

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

BMJ Open

Realist review of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the general population and marginalized communities from high income countries

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2024-084560
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	22-Jan-2024
Complete List of Authors:	Gonzalez-Jaramillo, Nathalia; University of Bern, ISPM Abbühl, Dominik; University of Bern, ISPM; University of Bern, Faculty of Medicine Roa-Díaz, Zayne; University of Bern Kobler-Betancourt, Cristopher; University of Bern Frahsa, Annika; University of Bern
Keywords:	COVID-19, Meta-Analysis, Vaccination

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reliez oni

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Realist review of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the general population and marginalized communities from high income countries

Gonzalez-Jaramillo Nathalia, MD,PhD,¹ Abbühl Dominik, MD,^{1,2} Roa-Díaz Zayne Milena, RN,PhD,³ Kobler-Betancourt Cristopher, ¹ Frahsa Annika, PhD.¹

1 Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland.

2 Faculty of Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland.

3. Medical Library, University library of Bern, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

Word count:

Abstract word count: 336

Declaration of funding

Conflicts of interest / financial disclosures: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

Patients or the public WERE NOT involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research

Acknowledgments:

We thank the Lindenhof Foundation for their financial support of our research group.

Corresponding author / Reprint requests:

Annika Frahsa. University of Bern, Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, Bern, Switzerland. <u>annika.frahsa@unibe.ch</u>

Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Switzerland.

Mittelstrasse 43

3012 Bern, Switzerland

Direct dial: +41 31 684 56 79

ORCIDs:

Nathalia Gonzalez: 0000-0003-4975-4439

1 2 3 4 5 6	Annika Frahsa: 0000-0002-0207-3989
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	
14 15 16 17 18 19	
20 21 22 23 24 25 26	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33	
34 35 36 37 38 39	
40 41 42 43 44 45	
46 47 48 49	

Key Points

Question: What is the difference between predicted vaccination willingness before roll-out and real-world vaccine uptake among the general population and marginalized groups from high income countries?

Findings: In this realist systematic review and meta-analysis that included 18 high income countries, the pooled proportion of vaccination willingness before and after roll-out was 67% versus 73%. The pooled proportion of vaccination willingness among people from diverse marginalized groups was 52%.

Meaning: Limited real-world evidence about vaccine uptake among groups experiencing disadvantage in high income countries is a call to action. Context-specific actions are required to promote vaccine uptake among marginalized groups.

Abstract

Importance

Since late June 2023, there has been a steady increase in reported hospitalizations and deaths from SARS-CoV2. To date, no data comparing the estimated uptake with the real-world statistics of vaccine uptake in the general population and in marginalized communities exist.

Introduction

High-income countries (HIC) achieved success vaccinating their populations against COVID-19, yet some historically, socially, or economically marginalized groups, were possibly left behind in HIC for complex reasons. Local vaccine access barriers and hesitancy possibly explain differences in uptake within and among countries. However, access barriers and vaccine hesitancy share common pathways, which complicates disentangling their effects in vaccination uptake.

Objective

We compared vaccination willingness before roll-out and one-year post-rollout uptake among the general population and disproportionately affected groups in HIC.

Methods

We conducted a quantitative realist synthesis on the prevalence of vaccine acceptance of general populations from HIC. We defined *vaccination willingness* as the proportion of participants willing or intending to receive vaccines prior to availability. We defined vaccine uptake as the real proportion of the population with

complete vaccination as reported by each country until November 2021. We pooled prevalence of vaccination willingness and vaccine uptake using random effects models. We reported our findings according to the statement on preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses.

Results

We included data from 62 studies and 18 HIC. For studies conducted among general populations, the proportion of vaccination willingness was 67% [95% confidence interval (CI) 62%–72%]. In real-world settings, the overall proportion of vaccine uptake among those countries was 73% (CI 69%–76%). The summary proportion of vaccination willingness among people from diverse under-resourced groups was 52% (95% CI 0.46–0.57). However, real-world evidence about vaccine uptake among groups experiencing disadvantage was limited.

Conclusion and Relevance

Our review emphasizes the importance of real-world data for assessing vaccine acceptance and particularly the need for more specific real-world statistics on vaccine uptake among under-resourced communities, disproportionately affected groups, and historically, socially, or economically marginalized groups, as well as the importance of context-specific actions to promote vaccine uptake.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- To our knowledge, this is the first systematic and realist review comparing vaccination willingness from studies and vaccine uptake using real-world data.
- Official country-level reports about vaccine uptake among under-resourced communities was limited so we could not compare vaccination willingness with real-world vaccine uptake statistics among specific groups.

Introduction

Cumulative excess death from the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic made it a leading global cause of death between 2020–2021.¹ Universal vaccination played a significant role transitioning into post-pandemic life.² COVID-19 vaccines were developed and authorized in record time; as of April 2023, 70% of the world population received at least one COVID-19 vaccine dose. However, vaccine uptake is

complicated; it involves more than simply making vaccines available. For instance, inequitable vaccine distribution possibly contributes to the 2.8-fold difference in vaccine coverage between high- and low-income countries.³ Whereas vaccine uptake in high-income countries (HIC) was 81%, vaccine uptake in low-income countries (LIC) was 29%.⁴

Countries with strong public health systems and economic resources achieved some early success vaccinating populations, yet people from historically, socially, or economically marginalized groups, such as people who experience homelessness, people from ethnic and racial minorities, as well as people with immigration or refugee experience, possibly remained unvaccinated for complex reasons. Regarding vaccination willingness and uptake among people from ethnic minority groups, Raizai et al.^{5, 6} identified several structural aspects resulting from a mistrust of government and public health bodies: systemic racism and discrimination at societal and healthcare system levels, histories of unethical studies, as well as underrepresentation of people from ethnic and racial minority groups in health, drug, and vaccine trials. Distrust in medical institutions from inappropriate care and mistreatment also impacted vaccination willingness among people from socially or economically marginalized groups, such as members of indigenous communities or racial minority groups as well as among incarcerated individuals. ^{7, 8, 9}

Additionally, local barriers to access vaccinations and individual vaccine hesitancy played roles explaining vaccine uptake differences within and among countries.³ Notwithstanding, structural access barriers and individual vaccine hesitancy possibly share common pathways, which complicates disentangling their effects in vaccination uptake.¹⁰ For instance, in a systematic review of barriers, facilitators, and vaccine hesitancy with included studies about mainly HIC, they found

Page 7 of 78

BMJ Open

individuals from minority ethnic groups concurrently experience more access barriers along with higher vaccine hesitancy and lower vaccine uptake when compared with individuals from majority ethnic groups and non-migrants.¹¹ Therefore, a debate is ongoing about the true proportion of hesitancy and vaccine refusal among unvaccinated individuals in HIC. Although individual vaccination willingness is not under discussion, understandings about vaccination willingness and vaccine uptake possibly inform health policies more reliably, identify access barriers to vaccines, facilitate vaccination campaign planning, and enhance uptake, eventually.

Generally, marginalization and vaccine uptake in HIC has been scarcely described in the literature. We performed a realist synthesis to evaluate COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and its determinants among people from under-resourced communities and disproportionately affected groups in HIC. We compared data collected from a specific systematic review with real-world statistics to study the general evolution of vaccination rates—from hypothetical acceptance before the widespread rollout of vaccination programs—until December 2021, one year after the first vaccine was available and when presumably, most HIC populations could be vaccinated. In addition, we compared hypothetical vaccination willingness between the general population and under-resourced communities and disproportionately affected groups in HIC.

Methods

Study design and sources of data

We conducted a quantitative realist synthesis on the prevalence of vaccine acceptance among the general population from HIC. We followed the realist and metanarrative evidence syntheses (RAMESES) quality and publication standards and reporting guidelines.¹² We also report our findings according to the statement on

preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses¹³ (PRISMA). We defined *vaccination willingness* as the proportion of participants willing or intending to receive a vaccine before vaccines were available. We defined *vaccine uptake* as the real proportion of the population with complete vaccination as reported by each country until November 2021.

A medical information specialist searched for surveys investigating COVID-19 vaccine attitudes among adult populations from HIC before COVID-19 vaccine rollout. We used the World Bank database to classify countries of origin according to income at the time of data collection [US\$12,536 or more gross national income (GNI) per capita in 2019]. We defined the study to include surveys reporting quantitative data on populations willing to be vaccinated when vaccines became available. We included surveys meeting the following criteria: 1) conducted in 2020–2021 among adult populations before vaccine rollout campaigns; 2) reported prevalence of vaccination willingness via questionnaires; 3) peer-reviewed; 4) performed probabilistic sampling; and 5) reported results for general populations and/ or under-resourced communities and disproportionately affected groups.

We excluded studies of unrepresentative participants from general populations, such as people with particular conditions or health statuses—like people with diabetes or pregnant people—or particular occupations—like health care workers or university students. We excluded articles with incomplete information, systematic reviews and meta-analyses, and reports from meetings or congresses.

We provide details for our search strategy, study selection, and data extraction methods in Supplementary section 1. When multiple records included data from the same country, we extracted data from all of them and calculated country-specific

 BMJ Open

pooled prevalence and used the pooled prevalence as the value to compare further with real-world statistics of vaccine uptake.

Study outcomes

For each country, outcomes of interest included 1) the proportion of people willing to be vaccinated according to results of the systematic review (primary outcome: vaccination willingness/acceptance); and 2) the proportion of vaccinated people according to the real-world data statistics (secondary outcome: vaccine uptake).

Data selection and extraction

Two reviewers independently screened all records and verified included and excluded studies by using REDCap (Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA). We report identification, exclusion, and inclusion of studies in the Figure S1 flow diagram. One reviewer extracted data using a pre-piloted extraction form, and a second reviewer verified the extracted data. Extracted variables included, yet were not limited to sample size, study design, publication date, survey date, country and study population composition, community type, age, vaccine hesitancy, vaccine acceptance, and vaccine refusal (Supplementary section 1.d). We extracted all proportions as reported. For the realist synthesis, we obtained available country-specific data from multiple sources.^{14, 15} We provide sources of information and definitions for country-specific variables in Supplementary section 1.d.

Potential bias assessment

Two independent reviewers assessed the risk of bias for each study using the checklist for prevalence studies from Hoy et al; we assessed each question independently and calculated scores, as recommended by checklist developers.¹⁶ However, we did not use total scores in analyses. Instead, we grouped questions into

categories according to the bias domain they addressed.¹⁷ We analyzed risk of selection bias and risk of nonresponse bias as potential sources of heterogeneity among studies. We provide potential bias assessment results in Supplementary section 2.Table S1.

Statistical analysis

Data synthesis

We estimated the pooled prevalence of vaccination willingness and 95% confidence intervals (CI) using random effects models. We used the 'metaprop' function from the 'meta' package in R (version 3.5.1) to synthesize and display findings from included studies in forest plots. For overall summary estimates, we calculated prediction intervals to represent the likely range of proportions obtained in subsequent studies conducted in similar settings.¹⁸ We quantified statistical heterogeneity using the l² statistic. Heterogeneity was classified according to the most recent version of the Cochrane Handbook: 0–40% might not be important; 30–60% may represent moderate heterogeneity; 50–90% may represent substantial heterogeneity; 75–100% considerable heterogeneity. However, in meta-analyses of prevalence, heterogeneity according to the l² statistic is expected to be substantial and possibly not discriminative.¹⁹ Therefore, we also calculated prediction intervals to describe the expected range of estimates.

Sensitivity analyses

We performed sensitivity analyses. First, we used the influence function in the 'metafor' package to compute outliers and influential case diagnostics, including externally standardized residuals and leave-one-out estimates of heterogeneity. Second, we investigated the impact of selection bias as a potential source of heterogeneity by means of meta-regression.

Page 11 of 78

Real-world data analysis

After synthesizing information from included studies, we compared results for each country with real-world data statistics concerning vaccination uptake. In addition, we identified how different country characteristics and policies (Supplementary section 3, Table S2) in each country could be associated with vaccination uptake. Specifically, we selected four components to examine separately: percentage of populations older than 65 years; social spending as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP); healthcare spending as a percentage of GDP; and stringency index (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker index) at the start date of vaccine rollout campaigns in each country since we thought them most likely associated with vaccine uptake among general populations.¹⁴

Results

After deduplication, we identified 3349 potentially relevant citations. After initial screening based on titles and abstracts, we selected full texts of 214 articles for detailed evaluation (Figure S1). After full-text assessment, we excluded 152 citations. We provide the complete list of excluded references and reasons for exclusion in the Supplementary section 1c. We included the remaining 62 articles that reported vaccination willingness before vaccine rollout at the country-level.

General characteristics of included studies.

We provide detailed characteristics of included studies in Table 1. Overall, studies included 299,769 individuals from 18 HIC. Among the 62 included references, 45 studies reported results for general populations and 17 studies reported results for at least one under-resourced community or disproportionately affected group. We calculated the weighted average of exported mean ages from each study; the mean age was 47.5 years. The proportion of women ranged from 16% to 93% among studies

including patients from both sexes. Two studies reported including only men.^{20, 21} Study sample sizes conducted among general populations ranged from 316 to 63,266 and study sample sizes conducted among under-resourced communities or disproportionately affected groups ranged from 83 to 18,474.

Since reporting vaccination willingness via questionnaire was an inclusion criteria, all studies used validated questionnaires or questionnaires developed specifically for studies.

General characteristics of the included countries

We present detailed characteristics of included countries in Table S2. Country populations ranged between 2.6 million (Qatar) and 332 million (United States). Median population was 11.1 million [interquartile range (IQR): 7.9–67]. Median percentage of populations older than 65 years was 19 (IQR: 16.8–22.2), and median value for life expectancy was 81.5 years (IQR: 81–83). With respect to economic indicators related to public policy, median social spending as a percentage of GDP was 25 (IQR: 18–29); median healthcare spending as a percentage of GDP was 10.3 (IQR: 8.7–11.3). We determined two median indicators of inequality: poverty gap 0.29 (IQR: 0.26–0.33) and gender wage gap 15 (IQR: 6–19), respectively.

Proportion of people from general populations reporting vaccination willingness before vaccine rollout

Among general populations, the summary proportion of vaccination willingness (Figure 1) was estimated across all study settings as 67% (95% CI 61%–72%, 45 studies). Forty-five studies reported vaccine acceptance among general populations: Australia (3 studies);²²⁻²⁴ Austria (1);²⁵ Canada (2);^{26, 27} Croatia (1);²⁸ Denmark (1);²⁹ France (5);³⁰⁻³⁴ Germany (1);³⁵ Greece (1);³⁶ Ireland (1);³⁷ Israel (1);³⁸ Italy (4);³⁹⁻⁴²

Japan (5);⁴³⁻⁴⁷ Portugal (1);⁴⁸ Qatar (1);⁴⁹ Switzerland⁷⁶ (1); United Kingdom (7);⁵⁰⁻⁵⁶ and United States (9).⁵⁷⁻⁶⁵

Proportion of people from under-resourced communities or disproportionately affected groups reporting vaccination willingness before vaccine rollout

The summary proportion of vaccination willingness for studies conducted among people from socially, economically, or historically marginalized groups (Figure 2) was estimated as 52% (95% CI 0.46–0.57, 17 studies). Seventeen studies reported vaccine acceptance among people experiencing homelessness (4);⁶⁶⁻⁶⁹ people using illicit and unprescribed drugs (2);^{70,71} lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender populations (3);^{21,72,73} incarcerated populations (2);^{20, 74} refugee and undocumented migrant populations (2);^{75, 76} an indigenous population (1);⁹ a rural community (1);⁷⁷ a Latino population (1);⁷⁸ and a Black American population (1).⁷ In the cumulative metaanalysis from sensitivity analyses, we found a trend towards acceptance according to dates of data acquisition ranging from 32% in early pandemic stages to 52% during late pandemic stages before vaccine rollout (Supplementary section 5.c)

Proportion of vaccine uptake from real-world country statistics one year after vaccine rollout

The summary proportion of vaccine uptake from included countries was estimated as 73% (95% CI 0.69–0.76, 18 countries). In general, the proportion of vaccine uptake for each country was higher than vaccination willingness before vaccine rollout (Supplemental material, Table S3), except for Croatia (-15%), Denmark (-3%), and the United States (-8%). In the cumulative meta-analysis, we did not observe an effect from date of vaccine approval on vaccine uptake at the end of 2021 (Supplementary section 6). However, in meta-regression analyses (Supplementary section 6. Sensitivity analyses) vaccine uptake increased according to the proportion

of the population older than 65 years [odds ratio (OR)=1.8, 95%Cl 1.04–3.1] and decreased at higher stringency index values (OR=0.8, 95%Cl 0.69–0.94).

Discussion

Main findings

Our realist synthesis involves data from 62 studies and 18 countries; we contribute to knowledge about the prevalence of vaccine acceptance among general populations and people from under-resourced communities, disproportionately affected groups, and historically, socially, or economically marginalized groups. Additionally, we compared proportions of expected vaccine uptake from studies conducted before vaccines were available with the real uptake from the end of December 2021. To our knowledge, ours is the first systematic and realist review comparing vaccination willingness and vaccine uptake using real-world statistics among general populations with people from under-resourced communities or disproportionately affected groups in HIC.

Included countries comprised 70% of HIC populations included in our study. Most countries had higher vaccine uptake when compared with vaccination willingness as reported by the studies conducted before vaccine rollout. For all studies among general populations, the proportion of vaccination willingness was 67% (95% CI 62%– 72%). In real-world settings, the overall proportion of vaccine uptake among countries was 73% (CI 69%–76%). However, study limitations prevented exploring possible explanations for lower-than-expected rates of vaccine uptake in Croatia, Denmark, and the United States.

The summary proportion of vaccination willingness among under-resourced communities, disproportionately affected groups, and historically, socially, or

BMJ Open

economically marginalized groups was 52% (95% CI 0.46–0.57). A few studies reported vaccine uptake and showed lower vaccine uptake, such as a study among healthcare workers from ethnic minority groups in the United Kingdom compared with White healthcare workers,⁷⁹ as well as a federated analysis of patient primary care records in the United Kingdom ⁸⁰ finding lower uptake by ethnicity (Black 68%, White 96%) and to a lower degree, by deprivation (most deprived 91%, least deprived 97%).

However, official country-level reports about vaccine uptake among underresourced communities and disproportionately affected groups in diverse perspectives was too limited so we could not compare vaccination willingness with real-world vaccine uptake statistics among specific groups.

Findings in context

The proportion of vaccination willingness among people from under-resourced communities, disproportionately affected groups, and historically, socially, or economically marginalized groups was consistently lower than the proportion of vaccination willingness among people from populations in total. Existing evidence suggest people from ethnic and racialized minority groups⁷ and indigenous communities reasonably distrust medical institutions from experiences of differential care and mistreatment.^{8, 9} Mistrust of institutions and governments was reported as the most common reason to delay vaccine uptake among incarcerated people.^{7,8,9,74} Experiences of discrimination, stigma, and barriers to access were reported as possible explanations for lower prevalence of vaccine acceptance among people from sexual and gender minority groups.⁸¹

Recent evidence provides initial insights about overcoming barriers to vaccination uptake. For instance, multi-component interventions with tailored communication of risks of remaining unvaccinated and benefits of becoming vaccinated,⁸² community-based action and engagement of religious and community leaders, dialogue to understand reasons for mistrust in government and public health bodies, as well as well as provision of access to convenient vaccination in collaboration with community-based and trusted health institutions.⁸³

We suggest future studies compare trajectories of vaccination willingness with vaccine uptake among under-resourced communities, disproportionately affected groups, and historically, socially, or economically marginalized groups. We also recommend future research link findings of trajectories with context-specific actions to address barriers to vaccine uptake among people from under-resourced communities, disproportionately affected groups, and historically, socially, or economically marginalized groups. Ultimately, more research is needed to better understand vaccine uptake and interactions between barriers, unwillingness, hesitancy, postponement, or other unknown aspects driving vaccine uptake. The identification of necessary adjustments needed to improve vaccination uptake among different groups may inform future vaccination programs.

Strengths and limitations

Studies reporting prevalence served as important sources of evidence during the COVID-19 pandemic and helped researchers understand factors related to the disease and inform policies. However, prevalence estimates from individual studies and pooled prevalence estimates from our meta-analyses may have been affected by selection and reporting biases.¹⁷ However, our inclusion criteria attempted to reduce such risks of bias, and we performed multiple sensitivity analyses that provided insights into possible sources of heterogeneity. In the specific context of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance, the fact that countries have reporting systems in place to keep

population-based statistics made it possible to assess the real-life counterpart of the studies.⁸⁴

Conclusion

Our systematic and realist review highlights COVID-19 vaccine uptake in HIC generally exceeded expressed vaccination willingness before vaccine rollout and vaccination willingness tended to be lower among under-resourced communities, disproportionately affected groups, and historically, socially, or economically marginalized groups when compared with total populations living in HIC. Our review emphasizes the importance of real-world data for assessing vaccine acceptance and particularly the need for more specific real-world statistics on vaccine uptake among under-resourced communities, disproportionately affected groups, as well as the importance of context-specific actions to promote vaccine uptake.

Y.C.Z.O.J.L

References

1. Ahmad FB, Anderson RN. The Leading Causes of Death in the US for 2020. JAMA 2021;**325**(18):1829-1830.

2. Biancolella M, Colona VL, Mehrian-Shai R, Watt JL, Luzzatto L, Novelli G, Reichardt JKV. COVID-19 2022 update: transition of the pandemic to the endemic phase. Human Genomics 2022;**16**(1):19.

3. Bayati M, Noroozi R, Ghanbari-Jahromi M, Jalali FS. Inequality in the distribution of Covid-19 vaccine: a systematic review. International Journal for Equity in Health 2022;**21**(1):122.

4. Mathieu E, Ritchie H, Ortiz-Ospina E, Roser M, Hasell J, Appel C, Giattino C, Rodés-Guirao L. A global database of COVID-19 vaccinations. Nature Human Behaviour 2021;**5**(7):947-953.

5. Razai MS, Osama T, McKechnie DGJ, Majeed A. Covid-19 vaccine hesitancy among ethnic minority groups. Bmj 2021;**372**:n513.

6. Razai MS, Kankam HKN, Majeed A, Esmail A, Williams DR. Mitigating ethnic disparities in covid-19 and beyond. Bmj 2021;**372**:m4921.

7. Bogart LM, Dong L, G, Hi P, Klein DJ, Smith TL, Ryan S, Ojikutu BO. COVID-19 Vaccine Intentions and Mistrust in a National Sample of Black Americans. Journal of the National Medical Association 2022;**113**(6):599-611.

8. Mosby I, Swidrovich J. Medical experimentation and the roots of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among Indigenous Peoples in Canada. Cmaj 2021;**193**(11):E381-e383.

9. Manca T, Humble RM, Aylsworth L, Cha E, Wilson SE, Meyer SB, Greyson D, Sadarangani M, Parsons Leigh J, MacDonald SE. "We need to protect each other": COVID-19 vaccination intentions and concerns

among Racialized minority and Indigenous Peoples in Canada. Soc Sci Med 2022;**313**:115400.

10. Njoku A, Joseph M, Felix R. Changing the Narrative: Structural Barriers and Racial and Ethnic Inequities in COVID-19 Vaccination. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2021;**18**(18).

11. Abba-Aji M, Stuckler D, Galea S, McKee M. Ethnic/racial minorities' and migrants' access to COVID-19 vaccines: A systematic review of barriers and facilitators. J Migr Health 2022;**5**:100086.

12. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, Buckingham J, Pawson R. RAMESES publication standards: realist syntheses. BMC Medicine 2013;**11**(1):21.

13. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, Shamseer L, Tetzlaff JM, Akl EA, Brennan SE, Chou R, Glanville J, Grimshaw JM, Hróbjartsson A, Lalu MM, Li T, Loder EW, Mayo-Wilson E, McDonald S, McGuinness LA, Stewart LA, Thomas J, Tricco AC, Welch VA, Whiting P, Moher D. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. Bmj 2021;**372**:n71. 14. Hale T, Angrist N, Goldszmidt R, Kira B, Petherick A, Phillips T, Webster S, Cameron-Blake E, Hallas L, Majumdar S, Tatlow H. A global panel database of pandemic policies (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker). Nat Hum Behav 2021;**5**(4):529-538.

15. Data TWB.

16. Hoy D, Brooks P, Woolf A, Blyth F, March L, Bain C, Baker P, Smith E, Buchbinder R. Assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater agreement. J Clin Epidemiol 2012;**65**(9):934-9.

BMJ Open

17. Diana B-G, Georgia S, Nicola L. Studies of prevalence: how a basic epidemiology concept has gained recognition in the COVID-19 pandemic. BMJ Open 2022;**12**(10):e061497.

18. Riley RD, Higgins JP, Deeks JJ. Interpretation of random effects meta-analyses. Bmj 2011;**342**:d549.

19. Migliavaca CB, Stein C, Colpani V, Barker TH, Ziegelmann PK, Munn Z, Falavigna M. Meta-analysis of prevalence: I(2) statistic and how to deal with heterogeneity. Res Synth Methods 2022;**13**(3):363-367.

20. Di Giuseppe G, Pelullo CP, Lanzano R, Napolitano F, Pavia M. Knowledge, attitudes, and behavior of incarcerated people regarding COVID-19 and related vaccination: a survey in Italy. Scientific reports 2022;**12**(1):960.

21. Ousseine YM, Vaux S, V, Entorren S, Bonmarin I, Champenois K, Lydie N, Velter A. Predictors of Uncertainty and Unwillingness to Receive the COVID-19 Vaccine in Men Who Have Sex with Men in France. International journal of environmental research and public health 2022;**19**(9).

22. Attwell K, Lake J, Sneddon J, Gerrans P, Blyth C, Lee J. Converting the maybes: Crucial for a successful COVID-19 vaccination strategy. PloS One 2021;**16**(1):e0245907.

23. Seale H, Heywood AE, Leask J, Sheel M, Durrheim DN, Bolsewicz K, Kaur R. Examining Australian public perceptions and behaviors towards a future COVID-19 vaccine. BMC infectious diseases 2021;**21**(1):120.

24. Enticott J, Gill JS, Bacon SL, Lavoie KL, Epstein DS, Dawadi S, Teede HJ, Boyle J, I CST. Attitudes towards vaccines and intention to vaccinate against COVID-19: a cross-sectional analysis-implications for

public health communications in Australia. BMJ open 2022;**12**(1):e057127.

25. Schernhammer E, Weitzer J, Laubichler MD, Birmann BM, Bertau M, Zenk L, Caniglia G, Jäger CC, Steiner G. Correlates of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in Austria: trust and the government. Journal of Public Health (Oxford, England) 2022;44(1):e106-e116.

26. Basta NE, Sohel N, Sulis G, Wolfson C, Maimon G, Griffith LE, Kirkl, Susan, McMillan JM, Thompson M, Raina P, for the Canadian Longitudinal Study on Aging Research T. Factors Associated With Willingness to Receive a COVID-19 Vaccine Among 23,819 Adults Aged 50 Years or Older: An Analysis of the Canadian Longitudinal Study on Aging. American journal of epidemiology 2022;**191**(6):987-998.

27. Lavoie K, Gosselin-Boucher V, Stojanovic J, Gupta S, Gagne M, Joyal-Desmarais K, Seguin K, Gorin SS, Ribeiro P, Voisard B, Vallis M, Corace K, Presseau J, Bacon S, I CST. Understanding national trends in COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in Canada: results from five sequential cross-sectional representative surveys spanning April 2020-March 2021. BMJ open 2022;**12**(4):e059411.

28. Bagic D, Suljok A, Ancic B. Determinants and reasons for coronavirus disease 2019 vaccine hesitancy in Croatia. Croatian medical journal 2022;**63**(1):89-97.

29. Neumann-Böhme S, Varghese NE, Sabat I, Barros PP, Brouwer W, van Exel J, Schreyögg J, Stargardt T. Once we have it, will we use it? A European survey on willingness to be vaccinated against COVID-19. The European journal of health economics: HEPAC: health economics in prevention and care 2020;**21**(7):977-982.

30. Detoc M, Bruel S, Frappe P, Tardy B, Botelho-Nevers E, Gagneux-Brunon A. Intention to participate in a COVID-19 vaccine clinical trial and

to get vaccinated against COVID-19 in France during the pandemic. Vaccine 2020;**38**(45):7002-7006.

31. Montagni I, Ouazzani-Touhami K, Pouymayou A, Pereira E, Texier N, Schuck S, Tzourio C, Group C. Who is hesitant about Covid-19 vaccines? The profiling of participants in a French online cohort. Revue d'epidemiologie et de sante publique 2022;**70**(3):123-131.

32. Ward JK, Alleaume C, Peretti-Watel P, Group C. The French public's attitudes to a future COVID-19 vaccine: The politicization of a public health issue. Social Science & Medicine (1982) 2020;265:113414.
33. Coulaud P-J, Ablona A, Bolduc N, Fast D, Bertr, Karine, Ward JK,

Greyson D, Jauffret-Roustide M, Knight R. COVID-19 vaccine intention among young adults: Comparative results from a cross-sectional study in Canada and France. Vaccine 2022;**40**(16):2442-2456.

34. Heyerdahl LW, Vray M, Lana B, Tvardik N, Gobat N, Wanat M, Tonkin-Crine S, Anthierens S, Goossens H, Giles-Vernick T. Conditionality of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in European countries. Vaccine 2022;**40**(9):1191-1197.

35. Bendau A, Plag J, Petzold MB, Ströhle A. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and related fears and anxiety. International Immunopharmacology 2021;**97**:107724.

36. Kourlaba G, Kourkouni E, Maistreli S, Tsopela C-G, Molocha N-M, Triantafyllou C, Koniordou M, Kopsidas I, Chorianopoulou E, Maroudi-Manta S, Filippou D, Zaoutis TE. Willingness of Greek general population to get a COVID-19 vaccine. Global Health Research and Policy 2021;**6**(1):3.

37. Murphy J, Vallières F, Bentall RP, Shevlin M, McBride O, Hartman TK, McKay R, Bennett K, Mason L, Gibson-Miller J, Levita L, Martinez AP, Stocks TVA, Karatzias T, Hyland P. Psychological characteristics 21

associated with COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and resistance in Ireland and the United Kingdom. Nature Communications 2021;**12**(1):29.

38. Maor Y, Caspi S. Attitudes towards influenza, and COVID-19 vaccines during the COVID-19 pandemic among a representative sample of the Jewish Israeli population. PloS one 2022;**17**(2):e0255495.

39. Caserotti M, Girardi P, Rubaltelli E, Tasso A, Lotto L, Gavaruzzi T. Associations of COVID-19 risk perception with vaccine hesitancy over time for Italian residents. Social Science & Medicine (1982) 2021;**272**:113688.

40. La Vecchia C, Negri E, Alicandro G, Scarpino V. Attitudes towards influenza vaccine and a potential COVID-19 vaccine in Italy and differences across occupational groups, September 2020. La Medicina Del Lavoro 2020;111(6):445-448.

41. Moscardino U, Musso P, Inguglia C, Ceccon C, Miconi D, Rousseau C. Sociodemographic and psychological correlates of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and resistance in the young adult population in Italy. Vaccine 2022;**40**(16):2379-2387.

42. Palamenghi L, Barello S, Boccia S, Graffigna G. Mistrust in biomedical research and vaccine hesitancy: the forefront challenge in the battle against COVID-19 in Italy. European Journal of Epidemiology 2020;**35**(8):785-788.

43. Ishimaru T, Okawara M, Ando H, Hino A, Nagata T, Tateishi S, Tsuji M, Matsuda S, Fujino Y. Gender differences in the determinants of willingness to get the COVID-19 vaccine among the working-age population in Japan. Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics 2021;**17**(11):3975-3981.

44. Machida M, Nakamura I, Kojima T, Saito R, Nakaya T, Hanibuchi T, Takamiya T, Odagiri Y, Fukushima N, Kikuchi H, Amagasa S, Watanabe H, Inoue S. Acceptance of a COVID-19 Vaccine in Japan during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Vaccines 2021;**9**(3):210.

45. Kadoya Y, Watanapongvanich S, Yuktadatta P, Putthinun P, Lartey ST, Khan MSR. Willing or Hesitant? A Socioeconomic Study on the Potential Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccine in Japan. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 2021;**18**(9):4864.

46. Sekizawa Y, Hashimoto S, Denda K, Ochi S, So M. Association between COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and generalized trust, depression, generalized anxiety, and fear of COVID-19. BMC public health 2022;**22**(1):126.

47. Yoda T, Katsuyama H. Willingness to Receive COVID-19 Vaccination in Japan. Vaccines 2021;**9**(1):48.

48. Soares P, Rocha JV, Moniz M, Gama A, Laires PA, Pedro AR, Dias S, Leite A, Nunes C. Factors Associated with COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy. Vaccines 2021;9(3):300.

49. Khaled SM, Petcu C, Bader L, Amro I, Al-Hamadi AMHA, Al Assi M, Ali AAM, Le Trung K, Diop A, Bellaj T, Al-Thani MH, Woodruff PW, Alabdulla M, Haddad PM. Prevalence and Potential Determinants of COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Resistance in Qatar: Results from a Nationally Representative Survey of Qatari Nationals and Migrants between December 2020 and January 2021. Vaccines 2021;9(5):471.

50. Batty GD, Deary IJ, Altschul D. Pre-pandemic mental and physical health as predictors of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: evidence from a UK-wide cohort study. Annals of medicine 2022;**54**(1):274-282.

51. Freeman D, Loe BS, Chadwick A, Vaccari C, Waite F, Rosebrock L, Jenner L, Petit A, Lewandowsky S, Vanderslott S, Innocenti S, Larkin M, Giubilini A, Yu L-M, McShane H, Pollard AJ, Lambe S. COVID-19 vaccine

BMJ Open

hesitancy in the UK: the Oxford coronavirus explanations, attitudes, and narratives survey (Oceans) II. Psychological Medicine 2020:1-15.

52. Freeman D, Waite F, Rosebrock L, Petit A, Causier C, East A, Jenner L, Teale A-L, Carr L, Mulhall S, Bold E, Lambe S. Coronavirus conspiracy beliefs, mistrust, and compliance with government guidelines in England. Psychological Medicine 2022;**52**(2):251-263.

53. Sethi S, Kumar A, Mandal A, Shaikh M, Hall CA, Kirk JMW, Moss P, Brookes MJ, Basu S. The UPTAKE study: a cross-sectional survey examining the insights and beliefs of the UK population on COVID-19 vaccine uptake and hesitancy. BMJ Open 2021;**11**(6):e048856.

54. Chaudhuri K, Chakrabarti A, Ch, An JS, B, Yopadhyay S. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the UK: a longitudinal household cross-sectional study. BMC public health 2022;**22**(1):104.

55. Sherman SM, Sim J, Cutts M, Dasch H, Amlot R, Rubin GJ, Sevdalis N, Smith LE. COVID-19 vaccination acceptability in the UK at the start of the vaccination programme: a nationally representative cross-sectional survey (CoVAccS - wave 2). Public health 2022;**202**:1-9.

56. Sherman SM, Smith LE, Sim J, Amlôt R, Cutts M, Dasch H, Rubin GJ, Sevdalis N. COVID-19 vaccination intention in the UK: results from the COVID-19 vaccination acceptability study (CoVAccS), a nationally representative cross-sectional survey. Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics 2021;**17**(6):1612-1621.

57. Earnshaw VA, Eaton LA, Kalichman SC, Brousseau NM, Hill EC, Fox AB. COVID-19 conspiracy beliefs, health behaviors, and policy support. Translational Behavioral Medicine 2020;**10**(4):850-856.

58. Fisher KA, Bloomstone SJ, Walder J, Crawford S, Fouayzi H, Mazor KM. Attitudes Toward a Potential SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine : A Survey of U.S. Adults. Annals of Internal Medicine 2020;**173**(12):964-973.

59. Malik AA, McFadden SM, Elharake J, Omer SB. Determinants of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the US. EClinicalMedicine 2020;**26**:100495.

60. Reiter P, Pennell M, Katz M. Acceptability of a COVID-19 Vaccine among Adults in the United States: How Many People Would Get Vaccinated? Vaccine 2020;**38**.

61. Pogue K, Jensen JL, Stancil CK, Ferguson DG, Hughes SJ, Mello EJ, Burgess R, Berges BK, Quaye A, Poole BD. Influences on Attitudes Regarding Potential COVID-19 Vaccination in the United States. Vaccines 2020;**8**(4):E582.

62. Craig BM. United States COVID-19 Vaccination Preferences (CVP): 2020 Hindsight. The Patient 2021;**14**(3):309-318.

63. Thunström L, Ashworth M, Finnoff D, Newbold SC. Hesitancy Toward a COVID-19 Vaccine. EcoHealth 2021;**18**(1):44-60.

64. Rane MS, Kochhar S, Poehlein E, You W, Robertson MM, Zimba R, Westmorel, A. D, Romo ML, Kulkarni SG, Chang M, Berry A, A, Parcesepe AM, Maroko AR, Grov C, Nash D, Team CCCS. Determinants and Trends of COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Vaccine Uptake in a National Cohort of US Adults: A Longitudinal Study. American journal of epidemiology 2022;**191**(4):570-583.

65. Kelly BJ, Southwell BG, McCormack LA, Bann CM, MacDonald PDM, Frasier AM, Bevc CA, Brewer NT, Squiers LB. Predictors of willingness to get a COVID-19 vaccine in the U.S. BMC Infectious Diseases 2021;**21**(1):338.

66. Iacoella C, Ralli M, Maggiolini A, Arcangeli A, Ercoli L. Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccine among persons experiencing homelessness in the City of Rome, Italy. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci 2021;**25**(7):3132-3135.

67. Tucker JS, D'Amico EJ, Pedersen ER, Garvey R, Rodriguez A, Klein DJ. COVID-19 Vaccination Rates and Attitudes Among Young Adults With Recent Experiences of Homelessness. The Journal of adolescent health : official publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine 2022;**70**(3):504-506.

68. Meehan AA, Yeh M, Gardner A, DeFoe TL, Garcia A, V, er Kelen P, Montgomery MP, Tippins AE, Carmichael AE, Gibbs Chw R, Caidi H, Mosites E, Rehman N. COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptability Among Clients and Staff of Homeless Shelters in Detroit, Michigan, February 2021. Health promotion practice 2022;**23**(1):35-41.

69. Rogers JH, Cox SN, Hughes JP, Link AC, Chow EJ, Fosse I, Lukoff M, Shim MM, Uyeki TM, Ogokeh C, Jackson ML, Boeckh M, Englund JA, Mosites E, Rolfes MA, Chu HY. Trends in COVID-19 vaccination intent and factors associated with deliberation and reluctance among adult homeless shelter residents and staff, 1 November 2020 to 28 February 2021 - King County, Washington. Vaccine 2022;**40**(1):122-132.

70. Dietze PM, Hall C, Price O, Stewart AC, Crawford S, Peacock A, Maher L. COVID-19 vaccine acceptability among people in Australia who inject drugs: Implications for vaccine rollout. Drug and alcohol review 2022;**41**(2):484-487.

71. Sullivan MC, Mistler C, Copenhaver MM, Wickersham JA, Ni Z, Kim RS, Shrestha R. Race, trust, and COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in people with opioid use disorder. Health psychology : official journal of the Division

of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association 2022;**41**(2):115-120.

72. Abramovich A, Pang N, Kunasekaran S, Moss A, A, Kiran T, Pinto AD. Examining COVID-19 vaccine uptake and attitudes among

2SLGBTQ+ youth experiencing homelessness. BMC public health 2022;**22**(1):122.

73. Christodoulou J, Fehrenbacher AE, Shaw EH, Vincent EM, Saleska JL. COVID-19 prevention behaviors, trust, and intent to vaccinate among youth at risk for HIV. PloS one 2022;**17**(3):e0266321.

74. Stern MF, Piasecki AM, Strick LB, Rajeshwar P, Tyagi E, Dolovich S, Patel PR, Fukunaga R, Furukawa NW. Willingness to Receive a COVID-19 Vaccination Among Incarcerated or Detained Persons in Correctional and Detention Facilities - Four States, September-December 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2021;**70**(13):473-477.

75. Shaw J, Anderson KB, Fabi RE, Thompson CA, Harris M, Aljabbarin N, Bolourchi D, Mozo N, Lichtenstein D, Lupone CD, Larsen DA, Shaw AV. COVID-19 vaccination intention and behavior in a large, diverse, U.S. refugee population. Vaccine 2022;**40**(9):1231-1237.

76. Page KR, Genovese E, Franchi M, Cella S, Fiorini G, Tlili R, Salazar S, Duvoisin A, Cailhol J, Jackson Y. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among undocumented migrants during the early phase of the vaccination campaign: a multicentric cross-sectional study. BMJ open 2022;**12**(3):e056591.

77. Crozier J, Christensen N, Li P, Stanley G, Clark DS, Selleck C. Rural, Underserved, and Minority Populations' Perceptions of COVID-19 Information, Testing, and Vaccination: Report from a Southern State. Population health management 2022;**25**(3):413-422.

78. Scott VP, Hiller-Venegas S, Edra K, Prickitt J, Esquivel Y, Melendrez B, Rhee KE. Factors associated with COVID-19 vaccine intent among Latino SNAP participants in Southern California. BMC public health 2022;**22**(1):653.

79. Martin CA, Marshall C, Patel P, Goss C, Jenkins DR, Ellwood C, Barton L, Price A, Brunskill NJ, Khunti K, Pareek M. SARS-CoV-2 vaccine uptake in a multi-ethnic UK healthcare workforce: A cross-sectional study. PLoS Med 2021;**18**(11):e1003823.

80. Curtis HJ, Inglesby P, Morton CE, MacKenna B, Green A, Hulme W, Walker AJ, Morley J, Mehrkar A, Bacon S, Hickman G, Bates C, Croker R, Evans D, Ward T, Cockburn J, Davy S, Bhaskaran K, Schultze A, Rentsch CT, Williamson EJ, Rowan A, Fisher L, McDonald HI, Tomlinson L, Mathur R, Drysdale H, Eggo RM, Wing K, Wong AY, Forbes H, Parry J, Hester F, Harper S, O'Hanlon S, Eavis A, Jarvis R, Avramov D, Griffiths P, Fowles A, Parkes N, Douglas IJ, Evans SJ, Smeeth L, Goldacre B. Trends and clinical characteristics of COVID-19 vaccine recipients: a federated analysis of 57.9 million patients' primary care records in situ using OpenSAFELY. Br J Gen Pract 2022;**72**(714):e51-e62.

81. Cahill SR. Still in the Dark Regarding the Public Health Impact of COVID-19 on Sexual and Gender Minorities. American Journal of Public Health 2021;**111**(9):1606-1609.

82. Hussain B, Latif A, Timmons S, Nkhoma K, Nellums LB. Overcoming COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among ethnic minorities: A systematic review of UK studies. Vaccine 2022;**40**(25):3413-3432.

83. Peters MDJ. Addressing vaccine hesitancy and resistance for COVID-19 vaccines. Int J Nurs Stud 2022;**131**:104241.

84. Liu F, Panagiotakos D. Real-world data: a brief review of the methods, applications, challenges and opportunities. BMC Medical Research Methodology 2022;**22**(1):287.

Table 1. General characteristics of included studies.

Author	Country	Study design	Date of data collection	Population	Sample size	Female sex proportion	Mean age	Vaccine acceptance	Hesitancy	Refusal	Unwillingness
Attwell ²²	Australia	Cross-	29-May-20	General population	1316	60	58	65%	27%	8%	35%
		sectional									
		survey									
Seale	Australia	Cross-	24-Mar-20	General population	1420	52		80%	14%	6%	20%
		sectional									
		survey									
Dietze	Australia	Cross-	22-Dec-20	People who inject drugs	100	41	39	48%	37%	15%	52%
		sectional		at least monthly in the							
		survey		past 6 months							
Enticott	Australia	Cross-	7-Mar-21	General population	1166	49	51.7	78%	15%	7%	22%
		sectional									
		survey									
Schernhammer	Austria	Cross-	3-Dec-20	General population	1007	44	42	36%	23%	41%	64%
		sectional									
		survey									
Kessels	Belgium	Cross-	16-Oct-20	General population	2060			34%	57%	9%	66%
		sectional									
		survey									
Lavoie	Canada	Cross-	29-Mar-21	General population	15019	50	48	58%	0%	0%	42%
		sectional									
		survey									
Basta	Canada	Cross-	29-Dec-20	General population	23819	53		84%	12%	4%	16%
		sectional									
		survey									
Abramovich (Canada	Cross-	30-Jan-21	2SLGBTQ+ youth	139	61	20	64%	0%	0%	36%
		sectional		experiencing							
		SURVEY		homelessness							

BMJ Open

Manca	Canada	Cross-	10-Dec-20	Indigenous population	342	53		64%	17%	18%	35%
		sectional									
		survey									
Bagic	Croatia	Cross-	11-Apr-21	General population	765	52.4	49	64%	19%	17%	35%
		sectional									
		survey									
Neumann-	Denmark	Cross-	15-Apr-20	General population	7664			80%	12%	8%	20%
Böhme		sectional									
		survey									
Detoc	France	Cross-	20-Apr-20	General population	3656	89	67	78%	48%	0%	48%
		sectional									
		survey									
Ward	France	Cross-	4-May-20	General population	5018			76%	16%	8%	24%
		sectional									
		survey									
Montagni	France	Cross-	10-May-20	General population	1640	78.4		71%	11%	19%	30%
		sectional									
		survey									
Ousseine	France	Cross-	11-Apr-21	Men who have sex with	18474	0	34	61%	22%	18%	40%
		sectional		men							
		survey									
Coulaud	France	Cross-	23-Dec-20	General population	3204	38.		60%	30%	10%	40%
		sectional									
		survey									
Heyerdahl	France	Cross-	16-Dec-20	General population	10000			57%	19%	24%	43%
		sectional									
		survey									
Bendau	Germany	Cross-	11-Jan-21	General population	1779	77.6	41	65%	24%	11%	35%
		sectional									
		survey									

BMJ Open

Kourlaba Greece	Greece	Cross-	3-May-20	General population	1004	51	41	58%	16%	26%	42%
		sectional									
		survey									
Murphy	Ireland	Cross-	5-Apr-20	General population	1041	51.5		65%	26%	9%	35%
		sectional									
		survey									
Maor	Israel	Cross-	6-Sep-20	General population	2024	52		76%	0%	24%	24%
		sectional									
		survey									
Caserotti	Italy	Survey with	30-Jun-20	General population	839	70.2	38	79%	0%	21%	21%
		repeated									
		measures									
La Vecchia	Italy	Cross-	28-Sep-20	General population	1055	51.7		54%	0%	46%	46%
		sectional									
		survey									
Di Giuseppe	Italy	Cross-	28-Apr-21	Incarcerated	685	0	42.4	64%	0%	36%	36%
		sectional									
		survey									
Moscardino	Italy	Cross-	28-Jun-21	General population	1200	49.2	29.8	73%	18%	8%	25%
		sectional									
		survey									
Palamenghi	Italy	Cross-sectional	l survey	General population	968			59%	0%	41%	41%
lacoella	Italy	Cross-	15-Feb-21	persons experiencing	112	24.1	53.1	63%	4%	32%	36%
		sectional		homelessness							
		survey									
Yoda	Japan	Cross-	30-Sep-20	General population	1100	46.9	44.8	66%	22%	12%	34%
		sectional									
		survey									
Ihshimaru	Japan	Cross-	26-Dec-20	General population	27036	48.9		38%	0%	63%	63%
		sectional									
		survey									

BMJ Open

Machida	Japan	Cross-	18-Jan-21	General population	2956	50.6		62%	0%	38%	38%
		sectional									
		survey									
Kadoya	Japan	Cross-	25-Feb-21	General population	4253	35	50.3	47%	31%	22%	53%
		sectional									
		survey									
Sekizawa	Japan	Cross-	6-May-21	General population	11846	49.6	54	62%	30%	9%	38%
		sectional									
		survey									
Soares	Portugal	Cross-	8-Jan-21	General population	1943	67.7	47.7	35%	56%	9%	65%
		sectional									
		survey									
Khaled	Qatar	Cross-	25-Jan-21	General population	1912	31.7		43%	45%	12%	57%
		sectional									
		survey									
Page	Switzerland	Cross-	31-May-21	Undocumented migrants	812	60.9	39	41%	0%	59%	59%
		sectional									
		survey									
Freeman	UK	Cross-	11-May-20	General population	2501	51.4	46.6	48%	7%	5%	12%
		sectional									
		survey									
Sethi	UK	Cross-	9-Oct-20	General population	4884	69.9		79%	14%	7%	21%
		sectional									
		survey									
Freeman	UK	Cross-	17-Oct-20	General population	5114	49.2	46.9	72%	17%	12%	28%
		sectional									
		survey									
Batty	UK	Cross-	31-Dec-20	General population	11955	56.4		85%	15%	0%	15%
		sectional									
		survey									

BMJ Open

Chaudhuri UK	Cross- sectional	31-Jan-21	General population	22421	58.5	55.4	89%	0%	11%	11%	
		survey									
Sherman	UK	Cross-	17-Jul-20	General population	1494	51	46	64%	27%	9%	36%
		sectional									
		survey									
Sherman	UK	Cross-	15-Jan-21	General population	1500	51	45.6	74%	14%	9%	23%
		sectional									
		survey									
Earnshaw	USA	Cross-	14-Apr-20	General population	845	40.9	40	86%	0%	0%	14%
		sectional									
		survey									
Fisher	USA	Cross-	20-Apr-20	General population	991	51.5	18	58%	32%	11%	42%
		sectional									
		survey									
Malik	USA	Cross-	1-May-20	General population	672	57		67%	0%	0%	33%
		sectional									
		survey									
Reiter	USA	Cross-	31-May-20	General population	2006	56		48%	43%	9%	52%
		sectional									
		survey									
Pogue	USA	Cross-section	al survey	General population	316	49.4		68%	23%	9%	32%
Craig	USA	Discrete	11-Nov-20	General population	1153	52.3		61%	0%	17%	17%
		choice									
		experiment									
		survey									
Kelly	USA	Cross-	30-Apr-20	General population	2279	52		75%	0%	25%	25%
		sectional									
		survey									
3											
			For peer rev	view only - http://bmior	oen.bmi.com	/site/about/o	nuideline	s.xhtml			
Page 35 of 78

BMJ Open

Christodoulou	USA	Cross-		30-Apr-20	Youth aged 18–28 at-risk	83	16	23	65%	0%	35%	35%
		sectional			for HIV							
		survey										
Sullivan	USA	Cross-		01-May-20	People with opioid use	234	56	46.8	32%	48%	20%	68%
		sectional			disorder							
		survey										
Stern	USA	Cross-		12-Dec-20	Incarcerated or detained	5110	17.6		45%	10%	45%	55%
		sectional			persons							
		survey										
Rogers	USA	Cross-		28-Feb-21	Adult homeless shelter	969	27.4	41	54%	18%	28%	46%
		sectional			residents and staff							
		survey										
Crozier	USA	Cross-		31-Dec-20	Rural, Underserved and	3721	56.5		39%	27%	24%	51%
		sectional			Minority Populations in							
		survey			Alabama							
Thunström	USA	Cross-		31-Mar-20	General population	3133	52	46	80%	0%	20%	20%
		sectional										
		survey										
Rane	USA	Survey	with	01-Oct-20	General population	4571	53		85%	9%	6%	15%
		repeated										
		measures	S									
Scott	USA	Cross-		31-Jul-20	Latino SNAP participants	486	93	40	48%	39%	13%	52%
		sectional			(food programme)							
		survey										
Bogart	USA	Cross-		31-Dec-20	Black Americans	207	71	50.8	30%	38%	32%	70%
		sectional										
		survey										
Rosen	USA	Cross-		31-May-21	Unhoused People in Los	4949			74%	7%	17%	25%
		sectional			Angeles County							
		survey										

BMJ Open

TUCKEI	USA	Cross- sectional survey	1-Mar-21	Young adults with recent experiences of homelessness	134	32		50%	0%	50%	50%
Shaw	USA	Cross- sectional survey	1-Mar-21	Refugees	244	55.3	38.5	57%	18%	25%	43%
Nguyen	USA	Cross- sectional survey	2-Aug-20	General population	63266	50.6		86%	5%	9%	14%
Meehan	USA	Cross- sectional survey	23-Feb-21	Clients and staff of homeless shelters	106	eu	44	58%	11%	31%	42%
35											

Figures

Figure 1. Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the general population

Study	Events	Total		Proportion	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
Kessels	700	2060	- 1	0.34	[0.32; 0.36]	1.2%	2.2%
Soares	686	1943	-	0.35	[0.33; 0.37]	1.1%	2.2%
Schernhammer	364	1007		0.36	[0.33; 0.39]	0.6%	2.2%
Ihshimaru	10138	27036		0.37	0.37: 0.381	16.4%	2.2%
Khaled	816	1912		0.43	10.40: 0.451	1.2%	2.2%
Kadova	1999	4253	- 1	0.47	[0.46: 0.49]	2.7%	2.2%
Freeman	1188	2501	-	0.48	[0 46 0 49]	1.6%	22%
Reiter	963	2006	-	0.48	[0 46 0 50]	1.3%	22%
La Vecchia	567	1055		0.54	[0 51 0 57]	0.7%	22%
Heverdahl	5690	10000		0.57	[0 56: 0 58]	6.3%	22%
Fisher	571	991		0.58	[0 55 0 61]	0.6%	22%
Kourlaba	579	1004		0.58	[0.55: 0.61]	0.6%	2.2%
Lavoie	8681	15019	•	0.58	[0.57: 0.59]	9.5%	2.2%
Palamenghi	571	968		0.59	[0.56: 0.62]	0.6%	2.2%
Coulaud	1013	3204	-	0.60	[0.58: 0.61]	2.0%	2.2%
Craig	704	1153		0.61	[0.58: 0.64]	0.7%	2.2%
Sokizawa	7207	11946		0.67	[0.61: 0.62]	7 20/	2.2%
Machida	1836	2056		0.02	[0.60: 0.64]	1 9%	2.2%
Radic	1000	765		0.02	[0.60; 0.67]	0.5%	2.2 /0
Shorman	400	1404		0.04	[0.60, 0.07]	0.0%	2.2 /0
Bondau	11/7	1770		0.04	[0.02, 0.00]	1 1 1 %	2.2 /0
Attual	055	1216	1	0.04	[0.02, 0.07]	0.00/	2.270
Allweit	633	1011	I	0.05	[0.02, 0.00]	0.0%	2.2%
Wulphy	700	1100	<u> </u>	0.05	[0.02, 0.00]	0.0%	2.2%
Molik	123	672		0.00	[0.63, 0.66]	0.0%	2.2%
Malik	400	216	1.	0.07	[0.03, 0.70]	0.4%	2.2%
Pogue	210	1010		0.00	[0.03, 0.73]	0.2%	2.2%
Montagni	1150	1040		0.70	[0.68; 0.73]	0.9%	2.2%
Freeman	3007	0114		0.72	[0.70, 0.73]	2.1%	2.2%
Moscardino	8/6	1200		0.73	[0.70; 0.75]	0.0%	2.2%
Snerman	1102	1500		0.73	[0.71; 0.76]	0.8%	2.2%
Kelly	1709	22/9		0.75	[0.73; 0.77]	1.1%	2.2%
Ward	3814	5018		0.76	[0.75; 0.77]	2.4%	2.2%
Maor	1546	2024		0.76	[0.74; 0.78]	0.9%	2.2%
Detoc	2837	3656		0.78	[0.76; 0.79]	1.6%	2.2%
Enticott	909	1166		0.78	[0.75; 0.80]	0.5%	2.2%
Caserotti	659	839		0.79	[0.76; 0.81]	0.4%	2.2%
Sethi	3873	4884		0.79	[0.78; 0.80]	2.1%	2.2%
Seale	1136	1420		0.80	[0.78; 0.82]	0.6%	2.2%
Neumann-Böhme	6131	7664		0.80	[0.79; 0.81]	3.2%	2.2%
Thunström	2506	3133	•	0.80	[0.79; 0.81]	1.3%	2.2%
Basta	20056	23819		0.84	[0.84; 0.85]	8.2%	2.2%
Batty	10114	11955		0.85	[0.84; 0.85]	4.0%	2.2%
Rane	3899	4571		0.85	[0.84; 0.86]	1.5%	2.2%
Earnshaw	725	845		• 0.86	[0.83; 0.88]	0.3%	2.2%
Chaudhuri	19910	22421		0.89	[0.88; 0.89]	5.8%	2.2%
Fixed effect model		204545	•	0.65	[0.65; 0.65]	100.0%	-
Random effects model Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / ² = 100%.	$\tau^2 = 0.711$	7, p = 0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.67	[0.61; 0.72] [0.26; 0.92]		100.0%
			0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8	0.9			

Proportions of vaccine acceptance in the general populations

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval

Figure 2. Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in special populations

Study	Events	Total		Proportion	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weigh (random
Bogart	63	207		0.30	[0.25; 0.37]	0.6%	5.8%
Sullivan	75	234		0.32	[0.26; 0.38]	0.7%	5.8%
Crozier	1440	3721		0.39	[0.37; 0.40]	11.5%	6.4%
Page	335	812	e i	0.41	[0.38; 0.45]	2.6%	6.2%
Stern	2294	5110	.	0.45	[0.44; 0.46]	16.5%	6.4%
Dietze	48	100		0.48	[0.38; 0.58]	0.3%	5.4%
Scott	233	486		0.48	[0.44; 0.52]	1.6%	6.2%
Tucker	68	134		0.51	[0.42: 0.59]	0.4%	5.6%
Rogers	526	969		0.54	[0.51; 0.57]	3.1%	6.3%
Shaw	140	244	+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	0.57	[0.51; 0.63]	0.8%	5.9%
Meehan	61	106		0.58	[0.48; 0.67]	0.3%	5.4%
Ousseine	11177	18474	+	0.61	[0.60; 0.61]	57.5%	6.4%
lacoella	71	112		0.63	[0.54; 0.72]	0.3%	5.4%
Di Giuseppe	438	685		0.64	[0.60; 0.67]	2.1%	6.2%
Abramovich	89	139		0.64	[0.56; 0.72]	0.4%	5.6%
Manca	221	342		0.65	[0.59; 0.70]	1.0%	6.0%
Christodoulou	54	83	<u> </u>	0.65	[0.54; 0.75]	0.2%	5.19
Fixed effect model		31958	•	0.54	[0.54: 0.55]	100.0%	
Random effects mod	lel			0.52	10.46: 0.571		100.0%
Prediction interval			22 32 27		[0.28; 0.75]		
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$	$\tau^2 = 0.2098$	p < 00					
		, - 5.6	0.5 0.6 0.7				
	Propor	tions of	ceptance among speci	ial population	S		

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
2 2	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
20	
27	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
42 42	
75 11	
44	
40 46	
40	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
50	
55	
0.0	

Table	of	contents	for the	supplementary	/ material
10010	· ··	0011101110	101 1110	Jappionionai	matorial

1.	Supplementary section 1: methods	3
	a.Search	3
	b.Figure S1 Flow diagram for selection of studies	4
	c.List of excluded references after full-text screening	5
	d.Definitions of variables and sources	13
2.	Supplementary section 2: Assessment of quality and risk of bias results	15
	Table S1. Risk of bias assessment of included studies (Adapted from Hoy et al)	15
3.	Supplementary section 3: Table S2.Country-specific real-world data	17
4.	Supplementary section 4: Country-specific analyses	18
	Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Australia	18
	Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Canada	19
	Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in France	20
	Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Italy	21
	Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Japan	22
	Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the United King	gdom22
	Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the United Stat	es23
5.	Supplementary section 5: Comparison between data from studies and real-wor	ld data25
	a. Table S3. Willingness to be vaccinated and real-world vaccine uptake	25
	b. Consolidated country data from studies and country real-world statistics	26
6.	Supplementary section 6: Sensitivity analyses	27
	a. Outlier and influential case diagnostics	27
	b. Cumulative meta-analysis of willingness to be vaccinated according to the acquisition. General population.	e date of data 28
	c. Cumulative meta-analysis of willingness to be vaccinated according to the acquisition. Special populations.	date of data
	d. Cumulative real-world data meta-analysis according to the date of first COV administered in each country	/ID-19 vaccine 29
	e. Results from the generalized linear models for vaccine uptake and country-level	data30

3	
4	
-	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
י <u>ג</u> רר	
22 22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
27	
22	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
1	
וד- ⊿רו∕	
4Z	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	

1 2

	f. Bubble plots from meta-regressiosn analyses to explore associations of country	-level data with
	vaccine uptake	30
	g. Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the genera	I population for
	studies with high risk of selection bias	31
7	7. Supplementary section 7 PRISMA checklist	32
	Prisma 2020 Checklist	32

to be the wiew only

Supplementary material

1. Supplementary section 1: methods

a. Search

Search date: November 30 2022 (last date searched)

(exp Coronaviridae/exp Coronavirus Infections/(2019 novel coronavirus disease or COVID19 or sarscov 2 infection or SARS coronavir* or 2019 novel coronavirus infection or 2019 ncov infection or 2019 ncov disease).ti,ab.) AND (exp Vaccines/exp Immunization/or ((vaccin* or immun* or Influenza Vaccines or COVID-19 Vaccin*) adj3 COVID-19).ti,ab.) AND (exp "Patient Acceptance of Health Care"/exp Vaccination/exp Attitude/or (Willingness or readiness or preparedness or disposition or acceptance or acceptability or perception or receptivity or hesitancy or intention or attitudes).ti,ab. not exp animals/)





c. List of excluded references after full-text screening

Exclusion reason	Reference
Wrong population (n=103)	1-103
Convenience sample (n=23)	104-126
Outcomes missing (n=21)	127-147
Qualitative study (n=3)	148-150
Focusing on booster vaccine (n=2)	151-152

- 1. Galanis, P. *et al.* Willingness, refusal and influential factors of parents to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Preventive medicine* 157, 106994 (2022)
- 2. Willingness to obtain COVID-19 vaccination in adults with multiple sclerosis in the United States ScienceDirect. (2022).
- 3. Luo, H. *et al.* Willingness to Get a COVID-19 Vaccine and Reasons for Hesitancy Among Medicare Beneficiaries: Results From a National Survey. *Journal of public health management and practice : JPHMP* 28, 70–76 (2022).
- 4. Serrazina, F., Sobral Pinho, A., Cabral, G., Salavisa, M. & Correia, A. S. Willingness to be vaccinated against COVID-19: An exploratory online survey in a Portuguese cohort of multiple sclerosis patients. *Mult Scler Relat Disord* 51, 102880 (2021).
- 5. Unroe, K., Evans, R., Weaver, L., Rusyniak, D. & Blackburn, J. Willingness of Long-Term Care Staff to Receive a COVID -19 Vaccine: A Single State Survey. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 69, (2020).
- 6. Wagner, E. F. *et al.* Virtual town halls addressing vaccine hesitancy among racial/ethnic minorities: Preliminary findings. *Journal of the American Pharmacists Association : JAPhA* 62, 317–325 (2022).
- 7. Vaccines | Free Full-Text | Intention to Be Vaccinated for COVID-19 among Italian Nurses during the Pandemic. (2022).
- 8. Vaccines | Free Full-Text | Attitudes towards COVID-19 Vaccination among Hospital Staff— Understanding What Matters to Hesitant People. (2022).
- 9. 'Vaccine hesitancy' among university students in Italy during the COVID-19 pandemic | SpringerLink. (2022).
- 10. Lo Moro, G., Cugudda, E., Bert, F., Raco, I. & Siliquini, R. Vaccine Hesitancy and Fear of COVID-19 Among Italian Medical Students: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Journal of community health* 47, 475–483 (2022).
- 11. Kelkar, A. H. *et al.* Vaccine Enthusiasm and Hesitancy in Cancer Patients and the Impact of a Webinar. *Healthcare (Basel)* 9, 351 (2021).
- 12. Riad, A. *et al.* Universal Predictors of Dental Students' Attitudes towards COVID-19 Vaccination: Machine Learning-Based Approach. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 1158 (2021).
- 13. Lennon, R. P. *et al.* Unique Predictors of Intended Uptake of a COVID-19 Vacciné in Adults Living in a Rural College Town in the United States. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP* 36, 180–184 (2022).
- 14. Euser, S., Kroese, F. M., Derks, M. & de Bruin, M. Understanding COVID-19 vaccination willingness among youth: A survey study in the Netherlands. *Vaccine* 40, 833–836 (2022).
- 15. Trent, M., Seale, H., Chughtai, A. A., Salmon, D. & MacIntyre, C. R. Trust in government, intention to vaccinate and COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: A comparative survey of five large cities in the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia. *Vaccine* 40, 2498–2505 (2022).

- 16. Hosokawa, Y. *et al.* The Prevalence of COVID-19 Vaccination and Vaccine Hesitancy in Pregnant Women: An Internet-based Cross-sectional Study in Japan. *Journal of epidemiology* 32, 188–194 (2022).
- 17. Grüner, S. & Krüger, F. The intention to be vaccinated against COVID-19: stated preferences before vaccines were available. *Applied Economics Letters* 28, 1847–1851 (2021).
- 18. Kavanagh, A., Dickinson, H., Dimov, S., Shields, M. & McAllister, A. The COVID-19 vaccine intentions of Australian disability support workers. *Australian and New Zealand journal of public health* 46, 314–321 (2022).
- 19. Harsch, I. A., Ortloff, A., Reinhöfer, M. & Epstude, J. Symptoms, antibody levels and vaccination attitude after asymptomatic to moderate COVID-19 infection in 200 healthcare workers. *GMS Hyg Infect Control* 16, Doc15 (2021).
- 20. G, D. G. *et al.* Surveying willingness toward SARS-CoV-2 vaccination of healthcare workers in Italy. *Expert review of vaccines* 20, (2021).
- 21. Chapman, G. *et al.* 'Scary to get, more scary not to': COVID-19 vaccine acceptance among healthcare workers in Central Queensland, Australia, a cross-sectional survey. *Communicable diseases intelligence (2018)* 46, (2022).
- 22. Stuckelberger, S. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine Willingness among Pregnant and Breastfeeding Women during the First Pandemic Wave: A Cross-Sectional Study in Switzerland. *Viruses* 13, 1199 (2021).
- 23. Jaiswal, J. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination Hesitancy and Behaviors in a National Sample of People Living with HIV. *AIDS patient care and STDs* 36, 34–44 (2022).
- 24. Temsah, M.-H. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 UK Variant of Concern Lineage-Related Perceptions, COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance and Travel Worry Among Healthcare Workers. *Front Public Health* 9, 686958 (2021).
- 25. Grafova, I. B. *et al.* Racial and ethnic differences in vaccine hesitancy Among registered nurses in New Jersey: A cross-sectional survey. *American journal of infection control* 50, 572–574 (2022).
- 26. Niznik, J. D. *et al.* Perceptions of COVID-19 vaccines among healthcare assistants: A national survey. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 70, 8–18 (2022).
- 27. Hogan, C. M. *et al.* Perceptions of COVID-19 Vaccine Incentives Among Adolescents and Young Adults. *JAMA network open* 5, e2216628 (2022).
- 28. Alhazza, S. F. *et al.* Parents' Hesitancy to Vaccinate Their Children Against COVID-19, a Country-Wide Survey. *Frontiers in public health* 10, 755073 (2022).
- 29. Bell, S., Clarke, R., Mounier-Jack, S., Walker, J. L. & Paterson, P. Parents' and guardians' views on the acceptability of a future COVID-19 vaccine: A multi-methods study in England. *Vaccine* 38, 7789–7798 (2020).
- 30. Bianco, A. *et al.* Parental COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: a cross-sectional survey in Italy. *Expert review of vaccines* 21, 541–547 (2022).
- 31. Choi, K., Becerra-Culqui, T., Bhakta, B., Bruxvoort, K. & Coleman, K. J. Parent intentions to vaccinate children with autism spectrum disorder against COVID-19. *Journal of pediatric nursing* 63, 108–110 (2022).
- 32. Afifi, T. O. *et al.* Older adolescents and young adults willingness to receive the COVID-19 vaccine: Implications for informing public health strategies. *Vaccine* 3473–3479 (2021).
- 33. Pierantoni, L. *et al.* Nationwide COVID-19 survey of Italian parents reveals useful information on attitudes to school attendance, medical support, vaccines and drug trials. *Acta Paediatr* 10.1111/apa.15614 (2020) doi:10.1111/apa.15614.
- 34. Brandt, E. J. *et al.* National Study of Youth Opinions on Vaccination for COVID-19 in the U.S. *J Adolesc Health* 68, 869–872 (2021).
- 35. Szmyd, B. *et al.* Medical Students and SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination: Attitude and Behaviors. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 128 (2021).
- 36. Halbrook, M. *et al.* Longitudinal Assessment of Coronavirus Disease 2019 Vaccine Acceptance and Uptake Among Frontline Medical Workers in Los Angeles, California. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* 74, 1166–1173 (2022).

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
1/	
14	
15	
10	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
50 27	
3/	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
50	
20	
29	
60	

- 37. Ciardi, F. *et al.* Knowledge, Attitudes and Perceptions of COVID-19 Vaccination among Healthcare Workers of an Inner-City Hospital in New York. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 516 (2021).
 - Elhadi, M. *et al.* Knowledge, attitude, and acceptance of healthcare workers and the public regarding the COVID-19 vaccine: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health* 21, 955 (2021).
- 39. Kreuter, M. W. *et al.* Intention to vaccinate children for COVID-19: A segmentation analysis among Medicaid parents in Florida. *Preventive medicine* 156, 106959 (2022).
- 40. Kaida, A. *et al.* Intention to Receive a COVID-19 Vaccine by HIV Status Among a Population-Based Sample of Women and Gender Diverse Individuals in British Columbia, Canada. *AIDS and behavior* 26, 2242–2255 (2022).
- 41. Gagneux-Brunon, A. *et al.* Intention to get vaccinations against COVID-19 in French healthcare workers during the first pandemic wave: a cross-sectional survey. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 108, 168–173 (2021).
- 42. Talarek, E., Warzecha, J., Banasiuk, M. & Banaszkiewicz, A. Influenza Vaccination Coverage and Intention to Receive Hypothetical Ebola and COVID-19 Vaccines among Medical Students. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 709 (2021).
- 43. Caron, B., Neuville, E. & Peyrin-Biroulet, L. Inflammatory Bowel Disease and COVID-19 Vaccination: A Patients' Survey. *Digestive diseases and sciences* 67, 2067–2073 (2022).
- 44. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on ophthalmic specialist training in Poland. | PLoS One;16(9): e0257876, 2021. | MEDLINE. (2022).
- 45. Janssen, C. *et al.* Hesitancy towards COVID-19 Vaccination among Healthcare Workers: A Multi-Centric Survey in France. *Vaccines* 9, 547 (2021).
- 46. Baghdadi, L. R., Alghaihb, S. G., Abuhaimed, A. A., Alkelabi, D. M. & Alqahtani, R. S. Healthcare Workers' Perspectives on the Upcoming COVID-19 Vaccine in Terms of Their Exposure to the Influenza Vaccine in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 465 (2021).
- 47. Patil, U. *et al.* Health Literacy, Digital Health Literacy, and COVID-19 Pandemic Attitudes and Behaviors in U.S. College Students: Implications for Interventions. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18, 3301 (2021).
- 48. Thompson, H. S. *et al.* Factors Associated With Racial/Ethnic Group–Based Medical Mistrust and Perspectives on COVID-19 Vaccine Trial Participation and Vaccine Uptake in the US. *JAMA Netw Open* 4, e2111629 (2021).
- 49. Goldman, R. D. *et al.* Factors associated with parents' willingness to enroll their children in trials for COVID-19 vaccination. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 17, 1607–1611 (2022).
- 50. Letterie, M. C. *et al.* Factors Associated With Parental COVID-19 Vaccination Acceptance. *Clinical pediatrics* 61, 393–401 (2022).
- 51. Puteikis, K. & Mameniškienė, R. Factors Associated with COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy among People with Epilepsy in Lithuania. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 18, 4374 (2021).
- 52. Daniel, C. L., Williams, J., Legg, R., McGowen, C. & Stutzman, J. Factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination intentions among adults in the deep South. *Vaccine* 40, 841–853 (2022).
- 53. Skeens, M. A. *et al.* Factors affecting COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in parents of children with cancer. *Pediatric blood & cancer* 69, e29707 (2022).
- 54. Di Giuseppe, G., Pelullo, C. P., Della Polla, G., Pavia, M. & Angelillo, I. F. Exploring the Willingness to Accept SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine in a University Population in Southern Italy, September to November 2020. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 275 (2021).
- 55. Purnell, M. *et al.* Exploring COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy at a rural historically black college and university. *Journal of the American Pharmacists Association : JAPhA* 62, 340–344 (2022).
- 56. Hahn, M. B., Fried, R. L., Cochran, P. & Eichelberger, L. P. Evolving perceptions of COVID-19 vaccines among remote Alaskan communities. *International journal of circumpolar health* 81, 2021684 (2022).
- 57. Gravelle, T. B., Phillips, J. B., Reifler, J. & Scotto, T. J. Estimating the size of 'anti-vax' and vaccine hesitant populations in the US, UK, and Canada: comparative latent class modeling of vaccine attitudes. *Human vaccines & immunotherapeutics* 18, 2008214 (2022).

- 58. Enhancing COVID-19 Vaccines Acceptance: Results from a Survey on Vaccine Hesitancy in Northern Italy PubMed. (2022).
- 59. Maltezou, H. C. *et al.* Determinants of intention to get vaccinated against COVID-19 among healthcare personnel in hospitals in Greece. *Infect Dis Health* 26, 189–197 (2021).
- Gray, A. & Fisher, C. B. Determinants of COVID-19 Vaccine Uptake in Adolescents 12-17 Years Old: Examining Pediatric Vaccine Hesitancy Among Racially Diverse Parents in the United States. *Frontiers in public health* 10, 844310 (2022).
- 61. Costantino, A. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine: A Survey of Hesitancy in Patients with Celiac Disease. *Vaccines* 9, 511 (2021).
- 62. Jefsen, O. H. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccine willingness amongst patients with mental illness compared with the general population. *Acta Neuropsychiatrica* 33, 273–276 (2021).
- 63. Chudasama, R. V. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccine uptake and hesitancy opinions from frontline health care and social care workers: Survey data from 37 countries. *Diabetes & metabolic syndrome* 16, 102361 (2022).
- 64. Doyle-Campbell, C., Mattison, M. J., Amedeo, V., Gaffney, S. & Achadinha, H. COVID-19 vaccine status and hesitancy in pharmacy students. *Currents in pharmacy teaching & learning* 14, 476–481 (2022).
- 65. Iadarola, S., Siegel, J. F., Gao, Q., McGrath, K. & Bonuck, K. A. COVID-19 vaccine perceptions in New York State's intellectual and developmental disabilities community. *Disability and health journal* 15, 101178 (2022).
- 66. Lutrick, K. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccine perceptions and uptake in a national prospective cohort of essential workers. *Vaccine* 40, 494–502 (2022).
- 67. Watts, A. W. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine Intentions and Perceptions Among Public School Staff of the Greater Vancouver Metropolitan Area, British Columbia, Canada. *Frontiers in public health* 10, 832444 (2022).
- 68. Gurenlian, J. R. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine Intention and Hesitancy of Dental Hygienists in the United States. *Journal of dental hygiene : JDH* 96, 5–16 (2022).
- 69. Wu, H., Ward, M., Brown, A., Blackwell, E. & Umer, A. COVID-19 Vaccine intent in appalachian patients with multiple sclerosis. *Multiple sclerosis and related disorders* 57, 103450 (2022).
- 70. Sieber, W. J. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: Associations with gender, race, and source of health information. *Families, systems & health : the journal of collaborative family healthcare* 40, 252–261 (2022).
- 71. Fedele, F. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: a survey in a population highly compliant to common vaccinations. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics* 17, 3348–3354 (2021).
- 72. Uhr, L. & Mateen, F. J. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in multiple sclerosis: A cross-sectional survey. *Multiple sclerosis (Houndmills, Basingstoke, England)* 28, 1072–1080 (2022).
- 73. Al-Mulla, R., Abu-Madi, M., Talafha, Q. M., Tayyem, R. F. & Abdallah, A. M. COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy in a Representative Education Sector Population in Qatar. *Vaccines* 9, 665 (2021).
- 74. Yang, Y., Dobalian, A. & Ward, K. D. COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Its Determinants Among Adults with a History of Tobacco or Marijuana Use. *J Community Health* 46, 1090– 1098 (2021).
- 75. Tsai, R. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Acceptance Among Individuals With Cancer, Autoimmune Diseases, or Other Serious Comorbid Conditions: Cross-sectional, Internet-Based Survey. *JMIR public health and surveillance* 8, e29872 (2022).
- 76. Hubach, R. et al. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among rural Oklahomans. Rural and remote health 22, 7128 (2022).
- 77. Lucia, V. C., Kelekar, A. & Afonso, N. M. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among medical students. *J Public Health (Oxf)* fdaa230 (2020) doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdaa230.
- 78. Teasdale, C. A. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine Coverage and Hesitancy Among New York City Parents of Children Aged 5-11 Years. *American journal of public health* 112, 931–936 (2022).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
12
1/
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
25
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
30
72
4U 41
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
52
57
54 57
22
56
57
58
59
60

- 79. Morris, J. L., Baniak, L. M., Luyster, F. S. & Dunbar-Jacob, J. Covid-19 vaccine confidence and hesitancy in nursing students and faculty at a large academic medical center. *Nursing outlook* 70, 347–354 (2022).
 - 80. Dzieciolowska, S. *et al.* Covid-19 vaccine acceptance, hesitancy, and refusal among Canadian healthcare workers: A multicenter survey. *Am J Infect Control* 49, 1152–1157 (2021).
 - Kelekar, A. K., Lucia, V. C., Afonso, N. M. & Mascarenhas, A. K. COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and hesitancy among dental and medical students. *The Journal of the American Dental Association* 152, 596–603 (2021).
 - 82. Shaaban, R. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance among Social Media Users: A Content Analysis, Multi-Continent Study. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 19, (2022).
- 83. COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance Among Health Care Workers in the United States | medRxiv. (2022).
- 84. Kozak, A. & Nienhaus, A. COVID-19 Vaccination: Status and Willingness to Be Vaccinated among Employees in Health and Welfare Care in Germany. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 18, 6688 (2021).
- 85. Xiang, X. M. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccination willingness among people with multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler J Exp Transl Clin* 7, 20552173211017160 (2021).
- 86. Fulda, E. S. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccination Rates in a Global HIV Cohort. *The Journal of infectious diseases* 225, 603–607 (2022).
- 87. Myers, A., Ipsen, C. & Lissau, A. COVID-19 vaccination hesitancy among Americans with disabilities aged 18-65: An exploratory analysis. *Disability and health journal* 15, 101223 (2022).
- 88. Kecojevic, A., Basch, C. H., Sullivan, M., Chen, Y.-T. & Davi, N. K. COVID-19 Vaccination and Intention to Vaccinate Among a Sample of College Students in New Jersey. *J Community Health* 46, 1059–1068 (2021).
- 89. Haile, Z. T., Ruhil, A., Bates, B. R., Hall, O. & Grijalva, M. J. Correlates of Covid-19 Vaccine Acceptance among Residents of Ohio: A Cross-sectional Study. *BMC public health* 22, 226 (2022).
- 90. Goldman, R. D. *et al.* Caregivers' Willingness to Accept Expedited Vaccine Research During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Cross-sectional Survey. *Clin Ther* 42, 2124–2133 (2020).
- 91. Heyne, S., Esser, P., Werner, A., Lehmann-Laue, A. & Mehnert-Theuerkauf, A. Attitudes toward a COVID-19 vaccine and vaccination status in cancer patients: a cross-sectional survey. *Journal of cancer research and clinical oncology* 148, 1363–1374 (2022).
- 92. Attitudes of Patients with Cancer towards Vaccinations—Results of Online Survey with Special Focus on the Vaccination against COVID-19 PMC. (2022).
- 93. Verger, P. *et al.* Attitudes of healthcare workers towards COVID-19 vaccination: a survey in France and French-speaking parts of Belgium and Canada, 2020. *Euro Surveill* 26, (2021).
- 94. Szmyd, B. *et al.* Attitude and Behaviors towards SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination among Healthcare Workers: A Cross-Sectional Study from Poland. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 218 (2021).
- 95. Eyllon, M. *et al.* Associations between psychiatric morbidity and COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: An analysis of electronic health records and patient survey. *Psychiatry research* 307, 114329 (2022).
- 96. Bellis, M. A. *et al.* Associations between adverse childhood experiences, attitudes towards COVID-19 restrictions and vaccine hesitancy: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ open* 12, e053915 (2022).
- 97. Shaw, J. *et al.* Assessment of US Healthcare Personnel Attitudes Towards Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Vaccination in a Large University Healthcare System. *Clin Infect Dis* 73, 1776–1783 (2021).
- 98. Gardner, J. *et al.* An assessment of Veterans attitudes and willingness to receiving the COVID-19 vaccine: a mixed methods study. *BMC infectious diseases* 22, 308 (2022).
- 99. Temsah, M.-H. *et al.* Adenovirus and RNA-based COVID-19 vaccines' perceptions and acceptance among healthcare workers in Saudi Arabia: a national survey. *BMJ Open* 11, e048586 (2021).

BMJ Open

100. de Sousa, M. J. et al. Acceptance of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination among cancer patients in Portugal: attitudes and associated factors. Supportive care in cancer: official journal of the Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer 30, 4565–4570 (2022). 101. Nohl, A. et al. Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccination among Front-Line Health Care Workers: A Nationwide Survey of Emergency Medical Services Personnel from Germany. Vaccines (Basel) 9, 424 (2021). 102. Pataka, A. et al. Acceptability of healthcare professionals to get vaccinated against COVID-19 two weeks before initiation of national vaccination in Greece. European Respiratory Journal 58, (2021). Qattan, A. M. N. et al. Acceptability of a COVID-19 Vaccine Among Healthcare 103. Workers in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Front Med (Lausanne) 8, 644300 (2021). Qunaibi, E. A. et al. A high rate of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in a large-scale 104. survey on Arabs. eLife 10, e68038 (2021). 105. Latkin, C. et al. A longitudinal study of vaccine hesitancy attitudes and social influence as predictors of COVID-19 vaccine uptake in the US. Human vaccines & immunotherapeutics 18, 2043102 (2022). 106. Algudeimat, Y. et al. Acceptance of a COVID-19 Vaccine and Its Related Determinants among the General Adult Population in Kuwait. Med Princ Pract 30, 262-271 (2021). 107. Babicki, M. & Mastalerz-Migas, A. Attitudes toward Vaccination against COVID-19 in Poland. A Longitudinal Study Performed before and Two Months after the Commencement of the Population Vaccination Programme in Poland. Vaccines (Basel) 9, 503 (2021). Gasteiger, N., Gasteiger, C., Vedhara, K. & Broadbent, E. Characteristics associated 108. with the willingness to receive a COVID-19 vaccine and an exploration of the general public's perceptions: A mixed-methods approach. Vaccine 40, 3461–3465 (2022). Romer, D. & Jamieson, K. H. Conspiracy theories as barriers to controlling the 109. spread of COVID-19 in the U.S. Soc Sci Med 263, 113356 (2020). Brownstein, N. C. et al. COVID-19 vaccine behaviors and intentions among a 110. national sample of United States adults ages 18-45. Preventive medicine 160, 107038 (2022).111. Niankara, I. COVID-19 Vaccine Development in a Quadruple Helix Innovation System: Uncovering the Preferences of the Fourth Helix in the UAE. Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity 132–132 (2020). 112. Holeva, V., Parlapani, E., Nikopoulou, V. A., Nouskas, I. & Diakogiannis, I. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in a sample of Greek adults. Psychology, health & medicine 27, 113-119 (2022). Waite, N. M., Pereira, J. A., Houle, S. K. D., Gilca, V. & Andrew, M. K. COVID-19's 113. Impact on Willingness to Be Vaccinated against Influenza and COVID-19 during the 2020/2021 Season: Results from an Online Survey of Canadian Adults 50 Years and Older. Vaccines (Basel) 9, 346 (2021). 114. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and attitudes in Qatar: A national cross-sectional survey of a migrant-majority population - Alabdulla - 2021 - Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses - Wiley Online Library. (2022). Al-Mohaithef, M. & Padhi, B. K. Determinants of COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance in 115. Saudi Arabia: A Web-Based National Survey. J Multidiscip Healthc 13, 1657–1663 (2020). Kreps, S. et al. Factors Associated With US Adults' Likelihood of Accepting COVID-116. 19 Vaccination. JAMA Netw Open 3, e2025594 (2020). Dorman, C. et al. Factors Associated with Willingness to be Vaccinated Against 117. COVID-19 in a Large Convenience Sample. J Community Health 46, 1013–1019 (2021). 118. Nikolovski, J. et al. Factors indicating intention to vaccinate with a COVID-19 vaccine among older U.S. adults. PLoS One 16, e0251963 (2021). Sallam, M. et al. High Rates of COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Its Association 119. with Conspiracy Beliefs: A Study in Jordan and Kuwait among Other Arab Countries. Vaccines (Basel) 9, 42 (2021).

60

120. Biasio, L. R., Bonaccorsi, G., Lorini, C., Mazzini, D. & Pecorelli, S. Italian Adults' Likelihood of Getting COVID-19 Vaccine: A Second Online Survey. <i>Vaccines (Basel)</i> 9, 268 (2021)
(2021). 121. Gutierrez, S., Logan, R., Marshall, C., Kerns, J. & Diamond-Smith, N. Predictors of COV/ID-19 Vaccination Likelihood Among Reproductive-Aged Women in the United States
Public health reports (Washington, D.C. : 1974) 137, 588–596 (2022).
122. Faasse, K. & Newby, J. Public Perceptions of COVID-19 in Australia: Perceived
551004 (2020).
123. Nguyen, L. H. <i>et al.</i> Self-reported COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and uptake among participants from different racial and ethnic groups in the United States and United Kingdom. <i>Nature communications</i> 13, 636 (2022).
124. Sethi, S. <i>et al.</i> The UPTAKE study: a cross-sectional survey examining the insights and beliefs of the UK population on COVID-19 vaccine uptake and hesitancy. <i>BMJ Open</i> 11, e048856 (2021)
125. Abu-Farha, R. <i>et al.</i> Willingness of Middle Eastern public to receive COVID-19 vaccines. Saudi Pharm 129, 734–739 (2021)
126. Willingness to Be Vaccinated against COVID-19 in Spain before the Start of Vaccination: A Cross-Sectional Study - PubMed (2022)
127. García, L. Y. & Cerda, A. A. Contingent assessment of the COVID-19 vaccine.
128. Freeman, D. <i>et al.</i> Coronavirus conspiracy beliefs, mistrust, and compliance with
129. Fridman, A., Gershon, R. & Gneezy, A. COVID-19 and vaccine hesitancy: A
longitudinal study. <i>PLoS One</i> 16, e0250123 (2021).
Experienced Adults: Qualitative Data from Two Samples. <i>Journal of general internal</i> medicine 37, 823–829 (2022).
131. Salali, G. D. & Uysal, M. S. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy is associated with beliefs on the origin of the novel coronavirus in the UK and Turkey. <i>Psychol Med</i> 1–3 (2022)
132. Levin, J. & Bradshaw, M. Determinants of COVID-19 skepticism and SARS-CoV-2
vaccine hesitancy: findings from a national population survey of U.S. adults. <i>BMC public health</i> 22, 1047 (2022).
133. Frontiers A Proactive Approach for Managing COVID-19: The Importance of Understanding the Motivational Roots of Vaccination Hesitancy for SARS-CoV2 Psychology (2022)
 134. McCaffery, K. J. <i>et al.</i> Health literacy and disparities in COVID-19-related knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and behaviours in Australia. <i>Public Health Res Pract</i> 30, 30342012 (2020).
 Borriello, A., Master, D., Pellegrini, A. & Rose, J. M. Preferences for a COVID-19 vaccine in Australia, Vaccine 39, 473–479 (2021)
 136. Kreps, S., Dasgupta, N., Brownstein, J. S., Hswen, Y. & Kriner, D. L. Public attitudes toward COVID-19 vaccination: The role of vaccine attributes, incentives, and misinformation. <i>NPJ Vaccines</i> 6, 73 (2021).
137. Hursh, S. R., Strickland, J. C., Schwartz, L. P. & Reed, D. D. Quantifying the Impact of Public Perceptions on Vaccine Acceptance Using Behavioral Economics. <i>Front Public</i> <i>Health</i> 8, 608852 (2020)
 Benis, A., Seidmann, A. & Ashkenazi, S. Reasons for Taking the COVID-19 Vaccine by US Social Media Users. <i>Vaccines (Basel)</i> 9, 315 (2021).
 Callaghan, T., Lueck, J. A., Trujillo, K. L. & Ferdinand, A. O. Rural and Urban Differences in COVID-19 Prevention Behaviors. <i>The Journal of Rural Health</i> 37, 287–295 (2021).
140. Sustained COVID-19 vaccine willingness after safety concerns over the Oxford- AstraZeneca vaccine. Ugeskriftet.dk (2022).

141.	Ku, L. The Association of Social Factors and Health Insurance Coverage with
COVIE	D-19 Vaccinations and Hesitancy, July 2021. Journal of general internal medicine 37,
409–4	14 (2022).

Items	Description	14
Study Identification	Authors, journal, and date of publication, doi	
Study design	Quantitative, Qualitative, Other	
Data Collection	Period of data collection	
Geographic Context	Country, City/State, multi-country study	
Sampling Method	Survey, Interviews, Other	
Study size	Number of participants	
Study population	General Population or marginalized, mean age, gender ratio, other characteristics if reported	
Vaccine acceptability	Percentage of population accepting, being hesitant about, or refusing a Covid-19 vaccine	
Promoters	Reasons for accepting a vaccine	
Barriers	Reasons for refusing a vaccine	
Demographic characteristics	Vaccine acceptance, hesitancy and refusal	
	across demographic characteristics, as	

Rzymski, P., Zeyland, J., Poniedziałek, B., Małecka, I. & Wysocki, J. The Perception and Attitudes toward COVID-19 Vaccines: A Cross-Sectional Study in Poland. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 382 (2021).

143. Felemban, R. M., Tashkandi, E. M. & Mohorjy, D. K. The willingness of the Saudi Arabian population to participate in the COVID-19 vaccine trial: A case-control study. *J Taibah Univ Med Sci* 16, 612–618 (2021).

- 144. Guidry, J. P. D. *et al.* U.S. public support for COVID-19 vaccine donation to low- and middle-income countries during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Vaccine* 39, 2452–2457 (2021).
- 145. Dror, A. A. *et al.* Vaccine hesitancy: the next challenge in the fight against COVID-19. *Eur J Epidemiol* 35, 775–779 (2020).
- 146. Catma, S. & Varol, S. Willingness to Pay for a Hypothetical COVID-19 Vaccine in the United States: A Contingent Valuation Approach. *Vaccine* (2021) doi:10.3390/vaccines9040318.
- 147. Burch, A. E., Lee, E., Shackelford, P., Schmidt, P. & Bolin, P. Willingness to Vaccinate Against COVID-19: Predictors of Vaccine Uptake Among Adults in the US. *Journal of prevention (2022)* 43, 83–93 (2022).

148. McFadden, S. M. et al. Confidence and Hesitancy During the Early Roll-out of COVID-19 Vaccines Among Black, Hispanic, and Undocumented Immigrant Communities: a Review. Journal of urban health : bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine 99, 3–14 (2022).

- 149. Butler, J. Z. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccination readiness among multiple racial and ethnic groups in the San Francisco Bay Area: A qualitative analysis. *PloS one* 17, e0266397 (2022).
- 150. Teixeira da Silva, D. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance among an Online Sample of Sexual and Gender Minority Men and Transgender Women. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 204 (2021).
- 151. Sonderskov, K. M., Vistisen, H. T., Dinesen, P. T. & Ostergaard, S. D. A positive update on COVID-19 booster vaccine willingness among Danes. *Danish medical journal* 69, (2022).
- 152. Lennon, R. P. *et al.* Underserved population acceptance of combination influenza-COVID-19 booster vaccines. *Vaccine* 40, 562–567 (2022).

1
2
3
4
5
6
0
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
21
∠∠ วว
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
20
20
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
57
54
55 56
50
57
58
59

	reported
 d. Definitions of variables and sources	

For individual studies:

Per country :

Data Sources : OECD, The World Bank, National Public Health Offices, Ourworldindata.org, US National Center for Education Statistics, Eurostat Database, Pew Research Center Currency is current US dollars

Items	Description
Vac	cination Data
Vaccine approval	Date of first vaccine approval
Vaccination rates, past	Double, single and total vaccination rates as of 26 11 2021
General I	Demographic Data
Population	Total population and percentage of foreign-
	born population
Gender ratio	Percentage of male population
Population, old	Population ages 65 and above, total
Life expectancy	Life expectancy at birth, total years
Religio	n and Ethnicity
Religion and Ethnicity	 Undenominational, Christians, Muslims,
	Hindus, Jews, Folk Religions, Buddhists,
	Others. Pew Research Center
E	Education
Educational attainment	Educational attainment, primary to Doctoral
	or equivalent, population 25+ years. OECD
School enrollment	School enrollment, primary, % gross. OECD
Econor	mical Indicators
GDP	GDP per capita. OECD
Poverty Gap	Of total population. OECD
Poverty Rate	Of total population. OECD
Gender wage gap	Of total population. OECD
Unemployement Rate	Of total population. OECD
Gini Coefficient	OECD
Soci	al Protection
Social Spending	Cash-benefits, direct in-kind provision of goodds and services, and tax breaks with social purposes. OECD
Sociopolitical	indicators of inequality
Violence Against Women	Prevalence in the lifetime. OECD
Social Institutions and Gender	Discrimination in the family, Restricted
	access to resources and assets, restricted
	physical integrity, Restricted civil liberties.
	OECD, Index

Pooplo at Dick of Poverty or Social	• •
reopie al risk of roverty of Social	Index, Eurostat
Exclusion	
Long Hours in Paid Work	Of total population. OECD
Wel	I-Being
Housing Overcrowding	Of total population. OECD
Social Connections	Social support and satisfaction with
Housing Cost Overburden	Of total population. OECD
Subjective Well-Being	Of total population. OECD
Difficulty making ends meet	Of total population. OECD
Negative affect balance	Of total population. OECD
Work-life balance	Of total population. OECD
Quality o	of healthcare
Universal healthcare	Yes/No
Health spendings	As share of GDP. The World Bank
Health coverage	Of total population. OECD
Consultations skipped due to cost	Per 100 patients. OECD
Medical Tests, treatment or follow-up	Per 100 patients. OECD
skipped due to costs	
Prescribed medicines skipped due to costs	Per 100 patients. OECD
Covid policy measures and d	lownsides of not getting vaccine
COVID-19 Stringency Index	Tracker (OxCGRT), Index

BMJ Open

2. Supplementary section 2: Assessment of quality and risk of bias results

Table S1. Risk of bias assessment of included studies (Adapted from Hoy et al)

Author	Was the study´s target population representative?	Was the sample frame a close representation of the target population?	Was the sample randomly selected?	Was the likelihood of non-response bias minimal?	Were data collected directly from the subjects?	Was an acceptable case definition used?	Was the study instrument reliable?	Was the same mode of data collection used for all subjects?	Score
Attwell	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
Seale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Dietze	Yes	Yes	Yes	es Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes		Yes	0		
Enticott	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Schernhammer	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2
Kessels	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Lavoie	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Basta	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Abramovich	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Manca	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Bagic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Neumann- Böhme	Ves	Ves	Ves	Ves	Ves	Ves	Ves	Ves	0
Detoc	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
Ward	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Montagni	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Ousseine	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Coulaud	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Heyerdahl	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Bendau	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Kourlaba	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Murphy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Maor	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
Caserotti	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
La Vecchia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Di Giuseppe	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Moscardino	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Palamenghi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
lacoella	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Yoda	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Ihshimaru	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

Page	54	of	78	
------	----	----	----	--

Machida	Yes	0							
Kadoya	Yes	0							
Sekizawa	Yes	0							
Soares	Yes	0							
Khaled	Yes	0							
Page	Yes	0							
Freeman	Yes	0							
Sethi	Yes	0							
Freeman	Yes	0							
Batty	Yes	0							
Chaudhuri	Yes	0							
Sherman	Yes	0							
Sherman	Yes	0							
Earnshaw	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
Fisher	Yes	0							
Malik	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
Reiter	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
Pogue	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
Craig	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
Kelly	Yes	0							
Christodoulou	Yes	0							
Sullivan	Yes	0							
Stern	Yes	0							
Rogers	Yes	0							
Crozier	Yes	0							
Thunström	Yes	0							
Rane	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2
Scott	Yes	0							
Bogart	Yes	0							
Tucker	Yes	0							
Shaw	Yes	0							
Meehan	Voo	Voo	Vee	Vee	Vee	Vee	Vaa	Vaa	0

3. Supplementary section 3: Table S2.Country-specific real-world data

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
12
13
14
15
16
1/
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
30
40
40 ∕/1
41 42
4Z
43
44
45
46

Country	Population	% of population over 65 years	Life expectancy	Date of first vaccine	% of population with complete vaccination as of 31 st 2021	Poverty gap	Gender wage gap	% unemployment	% unemployment in migrants	Social spending, %of GDP 2021	Healthcare spending, %GDP	Healthcare coverage	Stringency index at the date of first vaccine
Australia	25690000	16	83.2	22-Feb-21	74								53.24
Austria	8956000	19	81.8	27-Dec-20	71	0.294	14.9	4.9	8.3	31	10.3	99.9	82.41
Belgium	11590000	19	81.7	28-Dec-20	76	0.233	3.4	5.7	10.4	29	10.3	98.6	60.19
Canada	38250000	18	82.0	14-Dec-20	76	0.303	18.5	6.5	6.3	18	10.8	100	72.69
Croatia	3900000	22	77.7	27-Dec-20	49	<u> </u>							67.59
Denmark	5857000	20	81.2	27-Dec-20	77	0.289	4.9	5.1	8.4	28.3	10.1	100	51.85
France	67750000	21	82.6	27-Dec-20	73	0.261	11.8	7.9	13.1	33	11.3	100	63.89
Germany	83000000	22	80.9	26-Dec-20	71	0.256	13.9	3.2	5.6	28	11.4	89.5	82.41
Greece	10640000	23	81.9	27-Dec-20	68	0.331	5.9	13.3	28.6	26	7.8	100	84.26
Ireland	5000000	15	82.3	29-Dec-20	77	0.187	8.3	5.1	5.9	14	6.7	100	68.52
Israel	9364000	12	82.8	19-Dec-20	63	0.325	22.7	5	3.4	18	7.5	100	71.3
Italy	59110000	24	83.2	27-Dec-20	76	0.396	5.7	9	13.1	31	8.7	100	78.7
Japan	126000000	30	84.4	17-Feb-21	80	0.364	24.5	2.8	4.2	22.3	10.7	100	49.54
Portugal	10330000	23	80.9	27-Dec-20	83	0.266	22.7	5.9	8.4	25	9.4	100	63.89
Qatar	2660000	1	79.1	31-Jan-21	82								64.81
Switzerland	8703000	19	83.7	23-Dec-20	67	0.281	18	2.6	7,3	18	11.9	100	60.19
UK	67330000	18	81.2	08-Dec-20	70	0.326	16.3	3.9	4.3	22	10.2	100	63.89
USA	332000000	17	77.2	14-Dec-20	63	0.368	18.9	8.09	3.1	23	16.9	91.4	71.76

4. Supplementary section 4: Country-specific analyses Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Australia

a. All the studies from Australia



For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

b. Subgroup analysis from Australia according to vaccine acceptance in the general population and among special populations

Study	Events	Total		Proportion	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
General population			1				
Attwell	855	1316		0.65	[0.62; 0.68]	39.8%	26.2%
Seale	1136	1420		0.80	[0.78: 0.82]	30.2%	26.0%
Enticott	909	1166		0.78	[0.75: 0.80]	26.6%	25.9%
Fixed effect model		3902	\$	0.74	[0.72: 0.75]	96.7%	
Random effects model				0.75	[0.64: 0.83]		78.1%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, τ	² = 0.1850	6, <i>p</i> < 0.0	1	0110	[ere if eree]		1011/0
Special population							
Dietze	48	100		0.48	[0.38; 0.58]	3.3%	21.9%
Fixed effect model		100	\sim	0.48	[0.38; 0.58]	3.3%	
Random effects model				0.48	[0.27; 0.70]		21.9%
Heterogeneity: not applicat	ble						
Fixed effect model		4002	\$	0.73	[0.72: 0.74]	100.0%	
Random effects model			\sim	0.70	[0.60: 0.78]		100.0%
Prediction interval					[0.22: 0.95]		
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$ T	2 = 0.1850	5 p < 0.0	1		,,		
Residual heterogeneity: I^2	= 98%. p	< 0.01	0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9	12			

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is

centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I2 accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Canada

a. All the studies from Canada



For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

b. Subgroup analysis from Canada according to vaccine acceptance in the general population and among special populations

Woight

Woight

Study	Events	Total		Proportion	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
specialpopulation = 0			Ξ.				
Lavoie	8681	15019	+	0.58	[0.57:0.59]	52.8%	25.3%
Basta	20056	23819	•	0.84	[0.84: 0.85]	45.6%	25.3%
Fixed effect model		38838		0.72	[0.72; 0.72]	98.4%	
Random effects model				0.73	[0.42; 0.91]		50.6%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 100\%$,	$\tau^2 = 0.910$	03, <i>p</i> = 0	1				
specialpopulation = 1							
Abramovich	89	139		0.64	[0.55; 0.72]	0.5%	24.5%
Manca	221	342		0.65	[0.59; 0.70]	1.1%	25.0%
Fixed effect model		481	\diamond	0.64	[0.60; 0.69]	1.6%	
Random effects model				0.64	[0.32; 0.87]		49.4%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, τ^2	= 0.9103,	p = 0.90					
Fixed effect model		39319	4	0.72	[0.71: 0.72]	100.0%	
Random effects model				0.69	[0.46; 0.85]		100.0%
Prediction interval		-		-	[0.02; 1.00]		
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 100\%$,	$\tau^2 = 0.910$	03, p = 0					
Residual heterogeneity: /2	= 100%,	D = 0	0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8				

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I2 accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in France

a. All the studies from France



For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

b. Subgroup analysis from France according to vaccine acceptance in the general population and among special populations

Study	Evente	Total		Branartian	05% 01	Weight	Weight (random)
Study	Evenus	Total		Proportion	95 /o-CI	(lixed)	(random)
specialpopulation = 0							
Detoc	2837	3656	-	0.78	[0.76; 0.79]	6.7%	16.6%
Ward	3814	5018	-	0.76	[0.75; 0.77]	9.6%	16.7%
Montagni	1156	1640	-*-	0.70	[0.68; 0.73]	3.6%	16.6%
Coulaud	1913	3204	-	0.60	[0.58; 0.61]	8.1%	16.7%
Heyerdahl	5690	10000		0.57	[0.56; 0.58]	25.7%	16.7%
Fixed effect model		23518	٥	0.65	[0.64; 0.65]	53.7%	
Random effects model				0.69	[0.59; 0.77]		83.3%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 100\%$,	$\tau^2 = 0.239$	00, <i>p</i> < 0.0	4		-		
anasisinanulation 1							
Special population = 1	11177	10474		0.61	[0 60: 0 61]	16 2%	16 7%
Fixed affect model	111//	18/7/	A	0.61	[0.60; 0.61]	40.3%	10.7 /0
Pandom affaats model		104/4	•	0.61	[0.00, 0.01]	40.070	16 7%
Hataraganaity: not applicat				0.01	[0.37, 0.00]		10.7 /0
neterogeneity. not applicat	ЛС						
Fixed effect model		41992	6	0.63	[0.62; 0.63]	100.0%	
Random effects model				0.67	[0.58; 0.75]		100.0%
Prediction interval				-	[0.32; 0.90]		
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$. τ^2	2 = 0.2390	p < 0.01					
Residual heterogeneity: /2	= 100%, /	0 < 0.01	0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8				

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.



For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

b. Subgroup analysis from Italy according to vaccine acceptance in the general population and among special populations

Walaht

Maight

Study	Events	Total	Propor	tion	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
specialpopulation = 0							
Caserotti	659	839		0.79	[0.76: 0.81]	13.4%	16.9%
La Vecchia	567	1055		0.54	[0.51: 0.57]	24.8%	17.1%
Moscardino	876	1200		0.73	[0.70: 0.75]	22.3%	17.1%
Palamenghi	571	968	- -	0.59	[0.56: 0.62]	22.1%	17.1%
Fixed effect model		4062		0.65	[0.64: 0.67]	82.6%	
Random effects mode	I			0.67	[0.55: 0.77]		68.1%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$,	$\tau^2 = 0.242$	5, <i>p</i> < 0.0			. / 1		
specialpopulation = 1							
Di Giuseppe	438	685	- <u> </u>	0.64	[0.60; 0.68]	14.9%	16.9%
lacoella	71	112		0.63	[0.54; 0.72]	2.5%	15.0%
Fixed effect model		797	\diamond	0.64	[0.60; 0.67]	17.4%	
Random effects mode	1		1:	0.64	[0.46; 0.78]		31.9%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$, τ^2	2 = 0.2425	<i>p</i> = 0.91					
Fixed effect model		4859	\$	0.65	[0.63; 0.66]	100.0%	
Random effects mode	1		\sim	0.66	[0.56; 0.74]		100.0%
Prediction interval					[0.30; 0.89]		
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 97\%$,	$t^2 = 0.242$	5, p < 0.0					
Residual heterogeneity: 12	² = 98%, p	< 0.01	0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8				

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Japan



For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the United Kingdom

Study	Events	Total	Pr	roportion	95%-Cl	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
Freeman	1188	2501	÷ i	0.48	[0.46; 0.49]	9.1%	14.3%
Sherman	956	1494	-	0.64	[0.62; 0.66]	5.0%	14.3%
Freeman	3667	5114		0.72	[0.70; 0.73]	15.1%	14.3%
Sherman	1102	1500	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.73	[0.71; 0.76]	4.2%	14.2%
Sethi	3873	4884		0.79	[0.78; 0.80]	11.6%	14.3%
Batty	10114	11955	-	0.85	[0.84; 0.85]	22.6%	14.3%
Chaudhuri	19910	22421		0.89	[0.88; 0.89]	32. <mark>4</mark> %	1 <mark>4</mark> .3%
Fixed effect model		49869	•	0.80	[0.80; 0.81]	100.0%	
Random effects mode	el			0.75	[0.63; 0.84]		100.0%
Prediction interval		8			[0.27; 0.96]		
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 100\%$	$_{6}, \tau^{2} = 0.557$	70, p = 0					
			0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9				

Proportions of vaccine acceptance in the UK

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the United States a. All the studies from the U.S

Study	Events	Total	Proj	oortion	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
Bogart	63	207	į	0.30	[0.25; 0.37]	0.8%	5.2%
Sullivan	75	234		0.32	[0.26; 0.38]	0.9%	5.2%
Crozier	1440	3721		0.39	[0.37; 0.40]	15.8%	5.4%
Stern	2294	5110		0.45	[0.44; 0.46]	22.7%	5.4%
Reiter	963	2006	· 💻 ·	0.48	[0.46; 0.50]	9.0%	5.3%
Scott	233	486		0.48	[0.44; 0.52]	2.2%	5.3%
Tucker	68	134		0.51	[0.42; 0.59]	0.6%	5.1%
Rogers	526	969		0.54	[0.51; 0.57]	4.3%	5.3%
Shaw	140	244		0.57	[0.51; 0.63]	1.1%	5.2%
Meehan	61	106		0.58	[0.48; 0.67]	0.5%	5.1%
Fisher	571	991		0.58	[0.55; 0.61]	4.3%	5.3%
Craig	704	1153		0.61	[0.58; 0.64]	4.9%	5.3%
Christodoulou	54	83		0.65	[0.54; 0.75]	0.3%	5.0%
Malik	450	672		0.67	[0.63; 0.70]	2.7%	5.3%
Pogue	215	316		0.68	[0.63; 0.73]	1.2%	5.2%
Kelly	1709	2279	■	0.75	[0.73; 0.77]	7.7%	5.3%
Thunström	2506	3133		0.80	[0.79; 0.81]	9.0%	5.3%
Rane	3899	4571		0.85	[0.84; 0.86]	10.3%	5.3%
Earnshaw	725	845	-	0.86	[0.83; 0.88]	1.8%	5.3%
Fixed effect model		27260		0.59	[0.58; 0.60]	100.0%	
Random effects mode	1			0.60	[0.50; 0.68]		100.0%
Prediction interval					[0.20; 0.90]		
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$, τ	$t^2 = 0.6826$	p = 0					
		0.	2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8				
		Propor	tion of willingness to receive the vaccin	е			

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

b. Subgroup analysis from the U.S according to vaccine acceptance in the general population and among special populations

•						Weight	Weight
Study	Events	Total		Proportion	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
specialpopulation = 0							
Reiter	963	2006	-	0.48	[0.46; 0.50]	9.0%	5.4%
Fisher	571	991	- m ¹	0.58	[0.54; 0.61]	4.3%	5.4%
Craig	704	1153		0.61	[0.58; 0.64]	4.9%	5.4%
Malik	450	672		0.67	[0.63; 0.71]	2.7%	5.3%
Pogue	215	316		0.68	[0.63; 0.73]	1.2%	5.2%
Kelly	1709	2279		0.75	[0.73; 0.77]	7.7%	5.4%
Thunström	2506	3133		0.80	[0.79; 0.81]	9.0%	5.4%
Rane	3899	4571		0.85	[0.84; 0.86]	10.3%	5.4%
Earnshaw	725	845	-	+ 0.86	[0.83; 0.88]	1.8%	5.3%
Fixed effect model		15966	•	0.72	[0.71; 0.73]	50.9%	
Random effects mode	1			0.71	[0.63; 0.78]		48.4%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$, τ	² = 0.3292	, p < 0.0	1				
specialpopulation = 1							
Bogart	63	207		0.30	[0.24; 0.37]	0.8%	5.1%
Sullivan	75	234		0.32	[0.26; 0.38]	0.9%	5.2%
Crozier	1440	3721		0.39	[0.37; 0.40]	15.8%	5.4%
Stern	2294	5110		0.45	[0.44; 0.46]	22.7%	5.4%
Scott	233	486		0.48	[0.43; 0.52]	2.2%	5.3%
Tucker	68	134		0.51	[0.42; 0.59]	0.6%	5.0%
Rogers	526	969		0.54	[0.51; 0.57]	4.3%	5.4%
Shaw	140	244	* ¹¹	0.57	[0.51; 0.64]	1.1%	5.2%
Meehan	61	106		0.58	[0.48; 0.67]	0.5%	4.9%
Christodoulou	54	83		0.65	[0.54; 0.75]	0.3%	4.7%
Fixed effect model		11294	۵	0.44	[0.43; 0.45]	49.1%	
Random effects mode	1			0.48	[0.39; 0.57]		51.6%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 94\%$, τ	² = 0.3292	, p < 0.0	1				
Fixed effect model		27260	6	0.59	[0.58; 0.60]	100.0%	
Random effects mode	I		\sim	0.60	[0.53; 0.66]		100.0%
Prediction interval					[0.30; 0.84]		
Heterogeneity: 12 = 99%, t	$^{2} = 0.3292$	p = 0					
Residual heterogeneity 12	= 99% p	< 0.01	03 04 05 06 07 08				

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.



- 5. Supplementary section 5: Comparison between data from studies and real-world data
- a. Table S3. Willingness to be vaccinated and real-world vaccine uptake

Country	% (CI 95%) of the general population willing to be vaccinated before vaccines rollout*	% (CI 95%) of special populations willing to be vaccinated before vaccines rollout*	% of the general population with complete vaccination as of 31 st Dec 2021**	Difference between willingness and uptake
Australia	70 (58-79)	48 (27-70)	74	+4
Austria	36 (33-39)	-	71	+35
Belgium	34 (32-36)	-	76	+42
Canada	73 (42-91)	64 (32-87)	76	+3
Croatia	64 (60-67)		49	-15
Denmark	80 (79-81)	-	77	-3
France	69 (59-77)	61 (37-80)	73	+4
Germany	64 (62-67)	-	71	+7
Greece	58 (55-61)	-	68	+10
Ireland	65 (62-68)	-	77	+12
Israel	76 (74-78)	-	63	+7
Italy	67 (55-77)	64 (46-78)	76	+9
Japan	55 (42-67)	. -	80	+25
Portugal	35 (33-37)	4	83	+48
Qatar	43 (40-45)		82	+39
Switzerland	-	41	67	-
UK	75 (63-84)	-	70	+5
USA	71 (63-78)	50 (39-61)	63	-8
*From the results of the sy **https://ourworldindata.org	stematic review.		T	

b. Consolidated country data from studies and country real-world statistics

Study	Events	Total					Proportion	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
Belgium	700	2060				1	0.34	[0.32; 0.36]	0.7%	5.9%
Portugal	680	1943	+				0.35	[0.33; 0.37]	0.7%	5.9%
Austria .	363	1007					0.36	[0.33; 0.39]	0.4%	5.8%
Qatar	822	1912		+			0.43	[0.41; 0.45]	0.7%	5.9%
Japan	25955	47191			•		0.55	[0.55; 0.55]	18.6%	5.9%
Greece	582	1004					0.58	[0.55; 0.61]	0.4%	5.8%
Croatia	490	765			-		0.64	0.61; 0.67]	0.3%	5.8%
Germany	1139	1779					0.64	[0.62; 0.66]	0.7%	5.9%
Ireland	677	1041					0.65	[0.62: 0.68]	0.4%	5.8%
Italy	3256	4859					0.67	[0.66; 0.68]	1.7%	5.9%
Switzerland	120332-55	812							0.0%	0.0%
France	28974	41992					0.69	[0.69; 0.69]	14.3%	5,9%
Australia	2801	4002					0.70	[0.69; 0.71]	1.3%	5.9%
Canada	28703	39319					0.73	[0.73; 0.73]	12.3%	5.9%
USA	69697	95475				•	0.73	[0.73: 0.73]	30.0%	5.9%
UK	37402	49869					0.75	10.75: 0.751	14.9%	5.9%
Israel	1538	2024				+	0.76	[0.74: 0.78]	0.6%	5.9%
Denmark	6131	7664					• 0.80	[0.79; 0.81]	2.0%	5.9%
Fixed effect model		304718					0.69	[0.69: 0.69]	100.0%	
Random effects mode	el					-	0.62	[0.57: 0.67]	-	100.0%
Prediction interval Heterogeneity: I ² = 100%	, τ ² = 0.184	4, <i>p</i> = 0	0	4 0	5 06	07	- 0.8	[0.39; 0.81]		1.1012060440

Proportion of willingness to be vaccinated among the studies

Study	Events	Total	Proportion	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
Croatia	1911000	3900000	0.49	[0.49; 0.49]	0.5%	5.6%
Israel	5899320	9364000	• 0.63	[0.63; 0.63]	1.2%	5.6%
USA	209160000	332000000	0.63	[0.63; 0.63]	43.0%	5.6%
Switzerland	5831010	8703000	. 0.67	[0.67; 0.67]	1.1%	5.6%
Greece	7235200	10640000	- 0.68	[0.68; 0.68]	1.3%	5.6%
UK	47131000	67330000	0.70	[0.70: 0.70]	7.9%	5.6%
Austria	6358760	8956000	- 0.71	[0.71; 0.71]	1.0%	5.6%
Germany	58930000	83000000	0.71	[0.71; 0.71]	9.5%	5.6%
France	49457500	67750000	.73	[0.73; 0.73]	7.4%	5.6%
Australia	19010600	25690000		[0.74; 0.74]	2.7%	5.6%
Belgium	8808400	11590000	. 0.76	[0.76; 0.76]	1.2%	5.6%
Canada	29070000	38250000	u 0.76	[0.76; 0.76]	3.9%	5.6%
Italy	44923600	59110000	n 0.76	[0.76; 0.76]	6.0%	5.6%
Denmark	4509890	5857000	. 0.77	[0.77: 0.77]	0.6%	5.6%
Ireland	3850000	5000000	• 0.77	[0.77; 0.77]	0.5%	5.6%
Japan	100800000	126000000	0.80	[0.80; 0.80]	11.2%	5.6%
Qatar	2181200	2660000	0.82	0.82: 0.82]	0.2%	5.6%
Portugal	8573900	10330000	• 0.83	[0.83; 0.83]	0.8%	5.6%
Fixed effect model		876130000	0.70	[0.70; 0.70]	100.0%	
Random effects mod	lel		- 0.73	10.69: 0.761		100.0%
Prediction interval				[0.55: 0.85]		197235676
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 100\%$	$6. \tau^2 = 0.1298. p$	= 0				
		(060650707508085			

Proportion of real-world vaccine uptake



rstudent= externally standardized residuals, dffits= difference in fit values, cook.de=Cook's distances, cov.r= covariance ratios, tau2.del= leave-one-out estimates of the amount of heterogeneity, QE.del= leave-one-out values of the test statistics for heterogeneity, hat= hat values, weight= weights

b. Cumulative meta-analysis of willingness to be vaccinated according to the date of data acquisition. General population.

Study	Proportion	95%-CI
Adding Seale (k=1)	+ 0.80	[0.78; 0.82]
Adding Thunström (k=2)	0.80	[0.79; 0.81]
Adding Murphy (k=3)	0.76	[0.66; 0.83]
Adding Earnshaw (k=4)	- 0.78	[0.70; 0.85]
Adding Neumann-Böhme (k=5)	0.79	[0.74; 0.83]
Adding Detoc (k=6)	0.79	[0.75; 0.82]
Adding Fisher (k=7)	+ 0.76	[0.70; 0.81]
Adding Kelly (k=8)	0.76	[0.71; 0.80]
Adding Malik (k=9)	0.75	[0.70; 0.79]
Adding Kourlaba (k=10)	+ 0.74	[0.68; 0.78]
Adding Ward (k=11)	0.74	[0.69; 0.78]
Adding Montagni (k=12)	0.74	[0.69; 0.77]
Adding Freeman (k=13)	- 0.72	[0.66; 0.77]
Adding Attwell (k=14)	0.71	[0.65; 0.77]
Adding Reiter (k=15)	+ 0.70	[0.63; 0.76]
Adding Caserotti (k=16)	+ 0.71	[0.64; 0.76]
Adding Sherman (k=17)	+ 0.70	[0.64; 0.75]
Adding Nguyen (k=18)	0.71	[0.64; 0.77]
Adding Maor (k=19)	0.72	[0.65; 0.77]
Adding La Vecchia (k=20)	0.71	[0.64; 0.77]
Adding Yoda (k=21)	- 0.71	[0.64; 0.76]
Adding Rane (k=22)	- 0.71	[0.65; 0.77]
Adding Sethi (k=23)	- 0.72	[0.66; 0.77]
Adding Kessels (k=24)	0.70	[0.64; 0.76]
Adding Freeman (k=25)		[0.64; 0.76]
Adding Craig (k=26)	+ 0.70	[0.64; 0.76]
Adding Schernhammer (k=27)	.69	[0.63; 0.75]
Adding Heyerdahl (k=28)	.69	[0.62; 0.74]
Adding Coulaud (k=29)	0.68	[0.62; 0.74]
Adding Ihshimaru (k=30)	0.67	[0.59; 0.75]
Adding Basta (k=31)	.68	[0.60; 0.75]
Adding Batty (k=32)	0.69	[0.61; 0.75]
Adding Soares (k=33)	0.68	[0.60; 0.75]
Adding Bendau (k=34)	0.68	[0.60; 0.74]
Adding Sherman (k=35)	0.68	[0.61; 0.74]
Adding Machida (k=36)	.68	[0.61; 0.74]
Adding Khaled (k=37)	.67	[0.60; 0.74]
Adding Chaudhuri (k=38)	0.68	[0.61; 0.74]
Adding Kadoya (k=39)	0.67	[0.60; 0.74]
Adding Enticott (k=40)	0.68	[0.61; 0.74]
Adding Lavoie (k=41)	÷ 0.67	[0.61; 0.73]
Adding Bagic (k=42)	.67	[0.61; 0.73]
Adding Sekizawa (k=43)	0.67	[0.61; 0.73]
Adding Moscardino (k=44)	0.67	[0.61; 0.73]
Adding Palamenghi (k=45)	.67	[0.61; 0.73]
Adding Pogue (k=46)	0.67	[0.61; 0.73]
Random effects model	🔶 0.67	[0.61; 0.73]

c. Cumulative meta-analysis of willingness to be vaccinated according to the date of data acquisition. Special populations.

Study	Proportion	95%-CI
Adding Sullivan (k=1)	- 0.32	[0.26; 0.38]
Adding Christodoulou (k=2)	0.48	[0.19; 0.78]
Adding Scott (k=3)	0.48	[0.33; 0.63]
Adding Manca (k=4)	0.52	[0.38; 0.66]
Adding Stern (k=5)	0.50	[0.41; 0.59]
Adding Dietze (k=6)		[0.42; 0.58]
Adding Bogart (k=7)	0.47	[0.39; 0.55]
Adding Crozier (k=8)	- 0.46	[0.40; 0.51]
Adding Abramovich (k=9)	- 0.48	[0.42; 0.53]
Adding lacoella (k=10)	- 0.49	[0.44; 0.55]
Adding Meehan (k=11)	- 0.50	[0.44; 0.55]
Adding Rogers (k=12)	÷ 0.50	[0.45; 0.55]
Adding Shaw (k=13)	÷ 0.51	[0.46; 0.56]
Adding Tucker (k=14)	- 0.51	[0.46; 0.56]
Adding Ousseine (k=15)	- 0.52	[0.46; 0.58]
Adding Di Giuseppe (k=16)	÷ 0.53	[0.47; 0.58]
Adding Page (k=17)	0.52	[0.46; 0.57]
Random effects model	♦ 0.52	[0.46; 0.57]

d. Cumulative real-world data meta-analysis according to the date of first COVID-19 vaccine administered in each country

Country	Proportion	95%-CI
Adding UK (k=1)	0.70	[0.70; 0.70]
Adding Canada (k=2)	+ 0.73	[0.67; 0.79]
Adding USA (k=3)		[0.62; 0.77]
Adding Israel (k=4)		[0.62; 0.74]
Adding Switzerland (k=5)	+ 0.68	[0.62; 0.73]
Adding Germany (k=6)	0.69	[0.64; 0.73]
Adding Austria (k=7)	- 0.69	[0.65; 0.73]
Adding Croatia (k=8)	0.67	[0.62; 0.71]
Adding Denmark (k=9)	- 0.68	[0.64; 0.72]
Adding France (k=10)	+ 0.68	[0.65; 0.72]
Adding Greece (k=11)	+ 0.68	[0.65; 0.72]
Adding Italy (k=12)	- 0.69	[0.65; 0.72]
Adding Portugal (k=13)	0.70	[0.67; 0.74]
Adding Belgium (k=14)	0.71	[0.67; 0.74]
Adding Ireland (k=15)	- 0.71	[0.68; 0.74]
Adding Qatar (k=16)	+ 0.72	[0.69; 0.75]
Adding Japan (k=17)	+ 0.73	[0.69; 0.76]
Adding Australia (k=18)	- 0.73	[0.69; 0.76]
Random effects model	♦ 0.73	[0.69; 0.76]

		Standard	
	В	error	p-va
Intercept	80.683	10.35	
Stringency index	206	.10	
% of the population older than 65 years	.595	.28	
Healthcare spending as % of GDP	997	.46	
Social spending as % of GDP	.183	.21	

cine uptake and country-level data

OR

.81

1.8

0.36

1.2

95% CI

(0.69 - 0.94)

(1.04 - 3.1)

(0.14 - 0.91)

(0.78 - 1.84)

plore associations of country-level



Percentage of the population older than 65 years







g. Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the general population for studies with high risk of selection bias

Study	Events	Total		Proportion	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Schernhammer	364	1007	-	0.36	[0.33; 0.39]	7.3%	10.0%
Reiter	963	2006		0.48	[0.46; 0.50]	15.6%	10.1%
Craig	704	1153		0.61	[0.58; 0.64]	8.6%	10.0%
Attwell	855	1316		0.65	[0.62; 0.68]	9.4%	10.0%
Malik	450	672		0.67	[0.63; 0.70]	4.6%	10.0%
Pogue	215	316		0.68	[0.63; 0.73]	2.1%	9.8%
Maor	1546	2024		0.76	[0.74; 0.78]	11.4%	10.0%
Detoc	2837	3656		0.78	[0.76; 0.79]	19.9%	10.1%
Rane	3899	4571		+ 0.85	[0.84; 0.86]	17.9%	10.1%
Earnshaw	725	845		0.86	[0.83; 0.88]	3.2%	9.9%
Fixed effect model		17566	•	0.70	[0.69; 0.71]	100.0%	
Random effects mode Prediction interval Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$,	el τ ² = 0.5978	, p = 0		0.69	[0.58; 0.78] [0.25; 0.93]	1	100.0%

Proportion of vaccine acceptance among studies with high risk of selection bias

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

7. Supplementary section 7 PRISMA checklist

Prisma 2020 Checklist

Abstract checklist	ltem #	Checklist item	Reported (Yes/No)		
TITLE					
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Yes		
BACKGROUND	-				
Objectives	2	Provide an explicit statement of the main objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Yes		
METHODS					
Eligibility criteria	3	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review.	Yes		
Information sources	4	Specify the information sources (e.g. databases, registers) used to identify studies and the date when each was last searched.	Yes		
Risk of bias	5	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies.	Yes		
Synthesis of results	6	Specify the methods used to present and synthesise results.	Yes		
RESULTS					
Included studies	7	Give the total number of included studies and participants and summarise relevant characteristics of studies.	Yes		
Synthesis of results	8	Present results for main outcomes, preferably indicating the number of included studies and participants for each. If meta-analysis was done, report the summary estimate and confidence/credible interval. If comparing groups, indicate the direction of the effect (i.e. which group is favoured).	Yes		
DISCUSSION	•				
Limitations of evidence	9	Provide a brief summary of the limitations of the evidence included in the review (e.g. study risk of bias, inconsistency and imprecision).	Yes		
Interpretation	10	Provide a general interpretation of the results and important implications.	Yes		
OTHER					
Funding	11	Specify the primary source of funding for the review.	No		
Registration	12	Provide the register name and registration number.			
From: Page MJ, McKenzi	e JE, Bo	ossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reportin	Ig		

systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 0	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
1/	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Page 1, title
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Abstract
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Page 4
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Page 4
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Methods section, pages 5,6
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Supplementary section 1
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Supplementary section 1
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Supplementary section 1
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Supplementary section 1
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Methods section, page 6
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Supplementary section 1

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Supplementary section 1
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Data synthesis, page 7
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta- regression).	Sensitivity analyses, page 8
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Sensitivity analyses, page 8
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	NA
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
RESULTS	-	·	
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Figure S1
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Supplementary material, section 1c

 BMJ Open

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Results section, page 8 and Table 1
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Table S1
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Figure 1, Figure 2.
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Supplementary section 3,
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	Results section, pages 8-11
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Results section, page 10. Supplementary section 6
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Supplementary section 6
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Main findings, page 11
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Study limitations, page 13

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	-
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Findings in context, page 13
OTHER INFORM	ATION		
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	The review was not registered because it was a realist review
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	NA
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Page 1
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Page 1
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Supplementary material
systematic review For more informa	ation, vis	J 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71 sit: <u>http://www.prisma-statement.org/</u>	
		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

Prisma 2020 Checklists

Abstract checklist	Item #	Checklist item	Reported (Yes/No)
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Yes
BACKGROUND			
Objectives	2	Provide an explicit statement of the main objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Yes
METHODS	-		
Eligibility criteria	3	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review.	Yes
Information sources	4	Specify the information sources (e.g. databases, registers) used to identify studies and the date when each was last searched.	Yes
Risk of bias	5	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies.	Yes
Synthesis of results	6	Specify the methods used to present and synthesise results.	Yes
RESULTS			
Included studies	7	Give the total number of included studies and participants and summarise relevant characteristics of studies.	Yes
Synthesis of results	8	Present results for main outcomes, preferably indicating the number of included studies and participants for each. If meta-analysis was done, report the summary estimate and confidence/credible interval. If comparing groups, indicate the direction of the effect (i.e. which group is favoured).	Yes
DISCUSSION			
Limitations of evidence	9	Provide a brief summary of the limitations of the evidence included in the review (e.g. study risk of bias, inconsistency and imprecision).	Yes
Interpretation	10	Provide a general interpretation of the results and important implications.	Yes
OTHER			
Funding	11	Specify the primary source of funding for the review.	No
Registration	12	Provide the register name and registration number.	

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Page 1, title
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	2 See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	
INTRODUCTION	N		
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Page 4
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Page 4
METHODS	·		
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Methods section, pages 5,6
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Supplementary section 1
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Supplementary section 1
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Supplementary section 1
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Supplementary section 1
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Methods section, page 6
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Supplementary section 1
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Supplementary section 1
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	Data synthesis, page 7
Synthesis	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics	

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
methods		and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Data synthesis, page 7
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Sensitivity analyses, page 8
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Sensitivity analyses, page 8
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	NA
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Figure S1
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Supplementary material, section 1c
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Results section, page 8 and Table 1
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Table S1
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Figure 1, Figure 2.
Results of	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Supplementary

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
syntheses			section 3,
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	Results section, pages 8-11
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Results section, page 10. Supplementary section 6
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Supplementary section 6
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Main findings, page 11
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Study limitations, page 13
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	-
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Findings in context, page 13
OTHER INFORM	IATIO	N	
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	The review was not registered because it was a realist review
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	NA

Торіс	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item reported
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Page 1
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Page 1
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Supplement material
	1011, 1151	. <u>nup.//www.prisina statement.org</u>	

BMJ Open

Realist review of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the general population and under-resourced communities from high-income countries.

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2024-084560.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Mar-2024
Complete List of Authors:	Gonzalez-Jaramillo, Nathalia; University of Bern, ISPM Abbühl, Dominik; University of Bern, ISPM; University of Bern, Faculty of Medicine Roa-Díaz, Zayne; University of Bern Kobler-Betancourt, Cristopher; University of Bern Frahsa, Annika; University of Bern
Primary Subject Heading :	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Infectious diseases, Public health, Global health, Epidemiology
Keywords:	COVID-19, Meta-Analysis, Vaccination





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reliez oni

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Realist review of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the general population and under-resourced communities from high-income countries.

Gonzalez-Jaramillo Nathalia, MD,PhD,¹ Abbühl Dominik, MD,^{1,2} Roa-Díaz Zayne Milena, RN,PhD,³ Kobler-Betancourt Cristopher, ¹ Frahsa Annika, PhD.¹

1 Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland.

2 Faculty of Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland.

3. Medical Library, University library of Bern, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

Word count:

 Abstract word count:

Declaration of funding

Conflicts of interest / financial disclosures: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

Patients or the public WERE NOT involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research.

Acknowledgments:

We thank the Lindenhof Foundation for their financial support of our research group. We thank Kristin Marie Bivens for her editorial work and guidance on our manuscript.

Corresponding authors / Reprint requests:

Nathalia Gonzalez-Jaramillo. Email: nathalia.gonzalez-jaramillo@cslbehring.com

Annika Frahsa. University of Bern, Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, Bern, Switzerland. <u>annika.frahsa@unibe.ch</u>

Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Switzerland.

Mittelstrasse 43

3012 Bern, Switzerland . Direct dial: +41 31 684 56 79

ORCIDs:

Nathalia Gonzalez: 0000-0003-4975-4439

1 2 3 4 5 6	Annika Frahsa: 0000-0002-0207-3989
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	
22 23 24 25 26 27 28	
29 30 31 32 33 34 35	
36 37 38 39 40 41 42	
43 44 45 46 47 48 49	

Abstract

Objective

To compare vaccination willingness before roll-out and one-year post-rollout uptake among the general population and under-resourced communities in High income countries.

Design

A realist review

Data sources

Embase, PubMed, Dimensions ai, and Google Scholar

Setting

High-income countries

Definitions

We defined *vaccination willingness* as the proportion of participants willing or intending to receive vaccines prior to availability. We defined vaccine uptake as the real proportion of the population with complete vaccination as reported by each country until November 2021.

Results

We included data from 62 studies and 18 HIC. For studies conducted among general populations, the proportion of vaccination willingness was 67% [95% confidence interval (CI) 62%–72%]. In real-world settings, the overall proportion of vaccine uptake among those countries was 73% (CI 69%–76%). 17 studies reported pre-rollout willingness for under-resourced communities. The summary proportion of vaccination willingness from studies reporting results among people from under-resourced communities was 52% (95% CI 0.46–0.57). Real-world evidence about vaccine uptake after rollout among under-resourced communities was limited.

Conclusion

Our review emphasizes the importance of realist reviews for assessing vaccine acceptance. Limited real-world evidence about vaccine uptake among under-resourced communities in high-income countries is a call to context-specific actions and reporting.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- For country vaccination willingness we included only studies with national representative samples.
- For under-resourced communities' vaccination willingness, we included studies with purposive samples.
- We compared countries' vaccination willingness with official country-level national reports.
- Official country-level reports about uptake among under-resourced communities were limited.
- We could not compare vaccination willingness with real-world vaccine uptake statistics among under-resourced communities.

Introduction

Cumulative excess death from the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic made it a leading global cause of death between 2020–2021.(1) Universal vaccination played a significant role transitioning into post-pandemic life.(2) COVID-19 vaccines were developed and authorized in record time; as of April 2023, 70% of the world population received at least one COVID-19 vaccine dose. However, vaccine uptake is complicated; it involves more than simply making vaccines available. For instance, inequitable vaccine distribution possibly contributes to the 2.8-fold difference in vaccine coverage between high- and low-income countries.(3) Whereas vaccine uptake in high-income countries (HIC) was 81%, vaccine uptake in low-income countries (LIC) was 29%.(4)

Countries with strong public health systems and economic resources achieved some early success vaccinating populations, yet people from historically, socially, or economically under-resourced communities, such as people who experience homelessness, people from ethnic and racial minorities, as well as people with immigration or refugee experience, possibly remained unvaccinated for complex

reasons. Regarding vaccination willingness and uptake among people from ethnic minority groups, Raizai et al.(5, 6) identified several structural aspects resulting from a mistrust of government and public health bodies: systemic racism and discrimination at societal and healthcare system levels, histories of unethical studies, as well as underrepresentation of people from ethnic and racial minority groups in health, drug, and vaccine trials. Distrust in medical institutions from inappropriate care and mistreatment also impacted vaccination willingness among people from socially or economically under-resourced communities, such as members of indigenous communities or racial minority groups as well as among incarcerated individuals. (7), (8, 9)

Additionally, local barriers to access vaccinations and individual vaccine hesitancy played roles explaining vaccine uptake differences within and among countries.(3) Notwithstanding, structural access barriers and individual vaccine hesitancy possibly share common pathways, which complicates disentangling their effects in vaccination uptake.(10) For instance, in a systematic review of barriers, facilitators, and vaccine hesitancy with included studies about mainly HIC, they found individuals from minority ethnic groups concurrently experience more access barriers along with higher vaccine hesitancy and lower vaccine uptake when compared with individuals from majority ethnic groups and non-migrants.(11) Therefore, a debate is ongoing about the true proportion of hesitancy and vaccine refusal among unvaccinated individuals in HIC. Although individual vaccination willingness is not under discussion, understandings about vaccination willingness and vaccine uptake possibly inform health policies more reliably, identify access barriers to vaccines, facilitate vaccination campaign planning, and enhance uptake, eventually.

BMJ Open

Generally, marginalization and vaccine uptake in HIC has been scarcely described in the literature. We performed a realist synthesis to evaluate COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and its determinants among people from under-resourced communities in HIC. We compared data collected from a specific systematic review with real-world statistics to study the general evolution of vaccination rates—from hypothetical acceptance before the widespread rollout of vaccination programs—until December 2021, one year after the first vaccine was available and when presumably, most HIC populations could be vaccinated. In addition, we compared hypothetical vaccination willingness between the general population and under-resourced communities in HIC.

Methods

Study design and sources of data

We conducted a quantitative realist synthesis on the prevalence of vaccine acceptance among the general population from HIC. We followed the realist and metanarrative evidence syntheses (RAMESES) quality and publication standards and reporting guidelines.(12) We also report our findings according to the statement on preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses(13) (PRISMA). We defined *vaccination willingness* as the proportion of participants willing or intending to receive a vaccine before vaccines were available. We defined *vaccine uptake* as the real proportion of the population with complete vaccination as reported by each country until November 2021.

A medical information specialist searched three electronic databases: PubMed, Embase, and Dimensions ai. For informal sources, and to add possibly relevant articles where the search terms only appear in the full text of an article, we also screened the first 200 hits of a Google Scholar search. The detailed search strategy

is available in the Section 1 from the supplementary material. We sought peer-review scientific literature published before November 30, 2022. Different descriptors were used for each component of the search. for surveys investigating COVID-19 vaccine attitudes among adult populations from HIC before COVID-19 vaccine roll-out. We used the World Bank database to classify countries of origin according to income at the time of data collection [US\$12,536 or more gross national income (GNI) per capita in 2019]. We defined the study to include surveys reporting quantitative data on populations willing to be vaccinated when vaccines became available. We included surveys meeting the following criteria: 1) conducted in 2020–2021 among adult populations before vaccine rollout campaigns; 2) reported prevalence of vaccination willingness via questionnaires; 3) peer-reviewed; 4) performed probabilistic sampling; and 5) reported results for general populations and/ or under-resourced communities. To mitigate the risk of bias, for country vaccination willingness we included only studies with national representative samples. For under-resourced communities' vaccination willingness, we also included studies with purposive samples.

We excluded studies of unrepresentative participants from general populations, such as people with particular conditions or health statuses—like people with diabetes or pregnant people—or particular occupations—like health care workers or university students. We excluded articles with incomplete information, systematic reviews and meta-analyses, and reports from meetings or congresses.

We provide details for our study selection and data extraction methods in Supplementary section 1. When multiple records included data from the same country, we extracted data from all of them and calculated country-specific pooled prevalence and used the pooled prevalence as the value to compare further with real-world statistics of vaccine uptake.

Study outcomes

For each country, outcomes of interest included 1) the proportion of people willing to be vaccinated according to results of the systematic review (primary outcome: vaccination willingness/acceptance); and 2) the proportion of vaccinated people according to the real-world data statistics (secondary outcome: vaccine uptake).

Data selection and extraction

Two reviewers independently screened all records and verified included and excluded studies by using REDCap (Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA). We report identification, exclusion, and inclusion of studies in the Figure S1 flow diagram. One reviewer extracted data using a pre-piloted extraction form, and a second reviewer verified the extracted data. Extracted variables included, yet were not limited to sample size, study design, publication date, survey date, country and study population composition, community type, age, vaccine hesitancy, vaccine acceptance, and vaccine refusal (Supplementary section 1.d). We extracted all proportions as reported. For the realist synthesis, we obtained available country-specific data from multiple sources.(14, 15) We provide sources of information and definitions for country-specific variables in Supplementary section 1.d.

Patient and public involvement

Patients or the public WERE NOT involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research.

Potential bias assessment

Two independent reviewers assessed the risk of bias for each study using the checklist for prevalence studies from Hoy et al; we assessed each question independently and calculated scores, as recommended by checklist developers.(16) However, we did not use total scores in analyses. Instead, we grouped questions into

categories according to the bias domain they addressed.(17) We analyzed risk of selection bias and risk of nonresponse bias as potential sources of heterogeneity among studies. We provide potential bias assessment results in Supplementary section 2. Table S1.

Statistical analysis

Data synthesis

We estimated the pooled prevalence of vaccination willingness and 95% confidence intervals (CI) using random effects models. We used the 'metaprop' function from the 'meta' package in R (version 3.5.1) to synthesize and display findings from included studies in forest plots. For overall summary estimates, we calculated prediction intervals to represent the likely range of proportions obtained in subsequent studies conducted in similar settings.(18) We quantified statistical heterogeneity using the l² statistic. Heterogeneity was classified according to the most recent version of the Cochrane Handbook: 0–40% might not be important; 30–60% may represent moderate heterogeneity; 50–90% may represent substantial heterogeneity; 75– 100% considerable heterogeneity. However, in meta-analyses of prevalence, heterogeneity according to the l² statistic is expected to be substantial and possibly not discriminative.(19) Therefore, we also calculated prediction intervals to describe the expected range of estimates.

Sensitivity analyses

We performed sensitivity analyses. First, we used the influence function in the 'metafor' package to compute outliers and influential case diagnostics, including externally standardized residuals and leave-one-out estimates of heterogeneity. Second, we investigated the impact of selection bias as a potential source of heterogeneity by means of meta-regression.

Page 11 of 93

Real-world data analysis

After synthesizing information from included studies, we compared results for each country with real-world data statistics concerning vaccination uptake. In addition, we identified how different country characteristics and policies (Supplementary section 3, Table S2) in each country could be associated with vaccination uptake. Specifically, we selected four components to examine separately: percentage of populations older than 65 years; social spending as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP); healthcare spending as a percentage of GDP; and stringency index (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker index) at the start date of vaccine rollout campaigns in each country since we thought them most likely associated with vaccine uptake among general populations.(14)

Results

After deduplication, we identified 3349 potentially relevant citations. After initial screening based on titles and abstracts, we selected full texts of 214 articles for detailed evaluation (Figure S1). After full-text assessment, we excluded 152 citations. We provide the complete list of excluded references and reasons for exclusion in the Supplementary section 1c. We included the remaining 62 articles that reported vaccination willingness before vaccine rollout at the country-level.

General characteristics of included studies.

We provide detailed characteristics of included studies in Table 1. Overall, studies included 299,769 individuals from 18 HIC. Among the 62 included references, 45 studies reported results for general populations and 17 studies reported results for at least one under-resourced community. We calculated the weighted average of exported mean ages from each study; the mean age was 47.5 years. The proportion of women ranged from 16% to 93% among studies including patients from both sexes.

Two studies reported including only men.(20, 21) Study sample sizes conducted among general populations ranged from 316 to 63,266 and study sample sizes conducted among under-resourced communities ranged from 83 to 18,474.

Since reporting vaccination willingness via questionnaire was an inclusion criteria, all studies used validated questionnaires or questionnaires developed specifically for studies.

General characteristics of the included countries

We present detailed characteristics of included countries in Table S2. Country populations ranged between 2.6 million (Qatar) and 332 million (United States). Median population was 11.1 million [interquartile range (IQR): 7.9–67]. Median percentage of populations older than 65 years was 19 (IQR: 16.8–22.2), and median value for life expectancy was 81.5 years (IQR: 81–83). With respect to economic indicators related to public policy, median social spending as a percentage of GDP was 25 (IQR: 18–29); median healthcare spending as a percentage of GDP was 10.3 (IQR: 8.7–11.3). We determined two median indicators of inequality: poverty gap 0.29 (IQR: 0.26–0.33) and gender wage gap 15 (IQR: 6–19), respectively.

Proportion of people from general populations reporting vaccination willingness before vaccine rollout

Among general populations, the summary proportion of vaccination willingness (Figure 1) was estimated across all study settings as 67% (95% CI 61%–72%, 45 studies). Forty-five studies reported vaccine acceptance among general populations: Australia (3 studies);(22-24) Austria (1 study);(25) Canada (2 studies);(26, 27) Croatia (1 study);(28) Denmark (1 study);(29) France (5 studies);(30-34) Germany (1 study);(35) Greece (1 study);(36) Ireland (1 study);(37) Israel (1 study);(38) Italy (4 studies);(39-42) Japan (5 studies);(43-47) Portugal (1 study);(48) Qatar (1 study);(49)

Switzerland(1 study);(50) United Kingdom (7 studies);(51-57) and the United States (9 studies).(58-66)

Proportion of people from under-resourced communities reporting vaccination willingness before vaccine rollout

The summary proportion of vaccination willingness for studies conducted among people from under-resourced communities (Figure 2) was estimated as 52% (95% CI 0.46–0.57, 17 studies). The seventeen studies reporting vaccine acceptance in under-resourced communities included four studies among people experiencing homelessness;(67-70) two studies among people using illicit and unprescribed drugs;(71, 72) three studies among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender populations;(21, 73, 74) two studies among incarcerated populations;(20, 75) two studies among refugee and undocumented migrant populations;(50, 76) and one study for each one of the following: indigenous population;(9) a rural community ;(77) a Latino population;(78) and a Black American population.(7) In the cumulative metaanalysis from sensitivity analyses, we found a trend towards acceptance according to dates of data acquisition ranging from 32% in early pandemic stages to 52% during late pandemic stages before vaccine rollout (Supplementary section 5.c)

Proportion of vaccine uptake from real-world country statistics one year after vaccine rollout

The summary proportion of vaccine uptake from included countries was estimated as 73% (95% CI 0.69–0.76, 18 countries). In general, the proportion of vaccine uptake for each country was higher than vaccination willingness before vaccine rollout (Supplemental material, Table S3), except for Croatia (-15%), Denmark (-3%), and the United States (-8%). In the cumulative meta-analysis, we did not observe an effect from date of vaccine approval on vaccine uptake at the end of 2021 (Supplementary section 6). However, in meta-regression analyses (Supplementary

section 6. Sensitivity analyses) vaccine uptake increased according to the proportion of the population older than 65 years [odds ratio (OR)=1.8, 95%CI 1.04–3.1] and decreased at higher stringency index values (OR=0.8, 95%CI 0.69–0.94).

Discussion

Main findings

Our realist synthesis involves data from 62 studies and 18 countries; we contribute to knowledge about the prevalence of vaccine acceptance among general populations and people from under-resourced communities. Additionally, we compared proportions of expected vaccine uptake from studies conducted before vaccines were available with the real uptake from the end of December 2021. To our knowledge, ours is the first systematic and realist review comparing vaccination willingness and vaccine uptake using real-world statistics among general populations with people from under-resourced communities in HIC.

The countries included in the study represented 70% of the high-income country world population. Most countries showed higher vaccine uptake compared to the reported vaccination willingness in studies conducted before the vaccine rollout. For all studies among general populations, the proportion of vaccination willingness was 67% (95% CI 62%–72%). In real-world settings, the overall proportion of vaccine uptake among countries was 73% (CI 69%–76%). However, the scope of this study is limited in exploring possible explanations for lower-than-expected rates of vaccine uptake in Croatia, Denmark, and the United States. For all the other countries, the real-world uptake was consistently higher than the reported willingness before rollout.

It is worth noting that some studies not included in our meta-analysis that evaluated the willingness to receive the vaccine when the vaccination rollout had

BMJ Open

already started in their country may have reported higher rates of willingness to receive the vaccine compared to the country's real uptake.(79) However, this should not be interpreted as an overestimation since such willingness was estimated on the unvaccinated fraction of the population instead of the total population of the country who was completely unvaccinated only before the rollout.

The pooled proportion from studies reporting vaccination willingness among under-resourced communities before rollout was 52% (95% CI 0.46–0.57). Official country-level reports about vaccine uptake among under-resourced communities was too limited so we could not compare vaccination willingness before rollout with realworld uptake statistics among under-resourced communities after vaccine rollout.

Findings in context

The proportion of vaccination willingness among people from under-resourced communities was consistently lower than the proportion of vaccination willingness among people from populations in total. Existing evidence suggest people from ethnic minority groups(7) and indigenous communities reasonably distrust medical institutions from experiences of differential care and mistreatment.(8, 9) Mistrust of institutions and governments was reported as the most common reason to delay vaccine uptake among ethnic minority groups,(7) indigenous communities (8, 9), and incarcerated people.(75) Experiences of discrimination, stigma, and barriers to access were reported as possible explanations for lower prevalence of vaccine acceptance among people from sexual and gender minority groups.(80)

Despite the lack of official data on real-world uptake among under-resourced communities, some studies have reported lower vaccine uptake compared to the general population. For instance, a study among healthcare workers in the UK found that vaccine uptake was 58.5% among South Asian and 36.8% among Black ethnic

minority groups, compared to 70% in white healthcare workers.(81) Another analysis of patient primary care records in the UK found lower vaccine uptake among different ethnic groups (Black 68%, White 96%) and to and to a lesser extent, among different levels of deprivation (most deprived 91%, least deprived 97%). (82)

Recent evidence provides initial insights about overcoming barriers to vaccination uptake. For instance, multi-component interventions with tailored communication of risks of remaining unvaccinated and benefits of becoming vaccinated,(83) community-based action and engagement of religious and community leaders, dialogue to understand reasons for mistrust in government and public health bodies, as well as well as provision of access to convenient vaccination in collaboration with community-based and trusted health institutions.(84)

We suggest future studies compare trajectories of vaccination willingness with vaccine uptake among under-resourced communities. We also recommend future research link findings of trajectories with context-specific actions to address barriers to vaccine uptake among people from under-resourced communities. Ultimately, more research is needed to better understand vaccine uptake and the joint interactions among barriers, unwillingness, hesitancy, postponement, or other unknown aspects driving vaccine uptake. The identification of necessary adjustments needed to improve vaccination uptake among different groups may inform future vaccination programs.

Strengths and limitations

Studies reporting prevalence served as important sources of evidence during the COVID-19 pandemic and helped researchers understand factors related to the disease and inform policies. However, prevalence estimates from individual studies and pooled prevalence estimates from our meta-analyses may have been affected by selection and reporting biases.(17) Notwithstanding, our inclusion criteria attempted

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

to reduce such risks of bias, and we performed multiple sensitivity analyses that provided insights into possible sources of heterogeneity. A strength of the realist approach is the use of diverse sources of information. In the specific context of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance, the fact that countries have reporting systems in place to keep population-based statistics made it possible to assess the real-life counterpart of the studies.(85)

Conclusion

Our systematic and realist review highlights COVID-19 vaccine uptake in HIC generally exceeded expressed vaccination willingness before vaccine rollout and vaccination willingness tended to be lower among under-resourced communities, when compared with total populations living in HIC. Our review emphasizes the importance of realist reviews for assessing vaccine acceptance and particularly the need for more specific real-world statistics on vaccine uptake among under-resourced communities as well as the importance of context-specific actions to promote vaccine uptake and reporting.

Data availability statement

All data relevant to the study are included in the article or uploaded as online supplemental information.

Authors' contributions

NGJ and AF conceived the research idea and planned the work, ZR conducted the search, DA and NG screened the papers and extracted the data, NGJ analyzed the results, NGJ, and AF jointly wrote the report, CB, DA, and ZR, revised the report.

Figures and captions:

1. Title :Figure 1. Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the general population.

Caption: For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I2 accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

 Title : Figure 2. Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in special populations

Caption: For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I2 accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

BMJ Open

References

1. Ahmad FB, Anderson RN. The Leading Causes of Death in the US for 2020. JAMA. 2021;325(18):1829-30.

2. Biancolella M, Colona VL, Mehrian-Shai R, Watt JL, Luzzatto L, Novelli G, Reichardt JKV. COVID-19 2022 update: transition of the pandemic to the endemic phase. Human Genomics. 2022;16(1):19.

3. Bayati M, Noroozi R, Ghanbari-Jahromi M, Jalali FS. Inequality in the distribution of Covid-19 vaccine: a systematic review. International Journal for Equity in Health. 2022;21(1):122.

4. Mathieu E, Ritchie H, Ortiz-Ospina E, Roser M, Hasell J, Appel C, et al. A global database of COVID-19 vaccinations. Nature Human Behaviour. 2021;5(7):947-53.

5. Razai MS, Osama T, McKechnie DGJ, Majeed A. Covid-19 vaccine hesitancy among ethnic minority groups. BMJ (Clinical research ed). 2021;372:n513.

6. Razai MS, Kankam HKN, Majeed A, Esmail A, Williams DR. Mitigating ethnic disparities in covid-19 and beyond. BMJ (Clinical research ed). 2021;372:m4921.

7. Bogart LM, Dong L, G, Hi P, Klein DJ, Smith TL, et al. COVID-19 Vaccine Intentions and Mistrust in a National Sample of Black Americans. Journal of the National Medical Association. 2022;113(6):599-611.

8. Mosby I, Swidrovich J. Medical experimentation and the roots of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among Indigenous Peoples in Canada. CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne. 2021;193(11):E381-e3.

9. Manca T, Humble RM, Aylsworth L, Cha E, Wilson SE, Meyer SB, et al. "We need to protect each other": COVID-19 vaccination intentions

and concerns among Racialized minority and Indigenous Peoples in Canada. Social science & medicine (1982). 2022;313:115400.

10. Njoku A, Joseph M, Felix R. Changing the Narrative: Structural Barriers and Racial and Ethnic Inequities in COVID-19 Vaccination. International journal of environmental research and public health. 2021;18(18).

11. Abba-Aji M, Stuckler D, Galea S, McKee M. Ethnic/racial minorities' and migrants' access to COVID-19 vaccines: A systematic review of barriers and facilitators. Journal of migration and health. 2022;5:100086.

12. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, Buckingham J, Pawson R. RAMESES publication standards: realist syntheses. BMC Medicine. 2013;11(1):21.

13. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ (Clinical research ed). 2021;372:n71.

14. Hale T, Angrist N, Goldszmidt R, Kira B, Petherick A, Phillips T, et al. A global panel database of pandemic policies (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker). Nat Hum Behav. 2021;5(4):529-38.

15. Data TWB. 2020 [Nov 2022].

16. Hoy D, Brooks P, Woolf A, Blyth F, March L, Bain C, et al. Assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater agreement. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2012;65(9):934-9.

17. Diana B-G, Georgia S, Nicola L. Studies of prevalence: how a basic epidemiology concept has gained recognition in the COVID-19 pandemic. BMJ Open. 2022;12(10):e061497.

18. Riley RD, Higgins JP, Deeks JJ. Interpretation of random effects meta-analyses. BMJ (Clinical research ed). 2011;342:d549.

19. Migliavaca CB, Stein C, Colpani V, Barker TH, Ziegelmann PK, Munn Z, Falavigna M. Meta-analysis of prevalence: I(2) statistic and how to deal with heterogeneity. Research synthesis methods. 2022;13(3):363-7.

20. Di Giuseppe G, Pelullo CP, Lanzano R, Napolitano F, Pavia M. Knowledge, attitudes, and behavior of incarcerated people regarding COVID-19 and related vaccination: a survey in Italy. Scientific reports. 2022;12(1):960.

21. Ousseine YM, Vaux S, V, Entorren S, Bonmarin I, Champenois K, et al. Predictors of Uncertainty and Unwillingness to Receive the COVID-19 Vaccine in Men Who Have Sex with Men in France. International journal of environmental research and public health. 2022;19(9).

22. Attwell K, Lake J, Sneddon J, Gerrans P, Blyth C, Lee J. Converting the maybes: Crucial for a successful COVID-19 vaccination strategy. PloS One. 2021;16(1):e0245907.

23. Seale H, Heywood AE, Leask J, Sheel M, Durrheim DN, Bolsewicz K, Kaur R. Examining Australian public perceptions and behaviors towards a future COVID-19 vaccine. BMC infectious diseases. 2021;21(1):120.

24. Enticott J, Gill JS, Bacon SL, Lavoie KL, Epstein DS, Dawadi S, et al. Attitudes towards vaccines and intention to vaccinate against COVID-19: a cross-sectional analysis-implications for public health communications in Australia. BMJ open. 2022;12(1):e057127.

25. Schernhammer E, Weitzer J, Laubichler MD, Birmann BM, Bertau M, Zenk L, et al. Correlates of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in Austria: trust and the government. Journal of Public Health (Oxford, England). 2022;44(1):e106-e16.

26. Basta NE, Sohel N, Sulis G, Wolfson C, Maimon G, Griffith LE, et al. Factors Associated With Willingness to Receive a COVID-19 Vaccine Among 23,819 Adults Aged 50 Years or Older: An Analysis of the Canadian Longitudinal Study on Aging. American journal of epidemiology. 2022;191(6):987-98.

27. Lavoie K, Gosselin-Boucher V, Stojanovic J, Gupta S, Gagne M, Joyal-Desmarais K, et al. Understanding national trends in COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in Canada: results from five sequential cross-sectional representative surveys spanning April 2020-March 2021. BMJ open. 2022;12(4):e059411.

28. Bagic D, Suljok A, Ancic B. Determinants and reasons for coronavirus disease 2019 vaccine hesitancy in Croatia. Croatian medical journal. 2022;63(1):89-97.

29. Neumann-Böhme S, Varghese NE, Sabat I, Barros PP, Brouwer W, van Exel J, et al. Once we have it, will we use it? A European survey on willingness to be vaccinated against COVID-19. The European journal of health economics: HEPAC: health economics in prevention and care. 2020;21(7):977-82.

30. Detoc M, Bruel S, Frappe P, Tardy B, Botelho-Nevers E, Gagneux-Brunon A. Intention to participate in a COVID-19 vaccine clinical trial and to get vaccinated against COVID-19 in France during the pandemic. Vaccine. 2020;38(45):7002-6.

31. Montagni I, Ouazzani-Touhami K, Pouymayou A, Pereira E, Texier N, Schuck S, et al. Who is hesitant about Covid-19 vaccines? The profiling of participants in a French online cohort. Revue d'epidemiologie et de sante publique. 2022;70(3):123-31.

Page 23 of 93

BMJ Open

32. Ward JK, Alleaume C, Peretti-Watel P, Group C. The French public's attitudes to a future COVID-19 vaccine: The politicization of a public health issue. Social science & medicine (1982). 2020;265:113414. 33. Coulaud P-J, Ablona A, Bolduc N, Fast D, Bertr, Karine, et al. COVID-19 vaccine intention among young adults: Comparative results from a cross-sectional study in Canada and France. Vaccine. 2022;40(16):2442-56.

34. Heyerdahl LW, Vray M, Lana B, Tvardik N, Gobat N, Wanat M, et al. Conditionality of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in European countries. Vaccine. 2022;40(9):1191-7.

35. Bendau A, Plag J, Petzold MB, Ströhle A. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and related fears and anxiety. International Immunopharmacology. 2021;97:107724.

36. Kourlaba G, Kourkouni E, Maistreli S, Tsopela C-G, Molocha N-M, Triantafyllou C, et al. Willingness of Greek general population to get a COVID-19 vaccine. Global Health Research and Policy. 2021;6(1):3.

37. Murphy J, Vallières F, Bentall RP, Shevlin M, McBride O, Hartman TK, et al. Psychological characteristics associated with COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and resistance in Ireland and the United Kingdom. Nature Communications. 2021;12(1):29.

38. Maor Y, Caspi S. Attitudes towards influenza, and COVID-19 vaccines during the COVID-19 pandemic among a representative sample of the Jewish Israeli population. PloS one. 2022;17(2):e0255495.

39. Caserotti M, Girardi P, Rubaltelli E, Tasso A, Lotto L, Gavaruzzi T. Associations of COVID-19 risk perception with vaccine hesitancy over time for Italian residents. Social science & medicine (1982). 2021;272:113688.

40. La Vecchia C, Negri E, Alicandro G, Scarpino V. Attitudes towards influenza vaccine and a potential COVID-19 vaccine in Italy and differences across occupational groups, September 2020. La Medicina Del Lavoro. 2020;111(6):445-8.

41. Moscardino U, Musso P, Inguglia C, Ceccon C, Miconi D, Rousseau C. Sociodemographic and psychological correlates of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and resistance in the young adult population in Italy. Vaccine. 2022;40(16):2379-87.

42. Palamenghi L, Barello S, Boccia S, Graffigna G. Mistrust in biomedical research and vaccine hesitancy: the forefront challenge in the battle against COVID-19 in Italy. European Journal of Epidemiology. 2020;35(8):785-8.

43. Ishimaru T, Okawara M, Ando H, Hino A, Nagata T, Tateishi S, et al. Gender differences in the determinants of willingness to get the COVID-19 vaccine among the working-age population in Japan. Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics. 2021;17(11):3975-81.

44. Machida M, Nakamura I, Kojima T, Saito R, Nakaya T, Hanibuchi T, et al. Acceptance of a COVID-19 Vaccine in Japan during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Vaccines. 2021;9(3):210.

45. Kadoya Y, Watanapongvanich S, Yuktadatta P, Putthinun P, Lartey ST, Khan MSR. Willing or Hesitant? A Socioeconomic Study on the Potential Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccine in Japan. International journal of environmental research and public health. 2021;18(9):4864.

46. Sekizawa Y, Hashimoto S, Denda K, Ochi S, So M. Association between COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and generalized trust, depression, generalized anxiety, and fear of COVID-19. BMC public health. 2022;22(1):126.

47. Yoda T, Katsuyama H. Willingness to Receive COVID-19 Vaccination in Japan. Vaccines. 2021;9(1):48.

48. Soares P, Rocha JV, Moniz M, Gama A, Laires PA, Pedro AR, et al. Factors Associated with COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy. Vaccines. 2021;9(3):300.

49. Khaled SM, Petcu C, Bader L, Amro I, Al-Hamadi AMHA, Al Assi M, et al. Prevalence and Potential Determinants of COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Resistance in Qatar: Results from a Nationally Representative Survey of Qatari Nationals and Migrants between December 2020 and January 2021. Vaccines. 2021;9(5):471.

50. Page KR, Genovese E, Franchi M, Cella S, Fiorini G, Tlili R, et al. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among undocumented migrants during the early phase of the vaccination campaign: a multicentric cross-sectional study. BMJ open. 2022;12(3):e056591.

51. Batty GD, Deary IJ, Altschul D. Pre-pandemic mental and physical health as predictors of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: evidence from a UK-wide cohort study. Annals of medicine. 2022;54(1):274-82.

52. Freeman D, Loe BS, Chadwick A, Vaccari C, Waite F, Rosebrock L, et al. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the UK: the Oxford coronavirus explanations, attitudes, and narratives survey (Oceans) II. Psychological Medicine. 2020:1-15.

Freeman D, Waite F, Rosebrock L, Petit A, Causier C, East A, et al. 53. beliefs, mistrust, Coronavirus conspiracy and compliance with England. Psychological Medicine. government guidelines in 2022;52(2):251-63.

54. Sethi S, Kumar A, Mandal A, Shaikh M, Hall CA, Kirk JMW, et al. The UPTAKE study: a cross-sectional survey examining the insights and

beliefs of the UK population on COVID-19 vaccine uptake and hesitancy. BMJ Open. 2021;11(6):e048856.

55. Chaudhuri K, Chakrabarti A, Ch, An JS, B, Yopadhyay S. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the UK: a longitudinal household cross-sectional study. BMC public health. 2022;22(1):104.

56. Sherman SM, Sim J, Cutts M, Dasch H, Amlot R, Rubin GJ, et al. COVID-19 vaccination acceptability in the UK at the start of the vaccination programme: a nationally representative cross-sectional survey (CoVAccS - wave 2). Public health. 2022;202:1-9.

57. Sherman SM, Smith LE, Sim J, Amlôt R, Cutts M, Dasch H, et al. COVID-19 vaccination intention in the UK: results from the COVID-19 vaccination acceptability study (CoVAccS), a nationally representative cross-sectional survey. Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics. 2021;17(6):1612-21.

58. Earnshaw VA, Eaton LA, Kalichman SC, Brousseau NM, Hill EC, Fox AB. COVID-19 conspiracy beliefs, health behaviors, and policy support. Translational Behavioral Medicine. 2020;10(4):850-6.

59. Fisher KA, Bloomstone SJ, Walder J, Crawford S, Fouayzi H, Mazor KM. Attitudes Toward a Potential SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine : A Survey of U.S. Adults. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2020;173(12):964-73.

60. Malik AA, McFadden SM, Elharake J, Omer SB. Determinants of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the US. EClinicalMedicine. 2020;26:100495.

61. Reiter P, Pennell M, Katz M. Acceptability of a COVID-19 Vaccine among Adults in the United States: How Many People Would Get Vaccinated? Vaccine. 2020;38.
BMJ Open

62. Pogue K, Jensen JL, Stancil CK, Ferguson DG, Hughes SJ, Mello EJ, et al. Influences on Attitudes Regarding Potential COVID-19 Vaccination in the United States. Vaccines. 2020;8(4):E582.

63. Craig BM. United States COVID-19 Vaccination Preferences (CVP):2020 Hindsight. The Patient. 2021;14(3):309-18.

64. Thunström L, Ashworth M, Finnoff D, Newbold SC. Hesitancy Toward a COVID-19 Vaccine. EcoHealth. 2021;18(1):44-60.

65. Rane MS, Kochhar S, Poehlein E, You W, Robertson MM, Zimba R, et al. Determinants and Trends of COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Vaccine Uptake in a National Cohort of US Adults: A Longitudinal Study. American journal of epidemiology. 2022;191(4):570-83.

66. Kelly BJ, Southwell BG, McCormack LA, Bann CM, MacDonald PDM, Frasier AM, et al. Predictors of willingness to get a COVID-19 vaccine in the U.S. BMC Infectious Diseases. 2021;21(1):338.

67. Iacoella C, Ralli M, Maggiolini A, Arcangeli A, Ercoli L. Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccine among persons experiencing homelessness in the City of Rome, Italy. European review for medical and pharmacological sciences. 2021;25(7):3132-5.

68. Tucker JS, D'Amico EJ, Pedersen ER, Garvey R, Rodriguez A, Klein DJ. COVID-19 Vaccination Rates and Attitudes Among Young Adults With Recent Experiences of Homelessness. The Journal of adolescent health
: official publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine. 2022;70(3):504-6.

69. Meehan AA, Yeh M, Gardner A, DeFoe TL, Garcia A, V, et al. COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptability Among Clients and Staff of Homeless Shelters in Detroit, Michigan, February 2021. Health promotion practice. 2022;23(1):35-41.

BMJ Open

70. Rogers JH, Cox SN, Hughes JP, Link AC, Chow EJ, Fosse I, et al. Trends in COVID-19 vaccination intent and factors associated with deliberation and reluctance among adult homeless shelter residents and staff, 1 November 2020 to 28 February 2021 - King County, Washington. Vaccine. 2022;40(1):122-32.

71. Dietze PM, Hall C, Price O, Stewart AC, Crawford S, Peacock A, Maher L. COVID-19 vaccine acceptability among people in Australia who inject drugs: Implications for vaccine rollout. Drug and alcohol review. 2022;41(2):484-7.

72. Sullivan MC, Mistler C, Copenhaver MM, Wickersham JA, Ni Z, Kim RS, Shrestha R. Race, trust, and COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in people with opioid use disorder. Health psychology : official journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association. 2022;41(2):115-20.

73. Abramovich A, Pang N, Kunasekaran S, Moss A, A, Kiran T, Pinto AD. Examining COVID-19 vaccine uptake and attitudes among 2SLGBTQ+ youth experiencing homelessness. BMC public health. 2022;22(1):122.

74. Christodoulou J, Fehrenbacher AE, Shaw EH, Vincent EM, Saleska JL. COVID-19 prevention behaviors, trust, and intent to vaccinate among youth at risk for HIV. PloS one. 2022;17(3):e0266321.

75. Stern MF, Piasecki AM, Strick LB, Rajeshwar P, Tyagi E, Dolovich S, et al. Willingness to Receive a COVID-19 Vaccination Among Incarcerated or Detained Persons in Correctional and Detention Facilities - Four States, September-December 2020. MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report. 2021;70(13):473-7.

BMJ Open

76. Shaw J, Anderson KB, Fabi RE, Thompson CA, Harris M, Aljabbarin N, et al. COVID-19 vaccination intention and behavior in a large, diverse, U.S. refugee population. Vaccine. 2022;40(9):1231-7.

77. Crozier J, Christensen N, Li P, Stanley G, Clark DS, Selleck C. Rural, Underserved, and Minority Populations' Perceptions of COVID-19 Information, Testing, and Vaccination: Report from a Southern State. Population health management. 2022;25(3):413-22.

78. Scott VP, Hiller-Venegas S, Edra K, Prickitt J, Esquivel Y, Melendrez B, Rhee KE. Factors associated with COVID-19 vaccine intent among Latino SNAP participants in Southern California. BMC public health. 2022;22(1):653.

79. Morillon GF, Poder TG. Which factors drive the choice of the French-speaking Quebec population towards a COVID-19 vaccination programme: A discrete-choice experiment. Health Expect. 2024;27(1).

80. Cahill SR. Still in the Dark Regarding the Public Health Impact of COVID-19 on Sexual and Gender Minorities. American Journal of Public Health. 2021;111(9):1606-9.

81. Martin CA, Marshall C, Patel P, Goss C, Jenkins DR, Ellwood C, et
al. SARS-CoV-2 vaccine uptake in a multi-ethnic UK healthcare workforce: A cross-sectional study. PLoS medicine.
2021;18(11):e1003823.

82. Curtis HJ, Inglesby P, Morton CE, MacKenna B, Green A, Hulme W, et al. Trends and clinical characteristics of COVID-19 vaccine recipients: a federated analysis of 57.9 million patients' primary care records in situ using OpenSAFELY. The British journal of general practice : the journal of the Royal College of General Practitioners. 2022;72(714):e51-e62.

83. Hussain B, Latif A, Timmons S, Nkhoma K, Nellums LB. Overcoming COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among ethnic minorities: A systematic review of UK studies. Vaccine. 2022;40(25):3413-32.

84. Peters MDJ. Addressing vaccine hesitancy and resistance for COVID-19 vaccines. International journal of nursing studies. 2022;131:104241.

J. , nallenge, 2022;22(1):2k Liu F, Panagiotakos D. Real-world data: a brief review of the 85. methods, applications, challenges and opportunities. BMC Medical Research Methodology. 2022;22(1):287.

Table 1. General characteristics of included studies.

Author	Country	Study design	Date of data collection	Population	Sample size	Female sex proportion	Mean age	Vaccine acceptance	Hesitancy	Refusal	Unwillingness
Attwell(22)	Australia	Cross-	29-May-20	General population	1316	60	58	65%	27%	8%	35%
		sectional									
		survey									
Seale	Australia	Cross-	24-Mar-20	General population	1420	52		80%	14%	6%	20%
		sectional									
		survey									
Dietze	Australia	Cross-	22-Dec-20	People who inject drugs	100	41	39	48%	37%	15%	52%
		sectional		at least monthly in the							
		survey		past 6 months							
Enticott	Australia	Cross-	7-Mar-21	General population	1166	49	51.7	78%	15%	7%	22%
		sectional									
		survey									
Schernhammer	Austria	Cross-	3-Dec-20	General population	1007	• 44	42	36%	23%	41%	64%
		sectional									
		survey									
Kessels	Belgium	Cross-	16-Oct-20	General population	2060			34%	57%	9%	66%
		sectional									
		survey									
Lavoie	Canada	Cross-	29-Mar-21	General population	15019	50	48	58%	0%	0%	42%
		sectional									
		survey									
Basta	Canada	Cross-	29-Dec-20	General population	23819	53		84%	12%	4%	16%
		sectional									
		survey									
Abramovich	Canada	Cross-	30-Jan-21	2SLGBTQ+ youth	139	61	20	64%	0%	0%	36%
		sectional		experiencing							
		survey		homelessness							

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

Manca	Canada	Cross-	10-Dec-20	Indigenous population	342	53		64%	17%	18%	35%
		sectional									
		survey									
Bagic	Croatia	Cross-	11-Apr-21	General population	765	52.4	49	64%	19%	17%	35%
		sectional									
		survey									
Neumann-	Denmark	Cross-	15-Apr-20	General population	7664			80%	12%	8%	20%
Böhme		sectional									
		survey									
Detoc	France	Cross-	20-Apr-20	General population	3656	89	67	78%	48%	0%	48%
		sectional									
		survey									
Ward	France	Cross-	4-May-20	General population	5018			76%	16%	8%	24%
		sectional									
		survey									
Montagni	France	Cross-	10-May-20	General population	1640	78.4		71%	11%	19%	30%
		sectional									
		survey									
Ousseine	France	Cross-	11-Apr-21	Men who have sex with	18474	0	34	61%	22%	18%	40%
		sectional		men							
		survey									
Coulaud	France	Cross-	23-Dec-20	General population	3204	38.		60%	30%	10%	40%
		sectional									
		survey									
Heyerdahl	France	Cross-	16-Dec-20	General population	10000			57%	19%	24%	43%
		sectional									
		survey									
Bendau	Germany	Cross-	11-Jan-21	General population	1779	77.6	41	65%	24%	11%	35%
		sectional									
		survey									

BMJ Open

Kourlaba	Greece	Cross-	3-May-20	General population	1004	51	41	58%	16%	26%	42%
		sectional									
		survey									
Murphy	Ireland	Cross-	5-Apr-20	General population	1041	51.5		65%	26%	9%	35%
		sectional									
		survey									
Maor	Israel	Cross-	6-Sep-20	General population	2024	52		76%	0%	24%	24%
		sectional									
		survey									
Caserotti	Italy	Survey with	30-Jun-20	General population	839	70.2	38	79%	0%	21%	21%
		repeated									
		measures									
La Vecchia	Italy	Cross-	28-Sep-20	General population	1055	51.7		54%	0%	46%	46%
		sectional									
		survey									
Di Giuseppe	Italy	Cross-	28-Apr-21	Incarcerated	685	0	42.4	64%	0%	36%	36%
		sectional									
		survey									
Moscardino	Italy	Cross-	28-Jun-21	General population	1200	49.2	29.8	73%	18%	8%	25%
		sectional									
		survey									
Palamenghi	Italy	Cross-section	al survey	General population	968			59%	0%	41%	41%
lacoella	Italy	Cross-	15-Feb-21	persons experiencing	112	24.1	53.1	63%	4%	32%	36%
		sectional		homelessness							
		survey									
Yoda	Japan	Cross-	30-Sep-20	General population	1100	46.9	44.8	66%	22%	12%	34%
		sectional									
		survey									
Ihshimaru	Japan	Cross-	26-Dec-20	General population	27036	48.9		38%	0%	63%	63%
		sectional									
		survev									

BMJ Open

Machida	Japan	Cross-	18-Jan-21	General population	2956	50.6		62%	0%	38%	38%
		sectional									
		survey									
Kadoya	Japan	Cross-	25-Feb-21	General population	4253	35	50.3	47%	31%	22%	53%
		sectional									
		survey									
Sekizawa	Japan	Cross-	6-May-21	General population	11846	49.6	54	62%	30%	9%	38%
		sectional									
		survey									
Soares	Portugal	Cross-	8-Jan-21	General population	1943	67.7	47.7	35%	56%	9%	65%
		sectional									
		survey									
Khaled	Qatar	Cross-	25-Jan-21	General population	1912	31.7		43%	45%	12%	57%
		sectional									
		survey									
Page	Switzerland	Cross-	31-May-21	Undocumented migrants	812	60.9	39	41%	0%	59%	59%
		sectional									
		survey									
Freeman	UK	Cross-	11-May-20	General population	2501	51.4	46.6	48%	7%	5%	12%
		sectional									
		survey									
Sethi	UK	Cross-	9-Oct-20	General population	4884	69.9		79%	14%	7%	21%
		sectional									
		survey									
Freeman	UK	Cross-	17-Oct-20	General population	5114	49.2	46.9	72%	17%	12%	28%
		sectional									
		survey									
Batty	UK	Cross-	31-Dec-20	General population	11955	56.4		85%	15%	0%	15%
		sectional									
		survey									

BMJ Open

Chaudhuri	UK	cross-	31-Jan-21	General population	22421	58.5	55.4	89%	0%	11%	11%
		survey									
Sherman	UK	Cross-	17-Jul-20	General population	1494	51	46	64%	27%	9%	36%
		sectional									
		survey									
Sherman	UK	Cross-	15-Jan-21	General population	1500	51	45.6	74%	14%	9%	23%
		sectional									
		survey									
Earnshaw	USA	Cross-	14-Apr-20	General population	845	40.9	40	86%	0%	0%	14%
		sectional									
		survey									
Fisher	USA	Cross-	20-Apr-20	General population	991	51.5	18	58%	32%	11%	42%
		sectional									
		survey									
Malik	USA	Cross-	1-May-20	General population	672	57		67%	0%	0%	33%
		sectional									
		survey									
Reiter	USA	Cross-	31-May-20	General population	2006	56		48%	43%	9%	52%
		sectional									
		survey									
Pogue	USA	Cross-section	al survey	General population	316	49.4		68%	23%	9%	32%
Craig	USA	Discrete	11-Nov-20	General population	1153	52.3		61%	0%	17%	17%
		choice									
		experiment									
		survey									
Kelly	USA	Cross-	30-Apr-20	General population	2279	52		75%	0%	25%	25%
		sectional									
		survey									

BMJ Open

Christodoulou	USA	Cross-	30-Apr-20	Youth aged 18–28 at-risk	83	16	23	65%	0%	35%	35%
		sectional		for HIV							
		survey									
Sullivan	USA	Cross-	01-May-20	People with opioid use	234	56	46.8	32%	48%	20%	68%
		sectional		disorder							
		survey									
Stern	USA	Cross-	12-Dec-20	Incarcerated or detained	5110	17.6		45%	10%	45%	55%
		sectional		persons							
		survey									
Rogers	USA	Cross-	28-Feb-21	Adult homeless shelter	969	27.4	41	54%	18%	28%	46%
		sectional		residents and staff							
		survey									
Crozier	USA	Cross-	31-Dec-20	Rural, Underserved and	3721	56.5		39%	27%	24%	51%
		sectional		Minority Populations in							
		survey		Alabama							
Thunström	USA	Cross-	31-Mar-20	General population	3133	52	46	80%	0%	20%	20%
		sectional									
		survey									
Rane	USA	Survey with	01-Oct-20	General population	4571	53		85%	9%	6%	15%
		repeated									
		measures									
Scott	USA	Cross-	31-Jul-20	Latino SNAP participants	486	93	40	48%	39%	13%	52%
		sectional		(food programme)							
		survey									
Bogart	USA	Cross-	31-Dec-20	Black Americans	207	71	50.8	30%	38%	32%	70%
		sectional									
		survey									
Rosen	USA	Cross-	31-May-21	Unhoused People in Los	4949			74%	7%	17%	25%
		sectional		Angeles County							

BMJ Open

2												
3	Tucker	USA	Cross-	1-Mar-21	Young adults with recent	134	32		50%	0%	50%	50%
4			sectional		experiences of							
5			survey		homelessness							
6	Shaw			1_Mar_21	Pofugoos	244	55 3	38.5	57%	18%	25%	13%
7	Shaw	004	Ciuss-	1-10101-21	Relugees	244	55.5	50.5	5170	10 /0	2570	4370
8			Sectional									
9			survey									
10	Nguyen	USA	Cross-	2-Aug-20	General population	63266	50.6		86%	5%	9%	14%
17			sectional									
12			survey									
14	Meehan	USA	Cross-	23-Feb-21	Clients and staff of	106		44	58%	11%	31%	42%
15			sectional		homeless shelters							
16			survey									
17												
18												
19												
20												
21												
22												
23												
24												
25												
20												
27												
29												
30												
31												
32												
33												
34												
35												
36												
37												
38												
39 40												
40 //1	36											
42												
43				_					1			
44				For peer rev	view only - http://bmjope	en.bmj.con	n/site/about/g	guideline	s.xhtml			
45												

1	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
15	Weight Weight Study Events Total Proportion 95%-CI (Nickel (random)
14	Kessels 700 2060 ↔ 0.34 [0.32, 0.36] 1.2% 2.2%
15	Soares 686 1943 → : 0.35 [0.33, 0.37] 1.1% 2.2% Schemharmer 364 1007 → : 0.36 [0.33, 0.39] 0.6% 2.2%
16	Inshimaru 10138 27036 ■ 0.37 [0.37, 0.38] 16.4% 2.2% Khaled 816 1912 → 0.43 [0.40, 0.45] 1.2% 2.2%
17	Kadoya 1999 4253 ► 0.47 [0.46] 0.49] 2.7% 2.2% Freeman 1188 2501 ← 0.48 [0.46.0.49] 1.0% 2.2%
18	Reiter 963 2006 ← 0.48 [0.46] (50] 1.3% 2.2% La Vecchia 567 1055 ← 0.54 [0.510.57] 0.7% 2.2%
10	Heyerdahi 5590 10000 B 0.57 [0.56] 6.3% 2.2% Fisher 571 991 - 0.58 [0.55:0.61] 0.6% 2.2%
19	Kouriaba 579 1004 — 0.58 (0.55, 0.61) 0.6% 2.2% Lavoie 884 15019 E 0.58 (0.57, 0.59) 9.5% 2.2%
20	Palamenghi 571 998 0.59 [0.56] 0.62] 0.6% 2.2% Content 1012 3204 - 0.69 [0.54] 0.61 2.0% 2.2%
21	Couladd 19 3 3 3 4 0 10 2 10 2 10 2 2 10 2 2 10 2 10 2 2 10 10 2 10 10 2 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
22	Senzawa /29/11640 ■ 0.02 [00],02] /2/8 22% Machida 1830 2950 ■ 0.02 [00,06] /1.8% 2.2%
23	Bagit 400 705 0.04 [0.00, 0.07] 0.5% 2.2% Sherman 956 1494 4 0.64 [0.62, 0.66] 0.9% 2.2%
24	Attwell 855 1316 + 0.65 [0.62, 0.68] 0.8% 2.2%
25	Mulphy 677 1041 0.05 [0.62, 0.63] 0.66 2.2% Yoda 723 1100 0.66 [0.63, 0.68] 0.6% 2.2% Vote 0.72
26	Malik 450 672 - 0.07 [0.05, 0.70] 0.4% 22% Pogue 215 316 - 0.68 [0.63, 0.73] 0.2% 2.2%
20	Montagni 1150 1040 0.070 [0.66, 0.73] 0.9% 2.2% Freeman 3667 5114 0.72 [0.70, 0.73] 2.7% 2.2%
27	Moscardinio 876 1200
28	Very 1709 2279 0.15 [0.75, 0.71] 1.1% 2.2% Ward 3814 5018 0.76 [0.75, 0.77] 2.4% 2.2%
29	Mator 1340 2024 0.076 [0.74, 0.76] 0.9% 2.2% Detoc 2837 3656 0.78 [0.76, 0.79] 1.6% 2.2%
30	Enicoli 909 1100 0.78 [0.7, 0.80] 0.5% 2.2% Caserotti 659 839 - 0.79 [0.76, 0.81] 0.4% 2.2%
31	Settin 38/3 4884 • 0.19 (0.76) 080 2.1% 2.2% Seale 1136 1420 • 0.60 (0.76) 0.82 0.6% 2.2%
32	Neumann-bornne 0131 /064 ■ 0.80 (0.79,081) 3.2% 2.2% Thurström 2506 3133 ● 0.60 (0.79,0.81) 1.3% 2.2%
33	Basta 20056 23819 0.84 [0.84, 0.85] 8.2% 2.2% Batty 10114 11955 0.85 [0.84, 0.85] 4.0% 2.2%
34	Rane 3899 45/1 • 0.85 [0.84,0.86] 1.5% 2.2% Earnshaw 725 845 → 0.86 [0.83,0.88] 0.3% 2.2%
35	Chaudhun 19910 22421 • 0.89 [0.88; 0.89] 5.8% 2.2%
33	Fixed effect model 204545 0.65 [0.65; 0.65] 100.0% Random effects model 0.67 [0.67; 0.72] 100.0%
30	Prediction interval [0.26; 0.92] Heterogeneity. $r^2 = 100\%$, $r^2 = 0.7117$, $p = 0$
3/	0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 Proportions of vaccine acceptance in the general populations
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
12	
-+-+ 4 F	Title Figure 1. Dandem offects meta analysis of COVID 10 yearing acceptance in the sense larger larger larger
45	Continue Trigure 1. Kandom-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 Vaccine acceptance in the general population.
46	Caption: For each study, boxes and norizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and
47	accompanying 95% connuence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study
48	nooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccing accontance. Hotorogonality
49	estimate of 12 accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of accontance CI
50	- confidence interval
51	
50	
52	85x135mm (300 x 300 DPI)
53	03X133000 (300 X 300 D11)
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	

3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
, 8										
0										
9								Weight	Weight	
10		Study	Events	Total		Proportio	on 95%-C	(fixed)	(random)	
11		Bogart	63	207 -	II	0.3	30 [0.25: 0.37	0.6%	5.8%	
12		Sullivan	75	234		0.3	32 [0.26; 0.38	0.7%	5.8%	
13		Crozier Page	1440 335	3/21 812		0.3	39 [0.37; 0.40 11 [0.38: 0.45	11.5%	6.4% 6.2%	
14		Stern	2294	5110	-	0.4	45 [0.44; 0.46	16.5%	6.4%	
15		Dietze Scott	48 233	100 486		0.4	18 [0.38; 0.58 18 [0.44: 0.52	0.3%	5.4% 6.2%	
16		Tucker	68	134		0.5	51 [0.42; 0.59	0.4%	5.6%	
17		Rogers	526 140	969 244		0.5	54 [0.51; 0.57 57 [0.51: 0.63	3.1% 0.8%	6.3% 5.9%	
19		Meehan	61	106		0.	58 [0.48; 0.67	0.3%	5.4%	
10		Ousseine	11177	18474	+	0.6	61 [0.60; 0.61 63 [0.54: 0.72	57.5%	6.4% 5.4%	
19		Di Giuseppe	438	685		0.6	64 [0.60; 0.67	2.1%	6.2%	
20		Abramovich Manca	89 221	139 342		0.6	64 [0.56; 0.72 65 [0.59: 0.70	0.4%	5.6% 6.0%	
21		Christodoulou	54	83		- 0.6	65 [0.54; 0.75	0.2%	5.1%	
22		Fixed effect model		31958	•	0.	54 10 54 0 55	100.0%	_	
23		Random effects model				0.0	52 [0.46; 0.57		100.0%	
24		Prediction interval Heterogeneity: 1 ² = 98% T	2 = 0.2098	n < 0.01		-	[0.28; 0.75			
25		notorogeneity: r cont, t	0.2000	, p - 0.0	0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7					
26			Propor	rtions of v	accine acceptance among spec	cial populati	ons			
27										
28	Title - Fisser	2 Development	- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1							
29	Title : Figure	2. Random-effe	cts me	eta-ar	alysis of COVID-19	vaccine	e accepta	nce in	special	populations
30		r each study, box	kes an		izontal lines corresp		the respe	ective	point es	of that study
30 21	result in the fix	y 95% connuence		vai. i rod di	amond represents the	15 PI 04 ho 05%	confider		erval of	the summary
22	nooled estima	ate of the effect a	and is	contr	ed on nooled preval	ance of		accent	ance F	leterogeneity
32	estimate of I2 a	accompanies the	summ	arv e	stimate. Studies are	order	and by the	nrono	ortion of	f acceptance CL
33			Samm	:	= confidence interva	al.		prope		
34										
35										
36				82)	<55mm (300 x 300	DPI)				
37										
38										
39										
40										
41										
42										
12										
40										
44										
45										
46										
47										
48										
49										
50										
51										
52										
53										
54										
55										
56										
50										
57										
58										
59		Ear page raview	only	h++	//hmionon hmi com	/cito/ab	out/auid	olinos	(html	
60		FOI peer review	only -	nup:	//wmjopen.bmj.com/	site/ab	out/guid	ennes.	KIILIII	

Та	able	of contents for the supplementary material
1.		Supplementary section 1: methods
	a.	Search strategy (concepts / block building approach)
	b.	Figure S1 Flow diagram for selection of studies
	C.	List of excluded references after full-text screening
	d.	Definitions of variables and sources
2.		Supplementary section 2: Assessment of quality and risk of bias results
	Ta	ble S1. Risk of bias assessment of included studies (Adapted from Hoy et al)
3.		Supplementary section 3: Table S2.Country-specific real-world data
4.		Supplementary section 4: Country-specific analyses
	Ra	ndom-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Australia
	Ra	ndom-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Canada
	Ra	ndom-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in France
	Ra	ndom-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Italy
	Ra	ndom-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Japan
	Ra	ndom-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the United Kingdom22
	Ra	ndom-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the United States 23
5.		Supplementary section 5: Comparison between data from studies and real-world data25
	a. ⁻	Table S3. Willingness to be vaccinated and real-world vaccine uptake
	b. (Consolidated country data from studies and country real-world statistics
6.		Supplementary section 6: Sensitivity analyses
	a. (Outlier and influential case diagnostics
	b. aco	Cumulative meta-analysis of willingness to be vaccinated according to the date of data quisition. General population
	c. aco	Cumulative meta-analysis of willingness to be vaccinated according to the date of data quisition. Special populations
	d. adı	Cumulative real-world data meta-analysis according to the date of first COVID-19 vaccine ministered in each country
	e. I	Results from the generalized linear models for vaccine uptake and country-level data30

	f. Bubble plots from meta-regressiosn analyses to explore associations of country-leve vaccine uptake	l data with 30
	g. Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the general pop studies with high risk of selection bias	ulation for 31
7	7. Supplementary section. Checklists	32
	Prisma 2020 Checklist	32
	RAMESES II reporting standards for realist evaluations:	37

to peet teries only

Supplementary material

1. Supplementary section 1: methods

a. Search strategy (concepts / block building approach)

Overview databases and results

Date last searched: 30.11.2022

PubMed

1 (((Coronaviridae[MeSH Terms] OR Coronavirus Infections[MeSH Terms] OR 2019 novel coronavirus OR covid-19[Title/Abstract] infection[Title/Abstract] disease[Title/Abstract] OR sars-cov-2 OR sars coronavirus[Title/Abstract] OR 2019 novel coronavirus infection[Title/Abstract] OR 2019-ncov infection[Title/Abstract] OR 2019-ncov disease[Title/Abstract]) AND (Vaccines[MeSH Terms] OR Immunization[MeSH Terms] OR vaccines[Title/Abstract]) AND (patient acceptance of health care[Title/Abstract] OR vaccination[Title/Abstract] OR attitude[Title/Abstract] OR willingness[Title/Abstract] OR readiness[Title/Abstract] OR preparedness[Title/Abstract] OR disposition[Title/Abstract] OR acceptance[Title/Abstract] OR acceptability[Title/Abstract] OR perception[Title/Abstract] OR receptivity[Title/Abstract] OR hesitancy[Title/Abstract] OR intention[Title/Abstract] OR attitudes[Title/Abstract])) AND ((Adult[MeSH Terms] OR Young Adult[MeSH Terms] OR Middle Aged[MeSH Terms] OR Aged[MeSH Terms] OR Aged, 80 and over[MeSH Terms]))) NOT (editorial/ or letter/ or case reports/ or comments/) Filters: Humans, Exclude preprints, from 2006 - 2022(2600)

Embase

#	Concept	Search String	Results
1	COVID-19	'coronaviridae'/exp OR 'coronavirus infections' OR '2019 novel	171,270
		coronavirus disease':ti,ab OR 'covid-19':ti,ab OR 'sars-cov-2	
		infection':ti,ab OR 'sars coronavirus':ti,ab OR '2019 novel coronavirus	
		infection':ti,ab OR '2019-ncov infection':ti,ab OR '2019-ncov	
		disease':ti,ab	
2	Vaccine	('patient acceptance of health care':ti,ab OR 'vaccination':ti,ab OR	376,320
	acceptance	'attitude':ti,ab OR willingness:ti,ab OR readiness:ti,ab OR	
		preparedness:ti,ab OR disposition:ti,ab OR acceptance:ti,ab OR	
		acceptability:ti,ab OR perception:ti,ab OR receptivity:ti,ab OR	
		hesitancy:ti,ab OR intention:ti,ab OR attitudes:ti,ab)	
3	COVID	'vaccines'/exp OR 'immunization'/exp OR vaccin*:ti,ab OR immun*:ti,ab	1,385,897
	vaccine	OR 'vaccines':ti,ab OR (('covid-19 vaccin*' NEAR/3 'covid-19'):ti,ab)	
4	Combine	#1 AND #2 AND #3	18,915
5	Filters	#4 NOT ('conference abstract'/it OR 'conference paper'/it OR 'conference	10135
		review'/it OR 'editorial'/it OR 'letter'/it OR 'note'/it OR 'tombstone'/it)	
6	Population	([adult]/lim OR [young adult]/lim OR [middle aged]/lim OR [aged]/lim	3,660,406
		OR [very elderly]/lim)	
7	Filters	'animal cell'/de OR 'animal experiment'/de OR 'animal model'/de OR	2,971,939
		'animal tissue'/de OR 'case report'/de OR 'nonhuman'/de	
8	Combine	(#5 AND #6) NOT #7	2,274

Dimensions ai

ID Search Hits

Vaccine acceptance covid free text in title and abstract (1172)

Google Scholar

"covid" "vaccine acceptance" -program: first 200

b. Figure S1 Flow diagram for selection of studies

PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews which included searches of databases and registers only.



*Consider, if feasible to do so, reporting the number of records identified from each database or register searched (rather than the total number across all databases/registers).

**If automation tools were used, indicate how many records were excluded by a human and how many were excluded by automation tools.

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

c.	List of	excluded	references	after	full-text	screening
----	---------	----------	------------	-------	-----------	-----------

Exclusion reason	Reference
Wrong population (n=103)	1-103
Convenience sample (n=23)	104-126
Outcomes missing (n=21)	127-147
Qualitative study (n=3)	148-150
Focusing on booster vaccine (n=2)	151-152

- 1. Galanis, P. *et al.* Willingness, refusal and influential factors of parents to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Preventive medicine* 157, 106994 (2022)
- 2. Willingness to obtain COVID-19 vaccination in adults with multiple sclerosis in the United States ScienceDirect. (2022).
- 3. Luo, H. *et al.* Willingness to Get a COVID-19 Vaccine and Reasons for Hesitancy Among Medicare Beneficiaries: Results From a National Survey. *Journal of public health management and practice : JPHMP* 28, 70–76 (2022).
- 4. Serrazina, F., Sobral Pinho, A., Cabral, G., Salavisa, M. & Correia, A. S. Willingness to be vaccinated against COVID-19: An exploratory online survey in a Portuguese cohort of multiple sclerosis patients. *Mult Scler Relat Disord* 51, 102880 (2021).
- 5. Unroe, K., Evans, R., Weaver, L., Rusyniak, D. & Blackburn, J. Willingness of Long-Term Care Staff to Receive a COVID -19 Vaccine: A Single State Survey. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 69, (2020).
- 6. Wagner, E. F. *et al.* Virtual town halls addressing vaccine hesitancy among racial/ethnic minorities: Preliminary findings. *Journal of the American Pharmacists Association : JAPhA* 62, 317–325 (2022).
- 7. Vaccines | Free Full-Text | Intention to Be Vaccinated for COVID-19 among Italian Nurses during the Pandemic. (2022).
- 8. Vaccines | Free Full-Text | Áttitudes towards COVID-19 Vaccination among Hospital Staff— Understanding What Matters to Hesitant People. (2022).
- 9. 'Vaccine hesitancy' among university students in Italy during the COVID-19 pandemic | SpringerLink. (2022).
- 10. Lo Moro, G., Cugudda, E., Bert, F., Raco, I. & Siliquini, R. Vaccine Hesitancy and Fear of COVID-19 Among Italian Medical Students: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Journal of community health* 47, 475–483 (2022).
- 11. Kelkar, A. H. *et al.* Vaccine Enthusiasm and Hesitancy in Cancer Patients and the Impact of a Webinar. *Healthcare (Basel)* 9, 351 (2021).
- 12. Riad, A. *et al.* Universal Predictors of Dental Students' Attitudes towards COVID-19 Vaccination: Machine Learning-Based Approach. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 1158 (2021).
- 13. Lennon, R. P. *et al.* Unique Predictors of Intended Uptake of a COVID-19 Vaccine in Adults Living in a Rural College Town in the United States. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP* 36, 180–184 (2022).
- 14. Euser, S., Kroese, F. M., Derks, M. & de Bruin, M. Understanding COVID-19 vaccination willingness among youth: A survey study in the Netherlands. *Vaccine* 40, 833–836 (2022).
- 15. Trent, M., Seale, H., Chughtai, A. A., Salmon, D. & MacIntyre, C. R. Trust in government, intention to vaccinate and COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: A comparative survey of five large cities in the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia. *Vaccine* 40, 2498–2505 (2022).

- Hosokawa, Y. *et al.* The Prevalence of COVID-19 Vaccination and Vaccine Hesitancy in Pregnant Women: An Internet-based Cross-sectional Study in Japan. *Journal of epidemiology* 32, 188–194 (2022).
 - Grüner, S. & Krüger, F. The intention to be vaccinated against COVID-19: stated preferences before vaccines were available. *Applied Economics Letters* 28, 1847–1851 (2021).
 - 18. Kavanagh, A., Dickinson, H., Dimov, S., Shields, M. & McAllister, A. The COVID-19 vaccine intentions of Australian disability support workers. *Australian and New Zealand journal of public health* 46, 314–321 (2022).
 - 19. Harsch, I. A., Ortloff, A., Reinhöfer, M. & Epstude, J. Symptoms, antibody levels and vaccination attitude after asymptomatic to moderate COVID-19 infection in 200 healthcare workers. *GMS Hyg Infect Control* 16, Doc15 (2021).
- 20. G, D. G. et al. Surveying willingness toward SARS-CoV-2 vaccination of healthcare workers in Italy. Expert review of vaccines 20, (2021).
- 21. Chapman, G. *et al.* 'Scary to get, more scary not to': COVID-19 vaccine acceptance among healthcare workers in Central Queensland, Australia, a cross-sectional survey. *Communicable diseases intelligence (2018)* 46, (2022).
- 22. Stuckelberger, S. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine Willingness among Pregnant and Breastfeeding Women during the First Pandemic Wave: A Cross-Sectional Study in Switzerland. *Viruses* 13, 1199 (2021).
- 23. Jaiswal, J. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination Hesitancy and Behaviors in a National Sample of People Living with HIV. *AIDS patient care and STDs* 36, 34–44 (2022).
- 24. Temsah, M.-H. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 UK Variant of Concern Lineage-Related Perceptions, COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance and Travel Worry Among Healthcare Workers. *Front Public Health* 9, 686958 (2021).
- 25. Grafova, I. B. *et al.* Racial and ethnic differences in vaccine hesitancy Among registered nurses in New Jersey: A cross-sectional survey. *American journal of infection control* 50, 572–574 (2022).
- 26. Niznik, J. D. *et al.* Perceptions of COVID-19 vaccines among healthcare assistants: A national survey. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 70, 8–18 (2022).
- 27. Hogan, C. M. *et al.* Perceptions of COVID-19 Vaccine Incentives Among Adolescents and Young Adults. *JAMA network open* 5, e2216628 (2022).
- 28. Alhazza, S. F. *et al.* Parents' Hesitancy to Vaccinate Their Children Against COVID-19, a Country-Wide Survey. *Frontiers in public health* 10, 755073 (2022).
- 29. Bell, S., Clarke, R., Mounier-Jack, S., Walker, J. L. & Paterson, P. Parents' and guardians' views on the acceptability of a future COVID-19 vaccine: A multi-methods study in England. *Vaccine* 38, 7789–7798 (2020).
- 30. Bianco, A. *et al.* Parental COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: a cross-sectional survey in Italy. *Expert review of vaccines* 21, 541–547 (2022).
- 31. Choi, K., Becerra-Culqui, T., Bhakta, B., Bruxvoort, K. & Coleman, K. J. Parent intentions to vaccinate children with autism spectrum disorder against COVID-19. *Journal of pediatric nursing* 63, 108–110 (2022).
- 32. Afifi, T. O. *et al.* Older adolescents and young adults willingness to receive the COVID-19 vaccine: Implications for informing public health strategies. *Vaccine* 3473–3479 (2021).
- 33. Pierantoni, L. *et al.* Nationwide COVID-19 survey of Italian parents reveals useful information on attitudes to school attendance, medical support, vaccines and drug trials. *Acta Paediatr* 10.1111/apa.15614 (2020) doi:10.1111/apa.15614.
- 34. Brandt, E. J. *et al.* National Study of Youth Opinions on Vaccination for COVID-19 in the U.S. *J Adolesc Health* 68, 869–872 (2021).
- 35. Szmyd, B. *et al.* Medical Students and SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination: Attitude and Behaviors. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 128 (2021).
- 36. Halbrook, M. *et al.* Longitudinal Assessment of Coronavirus Disease 2019 Vaccine Acceptance and Uptake Among Frontline Medical Workers in Los Angeles, California. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* 74, 1166–1173 (2022).

- 37. Ciardi, F. *et al.* Knowledge, Attitudes and Perceptions of COVID-19 Vaccination among Healthcare Workers of an Inner-City Hospital in New York. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 516 (2021).
- Elhadi, M. *et al.* Knowledge, attitude, and acceptance of healthcare workers and the public regarding the COVID-19 vaccine: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health* 21, 955 (2021).
- 39. Kreuter, M. W. *et al.* Intention to vaccinate children for COVID-19: A segmentation analysis among Medicaid parents in Florida. *Preventive medicine* 156, 106959 (2022).
- 40. Kaida, A. *et al.* Intention to Receive a COVID-19 Vaccine by HIV Status Among a Population-Based Sample of Women and Gender Diverse Individuals in British Columbia, Canada. *AIDS and behavior* 26, 2242–2255 (2022).
- 41. Gagneux-Brunon, A. *et al.* Intention to get vaccinations against COVID-19 in French healthcare workers during the first pandemic wave: a cross-sectional survey. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 108, 168–173 (2021).
- 42. Talarek, E., Warzecha, J., Banasiuk, M. & Banaszkiewicz, A. Influenza Vaccination Coverage and Intention to Receive Hypothetical Ebola and COVID-19 Vaccines among Medical Students. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 709 (2021).
- 43. Caron, B., Neuville, E. & Peyrin-Biroulet, L. Inflammatory Bowel Disease and COVID-19 Vaccination: A Patients' Survey. *Digestive diseases and sciences* 67, 2067–2073 (2022).
- 44. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on ophthalmic specialist training in Poland. | PLoS One;16(9): e0257876, 2021. | MEDLINE. (2022).
- 45. Janssen, C. *et al.* Hesitancy towards COVID-19 Vaccination among Healthcare Workers: A Multi-Centric Survey in France. *Vaccines* 9, 547 (2021).
- 46. Baghdadi, L. R., Alghaihb, S. G., Abuhaimed, A. A., Alkelabi, D. M. & Alqahtani, R. S. Healthcare Workers' Perspectives on the Upcoming COVID-19 Vaccine in Terms of Their Exposure to the Influenza Vaccine in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 465 (2021).
- 47. Patil, U. *et al.* Health Literacy, Digital Health Literacy, and COVID-19 Pandemic Attitudes and Behaviors in U.S. College Students: Implications for Interventions. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18, 3301 (2021).
- 48. Thompson, H. S. *et al.* Factors Associated With Racial/Ethnic Group–Based Medical Mistrust and Perspectives on COVID-19 Vaccine Trial Participation and Vaccine Uptake in the US. *JAMA Netw Open* 4, e2111629 (2021).
- 49. Goldman, R. D. *et al.* Factors associated with parents' willingness to enroll their children in trials for COVID-19 vaccination. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 17, 1607–1611 (2022).
- 50. Letterie, M. C. *et al.* Factors Associated With Parental COVID-19 Vaccination Acceptance. *Clinical pediatrics* 61, 393–401 (2022).
- 51. Puteikis, K. & Mameniškienė, R. Factors Associated with COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy among People with Epilepsy in Lithuania. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 18, 4374 (2021).
- Daniel, C. L., Williams, J., Legg, R., McGowen, C. & Stutzman, J. Factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination intentions among adults in the deep South. *Vaccine* 40, 841–853 (2022).
- 53. Skeens, M. A. *et al.* Factors affecting COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in parents of children with cancer. *Pediatric blood & cancer* 69, e29707 (2022).
- 54. Di Giuseppe, G., Pelullo, C. P., Della Polla, G., Pavia, M. & Angelillo, I. F. Exploring the Willingness to Accept SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine in a University Population in Southern Italy, September to November 2020. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 275 (2021).
- 55. Purnell, M. *et al.* Exploring COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy at a rural historically black college and university. *Journal of the American Pharmacists Association : JAPhA* 62, 340–344 (2022).
- 56. Hahn, M. B., Fried, R. L., Cochran, P. & Eichelberger, L. P. Evolving perceptions of COVID-19 vaccines among remote Alaskan communities. *International journal of circumpolar health* 81, 2021684 (2022).
- 57. Gravelle, T. B., Phillips, J. B., Reifler, J. & Scotto, T. J. Estimating the size of 'anti-vax' and vaccine hesitant populations in the US, UK, and Canada: comparative latent class modeling of vaccine attitudes. *Human vaccines & immunotherapeutics* 18, 2008214 (2022).

2	
3	
4	
5	
6 7	
/ 8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14 15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
∠1 22	
22 23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28 20	
29 30	
31	
32	
33	
34 25	
35 36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42 43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49 50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55 56	
50 57	
58	
59	
60	

- 58. Enhancing COVID-19 Vaccines Acceptance: Results from a Survey on Vaccine Hesitancy in Northern Italy PubMed. (2022).
 - 59. Maltezou, H. C. *et al.* Determinants of intention to get vaccinated against COVID-19 among healthcare personnel in hospitals in Greece. *Infect Dis Health* 26, 189–197 (2021).
 - Gray, A. & Fisher, C. B. Determinants of COVID-19 Vaccine Uptake in Adolescents 12-17 Years Old: Examining Pediatric Vaccine Hesitancy Among Racially Diverse Parents in the United States. *Frontiers in public health* 10, 844310 (2022).
 - 61. Costantino, A. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine: A Survey of Hesitancy in Patients with Celiac Disease. *Vaccines* 9, 511 (2021).
 - 62. Jefsen, O. H. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccine willingness amongst patients with mental illness compared with the general population. *Acta Neuropsychiatrica* 33, 273–276 (2021).
- 63. Chudasama, R. V. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccine uptake and hesitancy opinions from frontline health care and social care workers: Survey data from 37 countries. *Diabetes & metabolic syndrome* 16, 102361 (2022).
- 64. Doyle-Campbell, C., Mattison, M. J., Amedeo, V., Gaffney, S. & Achadinha, H. COVID-19 vaccine status and hesitancy in pharmacy students. *Currents in pharmacy teaching & learning* 14, 476–481 (2022).
- 65. Iadarola, S., Siegel, J. F., Gao, Q., McGrath, K. & Bonuck, K. A. COVID-19 vaccine perceptions in New York State's intellectual and developmental disabilities community. *Disability and health journal* 15, 101178 (2022).
- 66. Lutrick, K. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccine perceptions and uptake in a national prospective cohort of essential workers. *Vaccine* 40, 494–502 (2022).
- 67. Watts, A. W. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine Intentions and Perceptions Among Public School Staff of the Greater Vancouver Metropolitan Area, British Columbia, Canada. *Frontiers in public health* 10, 832444 (2022).
- 68. Gurenlian, J. R. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine Intention and Hesitancy of Dental Hygienists in the United States. *Journal of dental hygiene : JDH* 96, 5–16 (2022).
- 69. Wu, H., Ward, M., Brown, A., Blackwell, E. & Umer, A. COVID-19 Vaccine intent in appalachian patients with multiple sclerosis. *Multiple sclerosis and related disorders* 57, 103450 (2022).
- 70. Sieber, W. J. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: Associations with gender, race, and source of health information. *Families, systems & health : the journal of collaborative family healthcare* 40, 252–261 (2022).
- 71. Fedele, F. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: a survey in a population highly compliant to common vaccinations. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics* 17, 3348–3354 (2021).
- 72. Uhr, L. & Mateen, F. J. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in multiple sclerosis: A cross-sectional survey. *Multiple sclerosis (Houndmills, Basingstoke, England)* 28, 1072–1080 (2022).
- 73. Al-Mulla, R., Abu-Madi, M., Talafha, Q. M., Tayyem, R. F. & Abdallah, A. M. COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy in a Representative Education Sector Population in Qatar. *Vaccines* 9, 665 (2021).
- 74. Yang, Y., Dobalian, A. & Ward, K. D. COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Its Determinants Among Adults with a History of Tobacco or Marijuana Use. *J Community Health* 46, 1090– 1098 (2021).
- 75. Tsai, R. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Acceptance Among Individuals With Cancer, Autoimmune Diseases, or Other Serious Comorbid Conditions: Cross-sectional, Internet-Based Survey. *JMIR public health and surveillance* 8, e29872 (2022).
- 76. Hubach, R. et al. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among rural Oklahomans. Rural and remote health 22, 7128 (2022).
- 77. Lucia, V. C., Kelekar, A. & Afonso, N. M. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among medical students. *J Public Health (Oxf)* fdaa230 (2020) doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdaa230.
- 78. Teasdale, C. A. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine Coverage and Hesitancy Among New York City Parents of Children Aged 5-11 Years. *American journal of public health* 112, 931–936 (2022).

- 79. Morris, J. L., Baniak, L. M., Luyster, F. S. & Dunbar-Jacob, J. Covid-19 vaccine confidence and hesitancy in nursing students and faculty at a large academic medical center. *Nursing outlook* 70, 347–354 (2022).
- 80. Dzieciolowska, S. *et al.* Covid-19 vaccine acceptance, hesitancy, and refusal among Canadian healthcare workers: A multicenter survey. *Am J Infect Control* 49, 1152–1157 (2021).
- Kelekar, A. K., Lucia, V. C., Afonso, N. M. & Mascarenhas, A. K. COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and hesitancy among dental and medical students. *The Journal of the American Dental Association* 152, 596–603 (2021).
- 82. Shaaban, R. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance among Social Media Users: A Content Analysis, Multi-Continent Study. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 19, (2022).
- 83. COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance Among Health Care Workers in the United States | medRxiv. (2022).
- 84. Kozak, A. & Nienhaus, A. COVID-19 Vaccination: Status and Willingness to Be Vaccinated among Employees in Health and Welfare Care in Germany. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 18, 6688 (2021).
- 85. Xiang, X. M. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccination willingness among people with multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler J Exp Transl Clin* 7, 20552173211017160 (2021).
- 86. Fulda, E. S. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccination Rates in a Global HIV Cohort. *The Journal of infectious diseases* 225, 603–607 (2022).
- 87. Myers, A., Ipsen, C. & Lissau, A. COVID-19 vaccination hesitancy among Americans with disabilities aged 18-65: An exploratory analysis. *Disability and health journal* 15, 101223 (2022).
- 88. Kecojevic, A., Basch, C. H., Sullivan, M., Chen, Y.-T. & Davi, N. K. COVID-19 Vaccination and Intention to Vaccinate Among a Sample of College Students in New Jersey. *J Community Health* 46, 1059–1068 (2021).
- 89. Haile, Z. T., Ruhil, A., Bates, B. R., Hall, O. & Grijalva, M. J. Correlates of Covid-19 Vaccine Acceptance among Residents of Ohio: A Cross-sectional Study. *BMC public health* 22, 226 (2022).
- 90. Goldman, R. D. *et al.* Caregivers' Willingness to Accept Expedited Vaccine Research During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Cross-sectional Survey. *Clin Ther* 42, 2124–2133 (2020).
- 91. Heyne, S., Esser, P., Werner, A., Lehmann-Laue, A. & Mehnert-Theuerkauf, A. Attitudes toward a COVID-19 vaccine and vaccination status in cancer patients: a cross-sectional survey. *Journal of cancer research and clinical oncology* 148, 1363–1374 (2022).
- 92. Attitudes of Patients with Cancer towards Vaccinations—Results of Online Survey with Special Focus on the Vaccination against COVID-19 PMC. (2022).
- 93. Verger, P. *et al.* Attitudes of healthcare workers towards COVID-19 vaccination: a survey in France and French-speaking parts of Belgium and Canada, 2020. *Euro Surveill* 26, (2021).
- 94. Szmyd, B. *et al.* Attitude and Behaviors towards SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination among Healthcare Workers: A Cross-Sectional Study from Poland. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 218 (2021).
- 95. Eyllon, M. *et al.* Associations between psychiatric morbidity and COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: An analysis of electronic health records and patient survey. *Psychiatry research* 307, 114329 (2022).
- 96. Bellis, M. A. *et al.* Associations between adverse childhood experiences, attitudes towards COVID-19 restrictions and vaccine hesitancy: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ open* 12, e053915 (2022).
- 97. Shaw, J. *et al.* Assessment of US Healthcare Personnel Attitudes Towards Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Vaccination in a Large University Healthcare System. *Clin Infect Dis* 73, 1776–1783 (2021).
- 98. Gardner, J. *et al.* An assessment of Veterans attitudes and willingness to receiving the COVID-19 vaccine: a mixed methods study. *BMC infectious diseases* 22, 308 (2022).
- 99. Temsah, M.-H. *et al.* Adenovirus and RNA-based COVID-19 vaccines' perceptions and acceptance among healthcare workers in Saudi Arabia: a national survey. *BMJ Open* 11, e048586 (2021).

3 4 5 6 7	 100. de Sousa, M. J. <i>et al.</i> Acceptance of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination among cancer patients in Portugal: attitudes and associated factors. <i>Supportive care in cancer : official journal of the Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer</i> 30, 4565–4570 (2022). 101. Nohl, A. <i>et al.</i> Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccination among Front-Line Health Care Workers: A Nationwide Survey of Emergency Medical Services Personnel from Germany.
8 9 10 11	 Vaccines (Basel) 9, 424 (2021). 102. Pataka, A. <i>et al.</i> Acceptability of healthcare professionals to get vaccinated against COVID-19 two weeks before initiation of national vaccination in Greece. <i>European Respiratory Journal</i> 58, (2021).
12 13 14 15	 103. Qattan, A. M. N. <i>et al.</i> Acceptability of a COVID-19 Vaccine Among Healthcare Workers in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. <i>Front Med (Lausanne)</i> 8, 644300 (2021). 104. Qunaibi, E. A. <i>et al.</i> A high rate of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in a large-scale survey on Arabs. <i>el ife</i> 10, e68038 (2021).
10 17 18 19	 105. Latkin, C. <i>et al.</i> A longitudinal study of vaccine hesitancy attitudes and social influence as predictors of COVID-19 vaccine uptake in the US. <i>Human vaccines & immunotherapeutics</i> 18, 2043102 (2022). 109. Algorithmeter Vaccine and the Delated of the COVID 10 Vaccine and the COVID
20 21 22 23	 106. Alqudeimat, Y. <i>et al.</i> Acceptance of a COVID-19 Vaccine and its Related Determinants among the General Adult Population in Kuwait. <i>Med Princ Pract</i> 30, 262–271 (2021). 107. Babicki M & Mastalerz-Migas, A Attitudes toward Vaccination against COV/ID-19 in
24 25 26 27	 Poland. A Longitudinal Study Performed before and Two Months after the Commencement of the Population Vaccination Programme in Poland. <i>Vaccines (Basel)</i> 9, 503 (2021). 108. Gasteiger, N., Gasteiger, C., Vedhara, K. & Broadbent, E. Characteristics associated with the willingness to receive a COVID-19 vaccine and an exploration of the general.
28 29 30 31	 public's perceptions: A mixed-methods approach. <i>Vaccine</i> 40, 3461–3465 (2022). 109. Romer, D. & Jamieson, K. H. Conspiracy theories as barriers to controlling the spread of COVID-19 in the U.S. <i>Soc Sci Med</i> 263, 113356 (2020).
32 33 34 35	 national sample of United States adults ages 18-45. <i>Preventive medicine</i> 160, 107038 (2022). 111. Niankara, I. COVID-19 Vaccine Development in a Quadruple Helix Innovation
36 37 38 39	 System: Uncovering the Preferences of the Fourth Helix in the UAE. Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity 132–132 (2020). Holeva, V., Parlapani, E., Nikopoulou, V. A., Nouskas, I. & Diakogiannis, I. COVID- 19 vaccine hesitancy in a sample of Greek adults. <i>Psychology, health & medicine</i> 27, 113–
40 41 42 43	 119 (2022). 113. Waite, N. M., Pereira, J. A., Houle, S. K. D., Gilca, V. & Andrew, M. K. COVID-19's Impact on Willingness to Be Vaccinated against Influenza and COVID-19 during the
43 44 45 46	 2020/2021 Season: Results from an Online Survey of Canadian Adults 50 Years and Older. <i>Vaccines (Basel)</i> 9, 346 (2021). 114. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and attitudes in Qatar: A national cross-sectional survey of a migrant-majority population - Alabdulla - 2021 - Influenza and Other Respiratory
47 48 49 50	 Viruses - Wiley Online Library. (2022). 115. Al-Mohaithef, M. & Padhi, B. K. Determinants of COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance in Saudi Arabia: A Web-Based National Survey. <i>J Multidiscip Healthc</i> 13, 1657–1663 (2020). 116. Kreps, S. et al. Eactors Associated With US Adults' Likelihood of Accepting COVID-
51 52 53 54	 19 Vaccination. JAMA Netw Open 3, e2025594 (2020). 117. Dorman, C. et al. Factors Associated with Willingness to be Vaccinated Against COVID-19 in a Large Convenience Sample. J Community Health 46, 1013–1019 (2021).
55 56 57 58	 Nikolovski, J. <i>et al.</i> Factors indicating intention to vaccinate with a COVID-19 vaccine among older U.S. adults. <i>PLoS One</i> 16, e0251963 (2021). Sallam, M. <i>et al.</i> High Rates of COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Its Association with Conspiracy Beliefs: A Study in Jordan and Kuwait among Other Arab Countries.
60 59	<i>Vaccines (Basel)</i> 9, 42 (2021). 10

- 120. Biasio, L. R., Bonaccorsi, G., Lorini, C., Mazzini, D. & Pecorelli, S. Italian Adults' Likelihood of Getting COVID-19 Vaccine: A Second Online Survey. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 268 (2021).
- 121. Gutierrez, S., Logan, R., Marshall, C., Kerns, J. & Diamond-Smith, N. Predictors of COVID-19 Vaccination Likelihood Among Reproductive-Aged Women in the United States. *Public health reports (Washington, D.C. : 1974)* 137, 588–596 (2022).
- 122. Faasse, K. & Newby, J. Public Perceptions of COVID-19 in Australia: Perceived Risk, Knowledge, Health-Protective Behaviors, and Vaccine Intentions. *Front Psychol* 11, 551004 (2020).
- 123. Nguyen, L. H. *et al.* Self-reported COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and uptake among participants from different racial and ethnic groups in the United States and United Kingdom. *Nature communications* 13, 636 (2022).
- 124. Sethi, S. *et al.* The UPTAKE study: a cross-sectional survey examining the insights and beliefs of the UK population on COVID-19 vaccine uptake and hesitancy. *BMJ Open* 11, e048856 (2021).
- 125. Abu-Farha, R. *et al.* Willingness of Middle Eastern public to receive COVID-19 vaccines. *Saudi Pharm J* 29, 734–739 (2021).
- 126. Willingness to Be Vaccinated against COVID-19 in Spain before the Start of Vaccination: A Cross-Sectional Study PubMed. (2022).
- 127. García, L. Y. & Cerda, A. A. Contingent assessment of the COVID-19 vaccine. *Vaccine* 38, 5424–5429 (2020).
- 128. Freeman, D. *et al.* Coronavirus conspiracy beliefs, mistrust, and compliance with government guidelines in England. *Psychological medicine* 52, 251–263 (2022).
- 129. Fridman, A., Gershon, R. & Gneezy, A. COVID-19 and vaccine hesitancy: A longitudinal study. *PLoS One* 16, e0250123 (2021).
- 130. Knight, K. R. *et al.* COVID-19 Testing and Vaccine Acceptability Among Homeless-Experienced Adults: Qualitative Data from Two Samples. *Journal of general internal medicine* 37, 823–829 (2022).
- 131. Salali, G. D. & Uysal, M. S. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy is associated with beliefs on the origin of the novel coronavirus in the UK and Turkey. *Psychol Med* 1–3 (2022) doi:10.1017/S0033291720004067.
- 132. Levin, J. & Bradshaw, M. Determinants of COVID-19 skepticism and SARS-CoV-2 vaccine hesitancy: findings from a national population survey of U.S. adults. *BMC public health* 22, 1047 (2022).
- Frontiers | A Proactive Approach for Managing COVID-19: The Importance of Understanding the Motivational Roots of Vaccination Hesitancy for SARS-CoV2 | Psychology. (2022).
- 134. McCaffery, K. J. *et al.* Health literacy and disparities in COVID-19-related knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and behaviours in Australia. *Public Health Res Pract* 30, 30342012 (2020).
- 135. Borriello, A., Master, D., Pellegrini, A. & Rose, J. M. Preferences for a COVID-19 vaccine in Australia. *Vaccine* 39, 473–479 (2021).
- 136. Kreps, S., Dasgupta, N., Brownstein, J. S., Hswen, Y. & Kriner, D. L. Public attitudes toward COVID-19 vaccination: The role of vaccine attributes, incentives, and misinformation. *NPJ Vaccines* 6, 73 (2021).
- 137. Hursh, S. R., Strickland, J. C., Schwartz, L. P. & Reed, D. D. Quantifying the Impact of Public Perceptions on Vaccine Acceptance Using Behavioral Economics. *Front Public Health* 8, 608852 (2020).
- 138. Benis, A., Seidmann, A. & Ashkenazi, S. Reasons for Taking the COVID-19 Vaccine by US Social Media Users. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 315 (2021).
- Callaghan, T., Lueck, J. A., Trujillo, K. L. & Ferdinand, A. O. Rural and Urban Differences in COVID-19 Prevention Behaviors. *The Journal of Rural Health* 37, 287–295 (2021).
- 140. Sustained COVID-19 vaccine willingness after safety concerns over the Oxford-AstraZeneca vaccine. *Ugeskriftet.dk* (2022).

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
a	
10	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
10	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
~~ 72	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
20	
3/	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
12	
45	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
21	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
57	
58	
59	

60

141. Ku, L. The Association of Social Factors and Health Insurance Coverage with COVID-19 Vaccinations and Hesitancy, July 2021. *Journal of general internal medicine* 37, 409–414 (2022).

- 142. Rzymski, P., Zeyland, J., Poniedziałek, B., Małecka, I. & Wysocki, J. The Perception and Attitudes toward COVID-19 Vaccines: A Cross-Sectional Study in Poland. *Vaccines* (*Basel*) 9, 382 (2021).
- 143. Felemban, R. M., Tashkandi, E. M. & Mohorjy, D. K. The willingness of the Saudi Arabian population to participate in the COVID-19 vaccine trial: A case-control study. *J Taibah Univ Med Sci* 16, 612–618 (2021).
- 144. Guidry, J. P. D. *et al.* U.S. public support for COVID-19 vaccine donation to low- and middle-income countries during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Vaccine* 39, 2452–2457 (2021).
- 145. Dror, A. A. *et al.* Vaccine hesitancy: the next challenge in the fight against COVID-19. *Eur J Epidemiol* 35, 775–779 (2020).
- 146. Catma, S. & Varol, S. Willingness to Pay for a Hypothetical COVID-19 Vaccine in the United States: A Contingent Valuation Approach. *Vaccine* (2021) doi:10.3390/vaccines9040318.
- 147. Burch, A. E., Lee, E., Shackelford, P., Schmidt, P. & Bolin, P. Willingness to Vaccinate Against COVID-19: Predictors of Vaccine Uptake Among Adults in the US. *Journal of prevention (2022)* 43, 83–93 (2022).

148. McFadden, S. M. *et al.* Confidence and Hesitancy During the Early Roll-out of COVID-19 Vaccines Among Black, Hispanic, and Undocumented Immigrant Communities: a Review. *Journal of urban health : bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 99, 3–14 (2022).

- 149. Butler, J. Z. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccination readiness among multiple racial and ethnic groups in the San Francisco Bay Area: A qualitative analysis. *PloS one* 17, e0266397 (2022).
- 150. Teixeira da Silva, D. *et al.* COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance among an Online Sample of Sexual and Gender Minority Men and Transgender Women. *Vaccines (Basel)* 9, 204 (2021).
- 151. Sonderskov, K. M., Vistisen, H. T., Dinesen, P. T. & Ostergaard, S. D. A positive update on COVID-19 booster vaccine willingness among Danes. *Danish medical journal* 69, (2022).
- 152. Lennon, R. P. *et al.* Underserved population acceptance of combination influenza-COVID-19 booster vaccines. *Vaccine* 40, 562–567 (2022).

d. Definitions of variables and sources

For individual studies:

Items	Description
Study Identification	Authors, journal, and date of publication, doi
Study design	Quantitative, Qualitative, Other
Data Collection	Period of data collection
Geographic Context	Country, City/State, multi-country study
Sampling Method	Survey, Interviews, Other
Study size	Number of participants
Study population	General Population or marginalized, mean age, gender ratio, other characteristics if reported
Vaccine acceptability	Percentage of population accepting, being hesitant about, or refusing a Covid-19 vaccine
Promoters	Reasons for accepting a vaccine
Barriers	Reasons for refusing a vaccine
Demographic characteristics	Vaccine acceptance, hesitancy and refusal across demographic characteristics, as reported

Per country :

Data Sources : OECD, The World Bank, National Public Health Offices, Ourworldindata.org, US National Center for Education Statistics, Eurostat Database, Pew Research Center

Currency is current US dollars

Items	Description			
Vaccina	tion Data 🥢			
Vaccine approval	Date of first vaccine approval			
Vaccination rates, past	Double, single and total vaccination rates			
	as of 26.11.2021			
General Dem	ographic Data			
Population	Total population and percentage of foreign-			
	born population			
Gender ratio	Percentage of male population			
Population, old	Population ages 65 and above, total			
Life expectancy	Life expectancy at birth, total years			
Religion ar	nd Ethnicity			
Religion and Ethnicity	Undenominational, Christians, Muslims,			
	Hindus, Jews, Folk Religions, Buddhists,			
	Others. Pew Research Center			
Educ	ation			
Educational attainment	Educational attainment, primary to Doctoral			
	or equivalent, population 25+ years. OECD			
School enrollment	School enrollment, primary, % gross. OECD			
Economica	I Indicators			
GDP	GDP per capita. OECD			

Poverty Gap	Of total population. OECD
Poverty Rate	Of total population. OECD
Gender wage gap	Of total population. OECD
Unemployement Rate	Of total population. OECD
Gini Coefficient	OECD
Social F	Protection
Social Spending	Cash-benefits, direct in-kind provision of goodds and services, and tax breaks with social purposes. OECD
Sociopolitical indi	cators of inequality
Violence Against Women	Prevalence in the lifetime. OECD
Social Institutions and Gender	Discrimination in the family, Restricted access to resources and assets, restricted physical integrity, Restricted civil liberties. OECD, Index
Perceived Health	Of total population. OECD
People at Risk of Poverty or Social	Index, Eurostat
Exclusion	
Long Hours in Paid Work	Of total population. OECD
Well-	-Being
Housing Overcrowding	Of total population. OECD
Social Connections	Social support and satisfaction with personal relationships, OECD
Housing Cost Overburden	Of total population. OECD
Subjective Well-Being	Of total population. OECD
Difficulty making ends meet	Of total population. OECD
Negative affect balance	Of total population. OECD
Work-life balance	Of total population. OECD
Quality of	healthcare
Universal healthcare	Yes/No
Health spendings	As share of GDP. The World Bank
Health coverage	Of total population. OECD
Consultations skipped due to cost	Per 100 patients. OECD
Medical Tests, treatment or follow-up	Per 100 patients. OECD
skipped due to costs	
Prescribed medicines skipped due to costs	Per 100 patients. OECD
Covid policy measures and do	ownsides of not getting vaccine
COVID-19 Stringency Index	Oxford Coronavirus Government Response

2. Supplementary section 2: Assessment of quality and risk of bias results

Table S1. Risk of bias assessment of included studies (Adapted from Hoy et al)

Author	Was the study´s target population representative?	Was the sample frame a close representation of the target population?	Was the sample randomly selected?	Was the likelihood of non-response bias minimal?	Were data collected directly from the subjects?	Was an acceptable case definition used?	Was the study instrument reliable?	Was the same mode of data collection used for all subjects?	Score
Attwell	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
Seale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Dietze	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Enticott	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Schernhammer	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2
Kessels	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Lavoie	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Basta	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Abramovich	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Manca	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Bagic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Neumann- Böhme	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Detoc	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
Ward	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Montagni	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Ousseine	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Coulaud	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Heyerdahl	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Bendau	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Kourlaba	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Murphy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Maor	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
Caserotti	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
La Vecchia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Di Giuseppe	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Moscardino	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Palamenghi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
lacoella	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Yoda	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Ihshimaru	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0

1							
2	Mashida	N	N	N		No.	N
1	Wachida	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Kadoya	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Sekizawa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6	Soares	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7	Khaled	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	Page	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
0	Freeman	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
9	Sethi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
10	Freeman	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
11	Batty	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
12	Chaudhuri	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
13	Sherman	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
14	Sherman	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
15	Earnshaw	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
15	Fisher	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16	Malik	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
17	Reiter	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
18	Pogue	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
19	Craig	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
20	Kelly	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
21	Christodoulou	Vaa	Vee	Vee			Vee
22	Culliner	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
23	Sullivan	res	res	res	res	Yes	Yes
24	Stern	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
24	Rogers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
25	Crozier	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
26	Thunström	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
27	Rane	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
28	Scott	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
20	Bogart	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
20	Tucker	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
30	Shaw	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
31	Meehan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
32							

BMJ Open

Yes

0

0

0

0 0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

1 0

1

1

1

1

0 0

0

0

0 0

0

2

0

0

0

0 0

Yes

BMJ Open

3. Supplementary section 3: Table S2.Country-specific real-world data

Country	Population	% of population over 65 years	Life expectancy	Date of first vaccine	% of population with complete vaccination as of 31 st 2021	Poverty gap	Gender wage gap	% unemployment	% unemployment in migrants	Social spending, %of GDP 2021	Healthcare spending, %GDP	Healthcare coverage	Stringency index at the date of first vaccine
Australia	25690000	16	83.2	22-Feb-21	74								53.24
Austria	8956000	19	81.8	27-Dec-20	71	0.294	14.9	4.9	8.3	31	10.3	99.9	82.41
Belgium	11590000	19	81.7	28-Dec-20	76	0.233	3.4	5.7	10.4	29	10.3	98.6	60.19
Canada	38250000	18	82.0	14-Dec-20	76	0.303	18.5	6.5	6.3	18	10.8	100	72.69
Croatia	3900000	22	77.7	27-Dec-20	49								67.59
Denmark	5857000	20	81.2	27-Dec-20	77	0.289	4.9	5.1	8.4	28.3	10.1	100	51.85
France	67750000	21	82.6	27-Dec-20	73	0.261	11.8	7.9	13.1	33	11.3	100	63.89
Germany	83000000	22	80.9	26-Dec-20	71	0.256	13.9	3.2	5.6	28	11.4	89.5	82.41
Greece	10640000	23	81.9	27-Dec-20	68	0.331	5.9	13.3	28.6	26	7.8	100	84.26
Ireland	5000000	15	82.3	29-Dec-20	77	0.187	8.3	5.1	5.9	14	6.7	100	68.52
Israel	9364000	12	82.8	19-Dec-20	63	0.325	22.7	5	3.4	18	7.5	100	71.3
Italy	59110000	24	83.2	27-Dec-20	76	0.396	5.7	9	13.1	31	8.7	100	78.7
Japan	126000000	30	84.4	17-Feb-21	80	0.364	24.5	2.8	4.2	22.3	10.7	100	49.54
Portugal	10330000	23	80.9	27-Dec-20	83	0.266	22.7	5.9	8.4	25	9.4	100	63.89
Qatar	2660000	1	79.1	31-Jan-21	82								64.81
Switzerland	8703000	19	83.7	23-Dec-20	67	0.281	18	2.6	7,3	18	11.9	100	60.19
UK	67330000	18	81.2	08-Dec-20	70	0.326	16.3	3.9	4.3	22	10.2	100	63.89
USA	332000000	17	77.2	14-Dec-20	63	0.368	18.9	8.09	3.1	23	16.9	91.4	71.76

4. Supplementary section 4: Country-specific analyses

Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Australia a. All the studies from Australia



For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I^2 accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

b. Subgroup analysis from Australia according to vaccine acceptance in the general population and among special populations

Study	Events	Total		Proportion	95%-Cl	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
General population			:::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::				
Attwell	855	1316		0.65	[0.62; 0.68]	39.8%	26.2%
Seale	1136	1420		0.80	[0.78: 0.82]	30.2%	26.0%
Enticott	909	1166	1	0.78	[0.75: 0.80]	26.6%	25.9%
Fixed effect model		3902	\	0.74	[0.72: 0.75]	96.7%	
Bandom effects mode	1	0002		0.75	[0 64: 0 83]		78 1%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 98\%$,	$t^2 = 0.1856$	6, <i>p</i> < 0.01		0.70	[0.04, 0.00]		/0.1/0
Special population							
Dietze	48	100		0.48	[0.38; 0.58]	3.3%	21.9%
Fixed effect model		100	\sim	0.48	[0.38; 0.58]	3.3%	
Random effects mode	1	-		0.48	0.27: 0.701		21.9%
Heterogeneity: not applica	able				L,		
Fixed effect model		4002	♦	0.73	[0.72: 0.74]	100.0%	
Random effects mode	I			0.70	[0.60: 0.78]		100.0%
Prediction interval	-	_		•	[0.22: 0.95]		
Heterogeneity: $l^2 - 98\%$	$r^2 = 0.1856$	3 n < 0.01			[
Besidual heterogeneity: / ²	2 = 98% p	< 0.01 (0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9	1			

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is

centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I2 accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Canada

a. All the studies from Canada



For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

b. Subgroup analysis from Canada according to vaccine acceptance in the general population and among special populations

Study	Events	Total				Proportion	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
specialpopulation – 0					÷.				
Lavoie	8681	15019		+		0.58	[0.57:0.59]	52.8%	25.3%
Basta	20056	23819			+	0.84	[0.84: 0.85]	45.6%	25.3%
Fixed effect model	20000	38838				0.72	[0.72: 0.72]	98.4%	
Random effects model						0.73	[0.42: 0.91]		50.6%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 100\%$,	$\tau^2 = 0.910$	03, <i>p</i> = 0					[0112, 0101]		0010 /0
specialpopulation = 1									
Abramovich	89	139		+		0.64	[0.55; 0.72]	0.5%	24.5%
Manca	221	342		-+	÷	0.65	[0.59; 0.70]	1.1%	25.0%
Fixed effect model		481		\langle	>	0.64	[0.60; 0.69]	1.6%	
Random effects model						0.64	[0.32; 0.87]		49.4%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, τ^2	= 0.9103,	p = 0.90							
Fixed offerst model		20210				0.70	10 71. 0 701	100.0%	
Fixed effect model		39319			, v	0.72	[0.71; 0.72]	100.0%	
Random effects model						0.69	[0.46; 0.85]		100.0%
Prediction interval		-					[0.02; 1.00]		
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 100\%$,	$\tau^2 = 0.910$	03, p = 0	I I	I	1				
Residual heterogeneity: I ²	= 100%,	p = 0	0.2 0.4	4 0.6	0.8				

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I2 accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

Weight

Wolaht

53 54

55 56

57

58

59

60

2							
3	Random-effects	meta-an	alysis of	COVID-19 vacci	ne acceptanc	e in Fran	ce
4	a All the studies	from E			•		
5	a. All the studies	from Fi	rance				
6							We
7	Study	Events	Total		Proportion	95%-CI	(fi
8	-				•		
9	Heyerdahl	5690	10000	H	0.57	[0.56; 0.58]	2
10	Coulaud	1913	3204	-	0.60	[0.58; 0.61]	1
11	Ousseine	11177	18474	+	0.61	[0.60; 0.61]	4
12	Ward	3814	1640 5018		0.70	[0.68, 0.73]	
13	Detoc	2837	3656	-	0.78	[0.76; 0.79]	Ì
14	20000	-007	0000		0110	[011:0, 011:0]	
15	Fixed effect model		41992	•	0.63	[0.62; 0.63]	10
16	Random effects mod	el			0.67	[0.60; 0.74]	
17	Prediction interval	2			1	[0.40; 0.86]	
18	Heterogeneity: $I^{2} = 99\%$, τ ² = 0.1399	9, <i>p</i> < 0.01		0		
19			Proportion	0.5 0.6 0.7 0	.8 a in France		
20				s of vaccine acceptance			
21	For each study, boxe	s and hori	zontal lines	correspond to the re-	spective point est	imate and a	acc
22	confidence interval. T	he size of	each hox is	proportional to the we	hight of that study	result in the	s fis
23					ight of that study		
24	The red diamond rep	resents th	ie 95% con	fidence interval of the	e summary poole	d estimate o	of
25	centred on pooled pr	evalence	of vaccine	acceptance. Heteroge	eneity estimate of	I ² accompa	ani
26	estimate. Studies are	ordered by	v the propo	tion of accentance CI	- confidence inte	nval	
20	estimate. Otdales are		y the prope				
27							
20	b Subaroup an	alveie fr	om Erar	oco according to	vaccino acc	ontanco	in
20	b. Subgroup and	aiyəiə ii		ice according to	vaccine acc	epiance	
21	population and a	mong s	pecial po	pulations			
27		•					
22 22							
22	Churcher	Fuenda	Tatal		Descetter		, V
24 25	Study	Events	Iotal		Proportion	95%-0	I (
30	specialpopulation = (1			
30	Detoc	2837	3656	+	0.78	[0.76: 0.79	1
3/	Ward	3814	5018	+	0.76	[0.75; 0.77	í
38	Montagni	1156	1640		0.70	[0.68; 0.73	j
39	Coulaud	1913	3204	+	0.60	[0.58; 0.61]]
40	Heyerdahl	5690	10000	+	0.57	[0.56; 0.58]] :
41	Fixed effect model		23518	٥	0.65	[0.64; 0.65]	
42	Random effects mod	el 2 0.000		-	0.69	[0.59; 0.77]	
43	Heterogeneity: $I^{-} = 100\%$	$\sigma, \tau^{-} = 0.239$	90, <i>p</i> < 0.01				
44	specialnonulation - 1						
45	Ousseine	11177	18474	+	0.61	To oo o ou	ı.
46	Fixed effect model		10/7/		0.01	10.60: 0.61	
47			104/4	♦	0.61	[0.60; 0.61]	i .
48	Random effects mod	el		\$	0.61 0.61	[0.60; 0.61] [0.60; 0.61] [0.37; 0.80]	
	Random effects mode Heterogeneity: not applic	el able		♦	0.61 0.61	[0.60; 0.61] [0.60; 0.61] [0.37; 0.80]]
49	Random effects mode Heterogeneity: not applic	el :able		♦	0.61 0.61	[0.60; 0.61] [0.60; 0.61] [0.37; 0.80]]
49 50	Random effects mod Heterogeneity: not applic Fixed effect model	el able	41992	♦	0.61 0.61	[0.60; 0.61] [0.60; 0.61] [0.37; 0.80]]]] 1
49 50 51	Random effects mode Heterogeneity: not applic Fixed effect model Random effects mode	el Gable el	41992	\$ •	0.61 0.63 0.67	[0.60; 0.61] [0.60; 0.61] [0.37; 0.80] [0.62; 0.63] [0.58; 0.75]]]] 1

		anoo								
	Events	Total					Proportion	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
ahl	5690	10000		 ;			0.57	[0.56; 0.58]	25.7%	16.8%
1	1913	3204		-			0.60	[0.58; 0.61]	8.1%	16.7%
e	11177	18474		+			0.61	[0.60; 0.61]	46.3%	16.8%
ni	1156	1640					0.70	[0.68; 0.73]	3.6%	16.5%
	3814	5018				-	0.76	[0.75; 0.77]	9.6%	16.7%
	2837	3656				•	0.78	[0.76; 0.79]	6.7%	16.6%
ffect model		41992		•			0.63	[0.62; 0.63]	100.0%	
n effects model ion interval		_					0.67	[0.60; 0.74] [0.40: 0.86]		100.0%
eneity: Ι ² = 99%, τ	² = 0.1399	9, <i>p</i> < 0.01		1				[]		
-			0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8				
		Proportio	ns of v	accine a	accepta	ance in I	France			

e respective point estimate and accompanying 95% e weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is rogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary e CI = confidence interval.

to vaccine acceptance in the general

Events	Total		Proportion	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
2837	3656	-	+ 0.78	[0.76; 0.79]	6.7%	16.6%
3814	5018	+	0.76	[0.75; 0.77]	9.6%	16.7%
1156	1640		0.70	[0.68; 0.73]	3.6%	16.6%
1913	3204	-	0.60	[0.58; 0.61]	8.1%	16.7%
5690	10000	E	0.57	[0.56; 0.58]	25.7%	16.7%
	23518	٥	0.65	[0.64; 0.65]	53.7%	
			0.69	[0.59; 0.77]		83.3%
$t^2 = 0.239$	90, <i>p</i> < 0.	01				
11177	18474	+	0.61	[0.60; 0.61]	46.3%	16.7%
	18474	۵	0.61	[0.60; 0.61]	46.3%	
			- 0.61	[0.37; 0.80]		16.7%
le						
	41992	٥	0.63	[0.62; 0.63]	100.0%	
			0.67	[0.58; 0.75]		100.0%
				[0.32; 0.90]		
= 0.2390	0, <i>p</i> < 0.0	1 1 1 1	1			
= 100%,	p < 0.01	0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0).8			
	Events 2837 3814 1156 1913 5690 $t^2 = 0.23$ 11177 le $t^2 = 0.2394$ = 0.2394 = 0.2394 = 0.2394	Events Total 2837 3656 3814 5018 1156 1640 1913 3204 5690 10000 23518 $t^2 = 0.2390, p < 0.2390, p < 0.2390$ 11177 18474 1847	Events Total 2837 3656 3814 5018 1156 1640 1913 3204 5690 10000 23518 $t^2 = 0.2390, p < 0.01$ 11177 18474 18474 $t^2 = 0.2390, p < 0.01$ $t^2 = 0.2390, p < 0.01$	Events Total Proportion 2837 3656 # 0.78 3814 5018 0.76 0.70 1156 1640 0.70 0.60 1913 3204 # 0.60 5690 10000 0.57 0.65 23518 0.65 0.69 $e^2 = 0.2390, p < 0.01$ 0.61 0.61 11177 18474 0.61 11177 18474 0.61 e^2 $0.2390, p < 0.01$ 0.63 e^2 $0.2390, p < 0.01$ 0.4 0.5	Events Total Proportion 95%-Cl 2837 3656 ** 0.78 $[0.76; 0.79]$ 3814 5018 ** 0.76 $[0.75; 0.77]$ 1156 1640 ** 0.70 $[0.68; 0.73]$ 1913 3204 ** 0.70 $[0.68; 0.73]$ 5690 10000 ** 0.60 $[0.58; 0.61]$ 23518 0.65 $[0.64; 0.65]$ 0.69 $[0.59; 0.77]$ $t^2 = 0.2390, p < 0.01$ ** 0.61 $[0.60; 0.61]$ 0.61 $[0.60; 0.61]$ 11177 18474 \bullet \bullet 0.61 $[0.60; 0.61]$ 0.61 $[0.62; 0.63]$ $e^2 = 0.2390, p < 0.01$ \bullet \bullet 0.63 $[0.62; 0.63]$ 0.67 $[0.32; 0.90]$ $e = 0.2390, p < 0.01$ 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.63 $[0.62; 0.63]$ 0.67 $[0.32; 0.90]$	Events Total Proportion 95%-Cl (fixed) 2837 3656 3814 5018 1156 1640 1913 3204 ** $0.78 [0.76; 0.79] 6.7\%$ 0.76 [0.75; 0.77] 9.6% 0.70 [0.68; 0.73] 3.6% 0.60 [0.58; 0.61] 8.1% 0.57 [0.56; 0.58] 25.7% 0.65 [0.64; 0.65] 53.7% 0.65 [0.64; 0.65] 53.7% 0.69 [0.59; 0.77] 11177 18474 18474 • • 11177 18474 18474 • • 11177 18474 18474 • • 11177 18474 18474 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • <td< td=""></td<>

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Italy

a. All the studies from Italy



For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I^2 accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

b. Subgroup analysis from Italy according to vaccine acceptance in the general population and among special populations

Study	Events Total		Proportion	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
specialpopulation = 0						
Caserotti	659 839		0.79	[0.76: 0.81]	13.4%	16.9%
La Vecchia	567 1055		0.54	[0.51: 0.57]	24.8%	17.1%
Moscardino	876 1200		0.73	[0.70; 0.75]	22.3%	17.1%
Palamenghi	571 968		0.59	[0.56; 0.62]	22.1%	17.1%
Fixed effect model	4062		0.65	[0.64: 0.67]	82.6%	
Random effects model	1002	Ĩ:	0.67	[0 55: 0 77]		68 1%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0.8\%$	$r^2 = 0.2425$ n < 0.01		0.07	[0.00, 0.17]		00.170
fictorogeneity. T = 50%, t	r = 0.2420, p < 0.01					
specialpopulation = 1						
Di Giuseppe	438 685		0.64	[0.60: 0.68]	14.9%	16.9%
lacoella	71 112		0.63	0.54: 0.72	2.5%	15.0%
Fixed effect model	797	\diamond	0.64	0.60: 0.671	17.4%	
Random effects mode		1:	0.64	[0.46: 0.78]		31.9%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\% \tau^2$	$= 0.2425 \ p = 0.91$			[
	- 01 - 1 - 0, p - 010 1					
Fixed effect model	4859	↓	0.65	[0.63; 0.66]	100.0%	
Random effects mode	l		0.66	[0.56; 0.74]		100.0%
Prediction interval			-	[0.30; 0.89]		
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 97\%$, 1	$c^2 = 0.2425, p < 0.01$					
Residual heterogeneity: 12	= 98%, <i>p</i> < 0.01	0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8				

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

Materia





For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the United Kingdom

Study	Events	Total		Proportion	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
Freeman	1188	2501	•	0.48	[0.46; 0.49]	9.1%	14.3%
Sherman	956	1494	-	0.64	[0.62; 0.66]	5.0%	14.3%
Freeman	3667	5114	E	0.72	[0.70; 0.73]	15.1%	14.3%
Sherman	1102	1500	-	0.73	[0.71; 0.76]	4.2%	14.2%
Sethi	3873	4884		0.79	[0.78; 0.80]	11.6%	14.3%
Batty	10114	11955	-	0.85	[0.84; 0.85]	22.6%	14.3%
Chaudhuri	19910	22421	•	0.89	[0.88; 0.89]	32.4%	14.3%
Fixed effect model Random effects model		49869		0.80 0.75	[0.80; 0.81] [0.63; 0.84]	100.0%	 100.0%
Prediction interval Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 100\%$,	$\tau^2 = 0.55$	70, p = 0		-	[0.27; 0.96]		
			0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9	9			

Proportions of vaccine acceptance in the UK

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the United States a. All the studies from the U.S

Study	Events	Total	Prop	ortion	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
Bogart	63	207	i	0.30	[0.25; 0.37]	0.8%	5.2%
Sullivan	75	234	_ 	0.32	[0.26; 0.38]	0.9%	5.2%
Crozier	1440	3721	—	0.39	[0.37; 0.40]	15.8%	5.4%
Stern	2294	5110	+	0.45	[0.44; 0.46]	22.7%	5.4%
Reiter	963	2006	—	0.48	[0.46; 0.50]	9.0%	5.3%
Scott	233	486	- -	0.48	[0.44; 0.52]	2.2%	5.3%
Tucker	68	134		0.51	[0.42; 0.59]	0.6%	5.1%
Rogers	526	969	- - -	0.54	[0.51; 0.57]	4.3%	5.3%
Shaw	140	244		0.57	[0.51; 0.63]	1.1%	5.2%
Meehan	61	106		0.58	[0.48; 0.67]	0.5%	5.1%
Fisher	571	991		0.58	[0.55; 0.61]	4.3%	5.3%
Craig	704	1153		0.61	[0.58; 0.64]	4.9%	5.3%
Christodoulou	54	83		0.65	[0.54; 0.75]	0.3%	5.0%
Malik	450	672		0.67	[0.63; 0.70]	2.7%	5.3%
Pogue	215	316	·	0.68	[0.63; 0.73]	1.2%	5.2%
Kelly	1709	2279		0.75	[0.73; 0.77]	7.7%	5.3%
Thunström	2506	3133		0.80	[0.79; 0.81]	9.0%	5.3%
Rane	3899	4571		0.85	[0.84; 0.86]	10.3%	5.3%
Earnshaw	725	845		0.86	[0.83; 0.88]	1.8%	5.3%
Fixed effect model		27260	•	0.59	[0.58; 0.60]	100.0%	
Random effects mode	I			0.60	[0.50; 0.68]		100.0%
Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / ² = 99%. τ	² = 0.6826	• ا 0 = م			[0.20; 0.90]		
		0.3	2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8				
		Proport	ion of willingness to receive the vaccin	е			

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I^2 accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.
Study	Events	Total		Proportion	95%-CI	(fixed)	(rand
specialpopulation = ()						
Reiter	963	2006	-	0.48	[0.46; 0.50]	9.0%	5
Fisher	571	991		0.58	[0.54; 0.61]	4.3%	5
Craig	704	1153		0.61	[0.58; 0.64]	4.9%	5
Malik	450	672		0.67	[0.63; 0.71]	2.7%	Ę
Pogue	215	316		0.68	[0.63; 0.73]	1.2%	5
Kelly	1709	2279	-	0.75	[0.73; 0.77]	7.7%	Ę
Thunström	2506	3133		0.80	[0.79; 0.81]	9.0%	;
Rane	3899	4571		0.85	[0.84; 0.86]	10.3%	
Earnshaw	725	845	-	► 0.86	[0.83; 0.88]	1.8%	;
Fixed effect model		15966	\$	0.72	[0.71; 0.73]	50.9%	
Random effects mod	el			0.71	[0.63; 0.78]		48
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$,	τ ⁻ = 0.3292	, p < 0.0					
specialpopulation = 1	1	0.07				0.00/	
Bogart	63	207	·	0.30	[0.24; 0.37]	0.8%	
Sullivan	10	234		0.32	[0.26; 0.38]	0.9%	
Crozier	1440	3721		0.39	[0.37, 0.40]	15.8%	
Stern	2294	5110		0.45	[0.44; 0.46]	22.1%	
Scott	233	480		0.48	[0.43; 0.52]	2.2%	
Degers	526	134		0.51	[0.42, 0.39]	0.0%	
Rogers	320	909		0.04	[0.51, 0.57]	4.3%	
Maahan	140	244		0.57	[0.31, 0.04]	1.1/0	
Christodoulou	54	100		0.56	[0.40, 0.07]	0.3%	
Fixed effect model	54	1120/	•	0.03	[0.34, 0.75]	10.370	
Pandom effects mod		11234		0.44	[0.45, 0.45]	43.170	5
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 94\%$,	$\tau^2 = 0.3292$, p < 0.0		0.40	[0.05, 0.07]		0
Fixed effect model		27260	6	0.59	[0.58; 0.60]	100.0%	
Random effects mod	el		\Leftrightarrow	0.60	[0.53; 0.66]		10
Prediction interval					[0.30: 0.84]		
Frediction interval	-						

b. Subgroup analysis from the U.S according to vaccine acceptance in the general

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I² accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.



5. Supplementary section 5: Comparison between data from studies and real-world data

a. Table S3. Willingness to be vaccinated and real-world vaccine uptake

Country	% (CI 95%) of the general population willing to be vaccinated before vaccines rollout*	% (CI 95%) of special populations willing to be vaccinated before vaccines rollout*	% of the general population with complete vaccination as of 31 st Dec 2021**	Difference between willingness and uptake
Australia	70 (58-79)	48 (27-70)	74	+4
Austria	36 (33-39)	-	71	+35
Belgium	34 (32-36)	-	76	+42
Canada	73 (42-91)	64 (32-87)	76	+3
Croatia	64 (60-67)		49	-15
Denmark	80 (79-81)	-	77	-3
France	69 (59-77)	61 (37-80)	73	+4
Germany	64 (62-67)	-	71	+7
Greece	58 (55-61)	-	68	+10
Ireland	65 (62-68)	· ·	77	+12
Israel	76 (74-78)	·	63	+7
Italy	67 (55-77)	64 (46-78)	76	+9
Japan	55 (42-67)	.	80	+25
Portugal	35 (33-37)	4	83	+48
Qatar	43 (40-45)		82	+39
Switzerland	-	41	67	-
UK	75 (63-84)	-	70	+5
USA	71 (63-78)	50 (39-61)	63	-8
*From the results of the sy **https://ourworldindata.org	stematic review.		7	

Weight

0.7%

0.7%

0.4%

0.7%

18.6%

0.4%

0.3%

0.7%

0.4%

1.7%

0.0%

14.3%

1.3%

12.3%

30.0%

14.9%

0.6%

2.0%

95%-CI

[0.49; 0.49]

[0.63; 0.63]

[0.63; 0.63]

[0.67; 0.67]

[0.68; 0.68]

[0.70; 0.70]

[0.71; 0.71]

[0.71; 0.71]

[0.73; 0.73]

[0.74; 0.74]

[0.76; 0.76]

[0.76; 0.76]

[0.76; 0.76]

[0.77; 0.77]

[0.77: 0.77

[0.80; 0.80]

[0.82; 0.82]

[0.83; 0.83]

[0.55; 0.85]

0.73 [0.69; 0.76]

0.70 [0.70; 0.70] 100.0%

95%-CI

[0.32; 0.36]

[0.33; 0.37]

10.33: 0.391

10.41: 0.451

[0.55; 0.55]

[0.55; 0.61]

[0.61; 0.67]

[0.62; 0.66]

[0.62; 0.68]

[0.66; 0.68]

[0.69; 0.69]

[0.69; 0.71]

10.73: 0.731

10.73: 0.731

[0.75: 0.75]

10.74: 0.781

[0.79; 0.81]

[0.39; 0.81]

Proportion

0.49

0.63

0.63

0.67

0.68

0.70

0.71

0.71

0.73

0.74

0.76

0.76

0.76

0.77

0.77

0.80

0.82

0.83

0.69 [0.69; 0.69] 100.0% 0.62 [0.57; 0.67]

0.34

0.35

0.36

0.43

0.55

0.58

0.64

0.64

0.65

0.67

0.69

0.70

0.73

0.73

0.75

0.76

0.80

Weight

5.9%

5 9%

5.8%

5.9%

5.9%

5.8%

5.8%

5.9%

5.8%

5.9%

0.0%

5.9%

5.9%

5 9%

5 9%

5.9%

5.9%

5.9%

100.0%

Weight

0.5%

1.2%

1.1%

1.3%

7.9%

1.0%

9.5%

7.4%

2.7%

1.2%

3.9%

6.0%

0.6%

0.5%

11.2%

0.2%

0.8%

43.0%

(fixed) (random)

Weight

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

5.6%

100.0%

(fixed) (random)

1

2 3 4 5 Total Proportion Study Events 6 7 Belgium 700 2060 Portugal 680 1943 8 363 1007 Austria 9 822 Qatar 1912 25955 47191 ٠ Japan 10 582 Greece 1004 11 Croatia 490 765 1779 12 Germany 1139 Ireland 677 1041 13 3256 4859 Italy 14 Switzerland 812 France 28974 41992 15 Australia 2801 4002 16 Canada 28703 39319 USA 69697 95475 17 37402 49869 UK 18 Israel 1538 2024 6131 7664 Denmark 19 20 **Fixed effect model** 304718 Random effects model 21 Prediction interval 22 Heterogeneity: I² = 100%, τ² = 0.1844, p = 0 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 23 Proportion of willingness to be vaccinated among the studies 24 25 26 27 28 Study Events Total 29 Croatia 1911000 3900000 30 5899320 9364000 Israel 31 USA 209160000 332000000 32 Switzerland 5831010 8703000 Greece 7235200 10640000 33 47131000 67330000 UK 34 Austria 6358760 8956000 Germany 58930000 83000000 35 France 49457500 67750000 36 Australia 19010600 25690000 37 Belgium 8808400 11590000 Canada 29070000 38250000 38 Italy 44923600 59110000 . 39 Denmark 4509890 5857000 Ireland 3850000 5000000 40 Japan 100800000 126000000 41 Qatar 2181200 2660000 Portugal 8573900 10330000 42 43 876130000 Fixed effect model Random effects model 44 Prediction interval 45 Heterogeneity: I² = 100%, τ² = 0.1298, p = 0 46 05055060650707508085 Proportion of real-world vaccine uptake 47 48 49 50 51

b. Consolidated country data from studies and country real-world statistics

6. Supplementary section 6: Sensitivity analyses

a. Outlier and influential case diagnostics



rstudent= externally standardized residuals, dffits= difference in fit values, cook.de=Cook's distances, cov.r= covariance ratios, tau2.del= leave-one-out estimates of the amount of heterogeneity, QE.del= leave-one-out values of the test statistics for heterogeneity, hat= hat values, weight= weights

b. Cumulative meta-analysis of willingness to be vaccinated according to the date of data acquisition. General population.

Study	Proportion	95%-CI
Adding Seale (k=1)	+ 0.80	[0.78; 0.82]
Adding Thunström (k=2)	• 0.80	[0.79; 0.81]
Adding Murphy (k=3)	0.76	[0.66; 0.83]
Adding Earnshaw (k=4)		[0.70; 0.85]
Adding Neumann-Böhme (k=5)	0.79	[0.74; 0.83]
Adding Detoc (k=6)	- 0.79	[0.75; 0.82]
Adding Fisher (k=7)	+ 0.76	[0.70; 0.81]
Adding Kelly (k=8)	0.76	[0.71; 0.80]
Adding Malik (k=9)	0.75	[0.70; 0.79]
Adding Kourlaba (k=10)	+ 0.74	[0.68; 0.78]
Adding Ward (k=11)	+ 0.74	[0.69; 0.78]
Adding Montagni (k=12)	- 0.74	[0.69; 0.77]
Adding Freeman (k=13)	+ 0.72	[0.66; 0.77]
Adding Attwell (k=14)	0.71	[0.65; 0.77]
Adding Reiter (k=15)	- 0.70	[0.63; 0.76]
Adding Caserotti (k=16)		[0.64; 0.76]
Adding Sherman (k=17)		[0.64; 0.75]
Adding Nguyen (k=18)	- 0.71	[0.64; 0.77]
Adding Maor (k=19)	0.72	[0.65; 0.77]
Adding La Vecchia (k=20)	0.71	[0.64; 0.77]
Adding Yoda (k=21)	<u>+</u> 0.71	[0.64; 0.76]
Adding Rane (k=22)	+ 0.71	[0.65; 0.77]
Adding Sethi (k=23)	+ 0.72	[0.66; 0.77]
Adding Kessels (k=24)	0.70	[0.64; 0.76]
Adding Freeman (k=25)	0.70	[0.64; 0.76]
Adding Craig (k=26)	<u>+</u> 0.70	[0.64; 0.76]
Adding Schernhammer (k=27)	+ 0.69	[0.63; 0.75]
Adding Heyerdahl (k=28)	0.69	[0.62; 0.74]
Adding Coulaud (k=29)	0.68	[0.62; 0.74]
Adding Ihshimaru (k=30)	0.67	[0.59; 0.75]
Adding Basta (k=31)	0.68	[0.60; 0.75]
Adding Batty (k=32)	0.69	[0.61; 0.75]
Adding Soares (k=33)	0.68	[0.60; 0.75]
Adding Bendau (k=34)	0.68	[0.60; 0.74]
Adding Sherman (k=35)	0.68	[0.61; 0.74]
Adding Machida (k=36)		[0.61; 0.74]
Adding Khaled (k=37)		[0.60; 0.74]
Adding Chaudhuri (k=38)	0.68	[0.61; 0.74]
Adding Kadoya (k=39)	0.67	[0.60; 0.74]
Adding Enticott (k=40)	0.68	[0.61; 0.74]
Adding Lavoie (k=41)	÷ 0.67	[0.61; 0.73]
Adding Bagic (k=42)	<u>+</u> 0.67	[0.61; 0.73]
Adding Sekizawa (k=43)	0.67	[0.61; 0.73]
Adding Moscardino (k=44)	0.67	[0.61; 0.73]
Adding Palamenghi (k=45)	+ 0.67	[0.61; 0.73]
Adding Pogue (k=46)	+ 0.67	[0.61; 0.73]
Random effects model		[0.61; 0.73]

c. Cumulative meta-analysis of willingness to be vaccinated according to the date of data acquisition. Special populations.

Study	Proportion	95%-CI
Adding Sullivan (k=1)	- 0.32	[0.26; 0.38]
Adding Christodoulou (k=2)	0.48	[0.19; 0.78]
Adding Scott (k=3)	0.48	[0.33; 0.63]
Adding Manca (k=4)	0.52	[0.38; 0.66]
Adding Stern (k=5)	0.50	[0.41; 0.59]
Adding Dietze (k=6)	0.50	[0.42; 0.58]
Adding Bogart (k=7)	0.47	[0.39; 0.55]
Adding Crozier (k=8)	- 0.46	[0.40; 0.51]
Adding Abramovich (k=9)	0.48	[0.42; 0.53]
Adding lacoella (k=10)	0.49	[0.44; 0.55]
Adding Meehan (k=11)		[0.44; 0.55]
Adding Rogers (k=12)	- 0.50	[0.45; 0.55]
Adding Shaw (k=13)	+ 0.51	[0.46; 0.56]
Adding Tucker (k=14)	+ 0.51	[0.46; 0.56]
Adding Ousseine (k=15)	0.52	[0.46; 0.58]
Adding Di Giuseppe (k=16)	- 0.53	[0.47; 0.58]
Adding Page (k=17)	0.52	[0.46; 0.57]
Random effects model		[0.46; 0.57]

d. Cumulative real-world data meta-analysis according to the date of first COVID-19 vaccine administered in each country

Country	Proportion	95%-CI
Adding UK (k=1)	0.70	[0.70; 0.70]
Adding Canada (k=2)	0.73	[0.67; 0.79]
Adding USA (k=3)	· 0.70	[0.62; 0.77]
Adding Israel (k=4)	- 0.68	[0.62; 0.74]
Adding Switzerland (k=5)	+ 0.68	[0.62; 0.73]
Adding Germany (k=6)	+ 0.69	[0.64; 0.73]
Adding Austria (k=7)	0.69	[0.65; 0.73]
Adding Croatia (k=8)	0.67	[0.62; 0.71]
Adding Denmark (k=9)	+ 0.68	[0.64; 0.72]
Adding France (k=10)	- 0.68	[0.65; 0.72]
Adding Greece (k=11)	+ 0.68	[0.65; 0.72]
Adding Italy (k=12)	+ 0.69	[0.65; 0.72]
Adding Portugal (k=13)	.70	[0.67; 0.74]
Adding Belgium (k=14)	- 0.71	[0.67; 0.74]
Adding Ireland (k=15)	+ 0.71	[0.68; 0.74]
Adding Qatar (k=16)	+ 0.72	[0.69; 0.75]
Adding Japan (k=17)	+ 0.73	[0.69; 0.76]
Adding Australia (k=18)	+ 0.73	[0.69; 0.76]
Random effects model	♦ 0.73	[0.69; 0.76]

	В	Standard error	p-value	OR	95% CI
Intercept	80.683	10.35	.000		
Stringency index	206	.10	.04	.81	(0.69-0.94)
% of the population older than 65 years	.595	.28	.03	1.8	(1.04-3.1)
Healthcare spending as % of GDP	997	.46	.03	0.36	(0.14-0.91)
Social spending as % of GDP	.183	.21	.4	1.2	(0.78-1.84)

e. Results from the generalized linear models for vaccine uptake and country-level data

f. Bubble plots from meta-regressiosn analyses to explore associations of country-level data with vaccine uptake



Stringency index











g. Random-effects meta-analysis of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the general population for studies with high risk of selection bias

Study	Events	Total		Proportion	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
Schernhammer	364	1007	-	0.36	[0.33; 0.39]	7.3%	10.0%
Reiter	963	2006	—	0.48	[0.46; 0.50]	15.6%	10.1%
Craig	704	1153		0.61	[0.58; 0.64]	8.6%	10.0%
Attwell	855	1316		0.65	[0.62; 0.68]	9.4%	10.0%
Malik	450	672		0.67	[0.63; 0.70]	4.6%	10.0%
Pogue	215	316	_	0.68	[0.63; 0.73]	2.1%	9.8%
Maor	1546	2024		0.76	[0.74; 0.78]	11.4%	10.0%
Detoc	2837	3656		0.78	[0.76; 0.79]	19.9%	10.1%
Rane	3899	4571	+	0.85	[0.84; 0.86]	17.9%	10.1%
Earnshaw	725	845		0.86	[0.83; 0.88]	3.2%	9.9%
Fixed effect model		17566	•	0.70	[0.69; 0.71]	100.0%	
Random effects mode	I			0.69	[0.58; 0.78]		100.0%
Prediction interval Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$, τ	² = 0.5978	p = 0		•	[0.25; 0.93]		
5 9 9			03 04 05 06 07 08 09	1			

Proportion of vaccine acceptance among studies with high risk of selection bias

For each study, boxes and horizontal lines correspond to the respective point estimate and accompanying 95% confidence interval. The size of each box is proportional to the weight of that study result in the fixed effect model. The red diamond represents the 95% confidence interval of the summary pooled estimate of the effect and is centred on pooled prevalence of vaccine acceptance. Heterogeneity estimate of I^2 accompanies the summary estimate. Studies are ordered by the proportion of acceptance CI = confidence interval.

7. Supplementary section. Checklists.

Prisma 2020 Checklist

Abstract checklist	ltem #	Checklist item	Reported (Yes/No)		
TITLE	-				
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Yes		
BACKGROUND	-				
Objectives	2	Provide an explicit statement of the main objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Yes		
METHODS					
Eligibility criteria	3	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review.	Yes		
Information sources	4	Specify the information sources (e.g. databases, registers) used to identify studies and the date when each was last searched.	Yes		
Risk of bias	5	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies.	Yes		
Synthesis of results	6	Specify the methods used to present and synthesise results.	Yes		
RESULTS		·			
Included studies	7	Give the total number of included studies and participants and summarise relevant characteristics of studies.	Yes		
Synthesis of results	8	Present results for main outcomes, preferably indicating the number of included studies and participants for each. If meta-analysis was done, report the summary estimate and confidence/credible interval. If comparing groups, indicate the direction of the effect (i.e. which group is favoured).	Yes		
DISCUSSION					
Limitations of evidence	9	Provide a brief summary of the limitations of the evidence included in the review (e.g. study risk of bias, inconsistency and imprecision).	Yes		
Interpretation	10	Provide a general interpretation of the results and important implications.	Yes		
OTHER		·			
Funding	11	Specify the primary source of funding for the review.	No		
Registration	12	Provide the register name and registration number.			
From: Page ML McKenzie JE, Resount DM, Reutron L, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an undeted guideling for reporting					

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

1	
2	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
20	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
21	
21	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
20	
20	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
15	
40	

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported					
TITLE	-							
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Page 1, title					
ABSTRACT								
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Abstract					
INTRODUCTION	n							
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Page 4					
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Page 4					
METHODS	-							
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Methods section, pages 5,6					
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Supplementary section 1					
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Supplementary section 1					
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Supplementary section 1					
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Supplementary section 1					
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Methods section, page 6					
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Supplementary section 1					
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Supplementary section 1					
Effect	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of	Data					
			22					

Page 73	of 93
---------	-------

 BMJ Open

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
measures		results.	synthesis, page 7
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Data synthesis, page 7
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta- regression).	Sensitivity analyses, page 8
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Sensitivity analyses, page 8
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	NA
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Figure S1
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Supplementary material, section 1c
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Results section, page 8 and Table 1
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Table S1
Results of	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect	Figure 1,
	•		24

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
individual studies		estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Figure 2.
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Supplementary section 3,
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	Results section, pages 8-11
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Results section, page 10. Supplementary section 6
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Supplementary section 6
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Main findings, page 11
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Study limitations, page 13
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	-
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Findings in context, page 13
OTHER INFORM	MATION		
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	The review was not registered because it was a realist review

 BMJ Open

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	•
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	NA
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Page 1
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Page 1
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Supplementa material

RAMESES II reporting standards for realist evaluations:

Title: Realist review of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the general population and marginalized communities from high income countries

		Reported in document Y/N/ Not applicable	Page no.	Comment
1	TITLE In the title, identify the document as a realist evaluation	Yes (refers to it as realist review)	Title	In the title, reference is made to "realist review"
SUN	MARY OR ABSTRACT		1	
2	Journal articles will usually require an abstract, while reports and other forms of publication will usually benefit from a short summary. The abstract or summary should include brief details on: the policy, programme or initiative under evaluation; programme setting; purpose of the evaluation; evaluation question(s) and/or objective(s); evaluation strategy; data collection, documentation and analysis methods; key findings and conclusions. Where journals require it and the nature of the study is appropriate, brief details of respondents to the evaluation and recruitment and sampling processes may also be included. Sufficient detail should be provided to identify that a realist approach was used and that realist programme theory was developed and/or refined	Yes	Abstract	

			Reported in document Y/N/Not applicable	Page(s) in document	Comment
INTR	ODUCTION				
3	Rationale for evaluation	Explain the purpose of the evaluation and the implications for its focus and design	Yes	P. 4	
4	Programme theory	Describe the initial programme theory (or theories) that underpin the programme, policy or initiative	Yes	P. 4	
5	Evaluation questions, objectives and focus	State the evaluation question(s) and specify the objectives for the evaluation. Describe whether and how the programme theory was used to define the scope and focus of the evaluation	Yes	P. 4	
6	Ethical approval	State whether the realist evaluation required and has gained ethical approval from the relevant authorities, providing details as appropriate. If ethical approval was deemed unnecessary, explain why	Not applicable	-	No original data collected

			Reported in document Y/N/ Not applicable	Page(s) in document	Comment
MET	HODS				
7	Rationale for using realist evaluation	Explain why a realist evaluation approach was chosen and (if relevant) adapted	Yes	P. 4	
8	Environment surrounding the evaluation	Describe the environment in which the evaluation took place	Yes	Title	Title locates the study to high income countries.
9	Describe the programme policy, initiative or product evaluated	Provide relevant details on the programme, policy or initiative evaluated	Yes	Title p. 5	Title refers to COVID-19 vaccine acceptance
10	Describe and justify the evaluation design	A description and justification of the evaluation design should be included, at least in summary form or as an appendix, in the document which presents the main findings. If this is not done, the omission should be justified and a reference or link to the evaluation design given. It may also be useful to publish or make freely available any original evaluation design document or protocol, where they exist	Yes	0nj	
11	Data collection	Describe and justify the data collection	Yes	S1	Supplementary section 1
	methods	methods – which ones were used, why and how they fed into developing, supporting, refuting or refining programme theory			

		Provide details of the steps taken to enhance the trustworthiness of data collection and documentation	Yes	S1	Supplementary section 1
12	Recruitment process and sampling strategy	Describe how respondents to the evaluation were recruited or engaged and how the sample contributed to the development, support, refutation or refinement of programme theory	Yes	p. 5,6	No original empirical study but review of other studies Methods section describes inclusion and exclusion criteria Supplementary section 1 provides more details on databases and screening process
13	Data analysis	Describe in detail how data were analysed. This section should include information on the constructs that were identified, the process of analysis, how the programme theory was further developed, supported, refuted and refined, and (where relevant) how analysis changed as the evaluation unfolded	Yes	p. 7 p. 8	Data synthesis Sensitivity analyses, page 8
		. 6	Lien	0	

			Reported in document Y/N/Unclear/ Not applicable	Page(s) in document	Comment
RESU	ILTS		1		
14	Details of participants	Report (if applicable) who took part in the evaluation, the details of the data they provided and how the data was used to develop, support, refute or refine programme theory	Yes	S1	Supplementary section 1
15	Main findings	Present the key findings, linking them to contexts, mechanisms and outcome configurations. Show how they were used to further develop, test or refine the programme theory	Yes	P. 8	Results section, and Table 1
DISC	USSION		0		
16	Summary of findings	Summarise the main findings with attention to the evaluation questions, purpose of the evaluation, programme theory and intended audience	Yes	P. 8-11	Figures 1 and 2 Results section,

			Reported in document Y/N/Unclear/ Not applicable	Page(s) in document	Comment
17	Strengths, limitations and future directions	Discuss both the strengths of the evaluation and its limitations. These should include (but need not be limited to): (1) consideration of all the steps in the evaluation processes; and (2) comment on the adequacy, trustworthiness and value of the explanatory insights which emerged In many evaluations, there will be an expectation to provide guidance on future directions for the programme, policy or initiative, its implementation and/or design. The particular implications arising from the realist nature of the findings should be reflected in these discussions	Yes	p. 13	

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 8	
0	
9 10	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
30	
30	
27	
2∠ 22	
22 24	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	

TITL	E		Reported in document Y/N/Unclear/ Not applicable	Page(s) in document	Comment
18	Comparison with existing literature	Where appropriate, compare and contrast the evaluation's findings with the existing literature on similar programmes, policies or initiatives	Yes	P. 11	Main findings
19	Conclusion and recommendations	List the main conclusions that are justified by the analyses of the data. If appropriate, offer recommendations consistent with a realist approach	Yes	p. 13	Cf. "Findings in context" in the manuscript
20	Funding and conflict of interest	State the funding source (if any) for the evaluation, the role played by the funder (if any) and any conflicts of interests of the evaluators	Yes	P. 1	

Adapted from table 1 in:

Wong G, Westhorp G, Manzano A, et al. RAMESES II reporting standards for realist evaluations. BMC Med 2016; 14:96.

Prisma 2020 Checklists

Abstract checklist	Item #	Checklist item	Reported (Yes/No)	
TITLE	-			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Yes	
BACKGROUND	ACKGROUND			
Objectives	2	Provide an explicit statement of the main objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Yes	
METHODS	-			
Eligibility criteria	3	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review.	Yes	
Information sources	4	Specify the information sources (e.g. databases, registers) used to identify studies and the date when each was last searched.	Yes	
Risk of bias	5	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies.	Yes	
Synthesis of results	6	Specify the methods used to present and synthesise results.	Yes	
RESULTS				
Included studies	7	Give the total number of included studies and participants and summarise relevant characteristics of studies.	Yes	
Synthesis of results	8	Present results for main outcomes, preferably indicating the number of included studies and participants for each. If meta-analysis was done, report the summary estimate and confidence/credible interval. If comparing groups, indicate the direction of the effect (i.e. which group is favoured).	Yes	
DISCUSSION				
Limitations of evidence	9	Provide a brief summary of the limitations of the evidence included in the review (e.g. study risk of bias, inconsistency and imprecision).	Yes	
Interpretation	10	Provide a general interpretation of the results and important implications.	Yes	
OTHER				
Funding	11	Specify the primary source of funding for the review.	No	
Registration	12	Provide the register name and registration number.		

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported				
TITLE							
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Page 1, title				
ABSTRACT	ABSTRACT						
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Abstract				
INTRODUCTION							
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Page 4				
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Page 4				
METHODS							
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Methods section, pages 5,6				
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Supplementary section 1				
Search strategy	2h strategy 7 Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.						
Selection process	lection process 8 Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.						
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Supplementary section 1				
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Methods section, page 6				
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Supplementary section 1				
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Supplementary section 1				
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	Data synthesis, page 7				
Synthesis	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics					

BMJ Open

Section and Topic	ction and ppic Item Checklist item			
methods		and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).		
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.		
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.		
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Data synthesis, page 7	
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Sensitivity analyses, page 8	
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Sensitivity analyses, page 8	
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	NA	
Certainty assessment	Certainty 15 Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.			
RESULTS	•			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.		
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Supplementary material, section 1c	
Study characteristics	Study 17 Cite each included study and present its characteristics.		Results section, page 8 and Table 1	
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Table S1	
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Figure 1, Figure 2.	
Results of	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Supplementary	

BMJ Open

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
syntheses			section 3,
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	Results section, pages 8-11
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Results section, page 10. Supplementary section 6
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Supplementary section 6
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Main findings, page 11
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Study limitations, page 13
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	-
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Findings in context, page 13
OTHER INFORM	IATIO	N	
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	The review was not registered because it was a realist review
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	NA

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Support 25 Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review. Page Competing 26 Declare any competing interests of review authors. Page Availability of data, code and other materials 27 Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review. Support <i>From:</i> Page Page Support Support <i>Hort</i> Describe Sources of financial or non-financial support for the review. Support <i>Hort</i> Describe Sources of financial or non-financial support for the review authors. Support <i>Hort</i> Describe Sources of financial or non-financial support for the review authors. Support <i>Hort</i> Describe Sources of financial or non-financial support for the review authors. Support <i>From:</i> Page Describe Sources of financial or non-financial support for the review. Support <i>Hort</i> Describe Sources of the following are publicly available and where they can be following are publicly available and where they can be following are publicly available and where they can be following are publicly available and the following are publicly available and wh	Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item reported
Competing interests 26 Declare any competing interests of review authors. Page Availability interests Availability of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review. Sup From: Page M.KcKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic review BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71 For For more information, visit http://www.prisma-statement.org/ Network prisma-statement.org/	Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Page 1
Availability of data, code and other materials 27 Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review. Supp mate From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic review BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1186/bmj.n71 From: Information, visit: http://www.prisma-statement.org/	Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Page 1
<i>From:</i> Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic review BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71 For more information, visit: http://www.prisma-statement.org/	Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Supplement material
			Peer review only	
For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

BMJ Open

RAMESES II reporting standards for realist evaluations:

 Title: Realist review of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the general population and marginalized communities from high income countries

		Reported in document Y/N/ Not applicable	Page no.	Comment
1 1	TITLE In the title, identify the document as a realist evaluation	Yes (refers to it as realist review)	Title	In the title, reference is made to "realist review"
SUMM	ARY OR ABSTRACT	1	1	1
	Journal articles will usually require an abstract, while reports and other forms of publication will usually benefit from a short summary. The abstract or summary should include brief details on: the policy, programme or initiative under evaluation; programme setting; purpose of the evaluation; evaluation question(s) and/or objective(s); evaluation strategy; data collection, documentation and analysis methods; key findings and conclusions. Where journals require it and the nature of the study is appropriate, brief details of respondents to the evaluation and recruitment and sampling processes may also be included. Sufficient detail should be provided to identify that a realist approach was used and that realist programme theory was developed and/or refined	Yes	Abstract	
	approach was used and that realist programme theory was developed and/or refined		-h/	

			Reported in document Y/N/Not applicable	Page(s) in document	Comment
INTR	ODUCTION		1	1	1
3	Rationale for evaluation	Explain the purpose of the evaluation and the implications for its focus and design	Yes	P. 4	
4	Programme theory	Describe the initial programme theory (or theories) that underpin the programme, policy or initiative	Yes	P. 4	
5	Evaluation questions, objectives and focus	State the evaluation question(s) and specify the objectives for the evaluation. Describe whether and how the programme theory was used to define the scope and focus of the evaluation	Yes	P.4	
6	Ethical approval	State whether the realist evaluation required and has gained ethical approval from the relevant authorities, providing details as appropriate. If ethical approval was deemed unnecessary, explain why	Not applicable	-	No original data collected

			Reported in document Y/N/ Not applicable	Page(s) in document	Comment
MET	THODS				
7	Rationale for using realist evaluation	Explain why a realist evaluation approach was chosen and (if relevant) adapted	Yes	P. 4	
8	Environment surrounding the evaluation	Describe the environment in which the evaluation took place	Yes	Title	Title locates the study to high income countries.
9	Describe the programme policy, initiative or product evaluated	Provide relevant details on the programme, policy or initiative evaluated	Yes	Title p. 5	Title refers to COVID-19 vaccine acceptance
10	Describe and justify the evaluation design	A description and justification of the evaluation design should be included, at least in summary form or as an appendix, in the document which presents the main findings. If this is not done, the omission should be justified and a reference or link to the evaluation design given. It may also be useful to publish or make freely available any original evaluation design document or protocol, where they exist	Yes	0nj	
11	Data collection methods	Describe and justify the data collection methods – which ones were used, why and how they fed into developing, supporting, refuting or refining programme theory	Yes	S1	Supplementary section 1

12Recruitment process and sampling strategyDescribe how respondents to the evaluation were recruited or engaged and how the sample contributed to the development, support, refutation or refinement of programme theoryYesp. 5,6No original empirical study but re of other studies Methods section describes inclu and exclusion criteria13Data analysisDescribe in detail how data were analysed. This section should include information on the constructs that were identified, the process ofYesp. 7Data synthesis13Data analysisDescribe in detail how data were analysed. This section should include information on the constructs that were identified, the process ofYesp. 8Sensitivity analyses, page 8
13Data analysisDescribe in detail how data were analysed. This section should include information on the constructs that were identified, the process ofYesp. 7Data synthesis9000000009000000001300000000130000000014000000001400000000140000000014000000001400000000140000000014000000001400000001400000001400000001400000001400000001400000001400000001400000<
analysis, how the programme theory was further developed, supported, refuted and refined, and (where relevant) how analysis changed as the evaluation unfolded

			Reported in document Y/N/Unclear/ Not applicable	Page(s) in document	Comment			
RESL	ILTS							
14	Details of participants	Report (if applicable) who took part in the evaluation, the details of the data they provided and how the data was used to develop, support, refute or refine programme theory	Yes	S1	Supplementary section 1			
15	Main findings	Present the key findings, linking them to contexts, mechanisms and outcome configurations. Show how they were used to further develop, test or refine the programme theory	Yes	P. 8	Results section, and Table 1			
DISC	DISCUSSION							
16	Summary of findings	Summarise the main findings with attention to the evaluation questions, purpose of the evaluation, programme theory and intended audience	Yes	P. 8-11	Figures 1 and 2 Results section,			

			Reported in document Y/N/Unclear/ Not applicable	Page(s) in document	Comment
17	Strengths, limitations and future directions	Discuss both the strengths of the evaluation and its limitations. These should include (but need not be limited to): (1) consideration of all the steps in the evaluation processes; and (2) comment on the adequacy, trustworthiness and value of the explanatory insights which emerged In many evaluations, there will be an expectation to provide guidance on future directions for the programme, policy or initiative, its implementation and/or design. The particular implications arising from the realist nature of the findings should be reflected in these discussions	Yes	p. 13	

BMJ Open

TITL	E		Reported in document Y/N/Unclear/ Not applicable	Page(s) in document	Comment
18	Comparison with existing literature	Where appropriate, compare and contrast the evaluation's findings with the existing literature on similar programmes, policies or initiatives	Yes	P. 11	Main findings
19	Conclusion and recommendations	List the main conclusions that are justified by the analyses of the data. If appropriate, offer recommendations consistent with a realist approach	Yes	p. 13	Cf. "Findings in context" in the manuscript
20	Funding and conflict of interest	State the funding source (if any) for the evaluation, the role played by the funder (if any) and any conflicts of interests of the evaluators	Yes	P. 1	

Adapted from table 1 in: Wong G, Westhorp G, Manzano A, *et al*. RAMESES II reporting standards for realist evaluations. *BMC Med* 2016; 14:96.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml