

Social inequalities in the misbelief of chloroquine's protective effect against COVID-19: results from the EPICOID-19 study in Brazil

Bruno P Nunes^{1,2}, Inácio Crochemore-Silva^{2,3}, Grégore I Mielke⁴, Luis Paulo Vidaletti², Mariangela Freitas da Silveira², Pedro C Halla^{2,5}

- 1- Postgraduate Programme in Nursing, Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil
- 2- Postgraduate Programme in Epidemiology, Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil
- 3- Postgraduate Programme in Physical Activity, Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil
- 4- School of Public Health, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
- 5- College of Applied Health Sciences, Department of Kinesiology and Community Health, University of Illinois

Correspondence to: Luis Paulo Vidaletti, Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas 96020-220, Brazil luigividaletti@gmail.com Telephone: +55 53 3284 1300

Declaration of interests

We declare no competing interests.

Abstract

Objectives: The aim of this study was to assess the spread of denialist messages regarding COVID-19 in Brazil, specifically examining how social inequalities contributed to the misconception of chloroquine having a protective effect against the virus.

Study design: Three countrywide population-based studies were conducted in 2020 (May 14-21, June 4-7, and June 21-24), including 133 Brazilian cities (n=88,772).

Methods: Participants were asked whether they believed in chloroquine's protective effect against infection with the SARS-CoV-2 virus (no/yes/don't know). A jeopardy index score to assess cumulative social deprivation was calculated based on gender, racial and socioeconomic variables. Descriptive analysis and inequality measures (Slope Index of Inequality – SII; and Concentration Index – CIX) were used to evaluate the main association under investigation. Multinomial logistic regression was used to evaluate 3-category outcome according to independent variables.

Results: Overall, 47.9% of participants either believed that chloroquine prevented against COVID-19 or said, “I don't know”. Misbelief and lack of knowledge about chloroquine were greater among the most vulnerable (lowest levels of education and socioeconomic status). Absolute and relative inequalities were observed according to jeopardy index. Lack of knowledge was 2.49 greater among women than among men. Race/ethnicity minorities, those with low education and low socioeconomic status were more likely to erroneously believe that chloroquine prevented against COVID-19. The highest absolute inequality was observed for the category “I don't know” (SII = -14.3).

Conclusions: Misbelief of chloroquine's protective effect against the SARS-CoV-2 virus was high in Brazil. People with greater social vulnerability were more likely to wrongly believe chloroquine prevented against COVID-19

Keywords: COVID-19. Chloroquine. Socioeconomic Factors. Epidemiology.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has caused several negative consequences for the world population^{1,2}. The most striking impact was the high avoidable mortality caused from inadequate management of the SARS-CoV-2 virus spread. Brazil holds the second-highest number of confirmed COVID-19 deaths (702,421; May 2023), with a mortality rate of over 330 deaths per 100,000 inhabitants. Despite representing 2.7% of the world population, the country accounts for 10.5% of the COVID-19 mortality as of September 2022³. In addition, mortality was unequally distributed in the population⁴⁻⁶. The higher mortality among most vulnerable individuals also worsened the ability of families to maintain and guarantee a family budget sufficient for dignified survival, increasing, for example, food insecurity⁷. In addition to population health issues, there was a deepening of social inequalities^{8,9}.

Inadequate pandemic management is related to scientific denialism¹⁰, as observed in Brazil^{11,12}. Throughout the pandemic, the former Brazilian president Jair Bolsonaro (mandate 2019-2022) carried out actions against science, such as political-party disputes with state governors, relativization of the magnitude and severity of the SARS-CoV-2 virus and creating a dichotomy between public health and economics. Even more severe was the strategy of denying scientific consensus, the delay in purchasing vaccines and the defense of medicines known to be ineffective for preventing and treating infection, such as chloroquine¹³.

As a result, there was a strong emphasis on chloroquine as an effective treatment of SARS-CoV-2 infection, leading to an indiscriminate use prescription by doctors. Unfortunately, the Federal Council of Medicine failed to fight chloroquine off-label use for COVID-19. Such strategies and actions influenced the population's perception of the protective effect of chloroquine in preventing and treating SARS-CoV-2 infection¹¹.

There is an assumption that scientific denialism related to chloroquine reached more the population that supports or is ideologically and electorally aligned with the President elected in 2018, which is characterized by men, older people, and individuals with greater social privileges (higher income and education, for example)¹⁴. Nevertheless, the complexity of information dissemination in society suggests that the fake news' effect may not be restricted to electorally aligned people⁴. Unequal access to high-quality information, lower access to health services¹⁵, and greater difficulties for daily life can make the effect of the spread of fake news about chloroquine more frequent in the most vulnerable people.

In this context, intersectionality is a relevant way of evaluating health indicators to measure social inequities^{16–19}. Previous evidence indicates more significant SARS-CoV-2 virus infection and mortality in contexts characterized by inequalities^{4,5,20}, especially among black, brown, or indigenous individuals and those presenting lower education and lower household assets levels^{5,6,21,22}. The systemic effect of scientific denialism in Brazil seems to widespread impact the society and not only on supporters of the current President, affecting the most vulnerable population deeply as found for mortality^{4,23}. Also, opinion surveys indicate that the positive perception of chloroquine is more concentrated among people with lower education level^{24,25}.

The aim of this study was to assess the spread of denialist messages regarding COVID-19 in Brazil, specifically examining how social inequalities contributed to the misconception of chloroquine having a protective effect against the virus. We hypothesized that scientific denialism is more concentrated in people with greater social vulnerability.

Methods

Data are from the EPICOVID-19 Brazil study. These include three repeated seroprevalence studies conducted in 2020: 1) May 14 to 21 (n = 25,025); 2) June 4th to 7th (n = 31,165); and 3) June 21 to 24 (n = 33,207). For each face-to-face survey, a three-stage probabilistic sample was selected (cities, urban census tracts and households). Participants tested for antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 using the WONDFO SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Test (Wondfo Biotech Co., Guangzhou, China), which detects the presence of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 (IgG and IgM). Further methodological details are available elsewhere^{21,26,27}. For the present study, 88,772 individuals with valid information for beliefs regarding COVID-19 were included in the analysis.

The primary outcome assessed in this study was the percentage of the population holding the misconception that chloroquine provides protection against the SARS-CoV-2 virus. This was measured using the following question: “What do you believe offers protection against the coronavirus? [take chloroquine – no/yes/do not know]”. In our study, responses “yes” and “I do not know” were considered as an indicator of denialism in the pandemic due to the wide dissemination led by the actions and speeches of the President, using fake news and misinformation about the "efficacy" of chloroquine to prevent and treat COVID-19.

A jeopardy index score was calculated based on the aggregation of four sociodemographic variables that express dimensions of social privileges: gender (male; female), self-reported race/skin color (“white”; “brown”/mixed race; “black”; “yellow”; and “indigenous”), education level (incomplete elementary school; complete elementary school; complete high school; complete university degree); and wealth score (divided in quartiles), which was based on characteristics and assets of the household²⁸. A composite jeopardy index

score was created by assigning the most privileged group of each variable a score of zero (men, white, highest education, and highest socioeconomic position) and the least privileged group a score of one (women and non-white) or three (none or incomplete primary level of education and the lowest quartile of socioeconomic position). Therefore, for each variable the following scores were assigned: gender (men = 0; women = 1); racial identity (white = 0; non-white = 1); education (university graduate = 0; complete secondary or incomplete university = 1; complete primary or incomplete secondary = 2; none or incomplete primary = 3); socioeconomic position (top quartile = 0; 3rd quartile = 1; 2nd quartile = 2, bottom quartile = 3). Scores for each indicator were summed, resulting a 'Jeopardy Index' ranging from 0 to 8. The index is lower for individuals with greater social privilege (or greater guarantee of human rights), which can also be interpreted as lower social vulnerability.

We performed descriptive analysis using prevalence and respective confidence intervals (95%CI). The main outcome ("believe in the protective effect of chloroquine against the SARS-CoV-2 virus") was analyzed according to the main exposure (jeopardy index) and by all variables that composed the index. We used multinomial logistic regression models to evaluate the crude and adjusted odds ratios of belief (yes) and lack of knowledge (don't know) in the chloroquine protective effect against COVID-19 according to each independent variable (sex, skin color, education level and wealth) where all variables were mutually included in adjusted model. According to jeopardy index, we evaluate the crude effect of the belief (yes) and lack of knowledge (don't know) in the chloroquine protective effect against COVID-19.

Complex measures of inequality were performed by calculating the Slope Index of Inequality (SII) and Concentration Index (CIX) using the jeopardy index as exposure. The SII represents the outcome's absolute difference (in predicted values through logistic regression)

according to the jeopardy index. Thus, the SII represents the absolute difference, in percentage points, between the values estimated for the extreme groups of the stratification variable. The linearity deviation was evaluated through visual assessment. The CIX evaluates the relative inequality similarly to the GINI index. Both indicators considered the entire distribution of the stratifier (jeopardy index) and were presented at values between -100 to +100. Negative and positive values express more pronounced inequalities among most and lowest vulnerable people, respectively^{29,30}.

Results

Sociodemographic characteristics of the 88,772 eligible participants are described in Table 1. Most participants were women (58.3%), self-reported their skin color as brown, and completed high school. Not knowing or believing that chloroquine has a protective effect against COVID-19 was observed in almost half of the sample (47.9%). Overall, 20.0% (95%CI: 19.7; 20.4) of participants reported they believed that chloroquine was effective, while 27.9% (95%CI: 27.4; 28.3) reported they did not know.

The highest prevalence of lack of knowledge and belief in the protective effect of chloroquine was observed in participants who declared themselves to be indigenous. Participants with university degree had a lower percentage of belief in the effect of chloroquine (16.5%) than those with lower levels of education. A gradient in education levels and wealth quartiles among those who are unaware of the actual effect of chloroquine was observed. The prevalence of lack of knowledge regarding chloroquine's protective effect was higher among individuals with lower education levels and those in the lowest wealth quartile. Conversely, among people who believe in the protective effect of chloroquine, the highest prevalence was observed among the lowest socioeconomic position group.

The associations of sociodemographic variables with lack of knowledge and the belief in the protective effect of chloroquine against COVID-19 are presented in Table 2. Women had lower odds of believing in the protective effects of chloroquine than men. Race/ethnicity minorities, as well as those with lower education levels and lower socioeconomic positions, had higher odds likely to erroneously believe that chloroquine prevented against COVID-19. Overall, women also and those with lower education and socioeconomic position were more likely than their counterpart to report lack of knowledge about the protective effects of chloroquine.

The prevalence of belief and lack of knowledge in the protective effect of chloroquine against COVID-19 according to the Jeopardy index is presented in Figure 1. Across all groups, the majority of participants did not believe in the protective effect of chloroquine. However, as the Jeopardy index scores increased, the proportion of participants who did not believe in the protective effect of chloroquine decreased. Conversely, the percentage of people who were unaware of the effect of chloroquine increased as the Jeopardy index scores rose. In general, around 20% of people believed in the protective effect of chloroquine, and this percentage did not vary based on the Jeopardy index score. Compared with those in the lowest jeopardy index score [male, white, highest education, and highest wealth quartile]), those with a score of four onward had higher odds of reporting they believed in the protective effects of chloroquine (Table 3), while participants with a score of two or higher had higher odds of being unaware of the effect of chloroquine. Differences between scores were greater among those who are unaware of the effect of chloroquine compared to believers, summarized in the indicators of absolute and relative inequalities (SII and CIX, respectively).

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics and description and belief in the chloroquine protective effect against COVID-19 according to sociodemographic variables. Brazil, EPICOVID (rounds 1 to 3), 2020. N=88,772*

| Variables | % | Belief in chloroquine protective effect | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | No % (95%CI) | Yes % (95%CI) | Don't know % (95%CI) |
| Sex | | | | |
| Male | 41.7 | 51.4 (50.7; 52.0) | 22.0 (21.5; 22.5) | 26.6 (26.0; 27.2) |
| Female | 58.3 | 52.6 (52.1; 53.2) | 18.6 (18.2; 19.0) | 28.8 (28.2; 29.3) |
| Race/skin color | | | | |
| White | 37.0 | 53.7 (53.0; 54.4) | 18.5 (18.0; 19.0) | 27.8 (27.1; 28.5) |
| Brown (mixed race) | 45.9 | 51.5 (50.9; 52.2) | 21.4 (20.9; 21.9) | 27.1 (26.5; 27.7) |
| Black | 12.9 | 53.5 (52.4; 54.6) | 18.9 (18.1; 19.7) | 27.6 (26.7; 28.5) |
| Yellow | 2.8 | 50.2 (48.3; 52.0) | 21.3 (19.7; 23.0) | 28.5; 26.7; 30.4) |
| Indigenous | 1.4 | 46.5 (43.5; 49.5) | 24.5 (21.9; 27.3) | 29.0 (26.3; 31.8) |
| Education level | | | | |
| University degree | 20.1 | 63.9 (63.1; 64.7) | 16.5 (15.9; 17.2) | 19.5 (18.9; 20.2) |
| High school | 36.6 | 53.3 (52.7; 54.0) | 20.5 (20.0; 21.1) | 26.1 (25.5; 26.8) |
| Elementary school | 19.6 | 46.3 (45.4; 47.2) | 20.9 (20.2; 21.6) | 32.8 (32.0; 33.6) |
| Incomplete elementary school | 23.7 | 45.3 (44.4; 46.2) | 21.4 (20.7; 22.0) | 33.3 (32.4; 34.2) |
| Wealth quartiles | | | | |
| 1 (Richest) | 22.6 | 58.0 (57.3; 58.7) | 19.1 (18.5; 19.6) | 22.9 (22.3; 23.6) |
| 2 nd | 23.8 | 54.0 (53.2; 54.9) | 19.0 (18.4; 19.6) | 27.0 (26.3; 27.7) |
| 3 rd | 24.6 | 51.2 (50.5; 51.9) | 19.5 (19.0; 20.1) | 29.3 (28.5; 30.0) |
| 4 (Poorest) | 29.0 | 46.8 (46.0; 47.6) | 22.0 (21.4; 22.6) | 31.2 (30.5; 32.0) |
| Total | 100.0 | 52.1 (51.6; 52.6) | 20.0 (19.7; 20.4) | 27.9 (27.3; 28.3) |

*Analytical sample: valid information to variable "chloroquine protective effect against COVID-19".

Table 2. Association between sociodemographic characteristics and misbelief in the protective effect of chloroquine against COVID-19. Brazil, EPICOVID (rounds 1 to 3), 2020. (n=88,772)


| Variables | Chloroquine protective effect (Reference: No) ^a | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| | Crude | | Adjusted ^b | |
| | Yes OR (95%CI) | Don't know OR (95%CI) | Yes OR (95%CI) | Don't know OR (95%CI) |
| Sex | | | | |
| Male | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Female | 0.82 (0.79; 0.86) | 1.06 (1.02; 1.09) | 0.83 (0.80; 0.86) | 1.06 (1.03; 1.10) |
| Race/skin color | | | | |
| White | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Non-white ^c | 1.17 (1.13; 1.22) | 1.02 (0.98; 1.06) | 1.09 (1.05; 1.14) | 0.92 (0.88; 0.95) |
| Education level | | | | |
| University degree | | | | |
| High school | 1.49 (1.41; 1.57) | 1.61 (1.53; 1.69) | 1.42 (1.34; 1.50) | 1.54 (1.46; 1.62) |
| Elementary school | 1.75 (1.65; 1.85) | 2.32 (2.20; 2.44) | 1.62 (1.52; 1.73) | 2.17 (2.06; 2.30) |
| Incomplete elementary school | 1.82 (1.71; 1.94) | 2.41 (2.27; 2.54) | 1.65 (1.54; 1.77) | 2.18 (2.04; 2.32) |
| Wealth quartiles | | | | |
| 1 st (wealthiest) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 2 nd | 1.07 (1.02; 1.13) | 1.26 (1.20; 1.33) | 0.97 (0.92; 1.03) | 1.12 (1.06; 1.18) |
| 3 rd | 1.16 (1.11; 1.22) | 1.45 (1.38; 1.52) | 0.99 (0.94; 1.04) | 1.16 (1.10; 1.22) |
| 4 th (Poorest) | 1.43 (1.36; 1.51) | 1.69 (1.61; 1.77) | 1.15 (1.09; 1.22) | 1.24 (1.17; 1.30) |

^a Multinomial logistic regression model. Odds ratios indicate the odds of reporting “yes” or “I don’t know” instead of “No”. OR <1 indicates that the participants were less likely, and OR >1 suggests that they were more likely to respond “Yes” or “I don’t know”, instead of “No”, to the question “Do you believe chloroquine offers protection against the coronavirus?”

^b Mutually adjusted for other variables presented in the table.

^c Black-Brown-Yellow-Indigenous

Figure 1. Predicted prevalence of the belief in the chloroquine protective effect against COVID-19 according to jeopardy index. Brazil, EPICOVID (rounds 1 to 3), 2020.



Note: Jeopardy index: Zero=male, white, highest education, and highest wealth quartile; Eight=woman, black-brown-yellow-indigenous, lowest education and lowest wealth quartile

Table 3. Belief in the chloroquine protective effect against COVID-19 according to jeopardy index. Brazil, EPICOVID (rounds 1 to 3), 2020.

| Variables | Chloroquine protective effect (Reference: No) ^a | |
|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| | Yes OR (CI95%) | Don't know OR (CI95%) |
| Jeopardy index ^b | | |
| 0 | Ref | Ref |
| 1 | 0.94 (0.81; 1.08) | 1.05 (0.91; 1.21) |
| 2 | 1.03 (0.91; 1.18) | 1.21 (1.06; 1.38) |
| 3 | 1.13 (0.99; 1.28) | 1.55 (1.37; 1.76) |
| 4 | 1.21 (1.07; 1.37) | 1.69 (1.50; 1.91) |
| 5 | 1.33 (1.17; 1.52) | 1.88 (1.67; 2.12) |
| 6 | 1.41 (1.24; 1.60) | 2.15 (1.90; 2.43) |
| 7 | 1.63 (1.43; 1.86) | 2.45 (2.16; 2.78) |
| 8 | 1.69 (1.47; 1.94) | 2.49 (2.15; 2.87) |
| SII (95%CI) | -4.3 (-5.3; -3.3) | -14.3 (-15.5; -13.2) |
| CIX (95%CI) | -3.0 (-3.8; -2.3) | -6.6 (-7.2; -5.9) |

^a Multinomial logistic regression model. Odds ratios indicate the odds of reporting “yes” or “I don’t know” instead of “No”. OR <1 indicates that the participants were less likely, and OR >1 suggests that they were more likely to respond “Yes” or “I don’t know”, instead of “No”, to the question “Do you believe chloroquine offers protection against the coronavirus?”

^b Jeopardy index: Zero= male, white, highest education, and highest wealth quartile; Eight= woman, black-brown-yellow-indigenous, lowest education and lowest wealth quartile

^c Slope index of inequality and Concentration Index (values between -100 a 100) according to jeopardy index.

Discussion

The findings indicate that during the first months of the pandemic there was a very high misbelief in chloroquine's protective effect against the SARS-CoV-2 virus. One in five Brazilians believed in the use of chloroquine as a protection against the coronavirus, while nearly a quarter were uncertain about its effects. Furthermore, our study showed notable disparities, with a higher prevalence of misbelief, particularly among the most vulnerable population groups. On the other hand, the belief in the protective effect of mask usage and adherence to stay-at-home policies were nearly universal and did not exhibit inequalities based on the jeopardy index (data not shown). These findings demonstrate the specific sources of denialism in Brazil and their influence on public perceptions.

The high misbelief in the protective effect of chloroquine against the COVID-19 could be attributed to the data collection period, which was carried out between May and August 2020. However, it is important to note that there was a high assertive belief in the protective effect of chloroquine (20% answered "yes") even with results and scientific consensus described in the first half of 2020 already pointing out the lack of robust evidence on the benefit of chloroquine and warned of its side effects. Since April 2020, the preliminary results of the CloroCovid-19 study pointed out the inefficacy and the risks of chloroquine in the disease treatment³³.

In addition, the most current evidence indicates a similar percentage of the Brazilian population that continues to believe in the protective effect of chloroquine. The survey "The Face of Democracy", for example, identified, in April 2021, that one in four Brazilians claims to have used drugs of the so-called "early treatment" against COVID-19 or to prevent infection by the SARS-CoV-2 virus.

The executive power's milestone of the public defense of chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine happened on March 27, 2020, by a post of the President on a social network. The post cited "accurate information" about chloroquine having a "high success rate" using as a basis a pre-print paper (published only in July 2020) that evaluated the effect of hydroxychloroquine in a non-randomized study with 36 French patients. This post was in line with publications by the President of the United States at the time³⁴. In February 2020, a parliamentary commission was created to deal with the COVID-19 crisis. In two sessions held in April and July 2020, chloroquine was the central meeting emphasis influenced by the speeches and posts of the head of the federal government. In these meetings, a parliamentarian aligned with the federal government informed the work of the Brazilian Army in manufacturing the drug to be sent to states and municipalities. Since then, technical documents and positions of the Federal Council of Medicine have been published supporting chloroquine mainly in the so-called "early treatment", even for cases with mild symptoms, as observed in an Informative Note from May 2020. Since then, strategies such as the COVID Kit have been popularized, including using federal government digital platforms (*TrateCOV*)³⁴. In this context, more robust scientific evidence has been signaling the null effect of chloroquine in the treatment and prevention of COVID-19, in addition to reports of the side effects which were widely recorded throughout the pandemic^{35–37}.

The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) stated, in June 2020, the ineffectiveness of chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine to treat SARS-CoV-2 infection. During the same period, the World Health Organization announced the interruption of clinical trials using chloroquine. In Brazil, except for the Federal Council of Medicine, scientific societies, scientists, and health councils warned about the risks of using

chloroquine to face the pandemic. In May 2020, the National Health Council published a note indicating that scientific evidence pointed to side effects and no benefit for outcomes related to COVID-19³⁸. Nevertheless, the defense of the drug by the president of the republic and his supporters continued throughout 2020 and 2021^{13,39}. Still, in 2022, statements about the benefit of chloroquine are found in several public interviews carried out by the head of the executive power³⁹. It is also worth noting that in addition to the negationist discursive practice, there was a deliberate omission on the subject at the Ministry of Health level, executing imprecise positions or campaigns with adequate information to face the pandemic.

The ineffectiveness of chloroquine (or hydroxychloroquine) to combat the SARS-CoV-2 virus is more than consolidated⁴⁰⁻⁴². Findings from the DETECTCOV-19 cohort in Manaus indicate a higher seroprevalence (immunoglobulin G positivity) among people who self-medicated as a prophylaxis strategy⁴³. Similar results were observed in studies on the effect of hydroxychloroquine as a preventive or post-exposure therapy⁴⁴. However, the population's perception of chloroquine's benefit (and others such as ivermectin) persists, according to results from 2021 and 2022^{24,45,46}.

Scientific denialism as a government policy has caused a greater concentration of misperception about the role of chloroquine in facing the pandemic. Our findings identify inequalities, especially for those who did not know if the drug protected against the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Although the answer "I do not know" seems to be a lack of knowledge, it represents the population's doubt influenced by the president's speeches. It is noteworthy that for effective non-pharmacological measures to prevent infection (staying at home and wearing a mask), the percentage of respondents who did not know

was <1%, respectively (data not shown). Thus, lack of knowledge seems to be more influenced by the government's denialist strategy than by a scientific question about the drug's effect. Thus, it is plausible to understand that the strategy of the Brazilian federal government was an initiative to discredit scientific consensus and create distrust in the population, making it challenging to adopt really effective strategies to face the pandemic^{12,47-50}. The perception of the available treatments tends to reduce the adoption of preventive measures. The governmental strategy aimed to herd immunity (i.e., "greater contamination possible")^{13,51} to achieve economic goals unrelated to basic human rights for life's protection. The herd immunity proved impractical as was speculated by science since 2020, the chloroquine treatment was ineffective, and the result was high mortality attributable to the federal government's denialist policy of the federal government^{4,52}.

In addition to study limitations related to the sampling and sample characteristics^{21,22}, a possible limitation of this analysis is related to the percentage of losses and refusals (46-47%), which can lead to a differential bias. The refusal might be higher among wealthier people who believe in the chloroquine effect^{31,32}. However, this possible bias may produce an underestimating misbelief in chloroquine's protective effect against the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Thus, the possible selection bias may be overestimating the association, but simultaneously decreasing the magnitude of the misbelief in the Brazilian population's chloroquine effect.

The misbelief in chloroquine's protective effect was widespread in the Brazilian population, not just the profile of people ideologically and electorally aligned with the President of the Republic. People with greater social vulnerability were those most

affected by a lack of knowledge about the effectiveness of chloroquine. The denialist federal management of the pandemic in Brazil was contaminant and contaminating, influencing the tragic mortality observed in the country.

Statements of ethical approval

This study complied with all ethical precepts and legislation governing research with human beings and was approved by the National Research Ethics Commission (CAAE 30721520.7.1001.5313). All participants signed an informed consent form.

Declaration of interests

We declare no competing interests.

Data sharing

The EPICOV19 datasets are freely available online.

Acknowledgments

The study was funded by the Brazilian Ministry of Health, Instituto Serrapilheira, Brazilian Collective Health Association and JBS Fazer o Bem Faz Bem. The funder has no role in study design, data collection/analysis, interpretation of findings, or manuscript writing.

References

1. Gebeyehu DT, East L, Wark S, Islam MS. Impact of COVID-19 on the food security and identifying the compromised food security dimension: A systematic review protocol. *PLOS ONE*. 2022 Aug 9;17(8):e0272859.
2. Panneer S, Kantamaneni K, Palaniswamy U, Bhat L, Pushparaj RRB, Nayar KR, et al. Health, Economic and Social Development Challenges of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Strategies for Multiple and Interconnected Issues. *Healthcare*. 2022 May;10(5):770.
3. Ritchie H, Mathieu E, Rodés-Guirao L, Appel C, Giattino C, Ortiz-Ospina E, et al. Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). *Our World Data* [Internet]. 2020 Mar 5 [cited 2022 Jun 7]; Available from: <https://ourworldindata.org/covid-deaths>
4. Xavier DR, Silva EL e, Lara FA, Silva GRR e, Oliveira MF, Gurgel H, et al. Involvement of political and socio-economic factors in the spatial and temporal dynamics of COVID-19 outcomes in Brazil: A population-based study. *Lancet Reg Health – Am* [Internet]. 2022 Mar 14 [cited 2022 Jun 7];0(0). Available from: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanam/article/PIIS2667-193X\(22\)00038-2/abstract](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanam/article/PIIS2667-193X(22)00038-2/abstract)
5. Baqui P, Marra V, Alaa AM, Bica I, Ercole A, van der Schaar M. Comparing COVID-19 risk factors in Brazil using machine learning: the importance of socioeconomic, demographic and structural factors. *Sci Rep*. 2021 Aug 2;11(1):15591.
6. Ribeiro KB, Ribeiro AF, Veras MA de SM, de Castro MC. Social inequalities and COVID-19 mortality in the city of São Paulo, Brazil. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2021 Jun 1;50(3):732–42.
7. II Inquérito Nacional sobre Insegurança Alimentar no Contexto da Pandemia da COVID-19 no Brasil [livro eletrônico]: II VIGISAN : relatório final/Rede Brasileira de Pesquisa em Soberania e Segurança Alimentar – PENSSAN. -- São Paulo, SP : Fundação Friedrich Ebert : Rede PENSSAN, 2022. -- (Análise ; 1) PDF.
8. Victora CG, Barreto ML, Leal M do C, Monteiro CA, Schmidt MI, Paim J, et al. Health conditions and health-policy innovations in Brazil: the way forward. *The Lancet*. 2011 Jun 11;377(9782):2042–53.
9. Victora CG, Hartwig FP, Vidaletti LP, Martorell R, Osmond C, Richter LM, et al. Effects of early-life poverty on health and human capital in children and adolescents: analyses of national surveys and birth cohort studies in LMICs. *The Lancet*. 2022 Apr 30;399(10336):1741–52.
10. Diethelm P, McKee M. Denialism: what is it and how should scientists respond? *Eur J Public Health*. 2009 Jan 1;19(1):2–4.
11. Duarte A de M, César MR de A. Negação da Política e Negacionismo como Política: pandemia e democracia. *Educ Real* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 11 [cited 2022 May 31];45. Available from: <http://www.scielo.br/j/edreal/a/DsjZ343HBXtdVySjcgmX3VS/?lang=pt>
12. Ajzenman N, Cavalcanti T, Da Mata D. More than Words: Leaders’ Speech and Risky Behavior During a Pandemic. *Camb Work Pap Econ* [Internet]. 2020 Apr 29 [cited 2021 May 7]; Available from: <https://ideas.repec.org/p/cam/camdae/2034.html>

13. Ventura D de FL, Aith FMA, Reis RR, Ferreira AB, Rosa AV da, Farias AS, et al. LexAtlas C19 - Brazil - The Timeline of the Federal Government's Strategy to spread Covid-19 [Internet]. Zenodo; 2021 Aug [cited 2022 Sep 12]. Available from: <https://zenodo.org/record/5167005>
14. Corrêa R. DATATEMPO: Saiba quem são os eleitores de Lula e Bolsonaro | O TEMPO [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Sep 13]. Available from: <https://www.otempo.com.br/politica/datatempo/datatempo-saiba-quem-sao-os-eleitores-de-lula-e-bolsonaro-1.2543660>
15. Horta BL, Silveira MF, Barros AJD, Hartwig FP, Dias MS, Menezes AMB, et al. COVID-19 and outpatient care: a nationwide household survey. *Cad Saude Publica*. 2022;38(4):e00194121.
16. Cooper B. Intersectionality [Internet]. *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory*. 2016 [cited 2022 Jul 7]. Available from: <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199328581.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199328581-e-20>
17. Venkatachalam D, Mishra G, Fatima A, Nadimpally S. 'Marginalizing' health: employing an equity and intersectionality frame. *Saúde Em Debate*. 2020 Aug 17;44:109–19.
18. Bauer GR, Churchill SM, Mahendran M, Walwyn C, Lizotte D, Villa-Rueda AA. Intersectionality in quantitative research: A systematic review of its emergence and applications of theory and methods. *SSM - Popul Health*. 2021 Jun 1;14:100798.
19. Mielke GI, Malta DC, Nunes BP, Cairney J. All are equal, but some are more equal than others: social determinants of leisure time physical activity through the lens of intersectionality. *BMC Public Health*. 2022 Dec;22(1):1–11.
20. Demenech LM, Dumith S de C, Vieira MECD, Neiva-Silva L. Desigualdade econômica e risco de infecção e morte por COVID-19 no Brasil. *Rev Bras Epidemiol* [Internet]. 2020 Oct 5 [cited 2022 Sep 13];23. Available from: <http://www.scielo.br/j/rbepid/a/fm3gkNqTH9XS9nBfqcGwgfG/?lang=pt>
21. Hallal PC, Hartwig FP, Horta BL, Silveira MF, Struchiner CJ, Vidaletti LP, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence in Brazil: results from two successive nationwide serological household surveys. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2020 Nov;8(11):e1390–8.
22. Horta BL, Silveira MF, Barros AJD, Barros FC, Hartwig FP, Dias MS, et al. [Prevalence of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 according to socioeconomic and ethnic status in a nationwide Brazilian survey Prevalência de anticorpos contra o SARS-CoV-2 de acordo com o status socioeconômico e étnico em uma pesquisa nacional no Brasil]. *Rev Panam Salud Publica Pan Am J Public Health*. 2021;45:e105.
23. Guimarães RM, Moreira MR. How does the context effect of denialism reinforce the oppression of the vulnerable people and negatively determine health? *Lancet Reg Health Am*. 2022 Aug;12:100270.
24. Tabak F. "A cara da Democracia": o que passa na cabeça dos brasileiros?: Ao Ponto (podcast do jornal O Globo) online no Globoplay [Internet]. Globoplay. 2022 [cited 2022 Sep 13]. Available from: <https://globoplay.globo.com/podcasts/episode/ao-ponto-podcast-do-jornal-o-globo/79bf660c-f340-415d-bb3f-d0621b73a708/>

25. Tabak F, Couto M. Terra plana, cloroquina como cura da Covid e homem na lua: o percentual dos brasileiros que acreditam em teorias da conspiração [Internet]. O Globo. 2022 [cited 2022 Sep 14]. Available from: <https://oglobo.globo.com/blogs/pulso/post/2022/07/terra-plana-cloroquina-como-cura-da-covid-e-homem-na-lua-o-percentual-dos-brasileiros-que-acreditam-em-teorias-da-conspiracao.ghtml>
26. Hallal PC, Barros FC, Silveira MF, Barros AJD de, Dellagostin OA, Pellanda LC, et al. EPICoVID19 protocol: repeated serological surveys on SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in Brazil. *Cienc Saude Coletiva*. 2020 Sep;25(9):3573–8.
27. Silveira MF, Barros AJD, Horta BL, Pellanda LC, Victora GD, Dellagostin OA, et al. Population-based surveys of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 in Southern Brazil. *Nat Med*. 2020 Aug;26(8):1196–9.
28. Barros AJD, Victora CG. Indicador econômico para o Brasil baseado no censo demográfico de 2000. *Rev Saúde Pública*. 2005 Aug;39:523–9.
29. Silva ICM da, Restrepo-Mendez MC, Costa JC, Ewerling F, Hellwig F, Ferreira LZ, et al. Measurement of social inequalities in health: concepts and methodological approaches in the Brazilian context. *Epidemiol E Serviços Saúde* [Internet]. 2018 Mar 5 [cited 2022 Jun 28];27. Available from: <http://www.scielo.br/j/ress/a/6PC8rqBSF4mwB7dsKT35vfH/?lang=en>
30. Barros AJD, Victora CG. Measuring Coverage in MNCH: Determining and Interpreting Inequalities in Coverage of Maternal, Newborn, and Child Health Interventions. *PLOS Med*. 2013 May 7;10(5):e1001390.
31. Hallal P. SOS Brazil: science under attack. *Lancet Lond Engl*. 2021 Feb 30;397(10272):373.
32. Hallal PC, Victora CG, Silveira MF, Barros AJD, Menezes AMB, Horta BL, et al. The challenge of conducting epidemiological research in times of pandemic and denialism: 1-year anniversary of the EPICoVID-19 project in Brazil. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2021 Aug 30;50(4):1049–52.
33. Borba MGS, Val FFA, Sampaio VS, Alexandre MAA, Melo GC, Brito M, et al. Chloroquine diphosphate in two different dosages as adjunctive therapy of hospitalized patients with severe respiratory syndrome in the context of coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) infection: Preliminary safety results of a randomized, double-blinded, phase IIb clinical trial (CloroCovid-19 Study). medRxiv. 2020 Apr 16;2020.04.07.20056424.
34. Penaforte TR. [Denialism as policy: the debate on chloroquine in a congressional inquiry in Brazil]. *Cad Saude Publica*. 2021;37(7):e00023021.
35. Melo JRR, Duarte EC, Moraes MV de, Fleck K, Silva AS do N e, Arrais PSD. Adverse drug reactions in patients with COVID-19 in Brazil: analysis of spontaneous notifications of the Brazilian pharmacovigilance system. *Cad Saúde Pública* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 22 [cited 2022 Sep 12];37. Available from: <http://www.scielo.br/j/csp/a/DQHfJwbLrnjCQFZLsYtNZfN/?lang=en>
36. Hernandez AV, Roman YM, Pasupuleti V, Barboza JJ, White CM. Hydroxychloroquine or Chloroquine for Treatment or Prophylaxis of COVID-19. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020 Aug 18;173(4):287–96.

37. Borba MGS, Val FFA, Sampaio VS, Alexandre MAA, Melo GC, Brito M, et al. Effect of High vs Low Doses of Chloroquine Diphosphate as Adjunctive Therapy for Patients Hospitalized With Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infection: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020 Apr 24;3(4):e208857.
38. Anjos L dos. NOTA PÚBLICA: CNS alerta sobre os riscos do uso da Cloroquina e Hidroxicloroquina no tratamento da Covid-19 [Internet]. Conselho Nacional de Saúde. [cited 2022 Sep 12]. Available from: <http://conselho.saude.gov.br/ultimas-noticias-cns/1194-nota-publica-cns-alerta-sobre-os-riscos-do-uso-da-cloroquina-e-hidroxicloroquina-no-tratamento-da-covid-21>
39. Freitas A, Nalon T, Moura B, dos Santos (Editores) LF. Todas as declarações de Bolsonaro, checadas. Reportagem: Ana Rita Cunha, Amanda Ribeiro, Luiz Fernando Menezes, Ana Freitas, Bruno Fávero, Priscila Pacheco e Marco Faustino. Desenvolvimento: Carolina Cavaleiro, Rômulo Collopy, Erico Rosa e Guilherme Lobo (Cafe.art.br), Sérgio Spagnuolo, Bárbara Libório, Ana Rita Cunha, Tai Nalon e Parafernália Interativa [Internet]. [cited 2022 Sep 14]. Available from: <https://aosfatos.org/todas-as-declara%C3%A7%C3%B5es-de-bolsonaro/>
40. Lamontagne F, Agoritsas T, Siemieniuk R, Rochweg B, Bartoszko J, Askie L, et al. A living WHO guideline on drugs to prevent covid-19. *BMJ* [Internet]. 2021 Mar 2 [cited 2022 Sep 12];372. Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/content/372/bmj.n526>
41. Martins-Filho PR, Ferreira LC, Heimfarth L, Araújo AA de S, Quintans-Júnior LJ. Efficacy and safety of hydroxychloroquine as pre-and post-exposure prophylaxis and treatment of COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis of blinded, placebo-controlled, randomized clinical trials. *Lancet Reg Health - Am*. 2021 Oct 1;2:100062.
42. Singh B, Ryan H, Kredo T, Chaplin M, Fletcher T. Chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine for prevention and treatment of COVID-19. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 May 5];(2). Available from: <https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD013587.pub2/full>
43. Lalwani P, Salgado BB, Filho IVP, da Silva DSS, de Moraes TB do N, Jordão MF, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and associated factors in Manaus, Brazil: baseline results from the DETECTCoV-19 cohort study. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2021 Sep 1;110:141–50.
44. Boulware DR, Pullen MF, Bangdiwala AS, Pastick KA, Lofgren SM, Okafor EC, et al. A Randomized Trial of Hydroxychloroquine as Postexposure Prophylaxis for Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Aug 6;383(6):517–25.
45. Santos F. A Cara da Democracia - Paradoxos do Negacionismo [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Sep 13]. Available from: <https://noticias.uol.com.br/colunas/a-cara-da-democracia/2021/06/02/paradoxos-do-negacionismo.htm>
46. Collucci C. Crença em tratamento ineficaz para Covid vai além do bolsonarismo, diz estudo [Internet]. Folha de S.Paulo. 2021 [cited 2022 Sep 14]. Available from: <https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/equilibrioesaude/2021/06/crenca-em-tratamento-ineficaz-para-covid-vai-alem-do-bolsonarismo-diz-estudo.shtml>
47. Galhardi CP, Freire NP, Fagundes MCM, Minayo MC de S, Cunha ICKO. Fake News and vaccine hesitancy in the COVID-19 pandemic in Brazil. *Cienc Saude Coletiva*. 2022 May;27(5):1849–58.

48. Storopoli J, Braga da Silva Neto WL, Mesch GS. Confidence in social institutions, perceived vulnerability and the adoption of recommended protective behaviors in Brazil during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Soc Sci Med* 1982. 2020 Nov;265:113477.
49. Knaul FM, Touchton M, Arreola-Ornelas H, Atun R, Anyosa RJC, Frenk J, et al. Punt Politics as Failure of Health System Stewardship: Evidence from the COVID-19 Pandemic Response in Brazil and Mexico. *Lancet Reg Health Am*. 2021 Dec;4:100086.
50. Touchton M, Knaul FM, Arreola-Ornelas H, Porteny T, Sánchez M, Méndez O, et al. A partisan pandemic: state government public health policies to combat COVID-19 in Brazil. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2021 Jun;6(6).
51. Furlan L, Caramelli B. The regrettable story of the “Covid Kit” and the “Early Treatment of Covid-19” in Brazil. *Lancet Reg Health – Am* [Internet]. 2021 Dec 1 [cited 2022 Sep 12];4. Available from: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanam/article/PIIS2667-193X\(21\)00085-5/fulltext#%20](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanam/article/PIIS2667-193X(21)00085-5/fulltext#%20)
52. Almeida L de, Carelli PV, Cavalcanti NG, Jr JD do N, Felinto D. Quantifying political influence on COVID-19 fatality in Brazil. *PLOS ONE*. 2022 Jul 12;17(7):e0264293.