

1 **Assessing the impact of the Gamma variant on**
2 **COVID-19 Patient admissions in a Southern Brazilian**
3 **tertiary hospital - A comparison of dual pandemic**
4 **phases**

5
6 Natalia R Domino^{1¶}, Bruna A Lapinski^{2¶}, Felipe Zhen¹, Guilherme Yamaguto¹,
7 Emanueli C S Costa¹, Vitor L Moriya¹, Luciane A Pereira³, Ricardo Petterle⁴, Meri B
8 Nogueira³, Sonia M Raboni^{1,4*}

9 ¹ Infectious Diseases Division, Hospital de Clínicas, Universidade Federal do Paraná,
10 Curitiba, Brazil

11
12 ² Microorganisms Research and Molecular Biology Laboratory, Universidade Federal do
13 Paraná, Curitiba, Brazil

14
15 ³ Virology Laboratory, Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, Brazil

16
17 ⁴ Department of Integrative Medicine, Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, Brazil
18

19
20 * **Corresponding author**

21 E-mail: sraboni@ufpr.br (SMR)

22 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.
23

24 **Funding:** This study did not receive any funding
25

26 **Abstract**

27 Since the first case of COVID-19, Brazil has undergone infection waves with distinct
28 characteristics. The description of new variants has alerted the emergence of more
29 contagious or virulent viruses. The variant of concern Gamma emerged in Brazil and
30 caused an epidemic wave, but its spread outside the country was limited. We report the
31 clinical-epidemiological profile of hospitalized patients with COVID-19 by comparing two
32 periods. A retrospective cohort study was performed. The primary outcome was to assess
33 individuals with COVID-19 admitted in wards and intensive care units at CHC-UFPR
34 between March 2020 and July 2021, correlating demographic, clinical-epidemiologic, and
35 survival data with the most prevalent viral variant found in each period. We used
36 Kaplan-Meier analysis to estimate the probability of survival and receiver operating
37 characteristic curves to evaluate laboratory tests to find a cutoff point for poor outcomes.
38 Data from 2,887 individuals were analyzed, 1,495 and 1,392 from the first and second
39 periods, respectively. Hospitalization predominated among males in both periods, and the
40 median age was significantly lower in the second one. The frequency of comorbidities was
41 similar. Various demographic factors, clinical assessments, and laboratory tests were
42 examined in relation to greater severity. When comparing the two studied periods, we
43 observed predominance of the Wild virus during the first wave and the Gamma variant
44 during the second, with no significant difference in outcomes. The findings suggest that
45 despite the association of many factors with increased severity, the temporal variation
46 between the two periods did not result in a notable divergence in the measured outcomes.
47 The COVID-19 pandemic has lasted for a long time, with periods marked by peaks of
48 cases, often caused by the emergence of viral variants, resulting in higher infection rates
49 and rapid dissemination but, for variant Gamma, no apparent greater virulence.

50 **Background**

51 The COVID-19 pandemic caused by the new coronavirus (*Severe Acute*
52 *Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 - SARS-CoV-2*) has been one of this century's most
53 significant global health challenges. It was responsible for approximately 760 million cases
54 and more than 6.8 million deaths worldwide until March 2023. [1] With the United States
55 leading the number of cases and Brazil ranking sixth, the American continent is the second
56 most affected by the pandemic. [1]

57 Similar to other countries, Brazil has had fluctuations in the number of cases and
58 fatalities since the first documented COVID-19 case in February 2020. Although the
59 pandemic has reached virtually every country, it has not occurred equally worldwide. In
60 some countries, the waves were shorter and more intense than in other countries. For
61 instance, Brazil was still in the second wave, whereas Iran was affected by four waves
62 until March 2021. [2] The population's susceptibility, restriction measures, health services
63 responses, and SARS-CoV-2 transmission rate were influential in determining the
64 occurrence and severity of the waves. [3]

65 Late in 2020, Brazil experienced a new rise in hospital admissions. Concurrently,
66 the description of new variants of interest (VoI) and variants of concern (VoC) raised the
67 hypothesis that a more contagious or virulent variant could explain the increase in number
68 of cases. [4] The B.1.195 SARS-CoV-2 strain was introduced in Brazil at the beginning of
69 the pandemic and was soon replaced by variant B.1.1.28. [5] Variant of concern Gamma
70 was first detected in four Japanese travellers who returned from Brazil in early 2021, [6]
71 and became more prevalent as the second wave progressed. When the Gamma variant
72 first emerged in northern Brazil, it was associated with mutations that increased viral load
73 and transmissibility, and it took less than three months for it to become dominant. [4]

74 Any individual can be affected by COVID-19, and up to 20% of those who are
75 symptomatic may progress to severe disease. Older adults and individuals with chronic
76 diseases are the most vulnerable to present severe and critical disease. [7–9] As a result,

77 they were the most prevalent group in terms of hospitalizations during the first wave. [8–
78 10] In the second wave, an increase in hospitalization among young and not chronically ill
79 individuals raised the hypothesis of a shift in the characteristics of patients requiring
80 hospitalization. [11] Thus, the present study aimed to examine the clinical and
81 epidemiological characteristics of individuals hospitalized with COVID-19 during two
82 pandemic periods caused by distinct VOC of the SARS-CoV-2 in a tertiary referral hospital
83 in southern Brazil.

84 **Material and methods**

85 **Study design**

86 A retrospective cohort study was conducted at Complexo Hospital de
87 Clínicas/Universidade Federal do Paraná (CHC-UFPR), a tertiary academic hospital in
88 Paraná, southern Brazil. The study has received approval from the Ethics Committee for
89 Human Research of the Complexo Hospital de Clínicas da Universidade Federal do
90 Paraná (#n 51400121.9.0000.0096). The data collection was conducted after obtaining
91 ethical approval from the committee on September 14, 2021, continuing until August 31,
92 2022. Subsequent to data inclusion in the database, all participants were assigned unique
93 numerical identifiers to ensure their complete anonymity and to safeguard their identities
94 from all subjects involved. Due to its retrospective nature, the informed consent was
95 waived.

96 The study was conducted with a convenience sampling of patients hospitalized in
97 respiratory units at CHC-UFPR suspected of COVID-19 disease and patients in other
98 critical units identified with B34.2 ICD 10 (infection by SARS-CoV-2 of unspecified location)
99 between March 11th, 2020 and August 1st, 2021. The inclusion criteria were patients with
100 confirmed or probable COVID-19 disease. The exclusion criteria were patients under the
101 age of 18, those who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 infection due to elective inpatient

102 care, those whose symptoms were attributed to other causes, and patients with missing
103 data.

104 Clinical and epidemiological characteristics of patients hospitalized due to COVID-
105 19 at two different epidemiological moments of the pandemic were compared. The first
106 moment comprised the period between March 11th, 2020 and February 16th, 2021, and the
107 second comprised the period between February 17th, 2021 and August 1st, 2021. The
108 cutoff date was chosen because the first COVID-19 infection in Curitiba by the Gamma
109 variant was confirmed on February 17th, 2021.

110 Subsequently, clinical and epidemiological characteristics were assessed to identify
111 risk factors associated with the progression to critical illness and trace survival curve
112 comparisons between the first and second periods.

113 Data collection

114 Epidemiological, clinical, and outcome data were collected based on a standard
115 notification form for severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) from the Influenza
116 Epidemiological Surveillance Information System (SIVEP Influenza), a national database
117 used to monitor cases of respiratory infections. Chest computed tomography (CT) data
118 and other relevant clinical information were obtained through the Hospital's Computerized
119 System.

120 Definitions

121 The COVID-19 case was classified as confirmed, probable, or discarded, as
122 presented in Table 1.

123 **Table 1. COVID-19 classification criteria.**

Classification	Criteria
Confirmed case	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR positive or,- SARS-CoV-2 antigen test positive or,- IgM reagent for SARS-CoV-2 and chest computed tomography (CT) with typical COVID-19 findings and COVID-19 clinical features.

Probable case	- IgM reagent for SARS-CoV-2 and chest computed tomography (CT) or, - IgM reagent for SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19 clinical features.
Discarded	Do not meet any of the above-mentioned criteria.

124 RT-PCR = Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction

125

126

127 The presence of two symptoms of fever, cough, dyspnea, and desaturation was
128 considered clinically compatible with COVID-19. Findings consistent with SARS-CoV-2
129 infection identified on chest CT included ground-glass consolidations, predominantly
130 peripheral, and involvement of multiple lobes. All CT scans were analyzed and interpreted
131 by a radiologist, and the request for the exam was the assistant physician's decision. For
132 the evaluation, only the first laboratory exams performed at the patient's admission (or, in
133 the case of nosocomial infection, those closest to the date of onset of symptoms) were
134 considered.

135 A Clinical Progression Scale was used to classify the disease severity. The score
136 ranges from 0 to 10, and the parameters include level of medical assistance (outpatient,
137 ward, or intensive care unit) and oxygen supplementation (no need for oxygen
138 supplementation, nasal catheter supplementation, high-flow nasal cannula, non-invasive
139 ventilation, or orotracheal intubation). Scores 4 and 5 were classified as moderate, and
140 scores above 6 were classified as severe disease. [12] The Charlson Comorbidity Index
141 (CCI) was used to categorize the studied sample according to the comorbidities. [13]

142 **Virus genotyping**

143 Virus genotyping was performed on clinical samples from patients included in the
144 study who had a quantification cycle (Cq) value <35 on the SARS-COV-2 RT-qPCR
145 diagnostic.

146 The viral RNA was isolated from the clinical sample using the Extracta 32
147 automated extraction system with the EXTRACTA DNA and viral RNA kit (Loccus, SP,
148 Brazil) according to the manufacturer's guidelines.

149 We used two probe-based genotyping systems to characterize SARS-CoV-2
150 variants. The first identified Alpha, Beta or Gamma, and Wild type. The second one
151 determined the Delta variant and differentiated Beta from Wild-type, Gamma, and Zeta.
152 RT-qPCR reaction was performed in the GoTaq™ Probe 1-step RT-PCR system (Promega
153 Bio Sciences, LLC. San Luis Obispo, CA, USA) according to the manufacturer's
154 guidelines, with an input of 2.5uL RNA in a total reaction volume of 10uL. [14]

155 **Data analysis**

156 Statistical analyses were performed using the R Studio software, version 3.6.1. A
157 descriptive analysis showed the clinical, epidemiological, laboratory, and molecular
158 features. Data from quantitative variables were presented as medians and interquartile
159 range (IQR). Univariate analysis was performed using Fisher's exact and Chi-squared
160 tests for categorical variables. Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis rank sum tests with
161 Tukey's multiple post hoc comparisons were used for continuous variables, as appropriate.
162 We used Kaplan-Meier analysis to estimate the probability of survival and log-rank testing
163 for between-group comparison. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were built
164 to evaluate laboratory tests to find a cutoff point for poor outcomes. To evaluate risk factors
165 associated with the outcomes, adjusted OR (aOR) was calculated using the multivariate
166 model with a stepwise selection of variables, with a cut-off point of $p < 0.2$. All statistical
167 tests were two-sided, with significance set at $p < 0.05$. A confidence interval (CI) of 95%
168 was used to adjust the estimates.

169 **Results**

170 A total of 4,546 individuals over the age of 18 were hospitalized in COVID-19
171 settings from March 11th, 2020 to August 1st 2021 (Figure 1). The first wave was from
172 March 11th, 2020 to February 16th, 2021 (a total of 343 days), and the second wave from
173 February 17th, 2021 to August 1st 2021 (165 days).

174

175 **Fig 1. Flow-chart of study design.**

176

177 Figure 2 shows the dynamics in the number of cases for the city of Curitiba, PR,
178 (Brazil), the hospitalizations at CHC-UFPR, and the viral variant detection in the region
179 over the same time period. As observed, Wild virus and Gamma variant predominated in
180 the first and second studied periods, respectively.

181

182 **Fig 2. Temporal distribution of COVID-19 cases in Curitiba (Brazil), hospital admissions, and viral**
183 **genotype.**

184

185 **Clinical and demographic characteristics of the study** 186 **population**

187 The overall median age was 56 years (IQR 44-66), with a predominance of men
188 (53.6%) and white race (89.6%). Overall, 2,359 (81.7%) patients reported having prior
189 diseases, the median Charlson Comorbidity Index score was 2 points (IQR 1-4).
190 Cardiovascular diseases were the most common comorbidities (46.1%), followed by type 2
191 diabetes (25.8%) and obesity (17.9%). The median time of symptom onset was 9 days
192 (IQR, 6-12) before hospitalization. The median time of hospitalization and mechanical
193 ventilation were 7 (IQR 4-16) and 8 (IQR 4-17) days, respectively. Regarding disease
194 severity, 1,109 (38.4%) individuals had severe disease, while 1,093 (37.9%) were admitted

195 to critical units; 641 (22.2%) patients died during hospitalization, while 77.8% were
196 discharged.

197 **Comparison of clinical and demographic data between the first** 198 **and second waves**

199 Comparative analysis showed a predominance of men in both waves, 54% in the
200 first and 53.2% in the second. There was a significant reduction in median age in the
201 second wave (52 years, IQR 42-63) compared to the first (59 years, IQR 47-68 years),
202 $p < 0.001$. The Wild strain was more prevalent in the first wave (78%), while Gamma variant
203 was more prevalent in the second wave (95.3%).

204 Table 2 summarizes the clinical and demographic characteristics of participants
205 included in the study, divided by pandemic waves. The frequency of comorbidities was
206 similar in both periods. In the second wave, there was a lower prevalence of
207 cardiovascular disease (42.2% versus 49.7% in the first wave, $p < 0.001$) and type 2
208 Diabetes Mellitus (22.4% versus 28.9% in the first wave, $p < 0.001$). There were more
209 hospitalizations among obese individuals in the second wave compared to the first (23%
210 versus 13.2%, respectively; $p < 0.001$). Further, the Charlson Comorbidity Index median
211 score in the first wave was 3 (IQR 1-4), while in the second wave was 2 (IQR 0-4),
212 $p < 0.001$.

213 **Table 2. Baseline characteristics by pandemic wave of individuals hospitalized at Complexo Hospital**
214 **de Clínicas UFPR, from March 11th, 2020 to August 1st, 2021.**

	First pandemic wave n (%)	Second pandemic wave n (%)	p value
Median age (in years)	59 (IQR 47-68)	52 (IQR 42-63)	<0.001
Sex			
Female	687 (46)	652 (46.8)	0.6602
Male	808 (54)	740 (53.2)	
Race (n)			0.0022

White	1285 (87.9)	1264 (90.8)	
Non-white	177 (12.1)	118 (8.7)	
<hr/>			
Genotype (n)	369	169	
Wild	288 (78.1)	2 (1.2)	
Zeta	52 (14.1)	5 (2.9)	<0.001
Gamma	27 (7.3)	161 (95.3)	
Alpha	2 (0.5)	1 (0.6)	
<hr/>			
Comorbidities			
Cardiovascular diseases	743 (49.7)	588 (42.2)	<0.001
Hematological diseases	27 (1.8)	21 (1.5)	0.632
Liver diseases	37 (2.5)	26 (1.9)	0.323
Asthma	59 (3.9)	60 (4.3)	0.691
Type-2 diabetes	432 (28.9)	312 (22.4)	<0.001
Neurological diseases	88 (5.9)	66 (4.7)	0.199
Lung diseases	116 (7.8)	54 (3.9)	<0.001
Immune diseases	52 (3.5)	32 (2.3)	0.076
Kidney diseases	73 (4.9)	41 (2.9)	0.011
Obesity	197 (13.2)	320 (23)	<0.001
<hr/>			
Respiratory support			
None	117 (7.8)	66 (4.7)	
Non invasive	820 (54.8)	840 (60.3)	<0.001
Invasive	558 (37.3)	486 (34.9)	
<hr/>			
Disease severity			
Mild	927 (62)	851 (61.1)	0.658
Severe	568 (38)	541 (38.9)	
<hr/>			
Outcome			
Discharge	1170 (78.3)	1076 (77.3)	0.564
Death	325 (21.7)	316 (22.7)	

216

217 There was no significant difference in the frequency of reported symptoms between
218 the waves, and the most common symptoms were desaturation (78.9% in the first wave
219 and 94.1% in the second), dyspnea (80.8% and 80.5%), and cough (62.2% and 58.8%),
220 as shown in Figure 3.

221

222 **Fig 3. Comparison between the frequency of the reported symptoms at the time of hospital**
223 **admission during the first and second pandemic waves.**

224

225 In the first pandemic wave, the median time from the onset of symptoms to hospital
226 admission was 8 days (IQR 5-11), while in the second wave, it was 10 days (IQR 8-12);
227 $p<0.001$. The length of hospitalization was similar, 8 days (IQR 4-16) and 7 days (IQR
228 4-16) in the first and second waves, respectively; $p=0.684$. The length of intensive care
229 unit (ICU) stay was 9 days (IQR 4-18) in the first wave and 10 days (IQR 4-21) in the
230 second wave, $p=0.257$, and the median time on mechanical ventilation was 7 (IQR 3-15)
231 and 10 (IQR 5-21) days in the first and second waves, respectively, $p<0.001$. The median
232 time from the onset of symptoms to orotracheal intubation was 8 (IQR 5-12) and 10 (IQR
233 8-13) days in the first and second waves, respectively, $p<0.001$. The proportion of patients
234 that did not require oxygen support was higher in the first (7.8%) than in the second wave
235 (4.7%); $p<0.001$. Regarding disease severity, there was no difference between the two
236 pandemic waves, and the proportion of patients admitted to the ICU was 40.3% in the first
237 wave and 35.3% in the second. Similarly, no significant difference was observed in in-
238 hospital fatality rate in both waves (21.7% in the first wave versus 22.7 in the second;
239 $p=0.5642$). In the second wave, there was an increase in hospitalizations of individuals
240 aged 31 to 40 and 51 to 60 years with severe illness, both with $p < 0.05$ when comparing
241 the severity of the disease across age groups. Additionally, during the first wave, a higher

242 severity of illness was observed among age groups between 61 and 70 years, between 71
243 and 80 years, and those aged over 80 years, all with $p < 0.05$.

244 Overall, 78.6% of the laboratory samples were collected within 48 hours after
245 admission. Patients admitted during the second wave had significantly higher inflammatory
246 test values. Table 3 summarizes the laboratory results.

247 **Table 3. Laboratory test results of individuals hospitalized at CHC-UFPR from March 11th, 2020 to**
248 **August 1st, 2021.**

Laboratory results	First pandemic wave Median (IQR)	Second pandemic wave Median (IQR)	p value
Lymphocytes count (NR 0,8-4,9x10 ³ /uL)	1310.29 (569.25-1326)	980.59 (519.5-1198.5)	<0.001
Total bilirubin (NR <1.2mg/dL)	0.44 (0.33-0.64)	0.46 (0.32-0.64)	0.8884
Creatinine (NR 0.72-1.25mg/dL)	0.86 (0.74-1.18)	0.80 (0.70-1.04)	<0.001
Aspartate aminotransferase (NR 5-34 U/L)	37 (25-57)	41 (28-65)	<0.001
Alanine aminotransferase (NR 0-55 U/L)	39 (23-63)	44 (28-75)	<0.001
DHL (NR 125-220 U/L)	383 (289-503)	423 (328-559.5)	<0.001
Ferritin (NR 4.63-204 ng/mL)	1079.26 (478-2023.49)	1246.36 (620.34-2487.88)	<0.001
CRP (NR ≤0.5 mg/dL)	7.29 (3.26-13.73)	9.51 (4.67-16)	<0.001
Procalcitonin (NR<0.5 ng/mL)	0.21 (0.08-0.72)	0.16 (0.07-0.6)	0.128
D-dimer (NR <0.55 mg/L)	1.06 (0.56-2.4)	1.06 (0.59-2.61)	0.453

249 NR = normal range. CRP = c-reactive protein. DHL = lactate dehydrogenase

250

251

252 **Disease Severity Analysis**

253 Univariate analysis of factors related to disease severity shows a higher median age
254 in patients with severe disease compared to those with moderate disease (59 versus 53

255 years, respectively; $p < 0.001$). Male sex was also significantly related to severe disease,
256 $p = 0.004$. The Charlson Comorbidity Index score was higher in the severe disease group,
257 with 3 points versus 2 points in the moderate disease group, $p < 0.001$. Hospitalization
258 length was longer in patients with severe disease (15 days; IQR 9-26) compared to those
259 with moderate disease (5 days; IQR 3- 9), $p < 0.001$. Similar findings were observed for the
260 length of ICU stay (10 days [IQR 4-20] in severe disease versus 4 days [IQR 2-6] in
261 moderate disease; $p < 0.001$). Higher values of ferritin (median 1549ng/mL [IQR 682.5-
262 2885.75ng/ml]; $p < 0.001$) and c-reactive protein (CRP) (median 12.2mg/dL [IQR 6.46-
263 16ng/ml]; $p < 0.001$) were also associated with severe disease.

264 Table 4 shows the multivariate analysis of factors associated with disease severity.
265 Age, sex, and obesity remained independent risk factors for severe disease.

266 **Table 4. Multivariate analysis of predictors associated with disease severity.**

Variables	Odds ratio	CI (95%)	p value
Age	1.01	1-1.02	0.044
Male	1.23	1.03-1.46	0.021
Charlson Comorbidity index score	1.11	1.03-1.2	0.005
Fever	1.22	1.03-1.46	0.025
Neurologic disease	1.68	1.09-2.6	0.020
Obesity	2.14	1.71-2.68	<0.001
Length of hospital stay	1.10	1.09-1.11	<0.001

267 Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval.

268

269

270 Outcome Analysis

271 Patients discharged were significantly younger and more likely to be female
272 compared to those who died (median 53 years versus 65 years, $p < 0.001$; and $p = 0.0032$
273 for sex), but no differences were observed for race. Mortality was more frequent among
274 patients with higher Charlson Comorbidity Index scores, and among those with kidney and

275 cardiovascular diseases. Although obesity was a risk factor for disease severity, no
276 significant difference was observed in the fatality rate. Also, no differences in outcomes
277 were found when the genotypes were compared. Furthermore, patients who died were
278 admitted significantly earlier to the hospital, and the median time between hospital
279 admission and the outcome was longer.

280 In the multivariate analysis, age, male sex (OR 1.3, CI 1.03-1.63, $p=0.024$), disease
281 severity classification (OR 5.04, CI 2.19-10.52, $p<0.001$) and need of invasive ventilatory
282 support (OR 5.64, CI 2.81-12.65, $p<0.001$) remained as independent risk factors for death.

283 Comparing the laboratory tests, patients who died had more pronounced
284 lymphopenia and higher values of lactate dehydrogenase (DHL), ferritin, CRP, and d-dimer
285 compared to those who survived. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were
286 built to analyze laboratory tests in order to determine a cutoff point for poor outcomes. A
287 value of 10.28mg/L for CRP revealed a sensitivity and specificity for worst outcomes of
288 61.3% and 62.9%, respectively (area under the curve [AUC]=0.655, 95% CI 0.628-0.681).
289 Creatinine exhibited a statistically significant difference in the outcome despite being
290 somewhat over the reference value, with a median of 1.92mg/dL for patients who died.
291 Moreover, values above 1.05mg/dL demonstrated 80.1% specificity but only 57.1%
292 sensitivity for adverse outcomes (AUC = 0.717, 95% CI 0.690-0.745). Age \geq 58.5 years,
293 Charlson Comorbidity Index score \geq 2.5, ferritin levels \geq 369.35ng/mL, DHL level \geq
294 432.5U/L, and D-dimer levels \geq 1.25mg/L were related to poor outcomes (AUC values of
295 0.708, 0.696, 0.613, 0.685, and 0.678, respectively) (supplementary material).

296 Figure 4 shows a comparison of survival rates for the first and second waves, and
297 no significant differences were found.

298

299 **Fig 4. Kaplan-Meier survival analysis of patients admitted at CHC-UFPR comparing the first and**
300 **second pandemic waves.**

301

302 At the end of the year 2020, there was an increase in the number of cases. It
303 occurred at a point in time when the learning curve for managing the disease had already
304 become better established, alongside the implementation of corticosteroid usage
305 protocols. Taking this into consideration, a comprehensive sub-analysis was conducted to
306 compare the outcomes between two distinct periods: November 1st, 2020, to February
307 16th, 2021, and February 17th, 2021, to August 1st, 2021. Despite the temporal shift, the
308 results revealed that there was no statistically significant difference in outcomes between
309 these two timeframes ($p = 0.2175$). This suggests that the observed results are consistent
310 across both periods, and the temporal variation did not have a substantial impact on the
311 measured outcomes.

312 **DISCUSSION**

313 The COVID-19 pandemic has had a profound impact on health services and also on
314 socio-economic aspects worldwide. It is a novel disease caused by an emerging pathogen
315 and has been present for approximately three years. During this period, we faced
316 pandemic waves caused by the emergence of viral variants as a result of persistent viral
317 replication independent of natural, passive, or active immunity. In Brazil, between the first
318 and second pandemic waves, in which Wild virus and Gamma variant prevailed,
319 respectively, frontline health care professionals reported perceiving more severe cases
320 and excessive work overload in the second wave. In this study, seeking to evaluate the
321 impact of these two events, we analyzed data from a single tertiary facility to compare the
322 hospitalizations between the first two waves of the COVID-19 pandemic.

323 Overall, a significant difference was observed in patients' age, who were younger in
324 the second wave compared to the first wave. Despite chronic diseases being more
325 prevalent in the first wave, obesity was significantly more prevalent in the second wave.
326 However, no significant difference was observed in the fatality rate, which was

327 approximately 22%. [8,10,15] Other studies also found a decrease in fatality rate
328 throughout the pandemic. [2]

329 The first reports describing the clinical and epidemiological characteristics of
330 COVID-19 showed high hospitalization rates among men and older adults. [9,16]
331 Subsequent studies showed that advanced age and male sex were associated with more
332 severe disease and the potential need for mechanical ventilation and admission to critical
333 units, regardless of pre-existing comorbidities. [17] A Mexican study showed that being
334 above the age over 65 was associated with a higher risk of hospitalization, especially
335 when obesity was present, [18] and a study from India showed a significant association
336 between advanced age and the risk of progressing to severe and critical disease. [19]
337 Immunosenescence is responsible for changes in the innate and adaptive immune
338 response, and advanced age is naturally related to poor immune responses. Differences in
339 the immune system, sex hormones, physiological factors, and lifestyle have been linked to
340 a higher risk of poor outcomes in men. [20]

341 Regarding comorbidities, a Brazilian population-based study showed that 16% of
342 individuals did not have comorbidities, [8] while an observational study from the United
343 States showed that 84,7% of the patients had at least one comorbidity at admission. [21]
344 Since the median age found in our study was lower than previously reported in the
345 literature and since older people tend to have more comorbidities, these may explain why
346 our study found more patients without comorbidities. Similar to what was previously
347 reported, the median time from symptom onset to hospitalization varied between 6 and 8
348 days. [8,15]

349 The overall fatality rate found in this study was considerably lower than those
350 reported in other studies, which can reach over 40%. [22] A national study conducted in
351 Brazil compared the characteristics of hospitalizations during the pandemic's early months
352 across the country's five macroregions and found a nationwide fatality rate of 38% and

353 31% in the Southern region. [8] Lower fatality rates were observed in studies conducted at
354 later phases of the pandemic, [15] which may suggest a positive learning trend and more
355 readily available physical and professional infrastructure. Adopting health care protocols
356 based on scientific evidence, such as using a high-flow nasal cannula in hospital wards,
357 [23] using corticosteroids and a qualified multidisciplinary health care team contributed to
358 the better results observed in this study.

359 Similar to the findings of an African population-based study, this comparative
360 analysis showed a rise in the median time from the symptom onset to hospital admission
361 in the second wave compared to the first, showing a bed shortage and a healthcare
362 system overload. [24] This hypothesis may be supported by the increase in the median
363 time of mechanical ventilation usage in the second wave without an increase in the length
364 of ICU stay, suggesting a higher turnover of ICU beds to fulfill the demand for this level of
365 care. Furthermore, the lack of beds in critical units may have delayed patients' intubation
366 at the appropriate moment, resulting in more severe cases being intubated and extending
367 the duration of mechanical ventilation.

368 As shown in previous reports, there was a reduction in the median age of
369 hospitalized individuals in the second wave compared to the first wave. [11] A Mexican
370 study compared the first three waves of the pandemic and showed an increase in the risk
371 of hospitalization among young patients throughout the waves, with a significant higher OR
372 in the age group of 25-29 years in the third wave compared to the age group above 45
373 years in the first wave.[2,20] The median age of hospital admissions was reduced by
374 nearly ten years, and there was a 7% increase in hospital admissions among individuals
375 aged 0 to 19. [18,20] Some hypotheses, such as previous infection immunity and
376 vaccination coverage, may explain this finding. In Curitiba, the COVID-19 vaccination
377 began on January, 2021, for older adults, reaching the age group of 65 years in mid-April
378 2021. The role of the Gamma variant is also questioned, but a causal relationship cannot

379 be established. It is possible that, as the variant becomes more transmissible, there has
380 been an increase in cases among the population that has remained vulnerable to infection,
381 such as the economically active population.

382 The proportion of patients with comorbidities in the literature varies by wave and
383 region. Our analysis found an increase in hospitalizations of individuals without
384 comorbidities during the second wave, which is in agreement with an Indian study, but
385 differs from a Spanish cohort that found an increase in ICU admissions among individuals
386 with comorbidities. [19–22,24,25] These contradicting findings might be attributed to
387 socioeconomic factors and challenges with healthcare access, as developing countries
388 face more significant barriers to health care and possibly less diagnosis and control of
389 chronic diseases. The prevalence of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and cardiovascular diseases
390 have both decreased significantly, while the prevalence of obesity has increased and has
391 been associated with more severe disease, but not with mortality.

392 The proportion of patients who did not require oxygen support was lower in the
393 second wave. These findings should be interpreted with caution, since oximeters for
394 monitoring saturation at home were made available as part of the restructuring of the
395 primary healthcare system. Improved assistance in these health units occurred, as did the
396 provision of home oxygen therapy. Furthermore, during the second wave, a more
397 pronounced scarcity of hospital beds was observed, leading to the prioritization of
398 hospitalization for patients with heightened disease severity.

399 In this study, laboratory tests revealed increased inflammatory markers such as
400 CRP, DHL, and ferritin levels in both waves, but they were significantly higher in the
401 second one. Changes in D-dimer levels and lymphopenia were also found. These findings
402 are consistent with previous studies, [20,21] which found that increasing CRP levels by
403 one unit raises the probability of developing severe disease by 0.06%. CRP is more than a
404 marker of inflammation; it is also capable of maintaining the inflammatory response by

405 attracting leukocytes to areas of inflammation and causing the release of pro-inflammatory
406 cytokines. It is reasonable to assume that high levels of CRP are associated with elevated
407 interleukin 6 (IL-6) levels, given that the CRP gene is predominantly activated by IL-6. [20]
408 Elevated serum levels of LDH, a protein present in the cell cytoplasm, may suggest tissue
409 injury or necrosis. According to previous studies, having high levels of LDH may increase
410 the risk of death by approximately four times. [17]

411 In contrast to the second wave's subjective perceptions, [11] there was no increase
412 in the severity of hospitalized cases or the number of deaths. The two waves had no
413 statistically significant difference in disease severity or outcome, and the survival curves
414 were similar. [11,24–26] Several factors might explain these findings, including an increase
415 in the number of beds, the use of high-flow nasal cannulas, and the learning curve in
416 disease management, which was associated with a standardized care protocol, enabling
417 an optimized clinical management throughout the pandemic, resulting in fatality rates lower
418 than previously reported in the country.

419 The first months of the pandemic in Brazil were primarily caused by two strains,
420 B.1.1.28 and B.1.133. The Gamma variant replaced the previous lineages in early 2021
421 and became the main variant in less than three months, [27] as this study also showed.
422 Unlike the first wave, in which the variant spread primarily from densely populated urban
423 areas, the second wave originated in the Amazon, a geographically remote area with
424 difficult access. The Gamma variant was estimated to have an effective higher median
425 reproductive number (R_e) and was 1.56-3.06 times more transmissible than previous non-
426 Gamma variants. [27] While earlier research has indicated elevated likelihoods of
427 hospitalization and admission to ICU among Gamma cases [3, 5, 28–31], it is noteworthy
428 that even though Gamma cases were predominant during the second wave, we did not
429 observe corresponding higher rates of ICU admissions or fatalities in our study. Other
430 studies also found differences in genotype prevalence across waves, including a decrease

431 in fatality rate following the emergence of VOC Alpha. [15] Although the Gamma variant
432 has spread to many countries, it has been identified mainly on the American continent
433 (with 58% of the cases in Brazil and 26% in the USA); [30] therefore, few studies have
434 compared the impact of its introduction in clinical and epidemiological aspects outside of
435 Brazil.

436 In the univariate analysis, age, male sex, fever, neurologic disease, Charlson
437 Comorbidity Index score, obesity, and length of hospital stay were all associated with
438 higher disease severity. These factors remained independent risk factors after the
439 multivariate analysis, as shown in previous studies. [2,17,19,21,22]

440 This study has limitations, mainly due to its retrospective nature, which depends on
441 accurate and comprehensive medical record entries. Moreover, the dynamic evolution of
442 disease understanding and treatment, alongside fluctuations in bed availability to fulfill the
443 demand for hospitalizations, may have an influence on certain outcomes. Additionally, we
444 were unable to conduct a genetic analysis on the entire sample.

445 In conclusion, the COVID-19 pandemic has lasted for a prolonged period, marked
446 by oscillations in cases termed waves. These fluctuations are frequently linked to the
447 emergence of viral variants harboring mutations that enhance viral fitness, replicative
448 capacity, and immune evasion, leading to increased infection rates and rapid spread.
449 Nevertheless, Gamma VoC did not display any apparent greater virulence compared to the
450 Wild strain, and the disease severity remained comparable to previous variants.

451

452

453 **Acknowledgments**

454 The authors would like to sincerely thank the Virology Laboratory of the Hospital de
455 Clínicas at the Federal University of Paraná, the Genetics Department Laboratory of the
456 Federal University of Paraná, and the Respiratory Virus and Measles Laboratory of

457 Fiocruz/RJ for their invaluable support, insightful information exchanges, and significant
458 contributions to this research. Your collaboration has greatly enriched the quality and depth
459 of our work.

460

461

462 **References**

- 463 1. WHO COVID-19 Dashboard. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2020. Available
464 from: <https://covid19.who.int/>.
- 465 2. Amin R, Sohrabi MR, Zali AR, Hannani K. Five consecutive epidemiological waves
466 of COVID-19: a population-based cross-sectional study on characteristics, policies,
467 and health outcome. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2022 Dec 5;22(1):906. doi: 10.1186/s12879-
468 022-07909-y. PMID: 36471283; PMCID: PMC9721063.
- 469 3. de Souza UJB, Dos Santos RN, Campos FS, Lourenço KL, da Fonseca FG, Spilki
470 FR, Corona-Ômica Br/McTi Network. High Rate of Mutational Events in SARS-CoV-
471 2 Genomes across Brazilian Geographical Regions, February 2020 to June 2021.
472 *Viruses.* 2021 Sep 10;13(9):1806. doi: 10.3390/v13091806. PMID: 34578387;
473 PMCID: PMC8473193.
- 474 4. Li J, Lai S, Gao GF, Shi W. The emergence, genomic diversity and global spread of
475 SARS-CoV-2. *Nature.* 2021 Dec;600(7889):408-418. doi: 10.1038/s41586-021-
476 04188-6. Epub 2021 Dec 8. PMID: 34880490.
- 477 5. Naveca FG, Nascimento V, de Souza VC, Corado AL, Nascimento F, Silva G, et al.
478 COVID-19 in Amazonas, Brazil, was driven by the persistence of endemic lineages
479 and P.1 emergence. *Nat Med.* 2021 Jul;27(7):1230-1238. doi: 10.1038/s41591-021-
480 01378-7. Epub 2021 May 25. PMID: 34035535.
- 481 6. Fujino T, Nomoto H, Kutsuna S, Ujiie M, Suzuki T, Sato R, et al. Novel SARS-CoV-2
482 Variant in Travelers from Brazil to Japan. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2021 Apr;27(4):1243–5.

- 483 doi: 10.3201/eid2704.210138. Epub 2021 Feb 10. PMID: 33567247; PMCID:
484 PMC8007308.
- 485 7. Harapan H, Itoh N, Yufika A, Winardi W, Keam S, Te H, et al. Coronavirus disease
486 2019 (COVID-19): A literature review. *J Infect Public Health*. 2020 May;13(5):667-
487 673. doi: 10.1016/j.jiph.2020.03.019. Epub 2020 Apr 8. PMID: 32340833; PMCID:
488 PMC7142680.
- 489 8. Ranzani OT, Bastos LSL, Gelli JGM, Marchesi JF, Baião F, Hamacher S, et al.
490 Characterisation of the first 250,000 hospital admissions for COVID-19 in Brazil: a
491 retrospective analysis of nationwide data. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2021 Apr;9(4):407-
492 418. doi: 10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30560-9. Epub 2021 Jan 15. PMID: 33460571;
493 PMCID: PMC7834889.
- 494 9. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J, et al. Clinical Characteristics of 138
495 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan,
496 China. *JAMA*. 2020 Mar 17;323(11):1061-1069. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.1585.
497 Erratum in: *JAMA*. 2021 Mar 16;325(11):1113. PMID: 32031570; PMCID:
498 PMC7042881.
- 499 10. Arias Ramos D, Restrepo Rueda DL, Rios Quintero EV, Olaya Gómez JC, Cortés
500 Bonilla I. Severe and critical COVID-19 in a tertiary center in Colombia, a
501 retrospective cross-sectional study. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2022 Mar 12;22(1):247. doi:
502 10.1186/s12879-022-07246-0. PMID: 35279082; PMCID: PMC8917827.
- 503 11. Bastos LS, Ranzani OT, Souza TML, Hamacher S, Bozza FA. COVID-19 hospital
504 admissions: Brazil's first and second waves compared. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2021
505 Aug;9(8):e82-e83. doi: 10.1016/S2213-2600(21)00287-3. Epub 2021 Jul 15. PMID:
506 34273268; PMCID: PMC8279962.
- 507 12. WHO Working Group on the Clinical Characterisation and Management of COVID-
508 19 infection. A minimal common outcome measure set for COVID-19 clinical

- 509 research. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020 Aug;20(8):e192-e197. doi: 10.1016/S1473-
510 3099(20)30483-7. Epub 2020 Jun 12. Erratum in: *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020
511 Oct;20(10):e250. PMID: 32539990; PMCID: PMC7292605.
- 512 13. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying
513 prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J*
514 *Chronic Dis.* 1987;40(5):373-83. doi: 10.1016/0021-9681(87)90171-8. PMID:
515 3558716.
- 516 14. Adamoski D, Baura VA, Rodrigues AC, Royer CA, Aoki MN, Tschá MK, et al. SARS-
517 CoV-2 Delta and Omicron Variants Surge in Curitiba, Southern Brazil, and Its
518 Impact on Overall COVID-19 Lethality. *Viruses.* 2022 Apr 14;14(4):809. doi:
519 10.3390/v14040809. PMID: 35458539; PMCID: PMC9027352.
- 520 15. Perazzo H, Cardoso SW, Ribeiro MPD, Moreira R, Coelho LE, Jalil EM, et al;
521 RECOVER-SUS Brasil Group. In-hospital mortality and severe outcomes after
522 hospital discharge due to COVID-19: A prospective multicenter study from Brazil.
523 *Lancet Reg Health Am.* 2022 Jul;11:100244. doi: 10.1016/j.lana.2022.100244. Epub
524 2022 Apr 12. Erratum in: *Lancet Reg Health Am.* 2022 Jul;11:100300. PMID:
525 35434696; PMCID: PMC9001143.
- 526 16. Gallo Marin B, Aghagoli G, Lavine K, Yang L, Siff EJ, Chiang SS, et al. Predictors of
527 COVID-19 severity: A literature review. *Rev Med Virol.* 2021 Jan;31(1):1-10. doi:
528 10.1002/rmv.2146. Epub 2020 Jul 30. PMID: 32845042; PMCID: PMC7855377.
- 529 17. Liu W, Yang C, Liao YG, Wan F, Lin L, Huang X, et al. Risk factors for COVID-19
530 progression and mortality in hospitalized patients without pre-existing comorbidities.
531 *J Infect Public Health.* 2022 Jan;15(1):13-20. doi: 10.1016/j.jiph.2021.11.012. Epub
532 2021 Nov 18. PMID: 34861603; PMCID: PMC8598256.
- 533 18. Oliva-Sánchez PF, Vadillo-Ortega F, Bojalil-Parra R, Martínez-Kobeh JP, Pérez-
534 Pérez JR, Pérez-Avalos JL. Factores de riesgo para complicaciones graves de

- 535 COVID-19, comparando tres olas epidemiológicas. Un enfoque desde la atención
536 primaria en México [Risk factors for COVID-19 severe complications comparing
537 three major epidemiological waves: An approach from primary health care in
538 Mexico]. *Aten Primaria*. 2022 Nov;54(11):102469. Spanish. doi:
539 10.1016/j.aprim.2022.102469. Epub 2022 Sep 13. PMID: 36244180; PMCID:
540 PMC9468309.
- 541 19. Matysek A, Studnicka A, Smith WM, Hutny M, Gajewski P, Filipiak KJ, et al.
542 Influence of Co-morbidities During SARS-CoV-2 Infection in an Indian Population.
543 *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2022 Aug 1;9:962101. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2022.962101.
544 PMID: 35979209; PMCID: PMC9377050.
- 545 20. Mousavi SF, Ebrahimi M, Moghaddam SAA, Moafi N, Jafari M, Tavakolian A, et al.
546 Evaluating the characteristics of patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection admitted
547 during COVID-19 peaks: A single-center study. *Vacunas*. 2023 Jan-Mar;24(1):27-36.
548 doi: 10.1016/j.vacun.2022.08.002. Epub 2022 Aug 30. PMID: 36062028; PMCID:
549 PMC9424515.
- 550 21. Bhargava A, Fukushima EA, Levine M, Zhao W, Tanveer F, Szpunar SM, et al.
551 Predictors for Severe COVID-19 Infection. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020 Nov 5;71(8):1962-
552 1968. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa674. PMID: 32472676; PMCID: PMC7314166.
- 553 22. Grasselli G, Greco M, Zanella A, Albano G, Antonelli M, Bellani G, et al; COVID-19
554 Lombardy ICU Network. Risk Factors Associated With Mortality Among Patients
555 With COVID-19 in Intensive Care Units in Lombardy, Italy. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2020
556 Oct 1;180(10):1345-1355. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3539. Erratum in:
557 *JAMA Intern Med*. 2021 Jul 1;181(7):1021. PMID: 32667669; PMCID:
558 PMC7364371.
- 559 23. Raboni SM, Neves VC, Silva RM, Breda GL, Ceregato AC, Broza TP, et al. High-
560 Flow Nasal Cannula Therapy in Patients With COVID-19: Predictive Response

- 561 Factors. *Respir Care*. 2022 Nov;67(11):1443-1451. doi: 10.4187/respcare.09764.
562 Epub 2022 Aug 9. PMID: 35944966.
- 563 24. Salyer SJ, Maeda J, Sembuche S, Kebede Y, Tshangela A, Moussif M, et al. The
564 first and second waves of the COVID-19 pandemic in Africa: a cross-sectional
565 study. *Lancet*. 2021 Apr 3;397(10281):1265-1275. doi: 10.1016/S0140-
566 6736(21)00632-2. Epub 2021 Mar 24. PMID: 33773118; PMCID: PMC8046510.
- 567 25. Carbonell R, Urgelés S, Rodríguez A, Bodí M, Martín-Loeches I, Solé-Violán J, et
568 al; COVID-19 SEMICYUC Working Group. Mortality comparison between the first
569 and second/third waves among 3,795 critical COVID-19 patients with pneumonia
570 admitted to the ICU: A multicentre retrospective cohort study. *Lancet Reg Health*
571 *Eur*. 2021 Dec;11:100243. doi: 10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100243. Epub 2021 Nov 4.
572 PMID: 34751263; PMCID: PMC8566166.
- 573 26. Nath R, Gupta NK, Jaswal A, Gupta S, Kaur N, Kohli S, et al. Mortality among adult
574 hospitalized patients during the first wave and second wave of COVID-19 pandemic
575 at a tertiary care center in India. *Monaldi Arch Chest Dis*. 2021 Oct 11;92(2). doi:
576 10.4081/monaldi.2021.2034. PMID: 34634900.
- 577 27. Gräf T, Bello G, Naveca FG, Gomes M, Cardoso VLO, da Silva AF, et al; Brazilian
578 Ministry of Health COVID-19 Genomic Surveillance Network. Phylogenetic-based
579 inference reveals distinct transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 lineages Gamma
580 and P.2 in Brazil. *iScience*. 2022 Apr 15;25(4):104156. doi:
581 10.1016/j.isci.2022.104156. Epub 2022 Mar 26. PMID: 35368908; PMCID:
582 PMC8957357.
- 583 28. Lin L, Liu Y, Tang X, He D. The Disease Severity and Clinical Outcomes of the
584 SARS-CoV-2 Variants of Concern. *Front Public Health*. 2021 Nov 30;9:775224. doi:
585 10.3389/fpubh.2021.775224. PMID: 34917580; PMCID: PMC8669511.

- 586 29. Martins AF, Zavascki AP, Wink PL, Volpato FCZ, Monteiro FL, Rosset C, et al.
587 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 lineage P.1 in patients from a region with exponentially
588 increasing hospitalisation rate, February 2021, Rio Grande do Sul, Southern Brazil.
589 Euro Surveill. 2021 Mar;26(12):2100276. doi: 10.2807/1560-
590 7917.ES.2021.26.12.2100276. PMID: 33769251; PMCID: PMC7995561.
- 591 30. O'Toole Á, Scher E, Underwood A, Jackson B, Hill V, McCrone JT, et al. Assignment
592 of epidemiological lineages in an emerging pandemic using the pangolin tool. Virus
593 Evol. 2021 Jul 30;7(2):veab064. doi: 10.1093/ve/veab064. PMID: 34527285;
594 PMCID: PMC8344591.
- 595 31. Funk T, Pharris A, Spiteri G, Bundle N, Melidou A, Carr M, et al; COVID study
596 groups. Characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern B.1.1.7, B.1.351 or P.1:
597 data from seven EU/EEA countries, weeks 38/2020 to 10/2021. Euro Surveill. 2021
598 Apr;26(16):2100348. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.16.2100348. PMID:
599 33890566; PMCID: PMC8063589.

600
601

602 **Supporting information**

603 **S1 Figure. ROC of laboratory parameters – Creatinine, Lactate dehydrogenase, Ferritin, CRP and D-**
604 **Dimer - in predicting the in-hospital mortality of COVID-19 patients.** Note: ROC, receiver operating
605 characteristic; AUC, area under the ROC curve; CRP, C-reactive protein.