Covid-19 lockdown effects on the seismic recordings of Central America

Mario Arroyo-Solórzano[1], Diego Castro-Rojas[2], Frédérick Massin[3], Lepolt Linkimer[1], Ivonne Arroyo[1] & Robin Yani[2]

1: Escuela Centroamericana de Geología y Red Sismológica Nacional, Universidad de Costa Rica, San José, Costa Rica.
2: Instituto Nacional de Sismología, Vulcanología, Meteorología e Hidrología, INSIVUMEH, Ciudad de Guatemala, Guatemala.
3: ETHZ-SED, Swiss Seismological Service, Zurich, Switzerland.

Correspondence to: Mario Arroyo-Solórzano (mario.arroyosolorzano@ucr.ac.cr)

Abstract. A noticeable decrease in seismic noise was registered worldwide during the lockdown measures implemented in 2020 to prevent the spread of Covid-19. In Central America, strong lockdown measures started during March of 2020. We have used seismic stations from Costa Rica, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua to study the effects of these measures on seismic records by characterizing temporal variations in the high-frequency band (4-14 Hz) via spectral and amplitude analyses. In addition, we study the link between the reduction of seismic noise and the number of earthquake detections and felt reports in Costa Rica and Guatemala. We found that seismic stations near the capitals of Costa Rica, Guatemala, and El Salvador, presented a decrease in their typical seismic noise levels, from 200 to 140 nm, 100 to 80 nm, and 120 to 80 nm, respectively. Our results showed that the largest reduction of ~ 50% in seismic noise was observed at seismic stations near main airports, busy roads, and densely populated cities. In Nicaragua, the seismic noise levels remained constant (~ 40 nm) as no lockdown measures were applied. We suggest that the decrease in seismic noise levels may have increased earthquake detections and the number of felt reports of low magnitude earthquakes. However, the variations observed in several seismic parameters before and after the lockdown are not significant enough to easily untangle our observations or link them to other contributing factors. Our results imply that the study of seismic noise levels can be useful to verify the compliance of lockdown measures and to explore their effects in earthquake detection and felt reports.

1. Introduction

The seismic noise recorded by seismometers includes microseisms and atmospheric, anthropogenic or cultural noise (Nimiya, 2020). The anthropogenic seismic noise in urban areas tends to be rowdier and more complex than elsewhere. This includes seismic signals generated by human activities such as transportation and industrial activities (Gross and Ritter, 2009; Diaz et al., 2017; Hong et al., 2020). It is difficult to identify precisely at what frequencies and how different human activities are represented in seismic records (McNamara and Buland, 2004; Green et al., 2017; Lecoq et al., 2020a). Indeed, the seismic noise includes various anthropogenic noises as a function of frequency, time, and distance in a range usually between 1-40 Hz (Kuzma et al., 2009; Riahi and Gerstoft, 2015; Diaz et al., 2017).

A reduction in the seismic noise worldwide has been observed coinciding with the lockdown measures to prevent the spread of Covid-19, whose outbreak was declared pandemic in March 2020 by the World Health Organization (Sohrabi et al., 2020). This effect has been first described for Shillong (India) by Somala (2020), for Northern Italy by Poli et al. (2020), and by Lecocq et al. (2020a) at a global scale. Governments have tried to prevent or delay the spread of Covid-19 by forcing the social distancing through measures like limiting non-essential activities, closing schools and universities, restriction of the mobility of the citizens, and shutdown of workplaces (Piccinini, et al., 2020).

Central America has been severely affected by the of Covid-19 pandemic with an estimated death toll of 18,145 by the end of 2020 (SICA, 2020). This small land bridge (1400 km long, 80–400 km wide) between the Americas is home to about 50 million inhabitants. It is located mostly in the Caribbean Plate and the Panama Microplate, surrounded by four major tectonic plates: the Cocos plate to the southwest, the Nazca plate to the south, and the North American and South American plates to the north and southeast, respectively. The boundary between the Cocos and Caribbean plates occurs at the Middle America Trench (MAT), where the Cocos Plate subducts underneath the Caribbean Plate and the Panama Microplate. The North Panama Deformed Belt (NPDB) constitutes the Caribbean Plate-Panama Microplate boundary, and the Polochic-Motagua Fault System (PMFS) marks the Caribbean-North American Plate boundary (Figure 1) (e.g. Adamek et al., 1988; Kellogg and Vega, 1995; Trenkamp et al., 2002; Vargas and Mann, 2013). This complex and active tectonic setting in Central America generates high seismicity rates and volcanic activity. For instance, some of the deadliest earthquakes (Figure 1) were the 1910 M 6.4 Cartago earthquake in Costa Rica, the 1972 M 6.3 Managua earthquake in Nicaragua, the 1976 M 7.5 Guatemala earthquake, and the 1986 M 5.7 San Salvador earthquake in El Salvador, with ~600, ~20,000, ~23,000, and ~6,000 fatalities, respectively (Espinosa, 1976; Mann et al., 1990; Harlow et al., 1993; Alonso-Henar et al., 2013).

Seismometers in urban settings optimize the spatial coverage of seismic networks at these areas, and warn of local geological hazards, for example the amplification of seismic waves (Ashenden et al., 2011). Some of the main institutions in charge of the permanent monitoring of seismicity in Central America are: the National Institute of Seismology, Volcanology, Meteorology and Hydrology (INSIVUMEH) in Guatemala, the National Service for Territorial Studies (SNET in El Salvador), the Nicaraguan Institute for Territorial Studies (INETER) in Nicaragua, and in Costa Rica the National Seismological Network of the University of Costa Rica (RSN-UCR) and the Volcanological and Seismological Observatory of the National University of Costa Rica (OVSICORI-UNA). Belize and Honduras lack an official seismic service and Panama has several local networks, such as the Chiriqui and the University of Panama (UPA).

Because high levels of the root mean square (RMS) of the high-frequency seismic anthropogenic noise displacement (HFSAND-RMS) hampers the ability to detect signals from earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, its analysis and delimitation is of the utmost importance (Lecoq et al., 2020a). The objective of this work is to present the first study of HFSAND-RMS during Covid-19 in Central America. We have used seismic stations in Central America (Figure 1) to evaluate the effects of lockdown measures in the seismic record near urban centers of four countries in the region: Costa Rica, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua. In addition, specific sites near populated centers and airports in Costa Rica and Guatemala are also analyzed. Finally, we explore the possible

76 impact of the low noise levels on the capability of detecting earthquakes and on the number of felt reports during
77 the lockdown.

78 **2. Data and methods**

79 **2.1. Seismic Stations and Data**

80 We consider data from vertical-component seismometers from 10 seismic stations located in Costa Rica,
81 Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua. Four of them are operated by the RSN (Costa Rica), four more by the
82 INSIVUMEH (Guatemala), one belongs to the MARN (El Salvador), and one to the INETER (Nicaragua) (Figures
83 1 and A1). Most of these stations have been selected within or near the capitals of each country, to obtain an
84 overview of the changes in the seismic records induced by the lockdown measures. In Costa Rica and Guatemala,
85 where we had more access to the records, we also selected three stations close-by other populated centers or
86 airports.
87

88 The selected stations include both broadband seismometers (BB) and short-period geophones (SP). For Costa
89 Rica, we use the TC.SJS1 station (BB, Guralp CMG-6TD) located at the main campus of University of Costa Rica
90 in San Jose. This station is 3 meters below the ground level, and the sensor is installed in a concrete pillar. We
91 also inspected the stations TC.BELE, TC.ERIA, and TC.ZEDO (SP, Sixaola instruments manufactured by
92 Raspberry Shake), located in urban areas at fire station buildings at ground level, close to Juan Santamaria
93 International airport, Liberia city in Northwestern Costa Rica, and in San Isidro city (Perez Zeledon) in
94 Southeastern Costa Rica, respectively. For Guatemala, we used the GI.GCG4 station (SP, OSOP Sixaola) located
95 in an urban area, close to the Aurora International airport. This station is 3 meters below the ground level, and the
96 sensor is also installed in a concrete pillar. Furthermore, we analyzed the stations GI.HUEH, GI.RETA, and
97 GI.CHIE (BB-Guralp CMG-3ESP), located in urban areas, close to local airports and Huehuetenango, Retalhuleu,
98 and Esquipulas downtowns, respectively. These stations are at ground level inside a dedicated vault with a
99 concrete pillar.
100

101 For El Salvador and Nicaragua, we use the stations SV.CEDA (BB, Nanometrics Trillium-120p), located close to
102 the Panamerican highway at the city of La Libertad and NU.MGAN (BB, Streckeisen STS-2), located at INETER
103 in Managua downtown. The continuous seismic data for Costa Rica and Guatemala were obtained directly from
104 the seismological networks of each country (INSIVUMEH, 2013; RSN, 2017) and from IRIS for El Salvador and
105 Nicaragua, via FDSN (International Federation of Digital Seismograph Network) web services (INETER, 1975;
106 SNET, 2004). We analyzed data over a time span covering one year from November 1, 2019 to October 31, 2020.

107 **2.2. Seismic noise analyses**

108 A spectral and amplitude analysis was carried out to characterize temporal variations in high-frequency (4-14 Hz)
109 seismic signals dominated by the anthropogenic noise via RMS. We computed the high-frequency seismic noise
110 amplitude prior to and during the pandemic lockdown measures (before March 16, 2020). The results have been
111 compared to the lockdown measures implemented by the governments for each country, as documented in Table
112 A1 (SICA, 2020), and their compliance by the population.

113

114 The high-frequency seismic noise amplitudes have been computed following the method described by Lecoq et

115 al. (2020a) and using the code provided by Lecoq et al. (2020b). In this technique, the method of Welch (1967) is

116 applied, in which a power spectral density (PSD) is calculated for each 30-minute time-windows with a 50 percent

117 overlap, converted into equivalent displacement, and combined into a single RMS value per time-window

118 (Blackman and Tukey, 1958). This reduces the numerical noise in the power spectra at the expense of reducing

119 the frequency resolution due to frequency binning, but this effect is minimized with a conservative smoothing

120 parameterization (Lecoq et al., 2020a). Moreover, to highlight the general temporal pattern of the amplitude of

121 the seismic noise, the displacement RMS time series with four samples per hour were averaged each day between

122 6h and16h, according to the local time (UTC-6). Additionally, for some stations in Costa Rica and Guatemala, the

123 median displacement RMS of each hour was computed, for each day, comparing the result before and during the

124 lockdown. Finally, an analysis of the percentage of change in the HFSAND-RMS was performed to obtain a

125 median amplitude value for the whole period during the major restrictive measures, from March 16 to May 15,

126 2020, and to compare it with the median of the period before lockdown measures from January 15 to March 15,

127 2020.

128 **2.3. Earthquake detection capability and felt reports**

129 For Costa Rica and Guatemala, the effect of the reduction of HFSAND-RMS on earthquake detection was

130 explored during the lockdown period, using the seismic catalogs of the RSN (Costa Rica) and the INSIVUMEH

131 (Guatemala). In both observatories, earthquakes are located automatically by SeisComP3 (Gempa, 2019) and

132 manually using the software SeisAn (Havskov et al. 2020). With this objective, a period before lockdown from

133 November 1, 2019 to March 15, 2020 (4.5 months) was taken as a reference to compare with a proportional period

134 during the confinement measures, from March 16 as of July 31, 2020 (4.5 months).

135

136 Using curves of earthquake magnitude-frequency distribution, we inspected earthquakes with moment magnitude

137 (Mw) $\leq$ 4.0 before and during lockdown, because small events reflect better the variations in the detection

138 capability. Furthermore, we quantified the average number of seismic phases per earthquake as function of the

139 magnitude, obtaining linear regressions for the two data sets. In addition, to explore the increase in the number of

140 earthquakes detected as a function of magnitude, we calculated the Gutenberg-Richter relationship (Gutenberg

141 and Richter, 1944) before and during the lockdown (Figure A2). To calculate these seismic parameters and their

142 uncertainties, we used the classical maximum likelihood technique of Aki (1965) modified by Weichert (1980).

143 To run this methodology, we used the OpenQuake software (GEM, 2020). The magnitude of completeness (Mc)

144 was estimated by the MAXC method, which corresponds to the maximum point in the non-cumulative graph of

145 the Gutenberg-Richter relationship (e.g. Wiemer and Wyss, 2000; Woessner and Wiemer, 2005).

146

147 We have also investigated the effect of lockdown measures on the number of earthquakes felt by the population.

148 For both, Costa Rica and Guatemala, we counted the number of felt earthquakes in different magnitude intervals.

149 In Costa Rica and Guatemala, the population reports via smartphones and social networks. Further, to analyze if

150 there is a correlation between the decrease in HFSAND-RMS and the increase in low-magnitude felt events, and

151   between the low-magnitude felt events and the hour of the day, we explored the spatial context of these events

152   with a map of felt seismicity and its occurrence hour, before and during lockdown.

153

154   Additionally, the RSN maintains an interactive application for smartphones called "RSN", which includes the

155   module *"¿Lo Sentiste?"* (Linkimer and Arroyo, 2020), also available at the RSN website. This app was developed

156   by the RSN based on the questionnaire *"Did you feel it?"* of the United States Geological Service (USGS)

157   (Atkinson and Wald, 2007; Wald et al., 2011), which was translated to Spanish and simplified and adapted to

158   Costa Rica. The users access the app and answer 12 simple questions (Table A2) and obtain a quick estimation of

159   the intensity determined by the community decimal intensity (CDI), which is an aggregate of the average sums of

160   the indexes associated with the questions (Dengler and Dewey, 1998). All the reports are shown in an emoticon

161   map that updates continuously and can be accessed in real time in the app or in the RSN website. Finally, after

162   enough (> ~300) reports and outliers have been manually removed, an average intensity map is generated

163   (Linkimer and Arroyo, 2020). We use this tool to complement the felt earthquakes analysis in Costa Rica,

164   collecting the number of felt earthquakes reported through this app, before and during lockdown, including only

165   the events with at least three reports and with Mw < 5.0. These events were also averaged by magnitude intervals.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Seismic noise and lockdown measures

168   The stronger lockdown measures in Central America started on March 16. In Costa Rica, some of the main

169   restrictions implemented by the governments were the closure of borders, schools, non-essential stores, and

170   beaches, as well as massive public events prohibition (concerts, soccer games, etc.) and home-office

171   implementation. Although in Costa Rica no curfew was imposed on citizens, a strict vehicle mobility restriction

172   has been maintained during the whole pandemic. For Guatemala and El Salvador, the lockdown measures were

173   very similar to those implemented in Costa Rica, but in some cases included restrictions on citizen mobility and

174   curfews. These measures have been softened or hardened as the pandemic evolved in each of these countries

175   (Table A1). Very few lockdown measures were taken in Nicaragua to prevent the spread of Covid-19 and there

176   were no specific measures applied to restrict social mobility.

177

178   An important decrease in the HFSAND-RMS is shown in seismic stations located near the capitals of Costa Rica

179   (University of Costa Rica campus, San José), Guatemala (close to the Aurora International airport, Guatemala

180   City), and El Salvador (close to the Panamerican highway) (Figure A1). This has been observed during the

181   lockdown measures (Table A1 and Figures 2 and 3), except for Nicaragua (urban area, at INETER, Managua).

182

183   Figure 2 shows the time of day on the vertical axis, the period analyzed on the horizontal axis, and the high-

184   frequency displacement RMS in colors, blue for the lowest level and yellow for the maximum. The graph clearly

185   shows the stillness of the night (blue colors between 22h and 5h), the relative quiet of weekends (vertical blue

186   bars that alternate periodically), and the hustle and bustle from day to day (in yellow colors). Figure 3 shows the

187   displacement on the vertical axis and time on the horizontal axis. The orange line represents the median recorded

188   displacement, which usually has its maximum during the hours of the day, when there is more seismic noise, and

189 its minimum during the nights. In addition, Figure 3 also show that the noise level is lower during the weekends.
190 In these figures, we marked the beginning of the social distancing measures on March 16 (red line), the period of
191 the end of the year holidays 2019 (1), Easter 2020 (2), and a brief period in July 2020 when there was a strict
192 return of lockdown measures in Costa Rica (3) (Table A1).

194 In both types of graphs (Figures 2 and 3), for the stations in Costa Rica, Guatemala, and El Salvador, the effect of
195 the social distancing measures can be clearly seen beginning on March 16, as a notable drop in seismic noise
196 (displacement). At the station in Managua, Nicaragua, where no important measures were adopted to limit urban
197 mobility and economic activities, there is no change in the seismic record (Figures 2d and 3d). In Costa Rica,
198 Guatemala, and El Salvador, the seismological stations show that the measures of social distancing produced a
199 decrease in the seismic noise levels similar to those observed in the 2019 New Year holidays.

201 For the TC.SJS1 station in San Jose, Costa Rica (Figure 2a and 3a), the displacement during a typical working
202 day before the lockdown used to be up to 200 nm, while during the social distancing measures, these values
203 decreased to 140 nm on average. In the case of the GI.GCG4 station in Guatemala City (Figure 2b and 3b), the
204 usual displacement before the lockdown was 100 nm on average, and during social distancing measures, these
205 values decreased to 80 nm on average. At the SV.CEDA station, near San Salvador (Figure 2c and 3c), the usual
206 displacement before the lockdown was on average about 120 nm, while these values decreased to 80 nm on
207 average during the lockdown.

209 The lower displacement values, tended to return to their usual averages values as the restrictive measures were
210 progressively eliminated. Even so, the values have not yet returned to the usual pre-pandemic levels by November
211 2020, when the average values were ~ 160 nm for San Jose, ~ 85 nm for Guatemala City, and ~ 110 nm near San
212 Salvador. This shows that some of the social distancing measures were still in place by November 2020 (Table
213 A1) or other factors are affecting the station environment (permanent or long-term activity loss, e.g., company
214 shutdown) (Figures 2 and 3). The place location where the level is closer to the usual averages is at La Libertad
215 near San Salvador. The most drastic effect of the limitation in the mobility of the inhabitants was observed during
216 Easter in April of 2020. The values observed were: ~60 nm in San José and ~50 nm in Guatemala City and near
217 San Salvador.

219 In the case of the NU.MGAN station in Managua, Nicaragua (Figures 2d and 3d), the registered displacement
220 values have remained constant before and during the pandemic, without any variation with respect to the usual
221 displacement records of this station (40 nm). It is a low-noise site compared to the other capitals because it has
222 particular conditions that favor its isolation from the environmental noise.

225 Results for Costa Rican stations TC.BELE, TC.ERIA, and TC.ZEDO are presented in Figure 4a and Guatemalan
226 stations GI.HUEH, GI.RETA, and GI.CHIE in Figure 4b. All these stations also show a decrease in displacement
227 RMS since the application of lockdown measures. However, the reduction, as well as the pattern of the
228 displacement RMS time series is very specific to each station. For Costa Rica (Figure 4a), the largest percentage

difference in the station record is found in the TC.BELE station, located near (~3 km) the country's main airport and in the Great Metropolitan Area (GAM) (Figure 1). This station varied from ~40 nm before lockdown to ~20 nm during the lockdown measures. For Guatemala (Figure 4b), a similar behavior was observed in the GI.RETA station, towards the western part of this country, which is one of the most touristic regions. This station varied from ~100 nm before lockdown to ~50 nm during the lockdown measures.

In addition, the daily variation of the average seismic noise per weekday, before and during the pandemic, was inspected for the station TC.SJS1 in Costa Rica (Figure 5a) and for station GI.RETA in Guatemala (Figure 5b). In both stations, the typical pattern of HFSAND-RMS is also shown, with minimums during weekends and nights, and maximums during the week and day (Figure 5). This is also highlighted during the lockdown, due to the measures adopted by each country (Table A1). Costa Rica, despite not imposing a curfew, established measures of vehicular restriction from 19h to 5h at its most strict stage. This is highlighted in the station TC.SJS1, showing a great decrease in HFSAND-RMS during these hours (Figure 5a). For Guatemala, the station GI.RETA clearly shows the effect of the curfew in its most restrictive stage, imposed from 17h to 5h (Figure 5b).

The percentage of HFSAND-RMS decrease was determined for the 10 stations analyzed here, in the same frequency band (4-14 Hz). Figure 6a shows the change obtained for the stations in Guatemala and El Salvador and Figure 6b shows the percentage obtained for the stations in Nicaragua and Costa Rica. Four categories of seismic noise reduction were identified: very high (36-49%), high (26-35%), intermediate (16-25%), and low (6-15%). The most outstanding seismic noise reduction (very high) due to the lockdown measures were obtained at the GI.RETA and TC.BELE stations. These values are explained by the site characteristics described above, strong sources of noise at stations close to major cities, highways, and high-traffic airports. The stations that show a high decrease were GI.GCG4, SV.CEDA, and TC.SJS1. These changes are closely related to the location of these sites at the populated capital cities of San José and Guatemala City, and to the Panamerican highway near San Salvador (Figure 1). Intermediate decrease values were identified in the stations GI.HUEH, GI.CHIE, and TC.ERIA. In this case, these values are associated with cities with less population density (Figure 1) but significant activity and proximity to touristic airports, such as Liberia city, in northwestern Costa Rica. Finally, low changes were identified in the NU.MGAN and TC.ZEDO stations. In Managua, this is due to the lack of social distancing measures and in the case of Perez Zeledon (Costa Rica), it could be related a lower population density, a station site building more confined, less exposed to population and environment dynamics, or lack of compliance with lockdown measures.

3.2. Possible effects of the lockdown in earthquake detection and felt reports

There were no significant earthquakes in Costa Rica and Guatemala during the time this study was conducted. Before lockdown in Costa Rica, the biggest earthquakes had a Mw of 5.6 on 21-01-2020 and in Guatemala a Mw of 6.2 on 19-11-2019. During lockdown, the largest events were a Mw 5.5 earthquake on 15-04-2020 in Costa Rica and a Mw 5.7 on 26-03-2020 in Guatemala. All these events were offshore earthquakes related to the interplate seismogenic zone. We conclude that the seismic rates during the time periods considered in this work were not affected by any specific large event..In Table A3 we summarize the main observations when comparing

267 the earthquake detections and felt reports from the time before the lockdown and during lockdown for Costa Rica
268 and Guatemala.
269
270 *Costa Rica*
271 Since 2018, the RSN network consists of around 160 sites, qualifying as a robust network with a high capacity for
272 detecting low-magnitude earthquakes (Linkimer et al., 2018). Figure 7 shows the comparison of the number of
273 seismic events recorded by the RSN and the reports of earthquakes felt before and during the lockdown measures.
274
275 Figure 7a shows the number of earthquakes on the vertical axis, and the range of magnitude on the horizontal axis,
276 grouped in intervals of 0.5, from Mw 2.0 to 5.5. The graph shows that there is no increase in the capacity to detect
277 earthquakes during the lockdown measures, and it even seems that more seismicity was detected in the period
278 before lockdown, possibly due to higher seismic productivity in that period. The Mc shows that the impact of the
279 lockdown measures in the detected earthquakes is not significant as Mc varies from 2.9 before to 3.0 during
280 lockdown (Figure A2a and A2b). Also, the a- and b-values obtained were very consistent and similar to recent
281 studies for Costa Rica (i.e., Arroyo and Linkimer, 2021). The a-value decreased slightly during the lockdown from
282 3.62 to 3.56, showing a general decrease in the seismic rate. On the other hand, the increase in the b-value from
283 0.76 to 0.77 could be explained as an increment in the number of low-magnitude earthquakes compared to the
284 number of higher magnitudes. This b-value could support the idea that more low-magnitude earthquakes were
285 detected during the lockdown period (Table A3). However, as it can be seen the variations very small to allow
286 strong conclusion. The observed variations could also be explained due to other contributing factors or even as
287 random coincidence.
288
289 In Figure 7b we show the average number of P-wave phases per earthquake for earthquakes with $M \leq 4.0$.
290 Although the difference in the number of P-wave arrivals before and during the pandemic is not too much (between
291 1 and 5 picks for magnitudes between 1.8 and 4.0), the values are consistently higher (on average ~20%) during
292 the pandemic, especially for the lower magnitudes ($M \leq 3.5$). This additional observation also favors the idea that
293 the decrease in HFSAND-RMS during lockdown may have had an effect on the earthquake detection capability
294 of the RSN (Table A3).
295
296 Figure 7c shows the number of felt earthquakes reported through social networks or telephone calls with respect
297 to a range of Mw from 2.0 to 5.5. This graph shows that there were a greater number of earthquakes with Mw >
298 3.5 reported as felt before the lockdown measures, but during the confinement, a greater number of reports for
299 low magnitude earthquakes (M < 3.5) were collected (Table A3). In addition, based on reports through the RSN
300 application *"¿Lo Sentiste?"*, we present in Figure 7d the average number of reports for M < 5.0 by magnitude
301 intervals. The trend lines in this graph show how the application *"¿Lo Sentiste?"* collected, on average, more felt
302 reports for magnitudes M < 5.0 during the lockdown measures. These figures suggest a greater sensitivity of the
303 population to low-magnitude earthquakes, possibly because the longer stays in their homes and the
304 implementation of home office and restrictions of mobility, allowed them to perceive more events and also to
305 report them to seismic agencies (Table A3).
306

307 Figure 8 shows the geographical distribution of felt events reported by the RSN (Figure 7c) before (1 Nov 2019-
308 15 Mar 2020) and during (16 Mar-31 Jul 2020) lockdown measures in Costa Rica. Even though the number of
309 earthquake reports was higher before (99) than during (74) the lockdown measures, the percentage of low
310 magnitude (M < 3.5) felt earthquakes was clearly higher (46%) during the lockdown than before it (only 27%).
311 These numbers suggest that the quiescence of the environment could be an important contributing factor to more
312 small earthquakes being reported (Table A3). Another aspect is that there were a greater number of higher-
313 magnitude earthquakes (M > 4.5) before the lockdown (20) than during it (11), and these events were located
314 onshore and closer to population centers (Figure 8).
315
316 We also checked the correlation between felt events, before and during lockdown, and the decrease in the
317 HFSAND-RMS of the four seismic stations analyzed in Costa Rica. There seems to exist a correlation in three of
318 them, two located in the metropolitan area of Central Costa Rica (TC.SJS1 and TC.BELE) and the other in an
319 urban area in Southeastern Costa Rica (TC.ZEDO). There were 25 felt earthquakes for Central Costa Rica before
320 the lockdown and 17 of them had a low magnitude (M < 3.5). These numbers are lower than those during
321 lockdown, when there were 36 felt earthquakes, including 28 of low magnitude (Figure 8). For Southeastern Costa
322 Rica, near the Perez Zeledon urban area (TC ZEDO), just five felt earthquakes were reported before the lockdown,
323 all of them with M > 3.5, but during lockdown seven events were reported as felt, four of them of low magnitude
324 (Figure 8 and Table A3). Then, again, these observations suggest an increase in felt reports from small earthquakes
325 in these regions as well. These felt events, as expected, were more perceived during the night hours, from 18h to
326 6h (Figure 8).
327
328 *Guatemala*
329 The INSIVUMEH seismic network is still under development. This network consists of 24 seismic stations, most
330 of them Guralp broadband sensors, some installed inside the main military detachments or national airports, while
331 others are installed in the main tourist cities of the country. For this reason, these stations can reach high levels of
332 seismic noise, which is why detecting low-magnitude earthquakes under pre-pandemic conditions were
333 challenging.
334
335 In Figure 9a, we present a comparison between the statistics before and during the lockdown measures. Similar
336 than Costa Rica, for Guatemala this graph shows that a higher number of events was recorded during the lockdown
337 measures (Table A3). However, the analysis of other seismic parameters are not conclusive: Mc varies only
338 slightly from 3,7 7o 3,8 from before to during the lockdown, which does not imply a significant increase in
339 earthquake detection (Figure A2c and A2d). But the a- and b-values seem to suggest an increment in low
340 magnitude earthquake, changing from 4.43 to 4.63 for the a value and from 0.87 to 0.91 for the value, for the
341 periods of before and during the lockdown.
342
343 In Guatemala, the average number of seismic phases per event of the same magnitude increases clearly for
344 magnitudes lower than 3.0 during the lockdown (on average ~40%) (Figure 9b). Then, the possible effect of the
345 lower levels in seismic noise for detecting more low-magnitude earthquakes could be stronger in Guatemala than
346 in Costa Rica (Table A3). This may be related to the much lower seismic station density of Guatemala.

347 Furthermore, it should be noted that the lockdown measures implemented by the Guatemalan government were
348 more drastic than in Costa Rica. Moreover, the number of felt events reported by the population shows again the
349 interesting trend of a general increase during the lockdown period, but in the case of Guatemala this is visible for
350 M ≥ 3.5 (Figure 9c and Table A3).

352 Figure 10 shows the distribution of the felt earthquakes reported to INSIVUMEH (Figure 9c) before and during
353 the lockdown. Before the lockdown, a total of 34 seismic felt events were reported, while during lockdown that
354 number increased to 47. The earthquake magnitudes were higher before lockdown (Figure 10a) with 21
355 earthquakes above M 4.5 (62% of the total felt events in this period) than during lockdown, with 19 earthquakes
356 above M 4.5 (40% of the total felt events in this period). Hence, during the lockdown there were more felt
357 earthquakes of lower magnitude (M < 4.5), including three earthquakes below M 3.5, in contrast to just one before
358 the lockdown. Once more, this trend suggests a correlation between the quiescence of the environment and and
359 increment in low magnitude felt events during the lockdown (Figure 10 and (Table A3). These felt events, as
360 expected, were more perceived during the night hours, from 18h to 6h (Figure 10).

362 Finally, from the spatial distribution of felt earthquakes during lockdown, we observed that, unlike the time before
363 the pandemic, there are more events originated onshore and mainly close to the populated places, such as
364 Guatemala City and Huehuetenango. These are epicentral locations near two of the seismic stations for which the
365 decrease in the HFSAND-RMS was observed: GI.GCG4 and GI.HUEH, respectively. In a seismic network under
366 development like the INSIVUMEH, with fewer stations, a high percentage of the low-magnitude seismicity is
367 likely not detected due to ambient noise, but the observations provided above seems to support the idea that the
368 lockdown measures cause an improvement in the detection capacity of this network.

369 **4. Conclusions**
370 An important decrease in the high-frequency seismic noise was detected at stations of three Central American
371 countries during the lockdown measures adopted to prevent the spread of Covid-19. In Costa Rica, Guatemala,
372 and El Salvador, the measures of social distancing produced seismic noise levels comparable to those observed
373 during the New Year holidays from previous years. The displacement observed decreased from 200 to 140 nm in
374 San Jose, from 100 to 80 nm in Guatemala City, and from 120 to 80 nm in the city of La Libertad near San
375 Salvador. In Nicaragua, with very few measures in place, there were no effects on the seismic noise levels of the
376 station analyzed, which also happens to be a quiet site (40 nm).

378 The decrease in the high-frequency seismic anthropogenic noise displacement is strongly dependent on the
379 location of the station and on the lockdown measures. Four categories of seismic noise reduction were identified
380 (very high, high, intermediate, and low), with significant values of ~50% decrease were observed in stations near
381 airports, busy roads, and densely populated cities. The greatest impact in the noise levels started on March 16 and
382 was specially related to the closure of educational centers and non-essential stores, the curfew from 17h to 5h in
383 Guatemala, and the restriction on vehicular mobility from 19h to 5h in Costa Rica. The most drastic effect of the
384 limitation in the mobility of the inhabitants was observed during Easter in April of 2020, when the values observed
385 were as low as ~60 nm in San José and ~50 nm in Guatemala City and near San Salvador.

387 We suggest that in Costa Rica, the lower levels in seismic noise allowed the detection of a higher number of

388 seismic phases (~20% more per magnitude) and therefore, the location of more small earthquakes than usual, as

389 well as more low magnitude earthquakes (M < 3.5) reported as felt. Similarly, in Guatemala, where the seismic

390 network is still under development, we suggest a similar effect with an increase of ~40% in the amount of the

391 phase picking for low magnitude events and, the detection of a higher number of low magnitude earthquakes (<

392 2.5) than before the lockdown. In addition, there were more felt reports during lockdown in both countries, mainly

393 in the urban areas of Central and Southeastern Costa Rica, and in Guatemala City and Huehuetenango. Although

394 we present some evidences to link the reduction in seismic noise and the increase in earthquake detections and

395 felt reports, the variations in the magnitude of completeness and the a- and b- values are not significant enough

396 before and during the lockdown to confirm that connection or to discriminate other possible contributing factors.

398 Finally, we suggest that there could be a connection between the lockdown measures and the number of felt reports

399 for smaller earthquakes (M < 3.5) in Costa Rica and Guatemala. This possible effect may have been induced by a

400 more quiescence environment, more people with home office measures and longer time at homes, which might

401 have stimulated a higher sensitivity in the population to feel low magnitude earthquakes and to report them to the

402 seismic agencies. This work demonstrates that seismic networks can monitor population mobility and

403 consequently can be used to verify the compliance of lockdown measures and to explore the consequences of

404 reducing seismic noise in earthquake detection and felt reports.

Code availability

408 All the codes used to analyze the seismic data are available in Lecocq et al. (2020b).

Data availability

411 The data is available by FDSN web services for INSIVUMEH and RSN-UCR seismic networks.

Author contributions
414 MA designed the study and wrote the paper with contributions from all co-authors. MA and DC processed the
415 seismic data and made figures. All the authors interpreted and analyzed the results and revised the article.

Competing interests

418 There are no competing interests.

Acknowledgments

421 This work was partially supported by the University of Costa Rica (UCR) projects 113-B5-704 "Vigilancia

422 sísmica de Costa Rica" and 113-B9-911 "Programa de Investigación Red Sismológica Nacional". Financial

423 support at the RSN for seismic instrumentation has been mainly provided by the UCR and the Law Number 8488

424 of the Republic of Costa Rica. Financial support at the INSIVUMEH for seismic instrumentation has been mainly

425 provided by the government of Guatemala. We thank Dr. Koen Van Noten (Topical Editor), Dr. Valerio de Rubeis

426 and Dr. Alan Kafka (referees), for their comments and suggestions to improve the manuscript. Also, special thanks

to all the personnel of all Central American seismic networks for maintaining the seismic instruments, locating

systems, and computer programs in operation, most of the time under very difficult conditions.

References

Adamek, S., Frohlich, C., and Pennington, W.: Seismicity of the Caribbean-Nazca Boundary: Constraints on Microplate Tectonics of the Panama Region. J. Geophys. Res., 93, 2053-2075, https://doi:10.1029/JB093iB03p02053, 1998.

Aki, K.: Maximum likelihood estimated of b in the formula log N = A – b*M and its confidence limits. Rev. Earthquakes Res. Inst, Tokyo Univ, 43, 237-239, 1965.

Alonso-Henar, J., Montero, W., Martínez-Díaz, J., Álvarez-Gómez, J., Insua-Arévalo, J., and Rojas, W.: The Aguacaliente Fault, source of the Cartago 1910 destructive earthquake (Costa Rica). Terra Nova. 25(5), 368-373. doi: 10.1111/ter.12045, 2013.

Alvarado, G., Benito, B., Staller, A., Climent, Á., Camacho, E., Rojas, W., and Lindholm, C.: The new Central American seismic hazard zonation: Mutual consensus based on up to day seismotectonic framework. Tectonophysics, 721 462–476, https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2017.10.013, 2017.

Arroyo-Solórzano, M., and Linkimer, L.: Spatial variability of the b-value and seismic potential in Costa Rica. Tectonophysics, 814 (2021) 228951, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2021.228951, 2021.

Ashenden, C., Lindsay, J., Sherburn, S., Smith, I., Miller, C., and Malin, P.: Some challenges of monitoring a potentially active volcanic field in a large urban area: Auckland volcanic field, New Zealand. Nat. Hazards, 59, 507–528. https://doi:10.1007/s11069-011-9773-0, 2011.

Atkinson, G. and Wald, D.: "Did You Feel It?" intensity data: A surprisingly good measure of earthquake ground motion. Seismological Research Letters, 78(3), 362-368, 2007.

Blackman, R., Tukey, J., and Tukey, W.: The measurement of power spectra from the point of view of communications engineering—Part I. Bell Syst. Tech. J., 37, 185–282, https://doi:10.1002/j.1538-7305.1958.tb03874.x, 1958.

Dengler, L. A. and Dewey, J. W.: An Intensity Survey of Households Affected by the Northridge, California, Earthquake of 17 January 1994. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 88, 441-462, 1998.

Díaz, J., Ruiz, M., Sánchez-Pastor, P. S., and Romero, P.: Urban Seismology: On the origin of earth vibrations within a city. Sci. Rep, 7, 1–11, 2017.

Espinosa, A.F.: The Guatemalan Earthquake of February 4, 1976. US Geol. Surv. Prof. Pap. 1002, 90, 1976.

GEM.: The OpenQuake-engine User Manual, Global Earthquake Model (GEM) OpenQuake Manual for Engine version 3.9.0, doi: 10.13117/GEM.OPENQUAKE.MAN.ENGINE.3.9.0, 183 pages, 2020.

Gempa: SeisComp 3 Real time data acquisition and processing [software computacional]. https://www.seiscomp.de/doc/index.html, last access : 20 Dicembre 2020, 2019.

Green, D. N., and Bowers, D.: Seismic raves: Tremor observations from an electronic dance music festival. Seismological Research Letters, https://doi: 10.1785 / gssrl.79.4.546 Page 15/22, 2008.

476

477 Green, D., Bastow, I., Dashwood, B., and Nippress, S.: Characterizing Broadband Seismic Noise in Central
478 London. Seismological Research Letters, 88, 113–124, https://doi:10.1785/0220160128, 2017.

479

480 Groos, J. C., and Ritter, J. R. R.: Time domain classification and quantification of seismic noise in an urban
481 environment. Geophys. J., https://doi: 10.1111 / j.1365-246X.2009.04343.x, 2009.

482

483 Gutenberg, B., and Richter, C: Frequency of earthquakes in California. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of
484 America, 34, 185-188, 1944.

485

486 Harlow, D.H., White, R.A., Rymer, M.J., and Alvarez, S.: The San Salvador earthquake of 10 October 1986 and
487 its historical context. Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am. 83 (4), 1143–1154, 1993.

488

489 Havskov, J., Voss, P. H., and Ottemöller, L.: Seismological observatory software: 30 Yr of SEISAN.
490 Seismological Research Letters, 91(3), 1846-1852, https://doi.org/10.1785/0220190313, 2018.

491

492 Hong, T.-K., Lee, J., Lee, G., Lee, J., and Park, S.: Correlation between Ambient Seismic Noises and Economic
493 Growth. Seismological Research Letters, 91, 2343–2354, https://doi: 10.1785 / 0220190369, 2020.

494

495 Información de la Red Sismológica Nacional de Costa Rica (RSN-UCR): Universidad de Costa Rica,
496 https://doi.org/10.15517/TC, 2017.

497 Instituto Nacional De Sismologia, Vulcanologia, Meteorologia e Hidrología de Guatemala (INSIVUMEH): Red
498 Sismológica Nacional [Data set]. International Federation of Digital Seismograph Networks.
499 https://doi.org/10.7914/SN/GI, 2013.

500 Instituto Nicaragüense De Estudios Territoriales (INETER): Nicaraguan Seismic Network. Instituto Nicaragüense
501 de Estudios Territoriales (INETER), https://doi.org/10.7914/SN/NU, 1975.

502

503 Kellogg, J.N. and Vega, V.: Tectonic development of Panama, Costa Rica and the Colombian Andes: constraints
504 from global positioning geodetic systems and gravity. In: Mann, P. (Ed.), Geologic and Tectonic Development of
505 the Caribbean Plate Boundary in Southern Central America, pp. 75–90 (GSA Special Paper, 295), 1995

506

507 Kuzma, H. A.: Vehicle traffic as a source for near-surface passive seismic imaging. Symposium on the Application
508 of Geophysics to Engineering and Environmental Problems, 2009 609–615, https://doi.org/10.4133/1.3176748,
509 2009.

510

511 Lecocq, T. et al.: Global quieting of high-frequency seismic noise due to COVID-19 pandemic lockdown
512 measures. Science, http://science.sciencemag.org/content/early/2020/07/22/science.abd2438, 2020a.

513

514 Lecocq, T., Massin, F., Satriano, C., Vanstone, M., and Megies, T.: Seismo RMS - A simple Python/Jupyter
515 Notebook package for studying seismic noise changes. https://zenodo.org/record/3820046#.YBaXbS3pM1K,
516 2020b.

517 Linkimer, L., Arroyo, I. G., Alvarado, G. E., Arroyo, M., and Bakkar, H.: The National Seismological Network
518 of Costa Rica (RSN): An Overview and Recent Developments. Seismological Research Letters, 89 (2A), 392-
519 398, https://doi.org/10.1785/0220170166, 2018.

520 Linkimer, L and Arroyo, I.: Ciencia ciudadana y herramientas de comunicación en la Red Sismológica Nacional
521 de la Universidad de Costa Rica. Revista Comunicación, 29 (2), 5-21, ISSN: 0379-3974 / e-ISSN1659-3820,
522 2020.

523 Mann, P., Schubert, C. and Burke, K.: Review of Caribbean neotectonics. In: Dengo, G., Case, J.E. (Eds.), The
524 Caribbean Region. The Geology of North America. Geol. Soc. Amer, Boulder, Colorado, pp. 307–338, 1990.

525 McNamara, D., and Buland, R.: Ambient Noise Levels in the Continental United States. Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.,
526 94, 1517–1527, https://doi:10.1785/012003001, 2004.
527
528 Nimiya, H., Ikeda, T., and Tsuji, T.: Temporal changes in anthropogenic seismic noise levels associated with
529 economic and leisure activities during the COVID-19 pandemic. Research Square,
530 https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-77786/v1, 2020.
531
532 Piccinini, D., Giunchi, C., and Olivieri, M.: COVID-19 lockdown and its latency in Northern Italy: seismic
533 evidence and socio-economic interpretation. Sci Rep 10, 16487, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-73102-3,
534 2020.
535
536 Poli, P., Boaga, J., Molinari, I., Cascone, V., and Boschi, L.: The 2020 coronavirus lockdown and seismic
537 monitoring of anthropic activities in Northern Italy. Sci Rep 10, 9404, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-66368-
538 0, 2020.
539
540 Riahi, N., and Gerstoft, P.: The seismic trafic footprint: Tracking trains, aircraft, and cars seismically. Geophys.
541 Res. Lett., https://doi: 10.1002 / 2015GL063558, 2015.
542
543 Servicio Nacional de Estudios Territoriales (SNET), El Salvador (SNET-BB).: International Federation of Digital
544 Seismograph Networks, https://www.fdsn.org/networks/detail/SV/, 2004.
545
546 Sistema de Integración Centroamericana (SICA) (2020). Observatorio Regional SICA-COVID 19.
547 https://www.sica.int/coronavirus/observatorioSICACOVID19/medidas/Costarica, last access: December 20,
548 2020.
549
550 Sohrabi, C., Alsafi, Z., O'Neill, N., Khan, M., Kerwan, A., Al-Jabir, A., Iosifidis, C., Agha, R.: World Health
551 Organization declares global emergency: A review of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19). Int. J. Surg.,
552 76:71-76, https://doi: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2020.02.034, 2020.
553
554 Somala, S. N.: Seismic noise changes during COVID-19 pandemic: a case study of Shillong, India. Nat. Hazards,
555 103, 1623–1628, https://doi.org/10.1007/s1106 9-020-04045-1, 2020.
556
557 Trenkamp, R., Kellogg, J.N., Freymeuller, J.T. and Mora, H.P.: Wide plate margin deformation, southern Central
558 America and northwestern South America, CASA GPS observations. J. S. Am. Earth Sci. 15, 157–171, 2002.
559
560 Vargas, C.A. and Mann, P.: Tearing and breaking off of subducted slabs as the result of collision of the Panama
561 arc-indenter with northwestern South America. Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am. 103 (3), 2025–2046, 2013.
562
563 Wald, D.J., Quitoriano, V., Worden, C.B., Hopper, M. and Dewey, J. W.: USGS "Did You Feel It?" Internet-
564 based Macroseismic Intensity Maps. Annals of Geophysics. 54 (6), 688-707, doi: 10.4401/ag-5354, 2011.
565
566 Weichert, D.: Estimation of the Earthquake Recurrence Parameters for Unequal Observation Periods for Different
567 Magnitudes. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 70.4, 1337 – 1346, 1980.
568
569 Welch, P.: The use of fast Fourier transform for the estimation of power spectra: A method based on time
570 averaging over short, modified periodograms. IEEE Trans. Audio Electroacoust, 15, 70–73,
571 https://doi:10.1109/TAU.1967.1161901, 1967.
572

573   Wiemer, S., and Wyss, M.: Minimum Magnitude of Completeness in Earthquake Catalogs: Examples from
574   Alaska, the Western United States, and Japan. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 90 (4), 859–869,
575   2000.

576

577   Woessner, J., and Wiemer, S.: Assessing the Quality of Earthquake Catalogues: Estimating the Magnitude of
578   Completeness and Its Uncertainty. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 95 (2), 684–698, 2005.

579

Figures

Figure 1. Map of Central American and location of the selected seismic stations from Costa Rica, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua, used in this work. The map shows the approximate location of the North Panama Deformed Belt (NPDB) and the Polochic-Motagua Fault (PMF). Darker red tones indicate areas with higher population density. The numbered stars represent the historic deadliest earthquakes mentioned in the text: 1) 1910 M 6.4 Cartago, Costa Rica, 2) 1972 M 6.3 Managua, Nicaragua, 3) 1976 M 7.5 Guatemala, and 4) 1986 M 7.5 San Salvador, El Salvador. © ESRI and its data partners (ArcGis Services).

590

591
592
593 **Figure 2.** High-frequency seismic anthropogenic noise displacement (HFSAND-RMS) evolution near capitals of
594 the countries studied in an hourly grid representation. a) TC.SJS1 station in San Jose, Costa Rica. b) GI.GCG4
595 station in Guatemala City, Guatemala. c) SV.CEDA station, near San Salvador in the city of La Libertad. d)
596 NU.MGAN station in Managua, Nicaragua. Gaps correspond to periods for which seismic data were unavailable
597 and the vertical red lines indicate the time when the first lockdown measures started in Central America. The
598 numbers 1, 2, and 3 show the New Year holidays of 2019, Easter of 2020, and a brief period in July 2020 when a
599 strict return of lockdown measures was implemented in Costa Rica, respectively.
600

601
602

Figure 3. High-frequency seismic anthropogenic noise displacement (HFSAND-RMS) evolution at the seismic stations near capitals of the countries studied. a) TC.SJS1 station in San Jose, Costa Rica. b) GI.GCG4 station in Guatemala City, Guatemala. c) SV.CEDA station, near San Salvador in the city of La Libertad. d) NU.MGAN station in Managua, Nicaragua. The blue line corresponds to the RMS amplitude time series of the vertical component, filtered between 4 and 14 Hz, and the orange line corresponds to median day-time, between the 6 and 16 hours of local time. Gaps correspond to periods for which seismic data were unavailable and the vertical red lines indicate the time when the first lockdown measures started in Central America. The numbers 1, 2, and 3, show the New Year holidays of 2019, Easter of 2020, and a brief period in July 2020 when a strict return of lockdown measures was implemented in Costa Rica, respectively.

612

613
614
615 **Figure 4.** High-frequency seismic anthropogenic noise displacement (HFSAND-RMS) evolution for specific sites
616 in Costa Rica and Guatemala in an hourly grid representation. a) TC.BELE (central Costa Rica, near Juan
617 Santamaria international airport), TC.ERIA (northern Costa Rica, urban area), and TC.ZEDO (southern Costa
618 Rica, urban area). b) GI.HUEH (northwest of Guatemala, urban area), GI.RETA (southwest of Guatemala, urban
619 area), and GI.CHIE (east of Guatemala, urban area). The gaps correspond to the time periods for which seismic
620 data were unavailable and the vertical red lines indicate the time when the first lockdown measures started in
621 Central America. The numbers 1 and 2 show the New Year holidays of 2019 and Easter of 2020, respectively.
622

623

624
625
626 **Figure 5.** Daily variation of the median seismic noise per weekday, before and during the lockdown (LD). a)
627 TC.SJS1 station in San Jose, Costa Rica. b) GI.RETA station in Retalhuleu, southwest of Guatemala.
628

629
630 **Figure 6.** Percent of change of the high-frequency seismic anthropogenic noise displacement (HFSAND-RMS)
631 in the band 4-14Hz during the period from January 15 to March 15, 2020 (before lockdown measures) with respect
632 to the time interval from March 16 to May 15, 2020 (after the lockdown measures were applied). a) Percent of
633 change in seismic stations of Guatemala and El Salvador. b) Percent of change in seismic stations of Nicaragua
634 and Costa Rica. © OpenStreetMap contributors 2020. Distributed under the Open Data Commons Open Database
635 License (ODbL) v1.0.

636

637
638
639 **Figure 7.** Event detection and felt earthquakes reported in Costa Rica before (1 Nov 2019-15 Mar 2020) and
640 during (16 Mar-31 Jul 2020) lockdown (LD) measures. a) Number of detected earthquakes. b) Earthquake
641 magnitude versus the average number of P-wave picks per Mw for the events with Mw < 4.0, and the
642 corresponding linear fits. The inset graph shows the average difference in the number of picks for magnitude bins
643 for the time periods before (BL) and during (DL) the lockdown. c) Number of felt earthquakes in Costa Rica. d)
644 Magnitude versus the number of reports from the population through the RSN application for smartphones *"¿Lo
645 Sentiste?"* for events with Mw < 5.0, and the corresponding linear fits.

Figure 8. Map of felt earthquakes reported in Costa Rica. a) Before lockdown measures (1 Nov 2019-15 Mar 2020). b) During lockdown measures (16 Mar-31 Jul 2020).

649
650 **Figure 9.** Event detection and felt earthquakes reported in Guatemala before (1 Nov 2019-15 Mar 2020) and
651 during (16 Mar-31 Jul 2020) lockdown (LD) measures. a) Number of detected earthquakes. b) Earthquakes
652 magnitude versus the average number of P-wave picks per Mw for the events with Mw < 4.0, and the
653 corresponding linear fits. The inset graph shows the average difference in the number of picks for magnitude bins
654 for the periods before (BL) and during (DL) lockdown. c) Number of felt earthquakes in Guatemala.

Figure 10. Map of felt earthquakes reported in Guatemala. a) Before lockdown measures (1 Nov 2019-15 Mar 2020). b) During lockdown measures (16 Mar-31 Jul 2020).

Appendix: additional figures and tables

Figure A1. Images from Open Street Maps of the site areas where the seismic stations (orange triangles) used are located. © OpenStreetMap contributors 2020. Distributed under the Open Data Commons Open Database License (ODbL) v1.0.

664
665
666 **Figure A2.** Magnitude-frequency distribution for earthquakes. a) Costa Rica before lockdown. b) Costa Rica
667 during lockdown. c) Guatemala before lockdown. d) Guatemala during lockdown. Green bars represent the
668 incremental (non-cumulative) number of earthquakes and yellow circles the cumulative distribution of events.
669 The grey solid line fits the data points for the cumulative distribution above the magnitude of completeness (Mc).
670 Vertical lines indicate the Mc estimated from the maximum curvature (MAXC) method.
671

Table A1. Main mobility lockdown measures between March and October 2020, in Costa Rica, Guatemala, and El Salvador during the Covid-19 pandemic according with the "Sistema de Integracion Centroamericana" (SICA), (2020). Nicaragua did not establish lockdown measures for social mobility. On March 18 the first positive case of Covid-19 was found in Nicaragua.

Month	Costa Rica	Guatemala	El Salvador
March 2020	**Day 6**, the first positive case for Covid-19 is detected. **Day 9**, the National Emergency Commission (CNE) and the Ministry of Health declare a yellow health alert. **Day 12**, closure of schools at risk; 50% reduction in capacity in meeting spaces; suspension of trips abroad for public employees. **Day 16**, a state of national emergency is declared. **Day 17**, closure of public and private educational centers, closure of non-essential stores, prohibition of mass events and total closure of beaches throughout the country. **Day 24,** vehicle mobility restriction from 22h to 5h.	**Day 6**, red alert is extended to the entire country after the first positive case for Covid-19 is detected **Day 16**, classes are suspended and the borders with El Salvador are closed. **Day 17** interruption of work activities in the public and private sectors, suspension of public transport, prohibition of meetings of any kind, religious and sport activities, closing of shopping centers. The total closure of air and land borders is implemented.	**Day 11**, interruption of educational activities **Day 16**, discontinuation of public and sport shows, closing of bars and gyms and non-essential shops. **Day 17**, El Salvador International Airport closes operations. **Day 18**, first positive case for Covid-19 detected. **Day 22**, mandatory 30-day quarantine and ban on crowds.
April 2020	**Day 1**, during Easter the daytime vehicle restriction was in place from 5h-17h. Vehicular traffic was allowed only one day per week according to the license plate number to make essential purchases. **Day 11**, a nighttime vehicle restriction is established 19h-5h until May 15.	**Day 1**, Greater air monitoring at Borders. **Day 9**, break in school lessons for the whole month.	**Day 3**, no circulation on beaches, rivers, lakes, spas, or tourist centers in the country. **Day 13**, entire population to be kept in compulsory home security with some exceptions, extended until April 28.
May 2020	**Day 1**, all public spaces and shops work at 50%; gradual reactivation of work centers from 5h to 19h. **Day 16**, vehicle restriction is maintained from 5h to 19h. Opening of hotels with a capacity of 50%. Opening of some national parks (50%). Beaches are open Monday-Friday from 5h to 8h.	**Day 4,** opening of shopping malls with few stores. Activities and public transport, as well as classes are suspended. Curfew from 18h to 4h. Prohibition of transit between territorial departments. **Day 14**, markets can open Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday from 6h to 13h, as well as supermarkets and convenience stores, from 9h to 16h. Closure of the country under restriction of total mobilization. **Day 25**, curfew 17h-5h with vehicle restriction between territorial departments. Total closure of the country.	**Day 7**, restriction of mobility between municipalities, people can circulate according to their occupation. **Day 10**, public transport may only circulate to mobilize duly identified health personnel.

June 2020	**Day 1**, tourist transport is enabled with restrictions and special measures. Operation of gyms, restaurants, and museums with a capacity of 50% **Day 20**, access to beaches from 5h-9:30h **Day 26**, mandatory use of masks is established.	**Day 15**, mobilization according to the last digit of the car plate in the territorial departments.	**Day 16**, restriction of mobility according to the last number of the identity document.
July 2020	**Day 3**, public parks, bars and massive events closed. **Day 11**, vehicle restriction for the whole country from 5h to17h according to license plate number. **Day 14**, increase in the capacity in public transport from 20% to 50% in routes shorter than 75 km. **Day 20**, vehicle restriction from 17h-5h according to license plates, but only in areas of orange alert.	**Day 13**, curfew is established from Monday to Friday from 18h to 5h and Saturdays from 14h to 5h. **Day 26**, vehicle restriction by license plate is eliminated and the curfew is modified from 21h to 4h.	**Day 6**, high restrictions are extended for 15 days, due to the increase in infections and deaths from Covid-19. **Day 29**, beginning of a new phase of economic reopening.
August 2020	**Day 1**, opening of commercial flights with limited routes from Europe. **Day 31**, Costa Ricans who return to the country may not quarantine. New vehicle restriction for weekdays 5h-22h and weekends 5h-20h.	**Day 24**, religious activities are reestablished with a maximum of one hour and a limit of attendees. **Day 26**, reopening of the La Aurora Zoo.	**Day 9**, personal clusters are established with groups not exceeding ten people. **Day 24**, beginning of the "Transitory Phase" in the process of the gradual reactivation of the economy.
September 2020	**Day 9**, temporary suspension of activities that involve massive movements of people. Controlled opening of economic activities.	**Day 6**, public servants work hours from 7h to 15h. **Day 18**, international airport reopens. Entry to the country conditioned to a negative PCR test. **Day 28**, vehicle restriction from 9h to 16h. Prohibition of alcohol sale between 19h and 5h.	**Day 1**, start of a new phase of economic reopening which includes public transportation and and most of economic activities.
October 2020	**Day 1,** opening of borders for travelers from California and Ohio and Mexico and Jamaica. **Day 15,** opening of flights from Central America. **Day 26,** foreign travelers are not required to present a negative Covid-test. **Day 27,** permission to use outdoor spaces for recreation.	**Day 1**, reopening of higher education centers and technical training centers. **Day 7**, hotel and tourism workers are allowed to hold events with restricted capacity.	**Day 3**, cultural spaces re-open. Opening of stadiums and public shows with social distancing (two meters) and beach trips at restricted hours. Opening of museums, cinemas, and hotels with capacity reduced to 50%. The public sector in general returns to work.

677
678

679 **Table A2.** Questions on the RSN module *"¿Lo Sentiste?"* (Linkimer and Arroyo, 2020).

680

Number	Question
1	Did you feel it?
2	What were you doing?
3	Where were you?
4	Did others nearby feel it?
5	How would you describe the shaking?
6	How did you react?
7	Was it difficult to stand and/or walk?
8	Did light objects move or fall from the shelves?
9	Did pictures on walls move or get knocked askew?
10	Did the furniture fall, overturn or fall?
11	Was there any damage to the buildings?
12	Additional comments on effects in nature, such as landslides, cracks in the ground, among others?

681
682
683
684 **Table A3**. Summary of observations when comparing the earthquake detections and felt reports from the time
685 before the lockdown (BL) and during lockdown (DL) for Costa Rica and Guatemala (see also Figures 7, 8, 9, 10
686 and A2). The observations that favor an increase in lower magnitude earthquakes (LM) are marked.
687

Observations	Costa Rica		Guatemala	
	M ≤ 3.5	M > 3.5	M ≤ 3.5	M > 3.5
Number of detected earthquakes	Slightly decrease	No change	Slightly increase (LM)	Increase
Number of picked phases	~20% increase (LM)	Slightly increase	~40% increase (LM)	No change
Number of Felt earthquakes	Increase (LM)	Decrease	No change	Increase
Number of felt earthquakes reports	No change	Increase	-----	
Mc	Slightly increase		Slightly increase	
a-value	Slightly decrease		Increase (LM)	
b-value	Slightly increase (LM)		Slightly increase (LM)	

688