical Sciences, University of São Paulo (ICB/USP), São Paulo, SP, Brazil.
- 11 2. Paulista School of Medicine, Federal University of São Paulo (EPM/UNIFESP), São Paulo,
12 SP, Brazil.
- 13 3. School of Public Health, University of São Paulo (FSP/USP), São Paulo, SP, Brazil.
- 14 4. University of Fortaleza (UNIFOR), Fortaleza, CE, Brazil.
- 15 5. Federal University of Ceará (UFC), Fortaleza, CE, Brazil.

16

17 # Contributed equally to this manuscript.

18 *Corresponding author:

19

20 Rafael André da Silva, Institute of Biomedical Sciences, University of São Paulo (ICB/USP),
21 São Paulo, SP, Brazil. E-mail: rafaels@usp.br .

22

23 Number of figures: 1

24 Number of tables: 1

25 Number of words: 2.632

26 Abstract: 245

27 Supplementary Materials: 1 (Supplemental Figure S1a) and (Supplemental Figure S1b)

28

29

30 **Abstract**

31

32 Social isolation is extremely important to minimize the effects of a pandemic. Latin American
33 (LA) countries have similar socioeconomic characteristics and health system infrastructures.
34 These countries face difficulties to deal with the COVID-19 pandemic and some of them had
35 very high death rates. Government stringency index (GSI) of twelve LA countries was gathered
36 from the Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker (OxCGRT) project. GSI is
37 calculated considering nine metrics of social distancing and isolation measures. Population data
38 from the United Nations Population Fund and number of deaths data was collected from the
39 dashboard of the World Health Organization (WHO). We performed an analysis of the period
40 March-December using a mixed linear model approach. Peru, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, Colombia,
41 Argentina and Ecuador had the highest death rates with an increasing trend over time, while
42 Suriname, Venezuela, Uruguay, Paraguay and Guyana had the lowest ones, which remained
43 steady. GSI in most countries followed the same pattern during the analyzed months. i.e., high
44 indices at the beginning of the pandemic and lower ones in the last evaluated months, while the
45 number of deaths increased over the whole period. Almost no country kept its GSI high for a
46 long time, especially from October to December. Time and GSI as well as their interaction were
47 highly significant. As their interaction increases, death rate decreases. In conclusion, a higher
48 GSI at the start of the pandemic COVID-19 would impact on the decrease in the number of
49 deaths over time, in LA countries.

50

51 **Keywords:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Coronavirus, Latin American countries, Social
52 isolation, Government stringency index

53 **Introduction**

54

55 The COVID-19 pandemic has affected healthcare systems and caused collapses across the
56 globe. In Latin America (LA), the first case of SARS-CoV-2 infection was recorded on
57 February 25th in the City of São Paulo. In less than a month after the first case, all LA countries
58 had confirmed cases of COVID-19^{1,2}.

59 The LA region has several obstacles that make it difficult for countries to take action
60 against the spread of the virus. Precarious conditions, such as poverty, lack of hospital
61 infrastructure, low sanitary conditions, high prevalence of chronic diseases and government's
62 tardy responses are factors that make it difficult to prevent contamination by the virus, so that
63 they facilitate transmission and directly impact the hospital system³⁻⁵. Through predictive
64 models' studies, it has been suggested that the virus could spread aggressively through LA^{6,7}.
65 Moreover, analyses of the initial cases of the COVID-19 pandemic in LA estimated an
66 unfavorable scenario for the countries, and also evidenced aggressive dynamics of the disease
67 outbreak in Brazil and Ecuador compared to Italy and Spain⁷. Above all, among the LA
68 countries, Brazil was considered a major epicenter of the disease⁸.

69 Although there are measures aimed at reducing the spread of the new coronavirus such
70 as social distancing, school closures, cancellation of public events and, sometimes, severe
71 methods such as lockdown, these measures have been relaxed, in addition to noncompliance by
72 the population and poor governmental management⁹. However, several current studies have
73 already associated non-pharmaceutical interventions and lockdowns in particular to mortality,
74 especially when measures are adopted early^{10,11}. Although recent studies have estimated that
75 non-pharmaceutical interventions are related to the number of deaths or the rate of infection of
76 COVID-19 in different countries¹², LA countries have not been the focus of these studies. LA
77 countries should be analyzed with caution taking into account that most of the countries in
78 America had difficulties in facing the pandemic^{1,2,13}. In addition, Brazil is among the countries
79 with the highest number of deaths caused by the virus¹⁴.

80 Considering that social distancing and isolation are important protective measures for the
81 containment of SARS-CoV-2 infection, and that there is lack of studies discussing on
82 demonstrating the relationship between the social isolation and death rate due to COVID-19 in
83 LA countries, based on the Government Stringency Index (GSI) from the Coronavirus
84 Government Response Tracker (OxCGRT)¹⁵, the objective of this work was to analyze the
85 relationship between GSI and time, as well as death rate from COVID-19 in 12 LA countries,
86 using a mixed linear model approach, especially looking at the measures adopted in the first
87 year of the pandemic. Through this model, the need for maintaining social distancing and
88 isolation measures over time at the start of the pandemic is explained and substantiated.

89

90 **Material and Methods**

91

92 **Data Sources**

93 Government stringency index (GSI) of twelve LA countries was developed by the Oxford
94 University and gathered from the platform Policy Responses to the Coronavirus Pandemic on
95 the website (<https://ourworldindata.org/policy-responses-covid>). This index represents the
96 strictness of government policies and was calculated considering nine metrics of social
97 distancing and isolation, such as school and work closures, stay-at-home requirements, transport
98 restrictions, constraints on public gatherings, cancellation of public events, public information
99 campaigns; restrictions on internal movements; and international travel controls. The index on
100 any given day is calculated as the mean score of nine policy measures, each taking a value
101 between 0 and 100. Hence, a higher GSI indicates a stricter response to the pandemic. The
102 detailed methodology for calculating indices is described elsewhere
103 ([https://github.com/OxCGRT/covid-policy-](https://github.com/OxCGRT/covid-policy-tracker/blob/master/documentation/index_methodology.md)
104 [tracker/blob/master/documentation/index_methodology.md](https://github.com/OxCGRT/covid-policy-tracker/blob/master/documentation/index_methodology.md)). To use that data, we first
105 calculated the mean of the GSI for each month. The number of cumulative monthly deaths data
106 was collected from the dashboard of the World Health Organization (WHO). Population data
107 were obtained from the United Nations Population Fund available on

108 (<https://www.unfpa.org/about-us>) and used to calculate the proportion of the number of deaths
109 for each country. This data was collected from the first day of March until the last day of
110 December of 2020.

111

112 **Statistical analysis**

113

114 We evaluated the relationship between GSI and time, and the death rates from COVID-19.
115 Since we analyzed repeated measures over a period of time (time was uniformly measured
116 across all countries), this is a longitudinal analysis requiring a mixed linear model approach,

117

$$y_{ij} = \mu_{ij} + X_{ij}^T \beta + Z\gamma + \varepsilon_{ij},$$

118

where

$$y_{ij} = \frac{N^{\circ} \text{ of deaths related to COVID - 19}}{N^{\circ} \text{ of inhabitants in the country}} \times 1000000$$

119

120 μ = mean of the death ratio adjusted by total population for each million inhabitants,
121 X_{ij} = vector of covariates, β = vector of the regression parameters for the covariates. Z = matrix
122 of covariates, γ = vector of random effects and ε_{ij} = vector of random errors. γ and ε are
123 uncorrelated.

124

125 In the model, the variables time (month) and GSI were considered both as fixed. In
126 addition, the country was included as a random effect. All statistical analysis was performed
127 under the most commonly used significance levels (1%, 5% and 10%) using the RStudio
128 statistical software v.3.6.

128

129 **Results**

130

131 We analyzed data of deaths related to COVID-19 in twelve LA countries in order to evaluate the
132 relationship between death rates, GSI and time progression. In this context, time and GSI are
133 useful to explain the dispersion of the data.

134

135 Figure 1a displays death rates from March to December. Peru, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia,
136 Colombia, Argentina and Ecuador have high death rates, with an increasing trend over time,
137 while Suriname, Venezuela, Uruguay, Paraguay and Guyana presented low death rates, which
138 remained stable. Figure 1b displays GSI from March to December. It is noticeable that there
139 was much fluctuation in the GSI for most countries, but with a large decrease from October to
140 December. The only country whose GSI was maintained high for the whole period was
141 Venezuela.

141

142 Also, in Figure 1a, it is possible to observe the asymmetry of the data, so a skew- t
143 distribution was adopted for the model's error. Since the model presents a variable dispersion,
144 we used a linear regression model for the dispersion.

144

$$y_{ij} | time_i, country_j, GSI_{ij} \sim ST(\mu_{ij}, \sigma_{ij}, \nu, \tau)$$

$$\mu_{ij}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\mu_{ij}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 time_i + \beta_2 GSI_{ij} + \beta_3 time_i \times GSI_{ij} + \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 country_j$$

$$\log(\sigma_{ij}) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 time_i + \alpha_2 GSI_{ij}.$$

145

146 where $i = 1, \dots, 10$ represents each of the months, starting from March, and $j =$
147 $1, \dots, 12$ corresponds to each of the countries. $time_i$ represents the i -th month, $country_j$
148 represents the j -th country, GSI_{ij} represents the GSI in the i -th month in the j -th country. σ_{ij}
149 corresponds to the standard deviation in the i -th month in the j -th country, with its
150 corresponding parameters α . The random effects $\gamma_0 \in \gamma_1$ have a normal distribution, and
151 the response variable has a skew- t distribution with parameters $\mu_{ij}, \sigma_{ij}, \nu$ and τ .

152

153 Table 1 displays the coefficient estimates of the mixed linear model and the
dispersion model. The random effects are random variables that do not assume a single value,

154 which means that its values cannot be displayed. Time and GSI, as well as their interaction,
155 were highly significant to explain the death rate under all assumed significance levels. As the
156 interaction of time and GSI increases, the death rate decreases.

157 In Supplemental Figure S1a, the QQ-plot envelope shows there is no evidence that
158 the skew-*t* distribution is inappropriate to explain the death rate for each million inhabitants.
159 Other aspects of the model were analyzed by the quantile residuals (Supplemental Figure S2b),
160 such as the correct specification of the model's dispersion and distribution. We can conclude
161 from these graphs that the model satisfies the assumptions so that the model specification is
162 appropriate.

164 Discussion

166 Robust evidence shows that, under most conditions, early adoption of stringent government
167 non-pharmaceutical interventions is associated with a reduction in transmission and death¹⁰⁻¹².
168 Continued intervention should be considered to keep transmission of disease under control¹⁰. In
169 addition it was estimated that GSI was able to decrease the number of deaths at different waves
170 during the course of SARS-CoV-2 disease in different countries¹². However, addressing the
171 influence of this factor on death rates remains a big challenge because countries publish their
172 testing data at different time points: some provide daily updates, while others provide only on a
173 weekly-basis, and some only publish figures on an ad-hoc basis at longer intervals.

174 Based on GSI data extracted from the OxCGRT project¹⁵, it is possible to propose
175 statistical models to evaluate how closely these variables are related to time. Herein, the model
176 shows that the relationship between time and GSI is highly significant. When analyzing time
177 and GSI together, it was observed that, as the interaction of these two variables increases, a drop
178 in the death rate is detected. For instance, according to this model, with a GSI set to 0 in March
179 and a GSI set to 80 in April. i.e. a 80% increase in the strictness of government policies, we
180 could have observed a reduction of approximately 32 deaths per million inhabitants. In Brazil,
181 whose population is near 212 million, that would represent 6,784 lives that could have been
182 saved at the beginning of the pandemic. This figure would be even higher in other months
183 within the analyzed period. Furthermore, once these two variables were analyzed separately, as
184 time increases, the rate of deaths per million inhabitants increases as well. Surprisingly, the
185 same happens with the GSI reported by the countries. In light of these observations, we can
186 make two hypotheses: 1) GSI alone may not entirely represent the reality regarding social
187 isolation and the death rate from COVID-19, since this condition depends on other factors, such
188 as the infrastructure of the countries' public hospitals, government management, and the
189 population's compliance with the rules. 2) Restriction policies as measured by GSI do not have
190 immediate effects and must be maintained over longer periods in order to decrease death rates
191 by COVID-19. Hence, the problem is complex and deserves to be studied in detail taking into
192 account other aspects that may be influencing the death rates.

193 LA countries present problematic issues, such as social inequality and less access to
194 healthcare. However, complying with social isolation is difficult for individuals when work is
195 the only source of income¹³. In our analyses, countries such as Peru, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia,
196 Colombia, Argentina and Ecuador have the highest death rates. Peru presents low conditions to
197 face a pandemic and even in lockdown at the beginning of the pandemic², it presented high
198 death rates. In a prediction study with data from the first 10 days of the pandemic, it was
199 estimated that Peru had the lowest effective reproductive number (R_e), parameter used to keep
200 track of epidemics⁷, therefore, the country had these numbers accentuated during the pandemic
201 period.

202 Brazil was the first LA country to report cases of COVID-19¹⁶⁻¹⁸. Since it presents
203 favorable conditions to face a pandemic when compared to other LA countries, it was expected
204 to have lower rates. However, in the present study, Brazil and Chile presented higher death
205 rates, followed by Peru. It is important to consider that, although Peru's president has played a
206 relevant role helping to control the number of deaths from COVID-19, there has not been
207 neither a national strategic plan to guide communication and educational health policies nor a
208 large-scale awareness campaign to stimulate people to protect their health and abide to the

209 protective measures. This lack of policies is also a current problem in Brazil². For instance,
210 through GSI e and COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports from Google, daily new cases and
211 real time R_t were calculated, showing that Brazil is not doing very well regarding its response to
212 COVID-19 pandemic¹⁹. Although Brazil presents a robust public health system and reasonable
213 GSI, the high death rates may be deeply connected to inadequate policy management that has
214 received several criticisms^{5,13}. In comparison to Brazil, Suriname had a similar GSI but a low
215 death rate, remaining stable over time. Except for Venezuela, no other country kept a high GSI
216 for longer periods. Particularly, GSI decreased at the end of the year (October-December) in
217 most countries, while death rates increased. On the other hand, isolation in Venezuela was
218 maintained even in December (an atypical month because of Christmas and holiday season), and
219 its death rates were low and remained unchanged over time.

220 According to the present analysis, Uruguay followed a relatively lower GSI than other
221 LA countries but showed low death rates. Uruguay was a country that acted quickly, closing its
222 borders and schools, with insertion of screening tests, reducing SARS-CoV-2 infections and
223 controlling the outbreak very efficiently²⁰. In contrast, Ecuador started with high social
224 isolation, but a decrease in the isolation rate was observed later. On the other hand, Ecuador had
225 a high mortality rate, which is accentuated over time even with the adoption of lockdown. In
226 addition, it should be noted that this country had poor conditions of public health infrastructure
227 at the beginning of the pandemic². At the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, it had been
228 already suggested that closing public transportation, workplaces and schools is particularly
229 effective in reducing COVID-19 transmission²¹.

230 The rapidly evolving pandemic in LA countries is worthy of especial attention,
231 considering their often weak and low stringency responses to the current sanitary crisis. In this
232 study, GSI varies considerably in all LA countries over time. This variation can partially explain
233 why these countries have been differently impacted by COVID-19. In spite of not specifically
234 addressing and discussing the government policies adopted by each country, in this
235 investigation, we successfully show that social distancing and isolation measured by GSI
236 influences death rates from COVID-19 over time. For instance, the interaction between GSI and
237 time can decrease the number of deaths, which demonstrates the importance of maintaining
238 social distancing and isolation measures for longer periods, as opposed to what most LA
239 countries did. Almost no country kept its GSI high for much time, especially from October to
240 December. We did not expect to find different results since several studies support the idea that
241 stringency policies are extremely important to contain the contagion or death of COVID-19¹⁰⁻¹².
242 Therefore, this is the first paper that discusses the importance of non-pharmaceutical
243 interventions based on increased GSI could have directly impacted on the number of deaths in
244 LA countries.

245 Our results have significant implications; however, some limiting aspects must be
246 considered. 1) The GSI was extracted from the OxCGRT project. The curators of this database
247 emphasized how challenging the collection of information on the exact data was due to the
248 nature and extent of the policies of the different governments. This complex data set can
249 obscure the qualitative differences in each of the nine metrics GSI measures across countries. In
250 addition, many local and cultural factors can affect the implementation of interventions. 2) Our
251 data provide a general interpretation of the influence of time and GSI on death rates in LA.
252 Therefore, future studies can deepen the search for more specific interpretations for each
253 country, taking into account local aspects and other metrics not covered here. 3) The numbers of
254 deaths from COVID-19 can be easily underreported^{18,19}, this is due to limited testing, problems
255 in determining the cause of death and the way in which COVID-19 deaths are recorded. Hence,
256 we cannot define the real impact of the GSI on death rates with perfect precision. 4) We know
257 that the differences in population size between countries are often large, and the COVID-19
258 death count in more populous countries tends to be greater. Thus, in order to perform a more
259 truthful comparison, we used the cumulative death data and calculated the death rate adjusted by
260 the population of each country.

261

262 **Conclusions**

263

264 We conclude that, in combination, time and GSI have beneficial effects on the decrease of death
265 rates from COVID-19 in LA countries. Higher strictness of social distancing and isolation, as
266 measured by the GSI, at the start of the pandemic, could have flattened mortality curves from
267 COVID-19 over time, particularly from March to December 2020. Our statistical model
268 explains and substantiates the need for maintaining social distancing and isolation measures
269 over time during the pandemic.

270

271 **Acknowledgments**

272 Publication charges for this article were waived due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

273 **Authors' addresses**

274 Rafael André da Silva and Vinicius Moraes de Paiva Roda, Institute of Biomedical Sciences,
275 University of São Paulo (ICB/USP), São Paulo, SP, Brazil, E-mails: rafaels@usp.br,
276 vinicius.moraes95@gmail.com. Luiz Philipe de Souza Ferreira, Paulista School of Medicine,
277 Federal University of São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, Brazil. E-mail: luiz.philipe@unifesp.br. Thiago
278 Maciel Valente and Fernanda Assunção Tiraboschi, University of Fortaleza (UNIFOR),
279 Fortaleza, CE, Brazil, E-mails: maciel.thiago@edu.unifor.br and tiraboschi@edu.unifor.br. Jean
280 Michel Rocha Sampaio Leite, School of Public Health, University of São Paulo (FSP/USP), São
281 Paulo, SP, Brazil, E-mail: jmichelsampaio@hotmail.com. Jeniffer Johana Duarte Sanchez,
282 Federal University of Ceará (UFC), Fortaleza, CE, Brazil, E-mail: jjduartes@dema.ufc.br.

283

284 **Authors' contributions**

285 Rafael André da Silva: Conceptualization, Methodology, Data curation, interpretation, Writing -
286 original draft, Supervision, critical review, Project administration. Luiz Philipe de Souza
287 Ferreira: Writing - original draft, Methodology, Design of the study, Manuscript drafting,
288 review, editing and Project administration. Jean Michel Rocha Sampaio Leite: Methodology,
289 Data curation, Critical review, Interpretation, Writing - review, editing and Project
290 administration. Fernanda Assunção Tiraboschi: Writing - review & editing. Thiago Maciel
291 Valente: Data curation, Writing - original draft. Vinicius Moraes de Paiva Roda: Writing -
292 original draft, critical review. Jeniffer Johana Duarte Sanchez: Conceptualization, Methodology,
293 Formal analysis, Data curation, interpretation, Validation, Supervision and Project Head .

294

295 **References**

296

- 297 1. Rodriguez-Morales AJ, Gallego V, Escalera-Antezana JP, et al. COVID-19 in Latin
298 America: The implications of the first confirmed case in Brazil. *Travel Med Infect Dis*.
299 2020;35. doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101613
- 300 2. Garcia PJ, Alarcón A, Bayer A, et al. COVID-19 Response in Latin America. *Am J Trop*
301 *Med Hyg*. 2020;103(5):1765-1772. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.20-0765
- 302 3. Miller MJ, Loaiza JR, Takyar A, Gilman RH. Covid-19 in latin america: Novel
303 transmission dynamics for a global pandemic? *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2020;14(5):3-7.
304 doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PNTD.0008265
- 305 4. Pablos-Méndez A, Vega J, Aranguren FP, Tabish H, Raviglione MC. Covid-19 in Latin
306 America. *BMJ*. Published online 2020:369-370. doi:10.1136/bmj.m2939
- 307 5. Burky T. COVID-19 in Latin America Several. *Lancet*. 2020;(January):547.
- 308 6. Pacheco-Barrios K, Cardenas-Rojas A, Giannoni-Luza S, Fregni F. COVID-19
309 pandemic and Farr's law: A global comparison and prediction of outbreak acceleration
310 and deceleration rates. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(9 September):1-25.
311 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0239175
- 312 7. Caicedo-ochoa Y, Rebellón-sánchez DE, Peñaloza-rallón M. Effective Reproductive
313 Number estimation for initial stage of COVID-19 pandemic in Latin American
314 Countries. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2020;95(January):316-318.
- 315 8. Bermudi PMM, Lorenz C, Aguiar BS de, Failla MA, Barrozo LV, Chiaravalloti-Neto F.

- 316 Spatiotemporal ecological study of COVID-19 mortality in the city of São Paulo, Brazil:
317 Shifting of the high mortality risk from areas with the best to those with the worst socio-
318 economic conditions. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* 2021;39(October 2020):101945.
319 doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101945
- 320 9. Chen YT, Yen YF, Yu SH, Su ECY. An examination on the transmission of covid-19
321 and the effect of response strategies: A comparative analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public*
322 *Health.* 2020;17(16):1-14. doi:10.3390/ijerph17165687
- 323 10. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, et al. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical
324 interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature.* 2020;584(7820):257-261.
325 doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2405-7
- 326 11. Brauner JM, Mindermann S, Sharma M, et al. Inferring the effectiveness of government
327 interventions against COVID-19. *Science (80-)*. 2021;371(6531).
328 doi:10.1126/science.abd9338
- 329 12. Hale T, Angrist N, Hale AJ, et al. Government responses and COVID-19 deaths: Global
330 evidence across multiple pandemic waves. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(7 July):1-14.
331 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0253116
- 332 13. The Lancet. COVID-19 in Latin America: a humanitarian crisis. *Lancet.*
333 2020;396(10261):1463. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32328-X
- 334 14. Naveca FG, Nascimento V, de Souza VC, et al. COVID-19 in Amazonas, Brazil, was
335 driven by the persistence of endemic lineages and P.1 emergence. *Nat Med.*
336 2021;27(7):1230-1238. doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01378-7
- 337 15. Hale T, Angrist N, Goldszmidt R, et al. A global panel database of pandemic policies
338 (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker). *Nat Hum Behav.* Published online
339 2021. doi:10.1038/s41562-021-01079-8
- 340
- 341 16. Philippe L, Ferreira DS, Valente TM, Tiraboschi FA. Description of Covid-19 Cases in
342 Brazil and Italy. *SN Compr Clin Med.* Published online 2020:19-22.
- 343 17. Valente TM, Ferreira LPS, Silva RAD, Leite JMRS, Tiraboschi FA BM. Brazil Covid-
344 19: Change of hospitalizations and deaths due to burn injury? *Burns.* Published
345 online 2020:9-11. doi:10.1016/j.burns.2020.10.009
- 346 18 de Souza WM, Buss LF, Candido D da S, et al. Epidemiological and clinical
347 characteristics of the COVID-19 epidemic in Brazil. *Nat Hum Behav.* 2020;4(8):856-
348 865. doi:10.1038/s41562-020-0928-4
- 349 19 Dongshan zhu SRM, , Xikun Han, Santo K. Social distancing in Latin America during
350 the COVID-19 pandemic: an analysis using the Stringency Index and Google
351 Community Mobility Reports. *Int Soc Travel Med.* Published online 2020:1-25.
- 352 20 Elizondo V, Harkins GW, Mabvakure B, et al. SARS-CoV-2 genomic characterization
353 and clinical manifestation of the COVID-19 outbreak in Uruguay. *Emerg Microbes*
354 *Infect.* 2021;10(1):51-65. doi:10.1080/22221751.2020.1863747
- 355 21 Vannoni M, McKee M, Semenza JC, Bonell C, Stuckler D. Using volunteered
356 geographic information to assess mobility in the early phases of the COVID-19
357 pandemic: A cross-city time series analysis of 41 cities in 22 countries from March 2nd
358 to 26th 2020. *Global Health.* 2020;16(1):1-9. doi:10.1186/s12992-020-00598-9
- 359

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


Table 1. Estimates of the dispersion model and mixed linear model for death rates from COVID-19 in 2020 in Latin American countries.

	Estimate	Std Error	<i>t</i> Value	<i>p</i> -value
μ				
Intercept (β_0)	491,633.0	69,250.3	7.099	<0.005***
Time (β_1)	-70,118.5	12,794.0	-5.81	<0.005***
GSI(β_2)	-6,721.4	984.6	-6.826	<0.005***
Time×GSI (β_3)	953.6	189.2	5.041	<0.005***
σ				
Intercept (α_0)	-3.89	0.59	-6.63	<0.005***
Time(α_1)	0.72	0.04	16.67	<0.005***
GSI (α_2)	0.05	0.01	8.00	<0.005***

Legend: GSI - Government stringency index. Significance levels: “***” 0.001, “**” 0.01, “*” 0.05, “.” 0.1. The relationship between the predictors and the original response variable is inversely proportional i.e. a negative sign indicates an increase of death rates while the positive one indicates a decrease. Importantly, considering the interaction effect was significant, the main effects cannot be interpreted individually. For instance, the interpretation from the estimate obtained for the parameter associated with the interaction (953.6) is that for a given fixed month, if the GSI increases, the death rate decreases.

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

Figure 1. Death rates from COVID-19 and Government Stringency index from March to December 2020 in Latin American countries.



Legend Figure 1a: Death rates adjusted by population size for each country per million inhabitants.
Figure 1b: Mean Government Stringency index reported as percentage.