

1 **TITLE PAGE**

2

3 **Title:** Demographic and professional risk factors of COVID-19 infections among  
4 physicians in low- and middle-income settings; findings from a representative survey  
5 in two Brazilian states.

6 **Authors:** Giuliano Russo<sup>1</sup>, Alex Cassenote<sup>2</sup>, Bruno Luciano Carneiro Alves de Oliveira<sup>3</sup>,  
7 Mario Scheffer<sup>2</sup>

8 **Affiliations:**

9 <sup>1</sup>Wolfson Institute of Population Health, Queen Mary University of London. 58 Turner  
10 street, E1 2AB, London (UK)

11 <sup>2</sup> Department of Preventive Medicine, University of São Paulo. Avenida Dr. Arnaldo,  
12 455, 2º andar, sala 2166, CEP: 01246-903, São Paulo - SP – Brazil.

13 <sup>3</sup>Department of Medicine I, Federal University of Maranhão, São Luís do Maranhão,  
14 Brazil.

15

1           **ABSTRACT**

2   **Introduction.** Health workers (HWs) are a key resource for health systems worldwide,  
3 and have been affected heavily by the COVID-19 pandemic. Evidence is consolidating  
4 on incidence and associated drivers of infections, predominantly in high-income  
5 settings. It is however still unclear what the risk factors may be for specific health  
6 professions, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

7   **Methods.** We conducted a cross-sectional survey in a representative sample of 1,183  
8 medical doctors registered with Brazil's Federal Council of Medicine in one developed  
9 (São Paulo) and one disadvantaged state (Maranhão). Between February-June 2021,  
10 we administered a telephone questionnaire to collect data on physicians'  
11 demographics, deployment to services, vaccination status, and self-reported COVID-  
12 19 infections. We performed descriptive, univariate, and multilevel clustered analysis  
13 to explore the association between physicians' infection rates, and their  
14 sociodemographic and employment characteristics. A generalized linear mixed model  
15 with a binomial distribution was used to estimate the adjusted odds ratio.

16   **Results.** We found that 35.8% of physicians in our sample were infected with COVID-  
17 19 in the first year of the pandemic. The infection rate in Maranhão (49.2%) [95% CI  
18 45.0-53.4] was almost twice that in São Paulo (24.1%) [95% CI 20.8-27.5]. Being a  
19 physician in Maranhão [95% CI 2.08-3.57], younger than 50 years [95% CI 1.41-2.89],  
20 and having worked in a COVID-19 ward [95% CI 1.28-2.27], were positively associated  
21 with the probability of infections. Conversely, working with diagnostic services [95%  
22 CI 0.53-0.96], in administrative functions [95% CI 0.42-0.80], or in teaching and  
23 research [95% CI 0.48-0.91] was negatively associated.

24   **Conclusions.** Based on data from Brazil, COVID-19 infections in LMICs may be more  
25 likely in those health systems with lower physician-to-patient ratios, and younger  
26 doctors working in COVID-19 wards may be infected more frequently. Such findings  
27 may be used to identify policies to mitigate COVID-19 effects on HWs in LMICs.

28

29   **Keywords:** COVID-19; physician health; health workers in Brazil; COVID-19 risk  
30 factors and infections; health labour market; health workforce in LMICs.

1

## 2 **1 INTRODUCTION**

3 Health workers (HWs) are a crucial healthcare resource, as they deliver services,  
4 manage the health system's building blocks, and represent the single most important  
5 health expenditure across the world.(1) Their role and importance have been  
6 particularly evident during COVID-19, when they have been at the frontline of curative  
7 and preventive services, and led the clinical response to the pandemic.(2) Precisely  
8 because of their exposure, many HWs across the world contracted the virus, and some  
9 have died.(3)

10 It is not clear how many HWs have been lost to COVID-19, and what the key risk-  
11 factors may be. The World Health Organization estimates that between 80,000 and  
12 180,000 may have actually died, if country-specific COVID-19 infection and fatality  
13 rates were to be applied to the 135 million-strong global health workforce (4). It is  
14 unclear which health professions were more affected, and what the specific risk factors  
15 could be, particularly for low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).(5)

16 Cross-sectional, cohort, and hospital-based prevalence studies have been carried out  
17 to estimate COVID-19 infections among health workers. An observational cohort study  
18 from Denmark (6) screening for COVID-19 infections among medical, nursing and  
19 students personnel identified 4.04% seropositive health-care workers. A metanalysis  
20 of the prevalence of staff infections in hospital settings from 47 eligible studies in  
21 America, Europe and Asia,(7) found the prevalence of infection was 7% for those  
22 studies using antibody tests, while for those studies using PCR tests, prevalence of  
23 infections was 11%. A highly referenced systematic review of the evidence from the  
24 first semester of the pandemic(8) estimated a total of 152,888 infections among health  
25 workers and 1,413 deaths worldwide.

26 A living review of the epidemiology of COVID-19 among HWs (9) concluded that these  
27 account for a significant proportion of global coronavirus infections worldwide; nurses  
28 may be the personnel most at risk, and illness severity is lower in non-patient facing  
29 workers.(10) Professional exposures such as involvement in intubations, direct patient  
30 contact, or contact with bodily secretions, were associated with increased infection

3

1 risk. However, there is evidence that private community exposure may be a stronger  
2 risk factor than work exposure.(11)

3 Exposure to at-risk-patients from high-infection regions or from dedicated COVID-19  
4 wards, would be relevant risk factors,(12) but it is not clear what specific healthcare  
5 settings would increase the risk of infection for HWs, and who exactly are the more  
6 exposed 'frontline workers'. A study assessing COVID-19 hospital admission in  
7 Scotland(13) found that older, male HWs were more at risk of infection and  
8 hospitalization; patient-facing healthcare workers and their households were at higher  
9 risk compared with non-patient facing ones. A prospective, observational cohort study  
10 in the UK and the US (14) concluded that self-reported infection rates among frontline  
11 health-care workers are higher than in the general population. On the other hand, a  
12 study from a UK hospital(15) showed that infection levels were greatest among HWs  
13 working in housekeeping, acute medicine, and general internal medicine, with  
14 surprisingly lower rates for those working in intensive care.

15 Less evidence is available from LMICs. An analysis of 101 medical staff admitted for  
16 COVID-19 in a Wuhan hospital in China (16) showed these to be younger than typical  
17 patients, and displaying milder symptoms. A study from Iran(17) also found COVID-  
18 19 infections among HWs to be greater among younger (<35) professionals,  
19 particularly among women and nurses. Another study in 14 hospitals from Qatar(18)  
20 found HWs infections to be more frequent in non-COVID-19 facilities, where Personal  
21 Protective Equipment (PPE) would be only erratically used. Another investigation of  
22 COVID-19 cases among HWs in Oman(19) confirmed that the majority of these were  
23 among young (>45 years), female workers, predominantly deployed in primary care  
24 settings.

25 A study assessing COVID-19 infections among health workers in a Rio de Janeiro  
26 hospital in Brazil(20) found an overall seroprevalence of 30%. Non-white staff (mostly  
27 hospital support workers) with lower income and schooling, as well as users of the  
28 mass transportation system, showed the highest infection rates. HWs income level,  
29 schooling and work modality appeared as negative predictors. Analogous studies from  
30 São Paulo hospitals(21)(22) showed HWs infection rates to be similar to those in the

1 wider population. Male and non-clinical workers appeared to be more at risk but  
2 working in COVID-19 services was not associated with higher levels of infections.

3 A knowledge gap exists on the association of HWs personal and professional  
4 characteristics with COVID-19 infections in low-income settings, particularly for  
5 doctors. This is particularly of interest in South America which has been hit particularly  
6 hard by the epidemic(23); an estimated 13,525 health workers died in Brazil, the  
7 world's second largest loss.(4)

8 In this paper we report the results of a study to explore the self-reported COVID-19  
9 infection rates among physicians in Brazil, with a view to identify the risk factors  
10 associated with infections. The study aimed at contributing to the existing knowledge  
11 on impacts of COVID-19 on health workers in LMICs, providing an evidence base for  
12 local and international policies to mitigate effects of the pandemic.

## 13 **2 METHODS**

14 As part of a research project on the impact of COVID-19 and the associated economic  
15 crisis on Brazil's health system,(24) we conducted a representative cross-sectional  
16 telephone survey among registered physician during the second year of the pandemic,  
17 in two states, São Paulo and Maranhão.

18 These represent extreme cases of economic and health system disparities.(25) With  
19 almost 47 million people, São Paulo has one of Brazil's highest income per capita  
20 (US\$ 12,776), and 43% of its population is covered by private health insurance  
21 schemes.(26) Conversely, Maranhão has slightly more than 7 million people, its  
22 income is about one third of São Paulo's, and just 7% of the population own a private  
23 health plan (Tab.1).

24 **Table 1: Selected economic, health system, and COVID-19 indicators for the study locations at**  
25 **the time of the study**

Area	Populatio n (2021)*	GDP per capita (USD 2019)*	Phys/100,000 **	COVID-19 Cases/100,000***	COVID-19 Deaths/100,000 ***	COVID-19 fatality***
------	------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------

Brazil	213,317,639	8,924	251.3	12,815.6	298.2	2.2%
São Paulo	46,649,132	12,776	310.5	9,345.2	319.1	3.4%
Maranhão	7,153,262	3,453	107.1	5,030.3	143.4	2.9%

1 Source: \*IBGE, 2022; \*\* Brazilian Medical Council, 2021; \*\*\* CONASS, 2021

2 São Paulo has three times the number of physicians per capita as Maranhão.(27) São  
3 Paulo appears to have been hit harder by the pandemic,(28) with three times the  
4 number of COVID-19 deaths per capita at the time of our study, and twice the number  
5 of infections among its population (Tab.1).

## 6 2.1 Data collection and sampling strategy

7 The physician database for the two states was provided by Brazil's Federal Council of  
8 Medicine; the survey sample was calculated by the Faculty of Medicine of the  
9 University of São Paulo, and the actual survey was carried out by the survey services  
10 institute 'Datafolha', under the technical supervision of the academic partners of the  
11 study. This survey is part of a wider study on the impact of COVID-19 and economic  
12 recessions on Brazil's health system and workforce.(24)

13 A representative cross-sectional study including 1,183 physicians was conducted in  
14 2021. Two independent sample sizes per state was calculated based on a total of  
15 152,511 active medical registries in São Paulo (N=144,852) and Maranhão (N=7,659)  
16 from the Federal Medical Council Medicine database (*Conselho Federal de Medicina*  
17 *- CFM*), using a 95% confidence level with 5% margin of error and statistical power of  
18 80% (see the two Simple Random Sampling with Replacement equations in  
19 Supporting information 1). Proportional stratified sampling was drawn distribution for  
20 gender, age, state and local of address (capital or countryside) were preserved.

21 Substitution was carried out exclusively in cases of unsuccessful contact or refusal to  
22 participate in our survey; 1,183 physicians were randomly selected, and five  
23 substitutions were identified for each sampled physician. Substitution sampling  
24 followed the same stratification criteria used for the initial sample calculation. We  
25 controlled sample replacements for state, sex, and age, so that every physician who

1 did not agree to participate was replaced by an individual with the same gender, age,  
2 and specialty characteristics to avoid selection bias.

3 Primary data were collected via a telephone survey carried out by 8 data collectors,  
4 including one field coordinator, 6 experienced interviewers, and two administrative  
5 staff responsible for checking missing data. Sample size calculations, sample  
6 selection, questionnaire design, substitution control, database assembly and data  
7 analysis were performed by the authors of this papers. Three senior researchers from  
8 the medical demography field previously piloted and calibrated the questionnaire with  
9 30 interviewees to estimate the substitution rate. Reproducibility was tested by  
10 sampling a random sample after the field collection and repeating the interview,  
11 resulting in 100% agreement.

12 Data collection was carried out between the 16<sup>th</sup> February and 15<sup>th</sup> June 2021 by the  
13 Datafolha Research Institute under supervision of the authors' research institutions.  
14 The interviews consisted of a 30-minute telephone questionnaire, containing 30  
15 questions ranging from multiple, closed questions to interdependently concatenated  
16 and semi-opened questions (see Supporting information 2: Survey Questionnaire).

17 Patient and public involvement. Medical doctors as well as members of the public were  
18 consulted and participated in the design of the original version of the survey  
19 questionnaire. The questionnaire was then piloted by Datafolha in a subset of ten  
20 doctors in the two states, and a final version was elaborated following the feedback  
21 received.

## 22 **2.2 Data analysis**

23 Self-reported COVID-19 infection events during the past year was the selected  
24 outcome variable, distinguishing between the severity of the infection events  
25 (asymptomatic, mild, and severe). We used sociodemographic characteristics (sex,  
26 gender, age, and income), medical employment characteristics (such as medical  
27 specialty, training and years of service), and type of work carried out in COVID-19 and  
28 regular wards (intensive care, inpatient or outpatient care, distance-based  
29 consultation, or research), as independent, explanatory variables.



1 We performed descriptive, univariate, and multilevel clustered analysis on the dataset.  
2 A generalized linear mixed model with a binomial distribution was used to estimate the  
3 adjusted odds ratio(29) as these allow for the inclusion of random or cluster-specific  
4 effects in the linear predictor. The inclusion of random effects in the linear predictor  
5 reflects the idea that there is natural heterogeneity across geographic clusters in their  
6 regression coefficients. Such method has been used extensively in health services  
7 research.(30) The 'enter' method was used for the selection of variables, and ANOVA  
8 tests were employed to verify the equality hypothesis among the different models.  
9 Data were shown as absolute frequency and proportion with a 95% confidence  
10 interval. The adjustment of different models was verified by indicators of residual  
11 deviance and the Akaike information criterion (AIC).(31) The database developed by  
12 the Datafolha data collectors was exported to the Statistical Package for the Social  
13 Sciences (SPSS) version 26 for Windows (International Business Machines Corp,  
14 New York, USA) and R-GUI version 3.5.3(32) for statistical analysis. All the  
15 significance levels were set to  $p < 0.05$ .

### 16 **2.3 Ethics considerations**

17 This study received the approval from the Research Ethics Committees of the Federal  
18 University of Maranhão (CEP UFMA 3.051.875), and from the Faculty of Medicine of  
19 the University of São Paulo (CEP FMUSP 3.136.269), and was approved by Brazil's  
20 Federal Council of Medicine, that provided the list of physicians registered with the  
21 council of medicines in the two states, and the respective telephone contact details.

22 All the physicians contacted via telephone were informed beforehand of the objectives  
23 of the survey, and their consent was verbally obtained to participate in the survey. All  
24 the forms and questionnaires were anonymized through a double coding system  
25 organized by the Faculty of Medicine of the University of São Paulo.

## 26 **3 RESULTS**

27 Our sample included 1,183 physicians, 551 from Maranhão and 632 from São Paulo,  
28 approximately split equally between urban and rural areas (Table 2 below). Most  
29 physicians in our survey (61.6%) worked both in public and private sector jobs (dual  
30 practice), with only 25.4% of them employed exclusively in the public. Most of our



1 physicians declared engaging in outpatient care (82.7%) in hospital or clinics settings,  
 2 and 63.4% of them were deployed directly to the delivery of COVID-19 services, to  
 3 COVID-19 wards or to COVID-19-specific outpatient care. Engagement in the delivery  
 4 of specific healthcare services was non-exclusive, as many physicians declared to  
 5 work concomitantly in multiple wards, services, and sectors.

6 **Table 2: Characteristics of physicians in the survey sample**

Characteristics/variables	n	Proportions and Confidence Intervals
Gender		
Male	665	56.2% (53.4%-59.0%)
Female	518	43.8% (41.0%-46.6%)
Age		
< 35 yeas	404	34.2% (31.5%-36.9%)
35 to 50 years	405	34.2% (31.6%-37.0%)
> 50 years	374	31.6% (29.0%-34.3%)
State		
Maranhão (MA)	551	46.6% (43.7%-49.4%)
São Paulo (SP)	632	53.4% (50.6%-56.3%)
Geographical location of deployment		
Rural areas (Interior)	598	50.5% (47.7%-53.4%)
Urban areas around capital cities	585	49.5% (46.6%-52.3%)
Health sector of deployment		
Exclusively Private	153	12.9% (11.1%-14.9%)
Exclusively Public	301	25.4% (23.0%-28.0%)
Dual practice	729	61.6% (58.8%-64.4%)
Employment in specific health services		
Outpatient clinical services (hospital or clinics)	978	82.7% (80.4%-84.7%)
Diagnostic tests equipment-related services	392	33.1% (30.5%-35.9%)

Surgery (in-patient care)	459	38.8% (36.1%-41.6%)
Outpatient surgery	450	38.0% (35.3%-40.8%)
Administrative position	288	24.3% (22.0%-26.9%)
Teaching and research	312	26.4% (23.9%-28.9%)
Engagement with COVID-19 services		
No	433	36.6% (33.9%-39.4%)
Currently working with COVID-19 services	631	53.3% (50.5%-56.2%)
Worked in the past, but not currently	119	10.1% (8.4%-11.9%)
Type of COVID-19 services delivered		
COVID-19 ward or Intensive care unit (ICU)	524	44.3% (41.5%-47.2%)
Outpatient COVID-19 care	490	41.5% (38.7%-44.3%)
Telemedicine or other distance-based COVID-19 services	178	15.1% (13.1%-17.2%)
Research on COVID-19	61	5.2% (4.0%-6.5%)
Epidemiological surveillance or COVID-19 boards	53	4.5% (3.4%-5.8%)

1

2 At the time of administration of the survey, the vast majority of physicians declared  
 3 having already been vaccinated (93%), with non-significant differences in the vaccine  
 4 uptake among Maranhão and São Paulo physicians.

5 35.8% of all the physicians declared having been infected with COVID-19 in the  
 6 previous year. Almost half (49.2%) [CI 45.0-53.4] of Maranhão physicians were  
 7 infected, with the majority of them having suffered only mild or no symptoms (42.3%)  
 8 (Fig.1). Conversely, in São Paulo 24.1% of physicians [CI 20.8 - 27.5] declared a  
 9 COVID-19 infection, again with the majority recalling mild or no symptoms (Fig. 1). In  
 10 our sample, 4.5% of physicians were affected by severe COVID-19 symptoms, with  
 11 the proportion in Maranhão (6.9%) [CI 5.0 - 9.2] significantly higher than in São Paulo  
 12 (2.5%) [CI 1.5 -4.0].

13 <Insert here - Figure 1: Physician infection rates in the sample locations>

1 Such infections directly resulted in the loss of 7,117 workdays, representing 2.36% of  
 2 the total working days in our physician sample.

3 The multivariate analysis showed that being from Maranhão State [95% CI 2.08-3.57],  
 4 younger than 50 years [95% CI 1.41-2.89], and having worked in a COVID-19 ward  
 5 [95% CI 1.28-2.27], were positively associated with the odds of contracting COVID-19  
 6 (Tab. 3). Conversely, working with diagnostic services such as X-rays or scans [95%  
 7 CI 0.53-0.96], in administrative functions [95% CI 0.42-0.80], or in teaching and  
 8 research [95% CI 0.48-0.91] had a protective effect on the probability of contracting  
 9 COVID-19.

10 **Table 3: Multivariate regression model for physicians personal and professional characteristics**  
 11 **and probability of being infected with COVID-19**

	B	S.E.	OR (95%CI)	p-value
Global Model (n=1,183)				
Maranhão state (n=551)	1.004	0.138	2.72(2.08-3.57)	<0.001
Gender Female (n=518)	-0.117	0.138	0.88(0.67-1.16)	0.396
Age				
> 50 years (n=374)			Ref.	Ref.
35 to 50 years (n=405)	0.706	0.182	2.02(1.41-2.89)	<0.001
< 35 years (n=404)	0.577	0.173	1.78(1.27-2.50)	0.001
Employment in specific health services				
Outpatient clinical services (hospital or clinics) (n=978)	-0.289	0.176	0.74(0.53-1.05)	0.102
Diagnostic tests equipment-related services (n=392)	-0.330	0.147	0.71(0.53-0.96)	0.025
Surgery (in-patient care) (n=459)	0.286	0.155	1.33(0.98-1.80)	0.065
Outpatient surgery (n=450)	0.047	0.155	1.04(0.77-1.42)	0.760
Administrative position (n=288)	-0.533	0.160	0.58(0.42-0.80)	0.001
Teaching and research (n=312)	-0.407	0.162	0.66(0.48-0.91)	0.012
Health sector				
Exclusively Private (n=153)			Ref.	Ref.

Exclusively Public (n=301)	0.248	0.256	1.28(0.77-2.11)	0.333
Dual practice (n=729)	0.129	0.236	1.13(0.71-1.80)	0.585
Type of COVID-19 services delivered				
COVID-19 ward or Intensive care unit (ICU) (n=524)	0.537	0.146	1.71(1.28-2.27)	<0.001
Outpatient COVID-19 care (n=490)	-0.237	0.150	0.78(0.58-1.05)	0.114
Telemedicine or other distance-based COVID-19 services (n=178)	0.056	0.196	1.05(0.72-1.55)	0.776
Research on COVID-19 (n=61)	-0.226	0.312	0.79(0.43-1.47)	0.470
Epidemiological surveillance or COVID-19 boards (n=53)	0.118	0.333	1.12(0.58-2.16)	0.723

1

2 When multivariate models were run separately for each state, the results were not  
3 materially different, except for 'Working in diagnostic services' that was no longer  
4 significant for the São Paulo cohort (see Supporting information 3: Maranhão and São  
5 Paulo multivariate regression models).

6 With specific reference to 'Age', when using '>50 years' as reference category, both  
7 the '35-50 years' and '35-50 year' categories showed strong, significant association  
8 with the outcome variable of likelihood of COVID-19 infections, although the latter  
9 appeared to have higher significance ( $p < 0.001$ ) and coefficient ( $B = 0.706$ ).

10 On the association between physicians' engagement in specific services and  
11 probability of getting infected, only being deployed in COVID-19 hospital wards or ICU  
12 displayed a strong positive association for the two states, while deployment in  
13 administrative services displayed a strong negative significance. The significance of  
14 being deployed in diagnostic services was only significant for the Maranhão cohort,  
15 and deployment in teaching and research activities for the São Paulo cohort, losing  
16 significance when analysed jointly across the sample.

#### 17 **4 DISCUSSION**

18 Our survey found that 35.8% of physicians in two Brazilian states were infected with  
19 COVID-19 in the first year of the pandemic. Although most of them only experienced  
20 mild symptoms, 7,117 workdays were lost following the infections. The rate of  
21 infections varied considerably between Maranhão and São Paulo physicians, with the

1 former being affected twice as much than the latter. Being a Maranhão physician,  
2 being younger than 50 years old, and deployed to a COVID-19 ward, were the factors  
3 positively associated with infections. Conversely, being deployed to diagnostic  
4 services, administrative functions, or to teaching and research, were found to have a  
5 protective effect. Physician gender, sector of employment, and deployment to other  
6 frontline services, were not significantly associated with infections.

7 These findings need to be interpreted with a degree of caution. Our survey sample did  
8 not include those physicians who died or were critically incapacitated because of  
9 COVID-19, therefore possibly underestimating overall infections. Our data on  
10 infections, personal and professional characteristics were based on physicians'  
11 responses, which could have been affected by recall bias (33). We did not collect  
12 information on availability and use of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) among our  
13 physicians, which is considered in the COVID-19 literature a key risk factor for  
14 infections.(14) Finally, Maranhão and São Paulo represent very particular settings in  
15 terms of income distribution, organisation of healthcare services, and labour markets  
16 characteristics;(34) therefore, the study findings may not be entirely generalisable to  
17 the rest of Brazil, let alone to other low- and middle-income countries. Despite these  
18 limitations, a few conclusions can be safely drawn from our work.

19 We show that over a third of the medical workforce in Maranhão and São Paulo was  
20 infected with COVID-19 in the first year of the pandemic, with a substantial loss of  
21 labour. This is consistent with the findings from smaller studies from Brazil(20) and  
22 other LMICs,(16,18,19) and therefore particularly relevant for those countries with a  
23 scarcity of healthcare resources, which will have been hit already particularly hard by  
24 the pandemic (35).

25 The higher infection rate among Maranhão physicians was in contrast to lower  
26 population infection rates (see Tab.1). Our multivariate analysis confirmed that  
27 working in Maranhão was one of the most significant risk factors of physician infections  
28 in our cohort. The lower ratio of physicians per capita in Maranhão (1.1 per 1,000 in  
29 Maranhão Vs 3.2 per 1,000 in São Paulo)(27) may be a factor here, as during health  
30 emergencies a smaller workforce will necessarily engage in multiple functions and  
31 tasks across sectors, therefore increasing opportunities for infection. This is consistent

1 with previous work(26) showing the differential impact of health system crises on  
2 unequal states in LMICs. If confirmed, such finding would be relevant for those studies  
3 forecasting effects of the pandemic on health workforces in different parts of the world  
4 (4)

5 Younger age was associated with higher infection rates among physicians in both  
6 Brazilian states, which on the one hand contradicts the existing evidence on COVID-  
7 19 risk factors from high-income countries,(36) but on the other, is consistent with the  
8 scant evidence from other LMICs.(16–19) New public and private medical schools are  
9 supplying the national workforce(37), newly graduated physicians were predominantly  
10 deployed to COVID-19 wards and Nightingale hospitals, as older physicians were  
11 excluded from COVID-19 functions because considered at risk.(38)(39) While such a  
12 policy may make sense from a health management and epidemiological point of view,  
13 it also poses ethical and equity questions on medical employment in LMICs,(40)(41)  
14 particularly at a time when contracts of newly graduated physicians suffer for  
15 increasing casualisation in Brazil and worldwide.(42)(43)

16 Not unexpectedly, our analysis also shows that working in COVID-19 wards is  
17 associated with higher rates of infections among physicians compared to working in  
18 administrative functions, teaching and research. Although this is consistent with what  
19 is already known on COVID-19 risk factors for health workers(9,14), it is however  
20 surprising that other ‘frontline’ functions (such as COVID-19 outpatient visits or  
21 diagnostic services) were not also significantly associated with increased odds of  
22 infections. Such a lack of effect could be of course explained by the suspension of  
23 some ‘non-essential’ services during the pandemic, which would have spared  
24 physicians from dangerous exposure (44). But it is also likely that the definition of what  
25 constitute ‘frontline health services’ may not be that clear-cut, particularly in LMICs  
26 settings during an epidemic, where boundaries and functions become blurred, and  
27 health workers end up carrying out whatever functions are needed.

28 It was also surprising to see similar odds of infections among public and private sectors  
29 physicians, particularly as publicly funded health systems are believed to have borne  
30 the brunt of the COVID-19 pandemic (45,46), particularly in Brazil.(47) In the case of  
31 Brazilian’s physicians it is more likely that blurred boundaries between public and

1 private employment may have made it difficult to accurately distinguish between  
2 physicians of the Unified National Healthcare System (SUS), from those of the private  
3 sector. As previous research has shown that the majority of Brazilian doctors  
4 simultaneously engage in a multiplicity of public as well as private forms of  
5 employment (48), and that private organisations often provide services within SUS  
6 (34), it is likely that the majority of physicians in our sample carried out functions  
7 simultaneously in public and private sector institutions, making it very difficult to  
8 identify the individual effects of the pandemic on either sectors.

9 If confirmed, the findings from this study have policy implications for the ongoing efforts  
10 to estimate the effects of the pandemic on HWs, as well as for health policymakers in  
11 LMICs. Emerging evidence from different countries hints that the WHO's high-end  
12 figure(4) of 180,000 COVID-19 deaths among HWs is probably an overestimation.  
13 Rather than applying population-based infection and mortality rates, our study  
14 suggests that rates among HWs may vary according to HWs density, with understaffed  
15 health systems and services suffering more infections and deaths. This could help  
16 refine projections, and re-focus policies to mitigate the impact of the pandemic on  
17 health workforces worldwide.

18 Although medical doctors might not be the HWs most at risk of COVID-19  
19 infections,(10) our study suggests that COVID-19's impact on such key and expensive  
20 human resource is not negligible, and less staffed parts of a country's health systems  
21 may be more at risk. Health authorities worldwide should therefore give priority during  
22 epidemics to protect those services with the lowest HW to population ratios, knowing  
23 that opportunities for infections will be greater where workers are more scarce.(45)

24 Finally, our work appears to confirm that younger doctors in LMICs may be more at  
25 risk of infection than their counterparts in HICs,(17,19) possibly because the health  
26 services in those countries have drawn from younger recruits to staff COVID-19  
27 services. While such decisions can be justified in the light of younger doctors' less  
28 severe hospitalization and fatality rates, health authorities should make sure younger  
29 doctors are compensated through better contracts, and access to more secure parts  
30 of the market for physician services (49).



## 1 **5 CONCLUSIONS**

2 Health workers are essential resources for any health system, and they have borne  
3 the brunt of providing life-saving services during the COVID-19 epidemic. Knowledge  
4 gaps exist on COVID-19 infections, mortality and risk factors among HWs, particularly  
5 in LMICs. We conducted a cross-sectional telephone survey in a representative  
6 sample of the physicians in the populous São Paulo, and the disadvantaged Maranhão  
7 state in Brazil, with a view to identify the associated risk factors for such a key medical  
8 profession.

9 We found that more than a third of physicians in two states were infected with COVID-  
10 19 in the first year of the pandemic. Although most of them only experienced mild  
11 symptoms, a substantial number of workdays were lost following the infections. The  
12 rate of infections varied considerably between Maranhão and São Paulo physicians,  
13 with the former being affected twice as much than the latter. Being a Maranhão  
14 physician, younger than 50 years, and deployed to a COVID-19 ward, were the factors  
15 positively associated with infections. Conversely, being deployed to diagnostic  
16 services, administrative functions, or to teaching and research, were found to have a  
17 protective effect.

18 More research is needed to explore depth and nuances of the impact of the pandemic  
19 on HWs in LMICs. Our findings on the greater impact for physicians from less-staffed  
20 parts of Brazil's health system carry implications for the identification of policy to  
21 mitigate COVID-19 effects on health workforces, and for their measurement  
22 worldwide.

## 23 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND FUNDING**

24 We are indebted to Prof. Trevor Sheldon and Dr. James Buchan for their valuable  
25 comments and suggestions to an early version of the manuscript.

26 This study received support from the Confap-MRC call for Health Systems Research  
27 Networks. Specifically, GR received the award from the Newton Fund/ Medical  
28 Research Council (UK), Grant Reference MR/R022747/1. AJC and MS received the  
29 award from the *Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo* (FAPESP-  
30 Brazil), 2017/50356-7. BdO received the award from the *Fundação de Amparo à*

1 *Pesquisa e ao Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico do Maranhão (FAPEMA-*  
2 *Brazil), COOPI-00709/18.*

### 3 **CONTRIBUTOR STATEMENT**

4 GR designed the study, conducted the analysis, and drafted the manuscript. AJC  
5 conducted the analysis, and contributed to data collection. BdO conducted the  
6 analysis, and participated in the data collection. MS designed the study, and revised  
7 the manuscript. All the authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

8

## 1 REFERENCES

- 2 1. Campbell J, Dussault G, Buchan J, Pozo-Martin F, Cometto G. A Universal Truth:  
3 No Health Without a Workforce [Internet]. Recife, Brazil: Global Health Workforce  
4 Alliance; 2013 [cited 2022 Mar 8]. Available from:  
5 <https://www.who.int/workforcealliance/knowledge/resources/hrhreport2013/en/>
- 6 2. Mehta S, Machado F, Kwizera A, Papazian L, Moss M, Azoulay É, et al. COVID-  
7 19: a heavy toll on health-care workers. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. 2021  
8 Mar 1;9(3):226–8.
- 9 3. The Lancet. COVID-19: protecting health-care workers. *Lancet*.  
10 2020;395(10228):922.
- 11 4. WHO. The impact of COVID-19 on health and care workers: a closer look at deaths  
12 [Internet]. Geneva, Switzerland: Health Workforce Department; 2021. Report No.:  
13 WHO/HWF/WorkingPaper/2021.1. Available from:  
14 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/345300/WHO-HWF-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/345300/WHO-HWF-WorkingPaper-2021.1-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)  
15 [WorkingPaper-2021.1-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/345300/WHO-HWF-WorkingPaper-2021.1-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
- 16 5. Vargese SS, Dev SS, Soman A S, Kurian N, Varghese V A, Mathew E. Exposure  
17 risk and COVID-19 infection among frontline health-care workers: A single tertiary  
18 care centre experience. *Clinical Epidemiology and Global Health*. 2022 Jan  
19 1;13:100933.
- 20 6. Iversen K, Bundgaard H, Hasselbalch RB, Kristensen JH, Nielsen PB, Pries-Heje  
21 M, et al. Risk of COVID-19 in health-care workers in Denmark: an observational  
22 cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020 Dec 1;20(12):1401–8.
- 23 7. Dzinamarira T, Murewanhema G, Mhango M, Iradukunda PG, Chitungo I, Mashora  
24 M, et al. COVID-19 Prevalence among Healthcare Workers. A Systematic Review  
25 and Meta-Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021 Dec 23;19(1):146.
- 26 8. Bandyopadhyay S, Baticulon RE, Kadhun M, Alser M, Ojuka DK, Badereddin Y,  
27 et al. Infection and mortality of healthcare workers worldwide from COVID-19: a  
28 systematic review. *BMJ Global Health*. 2020 Dec 1;5(12):e003097.
- 29 9. Chou R, Dana T, Buckley DI, Selph S, Fu R, Totten AM. Epidemiology of and Risk  
30 Factors for Coronavirus Infection in Health Care Workers. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020  
31 Jul 21;173(2):120–36.
- 32 10. Gómez-Ochoa SA, Franco OH, Rojas LZ, Raguindin PF, Roa-Díaz ZM,  
33 Wyssmann BM, et al. COVID-19 in Healthcare Workers: A Living Systematic  
34 Review and Meta-analysis of Prevalence, Risk Factors, Clinical Characteristics,  
35 and Outcomes. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2020 Sep 1;kwaa191.
- 36 11. Chou R, Dana T, Buckley DI, Selph S, Fu R, Totten AM. Update Alert 10:  
37 Epidemiology of and Risk Factors for Coronavirus Infection in Health Care  
38 Workers. *Ann Intern Med*. 2022 Jan 18;175(1):W8–9.

- 1 12. Gholami M, Fawad I, Shadan S, Rowaiee R, Ghanem H, Hassan Khamis A, et  
2 al. COVID-19 and healthcare workers: A systematic review and meta-analysis.  
3 International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2021 Mar 1;104:335–46.
- 4 13. Shah ASV, Wood R, Gribben C, Caldwell D, Bishop J, Weir A, et al. Risk of  
5 hospital admission with coronavirus disease 2019 in healthcare workers and their  
6 households: nationwide linkage cohort study. BMJ. 2020 Oct 28;371:m3582.
- 7 14. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, Joshi AD, Guo CG, Ma W, et al. Risk of  
8 COVID-19 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a  
9 prospective cohort study. The Lancet Public Health. 2020 Sep 1;5(9):e475–83.
- 10 15. Shields A, Faustini SE, Perez-Toledo M, Jossi S, Aldera E, Allen JD, et al. SARS-  
11 CoV-2 seroprevalence and asymptomatic viral carriage in healthcare workers: a  
12 cross-sectional study. Thorax. 2020 Dec 1;75(12):1089–94.
- 13 16. Liu J, Ouyang L, Yang D, Han X, Cao Y, Alwalid O, et al. Epidemiological, Clinical,  
14 Radiological Characteristics and Outcomes of Medical Staff with COVID-19 in  
15 Wuhan, China: Analysis of 101 Cases. Int J Med Sci. 2021 Jan 29;18(6):1492–  
16 501.
- 17 17. Sabetian G, Moghadami M, Hashemizadeh Fard Haghighi L, Shahriarirad R,  
18 Fallahi MJ, Asmari N, et al. COVID-19 infection among healthcare workers: a  
19 cross-sectional study in southwest Iran. Virol J. 2021 Mar 17;18(1):58.
- 20 18. Alajmi J, Jeremijenko AM, Abraham JC, Alishaq M, Concepcion EG, Butt AA, et  
21 al. COVID-19 infection among healthcare workers in a national healthcare  
22 system: The Qatar experience. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2020  
23 Nov 1;100:386–9.
- 24 19. Al Abri ZGH, Al Zeedi MASA, Al Lawati AA. Risk Factors Associated with COVID-  
25 19 Infected Healthcare Workers in Muscat Governorate, Oman. J Prim Care  
26 Community Health. 2021 Jan 1;12:2150132721995454.
- 27 20. Correia RF, Costa ACC da, Moore DCBC, Junior SCG, Oliveira MPC de, Zuma  
28 MCC, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and social inequalities in different  
29 subgroups of healthcare workers in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The Lancet Regional  
30 Health – Americas [Internet]. 2022 Mar 1 [cited 2022 Feb 15];7. Available from:  
31 [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanam/article/PIIS2667-193X\(21\)00166-  
32 6/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanam/article/PIIS2667-193X(21)00166-6/fulltext)
- 33 21. Oliveira MS de, Lobo RD, Detta FP, Vieira-Junior JM, Castro TL de S, Zambelli  
34 DB, et al. SARS-Cov-2 seroprevalence and risk factors among health care  
35 workers: Estimating the risk of COVID-19 dedicated units. American Journal of  
36 Infection Control. 2021 Sep 1;49(9):1197–9.
- 37 22. Buonafine CP, Paiatto BNM, Leal FB, de Matos SF, de Moraes CO, Guerra GG,  
38 et al. High prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection among symptomatic healthcare

- 1 workers in a large university tertiary hospital in São Paulo, Brazil. *BMC Infectious*  
2 *Diseases*. 2020 Dec 2;20(1):917.
- 3 23. Ritchie H, Mathieu E, Rodés-Guirao L, Appel C, Giattino C, Ortiz-Ospina E, et al.  
4 Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). *Our World in Data* [Internet]. 2020 Mar 5  
5 [cited 2022 Mar 9]; Available from: [https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus-source-](https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus-source-data)  
6 [data](https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus-source-data)
- 7 24. UKRI. How is the current crisis reshaping Brazil's health system? Strengthening  
8 health workforce and provision of services in São Paulo and Maranhão [Internet].  
9 UKRI gateway to publicly funded research and innovation. 2018 [cited 2022 Mar  
10 9]. Available from:  
11 [https://gtr.ukri.org/projects?ref=MR%2FR022747%2F1&pn=0&fetchSize=10&se-](https://gtr.ukri.org/projects?ref=MR%2FR022747%2F1&pn=0&fetchSize=10&selectedSortableField=title&selectedSortOrder=ASC)  
12 [lectedSortableField=title&selectedSortOrder=ASC](https://gtr.ukri.org/projects?ref=MR%2FR022747%2F1&pn=0&fetchSize=10&selectedSortableField=title&selectedSortOrder=ASC)
- 13 25. Paim J, Travassos C, Almeida C, Bahia L, Macinko J. The Brazilian health  
14 system: history, advances, and challenges. *The Lancet*. 2011 May  
15 21;377(9779):1778–97.
- 16 26. Andrietta LS, Levi ML, Scheffer MC, Alves MTSS de B e, Oliveira BLCA de,  
17 Russo G. The differential impact of economic recessions on health systems in  
18 middle-income settings: a comparative case study of unequal states in Brazil.  
19 *BMJ Global Health*. 2020 Feb 1;5(2):e002122.
- 20 27. Scheffer MC, Cassenote A, Guilloux AGA, Guerra A, Miotto BA. Demografia  
21 médica no Brasil 2020 [Internet]. São Paulo (BRA): Faculdade de Medicina USP,  
22 Conselho Federal de Medicina; 2021 p. 125. Available from:  
23 [https://www.fm.usp.br/fmusp/conteudo/DemografiaMedica2020\\_9DEZ.pdf](https://www.fm.usp.br/fmusp/conteudo/DemografiaMedica2020_9DEZ.pdf)
- 24 28. CONASS. PAINEL CONASS | COVID-19 [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Mar 14].  
25 Available from: <https://www.conass.org.br/painelconasscovid19/>
- 26 29. Burgess S, CRP CHD Genetics Collaboration. Identifying the odds ratio estimated  
27 by a two-stage instrumental variable analysis with a logistic regression model.  
28 *Stat Med*. 2013 Nov 30;32(27):4726–47.
- 29 30. Hamaker EL, Hattum P van, Kuiper RM, Hoijtink H. Model Selection Based on  
30 Information Criteria in Multilevel Modeling. In: *Handbook of Advanced Multilevel*  
31 *Analysis*. Routledge; 2010.
- 32 31. Park S, Lake ET. Multilevel modeling of a clustered continuous outcome: nurses'  
33 work hours and burnout. *Nurs Res*. 2005 Dec;54(6):406–13.
- 34 32. R Core Team — European Environment Agency. R: A language and environment  
35 for statistical computing [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2022 Mar 9]. Available from:  
36 [https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/oxygen-consuming-](https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/oxygen-consuming-substances-in-rivers/r-development-core-team-2006)  
37 [substances-in-rivers/r-development-core-team-2006](https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/oxygen-consuming-substances-in-rivers/r-development-core-team-2006)

- 1 33. Althubaiti A. Information bias in health research: definition, pitfalls, and  
2 adjustment methods. *J Multidiscip Healthc*. 2016 May 4;9:211–7.
- 3 34. Russo G, Levi ML, de Britto e Alves MTSS, de Oliveira BLCA, de Souza Britto  
4 Ferreira de Carvalho RH, Andrietta LS, et al. How the ‘plates’ of a health system  
5 can shift, change and adjust during economic recessions. A qualitative interview  
6 study of public and private health providers in Brazil’s São Paulo and Maranhão  
7 states [Internet]. *SocArXiv*; 2020 Jul [cited 2020 Jul 14]. Available from:  
8 <https://osf.io/qtgux>
- 9 35. Blanchet K, Alwan A, Antoine C, Cros MJ, Feroz F, Guracha TA, et al. Protecting  
10 essential health services in low-income and middle-income countries and  
11 humanitarian settings while responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. *BMJ Global  
12 Health*. 2020 Oct 1;5(10):e003675.
- 13 36. Ho FK, Petermann-Rocha F, Gray SR, Jani BD, Katikireddi SV, Niedzwiedz CL,  
14 et al. Is older age associated with COVID-19 mortality in the absence of other risk  
15 factors? General population cohort study of 470,034 participants. *PLOS ONE*.  
16 2020 Nov 5;15(11):e0241824.
- 17 37. Scheffer MC, Pastor-Valero M, Cassenote AJF, Compañ Rosique AF. How many  
18 and which physicians? A comparative study of the evolution of the supply of  
19 physicians and specialist training in Brazil and Spain. *Hum Resour Health*. 2020  
20 Apr 21;18(1):30.
- 21 38. Sodr  F. Epidemia de Covid-19: quest es cr ticas para a gest o da sa de p blica  
22 no Brasil. *Trab educ sa de* [Internet]. 2020 Aug 28 [cited 2022 Mar 11];18.  
23 Available from:  
24 <http://www.scielo.br/j/tes/a/YtCRHxTywqWm4SChBHvqPBB/?lang=pt>
- 25 39. In cio AM. Covid-19. M dicos com mais de 60 anos s o grupo de risco. Devem  
26 ou n o ser poupados? [Internet]. [cited 2022 Mar 31]. Available from:  
27 [https://www.dn.pt/pais/covid-19-medicos-com-mais-de-60-anos-sao-grupo-de-  
28 risco-devem-ou-nao-ser-poupados-11962500.html](https://www.dn.pt/pais/covid-19-medicos-com-mais-de-60-anos-sao-grupo-de-risco-devem-ou-nao-ser-poupados-11962500.html)
- 29 40. Scheffler RM. The labour market for human resources for health in low- and  
30 middle-income countries. Geneva; 12 p.
- 31 41. McPake B, Scott A, Edeka I. *Analyzing Markets for Health Workers: Insights from  
32 Labor and Health Economics*. World Bank Publications; 2014. 99 p.
- 33 42. Econ mico B. STF libera pejetiza o de m dicos e especialistas alertam para  
34 riscos [Internet]. *iG*. 2022 [cited 2022 Mar 24]. Available from:  
35 [https://economia.ig.com.br/2022-02-18/stf-libera-pejetizacao-de-medicos-e-  
36 especialistas-alertam-para-riscos.html](https://economia.ig.com.br/2022-02-18/stf-libera-pejetizacao-de-medicos-e-especialistas-alertam-para-riscos.html)
- 37 43. ILO. *Inequalities and the world of work* [Internet]. Geneva, Switzerland:  
38 International Labour Organization; 2021 [cited 2022 Mar 24]. Report No.: ISBN  
39 978-92-2-034165-0. Available from:

- 1 [http://www.ilo.org/ilc/ILCSessions/109/reports/reports-to-the-](http://www.ilo.org/ilc/ILCSessions/109/reports/reports-to-the-conference/WCMS_792123/lang--en/index.htm)  
2 [conference/WCMS\\_792123/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/ilc/ILCSessions/109/reports/reports-to-the-conference/WCMS_792123/lang--en/index.htm)
- 3 44. Russo G, Jesus TS, Deane K, Osman AY, McCoy D. Epidemics, Lockdown  
4 Measures and Vulnerable Populations: A Mixed-Methods Systematic Review of  
5 the Evidence of Impacts on Mother and Child Health in Low-And- Lower Middle-  
6 Income Countries. *Int J Health Policy Manag.* 2021;1.
- 7 45. Haldane V, De Foo C, Abdalla SM, Jung AS, Tan M, Wu S, et al. Health systems  
8 resilience in managing the COVID-19 pandemic: lessons from 28 countries. *Nat*  
9 *Med.* 2021 Jun;27(6):964–80.
- 10 46. Tessema GA, Kinfu Y, Dachew BA, Tesema AG, Assefa Y, Alene KA, et al. The  
11 COVID-19 pandemic and healthcare systems in Africa: a scoping review of  
12 preparedness, impact and response. *BMJ Global Health.* 2021 Dec  
13 1;6(12):e007179.
- 14 47. Dal Poz MR, Levcovitz E, Bahia L. Brazil’s Fight Against COVID-19. *Am J Public*  
15 *Health.* 2021 Mar;111(3):390–1.
- 16 48. Miotto BA, Guilloux AGA, Cassenote AJF, Mainardi GM, Russo G, Scheffer MC.  
17 Physician’s sociodemographic profile and distribution across public and private  
18 health care: an insight into physicians’ dual practice in Brazil. *BMC Health*  
19 *Services Research.* 2018 Apr 23;18:299.
- 20 49. Mcpake B, Squires AP, Mahat A, Araujo EC. The economics of health  
21 professional education and careers : insights from a literature review [Internet].  
22 The World Bank; 2015 Sep [cited 2018 Feb 5] p. 1–89. Report No.: 99535.  
23 Available from:  
24 [http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/570681468190783192/The-](http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/570681468190783192/The-economics-of-health-professional-education-and-careers-insights-from-a-literature-review)  
25 [economics-of-health-professional-education-and-careers-insights-from-a-](http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/570681468190783192/The-economics-of-health-professional-education-and-careers-insights-from-a-literature-review)  
26 [literature-review](http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/570681468190783192/The-economics-of-health-professional-education-and-careers-insights-from-a-literature-review)

27

28



1 **SUPPORTING INFORMATION CAPTIONS**


2

3 Supporting information 1: Sampling equations for replacement

4 Supporting information 2: Survey questionnaire

5 Supporting information 3: Maranhão and São Paulo regression models

**Figure 1: Physician infection rates in the sample locations**



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.27.22275696>; this version posted May 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).