# Original Research Article

### COMMUNITY INSIGHTS REGARDING COVID-19 VACCINE UPTAKE

### INTENTION VERSUS HESITANCY

#### **ABSTRACT**

KEYWORDS: COVID-19 vaccination, intensions, vaccine hesitancy, vaccine uptake

### 1. INTRODUCTION:

The corona virus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has imposed a serious disease burden throughout the world in an unfortunate background of unavailability of any specific antiviral treatment for this disease [1-2]. Immunization is the most successful and cost-effective health intervention for controlling the infectious diseases. Similar is the case with vaccines against COVID-19 which remain of great importance to prevent and control COVID-

19 [3-4-5]. However, the achievement and coverage of COVID-19 vaccination program depends on consumers' willingness and acceptance for the vaccination [6]. Therefore, it is very important to know the consumers' perceptions regarding vaccination against a newly emerged disease. However, public perception towards COVID-19 vaccine uptake is not available. Generally, consumers have queries regarding the safety and efficacy of the vaccine, adverse health outcomes etc. Besides

**Background:** It is widely believed that vaccine hesitancy is prevalent. Achievement of COVID-19 vaccination depends upon public willingness towards immunization against this disease. This study aimed at revealing the underlying situation regarding community hesitancy for COVID-19 vaccine. This study was conducted to determine the level of acceptance of COVID-19 vaccine uptake among community and to seek association between socio-demographic factors and various perceptions about COVID-19 vaccine.

**Methods and material:** A cross-sectional study was carried out on 390 health-care providers and general Pakistani people of age 20 years and above through non probability snowball sampling. An online questionnaire was used to gather data. The socio-demographic variables along with various concepts regarding intentions to take vaccine as well as hesitancy for the same were tried to bring on the surface. The p-value ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

**Results:** This study reveals that 61.28% of participants desired to get vaccinated. There was significant association between the desire to get vaccination with participant's age & occupation (p-value < 0.01). The significant association between the positive views of the health-care providers and the other study subjects (p<0.00) is highly encouraging. The other socio-demographic variables have varied effect on vaccine uptake intentions and hesitancy and require further research on this subject.

**Conclusion:** The study conducted on three hundred & ninety respondents consistently reveals the significant association between the positive views of the health care providers and the other study subjects with the p-values lesser than 0.001. The study concludes that other socio-demographic fabric of the community showed varied effect on COVID 19 vaccine uptake intentions and hesitancy.

**Recommendation:** 1. The broad based qualitative research is strongly recommended in order to better seek the community insights & perceptions regarding this public health issue.

2. The large number of Community people although want to get vaccinated against covid-19, still there is a widespread prevalent doubts about this vaccine as being not so safe for them. Such type of doubts among community necessitate that some counselling sessions be conducted in order to remove uncertainties among common people. Motivations of people need to be raised so as to increase the coverage of covid-19 vaccination.

this, there are prevailing myths and misconceptions about the need for vaccination and lack of trust in the health system [7-8]. Compliance for immunization against a novel strain of influenza altogether changes due lack of knowledge among the community regarding vaccine-preventable diseases [9]. Misinformation leading towards vaccine hesitancy could put public health at risk in responding to the current crisis [10]. Vaccine hesitancy is characterized by unwillingness or delay in acceptance and even refusal of vaccination although the service of vaccination is available. This could be due to failure of effective public health messaging because people who are hesitant can be convinced towards the vaccines' safety, efficacy, and necessity [11].

With the surge of post marketing phase of COVID-19 vaccines in different countries, community reservations regarding uptake of this vaccine is highly expected. This situation is more serious in the scenario of using imported vaccines in Pakistan. This situation necessitates that researcher should come forward to have an insight into perceptions of common people regarding this vaccine.

This study helps in finding out false perceptions regarding COVID-19 vaccine; this will in turn help in designing simple health education messages to motivate common peoples about COVID-19 vaccine and ultimately it will increase the vaccine uptake rate in developing countries.

### 2. OBJECTIVES:

1.To determine the level of acceptance of COVID 19 vaccine uptake among community.

- 2 To seek association between sociodemographic factors & various perceptions about covid-19 vaccine among study subjects.
- study was carried out among 390 health care providers and general Pakistani people above age 20 years via non probability snowball sampling. An online predesigned close ended Google form questionnaire was used to gather data about the community perceptions regarding COVID 19 vaccination. The study was completed in 4 months after the approval of ERC. Respondents of either gender, above 20 years of age were included in the study. The data was analyzed by using SPSS 23.00 and the associations between variables were sought by applying chi-square test, with p< 0.05 set as cut-off for level of significance.
- 4. RESULTS: The demographic characteristics of three hundred & ninety respondents are summarized in Table I. There was slight males' preponderance in comparison to females i.e.52.31% males against 47.69% females. The age distribution of respondents was 40.89 ± 3.54 years. The gender wise segregated age distribution was observed as 39.40 ± 4.34 years in males as compared to 42.39 ± 4.85 years in females. Majority of the respondents (95.90%) belonged to Sindh province and the participation from other provinces was only 4.10%. The 43.08% participants were health care providers while 56.92% were related to other occupations as shown in table 1.

**TABLE 1: DEMOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF STUDY PARTICIPANTS** 

DEMOGRAPHIC CHAF	RACTERISTIC	
	Age Groups	Frequencies (%)
	20 - 30 years	228(58.46%)
405	31- 40 years	55 (14.10%)
AGE	41-50 years	54(13.84%)
	51 - 60 years	32 (8.20%)
	> 60 years	21(5.40%)
GENDER		
	Male	204(52.31%)
	Female	186(47.69%)
PROVINCE	•	
	Sindh	374(95.90%)
	Punjab	11(2.82%)
	Balochistan	5(1.28%)
OCCUPATION		
	Health care providers	168(43.08%)
	Other than health care providers	222(56.92%)

**Table No: 2** shows that61.28% of participants said that they want to get COVID 19 vaccination.31.28% of participants said that COVID-19 vaccine provides full protection while others 68.72% said it doesn't provide full protection.46.2% said COVID-9 vaccine safe for all ages. The 42.56% participants were of

opinion that COVID-19 vaccine cause severe side effect. The 12.56% respondents were afraid thatCOVID-19 vaccine cause infertility; while 16.56% thought that these vaccines contain microchips. The 27.44% showed their desire to get vaccinated after recovery of COVID -19.

TABLE 2: COMMUNITY INSIGHTS REGARDING COVID-19 VACCINE n = 390

Variable		Frequenc	%
		у	
		(390)	
Want to get COVD-19 vaccination	Yes	239	61.28%
	No	151	38.72%
COVID-19 vaccine provides full protection	Yes	122	31.28%
	No	268	68.72%
COVID-9 vaccine is safe for all ages	Yes	180	46.15%
	No	210	53.85%
COVID-19 has undergone adequate test	Yes	153	39.23%
	No	237	60.77%
COVID-19 vaccine causes severe side	Yes	166	42.56%
effects	No	224	57.44%
COVID-19 vaccine causes infertility	Yes	49	12.56%
	No	145	37.18%
	Not sure	196	50.26%
	Yes	117	30.00%
COVID 19 vaccine causes death	No	273	70.00%
COVID-19 vaccine contains a microchip	Yes	63	16.15%

	No	327	83.85%
COVID-19 vaccine can make sick with corona	Yes	166	42.56%
virus	No	224	57.44%
Still need to get vaccinated after recovery of	Yes	107	27.44%
COVID -19	No	34	8.72%
	Not had COVID 19	249	63.84%

**Table No:3** shows the significant associations between the desire to get vaccination with participants age & their occupation (p- value < 0.01). Gender of participants revealed consistent in significant association with desire to get vaccination (p= 0.35), vaccine providing complete protection against COVID-19 (p = 0.52), vaccine safety for all ages (p= 0.13) and

participants opinion about prior adequate testing of vaccine (p= 0.23). Contrasting to this, segregation of study participants into health care providers & other occupations consistently depicted significant associations with all the variables related to their opinion regarding uptake of vaccine i.e. p= < 0.01.

TABLE NO 3: SSOCIATION BETWEEN SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE AND VIEWS ABOUT COVID-19 VACCINE SAFETY

SOCIO- DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	Do you want to get CO n=390	p-values	
AGE	Yes	No	
20 -30 years	160 (70.18%)	68 (29.82%)	
31 – 40 years	30 (54.55%)	25 (45.45%)	
41 -50 years	27 (50.00%)	27 (50.00%)	< 0.01*
51 -60 years	12 (37.50%)	20 (62.50%)	
> 60 years	10 (47.62%)	11 (52.38%)	
GENDER			
Male	120 (58.82%)	84 (41.18%)	0.35
Female	119 (63.98%)	67 (36.02%)	
OCCUPATION			
Health care providers	136 (80.95%)	32 (19.05%)	< 0.01*
Other than health care	101 (45.50%	121 (54.50%)	
providers	,	,	
	Do you think COVID-	19 vaccine provides	
	full protection?		
AGE			
20 – 30 years	75 (32.89%)	153 (67.11%)	
31 – 40 years	17 (30.91%)	38 (69.09%	
41 – 50 years	19 (35.18%	35 (64.82%)	0.24
51 – 60 years	9 (28.12%)	23 (71.88%)	
> 60 years	2 (9.52%)	19 (90.48%)	
GENDER			
Male	64 (31.37%)	140 (68.63%)	0.52
Female	58 (31.18%)	128 (68.82%)	
OCCUPATION			
Health care providers	66 (39.28%)	102 (60.72%)	

Other than health care providers	56 (25.23%)	166 (74.77%)	< 0.01*
	Do you think COVID-		
	all ages?		
AGE			
20 – 30 years	112 (49.12%)	116 (50.88%)	
31 – 40 years	24 (43.63%)	31 (56.36%)	
41 – 50 years	25 (46.29%)	29 (53.71%)	0.41
51 – 60 years	13 (40.63%)	19 (59.37%)	
> 60	6 (28.58%)	15 (71.42%)	
GENDER			
Male	100 (49.02%)	104 (50.98%)	0.13
Female	80 (43.01%)	106 (56.99%)	
OCCUPATION			
Health care providers	102 (60.72%)	66 (39.28%)	
Other than health care	78 (35.13%)	144 (64.87%)	< 0.001*
providers			
		/ID-19 has undergone	
	adequate test?		
AGE			
20 – 30 years	100 (43.85%)	128 ( 56.15%)	
31 – 40 years	23 (41.82%)	32 (58.18%)	
41 – 50 years	15 (27.78%)	39 (72.22%)	0.10
51 – 60 years	10 (31.25%)	22(68.75%)	
> 60 years	4 (19.05%)	17 (80.95%)	
GENDER			
Male	76(37.25%)	128(62.75%)	0.23
Female	77 (41.39%)	109(58.60%)	
OCCUPATION			
Health care providers	85 (50.59%)	83(49.41%)	
Other than health care	68(30.64%)	154(69.36%)	< 0.001*
providers			

Table No 4 shows that associations between nature of occupation & perceived health hazards of COVID -19 vaccine ere all statistically significant (p <0.001) except the perception that COVID-19 vaccines contain the microchip for population tracking (p=0.38). the gender of the

respondents showed no significant association with any of the perceived health hazards; while age of the respondents revealed significant results with perceptions of the respondents that the vaccine may lead to death (p< 0.001).

TABLE NO 4: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE AND VIEWS ABOUT PERCEIVED HEALTH HAZARDS OF COVID-19 VACCINE

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC	Do you think that COVID_19 vaccine cause				
PROFILE	severe side effect?	p -			
	n=390 value				
AGE	Do you think that COVID_19 vaccine cause severe side effect?				
	n=390				
	YES	NO			
20 – 30 years	84 (36.85%)	144 (63.15%)			

04 40	06	( 44 040()	00 (50.400()		
31 – 40 years 23		, ,	32 (58.19%)		
41 – 50 years       28         51 – 60 years       19         > 60 years       12		,	26 (48.15%)	0.33	
			13 (40.63%)	0.33	
> 60 years	12	2 (57.15%)	9 (42.85%)		
GENDER	00	(42.620/)	11E / EC 200/ \	0.65	
Male Female	89	,	115 (56.38%)	0.65	
OCCUPATION		' (41.39%)	109 (58.61%)		
Health care provide	ders 47	/ (27.070/)	121 (72.03%)	I	
Other than health	I I	(27.97%) 9 (53.61%)	103 (46.39%)	< 0.00	
		e causes infertility?	103 (40.39%)	< 0.00	
AGE	Yes	No	Not sure		
20 -30 years	20(8.78%)	95 (41.66%)	113(49.56%)		
31 – 40 years	10 (18.19%)	15 (27.27%)	30 (54.54%)		
41 -50 years	9 (16.66%)	20 (37.05%)	25 (46.29%)	0.14	
51 -60 years	5 (15.62%)	11 (34.37%)	16( 50.01%)		
> 60 years	5 (23.82%)	4 (19.04%)	12 (57.14%)		
GENDER	, ,				
Male	26 (12.75%)	74 ( 36.27%)	104 (50.98%)	0.92	
Female	23 (12.36%)	71 (38.17%)	92 (49.47%)		
OCCUPATION					
Health care	10 (5.95%)	80 (47.63%)	78 (46.42%)		
providers	(47.500()	05 (00 070()	(40/50 450/)	< 0.00	
Other than health care providers	39 (17.58%)	65 (29.27%)	118(53.15%)		
	⊥ it COVID - 19 vacci	ne can cause death?			
•					
AGE		Yes	No		
20 -30 years		42 (18.43%)	186 (81.57%)		
31 – 40 years		24 (43.63%)	31 (56.37%)		
31 – 40 years 41 -50 years		24 (43.63%) 24 (44.45%)	31 (56.37%) 30 (55.55%)	<	
		\ /	\ /	< 0.001*	
41 -50 years		24 (44.45%)	30 (55.55%)		
41 -50 years 51 -60 years		24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%)		
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years		24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%)		
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER		24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%)		
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER Male		24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%) 68 (33.34%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%) 136 (66.66%)	0.001*	
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER Male Female	ders	24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%) 68 (33.34%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%) 136 (66.66%)	0.001*	
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER Male Female OCCUPATION		24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%) 68 (33.34%) 49 (26.35%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%) 136 (66.66%) 137 (73.65%)	0.001*	
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER Male Female OCCUPATION Health care provid Other than health Do you think tha	care providers	24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%) 68 (33.34%) 49 (26.35%) 24 (14.28%) 93 (41.89%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%) 136 (66.66%) 137 (73.65%) 144 (85.72%)	0.001*	
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER Male Female OCCUPATION Health care provid	care providers	24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%) 68 (33.34%) 49 (26.35%) 24 (14.28%) 93 (41.89%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%) 136 (66.66%) 137 (73.65%) 144 (85.72%) 129 (58.11%)	0.001*	
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER Male Female OCCUPATION Health care provid Other than health Do you think tha	care providers	24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%) 68 (33.34%) 49 (26.35%) 24 (14.28%) 93 (41.89%) e contains a Microchi	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%)  136 (66.66%) 137 (73.65%)  144 (85.72%) 129 (58.11%)  p to track population?	0.001*	
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER Male Female OCCUPATION Health care provided of the control of the c	care providers	24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%) 68 (33.34%) 49 (26.35%) 24 (14.28%) 93 (41.89%) e contains a Microchi Yes	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%)  136 (66.66%) 137 (73.65%)  144 (85.72%) 129 (58.11%)  p to track population? No	0.001*	
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER Male Female OCCUPATION Health care provide Other than health Do you think that AGE 20 -30 years	care providers	24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%) 68 (33.34%) 49 (26.35%) 24 (14.28%) 93 (41.89%) e contains a Microchi Yes 32 (14.04%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%)  136 (66.66%) 137 (73.65%)  144 (85.72%) 129 (58.11%)  p to track population?  No  196 (85.96%)	0.001*	
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER Male Female OCCUPATION Health care provid Other than health Do you think tha AGE 20 -30 years 31 - 40 years	care providers	24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%) 68 (33.34%) 49 (26.35%)  24 (14.28%) 93 (41.89%)  e contains a Microchi Yes 32 (14.04%) 10 (18.19%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%)  136 (66.66%) 137 (73.65%)  144 (85.72%) 129 (58.11%)  p to track population?  No 196 (85.96%) 45 (81.81%)	0.001*	
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER Male Female OCCUPATION Health care provid Other than health Do you think tha AGE 20 -30 years 31 - 40 years 41 -50 years	care providers	24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%) 68 (33.34%) 49 (26.35%) 24 (14.28%) 93 (41.89%) e contains a Microchi Yes 32 (14.04%) 10 (18.19%) 12 (22.22%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%)  136 (66.66%) 137 (73.65%)  144 (85.72%) 129 (58.11%)  p to track population?  No  196 (85.96%) 45 (81.81%) 42 (77.78%)	0.001* 0.13 <0.001*	
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER Male Female OCCUPATION Health care provid Other than health Do you think tha AGE 20 -30 years 31 - 40 years 41 -50 years 51 -60 years	care providers	24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%) 68 (33.34%) 49 (26.35%) 24 (14.28%) 93 (41.89%) e contains a Microchi Yes 32 (14.04%) 10 (18.19%) 12 (22.22%) 7 (21.87%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%)  136 (66.66%) 137 (73.65%)  144 (85.72%) 129 (58.11%)  p to track population?  No  196 (85.96%) 45 (81.81%) 42 (77.78%) 25 (78.13%)	0.001* 0.13 0.001*	
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER Male Female OCCUPATION Health care provid Other than health Do you think tha AGE 20 -30 years 31 - 40 years 41 -50 years > 60 years	care providers	24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%) 68 (33.34%) 49 (26.35%) 24 (14.28%) 93 (41.89%) e contains a Microchi Yes 32 (14.04%) 10 (18.19%) 12 (22.22%) 7 (21.87%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%)  136 (66.66%) 137 (73.65%)  144 (85.72%) 129 (58.11%)  p to track population?  No  196 (85.96%) 45 (81.81%) 42 (77.78%) 25 (78.13%)	0.001* 0.13 0.001*	
41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER Male Female OCCUPATION Health care provid Other than health Do you think tha AGE 20 -30 years 31 - 40 years 41 -50 years 51 -60 years > 60 years GENDER	care providers	24 (44.45%) 16 (50.00%) 11 (52.38%)  68 (33.34%) 49 (26.35%)  24 (14.28%) 93 (41.89%)  e contains a Microchi Yes 32 (14.04%) 10 (18.19%) 12 (22.22%) 7 (21.87%) 2 (9.53%)	30 (55.55%) 16 (50.00%) 10 (47.62%)  136 (66.66%) 137 (73.65%)  144 (85.72%) 129 (58.11%)  p to track population?  No 196 (85.96%) 45 (81.81%) 42 (77.78%) 25 (78.13%) 19 (90.47%)	0.001*  0.13  <0.001*  0.42	

Health care providers	24	(14.28%)	144	(85.72%)	
Other than health care providers	39	(17.56%)	183	(82.44%)	0.38

Table No 5 consistently reveals significant associations with occupational status of participants and their views regarding COVID-19 vaccine uptake (p < 0.001) while other

demographic variables consistently show insignificant results for the same outcome variables.

TABLE NO 5: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE AND VIEWS ABOUT COVID-19 VACCINE UPTAKE

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	Do you think th you sick with cor n=390		vaccine can make	p - value
AGE	Yes		No	0.10
20 -30 years	80 (35.08%)		148 (64.92%)	
31 – 40 years	28 (50.91%)		27 (49.09%)	
41 -50 years	30 (55.55%)		24 (44.45%)	
51 -60 years	18 (56.25%)		14 (43.75%)	
> 60 years	10 (47.2%)		11 (52.38%)	
GENDER				
Male	82 (40.19%)		122 (59.81%)	0.32
Female	84 (45.16%)		102 (54.84%)	
OCCUPATION				
Health care providers	46 (27.38%)		122 (72.62%)	< 0.001*
Other than health care providers	120 (54.06%)		102 (45.94%)	
	If you have alrea	dy had COVID-	-19 and recovered,	
AGE	do you think you	still need to ge	et vaccinated?	
	Yes	No	Not Had COVID-19	
20 – 30 years	69 (30.26%)	17 (7.46%)	142 (62.28%)	0.27
31 – 40 years	16 (29.09%)	2 (3.64%)	37 (67.27%)	
41 – 50 years	11 (20.37%)	6 (11.11%)	37 (68.52%)	
51 – 60 years	6 (18.75%)	6(18.75%)	20 (62.50%)	
> 60 years	5 (23.81%)	3(14.28%)	13 (61.91%)	
GENDER				
Male	55 (26.96%)	18(8.83%)	131 (64.21%)	0.97
Female	52 (27.95%)	16(8.61%)	118(63.44%)	
OCCUPATION				
Health care provider	67(39.88%)	12 (7.15%)	89 ( 52.87%)	< 0.001*
Other than health care providers	40(18.01%)	22(9.91%)	160(72.07%)	

# 5. DISCUSSION:

Vaccines are the most optimal public health strategy to prevent infectious diseases <sup>[12]</sup>. The study aimed to link vaccine hesitancy with related conspiracy thinking of consumers.

Despite the fact that vaccination is considered as successful contributor to improvement of health and prevention of diseases, vaccine hesitancy contributes towards reduced uptake [13]

Encouragingly, the current study showed that 61.28% of total population wants to get COVID-19 vaccination. Increased vaccine acceptance in relation to vaccine effectiveness was found in other studies. [14] Among them 70% (p<0.001) of young population wanted to get vaccination; Salam et al in their study conducted in eleven counties also endorsed the same findings reporting age of study subjects as being significant factor contributing towards desire to get vaccinated [15]. In this study female (63.97%) participants were found willing to get vaccination than male while males were the most common recipients of COVID-19 vaccine in another study [15]

This study shows that majority of the health care providers i.e. 80.95% wanted to get COVID 19 vaccination that revealed statistically significant difference in distribution of health care providers and particpants related to other occupation (p<0.001) as they are at higher risk of get infected with COVID 19. Study of indonesia( Harapan) also support this study [16]. Another systematic review involving eight studies regarding acceptancce of COVID 19 vaccine conducted on healthcare workers and three surveys reported vaccine acceptance rates below 60%, with the highest rate being among doctors in Israel (78.1%) and the lowest vaccine acceptance rate (27.7%) reported among healthcare workers in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). Among the three studies conducted on parents/guardians, the vaccine acceptance rates were more than 70%. Similarly, two studies conducted in Malta on the university students revealed the vaccine acceptance rate as 57.3%; in this study the

university staff was excluded. The study conducted by Salam et al however showed the vaccine acceptance rate as 86.1% in Italy [15]. The wide spread continuum of any vaccine uptake largely depends upon the level of acceatability of latter by the community [17].

Widespread online misinformation has been observed during current pandemic period and could seriously intimidate vaccine acceptance in countries where accurate evidence-based information is not readily accessible [18]. To combat this situation, it is necessary to have a complete knowledge about the demographics of those who pose refusal towards a newly introduced vaccine [19].

Encouragingly, the prevalence of belief towards the COVID 19 vaccine providing full protection was 31.28%; overall concern towards vaccine causing side effects was 42.56%. Among study subjects 58.18 % participant of age group 31 years to 40 years, 56.38 % males, 58.61% females and 72.03% of health care providers ere of the opinion that COVID-19 vaccine does not cause severe side effects. While 36.27 % males38.17% female and 47.42% health care providers stated that COVID-19 vaccine does not cause infertility. The views of health care providers however were statistically significant (p<0.001). Responding to the query regarding microchip attached with the COVID-19 vaccine for tracking the population, 84.32% of males and 85.72% of the health care providers rejected this perception. Contrasting to this another study conducted in Jordon and Kuwait by sallam et al showed that around one-quarter of the study subjects dealt it as misinformation that COVID

19 vaccines causes infertility and it is used to implant microchips into humans or as a population-control scheme [20].

Concerning the claim that the vaccine can cause death, 81.57% of subjects of 20-30 years of age, 66.66% males,73, 65% female and 85.72% health care providers rejected this claim with the p-values as p <0.001, p=0.13 and p< 0.001 respectively. This is a very important piece of information arising from current study because it has been observed that understanding who will take up a vaccine, who plans not to or are uncertain, and why, is critical to designing a successful vaccination programme [21].

The current study showed 42.60% prevalence of the perception that COVID-19 vaccine can cause or enhance the disease in which 35.08% participants were younger than thirty years (p= 0.10), 40.19% were males against 45.16% females (p=0.32), 27.38% health care providers (p<0.001).

Another study with similar objectives showed 82.7% respondent thought about possibility of being re-infected after recovering from a previous COVID-19 infection and 1.1% respondent said they already had COVID-19, so they think they are immune to the disease [14]. Vaccine-associated enhanced disease has been rarely encountered with existing vaccines. [22].

Taken as a whole, the main reasons given for vaccine hesitancy among community are fears about side effects (infertility) and future adverse effects (i.e. death, microchip installation for tracking population) of a COVID-19 vaccine. Study on international survey among low and middle countries The main reasons of vaccine refusal were fear of side effects (41.2%) and

participants from Asian countries (Malaysia, Thailand, and Bangladesh) recorded a high percentage for fear of COVID-19 vaccine side effects <sup>[14]</sup>. Study of Lucia VC et all also showed the similar contributing factors to vaccine hesitancy that were concerns about serious vaccine side effects and lack of the information <sup>[23]</sup>. The results relating to uncertainty and misconceptions about COVID-19 point to areas that could be usefully targeted by public information campaigns <sup>[24]</sup>.

### 6. STRENGTH:

This is the first large representative study conducted in Pakistan about vaccine uptake or hesitancy and the reasons about why a COVID-19 vaccine has been accepted or refused. The results inferred from this study may be utilized in formulation of behavior change strategies in community so as to enhance the COVID-19 uptake.

## 7. CONCLUSION:

The study conducted on three hundred & ninety respondents consistently reveals the significant association between the positive views of the health care providers and the other study subjects with the p-values lesser than 0.001. The study concludes that other sociodemographic fabric of the community showed varied effect on COVID 19 vaccine uptake intentions and hesitancy.

### 8. Recommendations:

1. The broad based qualitative research is strongly recommended in order to better seek the community insights & perceptions regarding this public health issue.

2. The large number of Community people although want to get vaccinated against covid-19, still there is a widespread prevalent doubts about this vaccine as being not so safe for them. Such type of doubts among community necessitate that some counselling sessions be conducted in order to remove uncertainties among common people. Motivations of people need to be raised so as to increase the coverage of covid-19 vaccination.

#### Institutional Review Board Statement

## **REFERENCE:**

- Huang, C.; Wang, Y.; Li, X.; Ren, L.; Zhao, J.; Hu, Y.; Zhang, L.; Fan, G.; Xu, J.; Gu, X.; et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet* 2020, 395, 497–506. [CrossRef]
- World Health Organization. WHO
  Director-General's Opening Remarks at
  the Media Briefing on COVID-19—11
  March. Available online:
  https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/
  who-director-general-sopening-remarksat-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11march-2020 (accessed on 13 April
  2020).
- Wang J, Jing R, Lai X, Zhang H, Lyu Y, Knoll MD, Fang H. Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccination during the COVID-19 Pandemic in China. Vaccines (Basel). 2020 Aug 27;8(3):482. doi:

Ethics approval was obtained from Liaquat University of Medical and Health Sciences Institutional Review Board.

#### Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

## **Data Availability Statement**

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, RAFAINA SHAH., upon reasonable request.

- 10.3390/vaccines8030482. PMID: 32867224; PMCID: PMC7565574.
- Lurie N, Saville M, Hatchett R, Halton J. Developing Covid-19 vaccines at pandemic speed. New England Journal of Medicine. 2020 May 21;382(21):1969-73.
- 5. Yang, Y.; Peng, F.; Wang, R.; Guan, K.; Jiang, T.; Xu, G.; Sun, J.; Chang, C. The deadly coronaviruses: The 2003 SARS pandemic and the 2020 novel coronavirus epidemic in China. J. Autoimmun. 2020, 109, 102434. [CrossRef]
- Wirsiy FS, Nkfusai CN, Ako-Arrey DE, Dongmo EK, Manjong FT, Cumber SN. Acceptability of COVID-19 Vaccine in Africa. International Journal of Maternal and Child Health and AIDS. 2021;10(1):134.
- 7. Larson HJ, Clarke RM, Jarrett C, et al. Measuring trust in vaccination: a

- systematic review. Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2018;14 (7):1599–1609.
- doi:10.1080/21645515.2018.1459252
- 8. Setbon M. Raude J. Factors vaccination intention against the pandemic influenza A/H1N1. Eur J **Public** Health. 2010;20 (5):490-494.doi:10.1093/eurpub/ckq054. Xiao Χ, Wong RM. Vaccine hesitancy and perceived behavioral control: a meta-analysis. Vaccine. 2020;38(33):5131-5138. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.04.076
- Gidengil CA, Parker AM, Zikmund-Fisher BJ. Trends in risk perceptions and vaccination intentions: a longitudinal study of the first year of the H1N1 pandemic. Am J Public Health. 2012;102(4):672–679. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300407
- 10. Al-Mohaithef M, Padhi BK. Determinants of COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance in Saudi Arabia: A Web-Based National Survey. J Multidiscip Healthc. 2020 Nov 20;13:1657-1663. doi: 10.2147/JMDH.S276771. PMID: 33262600; PMCID: PMC7686470
- Razai MS, Osama T, McKechnie DG,
   Majeed A. Covid-19 vaccine hesitancy among ethnic minority groups.
- Piltch-Loeb R, DiClemente R. The vaccine uptake continuum: Applying social science theory to shift vaccine hesitancy. Vaccines. 2020 Mar;8(1):76

- Riad A, Pokorná A, Attia S, Klugarová J, Koščík M, Klugar M. Prevalence of COVID-19 Vaccine Side Effects among Healthcare Workers in the Czech Republic. Journal of Clinical Medicine. 2021 Jan;10(7):1428.
- 14. Bono SA, Faria de Moura Villela E, Siau CS, Chen WS, Pengpid S, Hasan MT, Sessou P, Ditekemena JD, Amodan BO, Hosseinipour MC, Dolo H. Factors affecting COVID-19 vaccine acceptance: An international survey among Low-and Middle-Income Countries. Vaccines. 2021 May;9(5):515.
- Sallam M. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy worldwide: a concise systematic review of vaccine acceptance rates. Vaccines. 2021 Feb;9(2):160.
- 16. Harapan H, Wagner AL, Yufika A, Winardi W, Anwar S, Gan AK, Setiawan AM, Rajamoorthy Y, Sofyan H, Mudatsir M. Acceptance of a COVID-19 vaccine in Southeast Asia: a cross-sectional study in Indonesia. Frontiers in public health. 2020;8.
- Gostin, L.O.; Ratzan, S.C.; Bloom, B.R. Safe. Vaccinations for a Healthy Nation: Increasing US VaccineCoverage Through Law, Science, and Communication. Jama 2019, 321, 1969–1970.)
- 18. Ditekemena JD, Nkamba DM, Mavoko AM, Hypolite M, Siewe Fodjo JN, Luhata C, Obimpeh M, Van Hees S, Nachega JB, Colebunders R. COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the Democratic Republic

- of Congo: a cross-sectional survey. Vaccines. 2021 Feb;9(2):153.
- Bond, L.; Nolan, T. Making sense of perceptions of risk of diseases and vaccinations: A qualitative study combining models of health beliefs, decision-making and risk perception. BMC Public Health 2011, 11, 943.).
- 20. Sallam M, Dababseh D, Eid H, Al-Mahzoum K, Al-Haidar A, Taim D, Yaseen A, Ababneh NA, Bakri FG, Mahafzah A. High rates of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and its association with conspiracy beliefs: A study in Jordan and Kuwait among other Arab countries. Vaccines. 2021 Jan;9(1):42.
- 21. WHO. Vaccines and immunization:
  World Health Organisation; 2020
  [Available from:
  <a href="https://www.who.int/health-topics/vaccines-and-immunization">https://www.who.int/health-topics/vaccines-and-immunization</a>.)
- 22. Haynes BF, Corey L, Fernandes P, Gilbert PB, Hotez PJ, Rao S, Santos MR, Schuitemaker H, Watson M, Arvin A. Prospects for a safe COVID-19 vaccine. Science translational medicine. 2020 Nov 4;12(568).
- 23. Lucia VC, Kelekar A, Afonso NM. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among medical students. Journal of Public Health (Oxford, England). 2020 Dec 26.
- 24. Faasse K, Newby J. Public perceptions of COVID-19 in Australia: perceived risk, knowledge, health-protective behaviors, and vaccine intentions. Frontiers in psychology. 2020;11)