Must Whatever Goes up Come Down? Mortality Gradients in the Emergence of COVID-19

Jordan D. Klein[a*]

[a]Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research,

Konrad-Zuse-Straße 1, 18057 Rostock, Germany

klein@demogr.mpg.de

[*]Corresponding author

Abstract

According to fundamental cause theory, even as disease burdens shift, social inequalities in mortality persist. Yet for emerging infectious diseases, isolating the roles played by underlying social disadvantage from unequal access to protective interventions remains a challenge. This is amplified in the historically unique case of COVID-19: since mitigation measures were deployed contemporaneously with the disease's global dissemination, we lack empirical evidence to disentangle the effects of pre-existing social conditions from interventions.

To address this gap, I developed a theory-guided, data-driven, geospatially explicit susceptible–exposed–infectious–recovered–deceased model of all 5,565 Brazilian municipalities. I parameterize pre-existing inequities through disparities in household transmission and infection fatality rates and model two interventions, non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) and vaccination, for which I simulate nine counterfactual distribution scenarios, from no interventions to real-world distribution and alternative more-equitable strategies.

In the absence of interventions the model reproduced an "expected" gradient: mortality became increasingly concentrated in low socioeconomic status municipalities as the disease proliferated. NPI adoption following observed, socially stratified patterns accelerated, rather than created, this gradient, suggesting pre-existing social conditions as the primary drivers of Brazil's COVID-19 mortality gradient, while unequal interventions merely reinforced their effects.

However, prioritizing the most vulnerable municipalities for vaccination inverted the gradient, an effect further compounded by equal adoption of NPIs, largely neutralizing the impact of these pre-existing conditions. These findings can help guide more equitable policy responses to future emerging infectious disease crises. This study is the first incorporating the pathways framework of inequalities in emerging infectious disease into mechanistic modeling.

Keywords: COVID-19, Mortality, Social Determinants of Health, Fundamental Cause Theory, Mathematical modeling, Vaccination, Brazil

Highlights:

- First national-level mechanistic model of COVID-19 inequalities in Brazil
- Pre-existing social vulnerabilities, not interventions, drove mortality disparities
- Targeting vulnerable areas for vaccination could have reversed these mortality gaps
- First mechanistic model of the pathways framework of emerging disease inequalities
- Advances limited research incorporating social vulnerability into disease models

1. Introduction

The fundamental cause theory (FCT) asserts that social conditions are the fundamental causes of disease (Link and Phelan, 1995). Relative advantages and disadvantages, by which those with greater resources can leverage them to gain access to protective factors, avoid risk factors, or receive effective treatments for disease relative to those with fewer resources, are transferable across epidemiological paradigms, including the emergence of novel infectious diseases (EIDs). Thus, while the proximal determinants of disease can change as societies go through health and epidemiological transitions, inequalities in health persist (Donkin, 2014; Phelan et al., 2004). Such inequalities, where populations with higher socioeconomic status (SES) have better health and lower mortality than those with lower SES, in line with the expectations of FCT, are termed *expected* social gradients in health.

Clouston et al. (2016) attempt to explain these dynamics through their theoretical model of the social history of disease, synthesizing FCT with epidemiological transition theory (ETT) proposed by Omran (2001). According to this theory, in the first stage of a disease's social history, when there is no knowledge about it, nor are preventions or treatments available, populations with higher SES are not able to effectively leverage their greater access to resources to achieve lower mortality from the disease relative to low SES populations, a phenomenon that Clouston et al. (2016) denote "natural mortality." Following the advent of preventative and curative countermeasures, their unequal diffusion according to SES is what gives rise to social disparities in mortality. However, this model does not account for how pre-existing inequities in access to resources may result in inequities in vulnerability to disease in general (Farmer, 1996), even prior to the advent of such protective interventions.

To address this theoretical gap, I introduce a model that builds upon the pioneering work of Bambra (2022) elucidating distinct pathways through which EID inequities arise, encompassing both pre-existing disease-agnostic inequities and the unequal adoption of disease-specific interventions. According to this model, applied to the recent global EID pandemic of COVID-19, social gradients in mortality can be produced through four pathways, either stemming from disease-agnostic pre-existing inequities or disease-specific interventions which are adopted unequally (Fig. 1). Within these two categories, inequities in COVID-19 mortality can be produced through inequities in exposure or inequities in outcomes. Within disease-agnostic pre-existing inequities, inequities in exposure are encapsulated by the unequal forces of infection of COVID-19 that result from disparities in living conditions, while inequities in outcomes are encapsulated by disparities in the lethality of COVID-19 stemming from inequities in health status and healthcare access and quality. Meanwhile, disparities in COVID-specific non-pharmaceutical intervention (NPI) uptake result in inequities in risk of exposure to COVID-19, while disparities in the uptake of COVID-specific pharmaceutical interventions yield inequities in outcomes if exposed to COVID-19.

I focus on the case of COVID-19 in Brazil, a country characterized by high levels of social and economic inequality, with the 17th highest income inequality in the world according to the World Bank. Brazil has been among the countries most severely impacted by COVID-19, with the 10th highest officially reported mortality rate in the world during 2020 and the first half of 2021, and the highest among countries with a population of 40 million or more (Ritchie et al., 2020).

However, the literature thus far on the temporal dynamics of social gradients in

COVID-19 mortality in Brazil has been limited, especially compared to countries in the Global North (Beese et al., 2022; Rhodes et al., 2024), though the evidence does show that social gradients in mortality developed in the months following COVID-19's emergence, with deaths increasingly concentrating in disadvantaged geographic areas and populations (Andrade et al., 2022; Bermudi et al., 2021; Brizzi et al., 2022; Cajazeiro et al., 2024; Castilho et al., 2023; Chauvin, 2024; Collazos et al., 2023; Raymundo et al., 2023; Razafindrakoto et al., 2022; Santana et al., 2024; Tavares and Betti, 2021). Explaining how these social gradients were produced is complicated by their contemporaneous emergence with the initial roll-out of NPIs, implemented in Brazil beginning in mid-to-late March 2020 (Faria de Moura Villela et al., 2021; Li et al., 2021), thus making it challenging to disentangle the contributions of disease-specific interventions from disease-agnostic pre-existing inequities.

Multiple pathways likely contributed to producing social gradients in COVID-19 mortality in Brazil. Previous work has found higher prevalence of comorbidities and poorer pre-existing health status in lower SES populations, which have been associated with higher rates of mortality (Li et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2022; Nassif Pires et al., 2020; Nunes et al., 2020; Razafindrakoto et al., 2022; Rocha et al., 2021). Other factors include inequities in healthcare access and quality, with greater utilization of the public as opposed to the private health system, greater distance to the nearest healthcare facility, and fewer hospital beds, intensive care units (ICUs), and physicians per capita in lower SES geographies, all of which increase the risk of mortality in COVID-19 patients through impeding access to quality healthcare (Boing et al., 2022; Brizzi et al., 2022; Li et al., 2021; Nassif Pires et al., 2020; Razafindrakoto et al., 2022; Rocha et al., 2021; Tavares and Betti, 2021).

There is also evidence of pre-existing disparities in living conditions which may have increased the risk of exposure to COVID-19 in more deprived communities (Bambra, 2022). Previous literature has found that incidence and mortality rates were higher in lower SES geographies with poorer quality, less sanitary, more crowded, and especially denser housing and living conditions (Chauvin, 2024; Nassif Pires et al., 2020; Nunes et al., 2020; Razafindrakoto et al., 2022; Rocha et al., 2021; Tavares and Betti, 2021).

Furthermore, there is ample evidence that once COVID-specific NPIs were introduced, inequities in NPI adoption produced social gradients in mortality through disparities in exposure (Bambra, 2022). Frontline, service sector, informal, and other workers in occupations that require in-person contact and/or that do not have paid leave are disproportionately concentrated in lower SES geographies in Brazil (De Negri et al., 2021; Li et al., 2021; Nassif Pires et al., 2020; Nunes et al., 2020; Razafindrakoto et al., 2022; Rocha et al., 2021). Consequently, while mobility sharply fell in the country as a whole following the introduction of social distancing NPIs (COVID-19 Mobility Data Network, 2020; Meta, 2023), lower SES states and municipalities with more frontline, service sector, informal, and other lower-skilled, lower-wage workers reported lower compliance with these measures and saw smaller mobility reductions (Li et al., 2021; Rocha et al., 2021; Tavares and Betti, 2021).

The unequal uptake of COVID-specific pharmaceutical interventions, especially vaccines once they became available, further contributed to social gradients in mortality. Although vulnerable populations were prioritized for vaccination, lower SES geographies had lower vaccine coverage (Martins et al., 2023; Villar et al., 2024), especially after controlling for political behavior (votes for Jair Bolsonaro in the 2018 and 2022 presidential elections) (Razafindrakoto et al., 2024; Seara-Morais et al., 2023), as a result of inadequate

logistics and health systems capacity.

To explore the role of these pathways in producing social gradients in COVID-19 mortality in Brazil, I construct a data-driven compartmental epidemiological model that simulates a COVID-19 outbreak across Brazil, designating population classes for each of its 5,565 municipalities. Drawing from real-world data, I parameterize each pathway as depicted in Figure 1. Pre-existing disparities in living conditions across municipalities, represented by household size, are used to capture the unequal force of infection pathway. For the unequal lethality pathway, I estimate infection fatality rates (IFR) before vaccines and treatments became widely available to represent pre-existing disparities in health status and variations in healthcare access and quality. The model incorporates inequities in COVID-specific NPIs by evaluating the proportional change in travel outside of home areas post-introduction of social distancing measures, relative to pre-COVID patterns. Lastly, disparities in vaccination rates across municipalities are integrated to represent inequities in COVID-specific pharmaceutical interventions.

This comprehensive approach allows me to address specific challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic: empirical evidence does not allow us to isolate the impacts of pre-existing inequities from those of disease-specific interventions on mortality gradients. In essence, we lack concrete evidence to understand how the pandemic might have unfolded if only one of these driving forces of inequity were at play. Models using this framework allow us to gain insights into hypothetical counterfactual scenarios that empirical methods cannot. We can thus examine how social gradients in mortality could have developed if no NPIs were introduced, if a vaccine were available at the beginning of the pandemic, and/or if these interventions were more equitably distributed than in the real-world. In essence, in this study I create a model world for exploring how gradients in COVID-19 mortality could have evolved under counterfactual scenarios using data-driven parameters; the goal is not necessarily to try to fit model dynamics to real-world data.

Few studies have systematically incorporated social vulnerability into mathematical models of infectious disease, especially in Brazil (Naidoo et al., 2024). The limited number of studies that have done so in the context of COVID-19 have been on the city or metropolitan area-level rather than national in scope and used hypothetical mobility and contact networks rather than real-world data (Barreto et al., 2024; Brotherhood et al., 2022; Cardoso et al., 2020). More than offering the first mathematical model of COVID-19 in Brazil investigating social disparities on the national level using real-world contact network data, this study is the first to utilize the pathways framework introduced by Bambra (2022) in modeling the factors that drive inequities in EIDs.

I posit that unequal adoption of social distancing NPIs and vaccination served to entrench the effects of pre-existing inequities in the production of social gradients in mortality. I hypothesize that more equitable distribution of these interventions that prioritized the protection of lower SES municipalities could have counteracted or even reversed the impacts of these pre-existing inequities.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. The model

I model the dynamics of COVID-19 in Brazil with a compartmental model governed by the following set of equations.

$$\frac{dS_i}{dt} = -(\lambda_i(t) + \eta_i(t))S_i \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{dE_i}{dt} = \lambda_i(t)S_i - \delta_E E_i \tag{2}$$

$$\frac{dI_i}{dt} = \delta_E E_i - \gamma I_i \tag{3}$$

$$\frac{dV_{Si}}{dt} = \eta_i(t)S_i - \lambda_i(t)(1 - v_e)V_{Si} \tag{4}$$

$$\frac{dV_{Ei}}{dt} = \lambda_i(t)(1 - v_e)V_{Si} - \delta_E V_{Ei} \tag{5}$$

$$\frac{dV_{Ii}}{dt} = \delta_E V_{Ei} - \gamma I_i \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{dR_i}{dt} = (1 - d_i)\gamma I_i + (1 - d_i(1 - v_p))\gamma V_{Ii} \tag{7}$$

$$\frac{dD_i}{dt} = d_i \gamma I_i + d_i(1 - v_p)\gamma V_{Ii} \tag{8}$$

There are eight compartments for a given municipality i: unvaccinated susceptible (S), exposed (E), and infected (I); vaccinated susceptible (V_S), exposed (V_E), and infected (V_I); plus recovered (R) and deceased (D) (Table 1). $\lambda_i(t)$ is the force of infection (FOI) (Table 2), which can vary over time t. Individuals progress from exposed to infected at rate δ_E and recover from infection at rate γ through either full recovery or death, with an IFR of d_i. Susceptible individuals can also be vaccinated at a time-varying rate $\eta_i(t)$. Vaccine efficacy against infection is v_e and against death post-infection is v_p (see Derivation of vaccination parameters for details). Since I am only modeling the first six months after disease introduction, I do not consider loss of immunity from either natural infection nor vaccination.

2.2. Force of infection

I break down the FOI of COVID-19 into two components: household, or mobility-independent transmission (λ_i^{HH}), which is time-invariant, and extra-household, or mobility-dependent transmission ($\lambda_i^M(t)$), which is time-variant.

$$\lambda_i(t) = \lambda_i^{HH} + \lambda_i^M(t) \tag{9}$$

I therefore assume that all mobility-independent transmission occurs within households and hereafter refer to mobility-independent transmission and household transmission interchangeably. I parameterize household transmission with the following equation:

$$\lambda_i^{HH} = \beta_i^{HH} \frac{I_i + V_{Ii}}{S_i + E_i + I_i + V_{Si} + V_{Ei} + V_{Ii} + R_i} \tag{10}$$

Where $\frac{I_i+V_{Ii}}{S_i+E_i+I_i+V_{Si}+V_{Ei}+V_{Ii}+R_i}$ is the proportion of the population in municipality i that is infectious. β_i^{HH} is the rate at which infectious individuals transmit COVID-19 within the household, which can be expressed as:

$$\beta_i^{HH} = \tau_{HH} c_i^{HH}, \tag{11}$$

where τ_{HH} is the daily household-specific probability of transmission given contact and c_i^{HH} is the number of potentially-infectious household contacts per day. I derive τ_{HH} from COVID-19 household secondary attack rates (SAR) from meta-analyses by Thompson et al. (2021) (0.166; 95% CI, 0.14-0.193) and Madewell et al. (2020) (0.211; 95% CI, 0.174-0.248). Since household SAR refers to the probability of transmission during the entire duration of the infectious period, and infection events are mutually exclusive, if we assume a uniform probability of infection during each day of the infectious period, τ_{HH} can be expressed with the following equation:

$$\tau_{HH} = SAR\gamma \tag{12}$$

I use the median of the household SAR point estimates obtained by Madewell et al. (2020) and Thompson et al. (2021) and conduct sensitivity analyses using the minimum and maximum values of the 95% confidence intervals of these estimates.

Assuming all transmission of COVID-19 outside of the household is related to mobility, I parameterize this FOI with the following equation:

$$\lambda_i^M(t) = \sum_j \beta_{ij}^M(t) \frac{I_j + V_{Ij}}{S_j + E_j + I_j + V_{Sj} + V_{Ej} + V_{Ij} + R_j}, \tag{13}$$

where $\beta_{ij}^M(t)$ is the mobility-dependent transmission rate between municipalities i and j, which can be expressed with the following equation:

$$\beta_{ij}^M(t) = \tau_M c_i^M(t) \omega_{ij}(t) \tag{14}$$

$c_i^M(t)$ is the number of daily contacts that individuals who live in municipality i have outside the home, which can change over time t, and τ_M is the probability of infection from these contacts. $\omega_{ij}(t)$ is the probability that extra-household contacts $c_i^M(t)$ are with individuals from municipality j. I thus can re-express the FOI equations of household and mobility-related transmission respectively as the following:

$$\lambda_i^{HH} = \tau_{HH} c_i^{HH} \frac{I_i + V_{Ii}}{S_i + E_i + I_i + V_{Si} + V_{Ei} + V_{Ii} + R_i} \tag{15}$$

$$\lambda_i^M(t) = \sum_j \tau_M c_i^M(t) \omega_{ij}(t) \frac{I_j + V_{Ij}}{S_j + E_j + I_j + V_{Sj} + V_{Ej} + V_{Ij} + R_j} \tag{16}$$

2.3. Parameterization of pathways to inequality

I incorporate each of the four pathways to inequality in COVID-19 mortality (Fig. 1) into my model through specific parameters. I incorporate unequal FOIs from pre-existing inequities in living conditions in the parameterization of household FOI (equation 15). Assuming that each individual has on average one potentially infectious contact with each other member of their household per day:

$$c_i^{HH} = \bar{HH_size}_i - 1, \tag{17}$$

where $\bar{HH_size}_i$ is the mean household size, or number of residents per household, in municipality i. This allows equation 15 to be re-expressed as the following.

$$\lambda_i^{HH} = \tau_{HH}(\bar{HH_size}_i - 1) \frac{I_i + V_{Ii}}{S_i + E_i + I_i + V_{Si} + V_{Ei} + V_{Ii} + R_i} \tag{18}$$

Unequal lethality is captured by the IFR parameter (d_i). Since the true number of cases and deaths are latent, I estimate IFR using reported numbers of cases and deaths. I divide cumulative confirmed and suspected COVID-19 deaths for 2020, i.e. deaths through the epidemiological week of 12/27/2020 (the final epidemiological week of 2020), by cumulative confirmed cases of COVID-19 through the epidemiological week of 12/20/2020, one week prior. The IFR estimate for each municipality is therefore the CFR of COVID-19 in 2020 with a one-week lag in cases, since this is the average duration from infection onset to recovery or death. Although I am only modeling the first six months after disease introduction, I estimate IFR using cases and deaths from all of 2020 to minimize the number of municipalities with either missing data or only a very small number of cases, the latter of which are prone to having unusually high or low CFRs due to cases and deaths being discrete events. In addition, no COVID-specific treatments or vaccines were approved nor given emergency use authorization in Brazil until 2021 (Geraque, 2021), suggesting that the IFR of COVID-19 was driven by disease-agnostic pre-existing inequities in lethality from disparities in health status and variations in healthcare access and quality throughout the entire year of 2020. I conduct sensitivity analyses by doubling and halving these IFR estimates.

I introduce disparities in uptake of social distancing NPIs to the model through mobility-related FOI (equation 16). To do so, I first need to derive its constituent parameters. The basic reproduction number (R_0), or the expected number of secondary cases from a single infectious individual in a completely susceptible population, of the wild-type of SARS-CoV-2 in Brazil according to de Souza et al. (2020)'s estimates, is the sum of the basic reproduction numbers specific to both modes of transmission parameterized in this model (equations 15 and 16), such that $R_0 = R_0^{HH} + R_0^{M}$ (see Derivation of the basic reproduction number for details). I use the point estimate of R_0 obtained by de Souza et al. (2020), and conduct sensitivity analyses using the upper and lower bounds of the 95% credible interval of their estimate.

Given equation 17, R_0^{HH} for Brazil as a whole can be expressed as the following (see equation S.16):

$$R_0^{HH} = \frac{\tau_{HH}(\bar{HH}size - 1)}{\gamma}, \tag{19}$$

where $\bar{HH}size$ is the mean household size of Brazil as a whole. Assuming frequency-dependent transmission and uniform extra-household contact rates across municipalities prior to the introduction of NPIs (see equation S.17),

$$R_0^{M} = \frac{\tau_M c_0^M}{\gamma}, \tag{20}$$

where c_0^M is the null extra-household contact rate at $t = 0$, where no interventions have been implemented. This is justified by previous findings that mobility did not vary by SES in Brazil prior to the introduction of social distancing NPIs (Li et al., 2021; Rocha et al., 2021). Letting the constant $\kappa_M = \tau_M c_0^M$, this can be expressed with the following:

$$\kappa_M = \gamma R_0 - \tau_{HH}(\bar{HH}size - 1). \tag{21}$$

This in turn allows equation 16 to be re-expressed as the following.

$$\lambda_i^M(t) = \kappa_M \frac{c_i^M(t)}{c_{0_i}^M} \sum_j \omega_{ij}(t) \frac{I_j + V_{Ij}}{S_j + E_j + I_j + V_{Sj} + V_{Ej} + V_{Ij} + R_j} \tag{22}$$

$\omega_{ij}(t)$ represents the conditional probability that an individual in municipality i has contact with individuals from municipality j, given that the individual leaves the home. This is estimated using mobility network data provided by Peixoto (2022). This data, collected by the company InLoco (now Incognia (2025)), captured the movements of users of mobile applications over distinct 24-hour periods covering over one quarter of the Brazilian population in 2020 (Peixoto et al., 2020). $i \neq j$ thus indicates devices that moved from municipality i to municipality j within day t, while $i = j$ indicates devices that have moved within their own municipality. Devices that did not move at all were not captured. According to Peixoto et al. (2020), although this is not necessarily a statistically consistent estimator of the population probabilities of traveling between municipalities, as the same device may be recorded more than once in a day, it provides a good representation of the overall mobility network and its dynamics.

Finally, the uptake of social distancing NPIs is captured in this model by the term $c_i^M(t)/c_{0_i}^M$ denoting the relative rate of extra-household contacts of residents of municipality i at time t compared to the null, which can be expressed as:

$$\frac{c_i^M(t)}{c_{0_i}^M} = 1 + \Delta M_i(t), \tag{23}$$

where $\Delta M_i(t)$ is the proportional change in mobility outside the home of individuals living in municipality i over time t following the introduction of NPIs, compared to a pre-COVID baseline. (In scenarios with no social distancing, $\Delta M_i(t) = \vec{0}$.) These estimates are obtained from Facebook Data for Good Movement Range Maps, where individuals with an evening location in municipality i are considered residents (COVID-19 Mobility Data Network, 2020; Meta, 2023). This parameterization relies on the assumption that changes in overall mobility are proportional to changes in mobility-dependent contacts. For sensitivity analyses, I double and halve the impact of these changes in mobility $\Delta M_i(t)$ on the resultant relative rate of extra-household contacts $c_i^M(t)/c_{0_i}^M$. Municipalities without sufficient observations to produce estimates of $\omega_{ij}(t)$ or $\Delta M_i(t)$ are imputed using the inverse squared distance-weighted means of municipalities without missing data.

Measuring social distancing NPI uptake during the COVID-19 pandemic using changes in mobility from digital trace data is an established practice, including in Brazil (Barreto et al., 2024; Brotherhood et al., 2022; Li et al., 2021; Razafindrakoto et al., 2022; Rocha et al., 2021; Tavares and Betti, 2021). This previous work has found similar mobility levels using these data sources across geographies prior to the introduction of NPIs, succeeded by sharp reductions in mobility following their introduction in mid March. These mobility reductions were also associated with occupational status, with areas having more informal and frontline workers showing smaller reductions than areas with more remote-capable professionals.

Inequities in vaccine uptake are incorporated into the model through the $\eta_i(t)$ parameter. (In scenarios with no vaccination $\eta_i(t) = \vec{0}$.) Real-world data on the rate of vaccine administration by municipality is obtained from Cota (2020), which compiles data on the Brazilian COVID-19 vaccination campaign from Ministério da Saúde (2024) beginning on 01/16/2021. For calculating the rate of vaccination uptake, each vaccination event is defined as the time that an individual received their second dose. All vaccines administered are assumed to confer the levels of protection against infection (symptomatic and asymptomatic) and death of BNT162b2 (Pfizer-BioNTech), the most commonly administered COVID-19 vaccine in Brazil (Ministério da Saúde, 2024). For more details on how vaccine efficacy in preventing infection (v_e) and vaccine protection against death

(v_p) are derived, please see Derivation of vaccination parameters.

A graphical representation of the model specifying the roles of each of these pathways is displayed in Figure 2.

2.4. Model output analysis

I initialize the model setting the whole population of each of the 5,565 municipalities as susceptible (S_i = municipality i 2020 midyear population estimate) with 10 exposed cases in the municipality of São Paulo, the location where the actual first cases of COVID-19 in Brazil were detected after being introduced from abroad via air travel (Candido et al., 2020; de Souza et al., 2020; Mee et al., 2022; Nicolelis et al., 2021; Serdan et al., 2020). I run iterations of the model using R (R Core Team, 2021) with the package *deSolve* (Karline Soetaert et al., 2010) for the counterfactual scenarios listed in Table 3.

Each simulation is run for 182 days (26 weeks/6 months, or half a year), from March 1 - August 29, 2020. Contemporaneous data for the time-variant mobility parameters ($\omega_{ij}(t)$ and $\Delta M_i(t)$) are used, while the time-variant vaccination parameter ($\eta_i(t)$) uses data from the first six months of the vaccination campaign. I obtain deaths in each municipality, D_i at each day t. Each day is part of an epidemiological week w, such that $D_{iw} = \sum_{t \in w} D_{it}$, which is rounded to the nearest whole number. The number of person-years in each epidemiological week, PY_{iw}, is calculated by dividing municipality i's midyear 2020 population estimate by 53 since there were 53 epidemiological weeks in the epidemiological year 2020 (Grolemund and Wickham, 2011). For each municipality, I obtain two indicators of SES frequently used in the literature, the social vulnerability index (SVI) and the municipal human development index (MHDI) (ipea- Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada, 2022). These indicators go in opposite directions, with a higher SVI indicating greater social vulnerability and thus lower SES, while a higher MHDI indicates greater human development and thus higher SES. See Tables 4 and 5 for how these indicators are derived, respectively.

For the weekly mortality time series produced by each simulation, I analyze how SES gradients in mortality evolve over time by calculating the relative risk (RR) of mortality in municipalities in the 5th compared to the 1st quintile of the (inverse) SVI and the MHDI for each week w. I also replicate these analyses using the empirical weekly time series of COVID-19 mortality in Brazil covering the same March 1 - August 29 time period. Since NPIs had been implemented during this period in Brazil but vaccinations had not yet been rolled out, the results should be similar to those obtained in the scenario with NPI adoption following real-world rates (scenario 2, Table 3).

To account for confounders of the relationship between municipality-level SES and weekly mortality, I construct a negative binomial regression model with the following specification:

$$log(D_{iw}) = log(PY_{iw}) + \alpha_w + W \times SES^T_{iq \in \{2,3,4,5\}} \beta_{q \in \{2,3,4,5\} w} + W \times X^T_{ik} \beta_{kw} + u_{iw} \quad (24)$$

where $SES_{iq \in \{2,3,4,5\}}$ is a set of dummy variables for quintiles 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the SVI or MHDI which are interacted with week w, $log(PY_{iw})$ is an offset, α_w is a set of week fixed effects, and u_{iw} is the error term. X_{ik} is an additional set of k municipality-level controls that are interacted with week. I control for the age-distribution (proportion of the population aged over 50) (Ministério da Saúde, 2021) and for intra-municipality inequality with the Gini coefficient (ipea- Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada, 2022).

I assume any bias in these age distribution estimates is proportional across municipalities. As robustness checks, I also control for region and state fixed effects and support for President Jair Bolsonaro measured by mean municipality-level first-round vote share of the 2018 and 2022 presidential elections (Justiça Eleitoral, 2022). Previous studies have identified Bolsonaro support as a confounder of the relationship between SES and COVID-19 mortality, as municipalities with more support for Bolsonaro are both more likely to have higher SES and to not adopt protective measures (NPIs and vaccination), all things being equal (Rache et al., 2021; Razafindrakoto et al., 2024, 2022; Seara-Morais et al., 2023; Xavier et al., 2022).

I fit this negative binomial fixed effects model using the *fixest* package in R (Bergé, 2018) and calculate Driscoll and Kraay cross-sectionally and serially correlated standard errors, especially appropriate for the spatially-dependent panel data produced by the model simulations (Driscoll and Kraay, 1998). To obtain the RR of mortality in SVI or MHDI quintile 5 (Q5) compared to quintile 1 (Q1) for each week, I exponentiate the coefficients $\beta_{q=5,w}$ and calculate the upper and lower bounds of the 95% confidence intervals of these estimates using standard errors calculated with the delta method (Cox, 2005). An $RR < 1$ signifies a higher risk of mortality in Q1 compared to Q5, suggesting an expected social gradient in mortality, an $RR > 1$ signifies the opposite, suggesting an inverted gradient, and $RR = 1$ signifies an equal mortality risk in Q5 and Q1, or no gradient.

3. Results

According to the empirical mortality data, with controls for age-distribution and intra-municipality inequality, when COVID-19 was first introduced to Brazil there was a far higher risk of mortality in municipalities in the 5th (inverse) SVI quintile compared to the 1st ($RR > 1$, Fig. 3), suggesting an inverted gradient in mortality with respect to social vulnerability. As the outbreak progressed, this empirical gradient shifted back and forth between expected ($RR < 1$) and inverted ($RR > 1$) directions, before settling into the expected direction by about the 8th week. However, the relative risk (RR) curve trends steadily back upward toward 1 over time. Outbreak simulations (scenarios 1–4, Table 3) broadly reproduce this dynamic but have greater uncertainty in their early RR estimates (when observed deaths are rare).

Scenario 1 (no NPIs, no vaccination) begins with an inverted mortality gradient, consistent with the empirical data in the earliest weeks. By weeks 11–12 (around the 3rd month), the ratio falls toward 1, marking a shift to an expected gradient. Once this crossover occurs (by the 4th month), the model sustains an expected gradient through the remainder of the six-month simulation. The start of this transition is accelerated in scenarios with NPIs (scenarios 2, 4), but after faster initial declines their RR curves plateau around 1 for several weeks as NPIs retard the transmission and geographic diffusion of COVID, before settling into expected mortality gradients (Figs. S.1-S.66).

Conversely, vaccination alone does not appear to have much of an effect (scenario 3), but slightly compounds the impact of NPIs when the two interventions are combined (scenario 4). Notably, the NPI-only scenario (scenario 2) reproduces the overall shape of the empirical mortality curve but lags real-world data by several weeks. However, it does not exhibit the upward trend towards 1 seen in the empirical mortality curve. In the NPI-only scenario, as in all simulations, once expected mortality gradients are achieved,

they remain largely stable.

Comparable patterns are observed when analyzing the mortality gradients of these same scenarios using MHDI instead of inverse SVI. However, there is an even greater uncertainty in the RR estimates at the beginning of the outbreak, while stable expected mortality gradients are reached somewhat later and are of somewhat smaller magnitudes than they are with SVI. Furthermore, the RR curve of the NPI scenario does not display similar dynamics to the empirical RR curve, as the latter never falls below 1. This implies a consistently inverted social gradient in real-world mortality with respect to MHDI during the first six months of the pandemic, even after accounting for age structure and intra-municipality inequality. This discrepancy highlights that empirical COVID-19 mortality gradients observed in Brazil can depend on the SES index employed.

Similar dynamics are observed between the SVI and MHDI RR curves for the counterfactual scenarios with alternative intervention distribution strategies (scenarios 5-9, Table 3), but with those of the MHDI shifted up and to the right and exhibiting a greater degree of uncertainty than the SVI (Fig. 4). Equal adoption of NPIs (scenarios 5, 8) shifts the RR curve to the right compared the baseline scenario while largely maintaining its shape, pushing back the time until a stable expected mortality gradient of similar magnitude is achieved by several weeks. In contrast, the implementation of equal vaccination (scenarios 6, 8) only slightly diminishes the magnitude of the expected mortality gradient. However, prioritizing the lowest SES municipalities for vaccination (scenario 7) shifts the RR curve up, yielding a more strongly inverted mortality gradient for most of the duration of the simulation, though it does drop below 1 in the final weeks.

The scenario that sees the greatest inversion of the mortality gradient is when both equal NPIs and equitable vaccination are implemented (scenario 9). The effects of these interventions reinforce each other, shifting the RR curve dramatically upwards and to the right, avoiding the emergence of the expected mortality gradient observed in all other scenarios. However, even with these highly redistributive strategies, the mortality gradient still begins converging back towards the expected direction by the end of the simulation. This highlights the difficulty of avoiding expected social gradients in mortality if underlying pre-existing inequities remain unchanged. Qualitatively similar results, especially the equal NPI-equitable vaccination scenario having the most-inverted mortality gradient, are observed across the sensitivity analyses and robustness checks, though with a greater degree of uncertainty in the RR estimates, particularly in the latter (Figs. S.67-S.92).

4. Discussion

These results suggest that the expected social gradient in COVID-19 mortality observed in Brazil was largely a result of disease-agnostic pre-existing inequities in living conditions and in health status and healthcare access and quality. This expected mortality gradient would most likely have developed even in the absence of unequally adopted disease-specific interventions; the NPIs implemented contemporaneously with the disease's emergence were likely not the source of this expected mortality gradient, but merely reinforced it and accelerated its development. Any initially observed inverted social gradient in COVID-19 mortality was thus likely an artifact of earlier introduction of the disease to highly connected, high-SES urban centers (Albuquerque et al., 2021; Candido et al., 2020; Castro et al., 2021; da Silva et al., 2022; de Souza et al., 2020; Fortaleza et al., 2020; Mee et al., 2022; Nicolelis et al., 2021; Serdan et al., 2020). These findings help fill a gap in

the empirical literature, providing evidence contrary to COVID-19 having been subject to "natural mortality" before the introduction of social distancing NPIs (Clouston et al., 2021, 2016), and evidence supporting all pathways having played a role in producing the expected mortality gradient (Bambra, 2022) (Fig. 1).

However, the emergence of this expected mortality gradient could have been delayed or even reversed by adopting alternative intervention strategies prioritizing the lowest SES municipalities. Though NPIs alone cannot reverse the emergence of expected mortality gradients, they can impede this process by reducing exposure to COVID-19 and thus slowing down transmission, delaying its diffusion down the SES gradient due to socially stratified mobility network structures (Licciardi and Monteiro, 2022). This delaying effect is most clearly produced if NPIs are adopted equally, buying time for other interventions that protect or improve the outcomes of those exposed to COVID to be distributed to vulnerable populations, in this case vaccines. But merely distributing vaccines equally is not sufficient; in order to successfully reverse the expected gradient in COVID mortality, they need to be targeted to the lowest SES municipalities. Still, even such equitable measures cannot fully overcome deep-rooted societal inequities embedded in living conditions, healthcare availability, and baseline health status.

Nevertheless, real-world empirical trends sometimes diverged from these simulation results. Several factors may help explain why. For instance, the empirical expected mortality gradient for the SVI re-inverting in the fifth month of the outbreak could reflect waning immunity, a phenomenon omitted in the model. The potential also exists that some unobserved factor not captured by any of the regression controls caused mortality to systematically shift to higher SES municipalities at this particular point in time. Indeed, previous studies have found that the social gradient in COVID-19 mortality in Brazil diminished or inverted from July/August, 2020 (Razafindrakoto et al., 2022; Rocha et al., 2021). This can, at least in part, be attributed to decreasing compliance with NPIs in higher SES municipalities over time, which is already captured in the simulations. This in turn can partially be explained by support for Jair Bolsonaro confounding the relationship between SES and the adoption of protective interventions (Rache et al., 2021; Razafindrakoto et al., 2024; Seara-Morais et al., 2023). Controlling for Bolsonaro vote share in the regression model robustness checks does shift the empirical RR curve down, and the RR curves of the simulations of scenarios with interventions adopted according to real-world patterns, indicating a more concentrated risk of death in the lowest SES municipalities. While this pushes back the time until the empirical mortality gradient re-inverts by several weeks, it does not entirely prevent this re-inversion from occurring during the final weeks of the study period. Further investigating the role of political behavior as a confounder of the relationship between SES and infectious disease mortality could be a valuable direction for future research.

By contrast, the persistent inversion of the empirical gradient when measured using the MHDI may reflect its components being less salient social determinants of COVID-19 mortality than those comprising the SVI. In fact, previous work has paradoxically found simultaneous positive associations between both higher municipal human development (da Silva et al., 2022; Fortaleza et al., 2020) and greater social vulnerability and mortality (Albuquerque et al., 2021; Andrade et al., 2022; Martins-Filho et al., 2021). Positive associations between the specific components of SVI and mortality have been found, especially with respect to lack of basic education (illiteracy and deficiency of primary education), poor environmental and housing conditions (poor access to water, sanitation, and garbage collection), and poverty (income relative to the minimum wage) (Passos et al.,

2021; Ribeiro et al., 2021; Silva and Ribeiro-Alves, 2021). Simultaneously, Razafindrakoto et al. (2022) and Baggio et al. (2021) have found total absolute income and the education sub-index of MHDI (which takes primary and secondary education but not literacy into account) to be associated with higher mortality, even while poverty, the human capital and urban infrastructure sub-indices of SVI (Table 4), and poor health, living, and working conditions remained risk factors. Nassif Pires et al. (2020) further demonstrate that while lower income and lack of educational attainment above the primary level are associated with poorer living, working, and health conditions, it is ultimately these latter conditions that are the proximal drivers of mortality. Consequently, the body of evidence suggests that it is not overall income and education levels per se, but rather their absolute deprivation, as well as associated absolute deprivation with respect to housing, environmental and working conditions, that are the most salient drivers of inequities in the risk of exposure to and severe outcomes of COVID-19 in Brazil. All of these factors are captured by the SVI, but not by the MHDI (Table 5). In future work, more comprehensive, theory-driven measurements of SES composed of the most relevant social determinants of mortality could be explored, inspired by previous research using principal component analysis, Alkire-Foster, and fuzzy-set approaches (Bermudi et al., 2021; Rocha et al., 2021; Tavares and Betti, 2021).

The simulated mortality gradient of the NPI scenario for the SVI lagging behind the empirical mortality gradient could be explained by Brazil's real-world outbreak having started markedly earlier than the March 1st date used in the simulations. With limited testing, the first COVID-19 cases in Brazil were probably not reported (de Souza et al., 2020; Mee et al., 2022), and according to phylogenetic analyses could have been introduced as far back as February 17th (Candido et al., 2020). By early March, community transmission was likely already well-established.

Additionally, although based on real-world data, the parameterization of NPIs in my model suffers from limitations hindering its ability to capture real-world dynamics. Since I only have data on proportional changes in mobility by municipality (COVID-19 Mobility Data Network, 2020; Meta, 2023) compared to a pre-pandemic baseline where mobility levels were similar across socioeconomic groups (Brotherhood et al., 2022; Li et al., 2021; Rocha et al., 2021), I assume a uniform baseline rate of potentially infectious extra-household contacts across municipalities, that any changes to this contact rate are directly proportional to changes in mobility, and that the probability of infection from these contacts is constant. However, this fails to take into account how both rates of contact outside the household and probability of infection could vary across municipalities independent of mobility and how they may also be affected by unequally adopted NPIs.

For example, previous literature has found positive associations between living in more densely populated municipalities, urban areas, and favelas, and COVID-19 incidence and resulting mortality, suggesting higher rates of potentially infectious contacts in the community, that are independent of mobility and housing conditions (Albuquerque et al., 2021; Brotherhood et al., 2022; Fortaleza et al., 2020; Mee et al., 2022; Razafindrakoto et al., 2022; Xavier et al., 2022). Furthermore, though populations with different SES may have had similar overall levels of mobility pre-pandemic, the modes of transportation by which this mobility occurred, with different associated contact rates, varied. Lower SES populations were more likely to walk, cycle, or use public transportation (Sá et al., 2016), while higher SES populations were more likely to use private automobiles or fly (Candido et al., 2020; Ribeiro et al., 2014). The risk of infection from contacts potentially also varied across these populations. Of particular relevance is evidence from the US

that lower income workers were more likely to work in occupations with high personal proximity to others, even before the pandemic (Mongey and Weinberg, 2020).

NPIs implemented in Brazil at the beginning of the pandemic independent of mobility included, but were not limited to, the use of face masks and other personal protective equipment, and physical distancing guidelines (e.g. 1.5-2m) (de Souza Santos et al., 2021; Faria de Moura Villela et al., 2021; Razafindrakoto et al., 2022; Rocha et al., 2021). These interventions aimed to reduce the probability of infection from each contact and are not captured by the mobility reduction parameter in my model. While there are cross-sectional data estimating compliance with these measures, in which an educational gradient is identified (Faria de Moura Villela et al., 2021), unfortunately no longitudinal municipality-level data exist to parameterize them.

Challenges in parameterizing other pathways to COVID-19 mortality gradients should also be noted, particularly unequal lethality via the IFR parameter. Estimation of municipality-level IFRs is sensitive to small-population municipalities where random fluctuations can inflate or deflate estimates since cases and deaths are discrete events. Additionally, measurement error in case and death data could introduce further uncertainties in IFR estimates that differentially affect municipalities. These potential sources of error may thus bias the IFR parameter estimates, though I attempt to mitigate them through aggregating data throughout all of 2020 and conducting sensitivity analyses. While aggregating smaller municipalities for IFR estimation could potentially further address some of these sources of error, this would come at the expense of using as much municipality-level real-world data as possible to parameterize my model.

Ultimately, if unequal distribution and adoption of social distancing and other interventions reinforce the effects of disease-agnostic pre-existing inequities and further entrench expected mortality gradients, then alternative intervention distribution and uptake strategies to counteract their effects should be considered. The uptake of the social distancing NPIs modeled in this study, where individuals reduce their mobility and rates of contact, is nonrivalrous in that their uptake by one person does not impact another's ability to do so (Feachem et al., 2002). Therefore a strategy encouraging their equal adoption by everyone would be most just in terms of fairness (Rawls, 1958). However, sometimes a strategy pursuing equality is not enough, especially when the distribution of pre-existing social determinants of mortality is already so unequal, as is the case in Brazil. Since vaccines are a rivalrous good, prioritizing some populations over others in the face of limited supply in pursuit of a specific public health goal could be justified. The same is true of other rivalrous public health interventions not modeled in this study, including mobility-independent NPIs, such as the distribution of masks and other personal protective equipment, testing, and ventilation upgrades, and treatments. Thus, a strategy pursuing equitable distribution of rivalrous interventions like vaccines, where the lowest SES municipalities are prioritized, in combination with equal adoption of nonrivalrous interventions like social distancing NPIs, would not only be the most effective in achieving the goal of mitigating the emergence of an expected COVID-19 mortality gradient, but also the most just. In future EID epidemics, to effectively minimize mortality inequalities, policymakers should devise equitable public health intervention strategies on the national and global level that prioritize the most disadvantaged and at-risk populations.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Marcia Castro, Cassio Turra, Sabrina Li, Amac Herdagdelen, Ridhi Kashyap, Doug Leasure, Sam Abbott, Carl Pearson, Brianna Rock, Pascal Klamser, Dirk Brockmann, Auss Aboud, and especially Filiz Garip, Jessica Metcalf, Deborah Balk, and Noreen Goldman, as well as the members of the Digital and Computational Demography Department at the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, and the IUSSP Epidemics and Contagious Diseases: The Legacy of the Past Workshop, University of São Paulo BIOMAT Seminar, Latin American Association of Population Conference, and University of Washington Computational Demography Working Group Seminar participants for all of their valuable input, advice, and feedback. I would also like to thank Pedro Peixoto for sharing the InLoco mobility data.

References

Albuquerque, M. da G., Santos, J.R. dos, Silveira, A.F., Junior, D.L.B., Nunes, R.B., Gandra, T.B.R., Silva, A.L.C. da, Miranda, G.B. de, Trevisol, A.R., 2021. Influence of socio-economic indicators and territorial networks at the spatiotemporal spread dynamics of Covid-19 in Brazil. Sociedade & Natureza 33. https://doi.org/10.14393/SN-v33-2021-59688

Andrade, L.A., da Paz, W.S., Fontes Lima, A.G.C., da Conceição Araújo, D., Duque, A.M., Peixoto, M.V.S., Góes, M.A.O., de Souza, C.D.F., Nunes Ribeiro, C.J., Almeida Lima, S.V.M., Bezerra-Santos, M., dos Santos, A.D., 2022. Spatiotemporal Pattern of COVID-19–Related Mortality during the First Year of the Pandemic in Brazil: A Population-based Study in a Region of High Social Vulnerability. Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg. 106, 132–141. https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.21-0744

Baggio, J.A.O., Machado, M.F., do Carmo, R.F., Armstrong, A. da C., dos Santos, A.D., de Souza, C.D.F., 2021. COVID-19 in Brazil: spatial risk, social vulnerability, human development, clinical manifestations and predictors of mortality – a retrospective study with data from 59 695 individuals. Epidemiol Infect 149, e100. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268821000935

Bambra, C., 2022. Pandemic inequalities: emerging infectious diseases and health equity. Int J Equity Health 21, 6. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-021-01611-2

Barreto, W.L., Pereira, F.H., Perez, Y., Schimit, P.H.T., 2024. Spatial dynamics of COVID-19 in são paulo: a cellular automata and GIS approach. Spat Spatiotemporal Epidemiol 50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sste.2024.100674

Beese, F., Waldhauer, J., Wollgast, L., Pförtner, T.-K., Wahrendorf, M., Haller, S., Hoebel, J., Wachtler, B., 2022. Temporal Dynamics of Socioeconomic Inequalities in COVID-19 Outcomes Over the Course of the Pandemic—A Scoping Review. Int J Public Health 67, 1605128. https://doi.org/10.3389/ijph.2022.1605128

Bergé, L., 2018. Efficient estimation of maximum likelihood models with multiple fixed-effects: the R package FENmlm. CREA Discussion Papers.

Bermudi, P.M.M., Lorenz, C., Aguiar, B.S. de, Failla, M.A., Barrozo, L.V., Chiaravalloti-Neto, F., 2021. Spatiotemporal ecological study of COVID-19 mortality in the city of São Paulo, Brazil: Shifting of the high mortality risk from areas with the best to those with the worst socio-economic conditions. Travel Med Infect Dis 39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101945

Boing, A.F., Boing, A.C., Veras, M.A., de Lacerda, J.T., da Silva, R.L.P., Barbato, P.R., Fabrin, C., Subramanian, S.V., 2022. Area-level inequalities in Covid-19 outcomes in Brazil in 2020 and 2021: An analysis of 1,894,165 severe Covid-19 cases. Prev Med 164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2022.107298

Brasil.IO, 2022. Boletins informativos e casos do coronavírus por município por dia. Brasil.io.

Brizzi, A., Whittaker, C., Servo, L.M.S., Hawryluk, I., Prete, C.A., de Souza, W.M., Aguiar, R.S., Araujo, L.J.T., Bastos, L.S., Blenkinsop, A., Buss, L.F., Candido, D., Castro, M.C., Costa, S.F., Croda, J., de Souza Santos, A.A., Dye, C., Flaxman, S., Fonseca, P.L.C., Geddes, V.E.V., Gutierrez, B., Lemey, P., Levin, A.S., Mellan, T., Bonfim, D.M., Miscouridou, X., Mishra, S., Monod, M., Moreira, F.R.R., Nelson, B., Pereira, R.H.M., Ranzani, O., Schnekenberg, R.P., Semenova, E., Sonabend, R., Souza, R.P., Xi, X., Sabino, E.C., Faria, N.R., Bhatt, S., Ratmann, O., 2022. Spatial and temporal fluctuations in COVID-19 fatality rates in Brazilian hospitals. Nat Med 28, 1476–1485. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-01807-1

Brotherhood, L., Cavalcanti, T., Da Mata, D., Santos, C., 2022. Slums and pandemics. J Dev Econ 157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2022.102882

Cajazeiro, J.M.D., Cardoso, A.M., Nobre, A.A., 2024. Ethnic-racial composition of the population in COVID-19 mortality: A spatial ecological approach to Brazilian health inequalities. Ciencia e Saude Coletiva 29. https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-812320242912.05552024

Candido, D.S., Claro, I.M., de Jesus, J.G., Souza, W.M., Moreira, F.R.R., Dellicour, S., Mellan, T.A., du Plessis, L., Pereira, R.H.M., Sales, F.C.S., Manuli, E.R., Thézé, J., Almeida, L., Menezes, M.T., Voloch, C.M., Fumagalli, M.J., Coletti, T.M., da Silva, C.A.M., Ramundo, M.S., Amorim, M.R., Hoeltgebaum, H.H., Mishra, S., Gill, M.S., Carvalho, L.M., Buss, L.F., Prete, C.A., Ashworth, J., Nakaya, H.I., Peixoto, P.S., Brady, O.J., Nicholls, S.M., Tanuri, A., Rossi, Á.D., Braga, C.K.V., Gerber, A.L., de C. Guimarães, A.P., Gaburo, N., Alencar, C.S., Ferreira, A.C.S., Lima, C.X., Levi, J.E., Granato, C., Ferreira, G.M., Francisco, R.S., Granja, F., Garcia, M.T., Moretti, M.L., Perroud, M.W., Castiñeiras, T.M.P.P., Lazari, C.S., Hill, S.C., de Souza Santos, A.A., Simeoni, C.L., Forato, J., Sposito, A.C., Schreiber, A.Z., Santos, M.N.N., de Sá, C.Z., Souza, R.P., Resende-Moreira, L.C., Teixeira, M.M., Hubner, J., Leme, P.A.F., Moreira, R.G., Nogueira, M.L., Brazil-UK Centre for Arbovirus Discovery, Diagnosis, Genomics and Epidemiology (CADDE) Genomic Network, Ferguson, N.M., Costa, S.F., Proenca-Modena, J.L., Vasconcelos, A.T.R., Bhatt, S., Lemey, P., Wu, C.-H., Rambaut, A., Loman, N.J., Aguiar, R.S., Pybus, O.G., Sabino, E.C., Faria, N.R., 2020. Evolution and epidemic spread of SARS-CoV-2 in Brazil. Science 369, 1255–1260. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abd2161

Cardoso, E.H.S., Silva, M.S.D., Júnior, F.E.D.A.F., Carvalho, S.V.D., Carvalho, A.C.P.D.L.F.D., Vijaykumar, N., Francês, C.R.L., 2020. Characterizing the Impact of Social Inequality on COVID-19 Propagation in Developing Countries. IEEE Access 8, 172563–172580. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3024910

Castilho, M., Pero, V., Razafindrakoto, M., Roubaud, F., Saboia, J., 2023. Negationism and the role of political factors in Covid-19 mortality in Brazil [Negacionismo e o papel dos fatores políticos para a mortalidade por Covid-19 no Brasil]. Nova Economia 33, 65–93. https://doi.org/10.1590/0103-6351/7528

Castro, M.C., Kim, S., Barberia, L., Ribeiro, A.F., Gurzenda, S., Ribeiro, K.B., Abbott, E., Blossom, J., Rache, B., Singer, B.H., 2021. Spatiotemporal pattern of COVID-19

spread in Brazil. Science 372, 821–826. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abh1558
Chauvin, J.P., 2024. Why did COVID-19 affect some cities more than others? Insights from Brazil before vaccination. Regional Science Policy and Practice 16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rspp.2024.100138
Clouston, S.A.P., Natale, G., Link, B.G., 2021. Socioeconomic inequalities in the spread of coronavirus-19 in the United States: A examination of the emergence of social inequalities. Soc Sci Med 268, 113554. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113554
Clouston, S.A.P., Rubin, M.S., Phelan, J.C., Link, B.G., 2016. A Social History of Disease: Contextualizing the Rise and Fall of Social Inequalities in Cause-Specific Mortality. Demography 53, 1631–1656. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-016-0495-5
Collazos, J.A.A., Dias, R., Medeiros, M.C., 2023. Modeling the evolution of deaths from infectious diseases with functional data models: The case of COVID-19 in Brazil. Stat Med 42, 993–1012. https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.9654
Cota, W., 2020. Monitoring the number of COVID-19 cases and deaths in Brazil at municipal and federative units level. SciELOPreprints. https://doi.org/10.1590/SciELOPreprints.362
COVID-19 Mobility Data Network, 2020. Facebook Data for Good Mobility Dashboard. COVID-19 Mobility Data Network.
Cox, C., 2005. Delta Method, in: Encyclopedia of Biostatistics. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/0470011815.b2a15029
da Silva, V.R., Pacheco, E.S., de Oliveira Cardoso, O., de Oliveira Lima, L.H., Rodrigues, M.T.P., Mascarenhas, M.D.M., 2022. Temporal trend of COVID-19 incidence and mortality rates and their relationship with socioeconomic indicators in the state of Piauí, Brazil: an ecological study, 2020-2021; [Tendência temporal das taxas de incidência e de mortalidade por COVID-19 e sua relação com indicadores socioeconômicos no Piauí: estudo ecológico, 2020-2021]; [Tendencia temporal de las tasas de incidencia y mortalidad por COVID-19 y su relación con indicadores socioeconómicos en el estado de Piauí, Brasil: estudio ecológico, 2020-2021]. Epidemiologia e Servicos de Saude 31. https://doi.org/10.1590/S2237-96222022000200022
De Negri, F., Galiezz, R., Miranda, P., Koeller, P., Zucoloto, G., Costa, J., Farias, C.M., Travassos, G.H., Medronho, R.A., 2021. Socioeconomic factors and the probability of death by Covid-19 in Brazil. Journal of Public Health (United Kingdom) 43, 493–498. https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdaa279
de Souza, W.M., Buss, L.F., Candido, D. da S., Carrera, J.-P., Li, S., Zarebski, A.E., Pereira, R.H.M., Prete, C.A., de Souza-Santos, A.A., Parag, K.V., Belotti, M.C.T.D., Vincenti-Gonzalez, M.F., Messina, J., da Silva Sales, F.C., Andrade, P. dos S., Nascimento, V.H., Ghilardi, F., Abade, L., Gutierrez, B., Kraemer, M.U.G., Braga, C.K.V., Aguiar, R.S., Alexander, N., Mayaud, P., Brady, O.J., Marcilio, I., Gouveia, N., Li, G., Tami, A., de Oliveira, S.B., Porto, V.B.G., Ganem, F., de Almeida, W.A.F., Fantinato, F.F.S.T., Macário, E.M., de Oliveira, W.K., Nogueira, M.L., Pybus, O.G., Wu, C.-H., Croda, J., Sabino, E.C., Faria, N.R., 2020. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of the COVID-19 epidemic in Brazil. Nat Hum Behav 4, 856–865. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0928-4
de Souza Santos, A.A., Candido, D. da S., de Souza, W.M., Buss, L., Li, S.L., Pereira, R.H.M., Wu, C.-H., Sabino, E.C., Faria, N.R., 2021. Dataset on SARS-CoV-2 non-pharmaceutical interventions in Brazilian municipalities. Sci Data 8, 73. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-021-00859-1
Donkin, A.J.M., 2014. Social Gradient, in: The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Health,

Illness, Behavior, and Society. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 2172–2178. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118410868.wbehibs530

dos Santos, C.V.B., Valiati, N.C.M., Noronha, T.G. de, Porto, V.B.G., Pacheco, A.G., Freitas, L.P., Coelho, F.C., Gomes, M.F. da C., Bastos, L.S., Cruz, O.G., Lana, R.M., Luz, P.M., Carvalho, L.M.F. de, Werneck, G.L., Struchiner, C.J., Villela, D.A.M., 2023. The effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines against severe cases and deaths in Brazil from 2021 to 2022: a registry-based study. The Lancet Regional Health – Americas 20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lana.2023.100465

Driscoll, J.C., Kraay, A.C., 1998. Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimation with Spatially Dependent Panel Data. Rev. Econ. Stat. 80, 549–560. https://doi.org/10.1162/003465398557825

Faria de Moura Villela, E., López, R.V.M., Sato, A.P.S., de Oliveira, F.M., Waldman, E.A., Van den Bergh, R., Siewe Fodjo, J.N., Colebunders, R., 2021. COVID-19 outbreak in Brazil: adherence to national preventive measures and impact on people's lives, an online survey. BMC Public Health 21, 152. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10222-z

Farmer, P., 1996. Social inequalities and emerging infectious diseases. Emerg Infect Dis 2, 259–269.

Feachem, R.G., Feachem, R.G.A., Weltgesundheitsorganisation (Eds.), 2002. Global public goods for health: the report of Working Group 2 of the Commission on Macroeconomics and Health. World Health Organization, Geneva.

Fortaleza, C.M.C.B., Guimarães, R.B., de Almeida, G.B., Pronunciate, M., Ferreira, C.P., 2020. Taking the inner route: spatial and demographic factors affecting vulnerability to COVID-19 among 604 cities from inner São Paulo State, Brazil. Epidemiol Infect 148, e118. https://doi.org/10.1017/S095026882000134X

Geraque, E., 2021. Limited use. Pesquisa FAPESP.

Grolemund, G., Wickham, H., 2011. Dates and Times Made Easy with lubridate. J Stat Softw 40, 1–25.

IBGE, 2011. Censo 2010 | IBGE. gov.br.

Incognia, 2025. Política de Privacidade: Inloco x COVID-19 [WWW Document]. URL https://www.incognia.com/pt/politicas/covid (accessed 4.2.25).

ipea- Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada, 2022. Biblioteca.

Justiça Eleitoral, 2022. Conjunto de dados - Portal de Dados Abertos do TSE.

Karline Soetaert, Thomas Petzoldt, R. Woodrow Setzer, 2010. Solving Differential Equations in R: Package deSolve. J Stat Softw 33, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v033.i09

Li, S.L., Pereira, R.H.M., Jr, C.A.P., Zarebski, A.E., Emanuel, L., Alves, P.J.H., Peixoto, P.S., Braga, C.K.V., Santos, A.A. de S., Souza, W.M. de, Barbosa, R.J., Buss, L.F., Mendrone, A., Almeida-Neto, C. de, Ferreira, S.C., Salles, N.A., Marcilio, I., Wu, C.-H., Gouveia, N., Nascimento, V.H., Sabino, E.C., Faria, N.R., Messina, J.P., 2021. Higher risk of death from COVID-19 in low-income and non-White populations of São Paulo, Brazil. BMJ Glob Health 6, e004959. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2021-004959

Licciardi, A.N., Monteiro, L.H.A., 2022. A complex network model for a society with socioeconomic classes. Math. Biosci. Eng. 19, 6731–6742. https://doi.org/10.3934/mbe.2022317

Link, B.G., Phelan, J., 1995. Social Conditions As Fundamental Causes of Disease. J Health Soc Behav 80–94. https://doi.org/10.2307/2626958

Liu, Y., Wang, K., Yang, L., He, D., 2022. Regional heterogeneity of in-hospital mortality of COVID-19 in Brazil. Infect Dis Model 7, 364–373. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idm.2022.06.005

Madewell, Z.J., Yang, Y., Longini, I.M., Jr, Halloran, M.E., Dean, N.E., 2020. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Netw Open 3, e2031756. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.31756

Martins, J.P., Siqueira, B.A., Sansone, N.M.S., Marson, F.A.L., 2023. COVID-19 in Brazil: a 3-year update. Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease 107, 116074. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2023.116074

Martins-Filho, P.R., Quintans-Júnior, L.J., de Souza Araújo, A.A., Sposato, K.B., Souza Tavares, C.S., Gurgel, R.Q., Fontes Leite, D.C., de Paiva, S.M., Santos, H.P., Santos, V.S., 2021. Socio-economic inequalities and COVID-19 incidence and mortality in Brazilian children: a nationwide register-based study. Public Health 190, 4–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2020.11.005

Mee, P., Alexander, N., Mayaud, P., González, F. de J.C., Abbott, S., Santos, A.A. de S., Acosta, A.L., Parag, K.V., Pereira, R.H.M., Prete, C.A., Sabino, E.C., Faria, N.R., Brady, O.J., 2022. Tracking the emergence of disparities in the subnational spread of COVID-19 in Brazil using an online application for real-time data visualisation: A longitudinal analysis. The Lancet Regional Health - Americas 5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lana.2021.100119

Meta, 2023. Data For Good at Meta Movement Range Maps. Data for Good.

Ministério da Saúde, 2024. Campanha Nacional de Vacinação contra Covid-19 - OPENDATASUS.

Ministério da Saúde, 2022. Sistema de Informação sobre Mortalidade – SIM (1979 a 2020) - OPENDATASUS. OPENDATASUS.

Ministério da Saúde, 2021. TabNet Win32 3.0: População Residente - Estudo de Estimativas Populacionais por Município, Idade e Sexo 2000-2021 - Brasil.

Mongey, S., Weinberg, A., 2020. Characteristics of workers in low work-from-home and high personal-proximity occupations. Becker Friedman Institute for Economics at UChicago 11.

Naidoo, M., Shephard, W., Kambewe, I., Mtshali, N., Cope, S., Rubio, F.A., Rasella, D., 2024. Incorporating social vulnerability in infectious disease mathematical modelling: a scoping review. BMC Med 22, 125. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-024-03333-y

Nassif Pires, L., Barbosa de Carvalho, L., Lederman Rawet, E., 2020. MULTIDIMENSIONAL INEQUALITY AND COVID-19 IN BRAZIL (No. 153). Levy Economics Institute of Bard College.

Nicolelis, M.A.L., Raimundo, R.L.G., Peixoto, P.S., Andreazzi, C.S., 2021. The impact of super-spreader cities, highways, and intensive care availability in the early stages of the COVID-19 epidemic in Brazil. Sci Rep 11, 13001. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-92263-3

Nunes, L., Rocha, R., Ulyssea, G., 2020. Vulnerabilidades da População Brasileira à COVID-19: Desafios para a Flexibilização do Distanciamento Social (No. 9). Instituto de Estudos para Políticas de Saúde, São Paulo.

Omran, A.R., 2001. The epidemiologic transition. A theory of the Epidemiology of population change. 1971. Bull World Health Organ 79, 161–170.

Pascual-García, A., Klein, J.D., Villers, J., Campillo-Funollet, E., Sarkis, C., 2021. Empowering the crowd: feasible strategies for epidemic management in high-density informal settlements. The case of COVID-19 in Northwest Syria. BMJ Glob Health 6, e004656. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-004656

Passos, V.M. de A., Brant, L.C.C., Pinheiro, P.C., Correa, P.R.L., Machado, I.E., Santos, M.R., Ribeiro, A.L.P., Paixão, L.M.M., Pimenta Junior, F.G., de Souza, M. de F.M.,

Malta, D.C., 2021. Higher mortality during the covid-19 pandemic in socially vulnerable areas in belo horizonte: Implications for vaccine prioritization; [Maior mortalidade durante a pandemia de covid-19 em áreas socialmente vulneráveis em belo horizonte: Implicações para a priorização da vacinação]. Revista Brasileira de Epidemiologia 24. https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-549720210025

Peixoto, P., 2022. Pedrospeixoto/mdyn.

Peixoto, P.S., Marcondes, D., Peixoto, C., Oliva, S.M., 2020. Modeling future spread of infections via mobile geolocation data and population dynamics. An application to COVID-19 in Brazil. PLOS ONE 15, e0235732. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0235732

Phelan, J.C., Link, B.G., Diez-Roux, A., Kawachi, I., Levin, B., 2004. "Fundamental Causes" of Social Inequalities in Mortality: A Test of the Theory. J Health Soc Behav 45, 265–285. https://doi.org/10.1177/002214650404500303

R Core Team, 2021. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Rache, B., Lago, M., Falbel, F., Rocha, R., 2021. Quantas Vidas Cabem em um Voto? (No. 18). Instituto de Estudos para Políticas de Saúde, São Paulo.

Rawls, J., 1958. Justice as Fairness. Philos Rev 67, 164–194. https://doi.org/10.2307/2182612

Raymundo, C.E., Oliveira, M.C., de Araujo Eleuterio, T., de Arruda Santos Junior, É.C., da Silva, M.G., André, S.R., Sousa, A.I., de Andrade Medronho, R., 2023. Spatial–temporal distribution of incidence, mortality, and case-fatality ratios of coronavirus disease 2019 and its social determinants in Brazilian municipalities. Sci Rep 13. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-31046-4

Razafindrakoto, M., Roubaud, F., Castilho, M.R., Pero, V., Saboia, J., 2024. Investigating the "Bolsonaro effect" on the spread of the Covid-19 pandemic: An empirical analysis of observational data in Brazil. PLoS ONE 19. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0288894

Razafindrakoto, M., Roubaud, F., Saboia, J., Castilho, M.R., Pero, V., 2022. Municípios in the Time of Covid-19 in Brazil: Socioeconomic Vulnerabilities, Transmission Factors and Public Policies. Europ. J. Devel. Res. 34, 2730–2758. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41287-021-00487-w

Rhodes, S., Beale, S., Daniels, S., Gittins, M., Mueller, W., McElvenny, D., van Tongeren, M., 2024. Occupation and SARS-CoV-2 in Europe: a review. European Respiratory Review 33. https://doi.org/10.1183/16000617.0044-2024

Ribeiro, G.R., Magrinyà, F., Filho, D.R.O., 2014. Study of the Changes in Urban Mobility of the Brazilian Middle Class, Brought about by the Population's Increased Income, and the Ensuing Impact on Urban Mass Transit. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, XI Congreso de Ingenieria del Transporte (CIT 2014) 160, 294–303. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.141

Ribeiro, K.B., Ribeiro, A.F., de Sousa Mascena Veras, M.A., de Castro, M.C., 2021. Social inequalities and COVID-19 mortality in the city of São Paulo, Brazil. Int J Epidemiol dyab022. https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyab022

Ritchie, H., Mathieu, E., Rodés-Guirao, L., Appel, C., Giattino, C., Ortiz-Ospina, E., Hasell, J., Macdonald, B., Beltekian, D., Roser, M., 2020. Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). Our World in Data.

Rocha, R., Atun, R., Massuda, A., Rache, B., Spinola, P., Nunes, L., Lago, M., Castro, M.C., 2021. Effect of socioeconomic inequalities and vulnerabilities on health-system

preparedness and response to COVID-19 in Brazil: a comprehensive analysis. The Lancet Global Health 9, e782–e792. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(21)00081-4

Sá, T.H. de, Pereira, R.H.M., Duran, A.C., Monteiro, C.A., 2016. Socioeconomic and regional differences in active transportation in Brazil. Rev. Saúde Pública 50, 37. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1518-8787.2016050006126

Santana, K.V.D.S.D., Marino, A., Martins, G.R., Lima, P.H.B.M., Mendonça, P.H.R., Rolnik, R., 2024. Space–Time Analysis of the COVID-19 Pandemic and Its Relationship with Socioeconomic and Demographic Variables in the Metropolitan Region of São Paulo, Brazil. ISPRS Int J Geoinf 13. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi13110397

Seara-Morais, G.J., Avelino-Silva, T.J., Couto, M., Avelino-Silva, V.I., 2023. The pervasive association between political ideology and COVID-19 vaccine uptake in Brazil: an ecologic study. BMC Public Health 23. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-16409-w

Serdan, T.D.A., Masi, L.N., Gorjao, R., Pithon-Curi, T.C., Curi, R., Hirabara, S.M., 2020. COVID-19 in Brazil: Historical cases, disease milestones, and estimated outbreak peak. Travel Med Infect Dis 38, 101733. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101733

Silva, J., Ribeiro-Alves, M., 2021. Social inequalities and the pandemic of COVID-19: the case of Rio de Janeiro. J Epidemiol Community Health 75, 975–979. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2020-214724

Tavares, F.F., Betti, G., 2021. The pandemic of poverty, vulnerability, and COVID-19: Evidence from a fuzzy multidimensional analysis of deprivations in Brazil. World Dev 139, 105307. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105307

Thompson, H.A., Mousa, A., Dighe, A., Fu, H., Arnedo-Pena, A., Barrett, P., Bellido-Blasco, J., Bi, Q., Caputi, A., Chaw, L., De Maria, L., Hoffmann, M., Mahapure, K., Ng, K., Raghuram, J., Singh, G., Soman, B., Soriano, V., Valent, F., Vimercati, L., Wee, L.E., Wong, J., Ghani, A.C., Ferguson, N.M., 2021. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Setting-specific Transmission Rates: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Clin. Infect. Dis. 73, e754–e764. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab100

Villar, J., Maddalena, L., de Abreu Camargo, T., Medina Maçaira, P., Baião, F., Cyrino Oliveira, F.L., 2024. A statistical analysis of COVID-19 mortality dynamics: Unraveling the interplay between vaccination trends, socioeconomic factors, and government interventions in Brazilian states. Socio-Economic Planning Sciences 92, 101855. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2024.101855

Xavier, D.R., Lima e Silva, E., Lara, F.A., e Silva, G.R.R., Oliveira, M.F., Gurgel, H., Barcellos, C., 2022. Involvement of political and socio-economic factors in the spatial and temporal dynamics of COVID-19 outcomes in Brazil: A population-based study. The Lancet Regional Health - Americas 10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lana.2022.100221

Table 1. Model compartments.

Compartment	Description
S	Susceptible *(unvaccinated)*
E	Exposed *(unvaccinated)*
I	Infected *(unvaccinated)*
V_S	Susceptible *(vaccinated)*
V_E	Exposed *(vaccinated)*
V_I	Infected *(vaccinated)*
R	Recovered
D	Deceased

Table 2. Model parameters.

Parameter	Description	Value	Source
λ_i (t)	Force of infection (FOI)	*Municipality-specific*	*Derived*
δ_E^{-1}	Latent period (days)	2.9	Pascual-García et al.
γ^{-1}	Infectious period (days)	7	Pascual-García et al.
d_i	Infection fatality rate	*Municipality-specific*	Ministério da Saúde Brasil.IO
$\eta_i(t)$	Rate of vaccine administration (per day)	*Municipality-specific*	Cota
v_e	Vaccine efficacy	.89	ACIP
v_p	Vaccine protection against death	.509	ACIP dos Santos et al.
λ_i^{HH}	Household/ mobility-independent FOI	*Municipality-specific*	*Derived*
$\lambda_i^M(t)$	Extra-household/ mobility-dependent FOI	*Municipality-specific*	*Derived*
β_i^{HH}	Household rate of transmission	*Municipality-specific*	*Derived*
τ_{HH}	Daily household probability of transmission	–	*Derived*
c_i^{HH}	Household contact rate	*Municipality-specific*	*Derived*
SAR	Household secondary attack rate	.189 (.14, .248)	Madewell et al. Thompson et al.
$\beta_{ij}^M(t)$	Inter/intra-municipality mobility-dependent transmission rate	*Municipality-specific*	*Derived*
τ_M	Mobility-dependent probability of transmission	–	*Derived*
$c_i^M(t)$	Mobility-dependent contact rate	*Municipality-specific*	*Derived*
$\omega_{ij}(t)$	Probability of contact with j	*Municipality-specific*	Peixoto, Incognia
$HH\bar{}size_i$	Mean household size (residents/household)	*Municipality-specific*	IBGE
R_0	Basic reproduction number	3.1 (2.4, 5.5)	de Souza et al.
R_0^{HH}	R_0 of household transmission	–	*Derived*
R_0^M	R_0 of mobility-dependent transmission	–	*Derived*
κ^M	Intrinsic mobility-dependent transmission rate	–	*Derived*
$\Delta M_i(t)$	Proportional change in mobility	*Municipality-specific*	COVID-19 Mobility Data Network, Meta

Notes:
Derived parameters indicate that they have been calculated by the author using other parameters with known values.

Table 3. Counterfactual model scenarios for different NPI and vaccine distribution/adoption strategies.

Scenario	Interventions implemented	NPI strategy	Vaccine strategy
1	None (*baseline*)		
2	NPIs	As in real world	
3	Vaccination		As in real world
4	NPIs & Vaccination	As in real world	As in real world
5	NPIs	Equal[a]	
6	Vaccination		Equal[a]
7	Vaccination		Equitable[b]
8	NPIs & Vaccination	Equal[a]	Equal[a]
9	NPIs & Vaccination	Equal[a]	Equitable[b]

Notes:
[a] All municipalities have the same adoption as the country as a whole.
[b] Lower SES municipalities prioritized for intervention. (Given real-world country-level vaccination rates, municipalities are fully vaccinated in ascending order by SES.)

Table 4. Social Vulnerability Index (SVI)- calculated by the arithmetic mean of its component indices.

Index	Subindex	Weight
Urban infrastructure (weighted mean of normalized subindices)	% with inadequate access to water and sanitation	.3
	% without access to garbage collection services	.3
	% in households with per capita income $< 1/2$ minimum wage & > 1 hour commute	.4
Human capital (weighted mean of normalized subindices)	Infant mortality rate	.125
	% children 0-5 not in school	.125
	% children 6-14 not in school	.125
	% girls 10-17 with children	.125
	% female heads of household with a child & no primary education	.125
	Illiteracy rate of population 15+	.125
	% children in households where no one has a primary education	.125
	% people 15-24 not in work or study & in households with per capita income $< 1/2$ minimum wage	.125
Income and work (weighted mean of normalized subindices)	% in households with per capita income $< 1/2$ minimum wage	.2
	Unemployment rate of population 18+	.2
	% people 18+ with no primary education & work in informal sector	.2
	% in households with per capita income $< 1/2$ minimum wage & elderly dependents	.2
	Children 10-14 employment rate	.2

Notes: All data are from ipea- Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada (2022).

Table 5. Municipal Human Development Index (MHDI)- calculated by the geometric mean of its component indices.

Index	Subindex	Derivation/Metrics
Longevity	–	$\frac{(life\,expectancy)-25}{85-25}$
Education-weighted mean of children & young people's (2/3) & adult (1/3) education	Children & young people's education (arithmetic mean of component metrics)	% children 5-6 in school
		% children 11-13 with or completing primary education
		% people 15-17 with primary education
		% people 18-20 with secondary education
	Adult education	% people 18+ with primary education
Income	–	$\frac{ln(income\,per\,capita)-ln(R\$8)}{ln(R\$4033)-ln(R\$8)}$

Notes: All data are from ipea- Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada (2022).



Fig. 1. Proposed pathways to COVID-19 mortality gradients inspired by (Bambra, 2022).



Fig. 2. Model diagram.



Fig. 3. Relative risk of mortality in municipalities in the 5th compared to the 1st quintile of SVI (top) and MHDI (bottom) during the first 26 weeks of an outbreak in the real world and simulations of scenarios 1-4 (Table 3). Shaded bands indicate 95% CIs (omitted where outside plot bounds).



Fig. 4. Relative risk of mortality in municipalities in the 5th compared to the 1st quintile of SVI (top) and MHDI (bottom) during the first 26 weeks of an outbreak in simulations of scenarios 1 and 5-9 (Table 3). Shaded bands indicate 95% CIs (omitted where outside plot bounds).