HEALTH SURVEILLANCE AND EPIDEMIOLOGICAL PROFILE OF SEVERE ACUTE RESPIRATORY SYNDROME DUE TO COVID-19 IN BRAZIL (2020-2024)

Authors

Silvio Alencar Cândido-Sobrinho[1], ORCID: 0000-0002-6055-5791; José Quirino da Silva-Filho[2], ORCID: 0000-0002-9619-4553; Francisco de Sousa Júnior[2], ORCID: 0009-0004-3782-4836; Vânia Angélica Feitosa Viana[1], ORCID: 0000-0002-5175-9549; Aldo Ângelo Moreira Lima[1], ORCID: 0000-0002-0299-1747.

[1]Post-graduate Program in Medical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, Federal University of Ceará, Brazil

[2]NUBIMED - Biomedicine Centre, Faculty of Medicine, Federal University of Ceará, Brazil

Corresponding Author

Silvio Alencar Cândido-Sobrinho, silvio.sobrinho@prof.ce.gov.br, Post-graduate Program in Medical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, Federal University of Ceará, Rua Prof. Costa Mendes, 1608 - 4th floor, Fortaleza, Ceará, Brazil.

WHAT WAS ALREADY KNOWN?

- **Variants influence COVID-19 severity:** Variants such as Delta and Gamma were already associated with increased transmissibility and lethality.
- **Vaccination has a protective role against severe forms of the disease:** Previous data showed reduced mortality with vaccines, especially after completing the primary series.
- **Regional inequalities impact outcomes:** Regions with lower healthcare infrastructure, especially in the North and Northeast, face higher fatality rates.

WHAT IS NEW?

- **Three major waves of SARS due to COVID-19, with marked differences by region and variant:** The second wave was the deadliest, and Omicron, though less pathogenic, had widespread circulation and three distinct peaks.
- **Direct impact of sociodemographic and economic factors on outcomes:** Lethality was higher among illiterate individuals, Black and Brown populations, and rural residents.
- **Robust effect of booster vaccination on survival:** Individuals with a first or second booster were up to 60% less likely to die and had four times higher survival at 40 days compared to unvaccinated individuals.

HEALTH SURVEILLANCE AND EPIDEMIOLOGICAL PROFILE OF SARS DUE TO COVID-19 IN BRAZIL (2020–2024)

CONTEXT

january 2020 → december 2024

5 years

Severe cases of COVID-19 nationalwide between january 2020 to december 2024

Nationalwide analysis per region

FINDINGS

THREE MAIN WAVES
VOI B.1.1.33, VOC ALPHA, VOC GAMA AND VOC OMICRON

SOCIOECONOMIC DISPARITIES
HIGHER LETALITY RATES RELATED WITH AGEING, LOWER EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, BLACK AND MULTIRACIAL, AND RESIDENTS FROM RURAL ZONES

VACCINE IMPACT
VACCINATION GREATLY REDUCED THE PROBABILITY OF DEATH

KAPLAN-MEIER ESTIMATOR
3 or more comorbidities



VACCINATION IMPACT

- THE BOOSTER VACCINATION SCHEDULE REDUCED THE PROBABILITY OF DEATH UP TO 60% OR: 0.40 [0.38-0.41]
- THE SURVIVAL PROBABILITY WOULD BE 4x HIGHER AFTER 40 DAYS WITH THE ADHERENCE TO THE BOOSTER VACCINATION SCHEDULE

ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 crisis exposed deep-rooted inequalities in Brazil, such as the concentration of healthcare resources in metropolitan areas. Despite the availability of effective vaccines, full immunization coverage was not achieved, allowing cases to progress to severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS). This study aimed to analyse the progression of mild, moderate, and severe cases between January 2020 and December 2024, covering a five-year period, taking into account regional, social, and variant-related differences, vaccination, and factors associated with SARS due to COVID-19 in Brazil. A total of 47,547,814 influenza-like illness (mild and moderate) cases, 2,127,427 SARS cases due to COVID-19, 533,966,291 vaccination records, and data on circulating variants were analysed. Among the SARS cases, 1,171,801 were confirmed by PCR; 777,672 patients recovered, and 394,129 died, resulting in a case fatality rate of 33.63%. Brazil experienced three major waves of SARS due to COVID-19, with the second wave being the deadliest across all regions. The Gamma and Omicron variants were the most persistent and impactful. The transition between variants influenced the regional dynamics of the pandemic, although little variation was observed in the proportion of circulating variants across regions. The study highlights the importance of continuous monitoring, genomic surveillance, and vaccination coverage to anticipate and mitigate future pandemic waves.

Keywords: COVID-19, Brazil, public health surveillance, epidemiology, epidemiological profile.

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of the Influenza A (H1N1) virus in 2009 triggered a rapid global spread, reigniting concerns about the potential of etiological agents to cause pandemics. In response to this emergency, Brazil's Ministry of Health established the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) Surveillance Group, focused on the prevention and control of emerging respiratory diseases[1].

Years later, the health crisis caused by COVID-19 would expose deep structural inequalities in the country: the concentration of Intensive Care Units (ICUs) in metropolitan areas[2], shortage of human resources, medications, and hospital supplies[3,4], vaccine hesitancy[5] and the emergence of new SARS-CoV-2 variants[6]. Despite the availability of effective vaccines, full immunization was not universal, allowing COVID-19 to progress to severe cases as SARS[7].

Brazil became the epicentre of the pandemic in 2021, largely due to its vast, heterogeneous territory and political scenario, which directly influenced decision-making processes during the health crisis[8]. Social inequalities further exacerbated this scenario, both through the concentration of healthcare resources and economic vulnerability, which forced a significant portion of the population to continue working despite recommendations for social distancing[9].

In this context, it is essential to understand how COVID-19 progresses to SARS among the Brazilian population by identifying risk groups and factors associated with unfavourable outcomes. Additionally, analysing the evolution of cases and deaths, crisis management strategies, the emergence of new variants, and the vaccination campaign is crucial to identifying gaps in the pandemic response and informing future public health policies. Thus, this study aims to describe the dynamics of COVID-19 in Brazil over five years (2020-2024), considering regional and social differences, the impact of circulating variants, vaccination, and factors associated with progression to SARS.

METHODS

Research Ethics

This study used aggregated data without the possibility of individual identification, made available in public repositories, and was therefore exempt from evaluation by a Research Ethics Committee according to the Brazilian National Health Council Resolution No. 510/2016[10].

Study Design

This is an observational study of the retrospective cohort[11], based on secondary data extracted from national health surveillance systems, encompassing mild, moderate, and severe cases of COVID-19 between 2020 and 2024 in Brazil.

Data Source

Data covering the period from January 1, 2020, to December 31, 2024, were retrieved as follows: mild and moderate cases were obtained from the 'Influenza-like Illness Notifications Database' (referred as 'ILI'); severe cases were obtained from the 'Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Database - including COVID-19 data' (referred as 'SARS'); and Vaccination data were obtained from the 'National COVID-19 Vaccination Campaign Database', all retrieved from openDataSUS repositories[12]. Information on circulating variants of SARS-CoV-2 in Brazil during the study period was retrieved from the Fiocruz Genomic Network repositories[13]. Human Development Index (HDI) 2010 data by municipality were obtained from the United Nations Development Programme[14]. Population data were retrieved from the IBGE Automatic Recovery System using *sidrar*[15].

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

For the ILI database (mild and moderate cases), all confirmed COVID-19 cases were included regardless of age, sex, or region, with laboratory-confirmed etiological agent, and whose outcome was cure, death, or home treatment. Records were excluded if it was not possible to identify the state of residence, notification date, or etiological agent (unspecified SARS or suspected cases).

Regarding the SARS database (severe cases), individuals confirmed for SARS-CoV-2 by PCR were included if they had a final classification of 'Cure' or 'Death', with an outcome duration between 0 and 38 days (IQR = 15 [10-20] days), and presented vaccination records with sequential applications (necessarily following the order: 'None', '1st Dose', '2nd Dose', '1st Booster', and '2nd Booster'), with manufacturer information available and with a minimum period of 7 days after application. Excluded were individuals without PCR confirmation, those who died from other causes, cases without outcome information (ignored cases), and cases with outlier length of stay or inconsistencies in vaccination data.

Regarding the National COVID-19 Vaccination Campaign data, individuals of any sex or region who received the 1st Dose, 2nd Dose, 1st Booster, or 2nd Booster were included. Individuals for whom age or state of residence could not be identified, as well as records of doses related to exceptional cases or new vaccination schedules were excluded.

Data Processing and Statistical Analysis

The data were processed using AWK, bash, and R[16] programming languages, with the *tidyverse* libraries used for data processing and string detection[17]. Graphs were generated with *ggplot2*[18], *ggpubr*[19], *survminer*[20] and *forestmodel*[21] libraries. Contingency tables were created using *tableone*[22].

Variables were expressed as mean ± standard deviation or median [IQR1-IQR3]. Adjusted incidence and mortality rates were calculated based on data from the 2022 Census. Differences in proportions were assessed using the chi-square test (χ^2), and comparisons of case fatality rates (CFR) between groups were performed using the Z-Test for the comparison of multiple two-sided proportions with p-value adjustment by the Bonferroni method using *rstatix*[23] and *rcompanion*[24]. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed using the *stats* library, and Tukey's test was conducted using *agricolae*[25] library.

Odds Ratios (OR) were reported as OR [95% CI lower - 95% CI upper], estimated through Generalized Linear Models (GLMs). Only complete cases (n=351,051) were considered for this step. Univariate models were fitted including 78 demographic variables (Region, Geographic Zone, Age Group, Sex, Pregnancy Status, 2010 HDI, Ethnicity, and Educational Level), clinical signs and symptoms (General: fever, chills, malaise, sweating, asthenia, prostration, severe fatigue, loss of appetite, hyporexia, insomnia; Respiratory: cough, coryza, bronchitis, sneezing, sore throat, wheezing, tachypnea, respiratory distress, chest pain, cyanosis, hemoptysis, SpO2 saturation < 95%; Neurological: headache, confusion, seizure; Musculoskeletal: myalgia, arthralgia, back pain; Gastrointestinal: nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, diarrhea; Other: tachycardia, edema, conjunctivitis, sepsis, loss of smell and taste) and risk factors (asthma, cardiopathy, pneumopathy, chronic kidney disease, immunosuppression, chronic liver disease, neurological disorder, obesity, puerperium, Down syndrome, diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, pancreatitis, alcoholism, anemia, COPD, stroke, hypertension, emphysema, hypothyroidism, arthritis, ascites, lymphoma, lupus, and cancer). Variables with $p<0.05$ and OR>1.0 were subsequently selected for the multivariate modelling stage, totalling 31 variables. The final model was adjusted using forward-backward stepwise regression with the *MASS*[26] library.

For modelling purposes, individuals were categorized according to their vaccination status into three groups: those who received no vaccination, those who received the first and/or second dose ('1st/2nd Dose'), and those who received the first and/or second booster ('1st/2nd Booster'). Additionally, the number of comorbidities/risk factors per individual was

calculated, including diabetes, neurological disorder, chronic kidney disease, chronic lung disease, immunosuppression, and obesity. These risk factors were selected based on a GLM model adjusted by stepwise selection. Individuals were then classified into three groups according to the total number of reported comorbidities/risk factors: '0' (no comorbidities/risk factors), '1-2' (one or two comorbidities/risk factors), and '3+' (three or more comorbidities/risk factors).

Finally, the effect of vaccination status combined with the number of comorbidities/risk factors on median survival time was evaluated through multivariate adjustment of Kaplan-Meier survival curves in the population of severe cases. Comparisons between survival curves were validated using the log-rank test, employing the *survival*[27] and *survminer*[20] libraries.

RESULTS

During the study period (01/01/2020 to 12/31/2024), a total of 47,547,814 cases of Influenza-like Illness (ILI) were reported, of which 25,082,124 were laboratory-confirmed (Figure S1). Simultaneously, 4,029,767 cases of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) were recorded, with 2,127,427 cases identified as being caused by SARS-CoV-2, and approximately half of these (1,171,801) confirmed by PCR methodology (Figure S1). Regarding the immunization coverage during the period, 184,375,251 1st Doses (90.78% coverage), 166,442,064 2nd Doses (81.95% coverage), 139,285,497 1st Booster doses (68.58% coverage), and 43,863,479 2nd Booster doses (21.59% coverage) were administered. For this study, the 1st+2nd+3rd dose schedules, revaccination, and additional doses were excluded. These regimens are intended for immunocompromised individuals, those undergoing stem cell transplantation, cases of vaccination errors (such as leakage or inadvertent vaccination), and other specific reasons.

Concerning missing data in SARS records for PCR-confirmed cases, 108 individuals had no information regarding sex at birth, 231,100 (19.7%) lacked information on ethnicity, 744,232 (63.5%) lacked education data, and 132,005 (11.3%) had no information regarding their geographic zone of residence. Additionally, a significant difference was observed between the notification date and the data entry date. The largest average delay was recorded in the North Region, with 16.63 ± 15.06^{a} days, followed by the Southeast Region with 15.32 ± 13.43^{b} days. No significant difference was found between the Central-West and Northeast Regions, with average delays of 12.58 ± 11.21^{c} and 12.58 ± 14.01^{c} days, respectively.

The South Region had the fastest reporting time, with an average delay of 12.22 ± 10.25[d] days (ANOVA, *post-hoc* Tukey, $p<0.05$).

The beginning of the pandemic was marked by a surge in cases and deaths, with well-defined curves observed for ILI-related deaths and new cases and deaths from SARS (Figure 1). incidence and mortality rates for SARS due to COVID-19 revealed three distinct waves, with pronounced peaks and regional variations (Figures S2-S3).

Genomic surveillance data in Brazil were made available with limited sampling, providing the temporal distribution of circulating viral variants across the country and regions between 2020 and 2024. The absolute and relative frequencies of the variants among the total sequenced samples were analysed (Figure 2-A), allowing for a comparative assessment of lineage dynamics over the epidemiological weeks. An increasing concern with the surveillance was evident from the rise in sequencing efforts. However, as incidence and mortality rates declined after 2022, the number of sequencings also dropped sharply. In 2024, several circulating variants were recorded without specific lineage identification (categorized as 'Others'), except for the sub-lineage JN.1 (KP.3*, XEC). No major differences were observed between regions regarding the relative frequencies of circulating variants (Figure 2-B).

The first pandemic wave was attributed to the variant of interest (VOI) B.1.1.33 and to the variants of concern (VOCs) Alpha (B.1.1, B.1.7). The second wave was associated with the prevalence of VOCs Delta (B.1.617.2+AY*) and Gamma (B.1.1.28, P.1*). The third wave was primarily driven by the circulation of the VOC Omicron (BA., FE., JD., LB., MJ., XBB., GK., XE), which became the predominant variant from the 45th epidemiological week of 2021 until the beginning of 2024 (8th week). Omicron also exhibited three distinct incidence peaks, each with progressively reduced amplitude, coinciding with the considerable progress of vaccination campaigns, particularly the administration of first booster doses (Figures 1-2; Figures S2-S3). After the reduction in these rates, unidentified variants (classified as "Others") began to emerge. From the second quarter of 2024 onward, the rise of the VOI JN.1 (KP.3*, XEC) was observed, accompanied by new fluctuations in incidence and mortality rates. By the end of the fifth year, JN.1 sublineage variants had become predominant in both the Americas and Europe, where updated vaccines targeting these variants were already available[28].

During the analysed period, 1,171,818 PCR-confirmed COVID-19 cases progressed to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS), of which 777,672 resulted in recovery and 394,129 in death, corresponding to a case fatality rate (CFR) of 33.63%. This rate varied significantly across all sociodemographic, socioeconomic, and health variables (χ^2, $p<0.05$) (Table 1). These variables - a total of 78 - were also fitted in univariate Generalized

Linear Models (GLMs) (Table S1), and only those with p-value < 0.05 and odds ratio (OR) > 1.0 were retained for further analysis (Figure 3).

Sociodemographic and Economic Factors

Regarding the Regions, the North (CFR: 47.32%; OR: 2.23 [2.11-2.34], p<0.05) and Northeast (CFR: 43.31%; OR: 1.40 [1.34-1.46], p<0.05) regions presented the worst scenarios, followed by the Southeast (CFR: 31.79%; OR: 1.49 [1.44-1.55], p<0.05) and South (CFR: 31.85%; OR: 0.92 [0.89-0.96], p<0.05), whereas the Central-West exhibited the lowest CFR at 29.61% (OR: Reference) (Table 1; Figure 3-A).

The vast majority of recorded cases were among individuals residing in urban areas (96.7% of recoveries and 95.6% of deaths). Although peri-urban and rural zones accounted for less than 5% of the total cases with recorded outcomes, an increase in CFR was observed with increasing distance from metropolitan centres (Table 1). Individuals from rural areas had the highest CFR (40.65%; OR: 1.03 [0.99-1.08]), followed by those from peri-urban zones (CFR: 34.35%; OR: 1.08 [0.92-1.27]), and finally urban residents (CFR: 33.21%; OR: *Reference*), although the differences between these groups were not statistically significant (Table 1; Figure 3-A).

Individuals aged between 0 and 59 months were classified as children, those between 5 and under 12 years as pre-adolescents, and those between 12 and under 18 years as adolescents. Individuals aged between 18 and under 60 years were classified as adults, and those aged 60 years and older as elderly. Regarding age classification, an increase in the case fatality rate (CFR) was observed with advancing age (Table 1). The lowest CFRs were found among children (CFR: 5.06%; OR: *Reference*) and pre-adolescents (CFR: 4.84%; OR: 0.77 [0.57-1.03], p>0.05), with no statistically significant difference between these two groups (Z-test and GLM, p>0.05). From adolescents, CFRs increased significantly (Z-test, p<0.05), showing a CFR of 9.34% (OR: 2.62 [1.62-4.23], p<0.05), followed by adults with a CFR of 20.48% (OR: 6.80 [4.41-10.53], p<0.05) and elderly individuals with a CFR of 47.29% (OR: 22.52 [14.60-34.89], p<0.05) (Table 1; Figure 3-A).

Male individuals exhibited a higher CFR (34.03%; OR: 1.10 [1.08-1.12], p<0.05) compared to females (CFR: 33.15%; OR: Reference). Among females, pregnant women aged between 15 and 45 years, regardless of whether gestational age was reported or not, had a lower CFR (8.0%; OR: 0.44 [0.38-0.50]) compared to non-pregnant women (CFR: 14.92%; OR: 0.76 [0.73-0.80]) (Z-test, p<0.05) (Table 1; Figure 3-A).

The 2010 Human Development Index (HDI) was adopted as a socioeconomic indicator, verified at the municipality level. Individuals were grouped according to HDI intervals from minimum to maximum values. A progressive increase in CFR was observed as the HDI decreased. Individuals residing in municipalities with HDI values between 0.418 and 0.751 had a CFR of 41.63% (OR: 1.44 [1.40-1.48], $p<0.05$); those between 0.752 and 0.783 had a CFR of 35.39% (OR: 1.09 [1.06-1.11], $p<0.05$); individuals from municipalities with HDI between 0.784 and 0.804 had a CFR of 33.88% (OR: 1.12 [1.09-1.15]); and those with HDI between 0.805 and 0.862 had the lowest CFR (26.82%; OR: *Reference*) (Table 1; Figure 3-A).

Regarding ethnicity, Black individuals exhibited the highest CFR (40.27%; OR: 1.17 [1.12-1.21], $p<0.05$), followed by Multiracial individuals (CFR: 37.29%; OR: 1.14 [1.11-1.16], $p<0.05$). The lowest CFRs were observed among Asian (CFR: 32.84%; OR: 0.92 [0.84-1.01]), Native American People of Brazil (CFR: 35.00%; OR: 1.21 [0.98-1.50], $p<0.05$), and Caucasian individuals (CFR: 33.26%; OR: Reference), with no statistically significant differences among these latter groups (Z-test, $p>0.05$) (Table 1; Figure 3-A).

Regarding the Educational level, cases classified as 'Not Applicable' referred to individuals under 7 years of age. The highest CFR was observed among illiterate individuals (CFR: 57.4%; OR: *Reference*) and those with primary education (CFR: 43.74%; OR: 0.72 [0.69-0.75], $p<0.05$) (Z-test, $p<0.05$). A progressive reduction was observed across the subsequent levels: individuals with secondary education had a CFR of 29.11% (OR: 0.55 [0.53-0.57]), and those with higher education presented the lowest CFR (24.00%; OR: 0.41 [0.39-0.43]) (Z-test, $p>0.05$) (Table 1; Figure 3-A).

The risk factors retained in the model (Figure 3-B) were: cardiopathy (OR: 1.14 [1.12-1.17], $p<0.05$), chronic kidney disease (OR: 1.94 [1.86-2.02], $p<0.05$), chronic liver disease (OR: 1.75 [1.61-1.90], $p<0.05$), immunosuppression (OR: 1.82 [1.74-1.90], $p<0.05$), pneumopathy (OR: 1.43 [1.37-1.49], $p<0.05$), neurological disorder (OR: 2.13 [2.05-2.22], $p<0.05$), Down syndrome (OR: 1.39 [1.19-1.63], $p<0.05$), diabetes (OR: 1.13 [1.11-1.16], $p<0.05$) and obesity (OR: 1.15 [1.12-1.19], $p<0.05$).

The symptoms retained by the GLM model (Figure 3-C) were: respiratory distress (OR: 1.15 [1.13-1.18], $p<0.05$), dyspnea (OR: 1.07 [1.04-1.09], $p<0.05$), tachypnea (OR: 1.06 [0.90-1.24], $p<0.05$), severe fatigue (OR: 1.14 [1.04-1.25], $p<0.05$), confusion (OR: 1.36 [1.22-1.50]), and oxygen saturation (SpO_2) <95% (OR: 1.23 [1.21-1.26], $p<0.05$).

The nosocomial characteristics of the population analysed highlighted factors such as the presence of risk factors significantly influencing outcomes, with CFR increasing progressively with the number of pre-existing conditions, reaching 56.38% among individuals

with three or more comorbidities (Figure 3-D; Table S2). Immunization also impacted clinical outcomes: individuals who were unvaccinated had a higher CFR (34.14%) compared to those who received booster dose (19.98%). The need for ICU support and invasive ventilation was strongly associated with death, with a CFR of 81.13% among patients requiring invasive ventilation (Figure 3-D; Table S2).

According to data from the National COVID-19 Vaccination Campaign, in addition to the primary vaccination series, additional, fractional, revaccination, and booster doses were administered. The COVID-19 SARS database includes information on '1st Dose' and '2nd Dose' as well as '1st Booster' and '2nd Booster' doses. Thus, this study focused on the primary vaccination series and booster doses.

Hospitalized individuals with COVID-19 SARS, when vaccinated, received doses of the following vaccines: ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AstraZeneca/Serum Institute), CoronaVac/Sinovac, BNT162b2 (Pfizer/BioNTech), Pfizer Baby, Pfizer Pediatric, Ad26.COV2.S (Janssen), VeroCell (Sinopharm), Covax (Covax Facility), and Gam-COVID-Vac (Sputnik V).

Approximately 85% of individuals who progressed to SARS had not been vaccinated (Table S2). The highest CFRs were observed among individuals who received only the 1st/2nd doses (CFR: 35.65%; OR: 0.90 [0.88-0.93], $p<0.05$), although the multivariate model adjusted for various confounders indicated a 10% lower likelihood of death compared to the unvaccinated group (CFR: 34.14%; Reference). In contrast, those who received the 1st/2nd booster showed a significant reduction in CFR, with up to a 60% lower likelihood of death compared to the unvaccinated group (CFR: 19.98%; OR: 0.40 [0.38-0.41], $p<0.05$) (Table S2; Figure 3-D).

The Kaplan-Meier survival curve analysis (Figure 4) revealed significant differences between the evaluated groups (log-rank test: $\chi^2 = 10{,}952$; dF = 8; $p<0.05$). The curves illustrate the probability of survival over time for each group (Figure 4-A). Individuals who did not receive any vaccine dose (yellow line) exhibited the lowest probability of survival over time. Those who received the 1st/2nd Dose (green line) showed improvement compared to the unvaccinated group but remained inferior to the group that received a booster. Individuals who received the 1st/2nd Booster dose (blue line) displayed the highest probability of survival among all groups.

Further, survival probability was analysed at specific time points (0, 10, 20, 30, and 40 days) based on the Kaplan-Meier model (Table S1). It was observed that individuals whose disease lasted for 30 days or longer showed a significant reduction in survival. Among

unvaccinated individuals, the survival rate at 30 days was 39.0%, dropping to 6.4% at 40 days. For those who received the 1st/2nd Dose, survival at 30 days was 37.0% and 6.0% at 40 days. In contrast, individuals who received 1st/2nd Booster dose maintained a survival rate of 57.0% at 30 days, decreasing to 22.0% at 40 days.

DISCUSSION

This study examines the dynamics of COVID-19 in Brazil between January 2020 and December 2024, considering mild and moderate cases reported by the Influenza-like Illness (ILI) surveillance system and severe cases requiring hospitalization due to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS). The research analyses interconnected factors such as the emergence of new variants, the vaccination schedule, the circulating variants across Brazilian territory, and the demographic and clinical characteristics of the susceptible population.

Brazil, with its continental dimensions, is marked by great diversity, reflected in its population. The different regions present unique demographic, social, economic, political and cultural characteristics. This heterogeneity, combined with the availability of public data, makes the country a valuable case for studying epidemiological dynamics, with results that can be extrapolated to global contexts.

Limitations and Challenges for Epidemiological Surveillance in Brazil

One of the main challenges encountered in this study was the quality of the available data. While the public release of health information is a valuable initiative, significant gaps in data completeness were identified. Issues related to data quality were already present before the pandemic and have been documented across other national databases[29–32]. In addition to missing demographic variables, important clinical and epidemiological information was often absent. Another critical limitation was the delay in data reporting, which compromised the accuracy of compartmental epidemiological models and made real-time crisis management more difficult.

Furthermore, after the official end of the pandemic emergency phase, there was a marked decline in the number of samples collected for genomic surveillance.

Emergence of Variants, Epidemiological Trends, and Regional Dynamics in Brazil

The SARS-CoV-2 variants rapidly acquired mutations that resulted in apomorphies enhancing their transmissibility and lethality, contributing to multiple outbreaks and culminating in public health crises such as those observed in Manaus[33,34].

The Alpha variant carried mutations in the Spike protein, notably E484K, which enabled immune escape by reducing the effectiveness of vaccines and monoclonal antibody therapies[35–37], as well as increasing both transmissibility[38] and lethality . Additionally, the N501Y mutation was associated with enhanced binding to the ACE2 receptor and further immune escape[39].

The Gamma variant, in addition to harbouring the E484K mutation, exhibited the D614G mutation, which increased replication efficiency in the respiratory tract and boosted transmissibility[40] In the Delta variant, the T478K and L452R mutations enhanced ACE2 binding affinity and replication capacity[41], while the P681R mutation was associated with increased pathogenicity[42].

As the circulation of these variants declined, coinciding with reduced incidence and mortality rates and the expansion of vaccination efforts, the Omicron variant emerged. With up to 50 accumulated mutations[6] , Omicron became the predominant circulating variant by 2022 (Figures 1-2, Figures S2-S3). Although less pathogenic than Delta, Omicron exhibited alternative mechanisms for cellular entry and immune evasion, potentially contributing to a global reduction in vaccine effectiveness and demanding a third vaccine dose for appropriate protection[43].

When analysing the circulating variant frequencies, the distribution dynamics were found to be remarkably similar across all regions of Brazil (Figure 2A-B). This suggests that the observed regional differences in pandemic are unlikely to be explained solely by variant circulation, which remained homogeneous nationwide. Therefore, other factors, such as, vaccination coverage, healthcare system capacity, socioeconomic conditions, and the local public health policies likely played a more prominent role in determining the epidemiological outcomes.

Sociodemographic Profiles and Health Inequalities in the Brazilian COVID-19 Pandemic

Regarding the Brazilian regions, the North and Northeast exhibited the highest CFRs (Table 1), highlighting a scenario marked by limited access to and lower quality of healthcare services. In contrast, these regions reported the lowest adjusted incidence and mortality rates (Figures S2-S3). The vast geographic expanse of the North contributes to population dispersion, making access to hospitals more difficult and forcing residents of remote areas to travel to capital cities for specialized medical care[44,45], as observed in the Amazonas state, where intensive care units are concentrated in the capital[46]. This issue is similarly seen in the Northeast region[47] and in peri-urban and rural zones. Therefore, the problem in the North

and Northeast was not primarily related to crisis management strategies (such as social distancing or lockdowns), but rather to the concentration of healthcare resources.

The elevated fatality rate among individuals aged 60 years and older is consistent with findings from other studies[48–50], reflecting the effects of risk factors and the decline of immune function in this age group[51,52]. The increased case fatality rate among men was also observed, possibly attributable to differences in comorbidity profiles between sexes[49,53,54].

In terms of ethnicity, it was observed that Black and Multiracial individuals experienced a higher number of deaths compared to Caucasians, in line with other studies reporting higher CFRs in these ethnic groups[55,56]. These differences may be associated with structural socioeconomic inequalities, reflecting historical disparities and intergenerational challenges in social mobility among racial groups. In Brazil, these inequalities are manifested in access to healthcare and across various social and economic dimensions, magnifying the impact Black and Multiracial populations[57,58].

Furthermore, higher levels of education were associated with lower mortality rates, a finding consistent with studies indicating that education, along with other socioeconomic factors, is also a critical determinant of access to healthcare[56,59,60]. Low educational attainment is directly linked to higher rates of informal employment[61] , a condition that results in greater social vulnerability. The lack of labour protections for workers in the informal sector prevented many from adhering to social distancing measures during the pandemic, thereby increasing their exposure to SARS-CoV-2 and consequently raising incidence and mortality in these groups.

From Comorbidities to Vaccination: Key Determinants of COVID-19 Severity

Since the beginning of the pandemic, studies have indicated that individuals with chronic diseases or risk factors exhibited more severe outcomes, allowing for the identification and prioritization of risk groups for medical interventions and vaccination campaigns. However, it remains challenging to establish a direct causal link between comorbidities and COVID-19 severity[62].

During the 2003 outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) caused by SARS-CoV-1, it was identified that ACE2 facilitated viral entry into cells. ACE2 is expressed in the bronchi, lungs, heart, kidneys, and gastrointestinal tract, aligning with the pathology observed in SARS-CoV-1 infections[63] . In 2020, it was confirmed that the new coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, shared the same cellular entry mechanisms[64,65]. Transcriptomic and proteomic studies identified high ACE2 expression in tissues such as the intestines, kidneys, testes, and heart, moderate levels in the lungs, and elevated expression in type II pneumocytes[65–67].

In addition to the lungs, SARS-CoV-2 likely targets other organs due to ACE2 expression, probably as a result of inflammatory processes and unresolved tissue injuries[68]. These processes can signal fibrosis and cardiac hypertrophy, vasoconstriction, endothelial dysfunction, and vascular inflammation, which may in turn trigger perivascular edema, systemic hypoxia, and disruptions in electrolyte balance, ultimately leading to multi-organ dysfunction[69,70].

The findings reinforce the critical role of comorbidities and hospitalization severity in disease progression (Table S2). The negative impact of comorbidities was already anticipated, as patients with multiple pre-existing conditions often have a lower response capacity to treatment. Vaccination demonstrated a significant protective effect, reducing the CFR among vaccinated individuals, especially those who received booster doses. Prolonged hospitalization time among fatal cases suggests more severe disease evolution, possibly due to secondary complications. Higher CFR among patients requiring invasive ventilation reflects the severity of respiratory failure in these cases. These results highlight the importance of preventive strategies and reinforce the role of vaccination in mitigating the most severe outcomes of COVID-19.

Vaccination in Brazil began with the approval of CoronaVac and ChAdOx1 nCoV-19. The efficacy rates reported for authorization for these vaccines were 50.9% and 70.42%, respectively[71,72]. A few months later, the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine (Comirnaty) reported an efficacy of 82% after the first dose, and the Janssen vaccine showed 85.4% efficacy among seronegative individuals and 76.4% against severe disease[73,74]. Studies have shown that regardless of the vaccine platform, there was a significant increase in efficacy after the complete vaccination schedule[75–78] (Table 2-3).

The survival curves demonstrate a significant benefit associated with booster doses, especially compared to those who received no vaccination (Figure 4). The 50% survival intercept point was considerably longer in the group that received a booster, suggesting an increased median survival time. Furthermore, among the most severe cases, starting at 30 days, the group that received a booster exhibited an 18 to 20 percentage point higher survival rate compared to other groups, and approximately four times higher survival at 40 days (Table S1). This analysis reinforces the effectiveness of booster doses to mitigate or prevent COVID-19 SARS cases.

OPERATIONAL AND PUBLIC POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, it becomes evident that structural and operational advancements are needed within the Brazilian healthcare system, especially regarding preparedness for future public health emergencies across different domains.

One of the main proposals involves strengthening policies aimed at expanding hospital services into rural and underserved areas, with an emphasis on increasing the number of intensive care unit beds and ensuring the equitable distribution of healthcare professionals in remote and peri-urban regions, historically lacking adequate coverage. Beyond physical infrastructure, the continuous training and support of health professionals is also essential, with incentives to retain them in hard-to-reach locations.

Another key area relates to the modernization of health information systems. The results revealed significant delays in data entry and a high rate of missing values for essential variables, which undermined real-time analysis and coordinated responses to the crisis. It is therefore recommended to continuously improve mechanisms for data collection, integration, and interoperability, through investments in digital technologies and ongoing training for the personnel responsible for data registration. This strategy should be aligned with the promotion of partnerships among federal entities, universities, and research centres to develop public platforms for automated analysis and evidence-based decision-making.

Additionally, the creation of a permanent federal fund for health emergencies is proposed, with the capacity for immediate activation in the event of a calamity. This fund should prioritize support for the most vulnerable populations, such as informal workers and individuals without access to labour protections, enabling effective compliance with social distancing measures without jeopardizing families' food and economic security. Registration of these populations could be integrated into the CadÚnico system, with regular updates and automated activation of emergency aid. This measure aims to reduce the population's sense of insecurity, considering that social distancing rules were established on March 11[79], yet emergency financial aid was only approved on March 30[80] and became available for withdrawal on April 9, nearly a month later[81], which was unfeasible for informal workers who rely on subsistence income.

Genomic surveillance, in turn, must be treated as a central component of the response to future pandemics. The heterogeneity and discontinuity of genomic monitoring in Brazil, as evidenced by the data presented, reveal the vulnerability of the country's capacity to track and respond to variants of concern.

Finally, it is essential to develop a public sector communication plan tailored to the sociocultural contexts of different Brazilian regions. Public health campaigns on vaccination and preventive measures must be conducted in accessible language. Such measures are crucial

to reducing vaccine hesitancy, combating misinformation, and increasing public engagement in health initiatives.

CONCLUSIONS

The results highlight the complexity and regional inequalities in the response to the COVID-19 pandemic in Brazil, revealing significant variations in case fatality rates and public health responses. Three major epidemic waves were observed, with the second being the most impactful across all regions. The circulation of variants such as Gamma and Omicron played a crucial role in the pandemic's dynamics, influencing incidence, mortality, and regional patterns[82], closely related to crisis management strategies involving social distancing and the distribution of hospital resources.

Incidence and mortality varied significantly between regions. The most vulnerable groups included the elderly, Black and Multiracial individuals, and people with low levels of education. Residents of rural areas exhibited higher lethality compared to those in urban areas, reflecting disparities in access to healthcare services.

Vaccination had a positive impact on reducing case fatality rates, particularly following the administration of booster doses. Unvaccinated individuals exhibited significantly higher mortality rates. Despite advances in the immunization schedule vaccine adherence remained uneven, and efficacy was limited in contexts of high variant circulation.

The progression of the pandemic in Brazil was deeply influenced by social and structural inequalities, disproportionately affecting vulnerable populations. Genomic surveillance, policies supporting social distancing, and vaccination were fundamental in mitigating the effects of the pandemic but faced significant limitations due to delayed implementation and unequal access. The findings reinforce the urgent need to strengthen healthcare systems, raise the concern for the constant training of employees responsible to collect and record secondary health data, expand access to vaccination, and promote continuous monitoring strategies to enhance preparedness for future public health emergencies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank the Brazilian Government and the Brazilian Ministry of Health for making public secondary data available and acknowledge all individuals directly and indirectly involved in the efforts to manage the COVID-19 crisis in the country.

Silvio Alencar Cândido-Sobrinho gratefully acknowledges the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES/MEC/BRAZIL) for the study grant (grant number: 88887.479534/2020-00) - Finance Code 001.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no competing interest.

DATA SHARING

Bash and R scripts used in this research will be made available at the Corresponding Author's GitHub upon publishing in a journal.

REFERENCES

1. Brasil. Sobre - Vigilância de Síndrome Respiratória Aguda Grave (SRAG) - Grupos - OPENDATASUS [Internet]. SVS/MS. 2023 [citado 21 de abril de 2023]. Disponível em: https://opendatasus.saude.gov.br/group/about/dados-sobre-srag

2. De Souza Noronha KVM, Guedes GR, Turra CM, Andrade MV, Botega L, Nogueira D, et al. The COVID-19 pandemic in Brazil: Analysis of supply and demand of hospital and ICU beds and mechanical ventilators under different scenarios. Cad Saude Publica. 2020;36(6).

3. French G, Hulse M, Nguyen D, Sobotka K, Webster K, Corman J, et al. Impact of Hospital Strain on Excess Deaths During the COVID-19 Pandemic — United States, July 2020–July 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2021;70(46):1613–6.

4. Alves L. Brazilian ICUs short of drugs and beds amid COVID-19 surge. Lancet [Internet]. 2021;397(10283):1431–2. Disponível em: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00836-9

5. Shakeel CS, Mujeeb AA, Mirza MS, Chaudhry B, Khan SJ. Global COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance: A Systematic Review of Associated Social and Behavioral Factors. Vaccines (Basel) [Internet]. 12 de janeiro de 2022;10(1):110. Disponível em: https://www.mdpi.com/2076-393X/10/1/110

6. Bai H, Zhang X, Gong T, Ma J, Zhang P, Cai Z, et al. A systematic mutation analysis of 13 major SARS-CoV-2 variants. Virus Res. 1º de julho de 2024;345.

7. Gong W, Parkkila S, Wu X, Aspatwar A. SARS-CoV-2 variants and COVID-19 vaccines: Current challenges and future strategies. Vol. 42, International Reviews of Immunology. Taylor and Francis Ltd.; 2023. p. 393–414.

8. Almeida GB, Vilches TN, Ferreira CP, Fortaleza CMCB. Addressing the COVID-19 transmission in inner Brazil by a mathematical model. Sci Rep. 1º de dezembro de 2021;11(1).

9. Costa S da S. Pandemia e desemprego no Brasil. Revista de Administração Pública [Internet]. agosto de 2020;54(4):969–78. Disponível em: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0034-76122020000400969&tlng=pt

10. Brasil. RESOLUÇÃO Nº 510, DE 07 DE ABRIL DE 2016 [Internet]. Brasília: Brazilian Ministry of Health; 2016. Disponível em: http://conselho.saude.gov.br/resolucoes/2016/Reso510.pdf

11. Zeegers MP, Bours MJL, Freeman MD. Methods Used in Forensic Epidemiologic Analysis. Em: Forensic Epidemiology: Principles and Practice. Elsevier Inc.; 2016. p. 71–110.

12. Brasil. openDataSUS [Internet]. 2025 [citado 31 de janeiro de 2025]. Disponível em: https://opendatasus.saude.gov.br/

13. Brasil. Genomahcov - Fiocruz [Internet]. Fundação Oswaldo Cruz. 2025 [citado 31 de janeiro de 2025]. Disponível em: https://www.genomahcov.fiocruz.br/

14. UNDP. IDHM Municípios - 2010 | United Nations Development Programme [Internet]. 2013 [citado 22 de fevereiro de 2025]. Disponível em: https://www.undp.org/pt/brazil/idhm-municipios-2010

15. Prado Siqueira R. sidrar: An Interface to IBGE's SIDRA API. [Internet]. 2022. Disponível em: https://cran.r-project.org/package=sidrar

16. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing [Internet]. The R Project for Statistical Computing. 2025. Disponível em: https://www.r-project.org/

17. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R, et al. Welcome to the Tidyverse. J Open Source Softw. 21 de novembro de 2019;4(43):1686.

18. Wickham H. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis [Internet]. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag; 2016. Disponível em: https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org

19. Kassambara A. ggpubr: "ggplot2" Based Publication Ready Plots [Internet]. 2020. Disponível em: https://cran.r-project.org/package=ggpubr

20. Kassambara A, Kosinski M, Biecek P. survminer: Drawing Survival Curves using 'ggplot2 [Internet]. CRAN; 2021. Disponível em: https://cran.r-project.org/package=survminer

21. Kennedy N. forestmodel: Forest Plots from Regression Models [Internet]. CRAN; 2020 [citado 20 de outubro de 2023]. Disponível em: https://cran.r-project.org/package=forestmodel

22. Yoshida K, Bartel A. tableone: Create "Table 1" to Describe Baseline Characteristics with or without Propensity Score Weights [Internet]. CRAN; 2022. Disponível em: https://cran.r-project.org/package=tableone

23. Alboukadel Kassambara. rstatix: Pipe-Friendly Framework for Basic Statistical Tests [Internet]. CRAN. 2023 [citado 24 de novembro de 2023]. Disponível em: https://cran.r-project.org/package=rstatix

24. Mangiafico SS. rcompanion: Functions to Support Extension Education Program Evaluation [Internet]. CRAN. New Brunswick, NJ: CRAN; 2022 [citado 20 de outubro de 2024]. Disponível em: https://cran.r-project.org/package=rcompanion

25. Mendiburu F de, Yaseen M. agricolae: Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research [Internet]. CRAN; 2020 [citado 20 de outubro de 2023]. Disponível em: https://cran.r-project.org/package=agricolae

26. Venables W, Ripley B. Statistical Analysis of Financial Data in S-Plus [Internet]. New York: Springer-Verlag; 2004. (Springer Texts in Statistics). Disponível em: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/b97626

27. Therneau T. survival [Internet]. Rochester, Minnesota: CRAN; 2021. p. 1. Disponível em: https://github.com/therneau/survival

28. Arora P, Happle C, Kempf A, Nehlmeier I, Stankov M V., Dopfer-Jablonka A, et al. Impact of JN.1 booster vaccination on neutralisation of SARS-CoV-2 variants KP.3.1.1 and XEC. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. Elsevier Ltd; 2024.

29. Souza IM de, Araújo EM de, Silva Filho AM da. Tendência temporal da incompletude do registro da raça/cor nos sistemas de informação em saúde do Brasil, 2009-2018. Cien Saude Colet. 2024;29(3).

30. Sousa CM de S, Mascarenhas MDM, Lima PVC, Rodrigues MTP. Incompletude do preenchimento das notificações compulsórias de violência - Brasil, 2011-2014. Cad Saude Colet. dezembro de 2020;28(4):477–87.

31. Santos CVB dos, Ferreira V de M, Sampaio JRC, Ribeiro PC, Castro HA de, Gutierrez AC, et al. Incompletude da variável profissão/ocupação nos bancos de síndrome gripal, síndrome respiratória aguda grave e mortalidade, Brasil, 2020-2021. Revista Brasileira de Saúde Ocupacional. 2023;48.

32. Ribas FV, Custódio ACD, Toledo LV, Henriques BD, Sediyama CMN de O, de Freitas BAC. Completeness of notifications of severe acute respiratory syndrome at the national level and in a regional health care in the state of Minas Gerais, during the COVID-19 pandemic, 2020. Epidemiologia e Servicos de Saude. 2022;31(2).

33. Ferrante L, Duczmal L, Steinmetz WA, Almeida ACL, Leão J, Vassão RC, et al. How Brazil's President turned the country into a global epicenter of COVID-19. J Public Health Policy [Internet]. 2021;42(3):439–51. Disponível em: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41271-021-00302-0

34. Neiva MB, Carvalho I, Filho EDSC, Barbosa-Junior F, Bernardi FA, Sanches TLM, et al. Brazil: The emerging epicenter of COVID-19 pandemic. Rev Soc Bras Med Trop. 2020;53:1–8.

35. Jangra S, Ye C, Rathnasinghe R, Stadlbauer D, Alshammary H, Amoako AA, et al. SARS-CoV-2 spike E484K mutation reduces antibody neutralisation. Vol. 2, The Lancet Microbe. Elsevier Ltd; 2021. p. e283–4.

36. Widera M, Wilhelm A, Hoehl S, Pallas C, Kohmer N, Wolf T, et al. Limited Neutralization of Authentic Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Variants Carrying E484K in Vitro. Journal of Infectious Diseases. 1º de outubro de 2021;224(7):1109–14.

37. Yang WT, Huang WH, Liao TL, Hsiao TH, Chuang HN, Liu PY. SARS-CoV-2 E484K Mutation Narrative Review: Epidemiology, Immune Escape, Clinical Implications, and Future Considerations. Vol. 15, Infection and Drug Resistance. Dove Medical Press Ltd; 2022. p. 373–85.

38. Lindstrøm JC, Engebretsen S, Kristoffersen AB, Rø GØI, Palomares ADL, Engø-Monsen K, et al. Increased transmissibility of the alpha SARS-CoV-2 variant: evidence from contact tracing data in Oslo, January to February 2021. Infect Dis. 2022;54(1):72–7.

39. Fratev F. N501Y and K417N Mutations in the Spike Protein of SARS-CoV-2 Alter the Interactions with Both hACE2 and Human-Derived Antibody: A Free Energy of Perturbation Retrospective Study. J Chem Inf Model. 27 de dezembro de 2021;61(12):6079–84.

40. Plante JA, Liu Y, Liu J, Xia H, Johnson BA, Lokugamage KG, et al. Spike mutation D614G alters SARS-CoV-2 fitness. Nature. 1º de abril de 2021;592(7852):116–21.

41. Motozono C, Toyoda M, Zahradnik J, Saito A, Nasser H, Tan TS, et al. SARS-CoV-2 spike L452R variant evades cellular immunity and increases infectivity. Cell Host Microbe. 14 de julho de 2021;29(7):1124-1136.e11.

42. Saito A, Irie T, Suzuki R, Maemura T, Nasser H, Uriu K, et al. Enhanced fusogenicity and pathogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 Delta P681R mutation. Nature. 10 de fevereiro de 2022;602(7896):300–6.

43. Willett BJ, Grove J, MacLean OA, Wilkie C, De Lorenzo G, Furnon W, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron is an immune escape variant with an altered cell entry pathway. Nat Microbiol. 1º de agosto de 2022;7(8):1161–79.

44. Garnelo L, Lima JG, Rocha ESC, Herkrath FJ. Acesso e cobertura da Atenção Primária à Saúde para populações rurais e urbanas na região norte do Brasil. Saúde em Debate. setembro de 2018;42(spe1):81–99.

45. Santos PPGV dos, Oliveira RAD de, Albuquerque MV de. Desigualdades da oferta hospitalar no contexto da pandemia da Covid-19 no Brasil: uma revisão integrativa. Saúde em Debate [Internet]. 2022;46(spe1):322–37. Disponível em: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0103-11042022000500322&tlng=pt

46. Palamim CVC, Marson FAL. Covid-19 – The availability of icu beds in Brazil during the onset of pandemic. Ann Glob Health. 2020;86(1):1–15.

47. Kerr L, Kendall C, da Silva AAM, Aquino EML, Pescarini JM, de Almeida RLF, et al. COVID-19 in northeast Brazil: Achievements and limitations in the responses of the state governments. Ciencia e Saude Coletiva. 1º de outubro de 2020;25:4099–120.

48. Dourado De Carvalho A, Ferreira De Deus AA, Caroline T, Trindade S, Tittoni AA. Perfil epidemiológico dos casos e óbitos por síndrome respiratória aguda grave confirmados para Covid-19. Revista Baiana de Saúde Pública [Internet]. 2021 [citado 30 de setembro de 2024];45(1):19–32. Disponível em: https://pesquisa.bvsalud.org/portal/resource/pt/biblio-1178340

49. Islam N, Khunti K, Dambha-Miller H, Kawachi I, Marmot M. COVID-19 mortality: a complex interplay of sex, gender and ethnicity. Eur J Public Health [Internet]. 1º de outubro de 2020;30(5):847–8. Disponível em: https://academic.oup.com/eurpub/article/30/5/847/5879989

50. Biswas M, Rahaman S, Biswas TK, Haque Z, Ibrahim B. Association of Sex, Age, and Comorbidities with Mortality in COVID-19 Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Vol. 64, Intervirology. S. Karger AG; 2021. p. 36–47.

51. Lima-Costa MF, De Andrade FB, Souza PRB De, Neri AL, Duarte YADO, Castro-Costa E, et al. The Brazilian Longitudinal Study of Aging (ELSI-Brazil): Objectives and Design. Am J Epidemiol. 1º de julho de 2018;187(7):1345–53.

52. Nunes BP, De Souza ASS, Nogueira J, De Andrade FB, Thumé E, Da Cruz Teixeira DS, et al. Multimorbidity and population at risk for severe COVID-19 in the Brazilian Longitudinal Study of Aging. Cad Saude Publica. 2020;36(12).

53. Channappanavar R, Fett C, Mack M, Ten Eyck PP, Meyerholz DK, Perlman S. Sex-Based Differences in Susceptibility to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus Infection. The Journal of Immunology. 15 de maio de 2017;198(10):4046–53.

54. Islam N, Shkolnikov VM, Acosta RJ, Klimkin I, Kawachi I, Irizarry RA, et al. Excess deaths associated with covid-19 pandemic in 2020: Age and sex disaggregated time series analysis in 29 high income countries. The BMJ. 19 de maio de 2021;373.

55. Rossen LM, Branum AM, Ahmad FB, Sutton P, Anderson RN. Excess Deaths Associated with COVID-19, by Age and Race and Ethnicity — United States, January 26–October 3, 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep [Internet]. 23 de outubro de 2020;69(42):1522–7. Disponível em: http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6942e2.htm?s_cid=mm6942e2_w

56. Magesh S, John D, Li WT, Li Y, Mattingly-App A, Jain S, et al. Disparities in COVID-19 Outcomes by Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status: A Systematic-Review and Meta-analysis. Vol. 4, JAMA Network Open. American Medical Association; 2021.

57. Dos Santos HLPC, Maciel FBM, Santos KR, da Conceição CDVS, de Oliveira RS, da Silva NRF, et al. Necropolitics and the impact of covid-19 on the black community in brazil: A literature review and a document analysis. Ciencia e Saude Coletiva. 1º de outubro de 2020;25:4211–24.

58. Camelo L V., Coelho CG, Chor D, Griep RH, de Almeida M da CC, Giatti L, et al. Racism and racial iniquities in poor self-rated health: The role of intergenerational social mobility in the Brazilian Longitudinal Study of Adult Health (ELSA-Brasil). Cad Saude Publica. 2022;38(1).

59. Salvato MA, Ferreira PCG, Duarte AJM. O impacto da escolaridade sobre a distribuição de renda. Estudos Econômicos (São Paulo) [Internet]. dezembro de 2010;40(4):753–91. Disponível em: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0101-41612010000400001&lng=pt&tlng=pt

60. Leone T. The geography of intergenerational mobility: Evidence of educational persistence and the “Great Gatsby Curve” in Brazil. Rev Dev Econ. 1º de agosto de 2022;26(3):1227–51.

61. de Holanda F, Filho B, de Moura RL. EVOLUÇÃO RECENTE DA INFORMALIDADE DO EMPREGO NO BRASIL: UMA ANÁLISE SEGUNDO AS CARACTERÍSTICAS DA OFERTA DE TRABALHO E O SETOR. Em Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada (Ipea); 2015. Disponível em: https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:155292846

62. Pietzner M, Denaxas S, Yasmeen S, Ulmer MA, Nakanishi T, Arnold M, et al. Complex patterns of multimorbidity associated with severe COVID-19 and long COVID. Communications Medicine. 1º de dezembro de 2024;4(1).

63. Li W, Moore MJ, Vasilieva N, Sui J, Wong SK, Berne MA, et al. Angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 is a functional receptor for the SARS coronavirus. Nature [Internet]. novembro de 2003;426(6965):450–4. Disponível em: https://www.nature.com/articles/nature02145

64. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, Krüger N, Herrler T, Erichsen S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Cell Entry Depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked by a Clinically Proven Protease Inhibitor. Cell. 16 de abril de 2020;181(2):271-280.e8.

65. Li MY, Li L, Zhang Y, Wang XS. Expression of the SARS-CoV-2 cell receptor gene ACE2 in a wide variety of human tissues. Infect Dis Poverty [Internet]. 28 de dezembro de 2020;9(1):45. Disponível em: https://idpjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40249-020-00662-x

66. Hikmet F, Méar L, Edvinsson Å, Micke P, Uhlén M, Lindskog C. The protein expression profile of ACE2 in human tissues. Mol Syst Biol. julho de 2020;16(7).

67. Hamming I, Timens W, Bulthuis MLC, Lely AT, Navis GJ, van Goor H. Tissue distribution of ACE2 protein, the functional receptor for SARS coronavirus. A first step in understanding SARS pathogenesis. Journal of Pathology. junho de 2004;203(2):631–7.

68. Russell CD, Lone NI, Baillie JK. Comorbidities, multimorbidity and COVID-19. Vol. 29, Nature Medicine. Nature Research; 2023. p. 334–43.

69. Kanugula AK, Kaur J, Batra J, Ankireddypalli AR, Velagapudi R. Renin-Angiotensin System: Updated Understanding and Role in Physiological and Pathophysiological States. Cureus [Internet]. 21 de junho de 2023; Disponível em: https://www.cureus.com/articles/163741-renin-angiotensin-system-updated-understanding-and-role-in-physiological-and-pathophysiological-states

70. Składanek JA, Leśkiewicz M, Gumięzna K, Baruś P, Piasecki A, Klimczak-Tomaniak D, et al. Long COVID and its cardiovascular consequences: What is known? Advances in Clinical and Experimental Medicine. 1º de março de 2024;33(3):299–308.

71. Brasil. PARECER TÉCNICO PÚBLICOUSO EMERGENCIAL - INSTITUTO BUTANTAN Vacina COVID-19 inavada (CoronaVac®) [Internet]. Brasília; 2021 jan [citado 6 de outubro de 2024]. Disponível em: https://www.gov.br/anvisa/pt-br/assuntos/noticias-anvisa/2021/anvisa-aprova-por-unanimidade-uso-emergencial-das-vacinas/parecer-no-2_2021_sei_ggfis_dire4_anvisa_butantan.pdf

72. Brasil. Parecer Público de avaliação de solicitação de autorização temporária de uso emergencial, em caráter experimental, da vacina covid-19 (recombinante) – Fundação Oswaldo Cruz (Fiocruz) [Internet]. Brasília; 2021 jan [citado 6 de outubro de 2024]. Disponível em: https://www.gov.br/anvisa/pt-br/assuntos/noticias-anvisa/2021/anvisa-aprova-por-unanimidade-uso-emergencial-das-vacinas/ppam-final-vacina-covid-19-recombinante-fiocruz.pdf

73. Brasil. PARECER PÚBLICO DE AVALIAÇÃO DA VACINA COVID-19-COMIRNATY APROVAÇÃO [Internet]. Brasília; 2021 maio [citado 6 de outubro de 2024]. Disponível em: https://consultas.anvisa.gov.br/api/consulta/medicamentos/arquivo/anexo/parecer/eyJhbGciOiJIUzUxMiJ9.eyJqdGkiOiIyNTUxNjYzIiwibmJmIjoxNzI4MzM3OTg4LCJleHAiOjE3MjgzMzgyODh9.8c9txkYTA95NDgie87-I8xg282kMg8536lEbl3BN4JH-0W8xLJbU8JV5Uqqbp3vZ94a0pzAm6AMDV0h6aGIyhw/?Authorization=

74. Brasil. PARECER PÚBLICO DE AVALIAÇÃO DO MEDICAMENTO-APROVAÇÃO JANSSEN [Internet]. Brasília; 2022 set [citado 6 de outubro de 2024]. Disponível em: https://consultas.anvisa.gov.br/api/consulta/medicamentos/arquivo/anexo/parecer/eyJhbGciOiJIUzUxMiJ9.eyJqdGkiOiIyNzQ4MjE2IiwibmJmIjoxNzI4MzQwMzYyLCJleHAiOjE3MjgzNDA2NjJ9.FkAgtFGlOnqezt4OujwEPwMiZinFormRS-9s14_NIEYv_U5fnZvEWUxMmWAqvWOYWkWTY52Q0T9pp4gHnDyw2w/?Authorization=

75. Cerqueira-Silva T, Andrews JR, Boaventura VS, Ranzani OT, de Araújo Oliveira V, Paixão ES, et al. Effectiveness of CoronaVac, ChAdOx1 nCoV-19, BNT162b2, and Ad26.COV2.S among individuals with previous SARS-CoV-2 infection in Brazil: a test-negative, case-control study. Lancet Infect Dis. 1º de junho de 2022;22(6):791–801.

76. Sadoff J, Gray G, Vandebosch A, Cárdenas V, Shukarev G, Grinsztejn B, et al. Final Analysis of Efficacy and Safety of Single-Dose Ad26.COV2.S. New England Journal of Medicine. 3 de março de 2022;386(9):847–60.

77. Tartof SY, Slezak JM, Fischer H, Hong V, Ackerson BK, Ranasinghe ON, et al. Effectiveness of mRNA BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine up to 6 months in a large integrated health system in the USA: a retrospective cohort study. The Lancet. 16 de outubro de 2021;398(10309):1407–16.

78. Luna EJA, Moraes JC, Roediger MA, Miranda EJFP, Braga PE, França JID, et al. Effectiveness of CoronaVac in the prevention of COVID-19, a test-negative case-control study in Brazil. Brazilian Journal of Infectious Diseases. 1º de setembro de 2024;28(5).

79. BRASIL. Portaria n° 356, de 11 de março de 2020 [Internet]. Ministério da Saúde. 2020. Disponível em: https://www.in.gov.br/web/dou/-/portaria-n-356-de-11-de-marco-de-2020-247538346

80. BRASIL. Senado aprova auxílio de R$ 600 para trabalhadores informais e autônomos [Internet]. Ministério da Cidadania. 2020. Disponível em: https://www.gov.br/pt-br/noticias/assistencia-social/2020/03/senado-aprova-auxilio-de-r-600-para-trabalhadores-informais-e-autonomos

81. BRASIL. Auxílio emergencial começa a ser pago na quinta-feira (9) [Internet]. Ministério da Cidadania. 2020. Disponível em: https://www.gov.br/pt-br/noticias/assistencia-social/2020/04/auxilio-emergencial-comeca-a-ser-pago-na-quinta-feira-9

82. Moura EC, Cortez-Escalante J, Cavalcante FV, Barreto IC de HC, Sanchez MN, Santos LMP. Covid-19: temporal evolution and immunization in the three epidemiological waves, Brazil, 2020-2022. Rev Saude Publica. 2022;56:105.



Figure 1. Temporal dynamics of incidence and mortality rates adjusted for population (grey line, left y-axis) by epidemiological week (x-axis), levels of immunization by vaccination stage (lines with right y-axis), and relative frequency of circulating variants in the territory (background bars proportional to the maximum rates, ranging from 0 to 100% relative frequency). The panel scales (y-axis) are independent and not proportional to each other. The figure presents the incidence and mortality rates of Influenza-like Illness ('ILI', mild and moderate cases) and Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) due to COVID-19 in Brazil between 01/01/2020 and 12/31/2024 (5 years), reporting respectively: incidence (A) and mortality (B) rates of mild and moderate cases, followed by incidence (C) and mortality (D) rates of severe cases.



Figure 2. Relative (left) and absolute (right) frequency of circulating viral variants in Brazil (A) and its Regions (B) between 2020 and 2024. A large number of samples were collected between 2021 and 2022 (A - Absolute frequency), followed by a decline. No substantial differences are observed in the relative frequencies when comparing Brazil to its regions, or between the regions themselves (A-B). Lineages are categorized by distinct colours, as indicated in the legend.

(A) Sociodemographic and economic factors

Variable		n	OR [CI 95%]	p-value
Region	Central-West	29427	Reference	
	Northeast	33952	1.40 [1.34-1.46]	<0.001
	North	16839	2.23 [2.11-2.34]	<0.001
	Southeast	192644	1.49 [1.44-1.55]	<0.001
	South	78189	0.92 [0.89-0.96]	<0.001
Geographical zone	Rural	14091	Reference	
	Peri-urban	1243	1.04 [0.88-1.24]	0.614
	Urban	335717	0.97 [0.93-1.01]	0.148
Age group	Children	13800	Reference	
	Teenagers	2430	0.77 [0.57-1.03]	0.088
	Adolescents	1352	2.62 [1.62-4.23]	<0.001
	Adults	166606	6.80 [4.41-10.53]	<0.001
	Elderly	166863	22.52 [14.60-34.89]	<0.001
Sex at birth	Female	156753	Reference	
	Male	194298	1.10 (1.08-1.12]	<0.001
Pregnant	Does not apply	318393	Reference	
	No	29042	0.76 [0.73-0.80]	<0.001
	Yes	3616	0.44 [0.38-0.50]	<0.001
HDI (2010)	0.805 - 0.862	97555	Reference	
	0.784 - 0.804	70831	1.12 [1.09-1.15]	<0.001
	0.752 - 0.783	86075	1.09 [1.06-1.11]	<0.001
	0.418 - 0.751	96590	1.44 [1.40-1.48]	<0.001
Ethnicity	Multiracial	113361	Reference	
	Caucasian	213202	0.88 [0.86-0.90]	<0.001
	Black	20319	1.03 [0.99-1.07]	0.189
	Asian	3561	0.81 [0.74-0.89]	<0.001
	Native american	608	1.06 [0.86-1.32]	0.566
School level	Illiterate	18717	Reference	
	Primary/middle	153862	0.72 [0.69-0.75]	<0.001
	High school	110616	0.55 [0.53-0.57]	<0.001
	Higher education	52677	0.41 [0.39-0.43]	<0.001
	Does not apply	15179	0.72 [0.47-1.11]	0.130

(B) Risk factors

Variable		n	OR [CI 95%]	p-value
Cardiopathy	No	232154	Reference	
	Yes	118897	1.14 [1.12-1.17]	<0.001
Chronic kidney disease	No	336805	Reference	
	Yes	14246	1.94 [1.86-2.02]	<0.001
Chronic liver disease	No	347652	Reference	
	Yes	3399	1.75 [1.61-1.90]	<0.001
Immunodepressed	No	337312	Reference	
	Yes	13739	1.82 [1.74-1.90]	<0.001
Pneumopathy	No	337436	Reference	
	Yes	13615	1.43 [1.37-1.49]	<0.001
Neurological disorder	No	334109	Reference	
	Yes	16942	2.13 [2.05-2.22]	<0.001
Down's Syndrome	Não	349910	Reference	
	Yes	1141	1.39 [1.19-1.63]	<0.001
Diabetes	No	268606	Reference	
	Yes	82445	1.13 [1.11-1.16]	<0.001
Obesity	No	315052	Reference	
	Yes	35999	1.15 [1.12-1.19]	<0.001



(C) Signs and Symptoms

Variable		n	OR [CI 95%]	p-value
Respiratory distress	No	132141	Reference	
	Yes	218910	1.15 [1.13-1.18]	<0.001
Dyspnea	No	81937	Reference	
	Yes	269114	1.07 [1.04-1.09]	<0.001
Tachypnea	No	350043	Reference	
	Yes	1008	1.06 [0.90-1.24]	0.501
Severe fatigue	No	348029	Reference	
	Yes	3022	1.14 [1.04-1.25]	0.004
Confusion	No	348813	Reference	
	Yes	2238	1.36 [1.22-1.50]	<0.001
SpO2 saturation < 95%	No	113614	Reference	
	Yes	237437	1.23 [1.21-1.26]	<0.001



(D) Nosocomial characteristics

Variable		n	OR [CI 95%]	p-value
Admission at ICU	No	230743	Reference	
	Yes	120308	2.59 [2.54-2.64]	<0.001
Mechanical ventilation	No	81751	Reference	
	Yes, non invasive	200746	1.47 [1.44-1.51]	<0.001
	Yes, invasive	68554	12.52 [12.11-12.95]	<0.001
Immunization	None	287545	Reference	
	1st/2nd Dose	47880	0.90 [0.88-0.93]	<0.001
	1st/2nd Booster	15626	0.40 [0.38-0.41]	<0.001



Figure 3. Forest plot presenting the Odds Ratios (OR) estimated from the binomial Generalized Linear Model, indicating the proportional association between independent variables and the occurrence of death for sociodemographic and economic factors (A), risk factors (B), signs and symptoms (C), and nosocomial factors (D). Each point represents the OR with 95% confidence intervals, and p-values < 0.05 indicate statistical significance. The X-axis displays the OR, with '1.0' representing the reference level (no proportional effect relative to the reference group). OR values > 1.0 indicate a higher likelihood of death or aggravating factor, while OR < 1.0 indicate lower likelihood or a protective factor.



Figure 4. Kaplan-Meier survival curves stratified by number of comorbidities and vaccination regimen. In panel (A), the factor analysed is the number of comorbidities, with individuals categorized as: '0' (no comorbidities/risk factors), '1-2' (one or two comorbidities/risk factors), and '3+' (three or more comorbidities/risk factors). In panel (B), the factor evaluated is the vaccination regimen, classified as: 'None' (no dose received), those immunized with one dose or with a complete primary schedule ('1st/2nd dose'), and those immunized with a 1st or 2nd booster ('1st/2nd Booster'). The curves show the probability of survival over time, with p-values indicating statistically significant differences (< 0.05) between groups.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the population with PCR-confirmed cases of SARS due to COVID-19 in Brazil, from 01/01/2020 to 12/31/2024 (5 years) and for each year. The χ^2 test indicated significant differences between cure and death proportions across all strata (χ^2, $p < 0.001$). Case fatality rates (CFR%) were compared using the paired Z-Test ($p < 0.05$). Significance letters indicate statistically significant differences between groups; identical letters represent groupings with no significant difference. Proportions are presented in descending order (from highest to lowest).

		01/01/2020 - 31/12/2024 (5 years)				2020				2021				2022				2023				2024			
(n=1,171,801)	Factor level	Recovered	Deceased	CFR (%)	χ^2	Recovered	Deceased	CFR (%)	χ^2	Recovered	Deceased	CFR (%)	χ^2	Recovered	Deceased	CFR (%)	χ^2	Recovered	Deceased	CFR (%)	χ^2	Recovered	Deceased	CFR (%)	χ^2
		777,672	394,129	33.63		273,699	144,464	34.55		410,239	217,339	34.63		66,899	26,184	28.13		16,122	3,730	18.79		10,713	2,412	18.38	
Region (%)	Central-West	82,488 (10.6)	33,977 (8.6)	29.17e	<0.001	29,961 (10.9)	11,527 (8.0)	27.78e	<0.001	42,624 (10.4)	19,793 (9.1)	31.71e	<0.001	6,765 (10.1)	2,078 (7.9)	23.5c	<0.001	1,942 (12.0)	326 (8.7)	14.37c	<0.001	1,196 (11.2)	253 (10.5)	17.46a	0.034
	Northeast	91,851 (11.8)	70,172 (17.8)	43.31b		34,156 (12.5)	31,754 (22.0)	48.18b		48,036 (11.7)	33,383 (15.4)	41b		7,105 (10.6)	4,310 (16.5)	37.75a		1,551 (9.6)	461 (12.4)	22.91a		1,003 (9.4)	264 (10.9)	20.84a	
	North	23,308 (3.0)	20,938 (5.3)	47.32a		9,508 (3.5)	9,616 (6.7)	50.28a		11,207 (2.7)	10,045 (4.6)	47.26a		1,686 (2.5)	1,010 (3.9)	37.46a		445 (2.8)	149 (4.0)	25.08a		462 (4.3)	118 (4.9)	20.34a	
	Southeast	433,662 (55.8)	202,142 (51.3)	31.79c		154,643 (56.5)	72,651 (50.3)	31.96c		229,084 (55.8)	113,102 (52.0)	33.05d		36,184 (54.1)	13,400 (51.2)	27.02b		8,419 (52.2)	1,847 (49.5)	17.99b		5,332 (49.8)	1,142 (47.3)	17.64a	
	South	14,6363 (18.8)	66,900 (17.0)	31.37d		45,431 (16.6)	18,916 (13.1)	29.4d		79,288 (19.3)	41,016 (18.9)	34.09c		15,159 (22.7)	5,386 (20.6)	26.22b		3,765 (23.4)	947 (25.4)	20.1a		2,720 (25.4)	635 (26.3)	18.93a	
Geographical Zone (%)	Urban	668,843 (96.7)	332,589 (95.6)	33.21b	<0.001	236,978 (97.2)	122,081 (95.7)	34c	<0.001	352,255 (96.6)	183,166 (95.6)	34.21b	<0.001	56,589 (95.9)	22,066 (95.3)	28.05b	<0.001	13,754 (95.3)	3,185 (94.0)	18.8b	<0.001	9,267 (94.1)	2,091 (93.3)	18.41b	0.001
	Peri-urban	2,278 (0.3)	1,192 (0.3)	34.35b		690 (0.3)	471 (0.4)	40.57b		1,072 (0.3)	613 (0.3)	36.38b		309 (0.5)	84 (0.4)	21.37c		91 (0.6)	12 (0.4)	11.65b		116 (1.2)	12 (0.5)	9.38c	
	Rural	20,708 (3.0)	14,186 (4.1)	40.65a		6,247 (2.6)	5,002 (3.9)	44.47a		11,325 (3.1)	7,840 (4.1)	40.91a		2,089 (3.5)	1,014 (4.4)	32.68a		582 (4.0)	192 (5.7)	24.81a		465 (4.7)	138 (6,2)	22.89a	
Age group (%)	Children	20,514 (2.6)	1,093 (0.3)	5.06d	<0.001	3,209 (1.2)	328 (0.2)	9.27c	<0.001	4,372 (1.1)	337 (0.2)	7.16d	<0.001	6,898 (10.3)	253 (1.0)	3.54c	<0.001	3,290 (20.4)	97 (2.6)	2.86c	<0.001	2,745 (25.6)	78 (3.2)	2.76c	<0.001
	Teenagers	5,726 (0.7)	291 (0.1)	4.84d		1,350 (0.5)	90 (0.1)	6.25d		1,505 (0.4)	83 (0.0)	5.23d		1,740 (2.6)	85 (0,3)	4.66c		613 (3.8)	19 (0.5)	3.01c		518 (4.8)	14 (0.6)	2.63c	
	Adolescents	4,048 (0.5)	417 (0.1)	9.34c		1,182 (0.4)	156 (0.1)	11.66c		1,612 (0.4)	190 (0.1)	10.54c		886 (1.3)	51 (0.2)	5.44c		218 (1.4)	9 (0.2)	3.96c		150 (1.4)	11 (0.5)	6.83c	
	Adults	434,987 (55.9)	111,999 (28.4)	20.48b		152,997 (55.9)	31,755 (22.0)	17.19b		258,252 (63.0)	75,253 (34.6)	22.56b		18,598 (27.8)	4,037 (15.4)	17.84b		3,200 (19.8)	558 (15.0)	14.85b		1,940 (18.1)	396 (16.4)	16.95b	
	Elderly	312,397 (40.2)	280,329 (71.1)	47.29a		114,961 (42.0)	112,135 (77.6)	49.38a		144,98 (35.2)	141,476 (65.1)	49.47a		38,777 (58.0)	21,758 (83.1)	35.94a		8,801 (54.6)	3,047 (81.7)	25.72a		5,360 (50.0)	1,913 (79.3)	26.3a	
Sex at Birth (%)	Female	351,932 (45.3)	174,524 (44.3)	33.15b	<0.001	122,997 (44.9)	62,028 (42.9)	33.52b	<0.001	180,993 (44.1)	97,229 (44.7)	34.95a	<0.001	34,031 (50.9)	12,358 (47.2)	26.64b	<0.001	8,370 (51.9)	1,790 (48.0)	17.62b	<0.001	5,541 (51.7)	1,119 (46.4)	16.8b	<0.001
	Male	425,671 (54.7)	219,566 (55.7)	34.03a		150,672 (55.1)	82,419 (57.1)	35.36a		229,214 (55.9)	120,091 (55.3)	34.38b		32,864 (49.1)	13,823 (52.8)	29.61a		7,752 (48.1)	1,940 (52.0)	20.02a		5,169 (48.3)	1,293 (53.6)	20.01a	
Pregnant (%)	No	78,342 (89.8)	13,741 (94.7)	14.92a	<0.001	28,093 (90.6)	3,630 (95.3)	11.44a	<0.001	44,015 (91.0)	9,350 (94.1)	17.52a	<0.001	4,796 (78.4)	593 (97.9)	11a	<0.001	915 (83.3)	92 (96.8)	9.14a	0.001	523 (78.6)	76 (100.0)	14.53	<0.001
	Yes	8,925 (10.2)	776 (5.3)	8.0b		2,899 (9.4)	178 (4.7)	5.78b		4,379 (9.0)	582 (5.9)	11.73b		1,321 (21.6)	13 (2.1)	0.97b		184 (16.7)	3 (3.2)	1.6b		142 (21.4)	0 (0.0)	0	
HDI 2010 (%)	0.805 - 0.862	291,851 (38.0)	106,963 (27.4)	26.82d	<0.001	107,175 (39.6)	38,346 (26.8)	26.35c	<0.001	144,903 (35.8)	58,463 (27.2)	28.75d	<0.001	28,634 (43.4)	8,364 (32.2)	22.61d	<0.001	7,041 (44.5)	1,126 (30.4)	13.79c	<0.001	4,098 (38.8)	664 (27.8)	13.94c	<0.001
	0.784 - 0.804	131,204 (17.1)	67,216 (17.2)	33.88c		44,588 (16.5)	24,601 (17.2)	35.56b		71,068 (17.6)	36,687 (17.1)	34.05c		10,837 (16.4)	4,713 (18.1)	30.31c		2,683 (17.0)	751 (20.3)	21.54b		2,028 (19.2)	464 (19.4)	18.62b	
	0.752 - 0.783	178,858 (23.3)	97,960 (25.1)	35.39b		62,793 (23.2)	35,101 (24.5)	35.85b		96,820 (23.9)	54,916 (25.5)	36.19b		13,990 (21.2)	6,515 (25.1)	31.77b		3,140 (19.8)	862 (23.3)	21.87b		2,115 (20.0)	566 (23.7)	21.11ab	
	0.418 - 0.751	165,921 (21.6)	118,333 (30.3)	41.63a		56,040 (20.7)	45,201 (31.6)	44.65a		92,101 (22.7)	65,092 (30.3)	41.41a		12,488 (18.9)	6,379 (24.6)	33.81a		2,963 (18.7)	964 (26.0)	24.55a		2,329 (22.0)	697 (29.2)	23.03a	
Ethnicity (%)	Caucasian	352,229 (57.7)	175,559 (53.1)	33.26c	<0.001	116,055 (56.4)	57,378 (49.4)	33.08d	<0.001	188,701 (57.3)	101,534 (54.5)	34.98c	<0.001	33,802 (63.4)	13,289 (59.1)	28.22c	0.12	8,232 (63.6)	2,063 (62.6)	20.04a	0.12	5,439 (61.0)	1,295 (60.2)	19.23b	0.003
	Multiracial	218,777 (35.9)	130,121 (39.4)	37.29b		74,429 (36.2)	48,798 (42.0)	39.6b		120,592 (36.6)	71,811 (38.5)	37.32b		16,595 (31.1)	7,743 (34.4)	31.81b		4,081 (31.5)	1,038 (31.5)	20.28a		3,080 (34.6)	731 (34.0)	19.18b	
	Black	30,112 (4.9)	20,302 (6.1)	40.27a		11,792 (5.7)	8,133 (7.0)	40.82a		15,411 (4.7)	10,771 (5.8)	41.14a		2,176 (4.1)	1,156 (5.1)	34.69a		454 (3.5)	140 (4.2)	23.57a		279 (3.1)	102 (4.7)	26.77a	
	Asian	8,031 (1.3)	3,927 (1.2)	32.84c		2,996 (1.5)	1,614 (1.4)	35.01cd		4,125 (1.3)	1,974 (1.1)	32.37d		687 (1.3)	282 (1.3)	29.1bc		147 (1.1)	39 (1.2)	20.97a		76 (0.9)	18 (0.8)	19.15ab	
	Native american	1,068 (0.2)	575 (0.2)	35bc		519 (0.3)	316 (0.3)	37.84abc		392 (0.1)	216 (0.1)	35.53abcd		84 (0.2)	24 (0.1)	22.22abc		35 (0.3)	15 (0.5)	30a		38 (0.4)	4 (0.2)	9.52ab	
School level (%)	Illiterate	9,596 (3.7)	12,931 (8.8)	57.4a	<0.001	3,446 (3.6)	5,366 (10.2)	60.89a	<0.001	4,435 (3.3)	6,122 (7.4)	57.98a	<0.001	1,272 (7.1)	1,173 (12.4)	47.95a	<0.001	278 (6.5)	157 (10.5)	36.09a	<0.001	165 (6.1)	113 (11.9)	40.65a	<0.001
	Primary/middle	102,007 (39.7)	79,312 (53.9)	43.74b		37,166 (38.4)	29,006 (55.1)	43.83b		52,545 (38.9)	43,389 (52.6)	45.23b		8,765 (49.0)	5,450 (57.4)	38.34b		2,117 (49.5)	911 (61.1)	30.09a		1,414 (52.7)	556 (58.5)	28.22b	
	High school	95,342 (37.1)	39,157 (26.6)	29.11c		35,617 (36.8)	12,998 (24.7)	26.74c		52,934 (39.2)	23,674 (28.7)	30.9c		4,902 (27.4)	2,009 (21.2)	29.07c		1,137 (26.6)	284 (19.0)	19.99b		752 (28.0)	192 (20.2)	20.36c	
	Higher education	49,699 (19.4)	15,695 (10.7)	24d		20,531 (21.2)	5,241 (10.0)	20.34d		25,117 (18.6)	9,369 (11.3)	27.17d		2,957 (16.5)	856 (9.0)	22.45d		742 (17.4)	139 (9.3)	15.78b		352 (13.1)	90 (9.5)	20.34c	



Figure S1. Eligibility criteria for patients with mild, moderate, and severe cases reported in Brazil from 01/01/2020 to 12/31/2024.For the ILI database, cases with ignored, discarded, or cancelled classifications were excluded, as well as those without a reported region and those classified by a non-laboratory method. For the SARS database, cases with other etiological agents were excluded, along with those lacking birth or closure dates, those with ignored outcomes or deaths due to other causes, those with discrepant closure dates, and those classified with an etiological agent identification method other than PCR.



Figure S2. Adjusted incidence and mortality rates of ILI (Influenza-like Illness) cases (left y-axis) by epidemiological week (x-axis), relative frequency of circulating variants (background bars scaled to the maximum values between 0 and 100% relative frequency), and vaccination trends observed across different regions of Brazil between 01/01/2020 and 12/31/2024 (5 years). Incidence rates were irregular (A-E), and Omicron was the most prevalent variant. Few deaths were recorded in the ILI dataset, resulting in case fatality rates below 1 per 100,000 inhabitants (F-J).



Figure S3. Adjusted incidence and mortality rates of SARS (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome) cases (left y-axis) by epidemiological week (x-axis), relative frequency of circulating variants (background bars scaled to the maximum values between 0 and 100% relative frequency), and vaccination trends observed across different regions of Brazil between 01/01/2020 and 12/31/2024 (5 years). Three distinct waves were observed during the Public Health Emergency period in the North and Northeast regions (B-C), while other regions showed up to five waves (Central-West, Southeast - A, D) or more (South - E). The highest mortality rates coincided with the widespread circulation of the Gamma variant across all regions, highlighting it as the most impactful variant on incidence and mortality during 2021 (F-J).

Table S1. Odds Ratios and corresponding confidence intervals from univariate generalized linear models with p-values < 0.05 and OR > 1.0.

	Factor level	Odds Ratio	CI 95% -	CI 95% +	p-value
Region	Northeast	1.75	1.69	1.81	< 0.05
	North	2.35	2.26	2.45	< 0.05
	Southeast	1.26	1.22	1.29	< 0.05
	South	0.02	0.95	1.01	> 0.05
Geographical zone	Peri-urban	0.87	0.77	0.98	< 0.05
	Rural	1.26	1.22	1.30	< 0.05
Age group	Teenager	0.87	0.71	1.06	0.163
	Adolescent	2.27	1.89	2.73	> 0.05
	Adult	4.92	4.56	5.30	< 0.05
	Elderly	18.08	16.77	19.49	< 0.05
Sex at Birth	Male	1.07	1.06	1.09	< 0.05
Pregnancy	No	0.33	0.32	0.34	< 0.05
	Yes	0.18	0.16	0.20	< 0.05
HDI (2010)	0.784 - 0.804	1.24	1.22	1.27	< 0.05
	0.752 - 0.783	1.13	1.11	1.16	< 0.05
	0.418 - 0.751	1.52	1.49	1.55	< 0.05
Ethnicity	Multiracial	1.28	1.26	1.30	< 0.05
	Black	1.35	1.31	1.39	< 0.05
	Asian	0.95	0.89	1.02	< 0.05
	American native	1.08	0.91	1.28	< 0.05
Educational level	Elementary/Middle Years	0.58	0.57	0.60	< 0.05
	High school	0.31	0.30	0.32	< 0.05
	Higher education	0.24	0.23	0.25	< 0.05
Respiratory distress	Yes	1.59	1.56	1.61	< 0.05
Dyspnea	Yes	1.66	1.63	1.69	< 0.05
Tachypnea	Yes	1.62	1.43	1.83	< 0.05
Severe fatigue	Yes	1.35	1.25	1.45	< 0.05
Confusion	Yes	2.15	1.98	2.33	< 0.05
SpO2 < 95%	Yes	2.16	2.13	2.20	< 0.05
Tachycardia	Yes	1.48	1.26	1.74	< 0.05
Cardiopathy	Yes	2.14	2.11	2.17	< 0.05
Chronic kidney disease	Yes	2.96	2.86	3.06	< 0.05
Chronic liver disease	Yes	2.38	2.22	2.55	< 0.05
Immunosuppression	Yes	1.84	1.78	1.90	< 0.05
Pneumopathy	Yes	2.38	2.30	2.46	< 0.05
Neurological disorder	Yes	2.48	2.40	2.56	< 0.05
Down's Syndrome	Yes	1.27	1.12	1.43	< 0.05
Diabetes	Yes	1.96	1.93	2.00	< 0.05
Obesity	Yes	1.44	1.40	1.47	< 0.05
Sepsis	Yes	6.11	2.24	16.67	< 0.05
Alzheimer	Yes	9.54	1.11	81.66	< 0.05
DPOC	Yes	5.09	1.99	13.00	< 0.05

Stroke	Yes	2.37	1.50	3.75	< 0.05
Ascites	Yes	2.26	1.01	5.03	< 0.05
Hypertension	Yes	1.53	1.23	1.90	< 0.05
Smoker	Yes	2.01	1.07	3.76	< 0.05
Edema	Yes	1.98	1.60	2.43	< 0.05
Cyanosis	Yes	2.60	2.23	3.03	< 0.05
Admission at ICU	Yes	5.50	5.41	5.58	< 0.05
Mechanical ventilation	Yes, not invasive	2.23	2.18	2.28	< 0.05
	Yes, invasive	26.92	26.19	27.68	< 0.05
Immunization	$1^{st}/2^{nd}$ Dose	1.19	1.17	1.22	< 0.05
	$1^{st}/2^{nd}$ Booster	0.62	0.60	0.64	< 0.05

Table S2. Nosocomial characteristics of the population with confirmed cases of SARS by COVID-19 through PCR methodology in Brazil by year, between 01/01/2020 and 12/31/2024 (5 years). The χ^2 test indicated significant differences between cure and death proportions across all strata (χ^2, $p < 0.001$). Case fatality rates (CFR%) were compared using the paired Z-test ($p < 0.05$). Significance letters indicate statistically significant differences between groups, where similar letters represent groupings, and proportions are organized in descending order (from highest to lowest proportion).

(n=1,171,801)	Factor level	Recovered	Deceased	*CFR (%)*	χ^2 Test
		777,672	394,129	33.63	
Number of comorbidities (%)	0	438,780 (56.4)	163,762 (41.6)	27.18c	<0.001
	1-2	333,263 (42.9)	223,091 (56.6)	40.1b	
	3+	5,629 (0.7)	7,276 (1.8)	56.38a	
Immunization (%)	None	637,970 (82.0)	330,637 (83.9)	34.14b	<0.001
	1st/2nd Dose	94,039 (12.1)	52,092 (13.2)	35.65a	
	1st/2nd Booster	45,663 (5.9)	11,400 (2.9)	19.98c	
ICU (%)	No	604,875 (77.8)	171,478 (43.5)	22.09b	<0.001
	Yes	172,797 (22.2)	222,651 (56.5)	56.3a	
Mechanical ventilation (%)	No	196,463 (28.5)	29,710 (8.8)	13.14c	<0.001
	Yes, non-invasive	454,070 (65.9)	141,030 (41.8)	23.7b	
	Yes, invasive	38,729 (5.6)	166,512 (49.4)	81.13a	

Table S3. Survival probabilities estimated using the Kaplan-Meier model at time points 0, 10, 20, 30, and 40 days. The study population was stratified as: unvaccinated, vaccinated with the 1st or 2nd dose, or vaccinated with the 1st or 2nd booster.

Vaccine Shots: None						
Time (days)	Numbers at Risk	Number of Events	Survival Probability	Standard-error	Lower CI95%	Upper CI95%
0	970259	3829	0.996	6.36E-05	0.996	0.996
10	779779	88340	0.900	3.15E-04	0.899	0.900
20	287537	130590	0.679	6.03E-04	0.678	0.680
30	78458	77565	0.390	9.01E-04	0.388	0.392
40	4521	33065	0.064	1.05E-03	0.062	0.066
Vaccine Shots: 1st or 2nd Dose						
Time (days)	Numbers at Risk	Number of Events	Survival Probability	Standard-error	Lower CI95%	Upper CI95%
0	142153	640	0.996	1.78E-04	0.995	0.996
10	108438	14717	0.884	8.87E-04	0.882	0.885
20	39754	20083	0.644	1.64E-03	0.641	0.648
30	11346	11217	0.368	2.28E-03	0.363	0.372
40	672	4784	0.059	2.59E-03	0.054	0.065
Vaccine Shots: 1st or 2nd Booster						
Time (days)	Numbers at Risk	Number of Events	Survival Probability	Standard-error	Lower CI95%	Upper CI95%
0	46844	224	0.995	3.19E-04	0.995	0.996
10	29458	3626	0.904	1.49E-03	0.901	0.907
20	10357	3089	0.754	2.86E-03	0.749	0.760
30	3149	1537	0.569	4.84E-03	0.559	0.578
40	215	796	0.220	1.11E-02	0.199	0.243