This study offers a reflection on the “lockdown” measures carried out in the context of the COVID pandemic19. This type of work seems to me relevant, relevant and very current.

I have some questions about, the data itself, the results presented and how they are presented.

About the data, the authors can do nothing, but it is known that the number of cases was not well measured, lack of sensitivity of the test, asymptomatic cases that never took the test that accounts for the cases.

Included

A question, which I do not intend to answer ... in the initial phase of contamination by COVID19, was there not an excess of zeal (which seems to me well) and therefore more cases in the ICU?´

Included

In the figures (of the results), the interval estimate should be adjusted to the type of data being analyzed (count data). In this context, values> = 0 and we observe the lower limit of the confidence interval with negative values.

It´s a presentation issue. This methods show the generated CI in the modelled time series.

From the observation of figures 2, 4 and 5 we also conclude that the differences between observed and estimated are not statistically relevant, the observed values are mostly contained in the confidence intervals.

Included in discussion.

From the observation of figures 2, 4 and 5 we also conclude that the differences between observed and estimated are not statistically relevant, the observed values are mostly contained in the confidence intervals. I think that reporting the differences (observed, predicted) related to the variable number of deaths, number of hospitalizations and number of cases without highlighting that the results are within the range of the predicted values is somewhat misleading.

Included in discussion.

Minor comments

FAC and FACP – lack abbreviation description

Correct Fig 5 caption.

Revisor I:

Overall, I enjoyed reading the manuscript. It seems methodologically sound

and fairly well written.

I tend to not agree with the results language tone. I think there is a

general uncertainty that is not reflected. After all these are results from

a potential future that that there is no experience whatsoever in the past.

Included a chapter in the end of the results section.

Methodologically the manuscript seems well. Nevertheless, it remains unclear

why different methodologies were adopted.

Alterations included

Models should further be discussed

(in the discussion section) beyond “our estimates are conservative”.

Further discussion included extensively.

I am for the acceptance of the manuscript publication after discretionary

proposed changes.