Estimating the impact of implementation and timing of COVID-19 vaccination programme in Brazil: a counterfactual analysis

Leonardo Souto Ferreira[1,2], Flavia Maria Darcie Marquitti[2,3,*], Rafael Lopes Paixão da Silva[1,2], Marcelo Eduardo Borges[2], Marcelo Ferreira da Costa Gomes[4,2], Oswaldo Gonçruz Cruz[4,2], Roberto André Kraenkel[1,2], Renato Mendes Coutinho[2,5], Paulo Inácio Prado[2,6], and Leonardo Soares Bastos[4,2]

[1] *Instituto de Física Teórica, Universidade Estadual Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil*
[2] *Observatório COVID-19 BR*
[3] *Instituto de Física 'Gleb Wataghin' and Instituto de Biologia, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil*
[4] *Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Programa de Computação Científica, Grupo de Métodos Analíticos em Vigilância Epidemiológica, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*
[5] *Centro de Matemática, Computação e Cognição, Universidade Federal do ABC, Santo André, Brazil*
[6] *Instituto de Biociências, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil*
[*] *Corresponding author: flamarquitti@gmail.com*

Abstract

Background:

The vaccines developed in 2020-2021 against the SARS-CoV-2 virus were designed to prevent severity and deaths due to COVID-19. However, estimates of the effectiveness of vaccination campaigns in achieving these goals remain a methodological challenge. In this work, we developed a Bayesian statistical model to estimate the number of deaths and hospitalisations avoided by vaccines in older adults in Brazil.

Methods:

We fit a linear model to predict the number of deaths and hospitalisations in older adults as a function of vaccination coverage and of casualties in younger adults. We then used this model to perform counterfactual analysis, simulating alternative scenarios without vaccination or with earlier vaccination roll-out. We estimated direct effects of COVID-19 vaccination by computing the difference between hypothetical and realised scenarios.

Results:

We estimated that more than 165 thousand individuals above 60 y.o. were not hospitalised due to COVID-19 in the first seven months of the vaccination campaign. An additional contingent of 100 thousand hospitalisations could have been avoided if vaccination had started earlier. We also

estimated that more than 75 thousand lives were saved by vaccination in the period analysed for the same age group, and that additional 48 thousand lives could have been saved had the Brazilian Government started the vaccination programme earlier.

Conclusions:

Our estimates provide a lower bound for vaccination impacts in Brazil, demonstrating the importance of preventing suffering and loss of the older adults Brazilians. Once vaccines were approved, an early vaccination roll-out could have saved many more lives, especially when facing a pandemic.

Keywords: Bayesian model, pandemic, hospitalisation, death

Word count: 3824

Key messages:

- The coronavirus pandemic affected more severely older adults, which presented the higher rates of hospitalisation and deaths related to COVID-19, leading most countries, as Brazil, to start the vaccination following a decreasing age scheme.
- Evaluating a hypothetical scenario of the absence of vaccines, we estimated the number of hospitalisations and deaths that Brazil has prevented due to the vaccination roll-out applied to persons above 60 years old: ≈167,000 hospitalisations did not occur and ≈77,000 lives were saved due to the vaccines.
- The estimates for the number of lives saved and the avoided hospitalisations are a lower bound for the actual number because only the direct effects for the older adults were taken into account, and no herd immunity effect was considered.
- Evaluating another hypothetical scenario, considering an eight weeks earlier roll-out, Brazil could have saved a minimum of additional ≈48,000 lives and avoided another ≈100,000 hospitalisations compared to what happened.

Introduction

Since March 15, 2020, the SARS-CoV-2 has been declared in community transmission in Brazil. During the first year of the pandemic, the epidemic spread fast in Brazil but with different timings and burdens between regions, because of regional differences in health assistance, income and local mitigation policies [1, 2]. On top of that, by January of 2021, Brazil's epidemics saw a strong increase in the number of notified cases and deaths due to SARS-CoV-2, specially in the northern region of Brazil [2]. The new burst quickly spread to the rest of the country, synchronizing the waves in each region, reducing by the end of May. This wave was later associated with the appearance of the VOC P.1, also known as Gamma, whose emergence was estimated as November of 2020 in Manaus [3, 4]. Brazil also had community transmission of Alpha VOC. However, it was not capable of overcoming Gamma, because the latter was found more transmissible and with a potential immunity escape [5, 6, 4]. Gamma variant was eventually substituted by the Delta variant in relative frequency, although the majority of Brazilian COVID-19 cases and deaths in 2021 occurred during the Gamma dominance [7]. The country did not suffer another marked increase in cases and deaths during the rest of 2021 as other countries, and such difference is attributed to the vaccination campaign in Brazil.

Brazil has an outstanding history of successful government policies for mass vaccination, including coordinated vaccination campaigns at country level, effective communication strategies, free availability of doses, and the capillarity of the Brazilian's Unified Health System (SUS). For instance, in 2010, the SUS was able to vaccinate 89 millions individuals [8, 9] in response to the 2009 H1N1 influenza pandemic. However, due to several funding cuts and widespread misinformation, the following vaccination campaigns could not surpass the coverage objectives. [10]. The COVID-19 vaccination campaign in Brazil suffered from poor coordination and logistics at the federal level [11], which delayed and slowed down the pace of vaccine roll-out. Vaccination eventually started on January 17, 2021, first covering institutionalised people, native Brazilians, and health professionals. After that, the vaccination roll-out was structured considering age groups, from older to younger individuals, in an at-risk basis [12, 13]. Currently, Brazil has 88.9% and 66.7% of the total population with one and two doses, respectively by the date of December 22, 2021 [14], with an ongoing campaign of booster inoculation. This coverage surpasses richer countries that had earlier

availability of vaccines.

We developed a statistical model to predict the number of deaths and hospitalisations by COVID-19 in age group of older adults from the time series of deaths and cases in younger age groups. The model considers the reduction in relative risks of older age groups as vaccine coverage progressed in this population over time. We then used the estimated effect of vaccine coverage on reducing relative risks in a counterfactual analysis to estimate the direct effect of vaccination in averting hospitalisations and deaths by COVID-19 in Brazil. Since the model directly accounts for vaccination, we could also provide estimates for the potential number of hospitalisations and deaths averted if vaccines were available earlier to the population. The analysis was conducted considering the age group of adults above 60 years old with a time series that runs until August 28, 2021.

Methods

Data

The weekly count of hospitalisations and deaths due to COVID-19 notified as Severe Acute Respiratory Infection (SARI) in each age group was obtained from the Influenza's Epidemiological Surveillance Information System (SIVEP-Gripe [15, 16]), extracted on October 18, 2021. This database is publicly available by the Brazilian National Health System. No ethical approval is needed according to the National Ethical Commission (CONEP) of the National Health Council, Resolution Number 510 of April 7, 2016. Shortly after the pandemic onset in Brazil, the anonymised data was published with all the individual cases notified by health care units, and municipal and state health secretariats. We filtered the dataset to keep only the cases that were hospitalised or died due to SARI associated with COVID-19. The association with COVID-19 was filtered based on the case classification field (CLASSI_FIN), plus all cases with a positive RT-PCR test for SARS-CoV-2 regardless of classification. All cases were aggregated by the state of residence. For the weekly count of hospitalised cases, the date of reference is based on symptoms onset. We used the date of death as reference for the weekly number of deaths. The vaccination data was extracted from the National immunisation Plan Information System (SIPNI) [14], extracted on November 6, 2021, which includes location, date, type of vaccine, dose (1st, 2nd, 3rd) of vaccine, and age of every person vaccinated against COVID-19 in Brazil. For the SIPNI, we considered the state of vaccine

application instead of the state of residence of the individual, as the latter is not always available; although people can be vaccinated in cities other than the one they reside, the difference in numbers is negligible at the state level.

Statistical model

We built a Bayesian statistical model to infer and predict the number of hospitalisations and deaths due to COVID-19 in age classes above 60 y.o. (60+) as a linear function of both the number of hospitalisations and deaths in the 20-29 age class and the vaccine coverage in each age class. We used the coverage of second dose (counting after 14 days from inoculation) of each vaccine v ={AZD1222, CoronaVac, BNT162b2}, produced by AstraZeneca/Oxford/Fiocruz, Sinovac/Butantan and Pfizer/BioNTech, respectively, from the SI-PNI [14]. Aside from these three vaccines, Ad26.COV2.S (Janssen) was also used in Brazilian territory. However, we considered that the number of inoculated doses was too low to have statistical significance in this analysis. The model is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{(t)} &\sim \text{Normal}(\mu^{(t)}, \sigma), \quad \sigma > 0, \quad t = 1, 2, \ldots \\ \mu^{(t)} &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 X^{(t)} + \sum_v \beta_v X^{(t)} \mathrm{c}_{Y,v}^{(t)} + \gamma^{(t)}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $Y^{(t)}$ denotes the number of hospitalisations or deaths at time t expected in the age group being studied, $X^{(t)}$ the number of hospitalisations or deaths at time t of the age group being used as reference, $\mathrm{c}_{i,v}^{(t)}$ denotes the coverage of vaccine v in age group i at time t, and $\gamma^{(t)}$ for $t = 1, 2, \ldots$ represents temporal Gaussian random effects, modelled as a first-order autoregressive process, AR(1), as the following

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^{(t)} &\sim \text{Normal}(\rho\gamma^{(t-1)}, \phi), \quad \phi > 0, \quad |\rho| < 1, \quad t = 2, 3 \ldots \\ \gamma^{(1)} &\sim \text{Normal}\left(0, (\phi(1-\rho^2))^{-1}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where ρ is a temporal correlation and ϕ is the random effects precision.

The model assumes a linear relationship between Y and X in absence of vaccination. The third term in Equation 1 expresses that, when vaccination is present, the difference between X and Y is

linearly related to the coverage of each vaccine (notice that a different β is fitted to each vaccine). Finally, the latter term of Eq. 1 accounts for temporal dependence among hospitalisations or deaths.

Finally, our prior distributions are given (in terms of precision) by:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\beta_0) &\propto 1, \\ \beta_1 &\sim \text{Normal}(0, 0.001), \\ \beta_v &\sim \text{Normal}(0, 0.001), \\ \sigma &\sim \text{Gamma}(1, 0.00001), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

and the prior distributions of the AR(1) random effects (following the notation of [17]) are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa = \phi(1-\rho^2) &\sim \text{Gamma}(2, 100) \\ \theta = \log\left(\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}\right) &\sim \text{Normal}(0, 0.15). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The inference is made using the integrated nested Laplace approximation (INLA) approach [17, 18] implemented in `R` [19]. The models are fitted independently for each age group of older adults (categorised here as 60-69, 70-79 and 80+) and Brazilian State using 20-29 age group as the reference one (X) between March 1, 2020, and August 29, 2021. The posterior trajectories of fitted and simulated time series are drawn from 1,000 samples for each simulation set and added to generate an aggregated posterior sample to the whole country, providing a 95% Credible Interval (hereafter, 95% CI).

To estimate the effect of vaccination, we set the coverage values to zero and predicted the number of hospitalisations and deaths expected in the absence of the explanatory variables of coverage. Then, we compare the cumulative number of hospitalisations and deaths of this hypothetical trajectory with their equivalent when observed vaccine coverage is considered from January 1, 2021 up to August 29, 2021. We also estimated the effect of vaccination on COVID-19 dynamics if vaccines were available earlier in 2021. To make this, we created two counterfactual scenarios of earlier vaccination by keeping the same pace and shifting the time series of observed vaccine coverage to start

four and eight weeks earlier. These counterfactual scenarios are repeated for each age target age group, considering the same amount of vaccines were available in these earlier starting scenarios. To keep the time series until August 29, 2021, in these hypothetical scenarios, we used the four and eight following weeks in the observed time series.

Results

In Fig. 1, the observed time series (dark orange curve and dots) and the estimated series without vaccination (light orange curve) present similar trajectories until May for 60-79 y.o, and until March-April for the age class of more than 80 y.o (80+). The curves by state are presented in the Results Section of the Supplementary Material (SM, hereafter). We also present the similarity between the fitted model and the observed data in Fig. S1 in the SM. The overlap of these curves shows that the risk of hospitalisations and deaths in the target groups relative to the reference group was little affected during the period when vaccine coverage was still small. Therefore, the model provides a realistic estimate of the reduction of relative risks of casualties in the target groups as coverage increases (see Fig. S2 and S3 in the SM).

The vaccination was not able to suppress the wave of hospitalisation cases due to the Gamma variant, which occurred from late January 2021 [6] to late March 2021 [20]. Although for 60-79 y.o., the estimates of deaths have no difference compared to the observed deaths during the Gamma wave, the vaccines decreased the fatal cases for those who were vaccinated earlier (80+) and who likely had a more robust immunity when the Gamma VOC hit. After, vaccination shows a decisive role to preclude the next wave of the deaths and hospitalisations cases at the time of the introduction of the Delta VOC, which occurred in Brazil between May 2021 and July 2021.

If the vaccination roll-out started four weeks earlier, it would have reduced even more hospitalisations and deaths than it actually did in the group 80+ during the Gamma wave (Fig. 2). It would also have affected the number of deaths in the 70-79 age group, decreasing its number during the Gamma wave. When we consider vaccine deployment of eight weeks earlier, the number of deaths would be reduced by approximately 45%, 50%, and 40% of the observed number that occurred during the peak of Gamma wave in the 60-69, 70-79, and 80+ age groups, respectively.

If we compare the cumulative number of hospitalisations and deaths between January 1, 2021,



Figure 1: Estimated number of hospitalisations (top) and deaths (bottom) by epidemiological week with (dark orange) or without (light orange) vaccination roll-out, by age group (panels). The observed number of hospitalisations and deaths are given by the black dots.

and August 29, 2021, with the counterfactual scenario without vaccination, we estimate that the vaccination against COVID-19 directly accounts for reducing at least 166,780 (95% CI: 157,198-176,309) hospitalisations, and 76,503 (95% CI: 71,832-80,714) deaths in the older adults age group. These figures increase to 219,006 (95% CI: 205,903-232,651) and to 101,416 (95% CI: 95,079-107,091), respectively, if we assume that the same vaccination started 4 weeks earlier. Finally, if the vaccination was started 8 weeks earlier, the number of hospitalisations and deaths averted would increase to 268,614 (95% CI: 248,858-289,034) and 124,962 (95% CI: 116,573-132,234), respectively (see Table 1). The small overlap between the probability distribution curve of the hypothetical four weeks earlier scenario and the curve of the realised scenario illustrates how significant the avert would be in the number of deaths and hospitalisations by starting vaccination earlier (Fig. 3) for all the age groups studied. The difference between the realised and the eight weeks earlier hypothetical scenario is even more remarkable, evidenced by the little overlap between the distributions for the



Figure 2: Estimated number of hospitalisations (top) and deaths (bottom) due to COVID-19 by epidemiological week with the realised (dark orange), 4 (light purple) and 8 (dark purple) weeks earlier vaccination roll-out, by age group (panels). The observed number of hospitalisations and deaths are given by the black dots. Check legend for grey scale.

different age groups.

Discussion

In this work, we used a Bayesian model approach to estimate the number of hospitalisations and deaths in the older adults population (above 60 y.o.) due to COVID-19 in Brazil, under three different scenarios of vaccination roll-outs: the realised one; starting immunisations four weeks earlier; and starting immunisations eight weeks earlier. These numbers were compared to a putative scenario with no vaccination. By assuming that the risks in the target group (older adults) relative to a reference group (20-29 age group) decrease as vaccination coverage increases, we accurately fit the decrease in the number of hospitalisations and deaths in the target group.

We estimated that vaccination in Brazil averted hospitalisations due to COVID-19 of more

Table 1: Estimated reductions in hospitalisations/deaths by age group and vaccine roll-out. 60+ is the aggregate of the all age groups of older adults.

Outcome	Age Group	Vaccine roll-out	Estimated reduction (95% CI)
Hospitalisations	60+	Realised	166,780 (157,198–176,309)
		4 weeks earlier	219,006 (205,903–232,651)
		8 weeks earlier	268,614 (248,858–289,034)
	60-69	Realised	70,987 (65,238–76,641)
		4 weeks earlier	99,425 (90,605–107,850)
		8 weeks earlier	126,102 (111,585–141,016)
	70-79	Realised	55,957 (50,158–61,945)
		4 weeks earlier	69,774 (61,846–78,351)
		8 weeks earlier	84,721 (74,065–96,134)
	80+	Realised	39,837 (34,861–44,874)
		4 weeks earlier	49,806 (43,109–56,685)
		8 weeks earlier	57,791 (49,327–66,424)
Deaths	60+	Realised	76,503 (71,832–80,714)
		4 weeks earlier	101,416 (95,079–107,091)
		8 weeks earlier	124,962 (116,573–132,234)
	60-69	Realised	22,518 (20,370-24,564)
		4 weeks earlier	31,849 (28,648–34,863)
		8 weeks earlier	43,158 (38,122–47,858)
	70-79	Realised	26,637 (24,440–29,027)
		4 weeks earlier	35,518 (32,511–38,783)
		8 weeks earlier	43,916 (39,993–48,055)
	80+	Realised	27,348 (23,830–30,440)
		4 weeks earlier	34,049 (29,765–38,110)
		8 weeks earlier	37,888 (32,962–42,515)



Figure 3: Posterior distribution of hospitalisations (left) and deaths (right) due to COVID-19 potentially averted by vaccination between January 1, 2021, and August 29, 2021, by age group, with the realised (dark orange), 4 (light purple) and 8 weeks earlier (dark purple) vaccination roll-out. Check legend for grey scale.

than 165 thousand individuals above 60 y.o. between January and August 2021, a decrease of 35% compared to the scenario with no vaccination. Furthermore, if we consider the mean cost of US$12,000.00 per admission in hospital [21], Brazil saved about US$ 2 billion in health care as a direct effect of vaccination, which is equivalent to what the country spent on vaccination in the same period (US$ 2.2 billion, [22]). An additional 100 thousand more individuals above 60 y.o. would not have been hospitalised if the immunisation had started eight weeks earlier. We also estimate that more than 75 thousand lives of older adults were saved in the period analysed, a 35% decrease in deaths that would occur between March and August in the scenario without vaccination. A further 48 thousand lives would have been saved if the Brazilian Government started the immunisation eight weeks earlier, *i.e.* at least 20% of the actual deaths in 60+ y.o. individuals during the period analysed could be avoided. It is important to notice that, although the Brazilian vaccination campaign was officially started in January 18, 2021 [12], second dose coverage in the population above 80 y.o. only reached the level of about 50% nationwide by the end of March [14]. For those of $60 - 69$ y.o., it only reached above 50% by the end of the first semester [14]. Since those age groups were mostly vaccinated with CoronaVac [23, 14], with an interval of $2 - 4$ weeks between doses at that time, the 4 and 8 weeks earlier vaccination scenarios are not unrealistic ones, since population level impacts are only significant after at least a significant part of the target population is immunised.

In the next paragraphs, we discuss three points that allow us to state that our estimates are a lower bound for the saved lives in the most critical period of COVID-19 epidemic in Brazil: (i) our model estimates only the direct effects of vaccination, therefore no herd immunity and no secondary morbidity or mortality effects were considered; (ii) we performed analysis considering only the most vulnerable age population (60+), which accounts for the 42.5% of hospitalisations and 62.8% of deaths in Brazil during the period analysed; and (iii) we considered exactly the same pace of vaccination in our hypothetical earlier roll-out scenarios that was performed, which is very slow if compared to the speed capacity and organization Brazil had during previous mass vaccinations [8, 9].

Vaccination can reduce hospitalisations and deaths via three main (direct and indirect) effects: reducing the severity of the disease in infected individuals; reducing the susceptibility to infection of vaccinated individuals; and reducing the transmission potential of vaccinated individuals that

do get infected, mostly by shortening the period during which viral shedding is high [24, 25, 26]. Our counterfactual scenarios assumed that vaccination affected hospitalisation and death only in the target age group (60+), but not in the reference age group (20-29 y.o.), since this age group remained unvaccinated in the period studied. This assumption means that we did not account for the curbing of infections caused by reducing susceptibility and transmission. Population effects, such as those affecting the transmission, are not included here, and therefore this model is always expected to underestimate figures of averted hospitalisations and deaths. Another factor we did not consider is that, with fewer hospitalisations, the healthcare system would provide better services and potentially increase the survival of individuals with severe COVID-19. High healthcare burden substantially affected in-hospital mortality, especially during peaks and in regions with fragile health infrastructure [2]. Ignoring this effect also leads to an underestimation of the vaccination effect on deaths.

Our estimates are restricted to age groups over 60 y.o. We made this choice for two main reasons: the National immunisation Plan prioritised an order of vaccination from older age groups towards younger age groups, so that for the period analysed, most of the vaccination effort had been directed towards these age groups. Vaccination of younger age groups by age criterion (excluding health workers, individuals with certain medical conditions, among others), in turn, only started after July in most states. The second reason is that age groups above 60 y.o. represent the highest risk of hospitalisation and mortality, accounting for 42.5% of hospitalisations and 62.8% of deaths in Brazil during the period analysed. Therefore, the choice to focus on these age groups reduces the estimates on the number of averted hospitalisations and casualties since it is also affected by the age pyramid distribution in each state.

Another hypothetical scenario, not analysed here, is considering a different pace of vaccination, compatible with the Brazilian capacity to organise mass vaccinations. In the past, Brazil was capable of making the oral immunisation of nearly 20 million children against polio in a single day [27, 28]. In the 2010 mass vaccination against Influenza, Brazil vaccinated more than 80% of the target group, corresponding to 89 million people, during the seasonal campaign [8, 9]. Recent local and national experiences with yellow fever vaccination [29] also indicate the country has the organisation and structure to make fast massive campaigns to control epidemics, which, for a variety of reasons, was not the case with the COVID-19 vaccination. Brazil vaccinated 250,000 doses per

day between February and March 2021, passing to an average of 500,000 doses per day in the period between April and May 2021, and reaching a pace of above 1 million doses per day only in June 2021 [14]. If the Brazilian government had used all its capacity to organise the COVID-19 campaign, one could expect more significant reduction in deaths and hospitalisations than the figures estimated in this work.

On the other tail of age groups (children), Brazil faces a similar problem to the one analysed here. The BNT162b2 pediatric vaccine was approved by the Brazilian Health Regulatory Agency (ANVISA) in December 16, 2021 [30], and the starting date of the pediatric vaccination was a month later – officially in January 14, 2022 [31, 14] in a slow rate of delivery. Contradictorily, Brazil has high pediatric hospitalisation and mortality from COVID-19. For the 5-11 age group the COVID-19 was the cause of 3302 and 3317 hospitalisations in 2020 and 2021 (until November 29, 2021), respectively [15], whereas 156 and 142 deaths occurred in 2020 and 2021 (until November 29, 2021), respectively, as a consequence of COVID-19 [15]. Additionally, deaths due to SARI consequences were 450 and 292 in 2020 and 2021 (until November 29, 2021), respectively [15]. In order to compare the magnitude of these figures related to SARI, one can look at the leading mortality cause of children in the 5-9 age group in Brazil: disregarding external causes (such as violence), nervous system diseases and neoplasms, the greatest cause of mortality between 2015 and 2019 was the sum of all respiratory system diseases, which in average caused 283 deaths per year [32]. These numbers put evident importance of the role COVID-19 alone is playing in child mortality. Based on the results presented in this work, in which we observe the direct effect of lives saved, comparing to a scenario with no vaccination, we can say, in advance, that postponing children's vaccination led to avoidable suffering and deaths. Therefore, future studies similar to ours will be needed to estimate the number of children's lives Brazil has sacrificed due to unexplained delays.

Acknowledgements

All authors thank the members of Observatório COVID-19 BR for their insightful discussion of the results of this work. Specially, we would like to thank Verônica Coelho, Maria Amélia Veras, Brigina Kemp, Maria Rita Donalísio, Lorena Barberia, Flávia Ferrari, José Cassio de Moraes, and Guilherme Werneck for their comments. The authors also thank the research funding agencies:

the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior – Brazil (Finance Code 001 to FMDM and LSF), Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico – Brazil (grant number: 315854/2020-0 to MEB, 141698/2018-7 to RLPS, 313055/2020-3 to PIP, 311832/2017-2 to RAK), Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo – Brazil (contract number: 2016/01343-7 to RAK), Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro – Brazil (grant number: E-26/201.277/2021 to LSB) and Inova Fiocruz/Fundação Oswaldo Cruz – Brazil (grant number: 48401485034116) to LSB, OGC and MGFC. The funding agencies had no role in the conceptualization of the study.

Data Availability Statement

All data and code used in this work is publicly available at https://github.com/covid19br/bayes-vacina-paper, we also provide a repository with raw data in [33].

Credit Author Statement

Conceptualization – LSF, LSB, MEB and RLPS. **Methodology** – LSF, LSB and PIP. **Software** – LSF. **Validation** – PIP. **Formal Analysis** – LSF. **Investigation** – LSF. **Data Curation** – MEB and RLPS. **Writing - Original Draft** – LSF, FMDM and RLPS. **Writing - Review & Editing** – All authors. **Visualization** – MFCG and LSF.

References

[1] de Souza WM, Buss LF, da Silva Candido D, Carrera JP, Li S, Zarebski AE, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of the COVID-19 epidemic in Brazil. Nature human behaviour. 2020;4(8):856–865.

[2] Castro MC, Kim S, Barberia L, Ribeiro AF, Gurzenda S, Ribeiro KB, et al. Spatiotemporal pattern of COVID-19 spread in Brazil. Science. 2021 May;372(6544):821–826. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abh1558.

[3] Naveca F, Nascimento V, Souza V, Corado A, Nascimento F, Silva G, et al. Phylogenetic relationship of SARS-CoV-2 sequences from Amazonas with emerg-

ing Brazilian variants harboring mutations E484K and N501Y in the Spike protein. Virological. 2021; . Available from: https://virological.org/t/phylogenetic-relationship-of-sars-cov-2-sequences-from-amazonas-with-emerging-brazilian-va 585.

[4] Sabino EC, Buss LF, Carvalho MPS, Prete CA, Crispim MAE, Fraiji NA, et al. Resurgence of COVID-19 in Manaus, Brazil, despite high seroprevalence. The Lancet. 2021 Feb;397(10273):452–455. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(21)00183-5.

[5] Coutinho RM, Marquitti FMD, Ferreira LS, Borges ME, Paixão da Silva RL, Canton O, et al. Model-based estimation of transmissibility and reinfection of SARS-CoV-2 P.1 variant. Communications Medicine. 2021;1:48. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/s43856-021-00048-6.

[6] Naveca FG, Nascimento V, de Souza VC, de Lima Corado A, Nascimento F, Silva G, et al. COVID-19 in Amazonas, Brazil, was driven by the persistence of endemic lineages and P.1 emergence. Nature Medicine. 2021 May;27(7):1230–1238. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01378-7.

[7] Cruz FO. VIGILÂNCIA GENÔMICA DO SARS-CoV-2 NO BRASIL; 2021. Available from: http://www.genomahcov.fiocruz.br/dashboard/.

[8] Yokota RT, Skalinski LM, Igansi CN, de Souza LR, Iser BP, Reis PO, et al. Risk factors for death from pandemic (H1N1) 2009, southern Brazil. Emerging infectious diseases. 2011;17(8):1467.

[9] Domingues CMAS, de Oliveira WK. Uptake of pandemic influenza (H1N1)-2009 vaccines in Brazil, 2010. Vaccine. 2012 Jul;30(32):4744–4751. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.05.007.

[10] Pacheco FC, França GVA, Elidio GA, Oliveira CM, Guilhem DB. Decrease in the coverage of measles-containing vaccines and the risk of reestablishing endemic transmission of measles

in Brazil. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2019 May;82:51–53. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2019.03.014.

[11] da Fonseca EM, Shadlen KC, Bastos FI. The politics of COVID-19 vaccination in middle-income countries: Lessons from Brazil. Social Science & Medicine. 2021 Jul;281:114093. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114093.

[12] da Saúde M. Plano Nacional de Operacionalização da Vacinação contra Covid-19; 2021. Available from: https://www.gov.br/saude/pt-br/coronavirus/publicacoes-tecnicas/guias-e-planos/plano-nacional-de-vacinacao-covid-19.

[13] Lana RM, Freitas LP, Codeço CT, Pacheco AG, de Carvalho LMF, Villela DAM, et al. Identification of priority groups for COVID-19 vaccination in Brazil. Cadernos de Saúde Pública. 2021;37(10). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-311x00049821.

[14] da Saúde M. Campanha Nacional de Vacinação contra Covid-19; 2021. Available from: https://opendatasus.saude.gov.br/dataset/covid-19-vacinacao.

[15] da Saúde M. SRAG 2021 - Banco de Dados de Síndrome Respiratória Aguda Grave - incluindo dados da COVID-19; 2021. Available from: https://opendatasus.saude.gov.br/dataset/bd-srag-2021.

[16] Bastos LS, Niquini RP, Lana RM, Villela DAM, Cruz OG, Coelho FC, et al. COVID-19 and Hospitalizations for SARI in Brazil: A Comparison up to the 12th Epidemiological Week of 2020. Cadernos de Saúde Pública;36(4):e00070120. Available from: https://www.scielosp.org/article/csp/2020.v36n4/e00070120/en/.

[17] Rue H, Martino S, Chopin N. Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian models by using integrated nested Laplace approximations. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology). 2009 Apr;71(2):319–392. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2008.00700.x.

[18] Rue H, Riebler A, Sørbye SH, Illian JB, Simpson DP, Lindgren FK. Bayesian Computing with INLA: A Review. Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application. 2017 Mar;4(1):395–421. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-060116-054045.

[19] R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria; 2021. Available from: https://www.R-project.org/.

[20] Ranzani OT, Hitchings MD, Dorion M, D'Agostini TL, de Paula RC, de Paula OFP, et al. Effectiveness of the CoronaVac vaccine in older adults during a gamma variant associated epidemic of covid-19 in Brazil: test negative case-control study. bmj. 2021;374.

[21] Miethke-Morais A, Cassenote A, Piva H, Tokunaga E, Cobello V, Gonçalves FAR, et al. Unraveling COVID-19-related hospital costs: The impact of clinical and demographic conditions. 2020 Dec. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.24.20248633.

[22] da Economia do Brasil M. Gastos da União com Combate à COVID-19; 2021. Available from: https://www.tesourotransparente.gov.br/visualizacao/painel-de-monitoramentos-dos-gastos-com-covid-19.

[23] Cerqueira-Silva T, de Araújo Oliveira V, Boaventura VS, Pescarini JM, Júnior JB, Machado TM, et al. Influence of age on the effectiveness and duration of protection of Vaxzevria and CoronaVac vaccines: A population-based study. The Lancet Regional Health-Americas. 2022;6:100154.

[24] Halloran ME, Haber M, Longini Jr IM, Struchiner CJ. Direct and indirect effects in vaccine efficacy and effectiveness. American journal of epidemiology. 1991;133(4):323–331.

[25] Scarbrough Lefebvre CD, Terlinden A, Standaert B. Dissecting the indirect effects caused by vaccines into the basic elements. Human vaccines & immunotherapeutics. 2015;11(9):2142–2157.

[26] Monge S, Olmedo C, Alejos B, Lapeña MF, Sierra MJ, Limia A, et al. Direct and Indirect Effectiveness of mRNA Vaccination against Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Long-Term Care Facilities, Spain. Emerging infectious diseases. 2021;27(10):2595.

[27] Risi Jr JB. The control of poliomyelitis in Brazil. Reviews of infectious diseases. 1984;6(Supplement_2):S400–S403.

[28] Olivé JM, Risi Jr JB, de Quadros CA. National immunization days: experience in Latin America. The Journal of infectious diseases. 1997;175(Supplement_1):S189–S193.

[29] de Oliveira Figueiredo P, Stoffella-Dutra AG, Barbosa Costa G, Silva de Oliveira J, Dourado Amaral C, Duarte Santos J, et al. Re-emergence of yellow fever in Brazil during 2016–2019: Challenges, lessons learned, and perspectives. Viruses. 2020;12(11):1233.

[30] da Saúde M. Anvisa aprova vacina da Pfizer contra Covid para crianças de 5 a 11 anos; 2021. Available from: https://www.gov.br/anvisa/pt-br/assuntos/noticias-anvisa/2021/anvisa-aprova-vacina-da-pfizer-contra-covid-para-criancas-de-5-a-11-anos.

[31] do Estado de São Paulo G. Indígena de 8 anos que faz tratamento de saúde em SP é 1a. criança vacinada do Brasil; 2022. Available from: https://www.saopaulo.sp.gov.br/spnoticias/indigena-de-8-anos-que-faz-tratamento-de-saude-em-sp-e-1a-crianca-vacinada-do-brasil-2/.

[32] da Saúde M. Banco de dados do Sistema Único de Saúde - DATASUS. Informações de Saúde, Sistema de Informações sobre Mortalidade; 2021. Available from: http://tabnet.datasus.gov.br/cgi/tabcgi.exe?sim/cnv/obt10uf.def.

[33] Ferreira LS, Marquitti FMD, da Silva RLP, Borges ME, Gomes MFC, Cruz OG, et al.. Repository for "Estimating the impact of implementation and timing of COVID-19 vaccination programme in Brazil: a counterfactual analysis". Zenodo; 2022. Available from: https://zenodo.org/record/6211980.