Adult vaccination in Brazil: a cross-sectional survey on physicians' prescription habits

Authors: Fernando B Serra [1]; Diogo Ribeiro[2]; Paula M Batista[1]; Thais N F Moreira[1]

Affiliations: [1]MSD Brazil, São Paulo, Brazil; [2] CTI Clinical Trial & Consulting Services, Lisboa, Portugal

Corresponding author:

Thais das Neves Fraga Moreira

MSD Brazil

Avenida Chucri Zaidan, 296

Vila Cordeiro – São Paulo/SP – Brazil - ZIP CODE : 04583-110

Phone: +55 11 51897204

Email: thais.moreira@merck.com

Authors' emails and phone numbers:

Fernando B Serra – fernando.brandao.serra@merck.com; (55)11 5189 7584

Diogo Ribeiro – dribeiro@ctifacts.com; (351) 21 382 54 40

Paula M Batista – paula.de.mendonca.batista@merck.com; (55) 11 5189 7679

Thais N F Moreira – thais.moreira@merck.com; (55) 11 5189 7204

Title in Portuguese: Vacinação de adultos no Brasil: uma pesquisa transversal sobre os hábitos de prescrição dos médicos

Short Title: Adult vaccination in Brazil

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVE

To characterize adult and older adult vaccination practices of physicians from various medical specialties in Brazil, identify the barriers influencing prescription of vaccines to these populations, and evaluate the physicians' knowledge on routinely prescribed vaccines.

METHODS

Cross-sectional survey conducted in Brazil between June-August 2018. Eligible physicians included those from general practice/family medicine, geriatrics, cardiology, gynecology, endocrinology, infectious disease and pulmonology. The survey's questions addressed the physicians' prescription habits, sociodemographic and clinical practice characteristics, barriers to vaccines' prescription to adult and older adult patients, and physicians' knowledge regarding routinely prescribed vaccines. The study focused on the vaccines recommended by the Brazilian Society of Immunization (SBIm) for adults and older adults. Study sample was stratified according to the number of physicians per specialty and Brazilian region.

RESULTS

A total of 1068 surveys were completed. The vaccines prescribed by the highest proportions of physicians were Influenza (>90% of physicians for adults and older adults), Hepatitis B (adults: 87%; older adults: 59%) and Yellow Fever (adults: 77.7%; older adults: 58.5%). Underprescription was reported by less than 20% of prescribing physicians for all adult and older adult recommended vaccines. The most common barriers to vaccination were the high vaccine cost, lack of time during appointments and lack of patient interest. Knowledge on target populations, dosage

schedule and availability in the Unified Public Health System (SUS) was generally low.

CONCLUSIONS

The results showed a considerable variability of prescribing habits across recommended vaccines and medical specialties. Although most prescribing physicians seem to be aware of the importance of adult and older adults vaccination, knowledge deficits on vaccines' target populations, dosage schedule and availability in the SUS may hamper their ability to prescribe vaccines to all patients with an indication.

Keywords: Prescription habits, Vaccine knowledge, Adults, Older adults

INTRODUCTION

Vaccines are recommended throughout a person's lifetime to avert vaccine-preventable diseases and their complications[1]. Although effective, safe and accessible vaccines are currently available, studies have reported that adult vaccination coverage rate is still at a suboptimal level in various countries[2, 3], including Brazil[4]. The low vaccination coverage rate leads to a considerable economic impact as a result of adult vaccine-preventable diseases[5].

Several factors have been deemed responsible for the low vaccination rates observed in the adult population. These include the limited public awareness and misinformation regarding adult recommended vaccines, gaps in incorporation of routine vaccine needs assessment during healthcare visits, and cost of vaccines[1].

The physicians' recommendations are the leading factor influencing the patients' adherence to adult and older adult vaccination[6, 7]. The patients consider them a reliable source of information and those receiving a recommendation from their physician are more likely to be vaccinated[1, 8]. Thus, physicians are of the utmost importance for increasing vaccination coverage rates[9].

In Brazil, the Brazilian Society of Immunization (SBIm) annually issues immunization schedules for different age groups, including adults (20-59 years)[10] and older adults (≥60 years)[11]. The SBIm also issues immunization schedules for special populations, providing recommendations for groups at increased risk for vaccine-preventable diseases[12].

Studies on physicians' behavior toward adult vaccination are lacking and, to the best of our knowledge, no studies evaluating the prescription habits of physicians in terms of adult and older adult vaccination in Brazil have been published. A comprehensive

characterization of physicians' habits and barriers to prescription could prove valuable to develop and establish strategies to increase vaccination coverage among these populations.

This study aimed primarily at characterizing the vaccination practices of physicians from various medical specialties in Brazil, including general practice (GP)/family medicine (FM), geriatrics, cardiology, gynecology, endocrinology, infectious disease and pulmonology. The study also intended to identify the barriers influencing the prescription of adult and older adult recommended vaccines and to evaluate the physicians' knowledge regarding routinely prescribed vaccines.

METHODS

This was a national, cross-sectional study conducted between June and August 2018 in Brazil. Study data were collected through an online survey self-completed by eligible physicians. The survey's questions addressed the physicians' prescription habits, sociodemographic and clinical practice characteristics, barriers to the prescription of vaccines to adult and older adult patients, and physicians' knowledge regarding routinely prescribed vaccines. This study focused exclusively on the vaccines recommended by the SBIm for adults and older adults in the years 2017/2018[10, 11].

This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Universidade Federal de São Paulo.

Physicians' prescription habits

In terms of prescription habits, the survey aimed at collecting the information depicted in Figure 1 for each adult and older adult recommended vaccine.

Figure 1 – Information collected on prescription habits for adult and older adult SBIm recommended vaccines.

Underprescription was defined as prescribing less than recommended by the SBIm and National Immunization Program (NIP). The survey did not provide the immunization recommendations from these entities and responding physicians were

expected to use their own knowledge of these recommendations to identify and report underprescription.

Physicians' knowledge on routinely prescribed vaccines

The survey assessed the physicians' knowledge regarding the recommended vaccines' target populations, dosage schedule and availability in the Brazil's Unified Public Health System (SUS). We used the most up-to-date immunization schedules issued by the SBIm for adults[10] and older adults[11] (2017-2018) and special populations (2015-2016)[13] at the time of the study to define the correct answers, with minor exceptions (see Supplementary Material). All correct answers are detailed in Supplementary Table 1 (for target populations), Table 2 (for dosage schedule) and Table 3 (for availability in SUS).

For target populations, physicians should select the age groups (Adults [20-59 years] and/or Older adults [>60 years]) for which each vaccine is recommended, as well as the respective special populations. The physicians' knowledge on this topic was assessed by means of an overall score. This score, ranging from zero to one, was calculated based on the individual scores obtained by each physician in the question regarding target populations. The individual score corresponded to the ratio between the number of correct options selected by the physician and the total number of correct answers defined for each recommended vaccine. Each incorrect option selected nullified a correct one, except in select cases – see Supplementary Table 1.

Physicians' knowledge on dosage schedules and availability in the SUS was assessed by determining the proportions of correct answers in the respective survey

questions. The correct answers for availability in the SUS focused on whether the vaccines were available free of charge at the basic health units (BHUs).

Sample size

A sample of 1068 physicians was needed to determine the proportion of physicians prescribing each SBIm recommended vaccine, with a margin of error of 3% and a significance level of 0.05. In the absence of data on the proportion of prescribing physicians for SBIm recommended vaccines, we followed the most conservative approach by considering a proportion of 50%.

The sample was stratified according to the number of active physicians per Brazilian region and medical specialty (Supplementary Table 4). This was based on the number of active physicians in Brazil (overall and per region) according to the Federal Council of Medicine's website[14] and on the distribution of physicians across medical specialties of interest, as described by Scheffer M. et al[15] – see Supplementary Material for a detailed description of this process.

Recruitment of physicians

The recruitment of physicians was based on the Fine Panel, a large physicians' panel covering Brazil and other Latin America countries. The recruitment of physicians for this panel is based on various sources: public information and websites, contacts of affiliated physicians provided by hospitals and medical associations, contacts obtained during visits to hospitals and clinics, voluntary registrations and peer-to-peer recommendations from registered physicians.

Physicians were eligible to complete the survey if they had a valid registration in the Fine Panel, either before or after being invited to participate in the study. Additionally, physicians had to meet all the following criteria: 1) worked at a public and/or private medical institution in Brazil; 2) belonged to one of the medical specialties of interest; 3) saw at least 30 patients per week. Conversely, physicians were not eligible if they were not in active clinical practice or if a sufficient number of physicians from the same medical specialty and Brazilian region had already completed the survey.

Statistical Analysis

Qualitative variables were summarized by absolute and relative frequencies. For the proportion of physicians prescribing each recommended vaccine, 95% confidence intervals were also computed. Quantitative variables were summarized by descriptive statistics, namely mean, median, standard deviation, minimum and maximum.

Comparisons between medical specialties and primary area of practice (public, private and public-private) in terms of the proportion of prescribing physicians for each vaccine were performed with the Chi-squared test.

RESULTS

Study sample construction

A total of 76 104 physicians were invited to participate in the study to obtain 1068 completed surveys. Of these, 759 surveys were completed by physicians registered in the Fine Panel before being invited to participate (8 741 invitations), while the remaining 309 were completed by physicians who registered after receiving the invitation (67 364 invitations).

Sociodemographic and clinical practice characterization

The responding physicians' demographic and clinical practice characteristics are described in Table 1.

Table 1 – Responding physicians' sociodemographic and clinical practice characteristics

Almost half of the physicians (48.2%) were gynecologists. On average, physicians had been practicing their medical specialty for 17.1 (±10.0) years and prescribing vaccines to adults and/or older adults for 13.9 (±8.3) years. Most physicians (89.9%) routinely recommended vaccines.

Prescription habits

The proportions of physicians prescribing – to all or some of their patients with an indication – each recommended vaccine to adults and older adults are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 – Physicians prescribing and underprescribing SBIm recommended vaccines to adult and older adults

The vaccines prescribed by the highest proportions of physicians to adults and older adults were Influenza (more than 90% of physicians for adult and older adult patients), Hepatitis B (87% for adults and 59% for older adults) and Yellow Fever (77.7% for adults and 58.5% for older adults). Conversely, Meningococcal B (18.8%) and Meningococcal conjugated ACWY (20.2%) were the vaccines prescribed by the lowest proportions of physicians for adults and older adults, respectively.

Prescription habits by medical specialty and primary area of practice

A statistically significant association between the proportion of prescribing physicians and medical specialty was found for all adult and older adult recommended vaccines, except for Influenza (since assumptions were not met, no statistical test was applied) – Supplementary Tables 10 and 11. The infectious disease was the medical specialty with the highest proportions of prescribing physicians for most adult recommended vaccines, except for PCV13 (prescribed by a higher proportion of pneumologists), Zoster (higher proportion of geriatrists), Dengue (higher proportion of GP/FM) and Bivalent and Quadrivalent HPV (higher proportion of gynecologists).

Likewise, infectious disease had the highest proportion of prescribing physicians for all older adult recommended vaccines, except for Yellow Fever, PCV13 and PPV23, which were prescribed by a higher proportion of geriatrists.

Statistically significant differences in the proportions of prescribing physicians between primary areas of practice were found for two vaccines only: Hepatitis A and B (adult patients), with a significantly higher prescription being observed among physicians working exclusively in the private sector, and PPV23 (older adults), with a higher prescription among physicians working exclusively in public services – Supplementary Tables 12 and 13.

Prescription of vaccines to all patients with an indication

The proportions of prescribing physicians who stated to prescribe vaccines to all adult and older adult patients with an indication were above 75% for all recommended vaccines – Supplementary Table 5. Influenza was the vaccine prescribed by the highest proportions of physicians to all adult (93.3%) and older adult (91.6%) patients with an indication. Zoster was the vaccine for which the lowest proportions of physicians prescribing to all patients with an indication was observed (76% and 76.9% for adults and older adults, respectively).

Barriers to vaccine prescription

Reasons for non-prescription

For all adult and older adult recommended vaccines, the most frequently selected reason for non-prescription was the fact that the vaccine did not belong to the scope

of the physicians' medical specialty. Doubts regarding the vaccine's indication and fear of side effects were the second most frequently selected reasons for non-prescription for nine and eight of the 17 adult recommended vaccines, respectively. For each vaccine, the reasons leading to non-prescription in adults and older adults are provided in Supplementary Tables 6 and 7, respectively.

Reasons for underprescription

The proportions of prescribing physicians who stated to underprescribe vaccines were below 20% for all adult and older adult recommended vaccines – Table 2.

The most common reasons for underprescription are summarized in Figure 2.

Figure 2 – Reasons for underprescription selected by the highest proportions of physicians.

The high vaccine cost and lack of time during the appointment were the barriers most frequently selected by the highest proportions of physicians for adult recommended vaccines (6 and 5 vaccines, respectively). For older adult recommended vaccines, the most commonly selected barriers by the highest proportions of physicians were the high vaccine cost and lack of patient interest (4 vaccines each).

For each vaccine, the reasons leading to underprescription in adults and older adults are presented in Supplementary Tables 8 and 9, respectively.

Physicians' knowledge on recommended vaccines

Figure 3 shows the result on physicians' knowledge regarding target populations for all recommended vaccines. Td and Meningococcal B were the vaccines for which physicians presented the highest and lowest knowledge, respectively (mean score of 0.76 and 0.09, respectively).

Figure 3 – Knowledge on SBIm recommended vaccines' target populations (A), dosage schedule (B) and availability in the SUS (C).

Regarding dosage schedule, Zoster was associated with the highest knowledge (80.2% of correct answers). Conversely, the lowest percentage of correct answers on this question was observed for PCV13 (1.9%).

Concerning availability in Brazil's SUS, Td and Tdap or Tdap-VIP were the vaccines for which physicians obtained the highest and lowest percentages of correct answers, respectively (82.3% and 20.1% of correct answers, respectively).

Knowledge by medical specialty

Results on vaccine knowledge regarding target populations, dosage schedule and availability in the SUS by medical specialty are presented in Supplementary Tables 14, 15 and 16, respectively. The infectious disease specialists showed higher mean scores of knowledge on target populations for most vaccines, except for Hepatitis A, Tdap or Tdap-IPV, PVC13 (higher mean scores in pulmonologists) and Td (higher mean score in endocrinologists). When compared with other specialties, the

proportion of correct answers regarding dosage schedule and availability in the SUS were descriptively higher among infectious disease specialists for ten and seven, respectively, of the 17 SBIm recommended vaccines.

DISCUSSION

The present study aimed at characterizing the prescription habits of physicians from various medical specialties regarding adult and older adult vaccination in Brazil. The proportions of prescribing physicians varied greatly across SBIm recommended vaccines, ranging from 18.8% (Meningococcal B) to 94.4% (Influenza) for adults and 15.0% (Meningococcal Conjugate ACWY) to 92.8% (Influenza) for older adults. The low proportions of physicians prescribing the meningococcal vaccines are in line with the SBIm recommendations, which state that the indication for these vaccines is dependent on the epidemiological scenario[10, 11].

The study results suggest that there is an awareness about the importance of adult and older adult vaccination among prescribing physicians. This is reflected by the fact that more than 3/4 of prescribing physicians stated to prescribe all recommended vaccines to every patient with an indication. Importantly, these data should not be interpreted as to indicate that all patients with an indication for a vaccine do in fact receive a prescription from their physician. First, these results pertain only to prescribing physicians – physicians who stated not to prescribe the vaccine were not considered in this analysis. Thus, a vaccine may be prescribed by a low proportion of physicians only while being prescribed to all patients with an indication by most of them. The prescription of the Meningococcal B vaccine to adults is such an example – despite being prescribed by 18.8% of responding physicians only, the proportion of those not prescribing this vaccine to all patients with an indication is low (18.9%). Thus, for each vaccine, the proportion of non-prescribing physicians (i.e., not prescribing a vaccine to any patient) and the reasons for non-prescription should also be considered. Second, not all physicians have the same knowledge regarding the vaccines' indication. Indeed, doubts regarding the

vaccines' indication were an important factor leading to non-prescription. Moreover, the diversity of responses observed in the question regarding target populations (Supplementary Table 14) suggest that this knowledge is not well disseminated among physicians, and that different physicians may have a distinct understanding of the same vaccine's indication. Consequentially, physicians who did not accurately know a given vaccine's indication may have incorrectly stated to prescribe it to all patients with an indication.

Barriers to vaccination lead to missed opportunities to immunize potential vaccine recipients, thus contributing to low vaccination coverages[16]. Doubts regarding the vaccines' indication was among the most common barriers leading to the non-prescription of vaccines in the present study, while the high vaccine cost, lack of time during the appointment and lack of patient interest were the most frequent barriers resulting in the underprescription of vaccines to adults and older adults. Tackling these barriers could thus prove valuable to increase the prescription of adult and older adult recommended vaccines in Brazil, namely through initiatives aimed at boosting physicians' knowledge on recommended vaccines' indications.

Despite the risk groups for Influenza and pneumococcal disease being similar, the results show that a markedly higher proportion of physicians prescribe the former, both to adults and older adults. A nationwide cohort study of the non-institutionalized Brazilian population estimated that appreciable proportions of adults aged ≥50 years present risk factors for Influenza and pneumococcal disease. Indeed, approximately 16% of adults in this age group are diabetic, 12% have heart problems, 5% have cancer and 4.5% suffer from chronic kidney disease[17]. Thus, reducing the discrepancy between the proportions of physicians prescribing the Influenza and

pneumococcal vaccines, by considerably increasing the latter, could prove beneficial to the life of millions of Brazilians.

The physicians' medical specialty, unlike their primary area of practice, seems to significantly influence the prescription of recommended vaccines to adult and older adult patients. The influence of the former may be explained by the fact that certain medical specialties tend to prescribe certain vaccines more commonly than others. For instance, one expects the prescription of HPV vaccines to be particularly common among gynecologists when compared to physicians from other medical specialties (e.g., cardiology or pulmonology). This is clearly reflected in the study results, particularly for the Quadrivalent HPV vaccine – prescribed by 95.3% of gynecologists versus 15.2% and 13.6% of cardiologists and pulmonologists, respectively.

Though most prescribing physicians reported to prescribe recommended vaccines to all patients with an indication, knowledge on target populations, dosage schedule and availability in the SUS was generally low. As nearly all correct answers were defined based on the SBIm immunization schedules, one possible explanation for these results is that physicians do not routinely follow the SBIm recommendations.

The results suggest that there may be a difficulty in incorporating newer vaccines (i.e., more recently approved) into routine clinical practice. Indeed, the study data show that physicians are more familiarized with older vaccines, such as Influenza (approved in 1997)[18], Hepatitis B (approved in 1993)[19] and Td (approved before 1999)[20]. This is reflected by the fact that these were among the four vaccines prescribed by the highest proportions of physicians to both adults and older adults and for which physicians presented the highest knowledge. Conversely, the most

recently approved vaccines in Brazil (Dengue and Meningococcal B, approved in 2015[21, 22], and Meningococcal Conjugate ACWY, approved in 2014[23]) were prescribed by the lowest proportions of physicians and were generally among those associated with the lowest knowledge, particularly for target populations and dosage schedule. These results highlight the need for initiatives aimed at promoting physicians' knowledge on SBIm recommended vaccines to focus on the most recently approved ones.

The stratification of physicians, by medical specialty and Brazilian region, ensured a sample that was both geographically representative and in which the distribution of physicians per medical specialty of interest was similar to that of the general population of physicians in Brazil (Supplementary Table 17). Still, one should note that only a limited number of medical specialties were included in the study and that the stratification did not encompass various other relevant characteristics, which may have differed between responding physicians and the general population of physicians in Brazil. For instance, the study population was comprised of a considerably lower proportion of physicians working exclusively in the public sector (4.8% vs. 21.6% in the Brazilian population of physicians)[15]. Moreover, one should consider the high number of invitations (76 104) required to obtain 1068 surveys. Such might be an indication that the study sample was comprised of physicians particularly interested in the topic of adult and older adult vaccination, which may have also impacted the generalizability of the study results. This is further supported by the fact that most physicians (89.8%) stated to routinely recommend vaccines.

In the survey, underprescription was defined as prescribing less than recommended according to the SBIm and NIP. However, the SBIm and NIP differ in the number of vaccines recommended to adults (5 versus 17, respectively) and older adults (4

versus 12, respectively). Thus, a physician may be compliant with the NIP recommendations while simultaneously prescribing less than recommended by the SBIm. As a result, underprescription may have been underestimated – for instance, physicians prescribing a given vaccine less than recommended by the SBIm may have stated not to underprescribe it if they considered the NIP recommendations only.

Physicians' knowledge on target populations may have been overestimated for vaccines recommended for both adults and older adults (except for PCV13 and PPV23). This is because physicians who selected "All patients (regardless of age and risk group)" as the target population were given the total score of one point, even without specifying any special population according to the SBIm immunization schedule[13] – Supplementary Table 1.

Lastly, the correct answers regarding availability in the SUS focused on whether the vaccines were available free of charge at the BHU according to the SBIm immunization schedules[10, 11]. Nonetheless, certain vaccines are available free of charge at the Special Immunobiological Reference Centers (CRIES), which are a part of the SUS. Physicians may have thus considered the availability of vaccines in the CRIES when responding to this question, which may have impacted the results.

In conclusion, a considerable variability of prescribing habits was observed in this study, both across SBIm recommended vaccines and, for most of these, between physicians from different medical specialties. Although most prescribing physicians seem to be aware of the importance of adult and older adult vaccination, knowledge deficits on vaccines' target populations, dosage schedule and availability in the SUS may hamper their ability to prescribe vaccines to all patients with an indication.

Initiatives to increase the physicians' knowledge (particularly on recently approved vaccines) are recommended to increase the vaccination coverage rate among the adult and older adult Brazilian populations, as is the adoption of measures to tackle the most common barriers to vaccination (high cost, lack of time during appointments and lack of patient interest).

Acknowledgements

"Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., a subsidiary of Merck & Co., Inc., Kenilworth, NJ, USA, provided financial support for the study." The authors would like to thank Dr. Edson Moreira for his review and support during the development of this manuscript and Leila Carvalho (employee of MSD Brazil at the time of the study) for her scientific contributions. We acknowledge CTI Clinical Trial & Consulting Services for all editorial support.

Author Contributions

All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript and attest that they meet the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors criteria for authorship.

Conflicts of interest

Fernando B Serra, Paula M Batista and Thais N F Moreira are employees of Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., a subsidiary of Merck & Co., Inc., Kenilworth, NJ USA, who may own stock and/or hold stock options in Merck & Co., Inc., Kenilworth, NJ, USA.

Diogo Ribeiro is an employee of CTI Clinical Trial & Consulting Services. This company received honoraria from the project funder for support in the study planning and manuscript development.

REFERENCES

[1] Williams WW. Surveillance of Vaccination Coverage Among Adult Populations — United States, 2014. MMWR Surveill Summ 2016;65. https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.ss6501a1.

[2] Giese C, Mereckiene J, Danis K, O'Donnell J, O'Flanagan D, Cotter S. Low vaccination coverage for seasonal influenza and pneumococcal disease among adults at-risk and health care workers in Ireland, 2013: The key role of GPs in recommending vaccination. Vaccine 2016;34:3657–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.05.028.

[3] Williams WW, Lu P-J, O'Halloran A, Bridges CB, Kim DK, Pilishvili T, et al. Vaccination Coverage Among Adults, Excluding Influenza Vaccination — United States, 2013. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2015;64:95–102.

[4] Monteiro CN, Gianini RJ, Stopa SR, Segri NJ, Barros MB de A, Cesar CLG, et al. Vaccination coverage and use of the Brazilian Health System for vaccination against influenza and pneumonia in adults and elderly with self-reported diabetes, municipality of São Paulo, 2003, 2008 and 2015. Epidemiol E Serv Saude Rev Sist Unico Saude Bras 2018;27:e2017272. https://doi.org/10.5123/s1679-49742018000200006.

[5] McLaughlin JM, McGinnis JJ, Tan L, Mercatante A, Fortuna J. Estimated Human and Economic Burden of Four Major Adult Vaccine-Preventable Diseases in the United States, 2013. J Prim Prev 2015;36:259–73. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10935-015-0394-3.

[6] Sevin AM, Romeo C, Gagne B, Brown NV, Rodis JL. Factors influencing adults' immunization practices: a pilot survey study of a diverse, urban community in central Ohio. BMC Public Health. 2016;16:424.

[7] Winston CA, Wortley PM, Lees KA. Factors associated with vaccination of medicare beneficiaries in five U.S. communities: Results from the racial and ethnic adult disparities in immunization initiative survey, 2003. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2006 Feb;54(2):303–10.

[8] Collange F, Verger P, Launay O, Pulcini C. Knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and behaviors of general practitioners/family physicians toward their own vaccination: A systematic review. Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2016 May 3;12(5):1282–92.

[9] Verger P, Fressard L, Collange F, Gautier A, Jestin C, Launay O, et al. Vaccine Hesitancy Among General Practitioners and Its Determinants During Controversies: A National Cross-sectional Survey in France. EBioMedicine. 2015 Jun 23;2(8):891– 7.

[10] Sociedade Brasileira de Imunizações (SBIm). Calendário de Vacinação SBIm ADULTO, Recomendações da Sociedade Brasileira de Imunizações (SBIm) - 2017/2018. 2017 [cited 2017 sep 06]. Available at: https://sbim.org.br/images/calendarios/calend-sbim-adulto.pdf.

[11] Sociedade Brasileira de Imunizações (SBIm). Calendário de Vacinação SBIm IDOSO, Recomendações da Sociedade Brasileira de Imunizações (SBIm) - 2017/2018. 2017 [cited 2017 sep 06]. Available at: https://sbim.org.br/images/calendarios/calend-sbim-idoso.pdf.

[12] Sociedade Brasileira de Imunizações (SBIm). Calendários de Vacinação - Pacientes Especiais 2019-2020. 2019 [cited 2020 jan 08]. Available at: https://sbim.org.br/publicacoes/guias/1138-calendarios-de-vacinacao-sbim-pacientes-especiais-2019-2020.

[13] Sociedade Brasileira de Imunizações (SBIm). Calendários de Vacinação - Pacientes Especiais 2015-2016. 2016 [cited 2017 sep 06]. Available at: https://www.previnavacinas.com.br/calendarios/calend-sbim-pacientes-especiais.pdf

[14] Conselho Federal de Medicina. Médicos ativos por região. 2017 [cited 2017 aug 16]. Available at: http://portal.cfm.org.br/index.php?option=com_estatistica.

[15] Mário Scheffer et al. Demografia Médica no Brasil 2015. 2015 [cited 2017 sep 06]. Available at: https://www.usp.br/agen/wpcontent/uploads/DemografiaMedica30nov2015.pdf

[16] Srivastav A, Black CL, Lutz CS, Fiebelkorn AP, Ball SW, Devlin R, et al. U.S. clinicians' and pharmacists' reported barriers to implementation of the Standards for Adult Immunization Practice. Vaccine 2018;36:6772–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.09.024.

[17] Nunes BP, Batista SRR, Andrade FB de, Souza Junior PRB de, Lima-Costa MF, Facchini LA. Multimorbidity: The Brazilian Longitudinal Study of Aging (ELSI-Brazil). Rev Saude Publica 2018;52Suppl 2:10s. https://doi.org/10.11606/S1518-8787.2018052000637.

[18] Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária. Vacina Influenza trivalente (fragmentada, inativada). [cited 2019 sep 04]. Available at: https://consultas.anvisa.gov.br/#/medicamentos/250000082889634/?substancia=19850&situacaoRegistro=C.

[19] Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária. Engerix B. [cited 2019 sep 04]. Available at: https://consultas.anvisa.gov.br/#/medicamentos/2500100359787/?substancia=19447.

[20] Ministério da Saúde. Programa Nacional de Imunizações. 2013 [cited 2019 sep 26]. Available at: http://bvsms.saude.gov.br/bvs/publicacoes/programa_nacional_imunizacoes_pni40.pdf

[21] Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária. Dengvaxia. [cited 2019 sep 04]. Available at: https://consultas.anvisa.gov.br/#/medicamentos/25351193951201526/?substancia=25982&situacaoRegistro=V.

[22] Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária. Vacina adsorvida meningocócica B (recombinante). [cited 2019 sep 04]. Available at: http://www.vacinar.com.br/bulas/BulaBexsero.pdf

[23] Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária. Menveo. [cited 2019 sep 04]. Available at: https://consultas.anvisa.gov.br/#/medicamentos/25351945177201612/?substancia=26000&situacaoRegistro=V.

TABLES

Table 1 – Responding physicians' sociodemographic and clinical practice characteristics

	Total (n=1068)
Age (years)	
Mean	44.70
Standard deviation	9.91
Median	43.00
Minimum	26.00
Maximum	75.00
Sex, n (%)	
Female	574 (53.7%)
Brazilian region, n (%)	
North	48 (4.5%)
Northeast	191 (17.9%)
Midwest	88 (8.2%)
Southeast	580 (54.3%)
South	161 (15.1%)
Medical specialty best defining clinical practice, n (%)	
Cardiology	244 (22.8%)
General Practice/Family Practice	85 (8.0%)
Endocrinology	80 (7.5%)
Geriatrics	26 (2.4%)
Gynecology	515 (48.2%)
Infectious Disease	59 (5.5%)

Pulmonology	59 (5.5%)
Years of medical specialty practice[a] (years)	
N	1063
Mean	17.06
Standard deviation	9.96
Median	15.00
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	46.00
Number of patients cared for during a regular work week	
N	1068
Mean	113.09
Standard deviation	76.72
Median	100.00
Minimum	30.00
Maximum	600.00
Time spent in public hospital services (%)	
N	569
Mean	31.33
Standard deviation	20.78
Median	30.00
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	100.00
Time spent in private hospital services (%)	
N	604
Mean	28.68

Standard deviation	21.55
Median	20.00
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	100.00
Time spend in public medical office services (%)	
N	367
Mean	30.91
Standard deviation	22.07
Median	25.00
Minimum	5.00
Maximum	100.00
Time spend in private medical office services for patients with health insurance plans (%)	
N	838
Mean	49.27
Standard deviation	26.19
Median	45.00
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	100.00
Time spend in private medical office services: when the payment is made exclusively by the patient (%)	
N	620
Mean	24.12
Standard deviation	23.15
Median	15.00
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	100.00

Routinely recommends vaccines to patients, n (%)	959 (89.8%)
Vaccine prescription as part of medical practice, n (%)	944 (98.4%)
Characterization of vaccine prescription in clinical practice, n (%)	
Very common	383 (40.6%)
Common	457 (48.4%)
Not very common	104 (11.0%)
Time prescribing vaccines to adult and older adult patients (years)	
N	955
Mean	13.85
Standard deviation	8.28
Median	12.00
Minimum	0.00
Maximum	48.00
Vaccines prescribed per week to adult and older adult patients, n (%)	
None	62 (5.8%)
1-5	388 (36.3%)
6-10	279 (26.1%)
11-20	220 (20.6%)
21-50	92 (8.6%)
>50	27 (2.5%)

[a]Excluding years of medical residency/specialization.

606 **Table 2** – Physicians prescribing and underprescribing SBIm recommended vaccines to adult and older adults

Vaccines	Physicians who stated to prescribe the vaccine[a] % (95% CI)		Prescribing physicians who stated to underprescribe the vaccine[b] % (physicians who stated to underprescribe the vaccine out of prescribing physicians)	
	Adults	Older adults	Adults	Older adults
Bivalent HPV	46.7% (43.7% to 49.7%)	NA	10.6% (53 out of 449)	NA
Dengue	19.9% (17.5% to 22.3%)	NA	13.6% (29 out of 213)	NA
Hepatitis A	34.9% (32.1% to 37.8%)	24.1% (21.5% to 26.6%)	18.0% (67 out of 373)	12.5% (32 out of 257)
Hepatitis B	86.6% (84.6% to 88.7%)	59.0% (56.0% to 61.9%)	9.3% (86 out of 925)	10.6% (67 out of 630)
Hepatitis A and B	46.7% (43.7% to 49.7%)	26.1% (23.5% to 28.8%)	17.4% (87 out of 499)	9.0% (37 out of 257)
Herpes zoster	46.4% (43.5% to 49.4%)	48.7% (45.7% to 51.7%)	19.6% (97 out of 496)	19.6% (102 out of 520)
Influenza	94.9% (93.5% to 96.2%)	92.8% (91.2% to 94.3%)	5.3% (39 out of 216)	7.5% (17 out of 160)
Meningococcal B	18.8% (16.5% to 21.2%)	NA	14.4% (29 out of 201)	NA
Meningococcal Conjugate ACWY	20.2% (17.8% to 22.6%)	15.0% (12.8% to 17.1%)	18.1% (82 out of 373)	10.6% (67 out of 77)
MMR	51.5% (48.5% to 54.5%)	23.3% (20.8% to 25.9%)	14.7% (81 out of 550)	8.8% (22 out of 249)
PCV13	49.4% (46.4% to 52.4%)	50.2% (47.2% to 53.2%)	14.6% (77 out of 528)	14.7% (79 out of 536)
PPV23	46.3% (43.3% to 49.2%)	50.9% (47.9% to 53.9%)	10.7% (53 out of 494)	12.9% (70 out of 544)
Quadrivalent HPV	59.7% (56.8% to 62.7%)	NA	7.2% (46 out of 638)	NA
Td	72.5% (69.8% to 75.2%)	52.1% (49.1% to 55.1%)	11.5% (89 out of 774)	12.9% (72 out of 556)
Tdap or Tdap-IPV	67.3% (64.5% to 70.1%)	35.4% (32.5% to 38.3%)	9.9% (71 out of 719)	14.8% (56 out of 378)
Varicella	26.1% (23.5% to 28.8%)	NA	12.5% (35 out of 279)	NA
Yellow Fever	77.7% (75.2% to 80.2%)	58.5% (55.6% to 61.5%)	10.2% (85 out of 830)	11.5% (72 out of 625)

MMR, measles, mumps and rubella; Tdap, adult tetanus-diphtheria-acellular; IPV, inactivated polio vaccine; Td: Tetanus and diphtheria; PCV13, 13-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine; PPV23, 23-valent pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine; HPV, human papillomavirus, NA, not applicable.

[a]Prescribing physicians include those prescribing vaccines to all or part of their patients with an indication.

[b]For each vaccine, the proportion of underprescription was determined based on the number of physicians who stated to prescribe it.

FIGURES

Figure 1 – Information collected on prescription habits for adult and older adult recommended vaccines



Figure 2 – Reasons for underprescription selected by the highest proportions of physicians



Figure 3 – Knowledge on SBIm recommended vaccines' target populations (A), dosage schedule (B) and availability in the SUS (C)